UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 108—PART 1

JANUARY 10, 1962, TO FEBRUARY 1, 1962
(PAGES 1 TO 1420)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1962

J
11
.R
V.108
pt.1

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 10, 1962

The 10th day of January being the day prescribed by Public Law 348, 87th Congress, 1st session, for the meeting of the 2d session of the 87th Congress, the Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, Vice President of the United States, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, in whose being is all life's meaning and in whose will alone is our peace: We beseech Thee, as the Congress convenes, to give every Member of both bodies, and to all who serve in any capacity in this shrine of each patriot's devotion, a vision splendid of the rich heritage with which the Republic stands in this testing day before the whole world.

We lift our Te Deum that in spite of our denials and betrayals the glory is still there, enlightening the earth, and that we are called to let its radiance shine through us. We did not create it. It was bequeathed to us by God-fearing men and women whose spirits are in the cloud of witnesses surrounding us this hour, as there are faced by Thy servants in this Chamber problems as vexing as any the elected representatives of the Nation have ever been called upon to solve.

Give us to realize that the defense of our faith in Thee, which is the victory that overcometh the world, and in the supremacy of spiritual verities, depends at last, not on any economic, military, scientific, or educational resource, but upon a passion, which burns like fire in our bones, to translate our religious faith into the acts of our daily life, at home and in our global stewardship. Increase our dedication to that holy calling, as we march to the drumbeat of Thy truth. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DEATH OF SENATOR STYLES BRIDGES, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, it is with profound sorrow and a deep sense of personal grief that I discharge the duty of officially informing the Senate of the death of my beloved friend and senior colleague, Senator STYLES BRIDGES, who departed this life on November 26, during the adjournment of the Congress.

Before the adjournment today, the usual resolution of respect and tribute to his memory will be offered.

It is my understanding that the majority leader will shortly seek unanimous consent for a fixed hour and day, next week, when Senators may pay their tributes to the memory of the late Senator BRIDGES. It is hoped that Senators will, so far as possible, reserve their tributes for that occasion, because, I would inform the Senate, the widow, the mother, and other members of the family of Senator BRIDGES, will be present at that time.

SENATOR FROM NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, it is my privilege and honor, as a Senator from New Hampshire, to send to the desk the official certificate of the appointment of MAURICE J. MURPHY, JR., as a Senator from New Hampshire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The certificate of appointment will be read.

The legislative clerk read the following certificate:

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that, pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of New Hampshire, I, Wesley Powell, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint MAURICE J. MURPHY, JR., a Senator from said State, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the death of STYLES BRIDGES, is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness: His excellency our Governor, Wesley Powell, and our seal hereto affixed at Concord, N.H., this 7th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1961.

WESLEY POWELL,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] ROBERT L. STARK,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The certificate will be filed.

If the Senator designate will present himself at the desk to take the oath, the oath will be administered to him.

Mr. MURPHY, escorted by Mr. COTTON, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President, and was subscribed by him.

LIST OF SENATORS BY STATES

Alabama.—Lister Hill and John J. Sparkman.

Alaska.—E. L. Bartlett and Ernest Gruening.

Arizona.—Carl Hayden and Barry Goldwater.

Arkansas.—John L. McClellan and J. W. Fulbright.

California.—Thomas H. Kuchel and Clair Engle.

Colorado.—Gordon Allott and John A. Carroll.

Connecticut.—Prescott Bush and Thomas J. Dodd.

Delaware.—John J. Williams and J. Caleb Boggs.

Florida.—Spessard L. Holland and George A. Smathers.

Georgia.—Richard B. Russell and Herman E. Talmadge.

Hawaii.—Hiram L. Fong and Oren E. Long.

Idaho.—Henry C. Dworshak and Frank Church.

Illinois.—Paul H. Douglas and Everett McKinley Dirksen.

Indiana.—Homer E. Capehart and Vance Hartke.

Iowa.—Bourke B. Hickenlooper and Jack Miller.

Kansas.—Andrew F. Schoeppel and Frank Carlson.

Kentucky.—John S. Cooper and Thruston B. Morton.

Louisiana.—Allen J. Ellender and Russell B. Long.

Maine.—Margaret Chase Smith and Edmund S. Muskie.

Maryland.—John Marshall Butler and J. Glenn Beall.

Massachusetts.—Leverett Saltonstall and Benjamin A. Smith II.

Michigan.—Pat McNamara and Philip A. Hart.

Minnesota.—Hubert H. Humphrey and Eugene J. McCarthy.

Mississippi.—James O. Eastland and John Stennis.

Missouri.—Stuart Symington and Edward V. Long.

Montana.—Mike Mansfield and Lee Metcalf.

Nebraska.—Roman L. Hruska and Carl T. Curtis.

Nevada.—Alan Bible and Howard W. Cannon.

New Hampshire.—Norris Cotton and Maurice J. Murphy, Jr.

New Jersey.—Clifford P. Case and Harrison A. Williams, Jr.

New Mexico.—Dennis Chavez and Clinton P. Anderson.

New York.—Jacob K. Javits and Kenneth B. Keating.

North Carolina.—Sam J. Ervin, Jr. and B. Everett Jordan.

North Dakota.—Milton R. Young and Quentin N. Burdick.

Ohio.—Frank J. Lausche and Stephen M. Young.

Oklahoma.—Robert S. Kerr and A. S. Mike Monroney.

Oregon.—Wayne Morse and Maurine B. Neuberger.

Pennsylvania.—Joseph S. Clark and Hugh Scott.

Rhode Island.—John O. Pastore and Claiborne Pell.

South Carolina.—Olin D. Johnston and Strom Thurmond.

South Dakota.—Karl E. Mundt and Francis Case.

Tennessee.—Estes Kefauver and Albert Gore.

Texas.—Ralph W. Yarborough and John G. Tower.

Utah.—Wallace F. Bennett and Frank E. Moss.

Vermont.—George D. Aiken and Winston L. Prouty.

Virginia.—Harry Flood Byrd and A. Willis Robertson.

Washington.—Warren G. Magnuson and Henry M. Jackson.

West Virginia.—Jennings Randolph and Robert C. Byrd.

Wisconsin.—Alexander Wiley and William Proxmire.

Wyoming.—Gale W. McGee and J. J. Hickey.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 1]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Bush
Butler
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Capehart
Carlson
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Case, S. Dak.
Chavez
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Dworshak
Ellender
Engle
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hickey
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan
Keating
Kefauver
Kerr
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, Hawaii
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith, Mass.
Smith, Maine
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Wiley
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Schoeppel] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. Neuberger in the chair). A quorum is present.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 228), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

> *Resolved,* That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair appoints the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], and the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], as the members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 229), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

> *Resolved,* That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 230), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

> *Resolved,* That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian unless otherwise ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—JOINT SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we are returning to a substantial calendar of business. There is much committee work to be done, a number of bills already on the calendar to be disposed of in the coming weeks, and legislation of national and international significance to be considered later in the session. I hope the period of recess has been a fruitful one, and that each Senator returns full of vigor and enthusiasm for the task ahead of us.

As is our custom, we will delay the transaction of routine business until the President has delivered his state of the Union address tomorrow. When we return to this Chamber, it will be in order for Senators to introduce bills and make such remarks as they see fit. I do not anticipate that any major legislation will be considered this week. It is my intention tomorrow, at the conclusion of business, to move that the Senate adjourn until Monday.

On Monday, the Senate will proceed to consider Calendar No. 1080, H.R. 8847, the so-called Du Pont tax bill. This is in accord with the action of the Senate on September 26, 1961, and with statements made by the leadership at that time. We appreciate the fact that the situation in regard to this matter, so far as it involves the rendering of a decision by the Federal district court, has not appreciably changed since September 26. Nevertheless, we are obliged to move to consider the bill on Monday next, in order to carry out the will of the Senate as expressed in September. We hope the matter can be resolved this time, and I expect it to remain the unfinished business until it is resolved.

The Senate will convene tomorrow at 12 noon, and at 12:10 p.m. will proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear the state of the Union address by the President of the United States. Discussion of routine business in the Senate will be delayed, I repeat, as is customary, until tomorrow when the Senate returns to this Chamber from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

DEATH OF SENATOR STYLES BRIDGES, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE—ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, after conference with the majority leader, it has been determined that beginning on Wednesday, January 17, at the hour of 1:30, Senators may present their eulogies in memory of our late departed comrade, the Senator from New Hampshire, Styles Bridges.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may join in the discussion at this point, I wish to state that the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois, and I did discuss this matter with the Senator from New Hampshire and others interested, and it was agreed that Wednesday next, the 17th of January, beginning at 1:30 p.m., would be the appropriate time for eulogies in memory of our late beloved colleague, Styles Bridges.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution relative to the death of Senator Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 231) as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Honorable Styles Bridges, late a Senator from the State of New Hampshire.
>
> *Resolved,* That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.
>
> *Resolved,* That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution presented by the Senator from New Hampshire is unanimously agreed to.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, in accordance with the third paragraph of the resolution just agreed to, I now move that the Senate adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of my deceased colleague.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 11, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 10, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Honorable Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House.

The CLERK. Members of the House of Representatives, the time has arrived for the meeting of the 2d session of the 87th Congress. Since the last session of Congress the great and beloved Speaker of the House has departed this life.

The Clerk of the House, in conformity with the rules, has called the House to order for the purpose of electing a Speaker. The roll will be called to ascertain whether a quorum is present.

The Clerk will call the roll.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 1]

Celler
Davis, James C.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Derwinski
Dooley
Hoffman, Mich.
Johnson, Md.
Kee
Martin, Nebr.
Michel
O'Konski
Rousselot
Shelley
Ullman
Younger

The CLERK. Four hundred and eleven Members having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER

The CLERK. Nominations for Speaker of the House of Representatives are now in order.

The Clerk recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Clerk, as chairman of the Democratic caucus I am directed by the unanimous vote of that caucus to present for election to the office of Speaker of the House of Representatives the name of the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts.

The CLERK. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] is recognized.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Clerk, by authority, by direction, and by unanimous vote of the Republican conference, I nominate for Speaker of the House of Representatives the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK, a Representative from the State of Indiana.

The CLERK. The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK of Massachusetts and the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK of Indiana have been nominated for Speaker. Are there further nominations? [After a pause.] If there are no further nominations, the Clerk will appoint the following Members to act as tellers: the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON]; the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN]; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK]; and the gentlewoman from Tennessee [Mrs. REECE].

The tellers will please take their places at the desk in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The roll will now be called, and Members responding to their names will indicate by surname the candidate of their choice.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The tellers having taken their places, the House proceeded to vote for Speaker.

The following is the result of the vote:

[Roll No. 2]

McCORMACK—248

Abbitt
Abernethy
Addabbo
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Alford
Andrews
Anfuso
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Bailey
Baring
Barrett
Bass, Tenn.
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Blitch
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Boykin
Brademas
Breeding
Brewster
Brooks
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Coad
Cohelan
Colmer
Cook
Cooley
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, John W.
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Doyle
Dulski
Edmondson
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Friedel
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gilbert
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord, Mo.
Inouye
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Md.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kitchin
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kowalski
Landrum
Lane
Lankford
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Loser
McDowell
McFall
McMillan
McSween
Macdonald
Mack
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Marshall
Matthews
Miller, Clem
Miller, George P.
Mills
Moeller
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Murphy
Murray
Natcher
Nix
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neill
Passman
Patman
Perkins
Peterson
Pfost
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Rains
Randall
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rutherford
Ryan
St. Germain
Santangelo
Saund
Scott
Selden
Sheppard
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tuck
Udall, Morris K.
Vanik
Vinson
Walter
Watts
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Williams
Willis
Winstead
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zelenko

HALLECK—166

Adair
Alger
Andersen, Minn.
Anderson, Ill.
Arends
Ashbrook
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Barry
Bass, N.H.
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brown
Broyhill
Bruce
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clancy
Collier
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Derounian
Devine
Dole
Dominick
Durno
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Fenton
Findley
Fino
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Fulton
Garland
Gavin
Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Gubser
Hall
Halpern
Harrison, Wyo.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Horan
Hosmer
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Judd
Kearns
Keith
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lindsay
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McDonough
McIntire
McVey
MacGregor
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Mathias
May
Meader
Merrow
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Minshall
Moore
Moorehead, Ohio
Morse
Mosher
Nelsen
Norblad
Nygaard
Osmers
Ostertag
Pelly
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Quie
Ray
Reece
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Robison
Roudebush
Rousselot
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Scherer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Springer
Stafford
Taber
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tupper
Utt
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Wallhauser
Weaver
Weis
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Widnall
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.

NOT VOTING—13

Davis, James C.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Derwinski
Dooley
Hoffman, Mich.
Kee
Martin, Nebr.
Michel
O'Konski
Shelley
Ullman
Younger

PRESENT

Halleck
McCormack

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. James C. Davis paired for Mr. McCormack with Mr. Martin of Nebraska paired for Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Shelley paired for Mr. McCormack with Mr. Michel paired for Mr. Halleck.

The CLERK. The tellers agree in their tally. The total number of votes cast was 414, of which the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK received 248, and the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK received 166. Two voted "present." Therefore, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK of Massachusetts is the duly elected Speaker of the House of Representatives for the 87th Congress.

The Clerk appoints the following Members to escort the Speaker-elect to the Chair: The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

(The Doorkeeper announced the Speaker-elect of the House of Representatives, who was escorted to the Chair by the committee of escort.)

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues of the House of Representatives, in my time here I have served under four Speakers—Mr. Byrns of Tennessee, Mr. Bankhead of Alabama, Mr. Rayburn of Texas, and Mr. Martin of Massachusetts, each a great and good man who served with fairness and with complete dedication to the responsibility of the high office of Speaker of the House of Representatives. A year ago in presenting Speaker RAYBURN, whose passing has saddened us all, I said there would be disagreements among us, and that is as it should be so long as in this Republic we have a two-party system. But, people of good will can disagree where disagreement is proper without rancor and without malice.

Now may I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to you Members of the House on the majority side that we on the minority side will not be in a negative position. We shall cooperate as best we can to build the economic and military strength of our country. And if our security should be threatened, we shall prove once again that we are a united, resolute people.

We have now chosen a new Speaker. He may find it a little difficult to move from the tempest and tumult of the floor of the House to the serenity of the Speaker's position, but I daresay he will make the move with dispatch.

So it is my happy privilege to present to you the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, himself a great and good man, a worthy successor of the great Speaker RAYBURN, and one who will carry on, we are all sure, with the honored traditions of this high office he now assumes.

To you, Mr. Speaker, congratulations and best wishes.

The **SPEAKER**. Members of the House of Representatives, my dear friends on both sides of the aisle, and my valued colleagues on both sides of the aisle, occupying my present position as Speaker of the House of Representatives as the result of the death of the late Speaker, our beloved and valiant friend, Mr. RAYBURN of Texas, I express the feeling universally held that Speaker RAYBURN was one of the great Americans and outstanding legislators in our Nation's history. Mr. Speaker RAYBURN was not only a great man, but he was also a good man. If SAM RAYBURN could speak to us today from the Great Beyond, knowing the intense love that each and every one of us have for our country, he would urge us in this trying period of the world's history to carry on with confidence and with unity.

I appreciate very much the generous references made to me by the distinguished minority leader and also my valued friend, because from the day he came here as a new Member, he and I have developed a respect which long ago ripened into true friendship, whose friendship I love and value very much.

I hope, CHARLIE—departing a little from my prepared remarks—that I will have great lateral support from you during this session.

I am most grateful for the action of my Democratic colleagues in the caucus on yesterday in selecting me as their candidate for Speaker of the House of Representatives, and today to my colleagues of the entire House I am most grateful for the honor they have conferred upon me in the action of electing me to this great office.

I profoundly appreciate the high honor of being the presiding officer of this the greatest legislative body in the world, and for this evidence of your great confidence, respect, and friendship I express to you my sincere thanks. In the exercise and performance of the powers and duties of the Speaker, parliamentary or otherwise, I shall perform such duties impartially with fair treatment to all Members in interpreting and enforcing the rules, but above all protecting the rights of all Members without regard to party affiliation.

While as leader in this body of my party, I have my political responsibilities, in the performance of my duties as Speaker, my responsibility is to the House itself and to all of its Members.

As majority leader I always considered that one of my primary duties was to protect the rights, under the rules and also in accordance with the customs of the House, of the minority party. I shall follow that course as Speaker.

This is not the time for extended remarks on my part, and particularly for reference to legislative matters or public questions we must face during this session of the Congress. However, I respectfully request that all Members give me, as far as possible, their understanding cooperation, as well as their tolerant consideration.

There is one brief observation that I consider pertinent to an occasion of this kind and at this time of the world's history. The distinguished minority leader pertinently and effectively also made reference to it.

We are living in a world of strain and tension in which evil forces exist bent on world domination, with resultant enslavement, persecution, and even death itself.

Confining myself to a strong national defense and a firm foreign policy, I am proud that the Congress for years has made a powerful record in these two important fields.

It is evident to all of us that great changes are taking place throughout the world. We must effectively meet the challenges that confront us in this period of world history if we want to have our Nation move forward. We must move forward through the complex shoals of world politics and domestic problems, through a maze of interlocking problems in science and society, which our predecessors in this body could never have contemplated.

Fortunately, as in the case of Presidents in the immediate past, we have in President Kennedy a strong leader who does not shrink from the challenges that confront him, and also, fortunately—and I say this with great pride—we have a Congress that does not shrink from these responsibilities. A strong President and a strong Congress, which fortunately our country and a free world have, working together guarantee ultimate victory for the cause of freedom and liberty. [Applause.]

For a third of a century I have been a Member of this body, and its traditions have become my traditions. Its fellowship is the finest any person could hope to have.

I will abide by the traditions and responsibilities we all hold so firmly.

I will continue to maintain the dignity of the House of Representatives, protecting its prerogatives and maintaining the right and privileges of its members.

So, it is in a very personal way that I conclude my remarks by thanking each and every one of you from the depths of my heart for this great honor that you have conferred upon me. I shall live up to the great traditions of this office, having in mind the contributions made by the Speakers of the past, particularly by the great contributions made by my predecessor.

Again, to you my Democratic colleagues for selecting me in caucus, and to all of my colleagues for electing me in the House, I express to you my deep and sincere thanks. [Applause.]

The Chair requests that the dean of the House of Representatives, my dear and valued friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], administer the oath of office.

(Mr. VINSON then administered the oath of office to Mr. MCCORMACK of Massachusetts.)

The **SPEAKER**. The Chaplain will offer the prayer.

THE PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer: Hebrews 11: 4: *He being dead yet speaketh.*

Almighty God, as we assemble for this 2d session of the 87th Congress, we find ourselves going up and down the sacred courts of memory.

We are calling to mind with deep and fond affection the life and character of the beloved Speaker. As Thou didst not lose him in giving him to us, so we have not lost him by his return to Thee.

Grant that, although absent from us in bodily presence, we may daily feel and hear his spirit urging us to carry on faithfully and courageously.

Gratefully and proudly we are ascribing unto him the words of the inspired poet in praise of the Duke of Wellington—

> Great in council and great in war,
> Foremost captain of his time,
> Rich in saving common sense
> And, as the greatest only are,
> In his simplicity sublime.

We earnestly beseech Thee to bestow upon our President, our newly elected Speaker, and on all our chosen Representatives every needed blessing for the duties of their high vocation.

Hear us as we bow in adoration and unite in offering unto Thee the prayer of the Prince of Peace—

Our Father, Who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name: Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven; give us this day our daily bread; and forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors; and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil; for Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever.

Amen.

MINUTE OF SILENT PRAYER IN MEMORY OF THE LATE SPEAKER RAYBURN

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair asks the Members to remain standing for 1 minute of silent prayer in memory of our late beloved Speaker RAYBURN.

(The House stood in silent prayer for 1 minute.)

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE CLERK

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

JANUARY 10, 1962.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law showing the election of HENRY B. GONZALEZ as a Representative-elect to the 87th Congress from the 20th Congressional District of the State of Texas, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Honorable Paul J. Kilday, has been received and is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

JANUARY 10, 1962.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law showing the election of J. D. (JOE) WAGGONNER, JR., as a Representative-elect to the 87th Congress from the 4th Congressional District of the State of Louisiana, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable Overton Brooks, has been received and is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

JANUARY 10, 1962.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law showing the election of LUCIEN N. NEDZI as a Representative-elect to the 87th Congress from the 1st Congressional District of Michigan, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Honorable Thaddeus M. Machrowicz, has been received and is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. The Members-elect will present themselves at the bar of the House to take the oath of office.

Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. NEDZI, and Mr. WAGGONNER appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

SELECTION OF THE HONORABLE CARL ALBERT AS MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the democratic caucus I am directed to report to the House that the democratic Members have selected as majority leader the gentleman from Oklahoma, the Honorable CARL ALBERT.

NOTIFICATION TO SENATE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 482), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That a message be sent to the Senate to inform that body that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled; that JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, has been elected Speaker; and that the House is ready to proceed with business.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 483

Resolved, That a committee of three Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has assembled and Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of the House has been assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

RESIGNATIONS FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following resignations.

The Clerk read as follows:

DECEMBER 11, 1961.

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On November 8, 1961, I submitted to Gov. Price Daniels, of Texas, my resignation as Representative from the 13th Congressional District in the Congress of the United States, effective December 15, 1961.

Sincerely yours,
FRANK IKARD,
Member of Congress.

DECEMBER 4, 1961.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker pro tempore,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Please be advised that I have today transmitted to the Governor of the State of New York, Nelson A. Rockefeller, my resignation as Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Sixth Congressional District of New York, which said resignation is to take effect as of midnight, December 31, 1961.

With every good wish and kindest and warmest regards, I am,

Sincerely,
LESTER HOLTZMAN.

NOTIFICATION TO PRESIDENT OF ELECTION OF SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 484

Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to inform the President of the United States that the House of Representatives has elected JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

S. RES. 228

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

S. RES. 229

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

S. RES. 231

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Honorable STYLES BRIDGES, late a Senator from the State of New Hampshire.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

DAILY HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 485

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered, the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives shall be at 12 o'clock meridian.

The resolution was agree to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

DECEMBER 13, 1961.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's office at 10:35 a.m., on December 13, 1961, and said to contain the 14th Annual Report of the Housing and Home Finance Agency covering housing activities for the calendar year 1960.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

ANNUAL REPORT, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was

read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 802(a) of the Housing Act of 1954, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the 14th Annual Report of the Housing and Home Finance Agency covering housing activities for the calendar year 1960.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 13, 1961.*

REPORT ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 205)

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 16, 1961.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's office at 11:05 a.m. on October 16, 1961, and said to contain the 42d report to Congress on lend-lease operations for the calendar year 1960.

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the 42d report to Congress on lend-lease operations for the calendar year 1960.

Information on the status of the various lend-lease accounts of our allies of World War II is contained in the report. As explained in previous reports there were two main types of lend-lease procedures under which other countries undertook to reimburse the United States: (1) Settlement agreements whereby the financial undertakings of the other governments were funded on credit terms and (2) arrangements described generally as "cash reimbursement accounts" under which the recipients were to pay the United States in cash at the time the lend-lease goods were provided.

In summary, lend-lease settlement agreements thus far concluded with various governments provide for the eventual payment to the United States of $1,577,570,755.50, plus interest. According to data supplied by the Treasury Department as of December 31, 1960, total collections and credits on these accounts amounted to $751,142,976.96. Payments during 1960 totaled $49,401,368.02. Additionally, on the "cash reimbursement accounts" foreign governments had, as of December 31, 1960, paid $1,301,529,123.32 of the $1,326,934,982.11 owed to the United States. A total of $109,310.00 was received during 1960.

Under the lend-lease program, the United States also loaned 409,782,670.64 fine troy ounces of silver to various countries. As of December 31, 1960, 366,066,067.73 fine troy ounces had been returned. Shipments of silver not assayed by the close of 1960 are not included in this figure.

This report gives an account of the negotiations with the Soviet Government on a settlement for some of the lend-lease aid received from the United States prior to V-J Day. As mentioned in the previous report, the discussions, which began on January 11, 1960, were discontinued on January 27, 1960, because there appeared to be no common ground for continuing. There have been no further developments on this matter.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 16, 1961.*

(Enclosure: 42d report to Congress on lend-lease operations.)

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that he is herewith submitting his resignation as a member of the Committee on Government Operations; the Committee on Science and Astronautics; and also as a member of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.

Without objection the resignations will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 372, of the 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

The Doorkeeper announced the return of the committee to notify the President.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, your committee on the part of the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make has performed its duty.

The President has asked us to report that he will be pleased to deliver his message at 12:30 o'clock p.m., January 11, 1962, to a joint session of the two bodies.

PROVISION FOR JOINT SESSION ON JANUARY 11, 1962

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 402

Resolved, That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on January 11, 1962, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POWER TO DECLARE RECESS ON THURSDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, January 11, 1962, it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PAYMENT OF EXPENSES IN CONNECTION WITH FUNERAL OF THE LATE SPEAKER RAYBURN

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 486

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized and directed to pay all the expenses in connection with the funeral of the late Speaker SAM RAYBURN, and such sum as may be found necessary to carry out the purpose of this resolution shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 487

Resolved, That effective January 10, 1962, there shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, for personal services in the office of the Speaker of the House, an additional basic sum of $10,000 per annum.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EULOGIES FOR THE LATE SPEAKER RAYBURN IN ORDER ON THURSDAY, JANUARY 18, 1962

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, January 18, 1962, after the reading and approval of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table I be permitted to address the House and to yield time to other Members for the purpose of eulogizing our late beloved Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today, and without making the procedure a precedent, all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD and to include pertinent material therewith.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent and approval, the Chair announces that on Thursday, January 11, 1962, the date set for the joint session to hear an address by the President of the United States, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those on his left and right will be open. No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privileges of the floor of the House.

THE LATE HONORABLE LOUIS C. RABAUT

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 488

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT, a Representative from the State of Michigan.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN J. RILEY

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 489

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable JOHN J. RILEY, a Representative from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE HONORABLE STYLES BRIDGES

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 490

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES, a Senator of the United States from the State of New Hampshire.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE HONORABLE SAM RAYBURN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 491

Resolved, That the House has learned with profound sensibility and sorrow of the death of SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-sixth through the Seventy-ninth, Eighty-first and Eighty-second, and Eighty-fourth through the first session of the Eighty-seventh Congress, having served as Speaker more than twice as long as any Speaker in the history of the Congress.

Resolved, That in the death of the Honorable SAM RAYBURN the United States has sustained an irreparable loss.

Resolved, That this House, of which he was a distinguished Member and leader, unite in honoring his sterling character, the ability, probity, and patriotic motives which illustrated his public career, and the grace and dignity which marked his intercourse with his fellow citizens.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, January 11, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The following executive communications were submitted subsequent to the adjournment of the 87th Congress, 1st session, pursuant to Public Law 87-330, and House Resolution 481:

1348. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 31, 1961, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on an interim report on Mississippi River at Guttenberg, Iowa, requested by resolutions of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted September 18, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 286). October 25, 1961, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration (pursuant to Public Law 87-330, approved September 30, 1961).

1349. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 9, 1961, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on Ontonagon Harbor, Mich., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted July 2 and July 16, 1958 (H. Doc. No. 287). October 25, 1961, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations (pursuant to Public Law 87-330, approved September 30, 1961).

1350. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 31, 1961, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of report on Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, channel to Victoria, Tex., requested by resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 3, 1959 (H. Doc. No. 288). October 25, 1961, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration (pursuant to Public Law 87-330, approved September 30, 1961).

1351. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the short form report on audit of the Panama Canal Co., fiscal year 1961, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 289). November 7, 1961, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed (pursuant to H. Res. 481, agreed to September 27 (legislative day, September 26), 1961).

1352. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the audit report of the abaca fiber program, administered by the General Services Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (H. Doc. No. 292). November 17, 1961, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed (pursuant to H. Res. 481, agreed to September 27 (legislative day, September 26), 1961).

1353. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the audit report of the Inland Waterways Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (H. Doc. No. 293). November 17, 1961, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed (pursuant to H. Res. 481, agreed to September 27 (legislative day, September 26), 1961).

1354. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of the Office of Defense Lending, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 294). December 27, 1961, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed (pursuant to H. Res. 481, agreed to September 27 (legislative day, September 26), 1961).

1355. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of the Federal home loan banks for the year ended June 30, 1961, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 295). January 2, 1962, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed (pursuant to H. Res. 481, agreed to September 27 (legislative day, September 26), 1961).

1356. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation for the year ended June 30, 1961 (H. Doc. No. 296). January 4, 1962, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed (pursuant to H. Res. 481, agreed to September 27 (legislative day, September 26), 1961).

1357. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of the Federal Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 297). January 8, 1962, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed (pursuant to H. Res. 481, agreed to September 27 (legislative day, September 26), 1961).

[*Submitted January 10, 1962*]

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1358. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting a list of reports which it is the duty of any officer or department to make to Congress, pursuant to rule III, clause 2, of the Rules of the House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 273); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

1359. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting a report for the period July 1, 1960, to June 30, 1961, pursuant to the provisions of paragraphs 103 and 104 of title 2 of the Code of Laws of the United States, and House Resolution 476 of the 87th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

1360. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report of the activities of the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, pursuant to the provisions of 38 U.S.C. 214 (H. Doc. No. 258); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1361. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Veterans' Canteen Service, Veterans' Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961, pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 4207 (H. Doc. No. 298); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1362. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the year ended June 30, 1961, pursuant to section 17(b) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1827) (H. Doc. No. 299); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1363. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67) (H. Doc. No. 300); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1364. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Crooked River project extension, Oregon, pursuant to section 9(a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) (H. Doc. No. 301); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1365. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the upper division, Baker project, Oregon, pursuant to section 9(a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) (H. Doc. No. 302); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1366. A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the 28th annual report of the Farm Credit Administration on the work of the cooperative farm credit system (including the report of the Federal Farm Credit Board), covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961, pursuant to section 3 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended; paragraph 3, section 4, of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended; the Executive order of March 27, 1933, creating the Farm Credit Administration; and section 6 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (H. Doc. No. 268); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1367. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting copy No. 2 of the statistical supplement, stockpile report, to the Congress, for the period ending June 30, 1961, pursuant to section 4 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act (Public Law 520, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1368. A letter from the Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on the mutual security program, comparison of the fiscal year 1961 program as presented to Congress with the actual program approved, pursuant to section 513 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, on the basis of data available on August 15, 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1369. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of operations, expenditures, and obligations under sections 7 to 14 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and the 1961 fiscal year appropriation act (74 Stat. 236); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1370. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1371. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480, agreements concluded during October 1961, pursuant to provisions of Public Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1372. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480, agreements concluded during November 1961, pursuant to Public Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1373. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, Chairman, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting a report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961, pursuant to provisions of section 3 of the act of Congress approved February 18, 1929 (45 Stat. 1222; 16 U.S.C. 715B); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1374. A letter from the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a report of an overobligation of $776.58 that occurred in one of their allotment accounts on August 31 and September 30, 1960, pursuant to Public Law 759, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1375. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the May 1961 report of the General Sales Manager with regard to each commodity which the Commodity Credit Corporation owns or which it is directed to support; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1376. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the circumstances surrounding the overobligation of an allotment, pursuant to section 3679, Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1377. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting reports on four violations by officers of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1378. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands in the Garfield Water District, Friant-Kern Canal division, Central Valley project, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1379. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriation to the Treasury Department for "Salaries and expenses, U.S. Secret Service," for the fiscal year 1962, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1380. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriation to the Department of Justice for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons," for the fiscal year 1962, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1381. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriation to the Department of Justice for "Support of U.S. prisoners," for the fiscal year 1962, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1382. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for "Grants to States for public assistance" for the fiscal year 1962, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1383. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Resources management," Bureau of Indian Affairs, for the fiscal year 1962, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1384. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Management and protection," National Park Service, for the fiscal year 1962, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1385. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, relative to reporting 16 violations of subsection (h) of overobligations, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665 (i)(2)); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1386. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual report on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program for the period January 1 to June 30, 1961, pursuant to section 4 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act, Public Law 520, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1387. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force transmitting a report of the Air Force military construction contracts awarded by the Department of the Air Force without formal advertising for the period January 1, 1961, through June 30, 1961, pursuant to section 505, Public Law 86–500; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1388. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting the quarterly report of the number of officers assigned or detailed for the first quarter of fiscal year 1962, pursuant to section 8031(c), title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1389. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposition of certain nationals of the United States in foreign countries who are alleged and determined to be of unsound mind, and dangerous to persons or property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1390. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting reports of the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army, and the Army General Staff on September 30, 1961, in compliance with section 3031(c) of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on the Armed Services.

1391. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report on the Department of the Army aviation personnel above the rank of major, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1961, pursuant to the provisions of the First Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act, 1946 (60 Stat. 20; 37 U.S.C. 118a–1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1392. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a proposed draft of legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for confinement and treatment of offenders against the Uniform Code of Military Justice; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1393. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the semiannual report of the Department of the Army contracts for military construction awarded without formal advertisement, covering the period January 1 through June 30, 1961, pursuant to section 505, Public Law 86–500, 86th Congress, 2d session; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1394. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research and Development), transmitting a report on Department of the Army research and development contracts, awarded during the period January 1 through June 30, 1961, pursuant to provisions of section 4, Public Law 557, chapter 882, 82d Congress, 2d session, approved July 16, 1952; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1395. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report "Real and Personal Property of the Department of Defense," as of June 30, 1961, pursuant to the National Security Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1396. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a recommendation to extend the loans of ships to the Governments of Portugal and Spain, pursuant to section 7, Public Law 87–387; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1397. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the first report on property acquisitions for stockpile purposes submitted by the Office of Civil Defense, Department of Defense, for the quarter ending September 30, 1961, and covers items acquired pursuant to the authority transferred to the Secretary of Defense by Executive Order 10952, effective August 1, 1961, pursuant to subsection 201(h), Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1398. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting reports submitted by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force for the period January 1 to June 30, 1961, listing contracts negotiated under authority of sections 2304(a)(11) and 2304(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1399. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1331 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for a different retirement date thereunder for entitlement to retired pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1400. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of proposed disposition of cobalt oxides and cobalt carbonates, in accordance with the provisions of section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b(e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1401. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of proposed disposition of shellac now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to provisions of section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b(e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1402. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of proposed disposition of subspecification chromite ore now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to provisions of section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b(e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1403. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of proposed disposition of subspecification ferrovanadium, pursuant to provisions of section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b(e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1404. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of proposed disposition of subspecification ferromanganese and electrolytic manganese, pursuant to provisions of section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b(e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1405. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of proposed disposition of ferromanganese fines placed in the national stockpile, pursuant to provisions of section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b(e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1406. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the report of actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes, for the quarter ending September 30, 1961, and covering items procured pursuant to the authority transferred to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by Executive Order 10958, effective August 14, 1961, pursuant to subsection 201(h), Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1407. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of rank and age group of the number of officers above the rank of major of the Army and Air Force or lieutenant commander of the Navy during the 6-month period preceding the date of the report, pursuant to Public Law 301, 79th Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1408. A letter from the Adjutant General, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting copies of the annual reports of officers of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, together with a report of audit for the fiscal year ended August 31, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 630, 74th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1409. A letter from the Attorney General transmitting a report presenting a review of the laws and regulations covering the reporting of collusive or identical bids received by Government agencies, and results of continuing review of the outstanding voluntary agreements and programs established under section 708(e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, pursuant to section 708(e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1410. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual report on borrowing authority for June 30, 1961, pursuant to section 304(b) of the Defense Production Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1411. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a copy of the 57th quarterly report covering the third quarter, 1961, pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1412. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics) transmitting the July–September 1961 report on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1413. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics) transmitting the July 1961 report on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1414. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics) transmitting the July–August 1961 report on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1415. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting the report of the Export-Import Bank of Washington as of the close of business June 30, 1961, pursuant to section 9 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1416. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on the progress of the liquidation activities of the national defense, war, and reconversion activities of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, pursuant to the RFC Liquidation Act (Public Law 163, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 230, 231), as amended, and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1417. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report covering the quarterly period ended June 31, 1961, which is the final report to be submitted covering the progress made in liquidating the assets formerly held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which were transferred to the Administrator of Small Business Administration by Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1954 and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957, pursuant to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act, as amended (67 Stat. 230), and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1418. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report covering the progress made in liquidating the assets of the former Reconstruction Finance Corporation which were transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury by Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957, pursuant to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act, as amended (67 Stat. 230), and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1419. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting copies of reports of every institution, organization, corporation, or association other than the U.S. Government, Government of the District of Columbia, and foreign governments, owning property exempt under the provision of section 3, Public Law 846, 77th Congress, approved December 24, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1420. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a suggestion that the bridges and structures built in the District of Columbia be identified as memorials to certain outstanding deceased Members of Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1421. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a list of the institutions or organizations whose properties were specifically exempted by special acts of

Congress prior to the passage of the act of December 24, 1942 (Public Law 846, 77th Cong.), showing the purposes for which such properties were used during the calendar year 1959; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1422. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prohibit the use by collecting agencies and private detective agencies of any name, emblem, or insignia which reasonably tends to convey the impression that any such agency is an agency of the Government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1423. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1924, as amended, and to amend section 6 of the act approved July 2, 1940, as amended, to eliminate requirements that applications for motor vehicle title certificates and certain lien information related thereto be submitted under oath; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1424. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to assess reasonable fees for the restoration of motor vehicle operators' permits and operating privileges after suspension or revocation thereof; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1425. A letter from the Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission, transmitting report showing lands acquired by the Commission during the fiscal year 1961, for the development of the park, parkway, and playground system of the National Capital and its environs in nearby Maryland and Virginia, pursuant to section 4 of the act of Congress of June 6, 1924 (renumbered sec. 13, Public Law 592, approved July 19, 1952); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1426. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting the 48th annual report for the calendar year 1960, pursuant to provisions of paragraphs 14 and 20 of section 8 of an act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, approved March 4, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1427. A letter from the Acting Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, transmitting the annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, pursuant to section 15 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (Public Law 592, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1428. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting draft of proposed legislation to extend the Library Services Act to American Samoa; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1429. A letter from the Secretary of State transmitting a report on the operations of the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West for the fiscal year 1961, pursuant to section 704(c), Public Law 86-472; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1430. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting 16th semiannual report, pursuant to section 1008, Public Law 402, 80th Congress, for the period January 1 to June 30, 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1431. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the activities of the Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, with regard to the disposal of foreign excess property under title IV of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, Public Law 152, 81st Congress, as amended, pursuant to section 404(d) of such act; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1432. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the annual report on administration of functions of the General Services Administration under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1433. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report providing information on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work, or for the manufacture or furnishing of property for experimentation, development, research, or test during the 6-month period ending June 30, 1961, pursuant to section 302(c)(11) of Public Law 152, 81st Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1434. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report covering personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations under section 203(j); and real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions under section 203(k) of that act, pursuant to section 203 (o) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1435. A letter from the Deputy Director for Congressional Relations, International Cooperation Administration, transmitting a copy of a letter to the Comptroller General of the United States, regarding a report (B-133258) to the Speaker, dated June 27, 1961, on an examination of the economic and technical assistance program for Iran as administered by the ICA during the fiscal years 1956 through 1960; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1436. A letter from the Director, Congressional Liaison Staff, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a copy of a letter to the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, regarding a report (B-133258) to the Speaker, dated August 21, 1961, on an examination of the economic and technical assistance program for Thailand as administered by the International Cooperation Administration during the fiscal years 1956 through 1960; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1437. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on the examination of the prices negotiated for certain electron tubes under Department of the Navy contracts with Raytheon Co., Waltham, Mass., pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1438. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961, pursuant to the authority contained in the act of May 7, 1928 (22 U.S.C. 278a); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1439. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected requisitioning actions by the Ordnance Supply Management Agency (OSMA) of the U.S. Army, Europe (Rear), communications zone, Orleans, France, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1440. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the power generated and related activities of the Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, in the southeastern area of the United States and the power marketing activities of the Southeastern Power Administration, Department of the Interior, for fiscal years 1959 and 1960, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1441. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the financial statements of the Columbia River power system and related activities for the fiscal year 1961, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1442. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the practices followed in the storage and warehousing of aircraft parts and equipment at the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla., pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1443. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected activities related to the lease and disposal of lands and mineral resources by the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1444. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of Army signal supply operations, U.S. Army, Europe (Rear), communications zone, Orleans, France, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1445. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the pricing of F-101 airplane wings under a fixed-price incentive subcontract negotiated by McDonnell Aircraft Corp., St. Louis, Mo., with Martin Co., Baltimore, Md., under Department of the Air Force prime contract AF-33(600)-23393, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1446. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the management of spare parts for Army equipment provided to Far East countries under the military assistance program, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1447. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of materiel standardization activities of the Military Clothing and Textile Supply Agency (M.C. & T.S.A.), Philadelphia, Pa., pursuant to the National Security Act of 1947, as amended (5 U.S.C. 171a); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1448. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected activities in the management of food supply by the Military Subsistence Supply Agency, Chicago, Ill., pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 67), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1449. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of housing allowances paid to the U.S. military personnel occupying rental guarantee housing projects in France, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1450. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of supply management of ordnance equipment and spare parts in the Department of the Navy, completed June 1960, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1451. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the estimated costs for subcontracted assemblies included in the incentive target price negotiated for B-52G airplanes under Department of the Air Force contract AF-33(600)-34670 with the Boeing Co., Wichita division, Wichita, Kans., pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1452. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the Federal contributions program of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1453. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a review of oversea commercial air shipments of military cargo for the military assistance program and U.S. Air Force units by the Department of the Air Force, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1454. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on review of the use of local currencies in Spain for contracting and administrative purposes by the U.S. Government, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1455. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the use of the cumulative sinking fund for the retirement of public debt obligations, Treasury Department, April 1961, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1456. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the inclusion of excessive premium pay costs and computation errors in the price negotiated by the Department of the Navy for fixed-price contract NObs 3647 awarded to the New York Shipbuilding Corp., Camden, N.J., pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67), and the authority of the Comptroller General to examine contractors' records, as set forth in 10 U.S.C. 2313 (b); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1457. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected activities of the Facilities and Materiel Depot, Aeronautical Center, Oklahoma City, Okla., Federal Aviation Agency, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1458. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution providing for the establishment of the National Capital Parks Memorial Board"; to the Committee on House Administration.

1459. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting the third report of the Federal voting assistance program covering the period from September 1959 to September 1961, pursuant to Public Law 296, 84th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

1460. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide that lands within the exterior boundaries of a national forest acquired under section 8 of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315g), may be added to the national forest, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1461. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (43 U.S.C. 315g)"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1462. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report relative to partial deferment of the December 31, 1961, construction payment due the United States from the Newton Water Users Association, Newton project, Utah, pursuant to Public Law 86-308, 86th Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1463. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of four orders and supporting documents covering cancellations and adjustment for the fiscal year 1961 of charges against individual Indians or tribes of Indians, pursuant to the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1464. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copy of an application for a loan under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 (Aug. 6, 1956, 70 Stat. 1044, as amended June 5, 1957, 71 Stat. 48) (Weber-Box Elder Conservation District, Ogden, Utah); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1465. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the fifth annual report on the status of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, pursuant to section 6 of the authorizing act of April 11, 1956 (70 Stat. 105); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1466. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of the activities of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 under title XIII to provide aviation war risk insurance, pursuant to section 1309 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1467. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report stating that the Department of Commerce has conducted no commissary activities outside the continental United States during the fiscal year 1961, pursuant to Public Law 390, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1468. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of August 31, 1961, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1469. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of September 30, 1961, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1470. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a report showing the permits and licenses for hydroelectric projects issued by the Federal Power Commission in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961, and the names and compensation of persons employed by the Commission for the same period, pursuant to section 4(d) of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1471. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission. transmitting several documents and publications relating to the activities of public utilities of the United States for the information of the U.S. House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1472. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report together with statements and supporting papers covering each of the claims considered and adjudicated, pursuant to section 6 of the 1959 amendment to the Texas City Disaster Relief Act (73 Stat. 706); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1473. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the annual report relating to all settlements made under authority of Section 2732—Property Loss: Incident to Service; Members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps and Civilian Employees, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 2732(f); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1474. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of claims settled by the Department of the Army during fiscal year 1961, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 2732; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1475. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Leopoldo Rocha Canas"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1476. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of tort claims paid by the Department of the Army under the Federal Tort Claims Act, title 28, United States Code, section 2671 et seq., and submitted pursuant thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1477. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of certain officers of the naval service erroneously in receipt of compensation based upon an incorrect computation of service for basic pay"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1478. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting five copies of a report listing tort claims approved for payment in the fiscal year 1961 and setting forth the name of each claimant, and other pertinent information, pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 2673; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1479. A letter from the Acting General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting two copies of the annual report ended June 30, 1961, of the Atomic Energy Commission concerning claims paid under the Federal Tort Claims Act, pursuant to section 2673, title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1480. A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting two copies of the court's opinion rendered October 4, 1961, in the case of *Cuyahoga County, Ohio* v. *The*

United States, No. Congressional 7–59, pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and H.R. 309, 86th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1481. A letter from the Executive Director, U.S. Olympic Association, Inc., transmitting a financial report covering the year 1960 pursuant to section 12 of Public Law 805; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1482. A letter from the national adjutant, Military Order of the Purple Heart of the U.S.A., transmitting an audit report for the fiscal year ended July 31, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 85–761; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1483. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of John B. Hogan"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1484. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1485. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting the report of all claims paid by the Federal Aviation Agency during the fiscal year 1961, pursuant to part 2, section 404 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U.S.C. 2673); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1486. A letter from the chairman, board of directors, Future Farmers of America, transmitting a report on the audit of the accounts for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 740, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1487. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the receipts and expenditures of the Department of the Interior in connection with the administration of the act for the fiscal year 1961, pursuant to section 15 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1343); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1488. A letter from the secretary-treasurer, the Military Chaplains Association of the United States, transmitting the annual report for the year 1960 covering proceedings, financial statement, and sample publications, pursuant to Public Law 792, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1489. A letter from the national shipswriter, Navy Club of the U.S.A., transmitting the proceeding of the 24th annual reunion held in Rockford, Ill., June 22–25, 1961; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1490. A letter from the secretary-treasurer, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, transmitting (1) annual certified public accountant's audit of the books and (2) annual report of the activities of the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961, pursuant to section 15(a) and section 16 of Public Law 605, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1491. A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting a report on the disposition of a bill for the relief of Pioneers, Inc., a corporation, Jess M. Ritchie, individually and as an officer of said corporation, which was referred to the court pursuant to H.R. 167 of the 85th Congress, 2d session; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1492. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1493. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1494. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of an order entered for an individual under the authority contained in section 13(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, pursuant to section 13(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on Judiciary.

1495. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1496. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of an order in re Emilia Vallera, A–12728537, an alien who has been found admissible to the United States pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1497. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1498. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1499. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of certain aliens where the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1500. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of aliens where the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1501. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of the activities under title XII, Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, as of September 30, 1961, to provide war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1502. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting quarterly report of the Maritime Administration, under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, from June 30, 1961, through September 30, 1961, in accordance with section 13 of that act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1503. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of operations in connection with the bonding of Government officers and employees, pursuant to section 14(c) of the act of August 9, 1955 (6 U.S.C. 14), for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1504. A letter from the Acting Director of Personnel, Department of Commerce, transmitting copy of report of scientific and professional positions established under the authority contained in 72 Stat. 213a, 5 U.S.C. 1161(e), and 72 Stat. 214, 5 U.S.C. 1163; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1505. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit variation of the 40-hour workweek of Federal employees for educational purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1506. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report stating that five scientific or professional positions were authorized, pursuant to Public Laws 85–462 and 87–367; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1507. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report of positions in grades GS–17 and GS–18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1508. A letter from the Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the 28th annual report covering the activities of the TVA during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1961; to the Committee on Public Works.

1509. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report regarding the construction of a magnetic fields component test facility and an antenna test range at Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Md., pursuant to section 3 of the act of July 21, 1961 (75 Stat. 216, 217); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1510. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on an expanded manned lunar program as recommended by the President to the Congress in his special message on urgent national needs, pursuant to section 3 of the act of July 21, 1961 (75 Stat. 216, 217); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1511. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to improve facilities at the Pacific Missile Range to make them adequate to launch a Thor-Agena B booster with Goddard Space Flight Center spacecraft, pursuant to section 4 of the act of June 1, 1960 (74 Stat. 151, 152); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1512. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to construct lunar landing research and 10-watt frequency environment noise facilities at the Langley Research Center, Hampton, Va., pursuant to section 3 of the act of July 21, 1961 (75 Stat. 216, 217); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1513. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to establish a facility in southwest Mississippi to be known as the Mississippi test facility, pursuant to section 3 of the act of July 21, 1961 (75 Stat. 216, 217); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1514. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting two copies of a report of contracts negotiated by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, pursuant to provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(a) (11) and (16), covering the period January 1 to June 30, 1961; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1515. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on additional facilities to augment the deep space network, pursuant to section 3 of the act of July 21, 1961 (75 Stat. 216, 217); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1516. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report for the fiscal year 1961 for the provision of computer, electrical drive, and instrument equipment for the centrifuge at the Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, Calif., pursuant to section 3 of the act of July 21, 1961 (75 Stat. 216, 217); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1517. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report regarding activities of the Arnold Engineering Development Center in connection with the Centaur launch vehicle program, pursuant to section 1(d) of the act of July 21, 1961 (75 Stat. 216); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1518. A letter from the Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, transmitting the 11th annual report in accordance with the provisions of section 12(c), Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong., 2d sess.); to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1519. A letter from the Chairman, the Renegotiation Board, transmitting the sixth annual report, pursuant to section 114, Public Law 870, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1520. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the use of commercial air carriers for oversea travel and shipment of unaccompanied baggage of Department of Defense personnel; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1521. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the Atomic Energy Commission and Department of the Navy large surface ship reactor, ALW land-based prototype project constructed under contracts with Westinghouse Electric Corp.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1522. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the combined statement of receipts, expenditures, and balances of the U.S. Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961, pursuant to section 15 of the act of July 31, 1894 (5 U.S.C. 264), and section 114 of the act of September 12, 1950 (31 U.S.C. 66b); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1523. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, relative to transmitting an agreement between the United States of America and the Department of Water Resources of the State of California for the construction and operation of the joint-use facilities of the San Luis unit, dated December 30, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 86-488; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1524. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide relief for the heirs of Fly, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottee No. 266, and for the heirs of Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottee No. 267; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1525. A letter from the clerk U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting a statement of all judgments rendered by the U.S. Court of Claims for the year ended September 30, 1961, pursuant to section 791(c), title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

The following reports were filed subsequent to the adjournment of the 87th Congress, first session:

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER: Committee on Science and Astronautics. Report on the practical values of space exploration (Rept. No. 1276). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER: Committee on Science and Astronautics. Report on research and development in aeronautics (Rept. No. 1277). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. Report on the truth about the film "Operation Abolition" (Rept. No. 1278). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER: Committee on Science and Astronautics. Report on commercial applications of space communications systems (Rept. No. 1279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report on activity of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 87th Congress, 1st session (Rept. No. 1280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER: Committee on Science and Astronautics. Report on national meteorological satellite program (Rept. No. 1281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. Report on manipulation of public opinion by organizations under concealed control of the Communist Party (Rept. No. 1282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. Report on Communist penetration of radio facilities (Conelrad—communications) (Rept. No. 1283). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 9481. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to authorize the payments of rewards to persons who furnish information leading to convictions of organizations or individuals of failure to register as required by such act; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 9482. A bill authorizing the acquisition and interception of communications in interest of national security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 9483. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Jackson, Miss., as the John Elliott Rankin Memorial Veterans Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 9484. A bill to designate the lake formed by the Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia, as Lake Eufaula; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 9485. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to promote public knowledge of progress and achievement in astronautics and related sciences through the designation of a special day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 9486. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide for loans to individuals attending the U.S. Military Academy, the U.S. Naval Academy, the Air Force Academy, the Coast Guard Academy, and the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9487. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to assist the States of Maryland, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia to reestablish their common boundaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9488. A bill to amend the provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 relating to the cancellation of loans, made under title II thereof for services as a teacher, and relating to eligibility for stipends for attending an institute conducted under title V or VI; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9489. A bill to amend title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to increase the amounts available thereunder for making loans to students; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 9490. A bill to provide Federal assistance in the construction of fallout shelters in connection with schools and hospitals; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9491. A bill to provide for the removal of an encumbrance on the title of certain real property heretofore conveyed to the Board of Education of the Vallejo School District, Vallejo, Calif., by the U.S. Housing Corporation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 9492. A bill to provide for the establishment of the John Muir National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 9493. A bill to reunite families in the United States by granting nonquota status to certain aliens entitled to a preference under the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9494. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to remove the limitation upon the outside income which an individual may earn while receiving social security benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 9495. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1961 and the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to permit under certain circumstances mustard seed and canary seed to be raised on acreage diverted from the production of wheat and feed grains; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9496. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1961 by deleting spring planted barley from the 1962 feed grain program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9497. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1961 to include the variety known as Compana as a malting barley eligible for increased acreage under the 1962 feed grain program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 9498. A bill to provide that certain disabled individuals shall be granted a preference in purchasing surplus Federal property where such purchase is for their own use; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 9499. A bill to amend section 277 of title 10, United States Code, to provide commissary and other privileges for persons who have been awarded the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 9500. A bill to continue for 2 years the suspension of duty on certain alumina and bauxite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BREEDING:

H.R. 9501. A bill to amend subsection (d) of section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 9502. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer to deduct for income tax purposes certain special assessments and other charges made against him or his property under local law without regard to whether they tend to increase the value of such property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 9503. A bill to include certain officers and employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare within the provisions of sections 111 and 114 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to assaults and homicides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF (by request):

H.R. 9504. A bill to protect the domestic economy, promote the national defense, and regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by adjusting conditions of competition between domestic industries and foreign industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 9505. A bill to prohibit exports to Communist countries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 9506. A bill to provide that the United States shall reimburse the States and their political subdivisions for real property taxes not collected on real property owned by a foreign government and therefore exempt from taxation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 9507. A bill for the relief of the city of Glen Cove, N.Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 9508. A bill to prohibit the purchase by the United States of bonds issued by the United Nations, and to suspend all appropriations for payment by the United States of expenses of the United Nations so long as other nations are delinquent in payment of their share of the expenses of that organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 9509. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to require certain engineering costs to be included in estimates submitted to the Secretary of Commerce; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 9510. A bill to amend sections 2 and 5 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semipublic buildings in the Georgetown area of the National Capital," approved September 22, 1950 (64 Stat. 903); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 9511. A bill to designate as Lake Eufaula the reservoir formed by the Walter F. George lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARDING:

H.R. 9512. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H.R. 9513. A bill to extend and amend the conservation reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 9514. A bill to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9515. A bill to provide for the disposition of geothermal steam by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9516. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that for the purposes of all laws administered by the Veterans' Administration net gain from the sale of a home by a beneficiary shall not be considered as income; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOSMER (by request):

H.R. 9517. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide that nonprofit enterprises for the rehabilitation of disabled persons, if otherwise qualified as small-business concerns, may participate in the benefits of the Government contract set-aside program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 9518. A bill to designate the lake formed by the Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia, as Lake Eufaula; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 9519. A bill to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and as amended by the Agricultural Act of 1961, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to imported tangerines; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 9520. A bill to continue for 2 years the suspension of duty on certain alumina and bauxite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 9521. A bill to cancel obligation to the United States for cost of food and medical services furnished internees of the Imperial Japanese Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 9522. A bill for the relief of certain members of the U.S. Marine Corps who incurred losses pursuant to the cancellation of a permanent change of station movement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9523: A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to make all veterans awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor eligible for special pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 9524. A bill relating to the tax treatment of transfers of rights to copyrights and literary, musical, and artistic compositions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 9525. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist States, counties, cities, political subdivisions of States, and public corporations established under State law in providing improved mass transportation services in those metropolitan areas which have planned and developed a mass transportation system; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 9526. A bill to amend section 1034 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that where the taxpayer or his spouse has attained the age of 65 no gain on the sale or exchange of the taxpayer's home will be taxed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9527. A bill to provide that surplus property of the United States may be donated to the States for the promotion of fish and wildlife management activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 9528. A bill to provide for the withholding and the forfeiture of the pay and allowances of certain members of the uniformed services who, while prisoners of war, aid the enemy or are guilty of other misconduct, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 9529. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for expenses incurred in the construction of residential fallout shelters of approved type and design; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 9530. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize the Small Business Administration to assist small-business concerns in obtaining leases of space in suburban shopping centers by providing insurance for surety bonds covering such leases; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 9531. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 9532. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 9533. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 9534. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 9535. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 9536. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 9537. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 9538. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9539. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 9540. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.R. 9541. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 9542. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 9543. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 9544. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 9545. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and assist the several States in carrying on a program of forestry research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 9546. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide minimum benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program for certain individuals who have attained age 72; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 9547. A bill to facilitate the application and operation of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 9548. A bill to amend section 4142 (relating to the definition of radio and television component) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 9549. A bill to provide for one or more floating trade fairs to provide a greater degree of access to foreign markets for American industry and agriculture, to help reduce the deficit in the balance of payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 9550. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Treasury shall coin special 50-cent pieces to commemorate the life and perpetuate the ideals and principles of the Honorable Sam Rayburn; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 9551. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code in order to extend for a period of 10 years the time during which military records may be corrected; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 9552. A bill to establish a Foreign Service Officers' Training Corps; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 9553. A bill to amend the act of July 23, 1955 (ch. 375, sec. 3; 69 Stat. 368), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 9554. A bill to amend the antitrust laws to prohibit certain activities of labor organizations in restraint of trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9555. A bill to prohibit strikes by employees employed in certain strategic defense facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 9556. A bill to authorize the construction of a multiple-purpose dam and reservoir at the Oakley site on the Sangamon River in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 9557. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to assist the States of Maryland, Pennsylvania, and West Virigina to reestablish their common boundaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 9558. A bill to provide career status as rural carriers without examination to certain qualified substitute rural carriers of record in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9559. A bill to amend section 4113 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall make necessary arrangements for sale of homes of employees of the Department of Medicine and Surgery who are transferred by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9560. A bill to amend section 1613 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that periods spent on active duty pursuant to recall occurring after August 1, 1961, and before January 1, 1962, shall not be counted in determining the period within which certain education and training must be initiated or completed; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9561. A bill to amend section 624 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the furnishing abroad of hospital care and medical services for wartime service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 9562. A bill to amend chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, to permit certain employees of the Veterans' Administration to be granted leave with pay in order to pursue their studies; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9563. A bill to amend chapter 21, section 801, title 38, United States Code, to provide eligibility for special housing of those veterans who have service-connected double amputations with amputation of one lower extremity and one upper extremity; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9564. A bill to amend chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the furnishing of nursing care to certain beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9565. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9566. A bill to amend section 641 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of a portion of the cost to the States of furnishing nursing home care to veterans of any war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 9567. A bill to rescind and revoke membership of the United States in the United Nations and the specialized agencies thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 9568. A bill to amend part 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to the right of carriers to discontinue operations or services of trains or ferries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9569. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Little Blue unit, Missouri River Basin project, Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 594. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the requirement that a poll tax or other tax be paid as a qualification for voting in any election; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.J. Res. 595. Joint resolution providing that the United States shall make no loans or grants to the United Nations until all members of the United Nations have paid in full their assessed share of the costs of the operations of the United Nations, including the expenses of operations in the Congo and the Gaza strip; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.J. Res. 596. Joint resolution providing that the United States shall make no loans or grants to the United Nations until all members of the United Nations have paid in full their assessed share of the costs of the operations of the United Nations, including the expenses of operations in the Congo and the Gaza strip; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 403. Concurrent resolution recognizing the National Museum of Steam Propulsion as a fitting and valuable institution for the collection and preservation of the memorabilia of the age of steam propulsion; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Con. Res. 404. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in regard to the United Nations Charter revision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Res. 492. Resolution to provide that the House of Representatives Office Building being constructed pursuant to the Additional House Office Building Act of 1955 shall be known as the Rayburn Building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. Res. 493. Resolution naming the building authorized by the Additional House Office Building Act of 1955 as the "Rayburn House Office Building"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. Res. 494. Resolution providing that the office building presently being constructed for Members of the House of Representatives shall be named the Rayburn House Office Building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. Res. 495. Resolution to rename and dedicate the House Office Building to the Honorable Joseph Cannon, the New House Office Building to the Honorable Nicholas Longworth, and the additional House Office Building to the Honorable Sam Rayburn; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H. Res. 496. Resolution designating the additional House Office Building as the "Sam Rayburn Office Building"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. Res. 497. Resolution to provide that the House of Representatives Office Building being constructed pursuant to the additional House Office Building Act of 1955 shall be known as the Sam Rayburn House Office Building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. Res. 498. Resolution to name the office buildings of the House of Representatives, the "Sam Rayburn Office Building," the "Frederick A. C. Muhlenberg Office Building," and the "Henry Clay Office Building"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H. Res. 499. Resolution providing that the office building presently being constructed for Members of the House of Representatives shall be named the "Rayburn House Office Building"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 500. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H. Res. 501. Resolution creating a nonlegislative select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the aged and aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. Res. 502. Resolution creating a standing Committee on Small Business in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. Res. 503. Resolution to provide for a memorial in the House of Representatives to the late Honorable Sam Rayburn; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. Res. 504. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 143; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. Res. 505. Resolution extending the greetings of the House of Representatives to the city of Altoona, Pa., on the occasion of the centennial anniversary of the Loyal War Governors' Conference; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Delaware, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the consideration of the constitutional amendment concerning equal legal rights for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt the equal rights for women amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the Referendum Act of December 10, 1961, approved by the Legislature of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 9570. A bill for the relief of Francesco Orlando; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9571. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Demetria Messana Barone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9572. A bill for the relief of Margherita Matania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.R. 9573. A bill for the relief of William T. Hutchinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 9574. A bill for the relief of Dominador K. Oyzon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9575. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elisa C. Rubio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN:

H.R. 9576. A bill for the relief of Erskine C. McCreery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9577. A bill for the relief of Amos Coates, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 9578. A bill for the relief of Annie Yasuko Bower; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 9579. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Cimino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9580. A bill for the relief of Sami Jawad and Elizabeth Al-Ani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 9581. A bill for the relief of Kwang Soo Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9582. A bill for the relief of Jolan Berczeller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 9583. A bill for the relief of Wieslawa Hinczewska Polak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 9584. A bill for the relief of Maria Olga Zielinska and Lydia Christina Zielinska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9585. A bill for the relief of Arie Adler, Miriam Adler, Chawa Adler, and Noomi Adler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9586. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vera Gwendolyn Sawyer (nee Edwards); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9587. A bill for the relief of Anthony E. O'Sorio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 9588. A bill for the relief of Claude Homann-Herimberg (nee Wagner); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9589. A bill for the relief of Kim Jung Im; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 9590. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Edward Hirsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 9591. A bill for the relief of Aldo Spagnoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9592. A bill for the relief of Stesanos Psarris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 9593. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain phosphate rights to the Dr. P. Phillips Foundation of Orlando, Fla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H.R. 9594. A bill for the relief of Paraskeve Doudoumis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 9595. A bill for the relief of Apolonia Rudzinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 9596. A bill for the relief of Daniel E. Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9597. A bill for the relief of James N. Tull; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 9598. A bill for the relief of Pan Lih Teh, Kathryn L. Pan, Nery Pan, Nilson Pan, and Nelson Pan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 9599. A bill for the relief of Solomon Annenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9600. A bill for the relief of Zeev Grabina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIKE:

H.R. 9601. A bill for the relief of Barbara Kolodziejczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9602. A bill for the relief of Law For Wing, Law Wan Koon Dai, Law Yee Lan, and Law Yee Ping; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 9603. A bill for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Joseph P. Mannix; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.R. 9604. A bill for the relief of Emilie Anselmo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9605. A bill for the relief of Chung Hi Lyou-Kim and Won-Bok Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 9606. A bill for the relief of Henryk Felix Lewandowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.R. 9607. A bill for the relief of the estate of Charles J. Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 9608. A bill authorizing the U.S. Government to reconvey certain lands to S. J. Carver; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 9609. A bill for the relief of Irene May Roberts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 9610. A bill to authorize Capt. Donald R. Strobaugh, U.S. Air Force, to accept the award of the Imperial Iranian Parachutist Badge, and to wear and display such badge; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 9611. A bill for the relief of Michael Fahim Elias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 9612. A bill relating to the elections under section 333 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by the shareholders of the G. L. Bernhardt Co., Inc., of Lenoir, N.C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 9613. A bill for the relief of George Kirkesselis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9614. A bill for the relief of Zoia Combes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

213. By Mr. CAHILL: Resolution adopted by Department of New Jersey, American Legion, protesting the use of private chartered airplanes for armed services personnel where Armed Forces airplanes and transportation equipment are available; to the Committee on Armed Services.

214. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Post 412, American Legion, Madeira, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to military officers being permitted and encouraged to speak out on the subject of the Communist menace and that appropriate action be taken to restore Major General Walker to his command and commend him for his outspoken patriotism; to the Committee on Armed Services.

215. Also, petition of the city clerk, city of Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution dated October 17, 1961, with reference to extending best wishes and prayers of the people of Chicago to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN in his illness; to the Committee on House Administration.

216. Also, petition of the city council of the city of Orangeburg, S.C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to commending the life and services of the departed Congressman JOHN J. RILEY and further expressing its genuine sympathy to his family; to the Committee on House Administration.

217. Also, petition of Board of Supervisors of Cattaraugus County, Little Valley, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation to protect rights of occupants other than Indians on the Allegheny Indian Reservation lands to be taken for the Kinzua Dam project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

218. Also, petition of Harold Elsten, Cortland, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to submitting supplemental information relative to a redress of grievance and the appeal of *Elsten* v. *U.S. and F.C.C.*; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

219. Also, petition of John W. Thomas, The American Baptist Convention, Chicago, Ill., relative to a resolution adopted by the American Baptist Convention relating to communism; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

220. Also, petition of Jose A. Galvar, Pampanga, Philippines, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to retroactively establishing the status of the Philippine Scouts on a basis comparable to the Army of the United States, including pay rates, decorations, and awards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

221. Also, petition of Quirico Del Mar, mayor, Cebu, Philippines, relative to pensions relating to Filipino veterans of the last World War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following reports for the second calendar quarter of 1961 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $233.50. E. (9) $449.61.

A. Donald C. Alexander, 603 Dixie Terminal Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Philip Carey Manufacturing Co., Lockland, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $8,141.09.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,053. E. (9) $2,053.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $9,361.31. E. (9) $9,361.31.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $14,768.38. E. (9) $14,768.38.

A. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $3,574.48.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,917.77. E. (9) $4,917.77.

A. American Thrift Assembly, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $751.75. E. (9) $11,736.22.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $615.46.

A. Robert E. Ansheles, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Thrift Assembly, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation, Mescalero, N. Mex.

A. Richard H. Appert, 14 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Alpha Portland Cement Co., and Weller Electric Corp., Easton, Pa.
E. (9) $99.73.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. Federated Department Stores, Inc., 222 West Seventh Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $8,143.75. E. (9) $384.68.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,292.50. E. (9) $155.15.

A. Arthritis & Rheumatism Foundation, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,330.37.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $25.

A. A. V. Atkinson, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,383.40.

A. Atlantic, Gulf & Great Lakes Shipbuilding Association, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Charles E. Babcock, Box 406, Vienna, Va.
B. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3025 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $1.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $3,225.

A. Roy Battles, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Grange of the Patrons of Husbandry, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Daniel S. Bedell, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America.
D. (6) $2,449. E. (9) $1,055.25.

A. Carl H. Berglund, 607 South Pine Street, Tacoma, Wash.
E. (9) $10.56.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,977.33.

A. C. B. Blankenship, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,920.80.

A. Mrs. Paul Blanshard, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $120.

A. W. G. Blewett, 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Peabody Coal Co., 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

A. A. Dewey Bond, 727 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $156.48.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, Sixth & Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth & Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.

A. Charles B. Bowling, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Boykin & De Francis, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mrs. Claire Hugo Stinnes, Grossenbaumerstrasse 253, Mulheim Ruhr, Germany.
E. (9) $175.

A. Boykin & De Francis, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Studiengesellschaft fur Privatrechtliche Auslandsinteressen, e. v. Contrescarpe 46, Germany.
E. (9) $270.

A. Charles N. Brady, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1122 Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors & Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $675. E. (9) $675.

A. Charles H. Brown & Gael M. Sullivan, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,830.94.

A. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,376.57. E. (9) $2,380.41.

A. John J. Burke, 1062 West Platinum Street, Butte, Mont.
B. Pacific Northwest Power Co., Postoffice Box 1443, Spokane, Wash.
E. (9) $350.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $180. E. (9) $180.

A. James A. Campbell, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,769.22. E. (9) $376.92.

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union & Metal Trades Council, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.
D. (6) $3,371.93. E. (9) $901.78.

A. William L. Carter, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Alger B. Chapman, Jr., 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Hal M. Christensen, 806 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Dental Association, 806 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,250.

A. Cities Service Petroleum, Inc., 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,437.50. E. (9) $511.98.

A. Nicholas S. Collins, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $110. E. (9) $35.86.

A. Paul G. Collins, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $15.60.

A. Committee for Effective Use of the International Court by Repealing the Self-Judging Reservation, 36 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $100.

A. Contracting Plasterers' & Lathers' International Association, 1343 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50,000.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,250.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.

A. Edward Corneaby, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,600.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $492.55. E. (9) $492.55.

A. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.
E. (9) $50.36.

A. Paul L. Courtney, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $482.49. E. (9) $482.49.

A. Customs Brokers & Forwarders Association of America, Inc., 8 Bridge Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $3,640.33.

A. Michael P. Daniels, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Abraham A. Dash, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) 474.99. E. (9) $7.50.

A. S. P. Deas, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.

A. John M. Dickerman, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,413.50. E. (9) $82.90.

A. William C. Doherty, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. James B. Dyess, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wheat Growers, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,160.53. E. (9) $3,160.53.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $569.52. E. (9) $19.10.

A. Far East Group, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $7.55.

A. James Finucane, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
E. (9) $1,389.91.

A. Florida Ship Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
E. (9) $1,560.92.

A. E. F. Forbes, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. A. Arthur Gardner, 1630 Jefferson Street, Hollywood, Fla.
E. (9) $8.75.

A. John A. Gosnell, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,650.01.

A. Cornelius R. Gray, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $1,033.82.

A. Noel Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph D. Henderson, 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
B. American Association of Small Business, Inc., 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Jake D. Hill, 1005 Security Federal Building, Columbia, S.C.
B. South Carolina Railroad Association, 1005 Security Federal Building, Columbia, S.C.
E. (9) $47.

A. L. S. Hitchner, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

A. J. D. Hittle, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,666.67. E. (9) $57.86.

A. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $1,000.

A. John Jay Hooker, Jr., 214 Union Street, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Tennessee Laundryowners Association, 932 Eighth Avenue South, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $20,000.

A. John M. Hurley, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
D. (6) $1,353.14.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,014.89.

A. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $293.20.

A. Peter D. Joers, 810 Whittington, Hot Springs, Ark.
B. Dierks Forests, Inc., 810 Whittington, Hot Springs, Ark.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Max H. Jordan, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $569.52. E. (9) $7.55.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,150.76.

A. Franklin E. Kepner, Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.
B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, 1022 Transportation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $4,062.50. E. (9) $245.30.

A. Joseph T. King, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General counsel for Associated Equipment Distributors & Sprinkler Irrigation Association.

E. (9) $631.31.

A. Mr. and Mrs. Harry L. Kingman.

D. (6) $955. E. (9) $955.

A. George W. Koch, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Atlantic, Gulf & Great Lakes Shipbuilding Association, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $1,046.46.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $1,323.10. E. (9) $3,193.82.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Agricultural Stabilization & Conservation County Office Employees, Jasper, Fla.

D. (6) $825. E. (9) $125.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.

B. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $450. E. (9) $125.

A. Alan Latman, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $844.37.

A. G. E. Leighty, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Linen Supply Association of America, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $4,504.05. E. (9) $4,504.05.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 530 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $2,125. E. (9) $1,665.72.

A. Robert J. McBride, 2007 Kalorama Road NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $68.10.

A. J. A. McCallam, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $615.46.

A. William A. McClintock, Jr., 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.

B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William J. McDonald, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.

B. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.

E. (9) $684.45.

A. A. J. McFarland, 126 North Eighth Street, Sterling, Kans.

B. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $999.99. E. (9) $250.

A. Joseph B. McGrath, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,692.30. E. (9) $260.35.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $36.50.

A. Suzanne MacLean, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $150.

A. MacLeish, Spray, Price & Underwood, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $15,025. E. (9) $1,295.62.

A. Jerome J. Madigan, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $500.

A. Julia L. Maietta.

B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,495. E. (9) $2,163.13.

A. James D. Mann, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Truck Council of America, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Tommy M. Martin, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $569.52. E. (9) $26.70.

A. Albert E. May, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $280. E. (9) $107.01.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,305. E. (9) $1,215.

A. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ross A. Messer, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $148.39.

A. Joseph L. Miller, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Northern Textile Association, Quinebaug-French Rivers Manufacturers Association, and Theisen Clemens.

D. (6) $1,050. E. (9) $105.

A. John R. Minor, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.

D. (6) $750.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,875.

A. Curtis Morris, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Bernard R. Mullady, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

D. (6) $2,730.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,449.20. E. (9) $1,423.22.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Agricultural Stabilization & Conservation County Office Employees.

D. (6) $1,875.60. E. (9) $1,495.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $20,446.15. E. (9) $21,277.37.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $750,135.45. E. (9) $19,344.23.

A. National Association of Post Office & General Service Maintenance Employees, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $14,150. E. (9) $2,299.98.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $11,811.22.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 95 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,235.

A. National Association of Wheat Growers, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,160.53. E. (9) $3,160.53.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $493,459.93. E. (9) $8,983.18.

A. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $175. E. (9) $667.51.

A. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $20,010. E. (9) $23,069.34.

A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, University Hospital, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.

D. (6) $250. E. (9) $464.96.

A. National Counsel Associates, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Central Scientific Co., 1700 Irving Park Road, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $2,500.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $7,645.10. E. (9) $2,221.40.

A. National Federation of Independent Businesses, Inc., 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $15,419.52. E. (9) $15,419.52.

A. National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $9,600.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $21,688.67. E. (9) $23,852.73.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $886.93.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,185.31. E. (9) $767.50.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $24,475.75. E. (9) $7,130.39.

A. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,188.12.

A. National Small Business Men's Association, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $2,775.01.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,881.56. E. (9) $9,381.88.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $514.89.

A. Henry C. Nelson, Jr., 1005 Security Federal Building, Columbia, S.C.
B. South Carolina Railroad Association, 1005 Security Federal Building, Columbia, S.C.
E. (9) $47.03.

A. Herschel D. Newsom, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Russ Nixon, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, 11 East 51st Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $747.51. E. (9) $260.

A. Joseph A. Noone, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $154.67.

A. Richard T. O'Connell, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,375. E. (9) $32.75.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 845 Northwestern Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philippine Sugar Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,500.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philippine War Damage Claimants Association, Escolta Building, 46 Escolta, Manila, Philippines.

A. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $5,337.74.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $334.98. E. (9) $654.85.

A. Geo. F. Parrish, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
D. (6) $4,624.98.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hays-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,400. E. (9) $948.37.

A. Edmund E. Pendleton, Jr., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $750.

A. George C. Pendleton, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $750.

A. Sandford Z. Persons, 820 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United World Federalists, Inc., 820 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $887.36. E. (9) $33.05.

A. Andrew A. Pettis, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, 534 Cooper Street, Camden, N.J.
D. (6) $3,461.52. E. (9) $1,610.10.

A. T. E. Pinkston, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.
E. (9) $290.78.

A. Ralph D. Pittman, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,249.98.

A. Ralph D. Pittman, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $702.

A. Sanford L. Platt, 728 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association; Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Raymond E. Plummer, 220 Central Building, Anchorage, Alaska.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $101.67. E. (9) $710.93.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $900.

A. Gordon M. Quarnstrom, 1726 Wilmette Avenue, Wilmette, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William H. Quealy, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Smith-Corona Marchant, Inc., 410 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. William H. Quealy, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, Standard Oil Building, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, New York, N.Y., etc.
D. (6) $8,249.97. E. (9) $8,676.31.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 3840 Greenbrier Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Box 48, Durant, Okla.
D. (6) $150.

A. William T. Reed, 5800 Connecticut Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $273.

A. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,779.60. E. (9) $1,779.60.

A. John Arthur Reynolds, 1008 Guarantee Savings Building, Fresno, Calif.
B. Western Cotton Growers Association of California, 1008 Guarantee Savings Building, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $1,725. E. (9) $2,885.11.

A. William E. Richards, Orleans, Nebr.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. John J. Riley, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,485.80. E. (9) $50.85.

A. Barbara Roads, 470 Palos Verdes Boulevard, Redondo Beach, Calif.
B. Air Line Stewards and Stewardesses Association, 316 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Maurice Rosenblatt, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Counsel Associates, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. Kermit B. Rykken, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Los Angeles, etc.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Sealy, Inc., 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $33.43.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New York Coffee & Sugar Exchange, 79 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $24.24.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.; and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $151.31.

A. Maurice J. Shean, 940 25th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. City and County of San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,900. E. (9) $2,762.45.

A. Henry M. Shine, Jr., 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,153.80. E. (9) $203.50.

A. Ralph Showalter, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $2,781.73. E. (9) $1,103.26.

A. Small Business Tax Conference, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,396. E. (9) $1,194.98.

A. John A. Smith, Stapleton Airfield, Denver, Colo.
B. Continental Airline, Stapleton Airfield, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $581.

A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orlean, La.
D. (6) $861.35. E. (9) $1,003.28.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Post Office Drawer 747, Duant, Okla.
E. (9) $150.

A. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Chester S. Stackpole, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Luther C. Steward, Jr., 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,867.20. E. (9) $26.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $13,505.25. E. (9) $4,568.63.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Association to Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, Naha, Okinawa.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $160.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Nozaki Associates, Inc., 92 Liberty Street, New York, N.Y.; Mitsubishi International Corp., 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.; and Ajinomoto Co. of New York, 30 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Monroe Sullivan, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $943.75. E. (9) $1,249.90.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 224 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $40.45.

A. Christy Thomas & Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of River & Harbor Contractors, 15 Park Row, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $77.38.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.
E. (9) $165.40.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,055.18.

A. William H. Tolbert, Post Office Box 191, Santa Paula, Calif.
B. Ventura County Citrus Growers Committee, Post Office Box 191, Santa Paula, Calif.
E. (9) $8,741.58.

A. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20,468.51. E. (9) $2,236.

A. Mrs. Hattie B. Trazenfeld, 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ahbe Jay Treu, 352 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Harry Jay Treu, Inc.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,567.52.

A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $360. E. (9) $360.

A. United World Federalists, Inc., 820 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,225. E. (9) $1,017.70.

A. Veterans of World War I, USA, Inc., 40 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold S. Walker, Jr., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $202.

A. Bailey Walsh, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. A. E. Holman & James Lofland, 6000 Saxony Road, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $4,685.12.

A. Bailey Walsh, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lion Manufacturing Co., 2640 Belmont Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $1,899.98.

A. Bailey Walsh, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Manufacturing Co., 3401 North California Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Herbert F. Walton, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Vincent T. Wasilewski, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Waterways Bulk Transportation Council, Inc., 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,660.

A. Merrill A. Watson, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $93.56.

A. Narvin B. Weaver, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cities Service Petroleum, Inc., 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Western Cotton Growers Association of California, 1008 Guarantee Savings Building, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $2,994.25. E. (9) $4,610.11.

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $18,542.89. E. (9) $11.36.

A. Edwin M. Wheeler, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. Kansas Railroad Committee, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 706 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,102.37. E. (9) $4,102.37.

A. Myron Wiener, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Far East Group, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $150.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 501 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $98.49.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Tribe of Indians, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) $1.38.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.
E. (9) $15.09.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Menominee Enterprises, Inc., Neopit, Wis.
E. (9) $68.55.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.
E. (9) $19.98.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.

A. Wilmer & Broun, 616 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Columbia Gas System Service Corp., 120 East 41st Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $366. E. (9) $2.15.

A. Clark L. Wilson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consultant to Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee.
D. (6) $2,400. E. (9) $3,602.83.

A. Theodore Wiprud, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Burton C. Wood, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,073.30. E. (9) $14.40.

A. William W. Woodruff, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $975. E. (9) $1,233.42.

A. Sidney Zagri, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,375.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1961:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19______ ◀

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report. ◀

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1 ◀

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(*a*) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(*b*) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(*c*) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $________Dues and assessments
2. $________Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $________Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $________Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $________Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $________TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $________Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $________TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $________TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $________Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $________Repaid to others during this Quarter
12. $________"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more
(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?

Please answer "yes" or "no": ________

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor*
	(*"Period"* from Jan. 1 through ________________, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(*a*) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(*b*) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $________Public relations and advertising services
2. $________Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $________Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $________Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $________Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $________Telephone and telegraph
7. $________Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $________All other expenditures
9. $________TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $________Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year
11. $________TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $________TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $________Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $________Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7-11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7-15, 8-15, 9-15: Britten & Blaten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

PAGE 2

A. Clarence G. Adamy, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $320. E. (9) $25.

A. V. J. Adduci, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,684. E. (9) $583.66.

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,801.23. E. (9) $4,801.23.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $16,500. E. (9) $20,547.76.

A. Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.

A. Air Freight Forwarders Association, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,583.29. E. (9) $7,583.29.

A. Donald C. Alexander, 603 Dixie Terminal Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Philip Carey Manufacturing Co., Lockland, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Leslie M. Alexander, Post Office Box 1980, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement & Power District, Post Office Box 1980, Phoenix, Ariz.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $3,028.

A. George Venable Allen, 4730 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Louis J. Allen, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I railroads in Tennessee.

A. Nicholas E. Allen and Merrill Armour, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 128 East 14th Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $10.13.

A. W. L. Allen, 8605 Cameron Street, Room 418, Silver Spring, Md.
B. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.

A. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $7,016.53.

A. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $9,269.36. E. (9) $9,269.36.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $26,011. E. (9) $26,011.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, AFL–CIO Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $32,723.71.

A. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $174,601. E. (9) $5,852.16.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,145.62. E. (9) $3,929.92.

A. American Justice Association, Defense Highway, Gambrills, Md.

A. American Legion National Headquarters, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $1,120.93. E. (9) $27,866.24.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $880.31. E. (9) $137.02.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $7,282.89.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $9,908.04. E. (9) $4,767.95.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,417.01. E. (9) $5,417.01.

A. American Optometric Association, 21 Bank Street, Lebanon, N.H.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $3,819.46.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $552. E. (9) $552.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,957.49. E. (9) $3,517.57.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $16,783. E. (9) $11,631.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,096.50.

A. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $51,351.71. E. (9) $2,820.22.

A. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $31,951. E. (9) $18,326.16.

A. American Stock Yards Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,350.

A. American Sugar Beet Industry Policy Committee, 500 Sugar Building, Denver, Colo.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, 275 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, Mass.
D. (6) $3.

A. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,333.31. E. (9) $7,320.85.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $22,175.32.

A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. American Yugoslav Claims Committee, 42–57 Parsons Boulevard, Flushing, N.Y.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $352.86.

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,475. E. (9) $1,384.62.

A. Jerry L. Anderson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. W. B. Ardery, Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Armored Carrier Corp., 222–17 Northern Boulevard, Bayside, N.Y.

A. J. Sinclair Armstrong, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. United States Trust Co. of New York, 45 Wall Street, N.Y.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Commissioner of Baseball, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $373.91.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Howard F. Knipp, 3401 South Hanover Street, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) $7.67.

A. Arthritis & Rheumatism Foundation, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,127.96.

A. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Associated Third-Class Mail Users, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,166.58. E. (9) $5,166.58.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $375.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,430.41. E. (9) $7,430.41.

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,389.90. E. (9) $2,389.90.

A. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $300.

A. Association of Stock Exchange Firms, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $476.02.

A. Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,012.95. E. (9) $1,012.95.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $25.

A. Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $1,500.

A. Richard W. Averill, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $198.95.

A. Harry S. Baer, Jr., 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Aeronautical Services Association, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $30.

A. Charles B. Bailey, Sr., 2035 South Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $1,911.39.

A. A. Z. Baker, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Stock Yards Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400.

A. George P. Baker, Soldiers Field Post Office, Boston, Mass.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. Donald Baldwin, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $64.

A. Joseph H. Ball, 90 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $61.14.

A. J. H. Ballew, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,425. E. (9) $333.95.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $3,225.

A. William G. Barr, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. A. Wesley Barthelmes, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insurance Company of North America and Life Insurance Company of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $431.60. E. (9) $60.80.

A. William B. Barton, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Laurie C. Battle, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. James F. Bell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $15.46.

A. Mrs. Rachel S. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Charles A. Betts, 1420 New York Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Can Company, 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles C. Bevis, Jr., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $17.85.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,290. E. (9) $558.25.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hudson Biery, 4017 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 4017 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Henry J. Bison, Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,129.

A. John H. Bivins, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $605.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $500.

A. Wm. Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $548.58. E. (9) $104.99.

A. William Blum, Jr., 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $105. E. (9) $13.70.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, Sharp & Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.
B. Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $862.95. E. (9) $150.

A. Bergson & Borkland, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Freeport Sulphur Co., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $0.75.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $895.21. E. (9) $2.71.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.

A. Boykin & De Francis, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mrs. Claire Hugo Stinnes, Grossenbaumerstrasse 253, Mulheim Ruhr, Germany.
E. (9) $180.

A. Boykin & De Francis, 1000 16th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Studiengesellschaft fur Privatrechtliche Auslandsinteressen, e. v. Contrescarpe 46, Germany.
E. (9) $265.

A. Charles N. Brady, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George L. Brady, 45 Monadnock Road, Newton, Mass.
B. Superior Oil Co., Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $457.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $465.27.

A. Frank P. Brennan, Avoca, Iowa.
B. Iowa Power & Light Co., Des Moines, Iowa.

A. Florence I. Broadwell, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,942.34.

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $102.81.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $1,900.

A. Derek Brooks, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $792.41.

A. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $6,998.62. E. (9) $6,998.62.

A. J. Olney Brott, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $625. E. (9) $10.85.

A. Bryant C. Brown, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance.

A. J. D. Brown, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $200.

A. Brown & Lund, Cafritz Building, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $33.60.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,532.42.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $100. E. (9) $11.22.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

B. Cross Florida Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $234.16.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $44.69.

A. John J. Bugas, Montrose, Colo.

B. Colorado Ute Electric Association, Inc., Montrose, Colo.

D. (6) $918. E. (9) $1,144.43.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., and 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., and National Federation Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.

D. (6) $4,522.65. E. (9) $225.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $190. E. (9) $190.

A. Maurice G. Burnside, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Division of Federal Relations, NEA, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,575. E. (9) $86.59.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa.

A. Robert M. Burr, 105 Mansfield Avenue, Darien, Conn.

B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,874.98.

A. Hollis W. Burt, 1212 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1212 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $47.50.

A. Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc., 800 Second Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Northwest Country Elevator Associates, 1252 Grain Exchange Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $4,000.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.

D. (6) $760.20. E. (9) $80.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $300. E. (9) $428.

A. Carl Campbell, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) $113.04.

A. John T. Carlton and C. M. Boyer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,300. E. (9) $235.93.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8325 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Carretta & Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association of America, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $39.20.

A. H. Allen Carroll, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $42.

A. Albert E. Carter, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $1,485.85.

A. William L. Carter, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene C. Carusi, 520 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Francis R. Cawley, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,200. E. (9) $485.45.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Alger B. Chapman, Jr., 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Taxicab Association, Inc., 4415 North California Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $750. E. (9) $7.50.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Camara Minera de Mexico, Gante 15, Mexico, D.F., Mexico.

D. (6) $230.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Camara Nacional De La Industria Pesquera, Manuel Maria Contreras No. 133, Mexico, D.F., Mexico.

E. (9) $111.31.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Colorado River Basin Consumers Power, Inc., 343 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.

E. (9) $27.65.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Hawaiian Botanical Gardens Foundation, Inc., 1527 Keeaumoku Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $6.63.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Union Nacional De Productores De Azucar, S. A. De C. V., Balderas No. 36, Primer Piso, Mexico, D.F., Mexico.

D. (6) $8,750. E. (9) $715.61.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. West Marin (Calif.) Property Owners Association, 960 Fifth Avenue, San Rafael, Calif.

E. (9) $145.13.

A. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

E. (9) $1,341.58.

A. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $3,509.68. E. (9) $4,295.75.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.

D. (6) $6,565. E. (9) $5,163.21.

A. Earl W. Clark, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $954. E. (9) $181.85.

A. Robert M. Clark, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, 1011 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $6,122.84. E. (9) $4,177.23.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $320.56.

A. Washington I. Cleveland, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Junius E. Cobean, Sr., 109 East Windsor Avenue, Alexandria, Va.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees.
D. (6) $1,100.

A. A. C. Cocke, 821 Gravier Street, New Orleans, La.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $430.57.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Investment Companies, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $125.96.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 845 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Committee for Collective Security, 307 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $20. E. (9) $109.32.

A. Committee on Constructive Price, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Committee for Pillion Resolution, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $100.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,897.24.

A. Committee to Support U.S. Congress Bill Creating a Commission on Obscene Matters and Materials, Post Office Box 74, Old Bridge, N.J.
E. (9) $4.88.

A. R. T. Compton, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pan American World Airways, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $12.65.

A. Orval R. Cook, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Edward Cooper.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.

A. Ben C. Corlett, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $65.70.

A. Edward J. Coughlin, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $195. E. (9) $20.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Corn Millers' Federation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. Edsall Lee Couplin, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
B. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Maximum Service Telecaster, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2.40.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $20.07.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Joint Resolution 1955 Legislature, Post Office Box 3170, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Copper & Brass Research Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Cuban-American Sugar Co., 347 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2.10.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Business Machines Corp., 590 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $518.94.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Mineral & Chemical Corp., Old Orchard Road, Skokie, Ill.
D. (6) $4,975. E. (9) $194.09.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William A. Cromartie, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $7.50.

A. Cross Florida Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
E. (9) $1,584.16.

A. H. C. Crotty, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 840 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 845 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

A. C. B. Culpepper, Post Office Box 1736, Atlanta, Ga.
B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Association, Inc.

A. Bryce Curry, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,140.

A. Bernard Cushman, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington. D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Customs Brokers & Forwarders Association of America, Inc., 8 Bridge Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $7,516.73.

A. John R. Dalton, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. D. C. Daniel, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $2.

A. Danish Shipowners' Association, 33 Amaliegade, Copenhagen, Denmark.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $712.50. E. (9) $11.95.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $611.51.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $7.50.

A. Lowell Davis, 601 Ross Avenue, Mart, Tex.
D. (6) $121.72. E. (9) $121.72.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. D.C. Transit System, Inc., 36th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Hilton Hotels Corp., Chicago, Ill.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $23.20.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Equitable Life Insurance Co., 3900 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Laundry-Dry Cleaning Association of the District of Columbia, 2400 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Variable Annuity Life Insurance Co., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Finance Conference, Inc., 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $473.16.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Comision de Defensa del Azucar y Fomento de la Cana, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5,500. E. (9) $221.36.

A. Tony D. Dechant.

B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Frank L. Dennis, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $381.71.

A. Mary S. Deuel, 3026 Cambridge Place NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,102.50.

A. Joe T. Dickerson, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,687.50. E. (9) $164.29.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Sacramento Yolo Port District, 705 California Fruit Building, Sacramento, Calif.

D. (6) $2,719.05. E. (9) $94.05.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Thurman & Wright, 1229 Latham Square Building, Oakland, Calif.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Westlands Water District, Post Office Box 4006, Fresno, Calif.

D. (6) $1,921. E. (9) $121.37.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.

E. (9) $1,500.

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $3,750.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $18,618.03. E. (9) $20,205.14.

A. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Division of Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $12,745.07.

A. Thomas Dixon, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Dolan, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $656.25. E. (9) $293.98.

A. Anthony P. Donadio, 2 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.

B. Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, 2 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.

E. (9) $116.

A. Paul R. M. Donelan, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $441.

A. James L. Donnelly, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $273.14.

A. Donoghue, Ragan & Mason, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

B. California Shipping Company, 320 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $605.77.

A. Donoghue, Ragan & Mason, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Sea-Land Service, Inc., Post Office Box 1050, Newark, N.J.

D. (6) $900. E. (9) $157.92.

A. Donoghue, Ragan & Mason, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Seatrain Lines, Inc., 595 River Road, Edgewater, N.J.

D. (6) $900. E. (9) $157.92.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $137.50.

A. Jasper N. Dorsey, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga.

B. Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Company, Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga.

D. (6) $767.75.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,809.23. E. (9) $232.

A. Fred H. Dressler, Box 188, Gardnerville, Nev.

B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

A. Ben DuBois.

B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.

A. Evelyn Dubrow, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

D. (6) $2,160. E. (9) $466.51.

A. Read P. Dunn, Jr., 502 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) $2,700. E. (9) $186.23.

A. William E. Dunn, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $675. E. (9) $14.15.

A. R. Russell Eagan, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $8.81. E. (9) $14.83.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $140. E. (9) $15.

A. Harold Edwards, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Health Federation, 709 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $700.

A. Harold E. Edwards, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $300.

A. Walter A. Edwards, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chrysler Corporation, 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) $250. E. (9) $100.

A. J. C. B. Ehringhaus, Jr., Raleigh, N.C.

B. North Carolina Railroad Association, Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.

D. (6) $2,875.02. E. (9) $241.35.

A. James B. Ehrlich, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $516.25. E. (9) $48.30.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,212. E. (9) $620.52.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Warren G. Elliott, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $650. E. (9) $21.60.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,000.

A. Perry R. Ellsworth, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $1.20.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,050. E. (9) $218.65.

A. Ely, Duncan and Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, Duncan and Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,600.

A. Ely, Duncan and Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, Duncan and Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, Duncan and Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $6,077.50. E. (9) $28.01.

A. Myles, W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Grover W. Ensley, 535 Lincoln Building, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $652. E. (9) $348.

A. John D. Fagan, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $8.20.

A. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $2,419.84.

A. Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $41,233.82. E. (9) $22,500.84.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $500.

A. Joe G. Fender, 314 Melrose Building, Houston, Tex.
B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.
D. (6) $3,203.77.

A. Edward O'Brien Fennell, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Air Lines, 5959 South Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $168.47.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $437.50.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La.; United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla.; and Okeelanta Sugar Refinery, Inc., South Bay, Fla.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. Maxwell Field, 219 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
B. New England Shoe & Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $11.30.

A. James Finucane, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Norman A. Flaningam, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,100. E. (9) $7.95.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $1,800.

A. Fordyce, Mayne, Hartman, Renard & Stribling, 506 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
B. National Rejectors, Inc., 5100 San Francisco Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
E. (9) $604.13.

A. James W. Foristel, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,312.50. E. (9) $228.39.

A. James F. Fort, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $437.14.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $475.

A. W. E. Fravel, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Elmer M. Freudenberger, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,500.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25,937.35. E. (9) $6,032.08.

A. David C. Fullarton, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $30.72.

A. Garrett Fuller, 836 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. West Coast Steamship Company, 601 Board of Trade Building, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) $330. E. (9) $48.50.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Lawrence H. Gall, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $675.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $500.

A. A. Arthur Gardner, 1630 Jefferson Street, Hollywood, Fla.
E. (9) $25.50.

A. Gardner, Morrison & Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Gardner, Morrison & Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mauritius Sugar Syndicate, Port Louis, Mauritius.
E. (9) $28.34.

A. Warner W. Gardner, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Henderson H. Carson, 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio, and 744 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hope Natural Gas Co., 445 West Main Street, Clarksburg, W. Va.
D. (6) $1,900. E. (9) $840.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. Inter-State Manufacturer's Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,012.50. E. (9) $22.82.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $301.08.

A. Philip Goldstein, 1000 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, 1011 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375.

A. James W. Grady, Jr., 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. James L. Grahl, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $210.

A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $64.57.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 318–418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $15,304.20. E. (9) $11,163.42.

A. Gravelle, Whitlock, Markey & Tait, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Structural Clay Products Industry Depletion Committee, Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,180. E. (9) $278.31.

A. Cornelius R. Gray, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Edward R. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $84.73.

A. Mrs. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $90. E. (9) $73.95.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Benefit Health and Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Weston B. Grimes, 1001 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Cargill, 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $4,635. E. (9) $4.20.

A. Ben H. Guill, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Smelting & Refining Co., New York, N.Y.; National Zinc Co., New York, N.Y.; American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co., St. Louis, Mo.; National Auto Dealers Association, Washington, D.C.; Athletic Mining & Smelting Co., Fort Smith, Ark.; and Matthiessen & Hegeler, La Salle, Ill.
D. (6) $6,865.88. E. (9) $4,870.65.

A. Terry Gunn, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Violet M. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,250.04. E. (9) $100.

A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,009.80.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $954. E. (9) $133.37.

A. Louis P. Haffer, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Freight Forwarders Association, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Haight, Gardner, Poor & Havens, 80 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Danish Shipowners' Association, 33 Amaliegade, Copenhagen, Denmark.
E. (9) $2,436.37.

A. Hal H. Hale, 419 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Randolph M. Hale, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Haley, Wollenberg & Bader, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Home Town Free Television Association, 2923 East Lincolnway, Cheyenne, Wyo.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. W. C. Hammerle, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. C. L. Hancock, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Copper & Brass Research Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y., and Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $636.56.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,275. E. (9) $36.60.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 500 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Livestock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,678.50.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $338. E. (9) $15.90.

A. Mrs. Glenn G. Hays, 212 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National WCTU, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $571.56. E. (9) $442.32.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. Hazen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $105.15.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $784.74.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $155.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Constructive Price, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $67.04.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Comite de Productores de Azucar, Antonio Miro Quesada 376, Lima Peru, S.A.
E. (9) $134.51.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Encyclopaedia Britannica Films, Inc., Wilmette, Ill.
E. (9) $80.81.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Reciprocal Inter-Insurers Federal Tax Committee, 400 United Artists Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $14,646.25. E. (9) $475.17.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,620.

A. Chas. H. Heltzel, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pacific Power & Light Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.

D. (6) $1,220. E. (9) $805.13.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,344.40. E. (9) $1,219.40.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y., and 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $119.97. E. (9) $119.97.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.

D. (6) $600.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Football League, 1 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. New York Wool Trade Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Philadelphia Wool & Textile Association, Post Office Box 472, Station S, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Brewers Association, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $5,000.

A. John W. Hight, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $100. E. (9) $10.

A. Dumond Peck Hill, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Coordinating Committee for Export Credit Guarantees, 1 Liberty Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,250.

A. Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, USMC (retired), 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

D. (6) $1,166.67. E. (9) $77.16.

A. Lawrence S. Hobart, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $200.

A. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr.

B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $43.60.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Fuller Holloway, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $7,432.83. E. (9) $607.83.

A. A. D. Holmes, Jr., Gallion, Ala.

B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $7.50.

A. Lawrence W. Horning, 1010 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. New York Central Railroad Co., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Warehousemen's Association.

A. Harold A. Houser, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,500.

A. W. C. Howard, Quanah, Tex.

B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts.

A. Erma D. Hubbard, 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.

B. Military Survivors, Inc., 509 Ridgley Avenue, Annapolis, Md.

A. W. T. Huff, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $275.

A. William J. Hull, 326 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Ashland Oil & Refining Co., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.

A. William J. Hull, 326 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc.

A. Robert I. Humphrey, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $10.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.

B. Richard F. Bates, Sacramento, Calif.; Edward S. Cohen, Washington, D.C.; and J. I. Meltzer, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $377.

A. William J. Hynes, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.

B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

E. (9) $148.28.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,387.50.

A. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $7,640.29. E. (9) $7,640.29.

A. J. Stuart Innerst, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $553.84.

A. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 67 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $750.44. E. (9) $750.44.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $300. E. (9) $469.92.

A. International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $1,495.

A. Inter-State Manufacturer's Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) $1,650. E. (9) $3.25.

A. Iron Ore Lessons Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, Saint Paul, Minn.

D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $976.75.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.

D. (6) $2,150. E. (9) $163.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

E. (9) $150.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,391.23. E. (9) $47.65.

A. Philip F. Jehle, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Retail Druggists, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. Mrs. Margaret E. Jenkins, 30 Deerpath, Norgate Roslyn Heights, Long Island, N.Y.

A. Joe Jenness, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Jennings, Strouss, Salmon & Trask, Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

B. Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District, Post Office Box 1980, Phoenix, Ariz.

D. (6) $13,000. E. (9) $1,400.

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.

B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn., et al.

D. (6) $2,158.76. E. (9) $288.33.

A. Peter D. Joers, Dierks Forests, Inc., 810 Whittington, Hot Springs, Ark.

B. Dierks Forests, Inc., 810 Whittington, Hot Springs, Ark.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Glendon E. Johnson, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $816.64. E. (9) $112.05.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.

B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,692.48. E. (9) $254.25.

A. W. D. Johnson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. Ned Johnston, 4539 Everett, Kensington, Md.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Geo. Bliss Jones, Montgomery, Ala.

B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $21.77.

A. Phillip E. Jones, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $50.

A. Edwin W. Kaler, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

D. (6) $8,750.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $3,780. E. (9) $905.39.

A. Sheldon Z. Kaplan, 817 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Guatemala Sugar Producers Association, Guatemala City, Guatemala.

A. Howard B. Keck, 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. The Superior Oil Co., 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

E. (9) $325.

A. Charles C. Keeble, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

E. (9) $17.12.

A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. West Coast Life Insurance Co., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. James C. Kelley, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. David Walbridge Kendall, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Zantop Air Transport, Inc., Detroit-Metropolitan Airport, Inkster, Mich.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $83.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $280.90.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $21.20.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $609.30. E. (9) $250.80.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

D. (6) $4,061.50. E. (9) $181.95.

A. Jeff Kibre, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $2,231.76. E. (9) $1,371.49.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $12.50.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $246.25.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $606.25.

A. Ludlow King, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $675.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) $510. E. (9) $175.75.

A. James F. Kmetz, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,552.

A. Robert M. Koch, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $12.75.

A. William L. Kohler, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $236.41.

A. Germaine Krettek, The Coronet, Washington, D.C.

B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $3,061.59.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $8,278.72. E. (9) $6,094.36.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $375.

A. J. Austin Latimer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $750.

A. Alan Latman, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $113.50. E. (9) $6.

A. Thomas B. Lawrence, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.

D. (6) $650.

A. Warren Lawrence, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Company of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $190. E. (9) $60.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $25.62. E. (9) $36.87.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $2,267.02.

A. Daphne R. Leeds, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Sealy, Inc., Serta Associates, Inc., Restonic Corp., 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $366.76.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $125. E. (9) $116.

A. Richard T. Leonard, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $504.70.

A. Roy T. Lester, M.D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,100. E. (9) $201.04.

A. John R. Lewis, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

A. Hal Leyshon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $1,361.47.

A. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

E. (9) $4.50.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $7,612,19. E. (9) $7,612.19.

A. L. Blaine Liljenquist, 917 15th Street N.W.. Washington, D.C.

B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5,060. E. (9) $12.95.

A. Lawrence J. Linck, 53 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

B. National Association of Chain Drug Stores, Vanderbilt Hotel, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,900. E. (9) $6,038.67.

A. Lester W. Lindow, executive director, Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $114.75. E. (9) $107.42.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,083.75. E. (9) $123.48.

A. Gordon C. Locke, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Long, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union of North America, Pressmen's Home, Tenn.

D. (6) $825. E. (9) $4.

A. Leonard Lopez, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,499.90. E. (9) $15.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Chain Drug Stores, 34th Street and Park Avenue, New York, NY.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 24 West Erie Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Roadside Business Association, 646 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Adolph von Zedlitz, 60 Sutton Place, South, New York, N.Y.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Western Medical Corporation, 415–423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. H. B. Luckett, 311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $407.17.

A. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street, Washington, D.C.

B. Division of Federal Relations, NEA, 1201 16th Street, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $168. E. (9) $11.68.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $750.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $2,225. E. (9) $40.76.

A. A. E. Lyon, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,050.

A. Breck P. McAllister, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. William C. McCamant, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $800. E. (9) $50.

A. John A. McCart, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees.

D. (6) $2,394. E. (9) $38.40.

A. James L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street, Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $250. E. (9) $8.64.

A. William A. McClintock, Jr., 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.

B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Angus H. McDonald.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,584.51. E. (9) $168.15.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $300.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Rev. A. J. McFarland.

B. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Pennsylvania Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $1,149.99. E. (9) $350.

A. William F. McKenna, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $616.40. E. (9) $121.33.

A. Marvin L. McLain, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $26.70.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,287. E. (9) $334.29.

A. W. H. McMains, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. C. W. McMillan, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) $3,999.96. E. (9) $677.46.

A. Clarence M. McMillan, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Roderick J. McMullin, Post Office Box 1980, Phoenix, Ariz.

B. Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District.

D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $2,132.24.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $293.75. E. (9) $3.20.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Optometric Association, Inc., c/o Dr. Melvin B. Dunbar, 21 Bank Street, Lebanon, N.H.

D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $69.46.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Frankel Brothers, 521 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., 'Washington, D.C.

B. Mrs. Willi Zietz, Savoy Hilton Hotel, New York, N.Y.

A. John G. Macfarlan, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,158. E. (9) $452.62.

A. MacLeish, Spray, Price & Underwood, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $584.52.

A. Albert E. Maddocks, 1883 South 7th East, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Jerome J. Madigan, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Don Mahon, Executive Secretary, National Independent Union Council, Box 959, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $442.25.

A. Walter E. Maloney, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,580. E. (9) $1,611.50.

A. Ben J. Man, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,128.88. E. (9) $618.60.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,200.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,374.99. E. (9) $159.65.

A. Olya Margolin (Mrs.), 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,290.99. E. (9) $91.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,052.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $457.64.

A. Raymond E. Marks, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. David M. Marsh, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D.C
B. Association of Casualty & Surety Co.'s, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $2,899.98. E. (9) $1,856.89.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $40. E. (9) $3.20.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Company, 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. J. Paull Marshall, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $276.12. E. (9) $192.

A. Paul V. Martenson, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Drew Martin, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $75.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $25.

A. David Mathews, Jr., 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. The Pittsburgh Coal Exchange.

A. P. H. Mathews, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,062.17. E. (9) $2,087.68.

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $590.63. E. (9) $162.10.

A. Joe G. Matthews, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $49.08. E. (9) $52.

A. C. V. and R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Secondary Material Industries, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John S. Mears, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,130.

A. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mehler, Goldsborough & Ives, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ferro Corp., 4150 East 56th Street, Cleveland, Ohio; O. Hommel Co., Post Office Box 475, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Glostex Chemicals, Inc., 2700 Bandini Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.; Pemco Corp., 5601 Eastern Avenue, Baltimore, Md.

A. Mehler, Goldsborough & Ives, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 292 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,315.

A. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. M. Barry Meyer, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D (6) $100. E. (9) $127.70.

A. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $1,524.11.

A. Midland Cooperative Dairy Association, Shawano, Wis., and 912 University Building, Syracuse, N.Y.

A. C. R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. John R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Military Survivors, Inc., 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.
D. (6) $459. E. (9) $1,396.26.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Jeppesen & Co., 8025 East 40th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $3,605. E. (9) $155.15.

A. Capt. A. Stanley Miller, 912 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A Clarence L. Miller, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Stock Yards Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, 2211 South Coast Building, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $302.59.

A. Lloyd S. Miller, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $835.

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,875.

A. M. D. Mobley, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Vocational Association, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Willis C. Moffatt, 536 First Security Building, Boise, Idaho.

B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif., et al.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $825.

A. Walter H. Moorman, 4650 East West Highway, Bethesda, Md.

B. Maryland Railroad Association, care of W. C. Purnell, 300 St. Paul Place, Baltimore, Md.

D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $49.89.

A. Cecil Morgan, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

B. Standard Oil Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $287.83.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, the Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Reciprocal Insurance Association, Kansas City, Mo.

D. (6) $6,710. E. (9) $193.88.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, the Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Ford Motor Co., the American Road, Dearborn, Mich.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, the Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Sperry and Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,300. E. (9) $7.05.

A. Bernard R. Mullady, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

D. (6) $2,730.

A. Vincent S. Mullaney, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $913.76.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., National Building, Webster City, Iowa.

D. (6) $600. E. (9) $600.

A. John Kevin Murphy, 222–17 Northern Boulevard, Bayside, N.Y.

B. Armored Carrier Corp., 222–17 Northern Boulevard, Bayside, N.Y.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $922.35. E. (9) $1,281.35.

A. National Association Chain Drug Stores, Inc., 34th Street and Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $6,038.67.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) $13,750. E. (9) $18.40.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $298.68. E. (9) $19,878.72.

A. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $460. E. (9) $460.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $7,787.88.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $3,230.73. E. (9) $3,230.73.

A. National Association of Plumbing Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $14,250. E. (9) $8,258.27.

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

D. (6) $527.50. E. (9) $253.29.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1422 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $47,637.01. E. (9) $682.50.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $7,491.48. E. (9) $7,491.48.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $50. E. (9) $314.29.

A. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $37,020. E. (9) $36,587.15.

A. National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, University Hospital, Minneapolis, Minn.

E. (9) $5,000.

A. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Association, Inc., 26 Auburn Avenue, Atlanta, Ga.

D. (6) $3,837.50.

A. National Conference for Repeal of Taxes on Transportation, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $1,907.69.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Coordinating Committee for Export Credit Guarantees, 1 Liberty Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $5,950. E. (9) $8,233.22.

A. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) $9,671.54. E. (9) $9,671.54.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

E. (9) $157.

A. National Counsel Associates, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Central Scientific Co., 1700 Irving Park Road, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $3,000.

A. National Economic Council, Inc., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,690.58. E. (9) $1,970.80.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,170.86. E. (9) $2,170.86.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $84,353.92. E. (9) $11,512.91.

A. National Food Brokers Association, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,516.12. E. (9) $1,516.12.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $337.

A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $847.80. E. (9) $2,537.65.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,174.22. E. (9) $3,345.50.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,729. E. (9) $1,729.

A. National Livestock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver 18, Colo.

D. (6) $4,290.80. E. (9) $1,826.27.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,507.79. E. (9) $2,581.93.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,984.13. E. (9) $1,984.13.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 237 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $751.98.

A. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Rejectors, Inc., 5100 San Francisco Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.

E. (9) $808.97.

A. National Restaurant Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $6,421.13. E. (9) $6,421.13.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $13,526.69. E. (9) $10,007.44.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,590.11. E. (9) $9,159.49.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,527.59.

A. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $278.43.

A. National Small Business Men's Association, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $2,775.01.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $86,416.32. E. (9) $5,221.59.

A. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $46.20. E. (9) $46.20.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $13,314.50. E. (9) $9,363.75.

A. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,475. E. (9) $12,182.93.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $420.

A. William S. Neal, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,750.02. E. (9) $2,892.83.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. James W. Rouse & Co., Inc., 14 West Saratoga Street, Baltimore, Md.; Walker & Dunlop, Inc., 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.; Frederick W. Berens, Inc., 1722 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.; The Carey Winston Co., 1723 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.; B. F. Saul Co., 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. New England Shoe and Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $211.30. E. (9) $211.30.

A. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,071.68. E. (9) $2,064.39.

A. Charles M. Noone, 1209 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $25.

A. T. A. Nooner, Jr., 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,600.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $280.71.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $155.08.

A. Robert T. Worth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 578 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $267.70.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. E. M. Norton, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $83.

A. Brice O'Brien, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $675.

A. George J. O'Brien, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. E. H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $8,885.47.

A. John F. O'Connor, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,374.96. E. (9) $266.55.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $600.

A. Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus 15, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,892.40.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Oliver & Donnally, 110 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $24.17.

A. Robert Oliver, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sperry and Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,412.24. E. (9) $87.65.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
E. (9) $40.05.

A. Samuel Omasta, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $7.50.

A. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $5,081.54.

A. Clayton L. Orn, 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

A. Joseph J. Oros, 329 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $38.25.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.

A. Kermit Overby, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $275.

A. Vaux Owen, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,692.04. E. (9) $5.65.

A. Edwin F. Padberg, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Walter Page, 912 University Building, Syracuse, N.Y.

A. Everett L. Palmer, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
E. (9) $202.13.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Post Office Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. J. D. Parel, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225.32.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 67 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $125.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Turkey Federation, Post Office Box 69, Mt. Morris, Ill.
E. (9) $17.50.

A. Holcombe Parkes, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $9,750.

A. James D. Parriott, 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

A. Robert D. Partridge, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electrification Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $268.40.

A. James G. Patton.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $918.92.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $16,900. E. (9) $354.12.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
D. (6) $1,300. E. (9) $41.58.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $544.71.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $1,403.74.

A. Robert Pennington, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Federal Relations, National Education Association, 2101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $226.

A. Ervin L. Peterson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $43.50.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $36.43.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. C. C. Woodard, 940 Northeast 79th Street, Miami, Fla.
E. (9) $10.

A. Kenneth Peterson, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Tom Pickett, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $106.66. E. (9) $81.39.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $76.25.

A. T. E. Pinkston, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.

A. James H. Pipkin, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texaco Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $1,155.36.

A. Pitcairn, Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.
E. (9) $5,029.07.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) $6,218.95. E. (9) $1,350.

A. Milton M. Plumb, Railway Labor Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, Railway Labor Building, Washington, D.C.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,025.

A. Frederick T. Poole, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Oil Pipe Lines.
E. (9) $300.

A. Frank M. Porter, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Richard M. Powell, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas W. Power, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $300.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,800.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $3.59.

A. Purcell & Nelson, Barr Building, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Nicaragua Sugar Estates, Ltd., Managua, Nicaragua.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $7.54.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. Felix M. Putterman, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Jewish War Veterans of the USA, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $198.95.

A. Gordon M. Quarnstrom, 1726 Wilmette Avenue, Wilmette, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, New York, N.Y., etc.
D. (6) $13,249.97. E. (9) $6,089.34.

A. Alex Radin, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $458.70.

A. Edward F. Ragland, 6917 Marbury Road, Bethesda, Md.
B. Tobacco Institute, Inc., 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $256.20. E. (9) $256.20.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $425. E. (9) $172.17.

A. J. A. Ransford, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tidewater Oil Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Grant S. Ray, 114 Huron Drive, Washington, D.C.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 3840 Greenbrier Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Box 48, Durant, Okla.
D. (6) $597.98. E. (9) $447.98.

A. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Stanley Rector, 506 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Robert E. Redding, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Conference for Repeal of Taxes on Transportation, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $228.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Creameries Association, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $3,626.42.

A. W. O. Reed, 6254 Woodland Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Texas railroads.
D. (6) $52.75. E. (9) $171.85.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,999.98. E. (9) $740.60.

A. Herbert S. Reid, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. New York State Association of Railroads, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $37.45.

A. James Francis Reilly, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 929 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $303.69.

A. Louis H. Renfrow, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the U.S., 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $58,921.55.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25,124.27. E. (9) $8,496.48.

A. James W. Richards, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Company (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $617.80.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.
B. Louisiana railroads.
D. (6) $63.85. E. (9) $230.15.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co., 112 East Washington Street, Bloomington, Ill.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $97.05.

A. Richard J. Riddick, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Freight Forwarders Institute, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,499.99. E. (9) $412.59.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers.

A. C. E. Rightor, 3300 Rolling Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $1,339.91.

A. James F. Rill, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Steadman, Collier & Shannon, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $5.

A. William Neale Roach, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $280.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $173.88.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Cos., 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $343.75.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Oil & Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $5,260.

A. Watson Rogers, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Food Brokers Association, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. George B. Roscoe, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $405. E. (9) $206.33.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $286.81.

A. William H. Ryan, 400 First St. NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,999.88. E. (9) $60.

A. Kermit B. Rykken, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Los Angeles, Calif., etc.

A. Kimball Sanborn, 810 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Boston & Maine Railroad, 150 Causeway Street, Boston, Mass.

A. O. H. Saunders, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,950.

A. J. A. Schwab, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Arthur E. Scribner, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1.50.

A. F. G. Scussel, Post Office Box 1980, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement & Power District, Post Office Box 1980, Phoenix, Ariz.
D. (6) $2,300. E. (9) $2,342.60.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harry See, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
E. (9) $3.65.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Federal Relations, NEA, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $222. E. (9) $6.13.

A. Fred G. Seig, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $198.91. E. (9) $248.

A. Serta Associates, Inc., 666 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $9,295.83.

A. Leo Seybold, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $116.65.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.; and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $161.88.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $968.

A. John J. Sheehan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $300.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 608 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Association of Port Authorities, Inc., Washington, D.C., and Airport Operators Council, Inc., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $791.65. E. (9) $683.06.

A. David A. Shepard, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Robert H. Shields, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Richard C. Shipman.
B. Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,292.48. E. (9) $60.85.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 801 International Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Ralph Showalter, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Union, United Automobile Aircraft & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) $2,927.68. E. (9) $626.39.

A. Everett E. Shuey, Helena, Mont.

B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

E. (9) $1,529.41.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $700.

A. Silver Users Association, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,152.50. E. (9) $1,014.78.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $13,900. E. (9) $7,708.01.

A. Harold S. Skinner, Post Office Box 2197, Houston, Tex.

B. Continental Oil Co., Post Office Box 2197, Houston, Tex.

A. Harold Slater, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,312.50. E. (9) $60.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $17.60.

A. Carleton D. Smith, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Radio Corp. of America, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Dudley Smith, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harold Arden Smith, 605 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $200. E. (9) $120.

A. James R. Smith, 1060 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.

B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.

D. (6) $1,051.60. E. (9) $785.59.

A. Wallace M. Smith, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 1200 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

D. (6) $769. E. (9) $457.64.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $317.82.

A. Frank B. Snodgrass, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.

D. (6) $225.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,350.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,436. E. (9) $732.43.

A. Charles B. Sonneborn, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $7.50.

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,053.36.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.

D. (6) $26,260.33. E. (9) $8,706.39.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers' Association, Post Office Drawer 747, Durant, Okla.

E. (9) $150.

A. William W. Spear, 214 National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.

B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $900. E. (9) $442.45.

A. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. John M. Sprague, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

E. (9) $15.30.

A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $150.

A. Steadman, Collier & Shannon, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $210.

A. Mrs. C. A. L. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Washington, D.C.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. B. H. Steuerwald, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $750.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $16,471.18. E. (9) $4,101.06.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

D. (6) $1,406.25. E. (9) 572.49.

A. Mrs. Ada Barnett Stough, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Francis W. Stover, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

D. (6) $2,375. E. (9) $275.90.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference.

D. (6) $1,384.62.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture & Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $6,250.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Allied Printing Trades Association, Box 728, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) $625.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ben Blumenthal, 608 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Federation of American Scientists, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Peach Springs, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Laguna Pueblo of New Mexico, Laguna, N. Mex.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, Idaho.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Scottsdale, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Seneca Nation of Indians, 25 Main Street, Salamanca, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tuscarora Nation of Indians, Lewiston, N.Y.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 827 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Structural Clay Products Industry Depletion Committee, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $40,556.23. E. (9) $28,948.06.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. U.S. Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $298.93.

A. Walter B. Stults, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $25.

A. Verne R. Sullivan, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aeromaritime, Inc., 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Amerop Commodities Corporation, 120 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould and Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. South Puerto Rico Sugar Co., 99 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Glenn J. Talbott.
B. Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dwight D. Taylor, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1250. E. (9) $410.36.

A. John I. Taylor, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $958.33. E. (9) $32.79.

A. J. B. Thayn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,374.99. E. (9) $25.55.

A. Christy Thomas and Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of River and Harbor Contractors, 15 Park Row, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $89.49.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,397.71.

A. William B. Thompson, Jr., 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6.50.

A. Eugene M. Thore, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $4.02.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Sigmund Timberg, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sealy, Inc., Serta Associates, Inc., and Restonic Corp.
E. (9) $635.13.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 4200 Cathedral Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Calif.
D. (6) $295. E. (9) $283.58.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $208.13.

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Dwight D. Townsend, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cooperative League of U.S.A., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Company, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $147.83.

A. Trade Relations Council of the United States, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard S. Tribbe, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,712.50. E. (9) $62.87.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,562.50. E. (9) $52.40.

A. J. T. Trullinger, National Bank of Commerce Building, Olympia, Wash.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif., etc.

A. Dick Tullis, 307 Maple Terrace, Dallas, Tex.
B. Superior Oil Co., Houston, Tex., and Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,200.

A. Ernest A. Tupper, 1420 New York Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Can Co., 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold J. Turner, Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co.; Southern Pacific Co.; and Union Pacific Railroad Co., Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. John W. Turner, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L.E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Local No. 30, Canal Zone Pilots Association, Post Office Box 601, Balboa, C.Z.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $71.31.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Range Association, 2438 Tulare Street, Fresno, Calif.
E. (9) $99.12.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
E. (9) $814.90.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,253.23.

A. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $203,228.80. E. (9) $22,994.96.

A. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $46,825.48.

A. United States Trust Company of New York, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Thomas M. Venables, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $63.67. E. (9) $24.97.

A. L. T. Vice, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $180. E. (9) $75.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Carl M. Walker, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $53.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $432. E. (9) $3.72.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $597.50. E. (9) $30.38.

A. Herbert F. Walton, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,052.02.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $883.48. E. (9) $1,679.58.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $50.

A. Waterways Bulk Transportation Council, Inc., 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $80. E. (9) $246.03.

A. J. R. Watson, I.C.R.R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
B. Mississippi Railroad Association, I.C.R.R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.

A. Watters & Donovan, 161 William Street, New York, N.Y.
B. New York & New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1.11.

A. Weaver and Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $10.98.

A. William H. Webb, LaSalle Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rivers & Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,490. E. (9) $249.50.

A. E. E. Webster, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,966.44.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
E. (9) $616.51.

A. Edwin M. Wheeler, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. Kansas Railroad Committee, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. Horace P. White, 1341 G Street, Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers, 941 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $468. E. (9) $1,232.70.

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $96.87.

A. Marc A. White, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Richard P. White, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $37.50. E. (9) $110.83.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Scott C. Whitney, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $975.

A. Donald S. Whyte, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $59.75.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Albert E. Wilkinson, Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Anaconda Co., Hennessy Building, Butte, Mont.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $455.55.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Berker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 501 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $19.20.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Tribe of Indians, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) $14.92.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.
E. (9) $15.13.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Menominee Enterprises, Inc., Neopit, Wis.
E. (9) $4.45.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.
E. (9) $14.07.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.
E. (9) $9.43.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. David C. Williams, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,636.68.

A. Harding deC. Williams, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,666. E. (9) $8.36.

A. Harold M. Williams, 67 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 67 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $49.63.

A. Laurens Williams, 602 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Robert E. Williams, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $950. E. (9) $113.65.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,700. E. (9) $320.56.

A. Clark L. Wilson, 714 Associations Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Consultant to Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $3,496.32.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,446.15.

A. Everett B. Wilson, Jr., 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Henry B. Wilson, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $18.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $214.90.

A. W. F. Wimberly, Post Office Box 4147, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Pure Oil Co., 200 East Golf Road, Palatine, Ill.

A. Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Theodore Wiprud, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Venlo Wolfsohn, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $8.50.

A. Frank G. Wollney, 67 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 67 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Russell J. Woodman, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

A. William W. Woodruff, 1730 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $1,429.92.

A. Albert Y. Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Flying Tiger Line, Inc., Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.
E. (9) $1,570.16.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Alexander W. Wuerker, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $542. E. (9) $106.02.

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. J. Banks Young, 502 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $109.75.

A. John H. Young, 1411 Major Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Zantop Air Transport, Inc., Detroit-Metropolitan Airport, Inkster, Mich.
E. (9) $1,283.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1961:

(Note.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the Record, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

File Two Copies With the Secretary of the Senate and File Three Copies With the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

Place an "X" Below the Appropriate Letter or Figure in the Box at the Right of the "Report" Heading Below:

"Preliminary" Report ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"Quarterly" Report: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19____◄

REPORT

Pursuant to Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
	(Mark one square only)			

Note on Item "A".—(a) In General. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) Separate Reports. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. Organization or Individual Filing:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

Note on Item "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. Employer.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

Note on Item "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. Legislative Interests, and Publications in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◄

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◄

A. Leslie M. Alexander, Post Office Box 1980, Phoenix, Ariz.

B. Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement & Power District, Post Office Box 1980, Phoenix, Ariz.

A. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. American Football League, 1111 Southland Center, Dallas, Tex.

A. Wm. J. Barnhard, 923 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Bruynzeel-Suriname Particle Board Co., Paramaribo, Surinam.

A. Becker & Greenwald, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Foreign Steamship Corp., 80 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph Borkin, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. New York World's Fair 1964–1965 Corp., Post Office Box 1964, Flushing, N.Y.

A. John J. Bugas, Post Office Box 178, Montrose, Colo.

B. Colorado-Ute Electric Association, Inc., Post Office Box 178, Montrose, Colo.

A. Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. H. Allen Carroll, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Eugene C. Carusi, 521 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Colorado River Basin Consumers Power, Inc., 343 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Alexander K. Christie, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., Wilmington, Del.

A. Mary U. Cleverley, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Committee on Constructive Price, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. R. Russell Eagan, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Mello G. Fish, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. Fowler, Leva, Hawes & Symington, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Waterways Bulk Transportation Council, Inc., 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Ginsburg, Leventhal & Brown, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Virgin Islands Gift & Fashion Shop Association, St. Thomas, Virgin Islands.

A. Thomas F. Hannon, 218 Cyrus Place, Alexandria, Va.

A. Walter Hasty, Jr., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee on Constructive Price, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Patrick J. Hillings, 3921 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Los Angeles City Employees, Section of the California Public Employees for Social Security, Whittier, Calif.

A. Richard D. Hobbet, 626 East Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wis.

B. Halquist Lannon Stone Co., Sussex, Wis.

A. International Trade & Finance, Inc., 1340 West Flagler Street, Miami, Fla., and the Woodner, Washington, D.C.

A. Chester W. Jackson, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Jennings, Strouss, Salmon & Trask, Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

B. Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement & Power District, Post Office Box 1980, Phoenix, Ariz.

A. Sheldon Z. Kaplan, 817 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Salvador Schaps, Servidora Electrica, S.A., San Salvador, El Salvador.

A. Keatinge and Older, 3325 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Great Lakes Airlines, Inc., etc.

A. Charles C. Keeble, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. A. H. Bull Steamship Co., 115 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold Leventhal, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Columbia Pictures Corp., etc.

A. Fred Livingston, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. New York World's Fair 1964–1965 Corporation, Post Office Box 1964, Flushing, N.Y.

A. Bernard Locker, 4716 44th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold O. Lovre and Philip M. DeVany, 639 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Football League, 1111 Southland Center, Dallas, Tex.

A. Breck P. McAllister, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles McKenna, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Roderick J. McMullin, Post Office Box 1980, Phoenix, Ariz.

B. Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement & Power District, Post Office Box 1980, Phoenix, Ariz.

A. Harvey F. McPhail, 343 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.

B. Colorado River Basin Consumers Power, Inc., 343 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Eugene J. Malone, Jr., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mermey Organization, 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Bureau of Education on Fair Trade, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. William R. Merriam, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Capt. A. Stanley Miller, 930 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. National Counsel Associates, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Central Scientific Co., 1700 Irving Park Road, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Rejectors, Inc., 5100 San Francisco Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.

B. Walter R. Mayne, 506 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Sugarcane Planters, Fourth Floor, Gonzaga Building, Rizal Avenue at Carriedo, Manila, Philippines.

A. Oliver and Donnally, 110 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph J. Oros, 329 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Wm. Edison Owen, 215 C Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael Padnos, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Rufus W. Peckham, Jr., 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Ralph D. Pittman, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pinkerton's National Detective Agency, Inc., 154 Nassau Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Mima R. Pollitt, Box 3593, Washington, D.C.

A. Royall, Koegel & Rogers, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pinkerton's National Detective Agency, Inc., 154 Nassau Street, New York, N.Y.

A. F. G. Scussel, Post Office Box 1980, Phoenix, Ariz.

B. Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement & Power District, Post Office Box 1980, Phoenix, Ariz.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

A. John H. Sharon, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Leonard L. Silverstein, 1000 Bender Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Investors Diversified Services, Inc., and Investors Syndicate of America, Inc., Eighth and Marquette, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. Calvin K. Snyder, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Walter B. Stults, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Walter H. Duisberg, 231 South Dwight Place, Englewood, N.J.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Coordinating Committee for Export Credit Guarantees, 1 Liberty Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Arvin E. Upton, 1821 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Henry A. S. van Daalen, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Common Carrier Conference—Irregular Route, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Powers of the Comptroller of the Currency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter which I addressed to the Honorable James J. Saxon, Comptroller of the Currency, on January 9, 1962. The text of the letter follows:

JANUARY 9, 1962.

Hon. JAMES J. SAXON,
Comptroller of the Currency,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SAXON: After reading your opinion in the First National City Bank of New York case with great care, I believe it advisable to make the following comments:

At the hearing, after you had referred to Westchester County branches of New York City banks, I had the following colloquy with you:

"Mr. CELLER. Your statement only emphasizes the fact that New York City banks have the opportunity to enter Westchester County by application for branches and approval thereof and that they can and should do it in this manner and not do it in a wholesale manner by grabbing up the second largest bank in Westchester. * * *

"The COMPTROLLER. Well, Mr. Chairman, this is a pertinent question. Where should the line be drawn?

"Mr. CELLER. Some agency has the power to control the number of those branches. Here you go in and allow willy-nilly a bank to secure control of 22 branches at one fell swoop. I think that is wrong. Let them grow gradually and let there be supervision over the number of branches that they shall have."

I am pleased that your decision is in accord with that position.

I am, however, disturbed by certain obiter statements in your opinion—noted in the press—which I find inconsistent with the intent and understanding of the Congress.

Thus, while your decision acknowledges your responsibility to act "within the statutory policies prescribed by the Congress," nevertheless in referring to the antitrust laws you state that the nature of commercial banking is such as to render "highly questionable for judging bank mergers the concepts developed in the application of those laws to industrial corporations." This would seem to question the judgment of Congress in not exempting banks from the Sherman Act and other antitrust laws. It would seem to question the wisdom of Congress in requiring the bank regulatory agencies to consider competition and tendency to monopoly factors in considering applications for approval of mergers. And it would seem to question the propriety of applying antitrust law precedents to bank mergers.

In your opinion you state that "we have considerable doubt that there can exist effective monopoly power in commercial banking as it operates in this country today." You also assert in your opinion, "that there has been a considerable overemphasis upon an alleged lack of competition in banking, and an alleged concentration in banking. To the contrary, banking is highly competitive. It is diffuse rather than concentrated."

I find these remarks utterly inconsistent with the position and understanding of Congress as expressed in the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, the Bank Merger Act of 1960, and the extensive supporting legislative history. Congress was well aware at the time it enacted these laws that it was dealing with a regulated industry. On the basis of uncontradicted facts adduced before both House and Senate committees, however, it considered that banking concentration was so acute a problem as to require corrective legislation.

I am sure you recognize that regulation of some aspects of an industry cannot, in itself, insure that unhealthy monopoly and detrimental absence of competition may not arise in such industries. It may be, therefore, that what you may have had in mind in the above utterances was that the Federal agencies, properly enforcing the applicable Federal statutes, would prevent any substantial lessening of competition or tendency to monopoly in the banking field.

In your opinion you take the position that only the banking agencies have the competency and equipment to determine competitive standards for banks. According to the press, you have more recently asserted that your office should have the sole or primary responsibility regarding the fixing of service charges by banks in restraint of trade.

I remind you, therefore, that Congress did not regard either your agency or the other Federal bank supervisory agencies to have such competence in evaluating competitive factors in the banking field as to entrust consideration of such factors solely to them. Thus your predecessor testified: "I have no competency in that (the antitrust) field. I do not know what the courts have done." (Hearings before Antitrust Subcommittee, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, on S. 3341, 84th Cong., p. 80.)

You, of course, are well aware that the statutes expressly envisage that these agencies will avail themselves of the special competence of the Department of Justice on such matters to receive its advice thereon. The courts also, undoubtedly, will have occasion to consider such factors in pending litigation before them.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

A Tribute to Archbishop Francis P. Keough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, last month Baltimore City lost one of its outstanding citizens and a great spiritual leader. It is with a deep and sincere sense of sadness that I note the passing of the Most Reverend Francis P. Keough, archbishop of Baltimore.

Archbishop Keough died at 8:35 Friday morning, December 8, 1961, in the Georgetown University Hospital after having been stricken with a cerebral thrombosis on November 30 past.

Born December 30, 1890, in New Britain, Conn., Francis Patrick Keough was educated at St. Mary's Parochial School in New Britain; St. Thomas Seminary, Hartford; Seminaire de St. Sulpice, Ossy, France; and St. Bernard's Seminary, Rochester, N.Y. He was ordained June 10, 1916. The first and only parish assignment of his career was 3 years as curate of St. Rose's Church in Meriden, Conn. He never became a pastor, an unusual circumstance in a clerical career.

Father Keough was consecrated bishop of Providence, May 22, 1954, a post he served with distinction until being named archbishop on November 29, 1947, by the late Pope Pius XII, following the death of Archbishop Michael J. Curley.

His loss will be felt not only by the members of his own faith but by all who knew him and came in contact with him, for his was a faith which surpassed ecclesiastical bounds, giving comfort to all, regardless of their method of devotion, their ancestral background, or the pigment of their skin. He was truly a religious man in every sense of the word.

Archbishop Keough's death marks the passing of a great spiritual leader from our midst, and he will be sorely missed, especially by the people of Baltimore, whom he served well and faithfully as archbishop for 14 years. I am grateful for the privilege of having known Archbishop Keough, and I mourn his death.

Medical Care and Hospitalization Under the Free Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I wish to propose a program for medical care and hospitalization for elderly Americans within the framework of the free enterprise system.

The problem of medical costs for elderly people is a problem that demands solution and should not become involved in the old arguments about socialized medicine.

There is no doubt in my mind that Federal sponsorship of a health and hospitalization plan, either directly through a new agency or as a part of social security, and no matter how limited the benefits in the beginning, would lead to the nationalization or socialization of medicine and a decline in the quality of medical care.

In general, I would seek to overcome the dangers and inadequacies of various current proposals by permitting each individual or married couple over age 62 to select his own health care insurance, permitting a choice of plans similar to that now offered Federal Government employees.

Regardless of other medical expenses, I would permit deduction of the total amount spent on such insurance in the income tax returns of individuals whose income exceeded levels I shall set tentatively at $2,500 for the individual or $4,000 for married couples.

I would authorize a tax credit in the amount of the insurance costs for those whose incomes are below these limits.

For individuals having no taxable income or who would pay a tax less than the cost of the insurance plan, I would authorize issuance of a certificate entitling them to purchase an approved health insurance plan. Such a certificate would be in the amount of the difference between the cost of the plan and the amount the individual or couple could pay by reason of a tax credit.

This would mean that a person with no taxable income would pay nothing for the insurance, and others would pay relative to their ability to pay.

The certificates would be accepted by insurance companies in payment of premiums and in turn would be accepted by the Internal Revenue Service as part payment of taxes due from the companies.

As I see it, my proposal has several distinct advantages.

It limits the assistance to those who really need it, and provides assistance in a degree commensurate with need. On the other hand, the social security approach would provide benefits regardless of the wealth of an individual while ignoring millions of needy persons who are not in the social security program.

It provides a variety of insurance programs that may be tailored to the conditions of individuals. The social security proposal restricts everyone to what I consider an entirely inadequate period of hospitalization with no payment of doctor bills.

It preserves both the American's historic right of free choice and the American free enterprise approach to solving individual needs.

My plan would not permit Federal bureaucratic control of the services offered and could not lead to socialized medicine as I am confident most other plans would do.

Finally, it utilizes at a minimum an existing Government agency without creation of a new mammoth bureau, and provides for a yearly review.

The United States has the highest standards of medical care in the world. Other nations have demonstrated what happens to such standards when the cold hand of government imposes itself between doctor and patient.

I think it would be tragic if the real need for medical care for elderly people who cannot afford it were to become the means of restricting them and all other Americans to a lower quality of medical care than we now enjoy, and perhaps to a curtailment of medical care.

The Sam Rayburn House Office Building Honors One of the Few Really Great Statesmen of This Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of our beloved leader, Sam Rayburn, all Americans in and out of Congress have suffered a great loss.

President Kennedy has said that while Mr. Rayburn's service extended from the administration of President Woodrow Wilson to nearly the end of the 87th Congress it was the quality of that service more than its length that was distinctive.

He added that Mr. Rayburn was "a strong defender of constitutional responsibilities of the Congress, he had an instinctive understanding of the American system and was a loyal counselor and friend of Presidents of both parties on the great matters which affected our national interest and security."

The President pointed out that he had singular opportunities as a young Congressman, and as President, to appreciate Mr. Rayburn's temperament and character. "Both were bedded in rock and remained unchanged by circumstances," said the President.

The President spoke for all of us when he said of Mr. Rayburn:

> This country has lost a devoted servant and the citizens of this country an unflinching friend.

Mr. Rayburn served with eight Presidents of the United States. His career in the House was longer than that of any previous Member and he was Speaker of the House longer than any of his distinguished predecessors in that post.

His life spanned the years 1882 to 1961, from the period following the Civil War through the two great World Wars to the atom bomb, the nuclear-powered submarine, and the jet airplane.

It covered the times that saw America's passage from the frontier period of the West to that of world leader, and grow from a largely rural nation of 50 million people to a powerful industrial and urban civilization of 180 million people.

His life covered a time of great ordeals and great achievements for our Nation, and during his active terms in the Congress he participated in all or most of them.

Mr. Rayburn believed in States' duties as well as States' rights. He believed in a strong Federal Government, one that could stand up to the Fascist and Communist powers, one that could unite and lead the free nations of the world in the greatest combined power ever known to history.

But he also believed in a Federal Government that would, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, do for all the people what they could not do by themselves.

Sam Rayburn in his political faith walked hand in hand with Presidents Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, and John F. Kennedy.

In honor of Mr. Rayburn I am today introducing a House resolution to provide that the House of Representatives Office Building which is being constructed pursuant to the provisions of the Additional House Office Building Act of 1955 shall be known as the Sam Rayburn House Office Building.

Opinion Poll of Minnesota's Third Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, more than 12,000 residents of Minnesota's Third Congressional District

responded to an opinion poll which I prepared last November.

This is an indication of the tremendous interest and concern that our citizens feel today for what we here in the Congress are doing. The results of the poll constitute valuable evidence of the mood of the people regarding some of the vital issues before us. Minnesota's Third District is not only one of the largest in the country, but also is one of the most diverse in terms of population characteristics. The district could well be described as a microcosm of the country in matters of public affairs opinion.

First, a word about the mechanics of the project itself. From beginning to end I had the able assistance of a government student intern who is a candidate for a Ph. D. in American Government at the American University in Washington.

We prepared the questions in the knowledge that their meaning might be open to various interpretations, that they had to be kept relatively short and could not fully describe all aspects of complicated issues, but that the results would be a relatively accurate reflection of the opinions of those who responded.

Volunteers working in my district office hand addressed the many thousands of envelopes, using the names of telephone subscribers in the entire district. There was no attempt to concentrate the poll in any particular area or in any population segment representing special political attitudes. Several newspapers were kind enough to print the questionnaire in full and this produced many additional replies. All returns were tabulated by a group of volunteer students from American University.

A surprisingly high number of persons responding also added their own comments. They gave me the benefit of their expanded views on many important issues, demonstrating a keen sense of awareness of Government matters and of a citizen's participation in representative government. More than three-fourths of all respondents requested to see the final tabulated results.

Many persons mentioned that it was difficult to answer some questions with a simple "yes" or "no." It is interesting that Congressmen often have the same difficulty in the votes they must cast; how easy it would be if every legislative issue were clear cut instead of being complex. Most questions require an evaluation of the favorable and the unfavorable aspects within that issue, and an expression of that evaluation by a simple "yes" or "no" vote when the roll is called in the House of Representatives.

Returns were received in large numbers from Republicans, Democrats, Democrat-Farmer-Laborites, Independents, and others. It is significant to note the great majority favoring a stronger American foreign policy, the public emphasis placed on the need for sounder money policies, and the overwhelming support for an improvement in our nonmilitary ability to prosecute the cold war.

Gratifying response to this experiment in democracy proved that the effort was indeed worthwhile. Thousands of people have been brought into closer contact with their Government, and it is more vital today than ever before that our people recognize the important contribution they can make to our system of self government.

The results of my annual legislative poll are as follows:

ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE OF CONGRESSMAN CLARK MACGREGOR

1. Do you feel that recent events in Cuba, Southeast Asia, and Berlin indicate the desirability and need for a stronger U.S. foreign policy?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	83.8	10.3	5.9

2. Do you favor establishing a new Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	24.4	60.0	15.6

3. Do you favor Federal assistance to education for—

(a) School construction?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	36.7	50.4	12.9

(b) Teachers' salaries?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	18.1	67.0	14.9

(c) Only those school districts without adequate resources?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	44.6	44.0	11.4

(d) Public schools?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	39.0	49.4	11.6

(e) Private schools?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	9.9	76.8	13.3

4. Do you favor medical care for the aged—

(a) With benefits paid for by added social security taxes which are compulsory?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	33.7	50.6	15.7

(b) With benefits to only those who wish to pay added social security taxes (voluntary participation)?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	33.8	43.7	22.5

(c) With increased participation by the Federal and State governments using general tax revenues?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	16.5	58.0	25.5

ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE OF CONGRESSMAN CLARK MACGREGOR—Continued

(d) Through sources outside the Government?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	37.0	34.3	28.7

5. Do you feel that Congress should put a stop to "backdoor spending" which bypasses congressional approval of appropriations and borrows funds from the Treasury with no budgetary control?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	82.5	10.2	7.3

6. Would you favor a peacetime GI bill to grant educational benefits to soldiers who serve during peacetime?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	37.4	58.4	4.2

7. Do you think the postal service should be self-supporting and that postage rates should be raised accordingly?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	76.2	19.0	4.8

8. Would you vote an additional $7 to $9 billion to send a man to the moon and back by 1970?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	34.2	60.7	5.1

9. Do you feel that Congress should continue to investigate activities designed to undermine our Government?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	90.5	6.8	2.7

10. Would you favor National Government control of television programing?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	12.8	83.1	4.1

11. Would you favor a new program designed to systematically reduce the national debt?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	87.8	6.5	5.7

12. In general, do you feel there are enough laws regulating business?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	76.6	18.2	5.2

13. In general, do you feel there are enough laws regulating labor unions?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	25.5	69.6	4.9

ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE OF CONGRESSMAN CLARK MACGREGOR—Continued

14. In your opinion, is the United States engaged in a nonmilitary war with communism which could end in total victory for either side without a major American military effort?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	70.7	22.2	7.1

(If you answered "Yes," please answer the following:)
(a) Do Americans generally realize we are so engaged?

	Yes	No
Percent	38.1	61.9

(b) Should we train more people to fight it effectively in terms of diplomacy, economics, and public information?

	Yes	No
Percent	95.9	4.1

(c) Are we now putting enough skill and effort into it?

	Yes	No
Percent	7.5	92.5

(d) Are we winning?

	Yes	No
Percent	12.6	87.4

(e) Does winning possibly require higher taxes and postponing some desirable domestic programs?

	Yes	No
Percent	72.1	27.9

15. Of the following general topics, check 3 to which you think Congress should give top priority in the session beginning January 1962.

	Percent
Improve our international situation in diplomacy, economics, and public information	60.4
Seek a peaceful world	44.3
Improve national defense	38.4
Balance the budget	35.5
Check inflation	32.2
Reduce unemployment	17.2
Improve public education	16.9
Improve civil rights	13.4
Solve farm problems	9.8
Win the space race	8.1
Other	14.4

Senator Styles Bridges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under general leave granted to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein the attached statement on the late, beloved Senator Styles Bridges:

SENATOR STYLES BRIDGES

The Nation was shocked and saddened to learn of Senator Bridges' untimely passing last November. My own State of New Hampshire and the entire country have suffered a tremendous loss. Senator Bridges served in the U.S. Senate continuously from 1937 to his death. During this period of time, he made an imperishable record as a leader and statesman. His career in the Senate of the United States is without parallel. The Nation is proud of his great contribution to our national life during most trying and difficult years in our history. Through the Senator's efforts, our Nation has been greatly strengthened and his leadership had a telling impact in the formulation of national policy.

Senator Bridges was a man of great courage and deep understanding with an ability to get things done. His work will stand as a monument to his outstanding contribution to our national welfare.

My friendship with Senator Bridges over the years was a most enriching experience. In his passing, I have suffered a deep personal loss. I join with his multitude of friends throughout the Nation in extending to the members of his family deep and heartfelt sympathy. He will always be remembered as a great American, a leader and a statesman of extraord'nary ability.

The Wondrous Workings of the U.S. Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, throughout the fall I have wrestled with the problems of young men whose lives were being disrupted by the Army's mad rush to drag them back into uniform and send them to camp so that they could pull weeds on the post golf course or rake leaves with their hands.

I thought I had hit a high point when I came upon a reservist in my district, a cook, who was rushed back to duty and found himself in the company of several dozen expert computer operators. Apparently there is a one-digit difference in the MOS numbers of cooks and computer operators, and my constituent is still being buffeted about various Army camps, sacrificing his chances for a civilian career, while the Army tries to find a computer that needs a cook.

But this was topped on my return to Washington yesterday to find a disabled, service-connected, veteran recalled to active duty despite the conclusion of several Army doctors that he was unfit for and could not perform military duty. Indeed, he was released from the Army only last year for this reason.

A telegram instructing him to disregard orders to active duty was sent too late to be received before his departure. He was authorized to report by air, but on arrival was told that he could collect only 6 cents per mile for travel.

The finance officer has told him that he cannot collect any pay from the Army unless he forfeits his service-connected disability compensation from the Veterans' Administration. He wonders how his wife and children are going to survive on the compensation, or if he forfeits it and is discharged as he should be, how long it might take to have it reinstated.

The officers at his present duty station recognize that he simply cannot perform military duties, and so he is free to sit in the barracks throughout the day pondering the wondrous workings of the U.S. Army.

Mr. Speaker, these comments are critical of the mobilization, and they are meant to be. I think that a great many unnecessary hardships have been created because of the speed the Army demanded and the inadequacy of its records prior to this recall.

It would not be fair to close, however, without paying a word of tribute to Capt. G. W. Williams, the assistant adjutant general at Second Army Headquarters, who bore the brunt of the countless inquiries and applications for deferment that were made. Without the courtesy, cooperation and assistance of Captain Williams, the work of my office and the situation of my constituents would have been far more difficult than it has been or is today.

Postal Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, another year has rolled by, but for our Nation's faithful postal clerks and carriers it is hardly 1962. To them, it is more like 1945.

Our Post Office employees are still being treated as Government's poor stepchildren—unfairly, inequitably, and slightingly, in comparison to their brothers.

Little has changed for the postal worker since the end of the war, when he began losing his then prosperous purchasing power. The reason is an outmoded and grossly discriminatory pay adjustment system.

A speedy correction is long overdue.

Last year, it will be recalled, a postal longevity bill—S. 1459—was overwhelmingly passed by both Houses, but President Kennedy felt obliged to veto it. We must try again. Something that is honest, decent, and proper, as this readjustment is, should not live or die on the condition of a postal rate increase.

It is silly to reason that the just compensation of an invaluable public service should be absolutely offset by postal revenues. For example, a small post office may have a revenue under $100 a year. No one would suggest that its postmaster's wage be so little. Such a postmaster, in fact, now makes $495 a year. Under the legislation I am introducing, he would get $550.

I hope no one would suggest either that, in order to obtain that modest increase, he would have to sell an extra $55 worth of stamps.

What I am proposing amounts to this: An immediate salary adjustment for every postal employee, as of January 1, 1962, with the largest proportional increases going to those with the lowest incomes. The increases would amount to about $1,000 to each postal worker. Starting wages would rise to just over $100 weekly. After 25 years of service, a carrier or clerk would be earning $130 weekly.

I feel that such a gradual raise of 30 percent in the course of a lifetime of service is the least the United States should offer its employees.

These are the mechanics of how the bill would correct the present inequities:

First. It would award longevity increases after 10, 13, and 16 years of service, instead of the current 13, 18, and 25 years. This would put postal employees on equal footing with other Federal workers. And this must be done to make the postal service as attractive a career as other Federal agencies offer.

Second. It would grant most postal employees an increase each year during the first 5 years of service. These increases would amount to nearly $3 weekly. The postal employee would get the $3 weekly increase again after 10, 13, and 16 years of service. As it stands now, postal employees, unlike other Federal employees, are limited to longevity increases amounting to less than $2 a week and have a much longer period to wait for it, as I have pointed out.

Thus I am only advocating an equal footing with other Government workers.

For postal workers such action, I feel, is essential and should be accomplished quickly to bail out, at long last, our dedicated postal employees from their postwar poorhouse.

Speaker Rayburn: Mentor and Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, because the Speaker is the elected choice of the House, whoever wields the gavel in this Chamber is insured a high measure of respect and regard. Despite the passage of time, however, it remains difficult to realize that we shall not be called to order again by SAM RAYBURN—that we shall not have his counsel and friendship here to sustain us again as so often in the past.

I undertake no encomium on our late beloved Speaker. His service here will be a panegyric for the ages. My desire is only to record here briefly my deep sense of personal bereavement in the passing of Mr. SAM. It had been my special privilege to enjoy association with this great man in this House for a quarter century. Only a score of my colleagues now serving were favored with longer continuous close availability of his wise, straightforward, kindly guidance.

Speaker RAYBURN extended to me countless courtesies and kindnesses through the years, as majority leader and as Speaker—and, of course, in his uncharacteristic but energetic role as minority leader in the 80th and 83d Congresses. All of us here know, however, that Mr. SAM did not play favorites. While he might admit to a slight preference for Democrats, his appreciation of the high honor of service here under any party banner assured an unhestitant hand of friendship for every Member.

The late Speaker held an unassailable confidence in the judgment of the American people. He was prepared always to abide by their choices. The people, he reasoned, would not be fooled for long, and poor choices would be corrected. He was a superb political strategist and tactician, but he did not countenance sharp practice. He insisted that a conscientious concern for the common good be held aloft as the standard to which all worthy politicians could repair.

SAM RAYBURN never forgot that it was the people who sent him here and kept him here for nearly half a century, through three wars, through years of depression and years of prosperity. He would not let any of us here forget this bedrock truth, and, for the enduring example set by his conception of the public trust, we remain in debt to his memory.

Preservation of Our American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on December 7 I issued a news release commenting on a court decision in New York to review the constitutionality of reciting an opening prayer in New York public schools. In the same news release, I commented on the banning of religious Christmas carols and nativity scenes from religious observances at eight schools in the Lagunda Salara Elementary School District in California.

In the Washington Evening Star of January 8, Reporter Jim Bishop devoted his column to this subject.

Since such a development is, in my opinion, a matter for concern and of great importance in the preservation of our American way of life, I wish to have the contents of my news release and Mr. Bishop's report printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

NEWS RELEASE OF HON. DON L. SHORT, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Something new has been added seemingly in school policy, with regard to the reciting of a brief opening prayer. Because parents of nine children in four schools in New Hyde Park, N.Y., contended that opening prayer violates the constitutional privilege of separation of church and state, the Supreme Court agreed to consider the constitutionality of reciting a brief daily prayer in New York public schools. The practice of opening prayer is not universal or required in our public schools, but it would seem pretty un-American for an opening prayer to be banned by law. This would definitely appear to be contrary to majority opinion. I am convinced that if a vote were taken, it would fall to the side of those who wish the small prayer to be left in the school curriculum.

Another disturbing development along this line comes in a news story from Redwood City, Calif. Religious carols and nativity scenes were banned from Christmas observations at eight schools in the Lagunda Salara Elementary School District. The reason given by the local superintendent of schools was fear that religious carols at Christmastime would offend non-Christians at the schools. The superintendent also said the order resulted from a ruling by the district attorney that Christmas songs of religious background could violate State laws against the practice of religion in schools. He added, "We depend upon the State for 80 percent of our money" and, "this is a serious and difficult problem." The children will be restricted to such tunes as "Jingle Bells" or "White Christmas." This in the United States of America, where a basic belief in God and simple prayer is assumed even though our Constitution carefully preserves freedom of religion.

What is wrong with silent prayer at the beginning of a school day for those who make prayer a part of their lives at home or in their church? Is this not a part of a truly liberal education, which our public schools strive for? What is wrong with demonstrating how the different religions practice their faith at various times of the year—if such religions are represented in the schools? Who would deny the Protestant, Catholic, Hebrew, or any other faith the right to show what they practice at Eastertime, Christmastime, Hanukkah, or such religious holidays? Is not all this a part of learning what our country—a vast melting pot of different races, languages, songs, religions—is like, just as we teach what other countries are like? We don't prevent the agnostic or atheist from expressing his or her viewpoint. Why should they then prevent those of us who believe and practice some form of religion from expressing ours?

This to me is the real meaning of freedom and liberty in this country.

PRAYER IN THE CLASSROOM?

(By Jim Bishop)

The question of prayer in schools is vexing. A solitary plea, muttered in unison by a group of spiritually disparate children, cannot affect the salvation of any of them. Religious life in the home is the important factor, and, if there is none at home, a prayer in class is a message never sent.

Still, the question of prayer in school has been permitted to become a public cause. The overwhelming majority of Christian parents insist that classes were always opened with prayer throughout the history of the republic, and should continue. The minority, atheists and non-Christians, claim that prayer violates the great American code of separation of state and church.

To understand the issue—or rather, to simplify it—one must realize that, when our forefathers decreed a separation of church and state, they were trying to achieve freedom of religion, not to bind it. They came from countries which had state religions—where a man had to belong to a given church or be denied the right of worship.

The Jeffersons, the Washingtons, the Adamses were trying to loose the theological bonds so that the Lutherans of New York could meet the Episcopals of Connecticut and the Catholics of Maryland and the Jews of Philadelphia without spiritual rancor. Each was entitled, without hindrance, to build a temple of his choice and there to address the Deity in the ancient rituals of his fathers.

America has always been a Protestant country. It was then. It is now. It would be a simple example of democracy to permit a Protestant prayer to be recited in all public schools without protest from the others. Separation of state and church does not imply separation of state and God. The writers of our Constitution and our Bill of Rights acknowledged God.

The U.S. Senate opens with prayer every day. Our coins proclaim: "In God we trust." The country officially acknowledges that there is a God and admonishes each man to find his own way to Him.

The current fight in Miami and in New York against prayer in school is a chafing, irritating matter to all. A group of pan-American employees in Miami are so upset that they write a group letter to me asking what they can do to maintain prayer in class.

"We would in no wise advocate the teaching of a particular faith or doctrine," they say, "realizing that this would be contrary to our freedoms. But, as the dominant faiths of our Nation are based upon God as the Supreme Being we feel that scriptures and prayers dedicated toward God should be a part of our school program.

There are 254 religious denominations in the United States. They have a total enrolled membership of 112,226,905—63.4 percent of the population. Of the 36.6 percent remaining, millions believe in God but do not attend any church regularly. The rest are agnostics or atheists.

The largest groups, in order of size, are: Roman Catholics, 40,871,302; Baptists, 20,877,223; Methodists, 12,359,279; Lutherans, 8,082,880; Jews, 5,370,000; Presbyterians, 4,212,554; Episcopalians, 3,359,048. The smallest group is the Old Order or York Brethren, 291.

The motives of those who are trying to extinguish religion in schools cannot be a liberalization of the spirit, but rather a denial of rights to the majority by the minority. Whether they win or lose in the Supreme Court, they will have bred religious distrust and contempt and I am opposed to any measure which sets the true brotherhood of man back.

What would they have us do? Teach the children to say, "Shhh," when the name of God is mentioned, or perhaps cover their ears with their hands? If their real goal is to force the schools to use their particular prayers, then the principals and teachers had better recite the psalms of all 254 sects. This amounts to less than one religion per schoolday and, in effect, cancels all of them.

It must be discouraging to God to watch puny man fight over the many paths to heaven. It would be better, I think, if the heads of the several sects organized a committee on religion in public schools, and came to an agreement about which prayers, which Bible readings, are least offensive to all.

By killing religion in the schools, we are, in effect, building a religious Tower of Babel in which we Americans speak many tongues, but none of us understands the others.

"Floating Merchandise Mart" To Help Seek World Markets for American Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which would provide for the establishment of a floating American Trade Fair in the form of an American ship which would visit the various countries of the world.

The purpose of this floating American Trade Fair is to afford American manufacturers and producers of agricultural products a greater opportunity to display their products to the people of the world and in this way more effectively compete in the stream of international commerce. Provisions would be made to take orders on the spot in the various ports for the products exhibited on the ship.

This legislation is designed to assist the President in his program to increase the flow of American exports and thereby reduce our serious balance-of-payments deficit.

It is my firm conviction that approval of this legislation will contribute substantially to a recognized national goal of increasing employment opportunities for American workers. This, of course is one of the essential features of the President's program for freer world trade.

This floating American Trade Fair will also increase opportunities for the American agricultural community to acquire new markets throughout the world.

I am very happy to announce that this project has been thoroughly discussed with representatives of the American Merchant Marine Institute and the AFL–CIO Maritime Committee. It is most encouraging to see representatives of management and labor in this very important segment of the transportation industry not only help develop this project, but also give it their unqualified support.

I am particularly grateful to Mr. Frank Darling, president of Local 1031, IBEW, Chicago, Ill., and Mr. Harry C. Herman, industrial relations consultant from New York City, who first called my attention to the need for this project. Mr. Darling's membership has suffered considerably because of competition from foreign imports in the electronics industry. I am happy to see that this very responsible labor leader is leading the way to stimulate American exports to help make up the deficiency of jobs in the American electronics industry.

Also, this legislation could not have been prepared without the assistance of Mr. Ralph E. Casey, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, and Mr. Joseph Curran, chairman of the AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, both of New York City.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to stress that the basic purpose of this legislation is to assist in particular the small manufacturers and their employees and the farmers of America who heretofore have not been afforded an opportunity to compete in foreign commerce.

The urgent need for this legislation can perhaps best be manifested by the fact that only 2 percent of American industry is now selling in foreign markets. It should be of particular concern to those Members of Congress from agricultural areas that only 10 percent of agricultural commodities are exported overseas, despite the tremendous support furnished by existing Government programs of an aid and assistance nature.

It is for these reasons that I today invite my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation.

This bill would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to proceed forthwith with the acquisition of a ship or ships which would be converted into appropriate facilities to exhibit products of individual American manufacturers. Provisions would also be made for the display of products of American agriculture.

The Secretary is authorized to either convert ships now owned by the American Government or, if no such ship is appropriate, he may enter into a charter agreement for the use of an appropriate facility now privately owned.

While I am aware that the Department of Commerce sponsors various trade fairs around the world, a study of exhibitors would show that the small manufacturers all over America are conspicuous by their absence because they cannot afford to participate in this type of venture. They simply cannot afford individual exhibits at each of the trade fairs while, through the use of this display ship, they could demonstrate their products in many countries with only one relatively inexpensive exhibit.

The Secretary is authorized under this bill to charge a nominal fee to help defray the cost of this floating American Trade Fair, but I think it should be perfectly clear to all of us that if we are going to make a concerted effort to put American products into world markets, some financial assistance will have to be forthcoming from the Federal Government.

It is anticipated that several hundred individual American exhibitors could display their wares on one floating American Trade Fair.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of visiting several European countries for the express purpose of ascertaining what problems would be created for the American business community as the Common Market of Europe develops. There should be no question in anyone's mind that when the full industrial potential of the Common Market nations is tied into one cohesive economic unit, the competition for world markets will become more intense.

It is my judgment that any further delay in helping stimulate American exports can well mean tragedy for countless American workers. It is for this reason that I sincerely hope Congress will quickly approve the legislation I have introduced today so that we can at least make a start toward increasing our export position.

On the basis of my observations in Europe, there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that people in foreign markets are willing to buy American products. While I am fully mindful of the complex nature involved in tariff structures and price differentials, these factors notwithstanding, I have heard many Europeans assure me they like the quality and fresh design of American products. It is my thorough conviction that one reason why we have not been able to capture a greater degree of international commerce is because the vast majority of American industry has not had an opportunity to seek these markets either because it does not have the incentive, the facilities, or the knowledge for trading abroad.

I should like to stress that our foreign competitors have already recognized these problems for their own industry, and in at least two instances of which I know, foreign countries are today using floating trade fairs to stimulate sales of their nation's products.

One of our most serious competitors, Japan, has two ships which carry extensive exhibits of Japanese industry touring world ports. It is my understanding that the Soviet Union has similar ships which now operate into ports within Soviet-bloc countries.

It is impossible for me to estimate the cost of putting a floating American trade fair into operation, but the best available estimates indicate that this project would cost approximately $4,000 a day for a Mariner-type ship of the 13,000-ton class. When you consider that anywhere from 800 to 1,200 exhibitors could participate in this venture at one time, the cost of helping create new jobs for Americans per exhibitor becomes relatively nominal.

There is no question that competitive conditions in foreign trade are radically changing in a worldwide upheaval of formal trade relations. It is this revolution in foreign trade relations which has led President Kennedy to give stronger emphasis and administration support toward the revamping of our foreign-trade policies.

We must not only keep up but increase our favorable balance of exports, and we must do this particularly among the small manufacturers of America who today in virtually every community of our Nation are being most adversely affected by foreign imports.

It would indeed be unfortunate if our country failed to realize the vast opportunities for American exports in the field of consumer goods that are now being created in the newly independent states throughout the world. Unless we make it possible for American industry to go after these markets now, it is my fear that once the consumers of these nations begin dealing with other countries, the force of habit will encourage them to continue dealing with other countries for many years to come.

This specially designed ship which I am urging the Department of Commerce to establish would visit all of the major ports of the world. With the help of the U.S. Information Service and our diplomatic missions in these various countries, buyers from inland markets would be encouraged to visit the American trade exhibit when it reaches the port nearest to them.

This floating merchandise mart, carrying American salesmen and their wares to ports of call in Europe, Africa, Asia, South America, and the Far East, could indeed provide for America a new concept of pioneering in international trade relations.

This floating American Trade Fair could be one of the most important factors in bringing the New Frontier to world markets.

I am particularly impressed with the assurance given by Mr. Joseph Curran, president of the AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, that his union would adopt minimum manning requirements to staff this ship with crew and officers to help keep the cost of operations to a minimum. We know that as new markets are opened up for American products throughout the world, this means greater operating opportunities for our American merchant fleet and the people who man it.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly anxious to have this legislation approved because Chicago, my hometown, is destined to become one of the major ports of the world since the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway. I am confident that Midwest manufacturers would be most anxious to display their products on a ship which could start from Chicago to ports all over the world.

I consider this legislation so vital as an aid toward helping America retain her position in world markets that I intend to ask the appropriate committee for an immediate hearing on this proposal.

No one would contend that this floating American Trade Fair is the answer to all of our problems in the complex structure of international world trade, but I am completely convinced that this one project offers a great deal of hope at least toward a partial solution.

I do hope that other Members of Congress will join in cosponsoring this legislation.

Railroad Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, during the 1950's the American railroad industry came to the Congress to ask for relief and help. The contention of the industry was that laws were archaic and unworkable and had caused near-chaotic conditions within their industry. They complained about having to go to every State through which a passenger train ran to get separate permission from each of the States to change schedules or to abandon trains. This was a costly and time-consuming procedure and harmful to the transportation systems.

In 1958, the Congress took cognizance of this problem and we enacted the 1958 Transportation Act. As is quite frequently the case with legislation, in writing this act I feel that the Congress went too far and we have opened up a Pandora's box. The 1958 act provides for discontinuance of passenger service through application to the Interstate Commerce Commission and without necessarily going to the various States involved. But the act does not set forth adequate criteria outlining and clarifying the responsibilities the railroads have to the public to provide needed passenger transportation.

In many cases railroads have taken arbitrary steps to discontinue passenger trains because individual trains were not showing a profit. These steps have often disregarded completely the convenience and necessity criterion and the public welfare.

In addition, the burden of fighting these cases has fallen upon the public and not upon the railroads.

All of this has led to a great increase in the number of passenger trains abandoned and the curtailment of service to the public.

Mr. Speaker, I am not one who would say that the railroads must continue to serve and provide extra services if they are financially unable to do so. However, in considering the finances of any railroad it is my contention that all aspects of the line's fiscal situation must be considered, not just its passenger service or the financial soundness of a single passenger train. The road's subsidiary operations and its freight operations must also be taken into consideration and used as a criterion for this type of action.

I have many friends on both the management and labor side of the picture in the railroad industry. I do not care to point a finger at either side and say that it is their fault that this situation has arisen.

However, I do maintain strongly that the public must be considered and that the general welfare of the Nation—including the railroads' capacity to provide troop transportation on a mass basis in times of emergency must be maintained.

I have, therefore introduced a bill which would make it harder for the lines just to abandon trains as they see fit. I feel that this legislation would enforce the responsibility which the railroads owe to the public and the Nation.

It is my hope that this type of legislation will help rather than hinder the railroads in performing the duties which they should and must perform to the traveling public and the Government.

Ambassador Biddle: Distinguished Diplomat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, as we meet here in the pleasant renewal of cherished associations, we are struck again by the sadness of friendships lost in the inexorable harvest since last we assembled in this House.

Of acute poignancy to me was the passing of Ambassador Anthony J. Drexel Biddle. It was my privilege to have his friendship through many years, and his competence, energy, and devotion in the public service had my deepest respect and admiration. When I saw him last in Spain in October, shortly before his return to the United States for further medical treatment, I was heartsick at the seriousness of his illness, but it was my prayer and hope that he would be spared for further distinguished work in his country's interest. Within a month, however, life's burdens had been lifted from him and the Foreign Service lost an outstanding diplomatic talent.

That Mr. Biddle was a member of a moneyed family was well known, but more significant was the character of public service contributed to the United States by that family through several generations. The Ambassador's father was a Marine officer in the best rough-and-ready tradition of that splendid fighting service. In the World War II period, at the age of 67, the elder Biddle was teaching self defense, commando style, to Marine recruits at Quantico, Va.

His son served in the Army in World War I and was released to inactive duty in the grade of captain. In 1944, following a series of diplomatic assignments in Europe, he resumed active duty as a lieutenant colonel and advanced to the grade of brigadier general. His European contacts were of great value to General Eisenhower's headquarters following the Normandy invasion. In 1955, when he ended his active military service, he was a special assistant to Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, then Army Chief of Staff.

It was as a diplomat, however, that Ambassador Biddle's fine combination of commonsense, coolness under stress and natural charm found most effective expression. President Roosevelt appointed him Ambassador to Norway. In 1937, he was assigned to Warsaw and was privy to the negotiations among European powers which sought, unsuccessfully, to stave off World War II. Mr. Biddle manned his post until Nazi tanks advanced on that hapless Polish capital. He nearly fell into hostile hands but reached his new assignment in Paris by way of Bucharest, Rumania. As deputy to Ambassador William C. Bullitt, he followed the withdrawing French Government to Angers, Tours, and Bordeaux, maintaining our lines of diplomatic communication until the French capitulation, when he was ordered back to the United States.

After his military service in World War II and the years subsequent, Mr. Biddle returned to public life in his home Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and became adjutant general. He also served as chairman of the Pennsylvania Aeronautics Commission.

When the final illness struck, Mr. Biddle was performing again the diplomatic tasks to which his talents were ideally suited, as Ambassador to Spain. In this age of continuous international stress, his passing was a tragic loss.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on November 16, 1961, as follows:

Anthony Biddle

As a man who came from impeccable Philadelphia lineage, Anthony J. Drexel Biddle could have spent his life raising Pomeranians or perfecting a talent for polo. Instead, Mr. Biddle saw fit to devote a good deal of his career to public service. His death at 64 diminishes the elegance and tact and gaiety of our diplomatic service. Before his service as Ambassador to Spain, Mr. Biddle performed with aplomb a host of diplomatic duties—including one extraordinary wartime mission in which he was our representative to seven governments-in-exile (Poland, Belgium, Norway, Greece, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and the Netherlands).

Throughout, Mr. Biddle put his grace and polish of manner to statesmanlike use. But whether in the uniform of a brigadier general or in the striped pants of an ambassador, Mr. Biddle also showed a shrewd realism in his estimate of men and events. Perhaps the reason why Mr. Biddle could be called the happiest millionaire is because he refused to conform to the stereotype of the idle rich. His main line did not lead solely to a country club.

Benefits Authorized for Individuals Recalled to Active Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to outline in the paragraphs below the benefits which are presently in force and are available to recalled reservists and National Guardsmen.

Particularly, I have been asked about whether or not wives and families of the men who lost their lives in the tragic plane crash recently are covered. The answer is in the affirmative. They are covered by dependency and indemnity compensation as outlined later in this statement.

Among the benefits available to individuals in the Armed Forces today, and I emphasize particularly those who are being recalled as reservists and members of the National Guard, are the following benefits which are indicated below:

Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act: Default judgment protection, court proceedings postponement, statute of limitation extension, rate of interest limitation, lease termination authorization, dependents eviction prohibition, contract cancellation preclusion, mortgage foreclosure and repossession stay, tax deferment, homesteading rights preservations, guarantee of insurance premium payments.

Aside from the guarantee of $10,000 commercial insurance, this act is administered locally by the courts and a serviceman is well advised to consult an attorney or legal officer of his unit before proceeding under this law.

Reemployment rights: Government and private.

These rights are guaranteed basically under appropriate sections of the Selective Service Act.

Unemployment compensation: Compliance with State laws required.

The rates payable here vary with the States and the various requirements of the individual States must be met.

Federal civil service preference: Appointment and retention.

Peacetime service must have been in campaign or expedition, for which a badge was awarded, or veteran must have service-connected disability.

Social security: Active duty—covered employment.

The basic military pay is the wage base on which the social security taxes are collected.

Disability compensation: Payable to veterans for service-connected disability.

Rates 80 percent of war rates, from $15 to $480 monthly. Full wartime rates, $19 to $600, payable if incurred in extrahazardous service.

Peacetime compensation rates are as indicated below, plus additional amount for dependents if 50 percent or more disabled.

(a) Ten percent disability, $15.
(b) Twenty percent disability, $29.
(c) Thirty percent disability, $44.
(d) Forty percent disability, $58.
(e) Fifty percent disability, $80.
(f) Sixty percent disability, $96.
(g) Seventy percent disability, $112.
(h) Eighty percent disability, $128.
(i) Ninety percent disability, $143.
(j) Total disability, $180.

(k) Anatomical loss, or loss of use of a creative organ, or one foot, or one hand, or both buttocks, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, rates (a) to (j) increased monthly by $38.

Anatomical loss, or loss of use of a creative organ, or one foot, or one hand, or both buttocks, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, in addition to requirement for any of rates in (l) to (n), rate increased monthly for each loss or loss of use by $38. But in no event shall the total payable under subsection (k) exceed $360.

(l) Anatomical loss, or loss of use of both hands, or both feet, or one hand and one foot, or blind both eyes with 5/200 visual acuity or less, or is permanently bedridden or so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, monthly compensation, $247.

(m) Anatomical loss, or loss of use of two extremities at a level, or with complications, preventing natural elbow or knee action with prosthesis in place or has suffered blindness in both eyes having only light perception, or has suffered blindness in both eyes, rendering him so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, monthly compensation, $287.

(n) Anatomical loss of two extremities so near shoulder or hip as to prevent use of prosthetic appliance, or suffered anatomical loss of both eyes, monthly compensation, $321.

(o) Suffered disability under conditions which would entitle him to two or more rates in (l) to (n), no condition being considered twice, or suffered total deafness in combination with total blindness with 5/200 visual acuity or less, monthly compensation, $360.

(p) In event disabled person's service-incurred disabilities exceed requirements for any of rates prescribed, Administrator, in his discretion, may allow next higher rate, or intermediate rate, but in no event in excess of $360.

(q) Minimum rate for arrested tuberculosis, $54.

(r) If entitled to compensation under (o), or the maximum rate under (p), and in need of regular aid and attendance, while not hospitalized at Government expense, additional monthly aid and attendance allowance, $120.

(s) If totally disabled and (1) has additional disability independently rated at 60 percent or more, or (2) is permanently housebound, $212.

Dependency and indemnity compensation: Payable to widow, children, and parents for service-connected death of veteran. Widow's rate, $112 plus 12 percent of service basic pay—minimum $122 monthly. Other rates vary according to number of children and income of parents.

Medical care: Treatment for service-connected disabilities in any 1 of 171 VA hospitals located in 48 States, and in private hospitals under certain conditions, if serviceman is separated for a service-connected disability or qualifies for compensation. A veteran meeting one of these requirements may also be furnished VA outpatient treatment for a service-connected disability and hospital care for a nonservice-connected condition if a Government bed is available.

Insurance: $10,000 nonparticipating policy available to a service-connected disabled veteran if he applies within 1 year from the date of his service connection.

War orphans' education: Children allowed up to $110 monthly while pursuing higher education—but not to exceed 36 months—if death of the serviceman is direct result of performance of duty, or received while engaged in extrahazardous service during the induction period. The induction period ends when individuals are no longer liable for induction into the Armed Forces under the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

Six-month death gratuity: Paid by service department for any death in service or a service-connected death within 120 days after service. Payable to spouse, children, or, if designated, to parents, brothers or sisters. Amount is six times monthly service pay, but not less than $800 or more than $3,000.

Hon. John W. McCormack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, it was with great pleasure that I cast my vote for the gentleman from Massachusetts to serve as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

JOHN W. McCORMACK has come to the Speaker's chair after 21 years of outstanding service as majority leader and a 33-year progressive record as a legislator. This is an impressive record of devotion to his country.

There is no one more qualified than he to hold the high position of Speaker; his character, intellect, legislative experience, his proven ability as a strong and helpful leader, admirably fit him for the arduous duties ahead. The office of Speaker is one of great power and responsibilities. We have complete confidence that JOHN McCORMACK will discharge his duties as Speaker with the wisdom, integrity, impartiality, and true statesmanship which have endeared him to us in the past. His serious devotion to duty in behalf of his Nation and his community has long been heralded.

Ever since coming to Congress, I have found JOHN McCORMACK to be a true friend; I shall always be grateful for his many courtesies and his assistance.

I consider it an honor to join with my colleagues in extending to our distinguished Speaker heartfelt congratulations and best wishes for many years of success and happiness in the high office he now holds. In these days of crises, the people of our Nation, and we, as Members of the House of Representatives, are fortunate to have him guide and help us preserve our freedom and meet our responsibilities to our country.

Bank Mergers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include testimony presented by me on December 4, 1961, before the Comptroller of the Currency in re the application of First National City Bank of New York and National Bank of Westchester to merge under the Bank Merger Act of 1960. My statement follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

I am particularly pleased to participate in the first open merger hearing held by the Comptroller of the Currency, because in a way we are at the crossroads.

Either we maintain our traditional way of competition or we change our direction and travel the way of cartelization. Industrial and business mergers never were more expansive than today. Concentration of economic power has become inordinate. Leading the field are financial entities.

I shall review the debilitating effect of the merger history of banks in this country at some length when I discuss the relevant factors which require denial of this application. But at the outset I think it imperative to call certain facts to your attention.

The number of banks have shrunk from 28,921 in 1929 to 13,971 in 1960.

Monolithic banks like First National City have emerged as a result of merger after merger and, as this application illustrates, continue to seek ever greater power through mergers.

The viselike grip of an oligopoly of banks dominates the banking interests in all large cities. The five largest commercial banks in every large metropolitan area save two held more than 50 percent of the commercial bank deposits in 1960. In the majority of such areas they held over 75 percent of such deposits. In 26 of such areas the 5 largest commercial banks held over 90 percent of all commercial deposits. In most of the metropolitan areas three commercial banks held from 65 to 96.9 percent [1] of all commercial deposits. Thus, a few banking leaders in almost all significant economic centers hold the power of life and death over industry and trade.

Lord Acton said: "Power corrupts. Absolute power corrupts absolutely."

Those banks already have absolute power, and they thus have the power to corrupt absolutely. Their officers hold in their hands the destinies of many enterprises. Thus, I am informed, when a large motion picture company—defendant in an antitrust suit—engaged in consent-decree negotiations with the Department of Justice, it thought it necessary to bring an officer of a bank with which it had a revolving loan. An antitrust violator thought the voice of its financier as to the scope of an antitrust judgment should be heeded.

I have referred to the corruptability of great power. This applicant and its fellow bank merger applicants, such as the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., furnish proof of such corruptability. Instead of expressing concern over the degree of banking concentration in all financial centers, they advance such concentration elsewhere as a justification for further augmentation of banking concentration in their own local areas. This is an immoral argument. This is an immoral application.

Should we promote the creation of a huge banking cartel through mergers?

This application would scotch competition in a substantial way. It would strike a blow at what is precious to us. You, Mr. Comptroller, must forfend that blow.

You, Mr. Comptroller, have a great responsibility. In my opinion the public interest requires denial of this application.

While this hearing represents an earnest indication of your appreciation of the necessity of giving careful and impartial consideration to an application for bank merger approval, I note that it was quite otherwise under your predecessor. Under him, I regret to say, approval automatically followed the filing of an application. Upon him rests an appreciable measure of responsibility for the present degree of concentration in the banking industry. In the period 1950 through 1960, the Comptroller of the Currency approved the merging of 904 banks.[2] Many of them were approved by Mr. Gidney despite the contrary recommendations of the Department of Justice and of the Federal Reserve Board.

If you grant this application you will set up a chain reaction. Banks of a size comparable to that of First National City will seek to do likewise. They, too, will go into suburbia—Westchester, Nassau, and Suffolk Counties—to grab up all local banks, arguing that only other giants can furnish competition to an existing giant. They will supplement this argument with the further argument that they cannot compete with First National City unless they, too, are permitted to absorb the smaller independent banks in these counties. Thus, a few blocks away, before your sister agency, the Federal Reserve Board, there is pending an application by another Brobdingnagian New York bank for approval of the creation of the Nation's largest bank holding company. And there, prophetically, the argument is being made that the existence of another large bank holding company in New York State justifies the one sought by Morgan.

As I shall point out more fully later, in the application before you we find a bold attempt to have you in effect overrule an earlier decision by the Federal Reserve Board against this applicant when it sought approval for a similar merger, First National City-County Trust, and to take a position directly contrary to that taken recently by the New York State Banking Board in denying a similar application by the Bankers Trust Co.

---

[1] Annual Report of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (1960), pp. 102–103.

[2] Annual Report of Comptroller of the Currency (1960), p. 16.

Where is this trend to end, Mr. Comptroller? It is a calamitous trend. You and the Federal Reserve Board have it within your power to prevent a few New York City clearinghouse banks from laying hands on practically all the banks and banking deposits in New York State. Unless you stop this gigantic reaching out for more and more moneyed power, every bank—every small independent bank in New York State—will be in jeopardy.

Such banking power bodes ill for all of us. What is then to prevent these giants from merging with each other, so that eventually only one or two huge banks remain? No combination is more potent than a moneyed combine. As Ben Franklin said: "If you would know the value of money try to borrow some." I do not want the borrowing business community to be at the mercy of a First National City-National Bank of Westchester combine.

Remember, too, New York City is also the financial capital of the Nation. Thus the proposed merger is not a matter of local but of national importance. It concerns not only the people in my Brooklyn district. It concerns as well the people in Kalamazoo, Mich., in Fort Smith, Ark., in Phoenix, Ariz.

Why do I speak so vehemently? So emphatically? I do so in order to impress you with the gravity and danger of banking concentration threatening our Nation. That gravity and danger is inherent in this application.

I turn now to this particular application.

II. THE APPLICANT

The applicant is the First National City Bank of New York City. It has 96 domestic offices including 9 branches approved but not yet established.[3] It has branches in each of the five counties of New York City and two in Nassau County. It has approval to establish two branches in Westchester County.

First National proposes to merge the National Bank of Westchester. The latter has 22 existing offices and 4 branches approved but not yet established.

III. THE BANK MERGER ACT OF 1960 IMPOSES A HEAVY BURDEN OF PROOF UPON THE APPLICANT

Before discussing the facts which require denial of this proposed merger, I shall advert to the statutory standards against which such facts must be tested. These statutory standards, I find, are ignored by the applicant, perhaps because of the illumination they would cast upon the weakness of its application.

The Bank Merger Act of 1960 (12 U.S.C. 1828) provides that: "* * * In granting or withholding consent under this subsection, the Comptroller, the Board, or the Corporation, as the case may be, shall consider the financial history and condition of each of the banks involved, the adequacy of its capital structure, its future earnings prospects, the general character of its management, the convenience and needs of the community to be served, and whether or not its corporate powers are consistent with the purposes of this act. In the case of a merger, consolidation, acquisition of assets, or assumption of liabilities, the appropriate agency shall also take into consideration the effect of the transaction on competition (including any tendency toward monopoly), and shall not approve the transaction unless, after considering all of such factors, it finds the transaction to be in the public interest."

The originating bill (S. 1062), as originally adopted by the Senate, had phrased the seventh factor differently; namely, whether the transaction would "unduly lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly."

As noted in your annual report for 1960,[4] in the Congress I expressed my concern and testified at length before the Senate and House Banking and Currency Committees, that this language in the bill might lead to the application of a test quite inconsistent with the competitive standards of the Sherman, Clayton, and Celler-Kefauver Antitrust Acts. I testified that such test might open the door to mergers rather than to make that door more difficult to open.

The Committee on Banking and Currency of the House was of the same opinion. It proposed the language now embodied in the act. The adoption by Congress of the seventh factor in its present form is a definite indication of its intent to impose a strict test rather than a lenient one with respect to the anticompetitive effect of bank mergers.

The background of this legislation furnishes further ground for the importance with which the seventh factor was regarded by Congress, in fact, that this factor was the primary motivation for the Bank Merger Act, which, today, you are called upon to enforce.[5] The Comptroller has recognized this legislative intent by incorporating part of the legislative history of the act in his annual report for 1960.

Congress was both aware of and concerned with the fact that prior to the 1960 act, controls over bank mergers were, I quote, "incomplete and confusing, particularly with respect to the competitive factors involved."[6] The House report stated:[7] "* * * Competition for deposits increases the amounts available for loans for the development and growth of the Nation's industry and commerce. Competition for loans gives the borrowers better terms and better service and furthers the development of industry and commerce. Vigorous competition in banking stimulates competition in the entire economy, in industry, commerce, and trade. There is no question that competition is desirable in banking, and that competitive factors should be considered in all aspects of the supervision and regulation of banks."

Congress also was greatly concerned over the consistent and substantial decline in the number of banks in this country. Year after year, as the House and Senate reports noted, the number of merged banks exceeded the number of new banks.[8]

I think it highly significant that although Congress did not adopt the Celler-Kefauver Act or the Sherman Act as the sole standards for evaluation by the bank supervisory agencies of proposed bank mergers, the enumeration in these reports of permissible mergers is very similar to those recognized under the antitrust laws.[9]

It is clear that a heavy burden rests upon the applicant. The House report asserted unequivocally:[10]

"We are convinced, also, that approval of a merger should depend on a positive showing of some benefit to be derived from it. As previously indicated, your committee is not prepared to say that the cases enumerated in the hearings are the only instances in which a merger is in the public interest, nor are we prepared to devise a specific and exclusive list of situations in which a merger should be approved. We do, however, reject the philosophy that doubts are to be resolved in favor of bank mergers. At the risk of saying the same thing another way, we feel the burden should be on the proponents of a merger to show that it is in the public interest, if it is to be approved. After all the factors have been weighed, the transaction should be approved only if the supervisory agency is satisfied that, on balance, its effect will be beneficial."

The statute in express terms admonishes you to consider whether this application is in the public interest. If this means anything it means that antitrust principles and antitrust philosophy must be given great weight because of their preeminently high place in the rubric of public interest. Since public interest is also a criterion under section 3(c) of the Bank Holding Company Act, I commend to your careful consideration the case of the *First New York Corp.*, 44 Fed. Res. Bulletin 912 (1958), a case in which this very applicant was involved.

And in this connection I bring to your attention the following statement from the decision of the New York Superintendent of Banking (adopted by the New York Banking Board), disapproving an application of Bankers Trust to acquire the County Trust Bank in Westchester County:

"In passing upon two important New York City bank merger applications in 1959, the superintendent applied to them, under the 'public interest' factor of section 10, certain tests deriving essentially from antitrust law."

IV. THE FACTS COMPEL DENIAL OF THIS APPLICATION UNDER THE RELEVANT STATUTORY STANDARDS

I turn to the facts which compel denial of this application under the applicable statutory standards. First, I shall outline the more relevant facts which pertain to this particular application. Secondly, I shall review the merger trend in the banking field which was the primary reason for the Bank Merger Act of 1960. That history furnishes a highly relevant background against which this application must be considered.

Facts directly related to this application

1. First National City Bank, with resources of almost $9 billion and deposits of $7,771 million[11] was, as of December 31, 1960, the third largest bank in the United States and the second largest in New York City. This merger would give it more banking offices and more IPC deposits than Chase Manhattan Bank.[12]

I may well be underestimating the position of First National since, as of December 31, 1960, its capital exceeded that of any other bank in the Nation. And as noted by the Federal Reserve Board in the First New York Corp. case, First National City has on occasion been the largest bank in terms of deposits in New York State.

---

[3] Including military facilities, etc., it has 99 branches. See appendix B–3, p. 1. The applicant does not state where such offices are located.

[4] Annual Report of Comptroller of the Currency (1960), p. 38.

[5] In the 1960 Annual Report of the Comptroller (p. 33), it is stated that "the basic purposes of the enactment of this legislation were (1) to make all bank mergers involving insured banks subject to Federal approval, and (2) to establish standards by which bank mergers were to be considered by respective banking agencies and to insure that adequate consideration would be given in each case to the effect upon competition."

[6] H. Rept. No. 1416, 86th Cong., 2d sess., p. 5. The S. Rept. No. 196, 86th Cong., 1st. sess., revealed a similar concern on the part of the Senate. It was noted that "in short, at the present time many, perhaps most, bank mergers can proceed with little or no consideration of competitive factors," p. 2.

[7] H. Rept. No. 1416, p. 3.

[8] See H. Rept. No. 1416, 86th Cong., 2d sess., p. 10; S. Rept. No. 196, pp. 8–9.

[9] See S. Rept. No. 196, pp. 19–20; H. Rept. No. 1416, p. 10.

[10] H. Rept., pp. 11–12.

[11] Application, p. 67.

[12] App. B–3, p. 1 to application.

First National admits that it is in the lead among banks in the United States in breadth of services offered.[13] It makes loans in virtually every State in the Nation. All of the Nation's 100 largest industrial corporations are its customers.

2. The applicant has achieved its mammoth size in substantial part from mergers:

Merger history, First National City

Name of institution	Year absorbed	Resources
		Millions
International Banking Corp	1915	$41
National City Co. (City Co. of New York)	1916	
Commercial Exchange National Bank, New York	1921	11
Second National Bank, New York	1921	30
Peoples Trust Co., Brooklyn	1926	76
Farmers Loan & Trust Co., New York	1929	205
Long Island National Bank, Long Island City	1931	4
Bank of America N.A	1931	500
First National Bank, New York	1955	713
Total		1,580

Sources: (1) Rand McNally, (2) Polk's "Bankers Encyclopedia," (3) Moody's "Bank and Finance Manual."

3. The National Bank of Westchester, with resources of $237 million and deposits of $216 million is the second largest bank in Westchester County. As of December 31, 1960, it held 23.4 percent of commercial IPC deposits; 19.6 percent of commercial bank loans; and 21.4 percent of the total commercial banking offices in the county. It was more than twice as large as the third leading bank in the county.[14]

Its home office is in White Plains which serves a trade area containing more than one-third of the population of Westchester County.

4. The National Bank of Westchester has achieved its position largely through the process of merger:

Merger history of National Bank of Westchester [1]

Bank	Year	Deposits
Huguenot Trust Co	1952	$7,040,500
Peoples National Bank & Trust Co. of White Plains	1953	27,060,000
First National Bank & Trust Co. of Tuckahoe	1954	13,590,643
Tarrytown National Bank & Trust Co	1954	7,207,074
Crestwood National Bank & Trust Co	1955	3,236,724
Westchester County National Bank of Peekskill	1955	12,752,482
Rye National Bank	1960	24,718,000
Mount Kisco National Bank & Trust Co	1960	24,066,000

[1] Does not include a proposed merger with the Gramatan National Bank & Trust Co. which may have already taken place.

Thus, a total of over $119 million in deposits is directly attributable to acquisitions during the past 10 years.

In 1955, the county of Westchester, with a population of 709,000 and an area of over 400 miles had 12 commercial banks. Now, with a population of over 800,000, as brought to your attention in July of this year by the Federal Reserve Board, the number of Westchester banks has declined to 9. Mergers have taken their toll.

I feel certain that the threat of huge New York City banks acquiring the largest Westchester County banks has been a major inducing cause for the merger of some smaller Westchester banks in recent years, and thus a further cause for the declining number of banks in that county. Moreover, a number of witnesses in the earlier First National City proceeding before the Federal Reserve Board, testified that there was a reasonable likelihood that such merger would cause independent banks in Westchester County to seek association with other New York banks.

It is inevitable, if this application is granted, that a chain reaction of mergers will be induced thereby.

Appropriate at this juncture of my discussion is the following language from the Board's decision on the application of First New York Corp.:

"Moreover if the increased power of County Trust would impel independent banks in the county to seek affiliation with New York City banks, it is likely that it would also lead them in some cases to seek mergers with other banks in the county. The record indicates that both County Trust and its largest local competitor, National Bank of Westchester, have been active in this respect in recent years. Bank mergers within the county could, of course, be accomplished without prior approval by the Board under the Bank Holding Company Act."

5. First National City has increased its dominance in New York City. Prior to October 1954, it had 16.5 percent of the banking resources then. In 1956, it had 19 percent. In June of 1960 it had 20 percent of the IPC demand deposits, 24.3 percent of IPC time deposits and 20 percent of the loans of commercial banks in New York City.

In the still larger New York banking district, as of December 31, 1960, First National City had 18.36 percent of the total commercial bank IPC deposits, 18.15 percent of the demand deposits, 19.22 percent of the time deposits and 17.42 percent of the loans. It had a larger percentage of the time deposits than any other bank, and only slightly less than the Chase Manhattan Bank in the other categories.

In the New York City-Westchester area, as of December 31, 1959, National City had 19.09 percent of the commercial bank assets and 18.6 percent of the deposits.

In June 1960 total bank deposits in Westchester County were less than $1½ billion.[15] This is to be compared with $8 billion in deposits of the merging companies.

Size, because of the power of control it embodies, and because of the deterrence by its existence to an incentive to enter the field or to compete on the part of smaller banks, is a most relevant consideration. In the First New York Corp. case, the Federal Reserve Board stressed that, "before considering the probable effect of the size or extent of the holding company system here proposed upon adequate and sound banking, the public interest and preservation of competition, it is necessary to determine what would be the actual size and extent of the proposed holding-company system. In making this determination, consideration must be given to the size of the proposed subsidiary banks and the extent of their operations."

This statement is peculiarly applicable to this application.

6. There is already a dangerous degree of commercial banking concentration in Westchester County. Two banks, one of them National Bank of Westchester, as of December, 31, 1960, had over 71 percent of the IPC deposits, over 75 percent of the loans, and over 62 percent of the banking offices.

7. There has been a marked and unhealthy increase in banking concentration in New York City because of mergers. Before the wave of mergers was initiated by the Chemical-Corn merger of October 15, 1954, the concentration ratio in terms of resources of the five largest banks was 57.7 percent. By September 1956 it was 66.9 percent. At the end of December 1958, in terms of deposits, it was 65.8 percent.

According to the complaint filed recently by the Department of Justice to try to prevent the merger of the Manufacturers Trust Co. with the Hanover Bank, the five largest banks in New York City hold 75.2 percent of total commercial bank deposits in New York City and 77.2 percent of total commercial loans. First National City, of course, is one of the five. It is significant that since December 31, 1956, whether we use assets, deposits, or loans as the criterion, there has been an increase of from 9 to 10 percent concentration in New York City.[16]

This is not an academic matter in relation to this application. In the Bankers Trust case the New York banks superintendent acutely said, "Moreover, this department may not ignore the influence which its decision on the present application may exert upon the future course of asset and market concentration in the banking industry."

8. The rule of stare decisis should bar this application. A scant 5 years ago this applicant, using the name of First New York Corp., applied to the Federal Reserve Board for permission to acquire the largest independent bank in Westchester County. Turned down in 1958, it appears now before you to seek permission to acquire the second largest independent bank in that same county.

It was my privilege to present testimony at that earlier hearing in opposition to that application. I testified and the hearing examiner and, ultimately, the Federal Reserve Board, found that the application should be denied because the adverse anticompetitive consequences of the plan, relevant under the fifth factor of section 3(c) of the act, outweighed any conceivable advantages from its consummation under the other factors.

In reaching this conclusion, the hearing examiner found in summary that "the program, by combining the dominant banking system in Westchester County with one of the largest banking systems in the Nation, establishes in Westchester County a financial organization of such relative size as perhaps to give it decisive advantage over competitors; may result in an undue concentration of banking assets and control; may induce unnecessary dislocation in the existing banking structure of the county—and thus unsound banking; may unduly and substantially lessen competition between city and county banks; and may result in undue reduction of the number of independent banks in the county with consequent reduction in the number of competing banking organizations.

* * * * *

"On balance, the prospective and possible benefits of the program do not outweigh its prospective and possible disadvantages. It is concluded that the program is not required for the needs and welfare of the community and area, and further, that the effect of the proposed acquisition may be to expand the size or extent of the holding company system involved beyond limits consistent with adequate and sound banking, the public interest, and, the preservation of competition in the field of banking. Under these circumstances the applicants have not sustained the burden of establishing that the public interest will be furthered by granting approval of the applications."

The Federal Reserve Board, in turn, elaborated its conclusion by pointing out among other things:

1. That a certain amount of competition existed between the Westchester Bank and First National City Bank there involved which, though small percentagewise, was substantial in amount and illustrated the existence of a convenient source of banking

---

[13] Application, p. 63.

[14] See application, p. 119.

[15] Distribution of Bank Deposits, by Counties and Standard Metropolitan Areas, June 15, 1960, p. 57.

[16] See supplemental report of hearing examiner in the matter of application of First New York Corp.

facilities as between Westchester County and New York City.

2. That the trend, asserted by the applicant, toward integration of the two areas gave rise to the inference that such existing competition between the two banks would become more intensive in the future.

3. That such potential competition would be lessened by the effectuation of the plan.

4. That the plan would give First National City considerably greater access to County Trust correspondent business than at present, and greater access than would be enjoyed by other New York City banks, and would have an adverse effect on such banks and on competition in New York City for correspondent banking business [viewing the New York bank as a supplier of services to County Trust and citing *United States* v. *Dupont & Company*, 353 U.S. 586 (1957).

5. That the plan would substantially strengthen the already strong position of County Trust in Westchester County, giving it additional competitive advantages over independent county banks.

It is particularly significant in the present proceeding that the decision of the Board in the First New York case took into consideration the predicted rapid growth of Westchester County and the asserted integration of that area into the New York City metropolitan region. Thus, the Board rested its denial in part upon the inference that the integration of the County Trust Co. with the large New York City bank there involved would eliminate not only the substantial existing competition between these institutions, but also the potentially more intense competition that would, predictedly, be created by the development of Westchester.

I refer to this last mentioned aspect of the Board's decision because the same applicant, in this proceeding, also stresses the potential development of Westchester.

If the name "National Bank of Westchester" is substituted for that of "County Trust Co.," you will find the First New York Corp. case on all fours with this application.

The decision of the New York State Banking Board disapproving the bank-holding application of the Bankers Trust-County Trust application is unusually pertinent to this application. That decision was rendered as recently as April of this year. There, Bankers Trust Co. sought permission to acquire the County Trust Co. The latter was the largest bank in Westchester County; Bankers Trust Co. was the sixth largest commercial bank in New York City. It was less than one-half the size of First National City Bank.

That application was turned down because, in the words of New York State banks superintendent:

"The competitive factors of section 142(1) are inconsistent with approval.

"(a) The formation of the proposed bank holding company would result in 'a concentration of assets beyond limits consistent with effective competition' [in Westchester County].

"(b) Such formation may result in such a lessening of competition [in Westchester County] 'as to be injurious to the interests of the public.'

"(c) Such action may result in a tendency toward monopoly [in Westchester County].

"3. Finally, the primary statutory factor for the Board's consideration, 'the public interest and the needs and convenience thereof' is, on balance, inconsistent with approval. While some added convenience to the public might result, in the event of approval, the anticompetitive implications of the proposed actions and the consequent adverse impact thereof on the public interest, weigh heavily toward disapproval."

I submit that the First New York Corp. and the Bankers Trust decisions are precedents of the most compelling nature for denial of this application.

Banking merger history

While I think it clear that this application, when considered by itself should be denied, there is an historical as well as a current background which furnishes compelling support for denial. That background supplies a basis upon which the current and future consequences of approval of this application may be presaged.

There can be no doubt of the relevance of this merger history. Said the Senate report:[17]

"The large numbers of mergers in recent years, the vast resources involved in these mergers, and the increases in the size of the largest banks, particularly those which have grown through mergers, all give rise to concern for the maintenance of vigorous competition in the banking system. The reduction in the number of banks and the loss of competition between merged banks also give rise to concern."

I may say at this point that the courts,[18] and the Federal Trade Commission[19] have recognized the relevance of such factors in determining the validity of a merger.

So acute has been the problem of mergers in the banking field that within the past 5 years Congress, with the active support of the executive branch of the Government, has considered it necessary to enact two statutes to slow down the merger parade. One was the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, and the other is the Bank Merger Act of 1960, with which this proceeding is directly concerned.

My own concern with the merger situation in the banking field led me to take an active part in the enactment of such legislation. The current situation, I regret to say, still leaves me with that concern.

There has been a very sharp decline in the number of banking institutions in this country. While it is said that a large number vanished during the major depression of the early thirties, it is a fact that there has been no upsurge in the number of banks since that time despite a burgeoning population and economy.

Thus, at the end of 1941, there were almost 15,000 banks in the United States. By the end of 1960, there were less than 14,000.[20] Even more pertinent, in 1940 there were 14,385 commercial banks; in 1950, 14,054; in 1955, 13,656; in 1960, 13,472.[21] It is apparent that the rate of disappearance has been greater in the last decade than in the prior decade.

Testifying in support of the Bank Merger Act of 1960, I pointed out, in 1959, that in 10 of the Nation's 16 leading financial centers, 4 banks owned more than 80 percent of all commercial assets. I added that in nine of these financial centers, two banks owned more than 60 percent of all commercial assets. Furthermore, I testified, in each of 16 financial centers, the first 4 banks owned 60 percent of all the commercial assets; and the first 2 banks, more than 40 percent. The cause of such concentration, I made clear, was that in the period 1950 through 1958, some 1,330 of the Nation's commercial banks disappeared by way of mergers and consolidations.

In the banking field, the trend is for the big to grow bigger, the small- and the medium-sized banks to become fewer, and for both of the latter to become part of the former.

In 1958 the 10 largest commercial banks had 19.9 percent of the deposits of all the commercial banks in this country.[22] In 1959 they had 20.2 percent.[23] As of December 31, 1960, the 10 largest commercial banks held 20.3 percent of all commercial bank deposits. In 1960, 23 commercial banks, each having more than $1 billion in deposits, had 29.8 percent of the deposits of all commercial banks in the United States. When it is realized that commercial banks were some 13,000 in number and had over $230 billion in deposits,[24] this is a dangerous picture of concentration.

In New York State, at the end of 1958, five commercial banks or groups held 52.1 percent of the deposits of all the commercial banks in the State.[25]

This concentration has come about, in large part, by mergers. In fact, in my home State, I regret to say, 40 percent of the banks in the State have been absorbed in mergers since 1945.[26]

In 1959, the honorary president of the Independent Bankers' Association of the 12th Federal Reserve District testified before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency that in California there were only 69 unit banks; in Oregon, 2 branch organizations held over 81 percent of the State's banking assets; in Washington State, 5 banking systems held about 90 percent of the banking assets; in Arizona, only 2 small banks were outside the orbit of the 2 bank holding companies which controlled almost all the banking assets; in Nevada, 1 bank holding company controlled 76 percent of the banking assets.

I would remind the Comptroller that he has a grave responsibility to prevent this unhealthy situation from becoming universal.

As one of the members of the Federal Reserve Board said: "Whenever you get a banking system where, as in this country, less than 3 percent of the banks have more than 63 percent of the deposits of commercial banks, I think you are getting into a dangerous area."[27]

What has been the enervating process by which the diminution in the number of competitive banks has occurred? From 1950 to the end of 1960, over 1,600 banks were absorbed by other banks. These absorbed banks had resources of almost $33 billion. Bank mergers, moreover, continue to be troublesome phenomena by their number and size. Thus, between May 13 to December 21, 1960, 191 banks, with resources in excess of $18 billion, were involved in mergers.[28] The ink had hardly dried on the President's signature approving the amendment of May 13, 1960, to the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, before merger approval was sought and obtained—by December 31, 1960—in 21 instances

---

[17] S. Rept. No. 196, p. 8.

[18] E.g., *United States* v. *Brown Shoe Company*, 179 F. Supp. 721 (E.D. Mo., 1959)—now on appeal to the Supreme Court; *United States* v. *Bethlehem Steel Corporation*, 168 F. Supp. 576, 586–87 (S.D.N.Y., 1958); *United States* v. *National Steel Corp.*, 26 F.R.D., 599 (S.D. Texas, 1960).

[19] E.g., In the matter of Scott Paper Co., FTC Doc. No. 6559, decisions of Jan. 5, 1959, and Dec. 16, 1960.

[20] Federal Reserve Bulletin, February 1961, p. 230.

[21] Polk's Bank Directory, March 1961, p. VII; 47 Fed. Res. Bull. 486 (1961).

[22] Annual Report of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (1960), pp. 41, 44.

[23] Staff report to House Committee on Small Business on Banking Concentration and Small Business, 86th Cong., 2d sess., p. 3.

[24] Polk, Bank Directory, March 1961, p. VIII. In 1959 commercial banks with $1 billion in deposits had over 25 percent of the total assets of insured commercial banks. Staff report, p. 3.

[25] Annual Report of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (1960), p. 54.

[26] Staff report, p. 47.

[27] Hearings before Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (1959), p. 63.

[28] 1960 Annual Report of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, p. 10.

New York State has been one of the leaders in this merger parade. As a result, at the end of 1960, it had 402 commercial banks. One hundred fifty-eight of these banks had one thousand three hundred and sixty-eight branches.[29] Between 1934 and 1958, the number of banks in New York declined from 934 to 561, a decline of almost 40 percent.[30]

Between December 31, 1960, and June 30, 1961, the number of banks merged in this country exceeded the number of new banks, while the number of branches increased by about 400.[31]

Applications for approval of bank mergers still continue to flow in considerable numbers. Each approval seems to encourage another. During the past 5 years, over 60 applications have been filed with the Federal Reserve Board under section 3 of the Bank Holding Company Act—16 of them within the period of November 1, 1960, to November 15, 1961. The Comptroller of the Currency has had 539 applications for mergers in the past 5 years—114 of which were presented during the past year. And in the period November 1, 1960, to October 1, 1961, the above number of applications was augmented by 33 filed with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The annual reports of the Federal Reserve Board, I might add, show some 700 bank mergers in the 1956–60 period.

I would sincerely hope that you will help effect a deceleration of this trend.

V. OTHER FACTORS AND THE ARGUMENTS OF APPLICANT

There are a number of additional factors which require denial of this application. The applicants' arguments, moreover, are not persuasive to the contrary. I repeat again, because of its importance: It is a fact that these very arguments were raised and rejected in both the First New York Corp. and Bankers Trust Co. matters, decided, respectively, by the Federal Reserve Board and the New York Banking Board.

A. Factor No. 1: This case has a factor which gives added support to denial of this application. First National admits that it has received permission to open two banking offices in Westchester County. It is obvious that this imminent potential competition with National Bank of Westchester will be eliminated by the proposed merger.

It is equally obvious from First National's experience in Nassau County that through these offices its alleged benefits to Westchester residents by coming into the county could be accorded. It admits that its experience in Nassau County has been that its banking offices there have drawn business from distances of 10 miles and more. Moreover, within the past year a substantial New York bank, the Chemical New York Trust Co., has opened a banking office in Westchester County.

B. Factor No. 2: This merger will have an effect far beyond Westchester County. The applicant, with its vast resources, will have two banks in Peekskill which is close to the borderline of Putnam County, and Peekskill is the largest city northward to Poughkeepsie in Dutchess County in New York State. The applicant has admitted that the estimated population service area is almost twice that of the population of Peekskill.

Additionally, I point out, National Bank has approval to open a bank at Jefferson Valley which is right at the Putnam County border.

In view of the applicant's argument of the county's need for its services, it is pertinent to note that, in 1957, the National Bank of Westchester, through its president, appeared as a witness before the Federal Reserve Board in a proceeding instituted by First National City to acquire the largest bank in the county. National Bank, at that hearing, testified that the development of Westchester County had not created a demand for banking services not adequately met by the banking facilities of the county alone or in conjunction with correspondent banks. It further testified that it had not experienced any difficulty in utilizing correspondents to meet the requirements of Westchester applicants for loans. Nothing in the instant application before you today contradicts such testimony. In fact, First National City, in its application, presents a striking exposition of the services of a correspondent bank.[32]

C. Factor No. 3: That National Bank of Westchester is likely to cease using other New York City banks as correspondent banks seems obvious. The application shows that banks other than First National City were its correspondents.

In the Bankers Trust case the New York bank superintendent took cognizance of the likelihood that affiliation of County Trust with Bankers Trust would tend, to a substantial degree, if not completely, to cut off other banks in New York City and elsewhere with correspondent relations with County Trust, and this, he said, "would result in at least a tendency toward monopoly in Westchester over 'wholesale' banking services, foreign banking services, and the numerous other specialized banking skills of Bankers Trust which are described in the application."

A fortiori, I say, would this be true, in the case of the instant application.

First National's argument as to limited future deposit growth because of an expected decline in New York City population and the expected further growth in the suburbs, cannot be reconciled with its admission that it is primarily a national and international bank. Furthermore, as I have already mentioned, First National City already is in Nassau County—a faster growing county than Westchester—and has approval to open several branches in Westchester.

Neither bank is in a poor or failing position. There has been a substantial increase in the operating income and in the earnings of both banks during the past 5 years.[33]

Since 1950 First National City has more than doubled its capital funds, and the dollar amount of its loans is up 156 percent. Since 1950 it has opened 52 banking offices here and abroad.[34]

In the case of National Bank of Westchester we have it from the lips of the applicant that it "has increased in size dramatically in recent years in about equal measure from mergers and from operational results."[35]

In 1960, First National City had its highest total earnings and highest earnings per share since at least 1953.

As of December 1960 the book value of that bank's stock was $64.55 while the price range was 71¼ to 90¾. And last week its price range was 107 to 110½. The book value of the stock of National Bank of Westchester as of December 31, 1960, was $13.39 while its price range was 27 to 41. Last week its price range was 43¼ to 46⅛.

The applicant's generalized argument that other smaller banks in Westchester County would not be adversely affected does not hold water. The present degree of banking concentration in Westchester County held by National Bank of Westchester and County Trust is such that there is considerable doubt as to whether smaller competing banks in the county will have long-range opportunity to do business profitably; whether they will have unfettered opportunity for growth and expansion; whether new banks will be able to enter into business without severe handicap; and whether new capital will find such new banks an attractive investment.

The short of the matter is that present concentration in Westchester County is serious enough; to combine the resources of the second largest banking institution in Westchester County with the gigantic resources of the First National City Bank of New York, may well compound that situation to an enormous extent. If smaller banks in Westchester now labor under a competitive disadvantage with the National Bank of Westchester, that disadvantage would pale into insignificance by adoption of the pending proposal. It now takes considerable courage for small businessmen to pool their resources and charter a new commercial bank in Westchester County. The obstacles to new charters, now especially serious because of concentration of banking assets, could well become infinitely greater once National Bank of Westchester had behind it the weight of the First National City Bank resources.

It follows that the acquisition would introduce in Westchester County an institution of such power that the banking community would be transformed into one overwhelmingly dominated by a single company, with a reasonable probability of price leadership and a general absence of price rivalry. Smaller banks in Westchester County could not be expected to be unaware of the financial power with which they would be confronted by virtue of this consolidation. In these circumstances their means of competition would be hardly comparable to those available to the First National City-National Bank of Westchester combination. It is nonsense to suppose that entry by First National City Bank in Westchester County might have no adverse competitive effect on the other eight banks in that area.

The applicant refers to mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations. Even if they be considered, First National City's position would be only slightly altered. As of December 31, 1960, no savings bank in the New York-Westchester-Nassau area had $2 billion in deposits. In Westchester County, the largest had $103,900,000 in deposits.[36]

The largest savings and loan association listed by the applicant had deposits of less than $210 million. The largest in Westchester County had less than $40 million in deposits.[37]

Moreover, commercial banks represent a clearly identifiable and distinct line of commerce. No other financial institution, either in the scope of its activities or in the size of many of such activities, compares with the commercial banks which have been described as the "department stores of finance." Commercial banks have the unique power to accept and create demand deposits. Surely a monopoly of commercial banks could not be justified because of the existence of mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations.

Finally, the applicant argues that there is a negligible overlap and negligible competition between the merging banks. In reality, however, the overlap and the competition are far from negligible.

First National City's service area, of course, includes Westchester County. In the local area, First National City has loans of $760 million and deposits of $1.7 billion. Both banks furnish an appreciable number of similar services.

They have almost 3,000 common depositors. Each bank had commercial loans outstanding for customers in the other's service area. First National City had 660 regular checking accounts for customers who had accounts in

---

[29] 47 Fed. Res. Bull. 486–487 (1961).

[30] Report of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (1960).

[31] 47 Fed. Res. Bull. 1002 (1961).

[32] See app. C–7, pp. 3–4 to application.

[33] See application, pp. 17, 66, 68.

[34] See application, p. 63.

[35] Id., p. 64.

[36] Application, pp. 126–127.

[37] App. B–4, pp. 77 et seq.

National Bank of Westchester. It also had 620 savings accounts for customers who had accounts in the other bank.

First National City has over 4,800 deposit accounts and over 4,500 loan accounts, involving very substantial sums, in the service area of National Bank of Westchester. The latter has 2,593 deposit accounts, 642 loan accounts, 1,073 checking accounts, and 1,193 savings accounts with customers in New York City and Nassau. It has over $25 million in outside-of-the-State mortgages.[38] First National City has over $1 million in deposits in other banks in Metropolitan New York City.

In the First New York Corp. case, the Federal Reserve Board had this to say:

"That a certain amount of competition presently exists between City Bank and County Trust is apparent. Applicants stated that deposits of City Bank originating in Westchester County were less than 1 percent of City Bank's domestic deposits, and that the deposits of County Trust originating in New York City were less than 3 percent of its deposits (exh. F, pp. 5, 6). One percent of City Bank's deposits, excluding deposits of national concerns and deposits at foreign branches, would be over $20 million. If only deposits of foreign branches are excluded, 1 percent of City Bank's deposits would be approximately $55 million. Three percent of County Trust's deposits would be about $10 million. Accordingly, despite the small percentages involved, it appears that the actual amounts involved are substantial."

Certainly, as large an amount is involved in this proceeding.

Applicant asserts that its monopolistic entry would be good for Westchester County. It proffers the benevolence of lower interest rates. But, I think there is an eloquent rebuttal to this argument in the words of that great spellbinder, William Jennings Bryan. Said he:

"I do not divide monopolies in private hands into good monopolies and bad monopolies. There is no good monopoly in private hands until the Almighty sends us angels to preside over the monopoly. There may be a despot who is better than another despot but there is no good despots."

In conclusion, I say that you will never have so strong a case as this to stop the trend toward monopolization of banking. You will never have such opportunity to prevent banking in one of the world's most important financial areas from falling into the hands of a few giants—the classic case of oligopoly. You will never have so just a cause to curb one of the most persistent leaders of such oligopolistic movement—First National City Bank.

I call upon you to deny this application.

Hon. John W. McCormack: A New and Great Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, this is truly a memorable day in the history of the House of Representatives, this Nation, and, indeed, the world.

It is an extreme personal privilege and pleasure for me to join with my colleagues in congratulating our distinguished son of Massachusetts, Representative John W. McCormack, upon his selection for the speakership of this House.

By our action here we have conferred upon him one of the highest honors that can be granted to any man and we have called upon him to fulfill one of the greatest responsibilities on this earth.

As we all realize, he richly deserves the honor and we are equally aware that he will discharge his responsibilities in the fullest measure of his acclaimed integrity and acknowledged ability.

If any man has ever earned such national and world distinction it is John W. McCormack. For practically his entire mature life, he has dedicated his spirit, his talents, and his energies in patriotic public service to his Nation.

He has served continuously in this body for nearly 35 years and throughout 21 of these years he has superbly fulfilled the most exacting duties of the office of majority leader. Because of his remarkable and outstanding performance in this office, he was repeatedly elected majority leader and has occupied that office longer than any man in either party in the history of the Congress. It is this unique background of knowledge and experience, possessed by no other living man, that the gentleman from Massachusetts, John McCormack, brings to his new and higher office.

Beyond and above knowledge and experience, the office of Speaker requires character. Character in a man is measured, in summary, by his devotion to principle, his industry in his work, his integrity of action, his compassion toward his fellow man, and his tolerance of the beliefs and causes of others who may differ with him.

For more than 30 years, Members of this body have had the opportunity to observe the character of John McCormack. Out of this observance, we have seen his demonstrated and unswerving devotion to principle founded upon his fervent faith in God, his fellow man, and his country.

We have watched his intensive and exclusive application of mind and energy, from dawn until well into darkness, to his work, not only as the national Representative of his district here, but also as our majority leader for over 20 years.

His integrity of action throughout his extraordinary career here is a byword in the annals of both parties. The testimony on this point comes from the distinguished minority whip himself, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends], when he stated in this House on last September 26—"The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] was always a man of his word. If he had made a promise of a commitment, he would keep it come what may. His word is his bond. We all know that and we respect him for it."

There is hardly an individual who has served in this body over the past 30 years who has not been the recipient of wise counsel, friendly encouragement, and practical assistance from John McCormack.

Throughout his long service here, and especially in his position as majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, John McCormack, has become universally recognized for not only his tolerance of the beliefs of others but his gentlemanly graciousness to others with whom he differs. He has presented his own beliefs with all the vigor and persuasion within his command, but he has been equally vigorous in proclaiming the right of others to friendly and fully speak their own beliefs, and in the rare instance where his own causes could not prevail he has reserved no rancor. With his devout faith in God and his sympathetic understanding of his fellow men the spiritual nature of the gentleman from Massachusetts, John McCormack, could not permit him to act otherwise.

In brief this is then the experience, knowledge, and character of the colleague whom we have selected to lead and guide us in our national legislative responsibilities through the gravest period and most challenging time of our history. We are supremely confident that with his unique capabilities and unmatched experience he will provide the inspirational and effective legislative leadership for this country to enter a new era of ever greater progress and strength at home with increasing success and prestige abroad.

We congratulate you, John, Mr. Speaker, and join in our prayers that God's help will be granted you in the discharge of your tremendous responsibilities and that the Almighty will preserve both you, and your devoted and gracious wife, among us in good health for many years to come.

Development Fund Drive of the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, in the district which I have the honor to represent is located one of the world's great healing institutions. In order to better fulfill its humane goals, it has been found necessary at this time to appeal publicly for assistance. Many distinguished citizens and humanitarians have interested themselves in this project. It is my opinion that their efforts in this direction are worthy of being recorded in these archives.

The Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center in New York City, the largest voluntary hospital in the world and the first medical center established in the United States, is now conducting a development fund drive for $50 million. The objective is the increased relief of human ailments through the advancement of medical science and the improved dissemination of medical knowledge.

---

[38] See application, p. 136 et seq.

The affiliation between Presbyterian Hospital and Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons was formalized 50 years ago and in 1928 gave birth to the complex of buildings known as the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center. This institution has benefited the entire world through contributions to better health.

Grayson Kirk, president of Columbia University and Augustus C. Long, president of the Presbyterian Hospital in the city of New York, announced that $35 million of the campaign goal will be used for new construction, already underway, to include the $13 million William Black Medical Research Building.

Gen. Lucius D. Clay, retired, is general chairman of the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center Development Committee. General Clay, chairman of the board of the Continental Can Co. and vice president of Presbyterian Hospital's board of trustees has guided the fund close to the halfway mark. He has interrupted this stewardship to serve the President of the United States as his personal representative in Berlin with the rank of ambassador.

In discussing Columbia-Presbyterian's combination of patient care, medical education, and research during the last 30 years, General Clay said:

> I believe that it is not an unrelated coincidence that these same past 30 years have seen more forward surge in medical science than in all the previous years of human history. This is by no means a claim that all such progress occurred in the center, but simply that the impetus in research, teaching, and treatment which found expression in the center idea has had extremely wide and useful results.

More than 3 million patients of all races, creeds, and circumstances have been treated at the medical center since it was opened in 1928.

The high quality of medical education and research at the Medical Center has drawn a steady stream of visiting scholars from all points of the globe, many of whom are leaders in medicine in their own institutions both in this country and abroad.

A most important accomplishment of the center has been the training of thousands of doctors, nurses, and other members of the health professions. Approximately 4,000 medical students, 5,000 interns, and residents, and hundreds of research scientists have gone out from the medical center during the last three decades.

This country leads the world in both the qualitative and quantitative scope of its medical education. Yet, it suffers from a shortage of doctors that threatens to grow more serious in the face of a burgeoning population and increased commitments for world leadership in all fields.

This merely adds to the urgency of supporting the expansion of our great teaching institutions like the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center.

In this era of growing requests by Government and private philanthropic organizations for research projects into various aspects of diseases the enormous demands for maintaining and extending research activities require more and better facilities—facilities unthought of when the Columbia-Presbyterian buildings were on the planning boards in the 1920's.

The trustees of Presbyterian Hospital and Columbia University deserve the grateful commendation of Americans everywhere for their determination to extend the contribution of Columbia-Presbyterian toward better health by a major expansion of facilities for patient care, research and medical education.

I cannot too strongly urge Americans to support our free institutions like Columbia-Presbyterian in their dedication to nurturing a better way of life for all men.

Presbyterian Hospital, like all voluntary hospitals, is critically dependent upon funds from philanthropic giving, fund-raising campaigns, bequests and endowments to enable it to serve the community.

Yet this institution stands ready to serve regardless of the patient's ability to pay. Medical care is provided in the wards and outpatient departments, without charge, by attending staff doctors. Community volunteers serve, without pay, in virtually all parts of the hospital.

A gift to the medical center's development program is an investment in the health of our Nation. Furthermore, it is a promise to the free world that we shall not shirk our responsibilities for the well-being of peoples everywhere.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 11, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Matthew 20: 27: *Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, we acknowledge humbly and gratefully that by Thy kind and beneficent providence we have hitherto been sustained and strengthened.

Grant that now, as we go forward into the days of a new year and a new session of Congress, with all of its perplexing problems, we may be sensitive and devoutly obedient to the leading of Thy divine spirit.

May our President, our Speaker, and the Members of this legislative assembly embody and express that noble kind of statesmanship which strives to preserve and perpetuate those lofty ideals and principles which Thou hast ordained.

God forbid that we should ever misdirect our aspirations and dissipate our energies by allowing them to become centered upon personal gain rather than upon Thy glory and the welfare of humanity.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord who went about doing good. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 402. Concurrent resolution that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on January 11, 1962, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 402 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber: the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

The Doorkeeper announced the ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m. the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have a great pleasure, the highest privilege, and the distinct honor, and to me, particularly on this occasion, always, but particularly on this occasion, of presenting to you the President of the United States. [Applause, the Members rising.]

STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 251)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Vice President, my old colleague from Massachusetts and your new Speaker, JOHN McCORMACK [applause], Members of the 87th Congress, ladies and gentlemen, this week we begin anew our joint and separate efforts to build the American future. But, sadly, we build without a man who linked a long past with the present and looked strongly to the future. Mr. SAM RAYBURN is gone. Neither this House nor the Nation is the same without him.

Members of the Congress, the Constitution makes us not rivals for power but partners for progress. We are all trustees for the American people, custodians of the American heritage. It is my task to report the state of the Union—to improve it is the task of us all.

In the past year, I have traveled not only across our own land but to other lands—to the north and the south, and across the seas. And I have found—as I am sure you have, in your travels—that people everywhere, in spite of occasional disappointments, look to us—not to our wealth or power, but to the splendor of our ideals. For our Nation is commissioned by history to be either an observer of freedom's failure or the cause of its success. Our overriding obligation in the months ahead is to fulfill the world's hopes by fulfilling our own faith.

I. STRENGTHENING THE ECONOMY

That task must begin at home. For if we cannot fulfill our own ideals here, we cannot expect others to accept them. And when the youngest child alive today has grown to the cares of manhood, our position in the world will be determined first of all by what provisions we make today—for his education, his health, and his opportunities for a good home—and a good job—and a good life.

At home, we began the year in the valley of recession—we completed it on the high road of recovery and growth. [Applause.] With the help of new congressionally approved or administratively increased stimulants to our economy, the number of major surplus labor areas has declined from 101 to 60; nonagricultural employment has increased by more than a million jobs; and the average factory workweek has risen to well over 40 hours. At year's end the economy which Mr. Khrushchev once called a stumbling horse was racing to new records in consumer spending, labor income, and industrial production. [Applause.]

We are gratified—but we are not satisfied. Too many unemployed are still looking for the blessings of prosperity. As those who leave our schools and farms demand new jobs, automation takes old jobs away. To expand our growth and job opportunities, I urge on the Congress three measures:

(1) First, the Manpower Training and Development Act, to stop the waste of able-bodied men and women who want to work, but whose only skill has been replaced by a machine, or moved with a mill, or shut down with a mine;

(2) Second, the Youth Employment Opportunities Act, to help train and place not only the 1 million young Americans who are both out of school and out of work, but the 26 million young Americans entering the labor market in this decade; and

(3) Third, the 8-percent tax credit for investment in machinery and equipment, which, combined with planned revisions of depreciation allowances, will spur our modernization, our growth, and our ability to compete abroad.

Moreover—pleasant as it may be to bask in the warmth of recovery—let us not forget that we have suffered three recessions in the last 7 years. The time to repair the roof is when the sun is shining—by filling three basic gaps in our antirecession protection. We need:

(1) First, Presidential standby authority, subject to congressional veto, to adjust personal income tax rates downward within a specified range and time, to slow down an economic decline before it has dragged us all down.

(2) Second, Presidential standby authority, upon a given rise in the rate of unemployment, to accelerate Federal and federally aided capital improvement programs; and

(3) Third, a permanent strengthening of our unemployment compensation system—to maintain for our fellow citizens searching for a job and cannot find it, their purchasing power and their living standards without constant resort—as we have seen in recent years by Congress and the administrations—to temporary supplements.

If we enact this six-part program, we can show the whole world that a free economy need not be an unstable economy—that a free system need not leave men unemployed—and that a free society is not only the most productive but the most stable form of organization yet fashioned by man. [Applause.]

II. FIGHTING INFLATION

But recession is only one enemy of a free economy—inflation is another. Last year, 1961, despite rising production and demand, consumer prices held almost steady—and wholesale prices declined. This is the best record of overall price stability of any comparable period of recovery since the end of World War II.

Inflation too often follows in the shadow of growth—while price stability is made easy by stagnation or controls. But we mean to maintain both stability and growth in a climate of freedom.

Our first line of defense against inflation is the good sense and public spirit of business and labor—keeping their total increases in wages and profits in step with productivity. There is no single statistical test to guide each company and each union. But I strongly urge them—for their country's interest, and for their own—to apply the test of the public interest to these transactions.

Within this same framework of growth and wage-price stability:

This administration has helped keep our economy competitive by widening the access of small business to credit and Government contracts, and by stepping up the drive against monopoly, price fixing, and racketeering.

We will submit a Federal pay reform bill aimed at giving our classified, postal, and other employees new pay scales more comparable to those of private industry.

We are holding the fiscal 1962 budget deficit far below the level incurred after the last recession in 1958; and, finally, I am submitting for fiscal 1963 a balanced Federal budget. [Applause.]

This is a joint responsibility, requiring congressional cooperation on appropriations, and on three sources of income in particular:

(1) First, an increase in postal rates, to end the postal deficit;

(2) Second, passage of the tax reforms previously urged, to remove unwarranted tax preferences, and to apply to dividends and to interest the same withholding requirements we have long applied to wages; and

(3) Third, extension of the present excise and corporation tax rates, except for those changes—which will be recommended in a message—affecting transportation.

III. GETTING AMERICA MOVING

But a stronger Nation and economy require more than a balanced budget. They require progress in those programs that spur our growth and fortify our strength.

CITIES

A strong America depends on its cities—America's glory, and sometimes America's shame. To substitute sunlight for congestion and progress for decay, we have stepped up existing urban renewal and housing programs, and launched new ones—redoubled the attack on water pollution—speeded aid to airports, hospitals, highways, and our declining mass transit systems—and secured new weapons to combat organized crime, racketeering, and youth delinquency, assisted by the coordinated and hard-hitting efforts of our investigative services: The FBI, Internal Revenue, the Bureau of Narcotics, and many others. We shall need further anticrime, mass transit, and transportation legislation—and new tools to fight air pollution. And with all this effort underway, both equity and commonsense require that our Nation's urban areas—containing three-fourths of our population—sit as equals at the Cabinet table. I urge a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. [Applause.]

AGRICULTURE AND RESOURCES

A strong America also depends on its farms and natural resources. American farmers took heart in 1961—from a billion-dollar rise in farm income—and from a hopeful start on reducing the farm surpluses. But we are still operating under a patchwork accumulation of old laws, which cost us $1 billion a year in CCC carrying charges alone, yet fail to halt rural poverty or boost farm earnings.

Our task is to master and turn to fully fruitful ends the magnificent productivity of our farms and farmers. The revolution on our own countryside stands in the sharpest contrast to the repeated farm failures of the Communist nations, and is a source of pride to us all. Since 1950 our agricultural output per man-hour has actually doubled. Without new, realistic measures, it will someday swamp our farmers and our taxpayers in a national scandal or a farm depression.

I will, therefore, submit to the Congress a new comprehensive farm program—tailored to fit the use of our land and the supplies of each crop to the long-range needs of the sixties—and designed to prevent chaos in the sixties with a program of commonsense.

We also need for the sixties—if we are to bequeath our full national estate to our heirs—a new long-range conservation and recreation program—expansion of our superb national parks and forests—preservation of our authentic wilderness areas—new starts on water and power projects as our population steadily increases—and expanded REA generation and transmission loans.

CIVIL RIGHTS

But America stands for progress in human rights as well as economic affairs, and a strong America requires the assurance of full and equal rights to all its citizens, of any race or of any color. This administration has shown as never before how much could be done through the full use of Executive powers—through the enforcement of laws already passed by the Congress—through persuasion, negotiation, and litigation, to secure the constitutional rights of all: the right to vote, the right to travel without hindrance across State lines, and the right to free public education.

I issued last March a comprehensive order to guarantee the right to equal employment opportunity in all Federal agencies and contractors. The Vice President's committee thus created has done much, including the voluntary plans for progress which, in all sections of the country, are achieving a quiet but striking success in opening up to all races new professional, supervisory, and other job opportunities. [Applause.]

But there is much more to be done—by the Executive, by the courts, and by the Congress. Among the bills now pending before you, on which the executive departments will comment in detail, are appropriate methods of strengthening these basic rights which have our full support. The right to vote, for example, should no longer be denied through such arbitrary devices on a local level, sometimes abused, such as literacy tests and poll taxes. As we approach the 100th anniversary next January, of the Emancipation Proclamation, let the acts of every branch of the Government—and every citizen—portray that "righteousness does exalt a nation."

HEALTH AND WELFARE

Finally, a strong America cannot neglect the aspirations of its citizens—the welfare of the needy, the health care of the elderly, the education of the young. For we are not developing the Nation's wealth for its own sake. Wealth is the means—and people are the ends. All our material riches will avail us little if we do not use them to expand the opportunities of our people.

Last year, we improved the diet of needy people—provided more hot lunches and fresh milk to schoolchildren—built more college dormitories—and, for the elderly, expanded private housing, nursing homes, health services, and social security. But we have just begun.

To help those least fortunate of all, I am recommending a new public welfare program, stressing services instead of support, rehabilitation instead of relief, and training for useful work instead of prolonged dependency.

To relieve the critical shortage of doctors and dentists—and this is a matter which concerns us all—and expand research, I urge action to aid medical and dental colleges and scholarships and to establish new National Institutes of Health.

To take advantage of modern vaccination achievements, I am proposing a mass immunization program, aimed at the virtual elimination of such ancient enemies of our children as polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus. [Applause.]

To protect our consumers from the careless and the unscrupulous, I shall recommend improvements in the food and drug laws—strengthening inspection and standards, halting unsafe and worthless products, preventing misleading labels, and cracking down on the illicit sale of habit-forming drugs.

But in matters of health, no piece of unfinished business is more important or more urgent than the enactment under the social security system of health insurance for the aged. [Applause.]

For our older citizens have longer and more frequent illnesses, higher hospital and medical bills, and too little income to pay them. Private health insurance helps some—for its cost is high and its coverage limited. Public welfare cannot help those too proud to seek relief but hard pressed to pay their own bills. Nor can their children or grandchildren always sacrifice their own health budgets to meet this constant drain.

Social security has long helped to meet the hardships of retirement, death, and disability. I now urge that its coverage be extended without further delay to provide health insurance for the elderly. [Applause.]

EDUCATION

Equally important to our strength is the quality of our education. Eight million adult Americans are classified as functionally illiterate. This is a disturbing figure reflected in selective service rejection rates, welfare rolls, and crime rates. And I shall recommend plans for a massive attack to end this adult illiteracy.

I shall also recommend bills to improve educational quality, to stimulate the arts, and, at the college level, to provide Federal loans for the construction of academic facilities and federally financed scholarships.

If this Nation is to grow in wisdom and strength, then every able high school graduate should have the opportunity to develop his talents. Yet nearly half lack either the funds or the facilities to attend college. Enrollments are going to double in our colleges in the short space of 10 years. The annual cost per student is skyrocketing to astronomical levels—now averaging $1,650 a year, although almost half of our families earn less than $5,000. They cannot afford such costs—but this Nation cannot afford to maintain its military power and neglect its brainpower. [Applause.]

But excellence in education must begin at the elementary level. I sent to the Congress last year a proposal for Federal aid to public school construction and teachers' salaries. I believe that bill, which passed the Senate and received House committee approval, offered the minimum amount required by our needs and—in terms of across-the-board aid—the maximum scope permitted by our Constitution. I, therefore, see no reason to weaken or withdraw that bill; and I urge its passage at this session.

"Civilization," said H. G. Wells, "is a race between education and catastrophe." It is up to you in this Congress to determine the winner of that race.

These are not unrelated measures addressed to specific gaps or grievances in our national life. They are the pattern of our intentions and the foundation of our hopes.

"I believe in democracy," said Woodrow Wilson, "because it releases the energy of every human being." The dynamic of democracy is the power and the purpose of the individual; and the policy of this administration is to give to the individual the opportunity to realize his own highest possibilities.

Our program is to open to all the opportunity for steady and productive employment, to remove from all the handicap of arbitrary or irrational exclusion, to offer to all the facilities for education, and health, and welfare, to make society the servant of the individual and the individual the source of progress, and thus to realize for all the full promise of American life. [Applause.]

IV. OUR GOALS ABROAD

All of these efforts at home give meaning to our efforts abroad. Since the close of the Second World War, a global civil war has divided and tormented mankind. But it is not our military might, or our higher standard of living, that has most distinguished us from our adversaries. It is our belief that the state is the servant of the citizen and not his master. [Applause.]

This basic clash of ideas and wills is but one of the forces reshaping our globe—swept as it is by the tides of hope and fear, by crises in the headlines today that become mere footnotes tomorrow. Both the successes and the setbacks of the past year remain on our agenda of unfinished business. For every apparent blessing contains the seeds of danger—every area of trouble gives out a ray of hope—and the one unchangeable certainty is that nothing is certain or unchangeable.

Yet our basic goal remains the same: a peaceful world community of free and independent states—free to choose their own future and their own system, so long as it does not threaten the freedom of others. [Applause.]

Some may choose forms and ways that we would not choose for ourselves—but it is not for us that they are choosing. We can welcome diversity—the Communist cannot. For we offer a world of choice—they offer the world of coercion. And the way of the past shows clearly enough that freedom, not coercion, is the wave of the future. At times our goal has been obscured by crisis or endangered by conflict—but it draws sustenance from five basic sources of strength: The moral and physical strength of the United States; the united strength of the Atlantic Community; the regional strength of our hemispheric relations; the creative strength of our efforts in the new and developing nations; and the peacekeeping strength of the United Nations.

V. OUR MILITARY STRENGTH

Our moral and physical strength begins at home as already discussed. But it includes our military strength as well. So long as fanaticism and fear brood over the affairs of men, we must arm to deter others from aggression.

In the past 12 months our military posture has steadily improved. We increased the previous defense budget by 15 percent—not in the expectation of war but for the preservation of peace. We more than doubled our acquisition rate of Polaris submarines—we doubled the production capacity for Minuteman missiles—and increased by 50 percent the number of manned bombers standing ready on 15-minute alert. This year the combined force levels planned under our new defense budget—including nearly 300 additional Polaris and Minuteman missiles—have been precisely calculated to insure the continuing strength of our nuclear deterrent.

But our strength may be tested at many levels. We intend to have at all times the capacity to resist nonnuclear or limited attacks—as a complement to our nuclear capacity, not as a substitute. We have rejected any all-or-nothing posture which would leave no choice but inglorious retreat or unlimited retaliation. [Applause.]

Thus we have doubled the number of ready combat divisions in the Army's strategic reserve—increased our troops in Europe—built up the Marines—added a new sealift and airlift capacity—modernized our weapons and ammunition—expanded our antiguerrilla forces—and increased the active fleet by more than 70 vessels and our tactical air forces by nearly a dozen wings.

Because we needed to reach this higher long-term level of readiness more quickly, 155,000 members of the Reserve and National Guard were activated under the act of this Congress. Some disruptions and distress were inevitable. But the overwhelming majority bear their burdens—and their Nation's burdens—with admirable and traditional devotion. [Applause.]

In the coming year, our reserve programs will be revised—two Army divisions will, I hope, replace those Guard divisions on duty—and substantial other increases will boost our Air Force fighter units, the procurement of equipment, and our continental defense and warning efforts. The Nation's first serious civil defense shelter program is underway, identifying, marking, and stocking 50 million spaces; and I urge your approval of Federal incentives for the construction of public fallout shelters in schools and hospitals and similar centers.

VI. THE UNITED NATIONS

But arms alone are not enough to keep the peace—it must be kept by men. Our instrument and our hope is the United Nations—and I see little merit in the impatience of those who would abandon this imperfect world instrument because they dislike our imperfect world. For the troubles of a world organization merely reflect the troubles of the world itself. And if the organization is weakened, these troubles can only increase. We may not always agree with every detailed action taken by every officer of the United Nations, or with every voting majority. But as an institution, it should have in the future, as it has had in the past since its inception, no stronger or more faithful member than the United States of America. [Applause.]

In 1961, the peacekeeping strength of the United Nations was reinforced. And those who preferred or predicted its demise, envisioning a troika in the seat of Hammarskjold—or Red China inside the Assembly—have seen instead a new vigor, under a new Secretary General and a fully independent Secretariat. In making plans for a new forum and principles on disarmament—for peacekeeping in outer space—for a decade of development effort—the U.N. fulfilled its charter's lofty aims. [Applause.]

Eighteen months ago the tangled, turbulent Congo presented the U.N. with its gravest challenge. The prospect was one of chaos—or certain big-power confrontation, with all its hazards and all of its risks, to us and to others. Today the hopes have improved for peaceful conciliation within a united Congo. This is the objective of our policy in this important area.

No policeman is universally popular—particularly when he uses his stick to restore law and order on his beat. Those members who are willing to contribute their votes and their views—but very little else—have created a serious deficit by refusing to pay their share of special U.N. assessments. Yet they do pay their annual assessments to retain their votes—and a new U.N. bond issue, financing special operations for the next 18 months, is to be repaid with interest from these regular assessments. This is clearly in our interest. It will not only keep the U.N. solvent, but require all voting members to pay their fair share of its activities. Our share of special operations has long been much higher than our share of the annual assessment—and the bond issue will in effect reduce our disproportionate obligation, and for these reasons, I am urging Congress to approve our participation. [Applause.]

With the approval of this Congress, we have undertaken in the past year a great new effort in outer space. Our aim is not simply to be the first on the moon, any more than Charles Lindbergh's real aim was to be the first to Paris. His aim was to develop the techniques of our own country and other countries in the field of air and the atmosphere, and our objective in making this effort, which we hope will place one of our citizens on the moon, is to develop in a new frontier of science, commerce, and cooperation, the position of the United States and the free world. [Applause.]

This Nation belongs among the first to explore it, and among the first, if not the first, we shall be. [Applause.] We are offering our know-how and our cooperation to the U.N. Our satellites will soon be providing other nations with improved weather observations. And I shall soon send to the Congress a measure to govern the financing and operation of an international communications satellite system, in a manner consistent with the public interest and our foreign policy.

But peace in space will help us naught once peace on earth is gone. World order will be secured only when the whole world has laid down these weapons which seem to offer present security but threaten the future survival of the human race. That armistice day seems very far away. The vast resources of this planet are being devoted more and more to the means of destroying, instead of enriching, human life.

But the world was not meant to be a prison in which man awaits his execution. Nor has mankind survived the tests and trials of thousands of years to surrender everything—including its existence—now. This Nation has the will and the faith to make a supreme effort to break the logjam on disarmament and nuclear tests—and we will persist until we prevail, until the rule of law has replaced the ever dangerous use of force. [Applause.]

VII. LATIN AMERICA

I turn now to a prospect of great promise: our hemispheric relations. The Alliance for Progress is being rapidly transformed from proposal to program. Last month in Latin America I saw for myself the quickening of hope, the revival of confidence, and the new trust in our country—among workers and farmers as well as diplomats. We have pledged our help in speeding their economic, educational, and social progress. The Latin American Republics have in turn pledged a new and strenuous effort of self-help and self-reform.

To support this historic undertaking, I am proposing—under the authority contained in the bills of the last session of the Congress—a special long-term

Alliance for Progress fund of $3 billion. Combined with our Food for Peace, Export-Import Bank, and other resources, this will provide more than $1 billion a year in new support for the Alliance. In addition, we have increased twelvefold our Spanish and Portuguese-language broadcasting in Latin America, and improved hemispheric trade and defense. And while the blight of communism has been increasingly exposed and isolated in the Americas, liberty has scored a gain. The people of the Dominican Republic, with our firm encouragement and help, and those of our sister Republics of this hemisphere, are safely passing the treacherous course from dictatorship through disorder towards democracy. [Applause.]

VIII. THE NEW AND DEVELOPING NATIONS

Our efforts to help other new or developing nations, and to strengthen their stand for freedom, have also made progress. A newly unified Agency for International Development is reorienting our foreign assistance to emphasize long-term development loans instead of grants, more economic aid instead of military, individual plans to meet the individual needs of the nations, and new standards on what they must do to marshal their own resources.

A newly conceived Peace Corps is winning friends and helping people in 14 countries—supplying trained and dedicated young men and women, to give these new nations a hand in building a society, and a glimpse of the best that is in our country. If there be a problem here, it is that we cannot supply the spontaneous and mounting demand.

A newly expanded food for peace program is feeding the hungry of many lands with the abundance of our productive farms—providing lunches for children in school, wages for economic development, relief for the victims of flood and famine, and a better diet for millions whose daily bread is their chief concern.

These programs help people; and, by helping people, they help freedom. The views of their governments may sometimes be very different from ours—but events in Africa, the Middle East, and Eastern Europe teach us never to write off any nation as lost to the Communists. That is the lesson of our time. We support the independence of those newer or weaker states whose history, geography, economy, or lack of power impels them to remain outside "entangling alliances"—as we did for more than a century. For the independence of nations is a bar to the Communists' "grand design"—it is the basis of our own. [Applause.]

In the past year, for example, we have urged a neutral and independent Laos—regained there a common policy with our major allies—and insisted that a cease fire precede negotiations. While a workable formula for supervising its independence is still to be achieved, both the spread of war—which might have involved this country also—and a Communist occupation have thus far been prevented.

A satisfactory settlement in Laos would also help to achieve and safeguard the peace in Vietnam—where the foe is increasing his tactics of terror—where our own efforts have been stepped up—and where the local government has initiated new programs and reforms to broaden the base of resistance. The systematic aggression now bleeding that country is not a "war of liberation"—for Vietnam is already free. It is a war of attempted subjugation—and it will be resisted.

IX. THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY

Finally, the united strength of the Atlantic Community has flourished in the last year under severe tests. NATO has increased both the number and the readiness of its air, ground, and naval units—both its nuclear and nonnuclear capabilities. Even greater efforts by all its members are still required. Nevertheless our unity of purpose and will has been, I believe, immeasurably strengthened.

The threat to the brave city of Berlin remains. In these last 6 months the allies have made it unmistakably clear that our presence in Berlin, our free access thereto, and the freedom of 2 million West Berliners would not be surrendered either to force or through appeasement—that to maintain those rights and obligations, we are prepared to talk, when appropriate, and to fight, if necessary. [Applause.] Every member of NATO stands with us in a common commitment to preserve this symbol of freeman's will to remain free.

I cannot now predict the course of future negotiations over Berlin. I can only say that we are sparing no honorable effort to find a peaceful and mutually acceptable resolution of this problem. I believe such a resolution can be found, and with it an improvement in our relations with the Soviet Union, if only the leaders in the Kremlin will recognize the basic rights and interests involved, and the interest of all mankind in peace.

But the Atlantic Community is no longer concerned with purely military aims. As its common undertakings grow at an ever-increasing pace, we are, and increasingly will be, partners in aid, trade, defense, diplomacy, and monetary affairs.

The emergence of the new Europe is being matched by the emergence of new ties across the Atlantic. It is a matter of undramatic daily cooperation in hundreds of workaday tasks: of currencies kept in effective relation, of development loans meshed together, of standardized weapons, and concerted diplomatic positions. The Atlantic Community grows, not like a volcanic mountain, by one mighty explosion, but like a coral reef, from the accumulating activity of all.

Thus, we in the free world are moving steadily toward unity and cooperation, in the teeth of that old Bolshevik prophecy, and at the very time when extraordinary rumbles of discord can be heard across the Iron Curtain. It is not free societies which bear within them the seeds of inevitable disunity. [Applause.]

X. OUR BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

On one special problem, of great concern to our friends, and to us, I am proud to give the Congress an encouraging report. Our efforts to safeguard the dollar are progressing. In the 11 months preceding last February 1, we suffered a net loss of nearly $2 billion in gold. In the 11 months that followed, the loss was just over half a billion dollars. And our deficit in our basic transactions with the rest of the world—trade, defense, foreign aid, and capital, excluding volatile short-term flows—has been reduced from $2 billion for 1960 to about one-third that amount for 1961. Speculative fever against the dollar is ending—and confidence in the dollar has been restored.

We did not—and could not—achieve these gains through import restrictions, troop withdrawals, exchange controls, dollar devaluation, or choking off domestic recovery. We acted not in panic but in perspective. But the problem is not yet solved. Persistently large deficits would endanger our economic growth and our military and defense commitments abroad. Our goal must be a reasonable equilibrium in our balance of payments. With the cooperation of the Congress, business, labor and our major allies, that goal can be reached. [Applause.]

We shall continue to attract foreign tourists and investments to our shores, to seek increased military purchases here by our allies, to maximize foreign aid procurement from American firms, to urge increased aid from other fortunate nations to the less fortunate, to seek tax laws which do not favor investment in other industrialized nations or tax havens, and to urge coordination of allied fiscal and monetary policies so as to discourage large and disturbing capital movements.

TRADE

Above all, if we are to pay for our commitments abroad, we must expand our exports. Our businessmen must be export conscious and export competitive. Our tax policies must spur modernization of our plants—our wage and price gains must be consistent with productivity to hold the line on prices—our export credit and promotion campaigns for American industries must continue to expand.

But the greatest challenge of all is posed by the growth of the European Common Market. Assuming the accession of the United Kingdom, there will arise across the Atlantic a trading partner behind a single external tariff similar to ours with an economy which nearly equals our own. Will we in this country adapt our thinking to these new prospects and patterns—or will we wait until events have passed us by?

This is the year to decide. The Reciprocal Trade Act is expiring. We need a new law—a wholly new approach—a bold new instrument of American trade policy. Our decision could well affect the unity of the West, the course of the cold war, and the economic growth of our Nation for a generation to come.

If we move decisively, our factories and farms can increase their sales to their richest, fastest growing market.

Our exports will increase. Our balance-of-payments position will improve. And we will have forged across the Atlantic a trading partnership with vast resources for freedom.

If, on the other hand, we hang back in deference to local economic pressures, we will find ourselves cut off from our major allies. Industries—and I believe this is most vital—industries will move their plants and jobs and capital inside the walls of the Common Market, and jobs, therefore, will be lost here in the United States, if they cannot otherwise compete for its consumers.

Our farm surpluses will pile up, and our balance of trade, as you all know, to Europe, Common Market, in farm products, is nearly 3 or 4 to 1 in our favor, amounting to one of the best earners of dollars in our balance-of-payments structure, and without entrance to this market, without the ability to enter it, our farm surpluses will pile up in the Middle West, tobacco in the South, and other commodities, which have gone through Western Europe for 15 years.

Our balance-of-payments position will worsen. Our consumers will lack a wider choice of goods at lower prices. And millions of American workers—whose jobs depend on the sale or the transportation or the distribution of exports or imports, or whose jobs will be endangered by the movement of our capital to Europe, or whose jobs can be maintained only in an expanding economy—these millions of workers in your home States and mine will see their real interests sacrificed.

Members of the Congress: The United States did not rise to greatness by waiting for others to lead. This Nation is the world's foremost manufacturer, farmer, banker, consumer, and exporter. The Common Market is moving ahead at an economic growth rate twice ours. The Communist economic offensive is underway. The opportunity is ours—the initiative is up to us—and I believe that 1962 is the time.

To seize that initiative, I shall shortly send to the Congress a new 5-year trade expansion action, far reaching in scope but designed with great care to make certain that its benefits to our people far outweigh any risks. The bill will permit the gradual elimination of tariffs here in the United States and in the Common Market on those items in which we together supply 80 percent of the world's trade—mostly items in which our own ability to compete is demonstrated by the fact that we sell abroad, in these items, substantially more than we import. This step will make it possible for our major industries to compete with their counterparts in Western Europe for access to European consumers.

On the other hand, the bill will permit a gradual reduction of duties up to 50 percent—permit bargaining by major categories—and provide for appropriate and tested forms of assistance to firms and employees adjusting to import competition. We are not neglecting the safeguards provided by peril points, an escape clause, or the national security amendment. Nor are we abandoning our non-European friends or our traditional most-favored-nation principle. On the contrary, the bill will provide new encouragement for their sale of tropical agricultural products, so important to our friends in Latin America, who have long depended upon the European Common Market who now find themselves faced with new challenges which we must join with them in overcoming.

Concessions, in this bargaining, must of course be reciprocal, not unilateral. The Common Market will not fulfill its own high promise unless its outside tariff walls are low. The dangers of restriction or timidity in our own policy have counterparts for our friends in Europe. For together we face a common challenge: to enlarge the prosperity of freemen everywhere—and to build in partnership a new trading community in which all free nations may gain from the productive energy of free competitive effort.

These various elements in our foreign policy lead, as I have said, to a single goal—the goal of a peaceful world of free and independent states. This is our guide for the present and our vision for the future—a free community of nations, independent but interdependent, uniting north and south, east and west, in one great family of man, outgrowing and transcending the hates and fears that rend our age.

We will not reach that goal today, or tomórrow. We may not reach it in our own lifetime. But the quest is the greatest adventure of our century. We sometimes chafe at the burden of our obligations, the complexity of our decisions, the agony of our choices. But there is no comfort or security for us in evasion, no solution in abdication, no relief in irresponsibility.

A year ago, in assuming the tasks of the Presidency, I said that few generations, in all history, had been granted the role of being the great defender of freedom in its hour of maximum danger. This is our good fortune; and I welcome it now as I did a year ago. [Applause.] For it is the fate of this generation—of you in the Congress and of me as President—to live with a struggle we did not start, in a world we did not make. But the pressures of life are not always distributed by choice. And while no nation has ever faced such a challenge, no nation has ever been so ready to seize the burden and glory of freedom. And in this high endeavor may God watch over the United States of America.

At 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m., the President accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m., the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their chamber.

REFERRAL OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to file a supplemental report on the bill H.R. 8890. I am making this request in order that the portion of the report which shows the changes in existing law will conform to the present "Ramseyer Rule"—rule XIII, clause 3—which has been amended by the House since the original report on this bill was filed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, without making the matter a precedent, that all Members today may extend their remarks in the Record and include pertinent, extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it not expected that today there may be extensions in the body of the Record? Permission has been granted for extensions in the

Record, but is permission granted to extend in the body of the Record?

The SPEAKER. Yes; by unanimous consent.

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN BUFFALO, N.Y.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would provide for the acquisition of a parcel of real property located at 641 Delaware Avenue, in Buffalo, N.Y., by the U.S. Government. This is known as the Ansley Wilcox House which became famous in 1901 when, in the library of this home, Theodore Roosevelt took the oath of office as President of the United States following the assassination of President William McKinley.

It is one of only four sites, outside of Washington, D.C., where the presidential oath has been administered. At the time Theodore Roosevelt was sworn in as President, the house was the residence of Ansley Wilcox, who was a civic leader of great prominence. It was built in the 1830's as the major's house of the old Poinsett Barracks, and is typical of post-colonial architecture.

The American Institute of Architects has recommended its preservation. National, State, and local organizations, supporting the movement for preservation of the Ansley Wilcox House, are: Buffalo and Erie County Historical Society, National Trust for Historic Preservation, American Institute of Architects, New York State Historical Association, American Association for State and Local History, Frederick M. Houghton Chapter of the New York State Archeological Association, Buffalo Federation of Women's Clubs, Sons of the Revolution, Sons of the American Revolution, Daughters of the American Revolution, Society of Colonial Wars, Mayflower Society, Daughters of American Colonists, Society of New England Women, Society of Colonial Dames.

It is estimated that the cost of acquiring this historical site would be approximately $400,000. Renovation would cost approximately $50,000. Adequate parking space is available on the grounds.

In view of the historical significance of the Ansley Wilcox House, I strongly urge the Congress to take speedy action on this proposal while it is still available for preservation as a national shrine.

WHEAT ACREAGE

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I introduced bill H.R. 9501. This legislation is urgently needed in areas such as I represent where considerable wheat acreage will be removed from production. In brief, the bill would permit farmers to plant barley on the land taken out of wheat production, and make barley interchangeable with other feed grains.

Barley is one of the few crops which can be planted on the idled acres, most of which under the farming practices used in western Kansas have been in summer fallow. Yet, under the law farmers cannot plant barley on the land unless they have a barley acreage allotment.

Unless this summer fallow land is covered, preferably by a growing crop, it will be threatened by serious wind erosion. This land could be severely damaged.

To solve the problem, I have proposed that farmers be permitted to plant barley, whether they have an allotment or not, provided they take the same number of acres out of grain sorghum or feed grain production. This will maintain total acres in feed grains at the level provided under the feed grain program. It will permit farmers to follow sound conservation practices without any interruption to any program.

This particular provision was included in the omnibus farm bill passed by the House last year. Unfortunately, it was not included in the Senate bill, nor was it included in the conference report. Corrective measures cannot be taken by administrative action. Legislation is the only possible way of correcting what could be a very bad situation.

I hope the bill will receive early attention by the House Agriculture Committee. I do not believe it will be controversial.

For the information of Members interested in this problem, I am including the text of the bill in my remarks at this point:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (d) of section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, is further amended by adding the following at the end of paragraph (1): "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a producer shall be deemed to have participated in the feed grain program for corn, grain sorghum, and barley, if the sum of the acreages of corn, grain sorghum, and barley, excepting malting barley, on the farm in 1962 does not exceed 80 per centum of the average acreage devoted on the farm to these three crops, excepting malting barley, in the crop years 1959 and 1960."

THE MIGRANT FARM LABOR STORY—I AND II

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to bring once again to the attention of my colleagues in this House the plight of some 200,000 working Americans and their families who are now living in the kind of squalor and poverty that made men shudder more than 100 years ago.

I refer to the migrant farmworkers of this country, who have until only recently been generally ignored by the public, the press, and, I feel, the Congress of the United States.

Many thousands of these workers are living today in the conditions which I have described, able to find work on only about 130 days of each year, often earning only around 50 cents per hour and too often forced to take their undernourished children into the fields so that the family can survive.

Mr. Speaker, I hope to see action taken this year by this body on the five bills which were passed in the other body during the first session as a first step in assisting this neglected segment of our population. The bills were forcefully managed in the other body by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, Senator Harrison Williams. I have introduced the same five bills in the House—H.R. 8879, H.R. 8880, H.R. 8881, H.R. 8882 and H.R. 8883.

Four of these bills deal with the present shocking situation. The fifth would establish a 15-member National Advisory Council on Migrant Labor representing farmers, migratory workers, health and welfare groups, and State officials.

The four action and regulatory bills speak for themselves:

The first bill generally prohibits employing children under 18. There is now no limit on the age or hours of children working in agriculture outside of school hours. Even 6- and 7-year-old youngsters work in the fields from dawn to darkness.

The second bill provides educational opportunities for the 150,000 children who follow the crops and average 2 or 3 years behind in their schooling. The bill would set up a 5-year program of Federal assistance to States and localities, including grants for summer schools.

The third bill provides a system of registering the often unscrupulous 8,000 crew leaders who recruit, transport, feed and house workers and contract out their labor.

The fourth action bill authorizes grants to public and nonprofit private agencies to establish health clinics. Migrants and their families now are less healthy than the general population. For instance, the infant mortality rate is twice that of the rest of the population, and few children are immunized against disease.

It seems hardly believable that the richest nation on earth would permit such conditions to exist for so long. In the nuclear age, when we are on our way to the moon, it is even less understandable that Congress can even hesitate before passing the migrant labor bills.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to include pertinent matter in the Record I include the first and second in a series of articles which were published last fall on this subject by the New York World-Telegram & Sun. The first of these articles was written by Robert H. Prall. The second, and all of the other nine articles in the series were written by World-Telegram Staff Reporter Dale Wright, who lived with the migrant farmworkers off and on for a period of about 6 months. I hope to receive permission to insert in the Record, from time to time, the remaining articles of this series, which I commend highly to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the New York World-Telegram & Sun, Oct. 9, 1961]

W.-T. & S. To Bare Exploitation of Migrant Farm Laborers—Reporter Lived as a Worker in Filthy Camps

(By Robert H. Prall)

Four migrant farmworkers died yesterday when flames swept the hazardous, overcrowded wooden building in which they lived, near the potato fields of Cutchogue, Long Island.

Assistant Suffolk County District Attorney Theodore Jaffe, shocked by the "deplorable conditions" he found at the labor camp, is making a full investigation.

"Six people were living in space not adequate for a single person," he declared. "As one police officer said, it's legalized slavery."

REPORTER LIVED ROLE

The World-Telegram knows all about the squalor, the filth, and the dangers of life in a migrant labor camp. On and off for the past 6 months one of its staff writers has been working along the seaboard as a migrant laborer.

Staff Writer Dale Wright, using an assumed name, took on the job of a migrant field hand and lived with the overworked, underpaid, exploited laborers who harvest America's crops.

Starting in Florida, he worked his way north through the Carolinas to New Jersey and eventually to Long Island's lush potato fields. He lived in sordid shacks similar to—and even worse than—the quarters where the four migrants died yesterday in Cutchogue.

CHEATED, OVERCHARGED

He saw how migrant workers are cheated on their hours and their pay, overcharged on the items they buy, shunted from farm to farm in rattle-trap buses and trucks. He got to know the "labor contractor" who rounds up the migrant crews with promises of "good pay" and then exploits them at every turn. He learned how hundreds of migrants, at the end of a trail of broken promises, wind up on relief rolls at public expense.

He found youngsters 6 and 7 years old laboring in the fields alongside their parents. He talked with the gnarled, crippled older workers living out a hopeless existence.

Dale Wright's series of articles on America's "forgotten man," the migrant farm laborer, will start tomorrow in the World-Telegram. It is a shocking revelation that could be written only by a man who lived the part.

The Forgotten People—I Saw Human Shame as a Migrant Worker

(Four migrant farmworkers died Sunday as fire swept their squalid living quarters in a Suffolk County labor camp, described by investigating authorities as shocking deplorable. The tragedy substantiates an on-the-spot survey by this paper. As long ago as last April the World-Telegram assigned Staff Writer Dale Wright to work as a migrant laborer to determine if protective laws are safeguarding the interests of America's "forgotten men." His articles revealing the abuses heaped on the overworked, underpaid, exploited migrant farm worker begin today.)

(By Dale Wright)

Despite certain limited improvements—on paper—in the laws protecting the migrant farm worker, he continues to be America's forgotten man—forced to work long, tortured hours, at substandard wages, cheated and exploited at every turn and compelled to live in filth and squalor and danger.

I know this because for 6 months, on and off from April to October, I worked as a migrant laborer along the Atlantic Seaboard from Florida to New York. I saw it with my eyes, I felt it in my blistered hands, I smelled it with my nose, and I rebelled at it in my conscience.

I labored with, slept with, ate with, and more than once suffered with the members of this vast army of men and women and children—most of them Negroes like myself—who stop and lift and grub from nature's earth a great part of the Nation's feed crop.

THINGS REPORTER FOUND

These are some of the things I found:

Many migrant workers are forced to work as many as 14 hours a day at a backbreaking task, the rewards of which are, in most cases, a string of broken promises.

They are grossly underpaid and, many times, not paid at all by conniving labor contractors who have them at their mercy.

They are cheated and exploited all along the line by profiteers in the roles of growers, shippers, packers, labor contractors, crew bosses, landlords and merchants.

Thousands of them live in shabby, unkempt hovels and shacks, usually hidden behind a clump of trees out of public view, without sanitary or plumbing facilities.

And, despite laws enacted to protect them, their children, starting at age 6, are worked long hours under a searing sun for less than the prevailing—or promised—pay.

HAZARDOUS VEHICLES

Under conditions inferior to those afforded cattle and freight, migrant laborers are transported from one work area to another in dilapidated, hazardous vehicles.

And at the end of the line, when all the crops are worked out, hundreds of the migrant workers wind up on relief at public expense in the Northern seaboard States.

The man who sits next to me in this newspaper office, Allan Keller, has done much to improve the lot of the migrant laborer. Mainly through his efforts and the campaigns by this newspaper over a period of years, a New York State legislative committee was named to look into the migrant labor problem and recommend changes in the laws.

Belatedly, teeth were put into regulations to provide better treatment for the migrant. The State Department of Health was empowered to license labor camps and require that minimum sanitary and health standards be maintained. Other States took steps—also on paper, to help and protect the forgotten man of America.

HAVEN'T HELPED MUCH

The changes in the laws haven't helped much. The miserable migrants, virtually without hope for a brighter tomorrow, are still hidden behind those clumps of trees.

At this moment, the migrant labor problem is being investigated anew by a subcommittee of the House Labor and Education Committee with a view toward drafting new remedial legislation.

It's another step in the long investigation of the stoop laborer, who has been studied, surveyed, microscoped, and diagnosed over the years as perhaps the sickest segment of the Nation's economy.

But I saw little improvement in the condition of the patient. The working and housing conditions were bad enough but it was the way he's cheated that outraged me.

He's overcharged for his squalid shack, his food, his clothing, his bottle of wine at the end of a hard week of work. And he's gouged on just about every other item he purchases.

MEAGER BREAKFAST

I found workers in central New Jersey who were charged 75 cents for a breakfast of one chicken wing, a spoonful of watery rice and a slice of bread. An extra slice cost them 10 cents more.

In the Long Island potato belt, where the four migrant workers perished in flames Sunday, I found a large crew of men and women being charged by a labor contractor with $1 weekly dues to a union which didn't exist. They also were being charged another $1.40 for social security, far out of proportion to the paltry pay they had received.

In many cases, I discovered, workers forced to pay for social security had no SS numbers at all, the payments obviously going wholly to profiteers operating at their labor camp.

In Hastings, Fla., the heart of the State's potato belt, I bunked for 2 days in a near-collapsed, insect-infested shanty for which I was compelled to pay $1.50 a night. Next door in an even more dilapidated hovel lived a married couple whose 2-month-old baby had been born there. They paid $10 a week.

WAILING INFANT

The infant wailed endlessly from dawn to darkness in its makeshift crib, a cardboard cabbage carton, as flies and potato bugs crawled in and out of its mouth and nostrils. A ragged burlap potato sack served as the baby's blanket.

But Florida has no corner on squalor. Near Hightstown, N.J., less than 20 miles from Trenton, the State capitol, I found seven men and women tomato pickers—none of them related—living in filth in a 10-foot square tarpaper shack for which they were charged $10 a week for rent.

Everywhere I traveled I found the itinerant laborer getting a wretched deal. And being inarticulate and always on the move, he is least able among America's workingmen to have his cries heard.

WORLD WAR I PENSIONS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Record at this point the following editorial which appeared in the National Tribune on January 4, 1962:

World War I Pensions

The 2d session of the 87th Congress convenes next Wednesday. Coming before the legislators will be a number of important but highly controversial issues. These include foreign aid, tariff revision, medical care for the aged, plugging tax loopholes, and the necessary endorsement of the Congress to build up our defense forces. Practically all of these except the last will face determined opposition from particular groups in the Congress.

It is our fervent hope that another most important piece of legislation will be reported for consideration by both the House and the Senate. We refer particularly to H.R. 3745, or some kindred bill which would grant some form of liberalized pension for the men who fought the First World War.

Many Members of Congress have been most frank in admitting that if this legislation can be reported to the House of Representatives it will be passed with few dissenting votes. It is also believed that there are a sufficient number of Senators who feel that something should be done to aid the older veterans of World War I to insure passage in that body.

The measure which has been adopted as the official pension bill of the Veterans of World War I, Inc., is H.R. 3745, and there have been more than a score of similar bills introduced in the House of Representatives. This measure calls for a 30 percent increase in pension benefits which are applicable under part III of Veterans Regulations. Specifically, the rates at the present time are $78.75 for a veteran at age 65 or who has been on the rolls for 10 or more years, and $66.15 for those under age 65, and who are permanently and totally disabled and meet certain income limitations.

Under the provisions of the Pension Act of 1959 which became effective July 1, 1960, there are some changes in the above rates with a higher amount payable to the veteran whose income is in the very lowest bracket and to those who have a large number of dependents.

It will be recalled that hearings were held on H.R. 3745 and other World War I pension bills last summer. At that time over 50 Congressmen either appeared in person or submitted statements to the Veterans' Affairs Committee setting forth in no uncertain terms their support for the legislation under discussion.

Chairman OLIN TEAGUE of the Veterans' Affairs Committee has indicated that he will call his committee into session at some later date to take some action upon a non-service-connected pension measure. The chairman has stated that he would like to ascertain first the findings of committee investigators who have been canvassing a cross section of World War I veterans in order to ascertain just why they have not in large numbers elected to change over to the Pension Act of 1959 so that they could in some cases be entitled to greater benefits, ranging from 8 to 10 percent. It is known that Representative TEAGUE is concerned over the fact that comparatively few World War I veterans and their dependents have chosen to transfer to this latest piece of legislation affecting them.

All of the major veterans' organizations feel that there is a definite and distinct need to liberalize the Pension Act of 1959 and undoubtedly they will press for some remedial legislation early in the session.

The men who fought in World War I now average over 67 years of age. Thousands and thousands of them are dependent upon the most meager income. Unfortunately, a large majority of them have never had the opportunity to earn sufficient social security entitlement that would provide for them a most substantial form of income. These persons are in desperate need and if relief is to be given them in the form of pension legislation it must come quickly.

The present death rate of these veterans is over 130,000 per year and as time passes this rate will accelerate most rapidly.

It is our sincere wish and prayer that this session of Congress will take cognizance of the desperate position in which these men and their dependents now find themselves and take speedy action to provide them with some tangible pension benefits in recognition of their services to this Nation over 43 years ago.

LIMITED FEDERAL AID TO CHURCH-RELATED SCHOOLS IS CONSTITUTIONAL

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, a thorough study of court decisions, and of 41 programs approved by Congress, reveals that Federal aid limited to the secular or neutral aspects of education in church-related schools is clearly constitutional.

The U.S. Catholic bishops' legal advisers, in their 82-page brief have done much to clear the air of misconception regarding the right of church-related and private schools to share in Federal aid to education.

The study addressed itself to this specific question: "May the Federal Government, as part of a comprehensive program to promote educational excellence in the Nation, provide secular educational benefits to the public in private, nonprofit schools, church-related as well as nondenominational?" The answer, supported by U.S. Supreme Court decisions and by Federal legislation is: "Yes."

Church-related schools perform a public function by providing essential citizen education and that this public function is, by its nature, eligible for support.

So long as the Government contribution is directed toward those kinds of expenses which are substantially the same in public and nonpublic schools, Government will not be involved in the purposeful support of religion.

For the reassurance of those who want to be certain that such limited aid is constitutional, I recommend the reading of: "NCWC Legal Department Issues Study Of School Aid Precedents" which appeared in the December 16, 1961, issue of the Pilot, published under the auspices of the Catholic archdiocese of Boston. Under unanimous consent, I include this contribution to American understanding and cooperation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

NCWC LEGAL DEPARTMENT ISSUES STUDY OF SCHOOL AID PRECEDENTS

WASHINGTON, December 14.—The U.S. Catholic bishops' legal advisers have concluded that Federal aid limited to the secular or neutral aspects of education in church-related schools would be clearly constitutional.

The Legal Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference says in an 82-page study that such aid has precedents in at least 41 programs approved by Congress.

It states that the U.S. Supreme Court has held in three decisions that government can aid the nonreligious aspects of a public service performed by a church-related institution.

The study says government support can be limited to the secular aspect by being directed toward neutral items of expense, those kinds of expenses "which are substantially the same in public and non-public schools."

Support, it declares, can be given in numerous ways, but the study specifically mentions matching grants or long-term loans to institutions, grants of tuition or scholarships to students, and tax benefits.

NOT A PETITION

Massive Federal aid to public education alone, it says would produce a "critical weakening" of church-related education and result in a dangerous government monopoly in education.

William R. Consedine, head of the NCWC Legal Department, announced the study at a press conference here (December 14).

He said the study is intended as a comprehensive constitutional statement and not as a petition for specific aid. "It is our hope that it will serve to clarify constitutional issues and to cause a more widespread recognition of the massive contribution of church-related and other private schools to the common welfare," he said.

The precise question taken up by the study is this:

May the Federal Government, as part of a comprehensive program to promote educational excellence in the nation, provide secular educational benefits to the public in private, nonprofit schools, church-related as well as nondenominational?

Answering in the affirmative, the study points to the public service contributions by church-related schools, to U.S. Supreme Court decisions, to Federal legislation and to the peril it sees in aiding public schools only.

It holds that church-related schools perform a public function by providing essential citizen education and that this public function is, by its nature, eligible for support.

PARENTAL RIGHTS

Asking how support for the secular aspect can be distinguished from support for the religious aspect of education in church-related schools, it says this can be done by an allocation of costs based on the principles of accounting, "as informed by the basic legal and educational principles applicable in this area."

To limit support, the study continues, it must be directed toward the neutral items of expense. "A corollary of this principle is that Government should not bear the complete cost of constructing and operating nonpublic schools," it says.

"So long as the Government contribution is directed toward the neutral expenditures, Government will not be involved in the purposeful support of religion," it adds.

The study also says that parent and child have a constitutional right, supported by U.S. Supreme Court decisions, to choose a church-related educational institution.

And, it states that Government has been denied power by the courts to impose upon the people a single educational system in which all must take part.

The study notes that 5.5 million students, around 13 percent of the national total, are in Catholic grade and high schools. It estimates that Catholic schools in 1960 saved taxpayers $1,800 million in education costs.

Social, as well as economic, benefits come from Catholic schools, it continues. "Typically, the Catholic schools are a meeting place for children of different economic and ethnic backgrounds * * *. They have historically proven an invaluable training ground to prepare citizens for full participation in a pluralistic society."

COURT DECISIONS

Turning to a detailed review of constitutional issues, the study says that opponents of the aid to church-related education generally rely on the first amendment's phrase that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion."

But, the study says, history teaches that the so-called no-establishment clause was meant to keep Government from transgressing upon religious liberty and was not intended to prevent relationships—even certain cooperative relationships—between church and state.

There are three decisions of the Supreme Court, it reports, which bear directly upon the inclusion of church-related institutions in governmental programs to carry out public welfare objectives.

"Not only do none of these decisions hold such aid-providing unconstitutional, they flatly affirm its constitutionality," says the study.

The first case, an 1899 one known as *Bradfield* v. *Roberts*, involved payment by the Congress to a Catholic hospital for treatment and cure of poor patients.

The Court held that the payment did not constitute an appropriation to a religious society in violation of the "no establishment" clause.

In the second case, the 1930 decision in *Cochran* v. *Board of Education*, the Court held that it was constitutional to use State funds to provide secular textbooks for all school students because this served a public purpose.

In the third, which is the famed case of *Everson* v. *Board of Education*, decided in 1947, the Court upheld a New Jersey statute which provided that, as part of a general transportation program for all students, reimbursement to parents might be made out of public funds for the transportation of their children to Catholic schools on buses regularly used in the public transportation system.

"The underlying principle of the case," says the study in reference to the Everson ruling, "is that government aid may be rendered to a citizen in furtherance of his obtaining basic citizen education, whether he obtains it in a public or a private, nonprofit school."

COURT COMMENT

Two other decisions are also cited. They are *McCollum* v. *Board of Education* and *Zorach* v. *Clauson*.

Both, says the study, concern released time religious education and not Federal aid, but they do contain Court comment on the controversial "no establishment" clause.

The 1947 McCollum decision, it notes, brought the phrase "wall of separation of church and state" into prominence, but the 1951 Zorach case made it clear that the phrase was not to be taken "in any absolute sense."

Two additional decisions "involving the all-important rights of free choice in selecting educational institutions" are cited. They are the 1923 ruling in *Meyer* v. *Nebraska* and the 1925 decision in *Pierce* v. *Society of Sisters*.

In the Meyer case, the Supreme Court reversed the conviction of a Lutheran parochial schoolteacher charged with violating a State law making it a crime to teach in any elementary school any language other than English.

The court said the law violated the rights of the teacher, the parent and the child. "The court thus struck at a doctrine which is everywhere identified with totalitarian regimes and which is unhappily on the ascendant in the United States: the view that all educational rights are the possession of the State," the NCWC Legal Department study says.

In the Pierce case, the court expanded its rejection of statism in education, the department comments, and overthrew an Oregon law requiring parents to send their children only to public schools. Catholics, Protestants and Jews had risen in opposition to the law.

The high court held that the law denied parental and child rights freely to choose education in nonpublic, including church-related, schools.

LEGISLATION

In regard to legislative precedent, the NCWC study says: "No stronger answer is to be found to the argument that no aid may be afforded education in church-related schools than the fact that the Congress has in numerous ways over the years deliberately provided such aid."

It notes that 41 such programs of aid have been reported by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. One program has resulted in 488 grants of land and buildings to religious-affiliated schools of 35 denominations, it reports.

The study then concentrates on possible loss to the Nation and to supporters of private schools by massive Federal aid programs limited to public schools.

Predicting the weakening of all church-related schools, and the closing of many, it adds that this would mean that parents would no longer as a practical matter possess their freedom to choose a school other than public.

"Moreover, a practical governmental monopoly on education would result," the study charges. "This would not only dangerously transform our free, pluralistic society, but would also pose the most serious problems respecting freedom of belief."

Freedom of belief is threatened, it says, because "values are inculcated in all schools, not only in those in whose curricula specific ethical or social concepts are advocated, but also in schools whose curricula distinctly omit such concepts."

The person whose conscience dictated choice of a church-related school would be coerced to participate in schooling whose orientation would be counter to his belief, the study says.

There are some questions the study expressly excluded from its scope. They are: the basic constitutionality of Federal aid to education; the constitutionality of Federal aid to education exclusively in public schools; and the constitutionality of Federal aid to religious instruction.

The study did not attempt to explore whether there exists a need for large-scale Federal aid to education.

Consedine said that the analysis of the constitutional issues was prepared by William B. Ball, of Harrisburg, Pa., in cooperation with staff members of the NCWC Legal Department.

Ball is executive director and general counsel of the Pennsylvania Catholic Welfare Committee and a former professor of constitutional law at Villanova University, Philadelphia.

Other major contributors, Consedine said, were George E. Reed, associate director of the NCWC Legal Department, and Father Charles M. Whelan, S.J., of the Georgetown University Law Center here.

Criticism and advice on the study, he added, came from numerous authorities, and professors of constitutional law, including Wilber G. Katz of the University of Chicago Law School; Paul G. Kauper, of the University of Michigan Law School; Dean Paul R. Dean and Chester J. Antieau of Georgetown University Law Center; and Arthur E. Sutherland and Mark DeWolfe Howe, of the Harvard Law School.

Although all of these authorities have on recent occasions taken the position that certain types of inclusion of church-related schools in Federal aid to education would be constitutional, none has specifically endorsed the position set forth in the study, Consedine said.

Attached to the department's major study was an analysis of the memorandum submitted to Congress on March 28, 1961, by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which discussed the first amendment and Federal aid to education.

The HEW study is accused of relying on sweeping generalizations in some of the majority and many of the dissenting opinions of the Supreme Court, instead of upon the exact rulings.

The Government memorandum held that across-the-board grants and loans to church-related elementary and secondary schools are unconstitutional, as are tuition payments for all pupils in these schools.

However, it held that loans for special purposes not closely related to religious instruction are probably constitutional and that inclusion of church-related colleges and universities in any Federal-aid program is constitutional.

The text of the legal department study is currently being distributed on a limited basis, Consedine said. A more fully annotated edition will be published, together with the HEW memorandum, in the winter, 1961, edition of the Georgetown Law Journal.

RAY OF PEACE

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the Women's National Press Club held its annual reception and dinner at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C., on Wednesday evening, January 10, 1962, the night of the opening of the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

The dinner is held annually by the Women's National Press Club for Members of Congress on the first night of the session. This year Walter Lippmann, the famed commentator, made an excellent address on the "Frustration of Our Time."

As I have read two excellent newspaper articles concerning this address, I am making part of my remarks the address contained in the Washington Post's issue of Thursday, January 11, 1962. I am also making part of my remarks an article concerning the dinner in the Washington Star's issue of January 11, 1962.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 11, 1962]

LIPPMANN ON THE FRUSTRATION OF OUR TIME—BETWEEN WAR THAT CAN'T BE FOUGHT AND PEACE THAT CAN'T BE ACHIEVED—OUR SPLENDID TASK: UNITING OF WEST IN A PROGRESSIVE ECONOMIC FORCE

(The following address was delivered last night by Walter Lippmann, distinguished author and columnist, before the Women's National Press Club)

It is an honor, which I greatly appreciate, to be asked to speak on this occasion. It is also a personal kindness. For Congress is about to convene, and that means that there will be many speeches in the months to come. Experience has taught me that it is always a good idea to be able to speak early in the program. By the time Congress has adjourned next summer, adjourned in order to go out and make more speeches in the constituencies, your bright and eager faces may not be so bright and eager at the prospect of hearing yet another speech. I am happy to catch you while you are still in such robust good health.

When I sat down to prepare this talk, I considered and rejected the idea of delivering a kind of preliminary message on the state of the Union. I remembered that this will soon be done with much more authority by the husband of a former newspaperwoman. So I decided to talk to you tonight about the state of our minds, the state of our nerves, and perhaps even about the state of our souls.

I am moved to do this by a letter I received just before Christmas. It was from a friend of mine who was a great hero in the First World War. He has been an extraordinarily successful man since then, and his letter began in this cheerful fashion. "My dear Walter: Another year of frustration, confusion, and compromise is about over."

I know that my friend is not alone in feeling this way and that during the coming session of Congress there will be many who will say what he says and feel as he does. At different times I suppose all of us share his feelings. There is indeed much frustration, much confusion, and—because we live on earth and not in Heaven—there is, of course, much compromise.

FRUSTRATIONS NOTHING NEW

I could have written back to my friend, reminding him that in every year of which there is any historical record, there has been much frustration and confusion and compromise. Anyone who thinks he can get away from frustration, confusion, and compromise in politics and diplomacy should make arrangements to get himself reborn into a different world than this one. Or if that is beyond his powers, he should move to some country where there are no newspapers to read.

However, it is certainly true that in our own time we are experiencing a very special frustration and confusion. There is, I believe, a reason for this. Certainly, if we knew the cause, we might feel better, even if we cannot do quickly something drastic to end the difficulty.

The age we are living in is radically new in human experience. During the past 15 years or so there has occurred a profound revolution in human affairs, and we are the first generation that has lived under these revolutionary new conditions. There has taken place a radical development in the art of war, and this is causing a revolutionary change in the foreign relations of all nations of the world. The radical development is, of course, the production of nuclear weapons.

As a scientific phenomenon the nuclear age began with the explosion at Los Alamos in 1945. But in world relations the nuclear age really began about 10 years later. For during the 1940's the United States was the only nuclear power in the world. But by the middle fifties and in the years following, the Soviet Union has created an armory of nuclear weapons and has built rockets which have made it, for all practical purposes of diplomacy, a nuclear power equal with the United States.

The essential fact about the appearance of two opposed great powers armed with nuclear weapons is that war, which is an ancient habit of mankind, has become mutually destructive. Nuclear war is a way of mutual suicide. The modern weapons are not merely much bigger and more dangerous than any which existed before. They have introduced into the art of warfare a wholly new kind of violence.

Always in the past, war and the threat of war, whether it was aggressive or defensive, were usable instruments. They were usable instruments in the sense that nations could go to war for their national purposes. They could threaten war for diplomatic reasons. Nations could transform themselves from petty states to great powers by means of war. They could enlarge their territory, acquire profitable colonies, change the religion of a vanquished population, all by means of war. War was the instrument with which the social, political and legal systems of large areas were changed. Thus, in the old days before the nuclear age began, war was a usable—however horrible and expensive—instrument of national purpose. The reason for that was that the old wars could be won.

In the prenuclear age, right down through the Second World War, the victorious power was an organized state which could impose its will on the vanquished. We did that with Germany and with Japan. The damage they had suffered, although it was great, was not irreparable, as we know from the recovery after World War II of West Germany and Japan and the Soviet Union.

But from a full nuclear war, which might well mean 100 million dead, after the devastation of the great urban centers of the Northern Hemisphere and the contamination of the earth, the water and the air, there would be no such recovery as we have seen after the two World Wars of this century.

The damage done would be mutual. There would be no victor. As far in the future as we can see, the ruin would be irreparable. The United States has the nuclear power to reduce Soviet society to a smoldering ruin, leaving the wretched survivors shocked and starving and diseased. In an interchange of nuclear weapons, it is estimated cooly by experts who have studied it, the Soviet Union would kill between 30 and 70 million Americans.

A war of that kind would not be followed by reconstruction, it would not be followed by a Marshall plan, and by all the constructive things that were done after World War II. A nuclear war would be followed by a savage struggle for existence, as the survivors crawled out of their shelters, and the American Republic would have to be replaced by a stringent military dictatorship, trying to keep some kind of order among the desperate survivors.

To his great credit, President Eisenhower was quick to realize what nuclear war would be. After he and Prime Minister Churchill had studied some of the results of the nuclear tests, President Eisenhower made the historic declaration that there is no longer any alternative to peace.

AN IMPOSSIBLE INSTRUMENT

When President Eisenhower made that statement no one of us, I think, understood its full significance and consequences. We are now beginning to understand them, and here I venture to say is the root of the frustration and the confusion which torment us. For while nuclear weapons have made war, the old arbiter of human affairs, an impossible action for a rational statesman to contemplate, we do not have any other reliable way of dealing with issues that used to be resolved by war.

It is enormously difficult to make peace. It is intolerably dangerous and useless to make war about the fundamental issues.

That is where our contemporary frustration and confusion originate.

We are confronted with an extraordinarily tantalizing and nerve-racking dilemma.

For as long a time as we can see into the future, we shall be living between war and peace, between a war that cannot be fought and a peace that cannot be achieved. The great issues which divide the world cannot be decided by a war that could be won, and they cannot be settled by a treaty that can be negotiated. There, I repeat, is the root of the frustration which our people feel. Our world is divided as it has not been since the religious wars of the 17th century and a large part of the globe is in a great upheaval, the like of which has not been known since the end of the Middle Ages. But the power which used to deal with the divisions and conflicts of the past; namely, organized war, has become an impossible instrument to use.

President Eisenhower and President Kennedy are the only two American Presidents who ever lived in a world like this one. It is a great puzzle to know how to defend the Nation's rights, and how to promote its interests in the nuclear age. There are no clear guidelines of action because there are no precedents for the situation in which we find ourselves. And as statesmen grope their way from one improvisation and accommodation to another, there are masses of people who are frightened, irritated, impatient, frustrated, and in search of quick and easy solutions.

The nuclear age is only a few years old. But we have already learned one or two things about how to conduct policy in this age. It was once said of a British admiral in the First World War that if he made a mistake, he could lose the British Fleet and with it the whole war in an afternoon. Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy are in a similar position today. In a few days or so Mr. Khrushchev can lose the Soviet state and the promise of a Communist economy. He can lose all the work of all his 5-year plans, his 7-year plans, and his 20-year plans. In that same time, Mr. Kennedy can lose the Constitution of the United States, the free enterprise system and the American way of life and along with them all the frontiers, old and new. I don't think I am exaggerating. A full nuclear war would produce by far the biggest convulsion which has ever occurred in recorded history. We cannot understand the realities of the Khrushchev-Kennedy encounter, which has been going on since they met at Vienna last June, unless we remind ourselves again and again of what war has become in the nuclear age.

The poor dears among us who say that they have had enough of all this talking and negotiating and now let us drop the bomb, have no idea of what they are talking about. They do not know what has happened in the past 20 years. They belong to the past, and they have not been able to realize what the present is.

In this present, only a moral idiot with a suicidal mania would press the button for a nuclear war. Yet we have learned that while a nuclear war would be lunacy, it is nevertheless an ever-present possibility. Why? Because, however lunatic it might be to commit suicide, a nation can be provoked and exasperated to the point of lunacy where its nervous system cannot endure inaction, where only violence can relieve its feelings. This is one of the facts of life in the middle of the 20th century. The nerves of a nation can stand only so much provocation and humiliation, and beyond the tolerable limits, it will plunge into lunacy. This is as much a real fact as is the megaton bomb, and it is a fact which must be given great weight in the calculation of national policy. It is the central fact in the whole diplomatic problem of dealing with the cold war. There is a line of intolerable provocation beyond which reactions become uncontrollable. It is the business of the governments to find out where that line is, and to stay well back of it.

Those who do not understand the nature of war in the nuclear age, those who think that war today is what it was against Mexico or Spain or in the two World Wars regard the careful attempts of statesmen not to carry the provocation past the tolerable limit as weakness and softness and appeasement. It is not any of these things. It is not softness. It is sanity.

But it leaves us with a task: because we cannot make war, because we cannot achieve peace, we must find some other way of meeting the great issues which confront us. For life will go on, and if the answers of the past do not work, other answers must exist and must be found.

The answer lies, I believe, in the nature of the struggle between our Western society and the Communist society.

It is often said that the struggle which divides the world is for the minds and the souls of men. That is true. As long as there exists a balance of power and of terror, neither side can impose its doctrine and its ideology upon the other. The struggle for the minds of men, moreover, is not, I believe, going to be decided by propaganda. We are not going to convert our adversaries, and they are not going to convert us.

The struggle, furthermore, is not going to be ended in any foreseeable time. At bottom it is a competition between two societies and it resembles more than any other thing in our historical experience the long centuries of conflict between Christendom and Islam. The modern competition between the two societies turns on their respective capacity to become powerful and rich, to become the leaders in science and technology, to see that their people are properly educated and able to operate such a society, to keep their people healthy, and to give them the happiness of knowing that they are able and free to work for their best hopes.

The historic rivalry of the two societies and of the two civilizations which they contain, is not going to be decided by what happens on the periphery and in the outposts. It is going to be decided by what goes on in the heart of each of the two societies. The heart of Western civilization lies on the shores of the Atlantic Ocean, and our future depends on what goes on in the Atlantic Community. Will this community advance? Can the nations which compose it work together? Can it become a great and secure center of power and of wealth, of light and of leading? To work for these ends is to be engaged truly in the great conflict of our age, and to be doing the real work that we are challenged to do. I speak with some hope and confidence tonight. For I believe that in the months to come we shall engage ourselves in the long and complicated, but splendidly constructive, task of bringing together in one liberal and progressive economic community all the trading nations which do not belong to the Communist society.

MAGNETIC ATTRACTION

I dare to believe that this powerful Western economic community will be able to live safely and without fear in the same world as the Soviet Union, and that the rising power and influence of the Western society will exert a beneficent magnetic attraction upon Eastern Europe. This will happen if we approach it in the right way. Jean Monnet, who is the original founder of this movement, has put it the right way. "We cannot build our future," he has said, "if we are obsessed with fear of Russia. Let us build our own strength and health not against anyone, but for ourselves so that we will become so strong that no one will dare attack us, and so progressive and prosperous that we set a model for all other peoples, indeed for the Russians themselves."

At the same time the wealth and confidence of the new community will enable the Western society to assist and draw to it the societies of the southern hemisphere, where social and economic change is proceeding rapidly.

You will have seen that I do not agree with those who think that in order to defend ourselves and to survive we must put a stop to the progressive movement which has gone on throughout this century. This movement began in the administration of Theodore Roosevelt. Its purpose was to reform and advance our own social order, and at the same time to recognize that we must live in the world beyond our frontiers. We shall lose all our power to cope with our problems if we allow ourselves to become stagnant, neurotic, frightened and suspicious people. Let us not punish ourselves by denying ourselves the hope, by depriving ourselves of the oldest American dream, which is that we are making a better society on this earth than has ever been made before.

Is all this conservative? Is all this liberal? Is it all progressive? It is, I say, all of these. There is no irreconcilable contradiction among these noble words. Do not Republicans believe in democracy, and do not Democrats believe in a republic? Such labels may describe political parties in England; they do not describe political attitudes in the United States.

Every truly civilized and enlightened American is conservative and liberal and progressive. A civilized American is conservative in that his deepest loyalty is to the Western heritage of ideas which originated on the shores of the Mediterranean Sea. Because of that loyalty he is the indefatigable defender of our own constitutional doctrine, which is that all power, that all government, that all officials, that all parties and all majorities are under the law—and that none of them is sovereign and omnipotent.

The civilized American is a liberal because the writing and the administration of the laws should be done with enlightenment and compassion, with tolerance and charity, and with affection.

And the civilized man is progressive because the times change and the social order evolves and new things are invented and changes occur. This conservative who is a liberal is a progressive because he must work and live, he must govern and debate in the world as it is in his own time, and as it is going to become.

[From the Evening Star, Jan. 11, 1962]

LIPPMANN NOTES RAY OF PEACE

(By Frances Lide)

Columnist Walter Lippmann warned last night that nuclear war is an ever-present possibility even though "only a moral idiot with a suicidal mania would press the button" to start such a war.

"However lunatic it might be to commit suicide," he declared, "a nation can be provoked and exasperated to the point of lunacy where its nervous system cannot endure inaction, where only violence can relieve its feelings.

"This is one of the facts of life in the middle of the 20th century," he told a capacity audience attending the Women's National Press Club's annual dinner honoring Members of Congress.

"It is a fact which must be given great weight in the calculation of national policy.

"There is a line of intolerable provocation beyond which reactions become uncontrollable.

"It is the business of the governments to find out where that line is, and to stay well back of it."

The speaker noted that "those who think that war today is what it was against Mexico or Spain or in the two World Wars regard the careful attempts of statesmen not to carry the provocation past the tolerable limit as weakness and softness and appeasement."

SANITY, INSTEAD

"But it is not softness," he asserted—"it is sanity."

"The poor dears among us who say that they have had enough of all this talking and negotiating and now let us drop the bomb, have no idea of what they are talking about," he said. "They belong to the past and they have not been able to realize what the present is."

Mr. Lippmann spoke before a VIP-studded gathering at the Mayflower Hotel which included Vice President JOHNSON, and a large contingent from the Cabinet and diplomatic circle as well as leaders of the Senate and House.

Noting that "the age we are living in is radically new in human experience," he declared that, to his great credit, President Eisenhower was quick to realize what nuclear war would be when he made the historic declaration that there is no longer any alternative to peace.

"The root of the frustration and confusion which torment us," he suggested is that "we do not have any other reliable way of dealing with issues that used to be resolved by war."

"It is enormously difficult to make peace," he continued. "It is intolerably dangerous and useless to make war."

"For as long a time as we can see into the future, we shall be living between war and peace, between a war that cannot be fought and a peace than cannot be achieved.

"Our world is divided as it has not been since the religious wars of the 17th century and a large part of the globe is in a great upheaval, the like of which has not been known since the end of the Middle Ages."

TO AVERT WAR

"If nuclear was is to be averted in the struggle between the Western and Communist worlds," he declared, "the competition between the two societies will turn on their respective capacity to become powerful and rich, to become the leaders in science and technology, to see that their people are properly educated and able to operate such a society, to keep their people healthy, and to give them the happiness of knowing that they are able and free to work for their best hopes."

"For Western civilization," he continued, "the future will depend on whether the nations of the Atlantic Community are able to work together to become a great and secure center of power and of wealth—of light and of leading."

Declaring that he spoke with "some hope and confidence," he added: "I believe that in the months to come we shall engage ourselves in the long and complicated, but splendidly constructive, task of bringing together in one liberal and progressive economic community all the trading nations which do not belong to the Communist society."

Bonnie Angelo, president of the WNPC, presented guests at the head table, while the galaxy of VIP's in the audience were introduced by Helen Hill Miller and Nancy Hanschmann.

The newly elected House Speaker, Representative JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, attended the reception before the dinner and congressional leaders who took a bow from the head table included Representative CARL ALBERT of Oklahoma, new majority leader of the House; Representative HALE BOGGS of Louisiana, new Democratic whip, and Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, new chairman of the Senate Republican Policy Committee.

Newcomers to Congress who were honored included Senator MAURICE MURPHY, Republican of New Hampshire, and Representatives JOE WAGGONER of Louisiana, LUCIEN NEDZI of Michigan and HENRY GONZALEZ of Texas, all Democrats.

Mrs. Henry M. Jackson, bride of the Senator from Washington, also received a special introduction.

CAPITAL GAINS TAX

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to accord the benefits of capital gains tax treatment to authors in the event of transfers of all rights to the artistic works that such authors have created. My bill will include transfers of rights to copyrights and literary, musical, and artistic compositions.

I have introduced this bill in the hopes that it will become part of a series of the legislative steps that must be taken to stimulate the growth and development of the arts in the United States. In the first session I introduced additional bills to repeal the crippling 10 percent admissions tax on live dramatic and musical performances and to create a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts. These bills, in my judgment, constitute must legislation if we are to take affirmative action to safeguard and strengthen the living theater and the dramatic and musical arts in general which are among our foremost national assets.

The underlying question in any arts legislation is to what extent should the Government be concerned with the cultural well being of its citizens?

The place of the dramatic and musical arts in the United States has been that of a poor relation. The theater, music, and opera are finding it necessary to struggle harder each day in order to survive the tentacles of economic adversity. There is little or no opportunity for growth and the best that can be hoped for under present conditions is to maintain the status quo.

Under present law tax treatment for authors of literary, musical, or artistic compositions is discriminatory. It is my conviction that an author should be accorded the benefits of capital gains tax treatment for his creations in the event he sells all his rights. This is a benefit given to the owner of a patent and if you examine the legislative history of the Internal Revenue Code you will discover no basis for favor of one group over the other. There are special provisions for the patent holder geared to induce and stimulate inventive activity. I believe that we should have comparable devices to stimulate literary, musical, and artistic compositions. Such legislation would serve an equally significant purpose with respect to the arts.

The strengthening of our cultural institutions will be of unquestionable assistance to all of us. What we need in the arts is expansion and experimentation. The poor relationship Government has had with the arts has merely compounded the downhill trend.

Enhancement of the arts must be cautious, yet vigorous. The environmental conditions surrounding the arts must be improved so that the arts can grow. My bill is another step toward that goal.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. LESINSKI for 2 hours on Tuesday, January 16, 1962.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 15, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1526. A letter from the Postmaster General, Chairman, Board of Trustees, Postal Savings System, transmitting the report of operations of the Postal Savings System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961, pursuant to section 1 of the act approved June 25, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 261); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

1527. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report relating to positions and their incumbents in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1528. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting the 16th Annual Report of the Federal Aviation Agency operations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 377, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. Supplemental report. H.R 8890. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, so as to extend their expired provisions for an additional year and to authorize payments under Public Law 815 for school construction in school districts with severe classroom shortages, to extend for 1 year the student loan program of title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1063, pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 9615. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 9616. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 9617. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 9618. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 9619. A bill to establish and prescribe the functions of a Department of Consumers, and to require the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit, and to create a Committee on Consumers in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 9620. A bill to deny the use of the U.S. postal service for the carriage of Communist political propaganda; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 9621. A bill to provide (1) that the United States shall pay the actual cost of certain services contracted for Indians in the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin; and (2) for a more equitable apportionment between such States and the Federal Government of the cost of providing aid and assistance under the Social Security Act to Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 9622. A bill to provide for the acquisition and preservation of the real property known as the Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EVINS:

H.R. 9623. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish, construct, equip, operate, and maintain a fish hatchery in Clay County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H.R. 9624. A bill to provide that the lake formed and to be formed by the Walter F. George lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River, Ala., and Ga., shall be known and designated as Lake Roanoke; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 9625. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to permit wheat grown in connection with vocational education in agriculture programs to be marketed without payment of penalty; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 9626. A bill to revise the definition of "retirement-straight line property"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 9627. A bill to amend section 109 of title 38, United States Code, to provide benefits for members of the armed forces of nations allied with the United States in World War I or World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio:

H.R. 9628. A bill to amend section 312(4) of title 38, United States Code, to provide that multiple sclerosis developing a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 7 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.J. Res. 597. Joint resolution providing for a review of certain reports of the Chief of Engineers with a view to determining whether certain improvements of the Tangipahoa River are warranted; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. Res. 506. Resolution to designate, name, and identify the House Office Buildings as the Joseph Gurney Cannon, the James Knox Polk, and the Sam Rayburn Buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 9629. A bill for the relief of Earl W. Self; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 9630. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret E. Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9631. A bill for the relief of Azizeh Abdallah Ayoub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 9632. A bill for the relief of Richard Shao-lin Lee and his wife, Grace Fu-hwa

Tang Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 9633. A bill for the relief of Augustyna Trzuskot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9634. A bill for the relief of Urzsula Barbara Kolodziej; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9635. A bill for the relief of Faithey Isobel Cunningham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 9636. A bill for the relief of Tom Hem (also known as Tom Him); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 9637. A bill for the relief of Rito De Haro Saucedo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

Thursday, January 11, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, in this hallowed moment we humbly bow with the solemn realization that no changes in sessions or in debates and decisions can alter the fact of facts that until we find Thee and art found of Thee, we begin at no beginning and come to no ending.

As this day in a scene upon which the eyes of the world, some hopeful, some hostile, are riveted with intensity of interest, the chosen leader of the Republic pictures to the assembled representatives of the people the state of the Union, help the legislators and the millions who will listen on the speaking air to examine each his own dedication or lack of it—to the strength of that Union in these days of its greatest test and peril.

Give us to know that each of us individually is a part of America, and that to the extent that in all our relationships we practice our democratic faith, we are a vital factor in the state of the Union. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

QUENTIN N. BURDICK, a Senator from the State of North Dakota, attended the session of the Senate today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 10, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives had assembled; and that John W. McCormack, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, had been elected Speaker, and that the House was ready to proceed with business.

The message announced that a committee of three Members had been appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had assembled and Congress was ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 402) that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on January 11, 1962, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 372, 84th Congress, the Speaker had appointed as a member of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, Mr. Roosevelt, of California, to fill the vacancy thereon.

The message communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Styles Bridges, late a Senator from the State of New Hampshire.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Sam Rayburn, late Speaker of the House of Representatives, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message further communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. John J. Riley, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Louis C. Rabaut, late a Representative from the State of Michigan, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the committee appointed on yesterday to wait upon the President and to inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make, has performed its duty. The President has advised us that he desires to deliver a message on the state of the Union today, Thursday, January 11, at 12:30 p.m., before a joint session of the two Houses.

JOINT SESSION TO RECEIVE COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 402) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on January 11, 1962, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution. Without objection, the concurrent resolution is agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, the Members of the Senate will leave in a body at 12:10 for the Hall of the House of Representatives.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER OF U.S. CITIZENS COMMISSION ON NATO

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under authority of Public Law 719, approved September 7, 1960, the Chair appoints Mr. Edward Fenner, of Illinois, a member of the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO, vice Mr. William F. Knowland, of California, resigned.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 2 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Bush
Butler
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Capehart
Carlson
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Case, S. Dak.
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Dworshak
Ellender
Engle
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hickey
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan
Keating
Kefauver
Kerr
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, Hawaii
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith, Mass.
Smith, Maine
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Wiley
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez] is absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. Schoeppel] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 402, I now move that the Senate proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (Felton M. Johnston), its Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), the Vice President, and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives, for the purpose of attending the joint session to hear the address to be delivered by the President of the United States.

(For the address delivered by the President, see House proceedings in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The joint session of the two Houses having been dissolved, the Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m., when it was called to order by the Vice President.

REPORT ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT (H. DOC. NO. 205)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, received by the Secretary of the Senate on October 16, 1961, transmitting the 42d report on lend-lease operations, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Forty-second Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations for the calendar year 1960.

Information on the status of the various lend-lease accounts of our allies of World War II is contained in the report. As explained in previous reports there were two main types of lend-lease procedures under which other countries undertook to reimburse the United States: (1) Settlement agreements whereby the financial undertakings of the other governments were funded on credit terms and (2) Arrangements described generally as "cash reimbursement accounts" under which the recipients were to pay the United States in cash at the time the lend-lease goods were provided.

In summary, lend-lease settlement agreements thus far concluded with various governments provide for the eventual payment to the United States of $1,577,570,755.50, plus interest. According to data supplied by the Treasury Department as of December 31, 1960, total collections and credits on these accounts amounted to $751,142,976.96. Payments during 1960 totaled $49,401,368.02. Additionally, on the "cash reimbursement accounts" foreign governments had, as of December 31, 1960, paid $1,301,529,123.32 of the $1,326,934,982.11 owed to the United States. A total of $109,310.00 was received during 1960.

Under the lend-lease program, the United States also loaned 409,782,670.64 fine troy ounces of silver to various countries. As of December 31, 1960, 366,066,067.73 fine troy ounces had been returned. Shipments of silver not assayed by the close of 1960 are not included in this figure.

This report gives an account of the negotiations with the Soviet Government on a settlement for some of the lend-lease aid received from the United States prior to V-J Day. As mentioned in the previous report, the discussions, which began on January 11, 1960, were discontinued on January 27, 1960, because there appeared to be no common ground for continuing. There have been no further developments on this matter.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 16, 1961.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate certain communications and reports of various agencies of the Government received since the adjournment of the first session, which, without objection, will be appropriately referred.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated by that Administration, covering the period January 1, 1961, to June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORTS ON NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION ON CERTAIN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT WORK

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., dated October 4, 1961, reporting, pursuant to section 1(d) of the act of July 21, 1961, on certain research and development work under that Administration; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Two letters from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., both dated October 11, 1961, reporting, pursuant to section 3 of the act of July 21, 1961, on certain research and development work under that Administration; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Three letters from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., dated October 17, October 20, and November 28, 1961, reporting, pursuant to section 3 of the act of July 21, 1961, on certain research and development work under that Administration; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., dated November 2, 1961, reporting, pursuant to section 4 of the act of June 1, 1960, on certain research and development work under that Administration; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION AT GODDARD SPACE FLIGHT CENTER, GREENBELT, MD.

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction at the Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Md., a magnetic fields component test facility; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT OF GENERAL SALES MANAGER, COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the General Sales Manager, Commodity Credit Corporation, concerning the policies, activities, and developments, including all sales and disposals, with regard to each commodity which that Corporation owns or is directed to support, for the month of May 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operations, expenditures, and obligations under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON AGREEMENTS CONCLUDED UNDER AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT

Two letters from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on agreements concluded during the months of September and November 1961, under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on agreements concluded during October 1961, under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 67)

A letter from the President, National Forest Reservation Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

REPORTS ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

Five letters from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, dated October 20, October 20, October 27, December 13, and December 22, 1961, respectively, reporting, pursuant to law, that sundry appropriations in the various departments were reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, dated September 27, 1961, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Management and Protection," National Park Service, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Reports on Overobligations of Appropriations

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, dated October 25 and October 26, 1961, respectively, reporting, pursuant to law, the overobligations of appropriations within that Department; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, an overobligation of an appropriation within that Commission; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on 16 overobligations of appropriations within that Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report of Department of Defense on Real and Personal Property

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Department on real and personal property, as of June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Loan of Ships to Portugal and Spain

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, on the loan of ships to Portugal and Spain; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Reports on Contracts for Experimental, Developmental, or Research Work

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports submitted by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, for the period January 1–June 30, 1961, listing contracts, in the amount of $10,000 or more, for experimental, developmental, or research work (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report of Office of Civil Defense on Property Acquisitions for Stockpile Purposes

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions for stockpile purposes by the Office of Civil Defense, covering the quarter ended September 30, 1961; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Flight Pay, Department of the Army

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on flight pay, for the period July 1–December 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Number of Officers on Duty With Headquarters, Department of the Army and Army General Staff

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army and the Army General Staff, as of September 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Department of the Army Construction Contracts Awarded Without Formal Advertising

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of the Army construction contracts awarded without formal advertising, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amendment of Title 10, United States Code, Relating to Disposition of Certain Nationals

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the disposition of certain nationals of the United States in foreign countries who are alleged and determined to be of unsound mind, and dangerous to persons or property, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Department of the Army Research and Development Contracts

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research and Development), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of the Army research and development contracts for $50,000 or more, which were awarded during the period January 1, 1961, through June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amendment of Title 10, United States Code, Relating to Offenders of Uniform Code of Military Justice

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for confinement and treatment of offenders against the Uniform Code of Military Justice (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amendment of Section 1331, Title 10, United States Code, Relating to Retirement Date

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1331 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for a different retirement date thereunder for entitlement to retired pay (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Number of Officers Assigned to Permanent Duty in the Executive Element of Air Force at the Seat of Government

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that as of September 30, 1961, there was an aggregate of 2,292 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Air Force Military Construction Contracts Awarded Without Formal Advertising

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Air Force military construction contracts awarded without formal advertising, for the period January 1, 1961, through June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Flight Pay of U.S. Coast Guard

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, for the information of the Senate, on flight pay of the U.S. Coast Guard, covering the period July 1 to December 31, 1961; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Medical Stockpile of Civil Defense Emergency Supplies and Equipment

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, on the medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment, for the quarter ended September 30, 1961; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Program

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program, for the period January 1 to June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Notice of Proposed Disposition of Certain Materials in the National Stockpile

Four letters from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., dated October 11, October 23, October 26, and November 28, 1961, respectively, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of notices to be published in the Federal Register of the proposed disposition of certain materials now held in the national stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., dated November 22, 1961, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of the proposed disposition of certain ferromanganese fines now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Identical Bidding

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the reporting of collusive or identical bids received by Government agencies, as of August 9, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Reports on Liquidation of Reconstruction Finance Corporation

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on liquidating the assets of the former Reconstruction Finance Corporation which were transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury by Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957, for the quarter ended September 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration on liquidating the assets formerly held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which were transferred to the Small Business Administration by Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1954, and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957, for the quarter ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the liquidating of the assets of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which were transferred to that Administration, during the quarter ended September 30, 1961; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on Export Control

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, for the third quarter of 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Reports on Awards of Contracts to Small and Other Business Firms by Department of Defense

Three letters from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, reporting, pursuant to law on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms for the months of July, August, and September, 1961; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms, for the period July–October 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on Borrowing Authority

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on borrowing authority, dated June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Reports of Export-Import Bank of Washington

Two letters from the Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Bank as of the close of business December 31, 1960, and June 30, 1961 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on Commissary Activities Outside Continental United States

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Department of Commerce conducted no commissary activities outside the continental United States during the fiscal year 1961; to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Provision of Aviation War Risk Insurance

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of aviation war risk insurance, as of September 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Provision of War Risk Insurance and Certain Marine and Liability Insurance

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of September 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of Activities and Transactions Under Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce on the activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended, for the period June 30 through September 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of Migratory Bird Conservation Commission

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, as Chairman of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Reports on Backlog of Pending Applications and Hearing Cases, Federal Communications Commission

Four letters from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission for the months of August, September, October, and November 1961 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Permits and Licenses for Hydroelectric Projects

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on permits and licenses for hydroelectric projects issued by that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of Federal Power Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Publications of Federal Power Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of the following publications of that Commission: "Uniform System of Accounts Prescribed for Natural Gas Companies, Class C"; "Uniform System of Accounts Prescribed for Natural Gas Companies, Class D"; "Hydroelectric Power Resources in the United States, Developed and Undeveloped, 1960"; "Typical Electric Bills, 1961"; "State Commission Jurisdiction and Regulation of Electric and Gas Utilities, 1960"; and "Map, Major Natural Gas Pipelines, June 30, 1961" (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of Interstate Commerce Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Administration of Federal Airport Act

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of that Agency on the administration of the Federal Airport Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Institutions or Organizations Whose Properties Were Exempted by Special Acts of Congress in District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the institutions or organizations whose properties were specifically exempted by special acts of Congress prior to the passage of the act of December 24, 1942, showing the purposes for which such properties were used during the calendar year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Reports on Institutions, Organizations, Corporations, and Associations Owning Property Exempt Under Public Law 846—77th Congress in District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on institutions, organizations, corporations, and associations owning property exempt under Public Law 846—77th Congress, covering the calendar year 1959 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Prohibition of Use of Certain Names by Collecting Agencies and Private Detective Agencies

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prohibit the use by collecting agencies and private detective agencies of any name, emblem, or insignia which reasonably tends to convey the impression that any such agency is an agency of the government of the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Amendment of Section 6 of District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, and to amend section 6 of the act approved July 2, 1940, as amended, to eliminate requirements that applications for motor vehicles title certificates and certain lien information related thereto be submitted under oath (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Amendment of District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as Amended

A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to assess reasonable fees for the restoration of motor vehicle operators' permits and operating privileges after suspension or revocation thereof (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report of National Capital Planning Commission on Land Acquisitions

A letter from the Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing lands acquired by that Commission during fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report of District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency

A letter from the Acting Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report of Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia

A letter from the Executive Secretary, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the calendar year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.

A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company, for the year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report of Veterans' Administration

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

Report of the Renegotiation Board

A letter from the Chairman, the Renegotiation Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, covering the fiscal year July 1, 1960, to June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

Report on Operations of Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operations of the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West, for the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report of U.S. Information Agency

A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, covering the period January 1 to June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED BY NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS' CONFERENCE

A letter from the President, NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, Paris, France, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, copies of the reports and recommendations adopted by that Conference at its seventh annual session, held in Paris from November 13 to 18, 1961 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON FOREIGN EXCESS PERSONAL PROPERTY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on foreign excess personal property of the Department of Defense, as of June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Department of Agriculture on activities under title IV of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 with regard to the disposal of foreign excess property, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF RECEIPT AND DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN PROPERTY

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations, and real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions, for the quarter ended September 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF FOREIGN EXCESS PERSONAL AND REAL PROPERTY

A letter from the Assistant General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the disposal of foreign excess personal and real property, for the fiscal year 1961; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF PRICING OF F-101 AIRPLANE WINGS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on an examination of the pricing of F-101 airplane wings under a fixed-price incentive subcontract negotiated by McDonnell Aircraft Corp., St. Louis, Mo., with the Martin Co., Baltimore, Md., under Department of the Air Force Prime Contract AF 33(600)-23393, dated October 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF PRICES NEGOTIATED FOR CERTAIN ELECTRON TUBES UNDER DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of the prices negotiated for certain electron tubes under Department of the Navy contracts with the Raytheon Co., Waltham, Mass., dated December 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF CERTAIN ESTIMATED COSTS FOR SUBCONTRACTED ASSEMBLIES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of the estimated costs for subcontracted assemblies included in the incentive target price negotiated for B-52G airplanes, under Department of the Air Force Contract AF 33(600)-34670, with the Boeing Co., Wichita Division, Wichita, Kans. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORTS BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, for the year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal home loan banks supervised by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, for the year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Office of Defense Lending, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, for the fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the financial statements of the Columbia River power system and related activities, for the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the abaca fiber program administered by the General Services Administration, for the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Veterans' Canteen Service, Veterans' Administration, for the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Southeastern Power System and related activities, Corps of Engineers (civil functions), Department of the Army, and the Southeastern Power Administration, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal years 1959 and 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Inland Waterways Corporation, fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, for the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, supervised by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, for the year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

SHORT-FORM REPORT ON AUDIT OF PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a short-form report on audit of the Panama Canal Company, for the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS ON REVIEWS BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of selected activities relating to the lease and disposal of lands and mineral resources, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, dated October 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of requisitioning actions by the Ordnance Supply Management Agency of the U.S. Army, Europe (Rear) Communications Zone, Orleans, France, dated October 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of materiel standardization Activities of the Military Clothing and Textile Supply Agency, Department of Defense, Philadelphia, Pa., dated October 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the Federal contributions program, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, dated December 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the management of spare parts for Army equipment provided to Far East countries under the military assistance program, dated October 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of supply management of ordnance equipment and spare parts, in the Department of the Navy, dated December 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of practices followed in the storage and warehousing of aircraft parts and equipment, Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla., dated November 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of selected activities in the management of food supply, by the Military Subsistence Supply Agency, Department of Defense, dated November 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of Army signal supply operations, U.S. Army, Europe (Rear) Communications Zone, Orleans, France, dated October 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of oversea commercial air shipments of military cargo for the military assistance program and Air Force units, by the Department of the Air Force, dated October 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of selected activities of Facilities and Materiel Depot, Aeronautical Center, Oklahoma City, Okla., of the Federal Aviation Agency, dated October 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the use of local currencies in Spain for contracting and administrative purposes, by the U.S. Government, dated September 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the use of cumulative sinking fund for the retirement of public debt obligations, Treasury Department, as of April 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the housing allowances paid to U.S. military personnel occupying rental guarantee housing projects in France, dated December 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the use of commercial air carriers for oversea travel and shipment of unaccompanied baggage of Department of Defense personnel, dated January 9, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Inclusion of Excessive Premium Pay Costs and Computational Errors in Price Negotiated for a Certain Contract

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the inclusion of excessive premium pay costs and computational errors in the price negotiated by the Department of the Navy for fixed-price contract NObs 3647, awarded to the New York Shipbuilding Corp., Camden, N.J., dated September 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report of Administrator of General Services

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on administration of functions of that Administration under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Economic and Technical Assistance Program for Thailand—Reply of International Cooperation Administration

A letter from the Director, Congressional Liaison Staff, Department of State, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, the reply of that agency to the report on an examination of the economic and technical assistance program for Thailand, during the fiscal years 1955 through 1960, transmitted to the Senate by the Comptroller General of the United States on August 21, 1961 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Economic and Technical Assistance Program for Iran—Reply of International Cooperation Administration

A letter from the Deputy Director for Congressional Relations, International Cooperation Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, the reply of that agency to the report on an examination of the economic and technical assistance program for Iran during the fiscal years 1956 through 1960, transmitted to the Senate by the Comptroller General of the United States on June 27, 1961 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Contracts Negotiated for Experimental, Developmental, or Research Work

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work, or for the manufacture or furnishing of property for experimentation, development, research, or test, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Addition of Certain Lands to National Forests

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that lands within the exterior boundaries of a national forest acquired under section 8 of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315g), may be added to the National Forest, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Agreement Between the United States of America and Department of Water Resources of the State of California Relating to Facilities of the San Luis Unit

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, an agreement between the United States of America and the Department of Water Resources of the State of California for the construction and operation of the joint-use facilities of the San Luis unit, dated December 30, 1961 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Relief of Certain Deceased Lower Brule Indian Allottees

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide relief for the heirs and devisees of Fly and Her Growth, deceased lower Brule Indian allottees (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Arbuckle Project, Oklahoma—Official Comments of State of Texas

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of the official comments of the State of Texas on the Arbuckle project, Oklahoma (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Certification of Adequate Soil Survey and Land Classification, Garfield Water District, Friant-Kern Division, Central Valley Project

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands to be benefited by the Garfield Water District, Friant-Kern Canal Division of the Central Valley project, California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Cancellations and Adjustments of Certain Debts of Indians

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders covering the adjustment or elimination of certain debts of individual Indians or tribes of Indians, covering the fiscal year 1961 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Deferment of Payment Due the United States From the Newton Water Users Association, Newton Project, Utah

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, his determination relating to partial deferment of the December 31, 1961, construction payment due the United States from the Newton Water Users Association, Newton project, Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Amendment of Section 8 of Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (43 U.S.C., sec. 315g) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Status of Colorado River Storage Project and Participating Projects

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the status of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Application for Loan Under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, an application for a loan under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, in the amount of $811,000, for the Weber-Box Elder Conservation District at Ogden, Utah (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Administration of Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the administration of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, for the fiscal year 1961; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Laws Enacted by Legislature of Puerto Rico

A letter from the Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Leopoldo Rocha Canas

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Leopoldo Rocha Canas (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Claims Paid by Department of the Army Under Military Personnel Claims Act

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on claims paid by that Department under the Military Personnel Claims Act, during fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Claims Under Texas City Disaster Relief Act

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on claims under the Texas City Disaster Relief

Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Relief of Certain Officers of Naval Service

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain officers of the naval service erroneously in receipt of compensation based upon an incorrect computation of service for basic pay (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Reports on Payment of Tort Claims

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department during the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Department of the Army during fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Acting General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Commission, covering the period from July 1, 1960, to June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Agency, during the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of Subversive Activities Control Board

A letter from the Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Minutes of National Reunion of Navy Club of the United States

A letter from the National Shipswriter, Navy Club of the United States of America, Sanford, Fla., transmitting, pursuant to law, the minutes of the National Reunion (convention) of that club, held in Rockford, Ill., June 22–25, 1961; also minutes of the several national staff sessions held during the year of 1961, in Chicago, Ill. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Audit Report of Reserve Officers Association

A letter from the Executive Director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that Association as of March 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Audit Report of Military Order of the Purple Heart of the U.S.A., Inc.

A letter from the National Adjutant, Military Order of the Purple Heart of the U.S.A., Daytona Beach, Fla., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that Corporation, dated July 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Audit Report on Future Farmers of America

A letter from the Chairman, Board of Directors, Future Farmers of America, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on that organization, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Financial Statement of Legion of Valor

A letter from the Corporation Agent, Legion of Valor, U.S.A., Inc., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a financial statement of that corporation, covering the period August 16, 1960–July 31, 1961 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Temporary Admission Into the United States of Certain Aliens

Four letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Temporary Admission Into the United States of Certain Alien Defectors

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain alien defectors (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order entered in the case of Emilia Vallera, granting admission into the United States of said alien defector (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Settlement of Certain Claims Against the United States

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

John B. Hogan

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of John B. Hogan (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Claim of Independent Cab Co. and Pulaski Cab Co. v. The United States

A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the claim of Fred Foster and George Morris, d.b.a. *Independent Cab Co. and Pulaski Cab Co.* v. *The United States*, Congressional No. 8-60; to the Committee on the Judicary.

Report of Secretary of the Senate

A letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on receipts and expenditures, for the period July 1, 1960, to June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Extension of Library Services Act to American Samoa

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Library Services Act to American Samoa (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Report of Post Office Department

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Bonding of Certain Federal Officers and Employees

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on operations by Federal departments and establishments in connection with the bonding of officers and employees, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Variation of 40-Hour Workweek of Federal Employees for Educational Purposes

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit variation of the 40-hour workweek of Federal employees for educational purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Report on Positions in Certain Grades of Classification Act of 1949

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on certain positions in grades GS–17 and –18 of the Classification Act of 1949; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Report on Filling Certain Scientific Positions in Department of Interior

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the filling of certain scientific positions in that Department (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

National Capital Parks Memorial Board

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation providing for the establishment of the National Capital Parks Memorial Board (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

Report of Tennessee Valley Authority

A letter from the Chairman and Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, Tenn., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

Report on the Federal Voting Assistance Program

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal Voting Assistance Program, for the period September 1959 to September 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Eleventh Session of Conference of Food and Agriculture Organization of United Nations

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, informing the Senate that the 11th session of the Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations was scheduled to be held at Rome, Italy, from November 4 to 23, 1961; ordered to lie on the table.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Resolutions of the State of New Hampshire; ordered to lie on the table:

"Resolution on the Death of U.S. Senator Styles Bridges

"Whereas U.S. Senator Styles Bridges, for the greater part of his lifetime, dedicated his services to the betterment of his fellow countrymen; and

"Whereas Senator Bridges faithfully and honorably served the State of New Hampshire as Governor, and fulfilled his duties in a most exemplary manner as U.S. Senator; and

"Whereas Senator BRIDGES has long been recognized as an outstanding champion of the individual rights and privileges of his fellow men and was internationally recognized as a statesman of the greatest stature: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That His Excellency, Gov. Wesley Powell, and members of the executive council express their deep and profound sorrow on the death of one of the greatest patriots in the history of the State of New Hampshire; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be spread upon the records, and a copy transmitted to his widow, Mrs. Doloris Bridges, his three sons, Styles, Jr., David, and John, his mother, Mrs. Alina Bridges, his sister, Miss Doris Bridges, and to the President of the U.S. Senate.

"WESLEY POWELL, *Governor*.
"PHILIP A. ROBERTSON.
"ANDREW JAMES.
"ROGER E. BRASSARD.
"HAROLD WEEKS.
"JAMES H. HAYES.

"Attest:

"ROBERT L. STARK,
"*Secretary of State*."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Delaware; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION ———

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to the consideration of the constitutional amendment concerning equal legal rights for women

"Whereas the women of our Nation have enjoyed full civil rights since the adoption of the 19th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas all citizens of our Nation should not only share equal civil rights but also equal legal rights; and

"Whereas there exist many statutes discriminating against women; and

"Whereas such legal differentiations, merely because of sex, lower the Nation's prestige and status in the world community; and

"Whereas both major political parties have announced support of equal legal rights in their respective platforms; and

"Whereas such a discriminating situation is outmoded; Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 121st General Assembly of the State of Delaware (the Senate concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to enact the required enabling legislation to present to the States for adoption the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"'Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex'; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States; to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the two U.S. Senators from Delaware; the Member of the House of Representatives from Delaware, and the Governor of the State of Delaware."

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Kiwanis Club, of Coral Gables, Fla., favoring an investigation of the Department of State; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Oheb Shalom Sisterhood, of Baltimore, Md., favoring the ratification of the genocide convention; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of the Slovak Liberation Council, of New York, N.Y., to the General Assembly of the United Nations, relating to the adjudication of the independence to Slovakia, pursuant to its declaration of December 14, 1960, against colonialism; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by Pennsylvania for America, Philadelphia, Pa., at Wayne, Pa., opposing the admission of Red China into the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Two resolutions adopted by Pennsylvania For America, of Philadelphia, Pa., at Wayne, Pa., supporting the objectives of the John Birch Society, and opposing the alleged trend to eliminate States rights, relating to aid to education in Prince Edward County, Va., and elsewhere; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Ralph Elon Turton, of Georgetown, Ky., relating to the repeal of clause 8, section 9, article I of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Francisco Cepero, of Santurce, P.R., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Joseph Ominsky, chief clerk of the House of Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania, transmitting a copy of the conference committee report on house resolution 62, passed by the 1961 Pennsylvania General Assembly, relating to equal rights for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by chapter 9 of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees, Cavite City, Philippine Islands, relative to the death of the late Speaker of the House of Representatives, Sam Rayburn; ordered to lie on the table.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be the usual morning hour, and that remarks during that hour be limited to 3 minutes; also that allowance be made for the introduction of bills and other routine matters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STOCK DISTRIBUTION TREATED AS RETURN OF CAPITAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I ask the Chair what the pending business is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending business is the bill, H.R. 8847, Calendar No. 1080, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the reference is to the so-called Du Pont bill, which the Senate will take up on Monday next.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consulting with the distinguished minority leader, it is the intention of the leadership to adjourn today until Monday. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock on Monday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

FUNERAL EXPENSES IN CONNECTION WITH THE DEATH OF THE LATE SENATOR STYLES BRIDGES

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk a Senate resolution. Having obtained approval of both the majority and minority leaders, I shall, after the resolution is read, ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 232), as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed to arrange for and attend the funeral of the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES, late a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, on vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES

Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 234) authorizing the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences to investigate matters pertaining to aeronautical and space activities of Federal departments and agencies, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the aeronautical and space activities of departments and agencies of the United States, including such activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized, from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963, inclusive, to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable, (2) employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants, and (3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency of the Government concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

(b) The minority is authorized to select one person for appointment as an assistant or consultant, and the person so selected shall be appointed. No assistant or consultant may receive compensation at an annual gross rate which exceeds by more than $1,400 the annual gross rate of compensation of any person so selected by the minority.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $90,000.00, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2645. A bill to authorize the construction of a multiple purpose dam and reservoir at the Oakley site on the Sangamon River in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 2646. A bill to amend the Act of June 29, 1961 (75 Stat. 129) in order to make permanent the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the harvesting of hay on conservation reserve acreage under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Foresty.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 2647. A bill for the relief of Yao Peng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 2648. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zagorka Golubovic Dzinoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 2649. A bill for the relief of Hamburg Tang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 2650. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, with respect to space communications facilities, and for other purposes; which by unanimous consent was referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

S. 2651. A bill to fix the rate of compensation for certain scientific and engineering positions in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. KERR when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2652. A bill to amend title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 to authorize financial assistance for the construction of public facilities designed for use as fallout shelters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 2653. A bill for the relief of Panagiotes (Peter) Kourkoulis; and

S. 2654. A bill for the relief of Athanasios (Arthur) Kourkoulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2655. A bill for the relief of Roberto Hidalgo Villarin;

S. 2656. A bill for the relief of Dionisios A. Maroudas; and

S. 2657. A bill for the relief of Margarete Heim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 2658. A bill for the relief of Chia-Yao Yuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 2659. A bill to prohibit transportation into a State of certain prescribed drugs dispensed by an individual not licensed to practice pharmacy in such State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2660. A bill to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Clark Canyon Dam in the State of Montana as Hap Hawkins Lake; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2661. A bill for the relief of John Joseph (also known as Hanna Georges Youssef); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 2662. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the harvesting of hay on conservation reserve acreage under certain conditions; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. MOSS):

S. 2663. A bill to provide assistance to business enterprises and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2664. A bill to provide a program of health care insurance for individuals aged 65 or over who are retired; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. COTTON submitted a resolution (S. Res. 232) relating to the funeral expenses of Hon. Styles Bridges, late a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, which was considered and agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 233); which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) banking and currency generally;

(2) financial aid to commerce and industry;

(3) deposit insurance;

(4) the Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;

(5) economic stabilization, production, and mobilization;

(6) valuation and revaluation of the dollar;

(7) prices of commodities, rents, and services;

(8) securities and exchange regulation;

(9) credit problems of small business; and

(10) international finance through agencies within the legislative jurisdiction of the committee.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $80,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 234) authorizing the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences to investigate matters pertaining to aeronautical and space activities of Federal departments and agencies, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. KERR, which appears under the heading "Report of a Committee.")

ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANT FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 235); which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized, from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963, to employ one additional clerical assistant to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

INVESTIGATION OF POSTAL SERVICE AND CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEMS

Mr. JOHNSTON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 236); which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and conduct such studies as may be deemed necessary with respect to any and all aspects of—

(1) the postal service, including but not limited to (a) postal rates, (b) modernization of facilities, (c) research and development programs, (d) public services, (e) operations, and (f) procedures; and

(2) the civil service system, including but not limited to (a) steps necessary to improve the merit system, (b) the shifting of positions from the merit system to a policymaking category, (c) the granting of civil service status to employees by Executive order or administrative action, (d) procedures for classifying positions and adjusting pay schedules, (e) administration of the health and life insurance programs, and (f) operation of the retirement program.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the

Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $75,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXV WITH REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 237); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended—

(1) by striking out "nine" in subsection (g) (relating to the Committee on Government Operations) and inserting in lieu thereof "thirteen";

(2) by striking out "seventeen" in subsection (m) (relating to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs) and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen";

(3) by striking out "seventeen" in subsection (n) (relating to the Committee on Public Works) and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen"; and

(4) by striking out all that follows paragraph 3. and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"4. Except as otherwise provided in paragraph 5., each Senator shall serve on two and no more of the following standing committees: Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences; Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; Committee on Appropriations; Committee on Armed Services; Committee on Banking and Currency; Committee on Finance; Committee on Foreign Relations; Committee on Government Operations; Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; Committee on the Judiciary; Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and Committee on Public Works. No Senator shall serve on more than one of the following standing committees: Committee on the District of Columbia; Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; and Committee on Rules and Administration. The foregoing provisions of this paragraph shall not be effective during any period when there are more than forty-seven Senators of the minority party.

"5. Any Senator serving on the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences or the Committee on Government Operations on the effective date of this paragraph may continue to serve on such committee notwithstanding the fact that he is also serving on two other committees referred to in the first sentence of paragraph 4. During any period in which one or more Senators are serving on three of the committees referred to in the first sentence of paragraph 4, as herein authorized, an equal number of Senators who are serving on the Committee on Rules and Administration may serve on one other committee referred to in the second sentence of paragraph 4, but shall not serve on more than one of the committees referred to in the first sentence of paragraph 4."

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING A REPORT BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. McNAMARA submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 238); which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved, That the time for filing a final report by the Special Committee on Aging, established by S. Res. 33, Eighty-seventh Congress, agreed to February 13, 1961, as amended and supplemented, is hereby extended to January 31, 1963.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of enabling the special committee to complete its work and prepare such final report, it is hereby authorized to exercise, until such date, all of the duties, functions, and powers conferred upon it by S. Res. 33, Eighty-seventh Congress, as amended and supplemented.

Sec. 3. The expenses of the special committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $185,000 from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the special committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY (for Mr. McNamara and Mr. Hart) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 239) expressing sorrow on the death of Hon. Louis C. Rabaut, late a Representative from the State of Michigan, which was considered and agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY (for Mr. Johnston and Mr. Thurmond) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 240) expressing sorrow on the death of Hon. John J. Riley, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina, which was considered and agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY (for Mr. Yarborough) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 241) expressing sorrow on the death of Hon. Sam Rayburn, late Speaker of the House of Representatives, which was considered and agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION OF MULTIPLE-PURPOSE DAM AND RESERVOIR AT OAKLEY SITE ON SANGAMON RIVER, ILL.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the construction of a multiple-purpose dam and reservoir at the Oakley site on the Sangamon River in the State of Illinois.

The proposed channel improvement project will provide for flood control, water supply, and recreational purposes by the construction of a dam and reservoir on the Sangamon River near Oakley and Decatur, Ill., with a capacity of 148,000 acre-feet, including 11,000 acre-feet for a permanent municipal and industrial water supply for central Illinois, recreation pool, 4,500 acre-feet for sedimentation, and related downstream channel improvements. The estimated cost of the project to the United States is $23,056,000 for construction and $135,000 for annual maintenance and operation; provided that prior to construction local interests agree to maintain all roads and bridges in the reservoir area and over the improved channel downstream from the dam, operate the existing non-Federal water supply dam and reservoir at Lake Decatur for flood control in accordance with regulations approved by the Secretary of the Army, and contribute in cash 15.1 percent of the first cost, presently estimated at $4,115,000 and 22 percent of the annual operation and maintenance cost, presently estimated at $38,000.

The benefit-cost ratio of the project is 1.2. It has the approval of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Chief of Engineers of the Department of the Army.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2645) to authorize the construction of a multiple-purpose dam and reservoir at the Oakley site on the Sangamon River in the State of Illinois, introduced by Mr. Dirksen, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACT OF 1958

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, with respect to space communication facilities, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

This bill will, I believe, establish the necessary foundation for the expediting of a worldwide communications system through the cooperative efforts of both the Government and private enterprise. There is an urgent need for legislation in this area in view of the remarkable progress being made in the space satellite communications field.

This bill will give us a starting place for exploring the many unresolved problems in the administration and development of a communications phenomenon which has unlimited potential in providing an instrument for peace and understanding between the peoples of the world. The potential significance of a well-coordinated undertaking of this vast magnitude is unlimited and can well become a most powerful asset to this Nation in the decades ahead.

By enacting legislation in this field during 1962, Congress can set the stage for the first dramatic worldwide distribution of a consumer product directly resulting from the space research and development of U.S. scientists, engineers, and technicians.

In this regard I should like to say to the Senate that I have discussed the matter with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Commerce, and I have advised him that if in the deliberations of the bill by the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, of which the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee is a member, any matter comes up with respect to which the Commerce Committee has jurisdiction, an agreement will be worked out whereby either the bill will be later referred to the Commerce Committee for its consideration, or that a program of joint hearings by both committees will be worked out.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The bill (S. 2650) to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, with respect to space communications facilities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Kerr, was received, read twice by its title, and, by unanimous consent, referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1962

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "The Trade Adjustment Act of 1962." I am pleased to announce that the following additional members of the Small Business Committee have joined with me as cosponsors of the proposed legislation: The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss].

The Trade Adjustment Act of 1962 has been prepared and introduced to follow up a letter which I addressed to the President of the United States on last Tuesday, January 9. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my letter to President Kennedy be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

January 9, 1962.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: I recognize the importance of expanded trade among the free nations of the world, and I understand your interest in supporting trade policies which would promote such trade. At the same time, I am deeply concerned, as I am sure you are, with the possible immediate impact of such expanded trade upon our domestic concerns. Indeed, as chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, I feel a strong responsibility to do what I can to assure that meaningful adjustment relief will be provided those enterprises injured or threatened with injury.

Such relief must of necessity include, among other things, financial assistance. You will recall that such assistance has been recommended by various studies and was included in legislation introduced by you and others in Congress.

To be meaningful, this assistance must be available without undue and unnecessary restrictions. A substantial majority of entitled concerns will be small and independent businesses which are simply unable to negotiate with a number of different agencies for relief. To require them to do so will be to deny them the financial assistance to which they may be entitled. Accordingly, this program of assistance should be handled by a single agency of the Government presently equipped with personnel and experience to do the job.

The Small Business Administration is successfully administering several business loan programs of all types and sizes. No other agency of government has comparable experience.

Therefore, I would hope that under the program established, once it is determined that financial assistance is appropriate, the Small Business Administration be given full authority in the lending function, and its decision as to the soundness of the loan under the criteria established in the legislation be final. I would recommend that the money to be used in such loans be appropriated to the SBA's revolving fund.

I believe that the success of this program as regarding financial assistance will be dependent upon such an arrangement. In addition, to do otherwise would not be consonant with the strong views of many in Congress, including myself, regarding the independence of the Small Business Administration.

I expect to introduce in the Senate a proposed Trade Adjustments Act within the next few days which will incorporate the suggestions I have made. I urge that this proposal be given the most careful consideration in connection with your legislative program.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,
John Sparkman,
Chairman.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the concept of a Federal program of assistance to business concerns, communities, and unemployed workers whose lives and activities have suffered as a result of the trade policy of the United States has been the subject of numerous bills introduced in each Congress since 1953. An excellent history of and commentary upon these bills will be found in the March 1961 issue of the Columbia Law Review. It is an article entitled "The Trade Adjustment Bills: Their Purpose and Efficacy," by Bruce E. Clubb and Otto R. Reischer—61 Columbia Law Review 490. More recently, one of the coauthors of that article, Dr. Reischer, a consulting economist who has taught economics at Rutgers University, the University of British Columbia, Michigan State University, and the University of Virginia, has prepared a study entitled "Trade Adjustment in Theory and Practice," which was published as a joint committee print of the Joint Economic Committee on November 21, 1961. As a member of that committee's Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, which commissioned the Reischer report, I have followed Dr. Reischer's work with a great deal of interest.

The concept of a coordinated but multifaceted national program of trade adjustment received the unanimous endorsement of the Senate Small Business Committee—with one member not participating—as long ago as the summer of 1960. That endorsement will be found at page 12 of Senate Report No. 1908, 86th Congress, 2d session, issued on August 23, 1960, and entitled "Impact of Imports on Small Business." The language of the Small Business Committee's report is relevant and important, and I should like to read it into the Record at this point, as follows:

6. Special help for seriously injured domestic industries: American manufacturers feeling the intense competition of foreign imports have, since April 1, 1957, initiated with the U.S. Tariff Commission 28 applications for escape-clause relief, and only 2 of those applications have resulted in the relief sought. These results, some witnesses contended, have discouraged them from seeking relief by this means.

Your committee takes note of the fact that the Tariff Commission found "serious injury" in six cases, but that relief was accorded officially in only one-third of those cases. There is a moral obligation on the country as a whole to provide more tangible help where the serious injury has been found but where the President has determined that higher tariffs or quotas are not in the interest of American foreign policy. No injured industry can be expected to bear willingly an economic burden that more properly belongs on the broader shoulders of the national economy.

Your committee suggests, as direct help to injured industries, such steps as the following:

(a) Readjustment aids: Specific Federal programs could be developed for case-by-case assistance to businesses and communities hard hit by imports. Such programs should help both entrepreneurs and employees to make necessary adjustments. Small businesses should receive market research and technical data collected and tailored for their particular individual problems. Displaced workers should receive help in retraining themselves for new or changed occupational opportunities. In some cases, relocation allowances might be made available, upon certification, by an appropriate authority, that certain unemployed workers are the victims of foreign trade competition and that their skills are needed in the section of the country to which they wish to move.

(b) Trade injury loans: Small businesses in industries found by the U.S. Tariff Commission to have been seriously injured by foreign imports should be entitled to preferential loan consideration by the Small Business Administration. The usual rate of interest on small business loans is 5½ percent; on disaster loans administered by the same agency, it is 3 percent. A new cateogry of trade injury loans at 4 percent may be advisable.

(c) Tax concessions: Business enterprises found by an appropriate authority to have been compelled to make expenditures for new, diversified plant and equipment, as a direct consequence of U.S. trade policies, should be allowed to amortize the new plant and equipment at accelerated rates for Federal income tax purposes. Various specific proposals along these lines have been included in a number of bills introduced in this Congress * * *. These proposals deserve the careful consideration of the tax-writing committees of the Congress.

Your committee's suggestions are offered as samples of the kind of help which the Federal Government might offer to meet what appears to be a clear moral obligation to those industries which have been pronounced seriously injured but for whom tariff and quota help have been denied, for overriding foreign-policy reasons, at the White House.

The method of defining the industries entitled to help is clear and workable; further suggestions for deserved help are in order, and will be the subject of additional study by this committee.

Mr. President, in March 1961 the exhaustive and long-awaited report of the Senate Commerce Committee's 2-year special staff study of U.S. foreign trade was issued under the title "The United States and World Trade—Challenges and Opportunities." At page 157, the learned special staff made recommendations as to the essential points of a national trade adjustment program, which conformed substantially to the Small Business Committee's recommendations. A few paragraphs from the Commerce Committee staff report, preceding the recommendations just mentioned, are worthy of note here. I read from page 145 of the report:

THE NEED FOR ADJUSTMENT

To limit imports requires adjustments; not to limit imports also requires adjustments. The cost of the latter seems far less than the cost of the former in terms of all the factors mentioned above plus the benefits that result from a more efficient use of resources.

Keeping our resources mobile is essential to economic progress. Economic adaptation is the essence of the steady shift from lower productivity to higher productivity use of land, labor, and capital. It is the lubricant for a closer meshing of the economic achievements of different countries, some developed, others less developed. Together with rising levels of international trade, it makes it possible for the American economy to benefit from the achievements of foreign industrialization, and for foreign countries to benefit from American achievements. It is the marrow of the process of international specialization.

Where the Government is called upon to help cope with market difficulties experienced by agriculture, manufacturing, and mining, the approach should be to facilitate the mobility of resources, not to retard it; to keep open the channels of change and private decision; and to lend a helping hand to those who find difficult the adaptation made necessary by a policy the Government had to follow in the national interest.

Mr. President, the key words of that quotation are the last words: "a policy—of more liberal trade—the Government had to follow in the national interest." I think that every well-informed American must now concede, as the President has eloquently indicated in the message we have just heard, that the Commerce Committee's special staff was correct in couching their finding in the language of compulsion, not the language of choice or option. What was said in 1961 is even more true today. The impact on world trade, and the consequences and conclusions for the United States, of the great new economic communities, customs unions and free trade areas of Europe, together with the rapid progress of former war-devastated countries and some of the underdeveloped countries, become ever more apparent and inescapable. The trade policies of 1930, 1934, and 1951 are no longer viable in the world of 1962. The tariff protections of former years are, whether we like it or not, going to come down, some very rapidly now, some more gradually—but down they will come. And, whatever the benefits for the Nation as a whole, the result for some industries, enterprises, and workers of the United States will be economic injury. In the words of the Senate Small Business Committee's report:

> No injured industry can be expected to bear willingly an economic burden that more properly belongs on the broader shoulders of the national economy.

And, I might add, an injured industry should not have to bear that burden. To shift that burden, as best we possibly can, to the broader shoulders of the national economy, where it belongs, is the purpose of the trade adjustment bills, the latest of which I introduce today.

Mr. President, my bill has drawn heavily on the suggestions made by Mr. Clubb and Dr. Reischer, as well as upon the many bills introduced in prior sessions of Congress—particularly the bill introduced in 1957 by then Senator Kennedy as S. 2907, 85th Congress, and a practically verbatim reintroduction of that bill in 1959 by the then Representative Chester Bowles, H.R. 9023, 86th Congress. I have also profited from and in part drawn upon the bill introduced last year by my esteemed colleague on the Senate Small Business Committee, Senator JAVITS, S. 851, 87th Congress. And, of course, no mention of trade adjustment would be complete without acknowledgment of the prolonged and pioneering efforts in the field by two other members of the Small Business Committee, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. I gratefully acknowledge my debt to all of them. However, I must also note that my bill contains significant departures from prior bills, including one new program not previously proposed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a statement I have prepared, which describes the Trade Adjustment Act of 1962, section by section, with source notes and comments.

Mr. President, this kind of legislation will be badly needed in connection with the new trade program which Congress will undoubtedly enact. I believe the bill is in keeping with the recommendations contained in the President's state of the Union message today, and I am very glad to introduced it. Naturally, I should be pleased to have other Senators become associated besides those who have already supported the proposed legislation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very much pleased to be a cosponsor with the Senator from Alabama of this important proposed legislation. The Senator may recall that when President Kennedy was a Senator, he proposed a trade adjustment program which I was privileged to cosponsor with him.

I believe the program which the Senator from Alabama now suggests will be of great help, particularly to smaller independent businesses, and that the general outlines of the program will be helpful, not only to smaller businesses, but to any big business which may be affected as well. I assure the Senator from Alabama of my wholehearted active cooperation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the section-by-section description will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2663) to provide assistance to business enterprises and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The section-by-section description presented by Mr. SPARKMAN is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION SOURCE NOTES AND COMMENTS ON THE TRADE ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1962

(By Senator JOHN SPARKMAN)

Title: The title follows the title of S. 2907, 85th Congress, (hereinafter referred to as "the 1957 Kennedy bill"), except that the words "communities, industries" have been dropped. My bill is aimed at assisting individual business enterprises and individual members of the labor force who have been adversely affected by the trade policy of the United States. This approach follows the recommendations of the Reischer report. It is my hope and expectation that adequate provision for assistance to communities, directly and through industrial development corporations, has been made by the Area Redevelopment Act, Public Law 87-27 (May 1, 1961, 75 Stat. 47).

Section 1 (short title): The short title of the bill is identical to that of the 1957 Kennedy bill, except that the year has been changed. The bill is called the Trade Adjustment Act of 1962.

Section 2 (purpose): The purpose of the bill, broadly stated, is to offset the impact on American businesses, especially smaller businesses, of an increasingly liberal national trade policy by a broad-gage program of adjustment assistance. The statement of purpose in my bill represents a composite of section 2 of the 1957 Kennedy bill and section 2 of the 1961 Javits bill, S. 851, with, however, the references to "communities" and "industries" eliminated, to conform to the individual business and individual worker approach recommended by Reischer. Section 2(b) of my bill expresses a Congressional intent that the provisions of the bill be liberally construed and that close questions of eligibility be decided in favor of applicants.

Section 3: Reischer and Clubb have recommended that the U.S. Tariff Commission be the agency that would initially determine eligibility of businesses and workers for assistance under a Federal trade adjustment program. Section 3 of my bill accepts and implements this recommendation by creating a Trade Adjustment Division in the Tariff Commission. Section 201 of the Small Business Investment Act—Public Law 699, 85th Congress—served as a model for this section.

Section 4(a) (certificates of eligibility): This section assigns to the proposed new Trade Agreement Division of the Tariff Commission the responsibility for determining eligibility and issuing certificates of eligibility for assistance to import-affected businesses and workers. In the 1957 Kennedy bill and most other prior trade adjustment bills, this function was given to a new agency, a Trade Adjustment Board. My bill accepts the arguments of Clubb and Reischer that the Tariff Commission is well equipped by experience and present function to carry out this responsibility without a new addition to the Federal bureaucracy.

Section 4(b) (eligible persons): Generally speaking, business enterprises and workers who are adversely affected by the trade policy of the United States are eligible for assistance. My bill's definition of eligible business enterprises is derived from section 5 (c)(1) of the 1957 Kennedy bill, while my definition of eligible individuals is drawn in part from section 5(b)(4) of the 1961 Javits bill and is in part original, again following the rationale of the Reischer report.

Section 4(c) (criteria for eligibility): This subsection, setting forth two prerequisites for eligibility of a business enterprise, follows section 5(c) of the 1957 Kennedy bill.

Section 5 (functioning of Trade Adjustment Division): The legislative language contained in section 5 of my bill is almost entirely original. The intent and purpose of the section, which has six subsections, is to enable the Tariff Commission, operating through the new Trade Adjustment Division the bill would create, to recommend trade adjustment assistance as an alternative to new or increased tariffs or other import restrictions, under each of the several statutory procedures it is now empowered to administer. Hence, the functions envisaged for the Commission are essentially the same as those envisaged for the Trade Adjustment Board in earlier bills; but my bill presents, for the first time, suggested statutory language to implement the Reischer recommendation that these functions be assigned to the Tariff Commission.

Section 5(a) would amend section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to authorize the Tariff Commission to investigate business efficiency, following the recommendation of the Reischer report (Joint Economic Committee), joint committee print, pages 36–37.

Section 5(b) would make a minor technical amendment in section 332(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, required by the amendment made by section 5(a) of my bill.

Section 5(c) would amend section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to give the Commission the alternative of recommending invocation of the Trade Adjustment Act provisions instead of increasing, or prohibiting a decrease in, tariffs, pursuant to that section of the 1930 act.

Section 5(d) would repeal section 336(g) of the Tariff Act of 1930, which prohibits the shift of any article from the dutiable list to the free list.

Section 5(e) would amend section 3 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 (the peril-point provisions) to permit the Tariff Commission to recommend invocation of the Trade Adjustment Act as an alternative to a recommendation of an increase or of no decrease in existing customs treatment or import restrictions.

Section 5(f) would make a similar amendment in section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, the escape clause provisions, insofar as they relate to the types of recommendation that may be made by the Tariff Commission.

Section 6 (Interagency Committee on Trade Adjustment): Section 3 of the 1957 Kennedy bill provided a model for section 6(a) of my bill; however, my bill would create an Interagency Committee on Trade Adjustment rather than a Trade Adjustment Board. The remaining three subsections establish the membership of the Committee, provide that it shall meet at least quarterly, and authorize it to call on all Federal departments, and, under my bill, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration would be designated as Chairman of the Committee and the Chairman of the Tariff Commission as Vice Chairman of the Committee. Other members would be the Under Secretaries of State, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor. The President would be empowered to name representatives of other departments and agencies, from time to time, as he deemed appropriate.

Section 7(a) (Functions of Trade Adjustment Committee): The function of the Interagency Committee on Trade Adjustment would be to determine the kinds and amounts of assistance needed by those classes of business enterprises and workers found by the Tariff Commission to be eligible for the benefits provided by the act. Here again I have been guided by the recommendations of the Reischer report, page 37, although the precise statutory language is original.

Section 7(b) would amend subsection (c) of section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to authorize the President to invoke the Trade Adjustment Act as an alternative to increased or continued rates of duty in proceedings under that section of the 1930 act. It will be noted that this section of my bill, which relates to the functions and powers of the President in section 336 proceedings, is the complement of section 5(c) of the bill, which makes a substantially similar amendment of the same section with respect to the functions of the Tariff Commission thereunder.

Sections 7(c) and 7(d) would make amendments to the peril-point and escape-clause provisions, respectively, of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, with respect to the powers and functions of the President thereunder, authorizing him, in either case, to invoke trade adjustment rather than continued or increased rates and types of protection. These sections complement the amendments made by sections 5(e) and 5(f) of my bill, with respect to the functions of the Tariff Commission in peril-point and escape-clause proceedings.

Section 7(e) establishes the manner by which the President shall invoke the Trade Adjustment Act: by giving notice to the Tariff Commission, the Trade Adjustments Committee, the House Ways and Means, and Senate Finance Committees.

Section 8 (Small Business Administration functions): At the heart of virtually every trade adjustment program proposed since 1953 have been the lending and technical assistance functions—but especially the lending program—of the Small Business Administration. The Reischer report recognizes the soundness of this approach (page 38) in these words:

"Under the proposed trade adjustment program devoted primarily to relieving the individual business enterprises of distress caused by increased imports, assistance granted would be chiefly in the form of loans, from the Small Business Administration."

Section 8(a) of my bill would have the business concern which the Tariff Commission has certified to be eligible for the benefits of the act apply to the Small Business Administration for technical advice and assistance.

Section 8(b) would empower the SBA to grant trade adjustment loans, by an amendment of section 7(b) of the Small Business Act. The language of the amendment of section 7(b) is derived, in substantial part, from section 8(a) of S. 851, the 1961 Javits bill. The trade adjustment loans would be limited to 25 years, including extensions and renewals, and would bear interest at 4 percent.

Section 8(c) would add a new subsection (e) to section 7 of the Small Business Act, authorizing SBA to make grants up to $25,000 to eligible business enterprises for procuring technical assistance in the private business community, to make detailed plans for their adjustment to changed conditions and to new lines, when a need to do so has been occasioned by the trade policy of the United States. Such grants would be made only where the technical assistance programs of SBA itself, and other Government agencies, were inadequate to the task at hand, or where greater efficiency or lower cost to the Government could be obtained by this route. I am indebted to Clubb and Reischer (61 Columbia Law Review 500) for the original suggestion upon which this subsection is based.

Section 8(d) would permit SBA to make all of its programs authorized under this section available to all certified eligible businesses not dominant in their lines, whether or not they are technically small businesses. I have again followed the recommendations of Reischer in this regard.

Section 8(e) would amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act to increase the authorized appropriation to the section 7(b) revolving loan fund by $100 million, the entire amount of the increase to be earmarked for the new trade adjustment loan program.

Section 9 (unemployment assistance program) follows almost verbatim the language of section 8 of the 1957 Kennedy bill and the 1959 Bowles bill. These provisions are noted without criticism or suggestions in the Clubb and Reischer article previously mentioned, 61 Columbia Law Review 495–496. However, the Senate may wish to consider tying this program into the Area Redevelopment Act.

Section 10 (training and transportation) follows closely the language of section 9 of the 1957 Kennedy bill and other similar bills. I have noted with keen interest and considerable agreement the suggestion of Clubb and Reischer, 61 Columbia Law Review 496–497, for extensive revision of this portion of the Bowles (1957 Kennedy) bill, along the lines of the Korean GI bill, 38 U.S.C. 1501–1510; however, time has not permitted me to work up legislative language to implement the suggestion. I may wish to do so later, by an amendment of this bill. In the meantime, I commend the cited commentary to the legislative committee to which this bill is referred.

Section 11 (provisions for retirement of eligible workers under social security age 60) follows the 1957 Kennedy bill, section 10. The Senate may wish to lower the age still further, to 55 or even 50, as recommended by Reischer.

Section 12 (accelerated amortization) is patterned upon section 11 of the 1957 Kennedy bill.

Section 13 authorizes necessary appropriations.

PLANNING GRANTS

I should like to add just a word more about one adjustment program proposed by my bill that is not found in any of the earlier trade adjustment bills, to the best of my knowledge. That is the authorization of the SBA, contained in section 8(c) of my bill, to award grants of up to $25,000 to certified eligible business establishments, for the purpose of engaging private management and industrial counsel in planning their adjustment to additional or different lines of production. In the extremely helpful Columbia Law Review article I have previously cited, Clubb and Reischer write as follows:

"Given a sufficiently large appropriation, the Department of Commerce might be able to organize a program of product and market analysis that could provide adequate informational adjustment assistance. There are at least two reasons why this should not be done, however. First, the Department would have to recruit and weld the necessary personnel into an effective organization. This would take time and money that need not be spent since there are already many experienced private firms that could undoubtedly do the job at least as well as the Department of Commerce. But a more important reason for having this job done by a private market and product analyzing firm is that the manufacturer would thus retain greater freedom of choice. It would therefore seem preferable were the trade adjustment bills to provide for grants to eligible firms for the purpose of retaining market and product analysis."

In two footnotes to this paragraph, the authors add:

"For a firm that has its own market and product research departments, a comparable grant could be made for the temporary support of that department.

"If such grants are to be made, of course, some sensible limitations must be put on the amount. Perhaps the best method would be to let the distributing agency determine the amount necessary, which, in any event, could not exceed a particular figure, say $25,000."

In addition to the fact that a business concern—faced with a need to make a major overhaul in its methods or major change in its line of production—may find it more convenient and expeditious to employ private management counsel for its planning than to seek the services of Government agencies, it is possible that such a method would also save the Government both cost and embarrassment. I can imagine, for example, that in some cases, it might be considerably more difficult for Government experts to recommend to a business firm a change to a new line of production, a recommendation in which existing producers in that line would have an obvious interest, than for a private management counseling firm to do so.

My bill would impose a $25,000 ceiling on adjustment planning grants, as suggested by Clubb and Reischer. In addition, it would require, as conditions precedent to the award of a grant, that a determination be made by the Small Business Administration that the planning assistance required could not be obtained by a certified eligible firm from Government agencies, or could be provided at less cost to the Government by employing private industry; that a national as well as a private interest would be served by the planning grant; that the SBA would have some control over the qualifications and methods of contract planners to be employed; and that the final plan prepared under the grant would be filed with the SBA, which would have discretion to make it public, in whole or in part.

I can anticipate, even with these qualifications, some difficulties in the administration of this proposed program and I therefore maintain an open mind on the question whether it is desirable and practicable. Nevertheless, I feel that the novel suggestion by Mr. Clubb and Dr. Reischer deserves to be put forward in bill form, to provide a convenient focus for consideration and discussion by the Congress, the executive branch, and the business community.

HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE AGED ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide a program of health care insurance for all persons aged 65 and over who are retired, through the social security mechanism but administered by the States. It provides preventive, diagnostic and short-term illness benefits; or long-term catastrophic illness benefits; or cash benefits to pay for private health care insurance.

Entitled the "Health Insurance for the Aged Act," the bill covers more than 12 million persons out of the 16.6 million Americans over 65 years of age, including the 2 to 4 million who are not eligible under social security.

The bill provides an optimum program of health care insurance and is consistent with the platform pledges of the Republican and Democratic Parties. It represents a compromise that I have worked out to accommodate those who advocate the social security approach and still retain the principles in the general revenue plan which my Republican colleagues and I put forward in the 86th Congress, and it therefore makes it possible for me to call for a genuine bipartisan effort now to enact a satisfactory health care program for the aging at this session.

I feel that I join millions of Americans in the determination that there should be a medical-care-for-the-aging bill in this session of the Congress. I have been deeply devoted to the general revenue medical care plan for the aged which, together with others of my Republican colleagues, I have sponsored continuously on this issue, but I am now convinced that it will not result in legislation soon. That legislation is urgently needed and, therefore, the time to work out an amalgram of both points of view is now. Hence, my offer of this compromise proposal as a formula for the solution of what has become the medical-care-for-the-aging deadlock.

I do not hold with those who feel that this body has only the one course of waiting for the other body on action on medical care for the aging. Certainly all respect must be shown to the constitutional prerogative in the initiation of tax legislation in the other body, but if after an appropriate interval it becomes clear that on this basis no result in legislation is likely in this session, then I believe that by appropriate amendment to a suitable bill this body ought to put the issue up to our coordinate body of the Congress as a duty to the country. This body has a duty to the country, too, to give its coordinate body an opportunity to enact legislation at this session by adding it as an amendment to another appropriate bill if necessary. I shall do everything I can to implement this course.

For more than a decade I have been vitally interested in health legislation which would provide not only a health care insurance program for the aging but also the medical research, personnel, and construction of facilities needed to keep pace with the mounting needs of our population. I have supported sound planning to increase the effectiveness of our health service system and to improve and expand our research.

The program would become part of the social security system, but actual administration would be handled by the States under agreement with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, or by the Secretary if he is unable to conclude an agreement with a State. This will make possible closer supervision in the maintenance of high medical standards and more efficient administration because of greater flexibility in the use of local facilities. It will also allow the States to improve service benefits under the same administration beyond the same basic Federal plan if they assume the costs of the added program.

The health benefits plan defines as eligible all persons 65 and over who are on social security, as well as those who are not on social security, as long as they meet the retirement qualification, and except for those receiving medical benefits under another Federal program. I would apply the definition of "retired" to all whose income for his last taxable year for purposes of Federal income tax did not exceed $3,000 in the case of an individual or $4,500 in the case of a couple who have filed a joint return; or who files a statement that for the taxable year in which he applies for health care insurance benefits his income will not exceed the above-mentioned sums. This limitation would not apply to anyone who had attained age 72.

The bill offers eligibles a choice of one of three optional benefit programs. One provides preventive illness benefits that would include 21 days of hospital care; physician's services for 12 visits; 63 days of nursing home care less any days of hospitalization at a ratio of 3 nursing home days to 1 hospital day; the first $100 of costs for diagnostic, laboratory and X-ray services; and 24 days of home health care services.

The second option, which is more liberal in its benefits than any other Government program, provides only long-term catastrophic or chronic illness benefits and would go into effect after the insured individual has incurred the first $125 of medical expenses. It covers 80 percent of the following costs in a calendar year: 120 days of hospital with surgical services, including oral surgery, drugs and appliances, laboratory and X-ray services in hospital; 360 days of nursing home care after transfer from hospital; and full visiting nurse or other home health care services.

For those eligible individuals who have private health care plans and want to continue them, a third option provides cash payments to an insurance carrier of premiums on a guaranteed renewable health insurance policy of which the eligible individual is the beneficiary, amounting up to $100 per calendar year. This amount is the per capita cost of the above two service plans.

A Federal medical insurance trust fund would be established to pay benefits for those receiving social security. For qualified older citizens not receiving social security benefits, participation would be financed out of general revenue by appropriations of the Federal Government paid into the Federal medical insurance trust fund. The total cost of providing medical benefits and administration under the bill is estimated to be $1,230 million per year. To finance the benefits of social security eligibles, the payroll taxes paid by employers and employees would each be increased by one-fourth of 1 percent in 1963 with an additional increase of one-eighth of 1 percent each in 1972. Similar increases of three-eighths of 1 percent and three-sixteenths of 1 percent are made in taxes paid by the self-employed. These increases derive the equivalent of 0.70 percent of payroll on a level premium basis, or enough to make this program self-sustaining.

The rapid annual increase in the number of Americans who are 65 years of age and older is presenting us with a problem of major proportions. Progress in medical science has brought about an even more spectacular rise in longevity in the group of men and women who are over 75 and 85 years of age, and their health needs have become more and more of a public responsibility.

Today it is becoming increasingly clear that, with the mounting costs of medical care and the growing pressure on our medical facilities, most of our older citizens cannot afford to get the kind of health care they need without some form of government help. The 1960 census showed that there were 16.6 million Americans 65 years of age and over. By 1970, if the present rate of increase continues, there will be over 20 million men and women in that age bracket. The number currently receiving social security retirement benefits is approaching 14 million.

The years of retirement should be healthy and creative years, but with costs for doctors, drugs, hospitalization, and other health care needs rising far beyond the ability to pay of almost two-thirds of the aging group at a time when their earning abilities have suffered a sharp decline, the magnitude and gravity of the problem call for prompt action.

Mr. President, when the Senate concluded its great debate on medical care for the aged in the 1960 session, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], a leading proponent of such legislation on the other side of the aisle, and I both pledged to the Senate that we would try to find a way out of the deadlock. My compromise proposal today is my contribution toward that effort.

Mr. President, I urge Senators to study the bill most carefully. As I have said, it joins the social security approach with complete coverage and the option to continue private coverage.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a comparison between the bill I am introducing today and the Anderson-King bill, and also a general description of the bill I am introducing now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the comparison and general description will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2664) to provide a program of health care insurance for individuals aged 65 or over who are retired, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The comparison and description presented by Mr. JAVITS are as follows:

Comparison of major health care insurance proposals for the aging, 1962

	Javits bill	Anderson bill (S. 909), King bill (H.R. 4222)
Coverage	All persons 65 and over who meet the retirement qualifications [1] and who are not beneficiaries of medical care under old-age assistance or other Federal assistance medical programs.	OASDI eligibles age 65 and over; also railroad retirees. 13.75 OASDI beneficiaries and 500,000 railroad retirees.
How many benefit	12,300,000 (as of 1963) estimated out of total age population of 16,000,000 (estimated)	14,240,000 (as of 1963).
Benefits	Eligible individuals may choose 1 of 3 optional programs: (1) preventive, diagnostic, and short-term illness benefits with specified services; (2) long-term illness benefits with specified services; (3) private insurance benefits under which the cost of a private insurance plan, up to a maximum of $100 per year, is paid for. Benefits specified under the preventive short-term care plan: (1) 21 days of hospital care; (2) 63 days of nursing care less any days of hospitalization at a ratio of 3 nursing home days per hospital day; (3) physicians' service for 12 days; (4) 1st $100 of costs for ambulatory diagnostic, laboratory, and X-ray services; and (5) 24 days of visiting nurse or other home health care services. Benefits specified per year under the catastrophic long-term or chronic illness plan—80 percent of the following costs, after payment of the 1st $125 of medical expenses: (1) 120 days of hospital care; (2) surgical service, drugs, and appliances, provided in a hospital; (3) 360 days of nursing home services less any days of hospitalization at a ratio of 3 nursing home days per hospital day; (4) full home health care services. Private insurance benefits—payment to insurance carrier of premiums on a renewable private health insurance policy which an eligible individual is beneficiary, not to exceed $100 per year.	(1) Inpatient hospital care—90 days per benefit period subject to a deductible of $10 per day for the 1st 9 days, but not less than $20; plus, (2) skilled nursing home care after transfer from a hospital—120 days per benefit period plus an extra 2 days for each unused day of hospital care, total not to exceed 180 days; plus, (3) home health services—240 visits per calendar year; plus, (4) outpatient diagnostic services, subject to a deductible of $20 per diagnostic study.
Administration	By States under agreement with Secretary of HEW, or by the Secretary if he is unable to conclude an agreement: States to be reimbursed; they can augment benefits under same administration if they assume added costs.	Secretary of HEW.
Financing	Benefits would be paid from a Federal medical insurance trust fund: (1) payroll taxes of employees and employers are increased ¼ of 1 percent of 1st $4,800 wages in 1963 each and ⅛ of 1 percent in 1972; for self-employed, ⅜ of 1 percent in 1963 and 3/16 of 1 percent in 1972. These increases derive the equivalent of 0.70 of payroll on a level premium (longrun) basis; (2) for other retirees, by appropriation from general revenue.	Increases OASDI taxable wage base from $4,800 to $5,000; provides for rate increase beginning in 1963 of ½ of 1 percent of wages; ⅜ of 1 percent of 1st $5,000 for self-employed.
Total cost, 1st year.	$1,230,000,000	$1,000,000,000.

---

[1] An individual would be "retired" if: (i) his income did not exceed $3,000, or $4,500 in combined income with his spouse, in his last taxable year; or (ii) he files a sworn statement that for the taxable year in which he applies for health care insurance benefits, his income will not exceed $3,000, or $4,500 for a married couple; or (iii) he had attained age 72.

SUMMARY OF HEALTH CARE INSURANCE FOR THE AGED ACT, SPONSORED BY SENATOR JACOB K. JAVITS

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

A health benefits plan for persons 65 years old or over through the social security mechanism (OASI) and administered by the States, providing preventive, diagnostic, and short-term illness benefits; or long-term catastrophic or chronic illness benefits; or cash benefits to purchase private health care insurance.

All persons 65 years of age and over who meet the retirement qualification are eligible including persons not eligible for OASI benefits, but excluding those receiving medical benefits under another Federal program.

FINANCING AND COST

The total cost of providing medical benefits is estimated to be about $1.23 billion. Benefits for the OASI eligibles and ineligibles would be paid from a Federal medical insurance trust fund. Per capita cost of the benefits package is $100 including administration.

To finance the benefits of OASI eligibles, the payroll taxes paid by employees and employers are each increased by one-fourth of 1 percent beginning in 1963, with an additional increase of one-eighth of 1 percent in 1972. Similar increases of three-eighths of 1 percent and three-sixteenths of 1 percent are made in taxes paid by the self-employed. These increases derive the equivalent of 0.70 percent of payroll on a level premium basis.

Benefits for those not eligible for OASI benefits would also be paid out of the medical insurance trust fund, but the cost of such benefits would be financed out of general revenue.

COVERAGE

Out of an estimated 16 million persons 65 and over, 12.3 million would be eligible. Excluded are 2.2 million on old-age assistance; over 1 million have earnings over $3,000; and more than one-half million are covered under other Federal programs.

SCOPE OF BENEFITS

Eligible individuals may choose one of three optional programs: (a) Preventive, diagnostic and short-term illness benefits with specified services; (b) long-term illness benefits with specified services; (c) private insurance benefits, under which the cost of a private insurance plan, up to a maximum of $100 per year, is paid for.

Benefits specified under the preventive short-term care plan: (a) 21 days of hospital care; (b) 63 days of nursing home care less any days of hospitalization at a ratio of 3 nursing home days per hospital day; (c) physicians services for 12 days: (d) first $100 of costs for ambulatory diagnostic, laboratory and X-ray services; and (e) 24 days of visiting nurse or other home health care services.

Benefits specified per year under the catastrophic long-term or chronic illness plan—80 percent of the following costs, after payment of the first $125 of medical expenses: (a) 120 days of hospital care; (b) surgical service provided in hospital; (c) full nursing home services; (d) full visiting nurse or other home health care services.

Private insurance benefits—payment to the insurance carrier of premiums on a noncancellable private health insurance policy of which an eligible individual is the beneficiary, not to exceed $100 per year.

The program is to be administered by the States under agreement with the Secretary of HEW, or by the Secretary if he is unable to conclude an agreement. States are to be reimbursed by the Federal Medical Insurance Trust Fund, and are authorized to augment benefits under the same administration if they assume the costs of the added program.

An Advisory Council on Health Insurance shall be established in the Department of HEW to advise the Secretary on general policies and administration of the program.

EFFECTIVE DATE: JULY 1, 1963

An individual would be retired if: (i) his income did not exceed $3,000 or $4,500 in combined income with his spouse, in his last taxable year; or (ii) he files a sworn statement that for the taxable year in which he applies for health care insurance benefits, his income will not exceed $3,000 or $4,500 for a married couple; or (iii) he had attained age 72.

IMPROVED MASS TRANSPORTATION SERVICES IN CERTAIN METROPOLITAN AREAS—AMENDMENT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I am today submitting a substitute measure amending my bill, S. 2390, to authorize a new program of Federal guarantees for qualified revenue bonds issued by local public transit agencies for the purpose of financing construction of new mass rapid transit systems.

We recognize that the economic health of our major metropolitan centers, the nerve centers of our Nation, is a matter of critical national concern and that such economic health is today threatened by inadequate mass transportation services. For that reason, we included in the omnibus housing bill passed last year a program of loans and grants to help stimulate development of modern and efficient mass transit systems.

In this new legislation introduced today, I suggest a new approach to this problem which would limit outright expenditures from the Federal Treasury and offer an alternative of Federal guarantees for locally issued bonds for those cities that can qualify.

This measure would create a $1 million Federal transit revenue bond guarantee fund administered under the Housing and Home Finance Agency. At such time as payments on locally issued revenue bonds guaranteed by the HHFA Administrator might fall behind, this fund would provide necessary costs for meeting the Federal guarantee.

This legislation spells out explicit standards to be met by local public transit agencies seeking eligibility for such Federal guarantees.

These agencies must have approved engineering reports, independent engineering opinions when required, evidence of sufficient statutory authority, evidence of financial resources, and so forth. Revenue bonds shall bear interest at an average rate not to exceed 3¾ percent per annum and shall have maturity dates not in excess of 50 years.

An important additional qualification calls for local agencies to agree that facilities of mass transit systems, such as subway tunnels, will be made available to any appropriate Federal agency or agencies for military or civilian defense purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Address entitled "The Role of Government in Education," delivered by Senator RANDOLPH at the National Conference on Curriculum Experimentation, Center for Continuation Study, University of Minnesota, on September 28, 1961; and a letter written by five Minnesota educators.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Remarks by Senator RANDOLPH at the dedication of the National Computer Center of Internal Revenue Service at Martinsburg, W. Va.; remarks of the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, at the dedication of the Internal Revenue Service National Computer Center, Martinsburg, W. Va.; remarks by Mortimer M. Caplin, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, at the dedication of the Internal Revenue Service National Computer Center, Martinsburg, W. Va.; and address by John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission regarding the role of the Federal Government in pioneering computer applications.

By Mr. WILEY:

Summary of proposals to meet the challenges of 1962 and promote peace and progress.

EULOGIES FOR THE LATE SENATOR STYLES BRIDGES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I announce to the Senate that eulogies for our late and beloved colleague Senator STYLES BRIDGES will be on January 17, next Wednesday, beginning at 1:30 p.m.

REMARKS TO THE DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 10, 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks which I delivered to the Senate Democratic conference on January 10, 1962, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

Today marks the beginning of the 2d session of the 87th Congress. On January 20, the 35th President will begin his 2d year in the White House. Those figures—35 Presidents, 87 Congresses—give one a sense of the continuity and the stability of our form of government.

The past year has witnessed another aspect of American democracy: its vigor. It was a year of achievement, marked by the President's increasing popular support and evident command of his office; marked also by the effective and responsible cooperation of this body.

To Democrats in Congress, the President's strength in the country—the confidence people have in his ability to lead us in the very tumultuous world we inhabit—is an asset of incalculable value.

It means that the climate for progressive legislation is good. It means that the country can face its problems with greater unity. And it means that Democrats will enter the 1962 elections supported by a public servant whose leadership is firmly approved by the electorate.

I think this conference of Democratic Senators can take a few bows itself, when we talk about public support. The two recent Gallup polls make good reading: one of them showed 79 percent of the people approving the way the President is handling his job; the other showed that 78 percent of the people believe the Democratic Party is best able to handle the problems they consider of paramount importance. I don't believe either one of these figures would have been nearly so high if the men in this room had performed less responsibly last year. In the check-and-balance system we serve under, the thoughtful cooperation of the Congress is essential for good government, and the public knows it. You provided it.

I do not think we should be troubled by the President's figure of 79 percent support, while the party at large drew only 78 percent. The difference is Caroline, and there's nothing we can do about it.

Let me take a few moments to go over some of the achievements of the last session in the domestic field. They include several laws of considerable importance to the country's present and future, and it is worth recalling what those are:

The area redevelopment program was established for economically distressed areas.

The minimum wage was increased to $1.25 per hour, and more than 3½ million workers were brought under wage and hour protection for the first time.

The social security program was liberalized, benefits to widows increased, and men permitted reduced benefits on retirement at 62.

A far-reaching housing act was adopted, providing, for the first time, long-term, low-interest housing for middle-income families.

Assistance was provided for the dependent children of needy unemployed parents.

A highly successful feed grains program was enacted.

The highway and airport acts were extended and improved.

A realistic water pollution control program—that is, one that can begin to meet community needs—was adopted.

The Senate passed a manpower retraining program which will help those men threatened with the loss of their jobs to machines to develop new skills.

A mass transportation program was put underway.

In the field of natural resources, the Senate passed major legislation affecting wilderness and shoreline areas; created a great oceanographic research program; and stepped up the Government's work in saline water conversion.

Five major agency reorganization plans went into effect.

Federal criminal law was strengthened, particularly in the antigambling area.

The Senate adopted a large-scale aid to education program, the debate on which will serve to instruct many Congresses to come. That is a partial account of the work you did in the domestic area. In defense and foreign policy matters, the record was equally outstanding. Congress approved of the principle of long-term commitments to the mutual security program; appropriated $600 million for aid to Latin America; created the Disarmament Agency and the Peace Corps; approved the creation of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; and, because it accepted the philosophy of Winston Churchill and John F. Kennedy, that, we should "arm to parley"—Congress gave the President what he asked for in military weapons and personnel.

Speaking of defense, I want to say a word about our military preparedness as we enter 1962. I expect most of you have been impressed, as I have, with the competence and drive of the Defense Establishment during the past year. It has clearly become, in the words of the Secretary of Defense, a more effective instrument of our foreign policy. In his report to the people last week, Secretary McNamara listed a number of accomplishments during 1961.

There has been a 50-percent increase in the portion of our strategic bombing force on 15-minute alert.

The size of the Polaris submarine force to be available by the end of 1964 has been increased by 50 percent.

There has been a 100-percent increase in our capacity to produce Minuteman missiles.

There have been substantial increases in the number of ready combat units and antiguerrilla forces, and in our airlift and sealift capacity to move these forces where they are needed.

Gains have been made in organization: in creating a Defense Intelligence Agency, a Defense Supply Agency, in planning and budgetary controls, and in the creation of a Strike Command combining the strategic Army and the Tactical Air Force.

The events of 1961 proved again how important our defense preparedness is to the security of the world. We suffered setbacks and frustrations in the world last year; Berlin and southeast Asia gave us many anxious days, and will continue to do so; and yet I believe the efforts made to strengthen our military forces during the year—including the sacrifices made by the Reserve and National Guard units called up in the autumn—resulted in a world picture on New Year's Day somewhat brighter than we expected it to be last summer.

In these times it is a commonplace to say that much work lies ahead to make free institutions safer and free people more prosperous. Nevertheless it is true; we turn from a heavy calendar of work in 1961 to an equally heavy one in the session ahead. We have profoundly important decisions to make in the field of international trade. We face great questions of tax policy, medical assistance to the aged, higher education—to suggest only a few of those matters on the horizon at this moment. We must expect other questions of urgency during the session, as critical as those we know about now.

In the resolution of these matters, I remind you again that I am your servant—as nearly as I can be, your advocate in discussions at the White House, and your representative in scheduling the business of the Senate. I learned a good deal about the Senate last year, and I expect to learn a good deal more this year—and indeed I should, because I am instructed in the subject by an incomparable faculty. I may add that, so far as I have anything to say about it, classes will usually end in time for dinner.

Before I close I want to say a word about our relations with the President. If my opinion of him is not already clear, I will spell it out: He has the capacity to be one of our greatest chief executives. I believe he will offer us this year, as he did in 1961, a sound program for America. I expect to be one of the most consistent supporters of that program in the Congress. I hope he will find the great majority of his party behind him when it counts. But I say again, as I did in our initial meeting last year, that the President is no admirer of monolithic thinking. He was too long a Member of Congress to believe that all wisdom resides in the executive branch. The best service we can render the President, and the country at large, is to speak our minds after mature reflection, and to make such laws as our conscience and reason demand.

No one in this room, and certainly no one in the White House, conceives that the world's gravest problems will be settled by the fiat of the President, or the bills and resolutions of the Congress. There are those who believe the President should propose a recipe for instant utopia, and that Congress should then be challenged to cook it. In my opinion that recipe has not been found, and the President will be suspicious of anything put up as qualifying for it. He knows that advances in human affairs are made painstakingly, by the cooperation and hard work of men of good will. I believe he will receive both from the Senate this year.

FOREIGN AND DEFENSE POLICY REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL POLICY MACHINERY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on November 15, 1961, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, released a final statement bringing to a close the subcommittee's nonpartisan study of how our Government can best staff and organize itself to develop and execute foreign and defense policy.

The statement of the Senator from Washington sets forth and comments upon 10 major conclusions which he drew from the study.

This 2-year subcommittee inquiry represents the first comprehensive review of the national security policymaking process undertaken since the passage of the National Security Act of 1947. The subcommittee held some 50 hearings, beginning with testimony of the Honorable Robert A. Lovett, on February 23, 1960, and ending with the appearance of Secretary of State Rusk on August 24, 1961. The subcommittee issued six staff reports containing detailed findings and recommendations for corrective action. Many of the recommendations contained in these reports and in the final statement of the Senator from Washington have been adopted by the administration; others are under study.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the closing statement of the Senator from Washington together with a representative group of editorials commenting upon this significant and successful inquiry.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINAL STATEMENT OF SENATOR HENRY M. JACKSON, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL POLICY MACHINERY

Freemen are locked in a struggle being waged on the earth's continents, in the depths of its seas, and in the reaches of space.

Our Communist foes acknowledge no bounds except those imposed on them by expediency. They draw Twenty-Year Plans portraying a Communist utopia in 1981—while they build walls around their unwilling subjects in 1961. In their pursuit of power, they debase language itself. "Democracy," in their lexicon, becomes the rule of the few over the many. "Peace" becomes the surrender of freemen to Communist domination.

The question is this: Can free societies outplan, outperform, outlast—and if need be, outsacrifice—totalitarian systems? Can we recognize fresh problems in a changing world—and respond in time with new plans for meeting them?

The requirements of national security press ever more strongly on our resources. Can we establish a proper scale of priorities which separates the necessary from the not really essential?

Program choice grows ever harder. Can we establish the right mix of military and economic aid? How are we to choose between competing multibillion dollar weapon systems?

Presidential control over foreign policy and defense programs becomes more difficult. How may the globe-girdling programs of the national security departments and agencies be harnessed on behalf of the Presidential purpose? How can we assure their efficient execution?

Standards of performance adequate for quieter times will no longer do. The Presidency and State and Defense and the rest of our Government must now meet new tests of excellence.

Some 2 years ago the Senate of the United States established the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery and asked it to make a nonpartisan study of how well our Government is now staffed and organized to meet the challenge of world communism.

The subcommitee solicited the views of the ranking authorities in our Nation. Its staff prepared background studies on the problem of the inquiry, and the subcommittee held extensive hearings, during which distinguished witnesses gave generously of their counsel.

Over the past year, the subcommittee has issued a series of staff reports with detailed findings and suggestions for corrective action. The studies have found an interested audience in the Government, in the academic community, and among private citizens. Many of the recommendations contained in these reports have been adopted by the administration; others are being weighed.

The subcommittee inquiry is now ended.

Certain broad conclusions have come home to me from our study.

First. We need a clearer understanding of where our vital national interests lie and what we must do to promote them.

Faulty machinery is rarely the real culprit when our policies are inconsistent or when they lack sustained forward momentum. The underlying cause is normally found elsewhere. It consists in the absence of a clear sense of direction and coherence of policy at the top of the government.

Unless our top officials are in basic agreement about what is paramount for the national interest—what comes first and what comes second—there is bound to be drift and confusion below. This has been so under every administration.

In our system, two men bear the heaviest responsibility for giving our national security policy focus and structure. One is the President. The other is his first adviser—the Secretary of State.

A clear and reasoned formulation of national policy, and its effective communication downward, is the prerequisite of successful delegation and coordination.

There is still much to be done in defining our vital interests and developing a basic national policy which supports them.

Second. Radical additions to our existing policy machinery are unnecessary and undesirable.

Our best hope lies in making our traditional policy machinery work better—not in trading it in for some new model.

The subcommittee inquiry brought to light scores of plans for novel changes in the policy process. They include proposals for a so-called First Secretary of the Government who would stand between the President and his Cabinet chiefs, large planning staffs attached to the White House or the National Security Council, cold war strategy boards and councils of wise men.

Such proposals have certain weaknesses in common: They try to do at the Presidential level things which can better be done by the departments and agencies; they violate sound administrative practice by tending to interpose officials between the President and his key Cabinet officials; they rest on the mistaken assumption that the weaknesses of one organization can be cured by creating another.

In fact, any proposals for net additions to our present national policy machinery should be greeted with a basic skepticism.

This is particularly true of suggestions for new committees. Committee killing, not creating more committees, remains the important job.

Properly managed, and chaired by officials with responsibility for decision and action, committees can be useful in helping make sure that voices that should be heard are heard. But a very high percentage of committees exact a heavy toll by diluting the authority of individual executives, obscuring responsibility for getting things done, and generally slowing decisionmaking.

Third. The heart problem of national security is not reorganization—it is getting our best people into key foreign policy and defense posts.

Good national security policy requires both good policymakers and good policy machinery. But organizational changes cannot solve problems which are really not due to organizational weaknesses.

More often than not, poor decisions are traceable not to machinery but to people—to their inexperience, their failure to comprehend the full significance of information crossing their desks, to their indecisiveness or lack of wisdom.

Fourth. There is serious overstaffing in the national security departments and agencies.

The caliber of the national service is impressively high.

But like so many large private organizations, our Government faces the problem of people engaged in work that does not really need doing. The size of the national security departments and agencies has swelled out of proportion even to the increased number and complexity of our problems.

The payroll costs, although formidable, are less important than the price paid in sluggishness of decision and action. Unnecessary people make for unnecessary layering, unnecessary clearances and concurrences, and unnecessary intrusions on the time of officials working on problems of real importance.

Many offices have reached and passed the point where the quantity of staff reduces the quality of the product.

Occasional swings of the personnel ax, accompanied by much fanfare, yield more in headlines than in lasting results. The fight against overstaffing must be waged each day anew.

Fifth. The career services should be made better training grounds for posts of national security leadership.

Our career services are not producing enough officials with the large executive talents, the breadth of experience, and the width of perspective needed in top foreign policy and defense posts.

A program for improvement should give officials of exceptional promise much greater flexibility and latitude in job assignments; it should stress movement of personnel between agencies; it should offer more opportunities for advanced training of the kind made available by our most efficient private corporations.

And above all, we require higher salaries at the top of the civil service and at the sub-Cabinet level. The present pay scales are dropping further and further behind those obtaining in private life—not only in business but increasingly also in the academic world. These inadequate salaries discourage too many able people from entering government service and encourage too many to leave it.

Sixth. We should reduce the needless barriers which stand in the way of private citizens called to national duty.

Our system of government uniquely depends upon the contributions of distinguished citizens temporarily in high government posts, who come from and return to private life—the Stimsons, the Forrestals, and the Lovetts.

In time of hot war, we let no obstacle stand in the way of getting our ablest people to work in the Government. But in this cold war, whose outcome will be equally fateful for the Nation, we tolerate pointless impediments to public service.

The present conflict of interest laws are a prime example. We will always need regulations to deter or penalize the rare official who tries to use his public office for private gain. But the laws now on the books are archaic—most go back to the Civil War. They are more responsive to the problems of the 1860's than the 1960's, and they often make it unduly hard for outstanding people to accept government posts. The job of updating these laws should be completed.

Seventh. Used properly, the National Security Council can be of great value as an advisory body to the President.

The true worth of the Council lies in being an accustomed place where the President can join with his chief advisers in searching examination and debate of the "great choices" of national security policy. These may be long-term strategic alternatives or crisis problems demanding immediate action. The Council provides a means of bringing the full implications of policy alternatives out on the table, and a vehicle through which the President can inform his lieutenants of his decisions and the chain of reasoning behind them.

The pitfalls to be avoided are clearly marked: At one extreme, overinstitutionalization of the NSC system—with overly elaborate procedures, and the overproduction of routine papers. At the other extreme, excessive informality—with Council meetings tending in the direction of official bull sessions.

Eighth. No task is more urgent than improving the effectiveness of the Department of State.

In our system, there can be no satisfactory substitute for a Secretary of State willing and able to exercise his leadership across the full range of national security matters, as they relate to foreign policy. The Secretary, assisted by his Department, must bear the chief responsibility for bringing new policy initiatives to the President's desk, and for overseeing and coordinating our manifold foreign policy activities on the President's behalf.

State is not doing enough in asserting its leadership across the whole front of foreign policy. Neither is it doing enough in staffing itself for such leadership.

State needs more respect for comprehensive forward planning. The Department as a whole attaches too little importance to looking ahead in foreign policy, and is too wedded to a philosophy of reacting to problems as they arise. The Policy Planning Council is not now in the mainstream of policymaking.

State needs more officials who are good executive managers—and who are broadly experienced in dealing with the full range of national security problems which now engage the Department. The administration of foreign policy has become "big business." This places a high premium on the ability to manage large-scale enterprises—to make decisions promptly and decisively, to delegate, and to monitor.

This need for "take charge" men is particularly urgent down through the Assistant Secretary level and at our large missions abroad. Round pegs in square holes are a luxury we cannot afford.

Ninth. We need a stronger, not a weaker, Bureau of the Budget.

Rich as we are, we cannot do all the things we would like to do to assure the national safety and provide for the general welfare.

The job of the President is to rank the competing claims on our resources in terms of their national importance—to distinguish between what cannot wait and what can wait.

The budgetary process is the President's most helpful tool in establishing such an order of national priorities, and in seeing to it that the operating programs of the departments and agencies conform to these priorities.

In this task, the President needs the help of a Bureau of the Budget staffed still more strongly than it now is with officials who can interpret agency programs in terms of their contributions to the President's overall goals.

The danger is always present that Bureau members will become champions of their own, rather than the President's program preferences. A strong Bureau requires strong Presidential control.

Tenth. The Congress should put its own house in better order.

Although the subcommittee inquiry was directed toward the executive branch, there is clearly much room for improvement on Capitol Hill.

One major problem is fragmentation. The Congress is hard put to deal with national security policy as a whole.

The difficulty starts with the executive branch. Except in the state of the Union and the budget messages, it presents national security information and program requests to the Congress in bits and pieces.

The present mode of operation of the congressional system compounds the problem. The authorization process treats as separable matters which are not really separable. Foreign affairs, defense matters, space policies, and atomic energy programs are handled in different committees. It is the same with money matters. Income and outgo, and the relation of each to the economy, come under different jurisdictions.

There is no place in the Congress, short of the floors of the Senate and the House, where the requirements of national security and the resources needed on their behalf, are considered in their totality.

The need is to give the Congress, early in each session, better opportunities to review our national security programs as a whole.

For its part, the executive branch can take the initiative by presenting our national security requirements as a package, with dollar signs attached. To put these requirements in better perspective, the Secretaries of State and Defense and other ranking officials could make themselves available for joint appearances on the Hill.

The Congress should move in parallel. At the beginning of each session, it can encourage its authorizing committees to meet jointly to take testimony on the full scope and broad thrust of our national security programs. A closer partnership can be urged upon the revenue and expenditure committees. And parent committees can undertake to secure more comprehensive briefings on programs before dividing them up among the subcommittees for detailed analysis.

One last point: Too many people believe that the cards are stacked in favor of totalitarian systems in the cold war. Nothing could be more wrong.

Democracies headline their difficulties and mistakes; dictatorships hide theirs. The archives of Nazi Germany told a story of indecision and ineptitude in policymaking on a scale never approached by our own Nation.

The words spoken by Robert Lovett at the first hearing of the subcommittee are still the right words:

"While the challenges of the moment are most serious in a policymaking sense, I see no reason for black despair or for defeatist doubts as to what our system of government or this country can do. We can do whatever we have to do in order to survive and to meet any form of economic or political competition we are likely to face. All this we can do with one proviso: we must be willing to do our best."

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON SENATOR JACKSON'S FINAL STATEMENT, SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL POLICY MACHINERY

[From the High Point (N.C.) Enterprise, Nov. 20, 1961]

JACKSON GROUP NAILS FAULTY GOVERNMENTAL MACHINERY

An unrelenting group is the Jackson committee, at least its chairman, HENRY M. JACKSON.

And well may it be.

Despite the fact the Kennedy administration has adopted bodily at least a dozen of its major recommendations, that group comes now clamoring for still more that somehow got pigeonholed in Washington.

In a pointed statement, the committee is urging the administration to:

1. Trim seriously overstaffed defense agencies.
2. Raise top Federal pay.
3. Remove barriers which exclude able private citizens from public service.
4. Call upon the State Department to assume more leadership in the making of national security policy.

Nobody, except the purely political minded who cling to the idea that to the victor belong the spoils, should find much wrong with those propositions. And especially can we agree with the timely observation that the State Department needs to be less wedded to the philosophy of reacting to problems as they arise. Good government needs men who can look down the road, see what's ahead, and get into position to deal with it effectively.

It is something of a valedictory by a committee that has been described as one of the most scholarly and nonpartisan investigators in modern congressional history. Officially the Jackson committee is a Subcommittee on Government Policy Machinery, but it has touched vitally internal concerns at a time when external matters hold the spotlight.

Its observation that faulty governmental machinery is rarely the real culprit when our policies are inconsistent or when they lack sustained forward momentum may amount to locking the barn door after the horse is stolen, but that shouldn't be the case. It is late, but not too late, for the Nation's taking seriously the Jackson report.

[From the Kinston (N.C.) Free Press, Nov. 20, 1961]

COMMITTEE'S SUGGESTIONS SHOULD BE ADOPTED

The Jackson committee, a Senate group charged with making a detailed study for the administration on government policy machinery, has offered some pertinent advice in its windup statement. The group is headed by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington.

The committee wants the administration to trim the "seriously overstaffed defense agencies, to raise top Federal pay and to remove barriers which exclude able private citizens from public service." It also called on the State Department to assume more leadership in the making of national security policy and to be less wedded to the philosophy of reacting to problems as they arise.

The conclusion of this study, which has been described as one of the most significant and nonpartisan studies in modern congressional history, stressed the need for top officials to be in accord on the matters pertaining to paramount national interest. The chairman emphasized that unless the top leaders concur confusion is bound to follow in the lower ranks of Government service.

The Kennedy administration has already adopted 10 or more suggestions by the group and will have opportunity to act on other suggestions. Among the items set forth in the windup statement for improving policy machinery were the following:

1. The Government must eliminate personnel in national security departments and agencies which are "doing work that does not really need doing."

2. The conflict-of-interest laws, some dating back to the Civil War, contain "pointless impediments to public service."

3. The State Department "is not doing enough in asserting its leadership across the full range of national security matters as they relate to foreign policy * * * neither is it doing enough in staffing itself for such leadership."

4. "We need a stronger, not a weaker, Bureau of the Budget." The Bureau is the President's most helpful tool in determining which national needs come first, the chairman pointed out.

5. "Congress should put its own house in better order." Because of the "fragmentation" resulting from the committee system, Congress never deals with national security problems as a whole, Senator JACKSON declared.

The report also recommended that the authorizing committees of the House and Senate meet jointly at the start of each session to hear testimony on the full scope and broad thrust of our national security programs.

The committee has struck at many of the basic needs in the matter of policymaking. The implementation of these suggestions should be welcomed by all in Government and out who are concerned for America's survival.

[From the Olympia (Wash.) Daily Olympian, Nov. 20, 1961]

TOO MANY COMMITTEES

How can a free government organize itself to outplan and outperform totalitarianism and achieve security in freedom?

Two years ago, a Senate group—headed by our HENRY M. JACKSON—tackled this challenging question. The solons and their staff interviewed hundreds of past and present Government officials and students of policymaking procedures. They held more than 50 hearings. As a result, the bipartisan Senate team has come up with some answers which are well worth considering.

An example from the Senators' final report: "We need a clearer understanding of where our vital national interests lie and what we must do to promote them." This, the committee said, is the responsibility of the President and the Secretary of State. JACKSON added: "Unless our top officials are in basic agreement about what is paramount for the national interest—what comes first and what comes second—there is bound to be drift and confusion below. This has been so under every administration."

The answer, the Senators assert, is in better performance by people—not changes in procedure. Or, in JACKSON'S words: "Our best hope lies in making our traditional policy machinery work better—not in trading it in for some new model. Committee killing, not creating more committees, remains the most important job. Committees exact a heavy toll by diluting authority of individual executives, obscuring responsibility for getting things done, and generally slowing decisionmaking."

The Senators said Federal national security departments and agencies are seriously overstaffed. "Many offices," JACKSON reports, "have reached the point where the quantity of staff reduces the quality of the product." While urging a reduction in the number of employees, the Senators urge higher salaries for those needed to do the job. "Inadequate salaries," JACKSON said, "discourage too many able people from entering Government service and encourage too many to leave it."

Sharp criticism was aimed by the Senators at our diplomatic service. The report says: "No task is more urgent than improving the effectiveness of the Department of State. The need for "take charge" men is particularly urgent down through the Assistant Secretary level and at our large missions abroad. Round pegs in square holes are a luxury we cannot afford."

Playing no favorites, the Senators then declared: "The Congress should put its own house in better order. One major problem is fragmentation. Congress is hard put to deal with national security policy as a whole. Foreign affairs, defense matters, space policies and atomic energy programs are handled in different committees. It is the same with money. Income and outgo, and the relation of each to the economy, come under different jurisdictions. The need is to give Congress, early in the session, better opportunities to review our national security program as a whole."

The Senators' task was to put a finger on Federal Government operations which need improvement. But 2 years of digging did not leave them disheartened. JACKSON'S closing words are these: "Too many people believe that the cards are stacked in favor of the totalitarian systems in the cold war. Nothing could be more wrong."

The committee has done a remarkable job of assaying the Nation's political machinery. Prompt action to implement many of its recommendations should be taken by both the administrative and legislative branches of the Federal Government. Furthermore, the portions of the report concerning committees and overstaffed agencies should be studied thoroughly by those who run the State's government in Olympia.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Nov. 21, 1961]

HOOVER REPORT BY JACKSON

For a couple of years, Senator JACKSON, of Washington, has been head of a special Senate committee examining the overall structure of the Government, and how it performs, chiefly with relation to national security.

The several reports filed by the committee should be required reading—and permanent guides—for all top officials.

The final sum-up boils down to these points:

There is serious overstaffing which leads to sluggishness in decisions and action. What the Government needs is better people, not more. Too many are doing work "that does not really need doing." Quantity of staff reduces the quality of the product.

Congress itself works by a process of fragmentation—committees working independently, too many jurisdictions, not enough partnership. Congress doesn't look at problems as a whole, only piecemeal.

The Jackson reports are the result of knowledgeable thinking, more than anything else. They are an attempt to give the Government direction.

President Kennedy has applauded the Jackson reports. And his administration, judging by the record to date, is especially in need of the main text. The burden of the report, as we read it, is an argument against going off in too many directions at once. In a word: First things first.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Nov. 21, 1961]

BETTER GOVERNMENT WITH FEWER PEOPLE

The departments and agencies concerned with national security, Senator JACKSON says, need fewer and better people.

His bipartisan Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery has just completed 2 years of study and hearings, and his conclusions merit respect. His charges of serious overstaffing no doubt reflect the bureaucratic tendency, when faced with a crisis, to add bodies, multiply reports and divide responsibility. Getting better people—which he calls the heart problem of national security—is a perennial challenge.

Government has to compete for talent, and it does not always win the competition. One thing that should be done, as Senator Jackson points out, is to modernize the present confusion of conflict-of-interest laws, which were designed for other eras and too often work unnecessary hardships.

The State Department comes in for special criticism. The Senator charges that it "is not doing enough in asserting its leadership across the whole front of foreign policy," nor is it staffing itself for such leadership; then it attaches "too little importance to looking ahead in foreign policy, and is too wedded to a philosophy of reacting to problems as they arise." The Policy Planning Council—which is supposed to be concerned with long-range policy formulation—is not now in the main stream of policymaking.

These are serious charges, though when crisis piles on crisis there is a natural human tendency to neglect long-range planning in favor of short-range maneuver. Long-range planning requires the luxury of a perspective relatively detached from the press of daily problems. Yet these plans need the close personal attention of the top policymakers—who themselves cannot escape the press of more immediate crises.

There is no perfect solution, short of breeding a race of supermen. But Senator Jackson is convinced that more can be done by strengthening the State Department qualitatively, particularly at the assistant secretary level. If it were in the main stream of policymaking, no doubt the Policy Planning Council could function more effectively in planning for the future crisis rather than, as too often is the case now, being swamped by the problems of today.

In calling for a stronger Budget Bureau, Senator Jackson recognizes the value of budgetmaking as an exercise in the determination of priorities. Making the career services better training grounds for national security leadership, as he urges, would both boost morale and broaden the selection base for top posts. But the key problem does remain recruiting the best people for jobs crucial to the Nation's future—and then using them.

[From the Evening Star, Nov. 21, 1961]

TO MEET TODAY'S TESTS

Senator Jackson has submitted a commendably brief, but effective, summation of the 2-year Senate subcommittee study on how well our Government is staffed and organized to meet the challenge of world communism.

The Washington Democrat, who is chairman of the subcommittee, bypasses the temptation which so often appeals to students of government, namely, of suggesting that a little, or a lot, of reorganization or expansion surely would make everything work better. In fact, he refers with a blunt sort of contempt to the scores of plans for novel changes in Federal policymaking machinery—ranging from a so-called first secretary of Government to "councils of wise men."

It is his own opinion, he makes clear, that there is less fault to find with the machinery than with the people who staff it. On this score, he starts at the very top by pointing out that it is the primary responsibility of the President and the Secretary of State to give "focus and structure" to our national security policy. From this level on down, the Senator points out, "standards of performance adequate for quieter times will no longer do." And while he describes the caliber of the national service as "impressively high," Mr. Jackson is frankly critical of the lack of "take charge" men in the national security agencies and in the State Department, of unnecessary people doing unnecessary work and even intruding unnecessarily on the time of others who are working on the problems of real importance. As one means of getting the better people, the Senator very soundly proposes an end to some of the "pointless impediments to public service"—such as outdated conflict-of-interest laws—and an upgrading of top Government salaries.

If there is a note of indignation in some of Senator Jackson's criticism, however, there also is one of sound confidence that our system is not second to that of totalitarianism in either hot or cold war. We can, he suggests, do whatever we need to do to meet any kind of competition. Correcting some of the shortcomings which he has pointed out would make us even better able to face these tests.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Nov. 21, 1961]

UNCOMPLICATED SENSE

Senator Henry M. Jackson has advanced some suggestions for the improvement of our creaking national policymaking machinery which appear to be based on good, uncomplicated hard sense. The recommendations are said to represent a consensus of a Senate subcommittee which Jackson headed and which has completed a 2-year study of the system under which our foreign and national security policy is evolved.

Senator Jackson and the subcommittee rejected the temptation to blame everything on the inherent differences between a free and totalitarian society. They also rejected the view that the only solution lies in complete reorganization under a new post of first secretary of the government.

Our basic system is fine, they said, but added that it has some weak points which can and should be corrected. These weak points are overfragmentation and the failure to place topflight men to key positions.

Overfragmentization is reflected by the existence of numerous agencies and committees, many of which are overstaffed, which complicate but contribute little to the policymaking procedures, they said. It also is reflected by the fact that Congress gets its information in "bits and pieces." Senator Jackson recommended joint appearances by Government officials before joint committees of Congress.

More capable men could be placed in the key positions, he said, by revision of the outdated and overly restrictive conflict-of-interest laws and by making the career services better training grounds for leadership posts. Once there, they should be given more responsibility.

The State Department, he said, must assert a stronger leadership across the whole front of foreign policy and must formulate a clear and definite national policy instead of reacting, as it does now, to individual problems as they arise.

[From the Durham (N.C.) Herald, Nov. 21, 1961]

LOOKING TO BETTER GOVERNMENT

The final report of the Government Policy Machinery Subcommittee, headed by Senator Jackson, Democrat, of Washington, looks in the direction of a stronger administration, to be gained by eliminating workers not needed and attracting abler citizens to public service, and a more unified and coherent congressional operation.

The objectives of the report will arouse widespread public support. Because they call for upsetting bureaucratic practices and for changes in the established way of doing things, their realization may prove difficult.

In the first recommendation of this final report, the committee attacks a situation much criticized by the public: the employment of unnecessary workers in Government departments and agencies. Employees in national security departments and agencies "doing work that does not really need doing" must be eliminated, the Jackson committee declares. Such elimination will enable these departments and agencies to concentrate on essential work. Unnecessary work not only calls for workers who are not needed, but it also claims an undue amount of the time and consideration of department and agency heads. No one realizes better than the person doing it that the work is unnecessary; and the worker then goes to great lengths to justify his work—and his job—in the eyes of his superiors.

The other aspect of the personnel recommendations concerns attracting more able citizens into Government service. The steps to accomplish this would be a revision of the conflict-of-interest laws, to remove "pointless impediments to public service," and raising the pay for higher positions in Government service.

The committee has proposed no radical changes. What it suggests merits sympathetic consideration; some of its proposals are clearly advantageous, and their adoption would enable the Government to operate more efficiently. The Jackson committee study has been worthwhile; its findings look not only to making Government more efficient but also to making it operate with greater consideration of the public interest.

[From the Carbondale (Ill.) Southern Illinoisan, Nov. 22, 1961]

BETTER PEOPLE IN CIVIL SERVICE

Much of the criticism of the U.S. State Department contained in the final summary of a 2-year study of national security policy machinery by a Senate subcommittee has its roots in a problem common to all Government departments. This is recruiting and holding able personnel.

Senator Henry M. Jackson, Democrat, of Washington, chairman of the subcommittee, said in the report that the State Department is not "doing enough in staffing itself for * * * leadership" across the whole front of foreign policy.

"State needs more officials who are good executive managers—and who are broadly experienced in dealing with the full range of national security problems which now engage the Department," the Senator said. "The administration of foreign policy has become 'big business.' "

There can be no argument with the contention that the State Department, and Government generally, needs able and experienced managers and leaders. The question arises, however, where these are to be obtained. There is no shortage of capable administration in the United States. Whether these individuals are willing to accept governmental posts is another question.

Businessmen who must expect to absorb personal financial losses when they take Government positions must have compelling reasons to feel that they are contributing something eminently worthwhile to the national welfare, and that their service is needed and appreciated.

At the lower echelons of public service, pay and other incentives must be such as to attract capable personnel from private employment.

The subcommittee's complaint that the career civil service is not producing enough officials with large executive talents reflects the inadequacy of a system in which relatively low pay as compared to private opportunities, and conflict-of-interest laws "discourage too many able people from entering Government service and encourage too many to leave it."

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) News, Nov. 22, 1961]

THE FINDINGS OF A 2-YEAR STUDY: FEDERAL MACHINERY SOUND—IT NEEDS BETTER OPERATORS

After one of the most thorough and objective studies ever undertaken on the congressional level, the Senate's special Subcommittee on Government Policy Machinery has issued a final report reflecting steady confidence in the American governmental system.

For the last 2 years the subcommittee, headed by Senator Henry Jackson, Democrat, of Washington, has looked for ways our Government could better organize itself to cope with seemingly more efficient totalitarian systems. In its previous findings and in 10 broad recommendations contained in the final report, it has repeatedly struck two general themes:

Our basic national policy machinery is sound. There are weaknesses which should be corrected, but more harm than help would come from a radical overhaul or from extensive new additions to the machinery.

More often than not, the weaknesses in generating and carrying out national policy are traceable not to the machinery but to the people running it. The key to improvement lies in quality of personnel.

Said Senator Jackson in the final report:

"Our best hope lies in making our traditional policy machinery work better, not in trading it in for some new model. Committee killing, not creating more committees, remains the important job.

"Unless our top officials are in basic agreement about what is paramount for the national interest—what comes first and what comes second—there is bound to be drift and confusion below."

Here is a statement that deserves to become a national motto, both in and out of government. It should be etched in every high place where the all-too-human tendency is toward indecision and diffusion of responsibility.

The Jackson committee view in this respect is actually an extension of a number of recommendations it made last year. Largely because of them, top Washington officials quietly dropped a proposal that had been made for creation of a First Secretary of the Government, who would supervise national security affairs for the President. And in its first days the Kennedy administration streamlined the National Security Council and abolished more than 1,000 interagency and advisory committees.

In its final report the Jackson committee aimed especially strong comments at the State Department.

"State is not doing enough in asserting its leadership across the whole front of foreign policy," it said. "Neither is it doing enough in staffing itself for such leadership. * * * The Department as a whole attaches too little importance to looking ahead in foreign policy, and it too often is wedded to a philosophy of reacting to problems as they arise."

The committee did not criticize Mr. Rusk or any Secretary of State by name. Its criticism, though, adds up to a warning to the President and Mr. Rusk that this country cannot afford a lack of initiative in foreign affairs and that no more urgent task exists than building a strong, forward-looking State Department.

Serious consideration also should go to its other recommendations, notably those calling for a stronger Budget Bureau, elimination of overstaffing in the Defense Department, and overhaul of our conflict-of-interest laws, which now deter many able men from public service.

The report ended on a note that would be well to remember:

"Too many people believe that the cards are stacked in favor of totalitarian systems in the cold war. Nothing could be more wrong. Democracies headline their mistakes; dictatorships hide theirs. The archives of Nazi Germany told a story of indecision and ineptitude in policymaking on a scale never approached by our own Nation."

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) News, Nov. 23, 1961]

THE REAL WEAKNESS

A Senate subcommittee on national policy machinery has been engaged for about 2 years in a nonpartisan study of how well our Government is organized to meet the challenge of world communism.

One of its conclusions, contained in a final statement released by its chairman, Senator Henry Jackson, Democrat, of Washington, is that no task is more urgent than improving the effectiveness of the Department of State.

In reaching this conclusion, the subcommittee has put its finger on what has become obvious to a large segment of the public as a critical weakness of the State Department and consequently of our foreign policy.

A paragraph from the conclusion says: "State needs more respect for comprehensive forward planning. The Department as a whole attaches too little importance to looking ahead in foreign policy and is too wedded to reacting to problems as they arise."

No official words have better described the way our foreign policy is being conducted.

When Khrushchev bellows, we react. When he smiles, we react. When the Communists build a wall in Berlin, we make hurried plans and issue eloquent statements.

In Laos, in Cuba, in any of the trouble spots of the world, our only policy—if it is a policy—seems to be to wait until the Communists make a move. Then we react with hurried conferences and expedient decisions designed only to meet the immediate problem.

There is no initiative on our part in taking steps that would throw the Communists on the defensive. There is no attempt to carry out a long-range plan for victory for the free world because there is no long-range plan.

If the subcommittee does nothing else than focus attention on this glaring weakness in our foreign policy, it will have rendered the Nation a considerable service.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 24, 1961]

CLUMSINESS ON THE BRIDGE

During World War II, Navy vessels in a certain sector suddenly began getting in each other's way; we recall the displeased admiral's command: "There will be no more collisions; repeat, no more collisions."

Well, in due course, collisions decreased. But the admiral's exhortation had little to do with this improved seamanship; it was the result of repairing those failings of foresight and judgment that had caused the accidents in the first place.

We are reminded of this sea story by Senator Jackson's remarks on completing a 2-year inspection of U.S. policymaking machinery. What the Senator and his subcommittee found apparently impressed him with the futility of issuing orders that don't really change anything.

He sees no corrections of past U.S. policy failures through "radical additions to our existing policy machinery." Nor does he get enthusiastic about the perennial suggestion of "reorganization." Indeed, one trouble he finds with U.S. policymaking is "serious overstaffing" of security and diplomatic agencies.

"The heart problem of national security," says the Senator, "is getting our best people into key foreign policy and defense posts. * * * More often than not, poor decisions are traceable not to machinery but to people—to their inexperience, their failure to comprehend the full significance of information crossing their desks, to their indecisiveness or lack of wisdom."

That is, or should be, perfectly obvious. But there are many who are impressed by elaborate organizational machinery to the point where they suppose that the beautiful thing runs by itself, or, at most, with occasional urging from on high. And so men of little experience and less judgment are installed in key policy posts, often to settle domestic political debts.

It is quite futile, of course, to exhort someone lacking commonsense to perform like a man of seasoned judgment; he simply doesn't know how. The only way to avoid the damage he will do, in countless daily errors of detail and poor judgment that eventually may produce a major accident, is not to put him on the bridge in the first place.

Even the finest piece of machinery won't survive clumsy handling. As we recall that wartime rash of collisions, the saddest part was the spectacle of fighting ships escaping enemy gunfire only to sink through self-inflicted damage.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligencer, Nov. 24, 1961]

FEWER PEOPLE

Senator Henry M. Jackson, Democrat, of Washington, chairman of a special Subcommittee To Study National Policy, has reported that there are just too darned many committees, people are engaged in work that doesn't need to be done, overstaffing results in sluggishness of decision and action, meddling committees dilute the authority of individual executives.

Jackson said that "committee-killing" is an important step needed to improve policymaking. Thereupon, he killed his own committee. Bravo for him.

Jackson opposes major additions to existing policy machinery and thumbs down the silly idea of creating a "first secretary" of Government.

Actually, the need—and Jackson underscores it—is for fewer people, but better people; for fixed responsibility, not watered-down authority.

The Jackson subcommittee's recommendations are valuable. We hope they don't just gather dust in some Presidential cubbyhole.

Government by committee is no good at any level, local, State, or national.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) News Register, Nov. 24, 1961]

TO THE POINT

Few congressional committees have won the universal respect accorded the Subcommittee on Government Policy Machinery, headed by Senator Henry M. Jackson, of Washington. Its impartial approach to touchy issues of policy, personnel, and procedure which too often are colored by partisan considerations; has won the confidence of Republicans and Democrats alike. Already a substantial percentage of the group's recommendations have been implemented, with every assurance given that the remaining proposals will be given sympathetic consideration.

The nature of the subcommittee's approach is indicated by two points stressed in a final statement submitted by Senator Jackson in winding up the group's work.

The Government, said the committee in its first point, must eliminate personnel in national security departments and agencies which are "doing work that really does not need doing."

The other point is equally significant.

"Unless our top officials are in basic agreement about what is paramount for the national interest—what comes first and what comes second—there is bound to be drift and confusion below."

The Government could do with a little more clear-headed thinking like that displayed by Senator JACKSON and his associates.

[From the Yakima Daily Republic, Nov. 25, 1961]

SOUND ADVICE

Administration officials should give serious consideration to the recommendations just made by the Government Policy Machinery Subcommittee headed by Senator HENRY JACKSON.

The key to the whole report—made after consultation with many authorities—was contained in Senator JACKSON's initial statement:

"We need a clearer understanding of where our national interests lie and what we must do to promote them."

The committee also recommended that the administration trim seriously overstaffed defense agencies, raise top Federal pay, and remove barriers which exclude able private citizens from public service.

The committee called on the State Department to assume more leadership in the making of national security policy and added that the department should be less wedded to the philosophy of reacting to problems as they arise.

Specifically, the committee recommended that the Government eliminate personnel doing work that does not really need doing that the Budget Bureau be strengthened, that conflict-of-interest laws be reexamined and that Congress should put its own house in order.

One of the revealing criticisms was the conclusion that faulty government machinery is rarely the real culprit when our policies are inconsistent or when they lack sustained forward momentum. Unless our top officials are in basic agreement about what is paramount for the national interest—what comes first and what comes second—there is bound to be drift and confusion below.

Senator JACKSON and his committee did an excellent analysis of governmental machinery and its operation.

The citizens can hope that the administration will implement the recommendations.

[From the Waukegan (Ill.) News Sun, Nov. 24, 1961]

FEWER, BUT BETTER MEN

For many years now, there's been a popular notion that we can somehow attain better government by employing more and more people in government service. This kind of thinking is nudged along by the public official who meets public criticism with a plaintive wail: "But, oh, we're so understaffed."

While there is undeniably a certain connection between good work and ample manpower, better government is sometimes dependent on fewer—and better—workers, as the bipartisan Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery noted the other day.

Senator JACKSON, of Washington, reports that 2 years of study have prompted the subcommittee to conclude that the departments and agencies concerned with national security are, among other things, suffering from a serious overstaffing. The elimination of excess manpower and a fresh concentration on hiring better people is the heart problem of national security, the Senator advises.

We are not experts on how to organize our national security effort, but certainly what Senator JACKSON says makes a great deal of sense. The proper response to unrelenting crisis is not an indiscriminate multiplication of personnel to the point of bureaucratic paralysis. The need is more one of brainpower than manpower, where the precious wisdom of a few top men can be far more valuable than the helter-kelter efforts of a legion of bureaucrats.

What Senator JACKSON is talking about then is the very fundamental and very difficult problem of attracting good men into public service. It is a qualitative problem rather than a quantitative one.

In this regard, it might be wise, as Senator JACKSON further suggests, that the Government take a new look at its tangled conflict-of-interest laws, particularly those which render a man impoverished before he can be considered worthy of public service. Probably the most recent outstanding example of this is Defense Secretary McNamara, formerly president of Ford Motor Co. In private life, Mr. McNamara made close to $500,000 a year and owned about $1.5 million in Ford stock, to say nothing of his stock options and retirement benefits. But all of this had to go before Mr. McNamara could accept his post in Washington free of conflict-of-interest suspicions or violations. Somehow we have always felt this is just too much to ask of most men.

[From the Rocky Mount (N.C.) Telegram, Nov. 24, 1961]

JACKSON COMMITTEE REPORTS

One of the most useful suggestions made by an investigating committee is the one that recommends the removal of barriers which exclude able private citizens from public service, particularly in the Federal Government. Coupled with this proposal, which was made by the Government Policy Machinery Subcommittee, were the recommendations that the administration trim seriously overstaffed defense agencies and raise top Federal pay.

Today in private industry there are plenty of executives who have the ability, drive, know-how that Government desperately needs. To get these men the Government must offer sufficient inducement. To leave private industry these men often give up fabulous incomes to serve. No one blames them when they often return to private industry after a short whirl in Government.

The statement issued by the subcommittee, known as the Jackson committee, closed the books on what has been called one of the most scholarly and nonpartisan investigations in modern congressional history. Although at least a dozen of the committee's major proposals have been adopted by the Kennedy administration, the concluding statement spotlighted 10 items of unfinished business.

At the head of the list was the conclusion that faulty Government machinery is rarely the real culprit when our policies are inconsistent or when they lack sustained momentum. Unless our top officials are in basic agreement about what is paramount for the national interest—what comes first and what comes second—there is bound to be drift and confusion below.

Proposals include the recommendation to eliminate personnel in national security departments and agencies which are doing work that does not really need doing. Of course, that is going on all over the Government, and even reaching down into the State level as well. We all know that plenty of Government workers must develop the art of looking extremely busy when there's really nothing for them to do.

The committee report placed special emphasis on bringing higher grade people to key defense and foreign policy posts, and recommending higher salaries at the top of the civil service ratings and the sub-Cabinet level. There is the obvious need for weeding out excess staff; some of the agencies have swelled out of proportion even to the increased number and complexity of our problems.

Kennedy has recognized the need for adopting many of the committee proposals, as witness his prompt action in reorganizing his National Security Council (which has seen two top leaders fired in the past few days), abolishing the supersecret Operations Coordinating Board, ordering the death of more than 1,000 interagency and advisory committees, and upgrading the role of the State Department in making national security policy. More needs to be done, but President Kennedy has certainly made a commendable start in this direction.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, Nov. 26, 1961]

ADVICE TO DIPLOMATS

In conducting foreign policy, American diplomats too often react negatively against outside forces and too seldom react affirmatively to support the vital national interests of the United States.

This criticism of the U.S. Department of State now has been underscored in a statement by Senator HENRY JACKSON based on a 2-year inquiry into national policy machinery by a Senate subcommittee.

The statement is being given serious consideration in the executive branch of the Government not only because Chairman JACKSON is a prominent Democratic leader but because of President Kennedy's endorsement of the statement.

In praising the report, Mr. Kennedy called JACKSON "the chief mover of the most constructive, far-reaching hearings ever held on the Government's conduct of national security objectives." He said the administration and the country are indebted to JACKSON for the study.

JACKSON's first recommendation set the tone for his statement: "We need a clearer understanding of where our vital national interests lie and what we must do to promote them." In effect, this recommendation emphasizes the same need for a national purpose and national goals that has been expressed earlier.

While JACKSON did not see the need for "radical additions" to existing policy machinery, he said he regarded the heart problem of national security as "getting our best people into key foreign policy and defense posts."

He criticized serious overstaffing in national security departments, urged the reduction of needless barriers that stand in the way of private citizens called to national duty, and recommended improving the effectiveness of the State Department.

JACKSON did not spare Congress itself from criticism. He said Congress should put its own house in better order. He cited in particular the "fragmentation" of the national security issue on Capitol Hill and the fact that Congress gets its information in "bits and pieces."

Congress' problems would be alleviated, of course, if jealous committee chairmen and committeemen could be persuaded to hold joint hearings for governmental officials. This would also reduce the amount of time officials now waste in explaining the same problem to different committees.

JACKSON was especially critical of the State Department for its failure to assert its leadership across the whole front of foreign policy. His subcommittee heard former and present officials, including Secretary Rusk, and while JACKSON mentioned no specific official in this connection, he criticized State Department personnel for their inexperience, their failure to comprehend the full significance of information crossing their desks, their indecisiveness and their lack of wisdom.

JACKSON's subcommittee started its review with a hearing February 23, 1960, so that it had the benefit of studying national security issues and their handling by both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations.

It is easier, of course, to criticize than to change Washington procedures, policies and people. But the JACKSON statement ought to stimulate more thoughtful review of national policymaking practices, spur more comprehensive forward planning, and remind our diplomats to act affirmatively in the national interest rather than merely to react negatively against threats to that interest.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Nov. 27, 1961]

POLICY AND POPULARITY

Many informed Americans will agree with Chairman JACKSON of the Senate Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery that "no task is more urgent than improving the effectiveness of the Department of State." But like Mr. JACKSON, whose committee recently concluded a 2-year study, they will not be too certain of just what to do about it.

The Senator from Washington says the Department is not doing enough to assert its leadership across the whole front of foreign policy, nor is it doing enough to staff itself for such leadership. A partial corrective may be found in the shifts of administration leaders announced Sunday. But Mr. JACKSON further says State needs more respect for comprehensive forward planning; that it is "too wedded to a philosophy of reacting to problems as they arise."

U.S. foreign policy in recent years has frequently been criticized for reacting rather than acting. Many critics before Mr. JACKSON have said that we should develop long-range policies that are based on our best understanding of the facts, and that we should persist in these regardless of temporary setbacks. Instead, so the critics have asserted, we do nothing until another country acts, and then we hastily improvise a policy of reaction.

Unfortunately this has often been the case, but finding the remedy is not nearly as simple as diagnosing the disease. Some blame must be attached to that amorphous entity, the people. Thus Norman Graebner, head of the history department of the University of Illinois, said at an American assembly conference in Columbia, Mo., a few days ago, that Secretaries of State have attached undue importance to the popularity of their policies at home.

Maintaining world peace, the speaker declared, "requires less the popularity of a nation's foreign policies at home than the ability of these policies, conducted by trusted public servants, to define and protect the specific interests of the United States in this Nation's conflicts around the globe."

That is true, and yet it is false to the extent that the policies must be supported at home or they will fail abroad. Take United States-China policy as an example. The experts who had the background to formulate a long-range China policy after the Chiang Kai-shek debacle of 1949 were hounded from the State Department by McCarthy. Chiang's partisans are so strong that the administration still cannot develop a rational China policy.

The success of a foreign aid policy may depend less on the preparation of an imaginative and carefully reasoned plan than on the support of two or three key Congressmen under pressure from their constituents to oppose all such schemes. On at least two occasions the State Department tried to bring President Tito of Yugoslavia to Washington for a state visit but was prevented by the opposition of a few influential Congressmen who had groups of anti-Tito Yugoslavs among their constituents.

What is really needed is a greater sophistication on the part of the American people, a greater awareness of what President Kennedy was talking about when he said at Seattle that the United States is "neither omnipotent nor omniscient." Diplomacy does not consist of a moral approach to every problem, or the advocacy of a holy war. It consists in a realistic appraisal of the power at a nation's disposal and the prudent use of that power in the Nation's best interest.

Who is to know what is in the Nation's best interest? In a free country every man is entitled to his opinion; but he is also obliged to inform himself, to base his opinion on fact and not on prejudice or daydreams. If the people were informed it would be far easier for the State Department to make plans that would be assured of popular support.

A whole apparatus is required—a President who will take the lead in explaining the facts, as Mr. Kennedy is now doing; such changes in the State Department as will contribute to efficiency and the employment of the best talent available, and a program that will provide the public, in Mr. JACKSON's words, with a "clearer understanding of where our vital national interests lie and what we must do to promote them."

That means education. If the public understands the facts it will not be too difficult to translate that understanding into forceful, intelligent policies.

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express, Nov. 27, 1961]

SENATE GROUP URGES SECURITY EFFECTIVENESS

For 2 years a Senate subcommittee headed by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, has been conducting an inquiry into Government furtherance of national security objectives and how a free government could organize itself to cope with seemingly more efficient totalitarian systems. Chairman JACKSON now has come up with some pertinent findings and recommendations, some of which are as follows:

The cards are not stacked in favor of totalitarian systems.

We need a clearer understanding of where our vital national interests lie and what we must do to promote them.

The real problem of national security is not reorganization but getting the best people into key foreign policy and defense posts.

There is serious overstaffing in the national security departments and agencies.

Needless barriers standing in the way of private citizens called to national duty should be reduced.

We need a stronger not a weaker Bureau of the Budget.

No task is more urgent than improving the effectiveness of the State Department.

Concerning the State Department Senator JACKSON had some pointed criticism.

"State," he said, "is not doing enough in asserting its leadership across the whole front of foreign policy. Neither is it doing enough in staffing itself for such leadership. State needs more respect for comprehensive forward planning. The Department as a whole attaches too little importance to looking ahead in foreign policy and is too wedded to a philosophy of reacting to problems as they arise. The Policy Planning Council is not now in the main stream of policymaking."

It is important that these comments come from an outstanding member of President Kennedy's own political party in the Senate, although the subcommittee he headed was a bipartisan one made up of Senators HUBERT H. HUMPHREY of Minnesota, and EDMUND S. MUSKIE, of Maine, Democrats, and KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, and JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York, Republicans.

The President has warmly praised the work of the subcommittee and expressed the administration's indebtedness for its recommendations, certainly an indication that something constructive is going to be done to implement them.

[From the Marietta (Ohio) Times, Nov. 27, 1961]

NEED STRONGER POLICY

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON's subcommittee has completed its 2-year study into national policy machinery. Early reports indicate it has produced much for national leaders to consider. One of his statements concerning it is that too many people believe that the cards are stacked in favor of totalitarian systems in the cold war. The Washington Democrat said: "Nothing could be more wrong."

He listed these major conclusions of the study: A clearer delineation is needed as to where our vital interests lie and what we must do to promote them; the heart problem of national security is getting our best people into key foreign policy and defense posts; the career service should be made better training grounds for posts of national security leadership; needless barriers in the way of private citizens called to national duty should be removed.

President Kennedy lauded the findings. It must be agreed that the country is indebted to the Jackson subcommittee. The administration should set about at once to carry out the findings, prodding Congress where its cooperative action is required.

The most important development should be an aggressive State Department, thinking ahead of the Soviets instead of just reacting to their moves.

[From the Bellingham Herald, Nov. 28, 1961]

STATE DEPARTMENT NEEDS GOOD MEN, NOT NEW MACHINERY

We don't know if the findings of the Senate subcommittee on National Policy Machinery had anything to do with President Kennedy's decision to shake up the State Department, but the timing and direction of the report and its reaction in the press indicate there may be some connection.

Of course there has been speculation for months about the role of Undersecretary Chester Bowles and the fact that his assignments and apparent interests have not coincided with the normal administrative emphasis associated with his title.

At any rate, Bowles is out and George W. Ball is in. At the same time, Walt Whitman Rostow, deputy special assistant to the President for national security affairs, has been named State Department counselor and chairman of its Policy Planning Council.

The subcommittee has been holding hearings for some time on the general subject "Organizing for National Security," with the operations of State, Defense and the National Security Council under scrutiny. The parent group is the Senate Committee on Government Operations and the subcommittee has been headed by Washington's Senator JACKSON, with HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, MUSKIE, of Maine, MUNDT, of South Dakota, and JAVITS, of New York, as members.

The San Francisco Chronicle notes that the subcommittee found the State Department "wedded to a philosophy of reacting to problems" rather than looking ahead in foreign policy. According to the Chronicle, it is one thing to belabor State in general simply because the field of foreign affairs is not in satisfactory condition. "The Department gets too much of that criticism. But far from dismissible with a wave of the hand is Senator JACKSON's severe and specific indictment. We take the President's praise for it as a hopeful sign that something will be done about this report."

The Wall Street Journal points to JACKSON's statement that correction of past U.S. policy failures will not come through radical additions to our existing policy machinery. "The heart problem of national security is getting our best people into key foreign and defense posts," the Senator declares. "More often than not, poor decisions are traceable not to machinery but to people—to their inexperience, their failure to comprehend the full significance of information crossing their desks, to their indecisiveness or lack of wisdom."

We say amen to that. Not because we have any special knowledge of the State Department, but because it is a truism that may be observed on every level of government or business. It is not so much the title or manner in which the executive operates. It is the caliber of the man involved and the way he operates that determines the effectiveness of any agency.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 28, 1961]

SHIFTS AT STATE

President Kennedy's first major reorganization, it is interesting to note, involves neither policy nor structure but people. In his own language, the State Department shifts are intended to "provide a more effective matching of people with responsibilities."

The changes announced Sunday might well have been made with the November 15 report of the Senate Committee on Government Operations in mind. That report declared:

"State is not doing enough in asserting its leadership across the whole front of foreign policy. Neither is it doing enough in staffing itself for such leadership.

"State needs more respect for comprehensive forward planning. The Department as a whole attaches too little importance to looking ahead in foreign policy, and is too wedded to a philosophy of reacting to problems as they arise. The Policy Planning Council is not now in the mainstream of policymaking.

"State needs more officials who are good executive managers—and who are broadly experienced in dealing with the full range of national security problems which now engage the Department. The administration of foreign policy has become 'big business.' This places a high premium on the ability to manage large-scale enterprises—to make decisions promptly and decisively, to delegate, and to monitor.

"This need for 'take charge' men is particularly urgent down through the Assistant Secretary level and at our large missions abroad. Round pegs in square holes are a luxury we cannot afford."

The transfer of three important members of the White House executive staff to State comes close to being a structural or organizational change, but whether personal or structural it is a good thing. The ambivalent arrangement the President initially set up might have worked, but if it had worked it would have been a triumph of genius over logic. Walt W. Rostow, who now becomes counselor to the Department and head of the policy planning staff, is in precisely the slot he should occupy in the administration. Richard N. Goodwin and Frederick G. Dutton also are properly located where they can discharge line responsibilities. The White House establishment will continue to have McGeorge Bundy to rely on. The previous arrangement seemed ideally calculated to create second-guessing and jurisdictional overlapping.

W. Averill Harriman has earned the job of Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs by his skill and tact in handling the delicate policy problems entrusted to him. Brooks Hays moves to the White House in accord with his own wishes. Other changes seem practical and logical.

Displacement of Chester Bowles as Under Secretary of States will dismay many of the administration's friends. It will also distress leaders in many countries who have come to look upon the amiable Under Secretary as a warm, sympathetic, and understanding friend. The President has appointed Mr. Bowles as his special representative and adviser on African, Asian, and Latin American affairs. He is well equipped for that role, and it is to be hoped that pains will be taken to see that he undertakes his mission with such unmistakable marks of the Government's confidence that he can be effective and useful. His influence and ability should not be lost to the Government, and it need not be lost if it is made clear that Mr. Bowles himself is not altogether to blame because his genius and that of his immediate colleagues did not mesh.

The Jackson committee has widely pointed out that "faulty machinery" is seldom the culprit when policies are not satisfactory. The trouble is rather "absence of a clear sense of direction and coherence of policy at the top of the Government." The committee traced wrong decisions, not to machinery but "to people—to their inexperience, their failure to comprehend the full significance of information crossing their desks, to their indecisiveness or lack of wisdom."

It is to be hoped that the President now has the right people in the policymaking spots in the State Department. He has moved with energy and dispatch to put them there and has not hesitated, in the face of inevitable criticism, to move to correct initial mistakes of assignment and organization.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Nov. 28, 1961]

IT'S PEOPLE, NOT ORGANIZATION, THAT COUNT IN POLICYMAKING

Senator JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, has for 2 years headed a Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery seeking to find out how our Government is staffed and organized to meet the challenge of world communism. Basic question was this: "Can free societies outplan, outperform, outlast—and if need be—outsacrifice totalitarian systems?"

The answer JACKSON comes up with is "yes." He attaches only the proviso of Robert Lovett, a notable witness before the subcommittee: "We must be willing to do our best."

When the Kennedy administration took office it was critical of some machinery through which Government was taking policy action—of various committees, the National Security Council, large planning staffs, etc.

So were some witnesses before the subcommittee. Some suggested a first secretary to stand between the President and his advisers and the confusing complex of departments and boards and committees. Through experience the administration has come to look with more favor on existing machinery. JACKSON, in the final report of his subcommittee, reveals why.

The major problem of policymaking is not in the machinery itself but in finding the best possible personnel. As JACKSON put it, "poor decisions are traceable not to machinery but to people—to their inexperience, their failure to comprehend the full significance of information crossing their desks, to their indecisiveness or lack of wisdom." Faulty machinery "is rarely the real culprit when our policies are inconsistent or when they lack sustained forward momentum."

Not that Government machinery can't be improved. It can always be simplified. Deadwood committees and personnel should be weeded out. Overstaffing can be avoided. Needless barriers to bringing top men into Government need to be removed—such as unnecessarily complicated and burdensome conflict-of-interest laws. Planning can be improved. Congress can change its methods. It should look at a problem in its completeness instead of piecemeal as it does now when different committees handle matters relating to national security, decide on priorities and approve financing.

But it all comes down to people. We need the best we can get and then need to give them the opportunity to do their best. This may seem a simple conclusion for a 2-year study. But it is an important and basic one. All too often leaders tend to believe that by some miracle of organization the inadequacies of personnel can be overcome.

[From the Economist, Dec. 2, 1961]

SPANNERS IN GOVERNMENT

After the last great war the way the American Government handled its national security policies—on defense, foreign politics, and economics—was reorganized to reflect the lessons that had been learnt during the struggle. But, as the cold war has become semipermanent, there have been many doubts about whether even this new machinery provides the planning, flexibility, and coordination to enable the right decisions to be taken in time, and many changes have been proposed. Two years ago the Senate established a Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, under Senator JACKSON, to find out how well the Government is organized and manned to meet the challenge from the Communist world. The committee's staff was able; its members included Senators HUMPHREY, JAVITS, MUNDT, and MUSKIE; its approach was nonpartisan; and its witnesses amounted to a rollcall of many of the most distinguished public servants America has had: Mr. Lovett, Mr. Kennan, Mr. Harriman, General Taylor, and Mr. Nitze among others. Their testimony makes enthralling reading.

Last week, just before the Government changes were announced, Senator JACKSON issued a personal "final statement" with which other members of the subcommittee are expected to agree. Its major conclusion is that no new machinery is needed and that any proposal to add to what exists should be examined with the utmost skepticism; in particular, committee-killing, rather than committee-creating, should be the order of the day. (In this respect and a few others the President has already taken the committee's advice.) But the machinery needs to be used better; it is plain that the subcommittee considers that the National Security Council was allowed to become too large and overinstitutionalized and to deal too often with routine matters under President Eisenhower, and that it should be confined to presenting the President with major alternatives of policy. The authority of the Secretary of State (who in the American system is the President's principal adviser in the foreign field) should be clearer and his effectiveness greater; this apparently answers those who advocate a "First Secretary" to share the President's load.

Senator JACKSON, who thinks that the main problem is to get the best possible people into the important jobs, finds a good deal to criticize on this score. For one thing the Government is, he says, overstaffed; the real crime is not that this wastes money but that it wastes the time and energies of the men who are really doing the work. Higher salaries are needed to attract good people; better training arrangements are needed to give them breadth of view and of experience; and it should be made easier to bring in distinguished men from outside by relaxing and modernizing the conflict-of-interest laws. Finally, Senator JACKSON argues that a stronger Bureau of the Budget would help the President to establish an order of national priorities and that Congress, whose dealing with matters of national security is dangerously fragmented, should improve its own organization.

[From the Foreign Service Journal, January 1962]

BALANCE SHEET FOR 1961

As in most years, the past year brought new demands on the Foreign Service and changes in organization and personnel practices designed to enable it better to meet these demands. The first year of a new administration is a time of testing of many new ideas and people. Also, 1961 was no exception to this pattern.

Three new agencies have come into being. New forms and methods of foreign assistance will, with congressional blessing, be vigorously pursued by AID. The Peace Corps has been born. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) has begun its important work.

To insure the coordination of the activities of these agencies both at home and abroad, the authority of the Secretary of State over them has been made clear. The Foreign Service, on its part, must do all within its power to support their activities. This will require, in particular, a much closer integration of effort, especially in Washington and in the substantive areas of our embassies, than has existed heretofore between the Service and ICA-AID.

Ways of formulating policy have also undergone changes which have strengthened the leadership of the Secretary of State. The passing of the Operations Coordinating Board and the Planning Board of the National Security Council, together with the new emphasis on forward policy planning at the Bureau level of the Department, are illustrative.

But—in the words of Chairman Jackson of the Senate Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery—"the heart of national security is not reorganization—it is getting our best people into key foreign policy and defense posts."

It is to the quality of personnel that we must look to make a prognosis on the future effectiveness of the Foreign Service. Here some progress was made in 1961, yet much remains to be done.

As far as the Service itself is concerned, significant legislative amendments were won on Capitol Hill and will undoubtedly make both conditions of service and career opportunities more attractive. The successful inauguration of personnel exchange programs with the Treasury and Defense Departments strengthens an important aspect of training. Also to be welcomed are a number of steps designed to place more responsibility on the embassies generally and upon the Mission Chief in particular. By wise decision, this year's budgetary problem will not disturb the vital recruitment of FSO's-8, nor affect the established selection-out process.

Senator Jackson's terminal report mentions a number of things which need attention in 1962 and beyond. We agree with him that the Department and the Foreign Service need "more officials who are good executive managers and who are broadly experienced in dealing with the full range of national security problems." Insofar as it may be directed at us, we are concerned by his criticism that "our career services are not producing enough officials with the large executive talents, the breadth of experience, and the width of perspective needed in top foreign policy and defense posts." Hopefully, 1962 will see the Department and all its associated components make progress comparable to that achieved in 1961.

MONTANAN—WORLD'S TOP COWBOY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the western section of this country has for many years been associated with bucking broncs, cowboys, and Indians. Today, the Indians no longer ride the plains, true cowboys are hard to find, and the bucking broncs are rapidly being surrounded by rodeo corrals. Nevertheless, a Montanan has again taken the title as the world's champion cowboy.

Benny Reynolds of Melrose, Mont., has won the famous RCA—Rodeo Cowboy Association—all-around title, at Dallas, Tex. Benny comes from a long line of rodeo performers; in fact he has been riding in rodeos since he was 5 years old. The last Montanan to win the title was Bill Linderman, of Red Lodge, Mont., winner of the title on two occasions, 1950 and 1953.

Riding the rodeo circuit is an exciting world to the young and the old. A feature story which appeared in the January 7, 1962, issue of the Great Falls Tribune gives a glimpse of the life and experiences of the Nation's top cowboy, Benny Reynolds. Mr. President, I ask that this article be printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Montana's Benny Reynolds, Top Cowboy—Winner of RCA All-Around Title Comes From Family of Rodeo Performers

(By 'Tana Mac)

One of the riding Reynolds family of Melrose rode right to the top of the rodeo world and brought Montana another world's champion cowboy title.

Twenty-five-year-old Benny Reynolds, who was reared on a ranch on Moose Creek about 7½ miles from Melrose, went into the National Finals Rodeo at Dallas, Tex., a week ago with a good lead over his nearest competitors for the all-around cowboy championship of the Rodeo Cowboys Association.

When the final event was completed, Reynolds had boosted his 1961 winnings to $31,309 for a clear claim to the title. He went into the Dallas finals with regular season winnings of $28,698.

Reynolds is a big, easygoing man—he is 6 feet, 3 inches tall and weighs 195 pounds. He's got a ready smile and he likes to meet people, although he's a bit on the bashful side.

His size and weight are an advantage in steer wrestling, but other cowboys say his long legs may be a handicap in spurring a bucking bronc.

He entered the National Finals in steer wrestling, in which he won $9,128 during the regular season, and bareback bronc riding, which earned him $8,856 prior to the finals. He also competes, and earns money, during the regular season in saddle bronc events and bull riding.

Benny wasn't the only Montana cowboy to bring home a title from the national finals. Ronnie Rossen, 24, of Broadus won the RCA bull riding championship.

The last time the RCA all-around cowboy championship was won by a Montanan was in 1953, when Bill Linderman won it. Linderman, of the famous Red Lodge rodeo family, also won the title in 1950.

Benny's boyhood on the Moose Creek ranch was good training for the rodeo world. His father, Frank, ran cattle and horses in the rough mountain country that surrounds the Moose Creek Valley.

That range not only afforded adventure for a boy, but it demanded riding skill to chase cattle and horses over the rugged terrain.

Those Reynolds horses were not all saddle horses, either, which had a lot to do with Benny's and his brothers learning how to ride well. Frank Reynolds staged many smalltown rodeos and he had a good string of bucking horses to keep the family in top riding condition.

Benny and his brothers, Johnny and Louis, often rode these broncs to school. All that was needed to encourage the horses to buck was a tight flank strap or a sudden jab of the spurs.

Benny well remembers one of the first horses he rode to school in Melrose. It was a small, well-built animal that had the temperament of a mule. It wouldn't offer to buck, strike, or kick, but it would suddenly balk.

When it planted its four legs wide and refused to take another step, no amount of coaxing would make it move until it was of a mind to do so. If another member of the family was on hand, a few applications with a quirt on the rump of the bottle-raised, spoiled horse might make it change its mind, but Ben's application of reins or whip never was enough.

"What'll I do if I'm alone and it balks?" Benny demanded of his father.

"I suppose you could get off and build a fire under it," Frank offered.

Benny could appreciate this type of humor that was so much a part of the family life. Yet sometimes people outside the family failed to see the joke.

Between the balky horse and a cow that hated to be milked, Benny was sometimes late for school.

"What's your reason today, Benny?" the teacher demanded one morning.

"Well, ma'am," Benny explained, "the cow's teat was sore."

Benny's father, Frank, who was himself a topflight cowboy, never believed that members of his family should be slaves to work. They never missed a rodeo. They could always take time out to visit when company came, and they had many visitors. The family had a host of friends, and many cowboys came for advice on how to ride. Because Frank never forgot a bronc, cowboys were always asking him to coach them on how to ride certain horses.

Benny was performing in rodeos when he was 5 years old, riding calves. He didn't always make a ride, but soon he was able to stay on until the calf quit bucking. As he says, "I just grew up in rodeo. I've been around it all my life."

No member of the riding Reynolds family was ever limited to one horse. The family owned too many horses for that, and they were always trading horses, with the result that they had all kinds, some with thoroughbred blood, some with Morgan, some with the strain of the quarter horse. As the boys grew older and began going with girl friends, they often made the girls presents of a horse.

"I ain't never gonna give Idaho away," John would say of a favorite brown gelding he rode. But he did, and the recipient was usually a member of the fair sex. It little mattered to him if he gave the same horse to two or three girls.

Yet the family, although they traded often, still formed lasting affection for some of their horses. There was the bay mare that the boys called "Goofy" that Frank would never trade. She was a thoroughbred, a race mare that gave birth to beautiful colts. She had at one time injured her head on a starting gate, and as a result she continually threw her head in nervousness when under saddle, yet she was a fast, gentle animal.

But the the boys gave her the name Goofy for trying to go through a fence with Louis at a race meet at Dillon. She had seen someone open a gate on the far end of the track, and before the race was over, she tried to go through the gate, which had been closed by then. Fortunately, the injury to Louis was only a wrenched hip.

Today, Benny takes great pride in his own saddle stock, and his affection for his horses is similar to that of his brother, Louis. Ben remembers the day Louis and he were chasing horses on Chicken Creek, and the lovely mare Louis was riding and gentling for someone else fell in gopher hole and broke her neck. Louis was ill for the remainder of the week. Not only was he shaken up physically, his grief went deeper.

Benny tried to imitate the riding ability of his father and mother, who had been Gertrude Schmidt before her marriage, but he also had his two brothers, John and Louis, to emulate.

John's name had stood among the top 10 cowboys in the Nation in saddle bronc riding. Too, he had ridden the world's champion bucking horse, Trail's End, in one of the finest rides ever executed on the horse. This was in Montana, at one of Oral Zumwalt's shows at Livingston 2 years ago.

After the whistle blew, John bucked off, and the horse, stumbling on the buck rein, rolled end over end, but missed crushing the tall cowboy, who at the time he made the sensational ride was suffering with a spinal injury.

John has not contested in the past 16 months due to this injury. Louis has not followed the circuit, either, for the past several years, because he is running his own cattle ranch out of Dillon.

Unlike his brothers, however, who started rodeo competition early in life and were champions before they were 16 years of age, Benny was slow commencing to ride in RCA shows. Instead, he took part in all the jackpot rodeos he could enter until he had perfected the finer points of staying on the hurricane deck of a pitching bronc. In the amateur circles, he began taking first money. Coaching him, in addition to his brothers, were his stepfather, Donal Smith of Melrose, and Smoky Beldon, former Wild West show rider for Tim McCoy.

The year prior to following big time rodeo, Ben rode in all the amateur shows staged by Horace Raty. The fine broncs of Raty's shows—horses like Scar Face and Tipperary—gave Ben the final schooling he needed. It was the following year, 1958, when the RCA announced Reynolds had won the Rookie Cowboy of the Year award.

But he received greater national attention that season when he became a hero on television's "Name That Tune." His earnings from that show were almost equivalent to his earnings in rodeo, and made him the idol of thousands of young would-be and genuine cowboys.

Youngsters all over the Nation sent in names for Benny's horse, the winning name receiving for its youthful entrant a prize pony. That particular year, Benny stood second in the Nation for world's all-around champion cowboy, Jim Shoulders edging him out by a slim margin.

The early spring of this year, Benny began to take a big lead in the all-around category, and he consistently held that lead throughout the year. In Montana, Benny won top honors at four of the State's biggest rodeos: Great Falls, Butte, Dillon, and Missoula.

One of his best purses, however, was claimed at Albuquerque, N. Mex., where in four events he walked off with a grand total of $2,128. He gave a fine accounting of himself at other top rodeos like Denver, Douglas, Wyo., and San Francisco.

Last spring Benny was married to a Texas girl who has her own cattle ranch and raises registered quarter horses. Benny also has ranch investments.

There's a story about Benny that may explain his rise to the world's rodeo championship.

One of those calves that Benny rode when he was a little shaver threw him hard. Pete Crump, a veteran rodeo hand, gave Benny an ice cream cone to take away the hurt.

Benny dashed back to the chutes and demanded he be given another calf to ride.

"Think you can ride this one?" the chute boss kidded.

"Nope, I don't think I can ride him but I might get another ice cream cone," chirped Benny.

So perhaps ice cream cones, not prize money, started Benny on the championship trail.

SENATOR SMATHERS' VISIT TO LATIN AMERICA ON A FACTFINDING TOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, one of the best traveled and most knowledgeable Members of the Senate with respect to affairs in Latin America is the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers]. This fall, in pursuance of his official duties, he made an exhausting and worthwhile trip to Mexico and Central America on a factfinding tour as chairman of the Senate Latin American Trade Subcommittee, and a member of the Senate Commerce and Finance Committees. Following is a set of seven articles concerning his trip published in Florida's leading newspapers.

I ask unanimous consent that the results of his findings on that trip be incorporated at this point in the Record for the benefit of the Senate.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[Dec. 6, 1961]

Article No. 1

(By Senator George A. Smathers)

Mexico City.—The Mexican man in the street is having serious second thoughts about Fidel Castro * * * and he may be getting ready to turn his back on the Cuban dictator, forever.

For the United States this is important because Mexico—Latin America's second largest country in population—exerts a powerful political and economic influence on the entire hemispheric system of nations.

It is always exhilarating to visit Mexico City, this bustling, sprawling metropolis of 4.6 million people, second only to New York in population among all the great cities of the New World.

Even now, bright Christmas decorations are being strung across the broad, tree-lined boulevards, a reminder of the country's deeply religious traditions, and a sharp contrast to the poisoned philosophy the Communists seek to spread in ever-increasing doses.

In the massive ideological assault that Castro has leveled against this nation of 36 million people, he has had the full cooperation and the seemingly endless resources of the Soviet Union's huge Mexico City embassy. Its hundred-man staff is large enough to take care of the Soviet's diplomatic business in every country of Latin America—if that were the Soviet's goal. (By way of example, every member of the Soviet Embassy here is a Russian citizen. In contrast, more than one-half of the employees of the American Embassy are Mexican.)

Last year the Soviets spent $11 million in Mexico for propaganda, much of it tied into the Castro pattern, compared to less than a million for our entire information program in this vital country. This $11 million does not include the active participation in pro-Communist propaganda activities carried out by the Czech and Cuban Embassies here.

Each week 7 tons of Russian-produced, Spanish language propaganda—textbooks, comics, movie films, slick magazines, newspapers—are unloaded from planes from Moscow, then sent to the Soviet Embassy and thereafter widely distributed. In remote village schools, as well as the national university, textbooks, laced with sly Communist propaganda, are distributed free to thousands of trusting students, too poor to buy their own schoolbooks.

I learned just today that last year the Soviet Union gave all-expense, 6-year scholarships to 150 Mexican students, to study in Moscow at the so-called Friendship University. Next year the Reds will grant 500 of these propaganda scholarships to Mexican youths. Five thousand applications are on file for such Soviet scholarships. On the other hand, the United States provided only 14 part-time scholarships for Mexican students to American universities last year, with 1,200 competing for the awards.

I was told that one night recently moviegoers all over Mexico paid premium prices to buy tickets for a special premier of a new Mexican film. The proceeds went to a national children's charity. Audiences were surprised to discover that immediately preceding the Mexican film a 30-minute Russian-made movie was shown, technically perfect, and masterful as a piece of Red propaganda.

Obviously, the battle against the Castro-Communist-attempted penetration of democratic Mexico is far from over.

Castro has the backing of powerful leftist elements on the Mexican political scene. Former President Lazaro Cardenas, who has made himself a hero to many of Mexico's 14 million peasants, is sought as an ally by the Castroites.

But there are bright sides, too. Within the last few days, hundreds of thousands of Mexicans who had hopefully looked upon Castro as some sort of social reformer who could export his promise of a better life for all were shocked to read Castro's boast: "I am a Marxist-Leninist and will be one until the day I die."

Now the Castro mask is off and reaction, in some quarters at least, has been swift.

Said former Mexican President Miguel Aleman: "We don't want communism or any other ism that will interfere with the institutional life of our country."

There are other Mexicans, too, many thousands of them, who have realized all along that the Castro revolution was a fraud.

And that is helpful, for the danger of Castroism in Mexico is not that it triggers off occasional antigovernment demonstrations or promotes anti-American slogans. Its real threat lies in the fact that it attempts to inject Marxism into Mexico's grassroots revolution, launched half a century ago and still going on. Castro's aim has been to subvert and destroy the Mexican revolution and bring about the ultimate loss of liberty for the people of this vibrant country.

That is what happened in Cuba. This is what Castro plans for Mexico.

Castro in Cuba rallied the people with false promises of liberty and justice. But when the black curtain was drawn back Castro had enslaved his people, stolen their liberty, deprived them of their religion, and killed many of those who opposed him.

Millions of Mexicans—probably the majority—have been appalled by Castro's admission—his bloody excesses and tyranny. They now see clearly that the revolution which Castro speaks about is not the same kind that the Mexicans had and believe in and revere.

Tonight I look forward to a meeting with the President of Mexico, Adolfo Lopez Mateos, and in my next article I will give you my impressions of the meeting.

[Dec. 7, 1961]

Article No. 2

(By Senator George Smathers)

Mexico City.—No one can expect to visit Mexico and return home with simple answers.

Mexico is as complicated as it is beautiful. Its history and culture have resulted from the melding of ancient Indian civilizations overlaid with five centuries of a Spanish conquistadore-type civilization and, more recently, the impact of an intense rebirth of Indian nationalization. This leads to seeming contradictions and inconsistencies in programs and policies of the government.

This was never more evident than in the recent vote cast by Mexico at the meeting of representatives of the Organization of American States which sought collective inter-American action against Fidel Castro.

At that meeting a resolution was offered by Colombia, which called for a January meeting of the foreign ministers of the OAS to determine a course of collective action on Cuba.

Fourteen nations, including the United States, voted in favor of the resolution; five nations abstained. Only Cuba and Mexico voted against the resolution.

In my meeting here with Manuel Tello, the fatherly, soft-spoken Secretary of Foreign Relations for Mexico, I said: "The people of my country do not understand Mexico's vote, nor do I. Frankly, we are confused."

The benign Foreign Minister, a deeply religious man, leaned across his old-fashioned desk and at some length earnestly explained that Mexico approached this question of OAS action against Cuba from a legalistic, juridical view.

According to Senor Tello, and many other Mexicans, the Rio Treaty, under which collective OAS action against Cuba is proposed, would have to be broadened before such action could be voted by the OAS. He told me that this would necessitate ratification of a broadened Rio Treaty by the Mexican Senate.

But, to my mind, there was probably a much more compelling reason than the juridical one. In 1910, when the Mexican Revolution got underway, there was a serious threat of collective action against it by Argentina, Brazil, and the United States. Action never materialized, but Mexicans have never forgotten the threat, and today while following the principles of multiple nation action to meet economic and social problems of the hemisphere, they shy away from any multi-nation action that to them smacks of intervention.

There were three other significant visits in this busy day. I spoke at a luncheon given by the American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico City and discussed with them the proposed U.S. tax on the earnings of American businesses abroad.

I told the businessmen that I am opposed to the tax, since I believe that U.S. companies should not be put in a less favorable competitive position than the firms of countries such as England, France, Germany, and Japan—all of which have important business interests in Mexico.

Free enterprise is a hallmark of our democracy and must be maintained and demonstrated in these rapidly emerging countries of the Western Hemisphere if they are to choose this system over that of government ownership. After a briefing at the Embassy, we had a large and spirited press conference at the Reforma Hotel. Unlike recent years, there was less evidence of the influence and impact of Castroism in the questions asked. I was able to remind some of my questioners that they took me rather seriously to task last year and the year before for my assertions that Castro was a Communist tool and menace and should be fought as tenaciously as one would fight a burglar in his home. Further, I was delighted to get in a few licks on the so-called image of Castro—and the duty of the press, to now report that Castroism was no longer individualistic since his admission of Marxism. It should now be labeled for what it is—complete unadulterated communism.

At 8:30 last night I drove with Tom Mann, our Ambassador, to the residence of President Adolfo Lopez Mateos. There, in his unpretentious functional office, we discussed many facets of United States-Mexican relations.

The 50-year-old President, a handsome, vibrant man, pointed out that Mexico had sided with the United States and the free world in many recent issues—for example, Mexico voted against Russian demands for a troika secretaryship in the United Nations, for the U.S. position of strength and no retreat at Berlin, and other vital and important Free World issues. While the matter was not discussed with the President, nevertheless, in talking with him and other officials and the so-called man in the street, I leave Mexico with the feeling that they will vote with us against the admission of Red China to the United Nations and that, since Castro's admission of long-time Communist beliefs, there is growing unhappiness over their vote with Cuba at the Organization of American States meeting.

It will be interesting to see what Mexico does when the OAS foreign ministers meet in Washington January 10 to vote on the Cuban question.

My meetings with U.S. Ambassador Thomas C. Mann, both at an informative briefing session at the Embassy, and at a dinner at the residence in the evening, left me with a sense of confidence in his ability and dedication.

His grasp of these many complex Mexican problems—the needs for increased Mexican economic productivity in the light of its rapidly increasing population, the aspirations and the intricacies of the PRX, Mexico's leading political party, which covers the full spectrum from extreme left to extreme right—reveals a man of deep knowledge of the country's psychology and political makeup.

We leave Mexico with the growing impression of a giant awakening—a restless, ambitious giant who is warm and friendly—who's motives are good—but who yet has not quite understood the true struggle and that he is involved in a fight.

[Dec. 8, 1961]

ARTICLE No. 3

(By Senator GEORGE SMATHERS)

GUATEMALA CITY.—Seven years ago this capital city and this country were caught behind the Communist iron curtain. Today Guatemala is a free and democratic nation, liberated from the Red grasp—but its problems are far from solved.

Guatemala is a ruggedly beautiful land of 4 million, about the size of Tennessee, and traces its history back to the time of a highly advanced Indian civilization which flourished nearly 2,000 years ago. Well over half of Guatemala's population today is Indian.

Guatemalans proudly boast that their mile-high capital has natural air conditioning the year around. A ring of volcanoes—a few of which are still active—circle the city, jutting upward sharply into the crystal atmosphere.

Without doubt one dominant personality stands out in Guatemala today. He is the President of the Republic—Gen. Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes.

Shortly after arriving by jet from Mexico, and after meeting with our Embassy officials in a briefing session, I visited the Guatemalan President in his mahogany-paneled office in the massive and beautiful Spanish colonial-style national palace.

In the long corridors outside his office a score of Guatemalans of all classes sat on benches, waiting their turn to see the President. There were businessmen, Government officials, and Indian peasants, some of them wrapped in shawls and holding infants in their arms. In the light of the recent violent history in Guatemala and the fact that Ydigoras' predecessor was shot and killed in the presidential palace, Ydigoras' accessibility to the people is remarkable.

As we entered the office I shook hands with the alert, clear-eyed 67-year-old national leader, whom I had met 2 years ago on my last trip here, and said, "Mr. President, you look fine."

With a wry smile he replied, "I am lean and hungry. One doesn't get fat on hope."

Having been exposed for many years to the subtle amenities of Latin American political figures, this directness was surprising and refreshing.

The President went on to say that not all Latin American countries are alike—that each has its special problems. He asked that the United States give careful attention to the unique problems of his country, and that we give sympathetic consideration to its pressing needs.

Guatemala's plight is linked directly to the recent Communist domination of the country, under the Red puppet Jacabo Arbenz who tyrannized Guatemala from 1951 to 1954. For several years before that there had been a softening-up process, when the country was controlled by a self-dubbed "spiritual socialistic" president, Juan Jose Arevalo.

The Communist reign of terror, instituted by Arbenz, came to a sudden and dramatic end in 1954, when Col. Castillo Armas led a revolution which overthrew the Reds.

Castillo Armas himself became president and was on his way to leading the country on the road back to democracy when assassinated by one of his trusted guards. Then Ydigoras was elected president.

The memory of the frightful killings and torturing, ordered by Arbenz, may have softened with time, but as President Ydigoras solemnly pointed out yesterday, although he and Castillo Armas wiped out the Communist cells in the country, some of the evil roots still fester just below the surface. Years of Communist indoctrination are not easily swept aside.

The Communists still greedily eye Guatemala. It was the first Communist beachhead in the Western Hemisphere and the only nation in the world ever to escape from Communist control.

Arbenz is today in communism's Cuba, where he plots to seize control of Guatemala again. Nightly broadcasts from Cuba, beamed to Guatemala, promise to "liberate" the country and "return it to the Red fold."

The President, in good English, told me that there are Castro agents constantly at work in his country and that hundreds of thousands of dollars are funneled in from Cuba through Mexico for use by Red subversion experts.

Ydigoras asserted that there are Communist military forces being trained in Cuba and on the Yucatan Peninsula for an invasion of Guatemala.

But Guatemala's leader is not idle. A vigorous man of action, he has rallied his own people, sought to alert Central America to the Communist's designs against every free government.

Guatemala was the first hemispheric nation to break off relations with Cuba. Since then the United States and nine Latin American countries have followed suit. Now Ydigoras has taken the fight one step further. He has proposed that the Central American nations set up a military alliance for mutual security against communism.

I was flattered when the President quoted from a recent Senate speech of mine, in which I suggested the establishment of a NATO-type inter-American military organization to deal effectively and directly with the Castro menace. He has gone beyond the talking stage of such a plan, and is now seeking basic agreements with his neighboring nations to translate the idea into action.

But Ydigoras doesn't spend all of his days brooding about Castro. There are wars to be waged against poverty and economic underdevelopment, as he knows well.

He has been a leader in setting up a common market for Central America, which is already reaping benefits. Last year, for the first time, the Central American nations exchanged $30 million worth of goods, and old and unrealistic trade barriers which walled off one country from another—to their mutual disadvantage—are beginning to fall away.

There are other hopeful signs. Guatemala has pushed its exportation of frozen beef to the $1 million-a-year mark. Under a new industrialization law 210 new factories have been established in the country within the past 3 years. Roads, irrigation projects, and schools are being built—30 new schools will be dedicated within the next month. Many of the latter programs were helped by U.S. foreign aid to Guatemala and the people of this country are grateful.

But Guatemala has economic dilemmas too. Within the last few years the price of Guatemalan coffee—by far its largest money crop for export—has slumped from $70 a hundred pounds to a little more than $20.

Two fierce tropical storms last year devastated millions of dollars worth of crops, and all parts of the country have felt the pinch.

I left the hour-and-a-half interview with President Ydigoras with this feeling: Guatemala is a country beset by many problems. It has come through a stormy period of Communist domination and now stands with the free governments of the Western Hemisphere. It has a great potential. It has a vigorous, enlightened leader. It is a nation deserving of our assistance.

[Dec. 9, 1961]

ARTICLE NO. 4

(By Senator GEORGE SMATHERS)

MANAGUA, NICARAGUA.—Twenty miles northwest of this capital city, across a dusty, tortuous mountain road, an old Nicaraguan carpenter teaches school beneath a sheltering tree.

His pupils are seven barefooted peasant children. They sit on a long bench, facing their teacher at his kitchen table-desk. While the children diligently trace their first letters on pieces of slate the carpenter-teacher goes to the front of his workshop where he laboriously turns a piece of wood on an ancient hand-powered lathe.

An American visitor who came upon the scene, asked the carpenter how it happened he was teaching school.

The old man explained that the village school was already filled, and that further, his students were the children of poor people, unable to provide books and paper for their offspring.

He said: "I am not well-educated myself. But I thought that these children should at least be taught to read and write."

With these words the old carpenter summed up the burning aspiration of most of his countrymen—the desire for education.

But the road to that goal is a hard one. In this country of mountains and plains, lying between the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean, 63 percent of its 1.4 million people cannot read and write. In some remote villages 95 percent of the people are illiterate.

When I arrived here yesterday I agreed with our Ambassador, Aaron Brown, that in the field of primary education the United States can make an important and lasting contribution to help this country solve many of its basic problems.

Ignorance breeds poverty, denies people the chance to gain a better life, keeps them tied to a primitive economic system, and makes them ready targets of the false promises of communism.

U.S. foreign aid, under the Alliance for Progress, has made primary education one of its main goals in Nicaragua.

But the education problem is massive, and U.S. aid can only serve as a catalyst to cause the Nicaraguans themselves to embark on a meaningful education program.

Today, even though the Nicaraguan Government spends 20 percent of its budget on education, this is far from enough money to meet the needs. Education for all Nicaraguans is linked to the depressed national income, which has suffered from falling market prices for its agricultural exports.

There is another problem. Nicaragua is the largest of the six Central American countries—about the size of Indiana, but has a population not much bigger than that of Dade County, Fla. As a result, much of the good land is not as yet under cultivation.

Last night at a dinner in the Embassy residence, situated on a hilltop overlooking Managua, I discussed the land problem with a cross-section of the country's business and government leaders.

They told me that a comprehensive land reform law is now before the National Congress, which would create an agrarian institute to further land settlement.

The agrarian institute would see that farmers who cultivate a plot of public land for a year or more would be given title to a 125-acre tract without charge, and have the opportunity to buy the balance of the land they till.

Nicaraguans are also seeking to increase the quality and quantity of their beef production. Yesterday, on a tour of a ranch near the capital I saw a heard of Brahmin cattle, the same breed which has proved so successful in Florida. Cattlemen here are hopeful of a bright future.

To me these steps indicate that progress is being made with some of the country's agricultural problems.

On another subject, I learned from several sources that although the Communist Party is outlawed in Nicaragua, its underground agents are hard at work. They have infiltrated the labor unions, intellectual groups, and the national university. In a country where most of the people can neither read nor write, the spoken word becomes most powerful and Castro's radio transmitters steadily bombard the Nicaraguan air with Communist propaganda.

At the start of the 20th century Nicaragua was seething with unrest as rival political parties fought for power. The country was burdened with mountainous debts.

In 1912, U.S. Marines landed to restore order, beginning an era of occupation which lasted until 1933.

As an interesting sidelight, the Marines introduced baseball to the country and today it is the national sport.

In 1936, Anastasio Somoza came to power and ruled as a strong-man president until his assassination in 1957. Most observers termed Somoza a dictator.

Somoza was killed 5 months before the national elections of 1957 and his son, Luis Somoza, a graduate of Louisiana State University, and the then president of the national congress, assumed the presidency. Five months later he was elected in his own right.

In 1959 a constitutional amendment was adopted, prohibiting the succession of President Somoza at the end of his term in 1963, or of any member of his family to the fourth degree of consanguinity.

The President's brother, General Anastasio Somoza, Jr., a graduate of West Point, is chief of the nation's national guard.

The Somoza brothers head the Liberal Party, which is actively and openly opposed by the Conservative Party. Fortunately, the leadership of both parties is anti-Communist, and friendly to the United States.

Nicaragua is a land of great potential. Much of its abundant natural resources have not yet been fully developed, and its fertile lands offer bright promises. However, its political future is in doubt, and the next few years will be critical ones in Nicaragua's history.

[Dec. 11, 1961]

ARTICLE NO. 5

(By Senator GEORGE SMATHERS)

PANAMA CITY.—"I dare Panama to break off relations with Cuba."

This challenge, flung out by Dictator Fidel Castro, was headlined across the front page of Panama newspapers as I arrived here. But to most Panamanians Castro's shout was one of desperation.

Everywhere I have been in this ancient, Pacific coast city I have asked people for their views on Castro. Said a leading political figure: "The people of Panama are sick and tired of Fidel Castro."

His view was shared by most of those with whom I talked. The aura of Castro's appeal to Latin America's destitute and impoverished is fast waning. His cynical promises, made 3 years ago, to give the masses a chance for a new life, have been drowned out by the fusillades of Red execution squads.

Millions of Latin Americans have shuddered in revulsion at the brutality of Castro's dictatorship.

Two years ago the cry of Fidelistas stirred thousands in this smallest of Central American nations. Today Castro may still hold the ideological support of isolated pockets of people here, but his image as a Robin Hood savior of the impoverished is shattered forever.

A few days ago Panama's chargé d'affaires in Havana was recalled for consultation, and yesterday the National Assembly overwhelmingly adopted a resolution calling for an immediate diplomatic break with Castro.

However, in Panama as in the United States, foreign policy is carried out by the Government's executive branch, under President Roberto Chiari.

Last night I met with the President, an alert, softspoken man, in the Presidential Palace. He nostaligically recalled having lived there as a boy, some 35 years ago, when his father served as President. The palace setting for our meeting was serene, but not too many years ago several men had been killed in this very building, during a bloody uprising.

The President, who speaks English, is a stanch friend of the United States, and an anti-Communist who is well aware of the Castro menace. Panama, 2 years ago, was the target of an invasion force launched from Cuba under Communist direction. The invaders were captured shortly after the landing but Panamanians remember this blow at their security and the affront to their national dignity.

The National Assembly vote has put great pressure on the President to break now with Castro, but he must consider another factor. On January 10 the Organization of American States will hold a vital meeting to decide what collective action it will take against Castro. Panama could be the host nation for the conference, and the Panamanian President might well not want to be put into the position of slamming the door in Castro's face at this time, and give Castro a built-in excuse for boycotting the OAS conference.

Earlier, at a luncheon meeting the affable Ricardo Arias, a former Ambassador to the United States who was defeated in the last presidential election and is now a leader of opposition to President Chiari's political party, spoke to me of his own party's anti-Communist and pro-United States posture.

However, even though the Reds have been outlawed in Panama since 1953, hard-core Communists are active underground, and have infiltrated influential student groups and labor unions.

Encouragingly, the Panamanian Government has dealt effectively with floods of Red propaganda and subversive material spewing into this country from Cuba.

The Panama Canal, which cuts a rugged swath across the isthmus linking North and South America, obviously has a great impact here. Panama's history as a Republic dates from the beginning of the canal.

When the canal was opened to world shipping in 1914, 1,100 boats plied their way across the isthmus. Last year more than 12,000 ships from 39 nations carried 65 million tons of cargo through the waterway, and therein lies a problem.

The canal, a $400 million manmade wonder of the early 20th century, is rapidly being choked with traffic. In 10 years, tonnage through the canal has soared 75 percent to an all-time high.

Now there is talk of a new, lockless, sea-level canal, built to allow speedy passage and big enough to take any ship in the world. I think it should be built, for reasons of military security as well as economic ones.

It would take 10 years to construct and might cost $4 billion, but some engineers say atomic explosions could blast a channel from Atlantic to Pacific at half that cost.

Engineers in Colombia and Nicaragua, as well as Panama, are already pouring over charts of their territory, all of them eager to have the canal cut through their nation, if such a canal is ever built.

Because the Panama Canal has existed here for 50 years, Panama's economy has developed far differently than that of other Central American countries.

The country, a lush and fertile land, has not developed its great agricultural potential. Oftentimes fruit and vegetables rot where they grow because there are no farm-to-town roads linking jungle-bound plantations with the seacoast markets.

Discussing the problem with our able Ambassador, Joseph Farland, I learned that he has been cooperating with Panamanian officials to determine the feasibility of a proposed 70-mile road which would link vast inland agricultural lands with the Atlantic coast. The road, if it receives engineering approval, would be built as an alliance for progress project.

The Ambassador, incidentally, a Republican appointed in the last administration and who served as U.S. Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, has proven his abilities as an American representative and has been retained by President Kennedy. His sincere, hard-working approach to Panama's problems, and his handshaking, speechmaking tours all over the country have won him the respect and admiration of thousands of Panamanians.

Last night, seated on the veranda of the Presidential Palace, President Chiari reminded me that Panama historically has earned most of its income by servicing and supplying the Panama Canal. Most of its purchases, in a seriously adverse balanced import trade, are made from the United States.

He felt that the country's great agricultural potential could be realized—to the enormous benefit of Panama's 1.1 million people—if consideration were given to her unique relationship with the United States. Markets, he pointed out, must be found for the products Panama wants to grow and produce.

A Cabinet member at his side earnestly nodded in agreement and added: "We don't want handouts from the United States. We want to develop our resources. If you can help get us the markets we'll take care of ourselves."

[Dec. 14, 1961]

ARTICLE NO. 6

(By Senator GEORGE SMATHERS)

CURACAO, NETHERLANDS WEST INDIES.—The dateline on this report of my Latin American tour was originally intended to read—Caracas, Venezuela.

However, when I arrived in Panama, my plans were changed. I was informed that the Venezuelan authorities in charge of arrangements for President Kennedy's arrival in Caracas on December 17 believed that—because I was considered a controversial figure in Venezuela—my presence in Caracas might possibly upset the President's visit.

Venezuela obviously is in a tenuous and difficult situation. On previous visits there I saw ample evidence of the strident anti-American groups that are shrilly vocal and difficult to control.

So in an effort to be cooperative and recognizing the tremendous importance of President Kennedy's first visit to Latin America, I gladly acceded to the request and rerouted myself to arrive in this small but virtually important Caribbean island, 40 miles off the Venezuelan Coast.

The shock of suddenly coming upon a Dutch-European type town in the midst of the verdance, the expansiveness and lassitude of the Caribbean is enough to bring anyone up short, gasping for breath and understanding.

Curacao is strikingly different from Latin America. The lush, extravagant foliage of Central America is a startling contrast to this island's barren growth, pushing forth skimpily from the volcanic rock.

But even more vividly contrasted is the habitated areas of both places. Central American cities are sprawling ambivalent affairs, the product of Old Spain and modern pressures—glass-fronted, space-age skyscrapers surrounded by medieval straw and palmetto villages.

Willemstad, the capital of Curacao, is for all purposes, a thriving, neat 18th century Dutch commercial town, set down on a sun-splashed Caribbean finger of land. Never has the name "Dutch cleanser" had such practical meaning as here in this orderly, clean town.

Willemstad's orange and brown gabled roofs subdue the harsh brilliance of the tropical sun. A townsman explained to me that, unlike other Caribbean islands, Curacao's residents use no white colors on the outsides of the buildings they erect, because long ago a Dutch governor's wife was annoyed by the sun's glare off the white buildings and decreed that a more restful color was to be used in all edifices. Thus developed the color of mamaya (pronounced ma-my'-ya)—a rusty brown orange color that adorns every building in sight.

Curacao, 38 miles long and only 7 miles wide at its broadest point, was discovered in 1499 by a Spanish navigator who had sailed with Columbus on this first voyage to America. Like so many of the West Indies it knew many masters. The Spanish first, then the Dutch, then the British, but in 1814 at the Treaty of London, the Dutch regained control and have maintained it ever since.

The peglegged Peter Stuyvesant was appointed Governor of Curacao in 1643, and in addition was later made the Governor of the New Netherlands. Through him the island of Curacao was first linked with New Amsterdam, the present New York City.

During the colonial period, this island earned the dubious reputation of being the center of the slave trade in the Caribbean area. But with the decline of the slave trade early in the 19th century Curacao lost much of its economic importance, and for a century the island lazed along as an unproductive dependency of the Netherlands.

It was not until 1916, when the oil refining industry was established to process oil bubbling forth from nearby Venezuelan wells, that a new era of prosperity and importance began for Curacao.

Today Curacao is—amazingly enough—the world's fourth largest port in terms of tonnage, topped only by New York, London, and Rotterdam. The massive refinery on Curacao, the fifth largest in the world, and an even greater refinery on the neighboring island of Aruba, spew forth millions of gallons of oil to be carried by ships to every part of the world.

Huge tankers, to reach Curacao's harbor and the refinery built on its shore, must steam up a channel which runs directly through the very heart of the city. Passengers aboard the vessels are startled to find themselves sailing in the midst of a sea of Dutch gabled roofs.

One of the New World's wonders is a bobbing pontoon bridge which crosses the downtown channel and which must be towed open by a tugboat each time an oil tanker arrives to load up at the refinery. In spite of the normal order in arrangement of life in Curacao, the resulting traffic jams are as choked as any 5 p.m. auto snarl on a street of a major Florida city.

When the Dutch seized this island and drove off the Spaniards, they also drove off the Indians who had lived here. Thus, when in 1863, slaves in Curacao were given their independence, they became at once freemen and the natives of the island.

Their numbers were made up chiefly from the peoples of five major African tribes. Today many of their descendants, who constitute 85 percent of Curacao's population, speak an unusual dialect—Papiamento—a mixture of Spanish and Portuguese, flavored with Dutch and English. Papiamento is spoken in Curacao and the neighboring islands of Aruba and Bonaire, and nowhere else in the world.

Dutch is the official language. However, in the city streets, and in the shops and business offices, I heard English spoken frequently.

I noticed in my hotel room a sign saying: "Fresh water is potable but scarce in Curacao. Please use it sparingly." It reminded me that on my last visit here, because of Florida's interest in salt water conversion, I had seen Curacao's $11 million saline water distillation plant—the world's biggest—which converts enough sea water daily to provide all of the pure drinking water for the island's 115,000 people.

Yesterday I drove through the city's old and narrow streets to visit Mikve Israel synagogue, the oldest Jewish house of worship in the Western Hemisphere, built in 1732. Later our car climbed the steep and winding hill leading to the handsome American consulate, and there visited with the U.S. Consul General, Mervyn V. Pallister, our country's chief representative in the island. The consulate, and the adjoining consul's residence, commanding an imposing view of Willemstad, were the gift to the United States 11 years ago from the Dutch Government.

Outside my window the Dutch flag flaps in the breeze. Were it not for the fact that I can also see palm trees and tropical plants, I would think I were viewing a typical Dutch city on a warm summer afternoon.

The imprint of the Netherlands tradition is everywhere but the island's natives have a strong national spirit of their own. In recognition of this fact, the Dutch granted Curacao a semiautonomous status in 1954.

There is little unemployment and a thriving economy, resulting from a sound administration, good local government and an educated native population. In general, Curacao is a happy island.

[Dec. 28, 1961]

ARTICLE No. 7

(By Senator GEORGE SMATHERS)

Two years ago I wrote in an article, "Latin America, as a Giant Rip Van Winkle, Is Slowly Awakening From a Long Sleep." On my trip just completed to Central America, it was everywhere evident that the giant has indeed awakened. He is getting to his feet—and the direction in which he walks will affect all of us.

The long ignored forces at work in Latin America can no longer be ignored. For surely no one can visit any country south of us, and not feel the burning desire of humble people to better their lot in life—and to accomplish this quickly. For centuries having had little or nothing, these dispirited people see no harm in striving for a change—any change. The idea of change holds out to them hope of improvement.

Fortunately, there are enlightened leaders in Latin America who recognize these pressures—and the danger of not translating them into practical programs of better education, better health and better living through democratic processes and peaceful means.

The problem, of course, varies to a large extent as one goes from country to country. In fact, President Ydigoras Fuentes of Guatemala kept emphasizing the point during our hour and a half discussion that "you North Americans make the mistake of lumping all the Latin American countries together and attributing to them the same problems, solutions and characteristics."

This, of course, is too often the case. We frequently don't distinguish sufficiently between those nations and governments that work toward democracy, for a closer relationship with the United States and a better life for their peoples—and those governments who pretend to be our friends, but who actually play both sides of the street.

There are still other leaders—Castro and the Communists—trading on the long frustrated hopes of the humble people, who promise quick solutions to ancient problems—through revenge, revolution and bloodshed. Fortunately, Castro's excesses have frightened most Latin Americans and at the same time shocked the seekers of the "status quo" into the realization that the aspirations of the large numbers of people can no longer be swept under the rug or suppressed.

In an affirmative effort to improve their economic conditions—five countries of Middle America, with a population of approximately 10 million people, have already set in motion the idea of a common market which will tear down strangling tariff barriers, stimulate the development of industry, and result in an improved economy for the participating countries.

For many years, in the Congress, I have advocated U.S. leadership in the creation of an Inter-American Bank to make development loans exclusively to the countries of this hemisphere. I therefore listened with fascination, at a meeting in Nicaragua, as Mr. Enrique Delgado, who is the first Executive Director of the newly formed Central American Bank, spoke enthusiastically of the low-interest-rate loans that the Bank is already making for new industries in Guatemala, Nicaragua, Honduras, and El Salvador.

There is—in my opinion—a growing cautious optimism over the future of Latin America with its 20 different nations and its 20 sets of complex problems.

The alliance for progress holds the brightest promise for Latin America. Everywhere I went on this recent tour I asked and was asked about it. The responses varied. I'm sure to the vast majority of people the alliance offers great hope. It demonstrates the genuine interest of the United States in helping our neighbors to help themselves. It is a practical approach to the many problems at hand—and it is earnestly supported by most of those who have heard about it.

But, strangely enough, there is also some opposition and criticism of it—springing principally from those groups who for centuries have held the reins of political and economic power in their hands. They don't like the alliance, for it demands a change from the status quo. It requires them to do something to improve the lot of their people in their country.

But, surely, they must help and cooperate in sensible land reform programs. They must pay a fair share of their income in taxes, they must bear a fair share of the burdens of programs for education, sanitation, hospitals and roads.

Many times on the tour I was accosted by Latin American friends of wealth and position—and even by some U.S. businessmen doing business in those countries—who voiced their dislike of the alliance for progress. In reply, I would say to them, "How can we ask the people of my State and the other States to reach into their pockets and pay money to provide an education program for a Latin American country, when the wealthy people here, whose responsibility it really is, are not willing to bear a fair proportion of the burden.

"A far-reaching revolution is underway in Latin America and we shall either help guide it into democratic, free enterprise channels, or else we will watch it explode into Communist dictatorship—where all is lost. Surely, the local people who can contribute have a greater stake in the outcome of this revolution than do we in the United States, even though we have a big stake in the future of Latin America."

Frankly, I like the quid pro quo concept of the alliance for progress, for it says briefly and sternly—we will help you put your house in order, but you must simultaneously demonstrate a willingness to help yourselves, and do so before it is too late.

Fortunately, many of the economically powerful in Latin America recognize the problem for what it is and they are willing to act constructively to solve it. Already in Guatemala, Colombia, and Peru I know of wealthy business groups and vast landholders who are taking the lead in land and tax reform programs. These men applaud the alliance for progress and its objectives. They fully realize that time has run out on the old way of life. They know that if they are to have anything to say about their country in the future they must cooperate now in bringing about conditions whereby they and their countrymen can enjoy a democratic future—a future where all people's rights and personal property are protected and respected.

This is the present hope, that these changes can be accomplished as we replace a program of foreign aid grants based on unbridled idealism, with one of democratic ideals based on solid realism.

The time has long since passed when we can continue to confuse our friends by helping our enemies with the same degree of generosity with which we help our friends. We must begin splicing together our economic and political programs so that negotiating leverage can be obtained in our efforts to bring about reform within democratic institutions as we understand them.

Certainly we need never apologize for this effort on our part of this program.

There are many other recommendations but there is neither the space nor the time to outline them here. This I shall do subsequently on the floor of the U.S. Senate. I'm grateful to the editors for this opportunity to report my observations of this recent trip.

ADDRESS BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last night at the annual congressional dinner given by the Women's National Press Club we were privileged to hear what, in my opinion, was one of the greatest and most profound speeches ever given in this Capital City. I refer to the brilliant and moving address of Walter Lippmann.

Every man and woman who was privileged to attend this dinner was, I am safe in saying, deeply moved by Mr. Lippmann's address in which he spelled out the causes of our present day frustrations and confusion. Mr. Lippmann diagnoses the basic cause of these frustrations as being the production of nuclear weapons, which made, for the first time, war an impossible action for rational statesmen to contemplate. For the first time, as President Eisenhower observed, there is no longer any alternative to peace. And because a nuclear war would result in victory for neither side, we are faced with the difficult task of finding new ways of meeting the great issues which confront us, new ways of settling disputes between nations. Mr. Lippmann is of the opinion that the great struggle between Western civilization and the Communists will not be ended within the foreseeable future. In this long and difficult and trying struggle, Mr. Lippmann expresses confidence that the Western World, if its member nations work together and cooperate in a common cause, will be able to live safely and without fear in the same world as the Soviet Union and that the rising power and influence of the Western society will exert a beneficent, magnetic attraction upon Eastern Europe. But, in order for us to succeed, it is necessary for the Western community of nations to act in a positive and progressive fashion with the purpose in mind of building a strong and healthy society. If we only act in a negative fashion and with an obsession of a fear of Russia, Mr. Lippmann is convinced that our future will be bleak indeed.

Let me quote what Mr. Lippmann said on this subject:

> We shall lose all our power to cope with our problems if we allow ourselves to become a stagnant, neurotic, frightened, and suspicious people. Let us not punish ourselves by denying ourselves the hope, by depriving ourselves of the oldest American dream, which is that we are making a better society on this earth than has ever been made before.

Mr. President, I only wish that Mr. Lippmann's address could be put into the hands of every American and read by him—indeed by every citizen of the Western World. Let me take this occasion to pay tribute to this great writer, columnist, and political philosopher. His writings and his thoughts receive the great respect to which they are entitled by all who are interested in the future of our society. He is respected and listened to by liberals and conservatives alike, for his words have meaning to all who believe in a free society and have faith that we can and will build a better world.

We are all greatly indebted to Walter Lippmann, especially those of us who are engaged in the political affairs of the Nation. We respect his judgment and we welcome and appreciate his advice and counsel. In the hectic day-to-day pace we lead as legislators, Walter Lippmann serves to remind us where we stand, of our aspirations, our hopes, and the direction which we travel.

I sincerely hope that we will have the benefit of Mr. Lippmann's counsel and commentaries for many years to come. I believe all my colleagues here in this body would join with me in expressing to this journalist our great respect and affection.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address Walter Lippmann delivered last evening be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is an honor, which I greatly appreciate, to be asked to speak on this occasion. It shows how good are the relations between our two national press clubs. It is also a personal kindness. For Congress is about to convene, and that means that there will be many speeches in the months to come. Experience has taught me that it is always a good idea to be able to speak early in the program. By the time Congress has adjourned next summer, adjourned in order to go out and make more speeches in the constituencies, your bright and eager faces may not be so bright and eager at the prospect of hearing yet another speech. I am happy to catch you while you are still in such robust good health.

When I sat down to prepare this talk, I considered and rejected the idea of delivering a kind of preliminary message on the state of the Union. I remembered that this will soon be done with much more authority by the husband of a former newspaperwoman. So I decided to talk to you tonight about the state of our minds, the state of our nerves, and perhaps even about the state of our souls.

I am moved to do this by a letter I received just before Christmas. It was from a friend of mine, who was a great hero in the First World War. He has been an extraordinarily successful man since then, and his letter began in this cheerful fashion:

"MY DEAR WALTER: Another year of frustration, confusion, and compromise is about over."

I know that my friend is not alone in feeling this way and that during the coming session of Congress there will be many who will say what he says and feel as he does. At different times I suppose all of us share his feelings. There is indeed much frustration, much confusion, and—because we live on earth and not in heaven—there is, of course, much compromise.

I could have written back to my friend, reminding him that in every year of which there is any historical record, there has been much frustration and confusion and compromise. Anyone who thinks he can get away from frustration, confusion, and compromise in politics and diplomacy should make arrangements to get himself reborn into a different world than this one. Or, if that is beyond his powers, he should move to some country where there are no newspapers to read.

However, it is certainly true that in our own time we are experiencing a very special frustration and confusion. There is, I believe, a reason for this. Certainly, if we knew the cause, we might feel better, even if we cannot do quickly something drastic to end the difficulty.

The age we are living in is radically new in human experience. During the past 15 years or so there has occurred a profound revolution in human affairs, and we are the first generation that has lived under these revolutionary new conditions. There has taken place a development in the art of war, and this is causing a revolutionary change in the foreign relations of all the nations of the world. The radical development is, of course, the production of nuclear weapons.

As a scientific phenomenon the nuclear age began with the explosion at Los Alamos in 1945. But in world relations the nuclear age really began about 10 years later. For during the 1940's the United States was the only nuclear power in the world. But by the middle fifties and in the years following, the Soviet Union has created an armory of nuclear weapons and has built rockets which have made it, for all practical purposes of diplomacy, a nuclear power equal with the United States.

The essential fact about the appearance of two opposed great powers armed with nuclear weapons is that war, which is an ancient habit of mankind, has become mutually destructive. Nuclear war is a way of mutual suicide. The modern weapons are not merely much bigger and more dangerous than any which existed before. They have introduced into the art of warfare a wholly new kind of violence.

Always in the past, war and the threat of war, whether it was aggressive or defensive were usable instruments. They were usable instruments in the sense that nations could go to war for their national purposes. They could threaten war for diplomatic reasons. Nations could transform themselves from petty states to great powers by means of war. They could enlarge their territory, acquire profitable colonies, change the religion of a vanquished population, all by means of war. War was the instrument with which the social, political, and legal systems of large areas were changed. Thus, in the old days before the nuclear age began, war was a usable—however horrible and expensive—instrument of national purpose. The reason for that was that the old wars could be won.

In the prenuclear age, right down through the Second World War, the victorious power was an organized state which could impose its will on the vanquished. We did that with Germany and with Japan. The damage they had suffered, although it was great, was not irreparable, as we know from the recovery after World War II of West Germany and Japan and the Soviet Union.

But from a full nuclear war, which might well mean 100 million dead, after the devastation of the great urban centers of the Northern Hemisphere and the contamination of the earth, the water, and the air, there would be no such recovery as we have seen after the two World Wars of this century.

The damage done would be mutual. There would be no victor. As far in the future as we can see, the ruin would be irreparable. The United States has the nuclear power to reduce Soviet society to a smoldering ruin, leaving the wretched survivors shocked and starving and diseased. In an interchange of nuclear weapons, it is estimated coolly by experts who have studied it, the Soviet Union would kill between 30 and 70 million Americans.

A war of that kind would not be followed by reconstruction, it would not be followed by a Marshall plan, and by all the constructive things that were done after World War II. A nuclear war would be followed by a savage struggle for existence, as the survivors crawled out of their shelters, and the American Republic would have to be replaced by a stringent military dictatorship, trying to keep some kind of order among the desperate survivors.

To his great credit, President Eisenhower was quick to realize what nuclear war would be. After he and Prime Minister Churchill had studied some of the results of the nuclear tests, President Eisenhower made the historic declaration that there is no longer any alternative to peace.

When President Eisenhower made that statement no one of us, I think, understood its full significance and consequences. We are now beginning to understand them, and here I venture to say is the root of the frustration and the confusion which torment us. For while nuclear weapons have made war, the old arbiter of human affairs, an impossible action for a rational statesman to contemplate, we do not have any other reliable way of dealing with issue that used to be resolved by war.

It is enormously difficult to make peace. It is intolerably dangerous and useless to make war about the fundamental issues.

That is where our contemporary frustration and confusion originate.

We are confronted with an extraordinarily tantalizing and nerve-wracking dilemma.

For as long a time as we can see into the future, we shall be living between war and peace, between a war that cannot be fought and a peace that cannot be achieved. The great issues which divide the world cannot be decided by a war that could be won, and they cannot be settled by a treaty that can be negotiated. There, I repeat, is the root of the frustration which our people feel. Our world is divided as it has not been since the religious wars of the 17th century and a large part of the globe is in a great upheaval, the like of which has not been known since the end of the Middle Ages. But the power which used to deal with the divisions and conflicts of the past; namely, organized war, has become an impossible instrument to use.

President Eisenhower and President Kennedy are the only two American Presidents who ever lived in a world like this one. It is a great puzzle to know how to defend the Nation's rights, and how to promote its interests in the nuclear age. There are no clear guidelines of action because there are no precedents for the situation in which we find ourselves. And as statesmen grope their way from one improvisation and accommodation to another, there are masses of people who are frightened, irritated, impatient, frustrated and in search of quick and easy solutions.

The nuclear age is only a few years old. But we have already learned one or two things about how to conduct policy in this age. It was once said of a British admiral in the First World War that if he made a mistake, he could lose the British Fleet and with it the whole war in an afternoon. Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy are in a similar position today. In a few days or so Mr. Khrushchev can lose the Soviet state and the promise of a Communist economy. He can lose all the work of all his 5-year plans, his 7-year plans, and his 20-year plans. In that same time, Mr. Kennedy can lose the Constitution of the United States, the free enterprise system and the American way of life and along with them all the frontiers, old and new. I don't think I am exaggerating. A full nuclear war would produce by far the biggest convulsion which has ever occurred in recorded history. We cannot understand the realities of the Khrushchev-Kennedy encounter, which has been going on since they met at Vienna last June, unless we remind ourselves again and again of what war has become in the nuclear age.

The poor dears among us who say that they have had enough of all this talking and negotiating and now let us drop the bomb, have no idea of what they are talking about. They do not know what has happened in the past 20 years. They belong to the past, and they have not been able to realize what a nuclear war would be.

Only a moral idiot with a suicidal mania would press the button for a nuclear war. Yet we have learned that while a nuclear war would be lunacy, it is nevertheless an ever-present possibility. Why? Because, however lunatic it might be to commit suicide, a nation can be provoked and exasperated to the point of lunacy where its nervous system cannot endure inaction, where only violence can relieve its feelings. This is one of the facts of life in the middle of the 20th century. The nerves of a nation can stand only so much provocation and humiliation, and beyond the tolerable limits, it will plunge into lunacy. This is as much a real fact as is the megaton bomb, and it is a fact which must be given great weight in the calculation of national policy. It is the central fact in the whole diplomatic problem of dealing with the cold war. There is a line of intolerable provocation beyond which reactions become uncontrollable. It is the business of the governments to find out where that line is, and to stay well back of it.

Those who do not understand the nature of war in the nuclear age, those who think that war today is what it was against Mexico or Spain or in the two World Wars regard the careful attempts of statesmen not to carry the provocation past the tolerable limit as weakness and softness and appeasement. It is not any of these things. It is not softness. It is sanity.

But it leaves us with a task: Because we cannot make war, because we cannot achieve peace, we must find some other way of meeting the great issues which confront us. For life will go on, and if the answers of the past do not work, other answers must exist and must be found.

The answer lies, I believe, in the nature of the struggle between our Western society and the Communist society.

It is often said that the struggle which divides the world is for the minds and the souls of men. That is true. As long as there exists a balance of power and of terror, neither side can impose its doctrine and its ideology upon the other. The struggle for the minds of men, moreover, is not, I believe, going to be decided by propaganda. We are not going to convert our adversaries, and they are not going to convert us.

The struggle, furthermore, is not going to be ended in any foreseeable time. At bottom it is a competition between two societies and it resembles more than any other thing in our historical experience the long centuries of conflict between Christendom and Islam. The modern competition between the two societies turns on their respective capacity to become powerful and rich, to become the leaders in science and technology, to see that their people are properly educated and able to operate such a society, to keep their people healthy, and to give them the happiness of knowing that they are able and free to work for their best hopes.

The historic rivalry of the two societies and of the two civilizations which they contain is not going to be decided by what happens on the periphery and in the outposts. It is going to be decided by what goes on in the heart of each of the two societies. The heart of Western civilization lies on the shores of the Atlantic Ocean, and our future depends on what goes on in the Atlantic Community. Will this Community advance? Can the nations which compose it work together? Can it become a great and secure center of power and of wealth, of light and of leading? To work for these ends is to be engaged truly in the great conflict of our age, and to be doing the real work that we are challenged to do. I speak with some hope and confidence tonight. For I believe that in the months to come we shall engage ourselves in the long and complicated, but splendidly constructive, task of bringing together in one liberal and progressive economic community all the trading nations which do not belong to the Communist society.

I dare to believe that this powerful Western economic community will be able to live safely and without fear in the same world as the Soviet Union, and that the rising power and influence of the Western society will exert a beneficent magnetic attraction upon eastern Europe. This will happen if we approach it in the right way. Jean Monnet, who is the original founder of this movement, has put it the right way. "We cannot build our future," he has said, "if we are obsessed with fear of Russia. Let us build our own strength and health not against anyone, but for ourselves so that we will become so strong that no one will dare attack us, and so progressive and prosperous that we set a model for all other peoples, indeed for the Russians themselves."

At the same time the wealth and confidence of the new community will enable the Western society to assist and draw to it the societies of the southern hemisphere, where social and economic change is proceeding rapidly.

You will have seen that I do not agree with those who think that in order to defend ourselves and to survive we must put a stop to the progressive movement which has gone on throughout this century. This movement began in the administration of Theodore Roosevelt. Its purpose was to reform and advance our own social order, and at the same time to recognize that we must live in the world beyond our frontiers. We shall lose all our power to cope with our problems if we allow ourselves to become a stagnant, neurotic, frightened, and suspicious people. Let us not punish ourselves by denying ourselves the hope, by depriving ourselves of the oldest American dream, which is that we are making a better society on this earth than has ever been made before

Is all this conservative? Is all this liberal? Is it all progressive? It is, I say, all of these. There is no irreconcilable contradiction among these noble adjectives. Do not Republicans believe in democracy, and do not Democrats believe in a republic? Such labels may describe political parties in England; they do not describe political attitudes in the United States.

Every truly civilized and enlightened man is conservative and liberal and progressive. A civilized man is conservative in that his deepest loyalty is to the Western heritage of ideas which originated on the shores of the Mediterranean Sea. Because of that loyalty he is the indefatigable defender of our own constitutional doctrine, which is that all power, that all government, that all officials, that all parties and all majorities are under the law—and that none of them is sovereign and omnipotent.

The civilized man is a liberal because the writing and the administration of the laws should be done with enlightenment and compassion, with tolerance and charity, and with affection.

And the civilized man is progressive because the times change and the social order evolves and new things are invented and changes occur. This conservative who is a liberal is a progressive because he must work and live, he must govern and debate in the world as it is in his own time and as it is going to become.

ADVANCEMENT IN USE OF B-52 BOMBER

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Air Force announced today that Maj. Clyde P. Evely, 39 years of age, from Petersburg, Va., with seven crew members aboard, established a new world record by flying 12,519 miles from Kadena Air Base, Okinawa to Torrejon Airbase, Spain in a B-52 bomber.

This flight, which arrived at 7:52 eastern standard time, January 11, in Spain, was accomplished without refueling, and required only 21 hours and 52 minutes. The average speed for the entire course was 575 miles per hour, with the highest speed at 662 miles per hour between Kadena, Okinawa, and Tokyo.

This is an unusual feat, and I desire to congratulate Major Evely and his crew, and further to commend the Air Force for such advancement in the use of the B-52 bomber.

TRIBUTE TO ALLEN W. DULLES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, at this first session of Congress this year I wish to voice a very brief tribute to Mr. Allen W. Dulles, who, during our adjournment, resigned as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

I pay this tribute because I worked very closely with him during the period that he was the head of CIA, during which time I learned to have the greatest respect and admiration for his mental qualities and for his physical courage.

Mr. Dulles has given a lifetime to public service. He first evinced an interest in foreign affairs at the age of 8, when he wrote a little narrative on the Boer War, which was then being fought. It was published quite extensively.

He entered the diplomatic corps in 1916 and was appointed legation secretary in Vienna. Later he served as a member of the American Commission to negotiate peace at the Paris Peace Conference.

In 1926 he was offered the post of counsellor to the U.S. Legation at Peiping, but resigned from the diplomatic corps to join a law firm in New York, where he remained for a period of time.

However, in 1927 he acted as legal adviser to the American delegation at the Three Powers Naval Conference, and later as adviser to the delegations at the Geneva disarmament conferences of 1932 and 1933.

From 1942 until V-E Day he was chief of the OSS in Switzerland, and until late in 1945 he headed the OSS mission to Germany.

In 1948 he was made chairman of a three-man group, commissioned by Washington, to make a survey of the U.S. intelligence system.

Then in 1950 he joined the CIA, and became its Deputy Director in 1951. In 1953 he was made Director of CIA, and remained in this post until December 1961, when he resigned from that organization.

Mr. President, I pay this tribute to Mr. Dulles because I know of no man who has been more objective in his public service and more sincere in his efforts to build up an intelligence system in the United States which would be worthwhile, and at the same time give us the greatest possible opportunity to obtain information that was available.

He is a man of great intellectual ability and great physical courage. I know of no man for whom I have more respect for his integrity and his character and his service to his country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Massachusetts on his fine statement relating to the exemplary, dedicated, and unselfish service given by Mr. Allen Dulles to the United States of America and to the freedom of the world.

I would not want this opportunity to go by without noting that Members on this side of the aisle, I am sure, join in the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Massachusetts. Speaking for myself, I must say that I have the highest regard for Mr. Dulles. He is a most gifted and able man, who gave of himself unstintingly and unselfishly for the best interests of our country.

He developed a great service in the Central Intelligence Agency, and served with that Agency under Democratic and Republican administrations, without any regard to partisan politics.

I am greatly pleased that the Senator from Massachusetts has made note of this service, because all too often a man who has done so much and given so much, once he is no longer holding a position or title of respect or honor, is forgotten. Let us make sure that that does not happen in the case of Mr. Dulles.

I am pleased that the Senator has brought this matter to our attention.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Allen Dulles is not only a constituent of mine, but also a brother in the law and a close friend. I am pleased to join in the expressions on this subject which have come from people all over the country, and which are voiced very appropriately and eloquently by the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. RUSSELL subsequently said: Mr. President, I understand that earlier today some comment was made in regard to the service of Allen Dulles as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

As one who was associated with Mr. Dulles during the entire period of his service, and who had many occasions to have conferences with him, in company with the distinguished Senator from Arizona, as a small Armed Services Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, I wish to add my tribute for the public services of Mr. Dulles.

Of course, mistakes are made from time to time in all matters of intelligence, particularly when we are undertaking to pierce what has been so eloquently designated by Mr. Churchill as the Iron Curtain. But Mr. Dulles had a particular talent for directing the Central Intelligence Agency. I thought it particularly appropriate that the President of the United States made a visit to the office of the Central Intelligence Agency to award to Mr. Dulles a Medal for Merit for his distinguished services.

I hope that in the future the CIA will have as dedicated and as able a Director as Allen Dulles.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to join in the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] in regard to the services of Allen Dulles. I think he was well qualified by experience; and he did perform with great ability, integrity, and dedication as head of the Central Intelligence Agency.

ATLANTIC CONVENTION OF NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, many of the world's leading citizens have assembled in Paris and are earnestly at work on recommendations which will have an ever-deepening influence on the future course of the free world.

I refer, of course, to the Atlantic Convention of representative citizens from the nations comprising the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Their deliberations began last Monday and will continue through 2 weeks.

Of all the problems mutually confronting the free world nations, particularly those of the Atlantic Community, one of the most urgent is the need to achieve greater solidarity in the economic, political, and spiritual realms. The Atlantic Convention has been commissioned, through the actions of the U.S. Congress and the parliaments of the other NATO nations, to chart the way toward this greater unity.

As one of the original sponsors of the resolution authorizing United States participation in this convention, I know I speak for a great majority of the Members of the Senate in wishing all of the delegates and convention administrators in Paris godspeed and success in their undertaking.

The world—both halves of it—is watching this meeting; our half with hope and confidence, the enslaved half with anxiety. There is no better evidence of this than the news reports and commentaries about the convention which have appeared in the Washington press. I ask unanimous consent that examples of this attention by the press be printed at this point in the Record. They include an Associated Press dispatch, an editorial, and a column written by Crosby S. Noyes, all published in the Washington Evening Star of January 8, 1962, and an editorial published in the Washington Daily News of the same date.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 8, 1962]

Herter Urges NATO To Integrate Politically

Paris, January 8.—Former U.S. Secretary of State Christian A. Herter today urged NATO nations to integrate politically to meet modern-day threats.

Mr. Herter, speaking to 80 delegates of the Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations, said: "We are gradually realizing that the modern world as we know it is coming to an end and we must conform our national actions to this historical fact.

"We feel in our bones that to fulfill our destiny to maintain freedom, we must link our national lives more closely with others. And in a world deeply split by ideological differences, a close-knit Atlantic Community seems our only hope for eventually establishing world order based on justice and the consent of the governed."

The Atlantic Convention opened a 2-week session today. Delegates will make recommendations to their governments on how to achieve greater cooperation and unity in NATO. Mr. Herter is cochairman of the U.S. Citizens' Commission on NATO.

Political integration is the most difficult of all practical steps toward a close-knit Atlantic Community, Mr. Herter said.

Mr. Herter said "our present military posture stems in good part from the shock of Korea. In the backwash of Sputnik, we took measures to make our alliance more effective. Now the obscene wall of Berlin, the outlaw breach of the nuclear testing moratorium, the torpedoing of the disarmament negotiations, stare us in the face.

"How much evidence do we need that this hostile force on the march must be met by a real combination of Atlantic force—military, economic, political—and the most important, spiritual?" he asked.

Mr. Herter repeated a proposal he made when he was Secretary of State in 1960 for a seaborne NATO-owned ballistic missile force. He also called for a substantial increase in mobile conventional forces.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 8, 1962]

The Atlantic Convention

For the next fortnight or so, beginning with today's opening session, 98 distinguished citizen delegates from the 15 member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization will take part in potentially far-reaching discussions designed to bring about greater political and economic cooperation within the vast community that makes up the alliance.

Nothing quite like this gathering has ever before been held in the free world, and it is thus rather experimental in character. Even so, although it is not likely to accomplish miracles, its sponsors—the parliaments of the various countries involved—regard it as a highly promising undertaking that can do much to strengthen NATO, and promote ever-increasing unity which it, to cope with the nonmilitary aspects of the growing Communist threat to man's freedom around the globe.

Our American delegation—created by Congress as "the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO"—is the largest of the 15 now gathered in Paris. Its cochairman are former Secretary of State Christian A. Herter and former Under Secretary William L. Clayton, who have coauthored a highly significant report on foreign trade. Other members (the group is evenly bipartisan) include Vice Chairman Elmo Roper, Eric Johnston, and such additional outstanding individuals as Hugh Moore, a retired manufacturer, and William Burden, ex-Ambassador to Belgium.

As set forth in the bill establishing the Commission, these men (all congressional appointees) are "not in any way to speak for or to represent the U.S. Government." Nevertheless, because they constitute a highly competent group with a lot of prestige, their work at "the Atlantic Convention" can hardly fail to serve a good purpose. They will report in due course to both House and Senate. Meanwhile, all of us have reason to wish them well. Certainly, if this unusual conference is fruitful in even only a limited sense, NATO and the free world at large will be the stronger for it.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 8, 1962]

CONVENTION OF ATLANTIC CITIZENS

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

Paris.—There is a kind of poetic justice in the fact that William L. Clayton and Christian A. Herter are in Paris today.

As Under Secretary of State, Mr. Clayton was one of the guiding spirits of America's greatest postwar initiative in the field of foreign policy—the Marshall plan. As Secretary of State, Mr. Herter gave his official blessing to the idea of a Citizens' Commission on NATO.

Today these two men are in Paris as cochairmen of the American delegation to the first Atlantic convention of NATO nations. The convention is a brainchild of the Citizens' Commission. And, it is hoped, it may, in turn, give birth to another major diplomatic initiative aimed at strengthening the Western World.

The idea of the citizens' convention has been kicking around in the U.S. Congress and NATO circles for more than a decade. For years it was firmly stymied by John Foster Dulles, who had little use for amateur advice of any kind and who saw a potential danger in the notion that a congregation of prominent citizens should meet to debate current Western problems. The danger, which is still real enough today, is that the issues of national and international importance might be compromised if subjected to uninformed and unrestrained enthusiasm which such an intercontinental congress would be likely to generate.

HERTER BOOSTED IDEA

Mr. Herter saw the problem in a different and somewhat more liberal light. Under competent leadership, he thought, a NATO citizens' convention could do no harm. Indeed, on the theory that papa doesn't always know best, it might provide invaluable enlightenment to the governments on some of the most vital issues facing the Western alliance. With Mr. Herter's backing the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO was set up by an act of Congress in 1960. Other NATO countries followed suit, and the present, 2-week meeting of 100 prominent citizens hailing from 15 countries is the result.

It is, by normal diplomatic standards, a somewhat unusual exercise. The Congress and its delegates have an official status in the sense that they are appointed by their respective governments and their expenses are paid out of public funds. It is unofficial in that no delegate is authorized to speak for anyone but himself.

Even the leaders are slightly bemused by the broadness of the directive urging them simply to "explore means by which greater cooperation and unity of purpose may be developed" within the Western community. And so far as the American delegates are concerned, they have no idea to whom the final results of the Congress—if any—should be reported.

STRONG VIEWS HELD

There should, however, be no shortage of intellectual fodder dished up at the forthcoming sessions by the broad assortment of politicians, intellectuals, businessmen, soldiers, and philosophers in attendance. Most of them have strong personal views on the future of the Western alliance, and most will demand to be heard. Among the many delegations there is a strong flavoring of internationalist radicals favoring some form of Federal Atlantic union. Clarence Streit, godfather, and indefatigable lobbyist of Union Now, is wheeling around town as if the convention represented the opportunity of a lifetime.

What may come of it all in practical terms is anybody's guess. The leaders are anxious to avoid exaggerated expectations and point out that whatever conclusions the Congress may reach, they will be valid only in their impact on public opinion and in their advisory effect on the various governments involved.

If there is any one concrete expectation that one can see at this point, it is in the economic field. Most certainly the Congress will dramatize Europe's growing unity and strength, together with the hope of other Western countries, including the United States, for closer association with the Common Market group.

If it does no more than give new expression and emphasis to this facet of the Atlantic community the Congress will have served a useful purpose. It comes at a time when closer economic cooperation could serve to mobilize public opinion behind the fight to liberalize trade within the group of nations represented here. If so, Mr. Clayton and Mr. Herter will have made no small contribution to the success of the Kennedy administration and to the future of the community of nations which they have served so long.

[From the Washington Daily News, Jan. 8, 1962]

THE ATLANTIC CONVENTION

Some 100 outstanding citizens from the 15 NATO nations began a challenging task in Paris this week—exploring ways that the West may achieve closer economic and political unity to counter the cold war front put up by the Soviet bloc.

They are members of the Atlantic convention, invited into session by our own U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO. They are working together not as instructed national blocs but as individual citizens without power to bind their governments.

They will, after exhaustive study, have some recommendations to make to the member governments of NATO. The governments, however, aren't committed to heed them.

Thus, what they recommend must bear such weight of reason and good sense that the nations will want to adopt their recommendations. This is indeed a challenge. We hope it is met.

We hope that these citizens, sharing and pooling their best efforts, may make some significant contributions to the strength of freedom, which has perhaps never before been so sorely tried.

THEY RIDE STRONG IN SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, out of the storm which whipped through the northern Great Plains the past week there came an epic saga which caught and gripped the attention of the Nation on newspaper page and TV screen alike. It was the story of Don Hight's drive of 1,800 cattle over 70 miles of frozen ground and through wind and snow to market them at Winner, in the Rosebud country of South Dakota.

Not in some time has a story from out of the West put pictures on the pages of the big city newspapers and produced word stories of man's contest with the elements as stirring as this one. One is prompted to ask, "Why?"

I venture, Mr. President, to suggest that it is because this rancher on the White River has not only demonstrated that a tough job could be tackled, and done but has revived a story from our past and rekindled the natural pride of our people in self-reliance and courage and determination.

Our famed South Dakota cowboy poet laureate, the late Badger Clark, wrote a poem which he named "On the Drive," which carries these lines:

My pard may sing of sighin' love
  And I of roarin' battle,
But all the time we sweat and shove
  And follow up the cattle.
Heeya-a! the bawlin' crowd of you!
Heeyow the draggin' cloud of you!
We're glad and gay and proud of you,
  We men that follow cattle!

But all the world's a movin' herd
  Where men drift on together,
And some may spur and some are spurred,
  But most are horns and leather!
Heeya-a! the rider sings along,
Heeyow! the reined hawse swings along
And drifts and drags and flings along
  The mob of horns and leather.

The outlaws fight to break away;
  The weak and lame are crawlin',
But only dead ones quit the play,
  The dust (snow) cloud and the bawlin'.

So, today, as the world's moving herd swings along, I call attention to one man's challenge of the difficult, and to voice my salute to Don Hight and his cowboys who have once again painted on a broad canvas the enterprise, determination, and grit that have made America great.

Out in South Dakota, Mr. President, they still ride strong in the saddle.

INAUGURAL STATEMENT OF DR. JAMES R. SCALES, PRESIDENT, OKLAHOMA BAPTIST UNIVERSITY

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on December 10, 1961, one of Oklahoma's distinguished scholars was inaugurated president of Oklahoma Baptist University. He is Dr. James R. Scales, a former dean of men students and a former vice president of this great denominational university.

Dr. Scales is recognized in the academic world because his stimulation of academic excellence and his scholarly interest in all phases of education have already contributed to the building up of this great institution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the inaugural address delivered by Dr. Scales at Oklahoma Baptist University be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

INAUGURAL STATEMENT BY DR. JAMES R. SCALES, PRESIDENT OF OKLAHOMA BAPTIST UNIVERSITY, DECEMBER 10, 1961

This ancient ceremony resembles nothing so much as a pretentious wedding. The banns have been posted, the musicians appointed, the guests invited, the family summoned. The marriage of the university and the man is finally to take place. The guests come, wearing the traditional garments, not really suitable for any other occasion, and thus supply the pageantry, their own entertainment. In every mind are unspoken questions. "How did she do? Is he good enough for her? Is the father of the bride really so affluent as he pretends to be?" As for that last, may I set at rest all anxiety: We are really poverty-stricken. The very pews you occupy may not be paid for, and only a lingering, prepresidential sense of delicacy restrains me from posting the groomsmen to the exits to panhandle the departing visitors.

I am surrounded here by human goodness. Great friends do me honor. Faculty colleagues have worked tirelessly to plan this hour. Chief of them is Vice President Nance, who organized numerous faculty committees for our first inauguration in 27 years. When Mr. Nance sought my views on the inaugural, I suggested we keep it simple, cut it short, and not spend any money. If all my recommendations are to be obeyed so scrupulously, our future here will be very lively indeed.

I am glad that the investiture could be conducted by three men who have been at the center of my life:

My father, whose proud friends form so large a part of this audience, the beneficiaries of his long and faithful ministry;

Chancellor Raley, whose tenure extends well beyond half the life of the institution. He has been most gracious to me in these months of transition, accepting his new responsibilities with imagination and enthusiasm;

Mr. Currin, the chairman of the board of trustees, who has given his best years in the service of higher education in Oklahoma. Only yesterday he was honored by his fellow townsmen as Citizen of the Year—and that could be any year. He is a shining exemplar of enlightened business statesmanship. When such men become committed to the goals of Christian education, and strengthen the partnership between private enterprise and private colleges, our horizons expand. When he has learned of our needs, great or small, his characteristic gesture has been to reach for his checkbook.

I must not fail to acknowledge the participation on this day of the accredited leaders of the great Baptist fellowship. Dr. Lackey, our executive secretary, who always makes time in his crowded schedule for the university; his assistant, Mr. Ingram, who so readily agreed to take the program assignment of Dr. Hobbs, the president of the Southern Baptist Convention; Dr. Bumpas, president of the Oklahoma Convention; and Dr. Hultgren, minister of the First Baptist Church, of Tulsa, who presides on this cold day as my warm personal friend.

Distinguished leaders of the Nation have come: Congressman STEED and, to bring the official greeting, Senator MONRONEY. They would be welcome were their mission less auspicious. I shall prize the letter from the President of the United States.

It is a pleasure to welcome the Governor to this campus. I recall that we sat next to each other in the classroom of the late Vern Thornton. The subject we studied was State government. I remarked to the students in the old chapel last spring that I had reached the awkward age—too old to be Governor and almost too old to be President. But the trustees have rectified that, and salved my pride a little by making me a president—and No. 9 at that. Dr. Dale, you will recall that Gov. William H. "Alfalfa Bill" Murray set great store on his own mystic powers and plumed himself on his science of numerology. No. 9 was Bill Murray's lucky number, and he was inordinately proud to be the ninth Governor; I am not sure all of the people shared his pride.[1]

Nothing has pleased me more than the involvement of the alumni in the plans we have announced for the University. That an alumnus, Dr. Richard Hopper, should be chairman of the trustees' committee to nominate a president, and should come here today, not disavowing the act, is a source of joy.

I certainly want to earn the respect of the students, whose president and eloquent spokesman you have heard. Last spring, I told the student demonstrators, who were circulating petitions and making assorted noises intended to influence the trustees' selection, that this was like very old times—for in the medical universities students chose the rector and even the professors; and then, when they wanted a change, they got that, too. My warning was this medieval practice had gone far enough: the first part is all very well; but, as for the other, let us leave the board of trustees to their business.

In the presence of venerable and beloved figures of church and school, we sense here the university as an unending community. Two scholarly ministers dramatize that continuity. As I was growing up in eastern Oklahoma, I came to know Dr. J. W. Storer, who spoke this morning, and Dr. E. C. Routh, whom we have just heard. I have taken them as my models in much. Can the values of a lifetime of learning be more sharply embodied than in these men—devout, literary, urbane—knowing much of history, ancient, medieval, and modern; no strangers to the world of ideas, who have never used their rare gifts in the spirit of haughtiness or pedantry?

From them and from Dr. Dale, another aristocrat in the republic of letters, I gained some sense of the structure of language and the importance of style. That the dean of Oklahoma historians should come on this occasion, in the ninth decade of his life, to set his imprimatur on me is a gladsome thing indeed.

Those whom you have heard represent only a few components in the modern university. But the most significant representative comes from this remarkable faculty, Dr. Warren Forbes Yarborough, the distinguished service professor of religion, with whom I studied New Testament in 1935; I never mastered the subject, but more edifying than his books has been his life, which has been fruitful by every measure of reckoning. I stand on many shoulders today, and I hope I stand as the champion of the sacred rights and sacred obligations of the teacher.

Without exception, I have had nothing but expressions of esteem from the trustees, from townspeople, from the academic community, and from churchmen of many faiths.

All this reminds me of a remark of a fellow educator in another Baptist school, "We have been complimented almost to death." We appreciate your good wishes, yet you must know that good wishes do not build strong white columns or soaring towers, or quiet laboratories—or scholarship funds. I have received much from you; I shall be asking for much more.

My brief address is on the subject, "Christian Education: The Leaven of Leadership in a Free Society."

I here publicly accept, in the presence of this great company of scholars, the office of president of the university. Eight great and good men have wrought well here; one of them remains to serve with me.

I assume these responsibilities with certain convictions: that education is life's greatest investment; that the higher learning is essential to the survival of civilization; and that this kind of school is indispensable in the total pattern of public and private education in this country. The leaven of spiritual leadership in Christian lands comes from places like this. I announce no new discovery but, as William Blake said, "When I tell the truth, it is not for the sake of convincing those who do not know, but for the sake of defending those who do."

In reviewing the life of an institution, as in language study or in philosophy, it is good practice to go back to the roots. On the medallion I wear is the motto of the university, "Veritas eruditione religioneque" (Truth through Learning and Religion). Baptists have always been in the mainstream of our society, and their concern for education indicates they intend to stay there. They believe with William Penn, "Religion ought not take men out of the world; it ought to put them back into the world to better it and purify it." Like the great Quaker, our people have been activists; they have not been afraid to put their faith or their learning to the test of human experience.

We despise not the day of small things when we say that our beginnings were humble, that the educational fare was often limited, and the social program the classic one of the hilltop denominational college: high thinking and plain living. If we may believe the reminiscences of early alumni, the climate had something of the sourness of puritanism without the discipline and beauty of that great movement. The founders committed us in the charter to "instruction in all branches of knowledge," a ruinously ambitious program. Even today it is beyond the scope of any single institution.

But there was here 50 years ago the nucleus of a good college. Fortunate were the first students in the quality of their seven-man faculty. The curriculum was not much more than the medieval trivium and quadrivium, but these dedicated men, who endured privations to found this school, did the main thing well. Knowledge grows exponentially with every passing decade, so that the 1961 curriculum is more nearly a centrivium of subjects, many of them unknown in 1910, but our purpose holds: to do the main thing well.

Those halcyon days of peace before 1914, when most of our colleges were established, seemed to be a solid, ordered world of certainties. To those who come into places of leadership in these parlous times, few things are certain: Every morning's surprises rob last night's certainties of their meaning. The atmosphere of our time is contaminated with the fallout of rampant evil. Our country, our planet, our universe, are theaters of strife. We are in danger of tearing ourselves apart—youth against elder, rural interest against urban, class against class, race against race, the radical left and the radical right.

There is another danger imposed on us by the struggle for continents and space. General Eisenhower, in his farewell address as President, voiced the curious warning—curious, that is, from a man of his background—that our way of life may be threatened by a military-industrial complex, ready to regiment our lives in the name of military necessity. It is a warning that the custodians of free institutions must heed.

For submerging everything else is the cold war, waged with every weapon short of Armageddon. And we must not complacently suppose that the ultimate cannot happen to us. In Robert Levitt's warning, "If Khrushchev's public statement 'We will bury you' does not have a message for us, then words have lost their meaning."

What kind of response do we, the bountifully endowed 6 percent of the world's people, have in this crisis? What appeal have we against the battle song of the Communist International?

"Arise, ye workers of the world;
  Arise, ye wretched of the earth;
For justice thunders condemnation,
  A new world's in birth."

Do freemen have the spiritual resilience for the sacrifices ahead? We need not go beyond the best-seller list to form a disquieting picture of the average American college graduate: "The Organization Man," "The Waste Makers," "The Image Merchants," "The Operators," "The Status Seekers," "The Ugly American," and other recent sociological works and contemporary novels. These are hollow men who have lost their way—cynical, grasping, lacking in abiding values—society is adrift, meretricious in its standards. If these are accurate judgments—

---

[1] Governor Edmondson was not able to be present.

We are here as on a darkling plain
Swept with confused alarms of struggle and light
Where ignorant armies clash by night.

And thus paralyzed, we shall be one with Nineveh and Tyre.

Education must do better than this. If, by applying the motto on this emblem, we can achieve a new integrity in our individual lives, and a new unity in our corporate life, we may yet witness not the sunset of civilization, but the explosive dawn of a new age of genius. There have been two such creative periods in the history of the West: one, in the city states of Greece in the fourth and fifth centuries before Christ, and the other, throughout Western Europe in the age we call the Renaissance. The third great age of human creativity can be now. If this vital link is to be strengthened, we must address ourselves to two groups—the learned who are indifferent to religion; the religious who are afraid of learning.

We, of the scholarly professions, have often failed in the painful process of interpreting the real issues of life—in history, and science, and philosophy. We wait for the Gallup poll to tell us what to think. We seek the ivory tower, escaping into a world of detachment and frivolity. Our scholarship is too often irrelevant to the world's sore need. True understanding cannot be forced, but our students are justified in the impatient question, made famous by Marshal Foch: "De quoi s'agit-il?" (What's the point?). In the phrase of our own "Uncle Jimmy" Owens, we must teach as for eternity.

The laudable ideal of learning for its own sake becomes, on too many a campus, a precious intellectualism, shared by an evermore restricted circle, a private dialog ending in a private joke. It is right that we guard against the tendency to become wise in our own conceits and to remember the obligations of sharing in a democratic society. The gifted do their best work, I think, where they must observe a decent respect for the opinion of mankind.

In the house of intellect, we are needlessly divided, even men of good will. Pettishly, we refuse to recognize other scholars and their work. C. P. Snow's concept of the two cultures, the sciences and the humanities, each indifferent to the other, is well known. Communication between the two, he says, is all but stopped. One of the advantages of a small campus is that men of many disciplines can still talk to one another in an easy fellowship.

No one who cares about the future direction of our society can afford to ignore science, at least since August 6, 1945; and I am glad that the young dean, a scientist who took office with me, is dedicated to bridging the gap in our understanding. Under his leadership, strong programs will be advanced. Yet it is not too much to ask that the scientific subjects be taught in the humane tradition. If science and technology are to gain a monopoly of the curriculum or to be taught in a mechanical way, we are already brutalized. Rockets and missiles are no more urgent than Plato or Paul, Isaiah, or Santayana.

All of us recall Job's catalog of woe, and his final humiliation, when God revealed himself to Job and to us:

"For I will demand of thee and declare thou unto me, where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? Declare if thou hast understanding. Whereupon were the foundations of the earth fastened? Or who laid the cornerstone thereof, when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?"

We, like Job, sometimes fail to see the unending miracles passing before our eyes every day. You recall, further along in that 38th chapter:

"Hast thou entered into the springs of the sea? Have the gates of death been revealed unto thee? Declare, if thou knowest at all. Hast thou entered the treasures of the snow, or hast thou seen the treasures of the hail? Hast the rain a father? Or who hast begotten the drops of dew? Canst thou bind the cluster of the Pleiades, or loose the bands of Orion?"

And on and on—God's great satirical questions to Job, each of which admits of but one humbling answer.

And the scholar is humble before the questions he cannot answer. We must remember that truth enters lowly doors sometimes, as it did enter this world in the person of Him whom we serve, and whom to know aright is Life Eternal.

We of the intellectual community must do a better job of understanding the business community; the special needs of the churches; the achievements of men who toil in hard places to lift mankind a little above the bestial level of existence.

We of the spiritual community must defend the scholar. From primitive times, people have feared the scholar and his magic. Even sophisticated Athens, at long last, took its vengeance on the superior Socrates. There are still those who fear the implications of free inquiry.

Church-related colleges have known the caution of expediency. After Darwin, there was the flight from higher criticism; after Scopes, the flight from anthropology. After three centuries of geographical isolation, the flight from foreign languages as unnecessary and possibly un-American. Let us absorb the lessons of the census figures. A once great rural denomination has become, like the society of which it is part, a greater urban denomination with a better educated constituency. Shall we retreat into idle hopes and empty dreams about a world which is past? Shall we temporize with the forces that would curb the free growth of the human spirit? Can we compel the heart to retain what the head has rejected?

For my own part, let me say that my beloved denomination has never imposed restraints on me in two decades in these classroooms. In times of bitter conflict, and teaching in a controversial field, I have been restricted only by my own ignorance. And I have been constrained by a sense of responsibility.

But there are those who look on the role of the college as a mirror—only reflecting the society that created it, and the most timid, common denominator of the constituency it serves. Let it be said in billboard language: A university does not follow, it leads. If it retreats, it retreats into disaster. We drive out the good minds of our fellowship at our own peril.

An unexamined faith will not sustain us long. As President Boone commented in the 1930 inaugural, "Ignorance may be bliss, but it is never piety." No Christian can mark off any area of his life as out of bounds to the intellect. No citizen can quarantine his life or his nation's life as out of bounds to the theological and the ethical. If the education of the individual is viewed in its entirety, disciplined hearts must dwell in the same body as disciplined minds.

This, then, is our mission: nothing less than providing Christian leadership for a free society. The role of reconciliation is better taken by those who have an enlightenment from within. We must not fail to speak freely and responsibly. To perpetuate freedom we have to practice it. In the spirit of reconciliation, divergent views are blended. Warring men identify in their foes the spark of divinity that reposes in us all. Old enmities give way; intellect stoops to candor; and reason to faith.

Any discourse on education in a free society must advert to Thomas Jefferson, to whose sublime spirit we credit the most significant American contributions to the rights of men: freedom of the person, freedom of religion, freedom of the mind. With sure instinct, he saw these three achievements when he wrote his own epitaph. Ignoring the great offices he had held, he chose for his monument the Declaration of Independence, the Virginia Statute on Religious Liberty, the University of Virginia. In an age when Burke was extolling the wisdom of prejudice, Jefferson bestowed on his fellow countrymen a passion for a divine sanity—which has not faded under the pressures of war or revolution or reaction. This versatile mortal, who in his letter to the Danbury Baptists, acknowledged his debt to our own fellowship, set us on the right course. And today the yeast of his revolutionary thought still moves upon the waters and in the spirit of man in Africa and Asia, and Latin America. His vow of eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man remains a beacon to scholars everywhere. This founder of the public university system, himself a product of the liberal arts college, never believed that all wisdom had been crystallized in his generation, and must be handed down intact, for "the earth belongs to the living." Julian Boyd, the distinguished editor of Jefferson's papers, said of the intellectual preparation Jefferson had at William and Mary College, "One thing we can be sure of is that his teachers did not try to instill in him the idea that this was the best of all possible worlds or that colonial Virginia was a stable orderly society incapable of improvement. William and Mary prepared him for a world of change."

And he helped change it.

What Jefferson had to say about freedom was not just for colonial rural society. His principles have served well this empire of cities; and today, where cross the crowded ways of life, men of intellect no less than untutored men of the soil, bless his memory. Soul freedom, intellectual freedom go together.

Jefferson was the living embodiment of the spirit of reconciliation in his own spacious life. There was no more bitter rivalry in American history than that which pitted him against John Adams. Yet in their retirement, as passions cooled, the two became great friends; and American letters have been enriched by the volumes of correspondence that passed between them. It is a feast of reason. Every subject was examined by these elder statesmen, so different in backgrounds and attitudes. Adams, with his unbending New England sense of duty, mellowed under the gentle urging of Jefferson's mind. Jefferson, confessing that music was his great passion, science his delight, agriculture his cherished occupation, and his beloved Monticello the end of all his private dreams, subordinated all these pursuits to the higher duty that society imposes on the citizen. Each man, in the spirit of reconciliation, helped the other, and together they have enlightened all posterity.

It is a coincidence of American history that on the fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1826, both lay dying. The old man in Massachusetts, in his last words saluted the old man in Virginia, his erstwhile enemy but eternal friend. "Thomas Jefferson still lives"—and he does, he does, so long as men love freedom and cherish truth.

A TRIBUTE TO MR. SAM

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on August 31, 1961, Sam Rayburn left

Washington on what was to be his last journey home to Texas.

On September 7, 1961, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 133, to provide for the coinage of a medal in recognition of the distinguished services of Sam Rayburn. Before referral to the Committee on Banking and Currency, 49 fellow Senators joined as cosponsors of the resolution.

When Sam Rayburn heard about the resolution, he wired me, asking that no action be taken on it, saying he felt such medals to be inappropriate for the living.

At this session, I have conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], who for the past 29 years had served in the Congress with Speaker Rayburn. I have been informed through the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget that the administration has no objection to this resolution. The chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee has advised me that he would be pleased to bring up this resolution in the near future.

A gold medal for Sam Rayburn is like "carrying coals to Newcastle." I can say this because I offered the resolution for the Congress to honor the service to his country of this great man.

The genius of this American democracy has been that we have been blessed with men like Sam Rayburn. They are the men who get the job done. Men like Sam Rayburn are the men who make democracy work.

When the Founding Fathers had finished their work of fashioning the Constitution of the United States, there was established a system of laws by which our people agreed to live.

Ever since, we have talked about a government of laws, rather than a government of men. But our system of government by law would long since have gone by the board, had it not been for men like Sam Rayburn; for Sam Rayburn respected the law; Sam Rayburn honored the law. Sam Rayburn served the basic law of this country. Therein lies the greatness of the man.

To understand Sam Rayburn, one has to appreciate the environment from which he came—the wonderful Fourth Congressional District of Texas. This is not said in deprecation of Tennessee, the State of his birth, the State which has produced so many fine Texans. I know the Fourth Congressional District; I know the people there; I know what Sam Rayburn means to them and what they meant to Sam Rayburn. Every elected official is a mirror of his constituency. He reflects, in the best sense, the considered judgment of the people he represents. A few great men magnify, rather than reflect; and Sam Rayburn magnified the greatness of his constituency.

I do not apologize for being a partisan Texan. All Texans are wonderful, by definition; but Sam Rayburn was the magnificent Texan; he was the tallest Texan of them all.

I need not review here today his public record; all Senators know it as well as I do. And when the record is finally compiled, the outstanding fact is not that he served his congressional district almost 50 years, or that his record of service as Speaker of the House of Representatives twice over exceeded that of Henry Clay. The record in which we are interested is a qualitative one, rather than quantitative. Sam Rayburn had the tough moral fiber and the intellectual tenacity to produce when his country called. And produce, Sam Rayburn did—and in the grand manner.

"Mr. Sam" was not perfect, and he would have been the first to disagree if anyone had said he was. His limitations were human. He had his likes and his dislikes; but, overall he had a sense of the pulse of history and a ready recognition of what the times demanded. Whether the subject under consideration was a Utility Holding Company Act, a Rural Electrification Administration measure, or an extension of the draft just prior to Pearl Harbor, Sam Rayburn produced. And it is by results that we judge a man.

Today, we are saying to history and to the generations of public servants who are to follow us in the Congress that Sam Rayburn was a great example of the finest tradition of public service in the United States. He heard when his country called, and he knew how to respond. His legacy, his example of service devoted to his country, will be an inspiration to young men and women so long as the United States survives.

This resolution, calling for a gold medal in honor of Sam Rayburn, asks that a simple tribute be engraved on the medal, as I feel it is engraved in the hearts of his countrymen: "For services rendered to the people of the United States."

This was Sam Rayburn's record—a record of services rendered. We are the beneficiaries. There is no partisanship in patriotism; Sam Rayburn belonged to us all.

He was a great Texan; but, most of all, Sam Rayburn was a great American.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a number of newspaper and magazine articles.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Houston Chronicle, Nov. 17, 1961]

Son of Old Frontier Played Powerful Role in New

(By Ralph McGill)

Sam Rayburn is dead in the autumn season of harvest and fulfillment: "Don't ever count the crop until it is in the barn," he used to tell young, impatient Congressmen. The crop of his life is now in eternity's barn and it can be counted and measured.

Sam Rayburn was not an average man. He was not, as some thought, taciturn and short of temper. He was not a man for smalltalk. He did not tolerate fools easily. Now and then he annoyed the more idealistic newcomers to the House by telling them that the "way to get along is to go along." (He did not mean it as cynically as it sounds.)

As we begin to look at the harvest of Rayburn's long, rich life, we discover that in the years of the New Deal, and the first of the New Frontier, it was he, the smalltown, rural conservative, who labored most successfully in the vineyard of social reform. He could be, and was, both conservative and liberal. But what he really was, was a man of great sensitivity and feeling for the needs and rights of people. He had no patience with those who proposed legislation which he thought had for its purpose merely the coddling or rewarding of people. But when the real needs of people were at issue, Mr. Sam was on their side.

AVERTED DISASTER

Had it not been for him, President Kennedy, for example, would have been brought to disaster in the first months of his administration. The Rules Committee was in defiant, hostile hands. It would not permit bills which established a new minimum wage, expanded social security payments, a housing act, and other legislation pledged by the Democratic administration, to be voted out to the floor. To get them there Sam Rayburn had to do battle with an old friend, Representative Howard Smith of Virginia.

It was a close vote—217 to 212. But the margin was wide enough—especially in a battle which might not have been won at all.

This was in early January 1961. It was in late summer that what seemed like an old man's lumbago pains began to bother Mr. Sam. He went home. Worried doctors found it was not lumbago at all, but cancer, already spread through the lymph system, and impossible to cure.

In the sorrow which welled up at the news, men began to remember that he had served well three Presidents, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, and John Kennedy. They each learned to lean on him. They encountered his sometimes irascible stubbornness. They knew moments of irritation and anger. But none doubted his loyalty. They knew that when the chips were down they could count on his complete loyalty to the Democratic Party and its basic principles. He might, and often did, refuse to accept presidential urgings and proposed legislation. Not even his enemies ever suggested he was a rubberstamp. But he was unfailingly a Democrat.

SAFE WITH RAYBURN

There are many examples of this presidential awareness.

One weekend when a VIP caller telephoned Washington he found the President and the Vice President were away. He reached the President in a distant city and asked, "Who's tending the store in Washington?"

"Rayburn," said the President. "The country's safe with him there."

Even Harold Ickes, though he quarreled often with Sam Rayburn (and with everyone else), wrote that Roosevelt's most vital legislation could not have been had without Sam Rayburn.

The President did not obtain all he wanted. But in the field of public utility reform, for example, strong legislation was enacted over the bitter fight of the powerful electric and gas industry lobbies. Rayburn was storm-tossed and under terrific pressure from interests in his home State. Yet he held on.

Rural electrification came via the Norris-Rayburn bill. Here again, the electric companies fought hard to prevent passage of it. Rayburn put it through the House and the Senate followed this leadership.

This was the period when President Roosevelt said, "I am fighting communism, Huey Longism, Coughlinism, Townsendism. I want to save our system, the capitalistic system; to save it is to give some heed to world thought of today."

In all these things Sam Rayburn was a stalwart.

LONELY, HARD LIFE

Perhaps he remembered his own harsh boyhood. He was the eighth child of 11. On an isolated 40 acres, young Rayburn grew up. He recalled the far stretching, level emptiness of the plains, and the hours when he swung on the gate on Sundays, hoping to see some rider coming on a visit. (Once he said of those days, "I have known loneliness that breaks the heart.") He toiled hard in the fields. He read history books at night.

He wanted school. When it came time for Sam to go to East Texas Normal, the young man had perhaps $5 saved from the meager amounts which came his way. His father waited until the train was in. He then silently handed his boy $25.

"God knows how he saved it," said Rayburn, in talking about that day. "He never had any extra money. We earned just enough to live. It broke me up, him handing me that $25. I have often wondered what he did without, what sacrifice he and my mother made beyond those which every day demanded of them."

DID ODD JOBS

At the Normal school he swept floors and did odd jobs for his room and board. He studied hard—especially history. He managed to get to law school. Politics were always in his mind. He once said that at 10 years of age he was determined to go to Congress. In the Southern States law is regarded as a necessary steppingstone to politics.

He went to Congress in 1912, the year Woodrow Wilson became President. Wilson was ever one of his heroes. He never thought of the Senate, and never aspired to it. To him, the House, the legislative body, was the most important and meaningful.

He was often at odds with Democratic Presidents. But he never even considered bolting the Democratic Party. He thought it not unusual that the country turns to Democrats when there is trouble. "I think this is because they are, for the most part, closer to the people and think in broader political terms," he once said. "The Republicans have a tradition of representing business—not people."

WAS FOR PEOPLE

This may help explain his support of legislation, attacked by the GOP Old Guard as socialistic, which enabled people to have a better life. REA is a perfect example. He pushed it hard. "It will take some of the harsh labor off the backs of farm men and women," he said.

He was elected Speaker in 1940. He held that postion until his death, save for the first Eisenhower administration. He respected President Eisenhower, and believed him to be an honest, well-meaning man. But he also thought him a Republican in the sense that Mr. Eisenhower's image of wisdom and "the best brains" seemed to be any man who had attained financial success.

JOHNSON FRIENDSHIP

There was a long, fast friendsip between him and Lyndon Johnson, now Vice President. The current Vice President first came to Washington as a Congressman and it was his fellow Texan Rayburn who schooled him and taught him the ropes. At the 1960 convention it was Rayburn who placed his protege's and friend's name in nomination for the Presidency. It was Rayburn, too, who was one of those who gave the green light to Senator Johnson's surprise acceptance of the Vice Presidential nomination.

Sam Rayburn's life was not Spartan, it was rich. Yet, he lived simply. He never took congressional junkets. Indeed, the record shows that he never left the United States but once. He went once to inspect the Panama Canal. When Congress adjourned he went home. He had two farms. On one he raised cattle. On the other he grew corn and cotton. He liked to fish and read. But he was not a man who had to be entertained. He could live with himself.

It is proper, in seeking to sum up the life of the man who served with (not under) Wilson, Roosevelt, Truman, and Kennedy, and who gave to each advice which was wise and politically pragmatic, to note that he is the last of his breed. He came quite literally from the frontier. The last President he served projected for the country a New Frontier in a time of growing population, automation, computers, and industrial techniques which approach the miraculous.

RESILIENT

Sam Rayburn came from the old frontier. Yet, none was more alert or at home in the New Frontier than he. His mind was so resilient that he could serve the Presidents in whose administrative years the Nation made its greatest social changes.

Our system has endured because the profit dollar developed, in the years spanned by Rayburn's life in the Congress, a social conscience. American captalism came to mean, among other things, public education, social security, unemployment insurance, aid to crippled children, to the blind, and, through hospital construction, aid to the sick. Capitalism pays the bill for disasters; it subsidizes farmers; it builds dams and irrigates deserts. It clears slums, finances housing, guarantees bank deposits. American capitalism resembles almost not at all the classic capitalism of Queen Victoria's day. It is almost unbelievable that one man's legistive experience spans these tremendous reforms—from 1912 until now. And rare is the important bill which does not bear his name or the stamp of Rayburn's advice or influence.

GREATER THAN PRESIDENTS

It is easy to see that he was, and that the sum of his life is greater than that of any one of the Presidents with whom he served. "Don't ever say a Speaker of the House served under a President, son," he once told a young reporter.

In writing about men who have served for a long number of years, it is too easy to slip into the trite conclusion that an era has ended and that it is perhaps as well that death has come to save a man from heartbreak and disappointment.

This is not true of "Mr. Sam." Until the lumbago pains would no longer respond to aspirin or mustard plasters, he could sniff the battle from afar and go forward confidently to meet it. He was a magnificent field commander. He grew old, but his mind, his political tactics and strategies did not. He was not losing his grip. The fact is there is none to take his place in the House. And, in certainty, he will stay on in the hearts of the thousands who knew and loved him.

[From the Daily Texan, Nov. 17, 1961]

'Tween the Horns

(By Hoyt Purvis)

When a famous person dies, every writer, large or small, important or nonentical, wants to write of the time they talked to or saw the famed person.

Certainly there are hundreds of writers who knew more of Sam Rayburn than I. And there are persons who read this paper who were well acquainted with Mr. Sam. But just the same, I can't help recalling my meetings with him.

Elsewhere on the page I write of the accomplishments of Sam Rayburn. But here I want to talk about some personal reflections.

The first time I met Mr. Rayburn was several summers back, when I was spending time in Washington, and the Capitol was my habitat. Having thoroughly familiarized myself with the place, I was resting obscurely in one of many out-of-the-way rooms, my nose in the paper. After a while I noticed a man sitting next to me, also reading, but I didn't pay much attention. Then, recognizing the famous Rayburn head, I hastened to introduce myself and shake hands.

Coming face-to-face with that Rayburnish scowl, I almost expected a growl, but instead got a smile, a friendly and warm conversation.

Now I am sorry that I only indulged in small talk, but so often that is the way you react.

My second meeting with Mr. Sam came just last June. The 14 of us from UT who went to Chile for the Student Leaders Seminary spent some prior time in Washington for orientation from the State Department and Foreign Service Institute.

One afternoon we paid visits to the various Texas legislators, and of course Mr. Sam was tops on our list.

That was just a few months back, and Mr. Sam was in the Speaker's chair, in full charge of the House.

I recall that just as we arrived at Rayburn's office, the bell indicating a rollcall sounded and we were amazed to see Speaker Rayburn literally galloping back to the floor.

It was a remarkable experience to observe the 79-year-old gentleman scurrying through the corridors, or banging down the gavel or his fist to get a point over.

When we gathered in his office a few minutes later we expected only a hurried introduction, but the busy bulwark of the Democrats took time for a heart-to-heart talk. It seemed highly significant at the time. And it was. People suspected that Mr. Sam was in his last days, but no one really would say it.

We remembered how it was so quiet as he started talking, and how once again that stone face melted into a friendly grin.

He described himself as a man who "has always been in a hurry." He said, "I did 3 years of college in 2 years, and had to sweep floors and ring bells to make it. I studied law at the university after being elected to the State legislature."

Mr. Sam told our group that if we wanted to be good Americans, one of the most important things was knowledge of our country's history. And he spoke with pride of his library in Bonham, and urged us to visit it soon. I think I will.

"Read about the men who were alive, and know particularly about the formative period. The most romantic thing in the world is U.S. history," said Rayburn.

And then, speaking as a man who knew, he said: "One man has as much sense as the next. It's those who work that make it. Ability is no good without energy. There is no primrose path to success."

He banged his fist on the desk as he made his final point. But he didn't need to. We would all remember. And I will always remember.

[From the Daily Texan, Nov. 17, 1961]

Great Career Ended

Dedication to Texas, to the Democratic Party, and to the United States were inherent qualities in Sam Rayburn. Courage, wisdom, and firmness, combined with this dedication, made Mr. Sam one of the great men of the 20th century.

Rayburn was a man who earned respect not just from Texans, or Democrats, or Americans, but from citizens of all States, and nations, and of all sorts of political beliefs.

He was not a back-slapping politician, but he knew how to pull the strings and was superb at getting what he wanted. Even in his days as a university law student and State representative he was demonstrating vigorous devotion to what he believed in. He followed the pattern for 48 years in Congress, serving longer than any other man.

Mr. Sam was not flashy. But his straight shooting and constant hard work allowed him to move up steadily in the national echelon. In 1940, a tense year in all the world, his fellow Representatives elected him to head the House. He made his position powerful, probably second only to the Presidency. He served as Speaker twice as long as Henry Clay, the previous record holder.

In 1961 he was still proving to be the vigorous captain of the House. One of the toughest battles in House history arose over changes in the rules committee. And Mr. Sam won out in a hot fight with his old friend, Howard Smith of Virginia.

When Mr. Sam first went to Washington back in the pre-World War I days, Texas was still a relatively young and undeveloped State. Such is no longer the case, and the Lone Star State has become more urbanized, and industrialized, and a strong force in national affairs. But it never outgrew Sam Rayburn. Rather it grew with Rayburn and because of him.

When he came home to Texas to live his last days the eulogies started pouring in. And they were all unanimous in sterling praise.

Early Thursday Mr. Sam left the great American stage. But the shadow of his greatness, and the sound and solemnity of that gavel he so often banged will remain indelibly impressed in American annals.

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Oct. 19, 1961]

Texas Reaps Benefits—Rayburn a Partner of F.D.R. in Bringing About New Deal

(By Marquis Childs)

Washington.—The qualities making for leadership in a democracy are blurred by television and radio, the media of mass communication that infinitely expand the opportunity of the clever demagog. It was out of quite another era, the era of the individual speaking from a body of conviction and belief deeply rooted, that Sam Rayburn came.

Mr. Sam has always known who he was. When he did speak sparingly and sparsely in language of almost Biblical simplicity, it was out of his origins in an America that still reflected the glow of the struggle for freedom and the harsh, demanding life of the frontier.

A SILENT PARTNER

Because he was so little concerned with his own personal prestige—his is one of the shortest biographies in Who's Who—a later generation is hardly aware of how much he had to do with shaping the Democratic Party. He was a partner of Franklin Roosevelt in the New Deal. And if for the most part he was content to be a silent partner he was nevertheless an indispensable component of the partnership that brought what was in effect a new party into being.

Roosevelt spoke for the city masses, the bosses and their constituents. Rayburn worked for the dispossessed South and West, for those who were in effect colonial drawers of water and hewers of wood for the industrial North. The partnership was highly successful in that the two major interests complemented each other and impressive majorities were rolled up in one election after another.

PUSHED HARD FOR REA

One of the New Deal goals that Rayburn pushed hardest was rural electrification. He had grown up in the age of oil lamps when the farmer's wife pumped all the water for the household by hand, besides doing the innumerable other chores for a big family. Rayburn was determined to have the farmer share with the city dweller the benefits of technology. He worked hard to get benefits for his own State of Texas and particularly when he recruited as his adjutant a smart young Texan new to the House named Lyndon Johnson.

The end of Rayburn's career coincides with a revolution of the right in Texas that seeks to take that State not only out of the New Deal but into the arms of the Republican right. This uprising, symbolized by Texas new Republican Senator, John Tower, is for States rights and against the Federal Government and all its works. The wealthy Texans financing the movement are well to the right of Louis XIV in the conviction of their own sovereignty.

Yet Texas today gets more Federal handouts than almost any other State. In 1960 Texas got 5.82 percent of the divvy from the nine largest Federal programs and in that same year paid 4.43 percent of the total tax burden. The total was $534,352,000 for Texas with a population of 9,850,000.

MORE THAN NEW YORK

This compares with $655,889,000 for New York State with its population of 16,782,000 and California which got $677,584,000 with a population of 15,717,000. The comparison shows up even more sharply in individual programs. On old-age assistance, for example, Texas got $103,187,000 while New York State got $46,732,000. This may be a reflection of the degree to which Texas out of its own sovereign tax revenues helps its own old people.

In military contracts Texas outranks all but three States with well over a billion dollars in defense procurement in 1960. In short, the process that Rayburn began many years ago to try to equalize the distribution of the Nation's wealth has gone forward with a vengeance. And, as Mr. Sam has from time to time wryly observed, those who shout loudest about States rights are often those who work hardest to snare the Federal dollar.

Nothing riled him so much as the fulminations of these conservatives who were at the same time eager to get all the benefits going from the measures initiated under the New Deal and the Fair Deal. A year ago, when President Kennedy was in Texas, Mr. Sam campaigned with him with the vigor of a man half his age. He showed that he could still hit at what he believed to be prejudice and hypocrisy with the fire of his youth.

In the House, where he has been Speaker far longer than anyone in history—he passed that record in 1951—he has in recent years been tired and sometimes impatient and indifferent. Discipline in the unwieldy Democratic majority was lax and both southerners and northerners strayed off the reservation with Mr. Sam's sanction in the belief that if they had to vote a certain way to get reelected then they had to vote that way.

When he came to Congress in 1913, Washington was a small provincial capital, a southern town with a transient population moving in and out as the Congress met. Increasingly the follies of the time oppressed him. But he never lost the integrity, the sense of being part of a nation he knew and loved, that he brought with him from the last frontier.

[From the Austin Statesman, Nov. 17, 1961]

Mr. Sam Won Many Battles, but Death Is Victor in His Last Fight

Sam Rayburn has won many battles. But the last one he could not win, that against rapidly spreading cancer. Though Mr. Sam was spared the excruciating agony of terminal cancer, his once-hardy frame was emaciated by his affliction, and his mind lost the alertness and sharpness, for which he was famous, in the last days and hours.

Rayburn was a Congressman and Speaker of the House of Representatives longer than any other man, breaking the speakership record previously held by Henry Clay.

He was a responsible custodian of the prestige of that office, acutely conscious of being a Democrat, but scrupulously fair in his rulings and in his treatment of his opposition, as shown by the fact that one of his intimates was Republican Representative Joe Martin of Massachusetts, who functioned as Speaker during the interval of Republican control of the House, lost early in the Eisenhower administration, and as shown by the fact that Republicans in Congress had a warm affection for him despite his being a vigorous exponent of numerous Democratic policies.

Yet he was no rubberstamp man. He disagreed with parts of Democratic administration objectives and said so. But in the stern disciplinary area of party politics he was a good soldier. He was a man about whom a sort of legend has grown as to his taciturnity and reluctance to make speeches. But when it became known that Rayburn was to address the House, the House filled speedily as the word passed that "Rayburn is on."

Rayburn, one of this land's greatest Americans, loved his country with a passion. Profoundly disturbed when the House, in the face of the imponderable of World War II which we had yet to enter, was about to abolish the Selective Service System and in stern, plain talk, demanded that it heed the realisms of the day which found German submarine war already seeking to drive us from the seas and about to sink the U.S. destroyer, the *Reuben Jones*, he demanded an extension. The issue was won by the closest of votes, that of one for retention of the Selective Service System, which won for this country irreplaceable time to prepare for the certainty of war.

He led the fight against the principle of holding companies controlling vast corporate domains, as was shown in the busted bubble of the Samuel Insull utilities empire. He stood for good and responsible Americanship, the rights of the people, a solidly endowed economy.

Having experienced poverty he had a broad sympathy for the unfortunate in times of stress and never hesitated to uphold the principle of public assistance until those in plight could be rehabilitated, though often under bitter attack from the wearers of silks and satins.

It is difficult for anyone long familiar with Rayburn at the gavel of the House to believe that that body can for a long time to come ever be the same without him.

In many major matters he was above mere partisanship. He had also the qualities of statesman. His death is a heavy blow to Texas, which derived prestige from his long incumbency in the chair and as House Member.

It is a blow to the Democratic Party, beset by the responsibilities of stewardship at a time when problems greater and unlike those at any other time in this country's history, face it, with the threat of devastating nuclear war and the intransigeance of Russia and its leaders toward any proposal that would soften or avoid the danger, and thus is a blow to the Kennedy administration. Neither party has a figure comparable to the unusual abilities and stature of Rayburn.

But in the midst of death life must go on. The world is for the living, but this is the time for shedding of tears. Comes now after a decent interval, and with the reconvening of Congress which shall know his presence no more, with the Chamber's artificial light bouncing off his baldpate as he sat or stood at the podium, with a face often as inscrutable as that of a sphinx, when a successor must be named. It will call for the most mature of decisions, with all the way from half a dozen to a dozen being mentioned, most largely unknown save in their own districts.

For the Democratic Party itself it also is a time for self-examination. One of its greatest, able to guide it through the shoal waters of party disunity and resulting prejudices, is gone.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Nov. 17, 1961]

Sam Rayburn

The end came for Sam Rayburn in the community he loved, in the midst of friends in the district that first sent him to Austin 54 years ago and chose him 25 times to represent it in Washington. The record he wrote is not likely to be surpassed. His achievement is among the amazing superlatives of American political history.

Mr. Rayburn's career was the epitome of the practical functioning of democracy where such intangibles as loyalty, friendship, and individual persuasion shape events more surely than the oratory of a Roosevelt or a Kennedy.

Above all else, Mr. Rayburn was human. Four of the eight Presidents of the United States who knew him live today to mourn the loss of a personal friend. So do two young Dallas boys whom he greeted with "Glad to see young folks my age," when he interrupted a busy conference schedule not long ago. For millions of other Americans, too—who knew him only as the unsmiling, gavel-pounding arbitrator of Democratic national conventions and sessions of the House of Representatives—a friend is gone.

Of all the lessons learned in mankind's chronicle, the most certain is that only history can weigh fairly the real worth of men. Many opposed with deep conviction the issues for which Mr. Rayburn strove. In the struggle, he was a relentless fighter but usually a warm friend when the tumult died.

So be it today, for in death there are no foes. There is only the lasting memory of the love of the many Mr. Rayburn befriended, and of the unique service he rendered longer than any other American.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 1, 1961]

Rayburn: "Tallest Texan of Them All"

(By Bicknell Eubanks)

Bonham, Tex.—"He was the tallest Texan of them all."

That was the comment of the senior Senator from Texas, Ralph Yarborough, at the passing of Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn. Senator Yarborough, who occasionally found himself at odds with Mr. Rayburn in the roily politics of Texas, spoke for his fellow Texans in general.

While Texans are proud of the historical stature of their neighbor, they have not been unanimous in approving his political policies, perhaps because he stands out as a towering individualist among people who themselves still reflect the individualism of their pioneer heritage.

But Sam Rayburn brought great prestige to his home district, the smallest congressional constituency in the State, and to Texas as a whole. Most Texans felt a pride in this prestige.

NATIVE OF TENNESSEE

Only a few political intimates ever got close enough to Mr. Rayburn, however, to sense the respect he held for the position, both official and historical, which he had been thrust into.

Interestingly, Mr. Rayburn never possessed the political power in his home State that he wielded on the national scene.

He had many political foes in the Lone Star State, though few bitter enemies.

[President Kennedy changed the itinerary of his western trip in order to attend funeral services in Bonham Saturday for Mr. Rayburn, Mr. Kennedy was scheduled to arrive in Texas shortly after noon Saturday, attend the funeral, and then fly back to California for a Democratic Party dinner in Hollywood Saturday night.]

Mr. Rayburn, a native of Tennessee, was brought to Texas as a young boy. He was the eighth of 11 children of a Confederate veteran and farmer, William Marion Rayburn, and Martha Waller Rayburn, both of them originally from Virginia.

He was so widely known as Sam Rayburn that few persons ever knew his full name, Samuel Taliaferro Rayburn.

CLASSIC TRADITION

Mr. Rayburn rose to prominence in the classic American tradition. He grew up amid simple surroundings. He said his father told him, "Sam, the only thing I can give you is character."

His boyhood on the farm near Bonham left its stamp on his political and economic philosophy. He once explained that a major reason why he worked so hard for rural electrification was because he remembered how his mother had to carry firewood and water, and he wanted to spare other mothers from having to perform such difficult chores.

Mr. Rayburn worked his way through college and attended what is now East Texas State College at Commerce. He later got a law degree at the University of Texas.

He showed his political aptitude early when he was elected speaker of the Texas House of Representatives at the age of 29, the youngest speaker in Texas history. The next year he ran for Congress and was elected. He took his seat on March 4, 1913, and had served ever since. His reelection soon became almost routine. He seldom had any opposition.

TWO DISAPPOINTMENTS

Mr. Rayburn once told Texas newsmen that he had had only two major disappointments. He had wanted to be President, but he explained that at the time when he could have been a choice, Franklin D. Roosevelt came on the scene, "and I didn't have a chance." The other was that his protege, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, did not get the Democratic nomination for President in 1960.

When Mr. Rayburn was at home, he filled a busy schedule. He would receive many visitors and long-distance telephone calls.

Once when this correspondent visited him during the lunch hour, he was interrupted by a caller from Oklahoma. The Oklahoman, a young garage operator, had come to Bonham to ask Mr. Rayburn for a top diplomatic job. Mr. Rayburn received him cordially and discussed the request gravely and calmly for about 30 minutes.

When Mr. Rayburn returned to the dining room, a sister asked him what did he do about the request. It was during a period when the Republicans controlled the House and Representative Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts, was Speaker. Mr. Rayburn chuckled:

"I just told him to get in touch with Joe. I wonder what Joe will do about it."

He chuckled some more as he told his guests to have second helpings.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 17, 1961]

Rayburn: A Solid, Unfrilled Citizen

(By William H. Stringer)

Washington.—The President, the Vice President, the Members of Congress, and the whole Nation is honoring the memory of Sam Rayburn, the plain-living, direct-spoken, unfrilled American who passed on in Bonham, Tex., after serving as Speaker of the House longer than any man in history, and twice as long as Henry Clay.

The House of Representatives won't find it easy to replace "Mr. Sam," whose strength of character and sense of duty helped keep the splintered, populous lower Chamber in step with the White House and Senate. President Kennedy saw this as the House kicked over the traces when Mr. Rayburn went home early this year, and defeated Senate-passed legislation.

SPEAKER 18 YEARS

Oldsters are saying around town that they don't build men like Sam Rayburn any more—solid, quietly believing in the basic goodness and rightness of things American, shunning the uses of publicity and televised congressional hearings, an "old-fashioned," conservatively dressed man from the small towns of the Nation.

But quite possibly his example has taken hold, as passed along in friendships on Capitol Hill, at numerous Washington dinners where he spoke briefly and pithily and in such a calm remark as this—to someone who asked him to define his philosophy: "Well, a little applied Christianity wouldn't hurt."

The Washington consensus, as Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson canceled his west coast flight and headed instead for Texas, was that it is the Nation's strength that it does produce such individuals.

"He was always there when he was needed," Mr. Johnson commented. "His voice and judgment were heard and respected. In the end, it all added up to one thing—he did what was right."

Mr. Rayburn was Speaker of the House 18 years. He served more years in the House of Representatives than any man since the Nation was born.

SHUNNED LABELS

Now the choice of House Speaker is expected to fall on Representative John McCormack, Democrat, of Massachusetts, the present Acting Speaker, with perhaps some of his authority shared by a younger and more effective man, Representative Richard Bolling, of Missouri, who would be House leader.

Northern liberals often called Mr. Rayburn a southern conservative—though he helped to send much of Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal through the House. Virgorous conservatives called him a liberal. Personally, he shunned labels even as he shunned making long speeches.

In 1960 he was for Mr. Johnson for President. But the bright young men and adroitly organized efforts of the Kennedy campaign defeated him. He had gaveled numerous Democratic nominating conventions into activity, and by quick nods and recognitions of those clamoring for notice from the floor he often influenced the course of events. In 1960 he had stepped down from this role, so he could work for his friend Lyndon.

Those who looked around Washington today for memories of "Mr. Sam's" work could recall the time just before World War II when the Nation's whole military program hung in the balance. On August 12, 1941, isolationists were on the verge of defeating the bill to extend the Draft Act.

Mr. Rayburn called upon Secretary of State Cordell Hull and the top men of the Armed Forces for letters to read to the House to impress its membership with the seriousness of the situation.

During the final debate he took the floor and appealed for support. And in the voting confusion as the ballot was taken, he used his knowledge of parliamentary procedure to freeze permanently the announced bare majority vote of 203 to 202—the vote which helped make the Nation prepared for war.

Many have testified that Robert E. Lee was Mr. Rayburn's real national hero, not because he was southern but because the name Lee meant duty, love of country, self-denial. In his inner-sanctum office in the Capitol, the photographs of General Lee are prominent.

The late David Cohn wrote of Mr. Rayburn: "He was born on the farm in the prepackaging era when folks got their cheese off the big round and their crackers out of the barrel, and so he clings to the outmoded concept that the contents are more important than the package."

Which, as many today would opine, is a lesson for this modern commercially vibrant country to remember well.

[From the Bonham (Tex.) Daily Favorite, Nov. 19, 1961]

Thousands Pay Last Tribute to Mr. Sam

"He has finished his course."

With those words, Speaker Sam Rayburn was laid to rest Saturday afternoon in Willow Wild Cemetery.

The new grave is beside that of his beloved sister, Miss Lu, and in the family plot with his mother and father and other members of his family who have gone before.

His pastor, Elder H. G. Ball, had spoken the comforting and reassuring words, "We do not say farewell, we only say goodnight."

He spoke the words before possibly the greatest assemblage of Government leaders ever to gather outside the Halls of the Nation's Capitol.

He spoke them to President John F. Kennedy, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, former Presidents Harry Truman and Dwight Eisenhower, more than 100 Members of Congress and the U.S. Senate, and scores of other high officials representing almost every department of the Nation's Government.

His impressive eulogy to Mr. Sam came during funeral services in the First Baptist Church which was filled to overflowing. The services were piped outside by loudspeaker in order that the thousands who could not get in might hear.

RITES IN WASHINGTON

The services were carried in full by national television. In Chicago the Chicago Symphonic Orchestra played special music before the services, while the body was being taken to the cemetery, and then after the interment rites were complete.

Simultaneously with the services here, memorial rites were being held in the Washington Cathedral, where those hundreds of friends in the Nation's Capital who could not come to Bonham could join in the final tribute.

It must have been just as Vice President Johnson had said it would be in Washington—"a lonesome place without Mr. Sam."

It was the same in Bonham.

THE WORLD GRIEVES

"We must realize that we are grieving not only in our own hearts—but the world, or most of it, is grieving with us today," Elder Ball, of the Tioga Primitive Baptist Church, said as he opened the impressive tribute to the man he referred to often as "our friend."

"The poor, the lonely, the less fortunate were objects of his compassion and his consideration.

"Such men are not born. They are made."

Elder Ball spoke of the ambition that began in a cottonfield of Fannin County, of Mr. Sam's climb to national prominence and the high position he achieved.

"He had the feeling that in that place he could be a servant to so many people in the world.

"He made himself a good servant of all the men and women and children who support the freedom and liberties we seek.

"He has fought a good fight for the liberties and freedom of this country.

"He has fought a good fight for the people of this country and the district he represents. He has kept the faith with the democracy of our country.

"He has finished his course."

KEPT FAITH WITH GOD

Elder Ball said that Mr. Rayburn "not only met local and national obligations in his position, but he has kept faith with God."

"As we come to this hour, the future holds all that is bright and eternal," Elder Ball said. "It can only be had when we enter through the portals of death. He is now where there will be no strife, no threats of war or destruction, but where there is nothing but peace.

"We are not saying farewell, we only are saying goodnight."

Immediately following the services, the presidential party left the church, followed by members of the family. Many hundreds of others had gathered at the cemetery for the brief commital rites. Chaplain Bernard Braskamp of the U.S. House of Representatives led the prayer at the opening of the service and at the cemetery.

So numerous were the arrivals Saturday morning of people in high government places that knowing who was here was difficult.

PRESIDENT FLIES IN

President Kennedy flew into Perrin Air Force Base and came to Bonham by helicopter. Former President Truman had arrived early and gone to see Mr. Rayburn's surviving brother and two sisters at the Rayburn home west of Bonham.

Former President Eisenhower flew to Perrin and came to Bonham by helicopter.

The First Baptist Church filled rapidly as ushers, directed by William "Fishbait" Miller, longtime doorkeeper at the House of Representatives, took congressional and senatorial representatives and their wives, and the scores of other high officials, including Congressman John McCormack, Secretary of Navy John Connally, Gov. Price Daniel, of Texas, and many others to their seats.

When the seating of distinguished visitors and others who occupied reserved sections was completed, the hundreds of others who had gathered outside were permitted to enter so long as seating facilities were available. Classrooms and other areas of the church had been opened and the services carried to them by loud speaker.

PRESIDENTS SEATED TOGETHER

President Kennedy and his party arrived moments before time for the services to begin, followed by members of Mr. Rayburn's family, his staff and others close to the family. The President sat in a front pew on the aisle. In order, next to him, sat Vice President Johnson, Mr. Eisenhower, Mr. Truman, 84-year-old Senator Carl Hayden of Arizona and Maj. Gen. Chester Clifton, Presidential military aide.

The casket had been moved directly to the church from the Sam Rayburn Library, where the body had lain in state from Friday until Saturday morning. It was not opened at the church.

Immediate members of the family surviving are Mrs. S. E. Bartley and Mrs. W. A. Thomas, sisters; Dick Rayburn, brother; nieces, Mrs. Joyce Lightfoot of Bonham and Mrs. Judy Rayburn Lowry of Dallas, and a nephew, Robert Bartley.

Mr. Rayburn died Thursday morning, November 16, 1961, in Risser Hospital following an illness of several weeks. He returned home from Congress for rest and treatment in August, was transferred to Baylor Hospital in Dallas early in October, and was returned to Bonham late in October.

His condition had been critical for the last several days as he fought the losing battle to cancer.

[From Life magazine, Dec. 1, 1961]

Unseen Side of the Man They Called Mr. Speaker

(By D. B. Hardeman)

(As Sam Rayburn's research assistant, the author enjoyed a close relationship with the Speaker. He is writing a biography of Mr. Rayburn.)

Sam Rayburn was all that has been said of him in the eulogies. He was a man of great honor and high ideals. But he was also a man of earthy humor and plain ideas and this was the man I got to know in my years of close association with him.

His roots were deep in the land of northeast Texas. "I love the dirt," he said. "I like to walk on it. I like to grow things on it. I like to preserve it. Everything comes from the dirt and eventually goes back to the dirt." He shared a mutual respect and understanding for his people—the real people, he always called them. Soon after he became Speaker of the House—"Mr. Speaker" he was called—he went home to discuss with his neighbors the threat of Adolf Hitler to Bonham, Tex., and the world. "We meet always and in all places as equals," he told them. "Among us we have no classes and no cliques."

His devotion to "the real people" and his enthusiasm for serving them were part of his heritage. From his father he acquired a love of politics. "Pa took his citizenship as a sacred duty," Sam said. From his mother, a woman of stern self-discipline and a keen mind, he learned judgment and patience. From both parents he acquired a deep sense of honor. "Matt" Rayburn lived to be 80 and was a strong, loving influence on Sam throughout her life. Early this year when he was in the middle of the hardest battle of his congressional career over a proposal to enlarge the House Rules Committee, he told me: "What I wouldn't give to be able to sit down and talk over some of these problems with my little old mother right now."

Outside his family, Sam's affections ran strongly toward children and young people. "I've never seen the Speaker around dogs," Vice President Lyndon Johnson said, "but I'll bet they love him because children do." They took to him instinctively. They crawled all over him and rubbed their hands over his bald head. I believe the only great disappointment of his life was that he had no children of his own. His brief marriage in 1927 was childless. Once when the Bonham Campfire Girls visited his home he said, "Now what do you girls want to talk about?"

"Where is your wife?" one small girl piped up.

"I don't have a wife," he replied gently.

"Why don't you have one?" she persisted.

"Oh, I'm so cranky that nobody would have me," he said with a laugh.

"I'll marry you," another girl said.

Rayburn roared with delight.

In Washington Mr. Sam enjoyed meeting groups of young people. A high Government official might be lucky to get 10 minutes of his time on a busy day but the Speaker would gladly devote an hour or more talking with high school or college students. "I like young men," he said. "Their minds and bodies are more resilient." Lyndon Johnson once confessed: "The Speaker and I have always been very close but if we are not as close as we were once, it is because I'm almost 50. If you notice, he never has old men around him."

The young men—and the old—who got to know Rayburn best in Washington were those who were welcomed in his hideaway on the ground floor of the Capitol. There in the late afternoon the "board of education" met for some light drinking and informal politicking. Away from work Sam's personality was dominated by laughter, cajolery and down-to-earth humor. He rarely told jokes in his speeches ("I tried it once and before I got through I was the joke"). But in private he liked to tell jokes on himself. Soon after William P. Rogers became Attorney General in the Eisenhower administration, the Speaker struck up a conversation with him at a formal dinner although they had not been introduced. Finally Rayburn inquired, "Do you have a position in the Department of Justice?"

"Yes," came the reply. "I am the Attorney General."

To work for Sam Rayburn was to join the large family as another admiring member.

He was very sentimental about his employees—at his Washington office, at home in Bonham, at the Rayburn Library. His Negro cook, Bobbie Phillips, was master of the Rayburn kitchen for 24 years until she died. When another employee once complained that his Christmas gift was not as large as hers, Bobbie flared: "Shut your mouth. You just ain't been a Rayburn as long as the rest of us."

Although he could be hard and cold on business matters, a basic gentleness always showed through when he was dealing with his helpers or acquaintances on a personal level. I once remarked to him about his extreme politeness to waitresses and bellhops. "I wouldn't be unkind to a little boy or a girl waiting on me for all the gold in Fort Knox," he said. "That little girl might be your sister or mine. What we do in this life is often determined by a mighty small margin. I missed being a tenant farmer by just that much"—he snapped his fingers—"but someone was kind to me in my youth."

Despite his courtesy and patience, Mr. SAM did not believe in taking an insult lying down. When a constituent wired demanding that certain action be taken and implying that the Speaker was not doing his job, RAYBURN replied: "I have received your insulting telegram. I think I am perfectly capable of tending to my business and if you would tend to yours, I think it would take most of your free time. The matter has already been taken care of."

One of the big irritations in RAYBURN's life was tardiness. We once got a late start on a drive from Bonham to Dallas where he was to address the delegates to the American Medical Association. When he realized we would probably arrive behind schedule he exploded, "I loathe being late. And I loathe people who are late."

Then he begin to laugh at himself. "That reminds me of John—who lived out from Bonham," he said. "He was getting married Saturday afternoon at 6 o'clock. He picked cotton till noon, then shaved, got a haircut, took a bath, trimmed his toenails, and was getting dressed.

"One of the groomsmen said, 'If you don't hurry you're going to be late to your wedding.'

"'Waal,' said John, 'they can't do no business till I get there.'

"So I guess," SAM wound up, "that the doctors will just have to wait."

Mr. SAM was also annoyed by inactivity. When he could think of nothing else to do at home in Bonham he would get out all his shoes and polish them. He dreaded holidays and Sundays because visitors were few. One Saturday early this year RAYBURN restlessly roamed his Capitol offices. Finally he lay down to take a nap. In a few minutes he emerged, grinning.

"If this keeps up," he said, "I'll be like old Howard, down south of Bonham. Every day he dressed up and stood around on the courthouse square all morning, just talking. One day a fellow asked an old colored man, 'Say, what does that fellow do?' He replied, 'Well, sir, he don't do nothing all morning and he rests all afternoon.'"

Despite his need to keep occupied, RAYBURN was a cautious, patient man. He never rushed into a decision. He carefully planned his words and actions. He used to remind us, "One of the smartest things anybody ever said was 'Wait a minute.'" And he adopted for his own a maxim attributed to President Calvin Coolidge: "You never have to explain something you didn't say." He admired brevity and clarity in the House. A freshman Congressman once asked him if he was talking too much on the floor.

"Yes," RAYBURN said.

"Well, what should I do about it?"

"Quit it," RAYBURN said.

The Speaker was a Democrat by deep conviction. He believed that his party knew best how to run the Government of the United States. Two months after he arrived in Washington in 1913 he wrote his first speech for Congress. In it were the principles—and hopes—that would serve him the rest of his life: "It is now my sole purpose here to help enact such wise and just laws that our common country will by virtue of these laws be a happier and a more prosperous country. I have always dreamed of a country which I believe this should and will be, and that is one in which the citizenship is an educated and patriotic people, not swayed by passion and prejudice, and a country that knows no east, no west, no north, no south, but inhabited by a people liberty loving, patriotic, happy, and prosperous, with its lawmakers having no other purpose than to write such just laws as shall in the years to come be of service to humankind yet unborn."

In political campaigns SAM was a fierce opponent. Yet he was held in affection by most Republicans because, while he fought hard, he never fought unfairly. "The greatest ambition a man can have is to be a just man," he often said.

A newspaperman once asked, "Mr. Speaker, you see probably a hundred people a day. You tell each one 'Yes,' 'No,' or 'Maybe.' You never seem to make notes on what you have told them, but I never heard of your forgetting anything you have promised them. What is your secret?"

RAYBURN's hot, brown eyes flashed:

"If you tell the truth the first time," he replied, "you don't have to remember."

(A series of articles written for the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Dallas Times Herald, and Houston Chronicle)

(By Bascom N. Timmons)

PART 1

For a good many years now I have thought of SAM RAYBURN as indomintable, indestructible, and imperishable.

I came to regard him as indomitable in the early days of our friendship when he came to Washington a stockily built, dark wavy-haired young man just 2 months past his 31st birthday to take the oath as Representative from the Fourth Texas Congressional District.

I came to think of him as indestructible and imperishable as in his long congressional service he went on to break record after record. First it w^s Henry Clay's tenure as Speaker, and which he then more than doubled. Then he surpassed by more than 2 years the longest previous continuous service in the House of Representatives of any man in the constitutional history of the United States.

When he entered a hospital at Dallas in his critical illness RAYBURN had been a Member of Congress 48 years, 6 months, and 3 days.

He set other marks, too, such as being the Democrat to preside as permanent chairman over the most national presidential nomination conventions of his party. There have been 12 presidential elections and 8 Presidents of the United States since he came to Washington. He was to be the colleague of an aggregate of more than 3,000 Members of the House of Representatives. Close to a majority of the present Members of the Senate served with him in the House.

As a lawmaker he has seen three wars—World War I, World War II, and the Korean war, and except only for Senator CARL HAYDEN of Arizona, who came to Washington only a few months prior to RAYBURN's arrival no person remains in public life who was here when the Texan came on the National Capital scene in 1913.

The annual expenditures of the Federal Government in RAYBURN's first year in Congress were $724,511,963. They will be more than 100 times that this fiscal year. The receipts of the Federal Government that fiscal year were $724,111,230 and there was a deficit of $400,733.

I preceded SAM RAYBURN to Washington by 8 months. My first big assignment as a Washington newspaperman, however, was to cover the first inauguration of Woodrow Wilson on March 4, 1913. It was RAYBURN's first big day, too, for he sat in the inaugural stand to see a Democrat inaugurated President after 16 years of Republican occupancy of the White House.

Marching with the West Point cadets that day was young Cpl. Dwight D. Eisenhower, who was to become the first native-born Texan ever to be President of the United States. I shared with Eisenhower and RAYBURN at least one thing—we came from adjoining north Texas counties. RAYBURN was from Fannin County, Eisenhower was born in Grayson, and I in Collin County.

RAYBURN did not take the oath of office until April 7 when President Wilson convened the New Freedom session of the 63d Congress which remained in continuous session until October 24, 1914.

Speaker Champ Clark administered the oath to RAYBURN as he entered a House in which there were men who would furnish headlines for the next four decades and more.

The parade of future congressional celebrities which accompanied RAYBURN over the threshold of history that day and the sitting Members already there had the makings of:

Two future Vice Presidents: Garner and Barkley.

Five future Speakers: Gillette, Garner, Rainey, Byrnes of Tennessee, and Rayburn.

Six Cabinet members: Burleson, Glass, Good, Shackelford, Palmer, and Hull.

Four tariff-bill authors: Payne, Underwood, Fordney, and Hawley.

An antitrust-law author: Clayton.

An 8-hour-day creator: Adamson.

The prohibition amendment and enforcement act writer: Volstead.

The Federal Reserve Act architect: Glass.

The writer of the largest number of Roosevelt New Deal laws: RAYBURN.

A Supreme Court Justice: Byrnes, of South Carolina.

A future Democratic presidential nominee: Davis.

There were also in Congress the last Representatives of the Civil War: General Issac Sherwood, Ohio, Union, and Maj. Charles M. Stedman, North Carolina, Confederate.

There were orators, such as Finis Garrett, of Tennessee, and Daniel E. Garrett, of Texas, and J. Thomas Heflin, of Alabama, and great legislative writers such as Lenroot and Esch, of Wisconsin, and Mann, of Illinois, and Sherley, of Kentucky. "Big Tim" Sullivan, of Tammany, New York, sat on the Democratic side and Boss William Vare of Pennsylvania, on the Republican side.

Two alltime Republican congressional greats had gone down to defeat in the Republican split which elected Wilson: Ex-Speaker Joseph G. Cannon, of Illinois, and Speaker-to-be Nicholas Longworth, of Ohio. But both were returned for the 64th Congress and RAYBURN, ardent Democrat, though he was, cherished his personal friendship with Cannon and Longworth as among the most valued things of his life.

In after years RAYBURN was to say of the men he found in the House of Representatives when he arrived:

"There were a great many people far ahead of me, and I wasn't jealous of them. I didn't envy them their positions. I was willing to await my turn."

As a Washington correspondent I watched RAYBURN get ready for his turn. He was fortunate that John Nance Garner, of Uvalde, who had been in Congress for 10 years, took a special liking to him. Garner was colorful, popular with both Democrats and Republicans, and no man was in a better position to obtain favors from the leadership.

He told RAYBURN that as the House was organized at that time the most powerful committees were (1) Ways and Means; (2) Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Representative Choice B. Randell, who RAYBURN succeeded in Congress, had been a Ways and Means Committee member and Garner himself wanted that post. He set about to help RAYBURN get Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee was Representative William C. Adamson, of Georgia. Adamson became very fond of RAYBURN and another rookie Member of Congress, Representative Alben W. Barkley, of Kentucky. He assigned to RAYBURN a great deal of work on the Adamson 8-hour law which averted a nationwide railroad strike in 1916.

Although Barkley was a notch higher in seniority on the committee than RAYBURN, Adamson made more use of the hard-working RAYBURN who began to get a reputation in the House as an advocate. RAYBURN never had a committee assignment other than Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

He served on the committee under the chairmanships of John J. Esch, of Wisconsin, Samuel E. Winslow, of Massachusetts, and James S. Parker, of New York, and although he opposed them on most measures, he was the warm personal friend of each and enhanced his reputation through the years of GOP congressional control. He became the committee chairman in the last 2 years of the Hoover administration and in the Roosevelt administration, authored much of the regulatory legislation put on the statute books.

His colleagues of his early days in Congress did not regard him as brilliant. But he was friendly, able, honest, industrious, serious, unhurried, and calm. He was regarded as a possessor of all the solid rural virtues in a Congress in which nearly all the leaders were of rural origin.

RAYBURN made his first speech in the House on May 6, 1913, when he lacked 1 day of having served a month in that body. He spoke in favor of the low Underwood tariff bill, which was to go on the statute books repealing the high Payne-Aldrich tariff law. An amendment to the Underwood bill provided for an income tax in accordance with the recently adopted 16th amendment.

"As a new Member of this body, I, of course, feel that I should have regard for the long-established custom of the House, which in a measure demands that discussion of questions shall be left to the more mature Members," RAYBURN said. "But I feel that as a Representative of more than 200,000 citizens of the Fourth Congressional District of Texas, I should be allowed to break in a measure whatever of this custom remains, and exercise my constitutional right to speak my sentiment on this floor and refuse to be relegated to that lockjawed ostracism typical of the dead past."

In the course of his speech, RAYBURN said:

"I came to this body a few weeks ago with childlike enthusiasm and confidence. It has always been my ambition to live such a life that one day my fellow citizens would call me to membership in this popular branch of the greatest lawmaking body in the world. Out of their partiality and confidence they have done this. It is now my sole purpose here to help enact such wise and just laws that our common country will by virtue of these laws be a happier and a more prosperous country. I have always dreamed of a country which I believe this should be and will be, one in which the citizenship is an educated and patriotic people, not swayed by passion or prejudice, and a country that shall know no East, no West, no North, no South, but inhabitated by a people liberty loving, patriotic, happy, and prosperous, with lawmakers having no other purpose than to write such just laws as shall in the years to come be of service to humankind yet unborn."

PART 2

Two rookie Texas Representatives in Congress, SAM RAYBURN, of Bonham, and Hatton W. Sumners, of Dallas, came to Congress together and for years were the closest of friends. Both got good committee assignments—RAYBURN on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Sumners on Judiciary and both eventually became chairmen of their committees.

RAYBURN and Sumners took adjoining offices 543 and 542 in the old House Office Building, which had been built when Uncle Joe Cannon was Speaker. Each had one room, which he shared with a secretary.

RAYBURN got a Congressman's pay—$7,500 per year, and the Federal income tax had not yet become effective. He got the going Congressional allowance for office help of $1,500 per year and hired one person at $125 per month. He represented a five-county District with a population of a little over 200,000. It was largely rural and made few demands on him.

He had won over an eight-man field in the primary and his majority, as I recollect it, was only 405. He was a bachelor, almost a teetotaler. Two of his Texas colleagues, John Nance Garner and James P. Buchanan were the two most accomplished poker players in Washington. RAYBURN was not a cardplayer. He played dominoes at night with Representative Cordell Hull of Tennessee and other colleagues in the homey lobby of old Cochran Hotel. He introduced Hull to the lady who eventually became the wife of the future Secretary of State.

He seemed little interested in women and had few dates with them. He took no junkets, went home when Congress adjourned and fixed political fences. He insisted that he did not feel well entrenched in his district and "always ran scared." Yet when he had opponents he put them away handily.

RAYBURN in our early acquaintance told me a great deal about his closely knit family. RAYBURN's father, William Marion Rayburn, had been a Confederate soldier who came home to Roane County, Tennessee, near the present great Norris Dam on the Tennessee River, and married Martha Waller.

Ten children were born to them in Tennessee. In 1887 the father, mother, and 10 children, 7 boys and 3 girls, moved to Texas and settled near Windom in Fannin County, where the elder Rayburn used all his resources to buy a 40-acre blackland cotton farm.

The 11th child, a son, was born in Texas. SAM, the eighth child, was christened SAMUEL TALIAFERRO, which he had shortened to SAM long before he appeared on the Washington scene.

The Rayburn family had rough going in their first years in Texas. They lived for 30 years in the little frame house where they first settled in Texas. In his early years in Congress RAYBURN was building the new family home which became a showplace in Texas. It originally cost, I think he told me, $2,800 in the low building costs of those days, but it was modernized and added to. RAYBURN also added to his land holdings and eventually developed the purebred stock farm which became his great pride.

RAYBURN had got what education he could at the little school near Windom, attended Mayo College at Commerce (predecessor of East Texas Normal) and after 2 years of college taught school for 4 years. He ran for a seat in the legislature at 23, served 6 years in Austin, the last 2 as speaker, the youngest Texas ever had, then in 1912 made his winning campaign for Congress.

RAYBURN told me that his desire to come to Congress was whetted by a speech of the great Texas orator, Representative Joseph Weldon Bailey, who represented the Fourth District which RAYBURN later was to represent. RAYBURN rode horseback in mud and rain 11 miles to Bonham to hear the speech by Bailey, who later became a controversial U.S. Senator from Texas. Bailey was always RAYBURN's political idol.

His ambition, RAYBURN said, always was to come to Congress and become its Speaker; that he never had any ambition to be a Governor, a Senator, a President, or a Vice President. Years afterward, in 1940, he did wish to be Franklin D. Roosevelt's vice-presidential running mate, but Roosevelt tabbed Henry A. Wallace to go on the ticket with him.

In the latter days of the Wilson administration and early days of the Harding administration RAYBURN with Hatton W. Sumners and Marvin Jones, Texas Representatives in Congress, and later Silliman Evans, a newspaperman, established bachelor quarters and acquired a famous cook, but RAYBURN himself was an accomplished cook, specializing in fried chicken.

He had become an ardent fisherman and it was his principal recreation. He had a hobby of collecting pocket watches, the most prized of which was one given to him by his colleagues when he was speaker of the Texas house. He was also for a long time a collector of Robert E. Lee books and photographs.

While a member of the Texas Legislature RAYBURN studied law and graduated from the University of Texas Law School. More than 30 years ago he moved to the kitchenless bachelor quarters at the Anchorage Apartment, where he continued to live in Washington, leaving it this year for the first time before congressional adjournment.

One day in 1916, when RAYBURN had been a Member of Congress for 3 years, Speaker Champ Clark beckoned to the Texan to take a seat beside him in the private corridor outside the House Chamber.

Clark told RAYBURN he had been watching him, was convinced he could attain any place in Congress, including the speakership, but that he ought to enlarge his horizon. Clark asked RAYBURN to jot down a course of reading. It included some writing of Thomas Jefferson, the biographies and writing of Presidents John Adams and John Quincy Adams, President Andrew Jackson, and Senator Thomas H. Benton.

Clark also told the Texan to do certain reading on Presidents James K. Polk and William McKinley, and to learn all he could about the legislative methods of both Polk and McKinley, who had been distinguished Members of the House of Representatives.

RAYBURN did all of the prescribed reading. Many times he, a convinced partisan Democrat, surprised me by admiring references to McKinley, an arch conservative Republican. RAYBURN told me McKinley came close to being the ideal legislator and was a much underrated President.

There is little doubt that of all the Presidents who were in office during his long Congress tenure RAYBURN had the greatest admiration for Woodrow Wilson. In the first Wilson inaugural address, which he had heard as a freshman Congressman, he had found the principles by which he was to live, and the course he thought his party ought to follow.

Yet it was to Wilson that he revealed his qualities of independence. He went to the White House one day in 1915 to discuss with the President a bill pending in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Wilson asked him to hold up action on the bill.

RAYBURN told the President he would continue to press for action on the measure, despite the White House opposition.

"I'm sorry I can't go along with you, Mr. President," he said brusquely as he picked up his hat and left Wilson's presence.

The purpose of the bill was to control the issuance of railroad stocks and bonds. The bill did finally become law by Wilson's signature but it was passed by a Republican Congress in 1919 and RAYBURN got help in its passage from Committee Chairman Samuel E. Winslow, a Massachusetts Republican.

In after years when he had become a master at placation RAYBURN would recall the brush with Wilson as an evidence of his tactlessness when he was a fledgling legislator.

PART 3

My closest association with SAM RAYBURN were in the two decades of the 1920's and 1930's. This, I think, was because these were years in which we both had considerable leisure. For RAYBURN that period of time saw his emergence as an important voice in his party and a very effective legislator.

RAYBURN by the end of the Wilson administration had won his fifth straight congressional term and, although he had nearly always had primary opponents, the Fourth Congressional District was electing him more or less automatically.

He had won his spurs as a party wheel in World War I and his congressional advancement was checked by his party's political fortunes which were not as propitious as his personal ones.

In 1918, midway in Wilson's second term, the Republicans won the House of Representatives and held a tight grip on it for 12 years. The Harding landslide in 1920 swept even into the South to strike down such shining Democratic lights as Representative Cordell Hull, of Tennessee.

RAYBURN moved far up in overall House seniority and became the top Democratic member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Representative John Nance Garner had become the big figure in the Texas delegation and during the 1920's Garner was also to become the choice of the Democrats for their House floor leader.

Garner bypassed some of the senior House Members and formed a young strategical and tactical group of his own, of which RAYBURN was the senior one. Others in the group were Representative Fred Vinson, of Kentucky, later Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court; and Representatives John McDuffie, of Alabama; Lindsay Warren, of North Carolina; John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, and John F. Carew, of New York.

Frequently Garner would ask me to sit in on their planning sessions, of which they had relatively few. Mostly each of his high lieutenants worked directly with Garner. One of RAYBURN'S duties was to keep up a close liaison with Representative Fiorello H. LaGuardia of New York, an irregular Republican. Sometimes (notably in the Mellon tax bills fights) the Democrats were able to draw to their side enough Republicans to win important amendments to legislation.

RAYBURN also took part in the fights against the Fordney-McCumber and Smoot-Hawley tariff bills. Of the three Republican Presidents who followed Wilson, RAYBURN'S relations were cordial with Harding and Hoover and especially good with Coolidge.

On his visits to the White House, sometimes for Coolidge breakfasts, he said he found that "Coolidge talked enough." RAYBURN frequently quoted with approval Coolidge's reply to a criticism of his silence. Coolidge said: "Well, I found out early in life that you didn't have to explain something you hadn't said." Hoover, RAYBURN called "a grand man, a hard-working President. I doubt if anybody who might have been President could have prevented the debacle of 1929, which took him down with it."

RAYBURN had less dealing with Harding than with any of the Presidents who served after he came to Washington, but found Harding "gracious" the few times he did have business with him. Of Harding's ill-starred Presidency, including the Teapot Dome scandals, RAYBURN said:

"I never thought Mr. Harding was a dishonest man. I don't think there has ever been a President of the United States who was a dishonest man. I think Harding was trusting. Some people who were not honest imposed upon him."

The Republicans won their seventh straight Congressional election in 1930. But it was so close that before the beginning of the session of Congress in December 1931 (this was before the lame-duck amendment to the Constitution advancing the beginning of Congressional and Presidential terms) deaths had so thinned the Republican ranks and augmented the Democrats that John Nance Garner was elected Speaker by three votes. RAYBURN became chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for the last 2 years of the Hoover administration.

With Democratic control of Congress in 1931 began the era of RAYBURN'S ever-increasing importance in party councils. Garner as Speaker became the highest ranking Democrat in the Nation and almost automatically an available candidate for the 1932 Presidential nomination.

The Democratic State Convention, meeting in San Antonio, instructed for Garner and elected RAYBURN his campaign manager, and chairman of the Texas delegation to the Democratic National Convention at Chicago. Garner in a three-way primary contest won the California delegates, defeating Alfred E. Smith and Franklin D. Roosevelt. His fellow Texan's campaign was not too easy for RAYBURN to manage, as Garner showed scant interest in it.

At Chicago Garner's strength never exceeded the 46 delegates from Texas, the 44 from California, and a few scattering from other States. But RAYBURN made the Garner candidacy a very important factor in the final outcome.

Roosevelt was far from assured of the two-thirds majority then necessary to nominate. Garner had told RAYBURN before the latter's departure for Chicago that he would not be a party to deadlocking the Democratic convention as it had been deadlocked in 1924 at Madison Square Garden.

The third ballot—all three taken at an all-night session—had found Roosevelt short of the nomination, but the Texas and California delegations of Garner could be enough to put him over. How to get them was a question. RAYBURN was for Roosevelt as his second choice after Garner, but it was doubtful it he could carry the Texas delegation, in which there was strong sentiment for Newton D. Baker, along with him.

From Washington Garner called RAYBURN and said curtly, "I think this thing has gone far enough." Rayburn thought so, too, but he faced the fact that if he could not win Texas for Roosevelt, the forces of the New York Governor would begin to disintegrate on the fourth ballot and a long deadlock would undoubtedly ensue.

"Do you authorize me to release the Texas delegation from voting for you for the Presidential nomination?" RAYBURN asked.

"Yes," Garner replied.

RAYBURN was now on his own and the key man in the convention. If he could switch Texas to Roosevelt, California would follow suit and Roosevelt would be in. If he could not it appeared the jig was up with Roosevelt and a long stalemate was in prospect.

RAYBURN, who always valued an 8-hour sleep, did not go to bed when the convention, after an all-night session, adjourned at 9:15 Friday morning. His soundings convinced him that it was nip-and-tuck between Roosevelt and Baker in the Texas delegation, and with many delegates determined to go on voting for Garner even in the face of his withdrawal.

It appeared to RAYBURN that the surest way to get a majority of the Texans for Roosevelt was for Garner to go on the ticket as Vice President. A conference between RAYBURN and James A. Farley, the Roosevelt manager, agreed that Garner could have second place. Roosevelt from Albany gave enthusiastic approval. But it still was doubtful Texas could be won for Roosevelt.

The San Antonio convention had done things in a big Texas way. It sent 180 men and women to Chicago to cast 46 votes in the national convention, each delegate having only a fractional vote. They were all for Garner, but where they would land with Garner out of it was unpredictable.

Late Friday afternoon RAYBURN decided to take his big gamble. He suddenly called a caucus of the delegation. The call was so sudden that only 105 of the 180 persons in the delegation showed up at the caucus. It soon developed into a howling mob scene. RAYBURN finally got a semblance of order and took a vote. The tally showed 54 for going to Roosevelt, 51 against. What would have happened if the other 75 Texans had arrived RAYBURN himself often speculated, but the 3-vote margin was enough to give Roosevelt Texas under the unit rule, and California followed Texas into the Roosevelt camp to give him the nomination on the fourth ballot.

Garner had told RAYBURN and Senator Tom Connally during the day: "I don't think I should give up the speakership for the Vice-Presidency." He never did say he would take it, but the convention gave it to him anyway.

RAYBURN, who had stuck so closely to his congressional job in Washington and devoted himself so exclusively to his own congressional district that his voice had hardly been a potent one in Texas party councils came out of the 1932 Democratic National Convention a very important figure in Texas and in the Nation. Thereafter his shadow was to continue to lengthen.

Garner's reluctance to give up the speakership was because he had won it only 2 years before, satisfying a long ambition. Garner was 62 years old, from a district where he was entrenched, and thought he could hold the speakership as long as he wanted to do so, and his party stayed in power. He thought the speakership second only to the Presidency in importance. The Vice Presidency he considered as "an office of little importance."

Garner's departure from the House opened up the way to advancement for ambitious Democrats. RAYBURN and the other Garner lieutenants failed narrowly in their effort to elect Representative John McDuffie as Speaker to succeed Garner. Instead the top House post went to Representative Henry T. Rainey, of Illinois, with Representative Joseph W. Byrns, of Tennessee, as majority leader.

As chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee RAYBURN pushed through more New Deal legislation than any other Member of Congress. He authored the Federal Communications Act, the Securities Exchange Act, the Rayburn-Wheeler Holding Company Act and the Rural Electrification Act, among others.

PART 4

SAM RAYBURN'S election as Democratic leader in the House of Representatives on January 4, 1937, marked the high-water mark of his eminence to that date. It was in the nature of a handsome early birthday present. RAYBURN was within 2 days of his 55th birthday.

He was in the excellent health he had always enjoyed and continued to enjoy for many more years. Robust and virile, he was capable of working long hours. He was heavier and blockier than when he came to the House 24 years before, and the black hair he brought with him to Washington had entirely vanished and he was the baldest man on Capitol Hill.

A movement for RAYBURN for the Speakership had been started by his House friends in December 1934 following the death of Speaker Henry T. Rainey before the Roosevelt administration was 2 years old.

Representative Joseph W. Byrns, of Tennessee, had been the majority leader since the beginning of the Roosevelt administration. Moreover, Byrns had been chairman of the congressional campaign committee which directed the 1934 congressional campaign and had been instrumental in helping many Members to be elected, and these Members felt under obligations to the Tennessean.

RAYBURN got out of the race in a characteristic statement of just 19 words, at which he asked me to look before he issued it. It could not have been improved upon. He wrote:

"I am no longer a candidate for Speaker. There are no alibis. Under the circumstances I cannot be elected."

Byrns won the Speakership and Representative William B. Bankhead, of Alabama, was chosen majority leader. RAYBURN evinced no interest in the latter post at the time. Pending before his powerful Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee at the time were three important pieces of legislation: reorganization of the National Recovery Administration (the Supreme Court later ruled NRA unconstitutional); railroad rehabilitation, and the future Federal policy on oil control, the latter being of prime importance to Texas.

Speaker Byrns died on June 4, 1936. Bankhead was elected Speaker on the same day, but as Congress was adjourning in 2 weeks no majority leader was elected, Representative John J. O'Connor, of New York, chairman of the Rules Committee, filling in.

RAYBURN managed the Speaker's committee of the Democratic National Committee in 1936 when the Roosevelt-Garner ticket carried all the States except Maine and Vermont. He returned to Washington and formally announced his candidacy for the majority leadership, and soon found that he was the apparent underdog in the race.

O'Connor had been conducting an intensive campaign and President Roosevelt seemed to be in his corner. RAYBURN could not believe this for O'Connor, as chairman of the Rules Committee, had blocked some New Deal legislation dear to Roosevelt's heart. But he was a brother of Basil O'Connor, who had been Roosevelt's law partner.

RAYBURN'S campaign was managed by Representative Fred Vinson of Kentucky, later Chief Justice of the United States, and by CARL VINSON, of Georgia, who came to Congress in a special election only a few months after RAYBURN did.

When it looked dark for RAYBURN, Vice President Garner arrived in Washington and went to work in his behalf. When Garner was criticized for intruding in House affairs he retorted:

"I'm for RAYBURN 200 percent and I am going to keep working for his selection."

Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, announced his support of RAYBURN and brought him important eastern seaboard support. Pennsylvania swung to him and with his almost solid southern backing he had pulled up even with O'Connor in early December. The White House did not make the expected fight for O'Connor, even seemed to be on RAYBURN'S side. He quickly won other northern and eastern support.

It was a bitter fight but when Representative Hatton W. Sumners on January 4 arose to nominate RAYBURN in the Democratic caucus it was only a question of the size of the RAYBURN majority. On the rollcall RAYBURN had 184 votes, O'Connor 127.

RAYBURN'S first year as majority leader was a turbulent one. The Republican membership had shrunk so low that it could not be an effective minority. There was, consequently, little incentive for party solidarity among the huge and unwieldy Democratic majority. It was a job-hungry Congress and all the choice patronage of the Roosevelt administration had been dispensed.

RAYBURN had been in office only a few weeks when President Roosevelt sent up his bill to enlarge the Supreme Court. Democrats split wide open. Representative Hatton W. Sumners, RAYBURN'S closest friend, and chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, refused to introduce the bill, calling it court packing. Representative Maury Maverick, of San Antonio, introduced it.

RAYBURN made known his determination to attempt to put the bill to passage if he could get it out of committee, but it remained lodged there. Relations between RAYBURN and Sumners cooled.

On the Senate side, Senator Tom Connally, of Texas, was one of the most vociferous opponents of the legislation. When it was apparent that the bill was doomed in the Senate, President Roosevelt asked Vice President Garner to liquidate the fight in the interest of party harmony. The bill ended up dealing only with procedural reforms in Federal district and circuit courts, with the Supreme Court section entirely eliminated.

There were administration reversals on the House side. The man who was later to be acclaimed as a great leader and great Speaker had not got off to an auspicious start. There was criticism that he was too mild. Even his mentor, John Nance Garner, told him: "You've got to get your knuckles bloody once in a while, SAM."

But RAYBURN was patiently practicing the arts of persuasive personal appeal which later he used so effectively.

RAYBURN had other troubles. Speaker Bankhead was in uncertain health, and had to be absent for long periods, and RAYBURN carried a double load. On July 5, 1939, RAYBURN was elected Speaker pro tempore to serve until Bankhead's return to a semblance of health. With Garner presiding in the Senate, Texas, for the first time, had the presiding officers of the two branches of Congress.

In 1938 RAYBURN was unable to consummate a project of immense importance to the entire Red River watershed, but especially to his own congressional district. A combined flood control and hydroelectric installation on the Red River had long been a cherished dream.

On June 1938, he got through legislation providing for the $75 million Denison Dam, which at present costs would have cost millions of dollars more. The dam was built under the supervision of Colonel (now Lieutenant General) Lucius Clay, now President Kennedy's personal representative in Berlin.

For the past several years, it had an annual electric power production of 270 million kilowatts, and is sold to both private distributing companies and cooperatives in the area.

Lake Texhoma, which resulted from the building of the dam, has a shoreline of 580 miles. Approximately 6,700,000 persons visited it for recreational purposes last year, and the total will go around 7 million this year.

On the Texas side of the lake, the Fish and Wildlife Service has established the Hageman natural wildlife refuge consisting of 11,427 acres. On the Oklahoma side, a similar refuge called Tishomingo has been established with 16,620 acres.

PART 5

The efforts of President Franklin D. Roosevelt to purge in the 1938 Democratic primaries Senators and Representatives who had opposed administration policies and measures certainly was not calculated to make SAM RAYBURN'S life as House Democratic leader more serene.

RAYBURN himself at the end of the session had sent out letters to all the House Members, praising them for their work in Congress, regardless of their stand on controversial administration measures.

RAYBURN said he favored the reelection of all House Democratic Members, adding that the party was broad enough to tolerate a few "fractious" Members. He made it clear that he thought it bad policy for Democratic leaders to be throwing their influence against Democrats seeking reelection in the impending primaries.

But Roosevelt went ahead with his purge efforts. One of those chosen for ousting was Representative John J. O'Connor, of New York, whom RAYBURN had defeated for the leadership. And of all the Democratic Senators and Representatives who Roosevelt sought to drive out of Congress he was successful only against O'Connor.

RAYBURN put through the wage-hour law, relief measures, the amendment of the neutrality act and various bills to begin building up defense for a threatened World War II.

By early 1939 it became evident that basic disagreements on administration policies were developing between President Roosevelt and Vice President Garner. It was also coming to be believed that Roosevelt desired a third term as President. On one of the regular Sunday night gatherings in Garner's hotel apartment, which RAYBURN, I and others regularly attended, Garner said:

"If Roosevelt runs I will oppose his nomination in every way I can. I would be against a third term on principle even if I approved every act of Roosevelt's two terms. If my own brother were President and wanted to run for a third term I would oppose him. The rule against the third term for a President of the United States has the sanction of history and has been supported by an overwhelming majority of the people."

RAYBURN did not express an opinion on a third term for Roosevelt. Garner fully intended to go back to private life. RAYBURN expected to continue as Democratic leader of the House whoever might be President after January 20, 1941.

Early in August, 1939, RAYBURN announced he favored Garner for President in 1940. RAYBURN did not then believe Roosevelt would want a third term.

On August 23, 1939, homefolk gathered for a Sam Rayburn Day at Denison in a demonstration of "thanks" for the Denison Dam project. RAYBURN in an address to the gathering said "history will place President Roosevelt and his accomplishments on the same plane with Washington, Jefferson, and Jackson."

In January 1940, Garner at Uvalde in a 44-word penciled statement said:

"I will accept the nomination for President. I will make no effort to control any delegates. The people should decide. A candidate should be selected in the primaries and conventions as provided by law, and I sincerely trust that all Democrats will participate in them."

There still was no announcement of Roosevelt's intentions regarding a third term when the Texas State Democratic Convention met at Waco in May.

The State convention instructed its delegates for Garner. The convention named RAYBURN as chairman of the Garner delegation to Chicago. I was a delegate-at-large. Just before I left for Chicago, he told me he wished me to serve as his proxy on the Democratic National Committee and to be his spokesman at Chicago if any occasion arose for it. He said I was to take whatever action I thought best without any consultation with him.

There had recently been some talk and Garner had been felt out—he did not know how authoritatively—on whether he would be receptive to "making it the same old team," meaning a Roosevelt-Garner national ticket for a third time. Garner gave me a letter with the understanding that if at any stage it became a convention floor matter I was to go to the chairman's stand and read the letter telling the convention Mr. Garner would not again take the nomination for Vice President under any circumstances.

President Roosevelt had still made no announcement on his attitude toward a third term when the national convention delegates assembled in Chicago, but it was now certain that he would be nominated, as he was, on the first ballot. The names of Garner and James A. Farley, however, had been formally presented as presidential candidates but except for the solid support of Texas, Garner received only a few other convention votes.

Following the nomination of Roosevelt, RAYBURN sought and obtained from a caucus endorsement of his candidacy for Vice President. Later President Roosevelt telephoned RAYBURN that he wished Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace as his vice-presidential ticket mate.

Roosevelt asked RAYBURN to second Wallace's nomination as Vice President. This RAYBURN agreed to do, withdrawing his own vice-presidential candidacy.

A considerable portion of the convention rebelled against the choice of Wallace. Efforts were made to bring Federal Loan Administrator Jesse H. Jones, of Texas, Gov. Paul C. McNutt, of Indiana, and others into the race but all declined.

Speaker William B. Bankhead, of Alabama, however, did enter the race and sought RAYBURN'S backing. RAYBURN could never understand why Bankhead with his uncertain health wished the nomination. Moreover, RAYBURN had already pledged his support of Wallace.

RAYBURN also moved to have a Texas caucus endorse Wallace, but instead the Texans by a majority vote went for Bankhead under the unit rule.

At a bitter, howling night session of the convention on July 18, Wallace was chosen over Bankhead, 626 to 329.

RAYBURN came back to Washington to resume his duties for the session of Congress which was to continue for the remainder of the year. There was a heavy program of national defense measures to be considered including the controversial extension of the drafting of men for military service.

Less than 2 months later Bankhead was dead and RAYBURN was Speaker.

SAM RAYBURN became the 42d Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives on September 16, 1940.

A solemn and saddened body of men elected him to be their presiding officer without a dissenting vote and in a transaction that lasted less than 2 minutes.

With the casket bearing the body of his predecessor, William B. Bankhead, in front of the Speaker's dais, RAYBURN held up his right hand and quietly said "I do" as the oath was administered by Representative Adolph Sabbath, of Illinois, the oldest Member of the House in years of service.

RAYBURN'S name was placed in nomination by Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, who explained that it would be necessary to elect a Speaker at the time in order that the House might continue to function properly and that the election was being held "with profound respect for the memory of the beloved Speaker who has just left us."

No other name was placed in nomination and Republicans as well as Democrats joined in the chorus of "ayes" that made RAYBURN Speaker.

RAYBURN made no acceptance speech. His only remarks as the oath was completed were the usual "the House will be in order." The House immediately held a state funeral for Bankhead who had died on Sunday, after his most recent illness had lasted only 2 or 3 days.

Three Speakers—Rainey, Byrns, and Bankhead—had died in the 6 years before the election of RAYBURN, whose ascendancy to that post a few days more than 21 years ago, was to be marked by an incumbency far exceeding that of any of his 41 predecessors.

It was written of RAYBURN at the time, that he once had a head of hair and a middle name, but had dropped both; that he had one of the baldest and most level heads in Congress.

He was the fourth man from west of the Mississippi to be elected Speaker, the others being Garner, Champ Clark, of Missouri, and D. B. Henderson, of Iowa.

When I saw RAYBURN for the first time after his election to what had always been his ultimate goal he had just returned from the funeral of the late Speaker Bankhead in Alabama.

"Well," he said, "it's a fur piece from Flag Springs."

"Fur piece" was a favorite RAYBURN colloquialism for "great distance" and Flag Springs was the little one-room schoolhouse in the Texas blacklands which RAYBURN had attended.

"And," he continued, "I still can't realize I'm Speaker."

The Speaker of the House of Representatives is a powerful figure in the Federal Government.

He is the real leader of the majority party in the House if he is a strong man, a policy consultant and legislative chieftain for the President, and the next official after the Vice President in the Presidential succession. It is only in protocol and presidential succession that a Speaker ranks behind the Vice President. The powers of the speakership are second only to those exercised by the President.

He, too, as the titular leader of the most numerous branch of Congress, is its spokesman and by tradition is expected to uphold the dignity and independence of the House of Representatives against all comers. The House must have felt strongly that RAYBURN did not fail it there, for it became the custom twice a year—on his birthday and the anniversary of his elevation to the speakership—for party lines to vanish as Republicans and Democrats showered encomiums on him.

Only twice in the 21 years after he ascended the Speaker's rostrum did RAYBURN surrender the gavel. In 2 years each in the 80th and 82d Congress JOSEPH W. MARTIN, of Massachusetts, RAYBURN'S close personal friend, presided over Republican Houses.

In that long period RAYBURN was many times the center of momentous happenings. RAYBURN himself said that the day he probably felt his responsibility the most deeply was on August 12, 1941.

On that day the question of extending the Selective Service Act was up for a vote in the House. Most of the thousands of soldiers who had entered the Army had done so with the understanding their service and training would be for only 1 year. There was war in Europe, but this country had stayed out of it.

The pleas of the War Department was that it would be catastrophic if the Army was allowed to disband were met by a demand of thousands of parents that the Government keep its contract to let their sons out of the service.

Flag-carrying mothers in groups called on individual House Members as the Draft Act was debated, asking them to oppose extension. The galleries were filled as the rollcall began. It was nip and tuck all the way.

Those of us in the Press Gallery found our tally sheets in disagreement. Even RAYBURN did not know which side had won. The tally clerk turned and handed him a slip of paper.

"On this vote," the Speaker announced, "203 Members have voted 'aye,' 202 Members have voted 'no,' and the bill is passed." By his quick action RAYBURN had frozen the situation, for no Member can change his vote after the result of a rollcall is announced.

There was one other maneuver remaining for opponents of draft extension—to ask for a recapitulation. This Representative Dewey Short, of Missouri, demanded and, because the vote had been so close, RAYBURN allowed it. Again the roll was called. As it was finished RAYBURN quickly announced: "No correction in the vote; the vote stands, and the bill is passed, and without objection a motion to reconsider is laid on the table."

Again Short arose and demanded reconsideration. That move was estopped by RAYBURN'S announcement that "without objection the motion is laid upon the table."

Representative H. CARL ANDERSEN, of Minnesota, got the floor to say: "I beg to differ with the Speaker. The Speaker did not announce that a motion to reconsider had been tabled."

"The Chair has twice stated that he did make the statement," the Speaker replied.

"I beg to differ with you——" the Minnesotan began. RAYBURN cut him short, with:

"The Chair does not intend to have his word questioned by the gentleman from Minnesota or anyone else."

By the one vote the House had kept the Selective Service Act operating. Less than 4 months later the Japs struck at Pearl Harbor. But for the retention of the draft law the Army would have been demobilizing instead of mobilizing when the United States went into a world war for the second time in a quarter of a century.

Heads of state and world statesmen came to the Halls of Congress for addresses during RAYBURN'S long tenure as Speaker. Returning war heroes came there, too.

RAYBURN presided over such occasions. The most moving were the wartime address of Winston Churchill, the return of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, after being relieved by President Truman of his Far East command, and the return of the hero of Corregidor, Gen. Jonathan Wainwright.

Of the $350 billion we spent in fighting World War II, much of it was for secret purposes, and RAYBURN would go before Appropriation committees to ask for the funds. A case in point was the atom bomb. RAYBURN himself at first did not know what the money was for. Many Members of Congress did not know of the atom bomb development until the first one had been dropped in Japan.

Among the other measures to carry on the war and prepare the Nation before it was directly in war which RAYBURN guided through the House were the repeal of the Neutrality Act, the arming of merchant ships, the laws granting war powers to the President, and the price control bills.

Until after World War II RAYBURN attended few Washington dinners or social affairs. He once said:

"One reason I don't go to these society dinners is that they don't serve chili."

He liked to give chili and tamale dinners for small groups of congenial people.

There are some social functions in Washington that a Speaker of the House is forced to attend, and others that he cannot gracefully avoid.

The Speaker's dinner at the White House is a fixed state event. During her lifetime his spinster sister Lucinda (Miss Lou) would go with him to these dinners. After her death his widowed sisters, Mrs. Thomas, and Mrs. Bartley, would go with him.

His annual birthday party on January 6 was another ritual. He gave a few big parties himself.

At the end of a social season during Miss Lou's lifetime he would say he was pining for some "crumbin."

"Crumbin" was a Lone Star species of cornbread that Miss Lou was especially skilled in baking.

RAYBURN had never crossed either ocean, a record he still held when he entered Baylor Hospital at Dallas in early October 1961. He made one trip to Panama, his first year in Congress. He also once spent a vacation in Mexico City. But year after year when his colleagues scattered toward the Parisian boulevards, Waikiki Beach or other faraway places with strange sounding names RAYBURN headed back to his Texas farm.

"When I get away from here I don't want to go anywhere in the world but home to see my lovely country, to see what little possessions I have, and to associate with by brothers and sisters and my other blood and my old friends," he once said.

RAYBURN was slow to take up air travel. Asked one day in the 1940's if he was going to fly down to his Texas home for Christmas, he said: "I am going, but I won't fly. I like to travel by train. Takes two nights and a day to get home that way, and the best rest I ever get is during that time. I spend most of it reading a wild west magazine. I went up in an airplane once, back in 1935. Made up my mind never to do it again."

"But, Mr. Speaker," a friend protested, "you've no idea how air travel has improved since then. Why if you took a trip to Texas by plane now, you'd never go any other way."

"That," answered RAYBURN with a twinkle, "is exactly what I am afraid of."

During the 80th Congress when he was not Speaker he made the trips in a big, long, black 1947 Cadillac, which constituted a very sincere compliment to him. Early in 1947 every Democrat in the House contributed $25 to buy the automobile for their leader.

In his latter years he began to use airplanes exclusively for his trips home.

PART 7

SAM RAYBURN's rank among the Speakers of the House of Representatives will be for history and not his own contemporaries to fix.

The two who prior to him got the highest ranking were Thomas Brackett Reed and Joseph G. Cannon. Henry Clay, who before RAYBURN had served longest, was never ranked as a great House presiding officer.

Reed, a fin de siecle figure, served a broken 6 years—two in the administration of Benjamin Harrison, two in the administration of Grover Cleveland and two in the administration of William McKinley.

A huge mountain of a man, a downeaster from Maine, Reed, a brilliant lawyer, was the possessor of a devastating tongue, and could wither an opponent with a word, or with a sentence at most.

Cannon, an Illinois man, although born in North Carolina and of southern stock, served 8 years in the Theodore Roosevelt-William Howard Taft administrations. He was undoubtedly the most colorful Speaker in history.

I, of course, never saw Reed. With Uncle Joe Cannon I had a delightful friendship when he was no longer Speaker and a very old man. He was then no longer the gladiator he had been. He was lefthanded and did wonderful things with his southpaw when he spoke and those gestures alone would fill the Press Gallery when he arose to speak.

Both Reed and Cannon were Republicans and arch conservatives—"stand-patters" in the idiom of their day. Both ruled the House with a tight rein. Garner was somewhat in the Reed and Cannon image, but Garner was Speaker for only 2 years.

There was no doubt RAYBURN was the leader of the House, but he had a method of his own, which had the appearance of being a leader among and not of the House Members. It worked exceedingly well for him.

Reed constantly clashed with Presidents. Uncle Joe Cannon could tell Theodore Roosevelt, as he did, that the House can take care of its reputation and its dignity in its own way. RAYBURN had good relations with the four Presidents who served while he was Speaker.

"The best way to get along is to go along," is a widely quoted piece of advice given by RAYBURN to young Members of the House. The inference might be that they should bend gently to leadership orders.

RAYBURN stated it better when 400 Texans in Washington turned out to honor him at a dinner when he was elected majority leader: "I expect to tell the President my convictions and at times may argue with him, but when he and the leaders of Congress have agreed upon a definite program, I will be for it 100 percent," he said.

John Nance Garner long before had said: "In party government you have to take some things you do not like. Party policy is the composite judgment of the party obtained in elections, conventions, caucuses and conferences. There must be discipline and responsibility and when a program is decided on everybody has to fall into line."

On another occasion RAYBURN said: "I have never asked a man to cast a vote which would violate his conscience or wreck him politically. In an overwhelming majority of the cases the Members in the House of Representatives vote for what they think is the best interest of the country."

RAYBURN got credit for running the House with a firm but fair hand—a man who used the arts of persuasion rather than coercion. He once said: "The greatest ambition a man can have is to be known as a just man." Richard M. Nixon, when he was Vice President, said: "There has never been a better or a greater Speaker than SAM RAYBURN."

Nixon made that statement on March 12, 1959, when he and 46 Senators who got their legislative feet wet in the House of Representatives presented RAYBURN with a silver tray bearing their inscribed signatures to be placed in the Rayburn Memorial Library at Bonham.

It is a novel experience to see a contemporary live to become a patriarch as RAYBURN did during my time in Washington. In that time also he became a legend, a Washington institution, and a pillar of Congress.

The most valuable thing RAYBURN got from Garner was "savvy"—an understanding of the House and the men and women who compose its membership, of which there is no greater cross-section of human nature. Most of them have fierce personal ambitions and nearly all of them feel they themselves have all the attributes and qualifications of leadership. All are elected and have constituencies. Year after year RAYBURN became more and more the counselor and father-confessor of House Members. He saw nearly all of them privately at some time each session in his big ornate formal office across the corridor from the House Chamber.

There was also the smaller back office near the middle of the Capitol where he relaxed with friends. Vice President Harry S. Truman was there in this little hideaway with RAYBURN and a kindred group when he was summoned to the White House to be told that Franklin D. Roosevelt was dead and he was President of the United States.

There are persons of all professions in Congress. RAYBURN, a lawyer, said it made no difference what their calling had been, if they had character and commonsense.

"When a person has commonsense, he has got all the sense there is," he said. "It all depends upon what is done with it."

Into this office daily also came prominent private citizens, Cabinet officers, committee chairmen, and party leaders, large and small. Some slightly eccentric characters at times got through the portals.

"Every few days," RAYBURN said, "some fellow comes in here and says: 'Here is the biggest question that confronts the human race.' I say: 'Yes, the fellow who passed you in the door going out, he had the biggest one, too.'"

A rather sad faced man, some visitors got the idea RAYBURN was a worrier. He said he wasn't, that when he went to bed he went right to sleep: "If I can't do my job standing on my feet, I sure can't do it lying in bed worrying."

An aid once told how RAYBURN managed to see so many people and do so many things in a day. A telephone call took him 3 minutes, even if it was with the President of the United States. Five or ten minutes was enough for a conference, even on a complicated problem. He never wrote letters longer than a page. He was never prodigal with words.

He became affectionately known to the nation as "Mr. SAM." That happy designation came about in this way: There were still at home in Bonham a rather large Rayburn family. There was unmarried Lucinda. SAM always called this sister, "Miss Lou," even when he was speaking to her. The neighbors took to designating the brothers as "Mr. Tom," "Mr. Jim," "Mr. Sam," and "Mr. Dick."

The custom spread over his congressional district as far as "Mr. SAM" was concerned. Hope Ridings Miller, a young woman from Sherman, came to Washington and became the writer of a social column. She began to refer to the Speaker as "Mr. SAM" as she had always heard him referred to in her Texas home.

Then suddenly, a decade or so ago, everyone seemed suddenly to realize how felicitous the appelation was. Henceforth he was to be "Mr. SAM."

When an effort was made to boom RAYBURN for Vice President in 1944, he showed no desire to change from the speakership which he by then held, although most persons believed that if Franklin D. Roosevelt were reelected in that year he would not live out his fourth term. The nomination went to Harry S. Truman, who did quickly succeed to the Presidency.

There was a move among Texans and in other States to offer him for President in 1952, and he gave no assistance to it. In 1956 and 1960 he strongly backed the presidential candidacy of Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

He refused the offer of permanent chairman of the 1960 Los Angeles Democratic National Convention to work for JOHNSON's nomination and to make the speech placing his fellow Texan in nomination.

Although RAYBURN never admitted it he became convinced soon after he reached Los Angeles that Kennedy had the nomination sewed up. He sat in his seat, second from the aisle, among Texas delegates, when JOHNSON was defeated by Kennedy. The next day JOHNSON was chosen as Kennedy's vice-presidential ticketmate.

The one native Texan he saw elected to the Presidency was Dwight D. Eisenhower, a Republican, and RAYBURN, as a Democrat, naturally did not like that, although Eisenhower always referred to himself as RAYBURN's "constituent."

On RAYBURN's 79th birthday Eisenhower sent him a telegram saying:

"I am happy to have been born in your congressional district (at Denison) because I prize your friendship and respect your many years of outstanding service to our country."

RAYBURN recently scoffed at a statement that this country has lost many of its ancient liberties.

"What liberties have we lost?" he asked. "The American boy and girl today can say what he pleases, think what he pleases, and choose his way of life freely as long as he does not trespass on someone else.

"We have amended our Federal Constitution 23 times, but we have every single liberty we had when the Constitution was written in 1787."

One of RAYBURN's greatest prides is the Sam Rayburn Library in Bonham, his Red River Valley hometown. RAYBURN started it back in 1948 with $10,000 which a magazine gave him as an award for outstanding public service.

Friends took over and contributions came from nearly every State in the Union. More than $400,000 was contributed. It was dedicated and opened in 1957. Into it have gone, or will go, his books, his official and personal papers, and all the treasured mementos he has collected in his lifetime. It is operated by the Sam Rayburn Foundation.

His love for the Capitol Building has been well known and from the beginning of his speakership he exhibited a proprietary interest in it. He fought for years against formidable and vocal opposition to effect changes in the east front he thought necessary and advisable.

The RAYBURN-directed extension of the Capitol's east front, which moved the familiar east exterior of the building 32½ feet east of its original location, will be fully completed January 1 at a cost of $15 million.

The east front has been called the Texas front by some because Vice President JOHNSON and Speaker RAYBURN each were to have had a handsome suite of offices there—JOHNSON's office to the right of the rotunda and RAYBURN's to the left.

An $86 million New House Office Building, rising to the west of the present two House Office Buildings, will owe its construction mostly to RAYBURN. It is to be completed by late 1963. Representative WALTER JUDD, Republican, of Minnesota, has introduced a bill to name it the Rayburn Office Building and this will probably come about.

Speaker RAYBURN came back for the opening of Congress in January peppery and vigorous. At the start of the session he succeeded in enlarging the Rules Committee as a means of easing the way for Administration bills.

But the House rebelled at some of the Kennedy bills and it was a thorny session for RAYBURN; by the end of the session after he had gone back to Texas ill the administration was taking a steady beating in the House.

RAYBURN thought his ailment was lumbago and to most of Washington it was inconceivable that he would not come bouncing back for the 1962 session of Congress. Then came the unhappy tidings of his serious illness.

The National Capital misses him.

"Speaker RAYBURN will always live in the history of a grateful Republic as one of the greatest public servants we have ever had," said Representative CLARENCE BROWN, Republican, of Ohio.

That, I think, is the way most of RAYBURN's contemporaries feel.

[From the Houston Post, Nov. 17, 1961]

MR. SPEAKER–MR. DEMOCRAT—SAM RAYBURN LOVED PEOPLE, EVEN ABOVE CHERISHED PARTY

(By Jim Mathis)

WASHINGTON.—A whole political era passed with House Speaker SAM RAYBURN.

He was Mr. SAM to generations of Texans; Mr. Democrat to legions of Democrats and Republicans, and Mr. Speaker to thousands of Congressmen with whom he served for half a century.

He served as a Member of Congress under eight Presidents. To four of them—Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy—he was confidant, adviser, instructor, friend, and at times, savior.

And although a giant in his country's Government in an age of organization, RAYBURN was until the last the hip pocket politician who learned solely upon hard-earned personal prestige and simple rules of conduct. The ways of highly geared and detailed operations with polished assistants were not his. He dealt man to man. He built solidly upon truth, kindness, good reasons, honor, and fair play.

In the course of an ordinary day as presiding officer of the House of Representatives, RAYBURN would see and talk with up to 100 persons, from the President to east Texas constituents. He took no notes, had no secretary or recording equipment standing by.

"How do you keep all this straight?" he was asked recently.

It was really simple, replied RAYBURN:

"You tell them the truth the first time, and you don't have to remember. You just tell them the same thing the second time."

The length of service recorded by RAYBURN is historical. He went to Congress on March 4, 1913, at the beginning of the administration of Woodrow Wilson.

After 27 years, he became Speaker at the age of 58. On June 12, 1961, he doubled the 3,056 days Henry Clay served as Speaker.

His 48 years and 8 months in the House far exceeded the 45 years, 8 months and 2 days of consecutive service by Adolph Joseph Sabath, of Illinois. In 1958, he quietly passed the 46 years of nonconsecutive service set by Joseph Cannon of Missouri.

Only Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, who came to Congress with his State's entry into the Union in 1912, has served longer in Congress.

But RAYBURN looked upon these records with distant pride. His close interest lay with what he accomplished in the day by day, year by year, and decade by decade march of events through Congress.

He was an ardent supporter of Woodrow Wilson, and as a freshman Congressman, wrote an early part of the Wilson program to regulate railroads. In 1917, it was RAYBURN who sponsored the first act to give insurance for soldiers and sailors, the first allotments to families, the first disability payments to wounded servicemen.

When the great depression rolled in, and brought Franklin D. Roosevelt with it, RAYBURN was chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The veteran RAYBURN fathered in the next few years the really enduring works of the Roosevelt New Deal. He wrote the Truth-in-Securities Act; the Railroad Holding Company Act; the bills creating the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Federal Communications Commission; the Public Utility Holding Company Act, and the Rural Electrification Act.

Democrats chose RAYBURN in 1937 as their majority leader. In this capacity, he guided the controversial Roosevelt legislation through bitter fights in the House.

On September 16, 1940, he was sworn in as Speaker to finish a term of Representative William Bankhead. Below the rostrum where he took his oath, Bankhead's body lay in state. RAYBURN was already a graybeard in service, readied by time and experience for the role of leader in Congress in the war years just ahead.

To him, on August 12, 1941, fell the awful responsibility of preserving the Selective Service Act that was to keep this country preparing for the fateful blow at Pearl Harbor.

He did so by one vote, coupling this narrow margin with determined rapping of his gavel which prevented reconsideration. Only a man of strong convictions and strong will could have faced down the uproarious Members of the House that day; only a persuasive leader could have gotten the bare margin from reluctant Members. But he saved the draft, and perhaps the country.

In postwar years, through the Truman administration and that of Mr. Eisenhower, RAYBURN often carried the brunt of efforts to extend aid around the world to stem communism. He and Mr. Truman were close personal friends—Mr. Truman was with RAYBURN when word came of Mr. Roosevelt's death.

Until Mr. Truman served out the Roosevelt fourth term, RAYBURN was second in succession to the Presidency.

With the sweep of the Republican Party and Mr Eisenhower in 1952, RAYBURN was confronted along with other Democrats with the job of picking up the pieces of their shattered party. His wise counsel, followed by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, then majority leader in the Senate, kept Democrats from unreasoning opposition. The responsibility exemplified by RAYBURN, in those days when the true party leaders were in Congress, did more than anything else to rebuild confidence in the Democratic Party.

It has often been written that the House speakership was the pinnacle of RAYBURN's ambitions.

He is quoted correctly in saying that he had "rather be Speaker than any 10 Senators." There is no question but that he loved the House, in the simplest and truest meaning of the word love. But ambitions are not so easily circumscribed.

There was a time when he looked with quiet longing and the barest of admissions to close friends at the Presidency. He knew the powers and potentials which rest in the White House. But Roosevelt chose a third term, and then a fourth. The Presidency rolled beyond RAYBURN's grasp as age mounted.

Even so, fate would have ruled RAYBURN President, had he chosen right. He could have had the nomination for the Vice Presidency in 1944, but asked that his name be withdrawn.

Mr. Truman accepted the offer from Roosevelt and went on to the Presidency. Characteristically, RAYBURN shrugged off the loss and stumped the South for Mr. Truman in 1948. He may have meant the difference for the beleaguered Truman.

And so RAYBURN came to be wholly satisfied with the speakership, the second most powerful position in Washington. In later years, he was to direct his efforts at placing his prize protege, Vice President JOHNSON, in the White House.

RAYBURN is one who followed his own advice on leadership—be a follower first. From his years of comparative obscurity, he absorbed and refined his own thinking on leadership to some simple precepts.

Where possible, he worked quietly behind the scenes in shaping legislation, with a word here, a whispered consultation there, or a meeting over bourbon and water in his side room, called the board of education. He preferred persuasion, but could lace recalcitrant Members with some pungent directives if necessary.

"SAM always said 'we've got to get the hell out of here' just when I got in fights over appropriations," fierce old Representative CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, has said.

But wherever he could, RAYBURN liked to work with kindness and good reasons. He sought the possible, seldom insisting on all he wanted or using all his powers as Speaker. He liked to label his give-a-little, take-a-little attitude as "applied Christianity."

RAYBURN had advice based upon his own formula for success and longevity for new Members of Congress. The average turnover in Congress is 150 seats every 2 years, and in RAYBURN's time, he served with more than 3,000 Members. He told his new charges to work hard, listen and not talk too much, master the issues, learn the rules of the House, and to follow the party leadership unless there were overwhelming reasons to do otherwise.

He summed up this portion of his advice in one sentence: "The way to get along is to go along."

His additional advice was for Members to consider their folks at home, but not forget the other Members of the House; to go home every chance they got, but not while big legislation was up, and to go easy on the Washington social whirl.

For new Members from Texas he had similar paternal advice, but added one positive order; no 10-gallon white hats and boots while in the House. One present Member can still remember the scorching he got for breaking the Speaker's rule against home State ostentation.

RAYBURN was a stickler for the dignity of his House, and believed in its collective commonsense to an unusual degree for a man so close so long. He looked upon the Members as a cross section of the best America had.

"They are the best jury I ever saw a man tried before," RAYBURN once said.

Occasionally, RAYBURN would hold his own trial—and once he found a man wanting, that man was relegated to obscurity, or at best, to talkative impotence. The Speaker was more likely to do this to uncooperative Texans.

In later years, RAYBURN mellowed in attitude toward opposition, personal or party. Not long ago, he said that there was no longer a man alive for whom he felt enmity. He had gotten, RAYBURN said, all hatred out of his soul, even for those who had spoken most unkindly of him.

Publicly grumpy—some newsmen always referred to him with a mixture of fear and admiration as a "crusty old warhorse"—RAYBURN was in reality a much more complex personality. If he seemed a hard, tough driver in the Congress, in his personal dealings he was often sentimental, melancholy, lonely, and seeking companionship. He had a dignity that stayed any excessive familiarity, but he could be deeply kind and warmhearted.

Children moved him easily. He kept a close watch on the families of Texas Congressmen, and frequently appeared unannounced at birthday parties.

Perhaps the most illustrative of how he could react with unexpected kindness amidst the harshness of Washington is this story told by a reporter, now a top executive for a large Northeastern business concern:

"One of our daughters died. The next morning SAM RAYBURN was at our front door. He said he had just come to help out in any way he could. Understand, I was fairly new in the bureau and wasn't important to my paper, and I certainly wasn't important to SAM in any political way.

"But there he was. He helped me make coffee and told our two little girls stories about Texas. I knew he was supposed to go have breakfast with the President at the White House that morning, and at one point I asked him about it.

"He said: 'Yes, but I called the President and told him I had a friend in trouble.'"

This was the same rugged fighter who could tell Roosevelt, who once left his attention wander during a talk to RAYBURN, in an unmistakable tone: "Looky here, Mr. President, by God, I'm talking to you. You listen."

And cooperative or not in legislation affecting the Nation, RAYBURN could quietly take the hide off a Republican. He did it in one paragraph to President Eisenhower at the 1956 Democratic convention, despite his awareness of how the folks back home went for "Ike." Said RAYBURN in a speech telecast nationwide:

"Personally, I like President Eisenhower. He was born in the district which I represent and everybody down there who remembers him says he was a good baby. (Laughter). Then he moved off to Kansas, and after he was 60 years of age he decided he would be a Republican, and I feel sure that, with his troubles with these Republicans in Congress, he regrets every day that fatal decision was made."

Here was another facet of the RAYBURN personality—his fierce party loyalty. Reasonable in the legislative halls—one of his best friends was former Republican Speaker JOSEPH MARTIN—RAYBURN could be most unforgiving on the campaign trail. He could like Republicans personally, as he did Mr. Eisenhower, but he could never undertsand why they were Republicans.

Paradoxically, he deeply resented charges that he put his party before his country, and had a difficult time forgiving those who dared utter such statements. In reckoning back over his record, it would seem he had reason to be angry.

Former President Truman, describing RAYBURN's fairness, had this to say:

"SAM RAYBURN is the only man I know who doesn't have to die to become a statesman."

Mr. Eisenhower recognized the unstinting cooperation of RAYBURN off the campaign trail, too. Once, before an embarassed but proud RAYBURN, Mr. Eisenhower paused in a state of the Union message to give birthday congratulations.

Probably RAYBURN's happiest moments came at the national conventions of his party. When he stood as chairman in the glare of the lights, enveloped in the physical animal noise from the floor, gavelling his beloved party along another search for a candidate, RAYBURN appeared in his zenith. His nod was fortune to those below, and the cold unseeing glance passing a delegate could mean ruin to the most carefully laid plans. And he could freeze a wandering, playful delegate with one look.

For three consecutive Democratic conventions—1948, 1952, and 1956—RAYBURN served as permanent chairman. No other man in the history of the party presided over so many. He stepped aside in 1960 to push the fortunes of Vice President JOHNSON.

The fact that no convention ever followed his advice about its candidate after Mr. Truman didn't seem to dim the Speaker's pleasure in the rough contact of convention politics.

He ignored lobbyist pressure, but was quick to respond to the scrawled, sometimes semiilliterate letters from farmers in his district.

RAYBURN had been solidly shaped by his early contact with hard working, Bible-reading people who make up his immediate family and the voters in much of his home counties. His liberal attitude toward any legislation designed to help the people, and a positive suspicion of giant business, were cornerstones of his political philosophy. He was, in final quality, a product of America's democratic processes, drawn from poor and hardy stock and molded over an expanse of 50 years in a decidedly Democratic cast.

SAMUEL TALIAFERRO RAYBURN was born of Scot-Irish parents in the mountains of East Tennessee on the banks of the Clinch River in Roane County on January 6, 1882.

His father was William Marion Rayburn, a onetime Confederate cavalryman who lost everything, including his horse, in the course of the war and died years later still hating Yankees. The mother was Martha Waller Rayburn, of a Virginia family. SAM RAYBURN was the 8th of 11 children.

When the future Speaker was five, the father sold his Tennessee farm and went to Texas. There he bought 40 acres of land in Fannin County and renewed his struggle against poverty. There was food enough, but everybody had to work for it, and the work was from can to can't, or from dawn to dark.

RAYBURN remembered the bleakness of that early childhood as long as he lived. His sense of loneliness flowed from it. He once told friends:

"Many a time when I was a child and lived way out in the country, I'd sit on the fence and wish to God that somebody would ride by on a horse or drive by in a buggy—just anything to relieve my loneliness. Loneliness consumes people. It kills 'em eventually. God help the lonely."

His interest in politics stemmed from age 10. That year he rode the family horse 12 miles to Bonham to hear Senator Joseph Weldon Bailey, his hero, speak. By 13, his mind was made up on a political career. At 17, he accepted the $25 his father had to offer and entered East Texas Normal College in Commerce. For the rest of his living while in school, he swept floors, milked cows, and rang the college bell. He dropped out after a year to teach, returned after a year, then quit to mix teaching and politics.

RAYBURN was 24 when he decided to run for the State legislature. His entire family dropped everything to campaign for him, a practice they followed until it was no longer needed. The Rayburns were a strong force for any local politician. Their man won easily.

In Austin, during the sessions, he attended the University of Texas and passed the bar examination. He was reelected twice, and in his third term at only 29 years of age he was elected speaker of the Texas house. His age record was to stand for 40 years, although RAYBURN later admitted he got through the session "by God, by desperation, and by ignorance."

A year later, he was elected to Congress from the district in which he grew up, and his last career began. Although he had some mean opposition, in later campaigns he never was seriously threatened.

Here in Washington, RAYBURN had lived since 1928 in a modest second-floor apartment as a bachelor. He was married and divorced early in life. He never remarried.

The Speaker brought only close friends to his apartment for long evenings of talk. His meals were usually sent in from a nearby restaurant, but occasionally RAYBURN opened a can of tamales sent to him from Texas. He did not cook chili.

Sometimes he sat at the table on a small wooden bench, much the same kind of bench rural people used in his childhood.

RAYBURN could have lived in much fancier surroundings. His pay as Speaker was $35,000 a year, and he got another $10,000 for expenses. His benefits of office also included an official limousine and a driver. But outward trappings did not impress him. He saw too much of them in the swirl of high-level Washington society to feel enchanted.

RAYBURN made courtesy calls to many social events, but much preferred to spend an evening at home with his friends or with one of his sisters who were frequent guests in Washington.

For years he bypassed expensive parties planned for his birthday for a quiet dinner with a couple from his hometown.

His free time was filled with books, usually history or western novels, and some quick fishing trips. One of the strange sights of the city was RAYBURN loading his plain fishing gear into the long limousine for a day out.

His heart was always in Texas, there in the black farming land, in his white frame home, with his family, among neighbors, with his white-faced Herefords, the turnip greens, and the trees.

One day in Washington, he looked down from Capitol plaza where he liked to stroll, across the grassy mall that rolls westward to the Washington Monument, and remarked:

"It's beautiful down there in Texas, too. Not many hills, but rolling prairie land. And that black land is 40 feet deep. There doesn't seem to be any bottom to it."

Hardly had his gavel fallen for the adjournment of a session before RAYBURN was on his way to Bonham. For years he went only by train, scorning the airplane. But one day he went with President Eisenhower to Texas by plane, and once he tasted the speed, only a jet would move him homeward fast enough.

Back in Bonham, RAYBURN could be seen beating about the countryside in a pickup truck, or until he got too old, aboard a high-priced cutting horse misnamed Pansy.

He kept in shape by cutting wood with double-bitted ax, but never, his friends said, enough "to get calluses on his hands." He was notoriously inept about things mechanical, and had trouble backing up his truck.

RAYBURN never traveled abroad, except for one early trip to Panama.

His health held up for years. His first trouble, the first sign of age, came in his 79th year in the form of backaches. He seemed to wither rapidly thereafter.

He was a stocky man, seldom straying far one way or the other from his 175-pound level. He stood 5 feet and 10 inches, and was quite aware of his shortness.

His face had set in a heavy saturnine pattern. In later years, all that was left of his once heavy brown hair was a thin fringe that rimmed his bald head under his hat brim. Finally, even that hair disappeared. He was most solicitous of the bare head in the cold winds of Washington.

A few years back, his eyes dimmed and he could not read. His assistants read what he could not hear. He had trouble recognizing people at short distances.

One step in the process of awareness of age—like that of ridding the soul of hate—was the link he formed at 74 with the church of his father. He was quietly baptized into the Primitive Baptist Church of Tioga, Tex., in 1956.

He had never before found the time for formal ties with a church, although a professed God-fearing man.

From that point, RAYBURN seemed to have come almost the full circle—from the people of East Texas and back to his folks. He completed it.

[From the Pecos Daily News, Oct. 11, 1961]

PROUD SAGA OF SAM RAYBURN BEGAN WITH LONELY YOUTH

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—William F. Arbogast, chief of the AP staff covering the House of Representatives, takes a long look at SAM RAYBURN, who has made an indelible imprint on U.S. politics. In discussing the RAYBURN saga, Arbogast writes not only as a close observer, but also as a friend of the Speaker.)

(By William F. Arbogast)

WASHINGTON.—The political saga of SAM RAYBURN nears its tragic end today.

The end isn't likely to find that hero of the SAM RAYBURN story proudly and authoritatively wielding the gavel of the highest office he ever sought. Instead, physicians have decreed for "Mr. Democrat" a less majestic fadeout, a victim of cancer.

But if the end comes soon—as doctors say it must—it will find SAM RAYBURN still officially holding the title of Speaker of the United States House of Representatives. The House is in recess. It won't meet again until January 10.

The story of SAM RAYBURN is the story of a lonely little boy helping grub a living out of Texas cotton land and dreaming of a future in politics.

It is the story of a dream come true in the face of adversity and obstacles which would have discouraged a less determined man.

SAM RAYBURN wasn't born to be Speaker of the House. He got there on his own.

He was born to be a farmer and at farming he spent his early life, first in his native Tennessee and then in Texas, which his father adopted as a permanent home for the Rayburn family of 11 children.

As a boy, SAM RAYBURN'S life was one of toil and monotony.

"When I was a boy," he once said, "I would sit on a fence on Sundays and wish that somebody would ride by on a horse—just anything to relieve the monotony."

He surprised almost everyone by seeking election to the Texas House of Representatives at the politically tender age of 24.

He won, and became at the age of 29, the youngest speaker in the history of the Texas Legislature.

In 1912, at the age of 30, RAYBURN achieved a burning ambition—election to the U.S. House of Representatives. He has been there ever since.

He rose to the chairmanship of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees and to the floor leadership of his party. Then in 1940, when the speakership was vacated by the death of William Bankhead, of Alabama, he won the job.

Except for 4 interrupted years when Republicans were in control, RAYBURN has held it ever since. His tenure as Speaker set a record.

If RAYBURN ever aspired to higher public office, he never disclosed his aspirations. He loved the House.

He brought to the speakership a mixture of "the stern guidance and loving care" which he said his parents gave to him. Between the two courses, he sought compromise.

RAYBURN left no doubt about who was boss of the House when he held the gavel. He believed that "if you lose control for even a split second, you are in serious trouble." He never lost control. When gavel-tapping failed to produce results, gavel-banging did. RAYBURN broke more gavels than did any of his predecessors.

Presidents addressed him as "Mr. Speaker." Without his help; they were in trouble on Capitol Hill and most of the eight under whom he served knew it. He did not hesitate to "tell them off" in plain English.

RAYBURN brooked no meddling in the affairs of the House. To him it is the greatest deliberative body in the world. He was jealous of its powers and prerogatives. He respected the Senate but often gave the impression that he considered it bush league compared with the House.

As Speaker, RAYBURN was a backroom operator. When he needed votes, he went after them. By personal persuasion, cajolery or threats if necessary, he frequently snatched victory from seeming defeat.

But he never asked a colleague to vote against personal conviction. He put loyalty to conscience, country and party in that order.

He called himself a Democrat without any ifs, ands or buts.

To the chairmanship of three Democratic National Conventions, RAYBURN carried the same vigor and at times seeming arbitrariness which marked his rule over the House.

Television viewers will long remember the scowls and defiant glares with which he nipped convention uprisings. He was the boss and he left no doubt about it.

RAYBURN enjoyed few things more than a good fight. He won more than he lost.

He failed to win presidential nominations for two fellow Texans, John Nance Garner in 1932 and 1940, and LYNDON B. JOHNSON in 1960.

He laid his personal prestige on the line last January when he championed enlargement of the House Rules Committee. He had his way by a slim edge, but whether he actually won is debatable. The Rules Committee still doesn't jump every time the House leaders crack the whip.

On the subject of leadership, RAYBURN had a homespun saying: "A man doesn't learn his job in the House until he's had his head damn near well bloodied a couple of times, but a leader may as well quit if his head is bloodied too often."

Opponents complained at times that he was harsh, arbitrary, dictatorial. But in the same voice they conceded fairness.

RAYBURN insisted on respect for the office of Speaker, if not for the man who held the office.

To him the title "Mr. Speaker" was honor and glory enough for any man.

Last June 12, when RAYBURN doubled Henry Clay's record of almost 8½ years as Speaker, colleagues poured forth tribute to RAYBURN.

Fighting back tears, "Mr. Speaker" acknowledged them with these words: "My career is crowned. I have achieved every thing I ever hoped or desire. When I leave here I will leave without any regrets."

Less than 3 months later he left at the insistence of his doctors.

[From the Austin Statesman, Nov. 17, 1961]

RAYBURN GAINED POLITICAL GREATNESS

(By Frank Eleazer)

SAM RAYBURN never was seen slapping a back. He didn't smile much. He seldom made speeches. He disliked and was disliked by photographers. He kissed beauty queens but rarely a baby. Despite these and other departures from the established tradition he attained political success, world renown, and even love and affection beyond the wildest dreams of most politicians.

RAYBURN not only served in the House longer than any man. He served as House Speaker more than twice as long as his nearest competitor. In his years of splintering gavels he built the job into the Nation's second most powerful, outranked only by the Presidency. He saw made and helped make more history than any of the eight Presidents he served with ("never say 'served under'," he chided reporters).

This was pretty good going for a poor country boy, born the eighth child of 11 in the Tennessee hills and raised on 40 acres in Texas. With nothing to do but chop cotton and read history books, young RAYBURN had picked his career before he was 10. He built it on $25, hard work, and the will to succeed.

The money was an unexpected assist from his dad, shoved into SAM'S pocket as he climbed aboard a hot, cindery coach on his way to enroll in East Texas Normal. From that day, SAM was on his own. Among his jobs was sweeping floors at the college, for which he earned $3 a month.

EARNED $45,000

As Speaker he earned $45,000 a year. He rode to his fishing holes in an air-conditioned $11,000 limousine, and fished with his chauffeur. He mingled with, and was one of, the great. He was trusted adviser to three Presidents (Roosevelt, Truman, and Kennedy) and had plenty to say, one way or another, about the administration of a fourth (Eisenhower) who preferred to take his advice somewhere else.

If all this went to Mr. SAM'S head, it didn't show. And his was a head not built for concealment. RAYBURN was bald as long ago as anybody could remember, and his glistening skull, although sometimes a sensitive subject with RAYBURN, was his trademark. With his Texas-type hat on him. Bareheaded, he was recognized anywhere.

BAROMETER

RAYBURN'S scalp served as a barometer of the mood he was in. Normally it displayed a cool, calm gleam, slightly tanned and somewhat freckly. When he was mad, the flush climbed up the back of his neck and encompassed his head. Nobody in his right mind took up any business with RAYBURN when this storm warning was showing.

President Kennedy—who went to the House as a youngster at a time when Speaker RAYBURN had long been a fixture—told of the time when as President, he was in Canada, Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON in Asia, and Secretary of State Dean Rusk at Geneva. A high-level call came into the White House switchboard for each of the three in his turn.

"Then who is keeping the store?" Kennedy said the frustrated caller demanded.

"The same man who's always kept it—SAM RAYBURN," the operator was supposed to have answered.

SAM RAYBURN was elected head storekeeper on Capitol Hill on September 16, 1940, on the death of Speaker William B. Bankhead. He had been helping keep it, and learning the trade, as a lawmaker from the Fourth District of Texas since his election in 1912 at age 30.

He took office with President Wilson, who became one of his heroes. From childhood, all RAYBURN's heroes were statesmen. Politics was the only career he ever considered, and he claimed to have decided at age 8, 9, or thereabouts he would run for the House and sooner or later be elected its Speaker. He liked politicians and thought House Members, especially, were the greatest people on earth. He knew the House was the greatest legislative body on earth, and anybody who in his presence used the term "upper body" to refer to the Senate simply didn't know much about getting along with SAM RAYBURN.

Although his friendship crossed party lines, RAYBURN was a Democrat first, last, and always. Unlike some other members of his party—especially some from the South—RAYBURN always stayed hitched. "Democrats just naturally seem to know better than Republicans how to keep the country runnin' right," was the way he sometimes sized up to political difference.

RAYBURN presided over the Democratic National Conventions of 1948, 1952, and 1956. Through the sheer force of his personality and firm grip on the rules, Mr. SAM from time to time saved them from what appeared to be imminent chaos. One Democratic convention he didn't run was held at Los Angeles in 1960. He stayed on the sidelines then to manage the campaign of his close friend LYNDON JOHNSON. He thought a Johnson-Kennedy ticket would be great. It turned out vice versa, but only after JOHNSON cleared with RAYBURN Kennedy's invitation to serve in the second spot on the ticket.

CONTRADICTION

As long ago as April 16, 1955, RAYBURN had become such an institution that more than 3,000 of the Democratic faithful, including Truman, Adlai E. Stevenson, and Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, gathered at a $100 per plate Rayburn dinner on an occasion which in previous years had honored Jefferson and Jackson. He had lived 73 years at the time. In all those years few people had seen RAYBURN cry. But this time, he couldn't quite hold back the tears.

Some observers claimed to be baffled by the apparent contradiction of RAYBURN's conservative nature and background and his liberal career at the side of Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Kennedy. Those who knew him better said this was easy to fathom. RAYBURN had seen want; he also knew the value of hard work in overcoming it. He did not think the Government should pamper the people. He believed, however, it was necessary sometimes for the Government to step in and give people a chance to get ahead on their own.

It was not out of character therefore that RAYBURN did more than any other man to help Roosevelt push through "New Deal" legislation then considered radical. Later he helped Truman with his Fair Deal. And when Kennedy's New Frontier came along, with its accent on youth, RAYBURN, by then 79, engineered legislative accomplishments about which even young administration men had despaired.

Yet RAYBURN was nobody's rubberstamp. When he couldn't go along with a Democratic President's legislative request he usually didn't raise any public fuss about it. He just did not push, and as likely as not, nothing happened. Truman once handed him a civil rights bill which RAYBURN thought was ahead of its time. He carried the bill back to Capitol Hill and forgot it. Yet some years later (with the help of JOHNSON, then Senate leader) he was instrumental in putting a civil rights law on the books. When Kennedy asked Federal help for teachers' salaries in 1961 RAYBURN said he would try, but he didn't think much of the idea himself and didn't think the chances were good. The House later proved him right.

As Speaker, RAYBURN developed influence and power far exceeding those nominally prescribed for the job. From his election in 1940, he held the job continuously except for the 4 years of the 80th and 83d Republican Congresses, when he served as minority leader. In his conduct of the office he was scrupulously nonpartisan. As his Party's leader he sought from fellow Democrats the same kind of party loyalty he practiced himself.

RARELY INTENSE

His leadership was only rarely intense. On most matters House Democrats under his reign didn't get even guidance. Some of them complained about this. Only on the relatively few issues deemed important either as party matters or as vital to the national interest did RAYBURN, through "whips," lay down a party position. In some cases, even here, he failed to apply the many pressures that are easily available to a speaker. As a result he found himself sometimes assailed simultaneously for lack of leadership and legislative tyranny.

Overall, even his critics had to admit that RAYBURN's performance was good. His friends called it great. They explained that he didn't scatter his shots or waste ammunition on minor matters. It was the same way with his House speeches. He did not make them often. When he did, the members listened. There were better orators in the House, but none who spoke with as much influence.

RAYBURN apparently grew up lonely, as some children do in big families, and lived, essentially, the same way. His early marriage lasted only 3 months. In Washington he lived alone for more than 30 years in the same one-bedroom bachelor apartment. Such meals as he wasn't taking with presidents, kings, prime ministers and lucky Washington hostesses he had sent in from a restaurant across the street. His most noted failing in later years lay in the fact that new, younger members thought him formidable, stern and beyond approach. As old men do, he scowled a lot. Actually, his friends said, what RAYBURN lacked was small talk.

READY TO HELP

He was elected speaker 10 times and on each occasion told the new Congress his office just off the House floor was always open to Members. Those who took him up on this found that it was, too. They soon learned in their dealings with Mr. SAM that he had a sympathetic ear for their problems and was always ready to help those with a reasonable case.

"The way to get along is to go along," he often advised newcomers to Congress who sought his advice.

By that he meant don't bother tilting with windmills. RAYBURN never fought lost causes, if he knew they were lost. Some of the more dedicated liberals disliked him for this. In later years they grumbled that RAYBURN no longer was leading, and began to talk about a possible successor.

In the end, though, he bailed them out of their worst predicament and in the process opened the way for Kennedy to put into law some of the social and economic programs he had promised in the 1960 election campaign. Kennedy had squeaked into office himself and the Democratic majority in the House had been trimmed by 19 votes. Mathematically it was easy to prove that Kennedy couldn't put his liberal program across in the House. Besides, there stood in the way the traffic cop committee on rules dominated, as it had been for years, by conservatives.

RAYBURN had learned the hard way he no longer could count on his old friend, Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia, the Rules chairman, for a Rules clearance in matters where Judge SMITH's conservative conscience took charge. Liberals for years had been pressing RAYBURN to break the Rules roadblock that from time to time had stopped liberal measures.

He had resisted their demands for two reasons: First, he thought in a pinch he could always do business with SMITH. Second—and the fact was a little-known one—RAYBURN himself had enjoyed the Rules Committee shelter sometimes when the heat was on for a bill that he did not like but did not want to oppose openly.

A STRUGGLE

This time RAYBURN acted. In a struggle that rocked organization of the House for almost the month of January 1961, he finally whipped SMITH, by a House vote of 216 to 212, and to use SMITH's term, "packed" the Rules group to give the leadership a majority of one. That got the legislative machinery rolling and before it had quit for the year it had ground out a minimum wage boost, higher social security payments, extended pay for the jobless, a multibillion-dollar housing bill and much of the other social and economic legislation on which the Democratic campaign of 1960 had been run.

RAYBURN was born near Kingston, Tenn., January 6, 1882. His father had been a Confederate soldier. When SAM was 5 the family moved to Texas and settled near Bonham. He grew up in the usual country pattern, and in later years liked to marvel at what roads, cars, electricity and the telephone had done to relieve the loneliness of rural living. Came college age and there was no money for college. SAM said he would make his own way. Except for his dad's parting gift of $25, that's what he did.

He got a B.S. degree, a teacher's certificate, and in 1906 at age 24 ran for the State legislature and made it. While at Austin he studied law and was admitted to the bar in 1908. At 29 he became the youngest speaker of the Texas House. In 1912 he was elected to Congress.

John N. Garner, then a House Member and later Vice President, showed him the ropes, and RAYBURN moved along fast. In 1931 he became chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee. Two years later he steered through the House such New Deal legislation as to the holding company death sentence, regulation of securities and the stock market.

WORKED HARD

But he always claimed as his proudest accomplishments passage of the Rural Electrification Act and inclusion of farm-to-market roads in Federal highway aid, both of which he said benefited the real people—the formerly isolated farmers.

His sure-footed performance, and his growing popularity led to his selection as party leader in the House, and then as Speaker in 1940.

RAYBURN worked hard and long during sessions of Congress. Along about 5:30 or 6 p.m. when the business was done he liked to relax in a hideaway just below the House Chamber which others called the board of education but which Mr. SAM referred to simply as "downstairs." There his intimates, mostly Texans, and an occasional newspaperman were privileged to drop in for a chat and maybe a drink. It was there that Vice President Truman was visiting on the afternoon of April 12, 1945, when the momentous call came that meant Truman was President.

Between sessions, while other lawmakers toured the world, RAYBURN wasted no time returning to Bonham. He left the country but once, early in his career in the House, when he joined a group inspecting the Panama Canal. At home RAYBURN liked to ride over his farm, inspecting the corn and the cotton, then to sit rocking on the porch of his big colonial farmhouse, receiving a steady stream of constituents, come to pay their respects. He had a ranch nearby where he raised Herefords.

RAYBURN was Speaker so long, and stood up so well under the job, that as the birthdays rolled by Members got to thinking that Mr. SAM was one of those institutions that continue forever. Few House Members had been around long enough to remember his predecessor. Many could not even remember the four Republican years that marked RAYBURN's only breaks in the chair.

At noon on June 12, 1961, RAYBURN had served as Speaker 16 years and 237 days, twice as long as Henry Clay, his nearest competitor. He was 79, said he had never been sick in his life, that he weighed the same 176 pounds he had weighed for 40 years, and that he figured to be around for quite a spell yet.

The tributes that were laid on the Speaker that day, by Members on both sides of the aisle, were such that the standard flowery, fulsome, melodious eulogies common in exchanges between Members on ceremonial occasions were reduced by comparison to mere awkward backhanded compliments. Members at last ran out of superlatives. RAYBURN, who had sat through it all glum and silent, took back his gavel, quieted the ovation, and said that if the things his friends had said about him were true, his life had indeed been a rich one.

"I am satisfied," he told the hushed House. "My political career has climaxed everything I ever hoped or trusted it might be. So that when I leave here I will leave without any regrets."

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Oct. 9, 1961]

SAM RAYBURN TAKES A LOOK AT THE WORLD—INTERVIEW WITH THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE

(With the first congressional session of the Kennedy administration now history how does the record look to one of the most powerful men in Congress—the 79-year-old Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN? And how does "Mr. SAM" measure the pulse of the country, and the world? Drawing on his years of experience, what does he feel about the critical present, the uncertain future? To find out, W. B. Ragsdale, of the national staff of U.S. News & World Report, went to Bonham, Tex., to get this exclusive interview with the dean of the House of Representatives, a personal acquaintance since the 1920's.)

Question. Mr. Speaker, these are dangerous times. Do you think that enough of the national effort is being turned toward strengthening this Nation? In other words, could people do more?

Answer. It is just a question of how much the people know, how much they are called upon to do. And that is what I have been trying to do—to bring them face to face with their responsibilities as citizens, or as a part of a group of citizens, or as a party, and let them know that their responsibility right now is terrific.

Question. Do you think most Americans are aware of that responsibility and realize what it means?

Answer. If this generation doesn't live up to its responsibilities, then what of the next generation, or the next?

I try to say to people that we are all in this thing together, we all go up and stay up, or we all go down together. There is no room now for selfishness. There is no place for hate and distrust. We must set out on the broad highway together and keep going.

Question. Most of the world's troubles seem to stem from Nikita Khrushchev. Have you formed any personal impression of him as a man or as a leader?

Answer. I met him once at a dinner at the White House. I sat some distance away from him. After dinner, President Eisenhower said, "Come in here, SAM, and talk to this man." So I got up close to him so I could look at him.

I wouldn't say that he had a face I liked, at all. My impression was that he had a cruel face, and I still think of that. I wasn't in his presence long enough to form much of an opinion of him, except that I have looked in the faces of a lot of men and I have judged them by their looks. And that is how I judged him.

Question. Did he impress you as a man who would dare drop a nuclear bomb on this country?

Answer. Well, if we were in that business—big war—yes. Now, whether he is reckless enough to drop the first hydrogen bomb, I don't know. He would have to be a pretty reckless man, because he knows other people have agencies of destruction just like he has. And I imagine he wants to live.

I would think that his scientists have acquainted him with all the destructive elements in these things—how far reaching would be the effects. I think he hesitates to drop the first one.

Question. Let's look at it from the U.S. standpoint. Do you feel that this still is a great and powerful nation?

Answer. Yes, the greatest and most powerful. And when called upon to exert its strength, it will do it now as it always has. I do not lose confidence in the fortitude and valor, patriotism and bravery of the average American. I think they are as high now as they have always been.

A great many people are standing on the corner criticizing this, that and the other, but when the supreme test comes, they usually come through, too.

Question. Are you saying that the people are just as self-reliant as ever? Is that what you think?

Answer. I do. I would hate to live in a country if I didn't have faith and confidence in the people. I think the American people are the best jury I ever saw an accused tried before, when they know all the facts.

Question. One hears a great deal of talk that people are getting more selfish than they used to be. What about that?

Answer. Well, a great many of them have more to be selfish about. They own more property, they have more income, and they want to keep it.

But selfishness has always been and always will be. Nearly everybody is going to be a little selfish about what they have to provide for their family. But when it comes down to the point of my saying that anything like the majority of the American people are selfish to the extent that they wouldn't support their Government in a crisis, I just don't believe it.

Question. Coming down to specifics, Mr. Speaker, does the level of Federal spending disturb you?

Answer. Well, of course, any spending disturbs people. Any payment of taxes disturbs people. But we must look the world in the face, and this is not a very happy world we are living in. It is a dangerous world, more dangerous to the civilization we know and love than people ever sought to exist in.

But, as long as the world is in an arms race, and as long as reckless people have hold of weapons that are totally destructive, we must spend.

We must keep ahead in that race so that we can defend ourselves. This takes a lot of money. We are spending $40 billion a year for defense. Now, that is one thing that we can't cut down on if we have any judgment. We just have to have the money to produce the things that are necessary to defend ourselves.

The national debt is big and is going to remain big.

Taxes are high, and they are going to remain high until the world settles down.

Unless we can have what President Kennedy spoke about in his speech at the United Nations—disarmament, real disarmament—we must go on spending. This arms race is what is costing the money, and we have to stay in it as long as it lasts.

I admired the President very much for the bold, frank statement he made to the people at the Assembly, and to the whole world.

Question. There are some people who say we are spending too much on social welfare and things of that kind—

Answer. And they don't know what they're talking about, a great many of them. A lot of people talk about social welfare and this, that and the other, and don't know much about it.

Every time you say something about social welfare, people go to yelling socialism and welfare state and all this. We don't have any welfare state. We haven't lost our grip on our domestic problems, and we aren't going to.

But there are just so many people who are going to jump up and accuse the other fellow of spending, spending, spending. And when those people are in power, they keep right on spending, spending, spending.

It is kind of ridiculous at times.

GOVERNMENT HAD TO GROW

Question. Are you disturbed by the growth of Government?

Answer. If I answered that question flatly, I would have to say that I am not—Government had to grow.

Talk about the simple Government of Jefferson—of course it was simple. There were just a few more than 3 million people, and there were no communications. There was not a hard-surfaced road in the United States, and there was no such thing as a monopoly at that time, because the Nation just wasn't big enough.

As these things grew and developed, the Government had to grow. At that time there weren't any railroads to regulate, no rates to fix, no bonds to be issued. But, as business grew, then trust laws had to be enacted and enforced, and it took a lot of people to do that. The same thing about the railroads—they started little, but they became big, and it went on and on.

Rural electrification came. That was the greatest boon to the farmer that I have ever seen.

And then, take Federal aid to highways. In 1944 I had them put into the bill for aid to highways a provision that 30 percent of every dollar that was spent by the Federal Government for highways must be spent on farm-to-market roads.

As we grow, the Government must grow. It is one thing to pass the law, and it is another thing to enforce it. I don't shrink from the proposition that the Government has grown, because where the Government has grown, it has been adding something that was in the interest of the public.

Question. You said earlier that defense and these other things cost a lot of money. Do you think that taxes are now about as high as people can stand?

Answer. You never know what people can stand. They are carrying a great burden now, of course. And we are hoping that we don't have to increase that burden, but, if the time should come when we needed more money—if we just had to have more money—I don't think there would be anything that would prevent Congress from raising taxes in certain places.

I think the people would go along if they had the information and knew the taxes were needed.

Question. Mr. Speaker, let's talk about you, personally, for a moment. How long have you been in public life?

Answer. I first ran for the Texas Legislature in 1906, and went into the legislative session of 1907. I went to Congress in 1913.

Question. You must have seen amazing changes in all those years——

Answer. Well, you would need to write a book, and even then that wouldn't be able to tell all of them.

Question. By and large, do you feel the changes have been for the better?

Answer. I think Government—both State and Federal—is more responsive now to the wishes and the needs of the people than it has been at any time during my legislative experience.

I know the changes have been for the better. We couldn't have gone on like we have if they were not.

Question. Have you noticed many changes in the role of Congress in that period?

Answer. Not too many—we have the same number of men and women in the House as they had then.

As far as I am individually concerned, I think that the character and ability of the men and women who are in Congress have not deteriorated, and I think that the caliber in education, experience and so forth for the Members of the House of Representatives today is probably higher than it was when I went there.

I am not one of those who say that we don't have as big men in Congress as we used to have. I think that is nonsense. I think we have more men and women of real ability in the Congress of the United States than I have ever known, and I think they have demonstrated it on many occasions.

When something that has affected the national interest has come up, a big majority of them—not all, but a big majority—has laid partisanship aside and moved ahead in the right direction.

HOW STRONG A PRESIDENT

Question. What about the White House? Do you think the Presidency has gained in power over the years?

Answer. The President, of course, has always had vast powers. He executes the law as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, and in those fields, of course, the President has maintained power.

The question is always: Who is the strong man? During my time we have had eight Presidents. Most of them have been strong men, some stronger than others.

The Congress of the United States wants the President to exercise his powers, and it wants to exercise its own powers—and it does. It does this every time a bill advocated by the administration comes up in the House. It exercises its power. It follows the President's recommendations, or it goes along its own line, takes another approach.

Sometimes this is better than the original approach made by the President, and the Presidents are always willing to agree that, if the Congress passes a better bill than they advocated, they are happy about it if they are the right kind of President—and most of them are.

Question. What about the present administration? How did Mr. Kennedy make out in the session of Congress just closed?

Answer. I think President Kennedy had one of the most successful sessions of Congress that I have ever served in. In his state of the Union message he laid down quite a program. Much of it was controversial.

The Congress passed on every one of his proposals in some way, and the vast majority of them have been enacted into law.

Therefore, I think that this 1st term of the 87th Congress, working with Mr. Kennedy, has done a real job. It has responded to his suggestions, and has enacted a very fine program.

Question. The President didn't get everything he wanted, though, did he?

Answer. No, not everything. But he got most of what he had asked for except the school business, and we did continue two very essential parts of that program.

Question. Would you say the record of the session is as good as you had expected?

Answer. It certainly is. I thought there would be more controversy about a great many legislative proposals.

And I will say this, also: There has been very little backbiting in the House of Representatives. Very few Republicans have been against something simply because a Democratic President wanted it.

There has been such a small amount of partisanship that it has been very pleasing to me.

Question. How would you list the credit side—the principal accomplishments—of the session just ended?

Answer. This divides into several parts. First—to fight the depression and start the country to moving again—there were, among the most important things, measures for area redevelopment, for housing—the most comprehensive program in history—an increase in minimum wages, a new farm bill, a strengthening of the whole fabric of defense, several important foreign-affairs measures. This Congress was one of the most productive in our history.

WHEN CONGRESS MEETS NEXT

Question. Now that this session is over, what are some of the problems that will have to be dealt with next session?

Answer. There are always new ones.

Of course, this school thing will have to be faced again, and I would imagine there will be some kind of solution, or compromise.

Foreign aid will be up again. There will be a row over that again. Some people don't believe there should be any aid.

And reciprocal trade will be up again. There are some people who would like to do away with reciprocal-trade agreements and go back to setting up tariff walls. But I think our American industry has got to adjust itself to a great many things.

Question. In what way?

Answer. There is a complaint about Japanese textiles. Now, we are a nation with many surpluses. We have a surplus in cotton. How much of a squeeze can we put on Japanese goods and still sell Japan several million bales of cotton? There are a lot of places where you can buy cotton, you know. And those new factories in Japan are up to date. A great deal of our American machinery is not up to date, and our industry is going to have to adjust itself.

We cannot afford—this greatest surplus-producing country in the world cannot afford—to settle down behind a tariff wall. If we enact tariff laws against other nations, they will enact tariff laws against us.

Money doesn't cross the ocean to balance trade. It's surplus goods for surplus goods. We must stay with some kind of arrangement whereby we can take their surplus goods and they can take ours, or our trade is bogged down. That's all there is to it.

Question. Speaking of industry, there are reports that the administration is opposed to business. Will you comment on that?

Answer. That is utter nonsense. No administration that had any sense would be against business. We want business to be prosperous. In order to carry on, we have to have people prosper and make profits whereby they pay taxes.

Question. Does business continue to have a fair hearing in Congress?

Answer. Yes, it certainly does, and always has had.

Question. What about the strength of union labor in Congress? Is that growing?

Answer. Union labor has a lot of strength, of course, because it has these millions of people. How much power labor has in Congress, I don't know.

TAKING THE PUBLIC'S PULSE

Question. There sometimes have been complaints that Congress is slow to respond to public wishes. Do you think that perhaps too much power may have been concentrated in the hands of minorities in some of the key committees?

Answer. No, I do not.

Now, this thing of responding to public wishes—well, sometimes it takes a long time to find out what the public wishes are.

The big storm for or against measures comes from a small minority, and Congress wants to wait around and see not only whether these changes are necessary, but whether they are wise, whether they would be in the public interest. Congress must determine by legislative procedure what it thinks is in the public interest, after hearings in committees, debates on the floor, and so forth.

But on this thing of responding to public wishes—sometimes we find out that what seems to be a public wish really is only that of a small minority. We determine that it is not in the public interest, so we don't enact it.

Question. Do you mean that first you have to find out what the public wish really is?

Answer. And on top of that, what is the wise thing to do? Sometimes the public might wish a thing this year and find out, next year, that if it had been enacted it would have been a mistake.

Congress just doesn't like to be rushed. And it shouldn't be on these vast questions. Great deliberation should be had, and many times it takes time.

Taking time sometimes is not really a loss of time.

Question. In the end, would you say that the will of Congress generally is the will of the people?

Answer. Generally, yes. It might not be the apparent will of the people at that moment, but wise people—and the people of the United States are wise when they know the facts—finally determine what is the right thing to do.

Question. There are those who say that Members of Congress think first of their home district, then of the national interest. How do you feel about that?

Answer. The man who comes to Congress has received the endorsement of his people. He thinks he is sent there to represent them, to get justice and fair play for them.

The people at home have shown faith and confidence in him that he will do the right thing in representing them: the projects in their district, how friendly they are to agriculture, if there is a lot of labor in the district, how friendly they are to labor and how fair they are to enterprise, too.

Then, if he or she has energy along with ability—and ability isn't much unless it has energy with it, because it doesn't go into operation—then I think they will say, "This is my country; this whole country is mine."

I think the average Member of the House of Representatives is a patriotic person who really, in the last analysis, wants to do the best for the whole country that he is capable of doing.

Question. When it comes to expressing the will of the people, do you feel it would be better if the Members of the House were elected every 4 years, rather than 2?

Answer. There are some people who say House Members ought to be able to serve during the whole term of the President.

Well, suppose at the middle of the term the people back home became dissatisfied with what was going on, and justifiably so? I think the people should be allowed to change. And, therefore, I am for continuing 2-year elections of Members of the House of Representatives.

Question. Looking closely at Congress, geographically, would you say that the South is losing power?

Answer. I would not. They have the chairmanships of a great many of the committees, and I think inside those committees nearly everybody is pretty reasonable.

When it comes to the floor of the House, some people have always wanted to build up this Republican-Southern bloc. Well, if they tried to organize this bloc against the Kennedy program, they didn't get very far this past session. I think that thing has been blown up, and blown up beyond what its influence really is.

I think a great many of men from the South are getting tired of being put into that lineup. And probably, too, some from the North are hearing their people say, "Well, this fellow has joined up with the Dixiecrats."

I never was for blocs—never joined one. I wanted to be a free, independent legislator; to vote my sentiment. And, of course, my sentiments are usually on the side the Democrats take, because I have had a part in making up that program.

ABSOLUTE FAITH IN UNITED STATES

Question. Mr. RAYBURN, almost all the pressures building in the country are exerted upon you in the Speaker's office. As you watch these pressures, and feel them, what crosses your mind about the American people—their present and their future; the future of the world?

Answer. I have absolute faith in the American people. I believe that more than 95 percent of the American people have more good in them than bad. And, when properly appealed to, they will respond—now as they have in the past.

The American people have never failed to respond to the best interests of the country when this country was in danger and in a crisis. I just know that they will do it again if they are called upon.

The great body of the American people is sound, patriotic, and willing to sacrifice to the limit to preserve, protect and to perpetuate the great future of this great country.

I have never doubted the patriotism of the willingness of the American people to sacrifice and do the right thing. I think we will come through in a fashion that will make us all proud.

So I look forward to living in this country at peace, I hope, and in friendliness for all good peoples of the world. We want other people to have their real life, and we want ours.

We do not want to interfere with the affairs of other governments.

And we want to stay at home and attend to our own business, and to build our own structure without interference from anybody else.

[From the Houston Post, Nov. 17, 1961]

GOLD MEDAL FOR MR. SAM?—YARBOROUGH RENEWS PLAN TO HONOR HOUSE SPEAKER

(By Felton West)

WASHINGTON.—Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas, took the initiative Thursday in planning to pay tangible tribute to Texas' beloved Speaker SAM RAYBURN.

YARBOROUGH announced soon after hearing of the Speaker's death that he will renew his effort to have a gold medal coined in honor of Speaker RAYBURN—an honor the man known as "Mr. Democrat" would not stand for while alive.

YARBOROUGH said he will attempt to make his resolution providing for coinage of the medal "the first order of business" when Congress reconvenes January 10.

YARBOROUGH began trying to honor RAYBURN with a gold medal last September 7.

At that time the Senator introduced in the Senate a joint resolution to provide for coinage of a single gold medal including the words "For Services Rendered to the People of the United States," to be presented to RAYBURN. The resolution would have provided $2,500 for the purpose, and it would have directed the Secretary of the Treasury to cause bronze duplicates to be cast for sale.

RAYBURN had gone home to Bonham on August 31.

YARBOROUGH urged speed in paying tribute, saying RAYBURN knew nothing about the effort to honor him, and it should be done before he could return.

Fifty other Senators quickly signed YARBOROUGH's resolution as cosponsors.

Then, 1 day after YARBOROUGH introduced the resolution, Speaker RAYBURN put his foot down on it without even returning.

In a telegram, he told YARBOROUGH he appreciated the friendly generosity but the medal would embarrass him, and he asked YARBOROUGH to lay off.

RAYBURN, YARBOROUGH said, felt such a tribute should not be given to the living.

YARBOROUGH reluctantly had a hearing on his resolution called off and had his resolution entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thursday, when RAYBURN could earn no more honors, YARBOROUGH said:

"Of all the officials of our Government of our generation who are deserving of a gold medal, SAM RAYBURN has earned it most of all."

[From the Houston Post, Nov. 17, 1961]

SAM RAYBURN, STATESMAN, LEFT ENDURING IMPRINT ON AMERICA

Few men are called statesmen while they live, but one such man was SAM RAYBURN, who served the Nation as Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives more than twice as long as any other who ever held the office. The wisdom which is the mark of a statesman was RAYBURN's in abundance.

Speaker RAYBURN's more than 48 years in Congress spanned an era of revolutionary changes in American social and economic life and saw the emergence of this country as the leader of the free world. He played a major role in these historic events. He was, in fact, the sponsor of much of the legislation which brought them about.

During his many years as Speaker, SAM RAYBURN held power second only to that of the President. He was in the tradition of the "iron" Speakers. He was the boss. But he was always scrupulously fair.

His frequently repeated advice to new Members was: "Be reasonable. Be fair." He followed his own advice to the letter. He was a master at giving a little and taking a little. He called it "applied Christianity."

His was the American story, success achieved by ability and hard work. He was born on a farm in Roane County, Tenn., in 1882. He was christened SAMUEL TALIAFERRO RAYBURN, but, like another Tennessean who became one of Texas' great sons, he shortened his first name to SAM and dropped the second one. In Who's Who and the Congressional Directory he listed himself simply as SAM RAYBURN.

The Rayburn family moved to a farm near Bonham when young SAM was 5. The father, a Confederate veteran, the mother, and the 11 children worked together in the cottonfields, barely making a living.

SAM RAYBURN worked his way through East Texas Normal College at Commerce and then taught school for several years to pay his debts. At 24 years of age he ran for the Texas Legislature and was elected. While in the legislature he studied law at the University of Texas and was admitted to the bar. During his third term he became the youngest speaker of the house in Texas history up to that time.

In 1912, he was elected to Congress. He was sworn in the day that Woodrow Wilson became President. He was never defeated for reelection. He became Speaker September 16, 1940. At the time of his death he had served longer in the House than any other man.

RAYBURN's genius as a presiding officer, both in Congress and as permanent chairman of three Democratic National Conventions, long will be remembered, but his most enduring monument will be the legislation he sponsored and worked for as chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and as majority leader.

The Truth in Securities Act, the Railroad Holding Company Act, the Public Utility Holding Company Act, the Rural Electrification Act, and the bills creating the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Federal Communications Commission were largely RAYBURN's work. Most of them evoked great storms of controversy, but RAYBURN was convinced of the need for them and time has proved him to be right.

As an orator, he shunned the bombastic and the flowery idiom which once were characteristic of public speakers. He spoke simply, softly, and his sincerity was evident to all who listened. At the times when he took the floor of the House to speak for or against a proposal, the cloakrooms emptied as the Members hastened in to hear him. On many issues on which the House was closely divided, a talk by RAYBURN tipped the balance.

He believed in and lived by the simple virtues. He had passionate zeal for the truth. He carried himself with dignity. He was loved by all who knew him well.

"Mr. SAM," who seemed as indestructible as the Washington Monument, is going to be missed on Capitol Hill.

[From the Houston Post, Oct. 16, 1961]

MARTIN SAYS RAYBURN IS "SENTIMENTAL," CREDITS HIM FOR "SO MANY THINGS"

(By J. F. terHorst)

WASHINGTON.—In this town, SAM RAYBURN is frequently called the only national monument that speaks. It's an irreverent truth, but also a testimonial to the man who has been in Congress 48 years, has served under 8 Presidents and has been Speaker of the House twice as long as anyone else.

They don't make greater Democrats than RAYBURN—yet it was to a favorite Republican that the cancer-stricken Speaker entrusted a secret before he left Washington.

"He called me to his office to have our picture taken as the only two living Speakers," said veteran Republican JOSEPH MARTIN, of Massachusetts. "He told me he was going home to Texas to rest his back. It was the day before the House was notified.

"SAM didn't have to tell me, but that's the kind of man SAM is."

Such is the friendship that exists between 79-year-old RAYBURN, the country's Mr. Democrat, and 77-year-old MARTIN, the man they used to call Mr. Republican.

And it's one reason why Democrats, Republicans, the President and the policeman outside RAYBURN's office door are taking so hard the same news from Texas.

In choked words over the telephone from his newspaper in North Attleboro, Mass., MARTIN reflected his abiding affection for RAYBURN.

"Everybody thinks of SAM as a grumpy man to get along with," said MARTIN. "You know, he is really very sentimental underneath that old Texas hide. He did so many things for me."

It's not usual to hear anyone talk of Rayburn as "Sam." He is Mr. Speaker to the Members of the House. A few Democratic leaders call him Mr. Sam to his face. Almost everybody does it out of Rayburn's presence. But between Mr. Democrat and Mr. Republican, it is simply "Sam" and "Joe."

Between them they ran the House of Representatives for almost 20 years, playing a game of musical chairs with the speakership, third most powerful office in the land. Between them, they chaired their parties' national conventions every 4 years.

Rayburn has been Speaker 17 years. Martin was Republican minority leader for most of that time, except for 4 years when he was Speaker. They got along famously.

In fact, it was Martin's relationship with Rayburn as well as his own ill health and age that caused House Republicans to dump him as floor leader in 1959 in favor of Representative Charles Halleck, of Indiana.

"There were some who resented my long and close friendship with Speaker Sam Rayburn," Martin said in his book, "My First 50 Years in Politics."

"My young Republican associates forgot that my friendship with Rayburn enabled me to obtain for our side a good deal more patronage, such as jobs around the Capitol, than we, as the minority, ever would have got otherwise."

Martin has a dozen ready illustrations of Rayburn's fair play in the political arena of the House—where the fighting can get as rough as a battle between Roman gladiators.

"Take 1953—Ike's first year," said Martin. "We Republicans were able to pass 73 percent of what the President wanted. But whenever Sam backed the bills, they were easier to pass.

"He never compromised his principles, either. Both of us knew that neither party has a monopoly on good ideas."

Martin credits his demotion to the rear ranks with a remarkable improvement in health. In his private meeting with Rayburn, Martin urged the Speaker to stay in Texas until the next session of Congress and "get a good rest."

"Of course, I didn't know that he was dying of cancer," Martin added. "If Sam isn't coming back, we're really going to miss him. I mean the whole country. The House never had a better Speaker."

But that's the kind of man Mr. Sam is.

[From the Brown County (Tex.) Gazette, Nov. 23, 1961]

A Tribute to a Friend: "I Shall Miss Him"

(By Forrest Kyle)

Last Friday morning about 11 o'clock I left Bangs for Bonham, Tex., to attend funeral services for a great Texas statesman and a warm personal friend. Hon. Sam Rayburn, who had been Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States for longer than any other man, had given up the struggle against cancer. The news was broadcast over radio and television, bringing sorrow to friends, not only in Texas but throughout the Nation.

Arriving in Bonham around 6 p.m. I found it impossible to find hotel accommodations, so great was the crowd that had traveled from great distances to attend the funeral. First, I went to the Rayburn Library where the body lay in state. There, from among the better than 3 million people which constitutes the population of Texas, 30,000 people passed in review before the bier of the man for whom friends had contributed and built the library as a living memorial to his name.

Unable to get a meal in the town of Bonham, my friend and I traveled 26 miles to Sherman for our supper. We came back just after 8 o'clock and, driving by the library again, we were amazed to see that the line of people passing through the building to view the body had not diminished.

I thought to myself, as I stood there watching this evidence of loyalty of friends and acquaintances, "What endeared this man to so many people?" And the answer came to mind almost before the question was asked: Loyalty begets loyalty. Mr. Sam's loyalty was never lightly given; it was strong, and sure, and enduring. Other factors, too, contributed to the magnetism of his great popularity, such as honesty, unselfishness, love of people, and the desire to help his fellow man.

Almost every town, village, or hamlet in this great State, regardless of political affiliations, were indebted to Mr. Sam in some way or other for favors rendered by him during his many years as Speaker of the House. Our own community of Bangs was no less indebted than the others; it owes a deep sincere gratitude to him for his efforts on behalf of the water projects here, which enabled the town to have good, pure drinking water piped from Lake Brownwood. Repeated efforts through other channels had failed; four consecutive times the project was turned down. Then Mr. Sam entered the picture, and today Bangs has water. Bangs also owes a debt of thanks to the Speaker for enabling the Bangs School Board to purchase the land and building which is now the Bangs High School. These are just a few of many such acts that made him the friend of Bangs.

But all Texas was his home; and he showed no more partiality to his own hometown than to the smallest village in the State. For this all Texas loved him—and all Texas is equally indebted to him.

This generosity was not limited to Texas alone. He loved America, too. This was evidenced in the number of high official dignitaries who came from many miles away to attend his funeral. For although Mr. Sam was a politician, it was not in the sense that many politicians use politics today. He used it, of course, but he did not misuse it. This was the reason that politicians of both parties loved and respected him.

His faith in people was a characteristic that remained with him throughout all the days of his life. Faith, in this day of mistrust, is a gem of great price, and in this respect Mr. Sam was a rich man.

He was honest. That statement said of any man is the highest prize on the shelf of human attainment, more worthy than riches, more desirable than fame. Mr. Sam's honesty was not hidden; it shone forth with a brightness that highlighted his life and drew friends like moths to a flame. And, in spite of the bluntness which honesty often gives, they remained as loyal to him, as he to them. They loved his straightforward, blunt manner, that left no doubt as to where he stood on any question.

Yet he was gentle; no man, possessed greater sympathies than Mr. Sam Rayburn.

I admired and respected him as did everyone else. He was a man whose character I would emulate, and which, should I succeed in a small way in doing, I would feel that I had accomplished a goal toward which all men should strive.

I shall miss him.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Nov. 17, 1961]

Story of Sam Rayburn—"Mr. Democrat" in Washington, Just as "Mr. Sam" to Homefolks

(By Allen Duckworth)

Sam Rayburn was both statesman and country squire.

In Washington, he was "Mr. Democrat," a fiercely loyal party man, idolized by his friends and feared but respected by the opposition.

He was also plain "Mr. Sam" when he came home from the marble halls to sit on the front porch of his farm home and talk things over with the folks of Fannin County.

Sam Rayburn never forgot his humble start: From a 40-acre farm to a half-century public career that took him as close as a heartbeat to the Presidency.

He was born Samuel Taliaferro Rayburn on January 6, 1882, in Roane County, Tenn., the 8th of 11 children.

Rayburn's father was a Yankee hater. He rode with Lee as a Confederate soldier. Under surrender terms, the southerners were told they could keep their horses, but at Knoxville his horse was taken from him.

The Rayburn family drove to Texas in a wagon when he was 5 years old, settling on a little farm near Bonham. There, Rayburn recalled, he experienced the "loneliness that breaks men's hearts."

"I'd sit on the fence on Sundays and wish that somebody would ride by on a horse—just to relieve the monotony."

After attending a two-teacher school in the area, Rayburn decided to seek a college education.

His dad was hard pressed financially, but managed to give young Sam $25 when he boarded the train for Commerce to enroll at East Texas Normal School (now East Texas State College). After that, he was on his own. To pay expenses, Sam rang the school bell and swept the buildings. He taught school for a year to earn enough for another year of college.

Rayburn's public career started in 1907, when he was elected to the house of representatives of the State legislature. While a legislator, he studied law at the University of Texas and opened a law office in Bonham.

During his third term, Rayburn was elected speaker of the house. He was only 29 years old and was the youngest man, up to that time, to serve as Presiding Officer of the house.

Rayburn ran for Congress and won in 1912. He had some tough reelection fights, but always won. Only death could and did remove him from the House, which he said "has always been my life and it has been my love."

While he loved the House, he also loved the black lands of his farm near Bonham.

One day in Washington, he was looking out a window at the Mall that leads from the Capitol to the Washington Monument.

"It's beautiful down there in Texas," he said. "Not many hills, but rolling prairie land. And that black land is 40 feet deep. There doesn't seem to be any bottom to it."

Rayburn often was called a bachelor. Actually, he was married for a brief time to Miss Metze Jones of Valley View in 1927. The marriage was dissolved after a few months.

His legislative career, from Texas House through congressional service, added up to 54 years.

When he opened the session in June of this year, Rayburn had been Speaker twice as long as any other man in history, 16 years and 273 days. Ten years before, he had passed the record set a century before by Henry Clay, who held the speakership for 8 years, 136 days.

The Texan had been in the House for 27 years before he was elected in 1940. At that time, he was Democratic majority leader. His career was interrupted during the sessions of 1947–48 and 1953–54 when Republicans were in the majority. During those interims, he was minority leader.

"I'd rather be Speaker than 10 Senators," Rayburn said when asked why he never ran for the Senate. "I love the House."

During World War II, Rayburn kept a tight rein on the House and supported all the Roosevelt administration measures. Four months before Pearl Harbor, a fast gavel saved the Selective Service Act and prevented depletion of Armed Forces.

RAYBURN was first in line to succeed to the Presidency after Roosevelt died. Vice President Harry Truman became President. There being no Vice President, the Speaker would have become President if Truman had vacated the Office.

RAYBURN also might have become President if there had not been troubles in his delegation from Texas at the 1944 Democratic Convention. He might well have become the nominee for Vice President instead of Harry Truman and would have become President upon Roosevelt's death.

It is said that RAYBURN liked many Republicans personally but never could understand their being Republicans.

Of Eisenhower, he said: "Now personally I like President Eisenhower. He was born in the district I represent. And everybody down there that remembers him says he was a good baby. Then he moved to Kansas. And after he was 60 years of age, he decided he'd be a Republican."

RAYBURN presided at three national conventions of his party—1948, 1952, 1956. He ran the conventions as he ran the House; no monkey business.

"You can't lose control of a national convention for a moment," he recalled. "If you do, you're sunk."

He declined the gavel at last year's convention to help LYNDON B. JOHNSON's bid for presidential nomination. After JOHNSON lost to John F. Kennedy, RAYBURN was in on the hurried conferences that led to JOHNSON's accepting the vice-presidential nomination.

RAYBURN always told Members of Congress that his office was always open to them. But he had a semisecret hideaway in the Capitol basement where only intimates were allowed. There, RAYBURN and his friends would "strike a blow for liberty," which meant having a drink.

Truman and RAYBURN were together when they received the news of President Roosevelt's death at Warm Springs, Ga.

RAYBURN was never a backslapper, never a joiner. He belonged to none of the fraternal societies.

Five years ago, with no advance publicity, RAYBURN went to Tioga and was baptized in the Primitive Baptist Church there at the age of 74. It was his first formal affiliation with any church, although he previously had listed the Baptist denomination as his preference.

RAYBURN served for more than a quarter of the House's existence.

He served with eight Presidents, four Democrats and four Republicans—Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy. He insisted on saying he served with Presidents and not under them.

It is estimated that he had seen 3,000 Members of Congress come and go.

RAYBURN left his own monument when he died—the $492,000 Sam Rayburn Memorial Library at Bonham.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Nov. 17, 1961]

BONHAM: FRIENDS, NEIGHBORS END LENGTHY VIGIL

(By Eddie Hughes)

BONHAM, TEX.—The newspaper tossed out by the paperboy Thursday afternoon was left untouched at the big white house with the pillars.

The big black headlines told why:

"Mr. SAM Is Gone."

"Mr. SAM" was the principal product of Bonham. These people had seen him grow to greatness in national and world prominence.

When SAM RAYBURN, 79, died in his sleep here at 6:20 a.m. Thursday, a sad sentiment was voiced by the friends and neighbors of the famed House Speaker.

Bonham Mayor Jess C. Magouirk (fc) had known Mr. SAM personally for 55 years.

"It's like losing the courthouse," he said.

Like many others, Mayor Magouirk felt anything he might try to say wouldn't nearly express how he felt about RAYBURN's death.

"I feel I am a member of the family. It is a tremendous loss. But the Nation's loss is greater."

Ray Peller Jr., 32, local lawyer and a stanch Democrat, said even the town's Republicans "always voted for Mr. RAYBURN, personally."

He felt Bonham "is going to miss SAM RAYBURN, and not the Speaker of the House."

His death, Peller said, came not unexpectedly. "We knew he was going to die; yet, it did little to soften the blow when we learned he did."

"He loved people, and people loved him."

First National Bank President Dick Saunders recalled RAYBURN would come to town to go to the barbershop. He would visit with people, joke with the man on the corner, give advice to the youngsters.

"We all revered him," Saunders said. "I voted for him for Congress all 25 times. I didn't always agree with him, though. But it is quite a loss to our little town."

Joe Kincaid, a postman, hadn't seen Mr. RAYBURN since Easter when the House Speaker came home for the holidays.

"I went fishing with him some," he said. "As a fisherman, I'd say he was pretty good. As a man, he was as good as they come."

RAYBURN's attorney, Robert (Buster) Cole, felt "it is not often that ordinary people have an opportunity to be associated with a figure of history, and to know a man intimately."

"I always thought his was the securest hand that led the Nation," he said of his own feeling.

Aubrey McAlister, publisher of the Bonham Daily Favorite, said of RAYBURN:

"We've always leaned on him for everything. But we have never worked with another man who was more considerate and less demanding for a man in his position.

"We're going to miss him. This is probably felt more keenly here in Bonham, his home since he was a boy, than anywhere else in the world."

Schools are going to be let out early here Friday. Stores will close up entirely Saturday. And Bonham prepares to pay its last respects to its greatest native son.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Nov. 18, 1961]

LONELY GRAVEDIGGER TELLS HOW MR. SAM HELPED HIM

BONHAM, TEX.—H. W. Stevenson was the loneliest man in Bonham as he lifted a spadeful of waxy black earth from the grassy hillside where Speaker RAYBURN will be laid to rest in Willow Wild Cemetery.

Mist clouded his eyes and he turned his head downward as he grubbed with the shovel and talked with effort.

"Right here," he said, emphasizing his words with a lunge of the shovel, "besides Miss Lu (RAYBURN's sister, Lucinda) is where Mr. SAM wanted to be when it had to be. I done the honors for Miss Lu, and this is my last chance ever to do anything for Mr. RAYBURN.

"Did he do me any favors? Lots of 'em. I guess the best thing he did was—what I liked the most—was just being recognized by the man when he'd see me.

"And when I used to drive a truck on the Red River project and they owed me $600, he saw to it I got it. A poor man don't forget a thing like that."

Then the lonely digger straightened his overall gallus and resumed his work.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Nov. 17, 1961]

KIND WORDS: EIGHT PRESIDENTS EARNED MR. SAM'S ADMIRATION

SAM RAYBURN served in Washington with eight Presidents, and he had kind words for each of them.

Warmest praise, naturally, was for the four Democratic Presidents.

RAYBURN's comments:

Woodrow Wilson: "I've always thought that President Wilson was one of the greatest intellects that ever sat in the White House. He was a great statesman."

Warren G. Harding: "I never thought Mr. Harding was a dishonest man. He was too trusting, and some people that weren't exactly right imposed upon him."

Calvin Coolidge: "I rather liked him. I think Coolidge said one of the smartest things that was ever said: 'I found out early in life you don't have to explain something you hadn't said.' "

Herbert Hoover: "I always thought that Mr. Hoover was a very efficient man. I like him. I think he's a grand man. But I always thought Mr. Hoover was a better man to be on the team than to be a captain."

Franklin D. Roosevelt: "His inaugural address, 1933, was one of the most inspiring things that I think the American people ever had. He had a program and he had the courage to stand by it and give a good reason for it. He had an appeal to the American people that very few men in the history of this country have had."

Harry Truman: "He made some of the biggest decisions that any man made who was ever President. I think history is going to be kind to Mr. Truman. I think it is going to put him way up among our great Presidents."

Dwight D. Eisenhower: "He was a great general * * * is a great patriot. I think he wanted to serve his day and generation well. I think history will be just to him."

John F. Kennedy: "I think he is going to make a good President and really be a man of destiny."

[From the Dallas Morning News, Nov. 17, 1961]

DRAFT ISSUE: MR. SAM'S FAST GAVEL SAVED BILL

Just 4 months before the United States was plunged into World War II, Speaker SAM RAYBURN used a fast gavel to guarantee the Nation at least a token armed force.

The strength of the Army was 1,400,000. The issue was extension of the Selective Service Act—the draft. Defeat would have released a million trained men from the Army.

Some say that Speaker RAYBURN, singlehandedly, saved the Nation's Army.

The draft had been in effect for a year and the administration sought to extend it. There was terrific pressure from back home on Congressmen; let Europe fight its war, send Johnny back home.

Shortly before rollcall, Speaker RAYBURN did what he did rarely: he stepped down and made a speech in favor of draft extension.

The bill squeezed through by a single vote, 203 to 202.

Before any Member could announce a change of vote, RAYBURN banged the gavel and announced the result. A few seconds of delay could have been fatal to the bill. And, fatal to America.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Nov. 18, 1961]

RAYBURN: BONHAM FOLK PAY THEIR RESPECTS

BONHAM, TEX.—The old man had obviously shined his weatherworn shoes, but he tugged at his tattered farm clothes in front of the Rayburn Memorial Library.

Lawrence Whitt, 78, had just taken a last look at the man he had known most all of his life—SAM RAYBURN.

"If you went out to his house with clothes like this, you'd be just as welcome as the President of the United States," Whitt declared.

The retired farmer and ginner shook his head and his eyes became moist once again.

"He was once so strong * * * so very strong."

Whitt, after a few moments of reflection, smiled and recalled seeing SAM RAYBURN working on his (RAYBURN's) ranch not over a year ago.

"He was out working with his hired hands * * * caring not that the sun was breaking sweat down the back of his neck.

"Ninety percent of his cattle he raised himself, you know," Whitt added.

Like Whitt, there were many farmers who came into town Friday to take a last look at the man who had many times greeted them in the fields as he passed by their farms.

Women came with children in their swaddling clothes; other children came, barely able to peer over the side of the casket.

School classes were let out early and students filed past the flower-decked casket in the majestically marble foyer of Mr. SAM's library. Even husky boys that wore football jackets could not hold back the tears.

The entire student bodies of three rural schools near Bonham paid their respects. Almost every head was still bowed when they reappeared outside again.

At noon, some of Speaker SAM's relatives, including his sister-in-law, Mrs. Dick Rayburn, and nieces and great-nieces, spent a few minutes inside—alone.

When they left, their faces reflected a similar feeling of sadness that marked the thousands of other mourners.

Mr. RAYBURN's body will be in state until 9 a.m. Saturday.

Thousands more visitors are expected Saturday morning before funeral services at the First Baptist Chuch here at 1:30 p.m.

Those attending funeral services are expected to include many from Washington. Perrin Air Force Base in nearby Sherman has already set up 400 beds to take care of the incoming Congressmen.

It was not known whether President Kennedy and Vice President JOHNSON would be able to visit the Rayburn Library before it closes Saturday.

"I'm sure that these doors will open for them—closed or not," remarked one oldtimer.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Nov. 17, 1961]

RAYBURN'S COUNTRY: BELOVED SOIL TO BE RESTING PLACE

(By Larry Grove)

BONHAM, TEX.—Speaker SAM RAYBURN will be laid to rest Saturday on a rolling hillside where the song of birds comes at sundown from high old elms and cattle grace a meadow below.

He never would have thought of any other place than beside members of his family in Willow Wild Cemetery. Not even the full honors of Arlington National Cemetery could have rivaled this place for Mr. RAYBURN.

"He was a good man—never lost the common touch—never forgot where he came from—that's what made him great." Those were often repeated words in Bonham Thursday from shopkeepers, policemen, widows, farmers, everyone.

By the hundreds they drove by the stately white columned house, their hearts with the grieving relatives inside. But the visitors only stood under the elms outside, chilled by afternoon winds. They showed their sense of sorrow and departed.

Miss Alla Clary, associated with the Speaker during 42 of his 48 years in Washington, embraced RAYBURN's only living brother, Dick Rayburn of Ector, as he arrived to join the family inside.

Miss Clary said Elder H. G. Ball of Tioga Primitive Baptist Church who will conduct the funeral service, baptized the Speaker not so many years ago.

RAYBURN said at the time: "It was the faith of my father—and I've always believed in it."

The First Baptist Church, which will be the scene of what will be one of the largest funerals for a national figure since President Franklin D. Roosevelt's, is a modernistic spired pink brick building that occupies an entire block just north of Bonham's business district. Even so, its 1,200 seats won't come near to holding the expected funeral crowd, to be headed by President John F. Kennedy.

The church is, along with RAYBURN's treasured memorial library, the most impressive building in Bonham. Bonham's houses are of substantial but modest frame, on streets shaded by leaf-shedding trees that hold a riot of autumn color.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Nov. 17, 1961]

TEXANS IN WASHINGTON FEEL LOSS AS PERSONAL

WASHINGTON.—Texans in Washington felt a deep personal loss Thursday in the death of Speaker SAM RAYBURN.

Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON was on his way to a speaking engagement in the Middle West when he heard the news and immediately left for Texas.

"The Capitol is a very lonely place without him. The good people of the world have lost a companion and an ally," the Vice President said in a statement.

"He was always there when needed. His voice and his judgment were heard and respected. In the end it all added up to one thing: He did what was right."

Secretary of the Navy John B. Connally, who like JOHNSON visited RAYBURN twice during his losing battle with cancer, said the speaker would stand alongside the "revered statesmen in our history."

"His passing is an immeasurable personal loss. I will deeply miss his wise counsel and will cherish the memory of the many times we shared together over the years," Connally said.

Supreme Court Justice Tom C. Clark of Dallas said RAYBURN was a true patriot—"teaching us that though one may be partisan in politics, he must, as did he, place devotion to country first."

"In the passing of Speaker RAYBURN, Mary (Mrs. Clark) and I have lost one of our dearest friends," Justice Clark said.

From Texas congressmen in Washington came these tributes:

JOE KILGORE of McAllen: "The whole world mourns the loss of a great leader. We will all miss him greatly."

BOB CASEY of Houston: "I have lost a close personal friend. I know the country and the State of Texas feel the same way. We've not lost just a man, but a great institution."

FRANK IKARD of Wichita Falls: "I think Speaker RAYBURN was one of the truly great men of this generation. He has been a balance wheel, a great reservoir of common sense. His passing leaves a great vacuum."

Gov. Bill Daniel of Guam, in Washington for a territorial Governors' meeting when word of RAYBURN's death arrived, said the loss was serious to the United States and the entire free world.

Daniel said when he left Guam he asked that the Texas flag be flown at half-staff on the Governor's grounds when RAYBURN died.

Assistant Secretary of Labor Jerry Holleman of Austin said RAYBURN's greatness rose above party label.

"The United States and the free world will miss his leadership," Holleman said. "His passing leaves a place in our hearts that will never be filled."

Assistant Attorney General Ramsey Clark of Dallas said the strength of the free world would feel RAYBURN's absence.

"He's one of the great men America has produced, in my opinion," Clark said.

[From the Baylor Lariat, Nov. 17, 1961]

DEATH UNSEATS TEXAS' MR. SAM

The flag in front of Baylor's Pat Neff Hall was at half-staff Thursday for the Grim Reaper had unseated the Speaker of our Nation's House of Representatives.

Regardless of their politics, Texans can be grateful for the life of SAM RAYBURN.

The 79-year-old native of Bonham, Tex., served in Congress for over 40 years.

He served as Speaker of the House for 17 years, more than twice the tenure of any other House leader.

While in Washington RAYBURN came to be called Mr. Democrat because of his strong and powerful leadership in Democratic Party politics.

He was an iron-willed partisan but was known and thought by members of both parties to be a fair man.

SAM RAYBURN is dead.

But from the Permian basin of west Texas to the gulf coast, from the deep east pine country to the Mexican border there can be found monuments to his efforts.

The epitaphs on the monuments might read: Government funds for Federal highways, dam and reservoir projects, conservation study, water-basin projects, flood study, disaster relief, salt-water conversion, Federal buildings and military installations.

RAYBURN was instrumental in the passage of legislation that yielded these benefits to Texas.

Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON, himself a veteran of 24 years in Congress, said of RAYBURN, "He was the greatest friend I ever had."

Texans may well say the same.

[From the Houston Post, Nov. 17, 1961]

SPEAKER MOURNED: "COUNTRY HAS LOST DEVOTED SERVANT"

Leading Americans in Texas and across the Nation mourned the death of House Speaker SAM RAYBURN Thursday and commented on the many contributions he made to his country.

The White House issued this statement by President Kennedy after the President departed from the Capital by plane for Seattle:

"Mrs. Kennedy and I join the Nation in mourning the death of Speaker RAYBURN. His public service stretched from the administration of Woodrow Wilson to the present day. But it was the quality of that service more than its length that was so distinctive.

"A strong defender of constitutional responsibilities of the Congress, he had an instinctive understanding of the American system and was a loyal counselor and friend of Presidents of both parties on the great matters which affected our national interest and security.

"I had singular opportunity as a young Congressman, and now more recently as President, to appreciate his temperament and his character; both were bedded in rock and remained unchanged by circumstance.

"This country has lost a devoted servant and the citizens of this country, an unflinching friend."

Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, who learned of RAYBURN's death while on his way to the National Airport in the Capital to catch a plane for Seattle, where he planned to attend a dinner for Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Democrat, of Washington, issued this statement:

"The Capital is a lonely place without him and the good people of the world have lost a companion and an ally. He was always there when he was needed. His voice and his judgment were heard and respected. In the end it all added up to one thing: He did what was right."

Johnson quickly arranged to go to Bonham and left by airplane from Andrews Air Force Base to fly to Perrin Air Force Base, near Sherman. The plane left Washington about noon.

Ralph Yarborough, Texas' senior U.S. Senator, was flying from Austin to Seattle, to attend the dinner honoring Magnuson when he heard of Speaker Rayburn's death. He left the plane at Dallas and with Barefoot Sanders, U.S. attorney for the northern district of Texas, proceeded to Bonham.

Yarborough said:

"Sam Rayburn will live in the hearts of them all. As such he will stand in histories of the 20th century world he helped so much to shape.

"More extensively than any man of his time, Sam Rayburn wrote his record with legislation that made the world we know today. The cause of democracy has lost a great and valiant leader. Texas has lost one of its good men and true.

"Sam Rayburn will live in the hearts of all who knew him and will be remembered so long as our democracy lives.

Yarborough said he will ask that the first order of business when Congress reconvenes in January be a resolution to strike a gold medal in honor of Rayburn.

Rayburn declined the resolution when it was introduced by Yarborough and coauthored by 50 other Senators in the last session.

Former Gov. W. P. Hobby, chairman of the board of The Houston Post:

"Sam Rayburn's greatness of mind and spirit were evident to all who knew him. Probably only a few persons fully realize the vast scope of his contributions toward making the United States the foremost Nation of the world.

"In these perilous times, his wisdom and his leadership will be sorely missed."

Oveta Culp Hobby, president and editor of the Houston Post and former Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

"To know Sam Rayburn was a privilege forever to be cherished. His counsel was always wise and his devotion to the cause of truth was inspiring.

"The Nation which he served so long and so ably has suffered a great loss, for he was indeed a leader without peer."

Representative Albert Thomas of Houston, on an inspection trip on the west coast for the House Appropriations Committee, released this statement through his office in Washington:

"He was a great American, and the entire country owes him a great debt. He was a middle of the roader in every respect. His contributions to the growth and history of this country will long be remembered."

Representative Bob Casey of Houston said:

"History has claimed Sam Rayburn, and this great American now belongs to the ages.

"Texas and our Nation have suffered a great loss, and I can see no one on the horizon to fill the void left by the passing from the scene of one of the world's great lawmakers and statesmen.

"While we did not always agree on matters of legislation, I know that he spent every ounce of his strength and his courage for what he believed to be the best interests of his district, his State and his country.

"I mourn his death as a friend and shall cherish forever the few warm moments of comradeship we had together. As a Member of the House of Representatives, I shall always regret that death has stilled forever the gavel of the greatest Speaker this Nation will ever know."

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower termed the death of Rayburn a grievous loss to every citizen.

Mr. Eisenhower, vacationing at the Augusta National Golf Club, issued the following statement:

"Speaker Rayburn's legislative leadership was unmatched. It will long inspire all who seek important positions in public service. On international affairs he was a tower of strength for four Presidents. An outspoken partisan, I found him also equally bipartisan in all matters affecting the security of our country.

"To know Mr. Sam was to admire and like him. Throughout my presidential years we met frequently, privately and publicly. Because I was born in his congressional district, he often referred to me as his 'vicarious constituent.' I took pride in calling him my 'first Congressman'."

"As his friend of many years I mourn his passing. It is a grievous loss to every citizen of the United States."

Former Vice President Richard M. Nixon said, "Sam Rayburn was one of the most effective political leaders the Nation has produced. While he always fought hard for his party, on issues involving national security he was always an American first and a Democrat second. Mrs. Nixon and I have sent a personal message to Mr. Rayburn's sisters, expressing our deepest sympathy."

Former Vice President John Nance Garner said, "One of the greatest men in the Nation has died" when informed at Uvalde of the death of Speaker Rayburn.

In a statement issued from his home later in the morning, the 92-year-old Garner, who also served as Speaker of the House said:

"He was one of the finest men in the United States and one of the best Presiding Officers the House of Representatives ever had. I was proud to claim his friendship."

Former President Herbert Hoover said in New York that Rayburn was one of America's great leaders, who "commanded both affection and respect irrespective of political affiliation."

"Our country is better for his life among us," Hoover said.

Harry S. Truman, who made a special trip to Texas to visit his old friend Rayburn a few weeks ago, was at home in Independence, Mo.

"I'm just as sorry as I can be to hear of Sam's passing," Mr. Truman said. "He was one of the great men of our time, one of our greatest statesmen."

Associate Justice Tom C. Clark of the U.S. Supreme Court, a Texan, said:

"In the passing of Speaker Rayburn, Mary (Mrs. Clark) and I have lost one of our dearest friends. He was a true patriot—teaching us that though one may be partisan in politics he must, as did he, place devotion to country first. Along with his family, we mourn his passing and shall sorely miss him."

Secretary of the Navy John B. Connally, a Texan and longtime friend and hunting companion of Rayburn's, said:

"Our Nation has lost one of its greatest leaders. Speaker Rayburn was of the breed that made the United States strong, and he will take his place alongside the revered statesmen of history. His passing is an immeasurable personal loss. I will deeply miss his wise counsel and will cherish the memory of each of the many times we shared together over the years."

U.S. District Judge Allen B. Hannay of Houston: "I was in the gallery when Rayburn was sworn in as speaker of the Texas House of Representatives. His election to Congress occurred the following year.

"I was a very close friend and a tremendous admirer of his. I thought his patriotism, his courage and his inteligence a tremendous asset to the American people. I think his loss is irreplaceable."

Houston Mayor Lewis Cutrer: "We mourn this great loss with the rest of the Nation and the world. This is a great loss not only to the Nation but to Texas.

"He was undoubtedly one of the greatest statesmen the State ever sent to serve its country in Congress. Sam Rayburn was a great humanitarian and through his outstanding leadership was able to become a champion of the rights of the people of all of the free world.

"He made one of the greatest contributions to his fellow men through his outstanding public service."

W. L. Clayton of Houston, chairman of the board of Anderson Clayton & Co.: "I knew him intimately and considered him one of my really great friends. His passing, fills me with real grief.

"I saw him about a year ago and he looked wonderful. I told him I was so glad. He said, 'Well, I've never been sick a day in my life. I've never even had a headache.'

"Then, 6 months later, he looked very bad. It's a loss to the world."

Herman Brown, president of Brown & Root, Inc.: "Sam Rayburn was an old personal friend but thousands of people who knew him will feel his loss just as keenly.

"He was a great steadying influence in Washington and had been a wise counselor to literally hundreds of Members of Congress during his long service. His strength lay in his uncanny ability to understand human beings."

George R. Brown, executive vice president of Brown & Root: "Mr. Rayburn was a dedicated public servant not only to his State but to his party and his Nation. He had helped make the Texas delegation a responsible one and the envy of most of the other States."

Woodrow Seals of Houston, U.S. district attorney for this section of the State: "Although history teaches us that no one is indispensable, I do feel that in my lifetime I will not see his like again."

Dr. Kenneth S. Pitzer, president of Rice University: "He was certainly one of the great figures of American Government in the past many years and his loss will be felt keenly by many Americans."

Dr. Philip G. Hoffman, president of the University of Houston: "In the death of Mr. Rayburn we have suffered the loss of one of the great public figures of our national history.

"We must find our consolation in the knowledge that he leaves a wealth of contributions to his State and Nation and a splendid example for those who aspire to become the public figures of tomorrow."

John T. Jones, Jr., president of the Houston Chronicle: "In the death of Speaker Sam Rayburn the people of Texas have lost a friend and an able representative. But the loss sustained by the entire citizenship of our Nation is even greater, for Sam Rayburn was a stalwart in the thinly-manned ranks of our dedicated professional politicians.

In uninformed mouths professional politician may sound like a dirty word, but in actual fact these people who dedicate their lives to the national welfare through the practice of politics are to be applauded and cherished.

"The good ones are few and far between, and we mourn the passing of the foremost of the number."

Dr. Charles L. Allen, pastor of the First Methodist Church in Houston: "I am deeply shocked and sorry. I feel he made a great contribution to the United States. I think he was one of the great statesmen of all times."

Bishop John E. Hines, bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Texas: "I certainly regarded him as a very effective servent of the whole Democratic order.

"He was a loyal party man but his ultimate loyalties transcended the party. He was a dedicated servant of his country. He will certainly be missed."

The Reverend K. Owen White, pastor of the First Baptist Church in Houston: "I've regarded him as an outstanding American and a great leader. I'm sure it's a loss for everybody."

Former Congressman Lloyd Bentsen of Houston: "He was a dear friend. I believe he had more influence on the legislative course of the Nation in the past 20 years than any other man. Few men become an institution in their time, but SAM RAYBURN did."

Governor Price Daniel: "I am deeply grieved to learn of the death of SAM RAYBURN. In more than half a century of public service Mr. RAYBURN brought great honor and distinction to our State and made lasting contributions to welfare of the Nation and the free world. His strong leadership will be missed greatly not only by our own country but by all the peaceful nations of the world."

J. E. Connally, chairman, State Democratic executive committee: "Mr. SAM was very close to me—in fact, almost like a father—so his death is a great personal loss; and I am deeply saddened.

"Speaker RAYBURN was truly the great living American. He now joins the ranks of the greatest of all great Americans.

"The people of this Nation have lost their most distinguished and devoted public servant. No other man has done more for his country.

"We shall, indeed, miss Mr. SAM."

Byron Skelton, Texas Democratic national committeeman: "SAM RAYBURN was one of America's great men of all without a peer. He walked and talked with the mighty but never forgot the little man or those needing help or protection. * * * His passing is mourned by every responsible American. The hearts of Texans are filled with sadness and personal tragedy, because in losing SAM RABURN they have truly lost a part of Texas."

Attorney General Will Wilson said:

"I am greatly saddened by news of the death of House Speaker SAM RAYBURN. His passing is a profound loss to Americans everywhere. The legacy he leaves behind is one of great devotion to the Nation he served, to the principles upon which it was founded and to the cause of peace. History will make a place for Mr. SAM among the great statesmen of our time."

Texas Supreme Court Justice Robert W. Calvert, whose first contact with Mr. SAM was in Washington, had this to say:

"All of those who appreciate the true art of government under the American system will mourn the death of SAM RAYBURN. As Texas as the soil of Fannin County, he was unyielding in placing the welfare of his country above all local clamor. More than anything else, when he set a course, he was firm. And he didn't let a few people hollering at him deter him from that course. He will be missed."

Texas Commissioner of Agriculture John C. White said:

"This is a deep personal loss to me and my family, a loss that we could never really be prepared to accept. My one thought and hope is that the Rayburn Library might now have as many friends as Mr. RAYBURN had and helped and guided during his lifetime. I know that is what he would wish for."

Read Granberry, a page boy in the Texas House of Representatives when RAYBURN was speaker of the Texas House and who is now executive director of the Legislative Council, said:

"He didn't have much of a smile but he had an interesting personality. Everybody liked him and had great respect for him."

U.S. District Judge R. Ewing Thomason, El Paso, who served in Congress with RAYBURN from 1930 to 1947 and who was reared in Gainesville, only a short distance from the home of his close friend, termed Mr. SAM "one of the greatest public officials of this generation."

"He was a great American. He had a long and distinguished record in public service. He was a man of high principle or he couldn't have represented the Blackland territory in east Texas for so many years. He will have his place in history."

Former Lieutenant Governor and now Railroad Commissioner Ben Ramsey paid tribute in this statement:

"Texas is fortunate to have had the counsel, guidance, and political judgment of SAM RAYBURN for 50 years. His passing is sad but the heritage he left is permanent."

R. B. (Bonna) Ridgeway, a roommate of RAYBURN's when both were members of the 31st Texas legislative session, said no one questioned Mr. SAM even in those days.

"He was nearer being 100-percent honest than anyone I ever knew. His three most outstanding attributes were honesty, loyalty to his friends, and loyalty to the Democratic Party. SAM RAYBURN's purpose in service was to do what was best for the people," said the former Texas lawmaker.

Speaker of the Texas House of Representatives James Turman, who represents RAYBURN's home county, said:

"Texas, the Nation and the entire free world today suffered a profound loss. Mr. RAYBURN's contributions to human dignity will live as long as the ideals of democracy.

"Mr. SAM was a beloved friend of the Turman family in Fannin County. As such, I shall never forget the encouragement and personal help he gave me in my political endeavors. More than this, his noble examples of statesmanship, justice, and concern for humanity will remain an inspiration to young men everywhere."

Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations: "The Democratic Party has lost one of the most colorful figures of this century and the Nation one of its most useful servants" with the death of Speaker RAYBURN.

"I have lost a beloved friend and ally in many battles," he added.

Representative OMAR BURLESON, Democrat, of Texas, serving as a U.S. delegate to the United Nations, said:

"Speaker RAYBURN was a man who possessed tremendous power and influence. His power and influence did not entirely emanate from the high position he held as Speaker of the House of Representatives as powerful as that position is, but from a personal leadership based on strength of character and a personal integrity."

Representative BRUCE ALGER, of Dallas, the only Republican member of the Texas delegation in the House, said:

"I join with the rest of the Nation in expressing sorrow at the passing of SAM RAYBURN. His long and eventful tenure in the House of Representatives is certain to leave its mark on the history of our country. My deepest sympathy goes to his sisters and other members of his family."

Representative OLIN TEAGUE, of College Station, who was in Hillsboro for a speech Thursday night, planned to stay in Texas and attend the RAYBURN funeral. He said:

"I think that America and the world have lost one of the greatest humans that ever lived. He was one of the most honest, honorable, and patriotic men I ever expect to know."

Congressman JIM WRIGHT, of Fort Worth, labeled Speaker RAYBURN the greatest man of this century and said his death "leaves a void which no other person can adequately fill."

WRIGHT, a Democrat and longtime friend of the House Speaker, said, "The United States and indeed the entire free world will miss him sorely."

Representative WALTER ROGERS, of Pampa, said:

"The United States and Texas have lost one of their great children. A man who never lost the common touch, and whose monument will live forever in his deeds and accomplishments for his fellow man. The entire world can be in sorrow at this moment, and I am sure that all who knew SAM RAYBURN will be."

Former House Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN JR., Republican, of Massachusetts, longtime Republican counterpart of Speaker SAM RAYBURN, said when advised of RAYBURN's death:

"Few men have had a greater influence in recent years on our national life than Speaker SAM RAYBURN. He was an outstanding legislator, Speaker longer than any other man in history, and a tower of strength for sound representative government.

"A man of great ability, high integrity and intensely patriotic, his death at this crucial period is a calamity. His uncanny ability to keep the Democrats in Congress working in unison will be sorely missed. His death comes as a blow to President Kennedy and the country in these critical months ahead. Personally, I mourn the loss of an intimate friend and associate of many years."

House Minority Leader CHARLES A. HALLECK, Republican, of Indiana, a Member of Congress since 1935, House majority leader in the 80th and 83d Congresses and minority leader in this Congress and the last one, said:

"I have always counted Speaker SAM RAYBURN as one of my closest friends in the Congress of the United States—as I have been his friend. Ours was a close personal relationship that far transcended party considerations. SAM RAYBURN was one of the great men of our time. He was a patriot of outstanding accomplishment. In these critical times his passing is a great loss to the Congress and the country. His was always a steadying hand in matters of great consequence to the Nation."

National Democratic Chairman John Bailey, who accompanied President Kennedy to the west coast said:

"The career of SAM RAYBURN is more eloquent than words can be in explaining why Democrats are heartsick with grief over the passing of the man all of us affectionately regarded as 'Mr. Democrat.' The career—longest service in the House, longest service as Speaker, three times the chairman of national conventions—demonstrates that SAM RAYBURN was recognized as a man of unusual abilities, integrity, and human understanding."

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, Senate majority leader, who was accompanying President Kennedy on his trip to the West, said of RAYBURN's death:

"I feel that I have lost both a father and brother, but I know the Nation's loss is greater still. He is the last of the old frontiersmen and his place will be difficult to fill."

Representative BOB WILSON, of California, chairman of the Republican congressional committee, said:

"SAM RAYBURN's service will always be a bright page in America's history."

Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, Senate minority leader, attending the funeral of a close personal friend in Peoria, Ill., issued this statement through his Washington office:

"Speaker SAM RAYBURN was one of the great statesmen of our generation. He was a man of consummate courage. I remember him even as chairman of House Commerce Committee when he handled legislation which had a durable impact on the economy of the entire country. As a Speaker, he was impeccably fair and his respect for the rights of the minority party was a household word."

[From the Houston Post, Nov. 17, 1961]

MR. SAM WOULD HAVE LIKED THIS YELLOW-ROSE TRIBUTE

WASHINGTON.—Joe Bartlett's yellow rose was the kind of a tribute Speaker SAM RAYBURN would have appreciated.

Bartlett, a reading clerk in the House of Representatives, was on his way to work Thursday when he heard of the Speaker's death.

Thinking back over his 20 years in Washington, Bartlett remembered such things as his first day as a page in the House when he was just 14. He remembered how, on that first day, he had broken a glass and spilled water all over RAYBURN. And he recalled the Speaker's graciousness in handling the situation.

There were other memories too—such as his chatting with RAYBURN and having his picture made with him just before the Speaker left Washington for the last time in August.

In all the time he knew the Speaker, Bartlett said, "there was never an unkind word."

"And I gave Mr. RAYBURN plenty of excuses too," he added.

So Bartlett stopped at a florist's shop on his way to work Thursday and bought a yellow rose—like the song, "The Yellow Rose of Texas." The florist gave him a black ribbon and he tied it around the stem.

In the House Chamber, Bartlett quietly laid the single flower on the Speaker's desk.

[From the Texas Co-op Power, statewide edition, December 1961]

MR. SAM

Mr. SAM is gone.

SAM RAYBURN, Member and Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives longer than any other man in history, slipped away quietly in the early morning of November 16.

But he will long be remembered.

He will be remembered by all as both the shrewdest of politicians and as a great statesman.

He will be remembered by all Texans as one of the greatest men the State has produced.

And the rural electric co-op folks will remember him especially as coauthor of the original Rural Electrification Act and as a stanch friend through all the years since 1936.

His contributions to rural electrification were recognized when he was honored in 1959 by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. A picture of him now hangs in the NRECA building alongside one of Senator George Norris, the other coauthor and leader in getting the rural electrification bill passed.

He was known to millions as "Mr. SAM," "Mr. Speaker," and even "Mr. Democrat."

In the process of earning those titles he had packed a tremendous amount of work into his 79 years of life.

Mr. RAYBURN was the 8th in a family of 11. He was born on a farm in Tennessee, and his family moved to Texas when he was 5. They settled on a 40-acre farm near Bonham.

Young RAYBURN attended a one-room country school at Flag Springs and worked on the farm until he was 18. Then his father gave him $25 and he went to East Texas Normal at Commerce. He worked his way through by sweeping floors for $3 a month, and he completed the 3-year course in 2 years.

After 2 years as a country schoolteacher, young SAM was elected to the Texas House of Representatives. He served three 2-year terms, the last as speaker of the house. He was the youngest speaker of the house in Texas history.

Mr. RAYBURN won a seat in the 63d Congress in 1912 and has been reelected every 2 years since then.

He was first named Speaker of the House in 1940. With the exception of the 80th Congress (1947–49) and the 83d Congress (1953–55), he has held that office ever since.

Mr. SAM served with eight Presidents: Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy.

And in the latter years of his career his colleagues agreed that he wielded power second only to that of the President.

President Kennedy himself led the Nation in paying tribute to Mr. SAM. He issued a statement that the Nation "has lost a devoted servant and the citizens of this country an unflinching friend."

The three living ex-Presidents, Truman, Eisenhower, and Hoover all joined in the tribute, along with other political leaders from both parties.

And the rural electric lines stand as another permanent tribute to his service to mankind.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to associate myself with the Senator's remarks, and I am sure that at an appropriate time other Senators will wish to make statements and submit eulogies concerning the life and the works of this great patriot.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the President of the United States has just delivered a great state of the Union message. He has again demonstrated conclusively to the people of the United States the quality of his leadership—great leadership. He has pointed convincingly to the fulfillment to date of the promise his administration held out when it took office a year ago. He has issued a memorable clarion call to the forces of freedom at home and abroad.

The Nation may well be both proud of President John F. Kennedy, and reliant upon his wise and courageous guidance. I am confident that he will prove to be one of our country's greatest Presidents.

WORLD'S DISTANCE RECORD ESTABLISHED BY B-52H PLANE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, a Boeing B-52H heavy bomber took off from Kedena Airbase in Okinawa at 9 a.m. yesterday morning. It passed over Washington, D.C., this morning at 1 a.m., and landed in Madrid this morning at 7:52 eastern standard time.

This spectacular flight of over 12,000 miles established a new record, breaking 11 existing records. The B-52H has broken the world's distance record for all types of aircraft without refueling.

On October 1, 1946, the Navy set the world's distance record in a flight from Perth, Australia, to Columbus, Ohio, a distance of 11,[illegible]5.6 miles, in a little over 55 hours. The B-52H has just flown over 12,000 miles, at an average speed of 575 miles an hour, in 21 hours and 52 minutes.

This new record clearly affirms the long-range performance of the Boeing B-52 aircraft in combat configuration. Our Nation can well be proud of this achievement.

Every Kansan has just cause for pride in the engineering, assembing, and piloting of this great aircraft.

Boeing B-52H heavy bombers are produced in the Boeing Aircraft plant at Wichita, Kans. Congratulations are due the officers and personnel of the Boeing Aircraft Corp.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR JOHN D. HOBLITZELL, JR., OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is with genuine sorrow that I affirm to the Senate, the death of former Senator John D. Hoblitzell, Jr., on Saturday, January 6, 1962, at Clarksburg, W. Va.

Senator Hoblitzell was my immediate distinguished predecessor in the Senate and also a cherished, personal friend. His sudden passing, attributed to a heart attack, has grieved not only his family, but a host of friends and associates, including his former colleagues in this forum.

Mrs. Randolph and our two sons have joined with me in expressing our sympathy to his widow, Mrs. Charlotte Reed Hoblitzell, and the three children—Patricia, 17, Julia, 16, and John Reed, 12.

Senator Hoblitzell was appointed as a Republican to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the late Senator Matthew M. Neely, and served from January 25, 1958, to November 4, 1958. During his Senate service he was a member of the District of Columbia Committee, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and the Joint Economic Committee. He was also appointed as an official U.S. delegate to the 1958 Conference of the Interparliamentary Union, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

I shall state some facts of his life and of his public service and my personal observations concerning his eventful career.

"Jack" Hoblitzell, as he was popularly known, was born at Parkersburg, W. Va., December 30, 1912, the son of John D., Sr., and Juliette Smith Hoblitzell. He was educated in the public schools at Parkersburg, and was graduated from West Virginia University in 1934 with a bachelor of arts degree in political science. He was president of his graduating class.

Always interested in the university, he was appointed to its board of governors in 1937 and served two terms.

During World War II he served 46 months in the U.S. Navy and was retired as Lieutenant Senior Grade.

Following the war, he was elected to the Wood County School Board, and in 1954 was elected president of the West Virginia School Board Association.

He gave generously of his time and talent to civic and fraternal groups and contributed to public service by participating in the activities of many organizations. Some of them were:

Director, West Virginia Chamber of Commerce; executive committee, Little Kanawha Regional Council; appointed to West Virginia University Board of Governors, 1937, served two terms; president, Parkersburg Junior Chamber of Commerce, 1939; director, U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, 1941–42; chairman, Vienna, W. Va., Fire Commission; chairman, Wood County Red Cross, 1948; member, Wood County School Board, 1950–56; member, West Virginia Council for Economic Education; delegate, White House Conference on Education, 1954; president, Parkersburg Chamber of Commerce, 1953; chairman, Governor's West Virginia Commission on State and Local Finance, 1954; vice chairman and trustee, National Citizens Council for Better Schools, 1955; president, West Virginia School Board Association, 1954; member, Citizens Committee To Investigate West Virginia Penal and Parole System, 1954; Citizens Committee on Higher Education, 1955; president, West Virginia Citizens Council for Better Schools; member, American Academy of Political and Social Science; member, reviewing committee, College of Commerce, West Virginia University; past president, Board of Realtors, Parkersburg, W. Va.

His personal awards included:

Outstanding Young Man of Year, Parkersburg, 1947; West Virginia Man of Year, 1956; certificate, activity, and service in behalf of Crusade for Freedom, June 1958; certificate of service in recognition of outstanding service to American education, National Citizens Council for Better Schools, June 1958; citizens award, in behalf of good government, Parkersburg, 1956.

Following his service in the Senate, he resumed his post as executive vice president of the Jackson County Bank in Ravenswood, W. Va., and later moved to Bluefield, W. Va., to become executive vice president of the First National Bank. At the time of his death, he was vice president of Alexander & Alexander, an insurance and investment firm at Clarksburg, W. Va.

Senator Hoblitzell was a member of the Parkersburg Trinity Episcopal Church, where funeral services were conducted by the rector, Rev. Griffin C. Callahan, and Rev. William C. Bowie, of Clarksburg. Burial was in Mount Olivet Cemetery.

Gov. W. W. Barron, of West Virginia, described Senator Hoblitzell as "an outstanding West Virginian who made great contributions to the good of his State and America. He also will be missed as a personal friend. I was very fond of him."

Former Gov. Cecil H. Underwood, in whose campaign Hoblitzell performed a key role in 1956, said:

> His strong voice and zealous leadership will be greatly missed in West Virginia. I am shocked to see such a young man leave our scene.

Representative Ken Hechler commented:

> Hoblitzell was one of the most dedicated and public-spirited men I have ever known.

Representative Arch A. Moore, Jr., said:

> West Virginia has lost one of its truly good men.

Significant tribute was expressed by a member of his former Senate staff, Mrs. Margaret Gallagher, who is now in the employment of Senator Fong, of Hawaii:

> The Senator was one of the most considerate and thoughtful persons that I have ever met. It was a real pleasure and privilege to be associated with him. His concern for the citizens of West Virginia was very great and sincere.

The Charleston (W. Va.) Daily Mail, in a meaningful editorial, set forth the value of his splendid service, as follows:

He Left West Virginia in His Debt

> Jack Hoblitzell did not have to go into politics. His background, his interests, and his abilities prepared him admirably for a successful life well above the partisan exchange. And having decided upon politics Jack Hoblitzell did not have to cast his lot with the Republican Party, which in West Virginia at least is scarcely the way to fame and fortune.
>
> But Mr. Hoblitzell was not interested in the easy or the opportune way. He believed devotedly that West Virginia needed a Republican Party if the two-party system was to function properly, and he gave himself fully and unselfishly to making it the best party he could. To this task he brought a clear and ranging mind, a wholesome and refreshing interest in public affairs and a conviction that, win or lose, it is the business of politics to make sense by the standard of better government.
>
> His untimely death is a loss to his party and a misfortune for his State. Both have profited by his disinterested service, and both would be farther along the road if there were more men like Jack Hoblitzell to put their public responsibilities above their private concerns.

I have a letter which Senator Hoblitzell wrote to me on January 4, 2 days before his untimely passing, in which he indicated he was the spokesman for a group of West Virginians who were formulating a program whereby we would appropriately celebrate the centennial of West Virginia in the year of 1963.

Mr. President, Jack Hoblitzell was a man of courage and of conviction—yet withal a sense of compassion.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to my esteemed colleague.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I was saddened to learn that on Saturday, January 6, a former Member of this body, and a fine citizen of the State of West Virginia, the Honorable John D. Hoblitzell, Jr., fell victim to a heart attack. A prominent political and civic leader, he was appointed by former Gov. Cecil H. Underwood to the U.S. Senate in January 1958 after the death of veteran Senator Matthew M. Neely. I liked "Jack" and I shall remember him as a pleasant and cheerful friend.

I join with my colleague in expressing sorrow at his passing, and I extend my sympathy to his family and loved ones.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I was shocked to learn of the untimely death of the man whom we affectionately knew in the Senate as "Jack" Hoblitzell. He was here only a short period of time—10 months, I believe—but those of us who had the opportunity to know him learned to love him, and appreciated his outstanding service to his State and his Nation.

He was a conscientious, hard-working, and able Senator from the great State of West Virginia.

It was my privilege to become closely associated with him on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I know of the personal interest he had in the welfare of our Federal employees during that service, and of the interest he had in all humankind.

I wish to extend my sympathy to Mrs. Hoblitzell and to the other members of the family of the late Senator Hoblitzell.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in connection with the remarks of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], he told of their work together on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I recall, as do other Members of the Senate, the articulate, active, and successful effort of my predecessor in reference to the barring from the U.S. mails of obscene literature.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It was with profound sorrow that I heard the Senator from West Virginia announce to the Senate the death of the former Senator from West Virginia, Mr. Hoblitzell. It was the privilege of Mrs. Case and myself to become acquainted with both Mr. and Mrs. Hoblitzell during the time of his service in the Senate. We found them to be delightful people personally. Mr. Hoblitzell was exceedingly well informed on fiscal matters and economic affairs affecting the welfare of the Nation. He was a devoted public servant.

To Mrs. Hoblitzell and other members of the family Mrs. Case and I extend our sincerest and deepest sympathy.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the words from two Members of this body who served with the late Senator Hoblitzell are most appreciated.

WEST VIRGINIA'S RISE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, when the Wall Street Journal, a reliable chronicler of our economic life, reports that President Kennedy has been fulfilling his campaign pledge to assist the State of West Virginia in achieving freedom from economic distress, it is time for all Americans to take note that John F. Kennedy is a man of his word.

Candidate Kennedy made no idle promise to the people of my State. Today, as President, he is conscientiously working for an economic renaissance of West Virginia, encouraging defense industries to locate there, and memorializing all Government agencies to think of the State when formulating their various programs.

The slow comeback of the economy of West Virginia, under the strong hand of President Kennedy, is described in an article by Mr. Paul Duke, in the December 28, 1961, edition of the Wall Street Journal. Because I believe this article should be universally read, so that all Americans can appreciate the integrity of our President's campaign pledges, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

West Virginia's Rise—Increased Federal Aid, National Recovery Help Lift State's Economy—Administration Funnels More Defense Work Into Area; Local Drive Lures Industry—Fulfilling a Campaign Pledge

(By Paul Duke)

Charleston, W. Va.—With an assist from Old Friend John F. Kennedy, this most depressed State in the Union is slowly beginning to emerge from its long dark siege of economic distress.

The chronic slump which has afflicted West Virginia since 1958 is easing under the impact of Federal, State, and self-help measures. Unemployment, in many respects worse here than in any other State in the land, is down to around 10 percent of the working force from over 11 percent a year ago and from a high of 15 percent early this year. Stepped-up business expansion has resulted in 5,000 new jobs since July 1; even the downtrodden coal industry is enjoying a mild pickup in employment.

"The sun is rising again over West Virginia," exults one top State official, expressing a widespread revival of confidence.

There's a general recognition, of course, that part of the State's upturn is traceable to a national recovery from recession—a recovery that was bound to affect even the most depressed areas. Steel mills, for example, are demanding more West Virginia coal to stoke fired-up furnaces.

But Uncle Sam's role in the budding renaissance also is large. Federal funds are flowing into the State in record volume; by some estimates an additional $350 million has been allocated under various assistance programs since the Kennedy administration assumed power in January 1960. The Democratic regime in Washington is striving to funnel Government contracts to West Virginia industry and it's helping to lure in new plants as well.

A PENTAGON PROD

Thus, the Pentagon is encouraging defense contractors to consider locating in West Virginia. Implicit is the suggestion they may benefit through increased orders. One result: Lockheed Aircraft Corp., after being prodded by Air Force Secretary Zuckert, decided to open a plant at Clarksburg that will employ 250 to make parts for the C–130 transport plane.

While it's eminently logical that this special trouble spot should qualify for special Federal help, political as well as economic motives underlie Washington's efforts. President Kennedy obviously is following through on his campaign pledge to help West Virginia get back on its feet. Understandably, he has a warm spot in his heart for this State of 1.8 million. For it was, after all, his surprise triumph over Minnesota's Senator Hubert Humphrey in the May 1960 Democratic primary here that put Mr. Kennedy on the road to the Democratic nomination and the Presidency.

State officials report Washington doors are always open to them. "All we have to do is call and they come running to help," declares a State relief aid, finding that Federal agencies are bending over backward to assist the State Democratic administration of Gov. Wallace W. Barron. Governor Barron, who took office last January himself, asserts: "I don't know of any way the new administration could be more helpful."

Indeed, the President is keeping tabs on much of the rehabilitation effort and has a personal watchdog on the scene in State Democratic Chairman Robert McDonough, a prime backer in last year's primary. Several times Mr. Kennedy has met with State leaders to discuss State economic problems. Once, during a visit of local citizens interested in converting an unused Government ordnance plant at Morgantown to an industrial operation, the President picked up the telephone and requested the Government's General Services Administration to give speedier consideration to the matter.

SOME REPUBLICANS BELITTLE AID

West Virginia's praise for the President's help is not unanimous, to be sure. Some Republicans maintain that the Federal largess is a mere drop in the economic bucket, that the State remains a long way from real recovery. "Kennedy has not by any means fulfilled his campaign promise to lift West Virginia out of the doldrums," contends former GOP Mayor David Francis, of Huntington.

At best, the present rate of improvement in this State may not be maintained indefinitely; at worst, a steel strike next summer could drastically reduce purchases of coal. "A steel strike would knock us flat on our faces again," reasons a Republican leader. "If coal doesn't move, West Virginia doesn't move."

Certainly the recovery period will be prolonged and painful. No overnight booms are in prospect. Unemployment is expected to continue high in the southern tier of coal-producing counties for a long time; nearly one of every four workers still is without a job in Boone and Logan Counties.

While the State is beginning to attract more industry, it desperately needs a few major concerns that would employ thousands and not just hundreds. But rough terrain and inadequate water supplies hinder prospects in many localities. In others, the flight of young people out of the State has reduced the bulk of the remaining labor force to unskilled older men little sought by modern industry.

"We're not so sick as we were, but we still have lots of bedsores," sums up a veteran Charleston newspaperman.

PUSHING ON SEVERAL FRONTS

Whatever the final outcome, the evidence so far suggests Mr. Kennedy is trying hard on several fronts to keep his pledge of help. His first Executive order last winter had the effect of doubling the amount of free Federal surplus food distributed to the State's needy; lesser increases went to other States. This was soon followed by establishment in hard-hit McDowell County of the administration's first pilot project for helping the poor buy their staples directly from groceries with Federal food stamps. More than 250,000 West Virginians are now getting free surplus food, and some 17,000 are getting food stamps.

Under relief measures proposed by the administration and approved by Congress, West Virginia is receiving an extra $30 million this year in extended unemployment benefits and aid to dependent children of jobless parents. Money from the new $394 million program to help depressed areas rebuild their economies is beginning to roll in, with the go-ahead already given for construction of a furniture factory in Mingo County and for job retraining projects in Mingo, Grant, Cabell, and Wayne Counties. Just last week Federal approval was given to a general redevelopment plan drawn up by Jackson County.

By far the biggest bonanza is an "extra" 150-mile interstate highway, 90 percent federally financed, that will cut through rugged mountain country to link the northern area with the somewhat isolated interior. Not only will Route 79 mean an estimated $225 million in Federal road funds, but it also will provide a badly needed artery for trucking West Virginia products to northern commercial centers. The interior finally will have easy and direct access to the major markets of Pittsburgh and the Lake Erie industrial complex. Within the State, the bonus highway project has been joyously received. "We couldn't build it by ourselves in a thousand years," remarks one State official.

But the award of this plum has also produced a loud cry of payoff from Ohio's Representative Scherer, ranking Republican on the House Roads Subcommittee on ,Roads. He and other out-of-State critics have strenuously objected to the allocation method; the Bureau of Public Roads simply dipped into a 343-mile reserve set aside for all 50 States and gave West Virginia nearly half the total. Bureau officials take the view that no injustice is being done the other States; they reason that Congress seems certain to increase the reserve later.

In some cases, the Kennedy regime is finding justification for rendering help that the Eisenhower administration could not, would not, or did not furnish. State Republican leaders tried unsuccessfully to win approval for the new highway in recent years but couldn't budge the Bureau of Public Roads. Somewhat similarly, a bogged-down move to convert an inactivated naval gun factory in South Charleston into a private chemical plant has been given the green light by the new administration.

The Kennedy camp's endeavor to channel more defense contracts into West Virginia, whose share of the national pie is extremely small, faces a big problem; West Virginia industries for the most part are not equipped to handle major defense orders for such things as airplane frames and missiles. But under Defense Department pressure a number of prime contractors are surveying West Virginia firms with an eye toward giving them more subcontract production of component parts for military equipment.

NEW SHIPYARD CONTRACT

As it is, the State is benefiting more than ever. On December 13, for example, the Marietta Manufacturing Co. received a $5.4 million award to build two Navy oceanographic vessels at its Ohio River shipyard at Point Pleasant, W. Va. The contract will mean an additional 600 jobs.

Some West Virginians feel, however, that State and community efforts are helping every bit as much, if not more, than the Washington assistance. The State is currently teaching new skills to 2,000 of its 63,300 unemployed in training units set up in 32 of the 55 counties. Of 100 recent graduates of a training school at Welch, 69 quickly found jobs in their new pursuits of auto and appliance repair and machine work.

Moreover, the new State commerce department, created by the legislature last winter, is making headway in its attempt to snare new industry. New enterprises coming in include a North American Aviation plant at Princeton for making B–70 bomber parts and a Corning Glass Works ovenware plant at Martinsburg. Other newcomers will manufacture electronics equipment, aluminum products and textiles. Since September 1, 30 outside industries have dispatched representatives into the State to investigate site possibilities.

In addition, expansion is underway at Du Pont's chemical plant at Belle, FMC Corp.'s chemical works at South Charleston, Goodrich-Gulf Chemicals' synthetic rubber plant at Institute and International Nickel Co.'s tubing factory at Huntington.

Governor Barron is pushing hard, too, to develop a flourishing tourist trade. The State already is preparing an ambitious program to lure outsiders to its 100th birthday in 1963. Another project in the works: an $800,000 State-sponsored building at the 1964 New York World's Fair to promote West Virginia's attractions.

RECOVERY AND TAXES

Such recovery efforts are not without their cost to West Virginians, of course. A new State income tax was imposed this year and the State sales tax has been boosted to 3 percent from 2 percent bringing a deluge of complaints from merchants along the Virginia border who report losing business to that no-sales-tax State. Total State tax collections are expected to climb to $280 million in the fiscal year ending next June, from $243 million in the previous year.

The new mood of hope has spread in various ways. There is even talk about a renaissance in the coal industry through establishment of pipelines into major eastern markets. Governor Barron plans to ask the legislature at its new session in January to authorize land acquisition for the project. The pipelines would permit transport of a coal-water mixture called slurry at rates making coal more competitive with gas and oil. If successful, it's claimed, the move could mean eventual reopening of hundreds of mines.

Even so, West Virginia is rapidly moving away from its old reliance on coal as its economic backbone. Manufacturing now enjoys a greater role nearly everywhere. Beckley, which almost became a ghost town when coal hit the skids, has staged a major comeback by regearing to factory production of plastics, textiles and electrical goods; the Beckley Manufacturing Co., largest in the area, employs 500 making electronics parts. Business leaders predict the Ohio Valley area, now the one oasis of prosperity with its gleaming chemical plants, will be in the van of any new nationwide boom.

Inevitably, the new Federal aid programs have been accompanied by snags and complaints. There is local criticism about redtape in qualifying for industrial development loans under the Depressed Areas Act. While 44 counties are eligible for assistance, money cannot be obtained unless a locality draws up a full-scale economic development plan. After this is approved, it then must submit additional plans to support individual project requests.

Some labor leaders grumble that not enough is being done to clear up severe pockets of unemployment. "We could stand a lot more help," says a top official of the State labor federation. The continued high flow of residual oil and glass imports, with consequent damage to markets for locally produced coal and glass products, still rankles.

But even critics concede the administration is making West Virginia justify its requests and is showing remarkable, nonpartisanship in parceling out assistance.

The administration refused to okay a $10 million contract to Wheeling's community-sponsored West Virginia Ordnance Co. for production of M-14 Army rifles even though local and State leaders made a strong pitch for the work. Pentagon officials said they felt Thompson Ramo Wooldridge, Inc., Cleveland, which got the contract, was better qualified. The controversial interstate highway required major changes in routing and had to be submitted three times before gaining final clearance from the Bureau of Public Roads.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SALES TAX ACT—CHANGE OF CONFEREES

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, during the closing days of the last session, there was before the conferees from the House and the Senate H.R. 258, which was the District of Columbia sales tax bill. It was a very important and much needed piece of legislation. During the closing days of the session the conferees were unable to come to an agreement as to the terms of the bill.

At this time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate still further insist upon its amendments to the said bill, and agree to the conference asked by the House, and that new conferees be appointed. I may say that the conferees I am asking to be designated are the regular members of the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia. They had the hearings. They heard all the testimony in this rather involved, complicated and complex revenue situation which exists in the District of Columbia.

I am hopeful that, as soon as the Senate conferees are appointed, the House will appoint new conferees and that they will meet very quickly and get to some agreement on the bill, which relates to the District of Columbia tax problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. BEALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

A BLUEPRINT TO SAVE LATIN AMERICA FROM CASTRO

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an article entitled "We Can Save Latin America From Castro," written by Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín, Governor of Puerto Rico, which appeared in the December 17 issue of This Week magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE CAN SAVE LATIN AMERICA FROM CASTRO

(By Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín)

SAN JUAN, P.R.—Every freedom-loving person in the United States is worried today about how to halt the spread of Cuban-type revolution through Latin America.

Let me make this clear. It's not the fact that there was a revolution in Cuba that has thoughtful people concerned. That revolution was long overdue. Rather it's the way that Fidel Castro has needlessly laid the Cuban revolution at the feet of Soviet totalitarianism. I, for one, was in favor of revolution in Cuba, including social revolution, and I am convinced that even Castro himself could have carried it out in terms of freedom and friendship with the United States and the Western World. It is a tragic and quite unnecessary loss that it did not take that course.

Meanwhile, it is obvious that agents of Havana as well as Moscow are working together for subversive purposes in every other Latin American nation.

How can Latin America cope with this new kind of revolution?

Not with guns and tanks, let me emphasize. It can only be done by wiping out the evils that prevail in varying degrees in all Latin American countries. Just think:

The per capita income in Peru is $119 a year. And $126 in Bolivia. That is less than the average man in the United States earns in 2 weeks.

In Ecuador one-fifth of 1 percent of the people hold over one-third of the land.

Seventy percent of the population of Bolivia is illiterate. And 90 percent in Haiti.

Life expectancy in Guatemala is only 43.8 years. Compare that with the 69 years of the United States.

To sick, hungry people living under conditions of grave injustice, Communist and Fidelista promises of a better life can be tempting. The price is their liberty, of course, but many have never experienced liberty in their own lives.

Fortunately, a determined move is at last underway to improve conditions, to set in movement the peaceful revolution that is the only alternative to a violent one. The "Alliance for Progress" that was signed at Punta del Este, Uruguay, last summer commits the United States and Latin America to an intensive effort toward that goal. It combines the work and ideas of Latin America with United States financial support and technical cooperation.

The main job will have to be done by the Latin American nations themselves. On the basis of our experience in Puerto Rico, I am convinced that they can do it—and in a democratic way with respect for personal freedom. Not many years ago, Puerto Rico could have been a fertile field for subversive activities. Many of our people were hungry. Most were extremely poor. Disease, ignorance and hopelessness were everywhere. "The Poorhouse of the Caribbean," we were called.

Not any more, however. By fresh thinking and hard work, we have raised our standard of living until it is the second highest in all Latin America. We have a fine flourishing democracy and the 2,300,000 citizens of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico are solidly behind it.

The last Communist who tried for public office here received precisely 235 votes out of half a million.

To one degree or another, the problems we faced are the same that affect Latin America today. As a result, a number of Latin Americans have come to Puerto Rico to learn which of our experiences could be of help to them. There are many, I think—always remembering that adaptations must be made to meet differing situations.

Operation Bootstrap is the name we have given to the economic part of our effort toward a good life. Throughout, careful planning and a set of thorough priorities have been our rule. I heartily urge both. Poor nations, like poor people, cannot afford to be careless. Every dollar or peso must swing its whole weight.

Here are the points that worked well for us:

1. LAND REFORM

The most important thing of all is to give hope to people, especially to hungry farmers who have been forced to till other men's soil for a few cents a day.

We broke up land-holdings over 500 acres and paid the owners a fair market price in cash. With the land, we set up a special kind of farm cooperatives in which the workers not only drew regular wages but shared in the profits. In addition, we distributed land directly to people for farms of a size suitable for working by a family.

We could not give land to all the landless at once, but tangible results could be seen. So there was hope.

I remember what a man 60 years old who had never owned land said when he received his plot.

"You mean the land is really mine now?" he asked incredulously.

"Yes, it is now yours," he was told. "Not even you can take it away from yourself."

Tears were in his eyes. "You cannot know what it means," he said, "after all these years of belonging to the land to have the land belong to me."

2. TAX REFORM

One of the reasons the rich get richer and the poor get poorer is low taxation of those abundantly able to pay, and the evasion even of that. It is the curse of a great part of Latin America today.

Very early, we undertook a complete reorganization of our tax structure to make certain that everyone bore a fair share of the tax load.

It gave us the money to tackle our reforms. I doubt if the nations of Latin America can ever wipe out poverty unless they remedy their tax inequities.

3. WATER AND ELECTRIC POWER

There are cities in Latin America where patients have died on the operating table because there was not enough power to keep the light going.

There are cities where water is in such short supply that it has to be rationed. There are countries where once rich land is so parched for water that it has become desert.

There was a time when much of Puerto Rico's land was parched, too, and we could not build factories for lack of electric current to run them.

It meant straining our resources, but we borrowed every dollar we could for the construction of vast hydroelectric projects. This gave us water to irrigate our land and the electric power we needed so badly to industrialize.

We ran the powerlines into the hills as well as the cities. The bare light bulb in a farmer's hut may not have added to the decor, but as one of our hill people said, "These wires bring light into our hearts."

I was happy to see the U.S. Government offer to assist Latin America in developing its water resources. I hope very much that the various Latin American countries take advantage of this proposal.

4. HOUSING

Unquestionably, the biggest single social problem in Latin America today, the one that contributes most to a sense of misery and despair, is bad housing. There are slums so dreadful as to be unbelievable. The United Nations made a survey in this connection. It found that Latin America urgently needed a minimum of 25 million decent homes.

The problem can be beaten. It must be beaten.

Governments can do their part by clearing slums and building low-cost housing so far as their budgets allow. In Puerto Rico, we have provided low-rent housing for 133,500 people in the past 10 years.

But the governments do not have to do it all. The people will pitch in. Some years ago, we tried a scheme under which the Government supplied concrete, equipment, and a foreman. Then the people built small houses themselves.

The response was inspiring. In rural community after rural community, neighbors worked together nights and weekends to help each other complete their new homes. That way we were able to put up such houses for just $400 apiece. To date, over 12,600 of these self-help houses have been built. People pay them off at $3 a month.

5. INDUSTRIALIZATION

It is the dream of every underdeveloped nation, I suppose, to industrialize—to establish factories that will furnish new jobs at good wages for its hordes of unemployed, and to manufacture the products required to expand its economy. The trouble is that enormous capital is essential, and underdeveloped nations don't have it.

We Puerto Ricans know how desperate this quandary can be. We have lived through it.

Accordingly, we have developed a plan to attract new industry to our towns, cities, and countryside. We have channeled Government funds as well as private capital toward the establishment of new industries. We have given 10 years' tax exemption to companies starting new industries here—and 13 years' exemption if they establish themselves in the countryside or small towns. We have erected factory buildings ourselves for the companies to move into. We have set up courses to train workers in new skills.

More than 700 new plants have now been opened. During the past decade, unemployment has been reduced substantially in spite of a 7-percent rise in population, and real wages have more than doubled. The Puerto Rican gross national product is currently increasing at the rate of 9.4 percent a year.

Some Latin Americans say, "You Puerto Ricans are doing so well because you have free access to U.S. markets."

It is true. But if the Latin American nations would join together to form a common market, removing tariff barriers, they could do even better. They are rich in natural resources, whereas our only real natural resource is people. True, the economic aid provided Puerto Rico by the United States is larger than that which could be given to any other Latin American country of our size. But, again, the vast abundance of unused land, the rich mineral deposits and the unused tax potential in most Latin American countries make up for this.

6. PUBLIC HEALTH

Tuberculosis is an evil companion. So are malaria and dysentery. Latin Americans can testify to that. They have these killers with them 24 hours a day. Millions of their children die of them.

It will demand a tremendous effort to suppress endemic diseases like these, but I have no doubt that it can be done. The establishment of medical clinics, X-ray programs, sanitary drives, and education in hygienic methods can achieve miracles. A better diet would do a great deal by itself toward controlling many diseases that are caused by extreme poverty.

In 1940, Puerto Rico's death rate from tuberculosis was 260 per 100,000. Now, it is down to 29 per 100,000 and still falling. Once malaria was a great scourge. Now, we have not had a malaria death in 6 years. It adds up to this: The death rate in Puerto Rico is now lower than in the United States.

7. EDUCATION

"I cannot read or write, but I will not rest until my children learn how."

This is the feeling all over Latin America. There is a deep, unquenchable thirst for education, and the people will make any sacrifice for it.

It is not a matter of erecting elaborate school buildings. Brick and mortar do not educate children; teachers and books do. Many of our scholastic buildings in Puerto Rico are simple indeed, but the significant fact is that 91 percent of our children go to school.

Education is the largest item in our budget. Almost 30 percent of the Government's revenues are devoted to it.

The charter of the Alliance for Progress calls for at least 6 years of primary schooling for all children. I look forward to the day when it is an actuality.

The charter further calls for a program of adult education, and I subscribe to it. Of all the activities of the Puerto Rican government, few have given me the satisfaction of our community education work.

We dispatch trained men into the most remote rural neighborhoods, not to do things for people, but to teach them to do things for themselves. The residents of one little place near Rio Grande, for example, applied to the Government to build a new road connecting them with a main artery. Under normal circumstances, it would have taken many years for the Government to get the job done. Instead, a Government technician went out and taught the people how they could lay the road themselves.

Every man in the community volunteered to help, and the road was built in a couple of months. The cost was $6,000—one-quarter of what it ordinarily would have been. Best of all, the people feel it is their road. "We have the finest road around here," they are bragging.

It is wonderful for the people and the Government when the people show self-reliance. It is the antithesis of totalitarianism.

Let me reemphasize. Latin Americans are at the crossroads. One road can lead them to Castroism—mobs crying, "To the wall!", and the end of all their liberties. On the other road, they can lift themselves in a peaceful, democratic way to prosperity, health, and hope.

Upon the outcome of their struggle depends the fate of freedom in this hemisphere for all of us.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, every Member of this body, every citizen of the United States is most concerned about the Communist takeover in Cuba. Everyone is anxious to find an answer to the question as to how do we stop this kind of Communist advance in Latin America.

In this lucid article Governor Marin spells out what he feels is the way to stop the Communist menace, to advance the economy of the countries, and to promote free and open societies. The Governor's article is "must" reading to all who are concerned over this vital issue. The Governor, of course, does not speak as a theoretician. He has put his blueprint, which he calls Operation Bootstrap, into practice in Puerto Rico and it has been proving successful. Governor Marin in his blueprint calls for land reform, tax reform, development of water and electric power, industrialization, public health programs and education.

From my recent trip to South America, I returned to the United States convinced that the type of program of social reform which Governor Marin spells out in his article is the answer—the only answer—to the Communist menace in Latin America.

It is this type of program that is envisioned in the Alliance for Progress. I am convinced that this program can succeed and that it will succeed. It deserves, in fact, it demands, our all-out support.

The Communists realize what the Alliance for Progress means. That is why they are fighting it tooth and nail.

I read the concluding paragraphs from the Governor's article:

> Let me reemphasize. Latin Americans are at the crossroads. One road can lead them to Castroism—mobs crying "To the wall," and the end of all their liberties. On the other road, they can lift themselves in a peaceful, democratic way to prosperity, health, and hope.
>
> Upon the outcome of their struggle depends the fate of freedom in this hemisphere for all of us.

AMBASSADOR LOEB — AN OUTSTANDING REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the December 15 issue of the Chicago Daily Tribune telling of the fine work which our ambassador to Peru, Mr. James Loeb, has been doing since his appointment this past spring.

I might say, Mr. President, that on my recent visit to Peru I saw at firsthand the fine work which Ambassador Loeb has been performing for our country. He has made a most excellent impression on the Peruvian people and has rendered yeoman service in helping to create a better understanding on the part of the people of Peru as to what our great country stands for. He is an effective and respected spokesman for the Alliance for Progress.

It has been my privilege to know Mr. Loeb for a number of years. The President could not have found a better or more highly qualified man for this important, sensitive, and difficult position. Mr. Loeb's background knowledge of South America, his democratic idealism and spirit, his vigorous and effective opposition to communism make him an ideal representative of our country in that important area.

Reading this article from the Chicago Daily Tribune, I believe that my colleagues will take pride, as I do, in the work that Mr. Loeb has been doing on our behalf. He is a working diplomat who by his service brings honor to our country and himself.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOEB'S FORTHRIGHT APPROACH IN PERU PAYS DIVIDENDS FOR UNITED STATES

(By Jules Dubois)

LIMA, PERU, December 14.—"I am in a more fortunate position than the career ambassador," James Loeb, 53, born in Chicago, said in an interview. "I can stick my neck out because I have something to go home to whereas the career ambassador is not in such an advantageous position."

Loeb was appointed Ambassador here last April and arrived in May after a briefing at the State Department. He has let it be known that he is the American Ambassador and has done so in writing which he made his profession when, with Roger Tubby, he left the White House after the Truman administration and bought the Adirondack Daily Enterprise of Saranac Lake, N.Y., in 1953, and the weekly Lake Placid News in 1960. Both he and Tubby are back in government now.

Loeb and his wife, the former Ellen Katz, have relatives in Highland Park where he attended high school. His brother, Ted R. Loeb, is in the insurance business. His sister is Mrs. Herbert van Straaten. Mrs. Barton Wolff is a sister of Mrs. Loeb. Ambassador and Mrs. Loeb are the only members of their families who have moved away from Highland Park.

He went east in 1925 to get his bachelor of arts degree at Dartmouth College and then returned to Chicago to take post-graduate studies at Northwestern University.

Loeb majored in languages and got his master of arts degree in 1931, then served on the faculty as a language instructor and emerged with a doctorate in philosophy in 1936.

From Northwestern and Chicago he went to New York City and obtained a post as a French teacher on the faculty of Townsend Harris High School which was affiliated with the City College of New York.

BECAME ADA EXECUTIVE BEFORE JOINING TRUMAN

In 1941 he resigned to become national secretary of the Americans for Democratic Action. Ten years later he was consultant to President Truman's counsel, Charles Murphy, and in 1952 he was executive assistant to Averell Harriman.

Sticking his neck out here in Peru came after Loeb boiled at the silence of the intellectual groups regarding Russia's resumption of atomic testing in the atmosphere and the explosion of a 50 megaton bomb. He wrote a letter to the rector of the engineering university whom he had entertained at the embassy.

"I have not seen a single protest on the part of the intellectual community of this great Nation," his letter read. "No student or educational organization, so far as I know, has written or published any protest or held meetings against these tests. Am I wrong in supposing that had these tests been made by the United States the reaction here would have been different? Am I right in asking whether this silence means a moral double standard?"

Career diplomats were shocked at the letter and the pro-Communist Peruvian left and the Communists themselves were angered. No career diplomat ever would have undertaken such a bold venture.

"I was wrong from a protocol aspect in writing that letter," Loeb admits. "But I waited unsuccessfully for 2 months for some outcry against the Russian tests and none came. There are Peruvians who have a different concept of Voltaire's expression: 'I disagree with what you say but I will defend to the death your right to say it.'

"Here there are people who will frankly say: 'I agree with what you say but I will deny to the death your right to say it.' I decided, anyway, that Saranac Lake is a good place to live in case they threw me out," he said.

But there was no rebuke from the State Department and the advantages of Loeb's noncareer approach far outweighted the disadvantages.

FRIENDLINESS IS KEY TO FOREIGN POLICY

Loeb's summation of our foreign policy toward Peru is a simplified one.

"Peru is a friendly nation and always has been," he points out. "It is our policy to help the country in every possible way. We try to help to solve the basic problems of the country."

That, in itself, is a herculean task. And now he finds himself in the middle of the presidential campaign here that could well decide the future of Peru's traditional friendship with the United States.

He recalls the story told to him by one of his predecessors, former Ambassador Henry R. Norweb, who was here when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor. It was told to him at a dinner given by Secretary of State Dean Rusk for President Manuel Prado in September before Prado's visit to Chicago.

"A few hours after the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor, President Prado, then in his first administration, telephoned Ambassador Norweb and asked if there was anything Peru could do to help the United States," Loeb narrates.

Loeb's association with the Americans for Democratic Action opened the doors of confidence to him among the leaders of the non-Communist left, or the strong mass political party, the APRA. What the APRA will do in the forthcoming campaign will swing the balance of power.

FATE OF COUNTRY IN APRA'S HANDS

Victor Raul Haya de la Torre, the party chief, is returning from Europe January 6 to attend the national convention. His decision in the monolithic structure of the party will decide the fate of the country, for an APRA presidential candidate may fester old sores in the army.

The army has not forgiven the APRA for the massacre of its officers in 1931. The party has been in coexistence with the Prado regime and regained its lawful status under him after being outlawed more than 8 years.

There is a possibility that Haya might decide for a coalition ticket that could be headed by Pedro Beltran, the former prime minister and minister of treasury who straightened out the economy of the country. Or he might elect to nominate one of his party for the presidential role and offer the vice presidency to a prominent member of Prado's party.

Loeb will have to walk the diplomatic tightrope in the next 6 months before the elections. He is aware of it.

Loeb arrived at a time when there is a complete reorganization of our aid program and it was challenging for him to come here in the midst of an election campaign which is not only important for this country but also for the entire hemisphere.

VIOLENCE IN CAMPAIGN IS STRONG POSSIBILITY

He was catapulted into the violence that might erupt and become constant during the campaign. Two days before he arrived ex-President Gen. Manuel Odria was stoned by a mob at Huancayo while campaigning.

The Embassy, Loeb insists, has only one position insofar as Peruvian politics is concerned. It is anti-Communist.

The post of American Ambassador is most important here and is looked upon with great respect in some circles and with obvious hatred among the Communists and fellow travelers.

Loeb's wife and two children have helped him in his efforts to meet the middle class, laboring people, and students.

SIXTEEN YEAR OLD DAUGHTER ATTENDS PERUVIAN SCHOOL

His daughter Susan, 16, goes to a Peruvian high school and finds it very interesting as do her parents.

When Loeb's son Peter, 19, was home from Harvard University for the summer where he is majoring in music, he wandered out to suburban Miraflores and played with a jazz club there for 2 weeks and later gave a jazz concert at the United States-Peruvian Cultural Institute. The concert drew an overflow crowd.

By sticking his neck out, Loeb has learned one thing and the Peruvians another. While the Peruvians have the innate Latin American sensitivity, they learned by Loeb's letter that the people of the United States are sensitive, too.

RETIREMENT OF VERNON L. TALBERTT

Mr. **HUMPHREY.** Mr. President, during the adjournment of the 1st session of the 87th Congress one of the most beloved and respected servants of the U.S. Senate, one of our real officials, retired. I invite the attention of the Senate to the retirement of Vernon L. Talbertt, the chief messenger in the Office of the Secretary of the Senate. Everybody in the Senate knows Vernon. Everybody loved him not only because of his great qualities as a man, but also because of his complete dedication to the Senate as an institution, as a public body, and because of his personal loyalty to and friendshihp for every Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, the Secretary of the Senate, Felton M. Johnston, wrote to us on December 20 and reminded us of the fact that at the end of 1961 Mr. Vernon L. Talbertt would retire. He called to our attention the fact that Vernon Talbertt had served 51 years, 6 months, and 8 days as a truly wonderful official of this body. Mr. Johnston, the Secretary, pointed out that Mr. Talbertt's service had been continuous, with the exception of 1 year, 4 months, and 18 days as an enlisted man in the U.S. Army. All of Vernon's service had been in the Office of the Secretary, and the records disclose that he had served under nine successive secretaries.

The words of Secretary Johnston, affectionately known to all of us as Skeeter, I think are quite appropriate. He said:

> I have never known a more loyal and conscientious employee, and I can attest to his energy and faithfulness. He has always been extremely helpful to the Members, officers, and employees of the Senate.

Mr. President, I am sure that many of us in this body sent letters to Vernon Talbertt, knowing that most likely we would not have an opportunity to see him before his retirement. I had the privilege of sending him such a letter on December 22. I should like to quote from it for the public record, because this man has been very kind to me. I think his acts of kindness were symbolic of his whole life. I said to him:

> I shall cherish your friendship as long as I live. If ever I can be of service to you or your family in any way, I trust that you will call upon me. May the good Lord bless you in the days of your retirement and may you be given the precious gift of continuing good health, vitality, and joyful spirit.

I cannot imagine the Senate of the United States without Vernon, but I suppose he would be the first to say we always make the necessary adjustments. Anyway, we owe him a debt of gratitude and a debt of thanks, and I think a statement of respect and honor. I know I speak for every Member of this body in these words.

DEATH OF LOUIS C. RABAUT, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 488) as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Louis C. Rabaut, a Representative from the State of Michigan.
>
> *Resolved,* That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.
>
> *Resolved,* That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. **HUMPHREY.** Mr. President, I submit, on behalf of the two Senators from Michigan [Mr. McNamara and Mr. Hart], a resolution relative to the death of Louis C. Rabaut of Michigan and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 239) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable Louis C. Rabaut, late a Representative from the State of Michigan.
>
> *Resolved,* That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.
>
> *Resolved,* That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

DEATH OF JOHN J. RILEY, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 489) as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable John J. Riley, a Representative from the State of South Carolina.
>
> *Resolved,* That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.
>
> *Resolved,* That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. **HUMPHREY.** Mr. President, I submit, on behalf of the two Senators from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston and Mr. Thurmond] a resolution relative to the death of Representative John J. Riley of South Carolina, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 240) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable John J. Riley, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina.
>
> *Resolved,* That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.
>
> *Resolved,* That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

DEATH OF SAM RAYBURN, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The legislative clerk will read the resolution (H. Res. 491), as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the House has learned with profound sensibility and sorrow of the death of Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-sixth through the Seventy-ninth, Eighty-first and Eighty-second, and Eighty-fourth through the first session of the Eighty-seventh Congress, having served as Speaker more than twice as long as any Speaker in the history of the Congress.
>
> *Resolved,* That in the death of the Honorable Sam Rayburn the United States has sustained an irreparable loss.
>
> *Resolved,* That this House, of which he was a distinguished Member and leader, unite in honoring his sterling character, the ability, probity, and patriotic motives which illustrated his public career, and the grace and dignity which marked his intercourse with his fellow citizens.
>
> *Resolved,* That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.
>
> *Resolved,* That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. **HUMPHREY.** Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] I submit a resolution relative to the death of Speaker of the House of Representatives Sam Rayburn, of Texas, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 241) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Honorable Sam Rayburn, late Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-sixth through the Seventy-ninth, Eighty-first and Eighty-second, and Eighty-fourth through the first session of the Eighty-seventh Congress.
>
> *Resolved,* That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.
>
> *Resolved,* That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. **HUMPHREY.** Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until noon on Monday next, in accordance with the order previously entered, and as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late distinguished Representative from Michigan, Louis C. Rabaut; the late distinguished Representative from South Carolina, John J. Riley; and the late distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, Sam Rayburn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, adjourned until Monday, January 15, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

U.S. Goals for 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the reconvening of Congress presents us—and the Nation—with complex, broad-scope problems, opportunities, and challenges.

With the beginning of a new year, we traditionally take a backward look and attempt to evaluate our progress. Following such a review, then, we shoot for new goals for the future.

These goals, however, will not be accomplished automatically, magically, or by wishful thinking. We, as a people, rather, must rededicate ourselves to creating—and putting into action—the workable programs that will better serve humanity and promote peace and progress.

Recently, I was privileged to review broad-scope objectives which, if attained, would, in my judgment, help us to better meet the challenges of 1962. I ask unanimous consent to have a summary of these propositions printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS FOR 1962

We, the people—to promote a world of peace and progress—rededicate ourselves to the following objectives:

I. Crystallize—and spread the principles and ideals of freedom around the world. In the past, we as a nation have not engaged in broad-scale efforts to export our political concepts. Why? Because we respected for all nations what we will fight to preserve for ourselves: That is, the right of self-determination. In a world threatened by communism (expansionism and aggression) we must, however, not only improve the U.S. system of freedom, but also expand efforts to establish a global climate in which all nations may enjoy the right of self-determination.

II. Create a more dynamic economic system to—

Enable all citizens to live on still better standards—now the highest in world history;

Assure that our agricultural-industrial-technological system meets the needs of a fast-growing 185 million population and the revolutionary fast-changing times;

Maintain the United States out-front economic position—with a gross national product estimated at a current output rate of $540 billion annually. By comparison this far exceeds in value the combined output, valued at $350 billion, of the Soviet bloc (including Albania, Bulgaria, Communist China, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, North Korea, North Vietnam, Outer Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, and the U.S.S.R.);

Strengthen our faith in the ability of the United States and the free world to continue to outproduce and outprogress (if not outbrag) the Communist world.

III. Be better stewards of our manpower, brainpower, monetary, agricultural, technical, scientific, and other human and natural resources to (a) assure best utilization—not wasteful dissipation—of these God-given and man-created resources, for the American people; and (b) demonstrate a willingness to earmark the necessary human and natural resources and productivity to promote peace and freedom in the world.

IV. Strengthen the free world defenses: A mighty jet-missile-space-nuclear U.S. force serving as the backbone of free world alliances provides a shield (a) against Communist military aggression and (b) holds the Communists at bay while undertaking counteroffensives on nonmilitary fronts to regain lost territory and attain the triumph of freedom—not communism—in the world.

V. To better understand—and more effectively combat—the threat of communism on military, economic, political, cultural, ideological fronts.

VI. Better educate the world on how free economic, social, cultural, political systems of, by, and for the people—not Red dictatorship—can best serve a people; better than totalitarian communism.

VII. Expand economic, political, social, cultural coöperation among nations of the free world alliances for peaceful progress.

VIII. Renew efforts to better understand, and improve, man's relationship to man. Despite thousands of years of existence and experience, mankind is still adolescently groping for a mature fundamental understanding of human relationships that will—if ultimately attained—enable people to work and live peaceably together on earth.

"The Role of the Government in Education"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a national conference on curriculum experimentation was held at the University of Minnesota, Center for Continuation Study, at the end of September. Among the speakers was a former member of the faculty at Davis and Elkins College, and now the senior Senator from West Virginia, JENNINGS RANDOLPH. In a searching and thoughtful address on "The Role of Government in Education," he spoke of the need and function of Federal support for the national educational effort, and of the need for review of educational methods. I ask unanimous consent that the speech given by Senator RANDOLPH be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent to include a letter commenting on Senator RANDOLPH's address, which was written by five Minnesota educators, and was printed in the Sunday Gazette-Mail, of Charleston, W. Va., on November 5, 1961.

If the Senator from West Virginia were not now on the floor, I would read aloud the letter of commendation which has been signed by a number of educators in my State. But I know that because of his modesty he would attempt to qualify the statements; so I merely submit the letter for printing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech and the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN EDUCATION

(An address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, at the National Conference on Curriculum Experimentation Center for Continuation Study, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., September 28, 1961)

It is doubtful that anyone in this room is unfamiliar with the famous declaration of the Ordinance of 1787 in which the Congress of the Confederation stated that:

"Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

Since that time there has been a steadily increasing involvement of the Federal Government in education, a participation which now embraces every major department of the executive branch and every level of education from elementary school to postdoctoral research. Since 1777, when the National Government initiated instruction of military personnel, there have been some 45 major programs enacted in aid to specialized and general education as well as research.

In the 87th Congress alone, 16 different measures involving substantial Federal assistance to educational, scientific and cultural affairs were either acted upon by one of the bodies of Congress or reported by a congressional committee. These ranged in scope from the School Assistance Act of 1961, offering aid to school construction and teachers' salaries, which was passed by the Senate with a vote of 49 to 34, to the very constructive measures introduced in the House by Representative FRANK THOMPSON, which would establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts and a system of State grants for the establishment of development programs in the arts.

There is no question, therefore, that the Federal role in education, and in related scientific and cultural activities, is a massive and diverse one. Nor is there any question in my mind but that this role is amply justified by the "general welfare" clause of the Constitution, the intent of the Founders, and the needs of modern society.

There will doubtless continue to emerge from some quarters—at the occasion of every Federal advance in this area—the claim that education is solely a State and local responsibility and that Federal aid inevitably leads to "Federal control." This cliche and the regrettable religious controversy were, of course, the chief obstacles to enactment of general aid-to-education legislation in the House this session. Regardless of how outworn the argument and how completely the history of such legislation fails to substantiate the fears of Federal control, it still carries a strong appeal to many. Apparently, however, the opponents of general aid to education are able to quell their anxieties concerning Federal control when the issue is one of aid to so-called federally "impacted" areas—many of which are communities that have lobbied intensively in Washington to acquire the Federal installations that are now presumed to be such a burden.

However, this is secondary to the issue on curriculum experimentation—a topic that is central not only to this conference, but also to the future of the American educational system. As Prof. Robert Ulich of Harvard stated a decade ago:

"Prolongation of school age is in itself not a blessing, but may even be a curse to civilization unless there goes together with the prolongation a revolutionary rethinking of the total program and a restructuring of the total educational system from the secondary school upwards."

I would concur with Professor Ulich's statement, as far as it goes, but I would extend this injunction to the elementary school as well.

The need for such "rethinking and restructuring" was recently dramatized for me by encountering reference to a study of elementary school geography conducted by John D. McAulay of Pennsylvania State University. Professor McAulay discovered that over the 20-year period covered by his inquiry, there was a lag of 10 years between formulation of new generalizations by professional geographers and the acceptance of such principles in the textbooks; and there was an additional lag of a decade before these materials were introduced in the public school curriculum.

If this condition still prevails—as it doubtless does in many if not most school systems, despite the greater articulation between university scholars and public school teachers—it would point toward very serious limitations in our traditional methods of local and State determinations of curriculum. And it becomes a "clear and present danger" to the function of public education when viewed in the light of such a comment as that of Dr. Bentley Glass regarding the doubling time of scientific knowledge as approximately 10 years.

It would be a reasonable conjecture also that in such fields as physics and the life sciences, where I believe the growth of knowledge has been particularly rapid in recent decades, this lag between the discovery and the diffusion of new principles is even greater than in geography.

Even such presumably reliable absolutes—in the minds of some—as the teaching of English and the classical languages seem to be not immune to the impact of new knowledge and new insights regarding the process of learning. But I am informed that the significant developments of descriptive grammar and scientific linguistics of the past few decades have as yet impinged but little upon elementary and secondary teaching of English.

And consider this statement regarding the teaching of classical languages, from the Committee on Secondary Schools of the American Council of Learned Societies:

"With respect to the classics, the panel agrees with the steering committee of the foreign language program of the Modern Language Association than 'an ancient language can be learned most efficiently if a modern foreign language has first been approached as speech' and therefore recommends that, contrary to practice, a modern language be studied before Greek or Latin."

This view would probably be considered rank heresy by most teachers of Greek and Latin today, and most assuredly by my own Latin teacher of 40 years ago.

I regret that I was not able to attend your earlier sessions and listen to the reports on some of the curriculum experiments that are in progress throughout the country. This is a seminal and immensely exciting field and one which holds much of the future of American education in its hands.

And it is a field to which the Congress is not insensitive in its own deliberations on aid to education. Though, in view of the deletion by the House Education and Labor Committee of the provisions of S. 1021 for curriculum experimentation, perhaps I had best qualify that statement. My very able congressional colleague, Representative THOMPSON, has the burden of explaining the House actions and I shall therefore restrict my comments to the functioning of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and its Subcommittee on Education.

In passing, it may be of interest to you to learn that among the nine members of our Subcommittee on Education, there are three of us who have had experience in teaching: Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, the chairman, who has a very distinguished background as a professor of law, and was a former law student and professor here at the University of Minnesota; Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH of Texas, who was an instructor for several years in the public schools of that State, and I, who taught public speaking and journalism for a number of years at Davis and Elkins College, West Virginia, and Southeastern University in Washington. It may fairly be stated therefore that in addition to the other able and highly educated members of that subcommittee, it has a substantial proportion of professional background for receptivity to the problems of our educational system, the community of scholars, and the teaching profession.

Regarding the more specific question of curriculum experimentation, we of course incorporated in the School Assistance Act of 1961 provisions prescribing that each State set aside 10 percent of its allotment for this purpose and other special projects.

However, more directly related and heavily oriented toward curriculum questions is the National Defense Education Act which was extended by the Congress for 2 years. The principal function of this program was and is to strengthen the curriculum, particularly in the areas of science, mathematics, and foreign languages. During the Senate committee hearings on this measure in May of this year, much of the testimony was devoted to curriculum problems, with considerable emphasis upon the need to broaden the curriculum support to include American history, government, economics, and sociology.

It is unfortunate that Federal assistance has not been extended to these areas, but that is largely the result in this instance, I believe, of the initial justification of the measure in terms of the limited conception of national defense. Though Federal support for a strengthened curriculum in many other areas is just as essential to the long-term security and development of America as the development of physics or foreign languages, it is more difficult to justify such action in terms of immediate national defense needs.

This brings me to the larger question of Federal support throughout the structure of knowledge and through all the modern branches of inquiry. Though not immediately bearing upon curriculum problems, this question most assuredly has long-range implications for such a conference as this.

Perhaps the best index of Federal activity in this field is given in the Federal Funds for Science bulletin published by the National Science Foundation. In the most recent edition, No. IX, total funds for research in all sciences—and this refers to research only, not research and development—in fiscal 1959 are recorded as $1.39 billion. The physical sciences, as would be expected, are the largest recipients, to the amount of $765 million; the life sciences follow with $420 million; the social sciences with $31 million, and the psychological sciences with $24 million. Other sciences, a category including space sciences, operations research, etc., received $150 million.

For fiscal 1961, there is an estimated $2.3 billion—the figures not yet having been completely tabulated—for an increase of approximately 65 percent, the physical sciences receiving the bulk of the increase, with a total amount of approximately $1.5 billion; the life sciences, $.68 billion; the psychological sciences, $.4 billion; the social sciences, $.4 billion; and other sciences, $.3 billion. Presumably, the category of space sciences, in view of the increased activity in this area, is no longer tabulated in other sciences.

If you will bear with me in relating a few more figures, I would like to extend the implications of these remarks as they apply to universities and the academic community.

In the total Federal funds obligated for research in fiscal 1960, approximately 39 percent was devoted to basic research, that is, the type of research directed toward the increase of knowledge within a particular field without reference to practical application of such knowledge. Within the aforementioned categories, the physical sciences averaged 31 percent basic research funds; the life sciences, 34 percent; the psychological sciences, 41 percent; and the social sciences, 24 percent. In comparison to the investment of private industry in basic research (perhaps 5 to 8 percent of its total research and development expenditures), this represents, of course, an extremely high ratio, and is probably sufficient to maintain an adequate "capital reserve" in scientific knowledge.

Of the total Federal funds obligated for basic research in fiscal 1960, 44 percent was distributed to educational institutions, 30 percent to Federal agencies, 14 percent to profit organizations, and 12 percent to foundations and other groups. Many university administrators are, of course, delighted by this distribution. Yet I suggest that the very fact of this Federal cornucopia holds threatening implications for the balanced development of knowledge within our academic community and ultimately for the intellectual and cultural life of America.

You ladies and gentlemen who live more intimately with the problem than I doubtless know that no Federal grant covers the full cost of research, and even less so when it is distributed on some sort of matching basis. The difference between the Federal grant and the actual cost of research must, therefore, be drawn from other sources of university revenue. With the heavy preponderance of Federal funds going to the physical and life sciences, this consequently means an inevitable weakening of support by the universities themselves of the social sciences, the psychological sciences and the humanities—those stepchildren of a modern industrial society which have traditionally carried a major share of the burden of transmitting our cultural heritage from one generation to the next.

Acknowledging that the bare figures are not an adequate index of the proportion of research activity among the various fields, because of the inordinate expense of so much of the research in the physical and biological sciences as compared to the psychological and social sciences, there still exists a disproportionate emphasis on the former. This imbalance is, of course, accentuated by the exigencies of national security, but it is not created by them. It stems primarily from a short-sighted utilitarian cast of our society. And with regard to congressional resistance toward Federal support of the social sciences, it emerges partly from the uninformed suspicion on the part of some Members of Congress that the social scientists "want to tell us how to live."

Both of these problems must be addressed by the academic community, for the universe of knowledge is one; and we cannot long skimp on behavioral studies and the humanities without soon feeling the effects in the tone and quality of life in America.

The correction of such imbalances cannot be initiated by the Congress. For we do not possess the expert, the professional and detailed knowledge of where the inadequacies exist. The initiative for action of the sort implied here must come from the academic, scientific and school spokesmen.

I have seen some of the reports of the work conducted under grants from the National Science Foundation by the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study at Boulder, Colo. This valuable work fully justifies the statement by your chairman, Dr. Paul Rosenbloom, that "a modest program, conceived with imagination, may be more valuable than a much more costly program of a routine nature." Such studies, conducted by the other major scientific and academic societies as well, should lead to the sort of rethinking and restructuring of which Professor Ulich spoke.

But it would seem to me that we would still need some agency in the nature of a National Advisory Council on Education to bring these findings in relation to one another, and through advice and persuasion, give more rigorous attention to a coherent curriculum that meets certain national minimal standards. Of course, I am aware of the vigilance with which State and local authorities guard their rights in the field of curriculum planning. And I do not suggest that these rights be overridden by any national authority. However, it does seem to me that the national scientific and academic societies and the Federal Government have a responsibility to bring the local agencies—through every voluntary means possible—up to national standards consistent with the needs of a rapidly changing technology and the increase in scientific knowledge. I would hope that the relevant congressional committees might receive the benefit of your counsel and that of your respective professional societies in the continuing future. For although the record of Congress on educational legislation this past session was hardly encouraging, the issue is not closed, and I can assure you that many of us are determined to achieve affirmative action in the future.

In closing, I would refer to a general curriculum problem and one which embraces many of the more detailed issues of your conference—that is, the need for the attainment of a point of view which can encompass the new and altered scope of change in life. This, I believe, is the central task of the schools today. One aspect of this problem was discussed by the eminent Austrian theoretical physicist Hans Thirring, in his article, "Education for the Age of Science" (Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, v. XV, No. 7, Sept. 1959), Dr. Thirring expressed the hope that there might be included in our primary and secondary school curriculum an "ABC of elementary wisdom."

We have conventionally assumed that wisdom is the peculiar attribute of age. In this respect we have shown little advance over the doctrine of the Athenian philosopher, Solon, who taught that wisdom is to be achieved only through suffering—possibly because our traditional education has forced men to suffer before achieving wisdom. Dr. Thirring believes that this need not be.

"According to the definition of wisdom which I am proposing," he writes "even a young person, driven by all the passions and impulses of his age, and without being a marvel of virtue or self-sacrifice, might be called wise, if he fulfills these conditions:

"First, to possess the knowledge and good will for a better understanding of, and insight into, himself and his fellow men.

"Second, to be able to assign the proper values to the various human issues, duties, and responsibilities.

"Third, to be trained to understand man's natural inclination to overestimate the issues lying within the range of his limited mental perspective."

These may seem ambitious aims to establish for primary and secondary schools, but I would venture to say that if the foundation for such a perspective is not laid during the relatively flexible and plastic condition of youth it is seldom achieved thereafter. For there are few of us who radically alter our intellectual and spiritual garments after passing into adulthood.

Now, this is not to suggest that the schools should merely attempt to inculcate a set of socially acceptable and humanitarian attitudes. Far be it from that. The kind of wisdom, the kind of excellence, which our society calls for today is not to be achieved by shortcuts or "life-adjustment" course.

On the contrary, the quality of mind most in need today is that which is fostered by discipline in the basic methods of inquiry and techniques of problem solving. Only when a student feels at home with the basic structure of investigative methods and problem solving will he welcome the challenge of novel conditions and achieve competency in meeting them. I would suggest, therefore, that we attempt to break through the ancient argument of "student centered" versus "subject matter centered" teaching and consider the value of "problem centered" teaching, with the problem embracing student, subject matter, and—I might add—teacher, as well.

In its practical applications this should mean that we would teach science as a process of inquiry rather than the products of inquiry; we would teach art as the creation and appreciation of objects rather than their identification and labeling; and we would teach history as a pattern of inquiry and a process in time rather than as an aggregate of facts.

Many people of late—laymen as well as scholars and teachers—have posed the problem in terms of a choice between quantity and quality, a choice between equality and excellence.

We have no choice. We must—if our civilization is to survive and persevere—have both.

We must have a generally informed citizenry capable of making intelligent decisions on matters of the public good. And we must have the highly trained specialists as well as the men and women of broadgage learning that our modern complex society demands.

In this regard, we may bear in mind the remarks of Epictetus when commenting upon the fall of Athenian democracy as caused by education of the few: "The State says that only free men will be educated; God says only educated men will be free."

[From the Sunday Gazette-Mail, Charleston, W. Va., Nov. 5, 1961]

MINNESOTA EDUCATORS LAUD SENATOR RANDOLPH'S WISDOM

EDITOR:

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, gave on September 28 at the University of Minnesota a brilliant speech on the role of the Federal Government in education. His address was one of the outstanding events of a national conference on curriculum experimentation, attended by about 75 leaders from all over the country, and from every segment of the educational community.

We were all impressed by Senator RANDOLPH's sincerity and deep understanding. He got down to the heart of the matter—how the general welfare depends on what our children are taught in our schools * * *. He stressed the importance of our young people learning to assign the proper values to the various human issues, duties, and responsibilities.

Your Senator also pointed out several ways in which the Federal Government could act in the national interest in these matters without interfering with local control. He made a forceful plea that both professionals and laymen discuss their interests in educational legislation with their Congressmen at the time when the congressional committees are working on these problems, and not to depend solely on the large lobbies in Washington.

He discussed many complex issues * * * without a single platitude or cliche. We also appreciated his frank and courageous answers from the floor.

Senator RANDOLPH came to our conference at considerable cost to his personal comfort as well as at a financial sacrifice. He left Washington immediately after the Senate adjourned with little time for rest.

We congratulate the people of West Virginia on being represented by such a wise and well-informed man. We hope the whole country will continue to benefit for a long time from the dedicated services of Senator RANDOLPH.

R. H. BECK,
Professor of Education.
F. E. BERGER,
Director, Center of Continuation Study.
N. DEWITT,
Chairman, Professor of Classics.
L. HURWICZ,
Professor of Economics.
P. C. ROSENBLOOM,
Professor of Mathematics, State Department of Education, Institute of Technology.
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA.

Berlin: The Symbol of Unification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, today one of the great trouble spots in the world is the city of Berlin. One can understand the problem by reading the newspapers, but a better appreciation and understanding can be had by visiting this famous city which is located physically within the heart of the Soviet zone of occupation. I was fortunate in the course of my legislative duties to visit Berlin, to talk to many people, to observe conditions, and to draw some personal conclusions. While my visit was of brief duration, I had the privilege and opportunity to speak with officials in authority, to inspect places barred to nongovernmental persons, and to receive briefings by military and civilian officials. Upon my return I was invited to speak before the International Relations Club of St. John's University and the Columbian Lawyers Association. After my talks, there was a question-and-answer period. I believe that my talk before the Columbia Lawyers Association on December 13, 1961, in the Bronx might prove interesting and informative to the readers. My speech follows:

Mr. President Nicholas Iannuzzi, Surrogate Samuel Di Falco, Judge Louis Pagnucco, who trained me in the district attorney's office of New York County in 1945, Sylvester Cosentino, president of my political club, distinguished guests and members of the association, at the outset let me thank you for the invitation offered through your secretary, Jerry Crispino, to address you. I am pleased to meet many of my old friends, some of whom I had the honor of sponsoring for admission to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States.

On December 6, 1961, I returned from a trip to Rome, Berlin, and Paris. I would like to talk about the city of Berlin.

1. What the issue is and what the problems are.
2. What is happening there.
3. What the recent events signify, such as: (a) The building of the wall in the middle of the city of Berlin from north to south separating West and East Berlin; (b) the interference with the free movement of our Government and our garrison soldiers; (c) the interference with our access routes.
4. What a free city of Berlin means to the free world.

Germany, as you know, after World War II was divided into four zones of occupation or sectors and Greater Berlin being a fifth zone of occupation. These zones were known as the United States, British, French, and U.S.S.R. The city of Berlin which is geographically located within the Soviet sector, 110 miles distant from the western allied frontier, was physically divided into four sectors, Britain, United States, French in the western part of the city and the Soviet in the eastern part of the city.

A 10-day visit normally could hardly qualify one as an expert but permit me to detail some of my activity in the political military economic spheres.

I had a very interesting talk with Gen. Lucius Clay, the special consultant and representative of President John F. Kennedy in Berlin, who was the former military governor in Germany and closely associated with Gen. Dwight Eisenhower in World War II. Those who wish to get more detailed information may read General Clay's book "Decision in Germany." After my talk with General Clay I concluded that if he were present on August 13 when the East German authorities started to put up the barbed wire and the wall that we would have taken quick action to preserve our access and rights by taking it down.

I and my colleagues were briefed as to recent events by Brig. Gen. F. O. Hartel of the Berlin Command, Lt. Col. Emanuel Tineri, staff secretary of office U.S. commander, Col. T. C. Foote and Maj. F. E. Karhohs. They discussed also our military posture in Berlin, the organizational setup of the Allied control council which governed and has jurisdiction over Germany, and the Allied Kommandature which governed Greater Berlin. They discussed the background of Germany, Berlin, and the recent events in Berlin beginning August 13, 1961, when the East German authorities with the urging and the consent of the Soviet Government commenced to build the wall through the city.

We interviewed the assistant chief of the U.S. Mission Berlin, E. A. Lightner. Later I had a short talk with Maj. Gen. A. Watson, the U.S. commander in Berlin, after his emergency talk with the Soviet commander. We were then briefed by the political analyst, Mr. G. F. Muller, and the economics expert, Mr. Frank Taylor.

We visited the trouble spot, "check point Charlie," on the Friedrichstrasse which is set aside as the entry point for our military forces and Government personnel and which was the scene of the confrontation of American and Soviet tanks. We visited the American, British, and French zones, and inspected the 28 mile wall which meanders through the heart of the city of Berlin from north to south dividing the Western sector of Berlin from East Berlin.

This wall must be seen to be appreciated. This wall of concrete, barbed wire, twists and turns for 28 miles from the north part of the city to the southern part of Berlin. Imagine if you will a concrete wall dividing 5th Avenue from 14th Street up to Central Park across 57th Street over to Columbus Avenue, up Broadway to 207th Street, across Fordham Road to the grand concourse down to 161st Street over to 3d Avenue and down to 125th Street over to the East River down to South Ferry, with a wall blocking intersections, and the buildings bricked up forming part of the wall for a distance of 28 miles. This is what the wall would mean in New York City. The houses are evacuated and land cleared behind it for a distance of 200 feet with tank traps and concrete poles imbedded into the ground. Near this wall stand soldiers on guard, the East German police or "vopos." Where the wall crosses the cemetery, the entrances are bricked up and the grief-stricken families are forced to place their wreaths at the base of the wall. They are denied the opportunity to bring their dead for burial or the opportunity to show their respect to their deceased loved ones. In the French sector, on Bernauer Strasse, East Berliners jumped to their death in seeking to escape. One can see crosses on the sidewalk with mourners placing their wreaths daily to show their sorrow.

It was on a Sunday, August 13, 1961, that West Berliners were surprised by the East Berliners putting up barbed wire fences. This precipitated a last minute exodus of East Berliners who sought to escape; young people, old people; secret police and others made their escape to West Berlin. During the month of August more than 40,000 refugees fled and took refuge at the Marienfelde refugee camp, where they were housed. Approximately 200,000 escaped during 1961 from Soviet sector and from East Berlin. I had the good fortune to see how they processed their refugees. One person in particular on November 4, escaped with a friend, avoiding the shots of East Berlin police, the vopos and the East German police. He swam across the Spray River and escaped. After a month's convalescence in the hospital, he was processed, given a job and permitted to make a new life. He was a former postal clerk who refused to join the secret police. He refused because he did not want to shoot down West Berliners and his friends. Many of the refugees who are processed through the camp are directed to that part of West Germany where they desire to go or where their talents or background fit them.

We visited McNairs training field barracks where we reviewed the training of our U.S. 2d and 3d battle groups of the 6th Infantry Division. We observed signal corps and artillery practice and riot control squad practice.

All this took place in drizzling rain. We interviewed Col. J. Deane and Lt. Col. D. Hickman, the battle commander. We inspected our military equipment and the Signal Corps equipments and the new Army rifles, submachine and machineguns, and antitank bazookas. Our equipment is modern; our boys well trained, poised, on edge, and ready. Colonel Deane told us the story of one of the boys by the name of "Mexico."

When East Berliners saw too many people escaping, they cleared the area near the wall and warned that any person who approached within 100 yards, would be shot or handled. Our troops refused to be restricted in their actions on our side of the wall and our boys moved forward, including this soldier, Private Mexico. The East German soldiers threatened to spray a hose on this young soldier.

As they brought the hose spray toward him, Mexico stood his ground, took off a hand grenade from his person and indicated by his gestures that if he were molested with the water hose that he would hurl the hand grenade. When the East Germans saw this they lowered the hose and spray and backed away. Trouble was averted. Colonel Deane said he felt like hugging the boy, because of the poise, courage, and restraint he displayed under pressure. Our boys are unafraid. They have been instructed not to start a fight but have been told not to back away from their position. Our boys are ready and equipped for any eventuality.

We visited the refugee camp of Marienfelde where we observed the process by which the West Berlin authorities handled and handles the hundred of thousands of refugees from East Berlin and the Soviet sector of Berlin. More than 3 million people have fled the Soviet Zone since the war. Over 200,000 have left since the beginning of the year, and despite the wall and tyrannical conditions, many people escape East Berlin to freedom in West Berlin.

We also visited East Berlin as tourists through the S. Bahn which is the elevated train system. To obtain entry to East Berlin, and to return, it was necessary to show identification which I did with my social security card inasmuch as I refused to show my passport or congressional documents so that my official status would not be disclosed. We were stopped by three guards. It is easier to get into East Berlin than out of East Berlin. When I started to get out of East Berlin the guard demanded a photograph. While I had my passport which contains my photograph in my inner pocket, I refused to show it and insisted that I was an American and that my social security card sufficed. The guard let me pass.

In Paris we interviewed Gen. James Gavin, Ambassador to France, with whom I discussed the Berlin situation, the position and attitude of Gen. Charles de Gaulle, the French attitude toward West Germany and Berlin, and the reasons General de Gaulle insists on developing his own atomic weapons.

We visited NATO headquarters where we conferred with Ambassador Tom Finletter on the role of West Germany in NATO. We were then briefed by top American officers of NATO on the overall NATO military posture, and the mutual weapon development program in its various phases. We had various conferences with businessmen on the economic situation, and the effect of the Common Market. There is no doubt that economic unity will conduce to political and military unity and that the Common Market is eliminating any tensions which might exist between France and West Germany.

What is the issue in Berlin and what are the problems? The important issue in Berlin is that the Western Allies are trying to maintain their position in Berlin and to keep West Berlin from being taken over by the Communists. Russia is trying to push the Western Allies out of Berlin and eventually to take over West Berlin. An ancillary issue and pertinent to the major issue is: Will East Berlin be recognized as a sovereign unit?

There are four major problems involved:

(1) Air and ground access to the city of Berlin from the West and freedom of movement within the city of Berlin.

(2) Our so-called propaganda activities.

(3) Refugee flow.

(4) Strength of allied garrison.

These issues and problems are related to the overall issue of: Shall there be a united Germany with Berlin as its capital and one treaty or shall there be a divided Germany with two treaties?

We must never forget that the Soviet fears the German people, its intelligence and its ability to make war. It has reason to respect Germany and its prowess. Germany, with its 72 million people, almost defeated Russia and laid waste its lands. The Soviet breakthrough in space and its development of missiles and nuclear weapons have been stimulated by captive German scientists. The Soviet is furious because West Germany joined the NATO forces in the NATO Pact. The U.S.S.R. intends to divide Germany as best it can even if it means separating 17 million Germans from West Germany and imprisoning 1.1 million East Berliners behind the wall.

Contrast France, which suffered from the devastation of war begun by Germany. France believes it can live in peace with Germany. France has joined with West Germany in the Common Market and De Gaulle believes that economic unity with Germany will relieve the tensions behind the countries and bring permanent peace. Trade between West Germany and U.S.S.R. in a common market program and an exchange of peoples might help in eliminating tensions.

The East German authorities claim that the Western Allies' activities in sending our troops through East Berlin are violating a sovereign state's rights and are provocative.

The Western Allies, that is, United States, United Kingdom, and France, do not recognize East Germany as a sovereign state or the German Democratic Republic as a legal government. Our position is that East Germany and East Berlin are parts of occupied territory under the jurisdiction of the Soviet subject to veto by the Allied Control Council and the four commanders in Berlin, the Komandatura, and that by agreement we have a right to come and go as we please.

The Soviet threatens to sign a separate peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic representing East Germany. The Western allies claim that the Soviet has no right to sign unilaterally a peace treaty with an illegal government and that we recognize only the Soviet authorty in East Germany and in East Berlin. The Western allies further claim that putting up a wall, stopping our personnel from free travel and requiring indentification and harassing our troops are designed to demonstrate the legality of the German Democratic Republic and the sovereignty of East Germany.

To better understand the present-day situation and to determine whether the allies are right or wrong, it is necessary to look backward and to at least reexamine some of the highlights in the long series of events which led to the situation today.

In 1943 the Western allies met with Soviet officials and agreed on zones of occupation for Germany and Berlin. Our soldiers did better than our statesmen anticipated and by the time Germany surrendered, our troops had gone far beyond the lines that the statesmen had set up. We were therefore required to pull back our forces from Saxony and Thuringia and on July 4, 1945, our forces entered into West Berlin which the Soviet vacated. England had suggested that we not pull back our troops, but the U.S. keeping to its agreement and understanding withdrew U.S. forces from Thuringia and Saxony which its armies had overrun and conquered.

Each of the allies, France, United States, and United Kingdom, controlled a zone in West Germany and the Soviets controlled a zone in East Germany; and the authority was subject to veto only by unanimous agreement of the four commanders acting as the Allied Control Council.

Greater Berlin was divided into four zones. Each of Western Allies garrisoned the Western zones allotted it and the Soviet garrisoned East Berlin. The city of Berlin was to be administered by a four-power Allied Kommandatura composed of four Allied city commandants, with a rotating chairmanship.

The Soviet commandant walked out of the Allied Kommandatura at the time of the Berlin blockade in 1948. Concurrently the freely elected citywide government was forced out of the city hall or rathouse located in the Soviet sector of Berlin; moved to Schoeneberg and the city was divided into East and West Berlin.

Analyzing what the Soviet Union has done since it withdrew from the Allied control council in 1948, and from the Allied Kommandatura, one can see a common thread in the Soviet actions, leading to one conclusion; that is that the Soviets decided to unilaterally terminate our agreements of occupation, and decided by itself that the Western Allies could have Western Germany and the Soviet would take Eastern Germany, including all of Berlin either under a puppet regime or under its own control. Here is what has happened which leads a person to such a conclusion:

1. East Germany set up a separate currency in 1948.

2. Soviet blockaded the ground access to Western Berlin in 1948.

3. East Germany imposed an Autobahn-toll on Western Germans, West Berliners, and foreigners on highways leading to Berlin.

4. East Germany curbed telephone service between East and West Berlin in 1952.

5. The German Democratic Republic passed a passport law on December 11, 1957 requiring East Berliners and East Germans to get passports if they desired to go to West Germany under the Federal Republic of Germany.

6. German Democratic Republic passed a law requiring West Berliners desiring to go to the Soviet Zone to get a special permit which is seldom granted.

7. The Soviets proposed that West Berlin be declared a free city with the United Nations protecting the free city November 27, 1958.

8. West German visitors were refused free access to the Soviet sector and East Germany.

9. August 13, 1961, East Germany constructed a wall 28 miles long, dividing East Berlin from West Berlin, barring East Berliners from going to West Berlin and West Germany, and imprisoning 1,100,000 East Berliners.

10. East Germany required identification by all people at crossings except at check point Charlie at the Friedrichstrasse where military forces and Government personnel commands cross to East Berlin; narrowed the opening at check point Charlie, and erected red and white striped customs barrier gate at the seven crossing points.

This is the history of events so far seeking to destroy the quadripartite agreement. It is a salami tactic, cutting off a piece at a time until there is no salami left.

While we Americans have a sound legal position in Germany and Berlin, the Soviet and East German authorities are acting, and because of lack of immediate Allied action the Soviet is cutting off the access routes. Allied forces and Government personnel have five agreed routes left for access to Berlin, three air corridors, the Autobahn from Helmstedt to Berlin and the rail line through Marienborn. There are seven crossing points between East and West Berlin. How long these access routes will remain open is a matter of conjecture. The East German authorities claim that the Western Allied activities in sending our troops through East Berlin are violating a sovereign state's rights and are provocative.

The Western Allies, that is United States, United Kingdom, and France do not recognize East Germany as a sovereign state and do not recognize the German Democratic Republic as a legal government. Our legal position is that East Germany and East Berlin are parts of occupied territory under the jurisdiction of the Soviet, subject to veto by the Allied Control Council and the four commanders in Berlin, the Komandatura, and air access to Berlin along the three corridors from West Germany is and has been unrestricted since the end of World War II in 1945.

We claim the rights with respect to air access to Berlin derive from precisely the same source as do the rights of the U.S.S.R. in East Germany, and in East Berlin, namely the joint military defeat of the German Reich and the joint assumption of supreme authority over Germany. These rights are confirmed by the circumstances under which the Four Powers entered Germany, by their subsequent discussions and agreements, and by open and established practice over a period of 15 years.

Right of access to Berlin was spelled out by the following events:

1. November 14, 1944, European Advisory Commission agreement.

2. Talks of Gen. Lucius Clay with General Zhukov June 29, 1945, regarding the withdrawal of troops and entry of American forces into Berlin.

3. Correspondence between President Truman and Marshal Stalin at end of Berlin blockade, 1949.

4. Orders by Gen. Vassily Chiukov in ordering end of blockade in May 1949.

5. An agreement between Allied Powers in 1949 guaranteeing right of access.

What do these recent events in Berlin signify? The 28 mile wall in the heart of the city is more than a physical division of a city. To Americans it is a symbol of a division between freedom and tyranny, freedom in the West and imprisonment in the East. To Germans in the West it is a barrier to the unification of Germany, and a goad to their nationalistic aspirations. This wall is ghoulish. Walls in the past such as the Chinese wall were designed to keep people out, this wall is designed to keep people in. It separates families and relatives. It seals the fate of 1.1 million Germans.

It is a prelude to a separate unilteral peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic with U.S.S.R.

It is an affirmative action reaffirming the Soviet declaration that it no longer recognizes quadripartite control of East Berlin and Berlin.

It is an attack on the Potsdam agreement which promised unity of Germany.

It is a forerunner of blockade to West Berliners.

It is a forerunner of a customs toll on the Autobahn which would hinder transportation of trade goods.

The wall blocking the crossing at the Brandenburg gate has a special and significant meaning. The Germans have always been neurotically attracted by symbols and the Brandenburg gate has been a symbol of the glorious past, a dreary present and an uncertain future. At the Bradenburg gate Germany was once united and here it was later divided. It was here that Napoleon celebrated his capture of Berlin, removed the Guadriga, a bronze statue of the goddess Victoria drawn by four horses, it was here that when Berlin split during the revolution of 1948, the Brandenburg gate became the symbol of reunification and freedom. Within its sight the Reichstag went up in flames. During the battle of Berlin, the U.S. Embassy which stood next to the Brandenburg gate was bombed and destroyed with other buildings in the vicinity. It is within its shadow that Hitler was entombed in his impenetrable bunker. It was here that the students of workers of East Germany on June 17, 1953, with sticks and stones stormed the barricades put up by the Red army until their bones were broken by Red enemy tanks.

What does Berlin mean to the world and to Germany? Without a unified Berlin there can never be a united Germany. West Berlin is a lighthouse of freedom in a dark totalitarian sea. It demonstrates the economic superiority of a free society which allows and encourages individual initiative. More important it is a shining model of political intellectual and spiritual freedom with which individual liberties are assured and the people chose those who govern them.

For the Western allies, free Berlin is their symbol, the evidence and the acid test of their unity, strength, and determination.

Berlin is a battleground of wills. The allies have a responsibility not to cause a nuclear war but they have a responsibility not to permit the freedom there to be whittled away by actions which in their small measurements, mean very little but when added up are substantial. France will not yield, Germany does not wish to yield, England seeks compromise, and the United States does not want to chance war. The U.S.S.R. wants to maintain what is theirs and to negotiate what belongs to the allies.

As General De Gaulle says, he is not concerned with the opinion of Nkrumah or world opinion. He will not negotiate to give away under threats, any of the rights which belong to the Allied Powers. He demands that the Soviet come forward with plans to negotiate the overall problems, not Berlin alone.

The task is difficult and the decision is weighty. With faith and the courage of freemen our leaders will decide. Whatever the decision is, we can be certain that our strength is superior, our equipment is of the best, and our boys in Berlin are ready for any eventuality. What shall we do?

We must encourage our leaders to stand firm; to let our President know that we support a firm position and that any further yielding on our part must be accompanied not only by a written agreement but also by physical changes which will permit the carrying out of the Soviet written promise and will not prevent performance of the promise.

That in view of the past broken promises by the U.S.S.R. of free access to Berlin, West Germany must be given that portion of the Soviet sector between the East frontier of the allied sector and the west frontier of Berlin, an area of 110 miles, so that the air corridors and access routes cannot be interfered with. This should be in my opinion one of the areas of negotiation in regard to Berlin.

Once our leaders make a decision we cannot submit any further arguments or reasons for any proposed settlement. We must make our wishes known now. After the decision is made and agreement is reached, we must maintain our word and we must be as soldiers in the ranks, and understand that thereafter it is not for us to reason why but it is for us to do or cry.

Extremist Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is fashionable nowadays to point the finger of shame at extremists of the right, and many, including President Kennedy, have impugned the motives of many conservative patriotic citizens. Also, occasionally, criticism is directed at leftists, although strangely enough, many political leaders are inconsistently silent when it comes to condemning extreme liberals.

As for me, I am not joining any chorus of intolerance. Rather, I would proclaim with pride that this is a land where freedom of belief is not condemned. Indeed, in America, our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution were born out of such travail of dispute and clash of view. Freedom of thought and expression is what has made America great. So, rather than scorn American citizens for their convictions, I prefer to welcome all extremists, providing only, of course, they do not violate or advocate measures in nonconformity with law and order.

Let all liberals and conservatives express their honest convictions, and as George Washington said, when the people have the facts they will do the right thing.

Congress Faces Many Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the election of Speaker definitely took the spotlight, especially for Massachusetts, as this session of Congress commences its work.

While the election of Congressman John W. McCormack was already assured, it is noteworthy, indeed, that for the third time since 1947, a distinguished son of the Bay State has taken over the third highest office in the land—an office second in succession to the Presidency. Congressman Martin held the position for two prior periods and now Congressman McCormack is being elevated to this very high post to succeed the great, beloved "Mr. Sam."

For our State, there is great significance in having another famous son of Massachusetts in this office because the Speaker of the House is the foremost parliamentary, political leader of the Nation and the world, whose influence over the course of history, at home and abroad, is truly immeasurable.

We of the Massachusetts congressional delegation are especially proud and gratified by the richly merited promotion of our distinguished and beloved colleague and friend, Congressman McCormack, who brings to his most arduous and vital tasks a ripe experience in the affairs of the Federal Government, seldom, if ever, excelled by any of his predecessors.

His election is another great day for Massachusetts, and it holds a promise of effective, united leadership on Capitol Hill and in the Government that will contribute greatly to the solution of many extremely grave and difficult problems.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND WORLD COMMUNISM

Fortunately, our defense machinery is in very good shape and our defense potential is incredibly powerful and well coordinated, and together with that of our allies continues to exert tremendous, deterrent effects upon possible aggression.

Our House Armed Services Committee of which I am a member, will continue its work in rounding out and, where necessary, buttressing the many components and systems which are required to defend us, to prevent all-out war and promote peace.

We have made very impressive gains in many vital fields of defense and our defensive and striking position is continuously being strengthened.

It is likely that our committee will be faced with many pressing demands from the American public to take a sharp look at the entire reserve setup, particularly the plight of those reservists recently called to active duty.

A most important corollary to the defense of the Nation and the free world must be our unceasing, determined campaign for peace with all its connotations and that means, of course, proposals for universal disarmament and control of nuclear energy based on carefully devised and special safeguards that will not only put an end to aggressive designs and actions, but prompt the organization of the world under a rule of law and a human brotherhood that will promote peace and betterment for all peoples. I expect that the Congress will make considerable progress along these lines this session, and it goes without saying that the President will find ready and overwhelming support in the Congress for any efforts he makes to check the forces of communism, dispel the fears of nuclear destruction and establish enduring peace. But we must recognize that it takes two to make a bargain and sincere Soviet cooperation is required to secure this end.

On the domestic front, there are numerous challenging, and especially complex, questions that Congress must tackle this year.

Recognizing the more or less urgent needs of the people, the national wellbeing, problems dealing with the growth and strength of our great, productive economy and compelling social problems that lay claim to our interest and attention, Congress will be called upon to consider: First, medical care and the public health; second, support and aid to education; third, streamlining and improving the tax sytsem; fourth, reciprocal trade; fifth, the continuing gap in international payments; sixth, accommodation to the problems and intricacies presented by the so-called Common Markets; seventh, broader planning and implementation of urban and community rehabilitation, renewal, and improvement; eighth, thorny agricultural problems requiring production for actual use rather than warehouse waste, reducing the staggering burdens on the public treasury, establishing more equitable balance between farm income and consumer prices; and, ninth, a host of problems having to do with better utilization, control and use of water, including development of new sources, elimination of pollution, conservation of precious natural resources.

These are but a handful of the many legislative proposals which will undoubtedly be presented for the consideration of the Congress.

There are numerous very controversial questions, like medical care, which the Congress will explore with regard to need, its cost, its adequacy to suit public need, adaptability to free enterprise and other pertinent factors.

In the field of education, another controversial area, consideration will be given to aid to construction, higher standards, support of State efforts for adequate pay for teachers, assistance to federally impacted areas, and other proposals relating to Federal encouragement and support of higher education through various grants, loans, scholarships, research projects, and other aids calculated to beef up our education system to cope with competitive standards in other countries and make higher education more generally available to qualified young Americans.

The revision of trade and tariff laws is bound to produce more controversy. Whether the Congress will go along with proposals to open still wider the markets of this country to cheaply produced foreign goods from overseas is at the moment obscure, but it is certain that any measure along these lines will be met with strong determined opposition.

Tax laws need general overhauling, but it is probably too much to hope for that this job can or will be completed this session. Amendments to plug current loopholes and exemptions would be vexatious and costly to many but quite superficial, indeed, in probing the real areas for drastic tax reforms which lie, most likely, in those revisions, designed to spur incentives, fortify free enterprise institutions, plow profits back into expansion, and reduce onerous exactions on many individuals of the rank and file, hard-working people so to speak, upon whom current taxes, coupled with the high cost of living, are working a genuine hardship, as well as reducing their social standards.

I hardly think that such a task can be adequately tackled in an election year but perhaps some start may be made.

There is a prospect and a hope that Congress may increase the membership of the House, taking into account the Members gained by the admission of Alaska and Hawaii.

Historically, whenever new States have been admitted to the Union, the membership of the House has been increased. It is, however, about 50 years since this has been done.

It is hoped that partisan politics will not enter into this question which is essentially an issue of basic government. If a bill can be passed authorizing four additional Members, this would greatly facilitate and simplify the problem of redistricting Massachusetts. We face the redistricting problem this year because the State was lacking only about 15,000 additional population in the census of 1960. Under the situation now obtaining, Massachusetts would secure the first seat made available in any bill increasing the size of the House.

A Christmas Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, we all received and appreciated many Christmas cards and messages. One of those which most impressed me was that which came from our colleague, the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, and with her permission I am glad to place it in the RECORD today. It is brief but it is thoughtful and timely.

I hope it will be widely read and I am sure that all who read it will feel well repaid. It is as follows:

1961.

GREETINGS: I write that you may know I think of you in these days when men and nations are confused and fearful. Let me remind you that in 1781 George Washington wrote: "We must not despair, the game is yet in our hands; to play it well is all we have to do." Surely we can do this.

For our strengthening I give you words that St. Teresa of Avila wrote in the 16th century:

"Let nothing disturb thee; let nothing
dismay thee:
All things pass; God never changes.
Patience attains all its strives for.
He who has God finds he lacks nothing:
God alone suffices."

May His blessing be upon you.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCES P. BOLTON.

New Era in Public Administration Advanced With Inauguration of National Computer Center of Internal Revenue Service at Martinsburg, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on November 6, 1961, the city of Martinsburg, W. Va., was the scene of another advancement in the technological revolution of our age. On that date the National Computer Center of the Internal Revenue Service was dedicated, thus initiating a nationwide data processing system which by 1980 will handle some 135 million tax returns and 450 million other documents.

Though the popular imagination is perhaps captured more by the dramatic advances of missile and satellite programs, the electronic computer is the more fundamental symbol of our times. For it is only through the achievements of electronic data processing that the exploration of space has been made possible, and it is the application of electronic computers to other areas of science, industry, business, and government that makes it possible for us to encompass the bewildering array of data provided in a modern industrial civilization.

Significant observations were made on this theme by Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon and by Commissioner of Internal Revenue Mortimer M. Caplin at the dedication of the National Computer Center. I therefore ask unanimous consent that my remarks delivered at that time and those of Secretary Dillon and Commissioner Caplin be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR RANDOLPH

Mr. Secretary, Governor Barron, Commissioner Caplin, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen, we are today dedicating another step in a technological and scientific revolution the end of which is not in sight.

It has become almost axiomatic to refer to our time as the Atomic Age or the Space Age. More accurately, we might refer to it as the Computer Age—for it is the modern and fantastically ingenious electronic computer which more than any other instrument makes possible the spectacular advances of the natural sciences and modern technology in this era.

When the present computer system of the Internal Revenue Service is completed, with its nerve center here at Martinsburg, I am informed that some 100 million returns will be compared to 450 million documents pertaining to personal finances. I have no accurate measure of the amount of taxes which will thus be recovered, but I should judge that it would be in the order of several billion dollars annually. One might observe in passing that this fact would seem to refute the notion of science as being ethically neutral—in this instance, science and technology are very much on the side of a higher and more rigorous morality regarding the payment of taxes.

Presently, there are some 9,000 persons employed by the Federal Government in the operation of computers. Their activities range from performing mock weapons tests at Los Alamos and operating the Ballistic Missile Early Warning System to ordering supplies and planning highway interchanges. And before many years the computer may well have invaded every segment of our economic, industrial and political life.

In all truth we are presently embarking upon a second industrial revolution even before we have fully accommodated ourselves politically and economically to the first industrial revolution of coal and iron. The dangers implicit therein were noted more than a decade ago by one of the pioneers in this field in a work entitled "The Human Use of Human Beings." In that book Prof. Norbert Wiener pointed out that the electronic computer and its progeny may be our servants or our masters, depending upon how we order our society.

I sincerely hope, therefore, as we dedicate this National Computer Center, that we dedicate these instruments and ourselves to the continued progress of a humane civilization and that we think always of our wondrous technology, not as an end in itself, but in terms of its contribution to greater freedom and prosperity in a democratic society.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, NATIONAL COMPUTER CENTER, MARTINSBURG, W. VA., MONDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1961

We are here today, not merely to dedicate one more Government building, but to launch a new era in public tax administration.

By employing electronic equipment to process an enormous mass of data far more rapidly and far more accurately than can be done by manual methods, we are taking a giant stride toward improving the operation of our tax system. We are also demonstrating that Government is a dynamic organism, capable of self-improvement through the adoption of modern tools and techniques. The British statesman, Edmund Burke, once said: "Government is a contrivance of human wisdom to provide for human wants. Men have a right that these wants should be provided for by this wisdom."

One of the continuing wants of the American people is ever more efficient and more effective public administration. By meshing an automatic data processing system into the operations of the Internal Revenue Service, we are moving closer to fulfilling that want.

The ADP system we are initiating here today is a major advance that brings an entirely new dimension to tax administration.

A very important element in this advance is the fact that adoption of automatic data processing equipment will increase our total revenues by helping to insure that all of our citizens are bearing their full and fair share of the national tax burden. It should also give comforting reassurance to our honest, taxpaying citizens—and they are in the vast majority—that life will be made far more difficult for the foolish few who are tempted to cheat or to evade. And, by enhancing the certainty and fairness of our tax administration, it will strengthen the Nation to face the tasks that lie ahead.

We are locked in a struggle with a powerful and resourceful adversary. There is no end in sight to that contest. We are confident that we shall emerge victorious—no matter what form the contest may take. But, to prevail, we must have an economy that flourishes and grows stronger every year.

Our economy must support heavy expenditures to meet our urgent national needs—both at home and abroad—and to sustain the defensive forces that guard our own security and that of the entire free world. These necessary expenditures are reflected in our present tax burden. More than half of our tax dollar is devoted to defense alone, and substantial additional portions go to other programs of vital importance to our national security. Therefore, every additional dollar of revenue derived from the improved collection techniques made possible by electronic equipment is a direct contribution to the advancement of our national interest.

The facility we dedicate today is the heart of the total ADP system. Within this building, magnetic tapes will eventually store the entire record of every taxpayer in the United States. These master tapes will transcribe information electronically from data supplied by nine regional service centers to be established throughout the country. Five or six years from now, when the system is fully developed, some 78 million accounts—72 million individual and 6 million business—will be maintained here on some 400 miles of tape. From this data, the Internal Revenue Service will be able to determine the tax status of any taxpayer, at any time.

With automatic data processing equipment, the Service will be able to keep a systematic check on failure of taxpayers to file returns, to determine quickly whether taxes are owed for previous years, and to instantly detect such things as duplicate claims for refunds. It will also enable the Service to do a better job of determining which returns should be selected for audit purposes.

But the advantages of ADP will not be limited to improve tax collection. The Internal Revenue Service is also charged with paying out refunds under our system of withholding. Last year, some 36 million refund checks were mailed. Every year, some 500,000 of these checks fail to reach their destination, usually because the taxpayer has moved without leaving any forwarding address. With the help of ADP, the Internal Revenue Service will be able to cure this situation and refunds will be faster and more certain.

The new technique will not dehumanize our tax administration. It will not be man against machine—the individual taxpayer versus a giant, impersonal monster that thrives only on numbers. The Internal Revenue Service will continue to offer all the assistance and other services now provided to taxpayers with questions or problems. In fact, the new system should permit the Service to devote more time to direct, personal contacts. The overall effect will be improved and more rapid service to taxpayers in all their dealings with the Government.

I am pleased that you could join us on this important occasion. As the ADP system becomes fully operative in the years ahead, I am confident that we will look back on this occasion as a major turning point in public tax administration.

DRAFT OF REMARKS BY COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE MORTIMER M. CAPLIN AT THE DEDICATION OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE NATIONAL COMPUTER CENTER, MARTINSBURG, W. VA., NOVEMBER 6, 1961

History has long been known to repeat itself, but these repetitions often produce some unpredictable patterns. A century ago, this city was the scene of bitter fighting between North and South—a symbol of the most divisive struggle in our Nation's life. Today, Martinsburg moves into a new role—the symbol of a cohesive revenue system through which Americans in all sections of our country contribute to the attainment of our national goals.

The adoption of electronic equipment as a tool in our individual, self-assessment tax system marks a major stride in revenue administration. In the next few years, the tax accounts of every taxpayer in the United States will be assembled under this roof, permitting us to collect internal revenues more efficiently and effectively than ever before and to provide better and more rapid service to taxpayers.

The Internal Revenue Service has made swift progress in converting its operations to an automatic data processing system. The construction of this national computer center is a good example of that progress. If we had met here 5 short months ago, we would have been standing in a field of grass. We owe a deep debt of gratitude to the General Services Administration; to the architect, John Hans Graham, and his Mr. David Bernstein; to the builder, Scott S. Bair; to the contractor, W. Harley Miller; and to the project engineer, Marshall Elam; and to many, many others for their splendid cooperation in expediting this center.

We also have been able to accelerate other parts of our conversion to automatic data processing. Our plans for new regional service centers are substantially ahead of our original timetable. Our Atlanta service center goes into operation in a little more than 1 month from now. Philadelphia will be operational a year later. Just last week, we announced the selection of Austin, Tex., as the location of our third regional service center. We expect to announce at an early date the site of the Cincinnati region's service center. This center will process tax returns, reports, and other documents for Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky, Virginia, and this very fine State of West Virginia.

In addition, we are moving up our timetable to convert existing service centers in Lawrence, Mass., and Kansas City, Mo., to automatic data processing in 1963. This means that these two service centers will then handle not only their regular processing work with present techniques, but will begin to process certain business tax returns with ADP methods. In 1964 we will convert the existing service center in Ogden, Utah, and activate the two remaining service centers in the New York and Chicago regions.

At the rate we are now proceeding, every taxpayer in the United States will have his returns processed under this new system by 1966.

It is with much pleasure and pride that I make these announcements and welcome you to our ceremonies today. We in the Internal Revenue Service believe that this new direction in tax processing dedicated here will have a profound effect on the future health of our American system of government.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, as a matter of further interest and information, regarding the role of the Federal Government in pioneering computer applications, the Honorable John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, recently delivered a most enlightening address on this subject before a national symposium of the Federal Government Accountants Association. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of Chairman Macy's remarks printed in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY JOHN W. MACY, JR., CHAIRMAN, U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION, BEFORE THE 10TH ANNUAL NATIONAL SYMPOSIUM, FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTANTS ASSOCIATION, SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 18, 1961

Government was far ahead of business in the use of EDP back in 1951, and it is still in the lead. Government has pioneered computer application and continues to pioneer it. Federal officials you will hear in this symposium are the leaders, not the followers, in the development of complex, large-scale applications of technology to assist management in reaching critical public decisions.

A brief review of the historical growth in automatic data processing gives us proper perspective on Government leadership.

The Univac which General Electric put into operation at Louisville, Ky., in the summer of 1954 was the first of these systems in business, but the first large-scale fully automatic business data processing system was delivered to a U.S. Government agency, the Bureau of the Census, in 1951.

By the end of 1957, 121 electronic systems for data processing had been installed in Government agencies. By 1957 almost every major activity in Government having large-scale paperwork and recordkeeping functions had been affected in some degree by the introduction of electronic systems.

Today there are over 700 computer systems operating in 30 Government agencies.

John Pfeiffer, in his book titled "The Human Brain," states that we need computers because we have developed ways of living too complicated for our brains to cope with. The needs, tasks, and responsibilities of big management have become so large and complex that they are no longer understandable or manageable without the aid of the modern computer. The conclusion is that the complex circuity and design of the computer are necessary to simplify life in management. Just as thousands of years ago man learned to use simple handtools and mechanical devices to help him better cope with his environment, we have had to develop new methods to cope with the complexity of the mid-20th-century environment.

EDP is only one example of the new methods and concepts crowding in upon us.

The scope of Government operations demands leadership in developing these new ways. It demands that we understand and make use of each new concept and practice that will help us do a better job.

The rapidity of change is best illustrated by the fact that in less than half a century we can see three tides in the development of management, each one overtaking its predecessors and leaving its mark.

First of these was the era of scientific management, which placed a premium upon functional specialization according to a careful analysis of the one best way to do a job. A hallmark of scientific management was the fractionating of superivsion and the separation of planning and control from the actual conduct of operations. It was an era of emphasis on devices to assure compliance. The ascendancy of machine-model scientific management over individual artisanship was expressed in industry in the formation of the great Detroit assembly lines. In government this thinking could be seen in emphasis on centralization and uniform practices—in the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, which led to the important establishment of the Bureau of the Budget.

The 1921 act represented a major revision in the whole budgetary procedure. It disposed of the practice whereby each agency came to Congress on its own and it focused upon an increase in Presidential control over financial planning. For the first time we had a national budgetary system. On the audit side we also saw the requirement of centrally prescribed and relatively uniform accounting and review systems. The General Accounting Office actually kept the books of the Post Office Department until 1950.

Another administrative revolution was being generated even before the techniques of scientific management were in full flower. The work of Elton Mayo and his followers gave impetus to the participative management philosophy. It was realized that the release of productivity and the success of programs were dependent upon the involvement of people in goals and methods. Management's interest again turned to decentralization and the placing of responsibility for results at the locus of operations.

The 1940's witnessed the development of concepts underlying the Budget and Accounting Act of 1950, which decentralized responsibility for financial management to agenices under general guidelines prescribed by the central agencies. These general guidelines permitted variation in practice to meet the needs of management in each agency, while they retained the element of consistency with central review. Although the term "financial management" did not come into general use until 1953 or 1954, I was exposed to some of the earliest uses of the new concept during my own experience at the Atomic Energy Commission in the late 1940's.

Now we are on the threshold of a new wave of managerial advance in which we will draw heavily upon a new concept of science in management. Contributions by mathematicians, statisticians, industrial engineers, and such social scientists as psychologists and economists are converging to provide new approaches to solving intricate management problems. We are finding new ways of thinking about the handling of information. We employ the capabilities of electronics both in the rapid communication of data and its manipulation.

We are thus in a position to bring more testable data to bear upon problems and to simulate solutions. While historical data will continue to be important for knowing what has happened, so that adjustments in direction can be made, managers are increasingly in need of predictive information. The concepts of operations research and the other "optimization" techniques have enhanced management's judgment by sharpening various alternative courses of action available to them, including the interrelated "penalties" and benefits accruing to each course.

The ability to obtain current, accurate, and meaningful information of the most comprehensive sort is yesterday's dream come true for those who carry the day-to-day administrative responsibility.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 15, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, who art the hope of all the ends of the earth, and the kindly light that leads us on through the encircling gloom: Help us who grope in the darkness of earth's dim ways to ever remember that even the shadows themselves are born of light. As Thy servants in this chamber face the tasks of another week, lift upon them the light of Thy countenance; may they be saved from despair by the hope that sends a shining ray far down the future's broadening way.

Even while we are spurred to fight with all our might against the present evil which threatens freemen everywhere, may we also be lured by the vision splendid of a coming good. To this end deliver us, we pray, from the political policies which are symptoms of spiritual disease. Give us the needed courage and strength for the arduous and vast tasks of rebuilding the waste places of the earth, if at last life for all men under all skies is to be made full and free.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

SAM J. ERVIN, JR., a Senator from the State of North Carolina, RUSSELL B. LONG, a Senator from the State of Louisiana, and JAMES O. EASTLAND, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, attended the session of the Senate today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 11, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 297)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 802(a) of the Housing Act of 1954, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the 14th Annual Report of the Housing and Home Finance Agency covering housing activities for the calendar year 1960.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 13, 1961.*

REPORT OF U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 263)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the U.S. Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 15, 1962.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in execution session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar, under the rule, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that speeches in connection with the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW AT NOON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the

Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon, tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STOCK DISTRIBUTION TREATED AS RETURN OF CAPITAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, at the conclusion of the morning hour, the unfinished business will be laid down; and it will be House bill 8847, Calendar No. 1080, the so-called Du Pont bill.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR SENATOR BRIDGES ON JANUARY 17

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, again I announce to the Senate, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader and myself, that there is an agreement to hold memorial services for our late and beloved colleague, Senator Bridges, of New Hampshire, at 1:30 p.m. on January 17, which is Wednesday of this week.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Navy Monthly Flight Pay

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, on Navy monthly flight pay, covering the 6-month period ended December 31, 1961; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Air Force Flying Pay

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on U.S. Air Force flying pay, covering the period March 1, 1961, through August 31, 1961 (accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Flight Training Program

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of the flight training program, covering the period August 1, 1960, to November 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Final Valuations of Certain Properties Under Interstate Commerce Act

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of final valuations of certain properties (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co.

A letter from the Washington counsel for the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Nobel Peace Prize Award Notices

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, copies of the 1962 Nobel Peace Prize award notices (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report on Review of Atomic Energy Commission and Department of the Navy Large Surface Ship Reactor A1W Land-based Prototype Project

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of Atomic Energy Commission and Department of the Navy large surface ship reactor A1W land-based prototype project constructed under contracts with Westinghouse Electric Corp., dated January 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Positions in Certain Grades of Classification Act of 1949

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18 in the General Accounting Office, covering the calendar year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Disposition of Executive Papers

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Archivist of the United States on a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. Johnston and Mr. Carlson members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the North Carolina Utilities Commission, Raleigh, N.C., favoring the ownership and operation of space communications facilities by investor-owned common carriers, subject to appropriate Government regulations; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The petition of Francisco Cepero, of Santurce, P.R., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DEVELOPMENT OF GOGEBIC IRON RANGE—JOINT RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently I received from State Senator Clifford W. Krueger a joint resolution adopted by the Wisconsin Legislature. The joint resolution reflects a tremendous need for improving the iron ore mines in northern Wisconsin and the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. Located in the North American continent, these low-grade iron ore deposits represent a real potential asset both economically and defensewise. Unfortunately, the need for greater developmental work in economical processing of the ore in the Gogebic Range has resulted in a shutdown of the mines. What has been the result? First, a serious economical setback for the communities dependent upon the mine operations; and second, retardation of development of one of our great and essential resources: domestic iron ore. The resolution requests the Congress to further investigate the problems and the considerations of stagnation in the ore development program.

Recognizing that this joint resolution reflects upon problems significant not only in Wisconsin, but to the Nation, I request unanimous consent to have the joint resolution printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Joint Resolution 141A

December 18, 1961—Introduced by entire membership. Adopted.

Joint resolution memorializing Congress regarding an investigation of the problems affecting the future of the iron ore mines on the Gogebic Iron Range in northern Wisconsin and Upper Peninsula of Michigan.

Whereas the majority of the deep shaft iron mines on the Gogebic Iron Range have ceased operations, thereby creating a serious economic hardship on the peoples and the communities involved; and

Whereas the future of the remaining mines is extremely doubtful, thereby creating an ever-increasing unemployment problem; and

Whereas we strongly believe that these mines must be kept operative and competitive in the national interest as well as in the local economic interest; and

Whereas it has been proved that there exist tremendous reserves of iron ore in the Gogebic Iron Range, which ore can be beneficiated and pelletized, thereby creating a product which is in demand by the steel companies; and

Whereas these processes of beneficiation and pelletizing demand large quantities of low-cost fuel which is not now available in the immediate area. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin request the Congress of the United States to name a committee to investigate the problems and the causes of the economic decline of the Gogebic Iron Range, as reviewed herein and seek a satisfactory solution to these problems to the end that the economic health of the area be restored; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be submitted to the President of the United States, the Governors of Wisconsin and Michigan, the U.S. Senators and Representatives of the States of Michigan and Wisconsin, and the house and senate of the State of Michigan.

PROTECTION OF THE GOLDEN EAGLE—RESOLUTION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, recently I received a statement from Gerard Brodeur, worthy president, Narragansett Aerie No. 0205, Fraternal Order of Eagles, enclosing a resolution unanimously adopted by the Narragansett Aerie endorsing Senate Joint Resolution 105 introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] and proposing that this joint resolution be amended to include protection for any golden eagle.

Mr. President, since the eagle is our national symbol, I firmly believe that all efforts to preserve the American eagle deserve encouragement and most serious consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by the Narragansett Aerie No. 0205, Fraternal

Order of Eagles, be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Fraternal Order of Eagles, at its annual 1961 convention, unanimously adopted a resolution to undertake a 5-year, continentwide research survey program, in cooperation with the National Audubon Society, to save the American bald eagle from extinction; and

Whereas the Eagles also endorsed Senate Joint Resolution 105, introduced by Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, of Texas, and cosponsors, which would amend the Bald Eagle Act of 1940 to extend protection to the golden eagle; and

Whereas protection of the golden eagle will afford greater protection for the bald eagle, national symbol of the United States of America, because the bald eagle is often killed by persons mistaking it for the golden eagle: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That our aerie go on record to support Senate Joint Resolution 105, amending the Bald Eagle Act of 1940 by inserting immediately after the words "American eagle" the words "or any golden eagle" (sec. 1 of the act entitled, "An act for the protection of the bald eagle," approved June 8, 1940; 54 Stat. 250; 16 U.S.C. 668), and that section 2 of such act be amended by inserting immediately after the words "bald eagle" the words "or the golden eagle"; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the U.S. Senators from our State to make known our support of the bill and also to seek their support of Senate Joint Resolution 105.

GERARD BRODEUR,
Worthy President.
MOZART A. MAILLOUX,
Secretary.

REPORT OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND U.S. DOLLARS UTILIZED BY COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES DURING 1961 IN CONNECTION WITH FOREIGN TRAVEL

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by that committee in 1961 in connection with foreign travel.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, U.S. Senate

[Expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961]

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Stephen M. Young:											
Spain	Pesetas	8,000	134.00	4,360	73.04	1,580	26.92	1,025	17.17	14,965	251.13
Switzerland	Francs	780	183.53	490	115.30	220	51.77	90	21.18	1,580	371.78
Total			317.53		188.34		78.69		38.35		622.91

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$622.91

ROBERT S. KERR,
Chairman, Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

JAN. 9, 1962.

REPORT ENTITLED "SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, 1961"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1117)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senate Small Business Committee, I submit a report entitled "Small Business Administration, 1961." I ask that the report be printed, together with the individual views of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS BY, AND INCREASED EXPENDITURES FOR, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 242); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to Indian affairs; irrigation and reclamation; minerals, materials, and fuels; public lands; and territories and insular affairs.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

CONTINUING STUDY OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1118)

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 246), and submitted a report thereon, which resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make complete studies of any and all matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States and their administration.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; (3) to hold such hearings, to take such testimony, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; and (4) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government, as the committee deems advisable.

SEC. 3. In the conduct of its studies the committee may use the experience, knowledge, and advice of private organizations, schools, institutions, and individuals in its discretion and it is authorized to divide the work of the studies among such individuals, groups, and institutions as it may deem appropriate and may enter into contracts for this purpose.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $160,000 for the period ending January 31, 1963, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ASSISTANCE TO SENATORS IN CONNECTION WITH INTERPARLIAMENTARY ACTIVITIES AND RECEPTION OF FOREIGN OFFICIALS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT NO. 1119)

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 247), and submitted a report thereon, which resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in order to assist the Senate properly to discharge and coordinate its activities and responsibilities in connection with participation in various interparliamentary institutions and to facilitate the interchange and reception in the United States of members of foreign legislative bodies and prominent officials of foreign governments, the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized effective February 1, 1962, and until otherwise provided by law, to employ one additional professional staff member to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of section 202(e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay the actual and necessary expenses incurred in connection with activities authorized by this resolution and approved in advance by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which shall not exceed $5,000 each fiscal year, effective February 1, 1962, and until otherwise provided by law, from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers certified by the Senator incurring such expenses and approved by the chairman.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 2665. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an amendatory contract with the Burley Irrigation District, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHURCH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2666. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the sale of his principal residence by a taxpayer who has attained the age of 60 years; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 2667. A bill for the relief of Sebastiana Santoro;

S. 2668. A bill for the relief of Francelina Jorge Querido, Jose Jorge Querido, Juis Jorge Querido, Elizia Jorge Querido, and Izabel Jorge Querido; and

S. 2669. A bill to amend Public Law 84-417; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2670. A bill to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to extend to imported tangerines the restrictions imposed by such section on certain other imported commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 2671. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain phosphate rights to the Dr. P. Phillips Foundation of Orlando, Fla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 2672. A bill for the relief of Jack Baer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 2673. A bill to amend section 1613 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that periods spent on active duty pursuant to recall occurring after August 1, 1961, and before January 1, 1962, shall not be counted in determining the period within which certain education and training must be initiated or completed; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mrs. NEUBERGER when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 2674. A bill to amend section 309(a)(1)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 2675. A bill for the relief of Yiannoula Vasiliou Tsambiras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 2676. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 to provide that Federal savings and loan associations may establish and operate new branches in States only if State savings and loan associations, or State banks and trust companies, are permitted by State law or practice to establish and operate new branches in such States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 2677. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to crediting certain service of females sworn in as members of telephone operating units, Signal Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 2678. A bill to amend the act authorizing participation of States in revenue from certain wildlife refuges in order to increase the amount of such participation; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 2679. A bill for the relief of John Alex Arvidson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 2680. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an amendatory contract with the Burley Irrigation District, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2681. A bill for the relief of Southwestern Medical Foundation of Dallas, Texas; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts:

S. 2682. A bill for the relief of Silvestero A. Moco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS BY, AND INCREASED EXPENDITURES FOR, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 242) authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction, and authorizing certain expenditures therefor, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. ANDERSON, which appears under a separate heading.)

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. KERR (for Mr. CHAVEZ) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 243) authorizing the Committee on Public Works to make a study of certain matters within its jurisdiction, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Works, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under Sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to flood control, navigation, rivers and harbors, roads and highways, water pollution, public buildings, and all features of water resource development.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS RELATING TO PUBLIC AND PRIVATE HOUSING BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 244) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters relating to public and private housing, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the

Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to public and private housing.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $107,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARING ENTITLED "RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEAMSTERS UNION AND MINE, MILL & SMELTER WORKERS"

Mr. EASTLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 245); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary five thousand copies of a hearing entitled "Relationship Between Teamsters Union and Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers," held by its Internal Security Subcommittee during the Eighty-seventh Congress, first session.

CONTINUING STUDY OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 246) to authorize a continuing study of U.S. foreign policy, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. FULBRIGHT, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

ASSISTANCE TO SENATORS IN CONNECTION WITH INTERPARLIAMENTARY ACTIVITIES AND RECEPTION OF FOREIGN OFFICIALS

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 247) to provide assistance to Members of the Senate in connection with interparliamentary activities and reception of foreign officials, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. FULBRIGHT.)

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT 59, 87TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution providing for the printing for an additional 20,000 copies of Senate Document 59 of the 87th Congress, 1st session, entitled "The Communist Party Line."

This document was prepared originally by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, for the Internal Security Subcommittee and contains, in layman's language, one of the finest analysis of Communist tactics and a guide for American citizens to help them spot the Communist Party line that I have ever read. The document covers foreign policy, domestic issues, labor, industry, agriculture, the Armed Forces, youth, women, culture, science, education, and a score of other fields in which Communists are attempting to penetrate or to destroy by means of propaganda and other tactics.

Mr. Hoover's document was distributed by the Internal Security Subcommittee and other Senators throughout the United States immediately following its printing on September 23 of last year. The response has been tremendous, and not a day goes by that requests for additional copies do not come to my office.

I have in my office requests for copies which cannot be filled because of the great demand which has depleted the subcommittee's supply. It is for this reason that I introduce this resolution requesting an additional 20,000 copies of this document. I am sure there are other Senators who have received requests for more copies of this pamphlet than are available. This is a practical means of educating our people on the typical Communist Party line, and I hope the Senate will give its approval to this resolution.

I have sent a letter to the chairman of the Rules Committee asking consideration of this resolution by that committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 248) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary twenty thousand additional copies of Senate Document 59 of the Eighty-seventh Congress, first session, entitled "The Communist Party Line" (prepared by J. Edgar Hoover for the Internal Security Subcommittee).

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 249) which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by S. Res. 58, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, and S. Res. 272, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to May 26, 1950, is authorized to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the problems of American small and independent business and to make recommendations concerning those problems to the appropriate legislative committees of the Senate.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AMENDATORY CONTRACT WITH BURLEY IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an amendatory contract with the Burley Irrigation District, and for other purposes.

The amendatory contract was approved by the Interior Department last August 29. That followed earlier approval, by a vote of 359 to 12, by the landowners of the Burley district. Congressional ratification is required; and this is the purpose of the bill I am introducing.

The principal feature of the amendatory contract is a discount of 0.7 mill per kilowatt-hour for electrical energy furnished by the Bureau of Reclamation for irrigation pumping. In return, the district will forego its contractual right to share in net power revenues from units 1 to 6 of the Minidoka powerplant. Thus, the district's share in power receipts, which has been erratic in recent years, would be replaced by assured benefits in the form of reduced power rates. The arrangement will remove an anomaly in the Bureau's rate structure in southern Idaho, and will permit better utilization of irrigation and power facilities, not only at the Minidoka Dam, but also at the Palisades Dam upstream on the Snake River.

The bill I am introducing would also authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a similar contract with the Minidoka Irrigation District. If this amendatory contract is successfully negotiated, and is approved by the landowners, the power facilities on the Minidoka project can be fully coordinated with other Federal installations on the Snake River, under a uniform rate structure.

I am hopeful that the bill can be promptly enacted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2665) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an amendatory contract with the Burley

Irrigation District, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Church, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXCLUSION FROM GROSS INCOME GAIN REALIZED FROM SALE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY BY A TAXPAYER 60 YEARS OF AGE AND OLDER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the sale of his principal residence by a taxpayer who has attained the age of 60 years. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a short statement relating to the bill, prepared by me, be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2666) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the sale of his principal residence by a taxpayer who has attained the age of 60 years, introduced by Mr. Dirksen, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items specifically excluded from gross income) is amended by renumbering section 121 as 122, and by inserting after section 120 the following new section:

"Sec. 121. Gain from sale or exchange of residence of individual who has attained age 60.

"(a) General Rule.—In the case of an individual, gross income does not include gain from the sale or exchange after December 31, 1961, of property used by the taxpayer as his principal residence, if—

"(1) the taxpayer has attained the age of 60 years before such sale or exchange occurs, and

"(2) such property has been used by the taxpayer as his principal residence for a period of not less than 5 years at the time such sale or exchange occurs.

"(b) Property Held Jointly by Husband and Wife.—In the case of property held by a husband and wife as joint tenants or as tenants by the entirety, the age requirement contained in subsection (a)(1) and the use requirement contained in subsection (a)(2) shall be treated as having been met by both the husband and the wife if it is met by either spouse.

"(c) Property Used in Part as Principal Residence.—In the case of property only a portion of which is used by the taxpayer as his principal residence, subsection (a) shall apply to so much of the gain from the sale or exchange of such property as is determined, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, to be attributable to the portion of the property used by the taxpayer as his principal residence.

"(d) Involuntary Conversions.—For purposes of subsection (a), the destruction, seizure, requisition, or condemnation of property, occurring after December 31, 1961, shall be treated as the sale or exchange of such property."

(b) The table of sections for such part is amended by striking out

"Sec. 121. Cross references to other Acts."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"Sec. 121. Gain from sale or exchange of residence of individual who has attained age 60.

"Sec. 122. Cross references to other Acts."

Sec. 2. (a) Section 1033 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to involuntary conversions) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) For exclusion from gross income of gain from involuntary conversion occurring after December 31, 1961, of residence of taxpayer who has attained age 60, see section 121."

(b) Section 1034 of such Code (relating to sale or exchange of residence) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(k) Cross Reference.—

"For exclusion from gross income of gain from sale or exchange after December 31, 1961, of residence of taxpayer who has attained age 60, see section 121."

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1961.

The statement presented by Mr. Dirksen is as follows:

Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen today introduced a bill to provide older people with tax relief when they wish to sell a home which has become unsuitable for their needs.

Adoption of Senator Dirksen's proposal will help fill a major gap in Federal legislation to assure suitable housing for older people.

The bill provides that when people 60 years of age or over sell dwellings occupied by them as homes for 5 years or more, the gains realized from such sales will be exempt from either Federal income or capital gains taxes.

During the Republican 80th Congress, special tax relief for older persons was created through the double personal exemption for persons over 65. The Dirksen bill is a further application of this principle.

Two-thirds of the couples over 65 and many single or widowed older persons now own their own homes, mostly mortgage free. Some are living in houses bought early in life for their families. Now, with their children out on their own, the original home may be too big for their needs; may, indeed, be a burden. Should they want to sell the home, however, they may find themselves confronted with a sizable loss through the combined impact of inflation and Federal taxes.

The tax loss, often solely the result of paper profits created by reduced purchasing power of the dollar, often serves as a major deterrent to procurement of housing more suited to the modified living patterns of older people. Where it has not stopped such sales, it has imposed a hardship on many older people who have sold their homes for whatever reason. It would seem appropriate for the Congress to correct the inequity in such situations.

Recognition already has been given to special housing needs of older people in many ways. Authorization of public housing programs for those with extremely low incomes, creation of home-loan programs for individuals with limited assets and for groups desiring to construct senior citizen dwellings as well as other congressional acts have gone a long way toward adequate housing for many older people.

The one group, and it is a large one, that has been ignored is that composed of older persons who already own their own homes. Justice would dictate that these people, too, be given recognition. It could be argued that present tax laws now force them to pay for a substantial portion of public housing provided less fortunate senior citizens. Certainly, current laws, as they relate to taxes on the sale of a home, reduce the ability of older homeowners to provide for their own needs without recourse to public programs.

The bill provides for such tax relief after age 60, because it is impossible to determine precisely when such an adjustment in an older person's housing arrangements may occur. Conceivably a move to a smaller home before retirement may be desirable. Possibly a home might be sold quite late in life and the proceeds added to the older person's income-producing capital, or even used to buy a life-care contract in one of the homes such as those now sponsored by many church groups.

Admittedly, many older people will want to remain in the homes they have occupied all their lives. Those who might want to make a change, however, should not be subject to the injustice of losing a substantial part of their home-ownership equity. The Dirksen bill, by providing tax relief, will expand the older homeowner's freedom to meet his own needs in his own way, a freedom which most senior citizens cherish deeply.

LEGISLATION NEEDED TO PRESERVE EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS OF KOREAN CONFLICT VETERANS WHO HAVE AGAIN BEEN CALLED TO MILITARY DUTY

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, some 155,000 members of the Reserve and National Guard have been called to active duty as a result of congressional action during recent weeks. Referring to these men, President Kennedy said:

> The overwhelming majority bear their burdens and their Nation's burdens with admirable and traditional devotion.

Many of these National Guardsmen and reservists are veterans of the Korean conflict and are entitled to educational and other benefits approved by Congress. Under the terms of section 1613 of title 8, an eligible veteran must complete his educational training within 8 years after his discharge or release from active duty and such training must commence within 3 years from discharge or release. Those Korean conflict veterans who have been recalled to active duty are prevented by the national emergency from meeting the statutory time periods presently prescribed by law. This creates a needless hardship which I am sure Congress will want to correct.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which provides that in computing the periods prescribed by law the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall disregard all periods during which the veteran served on active duty pursuant to a call or order issued after July 30, 1961, and before January 1, 1962.

This proposed legislation seems only simple justice, to preserve educational training rights for veterans who served in Korea and who are again faithfully serving their Nation. Let us keep faith with those who have been called. I urge the Congress to give prompt and favorable consideration to this proposal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2673) to amend section 1613 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that periods spent on active duty pursuant to recall occurring after August 1, 1961, and before January 1, 1962, shall not be counted in determining the period within which certain education and training must be initiated or completed, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO SIT DURING THE SESSIONS OF THE SENATE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be authorized to sit during the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the present session of Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE REPORTS, WITH NOTICES OF MOTIONS, DURING ADJOURNMENTS OR RECESSES OF THE SENATE DURING THE 2D SESSION OF THE 87TH CONGRESS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during adjournments or recesses of the Senate during the 2d session of the 87th Congress, the Committee on Appropriations be authorized to report appropriation bills, including joint resolutions, with accompanying notices of motions to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of offering certain amendments to such bills or joint resolutions, which proposed amendments shall be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection of the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF SUBPARAGRAPH A.3 OF ARTICLE VI OF STATUTE OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, today the President of the United States transmitted to the Senate, Executive A, 87th Congress, 2d session, a copy of the amendment to the first sentence of subparagraph A.3 of article VI of the statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency, approved by the General Conference of the Agency of October 4, 1961. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the amendment, and that the amendment and the message from the President be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the message from the President be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to acceptance, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the amendment to the first sentence of subparagraph A.3 of article VI of the statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency, approved by the General Conference of the Agency on October 4, 1961. The amendment relates to the composition of the Board of Governors and provides for more equitable representation on the Board for the area "Africa and the Middle East."

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the amendment.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 15, 1962.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Certified copy of the amendment.).

STOCK DISTRIBUTION TREATED AS RETURN OF CAPITAL—AMENDMENTS

Mr. GORE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8847) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that a distribution of stock made to an individual (or certain corporations) pursuant to an order enforcing the antitrust laws shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital; and to provide that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nominations of George W. Ball to be Under Secretary of State, George C. McGhee to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, Frederick G. Dutton to be an Assistant Secretary of State, W. Averell Harriman to be an Assistant Secretary of State, Walt Whitman Rostow to be Counselor of the Department of State, Chester Bowles to be Ambassador at Large, John O. Bell to be Ambassador to Guatemala, John H. Burns to be Ambassador to the Central African Republic, William A. Crawford to be Ambassador to Rumania, Parker T. Hart now Ambassador to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and Minister to the Kingdom of Yemen in addition to be Ambassador to the State of Kuwait, William J. Handley to be Ambassador to the Republic of Mali, Ridgway B. Knight to be Ambassador to the Syrian Arab Republic, Henry R. Labouisse to be Ambassador to Greece, Armin H. Meyer to be Ambassador to the Republic of Lebanon, William E. Stevenson to be Ambassador to the Philippines, Raymond L. Thurston to be Ambassador to Haiti, Dr. Ansley J. Coale to be U.S. Representative on the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, William S. Gaud to be Assistant Administrator for the Near East and South Asia in the Agency for International Development, Edmond C. Hutchinson to be Assistant Administrator for Africa and Europe in the Agency for International Development, Seymour J. Janow to be Assistant Administrator for the Far East in the Agency for International Development, Teodoro Moscoso to be Assistant Administrator for Latin America in the Agency for International Development, William C. Foster to be Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Adrian S. Fisher to be Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

Mr. President, also as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nominations of Ellis O. Briggs to be Ambassador to Spain, John M. Cabot to be Ambassador to Poland, and Robert McClintock to be Ambassador to Argentina.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 4, Public Law 106, 84th Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. KIRWAN as a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Construction of a Building for Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of title 20, United States Code sections 42, 43, the Speaker had appointed Mr. KIRWAN as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KUCHEL:

Address entitled "Community Action for Clean Air," delivered by him at Fifth Annual Medical Conference on Air Pollution sponsored by California State Department of Public Health, December 7, 1961, at University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.

By Mr. BUSH:

Statement issued jointly by him and Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, giving preliminary views on pending tariff proposals and barriers to greater free world unity, and editorial comment from Connecticut newspapers.

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from statement outlining challenges for 1962 dealt with in the President's state of the Union message.

Weekend broadcast by himself over Wisconsin radio stations dealing with the economic outlook for 1962.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Introductory remarks by Mr. RANDOLPH, remarks by Hon. Robert T. Griffin; remarks by Mr. RANDOLPH at the dedication of the U.S. courthouse and Federal office building, Charleston, W. Va., October 12, 1961; remarks by Gov. W. W. Barron; acknowledgments to those present by Representative John M. Slack, Jr.; remarks by Hon. John A. Shanklin, mayor of the city of Charleston, W. Va.; remarks by Hon. Chapman Revercomb.

By Mr. CLARK:

Article entitled "Toward Equitable Treatment of Americans Abroad," by Representative THOMAS E. MORGAN, published in the Committee Reporter, issue of November 1961.

VERNON L. TALBERTT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, when the Senate convened for this session, it convened for the first time in 51 years without the official presence of Mr. Vernon L. Talbertt. For that many years, plus 6 months and 8 days, Mr. Talbertt was an employee of the Office of the Secretary of the Senate, and for a long time the chief messenger of that office.

Mr. Talbertt served under nine successive Secretaries of the Senate. He has watched the making of history and tradition in this Chamber since the turn of the century. His service to the Senate and, through it, to the Nation, constitutes an extraordinary record of continuous dedication and loyalty.

I did not want the occasion of his retirement to pass without having reference to it appear in the RECORD of the Senate, of which he has been so much a part for a half century. I know that every Member of this body joins me in wishing Vernon Talbertt many many years of contentment and happiness.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the interesting thing about Vernon Talbertt's service is that with the exception of 1 year—when he was in the Army—his service to the Senate continued for more than 51 years. I think it will be generally agreed that there is an atmosphere of instability and uncertainty that somehow besets the whole world today. So, Mr. President, when a man has been faithfully and devotedly serving his government and serving this body for more than 50 years, with only one intervening year when he did not serve here, that is an outstanding record and a great testimonial to his fidelity, to his character, and his devotion to the Government.

I salute Vernon Talbertt for his great service; and I shall wish to mark it further by sending him a letter on this occasion.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, Vernon Talbertt takes with him into retirement the friendship of all of us in this Chamber. Each of us has been most privileged to enjoy his long friendship. Over the years in which I have participated in the Senate, I have often had the opportunity to know Vernon, his sweet disposition, his desire to serve and assist.

I am sure I correctly voice the hopes and prayers of all the Members of the Senate when I say that as he goes into retirement he may have many years of happiness head. I must add that we all hope he visits the Senate as often as he can.

THE RICHARD L. NEUBERGER MAGAZINE EDITOR AWARD

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, shortly before the Christmas holidays, members of the Society of Magazine Writers gathered in New York City, to honor the memory of one of their distinguished colleagues—and one of ours as well—the late Richard L. Neuberger, an author and writer of national reputation before he came to the U.S. Senate. We who knew Dick Neuberger as the junior Senator from Oregon have had occasion many times to recall his accomplishments as a legislator and a political leader. As an indication of their high regard for his talents, Dick Neuberger's fellow craftsmen in the writing profession have established an annual award in his name. On December 13, 1961, the first annual Richard L. Neuberger Award was presented to Mr. Robert Stein, editor of Redbook magazine. In keeping with Dick Neuberger's own interests and motivations, the award is to be given each year to the magazine editor judged by the magazine writers to have done the most to raise the standards of magazines as a medium of democratic communication.

It is a pleasure for me to report to the Senate the establishment of the Richard L. Neuberger Award and I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD with my remarks a summary of the award presentation, which was provided by the Society of Magazine Writers.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESENTATION OF THE RICHARD L. NEUBERGER AWARD FOR 1961, AT THE HOTEL ASTOR, NEW YORK CITY, DECEMBER 13, 1961

(By Vance Packard)

This year the Society of Magazine Writers has continued to make progress toward becoming a national organization that is the spokesman and conscience of the professional magazine writer. We have decided to express publicly our admiration for what we feel are outstanding performances in magazine editing.

We have established this year the annual Richard L. Neuberger Award, to go to the editor or publisher who has done the most, in our view, to raise the standards of magazines as a medium of democratic communication. The late Richard L. Neuberger, as most of you know, was a courageous and distinguished magazine writer, was the first magazine writer to become a Member of the U.S. Senate, and was a member of the Society of Magazine Writers.

As you may know, Dick Neuberger's widow succeeded him in the Senate. She has recently undergone an operation in Portland, Oreg. This morning I received this message, dictated by Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER from a hospital bed:

"I am proud that Dick's fellow writers are honoring his memory by paying tribute to the magazine editor who has done the most in the past year to raise the standards of magazines as a medium of democratic communication.

"Dick often used to say: 'I'm looked down upon because I am a politician, but I am looked up to because I am a writer.' He used this as emphasis in trying to get his audiences to realize the importance of their concern for their elected officials. It was always music to his ears to say: 'I am a writer.'

"Even before his last illness he often talked to me about relinquishing his Senate seat to return to writing. He took much greater satisfaction in seeing his byline in print than in reading all the column-inches about him.

"May this award help to bring an increased richness of thought and sensitivity to our national literary scene as you honor Dick in the profession he loved.

"MAURINE B. NEUBERGER,
"U.S. Senator, Oregon."

A large number of our members have proposed candidates for the first Richard L. Neuberger Award. On November 25 the awards committee met to choose a winner from among those nominated. The committee was under the chairmanship of Donald Robinson, a past president of the Society of Magazine Writers, and consisted of other past presidents and your current president. Attending the meeting to vote were James Poling, Robert L. Heilbroner, Morton M. Hunt, Jack Harrison Pollack, Lawrence Lader, Jhan Robbins, and Murray Teigh Bloom. Absentee ballots were received from Morton Sontheimer and Temple Fielding.

It might be appropriate to read an excerpt from the letter in which the editor chosen by the awards committee as the winner was nominated:

"Over the years I have known no other popular magazine that has been as courageous in its approach to social problems as the one edited by this man. It was one of the first to write about integration, to examine the problems of public education, of pseudo-religion, of national morality, of social welfare problems. As a writer, I have appreciated two articles of this editor's faith: one has been that he trusted the writer to judge facts and express his own opinion—it was not always vital to attribute everything to 'experts' and he has not expected the writer to start out with an editor-defined viewpoint. The second has been that no article needs to end up with 'nine things you can do.' It has been enough if the article calls the reader's attention to a serious problem and perhaps makes that reader stop and think about it."

Tonight it gives me great pleasure and satisfaction to present the first Richard L. Neuberger Award to Robert Stein, editor of Redbook magazine. The award plaque reads:

"The Society of Magazine Writers presents the Richard L. Neuberger Award to Robert Stein, Redbook, as the editor who has done the most in the year 1961 to raise the standards of magazines as a medium of democratic communication.

"VANCE PACKARD,
"President.

"DECEMBER 13, 1961."

In accepting the award, Mr. Stein spoke as follows:

"I should accept this award with humility, but I prefer to accept it with pride—pride in all the editors of Redbook, who work with a dedication that goes far beyond the requirements of any job; pride in the McCall Corp., which subscribes to and acts on the principle that substance and service are the soundest basis for commercial success; and, of course, pride in the writers, without whom nothing could be accomplished.

"If I understand this award correctly, it signifies your belief that what all of us do for a living has a social value and meaning that goes far beyond our selfish satisfaction and it signifies your hope that what we do can have more value and meaning as times goes on. In that belief and in that hope I join you wholeheartedly. And, on a personal level, I thank you for one of the most gratifying moments of my life."

ALLIANCE FOR LIBERTY

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] recently published an article in the Shingle, publication of the Philadelphia Bar Association, in which he outlined reasons for concern by the United States because of actions of the so-called neutralist nations.

Senator SCOTT recommends a thorough overhauling of U.S. policy toward the neutralists, and advocates that the United States propose an alliance for liberty in which like-minded nations would pledge allegiance in joint covenant to the ultimate freedom of mankind.

I commend the distinguished Senator for his thoughtful article, and request unanimous consent that a column written by Gould Lincoln, and published in the Washington Star of January 9, in which Senator SCOTT's proposals are discussed, be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALLIANCE FOR LIBERTY PROPOSED

(By Gould Lincoln)

Congress, through its committees, is going to take a hard look at the so-called neutralist nations, their activities and votes in the United Nations, and at the U.N. itself. The committees primarily will be those dealing with foreign affairs and policies, the Appropriations Committees, and perhaps those dealing with Government operations. Democrats and Republicans alike will join in such inquiries. Many Members of Congress have been concerned over the manner in which some of these neutralist countries have taken our aid and money and in the United Nations have sided with Soviet Russia and the Communist bloc generally.

Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, Republican, writing in the Shingle, publication of the Philadelphia Bar Association, has set forth many of the reasons for concern on the part of the United States over the neutralists. Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, a Republican member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, believes a great effort will be made to be more realistic; to work more closely with our friends among the nations, and to be more selective in giving aid to peoples who believe and go along with American ideas of freedom and democratic government.

Not only did Senator SCOTT recommend a thorough overhauling of U.S. foreign policy on neutralist nations, but he also proposed that the United States offer the world an "alliance for liberty" with those other nations which would "pledge allegiance in joint covenant to the ultimate freedom of mankind."

CALL SELVES THIRD FORCE

"Neutralist is the not wholly accurate term applied to certain nations which refuse to identify themselves with either the free or the Communist countries," Senator SCOTT wrote. "The would-be leader of the neutralists is India. Other members of this bloc include most of the Arab countries, several nations in the Far East and Africa, and such Red bedfellows as Yugoslavia and Cuba. These countries are not neutral in the sense that Switzerland is neutral because of its long history of nonbelligerence, or in the sense that Finland is neutral because geography forces it to look down the barrels of Russian cannon. But, rather, the neutralists fancy themselves as a 'third bloc' or third force of nations which attempt to act as counterweights in the East-West struggle."

Senator SCOTT added that in a peaceful world of competition between peace-loving nations "there would be room for this sort of Venetian diplomacy. But in a world where barbed wire separates slave states from free nations, national leaders who fail to distinguish between the principles of freedom and the principles of Lenin seriously undermine the strength of the free world."

The Pennsylvania Senator charged that some neutralist leaders play both sides against the middle for their own national or personal advantage. He criticized severely the failure of the neutralist nations' meeting in Belgrade to condemn the action of the Russian Communists when they resumed atmospheric nuclear tests last summer. Some of the neutralist leaders spoke briefly of their "regret," and others said they understood why Russia had to take this action. "This," wrote Senator SCOTT, "sounds like Tweedledum who said to Alice: 'I am very brave generally; only today I happen to have a headache.' "

LIST OF U.S. AID

Senator SCOTT detailed the amount—more than $6 billion—which the United States has given or loaned to the 24 neutralist countries which met at Belgrade. He showed the following: Yugoslavia, $2,081 million; India, $1,906 million; Indonesia, $479 million; United Arab Republic, $346 million; Cambodia, $257 million; Morocco, $168 million; Tunisia, $142 million; Afghanistan, $116 million; Lebanon, $83 million; Ethiopia, $79 million; Burma, $73 million; Iraq, $69 million; Ceylon, $63 million; Cuba, $54 million; Sudan, $31 million; Nepal, $27 million; Saudi Arabia, $27 million; Congo Republic, $19 million; Yemen, $10 million; Cyprus, $7 million; Somali Republic, $7 million; Ghana, $5 million; Guinea, $2 million. For Mali the figures were not available. The total was $6,051 million.

Commenting on those neutralists who have accepted large sums from this country, Senator SCOTT pointed out that Yugoslavia is now blaming the West for all international tensions and urging us to accept the Russian "solution" for West Germany and West Berlin, which could only mean free world capitulation in Europe in the end. He wrote, too, that India has an almost unbroken record of voting with the Red bloc in the U.N., or abstaining from votes that might embarrass Russia. In Egypt, President Nasser has kept from the people the true extent of American aid to his country.

Senator SCOTT wrote that "as President Kennedy has suggested, our treatment of nations who share our views in times of crises should differ considerably from dealings with others." The Senator pointed out that cracks are appearing in the Communist bloc, but added that the strife is mostly over what kind of communism should rule the world. Nevertheless, he declared that this is the time for the free world—and also the neutralists—to show their loyalty to liberty.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF UNITED NATIONS ACTION IN THE CONGO

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, events in the Congo in recent months have confused and dismayed many Americans.

Our central interest in the Congo should be to make certain that it does not fall into Communist hands. The actions of the United Nations, strongly backed by the United States, appear, however, to run counter to what should be our national policy with respect to the Congo.

Conflicting and contradictory reports from both official and unofficial sources make it difficult, if not impossible, to reach valid judgments on the situation in the Congo.

If the American public cannot otherwise obtain the facts on a matter as important as this, then it is the duty of the Congress to bring the facts to light.

Accordingly, I urge the distinguish chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to initiate an investigation of the United Nations action in the Congo, as proposed in Senate Resolution 207, submitted by my able colleague from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

Some of the questions which must be answered in such an inquiry are:

First. What exactly is the policy of the United States in the Congo?

Second. What exactly is the policy and the role of the United Nations in the Congo?

Third. Why is it necessary for the United Nations to crush the only openly pro-Western, anti-Communist province in the Congo, Katanga Province under the leadership of M. Tshombe?

Fourth. Why have not the savage murderers of the 13 Italian United Nations airmen been apprehended and brought to justice?

Fifth. By what logic and by whose recommendation and decision have hundreds of Central Congolese troops been brought into the United Nations military force for use against Katanga Province?

Sixth. What are the facts surrounding the bombing of hospitals and other nonmilitary targets by U.N. forces in Katanga Province, and why has not responsibility for this senseless action been fixed?

Seventh. Why has it been necessary, and by what justice must the United States bear such a high share of the costs of United Nations activity in the Congo?

Eighth. Why have not the American people been given specific reasons for the objections of certain of our European allies, other than Belgium, in connection with U.N. and U.S. actions in the Congo?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "The Congo Mystery," which appeared in the Wall

Street Journal of December 12, 1961, be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONGO MYSTERY

No one seems able to give a satisfactory explanation of the mystery of American involvement in the United Nations war against the Congo's Katanga Province.

To be sure, explanations of sorts are available. Secretary of State Rusk offers this one: "Our aim is the consolidation of the Congo under a stable government which will be able to pursue freely the true national interests of the Congolese." That sounds all right, but actually it begs several fundamental questions.

For one, does anyone know what are the true national interests of the Congolese, or indeed if they have any? The evidence, amassed during nearly a year and a half of anarchy following Belgium's abrupt grant of independence, indicates that they do not. Like most other people in tropical Africa, they have tribal interests. The man out in the Congo bush does not have anything resembling a national concept in his head, and should not be expected to have.

That being the situation, what is the great virtue of "consolidation"? Ideally it could be argued that the best hope for the Congo's future would be unity under a central government; certainly it can be said that the Congo economy could use Katanga with its copper riches.

But we are confronting not an ideal theory but the brutal facts of clashing interests and chaos. Katanga's Tshombe wants an independent state or at most a loose federal association with the central government in Leopoldville. If that is the way it is, that is the way it is. It is not at all clear that the U.N. has some moral duty to subdue Tshombe by force. Secretary General Thant is no Abraham Lincoln trying to hold together a great nation; the notion would be laughable if it were not sad.

Yet one does sometimes get the dismaying impression that the United States is supporting the U.N. Congo operation not so much for the sake of the Congolese as for the sake of the U.N. In other words, the U.N. is doing this; therefore we must support it. That is a drastic distortion of logic; we ought to be realistic enough to see that the U.N., especially with its bloated membership these days, is perfectly capable of acting in diametric opposition to American national interest.

The United States it seems to us, has but one real interest in the Congo. It is not to see to it that the country is organized on a central government basis; it is to see to it that the Congo, however organized, does not fall into the hands of the Communists.

And Tshombe is not the Red villain in this piece; whatever else may be said of him, he is, or was, anti-Communist and pro-West. The dubious honor of stooging for the Soviets goes to Gizenga of Stanleyville, a vice premier in that precious central government the U.N. is so solicitous of. But nobody is going to war against him.

In supporting the U.N. war against Katanga, we are not only alienating Tshombe's affections, we are also generating grave disquiet in the capitals of some of our closest allies—Britain, France and Belgium. It must regretfully be observed that they are right in questioning U.S. policy in this messy business. For what we may be doing is preparing the way for a Communist takeover of the Congo.

At first the United States was on sound ground in supporting the U.N. operation, for it was directed against the right target. Thanks to the U.N. presence, it was possible for the Congo Government to evict the Soviet and Czechoslovak officials. But in recent months our policymakers have either got confused or somehow let the U.N. get out of hand.

The pity of it is that the United States should be calling the tune, for it is unquestionably paying the piper. We bear almost half the cost of the Congo activity; our Globemasters carry the U.N. troops to the fields of battle. The United States could shut down the whole enterprise if it wanted.

And perhaps that is what the United States had better start considering, unless it can get its own policy and the U.N. back on the right track.

EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday the National Science Foundation released a study which indicates dramatic success in Russia in educating scientific specialists. The study indicates that Soviet leaders are convinced that the education and training of their youth offers the key to the defeat of the Western World.

I must say that the study, which is the most comprehensive and complete study yet made of education by the Soviet Union, arrives at startling and important conclusions in regard to American educational policy.

The article goes on to point out:

> Since the average quality of Soviet science and engineering graduates is comparable to that of American graduates, the superiority in numbers must be considered a crucial advantage. It is likely to increase the proportion of above average or outstanding engineers who will emerge from the broader manpower base of the Soviet Union.
>
> Possibly even more significant is the fact that the proportion of university-trained manpower engaged in teaching in the Soviet Union is slightly more than twice that of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that this article from the New York Times, describing the National Science Foundation report, be printed in the RECORD at this point; together with an analysis by Mr. Nicholas DeWitt, a very able and capable man, who is primarily responsible for the report; together with an editorial from the Washington Post, commenting, in a very balanced and thoughtful way, on the significance of the report.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GAIN IN SOVIET SCIENCE TRAINING AND LAG IN HIGH SCHOOLS FOUND

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

The Soviet Union was pictured yesterday as having scored a dramtic success in educating scientific specialists while still being confronted by serious shortages of youthful skilled labor.

This picture emerged from a comprehensive study of Soviet education published by the National Science Foundation.

In the current decade, the Soviet Union will turn out 4 million university graduates, including 2,500,000 engineers and scientists, Nicholas DeWitt, author of the study, predicts.

At the same time, he disclosed that the Soviet schools had been forced, at least temporarily, to abandon their goal of universal and compulsory high school education. This has been necessitated by the severe shortage of young manpower for industry that has forced millions to quit school early.

Mr. DeWitt cautions, however, that the Soviet leaders are convinced that education and training of their youth offer the key to defeat of the Western World.

His analysis is part of an 856-page volume on "Education and Professional Employment in the U.S.S.R."

The research, sponsored jointly by the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council, was carried out at Harvard's Russian Research Center, where Mr. DeWitt is an associate.

Observers of comparative education describe the results of the 3-year study as more complete than any presently available research on American education.

Since the average quality of Soviet science and engineering graduates is comparable to that of American graduates, Mr. DeWitt remarked, the superiority in numbers must be considered a crucial advantage. It is likely to increase the proportion of above average or outstanding engineering who will emerge from the broader manpower base of the Soviet Union, he said.

Possibly even more significant is the fact that the proportion of university-trained manpower engaged in teaching in the Soviet Union is slightly more than twice that of the United States, he said. While the narrow specialization of Soviet graduates may turn into a disadvantage in the long run, Mr. DeWitt suggested, the immediate prospects are those of a serious manpower threat to the Western World.

On the issue of manpower shortages, as a result of wartime losses, the study shows that the Soviet population of the 8- to 14-year age group, which was 37 million in 1939, had been reduced to 23,500,000 by 1959.

In an introduction to the study, Dr. Alan T. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation, said that significant changes had taken place since Mr. DeWitt published a book on "Soviet Professional Manpower," in 1955.

"The dynamic growth of Soviet scientific manpower," Dr. Waterman wrote, "is found to have markedly accelerated, and there are currently indications that the Soviet Union intends to place even stronger emphasis upon engineering development and scientific research."

URGES NEW APPRAISALS

These developments, he went on, "call for a continuing reappraisal of conditions in the Soviet Union."

Mr. DeWitt also said that the United States "in the past 3 years has been moving a little more vigorously."

But he found that there was still a lack of "broad goals and objectives which ought to be stated by somebody."

The issue, Mr. DeWitt maintained, is how the quality of American education can be improved, now there is no longer any problem of the quantity of high school attendance.

"If the aim of education is to develop a creative intellect critical of society and its values, then Soviet higher education is an obvious failure," Mr. DeWitt concludes.

"If its aim is to develop applied professional skills enabling the individual to perform specialized, functional tasks, then Soviet higher education is unquestionably a success, posing not only a temporary challenge, but a major threat in the longrun struggle between democracy and totalitarianism."

Contrary to the predictions of many American educators, Mr. DeWitt reports that the current Soviet school reform, while limiting the educational opportunities of Soviet children, will increase rather than decrease the academic rigor of education for able students.

MUST QUIT SCHOOL EARLY

The majority of Soviet youths will be pressed into the productive labor force with substantially less schooling than the regular standards, Mr. DeWitt says. In most instances, they will have 8 years instead of 10.

Only a minority, composed of the more gifted, and perhaps, the more privileged, will be able to continue formal, full-time education.

For this group of the gifted and privileged, however, elementary and secondary education will offer 11 years of schooling, instead of 10 under the prereform system.

The students will get 12,828 hours of instruction, compared with 10,787, before the reform. Of this amount, 29 percent will be in science and mathematics and 33 percent in applied activities and vocation skills.

The content of science and technology in the curriculum, both theoretical and applied, is expected to increase, along with the study of foreign languages.

Following are some other major findings of the study:

The Soviet Union has no equivalent to the American college liberal arts programs and therefore relies on specialists, often engineers and scientists, for much of its industrial management.

In 1959, higher education in the Soviet Union had 2,200,000 students, compared with 3,600,000 enrolled in U.S. colleges and universities.

More than half of all Soviet higher education graduates are women, and women also comprise one-third of all engineering professionals, compared with 1 percent in the United States.

Although the Soviet Union leads in absolute numbers of graduates in applied fields of engineering and science, the United States graduates many more nonapplied or general scientists in the physical and biological sciences—35,700 in 1958, compared to about 21,000 in Russia. However, the American figures included between 5,000 and 10,000 prospective teachers, not counted in the Soviet total.

The total education base in the Soviet Union is still far below that of the United States, with the median number of years of completed schooling put at 4 in Russia, compared with 11 in the United States. However, although Russia now has only half as many higher education graduates as the United States, American universities currently produce about 90,000 engineering, science and applied science professionals a year. The Soviet output is 190,000.

Projections indicate that during the current decade the Soviet rate of production in these fields will reach 250,000 a year, more than twice the expected American rate.

In advanced graduate education, roughly the equivalent of the American Ph. D. level, the annual production of the two countries is about the same, between 8,500 and 10,000 a year. However, the sciences and engineering get 75 percent of the total in Russia, compared with 55 percent in the United States.

VOCATIONAL REPORTS SCORED

Mr. DeWitt reports that among the major problems of the current Soviet school reform, which demands that students in secondary school and applicants for university admission must work in factories, has been the lack of vocational instructors. Factory managers and foremen complain of the great numbers of students who tend to get in the way, without much benefit either to industry or the students.

From the standpoint of educational opportunities, the Soviet Union has a long way to go, to catch up with the United States, Mr. DeWitt says.

Of every 100 children entering elementary school in the 2 countries, 57 complete their high school education in the United States, compared to only 30 in Russia. Moreover, 23 of the original 100 enter institutions of higher education in America, compared to 10 in Russia.

Finally, 12 of the students graduated from college in the United States, compared to 7 in Russia.

SOVIET COLLEGES LIMITED

Full-time higher education enrollment in the Soviet Union appears to have been deliberately frozen at about 1,200,000 or somewhat below the American enrollment of 1937.

This restrictive policy appears to be based on socioeconomic and political policies. Possibly it is designed to prevent the privileged group from becoming too large and also to swell the numbers of the nonuniversity skilled labor force.

PROBABLY INFERIOR

Soviet planners offer "a probably inferior part-time substitute (for higher education) in order that the pursuit of higher education will not take people away from full-time employment," Mr. DeWitt writes.

Educational quotas are used, partly to control the manpower flow into priority fields. They are used ruthlessly, it is also shown, to control the opportunities of minority groups. Thus, in marked contrast to the Soviet propaganda line, the university enrollment of Jews has steadily declined from 75,000 in 1935 to 53,300 in 1958.

Whatever the flaws, Mr. DeWitt suggests, "if we take the Communist threat in international power politics seriously, as we must, the issue of America's adequacy in engineering and scientific education—in quantitative as well as qualitive terms—becomes of central importance."

He calls the scientific and technological buildup "the principal source of Communist strength," despite the "denial to the Soviet people of educational opportunities in other fields of human knowledge."

Copies of the volume are available for $5.50 from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.

SOVIET-SCHOOL ANALYST

(By Nicholas DeWitt)

When Nichalos DeWitt entered Harvard College in 1948, his faculty adviser asked him what courses he wanted to study. Puzzled by this first encounter with the student's freedom of choice in American higher education, he replied: "What am I supposed to want to study?" In the intervening years, Mr. DeWitt has been asked by scores of American educators what he thought American students should be required to study.

With the publication of his book on "Soviet Professional Manpower—Its Education, Training and Supply" in 1955, he was 2 years ahead of the first Soviet sputnik in calling attention to Soviet education and science advances. The publication yesterday of his 856-page volume on "Education and Professional Employment in the U.S.S.R." marks him as one of the Western world's leading experts on the subject.

Technically, however, his academic position is still that of a graduate student and research associate.

As a student at Harvard, he submitted last month, the draft of his doctoral thesis on "The Economics of Soviet Education." As an associate, his home base is Harvard's Russian Research Center.

A NATIVE OF KHARKOV

Nicholas DeWitt was born in Kharkov, Russia, in May of 1923. His name, not an Americanization, came to him from his Russian father of Dutch-German ancestry, a small landowner, who died when his only child was very young.

In 1939, young DeWitt started his studies at the Kharkov Institute of Aeronautical Engineering. The Nazi invasion left him under German occupation. Toward the end of World War II he worked for the American Army and eventually for the United States War Shipping Administration in Italy.

With the aid of Jesuit priests he was able to come to Boston in 1947. He wanted to enroll at Harvard at once, but lacked the funds.

The following year, with the help of pay from a civilian instructorship in the Army in Boston, he applied. His irregular Russian records, most of them destroyed or lost, plus some courses at the universities of Rome and the Sorbonne, made enough of a puzzle for the registrar to send him to the office of Dr. James B. Conant, then president of the university.

Miss Ruth Constance Brown, a secretary in Dr. Conant's office, remembers that the anxious candidate, despite his impressive 6 feet 3 inches, looked "like a lost soul." She helped him present his problems to the proper authorities and, after settling his scholastic career, settled his private one by becoming his wife, about a year later.

LOST MOTHER FOUND

By that time, Mr. DeWitt had also learned that his mother, assumed lost, had survived in a German concentration camp. She rejoined her son in the United States in 1952.

Mr. DeWitt received his A.B. with honors from Harvard in 1952 and his Masters in International and Regional Studies in 1953. During the same year he became a naturalized citizen.

He is an expert's expert, intense about his research but undramatic in discussing his findings.

At a recent meeting of education experts and economists from half a dozen Western European countries, his familiarity with most intricate statistics and his ability to link them to the bigger economic and political picture made him the center of attention and arbiter of disagreements.

His accented speech is grammatically faultless except for occasional omission of an article, typical of Russian usage.

He is concerned because he thinks too few American educators recognize the need for high educational quality, not imitation of Russian details, as a key to the larger international contest.

He considers himself essentially an economist, but his major interest is in a little explored field: the development of human rather than material capital through investment in education.

To translate this study into practical economics, he believes 50-year trends in industrial societies must be carefully studied.

Associates describe him as a perfectionist and "an indefatigable digger," compulsive about facts and intolerant of sloppiness. He has the habit of suspicion concerning new sources that derives from researching the facts of a totalitarian state.

Amateur stamp collecting, a mediocre game of chess by Russian standards and skating passable for a father's duties are all the hobbies he finds time for. The researcher's life has brought his weight up to 250 pounds. His eyes are blue-gray; his hair is graying brown.

Mr. and Mrs. DeWitt live at 22 Holden Street in Cambridge, Mass. They have three children: Susan, 13 years old; Nicholas, Jr., 11; and Gregory, 7.

EDUCATION FOR SURVIVAL

If the ethos of a society shapes its schools, it is no less true that the character and quality of the school will shape the future of the society. Nothing, therefore, affords

Street Journal of December 12, 1961, be printed in the Record following these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Congo Mystery

No one seems able to give a satisfactory explanation of the mystery of American involvement in the United Nations war against the Congo's Katanga Province.

To be sure, explanations of sorts are available. Secretary of State Rusk offers this one: "Our aim is the consolidation of the Congo under a stable government which will be able to pursue freely the true national interests of the Congolese." That sounds all right, but actually it begs several fundamental questions.

For one, does anyone know what are the true national interests of the Congolese, or indeed if they have any? The evidence, amassed during nearly a year and a half of anarchy following Belgium's abrupt grant of independence, indicates that they do not. Like most other people in tropical Africa, they have tribal interests. The man out in the Congo bush does not have anything resembling a national concept in his head, and should not be expected to have.

That being the situation, what is the great virtue of "consolidation"? Ideally it could be argued that the best hope for the Congo's future would be unity under a central government; certainly it can be said that the Congo economy could use Katanga with its copper riches.

But we are confronting not an ideal theory but the brutal facts of clashing interests and chaos. Katanga's Tshombe wants an independent state or at most a loose federal association with the central government in Leopoldville. If that is the way it is, that is the way it is. It is not at all clear that the U.N. has some moral duty to subdue Tshombe by force. Secretary General Thant is no Abraham Lincoln trying to hold together a great nation; the notion would be laughable if it were not sad.

Yet one does sometimes get the dismaying impression that the United States is supporting the U.N. Congo operation not so much for the sake of the Congolese as for the sake of the U.N. In other words, the U.N. is doing this; therefore we must support it. That is a drastic distortion of logic; we ought to be realistic enough to see that the U.N., especially with its bloated membership these days, is perfectly capable of acting in diametric opposition to American national interest.

The United States it seems to us, has but one real interest in the Congo. It is not to see to it that the country is organized on a central government basis; it is to see to it that the Congo, however organized, does not fall into the hands of the Communists.

And Tshombe is not the Red villain in this piece; whatever else may be said of him, he is, or was, anti-Communist and pro-West. The dubious honor of stooging for the Soviets goes to Gizenga of Stanleyville, a vice premier in that precious central government the U.N. is so solicitous of. But nobody is going to war against him.

In supporting the U.N. war against Katanga, we are not only alienating Tshombe's affections, we are also generating grave disquiet in the capitals of some of our closest allies—Britain, France and Belgium. It must regretfully be observed that they are right in questioning U.S. policy in this messy business. For what we may be doing is preparing the way for a Communist takeover of the Congo.

At first the United States was on sound ground in supporting the U.N. operation, for it was directed against the right target. Thanks to the U.N. presence, it was possible for the Congo Government to evict the Soviet and Czechoslovak officials. But in recent months our policymakers have either got confused or somehow let the U.N. get out of hand.

The pity of it is that the United States should be calling the tune, for it is unquestionably paying the piper. We bear almost half the cost of the Congo activity; our Globemasters carry the U.N. troops to the fields of battle. The United States could shut down the whole enterprise if it wanted.

And perhaps that is what the United States had better start considering, unless it can get its own policy and the U.N. back on the right track.

EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday the National Science Foundation released a study which indicates dramatic success in Russia in educating scientific specialists. The study indicates that Soviet leaders are convinced that the education and training of their youth offers the key to the defeat of the Western World.

I must say that the study, which is the most comprehensive and complete study yet made of education by the Soviet Union, arrives at startling and important conclusions in regard to American educational policy.

The article goes on to point out:

> Since the average quality of Soviet science and engineering graduates is comparable to that of American graduates, the superiority in numbers must be considered a crucial advantage. It is likely to increase the proportion of above average or outstanding engineers who will emerge from the broader manpower base of the Soviet Union.
>
> Possibly even more significant is the fact that the proportion of university-trained manpower engaged in teaching in the Soviet Union is slightly more than twice that of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that this article from the New York Times, describing the National Science Foundation report, be printed in the Record at this point; together with an analysis by Mr. Nicholas DeWitt, a very able and capable man, who is primarily responsible for the report; together with an editorial from the Washington Post, commenting, in a very balanced and thoughtful way, on the significance of the report.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Gain in Soviet Science Training and Lag in High Schools Found

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

The Soviet Union was pictured yesterday as having scored a dramtic success in educating scientific specialists while still being confronted by serious shortages of youthful skilled labor.

This picture emerged from a comprehensive study of Soviet education published by the National Science Foundation.

In the current decade, the Soviet Union will turn out 4 million university graduates, including 2,500,000 engineers and scientists, Nicholas DeWitt, author of the study, predicts.

At the same time, he disclosed that the Soviet schools had been forced, at least temporarily, to abandon their goal of universal and compulsory high school education. This has been necessitated by the severe shortage of young manpower for industry that has forced millions to quit school early.

Mr. DeWitt cautions, however, that the Soviet leaders are convinced that education and training of their youth offer the key to defeat of the Western World.

His analysis is part of an 856-page volume on "Education and Professional Employment in the U.S.S.R."

The research, sponsored jointly by the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council, was carried out at Harvard's Russian Research Center, where Mr. DeWitt is an associate.

Observers of comparative education describe the results of the 3-year study as more complete than any presently available research on American education.

Since the average quality of Soviet science and engineering graduates is comparable to that of American graduates, Mr. DeWitt remarked, the superiority in numbers must be considered a crucial advantage. It is likely to increase the proportion of above average or outstanding engineering who will emerge from the broader manpower base of the Soviet Union, he said.

Possibly even more significant is the fact that the proportion of university-trained manpower engaged in teaching in the Soviet Union is slightly more than twice that of the United States, he said. While the narrow specialization of Soviet graduates may turn into a disadvantage in the long run, Mr. DeWitt suggested, the immediate prospects are those of a serious manpower threat to the Western World.

On the issue of manpower shortages, as a result of wartime losses, the study shows that the Soviet population of the 8- to 14-year age group, which was 37 million in 1939, had been reduced to 23,500,000 by 1959.

In an introduction to the study, Dr. Alan T. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation, said that significant changes had taken place since Mr. DeWitt published a book on "Soviet Professional Manpower," in 1955.

"The dynamic growth of Soviet scientific manpower," Dr. Waterman wrote, "is found to have markedly accelerated, and there are currently indications that the Soviet Union intends to place even stronger emphasis upon engineering development and scientific research."

URGES NEW APPRAISALS

These developments, he went on, "call for a continuing reappraisal of conditions in the Soviet Union."

Mr. DeWitt also said that the United States "in the past 3 years has been moving a little more vigorously."

But he found that there was still a lack of "broad goals and objectives which ought to be stated by somebody."

The issue, Mr. DeWitt maintained, is how the quality of American education can be improved, now there is no longer any problem of the quantity of high school attendance.

"If the aim of education is to develop a creative intellect critical of society and its values, then Soviet higher education is an obvious failure," Mr. DeWitt concludes.

"If its aim is to develop applied professional skills enabling the individual to perform specialized, functional tasks, then Soviet higher education is unquestionably a success, posing not only a temporary challenge, but a major threat in the longrun struggle between democracy and totalitarianism."

Contrary to the predictions of many American educators, Mr. DeWitt reports that the current Soviet school reform, while limiting the educational opportunities of Soviet children, will increase rather than decrease the academic rigor of education for able students.

MUST QUIT SCHOOL EARLY

The majority of Soviet youths will be pressed into the productive labor force with substantially less schooling than the regular standards, Mr. DeWitt says. In most instances, they will have 8 years instead of 10.

Only a minority, composed of the more gifted, and perhaps, the more privileged, will be able to continue formal, full-time education.

For this group of the gifted and privileged, however, elementary and secondary education will offer 11 years of schooling, instead of 10 under the prereform system.

The students will get 12,828 hours of instruction, compared with 10,787, before the reform. Of this amount, 29 percent will be in science and mathematics and 33 percent in applied activities and vocation skills.

The content of science and technology in the curriculum, both theoretical and applied, is expected to increase, along with the study of foreign languages.

Following are some other major findings of the study:

The Soviet Union has no equivalent to the American college liberal arts programs and therefore relies on specialists, often engineers and scientists, for much of its industrial management.

In 1959, higher education in the Soviet Union had 2,200,000 students, compared with 3,600,000 enrolled in U.S. colleges and universities.

More than half of all Soviet higher education graduates are women, and women also comprise one-third of all engineering professionals, compared with 1 percent in the United States.

Although the Soviet Union leads in absolute numbers of graduates in applied fields of engineering and science, the United States graduates many more nonapplied or general scientists in the physical and biological sciences—35,700 in 1958, compared to about 21,000 in Russia. However, the American figures included between 5,000 and 10,000 prospective teachers, not counted in the Soviet total.

The total education base in the Soviet Union is still far below that of the United States, with the median number of years of completed schooling put at 4 in Russia, compared with 11 in the United States. However, although Russia now has only half as many higher education graduates as the United States, American universities currently produce about 90,000 engineering, science and applied science professionals a year. The Soviet output is 190,000.

Projections indicate that during the current decade the Soviet rate of production in these fields will reach 250,000 a year, more than twice the expected American rate.

In advanced graduate education, roughly the equivalent of the American Ph. D. level, the annual production of the two countries is about the same, between 8,500 and 10,000 a year. However, the sciences and engineering get 75 percent of the total in Russia, compared with 55 percent in the United States.

VOCATIONAL REPORTS SCORED

Mr. DeWitt reports that among the major problems of the current Soviet school reform, which demands that students in secondary school and applicants for university admission must work in factories, has been the lack of vocational instructors. Factory managers and foremen complain of the great numbers of students who tend to get in the way, without much benefit either to industry or the students.

From the standpoint of educational opportunities, the Soviet Union has a long way to go, to catch up with the United States, Mr. DeWitt says.

Of every 100 children entering elementary school in the 2 countries, 57 complete their high school education in the United States, compared to only 30 in Russia. Moreover, 23 of the original 100 enter institutions of higher education in America, compared to 10 in Russia.

Finally, 12 of the students graduated from college in the United States, compared to 7 in Russia.

SOVIET COLLEGES LIMITED

Full-time higher education enrollment in the Soviet Union appears to have been deliberately frozen at about 1,200,000 or somewhat below the American enrollment of 1937.

This restrictive policy appears to be based on socioeconomic and political policies. Possibly it is designed to prevent the privileged group from becoming too large and also to swell the numbers of the nonuniversity skilled labor force.

PROBABLY INFERIOR

Soviet planners offer "a probably inferior part-time substitute (for higher education) in order that the pursuit of higher education will not take people away from full-time employment," Mr. DeWitt writes.

Educational quotas are used, partly to control the manpower flow into priority fields. They are used ruthlessly, it is also shown, to control the opportunities of minority groups. Thus, in marked contrast to the Soviet propaganda line, the university enrollment of Jews has steadily declined from 75,000 in 1935 to 53,300 in 1958.

Whatever the flaws, Mr. DeWitt suggests, "if we take the Communist threat in international power politics seriously, as we must, the issue of America's adequacy in engineering and scientific education—in quantitative as well as qualitive terms—becomes of central importance."

He calls the scientific and technological buildup "the principal source of Communist strength," despite the "denial to the Soviet people of educational opportunities in other fields of human knowledge."

Copies of the volume are available for $5.50 from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.

SOVIET-SCHOOL ANALYST

(By Nicholas DeWitt)

When Nichalos DeWitt entered Harvard College in 1948, his faculty adviser asked him what courses he wanted to study. Puzzled by this first encounter with the student's freedom of choice in American higher education, he replied: "What am I supposed to want to study?" In the intervening years, Mr. DeWitt has been asked by scores of American educators what he thought American students should be required to study.

With the publication of his book on "Soviet Professional Manpower—Its Education, Training and Supply" in 1955, he was 2 years ahead of the first Soviet sputnik in calling attention to Soviet education and science advances. The publication yesterday of his 856-page volume on "Education and Professional Employment in the U.S.S.R." marks him as one of the Western world's leading experts on the subject.

Technically, however, his academic position is still that of a graduate student and research associate.

As a student at Harvard, he submitted last month, the draft of his doctoral thesis on "The Economics of Soviet Education." As an associate, his home base is Harvard's Russian Research Center.

A NATIVE OF KHARKOV

Nicholas DeWitt was born in Kharkov, Russia, in May of 1923. His name, not an Americanization, came to him from his Russian father of Dutch-German ancestry, a small landowner, who died when his only child was very young.

In 1939, young DeWitt started his studies at the Kharkov Institute of Aeronautical Engineering. The Nazi invasion left him under German occupation. Toward the end of World War II he worked for the American Army and eventually for the United States War Shipping Administration in Italy.

With the aid of Jesuit priests he was able to come to Boston in 1947. He wanted to enroll at Harvard at once, but lacked the funds.

The following year, with the help of pay from a civilian instructorship in the Army in Boston, he applied. His irregular Russian records, most of them destroyed or lost, plus some courses at the universities of Rome and the Sorbonne, made enough of a puzzle for the registrar to send him to the office of Dr. James B. Conant, then president of the university.

Miss Ruth Constance Brown, a secretary in Dr. Conant's office, remembers that the anxious candidate, despite his impressive 6 feet 3 inches, looked "like a lost soul." She helped him present his problems to the proper authorities and, after settling his scholastic career, settled his private one by becoming his wife, about a year later.

LOST MOTHER FOUND

By that time, Mr. DeWitt had also learned that his mother, assumed lost, had survived in a German concentration camp. She rejoined her son in the United States in 1952.

Mr. DeWitt received his A.B. with honors from Harvard in 1952 and his Masters in International and Regional Studies in 1953. During the same year he became a naturalized citizen.

He is an expert's expert, intense about his research but undramatic in discussing his findings.

At a recent meeting of education experts and economists from half a dozen Western European countries, his familiarity with most intricate statistics and his ability to link them to the bigger economic and political picture made him the center of attention and arbiter of disagreements.

His accented speech is grammatically faultless except for occasional omission of an article, typical of Russian usage.

He is concerned because he thinks too few American educators recognize the need for high educational quality, not imitation of Russian details, as a key to the larger international contest.

He considers himself essentially an economist, but his major interest is in a little explored field: the development of human rather than material capital through investment in education.

To translate this study into practical economics, he believes 50-year trends in industrial societies must be carefully studied.

Associates describe him as a perfectionist and "an indefatigable digger," compulsive about facts and intolerant of sloppiness. He has the habit of suspicion concerning new sources that derives from researching the facts of a totalitarian state.

Amateur stamp collecting, a mediocre game of chess by Russian standards and skating passable for a father's duties are all the hobbies he finds time for. The researcher's life has brought his weight up to 250 pounds. His eyes are blue-gray; his hair is graying brown.

Mr. and Mrs. DeWitt live at 22 Holden Street in Cambridge, Mass. They have three children: Susan, 13 years old; Nicholas, Jr., 11; and Gregory, 7.

EDUCATION FOR SURVIVAL

If the ethos of a society shapes its schools, it is no less true that the character and quality of the school will shape the future of the society. Nothing, therefore, affords so much insight into the aims of a people as a study of their educational institutions and programs. For this reason the voluminous study of "Education and Professional Employment in the U.S.S.R." published today by the National Science Foundation has tremendous value for the American people.

The study shows plainly that the Russians have geared their educational system primarily to the production of scientists, engineers, and technicians. They are producing two or three times as many of these professionals as are produced by American universities. And there seems to be no doubt that they are producing able, well-trained professionals. The extent of the emphasis on science in Soviet higher education can be measured by the fact that about 59 percent of all 1959 graduates at the bachelor degree level were in scientific fields, as compared with 24 percent in the United States.

Of course, this interest in technology is not surprising in a country still developing its industrial potential and aggressively expansionist in its foreign policy. Like everything else in the Soviet Union, education is planned to meet national purposes. When the country has all the scientists and engineers and technicians it needs at home, it will export its surplus; and they will be influential, no doubt, in carrying Communist ideology into less developed areas. It is an interesting statistic of the NSF report that nearly one-third of all Soviet engineers, scientists, and agricultural specialists are engaged in administrative tasks and in running the government, reflecting the Soviet belief that they can perform these tasks better than nontechnically trained professionals.

The moral of this report is emphatically not that the United States ought to ape or emulate the Soviet Union. Perhaps the most useful facet of the NSF report—it was prepared by Nicholas DeWitt of the Harvard Univesrity Russian Research Center—is its recognition of the great differences between the aims of American and Soviet education:

"In the United States, although the aims and philosophy of education have often been the subject of controversy, the basic ideal which has guided and molded the development of the educational system has been the principle that education is good only if it is primarily for the sake of the individual; that its mission is to teach the individual how to think and to act, how to develop and perform a skill of his own choosing and for his own benefit, within the bounds and restraints set by the democratic system and its laws.

"The basic aims of Soviet education are altogether different. The educational system is designed to serve, not the individual, but the collectivist state which, by identifying itself with the common good, subordinates the individual—his rights, privileges, choice, and his entire physical and mental training—to its own needs. It is only within the confines of choice determined by the state that the individual may develop his personal abilities."

It would be a perversion of American ideals—a falsification of the concept expressed by Justice Brandeis that "the final end of the state is to enable men to develop their faculties"—for the United States to employ education as a national tool. Nevertheless, we need desperately to improve our own system of education in conformity with our own aims as an indispensable condition of national survival. We need to select and foster talent as the Russians do—without forsaking our purpose of making higher education available to all who want it and without abandoning our pursuit of the arts and the humanities.

TO THE MOON AND BACK

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times entitled "To the Moon and Back," which questions the appropriations which are expected to be asked for the space program this year.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO THE MOON AND BACK

A round trip for three persons to the moon and back, all expenses paid, may cost as little as $25 billion by 1969. It may cost as much as $40 billion. These are estimates given out in connection with the administration's reported plan to ask $5.5 billion during the next fiscal year for the military and civilian exploration of space. By 1964 the space program may call for about $7 billion a year, or more than the Federal Government ever spent in any peacetime year prior to 1936.

This will come to about $35 apiece annually. The grand total for the moon excursion would reproduce from 75 to 120 universities about the size of Harvard, with some change left over. It would build several million dwelling units; it would replace hundreds of wornout school buildings; it would construct hundreds of hospitals; it would pay for research that might wipe out some stubborn diseases, including cancer.

This is not to deny that it is a good thing, for both military and civil purposes, to venture into space. We can learn much in space that will make life easier, happier, and even safer on this cozy little earth. But when we go traveling in this fashion we ought to know precisely what it costs.

U.S. CUSTOMS SERVICE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, oftentimes our citizens are prone to criticize our dedicated Federal employees rather than praise them, and, therefore, I am delighted to call to the attention of the Senate a very excellent statement by Malcolm S. Forbes, editor and publisher of the Forbes magazine, on our U.S. Customs Service, which appeared in the January 15 issue.

As a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee for many years, I am somewhat familiar with the operations of the U.S. customs and recognize the valuable service they are rendering our Nation. The importance and the size of the operation can be evaluated from a statement in Mr. Forbes' article, which reads as follows:

> Into the New York port from foreign points come 1½ million people a year, 75 percent of them returning Americans. The port customs collects over $550 million a year, only a small fraction of it from dutiable things brought in by individual passengers. Today, with fewer employees, customs is handling in less time a far greater volume. Idlewild itself has a force of 120 inspectors working in five overlapping, 8-hour-a-day shifts round the clock 7 days a week. Doing the normal clerical work there are an additional 49 men who are trained so they can function as inspectors to expedite the job at peak periods. The goal sought—and maintained—for each inspector is to take no more than an average of 4 minutes per passenger.

I add my commendation to the splendid work that is being done by the U.S. Customs Service.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "U.S. Customs: Big Business Well Run," by Malcolm S. Forbes, be made a part of these remarks and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CUSTOMS: BIG BUSINESS WELL RUN

As an oft-traveling American businessman I'd like to abandon the usual role of critical commentator and turn to enthusiastic backslapping. The back: U.S. customs. They do an exceptionally difficult job extraordinarily well.

As one who comes into Idlewild—and occasionally Honolulu—several times a year, I developed a very high opinion of the efficient and courteous manner that the customs inspectors display in handling multitudinous travelers. To find facts to fit the opinion, I spent several hours the other day at Idlewild with the collector of New York port, Joseph P. Kelly, and his administrative officer, Frank R. Creed.

Into New York port from foreign points come 1½ million people a year, 75 percent of them returning Americans. The port customs collects over $550 million a year, only a small fraction of it from dutiable things brought in by individual passengers. Today, with fewer employees, customs is handling in less time a far greater volume. Idlewild itself has a force of 120 inspectors working in five overlapping, 8-hour-a-day shifts round the clock 7 days a week. Doing the normal clerical work there are an additional 49 men who are trained so they can function as inspectors to expedite the job at peak periods. The goal sought—and maintained—for each inspector is to take no more than an average of 4 minutes per passenger.

Complaints about U.S. customs for the most part fall into three categories.

First, there are those who complain because they feel others are being given preferential treatment—and those who complain because they think they should have had preferential treatment and didn't get it. The first part of the complaint usually stems from the fact that diplomats have immunity from customs and, therefore, are waved through. With the U.N. located in New York this happens often. Other times, when the arrival terminal is choked by the simultaneous arrival of many giant jets, the customs will, for a period of 15 minutes or a half hour, authorize spot checks, where perhaps alternate passengers open one or more of their bags while the others are passed through.

VIP'S—REAL AND PHONY

Usually the genuine very important persons are quickest and most pleasant in complying with the inspection procedures. But the would-be big shots, when they are made to open their bags like everyone else, even after they have dropped names all over the inspector, resent it.

The second category of complaints aimed at the inspector is simply a matter of the law. Plants, meats, some fruits, etc., are not permitted to be brought in under any circumstances. But the fellow bringing back a baseball-bat-sized piece of his favorite bologna sometimes feels it's taken away from him just to improve the inspector's own menu.

Often delays in getting through the line to an inspector arise because some travelers have the devil's own time getting their luggage open. They've reinforced the bulging bags with wrappings and rope and straps to keep them from bursting before arrival.

Customs also has the difficult task of enforcing the copyright act under which manufacturers can set quotas on imports of their own products, such as Jensen silver, assorted perfumes, musical instruments, etc. There are several hundred such articles and, unless the tourist has written permission from the manufacturer in this country, he cannot bring in the trademarked item from abroad. Again, some people tend to blame the inspector when he won't pass through their treasured, bargain-bought Steinway grand piano.

Every complaint that comes to customs is investigated. When somebody beefs about having had to wait an hour in line it is promptly and easily checked by checking his customs declaration, which is stamped with the time of its completion. By reviewing the time stamped on the declaration of the man in front of the complainant and the person behind, the officers can swiftly find out exactly how long it took the inspector to do his job. By this method, the order in which everyone went through every customs line can be completely reconstructed and the time involved exactly computed even weeks later.

Top boss of the New York port, Collector Kelly, often personally checks out letters of complaint that come to his attention and very frequently he can be found on line observing how the job is being handled. He has a cheerful determination to see that U.S. customs' reputation under his tenure is further enhanced.

CUSTOMS' VIEW OF THE PUBLIC

As for the other side of the coin—the customs men's opinion of the traveling public: Procedure is based on the premise that 99 percent of the travelers are basically honest, and 85 to 90 percent of returning travelers go through the line with no complications. The others usually hit some complications by virtue of bringing improperly filled-in declarations, bringing in copyrighted goods or forbidden fruits of one sort or another.

One veteran inspector, Joseph Burton, 40 years in the U.S. Customs Service and now deputy collector and head man on the scene at Idlewild, estimates than no more than 1 out of 500 travelers is "suspicious," and he is spotted with startling consistency. Many a tourist trying to sneak in an undeclared jewel or expensive Paris gown must be ruefully bewildered at how the inspector seemed to know it. The answer has nothing to do with a secret divining rod. Over half of the time it is simply a matter of advance information. Informers receive 25 percent of whatever penalty is imposed for attempted smuggling.

UNCLE SAM'S HELPER

The suave, persuasive jeweler who sold Mr. and Mrs. Gotrocks that lovely bracelet isn't content with his profits at the scene. As soon as the couple has departed his store he rushes to the phone and "tips" the nearest Treasury agent in the American consulate about the sale. If the store proprietor doesn't happen to think this is a nice thing to do to his foreign customers, some underpaid clerk can frequently be depended upon to supplement his income by helping Uncle Sam keep American tourists honest.

The most pleasant American tourists so far as customs is concerned? Those coming in by ship. They are rested, relaxed, in no hurry. They can take all the time they want in departing from the comforts of their liner.

Air travelers, on the contrary, are usually in a hurry, and before they have been 15 minutes in the terminal are pointing out to everybody who looks official that in the same amount of time they could have gone several hundred miles on the plane they just left. In addition to which, of course, the delightful effects of the huge meal, and spirit-elevating refreshments have worn off. They view the Customs man through eyes red and weary.

Surprisingly, the inspectors and their bosses still seem to have a pretty good opinion of their fellow citizens.

It certainly ought to be reciprocated.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND GOA

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Forcing a Choice," which recently appeared in the Omaha (Nebr.) World Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORCING A CHOICE

Much indignation has been expressed in the United States over the duplicity of Indian Prime Minister Nehru and the United Nations in the Goa affair.

Indignation is amply justified, but we would like to point out some fruitful results of Mr. Nehru's aggression.

For one thing, the military adventure in Goa exposed Mr. Nehru, in the eyes of freedom-loving people everywhere, as a double-dealer who talked peace and resorted to war. So goodby to Nehru's preachments, which must have been dreadfully boresome even to people who believed him.

For another thing, the Goa affair has exposed the true nature of the United Nations to all who are searching for truth and who are willing to look at the world of reality.

The truth is that the bankrupt and tottering United Nations employs one set of principles when it deals with the United States and its European allies, and another set of principles which it applies to "neutrals" and "emerging nations."

For example, in the U.N. view, it was all wrong for Britain, France, and Israel to try to seize the Suez Canal in 1956; but it is perfectly proper for India to capture Goa in 1961. And evidently it is all right for Indonesia to start war against the Dutch over New Guinea.

Aggression appears to be justified, in the windy councils of the U.N., whenever it is carried out under the label of "anticolonialism."

For such clear-cut lessons in U.N. justice and morality we Americans should be grateful. But we should have learned those lessons before we became involved in the Congo venture.

By financing the Katanga war, the United States has opposed its European allies and acted against its own national interest.

Now that the United Nations has revealed its double standard openly and clearly, it is high time that America end its straddling act and take a decisive stand.

America can choose between these two courses:

1. Continuing to support the United Nations in such outrageous enterprises as Katanga, and after such sellouts as the one in Goa, or

2. Standing four-square for the vital national interests of the United States at all times.

The choice should not be hard for Americans to make. We hope that Mr. Kennedy will make it without further delay.

ALASKA THREATENED BY SEAWAY ROBBERY ONCE MORE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, 2 years ago I took the floor of the Senate to call the attention of my colleagues to the plight of Alaska as a helpless victim of cruelly excessive water-transportation rates.

At that time I spoke, as I have again and again, and as I fear I may have to in the future, of the hobbling effect on the development of Alaska of high water freight rates which, more than anything else, make Alaska the State of the highest cost of living in the land. Nothing whatever has happened in 2 years to improve this situation.

When I spoke of high water freight rates to Alaska on January 11, 1960, the provocation was the announcement, at that time, that the most powerful of the Alaska water carriers, the Alaska Steamship Co., had come again, as it so profitably had before, to the then Federal Maritime Board crying for a 10-percent rate increase. This was on top of a 15-percent increase requested and granted less than 2 years previously. Despite vigorous protests of the State, the Maritime Board, as then constituted, let the increase go into effect without a hearing although this was requested by the State. To date, there is no decision by the Maritime Commission as to whether the 1960 rate raise will be allowed. The matter is now pending before a hearing examiner.

The reason I feel it my duty to review this situation today is that, once again the Alaska Steamship Co. has announced its intention of putting into effect another rate increase. It is particularly shocking that the new hike in rates is contemplated even before the company's case has been proved for the first.

Now, should another rate increase be allowed to go into effect at this time, Alaskans will be constrained to wonder whether they can ever hope for any relief at all. As is pointed out in the protest of the State of Alaska filed with the Maritime Commission on January 8, "an increase upon an increase already under investigation would make a mockery of the Commission's regulation."

Therefore, I appeal to the Maritime Commission, which is a new agency established by the present administration, under a reorganization plan I hailed at the time as at least a first step toward responsible maritime regulation, to act responsibly on these raids of the Alaska Steamship Co. on the citizenry of Alaska. I hope this new Commission, brought into being as an agency of the New Frontier, will explore new frontiers of rate regulation that will benefit not only the State of Alaska but the other offshore areas as well, and show some regard for the public interest.

At the time Reorganization Plan No. 7, which created the Maritime Commission, was under consideration in the Senate, I expressed the hope that the increase in membership of the regulatory body from the three members of the old Maritime Board to five members on the new Commission would bring new ideas and a fresh approach to the regulation of water carriers subject to its jurisdiction. I express that hope anew.

With the thought of providing the new Commission with facts that may be helpful to it in coming to a determination of the Alaska Steamship rate increases now pending before it I would review some of the matters which are of special significance. I believe my recital will provide ample reason for the Commission to decide both rate increase cases in favor of the public interest—in favor of the people of Alaska.

In the first place, the Alaska Steamship Co. is, despite its lamentations of poverty and affliction, a very profitable business enterprise. This company is, and has been, making money at a rate reflecting a handsome return on its investment.

In the course of proceedings on the 1960 rate increase application, the State of Alaska has found that the Alaska Steamship Co., earned, at a very conservative estimate, and on the basis of rates in effect prior to the 10-percent increase of 1960, a return on its investment in 1958 of not less than 19.74 percent, and in 1959 of not less than 8.335 percent. A 2-year average for 1958 and 1959 would show a return of not less than 13.246 percent.

The State further estimates that, with the application of more realistic depreciation periods for its vessels than have been allowed in the past, the profits of this carrier actually range between 21.931 percent and 22.737 percent for 1958; between 9.697 percent and 10.528 percent for 1959; and, for a 2-year average, between 14.659 percent and 15.484 percent.

And now the Alaska Steamship Co. has the nerve to come asking for another increase.

This company which, at a conservative estimate, earned not less than an 8.335 percent return on investment, after taxes, in 1959, earned this profit in a year in which the Alaska salmon industry—the mainstay of our economy—suffered one of the worst years it has ever experienced. While Alaska Steam made money in 1959, its profits were less than they would have otherwise been, since canned salmon accounts largely for the southbound traffic of the company.

But if 1959 was a relatively poor year for Alaska and the Alaska Steamship Co., 1960 was a different matter. The State had taken over the regulation and management of the salmon resource. In 1960 the Alaska salmon pack increased appreciably over that of 1959, from 1,770,795 cases to 2,571,156 cases—an increase of more than 800,000 cases. The Alaska Steamship Co. profited accordingly. Its revenues from water carrier operations, without adjustment for earnings from affiliated enterprises rose from $16,136,124 in 1959 to $19,239,972 in 1960—an increase of more than $3 million. The company itself had estimated its maximum 1960 profits would be, if the 1960 increase was granted, $17,673,521. With the 10 percent increase in effect, it earned more than a million and a half dollars in excess of its expressed expectations.

In 1961 things were even better for the Alaska salmon industry, and, correspondingly, for the Alaska Steamship Co. For the Alaska salmon pack of 1961 totaled 3,296,013 cases, as compared with the disastrous 1959 pack of 1,770,795 cases. For the Alaska Steamship Co. it is estimated by the State this would result in an increase in revenues for 1961 of approximately $500,000 over its income in 1960. The increase over 1959 would be approximately $1,052,000.

I would remind the new Maritime Commission that, not only is the Alaska Steamship Co. a profitable enterprise which cannot, I believe, show any justification for an increase in its earnings, it is a company whose management has long shown disregard of the public interest.

The following are examples of operations of the Alaska Steamship Co. which have eroded the confidence of Alaskans in its management, and given rise to doubts of its responsibility as a common carrier.

In the course of its investigation pursuant to the rate proceeding, instituted in 1960, counsel for the State of Alaska have found that personal profits of $361,311 accrued to David E. Skinner, president of the Alaska Steamship Co. and a principal stockholder of the company, and to Robert J. Behnke, his brother-in-law, from an intricate maneuver they financed by funds borrowed from a wholly owned subsidiary of the corporation—the Alaska Terminal & Stevedoring Co.

An analysis of the records discloses that in 1955 D. E. Skinner and R. J. Behnke each borrowed the sum of $94,000 from Alaska Terminal & Stevedoring Co. With this money they acquired a 49.9375 percent interest in Tanana Terminals, Inc., a corporation providing van equipment in the Alaska trade and then under the control of Jack Garrison.

On May 31, 1957, a new corporation—Arctic Terminals, Inc.—was incorporated and on June 30, 1957, received an installment stock subscription for $1 million—none of which was paid at the time—$490,000 from Alaska Terminal and Stevedoring Co. and $510,000 from Consolidated Freightways, Inc. On the same date Arctic Terminals—the new corporation—purchased the stock of Tanana Terminals for $1,100,000, took over Tanana's equipment and, thereupon, became liable to the former stockholders of Tanana in the amount of $1,100,000, of which $549,311 was payable to David E. Skinner and Robert J. Behnke, and the remainder to Jack M. Garrison.

Thus, Skinner and Behnke accumulated a profit of $361,311 from the investment of funds conveniently borrowed from a corporation in the Alaska trade under their control.

The money for this maneuver came from the Alaska rate paying public. Arctic Terminals, the purchaser of the stock in Tanana owned by Messrs. Skinner and Behnke, has received from the shipping public more than $2 million between January 1, 1957, and March 1960. These payments came from pickup and delivery charges as well as charges for water haul collected by Garrison Fast Freight as part of a division of revenues with Alaska Steamship Co. under a section 15 agreement filed with the Maritime Board. It is of interest to note the section 15 agreement filed by Garrison Fast Freight and Alaska Steam with the Maritime Board does not disclose the division of revenues with their common affiliate, Arctic Terminals.

The Alaska Steamship Co., apparently with good reason based on past history, seems to operate on the assumption it will have its way with any regulatory agency assigned the job of trying to keep it under control. This is reflected by a particularly shocking aspect of the 1960 rate increase proceeding which has come to light. The original order of the Federal Maritime Board, allowing the 10-percent increase to go into effect contained a provision that, although the rate increase suspension for which the State of Alaska appealed was denied, this was done in express reliance on the agreement of the company to set up a special account for funds accruing as a result of the increased rates. Presumably the purpose of this was to protect shippers using the service in the event the increase should be denied and their entitlement to a refund of overcharges established. Of course, even this proposed arrangement offered no protection to the consumers.

Now, however, it appears that, not only will the ultimate consumers, the unprotected citizens of Alaska, never receive any refund even if the rate increase is denied, but, further, there is no special account to protect the shippers.

Counsel for the State of Alaska discovered the absence of the account in the course of hearings on the case when testimony was given by an officer of the company that the special account had not been established and that, on the contrary, moneys received from the increased rates were simply thrown in with commercial revenues. This was a betrayal of the public interest by the Alaska Steamship Co. and by the officials of the former Maritime Board which permitted this.

This was the subject of a petition by the State for an order of the Board to require the account in which the State called attention to the condition upon which the Maritime Board denied the suspension requested by the State—the establishment by the carrier of the special account.

The State's petition was without avail. The predecessor agency of the Maritime Commission refused to enforce its own order, and, in effect, conferred its blessing on its violation by the carrier.

An even more distressing failure of the Federal Maritime Board to exercise control over the Alaska Steamship Co., allowing the company to flout the public interest, is evidenced by the lack of action available to the agency to investigate operations alleged to be in unlawful restraint of trade. More than 10 years ago the Department of Justice filed an indictment of violation of the antitrust laws against the Alaska Steamship Co., and, at the same time, a civil complaint based on the same charges. Alleging an unlawful conspiracy to restrain trade and commerce the complaint of the Department included a catalog of charges of intimidation of shippers; conspiracy with shippers against other water carriers; unfair exclusion of other carriers from dock space at Alaskan ports; and acts designed to exclude rail and motor carriers from the Alaska trade. It was the charge of the Department of Justice that the Alaska Steamship Co. would apparently go to almost any lengths to maintain a monopoly of the Alaska trade.

The Justice Department suits were dismissed in September 1952 on the sole ground the Federal Maritime Board had primary jurisdiction over the alleged practices. The Federal Maritime Board never exercised that jurisdiction. I hope the new Maritime Commission will take account of this reminder and do so.

Now, in the light of this let us see where the proposed new increases would be applied. The Alaska Steamship Co. wants:

First. A 10-percent surcharge on all shipments between Seattle and western Alaska ports on the Alaska Peninsula and the Bering Sea. This is a part of Alaska where, according to the record of testimony given in the pending rate case, the Alaska Steamship Co. has a virtual monopoly, with the possible exception of the *North Star*, a vessel operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs as a service to Alaskan natives.

It will be recalled that, during the last session of Congress, Alaska Steam, ever in a panic at threat of competition, tried to scuttle this useful service so the entire area would be reserved for the steamship company—at the highest price it can extract from the helpless citizenry.

Second. An increase in 10 percent in rates for canned fish shipped southbound from Alaska. Again, this is a service for which Alaska Steam has no effective competition. The record shows Alaska Steam carries 83.9 percent of canned salmon, 51 percent of canned clams and 90.8 percent of canned shrimp.

Third. An increase of 20 percent in rates for boxes, cans, and salt shipped from Seattle to ports in southeastern Alaska, southwestern Alaska, Bering Sea ports, and the Alaska Peninsula.

With respect to these requests, it is of interest to note that, where there is any hint of competition, this remarkable company can find a way of cutting rates. For example, in response to the existence of competitive service by the Griffiths Line, another recently established carrier operating in southeastern Alaska, the Alaska Steamship Co. promptly made reductions in certain rates.

Now what do we have here? Do we have a situation where the maritime regulatory body can do nothing to correct a situation in which a carrier operates as it chooses, at the price it chooses where and when it chooses? Do we have a situation where there is no body responsive to the public interest that will exercise its responsibilities on behalf of the people?

I sincerely hope not. It is my hope that the action of the Maritime Commission on the Alaska rate cases will prove the wisdom of the President in recommending and of Congress in approving Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961, which had as its primary purpose the separation of promotional and regulatory responsibilities with respect to the merchant marine. It will be recalled that the establishment of the Commission as the regulatory body and the delegation of maritime promotional responsibilities to the Secretary of Commerce by that reorganization plan were acts designed to insure impartial administration of regulatory legislation by an agency freed, as the Maritime Board was not, from responsibility for economic development of the same industry it regulated.

I express my belief that this new agency will recognize the plight of Alaska and come to its rescue with enlightened solutions to the fundamental problems reflected by the abnormally high water freight rates with which we have so long been afflicted.

I believe the new agency created by President Kennedy will respond to demand of the President in his state of the Union message for renewed attacks on economic problems hindering the progress of our economy, and recognize that the progress and development of Alaska will be thwarted forever unless means can be found for reducing our transportation costs.

THE BEST FARM PROGRAM

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, we hear and read a great deal of criticism of American agriculture and the American farmer. It is therefore heartening and worthy of note to receive a letter such as the one I am calling to the attention of the Congress today.

The president of the Oregon Broiler Growers Association, Mr. Burt Searl, has written to the President expressing his association's approval of the Kennedy-Freeman farm program which he terms "the best farm program that has been advanced in years."

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of President Searl's letter of January 5, 1962, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON BROILERS GROWERS
ASSOCIATION,
Corvallis, Oreg., January 5, 1962.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The board of directors of the Oregon Broiler Growers Association would like you to know that they are thoroughly in accord with the program in agriculture which is being developed by your Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman. We believe that the Kennedy-Freeman farm program is the best farm program that has been advanced in years. The commodity-by-commodity approach is a very sensible way of approaching the problems facing agriculture. We definitely favor the method followed with the turkey and broiler industries in which advisory boards of growers were named to examine the problems facing the industry and develop a program.

We would like you to know that we have complete confidence in Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and his economic adviser, Dr. Willard W. Cochrane. We hope that you will not be troubled by the criticism from some quarters about Government interference in agriculture. The problems facing agriculture are so vast and cover such wide areas, the entire United States in the case of poultry, that help from the Federal Government is needed in order to bring industry leaders together to develop a program and help administer it.

We believe that if the Kennedy-Freeman farm program is fully developed it will result in a prosperous agriculture which, as you know, is the backbone of our Nation.

Respectfully yours,
BURT SEARL,
President.

CC: Senator Wayne Morse, Senator Maurine B. Neuberger, Representative Walter Norblad, Representative Al Ullman, Representative Edith Green, Representative Edwin Durno, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, Economic Adviser Willard W. Cochrane.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a postcard which arrived in my mail over the weekend. I gather, from its stilted form, that every Senator in this body received a like card. It was addressed to us from The Network of Patriotic Letter Writers—a post office box in Pasadena, Calif.

It starts:

HAPPY NEW YEAR, MR. SENATOR: Did you know that if the United States were attacked by a Communist country, we could act in self-defense "only until the Security Council (of the United Nations) has taken over"?

Mr. President, this becomes symbolic of the kind of "poppycock" which organized and malicious propaganda groups are mobilizing in this country at this hour to try to discredit the United Nations and the foreign policy projections of our country at a time most critical in our national history.

I think we ought to stand on guard, alerted for the baskets full of cold, anonymous, and in some cases signed form letters which have no meaning to the signers, which represent the follow-through of those who subscribe, for a fee, I assume, to the services of the Network of Patriotic Letter Writers, of Pasadena, Calif.

I hope that, as always, the Members of this body will give proper weight, and only proper weight, to such mobilized misinformation and twisted and tortured interpretations of our own relationship to the United Nations at a time such as this.

The card concludes:

Do you think this is really a happy new year, Mr. Senator?

I think our answer always is that we have confidence in the good judgment of the American people and of its servants, in spite of the twisted and tortured perversions of truth in which some groups maliciously indulge in order to maintain themselves as executive secretaries of some sort of national organization.

PEARL HARBOR, 1962

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, last month, on December 7, the Pacific

War Memorial was dedicated at ceremonies held on the 20th anniversary of the 1941 attack on Pearl Harbor. Upon that occasion the Pearl Harbor Shipyard Log issued a special edition, giving an interesting history of Pearl Harbor from that fateful day more than 20 years ago. The issue was "dedicated to the thousands of men and women of all races, colors, and creeds who have placed country above self, and who, through their energy, devotion and skills, have perpetuated the proud traditions of the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard in keeping the ships of the fleet 'fit to fight'—in peace and in war."

As Pearl Harbor takes on an important new role in the nuclear age, I thought it would be of interest to the Senate to read some of the excerpts from the Pearl Harbor Shipyard Log of December 7, 1961. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the Log be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Lasting Memorial

Twenty years ago today, on Sunday, December 7, 1941, Pearl Harbor was suddenly thrust into world prominence.

The time was 7:55 a.m. Many men on ships were at worship or having breakfast in mess halls. Island residents were getting up to a day of leisure. The day shift of civilian workers had already invaded the Navy Yard and long lines of the graveyard shift crews lined the streets awaiting transportation home.

Suddenly and dramatically, 343 Japanese carrier-based aircraft appeared from overcast skies to launch a devastating attack on the U.S. Pacific Fleet at Pearl Harbor. The surprise attack ended scarcely two hours later but the bulk of the U.S. military might in the mid-Pacific lay in shambles.

Of the 97 ships in the harbor, 18 were sunk or damaged. The biggest prize of the day was the concentration of seven battleships at Ford Island.

Killed during the attack were 2,117 Navy men and marines. More than half went down with the battleship U.S.S. *Arizona*, which blew up after taking several bombs and aerial torpedo hits, and sank in less than nine minutes.

Today the rusted, twisted hulk of the once-proud battle ship remains at her berth—an everlasting memorial to the 1,102 men still entombed within. Over the steel grave of the *Arizona* is rising a permanent memorial, built with funds contributed by people throughout the 50 States.

Smoke and Sweat—And Heroism

When the smoke and fire of the catastrophe had cleared away from Pearl Harbor, thousands were dead and a vital part of the Pacific Fleet crippled. The battle cry of World War II, "Remember Pearl Harbor," rang out throughout the Nation.

During the dark days following the attack, there were heartening displays of national character—the initiative and courage of a free people, and the unceasing production of their industry.

Thousands left their homes on the mainland to join the war effort at Pearl Harbor Navy Yard. With determination, strength, and skill, men from all corners of Hawaii and the mainland became unified in one purpose—to keep the ships fit to fight.

The scene of America's setback in the months following December 7 became the scene of its equally significant triumph. Men on the front lines knew what Pearl Harbor workers could do. They knew the thrill of seeing the old *Saratoga* returning to action time and time again and saw the *Nevada* come out of the mud of Pearl Harbor and go to the Aleutians and Normandy, to the Philippines, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa.

Pearl Harbor mushroomed like a gold rush town and its people were housed and fed like Klondike miners. At the peak of employment, 26,000 civilian workers kept the vital Pacific base humming with ceaseless activity during the days when enemy attack and invasion were imminent. The production tempo further increased as the war moved westward.

The hard-won victories were often possible only because of long, weary hours of work on the part of Pearl Harbor Navy Yard's men and women.

With skillful, willing, and patriotic hands, they nursed the limping fleet back to full strength and rushed the damaged ships back to the front lines. They went on to win the E pennant for efficiency and set an example for the Nation in the purchase of war bonds, averaging a million dollars a month.

From the carnage of December 7, 1941, grew the magnificent base of the present Pearl Harbor. Pearl Harbor stands today as a monument not only to those who died, but to the living whose integrity and toil created it.

There were American heroes by the thousands on that black Sunday morning—men who died at their stations manning guns on sinking ships; men who stood by burning ships to rescue the injured through the hail of missiles; men who were cool and brave, supplying the leadership that brought order out of chaos when all seemed to be futile.

Typical of the many acts of bravery on that morning are those of former quarterman chipper, Julio DeCastro, who retired in 1950 after 30 years of Federal service, rigger and boat operator, George Nakamoto, of shop 72, and shop 51 quarterman electrician, Edward Kahai.

DeCastro and a gang of 19 yard workers cut through the hull of the capsized battleship *Oklahoma* with pneumatic chipping guns to rescue 32 sailors from pitch black compartments which were slowly filling with water.

"The *Arizona* was still burning—it threw an eerie light on us as we worked. And for about an hour there was antiaircraft firing all over the place. But we kept on working until Tuesday," DeCastro recalled.

Nakamoto, one of the very few Niseis allowed in Pearl Harbor during prewar years, was working for a private contractor dredging the harbor at the time of the attack. Despite the danger from enemy strafing and bombing, he towed the damaged mine layer *Oglala* from alongside the cruiser *Helena* with his tug *Balba*, then proceeded along battleship row to rescue survivors from the flaming waters.

"For outstanding loyalty, efficient action and disregard of personal safety," the tugboat captain received a special Navy citation.

Edward Kahai had just gotten off work and was standing in front of shop 51 waiting for his ride when the attack began. Thinking it was maneuvers, Kahai and some of his shopmates stood there enjoying the show until a bomb dropped on the *Pennsylvania* in drydock 1.

The group scurried for cover but came out a few minutes later to work on the power lines in drydock 1. Shortly after, he rushed to 1010 dock to help the marines put out fires on the *Helena* and *Oglala*. Weary and wet, he returned to shop 51 about 1 that afternoon and worked through 9 that night.

He retires tomorrow as quarterman electrician after 32 years of Federal service.

Seven thousand ships—large and small. This was the amazing record of ships repaired at Pearl Harbor shipyard during the war.

The speed with which Pearl Harbor workers returned damage ships to the scene of action became almost legendary. Best remembered among the spectacular jobs was the tremendous effort on the U.S.S. *Yorktown*. The shipyard took only 48 hours to prepare the carrier for the Battle of Midway.

Back from America's first major victory at Coral Sea, the battle-scarred flattop steamed into the shipyard on June 1, 1952, with severe bomb damage. Many considered that it it would require months to get the *Yorktown* back into fighting condition.

But 1,400 men swarmed over the different levels of the carrier, and restored the ship's structural strength in 48 hours. Four days after her arrival at Pearl, the *Yorktown* had joined Admiral Nimitz' force and was within 200 miles of the enemy, off Midway. What the *Yorktown* did after that is history.

Her planes took part in the operation that sank two enemy carriers and so disabled a third that it was easy prey for an American submarine. In addition, her planes scored devastating hits on other enemy vessels, helping to turn back the Japanese threat to Midway and the Hawaiian Islands. This was the turning point of the war.

The old carrier was later sunk in the Battle of Midway, but she did plenty of damage before going down.

There were countless other production achievements of heroic proportions, but these particularly stand out in the minds of the wartime workers:

The repair of the cruiser U.S.S. *Pensacola*, one of the largest jobs ever attempted at Pearl Harbor, took 9 months. The ship was torpedoed by the Japanese but managed to reach Pearl Harbor despite the fact that her deck was only 4 feet above water. The torpedo killed hundreds, and many men were trapped and died when the after compartments were closed off to save the ship.

The battlewagon U.S.S. *Maryland*, which the enemy twice claimed sunk on December 7, 1941, and again in 1945, was damaged while supporting landing operations in the Philippines. She was completely rebuilt from the forecastle to the third deck, 30 days ahead of the time allowed for her repair.

A cruiser was completely repaired structurally and made ready for sea in 14 days after having been hit in the bow and stern.

Two aircraft carriers with more than 10 regular days' work on each were made ready for action in 72 hours.

These were the glorious chapters of American industry written by Pearl Harbor's navy yard workers.

Pineapple Express, Wahoo Choo Choo, Toonerville Trolley. Call it what you will, Hawaii's version of a railroad system provided the main means of transportation for thousands of shipyard workers during the war years.

Once described as "a million banshees trapped in an oversized pineapple can," the noisy, pint-sized locomotive faithfully pulled 20 passenger cars from the O.R. & L. Depot at Iwilei to the end of the line at Pearl Harbor every day. Rocking and rolling like a dinghy in a hurricane, it traveled at the nerve-shattering speed of 27 miles per hour.

"Cattle cars," another popular mode of transportation, were the 30 island-made trailer buses, shuttling an average of 17,000 passengers daily to and from CHA 3. The buses operated 21 hours a day and formed the third largest transportation system on Oahu.

Within the shipyard, "leaping tunas" or "elephant trains" rambled all over the industrial area, picking up passengers free of charge. Best described as a wire-enclosed barge pulled by a tractor, the "leaping tuna" offered a much needed service for trips that would ordinarily be too long to walk and too short to ride. Crawling along at snail's pace, the "leaping tuna" rarely stopped en route to the terminals. Instead, passengers leaped on and off to get to their destination.

TWENTY YEARS LATER

On this 20th anniversary of the Pearl Harbor attack, Pearl Harbor symbolizes the phoenix of the Pacific, rising out of the ashes of December 7 to become the hub of the greatest and strongest naval command in history.

No huge battleships are resting in the harbor as they were on the morning of December 7, 1941. In their place are new mobile, powerful ships not even dreamed of 20 years ago. Though small by comparison, one of these missile-toting nuclear submarines can be more deadly than the combined firepower of the seven battlewagons moored at battleship row that fateful December morning.

Today the more than 400 ships, 3,000 aircraft, and 250,000 officers and men of the Pacific Fleet work constantly on and under the sea, on land, and in the air, to deter aggression, and to guard, and promote the peace.

On station, wherever the Navy sends them, these vigilantes of the Pacific are determined that there will never be another infamous day at Pearl Harbor—or anywhere else in the free world.

It is to these men and ships of the Pacific Fleet that Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard pledges its unwavering support.

SEGREGATION AT THE COSMOS CLUB AND THE METROPOLITAN CLUB

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand that the board of directors of the Cosmos Club is meeting today in connection with private club matters. I wish them well.

Mr. President, last Saturday I issued a press release for publication on Sunday in regard to a position I intended to take, as a private citizen, in respect to any possibility of being a guest at either the Cosmos Club or the Metropolitan Club. Apparently the editors of the Washington Post and Times Herald and the Washington Evening Star, in keeping with their many-times-demonstrated policy of selecting news on the basis of their personal prejudices in respect to the person issuing the news release, did not choose to publish it except a buried, inadequate reference to the release in each paper, not covering my argument in fair detail. The members of the Cosmos Club and the Metropolitan Club do not have the benefit of the reasons behind my personal views. I wish to say, to the everlasting credit of some of them, I received a considerable number of calls from members of the Cosmos Club in respect to the reasons for my views. In fairness to them, and with some implications of a commentary in respect to the news policies of the Washington Evening Star and the Washington Post and Times Herald, I shall read the news release referred to which was issued as of last Saturday, but which was inadequately covered by the Star and the Post:

From time to time I receive invitations to attend dinners or other functions as a guest at the Metropolitan Club and the Cosmos Club. In the past several days I have received two invitations to attend functions at the Cosmos Club. In declining the invitations, I have stated as follows:

I have decided as a matter of policy not to accept any invitation to any affair that is to be held at either the Cosmos Club or the Metropolitan Club. The reason for my policy is the fact that both of those clubs follow a policy of segregation as to their membership, which, of course, is their private right.

However, I have noted from my own experience each year that dinners or other functions are held at those clubs to which many Government officials, who are nonmembers of the clubs, are invited. By their presence as guests, they tend to underwrite the segregation policy of these two private clubs. It is, of course, the privilege and right of the individual guest to do that if he cares to.

However, as one who believes that the issue of civil rights in our country is so critical from the standpoint of the welfare of the Republic, I have decided to decline any and all invitations which would place me in a position, as a guest, of condoning by my very presence what I consider to be an un-American policy of segregation.

ARMY REVIEW OF DOUGLAS A. STONE HARDSHIP DISCHARGE CASE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent that a news release which I issued for publication, if any editor considered it to be of sufficient merit, as of last Saturday, January 13, to be printed in the RECORD, because this news release received either inadequate or no reporting by the press although it deals with a vital question of public policy.

Mr. President, this news release deals with a point I raised at the Democratic conference the other morning, which also I have discussed elsewhere. It deals with what I am satisfied is a growing anticongressional attitude and policy at certain levels or echelons within the Military Establishment. It deals with a so-called hardship case handled by the Army.

Although I have yet to hear from the Secretary of the Army directly, I am very much interested in learning of what part if any he played in handling the case.

I called the attention of the Army last November to a hardship discharge case not of a reservist but of an enlistee who is a son of a widowed mother. I did not ask for a hardship discharge. I never do. I only asked for a thorough consideration of the case and a decision on whatever its merits are found to be.

I found, upon further investigation, a most superficial examination of the case was made by the Army. In fact, the major general who filed his report with the Secretary of the Army denying the hardship could not have been more absurd in his report. Apparently, unbeknown to the Secretary of the Army, I had available to me—I thought through channels—the complete record of the case, and it was a record which could not possibly sustain the position of the major general.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the able Senator from Oregon be permitted to continue for 3 additional minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from California. I shall be finished quickly. The facts could not possibly sustain the position of the Army in regard to the case, and so on January 9, as the press release points out, I called this point to the attention of the Secretary of the Army. I called it to the attention of the commanding general. I pointed out that factually the Army was wrong in its finding; and, of course, one reason for denying this charge was the allegation that the widowed mother had another son and he was under moral obligation to support her. Of course, if the general had made any investigation at all, he would have discovered that the other son had no intention of supporting the widowed mother. I said, "I wonder if the general thought she could live off his moral obligations."

On January 10 I discussed this subject at the Democratic conference and elsewhere. I have been notified through a United Press story that his discharge later, on January 10, was granted, apparently upon a reconsideration of the case. I am satisfied that it was granted upon the merits of the case. I congratulate the Secretary of the Army, although I have not heard from him yet, for his belated examination of this case and the doing of justice that ought to have been done last November.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire press release be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESS RELEASE BY SENATOR WAYNE MORSE

Although I have not received any word from the Army, I have just read a United Press dispatch announcing that on January 10, the Army approved a discharge for Sp. Douglas A. Stone.

In November, I asked the Army to review Stone's application for a hardship discharge. I did not ask for a discharge for Stone, because as a matter of policy I never ask for a discharge for a member of the Armed Forces, but I do have the duty when a constituent believes that he is being unjustly dealt with by the Military Establishment to request a thorough review and consideration of his case. Under the law, that is the right of a constituent who is a member of the Armed Forces and under my oath of office, it is my clear duty. Once I am satisfied that the Military Establishment has reviewed a case on its merits, I take the position that it is the responsibility of the Military Establishment to make the final decision in the case.

I became satisfied on the record of the Stone case which I carefully examined that his case had not received a thorough examination by the Army. I was advised by Stone that his superior officers had informed him that if he had not asked for my intervention in the case, he would probably have received a hardship discharge. I called this information given to me by Stone to the attention of the Army and requested a further investigation into whether or not such an anticongressional policy prevailed at any echelon of the Army.

On December 5, the major general who was the commanding officer of Stone, sent me a letter notifying me, as a result of this evaluation, it has been determined that his request does not meet the requirements of Army regulations governing discharge for hardship reasons and therefore, cannot be favorably considered.

Unfortunately, the basis of the evaluation referred to by the general in his letter to me showed on its face that a careful and thorough review of the Stone case had not been made.

Under date of January 9, I wrote to the Secretary of the Army and also to Stone's commanding officer, protesting the handling of the Stone case. On Wednesday, January 10, I reported my experience on this case to the Conference of Democratic Senators. Several Senators reported to me that they had had similar experiences of what appeared to be an anticongressional attitude on the part of various personnel within the armed services in respect to the constitutional duty of a Member of Congress to see to it that justice is done to his constituents by the administrators of the Armed Forces.

It is interesting to note that the UP story quotes the Army as saying the discharge was approved Wednesday, the day before Morse had protested to Army Secretary Elvis J. Stahr that military commanders were discriminating against the soldier because the Senator had intervened on the soldier's behalf.

The Army is in error as to this fact in the case also. My protest to the Secretary of the Army was January 9. My protest to the Democratic conference was January 10, the day that the Army now says it granted Stone's application for a hardship discharge.

I am pleased to learn from the UP report that the Army has reversed its position on the Stone case. I assume that the Army reversed its position on the Stone case the day after I wrote my letter to the Secretary of the Army and to the commanding general and on the same day that I called this case to the attention of the Democratic conference. I trust that in due course of time I may hear from the Army directly.

ELEVEN NEW RECORDS OF B–52H HEAVY BOMBER

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement prepared by the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. Schoeppel] regarding recordbreaking flights of the B–52H heavy bomber.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Schoeppel

I am proud to cite the most recent accomplishments of the Strategic Air Command in establishing 11 new records with a B–52H heavy bomber built in Wichita, Kans., by the Boeing Co. This once again demonstrates the effectiveness and flexibility of manned bomber aircraft, and shows the importance of keeping this weapon in the Nation's defense system.

These are achievements no unmanned system can match. The U.S. Air Force claimed 11 nonstop distance, course and speed records Thursday when a Strategic Air Command B–52H flew 12,519 nonstop miles.

The previous distance record of 11,235.6 statute miles was set by the U.S. Navy on a flight September 29–October 1, 1946, from Perth, Australia, to Columbus, Ohio, in more than 55 hours. The SAC flight required less than half that time.

The latest version of the Boeing Co.'s Stratofortress, flown by a crew from the 15th Air Force's 413th Strategic Wing, Minot Air Force Base, N. Dak., departed Wednesday morning from Kadena Air Base, Okinawa, at 9 a.m., c.s.t. The flight path was a modified great circle course over Tokyo, Japan; Seattle, Wash.; Fort Worth, Tex.; Washington, D.C.; and Lajes in the Azores Islands, before arriving over Torrejon Air Base near Madrid, Spain, at 6:52 a.m. c.s.t.

The record-breaking B–52H came from SAC's combat-ready alert force and was flown by Maj. Clyde P. Evely, 39, of Petersburg, Va., aircraft commander, and an eight-man crew, who made the long flight in 21 hours and 52 minutes at altitudes ranging from 40,000 to 50,000 feet.

When his combat bomber landed at Torrejon Air Force Base, Major Evely and his crew established 11 records. They were: (1) World distance in straight line without landing, formerly held by the Navy. (2) World class C distance in straight flight without landing formerly held by Maj. Gen. William E. Eubank and a crew in a KC–135 at 10,229.30 miles, from Tokyo to Lajes (Azores) April 7–8, 1958.

The remaining nine records established or broke previous federation aeronautics international course records from Tokyo to Seattle, Tokyo to Fort Worth, Tokyo to Washington, D.C., and Tokyo to Madrid. Also from Seattle to Fort Worth and Seattle to Madrid, Fort Worth to Washington and Fort Worth to Madrid, and Washington to Madrid.

Gen. Thomas S. Power, Commander in Chief of SAC, sent a congratulatory message to the crew. Commenting on the significance of the flight, General Power said:

"Today's long-range flight by a SAC B–52H combat crew is another highly significant achievement of SAC's effectiveness. That the more than 12,000-mile flight was completed nonstop and without refueling clearly demonstrates the intercontinental capabilities of the B–52 bomber. The flight proved that SAC aircraft have the capability of reaching target destinations in any area of the globe. I congratulate the aircraft commander, the crew, and all the support personnel concerned with this historical flight for a job well done."

Lt. Gen. Archie Old, Jr., commander of the 15th Air Force, commented:

"Major Evely and his crew have clearly demonstrated the contribution the manned bomber makes to the overall strategic capability of our Nation's force of bombers and missiles. Regardless of the strategic target assigned to ballistic missiles in the future, there will always be a need for a man in an aircraft to make on-the-spot decisions that cannot be keyed into a missile's computer."

The SAC bomber weighed 488,000 pounds—exactly 244 tons—at takeoff. Average speed along the 12,519-mile route was 575 miles per hour. Top speed of 662 miles per hour was attained on the leg from Kadena Air Base to Tokyo. At landing, the B–52H carried sufficient reserve fuel to reach any SAC base in England or Africa.

The flight demonstrated the intercontinental range of SAC's long-range heavy bombers.

This tremendous flight, demonstrating both the ability and flexibility of the B–52H, is clear evidence that the long-range manned bomber will not soon be relegated to a back seat by current missile developments. Frankly, I regard the flight as one more link in the chain of evidence which led the Senate last year to provide an extra $525 million for the procurement of such planes. From the witness chair, from my seat on the Appropriations Committee, and from my desk in the Senate, I have urged the use of this additional sum.

The administration's refusal to procure additional B–52H bombers has left me with a deep sense of concern, and with a determination to continue to press for the construction of more heavy bombers for the SAC fleet. I hope this flight will open some eyes at the Pentagon and the White House and thus bring about a reexamination and a reversal of the decision which shut down this vital production.

COMPARISON OF DISARMAMENT PROPOSALS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, last September 25 the President of the United States, in what I think was one of the greatest public announcements that he has made since coming into office, made a stirring proposal before the United Nations in New York for total and permanent disarmament.

At my request, the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service has prepared a comparison of those U.S. disarmament proposals with those earlier put forward in Geneva in 1960. I think this compilation will be of interest to my colleagues and to others who subscribe to the Record in studying the current status of U.S. disarmament proposals. I hope to have a good deal more to say on this subject during the coming session.

It is my hope that with the new proposal we shall be able to move forward within the next few months toward the goal which we all seek—total and permanent disarmament in a world ruled by enforcible world law, enforced by an international police force.

I ask unanimous consent that the compilation to which I have referred, prepared by the Library of Congress, may be printed in the Record at this point together with an editorial published in the Philadelphia Inquirer under date of September 27, 1961, commending the President for the position which he took.

There being no objection, the comparison and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Disarmament Proposals of the United States—A Comparison of the Proposals of June 27, 1960, and September 25, 1961

Following is a tabular comparison of the U.S. disarmament proposals of September 25, 1961, and June 27, 1960. Although a number of measures are common to both proposals, the 1961 declaration advances in many respects beyond previous U.S. disarmament proposals. The declaration contains a new, flexible approach to negotiations on general disarmament; provides for augmentation of peacekeeping machinery and processes in phase with disarmament; emphasizes measures for reduction and eventual elimination at an early phase of strategic nuclear weapons delivery systems and weapons designed to counter these systems; introduces a no-transfer provision regarding nuclear weapons; and generally is a more detailed and comprehensive approach to the disarmament problem than has been put forward previously.

In both plans the ultimate goal, to be reached in the third stage of disarmament, is a world completely disarmed except for the forces and armaments necessary to maintain internal order and to constitute the international peace force.

Listed below is a synopsis of some of the major changes.

1. The 1961 declaration, in contrast with the 1960 proposal which involved a two-treaty approach to the goal of general dis-

armament, permits greater flexibility in terms of negotiating procedures. The 1961 declaration places the United States in favor of negotiation of a single treaty embodying general disarmament or, if this is not achieved, of an agreement covering the widest possible area of disarmament measures. The declaration also provides that, in the process of such general disarmament negotiations, the negotiating parties try to reach agreement on those measures whose immediate implementation would contribute to a reduction of tensions and form part of a general disarmament program.

2. The 1961 declaration emphasizes the connection between arms reductions and improvement of peacekeeping capabilities if general disarmament is to be achieved. It sets forth a program for strengthening the peacekeeping processes and machinery of the United Nations, in addition to providing for the establishment of a U.N. Peace Force as in the 1960 proposal.

3 The new proposal contains new measures in the first stage to deal with nuclear weapons. These include a no-transfer provision covering nuclear weapons, materials, and technology, adherence to a treaty on the cessation of testing of nuclear weapons, and the establishment of an international group of experts to examine means for reducing and eventually eliminating nuclear stockpiles. The transfer of fissionable materials from past production to peaceful uses in the first stage is no longer specifically conditioned on progress in reducing conventional armaments.

4. Greater emphasis is placed on the reduction and eventual elimination of strategic nuclear weapons delivery systems, or their conversion to peaceful uses, and of weapons designed to counter such delivery systems. Progress in this direction is specifically provided for in the first stage as well as the second stage. Testing of agreed categories of such weapons is to be limited.

5. The military force levels for the United States and the U.S.S.R. are to be reduced directly in stage I to 2.1 million instead of 2.5 million. The force level in stage II is to be subject of agreement, rather than 1.7 million as provided in the June 1960 proposal.

6 Specific provision is made in stage I for ground observation posts and for advance notification of military movements in order to lessen the risk of war by accident, miscalculation or failure of communication. While aerial inspection is not specifically stipulated, the declaration includes provisions for agreement on other means of reducing such risks and for the establishment of an international commission to study this problem.

7. The new plan provides for dismantling or converting to peaceful uses agreed military bases and facilities, wherever located.

8 Provisions for reducing military expenditures have been omitted from the new plan.

Comparison of recent U.S. disarmament proposals [1]

GOAL

U.S. proposal of Sept. 25, 1961	U.S. proposal of June 27, 1960	Comments
Free, secure, and peaceful world of independent states adhering to common standards of justice and international conduct and subjecting the use of force to the rule of law.	A secure and peaceful world of free and open societies..	New plan names these as "goal" rather than "ultimate goal," and omits the phrase "open" societies.
Adjustment to change to take place in accordance with the principles of the United Nations.	Settlement of disputes in accordance with the principles of the United Nations.	New plan substitutes "adjustment to change" for "settlement of disputes."
Permanent state of general and complete disarmament under effective control and resources to be devoted to man's material, cultural and spiritual advance.	General and complete disarmament under effective international control.	
SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES		
(a) Disbanding of all national armed forces and the prohibition of their reestablishment except for those required to preserve internal order and for contributions to a United Nations Peace Force.	Disbanding of all armed forces of all states and prohibition of their reestablishment except for those contingents required for internal order and contingents in the international peace force.	Substantially the same.
(b) Elimination from national arsenals of all armaments other than those required for a United Nations Peace Force and for maintaining internal order.	Cessation of production of all kinds of armaments and their complete elimination from national arsenals except for those agreed upon for use by an international peace force and agreed remaining national contingents.	New plan does not mention cessation of production of armaments but provides for it in each stage.
(c) Establishment and effective operation of an International Disarmament Organization within the framework of the United Nations to insure compliance at all times with all disarmament obligations.	Strict and effective international control, from beginning to end, of the carrying out of all disarmament measures, to insure there are no violations.	New plan placed control body within the framework of the United Nations.
(d) Effective means for the enforcement of international agreements, for the settlement of disputes, and for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations.	Effective means for enforcement of international agreements and for the maintenance of peace.	New plan adds settlement of disputes.
PROCEDURE		
Call on negotiating states to develop outline program set forth below into an agreed plan and continue efforts without interruption until whole program achieved. To seek widest possible agreement at earliest possible date. To seek agreement on immediate measures which would contribute to security and could facilitate and form a part of the disarmament program.	Ten Nation Committee to negotiate a treaty embodying 1st stage; then prepare a draft treaty on 2d and 3d stages; then arrange for world conference for accession of other states to 1st-stage treaty and all states to treaty covering 2d and 3d stages.	New plan does not specify the negotiating group and describes procedure which permits working on both the general program and immediate measures.
	In the course of negotiating a treaty for 1st stage, to arrange necessary technical studies to work out control arrangements; 1 of early studies to be on nuclear delivery systems.	New plan calls for several specific studies in 1st stage of subjects in which control knowledge now appears inadequate: CBR stockpiles, nuclear weapons stockpiles, accidental war.
GUIDING PRINCIPLES		
	TIMING	
(a) Disarmament to take place as rapidly as possible until completed		Innovation.
In stages containing balanced, phased, and safeguarded measures	3 stages containing balanced, phased, safeguarded measures.	
Each measure and stage to be carried out in agreed period of time	Each measure carried out in agreed and strictly defined period of time.	New plan omits "strictly defined."
	VERIFICATION	
(b) Compliance with all obligations to be verified from entry into force	Effective verification by control organization from initiation of implementation of each measure.	Same, in effect.
Progressive verification arrangement to verify not only agreed limitations but also that retained forces and armaments do not exceed agreed levels.	Verifications to include that retained armed forces and armament do not exceed agreed levels.	Same.
	Specific arrangements and means for effective initial and continuing verification of each measure by control organization to be specified in treaties.	New plan does not specify that detailed verification measures must be written into treaty.
	Verification to be capable of disclosing, to satisfaction of all parties, any evasions.	
(c) Manner of disarmament not to affect adversely the security of any state	No state to obtain military advantage over any other as a result of manner of disarmament.	Same concept.

See footnote at end of table.

Comparison of recent U.S. disarmament proposals [1]—Continued

GUIDING PRINCIPLES—Continued

U.S. proposal of Sept. 25, 1961	U.S. proposal of June 27, 1960	Comments
(d) As states relinquish arms, United Nations to be progressively strengthened.		Innovation.
(e) Transition from one stage to another to take place as soon as all measures of previous stage carried out and verification is continuing and as soon as arrangements agreed as necessary for next stage have been instituted.	Transition from one stage to another to be initiated when Security Council agrees all measures of previous stage have been implemented and verification is continuing, and any additional verification arrangements necessary for next stage have been established and are ready to operate effectively.	New plan does not specify that Security Council must make determination of readiness to proceed to next stage.
	Each measure to be initiated simultaneously by each party upon completion of necessary preparatory studies and establishment of arrangements necessary for verification.	Omitted from new plan.
	Treaty to remain in force indefinitely subject to right of a party to withdraw if obligations, including operation of control system, are not fulfilled.	Omitted from new plan.
	STAGE 1	
A. TO ESTABLISH AN INTERNATIONAL DISARMAMENT ORGANIZATION		
An International Disarmament Organization (IDO) to be established within the framework of the United Nations upon entry into force of the agreement, to be progressively expanded as required for effective verification.	An International Disarmament Control Organization to be established within the framework of the United Nations, and expanded as required by the implementation of general and complete disarmament.	The word "Control" is dropped from the title of the organization.
	Provisions for any preparatory or interim group to aid in the establishment of the Organization to be specified in the treaty.	In the new plan the IDO is to be established upon entry into force of the treaty; there is no provision for an interim group to aid in its establishment.
Provides for the following 3 organs: (1) A general conference of all parties, (2) a commission of representatives of all major powers as permanent members and certain (unspecified) other states on a rotating basis, (3) an administrator subject to the direction of the commission with authority, staff, and finances adequate to assure effective impartial implementation of the functions.	Provides for (1) a periodic conference of all parties, (2) a control commission, and (3) a Director General with responsibilities and staffing specified in the treaty.	
Functions of the IDO are to— (1) Insure compliance by verifying execution of measures;	Control organization to effectively verify measures.	
(2) Assist states in developing details of agreed further measures;	Arrangements for verification to be specified in the treaty.	New plan does not specify that all verification arrangements must be written into initial treaty.
(3) Provide for bodies to work out details of further measures and for other expert study groups as necessary to give continuous study to the problems.		
(4) Receive reports on progress of disarmament and verification arrangements and determine transition from one stage to the next.	Transition to next stage to be initiated when General Security Council of the United Nations agrees previous measures have been completed and verification measures for next stage are ready.	New plan provides for transition to be determined by control organization instead of Security Council.
B. TO REDUCE ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS		
Force levels of United States and U.S.S.R. to be limited to 2,100,000 each and appropriate levels not exceeding 2,100,000 for all other militarily significant states. Reductions to proceed by equitable, proportionate, and verified steps.	Initial force levels limited to 2,500,000 for United States and U.S.S.R. and agreed appropriate force levels for certain other states. After accession to treaty of other militarily significant states and verification of the reductions, force levels of 2,100,000 for United States and U.S.S.R. and agreed levels for other militarily significant states.	New plan omits initial force level of 2,500,000 and provides for direct reduction to 2,100,000. New plan provides that agreed levels of other "militarily significant states" not to exceed 2,100,000.
Levels of armaments of prescribed types to be reduced, in equitable and balanced steps, by transferring armaments to depots supervised by the IDA. When parties have agreed that forces and armaments are at prescribed levels, the armaments in depots to be destroyed or converted to peaceful uses.	Agreed types and quantities of armaments in agreed relation to the established force levels to be placed in storage depots in parties' own territories, under supervision of the Control Organization pending their final destruction or conversion to peaceful uses.	New plan does not specify that depots will be in own territory of each party. New plan provides for destruction or conversion to peaceful use of armaments in depot when parties agree armaments and Armed Forces are at prescribed level.
Production of agreed types of armaments to be limited		June 27 proposal does not call for limiting production of armaments (except nuclear) until 3d stage.
A Chemical, Biological, Radiological (CBR) Experts Commission shall be established within IDO for purpose of examining the feasibility and means for accomplishing the verifiable reduction and eventual elimination of CBR weapons stockpiles and the halting of their production.		New plan provides for Experts Commission on CBR. Old plan called for any necessary study group to be established during the negotiations.
C. TO CONTAIN AND REDUCE THE NUCLEAR THREAT		
(a) States not having acceded to a treaty effectively prohibiting the testing of nuclear weapons to do so.		Underscore U.S. views that, while a test agreement would become a part of a subsequent general disarmament program, such an agreement should be concluded at an early date pending efforts to make progress on the general program.
(b) Production of fissionable materials for use in weapons to be stopped	Production of fissionable materials for use in weapons to be stopped upon installation and effective operation of the control system.	Clause "upon installation and effective operation of the control system" omitted although general provisions for verification made elsewhere.
(c) Upon (b), agreed initial quantities of fissionable materials from past production to be transferred to nonweapons purposes.	Agreed quantities of fissionable material from past production to be transferred to nonweapons uses, including stockpiling for peaceful purposes, conditioned upon satisfactory progress in the field of conventional disarmament.	New plan does not condition transfer of fissionable materials to peaceful uses on "satisfactory progress in the field of conventional disarmament."
(d) Any fissionable material transferred between countries for peaceful uses to be subject to safeguards to be developed in agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency.		Innovation in new plan.
(e) States owning nuclear weapons not to relinquish control of them to any nation not owning them and not to transmit to such nation information or material necessary for their manufacture. States not owning nuclear weapons not to manufacture, attempt to obtain control of, or seek or receive information or materials necessary for manufacture of nuclear weapons.		Innovation in new plan.

See footnote at end of table.

Comparison of recent U.S. disarmament proposals[1]—Continued

STAGE 1—Continued

U.S. proposal of Sept. 25, 1961	U.S. proposal of June 27, 1960	Comments
C. TO CONTAIN AND REDUCE THE NUCLEAR THREAT—continued		
(f) A Nuclear Experts Commission of representatives of nuclear states to be established to examine the feasibility and means for achieving the verified reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons stockpiles.		Old plan called for "necessary technical studies" in the course of negotiating the treaty.
D. TO REDUCE STRATEGIC NUCLEAR WEAPONS DELIVERY SYSTEMS		
(a) Strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles in specified categories and agreed types of counterweapons to be reduced to agreed levels, in equitable and balanced steps, by transfers of excess to depots supervised by IDC. At specified periods the vehicles in depots to be destroyed or converted to peaceful uses.		The placing of strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles in depots could have been included in June 27 proposal for general armaments.
(b) Production of agreed categories of strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles and counter weapons to be discontinued or limited.		June 27 plan did not provide for any limitation on production of armaments, except nuclear, until 3d stage.
(c) Testing of agreed categories of strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles and counter weapons to be limited or halted.		Innovation in new plan.
	Declaration of and institution of onsite inspection at mutually agreed operational airbases, missile launching pads, submarine and naval bases in order to establish a basis for controls over nuclear delivery systems in subsequent stages.	New plan omits this provision, although it may be covered in functions of IDO.
E. TO PROMOTE THE PEACEFUL USE OF OUTER SPACE		
(a) Placing into orbit or stationing in outer space of weapons capable of producing mass destruction to be prohibited.	Placing into orbit or stationing in outer space of vehicles carrying weapons capable of mass destruction to be prohibited.	Same.
(b) States to give advance notification to participating States and the IDO of launching of space vehicles and missiles, with track of vehicle.	Prior notification to control organization of all proposed launchings of space vehicles and missiles and their planned tracks.	Same.
F. TO REDUCE THE RISKS OF WAR BY ACCIDENT, MISCALCULATION, AND SURPRISE ATTACK		
(a) States to give advance notification to States and IDO of major military movements and maneuvers, on an agreed scale, which might give rise to misinterpretation or cause alarm and induce countermeasures. Notification to include the geographic areas to be used and nature, scale, and time span of event.		
(b) Observation posts to be established at such locations as major ports, railway centers, motor highways, and airbases to report on concentrations and movements of military forces.	Establishment of a zone of aerial and ground inspection in agreed areas including the United States and U.S.S.R.	Aerial inspection not specifically mentioned.
(c) Such additional inspection arrangements to reduce the danger of surprise attack as may be agreed.		
(d) International commission to be established immediately in IDO to examine possibility of further measures to reduce risks of nuclear war by accident, miscalculation, or failure of communication.		Innovation.
	Exchange of observers on a reciprocal basis at agreed military bases, domestic and foreign.	Omitted from new plan, though possibly covered in functions of IDO. International commission on prevention of accidental war is an innovation.
G. TO KEEP THE PEACE		
(a) States to reaffirm obligations under U.N. Charter to refrain from the threat or use of any type of armed force, including nuclear, conventional, or CBR, contrary to principles of U.N. Charter.		Entire section is an innovation.
(b) States to agree to refrain from indirect aggression and subversion against any country.		
(c) States to use all appropriate processes for peaceful settlement of disputes and to seek within U.N. further arrangements for peaceful settlements and the codification and progressive development of international law.[2]		
(d) States to develop in stage I arrangements for the establishment of a U.N. peace force in stage II.[2]		
(e) U.N. peace observation group to be staffed with observers who could be dispatched to investigate any situation which would be threat to or breach of the peace.		
	CONTROL OF MILITARY EXPENDITURES	
	States to submit to the control organization data relating to the operation of their financial system as it affects military expenditures, amount of military expenditures, and percentage of gross national product earmarked for military expenditures, drawn up according to agreed criteria.	New plan omits all provisions for controlling military expenditures.

STAGE 2

U.S. proposal of Sept. 25, 1961	U.S. proposal of June 27, 1960	Comments
A. INTERNATIONAL DISARMAMENT ORGANIZATION		
Powers and responsibilities of IDO to be progressively enlarged to give it capability to verify stage 2 measures.		
B. ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS		
(a) Force levels to be further reduced by substantial amounts to agreed levels.	Force levels to be reduced to 1,700,000 for United States and U.S.S.R. and agreed levels for other states.	New plan does not specify the 2d-stage level, which the old plan set at 1,700,000.
(b) Levels of armaments of prescribed types to be further reduced by placing agreed quantities and types in depots to be destroyed at specified periods when parties have agreed that armaments and armed forces are at prescribed levels.	Quantities of all kinds of armaments of each state, including nuclear, CBR, and means of delivery, to be reduced to agreed levels and excesses destroyed or converted to peaceful uses. Agreed categories of missiles, aircraft, surface ships, submarines, and nuclear artillery and other weapons of mass destruction to be included.	
(c) Further agreed restrictions on production of armaments		In old plan, production of armaments not limited until 3d stage.
(d) Agreed military bases and facilities wherever located to be dismantled or converted to peaceful uses.		Innovation in new plan.

See footnotes at end of table.

Comparison of recent U.S. disarmament proposals[1]—Continued

STAGE 2—Continued

U.S. proposal of Sept. 25, 1961	U.S. proposal of June 27, 1960	Comments
B. ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS—continued		
(e) Depending on findings of Experts Commission, production of CBR weapons to be halted, existing stocks progressively reduced, and resulting excesses destroyed or converted to peaceful uses.	....	Previous plan included this in general armaments reduction paragraph, except for halting of production.
C. TO FURTHER REDUCE THE NUCLEAR THREAT		
Stocks of nuclear weapons to be progressively reduced to minimum levels which can be agreed as a result of findings of Nuclear Experts Commission, resulting excesses to be transferred to peaceful purposes.	....	Paragraph of June 27 plan concerning reduction of armaments included nuclear weapons. However, old plan did not relate nuclear reduction to findings of an expert group.
D. TO FURTHER REDUCE STRATEGIC NUCLEAR WEAPONS DELIVERY VEHICLES		
Further reductions in stocks of strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles and agreed types of counterweapons to be carried out in same procedure as stage I.	....	Paragraph of June 27 plan concerning reduction of armaments included delivery weapons.
E. TO KEEP THE PEACE		
Peacekeeping processes of U.N. to be further developed so that in stage III U.N. can effectively deter or suppress any threat or use of force in violation of principles of United Nations.		
(a) States to agree upon strengthening the structure, authority, and operation of U.N. to assure U.N. will be able to protect states against threats to or breaches of the peace.	....	Innovation.
(b) U.N. Peace Force to be established and progressively strengthened.	An international peace force, within the U.N., to be progressively established and maintained with agreed personnel strength and armaments sufficient to preserve world peace when general and complete disarmament is achieved.	In the 1961 declaration, the U.N. Peace Force would become operative contemporaneously with substantial arms reductions, not at such time as general and complete disarmament had been achieved.
	MILITARY EXPENDITURES	
	Expenditures for military purposes to be reduced in amounts bearing a relation to the agreed reductions in armed forces and armaments.	New plan does not call for reduction in military expenditures.

STAGE 3

U.S. proposal of Sept. 25, 1961	U.S. proposal of June 27, 1960	Comments
By time stage II has been completed, confidence, acceptance of rules of peaceful international behavior, and development of strengthened international peace-keeping processes within framework of U.N. to have reached a point where states can move to stage III.	....	
In stage III, progressive controlled disarmament and continuously developing principles and procedures of international law to proceed to point where no state would have the military power to challenge the progressively strengthened U.N. Peace Force and all international disputes would be settled according to agreed principles of international conduct.	....	
Progressive steps directed to attain a world in which—		
(a) States would retain only those forces, nonnuclear armaments, and establishments required for the purpose of maintaining internal order; they would also support and provide manpower for a U.N. Peace Force.	Forces and military establishments of all states to be finally reduced to those levels required for maintaining internal order and insuring personal security of citizens and of providing agreed contingents of forces to the international peace force.	Similar.
(b) U.N. Peace Force, equipped with agreed types and quantities of armaments, would be fully functioning.	International peace force and remaining agreed contingents of national armed forces to be armed only with agreed types and quantities of armaments.	Similar.

---

[1] This table has been arranged in the order of the proposal of Sept. 25, 1961. Next to each item of the 1961 proposal has been placed the comparable provision from the June 27, 1960, proposal. Any items from the 1960 proposal not included in the new proposal has been placed at the end of the relevant section. The language of the proposals is substantially retained although some condensations and alterations have been made.

[2] Would require Charter review.

THE U.N.'S ROLE IN DISARMAMENT

President Kennedy—in a well-timed and appropriately located ceremony in New York City, not far from United Nations headquarters—has dramatically underscored America's firm intention to push ahead toward safe and practical disarmament by signing into law the bill to establish a U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The President acted some 24 hours after presenting realistic disarmament proposals to the U.N. General Assembly—proposals that already are under fire from Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko, as was expected. Gromyko's blistering Assembly speech, attacking both the United States and the United Nations, gives some idea of the immense difficulties ahead.

Soviet opposition is all the more reason for the U.N. to get started now on the long, hard road to disarmament. The United States has taken the initiative. Solid support from free-world delegates in the General Assembly can help bring the Kremlin into line.

Of course it won't be easy. Of course the Russians will hem and haw, frustrate and delay, denounce and reject—as they are doing now, as they have done for the past 3 years in Geneva, as they did in every other conference pertaining to disarmament.

The most hostile, belligerent, menacing nation on earth naturally will obstruct rather than lead the way to disarmament.

It is the task of the United Nations—with the leadership and support of the President, the Congress and the people of the United States—to go ahead with the establishment of organizational machinery to supervise the control and limitation of arms.

This must be done no matter what the Soviet Union says.

We'll wager that the Russians, even though grudgingly, will give some measure of cooperation when it becomes apparent that U.N. disarmament apparatus is to become a reality whether they like it or not. Mr. Khrushchev, however reluctantly, would probably join in a disarmament setup if for no other reason than to be assured of a voice in its operation.

Details of the U.S. disarmament program, presented to the General Assembly to supplement proposals outlined by President Kennedy in his address Monday, are specific enough to be practical but are sufficiently flexible to allow for reasonable modification at the behest of the Soviet Union or any other nation.

The American plan, fundamentally, is to move simultaneously toward disarmament on many fronts, with relatively small steps at first, making gains wherever possible, crossing each bridge as it comes without getting bogged down at the very beginning on broad issues that need not be resolved until later.

Almost at the very start, however, an International Disarmament Organization must be established within the framework of the United Nations. This is the keystone of the U.S. plan. It is this organization that would prepare and execute effective inspection procedures to insure compliance with each disarmament step.

This is a realistic approach. The ideal of complete and general disarmament obviously is a long way from attainment. But now, amid the uncertainties of crises and the perils of fallout, is the time to begin. To wait any longer might be to wait until it is too late.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION PARLIAMENTARIANS CONFERENCE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, during the recess, Pennsylvania's distinguished junior Senator [Mr. SCOTT] attended the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentarians Conference as an official American delegate.

Following his return, the Senator from Pennsylvania sketched the highlights of that conference in a newsletter to his Pennsylvania constituency. His expert analysis of the NATO alliance and the feeling of unity among member nations was editorialized by the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette on the 27th of December 1961.

I commend to my colleagues in the Senate this editorial, which contains some of Senator SCOTT's observations, and is extremely laudatory in its praise of the cheerful report on NATO which the Senator outlined.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FRIENDS THOU HAST

Of the many Christmas messages that came our way this year, we found the most hope in a newsletter from Pennsylvania's Senator HUGH SCOTT.

The Senator sketched the highlights of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Parliamentarians Conference which he attended in mid-November as an official American delegate.

"Everywhere," he reported, "there was an air of unity and strength of conviction. No one denied that there were problems. But for every conflict and difference of opinion that may arise among free nations exercising their freedom to debate issues, there were mighty bonds of friendship and a clear community of interest holding together the free world as never before in history. There is no question that we are stronger in 1962 than we were in 1952. Don't you be misled by the gloomslingers."

Senator SCOTT describes NATO as the "great shield behind which the free world stands poised." Some of its achievements: more than 200 airfields and thousands of miles of pipelines constructed for use in an emergency, almost 2 billon cubic meters of fuel storage, millions of dollars worth of naval facilities completed or under construction, a huge network of radar and telecommunications, 28 fighting divisions under the command of Supreme Headquarters of Allied Powers in Europe (SHAPE).

This cheerful report on NATO is welcome not only for its affirmation of military strength and unity of purpose but also because it draws attention to recent international developments that can be ignored only at our peril.

The most significant international development of 1961, it seems to us, was an acceleration in the decline of the United Nations, the world federation in which so much of mankind has for so long reposed its hopes for peace. By late December, when India had seized Portuguese possessions by force of arms and against the appeals of the Western Powers, it had become painfully evident that the U.N. no longer served—if it ever did—as an effective deterrent to aggression.

The U.N. closes out the year badly discredited politically and almost bankrupt morally and financially. It will need a great deal of shoring up in 1962 if it is to survive as a useful instrument of peace.

Unlike the nations that have cynically violated their pledges of nonaggression and failed to support the U.N. financially, the United States should continue to fulfill its pledges and obligations to the U.N. We should work as hard for it in 1962 as we did when it was born in 1945.

But in pursuing the ideal of a world community of nations living in peace, let us not blind ourselves to the ugly realities of a continuing world conflict between East and West, between Communist imperialism and freedom.

Anonymous officials in Washington are reported to have complained, with much wisdom, that we have been so preoccupied with the underdeveloped nations of Asia and Africa that we have had little time for the underdeveloped alliance of Western states, which has been taken too much for granted.

We must put greater effort, and thus build more reliance, into NATO, the indispensable alliance of Western nations that have so much in common. While this alliance links us to a handful of powers of a dying colonialism and thereby confronts us with occasional embarrassments, let us not desert or offend old allies in a will-o'-the-wisp pursuit of new ones of dubious dependability. As Polonius advised his son, Laertes:

"Those friends thou hast, and their adoption tried.
Grapple them to thy soul with hoops of steel;
But do not dull thy palm with entertainment
Of each new hatched, unfledged comrade."

FOREIGN TRADE IN A DECADE OF CHALLENGE

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, it seems clear that no more crucial issue confronts this session of Congress than our country's course in international economic affairs. With the reciprocal trade agreements program expiring on June 30, the action of Congress in this field may influence the course of history for years to come.

I believe that no one has given more thoughtful consideration to the tremendous significance of this decision than my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New York. In an article entitled "Foreign Trade in a Decade of Challenge," published in the January issue of the Carpenter, Senator JAVITS has weighed the consequences of this pending decision, in the light of his experience during the intersession period, when he served as chairman of the Economic Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference and studied in Moscow the Communist economic offensive for the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress. He considers not only such important matters as employment and the expansion of our own economy, but also the economic strength and military power of the nations confronted today by a massive and multifaceted Soviet challenge.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN TRADE IN A DECADE OF CHALLENGE

(By Senator JACOB K. JAVITS)

The economic growth of the United States and the political survival of the free world demand:

1. Economic integration of the nearly $1 trillion of annual production in the Atlantic Community;

2. Application of this integrated economic power to social progress and defensive strength within the Atlantic Community, and to the development efforts of the less developed free world nations which are now seeking a way out of age-old poverty—and who will find the way, either of freedom or of Communist slavery.

I am convinced that success or failure in meeting these demands will have been indicated by the close of this decade. I am convinced that this year the United States will make a choice in the field of foreign trade which will represent a giant step in the direction of either success or failure. I should like to outline for you the nature of this choice and its implications to the United States and to the world.

THE CHOICE

On June 30, 1962, the present Trade Agreements Act will expire. This legislation authorizes the President to engage in limited reciprocal tariff reductions on an item-by-item basis. Exceptions to this authority are contained principally in the escape clause and peril point provisions. The escape clause which authorizes the raising of tariffs to prevent injury from imports to domestic producers will remain on the books even after the President's authority to lower tariffs expires.

This year the Congress can move in either one of two main directions: protectionism or trade expansion.

Thus, the Congress could permit the Trade Agreements Act to expire or it could renew it as is—both in cases leaving the exceptions on the books or even strengthening them. Under present conditions, this would be the path of trade reduction and, in my opinion, the choice of failure.

On the other hand, the Congress could give the President broad authority, including the power to lower the average tariff on whole categories of goods on a reciprocal basis. It could make a part of this authority the power to deal with quotas, especially on agricultural items, and to make special arrangements for the trading needs of low wage areas, like Japan and Hong Kong, and the developing nations. This would be the path of trade expansion and, in my opinion, the choice of success.

However, such authority should not be given to the President without certain positive safeguards. One of these would be adjustment assistance for workers, businesses, and whole communities experiencing injury from import competition. Such assistance would be designed to speed the process of adjustment to new competitive conditions. It would provide expanded unemployment compensation, retraining programs, early retirement and relocation allowances for workers. For adversely affected businesses it would provide rapid amortization and other tax incentives for modernization or conversion to other lines, loans, and technical assistance. For communities it would also provide loans and technical assistance for redevelopment. Furthermore, the President should be authorized to reimpose tariffs and quotas for predetermined periods of time and to phase them out as the process of adjustment takes hold. The National Import Policy Act of 1961 which I introduced in the Senate last year with Senator CASE, provides for such adjustment assistance and for the phasing out of additioal protection.

Another safeguard which the Congress may well wish to include and which would not impair the purpose of the program could be the retention of veto power by the Congress through concurrent resolution over all or parts of the President's actions under the authority given him. Also, annual reports on the programs to committees designated by the Congress could be required. The whole program could be limited to a reasonable period of years.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF TRADE EXPANSION

The road to a successful trade policy will not be entirely easy. For instance, although the overwhelming majority of the three-quarters of a million members of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America will receive great and lasting benefits from the acceleration of economic activity resulting from trade expansion, there will be some temporary dislocations and adjustments. An example may well be in the plywood field. However, with the proper kind of governmental policy and assistance, such adjustments as have to be made can be rapidly accomplished.

It should be noted that in the 18 European nations, members of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC), the 90-percent trade quota liberalization which has taken place among themselves between 1951 and 1960 was accompanied by the following economic facts: A doubling of intra-OEEC trade, from $27 billion annually to $55 billion annually; a doubling of residential construction, from $6 billion annually to $12 billion annually; and a 37-percent increase in per capita income. Since the European Common Market went into actual operation in 1958, residential construction activity among its six member nations alone increased from $7 to $8 billion annually.

It is of interest that both foreign trade and residential construction activity increased at a rate nearly three times that of per capita income. Over the same period, this same phenomenon was even more remarkable in the United States, with residential construction and foreign trade increasing five to six times faster than per capita income. I believe that the reasons for this are fairly obvious. An economic climate of confidence engendered by trade expansion will make the individual put an even relatively small increment to his income into better housing. To do so, he must believe in the future and it is no accident that both here and in Europe the harbingers of a better future—foreign trade and residential construction—marched along at the same pace.

The stake of the American construction industry in foreign trade is synonymous with its stake in the American economy. True, the stake is not as direct as that of the increasing number of U.S. workers whose manufacturing jobs depend on our ability to import the materials which they process, or whose jobs depend on the production and servicing of exports. There are now an aggregate of 20 million such workers. Nor is its stake as direct as that of the increasing number of businesses for whom the difference between profit and loss is determined by their production for or participation in exports. There are many thousands of such businesses sharing in our $20 billion of annual exports. But the stake of the American construction industry is clearly indicated by imagining what would happen to building in the United States, if those workers had no adequate raw materials from abroad or no imports to process or no exports to produce and service, and if those businesses should fail.

More and more, foreign trade is becoming the lubricant of the U.S. economy. Although it represents only about 7 percent of our gross national product—as compared to the European nations where its importance is five or six times as great—it is nonetheless essential. The European trade liberalization which was responsible to a large extent for our $3.3 billion increase in exports in 1960 over 1959 did much to soften the impact of our recession. But now this liberalization toward our products can stop and reverse itself to a certain degree with the raising of a common tariff. Further liberalization awaits our ability to reciprocate.

But much more is at stake.

I spent the last 3 weeks of November in Paris and in the Soviet Union. In Paris I served as chairman of the Economic Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference. In the Soviet Union I looked into aspects of the Communist economic offensive for the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress. Both of these experiences confirmed me in my conviction that trade policy under the leadership of the United States forms the key to the future of the free world.

In Paris, my fellow parliamentarians from the NATO nations showed a keen awareness of the need for our leadership. But this awareness can only be turned into action, if the United States can come before the Western Europeans with the bargaining power and the economic strength to back up its leadership role. It takes singleness of purpose and coordinated power to fight against Communist infiltration. This is clear from the experiences of trade with the Soviet bloc, where individual national policies of the West are sought to be exploited to divide and penetrate the free world. East-West trade policy is another essential element of the foreign trade program which we are contemplating. We must have a way to unite Western economic policies toward the Soviet block. Furthermore, we must have a way to share the increasing responsibility of meeting the export needs of the developing nations with Western Europe. Unless this is done the gain may well be that of the Soviet bloc.

Nothing less than the unity of the free world is at stake in a policy of trade expansion. I shall close with a note of warning on the alternative we face.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF PROTECTIONISM

If the United States does not shape a tariff policy which would give us the ability to negotiate reductions in the common tariff and other trade barriers of the enlarged European Economic Community and instead adopts a policy of high protectionism, we would become increasingly isolated from the mainstream of the world's economic and political life. Our leadership role would slip and, in the not too distant future, our economy would stagnate, unemployment and business failures could reach disastrous proportions, and the basis of our military might and political influence could diminish. The cause of freedom would have been greatly jeopardized and the free world be split.

How might these dire events come to pass?

During the first years, the onset of trouble would be almost imperceptible. The great European market which bought nearly $6.5 billion worth of goods from us in 1960 might buy slightly less. On the other hand, we would buy less from Europe and the rest of the world, and some industries would expand or spring up in this country to replace these imports. At first, some more people might be employed—enough even to give jobs to many of those who formerly manufactured for export. Prices would begin to rise. Costs would go up because things better produced elsewhere would have to be produced here. There would be little competition from the outside world to keep prices down and competition up.

In the meantime, the efficiency of the European producers supplying their new market of nearly 300 million people would increase. Soon, many of our products would not be able to compete with European goods in the European market—even if the common tariff were to be removed to a large extent—or in the other markets of the world.

Yet, it would become difficult for us to fully reverse this process. Unless we were willing to subject ourselves to drastic deflation and more unemployment we could not lower our tariff barriers. Our balance of payments problem which is principally the result of our failure to export enough would be aggravated. The Government might have to raise tariffs further, put on foreign exchange restrictions, limit capital movements, and perhaps even restrict American tourist travel overseas.

It would become difficult for us to import those raw materials and other products necessary to keep our industry going. Those countries, especially in Latin America, which now depend on the U.S. market to earn a large part of their foreign exchange needs could become more susceptible to barter trade with the Soviet bloc. As nations moved under Soviet economic domination, it would become increasingly difficult for us to purchase their commodities at any price.

Fifteen million American jobs are directly dependent on our ability to obtain raw materials or supplies. Five million more depend directly on export production and sales—approximately 3 million in manufacturing and up to 2 million in transportation, distribution and other services. These sources of employment would be hurt, while prices would climb.

Having less reason to reciprocally lower their barriers against our agricultural products, the rest of the world would reduce their purchases from the United States. And we would be burdened with more billions of dollars of unsalable agricultural surpluses. The Government would be forced to pay more in subsidies to our farmers, in order to preserve their purchasing power, and the surplus storage problem and expense would soar.

Thus, isolated and disadvantaged economically in relation to the rest of the industrialized world, our ability to maintain our armed might would be impaired and our ability to keep up the commitments of our alliances gravely impaired. Our voice in the councils of the world would be smaller and the Red tide would be far more threatening to us all.

In our rapidly changing world, where new currents of power—economic and political—have been unleashed all around us, the path of the protectionist which seems so easy and logical to some here at home is indeed a terribly dangerous one. Only by harnessing these mighty new currents of power to the purposes of freedom, only by having the courage and the foresight to meet them squarely in the great enterprise tradition of our country can we reach for the destiny of freemen.

PROGRAM OF THE ATLANTIC INSTITUTE FOR 1962

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on November 8, 1961 the Atlantic Institute—which is the international and nongovernmental organization seeking to advance free world unity—began its operation.

On that date it established its headquarters in Paris, with a branch office in Washington, and elected a former

Member of this body, Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, who was also U.S. Representative to the United Nations, as Director-General. I may add that I think this was a wise choice for this position. It also agreed on a declaration of purpose. These actions were welcomed by President Kennedy in a statement issued at the White House on November 9.

The Atlantic Institute adopted a program of work for 1962 which seeks to deal both with the short and the long range aspects of bringing about effective and speedy cooperative action between the Atlantic community and other free peoples.

Mr. Lodge recently stated that the movement toward unity is moving fast in Europe, and the non-European members of the Atlantic community must be ready for dramatic achievement in the near future.

So that Congress may be fully informed about this new activity, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD: First, the program for 1962 which was adopted by the Board of Governors of the Atlantic Institute at its meeting of November 26; second, a statement describing the Institute; third, a statement by former Prime Minister of Belgium, Paul van Zeeland, Chairman of the Board of Governors; fourth, a statement by Mr. Lodge, of November 8, 1961; fifth, a declaration of purpose, adopted by the Atlantic Institute on November 8, 1961; sixth, a historical summary of the Atlantic Institute; and seventh, a list of the Board of Governors of the Institute.

There being no objection, the documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Nineteen Hundred and Sixty Two Projects of the Atlantic Institute, November 27, 1961, "For Unity of the Free"

PROJECT I

(a) A conference will be held in Paris in the spring. Its aim will be to agree on a brief statement expressing vividly and eloquently the long range aims and ideals which the free people hold for all humanity—in short, to tell the world what we are really about.

(b) The Institute will continue, as a supplement to this effort, its Study on the "Future of the Atlantic community", with the object of setting forth a series of practical goals for the Atlantic community.

PROJECT 1

A study on the Atlantic implications of the Common Market.

Problem: What will be the consequences for the United States, and Canadian economies of the broadening of the Common Market to include most, if not all, of Western Europe?

(a) What should be the response to this challenge?

Should the United States and Canada seek to enter the Common Market; or

Should a free trade area, including an enlarged Europe as a unit, United States, and Canada, be formed; or

Should the special relationship envisaged for the Commonwealth and the Common Market serve as a model for an accommodation with the United States?

(b) In any of these cases, what should be the position of Latin America and Japan, the two principal dependent markets of the United States?

(c) What means could be devised for relating the lesser-developed countries to such a new trade bloc? How would all this affect GATT?

Proposed handling: Series of interviews by A.I. staff in Europe and North America with key researchers, government officials, businessmen, etc. Fact-finding and any basic research necessary done by associated institutions in Europe and U.S. Small conferences to synthesize views if necessary.

Goal: Completed study by September 1. All of this to be done in close contact with OECD and the European Economic Community. Emphasis will be put on the need for developing generally freer world trade.

PROJECT 3

How best can the Atlantic Community protect its currency and financial soundness, notably the warding off of balance of payments crises and insuring the smooth flow of capital, as needed, within the community?

PROJECT 4

The Board of Governors has adopted a declaration urging a large plan of educational assistance for the lesser-developed countries (appended).

The Institute will undertake a study, in consultation with the OECD and other agencies concerned, which will outline the need, the capacity of the West to meet it, and a specific plan for consideration by the competent authorities.

PROJECT 5

The Atlantic Institute will examine the feasibility of a large-scale program of educational and cultural exchange in the Atlantic Community, to be operated and paid for by the nations of North America and Western Europe.

(NOTE.—It is the belief of the Institute's Board that the unity of the free peoples will be advanced but not decisively effectuated by such steps as can be taken within the next few years and that only a massive effort to educate the next generation will really do the job.)

PROJECT 6

What is the extent of the Sino-Soviet danger, having particularly in mind the possible future relationship between Moscow and Peiping?

(The Director-General will also undertake a private study of possible devices for hastening diplomatic consultation and improving the far-sightedness of inter-allied decision-making.)

Declaration by the Board of Governors of the Atlantic Institute

NEEDED: A WORLDWIDE EFFORT TO WIPE OUT UNDEREDUCATION

Fifteen years ago the very word "underdevelopment" was hardly known. Ten years ago, the gap between "rich" and "poor" countries was still mainly seen as a problem to be solved either by charity or by a redistribution of wealth. Only recently was it fully recognized that the gap between the two was not being bridged but had tragically widened.

The time has now come when the West and the other free peoples must, in partnership, create and then carry out a coherent policy for development. If there is to be freedom and progress, rather than slavery and chaos, we have no choice.

Until now, we have thought largely in terms of material help. But if material things are to be more than a stop-gap, we must meet an equally basic need: education. Clearly, 1 well-trained technician is more valuable than 10 machines; 1 civil servant who has learned punctuality is more effective than an electronic brain; and one who popularizes agricultural techniques more productive than a garage full of tractors. Engines can be imported; but education not only takes roots, it fructifies and brings with it self-confidence and self-reliance.

Merely to wipe out illiteracy is not enough; nor will it suffice merely to promote university studies. Young states need both primary schools and higher studies; but they also require trained leaders and an informed citizenry. Civic education is as important as technical training. There must be adult as well as vocational education.

Effective education is not a routine matter. It must provide the means for the people of any community to assume their own responsibilities. Educational help to the young states must therefore primarily aim at making itself superfluous. One should first train the trainers and educate the educators. Any plan with a chance of success must provide for a transitional period of at least a generation.

Despite considerable efforts nationally and internationally, this need is not being met on the larger scale which is necessary. Undoubtedly, this is because it has not been presented to those in power as the vivid frontier, the neglected world opportunity.

The Atlantic peoples are uniquely qualified to help. As a community, we should join in offering to help less-educated peoples achieve the high standards of education which the modern age demands—and in the shortest possible time.

A bold effort with adequate support should be conceived, announced, and carried out by the Atlantic Community as a whole, in full partnership with all other free peoples who care to join. We should begin with a plan, drawn up together by givers and receivers, in the spirit of the Marshall plan. From the very beginning, each step must be guided by the principles of mutual respect with equal representation—and equal responsibility for failure or success.

There should in such a plan be a division of labor as between Europeans and Americans and as between the different states who each have their own specialties and their traditional connections overseas.

This plan for educational cooperation must have no political or doctrinal bias. We want the young states to conduct their affairs independently, as they choose. Their political, social, and economic systems will differ from those in the Atlantic world, as they will vary from continent to continent and culture to culture. But freedom and independence, however differently they may be managed, must be exercised competently to be real. A broad plan for education would seek to contribute to this competence and thus make independence prosperous and durable.

The Atlantic Community must create a mighty force to give the lesser developed nations of the world the education which is indispensable to their survival and growth.

Therefore, the Governors of the Atlantic Institute welcome the efforts of the OECD and others in this field. We will also arrange for an urgent study to outline the need and a specific plan to recommend to the authorities.

PARIS, *November 27, 1961.*

Statement Describing the Atlantic Institute

PARIS, November 8.—Henry Cabot Lodge, former U.S. Representative to the United Nations, was elected Director-General of the Atlantic Institute at a meeting here today of the policy committee of the Institute's board of governors.

The Atlantic Institute is a voluntary organization of leading citizens from Western Europe, Canada, and the United States, which had its inception at a conference in Bruges in 1957. Funds for the Institute's current operations have been provided by private individuals, foundations, and Western European governments. More than half of this financial support comes from sources outside the United States.

In announcing the election of Mr. Lodge as Director-General, Mr. Paul van Zeeland, Chairman of the Institute's Board of Governors and former Prime Minister of Belgium, characterized Mr. Lodge as "a statesman of insight and vigor" who had been "for more than two decades a leading contributor to the efforts of freemen to shape a better world." Mr. Lodge has been granted a leave of absence from his position as general consultant to Time, Inc., in order to devote full time to the Atlantic Institute.

Mr. Lodge, who was induced as Director-General immediately upon election, called the Atlantic Institute "an imaginative alliance of citizens of the Atlantic Community which offers tremendous promise in achieving the intentions and purposes of freemen today and in the years to come" and expressed himself as "proud to have been asked to serve as its first director-general."

The Atlantic Institute was proposed 4 years ago at a meeting of political, academic, and industrial leaders from the Atlantic Community then gathered in Belgium. Its announced purpose is "to work toward coordination of the national economic policies of our governments; toward the lowering of barriers to the movement of men, capital, goods, and ideas between our nations; toward joint measures for promoting vigorous economic growth, the control of inflation, and the harmonizing of our financial and monetary policies and their application." Among its Governors are Dr. James Conant, former president of Harvard University; Dr. Kurt Birrenbach, chairman of the board of Thyssen, Inc., a major German industrial complex; Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Representative to the United Nations; Lord Gladwyn, British Permanent Delegate to the United Nations; William C. Foster, Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; Mr. Antoine Pinay, former French Prime Minister; Mr. Haakon Lie, Secretary-General of the Norwegian Labor Party; and Lester Pearson, leader of the Liberal Party of Canada and a former President of the United Nations General Assembly.

Following the induction of Director-General Lodge, the nine-man policy committee of the Institute issued a declaration of purpose. The Atlantic Institute declaration stressed the present critical need for "a closer unity among the sovereign peoples of the Atlantic Community," while recognizing that in some nations "men who yearn for freedom have, out of poverty and weakness and ignorance, given control over their lives to others for periods of time." The declaration holds that for the men of these other nations "the goals of liberty and self-government can be achieved only through economic strength, physical health and education freely available to all." The declaration pledges all the individual members of the Institute "to search for, to stimulate, to develop, and to propagate ideas and courses of action to aid all humanity in progress toward liberty and self-government."

Mr. Lodge announced that the Atlantic Institute "will have studies undertaken in its behalf by world scholars, research institutes, intergovernmental bodies, and other organizations" to suggest solutions to pressing social, economic and political problems throughout the world. These studies, Director-General Lodge said, will be made available to the Atlantic Community governments, with which the Atlantic Institute will maintain a continuing and active relationship.

According to Director-General Lodge, the Paris headquarters of the Atlantic Institute will, in effect, be organized as "a clearinghouse, devoted to cataloguing and disseminating knowledge acquired by research centers working on problems related to the Institute's purpose." Mr. Lodge said that the Institute would "seek solutions to the problems which obstruct unity among men and the expansion of self-government under freedom and justice."

STATEMENT BY MR. PAUL VAN ZEELAND

PARIS, *November 8, 1961*.

The Atlantic Institute today named as Director-General the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, formerly U.S. Representative to the United Nations and for more than 20 years a leading contributor to the efforts of freemen to shape a better world.

The Atlantic Institute was created as a result of a resolution adopted by the Atlantic Congress in London in June 1959. This Congress consisted of several hundred leaders from the Atlantic countries. Similar recommendations had been made by the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference and by the Conference on Atlantic Community in Bruges in 1957.

I want to remind you that the aim of the Institute is to search for, to stimulate, to develop, and to propagate ideas and courses of action designed to unite the West and so to aid all humanity in progress toward liberty and self-government.

It is financed by contributions from individuals, private organizations, and governments.

We are fortunate indeed to have a statesman of Mr. Lodge's insight and vigor assume the leadership of the Atlantic Institute at this decisive point in its development.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR LODGE

I have, for several years, watched with interest and admiration the steady progress of the dedicated and distinguished people who have brought the Atlantic Institute into being, and am proud indeed to have been asked to serve as its first Director-General.

The Institute, a new and imaginative alliance of citizens of the Atlantic Community, offers tremendous promise in achieving the intentions and purpose of freemen, today and in the years to come. While it represents the kind of action called for to meet the persistent challenge thrust upon us by modern totalitarianism, its program will be undertaken for its own sake—because it expresses and will attempt to implement the ideals held in common by freedom-loving people everywhere.

The Institute will conduct studies to clarify and suggest solutions to the problems which stand in the way of social, economic, and political progress in the world society. We plan to have such studies undertaken on our behalf by world scholars, research institutes, intergovernmental bodies, and other organizations.

We plan to conduct hearings at which specially qualified individuals will be invited to present their views on current problems facing the Atlantic Community.

We propose to maintain active relationships with the governments of the Atlantic Community and make available to these governments the results of our studies.

We plan to sponsor public forums and conferences to encourage discussions of our findings.

We plan to organize a clearinghouse, devoted to cataloguing and disseminating knowledge acquired by research centers working on problems related to the Institute's purpose.

We will undertake such other activities as may seem indicated.

The staff of the Institute itself will not be large. Its organization is not yet completed.

Our budget for the first fiscal year is $350,000. Of this amount $180,000 comes from Europe and Canada; $170,000 comes from the United States. The funds consist of gifts from private foundations, individuals, and industry in Western Europe and North America, supplemented by small grants from 11 governments.

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE OF THE ATLANTIC INSTITUTE

The purpose of the Atlantic Institute is to search for, to stimulate, to develop, and to propagate ideas and courses of action designed to unite the West and so to aid all humanity in progress toward liberty and self-government.

Some of these courses of action are as follows:

Providing essential technical, educational, and cultural assistance to the peoples of lesser developed nations.

Working toward a concentrated and coordinated program of aid to these countries so as to increase the flow of development capital from highly industrialized nations to those now striving for the economic health that is a prerequisite to independence.

Working toward coordination of the national economic policies of our governments; toward the lowering of barriers to the movement of men, capital goods, and ideas between our nations; toward joint measures for promoting vigorous economic growth, the control of inflation, and the harmonizing of our financial and monetary policies and their application.

Such are the recommendations which we will make to governments and others in position of authority and influence.

Operational programs recommending these objectives will be announced by the Director-General as they are put underway.

As citizens of nations experienced in self-government, enjoying relative economic abundance, and bound together by geography and history, we share certain fundamental beliefs and goals.

We believe in the worth of the individual—man's right to be himself, to live out his life in accordance with his own abilities and aspirations; his right to speak and worship as he pleases, with freedom to associate with others of like mind and heart; his right to liberty and justice under laws of his own making, administered by men of his own choosing.

We recognize the persistent urge of all men to achieve such liberties as a divine spark unquenched by periodic experiments in the totalitarian management of human affairs. Man is born to be free, not a slave of the state.

We recognize that the goals of liberty and self-government can be achieved only through economic strength, physical health, and education freely available to all. For in liberty under law, the people are sovereign, their leaders their elected servants.

We reaffrm our beliefs at a time when new nations share our hope and faith and when dramatic technical developments bring the stubborn urge toward freedom to the promise of a greatly expanded reality.

Recognizing that the times require a closer unity among the sovereign peoples of the Atlantic Community, we have voluntarily united in the formation of the Atlantic Institute.

The Policy Committee of the Atlantic Institute: Dr. Kurt Birrenbach, Germany; Lord Gladwyn, Great Britain; Mr. Eric Johnston, United States; Mr. Haakon Lie, Norway; Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, Director-General; Mr. Jacques Rueff, France; Mr. L. Dana Wilgress, Canada; Mr. Paul van Zeeland, Belgium.

HISTORICAL SUMMARY OF THE ATLANTIC INSTITUTE

ORIGINS

The Atlantic Institute had its earliest roots in a resolution of a private conference on the Atlantic Community held in Copenhagen in 1953. Three years later, when NATO Ambassadors Lester Pearson, Halvard Lange, and Gaetano Martino made their 1956 study of possible nonmilitary cooperation under the treaty, three private bodies—the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, the Atlantic Treaty Association, and the signers of the Declaration of Atlantic Unity—all proposed that an Atlantic center of intellectual cooperation be set up.

In September 1957 the University of Pennsylvania and the College of Europe, with assistance from the Ford Foundation, sponsored a conference at Bruges, Belgium, of private citizens from many fields of endeavor in Western Europe and North America. The conference proposed by unanimous resolution (see app. I) that an Atlantic Institute be created.

A continuing committee (see app. II) was set up to explore the idea of such an Institute and establish the conditions necessary to its creation. The preliminary studies of this committee were presented to the NATO Parliamentarians Conference in November 1957. At three successive annual meetings, the NATO Parliamentarians passed resolutions calling for speedy establishment of an Atlantic Institute. The Chairman of the NATO Parliamentarians' Committee on Cultural Affairs and Information, Frans van Cauwalaert of the Belgian Parliament, and the Committee's rapporteur, Henry Jones, Canadian Member of Parliament, were instrumental in bringing the project before NATO and some of its member governments, although no action was then taken.

In June 1959 the NATO Parliamentarians Conference called together more than 700 citizens from NATO countries, who met in the Atlantic Congress of London. A committee of this Congress, chaired by L. Dana Wilgress, who had just retired as Canada's Ambassador to NATO, considered a report by Lucien Radoux, Deputy of the Belgian Parliament, based on the work of the Bruges committee. The Atlantic Congress, with only four dissenting votes, directed a resolution to its executive committee, asking that steps be undertaken to set up a center of studies for the whole Atlantic Community.

Col. J. J. Fens, Netherlands Member of Parliament and President of the Atlantic Congress, brought together a number of Congress delegates and other interested Americans, Canadians, and Europeans on October 16, 1959. Paul van Zeeland, former Premier of Belgium, was host to this meeting in Brussels and was subsequently elected chairman of the provisional committee for the Atlantic Institute. Under the provisional committee, a separate steering committee (see appendix III) was organized to determine the most feasible way or organizing an Atlantic Institute, if its studies showed that it could be done.

On April 4, 1960, the steering committee laid its report before the provisional committee. The product of several intensive meetings in Europe and North America and more than 300 interviews with well-known academic figures, civic and political leaders in 10 countries, the report declared that an Atlantic Institute was not only feasible but necessary. The steering committee recommended that the provisional committee move as quickly as possible toward the establishment of the Institute.

In the summer of 1960 an action group, again under Mr. van Zeeland's chairmanship, began formation of a permanent Board of Governors for the Institute and sought actively the financial means for its creation. Each member of the action group was also designated as a national representative charged with raising his nation's share of the Institute's costs.

On December 12, 1960, at the invitation of the action group, the permanent Board of Governors of the Atlantic Institute held its first meeting in Paris. By decicion of the Governors at this meeting, the Institute came into being on January 1, 1961.

The generosity of the Italian Institute of International Politics (Instituto per gli Studi Politica Internazionale) made available to the small Atlantic Institute staff several offices, cost-free. Even more important were the temporary services of the Italian Institute's Director, Prof. G. L. Bassani, who was named Director of the Atlantic Institute, pending appointment of a permanent executive head. The period since January 1961, has been devoted to the testing of Institute methods, the selection of a small staff, and the development of channels of cooperation with important national institutions.

FUNCTIONS OF THE ATLANTIC INSTITUTE

The Institute's sponsors believe that the Atlantic community is challenged as never before—by the world-compressing impact of expanding technology, by the population explosion, by the dramatic rise in independence and expectations of new nations, by the unprecedented perils of modern weapons, and by the relentless pressure of international tension; that there is urgent need to lay a new basis for self-confidence, freedom, progress, and cohesiveness in the whole free world.

The Institute will establish active relationships with universities, research institutes, intergovernmental bodies, and special-purpose organizations throughout the West, and with governments.

The Institute will be a three-way link between the academic community, governments, and the world of affairs. It will establish a clearinghouse, devoted to cataloging and disseminating data developed by research centers that will be working on problems pertinent to the Institute's purposes. Research on these questions—completed, in progress, or projected—will be classified and held available for swift use by means of electronic equipment.

The Institute will sponsor public forums or conferences to make known its findings or to call public attention to particularly grave problems. It will conduct hearings at which specially qualified individuals will be invited to present their views to the Institute on current Atlantic Community problems.

THE INSTITUTE'S BACKING

The Atlantic Institute is a community effort. It has been made possible through the financial support of private individuals and foundations, industry, and trade unions in the OECD countries and by 11 governments in Western Europe and North America.

The 40-man Board of Governors, the Atlantic Institute's policymaking authority, is broadly representative of the Atlantic Community. Board Chairman is Paul van Zeeland, Belgium. The Secretaries-General of OECD and NATO are ex officio members of the Board, as is the President of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference.

A Research Council of distinguished scholars will advise the Board of Governors and the Institute's staff.

THE INSTITUTE'S MANAGEMENT: THE POLICY COMMITTEE

It is upon the policy committee of the Institute's Board of Governors—men chosen for their knowledge and experience in diplomacy, education, politics, and industry—that responsibility will fall for choosing and defining the major policy issues with which the Institute will deal. Current policy committee members are:

Dr. Kurt Birrenbach, member of the Federal German Bundestag, chairman of the board of Thyssen, Inc.

William C. Foster, Director U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, former administrator of the Marshall plan and Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Lord Gladwyn, former British Ambassador and permanent delegate to the United Nations, former Ambassador to France.

Eric Johnston, former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, president of the Motion Picture Association of America.

Haakon Lie, Secretary General of the Norwegian Labor Party.

Henry Cabot Lodge, Director General of the Atlantic Institute, former U.S. Representative to the United Nations, former U.S. Senator, Republican nominee for Vice President, 1960.

Jacques Rueff, judge of the Court of the European Communities, member of the Institute of France.

L. Dana Wilgress, Canadian representative on the joint Canadian-American Defense Board, former Ambassador to NATO and Under Secretary for External Affairs.

Paul van Zeeland, former Premier and Foreign Minister of Belgium.

These men will meet frequently to discuss the problems of the Atlantic Community—political, economic, social, and cultural—and to define those which the Institute will study in depth.

For example, the Institute has already committed itself to an assessment of the longe-range future of the Atlantic Community. Men who, by reason of their deep study or long-term experience, have significant opinions on this topic are being consulted by the Institute staff, individually and in small, private seminars. Statements and books by social, political, and economic leaders are being systematically culled for challenging and practical ideas. The policy committee itself, each of whose members has played an important role in the postwar development of the West, will evaluate these ideas and opinions and publish its reports.

As now planned, these initial reports will deal with free world trade, free world aid to the developing countries, and the international monetary reserve system.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX I

From the resolution of the Bruges Conference in September 1957, proposing that an Atlantic Institute be created.

An Atlantic Institute

I. Aims and Purposes

To promote and develop:

1. A sense of community among the Atlantic peoples and all others who share their basic ideals.
2. The revitalization of Western cultural and spiritual values and of the social institutions of the Atlantic Community.
3. The harmonization of the long-term interests of the Atlantic Community with those of developing countries.
4. A point of focus for the Atlantic Community's cultural response to the challenge of communism and other forms of totalitarianism.
5. The discovery and development of Atlantic leadership adequate to these tasks.

II. Organization

1. One governing board of eminent citizens of the Atlantic Community, with an active executive committee.
2. So constituted and incorporated that it can receive funds from foundations, individuals, institutions, and governments.
3. Independent of any other institution.
4. Two centers of activity, one on each side of the Atlantic.
5. Facilities for study and research, workshops, and seminars. Access to a major library.
6. Advisory panels of experts, as necessary.

III. Proposed Working Methods

In general the institute should:

1. Make preliminary investigation of problems of the Atlantic Community and, as

appropriate, either pursue these further itself or refer them to more suitable institutions.

2. Encourage and assist the development of appropriate institutions, especially those with the function of education, with consultation to prevent unnecessary proliferation and duplication of efforts.

3. Seek to translate the results of findings into action, either directly or through other national or international organizations.

4. Seek to accomplish the informing of public opinion.

5. Offer its services as a clearinghouse for any activities compatible with the purpose of the institute.

APPENDIX II

Members of the continuing committee named in September 1957 to explore the establishment of an Atlantic Institute: Chairman: Willy Bretscher, editor in chief, Neue Zürcher Zeitung; Vice Chairman: Prof. Robert Strausz-Hupe, University of Pennsylvania; Vice Chairman: Henri Brugmans, Rector of the College of Europe; Robert Schuman, former French Foreign Minister; Adriano Olivetti, chairman of the board, Olivetti Co.; Dr. Kurt Sieveking, former lord mayor of Hamburg; John Sherman Cooper, U.S. Senator; John Sparkman, U.S. Senator; Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, U.S. Delegate to the United Nations; Prof. Hans Kohn, City College of New York; Prof. William Yandell Elliott, Harvard University; O. Meijer, Dutch industrialist; Prof. Otto von der Gablentz, Free University of Berlin; Prof. Léo Moulin, College of Europe.

APPENDIX III

Members of the steering committee of the provisional committee appointed in October 1959 for the Atlantic Institute: Honorary Chairman: Col. J. J. Fens; Chairman: Lucien Radoux; Prof. G. L. Bassani, Italy; Prof. Arnold Bergstraesser, Germany; Prof. Léo Moulin, Belgium; Prof. Frank Munk, United States of America; Father Jean Danielou, France; Dr. Franke Thistlewaite, United Kingdom; Rapporteur of the Committee: James R. Huntley, United States of America.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE ATLANTIC INSTITUTE (CONSEIL DES GOUVERNEURS DE L'INSTITUTE ATLANTIQUE)

Prof. Stratis G. Andreadis, president and chairman of the board of the Commercial Bank of Greece, officer of various other corporations, dean of the Athens Graduate School of Economics and Business Science.

Mr. Joseph Bech, Président du Parlement de Luxembourg, ancien Premier Ministre et Ministre des Affaires Estrangères.

Mr. Fritz Berg, president, Federation of German Industries.

Général A. Bethouart, membre du Parlement, ancien président de la Conférence des Parlementaires de l'Otan.

Dr. Kurt Birrenbach,[1] [4] member of the Federal German Bundestag, chairman of the board of Thyssen, Inc.

Mr. Erik Boheman, member of Parliament, former Ambassador, Stockholm.

Mr. Willy Bretscher, chief editor, Neue Zürcher Zeitung, member of the Swiss National Council, vice president of the Liberal International.

Mr. Will Clayton former Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, and holder of other high Government posts.

Dr. James Bryant Conant, president emeritus, Harvard University; former U.S. Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany.

Mr. Lewis W. Douglas, corporation executive, former U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain, former Congressman and public official.

The Baroness Elliot of Harwood, D.B.E., civic leader and Member of the House of Lords.

Mr. Maurice Faure, Membre du Parlement, ancien Ministre des Affaires Etrangères, ancien Ministre des Institutions Européennes.

Col. J. J. Fens, Member of the States-General, The Hague; former Chairman of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, member of the Assembly of Western European Union.[2]

Mr. Geoffrey de Freitas, Member of Parliament, former Under Secretary of State for Air and for Home Affairs, former Delegate to the United Nations Assembly and the Council of Europe.

Lord Gladwyn,[1] [4] former Ambassador and Permanent Delegate to the United Nations, and holder of other high British Government posts.

Mr. Christian A. Herter, former Secretary of State of the United States of America; former Governor of Massachusetts.

Mr. Eric Johnston,[1] president of the Motion Picture Association of America, Inc.; former president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; former member of numerous U.S. Government boards, commissions and committees.

Mr. Thorkil Kristensen,[3] Secretary-General, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; professor of economics; former Cabinet Minister and Member of Parliament.

Mr. Nils Langhelle,[3] [4] President of the Norwegian Parliament; former Cabinet Minister, President of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference.

Mr. Haakon Lie,[1] Secretary General of the Norwegian Labour Party.

Dr. Skur Lindebraekke, president of the Bergens Privatbank, Bergen; former member of Parliament.

Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.,[2] Director General of the Atlantic Institute; former U.S. Representative to the United Nations; former U.S. Senator.

Mr. Ivan Matteo Lombardo, political leader, economist, company director, president of the Italian National Productivity Council (CNP).

Mrs. Mary P. Lord, former U.S. Representative to the United Nations General Assembly.

Mr. Gaetano Martino, Member of Parliament, professor and rector of the University of Messina, former Minister of Education and Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Mr. George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Baron Friedrich Carl von Oppenheim, banking executive, president of the Europa-Union Deutschland, member of the board of numerous firms.

Mr. Lester B. Pearson, P.C., M.A., LL.D., M.P., leader of the Liberal Party of Canada and leader of the opposition in the Canadian House of Commons.

Mr. Antoine Pinay, Membre du Parlement, ancien Premier Ministre.

Mr. Jacques Rueff,[1] [4] Juge à la Cour de Justice des Communautés, membre de l'Institut de France.

Mr. Paul Henri Spaak, Ministre des Affaires Etrangères et ancien Premier Ministre de Belgique, ancien Secrétaire Général de l'Otan.

Mr. Adlai E. Stevenson, former Governor of Illinois and Democratic Party leader; U.S. Representative to the United Nations.

Mr. Dirk U. Stikker,[3] Secretary General of NATO, former Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands.

Dr. Prof. Vittorio Valletta, Président et Administrateur Délégué de la Fiat.

Mr. L. Dana Wilgress,[1] Canadian member, Joint American-Canadian Defense Board; former Permanent Representative to NATO; former Under Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Mr. Paul van Zeeland (Chairman of the Board),[3] Ministre d'Etat, ancien Premier Ministre et Ministre des Affaires Etrangères de Belgique.

AWARD TO SENATOR PASTORE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in the course of our adjournment my distinguished senior colleague, Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, was singularly honored by the Lido Civic Club of Washington as being its "Man of the Year of 1961."

In presenting this award to Senator PASTORE, it was not only Rhode Island that was honored, but the United States. Senator PASTORE's whole career has been one of service and help to fellow citizens—no matter whether he was in the State government of Rhode Island or, as he has been for these past dozen years, in the U.S. Senate.

As Attorney General Robert Kennedy said, Senator PASTORE is "not just a leader in Rhode Island or among Americans of Italian extraction, but a leader of the country as a whole."

To my mind, Senator PASTORE is a man of many great qualities. His forthright honesty, his ebullient eloquence, and his lucid mind, are typical, not just of any single national group within our country, but the best that our world has.

As a relatively new partner of Senator PASTORE in representing our State, it gives me particular pleasure to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this time the remarkably sensitive and warm speech Senator PASTORE delivered at the time he was given the award.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF U.S. SENATOR JOHN O. PASTORE AFTER RECEIPT OF AWARD AS "MAN OF THE YEAR" FROM LIDO CIVIC CLUB AT STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1961

I would be less than human if I did not express to you my deep gratitude for the distinction you have accorded me. It is an emotional experience of the highest order for an American of Italian descent to be singled out by his fellow Americans of like antecedents for so signal an honor. A man is at once exalted—and, at the same time, humbled by its significance.

The twin title, Italian-American, falls musically on the ear. It suggest harmony—and not hyphenation. It suggests history—history as ancient as Italy—as youthful as the dynamic America reaching through five centuries of challenges—to its rendezvous with destiny—today.

It can never become trite—in a moment like this—to think of the first Italian to see America—Christopher Columbus.

And it can never become trite to remember that America's name came not from the Great Discoverer—but from the better publicized Amerigo Vespucci.

May I then be humble enough to say—as I feel—that this highly prized distinction may probably be more deserved by some other sincere though obscure and unadvertised toiler in the ranks.

I know them—and you know them—patiently toiling as good citizens, generously blending into the American scene their native qualities of loyalty, perseverance, courage and character, which we have a right to feel are the contributions of our ancient culture.

---

[1] Policy committee member.
[4] Vice Chairman.

[1] Policy committee member.
[2] Temporary member of the Board.
[3] Ex officio member.
[4] Vice Chairman.

[1] Policy committee member.

Each of us in public speech is inclined to call the long roll of Italian-Americans who have distinguished themselves in the service of America—its official, military, religious, cultural and economic service. There are volumes upon volumes in which that service is recorded in its factual detail.

It is a proper part of the history of America—as is the equally documented contribution of our fellow Americans who, perforce, trace their beginnings to distant shores.

We have a pardonable pride in and a justifiable kinship with these distinguished Americans. But all of us, in our hearts, recall rather the near ones and dear ones—unsung perhaps in their modest lives—but surely not unwept—and not unhonored.

We have a right to believe that America is a little better for their presence. We have a duty to make America a little better as we seek to follow in their footsteps—and press beyond into life's beckoning space where they can walk and work no more.

The hero's path is not granted to us all. It is not granted to us all to bask in the fleeting light of fame. Heroism is an incident of comradeship. It is love of fellow man greater than love of one's own life. Fame is only an accident of the proper time and the happy opportunity. But honor is a man's own sense of his personal duty well done.

Honor is each man's own understanding of the part he has to play—and his determination to play it well. It is his knowledge that no man is unimportant in the great scheme of life—and that no act of his fails to throw its light or to cast its shadow in a troubled world.

And indeed it is a troubled world. Sinister forces are abroad that would separate man from man—and mankind from God. They would keep us so burdened—so dismayed—in the little whirlpool that is the daily life of each of us—that we would lose sight of the greater and longer lessons of history. These foreign ideologies would terrorize us telling of the futility of human existence. They would preach hate of fellow man. They would laugh at the sanctity of the family and all the institutions that make it sacred. We are too old a race to believe that a philosophy teaching hate for all others can endure. We are too young a people to forget Cicero's teaching of conscience and responsibility to the republic—and we mean this Republic to which we, too, have pledged our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

Every last man, woman, and child is mobilized for the fight of our lives—for our lives—for our land—for the things we like and for the ways we love.

In public life—in private life—what we think—what we say—what we do—is building now—this hour—this minute—the security of this country and the hope of the world. Or it can invite destruction to our country—and despair to civilization.

The life span of each individual is an invitation to unexplored space—to the realm of responsibility and opportunity of service to humankind. The life span of the human world has been determined by space still to be explored.

The day of Christopher Columbus is remembered as the Age of Discovery. It was the pursuit of the setting sun—the challenge of the unknown spaces to the west.

In our day, may I say, the challenge of space is the pursuit of the moon. Man would master the stars. Man would himself orbit in space as the satellites eternally follow the ordered design of the Creator.

Within the scientific mind of man, space exploration is technically feasible. It poses no more problem than challenged Columbus on uncharted seas. His sailors feared the forces of nature—their sails needed favoring winds. Today man revels in his control of the forces of nature.

The space age is coexistent with the atomic age.

If I say that atomic energy holds our great hope for the space age, I am only repeating the declared belief of our responsible authorities. And when I mention atomic energy at this time and place, it is to record the everlasting service to America of the Italian-born Enrico Fermi.

At the entrance to Stagg Field, the football stadium of the University of Chicago, the casual passerby may pause to read the inscription upon a plaque.

The plaque recites that on the afternoon of December 2, 1942, "man here achieved the first controlled release of nuclear energy"—the atomic era was born.

The word "man" stands for Enrico Fermi—often called the architect of the atomic age. Shrouded in the secrecy of war, the news could be revealed to only a trusted few. And it came by this secret code—"The Italian navigator has landed—and the natives are friendly."

Tonight we stand midway between October 12 and December 2. Sometime in the future that December date may be observed as Fermi Day—to the man who made possible America's priority in atomic power and prestige.

I would pause here to emphasize two points. First—atomic energy and atomic bombs are not synonymous. Though born of battle, the dedication of the atom in the mind of the scientist and in the heart of America is for peaceful uses.

It has been my privilege at Geneva and at Vienna to have witnessed something of this peaceful dedication on an international scale—except when some were compelled to echo the propaganda of a dictator.

The second point I would emphasize is this—I am sure that the late Enrico Fermi would have been the first to disclaim solo honors. He would have been the first to stress the truth that the development of the atom was not the work of one man—of one limited time—nor of one nation.

Mrs. Fermi, the brilliant and talented wife of Enrico Fermi, expressed this well—and I will use her words.

"Science is an international enterprise," she says, "the result of many efforts coming one after the other, each adding its impact to the results of previous ones. The group of physicists who in wartime and secrecy, almost in isolation, operated the first pile and made it yield atomic energy could not have done this without the work of previous scientists. Before energy could be freed from uranium nuclei in Chicago, uranium fission had to be discovered.

"Before Hahn and Strassman in Berlin in 1938, and Enrico Fermi in Rome in 1934, could achieve uranium fission, artificial radioactivity had to be discovered. Before Irene Curie and her husband could discover artificial radioactivity in Paris in 1933–34, the structure of the atom and its components had to be ascertained. (Indeed the nucleus of the atom had been discovered by the English scientist, Rutherford, in 1911.)

"The chain of scientific events could be traced back, zigzagging without interruption from one country to another to the time when the first philosophers started speculating about nature."

If I have ventured here to borrow from Mrs. Fermi's account of the history of the atom—it is partly because I see in it a similarity to the history of America. Here was a new land where opportunity beckoned—and the price was courage and character. Here was a land with the nucleus of personal liberty about which men long had dreamed.

Here the dream became a reality—the first experiment in true democracy—the epitome of human freedoms—government with the consent of the governed.

Here were the conceptions of personal rights and national moral responsibilities to which the cultures of many nations made contribution.

Here were the precepts and practices of human dignity and decency which America labored to perfect—and fought to protect—blessings we were prepared to share with all men of good will.

In God's good time the benefactions of America became ours—yours and mine—to possess.

They were ours out of the dreams and daring and guidance of our fathers and mothers, They framed their hopes for themselves and for us in a new America out of tired old lands that they never forgot in all their love for the new.

Hence, I think that the real spirit of such a night as you have created here lies not in accepting your gracious honor for myself alone. It is in acknowledging the debt that you and I owe to those who blazed the trail—those to whom we owe the gift of life—those to whom we owe the building of a secure place in the American scene to which ambitious youth of any race can become the heir.

It is not our purpose to measure our part in America's history by her titles or her treasures that we may gather to ourselves—but what we give out of ourselves to this America of our love.

In the fellowship of this night, therefore, as grateful heirs of the American past—as responsible custodians of the present—we accept the obligation as trustees of the American future—that it shall flourish in freedom—that it shall be preserved in the peace with honor that God has promised to men of good will.

NEW MEXICO STATEHOOD COMMEMORATIVE STAMP—ADDRESS BY HAROLD M. JINKS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an address delivered by Harold M. Jinks, Director of the Postmasters and Rural Appointments Division of the Post Office Department, representing the Postmaster General, at the dedication of the New Mexico statehood commemorative stamp, at Santa Fe, N. Mex., on January 6, 1962.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Harold M. Jinks

Four highly important headline events occurred just 50 years ago.

China, the sleeping giant of Asia, became a republic.

A luxury liner hailed by its builders as the world's first indestructible ship—the *Titanic*—struck an iceberg and sank off the coast of Newfoundland on its maiden voyage.

Woodrow Wilson, the Princeton professor turned politician, defeated Bullmoose candidate Theodore Roosevelt for the Presidency of the United States.

And New Mexico became a State.

The purpose of our gathering today is to commemorate—through the issuance of a new, 4-cent stamp—the latter event, which occurred on January 6, 1912.

Fifty years is but a fleeting moment in the passage of history.

Five decades ago, your State was the 47th to join the Union. Thus, you may consider yourselves one of our four newest States.

By contrast, Santa Fe, your State capital, is the oldest seat of government in the United States, founded by the Spaniards in 1610—more than 350 years ago.

This contrast of the old with the new is the key to New Mexico's future—the crux of your illustrious State's motto: "Crescit Eundo"—"It Grows As It Goes".

Surely, this motto demonstrates that the people of New Mexico have the necessary first requisite for boundless advancement—the will to progress.

Yours is a State which reverences the past, while keeping its eyes fixed firmly on the future. As your State motto exemplifies, you are truly a people on the go.

Your sense of history is shared by the Post Office Department, and we feel that we, too, are embarked upon a march of unprecedented progress.

The annals of the postal service are intertwined, to a large extent, with the fortunes of New Mexico.

Santa Fe was long a meeting place of great riders, so it was not considered unusual that F. X. Aubrey, of Santa Fe, set men talking about the possibilities of quick communication by his feat in long-distance riding—using relays of horses.

Aubrey wagered $1,000 that he could ride from Santa Fe to Independence, Mo., in 6 days or less—with the proviso that he could use relays of horses. He made the trip in 5½ days, thus winning the bet.

Thus was the idea of the pony express born. And though it was a short-lived venture, the pony express has taken its place as a romantic and adventurous episode in the evolution of rapid communication.

The Santa Fe Trail was probably one of the finest natural roads that could be found. Day after day the wagons rolled across the open prairie country with no guide but the beaten track that lay ahead.

In the early 1850's, the mail train consisted of from one to three wagons, drawn by four or six mules. A typical train would consist of one wagon for mail, one for baggage, and one for passengers.

In addition to a driver for each team, there were two outriders, to hurry the lagging animals along. All told, the party often numbered 10 men—all heavily armed.

An early description of a typical mail train, published in the Missouri Commonwealth, noted that "the mail is guarded by 8 men, armed as follows: Each man has at his side, fastened in the stage, one of Colt's revolving rifles; in a holster below, one of Colt's long revolvers, and in his belt a small Colt's revolver, besides a hunting knife; so that these 8 men are ready, in case of attack, to discharge 136 shots without having to reload * * * from the looks of this escort we have no fears for the safety of the mails.

Both New Mexico and the Post Office Department have come a long way since the days of the pony express and the overland mail.

In 1912—the year that New Mexico became a State—the event which we commemorate today—there was one first-class post office within its boundaries. Today, there are 27, among the 404 post offices of all classes in your State.

Fifty years ago, Santa Fe reported $20,344 in annual postal receipts.

Annual receipts for your post office now total $621,883 per year.

I'm sure I need not point out to you that postal receipts are often the indicator of economic stability in a given area; of economic growth.

Today, the post offices of this State handle more than $51 million a year and move nearly 660 million pieces of mail annually.

Each working day, the postal service in New Mexico handles 2,196,664 individual items of mail.

I cite these figures not to belabor you with statistics, but to emphasize the fact that the expansion of a city or a State, and the auxiliary growth of the postal service in that area, complement one another—each spurring the other to greater progress.

Today we are met in your beautiful and historic city to dedicate a commemorative stamp to the beginning of your progress as a State.

Federal law prohibits the display of a full color reproduction of the stamp. However, from the black-and-white enlargement before you, you see that the stamp features the Shiprock Tower, located in northwestern New Mexico. The stamp is printed in two shades of brown, with blue sky, on white paper.

Tomorrow, it will be sold in all of our 45,000 post offices, branches and postal stations, from coast to coast, from Miami to the Marshall Islands and from Maine to Pago Pago.

Through the medium of the mail, a hundred million of these stamps will communicate to the American people and to citizens of distant lands this tribute and reminder that—50 years ago today—the United States acquired a promising and progressive new State—the State of New Mexico.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is now closed.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business has been concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is nothing before the Senate.

STOCK DISTRIBUTION TREATED AS RETURN OF CAPITAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, H.R. 8847, Calendar No. 1080, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that a distribution of stock made to an individual (or certain corporations) pursuant to an order enforcing the antitrust laws shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital; and to provide that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution, be laid down and made the pending business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, on September 23, 1961, I presented the pending bill to the Senate. It would be repetitious to repeat my statement at this time. I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point the statement I made in the Senate on the day when I reported the bill from the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

H.R. 8847 provides for tax treatment of certain distributions of stock which a corporation is required to make because of the antitrust laws. The bill is necessary because of the unusual situation that has developed in the case of Du Pont, the very large chemical company.

The United States has been engaged in extensive antitrust litigation with Du Pont. In the course of this litigation, the Supreme Court decided on May 22 of this year that the Du Pont Co. must get rid of—divest itself of—the 23 percent of the stock of General Motors owned by it—63 million shares. This decision is based on the belief that the ownership of this stock may tend to limit competition in automotive paints and similar products manufactured and sold by Du Pont.

It should be observed that in many—perhaps most—cases in which one corporation controls another in violation of the antitrust laws, the controlled corporation is more than 80-percent owned. Therefore, in a great many of these cases if it is necessary for antitrust purposes to distribute the stock of the controlled corporation, this can be done without tax consequences to the shareholders because of section 355 of the Internal Revenue Code. In general, that section permits the tax-free distribution of the stock of an 80-percent owned subsidiary if parent and subsidiary have each been engaged in the active conduct of a trade or business for more than 5 years.

However, since Du Pont owns only 23 percent of the stock of General Motors, a distribution of this stock would not be tax free under section 355. Also, such a distribution would not be a partial liquidation—because there is no contraction of the business. Therefore, on a distribution of the General Motors stock, the individual shareholders of Du Pont would pay a tax on ordinary dividend income to the full extent of the fair market value of the stock received. Thus, if all the General Motors stock were to be distributed, under existing law each individual shareholder of Du Pont would have approximately $62 of ordinary income per share of Du Pont. This is because about 1⅓ shares of General Motors would be distributed for each share of Du Pont. The tax on this would, of course, be so high that the shareholder would in effect be losing a substantial part of his investment in Du Pont.

It should also be pointed out that the involuntary realization of such a large amount of income by individual Du Pont shareholders might well require them to sell some of the General Motors stock received, in order to obtain funds to pay the tax on this dividend. It was pointed out to the committee at the hearings that this would cause a large increase in the market supply of General Motors stock and would have a serious depressing effect on the value of that stock. This would, of course, be to the detriment of the General Motors shareholders who are not in any way involved in the violation of the antitrust laws. The hearings also brought out that the method of taxation proposed by the bill will greatly lessen the market impact of the distribution.

The bill provides for a return-of-capital treatment for individual shareholders in an enforced antitrust distribution. Under its provisions the fair market value of the so-called divested stock received by individual shareholders would be treated as a return of the capital invested by them in the Du Pont stock. Thus, an individual shareholder who receives the General Motors stock will have no immediate tax to pay unless the fair market value of the stock he receives exceeds his investment in the Du Pont stock. If there is any such excess, it will be currently taxable in the same manner as a gain from the sale or exchange of the stock. To illustrate, if an individual owns a single share of Du Pont which cost him $100 and he received $60 worth of General Motors stock, he will owe no tax at the time of this receipt but his basis for the Du Pont share will be reduced to $40—$100 minus $60. On the other hand, if the Du Pont share cost this individual $40, then on receipt of $60 worth of General Motors stock, his entire $40 basis would be used up and he would have a gain of $20—$60 minus $40. Since in recent years the market price of the Du Pont stock has been high, in general, only shareholders who acquired the Du Pont stock before 1950 will pay any tax. As a result, a large fraction of the recipients of the General Motors stock will not be under any pressure to sell this stock so that the depressing effect on the market will be minimized.

It must be emphasized that the bill will not result in the escape from tax of any appreciation in the Du Pont stock. This is because the basis of the Du Pont stock will be reduced by the fair market value of the General Motors stock received. Thus, whatever unrealized appreciation there is in the Du Pont stock will result in a gain on the later sale of that stock in the same manner and to the same extent as if there had been no distribution of the General Motors stock.

The individual shareholders of Christiana Securities Corp.—a party to the antitrust litigation—will also be treated in the same manner as the individual shareholders of Du Pont if Christiana should be ordered by a court to distribute any General Motors stock. Christiana owns about one-third of the Du Pont stock and thus, it may receive up to 20 million shares of General Motors stock if Du Pont should be required to distribute all of that stock. However, it should be made plain that the amendments made by the bill are not intended in any way as an expression of an opinion that any particular method of divestiture of General Motors stock by Du Pont or by Christiana is appropriate. It is contemplated by your committee that all issues as to the methods of divestiture shall be judicially determined solely with reference to the antitrust principles announced by the Supreme Court in the Du Pont case.

Since Christiana is a party to the suit and since its shareholders may have special tax benefits available to them, the bill taxes Christiana in a special manner in the receipt by it of General Motors stock from Du Pont. The receipt of such stock as a dividend will accordingly be taxed on its fair market value—approximately $45 a share—and not at its basis—approximately $2 a share—as would be the case under existing law.

The bill does not change the method of taxation on the receipt of an intercorporate dividend by any corporation that is not a party to the suit.

The bill as drawn applies only to the shareholders of Du Pont, to Christiana, and to the shareholders of Christiana. The Treasury Department and the Department of Justice have not yet determined what tax relief, if any, is appropriate in antitrust cases in general. For this reason, both Departments indicated that they would oppose a more general bill at the present time, but that they would not object to a bill dealing only with the problems arising out of the Du Pont case. Accordingly, both Departments do not object to the present bill.

I would add that the bill (H.R. 8847) was approved practically unanimously by both the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives and by the House itself.

It was reported favorably by the Senate Finance Committee by a vote of 14 to 2.

REVENUE FACTS

First. This bill as it is will yield $233 million in revenue. Moreover, if the court orders Christiana to sell its General Motors stock, this sum will be increased by $184 million; that is, to a total amount of $417 million. On the other hand, if the court orders Christiana to distribute its stock to its shareholders, the revenue will be increased by $136 million, so that the total will be $369 million. These estimates are based upon General Motors selling at $45 a share. Recent figures indicate that this stock is selling around $48 a share, so that on this basis the estimate will be higher. The question of whether Christiana should be forced to sell or distribute to its shareholders the General Motors stock it receives from Du Pont under the divestiture proceedings is a matter of judicial determination. The court must determine whether such sale or distribution is necessary to prevent violation of the antitrust laws.

Second. The complaint has been made that Christiana is not being taxed heavily enough. However, it should be pointed out that under this bill the additional tax to Christiana upon receipt of General Motors stock computed on the $45 market value of the stock received will amount to approximately $60 million. The entire fair market value of $45 would go into dividend income and there would be a dividend received deduction of 85 percent. The tax per share would therefore amount to 52 percent of $6.75, or $3.51. On the other hand, if this bill were not enacted into law, only 30 cents per share would be subject to the full corporate rate instead of $6.75 per share under the bill. The tax under existing law would be 16 cents per share—52 percent of 30 cents—to Christiana, although General Motors stock had a fair market value of $45. The total tax to Christiana upon the receipt of General Motors stock under existing law will be $2,880,000. The net savings to Christiana on the receipt of the General Motors stock if this bill were not enacted will amount to approximately $60 million.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I rise to make a very brief statement in support of H.R. 8847, the so-called Du Pont bill. As I have stated, the bill was reported by the Ways and Means Committee of the House, nearly unanimously, and was passed by the House. It was reported to the Senate by the Committee on Finance by a vote of 14 to 2.

It has no objection from the Treasury Department and the Department of Justice.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point two letters received by me, one from the Treasury Department, dated January 12, 1962, and the other from the Attorney General, dated January 13, 1962.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GENERAL COUNCIL
OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., January 13, 1962.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Mr. Colin Stam has passed on to me your request for a statement of the present position of the Treasury Department with regard to H.R. 8847, which would provide tax relief to individual shareholders receiving distributions of stock as a result of antitrust divestitures and would provide new tax treatment to corporate shareholders receiving divested antitrust stock which has appreciated in value in the hands of the distributor.

The Treasury Department would not object to the bill in its present form being enacted into law. This is, of course, the same position I expressed on behalf of the Treasury Department before the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee when these committees were considering the bill last fall.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

ROBERT H. KNIGHT,
General Counsel.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., January 13, 1962.

Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Robert Knight, General Counsel of the Treasury Department, has passed on to us the request of Mr. Colin Stam, Chief of Staff, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, for a statement of the present attitude of the Department of Justice with respect to H.R. 8847, now pending in the Senate.

You will recall that the Department has declined to recommend to your committee general legislation along the lines of H.R. 8847. We felt that such legislation was not necessary or justified in order to enforce the antitrust laws. General legislation giving free or capital gains rather than ordinary income tax treatment to stock distributions pursuant to antitrust divestiture decrees might serve as an inducement to persons contemplating anticompetitive acquisitions to enter into them because the risk of divestiture would be offset by potential tax advantages. As we have indicated, we believe that any general legislation in this field might better serve the public interest if it merely deferred tax without changing ordinary income to something else.

Although H.R. 8847 was originally cast in the form of general legislation, it has been almost universally considered as being designed to minimize what proponents asserted would be the harsh tax and market effects of the divestiture decreed by the Supreme Court in the case of *United States* v. *E. I. du Pont de Nemours*. In the last session of Congress, when it appeared that Congress desired to give relief in the Du Pont situation by changing the character of the tax on divestiture, we urged that if this relief was to be granted, it should not be in the form of general legislation; such general legislation might be an inducement to future anticompetitive acquisitions by others. We also urged that if relief was to be granted in the Du Pont situation, it should be available only if the divestiture occurred within 3 years after it was decreed. When H.R. 8847 was so limited in the House of Representatives, we did not object to its passage. If it is still the will of Congress to pass such a measure, our position remains the same.

There is, however, one very vital and important additional point. H.R. 8847 would provide special tax treatment for stockholders of Christiana Securities Corp., in the event General Motors stock is distributed to them by court order. The Department has been urging the District Court before which this matter is now pending effectively to accomplish the relief authorized by the Supreme Court, i.e., divorcement of Du Pont control of General Motors. The Government contends that it is necessary to require Christiana to sell the General Motors stock which it would receive as a stockholder of Du Pont so that the stock would not pass through to Christiana stockholders. If pass through occurred, a large percentage of General Motors stock would come directly into Du Pont family hands. This would mean that the Du Pont family could still effectively control both Du Pont and General Motors. The Department remains concerned that, unless the legislative history of the bill is kept quite clear, the provision for special tax treatment for distributions of General Motors stock to Christiana stockholders could be cited as an indication that Congress intended the courts to decree such a distribution.

As you know, the Senate Finance Committee report has, however, stated that it expresses no opinion as to what the courts should do with respect to Christiana's General Motors stock. Senate Finance Committee Report No. 1100, 87th Congress, 1st session, page 5 (1961). We would greatly appreciate your efforts to maintain on the Senate floor that this expression of your committee is also the sense of the Congress as a whole so that if the courts agree with the Government that sale by Christiana and not distribution is the effective remedy in the Du Pont case, the courts will be in a position to decree such a remedy completely free of any express or implied congressional mandate to the contrary.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY
Attorney General.

(CC: Mr. Colin Stam.)

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Attorney General expressed, in his letter, some concern that unless the legislative history of the bill is kept quite clear, the provision for special treatment for distribution of General Motors stock to Christiana stockholders might be cited as an indication that Congress intended the courts to decree such a distribution. This question was considered in our committee, and the Finance Committee report stated:

> Your committee wishes to make it very clear that it expresses no opinion as to what particular method of divestiture of General Motors stock by Du Pont or by Christiana is appropriate. It is contemplated by your committee that all issues dealing with the manner of divestiture are to be determined judicially, solely with reference to the antitrust principles announced by the Supreme Court in the Du Pont case.

The Attorney General states in his letter to me that he would greatly appreciate it if this expression of the committee is the sense of the Senate, so that the courts will be in a position to decree the remedy completely free of any express or implied congressional mandate to the contrary. I made such a statement before the Senate last year and I repeat that statement this year. The bill does not express an opinion as to the appropriate method of divestiture of General Motors stock by Du Pont or by Christiana. This is a matter solely for the courts. I desire the Senate to understand clearly that the proposed legislation will leave the courts free to determine the appropriate methods of divestiture without regard to the proposed legislation. This determination, of course, will be made by applying established antitrust principles. Thus, the court will make such determinations without regard to the proposed legislation.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GORE. If it is not the intent of the proposed legislation to give tax relief for a pass-through, then why is that provision in the bill?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I do not understand the Senator. It is not the intent of the bill to give relief for a pass-through. The question of what form the divestiture should take is a judicial question to be determined by the courts.

Mr. GORE. For a pass-through.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. It is made very clear in the committee report that nothing in the bill is intended to influence, in any way, shape, or form, any future decision of the courts.

Mr. GORE. Then why do we have the bill? The court has not yet acted. The bill provides for the granting of tax relief from a judgment which the court has not rendered. If it is not the intent to pave the way for a pass-through, then, I ask the Senator, What is the purpose of enacting the bill?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The purpose of the bill is to provide an equitable tax base for the distribution of General Motors stock to the stockholders of Du Pont. It does not attempt to determine the judicial question of what is the appropriate method of divestment.

Mr. GORE. But the court has not decreed the manner of divestiture.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The Supreme Court has decreed that Du Pont must divest itself of General Motors stock. What form this divestiture should take is left to the lower court.

Mr. GORE. The Supreme Court has so held, but the case has been remanded to the trial court to write the order for the means of divestiture, and the bill which the Senator now calls up provides relief only in case there is a passthrough. Yet the Senator from Virginia takes the position that it is not intended, apparently, to do what we are doing if we pass this bill.

If the Senator from Virginia will further yield, I wish to call to his attention the fact that the Du Pont officials do not agree with him. I hold in my hand a statement distributed to newspaper editors all over the country and to many news agencies and lobbyists in Washington last week, in which an official of the Du Pont Co., says this:

> It is obvious that prompt action by the Senate on H.R. 8847 would be of material assistance to the court in the efficient framing of a final decree.

The General Counsel of the Treasury Department, in testimony before our committee, referred to a section of the bill as an admonition to the court. If the Senator would like to have me read that statement, I will find it in the hearings.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I am not concerned about the position of the Du Pont Co. I regard the bill as a just measure for the distribution of the stock.

I am concerned about the fact that the bill had practically the unanimous support of the House Committee on Ways and Means, practically the unanimous support of the House of Representatives, and practically the unanimous support of the Committee on Finance, with only two dissenting votes. It also had the support of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia further yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I am not raising the question by what vote the bill was passed in the House or was reported by the Committee on Finance. It would not be the first time that an unwise action had been taken by an overwhelming majority. I am raising the question of the purpose, intent, and effect of the bill. The Attorney General has written me a letter in which he says that the Department of Justice is concerned lest the passage of the bill would cause the Government to lose the case in the court.

Would the Senator from Virginia be willing to have the letter from the Attorney General placed at this point in the RECORD?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I have already requested that it be inserted.

Mr. GORE. This is a letter addressed to me.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. At the beginning of my remarks, I placed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me as chairman of the Committee on Finance. I have already requested that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. GORE. I received a letter yesterday. I wonder if the Senator from Virginia would be willing to have that letter incorporated at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I have no objection. I assume it is on the same point.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, would the Senator from Tennessee be kind enough to read his letter, so that we who are listening to the debate may have the advantage of knowing its contents now, instead of having to wait to read the RECORD?

Mr. GORE. The senior Senator from Virginia has the floor. I shall be glad to read the letter, if he has no objection to my doing so.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a point of order. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia has the floor.

Mr. KERR. Does he have the right to yield the floor for this purpose?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may yield for a question.

Mr. KERR. Then I ask for the regular order.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I have no objection to having the letter read.

Mr. KERR. I have no objection, either, to the reading of the letter; but if the Senator from Tennessee wishes to make a speech on the subject, I think he ought to make it on his own time, and not as a part of the presentation of the chairman of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GORE. I did not propose to read the letter; I was requested to read the letter in order that the Senate might understand the subject concerning which the debate is proceeding. I said I would comply with the request, with the consent of the Senator from Virginia, and the Senator from Virginia yielded for that purpose. If the Senator from Oklahoma wishes to make a point of order, it is his privilege to do so.

Mr. KERR. That is what I thought, Mr. President.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Oklahoma made a point of order against the reading of a letter of the Attorney General of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has made a point of order against the yielding of the floor for that purpose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As I understand the Senator from Virginia, he stated that he reaffirmed the speech which he made last September about the point contained in the committee report of last September. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in the speech and in the report the distinguished Senator from Virginia said that one of the main reasons for the introduction of the bill and its recommended passage was that it would reduce the possible adverse effects upon the price of General Motors stock which would occur if the Du Pont Corp. was required to divest itself of its General Motors stock?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. That is substantially correct. Everyone knows that if 63 million shares of stock are put on the market, that will naturally have a depressing effect. But that was not the reason why the Senate Finance Committee, of which I am chairman, reported this proposed legislation. It was reported after long hearings; and, as the Senator from Illinois knows, it has been before the Senate for at least 2 years longer. The problem is a difficult one; and I believe we have arrived at a sound conclusion.

If the bill in the form the Senate Finance Committee recommends is passed, it will bring into the Treasury $450 million of new taxes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But the Senator from Virginia is saying that one of the reasons why the bill should be passed is that it would reduce the loss in the capital value of General Motors stock occasioned by its sale divestiture.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I assume that is a natural conclusion; but I hope the Senator from Illinois does not make the insinuation that the Senate Finance Committee was influenced entirely by what would happen to the stockholders of either General Motors Corp. or the Du Pont Co.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Virginia aware of the fact that in the pending litigation in Chicago the attorneys of the Department of Justice are contending that the disposition by sale or divestiture of 63 million shares of General Motors stock held by Christiana would not occasion any real diminution in the capital value, and that this is one of the points in contention in the lawsuit? Therefore, does not the statement of the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee—that the sale would have a great effect on the capital value—undercut one of the main features of the Government's case?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. As I have said before, it is very evident that the distribution of 63 million shares of General Motors stock would have an effect on the value of those securities. But I will also say that the proposed legislation is endorsed by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, by the Attorney General of the United States, by the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, by the House of Representatives itself, and by the Senate Finance Committee, with only two dissenting votes—those of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Can the Senator from Virginia really say that the proposed legislation in its present form is endorsed by the Attorney General?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I can; and that will be proved as the debate proceeds.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Everyone seems to be about to read letters from the Attorney General. I have also received a letter from the Attorney General; and if the Senator from Virginia will permit me to do so, I should like to have the privilege of introducing my letter.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I believe it is identical with the letter I received.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is not quite the same.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The letter he wrote me, which I received this morning, does not indicate that he is opposed to the bill; on the contrary, it indicates that he has no objection to it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator from Virginia objects to having the letter put into the Record, I shall not submit it now.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I have no objection to having the letter put into the Record; the Senator from Illinois seems to have the habit of making insinuations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I have no objection to having the letter put into the Record. Let Senators put into the Record all the letters they wish to put into it. So far as the chairman of the Finance Committee is concerned, he desires the fullest possible discussion and debate, and does not wish to have anything concealed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure that is true.

Is the Senator from Virginia willing to have the letter I have received printed in the Record at the conclusion of his remarks?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Certainly. Previously there was indication of a point of order by another Senator; but I have no objection.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Is there any objection to having the letter read now, so that instead of having to wait until the Record is printed and is available tomorrow, we may know now, during the debate, what the letter is?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Kerr], who previously raised objection, is not now in the Chamber. I assume that if he were present he would object; and I do not wish to take advantage of his temporary absence from the Chamber.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I understand that unanimous consent has been given to having the letter printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be read now, so that at this time we may have the benefit of the information contained it it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both letters be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the letters will be read.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I should like to suggest—if it meets with the approval of my colleagues—that the letter sent to the chairman of the Finance Committee—a letter which is similar to the other letter—be read first, if there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be done; and the clerk will proceed to read the letters.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the letters, as follows:

January 13, 1962.

Hon. Harry Flood Byrd,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Byrd: Robert Knight, General Counsel of the Treasury Department, has passed on to us the request of Mr. Colin Stam, Chief of Staff, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, for a statement of the present attitude of the Department of Justice with respect to H.R. 8847, now pending in the Senate.

You will recall that the Department has declined to recommend to your committee general legislation along the lines of H.R. 8847. We felt that such legislation was not necessary or justified in order to enforce the antitrust laws. General legislation giving free or capital gains rather than ordinary income tax treatment to stock distributions pursuant to antitrust divestiture decrees might serve as an inducement to persons contemplating anticompetitive acquisitions to enter into them because the risk of divestiture would be offset by potential tax advantages. As we have indicated, we believe that any general legislation in this field might better serve the public interest if it merely deferred tax without changing ordinary income to something else.

Although H.R. 8847 was originally cast in the form of general legislation, it has been almost universally considered as being designed to minimize what proponents asserted would be the harsh tax and market effects of the divestiture decreed by the Supreme Court in the case of *United States* v. *E. I. du Pont de Nemours.* In the last session of Congress, when it appeared that Congress desired to give relief in the Du Pont situation by changing the character of the tax on divestiture, we urged that if this relief was to be granted, it should not be in the form of general legislation; such general legislation might be an inducement to future anticompetitive acquisitions by others. We also urged that if relief was to be granted in the Du Pont situation, it should be available only if the divestiture occurred within 3 years after it was decreed. When H.R. 8847 was so limited in the House of Representatives, we did not object to its passage. If it is still the will of Congress to pass such a measure, our position remains the same.

There is, however, one very vital and important additional point. H.R. 8847 would provide special tax treatment for stockholders of Christiana Securities Corp. in the event General Motors stock is distributed to them by court order. The Department has been urging the district court before which this matter is now pending effectively to accomplish the relief authorized by the Supreme Court, i.e., divorcement of Du Pont control of General Motors. The Government contends that it is necessary to require Christiana to sell the General Motors stock which it would receive as a stockholder of Du Pont so that the stock would not pass through to Christiana stockholders. If pass-through occurred, a large percentage of General Motors stock would come directly into Du Pont family hands. This would mean that the Du Pont family could still effectively control both Du Pont and General Motors. The Department remains concerned that unless the legislative history of the bill is kept quite clear, the provision for special tax treatment for distributions of General Motors stock to Christiana stockholders could be cited as an indication that Congress intended the courts to decree such a distribution.

As you know, the Senate Finance Committee report has, however, stated that it expresses no opinion as to what the courts should do with respect to Christiana's General Motors stock. Senate Finance Committee Report No. 1100, 87th Congress, 1st session, page 5 (1961). We would greatly appreciate your efforts to maintain on the Senate floor that this expression of your committee is also the sense of the Congress as a whole so that if the courts agree with the Government that sale by Christiana and not distribution is the effective remedy in the Du Pont case, the courts will be in a position to decree such a remedy completely free of any express or implied congressional mandate to the contrary.

Respectfully submitted.

Robert F. Kennedy,
Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will read the next letter.

The letter was read, as follows:

Office of the Attorney General,
Washington, D.C., January 13, 1962.
Hon. Albert Gore,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gore: This will acknowledge with thanks your telegram of January 12, 1962, concerning H.R. 8847, consideration of which is to begin again in the Senate on January 15, 1962.

As you state, the "Justice Department considers that antitrust aspects of the Du Pont case dictate that the order of divestiture include as a minimum requirement a provision directing divestiture by Christiana Corp. of GM stock it receives by sale rather than by pass-through to Christiana stockholders." In fact, in the proceedings pending in the district court in Illinois, the Government has urged the court to decree that Christiana Securities Corp. and its stockholders be barred from receiving General Motors stock to be distributed by Du Pont. It is proposed that this be accomplished by requiring either that Du Pont distribute cash instead of stock to Christiana or that Christiana be required to sell any General Motors stock which is distributed to Christiana by Du Pont. The Government has urged the court not to authorize a so-called pass-through of General Motors stock through Christiana to its stockholders because a pass-through would permit a large percentage of General Motors stock to be lodged in Du Pont family hands. This would mean that the Du Pont family could still effectively control General Motors as well as Du Pont.

As we have indicated in a letter to Senator Paul H. Douglas, copy of which is attached, the Department is concerned that enactment of the provisions of H.R. 8847 with respect to distributions of General Motors stock by Christiana Securities Corp. may cause the district court to refuse the Government's request that Christiana be required to sell the General Motors stock distributed to it. We have concluded, however, that we must, and the courts should, accept the statement contained in the Senate Finance Committee report on the pending bill that provisions of the bill with respect to a pass-through by Christiana are not intended to be an expression of opinion as to "what particular method of divestiture of General Motors stock by Christiana is appropriate. It is contemplated that all issues dealing with the manner of divestiture are to be determined judicially, solely with reference to the antitrust principles announced by the Supreme Court in the Du Pont case." Senate Finance Committee Report No. 1100, page 5 (1961).

As you will recall, the Supreme Court was confronted in the Du Pont case with a record "concerned mainly with the alleged adverse tax and market effects of the Government's proposal for complete divestiture." *United States* v. *Du Pont & Co.* (366 U.S. 316, 325 (1961)). On the record the Court concluded that once a court had determined that a particular remedy was required for "effective relief, the Government cannot be denied the latter remedy because economic hardship, however severe, may result. Economic hardship can influence choice only as among two or more effective remedies. If the remedy chosen is not effective, it will not be saved because an effective remedy would entail harsh consequences." Id. at page 327.

You may be interested to know that the Government urged the district court before which the Du Pont case is now pending that the court should enter a decree in this matter before Congress reconvened. The court has not acted, however, and will apparently not do so before January 15.

We hope and believe, nevertheless, that the expressions by the Senate Finance Committee and by the Supreme Court should persuade the district court that Congress is not attempting in influence the relief granted by the court so that the bill would not interfere with the relief sought by the Government.

As we have indicated in our letter to Senator Douglas, it would be most helpful, however, if in further discussion of this bill in the Senate, it could be made crystal clear that the provisions in H.R. 8847 with respect to a pass-through of General Motors stock by Christiana is not intended as an expression of congressional opinion as to the method of divestiture so that if the court agrees with the Government that sale and not distribution is the effective remedy, it will follow the Supreme Court ruling to decree that remedy, and feel free of any contrary congressional mandate.

Robert F. Kennedy,
Attorney General.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, since the letter of the Attorney General to me, though not identical with the letter which he addressed to the Senator from Tennessee, is substantially similar to it, I am sure the Senator from Alaska will not ask to have it read, but I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I would like to have it read.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I would like to have it read. There has been some question about the letters. I think all three letters should be read. I ask that the letter be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The letter was read, as follows:

Office of the Attorney General,
Washington, D.C., January 13, 1962.
Hon. Paul H. Douglas,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Douglas: This will acknowledge with many thanks your letter of January 9, 1962, about H.R. 8847.

Your letter notes that the U.S. district court in Chicago has not entered its final decree in the antitrust suit against Du Pont and that the Congress does not even know what relief, if any, is needed.

Since the Congress adjourned and the proceedings have resumed in the district court, the Department has been urging that court that in order effectively to accomplish the relief authorized by the Supreme Court, i.e., divorcement of Du Pont control of General Motors, it is necessary to require Christiana to sell the General Motors stock which it would receive as a stockholder of Du Pont and not to allow Christiana either to retain that stock or pass it through to Christiana stockholders. Otherwise, a large percentage of General Motors stock would be lodged in Du Pont family hands. As you point out, this would mean that the Du Pont family would still effectively control General Motors. The Department has shared your concern that enactment of the pending bill allowing special tax treatment for distributions of Du Pont stock to Christiana stockholders could persuade the court that Congress preferred a distribution to a sale.

We have concluded, however, that we must, and the court should, accept and be bound by the statement contained in the Senate Finance Committee Report on the pending bill that provisions of the bill with respect to a pass-through by Christiana are not intended to be an expression by Congress as to "what particular method of divestiture of General Motors stock by Christiana is appropriate. It is contemplated that all issues dealing with the manner of divestiture are to be determined judicially, solely with reference to the antitrust principles announced by the Supreme Court in the Du Pont case." Senate Finance Committee Report No. 1100, page 5 (1961).

As you will recall, the Supreme Court was confronted in the Du Pont case with a record "concerned mainly with the alleged adverse tax and market effects of the Government's proposal for complete divestiture." *United States* v. *Du Pont & Co.* (366 U.S. 316, 325 (1961)). On the record the Court concluded that once a court had determined that a particular remedy was required for "effective relief, the Government cannot be denied the latter remedy because economic hardship, however severe, may result. Economic

> hardship can influence choice only as among two or more effective remedies. If the remedy chosen is not effective, it will not be saved because an effective remedy would entail harsh consequences." Id. at page 327.
>
> We hope and believe that the expressions by the Senate Finance Committee and by the Supreme Court should persuade the district court that Congress is not attempting to influence the relief granted by the court so that the bill would not interfere with the relief sought by the Government, namely, an order requiring Christiana to sell the General Motors stock which it receives.
>
> It would be most helpful, however, if in further discussions of this bill in the Senate, it could be made crystal clear that the application of the tax benefits in H.R. 8847 to a pass-through of General Motors stock by Christiana is not intended as an expression of congressional opinion as to the method of divestiture so that if the court agrees with the Government that sale and not divestiture is the effective remedy, it will follow the Supreme Court rule to decree that remedy, and feel free of any contrary congressional mandate.
>
> We also note your request that the Department take the position that this bill be postponed until such time as the court finally acts. The Department has vigorously urged the court to act on our prayer for relief without regard to pending legislation but in view of the statements of the Supreme Court and of the Senate Finance Committee, we are not in a position to argue that postponement of congressional action until the court acts is necessary to successful conclusion of our pending prayer for relief.
>
> We are ever grateful for the interest which you and Senator GORE have shown in this important matter.
>
> Respectfully yours,
>
> ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
> *Attorney General.*
>
> (CC: Hon. ALBERT GORE, U.S. Senate.)

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I should like to have the clerk read the last two paragraphs again, to see if I correctly understand them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the last two paragraphs will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> We also note your request that the Department take the position that this bill be postponed until such time as the court finally acts. The Department has vigorously urged the court to act on our prayer for relief without regard to pending legislation but in view of the statements of the Supreme Court and of the Senate Finance Committee, we are not in a position to argue that postponement of congressional action until the court acts is necessary to successful conclusion of our pending prayer for relief.
>
> We are ever grateful for the interest which you and Senator GORE have shown in this important matter.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KERR. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No Senator has the floor at the present time.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask for recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I think the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the chairman of the Committee on Finance, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Attorney General have all made valuable contributions toward clearing up the issue before the Senate. I think it is now crystal clear that the question before the Senate is one of legislation with reference to the handling of taxation and that the question before the court is one having to do with enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Not only the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives but also the Committee on Finance of the Senate specifically made it clear that the Congress had no purpose whatever—and that the bill had no purpose whatever—to influence the court in its responsibility with reference to antitrust questions. At the same time, the report of the Senate Committee on Finance made it crystal clear that the committee was reporting a bill having to do with a subject over which the Congress has sole responsibility under the Constitution; that is, taxation.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I will yield in a minute.

Therefore, I am especially appreciative of the fact that the Attorney General, in the letter to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, said:

> We also note your request that the Department take the position that this bill be postponed until such time as the court finally acts. The Department has vigorously urged the court to act on our prayer for relief—

That relief had to do with antitrust law enforcement, Mr. President.

> without regard to pending legislation but in view of the statements of the Supreme Court and of the Senate Finance Committee, we—

And that means the Department of Justice—

> are not in a position to argue that postponement of congressional action until the court acts is necessary to successful conclusion of our pending prayer for relief.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me that the letter itself disposes of the argument on the point. Nobody in the Committee on Finance who participated in reporting the bill wished to have anything to do with the court's decision on antitrust measures. The Congress has enough to do to take care of its constitutional responsibility with reference to taxation. The Senate Committee on Finance felt it had enough to do in that regard. It was not all the committee could do, Mr. President, and I wish to make that crystal clear. The capabilities of the Senate Committee on Finance are such that neither its physical nor mental talents have ever been strained to any great extent. However, the committee felt it had enough to do, insofar as this question was concerned, to participate in the manner provided by the rules of the Senate and the Reorganization Act, in cooperating with the Congress in meeting the congressional responsibility with reference to the handling of tax matters, neither infringing upon the court in regard to an antitrust decision nor shirking its responsibility to deal with tax questions.

I must say the Attorney General has made a tremendous contribution to the environment in which we now consider this bill. The Department has, in about as polite phraseology as it could use or formulate—and I must say in about as clear, cogent, and concise phraseology as I have ever read—made it clear it is not its desire that the Congress await action by the court to meet the responsibility of the Congress.

It is very appropriately suggested, in the letter to the distinguished chairman of the committee, in the letter to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee and in the letter to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that the Senate should make it crystal clear in its deliberations on the bill—and if Congress should pass the bill, in the legislative history with reference to it—that the Congress is in no way seeking to infringe upon the prerogatives or responsibility of the court with reference to its decision in the antitrust phases of this matter. The Senate Committee on Finance, as so pertinently referred to by the Attorney General and so repeatedly referred to by the chairman of the committee, made it crystal clear that the proposed legislation was not intended in any way to influence the court in its decision with reference to divestiture. Therefore, it seems to me that the letters from the Department of Justice to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, the distinguished Senator from Illinois and the distinguished Senator from Virginia have reaffirmed the basic fact which is controlling in this deliberation, which is that the Senate is properly engaged in its business of considering proposed tax legislation.

I thank the Senator from Illinois for making his letter available to the Senate. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for making the letter addressed to him available to the Senate. I thank the Senator from Virginia for making the letter from the Attorney General to him available to the Senate.

I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee for a question.

Mr. GORE. Is the Senator from Oklahoma aware that statements contrary to the statement of the Senator appear in both the bill and the committee report?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma is not aware that any provision of the bill is contrary to what the Senator from Oklahoma has just said.

Mr. GORE. Is the Senator aware——

Mr. KERR. The Senator is aware, period. He hopes that the Senator from Tennessee is aware, period. If the Senator from Tennessee has in mind some specific provision of the bill or the report about which he would like to ask a question, the Senator from Oklahoma will be glad to answer such question.

Mr. GORE. Then I shall be glad to ask the question of the most aware Senator in this body——

Mr. KERR. I cannot disagree with the Senator from Tennessee on that specific point.

Mr. GORE. More particularly and especially with regard to legislation of the nature of that before the Senate.

The Senator has kindly afforded me the opportunity to ask him a question about a particular provision.

For what class of stockholder does the pending bill provide tax reduction or tax relief?

Mr. KERR. If my memory serves me right—and if it does not, I know that the very clear and concise memory of the Senator from Tennessee will refresh mine—the bill refers to the tax treatment of stock passed from the Du Pont Co., either to individual stockholders or to any corporate stockholder who is a party to the litigation.

Mr. GORE. It goes one step further.

Mr. KERR. What is that step?

Mr. GORE. It provides for a pass-through of Christiana also.

Mr. KERR. Is not Christiana, the corporation, a party to the suit in question?

Mr. GORE. It is certainly referred to in the pleadings.

Mr. KERR. Is it or is it not a party to the suit?

Mr. GORE. I am not sure——

Mr. KERR. It is the information of the Senator from Oklahoma that Christiana is a party to the suit in question; and in answer to the Senator's question, the bill provides for the tax treatment of General Motors stock received, by reason of the divestiture order, from the Du Pont Co., either by individual stockholders or Christiana. It would be received by Christiana because Christiana is a corporate stockholder and a party to the suit. The bill provides that it shall apply to any corporate stockholder——

Mr. GORE. Of either corporation.

Mr. KERR. That is a party to the suit and, so far as I know, Christiana is the only one. If that statement is not correct, I ask the Senator to correct my memory.

Mr. GORE. I have long since learned that in a colloquy with the Senator who has great awareness one must be precise.

Mr. KERR. Precision does not hurt.

Mr. GORE. In answer to the Senator's question as to whether Christiana is a party to the suit, I believe the record shows that the suit was not brought against Christiana, but Christiana is now petitioning the court. That is my answer to the Senator.

I now ask the Senator if he will turn to page 3 of the bill in order that I may ask him a specific question.

Mr. KERR. One moment. I will accommodate myself to the Senator.

Mr. GORE. I read beginning with line 12:

> (e) Definition of Divested Stock.—For purposes of this section, the term "divested stock" means stock meeting the following requirements:

As I understand the bill, only the holder of "divested stock" would be eligible for the tax treatment provided by the bill.

Mr. KERR. Such provision is not included in what the Senator has read to me.

Mr. GORE. What is the Senator's definition of "divested stock"?

Mr. KERR. The Senator's definition is immaterial. The bill itself defines the term, and if the Senator will read on, he will find the definition.

Mr. GORE. Very well. I shall be happy to read it.

Mr. KERR. I presumed that was what he was about to do.

Mr. GORE. I shall be happy to read the statement. If the Senator will turn to page 4——

Mr. KERR. We do not need to turn to page 4 because the definition starts on line 15, page 3.

Mr. GORE. The definition is a long one. I concede that the particular parts of the definition upon which I wish to propound the question to the able Senator from Oklahoma are on page 4, if the Senator from Oklahoma is also willing to concede.

Mr. KERR. I am waiting to have my attention directed to the part of page 4 to which the Senator from Tennessee refers.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator from Oklahoma object if I proceed to page 4 without reading the entire definition?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, if the Senator is willing, that the definition of "divested stock" which appears in the bill starting with line 12, page 3, and ending on line 3 page 5, be printed in the Record at this point.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma has no objection.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> "(e) Definition of Divested Stock.—For purposes of this section, the term 'divested stock' means stock meeting the following requirements:
>
> "(1) the stock is the subject of an antitrust order entered after January 1, 1961, which—
>
> "(A) directs the distributing corporation to divest itself of such stock by distributing it to its shareholders (or requires such distribution as an alternative to other action by any person);
>
> "(B) specifies and itemizes the stock to be divested; and
>
> "(C) fixes the period of time within which the distributing corporation must divest itself of all stock to be disposed of by it by reason of the suit, and such period expires not later than three years from the date on which such order becomes final (appeal time having run or appeal having been completed); and
>
> "(2) the court finds—
>
> "(A) that the divestiture of such stock, in the manner described in paragraph (1)(A), is necessary or appropriate to effectuate the policies of the Sherman Act, or the Clayton Act, or both:
>
> "(B) that the application of subsection (a) is required to reach an equitable antitrust order in such suit or proceeding; and
>
> "(C) that the period of time for the complete divestiture fixed in the order is the shortest period within which such divestiture can be executed with due regard to the circumstances of the particular case;
>
> but no stock shall be divested stock if the court finds that its divestiture is required because of an intentional violation of the Sherman Act, or the Clayton Act, or both."
>
> (b) The table of parts for subchapter O of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:
>
> "Part IX. Distributions pursuant to orders enforcing the antitrust laws."
>
> (c) The amendments made by this section shall apply only with respect to distributions made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. GORE. With respect to lines 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21 on page 4, I invite the Senator's attention to page 5 of the committee report.

Mr. KERR. In order that I may keep up with the Senator in the manifestation of his very agile and able mind, since he has referred to those lines, I wonder if it is all right for me to read them.

Mr. GORE. Of course.

If the Senator is willing, let me say that I know perfectly well that neither he nor the distinguished chairman of the committee would in any way whatsoever misinform the Senate if he were aware of such misinformation.

I do not know who drafted the bill. I do not know who wrote the bill. But I propose to show that the gravamen of the proposed legislation contemplates a passing of General Motors stock through Du Pont and through Christiana, to be then vested in a few members of the Du Pont family, which the Attorney General has said in his letter to me will constitute, in the hands of that family, the same kind of working effective control of General Motors and Du Pont as Du Pont now exercises.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I am still awaiting the question from the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The Senator was about to read the lines to which I referred.

Mr. KERR. I know I was, but I had to get the gravamen. When the Senator introduced the gravamen, I did not know how he spelled it. I was not sure about how the word is pronounced. For a moment he threw me off base a little. I have tried to keep up with him in his very learned and articulate presentation which, Mr. President, is not only most persuasive, but at times very lucid even to the Senator from Oklahoma. But when he introduced the word gravamen into it, he diverted my attention a little.

Mr. GORE. The lucidity is increased by the Senator's awareness.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I ask the Senator from Delaware to let me try to get along with the Senator from Tennessee for a moment, because he is about to ask me a question.

He is about to ask me a question with reference to lines 6 through 21 on page 4 of the bill. Inasmuch as they constitute a definition of divested stock, I wish to have in my mind the provision to which he refers, as the foundation for his question. This is on page 3 of the bill—

> For purposes of this section the term "divested stock" means stock meeting the following requirements:

After a number of the requirements are set forth, at page 4 of the bill this language appears:

> and
>
> "(2) the court finds—
>
> "(A) that the divestiture of such stock, in the manner described in paragraph (1) (A), is necessary or appropriate to ef-

fectuate the policies of the Sherman Act, or the Clayton Act, or both:

If I correctly understand that language, it says that certain elements are included in the definition of the divested stock, which is the phrase referred to in the General Motors stock now owned by Du Pont, insofar as the proposed legislation is concerned. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. That is a part of the definition.

Mr. KERR. Lines 18, 19, 20, and 21, at page 4 read:

> but no stock shall be divested stock if the court finds that its divestiture is required because of an intentional violation of the Sherman Act, or the Clayton Act, or both."

Therein, if I understand the proposed legislation, is the provision referred to in the Finance Committee's report and in the letter from the Attorney General, in which it is clearly set forth that the proposed legislation in no way provides a deterrent to the handling of the stock, and provides that no stock shall be included in this definition if the court finds that the divestiture of that stock is required because of an intentional violation of the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act, or both.

Therefore, rather than that provision in the bill supporting the contention of the Senator from Tennessee, it entirely eliminates the basis for the objection he is making.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I am still waiting for the Senator's question.

Mr. GORE. The Senator said, "intentional violation." The Supreme Court has held that there was a violation.

To show the able Senator from Oklahoma that the committee report contemplates a pass-through and indeed says that the terms of the bill provide for a pass-through through Christiana——

Mr. KERR. Where is that language?

Mr. GORE. That is on page 5. I wish the Senator would let me read it. I read from line 4 at page 5 of the committee report:

> However, the court may direct Christiana to distribute some or all of the General Motors stock received in the distribution. If this were to occur, under terms of the amendments made by the bill the individual shareholders of Christiana would be treated in the same manner as individual shareholders of Du Pont were treated in the antitrust distribution made by it.

How does the Senator square that with his negative answer to me, as I recall it, that the bill did not contemplate a pass-through of General Motors stock to stockholders of Christiana?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield, so that I may ask the Senator from Tennessee to read the next sentence?

Mr. KERR. I will read the next sentence. The Senator from Tennessee is confusing the part of the proposed legislation which provides what will be the result of a certain method of divestiture, if ordered by the court, and only if ordered by the court, to the extent that he says that it is an act on the part of Congress directing or indicating such an action.

The bill itself makes that clear, and the report states:

> Your committee wishes to make it very clear that it expresses no opinion as to what particular method of divestiture of General Motors stock by Du Pont or by Christiana is appropriate.

Mr. GORE. In other words, the Senator provides a path for the judge to follow, he greases the rails, and provides a super-highway for a pass-through, and then says, "We really do not mean that."

Mr. KERR. We indulge the same presumption in favor of the judge that the people of Tennessee indulged in favor of the Senator when they sent him to the Senate; namely, that the judge is capable of reading this language. The committee report states:

> Your committee wishes to make it very clear that it expresses no opinion as to what particular method of divestiture of General Motors stock by Du Pont or by Christiana is appropriate.
>
> It is contemplated by your committee—

The Senator from Tennessee spoke about what was contemplated in this report, but he does not need to, because the report states what is contemplated, because this is what it says:

> It is contemplated by your committee that all issues—

All issues—

> all issues dealing with the manner of divestiture are to be determined judicially, solely with reference to the antitrust principles announced by the Supreme Court in the Du Pont case.

In other words, it is not contemplated that the proposed legislation shall in any way control the method or contemplate the method or indicate the method of divestiture. That is a prerogative solely of the court, with reference to which Congress has already passed a law in the antitrust legislation, in which it placed that responsibility in the court.

Giving the court responsibility with reference to the enforcement of the antitrust law does not mean that Congress abdicates its responsibility with reference to tax legislation.

The report makes it crystal clear that the committee wants no part in determining the method of divestiture. That is what the Attorney General asked to have made crystal clear. The Attorney General knew that this was in the committee report, because he said so in his letter to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator accept an amendment to make tax relief for Du Pont stockholders available if the judge provides for any one of several choices or alternatives of divestiture? Why does the Senator wish to stick to a pass-through?

Mr. KERR. The proposed legislation has to do with a method of providing a certain tax treatment in the eventuality of certain judicial decisions.

Mr. GORE. That is correct. The Senator has referred to the pertinent point. Is the Senator aware that the General Counsel of the U.S. Treasury, Mr. Robert Knight, in his testimony before the Committee on Finance, referred to this bill as an admonition to the court?

Mr. KERR. I am not aware of that fact. However, it does not make any difference in what manner the representative of the Treasury Department described the bill. The bill is a creature of the Committee on Finance. It is really a creature of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, the House itself, the Justice Department, and the Treasury Department.

They passed it after the Department of Justice had said it had no objection to it. They passed it after the Treasury Department had said it had no objection to it. The bill came to the Committee on Finance. It comes to the Senate as a creature of the Committee on Finance. The Committee on Finance has explained what it is. It sets forth its explanation in clear language, language which the Senator himself understands and which the Senate will understand. That understanding will be the basis of the vote.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, earlier the Senator from Tennessee, in criticizing the language in the bill as it defines the companies which would be eligible for the relief, said he did not know from what source the language came. I sat in on the conferences in which this formula was worked out. The language was drafted first by the Treasury Department and then was revised somewhat upon the recommendation of the Department of Justice. This language, with every comma, period, and word in it, has been approved by the Department of Justice.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware does not have the floor.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield, so that I may ask the Senator from Delaware a question?

Mr. KERR. No. The Senator from Tennessee and I occupied some 34 minutes. I am sure he is willing to allow the Senator from Delaware to have a part of the time. As soon as the Senator from Delaware and I have finished our colloquy, I shall be glad to return to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Very well.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The bill was modified only as the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department made their recommendations, and in reporting the bill the Committee on Finance accepted their recommendations in their entirety.

The Senator from Tennessee raised the question as to why any reference was made in the bill to the Christiana Corp. One of the reasons for this reference to Christiana Corp. is that we adopted a proposal which, if I remember correctly, the Senator from Tennessee supported, and which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] supported; namely, that Christiana as a corporation should be taxed higher upon receipt of the stock dividend than is provided under existing law. If the proposal of the Senator from Tennessee is accepted that we strike out all reference to Christiana under this bill it will save Christiana about $80 million.

Mr. KERR. I am very happy that the Senator from Delaware has made that fact clear at this point.

The fact is that due to the recommendations of the Department of Justice the proposed legislation was framed not only so that Christiana and Christiana stockholders would get no special benefits; it was framed so that Christiana alone, of all the corporate owners of Du Pont stock in America, would have to pay an extra tax if the bill should be passed. If present law remains in force, and if the Supreme Court's decision, already rendered, is made final, except only as to the method of carrying it out, Christiana will pay less than $4 million taxes.

If the bill is passed, Christiana will pay $75 million to $80 million in taxes. After having done so, it will still be a party to a proceeding before the district court in Chicago, the court which is charged by the Supreme Court of the United States to provide a method of divestiture to be carried out in accordance with the judgment of the Supreme Court.

The Department of Justice has asked that as a part of that order Christiana be compelled to sell its Du Pont stock. The bill does not in any way influence or indicate or direct that the court in Chicago shall do otherwise.

The Senator from Tennessee, and all other Senators who are as aware as he is, are just as aware as is the Senator from Oklahoma that whatever decision the district court may make can be appealed from by the Department of Justice back to the Supreme Court, if it is so desired.

As I understand, the only question remaining unresolved is the method of divestiture, since divestiture has been ordered. But if and after Christiana had paid a tax of $75 million more than any other corporation in America would have to pay proportionately if it owned Du Pont stock, the Department of Justice still could ask the court to order Christiana to sell the Du Pont stock which would come to it by reason of the divestiture which has been ordered by the Supreme Court. If that should occur, Christiana would be compelled to pay an additional tax of some $200 million or $300 million.

But the manner of handling the stock by Christiana is before the Federal court in Chicago, whose decisions are subject to appeal either by Christiana or the Department of Justice. The Committee on Finance did not want to decide or indicate or direct with reference to what that court's decision should be. The Committee on Finance made it specifically clear that it wanted no part of that; that the proposed legislation was in no wise to be regarded as an expression of legislative intent or purpose to direct or influence that court's decision. That is inherent in the language of the bill; it is specific in the language of the report; it is specific in the observation by the Attorney General; it has been specifically stated by the chairman of the Committee on Finance. There can be no question about it. Therefore, the position urged by the Senator from Tennessee that the proposed legislation seeks to influence the district court as to the manner of carrying out the order of the Supreme Court to effectuate divestiture is wholly without foundation.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. First, I congratulate the Senator from Oklahoma on his able presentation of the important point in connection with the proposed legislation; namely, that this is a tax bill; it is not an antitrust bill.

Mr. KERR. Nor is it a court seizure bill.

Mr. BUSH. Nor is it, pro or con, antitrust legislation or big business or small business legislation. It is purely a tax bill. I ask the Senator this particular question: Inasmuch as the court has to decide that the divestiture is necessary, is it not a fact that taxes cannot be properly collected until there is legislation on the subject; and is not that the reason why the Treasury Department has taken a favorable attitude toward the committee report in support of the bill?

Mr. KERR. I answer the Senator from Connecticut by saying that existing law has provisions for the taxing of the transaction whereby Du Pont would divest itself of its General Motors stock under present law. The decision of the Supreme Court directed that the divestiture take place in 10 years. The Department of Justice wants divestiture to take place in 3 years. So the bill provides that divestiture shall take place in 3 years.

It was the opinion of the Treasury, of the House Committee on Ways and Means, and of the Committee of Finance, that existing law would not be equitable as a method of tax treatment if Du Pont were compelled, under court order, to divest itself of the stock under existing law.

So the purpose of the bill is to provide a different tax treatment for the taxpayer who is the recipient of stock by reason of the order or decree of the Supreme Court for stock divestiture by Du Pont.

But it was the opinion of the Finance Committee, it is the opinion of the Senator from Oklahoma, and it is the opinion of the Treasury Department, that the enactment of the bill will not result in having the Federal Government receive any less taxes than it would receive in the absence of enactment of the bill. It was the opinion of the Finance Committee, of the Ways and Means Committee, of the House of Representatives, of the Treasury Department, and of the Senator from Oklahoma that the bill provides a more equitable tax treatment than existing law does; but it does not provide a method that would result in a loss of revenue by the Government. The fact is, and the opinion of the Senator from Oklahoma is, that if the bill is enacted, the Federal Government will receive in the neighborhood of $450 million of additional taxes in 3 years; but if the bill is not enacted and if the order issued by the court is carried out under existing law, the Government will receive only $300 million in taxes during a period of 10 years.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Pell in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Did the Senator from Oklahoma hear the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] say that the Secretary of the Treasury supported the bill?

Mr. KERR. No; I did not hear the Senator say that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I said the Secretary of the Treasury and the Department of Justice had no objection to the bill and helped draft the bill, and that the language of the bill was approved by them.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator from Tennessee say the Treasury is opposed to the bill?

Mr. GORE. I do not.

Mr. KERR. Then there is no difference between us as to that.

Mr. GORE. I was not aware that the Secretary of the Treasury ever said publicly that he was for the bill, although it has been my impression for a long time that he is for it. But it was never my impression that Attorney General Kennedy was for it, and it is not my impression that he favors it now.

Mr. KERR. Is the vote of the Senator from Tennessee determined by the position of the Attorney General?

Mr. GORE. It is not.

Mr. KERR. The opinion of the Attorney General is very persuasive to me. No Member of the Senate has a higher regard or higher respect for the Attorney General, and it is greatly enhanced by the very intelligent letter he wrote to the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Illinois. But I cannot find in the letter any comfort for either the Senator from Tennessee or the Senator from Illinois.

I noticed in the newspaper this morning—and, by the way, I enjoyed the Senator's "ad" in both yesterday's newspaper and today's newspaper. [Laughter.] I thought the Senator's pipeline to the press must be a very wonderful one. I noticed the headline "Gore Consults President."

Mr. GORE. That was not arranged through the press.

Mr. KERR. I presume it occurred.

Mr. GORE. I will talk to the Senator about that.

Mr. KERR. I was only reading what the press said:

> GORE CONSULTS PRESIDENT
>
> Senator Albert Gore, buttressed—

I know a little about anatomy, but probably not enough to exactly——

Mr. GORE. That is not an anatomical word.

Mr. KERR. No?

Mr. GORE. It is a physical word.

Mr. KERR. That is what I thought; and I thought this was an intellectual discussion.

This thought just now occurred to me: I wonder through what portion of his anatomy the Senator operates on these legislative matters. I would not want such a thing to happen to me, if it is what I think it is:

> Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, buttressed by a letter from the Attorney General, called on President Kennedy last night—

That would be doing business on the Sabbath, it appears to me, Mr. President—

> to request a delay in Senate action on a controversial tax bill.
>
> GORE disclosed that he had received a letter from Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy stating that it is the Justice Department's position that a Chicago Federal court should rule on the Du Pont antitrust case before any tax relief legislation is passed.

When I saw that item in the paper this morning, it gave me some concern. I am very happy that the Senator from Tennessee brought his letter to the Senate, and that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] brought his letter to the Senate, and that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] brought his letter to the Senate, for they disclose very clearly, cogently, and concisely that the Department of Justice is not taking the position that the Chicago Federal court should rule on the Du Pont antitrust case before any tax relief legislation is passed. So I am very happy that that question is now cleared up by the language of the official document itself, rather than being left suspended in the air, either buttressed or headed by the effort of either the Senator from Tennessee or the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Oklahoma has just now read the interpretation, made by a reporter for United Press International, of a paragraph of the letter received from the Attorney General. Would the Senator from Oklahoma mind rereading that sentence, in order that I may immediately follow that by reading from the Attorney General's letter to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee for a question; but I say to him, as I said a while ago, that if he wants to discuss the communication he has received from the Attorney General, I think he should do so in his own time.

Mr. GORE. But we have a great deal of time now.

Mr. KERR. However, I will yield to the Senator from Tennessee. What does he wish to do?

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator from Oklahoma read the reporter's interpretation?

Mr. KERR. No; but I will read what is in the newspaper.

Mr. GORE. Very well. The facts are that I made the letter available to the reporter——

Mr. KERR. This article does not so state.

Mr. GORE. I am telling the Senator from Oklahoma what happened.

Mr. KERR. I cannot read into this newspaper article something that the reporter did not write.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator from Oklahoma let me read it?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Tennessee does not doubt my ability to read, does he?

Mr. GORE. No.

Mr. KERR. Then let the Senator listen to me read it, and see whether I read it correctly.

Mr. GORE. I thought I detected some reluctance on the part of the Senator from Oklahoma to read it.

Mr. KERR. Not at all.

The second paragraph of the newspaper article reads as follows:

> GORE disclosed that he had received a letter from Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy stating that it is the Justice Department's position that a Chicago Federal court should rule on the Du Pont antitrust case before any tax relief legislation is passed.

Mr. GORE. Now will the Senator from Oklahoma yield, so that I may read——

Mr. KERR. I shall yield in just a moment.

Nothing in that part of the newspaper article indicates or states that the newspaper reporter saw the letter. If I am able to read correctly the language of that paragraph of the newspaper article, it is an indirect quotation of the Senator from Tennessee—not a quotation, either direct or indirect, from the letter of the Attorney General.

Mr. GORE. That is a simple declarative sentence which states that I disclosed that I had received a letter, and that the letter contained the following, which I wish to read——

Mr. KERR. No; it does not say "the letter contained the following." Will the Senator from Tennessee show that here?

Mr. GORE. Yes. Let the Senator read it again.

Mr. KERR (continuing).

> GORE disclosed that he had received a letter from Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy stating—

This is what GORE disclosed; this is not what the letter said.

Mr. GORE. I did not disclose; I said the letter said so and so. I wish to read what the letter stated, if the Senator will permit me——

Mr. KERR. I think it is wonderful for the Senator to do so. I think it would have been fine if the reporter had done it.

Mr. GORE. Let us see if the reporter did. I quote from the Attorney General's letter:

> You may be interested to know that the Government urged the district court before which the Du Pont case is now pending that the court should enter a decree in this matter before Congress reconvened.

If the Senator is ready to go to another matter, I shall be glad to ask another question, if he will yield.

Mr. KERR. In reference to what the Senator has just said, for 10 or 11 years the Justice Department has been urging the court to act on this matter. That statement, taken out of context, cannot substantiate the position of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I have not taken it out of context.

Mr. KERR. In that regard, I shall show something the Senator from Tennessee said.

Mr. GORE. I have not taken it out of context. I read it from the letter.

Mr. KERR. It was taken out of context. The letter to the Senator from Illinois said it was not the prerogative of the Department to do that; it was to be clear in the legislative record that they were not trying to influence the court in what the decision should be.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 16, pages 21370–21371, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee made this statement:

> Mr. President, the Senate has declined to pass a bill which has as one of its principal purposes the effort to influence the decision of the court. Now that this decision has been made—

And that decision was that the matter be postponed until January 15, 1962—

> and the bill has been postponed until January 15 by the consent of all, during the intervening time the court will have ample opportunity carefully to consider the problem and to reach a decision.

I thought that was a very enlightening statement. I am glad it is in the RECORD. It indicates to me that, insofar as the Senator from Tennessee is concerned, last September he did not want us to consider this bill until January 15——

Mr. GORE. Until the court had acted.

Mr. KERR. No, no. The Senator said until the court would have had time to act.

Mr. GORE. Well, it has had time.

Mr. KERR. Until it had had time and opportunity to act; and the Senator then said that would be ample time for the court to act.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] said at that time that the court would act on December 2.

Mr. KERR. The fact that the Senator from Delaware was mistaken in his opinion of what the court would do is no more detrimental to him than it is to the Senator from Tennessee, who took the same position.

Mr. GORE. I did not take the position; I said the court would have had time to act. I think the Chicago court has had ample time to act.

Mr. KERR. If this is accurate, the Senator from Tennessee set forth—and I read it—that the Justice Department takes the position that a Chicago Federal court should rule on the Du Pont antitrust case before any tax relief legislation is passed. Yet the correspondence from the Attorney General specifically states otherwise.

Mr. GORE. The letter from the Attorney General states that the Department of Justice specifically asked the court to act before the Congress reconvenes.

Mr. KERR. There is no doubt about that. The Attorney General has been asking the court to act for months, but it is not the prerogative of the Congress to tell the court what to do. I wish it were. There have been many times when I thought Congress should exercise the power it has with reference to the judiciary; but I recognize that, under the Constitution, that is the court's responsibility, and I presume the Senator from Tennessee recognizes it is the court's responsibility. The fact that he might not agree, or I might not agree, either with the manner in which the court shoud act, or time within which the court should act, does not give us the prerogative to direct the court's action.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. Yes; I yield further.

Mr. GORE. I believe the Senator was out of the Chamber when I quoted a statement by an official of the Du Pont Co. I should like to read it to him.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator about to ask me a question?

Mr. GORE. I did not think we had reduced ourselves to the extreme limitation of yielding only for a question.

Mr. KERR. I did not say I would not yield; I was merely asking if the Senator was about to ask me a question.

Mr. GORE. It is a part of a question which I wish to submit.

Mr. KERR. Very well. May I read that with the Senator?

Mr. GORE. Yes, indeed.

Mr. KERR. It will help me, perhaps, with my limited mental faculties, to comprehend what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. GORE. I am always happy to assist the Senator's awareness. I quote:

> It is obvious that prompt action by the Senate on H.R. 8847 would be of material assistance to the court in the efficient framing of a final decree.

This statement was distributed, according to the larger version I have, to the newspaper editors of the country. This particular one was delivered by hand to a news agency in Washington which made it available to me.

Is the Senator aware that the officials of the Du Pont Co. contend passage of the bill will render material assistance to the court in what they call an efficient framing of a final decree?

Mr. KERR. I am glad the Senator showed me this paper. It looks to me like a multigraphed statement. I see no reference to any official of the Du Pont Co. I see no one named. I see nothing to identify it with any official of the Du Pont Co.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. Insofar as I am concerned, I believe the Senator from Tennessee is aware, as I am, that the piece of paper which he holds in his hand, and which he entrusted to me, does not substantiate the statement that that is a statement of an official of the Du Pont Co. But whatever the officials of the Du Pont Co. might say does not control the action of the Senator from Oklahoma, and I had not supposed it did that of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I had not entertained such suspicions of my friend.

Mr. KERR. I am trying to argue this legislation on its merits.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. The sheet which I handed to the Senator is, as he has said, a mimeographed sheet. This is an abbreviation of a longer statement which I hold and now hand to the Senator, on the stationery of the E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Wilmington, Del., Harold Brayman, director, public relations department.

The statement which I read to the Senator is contained in the larger document, which is labeled, "Note to Editor." It, too, was brought to me, along with the abbreviated version.

I might further enlighten the Senator from Oklahoma. This statement quotes the attorney for the Christiana Corp. as pleading before the Chicago court that his company wants to move any shares to its stockholders under the new tax law. They are already referring to this proposal as law, not as a bill, which gives a different tax treatment to the General Motors stock that would be passed through the Christiana Corp.; and I repeat that the bill contemplates such a pass-through. It is my firm conviction that that is the principal purpose of the bill. I do not say it is the purpose of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Tennessee that I am perfectly aware of the fact that the officials of the Du Pont Co. favor the bill. I am sure there is not a Member of the Senate or of the House of Representatives or of the Justice Department or of the Treasury Department who does not believe the officials of the Du Pont Co. favor the bill.

The bill has been presented, however, on the basis of its merit. I say to my friend from Tennessee that if the bill is passed, it will cost most of the officials of the Du Pont Co. much more than existing law would cost them. If the bill is passed, it will transfer a tax load of more than a quarter of a billion dollars from small stockholders of the Du Pont Co. to large stockholders of the Du Pont Co.

If the bill is passed, it will increase the tax liability of Christiana, some 65 percent of which is owned by those related to the Du Pont family, as was mentioned, from $3 million or $4 million to $75 million or $80 million.

The fact is that in recommending the bill it has been made crystal clear by the officials of the Du Pont Co. that they do so seeking justice for their hundreds of thousands of small stockholders and for the more than three-quarter million stockholders of General Motors, rather than for the benefit either of the so-called Du Pont family or the officials of the Du Pont Co.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I preface my question with a statement which will try to clarify the issue?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the issue which is at stake in Chicago before the district court is not whether Du Pont shall divest itself of General Motors stock. This has been ordered by the Supreme Court. There are two issues before the court. The first issue is whether Christiana, which is a Du Pont family-held corporation and which controls Du Pont, shall divest. Second, if Christiana does so, should it divest by sales in the general market or by passing through the shares to its stockholders, with the Du Pont family controlling 80 percent of the Christiana stock?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, before the Senator asks the question, I wish to say that my yielding for a question does not mean in any way that I agree with the statement the Senator has made about Christiana controlling Du Pont. Christiana owns less than 30 percent of the stock of Du Pont. I am sure the Senator would not want the RECORD to reflect other than accuracy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think Christiana does control Du Pont, but I am glad the Senator has made a reservation on that point. What I said was that members of the Du Pont family controlled 80 percent of the stock of Christiana.

Is the Senator from Oklahoma aware of the fact that as between the two alternatives—namely, divestiture by sale on the part of Christiana, which the Department of Justice is advocating, and divestiture by pass-through, which Du Pont is advocating—the only tax advantage given by the bill is for the pass-through method, which the company wants, and not for the method of sales, which the Department of Justice wants?

Mr. KERR. I say two things to the distinguished Senator from Illinois. First, the court in Chicago and the Supreme Court will have to decide how Christiana divests itself of its General Motors stock, whether the bill is passed or not. If the Supreme Court order to Du Pont to divest itself of General Motors stock is carried out—and it certainly will be, Mr. President—millions of shares of Du Pont stock will be passed to Christiana, whether the bill is passed or not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The issue is, then, what Christiana does with that stock.

Mr. KERR. That question will be before the court whether the bill is passed or not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator answer my question?

Mr. KERR. I am going to answer it. I am answering it. The question of how divestiture shall be carried out, and as to whether or not Christiana sells its General Motors stock thus received——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Which the Department is asking the court to order.

Mr. KERR. Which the Department is asking it to do—will be before the court whether the bill is passed or not. The only difference relates to the number of General Motors shares. There will be 18 million shares of General Motors stock passed to Christiana under the present court ruling and under existing law. The decision the court is going to make about what Christiana does with that stock will have to be made whether the bill is passed or not. The only difference is one of numbers. The principle will remain identically the same.

On the basis of that fact, which I know is familiar to my friend from Illinois, I shall answer the question about the tax effect of the provisions of the bill.

If the court does what the Justice Department wishes it to do——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Which is to provide for divestiture of General Motors stock by Christiana by sale.

Mr. KERR. If the court does what the Justice Department wishes it to do, the court will direct Christiana to sell the General Motors stock it receives from Du Pont either under existing law or under the proposed law. Let us start from there.

The court will have the identical question before it insofar as the principle of law is concerned under the bill, if passed, or under existing law. In either event the Justice Department is seeking an order of the court requiring Christiana to dispose of or to divest itself, by sale, of General Motors stock it receives. If that is the order of the court, it makes no difference whether the company sells the stock it receives under existing law or the stock it would receive under the bill.

If the bill is not passed and if the court requires that Christiana divest itself of General Motors stock it receives—in order that I may clear up one point in my mind, I should like to ask the Senator from Delaware whether that has been ordered by the Supreme Court.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; the Court has not ordered Christiana to divest itself.

Mr. KERR. The Court has not ordered that?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is my understanding. It has been petitioned to do so.

Mr. KERR. The order thus far is only that Du Pont divest itself?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is my understanding.

Mr. KERR. Is that the understanding of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. That was my understanding, but I wish to be accurate in what I am about to say.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. On that basis, if the bill is not passed the Justice Department will have before it the same opportunity to express its desire and to ask the Court for an order requiring Christiana to sell whatever General Motors stock it gets.

If it does, the stockholders of Du Pont will not have to pay any tax. The corporation would have to pay the tax on the profit that it makes under the capital gains provisions, and, of course, under existing law it would be free to reinvest the proceeds.

This is the answer which really I think determines the significance of the Senator's question. If the bill is not passed, and if the order of the Supreme Court is carried out and Christiana is ordered to sell what General Motors stock it has, it will pay a capital gains tax on the profit. If the bill is passed, and if the Court, pursuant to the application of the Department of Justice, orders Christiana to sell its Du Pont stock, it will still pay a capital gains tax.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is just the point.

Mr. KERR. Christiana will still pay a capital gains tax upon the sale of its Christiana stock.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct. There will be no change effective by this bill so far as divestiture by sale on the part of Christiana is concerned.

Mr. KERR. None whatever, except a slight adjustment in the basis under the bill for the tax paid by Christiana.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The difference is in the pass-through method. The bill would give to a pass-through an added advantage which does not now exist. Therefore, it would be argued by the very able attorneys for Du Pont that the passage of the bill indicates that Congress wishes to give an advantage to the pass-through method rather than to the method of sale and therefore is, in effect, giving a signal to the Court as to what it should decide.

Mr. KERR. There is no advantage in the pass-through.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the bill as compared to present law there is.

Mr. KERR. There is no advantage in the pass-through.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There certainly is.

Mr. KERR. Not a bit, because if the Department of Justice fails in its efforts to secure an order from the court requiring the sale by Christiana of its General Motors stock, under the bill that stock would be passed through to the Christiana stockholders; whereupon they would have to pay the same identical capital gains tax that Christiana would have to pay if the court ordered Christiana to sell the stock, which is what the Department of Justice is seeking.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to correct him on that point?

Mr. KERR. Surely.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Under present law——

Mr. KERR. I did not say under present law. I said under the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What would happen under present law?

Mr. KERR. What would happen under present law?

Mr. DOUGLAS. To the stockholders of Christiana.

Mr. KERR. Under present law the stockholders of Christiana would be $3 million to $5 million better off than they would be under the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. With a pass-through under present law the individual stockholder of Christiana would pay the ordinary income tax rate, which, in the case of the Du Pont family——

Mr. KERR. But Christiana is not an individual.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, but the stockholders of Christiana are individuals.

Mr. KERR. But they would not have the liability.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, yes, they would. I am speaking of the individual stockholders in Christiana who would receive the pass-through.

Mr. KERR. No; they would not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Under present law.

Mr. KERR. No; under present law any stock that was passed by Du Pont to Christiana would be divested in the following manner——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if that is so——

Mr. KERR. Let me answer the Senator's question. He is out in the quicksand, and we are going to keep him there.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think there is some difference of opinion as to whose feet are in the quicksand.

Mr. KERR. Not a bit. Under present law, if Du Pont transferred, let us say, 10 million shares of General Motors stock as a dividend to Christiana, Christiana would owe not to exceed 52 percent of 15 percent of that General Motors stock to Du Pont, which is about $2 a share.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is, if the company does not divest. But now suppose——

Mr. KERR. Under existing law it does not have to divest.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand. I pointed out to the Senator that there are two issues at stake in Chicago. One is whether Christiana will be compelled to divest. The second issue is whether it will divest by sale or by pass-through, and the points I have been making have been directed to the second question, which is probably the more important question of the two. The essential fact, so far as divestiture by sale is concerned, is that the bill now before us makes absolutely no change in the existing law.

Mr. KERR. Oh, yes; it does.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; it does not.

Mr. KERR. Oh, yes, it does.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If there is a sale, it is an ordinary capital gains tax which is applied in both cases.

Mr. KERR. But before Christiana sells and becomes subject to the application of the capital gains tax, they would have had to pay 52 percent of 15 percent of the general market value of the General Motors stock, rather than 52 percent of 15 percent of the cost of that General Motors stock to Du Pont. In other words, before the question of divestiture by Christiana is up for decision, under existing law, if Christiana becomes the owner of that stock, the Senator knows that it is treated as a dividend, but the amount of the dividend is only the cost of the General Motors stock to Du Pont, which is about $2 a share. But if the bill were passed, Christiana—and Christiana alone of every corporate stockholder of Du Pont in America—would be taxed, not on the cost of the stock to Du Pont, but on the market value of the stock when it passed from Du Pont to Christiana, which is the difference between $2 a share and 52 percent of 15 percent of the market value.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if Christiana sells the stock, it will receive, of course, enormous amounts of money, which would be a capital gain to Christiana, and which under present law would be taxed at 25 percent——

Mr. KERR. Under the bill it would be taxed at 25 percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct. The 25 percent would not be in addition to the 7½ percent, for the basis would be adjusted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I suggest to the Senator from Illinois that he ask his colleague, any member of the staff, or any tax lawyer.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is not an addition for the basis is adjusted.

Mr. KERR. The owners must pay the income tax when they receive the stock as a dividend, and then they become the owners of the stock. Then when they are compelled to sell it, they cannot sell it on the basis on which they received it. There is no provision in the law permitting such action. They must sell it on the basis of the cost of the company from which they received it, and they would be taxed under the capital gains provision.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator will find that if such owners would pay a $4.50 tax on the present value of the stock, which is $55, and then pay a capital gains tax, the amount of the tax which they paid would be subtracted from the capital gains as a basis of computing the tax.

So in effect all that is paid is 25 percent of the capital gains.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Illinois is completely in error at that point. The committee report states:

> However, Christiana will pay the additional tax whether or not a distribution by it is ordered.

In other words, if the bill passes, we shall have raised the tax for Christiana when it receives its General Motors stock from about 16 cents under present law to $4.34 a share, based upon a market price of $55 for General Motors.

Mr. KERR. And the Senator from Illinois supported that view.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It was better than the 16-cents-a-share performance that was sought to be put over 2 years ago. That is true. They saved about $120 million.

Mr. KERR. We have not unless the bill is passed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If Christiana were ordered to divest itself of the stock by sale under existing law, it would save about $75 million over what it would have if the bill were passed.

If the position of the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Illinois prevails and this bill is defeated Christiana Corp. will save about $80 million in corporation taxes.

I think the record should be clear as to what they are trying to accomplish by their opposition.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We can check the record with reference to what the Secretary of the Treasury has said.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is not the contention of the Senator from Tennessee or the Senator from Illinois that no bill should be passed. We are not saying that the existing law should be maintained. Once the court decides we can provide what relief is necessary. We do say, however, that there are certain provisions in the existing bill that should be changed. We also think that we should wait until the court makes a decision, instead of passing in advance a tax bill which would give a clue to the court as to the type of decision which Congress seeks.

Mr. KERR. I go back to the report of the committee on Finance and to the statement of the Attorney General:

> It is contemplated by your committee that all issues dealing with the manner of divestiture are to be determined judicially, solely with reference to the antitrust principles announced by the Supreme Court in the Du Pont case.

The Attorney General has asked that that be made crystal clear in the legislative record on the pending bill. It is made crystal clear in the language of the bill, in the committee report on the bill, in the statement of the chairman of the Finance Committee, in the statement of the Senator from Delaware, and in the statement of the Senator from Oklahoma. Therefore the opposite is the case. We do not seek to influence the court in its decision. We specifically say so in the bill and in the report.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Virginia can pour all the perfumes of Arabia on the bill and say that they do not intend to influence the court, but all the perfumes of Arabia cannot blot out what the effect of the bill would be, namely, that it would give a tax advantage to a pass-through rather than to a sale of General Motors stock by Christiana, and hence direct the hand of the court. Secondly, the bill comes down on the Du Pont side of the case, as Du Pont argues that a sale of 63 million shares would hurt the value of the stock, whereas the Department of Justice is arguing that there would be no such requirement for a stock sale in the open market in any such large amount.

Mr. KERR. I agree with my friend on one statement he made—and he and I do not often agree. He spoke about the perfumes of Arabia. I am not familiar with them. So far as I know, their delectable odors have never ravished me.

Regardless of what they might do, all the perfumes of Arabia do not change the language in the report; neither do the imaginings of the Senator from Illinois. I say that because the report is proof against the perfumes of Arabia, which must have some particular charm or seductive lure, or they would not have been referred to in the eloquent language which the Senator from Illinois has used.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sorry; I paraphrased some language by Shakespeare.

Mr. KERR. I do not want to be accused of being disrespectful to Shakespeare.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator would never be disrespectful to Shakespeare.

Mr. KERR. No, no. If the perfumes of Arabia, whatever they may be, will leave this language unchanged insofar as the court is concerned, I know that the cold, analytical discussions and statements of the Senator from Illinois will leave the court equally undisturbed and unmoved.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If we may become cold and unemotional——

Mr. KERR. Let us not do that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Oklahoma tell me what would be the basis of the tax, under present law, on a pass-through of Christiana stock to the stockholders of Christiana?

Mr. KERR. I do not know what the tax would be on Christiana stock on a pass-through through Christiana to Christiana stockholders. I cannot answer the Senator's question.

Mr. GORE. General Motors stock.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I meant to say on a pass-through of General Motors stock through Christiana to stockholders of Christiana.

Mr. KERR. The effect of a pass-through of General Motors stock to the stockholders of Christiana would result in their being required to pay the ordinary income tax at the rates prescribed, based on the market value of General Motors stock which was thus received by them from Christiana.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is absolutely correct. That would be at a very high rate of taxation.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator seek that?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think so knowing——

Mr. KERR. There it is, Mr. President.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Just a moment, please.

Mr. KERR. There it is.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the Senator's question?

Mr. KERR. There is the answer. That is the purpose of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I did not understand the Senator's question.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator disclaim the purpose?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly, it is not my purpose to apply such a tax to the members of the family.

Mr. KERR. I only take the Senator at his word.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Oklahoma is moving altogether too fast for me. I was trying to obtain an analysis of the differences under the proposed bill as compared with the present law on a pass-through of that stock. The Senator from Oklahoma has very correctly said that the tax would be at ordinary income tax rates. That was what I was trying to establish, and I thought I was commenting on that issue. The Senator knows that 80 percent of the Christiana stock is owned by members of the Du Pont family.

Mr. KERR. That is incorrect.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They own or control 80 percent.

Mr. KERR. Hardly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They control 80 percent. Inasmuch as the Du Pont family is a very wealthy family, it would mean in all probability that the tax rate would be from 60 to 91 percent. I do not believe they should pay that rate of taxation. I want to make that clear. I made it clear in the meetings of the committee. The Senator from Delaware will bear me out.

Will the Senator from Oklahoma tell me what the rate of taxation on this group would be in the event the bill were passed in its present form?

Mr. KERR. If the bill were passed in its present form, the question of divestiture would still be before the court, uninfluenced by the bill as passed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Suppose the court should order divestiture by a pass-through?

Mr. KERR. If the court ordered a divestiture by a pass-through, the stockholders of Christiana would pay a capital gains tax.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Under the bill a modified capital gains tax.

Mr. KERR. A capital gains tax on the amount of the market value of General Motors stock received in excess of their cost in Christiana stock.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe that is substantially correct.

Mr. KERR. I know it is.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I point out that this would be——

Mr. KERR. But I say this to the Senator from Illinois, in that regard——

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I finish?

Mr. KERR. The Senator may finish in a moment. If the court does not order a pass-through, or permits it, but orders the sale by Christiana of this stock, the same tax will be paid by Christiana that would be paid under the circumstance referred to by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No.

Mr. KERR. The owners of Christiana would have the value of their investment decreased by the same amount, because there would be no difference between the corporation paying a capital gains tax in the amount of the market value above the cost to Christiana and the stockholder receiving it and paying a capital gains tax on the same amount. If Christiana sells it, it will pay a capital gains tax. If the stockholder receives it, he will pay the capital gains tax.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say that under the pending bill, on a pass-through, the individual stockholder in Christiana would pay a modified capital gains tax, the maximum of which would be less than 25 percent.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator show me that language in the bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The very statement which the Senator has made, and which he will undoubtedly correct in the RECORD, indicates that it would not be a pure or full capital gains tax, but that there would be deducted from the current market value of the General Motors stock received the price originally paid for the Christiana stock in determining capital gains.

Mr. KERR. That is the basis of all capital gains taxes. The tax is on the gain, not on the total amount of the sale. That is what a pure capital gains tax is—if a capital gains tax can be pure.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is modified to have a one and one-third share factor.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. The capital gains tax would eventually be the same, because when the basis of the Du Pont stock is reduced to zero, eventually when that stock is sold the capital gains tax will be on that much greater profit. Sooner or later the result will be the same with respect to capital gains.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Under the bill, it is a modified capital gains tax, not a pure capital gains tax and would be lower than on a so-called pure capital gains tax.

Mr. KERR. Not all the way.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is modified in the way I mentioned; namely, that there will be one and one-third shares of General Motors stock for each share of Du Pont held.

Mr. KERR. But the owner of Christiana stock will not get it that way. Christiana will get it that way. That is the way Christiana will get it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct; and if Christiana passes it through, that will be the way in which the individual stockholder of Christiana will receive the amount.

Mr. KERR. So the capital gains tax will apply to the same amount of money, whether it is paid by Christiana or paid by the stockholder.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No.

Mr. KERR. Of course it will. That is the provision of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to point out that under the bill no change is made in existing law so far as divestiture by sale by Christiana is concerned. The change is made so far as divestiture by pass-through is concerned, and therefore favors granted by the bill are for divestiture by pass-through rather than by sale. While the latter point may seem somewhat confused, I am quite certain it will be found that under the bill divestiture by pass-through by Christiana will be accompanied by a lower capital gains tax than will divestiture by sale for the latter will bear a pure and not a modified capital gains tax.

Mr. KERR. The Senator could not be more mistaken. Under the law, divestiture by pass-through would result in a different treatment. But the Senator has taken both positions here this afternoon: First, that he favored the application of the ordinary income tax rate; and then he immediately corrected that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I did not understand what the Senator was saying. I thought he was saying something else. I do not favor the application of ordinary income tax rates on the accruals in value which will occur because of the increase in value of General Motors stock. I wish to make that absolutely clear.

Mr. KERR. Then the Senator and I are entirely in accord on that point.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. KERR. The alternative which the Senator from Oklahoma knows about is to provide that instead of the rates which the Senator from Illinois said he would not want to see applied, the capital gains rate shall apply to this provision of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. On a pass-through by Christiana, something more than that is provided. It is a modified capital gains tax which makes the maximum rate of taxation less than 25 percent.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Illinois is in error on that. I can only enlighten him. If he is correct, I am sure he will show the Senator from Oklahoma the provision in the bill that makes the difference.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would not the basis of the Christiana stock be written down to zero?

Mr. KERR. If it were, then the entire market value would be subject to a capital gains tax, and the 25 percent of the total amount of the tax would be charged.

If the value of Christiana stock in the hands of a stockholder were zero, then the stockholder in Christiana would have to pay 25 percent of the entire market value of what he received. The Senator knows that. There is no abler man in the Senate, with reference to revenue and taxation, than the Senator from Illinois. He knows that if a capital gains tax is applied, it is applied to the increase in value; and if the increase is from zero to 100, the 100 is taxable. If the increase is from 2 to 100, then 98 is taxable.

So if the value of Christiana stock in the hands of a Christiana stockholder has been reduced to zero, and if the Christiana stockholder receives 1,000 shares of General Motors stock, under the bill he will owe 25 percent of the market value of the 1,000 shares of General Motors stock.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I support the bill as a fair and equitable bill from the standpoint of both the Government and the stockholders of the companies involved. I think there is confusion and misunderstanding on some of these points. The Senator from Illinois is correct in saying that if there is a pass-through of General Motors stock by Christiana, the stockholders receiving the General Motors stock would reduce the value of General Motors stock by the cost of the Christiana stock, and would upon receipt of the stock pay a capital gains tax on the difference.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Delaware for bringing out that point.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then upon the sale of the Christiana stock, which would have been reduced to zero, if and when it were sold, the answer would be exactly the same as was stated by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If the Christiana stock cost, for example, $5 a share, and a person received $75 worth of General Motors stock, he would immediately owe a capital gains tax on the $70 upon receipt of the General Motors stock. Then when he sold the Christiana stock, the original stock, instead of having a $5 cost factor, would have a zero factor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Delaware is very accurate and very fair, as he is always. However, is there any real, practical possibility of the Du Pont family selling Christiana stock and hence realizing the full capital gains tax revenue effects in the near future? As the Senator well knows, Christiana is the family holding company which the Du Pont family have developed in order to keep control over Du Pont.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not know whether Christiana will sell or distribute its Du Pont stock. I do not believe that Congress desires to legislate that Christiana divest itself of its Du Pont stock. Not even the Supreme Court or the Department of Justice has requested that. Certainly the Senator from Illinois is not suggesting that the bill should be amended in a manner which would force Christiana to get rid of all its Du Pont stock. If that is the way we want the Government to obtain revenue, we should pass a law now which would provide that everyone in the United States must cash in immediately all of his potential capital gains and pay the capital gains tax. In that way presumably a tremendous amount of revenue would come to the Federal Government. However, I do not believe anyone in America has gone so far as advocating forced sales solely for the purpose of providing the U.S. Government with revenue. Not even the Senator from Illinois is advocating such a procedure.

Whether the stock is held, sold, or distributed to the stockholders, the bill in no way affects the decision of the Supreme Court. As the Senator from Oklahoma has stated, and as has been spelled out in the committee report, it is the clear intention of the committee—and we included this language upon the suggestion of the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department—that we in no way seek to attempt to influence the court as to the method of divestiture.

The reason there is a paragraph dealing with Christiana is that the committee felt—and I think the Senator from Illinois agrees—that regardless of what the final decision may be, whether Christiana is to pass through the stock, sell the stock, or keep it, when Christiana receives the stock, it should pay a larger corporate tax. The bill makes that provision by changing the method of computation of intercorporate stock dividends.

The bill makes that provision for Christiana alone, which I think is wrong. I supported a provision which would have extended the principle as general legislation to all corporations when we changed this particular method of computation of stock dividends. But the Department of Justice insisted otherwise, and the Committee on Ways and Means called the bill back to include a provision restricting the new method of computation solely to Christiana. I reluctantly acquiesced in that view. However, the bill does raise the corporate tax on Christiana, which would be about 16 cents a share under present law, to about $4.34 a share, based upon a $55 market value for General Motors. That is provided in the bill and will be effective regardless of whether the decision in Chicago be to pass the stock through or to permit Christiana to keep it or to order it sold.

I believe the Senator from Illinois is in agreement with that particular provision of the bill. I know that a couple of years ago he agreed with me that this provision should be changed.

The Senator said that a large percentage of the stock of Christiana is owned by the original investors in Christiana. He is correct on that point, and it is upon those stockholders that the tax liability under this bill will fall.

This bill practically exempts from tax the thousands of little stockholders who certainly could not in any way have been responsible for any alleged antitrust violations. The bill also exempts from tax practically all of the approximately 50,000 employees of the company who have purchased stock under the company's stock purchase plan. In fact, the bill exempts from tax all stockholders whose costs of Du Pont exceed the market value of the General Motors stock.

Under this bill the more than 7,000 stockholders of Christiana—about 1,800—will pay practically all the tax, or about $150 million of capital gains tax. The other 5,000 smaller stockholders will pay less than $5 million. At the present market value of General Motors each stockholder will receive about $75 worth of General Motors stock as a Du Pont Co. stockholder, and all of those stockholders of the Du Pont Co. and the stockholders of the Christiana Corp.—should it be ordered to distribute—who paid $75 or more for their stock would owe zero tax under this bill. The bill would eliminate all the tax on all the stockholders of companies who are named in the court order if their costs were in excess of the value of the distributed General Motors stock. That means that all the 50-some thousand employees of the Du Pont Co. who purchased stock under their company's stock purchase plan—and most of that stock has been purchased since 1950—will be exempt from all taxation under this bill. Under this bill we shift the tax burden to those who the committee feels are best able to pay the tax—that is, those who have the least cost factor and the largest amount of gain.

For example, if the Du Pont stock cost $60 the owner would owe an immediate capital gains tax on $15, and for future tax purposes his cost of Du Pont would be reduced to zero.

Again, suppose his Du Pont cost $85. He would upon receiving the $75 worth of General Motors stock assign $75 as the base of his General Motors stock and reduce his cost of Du Pont to $10. He would owe no tax.

To cite another case on this point, I call attention to one of the largest stockholders of Christiana Corp. and a top official of the Du Pont company. I shall be willing to furnish his name if necessary. This individual owns 55,000 shares of Christiana Corp. stock with a cost of only 30 cents a share. Under the bill, the Christiana Corp. will first pay $4.34 corporation tax, and if the General Motors stock is passed through and distributed to this stockholder, he then will pay the full capital gains tax on the $75 minus 30 cents. Under existing law, if the Christiana Corp. were to sell its stock, as it naturally would, it would have the same capital gains tax but only a 16-cent corporation tax.

So this bill raises the tax of that stockholder by around $4.30 a share for each share of General Motors he would get.

Therefore, I do not think that by any stretch of the imagination one can correctly state that this bill is designed to help those who have the large profits or the officials of the company. On the contrary, the bill has results which are directly the opposite of that.

This company has had a rather remarkable growth pattern over a period of years and subsequent increases in the price of its stock. Therefore, those who have owned the stock for many years have large profits. But under our system of government there is nothing against that, and I am sure that the only wish the Senator from Illinois would have is that both he and I had participated in that gain. It is a part of the American system, and rather than censure the officials for having been sucessful I believe we should commend them.

The Senator from Illinois will remember that several years ago I opposed a bill which I felt was very unfair because it taxed every stockholder exactly the same without regard to the cost of their stocks. Under that bill the taxpayers who had actual losses would pay exactly the same tax as that paid by stockholders who had a profit. I thought that was unfair, and I think the Senator from Illinois joined me in opposing that bill. I am still opposed to such a proposal today. I think that the bill, if it is to be fair, should impose the tax on those who have the gain, and that is what this bill does.

There have been read to the Senate today letters received from the Department of Justice by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. In each of those letters there is a stated recognition of the right of Congress to proceed with this measure, and each of those letters suggests that this matter is entirely one for Congress to decide.

I have received numerous letters in regard to this subject, as other Senators have. Apparently the Justice Department received many letters from taxpayers who complained about the proposed tax treatment under existing law. I have a letter which was used in reply by the Department of Justice, signed by Lee Loevinger, Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice; and W. Wallace Kirkpatrick, First Assistant; date August 1, 1961. In the letter they state the following to a stockholder who had written to the Department of Justice. I am omitting the name of the individual to whom the letter was addressed:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., August 1, 1961.

DEAR ———: In your letter dated July 20, 1961, you suggest that taxation of the Du Pont-General Motors divestiture "amounts to outright confiscation" and would result in a windfall to the United States. You fur-

> ther suggest that the Government has no right to tax revenue occasioned by a divestiture.
>
> The Senate Finance Committee has scheduled hearings on a bill designed to change the tax impact of antitrust divestiture decrees.

The letter is dated August 1, just before we held the hearings. I read further from the letter:

> Since Congress establishes in the first instance the occasion for the application of taxes, and thus any tax due as a result of the Du Pont-General Motors decree is directly occasioned by the actions of the Congress, may we suggest that you convey your position to your Senators (one of whom, Senator WILLIAMS, is a proponent of the bill under consideration), since in the final analysis, Congress is the sole arbiter of the reasonableness of the imposition of any tax.
>
> I hope we have been of some assistance to you in this matter.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> LEE LOEVINGER,
> *Assistant Attorney General,*
> *Antitrust Division.*
> By: W. WALLACE KIRKPATRICK,
> *First Assistant.*

So the letter stated—very properly—that the person addressed should contact the members of the Finance Committee. The letter very properly states that those who wish to inquire about the matter or protest about it should contact the members of the Senate Finance Committee and the other Members of Congress since Congress has sole jurisdiction over tax changes. The letter does not question at all the propriety of contacting the Members of Congress in regard to this matter nor does it oppose our favorable action.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I had seen some press reports about the letter to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], to which reference has been made. I must say that after seeing a copy of the letter, I believe the press reports are completely misleading. As I interpret the letter signed by the Attorney General, it states that there had been some concern in his Department that the court might construe this bill as telling the court how it should write its decree; and he then states:

> We have concluded, however—

And I shall omit what I believe to be a surplusage of language, because I think it detracts from the impact and the directness of the statements made by the writer of the letter—

> that we must, and the courts should, accept the statement contained in the Senate Finance Committee report on the pending bill that provisions of the bill with respect to a pass-through by Christiana are not intended to be an expression of opinion as to—

And now the committee report is quoted—

> what particular method of divestiture of General Motors stock * * * is appropriate.

In effect, the Attorney General there is saying to us that he does not believe that he, himself, could have written any better language to make clear that we are not trying to tell the court how to decide that lawsuit.

Then on page 2 of the letter—and again I should like to omit what I deem to be a surplusage of language, because I think it tends to obscure what the Attorney General was saying:

> We * * * believe * * * that the expressions by the Senate Finance Committee * * * should persuade the district court that Congress is not attempting to influence the relief granted by the court so that the bill would not interfere with the relief sought by the Government.

Then I skip a few words; and then he states:

> It would be most helpful, however, if in further discussion of this bill in the Senate, it could be made crystal clear that the provisions in H.R. 8847 with respect to a pass-through of General Motors stock by Christiana is not intended as an expression of congressional opinion as to the method of divestiture so that if the Court agrees with the Government that sale and not distribution is the effective remedy, it will follow the Supreme Court ruling to decree that remedy, and feel free of any contrary congressional mandate.

As one member of the committee, I am prepared to state right now, just as I have heard other members of the committee state, that that is what we intend; namely, that the committee agrees that the case should be decided by the court on antitrust law principles. We agree about that; and the Senator from Delaware has said it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. And it has been said by all concerned; namely, that the court should decide the case on antitrust law principles, if the court decides to decide it.

If the court decides the case in any manner we have or have not anticipated insofar as this bill is concerned, of course, that will be the effective law. There is nothing we can do about that. The tax laws were drawn without reference to the antitrust laws. I myself have introduced bills to try to upset some of what I believed to have been the unintended effect of decisions, taxwise, involving antitrust matters. For example, I have proposed amendments—I believe the Senator has supported them—whereby when treble damages have resulted because of the antitrust laws, the period over which the damages are to be paid is to be considered for the purpose of taxes, rather than 1 year.

I can only conclude that the Attorney General has approved of the bill as it has been drawn, and has no objections to it. It seems to me, if he had objections, he should have stated them before our committee, which he failed to do, or he should have stated them in the letter. I find nothing in the letter or in the testimony given by his representative, speaking for the Antitrust Division, to indicate any opposition to the bill. Nor do I find any such suggestion in the letter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct; but in reference to that point, since some confusion may have arisen as a result of press releases, let me just read from a part of the letter the Attorney General wrote to the chairman of the Finance Committee, dated January 13, 1962, which letter was placed in the RECORD earlier this afternoon:

> In the last session of Congress, when it appeared that Congress desired to give relief in the Du Pont situation by changing the character of the tax on divestiture, we urged that if this relief was to be granted, it should not only be in the form of general legislation; such general legislation might be an inducement to future anticompetitive acquisitions by others. We also urged that if relief was to be granted in the Du Pont situation, it should be available only if the divestiture occurred within 3 years after it was decreed.

I am still quoting from the letter issued last Saturday by the Attorney General.

> When H.R. 8847 was so limited in the House of Representatives, we did not object to its passage. If it is still the will of Congress to pass such a measure, our position remains the same.

So the Department has no objection.

Continuing with this letter of the Attorney General, they reaffirm their concern on only one point. They express approval of the statement in the committee report in which it is clearly stated that we were not influencing the court's decision as to whether the stock should be divested or sold. All the Attorney General asked the chairman of the committee to do was to reaffirm the statement as contained in our report as the clear intent of the legislation when we pass it. With that understanding, as the chairman has stated it, as the Senator from Oklahoma has quoted it, and as I have quoted it again, with that clarification of our position, the Attorney General has told us he has no opposition to the bill's being passed. This is what we stated in the committee report:

> Your committee wishes to make it very clear that it expresses no opinion as to what particular method of divestiture of General Motors stock by Du Pont or by Christiana is appropriate.

We have repeatedly made it very clear that we are making no recommendation. All the Attorney General has asked us to do is repeat that when the bill is acted on by Congress.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, having made it clear to the Senate that this Senator finds no objection to the bill by the Department of Justice. I want to make it equally clear that I am not bound by the decision of the Department of Justice. I have been known to approve decisions of the Justice Department, and I have been known to oppose them, such as the position taken on the farm cooperatives. However, it seems to me to try to read into that letter some opposition on the part of the Justice Department is a very strained interpretation of the letter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree with the Senator's statement.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may read into the RECORD a letter from the General Counsel of the Treasury on the present position of the Treasury Department with regard to the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The letter is dated January 13, 1962, and reads as follows:

THE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., January 8, 1962.
Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Mr. Colin Stam has passed on to me your request for a statement of the present position of the Treasury Department with regard to H.R. 8847, which would provide tax relief to individual shareholders receiving distributions of stock as a result of antitrust divestitures and would provide new tax treatment to corporate shareholders receiving divested antitrust stock which has appreciated in value in the hands of the distributor.

The Treasury Department would not object to the bill in its present form being enacted into law. This is, of course, the same position I expressed on behalf of the Treasury Department before the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee when these committees were considering the bill last fall.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,
ROBERT H. KNIGHT,
General Counsel.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to ask two or three questions in order to understand the purport of this proposed legislation. If no legislation is passed under the terms of the bill before us, all the General Motors stock that has been distributed as stock dividend would be taxed at the full tax rate. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. In some of the higher tax brackets it would mean as much as 87 percent of the value of the stock would be confiscated. Even the Senator from Illinois has said he would not want to go that far.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the bill is passed and if the stock of the Du Pont Co. was bought at less than the value at which the General Motors stock will be distributed, there will be a tax on the difference on the surtax. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would be taxed at the capital gains rate. For example, at today's market value General Motors stock is $55 a share. A Du Pont stockholder would get one and one-third shares of General Motors for each share of stock. That means General Motors stock in the equivalent of $75 will be distributed to the shareholder of each share of Du Pont Co. If Du Pont stock had cost $60, its cost would be reduced to zero and there would be an immediate capital gains tax on $15. If the cost of Du Pont was $80 a share and he received $75 worth of General Motors stock he would reduce Du Pont on his books to $5 a share and carry General Motors at $75, and there would be no tax.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So the tax would come when the Du Pont stock was sold. If it had been bought at less than the value of $75, which figure the Senator has used as an example, that would be the figure used to compute the capital gains tax. If it was bought at a higher figure, then the Du Pont stock would be put at the value between $75 and $85, for example, and the capital gains tax would come when Du Pont's stock was sold at a profit, and not before. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. There is a precedent for this. Let us consider the utilities which obtain rights-of-way throughout the country. Those rights-of-way are usually obtained on 99-year leases. Suppose the Senator had bought a farm for $10,000 and I had purchased one for $5,000. The utility gets a 99-year lease from each of us and pays us $6,000. Under existing law, the cost is reduced from $10,000 to $4,000, and when the farm is sold it is sold on the basis of a cost $4,000. The Senator would owe no immediate tax. On the other hand, I would reduce the cost of my farm from $5,000 to zero for tax purposes, but having received $1,000 above my cost basis I would owe a capital gains tax on $1,000.

That is exactly the formula with which we are dealing in regard to owners of Du Pont and Christiana, under the bill. However, it will apply to Christiana only if the Court orders the General Motors stock to be distributed; then they will pay an immediate capital gains tax on the amount by which the market value of the General Motors stock exceeds the original cost.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is speaking now of Christiana?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am speaking of either Du Pont or Christiana. Under the bill a stockholder would get the benefit of the return of capital method only—and I emphasize the word "only"—if the court rules the company must divest to the stockholders. If the court does not rule the company must divest but that the company must sell there would be paid a capital gains tax under existing law and under this bill. The bill makes no change.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. When the Senator uses the word "divest," as opposed to "sale," what does he mean?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. By "divest," I mean to distribute the General Motors stock to the respective stockholders of Christiana or Du Pont. If Christiana distributes the General Motors stock which it would receive from Du Pont to its own stockholders, and if there had been an order from the court that the company must divest its stock to the stockholders, then the stockholders will get the benefit of computing a capital gains tax in the same manner as we have just described with respect to Du Pont.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If there is a sale, what would be the case?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If there is a sale, it would be a capital gains tax in either instance. On the other hand, if there is not a court order that they must divest themselves of this stock or take action by sale and the company decides to voluntarily distribute the stock anyway, it would be taxable under this bill and under existing law at the regular income tax rates. That was a provision put in on the specific request of the Treasury Department.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I ask the Senator one more question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That was to prevent the company from having the benefit of this provision if they do not need it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In respect to the bill which we are now asked to pass, the whole theory is that because the stockholders had no opportunity for discussion or a vote in regard to the question we should eliminate the surtax stock dividend idea and put this on a capital gains tax basis; is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. There is one other change proposed in the bill which should be pointed out and which will be effective regardless of what the court decision in Chicago may be in respect to Christiana.

Under existing law, Christiana would pay approximately 16 cents per share for each share of General Motors stock it receives. Under this bill that would be raised from 16 cents to $4.34 based on a value of $55 a share for General Motors stocks, which means that under the bill Christiana's tax as a corporation would be raised from around $3 million to around $80 million. That provision will be effective regardless of what happens in the court. In other words, if this bill does not pass, Christiana, as a corporation, will be about $75 million to $80 million better off than it would be otherwise.

We might say that Christiana is the only company so affected. I think we made a mistake in that regard. This problem was considered by the Ways and Means Committee and by our committee, and I think all of us who voted for the bill felt the provision should be general law, but the Justice Department for some reason wanted us to restrict this provision at this time to those companies which are affected in this court decision. Upon their insistence we did so. Therefore, it will be, in effect, a discriminatory tax increase to one corporation alone. I think that is unfortunate, but that will be the result of the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The principle behind the whole bill is the fact that the stockholders had no opportunity to say what they wished to do, but it was done for them by the court or by the Government?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. The purpose and the effect of the bill is to shift the tax burden, the revenue which will come to the Government, from those who are least able to pay it to those who have the largest gain on the stock which they hold. Only those who have had the stock over a period of years and who have a low cost factor below the market value of the General Motors stock would be taxed under the provisions of the bill.

For instance, there are some 50,000 to 60,000 employees of the Du Pont Co. who have bought stock under the company's stock purchase plan. Under the terms of the bill nearly all of them will be exempt in entirety because most of them have a cost factor in excess of the value of the General Motors stock which they will receive.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The people who do not have that cost factor are the original owners, who bought the stock at a low price.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

For instance, an individual may have bought stock at $75 per share. He has a cost factor of $75. He gets 1.37 shares of General Motors stock worth at today's price about $75. He owes no tax.

One might ask, "Why give him a tax exemption of $75 on cost when a man who has a cost of $25 for General Motors stock owes an immediate capital gains tax on the extra $50?"

The reason the committee thought that was fair is that when the stockholder bought the stock at $75 the man from whom he purchased the stock, or the series of owners prior thereto, had paid a capital gains tax on that stock already as the market price progressed from the $1 per share it was originally up to the $75. For instance, the man who bought the stock at $40 may have sold it to a fellow at $75. When the stock was bought at $75 somebody already had paid a capital gains tax on the sale of the stock on the way up. Why should we charge that man the same capital gains rate again on the resale of the stock when the situation was such that the tax had already been paid? Why charge that man exactly the same as the man who still owned the stock, at a cost of $1 a share?

I think this is a very fair bill. Our committee felt it was a fair bill. As I pointed out before, I do not say the bill is drafted in exactly the same language I would draft it if I had my way. I think it should be general legislation rather than special legislation, but we do not always get what we want, as the Senator from Massachusetts knows.

This bill does represent the considered opinion and agreement of the Department of Justice, the Department of the Treasury, the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, and most of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, as shown by the 14-to-2 vote.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is the belief that it is fair to the Government and fair to the others involved?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is fair to the Government and fair to the stockholders, and it is the fair and equitable solution to what I would say is one of the most complicated tax problems we have had before our committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. This question bears, I think, upon one phase of the questions asked by the Senator from Massachusetts. I thought there might be some confusion.

If we do not act on the bill it is not necessarily true that all of the General Motors stock will have to be sold or distributed as a dividend.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator understands that?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The Senator used the word "sold." It is my understanding the stock would not have to be sold, but it would be taxed as a stock dividend.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is the point involved. Neither is necessarily true. It would not have to be taxed as a stock dividend, necessarily. This is one of the problems with which the court in Chicago is dealing. The court has been asked to deal with it in equity.

I should like to have the opinion of the Senator from Delaware on the point. If the Chicago court were to act to direct Du Pont to distribute all of this as a stock dividend, or to sell the stock and to distribute the cash as a dividend, is there a question as to whether or not the order might be in violation of the law?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, and as the Senator from Minnesota pointed out, there are methods under existing law whereby the Du Pont Co. could minimize its tax burden. One of those plans was presented to our committee, as can be found on pages 8 and 9 of the committee hearings. This was offered the company, assuming that the Congress passed no legislation.

Mr. McCARTHY. This is the case under existing law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Under existing law.

Mr. McCARTHY. If I may add another point, it is the law even if the court in Chicago does not direct the company to act outside of existing law, or to limit the potentialities of existing law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Under the court order if the Congress does not pass any law the company will have 10 years in which to divest itself of its stock, and the company would have wide discretion as to how the distribution was made.

All that the court asked, so far as the Du Pont Co. is concerned, is divestiture within 10 years. At this point I wish to say that this is one of the reasons why the argument was made that it is important for the Congress to act before the court does, so that the court can know under what rules they are operating. This bill has been agreed upon by the Justice Department, by the Treasury Department, and by the company—all of them have agreed to our committee—that they would go along with a term of 3 years for divestiture. If we do not act there will be a 10-year term for divestiture considered by the court.

Mr. McCARTHY. The court may refuse to accept this.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. The court may refuse to do so. The court does not have to accept it. But, if it does accept this, it has to accept the 3-year divestiture period.

This is a plan which they could use to mitigate the tax burden as mentioned to our committee in the hearings on this bill.

This is a plan which could be used under present law.

First, the company could offer to exchange General Motor shares for Du Pont common at a ratio which would provide a premium to the exchanging stockholders.

They claim that they could get rid of several million shares in that manner. The Department of Justice and the Treasury Department agreed that such action would be permissible under the law.

Second, they could make an "offer to exchange General Motors shares for Du Pont preferred at a ratio in which the market value of the General Motors stock would equal the call price of the preferred." They could get rid of X number of shares in that manner.

Third, they could make "a distribution of a portion of the General Motors shares in lieu of cash dividends" over this period of 10 years. They could then make "sale of the General Motors shares remaining after the foregoing transactions had taken place."

The company estimated that if they followed this procedure, which they felt sure would disrupt the market conditions the estimated tax to the Federal Government would be $330 million over a period of 10 years. The estimated revenue under the bill as reported last September was $350 million. That was due to the fact that there was a $45 price on General Motors stock. Since the bill was reported the price of General Motors stock has advanced from $45 to $55 a share, and for that reason we are using an estimate of an additional $100 million revenue that would accrue. Both figures would be changed. A question which I asked the representative of the Treasury Department is found on page 13:

> Does the Treasury Department agree with the estimate of $330 million that would be paid under existing law as the result of the first plan which they presented to the Ways and Means Committee?

Mr. Knight of the Treasury Department said:

> Again, on the basis of their assumptions, their mathematics and interpretation of the law, it was correct.

So there is no disagreement as to the fact that there are methods whereby they could dispose of the stock under existing law without paying regular income tax rates.

One might say that if there is no difference in the tax liability why pass the bill? There would be serious market consequences as a result of some of these proposed actions, and again, under this plan, the tax would be charged against all the stockholders without any regard to their original cost. In other words, an individual who bought Du Pont 2 years ago bought it at a time when the stock sold for as high as $275 a share. Now it is around $225 a share. That individual would have a paper loss of $50 in his stock.

On the other hand, another stockholder purchased his stock 40 years ago at a price as low as $1 a share, which means he has a paper profit of $224 a share. Under existing law, if these plans are carried out or if the company is forced to sell, the tax is levied equally against both stockholders without any regard to their cost. Such tax treatment would be unfair. The committee felt that this was unfair. Under no circumstances under our tax program should we ever resort to taxing a stockholder on a loss. I think it would be unfortunate and unfair if we ever resorted to such procedure. For that reason the bill came out with the overwhelming support of the committees of both Houses of Congress.

Furthermore, under the proposal of the Senator from Tennessee that Christiana Corp. be forced to sell its stock and pay an immediate capital gains tax it would mean that charitable organizations, colleges, and so forth, would be taxed at the same rate as the other stockholders.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his explanation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I support the Senator. The basic argument in support of the bill is that it would provide for a much more orderly divestment, and at the same time it would provide for equity in the treatment of the profits of those who have invested in Du Pont and General Motors stock.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. If there is a tax to be levied—and there is some tax—it should not be levied on those who bought the stock in recent years or on the employees who are buying it under a stock purchase plan, who are not in any way responsible for any alleged violation of the antitrust laws. I shall not get into the argument as to whether there has been or has not been. But if there has been they were the least responsible. If there was any responsibility for a violation of the antitrust laws, certainly it rested with those who have owned and controlled the company over the period of years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Under the bill the tax would be levied on those who should pay it rather than on those on whom it would be unfair to levy it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct, and that is the opinion of those who support the bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is a difference between assessment of a capital gains tax at a proper time or a kind of capital levy. We might note that whatever the basis of the 60 million shares of General Motors now held by Du Pont may be—there have been some additions, I assume—but of those 60 million shares, the base for that 60 million was purchased between $17 and $19, and it was held without any challenge, so far as I know, from 1917 until 1949.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. So that anyone who became involved in Du Pont or General Motors in that period from 1917 to 1949 must have assumed that the purchase of stock made between 1917 and 1919, long after the Clayton and the Sherman Antitrust Acts were in effect, felt that this was a legitimate kind of operation. So nearly 30 years later the challenge came. But they had 30 years of peaceful operation in between.

I am not one to excuse quickly the innocent stockholders, because I think stockholders have some responsibility for the operation of a corporation. When corporations get so big that the stockholders cannot effectively participate in control, we ought to do something about procedure. But in this case I think we can make an argument that many stockholders involved were perfectly innocent of any responsibility. In fact, the court does not hold even the officers and directors did anything wrong. The court states that there is a potentiality for an improper controls and influence.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. What the court said is that there was a possibility that there might later be a violation. They used the word "innocent" in describing the stockholders. We are not excusing someone found guilty or charged with criminal violations of the antitrust laws.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I appreciate the contribution of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] in trying to clear up this subject.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, first let me state to the Senator from Delaware that I do not have any particular difficulty with the first section of the bill, although I have some misgivings about the acceleration of the tax as to those people who have a basis which is very low compared to the fair market value of the stock. The fair market value of the stock would eat up their basis and go the other way, so they would be forced to pay some capital gains tax. I do have some misgivings about that.

Overall I think it is a rather fair result that this section of the bill seeks to arrive at. What I am concerned about is the second section of the bill, and I think that the colloquy between the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], has somewhat brought this point out. As I understand, under present law, using the example set forth in the committee report on page 3, there would be a tax of 16 cents per share, whereas under the bill submitted by the committee there would be a tax of approximately $3.51 per share. I point out that these tax consequences result from treating this transaction as a regular dividend to Christiana, a corporate shareholder of Du Pont. The minority views set forth in the committee report point out what disturbs me, that in the case of individual stockholders of Du Pont this transaction is treated as a return of capital; whereas as to corporate stockholders—and Christiana in particular—this transaction is treated as a dividend.

I recognize that under present law, using the dividend approach, there would be a tax of only 16 cents. Under the bill, using the dividend approach, there would be a tax of $3.51. What I am wondering is what would be the tax if we treated Christiana as a regular individual stockholder, namely, if this were treated not as a dividend but as a return of capital?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There would be very little mathematical difference in this and direct capital gains liability due to the fact that they have a very low-cost basis. If it is treated as a return of capital, they would be subject to a capital gains tax on the full market value of the General Motors stock minus Christiana's cost in General Motors, which is about $1.50 to $2 per share.

So, therefore, mathematically there would not be too much difference.

But we are not suggesting that Christiana will have to sell this stock. Whether it is sold, held, or distributed is a matter for the courts to decide.

However, almost the same answer would result if the Government received a decree whereby Christiana could be forced to sell the stock and pay its capital gains tax, as is being advocated by some here on the floor of the Senate and as is being requested by the Department of Justice. But that is a question with which we as a committee did not feel that Congress should in any way interfere. The Department of Justice took the position that we should not, and therefore we are trying to make it clear that we are not in any way attempting to indicate to the court what its final decision on this point should be.

One of the other arguments against the plan is that the Treasury Department would be opposed to that method of treating intercorporate dividends as a return of capital. I think we would get a violent objection to it.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If I may, I should like to clarify the question asked. Why did we even tinker with the present formula in the tax law, increasing the tax from 16 cents to $4.39? Why is that provision in the bill anyway? What does it have to do with the question?

That goes back to the 1954 code. At that time, upon the request of the Treasury Department, our committee recommended and Congress adopted an amendment to the code, to correct a loophole in the tax law with respect to the tax treatment of the so-called exchange of warehouse receipts between affiliated corporations. Warehouse receipts were being transferred in a particular manner—and I will not go into details—but a loophole existed in the law with respect to the manner in which the receipts were being evaluated. The Treasury Department asked us to correct that loophole in the 1954 code.

Stock dividends were not intended to be affected. They were not intended to be referred to. After the bill was passed and after the court decision was rendered in the General Motors case the Internal Revenue Service called the attention of the chairman of our committee, as well as the attention of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to this error. They said after rereading the language of the law which they had presented to Congress—and they accepted the responsibility for it—they had found that an interpretation would have to be made that it unintentionally included stock dividends. That was never intended by them nor by Congress. I have yet to hear any member of the committees say that he intended that the language be so construed. However, the language of the law did include it. Therefore, the Internal Revenue Service recommended a change in the present law restoring the old formula for the computation of the intercorporate stock dividends. Prior to the 1954 revision stock dividends were taxed on the basis of the full value of the dividends less 85 percent intercorporate dividend credit.

They particularly suggested that this change should be made before any legislation was acted on dealing with the divestiture by the Du Pont Co. If we do not change it now, Christiana will save about $75 to $80 million under the provision of the 1954 code, a provision which was never intended to apply to such cases. It certainly was not the intention of any Member of Congress when that provision was passed.

In other words, under this bill we are attempting to correct that provision. That is the only reason we changed the provision from 16 cents to $4.34. If we defeat the bill, under existing law Christiana will pay between $75 to $80 million less tax.

I cannot understand why the Senator from Tennessee is fighting so hard to help this company.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate the Senator's explanation. I am somewhat familiar with that defect in the 1954 code, with reference to the use of the basis rather than the fair market value with respect to these dividends. Why should the Treasury Department or the Department of Justice be so exercised over the approach we take, particularly when this is a specific piece of legislation directed at a single group of corporations involved in an antitrust lawsuit?

What difference does it make what approach we take? What difference does it make whether we use the regular-dividend approach, or whether we use the fair-market-value approach, or whether we use the return-of-capital approach? I ask that particularly in reference to the use of the return-of-capital approach as to individual stockholders. I can see where the Treasury Department would be much more exercised over the fact that we were using the return-of-capital approach for millions of stockholders rather than for a comparatively few number of corporate stockholders.

If I understand the Senator's answer to my question regarding the tax results, if we take the return of capital approach, there would not be very much of a tax difference. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Between a formula of return of capital versus capital gains there would not be. But by what line of reasoning should we force this company to sell or to pay the equivalent of capital gains on its stock unless so ordered by the court?

Mr. MILLER. I am perfectly willing to let the chips fall where they may in a situation where stockholders, without any fault of their own, or a board of directors, in an innocent situation, had a transaction which was forced upon them as a result of action of the Federal Government in an antitrust suit. I am perfectly willing to have the tax be a million dollars or nothing in such a situation.

The idea behind the decision of the committee is to do equity in a situation which calls for equity. However, I am still concerned about the fact that as to individual stockholders we say it is a return of capital, but as to corporate stockholders, we say it is not a return of capital, but a dividend. It would seem to me particularly that if the tax consequences are not great, we ought to be consistent. Frankly, I am not too concerned about how exercised the Treasury Department or the Justice Department is over the fact that we might be consistent in this respect.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is not necessarily being consistent. We do not want, in correcting a situation, to open a loophole which will come back to haunt us later. We do not believe that what the Senator is proposing would be a practical or workable solution in all cases. It so happens that in this particular case the mathematics of it would not be too much different. There might be other corporations, however, which would be in an entirely different situation.

Mr. MILLER. May I ask the Senator this question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Is it not true as to individual stockholders?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No.

Mr. MILLER. I say that because individual stockholders in this case may be on a low basis, and in another case, involving antitrust suits, the situation may involve a very high basis.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But this does not take into consideration the cost to the company. This bill relates only to the individual, based upon his original cost of the stock he purchased. If his return of capital does not equal his investment, he owes no tax. It gets back to the same situation about the two farmers.

I believe this is fair and equitable, whether the stock was bought at $5 a share or $225 a share. The owners of the stock through the years have paid a capital gains tax on that stock as it has advanced in value and been sold. As one who has spent considerable time in working out this formula, I think it is fair and equitable both to the Government and to the stockholders.

Mr. MILLER. What is the basis in Christiana of Du Pont stock that Christiana holds?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I would not want to answer that question exactly.

Mr. MILLER. Approximately.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Approximately $3.

Mr. MILLER. If the basis is $3, and if the fair market value of General Motors stock, using the example set forth at page 3 of the committee report, is $45, there would be a profit of $42, if this were treated as return of capital, in the same manner as an individual stockholder. If that is so, it seems to me that what the Senator has said is correct. The Senator said the result would be the same if the court ordered divestiture by sale rather than by distribution to stockholders.

However, I suggest that the tax arising from this result would be considerably greater than the $3.05, which would result under the present bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The tax would be $10 per share to the corporation under that formula. But in the proposal the Senator is making we would not be correcting what is considered to be a loophole by both the committee and the Treasury Department.

Mr. MILLER. I am not at all convinced that this would correct the loophole created in the Revenue Act of 1954.

If this were a general bill, I would agree to that. However, it is not designed as a general bill. I agree with the view of the Senator from Delaware that this ought to be of general application. However, since it is not of general application, I cannot see that it will do much good as far as plugging a loophole in the Revenue Act of 1954 is concerned.

Let me summarize. I understand now that if we use the regular dividend approach, the tax would be 16 cents a share. If we use the regular dividend approach, based upon section 2 of the bill, the tax would be some $3.51 a share. But if we used the same approach in section 2 as is used in section 1, and treat this as a return of capital, the tax would then be about $10 a share.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The tax to the corporation would be about $10 a share, but in addition there would not be collected the amount of $150 million which the bill provides when the stock is passed through; so the Government would actually lose money.

In addition, we would be doing what the Department of Justice has specifically requested our committee not to do, and what the committees of both Houses have refused to do; namely, to indicate to the courts how Congress thinks this problem should be handled. We would be indicating to the courts our view as to whether the stock should be sold or distributed. I do not believe Congress should move into that field.

Conceivably, the Department of Justice can ask the court to order the stock to be sold, in which event there would be capital gains paid by the corporation. But if that is to happen I think the courts should so determine. We should let the Department of Justice go into court and win its case; we should not win the case for the Department of Justice in the Senate.

By the same token, we should not in any way prejudice the case for the company and should not attempt to win the case for the company. We are not dealing with a question of whether this stock should go to the stockholders, stay in the company, or be sold by the company. We are only seeking to provide the formula of taxation should a series of circumstances develop. We are letting the courts, and the courts alone, make that determination.

There was a suggestion by the Senator from Tennessee that Congress should include in the bill a provision which would make mandatory the imposition of a capital gains tax, which would be what the Senator from Iowa has spoken of. But if we did that, we would be suggesting what the court's decision should be as regard's Christiana. Regardless of how the court decision may go, I do not think we should in any way attempt to influence the court.

Mr. MILLER. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Delaware that we should not attempt to influence the court's decision. However, I am concerned with the Senator's statement that there will be a $150 million tax loss.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; I did not say that.

Mr. MILLER. I am sorry; I did not understand the Senator, then.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; I referred to the amount of the intercorporate tax which would be paid per share as compared with the 16 cents which would be paid under existing law. I said that the Senator from Iowa had not taken into consideration that under the bill if the distribution is made, there would be an additional $150 million collected from the respective stockholders of Christiana.

Mr. MILLER. I suggest to the Senator from Delaware that the same $150 million, approximately, would be collected from the stockholders if the money is treated as a return of capital and, in turn, the corporation divests itself of its stock to the individual stockholders.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not think we as a Congress have any right to write into the bill a proposal that Christiana should be forced or should not be forced to sell the stock. The Senator has a point, one which could be debated; but I disagree with his reasoning. We are changing the method of computing stock dividends, but when we make that change we are only writing into the law exactly what every Member of Congress, the committees, and the Treasury Department thought we were doing in 1954, and what we intended to do at that time. We are putting into the law something which we thought was already there until the error was called to our attention. The reason it is put in here now, frankly, is so that there will not be any need to come along at a later time and change the law after the distribution has been made. The Senator from Iowa knows that we cannot impose a tax retroactively. After all, if we are going to lock the barn we had better do so before the horse gets out.

Mr. MILLER. This is a point which has troubled me; however, it would be my understanding that we could impose a tax retroactively at least to the first of January of this year, even though the court order is handed down some time this year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It could be retroactive; but if the distribution had been made the tax could not be imposed retroactively. It has been the policy of Congress and our committee not to increase taxes retroactively. If the court is to make its decision based upon the existing law the distribution should be made in that way. The Senator from Iowa would not wish to change the rules of the game applicable to a decision which was made under existing law. If a change is to be made let it be made before the distribution is made.

Mr. MILLER. If the court's decision works a hardship, even in tax cases, Congress has previously taken action to ameliorate the results, and certainly I would have no objection to Congress taking action which would ameliorate the result of an antitrust suit.

I am not concerned—at least, I would have to be persuaded to be concerned—about the fact that we might take action some time this year, effective as of the first of January of this year, because I believe such action would be effective, and could be directed to be effective, in a transaction in the form of a court order which has been passed since the first of this year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It could be retroactive so far as a court order which has been passed this year is concerned; but if a distribution has been made, and the tax has been computed and paid, we should not retroactively increase the tax beyond what it was at the time the order was issued.

If the stock is distributed in accordance with existing law, and the intercorporate tax has been computed at, say, 16 cents a share, and the corporation receives its stock and pays its tax, I do not believe the Senator from Iowa would propose to go back and increase the tax on the company. I know I would not.

Congress can give retroactive relief, but we should not impose retroactive tax increases over and above the tax which was in effect at the time of the distribution.

That is why it is so important that this bill pass promptly.

Under the bill, while it is true that we are increasing the tax with respect to Christiana Corp., at the same time we are providing benefits for the stockholders of this company by virtue of the fact that we are giving them the right to compute their tax according to the same formula as provided in section 1 for stockholders of the Du Pont Co. if—I emphasize the word "if"—the Court orders the Christiana Corp. to divest itself of the stock by distributing to the stockholders.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Delaware has explained very well the difficulties which could result from treating the distribution to a corporate stockholder as a return of capital; but I must say that I am not completely persuaded that this is wrong, particularly if it is the consistent thing to do, because we are treating the individual stockholders—and there are millions of them—as if they had received a return of capital, and they all have a different basis.

I suggest there is much less of a problem in the case of corporate stockholders, because there are far fewer of them, than in the case of individual stockholders. I like to see consistency in the tax law. If there is to be a return of capital to individual stockholders, it seems to me that there should be a return of capital to the corporate stockholder. However, I suggest to the Senator from Delaware that if his main concern is the fact that if we legislate as I am suggesting, this would have a tendency to cause the Court to think we were directing it, in effect to require a sale of the stock, there are other ways of providing relief. If the basis of Christiana is such that it would end up by paying a tax of $10 under the return of capital theory, instead of $3.51, as the bill provides, under the regular dividend theory—using the fair market value approach—or instead of 16 cents a share, under the regular dividend theory (using the basis approach), then it seems to me we have a situation which is the one I alluded to when I first began my questioning, namely, the artificial acceleration of taxation. This is one thing which has caused me some concern about the first section of the bill. In this case, the Christiana Corp. has a basis in the Du Pont stock which is very low. If it receives a return of capital, which not only eats up that basis, but goes the other way, so that the corporation is forced to pay a long-term capital gains tax right now, upon divestiture, then we have an artificial acceleration of taxation.

It seems to me that one way of handling the situation would be to legislate a postponement of the tax—not to treat it differently, but to legislate a postponement.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Iowa will have exactly what he wants if he votes for the bill as it is. If Christiana keeps the stock, there will be a corporation tax and no more. If they have to distribute it and the stock goes to the stockholders, there would be a tax on Christiana's stockholders exactly in the same manner as is provided in title I.

The Senator from Iowa has said he would like to see some consistency in the tax law so that individuals and corporations would be taxed on the same basis upon the receipt of dividends. I say to the Senator from Iowa that there has never been any consistency in the tax laws as they apply to corporations for the treatment of dividends and as they apply to individuals. If the Senator or I receive a dividend it is taxable at its full value under existing law, at the regular tax rate, subject only to the 4 percent dividend tax credit. But under existing law—and this has been existing law since long before I became a Member of the Senate—if a corporation receives a dividend it takes an 85-percent credit immediately before it computes the corporation tax. That is because one corporation tax has already been paid on it. Under this bill or under existing law a corporation pays only 52 percent of 15 percent of the value of the dividend. But individual stockholders pay a tax on the full value of the dividend. So there will never be consistency under the tax law between corporations and individuals on dividends received.

Mr. MILLER. I am not speaking of consistency in the tax rates.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; I am speaking of consistency in the way they are computed. The Senator from Iowa said that he wants consistency in the way they are computed.

Mr. MILLER. No, I did not say that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then I misunderstood the Senator from Iowa. What was he saying?

Mr. MILLER. I recognize there are many differences in the tax rates and credits, and so forth, and my point is that it seems to me that in the essential nature of a transaction, there should be no difference between the treatment of an individual and that of a corporation. I say frankly that I do not know of any situation in which a transaction has been treated as a return of capital to an individual stockholder and as a dividend to a corporate stockholder.

Unless I am very much mistaken, I believe this bill calls for the treatment of an identical transaction in different ways, depending upon whether one is an individual or is a corporation, for the first time. I have no question about rates or credits; but I believe that the essential nature of such a transaction should be the same, as between either individuals or corporate stockholders.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Under the Utility Holding Company Act, when the utilities were broken up the stockholders all had paper losses, so that distribution resulted in no tax, and all were treated alike. But the corporations which received these dividends received them with the same dividend exclusion tax credit as under existing law.

To cite another example, only recently, for instance, the New York Central distributed certain holdings it had in the United States Freight Corp. As those stocks were distributed to the stockholders the tax to the individual stockholder was based on the full value of the stock on the date of receipt, but the tax to the corporations was on the basis of an 85-percent exclusion. That has always been the rule.

If the Senator is proposing that we adopt the basis that all dividends under this court decision be treated as a return of capital the Congress would be making major changes in our present tax laws, and it would require more study than has been given. That proposal is an entirely different subject and should not be considered as a part of this measure.

Mr. MILLER. Let me thank the Senator from Delaware for his detailed and fine answers to my questions. I do not like to labor this matter. I must say I am still not persuaded that there should be a difference in the treatment of transactions as between an individual, on the one hand, and a corporation, on the other, when both are stockholders in the same corporation.

I recognize we have some equity to do here. I am persuaded that section 1 of the bill does equity as to individual stockholders.

But when I come to the second section of the bill, and find there is a difference of 16 cents a share and $3.51 a share and $10 a share as to Christiana Corp., I am concerned, particularly when we are not being consistent in our treatment of the identical transactions as between individual stockholders in Du Pont and a corporate stockholder in Du Pont. It seems to me we might be able to dispose of this problem by being consistent in both cases and by arranging some kind of postponement of the tax to Christiana Corp., if that is necessary, in view of the subsequent action of the court.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This corporation question raises many problems to the Members of the Senate.

A news ticker release at 4 p.m. this afternoon deals with the brief filed this afternoon by the lawyers, in the Federal court in Chicago. I wish to read from the ticker:

> CHICAGO.—Lawyers for E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., said today "No sensible Du Pont management would ever consider favoring General Motors over Du Pont's many other customers."

The dispatch deals at some length with that. But the part of particular interest now, in view of the debate here, is that which reads as follows:

> The court has been trying to carry out an order of the Supreme Court to divest Du Pont of 63 million shares of General Motors stock. Du Pont is ready for divestiture, the lawyers said, and "the only important issue remaining is whether Christiana should likewise be required to divest itself of any stock that it holds or receives."

In view of the Senator's knowledge of this bill, would he say that in any respect the bill, as presented by the committee, would affect or influence the action the court might take in determining whether Christiana Corp. should be required to divest itself?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It certainly is not intended to influence the decision, and in that connection I quote now from page 5 of the committee report:

> Your committee wishes to make it very clear that it expresses no opinion as to what particular method of divestiture of General Motors stock by Du Pont or by Christiana is appropriate. It is contemplated by your committee that all issues dealing with the manner of divestiture are to be determined judicially, solely with reference to the antitrust principles announced by the Supreme Court in the *Du Pont* case.

It is not our intention, and certainly it is not my intention, that we in any way by our action on this bill, either affirmatively or negatively, indicate to the courts what we think they should or should not do.

It is true that some of us may have individual opinions, but as a committee we voted in favor of the bill clearly with the understanding that we are in no way indicating what decision the court should make. The Attorney General has said that with that statement in the committee's report and reaffirmed by the Members of Congress the Department of Justice has no objection to having Congress proceed to pass the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the Senator from Delaware has made a very clear and very definite statement on that point. I read that language in the report earlier in the afternoon, particularly in connection with the colloquy between the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Tennessee.

But what perplexes me a little is the final paragraph of the ticker item, which states:

> The Government has asked Judge Walter J. LaBuy to approve a final decree in the antitrust case as soon as possible. But Du Pont lawyers want to see if congressional action on a tax bill will affect the case.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the point.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. So that raises this question: Will this bill affect the decision in that case?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In testifying before our committee—and there were before the committee representatives of the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department and the company—all of them agreed that if this bill is passed, they will agree to a modification of the present Supreme Court order for a 10-year divestiture, and they will accept a 3-year divestiture. Naturally the company will not agree on a 3-year divestiture order on the possibility that this bill may pass at some future date. On the other hand, I do not think the Department of Justice today would agree unequivocally to a 10-year divestiture order regardless of what Congress does, because the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department say that if this bill passes they do not want the company to have 10 years for then it should be able to make the distribution in 3 years.

Therefore, to that extent, it would be better if the court knew what the law was going to be. Certainly, an official of the company who had to make a decision as to whether or not the preferred stock was to be called, or whether General Motors stock was to be distributed in lieu of cash dividends, or whether it was to be done over a 10-year period or a 3-year period could not make that decision without knowing the tax consequences.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the Senator from Delaware know when Christiana was formed?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No, not exactly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. 1915.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; about then.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the Senator know how its capital stock was subscribed? Was it subscribed by cash or by turning in shares of Du Pont stock?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is my understanding that to a large extent it was subscribed by turning in shares of Du Pont stock.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Were there any issues at that time with regard to the possible application of the Sherman or Clayton Antitrust Acts which would have made Christiana a refuge, so to speak, so the holders of Du Pont stock would enjoy some tax benefit by turning in the stock?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. None whatsoever; nor was there any question raised as to the propriety of Christiana holding the stock until 1949, about 30 years after it had been organized and had been functioning as a holding company. Then in 1949 the Department of Justice raised the question of the propriety of holding that stock as a possible violation of the antitrust laws.

In the Supreme Court decision later handed down, the Court did not find any criminal violation, or even any civil violation, of the antitrust laws; it only found that there was a "possibility" that in the future there may be a violation as a result of these holdings.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. So it is the Senator's firm belief that Christiana did not constitute a tax haven, so to speak, which would accomplish a tax benefit to the members of the Du Pont family who used it as a depository for their Du Pont holdings?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. I think the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department will bear out that statement. I may call attention to the fact that that company has always been a holding company. It has been taxed as a personal holding company, which means that when the company receives the dividends it distributes them to its stockholders who in turn pay the regular income tax. The dividends must be distributed, and there has been no question or suggestion that this may have been a tax haven. It could be no tax haven. On the contrary, it would be a tax advantage to have the General Motors in the hands of the individual shareholders instead of being held in the company. Dividends received from General Motors Corp. by Christiana are presently subject to an intercorporate dividend, before being passed on.

That is why the Senator from Illinois and I joined in objecting to the bill which was before our committee a couple of years ago, because it did not take that factor into consideration. Under that bill the company and the stockholders would actually have made money under the Court decision. I think I cast the deciding vote in the committee to defeat that proposal. It was not a very popular vote in my State, but I would still oppose that proposal because the bill as it was before us at that time gave a definite tax advantage to the holders of Christiana Corp.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would that be true of other corporate holders of Du Pont stock?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. To a certain extent, but the tax levied under this bill more than offsets this advantage. In my opinion this is a fair bill both to the Government and to the stockholders of the Du Pont Co. and the Christiana Corp. To a certain extent, however, it would be true.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I know that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The proposal which I made would have corrected the general law as to all corporations. The purpose of the bill which I introduced last year, and which was supported by the Treasury Department, would have made these changes general law. I think it should be general law. This bill before us is restricted to the Du Pont Co. and the Christiana Corp. only, on the specific request of the Department of Justice. I reluctantly went along with that request. In the colloquy last fall with the Senator from Illinois I said I would join him in extending the remedial legislation to general law. I think the law should be corrected as to all corporations. We do not correct it in that manner in the bill before us solely because the Justice Department so requested. The Treasury Department both this year and last year took the position that this was a correction of an unintentional benefit under the law.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am sure the Senator from Delaware realizes that, for a Member of the Senate who is not a member of the Committee on Finance, or who has not had an opportunity to go into this matter with all its ramifications, it does present complexities. The stockholders who are the innocent victims of Du Pont in accumulating General Motors stock are entitled to some relief, and not have this income treated as income of dividends, in case of a divestiture. But as to the holdings of a corporation like Christiana, and particularly it, the persons who created the policies and the corporation and continued to hold the stock, probably had a greater degree of awareness of the percentage of General Motors stock being acquired by Du Pont.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. That is the reason why I, as well as many other Members of Congress, supported the formula which would transfer the tax from those truly innocent stockholders, as the Senator has mentioned, to those responsible for the management of the company. Those are the ones who received the stock on a low cost. This bill provides that the tax burden go to those who have the largest gain. I may cite a specific case which I mentioned earlier today of one of the top officials of the Du Pont Co. I am willing to show the letter to which I refer to both Senators. I do not think it is appropriate to put it in the RECORD, although I do not think that the writer would object to its being put in the RECORD.

This man is one of the top officials of the Du Pont Co. He owns 55,000 shares of Christiana stock. He has had them on a long-term basis, and his cost factor is approximately 30 cents a share. Under this particular bill his tax would be more than it would be under existing law if the company were to receive the stock, pay its intercorporate tax, and then sell it and pay the full capital gains tax rates. His tax would be higher no matter what the court decision is, because under the bill we raise the intercorporate tax on Christiana from 16 cents a share to $4.35 a share at the present price of General Motors. That would be about $7 a share on each share of Christiana stock.

Now, that is a substantial increase. If the court orders that the stock should be distributed to the respective stockholders, the only difference between paying full capital gains tax on the $75 worth of General Motors stock the man will receive and the provision under the bill is that under the bill he would deduct the 30 cents cost of Du Pont stock and pay a capital gains tax on $74.70.

Under this bill that particular individual would have his tax increased a minimum of around $4.25 a share for each share of General Motors stock received, as compared with existing law.

This official, I might say, has endorsed the bill because, he said, while it provides a higher tax in his case it will reduce the tax for those thousands of smaller stockholders who are least responsible for the management of the company. It will eliminate almost all of the tax for the 50,000 employees of the Du Pont company who bought stock under the company's stock purchase plan. It will eliminate in entirety the tax of all the stockholders who bought stock since I believe about 1949 when the stock reached a price of $75 a share. Under this bill practically all of those small stockholders who had nothing to do with the acquisition of General Motors in the beginning will be excused in entirety from any tax obligation under the bill. We have shifted the tax to those who were responsible for the company's policies and who are the ones who have the largest potential profit.

The difference in the revenue under the terms of the bill and the bill which the Senator from Illinois and I opposed at the last Congress is that that bill would have provided only about $60 million revenue whereas this bill would provide about $470 million.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Regardless of the order so far as divestiture for Christiana is concerned?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, regardless of the order for the divestiture.

There would be a few million dollars' difference if Christiana were ordered to sell the stock as compared with what the stockholders would pay upon distribution. The reason that there would be very little difference, regardless of the order, is that the bulk of the stock of Christiana is owned by those stockholders who have relatively low-cost factor, $5 or $10 or less. Therefore, we find that regardless of the order there is little difference in the estimated revenue under the terms of the bill and what the revenue would be if this were taxable at a full capital gains rate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, obviously this is not exactly the most auspicious environment in which to make a legislative decision. It seems to me that when a case is pending before a court and the lawyers on either side say, "We wish to see if congressional action on the tax bill will affect the case," it throws the decision of the Senate into an area which is unfortunate. It would be much better if we were dealing with an abstract situation, rather than one in which there will be an interpretation, in some quarters, either that there is a determination on the merits of the case or, to a certain extent, a telling of the judge what he ought to do.

I recognize that the committee report says this is not the intent of the bill, and I give the committee report full faith and credit on that point. I am sure the committee would not wish to try to make a judicial decision. It does seem, however, as though we are in a sort of "shotgun" situation, and it is important that action be taken.

While I certainly would not want the action of the Senate to be delayed unduly, I do hope that we shall have an opportunity to read some of the statements which have been made during the debate this afternoon, and perhaps time to reflect on them a bit. Senators have been making statements with considerable influence, as is obvious from the character of the statements and the finality with which Senators have made their statements, but some of us would like an opportunity to reflect on the statements. I hope we shall have a few days to do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to comment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall, in just a moment.

I invite the attention of the Senator from South Dakota to the fact that the Supreme Court has already entered a final decree in regard to the Du Pont Co., stating that the company must divest itself of the 63 million shares of General Motors stock. That is final.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes, but there is a question as to Christiana.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I wish to refer again to the Department of Justice letter, which was written on Saturday, addressed to the chairman of the committee, in which it was stated that they had no objection to our proceeding in the consideration of this bill. A letter was also written to the Senator from Illinois, in which it was stated the Attorney General did not think the Senate's action would in any way influence the court.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think under the circumstances we should proceed. I hope I made that clear. We should come to some resolution of the problem.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The letter says, in part:

> When H.R. 8847 was so limited in the House of Representatives, we did not object to its passage. If it is still the will of Congress to pass such a measure, our position remains the same.

Mr. President, once again I ask unanimous consent that the last paragraph of the letter to the chairman of the committee may be printed in the RECORD at this point

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> As you know, the Senate Finance Committee report has, however, stated that it expresses no opinion as to what the courts should do with respect to Christiana's General Motors stock. Senate Finance Committee Report No. 1100, 87th Congress, 1st session, page 5 (1961). We would greatly appreciate your efforts to maintain on the Senate floor that this expression of your committee is also the sense of the Congress as a whole so that if the courts agree with the Government that sale by Christiana and not distribution is the effective remedy in the Du Pont case, the courts will be in a position to decree such a remedy completely free of any express or implied congressional mandate to the contrary.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I was talking with representatives of the Department of Justice this morning. I talked with two different representatives of the Antitrust Division. Both of these representatives said they had no objection to our proceeding if we would make it clear in our explanation of the bill that we were not in any way suggesting how the court should determine its case. One of the gentlemen went further and said they could more intelligently arrive at a decision after we had acted because of the fact that if we act favorably on this bill they are going to insist upon a 3-year limitation for distribution. If we do not act favorably on this bill they will agree to a 10-year distribution.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it within the issues before the court in Chicago to determine whether or not the divestiture, if ordered for Christiana, should be within 3 or 10 years?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Supreme Court has ruled specifically that the company must be given 10 years to make this distribution. It is by mutual agreement by the Department of Justice, the Department of the Treasury, and the company that the term has been reduced to 3 years provided this bill passes. This agreement was submitted to our committee and is a part of the record.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That can be done notwithstanding the directive of the Supreme Court?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. They could agree because it is a restriction. It is not an extension. It is a restriction.

When I say that it can be done, I assume it would have to be agreed upon by the judge. I assume, however, that with all parties in agreement the judge would concur.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I assume that if both parties agreed to that, it could be done.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I assume that they would agree. The understanding of the committee is that all parties concerned would accept this as a final decree should this bill pass.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to comment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from South Dakota for reading the press dispatch about the judicial proceedings which are taking place simultaneously in Chicago on this same question, and particularly for reading the last paragraph:

> The Government has asked Judge Walter J. La Buy to approve a final decree in the antitrust case as soon as possible. But Du Pont lawyers want to see if congressional action on a tax bill will affect the case.

In other words, the Du Pont people want the judge to postpone his decision until after Congress acts, because they think action by Congress will affect the decision.

This afternoon, on the floor, very respected Members of this body have said that this bill, if passed, will have no effect whatever upon the decision of the judge. I wish that were so. I am sure the statement was made in good faith, but the Du Pont people do not think it is so. They want to have the decision held up until the bill is passed. They think the bill will influence the case. That is precisely what the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Illinois have been contending the entire afternoon.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Just a moment. I have the floor. I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. GORE. I thought the Senator from Illinois had the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; but I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished Senator from Delaware has said that unless the Court confined the period of its order for divestiture to 3 years none of the tax benefits in the bill would be available to anyone. Now, the Senator from Delaware is correct in what he says, but it does not follow that this is not an attempt to tell the Court how to render a decision.

The Senator from Delaware has said it is such an attempt. Indeed, a little bit earlier the Senator said we needed to pass the bill so that "they" could act more intelligently. He does mean to influence the court, if he wants someone to act more intelligently, after we pass this bill and in accordance with its terms.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is not objecting to a suggestion that the Supreme Court can at least act intelligently. What I said—and I put my own interpretation on it—was that I think the Senator from Tennessee became somewhat confused in his release to the newspaper this morning. I hope he is not becoming confused again. What I repeated was what the representatives of the Treasury Department and the Department of Justice said to the committee.

The committee feels that the court can make its decision within the framework of the bill under the 3-year minimum, or under existing law, using the 10-year period.

All I am asking is that we decide the question and vote on the bill. Let us approve it or reject it, and tell the court and the company under what tax laws they will be operating.

I should like to reread from a letter which Mr. Loevinger, the assistant Attorney General, wrote to one of my constituents urging the constituent to get in contact with me, as a member of the Finance Committee, and to make his suggestions as to what legislation he thought necessary to correct this tax inequity.

I quote:

> The Senate Finance Committee has scheduled hearings on a bill designed to change the tax impact of antitrust divestiture decrees. Since Congress establishes in the first instance the occasion for the application of

taxes, and thus any tax due as a result of the Du Pont-General Motors decree is directly occasioned by the actions of the Congress, may we suggest that you convey your position to your Senators (one of whom, Senator Williams, is a proponent of the bill under consideration), since in the final analysis, Congress is the sole arbiter of the reasonableness of the imposition of any tax.

In other words, he has told those who have written to him to consult Members of Congress and that Congress is the sole deciding arbiter as to what tax formula should be applied. Last Saturday the Attorney General, Mr. Kennedy, wrote to the chairman of the committee stating that he has no objection to the bill as reported. In a similar letter to the Senator from Illinois he used language the substance of which again was that he had no objection to Congress proceeding to the consideration of this bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator will find that, in effect, his language was that they were in no position to say that our consideration of this question would affect the court's decision, because in Chicago their contention is that the court should decide independently of any action by Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. He has no objection.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The point is that by the tax favors which we give, by the length of time which we prescribe for divestiture, and by the seriousness with which we brought the charge that divestiture would depreciate the value of the stock, we are really playing into the hands of the Du Pont lawyers. We can be certain that the able Du Pont lawyers will take full advantage of these facts.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If we defeat the bill and allow distribution, under existing law, Christiana will be saved from $75 million to $80 million in taxes because the bill provides an increase in the corporate tax, which this corporation would be required to pay under existing law.

Let those who are shedding their crocodile tears for the small shareholder realize that if successful in their opposition to this bill they would increase the tax on all the employee shareholders of the Du Pont Co., they would increase the tax on over 100,000 small stockholders of the Du Pont Co. who under this bill would pay no tax, and they would reduce the tax of Christiana Corp. by over $75 million.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore] will make a motion to refer the bill back to the committee, and that it be held in committee until a legal decision has been rendered; and when this legal decision has been rendered, and is final, and we know something about what the tax consequences of the decision will be, we can then pass a tax law. But we should not pass a tax law which would give a pretty strong hint to the courts as to what Congress thinks the decision of the court should be.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The court could have acted last year; it had the case under consideration. If there were any thought that the bill should not have been considered none has been expressed. Representatives of the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department appeared before our committees, and not in a single instance anywhere have I seen a suggestion made that we should wait until after the final decision has been rendered. On the contrary, those departments have supported the proposed legislation, and many have suggested that we should proceed to act.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to add one more point.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I would like to conclude and then yield the floor; however, I yield to the Senator from Illinois at this time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There was another feature in the press report which the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Case] read which I think should also be commented upon, and that was the statement of the attorneys for Du Pont and the opinion of the reporter that the issue had narrowed down to what was to happen to the stock held by Christiana. The issue was whether Christiana would divest and, if so, how. That was precisely the issue which the Senator from Illinois stated earlier in the afternoon was involved and to which, as I remember, the Senator from Oklahoma took exception. So I think the point I have made has been borne out by the developments which were simultaneously occurring in the court in Chicago.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In testimony before our committee, representatives of both the Treasury Department and the Department of Justice recommended the exact language which we included in the bill. This language specifically provides that if the court does not order Christiana to divest itself of this stock or order them to sell it, they are in no way affected by the bill, except that it does increase their intercorporate tax.

We provide specifically that if the court does not order a divestiture, there will be no benefit under the bill. If the court orders it to be sold, they pay the capital gains rate in the same manner as under existing law.

Mr. President, I conclude my remarks by asking unanimous consent that a memorandum prepared by Mr. Colin F. Stam, chief of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, specifically pointing out that Christiana would not get any benefits under the bill in the absence of a court order, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Congress of the United States,
Joint Committee on
Internal Revenue Taxation,
Washington, D.C., September 21, 1961.

Hon. John J. Williams,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: Reference is made to your inquiry as to what would happen if Christiana were not compelled by the court to distribute the General Motors stock it received from the Du Pont Co., but it voluntarily made such a distribution to its own stockholders.

In such a case, the language of section 1111(a) would not apply as the distribution would not be made under order of the court as required by section 1111(e). Therefore, the stockholders of Christiana would be subject to a dividends tax based on the full market value of the General Motors stock voluntarily distributed by Christiana.

Sincerely yours,
Colin F. Stam,
Chief of Staff.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the committee report outlining the tax treatment of Christiana and its stockholders under existing law as compared to the bill, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpts Submitted by Senator Williams of Delaware

Under existing law a dividend in kind paid by one corporation to another is measured by the basis of the property distributed in the hands of the distributing corporation if this basis is less than fair market value. Accordingly, under present law if Du Pont Co. were to distribute one share of General Motors stock (having a fair market value of $45) as a dividend to Christiana Securities Corp., and this stock had a basis to Du Pont Co. of $2, this would be a $2 dividend to Christiana. The 85-percent dividends received deduction would be $1.70, so that only 30 cents would be subject to tax at the full corporate rate because of the receipt of the General Motors stock. Thus, the tax would be 16 cents (52 percent of 30 cents) to Christiana, although the General Motors stock had a fair market value of $45.

Under section 301(f), which would be added by the bill, in the case of an antitrust distribution ordered in a suit to which Christiana is a party, the tax to Christiana would be computed on the $45 fair market value of the stock received. This entire amount ($45) would go into dividend income and there would be a dividends received deduction of 85 percent of $45 ($38.25), so that tax at the full corporate rate would be paid on $6.75 ($45 minus $38.25). The tax would, therefore, be 52 percent of $6.75 or $3.51. Because of section 1223(2) of the Internal Revenue Code, Christiana's holding period for the General Motors stock received would include the period during which the General Motors stock was held by Du Pont.

Section 3 of the bill would add to the code technical amendments relating to the new section 301(f).

The amendments made by the bill apply with respect to distributions made after the date of enactment.

Christiana Corp. is the largest corporate shareholder of Du Pont, owning about one-third of the outstanding stock. For this reason, if Du Pont distributes all of the General Motors stock owned by it, Christiana will receive about 20 million shares of General Motors. The Department of Justice is expected to seek a court order requiring Christiana to divest itself of the General Motors stock by selling such stock. However, the court may direct Christiana to distribute some or all of the General Motors stock received in the distribution. If this were to occur, under terms of the amendments made by the bill, the individual shareholders of Christiana would be treated in the same manner as individual shareholders of Du Pont were treated in the antitrust distribution made by it. Your committee wishes to make it very clear that it expresses no opinion as to what particular method of divestiture of General Motors stock by Du Pont or by Christiana is appropriate. It is contemplated by your committee that all issues dealing with the manner of divestiture are to be determined judicially, solely with reference to the antitrust principles announced by the Supreme Court in the *Du Pont* case.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This subject has been debated in the courts over a period of 13 years. It has been debated in Congress for the last 3 or 4 years. We have now before us a bill which in my opinion is a fair and equitable solution of one of the most complicated tax problems to come before the committee since I have been a member, one upon which we now have agreement among the parties affected. The companies affected, the Treasury Department, and the Department of Justice have all endorsed it. There is no opposition from the Departments.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will yield in a moment, and then the Senator from Tennessee can have the floor.

Representatives of both the Treasury Department and the Department of Justice have said that they have no opposition to the bill. They have no objection to its passage. The Treasury Department and the Department of Justice have cooperated in writing the language which is in this bill. It was reported first by the Ways and Means Committee and then called back to that committee upon the request of the Department of Justice, representatives of which had at the last moment thought of another provision that they wanted included in the bill. This provision which would restrict the coverage of the bill to the one case in question was accepted. The committee incorporated in its entirety the recommendations of the Department of Justice.

At no point has the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] or anyone else called our attention to anyone connected with the administration saying that the bill should not be acted upon at this time.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I submit to the able senior Senator from Delaware that in my humble opinion any unbiased lawyer reading the remarks the senior Senator from Delaware has made in the Senate this afternoon would conclude that the Senator has described the bill as one designed to influence the court.

The Senator has just concluded by saying that the bill provides an equitable solution to a problem.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I said to a tax problem, a tax problem about which the Department of Justice has been writing to its correspondents, telling them to write to Members of Congress, including the Senator from Delaware, asking the Members of Congress to correct this inequity. We are only exercising this authority and responsibility which the Department of Justice said was ours.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I submit to the Senate that the able Senator from Delaware has said three things. First, he has said that the bill provides an equitable solution to a problem which has been before the courts for 13 years. It is still before the courts. The final decree has not been entered. The Senator says the bill provides an equitable solution to the problem.

Second, the Senator says that unless the court follows the lines of the pending bill as to time and manner of divestiture, none of the benefits in the bill to any stockholder are available. He is correct in that statement.

Third, he says that the bill is not designed to influence the court. He says that in one breath. In the other breath, he says that he believes the Senate ought to pass the bill so that the court can act more intelligently.

What lawyer, what reasonable person, could read this statement and reach any conclusion other than that the basic purpose of the bill is to provide a solution satisfactory to the Senator from Delaware, a solution legislatively determined, and a solution designed to influence the court to comply therewith?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator for his observation. He asked me what unbiased lawyer would reach that conclusion. It has been my experience as a layman that lawyers—and I have the greatest respect for that profession—are never unbiased. I say there is no such person as an unbiased lawyer. A lawyer will take the view of a case based upon the position of his client.

This bill is not intended to influence the court. The Court has made its decision in connection with the Du Pont Co. It must divest itself of its holdings of 63 million shares of General Motors stock. That decision has been made.

Mr. GORE. Just a moment, please.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The second section deals with Christiana. This bill, which the Senator from Tennessee opposes, would raise the tax on Christiana from $3 million under the present law to $80 million. If the Senator is not in favor of that reduction let him vote for the bill. I am sure Christiana will appreciate his efforts to save them this extra tax, but I am sure that many small stockholders will be wondering.

The bill excuses from all tax liability the overwhelming majority of stockholders of both of these corporations in numbers, not in percentage of ownership, but in numbers. All those stockholders who have acquired the stock in recent years at a higher price would be excused. It levies the tax on those who control the companies by virtue of having owned the stock over a good many years. That seems to the committee to be fair.

To the extent that the dividend exceeds the cost of the Du Pont stock a stockholder would owe the capital gains tax and to that extent only.

I support the bill, and I hope the Senate will pass it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I promised the Senator from California, who has a statement to make on another subject, that I would not go beyond 4:30. I have already extended my time beyond that. The Senator will have an opportunity to speak on his own time.

KEEP AMERICA'S GREAT MERCHANT MARINE GOING FORWARD

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am alarmed at developments in the Federal Maritime Commission's fleet replacement program which recently have been brought to my attention. The Department of Commerce, I understand, is contemplating the "freezing" of all ship construction funds for the balance of fiscal 1962. This would mean the postponement of orders now on the books for about 18 ships.

Such action would be devastating to America's position on the high seas. It would be detrimental to the highly specialized labor force which exists in the shipbuilding trades. Our merchant marine is indispensable to the defense of the Nation both now in the cold war and in any emergency that might arise.

The beginning of the Second World War found us ill prepared for the arduous task of shipping men and supplies to the fronts. The lessons of this war—the assemblage and development of skills and facilities needed to build a naval and cargo fleet overnight—must cause us to pause and explore seriously what amounts to discouragement of our shipping industry.

More than 10,000 families make their living in shipbuilding and ship repair industries on the Pacific coast alone. The serious displacement of labor that would result—not only on the Pacific coast, but on the east coast, the gulf coast, and in the Great Lakes region as well—demands that we stop any downgrading of the fleet replacement program.

In the cold war, in our peacetime trade, and in carrying our commerce to the farflung ports of the world, U.S.-flag merchant ships are truly our first line of defense. They are the sure guarantee for the principal movement of American exports and imports.

They are the completely controlled sea links with our friends and allies around the globe. To repeat an oft-heard truism: The free world is a maritime federation.

In actual conflict, particularly in any form of limited or conventional war, the American merchant marine inevitably becomes the fourth arm of national defense. It always has played such a role, it always will.

Our total available operating merchant fleet—even if we consider the category of American ships flying under other flags—is, at best, marginal to meet any initial emergency sealift requirements. As it is, the slow rate of progress made in the replacement of aging vessels has left us facing the coming years with a largely obsolescent merchant marine.

We have far too few modern passenger liners capable of quick conversion to troop ships. Our cargo ships are old and most of them slow. More than half the Nation's modern and high-speed tankers are operating under the Liberian and Panamanian flags.

When we are involved as we are in a cold war on all fronts; when unrelenting Soviet competition requires steady progress on all fronts, we cannot afford to take any action which would impair our defense stature. We must recognize the target that Khrushchev has set—to leave the United States far behind—commits us to a race in which we dare not drift or lag behind. We cannot and must not underestimate Soviet seapower as an instrument for world expansion and domination.

The significance of naval strength has become apparent to Russia. Russia has turned to shipbuilding on a large scale since 1956, and beginning in 1958, the U.S.S.R. launched a 7-year plan approximately to double its merchant fleet in both number and total tonnage. According to several sources the program has progressed so successfully that its goal may be easily surpassed. By 1965, Russia will have about 1,200 merchant vessels totaling about 7.8 million tons. The Soviet now operates about 900 merchant ships, placing them not far behind American-flag merchant shipping fleet of about 970 ships. At present, our tonnage far exceeds theirs. Currently, our gross tonnage is about 9.5 million tons and theirs about 3.8 million.

Much of the U.S.S.R.'s success is credited to the great emphasis, particularly in the last year and a half, on tanker procurement—which complements the Soviet worldwide petroleum offensive. By 1965, its tanker fleet will have increased about 125 percent from its present capacity and during the planned 7-year period it will be tripled in capacity.

Emphasis is also being placed by the Soviet on large size tankers designed to carry up to 48,000 tons. Tanker production has not kept up with the Soviet Union's commitments to supply oil to other nations. Consequently, more than half of Soviet tanker orders are being built in nonbloc countries—Italy, Japan, Germany, Finland, and the Netherlands are among those supplying tankers for Russia.

Russian trade, hand in hand with merchant ship expansion, has expanded by leaps and bounds in the last few years. By the end of 1960, Soviet trade had almost doubled its 1958 levels. The tempo and scope of U.S.S.R. trade promotion, as to be expected, is particularly noticeable, in the underdeveloped areas. Their success may be measured by the nearly 170-percent increase in trade turnover with less developed nations in the last 5 years. Industrious Russians have tramped the trade routes, turning up at fairs and exhibitions with impressive offers. They trade not for profit but for power. Goods are merely a means to project the Soviet image and influence.

We have not opened our eyes to the challenges freemen face on the seas. If we fail to do so, the consequences will be great. Russia has found a convenient means to export communism to noncontiguous areas, which is particularly helpful when the U.S.S.R. wants to ride the crest of nationalistic uprising.

The intent of Congress has been to insure the maintenance of an American shipbuilding industry which it considers vital to the defense of the Nation. Now more than ever, a vastly increased reservoir of ship construction skills and adequate facilities will be needed to meet any future defense emergency.

Any postponement of well-conceived plans for replacing our aging and obsolescent ships is ill advised. Our Nation cannot once again face the costly, dangerous situation of being confronted with "bloc obsolescence," where a large number of vessels built at approximately the same time all become overage simultaneously. An orderly replacement program now is more economical than once again starting from behind sometime in the future. The next time it will be too late. An orderly replacement program now is dictated by the needs of possible defense requirements and efficient peacetime transportation. A slowdown for purely monetary reasons would be a deliberate undermining of our national economic and potential military strength. Such action would not be a test of prudence for wise national policy.

SANCTIONS AGAINST CUBA THROUGH THE OAS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there is presently pending in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations a vital piece of legislation which merits the immediate attention of the Senate, and final action by the Congress prior to the important meeting of the Organization of American States at Punta del Este, Uruguay, on January 22 to consider the question of whether the OAS should apply sanctions against the Communist Cuba regime of Dictator Fidel Castro. This is House Concurrent Resolution 226, better known as the Selden resolution. It was approved by the House of Representatives on May 17, 1961, by a vote of 402 to 2. It has been resting in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee since that time without action. The resolution calls for the application of sanctions against the Cuban Government with the following language:

> Whereas the Caracas Declaration of Solidarity of March 28, 1954, declares that the domination or control of the political system of an extracontinental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America, and would call for a meeting of consultation to consider the adoption of appropriate action in accordance with existing treaties; and
>
> Whereas Cuba today has become a base and staging area for Communist subversive activity through the hemisphere; and
>
> Whereas the present Government of Cuba offers a clear and present danger to the spread of political liberty, economic development and social progress through all the republics of the hemisphere; and
>
> Whereas the Declaration of Havana of September 2, 1960, was an open attack on the Organization of American States clearly showing that the present Government of Cuba stands in defiance of every proclaimed principle of the inter-American system; and
>
> Whereas the present Government of Cuba has signified its unquestioning acceptance of the Soviet line on international affairs; and
>
> Whereas representatives of the present Government of Cuba continue to participate in the councils of the Organization of American States; Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress that such steps as may be necessary should be initiated in the Organization of American States to reevaluate the role of the Government of Cuba in inter-American affairs for the purpose of imposing sanctions under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance; and also to exclude representatives of the Government of Cuba from attendance at meetings of the Inter-American Defense Board.

The report of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, which ordered the resolution reported favorably on May 11, 1961, reads as follows:

> The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 226) expressing the sense of the Congress that such steps as may be necessary should be initiated in the Organization of American States to reevaluate the role of the Government of Cuba in inter-American affairs for the purpose of imposing sanctions under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the resolution do pass.
>
> House Concurrent Resolution 226 was originally introduced as House Concurrent Resolution 218 on April 13, 1961, by the Honorable ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR., and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which in turn referred it to the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs. The subcommittee in executive session on April 26, 1961, ordered a clean House concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 226) reported to the full committee. The Committee on Foreign Affairs considered the resolution in executive session on May 11, 1961, and ordered it favorably reported. Similar resolutions were also introduced by the following Members: Hon. DANTE B. FASCELL (H. Con. Res. 227); Hon. LEONARD FARBSTEIN (H. Con. Res. 228); Hon. CHESTER E. MERROW (H. Con. Res. 229).
>
> The purpose of this resolution is to indicate congressional support for the taking of collective measures by the Organization of American States under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance (Rio Pact) against the present Government of Cuba. Communist intervention in hemisphere affairs is no longer a threat—it is an established fact. The present Cuban Government is serving today as the base for the international Communist movement in the Western Hemisphere.
>
> House Concurrent Resolution 226 declares the intention of Congress to support the Organization of American States and the present administration in its efforts to isolate this sore of communism before it spreads further in the area. The measures that can be decided upon by a meeting of consultation of ministers of foreign affairs convoked under the Rio Pact are those detailed in article 8 of the Rio Pact. They are: Recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions; breaking of diplomatic relations; breaking of consular relations; partial or complete interruption of economic relations or of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, telephonic, and radiotelephonic or radiotelegraphic communications; and use of armed force.
>
> The resolution deals with one other issue relative to Cuba, and that is its membership and the attendance of its representatives on the Inter-American Defense Board (IADB). This board deals with highly classified hemisphere defense plans.
>
> On April 26, 1961, the day of the subcommittee's action, the Inter-American Defense Board voted to deny Cuban representatives

> access to classified meetings and classified documents. This move by the Board did not, however, deal with the real problem of a country's membership on the Board while in defiance of the proclaimed principles of the inter-American system as in the case of Cuba's open alinement with the Soviet-Sino bloc; nor does it prohibit the attendance at meetings and access to data which are not designated as classified. The Council of Delegates of the Board lacks authority to effectively deal with this situation.
>
> In the opinion of the committee, conditions should be prescribed by the foreign ministers for continued IADB membership that give full consideration to the altered political and military position of any member. Conditions changing or clarifying the terms of membership on the Board would require the vote of the foreign ministers. The Board was originally established at the foreign ministers level and therefore any changes in the requirements for membership would require their approval. For this reason the inclusion of congressional intent in the House Concurrent Resolution 226 is desirable on this matter.
>
> The committee urges the adoption of this resolution by the Congress.

Since this report was filed by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and since the House acted by a vote of 404 to 402 in approving this resolution, there have been several important developments which make it imperative that final favorable action be given this resolution without delay.

For one thing, Mr. President, Dictator Castro has announced to the world that he is and has been a dedicated Marxist-Leninist Communist for some time, and that he will continue to be one until the day he dies.

He has finally unmasked himself to State Department Latin American experts, some members of the press corps, and to a few others who have steadfastly refused to believe that Mr. Castro could be anything other than another do-good reformer or agrarian reformer. In fact, some of these so-called experts still profess disbelief or merely accuse Mr. Castro of having betrayed a good revolution.

Second, even the Department of State has now issued two significant white papers on Mr. Castro and his revolution, one in April 1961, prior to House approval of the Selden resolution, and another dated December 6, 1961, and released to the public on January 3, 1962. In this second white paper on Cuba, the State Department told the Inter-American Peace Committee that Cuba "represents a bridgehead of Sino-Soviet imperialism and a base for Communist agitation and subversion within the inner defense of the Western Hemisphere." This 12,000-word document stated that Cuba has received "tens of thousands of tons" of weapons from Communist countries valued at $60 million to $100 million. This, it said, put Cuba in a position to support subversive activities and guerrilla operations in Latin American countries.

Cuban ground forces were pictured as "larger than those of any other American republic except the United States." Cuban forces, including the militia, were put at 250,000 to 400,000 troops. It was further asserted by the State Department that Cuba's forces had been "reequipped by the Soviet bloc for the maintenance of its armed forces." The report added that the Soviet Union had "supplied Cuba with considerable numbers of Mig fighters and aircraft of other types."

Declaring that Cuba has become "an appendage of the Communist system," the State Department warned that the revolutionary movement led by Mr. Castro "provides an ideological screen of nationalism and social reform behind which Communist Parties in the area are at work."

The State Department report declared that "this situation creates a serious threat to the individual and collective security of the American Republics and by extension to the security of the nations allied with the United States in opposing the expansion of Sino-Soviet imperialism."

The report went on to declare that since the Castro regime assumed power 3 years ago "it has deliberately tried to undermine established governments in Latin America and destroy the inter-American system." The situation, the Department warned, "confronts the nations of the Western Hemisphere with a grave and urgent challenge."

The document, entitled "The Castro Regime in Cuba," gives details on the extent of the island's political, ideological, military, economic, and cultural ties with the Soviet bloc.

Mr. President, no doubt the State Department had a very deep purpose in issuing such a hard-line paper against a Communist regime, because usually, unless the Department is trying to sell its foreign-aid program to the Congress or the people, it handles hard statements about Communist regimes and their aims and designs with kid gloves, for fear of provoking difficulties or "escalating into a nuclear holocaust"—to employ a good State Department term which often is used to soft-pedal anti-Communist statements and actions.

I believe the purpose of this paper, Mr. President—and it has been so interpreted by others, including the New York Times—was to rally support for winning approval by the 21 nations forming the Organization of American States to apply sanctions against Communist Cuba. We need 14 votes, or two-thirds of 21, to win approval of such action against Cuba. All reports recently have indicated that if we really work hard enough, we can come up with the necessary 14 votes. In fact, Mr. President, we had 14 votes on a test ballot at the December 4, 1961, meeting in Washington, D.C. The question at that time was whether to hold the January 22, 1962, meeting at Punta del Este, Uruguay. The vote was 14 for the meeting, 2 against, and 5 abstentions.

Although there may be some in the administration who do not desire to impose sanctions on Mr. Castro—who merely favor the Colombian plan which calls naively for asking Mr. Castro to sever his ties with the Sino-Soviet bloc—I believe that the President and the Secretary of State earnestly desire to take a firm position at Punta del Este. In fact, it has been reported that the President has rejected the soft Brazilian plan, and I have information that the President has sent a strong response to Argentine President Arturo Frondizi's weak approach to the Punta del Este meeting. At the present time the United States favors a three-pronged action against Cuba: First, a moral indictment of the Castro regime; second, requirement of mandatory severance of relations with Cuba by all nations in the OAS if 14 nations, or two-thirds, vote to break relations; and third, application of sanctions as called for in the Selden resolution. These actions would be imposed on Mr. Castro only if he should refuse to sever his ties with the Sino-Soviet bloc and cancel 72 agreements with the bloc within 60 days. As I understand our present working plan, the proposed actions against Mr. Castro could be changed only if two-thirds of the OAS nations should vote to rescind the previously voted actions.

Mr. President, this three-pronged action against Communist Cuba would be no more stringent than the actions taken by the Organization of American States against anti-Communist Dictator Trujillo in the Dominican Republic. We should all be able to agree, Mr. President, that the threat posed to the Western Hemisphere by the menace of world communism is many times graver than that which was posed by General Trujillo. In addition, General Trujillo was not backed by a world conspiracy which in the past 45 years already has conquered 26 percent of the world's land mass and 36 percent of the world's population.

Mr. President, the question we have to decide in acting or not acting on this resolution is whether we in the Senate favor applying a single standard or a double standard in dealing with threats to the Western Hemisphere—whether we favor a soft standard for Communist dictators and a hard line in dealing with anti-Communist dictators.

This, however, is not the only question we have to decide, Mr. President. We must determine also whether we wish to express the sentiments of the people in the 50 States which we have the honor to represent in the U.S. Senate. There can be no question as to the feeling of the overwhelming majority of the American people in moving to short circuit the Communist threat posed to the Western Hemisphere by the Communist dictatorship lying 90 miles off our shores. I know of nothing that has caused our people more concern.

We must also decide whether we are going to demonstrate to the people of Latin America, who share this threat with us, that we in the U.S. Senate favor action to thwart this danger posed by Mr. Castro, who may soon have the capability to launch superbomber and missile attacks against any point in the Western Hemisphere. There is substantial evidence now, Mr. President, indicating that Mr. Castro is constructing missile launching sites in Cuba; and Representative Selden reported on December 31, 1961, that Mr. Castro has extended several airport runways throughout the island to sufficient length to accommodate long-range intercontinental jet bombers.

We must also determine, Mr. President, whether we are going to support the President in his apparent desire to take a firm stand at Punta del Este. Many of us have criticized his administration for the decision not to provide the vital air cover requred for victory in the Cuban invasion. Now that he proposes, as he has in his letter of last Friday to President Frondizi, to take a strong stand in favor of a moral indictment of the Castro regime, severance of relations by all OAS countries, and application of sanctions against the Communist dictatorship through the OAS, then he merits the full support of the Senate.

Even the Selden resolution is not everything desired; but it provides us with an instrument through which we can express our sentiments and those of the people of the 50 States we represent, prior to the January 22 meeting at Punta del Este. If we permit this opportunity to pass, and if the OAS should fail by one vote to approve what presently appears to be our policy position, or if the OAS approves some plan of appeasement, such as that offered by Colombia, then the Senate will have to share in any criticism directed at the administration for failure to carry the United States position and for making possible another Castro victory on top of the invasion fiasco of last March. Failure to impose sanctions on the Castro regime will only serve to increase Communist control in Cuba and strengthen Mr. Castro's hand in seeking to export the cancer of communism throughout the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

TWO-THIRDS CONGRESSIONAL TRADE VETO

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in the state of the Union message Thursday, there were two interesting points regarding the power of the Congress. In requesting Presidential authority to lower taxes, the President said that this would include giving Congress the power to veto his decisions. However, in requesting the authority, for an additional 5 years, to lower tariffs, there was no reference to the Congress in terms of giving the Congress some say over what the President does in the field of trade.

I suggest that serious thought be given to granting to the Congress, by a two-third vote, veto authority to disapprove major trade agreements negotiated by the executive branch. This is assuming that the President will soon propose new legislation providing broader trade negotiating authority.

By way of a footnote, I was interested to see that, although the President has been talking a great deal about "across-the-board" authority, his state of the Union address referred instead to "bargaining by major categories." This marks a significant departure from his previous statements.

I offer this suggestion for a two-thirds trade veto in the hope that it will help enable the Congress to develop and enact a balanced trade policy. Such a policy should give the necessary administrative power to the executive branch and at the same time retain to the Congress as much as possible of its Constitutional authority in trade matters.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution assigns the Congress authority for the "regulation of commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States." My proposal seeks to restore a portion of this authority to the Congress, recognizing that in the fast-moving world in which we live, the day-to-day implementation of trade policy must be under the control of the President. I need do no more than remind the Senate that the Congress, in particular, the Senate, has a similar authority as regards the ratification of treaties between the United States and foreign nations.

It is my opinion that granting trade veto power to the Congress would have the added advantage of helping to win the kind of broad congressional support necessary to take the giant step that we must take to strengthen and secure America's trade relations with the Common Market and, indeed, with all of the nations of the free world.

Under my proposal congressional disapproval would have to be expressed within 60 days. Perhaps 30 days is preferable. Obviously, the shorter the period the better, so long as the Congress has adequate time to consider the matter thoroughly. Before the expiration of this period, both Houses of the Congress, by a two-thirds vote, would have to adopt concurrent resolutions disapproving a given trade agreement, or it would go into effect as negotiated by the executive branch.

There is no question that a two-thirds congressional veto could be exercised only in those instances in which the Congress determined that the executive branch had clearly exceeded the intent of the Congress as reflected in the relevant trade statutes.

There are ample precedents for this procedure. Reference to the congressional veto procedure first appeared in 1854. The use of the veto was attempted as early as 1920, although the practice did not really become established until 1939 with the passage of the Reorganization Act. Both the Reorganization Act of 1949 and the 1958 extension of the Trade Agreements Act are modern cases in point. Under the latter, the 1958 extension of the Trade Agreements Act, the Congress by a two-thirds vote may override the President's rejection of a Tariff Commission recommendation for escape clause action. This procedure, incidentally, has never been invoked.

Last year, the President in his ill-fated 1961 do-it-yourself farm bill urged that the Secretary of Agriculture frame new farm policies subject to a veto by the Congress. The President indicated support for this principle again on Thursday in his state of the Union message as regards taxes. I also remind the Senate that the legislative veto figured largely in last year's debate on long-term foreign aid.

Today, I should like to put forward legislative language giving Congress trade agreements veto power by a two-thirds vote. It is my hope that the administration officials responsible for drafting trade legislation will give serious consideration to incorporating something along these lines in their proposed bill.

I ask unanimous consent that my draft and a summary appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary and draft were ordered, to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF TWO-THIRDS CONGRESSIONAL TRADE VETO PROPOSAL

The following legislative language is submitted for study purposes:

It provides a two-thirds congressional veto of foreign trade agreements and modifications of agreements entered into after June 30, 1962. The Congress would not be empowered to disapprove separate parts of agreements or modifications.

The procedures to be followed are based on the Administrative Reorganization Act of 1949, and the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958.

1. The President would be required to submit trade agreements and modifications to both Houses of the Congress. Agreements would become effective at the end of 60 days after submission (not counting days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days).

2. On submission, they would be referred to the Committee on Finance in the Senate and to the Committee on Ways and Means in the House.

3. If the committee did not report said agreements or modifications within 10 calendar days, it would then be in order to discharge the committee from further consideration. A motion of discharge would have to be made by a person favoring it. It would be "highly privileged," and debate thereon would be limited to 1 hour equally divided between proponents and opponents. (The vote required to discharge a committee is a simple majority of those present and voting.)

4. When the committee had reported a concurrent resolution of disapproval or had been discharged from further consideration, debate on the resolution would be "highly privileged." It would be limited to 10 hours equally divided.

5. If one House acted while the other was considering a resolution, the resolution of the House which had acted first would be substituted for that of the House which was considering a resolution. If the committee of the second House had not acted, the resolution of the first House would be referred to committee and the procedure outlined above would be followed.

6. If an agreement or modification was submitted and the Congress was preparing to adjourn before a 60-day period elapsed, the Congress could under its regular procedures pass a bill or joint resolution that, notwithstanding the provisions of this proposal, the agreement or modification in question would become effective on a given date.

AMENDMENTS TO TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION BILL

At the proper place insert the following:

"SEC. . Section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1351), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(g)(1) The President shall submit to the Congress each foreign trade agreement entered into under the authority of subsection (a) after June 30, 1962, and each modification made after such date of any foreign trade agreement entered into under the authority of such subsection (whether or not such agreement was entered into before, on, or after such date). Each such agreement or modification shall bear an identifying title, shall be delivered to both Houses on the same day, and shall be delivered to each House while it is in session.

"'(2) Each foreign trade agreement entered into under the authority of subsection (a) after June 30, 1962, and each modification made after such date of any foreign trade agreement entered into under the authority of such subsection shall become effective upon the expiration of the first period of sixty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress following the date on which such agreement or modification is transmitted to it; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such sixty-day period there has not been passed by the two Houses of the Congress, by the yeas and nays by a two-thirds vote of each House, a concurrent resolution stating in effect that the Senate and House of Representatives do not approve the foreign trade agreement or the modification, as the case may be. In the computation of the sixty-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of any adjournment of more than three days to a day certain or of an adjournment of the Congress sine die.

"'(3) Any provision of a foreign trade agreement or of a modification of a foreign trade agreement may, under provisions contained in the agreement or modification, become effective at a time later than the date on which such agreement or modification would otherwise become effective under paragraph (2).'

At the proper place insert the following:

"SEC. (a) The following subsections of this section are enacted by the Congress:

"(1) As an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in such House in the case of resolutions (as defined in subsection (b)); and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

"(2) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

"(b) As used in this section, the term "resolution" means only a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That the Senate and House of Representatives do not approve the foreign trade agreement (or the modification of the foreign trade agreement) entitled "   " submitted by the President to the Congress on   , 19   , pursuant to subsection (g) of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.'; the blank spaces being appropriately filled; and does not include a concurrent resolution which specifies more than one foreign trade agreement or modification, as the case may be.

"(c) A resolution with respect to a foreign trade agreement or modification of a foreign trade agreement shall be referred to the Committee on Finance of the Senate or to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

"(d)(1) If the committee to which has been referred a resolution with respect to a foreign trade agreement or modification of a foreign trade agreement has not reported it before the expiration of ten calendar days after its introduction (or, in the case of a resolution received from the other House, ten calendar days after its receipt), it shall then (but not before) be in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of such resolution, or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution with respect to such agreement or modification which has been referred to the committee.

"(2) Such motion may be made only by a person favoring the resolution, shall be highly privileged (except that it may not be made after the committee has reported a resolution with respect to the same agreement or modification), and debate thereon shall be limited to not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. No amendment to such motion shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(3) If the motion to discharge is agreed to or disagreed to, such motion may not be renewed, nor may another motion to discharge the committee be made with respect to any other resolution with respect to the same agreement or modification.

"(e)(1) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution with respect to a foreign trade agreement or modification of a foreign trade agreement it shall at any time thereafter be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of such resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable. No amendment to such motion shall be in order and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(2) Debate on the resolution shall be limited to not to exceed ten hours, which shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(f)(1) All motions to postpone, made with respect to the discharge from committee, or the consideration of, a resolution with respect to a foreign trade agreement or modification of a foreign trade agreement, and all motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

"(2) All appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution with respect to a foreign trade agreement or modification of a foreign trade agreement shall be decided without debate.

"(g) If, prior to the passage by one House of a resolution of that House with respect to a foreign trade agreement or modification of a foreign trade agreement, such House receives from the other House a resolution with respect to the same agreement or modification, then—

"(1) If no resolution of the first House with respect to such agreement or modification has been referred to committee, no other resolution with respect to the same agreement or modification may be reported or (despite the provisions of subsection (d)(1)) be made the subject of a motion to discharge.

"(2) If a resolution of the first House with respect to such agreement or modification has been referred to committee—

"(A) the procedure with respect to that or other resolutions of such House with respect to such agreement or modification which have been referred to committee shall be the same as if no resolution from the other House with respect to such agreement or modification had been received; but

"(B) on any vote on final passage of a resolution of the first House with respect to such agreement or modification the resolution from the other House with respect to such agreement or modification shall be automatically substituted for the resolution of the first House."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, we must be realistic. Very probably, the most far-reaching single decision which the 2d session of the 87th Congress will be called upon to make is in the field of trade. We must decide whether we are to go forward or to go backward—and it is not an easy decision. "Free trade" and "protectionism" are glib terms. They have been seriously overworked. What we need is a sensible program that will permit an orderly progression toward wider trade contacts. I stress the word "orderly" for it is this concept of an orderly movement toward wider trade contacts that we must keep in mind.

While expanding trade with the nations of the free world, we must also see to it that our own economy is strong and that we permit it to continue to grow and develop by preserving conditions for it to do so. The question is not whether we move forward, but what kind of steps we take to get ahead.

I hope that the President will work with the Members of the Congress in framing a trade policy that meets these broad criteria. We cannot afford to entirely disregard the Congress or the problems and needs of the domestic industries about which many Congressmen are rightly concerned. New trade legislation must retain certain responsibilities to the Congress and also provide procedures to help and relieve American employers and workers who will be affected by changes in our trade policies. These requirements are not easily met. We shall not have trade legislation overnight. It will take a great deal of hammering and negotiating, but I am confident that the job can be done and done effectively.

It would be entirely futile and self-defeating for the United States to stand aside and not participate in the great movement to bring about closer economic and trade ties among the nations of the free world. Our Nation has consistently been in the forefront of the drive for closer trade relations. We must continue in this role. The President, the Congress, and the American people must support this objective.

The Constitution gives the Congress the power to regulate domestic and international commerce. In these difficult and complex times, we must certainly give the President wide leeway in the development and implementation of trade policies. At the same time, the Congress must have some opportunity in exceptional cases to express its disagreement with steps taken by the President.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 16, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 15, 1962:

The following-named persons were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the positions indicated:

General Services Administration

Bernard L. Boutin, of New Hampshire, to be Administrator of General Services, vice John Moore, resigned.

U.S. Tariff Commission

Ben David Dorfman, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1967, vice James Weldon Jones, term expired.

National Capital Transportation Agency

Edwin T. Holland, of Virginia, to be a member of the Advisory Board of the National Capital Transportation Agency, vice F. Moran McConihe, resigned.

St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation

Joseph H. McCann, of Michigan, to be Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, vice Martin W. Oettershagen, resigned.

Central Intelligence Agency

John A. McCone, of California, to be Director of Central Intelligence, vice Allen Welsh Dulles, resigned.

District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency

John L. Newbold, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for the term expiring March 3, 1965, vice John A. Remon, term expired.

Federal Maritime Commissioners

The following-named persons to be Federal Maritime Commissioners, to which positions they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

John S. Patterson, of Maryland, for the term expiring June 30, 1962. (New position.)

Ashton Barrett, of Mississippi, for the term expiring June 30, 1963. (New position.)

Thomas E. Stakem, of Virginia, for the term expiring June 30, 1964. (New position.)

John Harllee, of the District of Columbia, for the term expiring June 30, 1965. (New position.)

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the positions indicated:

Department of Commerce

Jack N. Behrman, of Delaware, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, vice Rowland Burnstan, resigned.

William Ruder, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, vice George T. Moore, resigned.

Maritime Administration

Donald W. Alexander, of Florida, to be Maritime Administrator. (New position.)

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the positions indicated:

Treasury Department

James Allan Reed, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, vice A. Gilmore Flues, resigned.

Superintendent of the Mint

Michael H. Sura, of Pennsylvania, to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa., vice Rae V. Biestar, resigned.

Bureau of Customs

Gertrude N. Cwikla, of Connecticut, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 6, with headquarters at Bridgeport, Conn., vice Anne A. Mitchell.

Eugene V. Atkinson, of Pennsylvania, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 12, with headquarters at Pittsburgh, Pa., vice Wilbert H. Beachy.

Minnie M. Zoller, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 21, with headquarters at Port Arthur, Tex., vice James L. Latimer.

Sam D. W. Low, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 22, with headquarters at Galveston, Tex., vice Charles J. Walker, Sr., resigned.

Charles H. Kazen, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 23, with headquarters at Laredo, Tex., vice Frank D. Yturria.

Raymond H. Dwigans, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex., vice Douglas Butler.

William W. Knight, of Alaska, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 31, with headquarters at Juneau, Alaska, vice Walter B. Heisel, retired.

Corwin S. Snyder, of North Dakota, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 34, with headquarters at Pembina, N. Dak., vice Philip A. Hoghaug, resigned.

Samuel S. Wyatt, of Tennessee, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 43, with headquarters at Memphis, Tenn., vice Arthur Rogers.

John A. Vaccaro, of New York, to be surveyor of customs in customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N.Y., vice Harry Edwards, resigned.

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

William C. Foster, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency;

Adrian S. Fisher, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

Agency for International Development

William S. Gaud, of Connecticut, to be Assistant Administrator for the Near East and South Asia, Agency for International Development;

Edmond C. Hutchinson, of Maryland, to be Assistant Administrator for Africa and Europe, Agency for International Development;

Seymour J. Janow, of California, to be Assistant Administrator for the Far East, Agency for International Development;

Teodoro Moscoso, of Puerto Rico, to be Assistant Administrator for Latin America, Agency for International Development.

United Nations

Dr. Ansley J. Coale, of New Jersey, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Diplomatic and Foreign Service

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

John O. Bell, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Guatemala.

John H. Burns, of Oklahoma, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Central African Republic.

William A. Crawford, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Rumania.

Parker T. Hart, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Yemen, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Kuwait.

William J. Handley, of Virginia, a Foreign Service Reserve officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Mali.

Ridgway B. Knight, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Syrian Arab Republic.

Henry R. Labouisse, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Greece.

Armin H. Meyer, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Lebanon.

William E. Stevenson, of Colorado, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Philippines.

Raymond L. Thurston, of Missouri, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Haiti.

Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, to be the President's Special Representative and Adviser on African, Asian, and Latin American Affairs, and Ambassador at Large, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

Department of State

George W. Ball, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of State.

George C. McGhee, of Texas, to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

Frederick G. Dutton, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Walt Whitman Rostow, of Massachusetts, to be Counselor of the Department of State.

U.S. Attorneys

Robert D. Smith, Jr., of Arkansas, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Arkansas. He was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

The following-named persons to the positions indicated. They were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

U.S. District Judges

Adrian A. Spears, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Texas.

Harrison L. Winter, of Maryland, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Maryland.

The following-named persons to the position indicated for the term of 4 years. They were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

U.S. Attorneys

Clinton N. Ashmore, of Florida, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Florida.

Alexander Greenfeld, of Delaware, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Delaware.

John M. Imel, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Oklahoma.

Robert C. Zampano, of Connecticut, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Connecticut.

The following-named persons to the positions indicated. They were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

U.S. District Judges

Ben C. Green, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Ohio.

Sarah T. Hughes, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Texas.

Charles G. Neese of Tennessee, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Tennessee.

James L. Noel, Jr., of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Texas.

John Weld Peck, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Ohio.

L. Richardson Preyer, of North Carolina, to be U.S. district judge for the middle district of North Carolina.

Louis Rosenberg, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania.

George Rosling, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of New York.

Talbot Smith, of Michigan, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Michigan.

The following-named persons to the position indicated for the term of 4 years. They were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

U.S. Marshals

James R. Berry, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Pennsylvania.

Vance W. Collins, of Kansas, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Kansas.

Marion Mathias Hale, of Texas, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Texas.

Richard J. Jarboe, of Indiana, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Indiana.

Joseph W. Keene, of Louisiana, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Louisiana.

Leo A. Mault of New Jersey, to be U.S. marshal for the district of New Jersey.

Harry M. Miller, of Kentucky, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Kentucky.

Robert I. Nash, of Texas, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Texas.

The following-named persons to the positions indicated. They were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

U.S. Circuit Judges

Griffin B. Bell, of Georgia, to be U.S. circuit judge, fifth circuit.

Walter Pettus Gewin, of Alabama, to be U.S. circuit judge, fifth circuit.

Paul R. Hays, of New York, to be U.S. circuit judge, second circuit.

Thurgood Marshall, of New York, to be U.S. circuit judge, second circuit.

Clarence W. Allgood, of Alabama, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Alabama.

Dudley B. Bonsal, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York.

Leo Brewster, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Texas.

Irving Ben Cooper, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York.

Frederick A. Daugherty, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. district judge for the northern, eastern, and western districts of Oklahoma.

Wilfred Feinberg, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York.

Frank Gray, Jr., of Tennessee, to be U.S. district judge for the middle district of Tennessee.

U.S. Coast Guard

Rear Adm. Edwin J. Roland to be Assistant Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard with the rank of vice admiral.

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the positions indicated:

Department of the Navy

Fred Korth, of Texas, to be Secretary of the Navy, vice John B. Connally, Jr., resigned.

Department of the Air Force

Neil E. Harlan, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, vice Lyle S. Garlock, resigned.

Canal Zone

Maj. Gen. Robert John Fleming, Jr., O17095, U.S. Army, for appointment as Governor of the Canal Zone, under the provisions of section 6, chapter 1, title 2, Canal Zone Code, to succeed Maj. Gen. William Arnold Carter, O18023, U.S. Army, on or about February 1, 1962.

In the Army

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. Paul DeWitt Adams, O17306, U.S. Army, in the rank of general.

The following-named officers, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Samuel Leslie Myers, O17180, U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. John Phillips Daley, O18358, U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. William Wilson Quinn, O19283, U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

The following-named officer for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299:

To be captain, Women's Army Corps

Quinby, Therese A., L587.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298:

To be first lieutenants

Abreu, Ronald P., O92150.
Culp, Don F., O93033.
Custer, Leslie L., O94065.
Ellerthorpe, Donald O., O94292.
Essex, Peter E., O82566.
Hopper, Robert F., O92204.
Jones, Charles C., O92205.
Kouril, Robert F., O94312.
Little, William E., Jr., O92216.
Lucas, Robert H., O94613.
McGovern, Richard T., O93056.
McKeon, James E., O94110.
McMahan, Emmet K., 3d, O92225.
Peeler, Charles E., O93486.
Simpson, Robert M., O94343.
Snell, Douglas H., O92252.
Spitz, Harry R., Jr., O93081.
Terry, Robert L., O92132.
Thornton, Tommy W., O93526.
Wichert, Gilbert H., O92270.

To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Balkema, Sarah A., N3035.

The following-named person for appointment as a temporary brigadier general in the Army of the United States and for reappointment as colonel in the Regular Army of the United States, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 1211, 3442, and 3447:

Elegar, Augustus G., O18625.

The following-named person for reappointment as a captain in the Regular Army of the United States, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 1211:

Vincent, Clifton F., O57440.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be lieutenant colonel

Hamilton, Robert C., O1015977.

To be majors

Bordiga, Carl J., O1109823.
McDonald, Joy A., O1317649.
Wilder, Harold W., O1319693.

To be captains

Adair, Thomas W., O1876696.
Bailey, Robert H., O4006891.
Bartholomew, Theodore F., O1885576.
Belock, Frank, O979533.
Beri, Albert P., O1924803.
Brooks, Buford, O4028739.
Carvell, Richard F., O4006659.
Click, Charles E., O2263301.
Coder, John D., O1930193.
Croyle, Donald W., O4005178.
Curd, Vernon F., O555206.
Dubeau, Leo F., O2289006.
Duemler, Richard R., O996980.
Greenlaw, Kenneth N., Jr., O1934918.
Harvey, Aaron C., Jr., O4007167.
Heiter, James A., O4006452.
Henry, Cecil M., O4006343.
Henschel, William E. M., O1890542.
Jacobs, Ernest F., Jr., O989934.
Jarrett, George A., O1885811.
Johnsen, Richard B., O4034128.
Johnson, James D., O4006669.
Kelley, James J., O4009620.
Kennedy, John D., Jr., O1935966.
Klein, John M., O1336226.
Lee, John L., Jr., O968800.
Logan, James M., O4010311.
Mann, John, O1877909.
Murphy, Thomas P., O2262161.
Nair, Robert L., O1841756.
Pankowski, Alfred J., O4004571.
Phillips, Donald M., O949279.
Roark, Thomas R., O2204373.
Ross, Hugh A., III, O1339395.
Scheets, George M., O1882237.
Sheehan, John J., O2014600.
Simpson, Henry E., Jr., O4005366.
Singleton, James L., O1924519.
Siranni, John F., O4010321.
Smith, William H., O4005154.
Tracy, Charles J., O4040630.
Tuggey, Howard J., O1924866.
Vinson, Frank C., Jr., O1881219.
Warr, Thomas J., O4029074.
White, John W., O4030630.
Williams, William F., O2028764.
Womack, Richard J., O2028459.
Wynn, James W., O4028935.
Zimmerman, Lawrence E., O1882139.
Zugschwert, John F., O4010191.

To be first lieutenants

Atwood, John B., O1880870.
Banks, James C., O4069816.
Beld, Thomas W., O5304296.
Blascak, Donald W., O4069723.
Bonilla-Acevedo, Tomas, O4074780.
Brandt, Harold H., O5405216.
Brann, Travis L., O4405007.
Bryden, John M., O4061375.
Calhoun, Creighton L., O4063295.
Chisholm, John J., O5203015.
Clifford, Peter L., O4074791.
Cockrell, Elroy M., O4031205.
Condon, Russell W., O4048821.
Connolly, John J., Jr., O4036321.
Daub, Alfred V., Jr., O4010591.
Denton, Curtis W., O5400270.
Eads, Hugh F., O5201409.
Fay, Warren E., O2298327.
Featherstone, Stephen E., Jr., O4031390.
Fournier, Albert L., O5001059.
Freeman, Clinton A., O4034819.
Freeman, Lowell F., O5203379.
Friedman, Fred L., O4045463.
Friend, Bernard D., O5301964.
Gentry, Paul E., O4025953.
Gray, Joseph M., O4075359.
Griffin, James A., O5001587.
Grim, Charles D., O4057028.
Hagyard, Warren A., O4062136.
Hannon, Murray W., O4077182.
Hawranick Theodore, III, O5204187.
Herbst, William R., O4062074.
Hester, Jack W., O5303564.
Hogan, Thomas J., O4069500.
Hunter, Robert E., O4063802.
Ivey, Claude T., O5304344.
Jackson, Raymond L., Jr., O5505683.
Jarrett, George H., O4031315.
Johnson, Ernest D., O4063777.
Jones, Allen C., O5303957.
Layfield, Marvin C., O4058895.
Malone, John F., O5303683.
McCarthy, Edward W., Jr., O4064606.
McCoy, George V., O4074619.
McGrath, William B., O5001090.
Morgan, Burford F., O5300748.
Morris, Dannie B., O5305205.
Myrah, John M., O4010952.
Porter, Thomas A., O4022650.
Prewett, William A., O5405074.
Pridgen, Henry A., O5302540.
Purvis, Ralph M., O5405108.
Raetz, Paul E., O5505456.
Reel, Ralph E., O4047349.
Rink, James H., O2289238.
Rosenberg, Theodore M., O2304296.
Ruhlin, James R., Jr., O4030944.
Singletary, Charles B., O2303559.
Smart, Ernest A., O4053078.
Sparks, Alton R., O4084286.
Stasky, Gail V., O4086048.
Steed, Dale C., O4071617.
Steverson, Lynn, O5304072.
Tedesco, John J., O4084547.
Tisson, Guenter J., O5307412.
Treadwell, John J., III, O4009790.
Trouve, Reymond J., O4052877.
Turpin, Robert P., O5304275.
Vargo, John J., Jr., O4076109.
Vicknair, Darrell H., O4071205.
Williams, Robert B., O5203353.

To be second lieutenants

Ackerman, Rene J., O5005830.
Adams, James C., O5309251.
Alfredson, George H., O5510664.
Anckaitis, William H., O5008484.
Anslinger, Raymond W., O5510690.
Barnhart, David S., O5704015.
Biddle, David L., O5208918.
Blackburn, John T., O5511679.
Boyd, Claude D., III, O5306537.
Brandt, Goetz K., O5705771.
Britz, Ronald J., O5511620.
Brunner, George S., O5513233.
Butler, David H., O5309880.
Buzan, Thomas G., O5403650.
Crawford, Robert C., O5208575.
Crofoot, George W., O5001574.
Cubine, Gerald W., O5307196.
Dorf, John H., O5307068.
Dubov, Bruce J., O5008876.
Duncan, Garrett E., Jr., O5212619.
Emery, Douglas E., O5002910.
Follett, Franklin P., O5508808.
Fry, Charles H., O5311001.
Funderburk, Ronald N., O5409579.
Furman, Daniel R., O5405402.
Gergulis, John G., O5007041.
Gilmore, Ralph J., Jr., O5307337.
Godwin, Bobby J., O5405403.
Gomez, Vincent C., O5000573.
Greife, John L., O5701896.
Grones, Melvin J., O5404279.
Gustafson, Carl S., O5405345.
Hagerty, Paul P., O5002908.
Hall, James R., Jr., O5304334.
Hannan, William T., Jr.
Harris, Henry L., O5305227.
Hawn, Darryl R., O5203808.
Heim, Craig G., O5205029.
Hendel, Robert C., O5507034.
Henry, Pierre E., O5006672.
Herrington, Roscoe B. P., O5308443.
Hess, Ronald H., O5206719.
Hindman, John E., O5512293.
Hixson, Peter C., O5508034.
Hobbs, Dale G., O5704699.
Holder, Richard T., O5303713.
Imes, Allan B., O5308088.
Jarman, Edward E., O5311582.
Jennings, Theodore L., O5503071.
Jones, Albert F., Jr., O5409595.
Kahn, William, O5305490.
Kaler, William R., O5207055.
Kelley, Jack T., O5307608.
Kenyon, James F., Jr., O4069725.
Kircher, Alfred H., Jr., O5404170.
La Forgia, Salvatore F., O5008706.
Landrum, Phillip M., Jr., O5307611.
Lillie, Warren T., O5307364.
Line, Edward D., O5202071.
Lovelace, George E., O5505857.
Lozier, Gary O., O5704981.
Luberacki, Robert J., O5006438.
Lyell, Richard L., O5509009.
MacDonald, James H., O5508242.
MacKinnon, William N., O5213749.
May, Karl E., O5208209.
Mehrtens, Frederick J., Jr., O5308371.
Miller, Thomas H., O5306291.
Needham, Walter D., O5213762.
O'Connor, Patrick M., O5513140.
Parnell, William C., III, O5404030.
Parr, Gary K., O5403061.
Patterson, Joseph M., O4085231.
Pearson, John E., Jr., O5307905.
Piatak, John R., O5207820.
Pitts, Walter E., Jr., O5402878.
Polk, Burley R., O5403654.
Ralphs, William J., O5307519.
Richardson, Charles W., Jr., O5403762.
Rowland, Jerry D., O5509424.
Sanaker, John M., O5307136.
Shirley, William A., O5309205.
Skillings, James A., O5006843.
Smith, Paul R., O5509615.
Solliday, Charles W., O4047419.
Spillane, Robert B., O5308774.
Sutton, William F., O5300150.
Teates, Bryan W., Jr., O5208798.
Tudor, Robert W., O5208845.
Varner, Thomas A.
Ware, William M., O5307714.
Webb, Earl E., O5305544.
Whorton, Billy L., O5304537.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3292, 3293, 3294, and 3311:

To be majors, Medical Corps

Jacob, Jackie E., O5207482.
Love, Drury M., O993715.
Sacoto, Enrique, O5202449.
Wright, Lloyd T., O2209672.

To be captains, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Guerrero-Guerrero, Maria E., J100258.
O'Brien, Eileen, J100130.

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Ellis, Sarah L., N764866.
Munchbach, Rose M., N901726.
Pittman, Conradine, N805593.
Rancourt, Dorothea L., N902276.
Sagath, Esther E., N901197.
Sederowicz, Helen J., N901777.

To be captains, Chaplain

Lamm, Harold C., O2282646.
Lightcap, Thomas K., O2272298.
Rogers, Michael J., O2291817.
Rothwell, Vincent L., O2289590.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Barton, Ronald F., Jr., O1939803.
Dipietro, Girard J., O5202578.
Hall, James B., O5301064.
Hoffman, William, Jr., O5202598.
Kleehammer, Daniel S., O4018612.
Lee, Leslie M., O2297821.
Reynolds, Shirley L., O4043546.
Shell, Doran D., O5306940.

To be captains, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Jones, Robert W., O4025815.
McKay, Jack G., O1887918.
McKay, William P., O4024247.
Spencer, Bryan S., 01939422.
Taylor, George O., Jr., O67769.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Bailey, Richard H., O4067477.
Bernstine, Richard T., O2289829.
Chaney, Samuel A., O5204444.
Evans, Oliver N., O989229.
Goumas, Melto, O2239112.
Hark, William H., O2284578.
Haug, James A., O5703088.
Huott, Archer D., O4023364.
Jackman, Roger L., O2289947.
Kennard, John W., O5701223.
Massad, Louis B., O4032505.
Mayo, Robert W., O2290158.
Newton, John K., O4051249.
Ross, Lawrence R., 05003258.
Russell, Philip K., O4031789.
Strevey, Tracy E., Jr., O2291380.
Turner, John C., O5407844.

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Bradley, John J., O2203262.
Edell, Joseph E., Jr., O2263168.
Correa, Arnaldo L., O968091.
Sperling, Gerald J., O2267844.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Cantrell, Henrietta I., N2298019.
DeVoss, Joan K., N2292890.
Iannacone, Marie R., N2294761.
Silvestre, Patricia A., N2293843.
Symonds, Jean M., N2292014.

To be first lieutenants, Chaplain

Day, Roland F., O2298202.
Jett, Mace T., Jr., O5301234.
Kyle, Charles G., O5407890.
Moore, Willard P., O2296428.
Sessums, Richard C., O2295161.

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Ayres, Richard F., Jr., O2303875.
Ebner, Stanley, O2300865.
Hanes, John G., O5505681.
Raby, Kenneth, A., O5502156.
Williams, Jack H., O2301009.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Liberta, Thomas R., O5217189.
Osborn, James R., O2298154.
Ross, Jerome.
Weaver, John E., O4077111.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Brewer, Jerry R., O2296654.
Dunkelberg, Wilbur E., Jr., O2289294.
Fazio, Robert A., Jr., O4067013.

Garland, William B., Jr., O5411191.
Johns, William C., O5701726.
Kisel, John G., O2292507.
Lewin, Mark H., O2297965.
Pannell, Robert F., O5400483.
Poksay, Robert A., O2295574.
Sande, Sigvart, O2287999.
Thornburg, La Monte F., O5700008.

To be first lieutenants, Veterinary Corps

Flowers, Herschel H., O4043890.
Hildebrant, Paul K., O4048537.

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Murray, Haraldean, L2300412.

To be second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Reinpold, Rita R., N5407284.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Brown, Wallace J., O5307697.
Coleman, Jerry B., O2299874.
Constable, Joseph F., O5212339.
Donley, Kenneth G., W2207985.
Elsarelli, Leon E., O5209295.
Greenhalgh, Donald L., O5700839.
Hahn, Ruediger, O2299402.
Holzer, Donald B.
Hoxsey, George E., O5705938.
Huff, William H., III, O2298448.
Judy, Richard B., O5408204.
Ketelsen, Keith D.
Longley, Karl E., O2302236.
McKee, Terry L., O2303989.
O'Barr, Billy J.
Peacock, James L., O2298352.
Sandleback, Eugene J., O2298294.
Schafer, Thomas E., O5410603.
Severson, Joel S., O5512109.
Shelton, Edward J., O5410576.
Sobocinski, Philip Z., O2297443.
Walker, James O., Jr., O5410659.
Weidner, Douglass S., O2302261.

To be second lieutenants, Women's Army Corps

Slater, Suzanne, L2298114.
Snell, Diane L., L5302029.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Fulghum, Joe R., Jr.
Kirkpatrick, Harold C., O5412457
McAllister, Hugh A., Jr.
Perkins, Jacob H.
Phillips, Robert E., Jr.
Rich, William J.
Wills, Alton G.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Allen, John R.
Anderson, Robert S.
Avery, James W.
Bartholomew, Alanson D., II
Beadle, Norman L., O5412639
Bond, Richard R.
Boyd, Richard F.
Cartlich, George L., III
Christopher, George L.
Cook, Ronal B.
Culpepper, George V.
Damewood, John H.
Decker, David J.
Elan, John N.
Halbritter, Frederick P.
Hawley, Gary D.
Hersey, Donald L.
Hood, Brian C.
Hughes, William G.
Johnson, Thomas G.
Kelley, Edward M.
Killgrove, Albert G.
LaRue, Lowell G.
Maksimowski, Richard J.
Markiewicz, Joseph
Mitchell, David G.
Napier, Joseph S.
Newman, Neil E., O5412449
Patete, Frank M., O5515258
Quick, James B.
Rusk, James E.
Ryan, William E.
Sharkis, Alan
Sims, Larry P.
Solymosy, Edmond S.
Steele, Harry W.
Stump, Charles H.
Turpin, William P., IV
Winter, Norman E., O5515143
Yeargan, Randall L.

(NOTE.—All of these officers (with the exception of Melvin J. Grones and Joseph Markiewicz) were appointed during the last recess of the Senate.)

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ellis O. Briggs, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career ambassador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain, vice Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, deceased.

John M. Cabot, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Poland.

Robert McClintock, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Argentina.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 15, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 11: 3: *If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?*

Eternal God, who art the refuge and shelter of the righteous, help us to understand more clearly that our Nation has no firm foundation upon which to build and no bulwark against defeat and downfall unless we enlarge our faith in Thee and in spiritual values.

May the security and survival of the noblest way of life for which we are eagerly working and earnestly praying find their inspiration in the assurance of Thy divine wisdom and power, Thy mercy and loving kindness.

Grant that daily we may yield ourselves to the sovereign and beneficent will of our blessed Lord whose strength is invincible and whose spirit will keep us calm and courageous in days of darkness.

To Thy name we ascribe the praise and glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 11, 1962, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

S. RES. 239

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable Louis C. Rabaut, late a Representative from the State of Michigan.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

S. RES. 240

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Honorable John J. Riley, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

S. RES. 241

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable Sam Rayburn, late Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-sixth through the Seventy-ninth, Eighty-first and Eighty-second, and Eighty-fourth through the first session of the Eighty-seventh Congress.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

The message also announced that under authority of Public Law 719, approved September 7, 1960, the Vice President had appointed Edward Fenner, of Illinois, a member of the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO in place of William F. Knowland, of California, resigned.

BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 20 U.S.C. 42, 43, the Chair appoints as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND TECHNOLOGY FOR SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 4, Public Law 106, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Construction of a Building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

DISPENSING WITH CALL OF CONSENT AND PRIVATE CALENDARS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar today be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request with respect to the call of the Private Calendar tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF DEMOCRATIC WHIP

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time—and it is with great pleasure that I do so—to advise the House officially that the great American and distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] will serve as Democratic whip of the House.

BILL TO PERMIT DEDUCTIONS FROM INCOME TAX OBLIGATIONS FOR UNITED NATIONS CONTRIBUTIONS

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill that will provide an avenue for U.S. citizens to express their endorsement of the United Nations not only by words but also in a very tangible and meaningful way.

My measure will permit American taxpayers to deduct from their individual income taxes any contributions to the United Nations and its specialized agencies such as UNESCO.

The measure will enable supporters of the U.N. to wish the organization well at a time when crucial financial and moral supports are needed. And it will provide Americans an opportunity to express the view, shared by President Kennedy, that it takes more than arms to keep the peace.

Too long, Mr. Speaker, have the supporters of the U.N. in this country been silent in the face of unreasonable criticisms directed against it by opponents whose views have been given unrepresentative prominence. Some of the critics of the U.N. have narrow, selfish economic interests. And it has been well publicized that a well-financed, lavish campaign against the U.N. on behalf of the so-called Katanga government has been operating in freewheeling style in the United States. And it appears that some of this criticism may be coming from organizations that enjoy tax-exempt status or claim to.

I do not have swollen expectations for the U.N., Mr. Speaker. I do not believe it is an infallible organization. But I insist that the U.N. has richly earned the support of the peoples of the world in its efforts to provide a forum for conciliation of international tensions and conflicts and to assist developing countries with their medical, education, and social problems. Our membership in the United Nations, beginning with the San Francisco Conference in 1945, has been endorsed by a broad range of bipartisan support from the leaders of our two great major political parties. I hope they will join with me in another move to reaffirm our support in an organization that is one of our best hopes for a just peace.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOE STARNES OF ALABAMA

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, last week a former Member of the Congress and one of the leading citizens of my district passed away while in Washington on behalf of his home town. I refer to the untimely death of Joe Starnes, of Guntersville, Ala., a Member of the House of Representatives from the 74th through the 78th Congresses.

Mr. Starnes died of a heart attack while appearing before the Interstate Commerce Commission as a representative of the city of Guntersville.

As a Member of the House he served on the Appropriations Committee and on the Un-American Activities Committee. During World War II he served as a colonel in the infantry in the European Theater and he also served with the Army of Occupation until his discharge in February 1946. He resumed the practice of law in Guntersville and was well known for many public services over the State.

Mrs. Rains and I extend our deepest sympathy to his wife and his two sons, Joe, Jr., and Paul, and I am sure that many Members of the House will be saddened by his passing.

I include an editorial from the Sand Mountain Reporter, also a news story from the same newspaper:

Joe Starnes

Our area has suffered a great loss in the death of Joe Starnes, one of Marshall County's most active and productive citizens.

Starnes first distinguished himself as our Representative in Congress. Since he left Congress, he had devoted much of his time, talent, and energy to church, civic, and community endeavors.

In recent years, he served as State commander of the American Legion, then as president of Civitan International. It was during his busy work as head of Civitan International that he was stricken with his first heart attack. Though doctors ordered him to give up most of his community service and church activities, he found it difficult to give up this service to his fellow man, and indeed continued to do more than he should have for his own good.

Though his death leaves our area with a great void, the fruits of his labors will continue to be a monument to this good citizen.

In Washington—Ex-Congressman Joe Starnes Suffers Fatal Heart Attack

Former Congressman Joe Starnes, Sr., collapsed and died in Washington Tuesday.

The 66-year-old Guntersville attorney was representing his hometown in a hearing before the Interstate Commerce Commission when he was stricken.

A doctor said his death was caused by coronary thrombosis. Starnes had suffered a severe heart attack 2 years ago, and a second attack last year.

W. D. Newman, of Guntersville, was in Washington yesterday to make arrangements for bringing the body back to Guntersville.

Funeral arrangements will be announced by the family in Guntersville, probably sometime today.

Starnes is survived by his wife and two sons, Joe, Jr., of Guntersville, and Paul, of Ellijay, Ga.; one brother, Hardin, of Guntersville; and two sisters, Mrs. John Siebold, of Guntersville, and Mrs. G. D. Wells, of Albertville.

A member of one of Marshall County's most prominent families, Starnes was born and reared in the Claysville community near Guntersville.

He attended high school in Guntersville, served overseas during World War I, then returned to get his law degree at the University of Alabama.

After graduating from the university, he set up a law office in Guntersville which he continued since that time. In recent years a son, Joe, Jr., has been his law partner there.

On April 10, 1918, he was married to the former Della Whittaker of the Cottonville community.

Later he taught school in Marshall County for 4 years.

Starnes was elected to Congress in 1935, and served for 10 years as the Representative for this district. During this time he was very active in setting up the TVA system, and a number of other national programs.

He served again in the oversea Army during World War II, and continued in the National Guard until his retirement as a colonel a few years ago.

Starnes was prominently identified with his work in a large number of religious, civic, and service organizations.

He served as State commander of the American Legion, and 2 years ago as president of Civitan International. It was during his term as Civitan president that he was stricken with a severe heart attack, and doctors ordered him to cut back on some of his extra activities.

A longtime member of the Guntersville First Methodist Church, Starnes had served for many years on the official board and as a Sunday school teacher. For a number of years he was an associate district lay leader.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the untimely passing of an old and steadfast friend causes acute grief, but when a great and good man goes, bereavement is softened when we can recollect that his passage through this life blessed those around him.

Such a great and good man was my old and cherished friend, Joe Starnes, who served as a Representative here from 1935 through 1944. His was a life that many could envy and emulate. It was a career of vigor, activity and enterprise, arduous and demanding, but always in the service of the people of his community, Alabama, and the Nation. He died while appearing before an Interstate Commerce Commission hearing, pleading for what he was convinced was worthy objective. His death was characteristic of his life.

Joe Starnes was born of a fine, old Marshall County family in Guntersville, Ala., on March 31, 1895. Endowed with all the attributes of a scholar, it is significant of his gifts, that he was chosen to teach elementary school, when he was only 17 years of age. When he was 22, he left the classroom to enlist in the 53d Infantry, 6th Division. He served with distinction overseas and left the service at the war's termination, with the rank of lieutenant and was decorated with the Silver Star.

A war veteran, he entered the University of Alabama Law School and was graduated in 1921. He was admitted to the bar that year and established a law practice in Guntersville.

Actively interested in national defense he was a member of the 167th Infantry, Alabama National Guard since 1923 and attained the rank of colonel. His interests in fostering better education never flagged.

He worked unremittingly for better schools and was known statewide as a champion of the teaching profession. He became a member of the Alabama State Board of Education in 1933 and was vice chairman since 1948. He was elected to the House for four successive terms.

At the outbreak of World War II, he served as a colonel of Infantry in Europe and in the Army of Occupation from 1945 until 1946. He returned to Guntersville and resumed his law practice.

It has been said that it requires no great magic to recall great men to life. One only has to recall what their lives meant to their fellowmen. Joe Starnes left an indelible stamp on the progress of education, the law and community progress during very trying decades of this century. In the Congress and outside it he fought vigorously for our national defense.

We who were privileged to have his friendship will miss Joe Starnes, but we can take comfort in remembering how many gained from a life well spent in service.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 263)

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the annual report of the U.S. Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961.

John F. Kennedy.

The White House, *January 15, 1962.*

PROPOSAL TO RESTRICT PRINTING OF CERTAIN EXTRANEOUS MATTER IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. **JONES** of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. **JONES** of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to announce that I intend to press for consideration of the bill, H.R. 1173, which I introduced at the beginning of the last session which would amend the law to regulate and restrict the printing of certain extraneous matter in the Congressional Record and limit the number of insertions of extraneous matter in the Appendix of the daily Congressional Record.

I might say over the past few years, I have made a rather comprehensive study of abuses that have grown up in the use of the Congressional Record, particularly as to the insertion in the body of the Record of irrelevant and extraneous matter that certainly should go in the Appendix of the daily Record. I think by looking at the first two issues of the Congressional Record of this session, most people will agree that we need some ground rules to determine how we shall use the privilege we have of expressing not only our own thoughts but the thoughts of others through the use of the Congressional Record. I am hopeful that I will have the support of other Members in trying to make the Record reflect a true record of the proceedings of the House of Representatives.

Mr. **TEAGUE** of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. **TEAGUE** of California. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones] knows, I, too, introduced last year a bill having to do with reducing the mass of extraneous material which appears in the Congressional Record. I want him to know that I have no pride of authorship. I fully support his bill and will do everything in my power to see that it becomes law.

I congratulate him on his interest in this subject.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, the President has made it known that he will ask Congress for authority to purchase $100 million in United Nations bonds.

This is incredible.

Why should the taxpayers of this country be required to pay for the derelictions of the Soviet bloc and certain other nations? How much longer do the leaders of this Government propose to submit American citizens to blackmail by paying for the international delinquency of Russia, Cuba, and other nations?

For 16 years the United States has been paying for more than its share to keep the U.N. in business; now let the other members pay up the millions they owe before we invest a single dollar in a phony bond issue.

I have introduced a joint resolution—House Joint Resolution 595—to prohibit the purchase of any U.N. bonds by the United States until such time as all member nations have paid in full their share of the expenses of the organization, including the expenses of United Nations operations in the Congo and the Gaza strip.

I would urge those of you who feel as I do about this vital matter to introduce similar joint resolutions.

THE LATE HONORABLE DON GINGERY

Mr. **VAN ZANDT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. **VAN ZANDT**. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the adjournment of the 1st session of the 87th Congress my predecessor in Congress from Pennsylvania, the Honorable Don Gingery of Clearfield, Pa., died after a brief illness.

I know that Members of Congress join me in expressing sympathy to Mrs. Gingery and the children.

Mr. Gingery who served two terms in Congress was elected to the 74th Congress in 1934. He was reelected in 1936 to the 75th Congress. During his congressional career, Mr. Gingery served on important committees and was recognized in Pennsylvania as being among the most prominent Democrats in the Keystone State.

The following account of the death of former Congressman Gingery appeared in the October 16, 1961, issue of the Clearfield (Pa.) Progress and outlines his public service at the State and National levels:

Don Gingery, 77, Long Prominent in Politics, Dies

Don Gingery, former Member of Congress and for some 50 years prominent in Democratic Party affairs, died Sunday afternoon in the Clearfield Hospital. He was 77.

A native of Clearfield, Mr. Gingery was elected to Congress in 1934 from the then 23d Congressional District, defeating the incumbent John Banks Kurtz by the largest majority accorded a Democratic candidate in any election. He was reelected in 1936, the only Democrat ever to serve the congressional district more than one term.

Congressman Gingery took pride in being a New Deal Democrat, and in office or out was a stanch supporter of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. While in Congress he worked unceasingly to obtain the maximum in public works projects for his district, then hard hit by the midthirties depression. He served on several important House committees and advocated U.S. military buildup in pre-World War II days. During his second term he headed a congressional committee tour of the Philippines, visiting Hawaii and Japan en route.

Mr. Gingery's introduction to public life came in 1915 when he was elected to the State legislature as a representative from the First District of Clearfield County.

He later served as a member of the State Democratic executive committee, Democratic Chairman of Clearfield County and as a delegate to Democratic National conventions. As a young man he was a member of the Pennsylvania National Guard, serving as a captain under General Wiley when the Guard was called out in the hard coal disturbances of the early 1900's.

In the 1940's he served as Solid Fuels Administrator for the Federal Government, with headquarters for a large section of western Pennsylvania at Altoona.

Mr. Gingery was a talented violinist and played with many nonprofessional musical groups from time to time.

The son of the late Dorsey J. and Ada (Albert) Gingery, he was married to the former Miss Anna Leavy who survives.

He also leaves two daughters, Mrs. A. A. (Sarah) Walker, Columbus, Ohio, and Mrs. James W. (Mary Louise) Carpenter, Cleveland, Ohio, and two sons, Don E. Gingery, Chevy Chase, Md., and Hugh A. Gingery, Rockville, Md. There are 13 grandchildren. In addition to his parents, a sister, Mrs. Lena Rhea, preceded him in death.

Mr. Gingery was a member of Trinity Methodist Church and of B.P.O. Elks No. 540 of Clearfield.

Funeral services will be held from the Fred B. Leavy Funeral Home Wednesday morning at 11 o'clock with the Revs. H. W. Glassco, D.D., and W. W. Banks officiating. Burial will be in Hillcrest Cemetery.

Friends will be received at the funeral home tonight from 7 to 9 o'clock; Tuesday from 3 to 5 and 7 to 9 p.m. and until the hour of service Wednesday.

TELECASTING AND BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to announce to the House that in the special order just granted for tomorrow I intend to discuss the rules of the House with respect to the power of committees to permit telecasting and broadcasting of their public hearings.

This subject has been one of some controversy over the past decade, and now that we have a new occupant of the chair I hope that early in this session he will have an occasion to express his views and rule on this very important subject. I hope all Members who may be interested in this subject will participate in the discussion tomorrow.

NONE IS SO BLIND AS HE WHO WILL NOT SEE

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the 2d session of the 87th Congress, I introduced H.R. 9567, a bill to rescind and revoke membership of the United States in the United Nations and the specialized agencies thereof and to repeal the Immunities Act relative thereto.

I introduced this resolution because it is my firm conviction that this Nation cannot survive as a Republic as long as we are shackled to an international organization by a treaty which supersedes our Constitution. As stated in the Declaration of Independence:

> When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

So in this resolution that same decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that I state the causes which impel me to seek this separation.

To prove my point, I submit the following facts for a candid review. Our Constitution provides:

> This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land.

Hence, any law enacted by Congress pursuant to a treaty becomes the supreme law of the land even though it would otherwise be unconstitutional.

The supremacy of laws under a treaty was clearly set forth in the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in 1920 in the Missouri versus Holland case wherein a Federal law, otherwise unconstitutional, was held valid because of a treaty between Canada and the United States. This decision clearly held that where there was a conflict between the provisions of our Constitution and the provisions of a treaty, this conflict must be resolved in favor of the treaty. This same doctrine has been extended to include executive agreements. The result of this situation has been to destroy our limited form of republican government and has denied to each State a republican form of government as guaranteed by the Constitution and has supplanted it with a government of unlimited powers which destroys the historical separation of executive, judicial, and legislative branches of our Government. This was certainly never envisioned by the framers of the Constitution.

When the United Nations Charter was submitted to the Senate for ratification, great stress was laid upon article 2, subparagraph 7, which states:

> Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present charter.

I do not believe that the U.S. Senate would have ratified this treaty without relying on the above-quoted paragraph. However, this paragraph has been completely and constantly ignored over the past 16 years and every organization, commission, and covenant flowing out of the United Nations Charter has been for the sole purpose of intervening in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the member nations as well as the several States of our own Union, completely destroying the sovereignty of each State to legislate in contravention of the treaty provisions. Mr. Moses Moskowitz, a noted internationalist, made the following statement in the American Bar Association Journal of April 1949 (35 A.B.A.J. 283, 285):

> Once a matter has become, in one way or another, the subject of regulation by the United Nations, be it by resolution of the General Assembly or by convention between member states at the instance of the United Nations, that subject ceases to be a matter being "essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the member states." As a matter of fact, such a position represents the official view of the United Nations, as well as of the member states that have voted in favor of the universal declaration of human rights. Hence, neither the declaration nor the projected covenant, nor any agreement that may be reached in the future on the machinery of implementation of human rights, can in any way be considered as violative of the letter or spirit of article 2 of the charter.

Following this, the Acheson State Department made this official declaration:

> There is now no longer any real difference between domestic and foreign affairs.

These statements plainly render article 2, subparagraph 7, of the charter meaningless.

John Foster Dulles, former Secretary of State, in a speech before the American Bar Association in Louisville, Ky., April 12, 1952, said:

> Treaty law can override the Constitution * * *. They (treaties) can cut across the rights given the people by the constitutional Bill of Rights.

This conversion of our limited republic to an unlimited democracy is a death blow to this Nation.

The realization of this tragedy was the reason for the proposal of the Bricker amendment nearly a decade ago. The Bricker amendment simply provided that when there was a conflict between the Constitution of the United States and a treaty, that conflict must be resolved in favor of the Constitution, and yet the Bricker amendment was defeated by a narrow margin under strong propaganda pressure from the Council on Foreign Relations and politicians who gloried in the unlimited power conveyed upon them by the United Nations Charter. There were just too many politicians and too few statesmen.

Now let us look at the record. According to Trygve Lie, longtime Secretary General of the United Nations, he stated flatly that there was a secret agreement between Alger Hiss and Molotov to the effect that the head of the United Nations military staff should always be a Communist. That agreement has never been broken, and we have had a succession of Communists filling that post, the present one being Mr. Arkadov. As a first consequence of this treasonous agreement, this country lost its first military engagement in Korea at a cost to this country of more than $20 billion and 145,000 American casualties, to say nothing of the honor and prestige of this Nation.

This was the first war in which we engaged, not as the United States military force, but as a United Nations force, although we contributed 90 percent of the men and the money. How convenient this was to the Communists to have one of their own men as head of the United Nations military staff, who reviewed all orders going from the Pentagon to General MacArthur and gave them to our enemy before General MacArthur received them. The enemy, which consisted of the Red Communist army and Russian equipment and fliers, was driven back to the Yalu River and given sanctuary on the other side. General MacArthur could have destroyed the enemy in short order had he been permitted to pursue them across the river from whence they came. Because General MacArthur could not in good conscience follow these orders, he was recalled and the Korean war ended in dismal defeat.

We were sold the U.N. on a promise of peace, but we failed to realize that this peace was to be on Communist terms; in fact, it was to be a total victory for the international Communist conspiracy. Our faith in this hope was so firm that we were lulled into a state of false security while the Communist world gobbled up 13 or 14 countries, bringing 800 million people under their domination. Russia has used the veto power nearly a hundred times. The United Nations has been completely unable to bring any degree of peace, and Russia itself has created 13 or 14 military conflicts between the East and the West.

The United Nations has not as yet passed a resolution of censorship against Russia for its Hungarian blood bath but rather stood idly by and helped to betray the Hungarian freedom fighters into the hands of Russia. It could not even get a censorship resolution against India for its military invasion of Portuguese enclaves.

Further, Mr. Speaker, what may I ask is the United Nations doing to prevent President Sukarno, of Indonesia, from carrying out his military attack against the island possession of Holland which lies more than a thousand miles away from Indonesia? Is colonialism under Holland a bad thing but colonialism under pro-Communist Indonesia a good thing? I have been unable to get any rationale on this question. In fact, it has passed no resolutions of condemnation against Russia or any of its satellites or against the so-called neutral countries but busies itself with resolutions of condemnation against our allies, such as Portugal, Holland, and France.

The power, the honor, and the prestige of America have fallen from their high point in 1945 to an absolute zero today.

The action in Katanga is nothing short of lunacy. Not a voice was raised in the United Nations when Syria withdrew from the United Arab Republic, but that same organization sent troops into the Congo to prevent self-determination of a civilized and Christian province which did not want to be a part of a Communist-controlled Congo.

Our defeat in the abortive Cuban invasion can be laid on the doorstep of the United Nations, as the United Nations treaty prohibits us from engaging in any military operations without the consent of the United Nations Security Council in which Russia holds the veto power. At this point, Mr. Speaker, may I remind the Members of the House and the people of America that the Cuban situation was not even mentioned in the President's state of the Union message on January 11 although the so-called white paper issued by the Department of State declares that Cuba constitutes a Sino-Soviet bridgehead in the Western Hemisphere and that the military power of Cuba is second only to that of the United States in the Western Hemisphere due, of course, to the millions of dollars of armaments, equipment, and technicians and money furnished by the Communist countries to Fidel Castro. Why, I ask, was not this clear and present danger to the security of our country discussed in the state of the Union message together with a proposal to dispel this danger?

Let me put this in very simple and understandable terms so that no one can misunderstand it. This situation is analogous to having a rattlesnake in the bedroom, and father ignores this danger to his family and starts blithely off on a big game hunt in Africa leaving mama and the children to cope with the rattlesnake in the bedroom.

Mr. Speaker, how silly can we get to relinquish the right to protect our Nation against Communist invasion in the Western Hemisphere? If we continue our membership in this organization, you can look to see this Nation condemned for having our naval base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. You can also look to see us condemned for owning the Panama Canal, and the same 66 votes which threw France out of its legal position in Bizerte can vote us out of Guantanamo and out of Panama. You can see, and with reason, Mexico demanding through the United Nations all of that territory taken from them under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo following the Mexican War in 1848. You can see Russia demanding the return of Alaska because we only paid them $17 million when it is really worth billions and certainly the American Indians, if they had representation in the United Nations, could demand the return of Manhattan Island together with the rest of the land that was legally theirs. You say this is fantastic? You would have said that the present situation in Cuba was a fantastic idea 10 years ago.

You can expect to see a one world government, Communist controlled, under the United Nations. You will see the United Nations run up astronomical debts which we, under the terms of the treaty, are bound to pay.

In a book by William Z. Foster, former head of the Communist Party, U.S.A., entitled "Toward Soviet America," he gives a complete blueprint of the conquest of America by the international Communist conspiracy. It is as clear a blueprint as given by Adolf Hitler in "Mein Kampf." Following are some of the things you may look for under the controlled Communist America as stated by William Z. Foster:

> The final aim of the Communist international is to overthrow world capitalism and replace it by world communism. * * * The Communist Party of the United States * * * is the American section of the Communist international. The Communist international carries out a united revolutionary program on a world scale. * * * The American Soviet government will be organized along the broad lines of the Russian Soviets. * * * Under the dictatorship all the capitalist parties—Republican, Democratic, Progressive, Socialist, etc.—will be liquidated. * * * Likewise, will be dissolved all other organizations—including chambers of commerce, employers' associations, Rotary Clubs, American Legion, YMCA, and such fraternal orders as the Masons, Odd Fellows, Elks, Knights of Columbus, etc.—lawyers will be abolished. The press, the motion pictures, the radio, the theater, will be taken over by the Government * * * Studies will be revolutionized, being cleansed of religious, patriotic and other features of the bourgeois ideology. * * * The decisions of the Soviets are enforced by the armed red guard. * * * Citizenship is restricted to those who do useful work, capitalists, landlords, clericals and other nonproducers being disfranchised. * * * In the so-called black belt of the South where the Negroes are in the majority, they will have the fullest right to govern themselves and also such white minorities as may live in this section. * * * Where the party elects its candidates to legislative bodies they make use of these public forums to bring forward the Communist program * * * the trade unions are the great schools for communism. * * * Religion has sanctified every war and every tyrant, no matter how murderous and reactionary. * * * The free American woman, like her Russian sister, will scorn the whole of bourgeois sex hypocrisy and prudery.

Our Declaration of Independence concludes with these words:

> And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

This is a full and complete acknowledgment of divine guidance. Nowhere in the United Nations Charter or any of its subsidiaries do you find any reference to a Supreme Being. The Bible says:

> Unless the Lord build an house, they labor in vain who build it.

There is, indeed, no evidence of the Lord's work in the United Nations.

I know that I will be accused of being irresponsible and fanatical, but I find myself in good company. The testimony of five of our greatest fighting men, General Clark, General Van Fleet, General Stratemeyer, Admiral Joy, and Lieutenant General Almond, before the Jenner committee in 1954, is summed up in the words of General Stratemeyer:

> We were required to lose the Korean war.

Lord Beaverbrook, noted British publisher, said:

> Here in New York City, you Americans have the biggest fifth column in the world—the United Nations.

At this point, may I say, Mr. Speaker, that Alger Hiss recommended the first 500 employees for the United Nations.

Then, after that, the late Robert Taft said:

> The U.N. has become a trap. Let's go it alone.

Herbert Hoover said:

> Unless the U.N. is completely reorganized without the Communist nations in it, we should get out of it.

Winston Churchill said:

> Don't pay attention to the U.N.

Charles de Gaulle has warned the U.N. to stay out of Algiers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the present management of the United Nations. Russia had been demanding a troika to supplant the U.N. Secretariat after the death of Hammarskjold. The failure of Russia to secure this troika was hailed as a great victory for the West, but was it? U Thant of Burma, a self-styled Marxist, was chosen and he agreed to invite a limited number of U.N. under secretaries "to act as my principal advisers on important questions." So far he has indicated two: Georgy P. Arkadov, a Communist from the Soviet Union, and Ralph Bunche of the United States. This was a Communist victory in that Russia now has its troika: one an avowed Marxist, the second a dedicated Communist, and the third with a pro-Communist bias. A résumé of Dr. Bunche's record, prepared by Archibald B. Roosevelt, son of Theodore Roosevelt, includes this paragraph:

> Dr. Bunche was part of the editorial apparatus of an openly Communist magazine, Science and Society, for over 4 years. He contributed to this publication and added his name and prestige as a professor of Howard University even after the Communists in their publication, The Communist, openly stated that Science and Society magazine had as its function "to help Marxward moving students and intellectuals to come closer to Marxism-Leninism; to bring Communist thought into academic circles."
>
> In a Senate probe by the Internal Security Subcommittee it was brought out that Dr. Bunche had repeatedly pressured persons in charge of U.N. employment to hire a notorious Communist agent, in spite of the fact that here was a derogatory report against the individual by a security agency of the Government.

Dr. Bunche was a high official in the Institute of Pacific Relations, an organization investigated thoroughly by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and described as follows:

> The effective leadership of the IPR used IPR prestige to promote the interests of the Soviet Union in the United States.

The object of this IPR was, in 1944, to force the Chinese Government to adopt reform measures and make concessions to the Chinese Communists which would pave the way for seizure by Soviet forces.

The IPR leadership sought to bring into public discussion at a vital meeting internal conditions in China so that Chiang Kai-shek would be criticized for the internal situation in China.

Dr. Bunche is on record as supporting the position of the IPR leadership in this matter.

It is my considered opinion that Dr. Bunche must be considered a security risk for our country in any position which he may hold.

This "troika" arrangement, engineered by the Communists, is frightening and devastating when you consider the United States of America has no foreign policy of its own except the United Nations.

Lincoln once said:

> If destruction be our lot, we ourselves must be the author and finisher.

This is it, Mr. Speaker. If this Republic is to perish, we ourselves, within our own household, will be the architect and finisher of our fate.

OUR RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important questions that will confront this Congress is the question in reference to our reciprocal trade agreements program. Shall we extend it? Shall we broaden it? Shall we discard it and give the President additional power to make trade treaties which is asked for?

This question has been presented pro and con in Nation's Business of January of this year.

The new majority whip has stated in his article that we should give the President extended powers. I have stated in my article that we should not, and that we should take back some of the constitutional powers given him in connection with reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to read both sides of the question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include my article in the RECORD, and I hope that the new whip on the majority side will also include his article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Nation's Business of January 1962:

BENEFIT TO UNITED STATES ONLY A MYTH

(By U.S. Representative NOAH M. MASON)

When the first extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act came to a vote in February 1937 I was 1 of 13 Members of the House who voted "No." It was my first important vote in Congress. I have never regretted that "no" vote.

In fact, I have voted "No" every time the act has been extended since then. Those first 13 "no" votes have gradually increased until today there are more than 200 votes in the House against further extension of the act.

The word "reciprocal" is a misnomer. It is anything but reciprocal. Our trade program has developed into a one-way street with the benefits all flowing one way—away from the United States. What has it accomplished?

The four reasons given for its enactment in the first place were that it would:

Advance world peace;

Make for world prosperity;

Bring about amity among the nations;

Remove world trade barriers.

Has it accomplished any one of these four objectives?

Has world peace been advanced? During the 27 years the act has been on the books we have had World War II. We have had the Korean war. We have had the so-called Spanish Civil War. We have had 14 years of war in Indochina. We have trouble between England and Egypt, between India and Pakistan. We have had Communist Russia extending her Iron Curtain until she now has control and domination over 900 million people instead of the 300 million people of the Soviet Union before the close of World War II. Can anyone truthfully say world peace has been advanced?

What about world prosperity, the second objective? Are we any nearer world prosperity today than we were in 1934 when the program was instituted?

To try to bring about world prosperity we have given away more than $140 billion in the past 20 years—$60 billion lend-lease during the war and $80 billion since—to say nothing of the $350 billion we have spent for national defense in the cold war.

Certainly our prosperity has not been advanced. We are more than $285 billion in debt today, which is more than all the other nations of the world put together owe—and more than twice as much as all the nations of Europe put together owe.

What about the third objective? Is good will or amity among the nations any nearer today than it was before 1934?

Let us be specific: Has the relationship between India and Pakistan improved since 1934? Between Palestine and Arabia? Between Italy and Yugoslavia? Between Communist China and Nationalist China? Between the United States and Cuba? What about our relations with Russia? Are they improved?

What about internal dissensions and strife? Italy with her 36 percent Communist vote in the last election; France with a national legislature that is 25 percent Communist? What about England torn between her socialist Labor Party and her Conservative Party?

Have good will and amity among men been advanced by the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act? My answer is: Not so anybody can notice it.

Finally, have world trade barriers been reduced or removed? Do we have a freer flow of goods today across national borders than we had in 1934?

While world tariff walls have been lowered, other obstacles or barriers more effective than tariffs have been erected in their place—among them import and export licenses, trade preferences, currency manipulations, multiple currencies, quotas, subsidies, state trading, and the European Common Market freezeout.

It is a fact, and we must face it, that, under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, practically every foreign country that has lowered its tariff walls has erected other barriers against U.S. imports, thereby nullifying the effect of their tariff concessions or reductions.

In the face of these facts—can anyone say our 27 years of experience under our so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been a success from the standpoint of its effect upon our American economy? Has it been a benefit to American workmen? The answer to both questions is "No."

In addition to the advantages we have given foreign nations under our Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, during the past 15 years we have poured out to war-torn foreign nations some $75 billion to rebuild their factories; to replace their wornout or war-destroyed machinery with our modern machinery—thus creating competitors for us in both foreign markets and in our own American market.

So, today we face the question: Is the United States being priced out of the world markets? It certainly begins to look that way. One thing is absolutely certain: The United States is facing increased competition in world markets.

Today, for the first time in our history, we have an unfavorable international payments balance. In 1958, our unfavorable world payments balance was $3.4 billion. In 1959, it was $3.7 billion. In 1960, it was $3.9 billion. What it was in 1961 we do not know exactly yet. But we do know that no nation on earth can run a deficit in its international balance of payments of this magnitude very long without going on the rocks.

Our Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act gave the President the power to regulate foreign trade. In effect, this put the State Department—an arm of the Executive—in control of American industry.

Under the guise of seeking allies and friends in an unfriendly world, the State Department has issued what may be termed death sentences to hundreds of American industries and destroyed millions of American jobs.

Consider these effects on American industries already dealt body blows by the tremendous imports flooding our markets today:

1. The American jeweled watch industry has been practically closed out as a result of our tariff reductions since 1934. We formerly had 20 jeweled watch companies in the United States; now we have only a handful. More than 80 percent of the American market for jeweled watches has been taken over by Swiss watch manufacturers.

2. Lowered tariffs in the fresh and frozen fish industry have resulted in such large fish imports at such cheap rates that American fishermen are unable to compete. Some of our largest fish processing plants have moved to other countries where wage rates are lower.

3. Widespread unemployment is now prevalent in our industries that make chinaware, pottery, glassware, and kitchen articles. All industries classified as handcrafts are affected, industries that depend largely upon hand skills. This is the direct result of tariff reductions and the greatly increased imports of those articles.

4. Thousands of lead and zinc miners are today out of work and on relief because of greatly increased imports of both lead and zinc. Recently our zinc factories have been reducing their working forces or going on a part-time basis because of the importation of processed zinc.

5. An excellent example of the way import licenses work is the American motorcycle. American producers formerly enjoyed a substantial market for motorcycles in Great Britain, in Australia, and in other British areas. The British duty on motorcycles was reduced under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, but the British import license system has absolutely shut American motorcycles out of British markets.

These are just a few samples of the direct results of our reciprocal trade agreements program, and the results are only beginning to become evident. In the face of these facts, can anyone say that our trade program has been a success? Should the program be continued? Should the President be given the power to lower our tariffs still further?

How can we maintain high wages for American workmen and high living standards for American people when we permit goods manufactured by foreign workmen working for low wages and farm products raised by farmers who for centuries have been living like serfs, to flood our markets and destroy the jobs upon which our workers depend? There is such a disparity in labor costs between European and American labor that three workers can be employed is Europe for what it costs to employ one in America.

The Constitution gives Congress, and not the Executive, the authority to set tariffs. Congress should no longer shirk its responsibility. Congress should assume that responsibility and through its arm—the U.S. Tariff Commission—repair the damage done by the misguided policies of the past 27 years.

I feel sure this will be done within a year or so. The exportation of American jobs and industry and the ever increasing importation of foreign-made goods to be sold on the American market will be one of the campaign issues next fall.

If we continue any longer on the path to economic destruction, more American capital will go overseas, more and more American businessmen will transfer their plants abroad, more and more American factories will close, and more and more American workers will be out of work. It is past time to act. We must repeal the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and do it now.

CASTRO'S CUBA

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the subject matter of President Kennedy's state of the Union message encompassed the globe and reached even to the moon. But it totally ignored a crucial threat 90 miles from our shores.

On the problem of Castro's Cuba the President offered only a thundering silence.

In his corresponding message a year ago, delivered 10 days after his inauguration, Mr. Kennedy at least cautiously acknowledged:

> In Latin America, Communist agents seeking to exploit that region's peaceful revolution of hope have established a base in Cuba.

This year, however, Cuba is not so much as mentioned.

The President voiced only the meaningless generalization—itself factually questionable, to say the least—that "the blight of communism has been increasingly exposed and isolated in the Americas." He did boast of our intervention against the non-Communist dictatorship in the Dominican Republic. And, of course, he proposed more billions in U.S. aid to Latin America.

But there was not a word about Castro's now admitted Sino-Soviet ties—or about his now openly avowed Communist loyalties and objectives.

Not a word about the position the United States will take in the upcoming Inter-American Foreign Ministers' Conference convening in Uruguay, January 22, ostensibly to deal with the Cuban threat. A news report from Mexico City, published in a Washington newspaper the same day the state of the Union message was delivered, claimed that a proposal by Central American countries, calling for condemnation of Castro, expulsion of Cuba from the Organization of American States, and diplomatic and economic sanctions against the Castro regime, had been turned down by our State Department on the specious grounds that it could not muster the necessary two-thirds vote.

Most shocking of all, there was not a word in the President's message about a U.S. State Department white paper issued only 8 days earlier, reciting with startling frankness, accuracy, and detail, the Castro-Communist tieup and threat in this hemisphere. The authorship of this white paper seems veiled in mystery. Can it be that patriotic realism has actually infiltrated the State Department? One wonders whether or when someone has been—or will be—fired for so bluntly telling the truth.

Here are some excerpts from this amazing document:

> From the time the Castro regime came to power it has deliberately tried to undermine established governments in Latin America and destroy the inter-American system. In the process it has associated itself with the Sino-Soviet bloc in an active partnership and adopted totalitarian policies and techniques to cement dictatorial control over the Cuban people. This situation confronts the nations of the Western Hemisphere with a grave and urgent challenge.
>
> As a bridgehead of Sino-Soviet imperialism within the inner defenses of the Western Hemisphere, Cuba under the Castro regime represents a serious threat to the individual and collective security of the American Republics.

This white paper details the massive military buildup which has occurred in Cuba under Castro. It points out that Cuba's ground forces are now larger than those of any American Republic, except the United States, and at least 10 times larger than that of any previous Cuban

Government. It cites major contributions of the Communist bloc to this buildup. It cites pledges of military support for Cuba by both Soviet Russia and Red China. It spells out all aspects of the Communist takeover in Cuba in frightening detail. It even records Castro's Communist associations dating back to 1948.

Yet Cuba and Castro are not so much as mentioned in President Kennedy's state of the Union message—nor is there any hint of a forthcoming communication to the Congress on the subject.

Why, Mr. President?

And an even more urgent and insistent question:

When, Mr. President?

NEED FOR THOROUGH STUDY OF BOND PURCHASE PROPOSAL

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, there had been considerable indication in the few weeks prior to our return that the Congress would be asked to approve purchase of approximately half of the $200 million worth of bonds issued by the United Nations to finance its operations over the next 18 months. The state of the Union message put an end to any speculation in this regard, the President indicating his belief that participation in the bond issue is in the best interests of the United States.

Although I have consistently endorsed our support of the United Nations in the past, at this point in time I have some serious reservations as to the wisdom of any such financial commitment. I am certainly willing to hear the administration's case for its position, but United Nations activities of late have surely left ample room for doubt as to whether resort to deficit financing by that organization should be condoned.

I do not profess to know all there is to know about the intricacies of our relationship with the United Nations. I do not pretend to be aware of all the information that is at the fingertips of those who manufacture our policy. Conceivably some of the knowledge necessary to the making of intelligent decisions is peculiar to the executive branch. I merely state my belief that, based on the information available to the public thus far, there is considerable cause for doubt as to the wisdom of certain U.N. activities and the wisdom of our support, financial and otherwise, of those activities.

I feel that the faith and hopes which the American people have reposed in the United Nations have been shaken severely. There is much confusion and lack of understanding. It is time to clear the air.

In my opinion it is imperative that we make a careful and deliberate reassessment of every phase of our United Nations policy. The activities of that organization in the Congo, its reaction to the Goa affair, the failure of roughly 80 percent of its members to meet their financial obligations—these are but a few of the matters to which I feel Congress must devote serious study before making any additional financial commitments of the nature just mentioned. It is time to be frank and realistic. It is time to openly and objectively reassess the potential of the United Nations as an organ for peace. It is essential that Congress go to the very heart of our relationship with the United Nations before we extend and commit ourselves in ways that could prove eminently unsound.

I would like to include at this point in the Record an editorial by Mr. Alexander F. Jones entitled "The International Patsy," which recently appeared in the Syracuse (N.Y.) Herald-Journal:

THE INTERNATIONAL PATSY

(By Alexander F. Jones)

> If there is to be peace in the new year it must come through action by the majority of members in the United Nations.
>
> That action will not be promoted by any attempt of the United States to buy it.
>
> The United Nations is on the verge of bankruptcy with 82 of 104 members in arrears of dues, or openly refusing to pay for costs of the Congo and Gaza Strip operations.
>
> To restore some semblance of financial stability the General Assembly has authorized U Thant, Secretary General, to issue $200 million in long-term bonds to make up present deficits.
>
> And the White House and Harlan Cleveland, Under Secretary of State, are urging the United States, through congressional action, to buy half that issue as "our fair share."
>
> That, in my opinion, is the first of the new year irresolutions and if it is to be followed by any more softheaded conclusions we will be doing more to bring about the dissolution of the United Nations than any of its open enemies.
>
> No one yet has ever been able to buy genuine respect, be it any individual, a corporation, a state, a nation, or a world organization like United Nations.
>
> When 82 of 104 nations disregard their financial obligations and refuse to pay up the core of your peace apple is rotten and the guilty members who strut around the United Nations are smirking deadbeats. They exert their constant under-the-table efforts to defeat honest peace efforts.
>
> When a man refuses to pay the rent his furniture is put on the street.
>
> When a corporation cannot meet commitments the bankruptcy courts take over.
>
> When a nation rejects its currency and debt obligations its fiscal responsibility is imperiled.
>
> There is not a single nation in arrears to the United Nations, with the exception of tribal splinter regions that do not deserve to be called separate countries, that cannot pay its just dues in the peace organization. If there is just a nation than can prove its case, the United States could make a direct loan for that purpose.
>
> But to allow the Soviet Union, the Communist bloc, and the Asian-African bloc to refuse to pay for the Congo and Gaza Strip costs for political reasons is weakness of a frightening nature.
>
> We would gain no prestige or credit for trying to hold the United Nations together by picking up half the deficit. We have one vote in the U.N., just like Chad, the desert oasis with a population of 100,000 nomads and 300,000 camels, goats, and hyenas.
>
> What the United Nations needs first of all is a hard-shelled treasurer empowered to make members realize that status there is no rejection privilege extended to any country that refuses to pay because it disagrees with a majority political or military action.
>
> Let such an official get on the General Assembly dais and read the list of delinquents and why they refuse.
>
> What this situation requires is some plain old-fashioned American guts.
>
> That type of intestinal fortitude exists in Great Britain, where Lord Home, Foreign Secretary, is calling a spade a spade and earning the cheers of his countrymen.
>
> "There is a double standard growing up in the United Nations whereby British colonialism is criticized and Soviet Union imperialism ignored." Said Lord Home, "The U.N. is embarking on a reckless and dangerous practice of passing resolutions careless of peace or security.
>
> "A resolution passed by the General Assembly stated that 'inadequacy of political, economic, social, or educational preparedness should never serve as a pretext for delaying independence.' This total lack of responsibility has resulted in the chaos in the Congo.
>
> "And for the first time U.N. members are supporting the use of force to achieve national ends. Goa is a case in point. For whatever the provocations suffered by India there is no doubt at all her actions were a direct breach of the U.N. Charter and international law.
>
> "There seems to be a code of behavior where there is one rule for the Communist bully, who rules by fear, and another for the democracies, because their stock in trade is reason."
>
> It was Lord Home who made public the 82-out-of-104 delinquency figure.
>
> And now Congress is going to be asked to buy half the U.N. bond issue—American taxpayers picking up the check for Lord Home's "Communist bullies," the traitors of New Delhi, the anti-Semitists of the Near East, the African tribesmen parading around the General Assembly in white nightgowns.
>
> What freedom or liberty or measure of our self-respect is there in constantly paying off sneering enemies and international confidence men in what is nothing but veneered blackmail?
>
> It is my hope some Senator or Congressman will get up on his hindfeet, demand a full explanation of U.N. delinquencies and why, and paint the situation there as it presently exists—just for our own self-respect.
>
> It gripes some of us to see bleeding hearts continue to make us the eternal international patsy.

"UNCERTAINTIES UNDER OUR ANTIMONOPOLY LAWS" ADDRESS OF COMMISSIONER EVERETTE MACINTYRE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, remarking on the confused state of our law in a field other than antitrust, Mr. Justice Jackson observed:

> If there is one thing that the people are entitled to expect from their lawmakers, it is rules of law that will enable individuals to tell whether they are married and, if so, to whom?

Almost, but not quite as important, are guides in the antitrust area.

Inasmuch as the antimonopoly laws are necessarily couched in general language, it gives rise to uncertainties regarding the legal status of certain acts and practices. This, in turn, leaves businessmen uncertain about the application of the law. Fortunately, Commissioner Everette MacIntyre of the Federal Trade Commission has given much thought to this problem.

In a truly brilliant address that Commissioner MacIntyre delivered at the winter conference of the American Marketing Association, in New York City on December 27, 1961, he made the exceedingly valuable suggestion that an administrative agency, such as the Federal Trade Commission, be looked to for help in solving the problem. Such administrative agency by taking action from day to day could be looked to for spelling out and specifying what trade restraints, which if continued, are likely to lead to violations of the antimonopoly laws. In this address he elaborated upon the remarks he made when he was sworn in as a member of the FTC and stated that this action could take the form of substantive rulemaking by the agency, and thereby businessmen would be assisted in avoiding the continuation of practices which might make them subject to possible punitive proceedings.

Because of the importance of Commissioner MacIntyre's address and also because he so ably served as general counsel to the House Small Business Committee, I wish to use this means of calling my colleagues' attention to it.

The address is as follows:

UNCERTAINTIES UNDER OUR ANTIMONOPOLY LAWS

(Remarks by Everette MacIntyre, Commissioner, Federal Trade Commission, at the Winter Conference of the American Marketing Association, New York, N.Y., December 27, 1961)

Businessmen and others of the public seek but do not find an unqualified answer to the question, "What trade restraints and monopolistic acts are unlawful?" It requires no great amount of legal research to find out why that is true.

The Anglo-Saxon common law has dealt with trade practices and monopolistic acts over a period of centuries. However, under the common law, trade practices and monopolistic acts are unlawful only when employed with the intent to coerce or damage a competitor or the promotion of a monopoly.

Statutory law in this country regarding the subject is, with the exception of a few provisions applying to particular acts, almost as general and indefinite as the common law. Of course, when the Sherman Antitrust Act was passed in 1890, it was thought that the language of its provisions made more definite the law for the regulation of interstate and foreign commerce. Particular basis for that thought is found in the words of the first section of that law to the following effect: "Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy in restraint of trade or commerce * * * is hereby declared to be illegal," and the words of section 2 to the effect that "every person who shall monopolize, or attempt to monopolize, or combine or conspire with any other person or persons, to monopolize any part of the trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding $5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court."

First, proposals were made that the Sherman Act be amended to provide for some exemptions from its application to certain conditions and practices. Those proposals were rejected. Then proposals were made to make the application of the Sherman Act more flexible by making it effective only where trade restraints and monopolistic conditions were found to be unreasonable.

At first the Supreme Court rejected proposals that it make the Sherman Antitrust Act indefinite by reading into it an interpretation which would make it applicable only to unreasonable restraint of trade.[1]

These proposals would have amended the Sherman Act to permit the continuation of a number of combinations in restraint of trade.[2]

Although these proposals were not acted on by the Congress, the law, through the process of judicial interpretation, was made almost as general and broad in its sweep as the common law of England and this country. A part of this development was the decision by the Court in the Standard Oil case.[3] In that case the "rule of reason" was read into the Sherman Act and that law was, thereby, made to apply only to unreasonable restraints of trade. It was reasoned that the Sherman Act "* * * followed the language of development of the law of England." In that connection the Court held:

"The statute under this view evidenced the intent not to restrain the right to make and enforce contracts, whether resulting from combination or otherwise, which did not unduly restrain interstate or foreign commerce, but to protect that commerce from being restrained by methods, whether old or new, which would constitute an interference that is an undue restraint.

* * * * *

"Thus not specifying but indubitably contemplating and requiring a standard it follows that it was intended that the standard of reason which had been applied at the common law and in this country in dealing with subjects of the character embraced by the statute, was intended to be the measure used for the purpose of determining whether in a given case a particular act had or had not brought about the wrong against which the statute provided."

Thus it is seen that the Sherman Act thus interpreted is as Mother Hubbard's dress, covering almost everything but touching nothing in particular. The uncertainties inherent in such a situation were aptly described in the opinion of Justice Harlan, a member of the Supreme Court who participated in the decision in the Standard Oil case. He said:

"To inject into the act the question of whether an agreement or combination is reasonable or unreasonable would render the act as a criminal or penal statute indefinite and uncertain, and hence, to that extent, utterly nugatory and void, and would practically amount to a repeal of that part of the act. * * * And while the same technical objection does not apply to civil prosecutions, the injection of the rule of reasonableness would lead to the greatest variableness and uncertainty in the enforcement of the law. The defense of reasonable restraint would be made in every case and there would be as many different rules of reasonableness as cases, courts and juries. What one court or jury might deem unreasonable another court or jury might deem reasonable. A court or jury in Ohio might find a given agreement or combination unreasonable."

The Federal Trade Commission Act is couched in general terms, making unlawful unfair methods of competition and unfair and deceptive acts and practices. The Supreme Court has ruled that the words "unfair methods of competition" are not defined by the statute and their exact meaning is in dispute. However, they have held them to be applicable to practices opposed to good morals because characterized by deception, bad faith, or oppression, or as against public policy because of their dangerous tendency unduly to hinder competition or create monopoly. Woodrow Wilson appreciated the need for businessmen to be more precisely informed about the meaning of these general terms of the law. For that reason, in 1914 he asked two things:

(1) He asked that some additional legislation be enacted, stating that—

"The business of the country awaits also, has long awaited, and has suffered because it could not obtain further and more explicit legislative definition of the policy and meaning of the existing antitrust law. Nothing hampers business like uncertainty. Nothing daunts or discourages it like the necessity to take chances, to run the risk of falling under the condemnation of the law before it can make sure just what the law is.

* * * *

"Surely we are sufficiently familiar with the actual processes and methods of monopoly and of the many hurtful restraints of trade to make definition possible, at any rate up to the limits of what experience has disclosed. These practices, being now abundantly disclosed, can be explicitly and item by item forbidden by statute in such terms as will practically eliminate uncertainty, the law itself and the penalty being made equally plain.[4]

* * * *

"I think it will be easily agreed that we should let the Sherman antitrust law stand, unaltered, as it is, with its debatable ground about it, but that we should as much as possible reduce the area of that debatable ground by further and more explicit legislation; and should also supplement that great act by legislation which will not only clarify it but also facilitate its administration and make it fairer to all concerned."[5]

---

[1] *U.S.* v. *Trans-Missouri Freight Assn.*, 166 U.S. 290 (1897); *U.S.* v. *Joint Traffic Assn.*, 171 U.S. 505 (1898).

[2] In 1909, S. 6440, introduced in the 60th Cong., 2d sess., proposed to amend the Sherman Act to give all corporations except railroad companies (already subject to the Interstate Commerce Act) immunity from antitrust prosecution unless notified within 30 days by the Commissioner of Corporations, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, that any proposed contract or combination filed with the Commissioner of Corporations was in unreasonable restraint of trade. It would have limited the amount of recovery in a civil action for injury to business under section 7 to single instead of threefold damages and, according to the Senate Judiciary report on it, would have provided "that no prosecutions under the first six sections of the act should be maintained for past offenses unless the contract, or combination, be in unreasonable restraint of trade * * *." S. Rept. No. 848, 60th Cong. 2d sess. 9 (1909). The Senate Judiciary Committee rejected the proposed amendment, saying that to make "civil and criminal prosecution hinge on the question of reasonableness or unreasonableness * * * destroys * * * the provisions of the act as to criminal prosecutions, and renders them nugatory, and opens the door wide to doubt and uncertainty as to civil prosecutions * * *. The defense of reasonable restraint would be made in every case and there would be as many different rules of reasonableness as cases, courts, and juries." Guthrie, Constitutionality of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act of 1890, 11 Harv. L. Rev. 80 (1897) at 9–11.

[3] 221 U.S. 1.

[4] "The New Democracy," Woodrow Wilson, vol. 1, p. 85.

[5] Ibid., p. 75.

Congress responded to these suggestions by taking under consideration proposals contained in a bill introduced by Congressman Clayton, of Alabama. Out of that grew the Clayton Antitrust Act, among the provisions of which are those condemning price discriminations, tieing and exclusive dealing arrangements, certain mergers and acquisitions, and interlocking directorates.[6]

(2) Wilson also asked that a Federal Trade Commission be created. He wanted such an agency, among other things, to assist businessmen in securing a better understanding of their responsibility under the law. In that connection, he stated:

"It is of capital importance that the businessmen of this country should be relieved of all uncertainties of law with regard to their enterprises and investments and a clear path indicated which they can travel without anxiety. It is as important that they should be relieved of embarrassment and set free to prosper as that private monopoly should be destroyed. The ways of action should be thrown wide open." [7]

On September 2, 1916, in his speech of acceptance on renomination to the Presidency, Wilson restated his view of the function of the Commission in the following terms:

"A Trade Commission has been created with powers of guidance and accommodation which have relieved businessmen of unfounded fears and set them upon the road of hopeful and confident enterprise.[8]

"We have created, in the Federal Trade Commission, a means of inquiry and of accommodation in the field of commerce which ought both to coordinate the enterprises of our traders and manufacturers and to remove the barriers of misunderstanding and of a too technical interpretation of the law. * * * The Trade Commission substitutes counsel and accommodation for the harsher processes of legal restraint." [9]

It is clear that it was intended by Wilson that with the establishment of the Federal Trade Commission we would have an agency which would apply the law against unfair trade practices on a broad basis in an effort to eradicate harmful practices in their incipiency. It was thought this would be done by specifying harmful trade practices item by item. In this way, it was thought, businessmen would be assisted in avoiding the continuation of practices which would make them liable as criminals under the Sherman Antitrust Act.

Unless the Federal Trade Commission undertakes the specification of harmful trade practices item by item, which probably would lead to trade restraints violative of the Sherman Act, businessmen will be left without guidelines of what is legal and what is illegal under our antimonopoly laws.

It is clear that the national public policy against monopolies and monopolistic practices and conditions precludes any thought of cutting down the scope of the sweep of the Sherman Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act. On that point, the Chief of the Antitrust Division of the U.S. Department of Justice has made this statement:

"When asked for comment on a legislative proposal for antitrust exemption, we will take a long, hard look. With exceptions already covered by existing laws, we have seen no persuasive case for compromising any antitrust principles in special cases." [10]

From existing circumstances and our experience, it is clear that public policy will continue to dictate that our antimonopoly laws continue with their broad sweep covering a multitude of unspecified trade practices and conditions. It cannot be expected that the Congress will undertake to specify in new legislation each of the trade practices and conditions likely to fall within the broad sweep of the Sherman Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act. Therefore, businessmen and the public are unlikely to enjoy flexibility, breadth and certainty under our antimonopoly laws unless there is action from day to day by an administrative law agency such as the Federal Trade Commission, devoted to spelling out and specifying what trade restraints and conditions are unlawful, and aiding in the establishment of guidelines for avoidance of pitfalls leading to violations. Reference has been made to the responsibility of the Commission to proceed against unfair trade practices on an industrywide basis. Hope has been expressed that the Federal Trade Commission will give attention to its responsibilities in this regard.

Considerable discussion has centered on the power of the Federal Trade Commission to make substantive rules which would cover industrywide unfair trade practices. In this discussion, section 6(g) of the Federal Trade Commission Act has been cited. It provides:

"SEC. 6. That the Commission shall also have power"—(g) From time to time to classify corporations and to make rules and regulations for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act."

It is reasoned that this provision of the law could be relied upon to aid the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities in prohibiting the unfair methods of competition and unfair and deceptive acts and practices made unlawful by section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

This idea is not new. For a substantial period of time the Commission has utilized a trade practice conference procedure for the purpose of informing itself about industrywide practices alleged to be unfair. It has proceeded to utilize that information in formulating statements of what the Commission believed to be applicable as law to the trade practices in question. These statements were designated as trade practice rules and were designed to afford guidance to industries and enable them to voluntarily operate in compliance with the interpretations of the law by the Commission and the courts. It was hoped that through such advisory rulemaking procedures there would be voluntary compliance with the acts administered by the Commission.

The Commission as early as 1918, some 3 years after its organization and nearly 1 year before its first formal case was decided in the courts,[11] was confronted with an industrywide practice of misbranding gold finger rings. In lieu of proceeding formally against the individual manufacturers involved, the Commission designated a Commissioner to hold conferences with members of the industry and recommend an acceptable disposition of the entire matter, which would end the abuse and eliminate the resultant consumer deception. As a result of that conference, the members agreed upon proper markings for their products which were acceptable to the Commission, and that agreement became effective on May 1, 1919. The records indicate that the agreement was 100 percent effective and ended the abuse.

Since that early beginning there has gradually evolved the Commission's present trade practice conference program. In the intervening years, in excess of 250 U.S. industries have, at one time or another, operated under various forms of trade practice rules. Today, rules are in effect for 163 industries. Huston Thompson, Chairman of the Commission in 1921, has written that the trade practice conference procedure was developed to meet situations where one member of an industry started an unfair method of competition and others in the industry were forced to adopt it in the interest of self-preservation, with the result that the Commission would be deluged with complaints.[12]

Trade practice conferences have been initiated at all stages in the progress of unfair practices within an industry. They have run the gamut of fairly standard rules where the law has been well settled in case decisions and the practices fairly uniform to the detailed working out of express standards for guidance of industries early in the history of the emerging industry and in the initial stages of unfair practices within the industry.

In more recent years, the trade practice rules have been more often utilized to afford detailed and specific guidance to industry on specific problems of compliance which were peculiar to the industries affected and in the early stages of the use of unfair methods. Illustrative of this trend was the promulgation of the rayon rules.[13] This new industry, producing a product which closely resembled silk in appearance and texture, was susceptible of deceiving consumers by its appearance alone, and, additionally, terminology was developing in the many industries using the product which enhanced that deception. The rayon rules carefully spelled out detailed instructions concerning the requirements of effective marking of products made of the material and prohibited specific designations. These rules have been revised through the years to meet additional problems with the technological developments of composition and manufacture, and they were a forerunner of the present Textile Products Labeling Act.[14]

A cursory examination of trade practice rules enacted in the past 10 years shows that the Trade Practice Conference procedure has been used increasingly in industry after industry to afford guidance to members in new industries or where practices deemed violative of acts administered by the Commission were in the initial stages.

An example is the recently promulgated rules for the pleasure boat industry.[15] That industry, as you know, has had tremendous growth in the past few years. Competitive as well as deceptive practices grew with the expansion of the industry. They involved representations as to power, safety, composition of hull, durability, and confusing guarantees. In cooperation with that industry, the rules carefully spelled out answers to all of these and other problems, which, if not solved, would have resulted in involvement with the Commission by a substantial segment of the industry and multiple practices.

It is difficult, if not impossible, in the case of many rules to evaluate their effectiveness for a number of reasons:

1. No accurate measurement of the number of violations existing prior to promulgation of the rules is available;

2. In most such proceedings there is no thorough complete industrywide investigation after the promulgation to determine

---

[6] 15 U.S.C. 12–19.

[7] Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. XVI, Bureau of National Literature, Inc., pp. 7909–7910.

[8] Ibid., p. 8151.

[9] Ibid., p. 8158.

[10] Hon. Lee Loevinger, Assistant Attorney General, record of the hearings before American Bar Association, section of antitrust law, vol. 18 pp. 103–104, Apr. 6, 1961.

[11] *Sears Roebuck and Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission*, 285 Fed. 307, C.C.A. 7 (1919).

[12] January-February 1940, George Washington Law Review, pp. 268, 269.

[13] Rayon Industry, promulgated Oct. 26, 1937.

[14] Textile Fiber Products Identification Act (approved on Sept. 2, 1958, 85th Cong., 2d sess.; 15 U.S.C. secs, 70, 72, Stat. 1717), promulgated on Mar. 3, 1960.

[15] Promulgated on Aug. 4, 1961.

the number and nature of continuing violations; and

3. In increasing numbers of industries, rules involving specific practices have been developed early in their usage, and their service lies not only in ending existing abuses, but it is frequently much greater in the prevention of future abuses.

Students of FTC procedure and the laws it administers have praised the benefits of the Trade Practice Conference procedure.

An article in the George Washington Law Review[16] concludes that the procedure "has performed for industry and the public a great educational service, the value of which in eliminating unethical practices, and cutting the cost of law enforcement, cannot be overestimated."

The Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure[17] made this statement:

"Even where formal proceedings are fully available, informal procedures constitute the vast bulk of administrative adjudication and are truly the lifeblood of the administrative process. No study of administrative procedure can be adequate if it fails to recognize this fact and focus attention upon improvement of these stages."

In a number of cases where the courts have had occasion to consider the applicability of trade practice rules in particular cases, they have commented favorably on the rules and upheld the principles enunciated in them.[18]

In addition to these cases, the value of interpretive opinions and rules has been often considered and examined by the Supreme Court. Perhaps the Supreme Court's opinion of such procedures is best summed up in the case of *Skidmore* v. *Swift & Co.*[19] as follows:

"The Administrator's policies are made in pursuance of official duty, based upon more specialized experience and broader investigations and information than is likely to come to a judge in a particular case. They do determine the policy which will guide applications for enforcement by injunction on behalf of the Government. * * * This court has long given considerable and in some cases decisive weight to Treasury Decisions and to interpretative regulations of the Treasury and of other bodies that were not of adversary origin.

"We consider that the rulings, interpretations and opinions of the Administrator under this Act, while not controlling upon the courts by reason of their authority, do constitute a body of experience and informed judgment to which courts and litigants may properly resort for guidance.

On September 15, 1955, the Commission initiated a new method of interpretive rules in the form of Guides.

The first guide adopted on the above date covered cigarette advertising. Prior to the adoption of those guides, the Commission had obtained final cease and desist orders in seven cases and negotiated 17 stipulations involving cigarette advertising.

In 1954 and early 1955, the cigarette industry embarked upon an intensive advertising program of filter-tip cigarettes. That advertising campaign coincided with widely disseminated information linking cigarette smoking to adverse effects on health.

Since the adoption of the cigarette advertising guides, in excess of 200 individual instances of questionable claims have been promptly discontinued when brought informally to the advertiser's attention. Of equal or greater importance is the fact that in substantial numbers of instances where new advertising themes in that industry were contemplated, they were and are presented to the Commission staff in advance and then conformed to the informally expressed views of the staff, thus avoiding the dissemination of deceptive claims in the first instance.

The Commission's files are replete with information to the effect that in many instances the wide publicity given to the Commission's Trade Practice Rules and its statements of guides, have had a wholesome effect in improving compliance with law. However, the sad fact about the matter is that in a number of very important areas, industry-wide practices adverse to the trade generally, and apparently inconsistent with the law, have been continued despite the full light of pitiless publicity of the Commission's Trade Practice Rules and Guides. In these instances, it would appear that what is needed is some mechanism to enforce, on an industry-wide basis, a compliance with the law against unwholesome and destructive trade practices. This is particularly true in those instances where the use of the unfair trade practice involves large numbers, perhaps hundreds, in a given industry. Obviously, it is impractical and, perhaps, unfair, to proceed against one or two in such a situation through litigation, and leave the others free to continue the questionable practices.

In recent months, concern with this crisis in the administrative process has deepened. More than ever it is believed that these untested but promising rulemaking procedures should be explored for use as a supplement to adjudicative work.

Pursuant to specific statutory authority, the Federal Trade Commission and other administrative agencies have already engaged in broad-scale substantive rulemaking; and these processes have consistently been validated in the courts. Examples are this Commission's rules under Fur, Wool, Textile, and Flammable Fabrics Acts, as well as far-reaching rulemaking activities of the Food and Drug Administration, Treasury Department, and Internal Revenue Service.

While it may be contended that these are specialized grants of power in closely defined regulatory contexts, it is believed that adequate substantive rulemaking authority exists under the Commission's organic statute to permit this kind of rulemaking proceedings. Reference is made to the broad powers of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. Also, as has been stated, section 6(g) of the Federal Trade Commission Act empowers the Commission "from time to time to classify corporations and to make rules and regulations for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act." This authority, in terms, is plenary; and there is nothing elsewhere in the statute to suggest that Congress did not intend section 6(g) be given an expansive construction consistent with the purposes of the legislation. Thus, the courts have already made it clear that the Commission's Rules of Practice, properly adopted pursuant to the basic statutory grant of section 6(g), have the force and effect of law.[20] Should it be conceded, short of a judicial declaration, that substantive rules properly adopted under section 6(g)'s grant would be any less valid? The public interest now commands an early test of whether sections 5 and 6(g) afford sorely needed substantive rulemaking remedies in aid of lagging quasi-judicial authority.

The rulemaking process, as has often been pointed out, is that aspect of the administrative process most analogous to the statute-making power of the legislature. It is thus to be contrasted with the administrative adjudicative process, which most resembles the decisionmaking of the courts. Too often, in stressing adjudicative powers and in analogizing our activities to those of the courts, we fail to remember that both functionally and conceptually we are fundamentally an agent of the legislature. As the Supreme Court said in *Humphrey's Executor* v. *United States*,[21] the Commission's duties are not only quasi-judicial but also quasi-legislative.

Professor Fuchs defines rulemaking as "the issuance of regulations or the making of determinations which are addressed to indicated but unnamed and unspecified persons or situations;"[22] and another commentator states that "What distinguishes legislation from adjudication is that the former affects the rights of individuals in the abstract and must be applied in a further proceeding before the legal position of any particular individual will be definitely touched by it; while adjudication operates concretely upon individuals in an individual capacity."[23]

Rulemaking and adjudication are necessary and complementary weapons in the arsenal of administrative powers. So long as appropriate procedural safeguards are provided, the agency's choice of one mode or the other is not subject to judicial attack. In the noted Storer case,[24] for example, we find a dramatic example of the Government's using rulemaking and adjudication as its one-two punch. There the Federal Communications Commission, without hearing, denied Storer's application for an additional television station license. The sole basis for this denial was that granting the application would violate a Commission rule against a multiple ownership of stations. That rule had been enacted earlier the same day.[25]

On November 30, 1961, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, in the case of *Wisconsin* v. *Federal Power Commission, et al.*—Fed. 2d—(1961), held that an action by the Federal Power Commission to set guidelines by which it will be controlled in its regulatory functions is within its authority under the Natural Gas Act. Under that act the Federal Power Commission was authorized to make determinations regarding rates, charges, or classifications observed, charged, or controlled by any natural gas company, and in that connection to determine the justness and reasonableness of what the gas company demanded. The Power Commission found that by proceeding against individual companies through the use of the case-by-case method, it was failing to carry out effectively the congressional mandate. It chose to meet the problem by a rulemaking process by which it would make a determination of what was reasonable and make its determination applicable to the operations of all of the companies operating in a particular area. This the court held it may do under the general terms of the Natural Gas Act.

There are, of course, a number of questions which arise in connection with possible use of rulemaking procedures, e.g., whether rules would have retroactive effect; [26] whether they would be "substantive" or "interpretative"; [27] the extent to which a reviewing court will be free to substitute its judgment for that of the Commission.[28] To meet the requirements of due process, a substantive rule would necessarily be found upon clearly defined standards and the rule itself expressed in such definite terms that persons subject to it would have no doubt about its meaning. But it seems that these are largely questions relating to the ultimate effect of a particular rule or to the allowable scope of judicial review, and it is believed we should not permit such questions to obscure the need for such powers or to weaken our resolution to proceed with an appropriate test of our existing authority.

---

[16] Silver Anniversary Edition, January–February 1940, p. 450.

[17] Final report published 1961, on p. 4.

[18] *Prima Products, Inc., et al* v. *Federal Trade Commission,* 209 Fed. (2d) 405, (2d Cir., Jan. 7, 1954).

Northern Feather Works, Inc. and Sumergrade & Sons v. *F.T.C.*, 234 F. (2d) 335 (3d Cir., 1956).

Lazar et al, v. *F.T.C.*, 240 F. (2d) 176, (7th Cir., 1957).

[19] 323 U.S. 134 (1944).

[20] *Kritzik* v. *Federal Trade Commission,* 125 F. 2d, 351 (7th Cir. 1942); *Hill* v. *Federal Trade Commission,* 124 F. 2d 104 (5th Cir. 1941).

[21] 295 U.S. 602, 625 (1935).

[22] Fuchs, Procedure in Administrative Rule-Making, 52 Harv. L. Rev. 259, 265 (1938).

[23] Dickinson, Administrative Justice—The Supremacy in Law, p. 21 (1927).

[24] *United States* v. *Storer Broadcasting Co.*, 351 U.S. 192 (1956).

[25] But cf. *Securities and Exchange Commission* v. *Chenery Corp.*, 332 U.S. 194 (1947).

Selective and prudent use of rulemaking proceedings and their foundation upon clearly established standards after investigation may be vastly beneficial, both to the public interest and to concerned businessmen. We can envision a type of proceeding which would probe in depth such broad industry problems and which, after full observance of the procedural requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act, would terminate with a general rule prohibiting the practice. Examples immediately spring to mind of recurring problems which the Commission has handled on a case-by-case basis in the past but which might more effectively—and economically—have been approached via a substantive rulemaking route: The purchasing activities of wholesale buying groups in the automotive parts industry, fictitious pricing and deceptive guaranty practices in the watch industry, deceptive labeling of reprocessed motor oils, misrepresentations of hair restoring remedies, to list a few. If such practices were approached on a quasi-legislative basis, these could be likely advantageous:

1. The problem of equitable treatment among competitors would be simplified. At the conclusion of the whole rulemaking proceeding, in which all would have had an opportunity to participate, all members of the industry would be equally informed of the Commission's ruling as to the practice in question.

2. The existence of an authoritative, prohibitory statement by the Commission carrying with it formal, enforceable sanctions with respect to a given practice would have an extremely strong deterrent effect upon the members of the industry.

3. Subsequent quasi-judicial proceedings against recalcitrant members of the industry would be immensely simplified because these proceedings would involve only the factual issue of whether the rule had been violated. The effect of the act producing the violation would not be an issue in subsequent proceedings.

Such procedures could endow the Commission with a new, far-ranging flexibility. For example, the present case-by-case approach is cumbersome and poorly adapted in many instances to keeping pace with the commercial innovations of a dynamic economy. The regular emergence of new types of distribution outlets, new methods of distribution, new selling devices, and ever-deepening competitive pressures, finds the Commission unable to keep pace by using case-by-case method solely. It may well be argued that the administration of those statutes confided to the Commission's enforcement might be made far more effective in many instances by the use of rulemaking procedures than through disjointed, long drawn out, case-by-case adjudicative process.

Rulemaking procedures would be limited to a narrow range of practices which the Commission had reason to believe were in violation of law. In contrast to Trade Practice Conference Rules, the results—after full hearing, and subject to appropriate judicial review—would be conclusive, so far as the issue of lawfulness was concerned. Subsequent adjudicative proceedings could then be instituted against particular respondents charged with violation of the rule, and the rule would carry with it the same sanctions as would the statute itself. Thus, these rulemaking proceedings would not be aimed at a generalized restatement of the law as applied to a particular industry or at solving every industry problem in one package, but, rather, would be focused upon critical competitive problems in a particular industry as they arose. In this respect, the results would be more like Internal Revenue Service tax rulings than like our present Trade Practice Rules or Industry Guides.

The use of substantive rulemaking proceedings could mean a substantial realinement in the Commission's activities. It should be emphasized once again that these recommendations suggest no abatement in the Commission's fundamental adjudicative work; but they do contemplate a strong, new emphasis upon the solution of industrywide problem areas through rulemaking procedures as a supplement to the Commission's present enforcement responsibilities. In fact, it is quite possible that case-by-case application of a prior fixed rule would involve a far narrower, less complicated range of issues than under the present procedures with a consequential increase in the number and effectiveness of the Commission's adjudicative efforts.

This would require more than a realinement. It would require also a competent legal and economic staff at the Commission and the sympathetic cooperation of American businessmen as well. They must appreciate the basic fact that effective antitrust enforcement is the most probusiness public policy ever developed by the genius of American democracy. Its sole objective is to insure the preservation of a competitive enterprise system. Too often businessmen miss this point. It is no accident of economic and political history that nations with truly competitive economies have never embraced totalitarian creeds, either of the fascistic or communistic variety.

A vigorous and informed antitrust enforcement program is just as important to businessmen as it is to labor, farmers, and consumers. After all, we are all in the same economic boat, and it is driven by the enterprise system. It then inevitably follows that public officials must have the economic facts necessary to make informed judgments as to how competitive processes may be preserved.

As has been mentioned earlier, the case approach to antitrust problems is not adequate for many of our problems. The great danger of relying solely on this approach is that it strikes only at individual firms and often fails to develop the economic facts necessary to develop adequate remedy. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that we must make reliable economic understanding the cornerstone of any legal edifice constructed to insure the maintenance of a competitive economy.

The case approach is especially effective when two assumptions are fulfilled: (1) a particular firm (or small group of firms) is violating a law, and (2) the economic and legal remedy is relatively simple.

The most meritorious derivative of the suggested approach to competitive problems is that it directs attention to an entire industry rather than focusing attention solely on particular firms, and it involves an analysis of all relevant aspects of a problem rather than dealing only with symptoms. Moreover, if businessmen cooperate willingly in such undertaking, they may become partners rather than antagonists in the development of sound antitrust policies. This should avoid many of the pitfalls of becoming enmeshed in the interminable legal processes inherent in the case approach. The adversary approach to antitrust problems too often emphasizes conflicts and differences, when what we should strive for is a harmonizing of interests.

THE DU PONT CASE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there are reports that pressure is being exerted in the other body to move H.R. 8847, a bill to provide relief to individual Du Pont stockholders receiving distributions of General Motors stock as the result of the May 22, 1961, Supreme Court order that Du Pont must divest itself of its 63 million shares of General Motors stock within 10 years. This divestiture order is the result of a decision of the Supreme Court that Du Pont's holdings of General Motors stock is in violation of the Clayton Antitrust Act.

H.R. 8847 has had an unusual legislative history. Although the Supreme Court ruling holding that the divestiture must proceed was as recent as May 22, 1961, and the matter is still within the discretion of the district court as to just when the divestiture must proceed the issue of the tax treatment of involuntary divestitures resulting from antitrust decrees is not new nor are tax issues in the Du Pont case new. Congress could have acted generally in this area since 1957.

There is no justification for the hasty manner in which the issues involved in the Du Pont divestiture have been considered by the Ways and Means Committee and the House of Representatives.

Actually the issues are not complex, nor are the alternative courses of action complex.

What seem to be the true issues are becoming alarmingly clear. Is the Congress of the United States to become a court of appeals for powerful economic forces seeking special privilege? Are we going to have government by law which relates to general situations or are we going to have government for special groups and special cases?

There was a time when the people could count on the fourth estate, the press, to alert them to the attempts which are made from time to time to provide government by men instead of government by law.

In this instance it appears as if the press is in cahoots with the operation. Why else has there been such minimal reporting of the unusual aspects of the handling of this legislation and the failure to report what some of us have pointed out are the basic issues?

---

[26] Cf. *Manhattan General Equipment Co.* v. *Commissioner*, 297 U.S. 129 (1936).

[27] Compare *Skidmore* v. *Swift & Co.*, 323 U.S. 134 (1944), with *American Telephone & Telegraph Co.* v. *U.S.*, 299 U.S. 232 (1936). See Griswold, "A Summary of the Regulations Problem," 54 Harv. L. Rev. 398, 411 (1951).

[28] " 'Interpretative' rules—as merely interpretation of statutory provisions—are subject to plenary review, whereas 'substantive rules' involve a maximum of administrative discretion." Senate Committee Print, S. Doc. No. 248, 79th Cong., 2d sess., p. 18 (1946).

I am not unfriendly to the claim of inequity by the Du Pont Co. which would result if the divestiture order went through as presently ordered. I am not one who feels that the decision of the Supreme Court, which declared the Du Pont holdings of General Motors stock was a violation of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, was a proper or a wise decision.

Why then did I at 8 o'clock on the evening of September 19, 1961, take the floor of the House to oppose the passage of H.R. 8847? My reasons were stated then and may be read verbatim as given without change in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 15, page 20323. Why did the press fail to report the points I tried to drive home at this time?

Why does Congressional Quarterly, which devotes two pages in the January 12, 1962, issue to the Du Pont case, fail to refer to these points, indeed fail to even point out that these points were advanced?

I shall mention the unusual procedural aspects followed, and then move to the substantive issues involved. The Ways and Means Committee made little or no attempt to consider the Du Pont case as an example which suggested amending our basic law in respect to the tax treatment of involuntary divestitures resulting from antitrust violation decrees by the courts where criminality was not involved. The representatives of the Treasury Department who sat in the executive sessions in considering this legislation made no effort to relate the specific case to general law. The Justice Department officials had little or no comment to make on how legislation of this nature would bear upon antitrust enforcement, or whether the specific case indicated that the antitrust laws required amendment.

The Ways and Means Committee voted out H.R. 8847, which at least was couched in language which made it general law even though the specifications were such that the bill in effect applied only to the Du Pont situation. The Rules Committee granted a rule on this bill.

Word came down from the Justice Department to the Du Pont interests that H.R. 8847 was too broad and it would be vetoed unless it were amended to explicitly relate only to the Du Pont case. The Ways and Means Committee was called into unusual session to adopt an amendment which restricted the bill by name to the Du Pont case in accordance with the Attorney General's dictate.

There was no time for a dissenting Member—and my dissent to the entire handling of this matter was a matter of record—to prepare and file minority views.

The bill came on the floor of the House late in the evening, late in the session, in a climate that was hardly conducive to careful review and consideration.

Now to the issues. First, the only taxpayers benefiting from H.R. 8847 are taxpayers who are in an income bracket above 25 percent. The capital gain treatment of 25 percent, of course, only benefits taxpayers in the higher income brackets.

The impact upon the market value of General Motors stock from an unloading of large quantities of shares will not affect an investor who has bought and is holding General Motors shares as an investment. It will, it is true, affect a stockholder who is holding General Motors stock as a speculation. The bulk of the stockholders, particularly in the lower income brackets, are investors—not speculators. I am not speaking against stock speculation. I believe it has an important part to play in keeping a sound and free market. However, I would point out that speculation must contemplate all manner of changes—economic, political, as well as social. I see no justification for special congressional action to relieve a speculator of some of the risk he has assumed. On the contrary, I see strong reasons against such action.

I am concerned about stockholders in the higher income brackets who are essentially investors and the inequity a forced sale imposes upon them. The primary inequity results from the impact of post-World War II inflation on the capital gain their holdings will reflect. However, I must state that the damage done by inflation locking in investment is damaging all holders of securities acquired before 1945 and adversely affecting our entire economy. There is a legitimate case of inequity on the part of the higher bracket taxpayers who hold Du Pont and General Motors stock.

The only point I am making is that it is wrong to appeal to the public or anyone else on the grounds that it is the little investor who will be damaged if this legislation does not pass.

I am quite aware of the need for trying to tone down the demagogs who would be in full hue and cry if it was publicly known that this bill was only for the benefit of higher income taxpayers. This is one of the tragedies that we face today in considering intelligently much of the legislation presented to the Congress.

However, I believe it is important that demagoguery be faced frontally, not through the employment of deceit.

My suggestion for amending the involuntary divestiture section of the tax code is quite simple. Permit the district court judge who has found that an antitrust violation has occurred and has already the authority to order the terms of a divestiture to also state the tax incidence the divestiture is to receive, ordinary income or capital gain treatment.

The district judge is the one who has gone into the equities of the specific case of antitrust violation. He stretches out the period for allowing divestiture or shortens it out depending upon the economic impact and the equities involved. It is no strain to the tax law to permit him to state the terms of tax treatment as ordinary income or capital gain the divested investment should receive.

As it is, we have pending before Ways and Means other cases of involuntary divestitures resulting from antitrust violations. Under the precedence of H.R. 8847, if it becomes law, each party involved will have to go hat in hand to the Justice Department to receive an assurance of no Presidential veto and then try to get Congress to pass a special bill of relief.

This is government by men, not government by law. Its implications are dangerous and sinister.

TELECASTING, BROADCASTING, AND PHOTOGRAPHING PUBLIC COMMITTEE HEARINGS OF THE HOUSE

The **SPEAKER**. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. **MEADER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MEADER**. Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon I announced that I intended on tomorrow to discuss the Rules of the House insofar as they relate to the authority of committees to permit telecasting, broadcasting, and photographing of their public hearings.

Subsequently, after conferring with the Speaker, it seemed it might be appropriate to raise the parliamentary inquiry tomorrow; and I shall seek recognition as soon after the commencement of the session tomorrow as possible for the purpose of propounding a parliamentary inquiry on this subject.

So that Members may be advised, I intend under permission granted to incorporate in my remarks a brief which I prepared and delivered to the Speaker on Friday last in which I set forth my interpretation of the rules and the precedents insofar as they bear upon this question; and also set forth my reasons for the belief that this authority in committees to permit the telecasting and broadcasting of their public hearings is in the public interest.

I have discussed this question informally with Speaker MCCORMACK and in correspondence with him, a copy of which I incorporate at this point in my remarks:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 12, 1962.

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GEORGE: I am in receipt of your letter of January 5, with enclosures, also your letter of January 12, with enclosures, in relation to "authority of House committees to permit news coverage of their public hearings by telecasting, broadcasting, and photography * * *" which I shall read and study with special interest. As you can appreciate, I am not in a position at the present time to give a specific answer to the question raised by you in your two letters and enclosures. However, your views as expressed in your letters and enclosures will receive my serious consideration and attention.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,
JOHN W. MCCORMACK, *Speaker*.

January 12, 1962.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: In my letter to you of January 5, 1962, concerning the authority of House committees to permit news coverage of their public hearings by telecasting, broadcasting, and photography, I indicated that I would submit a brief in support of my contention that House rules vest such power in committees.

I enclose herewith the brief referred to and will shortly discuss with you an appropriate time to raise this parliamentary question.

Sincerely,

George Meader.

January 5, 1962.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
Washington, D.C.

Dear John: As I told you over the phone yesterday afternoon, it is my intention to request a parliamentary ruling early in the coming session on the authority of House committees to permit news coverage of their public hearings by telecasting, broadcasting and photography.

As you know, I have taken an interest in this subject during my entire service in the House and propounded a parliamentary inquiry to Speaker Rayburn early in the 84th Congress. When Speaker Rayburn ruled adversely, I sought to clarify any doubt in the rules of the House by offering resolutions to amend the rules.

February 22 of last year I testified in support of my resolution before the Rules Committee. Enclosed are tearsheets from the Congressional Record of February 17, 1961 and February 23, 1961, containing a discussion of this subject and also a copy of House Resolution 173.

So far as I can recall, in your capacity as majority leader you did not participate in any of these discussions, and I am unaware of your personal views on the desirability of television, radio, and photographic coverage of public hearings of House committees. I hope you will agree that such coverage is in the public interest and that the House rules now authorize committees in their discretion to allow such coverage of their public hearings. In the event you are of the opinion that the existing language in House rules does not authorize committees to permit such news coverage, I hope you will support a clarification in the way of an amendment to the rules.

As I mentioned to you, I have also discussed this matter with Congressman Francis Walter who advised me he had also spoken with you and believed that television, radio, and photographic coverage of House committee public hearings not only was desirable but that it was permissible under the rules of the House as they now stand.

Before propounding a parliamentary inquiry, of which, of course, I would give you ample notice, I hope to prepare a brief in support of my contention that the rules and precedents of the House can properly be interpreted to authorize House committees to permit news coverage of their public hearings by all forms and media of communciation.

Sincerely,

George Meader.

The brief is in two parts, and I will now read it. I hope Members will concern themselves with this very important question:

May Committees of the House of Representatives, in their discretion, permit telecasting, broadcasting, and photography of their public hearings?

I believe the above question should be answered "yes." In support of this conclusion, I submit the following:

I. FULL AND ACCURATE REPORTING OF HOUSE COMMITTEE PUBLIC HEARINGS IS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Under our system of government, ultimate decisions on national policy are made by sovereign citizens through their participation in the election process and through their elected representatives. This system depends for its success upon complete and accurate information being available to the electorate about the public business.

Any measures which help to provide full and accurate information to the public contribute to the formulation of a sound, factual foundation for public opinion and wise decisions by the people. Conversely, anything which obstructs or inhibits the flow of information about public business to the electorate tends to create a distorted or incomplete factual foundation for public opinion and invites unwise decisions.

Accordingly, it would seem clearly in the public interest to permit the full and free use of modern media of communication, including telecasting, broadcasting, and still and motion photography, to provide information to the public concerning the public hearings of House committees.

This is particularly true in our modern society where the activities of our Federal Government have become expanded and complex, and where the legislative branch is required more and more to depend upon the specialization that is possible only through the committee system to engage in serious and penetrating study of specific national problems.

The committee hearing is the public forum where Government officials, spokesmen for associations, and groups, and individual citizens can present their facts, their arguments, and their views on questions of national interest. The conflicting points of view, the interchange between members and witnesses, and the very manner in which the committee develops a factual record for consideration of proposed legislation are matters which the American public is entitled to know fully and accurately.

The use of telecasting, broadcasting, and photography at public hearings to inform the public about the activities of House committees will promote public knowledge of House committees and their work and thus enhance the prestige and the influence on our national life of what has been described as the greatest parliamentary body in the world's history.

It is a peculiar quirk of the human mind that what one does not know about, for that person does not exist. To the extent a blackout or a partial blackout is maintained over the activities of House committees, the public knowledge, and acceptance of the work of the House is diminished and, in comparison with other agencies of our Federal Government, its prestige, its influence, and its importance suffer.

Both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy have effectively utilized televised press conferences to inform the public of their activities and their views and thus to influence public opinion. Committees of the U.S. Senate, which has no inhibition against telecasting and broadcasting committee hearings, have become familiar to every household in America. Why should the House of Representatives deny itself the use of modern media of communication to let the American people know what it is doing and how it is studying the problems of the Nation in its public committee hearings?

It seems to me beyond question that it is in the public interest that House committees be allowed, in their discretion, to permit coverage of their public hearings by all media of communication, including telecasting, broadcasting, and still and motion photography.

II. HOUSE RULES AUTHORIZE COMMITTEES TO ALLOW THE UTILIZATION OF ALL MEDIA OF COMMUNICATION TO REPORT THEIR PUBLIC HEARINGS

It is my contention that the rules of the House invest in committees jurisdiction to allow the coverage of their public hearings by all media of communication, which in the previous section of this brief, I have demonstrated was clearly in the public interest.

Rule XI. Clause 26 (a). The rules of the House are the rules of its committees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is a motion of high privilege in committees. Committees may adopt additional rules not inconsistent therewith.

Rule XI. Clause 26(g). All hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public, except executive sessions for making up bills or for voting or where the committee by a majority vote orders an executive session.

It is my contention that the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which was made a part of the Standing Rules of the House on January 3, 1953, requires "all hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees" to be open to the public. Coupled with the authority in rule XI 26(a) to "adopt additional rules not inconsistent with House rules," a committee is clothed with sufficiently broad authority, not only to permit citizens to be present in person as spectators, but to permit representatives of the press, television, radio, and photography not only to be present as spectators, but to employ their particular media of communication in reporting to the public the hearings of the committee, subject of course, to such limitations, conditions, and regulations as the committee, in its judgment, may see fit to impose.

The foregoing interpretation of the rules would seem to be reasonable and fair.

Unfortunately, however, the parliamentary rulings of the last 10 years have cast doubt on what would at first seem to be proper application of clear language of the House rules.

PAST PARLIAMENTARY RULINGS

In the 82d Congress the Speaker, Mr. Rayburn, in answer to a parliamentary inquiry propounded by the then minority leader, Mr. Martin of Massachusetts, ruled that committees had no power to authorize telecasting or broadcasting of their public hearings on the grounds that the rules of the House, which are expressly made the rules of its committees, are silent and do not expressly authorize committees to permit telecasting and broadcasting of their hearings.

The parliamentary inquiry and the ruling on it were prompted by hearings being held at that time by the House Un-American Activities Committee in the city of Detroit. Until the Speaker's ruling was made, that committee had permitted its proceedings to be televised and broadcast—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 1, pages 1334–1335.

At this point, I include the text of the proceedings containing the parliamentary ruling referred to above:

TELEVISING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, several days ago the Committee on Un-American Activities called a meeting to be held in Detroit and, I understand, voted to have those hearings televised.

I now understand that the televising of the hearings has been canceled. I understand further that the Speaker, in whom we all have great confidence, has taken the position he has the authority under the rules of the House to call off the televising of the hearings.

I also understand that the Speaker justifies his decision on the ground that the Committee on Un-American Activities operates under the general rules of the House, which of course is true. The general rules of the House give the Speaker the right or privilege of passing upon television, radio, or anything photographic, as far as the House is concerned. But I question, Mr. Speaker, whether this authority would apply to a hearing held in Detroit.

I call the Speaker's attention to the fact that under section 319, Secrecy of Committee Procedure, there is the following quotation:

"It is for the committee to determine, in its discretion, whether the proceedings of the committee shall be open or not."

From that provision under section 319 it is clearly implied that the committee shall be the judge of what publicity it might desire. Furthermore, in my opinion, it is more of an authority than the Speaker could assume under the general rules of the House.

I note also under the rule, under which, as I understand it, the order to prevent the Detroit television was given, it is stated that—

"The rules of the House are hereby made the rules of its standing committee so far as applicable."

I believe it would be stretching authority considerably to say that because of this rule the Speaker has the right to interpose his own power over a committee as to its own publicity. It could, I am free to admit, be well argued that the chairman of the committee acting as head might have the authority.

May I also call attention that television was used by the subcommittee investigating the tax scandals; the Madden Select Committee Investigating the Atrocities Relative to the Katyn Massacre; the Hébert Subcommittee Investigating Armed Services Procurements, and the Un-American Activities Committee itself in investigating the Reds in Hollywood. In the Senate there has been the Kefauver committee, the Atomic Energy Committee, the District of Columbia Committee, and the Russell committee. All those decisions to televise were made by the committees themselves.

Mr. Speaker, for clarification of the rules and so that we may understand what may be expected from now on, I submit my parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman cannot be heard on the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer his parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, as always, has been kind enough to inform the Chair that he was going to submit this parliamentary inquiry.

It is true that some committees and some subcommittees of the House have begun the practice of having their hearings and their meetings televised; but in each and every instance when the Chair has called attention to the fact that he did not think the rules of the House authorized this, each and every chairman of a committee or subcommittee has ceased doing so at that moment, as far as the Chair understands at this time.

The Chair is operating under the rules of the House. One of the rules reads as follows:

"The rules of the House are hereby made the rules of its standing committees so far as applicable."

There is no authority, and as far as the Chair knows, there is no rule granting the privilege of television of the House of Representatives, and the Chair interprets that as applying to these committees or subcommittees, whether they sit in Washington or elsewhere. As the gentleman from Massachusetts says, the Chair, whoever is the Speaker, has control of this end of the Capitol and the House Office Buildings. There being no rule with reference to television or radio the Chair interprets that the rules of the House shall apply to the committees whether they sit in Washington or outside of Washington. The Chair might indulge in a slight amount of histronics in saying that if committees all wanted to be televised, and they were not allowed to be televised under the rules of the House in the Capitol or in the House Office Buildings, why they would probably move out of town and think that they would escape the rule, or make a rule in that fashion.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that this is a twilight zone which has not been clearly defined as to just what authority the Speaker might have, and I think we should at the earliest possible moment, have some definite rule established. I want to say, too, in fairness to the Speaker, that there have been instances—not this particular one—that called for his disapproval of broadcasting. In other words the decision did not come just upon the Detroit broadcast.

The SPEAKER. In every instance the Chair has held exactly like he has regarding this proposed hearing in Detroit.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think television and broadcasting is here to stay and will probably increase in popularity as the days go by. For that reason we should have revision of the rules to define authority.

The SPEAKER. If the House adopts a rule, the Chair will abide by and enforce it, like he does all of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. In order to do that we would have to amend the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. The Chair was simply calling attention to the rules of the House which do not permit this television in the House of Representatives or in any committee of the House of Representatives, and the Chair is entirely right about that.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it is not quite as clear as all that.

Mr. RANKIN. I hope the rule will never be changed, myself.

In the 83d Congress under Speaker MARTIN, of Massachusetts, without any formal ruling, House committees were authorized to permit telecasting and broadcasting of their proceedings and did, in fact, allow such broadcasting and telecasting and other reporting of their proceedings by photography, moving pictures, and so forth.

In the 84th Congress—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 1, page 628—I propounded a parliamentary inquiry to the Speaker, Mr. Rayburn, as a result of which the Speaker ruled that committees were not authorized to permit telecasting or broadcasting or photographic coverage of their committee proceedings.

At this point, I include the text of the proceedings containing the parliamentary ruling referred to above:

TELEVISING AND BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. MEADER. I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MEADER. With the 84th Congress now organizing its committees, it seems to me important to have a clear ruling on the authority of committees to disseminate or permit the dissemination of news of their hearings and proceedings.

By way of background, I might say that this question was raised by the present minority leader in the 82d Congress on the 25th of February 1952. At that time the Speaker expressed the opinion that the rules of the House did not now authorize committees to permit radio and television coverage of their public hearings. I should like to propound that same inquiry but ask for a little greater clarification as to just what news coverage is permissible under the rules of the House of committee public hearings, whether news reporters are permitted to be present; whether photographers taking still pictures are permitted to be present; whether motion picture cameras for newsreel purposes with sound are permitted to be present; whether live radio broadcasting or telecasting or recorded radio broadcasting are permissible.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule and also make a statement. Something along along the same line was propounded to the present occupant of the chair by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] February 28, 1952.

Rule XI of the House provides that the rules of the House of Representatives shall be the rules of the committees of the House of Representatives so far as applicable. The Chair does not think anyone would contend that the House of Representatives is authorized to televise its proceedings or put them on the radio. The Chair held at that time that this was outside of the rules and also held in response to another inquiry that a committee sitting outside of Washington was under the same rules as a committee inside of Washington, and the Chair held that it was controlled by the same rules.

There is nothing new with reference to this, because the same rules are in effect now in the House of Representatives as they were on February 25, 1952, and until the rules are changed, which would have to come from a resolution reported by the Committee on Rules and adopted by the House changing the rules of the House, the Chair still thinks that it is not in accordance with the rules of the House of Representatives or its committees to televise or broadcast hearings or actions before any committee of the House, and so holds and will hold unless and until the rules of the House are amended.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Perhaps due to my lack of understanding, does the Chair then hold that a regular standing committee of the House cannot authorize broadcasting either by radio or television of its hearings?

The SPEAKER. That is what the Chair held in 1952 and that is what the Chair holds in 1955.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MEADER. Will newsreel cameras be permitted to be present in the committee room during public hearings?

The SPEAKER. The reply is the same. It is the same as television.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SCOTT. Would the Speaker also hold that in the absence of any rule of the House on this subject committees should be required to prohibit the taking of photographs before, during, or after any committee hearing if the Speaker so directed?

The SPEAKER. That is a question to be decided by the committee. The present occupant of the chair was chairman of a committee at one time. When the photographers came in, the Chair always told them they could take pictures of the committee or anyone in the room they wanted to until the proceedings of the committee began. Then they were asked to retire, and they always did retire.

Mr. SCOTT. Is it a correct statement, then, that the matter of photographs before, during, or after committee hearings is in the discretion of the committee chairman or the duly designated presiding officer?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would hold the photographs could be taken before and after the proceedings, but not during them.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Chair.

It is apparent that both of Speaker Rayburn's rulings were based upon the following theory:

First. That the rules of the House are the rules of its committees.

Second. That the rules of the House are silent and do not expressly authorize telecasting, broadcasting, and photography of House proceedings.

Third. Thus, the rules do not authorize a committee to permit telecasting, broadcasting, and photography of its public hearings.

I wish to analyze these propositions one by one and suggest considerations which, in my judgment, would justify a more liberal parliamentary ruling on this question.

The first proposition of Speaker Rayburn's theory, it seems to me should be modified as follows:

First, it is, of course, true that rule XI provides that the rules of the House shall "so far as applicable, be the rules of the committee." The words "so far as applicable" should not be overlooked and differences between the functions of committees and the functions of the House, itself, particularly as they relate to the conduct of public hearings, should be considered.

The House, itself, does not conduct hearings, as such, except in unusual circumstances such as contempt proceedings, and no one who is not a Member or officer of the House is permitted to participate in House debates or actions.

A committee, on the contrary, calls before it officials of the Government, representatives of associations or groups, or individual citizens who may appear either voluntarily, or involuntarily pursuant to subpena.

A committee hearing is a public forum in which the citizen is afforded an opportunity to express his views on national policy. It is a factfinding proceeding wherein the committee seeks to develop the facts and arguments as a foundation for the formulation of national policy and as a basis for the recommendation that it will make to the House on proposed legislation.

This basic difference, it seems to me, might well justify a holding that the rules of the House, which by their silence (if indeed they are silent), fail to authorize telecasting and broadcasting of the proceedings of the House, itself, where the public participates only as silent spectators, are not applicable to the public hearings of committees.

This is particularly so, it seems to me, when we take account of the mandatory requirement of rule XI 26(g) that all hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public; and the additional provision of rule XI 26(a) that the committees may adopt additional rules not inconsistent with House rules.

There are other provisions of rule XI 26, which seem to recognize a distinction between the functioning of the conduct of a public hearing of a committee and the function of debating, amending, and voting upon a bill in the House of Representatives.

Rule XI 26(h) authorizes a committee to establish a quorum for taking of testimony of as few as two members, even though a quorum for taking committee action would require the physical presence of a majority of the whole committee.

Rule XI 26(i) requires the chairman to make an opening statement describing the subject of the investigation.

Rule XI 26(j) requires the committee to make available copies of paragraph 26 of rule XI of the House rules and any additional committee rules which have been adopted.

Rule XI 26(k) authorizes witnesses at investigative hearings to be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights.

Under rule XI 26(l) the chairman may punish breaches of order and decorum, and of professional ethics on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings; and the committee may cite the offender to the House for contempt.

It is possibly worth noting that many of the provisions cited above were contained in the so-called Doyle resolution adopted by the House, March 23, 1955, 2 months after the most recent of the two rulings Speaker Rayburn made as quoted above, January 24, 1955.

Second, it seems to me that the principle of interpretation employed by Speaker Rayburn in basing his ruling on the absence of express authorization in House rules concerning the conduct of committee public hearings and the news coverage thereof, if followed consistently, could produce a rigidity and inflexibility in the rules of the House which might well impair the ability of the House, through its majority, to work its will. If Chief Justice John Marshall had interpreted the U.S. Constitution in this fashion, either the growth of our National Government would have been impaired, or we would have found our Constitution flooded with a host of amendments on all conceivable subjects.

House Rules are described by Lewis Deschler, House Parliamentarian, as "perhaps the most finely adjusted, scientifically balanced, and highly technical rules of any parliamentary body in the world." I believe they are still sufficiently flexible to be susceptible of interpretation, which takes account of new discoveries in our national economy. Radio broadcasting and telecasting are probably the most important developments in the rapid and accurate dissemination of news which have occurred in the history of mankind.

Consider the problems which would have arisen if our U.S. Constitution, in referring to armies and a navy, had been interpreted so strictly as to require amendment before our Government could have established an air force or engaged in the development of missiles, rockets and space exploration.

Third, Speaker Rayburn's ruling seems to be based upon the assumption that the rules are silent and give no express authorization for broadcasting or telecasting proceedings of the House.

It certainly is true that the Rules of the House do not in so many words expressly empower the Speaker to permit the telecasting and broadcasting of House procedings. There are, however, passages in the rules governing the conduct of proceedings in the House Chamber, in addition to the general authority of the Speaker as the principal officer of the House, which as I view them, could properly be interpreted as vesting in the Speaker the power, in his discretion, to permit the telecasting and broadcasting of proceedings of the House.

Rule I, clause 2 provides that the Speaker shall preserve order and decorum, and, in case of disturbance or disorderly conduct in the galleries, or in the lobby, may cause the same to be cleared. Clause 3 provides that the Speaker shall have general control, except as provided by rule or law, of the Hall of the House, and of the corridors and passages and the disposal of the unappropriated rooms in that part of the Capitol assigned to the use of the House, until further order.

The foregoing would seem to vest extremely broad authority in the Speaker over the conduct of the proceedings in the House of Representatives. The provision of general control of the Hall of the House would seem to be sufficiently broad to permit, as this power has actually been employed in joint sessions, joint meetings and in the opening of a new session of Congress, the live telecasting and broadcasting of proceedings in the Hall of the House.

The resolutions providing for joint sessions or joint meetings uniformly have been silent on whether or not such proceedings could be telecast, broadcast, or photographed. Therefore, the authority for such coverage of joint meetings, joint sessions, and opening sessions of the House must find their authority, if such coverage is authorized and lawful, in the power of the Speaker to exercise general control over the Hall of the House or possibly in those rules which, under the Speaker's discretion, provide radio, television, and photography space for the press.

Rule XXXIV, clause 2 provides:

> Such portion of the Gallery over the Speaker's chair as may be necessary to accommodate representatives of the press wishing to report debates and proceedings shall be set aside for their use, and reputable reporters and correspondents shall be admitted thereto under such regulations as the Speaker may from time to time prescribe; and the supervision of such gallery, including the designation of its employees, shall be vested in the standing committee of correspondents, subject to the direction and control of the Speaker; and the Speaker may assign one seat on the floor to Associated Press reporters, one to the International News Service, and one to the United Press Associations, and regulate the occupation of the same. And the Speaker may admit to the floor, under such regulations as he may prescribe, one additional representative of each press association.

Rule XXXIV, clause 3 provides:

> Such portion of the Gallery of the House of Representatives as may be necessary to accommodate reporters of news to be disseminated by radio, wireless and similar means of transmission, wishing to report debates and proceedings, shall be set aside for their use, and reputable reporters thus engaged shall be admitted thereto under such regulations as the Speaker may from time to time prescribe; and the supervision of such gallery, including the designation of its employees, shall be vested in the standing committee of radio reporters, subject to the direction and control of the Speaker; and the Speaker may admit to the floor, under such regulations as he may prescribe, one representative of the National Broadcasting Company, one of the Columbia Broadcasting System, one of the Mutual Broadcasting System, and one of the Transradio Press Service.

The fact that Speakers, in the past, have not seen fit to authorize telecasting and broadcasting or photography of the proceedings of the House, itself, with the possible exception of the opening of a session of Congress, but have permitted broadcasting, telecasting, and photography of joint sessions and joint meetings, to my mind, indicates that the authority exists in the Speaker and in his discretion he has employed it on some occasions and refrained from employing it on others. If this is a valid interpretation of the rules, then it is clear that committees likewise, in their control over the committee room and the proceedings of the committee and the maintenance of order, would have the discretion to allow telecasting and broadcasting and photography in some instances, and refuse to allow it in others.

The only reference to this subject in the precedents of the House other than the rulings above discussed is found in Cannon's Precedents, volume 8, page 968, section 3633, relating to amplifying devices in the Hall of the House in which it is noted that "radio facilities for broadcasting the proceedings of the House were also installed at this time and after brief tests were discontinued."

I understand that when the House Chamber was remodeled, sound amplification facilities were installed as a permanent part of the equipment of the House Chamber and that two lines run from the microphone to an outlet near the clock opposite the Speaker's desk from which, through a multiple device, all radio, television, and sound track for photography equipment receive their sound signals. I further understand that at the time of remodeling of the House Chamber there was a permanent installation of lights at the expense of the Capitol to provide adequate lighting for photography and television.

CONCLUSION

I fully realize there is a natural inclination to follow the precedents already established, especially when they were rulings of our late beloved Speaker Sam Rayburn, and in this connection desire to make the following observations:

First. The question of interpretation of the rules in this instance is one in which reasonable men might well differ. In fact, there have been contrary rulings by the two most recent Speakers. While Speaker MARTIN's ruling was not a formal one in the 83d Congress, committees did, in fact, permit telecasting, broadcasting, and photography of their proceedings with the informal approval of the Speaker, and no Member propounded a parliamentary inquiry during Speaker MARTIN's tenure. This would seem to indicate that those who favored such authority in committees would have no occasion to propound an inquiry and those who opposed such authority did not see fit to raise the question.

Second. Subsequent to the last parliamentary ruling, the House adopted a resolution amending the rules of the House with relation to committees and the conduct of their hearings known as the Doyle resolution which is referred to in an earlier part of this brief in some detail. It would seem appropriate to reexamine the pertinent provisions of House rules in the light of the adoption of the Doyle resolution which spelled out in many respects the authority of House committees and their chairmen in the conduct of public committee hearings.

Third. Broadcasting and telecasting and newsreel photography have taken great strides as media of dissemination of news in the 7 years since the ruling of January 24, 1955.

According to figures published by the Advertising Research Foundation using Bureau of Census information, 67 percent of the households in the United States had television sets in 1955 and by 1960, this number had increased to 87.5 percent.

In this period the use of television for coverage of public events and the activities and views of public officials has found ever-increasing public interest. The telecasting of the proceedings of the United Nations and its committees, telecasting of Presidential news conferences and the coverage of political party conventions are outstanding examples of the use of these media of communications to permit the American people to learn about public proceedings and the public issues involved.

No one can question the basic proposition that the public has a right to know about the public business. The hearings and reports of the Moss Special Subcommittee on Government Information of the House Committee on Government Operations and the news of that committee's work certainly indicate a general belief on the part of the public that they should not be excluded from or hampered in learning about the expenditure of their tax funds and the exercise of the power vested in legislative or administrative public officials.

I hope the newly elected Speaker may so interpret House rules as to effectuate this basic people's right so necessary to the sound and intelligent functioning of the process of self-government by the people through elected representatives.

SCHOOL FALLOUT SHELTERS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, civil defense officials have urged the importance of preparing for possible nuclear attacks for some time. But little has been done. Two or three reasons share the responsibility for the inaction. The first reason is that many people have not been impressed with the danger. It is so utterly fantastic that it seems more like a movie or TV horror story than a grim reality. The second reason is that some people who do grasp the possibility, and who have considered the aftermath, do not wish to face the difficulties of resuming life in a wrecked society or in a society dominated by Communists. The assumption is that, if a nuclear attack does occur, it will cover most of the continent. Any individuals who survive will be isolated and forced to live underground for weeks or months. If and when they emerge, it will be into a world devoid of food, with food plants and food animals destroyed along with the more sophisticated means of production and distribution. Furthermore, it will be a world without law and order—a world of anarchy and violence. It seems hardly worth the trouble to attempt to survive an all-out nuclear attack.

The third reason for inaction in the matter of civil defense, and probably the strongest one, is that no practical program has been proposed as yet. A comprehensive program was promised some months ago, but it is still delayed and may not be available before some time in the coming calendar year. The fact is the difficulty of devising a system of shelters which would give adequate protection to a major fraction of the population is practically beyond solution.

Provision might be made for aggregations of people who spend a large part of the day in one limited area, such as factories or office buildings. But many people scatter over a considerable area in their work or other activities and, even if they had prepared a suitable shelter, they could not reach it in time after a warning. Since most people spend a large part of the time in their homes, it seems logical to reach the conclusion that every home should be provided with some kind of shelter.

At this point two special difficulties arise. Shelters for individual homes would necessarily be built at private expense. The cost of construction and of supplying the necessary provisions and facilities would be prohibitive for most families. Any protection afforded by the numerous and more or less flimsy structures offered for sale is probably highly illusory. A well-constructed building, particularly if made of masonry, might do as well. A few hundred dollars will not construct and equip a satisfactory shelter for a family. The second difficulty has to do with the morality involved excluding nonmembers of the family. In the panic of an emergency, every individual would tend to dive for the nearest shelter. It might be a matter of killing to keep him out or to gain entrance.

Unless we can find some way to go underground more or less permanently, it seems reasonable to say that protection for a great many people is out of the reach of possibility. We must resign ourselves to the probability that, in a full-scale atomic attack, many of us will perish. But it is also correct and judicious to believe that significant numbers of our people could be provided with a type of protection that would be fully adequate. No stock of missiles is in existence which could cover every spot with a direct hit, even admitting the doubtful possibility of pinpointing the accuracy of every hit. At ground zero no man-made shelter might be effective. But a few yards, or a few miles, away, practical provisions are within the reach of ingenuity and of expense. And we should hasten to provide them—now.

It is completely unnecessary to argue the point that no segment of our population is more important to preserve than our children. On them rests our hope of the future. If all adults in the country perished and our children survived, our society could go on with a vigor but little diminished.

Fortunately, protection measures for those now in the public and private schools of the country are the most practical of all to create. Some 50 million of them spend 6 or more hours daily in school. Many of these spend the remaining hours of the day within a short distance of the school they attend, and could possibly reach it after warning of an attack. A school is a miniature form of society in itself, already organized for collective action, and highly capable of evolving into a tiny full-scale government which could maintain itself for a considerable period of time, given the necessary supplies and equipment. Anybody familiar with the behavior of a normally well-disciplined school could hardly doubt that it could cope with the needs of the occasion, probably with far less panic and confusion than a heterogeneous group of unorganized adults.

Some of the details of a program for schools might be explored to see the relative ease with which effective measures for protection might be supplied. First, of course, is the matter of construction. For new school buildings, the devise that comes readily is some sort of subbasement, integral with the foundation walls of the building. For schools already in use, a separate structure contiguous to the buildings and connected with them by adequate underground passages would be called for. The cost of such construction has been estimated at from $40 to $100 per pupil. Conditions of site present so many variations that a cost figure would be difficult to determine for all schools. But it is seen that the estimated cost is within the figures for such common appurtenances as gymnasia, auditoriums, cafeterias, and the like, which are all indispensable features of modern schools. A community which unhesitatingly supplies these should not balk at providing an additional feature which might be more important to young lives than all of them.

Provision of suitable supplies for a shelter is another problem comparatively easy to solve. Considerable food is already stored in most schools for cafeteria use. It would not be difficult to store larger quantities in the shelter, withdraw some of it from time to time for cafeteria use, and immediately replace it. Concentrated emergency rations could also be stored. The total refrigeration requirements might not exceed very seriously those already supplied. For a water supply, a drilled well might be sunk in most instances. Uncontaminated air might be a more difficult problem. Some sort of filter, if a suitable one is available, would be required.

Some heat, light, and power is another requirement. The use of oil fuel for those requirements seems indicated. Small oil burners could provide heat for cooking and power to operate a small electric generator sufficient to operate communication systems and for other necessary purposes. It is extremely important that connection with the outside world should be maintained, hence a highly efficient communication system should be supplied and maintained. It might readily be a link in the nationwide network to transmit Government orders and to spread information as to conditions elsewhere in the country. Many schools already possess and use various items of scientific equipment needed to test for the presence of radioactive material and for other purposes. Such equipment should be brought up to the highest standards for anticipated needs.

A certain degree of medical and first-aid competence is still another requirement. Some schools already maintain nurses. A requirement that the teaching force develop some skill and training in these matters should not be unreasonable. In addition to the ordinary hazards of illness and accident, it might be anticipated that cases of burns and atomic fallout exposures would present themselves for treatment, and a minimum of training and equipment for dealing with them might save many lives.

And now we come to a detail which apparently has attracted little attention. In the event of an atomic attack requiring use of the shelter, those who occupy it would be cut off from the rest of the world for a period which might run into weeks or months. It is highly essential that organized government go on within the shelter. In order to assure safety for all, it might be necessary to impose an autocratic type of government. It is strongly suggested that some person within the school system should be vested by detailed and definite civil law to assume what might be called command. Presumably this person would be the principal. His successors in line should also be known and recognized by law, so that there would never be any doubt as to who was in charge. Some who are not students may be admitted to the shelter. But it should be kept in mind that the shelter is intended for the schoolchildren. Consequently it should be provided by statute that no such person should be permitted to interfere with the government and management of the shelter, even if that person should be the Governor of the State or a high Federal official. There is no room for uncertainty in an emergency, when lives are at stake. If the principal of the school is not capable of accepting the responsibility, or is unwilling to accept, he should be replaced by some one who is. He must be the captain of his ship, the commander of his army, and have similar recognized authority to act as his judgment dictates.

As was stated earlier in this argument, a school is peculiarly suited to the establishment of a miniature government. The officers of the school are accustomed to making decisions and to issuing directions and commands. The students are normally accustomed to conformity and obedience, and to at least a degree of respect for authority. Furthermore, the usual student body is readily organized to accept and carry out responsibility. It may be surprising in this supposedly undisciplined age that boys and girls in their early teens recognize emergency situations. They readily grasp the necessity for indicated action, and they carry out instructions with a higher degree of fidelity and determination than a similar group of adults. An individual in a school shelter properly constructed and equipped, and with definite arrangements for the maintenance of law and order, would be safer and more secure, and consequently with a better chance of survival, than in almost any other situation.

It is important, further, that the authority of the commander of a school shelter should extend after the time of emergency from the shelter until contact with regular lawful authority could be made, and responsibility surrendered to that authority. After an atomic attack, disorder may be the common condition of the outside world. A well-organized school group could easily become the nucleus of restored civil government. Perhaps the shelter commanders should be furnished with sufficient force in the shape of firearms to assert their decisions. It is at least a matter for consideration.

If we are sufficiently impressed with the possibility of atomic attack to go to the expense of fallout shelters, we should not stop at halfway measures. It would be futile to dig a hole in the ground and then expect matters to take care of themselves. We should foresee every possible contingency and make every effort to meet its needs. Certainly the details offered above are minimum essentials. Their implementation may well require both Federal law and State law. There appears to be much favor for a Federal appropriation to help meet the cost. Such an appropriation, if made, should be accompanied by strict requirements that State law be enacted to make protection for schoolchildren complete. Unfortunately, the danger is not a mere temporary one. It is possible that the rash of crises breaking out in all parts of the world may be soothed without resort to war. But there is nothing in sight to offer hope of permanent freedom from danger. The evil genius of the atomic bomb, once released from the bottle, can never be reconfined. It will haunt the dreams of our children and our children's children for generations to come. We need protection now, and if the cost of protection is wisely spent it will be a permanent investment in security.

FUTURE OF IRON ORE MINES ON GOGEBIC IRON RANGE IN WISCONSIN AND MICHIGAN

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and revise and extend his remarks, and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, December 19, the Wisconsin State Senate passed Joint Resolution 141A. This resolution had been passed by the Wisconsin Assembly on December 18. State Senator Clifford W. Krueger has written me asking that this joint resolution as passed by the Wisconsin State Legislature be made a part of the Congressional Record.

Under unanimous consent I include Joint Resolution 141A, memorializing Congress regarding an investigation of the problems affecting the future of the iron ore mines on the Gogebic Iron Range in northern Wisconsin and Upper Peninsula of Michigan, in the body of the Record.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the majority of the deep shaft iron mines on the Gogebic Iron Range have ceased operations, thereby creating a serious economic hardship on the peoples and the communities involved; and

Whereas the future of the remaining mines is extremely doubtful, thereby creating an ever-increasing unemployment problem; and

Whereas we strongly believe that these mines must be kept operative and competitive in the national interest as well as in the local economic interest; and

Whereas it has been proved that there exist tremendous reserves of iron ore in the Gogebic Iron Range, which ore can be beneficiated and pelletized, thereby creating a product which is in demand by the steel companies; and

Whereas these processes of beneficiation and pelletizing demand large quantities of low-cost fuel which is not now available in the immediate area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin request the Congress of the United States to name a committee to investigate the problems and the causes of the economic decline of the Gogebic Iron Range, as reviewed herein and seek a satisfactory solution to these problems to the end that the economic health of the area be restored; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be submitted to the President of the United States, the Governors of Wisconsin and Michigan, the U.S. Senators and Representatives of the States of Michigan and Wisconsin and the House and Senate of the State of Michigan.

DISCRIMINATION IN WASHINGTON CLUBS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Zelenko] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend certain laws which apply in the District of Columbia to deny benefits under those laws to any corporation, group, society, association, or other organization which in its operation discriminates among individuals on the basis of race or color.

The deplorable practice of certain groups, societies, and associations in the District of Columbia which practice discrimination are hindering the efforts of this administration and Government in our ceaseless effort to project an image of true democracy throughout the world. It is particularly harmful when such un-American practices are permitted to take place in our Nation's Capital and by groups which claim as members, leaders in public and private life. The time has come to take affirmative and aggressive action at once to eliminate these last vestiges of segregation at the seat of our Government.

This legislation would deny to organizations practicing discrimination such governmental benefits as the granting of liquor licenses, exemptions from real estate tax, exemptions from personal property tax, and issuance of certificates of occupancy.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation and earnestly request that it be given early and favorable consideration by Congress.

CONGRESS: THE LAWMAKING BODY

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, during the adjournment period I devoted several issues of my weekly newsletter, Reporting From Washington, to a discussion of our procedures for considering and passing bills here in the U.S. Congress. My first letter on this subject was entitled "How Do Bills Become Law?" It was followed by a series of four letters describing the standing committees of the House that have the really heavy work of legislation. Since the publication of the letters I have had requests for copies from various schools, libraries, and individuals in my district. Believing there may be others who would be interested in having this information, I, under unanimous consent, include the five letters in the Record herewith:

How Do Bills Become Law?

November 11, 1961.

It isn't too simple a process, you know. In the first place there are at least 10,000 bills introduced every year. During the 1st session of the 87th Congress, which adjourned on September 27, 1961, 685 became law. I can give you no more here than a capsule review of the complicated process that very often changes a bill so much from the day it is introduced to the day of passage that you would hardly recognize it again. So many people have their fingers in the pie. So many sides of it must be given earnest study. It is a slow process—but that very fact more often than not protects us from the unwisdom of hasty decision.

A bill may be introduced by a Congressman or Senator at any time while Congress is actually in session. The bill is simply placed in the hopper next to the Clerk's desk. It is then referred by the Speaker to the appropriate committee which holds public hearings and studies all aspects of the bill in executive session. Consideration by the committee depends upon the will of the chairman. Many bills are handed to subcommittees and are given intensive study and consideration before being reported to the full committee. The full committee in turn considers the bill and decides whether to report it out for consideration on the floor of the House.

Bills are seldom considered without a previous report from the Bureau of the Budget and the department or agency that would be concerned with the bill once it becomes law.

When the full committee has voted the bill out, a report is submitted and in most instances the hearings are printed and made available. The report explains the purpose and anticipated effect of the proposal and may also include differing views of the individual committee members.

The measure is then sent to the Rules Committee and a rule is requested which will prescribe the length of time allowed for debate, and any other limitations under which it is to be considered, such as whether amendments may be offered on the floor by any member or only by members of the committee which reported the bill.

The bill is then assigned a place on the calendar, and in due course is called up for debate on the House floor. The House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House for consideration of the bill. After the allotted time for general debate, amendments are submitted, argued, and voted upon. Then the Committee of the Whole rises and the Speaker resumes the chair. A roll call vote on sundry controversial amendments may be taken before final passage.

Then the bill goes to the Senate where it is put through somewhat the same process. If the House and Senate bills are in disagreement, a conference takes place and when agreement is reached a conference report is filed which must be voted on in both Houses. Then the final bill goes to the White House for the President's signature. Should he veto, it is returned to both Houses where a two-thirds vote of each is needed to override the veto.

But the longer you are privileged to work at it, the more convinced you become that this country of ours is the most wonderful country in the world and the more earnestly you hope that you may be worthy to serve her.

NOVEMBER 18, 1961.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Congressional sine die adjournment gives us all quite a chance to do other than the normal thing. So while I am about these other things wouldn't it be a good idea if I sent you short briefs about the committees that have the really heavy work of legislation? Here you are:

AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE

This committee consists of 35 members—21 Democrats and 14 Republicans. The current chairman is Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina. As the name implies, this committee handles all Federal legislation affecting agriculture, including price supports on major crops, soil conservation matters, soil bank payments, agriculture and industrial chemistry, agricultural colleges and experimental stations, research, extension services, production, marketing, and stabilization of farm products, animal industry and diseases, crop insurance, entomology, farm credit, forestry, home economics, livestock and meat products inspection and rural electrification.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

The Appropriations Committee is the largest standing committee, consisting of 50 members—30 Democrats and 20 Republicans. The chairman is Representative CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri. When this committee was established in 1865, it had charge of all Federal appropriations. Gradually, its jurisdiction was split among other committees until 1922, when all appropriation measures again were placed under its authority.

The Appropriations Committee handles the hundreds of agency requests through a series of subcommittees, which report to the full committee after hearings and examination of agency budgets. It appropriates funds for the support of the Government, conducts studies and examinations of the organization and operation of the executive departments and agencies, holds nationwide hearings and has subpena power for witnesses and documents, reviews appropriation requests by agencies and hears testimony of individuals and agency witnesses in support of budget requests.

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

This committee which has 37 members—21 Democrats and 16 Republicans—was established by the 1946 Congressional Reorganization Act to take charge of activities affecting the Nation's defense efforts. The chairman is the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia. The Armed Services Committee has jurisdiction over matters affecting the Department of Defense generally, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force; ammunition depots, forts, arsenals, military reservations and establishments; the pay, promotion, retirement and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces; scientific research and development in support of the armed services; selective service; the size and composition of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force; soldiers' and sailors' homes and strategic and critical materials necessary for national defense.

BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

There are 30 members on the Banking and Currency Committee—18 Democrats and 12 Republicans. The current chairman is Representative BRENT SPENCE, of Kentucky. Established in 1865, this committee has extended its fields of jurisdiction as the Nation's money system became more complex. The Banking and Currency Committee handles matters involving the Nation's banking and currency; economic controls on commodity prices, rents and services in wartime; deposit insurance; the Federal Reserve System, financial aid to commerce and industry, coinage of gold and silver and measures affecting these minerals; issuance and redemption of Government notes, and public and private housing.

DECEMBER 2, 1961.

SECOND REPORT ON COMMITTEES

DISTRICT COMMITTEE

This committee often is referred to as the city council of Washington. It has 24 members—15 Democrats and 9 Republicans. The chairman is Representative JOHN L. MCMILLAN, of South Carolina. The District Committee handles all matters relative to municipal affairs of the District of Columbia, including incorporation and organization of societies, insurance, criminal and corporation laws, municipal and juvenile courts, public health and safety, and taxes.

EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE

This is another postwar committee, founded in 1947. It deals with the humanities legislation, covering the entire field of labor, such as Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin laws, minimum wage, etc., as well as education bills, the school lunch program, vocational rehabilitation, and the welfare of minors. There are 31 members on the Education and Labor Committee—19 Democrats and 12 Republicans. The current chairman is Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, of New York.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

As you know, this is the committee I have served on for 21 years. One of the truly venerable committees of the House, it was founded in 1822, and at one time had control of appropriations. There are 33 members of the Foreign Affairs Committee—20 Democrats and 13 Republicans. Our chairman is Representative THOMAS E. MORGAN, of Pennsylvania. The Foreign Affairs Committee studies relations of the United States with foreign nations; handles regulations affecting acquisition of land and buildings for foreign embassies and legations, foreign loans and grants, international conferences and congresses, the diplomatic corps; fosters foreign trade, the protection of American citizens abroad, passport regulations, the Red Cross, the United Nations, and international financial and monetary organizations.

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

Established in 1952, this committee is one of the newest in the House. It consolidates the activities that were formerly handled by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which was set up in 1927. There are 30 members on this committee—19 Democrats and 11 Republicans. The chairman is Representative WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Illinois. Originally, 11 separate committees did the work now done by the Government Operations Committee. It handles budget and accounting matters, bills affecting reorganization of the executive branch; receives and examines reports of the Comptroller General's Office; and checks economy and efficiency in the operation of the Federal Government. The committee can hold hearings anywhere in the United States with subpena power over witnesses and documents.

HOUSE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

This committee is referred to as the "Housekeeping Committee" and handles allocation of funds appropriated by Congress for operation of the House of Representatives. There are 25 members on the committee—15 Democrats and 10 Republicans. The chairman is Representative OMAR BURLESON, of Texas. The House Administration Committee also handles affairs concerning the Library of Congress, the House Library, selection of stationery and pictures, the Botanic Gardens, the erection of monuments, the Smithsonian Institution, the printing and distribution of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the assignment of office space, administration of House Office Buildings and the House wing of the Capitol, reports on travel by House Members, and handles enrollment of all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions after passage by the House and their presentation to the President.

DECEMBER 9, 1961.

(This is the third of my series concerning the various standing committees of the House of Representatives, their activities and functions)

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

In 1951 this committee received its present name, replacing the old Public Lands Committee, which was established in 1805. There are 31 members on the committee—18 Democrats and 13 Republicans. The chairman is Representative WAYNE ASPINALL, of Colorado. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee considers matters relative to natural resources, Indians, national parks, irrigation and reclamation, mineral land laws, and matters pertaining to grazing and mineral resources on public lands.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE

This committee handles legislation dealing with all types of commerce—travel, telephones, telegraph, the stock market, public health, weather reporting and forecasting, interstate business, civil aeronautics, inland waterways, interstate oil compacts and natural gas, railroad labor and retirement, regulation of interstate communications and interstate transmission of power. There are 33 members of this committee—20 Democrats and 13 Republicans. The chairman is Representative OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

The Judiciary Committee handles matters affecting the courts, constitutional amendments, national holidays, immigration, patents, antitrust proceedings, civil and criminal claims against the Government, Federal penitentiaries, U.S. Patent Office, copyrights and trademarks, protection of commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and revision of the U.S. statutes, and State and territorial boundaries. There are 35 members on the Judiciary Committee—21 Democrats and 14 Republicans. The chairman is Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York.

MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE

The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has 31 members—19 Democrats and 12 Republicans. Its chairman is Representative HERBERT C. BONNER, of North Carolina.

This committee has legislative authority over shipping, the Coast Guard, fisheries and wildlife, navigation, the Panama Canal, the merchant marine, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, conservation of fish and wildlife resources, inspection of ships, administration of the Panama Canal, registering and licensing of vessels, international ship safety rules and regulations of the U.S. Coast Guard and Merchant Marine Academies.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

This committee handles bills affecting the 2.5 million Government employees, the 10-year census, postal services and operation of the Nation's 36,000 post offices, the National Archives, compensation, classification, and retirement of officers and employees of the U.S. Government. There are 25 members on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee—14 Democrats and 11 Republicans. Chairman is Representative Tom Murray, of Tennessee.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

There are 34 members on the Public Works Committee—20 Democrats and 14 Republicans. The chairman is Representative Charles A. Buckley, of New York. This committee handles matters pertaining to flood control, river and harbor improvements, highways, Government buildings, navigational projects and water power. Included in these fields are measures relating to the Capitol, Senate, and House Office Buildings, construction and maintenance of roads, the National Zoo, bridges, dams, and power projects.

December 16, 1961.

(This is the fourth report of my series concerning the makeup of the standing committees of the House of Representatives)

RULES COMMITTEE

The Rules Committee is known as the "watchdog" committee, or the "traffic control" committee of the House. It sets up the rules under which the House considers legislation, such as whether or not amendments will be allowed and the length of time a bill shall be debated. It also has jurisdiction over propositions to make or change the rules of House final adjournment of the Congress. This year, as you will recall, this committee was enlarged from 12 to 15 members—10 Democrats to 5 Republicans. The Chairman is Representative Howard W. Smith of Virginia.

SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS COMMITTEE

Only 3 years old, this is the "space age" committee which handles matters pertaining to astronautical research and development, including resources, personnel, the Bureau of Standards, weights and measures and the metric system, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, outer space—including control and exploration, science scholarships, and scientific research and development. Representative George P. Miller of California is chairman of the Science and Astronautics Committee and it has 25 members—15 Democrats and 10 Republicans.

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

This committee investigates propaganda activities, subversion and un-American activities which attack the principle of the form of government guaranteed by the Constitution. It determines the extent, the character and object of such propaganda, of domestic or foreign origin. The committee reports to the House the results of its investigations, together with recommendations for remedial legislation. There are 9 members of the committee—5 Democrats and 4 Republicans. The chairman is Representative Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania; Representative Gordon Scherer, of Cincinnati, is the ranking Republican member.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

This committee was established after World War II. Legislation pertaining to veterans was formerly handled by various other committees such as Education and Labor and Armed Services. The Veterans' Affairs Committee now handles matters pertaining to veterans' compensation, vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans, Government life insurance issued to servicemen, pensions, readjustment of servicemen to civilian life, soldiers' and sailors' relief, veterans' hospitals, and medical care and treatment of veterans. Representative Olin Teague, who is a veteran himself, is the committee chairman. There are 25 members—15 Democrats and 10 Republicans.

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Founded in 1789, this is one of the oldest committees of the Congress. It is generally known as the tax committee and is responsible for all revenue and social security measures. It also handles matters pertaining to customs collection districts, ports of entry, reciprocal trade agreements, the bonded debt of the United States, deposit of public moneys and transportation of dutiable goods. There are 25 members on the committee—15 Democrats and 10 Republicans. Representative Wilbur D. Mills, of Arkansas, is chairman.

RESTRICTIONS ON EARNINGS OF THOSE UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY SHOULD BE REMOVED

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, early in the last session of Congress I introduced H.R. 315, to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving social security benefits. My bill is still pending before the Ways and Means Committee. A column by Robert Peterson, which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of November 6, 1961, very clearly gives the reasons why the restrictions on earnings should be lifted. Under unanimous consent, I include the column in the Record as part of my remarks:

Life Begins at 40—Wants Restrictions on Earnings Lifted

(By Robert Peterson)

For years I've been trying to support Uncle Sam's contention that elders who earn more $1,200 a year should forfeit something from their social security checks.

I took my unpopular stand after going to Washington, digging into the facts and making an honest effort to understand the reasoning behind the social security law restricting the earnings of beneficiaries between the ages of 62 and 72.

Those with whom I talked reminded me that the social security program was not intended to serve those elders lucky and healthy enough to continue working. Instead, it was devised primarily to help those seniors who could no longer work.

Looking at it from that point of view there seemed to be merit in this law requiring that those healthy and active enough to earn more than a hundred a month should relinquish a bit of their social security.

CHANGES MIND

But I'm changing my mind. People have come to view their social security benefits as inalienable rights, and the law restricting their income has been held up to such ridicule and castigation that it has ceased to be regarded as a sound and worthy instrument.

Although I continue to respect the premise on which law was based, I think this earnings restriction should now be abolished for these reasons:

First, the reasoning behind this law is not easy to understand.

Second, it violates our traditions to be told that a man who retires can receive a pension while a man who has the spunk and will to continue working must forfeit all or part of such a pension.

IT'S UNSOUND

Third, it is discriminatory because the restriction applies only to earnings from employment rather than to income received from such sources as dividends or rentals.

Fourth, it is geriatrically unsound to do anything which discourages—rather than encourages—older people from working as long and as enthusiastically as they possibly can.

Of course, there are those who would like to abolish the entire social security program and who contend that people should stand on their own and provide for their own support in old age. But a large percentage of the population is simply unable to do this. Our social security program adopted in 1935 is here to stay.

The lawmakers say it will cost about $2 billion a year if the law is changed to remove restrictions on the earnings of social security recipients. But since this is obviously what people want let's trim the budget at some other point and permit the will of the majority to prevail.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mrs. Norrell (at the request of Mr. Trimble) for today through January 20, 1962, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Patman for 10 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Meader, for 30 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. Meader, for 10 minutes today, vacating his special order for Tuesday, January 16.

Mr. Curtis of Missouri, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Staggers (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 5 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Pelly (at the request of Mr. Barry), for 20 minutes, tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Reuss and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Ashmore and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOOLEY in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS and to include a speech by Mr. SCHERER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BARRY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mrs. DWYER.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. GLENN.

Mr. BOW.

Mr. SHORT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HEALEY.

Mr. ZELENKO.

Mr. COHELAN.

Mr. BRADEMAS.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1745. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1955, relating to the regulation of fares for the transportation of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 16, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1529. A letter from the national adjutant, Disabled American Veterans, transmitting reports and proceedings of the national gathering held in St. Louis, Mo., August 21-25, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 304); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1530. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Annual Report of the Secretary of Defense on the Reserve component of the Armed Forces for the fiscal year 1961, pursuant to section 279 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1531. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting the report of the Secretary of the Air Force on progress of the flight training program for the year 1961, pursuant to Public Law 879, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1532. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting reports by the Secretaries of the Army and Navy relating to officers above the rank of major in the Army and lieutenant commander in the Navy receiving monthly flight pay for the 6-month period ending December 31, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 301, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1533. A letter from the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., transmitting the Annual Report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., for the year ending December 31, 1961, pursuant to the act incorporating said company; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1534. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report on the state of the Nation's Capital to the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1535. A letter from the Assistant General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a report relating to foreign excess property disposed of during fiscal year 1961 by the Atomic Energy Commission, pursuant to section 404, 63 Stat. 398; 40 U.S.C. 514; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1536. A letter from the Sergeant at Arms, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting a statement in writing exhibiting the several sums drawn by him pursuant to sections 78 and 80 of title 2, United States Code, the application and disbursement of the sums, and balances, if any, remaining in his hands, pursuant to title 2, United States Code 84; to the Committee on House Administration.

1537. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

1538. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of November 30, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1539. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Power Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1540. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the 75th Annual Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission to the Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1541. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting copies of certain final valuations of properties of certain carriers, pursuant to section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1542. A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting a statement of all judgments rendered by the U.S. Court of Claims for the year ended September 30, 1961, pursuant to section 791(c), title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1543. A letter from the Navy Cross corporation agent, Legion of Valor, U.S.A., Inc., transmitting the financial statement of the Legion of Valor, U.S.A., Inc., covering the period from August 16, 1960 to July 31, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 224, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1544. A letter from the Maritime Administrator, Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administration for the fiscal year 1961; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1545. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a report relating to Civil Service Commission positions in grade GS-18, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 9638. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept for administration under the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented, donations of encumbered lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 9639. A bill to render Cuba refugees eligible for adjustment of status under section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BLITCH:

H.R. 9640. A bill to provide that the lake formed and to be formed by the Walter F. George lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River, Ala. and Ga., shall be known, and designated as Lake Roanoke; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9641. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and certain other expenses paid by him for the education of a dependent foreign student at a college or university in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H.R. 9642. A bill to extend and amend the conservation reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 9643. A bill to increase annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 9644. A bill to deny the use of the U.S. postal service for the carriage of Communist political propaganda; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 9645. A bill to provide a credit against the individual income tax for individuals who make contributions or gifts to the United Nations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 9646. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America to be held in 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARDING:

H.R. 9647. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an amendatory contract with the Burley Irrigation District, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 9648. A bill to amend the code of law of the District of Columbia with respect to the admission of persons to public exhibitions, shows, performances, or plays in the District of Columbia, to prohibit the radio or television broadcasting of certain objectionable matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 9649. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes", approved July 5, 1946, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H.R. 9650. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Navy to convey certain excess land together with all buildings and improvements thereon, formerly designated as the Columbia River Group, Pacific Reserve Fleet, Tongue Point, Astoria, Oreg., to Clatsop County, Oreg; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 9651. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 9652. A bill to make more uniform the laws governing the coastwise trade of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 9653. A bill to assist in the reduction of unemployment through the acceleration of capital expenditure programs of State and local public bodies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9654. A bill to include the holders of star route and certain other contracts for the carrying of mail under the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PILCHER:

H.R. 9655. A bill to provide that the lake formed and to be formed by the Walter F. George lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River, Ala. and Ga., shall be known and designated as Lake Roanoke; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 9656. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended; the Federal Airport Act, as amended; and the National Housing Act, as amended; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9657. A bill to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 9658. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to assist the States of Maryland, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia to reestablish their common boundaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 9659. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the furnishing of hospital and medical care (including outpatient treatment) to peacetime veterans suffering from noncompensable service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 9660. A bill to amend certain laws which apply in the District of Columbia in order to deny benefits under those laws to any corporation, group, society, association, or other organization which in its operation discriminates among individuals on the basis of race or color; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 9661. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9662. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 9663. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 9664. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 9665. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 9666. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 9667. A bill for the relief of Chu Hyoung Chun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 9668. A bill for the relief of Maurice Diran Sobajian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Kentucky:

H.R. 9669. A bill for the relief of Molly Kwauk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 9670. A bill for the relief of Minerva Mae Ryley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI (by request):

H.R. 9671. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Battista Cammalleri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 9672. A bill for the relief of Amedeo Mugno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 9673. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eurina P. Richards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 9674. A bill for the relief of Sung Ae Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 9675. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Leung Chi King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9676. A bill for the relief of Eve Banasiak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 9677. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cecilia (Cecylia) Bonkowski Ruminska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 9678. A bill for the relief of Carmine Trimarchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 9679. A bill for the relief of Hisoe Iwata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 9680. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Kololian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9681. A bill for the relief of William Bloom, also known as William Blake; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 9682. A bill for the relief of Julius Szlajmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 9683. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucine Broussalian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

222. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of 365 persons in several States urging the Congress of the United States to stop the Red mail subsidy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

223. By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Resolution of the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Senator Kuchel Relating to Air Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last December 7, I made a speech at the University of Southern California in connection with the California State Department of Health weeklong seminar of air pollution.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the comments I made at that time be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNITY ACTION FOR CLEAN AIR

(Speech of THOMAS H. KUCHEL, U.S. Senator, before closing session of Fifth Annual Medical Conference on Air Pollution sponsored by the California State Department of Public Health, Thursday, December 7, 1961, at 1:15 p.m. in the Hancock Auditorium, University of Southern California, Los Angeles)

The obnoxious effects of the 20th century phenomenon known as smog have been realized for more than a decade and a half. The possibly dire consequences have been a subject of concern nearly that long.

As we take cognizance of those facts, we should recall that the first murky occurrences reported from Los Angeles in the hectic years of World War II were regarded for quite some time more as a topic for banter by comedians than as an ominous warning that the American people might have to pay a high price for the benefits of what we call technological advances in our mode of living and our economy.

During the subsequent period, the seriousness of air pollution has become more fully appreciated. The holding of a meeting such as this is a testimonial to an awareness in at least certain quarters that we cannot tolerate continued befouling of the atmosphere which is essential to human existence, let alone more contamination.

I can tell you—as one who has been in the forefront of efforts to obtain congressional appreciation for the importance of this curse—that it has not been easy to awaken persons not exposed to smog-caused misery and discomfort to the necessity of attacking it on varied and numerous fronts. Still, it is gratifying that since enactment of the Air Pollution Research Act, which I had the honor of introducing in Congress back in

1955, the scientific onslaught has been greatly stepped up and broadened. I am pleased that over the past 7 years, total appropriations by Congress to Federal agencies for research and investigation have risen from a pitiful level of under $1 million to the figure of $8,800,000 for the fiscal year in which we now are operating.

Ordinarily, I am loath to have Congress take on costly new programs especially when Government is urged to foot the bill for activities which basically are a major concern of private citizens and industries. But when the fundamental health and safety of millions of people is jeopardized by a monster with ever-expanding grasp, I certainly feel that expenditures—and substantial sums, not mere token outlays—by the Federal Government are fully warranted. Hence, I am glad to have this opportunity of pointing out that during the time since Congress agreed with me on the urgent need for Federal leadership and participation altogether more than $30 million has been voted to finance research, investigation, measurement, observation, training, and other effort under the direction of the U.S. Public Health Service.

Now the question arises, What has been accomplished? Along with asking that, many want to know: Is it enough?

I must leave it to the technical and scientific people to report on their achievements and progress but I can tell you that there seems to be sound reason for feeling our efforts to put an end to further pollution and then to reduce the discharge of contaminants are far less than the public welfare requires.

This is the judgment of, among others, the two most recent occupants of the White House. Both President Kennedy and President Eisenhower have told Congress specifically that it is imperative to broaden our programs and to intensify our labors in the air pollution field. In my own capacity as a legislator, I say it is foolhardy to believe that we are doing everything which might be undertaken to protect ourselves against this insidious danger giving mounting concern in more and more places across our Nation.

Lately there has been widespread alarm, bordering on impatience in some neighborhoods and certain strata of the population, about the danger of radioactive fallout. Such apprehension is directed at an event which—God willing—may never happen. Yet, over the course of a year, sometimes for prolonged periods of day after day, often recurring with exasperating frequency, millions and millions of Americans are exposed repeatedly to a danger not only with us but growing in fierceness and extent, one which may be far more serious than even the gloomiest among us suspect.

On that point, let me observe that since American eyes were opened to the repetitious nature of Los Angeles smog there has been a spreading national consciousness that pollution in various forms is already causing heavy damage, both physical and monetary in widely separated areas. This condition cannot be ignored.

Here in California alone, we have observed the symptoms of an undeniably menacing situation in such physically unlike communities as San Diego, the bay area, the farming sections of San Joaquin Valley, and the vicinity of our own State capital of Sacramento. On the opposite side of the continent, measurements this year in the National Capital and its environs in Virginia and Maryland brought frightening disclosure that concentrations of certain contaminants—fortunately for only brief periods and at rather wide intervals—sometimes have exceeded what is tolerable under the regulations and standards devised for the safety of people in Los Angeles.

As a legislator whose voluminous correspondence opens the eyes to multitudinous concerns and problems of American citizens, I can tell you that in a good many parts of our land there is a rising demand for drastic and sweeping action and for speed in taking it.

I am gratified that a wide spectrum of research projects has been financed by the Federal Government under authority of the law which bears my name. But it is obvious that we cannot protect the people's health by confining our efforts to the laboratory or making experiments in private. I agree it is essential to investigate the physiological consequences of exposure to smog, in order to know what elements must be removed from the atmosphere soonest and to determine to what degree we can tolerate certain emissions. I favor the establishment of atmosphere-measuring stations and scientific analysis of specimens collected.

At the same time, I fear that preoccupation with purely scientific studies may lead to an undesirable and avoidable invocation of needlessly stringent regulation. I am disturbed about the possibility that delay in encouraging other action may result in Federal invasion of what I characteristically have deemed the jurisdiction of municipal, county, regional, and State authorities. I would very much dislike to see the person of Uncle Sam clothed in a policeman's uniform, using the authority and power of a central government to act as a cop on the beat ordering incinerators or furnaces out of use or ruling automobiles off the road. Pressure for stern and far-reaching governmental action exists and is mounting, however.

As a sample of what may be in store, observe the quite momentous step taken in this very State. California at the moment is on the verge of specifying the particular types of devices or gadgets which must be attached to automotive vehicles in order to prevent the discharge of toxic elements injurious to humans, livestock, growing things, and even inanimate objects.

Back in the Nation's Capital, one of my Senate colleagues is sponsoring a bill—one which I am not yet convinced must be enacted to safeguard our people, but nevertheless, a proposal with plausible appeal to many—which would go a long way in the exercise of Federal police power. Among other things that bill would authorize abatement procedures similar to those provided in the Water Pollution Control Act, with Federal cease-and-desist orders and judicial enforcement as the climax. Unless results are achieved by voluntary measures, including perfection and use of devices to lower contamination, or effective controls at the community or area level, the time may very well come when Congress concludes that such far-reaching action is warranted.

There is a crying need for more interest, greater expression of responsibility, and larger investments of ingenuity in this situation. I am disturbed by many complaints about foot dragging. I had hoped that industry would display more concern about its part in checking the growth of this monster. I likewise hoped I could play a role in staving off precipitate legislation which might do violence to our concept of private enterprise and initiative by working to have Congress put up money for research that might pave the way for voluntary measures and realistic local controls.

Rightly or wrongly, the finger of suspicion about the primary source of the most objectionable air contamination is directed at motor vehicles. If that is so, it would seem to behoove the automotive industry to expend more energy and to clamor persistently for guidance, for data and facts, and for ideas. One would think that a segment of the American economy so imaginative as to conceive and foster design and production of conveniences and comforts such as automobile radios and air conditioners would have been equally eager to do everything possible toward reducing the amount of aerial garbage overhanging crowded city streets on too many days.

Here in southern California we do have an encouraging example of what can be done by public-spirited industries. I am heartened that our petroleum refiners, the big steel plant in a neighboring county, and assorted other manufacturing establishments recognized their obligations to install apparatus or alter operating methods so that contaminating discharges into the atmosphere might be curtailed. In different areas of the Nation such as Pittsburgh, Pa., it has been demonstrated that similar steps were possible to promote the public welfare.

Likewise, California has pointed the way toward sound and fair control procedures at the metropolitan area level. This use of governmental power is in accordance with American traditions and ideals. By creating air pollution control districts for Los Angeles County and the San Francisco Bay region, the State legislature has afforded a means of formulating programs tailored to fit peculiar local conditions and to attack particular local problems.

Because of the complexity and spreading blight of this problem, there appears to be both room and need for greater consultation and collaboration in efforts at its solution.

Many agencies of government at different levels, along with industries and businesses whose products and operations may be factors in or affected by air pollution and scientific and civic associations, undoubtedly could benefit themselves and advance the cause of cleaner air by swapping knowledge, evaluating ideas, and charting remedial courses along which all might travel.

A real desire to give practical application to findings of researchers and investigators could open the way to concrete achievements and thus be a boon to mankind.

Progress along these lines should be stepped up. In the hope of accelerating it, I twice have introduced in Congress legislation which I feel would be helpful to all with a stake and duty in remedying this condition existing so widely today. I am committed to strengthening the leadership role of the National Government, as Presidents Kennedy and Eisenhower recommended. To my regret, while the Senate twice has approved this legislation, there has been no committee consideration, and consequently no floor action, in the House of Representatives. I deplore such delay and trust that the next session in 1962 will find our colleagues in the other Chamber more disposed to give added impetus to Federal activities and efforts.

My proposal is no panacea. Its enactment would not result in overnight elimination of the chemical fumes and other contaminants which are suspected of making bronchial diseases more acute, of causing fruits and vegetables to shrivel, of bringing on tears and coughing, of lowering downtown visibility. But I do consider it imperative and highly desirable. Therefore I solicit your help in overcoming the apathy which has stalled it in the other branch of Congress.

Briefly, this bill would broaden our knowledge of the scope and nature of air pollution problems and give impetus to my thought that there is a great potential in voluntary action by informed people. It would not put Uncle Sam in the role of a cop on the beat but it would have him pointing the way as a guide and focusing attention on the need for practical measures.

The legislation which I say has Senate approval and is pending in the House would empower the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and, under him, the Surgeon General to call conferences, hold hearings, and make investigations whenever requested by State or local officials or whenever he believes such moves appropriate for the purpose of ascertaining all relevant facts about major pollution problems which may affect or be of concern to American communities or which are interstate in extent or character. The contemplated hearing boards would make reports with recommendations but, in respect for the concept of limiting the exercise of what are considered police powers, their conclusions, findings, and suggestions would not be binding or imposed upon any person, agency, or organization.

This is a minimum next step forward, in my estimation. It is a reasonable one and it has been advocated by two different administrations in Washington.

In the meantime, the Congress is awaiting reports on a so-called crash investigation into the part motor vehicles play in air pollution. Within the next year a comprehensive report is due from the U.S. Public Health Service, resulting from studies carried on with funds which I was privileged first to induce Congress to appropriate in order that the Schenck Act would not be a meaningless collection of words on the statute books. This report may have far-reaching significance and implications. It may result in greater public demand that Uncle Sam do something in the role of policeman. It may give rise to proposals that the Congress lay down standards of air purity under the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution or public welfare concepts of using Federal authority as it has done in the field involving foods and drugs.

We have come a good distance since the first feeble moves, back in 1954, to have the Federal Government take part in the war on smog. I regret that progress has not been greater, that action has been slow. At the same time I feel we have reason to be somewhat encouraged by developments since President Eisenhower set up at my urging 7 years ago the Ad Hoc Interdepartmental Committee on Community Air Pollution Problems. There is no denying the inescapable necessity of seeing that our vaunted industrialization and mechanization and technical progress do not choke off the supply of air we once thought limitless and inexhaustible.

A conference such as this is evidence of a spreading awareness of the need and wide responsibility for grappling with a menace of grave proportions. I trust that among its results will be constructive indications to the Congress of additional legislative steps to improve the protection of our people against polluted air. I trust that it will intensify the determination of all attending to fight as vigorously as they are capable to awaken all elements of our people about the importance of overcoming the problem.

Sam Rayburn: Friend and Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, Sam Rayburn was a man whose qualities radiated in spite of his quiet nature. He is greatly missed by all who knew him, and throughout the country, even by those who did not have the privilege of knowing him personally. I consider it a high honor to have served in the House with Mr. Sam as Speaker. He was a good friend as well as a great statesman.

His friendship can be truly appreciated only by those who knew him. His statesmanship, however, is evident to anyone who has lived through the Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower administrations and this first year of the Kennedy administration, or to anyone in future times who studies those significant years. Few men will leave an imprint as large as Mr. Sam's.

Labor Unions Versus Public Interest in Defense Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to bills which I introduced on the opening day of Congress, which I sincerely believe to be in the best interests of our defense effort.

One of the bills, H.R. 9555, would prohibit strikes by employees employed in certain strategic defense facilities, such as missile sites, and so forth. The second, H.R. 9554, would amend the antitrust laws to prohibit certain activities of labor organizations in restraint of trade.

These bills are identical to the two introduced last September by Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, of Arkansas, chairman of the Permanent Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Government Operations Committee. Hearings held by this committee last April and May showed that a series of strikes, work stoppages, featherbedding and other inefficient and uneconomical practices and abuses at Cape Canaveral, Vandenberg and other missile bases and defense establishments, had most certainly harmed our defense efforts. The revelations brought out during the course of these investigations were truly shocking and astounding.

In a speech given last September by Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell L. Gilpatric, before the National Security Industrial Association—which is made up of defense contractors—I note that he stated "the country has a right to demand of both defense industry and defense establishments a higher level of efficiency." I agree with this statement. I feel the country has a right, and I feel the Congress has a duty, to follow up this demand by considering and passing legislation which will put the necessary teeth into the laws which will help provide this high level of efficiency. While the Missile Sites Labor Commission, set up by President Kennedy on May 26, 1961—after the revealing story of missile site abuses by some labor groups had become public—admittedly has done a fine and effective job, and has succeeded in reducing the abuse of our defense program to a great extent, this, in my opinion, is merely a stopgap measure, depending to a great extent upon the promises of some labor leaders, or voluntary compliance, to lessen and prevent such abuses. Promises, as we all know, are like piecrust—easily broken. A few hotheads in labor, just as a few hotheads in management, can too easily and quickly undo all the good which men of integrity and honor have brought about.

I noted further, in an article published in the Washington Star last October 10, that Secretary Goldberg, commenting upon the progress made by the Commission, pointed out that while strikes idled workers at missile and space sites for 1,136 man-days in September 1961, this strike record was better than the 4,979 man-days lost in September 1960—before establishment of the Missile Sites Labor Commission—and said "it is too high in view of the critical importance to the Nation of our missile and space programs."

While I full well realize Secretary Goldberg was not suggesting that the Missile Sites Labor Commission be dissolved, I believe and feel certain many other Members of Congress will agree with me, that we should exercise our responsibilities, as representatives of our people, to pass legislation which can insure the highest level of efficiency needed in our defense effort. The public deserves, and has a right to this insurance, and we would be remiss if we did not bend every effort to provide it.

I, of course, have been queried as to the likelihood or possibility that such legislation would be given consideration by the present administration. Let me say that I feel President Kennedy should be more than willing to give his political blessing to such proposals, in view of several statements he made while running for the office of President, regarding our "missile lag." Let me give you two examples from the printed "Speeches of Senator John F. Kennedy, Presidential Campaign of 1960." Here is a quote from a speech made before the VFW Convention at Detroit, Mich., where he said:

> The facts of the matter are that we are falling behind—behind in our schedules, behind in our needs, behind the Russians in our rate of progress. The missile lag looms larger and larger ahead * * * we need to put our Strategic Air Command on an air alert and under wide dispersal, improve our systems of continental defense, step up our antisubmarine warfare effort, increase the thrust of our rocket engines, harden our missile bases * * *.

In a speech made at Kittanning, Pa., on October 15, 1961, Candidate Kennedy said:

> I believe that the present rate of growth of the Soviet Union in military strength, particularly in long-range missiles, is greater than ours, and while I believe that today the United States is secure, I believe there is a danger in 1962, 1963, and 1964, that unless we move ahead at a greater rate, we won't meet it * * *.

In adding up these statements, and the facts as developed during the investigations by Senator McCLELLAN, it becomes painfully apparent that we cannot afford to pamper one segment of our population at the expense of the security of our Nation. These legislative proposals should not be construed as a criticism of labor as a whole, any more than antitrust legislation of the past should be considered as criticism of business or management as a whole.

I believe it is important for the Congress to consider and pass this legislation, and for the President to join in this effort. We must remember that whether we like it or not, we are in a race for survival as a free nation. This situation is not one of our choosing and we have to bear in mind that neither is our defense effort. The work on missile sites and defense installations is critical in the final determination of whether or not the United States maintains its present military superiority.

I sincerely hope the Members of Congress will see their way clear to join in consideration and passage of this, or similar legislation.

A Parallel in Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, on last Wednesday, the House installed a new Speaker and Majority Leader. Both JOHN W. MCCORMACK and CARL ALBERT are capable and experienced legislators—dedicated to our form of government and the welfare of the people. The Democratic majority did well in its choice of these two Members.

A parallel exists in my State of New Jersey where, on last Tuesday, the State senate installed a new president of the senate and majority leader, except both are Republicans, but apart from party affiliations, the similarity remains. Frank S. Farley, the new president of the senate, and Charles W. Sandman, the majority leader, are capable and experienced legislators. Senator Farley of Atlantic County has served as State senator for over 20 years, and has been a dedicated public servant all of his adult life. He is an acknowledged Republican leader in South Jersey, and has received many honors for a host of accomplishments. His political motif has always been good government and the welfare of the people. He has never forgotten the training of his youth as a member of one of the fine old families of Atlantic City, and is always kind, considerate, and fair in his associations with his colleagues and constituents.

Senator Sandman, the new majority leader, is a man of great fortitude borne of good training and experience in government. As the senator representing a small county, he has had to battle with the political leaders from the large counties, and has always fared well in the result and gained stature at the same time. He, too, is a patient, kindly man with a convincing manner that pleases and placates all who come in touch with him.

The State of New Jersey is, indeed, fortunate in having these fine officials directing the senate during the forthcoming year, and as the senators representing two of my three counties of the Second Congressional District, Atlantic and Cape May Counties, I am looking forward to our cooperation, which has been so steadfast and helpful to me in my 4 years in Congress.

Remarks of Congressman Edwin B. Dooley at Assembly of Rye, N.Y., Junior and Senior High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on December 14, 1961, I had the pleasant opportunity of addressing more than 1,000 students at the Rye Junior and Senior High School in my district of Westchester County, N.Y.

The attitude, responsiveness, and conduct of the students of that institution was most impressive and admirably reflected the fine leadership of the principal, Miss Elizabeth Brown, and the teachers there.

The text of my remarks follows:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN EDWIN B. DOOLEY, RYE JUNIOR AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL, RYE, N.Y., DECEMBER 14, 1961

I am honored to have been invited to participate in your assembly program this morning. I am especially indebted to your principal for affording me this opportunity.

I stand before you with mixed emotions. On the one hand, I am grateful for the opportunity to exchange greetings with my younger constituents, for to do so is always an enriching experience. Too frequently, students are limited to visualizing their Federal Government and Representatives in Washington through the pages of their social studies books. If time permitted, I would like to vist every high school in this area, for it is young men and women like yourselves whose future destinies are most affected by the legislative decisions made in Washington.

On the other hand, because of the nature of the subject, this is perhaps the most difficult speech I have ever been called upon to deliver.

About 3 weeks ago a petition which originated here at Rye High School was brought to my attention. It was addressed to President Kennedy, your United Nations Delegate Adlai Stevenson, your two New York Senators, and myself. Although some of you in this auditorium did not sign it, I am sure at least some portions of it expressed the sentiments of all.

After citing your apprehension over the possible effects here in Rye of a nuclear attack on New York City you said, and I quote, "We want to live. We want a peaceful world, where we can learn, and play and work, and enjoy the good things in the world as we know it now. We think young people everywhere want these things too. And we believe that it is your wish, too."

Although those words originated with you, the sentiments are indeed universal.

I have not come here to say you have nothing to fear. To do so would be an insult to your knowledge of current events. The fears of all of us are perhaps one of the stabilizing forces in the world today. It was a benevolent Almighty who instilled fear in the heart of man and beast alike, for this was to be the primary force in their survival. But unlike the beast, man was endowed with more noble emotions to the end that he has had to learn to understand his fears.

With much justification, you and I may feel we are living in the darkest and most perilous days of history, when too few of our scientific achievements are harnessed for peaceful purposes. Nevertheless, I sometimes wonder if the dangers of our times, magnified by more rapid communications, have not blurred our vision of the past. Man has always lived with fear.

From the Egyptian enslavement of the children of Israel to the slaughter of Christians in the Colosseum at Rome, fear for survival did not deter the growth of the great western religions. From the outnumbered ranks of Lexington to the battle of sticks and stones against tanks in Budapest, fear did not dampen man's yearning desire for dignity and independence.

Fear of a mysterious continent, savage Indians, and cold winter winds did not discourage those brave men, women, and children from settling in America. Fear is in the mind of Astronaut Commander Glenn, but it will not alter his desire for accomplishing a higher ideal, that of challenging the mysteries of space.

But some of you may be saying to yourselves, these people are all nobler than I. Perhaps, but I wonder how many of you in your younger years sustained a bloody nose against uneven odds when you felt you were in the right? How many will risk the temporary disgrace of failure rather than cheat on an exam?

So it is in the world today. We must never betray our moral principles strictly in the name of survival.

Your petition concludes with the appeal, and I quote, "We urge you to listen to us, and to start to take the steps necessary for world disarmament and permanent peace." I wonder if those of you who signed the petition appreciate the significance of those words.

When you asked your President to "start" to take the steps necessary for peace, you were asserting that the United States had not yet done so.

I disagree. Although you were too young to remember, there was a time when your Government enjoyed a monopoly of atomic weapons. During that period—in 1946 to be specific—former President Truman endorsed a plan that was submitted to the United Nations by one of our greatest living Americans, Bernard Baruch. This would have turned over all phases of atomic development to an agency of the United Nations. Russia rejected the offer. Eight years later former President Eisenhower submitted his open skies proposal to the United Nations, which would have laid open to the penetrating aerial camera lens any possible military buildup, either nuclear or conventional. This, too, was rejected. These and many other offers for effective arms control were made by the United States from a position of strength, not weakness.

While I disagree with this part of your petition, I think it is very significant that here in Rye, N.Y., there are at least 280 high school students who freely express dissatisfaction with their Government's efforts for world disarmament.

In Russia, your contemporaries of high school age would never do likewise. Because there is virtually no public discussion of governmental policy either on the radio, in the newspapers, or among adults in the home, these young people have been convinced their Government seeks peace, that it has been forced into warlike preparations only by hostile and aggressive acts of the Western Powers. For this reason above all others, Soviet young people will blindly exert any effort their leaders require of them.

We have in the world today two opposing systems, each capable of destroying the other, where the people of one are satisfied their Government can do no wrong, and where the people of the other are traditionally skeptical of the performance of their leaders.

In Communist countries, only a chosen few can depose a leader either by a bullet or other brutal means; in the United States your parents can eliminate those of us in public office through their ballots. In Russia, through ignorance, the people are satisfied with the efforts of their leaders for world peace; in the United States, through spirited discussion, our people feel too much effort cannot be exerted.

Yet, freedom of discussion and action is a trust. Our criticism should always meet the test of being constructive. On grave issues such as nuclear testing and disarmament we should always strive for unity of action and purpose, while reserving the right as freemen to criticize. To do otherwise would be to weaken the cause of freedom.

The strength of a country rests with the strength of the individual. Just as light dispels darkness, understanding dispels panic. As panic destroys the person, so also can it destroy government.

President Kennedy recognized this when, in the spirit of Lincoln at Gettysburg, he warned the Nation that "we shall have to test anew whether a Nation organized and governed such as ours can endure."

It is a test we have met many times before. With your support, I am confident we will meet that test again.

May you all have a very happy holiday.

The Economic Outlook for 1962

REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation, going ahead at a moderate rate of progress, can look ahead to 1962, according to predictions, as a year of opportunity and advancement—and, yes, of challenge.

In a weekend broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations, I was privileged to reflect upon some of the major features of the economic picture.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

The Nation—with the dawn of 1962—can look ahead optimistically to a fairly good year of economic progress.

As of now, the economy is turning out: A record volume of goods and services, estimated at a rate of $540 billion annually; peak income of $429 billion, with about 67 million workers employed; and a generally brightening outlook in many fields.

Despite the fact that the Nation is rolling along at a moderately good pace, however, a microsopic analysis still reveals dark spots in the economic picture.

In agriculture, for example, the American farmers—including Wisconsin dairymen—are still experiencing prices of farm products too low in relation to the price of equipment, labor, taxes, and other farm expenses; deplorably low income of 85 cents per hour—compared with $2.29 per hour for workers in manufacturing industries; and surpluses that still weigh as a liability—not an asset—on the economy.

The labor picture, also is clouded. Despite upsurges in the general economy, there are still about 4 million unemployed (including about 70,000 in Wisconsin). The major categories include manufacturing, agriculture, construction, and other fields.

Unless this situation is corrected rapidly, the high rate of unemployment will not only have tragic effects for the jobless workers and their families, but will also be a dragging millstone on the overall economy.

What is needed? A microscopic analysis of the causes of unemployment, such as: Reduced output of an industry; displacement because of automation; slowdowns because of imports taking over markets from U.S. producers; and changing trends in the economy. Following such an analysis, the job will be to evolve specific plans, industry by industry, for improving the economic outlook.

The Government, too, must play a responsible roll in promoting economic progress by (a) Reform of the tax laws to spur—not stunt—growth and progress; (b) restricting Federal expenditures to absolute essentials; and (c) encouraging expansion of job-creating enterprises to assure not only adequate revenue and a balanced budget, but also provide a real stimulus to an overall economy.

The ogre of inflation, however, remains a threat and danger to the economy. In free enterprising Government cooperative efforts to promote a faster rate of progress, then, we must guard against ballooning inflation—an economic evil that hits hardest the folks in the moderate-to-low income brackets.

OPTIMISM—KEY TO ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

Progress in our economy, also, depends to a tremendous degree upon optimism and confidence in our economy by you, Mr. and Mrs. America.

Now, is there a justification for such confidence and optimism? In my judgment—yes, absolutely yes.

In the past, unfortunately, there have been mistaken—and sometimes ridiculous and irresponsible—efforts (both at home and abroad) to categorize our economy as second rate.

The economic facts of world life, however, demonstrate that this is far from the truth.

Let's cite some examples: First, comparison with Communist progress. Today, the United States—as mentioned—has a GNP rate of about $540 billion annually. According to best estimates available, this is way ahead of the combined output of all the Communist countries—valued at $350 billion annually. The Red bloc includes Albania, Bulgaria, Communist China, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, North Korea, North Vietnam, Outer Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, and the U.S.S.R.

Second, what about competition with free-world nations? Again, the United States is way out front. Annually, our production far exceeds—in fact, about doubles—the combined output of the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Canada, and Italy.

For these reasons, then, the American people should, in my judgment, be absolutely out of patience with—in fact, irritated with—the economic pessimists who, for whatever motives, downgrade our economic progress and accomplishment. There is absolutely no justification either for political or economic shortsightedness in underselling our country.

From these comparisons, then, it is obvious that we are not in danger of being immediately overtaken either by the Communists or non-Communist nations—although we cannot disregard such competition. The long-range efforts of the economy, then, should be zeroed in on such targets as (1) providing the goods and services to meet the needs of a growing 185 million population—expanding at the rate of 3 million a year; (2) creating the jobs necessary for our labor force, growing at 25,000 a week; (3) strengthening the economy to enable it to bear the burden of an ever-growing Federal budget—including skyrocketing costs for defense amounting to about $50 billion annually; and (4) promoting economic progress—not just in response to competition from abroad, but, rather, to live up to the great traditions and particularly the potential of our free economy—the mightiest production system in the history of the world.

The Railroad Industry Needs Help From Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, last fall the Railroad Transportation Institute held its annual meeting at Pittsburgh, Pa., on October 24 and 25. The institute, organized 7 years ago, is educational in purpose and provides a forum for the discussion of mutual problems and trends in transportation and for consideration of new techniques and developments in regulatory law and practice.

It was a pleasure to accept an invitation to attend the first day's session of the institute on October 24, at which time I delivered the following address:

THE RAILROAD INDUSTRY NEEDS HELP FROM CONGRESS

(Address by the Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, before the Railroad Transportation Institute, Pittsburgh, Pa., October 24, 1961, 10 a.m.)

I appreciate the honor of the invitation to address this gathering of experts in railroad transportation.

As you all know, I am an old railroader. Although no longer actively engaged in railroading, I have retained my interest in the industry.

As a Member of Congress I am intensely concerned with whatever affects the welfare of this Nation.

Transportation not only affects the welfare of everyone in the United States—it is the foundation on which an industrial civilization such as our is built—and without which it could not continue.

During the years when this Nation was expanding from the east coast to develop the vast areas to the Pacific, railroads were the prime movers of goods and people.

For many years railroads and common carriers were synonymous.

Now there are other common carriers—and much of the Nation's transportation is by private means as well.

The motor vehicle and modern highways have increased the mobility of an already mobile people.

The jet age—with its ultramodern aircraft and service facilities—has reduced travel almost to the status of commuting.

But despite these new modes and methods of transportation the railroads remain the backbone of the system—basic to the American economy—and not only to the economy but to our very survival and that of the free world.

We all know that the railroad industry is the second largest in the United States—that it represents an investment of nearly $35 billion—and is one of the Nation's largest employers and taxpayers—as well as one of the largest buyers and users of goods and services produced by others.

Yet we also know that this great industry is today in grave economic trouble.

Partly—railroads are victims of their own history and of the chaotic conditions that marked our growth and development as a nation.

But in larger part they are victims of the excesses of Government control and of the failure of Government to gear its policies toward transportation to the changed conditions of today.

Although railroads have lost their position as the only common carriers of consequence, they continue to be regulated much as when they were the only practical means for transporting large volumes of goods.

Railroads are still the best means of moving the vast volume of traffic.

But under present conditions they may not compete with other common carriers on an equal footing and both the railroads and other common carriers are unfairly handicapped in competing with private and other unregulated carriers.

Railroads must work under limiting restrictions which are not applicable to other forms of transportation.

If railroads were permitted to compete on equal terms with other forms they would be able—as true common carriers—to provide better public service.

You are all as well or better aware than I of the many problems the railroad industry now faces.

But let me mention a few which are—in some measure at least—related to Government regulation.

Railroads have been trying to operate a 1961 business under 1920 regulations.

As a result technological development has been retarded and many new and proved techniques have not been widely applied.

Restrictions have made it impossible for railroads to use their capabilities as mass producers of transportation to enlarge their markets and earning power.

Railroads need a large volume of business to realize the full capabilities of the plant.

Continuing low earnings necessitate a tight rein on maintenance and capital expenditures.

If prolonged—as earnings have been since World War II—the inevitable result is a shrinkage of railroad capacity.

Reserve railroad capacity is now less than at the beginning of World War II and would be dangerously inadequate in the event of a national emergency.

No transportation form has a vested right to handle certain traffic or to be protected against fair competition.

On the other hand, no form of transportation should be arbitrarily or unfairly precluded from competing with others.

Railroads should not be barred from charging rates for their services which exceed the cost of performing the service.

Consumer prices should not be inflated by unnecessarily high transportation costs.

Each transportation agency should be free to tailor services to fit the needs of customers.

But under Government regulation today, these basic principles of sound regulatory policy are completely ignored.

The result has been to encourage the inefficient in transportation at the expense of the efficient.

Total freight volume has increased rapidly, but the railroad share and that of common carriers as a whole have steadily declined.

The greatest increase by far has been in unregulated transportation, especially private.

Unless this trend is quickly reversed, there is danger that the Nation will soon find itself without an adequate common carrier system.

Despite the mushrooming growth of unregulated carriage, few changes have been made in the basic pattern of transport regulation and even these have been made on a sort of patchwork, emergency, or crises basis, without attention to basic problems or long-range goals.

The Transportation Act of 1958 was a step in the right direction but the railroads need more freedom to make competitive rates.

Provision should be made to allow the railroads to offer any rate so long as it is compensatory and is not unduly discriminatory between shippers or regions.

Rates must not be denied in order to protect other forms of transport.

Ratemaking freedom should be extended and not curtailed.

Consideration of the revenue effect of a proposed rate should be limited to the carrier proposing the rate.

The same ratemaking rule should apply to all carriers subject to the Transportation Act and should not be used by the ICC as an instrument to manipulate the normal competitive balance.

In this connection it would seem that the ICC should not set specific rates but only reasonable minimum and maximum rates.

If ever an industry needed the attention of Congress to correct grave inequities, it was railroads in 1961.

But, ironically, the measure that received priority attention almost to the exclusion of all others was one that would have repealed even the limited ratemaking freedom won for railroads in the Transportation Act of 1958.

Although the measure did not get out of the Senate Commerce Committee, the danger is not yet past.

For its supporters, led by James Hoffa and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, have promised an even more determined effort next year.

Both shippers and railroads gained in the defeat of recent proposals to suspend the power of the ICC to approve mergers.

While the exact number of railroad systems needed to serve the Nation cannot be stated exactly—it is clear that the Nation cannot afford the luxury of existing duplication.

To compel certain railroads to merge with others according to some plan worked out by a Government body would be tantamount to nationalization.

Mergers must be worked out by railroads themselves on the basis of practical and realistic interests in each case.

However, Government can and should make certain of reasonable safeguards to protect weaker railroads in the way of maintenance of routes and services—and the power to do this already has been vested in the ICC.

Few markets grow faster than transportation—which is predicted to double in 1980.

With present restrictions on railroad operations—it is impossible for railroads to develop as they should and as the national interest requires.

One of the major limiting factors is the insufficiency of funds generated through depreciation.

The low average rate for depreciation of road and structures and equipment makes the railroad especially vulnerable to inflationary influences.

For example—a car which cost $2,500 in 1929 can only be replaced today at a cost of $10,500 or more.

The difference has to be made up largely from borrowed funds—but the low level of railroad earnings has little appeal either to investors or lenders.

Congress should take note of these factors and allow a more realistic depreciation program.

Railroads should be allowed to recover their investment in plant and equipment within a shorter tax writeoff period than the present average of 40 years and should be permitted to earmark more funds out of income for replacement of property worn out in operations.

Rolling stock should be allowed a writeoff period of 15 years and other equipment 20 years.

One area in which Congress has acted to remove inequities between railroads and other transportation is in tightening the agricultural commodities exemption.

The 1958 act returned several formerly exempt products to regulation.

But again it did not go far enough.

The agricultural commodities exemption should either be repealed or extended to railroad operations.

Present regulation places railroads at a severe disadvantage in competing for hauling these commodities.

Their rates must always be published and cannot be changed on less than 30 days' notice to the public.

Other carriers may quote any rate necessary to obtain the traffic.

The opportunity to handle agricultural commodities traffic must be made available to all carriers on equal terms.

Congress should also repeal the bulk commodities exemption applicable to barge transportation or extend it to include the same commodities when carried by railroads.

Also, the commodities clause should be repealed.

This, as you know, is a restriction on the right of railroads to transport commodities which they own, or in which they have an interest.

It applies only to railroads, and other transport forms are not so restricted.

The passenger problems of railroads particularly need attention.

The provision for discontinuing certain passenger service contained in the 1958 act made it less cumbersome and burdensome to discontinue unprofitable trains and services.

But what is needed most are measures to help preserve railroad passenger service by making it possible to operate passenger trains at a profit.

Repeal of the 10-percent passenger fare tax would help and would also remove the discrimination against the people who must use public transportation.

Most of the critical passenger service problems involve the commuter lines.

Modernization to permit profitable operation of commuter service is not possible unless traffic volume is high—and unless railroad property used in this service is relieved of the heavy and inequitable taxloads it now carries.

Many cities that have allowed their raillines to disappear are belatedly finding out that they will have to be rebuilt—and at far higher cost.

Only a few short months after allowing its privately owned taxpaying commuter railroad to close up shop—the city of Los Angeles is reported to be seriously considering the construction of a costly new rapid transit system—employing conventional tracks and trains.

San Francisco is in the process of readying final plans for a similar system of rapid transit.

A fully automated rail rapid transit system costing $200 million has been proposed for Atlanta.

Right here in Pittsburgh—an exhaustive transport study is being made at a time when the Pennsylvania Railroad has about concluded that its commuter service to the city cannot be made to pay.

In short—the preoccupation over the past decade with multilane freeways and expressways as a solution to metropolitan transportation problems is now revealed as the wrong approach.

Valuable tax-ratable property is replaced by nontaxable concrete and asphalt—and no matter how fast approach highways are built—they do not solve the problems of parking and street congestion within the cities themselves.

One of my colleagues in Congress estimates that if railroad commuter service were discontinued in just five cities—the cost of additional highways to take up the slack would be $31 billion.

While the commuter problems are basically local or area problems—insofar as they affect the capability of the railroad system to serve the Nation they are national problems.

During the session of Congress just ended legislation was enacted which provides funds for assisting local government agencies with commuter service.

This is a step in the right direction.

Measures to provide more adequate funds for procuring commuter equipment should follow.

An ICC proposal to help preserve essential passenger service by subsidy to individual railroads will probably come before the next session of Congress.

I have mentioned only a few of the more serious inequities that handicap railroads as a result of the failure to modernize our national transportation policy and laws; there are many more.

Despite these handicaps—railroads since World War II have somehow managed to invest over a billion dollars a year on the average to provide new plants and equipment.

They have also developed ingenious new methods and concepts such as piggybacking and containerization.

Considering the low level of railroad earnings in the same period—their record in this area of self-help is outstanding.

Yet there are those who say that railroads have not done enough.

Curiously some who say this are Members of Congress who have voted to approve expenditures totaling $1,364 million in foreign aid to railroad projects outside the United States.

Surely it is reasonable to expect our Government to give as much attention to insuring adequate railroad service at home—as it has to providing for railroad needs in other countries.

In saying this—I do not mean to imply that the remedy for railroad ills lies in a massive infusion of tax dollars.

Nor does it involve the enactment of measures that would place undue burden on railroad competitors.

Above all—the remedy does not lie in hamstringing private transportation.

The motor vehicle is here to stay—and an American citizen still has the right to choose whether he will drive his own automobile or operate his own trucks—or engage the services of carriers for hire.

Freedom of choice for the individual is one of the freedoms which are the very foundation of our national life.

But the general welfare and defense of the entire Nation is endangered when the common carrier system of transportation is not kept strong.

The only sound remedy lies in relaxing government regulations which prevent common carriers from competing on equal terms—both servicewise and costwise—with private transportation.

There are obvious advantages in common carrier service for a large part of the traffic now carried by private vehicles—and given the freedom to tailor charges and services to fit the customers' needs—common carrier service could be made much more attractive than private carriage.

The Federal Government is engaged in a variety of programs designed to regulate and promote various forms of transportation—with little or no coordination among the programs.

Better coordination is necessary in the public interest and many Members of the Congress, including myself, are working to that end.

Through legislation—some of which I have briefly indicated today—the Congress can contribute substantially to solving the problems facing the railroads and to maintaining the strong and adequate common carrier system which is vital to our national existence.

You may rest assured that I shall continue to support measures which will strengthen our rail transportation system and provide a regulatory climate within which a well coordinated—truly national system of transportation may evolve.

It has been a great pleasure to be here today and I thank you for affording me the opportunity.

Commission on Campaign Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, on October 4, 1961, President Kennedy appointed a nine-member Commission on Campaign Costs. This Commission is a temporary, nonpartisan, study group. The work of the Commission will be to consider the cost of campaigning in Presidential elections and to recommend to the President not later than April 30, 1962, improved methods and means of financing future campaigns for President and Vice President of the United States. I think it appropriate at this time for Members of both the Senate and House of Representatives to know what is being done in this field. Therefore, I wish to call my colleagues attention to the statement of the President in announcing the appointment of the Commission, and also the Commission's statement subsequent to its first meeting with President Kennedy on November 9, 1961.

Senator CANNON has introduced S. 2426 in the Senate and I have introduced H.R. 9255. These bills provide for numerous changes in the Federal election laws:

The President today named a nine-member Commission on Campaign Costs to consider the costs of campaigning in presidential elections and to recommend improved ways of financing essential expenditures required of the major party nominees for President and Vice President.

Alexander Heard, dean of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina, will serve as Chairman of the President's Commission on Campaign Costs. Dean Heard, a leading authority on the problems of campaign financing, is author of the definitive study "The Cost of Democracy," published last year by the University of North Carolina Press.

The Commission is a temporary, nonpartisan, study group. It will do its work during the fall and will make its recommendations to the President in the spring in time for its recommendations to be considered by the next session of Congress.

In announcing the appointment of the Commission, the President said:

"Election of the President of the United States is the supreme test of the democratic process in this country. Because the duly nominated candidates of both our national parties must campaign throughout the country, carrying their views to all the Nation's voters, there are great financial burdens in conducting presidential campaigns. To have Presidential candidates dependent on large financial contributions of those with special interests is highly undesirable, especially in these days when the public interest requires basic decisions so essential to our national security and survival. The financial base of our presidential campaigns must be broadened.

"Among the services which must be paid for are staff assistance, transportation and communication facilities, radio and television time. Under present circumstances these items are enormously expensive, and thus the ability of candidates to carry on campaigns is, in large measure, governed by their success as fund raisers.

"Traditionally, the funds for national campaigns have been supplied entirely by private contributions, with the candidates forced to depend in the main on large sums from a relatively small number of contributors. It is not healthy for the democratic process—or for ethical standards in our Government—to keep our national candidates in this condition of dependence. I have long thought that we must either provide a Federal share in campaign costs, or reduce the cost of campaign services, or both.

"My Commission on Campaign Costs will take a fresh look at this problem, and will make such recommendations as it deems appropriate, looking toward proposals for the next session of Congress.

"A Federal share in presidential campaign costs has been under public discussion for a great many years. President Theodore Roosevelt was among the first to propose that presidential campaigns be assisted by the Government. Comparable proposals have been advocated subsequently by private citizens and by Members of the Congress, notably by the late Senator Neuberger of Oregon. Several such proposals are contained in bills pending in the current Congress. I am asking the Commission to inform itself on all of these as it conducts its study. In addition, I am asking the Commission to examine programs actually employed by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and by several democratic countries overseas in which governments participate in financing political campaigns. Finally, I expect that the Commission will consider a variety of other measures used in this country and elsewhere for facilitating campaigns, among them the permissive legislation which made possible last year's television debates without cost to the candidates.

"As I made plain in a press conference last May, I regard the inquiry to be undertaken by this Commission as a matter of great importance. I am grateful to the distinguished members of the Commission for their willingness to serve. I look forward to the results of their inquiry."

In addition to the Chairman, the other members of the President's Commission on Campaign Costs are:

V. O. Key, Cambridge, Mass., professor of government, Harvard College.

Dan Kimball, Los Angeles, Calif., president, Aerojet-General Corp., former Secretary of the Navy.

Malcolm Moos, New York City, adviser to the Rockefeller brothers on public affairs, professor of political science, Johns Hopkins University, former administrative assistant to President Eisenhower.

Paul Porter, Washington, D.C., member of law firm of Arnold, Porter & Fortas, former Chairman, Federal Communications Commission.

Neil Staebler, Ann Arbor, Mich., small businessman, Democratic national committeeman from Michigan, former chairman, Michigan Democratic State Central Committee.

Walter Thayer, New York City, president, New York Herald-Tribune, former chairman, United Republican Finance Committee of New York, national finance chairman of Volunteers for Nixon-Lodge.

John Vorys, Columbus, Ohio, member of law firm of Vorys, Sater, Seymour & Pease, former Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

James Worthy, Chicago, Ill., president, Republican Citizens of Illinois, former president, United Republican Fund of Illinois, former Assistant Secretary of Commerce in the Eisenhower administration, former vice president, Sears Roebuck & Co.

Members of the Presidents' Commission on Campaign Costs met with the President at noon today to launch its task of considering the costs of campaigning and recommending improved ways of financing expenditures required by nominees for President.

President Kennedy asked the Commission to make a report to him as early next spring as possible, but not later than April 30th.

Following the 3-hour organization meeting the Commission announced the appointment of Dr. Herbert E. Alexander as Executive Director to head the staff of the Commission. Dr. Alexander is presently director of the Citizen's Research Foundation, Princeton, N.J., from which position he will take a leave of absence.

The Commission will seek and welcome the views of interested parties, however it has tentatively decided not to hold formal hearings.

Challenges for 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last week President Kennedy presented the state of the Union message to the Congress.

The Congress now in accordance with its constitutional responsibilities must examine the problems and proposals in these and other fields; accept, or reject the proposals—as best serves the public interest; consider alternative methods of dealing with national problems; and then, as needed, enact new laws—or revise old ones—to better meet the needs of the Nation for progress and security.

We recognize, of course, that the problems confronting us cover a worldwide spectrum. We will need, then, to adopt a realistic priority system—"putting first things first." Prior to the President's message, I was privileged to review some of the major issues which—in my judgment—should be of high priority. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of this statement printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. DEFENSE

Putting more muscle and striking power into U.S. jet, missile, nuclear deterrent-to-aggression forces; expanding psychological-ideological offensives of the free world; strengthening the military, economic, political alliances of free nations, now serving as a bulwark against Red expansionism; develop a realistic civil defense program for maximum protection of the civilian population in event of war.

2. TAXES

Consideration of the President's special "Tax package"; efforts to wipe out inequities; avoid overlapping or pre-empting of State-local sources of revenue; establish a more equitable tax system.

3. ECONOMY

Handling a skyrocketing Federal budget, accompanied by deficits; coping with an ever-growing national dept; promote a favorable "balance of payments" for exports-imports; lowering too-high level of unemployment, still totaling over 6 percent of the labor force; expanded private and governmental efforts to promote a good rate of domestic progress.

4. HUMAN NEEDS

Medical care for the aging; aid to dependent children; efforts to establish realistic criteria for eligibility for public welfare programs.

5. AGRICULTURE

Review level of price supports; take a new look at supply-demand situation; more effectively utilize surpluses for: Food-for-peace program; special school milk and school lunch programs; food for the needy; etc. Carry forward improved conservation, management, and utilization practices for soil, water, and forest resources.

6. FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Resolving the question of scope of possible additional Federal aid; aid to private schools.

7. RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Review of national and international trade policies; efforts to eliminate discriminatory tariffs, quotas, etc., against U.S. products; possibility of providing assistance to U.S. industries damaged by, or suffering from, inflow of commodities under trade agreements; attempt to improve market opportunities for U.S. firms.

8. SPACE EXPLORATION

Putting more boost in our big booster rocket program; stepping up our man-in-space program; research for possible use—and defense against use—of space vehicles for military purposes; expand Government-private cooperation in utilization of satellites and other space vehicles for communications, weather reporting, and other purposes.

9. DOMESTIC PROGRESS

Strengthening free enterprise system; promote labor management cooperation—and curb abuse of economic or political power—to: (a) Better fulfill needs of people and nations; (b) hold down inflation; and (c) meet the crises of the times; carrying forward projects needed for port and harbor development, flood control, watersheds, conservation, highway, airports, housing and home building, antipollution of water and other programs.

10. FOREIGN POLICY

A comprehensive review of—and recommendations for improving—U.S. foreign policy and needs to more effectively deal with the global threat of communism, including: the Communist bloc; the Congo; Cuba; southeast Asia; and elsewhere in the world. The Congress also should consider enacting emergency legislation to deal with unforeseen contingencies—including war. Overall, U.S. foreign policy, of course, should not just be against communism; but—positively—should be designed to advance peace and progress in the world.

CONCLUSION

Admittedly, these are only highlights of a very long, complex legislative program ahead in Congress.

In these critical times, we need: High statesmanship and an ever-greater sense of responsibility; and a rededication of—and renewed effort by—our citizens and leaders to meet the complex challenges of these high tension times.

I am confident, however, that by: A greater awakening to the challenges ahead of us—domestic and foreign; and more effective utilization of our available and potential human, natural, and man-created resources, we can stop the Communists' progress toward world conquest; and strengthen a world climate of security in which people can dedicate more of their efforts toward peaceful purposes.

Dedication of U.S. Courthouse and Federal Building in Charleston, W. Va., Attended by State Notables

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is my belief that in the tomorrows we will regard 1961 as the year that America turned the corner on the road to a new era of greatness. The signs are already evident in many areas of the land, and in our own State of West Virginia there is a growing sense of hope in the future.

A significant factor in this new vibrancy in America is the heightened awareness of the partnership between the Federal Government and the individual States. In West Virginia this relationship was strengthened by the dedication in Charleston of a new U.S. courthouse and Federal building. Among the many governmental leaders speaking at the dedication were Gov. W. W. Barron, Representative John M. Slack, the Honorable John A. Shanklin, mayor of the city of Charleston, and the Honorable Chapman A. Revercomb, former U.S. Senator. The Honorable Robert T. Griffin, special assistant to the Administrator of the General Services Administration, represented the Federal Government on this occasion. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks and those of the other speakers at the dedication be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY HON. ROBERT T. GRIFFIN, DEDICATION CEREMONY, CHARLESTON, W. VA., OCTOBER 12, 1961

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests and friends, it is a privilege to be here today. I am flattered to appear on a program and a platform with so many speakers of renown. In deference to them and this fine audience, I will be brief.

The General Services Administration, as you may know, is frequently identified as Uncle Sam's landlord. In that capacity, it manages a giant network of buildings—federally owned and leased—from Maine to

Hawaii. One of the many responsibilities of GSA is to provide suitable working space for the thousands of Federal employees who discharge the highly diversified duties of modern government.

Here in Charleston, as in many another city, GSA first determined the need and feasibility of a building through a process of community surveys. It then worked with your community leaders and elected officials to obtain a site, and after that it contracted for architects, engineers, and builders. In supervising the progress of the project from conception to completion, it sought to serve your interests by localizing as much as possible the planning, the labor, and the skill that have transformed a dream into a reality.

I am happy to say, too, that for us in GSA this marks a second recent occasion to work closely with your officials and to share with your officials—local, State, and national—a sense of achievement. Our agency was charged with the disposal of the Government's surplus ordnance plant in neighboring south Charleston. Its sale to a firm prepared to reopen the facility and promote employment in this area gratified many people, including the President of the United States.

With propriety, I feel sure, time might now be taken to recount the history of the building we are dedicating today. And with such a recital would go sincere thanks to all those who labored long for the goal attained. On both scores, however, it may be reasonably assumed that the people of this community are well informed and gratefully aware.

Two features of your impressive courthouse and Federal office building deserve mention. On a wall inside will be found a permanent exhibit panel. Displayed there are authentic facsimiles of our Nation's most precious documents—the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. For young and old, in years to come, your freedom shrine will stir anew pride and appreciation of the enduring democratic precepts which are the bedrock of American freedom.

Flanking the main entrance of the building are large reproductions of the great seal of the United States, front and back, in calling attention to them, I should like to ask Mayor Shanklin to come to the rostrum.

Here, Your Honor, as a memento of this auspicious event, is a bronze medallion. It is a faithful miniature of the great seal. With the best wishes of Administrator John L. Moore, of General Services, it is presented to you and the people of Charleston as a keepsake symbol of the unity, integrity, and idealism which mean so much to all Americans.

Remarks by Senator Jennings Randolph, Democrat of West Virginia, in Dedication of the U.S. Courthouse and Federal Office Building, Charleston, W. Va., October 12, 1961

Mayor Shanklin, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen, we are gathered today to dedicate another step in the steady progress of Charleston. This building, which will house two U.S. courts and some 18 Federal agencies is witness to the growing economic and commercial significance of this city and our State.

But it is also testimony of a larger process at work in our society—the growing responsibilities of the Federal Government and the extension of the physical presence of the Government into such regional and local field offices as this.

In dedicating such a structure, it is appropriate for us to give thought to the question of the broader purposes to which we commit not only this building but our Government and our society as well.

Contrary to the presumptions of some critics, the increased scope of governmental responsibilities and action is not due to an insatiable thirst for power by so-called bureaucrats. It has been due to the inevitable growth in complexity of modern industrial pattern and to the greater number and variety of problems which transcend State boundaries.

It is our eternal debt to the wisdom of the founders of the Constitution that they established a framework within which the Federal Government might function to meet these problems without diminishing the personal and civil liberties which animate the spirit of democracy.

We hear much today from some quarters about the encroachment of the Government upon these liberties. Yet a dispassionate reading of American history would reveal, with occasional temporary lapses, that progress in the essential civil liberties—freedom of religion and of speech, freedom of the press and assembly, and extension of the right to vote—has been augmented by the Federal Government, rather than lessened.

True, the scope of the Government has grown, especially within recent decades, and with it governmental authority. But the principal change has been in control of the external conditions of our society which render more secure the internal life and liberty of the human spirit.

This then is the proper division of authority between the individual and the Government, between liberty and control. In those areas where spontaneity, creativity and the free interchange of ideas are involved, liberty must reign supreme. In those areas where men must be restrained from doing injury to their fellows and where we are moving toward an increasing awareness of our collective responsibilities, the Government rightfully exercises its authority for the benefit of all.

Thus, such Federal actions as maintenance of certain mutual restraints in trade and economic competition, enforcement of minimum wage and working conditions, and provision for the years of retirement—among many others—have not encroached upon, but rather, they have enhanced the development of individual freedom and the life and liberty of the mind. It is to these values that this building, our Government, and a free society are dedicated.

Remarks by Governor Barron, Dedication of New Federal Building, Charleston, Thursday, October 12, 1961

Dedications are special kinds of ceremonies. They are special because they represent milestones—measures of human accomplishment. Buildings grow out of needs, and when they are erected and ready for dedication they represent a victory, a fulfillment, an evidence of progress. Moreover, they are tangible victories, readily observable and reasonably permanent.

Monuments of the type represented by this new Federal building commemorate the vision of the past, but they also signify the prospects for the future.

The State and Federal levels of government are full-fledged partners in virtually every aspect of public life ranging from soil conservation to employment security. Increased Federal services to States have, over the years, brought more and more Federal employees to live in our midst. Rather than forcing us to go to Washington for every need, they have brought their services to our doorsteps. This makes sense both in terms of economy and convenience—to the Federal Government and to West Virginia. It was a simple yet far-reaching idea that these services could be more effective in a new house. We now have that new house, and a beautiful one it is.

The building we are dedicating today was erected to meet a real need: to serve an immediate practical purpose. The design was for utility, but much more was achieved. It has been said that beauty is its own excuse for being. Certainly the planning and building of a beautiful city and an attractive State is a worthy end in itself.

Never before has there been so much interest in lifting the face of West Virginia. All around us the new is replacing the old. Our new Federal building is a pace setter—an example of the kind of architecture that should grace all of our metropolitan centers. Through urban renewal projects and private enterprise we should see increasing numbers of truly modern structures of the type we now dedicate. And when they exist in abundance, our State will have a different appearance—a 20th-century look and a 20th-century attitude to go with it. We will be proud because the new look will be tangible evidence that West Virginia has come of age in the generation that accepts progress as our direction and as our goal.

Nearly 100 years ago the people of western Virginia identified their own interests as parallel with those of union. The State of West Virginia was thus conceived in the crucible of a war destined to weld our growing America into one of service to all. It is this concept of service to all Americans that has now brought to Charleston this impressive new building. So, here today we can be proud that the Union western Virginians fought to preserve has built this great structure to serve the needs of both a great Nation and a proud and progressive State.

Charleston Federal Building Dedication, October 12, 1961

(Acknowledgments to those present.)

This ceremony today—the dedications of a new Federal building to serve Charleston and surrounding communities—provides a significant event for all of us and a particularly happy occasion for me personally. A new Federal building is opened in a community only once in a lifetime; it is a permanent addition to the economic and political life of the city.

As a lifelong resident of Charleston, I have had an opportunity to watch the growth of this city and its increasing importance in the scheme of regional and national developments.

This ceremony today serves as an assurance of even more important stature yet to come, and of the confidence of the Federal Government in the stronger role yet to be played by this metropolitan area in the advancement of Federal programs. Today's ceremony is also significant because we are dedicating a landmark in steel and stone, permanent reminder of the durability of our Federal Union.

In these days of unrest and uncertainty, there is much cause to doubt the strength of organizations developed by mankind. Those who advance their causes through the destruction of organizations are active everywhere—in Berlin, in Cuba, in Africa, and southeast Asia. We are seeing a concerted attack upon the United Nations, a body which was created in an effort to guarantee justice for all peoples and governments. It is easy to become discouraged about the association of men for noble purposes, and to develop strong doubts about the permanence of governments and their functions.

Against this pattern of doubt and unrest, however, there stands the American Union of States, bound together by a written Constitution and the laws passed by the Congress—a Government by the consent of the governed.

In many countries, the buildings which house representatives of the national government are symbols of fear and oppression. The people of these countries avoid these buildings, and often cross the street rather than pass directly in front of their doors.

The connotations of federal government in such countries are invariably evil, the federal building houses the secret political police and party officials who can take away the citizen's right to a job or credentials permitting him to buy food and necessities. A single command coming from one of these federal buildings can uproot whole communities and send them away into a wilderness for the rest of their lives without right of appeal.

We must not forget that these circumstances exist elsewhere even though we live in a different world and are blessed by constitutional guarantees supported by the active will of the majority. Thousands of citizens in Poland, Hungary, and East Germany have entered federal buildings and have never been seen again.

In contrast, we are proud of this new structure, it will house representatives of a Government chosen by all of us, and those representatives will administer the services of that Government impartially and without regard to race, creed, or political belief. When we consider this building and this ceremony, I believe we should bear in mind the comparison between the meaning of Federal authority in our country and elsewhere in the world. Every time we pass this way, that comparison should be refreshed, and memory should make us more alert then ever to the challenge required to keep strong our own Federal Union and its institutions.

Today's dedication, then, is much more than just the opening of a new Government building. It is another sign that we, as a people, governing ourselves, can create the services we need without the dictatorship of a one-party state.

The struggle which rages today in the international arena is basically a struggle between those who insist upon the right to plan for themselves and their future by means of elected representatives of their own choosing, and on the other hand, these who maintain that a minority in a police state can arbitrarily plan the use of national resources for the benefit of the majority.

Bearing this in mind, it seems to me that every dedication of this kind in an American city is another bit of proof that ours is the best way of life. It is another endorsement of the conviction of our Founding Fathers that we could stand firm on a strong Constitution and improve our national stature a little more each year.

Today, at this dedication, we are adding one more piece of evidence to our belief in ourselves and our future, and we are offering another piece of evidence to confound those who maintain that the democratic way cannot survive. We have just cause to be proud and pleased with the work of those who made this new facility possible.

The problems of a growing nation and a restless world will always be with us, and we must expect to face repeated challenges as the years of our history advance. But, we do move ahead, as we have here in the Kanawha Valley, from the log house which first flew the American flag to this magnificent new building.

Much has changed, but not the principles on which our Federal Union was founded or our devotion to those principles. As a symbol of that Union and that devotion to it, I am proud to commend this building to your attention and to assure you that those who work here will be committed to the public betterment.

REMARKS BY HON. JOHN A. SHANKLIN, MAYOR OF THE CITY OF CHARLESTON, DEDICATION CEREMONY, CHARLESTON, W. VA.

It is indeed a pleasure as well as an honor for me as mayor of Charleston to welcome all present to this dedicatory service for this beautiful Federal building.

On November 23, 1959, a small group of citizens with top officials of General Services Administration, together with the former Governor of West Virginia, Hon. Cecil H. Underwood, the architects and contractors, met here to participate in the ground breaking ceremony.

Now, just some 23 months later we see this magnificent building, designed by Greife & Daley and C. E. Silling & Associates, all local architects, not only from the artistic point of view—but from the utilitarian standpoint.

This building will provide a much needed facility in Charleston, and will be a great benefit to all the communities in this part of West Virginia.

REMARKS AT DEDICATION OF THE NEW FEDERAL BUILDING AT CHARLESTON, W. VA., OCTOBER 12, 1961, BY HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB

I am sure that the citizens of this community, and the State, dedicate this modern, fine building with a just feeling of pride and appreciation—pride in the structure itself and the purposes to which it is to be devoted. It is a mark of progress in a progressive city and country. It will be a monument to those who planned and built it—and a monument to those who use it well.

From these quarters the national laws will be applied and administered.

Here will convene the Federal court, presided over by an able judge, to apply the country's laws to the problems and issues that arise for people, involving their rights, their liberty, and their property. Here will be upheld the rights of the people under the laws of this Nation.

Here, also, will be located the various administrative offices of the executive branch of the Federal Government, touching the lives of all who dwell in this area, administering the laws that have been enacted for the security and orderly life of those who dwell in America.

The application and administration of law will in large measure determine the verity of the freedom which has long been the claim of our people and which is their most valuable temporal possession.

As has been so truly said: "The reason of the law is the life thereof." Unless it be administered in the light of reason, government can be oppressive and the very purpose of law for a free people can be destroyed.

Never before has there been a time when it was so important that the law be enacted and administered with consideration of the people, than now. This is necessary if we are to save internally that which we prepare to defend against outside aggression.

In an existing basic division in the whole world, involving those, on one hand, like ourselves, who maintain that the freedom of the citizens in living his life is paramount to the desires of those who operate government; and, on the other hand, the view of those in power in other lands that it is their right to direct the lives of the citizen without limit on oppression and abuse, presents the gravest of issues for us.

It is, indeed, a very old issue. Freedom against tyranny. Our forefathers met that problem for us when they chose the way of freedom of the individuals as the highest purpose of government. This issue has confronted men ever since they were organized, or organized themselves, into groups called nations. However, today it confronts us as a flaming threat. We must meet it with all the power and the wisdom which we possess. It is a time for steadfastness—a time for good sense and judgment—not for emotions and feelings.

We are firmly anchored to the position that we must not, and will not, give up the liberty of the people living here. If that be taken from us, or surrendered by us, all else is worthless. Americans cannot live that way.

Therefore, it is a time for new dedication to the security and united strength of our people, and to the well-being of all who stand with us in this hour.

So as we dedicate this structure, let us rededicate our own lives, all of us, both those who administer law and all those who live under it, to the freedom we have inherited within our land, and to the preservation and defense of it.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of January 13, 1962:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, Jan. 13, 1962)

The opening of the 2d session of the 87th Congress went according to expectation. The usual opening formalities were followed by the unusual election, in the off year, of a new Speaker and reorganization of the House made necessary by the death of Sam Rayburn. The Democrats, in caucus, nominated as their candidate for Speaker of the House, JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts. We Republicans nominated CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana. On the rollcall vote every Democrat voted for Mr. MCCORMACK and the Republicans, without exception, cast their votes for Mr. HALLECK. This points up, once again, the importance of the first vote and illustrates the argument I have been making for 7 years, the fallacy in the thinking that a conservative Democrat can be effective in Congress as an advocate of conservatism. With that first vote every single Democrat supported the liberal JOHN MCCORMACK, who is listed in the ACA index with a 0 rating, and thus insured the continuation of the most liberal Members of the House as chairmen of key committees such as Education and Labor, Judiciary, Government Operations, and Public Works, all headed by men with 100-percent ADA voting records.

My reaction to the President's state of the Union message was simply stated to the press as "God help us for the President's total lack of understanding of sound economics, and the role of freemen in a free society." I consider it fortunate for the Nation that the most vital of his proposals regarding trade and tariffs, socialized medicine, and taxes will have to be threshed out in the Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member, and where we do have some solid thinkers who firmly believe in constitutional government.

As this historic session of Congress begins, it seems to me important that I restate the basic beliefs I hold, all constructive, all positive, and which I have repeated to the people of Dallas County many times. The Americans for Constitutional Action have stated these principles in such clear language that I am borrowing their seven points to restate my own thinking. (1) I am for safeguarding the God-given dignity of the individual and promoting sound economic growth by strengthening constitutional government. Which means I must be against "group morality" and a socialized economy through centralization of power. (2) I am for sound money and against inflation. (3) I am for the private, competitive market and against Government interference. This means I am for protecting the individual's freedom of choice and a competitive market and against price-fixing, wage-fixing, and Federal controls. (4) I am for local self-government and against central government intervention. Simply put this means I am for the citizen's right to be let alone and opposed to Federal Government intervention in local government and private affairs. (5) I am for private ownership and against Government ownership. I believe strongly in the free enterprise system of private ownership and control of the means of production and distribution as opposed to the Socialist-Communist doctrine of government ownership of the means of production and in this connection I strongly oppose the unfair competition of Government with private, competitive enterprise. (6) I am for individual liberty and against coercion. I believe in protecting individual rights and responsibilities and will fight against the coercion of indivduals through Government sanctions. (7) And finally, I am for national sovereignty of the United States and will do all in my power to strengthen and preserve it.

It is my sincere hope that every citizen of the Fifth District of Texas will consider carefully these concepts of Government and the destined role of the United States in world history, so that in assessing my stewardship as your Representative in Congress for the past 7 years, you will know for certain whether or not you are in agreement or disagreement with these principles. It is a mystery to me, and I wish someone could explain the paradox which permits honest men to publicly advocate States rights, the free enterprise system, elimination of Federal controls, adherence to the above-stated seven basic principles of a free society, and then turn right around and urge support of candidates who are part of an administration and a party leadership dedicated to insuring the passage of programs directly opposed to these fundamental principles.

So once again I have stated my beliefs. But it is our Government. That means you. If you share these beliefs you have the opportunity (and your country needs you) to join with me in preserving a free society for free people.

Another's view of our President's state of the Union message might well be: "We cannot expect the Americans to jump from capitalism to communism, but we can assist their elected leaders in giving Americans small doses of socialism, until they suddenly awake to find they have communism" (Nikita Khrushchev).

Citizens of Wisconsin Are Proud of "Country Beautiful" a Notable New Magazine With an Inspired Approach and a Truly Artistic Format

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the Members of the House a new and proud addition to the field of magazine publishing—Country Beautiful. In a day filled with the commonplace it is a pleasure to welcome the exceptional.

This publication—which was launched last September after extensive planning—shows in every page the sensitivity of that planning.

In a day filled with commercialism it is a pleasure to welcome a magazine which succeeds in being totally different. It deals with the values which affect the spirit. Every article published is designed to help the reader better understand his situation and to help him find ways of improving himself and his surroundings. The art work and the photography are of the highest quality and give positive representation to the beauty of those surroundings, and to the great potential in them which man can help to realize. This theme was well presented in an article in an early issue on President Kennedy's food for peace program.

It has always been a pleasure to represent the State of Wisconsin. To the many reasons for this there has now been added a new one—Country Beautiful. Bing Crosby summed it up better than I can when he said:

> Country Beautiful is a breath of pure, fresh country air, in a smoke-filled world.

A Bill To Close the Loophole in Coastwise Shipping Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to eliminate a loophole in maritime law. Under the present act, U.S. vessels only are permitted to carry freight between two points in the United States.

The act which my bill would amend is the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, commonly referred to as the Jones Act, which in section 27 thereof provides that no merchandise shall be transported by water or by land and water between points in the United States, either directly or via foreign port, in any vessel other than one built in and documented under the laws of the United States and owned by U.S. citizens. There is a clause in section 27, however, which I propose to repeal, containing an exception or waiver in favor of routes which are in part over Canadian rail lines and their own and connecting water facilities. This exception opens the door to an operation such as was recently announced by the Canadian rail lines under which they would move merchandise in bonded railroad cars from Midwestern points in the United States to Prince Rupert, thence transshipped via their Canadian-owned railroad car carriers for discharge in Whittier, Alaska, a terminal of the U.S. Government-owned Alaska Railroad.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my bill is to remove the discrimination of this loophole and assure equal treatment of all coastwise cargo transportation. In this connection, the bill seeks to protect U.S. privately owned carriers from unfair Government-subsidized foreign-owned railroad and barge service.

If some of the existing volume of traffic to and from Alaska is diverted through new routes via Canada, the U.S. carriers presently struggling under great financial difficulty to maintain service will be forced to curtail or completely abandon their operations.

If Alaska trade is open to foreign-flag subsidized service, Mr. Speaker, temporarily the U.S. Government-owned Alaska Railroad might benefit, but Seward, Anchorage, Valdez, and all southeastern Alaska ports would suffer substantially. I believe some of these communities would disappear entirely in the wake of no regular transportation at all.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, American-owned barge lines and steamship companies have operated under great difficulty. A Canadian Government subsidized railroad barge line from Prince Rupert would threaten continued operation of U.S. privately owned unsubsidized carriers and thereby in the long run Alaska's overall economy would lose heavily. American railroad lines and west coast suppliers would be hard hit.

It is no secret, Mr. Speaker, that the Alaska Steamship Co. has recently been advised that its contract to carry the U.S. mails will be further drastically cut. Also it is known that this company has been transferring its capital into other areas and business activities. Just such a syphoning off of traffic to a Canadian-subsidized carrier could result in abandonment of the old long-established privately owned service.

The Congress should see to it that the laws governing coastwise trade of the United States do not discriminate against U.S. carriers.

It is to the long-range overall economic advantage of Alaska to see that the loophole in the law is removed, such as my bill contemplates.

Otherwise, Alaska may wake up and find that outside of a U.S. Government-owned railroad from Whittier to Fairbanks and a Canadian rail car service from Prince Rupert to Whittier, she will have no other regular freight service by water.

This Canadian railroad development could be a brainchild of some bureaucrat in the Alaska Railroad. I know some advocates of big government that will never rest until the Alaska Railroad is extended over land to connect with Canada's railroads, regardless of the cost to the American taxpayers. The report of the Battelle Institute, which conducted independent research for the Alaska Rail and Highway Commission, clearly showed that Alaska could best be developed and obtain the lowest freight costs by the building of highways to tidewater.

In the past there was a program to have tolls imposed on the highway to put private truckers out of business and force shippers to use the railroad.

Mr. Speaker, I warn that if U.S. water carriers serving Alaska are forced to curtail or terminate completely their existing service, as well may be the case, it would be a serious economic blow to Alaska. It would hurt all west coast ports. But the precedent of allowing foreign-flag operations could do harm in many areas.

This is an emergency situation, Mr. Speaker, and therefore I am asking for expeditious action on my bill by all agencies and the House Committee on Merchant Marine.

Climate for Surrender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, one of our colleagues, GORDON H. SCHERER, of Ohio, made an outstanding speech before the annual meeting of the Cincinnati Club on Tuesday, November 28, 1961, entitled "Climate for Surrender." This is a factual description of the problems which face our country in combating the inroads of communism based on Mr. SCHERER's experence as a member of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House.

Every Member of Congress is aware of the threat of communism and I am convinced is determined to do everything possible to prevent it overthrowing our priceless liberties and freedoms. I am sure that reading this outstanding address we will all renew our fight against the spread of this godless ideology and do whatever is possible for our country's protection. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address, as follows:

CLIMATE FOR SURRENDER

(Address by GORDON H. SCHERER, Member of Congress, Ohio, at the annual meeting of the Cincinnati Club, November 28, 1961)

Not many people longer deny that we are engaged in a life or death struggle for survival with the international Communist apparatus. We cannot hope to prevail in this struggle unless all Americans in every field of endeavor are absolutely convinced beyond any peradventure of a doubt that we are not engaged in a popularity contest with a competing economic system; that we are not faced merely with certain annoying adjustments which should be made so that we may coexist with a different system of government; but that we are now in a death grip with an enemy the like of which for debasement and inhumanity the world has never before experienced—an enemy we can ignore, appease, negotiate with, only at the expense of our survival.

This is the challenge of our day to all patriots of this Republic. We must accept this challenge. We shall either dedicate ourselves to it or, like the countries already behind the Iron Curtain, face slavery and eventual destruction.

I mention patriots with some misgivings since today there is a fast-growing, cynical segment of the populace which scoffs at and scorns any mention of patriotism. To them patriotism is old fashioned. To them any show of reverence or respect for the flag is a display of childish emotionalism unless it happens to be the banner of the United Nations. To them Americanism is not even secondary to "one-worldism." To them the American heritage and basic constitutional rights should be chipped away when welfare statism or political expediency demands.

In a recent issue of Reader's Digest, Dr. Max Rafferty, a school superintendent, asked what has happened to patriotism. Let me plagiarize just a few paragraphs from Dr. Rafferty to illustrate the change that has taken place. He reminds us that over 100 years ago our country was engaged in a strange sort of undeclared war against the forces of despotism, as it is now. A young man only 21 years old volunteered to go behind enemy lines to collect information. He was captured and tried as a spy. Surrounded by the jeering foe, cut off beyond all hope of rescue, the rope already knotted around his bare throat, he broke his steadfast silence. His words echo down the corridors of time to us today, ringing and magnificent. He said: "I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country."

A little over a year ago another young American went on trial for his life in Soviet Russia. The country for which Nathan Hale died had grown now to glorious life and wonderful reality—the last best hope for man on earth. What do we hear this young man say: "I didn't know what I was doing. I know now I was risking world peace. My superiors were responsible."

Some will say that Gary Powers was the victim of new Communist brainwashing techniques, but what about Irvin C. Scarbeck, a trusted employee of the U.S. Embassy in Warsaw, recently convicted, who gave his country's secrets to the enemy because he was afraid some harm might come to his mistress?

What about Bernon Mitchell and William Martin, two brilliant young mathematicians in our top security agency, from fine American homes, educated in our best universities? They defected to the Soviet Union last year and disclosed to the enemy that the United States had broken the Kremlin's secret code. On television and radio in the Soviet Union they bitterly condemned the United States, thus giving the Communists a tremendous propaganda victory in the cold war.

What about the men in the National Security Agency who approved these men for employment and top security clearance when they knew that at least one of them had been the worst type of sex deviate, thus making him easily subject to blackmail by the agents of the Kremlin?

You can understand such approval when it is determined, as it was just last week by the Committee on Un-American Activities, that Maurice H. Klein, who was personnel officer and later Assistant Director of the National Security Agency, in violation of the law, changed the information in his own personnel file. On one form he said his mother was born in Russia; on another, that she was born in the United States. Klein claimed to be a graduate of Harvard Law School when actually he attended Harvard only 1 year. When called before our committee, he denied he substituted records in his file. Such substitution has now been proved, and his testimony just the other day was referred by our committee to the Justice Department for possible perjury prosecution.

Let's consider another so-called brilliant young American, one Edward Yellin, who graduated from one of our leading universities. He went to work as a colonizer for the Communist Party. Now what's a Communist colonizer? It is a person who misrepresents his educational attainments by downgrading them in order that he may obtain a menial job in an industrial plant. As an example a person with a master's degree claims only 2 years of high school on his job application. He hides his Communist connections from both his employer and his fellow employees on the assembly line. He then surreptitiously attempts to indoctrinate his fellow workers and, following Communist directives, stirs up strife and dissension in the plant.

Yellin was before the Committee on Un-American Activities in Gary, Ind., in 1958. He defied the committee and refused to answer questions about his activities as a colonizer for the Communist apparatus. He was tried and convicted in the Federal court for contempt of Congress.

Now the National Science Foundation has been set up by your Government primarily in the interests of national defense—and note I say in the interests of national defense—to advance scientific study and research in this country. After his conviction, while his case was on appeal and while a graduate student at the University of Illinois, Yellin made application for a National Science Foundation fellowship to continue his studies at the University of Illinois. Believe it or not, he was given one from taxpayers' money.

Professors at the University of Illinois who knew about his conviction and activities in behalf of the Communist Party and who recommended Yellin for the fellowship were strangely silent in their recommendations about Yellin's Communist background and his conviction. On the other hand, this Government foundation—again, believe it or not—made no inquiry concerning Yellin's character and background except as to his proficiency as a scientist.

You would have been nauseated as I was to listen to those in the National Science Foundation who approved the award. They said in substance that they were interested only in Yellin's ability and suitability as a scientist; that some scientists were a different breed of cats than the rest of us and that they would not give the Government the benefit of their scientific knowledge and research if we inquired too closely into their backgrounds and political beliefs.

If you think this is an isolated case, let us take a look at one or two others. Lee Lorch started off at the University of Cincinnati some years ago. True, Lorch was a brilliant mathematician—but also an identified, hard-core Communist. He was fired from three universities. He also subsequently received a grant from the National Science Foundation.

One of the great universities in this country—some people refer to it as one of the more liberal—received from the Federal Treasury over a 3-year period $277,000 for scientific research projects. These projects were requested by and were under the supervision and direction of a professor who, when before our committee just a few weeks ago, invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to answer questions concerning his membership in the Communist Party.

I don't want what I have said to be considered an indictment of our colleges or the young people of this country because I am talking about a small minority. Yet just 10 years ago there were way too many young men who sold out their fellow American soldiers and licked the boots of the brutal Chinese and North Korean invaders and made tape recordings praising communism. Although a minority, there are still too many phony sophisticates who, as Dr. Rafferty says, clutter up our colleges and agitate against our ROTC, parade in support of Fidel Castro, and riot against congressional investigating committees. Whether we like it or not, it is our fault. We have been so busy educating for what we call life adjustment that we have forgotten to educate for survival. We have in effect taught by precept and example that it is better to be Red than dead.

Too many of our leaders in education, in the clergy, and in government, who are the vocal proponents of appeasement, not only themselves ignore but hide from our youth that eternal challenge proposed by Patrick Henry to his fellow Virginians when he said:

"Is life so dear and peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?"

What can we expect when some of these leaders, including the President of the United States, oppose, as insulting, loyalty oaths for students who want money from their Government to further their education? Why do they oppose loyalty oaths in this specific instance when they so readily sanction every public official from dogcatcher to President taking an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States? The antiloyalty oath crowd does not consider it insulting to compel a boy who is drafted into the armed services to swear allegiance to the United States and to swear to defend it against all enemies, foreign and domestic, with his life if need be.

Somehow we hear no complaint from these so-called liberals when a person joining the church of his choice is required to most solemnly swear adherence to the tenets of that particular religious faith. They still feel that it is perfectly proper when two persons are united in wedlock, in a most sacred ceremony to take vows of dedication and loyalty to each other.

Does it not seem passing strange that this great furor has arisen over the swearing of loyalty to this great country of ours and disclaiming Communist Party membership when a student is asking for something from his Government and not inquiring as to what he can do for it?

Today we are rapidly losing this struggle with international communism simply because our spiritual and moral fiber has been eroding. Our love for, our dedicated service to, and our fervent faith in, the power, goodness, and destiny of this great constitutional republic—in other words, our patriotism—is slowly dying.

We have been gradually softened and brainwashed into believing that the faith of our fathers in the strength, in the principles, in the purpose, and in the destiny of this Nation and its Constitution, which have brought us through crisis after crisis in our long history and which have made us the light and hope of a chaotic world, are no longer adequate weapons in our present struggle for survival.

I am going to recount a few of the things we have done recently during this struggle which are difficult to believe and then be a little presumptuous and tell you why, in my opinion, we have followed such a course.

One of the most effective weapons used against us in this cold war has been the intensive, massive, and vicious Communist propaganda assault on the free world, including the United States. Our Committee on Un-American Activities, after exhaustive hearings, established that some 13 million pieces of Communist propaganda were coming into this country each year through the U.S. mails alone. I wish I had time to tell you about it and its effect, but that is a subject for another speech.

Most of this material is delivered to the addressees but, under an Attorney General's ruling during the Roosevelt administration, the Post Office was able to hold up a part of this poison which arrived at our shores in bulk, unsolicited, and unlabeled as political propaganda as intended by the 1938 Foreign Agents Registration Act. Of course, the Communist news media complained bitterly and the leftwing in this country cried censorship.

Lo and behold, on April 25, we were shocked beyond belief when the President reversed the Attorney General's opinion and allowed this unsolicited, unlabeled Communist propaganda to flood this country. Since this Presidential order, do you know that the volume of this stuff has increased 130 percent?

Next let us look at the Communist agricultural system which has failed miserably. This is where the Soviets and Red Chinese are hurting most. So what do we do? We permit the shipment of taxpayer-subsidized agricultural products to the Soviet Union. Thus we allow more Russian farmers to go to work in their missile plants. Whether some people admit it or not, we are at war with international communism. In a war you even sink the ships of neutrals that are trying to deliver essential commodities to the enemy.

But it is not only agricultural products that we are now sending to the Soviet Union. Believe it or not, strategic materials are now finding their way into Communist ports at an appalling rate. Don't we ever learn? American scrap iron went to the Japanese for dollars and was returned to us in the bodies of American boys. We have been sending planes and other war material to Tito for years. Now we are sending jets and training Communist pilots at Air Force fields in Texas. The excuse is that Tito is feuding with Khrushchev. Look at what Tito and Nehru did to us in the U.N. and at the recent conference of the so-called neutrals at Belgrade. We have our differences fairly regularly with Macmillan and De Gaulle, but, if the shooting starts—when the chips are down—England and France will be in our corner and Tito's United States-made jets will be flying side by side with Khrushchev's MIGs.

The 81 Communist Parties of the world, meeting in Moscow, who are always leading peace offensives and supporting so-called sane nuclear policies, cheered when Russia rocked the world with its 50-megaton nuclear bomb. Among them was Comrade Harry Winston the U.S. Communist Party organizational secretary, who was recently released from prison. Winston was one of the 11 Communists convicted for advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence. Yes, Winston was released, given a U.S. passport, went to Moscow and began to plot against us again.

About the same time, as a friendly gesture to the peace-loving Khrushchev, Bobby Kennedy ordered the release of two Russian spies. More recently he ordered the dismissal of spy charges against Igor Y. Melekh, a Soviet staff member of the United Nations. He was allowed to return to the U.S.S.R. It is a wonder we did not give him a medal before shipping out.

Is there any reason why, when our relations with the Soviet Union have reached such a low point that we have had to call up thousands of American boys, we should relax security checks on appointees to high Government positions? Derogatory information in FBI and other intelligence reports have been ignored. More than 200 persons have been cleared through Executive waivers.

We even granted a passport to Owen Lattimore for a so-called study trip to Outer Mongolia. Lattimore, as you know, has been named by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security as a conscious, articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy. Since Lattimore's visit, Outer Mongolia, a stooge of the Soviet Union if there ever was one—in fact, a part of the Soviet Union—has been admitted to the United Nations. Not counting the Iron Curtain satellites, the Soviet Union already has three votes in the United Nations to our one. Outer Mongolia will give it four.

We, of course, will be paying Mongolia's dues to the U.N., the same as we are doing today for dozens of other tincup countries who have defaulted in the amount of $44,777,541. Included in this list of delinquents is the Soviet Union which owes the kitty more than $30 million. Although there are 101 nations and tribes now U.N. members, the United States with one vote pays 38 percent of the total freight. Since we are also carrying the load for those who won't cough up, we are over the 50 percent mark.

Now all of us have heard of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, who some years ago was in charge of the development of the atomic and hydrogen bombs. The Atomic Energy Commission, after exhaustive hearings, threw him out and denied him security clearance. The hearings established beyond any peradventure of a doubt that he had been identified as a Communist; that both his wife and his mistress were Communists as well as his brother; that he was a regular contributor to Communist causes; and that he lied to security officers when questioned about his activities in connection therewith. Oppenheimer even admitted at his hearing that he had lied in this respect.

Oppenheimer just recently was appointed as a representative of the Organization of American States as a roving professor in Latin America. It is no secret that all of Latin America is the object of Communist infiltration and subversion. Since we pay 66 percent of the operating costs of OAS, Oppenheimer had to have the nod of our State Department for this highly sensitive job.

And speaking of the State Department, the Lord knows that if there ever was a spot where the most capable and experienced man available is needed, it is at the head of the State Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs. Now who is appointed? None other than one Anthony Bontempo. Now, Bontempo is a loyal American. However, he has absolutely no background or experience whatsoever in security matters.

Even the New York Times, in reporting his appointment, said:

"As commissioner of conservation for the State of New Jersey, Bontempo put some 80,000 miles on the speedometer of his State car in pursuit of proper utilization of the State's natural resources. He has led the drive to reclaim and develop the Jersey meadowlands. He has initiated plans for a wholesale food market and spearheaded a drive for regional planning."

These might be excellent qualifications for a director of parks and playgrounds but, when we are engaged in a cold war in which our security is the focal point of attack, such an appointment is a farce. The St. Louis Globe-Democrat calls the appointment preposterous.

FRANCIS E. WALTER, one of the top Democrats of the House, complained not only of Bontempo but also of his assistant appointed at the same time, one Michael Cieplinski, who, if my information is correct, has been a citizen only 12 years.

WALTER said they were "totally unqualified political appointeees." He felt so strongly that he introduced legislation to try to stop the appointments.

Henry J. Taylor, the well-known columnist for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, in his column entitled "Letdown in Security," said that, as a result of the appointments, "the State Department is being rocked by a disgraceful and alarming blow to our Nation's security." Taylor continued:

"Incredible as it may seem in the face of Soviet espionage, the word has gone out—as it did in the days of Alger Hiss—that internal security problems are 'tut-tut, never mind.' To confirm that 'tut-tut' signal the dismissal of the 25 experts * * * was accompanied by placing in charge a pair of political hacks."

Taylor concluded:

"But these political hacks have the backing of Chester Bowles in a scandalous, self-serving move to butter up the leftwing of his party. Bowles is leading their organized playing-down of the Communist problem here at home. In its innocence our public may not believe such a liquidating movement is afoot under the banner of liberalism.

But it is, and Bowles is doing his part in the place he can do it as Undersecretary of State."

I don't have time, but I could take you down a long list of almost equally bad appointments.

I have referred to the meeting of the Communist Parties in Moscow a few weeks ago. The same 81 Communist Parties from throughout the world met there in December of last year. They decided it was necessary to make an all-out attack on anti-Communist organizations and persons, particularly in the United States, if the Communist program of infiltration and subversion was to continue to go forward.

It was almost uncanny but within a few weeks there began in the liberal press and magazines here in the United States a simultaneous, sinister, and often vicious attack on practically all the well-known anti-Communist movements in this country. A recent report of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security entitled "The New Drive Against the Anti-Communist Program" is alarming. It deals in great detail with this assault. I only wish there were time to talk about it.

At the height of this anti-Communist campaign there appeared a new book entitled "The Un-Americans," by Frank Donner. This is a vitriolic, libelous, and vicious attack on the Committee on Un-American Activities. Of course, this committee has always been under attack. But the campaign of vilification and for abolition of this committee has been stepped up as part of the all-out anti-Communist drive in the United States.

Leftwing writers like Gore Vidal, who by the way was a guest at a gay White House party a few days ago, have been praising this book. They call its author, Frank Donner, a brilliant constitutional lawyer, in an attempt to give the book prestige. It is significant that Vidal and his other leftwing cronies conceal the fact that Frank Donner has been an identified Communist; that he has a long, well-documented record of service to Communist causes; that as a top employee of the U.S. Government in the early days of the National Labor Relations Board, he was a member of a Communist cell comprised solely of Government officials in the NLRB. They met regularly to discuss National Labor Relations Board policy in the light of Communist Party directives.

Do I hear someone ask: "How is it possible, SCHERER, for these things to happen?"

I have a theory about this. Let's see whether you agree with me.

At the outset, let me state as plainly and as forcibly as I can that, in expounding this theory, I am not accusing anyone of being disloyal or even having sinister motives.

Today we have in the top echelons of this Government, the likes of Stevenson, Bowles, Jimmy Roosevelt, Schlesinger, Fulbright, and Galbraith. Their whole record over the years indicates that they are soft on communism; that they believe there is no substantial threat to our security from internal subversion; that the anti-Communists and congressional investigating committees exaggerate the menace; that they do more harm than good.

The ego of these liberals and leftists is such that they look down on the rest of us; they feel that, because of their superior intellect—FULBRIGHT is an example—they and perhaps they alone have the key to the solution of the world's tensions. In fact, they have a phobia that they can reform and make good little boys out of the murderer of the Ukraine, the butcher of Hungary, the enslavers of Tibet and the masters of 800 million captive people now behind the Iron Curtain. They indicate that, if left alone by the super-patriots, the military, and the rightwing rabble in the Congress, they can, through the application of their special and superior talents, negotiate a settlement of the cold war tensions with the despots of the Kremlin.

Ever since January 20 these boys have been running the ship of state. We had many just like them in Foggy Bottom during the Eisenhower administration. Most of them are still there.

They have decided that, in order to negotiate a settlement with the international Communist apparatus, it is necessary to create a favorable climate or atmosphere in which to move and operate. They feel that such a climate cannot be obtained unless certain irritants emanating from this country which are plaguing the Communists are removed.

The London Times of a few months ago put its finger on this approach. It said: "President Kennedy was told by his advisers even before taking office that it was felt the Soviet Union was in an accommodating mood. The record shows that this conclusion was accepted and was a belief that the cold war could be terminated within the lifetime of the Kennedy administration," the London Times concluded.

If this analysis of the administration strategy is correct, then you have a charitable answer to the almost unbelievable and heretofore unexplainable actions which I have been discussing. There is another example which I think proves this theory to be true.

In 1958 the National Security Council, after long and careful deliberation, decided that, while our men in the Armed Forces were trained and familiar with military weapons, they, like the general public, were unaware of the new, sinister, and diabolical weapon of modern psychological warfare, namely, subversion and infiltration; that they were not fully aware that it was largely by the use of this new weapon that international communism in the short space of a few years had been able to successfully dominate and control one-third of the land mass of the world and one-third of its people.

The military was, therefore, directed to acquaint our men and the civilian population through anti-Communist seminars with the various facets of this new, dangerous, and effective weapon which is being so successfully used against us at this very moment. Since the President is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, and since the military is more directly under the control of the top leadership of this country than any other agency of Government, it can be readily seen that, if there is to be created a favorable climate, free of irritants to the Soviets, it is necessary first to put a stop to these anti-Communist speeches and seminars by the military.

In these seminars all of the ugly and heinous tactics and objectives of the amoral, atheistic, Communist apparatus were being exposed to the cold light of common day. These, like the revelations of congressional investigating committees, were truly irritants to the boys of the Kremlin and certainly not conducive to the favorable climate or atmosphere which the appeasers were trying to create.

It is obvious therefore that General Walker who was doing the most effective job right under the noses of the Communists had to be silenced. It should be obvious now that the reasons given by the top echelon for the Walker reprimand and transfer were not the real reasons.

While we reprimand and remove from his command a great patriot like General Walker, the Air Force provides a plane to enable Dr. Vera Micheles Dean, a controversial leftwinger, to lecture at the Air Force School in Montgomery, Ala. She came to this country from her native Russia in 1919. Her activities are described in the publication "Plan Talk" as follows:

"Behind the perfect front afforded by the esteemed Foreign Policy Association, Mrs. Dean has been sending forth an unending stream of propaganda, intermingled with genuine information, that is calculated to strengthen the position of the Soviet Union in pursuing all its aims, regardless of their nature and their effect upon the interests of world peace and the United States."

We have been looking at some of the seemingly unbelievable things that have been happening inside this country. Let's take a squint at some of the thinking that prevails in the conduct of our foreign policy. I will give you a typical example. It just happened a few days ago.

Katanga Province is the most prosperous, orderly, and economically stable government in the otherwise incredibly uneducated and turbulent Congo. Above all, Katanga is the only pro-Western and anti-Communist province of this tormented former Belgian colony.

The Katanganese want no part of the pro-Communist, central Congo government and its shocking, mutiny-prone, atrocity-guilty, riffraff army.

Yet last week Adlai Stevenson deserted Britain and France and voted with the Kremlin in demanding that the Kantanganese cease forthwith in trying to set up their own government, apart from the pro-Communist Congo central government; that the United Nations use armed force if necessary to make the Katanganese deport all foreign mercenaries, Belgians—military, paramilitary, technical, political, and economic advisers.

Why do we do this, especially when we have supported independence and a seat in the United Nations for every other aggregation of tribes unprepared for self-government? How far will we go to appease Khrushchev in order to get him to negotiate in Berlin? Keep this up and the administration is going to force more people into the right-wing camp which it detests.

How often do we have to be tricked and deceived before we are willing to recognize the true nature and objectives of world communism? Like Hitler, the Communists have given us a blueprint of their strategy and objectives. They have said and they have written that there can no more be sincere diplomacy than there can be dry water. It is also written so that all who read may know that, to accomplish Communist objectives, any and every conceivable type of promise, treachery, deceit, espionage, sabotage, abduction, and murder is to be used. Even if it were not so written, the Bible says, "By their acts, ye shall know them."

The Soviets in their drive for world domination have entered into more than 1,000 treaties, agreements, and nonaggression pacts with other countries of the world. They have flagrantly broken and violated all of these except a handful which it has suited their purpose to keep.

The spirit of Camp David which the world hailed has become the ghost of calumny. At Paris Eisenhower and the United States were insulted, humiliated and vilified as never before. In Vienna Kennedy was ignominiously spanked and given his orders. In the United Nations Khrushchev threw his weight around like a bully and got away with it. The Kremlin's pipsqueak stooge, Fidel Castro, has kicked us around and humiliated us as never before in our long history. The so-called neutral nations a few weeks ago at Belgrade, nations to whom we have poured out billions in aid to buy their friendship, licked Khrushchev's boots and gave the United States an insulting cold shoulder.

For 2 years at the disarmament and nuclear test ban talks at Geneva, we negotiated like suckers while the Soviets never had any intention of arriving at agreements. They continued these fraudulent negotiations solely for the purpose of enabling them to obtain a nuclear advantage.

I won't even talk about Berlin.

Haven't we had enough? Haven't we learned that you cannot appease or negotiate with the Communists? Don't we know that the Soviets practice the salami-type of aggression? They take slice after slice, but each one so thin that it is not worth fighting for and then all that is left is the string and, of course, who would fight for a string?

I can hear the leftwing scream: "SCHERER is a warmonger." No, but the only way to prevent war and to avoid eventual domination by international communism is to call the Soviets' bluff—to draw the line and say: "This far and no farther," and mean it and by our actions and deeds let the Soviets know we mean it. They will not start an all-out nuclear war. They will not risk the almost total destruction of their cities when they have come so far in the short space of 40 years by internal subversion or indirect aggression.

If they had not learned the lesson of success by subversion or indirect aggression before, they certainly learned it in Cuba. If the Soviets had sought to take Cuba by outward aggression, by force of arms, in the air, on land, or by sea, they would have failed miserably because we would have moved in with everything we had. Yet today Havana—90 miles from our shore—is as Communist-dominated and controlled as are Moscow and Peiping. The Soviets did it without the loss of a man. They took Cuba intact. They did not need to destroy physically the Cubans or their possessions. They have taken their people and their possessions and have put them to use.

The weapon we must fear most and learn to combat is indirect aggression or internal subversion and infiltration. This is really what the General Walkers are trying to do. This is what we all must do if we are to survive.

Toward Equitable Treatment of Americans Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Congress last year included as a part of the foreign aid appropriations bill a provision that—

> It is the sense of the Congress that any attempt by foreign nations to create distinctions because of their race or religion among American citizens in the granting of personal or communication access or any other rights otherwise available to U.S. citizens generally is repugnant to our principles.

This provision was consistent with the so-called Lehman resolution adopted by this body in 1956, of which the then Senator Kennedy was a cosponsor, and the provisions of law enacted by previous Congresses. Such a provision is also consistent with long-established American traditions.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the other body, and a colleague from Pennsylvania, Hon. THOMAS E. MORGAN, recently had published an article on this subject in the November 1961 issue of the Committee Reporter, organ of the American Jewish Committee. Dr. MORGAN points out the difficulties encountered by individual U.S. citizens of the Jewish faith and by American firms seeking to pursue their affairs in Arab lands. It is a sad fact that Americans of the Jewish faith, for example, are barred from visiting Jordan even though U.S. tax dollars underwrite approximately half of the budget of that nation and Jordan can ill afford to turn away potential earnings from tourism.

The 1960 Democratic platform, "The Rights of Man," contained as a pledge:

> Protection of rights of American citizens to travel, to pursue lawful trade and to engage in other lawful activities abroad without distinction as to race or religion is a cardinal function of the national sovereignty.

Full force and effect should be given to this pledge. We must neither at home nor abroad let any of our citizens be relegated to a second-class status. For the U.S. Government to be a party to such distinctions by not effectively opposing them is not only contrary to some of the oldest traditions of this Nation but in effect serves to negate the efforts to strengthen the concepts of freedom and democracy throughout the world on which we are now expending so much of our national effort and treasure.

I ask unanimous consent that the article which was prepared by my colleague from Pennsylvania, Representative THOMAS E. MORGAN, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, entitled "Toward Equitable Treatment of Americans Abroad," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOWARD EQUITABLE TREATMENT OF AMERICANS ABROAD

(By Representative THOMAS E. MORGAN, of Pennsylvania) [1]

When the foreign-aid bill was under consideration before my committee this summer, we inserted in the statement of policy an expression to the effect that "any attempt by foreign countries to create distinctions because of their race or religions among American citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access or any other rights available to U.S. citizens generally is repugnant of our principles." It added that "in all negotiations between the United States arising as a result of funds appropriated" under the Foreign Assistance Act or arising from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities, "these principles shall be applied as the President may determine * * *."

The principles enunciated in the statement of policy are in accord with a view long held by our Government. One need only recall the well-known protests by the United States against the mistreatment of American citizens of the Jewish faith by czarist Russia. These protests culminated in 1911 in the abrogation of our trade treaty with the Russians, a treaty that had been in effect since 1832. During the 1930's our Government was forceful in its protests to Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy concerning their maltreatment of Americans of the Jewish faith.

When the Arab League initiated its economic boycott against Israel in 1951, the boycott was initially applied only to companies with Israeli branches or otherwise doing business in Israel. But during the past decade the boycott has been extended to American firms that have American citizens of the Jewish faith among their owners, officers, directors and personnel. A recent issue of Fortune magazine indicates that about 80 American companies are on the boycott list. The effect of such a boycott can be far-reaching for it touches not only hundreds of thousands of employees and stockholders of all faiths and their families but also suppliers and transporters of goods as well as the communities in which these companies are located.

Travel of American citizens of the Jewish faith has been restricted. American Jews are barred from using the U.S. built air terminal facilities at Dhahran, Saudi Arabia. These discriminatory practices have been applied to Members of Congress traveling on official U.S. business.

I noted with particular interest a recent announcement by the Government of Morocco, an Arab League member, that a prominent Jewish Moroccan, R. Benarroch, had been appointed to a high post in that country's defense ministry. He is only one of several Jews holding responsible positions in the Sherifien Government. I can only express the hope that other governments in the Near East will soon avail themselves of the talents of all their citizens without regard to race or creed to participate in advancing their national welfare.

When the foreign-aid bill went to conference to iron out differences between the House and Senate versions, the House conference in the interest of a more concise statement of policy accepted a more general statement similar to that adopted by the Senate. Included in the final act is a reaffirmation of "freedom of the press, information, and religion, freedom of navigation in international waterways, and recognition of the right of all persons to travel and pursue their lawful activities without discrimination as to race or religion. In the administration of all parts of this act these principles shall be supported in such a way in our relations with countries friendly to the United States which are in controversy with each other as to promote an adjudication of the issues involved by means of international law procedures available to the parties."

Language similar to that deleted by the conference committee was inserted by amendment on the House floor in the foreign aid appropriation bill. The Senate Appropriations Committee, in its report on the foreign assistance appropriation bill, urged "the executive departments concerned to give force to the sense of the Congress as expressed in this section in the administration of the foreign assistance program, to the extent feasible, and by other appropriate means."

The House adopted an amendment to the bill establishing the Peace Corps that barred the use of the Corps in countries where discrimination would be practiced against members of the Corps. In the final version the language did not appear. The conferees were convinced that in the less developed countries government policy frequently may not be well coordinated and public opinion not fully matured. Hence individual incidents of discrimination might occur which did not reflect either the policy of the government or the attitude of the public generally. Further, the committee was assured that the Peace Corps would not maintain a program in any other country in which volunteers were repeatedly subject to discrimination.

In the statement of the House managers accompanying the conference committee report on the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, the managers on the part of the House expressed the desire that "in the administration of the various programs authorized by this bill, no discrimination as to race, creed, or color be practiced in the selection of individuals to perform functions under this bill or to benefit from the provisions of the programs authorized in the bill. Similarly they desire that countries that practice such discrimination shall not be the beneficiaries of any of the programs authorized in this bill."

---

[1] Representative THOMAS E. MORGAN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, is chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. A Member of Congress since 1944. Dr. MORGAN is a graduate of the Detroit College of Medicine and Surgery.

It must be apparent from the instances cited above that the House has been unusually diligent in expressing itself on the matter of discrimination. This involves much more than the relatively few Jewish and non-Jewish Americans who are directly affected; it involves a matter of national pride and respect. It is our expectation that the executive branch, in administering the various programs that we have authorized, will be equally diligent in carrying out these principles.

"What To Look for in the New Session": An Interview With Hon. John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives, U.S. News & World Report, January 22, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that Members of the House of Representatives and citizens generally will read with great interest an interview published in the January 22, 1962, issue of U.S. News & World Report in which the distinguished new Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK, expresses his views on the forthcoming session of Congress.

The text of this significant interview follows:

WHAT TO LOOK FORWARD TO IN THE NEW SESSION

(An interview with Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK)

Question. Mr. Speaker, do you think there will be a close working relationship this year between the House of Representatives and the White House?

Answer. Oh, yes. Of course, no President gets 100 percent of his program. President Kennedy was very successful last session in getting legislation that he recommended—and I have every confidence that there will be the same cooperation in this session, and it will be a very successful session.

Question. Do you expect any real trouble from the so-called coalition of southern Democrats and Republicans?

Answer. Well, the coalition works both ways. Our task is to get enough Republican votes for progressive legislation that will enable us to get such legislation approved. That is no new task. We've had that for a long while.

Question. Do you sense any more conservative attitude in Congress now than there was a year ago, or a few years ago?

Answer. No. I think the state of mind is pretty much the same.

Question. I wonder if you'd be willing to tell us, against the background of all these stories of differences between you and President Kennedy, what, if any, are your political differences with the President?

Answer. There's no justification to what I've read. The President and I are very friendly—always have been. I don't have to agree with you 1,000 percent or you with me. I've been a progressive for 33 years—for all my life.

Joe Kennedy, the President's father, and I have been close friends as far back as I can remember. The grandfather, John F. Fitzgerald, until his death, was a very, very close friend of mine.

The talk of political differences with the President is absolutely unfounded. I read about a feud and all this and that and everything else. There's nothing to that at all.

Question. Is it true that you and the President have had your political difficulties back in Massachusetts as distinct from here in Washington?

Answer. What have you got in mind?

Question. A fight over the party machinery.

Answer. The party machinery in Massachusetts doesn't mean a thing so far as control is concerned. The State [Democratic] Committee doesn't mean a thing to me as such. Individual members who are friends do. The State Committee as such never meant anything to me because I never had any statewide ambitions.

Question. Do you have any doubt that you and President Kennedy will be able to get along well?

Answer. I certainly have no doubt. There is absolutely no justification for creating the image that there's a feud between President Kennedy and myself.

The fight [in 1956] for chairman of the Democratic State Committee in Massachusetts—about which much is made—was purely impersonal. Control of the party was not involved. Furthermore, if anyone would undertake to make a fight for control of the Democratic Party, no matter who he is, the Democratic voters of Massachusetts would defeat a man on that issue because they don't stand for control—they're independent and individualistic, and I'm glad they are.

Some men may have more influence with the Democrats of my State than others. For example, I probably would have more influence today than I had 30 years ago—or 40 years ago, when I started in the legislature. But, on the question of control, the Democrats of Massachusetts are very individualistic. So there was never any fight for control of the party. I supported the man who had supported me in the past, and who was always loyal to me.

Did I answer your question on my relations with the President?

Question. Yes, you answered it—

Answer. Furthermore, I have profound respect for the office of President. I have profound respect for the occupant of the office—without regard to his party.

I could never conceive of any man who is President of the United States not doing what he thinks is for the best interest of our country. I might disagree with him, but I would never impugn his motives.

If that's so with reference to a President who's not of my own party, what is it with reference to President Kennedy, who is the leader of my party? I might say that nobody was closer to F.D.R. than I was on the legislative level—or to Harry S. Truman. And that relationship exists and will continue to with President Kennedy.

I believe in the separation of powers, but that doesn't mean the divisibility of branches of Government. I don't believe there should be a wall between.

Question. Can you say what will be the major issues in this session of Congress?

Answer. Well, you're going to have the issue of reciprocal trade—and new trade recommendations made by the President. There will be the question of a new Department of Urban Affairs. There will be the postal increase bill. There's the manpower development and training bill. There's the medical assistance bill—for the senior citizens—and the school legislation as well as the college bill. There is to be other progressive legislation, too.

Question. You didn't mention taxes. Do you feel there will be a tax bill passed by the House that will carry out the recommendations the President made this past year?

Answer. I would think that any bill reported out by the Ways and Means Committee would pass the House, and I would expect that the Ways and Means Committee, before any bill was reported out, would harmonize any differences with the executive department—or vice versa.

Question. Do you think a bill will be reported out by the Ways and Means Committee?

Answer. If legislation is necessary to carry out the purposes sought, I would say that a bill will be reported out, and at that time the views of the executive and the legislative, in committee, would be very well harmonized.

Question. On this question of tax legislation, would you be willing to predict whether the House would agree to the 8-percent investment credit on business spending for plant and equipment?

Answer. No, I'm not. To answer on any of the details of the parts of the bill now would be beyond my power. I doubt if any member of the Ways and Means Committee could give you a specific answer. I would say that, if legislation is necessary, I expect that legislation will be reported out of the committee.

Of course, involved in this is also withholding of taxes on dividends and interest and foreign profits—earnings abroad—as well as expense-account deductions, which, of course, is a very important subject in itself, particularly among businessmen.

Nobody wants to disturb reasonable and proper expenses. It's the abuse that some have made of expense-account deductions that is the problem. Where abuses develop, then they very easily become contagious.

Question. Do you think foreign aid will be looked at with a more critical eye by Congress this year?

Answer. I think the emphasis would be put more on self-help on the part of countries getting aid. That's been the evident trend for the past several years. Of course, there's military assistance in certain areas that you've got to give, but I think the emphasis in the economic field will be more on long-term loans to help those countries that are willing to help themselves.

Question. Do you feel that Congress will give the President more power to reduce tariffs than he has had?

Answer. I'm in favor of something being done in this field because, in my opinion, it's vitally important in our national interest. In my opinion, Congress will give the President broader authority in this field.

Now, again, people may agree that something needs to be done, but they might have an honest disagreement about some of the details of what should be done. That isn't fatal to a bill.

Question. On the question of medical care for the aged, do you favor placing it under social security?

Answer. Yes, I've always been in favor of it.

Question. What's your judgment about the chances——

Answer. If the bill is reported out of committee, I feel that we will get it through the House. The difficult task will be in having a bill reported out of committee.

WAYS TO HELP SCHOOLS

Question. How about your view on aid to schools, including parochial schools and private schools?

Answer. Parochial schools are private schools. I always refer to private schools, because there are private schools that are not church-related—though it is true that most of them are church-related, I will agree. Do you want my position on school legislation?

Question. Yes——

Answer. I've always supported school-construction legislation.

My position on school legislation is very simple. I respect the fact that people may not agree with me and I respect their right to their views and their right to disagree. But I expect others to respect the fact that I have the right to my views.

To begin with, I've always supported school legislation, and you'll find that, whenever the vote came, I voted for it. And you'll find that I spoke for aid to schools in the past years. I believe that we should strengthen our whole educational system.

I'm talking now about elementary and secondary schools. I realize we can't legislate for private schools on the same basis that we can for public schools. But I do believe that we can strengthen our overall school system, including private schools.

I support the general bill for school aid. But I also believe that, in the best interests of our country—certainly in strengthening the overall elementary- and secondary-school system—there should be provisions for long-term loans at reasonable rates of interest to private schools for the building of classroom facilities: (1) to teach science, (2) to teach mathematics, and (3) to teach languages.

I don't know how anybody can say that that's inconsistent with the Constitution, and I don't see how anybody can, in this day and age, disagree. But people do. They have a right to their views.

I also believe in the 50 percent forgiveness for those who have received Government loans to finish their college education and to enter the career of teaching. When they teach in public schools, they are given, as you know, 50 percent forgiveness of the loan over a 5-year period. This should be extended to private schools.

Private schools have a demand for teachers. This is an unintentional discrimination against the private schools, when graduates of colleges who wish to make teaching a career in private schools are denied the same privilege of loan forgiveness given to teachers in public schools. I imagine it makes it more difficult for the private-school system to get the young-men and young-women teachers.

That's been my position. However, suppose a bill were reported out of committee without any provision for private schools—what would I do? I would vote for it. I am quoted as saying I'd vote against such a bill. All anyone had to do was to ask me. My views are entirely different than they have been portrayed.

Question. Are you and the President in disagreement on some phases of aid to education?

Answer. I couldn't answer that question. I don't know definitely what are the President's views with reference to my views relating to private schools. I'm for the general education bill—have always been, through the years—every rollcall will find me voting for it.

However, I believe that long-term loans to private schools for the purposes I have stated would be for the best interest of our country. I think it would be unfortunate not to encourage the almost 6 million young Americans attending private schools to study to be scientists, physicists, mathematicians, learned in the languages.

Question. Do you think that aid to education is going to be approved in this session?

Answer. Of course, without the question of private schools involved, such legislation has been defeated in the past. And, without the question of teachers' salaries involved, legislation has been defeated in the past. It's only a few years ago that, on the final passage in the House, a bill confined, as I remember, to school construction was defeated by five votes. It was almost the same bill that former President Eisenhower had recommended a year or so before. But there was a change in the climate of the administration between the recommendation and the time the bill came up for vote. The result was that it was defeated by five votes, and we didn't get many Republican votes for it.

Question. And was that limited to public schools?

Answer. That was confined to public schools, yes. So if we have a straight school-construction bill, it's going to have a hard job getting approval. We brought up an abbreviated bill the last session, and it was defeated by a very substantial margin. I voted for it.

Question. Would you care to predict what will happen this time?

Answer. No, I couldn't. I would say this: that I favor a bill with provisions for loans to private schools. If we get a bill up for vote and the provisions for aid to private schools are not in it, or if they are in and the House votes to strike them out, I'd vote for the bill just the same.

THE CHURCH AND EDUCATION

Question. It sometimes is said that, as a Roman Catholic, your attitude toward aid to education has been influenced by the church. Could you discuss that?

Answer. There has never been any member of the hierarchy of the Catholic Church that has ever discussed the subject with me.

You know, the strange thing to me is to read in the paper about so-and-so as a Member of Congress and a Catholic. You never hear anybody mentioned as a Presbyterian or an Episcopalian, or a Baptist, or any other religion, and that is correct. My views are my own independent views. Nobody has ever even spoken to me.

I have felt for many years that long-term loans for certain purposes, for private schools, were proper. As a matter of fact, you could go much further. You could have specific grants.

Nobody talks about the constitutionality of long-term loans for college dormitory purposes, or about aiding private colleges, yet the same basic constitutional questions are involved.

We have long-term loans now for equipment—purchase of equipment—in private schools for those purposes, already in the law. Mine is just a step further through the building of classroom facilities for the purposes I have heretofore stated. There are many aspects of this question. As a matter of fact, one of the greatest educational bills we have is the one I introduced—the Donable Property Act. Schools, colleges, as well as hospitals, are the beneficiary of all this surplus property that the Government has.

Last year there was an acquisition value in this property of about $400 million—just last year, alone. Since the bill became law, the hospitals and schools of the country have got probably $4 to $5 billion acquisition value in usable items. And I am the author of the bill. They all benefit.

So—from the angle of effect on education and hospitals, the Donable Property Act is a matter of great significance and importance. And, since it's been mentioned, I will just tell you that I resent with all the vigor at my command these references to my religion influencing my attitude on public questions.

Question. Some people say that your party tends to be one of big spenders. Is an effort to be made to curtail spending in this session?

Answer. Of course, the accusation is not supported by the facts. The Democratic Party is one of great builders. I could make a campaign speech in response to that question, but it would be inappropriate on this occasion.

Of course, the cost of Government is increasing and in all governments—Federal, State, and local—there are factors that we're all acquainted with. But I know what you mean—you mean unnecessary expenditures. The increased expenditures last year—a little over $6 billion, as you will remember—were for national defense. I think the American people will support any recommendation that the President felt was necessary for the defense of our country. I'd even go further: I think they would be willing to make sacrifices by accepting additional taxes if necessary for greater national defense.

COALITIONS IN HOUSE

Question. Coming back to the House of Representatives: Is there such a thing as a real working coalition in the House—a conservative coalition?

Answer. I cannot answer that question, because that presupposes a definite organization. I've heard it charged, but I couldn't say, on the evidence I've had, that it is so.

Question. Well, would you say that, to the same extent there might be a conservative coalition, there is also a liberal coalition?

Answer. On all important legislation of a progressive nature—recognizing that there might be honest differences of opinion—every effort is made to try to attract the progressive-minded Members in both parties to support progressive legislation that is before the House.

Question. Conservative grouping is a little bit more formal than the liberal grouping, is it not?

Answer. You're the one who made that statement, and you'd have to give me evidence. I see no evidence upon which I could make a finding that there is a formal organization.

Question. Do you favor an increase in the size of the House?

Answer. I favor an increase.

Question. How many members would you favor adding?

Answer. The House membership in this Congress will be 435. The increase suggested is either to 451 or 438 or 439. The 438 is by reason of the admission of Hawaii and Alaska.

Three States lost Congressmen because of admission to the Union of Alaska and Hawaii, and I strongly favored the admission of Hawaii and Alaska. Massachusetts is one of those suffering loss of a seat in the House as a result. And so it seems to me there's a clear case for increasing House membership to this extent.

There's some logic to the argument that, to keep the House odd-numbered, membership should be 439 rather than 438. You can't ignore the logic of that argument. So any reasonable bill that the committee reported out is one that I would support, even if more than three or four.

Question. Isn't it going to be a little hard to hold the House, though, on any fixed number of new Members, once you open up the subject?

Answer. That's one of the imponderables that confronted us last year, and you can't really answer that until the matter comes before the House. No one could give a definite answer before action by the House.

Question. Complaints are heard that the House membership is out of balance; that is to say, it gives too much weight to the viewpoints of the rural areas and the small towns and small cities and not enough to the viewpoints of the big cities. Would you agree with that?

Answer. No; not today—not for some past years. There might have been something to that when I first came to Congress, but, no; I could not agree to that now—otherwise,

you wouldn't have had housing legislation, minimum wage, so many progressive bills that are of primary interest to the urban districts, particularly cities. You wouldn't have them enacted into law if that was so. I think that's the answer.

REFLECTING PUBLIC WISHES

Question. Would you say that a Member of the House tends to be closer to the people than either a Senator or the President, inasmuch as House Members stand for reelection every 2 years?

Answer. I don't think either branch is closer to the people than the President. The President is a symbol of all the hopes and aspirations of our people.

As between the two branches, the Senate now, of course—as a result of direct election and, in most States, direct nomination—is certainly close to the people. But, having that in mind, I don't think the Senators, as close to the people as they are, are as close as the Members of the House, because they cover a State and we represent a congressional district. And, by reason of that service to a district, we can keep closer—and the people know their Congressman pretty well, where they might not know the Senator.

Question. A Member of the House, because he's elected every 2 years, has a chance to get close more often than a Member of the Senate—

Answer. I think the House Member would be closer even if there were 4-year terms.

Question. You've been in Congress a long time. Has it been your observation over the years that Members, by and large, tend to reflect what they conceive to be the majority view of the people of their own district?

Answer. I would think most Members view things from a national angle. My experience teaches me that. Take my own case: I've always supported farm legislation. I come from Boston, where there isn't a farm in my district. But there's a problem in agriculture. I've always supported farm legislation, because I realize the great importance of agriculture to our national economy.

I've always voted, also, for projects to develop our natural resources and to protect against floods, etc.

Just because these projects are not located in New England is no reason why I should vote against them. I don't know why I should vote against a great project out West or down South or anywhere else if it benefits our country.

Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, following is the text of my remarks on the subject of Red China, delivered in a speech before an adult church group at St. Augustine's Auditorium in Larchmont, N.Y., on November 28, 1961:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN EDWIN B. DOOLEY, BEFORE COMBINED CHURCH GROUPS OF ST. JOHN AND ST. PAUL'S, AND ST. AUGUSTINE'S, AT ST. AUGUSTINE'S AUDITORIUM, LARCHMONT, N.Y., NOVEMBER 28, 1961

I am honored by your invitation to address this gathering tonight on what I consider to be one of the most important moral issues of our time.

After viewing the motion picture "Red China—Outlaw," I am not going to try to deliver the words of good cheer and optimism often associated with a Congressman. I don't think that is what you came here for.

I am proud to be one of those who has joined with over 1 million fellow Americans in signing a petition against the admission of Red China to the United Nations. Perhaps it would be well to read the entire petition, for its brief message pretty well sums up what I have to say this evening. The petition reads as follows:

"We continue to oppose the seating of Communist China in the United Nations, thus upholding international morality and keeping faith with the thousands of American youths who gave their lives fighting Communist aggression in Korea. To seat a Communist China which defies, by word and deed, the principles of the U.N. Charter would be to betray the letter, violate the spirit and subvert the purpose of that charter. We further continue to oppose U.S. diplomatic recognition or any other steps which would build the power and prestige of the Chinese Communist regime to the detriment of our friends and allies in Asia and of our national security. Any such action would break faith with our dead and the unfortunate Americans still wrongfully imprisoned by Communist China and would dishearten our friends and allies in Asia whose continued will to resist Communist China's pressures and blandishments is so vital to our own security interests in that part of the world."

Today, the United States is faced with a dangerous contradiction on the issue of its relations with the Chinese Communist regime and, in particular, on the question of seating Peiping in the United Nations.

What is this contradiction? On the one hand, the United States has declared itself utterly opposed to the admission of Red China to the U.N. It has done this through the articulation of the American people's sentiments through the Congress, and through the strong public statements of Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy. There should be no doubt where the United States stands on this issue. Yet—and herein lies the contradiction—the governments of the world are still not convinced. In the U.N., the member delegations are confused. It has been a thinly disguised secret that the Communist bloc delegations believe that the U.S. policy is moving toward accommodation of Red China. Our allies now believe that our policy will soon change. Even those nations in Asia who are most intimately concerned with Red Chinese aggression are fearful that the United States will permit Red China to be seated in the U.N. In the face of strong statements from the White House to the contrary, why has this happened? The answer probably lies with the fact that many of those who have been entrusted by the President to implement our policy toward Communist China have indicated, time and again, that they are personally opposed to the present position of their Chief Executive and the announced policy of the U.S. Government. Their public statements have given the nations of the world good reason to doubt that the United States means what it says.

Let us examine just a few. The U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., Adlai E. Stevenson, said that it was "inevitable" that Red China be admitted to the U.N. and added: "Moreover, as a member of the U.N., Communist China would be more accountable to world opinion than as an outcast." Under Secretary of State, Chester Bowles, is considered one of the creators of the "Two China" policy and publicly calls for a "fresh perspective" on Communist China to meet "the crucial issue of disarmament." Harland Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizational Affairs, has long been a proponent of the admission of Communist China to the U.N. In addition, the U.S. Ambassadors to India and Japan have both openly advocated admission of Red China to the U.N.

I do not want this to be interpreted as meaning that I am in any way attempting to cast a cloud of suspicion over these individuals' loyalty, for each and every one has devoted most of his life to the service of his country. I do, however, think they are all in tragic error and should at all times be required to echo the sentiments of their Chief Executive on this grave issue.

Moreover, those who would admit Red China to the U.N. are not all to be found in one of our two major political parties, for many were in high places of responsibility in previous administrations. These people can be easily identified because they are prone to calling themselves pragmatists, or in other words they believe in being what they call practical and realistic. Unfortunately, however, they forget that those who created the U.N. were neither pragmatic nor practical, but rather were idealistic in that they had faith enough to believe that the nations of the world would someday pay the price of individual sovereignty in order to live and prosper together in mutual peace.

No, advocates of Red Chinese admission to the U.N. cannot in any way be identified by party affiliation. As a matter of fact, among the charter members of the Committee of 1 Million, producers of the fine movie we have just seen, were former President Hoover, Congressmen Walter Judd and John McCormack, Senator John Sparkman, and George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO. On the subject of party politics, you couldn't safely put these gentlemen together in the same room for 5 minutes. Yet on this issue, they are as one.

Moreover, protagonists in this debate cannot even be sorted by the line dividing conservatism from liberalism. Both Senators DODD and DOUGLAS, whom we had the pleasure of listening to during the movie, would hardly appreciate being called conservatives on most issues. As a matter of fact, my good friend and colleague from Illinois, Senator DOUGLAS, is often referred to as "the darling of the liberals." No, this is neither a party nor a philosophical question, but rather it is exactly what I called it at the outset of my remarks tonight—a moral issue.

It seems to me this whole thing is answered by the Charter of the U.N. itself, where membership is, and I quote, "open to all peace-loving states which accept and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out the obligations of the charter."

How could Red China possibly portray itself as a peace-loving state, when its leaders continually preach that war between capitalism and communism is inevitable? Just last month at the Communist Party Congress in Moscow, there was an open clash between Russia and Red China on party ideology in that Red China subbornly held to the theory that war is not only inevitable, but in fact desirable as a means for advancing communism's goal of world conquest. Further than this, Red Chinese leaders have been quoted as saying that nuclear war between East and West would be to their ultimate advantage because such a holacaust would leave Red China as the dominant survivor, due to her vast and widely dispersed population and industrial plant.

If Red China gained membership, how, I ask you, could she live up to the obligations of the charter, where member states are required to (1) settle their international disputes by peaceful means; (2) refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the U.N.; (3) give the U.N. every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the charter, and to refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the Organization is taking preventive or enforcement action. On this third point, while we are gathered here, she is doing all in her power to subvert the efforts of the U.N. forces in bringing peace to the Congo.

This very evening, Laotian and South Vietnamese peasants are being roused from their uneasy sleep to be murdered and butchered by guerrilla forces trained and equipped by the Red Chinese.

No my friends, there can be no question about the nature of Red China in the eyes of any who seek the truth. It is a government which, by its words and deeds, openly and constantly violates every basic principle for which the United Nations stands.

As the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles said in 1958, "The United Nations is not a reformatory for bad governments. It is supposedly an association of those who are already peace loving and who are able and willing to carry out the charter obligations."

But there are those who say that admission of Red China is inevitable in the long run, so why not now? Well, my answer to them is that it is about time we and our friends stopped crying that this and that is inevitable and started saying instead that the free world can fashion its own destiny.

Another argument often raised in support of Red Chinese membership is that Russia and her satellites gained membership, so why not Red China? This is a specious argument to say the least, for the situation in 1945 when Russia became an original member and the circumstances today are in no way analogous. In 1945, Russia had been allied with the Western Powers in the war against Nazi Germany. After assisting in drafting the charter, it of course became a member. At that time, we, along with the other original members, had to assume that Russia was a peace-loving nation, willing to live by the charter. We correctly chose not to prejudge Russia's qualifications. That this trust was soon to be violated makes the case against committing a similar mistake even more convincing, especially since this time we don't have to rely on blind judgment in the case of Red China. As Senator Dodd said last month, "having been wrong a dozen times, we do not propose to be wrong a thirteenth."

Which leads me to yet another argument used by those who would reward this bandit regime with the cloak of respectability; namely, that membership would subject Red China to the good influence of international society. My answer to this is simply, what has this good influence done for Russia?

But all these reasons for keeping Red China out of the U.N. pale when compared to the disgrace that would attend admittance of a godless state.

While religious worship has been discouraged by the Soviet Government through insidious attacks and carefully planned ridicule, nevertheless, millions still openly defy their leaders by continuing to worship in their churches. As destestable as this is, never in the history of mankind has religious worship been systematically erased and smothered as it has been in Red China. There, the people are not even permitted to be atheistic, for they all must worship at the altar of the state and its dictators. The state has become the diety.

In none of the religious or ethical gospels from which came the concepts and precepts which have prevailed in Chinese thinking and teaching is there glorification of "the state." In Buddhism, in Taoism, and in Confucianism the emphasis is on man, the individual, on conduct, on rights and duties, on relations between and among human beings. In the thought both of the sages and of the people, the state was the family enlarged and the ruler was a "father." Since 1949, countless thousands of leaders of these ancient religions of the Orient, together with tens of millions of their followers, have been executed. The moral fabric of the nation has been torn to shreds.

Martyred at the same time were millions of Chinese Christians, both Protestant and Catholic. I was advised by the Department of State just yesterday that 140 American priests, ministers, and nuns were thrown into jail. The Colosseum at Rome in its darkest days never exceeded the tortures committed in Red China in the 5 bloody years of 1949 through 1954. The full story will probably never be told because so few survived.

Father Thomas J. Bauer of nearby Maryknoll Mission has listed the barbaric means of execution employed by the Red leaders as including stoning and burying and burning alive. Over half of the American Catholic priests imprisoned were of the proud and courageous Maryknoll Mission, which graces the banks of the Hudson at Ossining.

As an example of this brutality, although it is unpleasant, let me read to you from the pages of the New York Times for September 3, 1952, the events leading up to the death in a Red Chinese prison of Bishop Francis X. Ford, also of the Maryknoll Mission. I quote:

"Before he died he was questioned interminably, kept on a meager prison diet and humiliated before the people he had served more than half his lifetime.

"He was accused of espionage, the possession of weapons and various other illegal acts, but was never brought to public trial. While he and Sister Joan Marie were being escorted by bus from Mesan to Canton the nun said they were removed from the bus in several villages and paraded before the villagers as students beat the bishop with ropes, sticks, and stones. The nun said the bishop's hands were tied during these exhibitions and added that the students heaped refuse on him as he fell. When they got to Canton jail, she stated, the bishop was forced to undress in her presence before they were separated. Later the Sister was shown a grave, and forced to sign a document stating that the bishop had died of old age, illness, and natural causes."

All this to one who had served the Chinese people since 1917, one who is remembered by his associates as a polite, cheerful man who founded a number of schools, spurred the building of roads and drew up plans for many river bridges in his area of the country. This was his earthly tribute for having remained in China all during the Second World War in order to be by his people in their hour of great need, and for tirelessly lecturing on behalf of relief for China after he returned to the United States for an intended rest.

And yet another example of Christian martydom languishes in a Red Chinese prison today, in the person of Bishop James E. Walsh, also of the Maryknoll Mission, the first American Catholic to be consecrated as a bishop in China.

He was the only American Catholic priest in Shanghai who was not arrested in the infamous roundup of June 15, 1953. For a little while after that he was permitted considerable freedom within the city limits. This personal freedom gradually disappeared with increasing Communist restrictions on his movements, activities, and contacts with the Chinese people. The bishop chose to remain in Shanghai even after September 1955, when the Chinese Communist representatives to the ambassadorial talks at Geneva assured Ambassador U. Alexis Johnson that Bishop Walsh was free to leave. He felt that his continued presence lent moral support to Chinese Catholics in the face of increasing pressure on them. Bishop Walsh's desire to remain until ordered out by the Communists was with the approval of the Vatican. After this, Bishop Walsh was arbitrarily denied permission to administer the sacraments.

On October 18, 1958, he was arrested, and on March 18, 1960, after holding him incommunicado for 17 months, the Chinese Communists tried and sentenced Bishop Walsh to 20 years in prison for espionage. Today, at the age of 70, this courageous bishop faces nearly 19 years more of prison.

Need I say more. I have no doubt as to the judgment of the Almighty against those who perpetrated these crimes against not only the brave people of China, but against all mankind. But it is also the responsibility of mortal man to prevent this from recurring elsewhere.

To the shame of the entire free world, these very same Chinese Communists were permitted to transform the peaceful palaces of Tibet into public torture chambers for its monks. Today the lovely land of Tibet is godless and devoid of any national character. Half of the territories of Korea, Laos, and Vietnam have withered the same way.

Hundreds of millions of these Orientals chose neither to be Red nor dead—they were merely victims of a struggle they had no part in creating. It is not our moral right to make this choice for them by sealing their fate through the respectability of United Nations membership.

On this issue we must all stand up and be counted.

Communism in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I include a speech I delivered to the Canton, Ohio, P.E.O., with regard to the menace of communism in the United States:

WHAT CAN I DO AS AN AMERICAN CITIZEN TO COMBAT COMMUNISM?

I am delighted to have the opportunity to speak to you today and to try to help you answer the question Mrs. Parkinson gave me as my title "What Can I Do as an American Citizen To Combat Communism."

First, let me say that America was founded on a dream. A dream that free men could govern themselves with the help of God under law. That was the basic meaning of Bunker Hill, Valley Forge and Yorktown and of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. That dream has become a glowing reality. Today, America stands a beacon of freedom to the world. The nails of sweat and toil and blood built a solid government—a government based upon tolerance, fairplay and faith in God. We in America can count our blessings one by one and pledge our lives that this government of, by and for the people shall continue.

Just a little more than a hundred years ago another dream was spawned from evil minds across the sea. That dream of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels has also become a reality—a reality punctured by the bloody signposts of human slavery, concentration camps, the denial of God. Today communism encompasses one-third of the world's peoples and one-fourth of the earth's surface. Make no mistake, the challenge is total. Communism seeks to erase forever from the annals of history the ideals of our western Christian culture. If communism conquers, the world will descend into a new age of paganistic barbarism.

A very great and distinguished American appears before my Appropriation Subcommittee every year to justify the budget of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I have reference to J. Edgar Hoover. I have the greatest and highest regard for this very fine, patriotic American. He is one of the finest Christian gentlemen I have ever known and I know of no one more devoted to the task at hand than Mr. Hoover. Much that I have to say to you today is a repetition of things he has said before my subcommittee. He has said so many things that I endorse so wholeheartedly that I repeat some of them today as though they were my own statements, although the seed was originally planted by this great American.

The question in which you are interested, a very vital question, is what can we, as Americans, do to combat this Communist menace, this atheistic conspiracy.

Most important, I think we must be informed of the nature of this ideology and its method of operating. We must be cognizant of the fact that the Communist appeal in glowing promises have lured far too many unwitting persons into accepting its philosophy. We must counteract communism with the strength of our democracy, its history, its tradition, its heritage. We must be able to effectively contrast the ideal of justice and liberty with the sordid history of Communist societies. The pages of this Nation's history are replete with practical lessons in the struggle for freedom. Each of us can learn much from it.

Obviously, the exclusive use of lofty phrases upholding democracy is not enough. Our daily action must make the democratic heritage come alive. Aggressive citizenship, participation in community affairs, exercising the right to vote, careful selection of those who represent us in government is a vital factor in making the American system work. As a nation founded on the precepts of justice, equality and freedom, we must always respect the dignity of the human being and the rights of the individual. Never must we permit bigotry and prejudice to sap our society of its strength. Unfortunately, the fear of communism has sometimes led to an unfair attack on those whose views differ from the majority. Honest dissent must not be made the target of hysterical and reckless charges. Such activities merely play into Communist hands and serve to confuse and divide our society.

Our Christian tradition is a mighty bulwark in repelling the attempts of communism to capture the minds of men. Our Founding Fathers, as men of God, sought and knew the guidance of the Divine Creator. We, too, as Christians, must undergird our daily lives with the spiritual truths. Our enthusiasm and commitments must surpass the fervor of the Communists. Our words and deeds must be dynamic witnesses for the faith we proclaim. The lessons of the holy scripture can indeed be effective guides for action as we face the problems of our mid-20th century world.

Our security can be strengthened by strengthening the spiritual forces of each community. The individual must recognize that the rights and benefits which he receives by virtue of his citizenship can carry with them the necessity of discharging certain obligations of citizenship. Our Government is a miracle of faith, but it can remain strong and durable and workable only as the individual devotes his efforts to discharging his civic responsibility in his own community. In this age of uncertainty, in this age when the struggle between freedom and totalitarian enslavement is drawing toward a climax, we have need of faith as never before.

We have need of a faith of the kind that put iron into the souls of our forefathers, enabling them to meet and overcome adversity. We have need of that same faith to fortify ourselves today as we meet the Communist enemy in today's deadly contest.

In this struggle, which has long since been joined, there are many things which the individual can do to strengthen the forces of freedom. Merely keeping informed on current events which affect our Nation is one of the means of our protection, as I have said before. In addition, the truly responsible citizen will acquaint himself with the activities of the enemies of democracy so that their efforts to undermine our freedom will be recognized. For the Communist is a trained master of deceit. Communist methods of duping individuals and infiltrating legitimate organizations must be understood if they are to be combated. I can think of no better way to form a basis for this understanding than to read J. Edgar Hoover's recent book, entitled "Masters of Deceit."

Every exposure of communism's false premise, inherent contradictions, deceitful tactics, and empty promises helps to shatter its ideological appeal and to fortify against its psychological pressures.

But in this struggle for men's minds exposure alone is not enough. Exposure must be complemented by a long-range educational program with a dual purpose. This program must encompass not only a penetrating study of communism, but also a thorough grounding in the basic principles of our individual freedom under law. This educational program must be designed to train people to think and to distinguish between truth and error. Each year more colleges are offering courses which present a critical analysis of the theory and practices of communism. In at least one college, a course of this type is compulsory.

Books contrasting communism with democracy are now being published for use in our high schools. This academic instruction can be supplemented by individual study of the wealth of anti-Communist material as well as by participation in group discussions and public forums. This program of education in communism must not, of course, constitute or be confused with the advocacy of the Communist doctrine. It can and it should be limited to a critical study of Communist strategy and tactics and the materialistic philosophy underlying them.

Now let me give you a word of caution. Knowing what communism really is and how it operates will also help to avoid the danger of confusing communism with legitimate dissent on controversial issues. Communism feeds on social ferment on both the local and national levels. The Communist Party U.S.A. is continually exploiting social, economic, and political grievances for its own tactical purposes. For this reason the party line will frequently coincide with the views of non-Communists on specific issues.

We must not, therefore, indiscriminately label as Communists those persons whose opinions on a particular question may on occasion parallel the official party position. We must also guard against the tendency to characterize as Communists those who merely disagree with us or who advocate unorthodox facts or unpopular beliefs. When anyone is erroneously branded a Communist it not only constitutes an injustice to the individual but also helps communism by diffusing the strength of the anti-Communist forces. In combating communism we must beware of vigilante action. Our responsibility as citizens is to be certain of facts and report these facts to the proper authorities.

Knowledge of communism is only the first phase of the battle. This knowledge must be augmented by a continuous revitalization of our own inherently superior strength through the practical daily exercise and development of our democratic principles. Too frequently emphasis is placed on acquiring an understanding only of the mechanical functions of our Government, such as elections, the enactment of legislation or judicial review. This knowledge, important as it is, becomes a mere collection of sterile facts without a deep appreciation and continuing awareness of the reason for the very existence of our form of government.

The freedom of the individual under law, without the realization of this fundamental philosophy of freedom, such basic individual rights as freedom of speech, the press, and religion are taken for granted. Forgotten is man's bitter fight through the centuries to wrest these freedoms from tyranny. The exercise of these individual freedoms, which we often take for granted, is largely responsible for our Nation's reputation for getting things done. Many of us have seen or have even participated in programs for community improvement promoted by private organizations and civic groups. Recognizing a specific problem which required cooperative action and sparked the individual initiative, whole communities have organized, for example, to attract new industries, to eradicate blight in slum areas, to eliminate racial tensions or to improve educational opportunities.

Public officials, religious leaders and representatives of business, labor, and the professions realizing a common interest, have fused their energies and in many cases have literally transformed the communities. Significantly, however, while many of the problems these communities faced were similar, there was no set pattern in the solutions which were devised. Just as specific local problems in resources have determined the nature of the response, so, too, any organized program to immunize a community against Communist penetration must be tailored to prevailing local conditions.

All that is required is imagination, resourcefulness and some personal sacrifice coupled with the will to inspire positive action to combat communism and to strengthen democracy at the community level. In a democracy the importance of local communities cannot be overemphasized. It is there that the social understanding and growth take root. It is there that education, business, labor, and religion take on form and substance to influence, nourish, vitalize, and give direction to our national life. It is in our local communities that cogent and penetrative thinking should be done and should be done now to reevaluate the position of this Nation in the present world crisis. From this constructive effort can come a decisive contribution to formulating and carrying out a coordinated, comprehensive, affirmative global strategy which will insure the supremacy of freedom over all types of totalitarianism.

Communism has hurled a mortal challenge. Our response and the response of freemen everywhere will determine whether or not freedom itself survives. It is no longer sufficient for us to adopt the negative approach of merely reacting defensively to every shift in Communist tactics. We must place greater emphasis on the positive role which our democratic way of life can perform in this struggle. American reality is superior in every way to the Communist illusion. It is superior not because it is ours, but because it expresses the universal qualities of human nature.

We possess the true legacy of man's age-old struggle from slavery to freedom. Ours is an inheritance solidly grounded in the reality of man's manifold needs and aspirations and on his inherent dignity and worth as a sovereign individual. A demonstrated faith in this heritage of democracy rooted as it is in Judeo-Christian tradition is our mightiest weapon in our struggle for the minds of men. Our military might, political structure, economic resources, while effective, will not by themselves insure the victory of freedom over communism.

These weapons must be reinforced by each citizen's experience and abiding awareness in the intrinsic superiority of his society.

From this awareness will develop a revitalized determination not only to continue our resistance to communism, but more important still, to make our living democracy a force of moral and spiritual persuasion which will fire the imaginations of the entire world.

There are some who in the past have criticized the church and the clergy for being soft toward communism. I deny this. To my mind, more than ever, we need as a nation a strengthening of our religious faith. If we have men and women articulate in their Christian heritage, they can meet and overcome the temptations of the Communist challenge. Far too often the Communists are able to make converts because the individual is weak. Weak spiritually, morally, and civically. The Communists have a term "improving the ideological level of the member," meaning the member must know more about Marxism, Leninism. We need, so to speak, to raise the spiritual level of our people to give them the knowledge, the inspiration, the guidance to stand on their own feet to appreciate the full grandeur and majesty of our religious heritage. Hence, the great challenge which faces ministers of the Gospel. In reality they stand on the frontline today in the fight against communism. The type of men and women we produce in America today in a large measure is their responsibility. They have the duty of guiding young lives, helping to produce aggressive, alert, meaningful citizens.

Nothing today can be more important than our Sunday schools, youth training programs, church camps and study groups. These are truly arsenals of democracy.

Joseph Addison has said, "What a sculptor is to a block of marble, education is to the soul." Here is our answer. America's clergy today are doing a magnificent job. They are helping to preserve the dignity of man as the image of God, and to mold the individual into a worthy citizen of democracy. Over the years, as could be expected, churches and religions have been and will so remain targets for Communist infiltration. The clergy of America needs the full support of patriotic Americans in our common struggle against the enemy.

Education is truly the etching pen of the human soul. We need education in the ways of men and God. An education which will make us stronger Americans and our Nation a better America.

And, so, when you ask me what you can do to combat communism, I say: First, know and understand the enemy; second, know and understand yourself and the great spiritual heritage of the United States; and third, know and understand the romance and the glories of the history of this great Republic so that you may expound upon it with the fervor of an evangelist. Such knowledge will result in great devotion to our country and that devotion, firmly planted in the spirit, will make this Republic invulnerable.

United States-Japan Atomic Industrial Forums Joint Conference on Nuclear Power, Tokyo, Japan, December 3-8, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, representing the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I was honored to have the privilege of delivering the following address to the United States-Japan Atomic Industrial Forum, Joint Conference on Nuclear Power, in Tokyo, Japan, December 6, 1961:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE UNITED STATES-JAPAN ATOMIC INDUSTRIAL FORUM, JOINT CONFERENCE ON NUCLEAR POWER, DECEMBER 7, 1961

Let me say at the outset that I am deeply pleased to be in your beautiful country and equally honored to address this distinguished group today.

Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, the Chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, conveys his regrets that he can't be here with us today. Congressman HOLIFIELD has been confronted with an urgent workload of congressional business during the first 2 weeks of December. Reluctantly, therefore, he had to cancel his plans to meet with you.

In just the few short days that we have been here, we have become aware of the beauty and the culture of Japan. We have also been impressed by the industry and energy that we see about us everywhere. Your achievements have been legion and you may well be proud of them.

It has been most stimulating to learn of your efforts and plans here in Japan to harness the energy of the atom for peaceful purposes. We were very much impressed with the comprehensive nature of your program.

You appear to have both a very strong theoretical and experimental program directed toward the solution of the problems connected with the use of atomic energy. Your approach to the problem reflects very favorably on the vision and technical competence of your scientists and engineers.

The degree to which Japanese industrial firms are being brought into the atomic development program is especially indicative of the soundness of your program. In this way, as we have found out, you will bring to bear a myriad of talents and resources on the tasks before you.

You have already attained an important landmark in your efforts as evidenced by the design and construction of the JRR-3 research reactor—the first reactor designed and built entirely by your own efforts. This project provides proof of the soundness of your efforts in the atomic field.

The step you have already taken in the nuclear power field is also impressive. Here I refer to the two power reactors you now have under construction. I understand your first power reactor, the 12,000-kilowatt boiling reactor, is scheduled to be completed next year and the 150,000-kilowatt gas-cooled reactor will follow shortly.

This show of energy, initiative and inventiveness in atomic energy could not be equaled by many other nations in the world today. To the extent that international cooperation has made this success possible and specifically to the extent of America's contribution, we are pleased to have played a role in your vigorous atomic energy program.

I cannot help but compliment you on the soundness of your approach in the atomic energy field. Your emphasis on developing the basic skills and performing the basic research needed in atomic energy reflects the obvious sober thought and consideration which has been given to this program. The combination of this experimental work and the effort which we see going into the development of commercial fabrication techniques creates a firm groundwork for progress.

In your country, as in mine, there have been outstanding achievements in nuclear research. For you, as for us, another equally important task remains ahead—making atomic power a commercially competitive source of energy.

I understand you too are finding the solution to the attainment of economically competitive power a difficult job. Although nuclear power costs continue to decrease so have the costs of power from the new conventional plants. I understand you here have recently experienced a reduction in fuel oil costs and additional reductions are expected in the future.

These developments make the solution of the economic problem more difficult but I'm sure you agree with me that it can be solved. I'm sure we all also agree that nuclear power must be developed to meet the world's ever-increasing demands for energy.

I have been interested to learn about the outlook for nuclear power in Japan. The great economic strides realized by Japan in just the last several years indicate an enormous need for increased electrical power. I have been informed that you expect a fivefold increase in your power demand by 1980 and that to meet part of this accelerated demand for electrical power, you plan to bring in about 1 million kilowatts of nuclear power in the 10-year period ahead and approximately 6 million to 8,500,000 kilowatts in the next period, 1970-80.

These are admirable, ambitious goals, and we wish you success in achieving your nuclear objectives. We hope that American atomic equipment companies will be able to obtain a fair share of this business, along with our British and European friends, and of course your own industry.

In this regard, our interest is not limited to that of a sportsmanlike competitor—we shall always stand ready to discuss with candor any proposal for international cooperation.

Specifically, I am aware of your concern with respect to long-range assurances of the availability of enriched uranium. I am sure that the joint committee will sympathetically receive any suggestions in this regard. Moreover, we shall listen with interest to discussions on this subject in the course of this conference.

You know, of course, of President Kennedy's interest in this subject. In announcing the increased availability of enriched uranium, the President on September 26, 1961, stated:

"The purpose of this announcement is to provide assurance of the availability of enriched uranium for peaceful programs contemplated at home and abroad. As those programs develop in the future, it will undoubtedly be necessary to make further determinations to meet their requirements."

It is my hope that suitable arrangements can be worked out so that your atomic power program will not be impeded.

Let me say also that we appreciate fully your concern over the U.S. nuclear fuel pricing policy. But again, this is an area where I believe that forthright discussions of the many problems involved can lead to mutually satisfactory solutions.

I would also like to see more nation-to-nation discussions of the reactor siting problem. Recently the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission published its reactor site criteria. Necessarily, these criteria can only be guidelines and not firm requirements at this early stage in the development of nuclear technology. If this is true within the United States, it is even more true when the criteria are applied to other nations with different geographical and other considerations. Perhaps a nation-to-nation exchange of ideas on this problem would be a helpful device leading to the establishment of sensible site criteria on an individual basis.

I might add that the Joint Committee stands ready to consider other constructive measures for cooperation in the field of atomic energy. It has been American policy, since the dawn of the atomic age, to share with the world community the atom's manifold benefits. I believe that our good faith in this regard has been amply demonstrated in the support which we have given to Euratom and to the International Atomic Energy Agency, not to mention the many cooperative programs undertaken with individual nations, including Japan.

We invite Japan then to move forward with us as partners toward the achievement of a common goal: the betterment of mankind's condition through the use of man's most awesome servant—atomic energy. Let us learn from each other; let us profit from each other's experience; let us proceed in a spirit of mutual trust.

It has been said that "man is neither the child of fortune nor the slave of fate." Our achievements will thus depend on the vigor with which we pursue our goals—in short, on how well we do our job. The atom can be the leading citizen of the world. It is our task to make it so.

Workreation: A Program Which Has Proved Its Value

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1952, "workreation" was a new word in the teenager's vocabulary in Berkeley, Calif.

What does workreation mean? It means just what it says—work and recreation.

Workreation provides a work and recreation program for 14- to 17-year-old boys and girls who, because of their youth and inexperience, would not be able to procure summer jobs. These boys and girls work 4 hours, for which they are paid $1 per hour, and also benefit from 2 hours of supervised recreation for 5 days a week during their 3 months of summer vacation.

Designed to give youngsters work experience as well as an opportunity to earn their own money, workreation is Berkeley's answer to all play and no work can make Jack—and Jill—a problem to himself, his family, and his community. Providing gainful occupation during the summer has proved a very positive means of curbing juvenile delinquency, though the program stands on its own feet and does not attempt to do good in this respect.

HOW WORKREATION BEGAN

How did workreation start? The background, or reason for, fits most communities' economic picture. Hundreds of boys and girls besiege employers for summer work which does not exist. Knowing that teenagers' interests and needs require physical work and fair wages for work done, Berkeley employers could not realistically absorb the youth of the community every year between June and September.

Prompted by concern for these teenage children, a group of Berkeley citizens faced up to the problem in 1952. They asked the president of one of the heavy industries, characteristic of the city and typical of the plants unsafe and unsuitable for teenage labor, to serve as chairman of a citywide committee to work on the problem. The manager of the California Department of Employment, a member of Alameda County Board of Supervisors, an executive of the YMCA, members of the city council and the board of education, and representatives of the city playgrounds, the park department, and PTA met to do something about a work experience for teenagers. Thus, the Workreation Committee was formed.

A budget was drawn up and work projects were set up and submitted to the city council. Details of workmen's compensation, public liability, social security, income tax deduction, work permits, payment at end of program, clearance with labor commission were all worked out. When the summer of 1952 arrived, for the first time there was a program waiting for teenagers, financed by the city and the board of education. Since then the Berkeley city library has also participated. The program is administered by the Berkeley Workreation Committee.

PARENTS' COMMENTS

Characteristic of the parents' comments about the program are:

Bob wasn't too interested when he first started, but his attitude certainly changed after he had worked a few days. He liked the work very much. He's rather hard to get up in the mornings but got up readily each morning while working for Workreation. I feel he really gained so much in the weeks that he worked.

I think the Workreation program is a wonderful thing. It keeps the youngsters out of trouble, and also keeps them out of the streets. It is a means of keeping their minds occupied, because they have to think to master their jobs.

We couldn't afford to send him to camp, and the work he did was almost like a vacation to him. It's hard for a boy 14 years old to stay home and not have anything to do, and he was so proud to have the chance to earn his own money.

This unique program embodies aspects of President Kennedy's important program for youth. It includes a work experience, it includes physical fitness, and it helps to curb juvenile delinquency.

As a Berkeleyan I am justly proud of what my constituents back home have done, and in honor of the 10th anniversary, which Berkeley Workreation is celebrating this year, I am pleased to bring this program to my colleagues attention.

The Federal Government and Urban Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, as a contribution to the current discussions dealing with the proper role of the Federal Government with regard to our urban areas, I include as a part of my remarks an excerpt from a recent report of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations entitled, "Governmental Structure, Organization, and Planning in Metropolitan Areas." The excerpt sets forth the Commission's recommendation for improved coordination of Federal programs in urban and metropolitan areas.

As a member of the Commission, Mr. Speaker, I endorsed this recommendation wholeheartedly. In my judgment, it represents the most immediately practicable and necessary step which should be taken to assure urban areas the maximum benefits of the various programs enacted by Congress and to minimize the waste, conflict and duplication of effort which so often has deprived urban areas of the help they need.

The excerpt from the Commission's report follows:

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND URBAN AREAS

The Commission recommends that steps be taken within both the executive and legislative branches of the National Government to bring together in better coordination and interrelationship the various Federal programs which impact upon orderly planning and development within the large urban areas.

The fragmented and conflicting impact at the State and local level of disparate Federal programs concerning urban highways, urban renewal, housing, airport and sewage facility construction, and so on, are well known. If improvements in governmental structure and metropolitan area planning are to be made by the State and local level as recommended in the earlier chapters of this report, there must be corresponding improvement at the national level.

Several major proposals have been advanced for increased activity by the Executive Office of the President and by the Congress, including the establishment of a new special assistant to be "Mr. Urban Affairs," the creation, on a basis parallel to that of the Council of Economic Advisers, of a Council on Metropolitan or Urban Affairs, and the establishment of an Interagency Coordinating Committee. These are important proposals, but they involve detailed considerations of the internal organization of the executive branch of the National Government upon which this Commission does not proffer a specific recommendation, since our statutory mandate is confined to relationships among levels of government, in contrast to the administrative reorganization of any particular level. The Commission desires to emphasize, however, that intergovernmental relations with respect to urban affairs are being unnecessarily impaired because of inadequate coordination of Federal programs and urges prompt and effective steps toward improvement of this situation.

The Federal response to metropolitan problems has not only tended to bypass the States; it has also operated on a single-purpose functional basis, with insufficient attention paid to the need for planning or coordination of the various functions on a comprehensive basis at the Federal level. While large sums of Federal money have been spent on such programs as urban renewal, public housing, highways, airports, hospitals, sewage treatment facilities, river and harbor improvements, etc., little attention has been given to developing a coordinated plan of action at the national level to overcome the conflicts and gaps in their impact upon particular metropolitan areas. Such Federal coordination includes the need for Federal institutional arrangements for properly relating those aspects of the activities of the various Federal departments which are concerned with urban affairs.

1. FORMULATION OF NATIONAL GOALS AND POLICIES

The Federal Government has developed machinery in the Executive Office of the President for the formulation of a national economic policy (the Council of Economic Advisers) but it has not as yet come to grips with the implications of various grant-in-aid and other programs directly affecting the urban areas. In other words, the existing machinery does not meet the need for breaking down each of these programs into its component parts as they affect metropolitan areas and then reconstructing these parts into a new metropolitan area policy which is reconcilable with the national goals.

It is interesting to note, however, that as far back as 1937 the President's Committee on Administrative Management recommended the establishment of a permanent planning agency "to serve as a clearing house of planning interests and concerns in the national effort to prevent waste and to improve our national standard of living;" and "to cooperate with departmental, State, and local agencies and in general to use the Board's good offices to see that planning decisions are not made by one group in ignorance of relevant undertakings or research going on elsewhere." The committee felt that "this cooperation constitutes an important guaranty against overcentralization in governmental planning and against decay of local governmental interest."[1]

During this same time the National Resources Committee (later the National Resources Planning Board) recommended that a unit be set up in an appropriate Federal agency to conduct urban research and perform functions for urban communities comparable to those performed for rural communities by the Department of Agriculture. It went on to urge that the Bureau of the Budget undertake a study of the best methods for bringing about the closer coordination of Federal activities in urban communities and for improving and facilitating collaboration between the cities and the Federal Government. While no action was taken to implement these recommendations, the NRPB itself set up 11 regional offices which were not only largely oriented around State planning agencies and organizations, but also made a real attempt to deal with regional and subregional planning in terms of problem areas rather than solely on a political unit basis. The fact that the NRPB was legislatively "dismissed" in 1943 indicates, among other things, that the real need for Federal coordination in this field was not yet recognized, possibly because the Federal programs impinging on metropolitan areas had not yet reached sizable proportions.

Currently, when the President's program is prepared, the national needs in a given number of fields are considered. The Federal activities scheduled to be carried out in each of these fields tend to be viewed in terms of meeting the requirements of that field alone. While the total of all these activities appears to add up to a national policy, in fact considerable friction develops in the metropolitan areas where many of the component parts of each of the activities come into conflict with the corresponding component parts of other activities. However, our Federal form of Government makes it essential that the policy coordination function be carried out not only in Washington and the Federal field offices, but also in conjunction with State and local agencies. The interaction of all interested parties is essential to effective programs at the level of the metropolitan area.

At the fourth meeting of the ad hoc Interagency Committee on Metropolitan Area Problems, a report to incoming President Kennedy was approved which emphasized that "large-scale urban development programs are a recent phenomenon * * *. The coordination problems created by these programs are only now becoming recognized and understood."[2] Thus, it is not surprising that no truly formal device for coordination has yet been developed at the White House level. The executive branch over the past 2 or 3 years has been feeling its way, with the assignment of relevant duties to a Presidential assistant in the White House and with staff assistance from the Bureau of the Budget and from the former ad hoc Interagency Committee serving an essentially catalytic function.[3]

2. COORDINATION OF OPERATING PROGRAMS

The ad hoc Interagency Committee on Metropolitan Area Problems developed a list of the programs of the Federal Government operating primarily in metropolitan areas which shows how many agencies and what varied activities are now involved in meeting metropolitan area requirements (see appendix K). The Committee report indicates that a number of conflicts between these agencies have arisen and have served to impair the effectiveness of each of the programs involved. The fact that there was not more evidence of lack of coordination was attributed to (1) the existence of gaps as well as overlaps in the activities; (2) the tendency of Federal agencies to draw away from each other in administering their programs rather than duplicate activities; and (3) the lack of a policy framework against which to evaluate the Federal activities.

While the agencies involved in metropolitan activities run the gamut from the Department of Defense to the Veterans' Administration, the Housing and Home Finance Agency has more program involvement with most metropolitan communities than any of the others. The Agency itself consists of two constituent units (the Community Facilities Administration and the Urban Renewal Administration) and three constituent agencies (the Federal Housing Administration, the Public Housing Administration, and the Federal National Mortgage Association), all under varying degrees of oversight by the Office of the Administrator, HHFA.

Interagency problems were dramatized by the differences of approach between HHFA and the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Commerce with regard to the relationship between the interstate highway program and urban renewal activities. While it would appear obvious that these two functions should be geared together closely, until recently the planning and actual physical activities involved in each function were proceeding independently. With the highway program making no provision for the relocation of the families forced to move by the construction involved, Mayor Richardson Dilworth of Philadelphia pointed out that "if people are given no help in relocating from the path of highways, this obviously augments the housing problems which the renewal program is trying to solve. And renewal activities must be closely related to the programing of highways if we are to avoid, on the one hand, the creation of new blight along new highways, and, on the other hand, the churning up of a newly renewed area to make way for a new highway."[4] And to carry this possible oversight one step further, the housing mortgage insurance activities often have been developed with little regard for the metropolitan problems created, of a political, economic, and social nature, by new patterns of housing development.

There has been one significant exception to this long history of unilateral functional programing. This exceptional approach was adopted on the assumption that the best way to see that coordination takes place is to require that the community involved develop a "workable program" before being assisted. Thus the Housing Act of 1954 requires that in order to be eligible for certain forms of Federal assistance to urban renewal and public housing, the community must convince the HHFA Administrator that the purposes of that urban renewal will be achieved. The community does this by preparing a workable program that includes among its provisions a comprehensive community plan. If such a plan is in existence, it is expected that the coordination of Federal and other public and private community development activities will be facilitated.

One other device has been used for Federal interdepartmental coordination, but only in the field of housing. Under Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947, a National Housing Council was established under the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The Council consists of representatives from the Veterans' Administration, the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Commerce, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the heads of the three HHFA constituent agencies. The Housing Administrator serves as the Chairman of the Council. The object of the Council is to coordinate the activities of all agencies of the Federal Government concerned directly or indirectly with housing. There is, however, little indication that this Council has made any outstanding strides in the direction of coordinating Federal Government housing and financing activities, but rather it has served primarily an educational purpose.

Within the Office of the HHFA Administrator, there is an Office of Program Policy. This Office assists the Administrator in analyzing the type and magnitude of metropolitan developments which exist or are likely to occur, and carries on other duties designed to help the HHFA meet the metropolitan needs that arise. While this Office identifies problems requiring coordination between HHFA and other Federal agencies, and recently helped work out an important program agreement between the agency and the Department of Commerce, it is obviously limited in the powers it has to achieve interagency coordination. In any event, it would have difficulty in objectively evaluating the metropolitan area programs of other Federal agencies and in getting such evaluations accepted.

One of the recent constructive steps forward in interagency coordination has been the agreement negotiated between HHFA and the Department of Commerce in November 1960 to make highway (1½ percent) funds and urban planning funds (sec. 701 funds) available for joint use in comprehensive urban and metropolitan planning. (See appendix L.) Thus, we find one of the basic difficulties we mentioned earlier apparently on the threshold of resolution. The Federal highway legislation referred to authorizes the use of 1½ percent of total program funds for planning and research work in connection with the federally aided highway program.

---

[1] U.S. President's Committee on Administrative Management, "Administrative Management in the Government of the United States, 1937," pp. 25-26.

[2] Ad hoc Interagency Committee on Metropolitan Area Problems, "Coordination of Federal Metropolitan Area Development Activities," (January 1961) pp. 10-11.

[3] The ad hoc Interagency Committee was abolished by President Kennedy in March 1961 and its functions assigned to one of the special assistants to the President.

[4] Robert H. Connery and Richard H. Leach, "The Federal Government and Metropolitan Areas" (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960), p. 19.

Under the terms of the agreement a joint steering committee (representing the Bureau of Public Roads and the Urban Renewal Administration) is to be appointed with overall responsibility for encouraging joint planning projects and reviewing and evaluating the success of this joint effort at the metropolitan area level. Regional joint committees from the two agencies will be set up to encourage and assist the States and local governments to undertake this comprehensive planning. Either State or local agencies may initiate a proposal for a jointly financed planning project, but the project must be sponsored jointly by (1) a State, metropolitan, or regional planning agency eligible for urban planning grants, and (2) a State highway department. It was presumably the hope of further developments such as this that led the ad hoc interagency committee to recommend that the internal structure of the HHFA be strengthened to vest full operating and policymaking authority in the Administrator, so that his Office could increase its leadership function among the Federal agencies with respect to metropolitan activities.

With respect to the coordination of Federal field activities, one example may merit consideration for future application. From 1943 to 1952, the Budget Bureau maintained four regional offices located in Dallas, San Francisco, Denver, and Chicago. More were planned but never approved by Congress. Among its functions, the Bureau's field service was assigned responsibility for promoting coordination of Federal field programs, consulting with State and local officials with respect to Federal programs affecting them, and appraising the effect of Federal fiscal policies on State and local governments. The San Francisco office achieved the highest degree of success of the units created, being instrumental in the establishment of the Pacific Coast Board of Intergovernmental Relations, known as PACBIR. This board developed into a striking example of the successful coordination of all three levels of government.

Every major component of government on the Pacific coast participated in this effort at intergovernmental cooperation. Created on a purely voluntary basis, it served the purpose of mutual discussion and cooperation in administrative efforts to solve mutual problems. Membership among levels of government was carefully balanced so that no level would be put at a disadvantage. While it had no power to enforce any decisions, its discussions often led to consensus and resolution of conflict. Among the items on its agenda were many of direct significance to metropolitan areas, including housing, industrial development, administration of Federal grant programs, public works planning and timing, etc.[5] While the factors which led to the discontinuance of PACBIR are many and varied, it is relevant to note that such a device was able to command enthusiastic support from State and local officials alike, even though objections to it were raised at the national level.

3. A DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

The issue of whether or not there should be established within the National Government a Department of Urban Affairs, or a comparable Cabinet-rank agency, is excluded from treatment in this report. The Commission is conducting a separate study relating to this question, and any views or recommendations thereon by the Commission will be issued as a separate document.

---

[5] Stanley K. Crook, "The Pacific Coast Board of Intergovernmental Relations," Public Administration Review, vol. 11, No. 2 (spring 1951), and Miriam Roher, "Coast States Try Cooperation," National Municipal Review, vol. 34, No. 10 (November 1945).

Memorial to Alexander Hamilton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity of placing into the RECORD the following statement which I made before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs this morning in support of House Joint Resolution 449, which is a bill to establish the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national memorial:

STATEMENT OF HON. HERBERT ZELENKO BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is a privilege for me to appear before you. My purpose here today is to support House Joint Resolution 449, which I introduced on June 13, 1961. This legislation provides for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national memorial.

House Joint Resolution 449 is an amended version of House Joint Resolution 85 previously introduced by me on January 3, 1961. The amendments have been incorporated into House Joint Resolution 449 in accordance with the suggestions of the Department of the Interior contained in a letter to the Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL, chairman of this committee, dated May 9, 1961.

House Joint Resolution 85 was a reintroduction of House Joint Resolution 717, which I introduced in the 86th Congress, but which had not been acted upon.

House Joint Resolution 449 directs the Secretary of the Interior to take such action as may be necessary to establish the Grange, the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton situated in New York, N.Y., as a national memorial and designate it as the Hamilton Grange National Memorial.

The Grange, built in 1801, was the only home ever owned by Alexander Hamilton, who was a major draftsman and proponent of the Federal Constitution and the foremost architect of American financial policy in the first critical years of the Federal Union. The design of the structure is simple but dignified and is one of the few houses of the Federal period still standing in New York City.

Hamilton occupied the Grange for several years prior to his death. His home today is the most tangible link with his career and his times. The night before his fatal duel with Aaron Burr in 1804 was spent in this structure. There is no national memorial to Alexander Hamilton. The preservation of the Grange will fill this void.

The American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society, which owns the property, has agreed to transfer the title of the Grange to the United States without cost. In the house at the present time are many objects which relate to Hamilton, such as paintings, furniture, and personal mementos, also to be donated. There is now under consideration by the present owners the legal status of a certain endowment fund approximating $50,000 which may be made available to the United States if there are no legal difficulties encountered, and this sum will further the purposes of this legislative proposal.

Among the plans involved in the preservation of this historic property is one to move the structure a short distance from its present location where, because of newer surrounding buildings, it does not lend itself properly to the preservation contemplated.

The new proposed site is on the campus of the College of the City of New York, a short distance away. This will bring the structure into an appropriate situs, that is, within the grounds of an institution of learning. At the new site it will also overlook a fine public park. The city of New York has indicated that it will make the necessary land available.

At this time I wish to read the following letter from the president of Columbia University and to make it part of my presentation:

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,
New York, N.Y., April 21, 1961.

Hon. HERBERT ZELENKO,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HERBERT: My attention has been called to a resolution, House Joint Resolution 85, introduced by you in the House, and also currently before the Senate as Senate Joint Resolution 29, for the establishment of the home of Alexander Hamilton, the Grange, as a national monument. This, to my mind, is an extremely worthy project. Hamilton served his country well as an officer in the Revolution, as a member of the Continental Congress, and as Secretary of the Treasury.

Of more particular interest to your alma mater were Hamilton's student days here and, subsequently, his important services as a trustee, for which the college granted him an honorary master of arts degree. Also, as you know, the alumni association of Columbia College annually awards its Alexander Hamilton Medal to a distinguished graduate.

For these and many other services to the country and to the State of New York, it is only fitting that his home should become a national monument—that the students and citizens of our country may be reminded of the principles for which he stood and the services he performed.

On behalf of Columbia, may I, therefore, congratulate you for introducing this bill and support wholeheartedly its passage.

Sincerely,

GRAYSON KIRK,
President.

I would appreciate the favorable and early consideration of this legislation.

Proposed New Executive Power Over Tariffs, and Barriers to Greater Free World Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, in his state of the Union message, the President requested broad new Executive power over tariffs.

The Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, held hearings December 4–14 on the world trade policy of the United States and on the need for forging closer ties among the industrialized nations of the free world.

Following the conclusion of the hearings, a joint statement was issued by the gentleman from Missouri [THOMAS B. CURTIS], and myself; and in it we expressed some preliminary views and discussed some of the major barriers to greater free world unity.

We concluded that the area of public discussion of these matters must be broadened, and that the administration's program, as outlined to date, tends to focus attention on only one problem among the many related problems which confront the United States in the task of forging greater unity among the industrialized free nations.

Among problems which we believe deserve more urgent and higher priorities are these:

First. The need for vigorous action by the United States toward formation of a new alliance of free nations outside the framework of the United Nations.

Second. The need for a more equitable sharing of the burdens of the common defense against Communist imperialism.

Third. The present lack of a unified free nations policy respecting trade with the Soviet Union, Communist China, and the Communist satellite nations.

Fourth. The persistent and dangerous deficit in the U.S. balance of payments.

Fifth. Rigid protectionism by the United States and Western Europe in agriculture and energy resources.

Sixth. The need for Western Europe to accept a greater share of the increasing industrial output of Japan and other lowest-wage countries.

Seventh. The need for the United States and Western Europe to agree on the provision of adequate markets for the products of the developing nations of Latin America and Africa.

Eighth. The need for improvement in the competitive position of American industry in world markets.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the statement to which I have referred be printed following these remarks in the Record, together with four editorials commenting on the statement, which have appeared in the Connecticut press.

There being no objection, the statement and the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S REQUEST FOR BROADER EXECUTIVE POWER OVER TARIFFS: ISSUES AND VIEWS

(By U.S. Senator Prescott Bush, Republican, of Connecticut, ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee and Representative Thomas B. Curtis, Republican, of Missouri, ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy)

The President's announced determination to forge closer links between the United States and the nations of Western Europe merits the approval of all Americans. Certainly, we of the Republican Party are fully aware of the importance of a greater degree of unity and agreement upon common purposes in the free world. We are pleased therefore that the present administration is continuing the efforts made by the previous administration to achieve these ends.

Indeed, we believe the present administration may have set its sights too low. Has not the time now come to work vigorously to form a "Concert of Free Nations" within which all other freedom-loving friendly countries and the United States may work in harmony to counter the challenge of the Soviet Union, Communist China and the Communist bloc satellites? Now is the time, we believe, to press for the formation of such an alliance. Freed of the frustrations which beset the free world in the United Nations, it could accomplish much toward winning the cold war.

We do not recommend abandonment of the United Nations, but it is painfully evident that it is an ineffective instrument for achieving the objectives America shares with Western Europe. As a forum in which tensions between the East and West may be relieved, or in which the newly developing nations may voice their aspirations, the U.N. may continue to serve a useful purpose. We share, however, the views expressed by John J. McCloy (the President's disarmament adviser), Senator Fulbright, and others that a new alliance of free nations is needed to meet the challenge of world communism which the U.N. Assembly majority has evaded.

As a start toward formation of such an alliance, we urge the administration to seek to expand the framework of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization so as to provide for closer ties between them and free nations outside the Atlantic Community.

The NATO Treaty provides, in article 2, that members "will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any and all of them." Here without further ado or legislation, we already have the authority and foundation for wide economic negotiation and collaboration. The administration should press for full implementation of this provision.

The issues involved in the administration's vaguely outlined proposals that Congress give to the President new broad and sweeping power to negotiate tariff reductions are of such gravity that partisanship centered on domestic political considerations must be rigidly excluded. These issues must be fully explored. It would be extremely unfortunate if the debate on extension or revision of the Trade Agreements Act were to be conducted in the black-and-white terms of "free trade versus protectionism." We deplore the tendency, already evident in some quarters, to picture those who refuse to accept blindly proposals which the administration itself has yet to specify as advocates of retreating to a "Fortress America," allegedly cowering behind exclusionary tariff walls.

Major questions raised by the subcommittee's hearings include:

1. Is it necessary at this time to give the President broad new powers to negotiate tariff reductions with the European Economic Community (Common Market)?

2. Can increased exports solve the U.S. balance of payments problem?

3. Will American industry's ability to compete really be increased by mutual across-the-board tariff reductions by the United States and the Common Market?

4. Will Western Europe accept increased imports from Japan and other low-wage countries?

5. Can the United States and Western Europe agree on a mutual program to provide adequate markets for the products of the developing tropical countries—in Latin America and Africa?

6. Are the United States and Western Europe presently prepared to press for free trade in agriculture and in energy resources?

7. Can and will Western Europe and the United States agree on a joint policy respecting trade with Communist bloc nations?

8. Will a "trade and life adjustment" program, as hinted in vague terms by the administration, be effective in relieving the admitted hardships forced by tariff cuts?

These questions need to be fully answered. Certainly they cannot be swept under the rug in the "great debate" which will inevitably result from the administration's request.

ONE-SIDED HEARINGS PROTESTED

The procedures followed by the majority of the Joint Economic Committee in conducting the recent study are scarcely suited to a great debate or great issues. We have no criticism of the papers which were commissioned by the subcommittee's chairman and published as Joint Committee prints. On the contrary, they contain much valuable material and constitute for the most part scholarly contributions to the discussion of the matters under consideration.

Of great and fundamental concern, however, was the one-sided nature of the hearings which were conducted by the subcommittee over a period of 9 days, December 4 to 14. There is substantial circumstantial evidence that the hearings were deliberately and hastily staged as a propaganda springboard for the administration's program. With one exception, all of the witnesses who testified represented a single point of view in support of the administration's request for broadened executive power under the Trade Agreements Act.

We object moreover to the failure of Under Secretary of State George W. Ball and a parade of other administration spokesmen to disclose to the subcommittee details of the legislative proposals under consideration, and to have ready the type of information which the subcommittee and the public must have before sound judgments can be made. A colloquy between Senator Pell, a member of the majority of this subcommittee, and the Under Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz, on the vitally important subjects of potential unemployment effects of lowering tariffs and so-called trade adjustment proposals illustrates the present lack of information. A brief quotation from the record suffices to reveal the inability of Mr. Wirtz to produce basic information to which the subcommittee is clearly entitled.

"Senator Pell. Another question is in connection with trade adjustment, on page 11 of your testimony. I was wondering if you would give us some thought, some idea as to your views as to what specifics—I note you say that we shall discuss it at a more appropriate moment.

"What more proper moment could there be than this?

"Mr. Wirtz. After there has been an indication of the position of the administration through a source which I am not in a position to command * * *. The President has not spelled out his position in any detail. * * *

"Senator Pell. To us—at least to me—it makes it much more difficult discussing the whole program when we really do not know what the whole program is we are discussing.

"Mr. Wirtz. That is correct."

The ranking minority member of the full committee, Senator Bush, recognized this problem at the outset of the hearings, and requested that the subcommittee delay the writing of a report until the complete details of the administration's proposals were known and were considered by the subcommittee. This request was ignored, and the chairman announced to the press at the close of the hearings that he intended to submit a report early in January. This announced decision to proceed with a report and, presumably, recommendations, before the evidence is all in, is the basic reason for this statement of views and issues.

We now proceed to discuss questions which must be answered before the Congress can legislate intelligently in response to the administration's request.

IS IT NECESSARY AT THIS TIME TO GIVE THE PRESIDENT BROAD POWERS TO NEGOTIATE TARIFF REDUCTIONS WITH THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY?

Much of the testimony centered upon the alleged "necessity" of giving to the President broad new powers (although not specifically defined) to negotiate tariff reductions on or before the expiration of the present legislation next June. It was argued that this new authority is urgently needed because of the emerging of the European Economic Community (Common Market) and of its possible expansion at some later date to include the United Kingdom and perhaps other members of the European Free Trade Association (Outer Seven).

No clear or convincing case was made for urgency.

There is first of all considerable uncertainty about the timetable by which the Common Market countries will progress toward an agreement on a common external tariff for manufactured goods, and even greater uncertainty about their progress in arriving at a common agricultural policy. This uncertainty is compounded by the United Kingdom's recent application to join, which raises a whole set of new, difficult, and complicated problems.

As was observed in one of the study papers submitted to the subcommittee ("The European Economic Community and the United States" by Robert R. Bowie and Theodore Geiger):

"Just how far and how fast the integration of the Six would proceed without the addition of the United Kingdom and other members of EFTA is today extremely difficult to predict, and their addition makes prediction the more hazardous."

It should be noted further, as was disclosed in the hearings, that under existing authority, representatives of the President already have been negotiating with the Common Market. The last day of scheduled hearings by this subcommittee was indeed suddenly canceled because the President had dispatched to Brussels the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Charles S. Murphy, in an effort to resolve difficulties flowing from a reported Common Market decision to exclude trade in agricultural commodities from the U.S.-Common Market negotiations which have been underway for many months.

Moreover, the President's existing power for bargaining with the nations of Western Europe is not limited to bargaining on tariffs. Rather than be confined to the narrow scope of tariff discussions, the President can invoke, as we have recommended, article 2 of the NATO Treaty and call upon our fellow members of NATO (which includes all the Common Market countries and the United Kingdom) to join the United States in discussions aimed at elimination of "conflict in their international economic policies." In such a forum, tariff matters could be placed in proper focus alongside the enormous contributions America has made and is making to the peace and security of the world, and to Western Europe in particular.

Would it not be appropriate for the United States to call attention to the great progress already made in lowering our tariffs, and that these reductions have in many cases been made without our receiving an adequate quid pro quo?

In this connection, consider the testimony of Theodore V. Houser, Chairman of the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development:

"Most other developed countries have more numerous and discriminatory quotas and other trade restrictions than has the United States, and the new regional arrangements in Europe are introducing futher discrimination against the United States.

"For these reasons, as well as because of the balance-of-payments situation, it is appropriate that other countries should move faster and further in trade liberalization."

Would it not be reasonable to say to the nations of Western Europe, and particularly to those to whom we have given billions in Marshall plan aid for the rebuilding of their industrial plants: Give us a breathing spell until you lower your tariffs to the level of ours?

Tariffs and other trade restrictions could be considered in such a forum as one of the many interrelated problems which must be solved before closer unity in the Atlantic community can be achieved.

The Bowie-Geiger study paper to which we have previously referred suggests the complexity and urgency of these issues by listing five basic tasks which face the Atlantic nations as follows:

"First, they must assure the security of the non-Communist world through military strength and deterrence.

"Second, they must foster economic growth, independence, and viable societies in the less developed regions.

"Third, they must work out a common approach for their political and economic relations with the Communist bloc.

"Fourth, they must enhace the vitality of their own societies and economies in order to provide the resources for carrying on these tasks.

"Above all, in order to perform them, the Atlantic nations must develop political ties and institutions adequate to insure unity of purpose and effort."

To these should be added the task of finding a satisfactory relationship between the Atlantic nations and industrialized Japan which will insure the achievement of a maximum common contribution in the struggle against Communist imperialism in the Orient as well as in other world regions.

Considering the wide range of problems to be solved in the successful accomplishment of these tasks, and in reaching agreement on a fair distribution among free nations of the burdens which necessarily will be involved, the tariff problem does not appear to have the overriding importance which the administration places upon it. The tariff question might well yield first priority and be deferred until substantially greater progress has been made toward solutions of these related basic problems.

WILL INCREASED U.S. EXPORTS SOLVE THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS PROBLEM?

An underlying assumption of the administration's determination to request new tariff-cutting authority for the President appears to be a belief that an expansion of U.S. exports will solve this country's balance-of-payments difficulties.

The validity of such an assumption is open to serious question.

The United States has for many years enjoyed a favorable balance of trade on merchandise exports and imports. In the latest year for which full figures are available, 1960, merchandise exports totaled $19.4 billion, and merchandise imports $14.7 billion, resulting in a favorable balance of $4.7 billion. We also enjoyed a favorable balance on nonmilitary services, receipts from these items totaling $7.6 billion against payments for similar items of $5.6 billion (including U.S. tourism, $1.7 billion), a gain of $2 billion.

These plus items, totaling $6.7 billion in the aggregate, were more than offset, however, by deficit items of which those of major importance were U.S. military expenditures abroad, $3 billion; U.S. Government grants and credits (foreign aid), $3.4 billion; U.S. (private) direct and portfolio investment abroad, $2.5 billion, and an increase of $1.3 billion in U.S. private short-term assets abroad.

The net result in 1960 was a deficit in our balance of payments of $3.8 billion. In 1958 and 1959, the United States incurred deficits of $3.5 billion and $3.9 billion, respectively, and the December 1961, issue of "Economic Indicators" reports that the deficit is running at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of $3.4 billion.

Is there any reasonable prospect that any reductions that could be expected or hoped for in the external tariffs of the Common Market will result in an expansion of U.S. exports sufficiently large to close a "deficit gap" which in recent years has ranged between $3.5 and $4 billion?

Consider in this connection the testimony of Dr. Henry C. Wallich, former member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers and a member of the economics faculty of Yale University, who has specialized in balance-of-payments problems.

Dr. Wallich advised the subcommittee that as the U.S. gross national product expands, imports increase at a faster rate than exports. He testified as follows:

"I would guess that if this economy were run at its full potential—if one can put it that way—by 1963 we might get well over $600 billion GNP—maybe $620 billion. That means $100 billion GNP above now. For each billion GNP typically in a cyclical advance, we add some $40 million of imports. That means for $100 billion, we will add something like $4 billion of imports. Now, this will be offset by some rise in exports—if we buy more others will buy more from us—and typically our exports have gone up by something like $1 billion a year. So, over 2 years, to 1963, maybe we would gain $2 billion in exports. That still would leave an increase in the balance-of-payments deficit, if nothing were done about it, of $2 billion."

We share the administration's desire that the economy achieve its full potential as quickly as possible, although we may disagree over methods to achieve that goal. We question, however, whether the President's advisers have fully comprehended the balance-of-payments effects of an increase in the GNP, as outlined by Dr. Wallich, in advocating a sweeping reduction in tariffs by this country. For tariff reductions, obviously, would increase imports even more rapidly than the normal expansion of imports to be anticipated from a rise in GNP.

Accordingly, we believe there are ample grounds for skepticism concerning the administration's apparent assumption that a mutual reduction of tariffs with the Common Market will result in a sufficient expansion of U.S. exports to make a significant contribution to closing the deficit gap in our balance of payments. We believe that more fundamental solutions are needed, including a more equitable sharing of the costs of the common defense among the United States, the nations of Western Europe, Japan, and other free nations.

We suggest that prudence dictates that the administration make more strenuous efforts along such lines to close the balance-of-payments gap before it embarks upon a tariff-cutting course which would widen it.

WILL MUTUAL TARIFF REDUCTIONS BY THE UNITED STATES AND THE COMMON MARKET INCREASE AMERICAN INDUSTRY'S ABILITY TO COMPETE IN WESTERN EUROPE?

Another assumption evident during the hearings was that tariff reductions by the United States, in exchange for comparable reductions by the Common Market, would increase American industry's ability to compete in Western Europe. This requires searching examination.

There are grounds for believing that American industries have established branch plants in Western Europe for other reasons than to get behind the Common Market external tariff wall before it is erected. These include a desire to get close to a booming market, to achieve greater efficiency in sales and service, to eliminate some costs such as ocean freight, and to reduce other costs, notably labor.

In connection with the latter point, a comparison between average wage rates in manufacturing industries in the United

States and those paid by competitive industrialized nations provides food for reflection. In 1960, our manufacturing industries paid on the average, $2.29 an hour, in comparison with $1.02 in Sweden, $0.90 in the United Kingdom (adult males only), $0.70 in Switzerland, $0.63 in West Germany, $0.44 in Austria, $0.43 in France, $0.37 in Italy, and $0.29 in Japan (including salaried employees and family allowances).

We are familiar with the argument of economists that wage differentials are in themselves unimportant and that what counts is the difference between unit labor costs. We agree that in the United States there are some industries that turn out goods which can compete in any and all markets to which they are permitted access and that among these are industries which pay wages above the U.S. average.

We question, however, whether economic theory has kept pace with the reality of the rapid modernization of plant and equipment in Western Europe and Japan which enables certain industries in these nations, paying far lower wages than are prevalent here, to mass produce goods as efficiently as can their American competitors.

Additionally, we question the fond hope expressed by some of the witnesses that wage rates in the nations of our industrial competitors will rise sufficiently rapidly and sufficiently high to eliminate the disparity before it can seriously harm American industries and the workers they employ. U.S. wage rates will be rising also.

The validity of the academic theory is made suspect by the fact that the nations of Western Europe do not accept it for themselves. Faced with competition from lower-wage Japan, they impose outright quantitative restrictions—quotas, to use a blunt, unpopular word—against Japanese goods.

This was brought out in a colloquy between Senator **Bush** and Jerome B. Cohen, dean of graduate studies, the Bernard Baruch School of Public Administration, New York City, which appears in the record as follows:

"Senator **Bush**. Mr. Chairman, I want to go back to * * * the question of * * * discrimination against the Japanese by the European Common Market people.

"Now isn't it true that the basis of their discrimination is because the Japanese, because the low-wage costs, and the big wage differential between Japan and these countries—they compete very severely with this particular Common Market that is trying to build itself up? Isn't that the basic reason there for the exclusion of Japanese goods?

"Mr. **Cohen**. We had a session in New York a week ago—the Committee for Economic Development is making a study of Japan and United States economic relations * * * there were about 15 European businessmen and European officials participating in this session. This was one of the questions that came up: Why is it that there is this discrimination in Europe? And one of the main points that each one in turn as we went around the table—Sweden, Italy, Germany, and so on—was the wage question—the fact that they felt that Japan was a lower-wage country, and therefore that they could not effectively compete. This undoubtedly is one of the largest factors in the European attitude toward Japanese goods."

It should be noted that the disparity between Japanese industrial wages and those prevailing in the countries of Western Europe is in many cases less than that between U.S. wage rates and the wage rates of the Common Market countries and the United Kingdom.

This fact raises the unpleasant and difficult question: If restrictive measures are necessary to protect labor in Western Europe against the lower wage rates in Japan, may they not also be necessary to protect American labor against the lower wage rates of Western Europe as well as of Japan?

We conclude that tariff reductions by the United States, in exchange for comparable reductions in the external tariff of the Common Market, will have little significant effect in increasing the ability of American industry to compete in Western European market. We believe, for reasons more fully discussed in the next section of this report, that such reductions, if not carefully controlled, may have a seriously damaging effect upon American industry's ability to compete in domestic markets.

More fundamental solutions to the competitive problem must be sought.

In this connection, we have noted President Kennedy's admonitions to management and labor to hold prices and costs in restraint, in his speeches before the National Association of Manufacturers and the AFL–CIO convention.

We wish the President had laid even greater stress upon the necessity of achieving a more equitable distribution of productivity gains—in lower prices to consumers, in wage increases attributable to increased labor productivity, and in profits for industry which may be used to improve the competitive position of plant and equipment.

In view of the AFL–CIO's curt rejection of the President's appeal for voluntary restraint in collective bargaining, and its adoption of a resolution calling for still higher wages and shorter hours, we believe the administration faces a major task in creating here at home better public understanding of America's competitive position in the world and of the necessity of improving it.

We believe further that the administration must advance beyond the limited tax incentives to new investment in plant and equipment which it has proposed, and move boldly toward a major reform in tax policy to enable American manufacturing industry, with its higher wage scales, to compete more effectively in world markets. The evidence seems clear that the rapid economic growth of Western Germany and other Common Market countries is attributable in large measure to liberal depreciation and other tax policies which encourage free enterprise to invest heavily in plant modernization.

WILL WESTERN EUROPE ACCEPT A GREATER SHARE OF EXPORTS FROM JAPAN AND OTHER LOW-WAGE COUNTRIES?

In the preceding section, we have recorded the wage differentials which exist between Japan, the nations of Western Europe, and the United States, and have referred to the discriminatory restrictions against Japanese products which have been imposed by the Common Market countries and other Western European nations.

These facts raise a fundamental problem. The United States follows the most-favored-nation doctrine in its international trade relations. This means that the lowest tariff we grant to any one country is automatically extended to all countries with which we have trade relations.

Thus, if the United States reduces tariffs to the Common Market by as much as 50 percent, as the administration reportedly intends to propose, then we will automatically reduce our tariffs by 50 percent to Japan, Hong Kong, India, Pakistan, and other low-wage countries which are intent upon increasing industrial production.

During the hearings, testimony was received that Japan hopes to almost treble her exports to the United States in the present decade, increasing shipments from their 1960 total of $1.1 billion to $2.8 billion a year by 1970.

Whether the United States can absorb such an increased volume of Japanese imports without serious dislocations in the domestic economy is open to question, but more fundamentally important is whether Western Europe can and will agree to open its markets to Japan and the other low-wage countries.

In this connection we call attention to one of the recommendations of Prof. Warren S. Hunsberger, of the Johns Hopkins University, an expert on United States-Japanese relations, who testified before the subcommittee as follows:

"The U.S. Government should support Japan's reasonable demands for acceptance and status among the leading powers, where Japan belongs and can contribute a great deal. The United States should continue to support Japan's efforts to remove the discrimination against Japan which 15 countries now engage in by invoking article 35 of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The United States should also support Japan's request for admittance to full membership in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development."

While the industrial output of other oriental low-wage countries has not yet reached the volume of Japan's, it is growing. The nations of the West should begin to consider how markets can be found for the goods produced by these countries, and how their output can be used to strengthen rather than weaken the free world.

We believe the United States should vigorously exercise leadership in this area, and that a solution to the problem of markets for the products of low-wage countries might well take precedence over negotiations for mutual tariff reductions by the United States and the Common Market.

Unless a sound solution is found before such negotiations are concluded, the U.S. most-favored-nations policy of extending tariff reductions to all countries with whom we have trade relations, including the low-wage nations of the Orient, might create serious dislocations in domestic markets.

CAN THE UNITED STATES AND WESTERN EUROPE AGREE ON A PROGRAM TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE MARKETS FOR THE PRODUCTS OF DEVELOPING TROPICAL COUNTRIES—IN LATIN AMERICA AND AFRICA?

Comparable to the problem facing the Atlantic community in dealing with the expanding industrial output of Japan and other oriental low-wage countries is that of providing adequate markets for the expanding output of the developing countries of Latin America and Africa.

In the development of the Common Market, special and substantial preferences were made for tropical products exported from the former French and Belgian possessions in Africa and a few other former colonies of member nations.

The application to join the Common Market by Great Britain raises many complications in this connection. New Zealand, Australia, and Canada now enjoy free entry into the British market for their important agricultural products—butter, lamb, and cheese in the case of New Zealand; wheat, meat and butter in the case of Australia, and wheat in the case of Canada.

The difficulties arising were succinctly summarized in the Bowie-Geiger study paper to which we have previously referred:

"If the British were simply to join the Community, leaving the Commonwealth and the remaining oversea possessions outside, a serious problem would be created for the countries which are heavily dependent upon exporting tropical products to the British market. For the British would have not only to deny these imports of tropical products the preferences they now enjoy in the British market; they would also have to subject the tropical exports of the colonies and Commonwealth members to the common external tariff, which gives a substantial preference to competing products from French Africa. (For example, the common external tariff for coffee is now 16 percent, for cocoa 9 percent, and for bananas 20 percent.) This is recognized on all sides as an unreasonable and unacceptable result."

After discussing ways in which the United Kingdom and the Common Market might seek a solution, the Bowie-Geiger paper goes on to underscore the interest of Latin America and other areas in this problem in these words:

"Countries outside the Commonwealth and the Community are vitally interested in the way this problem is worked out. The Latin American countries, and with them the United States, have an obvious concern about the extension of preferences in the continental European market to their competitors in Africa and the Caribbean for such products as coffee, sugar and bananas. Southeast Asia is also concerned. The dependence of these countries on exports of tropical products is no less than that of the British colonies and the Commonwealth members. Thus we see again the interest of the rest of the free world in a liberal solution."

Here again, we believe the administration should press vigorously for a sound solution of this problem before it proceeds to enter discussions with the Common Market which are narrowly confined to tariff reductions on industrial goods.

ARE THE UNITED STATES AND WESTERN EUROPE PREPARED TO PRESS FOR FREER TRADE IN AGRICULTURE AND IN ENERGY RESOURCES?

It is a curious anomaly that the most ardent advocates of free or freer trade in industrial goods turn a blind eye toward the rigid protectionism that the United States and virtually all other nations practice in the field of agriculture. If pressed, they concede that it is discriminatory against industry and industrial workers to move toward freer trade in this field without moving in the same direction in agriculture. But, it is argued, the agricultural problem is so difficult, so complicated—and so political—that it must be brushed aside.

We refuse to accept such a defeatist argument, and insist that simple justice to American manufacturing industry and to its working men and women demands that progress toward solving the agricultural problem go hand-in-hand with any further steps toward tariff reductions on industrial goods.

The U.S. Government heavily subsidizes agricultural production. We heavily subsidize agricultural exports, by direct cash payments as well as by the foreign aid shipments involved in the Public Law 480 program. And to protect artificially high domestic farm prices, we impose rigid prohibitions against the importation of agricultural products from abroad.

How heavily American agriculture is dependent upon export subsidies is revealed in figures supplied by the Department of Agriculture. For the period July, 1954, through June, 1961, Government-financed programs supported $9.5 billion out of a total of $28.5 billion in agricultural exports. In that period the total agricultural exports "outside specified Government-financed programs" of $19 billion include many products subsidized domestically. Additionally, many transactions not directly financed by Government receive governmental assistance in the form of (1) extension of credit for relatively short periods, (2) sales of Government-owned commodities at less than domestic prices, or (3) export payments in cash or kind.

It is clear that American industry and American industrial workers contribute a substantial portion of the taxes they pay to subsidize agricultural exports, in addition to subsidizing domestic farm prices at artificially high levels.

A striking example of how American agricultural policy increases the competitive disadvantage of American industry lies in our treatment of cotton exports. Because of high domestic price supports, the United States sells cotton to foreign textile manufacturers for 8½ cents a pound less than domestic manufacturers must pay.

We note that a tentative step by the administration toward elimination of this inequity by imposing an import tax sufficient to wipe out the competitive advantage thus gained by foreign manufacturers has encountered strong protests in Japan.

Like the United States, the nations of Western Europe practice a high degree of protectionism in agriculture. The Common Market is encountering difficulties in working out a common agricultural policy, and these difficulties will be increased as negotiations for the entry of the United Kingdom are undertaken.

But, if this were a perfect world in which free trade were permitted to have full rein, it would appear that the mutual agricultural problems of the United States and Western Europe could be rationally solved.

U.S. agriculture is highly efficient, the most efficient in the world. In contrast, the main problem of European agriculture is not so much chronic overproduction as in the United States, but poverty and inefficiency.

If free trade theory were followed to its logical conclusion, the United States should cease to provide subsidies to its highly efficient agricultural economy, and let American farm products compete in world markets without Government support. Our rigid prohibitions against imports of such products as Argentine beef or Australian mutton which can be produced more efficiently and at lower prices elsewhere, should be removed, with resultant benefit to the American consumer. Europe should open her markets to the farm surpluses of the United States and other efficient agricultural producers.

We recognize that such a shift to free trade in agriculture by the United States and Europe would require radical readjustments and a drastic alteration of past Government policies. We are fully aware that it would take many years to accomplish.

We believe, however, that at least a modest start in that direction must be made if a move toward freer trade in industrial goods is to be made palatable to American industry and the workers it employs.

At a minimum, we believe the administration must reverse its policy of higher and higher domestic farm price supports, which have already added $1.2 billion a year to the agricultural subsidy program, now over $6 billion annually.

Additionally, an attempt to work out a rational free world agricultural policy should be placed high on the list of priorities for discussion at a conference of Atlantic Community nations, such as we have suggested take place under article 2 of the NATO Treaty.

Similarly, we believe the United States and Western Europe must reexamine the rigid protectionism which is practiced in the field of energy resources.

The United States is the world's most efficient, highly automated producer of coal. American coal can be landed on the shores of Europe at prices lower than it can be produced by European mines. Yet European countries impose quantitative restrictions and other discriminations against American coal.

This country has imposed quotas on imports of petroleum products, especially residual fuel oils. These have adversely affected our relations with other nations, particularly in Latin America, and have had an adverse effect upon competitive costs of industry on the eastern seaboard.

Should not the United States and Western Europe move toward freer trade in such areas before rushing into a program of tariff reductions confined largely to industrial goods?

CAN AND WILL THE UNITED STATES AND WESTERN EUROPE AGREE ON A JOINT POLICY RESPECTING TRADE WITH COMMUNIST BLOC NATIONS?

A major source of friction between the United States and our Western European allies arises from the lack of a joint policy respecting trade with the Soviet Union, Communist China, and the Communist satellite nations.

The Soviet Union has undertaken—and with considerable success—an aggressive economic offensive which is designed to divide the industrial countries and to win the developing countries.

A major objective is to strengthen and accelerate the Soviet economy. From the West, the Russians import strategic equipment, entire plants, and technological competence which they find difficult to provide from their domestic resources.

In payment, the Communists supply mostly raw materials and commodities, frequently at prices well below world markets. In so doing, they achieve a second objective—the disruption of the normal flow of raw materials within the free world and the creation of maladjustments in price structures.

Additionally, much of Soviet trade has a political rather than an economic motive, and this is especially noticeable in its dealings with the developing nations whom they hope to convert to the Communist system. Communist goods and equipment shipped to the newly emerging nations are accompanied by "technicians" whose function, we suspect, is as much political as it is technical.

Drift and indecision have characterized the Western response to this Soviet offensive. The nations of Western Europe in some cases have looked upon trade with the Communist bloc as an extension of the normal commercial trading relations they enjoy among themselves, whereas in reality they are dealing with monopolistic state trading organizations which are ready at any time to subordinate economic to political considerations.

There has been a progressive erosion of allied controls over the shipment of strategic materials to the Communist bloc nations. The United States has a much stricter definition of what materials are "strategic" than have our allies, a fact which gives rise to divisive disputes.

We believe there is urgent need for the United States to make a determined effort to obtain a coordinated economic policy toward the Communist bloc nations. Such a joint policy should include: (1) effective multilateral controls on the shipment of strategic goods and the extension of export credits which tend to strengthen the bloc's military and industrial power base; (2) agreement on the method by which the West should control the flow of technological advances and knowledge to the bloc, and the amount of such information which should be passed on; (3) provisions to control the disruptions and dislocations caused by the "dumping" of Russian commodity and raw material supplies upon world markets; and (4) protection of the economies of the developing nations from the danger of Communist bloc trade and aid penetration designed to create politically motivated dependence on bloc markets and supplies.

Again, we believe that broadly based discussions under the aegis of article 2 of the NATO Treaty which encourages member nations to "seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies" and to "encourage economic collaboration" among them provide a better method of approaching this problem than do discussions between the United States and the Common Market which are limited to the narrow field of tariff reductions on commercial goods.

If coordinated, the economic power of the United States and her allies of the West and

Japan is so great as to play a decisive part in the cold war. We urge the administration to spare no effort in achieving the required coordination.

WILL A "TRADE AND LIFE ADJUSTMENT" PROGRAM BE EFFECTIVE IN RELIEVING THE ADMITTED HARDSHIPS FORCED BY TARIFF CUTS?

Advocates of across-the-board tariff reductions by the United States in order to persuade the Common Market to make comparable reductions concede that hardships would inevitably result. Industries vulnerable to import competition would suffer financially; for some, bankruptcy would be the consequence. Thousands upon thousands of men and women employed in such industries would lose their jobs. Entire communities which are dependent upon a single industry which cannot meet import competition would face the prospect of becoming ghost towns. All these disasters would result, the freer trade advocates concede, and accordingly they recommend government intervention with a "trade and life adjustment" program of which the details have yet to be specified.

Internal domestic competition within the United States, the exhaustion of resources, changing consumer tastes, technological advances—all these and other factors have resulted in hardships, both corporate and individual. For example, New England experienced an extremely difficult transition period following the migration of its textile industry to the South because of lower cost factors, notably the lower wage rates prevailing in Southern States. Over a 20–30 year period, New England replaced the vanished textile industry with electronics and other new technologies, but in the meantime the cost in human suffering was great and there was little Government could do to relieve the hardships.

Other examples which come readily to mind are the demise of the buggy whip industry with the advent of the automobile; the ghost mining towns of the Western States, West Virginia and Pennsylvania; the displacement of the steam locomotive by the diesel engine, and of harvested natural ice by mechanical refrigeration, etc.

There is a key difference, however, between these adjustment problems and those proposed to be created by a new program of tariff reductions on commercial goods. In the latter case, the hardships will be inflicted by direct and deliberate discriminatory action of the Government. This indeed seems cruel and callous.

It should be noted that what is proposed is the reversal of a traditional governmental policy. As the author of one of the papers submitted to the subcommittee ("U.S. Commercial Policy: A Program for the 1960's" by Peter B. Kenen, associate professor of economics, Columbia University) has written:

"From the birth of the present program, the State Department and White House have been obliged to promise that the United States would never knowingly cause injury to any American enterprise by granting tariff concessions to other countries, and that, in the event of inadvertent injury, would take remedial action. This pledge was prominent even in President Roosevelt's 1934 message to Congress proposing the trade agreements program; it was repeated again and again * * *"

Now it is proposed that tariff reductions be made regardless of the injury to industries and the workers for whom they provide jobs. It is said, as Kenen puts it, that the United States must recognize "the need to do injury."

To salve the wounds caused by reckless tariff cutting, it is proposed to enact a new Federal aid program of trade and life adjustment. While details of such a program are thus far shrouded in obscurity, the broad outlines appear to encompass Federal loans or tax advantages to enable factories to convert to lines of production not immediately affected by imports, a Federal dole to the workers made jobless by import competition, plus allowances for retraining them for some other form of economic activity and, possibly, moving expenses to enable jobless workers to move their families to other, more favorable economic areas.

A similar program was proposed by David J. McDonald, president of the United Steel Workers, in 1953–54, when President Eisenhower's Commission on Foreign Economic Policy (the Randall Commission) and the Congress had a prior revision of the Trade Agreements Act under consideration. It was rejected, both by the Commission and by the Congress. The policy then adopted, and followed since, was one of gradual, selective, and reciprocal tariff reductions, within limits set by the Congress, and retention of the "peril point" and "escape" clauses as safeguards. The "peril point" was intended to provide a method by which the Tariff Commission could set floors beneath which tariff concessions could not safely be made, and the "escape clause" a way in which the Commission and the President could rectify serious injury.

Whether these safeguards have worked as effectively as intended has been questioned by some. Others have contended they are too restrictive upon State Department negotiators when tariff discussions are undertaken under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

While this is a matter of controversy, what seems indisputable is that our present policy, embodying both safeguards, has permitted a substantial expansion in both U.S. exports and imports.

In 1953, our merchandise exports (excluding mutual security program shipments) totaled $12.4 billion; by 1960 they had grown to $19.6 billion, and in 1961 are expected to exceed $20 billion. Merchandise imports in 1953 were $11 billion, by 1960 they had risen to $14.6 billion and in 1961 are expected to reach approximately the same level as last year.

Surely, a trade policy which has permitted such a significant expansion of both exports and imports and has resulted in such a favorable balance on the merchandise account should not be lightly discarded. The burden of proof rests heavily on those who advocate an untested, unproven "trade and life adjustment" program as a substitute.

During the hearings, several witnesses testified that the problem of adjustments to tariff reductions might not be as great as might be supposed. In support of this view, they pointed to the experience of the Common Market countries. Although dislocations had been anticipated, it was said, little use had been made of special funds created to deal with unemployment, to retrain laid-off workers and to help finance industry conversion programs.

This may be true, but it should be noted that internal tariff reductions in the Common Market were made at a time of booming prosperity in which conditions of full employment generally prevailed. Indeed, in some of the member nations there was overemployment, evidenced by large scale importations of laborers. Can the Common Market experience, therefore, be accepted as a guide for policy in the United States where serious unemployment exists at a level exceeding 6 percent of the labor force?

An additional ground for skepticism is the statement in one of the study papers submitted to the subcommittee ("Trade Adjustment in Theory and Practice" by Otto R. Reischer) that "application of readaptation measures in some instances have been less than effective because some of the national governments as well as industrial interests involved in the European Coal and Steel Community, for example, have, in effect, sabotaged directives of the high authority. The European experience, at least up to now, would not seem to be a good basis for judging the efficacy of a trade adjustment program in the United States."

There have been suggestions that a trade and life adjustment program could be undertaken through expansion of the Area Redevelopment Act which was enacted in 1961 to aid the so-called depressed areas of chronic and persistent unemployment in this country.

We observe that the Area Redevelopment Administration has scarcely had time to do more than designate a total of 826 labor market areas and 1,035 counties in the United States as areas eligible for assistance under sections 5(a) (industrial areas) and 5(b) (rural counties) of the act. We have been informed that the ARA has encountered serious administrative problems which are yet unsolved.

We note that the first widely publicized undertaking of the ARA was a $160,000 Federal water system donated to Gassville, Ark., to help induce a nonunion shirt factory to locate in the community.

As stated in the Washington Post of December 8 and 9, 1961, this project raises "disturbing questions of public policy and economic development."

Should Federal aid be given to projects which, in the words of the Post article, "are built on shaky foundations of low wages, antiunion commitments on the part of a community, and heavy public subsidies to unstable industries seeking out low-wage and even subservient areas"?

We believe the Congress will want to examine carefully the operations of the ARA, and determine whether it is fulfilling expectations, before entrusting to this agency the rehabilitation of additional depressed areas which would be created if the administration's tariff-cutting powers were enlarged and injudiciously used on an across-the-board basis.

CONCLUSION

The administration's trade program thus far has been outlined only in general terms in recent addresses by President Kennedy and Under Secretary of State George W. Ball, coupled with statements before the subcommittee by Mr. Ball and other administration witnesses in the recent hearings.

Our final judgments must await specification of the program in more comprehensive detail and its examination in such detail by the legislative committee with jurisdiction. Nevertheless, we have felt compelled to raise the questions we have considered and to express some preliminary views in order to broaden the area of public discussion.

Our major objection to the program as discussed to date is that it tends to focus public attention on only one problem among the many related problems which confront the United States in the task of forging closer unity among the industrialized nations of the free world.

The questions we have raised outline some of these problems, among which we would underscore the following for which solutions deserve higher and more urgent priorities:

1. The need for vigorous action by the United States toward formation of a new alliance of free nations outside the framework of the United Nations.

2. The need for a more equitable sharing of the burdens of the common defense against Communist imperialism.

3. The present lack of a unified free nations policy respecting trade with the Soviet Union, Communist China, and the Communist satellite nations.

4. The persistent and dangerous deficit in the U.S. balance of payments.

5. Rigid protectionism by the United States and Western Europe in agriculture and energy resources.

6. The need for Western Europe to accept a greater share of the increasing industrial output of Japan and other lowest-wage countries.

7. The need for the United States and Western Europe to agree on the provision of adequate markets for the products of the developing nations of Latin America and Africa.

8. The need for improvement in the competitive position of American industry in world markets.

There are other problems, notably that of preserving industries and industrial skills which are essential to the national defense and whether, and to what extent, subsidies are necessary for this purpose, as in the case of the merchant marine. This vital question received little attention in the subcommittee's hearings.

We believe that instead of myopic concentration on the limited field of traiffs on industrial goods, the administration should broaden its vision to encompass the whole wide range of problems which must be resolved before the industrialized free nations can more effectively pool their resources to insure victory in the cold war.

Again, we urge the administration to take dynamic and vigorous action toward the formation of a new alliance of free nations in which these problems can be considered in proper perspective and steps taken toward a more equitable and widespread sharing of the burdens of the common defense against Communist imperialism. In such action, we believe, lies the ultimate triumph of freedom in the cold war.

More Urgent Needs

We have heard and we shall continue to hear about the urgency of getting in step with the European Common Market if we are not to face a severe economic challenge. We believe this to be so. We are a great nation capable of producing more than all of the members of the Common Market lumped together. We are in a position to expand our foreign trade in spite of the fact that we pay the highest wages in the world because our methods are up to date and our workmen are craftsmen in many fields.

We certainly do not suggest that crutches be given to obsolete industries which are simply clinging on until time takes its inevitable toll. By the same token, there are valuable industries employing many thousands of Americans which are as deserving of assistance through tariff restrictions as the farmers are deserving of price supports.

This is where we agree with two ranking members of the Joint Economic Committee and the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy. These two Members of Congress, respectively our own Senator Prescott Bush and Congressman Thomas E. Curtis, Republican, of Missouri, have drafted a joint request to the two committees to forward to them a draft of the report which will be offered to the coming session.

Both men believe that in spite of the course we must follow, there is no great urgency in simply slashing tariff barriers across the board.

They outline eight other specific problems for which solutions deserve higher and more urgent priorities.

For the sake of argument as to what is more urgent, we herewith present those problems which Senator Bush and Congressman Curtis, of Missouri, consider as top priority.

1. The need for vigorous action by the United States toward formation of a new alliance of free nations outside the framework of the United Nations.

2. The need for a more equitable sharing of the burdens of the common defense against Communist imperialism.

3. The present lack of a unified free nations policy respecting trade with the Soviet Union, Communist China, and the Communist satellite nations.

4. The persistent and dangerous deficit in the U.S. balance of payments.

5. Rigid protectionism by the United States and Western Europe in agriculture and energy resources.

6. The need for Western Europe to accept a greater share of the increasing industrial output of Japan and other lowest-wage countries.

7. The need for the United States and Western Europe to agree on the provision of adequate markets for the products of the developing nations of Latin America and Africa.

8. The need for improvement in the competitive position of American industry in world markets.

The Tariff Fight

Of all the issues to face the new Congress, that of liberalizing trade policies is likely to prove the most explosive, most time consuming, most significant of the session.

The necessity of making America more competitive in the world is upon us. We have watched European postwar recovery reach a point where now, through the instrument of the Common Market, it threatens to become the principal trading bloc in the world—at the expense of our own economy. Thus, the creature of our own assistance has reached the stage where it rivals, and in some cases, already exceeds our own activities.

Senator Prescott Bush this weekend added some significant thoughts to the coming debate. In a lengthy statement, he developed a strong case that the way to meet this growing economic challenge is not through tariff reductions alone, but through a massive attack on barriers to free world unity.

In effect, Senator Bush is serving notice that he does not fully support President Kennedy's appeal for stronger Presidential powers to cut tariffs, so as to better compete with European industry.

Senator Bush, while urging development of stronger economic ties with Europe, as well as numerous other ways of strengthening our position, does not deny the significance of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement as a major instrument in shaping that relationship. Its continuance—or more fundamentally, its modification—is at the root of the administration's program.

Perhaps broader Executive power over tariffs is not the whole answer to meeting the challenge of the Common Market. But it is obviously one major phase of it, and as such, deserves the attention it is receiving. Perhaps Senator Bush is correct in approaching the problem on a wider basis, but meanwhile, the Trade Act does expire this June, and some action on it is a must for Congress.

Senator Bush Weighs the Tariff Issue

As the Kennedy administration continues to build up pressure for a broader executive control over tariffs, Connecticut's Senator Prescott Bush and Representative Thomas B. Curtis of Missouri—both members of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress—have raised some questions of high import in the mounting debate.

Their questions are particularly important in industrial Connecticut, because in our opinion, nothing could be potentially more damaging to this State's prosperity than a Federal tariff policy based entirely on partisan political theories.

And the Bush-Curtis statement implies that just such partisanship may be shaping a narrow approach to serious domestic and international problems of the broadest scope.

The Republican leaders see the tariff-cutting issue not as a black-and-white struggle between free trade and protectionism but as a genuine American need—which should however, be related to other problems for which solutions deserve higher and more urgent priorities.

The problems which they would relate to, but raise above, the tariff issue are:

1. The need for vigorous action by the United States toward formation of a new alliance of free nations outside the framework of the United Nations.

2. The need for a more equitable sharing of the burdens of the common defense against Communist imperialism.

3. The present lack of a unified free nations policy respecting trade with the Soviet Union, Communist China and the Communist satellite nations.

4. The persistent and dangerous deficit in the U.S. balance of payments.

5. Rigid protectionism by the United States and Western Europe in agriculture and energy resources.

6. The need for Western Europe to accept a greater share of the increasing industrial output of Japan and other lowest-wage countries.

7. The need for the United States and Western Europe to agree on the provision of adequate markets for the products of the developing nations of Latin America and Africa.

8. The need for improvement in the competitive position of American industry in world markets.

The wholly natural Democratic reply to this claim will be a challenge to the nonpartisanship of Republicans Bush and Curtis. But as an early minority report in the hearings and the directions of the Joint Economic Committee this is both stimulating and productive commentary. Tariff concepts have such deep roots and such emotional undertones in both parties that it will be very easy for Congress to tie itself in knots on this question. A look at the larger problems related to tariffs helps to restore some focus.

Tariff Questions

President Kennedy's request for broader executive power over tariffs, an issue destined to become one of the hottest in Congress this session, has already polarized Senators and Representatives.

U.S. Senator Prescott Bush, ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee, has teamed with U.S. Representative Thomas B. Curtis, Missouri Republican and ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, to issue a position paper on the proposed tariff measures.

Part of their 21-page statement is devoted to the question, "Will mutual tariff reductions by the United States and the Common Market increase American industry's ability to compete in Western Europe?" Liberal trade proponents say unquestionably that they will, but the Bush-Curtis statement indicates that this contention bears much closer examination.

The establishment of branch plants of American industries in European countries is not solely to get within the tariff barriers of the Common Market, as some would lead us to believe. Several factors, principally propinquity to foreign markets, availability of lower wage labor and administrative efficiency, are involved.

Some American industries produce certain products at a unit cost that enables them to sell anywhere in the world; but many, including a large portion of those who have already opened oversea branches, cannot compete with foreign products produced at a fraction of the cost involved in U.S. manufacturing.

The Bush-Curtis statement includes a listing of the hourly wage scales paid by the industrialized nations which speak meaningfully for themselves. In 1960 U.S. manufacturing industries paid an average of $2.29 an hour in contrast with 90 cents an hour in England, 60 cents an hour in West Germany, 43 cents an hour in France, 37 cents an hour in Italy, and 29 cents an hour in Japan.

There is a limit to the degree of efficiency American industries can reach. And with a $2-an-hour differential with a nation like Japan, reaching comparable costs through efficiency is improbable.

Particularly inasmuch as industries in Japan and Western Europe enjoy tax policies and depreciation allowances that enable them to approach an efficiency sufficient to compete with American production.

It has been argued that foreign wages are due to rise and that production costs will be somewhat leveled. But it must not be forgotten that U.S. labor costs are rising and in spite of President Kennedy's call for wage and price restraint, U.S. labor, as pledged by the recent AFL–CIO convention, is going to fight for higher pay and shorter hours. A lowering of the protective tariff barriers in order to gain a better competitive position may prove illusory.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 16, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Proverbs 9: 10: *The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom.*

Most merciful and gracious God, at this noon hour of a new day, we are humbly and reverently turning our thoughts unto Thee in the sacred attitude of prayer.

Grant that we may always acknowledge our absolute dependence upon Thee lest we become guilty of the sacrilege of surrendering to the arrogant and supercilious feeling that we are quite sufficient unto ourselves in wisdom and strength.

Gird us with unity of spirit as we highly resolve to achieve for suffering and struggling humanity a new birth of freedom and a larger hope for peace on earth and good will among men.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday, January 15, 1962, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

ADJOURNMENT FROM TODAY UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the democratic caucus, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 507

Resolved, That CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas, and MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, of Michigan, be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Ways and Means.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Sixth Semiannual Report of the Secretary of the Interior prescribed by section 5 of the act of August 21, 1958, entitled "To provide a program for the discovery of the mineral reserves of the United States, its territories and possessions by encouraging exploration for minerals, and for other purposes."

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 16, 1962.*

THE LATE HONORABLE OWEN BREWSTER

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I notify the House of the passing of a former Member, Hon. Ralph Owen Brewster, of Maine.

It was indeed a sad hour for the State of Maine when on Christmas Day, 1961, death claimed the former U.S. Senator Owen Brewster, of Maine.

Senator Brewster was never one of those persons to stand by and watch the current of life swirl by him. Instead, he flung himself into it with a passion and was carried along in a stream of fast-moving and dynamic events.

On February 22, 1888, Mr. Brewster was born in Dexter, Penobscot County, Maine.

He attended the public schools, and was graduated from Bowdoin College, Maine, in 1909, and from the law school of Harvard University, Mass., in 1913. Service in the Maine State House of Representatives was his in 1917 and 1918, but he resigned from this legislative area to enter the military service where he served honorably and successively as private, second lieutenant, captain, and regimental adjutant of the Maine National Guard 3d Infantry.

For the 1921 to 1923 period he again returned to the Maine State House of Representatives, and from 1923 to 1925 he served in the Maine State Senate.

In 1925 Owen Brewster became Governor of the State of Maine, serving in this executive capacity until 1929.

He was elected as a Republican to the 74th, 75th, and 76th Congresses, January 3, 1935 to January 3, 1941. In 1940, he was elected to the U.S. Senate for the term commencing January 3, 1941, and he was reelected in 1946 for the term ending January 3, 1953.

As is immediately evident from Senator Brewster's background, he was a man dedicated to public service in the interests of his State of Maine. In his passing from the scene of life, he will not be forgotten by his State, for he has done so many of those good and fine things for which men are always remembered.

Great is the grief that now visits with Senator Brewster's wife, his son, and other members of the family, and Mrs. McIntire and I want to extend our sympathy to them in this lonely hour of sadness.

Mr. Speaker, I have in my possession several editorials and other materials extracted from Maine newspapers, all treating of tribute to the late Senator Brewster. Under unanimous consent I insert these materials into the RECORD as an extension of my remarks.

[From the Bangor Daily News, Dec. 28, 1961]

DEATH ENDS NOTABLE CAREER

Few men have served the State of Maine as long or as industriously as the late former U.S. Senator Owen Brewster, of Dexter, who died suddenly in Boston on Christmas Day.

His public career began in 1915, when he was elected to the Portland School Board, and ended when he lost the GOP nomination to Frederick G. Payne in 1952, after serving two terms in the U.S. Senate. In between, he had served in the Maine Legislature, was in the Governor's office for two terms, and was in the U.S. House.

Among programs which he championed as Governor was the promotion of Maine's recreational attractions. He brought about the establishment of the Maine Development Commission—later succeeded by the present Department of Economic Development—in this connection.

He encountered several setbacks in the course of his career and was often in the center of controversies. But he remained active and influential in public affairs.

He was pursuing various community affairs and interesting himself in the State's aviation problems at the time of his death. He had a hand in organizing the conservative Americans for Constitutional Action after his retirement from the Senate.

The Dexter native was a man of varied accomplishments. He was a teacher for a time and was busy in the field of law. He was prominent in Christian Science activities and for a period served as president of the Church of Christian Science in Boston.

The State and the Nation have lost an industrious public servant and civic leader.

[From the Eastern Gazette, Dec. 28, 1961]

Owen Brewster, Dexter's First Citizen

One of the ablest men in Maine, who devoted a lifetime of service to his State and Nation, has gone to rest.

His zest in battle for things he believed in kept Owen Brewster constantly in the limelight of controversy throughout his long political career.

The more recent years of retirement from official duties did not give such sharp play to his rare combination of brilliant mind and eloquent tongue. But in these later years, perhaps, he made his greatest public contributions.

He was unsparing of time, talent, and energy in promoting the progress of his home town of Dexter. He continued to aid actively in supporting his political party and the fundamental principles of government he stood for. And he played a major part in furthering numerous statewide and regional programs.

Dexter is proud to have been the home of such a man and suffers a great and unique loss in the passing of Owen Brewster.

[From the Waterville Morning Sentinel, Dec. 26, 1961]

Owen Brewster

Maine has lost one of her most able and articulate public figures.

The death of Owen Brewster takes from the political scene a man who never feared controversy and was always ready to battle for the things in which he believed.

His career as Governor, Representative to Congress, U.S. Senator, and as elder statesman was flecked with controversy. He never feared it and those who crossed swords with him needed sharp blades if they hoped to win their point.

One did not always agree with Owen Brewster. He didn't expect it. He saw debate and controversy as important in shaping policy. He had great intellectual powers and expected those who opposed him to bring equal powers to bear in support of their positions.

And, whether one agreed with Owen Brewster or not, one was glad that Maine and the Nation had such as Owen Brewster in public life.

The State and the Nation are richer because he spent most of his years in public service and because he didn't withdraw from public life when the fortunes of politics retired him from the U.S. Senate.

"Those who held different views found their mettle tested to the full in any contest with him," said U.S. Senator Edmund S. Muskie, the man who succeeded him in the Senate.

"Few men in Maine's history have had a more illustrious career than Owen Brewster," said Gov. John H. Reed, upon learning of his death.

His talents will be sorely missed.

[From the Houlton Pioneer Time, Dec. 28, 1961]

Owen Brewster

In the sudden and unexpected death of former Governor and U.S. Senator Owen Brewster, of Dexter, the State of Maine has lost one of its most loyal and devoted servants.

His long career in public life began inconspicuously as a school committeeman soon after his graduation from Harvard Law School. From this small beginning he progressed, not always smoothly and without controversy, to the position of U.S. Senator from this State.

He was an exceptionally able and articulate statesman. Throughout his long career as Governor of Maine for two terms, Representative in Congress from the 3d Maine district for three terms, and U.S. Senator for two terms, he showed steadfast dedication to his State, to his country, and to the people he represented.

It can truly be said that he devoted a lifetime of service to his native State because, even though he was living in semiretirement, he found time to stanchly support constructive efforts aimed at the welfare of Maine.

He was never afraid of controversy, thrived on vigorous partisan debate, and reveled in the game of politics to which he was devoted and at which he was extremely adept.

Tributes to this distinguished son of Maine have come from men and women in every walk of life and from highly placed members of both political parties who recognized his ability as a coworker and respected his talents as an adversary. Truly, Maine mourns for one of its outstanding senior citizens.

[From the Bangor Daily News, Dec. 29, 1961]

Final Homage Paid Ex-Senator Brewster

Dexter.—Final homage to former U.S. Senator Owen Brewster, Maine's distinguished statesman and a longtime leader in the State's Republican Party, was expressed at Christian Science funeral services at the First Universalist Church here Thursday afternoon.

Prominent State and National Republicans were present at the services which were conducted by Mrs. Mildred Booth Lord of Bangor, former first reader and president of the Bangor Christian Science Church.

DIGNITARIES ATTEND

Among those attending were Gov. John H. Reed with David A. Nichols of Lincolnville, State GOP chairman, and William F. Mussenden of Bath, chairman of the GOP finance committee; Senator Margaret Chase Smith, Representative and Mrs. Clifford G. McIntire of the Third District, former Gov. and Mrs. Horace Hildreth of Cumberland, Gen. and Mrs. Frank E. Lowe of Harrison.

Philip S. Wilder, assistant to the president of Bowdoin College, John L. Baxter and Brig. Gen. Boyd W. Bartlett, members of the board of overseers at the college, were present. Bowdoin president James S. Coles was unable to be present due to illness.

Prominent senators and representatives of the State legislature, members of the Maine Bar Association and other organizations were seated in reserved sections of the church.

RELATIVES ATTEND

Members of the immediate family present included Mrs. Owen Brewster, her son and family, Mr. and Mrs. Charles F. Brewster, Miss Betsey Anne Brewster, Whitmore F. Brewster of Bangor; Charles S. Brewster of Dexter, brother of the deceased; Mr. and Mrs. Wendell Brewster of Bethel, Mr. and Mrs. Harley Jordan of Boston.

Other relatives attending were Mr. and Mrs. Paul Carver of Sedgwick, Mr. and Mrs. Ed Tescaner of Newton, Mass., Mr. and Mrs. William Brewster of Auburn, Mrs. Dorien V. McGraw of Milbridge, Mrs. Helen Ayer of Dexter, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Foss of Falmouth, Mr. and Mrs. Richard Foss of Portland, Mrs. Edmund Hoctor of Shrewsbury, Mass., Mr. and Mrs. Clifton Foss of Cape Elizabeth, Peter Foss of Portland, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Libby, Sr., of Portland, Miss Margaret Chenery of South Portland, Mrs. Henry Thompson of Portland, Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Swanton of Dexter.

USHERS, BEARERS LISTED

Ushers were Clarence W. Crosby, chief usher, James F. Cox, Bartolo M. Siciliano, Thomas N. Tillson of Dexter, Frank Fellows of Bucksport, Dorien McGraw of Milbridge, Francis Allen of Bangor.

Honorary bearers were Nathan C. Bucknam, Bert L. Call, Millard G. Otto, Clarence Crosby, Charles Dustin, Jere Abbott of Dexter, and Henry T. Gerrish of Dover-Foxcroft.

Active bearers were Halford Davis of Washington, D.C., Dennis Lombardi of Bangor, Harold M. Wolff, K. Stanford Blake, Delphis Higgins, and Earl Fanjoy of Dexter.

ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTED

Representatives of the following Dexter organizations were seated in a reserved section: American Legion, Dexter Club, Dexter Development Association, Grange, Lion's Club, Masonic Lodge, Odd Fellows, Republican Town Committee, American Legion Auxiliary, Eastern Star, Rebekah Lodge, Women's Literary Club, Daughters of the American Revolution, Christian Science Society of Newport.

Organist at the rites was Mrs. Claire Wilkins of Dexter. The Reverend E. King Hempel, church pastor, was host minister.

The remains were entombed in the Dexter vault to await spring burial in Mount Pleasant Cemetery at Dexter.

[From the Bangor Daily News, Dec. 26, 1961]

Ex-Senator Brewster Dies Unexpectedly

Dexter.—Former U.S. Senator Owen Brewster, 73, died unexpectedly Monday morning at Boston where accompanied by Mrs. Brewster he had been visiting during the Christmas season.

Senator Brewster's son, Charles F. Brewster, of Bangor, said Monday afternoon that his father's death was totally unexpected, and added that the former Senator had been slightly ill with a virus infection but that his general health appeared to be good.

Senator Brewster had been active in community affairs, since retirement from political life and was associated with his son in practicing law at Bangor.

Christian Science services will be conducted Thursday at 2:30 p.m. at the First Universalist Church in Dexter.

Maine political figures joined in mourning Monday the death of Brewster.

GOVERNOR REED

Governor John H. Reed, spending the Christmas holiday in Fort Fairfield at the home of his parents, said Brewster's passing "removes from the scene one of Maine's greatest statesmen. He devoted a lifetime of service to his native State.

"As Governor, Representative to Congress, and U.S. Senator, he brought great credit to Maine. Few men in Maine's history have had a more illustrious career than Owen Brewster. I join with thousands of friends in mourning the passing of a truly great public servant."

Reed ordered flags at the State House flown at half staff until after the funeral services.

SENATOR MUSKIE

In Washington, Senator Edmund Muskie said Brewster "was an able, articulate, and aggressive fighter for the principles in which he believed. He enjoyed vigorous partisan debate and saw it as a useful instrument for shaping sound national policies. Those who held different views found their mettle tested to the full in any contest with him.

"To the last, he was not afraid of controversy in pressing his views as to how Maine's interests might best be served. His voice is stilled but not forgotten.

"Mrs. Muskie joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Brewster and the family.

GOVERNOR BAXTER

Former Gov. Percival Baxter, who preceded Brewster as the State's chief executive, said in Portland that Brewster "was a man of marked ability.

"He became a national figure in the Halls of Congress where he served faithfully his State and Nation. He was recognized as a leader of men and his presence and advice will be sorely missed in these difficult times."

REPRESENTATIVE GARLAND

In Saco, Representative Peter A. Garland, Republican of Maine, said the State "has indeed suffered a tragic loss" in Brewster's death. "He was a tireless worker for the State of Maine," Garland added.

NICHOLS

David A. Nichols, Lincolnville, chairman of the Maine Republican State Committee, commented: "With the passing of Governor Brewster the Republican Party has lost one of its most vigorous leaders. For him, retirement from public office did not mark the end of active service to his party; to the day of his death he served notably as county finance chairman and as an effective precinct worker. We shall not soon look upon his like again."

REPRESENTATIVE M'INTIRE

Representative Clifford G. McIntire, reached in Massachusetts where he was spending Christmas with relatives, said Brewster's passing "is a deep loss to our State and Nation and to those privileged to know him as a friend.

"His distinguished service as Governor, Congressman, Senator, and outstanding Maine citizen is a record of dedicated citizenship that has covered nearly four decades. I shall always treasure the memory of his many kindnesses and counsel as we often discussed issues important to the State and Nation. Mrs. McIntire joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Brewster and family."

SCRIBNER

Former Under Secretary of the Treasury Fred C. Scribner, Jr., Portland, declared: "I am surprised and shocked at this unhappy news. Maine has lost one of its outstanding senior citizens.

"Few men have been as highly honored by this State. He in turn loved Maine and was deeply devoted to his native State, as he was to his church and his party. Owen Brewster will be remembered for the devotion and strength which he gave to the causes which gained his support.

"In politics he fought always for those who supported principles in which he believed, but once the party's candidates were chosen, no one worked harder or with greater singleness of purpose for their success.

"His wife and son have my sincere sympathy at this time."

Scribner is a former state GOP chairman and is now counsel for the National Republican Committee.

COLES

President James S. Coles, of Bowdoin College Monday night mourned Brewster's death.

"In the loss of Owen Brewster, we have lost a servant of great ability," Coles said. "Just as in his many years of public service, in his 20 years as an overseer of Bowdoin College, he always brought his intellectual power to the problem at hand, and his wit and charm to his many friends."

Coles said the flag on the Brunswick campus will fly at half staff Tuesday in memory of Brewster.

Surviving are his widow, Dorothy (Foss) of Dexter; one son, Charles of Bangor; a brother, Charles S. of Dexter; two grandchildren, and several nieces and nephews. Another son, Owen, died in the 1930's while in high school.

Funeral arrangements are being handled by the Crosby Funeral Home in Dexter.

Brewster worked his way up the political ladder by easy stages from school committeeman to U.S. Senator. Along the route he served in both houses of the Maine Legislature, twice as Governor of his native State and for 6 years as a member of the National House of Representatives.

But his career was not without its rough spots. His primary opponent in his first race for the gubernatorial nomination was declared the winner at the outset. Brewster brought charges of fraud and irregularities. The original award of the certificate of nomination was reversed subsequently.

After two terms in the Senate, Brewster was defeated in the 1952 Republican primary for renomination.

While a Senator, he figured in 1947 in a stormy hearing at which he and Howard Hughes, millionnaire Hollywood plane and tool manufacturer and moviemaker, engaged in a personal feud.

Brewster at the time was chairman of a Senate war investigating committee. A subcommittee of that body was investigating Hughes' World War II airplane contracts.

TESTIFIED BEFORE OWN COMMITTEE

Hughes claimed that Brewster had offered to sidetrack the inquiry if Hughes would merge his Trans World Airline with Pan-American Airways. In an unprecedented procedure, Brewster, voluntarily dropping his rights as a Senator, appeared as a witness before his own committee to deny the accusation under oath. Hughes was equally vehement, demanding the right to cross-examine Brewster personally.

The Maine Senator was a member of a 10-man Senate-House committee that, in 1946, investigated the Pearl Harbor disaster of December 7, 1941. The majority laid solely to military men in both Hawaii and Washington the failures that contributed to the disaster. They declared that President Franklin D. Roosevelt and his Cabinet "discharged their responsibility with distinction, ability and foresight."

Brewster was one of the two Republican Senators who dissented. In a minority report, these two asserted that Roosevelt "was responsible for the failure to enforce continuous efficient and appropriate cooperation" in Washington "in evaluating information and dispatching clear and positive orders to the Hawaiian commanders."

Brewster had no liking for the New Deal. A particular target was the reciprocal trade program. He called it "Alice-in-Wonderland economics."

SUPPORTED F.D.R. IN WAR

But he fully supported the President in the war. He was the man behind the platform adopted by the Maine Republican Convention in 1942 that pledged unqualified support to Roosevelt as Commander in Chief.

"Up in Maine we have been brought up on the sea," he commented, "and when the ship gets out of sight of land we recognize that the captain is boss * * * I did not vote for the captain, but * * * if I am compelled to a choice between Roosevelt and Hitler, I choose Roosevelt."

Brewster unsuccessfully sought the U.S. Senate nomination twice and the nomination as Representative once before he won election to the House in 1934. There he strongly supported the Townsend old-age pension plan.

In 1940 he was nominated for the Senate after a spirited contest with Gov. Lewis O. Barrows, a former political associate. In the election he defeated former Gov. Louis J. Brann, the strongest Maine Democrat in many years.

He served as a member of the watchdog committee headed by Senator Harry S. Truman that investigated defense and then war costs. In that capacity Brewster and four other Senators made a world tour in 1943, visiting battlefronts in every major theater except Russia. The group represented the military committee as well as the Truman committee and wore Army uniforms.

In 1947 Senator Brewster became chairman of the Special Senate War Investigating Committee.

OF MAYFLOWER DESCENT

A direct descendant of William Brewster of the *Mayflower*, Brewster was born at Dexter, February 22, 1888, the son of William E., and Carrie (Bridges) Brewster. He was educated in the Dexter public schools and at Bowdoin College and Harvard Law School. For a year between Bowdoin and Harvard he served as a high school principal.

At Harvard, where he waited on tables to help pay expenses, Brewster was a member of the editorial board of the Harvard Law Review, working with Robert A. Taft, later a Republican Senator from Ohio. In 1948 and 1952 Brewster supported the Ohioan's unsuccessful candidacy for the presidential nomination.

During his 4 years at Bowdoin and for 2 years at Harvard, Brewster roomed with Harold H. Burton, later Republican Senator from Ohio and subsequently an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. Another classmate was James P. Kem of Kansas City, who became a Republican Senator from Missouri.

Brewster started the practice of law in Portland in 1913. His first public service was as a member of the Portland school committee, from 1915 to 1923. It was during that period that he was elected to the Maine Legislature.

He was renominated for a second term in the house, but resigned to enter military service in World War I. When the armistice ended that conflict, he was in a field artillery officers training school at Camp Zachary Taylor, Ky.

CHAMPIONED PROHIBITION

Returning to Portland, he was elected to another term in the Maine house, and in 1923 went to the State senate. Then in 1924 he moved to the Governor's chair, where he served two 2-year terms before going to Congress for three terms in the House and two in the Senate.

As Governor, he championed prohibition, emphasized the value of advertising Maine's recreational attractions—he originated the Maine Development Commission—and vetoed a bill favored by power interests to permit transmission of Maine electricity out of the State.

An avid aviation enthusiast, Brewster represented this country at various aviation conferences at home and abroad.

While he attended his share of Washington cocktail parties, Brewster was a teetotaler. To be sociable, he would accept a glass but hold it in his hand throughout the affair. In religion, he was a Christian Scientist. He served for a time as president of the mother church of Christian Science in Boston.

NOTED AS SPEAKER

Although he had been known for years as Ralph O. Brewster, Brewster decided in 1943 that the first name had little meaning while his middle name, Owen, was an honored one in his family. So he adopted the form of Owen Brewster.

Brewster was in great demand as a speaker while a Senator. He had a large vocabulary, a flowing style and a nasal twang that to many was typical of his down-east constituency. The Republicans used him frequently as a political campaigner. In 1944 he was vice chairman of the Republican Senate campaign committee. He was chairman in 1946, when the GOP won control of the Senate, and was chairman again in 1949-50.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, the late Owen Brewster of Dexter, Maine, a former distinguished Member of this body, was a man who devoted his life to politics and causes which he believed were just.

Perhaps he will be best remembered in our State of Maine for his eloquence and his unswerving loyalty to his State, county and political party.

He was honored with every major office his State could give him—serving as Governor, Congressman, and U.S. Senator. Not always successful in his quests for office, in defeat he exemplified the finest type of sportsmanship.

His many community endeavors attested to the man's fine Christian spirit. One example was his life-long work with the Boy Scouts of America.

It was a privilege to count this man among my personal friends; my sympathy goes out to Mrs. Brewster and Charles Brewster, their son.

Maine has lost a learned, patriotic and devoted citizen.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. GARLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues from Maine in paying tribute to one of Maine's most loyal sons, the late Ralph Owen Brewster. He was a man who rose to great heights in his too-short 73 years. In the annals of Maine, and the entire country, I find it difficult to name one who served the public and his country so well and so unselfishly for 46 years. During these years, he was to know fame, honor, and deep personal tragedy grief that only a father can realize—the loss of a son.

Ralph Owen Brewster came from the little town of Dexter, Maine, to serve his State as a representative and senator to its legislature, then as its Governor. From there, he came to know the rigors of the national political battle, serving first in the House of Representatives and then in the U.S. Senate until his retirement in 1952.

Always a fighter of evil, he also fought for that which is right and just.

Serving my first year in this House of Representatives, I was fortunate to have the counsel and wisdom of this friend. He was always there to assist with a guiding hand.

To Mrs. Brewster and Charles I offer my deep and sincere condolences in this dark moment of their loss. They have lost a husband and father, and the State of Maine and the Nation a true friend.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the death of Ralph Owen Brewster, the country and the Republican Party lost one of its dedicated servants. Owen Brewster, as a Congressman, a Governor of Maine, and as a U.S. Senator, served with devotion and with distinction.

It was my privilege to know Owen Brewster intimately for over 25 years. I admired the zeal and enthusiasm he put into his work whether it was in a party service or a public position. His loyalty to a cause could not help but evoke universal commendation.

Born in Maine, educated at Bowdoin and Harvard, he came naturally by his republicanism. He gave generously of his time and money for the promotion of his party. He was one of its most eloquent voices, and his campaigning called him many times into all parts of the country.

His contributions to the public service as Congressman, Governor, and U.S. Senator were outstanding. In his death, Maine has lost one of its most distinguished citizens, and I have lost a faithful friend. To his good wife, I extend my deepest sympathy in her hour of sorrow.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, Owen Brewster contributed much to the welfare of our country during his service in the Congress as a Representative and later Senator from the State of Maine. He was active in debate, logical and forceful in his arguments and highly respected by everyone who came in contact with him. He served the Republican Party with unselfish zeal and it was my privilege to have an opportunity to witness his work for his colleagues.

Senator Brewster was one of the first men I met when I came to Congress and he gave me much good advice which I always treasured. He was not one who would hesitate to meet a question head-on and reach a conclusion because of his agile mind.

I extend to his widow and loved ones my most sincere sympathy at their great loss.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life and character of the late Ralph Owen Brewster.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JANUARY 16, 1962.

The Honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE.

SIR: I herewith submit my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture.

Very truly yours,

CLARK W. THOMPSON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE CLARK W. THOMPSON OF TEXAS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, last fall it was my pleasure to make a speech in Galveston, Tex., at the request of my old friend the gentlemen from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON]. Galveston is his hometown and the occasion was an observance of Know Your America Week. The audience consisted of the combined luncheon clubs of Galveston County. I accepted the invitation and traveled half way across the continent to Texas largely because of my great admiration for Mr. THOMPSON. I have watched his work in this body for many years. In my work on the House Un-American Activities Committee I have observed his wise and effective efforts in our fight against communism. I believe my admiration for Mr. THOMPSON is shared by a great many in this body and wherever he is known and with that in mind, it is my pleasure to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article by a feature writer of the Galveston News, Miss Kitty Kendall. It appeared on December 24, last:

ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SEVEN YEAR OLD STANDARDS SEEM TO DIRECT CLARK THOMPSON

(By Kitty Kendall)

The directives in a speech made 187 years ago seem epitomized in Galveston's Congressman CLARK W. THOMPSON.

The speech was made to Bristol electors November 3, 1774, and the activities observed in a typical day at the local office of THOMPSON seem to parallel the almost-two-centuries-old principles:

"It ought to be the happiness and glory of a Representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. * * * It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasures, his satisfaction, to theirs; and above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interests to his own."

LAST PLACE

Following a strenuous first session of the 87th Congress, a busy, private office rightfully seems the last place you'd expect to find a Congressman.

Nevertheless, THOMPSON can be found in his office at 501 Post Office Building daily, except Saturday and Sunday (unless he's making calls in the various counties), amidst ringing telephones, busy secretaries, a hodgepodge of farmers, city, and county officials, newspaper reporters and men-on-the-street awaiting their turns to talk with the Government official, plus an appointment book of future engagements filled up-to-here.

The office scene is unchanged, it remains a beehive of activity, though THOMPSON might be on a bus en route to help a farmer in some other county solve his problems; making a speech at Rotary; meeting with the Galveston Chamber of Commerce; giving a talk to a high school group or ILA local; attending a luncheon at the request of the League of Women Voters in Lake Jackson, or perhaps on the other side of Colorado County discussing soil conservation.

WEEKLY COLUMN

On the other hand, THOMPSON might have to excuse himself during an interview to dictate his weekly newspaper column that is bound to a deadline, or to prepare notes for a radio or television broadcast.

The busy Congressman's Galveston office staff is comprised of two secretaries—Miss Julie Burlen and Miss Mildred Baxley—as well as Bob Stafford of Galveston. Bob Miller, keeps THOMPSON's Washington office open during congressional recesses.

The Galveston staff accompanies THOMPSON to Washington and the office here is closed during sessions of Congress.

What is the explanation of the busy life the Congressman leads in Texas at the close of congressional sessions?

BRINGS WASHINGTON

"Well, now, I'll tell you," THOMPSON said as he asked Miss Julie to hold his telephone calls, "I believe in the Government being accessible to the people. With that in mind, I have found all the farmers and other folk can't come to Washington with their problems, so I try to bring Washington to them."

His statement was convincing because of his sincerity. One secretly reproached oneself for not having come earlier to get better acquainted with this man who apparently has a big hand in shaping the destiny of the farming communities in 15 Texas counties.

As Congressman from the Ninth District, THOMPSON serves just under a half million people. Galveston is one of the district's 15 counties; the other counties are Austin, Brazoria, Calhoun, Chambers, Fort Bend, Fayette, Lavaca, Matagorda, Victoria, Waller, Wharton, Colorado, Goliad, and Jackson.

VERY KIND TO ME

"The people are very kind to me," the affable official said. Observing the accomplishments of the Ninth Congressional District Representative over a period of almost 25 years (including active duty in the Marine Corps), indications are that THOMPSON is kind and generous to the people he represents.

It's the Congressman's belief that he can accomplish more for the people if he familiarizes himself with the everyday facets of their lives. He travels by bus on many occasions to visit farming communities; at other times he uses aircraft, private car, and trains.

In addition to his duties as a Congressman, the seemingly tireless THOMPSON serves as chairman of two subcommittees: rice and family farms.

FROM ALL WALKS

During an interview in the Congressman's Galveston office, people from all walks of life poured into the office seeking help and advice. Many of the problems, it was apparent, had nothing to do with Congress, legislation or farming.

Though burdened with a demanding schedule, the Congressman seems to remain calm and apparently takes to heart the problems of our people.

"You can't handle this sort of job," THOMPSON said calmly, "if you get all lathered up."

TAKES PHONE CALLS

It was 9 a.m. and the Congressman advised Miss Julie he would take his phone calls. The first one of 12 that came through in the next 40 minutes was from Clear Creek on the subject of flood control.

Others concerned a job with the Peace Corps; a report on social security complications; a storm of protest from a veteran regarding the closing of the local Veterans' Administration office scheduled December 29; information regarding visas for immigration purposes; brief comments on a comprehensive report from the U.S. Corps of Engineers on proposed hurricane protection of Galveston and other cities and towns; a matter concerning the rice industry; the flood control program on San Bernard River through Brazoria,, Wharton, Fort Bend, and Colorado Counties; a matter of the hug-the-coast highway;, road and highway problems, and others.

TRUE TO TRADITION

The Congressman, true to the tradition of most successful men, wanted to credit his wife for a generous measure of his achievements.

"Libbie has always been my good right hand. She's followed me, you might say, through two dismal wars, and being the wife of a politician requires both patience and fortitude," THOMPSON said as he picked up a thick brochure titled "Sam Rayburn" (who was a close friend of the THOMPSONS).

It was learned that Mrs. Thompson often accompanies the Congressman on his trips through the 15 counties, and is called upon to speak before high school assemblies. She recently talked to 900 high school students in a nearby county.

COLLEGE GRADUATE

The Congressman, a graduate of the University of Oregon who in his earliest manhood planned to become a merchant, has an extensive vocabulary and is in great demand for talks before civic organizations, professional clubs, etc.

In fact, the interview had to end to allow the Congressman time to drive to West Columbia to speak at a Rotary luncheon. But enough time had been given to confirm the belief that THOMPSON adheres closely to the principles outlined in the speech made in 1774:

"It is (to paraphrase slightly) his happiness and glory to sacrifice his repose, his pleasures, his satisfaction, to theirs, and above all to prefer the interests of the people to his own."

THE LATE MRS. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin.?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I sadly report to the House that the beloved wife of our colleague, WILLIAM K. VAN PELT, passed away suddenly last night.

Sophie Van Pelt was a gracious lady, a loving mother, and faithful companion. Her untimely death will be an irreparable loss, of course, for her family, and those of us who knew her share in the deep sorrow so suddenly visited upon them.

Mr. Speaker, I know I express the sentiment of the House when I express our profound sympathy to our colleague, BILL VAN PELT, and his two fine children in their tragic hour of sorrow.

TELECASTING, BROADCASTING, AND PHOTOGRAPHY OF PUBLIC HEARINGS OF COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MEADER. May committees of the House of Representatives, in their discretion, permit telecasting, broadcasting, and photography of their public hearings?

Mr. Speaker, by way of background, let me say that I have discussed this matter informally with the Speaker and also have corresponded with him. Last Friday I handed him a brief reviewing the precedents and discussing the proper interpretation of the Rules of the House. This correspondence and the brief can be found on pages 223–224 of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Since preparing the brief, two additional matters have been called to my attention which, in my judgment, are relevant to consideration of this question.

First, I have in my hand a memorandum on the stationery of the Radio and Television Correspondents Gallery, signed by Robert H. Fleming, chairman, dated January 10, 1962, containing rules governing radio, television, and photographic coverage of the opening session of the House on that day. The memorandum contains 14 items of the order of business and recites that coverage was permitted of all items except Nos. 3, 5, and 8, and that there would be no television, radio or film coverage of quorum or rollcalls. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this memorandum be incorporated at this point in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(The memorandum referred to follows:)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
RADIO-TELEVISION
CORRESPONDENTS' GALLERIES,
Washington, D.C., January 10, 1962.

MEMORANDUM ON OPENING OF THE HOUSE—12 NOON

Through the cooperation of Mr. McCORMACK and Mr. Deschler, the ceremonies opening the House session may be covered, with certain limitations. The Executive Committee of the Radio-TV Gallery has accepted these as a common obligation and agreed there will be no television, radio or film coverage of quorum or rollcalls.

The order of business follows. Coverage is permitted except in Nos. 3, 5, and 8.

1. (Twelve noon) Clerk calls House to order.
2. Clerk reads announcement of Speaker Rayburn's death.

3. Quorum call shall not be covered. (Lights and mults will be turned off.)

4. Nominations for Speaker.

5. Rollcall (if demanded) shall not be covered. (Lights and mults turned off.)

6. Clerk announces result of vote.

7. Committee named to escort new Speaker to chair.

8. Committee departs to escort new Speaker. (Lights and mults will be turned off until committee is ready to return.)

9. Speaker is escorted into Chamber.

10. Introduction of Speaker.

11. Remarks by Speaker.

12. Oath is administered to new Speaker.

13. Speaker asks Chaplain to offer prayer.

14. When the Speaker says: "The Chair lays before the House the following." Everyone starts fading out pictures and audio (lights and mults off).

Television, radio and reel coverage will end at this point. Lights and mults will be turned off. The House will remain in session, so all equipment must be obviously out of action.

The responsibility for maintaining the agreement with the officers of the House rest with the Gallery Committee. All concerned are advised that the committee will meet that responsibility.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, this memorandum seems to be significant because it appears to record formal permission for television, radio, and photographic coverage of a session of the House of Representatives in the Chamber of the House and to authorize coverage of some portions of the House proceedings and prohibit coverage of others.

If the rules of the House authorize television, radio, and photographic coverage of House proceedings or portions thereof in the discretion of the Speaker, it can be argued that the rules of the House, since they are made the rules of committees so far as applicable, likewise authorize television, radio, and photographic coverage of public committee hearings in the discretion of the committee.

The second matter which has been called to my attention since I presented my brief to the Speaker is that the Subcommittee on Postal Operations of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House, held public hearings in Boston, Mass., November 21 and 22, 1961, on laws relating to obscene matter in the mails. I am informed that the following members of the subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN] were present: Representatives DULSKI, ADDABBO, and DANIELS. I am also informed that also present at the committee hearings or at least a part of them were the Acting Speaker, Mr. MCCORMACK, and Representatives O'NEILL and BURKE.

It is my understanding that a request was made to permit the coverage of this public hearing by photography and television, and that the chairman of the subcommittee, Mrs. GRANAHAN, called attention to the presence of the Acting Speaker at the hearing and suggested that this request should be passed upon by him. The Acting Speaker, Mr. MCCORMACK, refused, saying that the chairman of the subcommittee was in charge of the hearing and declined to pass upon the request, whereupon the chairman, Mrs. GRANAHAN, stated that if it was up to her, she would allow such coverage and did, in fact, do so.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Michigan will permit me to interrupt him for the record, the present occupant of the chair was not Acting Speaker at the time. I think that should be shown in the RECORD. I simply wanted the RECORD to show that fact. I know my friend from Michigan appreciates it.

Mr. MEADER. Because of the familiarity of the Speaker with my views as set forth in the brief and contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, I do not wish to discuss the public interest or the applicable rules of the House or precedents at length. I only wish to urge that the last 7 years have witnessed developments, notably the adoption of the Doyle resolution governing the conduct of public committee hearings and a vast increase in the use of television and radio for news coverage of governmental activities and to express the hope that the Speaker, under these circumstances, will be able to interpret the rules of the House so as to allow the American public the use of these marvelous new media of communication in informing themselves about the public business.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] was kind enough to inform me by letter that he proposed to propound a parliamentary inquiry concerning the rights of committees to permit broadcasting, telecasting, and photographing of their sessions.

Members of the House are aware that on two previous occasions parliamentary inquiries were addressed to Mr. Speaker Rayburn concerning this same subject.

On February 25, 1952, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the minority leader at that time, first raised by way of a parliamentary inquiry the question which the gentleman from Michigan now propounds.

Again, on January 24, 1955, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] brought up the matter for further clarification of Speaker Rayburn's first opinion.

Mr. Speaker Rayburn's two opinions may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 1, page 1334, and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 1, page 628.

In substance, what the then Speaker decided was that there was no rule of the House that authorized or permitted the committees to have their sessions broadcast, telecast, or photographed.

What happened in the subcommittee in Boston is certainly no precedent, because I was neither Acting Speaker nor Speaker pro tempore then. I was, with pleasure, sitting in with a subcommittee of one of the committees of this House to listen to the witnesses and to show by my presence my interest in the hearings they were holding in Boston at that time.

Certainly, I am sure that everyone will realize there was no authority on my part to act at that time. What took place then was a matter coming within the purview of what might be termed the vacuum caused by the death of our late beloved Speaker.

In both opinions Mr. Speaker Rayburn pointed out that it was a matter for the House itself to determine by an amendment of its rules if it intended to permit such procedure.

For the benefit of the Members who have not read Mr. Speaker Rayburn's remarks on this subject, the Chair will include herewith those opinions of our former beloved Speaker:

TELEVISING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

(Remarks of Speaker Rayburn in response to a parliamentary inquiry made by Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts, on February 25, 1952 [CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 98, pt. 1, pp. 1334, 1335])

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, several days ago the Committee on Un-American Activities called a meeting to be held in Detroit and, I understand, voted to have those hearings televised.

I now understand that the televising of the hearings has been canceled. I understand further that the Speaker, in whom we all have great confidence, has taken the position he has the authority under the rules of the House to call off the televising of the hearings.

I also understand that the Speaker justifies his decision on the ground that the Committee on Un-American Activities operates under the general rules of the House, which of course is true. The general rules of the House give the Speaker the right or privilege of passing upon television, radio, or anything photographic, as far as the House is concerned. But I question, Mr. Speaker, whether this authority would apply to a hearing held in Detroit.

I call the Speaker's attention to the fact that under section 319, Secrecy of Committee Procedure, there is the following quotation:

"It is for the committee to determine, in its discretion, whether the proceedings of the committee shall be open or not."

From that provision under section 319 it is clearly implied that the committee shall be the judge of what publicity it might desire. Furthermore, in my opinion, it is more of an authority than the Speaker could assume under the general rules of the House.

I note also under the rule, under which, as I understand it, the order to prevent the Detroit television was given, it is stated that—

"The rules of the House are hereby made the rules of its standing committees so far as applicable."

I believe it would be stretching authority considerably to say that because of this rule the Speaker has the right to interpose his own power over a committee as to its own publicity. It could, I am afraid to admit, be well argued that the chairman of the committee acting as head might have the authority.

May I also call attention that television was used by the subcommittee investigating the tax scandals; the Madden select committee investigating the atrocities relative to the Katyn massacre; the Hébert subcommittee investigating the armed services procurements, and the Un-American Activities Committee itself in investigating the Reds in Hollywood. In the Senate there has been the Kefauver committee, the Atomic Energy Committee, the District of Columbia Committee, and the Russell committee. All those decisions to televise were made by the committees themselves.

Mr. Speaker, for clarification of the rules and so that we may understand what may be expected from now on, I submit my parliamentary inquiry.

• • • • •

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, as always, has been kind enough to inform the Chair that he was going to submit this parliamentary inquiry.

It is true that some committees and some subcommittees of the House have begun the practice of having their hearings and their meetings televised; but in each and every instance when the Chair has called attention to the fact that he did not think the rules of the House authorized this, each and every chairman of a committee or subcommittee has ceased doing so at that moment, as far as the Chair understands at this time.

The Chair is operating under the rules of the House. One of the rules reads as follows:

"The rules of the House are hereby made the rules of its standing committees so far as applicable."

There is no authority, and as far as the Chair knows, there is no rule granting the privilege of television of the House of Representatives, and the Chair interprets that as applying to these committees or subcommittees, whether they sit in Washington or elsewhere. As the gentleman from Massachusetts says, the Chair, whoever is the Speaker, has control of this end of the Capitol and the House Office Buildings. There being no rule with reference to television or radio, the Chair interprets that the rules of the House shall apply to the committees whether they sit in Washington or outside of Washington. The Chair might indulge in a slight amount of histrionics in saying that if committees all wanted to be televised, and they were not allowed to be televised under the rules of the House in the Capitol or in the House Office Buildings, why they would probably move out of town and think that they would escape the rule, or make a rule in that fashion.

Mr. Martin of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that this is a twilight zone which has not been clearly defined as to just what authority the Speaker might have, and I think we should at the earliest possible moment, have some definite rule established. I want to say, too, in fairness to the Speaker that there have been instances—not this particular one—that called for his disapproval of broadcasting. In other words the decision did not come just upon the Detroit broadcast.

The Speaker. In every instance the Chair has held exactly like he has regarding this proposed hearing in Detroit.

Mr. Martin of Massachusetts. I think television and broadcasting are here to stay and will probably increase in popularity as the days go by. For that reason we should have revision of the rules to define authority.

The Speaker. If the House adopts a rule, the Chair will abide by and enforce it, like he does all of the rules of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Rankin. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The Speaker. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. Rankin. In order to do that we would have to amend the rules of the House.

The Speaker. That is correct.

Televising and Broadcasting of Committee Hearings

(Remarks of Speaker Rayburn in response to a parliamentary inquiry made by Mr. Meader, of Michigan, on January 24, 1955 [Congressional Record, vol. 101, pt. 1, pp. 628–629])

The Speaker. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. Meader. I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. Meader. With the 84th Congress now organizing its committees, it seems to me important to have a clear ruling on the authority of committees to disseminate or permit the dissemination of news of their hearings and proceedings.

By way of background, I might say that this question was raised by the present minority leader in the 82d Congress on the 25th of February 1952. At that time the Speaker expressed the opinion that the rules of the House did not now authorize committees to permit radio and television coverage of their public hearings. I should like to propound that same inquiry but ask for a little greater clarification as to just what news coverage is permissible under the rules of the House of committee public hearings; whether news reporters are permitted to be present; whether photographers taking still pictures are permitted to be present; whether motion picture cameras for newsreel purposes with sound are permitted to be present; whether live radio broadcasting or telecasting or recorded radio broadcasting are permissible.

The Speaker. The Chair is ready to rule and also make a statement. Something along the same line was propounded to the present occupant of the chair by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Martin] February 25, 1952.

Rule XI of the House provides that the rules of the House of Representatives shall be the rules of the committees of the House of Representatives so far as applicable. The Chair does not think anyone would contend that the House of Representatives is authorized to televise its proceedings or put them on the radio. The Chair held at that time that this was outside of the rules and also held in response to another inquiry that a committee sitting outside of Washington was under the same rules as a committee inside of Washington, and the Chair held that it was controlled by the same rules.

There is nothing new with reference to this, because the same rules are in effect now in the House of Representatives as they were on February 25, 1952, and until the rules are changed, which would have to come from a resolution reported by the Committee on Rules and adopted by the House changing the rules of the House, the Chair still thinks that it is not in accordance with the Rules of the House of Representatives or its committees to televise or broadcast hearings or actions before any committee of the House, and so holds and will hold unless and until the rules of the House are amended.

Mr. Hoffman of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The Speaker. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. Hoffman of Michigan. Perhaps due to my lack of understanding does the Chair then hold that a regular standing committee of the House cannot authorize broadcasting either by radio or television of its hearings?

The Speaker. That is what the Chair held in 1952 and that is what the Chair holds in 1955.

Mr. Meader. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The Speaker. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. Meader. Will newsreel cameras be permitted to be present in the committee room during public hearings?

The Speaker. The reply is the same. It is the same as television.

Mr. Scott. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The Speaker. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. Scott. Would the Speaker also hold that in the absence of any rule of the House on this subject committees should be required to prohibit the taking of photographs before, during, or after any committee hearing if the Speaker so directed?

The Speaker. That is a question to be decided by the committee. The present occupant of the chair was chairman of a committee at one time. When the photographers came in, the Chair always told them they could take pictures of the committee or anyone in the room they wanted to until the proceedings of the committee began. Then they were asked to retire, and they always did retire.

Mr. Scott. Is it a correct statement, then, that the matter of photographs before, during, or after committee hearings is in the discretion of the committee chairman or the duly designated presiding officer?

The Speaker. The Chair would hold the photographs could be taken before and after the proceedings, but not during them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is aware, from reading the Congressional Record, that the Committee on Rules, during the 1st session of the 87th Congress had under consideration House Resolution 173, introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Meader]. This resolution proposed an amendment of the rules of the House to permit each committee to determine whether its proceedings should be broadcast, telecast, or photographed. It was reported in debate on the floor of the House that the Committee on Rules had taken adverse action on reporting out that resolution.

The present occupant of the chair thinks that he should follow precedent and give due consideration to opinions of former Speakers. The Chair thinks that Mr. Speaker Rayburn's opinions were well considered and the Chair intends to follow those opinions until such time as the House, by its own action in amending its rules, provides for a different method of proceeding.

THE LATE HONORABLE LOUIS C. RABAUT, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Lesinski] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my unpleasant duty to announce to the House the passing away of our dearly beloved friend and colleague Louis C. Rabaut of the 14th District of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, it is with the deepest regret that I stand here today in the well of the House to eulogize the one who was my closest friend in Congress, Louis C. Rabaut. In all sincerity I wish it were not so and this unpleasant task not placed upon me. Although I recognize that death is something we all have to face at one time or another, I would rather remember the individual as I knew him and would think of him as just being away. Of course, if you believe in the hereafter, this is so.

I knew Mr. Rabaut for many years prior to my being in Congress. He was a close friend and associate of my father. They had mutual understanding and traveled many times together by car between Detroit and Washington. That was when travel was a lot harder than it is today, for there were no modern expressways at that time.

As with my late father, Congressman Rabaut and I struck up a warm friendship in spite of our difference in age. The reason may have been the similarity in our philosophy on matters pertaining to the welfare of the American people, although, as the Record shows, we did not always agree when it came to a rollcall vote.

He was always helpful to new Members of Congress, readily giving them the benefit of his experience and knowledge of the House.

He was a man admired by his people, loved by his family, and respected by his political enemies. He had no real enemies, for it was impossible to be disrespectful to this gentleman amongst gentlemen, for that he was; and anyone who came in contact with his warmness immediately lost any displeasure that may have existed.

I knew Louis to be a pious man. He went to mass every morning, and it is my understanding that he received the sacrament every day. His piety did not, however, blind him to the greed of others; and, as he executed his duties in Congress, he was always fair. This was possible only because of his intense desire to know all the ramifications of a problem and to act to the best interest of all concerned.

His past experience as a builder of homes taught him the importance of values realized through one's efforts. He was many times miffed by those politicians who are continuously attempting to belittle the role of a Congressman, for he knew that under our type of government the people of this country have recourse through their elected officials.

I shall miss my dearly beloved colleague, for, although to me he may be just away, his absence will be felt by all of us who learned to respect him for the many qualities that made him a great man, a good father, and an admired and respected Representative in Congress.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to have inserted in the Record Mr. Rabaut's official biography and the text of the address by the Reverend Marshall L. Lochbiler, rector of the University of Detroit, after the solemn requiem mass for Mr. Rabaut in SS. Peter and Paul's Church, Detroit, Mich., on Thursday, November 16, 1961:

Louis Charles Rabaut, Democrat (lawyer), of Grosse Pointe Park, Mich.; was born in Detroit, Mich., December 5, 1886, son of Louis A. and Clara Lenau (Reid) Rabaut; attended a parochial school; A.B. degree 1909, Detroit College; LL.B. degree 1912, Detroit College of Law; M.A. degree 1912, University of Detroit; admitted to the bar, 1912; married Stella M. Petz, of Detroit, and they have three sons and six daughters—Rev. Francis Dermott (S.J.), Marie Celeste (Sister Mary Palmyre, I.H.M.), Louis III, Mary Jane (Mrs. August Amato), Vincent, Carolyn Marie (Mrs. Jules DePorre), Joan Marie (Mrs. John Barrett), Stella Marie (Sister Stella Maris, I.H.M.), and Martha Mary (Sister Martha Marie, I.H.M.); 1935, guest of the Philippine Government at the inauguration of the Commonwealth; 1936, received a special citation from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Michigan Department, for service as chairman of the Michigan congressional committee which obtained the establishment of veterans' facilities in Michigan; 1939, delegate to the Interparliamentary Union at Oslo, Norway, and inspected the U.S. Foreign Service offices in the Scandinavian countries; 1941, chairman of the first official congressional committee to South and Central America inspecting Foreign Service offices and studying effects of the cultural relations program in 17 countries, seeking the unification of the countries of the Western Hemisphere prior to the entrance of the United States in World War II; 1944, received annual award of the International Economic Council for outstanding devotion to world trade; 1945, at the invitation of the Secretary of State, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., headed a congressional group on an inspection of the Foreign Service establishments and other Federal activities in Great Britain and certain countries of Europe; 1948 to 1952, one of six members of the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion (reconstruction of the White House); 1954, author of the amendment inserting the words "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America; conducted ceremonies paying tribute to the American flag for the first time in the House of Representatives on Flag Day, June 14, 1955, when the song, "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag," was born under the Capitol dome; successfully advocated the acceptance by Congress of funds from ASCAP to press the record for the music and song of the "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag" for distribution by Congress to the communication outlets of the Nation; author of the legislation placing a cancellation mark on mail using the words "pray for peace" for which in 1956 he received an award from the Catholic War Veterans, Department of Michigan, "in recognition of unswerving devotion to God and country," and from the Daughters of the American Revolution the Award of Merit: "In grateful acknowledgment and sincere appreciation of outstanding services and worthy accomplishments for the protection of our constitutional Republic"; and in 1957 the George Washington Honor Medal from Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge with inscription "for outstanding achievement in bringing about a better understanding of the American way of life"; elected to the 74th, 75th, 76th, 77th, 78th, 79th, 81st, 82d 83d, 84th, 85th, 86th, 87th Congresses; member of the Committee on Appropriations.

ADDRESS AT THE FUNERAL MASS OF THE HONORABLE LOUIS C. RABAUT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

We have come to Saints Peter and Paul's this morning, the venerable church in which Congressman Rabaut worshipped for so many years, in which he was married, in whose choir he so often sang, and in which, just a few months ago, he observed the 50th anniversary of his very happy marriage, to pay a final tribute of honor to a man we knew and loved, a distinguished citizen and an esteemed Member of Congress. With his family, his numerous friends and associates, we deeply mourn his loss. On this sad occasion, we extend our sincere and prayerful sympathy to his bereaved wife, his devoted sons and daughters, and the members of his family. In the presence of death, the events that circumscribe our daily lives lose their compelling and preemptive interest, and we begin to explore unsounded levels of personal identity, fundamental levels of deeply purposeful reality. We ask ourselves; what is life? What is its ultimate purpose? Whither is the ceaseless activity of our lives carrying us. Unless we know and understand the meaning of life, its ultimate purpose, we cannot map out for ourselves a program of life, chart our course through life correctly, employ our energies and use our time wisely.

For some, life has no meaning. Like Macbeth, "life is a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing." Often enough, they are people whose past conduct gives them reason for dreading the judgment of a life after death. For others, the meaning of life, its ultimate purpose, is the attainment of wealth, i.e., material possessions. For others, it is prestige, excellence in some field of human endeavor, either physical, intellectual, or artistic. For still others, the all-absorbing purpose of life is something lower in the scale of human values: some form of sense-gratification. Men and women who look for the fulfillment of their dreams in these material goals find only partial or incomplete fulfillment, often enough utter disillusionment. Under the impact of death and in the light of that wisdom which the shocking experience of death uncovers, such goals, as the final purpose of life, are meaningless.

Man's true goal, his master value, to which he relates and subordinates, all material goals, must take into account his true nature, the faculties that distinguish him and set him apart from all other things, animate and inanimate, namely his intellect and will. His intellect is made for the attainment of truth, and his will for the attainment of goodness. They will find their perfection, their fulfillment only in the attainment of perfect and absolute truth and goodness. But perfect and absolute truth and goodness are found only in God. Man, therefore, will find the perfection of his being only in God. Man will find the meaning of life and its ultimate purpose in his return to God.

It was this true concept of the meaning of life and its ultimate purpose, and the full realization and the practical working out of this truth in his life, that gave to Congressman Rabaut's life its finest distinction, that made it possible for him to accomplish so much good and of such permanent value in the best interest of his family, his church, and in the Nation at large. It gave correct direction and sound motivation to his boundless energy and surpassing talents. It implemented his tremendous enthusiasm. It influenced the convictions he so firmly held and the opinions he so forthrightly and fearlessly expressed, both in private and in public life. Like interwoven strands of gold, it highlighted his labors and activities, enriched his complex and diversified human relationships, strengthened his commitment to make this world a better, finer, and happier place in which to live, especially in his repeated and determined efforts to alleviate poverty and human misery, so often induced by man's inhumanity to man. It made him a man of unswerving principle, one who never could be influenced by expediency nor swayed by the shifting winds of public opinion. Above all, it made him a man of unquestioned integrity.

This purposeful concept of the meaning of life was born of right reason illumined by faith: a faith that was confirmed in content and buttressed in sanction through the fulfilling revelation of God in Christ, a faith that divinely oriented men's lives through immutable and objective principles of human conduct.

Renown and distinction came to Congressman Rabaut in generous measure throughout a long and useful life, but in reaching for these legitimate honors he never betrayed God's master plan, careful, as he was, always to subordinate his desires, his plans and ambitions to the greatest achievement of life: the salvation of his soul and the souls of those who came within the ambit of his influence and responsibility. He knew that one day he would be called upon to give an exact accounting of his stewardship.

Congressman Rabaut bequeathed the clear vision and full vigor of his faith and his confidence in God's plan to posterity, especially to the members of his family all of whom he loved so dearly. The richness of this inheritance is reflected in their lives, more apparently, perhaps, in the lives of those of his children who embraced the religious life, one of whom, a Jesuit priest, is officiating this morning at his father's funeral Mass. Through these dedicated lives, the spirit of Congressman Rabaut will live on, be perpetuated in the purposeful living

> and God-centered lives of countless other souls touched by their influence and ministrations.
>
> Congressman Rabaut accomplished so much and of such permanent value in this life because he kept his vision of eternity clear and certain, always in perfect focus. As a devout Christian, he saw in the truth of Christ's resurrection a symbol and a promise of his own immortality—that death was not the end of the road but the gateway to eternal life. There was hope in his heart and a ready song on his lips because he was certain that the Son of God would keep His promise, the promise that is repeated in every requiem Mass, that was repeated in the funeral Mass this morning: "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in Me, even though he be dead, shall live; and all who live and believe in Me shall not experience death forever."
>
> Congressman Rabaut has pasesd through the somber shadows of death, to glimpse the brightness of eternal day. Faith has yielded to knowledge. The happiness that his good deeds have merited, the grandeur and richness of the reward awaiting him, is overpowering, beyond human reckoning or description. Saint Paul said of his swift and fleeting vision of heaven: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath it entered into the mind of man to conceive what God has prepared for those who love Him." In the spirit of the church in which Congressman Rabaut worshiped and to whose truths he so completely and loyally subscribed, may I suggest a prayerful remembrance of his soul, that, if perchance in the judgment of God his soul has need of further purification, through our prayers and suffrages, he may more quickly come into the full possession of his inheritance, his divine and eternal living with Christ in God.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to insert in the Record the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Martin], the gentleman from Louisiana, [Mr. Passman], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Kluczynski], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Brien], and the gentlewoman from Arkansas [Mrs. Norrell].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, with the death of our good friend, Louis Rabaut, this House lost one of its ablest and most dedicated Members. His death was undoubtedly hastened because of his keen devotion and arduous work for his district, the State of Michigan, and the Nation. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, he gave unstintingly of his fine talents to advance the work of the Congress. He never avoided any task, no matter how much effort it required. This characteristic was amply demonstrated by the great amount of time and effort he devoted to the fiscal affairs of the District of Columbia.

He was a real patriot and much of his great talents and endeavors were devoted to patriotic causes. He was also a deeply religious man and will be remembered for his successful crusade to add the words "under God" to the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Louis Rabaut was a kind and considerate friend. He was an outstanding Member of this body. Those of us who had the privilege of serving with him over a long span of years feel his death as a real personal loss.

My deepest sympathy is extended to his fine family.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, geographically, Grosse Pointe Park, Mich.—the place of residence of the late beloved Louis C. Rabaut—and Monroe, La.—my own place of residence—are many miles apart. Economically and politically, as well as in numerous other respects, the 14th Congressional District of Michigan, which Louis Rabaut served with distinction through a full quarter century, and the Fifth Congressional District of Louisiana, which I have had the honor and privilege of representing in the Congress since January of 1947, differ vastly. But I would say on this occasion that, despite these diverse interests, throughout the past 15 years I enjoyed no friendlier personal relationship, and no more productive working association in the Congress, than it was my good fortune to have experienced with Louis Rabaut. Particularly, this outstanding patriot and statesman, who served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations, was especially understanding of the problems of flood control and related matters in the lower Mississippi River Valley—which is the drainageway to the sea of almost half of the whole of America—and his contributions in solving many of these problems, as well as in endeavoring to deal as effectively as possible with all of them, were of immense value to this great area and to the Nation as a whole. For these efforts and accomplishments on the part of Louis Rabaut, I, myself, have an enduring debt of gratitude.

I wish also to note at this time, Mr. Speaker, that a limited few of us indeed succeed so worthily and so well as did our late colleague—to whose memory we join today in paying tribute—in fulfilling his responsibilities and discharging his duties to God and country. Our Nation, his State and district, and the individuals who were associated with him along the way, have been the richer, fuller, better because of him.

I am incapable of words to express adequately the measure and depth of my respect and esteem for our late friend and his great works, or my sense of personal loss at his passing. Therefore, I shall conclude my remarks here by conveying my heartfelt sympathy to the bereaved family of this faithful and devoted husband, father, and grandfather. May they be sustained by the cherished memory of his good and useful life and by their deep and abiding Christian faith that his immortal soul is at peace with his God.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that we in Congress pay tribute today to Louis C. Rabaut, who served his people and his Nation ably and patriotically as a Member of Congress for a quarter of a century.

The good which he has rendered, the benefits which he has bestowed, the ideals which he has nurtured will live on as an undying memory in our minds and in our hearts. As a friend, he was faithful; as a colleague, he was conscientious; we could not ask for more.

It was my pleasure to work with him on matters which showed his undying devotion to the national well-being. As a member of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, he was always willing to look for a way to make this a better nation by improving where improvements were needed. His service to this Nation and its people, and to his district and its people, can make us proud of our representative form of government.

In losing Louis C. Rabaut, this House has lost a friend and benefactor. But now he serves in a higher House, and peace be with him. To his family, let it be known that his was a fruitful and productive life for which they may be very proud. I extend to them every sympathy in their loss.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, the untimely passing of our distinguished colleague from Michigan, the Honorable Louis Charles Rabaut leaves us sad and depressed. We will miss him.

Lou was a kind and considerate man. He was a hard worker and a real fighter for fairness and justice. He was an able and efficient public servant and during his many years as a Member of the House of Representatives he left an imprint that will not soon be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, it was on November 12, 1961, when I was called upon to make a speech at a banquet honoring our former colleague, who served 11 years in Congress, and one of my best friends, now a Federal judge, Thaddeus M. Machrowicz, to an overflow crowd of over 1,000 people at Hamtramck, Mich., that I said we were very happy and proud our prayers made it possible that with us that night we had the dean of the Michigan delegation in Congress, Lou Rabaut who had served 25 years in Congress representing the 16th District of Michigan.

Ten minutes after concluding my remarks, Lou was called on by the master of ceremonies and he started by saying: "Reverend Fathers, honored guests, as dean of the Democratic delegation of Michigan—" and then he hesitated, stopped, and fell to the floor. He was rushed to the hospital where he died.

Lou Rabaut was the author of amendment inserting the words "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America. He conducted ceremonies paying tribute to the American flag for the first time in the House of Representatives on Flag Day, June 14, 1955, when the song "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag" was born under the Capitol Dome, and he brought about the acceptance by Congress of funds from ASCAP to press the record for the music and song of the "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag." He also had caused the distribution by Congress of the new allegiance oath to the communication outlets of the Nation. He was author of the legislation placing a cancellation mark on mail using the words "pray for peace," for which, in 1956, he received an award from the Catholic War Veterans, Department of Michigan, in recognition of unswerving devotion to God and country; and from the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Award of Merit.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, this world is better because Lou Rabaut lived with and amongst us.

To his devoted wife and family, Mrs. Kluczynski and I extend our sincere sympathy and we pray the Lord that

Lou will rest in peace and that those who are dear to him may have the strength to bear their great loss.

Mrs. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in paying tribute to the memory of our colleague, Louis Rabaut.

It was with sorrow that I learned of his death. For many years he and my husband, the late Congressman W. F. Norrell, had worked together on the Appropriations Committee, and they shared a warm friendship in their dedication to duty as servants of the people. I know that Louis' colleagues on the committee will feel deeply the loss of his counsel, and that all of us will cherish the memory of his fellowship with us.

My understanding sympathy is extended to his widow and children.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Gary].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in paying the last sad tribute of respect to our beloved friend, Louis Rabaut. He was a genial soul who loved his fellowman. Never did he let an opportunity pass by to help a fellow Member. With joy in his heart and a smile on his face he graced practically every social occasion with a song. He loved to sing and audiences welcomed his voice.

It was by no means all song and laughter, however, with this lighthearted bard. Having served with him on the Appropriations Committee, I can attest his devotion to duty and his dedication to public service. He represented his district, State and Nation well. His long and distinguished record have earned for him the encomium "Well done thou good and faithful servant" and to him we give praise and honor today while expressing to the family, which he so dearly loved, our heartfelt sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara].

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I share the feeling of tremendous loss felt by Members of this House and particularly those of us from the State of Michigan upon the death of our beloved colleague, Louis Rabaut.

Louis Rabaut was a good friend, an able and dedicated legislator, a devoted husband and father, and an outstanding citizen.

As a newer Member of the Congress, I have been immeasurably helped by his encouragement, support and wise counsel.

Louis Rabaut took a deep and sincere interest in the needs and problems of his fellow man, whether he be friend, colleague, constituent, or indeed, any citizen, even if unknown to him, who sought his help or whose life was touched by his kindness and charity.

Mr. Speaker, I shall miss Louis Rabaut very much. All those who knew him or his work must share our sense of loss.

I extend my deep sympathy to Louis Rabaut's family, his friends and his constituents.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this is an historic Chamber; it is crowded with the memories of great men and great deeds—the arbitrament of great issues.

It is crowded with the memories of great friendships. Our late colleague from Michigan, Louis Charles Rabaut, had his part in both. He was for more than a quarter of a century the friend of every man here.

In an ancient manuscript, after an enumeration of the virtues, we are told that the greatest of all is love. Louis Rabaut's life was an exemplification of the truth of that admonition.

He loved people. He loved the House and the Members of the House. He loved his work. He loved the children of the District of Columbia. His heart was always touched by the thought that the committee under his jurisdiction, of which he was chairman, administering the affairs of the District of Columbia, might not provide for the children.

He rendered many notable services which went unobserved. When we had the first meeting of the Commission to rebuild the White House, Mr. Rabaut who was a builder, and whose familiarity with the many problems involved, was obviously superior to many of the architects and engineers who were consulted that he was immediately made a member of the Commission and had more to do with the rebuilding of the White House than any one connected with it. His name is inscribed in the bronze and granite of this great building belonging to the people, and so intimately connected with every President who has lived there since Adams and who will be associated with it, we trust, for all time to come.

Louis Rabaut was a deeply religious man. His daily life was a quiet unobtrusive advocacy of his faith. He was an everliving and convincing emissary of his Lord. He gave to the Sisterhoods of his Church three wonderful daughters. He gave to the priesthood of the Church a stalwart son, and he gave to the world 30 grandchildren who were his pride and joy.

The night is not forever.

The sun goes down to rise upon a new and more glorious day.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I knew Louis Rabaut intimately for over 13 years. Our association for the last 11 years on the Committee on Appropriations was one that I shall never forget. The first 2 years as a member of the Committee on Appropriations I served on a subcommittee under the acting chairmanship of Louis Rabaut. It was the committee that then had jurisdiction over all appropriations for the Army Corps of Engineers and some related agencies. This was during the Korean war, and under Louis Rabaut's wise and firm guidance that committee did an excellent job. Those of us who were new to the committee will forever be grateful for his helpful cooperation and assistance. I learned tremendously from Louis on how to approach appropriation problems; the intricacies and ramifications of the Federal budget. I am certain that if our former colleague, Glen Davis of Wisconsin, were here, he would reemphasize what I have said about the 2 years that we spent on that subcommittee, as a colleague of Louis Rabaut.

In addition, may I say that those of us from Michigan who served with Louis have always respected his judgment and his views. He was a cooperative member of our Michigan delegation. I firmly believe the Members of this body have lost a wonderful and valuable friend. Those of us on the Committee on Appropriations will badly miss him in the months and years ahead. The citizens of Michigan, in the passing of Louis Rabaut, have lost a fine, good, and constructive citizen. We must accept the fact that Louis is gone, but his memory will live forever.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of our esteemed colleague, Hon. Louis C. Rabaut, who represented the 14th Congressional District of Michigan so ably over the years, was a saddening blow to his friends and colleagues who held him so high in their esteem.

Sham, false pride, and deceit were abhorrent to him; humility, sincerity and understanding of the little man's problems were his native endowments. He underwent trying and confining illnesses with courage, and triumphed over them; and in the fleeting seconds when he must have recognized the approach of death, we can visualize that he met death fearlessly and with confidence in the Hereafter for which he struggled on this earth.

To his widow and his family—many of whom are deep in religious vocations—we offer our sympathy, and we know that the spirit of Louis C. Rabaut will abide in our hearts to help us and guide us in our congressional deliberations.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. Griffiths].

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my sympathy to the family of Louis Rabaut at his passing, but I would like to turn from this sadness to speak of Louis Rabaut in a different vein. Louis Rabaut was not only a kind man, a good Congressman and a religious man; Louis Rabaut was a joyous man. He lived in joy all the days of his life and he died praising his fellow men. It was a pleasure for me to come to this Congress and to have Louis Rabaut give me advice on how to be a Congresswoman. I appreciated it. I appreciated all the days I sat beside him on this floor and listened to his counsel. I appreciated the fact that he explained to me the parliamentary maneuvers, and I am grateful to him for the little jokes he told me about his family; for the pleasure with which he spoke of his grandchildren; for the great tributes he paid to Mrs. Rabaut; for the kindness with which he spoke of every person who was in this House.

Mr. Speaker, it was a pleasure to know a man so devoted to his family, so devoted to his friends, and so devoted to his religion. If it could be said of any man that he was an ornament to his religion, Louis was such a man.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that I knew Louis. I know that Louis lived and died in joy as he wanted to. I know that we who are in this House this year, who knew him well, will greatly miss him.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. Sullivan].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the warmth of Congressman Rabaut's friendship was gentle and kind and always at hand when sorrow touched any of us, or when good fortune or happiness came our way. He will long be remembered for his many legislative accomplishments of an enduring nature; he will be best remembered by us who served with him, however, for the beautiful character he exemplified.

He was fun to be with—he had a wealth of anecdotes to illustrate and illuminate even the most serious subject, just as Abraham Lincoln could use humor instructively. But, like Lincoln, Congressman Rabaut was fundamentally a serious-minded, deep-feeling, dedicated man who worked throughout his long public career for the benefit of the public rather than narrow interest groups.

I want to express to our beloved friend's wonderful family—of which he was so tremendously proud—my deepest sympathy for the loss which they have experienced, a loss which everyone who knew Louis Rabaut cannot help but share.

While such decisions, of course, are beyond our ken, I think all of us here are convinced in our own minds and hearts that if any mortal among us deserved to achieve the Kingdom of Heaven, Louis C. Rabaut lived the kind of life which should earn for him eternal rest.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Rabaut came to this body 2 years before I did and, like you, I had the privilege and pleasure of working with him continuously for some 27 years.

Mr. Speaker, a book could be written—and one should be written—extolling his many fine qualities and the outstanding work that he did in this House for the Nation as a whole and for that great district that he so ably represented in the great State of Michigan for lo, these many, many years.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to those fine, human, gentle qualities, back of all of it was a brilliant mind, a man of character, stability and understanding. But of all of those many outstanding virtues that he possessed one struck me above all of them, and that was his practical realism. Louis was an idealist, but he tempered that idealism with that old, practical realism. He accepted the world in which he lived, and he loved it. He recognized its shortcomings, but in his quiet, inimitable manner he tried to improve it. At the same time he had that good old sense of understanding and that great wisdom and judgment that kept him on an even keel rather than trying to overturn and reform this great world in 1 day or 1 week or 1 year.

He had brains, character and stability. He knew how to effectively use all of those grand qualities. I join all my colleagues in expressing sympathy to his lovely family and to his host of friends for their great loss.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Harvey].

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues of the House in paying deserved tribute to the late Louis C. Rabaut. I only wish I could speak on a more personal plane of the many fine accomplishments and services contributed by Congressman Rabaut who, for 25 years, served with great distinction for the 14th District of Michigan, his State, and our Nation in the House of Representatives. As a freshman Member of this great body, which is certain to miss the ability and service of one of its finest senior Members, I sincerely regret that time did not permit a closer personal relationship between us. But his work, his dedication, and his sincere efforts in the betterment of mankind presented me a keen insight of the character and integrity of a truly outstanding Representative. His devotion and accomplishments completely overshadow my words. He will be sorely missed by this House.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Natcher].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the House has indeed sustained an irreparable loss in the death of my friend, Louis C. Rabaut of Michigan.

It was a great privilege for me to serve on the Committee on Appropriations with Louis C. Rabaut and this applies especially to my service on the Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations. He stood for the finest as a gentleman and as a true statesman. He was kind, considerate, industrious, conscientious, and courageous.

Particularly will I always remember the numerous occasions when he would talk with me about his family—his pride, thoroughly justified, was always clearly reflected in his happy countenance as he spoke with love and devotion of his children and grandchildren. He was truly a living example of one who had an abiding faith in the strength that comes from close family ties and he never ceased to espouse the need for this country to adhere to the unity that stems from happy devoted families.

Louis Rabaut was a man of stability and endurance and this Nation and the State of Michigan can ill afford to lose such a champion of democracy. He fully earned the confidence and respect in which he was held by the entire membership of the House and his passing has indeed left a tremendous void.

I join in expressing my sincere sympathy to the members of his family and his many friends.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Santangelo].

LOUIS RABAUT—WITH GOD AND UNDER GOD

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, to know Louis Rabaut was to love him, and I knew him well. For 3 years I served with him as a member of the Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee of the District of Columbia. As chairman of the subcommittee, he had the burden and responsibility to move the program forward. We spent many hours together on details of the District of Columbia budget. Failing health and a weak heart did not restrain him in his assiduous duties. His sacrifice to his duties was great.

Louis Rabaut was a deeply religious man. His belief in God and in the dignity of man permeated his whole life and found vessels in the form of three daughters who became nuns, one son who became a priest and five children who married and became parents. Little wonder then that he successfully sponsored the measure to insert the words "under God" in our "Pledge of Allegiance." This bill was his greatest comfort and pride and his words "under God" will be repeated by all Americans while our Nation lives in freedom. His words in our "Pledge of Allegiance" are his guarantee of eternal fame.

On November 12, 1961, peace came suddenly to Louis Rabaut. As he was about to praise his former colleague, Thaddeus Machrowicz, Louis Rabaut collapsed and was gathered into the arms of his Saviour. We mourn his loss. Here was a man, a father, and a friend. No person knew the District of Columbia better—knew its needs and its wants. He was intolerant of waste, sympathetic to need and sensitive to our Government's obligations. His experience as a father of nine children made him responsive and understanding. When witnesses and representatives of special interests sought to curtail relief to children born out of wedlock, he declared in no uncertain words that he would not permit innocent children to suffer for the sins of their parents. He refused to permit the sins of the indiscreet to be visited on their children.

He encouraged the chase after parents who abandoned their offspring and left the jurisdiction. He called these people the "galloping pappies" who must be bridled.

He realized that education was the backbone of our democracy and he was generous in his appropriations for schools, facilities and for teachers' salaries. On one occasion I recall that although an appropriation was not requested, he authorized the use of available unused funds so that the children could have the books to read and the tools with which to expand their education.

He was quick to prevent harm and discomfort. When families were being dislocated in areas of land not developed for an undue length of time, he moved into action and saw to it that no more families were evicted from their homes until the redevelopment of vacant land began taking place and there was provision for relocation of dislocated families.

The concern of 800,000 residents in the District was his. While some people clamored for more funds without apparent justification, he was not stampeded, but would approve only after justification was forthcoming. His sense of justice was high. When general legislation saddled the District of Columbia with additional burdens and expenditures, he recommended that the Federal contribution be increased to provide funds to meet the additional burdens.

Louis Rabaut possessed a buoyant spirit—a "joie de vivre"—a joy of living. At work he toiled happily and long; after work he sang on every possible occasion, bringing cheer to his companions and friends. He exuded happiness and radiated friendship wherever he went. He was proud, as he might well be, of his 9 children, his wife, and his 29 grandchildren. Frequently, we exchanged stories about my five children and his nine children and grandchildren.

He was an adviser, a friend, and a confidant. He encouraged me to participate in the hearings which sometimes seemed interminable. He bragged that in his committee there were no leaks, although interest was high after a markup of a bill and reporters sought scoops.

All that one can take from this world is character and a philosophy of life. His philosophy can be summed up in the words of an anonymous author:

I shall pass this way but once
Any good that I can do
Or any kindnesses that I may show
Let me not defer it or neglect it
But let me do it now
For I shall not pass this way again.

Louis Rabaut passed this way to the Great Beyond. Because on the way he touched me, I am richer in experience, wiser in judgment and happier in thought. All who met him on his journey through the corridor called life share this feeling and sentiment. I extend my condolences to his wonderful family and assure them that their memories are priceless and that Louis Rabaut shall forever live in the minds and hearts of his friends and Americans.

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to our distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the death of our late friend and dear colleague, Louis Rabaut, the House has lost one of its most valuable and highly esteemed Members. Elected to this body in 1934, he served continuously with the exception of one term. Possessed of great ability, a dedicated legislator, his fine qualities were early recognized by the assignment of Louis Rabaut to the important Committee on Appropriations of the House. His forward looking outlook was evidenced by consistently voting for progressive legislation. As chairman of the District of Columbia Subcommittee on Appropriations he performed his duties and his trust in such manner that the people of the District will always remember Louis Rabaut and the great work he did in their behalf.

He was a man of deep faith and religious convictions. His family life was exemplary, an example for all of us to follow. Blessed with nine children, three sons and six daughters, he and Mrs. Rabaut gave their children a family atmosphere of love, parental discipline, and deep religious faith and devotion. One son is now a priest of the Society of Jesus, and three daughters are nuns, dedicating their lives to God, mankind, and to country.

Louis Rabaut will long be remembered in America as the author of the public law that inserted the words "under God" in the "Pledge of Allegiance" to the flag of the United States of America, a matter which has been referred to by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Santangelo]. This legislation most effectively portrays the spirit that was the foundation of the life of Louis Rabaut, not only the foundation, but also the character of life of Louis Rabaut, intense love of God and of country.

He was also the author of legislation that placed on our mail the cancellation mark using the words "pray for peace."

To Mrs. Rabaut and her fine sons and daughters, and to her grandchildren, I extend—and Mrs. McCormack joins with me—our heartfelt sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Louis Rabaut has left to Mrs. Rabaut and to his loved ones a proud record for God and country, a memory that will always live.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Taber].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, from the time Louis Rabaut came to Congress many years ago he has sat on committees with me giving his heart to all his work and to all of the important matters that came before the committee. I used to meet him after committee sessions, and very often we spent time visiting with each other. I regarded him as a real friend, one who would do his best to help his fellow man.

I extend to Mrs. Rabaut and her children my deep and sincere sympathy.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Knox].

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound regret that I learned of the death of Louis Rabaut. The Congress has lost one of its highly respected, hardworking, and able legislators. The State of Michigan and the country has lost one of its outstanding citizens.

Louis Rabaut was forthright, fair, and steadfast when it came to matters of principle, yet he was willing to hear fully the merits of proposals and exercise his judgment accordingly. Above all, his patriotism to his country came first and his unselfish devotion to the welfare of his country was shown by his enviable record as a member of the Appropriations Committee and in the Congress.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his beloved wife and family. May Louis Rabaut find rest and peace in his eternal reward.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the Michigan delegation, and the other Members of the House, in this tribute to the late Louis Rabaut. I am sure Louis Rabaut needs no encomiums of mine. His life and words will be amply documented on the pages of the history of this great body.

The monuments that are his, the monuments erected through and by his magnificient services in the House of Representatives, are now built into the very fabric of this great country of ours. He loved this place with a great devotion. This was so because he loved public service. He had a profound affection for his colleagues, regardless of party, race, religion, or national origin.

He devoted himself to God. He understood the meaning of goodness and morality, and the place of religion in our system of government.

One of our colleagues who was present when the fatal attack occurred reports that he passed from this life with a smile on his face. This must have been so, for he went to his eternal reward doing precisely what he wanted to do, paying tribute to one of our former colleagues, the Honorable Thaddeus Machrowicz, now a distinguished member of the U.S. judiciary.

I was honored and privileged to represent the Committee on Appropriations at his funeral services in Detroit. It was one of the finest and most impressive funeral services I have ever attended, conducted by his own son, a Jesuit priest, and there was present his three daughters who are nuns, and the remaining children. His funeral was attended by hundreds and hundreds from all walks of life in the Detroit area, the State of Michigan, and the country.

I extend to his devoted wife and family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I knew the late Louis Rabaut very well. There were two things he enjoyed in life, to sing and to be nice to people. He could do both. If it was within Louis' power to bestow a favor upon his fellow man, he made every effort to see that it was granted. He had faith and piety—and was always eager and willing to lend his helping hand. He was charitable, generous, and kind. He worshiped God—and he worshiped his family.

My memories will perhaps be deeper because he did something for me. When World War II was declared, President Franklin Roosevelt said that there would not be a dam or reservoir built in the United States until it was over. Louis Rabaut was chairman of the Deficiency Committee of Appropriations and put in funds for a dam and reservoir in my congressional district. It was the only project that was built in the United States, and provided sufficient water to manufacture the materials and steel needed for the emergency.

His memory shall always be deeply cherished. I fervently pray that God will continue to shower His choicest blessing—good health—upon his fine wife and family. God bless them in their saddened grief and sorrow.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today we pay tribute to my dear and beloved friend, LOU RABAUT, whose passing brought sorrow to us. Our tributes to Lou are not for the worldly wealth he accumulated, not for anything he inherited, but for his good fiber and good name, for his zealous and steadfast devotion to his high principles and ideals.

Lou was my steadfast friend—he was our friend because the warmth of his personality spread to all of us and his kind and cheerful manner ingratiated him to everyone. Lou was truly a gentle soul, kind, considerate, and always helpful whenever and wherever possible. Lou epitomized the true concept of a good Christian. His life was indeed an exemplary one. He was devoted to his gracious wife, children, and grandchildren. Lou was a deeply religious man. His example at home must have influenced the choice of four of his children to join the religious orders—his son a Jesuit priest and three daughters becoming nuns.

Lou was a zealous and diligent worker, yet he had a jovial spirit and keen sense of humor that made it a pleasure to be in his company.

Lou lived a full useful, rich, and active life. His passing from this world was sudden, but this manner of passing was a Godsend to Louis because by living his clean, wholesome, Christian life he had prepared himself for his eternal reward which he now enjoys.

To his children and grandchildren Louis left a priceless heritage. They have my sympathy in their loss. To Mrs. Rabaut, whose rich legacy is their children and grandchildren, the memory of many happy, golden years of perfect companionship with one of the finest gentlemen I have ever known, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of LOUIS C. RABAUT, of Michigan. He and I were first elected to Congress in 1934. More than 100 freshman Congressmen were elected that year. When the 74th Congress convened, the freshman Members organized into a group and LOUIS RABAUT and I were among the officers of the organization. We were good friends from the beginning.

LOUIS RABAUT will long be remembered by those who knew him as a dedicated and devoted public servant. He stood tall and strong for the things in which he believed. He was absolutely fearless. As a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, he did a wonderful job through the years.

Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute to the memory of a great friend, and express sympathy to members of the fine family left behind.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, a bright light that shone so long in this Chamber has gone out. A great soul has gone to a higher reward. A wonderful friend of all of us has said "goodby."

It is with deep sadness and full understanding of the loss to this body and the Nation that I rise in tribute to our respected and revered colleague, the late LOUIS C. RABAUT. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], and others have offered eloquent tributes to his memory. I can add little to what they have said.

For a quarter of a century, LOUIE RABAUT was the spokesman of the people of Michigan's 14th Congressional District. His national service is reflected by the multitude of awards presented to him by service groups throughout our country.

As a public servant, he devoted his energies tirelessly to the needs of his district and his Nation. As a Democrat, he worked unstintingly for the growth and progress of his party. As a man, he gave of himself—his abilities, his warmth and humanity, his personal devotion to the ideals which we strive to make reality—and he earned the respect and affection of all who knew him.

LOUIS served on one of the most important committees and some of the most important subcommittees in this House. In those capacities he assisted many Members many times and performed outstanding service for his country. LOUIS RABAUT was a man of deep religious convictions. One of the things he did in this House in which he took great pride was his authorship of the amendment to the "Pledge of Allegiance" to the flag which inserted the words "under God." How significant is that fact in an age in which our principal concern is with the spread of atheistic communism.

LOUIS was a devoted husband, the father of a large, devoted, and wonderful family. To them we extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join my colleagues from Michigan, my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations, and others, in paying tribute to the life and achievements of LOUIS RABAUT, and in extending our sympathy to his wonderful family.

LOUIS RABAUT had a zest for living. He had loyalty; he had friendliness and helpfulness.

All of us from Michigan, not only those who serve in the Halls of Congress, but others from Michigan, and not just from Detroit, remember the contributions that LOUIS RABAUT made to our gatherings here of the Michigan State Society and of the Michigan Chamber of Commerce in their annual trek to Washington when he and Harry McDonald, another Michiganite, would lead us in song and contribute to the spirit of the occasion.

I say he was loyal. He was loyal to his party; he was loyal to his State. He did all he could for anyone associated with him.

I wish to mention just one instance of LOUIS RABAUT's helpfulness. Less than 2 years ago, the University of Michigan was anxious to obtain a new cyclotron, at a cost of $1.8 million. I see my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] a member of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee here, who will recall the active interest that LOUIS RABAUT took in providing this marvelous machine for studying the nuclei of the heavier elements. He was helpful, but he had to be convinced of the justice of a cause before he gave that help.

Mr. Speaker, I also was privileged to attend the funeral of Mr. RABAUT in Detroit, and concur with the description which has been given by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] as to the beauty of that service and the spirit of the people of Detroit who turned out in great numbers to pay tribute to a great servant of the State of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, all of us will miss him. His memory will be preserved and his family will realize that his colleagues in the House of Representatives had a very high appraisal of his work here.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI].

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of the late LOUIS C. RABAUT. Although my acquaintance with him was not as lengthy and as deep as that of many who eulogize him today, I feel that I, too, was touched by his life and his goodness. For many years I knew of his reputation as a man deeply religious, a devoted father and family man, a man humane by instinct and practice, the last of those Michigan Democratic Congressmen of the New Deal era who helped enact the historic social legislation of the 1930's.

The untimely death of LOUIS C. RABAUT tempers my entry into this esteemed body. As a new Congressman I regret the loss of opportunity to work with this veteran of worthy causes and benefit from his counsel and guidance. A few days before his death, Mr. RABAUT had called me to offer his assistance in my assumption of the duties of Congressman. Several days later, while speaking at a testimonial dinner for my esteemed predecessor, Judge Thaddeus Machrowicz, he was stricken with a fatal attack. In a sense, he died with his boots on, in a manner strikingly similar to that in which the late, great Alben Barkley passed on.

LOUIS C. RABAUT's constituents honored him by repeatedly reelecting him, and he honored them, the Congress, and the Nation with a high sense of purpose which will continue to be a source of inspiration to us all. I extend my sympathy to the late Mr. RABAUT's wife and family.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in sadness to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a great Congressman and a man who has helped and befriended me, Louis Rabaut, of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, to illustrate the qualities of this fine, wonderful man, I should like to relate an incident which occurred recently. On two occasions I have brought my little daughter to the floor of the House. On the second occasion she said to me, "Where is that nice man who told us about the 'Pledge of Allegiance'?"

Mr. Speaker, this illustrates that Mr. Rabaut, who was so kind a man, and had such a strong belief in God and in his country, would take time from his congressional duties to explain the "Pledge of Allegiance" to a little girl.

Mr. Speaker, to Mrs. Rabaut and to the members of his family I extend my deepest and most profound sympathy.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I gladly yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn of the passing of my colleague the late Congressman Louis Rabaut. The State of Michigan and the entire Nation has lost one of its most valued citizens in the passing of Mr. Rabaut. He was always eager and willing to assist all persons in all walks of life in solving their problems.

I had the distinct pleasure of working with the late Mr. Rabaut for a number of years when he served as chairman of the House District Appropriations Subcommittee as I am chairman of the House District Legislation Committee. I always found Mr. Rabaut to be sound thinking, patient, and tolerant in connection with all the problems confronting the Nation's Capital. He spent hours and hours of valuable time and effort to make our Nation's Capital the most beautiful city in the world and a safe place for the residents of the District of Columbia to live and make the city safe for the people throughout the United States when they visit the Nation's Capital.

Very few people in our decade lived a happier life than Mr. and Mrs. Rabaut and all of their lovely children. I had the pleasure of serving 23 years in the Congress of the United States with Congressman Rabaut, and I am certain that he was an inspiration to all new Members of Congress as he always had time to discuss any problem any Congressman had in connection with the House District Appropriations Committee.

My heartfelt sympathy goes out to Mrs. Rabaut and their fine children.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dingell].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my distinguished dean for taking the time today so that the House might pay an appropriate tribute to one of its great and beloved Members. I am, as are all my colleagues, saddened by the death of Louis Rabaut. I was present at the affair held in honor of our former colleague, the Honorable Thaddeus Machrowicz, who has now become a Federal judge, when our good friend, the late Louis Rabaut, passed on. Louis died doing what he liked to do and when our beloved friend had the privilege of visiting Louis Rabaut's wife and family to express both his condolences and his personal sadness over what had happened at this dinner held in honor of Judge Machrowicz, Mrs. Rabaut expressed instead her gratitude that God had permitted Louis Rabaut to be present at the dinner in spite of his very much weakened health, to pay an appropriate tribute to a friend and to participate in an affair held in his honor. I think that is the measure of both Mrs. Rabaut and their family.

All who knew Lou are well aware of the gentle and humane character of the man and of the rock-like integrity and courage with which he faced legislative problems in the Congress and with which he faced political problems at home.

We are aware, indeed, of the good works which he has done and of the affection and regard in which he held his colleagues and in which his colleagues so well held him.

We are also aware that the membership of the House owes a great collective debt of gratitude to Lou for the assistance which he richly and warmly extended all of us. We are all aware of the fact that this country is dotted with real monuments to Lou's legislative efforts; and I refer to the various public works around the country built as a result of his efforts, as mentioned by one of our distinguished colleagues—the dams and the river projects, and so forth, which we have. We in the State of Michigan recognize the good work which he did for us in the Food and Drug Administration new building there, in the improvements to our Federal buildings and in the new Federal buildings which were constructed throughout the State. These are a very real tribute to the man. I am sure all of us here recognize that the greatest measure of Louis Rabaut was the love which he carried with him for his fellow man, both within and without the Congress of the United States. Louis rendered a very thankless task with enthusiasm, with dignity and with courage. Not infrequently he was treated right in the public press of the city of Washington for his efforts to serve the taxpayers in the conduct of affairs of the District of Columbia, and his concern over the problems of wise administration in the District of Columbia. He rarely received the credit which he deserved for his efforts on behalf of the poor, on behalf of the hungry, on behalf of the needy and of the destitute of this city.

It was in this that Louis took his greatest pride, that he was responsible—repeatedly without credit—for the school lunch program of the city of Washington; for the improvement of ADC; for the improvement of all welfare programs which he regarded as essential to the basic dignity of the people who looked to him as the principal source of help through, perhaps, their most difficult hours.

So the House today bids an affectionate farewell to one of its great and distinguished Members. I join my colleagues in expressing to the beloved widow of Louis Rabaut our deepest sympathy and our affection for him. I join his colleagues and mine in the knowledge that the name of Louis Rabaut and the affection in which he was held not only in the State of Michigan and the city of Detroit but here in this Chamber of the House of Representatives will continue for as long as any of us are present.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would not want this moment to pass without expressing my wholehearted agreement in the magnificent statements that have been made about our late collegaue, Louis Rabaut. I think Louis Rabaut died as he would have wanted to—he died in harness, working at his job to which he was devoted. Louis Rabaut loved the House of Representatives. He had the capacity to make and to keep friends. It seems to me that I came to know Louis Rabaut almost the minute I came here and I was one of those, among a great many, who numbered him among my friends. His devotion to his family and to his religion and to his convictions will remain as a monument to his memory and as an example to all of us.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members of the House have the privilege of extending their remarks in the Record for our late colleague, Louis C. Rabaut.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in all that has been said in praise of our deceased friend and colleague, the Honorable Lou Rabaut, one of the grandest men I have ever known, every inch a gentleman of the highest order, a devout Christian who practiced being kind to his fellow man, an able legislator, and a wonderfully good husband and father. I served with this great and good man on the Appropriations Committee for many years during which time I learned to know his heartbeats. I shall miss his smiles and his friendship. God rest his soul.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I rise today to pay tribute to our beloved colleague and friend, the late Louis C. Rabaut. He was truly a patriot—one who felt that we Americans should give greater expression to our love of country, lest we begin to take this Nation for granted.

These feelings led him to appropriately revise our "Pledge of Allegiance" to the flag to emphasize that ours is a nation "under God." He further dramatized the "Pledge of Allegiance" and reawakened Americans to its use by presenting music to its words.

I am sure that above all his other accomplishments, great as they were, Louis Rabaut would like to remain in our minds as an effective patriot who fought for the preservation of his country's traditional way of life. For this he will long be remembered and revered. If every American would work to be as devoted in behalf of his Nation, our security and purpose would be stronger and clearer.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues from Michigan in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory and life and service of our late colleague and friend, Louis C. Rabaut, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

For more than a quarter of a century Louis Rabaut served the people of his district and the State of Michigan and the Nation, and he served them all with distinction and dedication.

It has been my privilege to be closely associated with Louie Rabaut for several years as we each served as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. We served together on the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations. Congressman Rabaut was always a hard worker, a determined member of the committee and a most effective Representative. He had a great capacity for bringing about harmony and a spirit of forbearance at a time of tense emotions by asking at times for a brief cooling off period, and sometimes he would sing a song to break or ease the tension.

He was a deeply religious man and a man who lived by the principles he professed. Louis Rabaut will be missed from the Halls of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I extend an expression of sincere sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that we record the passing of our very good friend and colleague, Louis C. Rabaut. Of Louie, as we all knew him, it can be said that he was one of Michigan's outstanding Representatives in Congress.

He was a humble man who had a kindness of heart and the highest concept of citizenship. In all his actions he moved with such ease and courtesy that it may be said without exaggeration that wherever he moved he seemed to radiate vitality and friendship. He was always calm, strong, and self-confident, and he respected in others the qualities he possessed himself—sincerity of conviction and frankness of expression.

His lines of friendship encircled friends of all elements of our social life. He was a man who contributed much to the civic, social, and spiritual life of the area in which he lived and the district and State he represented. Louie was a humble man with goodness of soul and kindness of heart and a man who rejoiced mightily when any act or deed of his added to the enrichment of our lives.

I cannot attempt to grasp or sum up the aggregate of his service in public life in a few words, and it is needless.

His life comprised a term of some years and produced a performance which I might say genuinely has been by his toil and stimulated by his love for his State and Nation—a record that won for him the great commendation and respect of all our people.

He was a firm believer in our American way of life. His great faith in the principles and ideals of government was not the outcome of any vigorous enthusiasm but the deep-rooted growth of many years.

In all things it can be said that he was a great American. His one great ambition in life was to hand on to posterity and the generation of tomorrow a greater and finer America than was handed to him.

Louie will be greatly missed by his colleagues and by the people he was proud and honored to represent. So today we mourn his loss and extend to his family our deepest heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, Louis Charles Rabaut, of Michigan, was imbued with a strong lively spirit of friendliness toward humankind. He was filled with an abundance of true happiness of soul. He loved to sing the old melodies and tunes.

As a Congressman no one was more serious in his attention to duty. It can be said that he was one of the powerful members of the intellectual group of the House of Representatives.

He was always a true gentleman, as well as a devout Christian. His great love for his family was the shining light of his career. Four of his talented children entered the religious orders of the Catholic Church. His service in the House was marked by many patriotic ceremonies and services, together with interpretations of historical subjects.

His high sense of patriotism will always be remembered in the history of our Nation as in the "Pledge of Allegiance" to the flag inserting the words "under God" by legislative act.

The exemplary life led by this gentle and understanding leader set moral standards of human conduct that few men could ever attain.

The Nation, State of Michigan, and the House of Representatives have lost a great political leader and statesman who by example reached the heights of legislative accomplishment and human behavior.

We, his colleagues from the State of Illinois, with great sadness extend our sympathies to his dear wife, Stella, and loving children.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is as much a privilege today as ever before, to praise the name of the Honorable Louis C. Rabaut of the Michigan 14th District. Yet in so doing today, we are obliged to add a note of deep regret, in deference to the absence of Mr. Rabaut from the seat he so long distinguished through service in this House.

As the Representative of Detroit's East Side, Louis C. Rabaut brought with him to Washington the pioneer spirit of the Old Northwest. With this at his command, he soon became known as one of the most diligent, effective, friendly, and talented Members of the House; a specialist in many fields, with marked abilities too numerous to record here in full.

He will, however, be best remembered for a few specific acts, one of which was his authorship of the amendment inserting the words "under God," in the "Pledge of Allegiance" to the American flag. Another: authorship of the legislation placing a cancellation mark on mail using the words "pray for peace," for which he received an award from the Catholic War Veterans, Department of Michigan.

During his time in Washington, as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, Louis C. Rabaut supervised the spending of billions. On one occasion he saved the taxpayers $535 million by inserting 13 words in an appropriation bill. And on all occasions, he was alert to the needs of his people: those of Detroit, of Michigan, and of the Nation at large. All of them shall miss him in the days ahead, as shall we, his colleagues in this House. For there was a man of brilliance and of wit, and one to whom public service appeared the noblest cause of all. We were all, I believe, benefited in the knowing of such a man—as were all his many friends and acquaintances, throughout the country and throughout the world.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, Louis Rabaut loved life and his fellow men. We all will miss him greatly.

For over a quarter of a century Louis Charles Rabaut served with distinction in the House of Representatives. He was diligent in that service.

To those of us who served with him on the Appropriations Committee, his image is indeed clear. He had a keen sense of humor. He was honest in his convictions and fought valiantly to support them. The record will disclose the great value of Louis Rabaut to the purpose and the work of the House Committee on Appropriations.

He and Mrs. Rabaut raised a wonderful family of nine children. That four of them have volunteered for unselfish devotion to their church for life is indeed a tribute to the house and home he headed.

I wish to join with my colleagues in extending our sincere sympathies to his widow and to the entire family.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great personal sadness that I learned on last November 12 of the passing of my good friend and colleague, the Honorable Louis C. Rabaut. I had grown to know and admire Louis Rabaut through our association on the Committee on Appropriations and to share the general esteem with which he was held by his colleagues in the House.

For a time I served with Mr. Rabaut on the Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations and during this period of service I was able to see at firsthand how this fine, gentle person was able to handle extremely difficult, often emotion-packed situations. Unfailingly I found him to be calm, dignified, and completely fair and just in all of his dealings. Although a member of the minority on that subcommittee I could find no reason to complain about the honorable and just manner in which he conducted hearings and executive sessions.

Mr. Speaker, Louis Rabaut was a man gifted beyond most of his fellow men with a genuine although often subtle sense of humor. It was perhaps this fine sense of humor that enabled him to carry on with such quiet dignity during some very trying times when others would have thrown up their hands in dismay.

I would like to recall for my colleagues, if I may, a brief vignette which points up this ability of his to survive even the most harassing times and difficult situations without at any point becoming curt or discourteous.

It was at the close of the hearings on the public works appropriations bill for

1960 that this particular event took place. As one of the ranking majority members of that subcommittee Mr. Rabaut had been frequently asked by the chairman to conduct the hearings for him. The hearings had been long, technical and involved. A thousand witnesses had paraded before the subcommittee, each with a different problem, each with a complex situation to discuss. Many of these problems and situations were extremely knotty ones.

It was my privilege to bring before the subcommittee a group of constituents on the last day of the hearings and to be present during the closing moments of those hearings. As the last witness had said his piece and left the room, Louis Rabaut leaned back in his chair. It was obvious that he and other members of the committee were tired. But Mr. Rabaut at once began to joke with his colleagues on the committee and those of us still in the room.

One colleague recalled that Louis had a fine tenor voice and had, upon occasion, entertained his colleagues and guests. He was called upon to close the hearing with a song. He protested—but it was obvious that the protest was not from his heart and he finally consented to sing for us. I have seldom heard a finer rendition of an old Irish ballad than he gave us that spring afternoon. It was, indeed, one of the most pleasant memories I have of the Congress.

And it typifies the man, Louis Rabaut. Although tired and worn from months of hard, strenuous work, he was, nevertheless, still full of fun, still full of life and vigor.

Mr. Speaker, it may be said that one of his great assets was his love of life, his love of his fellow men and his unfailing sense of humor. The public has lost a fine, dedicated public servant. I feel that I have, personally, lost a good and true friend.

Mrs. Weaver joins me in expressing to his family our sincerest sympathy upon their loss.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Louie Rabaut was one of the most respected Members of the House. I knew him best because of our common interest in the development of natural resources. He was one of the most enthusiastic supporters of the St. Lawrence Seaway project and few men in the Congress contributed more to the realization of this great project.

Louie Rabaut was not provincial in his support of waterway development, however. He was able to see the needs of such programs throughout the country. In the Mississippi Valley, we knew him as one of our outstanding friends and supporters.

All of us in the House of Representatives and in the country at large have sustained a great loss in the passing of Louie Rabaut.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow and a feeling of personal loss that I learned of the passing of our beloved colleague, Louis C. Rabaut. For the last 3 years I have been ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia of the House Committee on Appropriations. Louis Rabaut during that time was, and for many years before had been, chairman of that subcommittee. I have worked closely with him, and can say that we have never had a minute's disagreement during the time we served together. As ranking minority member, I received every consideration which could possibly be expected from Chairman Rabaut. In fact, it can be safely said that under the chairmanship of Louis Rabaut there were no parties in the District of Columbia Subcommittee—we were all working for the same goals and working shoulder to shoulder.

Although he could be a hard man over a wasted dollar, Louis Rabaut always erred on the side of generosity where people were concerned. He was proud of many of the institutions of the District of Columbia which had been established at his suggestion or under his tutelage, but he was especially proud of the cooperative houses for mothers of dependent children and their families. These houses were established at Mr. Rabaut's suggestion, and their success was a source of deep personal satisfaction to him.

The blithe spirit of Louis Rabaut was best portrayed on the numerous occasions when he would burst into song. His rich voice and his extensive memory of the words and music of many pieces helped shake the doldrums from any dull evening. In fact, Louis Rabaut often used a song to dispel a tense moment in much the same manner as some people use stories.

Louis Rabaut was devoted to the family—not only to his own beloved family, but to the American family as an institution. In fact, it can be said that he was a good man, a good American, and a fine Congressman.

To his family I extend my deepest sympathy in their bereavement. They have suffered a loss which I am sure is staggering to each of them, but to assuage this loss is the solemn pride which they must feel in being part of a life which was so well lived.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked when I learned this fall of the sudden passing of our friend and colleague, the greatly admired and beloved gentleman from Michigan, Louis Charles Rabaut. His death was a loss to his district and the Nation.

Everyone who had the privilege of associating with Louie Rabaut, as he was affectionately called, was aware of those personal qualities which he possessed in such full measure which made him one of the most popular men who ever came to Congress. Louie Rabaut was a Member of Congress when I first came to the House of Representatives. He was always helpful to new Members. As was the case with many other new Members, I benefited from his advice and counsel. He had a host of friends throughout the country.

As we all know, in his long service in the House and on the Appropriations Committee, he has sponsored and managed a great deal of legislation in the public interest, and his work here will indeed be a heritage of which his friends and loved ones can always be proud.

I extend to his surviving family my deepest sympathy and condolences.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Louis Rabaut will reverberate through the Halls of Congress where he won respectful affection from his colleagues.

Mr. Rabaut was a good Congressman, one who learned his job conscientiously, performed its duties with diligence, and maintained an excellent record.

Louis Rabaut loved people and he was always looking for ways in which he could be helpful. To him friendship was very important and there was not anything he would not do to aid a friend.

Congressman Rabaut was the type of legislator who is so greatly needed in our country today. A real American, he was a living example of what can be accomplished by hard work and individual initiative. His achievements and success were his own. I feel that in his years in Congress he found much self-satisfaction in a job well done.

Louis Rabaut was truly a religious man in every sense of the word. His loss will be felt not only by the members of his own faith but by all who knew him regardless of their method of devotion.

Our friend has gone to his reward, but his memory will always remain with everyone who ever had the pleasure of knowing him and of sitting with him in this Chamber.

God grant him eternal peace.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most rewarding thing in the life of a Member of Congress is the associations with some of the great men who come here to be Members of this body. Certainly, I know that my life has been greatly enriched by this experience and that in the front line of those who have helped me most and who most greatly inspired me was Louis Rabaut. The warm and human heart of friendship was there for me whenever I called for it; and his able and sage judgment was a constant support. His family life was an inspiration to all, as was his religious life. By placing the phrase "under God" in the "Pledge of Allegiance" to the flag, he did one of those simple but great things that was characteristic of the noble man that he was.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of the late distinguished Representative from Michigan, Louis Rabaut. He was a beloved and highly esteemed friend, and we shall all miss him sorely.

I remember that when I first came to Washington as a Member of the 81st Congress, Congressman Rabaut was already well experienced in the ways of our National Legislature. Although I did not represent a district in his own State, he never denied me either his time or his help. He was a thoughtful, kind and patient man, whose advice has served me in good stead on many occasions, and whose wonderfully human stories—especially about his lovely family of nine children—brightened many a moment in these halls.

During his quarter of a century of service in the House of Representatives, Congressman Rabaut compiled an imposing list of legislative achievements.

I know that one of them was especially dear to his heart. It was his proposal to include the words "under God" in the "Pledge of Allegiance" to the flag. Many of us joined with him in sponsoring similar resolutions. I know that he was very, very pleased when the Congress approved this change.

Congressman Rabaut was an able and accomplished legislator, an outstanding representative of his district, and a true friend. He served his God through his family and his work, and his fellow men through his legislative and charitable endeavors. He has left an indelible imprint on the record of the Congress, and on all those who came in contact with him.

I am confident that his widow and his family will derive some consolation from the knowledge that the good Lord has chosen him to be among His very own, and that their sorrow is shared by a legion of his friends.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the House who knew Louis Rabaut, I know, learned of his passing with deep regret. He had served in the Congress for 13 terms. His many fine qualities were recognized by all his colleagues and he was a kind and clever gentleman with a disposition that endeared him to them. He was a dedicated public servant who used his influence and his vote for what he always believed was in the interest of his country and the constituency he represented. He was a loyal citizen who supported and defended our form of government from all enemies, foreign, and domestic. He rendered conspicuous service on the Appropriations Committee for many years and had attained a place on that committee of great influence. I know his faithful service will be missed by that hard working committee. During his long service he received many public recognitions of his contributions to the welfare of his country.

The sweetness of his voice was evidence of the sweetness of his disposition. I remember hearing him sing a simple little song in Radio City years ago where there were also nationally known performers. He captured the show and the audience.

His life and his character will be an inspiration to those who knew him and he will long have a place in the hearts of his many friends. We will all miss Louis Rabaut and will remember him with affection. To his family, I wish to express my deep sympathy.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, in Louis Rabaut's death the House has lost a vivid character and one of the most conscientious men I have ever met. During debate he was incisive and those who questioned his statements or arguments soon found out that he knew his facts and he was well aware of what he was talking about.

As a personal friend he was a most lovable character with a keen sense of humor, a heart of loyalty and one who was always ready to be of help in any way possible. He was a religious man, and his devotion to his high standards of christianity were only matched by his loyalty and love for our country.

He will be greatly missed by his colleagues and there is no doubt in my mind that the people he represented in the Congress so faithfully and well will have a hard time finding a man of his unusual qualifications to take his place. My heartfelt sympathy goes to his widow and his family and may their grief be lightened by their knowledge of the glory of his service and the beauty of his life.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing sorrow over the passing of my good friend, the Honorable Louis C. Rabaut, of Michigan. His untimely death on November 12, 1961, was a shock to all of us.

Our mutual interest in music helped bring us together during my early days in the Congress. I remember that Louis was responsible for ceremonies conducted on the floor of the House on Flag Day, June 14, 1955, when for the first time a choral group—the Singing Sergeants of the U.S. Air Force Symphony Orchestra—was brought to the floor.

Louis Rabaut will be greatly missed by his country, his friends, and his constituents whom he served so well.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his wife and family.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, this Chamber has not often received the privilege of paying tribute to a man of such high moral principle and personal honor as Louis Rabaut. The many honors and tributes which he has received, not only from his own State but from the Nation as well, have honored him as a patriot, as a statesman and most importantly, as a man of great personal and public devotion. His service in the Congress has been long in years, wide in experience and varied in concern.

To this Chamber and to the people of the Nation he has brought his own sense of moral principle and high ideals. He made us all aware that this country is "one Nation under God." Each time we pledge allegiance to the flag, we are reminded that the basic foundation of our Nation is a faith and trust in God and in His desire for a world of justice and brotherhood. These same words of the Pledge of Allegiance are oral reminders and silent tribute to the memory of our colleague. His Nation and this Chamber owe a debt to Louis Rabaut for recalling to us the basic ideals of this democracy.

Louis Rabaut saw that these were not only the ideals of our Nation, but were the basic hopes, ideals and basis of faith that are shared by all peoples. "Pray for Peace" as a cancellation mark on the mails of the United States has been a constant reminder to our Nation and to the nations of the world that the American people have an alternative to nuclear war and ancient savagery. The alternative is a return to the principles of morality and honor to which all men are bound.

Our former colleague was an honor to himself, his State, his Nation and the world. It is an honor for me to pay tribute to our former colleague today. His words and his works have done much to lead our Nation toward a course guided by morality and principle in a world which so often lacks these qualities and for this we are thankful.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, this House of Representatives has suffered an irreparable loss in the passing of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable Louis Charles Rabaut, of Michigan. Lou Rabaut was one of my close friends and I have always enjoyed our friendship and have always had great respect for him as a man and as a national legislator. Had it not been for Lou Rabaut I would not have succeeded to the chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, Federal judiciary, and related agencies. It was at his suggestion that I was named to this subcommittee by Chairman Clarence Cannon in 1946.

His charming widow and fine family have my deepest sympathy and prayers in Lou's passing.

On November 14 last, the editorial page of the Washington Post, in a tribute to Lou Rabaut, had this to say about him:

> Representative Louis C. Rabaut had 9 children and 25 grandchildren and, as his last official biography observed, he knew, "family problems." In the years that he was the chief congressional influence on the District's budget, he was a warmhearted defender of this city's children. When, last June, a witness before his House Appropriations Subcommittee attacked the local program for aid to dependent children, Mr. Rabaut replied: "It's easy enough to find fault. I'm looking for solutions. What are we going to do with the children?" When another witness suggested cutting back aid in cases of illegitimacy, Mr. Rabaut declared: "You aren't going to hurt those children."
>
> He was interested in public health, and his investigations 4 years ago led to a sharp improvement in conditions at District of Columbia General Hospital. He was interested in education, and sometimes held his school budget hearings at night so that parents could appear. His definition of liberalism included the stanch defense of individuals whom he considered wronged by a big city government. When this newspaper objected last year to his urban renewal bill, commenting that it gave too much weight to the complaints of individual property owners in one project area, Mr. Rabaut wrote back: "Nowhere in this country do citizens have less recourse in grievances of such a local nature than they have in this city. Do you want me to turn a deaf ear?" His reductions in budgets, and particularly his reluctance to increase the Federal payment, often seemed excessive. Yet he was respected at the District Building as a technician whose decisions were rarely arbitrary.
>
> Mr. Rabaut died Sunday at a testimonial dinner in Detroit, near his 14th Congressional District. The monument he leaves behind him is here, where he dealt in good faith with this city and its people.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Appropriations has recently suffered the loss of two of its most respected members. I refer of course to the passing from this earthly scene of John J. Riley, of South Carolina, and Louis C. Rabaut, of Michigan. I will pay my tribute to John Riley later but now wish to join our colleagues from Michigan and elsewhere in expressing profound sorrow over the passing of Louis Rabaut.

Mr. Rabaut was a senior member of the Committee on Appropriations when

I came to Congress in January of 1953 and was assigned to that committee. During the intervening 10 years I had an opportunity to become closely associated with him on that committee. I found him to be a hard worker and conscientious in the discharge of his responsibilities. He entertained strong convictions and never hesitated to express them or fight for them. He enjoyed the respect of all members of the committee, as well as the House, and has left his mark on the committee and House records.

In the passing of Louis Rabaut, the Committee on Appropriations has lost a valuable member, the House of Representatives an effective legislator, the 14th District of Michigan an able Representative, and his family a loving and devoted husband and father. My profound sympathy is extended to them in their bereavement.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in remarking on the commendable life and character of our late friend, Louis Rabaut. It was my good fortune to have had his friendship and confidence during my many years of service in the House of Representatives. I know his membership in this House will be sorely missed by the people of the district which he represented so long and faithfully and also by the country at large for the many valuable contributions he made toward the enactment of helpful and constructive legislation.

I wish to express my deepest sympathy to all of the members of his fine family.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness of heart that I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of the late Louis C. Rabaut who so ably served his State and his Nation in these Halls.

Louis Rabaut was a statesman of great ability and high ideals. He was a loyal American and his patriotism and love of his country were of primary consideration in his every action. His devotion to the principles which have made our Republic great and his untiring efforts to perpetuate these great principles will long be remembered. Even prior to his passing his achievements in these fields were recognized by a number of patriotic organizations which paid him tribute.

He was truly a Christian gentleman. He wished to leave no question that in our country we have our foundations of faith based on the word of a Supreme Being. To the credit of Louis Rabaut is the amendment providing for the insertion of the words "under God" in our pledge of allegiance to the flag.

It was my privilege not only to be associated with our late colleague on the floor of the House but also as a member of the Michigan delegation and as a member with him on the House Appropriations Committee for many years. During these associations I came to know him and admire him as a dedicated man.

I join my colleagues today in extending members of his family my deepest sympathy.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I join with my many colleagues in paying tribute to a good and great man. His loyalty to the Michigan delegation, to his State and the Nation marks his passing as a great loss.

Our loss is deeply felt not only because of the character and high qualities of our colleague but more important, the fact that in this era in our history the qualities he possessed are most needed.

History will record that Louis Rabaut devoted his entire life to these principles and to him alone can be attributed the addition to the pledge of allegiance of the words "under God." He was also responsible for the pledge of allegiance being set to music.

To me, personally, his death was a great loss. His counsel, advice and analysis of bills reported to the floor was sought by all of us.

The time Louis Rabaut spent on the Appropriations Committee in his endeavor to make the city of Washington the most outstanding Capital of the world was a beginning which we all must continue to carry out. We deeply mourn his untimely passing.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, may I say a few words in honor of our late colleague from my home State of Michigan, Representative Louis C. Rabaut.

During his many years in the House of Representatives, Congressman Rabaut served his Nation faithfully, efficiently and with boundless energy and courage.

At the time of his death, Congressman Rabaut was on his way to praise a friend, a former colleague of ours here in the House who was appointed a Federal judge.

Praise of his friends came easy to Representative Rabaut, and these friends numbered in the hundreds. He had the ability to resolve disputes, to turn away harsh words with a jest, but when matters of basic principle and belief were involved, he would not and could not be moved from that which he believed was right and honorable.

Congressman Rabaut loved this Nation and its people, and this love was exceeded only by his love of God. He was author of an amendment here in these halls in which the words "under God" were inserted in our Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

Under the eyes of God, Congressman Rabaut saw our Nation flourish and prosper, and under the eyes of God he lived a full, rich life with compassion and understanding of his fellow human beings.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues today in paying tribute to a great American and distinguished former Member of this body—the late Louis C. Rabaut.

We, who have had the privilege of serving with him in the Congress, knew him to be devoted and loyal to his friends. He was a true public servant; he served his Nation and the people he represented, with honor and distinction. As a Member of the House of Representatives for 25 years he was admired and respected by all who knew him; he was an able legislator who rendered invaluable service to his country, his constituents, the Congress, and the important Appropriations Committee, of which he was a member.

Louis Rabaut is sorely missed by us; we shall always remember his devotion to his ideals and his duty. I express my deepest sympathy to his dear wife and family.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, ringing melodiously in the ears of Members is the song so often we have heard Lou Rabaut sing:

He made the night a little brighter wherever
he would go—
The Old Lamplighter of long, long ago.
His snowy hair was so much whiter beneath
the candle glow—
The Old Lamplighter of long, long ago.

You'd hear the patter of his feet as he came
trodding down the street,
His smile would hide a lonely heart you see.
If there were lovers in the park he'd pass a
lamp and leave it dark.
Remembering the days that used to be.

For he recalled when dreams were new,
He loved someone who loved him too,
Who walks with him in memory.
He made the night a little brighter wherever
he would go,
The Old Lamplighter of long, long ago.

That was Lou Rabaut. He made the world a little brighter, wherever he would go. He sang many songs, and he loved to sing because of the music in a soul where all was at peace, because it was his mission wherever he would go to make the night a little brighter. Once when he and Tom O'Brien were in Ireland, and the great John McCormack was grievously ill and near the end, they were invited to visit the stricken McCormack, who at this stage of his illness had lost his voice, the golden voice that had enraptured millions. At McCormack's bidding Lou Rabaut sang for him one of McCormack's favorite songs, and then on urging another and another until an hour had passed, McCormack applauding from his sickbed and reliving in Lou Rabaut's singing the glory of the years of his own singing.

Yes, Lou Rabaut sang many, many songs, sang them as few singers could in any land or at any time, but the "Old Lamplighter" was his theme song. I heard it first in my freshman year, so tenderly embellished in memory with the sweet charm of Lou Rabaut, when Lou Rabaut, Murphy of New York, Lichtenwalter of Pennsylvania, Morton of Kentucky, Franklin Roosevelt, all gifted with good voices and a love of singing, occasionally with some others, would gather of an evening at the Congressional Hotel. All the old favorites were sung, the repertoire of all the Congressman artists being all inclusive, but always the highlight was "The Old Lamplighter."

He made the night a little brighter wherever
he would go—
The Old Lamplighter of long, long ago.

That was Lou Rabaut. He made a little brighter the lives of all his colleagues. He spread sunshine in the nooks of our legislative routine. He was a legislator of the finest quality. His accomplishments were many and of lasting impact upon his country and its future. His place in the history of the Congress of the United States is secure.

But, over and above all, LOU RABAUT was a man who lived his life by faith in his God and made the night a little brighter wherever he would go. His friendship has enriched my life. I shall miss him, sorely miss him, but his presence, even though not discernible to human eyes, I shall never cease to sense.

To his beloved wife, his children, his grandchildren, and the other family members I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, during my years of service in the Congress, it has been a real privilege for me to be associated with LOUIS RABAUT. He had a philosophy of life and a dedication to duty that was not surpassed. Always cheerful, always ready with counsel, and always willing to lend a helping hand, he was a true friend. He will be greatly missed by all of us. To his family, we extend our deepest sympathy.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, it is with humbleness that I join my colleagues in the House at this time in paying tribute to the late Congressman LOUIS RABAUT, of Michigan.

He was a man big of heart and of mind. His warm, gracious countenance, which touched the lives so many Members of the House, is deeply missed by myself and others. For, even in his latter years, he displayed a zest and understanding for life which were a tribute to the agelessness of the human spirit.

We all remember Mr. RABAUT for his major contributions to the American scene—his pioneer efforts during the New Deal for social security and other legislation, his work in appropriations, his activities on behalf of world understanding, and particularly the good neighbor program with our friends to the south.

Mr. RABAUT was already a distinguished veteran of the House when I first came to Congress. I remember well his courtesies and his enlightening counsel. He was a deeply religious man, and it was through his leadership that the traditional salute to the flag, repeated in classrooms and in ceremonies daily throughout the land, was changed to include, "under God." For this, he will always be remembered.

And, there were the little things—the small events which make up daily living—by which he showed his stature. In the closing hours of each session, when the House was in recess awaiting legislation from the Senate side, I fondly remember Mr. RABAUT going to the microphone in the well of the House and leading the Members in congenial folk singing. He had a beautiful tenor voice, and the singing was just the spiritual lift that the tired Members needed to carry on with full vigor when the House was once again rapped to order by the Speaker. During these recesses, my late husband, Jack, used to join us on the floor and his bass voice blended splendidly with that of Mr. RABAUT. It was a precious and warm bit of congeniality which many of us came to cherish and expect at the close of each session.

Mr. RABAUT lived his life ever actively. Even during his final term, shortly before his death last November 12, he remained one of the hardest working Members of the Congress. I am reminded of the lines written by Poet Byron, who had in mind the kind of man Mr. RABAUT was, when he wrote:

> His was "a spirit that on this life's rough sea
> Loves t' have sails fill'd with a lusty wind
> Even till his sail-yards tremble, his masts
> crack,
> And his rapt ship run on her side so low
> That she drinks water, and her keel plows
> air".

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to a great American, LOUIS RABAUT. He served this Nation and the cause of freedom with honor and distinction. He was truly a great American. His unselfish devotion to this Nation has been an inspiration and an example to each of us. He really knew no north, south, east, or west. He was an American whose every effort was dedicated to the preservation of this Republic.

Mrs. Dorn and the family join in expressing to his wonderful family our deepest and most heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to join in the expressions of the Members here in tribute to our late and revered colleague from Michigan, Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT.

Representative RABAUT served in this body during 13 Congresses. His multitudinous and remarkable achievements and distinctions have already been recited here.

His diligence in legislative study was a byword in these Halls and his appeals for approval of the legislation he believed in were forceful and persuasive.

However, he was perhaps known, and endeared himself most to us, by the qualities of his great heart. He was a kind and thoughtful man and, in the midst of his heavy duties, he always had time to give wise counsel, encouraging words and generous assistance to junior Members. He was a person of great good nature and genial disposition.

He was one of the most learned and effective national legislators in modern times. He exemplified in the highest degree the true spirit of faith in God, in country, and in his fellow man. His extraordinary record of patriotic service to this Nation and his State will forever brighten the pages of congressional legislative history.

The learning and geniality of LOUIS RABAUT will be solely missed in this body, but his patriotic service will remain forever as an inspiring example for those who come after him.

We extend our sincere sympathy to his gracious wife, Mrs. Rabaut, and his children in their great sorrow.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, to the younger members of the Michigan delegation, LOUIS RABAUT was more than our dean. He was like a father to us.

Every Member of Congress, no matter what his background of experience, if it has been in Government or outside it, when he first arrives on the Washington scene he walks into the House Chamber nervous and unsure of himself. One of the first Members at my side when I arrived was LOUIS RABAUT who put his strong right arm upon my shoulder and said reassuring things which helped me adjust to this great responsibility and to develop self-confidence more quickly than would have been probable otherwise. Having been a Member of the House for a long time, he was always full of anecdotes about debates on various issues and little known facts about certain individual Members which were always helpful in understanding the workings of the House and the philosophy of the Members. This is valuable in sizing up situations.

LOUIS RABAUT was always fair in his dealings with all of us, never condescending although he outranked us both in years and service, respecting our judgment both individually and collectively, even though on some occasions it might have differed from his. He was both a wise counselor and a good friend. Held in high esteem by other Members of Congress, the very fact that he was a Member of our Michigan delegation increased the prestige of our delegation.

Although the family and his circle of friends will miss him dearly, we all have the consolation of knowing that he has rendered his country great service and therein left a legacy that all of us could well emulate.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late LOUIS C. RABAUT. The gentleman from Michigan was an outstanding Member of the House. I have never known a Member who was as devoted to his duties and worked as hard as he did in discharging the responsibilities which this House imposed upon him. His diligence to duty, his capacity for hard work and his devotion to the House of Representatives and to the Nation can serve as an inspiration for all of us.

I know of no more able Member of this House than our late, beloved colleague. I want to extend my utmost sympathy to members of his family. I am proud that I had an opportunity to serve with him.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, LOUIS RABAUT was not of my religious or political faith.

But I honor him most for his piety and his patriotism.

I would only hope to serve the same God and country with equal sincerity and devotion.

One's remembrances of a man are perhaps the truest measure of his imprint—and his character.

I shall recall the memory of LOUIS RABAUT each time I repeat the words, "under God," in the "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag."

I shall recall his memory—and his personal friendliness and courtesies extended to a delegation from my hometown—whenever I drive past the river diversion project in Battle Creek which he, as an Appropriations subcommittee chairman, helped make possible.

But perhaps my most vivid remembrance will be because of a member of the family in which LOUIS RABAUT took such deep and justifiable pride—the son who, as a priest of his church, with singular display of faith and courage, officiated at the requiem mass for his own father.

I think that is the remembrance which would please Louis Rabaut most of all.

For what little it can add to the treasured memories and comforting faith of his loved ones, Mrs. Johansen and I extend our sincere sympathy.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in paying a final tribute to our distinguished friend, the late Louis C. Rabaut.

When I first came to the House of Representatives, Louis became one of my first personal friends, and over the years we developed a warm and cordial friendship.

For 25 years, Louis served his constituents well. He was truly a representative of people everywhere who cherish the goals of progressive and humanitarian legislation. The Nation is indebted to him for the very important part he played in the progress that has been made in our country.

To his beloved wife and other members of his family, I express profound sympathy.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the years go by Members of the House of Representatives form many friendships. Most of these might be called casual. We each have a warm regard for the other. If our paths cross in matters of legislation we may become more or less intimate with each other. As I look back on my own service I can think of many who would exchange with me the title of "friend." However, there are in my mind always a few who are outstanding and who have from time to time demonstrated for me a warmth and an affection and a helpfulness that sets them apart and in my mind and heart, places them on a pedestal. Such a one was Louis Rabaut. I cannot remember just when it was that he took me under his wing and began to give me his help in many things, particularly those which I presented to the Appropriations Committee. I can think of many times when his words of wisdom probably meant the difference between success and failure of some project of mine. His death grieves me sorely. I shall miss him, and I shall miss his good counsel. I hope that the things he has taught me will guide me in the years to come.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in the recent death of Louis C. Rabaut, the House of Representatives lost a wise and dedicated Member, and many of us who have served long years with him feel that we have just lost a dear friend. Louis Rabaut's excellences were not of the flamboyant and spectacular kind. His manner of speech was characterized by gruff practicality rather than by smoothness or eloquence. Most of his work in Congress was silent, grinding work in committee, on the vital but unglamorous matter of the expenditure of funds.

Louis Rabaut had served in the House since the 74th Congress, being reelected to each succeeding Congress except the 80th. During the 25 years of his service, he won the respect and gratitude of each Member who had an opportunity to work with him in the Appropriations Committee, or to observe the care and fairness with which he approached his decisions.

It is gratifying that the record of a man of such high moral qualities is marked by his memorable achievement of the sponsorship of the bill adding the phrase, "under God" to the Pledge of Allegiance. To his credit, also, is the bill he sponsored, by which the phrase "Pray for Peace" is used in our post office cancellations.

In his official life as a legislator, and in his private life as a family man, Louis Rabaut was a person of warmly human sympathies, and of strong religious feeling. It has long been well known that, in his position as chairman of the Subcommittee on District Affairs of the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. Rabaut could be counted upon to support projects looking to the welfare of the sick, the poor, or children, so long as the need was soundly demonstrated, and the means of meeting it shown to be efficient. His concern for the needs and the education of children is reflected also in the family life he shared with his wife, the former Stella M. Petz, and their nine children. The depth of religious feeling the two instilled in their children is indicated by the fact that one of their three sons is a priest, Father Francis Dermott, S.J., and three of their six daughters are nuns, in the order of the Immaculate Heart of Mary; Sister Mary Palmyre, Sister Stella Maris, and Sister Martha Marie. Similarly, their depth of family feeling is reflected in the fact that their married children have presented Mr. and Mrs. Rabaut with the glorious total of 25 grandchildren—a fact of which Louis Rabaut used often to boast. He will long be held in grateful remembrance by those who appreciate how well he served God, his country, and his fellow man.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, when the name of Louis C. Rabaut was called, there was no answer.

His familiar face and voice have vanished from this national forum where he served the people of the 14th Michigan District and the people of the 50 States for a quarter of a century.

From the mid-1930's until 1961, with the exception of the years 1946–47, he participated in the shaping of legislation that lifted the United States from a demoralizing depression to its present position as the powerful and responsible leader of the free world.

The older Members of this House have seen many colleagues come and go. Some were with us such a brief time before the fortunes of politics or the accidents of life took them from us that our memory of them dims.

Others, with that extra quality of the born legislator that their constituents appreciate, are endorsed again and again by the folks back home.

They are the veterans who carry forward the traditions and the standards of this House.

Louis Rabaut was one of these dependable men.

Above and beyond his ability, and his experience as a member of the Appropriations Committee, was the faith that illuminated and inspired his every thought and action.

His special interest was the Foreign Service of the United States, and he made many official trips to inspect and study the work of our diplomatic and consular representatives abroad. He knew that the future of freedom itself would succeed or fail in ratio to our respect, understanding, and assistance to the legitimate objectives of other national communities.

In his personal life, he was an exemplary husband and father, and a devout communicant of his church.

Louis Rabaut was proud of his American heritage.

He saw that the great human values liberated in our open society were guided from the beginning by the American people's reverence for their Divine Creator.

That is why our departed colleague had immortal confidence in freemen and in their future.

As the author of the amendment inserting the words "under God" in the "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America," he made us aware, as never before, that our rights and responsibilities and aspirations must work together in living testament to the Father of us all.

By his achievements as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, our late colleague and friend Louis C. Rabaut encouraged and strengthened us to meet the obligations ahead.

His presence is gone, but his spirit will be ever with us.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Louis Rabaut is no longer with us. For 25 years he represented the 14th District of his native State of Michigan. For 25 years he graced this Chamber with his presence and his wisdom, benefiting all of us with the thinking of his keen legal mind.

Louis Rabaut was a kind, good man—a man that one was proud to call a friend. Today we rise to pay tribute to our departed colleague and friend with the realization that his resonant voice, his wit and friendly smile will no longer greet us when we come into this Chamber.

His accomplishments during his quarter century in this body would fill a large testament of good works. There were few important events which did not involve the energetic, good-humored Louis Rabaut. He was, however, a man whose love and respect for the people he represented was exceeded only by that for his family. His acceptance of life was serious but he never allowed that to prevent him from enjoying it. Words are inadequate to describe this man's deep love of his fellow man. A love which always expressed itself in his willingness to assist anyone at any time. He was a man dedicated to the common good of our country and who tried all his life to live up to the admonition "Love thy neighbor." Those of us who worked with him here knew that he succeeded. My deepest sympathy goes out to Louis Rabaut's bereaved family.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the death of Congressman Rabaut came as a great shock to me, as I am sure it did to the rest of the Members of the House, for, despite illnesses he appeared to us to be an indestructible rock who could always be counted on to overcome any setback and come back to his duties here and carry them out courageously and with great compassion.

I enjoyed his friendship and treasured his advice and guidance. He was never too busy to help a new Member to become familiar with the work of the House, and as the new Member began to achieve experience here, he was always ready to suggest new ideas for meeting new problems.

Patriotism, piety, love of family, and a deep and sincere sense of friendship dominated his life. He was in the literal sense a good man. I want to take this opportunity to express to Mrs. Rabaut and her fine children my deepest sympathy. He has left a wonderful heritage of integrity and decency, both in the life he led and in the laws he was instrumental in writing as a Member of Congress.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I was serving on active duty in the Navy in the Mediterranean last fall when I got the word that my great friend and our beloved colleague, Louis Rabaut, had passed into the Great Beyond. It was a sad day for me.

Louis Rabaut was one of the first Members of this body with whom I became acquainted as a freshman Congressman. In that first year in the House I had the privilege of serving with him on the Board of Visitors to West Point. It was then that I came to know of his great capacity for friendship, his warm understanding, his deep love for young people, and the sound wisdom and commonsense bred from a lifetime of experience that have meant so much over the years to all the deliberations of this House. I was indebted to Louis Rabaut for the advice and encouragement he gave to me as a new Member.

Louis Rabaut will be remembered for many, many years for his service as a Member of Congress. He will be remembered for what he did in including a reference to the Diety in our pledge of allegiance—"this Nation under God"—one of his proudest accomplishments. But he will also be remembered as one who always had the time and the willingness to help anyone in need. His staff was devoted to him. His friends were legion. Here was a great man, and a good man.

This House will be the less for his passing from our scene. To his widow and his family I extend my heartfelt sympathy in their loss.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, others have expressed here with sincere eloquence our sense of loss at the untimely passing of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable Louis C. Rabaut, of the 14th Michigan Congressional District—a true man of good will. I cannot forbear to add, however, a brief but heartfelt notation of my own sadness at the realization that this cheerful spirit, this bright intellect, this energetic and faithful man, has gone to rest.

Through a quarter century of our service here, my admiration and respect for Louis Rabaut grew. He was a superb example of the dedicated public servant. He wore proudly the badges of faith and patriotism. It was evident that he had before him always the realization that, as a man, he was accountable to the Almighty for the expenditure of each day. It was plain, too, that he regarded a hard day's work in their interest as his recurring daily debt to the people of the United States and, particularly, the citizens of his district in Michigan.

Louis Rabaut loved and respected his church and his Nation. He was a gentleman, but he knew that a resolute battle for the right was not incompatible with gentlemanliness. He was conscientious, earnest, and resourceful as a legislator, and the lawmaking of this Nation gained from his efforts over many years.

His was a clean, full life—nearly 30 years of public service; 50 years of happy marriage; 9 fine children, 4 of whom dedicated their lives to their church. Surely, when our beloved colleague presented himself at the eternal gates his credentials were not found wanting.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in paying tribute to the memory of our late colleague from Michigan, Louis C. Rabaut. His death has greatly saddened his many friends and associates in Congress and elsewhere and brings a tremendous loss to Michigan and the Nation.

As a fellow member of the Michigan delegation, I knew him as a true gentleman, an able legislator, and a devoted patriot. A member of the important Appropriations Committee, he was always helpful to the people of the Sixth District and always most kind and considerate to me personally. His interest in the welfare of Michigan was never hemmed in by party lines. But aside from the times when heavily burdened by legislative work, I remember "Uncle Louie," as I called him, as a lighthearted, fun-loving man who took great joy in getting a group together to sing around a piano.

Congressman Rabaut served his State and his country for a quarter of a century in a dedicated manner, taking a genuine interest in the problems of all his fellow men. Though his legislative accomplishments were many and he shared the responsibility for the prudent spending of billions of dollars as a member of the Appropriations Committee, he was most proud of legislation he sponsored to include the words "under God" in our Pledge of Allegiance. His deep religious and patriotic feelings which prompted him to introduce this meaningful revision in the pledge will live after him. And his adherence to the noble ideals of this Republic will serve as an inspiration to all who follow him.

I am proud to have had the opportunity to serve with him and I want to extend my deepest sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have heard expressed for the past few days our sense of loss at the untimely passing of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable Louis C. Rabaut, of Michigan, a true citizen of good will and a longtime personal friend of mine.

Having served with Mr. Rabaut on the Appropriations Committee and having served with him as chairman and ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, I cannot but add a personal footnote to the grief that has been expressed here since his passing.

Louis Rabaut was one of the kindest men I have ever known. He was a warm-hearted person, a conscientious legislator, a true Samaritan with an interest in his fellow man. At the same time, he was a man of cheerful spirit, bright intellect and abounding energy—but, above all, he was faithful to his God, his country, and to his colleagues.

Through almost 20 years' service with Louis Rabaut my admiration and respect grew. I came to know him as a superb example of a public servant. He carried proudly the banners of faith and service and patriotism and it was always readily apparent that he applied a rule to his every act. This rule was his own realization that, as a man, he was accountable to the Almighty for the way in which he used each day.

It was just as obvious that he regarded a hard day's work in the interest of his constituents as his recurring daily debt to them.

Louis Rabaut loved and respected his home, his State, his church, and his Nation. He was, at all times, a gentleman, but he knew that a resolute battle for the right was not incompatible with gentlemanliness.

His was a clean, full life—nearly 30 years of service to the public; 50 years of happy marriage; nine fine children, four of whom turned their lives to the church.

It can truly be said that when Louis C. Rabaut presented his credentials at the gates of Heaven, they were found to be in excellent order and he now sits near the throne of God.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly saddened by news of the passing of my dear and valued friend and esteemed colleague for many years, the Honorable Louis C. Rabaut, of the great State of Michigan.

Louis Rabaut was one of the most distinguished, beloved men ever to serve in this great body. He was unique in his lovable, personal qualities, outstanding in his ability, and the wide sweep of his interests and his effective service to his district, State, and Nation.

Louis Rabaut was a great humanist and his humane feelings for his fellow man could not be excelled. He labored tirelessly throughout the many years of his distinguished public service for the betterment of human relations and for the advancement and improvement of human standards, for the elevation of the lot of the average citizen.

Warm and genial of nature, he had a host of close friends in this body and wherever he was known; his beaming, magnetic personality was felt in every gathering of which he was a part. A talented singer, he was always very happy to lend his great gifts in this regard to every occasion when he was called upon to do so, and he not only sang beautifully and impressively, at formal and solemn occasions on the floor of the House and elsewhere but he also took special pleasure in singing for his friends at social gatherings and impromptu entertainments.

He was a most valuable member of the great House Appropriations Committee and enjoyed the confidence of his colleagues and the leadership of the House. He was clearly and indelibly marked as a great leader in the Congress and the country.

Louie performed many special services and supported and advanced many meaningful pieces of legislation. Among these, I have the feeling that he was especially proud of the measure he steered through Congress officially designating Rev. Francis Bellamy's famed "Pledge of Allegiance," with the addition of the compelling and meaningful words "under God," as our national pledge.

He put real heart service into this effort and not only secured the enactment of Public Law 287, 79th Congress, signed into law as House Joint Resolution 243, on Flag Day, June 14, 1954, by President Dwight D. Eisenhower, which made the Pledge of Allegiance official, but he also arranged with one of America's most beloved and distinguished composers, Mr. Irving Caesar, to write appropriate and very impressive music for the pledge.

In addition, Louie also arranged to have this historic work sung for the first time on the floor of the House of Representatives on Flag Day, June 14, 1955, by the official Air Force choral group, the "Singing Sergeants," under the direction of Capt. Robert L. Landers, AFRES, in special Flag Day ceremonies.

To the end of time, this immortal pledge will be recited and sung by millions and millions of people and little children in every hamlet, village, town and city in this great country, an enduring, perpetual recollection of one of Michigan's greatest sons, our beloved friend, Louis Rabaut.

Louie was very dear to me during the years I have been in the Congress and I esteemed and cherished him profoundly. He was one of our greatest leaders and one of our dearest friends. He was beloved, respected and admired wherever he was known, and the warmth of his heart, the radiance of his personality, the compassion and generosity of his impulse have been everlastingly impressed upon the annals of this great body and in the hearts of all those of us who were privileged to know and to love this noble soul.

Louis Rabaut's family was part of his very being and he was indescribably proud of his devoted wife, his loving sons and daughters, of whom he often spoke in such a way that made it clear to all that his wonderful family was enshrined and forever locked in his heart.

He was proud of all his children, but I thought he was especially grateful for those who gave their lives in the religion to the service of the Living God, because Louis was a man of profound, religious faith who always worked and lived by the precepts of the Divine Master.

In his passing, a giant oak has fallen in the forest and a noble soul has gone to rejoin his Creator. With very heavy heart, I extend to his beloved and grieving family, his gracious helpmate and wife of many years, and his wonderful children—my most heartfelt sympathy for the truly irreparable loss which has come to them, to the House of Representatives, to the Nation and to all of us who dearly loved this great American and gracious, Christian gentleman.

I join his dear ones in mourning his passing, and sad of heart, pay tribute to his noble character and illustrious achievements. I pray that they will find that solace and comfort in their faith, as their dear, departed one would have them do, that will bring them reconciliation to the divine will.

The loving memory of this good and dear man will remain in my heart to the end of my days; it will dwell here in the historic precincts of this House, for very many years to come, inspiring and guiding the House toward noble goals, exalted ends and warm human fellowships, for such are the treasured bequests of the courtly gentleman from Michigan, Hon. Louis Rabaut.

May the good Lord smile graciously upon our beloved friend and colleague and grant him enternal rest and peace in his heavenly home.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely thank my colleagues for the contributions they have made on behalf of our deceased friend and colleague, Congressman Rabaut. He, indeed, will be missed by all of us. But may his guiding spirit remain with us forever.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the life, character, and services of our late colleague, Mr. Rabaut.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'Hara of Michigan). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN J. RILEY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMillan].

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, we were all shocked and distressed to learn of the passing of the late Congressman John Riley who has represented South Carolina's Second Congressional District for the past 15 years. Congressman Riley was loved by every person in South Carolina and I am certain every Member of Congress who was privileged with his acquaintance.

He was a gentleman under all conditions and at all times regardless of the pressure, trials and tribulations he was called on to bear during hearings when some of the largest appropriation bills ever enacted by the Congress of the United States were being considered. Congressman Riley was firm in his convictions, quiet, deliberate and a deep thinker. He enjoyed a wonderful reputation in the business world as well as in the legislative field.

I have had the pleasure and privilege of meeting hundreds of Congressmen and Senators in the 23 years I have been a Member of the House of Representatives and I have never met a more genial Christian gentleman that John Riley. He and his wonderful wife, Corinne, and two children were very close in their family ties.

John, as he was affectionately known by all his colleagues, was when his health permitted regular in his attendance at committee meetings and was always on the floor of the House when legislation was under consideration.

The world is certainly a better place for all of us to live in because of John Riley's having lived among us for 66 years. I shall personally miss him as a friend and a person with whom I could discuss my most intimate problems at all times.

The Second Congressional District, South Carolina and the Nation have suffered a great loss because of the passing of John Riley as his shoes will be hard to fill on the House Appropriation Committee and in the National House of Representatives.

My heartfelt sympathy goes out to Mrs. Riley and her two fine children.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, those of us who knew John Riley loved him. John Riley was a good Christian, an effective legislator, a soft-spoken and dedicated American. He loved to help people, and people loved to help him. I guess nobody in the history of the district which our late colleague represented had ever been more loved than was John Riley.

He worked hard in the American Legion and in his beloved South Carolina among the youth of his constituency; long before he came to Congress, he was one of the organizers of the Little League and American Legion Junior League baseball. He discovered the baseball player whose name is known to many of you, Bobby Richardson of the New York Yankees.

John Riley was a great American, and the day of his passing was a sad day for us all. He will long be remembered because of his character. He was too busy with the everyday tenor of life to think of himself.

> But such a tide as moving seems asleep,
>   Too full for sound and foam,
> When that which drew from out the boundless deep
>   Turns again home.

He is gone. John Riley has met his Maker; no one will be more fondly remembered because the life he lived and the things he did qualified him to meet his Maker. We will miss him because John Riley will be missed by everybody. To his loved ones I extend my sympathy and my hope they may be consoled by the knowledge that the Nation grieves with them.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of personal loss that I join in this last tribute to my good friend and beloved colleague, the Honorable John J. Riley, of South Carolina. I say personal not only because he was a close friend of mine but because he represented the district in which my wife was born and reared. Many of her relatives knew him by his first name. He was a great South Carolinian and a great American. He was a Christian gentleman and an outstanding Member of this House.

JOHN RILEY brought to his work in the House of Representatives a background ranging from teaching to varied business interests. He used this experience to the Nation's advantage in his distinguished service on the House Committee on Appropriations, gaining a reputation as a knowledgeable and competent legislator.

All those who knew him respected and admired him for his ability and his devotion to public service. He worked constantly in behalf of his district, his party, and his Nation, never failing to offer his best to this service which meant so much to him.

Our Nation has lost a tireless worker in the cause of justice and freedom. The people of South Carolina's Second District have lost an able and influential representative. We, his colleagues, have lost a wise and trusted comrade and a good friend. I know I speak for us all when I offer to the Riley family our heartfelt sympathies for their loss, the loss of a kind and good man, and a great colleague and an outstanding American.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I join the South Carolina delegation in paying tribute to my good friend JOHN RILEY.

He was a man of many talents and contributed immeasurably to the work of the committee and the House, and he assisted in national defense to an extent few realized.

He died as he would have liked to die—dramatically in full possession of all his exceptional powers on his way back to participate in the opening of the session.

I once heard a very wise man say that no man was truly educated—regardless of how many degrees and academic honors he received—until he had taught himself. Certainly, judged by that criterion, JOHN RILEY was a learned and erudite man. He taught in the local schools and was a college professor. And most notable of all he taught the Boy Scouts—one of the greatest community services that can be rendered—in his post of the American Legion.

It will be difficult to fill his place on the committee. And it will be impossible to fill his place in the hearts of those who knew him.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as we begin a new session, we who served with him are saddened by the sudden death a few weeks ago of our valued friend, JOHN J. RILEY, of South Carolina.

JOHN RILEY for many years served with outstanding distinction the people of his district in the Halls of Congress. The sincere, dedicated service he rendered reflected great credit upon his family and his district.

JOHN RILEY intensely loved America. He showed this on many occasions, particularly as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, where he was a bulwark of strength in maintaining a powerful national defense, and on the domestic level in the field of public works in particular, many of which were directed to the national defense of our country.

We who served with him will always remember JOHN RILEY for his gentleness and his kindness, for he was always a gentleman. A legislator of determined spirit in the performance of his duties, but in connection with his fellow men he was humble, kind, and considerate. These qualities, and his nobility of character, endeared JOHN RILEY to all of his colleagues.

JOHN RILEY and I were close friends. I valued very much the friendship that existed between us. His service in this body and the nobleminded qualities JOHN RILEY possessed leave to his loved ones a great source of consolation in their bereavement.

I extend to Mrs. Riley and her son and daughter my deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, JOHN RILEY came here in the height of the depression. He took hold immediately with the work of this committee, and in the Committee on Appropriations he was devoted to his work. He was one of those Members who worked hard enough at the job so that he knew what they had been holding hearings on, and he took part in those hearings in a very intelligent and effective manner. He was the type of man who could not be bulldozed; he could not be led astray when he made up his mind as to what was the right thing to do. He was a quiet man, a gentleman; at the same time he had the absolute courage of his convictions and did a real good, effective job on the floor of the House. I wish to extend to Mrs. Riley and the family my sincere and deep sympathy.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in the tributes which have been paid to our former colleague, JOHN RILEY. It was my good fortune to serve with him many years ago on the Committee on Banking and Currency before he assumed his position on the Committee on Appropriations. He served on that committee at a difficult time during the war years, and immediately subsequent thereto, when legislation of great controversy was being considered. I, under those circumstances, got to know JOHN RILEY very well. He impressed me as being a man of great courage, a man of principle, to which he subscribed, and which he lived up to. He was also a reasonable man. This was a committee where one was subject to persuasion when he became acquainted with the economic facts which were presented to the committee. JOHN RILEY was a man who was open to reason and logical in his approach to problems. I think this House will miss his wise counsel and his devotion to duty, and I personally shall miss his warm friendship and affection. I, too, join in extending sympathies to his wife and to his family.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I join with the many friends of JOHN J. RILEY in expressing my sorrow at his untimely passing.

I subscribe to every tribute which has been paid him by the Members of the House and especially by the members of our Committee on Appropriations.

JOHN J. RILEY represented the finest as a gentleman and as a true statesman. He was kind, considerate, able, industrious, sincere, and courageous. The State of South Carolina suffered a great loss in the death of this outstanding Representative.

I join in expressing my sincere sympathy to the members of his family and his many friends.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO].

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from South Carolina in expressing sorrow in the passing of our colleague on the Committee on Appropriations, JOHN J. RILEY.

Mr. Speaker, I subscribe to the sentiments expressed by the Members of the House, especially those on the Appropriations Committee, in regard to his contributions to the welfare of our country and to the defense of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN J. RILEY was a gentleman. He was always pleasant and friendly. He truly represented the fine qualities of a gentleman and statesman.

Mr. Speaker, he has rendered a great service to his constituents, his State, and his Nation. The State of South Carolina has suffered a grevious loss in the death of this outstanding representative. Mr. Speaker, I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his wife and the members of his family and his many friends throughout the country.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in paying tribute to our departed colleague, JOHN RILEY. I express my sincere sympathy to my colleagues from South Carolina in this great loss which they have sustained, and which we share with them.

Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked and saddened when I learned of the untimely passing of JOHN RILEY. I had a high regard and great affection for him. It was a great privilege to have JOHN RILEY as a friend, and he always had a pleasant greeting when we met. He was an outstanding Member of this House, able, conscientious, sincere, and devoted to his duties.

The passing of JOHN RILEY is a great loss, not alone to his district and the State of South Carolina, but to the entire Nation. We need more men like him in public life today.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my deep personal sympathy to the widow and the other members of the family.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the deep sense of sorrow expressed by the South Carolina delegation over the death of our beloved colleague, Congressman John Riley, is shared by all who knew him or who came in contact with him.

Mr. Speaker, since I knew him intimately, the grief of his friends is my grief. I served with him on the Committee on Appropriations, and particularly the Subcommittee on Public Works. He was quiet, tremendously efficient, and tirelessly devoted to his committee work. He personified to the fullest and finest that symbol of cordiality and gentlemanness that is the hallmark of people from the South.

Mr. Speaker, he was an able legislator; he was a good and great man who has now passed from our midst. I know he has left an indelible impression upon this Chamber and the hearts and minds of all who knew him.

Mr. Speaker, I join with his colleagues from South Carolina and all the Members of this Congress in expressing my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I did not have the privilege of knowing Congressman John Jacob Riley very long or very intimately; however I recall so pleasantly his cordiality to me, a freshman Member of the House. He was eager to help and put at ease a new Member in every way. He was a fine and seasoned Representative, and I held him in very high regard. His presence will be missed in the House, and his many friends and colleagues will mourn his passing. As one who was the grateful recipient of his consistent kindness and cordiality, I should like to join in conveying to his family my deepest sympathy and regret over his passing.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Gary].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, John Riley was a noble soul. He made a great record in the Congress.

I had the privilege of serving with him on the Appropriations Committee, and I found him to be an exceptionally able and distinguished legislator. He possessed wisdom, judgment, and courage, which made him an outstanding Representative of his district, State, and Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I deem it a privilege to join the many friends of John Riley on the floor of the House today in paying to him the well-deserved tribute which has been voiced here and I extend to his family my heartfelt sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the passing of a colleague is always a sad occasion. At this time as we take note of the loss of John J. Riley I feel particularly moved because he was one of the finest gentlemen with whom it had been my pleasure to associate.

John J. Riley possessed the personal attributes which mark a man as a leader. He was of strong Christian character, outstanding ability, and dedicated to the fundamental principles which have made America strong. His quality of mind and his strength of character were recognized and appreciated by all who knew him. His quiet manner was attractive and pleasing but was never mistaken for weakness or lack of aggressiveness in his advocacy of the principles in which he believed.

Just a few weeks before his passing I was privileged to be with him in Columbia, S.C., where I had been invited to speak to one of the outstanding civic clubs. Our late colleague had come from his home in Sumter to be present at this meeting to introduce me to his friends and constituents with whom we were meeting. The graciousness of his welcome and the warmth of the reception which I received because of his presence at this gathering will be indelibly carved upon my memory. I shall always remember this occasion because it was the last opportunity that I had to spend some time with this great man whom I admired so much.

John Riley had served the people of his community, State, and Nation in many capacities. In each capacity he served them well. As a teacher and athletic coach in the public schools of South Carolina he made a great contribution to the young people who were privileged to receive his instruction. As a member of the U.S. Navy during World War I he made an outstanding record during time of military conflict. Following World War I and until his untimely passing he had been interested and active in veterans' affairs because of his desire to serve those with whom he had fought. His activity in the American Legion and the 40 & 8 brought many honors to him in recognition of his untiring interest in his fellow veterans. It was in the American Legion activities that he maintained a continuing interest in young people and because of this interest was one of the leading Legionnaires in South Carolina in promoting the American Legion junior baseball program.

John Riley served his community in other civic endeavors, including his work as president of the chamber of commerce of his city and of the Rotary Club of Sumter.

As a graduate of one of the outstanding educational institutions of the South, Wofford College, he reflected great credit upon that institution where he had earned his bachelor's and master's degrees. His interest in the advancement of the college continued throughout his life, and it is said that his service as president of the alumni association of the college was one of the brightest years that the association has enjoyed.

This wonderful man was also interested in the religious life of his community. His devotion to the affairs of his church, and to Christian activities generally, fully measured up to the outstanding performance that he gave to every worthwhile activity. His devotion to God was such that I know that as he experienced illness a few months ago he was able to have the feeling that he loved today and could face tomorrow unafraid.

Mr. Speaker, I have never known a more devoted family than we saw in the Riley family. His wonderful wife of 45 years, affectionately known as Miss Corinne, and the two fine children born of that union have sustained a great loss which evokes from each of us deepest sentiments of sympathy. However, the deep sense of loss which they must feel should be infinitesimal when compared to the great sense of pride which they must have in the life and works of their departed husband and father.

I express to the family and innumerable friends of our distinguished departed colleague, John J. Riley, the most profound sympathy of my family in the sad experience which they are now having.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Alexander].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to our departed friend, John Riley. John Riley was one of the finest gentlemen I have ever known. I knew John Riley before I ever came to this body. As a leader of the American Legion in North Carolina, I came in contact with my great friend, John Riley, there.

It should be stated, I think, that the American Legion Stadium in his home city of Sumter, S.C., was named for John Riley while he was still living—one of the highest tributes, I think, that can be paid to any man. To know John Riley was to love him. When I first came to the Congress, John Riley was one of the Members who impressed me as being most helpful to a new Member of this great body. John Riley possessed all of the great characteristics and that nobility of character that make a great man. He was humble, quiet, considerate, and wise. I had an office very near his in the New House Office Building and on many occasions would go and sit and talk with my good friend, John Riley, in regard to problems which we mutually had. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I came to know how courageous John Riley was. At all times, I never knew him to vote anything but his conviction on any issue regardless of the pressure that was brought to bear upon him. John Riley rendered great service, not only service to the youth of our land in the American Legion programs, but service to his community, to his State, and to the Nation. Certainly, I am going to miss him as our other colleagues have said they, too, will miss him. I join in all the tributes that have been made to him and to express to his wife and other members of his immediate family, my sincere grief at their great loss.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Hemphill].

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I join the dean of our delegation and our other colleagues here in paying tribute to a wonderful friend and a great South Carolinian, JOHN JACOB RILEY, a statesman, citizen, leader, and friend. I suppose we could use different phraseology to characterize his service and the magnificent impact of his life. I think of such words as dedicated—serious—tolerant—democratic—beloved—soul of integrity—learned. I could use many more; suffice it to say he was a Christian gentleman in every sense of the words.

JOHN RILEY never talked about his religion—he lived his religion. One had only to know him to know that he was a Christian and that Christian principles guided his life. He lived a life of love, which is the noblest of purposes and there come to my mind all the things that JOHN RILEY exhibited by the life he led—love for his God and for his country—love for his wonderful family—love and affection for his friends, love for his work, love for the youth with whom and for whom he worked so hard—love of sports of every kind—love of a fight and love of the right.

In business, JOHN RILEY was a successful businessman and, no doubt, had he continued in his business career instead of coming to the Congress of the United States, he could have accumulated great wealth and could have been one of the most successful businessmen in the State. Instead, he gave his time and his talent for his Nation, his State and its people. How fortunate we are that he was a man of such purpose and such integrity.

At his funeral in his hometown of Sumter, the great and the small gathered to pay tribute to him and to do honor to a great life and to a great and good man. The Governor and the Lieutenant Governor and other State officials were present. Four past Governors, including two U.S. Senators and our entire congressional delegation, as well as State legislative delegations from each of the counties he represented, were present. Townspeople and friends from far and near were there. They all came to do him honor because he had done honor and exemplified honor to all who knew him.

Mr. Speaker, a great and good man has walked among us. Let us all be thankful for his life and let us be grateful that we knew him.

I know he has passed from the vale of mortal life, but I like to think of him as living and existing among us because of the influence he had on the lives of all who knew him. I am reminded of a short poem by James Whitcomb Riley entitled "He Is Not Dead":

HE IS NOT DEAD

I cannot say, and I will not say
That he is dead. He is just away.
With a cheery smile, and a wave of the hand,
He has wandered into an unknown land,
And left us dreaming how very fair
It needs must be, since he lingers there.
And you—oh, you, who the wildest yearn
For an old-time step, and the glad return,
Think of him faring on, as dear
In the love of There as the love of Here.
Think of him still as the same, I say,
He is not dead—he is just away.

The world is a better place to live in because JOHN RILEY lived. May others like him rise to inspire succeeding generations.

To his beloved wife, who toiled nobly beside him here, and elsewhere, to his family he loved so much, to his legion of friends, our continuing sympathy.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to serve for many years with our colleague JOHN RILEY. I have never known a more devoted or conscientious public servant. He was interested in the welfare of his people and in the general welfare of the Nation. He was especially interested in the defense of our country and in the preservation of our liberties and traditions. His work on the Defense Sub-Committee on appropriations was outstanding. It was an honor and privilege to work on the same team with this great man, this Christian gentleman.

It was a great shock to all of us to lose JOHN RILEY. I join my colleagues in paying tribute to his memory and in expressing sympathy to Mrs. Riley and the other members of the family.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, JOHN RILEY was one of the very finest men that it has ever been my privilege to know. He was a true gentleman. In all the years that I knew JOHN RILEY, I cannot recall one instance where he lost his temper or was in the least bit impatient or irritable. He was remarkably balanced. His patience and consideration was radiated to those around him and those of us who knew him intimately. I will remember the time JOHN RILEY left a subcommittee meeting of the Appropriations Committee and came up to the floor of this House to ask me about a matter pertaining to my district. He said the subcommittee would follow his recommendation and he wanted to know how I felt and then he went immediately back to the waiting subcommittee. This was typical of the consideration, kindness, courtesy, and good manners exemplified by JOHN RILEY. He thought of others. His life was dedicated to others. From the time of his youth he was always doing things for the betterment of his community, county, State, and Nation.

JOHN RILEY worked quietly but effectively in the defense of our great country. He believed in a strong national defense. He believed that the best way to preserve peace and to prevent war was to be strong. He was truly a statesman who gave his country his utmost during a time of critical need. The whole Nation can be grateful for his stanch, unostentatious service on the great Appropriations Committee. Yes, indeed, the entire free world can be thankful for his successful efforts to make the United States truly the arsenal of democracy and the heart and core of freedom everywhere.

JOHN RILEY fought for States rights, local government, and individual liberty in the tradition of the early Founding Fathers of this Republic. JOHN RILEY had confidence in the citizen. He believed the citizen could govern best at the local and State level with a minimum of Federal interference. JOHN RILEY believed in a sound dollar, a balanced budget, and fiscal responsibility. The overwhelming majority of the people of South Carolina and of his congressional district stood behind him in his defense of those principles and ideals that made him great.

JOHN RILEY was a man of great moral character. His moral character and ideals were based and founded upon his devotion to Christianity. JOHN RILEY was a devout Christian. I feel that this House is a better House because JOHN RILEY served here. I know that I am a better American because I knew and associated with JOHN RILEY. He will be greatly missed but his spirit and example will live on in the lives of all of us.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in my deepest sympathy to his lovely widow and his two splendid, outstanding children.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the death of JOHN JACOB RILEY marks the passing of a true gentleman and effective legislator. His strict attention to his duties made him a most valuable Member of the Congress. He gave great strength to the South Carolina delegation and added prestige to the dignity of our body.

He was deeply interested as a veteran in veteran affairs. As a civic leader he spearheaded many programs at the local level.

He enjoyed the friendship of everyone and wielded great influence in party matters.

The people of the Nation and South Carolina have lost a loyal, patriotic and dedicated public servant. We have lost a revered colleague and friend. We of the Illinois delegation extend to his dear wife, Corinne and children, our heartfelt condolences.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, all of us who serve in the House were, I know, greatly distressed and shocked by the news of the passing of our good friend and colleague, the Honorable JOHN J. RILEY, of South Carolina.

I had grown to know and respect JOHN RILEY during my service with him on the Committee on Appropriations and more particularly through our service together on the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations. Those who have served with him on this subcommittee know of the long hours of hard and dedicated work which JOHN RILEY put in.

I can say from personal experience and observation that he was a most knowledgeable Member of the House, that he understood the problems faced by our Nation in preparing and building its defense forces against communism. He had a grasp of the immediate and pressing problems of each of the armed services which enabled him to penetrate below the surface and come at once to the heart of any problem under discussion.

Mr. RILEY began his adult career as a schoolteacher in his native South Carolina but this career was broken off by the advent of World War I. He served during that first world conflict in the U.S. Navy.

After the war Mr. Riley became a Sumter businessman and developed quickly into a leading figure in the business community of that city. He played a leading role, as well, in civic affairs and it was only natural for his fellow citizens to turn to him for election to the Congress.

Since coming to the Congress Mr. Riley had served without fanfare but with distinction and great dedication.

A good and fine man has been taken from our midst and the people of South Carolina and the Nation have lost a well-balanced, able and effective public servant. Those of us who have served with him here have lost a good friend.

Mrs. Weaver joins me in expressing our deep sympathy to his wife and family at their great and unexpected loss.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, having had the privilege of serving on the House Appropriations Committee with John J. Riley, of South Carolina, I am in a position to say most sincerely that no one ever served closely with him who did not have high regard and warm affection for him, and who was not impressed with the genuineness of his dedication to duty. His service to his district and State, and to our Nation was of enduring and outstanding quality. He will be greatly missed, not only in the Committee on Appropriations, but in the overall work and deliberations of the Congress.

I join with my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, in paying tribute to the memory of John Riley, a man of great devotion to his country and his constituency, who could not be swayed from his high ideals. My deepest sympathy goes to his family in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, it is always a sad occasion when a man of John Jacob Riley's stamp and purpose leaves us.

To those of us who had the privilege to work with and to affectionately know John Riley there is no replacement.

A perusal of his biography is enough to acquaint us with the fact that John's was the honest life, the useful life, the unselfish life, cleansed by devotion to an ideal.

John Riley came to Congress after an outstanding career in his own community. His work in his church, his fraternal life, and as head of boy's work in the Sumter Post of the American Legion is only part of his record, a legacy beyond price to those in his family he leaves here. I wish to join my colleagues in extending our sincere sympathies to Mrs. Riley, his son and his daughter.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, Hon. John J. Riley served in the 79th and 80th Congresses as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee. He was a diligent, capable, and hard-working member of that committee and he had the respect, the confidence and the friendship of all its members. We missed his fine service and his good judgment when he was subsequently assigned to the Committee on Appropriations on which committee he has been a distinguished and influential member for many years. John Riley was a genial, a kind, and clever gentleman. He was a devoted public servant. He had a high concept of his duty to his constituents, to his State, and to his country. He was held in respect and confidence by his constituents and I am confident he could have remained in Congress as long as he desired. It was a pleasure and a privilege to be associated with him. His many good qualities and faithful service will long remain as an inspiration to his colleagues.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in all that has been said about our deceased friend and colleague, the Hon. John Riley.

John was one of the most kindly gentleman I have ever known.

To know John Riley was to love and respect him. His soft-spoken manner was almost like music. He practiced being a friend to man. An able legislator, a patriotic American of the highest order. John Riley was indeed one of God's noblemen.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a sad experience to return to this second session of the 87th Congress to find that so many of our good and respected colleagues have been called to their eternal reward during the few months that we were away from these hallowed Halls.

Of all of those who have gone on to be numbered among the constituency of the blest I find that the loss of John Riley strikes closest to home since our friendship—and it was a warm one—dated back to almost the day that I came to Congress in 1947. Perhaps it was our close affiliation in the matter of conservative legislation that brought us together although I am inclined to believe that it was our late colleague's uniformly sunny disposition and unfailing gentlemanly conduct that drew me to him. In any event, he was a steady and sturdy defender of what he considered to be fair and equitable and I know from conversations with admiring constituents of his that they considered themselves most ably represented by this dedicated legislator.

In the extracurricular phase of our relationship we had a great deal in common through our active participation in the work of the American Legion. A veteran of the First World War, John Riley carried into his peacetime avocations the same devoted sense of duty that inpelled him throughout his tour of duty with the Navy and which marked that period as preparation for the congressional assignment just relinquished to answer that higher call that must come to all of us.

As we mourn the absence of this genial colleague and comrade from his accustomed place we shall also earnestly petition the Almighty, in whose presence he now stands, to undergird the members of this bereaved family with His everlasting arms.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has lost a very useful and valuable Member in the passing of John J. Riley, of South Carolina, and the fine people of his State and district have lost one who placed their welfare and the welfare of his country above his party.

John was gentle, kind and I had great admiration for his honesty, his sincerity and his utter lack of pretense. He had a charitable approach in all transactions with his colleagues and was a great American. We shall cherish his memory and permanently be conscious of his loss.

My heartfelt sympathy goes out to his wife, son, and daughter in this their greatest loss.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, it is in deep saddness that we today recognize the great loss this House has experienced in the passing of our colleague, the Honorable John Riley from South Carolina.

I treasured an acquaintance since I first became a Member of this legislative body. His quiet effective service is a model to all who would seek an example of one devoted to the service of his fellowman.

Mrs. McIntire joins with me in our deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked to learn of the passing of our dear friend and colleague John Riley, of South Carolina. His untimely death saddened and shocked me as it did everyone.

I deem it a great privilege to have known John Riley for many years, and I can say without reservation that I know of no Member of Congress who was more diligent or conscientious with respect to his duties in representing his district and his Nation than was John Riley.

Through his long service in the Congress and as a member of the Appropriations Committee John Riley made great contributions with respect to the legislation before his committee and before the Congress.

I have always had great admiration for John Riley. The House of Representatives has lost a stalwart Member.

I join all of my colleagues in expressing to his surviving family and friends my deepest sympathy and condolences.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, permit me to join with my colleagues from South Carolina and others in paying a brief but sincere tribute to my friend and colleague the late Honorable John J. Riley, whose untimely death was saddening to us all.

John Riley was a fine gentleman, a true friend, an able legislator, and one who served the people of his district and his home State of South Carolina with dedication and conviction. I was privileged to work with Congressman Riley on the Appropriations Committee for several years and found him to be a man of keen insight and determination.

He was a man of honor and one could always depend on his word. He was reliable, responsible, and trustworthy and served as a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee and of Congress. We shall all miss him.

Mr. Speaker, I extend an expression of sincere sympathy to Mrs. Riley and the members of his family.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has lost one of its most beloved and valuable Members in the passing of the Honorable John Riley, of South Carolina. Those of us who served on the Appropriations Committee with him know of his intense devotion to duty and his fine understanding of the problems of the

Government. Any Member who knew him was aware of the fine sense of ideals, the sterling character, and the wonderful disposition which caused him to be respected and admired by us all.

I join my colleagues in extending my sympathy to his family. Their sense of loss must be lighter realizing that it is shared by so many of us.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, John Riley was a quiet and courteous Member of the House who was highly respected by every Member. He rarely took the floor, but when he did speak, he was listened to because all the Members knew that he was speaking with great sincerity and from strong beliefs.

I think that John Riley's last speech on the floor was in behalf of the Peace Corps and the idealistic young men and women who make up its membership. I am sure that if he could have determined in advance what his last speech would be, it would have been one in support of hope and idealism for the future.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his widow on this sad occasion.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I join our colleagues from South Carolina and elsewhere in paying a tribute of respect to the memory of our departed friend, John J. Riley. The news of his untimely passing, just a few days before he and Mrs. Riley were to return to Washington for the new session of Congress, came as a profound shock. I had been looking forward to working with him again in the Committee on Appropriations, as we had worked together for nearly 10 years, and it is difficult for me to realize that we will not have the benefit of his judgment and wise counsel in the future.

Service on the Committee on Appropriations is a full-time job for any Member of Congress. Hearings begin early in the year and continue until nearly the end of every session. John Riley was a faithful attendant at committee sessions and always carried a full share of the work. This necessarily kept him from participating as actively as I am sure he would like to have done in the debates that transpired on the floor from day to day. It was only when he had something to say to his colleagues, or when some bill was under consideration in which he had a special interest, that he took the floor to share his views with the Members of the House. But whenever he did participate in debate, he was heard with interest and profit because he enjoyed the respect and confidence of the membership.

Our Nation can ill afford to lose men of his stature and ability and his passing from the earthly scene will be a great loss to the people of his district, to the State of South Carolina, and to our country.

Mrs. Jonas joins me in extending sincere condolences to Mrs. Riley in her loss of a kind, considerate, and devoted husband.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, the sorrow we experience in the passing of our friends is often difficult to endure. Such sorrow is measured by our affection for them, and when I learned that the Great Master had called our kindhearted, generous, distinguished, able and beloved colleague, John Riley, from his labors on this earth, I was stricken with sincere grief.

Every Member of this body loved John Riley, because he was above all else a Christian gentleman and a true and trustworthy friend. It is difficult for me to find appropriate words to express myself about one so beloved and respected, so devoted to the performance of his official duties, and so determined to serve his constituency and his fellow man. John Riley was a true nobleman, noble in thought, in purpose, and in action, and appreciated these qualities in other people. His conception of nobility has been clearly expressed in these words:

> Howe'er it be, it seems to me,
> 'Tis only noble to be good,
> Kind hearts are more than coronets,
> And simple faith than Norman blood.

I did not have the privilege of knowing John Riley, except by reputation, until I was sworn in as a Member of this body in June 1953. As the years passed I was drawn closer to him by ties of association and friendship. He was a man who gave the most careful thought and consideration to every piece of legislation. He received a real joy from the service he rendered his country. It was his sincere desire and purpose to cast an intelligent and conscientious vote on every occasion, and when he determined what was best for his country he was not to be deterred by pressure groups or any other self-seeking interest. He had the courage and the willpower to do what he believed to be best at all times, irrespective of political consequences.

This distinguished and patriotic South Carolinian served on the House Committee on Appropriations with outstanding ability for many years. John Riley was a sound and practical businessman whose judgment and wisdom were of incalculable value to his colleagues of the Committee on Appropriations and the entire House membership. His wise counsel and clear thinking no doubt saved large sums of money for the taxpayers of this country. He was temperate in all things, and never an extremist. He practiced this philosophy at all times and under all circumstances. He possessed many fine traits of character, but his absolute honesty and dependability endeared him to all men.

John Riley was not only a man experienced in the business world but he was also a former professor at Clemson College, South Carolina. It has been many years since he taught school but he never lost his love for young people. He was always an active Legionnaire and gave much of his time and talent to the American Legion junior baseball program. He had great success while in charge of this program in the State of South Carolina. It was near the end of the 1st session of the 87th Congress when this fine American made a great speech on the floor of the House in support of the Peace Corps. Many Members who felt impelled to vote against the creation of the Peace Corps were constrained to admit that his speech in behalf of the young men and women of this country was one of the strongest and most forceful arguments made during the first session of this Congress. His remarks were convincing because they gave sincere expression to his abiding faith in America's young men and women.

As a father, teacher, businessman, legislator, and Christian gentleman, John Riley had a tremendous influence on people in all walks of life. His family and loved ones can take solace in the fact that he died in the service of his country and that he was one of those—

> Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
> Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
> Men who possess opinions, and a will;
> Men who have honor, who will not lie.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened to join in the eulogies for our distinguished friend, the late gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. Riley, who passed away early this month. I had the privilege of serving with John Riley on the Committee on Appropriations for a number of years and found him to be a fine gentleman, a great American, and a highly competent legislator.

I know we all will miss John Riley. His fine widow, his daughter, and his son have my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, for almost 5 years as a Member of Congress, I was privileged to have across the hall from me a gentleman, a man of honor and of integrity.

Now that gentleman, the Honorable John Jacob Riley, of South Carolina, is no longer with us. Death has come to him, as it must to all of us.

Congressman Riley will be sorely missed. I am certain that his native State of South Carolina, which he loved so dearly, will particularly feel the loss of one who dedicated his life to making its cities, its towns, its countryside a better place in which to live.

The good neighbor policy is one which too often is easy to achieve at a distance, but difficult to achieve at short range. But Congressman Riley showed me and my staff what it means to be a good neighbor, a gracious neighbor, one who was willing to answer a question, fill a request, lend a helping hand cheerfully, efficiently, and then take the extra step of doing a little more than was necessary to make life a little better for those who first were getting their feet wet in Washington.

He was a man I was proud to know, one who performed his duties quietly and without fanfare. He had profound concern for his fellow human beings, and he turned this concern into positive action for betterment in his own community and his own State.

Few will come close to his compassion for his fellow man. In the House of Representatives where words are spoken which would be better left unsaid, where tempers have a habit of rising in the heat of debate and consideration, Congressman Riley had the ability to remain calm and cool, to demonstrate southern hospitality at its best to his fellow Members of the House of Representatives.

Congressman Riley was a good neighbor in every sense of the word. His door was always open to any and all who wanted to see him. He could disagree sharply on issues, but he always left you smiling after you had seen him. He was willing to do anything in his power for another human being, no matter what his station in life, no matter how difficult or complex his problem might be.

I cannot help feeling that if there were more Congressmen Rileys in this world, that many of the things we now regard as major problems would simply dissolve. He had the perspective to realize that charity does begin at home, not in just the dollars-and-cents sense of giving, but in the ability to give of oneself to another human being of his understanding and his wisdom.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was in my office when, chancing to look out of the window, I noticed the flag at half-mast. We all have had that experience, and when we are telephoning for information there runs through our minds the thought of whom of our colleagues has gone beyond the human realm. When I learned that the flag at half-mast was a tribute to the memory of John Riley there fell upon me a sense of deep personal grief.

My colleague came from South Carolina and I from Illinois. We had never served on the same committee and in the discharge of our respective legislative duties our paths had seldom crossed. Yet, I felt for John Riley a deep personal affection. To me he personified in the highest measure, sweetness and gentleness. I cannot imagine that ever in his life he was guilty of an unkind act or that ever a word passed through his lips that was not sweetened with compassion and human understanding.

Once I had gone to see John Riley. I had received a letter from one of the Democratic ward committeemen in my district, the Honorable Claude W. B. Holman, alderman in the City Council of Chicago as well as committeeman for the fourth ward, who was interested in the doing of some small service to one who resided in Congressman Riley's district. I can never forget that 10 or 15 minutes in John Riley's office. He received me as one brother would receive another. It was not a large matter, merely one of those times in the lives of all of us when we need an understanding and a friendly hand, and that hand John Riley extended.

John Riley was deep in my heart, and in his gentleness and in his sweetness I envisioned a man seeking while on earth to walk with his God.

My district is far in the north and the district that John Riley so ably and so conscientiously represented is far in the Southland, but I would say to the members of his family, to whom humbly but most sincerely I extend my sympathy, that the grief of the Second District of South Carolina is shared in the Second District of Illinois. His life glorified the attributes of nobility that are the common heritage of all Americans, north and south, east and west.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the late beloved gentleman from South Carolina, John Riley. He was indeed a very fine gentleman—quiet and reserved—but a deep thinker. We served on the Appropriations Committee together for many years. He was a loyal public servant. Just to be left with the pleasant and cherished memories of John Riley, makes any man's life richer and fuller.

My deep heartfelt sympathy is extended to his good wife and children in their bereavement.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly saddened to learn of the death of my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina, John J. Riley. Ever since he first came to Congress we seemed to hit it off together, and when he served on the Banking and Currency Committee we became close friends. He was one of the greatest men I have known, quiet but extremely sound and patriotic. I shall miss him and extend my deepest sympathy to his loved ones.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, we of the Appropriations Committee knew and respected the outstanding qualifications of John Riley by his day-to-day work. We had the privilege and pleasure of working with our distinguished colleague through many years. His level head, his common honesty, and his sterling character endeared him to all of us. His advice and clear thinking enabled this country to build our present national defense strength which the whole Nation now enjoys and stands secure.

His worth to the Nation and his great district was immeasurable. The imprint he made on the membership of the Congress will long endure. I join his family and host of friends and membership of the Congress in mourning his passing.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, share the loss of my colleagues in the passing of our beloved friend and colleague, John Jacob Riley. I know this man is mourned by all who were privileged to know him. He was a man of Christian character, strong religious principles, and compassion for his fellow man.

With his passing, South Carolina has lost one of her noblest sons, the United States has lost one of her greatest citizens and servants, and we of the Congress have lost one of our most respected and most effective legislators.

John Riley loved our country and the institutions which have made us a great Nation. He fought diligently to protect our constitutional Government and to preserve our States rights.

Special tribute should be paid to the friendship he gave to new Members of the Congress for he was a personal friend and counselor to the inexperienced. I am deeply indebted to him for the many kindnesses and courtesies he extended to me since my own arrival in the Congress in 1952. I highly valued his friendship, I respected his convictions, and I admired his dedication to sound principles of government. I shall miss him.

To his widow, his daughter, and his son, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our departed friend, the Honorable John J. Riley, of South Carolina. After becoming a Member of Congress 9 years ago, it was natural for me to feel a kinship with all of my colleagues from South Carolina, since my father was a native of that great State, and in my youth I had visited there at his old home area around Florence.

John Riley was typical of a true southern gentleman. He was able: effective in a quiet, dignified manner; gracious and attentive to the many duties that were his. He was one of the most friendly men I have ever known, and was never too busy to talk with one and to give encouragement to those seeking his advice and help.

We shall miss our dear friend, John Riley, and I wish to extend to his loved ones my heartfelt expression of deepest sympathy and to pray that the blessings of divine providence may be with them, and guide and sustain them.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, those who established our cherished liberty and our Government have long been gone from the scene of their labors. The great trust has descended to us through countless hands. Some of these hands—Members of this House and this generation's keepers of the trust—are almost daily dropping from among us.

One of those who carried his share of this burden stanchly and well was my good friend, the late House Member, John J. Riley, from South Carolina's Second District. On January 2, at the age of 66, he was fatally stricken by a heart attack.

As longevity is reckoned today, John Riley should have been with us for many more productive years. But who can tell when the sands of time shall run out for any man? It is hard for his family, friends, and colleagues to accept the fact of John Riley's passing. But I think John would like us to consider these words of Plutarch in our remembrance here today:

> The measure of a man's life is the well spending of it, and not the length.

I know that John Riley subscribed to this philosophy, for he lived it fully in the span of his allotted years.

John Riley served eight terms in Congress. He was first elected to the 79th Congress in 1945 to succeed the late H. P. Fulmer. He was a conservative in the best tradition of southern Democrats. He wanted a strong country which will endure. He wanted a balanced budget. He wanted a nation which will lead wisely and well. He wanted to contribute to the making of these and he did so in full measure.

John Riley possessed a full measure of humility, described by Tennyson as "the highest virtue, mother of them all." He brought to this House a forthright spirit and what Virgil called "the noblest motive * * * the public good." As a teacher in the public schools of Orangeburg, S.C., and at Clemson College, he epitomized the criterion of a scholar's utility described by Coleridge as "the number and value of the truths he has circulated, and the minds he has awakened." The deliberations of this House and the committees on which he served have often benefited from his judicious and scholarly contributions. No wide-eyed dreamer was he. His experience and success in real estate and the building and loan business gave him a knowledgeable and practical approach to this

Nation's economic and social problems. His dedication and espousal of an adequate military posture for this country was forged in the crucible of World War I in which he served in the U.S. Navy.

We shall miss John Riley's loyal friendship, his wise counsel, his many personal kindnesses, his clear vision and vigorous support of the great institutions, interests, and traditions of America. I shall mourn this good man, for I was close to him and I knew him for the sterling qualities that he possessed. He was sound. He was strong. He was good for the Nation. I share the grief which is felt in overwhelming measure by his widow and family.

Mr. McMILLAN. I wish to thank all the Members for their contributions paying tribute to this great and just friend.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of our late colleague, and that those who have spoken may revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McMILLAN. Do I understand that the statement sent over by Senator Thurmond cannot go in the Record?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It cannot be done in this body; it will have to be done in the other body.

THE LATE HONORABLE STYLES BRIDGES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Merrow].

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, the Nation was shocked and saddened to learn of the untimely passing of Senator Styles Bridges last November. My own State of New Hampshire and the entire country have suffered a tremendous loss. Senator Bridges served in the U.S. Senate continuously from 1937 to the time of his death.

Prior to his election to the Senate, Senator Bridges was Governor of New Hampshire during 1935 and 1936. In 1936, he was elected to the Senate and was reelected for his fifth term on November 8, 1960. This period of service spreading over a quarter of a century is a monument to his memory of which we are all proud. During the 2d session of the 82d Congress he was the Republican leader in the Senate, and was President pro tempore of the U.S. Senate during the 83d Congress. He was chairman of the Appropriations Committee during the 80th and 83d Congresses and was a ranking Republican member on the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Senator Bridges served on many committees and was chairman of the Republican policy committee in the Senate. With all of these important assignments, his influence was extensive, constructive, and most helpful to the Nation. During his 25 years of service, he made an imperishable record as a leader and statesman.

The career of Senator Bridges is without parallel. The Nation is proud of his great contribution to our national life during some of the most trying and difficult years in our history. Through the Senator's efforts, our Nation has been greatly strengthened and his leadership had a telling impact in the formulation of national policy.

Senator Bridges was a man of great courage and deep understanding. His accomplishments were possible because of his extraordinary ability and because of his undying devotion to the many tasks confronting him. His work will stand as a telling testimony to the many contributions which he made to our national welfare.

Senator Bridges was much beloved by his host of friends throughout the country. My friendship with Senator Bridges over the years was a most enriching experience and I am happy to have had the opportunity of having served with him in the Congress of the United States. In his passing, I, as many others, have suffered a deep personal loss. I join with his multitude of friends throughout the Nation in extending to the members of his family deep and heartfelt sympathy. He will always be remembered as a great American, a most able leader and statesman with a deep and abiding concern for the welfare of his State and country which he served so unselfishly with marked distinction.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from New Hampshire in paying tribute to the late Senator Bridges of New Hampshire. The State of Maine shares with New Hampshire pride in this great citizen and his distinguished career in the service of his country.

Senator Bridges was born in a community in the Third Congressional District of the State of Maine. I have always cherished his friendship. I knew his brother, the late Ronald Bridges, very well. It has been my privilege also to be personally acquainted with his sister, Doris Bridges, as well as his mother. Through this acquaintanceship with the family I am conversant with the Senator's background, and with his hard work and devotion as a very, very young man carrying the burdens as the man of the house after losing his father.

He made a great effort to acquire an education. He was graduated from the University of Maine and served in the Agricultural Extension Service in the County of Hancock, Maine, which is also in the Third District.

From this assignment he went to New Hampshire, where he distinguished himself in the service of that great State.

Surely the State of his birth, his adopted State of New Hampshire, and our country at large, have had great leadership in this distinguished man.

I join with my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to him and in expressing to Mrs. Bridges, his mother, and his sister our deep sympathies.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of Senator Styles Bridges takes from our midst a great American and an outstanding legislator. He was also my close, personal friend—a friendship that I valued very much. I attended his funeral services, and on that occasion the distinguished minority leader of the other branch and I delivered eulogies on our dear friend, Styles Bridges.

Mr. Speaker, Styles Bridges stood for strength and national defense. He stood for a firm foreign policy. He was a bulwark of strength during his years of service in the Halls of Congress during this trying period of the world's history. His contributions were many. His memory will long remain. As I said on the occasion of his general services, he was not only a great man, but a good man. The light from the candle of life of a good person shines on for a long while. The light from the candle of life of a great man and a good man, such as Styles Bridges was, never dies. On that occasion I met his dear mother, a sweet lady. She and Styles Bridges' wife bore their great loss in a sweet, religious philosophical manner.

To Mrs. Bridges, the wife, and to Mrs. Bridges, the mother, and to the other loved ones left behind I extend my deep and profound sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Barry].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to add my tribute to the late Senator Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire. It was my privilege to know him long before I became a Member of this body. I would like to place in the Record the fact that in the 79th Congress Senator Bridges was the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services and also of the Committee on Appropriations and the second ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. When the 80th Congress convened, a Republican-controlled Congress, it was necessary for him to drop one of these committees. He dropped the committee on which he was second in rank, the Committee on Foreign Relations. Soon thereafter the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the great Senator from Michigan, Arthur Vandenberg, died. His death was followed by a deterioration in the bipartisan foreign policy which he had done so much to create. Then-President Harry Truman called in the senior ranking Republican of the U.S. Senate with the request that he do everything in his power to re-create a bipartisan foreign policy approach. Having resigned prior to that time from the Committee on Foreign Relations he was not in a position to do then what he so wanted to do and what the President of the United States thought was in the best interests of the Nation. Nevertheless, he did me the honor of asking me to come down to the

Senate and act as liaison with the White House in re-creating bipartisan foreign policy. In the meeting with John Foster Dulles, who was then serving Dean Acheson, and as a result of meetings in the Senate, it was finally determined that the job of re-creating bipartisan foreign policy could not rest on the shoulders of a man who was not a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I say this with a degree of sadness because, in looking back, it seems to me that this was the one thing he most wished to do. Nonetheless, he went on to contribute as much as he could toward building bipartisan foreign policy. Often he would say to those of us who knew him that he was the first "Republican internationalist Senator."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the well-chosen words spoken here today paying high tribute to a valiant servant of the Nation, Senator Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the death of the great Senator from the State of New Hampshire, Styles Bridges, was a severe blow to the cause of republicanism. His brilliant and spirited defense of party principle and policy marked him as a leader in all of its activities.

His strength of purpose in unifying the loyal opposition of his party in the Senate contributed much to shaping public opinion in its understanding of the Republican stand on important issues.

His great loss can best be measured by the greatness of his advocacy of strict conservatism in the handling of our foreign policy.

This great leader will be difficult to replace.

He was an honorable and dedicated public servant.

We, the members of the Illinois delegation, extend our heartfelt condolences to his loving wife, Doloris, and family. The Nation has lost a great leader and the State of New Hampshire one of its most noble sons.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly shocked and saddened when I learned of the untimely passing of Senator Bridges. I considered him one of the outstanding statesmen of our time, and his passing is an irreparable loss to our Nation.

I first met Senator Bridges early in 1940, before I came to Congress. I was Republican State chairman of Colorado at that time, and he was a candidate for the Republican nomination for President. He came to Colorado in his campaign for the nomination and I was happy to arrange several meetings for him. I found him a very gracious and affable person, and our association developed into a fine friendship, which has continued over the years. While Senator Bridges was unsuccessful in obtaining the nomination in 1940, he did make many friends in Colorado and had some support from Colorado in the convention.

I was a great admirer of Senator Bridges, and always enjoyed a visit with him. His passing comes at a most unfortunate time and just when he was needed the most. His long experience in legislative affairs will be sadly missed in the days ahead.

Mrs. Chenoweth joins me in extending our sincere sympathy to Mrs. Bridges and the other members of the family.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the entire world was saddened by the passing of the late Styles Bridges of New Hampshire. I had the privilege and pleasure of working with Senator Bridges on several occasions when we had mutual problems. I always considered Senator Bridges a sound thinker and one of the Nation's ablest legislators.

The State of New Hampshire and the Nation have suffered a great loss in the passing of Senator Bridges. He was a tower of strength in the U.S. Senate and it is my sincere opinion that the world would be in further financial difficulty today if it had not been for the good work of Senator Bridges and a number of other Senators who have the same philosophy of sound government as the late Senator Bridges expressed during his entire term of service in the U.S. Senate.

I shall miss him as a friend. I had the pleasure and privilege of visiting in his home soon after I first became a Member of Congress and also had lunch with him in the Senate only a few weeks before the 1st session of the 87th Congress adjourned. The late Senator Bridges believed in a solvent government and believed in preserving the provisions of the Constitution.

My deepest sympathy goes out to Mrs. Bridges and her entire family.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest men it was ever my privilege to know in the membership of the other body was the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire, the Honorable Styles Bridges. I came to know Styles quite well as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and sat with him at the conference table in the conferences between the House and the Senate on innumerable occasions.

The State of New Hampshire has lost one of its finest public servants, and the people of this country one of its most capable and fair legislators. His lovely widow, Doloris, has suffered a great loss in the passing of my friend, Styles Bridges.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, just as the Congress was about to assemble again, Styles Bridges, who had been ill, and had quite a bit of hospitalization and confinement to his home, passed away.

He had been in the Senate for 24 years and had been right along one of its most distinguished Members. It had been my privilege to work with him on appropriations bills, and in the conferences between the House and the Senate to frame the most critical bits of appropriation language for a large number of years. I have known him to come into a conference where the conferees were all at swords' points, and to bring about an agreement practically on his own. This made him one of the ablest and most forceful men in the Senate, and for many years he was in that position.

I doubt if there will be anyone to take his place so effectively and so strongly as Styles Bridges. I wish to extend to his widow and his mother and the rest of his family my sincerest and deepest sympathy.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in tribute to the late Senator Bridges of New Hampshire.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

FUND FREEZING WOULD JEOPARDIZE SHIP CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, according to persistent reports circulating throughout the shipbuilding industry, the Bureau of the Budget is considering the freezing of ship construction funds previously appropriated for the balance of fiscal 1962. This would delay the award of construction contracts for 18 ships scheduled for bid during this period.

Both labor and management in the ship construction industry are very much disturbed with regard to these persistent reports, because if true they would adversely affect the livelihood of 10,000 families presently engaged in shipbuilding and ship repair on the Pacific coast of the United States alone.

To my personal knowledge, several Members of Congress, as well as representatives of labor and management in the shipbuilding industry, have written both the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Commerce, requesting a verification or denial of these rumors. Without exception, the answers received have been vague which certainly lends credence to the reliability of the report.

It will be recalled, Mr. Speaker, that Congress and the executive branch of the Government in 1957 embarked on a long-range fleet replacement program for the purpose of replacing obsolete World War II ships at a minimum rate of 30 ships a year. As a result of this program, thousands of families, many related small businesses, and numerous large shipbuilding yards have made heavy financial commitments which are in serious jeopardy unless this program goes forward on the basis of the minimum schedule of 30 ships a year.

Further evidence as to the reliability of the report is a published "revised bid dates" which appeared in the "Weekly Outlook Letter" for January 6, 1962, published by Simon Boardman Publishing Corp., and attributed to the Federal Maritime Administration. As a result of these revised dates, the bid opening for a total of 18 ships has been delayed approximately 3 months in each instance, with the new contract award dates all falling beyond July 1, 1962, and well into fiscal 1963.

Unless these 18 ships are rescheduled back to the original timetable, only 7 ships will be contracted for in fiscal 1962 as against 31 in the previous fiscal year. Obviously, there is serious concern over the work gap of approximately 6 months which would be devastating to the economy of the entire industry.

With increased emphasis on the buildup of our military posture and with the American merchant marine admittedly our fourth arm of defense, it is inconceivable to me that any such action by the Administration is contemplated. Nevertheless, if the rumor is correct, then it is logical that the Administration will request no funds whatsoever for shipbuilding in fiscal 1963. In other words, the 6-month work gap and the freezing of $120 million of the 1962 appropriations would make this amount available in fiscal 1963. That is to say no extra funds would be requested for fiscal 1963 to make up for the 6-month contract moratorium in 1962.

With the President's budget message scheduled for Thursday of this week, I take this occasion to point up the urgency of sufficient funds in the budget to maintain the fleet replacement program with a minimum construction of 30 ships per year, as was agreed upon in 1957. In this connection, I would hope that necessary steps will be immediately undertaken which would permit the Maritime Administration to reinstate contract award dates for the 18 ships previously mentioned as originally scheduled. If this is not done, it will result in wide-scale unemployment and chaotic conditions generally within the entire shipbuilding industry.

THE UNITED STATES MUST NOT SLOW DOWN ITS SHIP REPLACEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly], for bringing to the attention of the House the rumored slowdown in our ship replacement program. It is a matter of great concern to all of us who are convinced that our Nation must have a merchant marine adequate to meet our needs in times of both war and peace. That view has been shared by our military authorities who have termed our domestic fleet the "fourth arm of defense." It is the basic policy of the 1936 Merchant Marine Act which has been supported by Congress throughout the years. That policy of national defense has included the need for maintaining shipyards on all coasts staffed by skilled shipbuilders. A slowdown of our ship replacement program would run contrary to our basic policy. It would also be damaging to our economy.

About 4 years ago the Maritime Administration announced the beginning of a ship replacement program which was designed to replace about 300 ships of our domestic fleet. The program involved the expenditure of approximately $3.5 billion in new ship construction of which the Government and the shipping industry would share in the costs. The program envisioned the construction of 30 ships per year over a period of 10 years, thus replacing our war-built ships which are rapidly becoming obsolescent and incapable of competing successfully with the modern vessels being constructed by foreign nations.

Some time after the program was announced, the Maritime Administration decided that it would stretch out the construction work over a period of 12 to 14 years. The yearly number of ships to be built would then be reduced from 30 ships to about 20 to 25 ships.

But in the first year of construction, the Budget asked funds only for 14 ships and Congress appropriated money only for that number. The same was true in the following year. The next year—fiscal year 1962—funds for 18 ships were appropriated.

Now we are reliably informed that some ship construction contract dates have been extended so that only seven ships will be constructed in fiscal 1962. If this action reflects a new ship construction policy of the Maritime Administrator, then not only we who are concerned about maintaining our merchant marine are disturbed, but so are our shipyards who have not had sufficient work even under the first few years of the replacement program.

If we do not replace our old ships at a faster rate than 7, or even 14, ships per year, many of the vessels of our domestic fleet will be ready for the graveyard before they are replaced at all. And the United States will soon find itself in the same position it was prior to World Wars I and II when it did not have sufficient ships to meet the needs of either war or our commerce. We paid dearly for that unpreparedness. One would think that we had learned our lesson, but apparently we have not.

Unless we speed up our ship replacement program to 20 or more ships per year, several of the Nation's shipyards must close. Thousands of shipyard workers will be thrown out of jobs. They must of necessity find employment elsewhere. Their shipbuilding skills will be lost to the industry, for they will be reluctant ever again to return to shipbuilding with its uncertainties and its peaks and valleys experience of employment.

I sincerely trust that the Administration will not abandon the policy of the Merchant Marine Act. The maritime nations of the world know from experience the value of an adequate merchant marine. The Russians learned from the experiences of World War II and are now engaged in an extensive shipbuilding program. If they proceed as rapidly in the last 5 years of their 7-year program as they did in the first 2 they will have the largest merchant marine in the world, and could eventually control the commerce of the seas. We cannot permit that to happen not only in the interests of our national defense but in the interests of our international trade. History has taught us that we cannot depend upon the ships of foreign nations to carry our cargoes either in times of peace or war.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY SPEAKS DIFFERENTLY THAN CANDIDATE KENNEDY

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, a remarkable change has occurred in the outlook of our former colleague who addressed us last Thursday.

In 1960 while campaigning for the highest office in the land, he proclaimed that the Reciprocal Trade Act was a sound policy that could be used to expand trade and protect domestic industry if we had a bold new President who was willing to do the job.

I assumed that he referred to himself.

Last Thursday, he informed us that the Reciprocal Trade Act is outmoded and "we need a new law—a wholly new approach—a bold new instrument of American trade policy."

Is it possible then, that we did not get a bold new President, and that his reference was to the former Vice President?

This is not the reason given for requiring a new approach, however. Instead, he refers to the European Common Market as the great challenge that requires new legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing new about the Common Market. It was formed in Rome in 1957 and its phenomenal success as a European protectionist organization was just as obvious a year ago as it is today.

How then do we explain the difference between the statement of last Thursday and the remarks of Senator John F. Kennedy at New York City on October 12, 1960, when he said:

> I believe that we can protect our domestic industry within present laws, with Presidential leadership, with a knowledge of the problem, with effective workings between the President and the State Department and countries abroad, and with the provisions in the present reciprocal trade laws if vigorously, effectively, and responsibly administered.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE U.S. SENATOR STYLES BRIDGES OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Bass] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to a great man such as my late colleague from New Hampshire Styles Bridges is a difficult task. To pay proper tribute to my good friend of many years is a more difficult task. A close friend of the Bass family since he first served as my father's secretary in the early 1920's, the death of Senator BRIDGES is for me a very personal loss.

His death has been a severe shock to the people of my home State of New Hampshire. They knew him as a sincere and loyal friend, constantly working in the best interests of the State. He was steadfast and firmly committed to his beliefs, yet always possessive of human understanding.

In 1934, STYLES BRIDGES was elected Governor of New Hampshire, the youngest in the Nation at the age of 36. Two years later he was elected to the U.S. Senate. He was reelected to his fifth term in November 1960.

During his first year in the Senate, he was mentioned as a possible vice-presidential candidate with Alf Landon, and later as a possible presidential nominee. His leadership in the Senate has been impressive—Republican leader, 82d Congress; President pro tempore, 83d Congress; chairman of the Appropriations Committee during the 80th and 83d Congresses. During this past session, he was ranking Republican member of the Appropriations Committee, member of the Armed Services and Space Committees, and chairman of the Republican Policy Committee.

The Nation has lost a great patriot. Ever striving to preserve the American way, STYLES BRIDGES expended his energies with equal fervor whether as a legislator or as one of the foremost leaders of the Republican Party. I have campaigned with STYLES and worked with him as a member of the New Hampshire delegation for 7 years. I was personally aware of his untiring efforts for the people he served.

STYLES BRIDGES will be sorely missed on Capitol Hill, in the Nation and in New Hampshire. The United States has lost an outstanding American citizen. To his family, Mrs. Bass and I convey our deepest sympathy.

CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, all during the last congressional session, I joined my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in urging the creation of a special House Committee on Captive Nations. Unfortunately, the obstructionism of the State Department was largely responsible for the failure to approve one of the numerous resolutions that were introduced in the House by Members of both political parties. I am hopeful now that during this session of Congress one of the resolutions will be approved by the Rules Committee for discussion on the floor in order that we may proceed with the organization of this vitally important committee.

One of the basic weaknesses of the Soviet Union is the discontent of the peoples of the so-called satellite nations and the discontent of the non-Russian peoples within the Soviet Union itself. Recent events in Albania indicate the great amount of unrest that exists even within the Communist Party proper.

As I have indicated previously on many occasions, Mr. Speaker, through the creation of this important committee we can accumulate truth and facts pertaining to the enslaved conditions of the subjugated nations within the Soviet Union and those classified as satellites. We can thoroughly expose the slave conditions within the Soviet Union and thus generate a tremendous counteroffensive for the free world.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the creation of this special House Committee on Captive Nations at this particular time would serve in a most effective manner to combat Red propaganda concerning Western imperialism and would be a most vigorous instrument which is badly needed to strengthen considerably our foreign policy.

It is generally known that the letter sent by Secretary of State Rusk to the able chairman of the Rules Committee befogged the issues upon which the proposal for a Special House Committee on Captive Nations rests. It unnecessarily delayed favorable consideration of the many resolutions pending in that committee on this vital measure. What is not widely appreciated at this time is the glaring fact that much of the content of the Secretary's letter last August has been contradicted by the stand expressed in Ambassador Stevenson's letter in the United Nations last November. In sharp contrast to the Rusk letter, the Stevenson communication of November 25 to the President of the United Nations Assembly attacks Moscow's colonialism both within and outside the Soviet Union, emphasizes the independence and freedom aspirations of numerous captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union, and calls for a concentration of American and world attention on Moscow's colonial empire.

My intention at this time is not to stress these contradictions. It is, instead, to show again the utter necessity for the formation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations, a necessity reinforced by these contradictions. We have maintained right along that such a committee would serve not only the interests of the American people but also those of our executive departments.

Mr. Speaker, in urging an early reconsideration of this basic measure by the Rules Committee, I believe it is fitting to present again the statement of policy issued on this proposal by the Republican policy committee of the House of Representatives:

STATEMENT OF POLICY

The Republican policy committee of the House of Representatives urges the adoption of House Resolution 267 providing for the creation of a bipartisan congressional committee to be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

1. The primary issue of our times is the struggle between atheistic, totalitarian, imperialist Communist slavery and the libertarian governments of the free world.

2. The nature of this struggle is primarily psychopolitical and the Soviet Union depends heavily upon propaganda as it wages its campaign of subversion and aggression. This propaganda is based upon the demonstrably false promise that world communism seeks to liberate the peoples of developing nations from colonialism and imperialism.

3. This fallacious promise can be effectively countered by the assembling and forthright utilization of all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, mainland China, Cossackia, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Idel-Ural, Latvia, Lithuania, North Korea, North Vietnam, Poland, Rumania, Tibet, Turkestan, Ukraine, White Ruthenia, and other subjugated nations.

4. The Soviet Union has displayed to all the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in its brutal suppression of the people of these captive nations.

5. The captive nations constitute a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by the Soviet and Chinese Reds as well as a positive means for the advancement of world freedom in this psychopolitical struggle.

6. The President and the Department of State will draw needed strength in this struggle from a continuing exposé of Soviet imperialism.

Events of the past several months have already substantiated the validity of this statement. Moreover, as further indications of the persistent interest in the captive nations and in a Special House Committee on Captive Nations, I insert the following material to be appended to my remarks: An editorial on "Hungary's Victory for Freedom" in the November 13, 1961, issue of the Miami Herald:

HUNGARY'S VICTORY FOR FREEDOM

We were surprised to receive a booklet calling the "Hungarian Revolution" 5 years ago this month "the greatest victory which the free world has known since the Berlin airlift."

It seemed a disaster at the time. Two hundred thousand Soviet troops with 2,500 tanks and armored cars rolled like a juggernaut over the bodies of freedom fighters. The young rebels trying to cast off the Red yoke fought gallantly but hopelessly with rocks and home-made Molotov cocktails.

Then nearly 200,000 Hungarians risked their lives to escape from their native land. Almost 40,000 of them found asylum in the United States.

Other thousands were deported as the Soviets clamped their manacles tight again on the prostrate nation.

Moscow ignored 12 resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly condemning these acts. The Soviet slavemasters wouldn't even admit U.N. observers to Hungary. Their Chinese henchman, Chou En-lai, later boasted that "the noise subsided slowly."

Why is Hungary's 1956 revolution now called a victory?

We shall cite the reasoning in a manifesto for the fifth anniversary published by the American Friends of the Captive Nations:

The freedom fighters, many of them boys in their teens, forced the Red army to withdraw from Hungary. They were not defeated by the Soviet soldiers who had been policing them since 1948. The Kremlin discovered it could not rely on those men or on the puppet Hungarian army, which defected wholesale to the revolution.

"Khrushchev's worst fear is of another Hungary which, this time, might spread to other captive countries. His primary aim is to convince the world that the Communist empire is stable, and that Hungary can never recur.

"But he is wrong. The situation in Eastern Europe is not stable. It is not stable in East Germany, as last summer's stampede of refugees to West Berlin showed.

"It is because of the instability of his empire that Khrushchev must act. He must either advance or retreat; he cannot stand still. Therefore, if he cannot advance his aims in East Germany and Berlin, he ultimately will be forced to retreat—and retreat not only from East Germany, but from the other captive nations as well * * *

"That's why, on the fifth anniversary of the Hungarian revolution, we, the undersigned, urge our governments to stand proudly by their commitments to the free people of West Berlin and never to retreat."

Signers of the manifesto number 48 well known persons such as Novelist Thornton Wilder, Symphony Conductor Bruno Walter and six U.S. Senators from both parties. We think they have a point about the "victory" in Hungary in 1956.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Van Pelt (at the request of Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin) on account of death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Flood, for 1 hour, on Monday, January 22, 1962, on the subject of Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. Flood, for 1 hour, on February 15, 1962, on Lithuanian Independence Day.

Mr. Morse (at the request of Mr. Barry), for 15 minutes, on Thursday, January 18, 1962.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for 1 hour, on Monday, January 22, 1962.

Mr. Sikes (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for 15 minutes, on Thursday, January 25, 1962.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. Sullivan.

Mr. Gathings and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Boggs) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Anfuso in two instances.

Mr. Smith of Iowa.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Barry) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Cunningham in two instances.

Mr. Beermann.

Mr. Derwinski.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, January 18, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1546. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a plan relating to the reorganization of the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1547. A letter from the executive director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, transmitting the audit report of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States as of March 31, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 595, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Report, pursuant to House Resolution 56, 87th Congress, 1st session, on Refugee Problem in Hong Kong (Rept. No. 1284). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 9684. A bill to amend sections 303 and 310 of the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may, if it finds that the national security would not be endangered, issue licenses for the operation of an amateur station to certain aliens for any temporary period, not in excess of 3 years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS:

H.R. 9685. A bill to provide that the lake formed and to be formed by the Walter F. George lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River, Ala., and Ga., shall be known and designated as Lake Roanoke; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 9686. A bill to amend the Code of Law of the District of Columbia with respect to public exhibitions, shows, performances, plays, or broadcasting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 9687. A bill to provide for the enlargement of the national cemetery at Hampton, Va.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 9688. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for surviving spouses without deduction from original annuities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9689. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 9690. A bill to amend the International Peace and Security Act of 1961 to provide for the establishment and support of a Western Hemisphere police force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 9691. A bill to permit the exchange between farms of cotton acreage allotments for rice acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 9692. A bill to amend the act of April 22, 1960, entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park, in the State of Missouri"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9693. A bill to establish a minimum reward for information leading to the apprehension and conviction of violators of the Federal narcotic laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 9694. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Pennsylvania among the States which may obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for State and local policemen and firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 9695. A bill providing for the regulation of rates for all forms of casualty insurance including fidelity, surety, and guarantee bonds and for all forms of fire, marine, and inland marine insurance, except as herein provided, and of rating and advisory organizations within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 9696. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, with respect to space communications facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H.R. 9697. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 9698. A bill to authorize the extension of conservation reserve contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.R. 9699. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property owned by the District of Columbia located in Prince William County, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 9700. A bill to require the inspection and certification of certain motor vessels known as towboats; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 9701. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday, to be known as "Columbus Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL:

H.R. 9702. A bill to adjust postal rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 9703. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 9704. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 9705. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 9706. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 9707. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 9708. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H.R. 9709. A bill to provide that the lake formed and to be formed by the Walter F. George lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River, Ala. and Ga., shall be known and designated as Lake Roanoke; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BEERMANN:

H.J. Res. 598. Joint resolution providing that the United States shall make no loans or grants to the United Nations until all members of the United Nations have paid in full their assessed share of the costs of the operations of the United Nations, including the expenses of operations in the Congo and the Gaza Strip; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H.J. Res. 599. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9710. A bill for the relief of Murdell Maude Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9711. A bill for the relief of Anna Carbone Masiello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 9712. A bill to provide for the sale of certain reserved mineral interests of the United States in certain real property owned by Jack D. Wishart and Juanita H. Wishart; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 9713. A bill for the relief of Michalina Adela Chudziak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H.R. 9714. A bill for the relief of Thomas D. Hutzel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 9715. A bill for the relief of Yehuda Licht; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 9716. A bill for the relief of Katsutoshi Fujii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9717. A bill for the relief of Marica Margetich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

224. Mr. CUNNINGHAM presented a petition of 462 persons in 13 States urging Congress to immediately stop the Red mail subsidy, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 16, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, in our common faith in Thee that binds us all together and makes us one in the source of our strength to do and to endure, in all the commotion and confusion of the baffling present with its imperative demands, we would turn aside for this beginning moment to lift the fret and fever of our daily lives into the quietness of Thy presence.

As from this Chamber of legislation the lines go out to the homes of the Nation where the final strength of the Republic and its future is stored and nurtured, we beseech Thee, O God, that it may please Thee to purify and exalt the domestic life of the people, to deepen the sense of the worth and sacredness of home, so that the families of our land may be schools of noble discipline and the nurseries of strong character and of true religion.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

WARREN G. MAGNUSON, a Senator from the State of Washington, and PHILIP A. HART, a Senator from the State of Michigan, attended the session of the Senate today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 15, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON PROGRAM FOR DISCOVERY OF MINERAL RESERVES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Sixth Semiannual Report of the Secretary of the Interior prescribed by section 5 of the act of August 21, 1958, entitled "To provide a program for the discovery of the mineral reserves of the United States, its Territories and possessions by encouraging exploration for minerals, and for other purposes."

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 16, 1962.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection with the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON STATUS OF TRAINING OF RESERVE COMPONENTS OF ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the status of training of each reserve component of the Armed Forces and the progress made in strengthening of the reserve components, for the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

SALE OF CERTAIN LAND BY COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property owned by the District of Columbia located in Prince William County, Va., and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING ACTIVITIES, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of automatic data processing activities at Department headquarters and at the New York and Richmond offices, Post Office Department, March 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS ON POSITIONS IN GRADES GS-16, GS-17, AND GS-18

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in that Commission in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, for the calendar year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, Chicago, Ill., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in that Board in grades GS-16, GS-17, and

GS-18, for the calendar year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RESOLUTION OPPOSING FEDERAL TAXATION OF MUNICIPAL BOND INTEREST

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the economic revolution has resulted in dramatic, far-reaching changes, directions and trends in our way of life.

Among other things, there has been a shift of population. Once, we were an agricultural nation; now, about 70 percent of our people live in urban areas.

As a result, there has been a tremendous increase in demands for public service—including water, sanitation, transportation, and others—upon the urban communities.

Unfortunately, there has not always been an adequate source of financing for such programs.

To help meet this problem, we recall that there has been special exemption of interest on municipal bonds from Federal taxation.

As I understand it, the Treasury Department is now considering this policy, with a possible view to advocating repeal of exemptions. In addition, a bill is now pending before the House Ways and Means Committee for such a purpose.

Personally, I feel that Congress will want to weigh very carefully any proposal that will make it more difficult for municipalities to meet their financing problems.

Recently, I was privileged to receive from Mayor W. P. Atkinson, of South Milwaukee, Wis., a resolution adopted by the common council.

The resolution opposes repeal of the tax exemption on municipal bonds.

Believing this deserves the consideration of Congress, I request unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OPPOSING FEDERAL TAXATION OF MUNICIPAL BOND INTEREST

Whereas the exemption of municipal bond interest from Federal taxation has traditionally been one of the principal features of such bonds which has contributed to the maintenance of a low interest; and

Whereas proposals are now being advanced which would result in the taxation of financial institutions because of their holdings of municipal bonds; and

Whereas it is vital to municipalities throughout the country that their obligations maintain a tax free status in order to keep interest rates at reasonable levels: There be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of South Milwaukee, That it does hereby register its firm opposition to any proposal which would cause municipal bonds to lose their present status of Federal tax exemption; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY and the Honorable WILLIAM PROXMIRE, U.S. Senators from Wisconsin, the Honorable CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Fourth District Congressman, the U.S. Senate Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, so that they may be aware of the position of the city of South Milwaukee regarding this matter.

Adopted December 19, 1961.

LOUIS J. MOSAKOWSKI,
City Clerk.

Approved December 20, 1961.

W. P. ATKINSON,
Mayor.

QUEENS COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION ANNOUNCES NEW JUDICIAL SELECTION PLAN

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the unprecedented number of vacancies in the Federal judiciary has served to center unusual attention on the difficult problem of judicial selection.

Lifetime Federal judgeships cannot simply be doled out as rewards for political service, without doing grave damage to the judiciary. Our objective must be to find the best qualified men and women available for service, if we are to maintain confidence in our courts and the highest standards of justice for our citizens.

Last year my colleague, Senator JAVITS, and I requested the help of the bar associations in New York to screen potential candidates and to recommend on a wholly nonpartisan basis the best qualified lawyers for vacancies in their respective Federal courts. The response to this request was overwhelmingly favorable; and in the course of the year we were able to transmit to the Attorney General, for his guidance, the names of dozens of potential nominees with the requisite qualifications. I continue to believe that the bar associations should be called upon to play a very active part in the process of judicial selection, as a safeguard against the appointment of any incompetents to the bench.

The Queens County Bar Association last week released the details of a plan for the selection of judges, which could be an important step in improving the procedures for staffing our judiciary. I know the plan has been under consideration for many months, and is the result of a very thorough study of existing practices. Its purpose is to assure that only persons of unquestioned integrity, moral courage, judicial temperament, and legal ability are appointed or elected to the courts. If successfully implemented, it could well serve as a model to other bar associations and as a spur to wider consultations with bar groups in the appointment of all judges.

Mr. President, I know this plan will be of interest to other Members who are concerned with the status of our courts and the caliber of our judges. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the rules and regulations adopted for implementation of this plan be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks. I also ask that the rules and regulations be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the rules and regulations were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULES AND REGULATIONS OF THE QUEENS COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION GOVERNING THE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY ANENT JUDICIAL CANDIDATES AND CAMPAIGNS

(Effective on and after March 15, 1962)

(When used herein "association" means the Queens County Bar Association; "committee" means the committee on judiciary of the Queens County Bar Association; "president" means the president of the Queens County Bar Association; and "chairman" means the chairman of the committee on judiciary.)

ARTICLE I. ORGANIZATION

1. The committee on judiciary shall be the committee to administer the rules and regulations hereinafter set forth.

2. The committee, subject to confirmation by the board of managers, shall select and employ a campaign manager who need not be a member of the committee or a member of the bar. He shall perform such duties as may be assigned to him by the committee or its chairman.

3. The committee may create such subcommittees with such functions, within the scope of the duties of the committee, as it shall determine. The members of such subcommittees shall be appointed by the chairman subject to confirmation by the committee.

ARTICLE II. PURPOSES AND GENERAL OBJECTIVES

1. It shall be the purpose of the committee to create and promote within the electorate a true sense of the importance of electing honest and able judges; to encourage and enlist the candidacies of persons who are highly qualified for judicial office; and to carry out impartially the procedure provided herein regarding candidates for judicial offices. The committee shall conduct an active campaign for the election of the endorsed candidates of the association and for the defeat of candidates who are not qualified for judicial office.

2. The association, in the manner hereinafter prescribed, shall ascertain by questionnaires the composite opinion of the members of the Queens County Bar Association as to the fitness and qualifications of the candidates for judicial offices, with jurisdiction in Queens County, whether elective or appointive, and for such other offices connected with the administration of justice as may be determined upon by the board of managers, and shall endorse candidates for such offices.

3. The association shall endorse only those candidates who are found to possess all the essential qualifications for judicial office, as hereinafter set forth, and shall refuse to endorse and strive to defeat candidates who are clearly not qualified for judicial office.

ARTICLE III. FINANCES

1. The committee shall determine each year the amount of its budget, which shall be subject to review and modification by the board of managers.

2. The committee shall not, without prior approval of the board of managers, obligate the association for any expenditures in excess of the amount of its budget as approved by the board of managers.

3. All disbursements of funds allocated to the committee by the board of managers shall be made by the treasurer of the association upon the order of the committee approved in writing by its chairman or in his absence by the vice chairman. The committee may authorize the campaign manager to issue such orders on its behalf.

ARTICLE IV. AGREEMENT OF CANDIDATES

From each candidate for judicial office, the committee shall, prior to the submission of any questionnaire affecting him, request an agreement in the form hereto attached and marked "exhibit A." If any candidate fails or refuses to execute such agreement, the committee shall take such action as it deems proper.

ARTICLE V. BIOGRAPHIES OF CANDIDATES

Prior to the submission of any such questionnaire the committee shall also request from the candidate such biographical information as, in the opinion of the committee, shall be desirable and necessary. If any candidate fails or refuses to supply such information, the committee itself may obtain such information and publish the same, or it may state the fact of such failure or refusal in the questionnaire. The committee, in submitting biographical information, shall not be limited to, nor precluded by the information supplied by the candidate.

ARTICLE VI. QUESTIONNAIRE

1. The questionnaires on candidates shall in every instance be submitted to the members of the association and (except as provided in article VII prescribing procedure relating to incumbents) shall contain the questions set forth in section 2 of this article.

2. In tabulating answers to such questionnaire, the committee shall give to each question the weight in points as shown by the following schedule, said points to be scored for each candidate in the proportion that the number of favorable answers to each such question bears to the total number of answers to each such question:

Question:	*Points*
1. Have you confidence in his integrity and moral courage?	25
2. Has he judicial temperament?	25
3. Has he adequate legal ability?	25
4. Has he above-average legal experience?	10
5. Is he courteous and considerate?	5
6. Would he be industrious and prompt in the performance of his duties?	10
Total points	100

3. The form of the questionnaire and the weight in points given to each question may be changed from time to time by vote of a majority of all the members of the committee present at a regularly called meeting, subject to approval by the board of managers.

ARTICLE VII. PROCEDURE RELATING TO INCUMBENTS

1. (a) Not less than 90 days prior to redesignation, primary, judicial convention, expiration of an appointive term dates, as the case may be, the biographical information and questionnaire in the form prescribed in this article shall be submitted with respect to all incumbent judges who have not publicly and unequivocally declared that they will not seek reelection. An incumbent judge is one seeking reelection or reappointment to the same judicial office after having served at least 1 year in that same office prior to the expiration or termination of his present term.

(b) The questionnaire shall be in the following form: "In your opinion, is this judge entitled on his record to immediate endorsement for reelection or reappointment?"

2. Immediately after the date fixed for the return of the questionnaire, the answers thereto shall be tabulated under the direction of the committee by an independent firm of certified public accountants.

3. Based on the tabulation of the answers to the questionnaire, upon approval by the board of managers, the committee shall:

(a) Immediately endorse for election or reappointment each incumbent judge who has received not less than 80 percent favorable answers on the question;

(b) Take no formal action at the time with respect to those incumbent judges who have not been endorsed.

The base for the determination of the percentages of favorable and unfavorable answers to the question shall be the sum of the yes and no answers.

4. Not later than 15 days after the date fixed for the return of the questionnaire, the action taken by the committee pursuant to section 3(a) hereof, upon approval by the board of managers, shall be publicly announced.

ARTICLE VIII. PROCEDURE RELATING TO OTHER CANDIDATES

1. The chairman, by procedure he deems appropriate, shall fix the date for the submission by candidates of the agreement and biographies provided for in articles IV and V.

2. Promptly thereafter, the committee shall submit the questionnaire prescribed in article VI, section 2, with respect to all nonincumbent candidates and all incumbent candidates who have not been endorsed under article VII, provided, however, that no questionnaire shall be submitted in a field in which the incumbent has already been endorsed.

3. Immediately after the date fixed for return of the questionnaire, the answers thereto shall be tabulated by an independent firm of certified public accountants, under direction of the committee, in accordance with article VI, section 2.

4. The committee shall thereupon endorse the candidate receiving the highest number of points for each judicial office for which no endorsement has been previously made, provided such candidate receives a total of 70 points on all questions and receives 70 percent favorable answers to the question on legal ability and 80 percent favorable answers to the question on integrity. If the answers to the questionnaire indicate that a candidate is so little known to members of the bar that an adequate appraisal of his qualifications cannot be made, then the committee, with the approval of the board of managers, may decline to give further consideration to such candidate.

5. No candidate shall be considered for endorsement unless his name shall have been submitted in the questionnaire.

6. Only one candidate shall be endorsed for each judicial office, except that when two or more candidates for the same office are shown to be clearly entitled to endorsement, the committee, upon the approval of the board of managers, may endorse all of such candidates.

7. Endorsements made pursuant to this article shall be publicly announced not later than 30 days after the date fixed for the return of the questionnaire.

ARTICLE IX. GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. All information contained in the questionnaire shall be held in confidence by members of the committee, by members of the board of managers, by officers of the association, and by persons employed to tabulate answers to the questionnaire.

2. The information contained in answers to the questionnaire as to any particular candidate may be disclosed to him personally at his request and may be made public if a candidate shall openly challenge the accuracy or fairness of the report of the committee founded on the questionnaire.

3. If the committee at any time shall determine that an endorsed candidate has given false information upon a matter which, in the opinion of the committee, is material, or if the committee shall determine that an endorsed candidate is not complying fully with his agreement with the association, then the endorsement of the association may be revoked by an affirmative vote of a majority of the committee present at a meeting called for such purpose, provided, however, that such revocation shall be subject to approval, modification or reversal by the board of managers.

4. The committee is empowered to employ such means as it may deem necessary and proper to carry out the intent and purpose of these rules and regulations and to take such action as it may deem necessary and proper to effect the election of qualified candidates for judicial office.

5. A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

ARTICLE X. ESSENTIAL MINIMUM QUALIFICATION FACTORS FOR JUDGES

Essential minimum qualification factors for judges are herein enunciated to serve as guideposts to the association, its board of managers and its judiciary committee in assessing prospective judicial candidates, as follows:

1. Experience: (Any candidate should have at least 10 years of active legal practice or equivalent experience for appointment to any judicial office. Years of actual former bench service shall be considered as part of active legal practice.)

Minimum experience in actual law practice:	*Years*
Magistrate's court	10
Special sessions court	10
Domestic relations court	10
Municipal and city court	10
County court	15
Surrogate's court	15
Supreme court and court of claims	15
Appellate courts	20
Federal district courts	15
Federal circuit courts	20

(NOTE.—If court reform consolidation is approved, then the qualifications for nomination to the general court would also be for 10 years of active legal practice, and if the domestic relations court function is placed in the supreme court under consolidation, then 15 years of active legal practice should be the minimum qualification in this event.)

2. Other qualification factors: (a) Legal ability, (b) demonstrated courage, (c) honesty, (d) character, (e) integrity, (f) industry, (g) judicial temperament (patience, general courtesy and dignity), (h) scholarship and above-average experience.

The committee was in unanimous agreement that no minimum or maximum age qualifications be set for judicial office and that, in any event, the recommendations for judicial qualification, once established and adopted by the bar association, should not be inflexible, but should serve as recommended guideposts in the future selection and nomination of judges.

EXHIBIT A TO THE RULES AND REGULATIONS GOVERNING THE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY ANENT JUDICIAL CANDIDATES AND CAMPAIGNS

To the Queens County Bar Association and Its Committee on Judiciary:

AGREEMENT

As a condition of having my name submitted by the Queens County Bar Association to its members, I solemnly agree, irrespective of whether I receive the endorsement of said association, as follows:

1. I will not solicit or knowingly accept funds, directly or indirectly, from any lawyer.

2. I will not permit a lawyer to serve on my campaign committee.

3. I will submit to the committee on judiciary of the Queens County Bar Association an accurate list of the members of my campaign committee not later than 30 days before election day.

4. I will submit to said committee on judiciary an accurate list of contributors and pledgors to my campaign fund, with address, business connection, and the amount

of the contribution of each contributor or pledgor 1 week before election day.

5. If elected, I will not hear contested cases in which a member of my campaign committee or contributor or pledgor to my campaign fund is interested as a party, except upon full disclosure of this relationship and with the consent of all parties to the litigation.

6. I will conduct my campaign with due regard to the dignity and importance of the office for which I am a candidate and will not permit or tolerate the publication of any unfair or misleading advertising in support of my candidacy.

7. I desire from the members of the bar a free and frank expression of opinion as to my qualifications for judicial office and I will not personally, or through my committee, directly or indirectly seek to influence the opinion of any members of the bar by solicitation or otherwise.

8. If elected, I will appoint only a lawyer to serve as my secretary, or clerk to the justices (supreme court), or clerk to the county judges, as the case may be.

9. Irrespective of whether I receive the endorsement of the Queens County Association, I pledge myself unreservedly to comply fully with the provision of this voluntary agreement.

Date

Signature

STUDIES AS TO EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY OF OPERATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 250), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1962 through January 31, 1963, to make investigations into the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government including the possible existence of fraud, misfeasance, malfeasance, collusion, mismanagement, incompetence, corrupt or unethical practices, waste, extravagance, conflicts of interest, and the improper expenditure of Government funds, in transactions, contracts, and activities of the Government or of Government officials and employees and any and all such improper practices between Government personnel and corporations, individuals, companies, or persons affiliated therewith, doing business with the Government; and the compliance or noncompliance of such corporations, companies, or individuals or other entities with the rules, regulations, and laws governing the various governmental agencies and its relationships with the public: *Provided,* That in carrying out the duties herein set forth, the inquiries of this committee shall not be deemed limited to the records, functions, and operations of the particular branch of the Government under inquiry, and may extend to the records and activities of persons, corporations, or other entities dealing with or affecting that particular branch of the Government, and that:

Sec. 2. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof be further authorized from February 1, 1962 to January 31, 1963, inclusive, to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been engaged in in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Sec. 3. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is further authorized and directed from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, to make a full and complete study and investigation of syndicated or organized crime which may operate in or otherwise utilize the facilities of interstate or international commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur, and, if so, the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations, or other entities by whom such utilization is being made, what facilities, devices, methods, techniques, and technicalities are being used or employed, and whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of the law of the United States or the laws of any State, and further, to study and investigate the manner in which and the extent to which persons engaged in organized criminal activities have infiltrated into lawful business enterprise; and to study the adequacy of Federal laws to prevent the operations of organized crime in interstate or international commerce; and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect the public against the occurrences of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on the Judiciary or by the Committee on Commerce of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Sec. 4. The Committee on Government Operations or any of its duly authorized subcommittees shall report to the Senate by January 31, 1963, and shall, if deemed appropriate, include in its report specific legislative recommendations.

Sec. 5. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized, as it deems necessary and appropriate, to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony, either orally or by deposition; (7) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (8) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable; and further, with the consent of other committees or subcommittees to work in conjunction with and utilize their staffs, as it shall be deemed necessary and appropriate in the judgment of the chairman of the committee: *Provided further,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

Sec. 6. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $400,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 2683. A bill for the relief of Laszlo Janos Buchwald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2684. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan C. Jacobe, and their four children, Angela Jacobe, Teresita Jacobe, Leo Jacobe, and Ramon Jacobe; and

S. 2685. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Pandelis Salvaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 2686. A bill for the relief of Stepanida Losowskaja; and

S. 2687. A bill for the relief of Robert D. Barbee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (for himself, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Mundt, and Mr. Metcalf):

S. 2688. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1961 and the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to permit under certain circumstances flaxseed to be raised on acreage diverted from the production of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2689. A bill to amend sections 3(7) and 5(b) of the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STENNIS (for himself and Mr. Eastland):

S.J. Res. 146. Joint resolution to provide for designation of the U.S. Veterans' Administration hospital at Jackson, Miss., as the "John Elliott Rankin Memorial Veterans Hospital"; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RESOLUTIONS

STUDIES AS TO EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY OF OPERATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 250) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make certain studies as to the efficiency and economy of the operations of the Government, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. McClellan, which appears under a separate heading.)

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS WITHIN JURISDICTION OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 251); which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) interstate commerce generally;

(2) foreign commerce generally;

(3) maritime matters;

(4) interoceanic canals;

(5) transportation policy;

(6) domestic surface transportation, including pipelines;

(7) communications, including a complete review of national and international telecommunications and the use of communications satellites;

(8) Federal power matters;

(9) civil aeronautics;

(10) fisheries and wildlife;

(11) marine sciences; and

(12) Weather Bureau operations and planning, including the use of weather satellites.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $——————, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STOCK DISTRIBUTION TREATED AS RETURNS OF CAPITAL—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8847) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that a distribution of stock made to an individual (or certain corporations) pursuant to an order enforcing the antitrust laws shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital; and to provide that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

DESIGNATION OF COLUMBUS DAY AS A LEGAL HOLIDAY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, on September 12 of last year I introduced on behalf of myself and my senior colleague from Delaware [Mr. Williams], Senate bill 2531, to designate Columbus Day as a legal holiday.

At the request of the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Bush], I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of this bill, the name of the Senator from Connecticut appears as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATION OF BERNARD L. BOUTIN TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Government Operations will hold hearings on the nomination of Mr. Bernard L. Boutin to be Administrator of General Services, on Thursday, January 25, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 3302, New Senate Office Building.

Anyone who may wish to appear at the hearing at that time, either in support or in opposition to confirmation of the nomination, should notify the clerk of the committee.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Address of Senator Jennings Randolph, to the faculty and student body of Salem College, October 30, 1961, entitled "The Citizen and International Affairs."

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts of his statement on U.S. export trade.

FEDERAL SPENDING IMPACT IS GREATER THAN BUDGET TOTALS INDICATE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this morning's newspapers carry summaries of the study prepared by Dr. Roy E. Moor, of the staff of the Joint Economic Committee, on "The Federal Budget as an Economic Document." The study was prepared for the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, of which I have the honor to be chairman.

Dr. Moor's study shows that the present Federal budget significantly conceals the economic impact of Government. His careful, comprehensive analysis, containing much material not previously available in published form, should provide a sound basis for reform of the budget document, to make it more useful for evaluating the economic consequences of different policies.

A striking fact about Federal fiscal bookkeeping disclosed in this study is the extent to which the budget understates the actual receipts and expenditures of the Government. In 1960, for example, when the conventional budget showed expenditures of about $79 billion and receipts of over $78 billion, the Federal Government actually took in $127 billion and spent $130 billion. The actual deficit of Federal expenditures over receipts was significantly greater in that year than the conventional budget totals would indicate.

This occurs because a number of important accounts are left out of the budget entirely—such as social security, unemployment compensation, and railroad retirement—because they are self-financing, by earmarked taxes, and do not affect the general tax fund. But this does not reduce the economic impact of these flows of funds to and from the Government. Other Government activities, such as those of the Post Office Department, are represented in the budget only as a net deficit or surplus. Yet the actual fiscal effects of their operations are many times greater than these sometimes small sums would suggest.

An article by Bernard Nossiter, published today in the Washington Post, provides a useful summary of Roy Moor's study. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record at the close of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that an article published in the New York Times of this morning also be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 16, 1962]

Report Says U.S. Budget Form Falls Short, May Be Misleading

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

Congress has been told that the big budget it will get on Thursday tells too much about too little.

A study prepared for the Joint Economic Committee says the document's format yields only minor economic information and may be misleading to those who use the totals.

The report urges many reforms so that the budget will show how the Government's real spending and tax take affect the economy and what the true costs and benefits of each new policy will be.

The 189-page study was written by Roy E. Moor, an economist on the joint committee's staff. He served as a fiscal economist with the Treasury from 1953 to 1958. In recent years, he taught at Williams College and held a research professorship at the Brookings Institution.

Most economists agree with Moor's critique. They complain that the budget is largely designed to serve the needs of congressional appropriations committees and not analysts of public policy.

Moor observed, however, that the Budget Bureau is taking steps to make its too voluminous document more meaningful. Among these, he said, are the inclusion of an income accounting that translates the Government's fiscal actions into national income accounts, long-range forecasts, and a new format this year that separates material needed by the appropriations committees from data the public wants.

The major weaknesses of the conventional budget account, Moor said, are that it lumps together different estimates, includes a lot of transactions that cancel out, and excludes many others that have important economic consequences.

For example, the report noted, the Federal Government took in nearly $127 billion in 1960 and spent about $130 billion—figures much larger than those published in the budget or any other Government source.

Among the things a reformed budget should show, Moor said are:

The economic assumptions underlying revenue estimates, including alternative revenue estimates for different assumptions.

A spotlight on the present and future costs of new proposals, including actions the administration takes on its own and those for which it must get congressional assent.

A summary of the expected impact on jobs, resources and incomes of each agency's programs, plus a summary of the Government's impact as a whole.

A quarterly review of changed estimates.

A distinction between current operating costs and expenditures for capital projects like highways and dams.

In addition, Moor said, the budget should have a longer perspective. It should spell out the current costs of a new program and the expected future costs over the project's life. At the same time, he said, the budget should also estimate the benefits expected over the life program.

To make it clear why one program is chosen over another, Moor proposed that the budget spell out the costs and benefits of alternative measures.

Many of these analyses are made now by Government agencies, Moor observed, and it would not require much more effort to make them public.

"A budget without relevant analysis," he said, "is merely a meaningless and sterile collection of figures."

[From the New York Times, Jan. 16, 1962]

U.S. Budget Hit as Spending Guide—Report to Joint Unit Cites Federal Sums Not Included

Washington, January 15.—Congress was told today that the annual Presidential budget was a poor guide to the Government's impact on the economy because it did not reflect the full range of Federal spending.

Dr. Roy E. Moor reached this conclusion in a book-length report prepared for the Joint Senate-House Economics Committee on whose staff he serves. The bulky budget for the fiscal year 1963 will be sent to Congress Thursday.

Dr. Moor recommended that changes be made so that the budget would be a more accurate and useful economic gage.

Estimating that in 1960 the Government had actual cash receipts of nearly $127 billion and expenditures of about $130 billion, Dr. Moor said the published budget amounts were $78 billion receipts and $77 billion expenditures.

Not only are the operations of such things as the social security insurance system handled outside the budget, Dr. Moor said, but it omits wholly or partly the gross receipts and expenditures of the Post Office and other Government enterprises and lending agencies, receipts and expenditures of foreign currencies and many monetary and banking transactions.

"The conventional budget totals as presently constructed give only minor economic information and may be misleading," he said.

One way in which the budget may mislead students of the economy, he said, is by summing up at a single point economic occurrences that spread out over a considerable time, like taxes collected monthly and tax refunds that actually take the form of credits against future taxes. Moreover, he said, many Government contracts have had their effect on the national economy, because of payments by the contractor, before the contractor is paid by the Government.

Dr. Moor said changes being made by the present administration in the budget document were useful, but he proposed a series of further changes designed to make the budget more comprehensive and to give clues to the future effect of Government policies.

Senator William Proxmire, Democrat, of Wisconsin, said in a statement accompanying the report that it "should provide a starting point for needed reform" and meanwhile could serve as "a useful primer for understanding and analyzing the 1963 budget."

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S RESPONSE TO THE RUSSIAN SCIENTIFIC CHALLENGE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday I placed in the Record a résumé of the report released by the National Science Foundation on Soviet Russia's successful and massive increase in the number of graduating engineers and scientists. The National Science Foundation suggests the serious implications for our Nation's military defense in the growing Russian advantage.

Mr. President, in an age when military power depends overwhelmingly on superiority in scientific technology, the safety of our Nation and the future of freedom will hinge on whether we can and will meet this Soviet challenge in scientific education.

For this reason, I was greatly heartened by the recognition of the importance of this increasing Soviet scientific advantage in President Kennedy's press conference of yesterday. His one announcement at that press conference was the citation of the National Science Foundation study of Russian education, to which the President added some chilling statistics on the sharp decline in the quantity of scientific education in this country in the last decade.

The decline in the number of United States scientific graduates is particularly alarming since it runs counter to the sharp rise in population and the tremendous increase in the demand for skilled and trained scientists. The President said that he was calling on his Science Advisory Committee for prompt recommendations to meet this challenge.

I ask unanimous consent that the President's announcement in this regard at his press conference of yesterday be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> The President. I have just one announcement. I am sure you are all familiar with the story in the morning paper of the documentation on the study of comparisons of those in our schools and universities and the kind of subjects which they study which was published by the National Science Foundation. This had been a matter of some concern to me for some time because one of the most critical problems facing this Nation is the inadequacy of the supply of scientific and technical manpower to satisfy the expanding requirements of this country's research and development efforts in the near future.
>
> In 1951, our universities graduated 19,600 students in the physical sciences. In 1960, in spite of the substantial increase in our population, during the last 10 years, and in spite of the fact that the demand for people of skill in this field has tremendously increased with our efforts in defense and space industrial research, and all of the rest, in 1930, the number had fallen from 19,600 to 17,100. In 1951 there were 22,500 studying in the biological sciences. In 1960, there were only 16,700. In the field of engineering, enrollment rose from 232,000 to 269,000, in the period 1951 to 1957. Since 1957, there has been a continual decline in enrollment. Last year the figure was down to 240,000.
>
> A MATTER OF GROWING CONCERN
>
> This is a matter of growing concern. It is more than a matching of numerical supply to anticipate a demand, for this alone would be difficult. Because of the seriousness of this problem for the long-range future of the United States, I have asked my Science Advisory Committee, in cooperation with the Federal Council for Science and Technology, to review available studies and other pertinent information, and to report to me as quickly as possible on the specific measures that can be taken within and without the Government to develop the necessary and well-qualified scientists and engineers and technicians to meet our society's complex needs—governmental, educational and industrial.
>
> In undertaking this task, the Committee will draw on the advice and assistance of individuals and agencies, including the National Academy of Sciences, which will shortly begin, at my request, a new study of scientific and technical manpower utilization.
>
> To all those who may be within the sound of my voice or who may follow your stories in the papers, I want to emphasize the great new and exciting field of the sciences and while we wish to emphasize always the liberal arts, I do believe that these figures indicate a need on the national level and also a great opportunity for talented young men and women. I hope that their teachers and their school boards, and they, themselves, and their families, will give this matter consideration in developing their careers.

ANNUAL AWARDS CEREMONY, U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this morning in the departmental auditorium there was the ceremony for the annual awards program of the Civil Service Commission, and there was special recognition of the 79th anniversary of the signing of the Civil Service Act, which was signed on January 16, 1883. That was the formal establishment of the merit concept of Federal civil service employment.

For 79 years the civil service has based its merit program on the basic elements of confidence, stability, and equal opportunity. Equality of opportunity in the civil service is clearly defined as a right of all citizens of the United States, regardless of politics, religious belief, race, color, or creed. All are entitled to compete for such employment on the basis of their ability. It is this principle which makes our civil service representative of all the people in our country.

Mr. President, at this morning's ceremony, many of the outstanding Federal workers and civil service employees were presented with outstanding service awards, with pins in recognition of their service, which in some cases has extended for as long as 40 years. A very excellent program was arranged by the Commission.

The distinguished Vice President of the United States was the speaker on that occasion. He made a splendid address concerning the importance of the civil service system and the dependence of our Nation on these employees. I wish to read at this time several excerpts from his speech:

> Certainly one of the great milestones in the development of our Government was the birth and growth of the civil service system.
>
> Teddy Roosevelt was one of the earliest and most instrumental in making the system work. Maybe it was fitting that it took a Rough Rider to do it.
>
> But Roosevelt knew that a civil service system was the heart of clean government. He said, "The merit system of making appointments is, in its essence, as democratic and American as the common school system itself."

Mr. President, the Vice President made some very excellent comments in regard to the work of our Civil Service employees. I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, together with the forward in the program by the Civil Service Commission and the program itself.

There being no objection, the program and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNUAL AWARDS CEREMONY, THE U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION, 1962

FOREWORD

To the Employees of the Civil Service Commission, 1962:

On the occasion of the 10th Annual Awards Ceremony, it is again our privilege to give public recognition to the achievements of the people who are the Civil Service Commission.

Since 1952, we have used the anniversary of the signing of the act which created the Commission and the Federal merit system, not only to honor those who have served the Commission and the Government in an outstanding and loyal manner, but also to rededicate ourselves to the tasks ahead. We are entering a period in our history that presents both unparalleled challenges and opportunities. We in the Commission are responsible for leading a most potent force, the Federal career service, to meet the challenges and to grasp the opportunities of the "sixties."

We express to you our heartfelt thanks for past accomplishments and urge your rededication to the tasks ahead.

JOHN W. MACY, Jr.,
Chairman.
FREDERICK J. LAWTON,
Commissioner.
ROBERT E. HAMPTON,
Commissioner.

PROGRAM

Tuesday, January 16, 1962, 10 a.m., the departmental auditorium

Master of ceremonies: Warren B. Irons, executive director.

Presentation of the colors: Color Guard, U.S. Marine Corps.

The national anthem: U.S. Marine Corps Band.

Greetings: John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman.

Speaker: The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States.

Musical selection: U.S. Marine Corps Band, Lt. Col., Albert F. Schoepper, director.

Presentation of honor awards

Length of service: Executive Director Irons.

Special awards: Chairman Macy, Commissioner Lawton, Commissioner Hampton.

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON DELIVERED AT THE CIVIL SERVICE AWARDS CEREMONY, 10 A.M. TUESDAY, JANUARY 16, 1962

It is a special pleasure for me to come down here and help you celebrate the 79th birthday of the Civil Service Act.

This is my first opportunity to visit you since my rating went up. Of course, it wasn't the rating that I'd applied for—but this is a common complaint which you in the service can understand.

You who have a front row seat on the "ins" and "outs" of government can appreciate the pitfalls of public service perhaps better than anyone else.

Recently during the State Department shakeup, I'm told that the standard instructions when you went out to lunch were: "If my boss calls while I'm out, be sure to get his name."

Certainly one of the great milestones in the development of our Government was the birth and growth of the civil service system.

Teddy Roosevelt was one of the earliest and most instrumental in making the system work. Maybe it was fitting that it took a rough rider to do it.

But Roosevelt knew that a civil service system was the heart of clean government. He said, "The merit system of making appointments is, in its essence, as democratic and American as the common school system itself."

I know that you get as annoyed as I do at those who make it a daily habit to complain about the bureaucrats. A distinguished diplomat once observed to me that a close investigation reveals it is the plutocrats who talk the most about the bureaucrats.

During the past year I have visited many lands. I have been in cities that were ancient even before the birth of Christ and in countries so new there has not been time to put them in a standard atlas.

And among the many things that stood out was the inescapable fact that in the modern world, no nation—new or old—can have unity and prosperity without a trained civil service.

To Americans, a trained and competent civil service has become a commonplace. We may grumble and grouse over reports about bureaucrats and inefficiency. We may growl over reports and rumors of allegedly plush-lined government jobs.

But in our heart of hearts, we know that our affairs are in good hands. We know that mistakes are ridiculously few in comparison to the tremendous job that is being done.

Therefore, it comes as something of a shock to visit a country where trained civil servants are virtually nonexistent.

A nation's people cannot be safeguarded against disease without trained public health officials. A nation's homes cannot be safeguarded against crime without trained civilian police. A nation's finances cannot be safeguarded against inflation or bankruptcy without trained clerks and economists.

And yet, there are nations in this world today who cannot find enough trained people to make even a beginning in the struggle to solve these problems.

In the past few years, many new nations have come into being. They have shaken off the shackles of the past and established their right to be treated with respect as independent countries.

Their independence was long overdue from a moral standpoint—and moral considerations must govern. But there would be nothing moral about closing our eyes to the fact that independence—to survive—requires the services of trained, professional administrators.

In many instances, the birth of these new nations was attended by struggle and turmoil. Some of these struggles are continuing. No one can be positive as to where or how they will end.

But we do know that a nation cannot sustain unity unless it meets its obligations to its own citizens. And this is the task of the professional administrator—the man or the woman who can make decisions on the merits and carry them out.

I am convinced that this is a factor which will have to play a larger role in our foreign aid programs. We must ship not just the materials that will raise their living standards and the technicians who know how to use them but the professional administrators who can help the governments set up a professional civil service.

This is not an easy matter to handle. In most of the underdeveloped nations, there is a suspicion of such actions which is understandable, however mistaken. It will take years of patient work to erase that suspicion.

We have, of course, made many efforts to help other nations with their problems of day-to-day administration. But I believe those efforts will have to increase. And in the years that lie ahead, our trained civil service may become one of the most potent of our implements of foreign policy.

We are facing an exciting year. It will be a year of tremendous importance for Americans.

There are before us challenges and opportunities fantastic in size and complexity.

We must reshape our trade patterns so we can continue to compete in a world which is readying itself for a new economic giant—the European Common Market.

We must redouble our efforts to put on that extra burst of speed which will determine our standing in outer space.

We must be ready at all times for any new and unexpected challenges that may be hurled at us by world communism.

We must dedicate ourselves to maintaining—even at a sacrifice—the world organization which, however imperfect, holds forth the only hope for an orderly globe.

We must continue our attack upon the killing and crippling diseases with the hope that eventually we can eradicate these scourges of mankind.

We must devise new means to handle the periodic recessions which have weakened our economy.

And above all, we must continue our never-ending search for peace—honorable peace in which freemen can be secure.

None of these goals can be attained without you—the dedicated men and women of the civil service.

To you, all Americans owe their unity, their strength and their ability to maintain freedom in a world where freedom is gravely challenged. On behalf of all Americans, I thank you for your daily efforts.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEED GRAIN PROGRAM—SUCCESS OR FAILURE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the December 1, 1961, issue of Successful Farming published an article under the caption "Feed Grain Program: Success or Failure."

Mr. Richard R. Newberg and Marshall Burkes, of Ohio State University, went to the records and to the farmers of seven States for the answers.

All factors were objectively considered. The results are revealing.

Of particular interest is that part of the article dealing with "Intentions for Next Year," meaning the crop year of 1962. This article merits careful study, for it may be assumed that Congress will be dealing with the farm problem during the present session.

Hence I ask unanimous consent that the article in its entirety be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Feed Grain Program; Success or Failure?

(By Richard R. Newberg and Marshall Burkes)

What happened in 1961: Corn production down 371 million bushels, grain sorghum production down 128 million. Program costs of reduction: $1.50 per bushel. Farmers report costs down a little on participating farms, but returns are down more than cost reduction. Result, somewhat lower income. More fertilizer used on feed grains and heavier planting increased yields on farms. Major reasons for 1961 participation—to help surplus problem and fact that soil was too wet to plant corn on time.

What's ahead in 1962: Corn planting intentions up 6 to 8 million acres. Signers plan to retire 37 percent less acreage; 1961 nonparticipants do not intend to sign up for 1962. More fertilizer will be used. If crop year is normal, even with the program, production may be up 300 million bushels over 1961—and probably will equal or exceed 1960 output. Little change planned from this year's record soybean acreage. But, extremely low corn prices this year, high payments, or another wet spring could increase signup.

The 1961 emergency feed grain program's objectives were to: Reverse the rapid buildup of stocks, and to reduce Government costs. Now, at the end of the crop year, we have answers to two important questions: (1) What has been the effect on production and Government costs, and (2) what is likely to be the effect in 1962?

USDA crop reports show: First, under the 1961 program, payment was made for retirement of approximately 26 million acres from corn and grain sorghum production. However, the planted acreage of corn and grain sorghum actually is down only 17.5 million acres—that's a reduction in acreage of 20 percent.

The estimated reduction in corn production is 371 million bushels, a 9.5 percent decline from last year. The reduction in grain sorghum is 128 million bushels—a 21 percent production cut and an acreage reduction of 29 percent.

Here are acreage and production figures:

	Acreage planted (millions of acres)			Production (millions of bushels)		
	1960	1961	Change	1960	1961	Change
Corn	71.4	58.3	−13.1	3,891	3,520	−371
Grain sorghum	15.3	10.9	−4.4	608	480	−128
Oats	26.6	24.3	−2.3	1,151	994	−157
Barley	13.8	13.2	−.6	427	380	−47
Soybeans	18.0	23.6	+5.6	559	720	+161

Analysis: The higher price supports on soybeans were a major factor in the shift of land from feed grains, particularly oats, to soybean production. Result: An increase of 161 million bushels of soybeans.

Farmers reduced acreage of oats and barley—in addition, yields were down from last year. So output of these two crops was cut a total of about 13 percent. This cut combined with the 13.2 million ton (10 percent) reduction in grain sorghum and corn gives a total reduction of approximately 17 million tons—or 11 percent in all feed grains.

However, when you add the increased soybean meal production, the total cut in feed output is only about 13 million tons. And the real reduction is somewhat less because soybean meal has more feed value per pound than barley, oats, corn, or grain sorghum.

What about cost? Figuring the feed grain crop at $40 per ton and soybeans at $2.25 a bushel, the value of the total reduction of corn is $416 million; of grain sorghum $128 million. The value of the reduction of barley and oats is $144 million.

However, partly offsetting this reduction is an increase of $362 million in soybean production (much of which is likely to end up in Government storage bins).

Thus, the total U.S. net reduction in these important Corn Belt crops which are directly affected by the emergency feed grain program is approximately $326 million. The estimated Government costs of the program is $750 million. For corn and grain sorghum alone, this is a cost of almost $1.50 for each dollar reduction in output. When barley, oats, and soybeans are included, it is a cost of over $2 for each $1 cut in output.

What farmers told us: Why did production remain so large despite the Government's paying for retirement of 26 million acres? We went to farmers for answers—interviews were made in Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Oklahoma, and Ohio. Both people who signed up in the program and those who didn't were checked. We collected information on acreages planted to principal crops, fertilizer application, planting rates, and other factors affecting yields. Reasons for going into the program and future prospects also were determined both for farmers who participated and for those who did not.

Results show: Among farmers who signed up, the reduction in corn acreage from last year averaged about 80 percent as much as the amount of land put into the program.

A large number of the farmers participating had a corn or sorghum base considerably higher than last year's planted acreage. Of course, there were some farmers with allotments lower than 1960 production. But the acreage on which payments were made under the program was considerably higher than the actual reduction in planted acres from last year. This was true even though many farmers reduced acreage well below the amount they signed up either because of their rotation pattern, or because the land was too wet to plant this spring. Of course, a lot of farmers indicated they went into the program because it was difficult to get into their fields this spring.

We found that many farmers who didn't sign up in the program actually reduced corn acreage from last year. Often these acres were put into soil-conserving uses and the farmers could have qualified for payment but, as a matter of principle, refused to accept the payments.

On the average, nonparticipating farmers increased their acreage of corn over last year—increase in corn acreage averaged 8.4 percent for those interviewed. A common reason for increasing corn acreage was the uncertainty of corn supplies and prices of livestock feed this fall.

Average corn yields are up—approximately 6 bushels over 1960, according to Government crop reports. The good growing weather, particularly late last summer, is credited with being the major factor.

To determine how much of the difference was due to the weather—and how much was due to improved production practices encouraged by acreage limitations and higher supports—farmers were asked what changes they had made. The results show that almost all of the farmers had made some yield-increasing production changes.

Increase in fertilizer application was most common. The average increase was much above annual increases in past years. Fertilizer on corn was up approximately 17 pounds per acre, with nitrogen increased most. Nonparticipating farmers used slightly more fertilizer than participating farmers. Based on expected yield responses, the effect of the greater rate of fertilizer use was to increase yields between 3 and 4 bushels per acre.

Other practices: In addition, many farmers increased their planting rates and improved their methods of working their corn land.

Relative quality of land retired and land put into corn was compared. The average difference in land quality of retired acreage and land planted to corn was determined to be slightly over 4 bushels per acre, although many farmers said the yield would be about the same on the land retired as on land planted to corn.

Thus, adding the effects of increased fertilizer, increased planting rate, and the retirement of poor land, the total effect was to increase the yield of corn on land in the program by slightly over 5 bushels per acre. For nonparticipants, the average increase in yield attributed to more fertilizer and some increase in planting rate is slightly over 4 bushels per acre.

The emergency feed grain program has not achieved administration goals. The program has tended to stimulate adoption of yield-increasing practices which will be continued and even expanded next year. This situation, along with the expected reduction in participation for next year, promises to result in another huge corn crop. We must look for alternatives for solving this problem.

Intentions for next year are even more significant. Once farmers establish an improved practice—such as additional fertilizer—which brings better yields, they do not go back to old methods. Farmers interviewed indicated they intend to continue the yield-increasing practices—and they intend to step up the fertilizer applications next year. In a few cases, farmers who had never used fertilizer before used it this year and plan to use more next year with heavier planting rates.

Acreage changes planned for next year are most significant. Nonparticipants plan a 2-percent increase in acreage for next year. Participants plan a 20-percent increase in corn acreage.

Given the same program with the same payment rates, very few of the farmers who didn't sign up this year intend to do so next year. But, quite a few of the farmers who signed up this year do not intend to next year. Further, many farmers who put maximum acreage in the program intend to put in much lesser amounts next year.

Only a very few of the farmers interviewed indicated they would put in more than the minimum of 20 percent to qualify for price supports.

Therefore, it is indicated that there will be 35–40 percent less acreage retired if the same program is provided in 1962. Thus, we can expect an increase of 6 to 8 million acres of corn over this year with a total production of approximately 3.9 billion bushels, providing the crop year is about as good as in 1960 and not quite as good as in 1961. This is slightly more than the 1960 output.

With a corn year similar to this year, the expected effect would be an increase in production of about 400 million bushels over 1961. Indications are that farmers will plant more grain sorghum but about the same acreage of soybeans, oats, and barley next year.

Farmers were asked what they want. They were asked why they went into the program this year and what changes they think should be made in 1962. The most common reason for participation was to help with the surplus problem or to reduce the high cost of Government storage. Second in importance was the weather or inability to get into the fields. Third was expected reductions in costs of farm operation.

When asked what effect the program has had on their income for this year, most of the farmers said that it had no effect or that it had decreased their income—because they had not managed to achieve the reduction in cost which they had anticipated or that they could have made more from their land by cropping it.

For the next year, most of the farmers want higher payments on their land specifically, or they feel that there is need for greater equity both in terms of the allotment for corn acreage basis and in payment rates.

Of course, a large number of farmers who have not participated recommended that the program be done away with entirely and that we return to the free market.

Some farmers want complete control over all phases of agricultural production, a view which the USDA officials appear to share. Others want a complete return to the free market and abandonment of any form of government control or supports. However, the majority of farmers appear to prefer something other than either of these extremes.

THE ILLINOIS WATERWAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, since the canalization of the Illinois River by widening and deepening, so as to admit barge traffic, there has been a steady growth in travel on the Illinois River over a period of time. An estimate has been made that as of 1961 total barge tonnage was more than 26 million. It is estimated also that in calendar year 1962 that tonnage will be exceeded.

In this connection, Mr. President, a rather interesting article was published in the Daily Republican Times of Ottawa, Ill., dated December 30, 1961, under the caption "Waterway Is Major Artery." I believe this article merits wider circulation, and for that reason I ask unanimous consent that it be included as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM STEEL TO PEANUTS—WATERWAY IS MAJOR ARTERY—TONNAGE HITS 26 MILLION—SEE RECORD DURING 1962

Do you like peanuts? As many as 500 tons per week, maybe? Peanuts in that quantity were one of the many cargoes shipped through La Salle County in 1961 via one of the Midwest's greatest commercial routes, the Illinois Waterway.

Altogether, more than 26 million tons of coal, petroleum products, grain, sand and gravel, sulfur, iron, and other products passed through this important link between Lake Michigan and the Mississippi River in 1961.

Waterway officials report that tonnage for the year was down from 3 to 5 percent from the total shipped in 1960, but predict that shipping in 1962 may rise to a new record of 27 million tons.

The waterway is a key factor in the economy of both Illinois and La Salle County.

Manufacturers in the county receive many of their raw materials via the waterway, and much of the grain harvested here is shipped via the river. For thousands of private citizens, the waterway is a recreational area for the operation of a growing number of pleasure boats.

Two of the seven locks of the Illinois Waterway system, which maintain the river at navigable depths with their dams, are located in La Salle County—at Marseilles and Starved Rock. Other locks of the system are at Lockport, Brandon, Dresden Island, Peoria and La Grange.

The beginnings of the present waterway system go back to 1900 when a navigable canal was constructed along the northeast end of the former Illinois-Michigan Canal to provide sanitary drainage for Chicago.

In 1908 the people of the State voted a $20 million bond issue to complete canalization of the waterway from the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal to Utica, and the Federal Government assumed jurisdiction of the partially completed improvements in 1930.

Since the waterway was completed in 1933, it has been operated and maintained by the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers. The Peoria and La Grange locks and dams were added from 1936 to 1938, to replace four outmoded locks in that section of the river.

A traffic on the 327-mile water route continues to grow, new locks will be needed in the future. It is estimated the Lockport and Brandon Roads locks will reach their practical capacity by 1968, Marseilles by 1970, Dresden Island by 1972 and Starved Rock, Peoria and La Grange by 1977. Congress has authorized the project of building additional locks at the present sites as the need arises, and a cost estimate of $115 million has been set.

Most of the cargo coming upriver goes to industrial plants and services in the Chicago area, but waterway officials report an increasing amount of industry is "springing up" all along the river.

In La Salle County, production cutbacks at Libbey-Owens-Ford (shipment of coal down to 1,200 tons per week) and some other firms have largely been offset by waterway shipments of raw materials to such new plants as the National Phosphate Co. near Marseilles.

At present Libbey-Owens-Ford is using about 85,000 tons of coal and 10,800 tons of soda ash per year, and plant officials foresee no increase in the coming year. The company formerly used about twice the above amount of raw materials, according to Assistant Plant Manager Al Guthrie.

Officials at National Phosphate report that when their plant is in full operation, it will require raw materials (phosphate rock from the South and liquid sulfur from the Texas gulf) totaling approximately 1,500 tons per day.

Coal, sand and gravel, sulfur, fuel oil, and salt, are the major waterway imports of the county, and its major export is grain.

Although shipments of corn and soybeans from the county have shown a steady growth, they were down slightly in 1961 due to poor harvesting conditions. Grain elevator operators report that most grain is shipped in October and November and at the beginning of each new tax year.

While most soybeans are now being shipped to Chicago for processing or shipments overseas via the St. Lawrence Seaway, corn goes both north and south. Large shipments are made annually to New Orleans and Vicksburg, Miss.

At the peak of the harvest season, each of the grain elevators located along the river may ship one to three 50,000-bushel barges per week. Much of the corn is presently going to cattle and poultry feeders in Southern States, they report.

In November of 1961, 74,900 tons of grain passed north through the Starved Rock lock.

As commercial shipping grows, the number of private pleasure boats on the river is also growing. Because many of the boats remain in one stretch of the river, their traffic accounts for only about 7 percent of more than 6,300 lockages each made during 1961 at the Marseilles and Starved Rock locks.

Registration of private boats for the State is incomplete, but officials estimate that about 130,000 are presently in use in State lakes and streams. Numbers of the larger boats pass through La Salle County en route to the Mississippi, headed south for the winter. Sale of private boats in the county is a thriving business, although 1961 was economically a slack year in the county.

Forty-eight employees maintain and operate the county's two locks and dams.

Lockmasters report that the number of lockages in 1961 didn't differ much from the previous year, but that tugs were pushing larger tows of an additional three or four barges.

This growth requires double lockages due to the limited length of the locks and requires more time than a straight lockage or jackknife lockage. A double lockage may require 1½ hours to pass the tug and all barges through.

Traffic up and downstream is controlled by the lockmaster via radio, which all tugs and many private boats now have.

The most recent improvement in the lock system in La Salle County is at Starved Rock where a row of four new protection piers keep tows away from the dam and help guide them into the lock. In the unending task of keeping traffic channels open to a minimum depth of 9 feet, the Corps of Engineers also spent 2 months dredging the river through the county in 1961.

Some 200 tugs ply the river each year, pushing tows which range through coal, iron ore, imported goods, heavy manufactured goods and many other items. About 35 companies have tugs in regular operation on the waterway throughout the year.

Traffic churns through the waterway in all seasons and weather. Although it isn't much of a problem on the open river, ice formed in extremely cold periods may cut the locks effectiveness in half for a few weeks, permitting passages only one barge wide. Although ice doesn't stop the tows, it may slow their speed considerably at times, lockmasters report.

An average of 80 barges pass through each of the locks in La Salle county daily. Some of these are empty of cargo, as 75 percent of the total cargo load goes upriver to Chicago or Indiana ports (via the Calumet-Sag channel).

Although many cargoes are seasonal, others such as coal are year round. Coal is the most prominent cargo, coming from mines in southern Illinois. For the Marseilles-Starved Rock locks during the past year, cargoes in order of prominence were coal, petroleum products, miscellaneous cargoes, grain, iron and steel manufactures, sulphur, sand and gravel and scrap iron and steel.

Liquid sulphur is a newcomer to the waterway scene, and of growing importance. It must be shipped in special heated barges. Another new cargo coming into prominence is high grade iron ore shipped from deposits in South America to northern steel mills.

As population and commerce along the waterway continue to grow, the value of cargo shipped on the Illinois Waterway is approaching the half-billion-dollar mark, and that ain't (according to the new Webster) peanuts.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

STOCK DISTRIBUTION TREATED AS RETURN OF CAPITAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8847) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that a distribution of stock made to an individual (or certain corporations) pursuant to an order enforcing the antitrust laws shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital; and to provide that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, prior to any discussion on the bill before the Senate, I discussed with the distinguished majority leader the question of the recess in the Lincoln period, and he has come to some conclusion thereon in which I concur. I believe if he made a statement on it now it would be helpful to all Senators in making up their calendars for February.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader, and following the usual custom, precedent, and tradition covering the birthday of one of our great Presidents, Abraham Lincoln, I wish to announce to the Senate that there will be no votes from the 9th to the 13th of February inclusive, and, if at all possible—but this is not a firm commitment—we shall try to see to it that there will be no votes on either the 8th or 14th of February. However, Senators should be on notice that there may be votes on the 8th or 14th of February. So far as the 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, and 13th of February are concerned, Senators are at liberty to fulfill Lincoln Day commitments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have one further question to address to the distinguished majority leader.

I understand that probably this morning a conference was held—I may be in error on that—to make a further determination as to major proposed legislation which will be coming before the Senate after we dispose of the unfinished business. I thought perhaps the majority leader might at this time wish to make an observation in that regard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is not much I can say as yet, because there will be a meeting of the Policy Committee shortly. Tentatively it is the leadership's suggestion that on the 29th of this month the higher education bill be considered.

It is anticipated that the Du Pont bill, now before the Senate, will consume some days of debate still, and that following, between then and the calling up of the higher education bill, we shall attend to other items on the Calendar, on which individual Senators have asked that they be notified and on which there may well be a degree of debate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader. I suggest that perhaps later in the day, if there are any further observations he can make for the guidance of the Senate, we should appreciate it manifestly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall do my best.

STOCK DISTRIBUTION TREATED AS RETURN OF CAPITAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8847) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that a distribution of stock made to an individual (or certain corporations) pursuant to an order enforcing the antitrust laws shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital; and to provide that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the big question involved in the Du Pont tax bill is not how much taxes will be paid, or which particular taxpayers will pay them, but whether the Du Pont control of General Motors and its monopoly control of General Motors purchases of fabrics and finishes, found by the Supreme Court to be a violation of the antitrust law, will be broken or will be continued. Though the tax consequencs of the pending bill are important—and I shall discuss them in due course—I wish first to define the antimonopoly issue which I think looms in paramount importance.

With the disturbing number of mergers and the increasing instances of big corporations acquiring the assets of one competitor after another, our attention has perhaps been diverted from another form of external corporate expansion which, from an economic point of view, and effective monopolistic practices, is of equal and, in some cases, perhaps of even greater significance. I refer to the buying of a minority, though substantial, stock interest in other large concerns by one particularly large and powerful corporation, together with affiliated and interlocked corporate entities, persons and personal holding companies. When such a cohesive interest group reaches the importance and power of the Du Pont corporate complex, the economic consequences are compounded.

In studies and investigations conducted by the U.S. Government in 1947, 1948, and 1949, the Du Pont Co. and its interlocked structure of giant corporations, stock holdings, affiliates and affinities, was found to constitute such a complex.

Thereupon, the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department under the Truman administration filed an antitrust action against the Du Pont Co., the Christiana Corp., Delaware Realty Corp., and other corporate entities and persons. The prosecution of the suit was continued for 8 years by the Eisenhower administration and two Supreme Court decisions holding Du Pont to be in violation of the Antitrust Act were won. This, in my view, was the most important antitrust court victory in the history of our country. Initiated, as I said, in the Truman administration, it was prosecuted successfully during the Eisenhower administration.

But now I am apprehensive that it is about to be aborted by this bill during the first year of the Kennedy administration.

I think this would be a sorry political story. But politics is not the most important question, no more than the tax consequence is the most important question. The great importance of this issue lies in the success or failure of the antimonopoly action.

The Federal Trade Commission conducted a study of intercorporate relationships. A report was made to the Federal Trade Commission, and it was printed by the Federal Trade Commission. I have tried repeatedly, but thus far unsuccessfully, to obtain public release of the report. The report is entitled "The Du Pont Complex." I have written the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission two letters. I have talked with him by telephone. I visited with him twice. My staff assistants have talked with him several times. Yet the report which has been given to me, marked "confidential," has not yet been released. The latest letter I have from Mr. Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, is dated January 15, 1962. In that letter he quotes the law which he and the Commission believe restricts the publication of the report. I read the concluding paragraphs of the letter:

> Under the circumstances, the Commission in its meeting this morning concluded that it could not take the responsibility for divulging names of customers from this report at this time.
>
> It was the decision of the Commission, however, that you could make any use of the report that you saw fit so long as you did not make public the names of the customers contained in the report.
>
> With kind personal regards, I am,
>
> Respectfully,
>
> PAUL RAND DIXON,
> *Chairman.*

I shall comply with that injunction. At first I was tempted to use the rules of the Senate, which provide a way for a Senator to discuss with his colleagues confidential information. However, since Mr. Dixon has gone so far as to make it possible for me to use this report in any way I see fit, other than to disclose the names of the customers, which in this case are customers of the Du Pont Co. and its affiliates, I shall not go so far as to move that the galleries be cleared and the doors closed.

I should like to say, however, that the identity of these customers, the trade relationships, the contractual relationships, and practices, whether evidenced by written contracts or not, constitute an important part of the study entitled "The Du Pont Complex."

I should like to read briefly from a portion of the report which does not divulge the names of customers, I read:

> In two recent reports the Federal Trade Commission has examined the problem of the external expansion of business—the buying up by one company of the stock or assets of another. In these reports attention was focused upon those forms of external expansion which result in the complete, or virtually complete, disappearance of the company whose stock or assets were acquired. With few exceptions these reports dealt with cases in which a majority control of stock was acquired or all of the assets were merged.
>
> There are, however, other forms of external expansion. One of the most significant

> of these, from an economic point of view, is the form in which one large company buys a minority, though substantial, interest in another large concern. The importance of the problem becomes compounded when the acquiring firm obtains such interests in a number of large corporations, binding them together into a loosely held but nonetheless cohesive interest group or complex of corporate power.

Mr. President, I call attention to the following sentence, because it has particular bearing upon the bill pending before the Senate:

> The firm of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc., constitutes the center of such a complex, and thus provides an excellent opportunity to study this form of external expansion.
>
> This report presents an analysis of the Du Pont complex.

I digress again to express regret that the Federal Trade Commission has not found a way to make public this very significant report on the Du Pont complex. I continue to read:

> In this complex are to be found some of the largest corporations in American industry, representing a tremendous aggregation of economic power. The complex evolved as a dominant factor in the period between World Wars I and II and during those years it became not only a great power in U.S. industry but also an important participant in international cartel affairs. The genesis of the complex and its corporate composition are examined. The economic ties which unite the complex are explored. And finally, the impact of this complex upon competitive markets is studied.
>
> Briefly, the report reveals the existence of a system of preempted, closed markets of significance to all business units seeking to engage in the manufacture and sale of the same or competing products.
>
> It reveals the apparent existence of a division of markets between large sellers and large buyers for a number of important products. The report points out that such preemption and division of markets weakens the competitive position and the investment potential of the smaller independent concern. And finally, it describes the way in which other large firms outside of the complex, whose activities impinge upon a member of the group, accommodate themselves to the power of the complex.

I believe that the following two sentences are particularly important and deserve emphasis. Therefore, I will read them, and then reread them:

> Of all the problems involved in the concentration of economic power, none is more difficult of solution than this problem of the "interest group" or complex of giant corporations. Yet none is more important of solution if a free, competitive economy is to be maintained.

For emphasis, I reread this paragraph:

> Of all the problems involved in the concentration of economic power, none is more difficult of solution than this problem of the "interest group," or complex of giant corporations. Yet none is more important of solution if a free competitive economy is to be maintained.

This Federal Trade Commission report entitled "The Du Pont Complex" goes to the very heart of the principal issue involved in the pending bill. That issue, let me repeat, is not how much taxes will be paid, or which particular taxpayers will pay them, important as these questions are, but rather whether the monopoly control of the Du Pont complex over General Motors and its purchases of automobile finishes and fabrics will be broken or will be continued.

I think I may say, without divulging the names of companies or customers, that the report reveals that the Du Pont complex has exercised control over purchases by General Motors of the glass for the windshields and doors of General Motors automobiles, and of the tires for General Motors cars. Indeed, because another corporation which Du Pont controls manufactures a certain element which makes gasoline allegedly more high powered and antiknock, we find that General Motors automobiles are made to use gasoline which has an additive of tetraethyl lead. This product is furnished by a particular company which constitutes a part of the Du Pont complex.

I wish that all Members of the Senate could take the time to come by my desk and read this report. It has been in existence quite a long while, and the studies concurrent with it form the foundation of the antitrust suit which was filed against Du Pont and other defendants previously identified.

Because the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] have entered the Chamber since I read from the report entitled "The Du Pont Complex," I should like to reread, for their benefit, the last paragraph which I read to the Senate with emphasis:

> Of all the problems involved in the concentration of economic power, none is more difficult of solution than this problem of the "interest group" or complex of giant corporations. Yet none is more important of solution if a free, competitive economy is to be maintained.

I have proposed to show that the purport and the effect of the pending bill is expected to be, and I fear will be, a continuation of this monopoly control by a small group of people over this giant industrial complex, a problem the solution of which the Federal Trade Commission says is important if a free competitive economy is to be maintained.

I believe in free enterprise. I believe in our competitive capitalistic system. Let me say to my friends, the senior Senator from Oklahoma and the senior Senator from Delaware, who I believe are the two principal proponents of the bill in the Senate, that one of the great dangers to our free enterprise system—indeed, the greatest danger, in my opinion—is the monopolistic concentration of power in the hands of a few, the big and the mighty, thereby stifling and choking the energies of the many, the small, the new, and the ambitious, setting underway emotions and sentiments which might rise to such a tide that they would be irresistible.

I suggest to Senators that they, as I have done, write to the Federal Trade Commission and secure for themselves a copy of the report "The Du Pont Complex."

A few moments ago I said that this study was made concurrently with and perhaps as a part of the governmental studies and investigations which led to the filing of the antitrust monopoly action against the Du Pont Co., Christiana Corp., and other corporate entities and persons. I should like to read from the original bill of complaint filed in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division. I read from page 10, item 18, of the complaint:

> 18. Du Pont Co., General Motors, and U.S. Rubber together constitute the largest combination of manufacturing enterprises in the United States. For the year 1947, the assets, sales volume and net income after taxes of the defendant manufacturers were as follows:

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	Assets	Sales (round numbers)	Net income after taxes (round numbers)
Du Pont	1,438	783	120
General Motors	2,473	3,815	288
U.S. Rubber	348	581	21
Total	4,259	5,189	429

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I now read a portion of article 20:

> The Du Pont Co. produces many products which are used in the operations of other defendant manufacturers. General Motors and U.S. Rubber constitute a substantial market for many of such products produced by Du Pont Co.
>
> ART. 24. There are numerous manufacturers, other than the defendant manufacturers, located in various parts of the United States, which manufacture and sell products of substantially the same type, kind, and quality as the products manufactured and sold by the defendant manufacturers, and but for the combination and conspiracy alleged hereinafter these other manufacturers would be able to offer their products competitively to the manufacturing defendants having need for them. In addition, the potential market in which these other manufacturing companies may compete generally has been restricted substantially by the nature and the magnitude of the growth of the defendant manufacturers, and the ability of said other manufacturing companies to compete effectively has been substantially impaired by the illegal means hereinafter alleged.

I read now briefly from article 30:

> The aforesaid combination and conspiracy to restrain interstate trade and commerce and to monopolize a substantial part thereof, has consisted of a continuing agreement and concert of action among the defendants, the substantial terms of which have been that defendants:
>
> (a) Agree to acquire, hold and perpetuate control by the defendant individuals and class defendants of the directors, executives, and corporate policy of each of the corporate defendants:
>
> (1) By establishing Christiana and Delaware as personal holding companies, a majority of the outstanding voting stock of which would be held by the defendant individuals and class defendants and their families in perpetuity and voted by them;

Mr. President, I digress from reading the text of the original complaint, to say that yesterday it was stated on the floor of the Senate that the antitrust issue had been settled, all that remained was the passage of a tax bill. But, Mr.

President, nothing could be farther from the truth. I am confident that my friends and colleagues so understand it, or else they would not have so stated it; but that does not comport with the facts. Indeed, a lawyer for the Du Pont Co. was quoted yesterday, in Chicago, in appearing before the district court, as saying—and that statement was read into the Record, yesterday—that the one remaining issue was the ordered action of the Christiana Corp., whether the divestiture of General Motors stock by Du Pont to Christiana is to be ordered; and if that is ordered, whether Christiana shall be required to divest; and, if so, by sale or by pass-through to Christiana's shareholders.

Mr. President, that is the antitrust issue; it is the antimonopoly issue. An attempt to arrive at a legislative solution of that issue, is, in my humble opinion, the principal motivation for this bill—not perhaps by my two colleagues in the Senate, neither of whom wrote this bill, in my opinion; not by the staff of the Senate Finance Committee, which in my opinion did not write this bill; not by the Government of the United States, which so far as I know did not submit this bill.

Who wrote the bill? Devious and technical as its terms are, I cannot provide the answer, nor has the answer been given on the floor of the Senate.

Ah, Mr. President, the antimonopoly question has not been settled. It is pending now in the court in Chicago. Yet we are asked to provide today, here in the Senate, a solution, by means of legislation.

Mr. President, the statements made by some of my colleagues; namely, that the antimonopoly question had been settled, that the antitrust issue had been settled—are not the only such statements which have been made. In a brochure sent by the Du Pont Co. to newspaper editors and reporters across the country, I find the following statement:

> Since the Supreme Court has directed Du Pont to divest its 63 million shares, the basic antitrust aspects of the litigation are settled.

Mr. President, that is not a correct statement—as my colleague, the distinguished and able Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] asserted yesterday, and knows perfectly well, and as the lawyers for the Du Pont Co. said yesterday before the court in Chicago—if the statement read into the Record of the Senate's proceedings yesterday was correct. The remaining issue is the important antitrust issue involved in this entire question, which has been before the courts for 13 years, and for which, so the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] yesterday said, this bill will provide an "equitable solution."

Why should Congress legislate a Du Pont Co. victory? The Du Pont Co. has lost the case in the courts, and now comes to the Congress, in an attempt to win it. Mr. President, this is the next to the last foxhole. If the Senate were to pass the bill, only one more step would be necessary; namely, approval of the bill by the President.

I have said before that the Du Pont Co. has conducted a campaign of misinformation and deception. I read now a statement issued to all the editors of the newspapers of our country; namely, that "the basic antitrust aspects of the litigation are settled." But, Mr. President, what is the contest now before the court in Chicago about? What is it that is unsettled out there? It is not a question of a tax rate. That question is not before the court. It is not a question of legislative enactment that is before the court—at least not officially. The question is enforcement of the antitrust law. The question is whether the order of the trial court to which this issue has been remanded by the Supreme Court, for entry of an appropriate order to effectuate the order and decree of the Supreme Court, shall require sale of General Motors stock before it reaches Christiana Corp., or, if it reaches Christiana Corp., whether it shall require devistiture by Christiana Corp., and if so, whether by sale or distribution to stockholders.

Mr. President, I was complimented yesterday as being capable of lucidity in statement. I appreciate that generosity. I hope the statement I have just made is lucid. I am confident that it is correct. And this goes to the heart of the issue, not only before the courts, but the issue for which this bill, it is said, will provide an "equitable solution."

Yes, not only has an attempt been made to mislead the thousands of stockholders, many of whom have written Senators because they have been misled, but here I have read a patent attempt to mislead the newspaper editors of the country.

I should like to return now to read further from the original complaint with respect to the Christiana Corp. I am reading now from page 16 of the original complaint before the Federal district court in Chicago:

> (2) By utilizing Christiana and Delaware to acquire sufficient of the common stock of Du Pont Co. to control it, and to hold such stock in perpetuity, and to vote it;
>
> (3) By causing Du Pont Co. to acquire sufficient of the common stock of General Motors to control it, to hold such stock in perpetuity, and to vote it;
>
> (4) By causing the defendant individuals and certain of the class defendants to acquire sufficient of the common stock of U.S. Rubber to control it, to hold such stock in perpetuity for themselves and their families, and to vote it;
>
> (b) Agree to utilize control of the defendant manufacturers to enhance the size, power, and market control of each of them at the expense of its competitors:
>
> (1) By causing each defendant manufacturer which uses products produced by one or more of the other defendant manufacturers to purchase substantially all of its requirements of such products from such other defendant manufacturers, and to exclude competitors of such other defendant manufacturers from the opportunity of competing freely for such business;
>
> (2) By causing Du Pont Co. to expand its production facilities, through acquisitions and otherwise, so as to enable it to produce the types and quantities of products in the chemical and related fields which are used in substantial quantities by the other defendant manufacturers;
>
> (3) By causing General Motors and U.S. Rubber to expand in their respective existing fields, and into new fields, through acquisitions and otherwise, so as to enlarge the closed and noncompetitive market available to Du Pont Co. for products sold by it to General Motors and U.S. Rubber, and to increase the profits available to Du Pont Co. from its ownership of General Motors stock;
>
> (4) By subsidizing the expansion of Du Pont Co. by using for such purpose the profits derived by it from the sale of its products on a closed market basis to General Motors and U.S. Rubber, as well as the profits derived by Du Pont Co. from its ownership of General Motors stock;
>
> (5) By subsidizing the expansion of General Motors by causing Du Pont Co. and U.S. Rubber to grant General Motors systematic secret rebates and preferential prices on certain of the products sold to General Motors on a closed market basis by Du Pont Co. and U.S. Rubber, and selling such products at higher prices to customers of Du Pont and U.S. Rubber other than General Motors;
>
> (6) By subsidizing the expansion of U.S. Rubber by using for such purpose the profits derived by it from the sale of its products on a closed market basis to General Motors and Du Pont Co.;
>
> (7) By inducing suppliers of each defendant manufacturer to purchase products on a basis of reciprocity from one or more of the other defendant manufacturers, and to refrain from purchasing such products from competitors of such other defendant manufacturers;

I digress to say, Mr. President, that this is a very strong complaint. The Antitrust Division of the U.S. Department of Justice has been fortunate to have some brilliant young attorneys, dedicated to the public welfare. This was true during the administrations of former President Truman and former President Eisenhower, and it is true now.

I should like to read further from the original complaint. I am reading now from page 18:

> (8) By causing each defendant manufacturer to make patents, technical data, and trade information obtained by any one defendant manufacturer, available to the other dependant manufacturers on an exclusive or preferential basis;

Mr. President, this is a graphic description of how the whole Du Pont complex is controlled by a few. Control of the Du Pont Co. is vested in the Christiana Corp., which in turn is controlled through 80-percent ownership by a relatively few members of the Du Pont family. Thus we see that the heart and core of this antitrust problem rests with the treatment of the General Motors stock as and after it is divested by the Du Pont Co.

Will a large block of it go to Christiana, which has been the mainspring in this monopoly? If so, will this large block then go to the few members of the Du Pont family, the seat of the control of this entire monoply?

In fact, according to the most recent records I have been able to obtain, the Du Pont family rather than the Du Pont Co. exercises control of United States Rubber, yet this bill would pave the way for a pass-through of General Motors stock to the Du Pont family, which controls United States Rubber. If such a pass-through is made possible or comes about as a result of enactment of the pending bill, we have the statement of Mr. Robert Kennedy, Attorney General of the United States, that this would enable the Du Pont family to exercise effective control of both General Motors and the Du Pont corporation.

How would this bring about an equitable solution to the judicial proceedings? Where are the interests of the people in such a solution? Where are those who are concerned about small business? Where are those who make Fourth of July speeches about the octopus of monopoly controls? I urge them to come to the floor of the Senate and to defend the rights of the people, to protect the free enterprise system from the biggest monopolistic complex in the world today.

I read again from the original complaint:

> (c) Agree to utilize control of the defendant manufacturers to eliminate competition among themselves:
>
> (1) By causing General Motors to refrain from entering into chemical manufacturing fields, including the manufacture of paints, varnishes, and related products, and to grant Du Pont Co. exclusive production rights in chemical discoveries made by General Motors;
>
> (2) By causing General Motors to refrain from manufacturing tires and tubes;
>
> (3) By causing United States Rubber to refrain from expanding its operations into chemical and related fields in which Du Pont Co. operates, or into fields in which General Motors operates.
>
> 31. During the period of time covered by this complaint and for the purpose of forming and effectuating the aforesaid combination and conspiracy, the defendants by agreement and concerted action have done the things which, as hereinbefore alleged, they conspired to do, and more particularly, have done, among others, the following acts and things.

Then there follows in this complaint, Mr. President, a long list of acts, some of which the Supreme Court finally held constituted a violation of the antitrust laws.

In that connection, a great deal has been said about everybody being innocent in this whole proceeding. One would gather from the propaganda which the Du Pont Co. has disseminated that everybody has been innocent in this; that nobody had intended to set up a monopoly; that this all happened by accident, by some peculiar quirk of fate; that the Du Pont complex came into being perhaps with a flash of lightning, with no intent involved, with no intent to restrain trade, with no covert deals made to segregate markets or to squelch competition.

I shall read what the Supreme Court said:

> The fact that sticks out—

Mr. President, that is rather unusual language for the Supreme Court to use, it seems to me, but it is graphic.

> The fact that sticks out in this voluminous record is that the bulk of Du Pont's production has always supplied the largest part of the requirements of the one customer in the automobile industry connected to Du Pont by a stock interest. The inference is overwhelming that Du Pont's commanding position was promoted by its stock interest and was not gained solely on competitive merit.

Where are those Senators who are always making good speeches at chamber of commerce meetings about our great American competitive system? Why are they not here trying to protect that American free enterprise system? Perhaps they will be before the debate ends, because I intend to do everything within my power, everything of which I am capable, to drive home to the Senate and to the country the central issue involved in the bill, which is whether this monopoly of the Du Pont complex will be broken or will be continued.

Then let us take a vote, and the American people can see and read and know, not only this year but also in years to come, who is on the side of this giant corporate complex which has been held by the Supreme Court to have violated the antitrust laws and who is on the side of the free enterprise system, the American system, which I think has brought the greatest measure of blessing to and offers the greatest hope for the American people.

I agree with the statement in the report of the Federal Trade Commission:

> Of all the problems involved in the concentration of economic power, none is more difficult of solution than this problem of the interest group or complex of giant corporations. Yet none is more important of solution if a free, competitive economy is to be maintained.

I wish to read further from the Supreme Court decision:

> We agree with the trial court that considerations of price, quality, and service were not overlooked by either Du Pont or General Motors. Pride in its products and its high financial stake in General Motors' success would naturally lead Du Pont to try to supply the best. But the wisdom of this business judgment cannot obscure the fact, plainly revealed by the record, that Du Pont purposely employed its stock to pry open the General Motors market to entrench itself as the primary supplier of General Motors' requirements for automotive finishes and fabrics.

So the Supreme Court does not say that this happened by accident. The Supreme Court does not agree with those who say that this great corporate complex came as manna fallen from heaven. The Supreme Court said:

> Du Pont purposely employed its stock to pry open the General Motors market to entrench itself as a primary supplier of General Motors' requirements for automotive finishes and fabrics.

The report of the Federal Trade Commission to which I have referred shows in detail how the company has done the same thing with relation to glass and tires.

In addition, the other day I read some statistics that showed that, at least at the time those statistics were printed, the Du Pont Co. was the largest stockholder of one of our large oil companies. Though some may think that the action by which the Du Pont Co. was created was taken for investment purposes only, I, along with members of my staff, have taken pains to inquire a little deeper into the subject. Two brilliant young men of my staff, William G. Allen and Andrew G. Lynch, spent a good portion of several months, and I have spent a good portion of several months digging into the issue before the Senate, an issue which is so blandly dismissed as an "equitable solution," legislatively ordered, of an antitrust problem that has been fought in the court for 13 years.

I have found a statement of the treasurer of the Du Pont Co. made at the time Du Pont decided to purchase General Motors stock:

> The recommendation to make an investment in the motor industry may come as quite a shock to many of our directors at first, due to lack of full understanding of the opportunity offered and its relation to other opportunities that may present themselves from time to time.

A comment of Mr. Irenee du Pont on acquisition was as follows:

> This investment was made on the invitation of Mr. W. C. Durant, founder of the General Motors Corp., and a condition imposed and agreed to by the Du Pont Co. was that the Du Pont Co. would assume responsibility for the financial policies of the General Motors Corp. and that Mr. Durant would assume responsibility for operations. Accordingly, the board of directors of the General Motors Corp. created a finance committee composed chiefly of Du Pont men and Mr. Durant and this committee was placed in complete charge of the financial affairs of the corporation. An executive committee was also created with Mr. Durant as chairman and this committee was placed in entire charge of the operating policies of the corporation.

I read another statement by the treasurer of the Du Pont Co.:

> Our interest in the General Motors Co. will undoubtedly secure for us the entire Fabrikoid, Pyralin, paint, and varnish business of those companies, which is a substantial factor.

As I understand the record, Du Pont was in the process of acquiring the two companies named, together with five additional companies.

Also, the treasurer said that Du Pont would "share in the profits of the industry to an extent equal to 120 percent of our investment, and will receive 14 percent in annual dividends thereon."

I must say that a 120 percent profit is a rather healthy profit—rather, a heavy profit; I would not say it is healthy. This was by design. This was by arrangement. General Motors Corp. was in difficulty, in great difficulty. Du Pont moved in, not to acquire a majority of the stock, but to acquire enough to fasten its tentacles upon the throat of this promising corporation. Du Pont has controlled General Motors ever since. It controls it now. That is true not only of General Motors; the tentacles of Du Pont have spread and spread and multiplied. Finally, the Government won a decision in the Supreme Court. Du Pont lost. However, Du Pont will win on the floor of the Senate if we pass this pending bill, providing for a pass-through of General Motors stock through Christiana to the Du Pont family.

Although unable to quote company names and customers from the Federal Trade Commission report, I do have a report of the Temporary National Economic Committee of 1940, which I am privileged to quote. I am reading now from the report under the subhead of "Du Pont's Sphere of Influence":

> The total value of the identified holdings of members of the Du Pont family in the 200

corporations aggregated about $565 million, of which $553 million was represented by holdings in E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. (direct family holdings and proportionate interest through Christiana Securities Co.), $8 million by holdings in U.S. Rubber Co., and about $4 million by holdings in Phillips Petroleum Co. This entire vast amount was in common stocks with the exception only of $9 million of 6 percent debenture stock of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. and $2 million of preferred stock of U.S. Rubber Corp. The Du Pont holdings represent the largest aggregation of wealth encountered in the study of the ownership of the 200 corporations. Their market value amounted to about 2 percent of that of all stock outstanding of the 200 corporations and to over 6 percent of the value of the stock included in the 20 largest shareholdings. The total assets of the three corporations under control of the Du Pont family (E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.; General Motors Corp.; U.S. Rubber Co.) aggregated about $2,100 million and represented 3 percent of the aggregate assets of the 200 corporations and nearly 1½ percent of those of all nonfinancial corporations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that those figures are only for the latter part of the 1930's?

Mr. GORE. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As of today the value would be many multiples of that figure. Is that true?

Mr. GORE. Not only would the value of the stock involved have multiplied, but the tentacles of the Du Pont complex have been greatly extended. Many more corporations have been brought into the complex, under the influence, and into the combine. I have heard many stories, read many facts, and seen many statistics to illustrate this fact.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Last fall, in the concluding hours of the session, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement of the holdings of the E. I. du Pont de Nemours Co. as given by Moody's Manual. Those are found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 16, pages 21358-21362. That, of course, shows an extraordinary range of companies, as the Senator from Tennessee has said. It includes not only General Motors, but also large holdings in Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. and in Phillips Petroleum Co., and in Remington Arms Co., many firms manufacturing paints, powder, chemicals, synthetics and textiles.

The salaries and wages alone paid out by the company and consolidated subsidiaries in 1960 amounted to $635 million—that is, wages and salaries alone—and, of course, the amount of the capital involved was many times that figure.

Mr. GORE. In addition, to that we must add the holdings of the members of the family, who in turn control the Du Pont corporation, which in turn has the holdings to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe that is the case with respect to U.S. Rubber. That is held by the family, rather than by the Du Pont corporation.

Mr. GORE. Yes; I understand that to be the case. Moreover, if this pass-through is permitted of General Motors stock to the relatively few members of the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family, that family, according to the Attorney General of the United States, will hold effective control of General Motors, just as they now hold effective control of U.S. Rubber.

So the key here is the pass-through, the pass-through of General Motors stock now held by the Du Pont Co., without payment of taxes by Du Pont to the Christiana Corp., and then through the Christiana Corp., with only nominal taxes, to the members of the Du Pont family, some of whom would pay substantial taxes, while other stockholders would pay very little, if anything.

That is the central issue; that is the question—pass-through. The bill paves the way, let me repeat, for a pass-through.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the table and explanatory material which appears beginning on page 119 of the TNEC report. Even though the table is old, it is still quite revealing.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DU PONT SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

The total value of the identified holdings of members of the Du Pont family in the 200 corporations aggregated about $565 million, of which $553 million was represented by holdings in E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. (direct family holdings and proportionate interest through Christiana Securities Co.), $8 million by holdings in U.S. Rubber Co., and about $4 million by holdings in Phillips Petroleum Co. This entire vast amount was in common stocks with the exception only of $9 million of 6 percent debenture stock of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. and $2 million of preferred stock of U.S. Rubber Corp. The Du Pont holdings represent the largest aggregation of wealth encountered in the study of the ownership of the 200 corporations. Their market value amounted to about 2 percent of that of all stock outstanding of the 200 corporations and to over 6 percent of the value of the stock included in the 20 largest shareholdings. The total assets of the three corporations under control of the Du Pont family (E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.; General Motors Corps; U.S. Rubber Co.) aggregated about $2,100 million and represented 3 percent of the aggregate assets of the 200 corporations and nearly 1½ percent of those of all nonfinancial corporations.

From the point of view of control the Du Pont empire centers in the E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. Members of the Du Pont family owned directly or indirectly 43.9 percent of the voting stock of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. This block, if acting in unison represents unassailable control, since it would be practically impossible for any other interest group to acquire a larger block in a corporation so heavily capitalized. Family control goes back to the foundation in 1802 of the direct predecessors of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. The company, however, began to expand on a large scale only after 1914, and at that time the now dominant branch of the family acquired control from Coleman du Pont, then the largest shareholder.

E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., in turn, owned 23 percent of the common stock of General Motors Corp., acquired shortly after its formation. This was by far the largest block in existence, the next largest being one of 6 percent held by the officers of the corporation through the General Motors Management Corp. and the General Motors Securities Corp., class A stock. In view of the very heavy capitalization of the company and the wide diffusion of its stock, this block appears to carry safe working control. (Members of the Du Pont family owned another 0.62 percent of the common stock of General Motors Corp.)

The Du Pont family owned 15.7 percent of the common and 6.5 percent of the preferred stock (both voting issues) of U.S. Rubber Co., the largest block known to exist. As the remainder of the stock is widely distributed, U.S. Rubber Co. may be regarded as being under working control by the Du Pont family.

Holdings of the Du Pont family in Phillips Petroleum Co. amounted to 2.2 percent of the common stock, with a market value of less than $4 million. This was not the largest known block in existence and apparently did not carry a decisive influence on the management.

Originally no close industrial relationship appears to have existed between E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. and General Motors Corp. The acquisition by E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. rather seems to have been the result of the desire for profitable investment of the large undistributed profits which E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. had accumulated during the World War. The control over U.S. Rubber Co., one of the largest tire producers, on the other hand, might be regarded as industrially related to the indirect control of the Du Pont family over General Motors Corp. The holdings of the Du Pont family in Phillips Petroleum Co. appear to be incidental and do not carry control.

The instrumentalities used by the Du Pont family in controlling its sphere of influence are of considerable interest because of the great number of the individuals participating in the ownership of the family block and the complex machinery built up to keep control concentrated, notwithstanding the diffusion of ownership. All in all, about 75 family members of 3 generations own beneficially some of the family holdings. There are probably other family members who owned stock in the family-controlled corporations but did not show up in the study, and some family members most likely owned more stock in one or more of the family enterprises than they were credited with on the record. So far as the records go, no single individuals owned directly more than 0.70 percent of the common stock of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. or not much over 1½ percent of the total family holdings.

The cornerstone in the sphere of influence of the Delaware branch of the Du Pont family is the Christiana Securities Co., originally a family holding company and now a public investment company though still safely controlled by the family through majority ownership. Christiana Securities Co. alone owned 27.6 percent of the common stock of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., practically all of which it has held since 1915. This is the largest single block in existence and alone would probably suffice for working control of the corporation. In addition, individual members of the Delaware branch owned about 4 percent of the stock of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. directly, 4 percent through trust funds and 2¾ percent through a family holding company. This brought the total holdings of the Delaware branch to 37 percent of the stock of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., undoubtedly sufficient for safe control of the corporation. Interestingly enough the dominating position in the key corporation—Christiana Securities Co.—is not scattered among individual owners, but occupied by a family holding company (Delaware Realty & Investment Co.) which owned 32.7 percent

of the common and 29.3 percent of the preferred stock of Christiana Securities Co. The stock of the Delaware Realty & Investment Co., finally, was held mainly by about a dozen nephews and nieces of Pierre S. du Pont and their children, to a considerable part not directly but through trust funds. Other members of the Delaware branch (including Pierre S. du Pont himself) owned somewhat over 40 percent of the common stock and 29 percent of the preferred stock of Christiana Securities Co.—of which 8 percent of the common and 10 percent of the preferred stock were held through family trust funds.

Holdings of the Du Pont family in equity securities of the 200 largest nonfinancial corporations

[Percent of total stock outstanding]

Company	Individuals	Trusts and estates	Personal and family holding companies	Du Pont dominated corporations	Total
American Sugar Refining Co., The	0.19	----------	----------	----------	0.19
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co	3.76	3.96	30.76	----------	38.48
General Motors Corp	.01	.29	.23	19.78	20.31
Mid-Continent Petroleum Corp	----------	----------	.46	----------	.46
Phillips Petroleum Co	1.25	----------	.93	----------	2.18
United Fruit Co	.27	----------	----------	----------	.27
United States Rubber Co	7.52	----------	3.99	----------	11.51

Record holders and holders having legal and beneficial ownership in such holdings

UNITED STATES RUBBER CO.

[Size rank: 105. 8 percent noncumulative 1st preferred (voting) as of Apr. 11, 1938. Shares outstanding as of Apr. 11, 1938: 651,091. Price as of December 1937: $46½]

HOLDERS OF RECORD

Name of record holder		Holdings		
		Number of shares	Value	Percent of shares outstanding
1. Laidlaw & Co		19,863	$923,630	3.05
2. Shearson Hammill & Co		17,821	828,676	2.74
3. St. Lawrence Sugar Refineries, Ltd		17,525	814,912	2.69
4. Wilmington Trust Co		16,951	788,222	2.60
5. Irénée du Pont		12,113	563,254	1.86
6. Rubber Securities Co. (a holding company for the Du Pont family)		11,876	552,234	1.82
7. Laird, Bissell & Meeds, held for—	*Shares*			
Renappi Corp	1,500			
Ethel H. du Pont	2,000			
H. B. du Pont	1,300			
Nemours Corp	2,850			
Jean R. Davis	200			
Richard E. Riegel	100			
Edith du P. Riegel	100			
Andrew W. Edmonds	100			
George P. Edmonds	100			
Lammot du Pont III	100			
P. S. du Pont IV	100			
William A. Worth	100			
Pamela C. Copeland	100			
6 others	260			
Total	8,910			
7. Laird, Bissell & Meeds, etc—Continued				
Shares registered in name of Laird, Bissell & Meeds but not in their possession as of this date	*Shares* 510			
Total	9,420	9,420	$438,030	1.44
8. Carl M. Loeb & Co		8,150	378,975	1.25
9. Thomson & McKinnon		7,652	355,818	1.18
10. Pierre S. du Pont		6,644	308,946	1.02
11. Cudd & Co (nominee for Chase National Bank; beneficiaries not disclosed)		4,212	195,858	.65
12. Brown Bros., Harriman & Co		3,885	180,652	.60
13. Lazard Freres		3,859	179,444	.59
14. E. F. Hutton & Co		3,747	174,236	.58
15. F. B. Davis, Jr		3,700	172,050	.57
16. H. Hentz & Co		3,522	163,773	.54
17. Francis I. du Pont & Co		3,410	158,565	.52
18. Dean & Co		3,400	158,100	.52
19. A. Felix du Pont		3,346	155,589	.51
20. Dominick & Dominick		3,827	152,846	.50
Total		164,383	7,643,810	25.23

LEGAL AND BENEFICIAL HOLDERS

Type and name of holder		Holdings		
		Number of shares	Value	Percent of shares outstanding
INDIVIDUALS, PERSONAL AND FAMILY HOLDING COMPANIES, TRUSTS AND ESTATES				
Irénée du Pont		12,113	$563,254	1.86
Pierre S. du Pont		6,644	308,946	1.02
P. S. du Pont IV		100	4,650	.01
Ethel H. du Pont		2,000	93,000	.32
A. Felix du Pont		3,346	155,589	.51
H. B. du Pont		1,300	60,450	.21
Lammot du Pont III		100	4,650	.01
Nemours Corp., a holding company, the stock of which is owned by—	*Percent*			
Paulina du Pont Dean	79.96			
J. Simpson Dean	20.04			
Total	100.00	2,850	132,525	.44
Renappi Corp., a holding company, the stock of which is owned by—	*Percent*			
Wilhelmina du Pont Ross	89.86			
Donald P. Ross	.06			
Wilmington Trust Co., trustee	10.08			
Total	100.00	1,500	69,750	.23
Edith du P. Riegel		100	4,650	.01
Richard E. Riegel		100	4,650	.01
Pamela C. Copeland		100	4,650	.01
Rubber Securities Co. (a holding company for du Pont family; for details see information given under common stock, supra)		11,876	552,234	1.82
F. B. Davis, Jr		3,700	172,050	.57
Jean R. Davis		200	9,300	.03
OTHER CORPORATIONS, NONFINANCIAL				
St. Lawrence Sugar Refineries, Ltd		17,525	$814,912	2.69
BANKS, BROKERS, ETC.; BENEFICIARIES NOT DISCLOSED				
Wilmington Trust Co		16,951	788,222	2.60
Chase National Bank		4,212	195,858	.65
Laidlaw & Co		19,863	923,630	3.05
Shearson Hammill & Co		17,821	828,676	2.74
Carl M. Loeb & Co		8,150	378,975	1.25
Thomson & McKinnon		7,652	355,818	1.18
Brown Bros., Harriman & Co		3,885	180,652	.60
Lazard Freres		3,859	179,444	.59
Dominick & Dominick		3,287	152,846	.50
E. F. Hutton & Co		3,747	174,236	.58
H. Hentz & Co		3,522	163,773	.54
Francis I. du Pont & Co		3,410	158,565	.52
Dean & Co		3,400	158,100	.52
Subtotal		163,313	7,594,055	25.07
Total record holdings not included above		1,070	49,755	.16
Total		164,383	7,643,810	25.23

> The Florida branch of the Du Pont family held about 5 percent of the stock of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., mostly through Almours Securities, Inc., dissolved after the death of Alfred du Pont. At that time the holdings of Almours Securities, Inc., were distributed to the descendants of Alfred du Pont, over three-fourths of the total going into one family trust fund.
>
> The same tendency to put a large proportion of the family block in holding companies and trust funds is evident in the Du Pont holdings of U.S. Rubber Co. and Phillips Petroleum Co. stock. About 5 percent of the common stock and 2 percent of the preferred stock of U.S. Rubber Corp. was held by Rubber Securities Co. (of which Lammot du Pont owned 73.3 percent and Irénée S. du Pont, 24.5 percent), but about 10½ percent of the common and another 4 percent of the preferred stock was owned directly by other members of the Delaware branch of the Du Pont family. Of the family holdings in Phillips Petroleum Co. about one-half was owned by Christiana Realty & Investment Co., a family holding company, 88 percent of whose stock was in the hands of family trust funds, and the other half directly, mostly by Lammot and Irénée du Pont.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, since the studies undertaken more than a decade ago and the initiation of the suit against Du Pont, the Du Pont complex has been greatly expanded, as I have said, its cohesiveness tightened, its effectiveness multiplied. Today, the Du Pont Co. and General Motors are the axis of a giant corporate complex that is competitively irresistible. It is from this threat and danger to our free competitive enterprise system that the Government, through three administrations, has sought relief in the courts.

The Antitrust Division of the Justice Department has done a magnificent job from the beginning through the filing of its most recent brief before the Federal district court in Chicago on December 29, 1961, a copy of which I have obtained. In this brief, the Justice Department insists that only a complete divestiture of its General Motors stock by both the Du Pont Co. and the Christiana Corp. will be sufficient "for effective relief."

Specifically, the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department has opposed with all its vigor, not only in its recent pleadings, but in petitions and briefs presented repeatedly through the Eisenhower administration, a pass-through of General Motors stock to a comparatively few members of the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family. The Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has been insisting and, by its most recent brief, vigorously asserted that such a pass-through would perpetuate the control of General Motors by the same corporate and financial complex which has been held by two Supreme Court decisions to be in violation of antitrust law. Yet, Mr. President, the purport and the effect of the pending bill, as I said yesterday, is to pave a superhighway for such a pass-through. Not only is that superhighway paved with tax relief to make it easy, but passage of the bill by the House and the Senate will constitute a political endorsement of a pass-through, an endorsement concurred in, I fear, by overwhelming majorities of both House and Senate and by President John F. Kennedy, should he sign the bill into law.

I say this would be wrong; it would be adverse to the public welfare.

I think we are gaining support in our opposition to the bill. Two weeks ago I read an article which said that the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and I were standing almost alone in our opposition to it. Then I read another article in which the junior Senator from Tennessee was described as making a lonely fight. But we have been gaining. The opposition has support now which it did not have last week. One by one, other Senators have been awakening to the importance of this issue. There is some faint hope of victory in my heart now, not because I have counted votes, but because the cause I present here is so right, so identified with the public welfare, so important to the free enterprise system, so necessary to break the grip of the largest monopoly in the country, that I think more supporters of our point of view will rally to the cause.

In the brief of the Department of Justice, filed before the Federal district court in Chicago on November 22, 1961, I find the following:

> This memorandum is submitted by the United States in support of the proposed final judgment which it respectfully submits should be entered by this court in making a final disposition of this action. As will be discussed in detail in subsequent portions of this memorandum, we believe that the substantive provisions of our proposal are in all respects consistent with the two decisions of the Supreme Court in this action. The central provisions of our decree providing for divestitures by Du Pont and Christiana have allowed for the greatest possible latitude and discretion with respect to the methods and time for the required divestitures, the only limitations being that the divestitures shall be completed within a 10-year period and that there should be no divestiture by way of a distribution to Christiana Corp. which would leave it or its stockholders with permanent ownership of what would be the largest single block of General Motors stock.

There, Mr. President, in the very first page of the Government's brief, is stated the issue, which is as follows:

> That there should be no divestiture by way of a distribution to Christiana Corp. which would leave it or its stockholders with permanent ownership of what would be the largest single block of General Motors stock.

I read now from page 4 of the brief:

> The fact that the Government has, since the outset of this litigation and consistently throughout its course, adhered to the view that divestiture by Christiana is essential to effect relief is reflected in the extracts from prior proceedings in this action set forth in appendix A hereto. This should be sufficient to negative the existence of any factual basis should Christiana reassert its prior contention that the Government has at some stage procedurally abandoned its demand for relief against it.

I read now from page 7:

> In an effort to forestall an order of divestiture applicable to it, Christiana has vigorously asserted that it has not been "adjudicated" to have violated any antitrust law. While this may be conceded as literally true, the attempt to argue therefrom that Christiana is in essence an innocent bystander which should not be subjected to any burden can hardly receive sympathetic hearing in the light of Christiana's prominent role in the condemned relationships which have existed between Du Pont and General Motors since the acquisition of the General Motors stock. However, in light of this contention, Christiana's participation in Du Pont's violation of section 7 through its stock holdings and the interlocking of its directors and officers with both Du Pont and General Motors will be reviewed.
>
> The evidence before this Court has established such an identity of interest between Christiana and Du Pont as to justify this Court in concluding that Christiana's participation in a deliberate course of conduct by Du Pont is of the highest relevance to the question of the power of this Court to order divestiture by Christiana. Christiana, with approximately 30 percent of the outstanding stock of Du Pont, is, and has been since 1915, the controlling stockholder of Du Pont. There are nearly 200,000 shareholders in Du Pont. Of this number, one, Christiana, has almost one-third of the outstanding stock. No other single stockholder controls a block of stock of more than one-tenth of the size of the Christiana-Du Pont holdings. This control of Du Pont by Christiana was recognized by this court when it found, at 126 F. Supp. 235, 239:
>
> "The Du Pont family had voting control of Christiana and Delaware whose Du Pont stock is consistently voted as a block in favor of Du Pont management, coupled with the fact that for many years members of the Du Pont family have been major executives of the corporation, indicates control of management of Du Pont by the Du Pont family."

I call the following to the attention of my colleagues, because the pass-through of Christiana is central to the issue before the Senate.

> Since its formation, Christiana has been a control instrument through which the Du Pont family has dominated E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Might it be helpful if the arithmetic of these holdings were introduced in the RECORD, so we could see the quantitative relationships? I wonder whether the Senator from Tennessee would be willing to answer some questions in that connection.

Mr. GORE. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, is it true that there are about 274 million shares of common stock of General Motors?

Mr. GORE. I believe that is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And is it true that the Du Pont Co. owns 63 million of those shares?

Mr. GORE. That is according to the testimony before our committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That comes, does it not, to about 23 percent of the General Motors stock?

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As I understand, the Supreme Court has ruled that this holding of 23 percent in effect gives the Du Pont Co. control over General Motors, in view of the fact that no other holding is equal to 1 percent.

Mr. GORE. I believe that is undisputed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Now we come to Christiana: Is it true that Christiana Corp. owns 13.4 million shares of Du Pont, or 29 percent of Du Pont?

Mr. GORE. I believe that is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it true, therefore, that Christiana controls Du Pont, and Du Pont controls General Motors?

Mr. GORE. That is according to the statements of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, with which I agree.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And, therefore, Christiana controls General Motors?

Mr. GORE. Yes, and the Du Pont family controls Christiana.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it true that 65 members of the Du Pont family own or control 80 percent of the stock of Christiana?

Mr. GORE. That is according to the testimony.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it true that of those 65 members of the Du Pont family, 38 are husbands and wives?

Mr. GORE. That is set forth in the brief of the Department of Justice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have that memorandum printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPENDIX A. LINES OF COMMUNICATION BETWEEN CONTROL DU PONT FAMILY MEMBERS

Since Lammot du Pont Copeland was the principal witness for defendant Christiana, this appendix will examine the relative ease with which this single individual can communicate with the 65 members of the Du Pont family who were listed in Government proposed finding of fact A-35. These lines of communication and avenues of contact do not purport to be all means for facilitating unified conduct in respect to Du Pont and General Motors stock holdings which exist between Lammot du Pont Copeland and the listed individuals but are limited to record facts. Since we are concerned, not with the ability of Lammot du Pont Copeland to communicate with various of his relatives, but with the ability of the group as a whole to establish and utilize lines of internal communications, whatever facts are established with regard to Copeland's ability to communicate must be multiplied many times in gaging the relative ease and facility with which the group can communicate with a view toward common action.

Copeland is an officer and director of Christiana and Du Pont, a director of Wilmington Trust, Longwood Foundation, Winterthur, News Journal, and a Canadian trucking corporation. Where a listed individual is shown as an officer or director of a corporation, that corporation is one of those in which Copeland is also a director or officer. Where the individual or individuals concerned are interested in Wilmington Trust or Delaware Trust, either as: grantors, advisors or joint trustees of trusts; officers, directors, employees, or stockholders; or in more than one such capacity, this relationship is shown by the letter (W) or (D) following each of their names. Husband and wife are listed together:

1. A. E. Bissell (D) (W), director of Winterthur.

2. John B. and Octavia du Pont Bredin (W); they reside near Wilmington; Copeland knows both; Bredin is a former employee of Du Pont; Bredin is a director of the Canadian Trucking Co.

3. Margaretta du Pont Carpenter (W); Copeland knows her; she lives near Wilmington.

4. W. Sam Carpenter, Jr. (W), brother-in-law of 3; board member of Du Pont, Wilmington Trust, Christiana, and Winterthur.

5. W. Sam Carpenter III and Murton du Pont Carpenter (W) the son of 4 and the daughter of 11, respectively.

6. Lammot du Pont Copeland (W).

7. Colgate W. Darden, Jr. and Constance du Pont Darden (W); known to Copeland; director of Du Pont; Copeland and Darden were fellow directors of U.S. Rubber.

8. Paulina du Pont Dean (W), known to Copeland; resides near Wilmington; her husband is an officer and director of Wilmington Trust.

9. A. Felix du Pont, Jr. (W); director of Christiana; resides near Wilmington; known to Copeland.

10. Emile F. du Pont (D), director of Du Pont.

11. Eugene E. du Pont (W), director of Du Pont.

12. Henry B. and Emily T. du Pont (W); director of Du Pont, Wilmington Trust, Longwood, and Winterthur; known to Copeland; has extensive business relations with him.

13. Henry F. and Ruth W. du Pont (W); director of Du Pont, Wilmington.

14. Irenee and Irene du Pont (W); known to Copeland; resides near Wilmington.

15. Irenee du Pont, Jr., and Barbara du Pont (W); known to Copeland; director of Du Pont, Christiana, and Longwood; resides near Wilmington.

16. Jessie Ball du Pont; Elbert Dent, her son-in-law and cotrustee of the Alfred I. du Pont (her husband) estate lives in Wilmington; and is known to Copeland.

17. Elizabeth du Pont Bayard (W), a sister of 11.

18. Lammot du Pont, Jr. (W), known to Copeland; assistant vice president of Wilmington Trust; lives in Wilmington.

19. Margaret F. du Pont (W), known to Copeland; lives near Wilmington; and is the widow of Lammot du Pont; all of her children are known to Copeland.

20. Amelia E. du Pont, the widow of Eugene du Pont; she died in 1917. The stock listed in her name is trusteed with the Bank of Delaware. It will be noted that besides being the wife of Eugene du Pont, she is herself a Du Pont and the aunt of Alice du Pont (who married T. Coleman du Pont, another relative), Mary L. du Pont (who married William du Pont), Ethel du Pont Barksdale, and Renee du Pont Harvey. Exhibit 611A shows that the Bank of Delaware is a depository for large blocks of Du Pont stock owned by her descendants through her marriage with Eugene and by her nieces' descendants. Through these several intermarriages, this group has become relatively cohesive. It includes Alice Potter, her grandniece and Bernard Peyton, her grandson, 37 and 36, infra.

21. Pierre S. du Pont III and Jane Holcomb du Pont (W), known to Copeland, officer and director of Du Pont; director of Wilmington Trust, Christiana and Longwood; resides in Wilmington and has other business interests in common with Copeland.

22. Reynolds and Katherine du Pont (W); known to Copeland; former employees of Du Pont, director of Canadian trucking company; originally from Wilmington.

23. Estate of Philip F. du Pont (W); Philip was a brother of 11.

24. S. Hallock and Virginia S. du Pont (W); director of Longwood; known to Copeland; lives near Wilmington.

25. William du Pont, Jr. (D); known to Copeland; lives in Wilmington.

26. Willis du Pont (W); known to Copeland.

27. George P. and Natalie du Pont Edmonds (W); chairman of the board of Wilmington Trust; known to Copeland; resides in Wilmington.

28. Mary du Pont Faulkner (W); known to Copeland.

29. Robert B. and Lucille E. du Pont Flint (W); formerly employed by Du Pont; known to Copeland; resides near Wilmington.

30. Crawford H. and Margaretta du Pont Greenewalt (W); president of Du Pont; director of Du Pont, Christiana, Longwood, Winterthur; known to Copeland; resides in Wilmington.

31. Edmund du Pont (W); director of Winterthur.

32. Esther du Pont Thouron (W); known to Copeland; resides near Wilmington.

33. W. W. Laird, Jr. and Winnifred M. Laird (W); Treasurer of Christiana; known to Copeland; resides near Wilmington.

34. Marian du Pont Scott (D); sister of No. 25, supra.

35. Ernest N. and Irene S. du Pont May (W); formerly employed by Du Pont; resides near Wilmington; known to Copeland.

36. Bernard Peyton—director of Du Pont.

37. William S. and Alice G. Potter (W); director of Wilmington and Winterthur.

38. William G. and Nancy R. Reynolds (W); daughter and son-in-law of 11; sister and brother-in-law of 5.

39. Richard E. and Edith du Pont Riegel (W); known to Copeland; resides near Wilmington.

40. Henry B. Robertson (W); director of Longwood; known to Copeland; resides near Wilmington.

41. Wilhelmina du Pont Ross (W); her husband is an officer and director of Wilmington Trust; known to Copeland; resides near Wilmington.

42. Philip G. Rust (W); formerly resided in Wilmington; known to Copeland.

43. Hugh R. Sharp (W); known to Copeland; has adjoining offices; has many business dealings with Copeland; resides in Wilmington.

44. Mary Chichester du Pont Clark (W); mother of 9.

45. Henry H. and Marianna du Pont Silliman (W); director of News Journal Co.; known to Copeland; resides near Wilmington.

46. Henry H. Silliman, Jr. (W); son of No. 45; known to Copeland; employee of Du Pont.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, is it true that these people can be presumed to have a good deal of community interest and family affection which joins them together? I point out that, of course, there is nothing wrong with that.

Mr. GORE. Well, through corporate ties, personal ties, blood ties, neighborliness, community interest, and financial affinity, the Wilmington branch seems to be rather closely knit—financially, at least.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And these 65 either live in Wilmington or closely adjacent to Wilmington. Is that true?

Mr. GORE. Well, it is described as "the Wilmington branch."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. Neither the Louisville branch nor the Florida branch is included, except for one family. Therefore, can it be correctly said that the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family controls Christiana, and Christiana controls Du Pont, and Du Pont controls General Motors; and, therefore, the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family controls General Motors?

Mr. GORE. I think that is indisputable.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

If the 63 million shares of General Motors which the Du Pont Co. owns are distributed, Christiana would receive 29 percent of those shares, would it not, since it owns 29 percent of Du Pont?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, that amounts to 18.3 million shares. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. That is my understanding.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, the shares which the 65 members of the Du Pont family own amount to 14.6 million. This comes to 5.3 percent of the total stock of General Motors. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. That is according to my understanding, which would be more than five times larger than any other bloc held.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that, in addition to these holdings of the Du Pont Co. in General Motors, these members of the Du Pont family as individuals own additional General Motors stock?

Mr. GORE. Yes, just as they own additional shares in other corporations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the members of the Du Pont family own Du Pont stock directly?

Mr. GORE. I understand so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And that this comes to approximately 3.4 percent of the General Motors stock?

Mr. GORE. Held by Du Pont.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. That 3.4 percent of the General Motors stock will be received by the members of the family. As a matter of fact, I think that the Du Pont family members and their family controlled corporations and trusts as individuals own 14 percent of Du Pont stock.

Mr. GORE. There must be added to that the number of shares owned directly by Christiana itself, which amounts to some 530,000 shares of General Motors.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. As I understand, the Department of Justice is not seeking to divest individual members of the Du Pont family of those shares of General Motors stock which they will obtain because of their ownership in Du Pont. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. As I understand, out of the long, contentious litigation, the Justice Department has acquiesced, with a great deal of reluctance, to the retention by the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family, several members of which were the defendants in the original complaint filed, of the General Motors stock they might receive as a result of Du Pont stock they individually own.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So that if a pass-through of Christiana holdings in General Motors to its stockholders is permitted, the 65 members of the family will have not only that 5.3 percent, but they will have a 3.4 percent which they will obtain because of their direct stock ownership in Du Pont. So their General Motors holdings will be, at a minimum, 8.7 percent. Is that not true?

Mr. GORE. I think that is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. To repeat, if the pass-through of General Motors stock by the Christiana Corp. to Christiana stockholders is permitted, we have established that 65 members of the family will get 5.3 percent of the General Motors stock. And in addition to that, because of their direct ownership in Du Pont, they will get another 3.4 percent of the General Motors stock. So that, according to the exhibit submitted by the Government, their holdings would be 8.7 percent. That fact appears in Government's general exhibit No. 2.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In studying general exhibit No. 2, the Department of Justice also listed the holdings of corporations and trust funds controlled by this family, which would amount to another six-tenths of 1 percent, or seven-tenths of 1 percent, not included in the preceding figures. So that, in reality, the holdings would be approximately 9.4 percent. That is shown in general exhibit No. 2.

Mr. GORE. Yes. I have seen that exhibit. The Senator has read and stated it correctly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It means that, even if a requirement for Christiana to divest by sale were to be carried through, and the sales took place to persons other than the Du Pont family—to outsiders—this branch of the Du Pont family would still have 4.1 percent of the General Motors stock either directly or through corporations which they control. So they are not being stripped and sent out into the world naked, so to speak. They will still be powerful owners of General Motors, owning four times more than the next largest stockholder.

Mr. GORE. But if, on top of that, a pass-through of General Motors stock through Christiana is permitted, it would mean, according to the Attorney General of the United States, the Honorable Robert Kennedy, that the Du Pont family could still effectively control General Motors as well as Du Pont.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They would hold—own or control—at a minimum, 9.4 percent of the stock of General Motors.

Mr. GORE. Approximately.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This does not include—and I think this is an important point for the RECORD—any direct holdings which the members of this family may have in General Motors itself. Is that correct.

Mr. GORE. No, it does not include directly owned General Motors stock.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We do not know what that is, but it is at least possible that, just as they have direct holdings in Du Pont and Christiana, they may have direct holdings in General Motors; and we know that Christiana not only has a large block of stock in Du Pont, but over 500,000 shares in General Motors directly.

Mr. GORE. But the proponents of the bill seek to pave the way for a pass-through of Christiana, with only a nominal tax to Christiana, of General Motors stock to those members of the Du Pont family who are principal holders of Christiana stock.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator yield further for some correlative questions to indicate the amount of money which is at stake in this matter?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Tennessee, I think, has quite properly concentrated his attention upon the antitrust features of this bill, but there have also been references to the profits which have been made by the purchase of General Motors stock by Du Pont. While this is not immediately an issue, it will become an issue when the tax features of the bill are considered by the Senate.

Is it not true that Du Pont acquired stock of General Motors in 1917 and 1918, and possibly the early months of 1919, amounting to 63 million shares?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And is not the testimony established that the average price of acquisition of the 63 million shares was $2.09 a share?

Mr. GORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Tennessee inform us what was the market price of the General Motors shares last Friday, or yesterday?

Mr. GORE. I think it was approximately $55 yesterday.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GORE. In that connection the Senator might find it interesting to recall that when we were debating the bill last September our distinguished friend and able colleague the senior Senator from Delaware spoke of the possible grave consequences to the stock of General Motors if the Senate failed to pass the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What was the price of General Motors stock at that time?

Mr. GORE. Forty-five dollars.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now it is $55?

Mr. GORE. Yes. Let me point out that the senior Senator from Delaware was not the only prophet of doom.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Or gloom.

Mr. GORE. Our distinguished friend the junior Senator from Illinois had words to say.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not the senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. GORE. No, it was not the senior Senator. From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 16, page 21370, I quote the remarks of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]:

> I concur in the views expressed by the Senator from Delaware with respect to the possible sharp impact on the market value of the stock as a result of the failure of Congress to take final action on this subject.

Perhaps I had better read a little further:

> In the space of 3 or 4 months, before final action can be had, there can be some intensely sharp reaction before we get through.

Well, we have had some sharp reaction all right, but in the other direction.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There has been an increase in value of $10 per share.

Mr. GORE. Yes. If the senior Senator from Illinois and I win nothing else, if the Senate should pass the bill and the President should conclude to sign it—which I hope he would not do should the Senate make such an error as to pass the bill—the Government today would collect in excess of $100 million in taxes more than it would have collected from a divestiture under the terms of the bill, based on last September's market value of General Motors stock.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true, since there are 274 million shares of General Motors common stock and the stock value has gone up $10 a share, that we have increased the capital values held by the stockholders of General Motors by $2,740 million, approximately $2¾ billion?

Mr. GORE. The Senator heaps garlands upon my head.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to have some of them for myself.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. May I ask whether the distinguished Senators on the other side of the aisle are claiming credit for some of the inflationary results of this administration?

Mr. GORE. I was not claiming credit for inflationary results. I was asserting that if the senior Senator from Illinois and others with me who have been making this fight should win nothing more, additional taxes due to the appreciation in stock values will at least pay our salaries for a few years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the Senator believe that General Motors, in gratitude for the increase in value of its stock, which we have helped to bring about, should make contributions to charities in Tennessee and Illinois and dedicate their contributions to these charities to the junior Senator from Tennessee and the senior Senator from Illinois? Would that not be a touching exhibition of gratitude?

Mr. GORE. I should be satisfied to settle for no contributions in Tennessee, because I fear some might be dedicated against me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. To continue this thought, since Du Pont owns 63 million shares of stock, which have increased in value $10 per share, we have helped the Du Pont corporation by $630 million, is that not true?

Mr. GORE. I am not sure we are responsible for having helped them. At least we saved the bill from passing last September.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since the 65 members of the Du Pont family own 8.7 percent of the General Motors stock, or about 24 million shares, they are $240 million richer now than they were last fall.

Mr. GORE. Well, that is perhaps not all the story. I am not sure they have counted it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If we may go to the gains which have been made, Du Pont bought General Motors stock with the profits which it had accumulated by selling munitions first to the allied governments and then to our Government during the First World War. That issue has been threshed out for years, and I am not going to comment further on it. It is a fact that the profits made from the sale of munitions furnished Du Pont with the money with which it bought General Motors and many other corporations which it acquired in 1918, 1920, and so on. At that time Du Pont bought General Motors stock for $2.09 a share, or a total purchase price for 63 million shares of approximately $130 million. Now the stock is worth $55 a share. The profit per share, if the stock were sold now, would be approximately $53 a share, or a total of $3,339 million. That is a $3⅓ billion accretion in value on the General Motors stock owned by Du Pont.

Mr. GORE. That is an interesting statement.

The distinguished junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] made some very pertinent and challenging statements in the Senate yesterday about the propriety of being consistent in the application of tax relief or the imposition of tax burdens.

This is a corporation which has appreciation profits, as the Senator has pointed out, of more than $3 billion, yet under the bill the Du Pont corporation, if the court followed the outlines of the bill, would be allowed to distribute this stock without payment of any tax on its profit of more than $3 billion.

I wonder how that would sound to a "cornhusker" in Iowa, who pays his taxes on the small amount of profits he makes from the operation of his farm. How will that sound to the small businessman who is going to make his tax payment in a few weeks? How will that sound to the worker who, at the end of every week, has his paycheck diminished to pay his share of the taxes to the U.S. Government?

How are we to explain this action for the Du Pont corporation, which acquired the stock with a working arrangement under which it would control General Motors, with an understanding that it would make a 120-percent profit, an acquisition which has now been held to violate the antitrust laws, to have resulted in segregated markets, and stifled competition? Thus, it has illegally—not legally, but illegally—realized appreciated values in excess of $3 billion.

But instead of taxing Du Pont, as we tax the worker every Friday afternoon, instead of requiring Du Pont to pay a tax such as every small businessman who has any profits at all must pay, we are asked to pass a bill providing for a complete pass-through, if the court follows the lines of the bill.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. Permit me to make one further statement and then I shall be happy to yield. Let me remind Senators that despite all the propaganda about how hundreds of thousands of small stockholders—widows and their mites—are going to be helped by the bill, not one stockholder of Du Pont stock anywhere in the United States would be helped one iota by the bill unless the court should render a decision prescribing the manner and the time of divestiture strictly in accordance with the terms of the bill.

Yet it is said that the bill is not intended to influence the court. That reminds me of a man taking a running leap off a bluff and yelling back over his shoulder, "I didn't intend to do it."

I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, my friend from Tennessee knows from my colloquy with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] yesterday that I have no particular misgivings with respect to section 1 of the bill. My concern relates primarily to sections 2 and 3 of the bill.

I should like to refresh the recollection of the Senator from Tennessee on one point that affects some cornhuskers, at least, in South Dakota. Several years ago there were extensive land condemnation proceedings in connection with some of our river development programs. Congress saw fit to grant relief to those whose land was taken because in those situations there were farmers with acreage which had cost a very small amount of money, but which down through the years had increased in value, so that when the Government condemned the land—an action over which they had no control whatsoever—the owners literally were forced to receive a profit. So Congress decided that relief would be granted by permitting this profit to go untaxed if the farmer would reinvest the entire amount of the proceeds, including the profit, in other land used in agriculture.

Mr. GORE. We permit the same action now in cases involving condemnation of a farm or home. If the owner reinvests in similar property he is eligible for special tax treatment.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator is correct. The point I wish to make is that I do not believe the cornhuskers in Iowa or South Dakota would be particularly exercised if an analogous type of relief were granted to innocent stockholders who have a profit forced upon them as a result of action by the Federal Government over which they have no control, in an innocent type of situation. It is for that reason that section 1 of the bill does not give me any particular concern.

Mr. GORE. I point out to the Senator from Iowa that his statement does not deal with an analogous situation. He has leaped over one taxpayer. He has leaped over—and in his analogy he has passed through—the Du Pont Co. The Du Pont Co. is not innocent. The Du Pont Co. has been held in violation of the Antitrust Act. It is in consequence of this violation that the Du Pont Co. has been ordered to divest. So the Du Pont Co. is not analogous to the Iowa cornhusker whose farm has been condemned for a right-of-way.

Mr. MILLER. I did not mean to imply that I thought the Du Pont Co. was analogous. I think the Du Pont stockholders, the ones upon whom the profit in the form of General Motors divested stock will be forced, are analogous to the farmer. That is my point; and I think they are analogous. For that reason I believe I can in clear conscience support section 1 of the bill. But the point I wish to make is that section 2 of the bill, which relates to the Christiana Corp., and proposes to take an entirely different approach with respect to an identical transaction, gives me concern.

I was very much interested in some of the points brought out in the colloquy between the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. However, it seems to me that, granting all the facts that were explained on the floor of the Senate, it will still be up to a Federal Court judge in Chicago to make a decision as to whether or not the antitrust laws will be violated if there is a pass-through to Christiana stockholders. If the Federal judge in Chicago decides that the Federal antitrust laws would not be violated, a pass-through might well be indicated. But if the Federal judge decides that antitrust laws would be violated—and I am certain that that is the point Senators were attempting to bring out so far as their opinion was concerned—the Federal judge would order a sale of that stock. As was brought out yesterday, if the Federal judge should decide that there shall be a sale by Christiana in the open market of the General Motors stock, the tax results would be about the same as if we provided in the bill that there should be identical treatment to that accorded individual stockholders.

Mr. GORE. I realize that that information was given to the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa in the debate yesterday, but I respectfully suggest that it was incorrect information.

Mr. MILLER. I would appreciate it very much if the Senator from Tennessee would clarify the information I received yesterday in the Senate.

Mr. GORE. I shall be happy to do so in due time, when I reach that portion of my speech which deals with the tax questions. What I am trying to focus upon now is the antimonopoly issue, which I think is paramount in the bill. I heard the excellent discussion presented by the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa yesterday, and I found considerable sympathy with his point of view. It seemed to me that the logic of his statements was difficult to refute, and I regretted that he was given information which I do not think was correct. But today I am trying to concentrate upon what seems to me, by all odds, the most important question. The Senator was not present when I began my remarks. When I began, I said that in my opinion the big issue was not the question of how much in taxes would be paid or which particular taxpayers would pay them, but rather whether Du Pont's monopoly control of General Motors and the monopoly of the General Motors market for paints and fabrics, which the Supreme Court held was in violation of the antitrust laws, would be broken or would be continued. I am happy that the Senator is present so that I can make that point again. I realize that he is concerned with the preservation of free enterprise. He is interested in the survival of small business. I welcome his presence.

Mr. MILLER. I understand that the Senator from Tennessee is making a point with regard to the antitrust situation. The point I wish to make—or at least I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee if he would care to comment on it—is that regardless of what kind of case is made in the Senate regarding the antitrust situation, I do not think it would make a bit of difference to a Federal judge sitting as a true Federal judge in Chicago. He will make up his mind what he—and not the U.S. Senate—thinks should be done about the antitrust situation before him in the case of Christiana.

If that is so, it seems to me we might delete from the bill any reference to any section of the Internal Revenue Code, or to any change in the Internal Revenue laws, that might affect Christiana. If we did that, the individual shareholders would be protected. There could not be any possible suggestion that any legislation was passed in Congress which might somehow or other affect the Federal judge's decision in Chicago.

If the Federal judge decides that there should be a divestiture in the form of pass-through to the shareholders of the Christiana of General Motors stock, it will be because, no matter what case my colleagues from Tennessee and Illinois make on the antitrust situation, the Federal judge has decided that it can be done without violation of the antitrust laws.

If, on the other hand, the Federal judge decides that there should be a divestiture by sale, it would be my thought, on the basis of my understanding yesterday, that the tax consequences which would follow under present law would be practically identical to what they would be if the bill itself were amended to provide for consistent treatment as between individual shareholders and Christiana.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, to begin with, the lawyers for the Du Pont Co., the lawyers for the Christiana Corp., and the officials of the Du Pont Co. do not agree with those who say that this bill, should it become law, will not have a bearing upon the decision of the judge. Indeed, the pending bill, in my opinion, is designed specifically for that purpose. Propaganda has been put out as to how this bill would benefit the hundreds of thousands of stockholders. That is not true. However, propaganda to that effect has been wildely broadcast. It is stated that hundreds of thousands of stockholders would benefit by the passage of the bill, and that the passage of the bill is in their interests. I have received thousands of letters from stockholders in Tennessee, many of them small stockholders, who think their interest is involved in this bill.

The bill is drawn so that unless the judge follows the directions, the road markers, the methods of divestiture contained in the bill, no benefits of the bill will be available to any stockholders anywhere.

I do not know just how reasonable men can conclude that this bill is not designed to influence the decision of the court. Indeed, the General Counsel of the Treasury, in testifying before the Committee on Finance on the bill, used the word "admonition." Let me read from his statement. This statement is by Mr. Knight, General Counsel of the Treasury.

Mr. MILLER. From what page is the Senator reading?

Mr. GORE. I am reading from page 28 of the Finance Committee's hearings:

> The sum would be payable over a shorter period of time if the court adheres to the admonition contained in section 1 of the bill with regard to limiting the period of divestiture.

Mr. MILLER. I may say to the Senator from Tennessee, on that point, I find it difficult to believe that the mere opinion expressed by some administrative official, that a statement in a proposed bill or even in a bill that has been passed is an admonition, would have any possible bearing on the independent thinking of a Federal judge.

Mr. GORE. Let me read what an official of the Du Pont Co. has said in a document sent to all the newspaper editors of the country only last week.

> It is obvious that prompt action by the Senate on H.R. 8847 would be of material assistance to the court in the efficient drawing of a final decree.

Mr. MILLER. I may say to the Senator that I would also be of the opinion that a guess on the part of an official of a corporation as to what the court would be guided by is not more than a guess.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not a fact, according to press dispatches, that the attorneys for the Du Pont Co. appearing before Judge LeBuy yesterday said that they thought his decision should be postponed until after the bill is passed, because the bill would be valuable in enabling him to make his decision? That is, according to the press dispatches, the official position of Du Pont in the Federal Court.

Here we have statements by the general counsel of the Treasury, by the officials of the Du Pont Co., and by the legal representatives of the Du Pont Co. to the effect that the action of Congress should affect the decision of the court, and that this is one reason why they want this action by Congress before Judge LeBuy hands down his opinion.

Mr. GORE. Let me add to that a statement by the attorneys for Christiana:

> The company wants to move any such shares to its stockholders obviously under the new tax law which gives capital gains treatment.

The lawyers for Christiana, though a bit prematurely, are referring to the pending bill as the "new tax law."

The case is conclusive. I submit that the officials of Du Pont think this bill will help the judge.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee what his thinking is regarding the suggestion I made a few moments ago, about the possibility of deleting the provisions of the bill which relate to the Christiana Corp., leaving intact the provisions of the bill which provide equitable relief to individual shareholders.

Mr. GORE. There is a great deal of merit to the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa. I say this to him in all frankness and candor. I thought so when he made the suggestion yesterday. I listened to it with a great deal of attention. It was stated in Chicago yesterday that the only remaining issue before the court was not whether Du Pont should divest—that has been decided by the Supreme Court—but the question before the Chicago court concerned divestiture by Christiana—should it divest, and if so, how.

The Senator has made a very valuable suggestion. If we eliminate any reference to Christiana, any provision relating to Christiana, any provision by which divestiture could be made by Christiana under the terms of this bill—in other words, if we eliminate all reference—I believe that is what the Senator's word was—to Christiana, I believe there is a great deal of merit to that suggestion.

Mr. MILLER. However, I should like to point out to the Senator from Tennessee that the value of my suggestion might be diminished if, as he suggests, the information given to me yesterday was inaccurate. I must say that I am still persuaded that if we change the bill to provide that Christiana would be controlled in the same manner as individual shareholders, that the transaction of divestiture would be the same to the individual shareholder as it is to Christiana, that it would not be a return of capital as to the individual shareholders, on the one hand, and an intercorporate dividend as to Christiana on the other, the tax consequences which would flow from that change would be about the same, and the Treasury would be protected in the same fashion as it would be as if nothing were said and the court ordered the divestiture by sale.

Mr. GORE. As much merit as I think lies in the Senator's suggestion, I think the preferable and more advisable action on the part of the Senate would be to await the ruling of the court.

Mr. MILLER. So far as Christiana is concerned.

Mr. GORE. So far as any issue is concerned. The judge has asked for the filing of final briefs next Monday. What is the hurry? Why must we hurry in the very first week of the session, to pass a bill, to try to preempt the issue and provide, in the words of the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], "an equitable solution" to a case which has been fought in the courts for 13 years? It is still in the courts. Why not let the courts settle it? Then we can act in the light of the court's judgment. But we are asked to pass a bill to provide relief from a court decision before the court has rendered that decision. How anomalous can a situation be? How impetuous, how injudicious can the Senate become? What pressures impel us to such inadvisable lengths?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator knows that he and I have similar misgivings about certain sections of the bill. However, I suggest that I could in very clear conscience vote for at least a portion of the bill right now, regardless of what the Senator from Tennessee has just said, because so far as the Du Pont shareholders were concerned, the Court made its decision last year, and it was that there shall be divestiture.

Mr. GORE. By Du Pont?

Mr. MILLER. By Du Pont. To me, that is the heart of the problem which the bill should reach.

Mr. GORE. The case was remanded to the trial judge with instructions to him to write an order for divestiture which would provide effective relief. What is the effective relief which the Government seeks and has sought since 1949? It is relief from the monopolistic control of General Motors by Du Pont. The Government contends, and the Attorney General says in his letter dated January 13, 1962, to me, which was read to the Senate yesterday, that if the General Motors stock is permitted to pass through the Christiana Corp. into the hands of the few members of the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family—well, let me refer to the letter. I read as follows:

> In fact, in the proceedings pending in the district court in Illinois, the Government has urged the court to decree that Christiana Securities Corp. and its stockholders be barred from receiving General Motors stock to be distributed by Du Pont. It is proposed that this be accomplished by requiring either that Du Pont distribute cash instead of stock to Christiana or that Christiana be required to sell any General Motors stock which is distributed to Christiana by Du Pont. The Government has urged the court not to authorize a so-called pass-through of General Motors stock through Christiana to its stockholders because a pass-through would permit a large percentage of General Motors stock to be lodged in Du Pont family hands. This would mean that the Du Pont family could still effectively control General Motors as well as Du Pont.

It is relief from this monopolistic condition for which the Government has pleaded in the courts for 13 years, the Government finally having won two decisions before the Supreme Court, the last one of which held unmistakably that relief should be granted. The court then remanded the case to the trial judge, as I have said, to write an order for effective relief.

The lawyers for Du Pont have stated to the court in Chicago, according to statements read yesterday, that the only remaining issue was with respect to the treatment of Christiana. What is that issue? The issue is whether the Du Pont Co. will be allowed to distribute General Motors stock to Christiana; if so, whether Christiana will be permitted to retain it or be required to divest itself of it; and if divestiture by Christiana is ordered, whether it shall be by sale or distribution to its stockholders.

The Government maintains in the brief I have cited at length here today that the Du Pont family controls Christiana; that Christiana controls Du Pont; that Du Pont controls General Motors. I have read from the report of the Federal Trade Commission entitled "The Du Pont Complex," which shows that this complex controls the tires that go on General Motors automobiles; that the complex controls the manufacturers of the glass that is used in the windows and windshields and the manufacturers of the paint and fabrics; that it controls everything, in fact, but the horn. It is relief from this monopolistic condition which has been illegally brought about as to which the Government seeks a decision and has been seeking one for 13 years. Now that the case is in the final stage of litigation, Du Pont, having lost in the courts, runs to Congress and asks us to pave a superhighway for a pass-through which the Attorney General says would vest monopoly control right back in the nexus of the ownership, the Du Pont family, which now exercises that control.

This is an intolerable situation in which we are placed. I think it would be utterly unwise and unthinkable for the Senate to pass the bill under these circumstances.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I cannot see what possible difference the provisions of this bill, so far as they relate to individual shareholders, could make in the decision of a Federal judge as to whether an antitrust situation would continue if there was divestiture to the stockholders rather than divestiture by sale. For that reason I am not persuaded that the passage of this portion of the bill would have any bearing whatsoever upon the independent thinking of the Federal judge in Chicago. However, I must say that I wonder about the passage of the provisions relating to Christiana, because as to Christiana Corp., unlike Du Pont Co., a decision has not yet been made whether there should be divestiture. To me, that is the essential difference between the two situations.

Mr. GORE. That is primarily the question on which, in my opinion, the bill seeks to influence the judge. I wonder if the Senator would offer, or would support, an amendment to strike that provision of the bill which applies to Christiana?

Mr. MILLER. I would be pleased to work with the Senator from Tennessee on that.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I say to the able Senator from Tennessee and the able Senator from Iowa that this is one of the principal points argued in the recent brief. Counsel argues that the decree of divestiture should not extend to Christiana. I have heard the discussion between the two able Senators. If I correctly understood what the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] said about equity, it is this very point that is being raised by the Government of the United States, namely, that using the old, established principles of equity, and citing numerous cases, the court, having once acquired jurisdiction, may reach beneath the parent corporation, in order properly to effectuate its decree. This is the argument today of the Government of the United States, and it is the argument used in the recent brief.

What situation now confronts us? While this important legal question is pending in court, based upon what we lawyers call equity; an attempt is made to come in through the back door—into this Chamber, to ask us to apply the principles of equity, before the court itself makes its decision, under its responsibility.

I repeat what I said some months ago; namely, that this proposed legislation is entirely premature. It is an invasion of the separation of powers. This responsibility belongs to the court, not to us.

I have been reading the brief filed recently by the Government, since our last debate, and I have been much impressed. I try to consider this matter as objectively as possible. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] may remember that I did not go into the technical side of this tax question. I looked—as a lawyer—at a case which had not yet been concluded. To me, it is extremely significant that defendants—after having been knocked down twice, in a sense, by the decision—are appealing to the court not to pass judgment on this case now, but to wait until the Congress acts. I say such a course is highly irresponsible.

In the course of the debate it is said that this proposed legislation is not intended to influence the court's decision. Perhaps its purpose is not to influence the court's decision, but this legislation would take away the court's responsibility and authority. I am sorry to say that the court seems to be willing to yield on this matter.

I say to the Senator from Tennessee that this is the principal point, which has been made over and over and over again. It should be made crystal clear, so that every Senator will be able to understand what the real issue is.

Certainly such action as is contemplated is not our function. Instead, it is the function of the court. When the court makes its decision, then we can act, if we then wish to apply what we may call legislative principles of equity.

However, I am frank to say—and I may speak later about this matter—that I have a suspicion as to what the court will do in this case. If my suspicion is well founded, and as I read the briefs and the record in this case, I believe the case will be taken again to the Supreme Court. I do not think the Supreme Court will permit a lower court, in passing judgment in this case, to permit a pass-through by the Christiana Corp.

Having that situation in mind, it appears that enactment of this proposed legislation is sought, in an attempt to forestall the action of the U.S. Government in this case. As has been brilliantly stated by the Senator from Tennessee, after 13 years this case now could be lost by legislative interference.

I hope that following more debate on this point, and as greater understanding of this matter comes to this body, the Senate will not lend itself to such interference and such premature action.

As I have said, I have not completed my study of this matter. I understand we shall have a day or two of additional debate. In the interval I shall reread the briefs.

I understand that the position of the Government is that the Federal courts have acquired jurisdiction; and that even though the Christiana Corp. may not have had a specific order issued against it, yet, being the child of the parent, under the rules of equity—the court's decree can be broad enough to effectuate the full relief sought by the Government in this suit. This is the basic principle involved, which is now before the court.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield, so that I may ask one or two questions of the Senator from Colorado?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator.

I wish to ask the Senator from Colorado several questions. First, let me say that I am concerned about his statement that he thinks the entire bill is premature. Frankly, I must take exception to that statement. I do not think the part of the bill which relates to the individual stockholders is premature.

Will not the Senator concede that as to the Christiana Corp. situation, a divestiture to the stockholders will either result in continuation of an antitrust situation or it will not—either one or the other. In other words, the matter is either black or it is white; and it is for the Federal judge to make that decision.

I must say that I cannot see any possible relevance regarding the tax treatment of the individual shareholders that can be born of the court's decision, because the tax treatment of the individual shareholders has absolutely nothing to do with the question of whether an antitrust situation exists.

It is for this reason that I suggest to the Senator from Colorado that he should not have any particular reservations about the sections of the bill which relate to the individual shareholders.

But I can understand how, in the case of the Christiana Corp., the question of whether there should be divestiture might be clouded a little by the tax treatment going to Christiana Corp. That is why I say I wonder about that portion of the bill.

Mr. CARROLL. In response to the question of the able Senator from Iowa, let me say that the Supreme Court has passed on this question. Despite the fact that economic hardship may be involved in its decree or its judgment, the Supreme Court has directed the lower court to fashion an order giving equitable relief; and a time limit has been set. The judge can take 2 or 3 or 4 months, for instance, if he wishes; but, as I understand, once he makes his final decision, it will become operative within 90 days. My point is that once he makes his decision—and it is about time that he makes it—then if equity relief for the shareholders is needed—a matter in which both the able Senator from Iowa and I are interested—there will be ample time for Congress to deal with that matter.

But I do not like the idea of asking the Congress to give legislative relief to the Christiana Corp. before there has been a judicial determination. I ask the Senator from Tennessee to give some thought to this matter. Certainly there will be ample time. In a short time the briefs will be filed; and the judge will study them, and then will make a determination.

As I read the history of the handling of this matter by members of the office of the Attorney General in another administration, I believe there is a general consensus of opinion that perhaps there should be some tax relief, because of the forced divestiture. But that is not the issue before us today, at all. I hope all Senators will read the brief filed by counsel, in which he asks the court to withhold judgment on the Christiana Corp. question until legislative relief can be obtained. I say this is ill advised, and it is not in the interest of good government, and it is not in keeping with the separation of powers under the Constitution. This is the point I wish to make. I shall withhold judgment until later. After the court reaches its decision, if such an application then is made to this body, there will be time enough for us to act on it. But in the meantime I suggest that we postpone such action until a day certain or until the occurrence of a certain event. Let the court pass upon it; as for now, let the bill be recommitted to the Senate Finance Committee. If it is desired that the bill be kept on the calendar, let us have a postponement until a time certain or to the happening of a certain event. I think this is a proper statement of the parliamentary situation. All we seek is to let the court do its job, and then, if we have to, we will do ours.

Mr. GORE. The Senate can, of course, make such disposition of this bill as a majority may desire. One form which that might take would be to recommit the bill to the Finance Committee with instructions to consider the matter when the decision of the court shall have become final. That would be a condition, the occurrence of a condition, such as the Senator has in mind, I dare say.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. I think that is one possible answer. It is, I think, advisable; but I was thinking that we could keep the bill on the calendar.

Mr. GORE. Yes, we could if the Senate desired to do so.

Mr. CARROLL. I think a postponement to a day certain or to the time of the happening of a certain event; until after the judgment, might be appropriate. I will check with the Parliamentarian to see whether that can be done. In law and in public service the law does not presume evil; it presumes good. The presumption is that the judgment by the court will be good and therefore in the public interest. If it is a good judgment, we may not be required to act. If relief were needed, the relief would be sought. We do not desire to punish small groups of people, and we do not want to give benefits to certain classifications that should not get them. At that time we would consider the equity question.

Mr. GORE. What the Senator is saying is that, in all probity, we should not proceed to provide relief from the decision of a court until we know the provisions of that decision.

Mr. CARROLL. It is just as simple as that. We do not know now what the judge is going to do.

Mr. GORE. Or if the provisions of the bill will be suitable and appropriate to the decision which may finally be rendered.

Mr. CARROLL. If the Senator will yield, I wish to make an assumption. It is a hypothetical one, and I hope I am wrong, but let us assume that the judge in the lower court rules that the decree does not apply to Christiana. Does the Senator know what would happen in that case? I think the Department of Justice would have to go to the Supreme Court with that question. I do not know how long it would take to get a decision. I think the Department of Justice, based upon the letter from the Attorney General, and based upon the briefs I have read, would go back to the Supreme Court and say to the Supreme Court, for the third time, "Please instruct the lower court in its actions."

Mr. GORE. Moreover, this has been the position maintained up to this time by the Justice Department in three administrations, two Democratic and one Republican.

Mr. CARROLL. Exactly. Therefore, I think it bolsters the argument made last fall and bolsters the principal issue here. The proposed legislation is entirely premature. Why? Because there has been no final judgment. Let us permit the case to go again to the Supreme Court if necessary. If the lower court should rule that Christiana is not brought within the framework of the decree in this case, and the Justice Department goes to the Supreme Court, all divestiture proceedings would be stayed pending the Supreme Court decision. I think all proceedings would be stayed until the principal monopolistic issue were resolved.

It seems to me a matter of pure and simple logic.

Of course, as the Senator has said, if this bill passes and the President signs it, the rug will be pulled out from under 13 years of litigation. If this is what is intended, then I think the public ought to know what is going on.

I commend the able Senator from Tennessee and the able Senator from Illinois for the fight they have made on the floor to have the issue understood. It is a complicated issue, and the litigation is highly involved. I have been back in Washington only a few days. However, I have gone into the briefs and have talked with lawyers in the case. I do not know what the judge will do. I hope what I have said will not influence his judgment. He is considering the briefs, and they are brilliant briefs, submitted by both sides. Let us wait for the judgment of the court. Let us wait to see what he will decide, without interfering with the Government's case, and without interfering with Du Pont's case.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I am sure he is aware that the Department of Justice has been concerned that the passage of the bill might cause the Government to lose its case in Chicago.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. I do not think there is the slightest doubt that the legislation in its present form will pull the rug out from under the Government in the brief that is filed with the court, if I may use that expression again. It is why I may have to vote for some amendments, purely as a defensive action. But the truth is, I think we ought not to intervene on the Government's side. I think the bill should be recommitted or postponed to a day certain. Let the judge make his determination. The forces here involved are strong and well organized. As a defensive measure, I may have to vote for such amendments as will enable us to get the strongest bill possible, because I know the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Illinois are fighting what looks regretably like a last-ditch batle.

If the court holds a certain way and if it is desired to bring the Christiana issue before the Supreme Court, let that be done. In the meantime, no stockholder would have lost a thing. I would hope there would not be a delay of over a year. Then if the question of equity legislation comes before Congress, we would meet that question and cross that bridge when we come to it.

I thank the Senator for having yielded to me.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his able statement. Since he has referred to the brief of the Justice Department and its position, I should like to read from page 4 of the brief filed November 27, 1961:

> The fact that the Government has, since the outset of this litigation and consistently throughout its course, adhered to the view that divestiture by Christiana is essential to effective relief is reflected in the extracts from prior proceedings to this action set forth in appendix X thereto.

I had read that sentence previously. Following the able statement of the junior Senator from Colorado I thought it appropriate to read it again.

I read further from page 8:

> The evidence before this court has established such an identity of interest between Christiana and Du Pont as to justify this court in concluding that Christiana's participation in a deliberate course of conduct by Du Pont is of the highest relevance to the question of the power of this court to order divestiture by Christiana.

I read one other sentence which I have previously read:

> Since its formation, Christiana has been a control instrument through which the Du Pont family has dominated E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. Thus, at the time of Du Pont's initial acquisition of General Motors stock in 1917, the identity of interest between Du Pont and Christiana was already well established. This control of Du Pont by Christiana has extended to the present date. In our memorandum of September 26, 1958, in support of the Government's then proposed decree we set forth certain facts regarding the identity of Christiana and Du Pont which bear repeating here.

Mr. President, before I read these facts which were set forth in 1958 I invite to the attention of the Senate—which I dare say is not necessary—the fact that this was during the term of former President Eisenhower. This is what the Justice Department said in 1958:

> Irrefutable evidence shows that throughout the history of the relationship between Christiana and Du Pont, the officers and directors of Christiana have at all times been officers and directors of Du Pont and at all times held the key executive positions in that company. This is shown by the following résumé of the various official positions held in Christiana and Du Pont by each of the persons who had been directors of Christiana.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the table contained in the brief as filed during the Eisenhower administration with respect to these identities, found on pages 10 and 11 of the brief.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Pierre S. du Pont: Christiana, director and president; Du Pont, director, president, chairman of board, member of finance committee.

Irenee du Pont: Christiana, director, treasurer, and vice president; Du Pont, director, vice president, president, vice chairman of board of directors, member of executive and finance committees.

Lammot du Pont: Christiana, director and vice president; Du Pont, director, vice president, president, chairman of the board, member of executive and finance committees.

R. R. M. Carpenter: Christiana, director; Du Pont, director, vice president, member of finance and executive committees.

A. Felix du Pont: Christiana, director; Du Pont, director, vice president, member of executive committee.

John J. Raskob: Christiana, director, secretary and treasurer; Du Pont, director, vice president, treasurer, member of finance and executive committees.

Henry Belin du Pont: Christiana, director and secretary; Du Pont, director, vice president, member of executive committee.

H. Fletcher Brown: Christiana, director; Du Pont, director, vice president, member of finance and executive committees.

Lammot du Pont Copeland: Christiana, director and vice president; Du Pont, director, secretary, member of finance committee.

Crawford H. Greenewalt: Christiana, director; Du Pont, director, president, member of finance and executive committees.

W. S. Carpenter, Jr.: Christiana, director; Du Pont, director, president, chairman of board and member of finance and executive committees.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the interlocking directors and officers within the Du Pont complex as of 1943.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Interlocking directors and officers within the Du Pont complex, as of 1948

EXECUTIVE POSITIONS HELD BY MEMBERS OF THE DUPONT FAMILY

	Christiana Securities Co.	Wilmington Trust Co.	E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc.	General Motors Corp.	United States Rubber Co.
Pierre S. du Pont	President, director	Honorary chairman, director.	Honorary chairman, director.	Formerly chairman	
Irenee du Pont	Treasurer, director	Formerly director	Director	Formerly director	
Lammot du Pont	Vice president, director	Director	do	Formerly chairman	
Henry B. du Pont	do	do	Vice president, director	Director	
A. Felix du Pont, Jr	Director		Director		
Lammot du Pont Copeland	Vice president, director	Director	Secretary, director	Director	Formerly director and member of finance committee.
W. S. Carpenter, Jr	Director	do	Chairman, director	do	
C. H. Greenewalt	do		President, director		
R. R. M. Carpenter [1]	do		Director		
Donaldson Brown			do	Director	
William F. Harrington		Director	do		
Colgate W. Darden, Jr					Director.

OTHER KEY EXECUTIVES

	Christiana Securities Co.	Wilmington Trust Co.	E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc.	General Motors Corp.	United States Rubber Co.
Francis B. Davis, Jr			Formerly president, Du Pont Viscoloid, Co.	With General Motors 1921-23.	Chairman, director.
George P. Edmonds		President,[2] director	Director		Director.
Alfred P. Sloan, Jr			do	Chairman, director	
A. B. Echols		Formerly director	Vice president, director	Director	
J. J. Raskob	Director		Formerly director	Formerly director	

[1] Deceased June 1949.

[2] Became president of Wilmington Trust in November 1948.

Sources: Moody's Manuals; Poor's Manuals; Who's Who in Commerce and Industry (1948); Who's Who in America (1948).

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Thus far we have pointed out that the 65 members of the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family control Christiana, which in turn controls Du Pont, which in turn controls General Motors; and that, therefore, these 65 members of the Du Pont branch who have stock in Christiana control General Motors. The Senator from Tennessee has brought out the fact that Christiana Corp. is, in effect, a control device, whereby the succeeding generations of the Du Pont family may take united action inside Du Pont and inside General Motors and other companies.

Mr. GORE. Yes. Also, I wish to read from the brief of the Justice Department, page 12:

> In short, the evidence is irrefutable that the directorship of Christiana has at all times constituted the top management of Du Pont.
>
> The relationships between Christiana and Du Pont are such that, by any objective standards, they must be regarded as parts of a single organic structure dominated by Christiana.
>
> However, the influence of Christiana and its directors does not stop with Du Pont directorships and offices but extends on into the administration of General Motors. Of the 11 persons who have been directors of Christiana during its history, 7 have also been directors of General Motors.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is also true that there are two further control devices of the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family; namely, Wilmington Trust and Delaware Trust, which are Du Pont-controlled trust companies. According to appendix D of general exhibit 2, submitted by the Government, Wilmington Trust has slightly over 2 million shares of Du Pont stock trusteed to it. It has an exclusive right to vote over a million of these shares, and jointly with a family joint trustee 318,000 shares, and subject to a family adviser 460,000 more; therefore, the total stock controlled by Wilmington Trust and family members, or by family members only, comes to 1,927,000 shares.

In addition, there is Delaware Trust, which is a Du Pont company, which has 1,657,000 shares of Du Pont stock. It has the exclusive right to vote 1,473,000 of those shares, and can vote jointly with members of the Du Pont family 145,000 shares.

The cohesiveness of the 65 members of the Du Pont family consists, therefore, not merely in a blood relationship, not only in the fact that they live in or near Wilmington, not only in the fact that they have very close relationships with Mr. Lammot du Pont Copeland, but also in the fact that they have these two other control devices owned by the Du Pont family which, between them, hold 3.6 million shares of Du Pont stock. They, with the key members of the family, have control over the voting of those shares.

Individual members of the Du Pont family may come and go. Generations may succeed each other. Du Ponts may come and go, but Wilmington Trust, Delaware Trust, and Christiana go on forever. And they give continuing unity and continuing control.

Mr. GORE. According to the brief, it is so designed. Nothing that the Senator has said is intended, I am sure, and nothing I have said is intended to be any personal criticism of, or personal assault on, members of the Du Pont family.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. I think we ought to make the record perfectly clear. We are speaking of facts and effects, not motives.

Mr. GORE. The fact stands that not only was Du Pont a defendant in the complaint filed by the Government, but so also were the Christiana Corp., the Delaware corporation, and members of the Du Pont family.

The court action is not a criminal action. The defendants in that action are not being prosecuted for some criminal act. They have not been prosecuted for a criminal act. The case is a civil action brought pursuant to the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act. The original complaint charges that the corporations named and the citizens who happen to be members of one family have conspired, have used concerted action, and have banded together—corporate, personal, and otherwise—for the purpose of violating the law by imposing monopoly control over a very large corporate and industrial complex. It is relief from that situation that is sought by the action against the corporations and the members of the Du Pont family.

The Government has pleaded before the courts for 13 years for relief from that situation. The case is now in the final stages of adjudication. I hope the legislative branch of the Government will permit enforcement of the law which the legislative branch passed.

In this connection I should like to read what Mr. Lammot du Pont Copeland said about Christiana Corp., about which the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] questioned me. The statement is contained in the Government brief on page 12:

> The basic function of Christiana is to hold Du Pont common. It has 30 percent of it. That is its reason for being in existence. It would be contrary to its purpose to give up Du Pont common and take General Motors in its place. There would just be no logic to it. It is a reversal of its whole function. It is not an investment corporation in the popular sense of the word.

I wish to read from page 47 of the brief:

> Moreover, the Supreme Court found that, "Du Pont purposely employed its stock to pry open the General Motors market to entrench itself as the primary supplier of General Motors' requirements for automotive finishes and fabrics." Thus the injunctive provisions in the Government's proposed judgment are not being directed at some unforeseen results of innocent conduct, but rather are aimed at barring enjoyment of

> the consciously intended fruits of the violation, as well as protecting the public's interest in the matter.

Mr. President, that statement, in the words of the Department of Justice, is my answer to those who might claim that because I contend that a monopoly should not vest in a few members of the Du Pont family, I am trying to perpetrate some personal persecution. That is not the case at all. There are many laws which citizens are not permitted to violate. The injunctive process is available to citizens and officers of the court alike, as is redress for wrongs committed and relief from conditions found to be in violation of the law. That statement applies to individuals as well as to corporations.

With that comment I should like to reread from the brief of the Department of Justice the sentence that I just read:

> Thus the injunctive provisions in the Government's proposed judgment are not being directed at some unforeseen results of innocent conduct, but rather are aimed at barring enjoyment of the consciously intended fruits of the violation, as well as protecting the public's interest in the matter.

As I have said, to be specific, the relief sought here is relief from a monopolistic condition. The Attorney General of the United States, in a letter read to the Senate only yesterday, and again cited today, repeated a statement which the Government has cited in briefs for 13 years: The Christiana Corp., as well as Du Pont Co., must divest itself of General Motors stock. Indeed, the Government contended in the beginning of the litigation that members of the Du Pont family should divest themselves of the General Motors stock which they held personally.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As the case proceeded, the Government reluctantly withdrew from that position. Is that statement correct?

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So that members of the family still own approximately 3.3 percent of General Motors stock which has been certainly traced, and then an additional 0.6 percent covered in exhibits not included in the formal pleading of the Government before the courts. So that, as was said earlier, if the court orders divestiture on the part of Christiana by sale, as the Government has contended, members of the family will not be stripped of all of their General Motors stock. On the contrary, they will have approximately 4 percent of General Motors stock, and that amount will be more than four times the holding of any other single group. The issue is whether they shall have 9.4 percent. The issue is on the 5.3 percent which would be held by Christiana. Is that not true?

Mr. GORE. Not held by Christiana.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Which would be held by Christiana.

Mr. GORE. I am not at all sure that I would agree with the acquiescence of the Department of Justice to the extent described by the senior Senator from Illinois. However, that question is moot. The only question remaining to be decided, according to the attorneys for Du Pont in Chicago, is whether this stock can be divested, as I have stated, by Du Pont to Christiana; and, if so, whether Christiana will be permitted to retain or must divest itself of it; and if it must divest, then how—by pass-through or by sale?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. Since so many positions have been stated, perhaps it would be well if I read at this point the proposed order of the court which was submitted to the court by invitation of the court by the Government on October 2, 1961. I am reading from page 12:

> A. Within 10 years after the effective date of this judgment Du Pont shall completely divest itself of all General Motors stock by distribution to its stockholders and/or such other method or combination of methods as it may select, subject to the provisions of this final judgment. The divestiture shall commence within 90 days after the effective date of this judgment.
>
> B. Within 10 years after the effective date of this judgment Christiana shall divest itself of all General Motors stock which it now owns and any General Motors stock which it may hereafter be permitted to acquire in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of this judgment. Such divestiture shall be effected by sale or such other method or combinations of methods as Christiana may select: *Provided, however,* That such divestiture shall not be effected by any disposition to a stockholder who shall remain a stockholder after the disposition.

There are provisions in the proposed order which are injunctive in nature, and I do not believe it necessarily pertinent to this discussion to read them at this time.

The Government made a second proposed judgment, in the event the court could not in its wisdom concur in the proposed judgment which I have read. The Government submitted an alternative which could be followed in the event the court decided that it did not have jurisdiction over Christiana in the premises.

> A. Within 10 years after the effective date of this judgment Du Pont shall completely divest itself of all General Motors stock by such method or combinations of methods as it may select except that Du Pont shall not make any disposition of such stock to Christiana or to the stockholders of Christiana in their capacity as such stockholders.

Mr. President, how much more emphatically could a record be established? How could the President of the United States sign a bill contrary to the contentions of the governmentf or 13 years? I would hope, in the event the Senate so unwisely acted, he would not seriously consider signing it, particularly in view of the fact that the litigation is in its final stages, and that the final briefs of litigants are requested to be submitted next Monday.

Yes, I know, Mr. President, that the committee majority, in its report, protests that "it expresses no opinion as to what particular method of divestiture of General Motors stock by Du Pont or by Christiana is appropriate. It is contemplated by your committee that all issues dealing with the manner of divestiture are to be determined judicially, solely with reference to the antitrust principles announced by the Supreme Court in the Du Pont case."

Why, then, the bill, Mr. President? If the Senate, in fact, does not wish to inject itself legislatively into a matter now in final determination in the courts, why pass this bill?

What is the purpose of the bill, unless it seeks in some way to preempt the decision? If the Senate wishes to leave the courts free of influence of a legislative and political endorsement of a pass-through, then why should the Senate pass a bill before the court has rendered its judgment? How, in good conscience and propriety, I ask, can the Senate pass a bill providing relief from a court judgment before the court has even rendered its judgment, let alone before the judgment has become final? What pressure is it that impels the Senate to act so prematurely, injudiciously and unwisely?

Many thousands of people and, I fear, some of my colleagues have been misled by a deliberate campaign of deception, misinformation, propaganda, and lobbying. This propaganda and lobbying campaign has been spearheaded by Crawford Greenewalt, president of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. He has been buttonholing every Senator he could possibly reach. Mr. Greenewalt has a right to visit Senators, and I would not deny him that right. He has a right to write letters to his stockholders, and I would not deny him that right. Neither he nor his company nor associates, however, have a right to violate the antitrust law and it is, I firmly believe, for the purpose of perpetuating the condition from which this Government has sought relief since 1949 that Mr. Greenewalt and his associates embarked upon such a vigorous and, it appears terribly successful, campaign to mislead their hundreds of thousands of stockholders and the American people, and thus to pressure the Congress into passing the pending bill.

Mr. President, I do not say these things lightly or without material evidence. Mr. Greenewalt has written letters to thousands of people in Tennessee, for instance, and I presume to people in many other States, urging them to get in touch with my senior colleague and me in behalf of the passage of the bill. As I have said, he has a right to write as many letters as he likes, but he has misinformed and misled our people. And, I do not think anyone has a moral right to mislead and deceive the American people. I have received hundreds of letters from my constituents urging me to support passage of the pending bill. Here is a letter I would like to read. This letter was written by hand on a sheet of tablet paper:

> When no wrong has been done, I do not think it is just to punish me, an innocent stockholder.

It is plain that this person has been misled into believing that unless Congress passes this bill, he, an innocent stockholder is going to be unjustly punished.

Mr. President, to mislead this good, small stockholder in this manner is reprehensible, and this has been done on a mass scale. Any person who would undertake such action in order to pressure Congress into performing an unwise act cannot but hold Congress, and the Senate, in contempt.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In his prepared testimony before the Committee on Finance on September 13 last year, Mr. Greenewalt submitted two exhibits, one of which listed the number of domestic stockholders of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. by States. The total number was 209,467. In exhibit B, there was a classification of 735,000 stockholders in General Motors by States.

The significance of this classification by States—I think is fairly obvious—I may say that as to the State of Illinois Mr. Greenewalt listed 7,967 Illinois stockholders in E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., and 48,140 stockholders in General Motors.

I have checked with my office, and we estimate that we have received about 2,000 letters supporting the position of the Du Pont Co. This seems at first sight to be a tremendous outpouring of public opinion. However, there are over 10 million people in the State of Illinois, and it should be realized that there are perhaps 2½ million households. So these figures represent perhaps one-tenth of 1 percent of the households in the State.

While it is absolutely within the right of Mr. Greenewalt to correspond with the stockholders of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., and, if he has done so, with the stockholders of General Motors, nevertheless we ought to consider the interests of the Nation as a whole and not be frightened by letters which come, after all, from a very small segment of the people in our State, who write, I think, without full information of what the real issues are, as the Senator from Tennessee has developed.

Mr. GORE. Even though they wrote with full information, even assuming they had not been misled, are Senators but robots? Must they weigh the amount of mail they receive for and against a bill? Must they stick a weather vane to the breeze to determine the manner of their conduct? Or must they measure and weigh and evaluate and consider the merits and the soundness of proposals before the Senate?

Mr. DOUGLAS. To ask that question is really to answer it. We should use our independent judgment according to what we think is best for the interests of the people of the United States.

Mr. GORE. I think so, of course. The senior Senator from Illinois wants to hear from his constituents. The senior Senator from Illinois and I welcome expressions of sentiment and opinion from all our constituents, from any constituent who desires to write. I know that he is aware, as I am, that 2,000 persons in Illinois are not, in the normal course of events, very likely to write to him about a complicated and technical piece of proposed legislation such as this unless they have been inspired to do so by some organized campaign.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, the right of petition is inherent in the American system, and both the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Illinois have made it perfectly clear that they do not blame Mr. Greenewalt for communicating with his stockholders or with the stockholders of General Motors in this fashion. We simply ask that Members of Congress and members of the public consider this issue on its merits, and that we in Congress should not try to influence the Court in the decisions which it will shortly have to make.

Mr. GORE. I have said specifically that Mr. Greenewalt has a perfect right to buttonhole as many Senators as he can, who are willing to see him and have the time to see him. He has a right to write as many letters as he wishes. But I do not believe any citizen has a right deliberately to set out upon a campaign to deceive and misinform the American people.

In connection with the question of the innocent stockholders, there is another phrase that has been given great circulation in connection with this propaganda campaign. It is the phrase "harsh treatment."

I digress momentarily to observe that no one has said that this little stockholder in Tennessee is guilty of anything. No one has charged him with guilt. It does not follow, however, that the Du Pont Co. is innocent of violating the antitrust law. Indeed, the Supreme Court said:

> The fact that sticks out in this voluminous record is that the bulk of Du Pont's production has always supplied the largest part of the requirements of the one customer in the automobile industry connected to Du Pont by a stock interest. The inference is overwhelming that Du Pont's commanding position was promoted by its stock interest and was not gained solely on competitive merit.
>
> We agree with the trial court that considerations of price, quality and service were not overlooked by either Du Pont or General Motors. Pride in its products and its high financial stake in General Motors' success would naturally lead Du Pont to try to supply the best. But the wisdom of this business judgment cannot obscure the fact, plainly revealed by the record, that Du Pont purposely employed its stock to pry open the General Motors market to entrench itself as the primary supplier of General Motors' requirements for automotive finishes and fabrics.

It is from this condition that our Government has sought relief for 12 years. The Du Pont Co. has lost the case in the courts and now seeks to win it in Congress.

And, after much study, it is my considered opinion that it is for the purpose of avoiding the judgment of the U.S. Supreme Court, finally won through the persistence of the Government and the dedicated efforts of some brilliant young attorneys in the Antitrust Division, that Mr. Greenewalt and his associates have embarked upon this highly financed campaign of misrepresentation to bring pressure upon Congress to pass this bill.

It is from this condition, as I have said, that the Government has sought relief.

I read into the RECORD this morning a wholly untrue statement which has been sent to all the newspaper editors of the country. Just last week an effort was made to mislead the press and the people of the country and the U.S. Congress. Moreover, I am sorry to say that many have been misled.

Why would hundreds of people in Tennessee write me to support this complicated, technical piece of legislation? Obviously this flood of letters has been inspired by Mr. Greenewalt's propaganda, pressure, and lobby campaign.

Now, what has he told these people? Immediately following the first Supreme Court decision, holding Du Pont in violation of the antitrust law and directing it to divest its General Motors stock, it will be recalled that there were widely circulated statements that the harsh tax burden upon stockholders of the Du Pont Co. would amount to $1 billion or more. More recently, the consequences have not appeared to be so dire, but even in Mr. Greenewalt's letter of January 2, 1962, to thousands of people in Tennessee and, I presume, hundreds of thousands in the United States, he manages quite cleverly to leave the impression that unless they, the blighted and persecuted little stockholders, succeed in persuading their Senators to pass this bill, then, in some way which he does not exactly describe, they are going to be personally hurt.

Here is another letter from which I should like to read:

> This is to let you know that if H.R. 8847, the so-called Du Pont bill, is not passed, I will be hurt directly and seriously.

When Mr. Greenewalt was under examination before the Senate Finance Committee, he had a different story to tell. There he said he proposed to follow a plan, under existing law, by which Du Pont would divest itself of General Motors stock in a manner that would not cause the individual stockholders to pay any more taxes than they would now pay on cash dividends on their stock. This testimony will be found on pages 77, 78, and 79 of the hearings before the Senate Finance Committee. Under the plan which Mr. Greenewalt proposed to follow, he said the Du Pont Co. would pay approximately $330 million in taxes. He said, I repeat, "stockholders would be paying no more than the tax they now pay on the cash dividends."

He did not advocate passage of the pending bill because it would cause the little stockholders in Tennessee to pay less taxes—not at all. If this bill became law, it would provide complete tax exemption for the Du Pont Co. on the multibillion-dollar profits in its General Motors stockholdings. Du Pont would not pay any part of the $330 million which Mr. Greenewalt estimated would be the company's tax liability under the plan he proposed to follow if Congress should resist the blandishment and pressure of his campaign to pass this bill.

Who would pay the taxes if this bill passes? Not the Tennessee widow with her mite of two shares of stock.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, she will not gain by the passage of the bill.

Mr. GORE. Yes, she will not gain at all. She will experience no appreciable tax consequences from whichever plan is followed. Under existing law the tax burden would be borne by the corporation. If the pending bill becomes law taxes in a substantially equivalent amount will be paid by stockholders, largely by those holding large blocks of stock.

Lest there be some room for doubt, I should like to read the statement of Mr. Greenewalt which appears on page 78.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator from Illinois have before him the hearings on page 78?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do. I wonder whether the Senator from Tennessee will check the statement by Mr. Greenewalt, which I should like to read, and will make whatever comments may seem to him appropriate.

Mr. GORE. Very well, I will.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In response to a question asked by Senator LONG of Louisiana, we find the following:

> Mr. GREENEWALT. That is correct, only in theory. I would like to impress upon the committee the magnitude of this problem. It is really huge. We feel, in making these estimates, that the maximum we could properly pay out in the form of General Motors stock is something of the order of 25 percent of our regular cash dividend. The reason for this is that our stockholders rely on the cash, naturally, to eat, to send their children to school, or for whatever reason they desire the cash. Obviously, we can pay no more in General Motors stock than we think there is some possibility of their being able to retain. The rest we must pay in cash, we feel. So this places a practical limit on the percentage of our regular cash dividend that we can pay out in stock. Have I made that clear?
>
> Senator LONG. Yes, sir.
>
> Mr. GREENEWALT. Du Pont also could offer to exchange General Motors shares for shares of Du Pont common and preferred which could then be retired. Assuming certain statutory tests are met, as we believe would be the case, the exchanging stockholders would be subject to capital gains tax. As an incentive, it would be necessary to offer a suitable premium. In that event, exchanges might appeal to stockholders with a tax-exempt status, such as religious, educational, and charitable institutions, and to those Du Pont stockholders whose cost basis for Du Pont stock is high enough so that there would be little or no tax incident to the exchange. We believe we could dispose of as many as 10 million General Motors shares through essentially tax-free exchanges.
>
> It thus appears that we could dispose of as many as 25 million shares of General Motors by methods which would produce no additional tax revenue.

Mr. GORE. From anyone.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, from anyone.

I read further:

> If we are correct in these estimates, there would still be left more than 35 million shares which we expect the company would have to sell within the 10-year period. Du Pont would be required to pay a tax on any capital gains realized on these sales and the tax revenue yield on all this would be in the neighborhood of $330 million based on current market value of General Motors stock.
>
> Under present law, then, tax revenues under the combination of methods of divestiture which now appears most favorable—

Most favorable to Du Pont, I presume.

Mr. GORE. Well, as President of the company, he would naturally consider it from that point of view, I believe.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

I continue to read—

> would total about $330 million. A distribution under H.R. 8847 would yield tax revenues of about $350 million.

Mr. GORE. Who pays the $330 million under existing law, under the plan proposed by Mr. Greenewalt?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the main the Du Pont Co.

Mr. GORE. Yes, the Du Pont Co. If we passed this bill, who would pay the $350 million?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the main the individuals or other stockholders.

Mr. GORE. Not the Du Pont Co.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. Is that not strange? Senators have received thousands of letters from small stockholders who have been misled into thinking that unless the Senate passes this bill, the value of their stock will be crushed or some sort of harsh tax treatment will be meted out to them; but Mr. Greenewalt in his own testimony said that if Congress passes no such bill, he proposes to follow a plan which would not cause the individual stockholders to pay a single dollar of tax in addition to what they now pay on their cash dividends. Yet he says that if Congress passes the bill, the Du Pont Co. will pay no tax, whereas if the bill is not enacted, the Du Pont Co. will pay $330 million.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And the total amount of tax will be slightly greater in the second case, according to Mr. Greenewalt.

Mr. GORE. And in which case the stockholders will pay all of it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And that total tax will be $20 million more.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, how more completely can the country be misled? How can white be made to look blacker than that? Does not the Senator from Illinois think that is really a remarkable performance in so-called public relations?

Mr. DOUGLAS. So far as I can tell, I think this bill is not of benefit to the average Du Pont stockholder.

Mr. GORE. If it is of benefit to him, where is the benefit?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have not been able to find it.

Mr. GORE. Yet a widow in Tennessee has stated in her letter to me that she owns five shares of the stock and she believes she is going to be personally hurt.

Mr. President, I have at my desk many letters. It disturbs me that men who have been so fortunate in companies that have had such vast and profitable success in America would set out upon a campaign—deliberately set out upon a campaign—first, to mislead the people, and, second, to pressure the Congress, through the people who have been misled, into passing a bill to perpetuate—I think it has as its primary purpose the effort to perpetuate—the monopolistic condition of which they have been held guilty, and therefore in violation of the antitrust laws.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We have just developed the fact that, according to Mr. Greenewalt's plan—and he is, of course, the president of Du Pont—he would not be compelled to sell the some 60 million shares, which the apologists of Du Pont have said off the floor of the Senate he would be compelled to sell, and which certain Senators have repeated on the floor, but he said he could dispose of 25 million shares by distribution in lieu of cash dividend or exchange. This would reduce the total that would have to be disposed of by sale from some 60 million to 35 million shares.

Is it not true that General Motors has a pension plan which annually purchases about 1,100,000 shares of General Motors stock?

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So that over a 10-year period this pension plan could purchase 11 million shares from Du Pont. It would diminish the number of shares to be disposed of from 35 million to 24 million shares. Is not that true?

Mr. GORE. That is according to my information.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that General Motors, on the average, issues 1,300,000 shares a year of new General Motors stock—I think the record bears that fact out—and over 10 years that would amount to 13 million shares? That new stock could come from Du Pont holdings of General Motors which are to be disposed of. It would reduce the number of shares to be sold to approximately 11 million shares over 10 years.

Can it be said that the sale of 11 million shares over 10 years would have a catastrophic effect upon the market price of General Motors stock?

Mr. GORE. I do not think so, particularly when 7 or 8 million shares or more change hands on the stock exchange every year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Have we not had a test of this in the experience of the Ford Foundation?

Mr. GORE. Yes; we have.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Ford Foundation, in a period of 5 years, disposed of the equivalent in value of 24 million shares of General Motors stock without any adverse market consequences. As a matter of fact, the price of Ford stock has increased appreciably during those years. As I remember, the price has increased by $46 a share—from $64.50 to $110.75. And Ford is a more volatile and less stable stock than is General Motors stock.

If the Ford Foundation can dispose of the equivalent of 24 million shares of General Motors stock without loss and indeed with an appreciable gain cannot Du Pont dispose of 11 million shares in 10 years without adverse market consequences?

Mr. GORE. I think so; and yet that is one of the ostensible reasons given for passage of the bill. On tomorrow I shall examine the two ostensible reasons given for passage of the bill, and I think I shall be able to demonstrate to the Senate that the arguments advanced for neither of them will hold water.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As a matter of fact, Du Pont would have to sell only 11 million shares; but even if it had to sell 24 million shares in 10 years, if the Ford Foundation can sell the equivalent of 24 million shares in 5 years of a more volatile stock and a less stable stock, and without adverse market consequences, could not Du Pont sell even as much as 24 million shares in 10 years.

Mr. GORE. I would surely think so. If we are able to show that neither of the two ostensible reasons advanced in favor of passage of the bill is valid—or, to put it another way, is supported by facts or logic—then we must look for the real reason for advancement of the bill. I shall be glad to engage the Senate's attention tomorrow again, and I shall examine those ostensible reasons, and then refer once again, with some additional facts, to what I regard as the two real reasons for attempting to influence the court to perpetuate the monopolistic condition which the Supreme Court has held violates the antitrust laws.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Tennessee permit me to introduce another consideration in the question as to whether the sale of General Motors stock by Du Pont would have adverse market effects?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Even if the price of General Motors stock were to be somewhat depressed by the sale—and we do not admit that, and I do not think it would occur, but even if it were to occur—it would merely alter the ratio of market price to earnings. The earnings of General Motors would not be affected. At present, the dividend is $4. Assuming this represents earnings, the ratio of $55 to $4 is a little less than 14 to 1.

Even if the price of the stock were to fall to $50 a share, the earnings would remain the same, because fundamentally the operating conditions would not change. If anything, the operating conditions might improve, because General Motors could then buy its fabrics and finishes from more competitive sources, and the costs would be decreased. The earnings to price ratio, if the price went down to $50, would be 12½ to 1. This would make it a very attractive stock. The idle funds of the market would rush in.

It is the same as if one lowers the level of a portion of a lake and then allows the remainder of the water in the lake to seek its natural level. The water rushes in to fill the vacuum, to establish the level.

We have heard a lot about the socalled free market in the stock market. If one lowers the ratio of price to earnings of a stock, one invites a tremendous investment. This will drive up the price of the stock.

When I saw the eminent representatives from the firm of J. P. Morgan disregard this fact, I began to worry as to whether they really knew as much about the stock market as they purported to know.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his observation.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, if there is no objection, I have some insertions to make in the RECORD. I shall be glad to suggest the absence of a quorum thereafter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOW SOME "BIRCHERS" WERE "BIRCHED"

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last November a distinguished and courageous American newspaperman, former U.S. Senator Thomas M. Storke, was awarded the Nieman Foundation for Journalism's Lauterbach Award. That award is given annually for outstanding work in defense of civil liberties. Senator Storke is editor and publisher of the Santa Barbara News-Press, an old, highly respected, and progressive American newspaper. Incidentally, Tom Storke traces his gallant ancestry, over many generations, to the days of the Dons. He loves his country with precisely the same devotion each of us in this Chamber does.

Tom Storke merited the award, a richly deserving tribute to a high public service his newspaper rendered to the people of Santa Barbara and, in a very real sense, to the people of the Nation. Something over a year ago, beautiful Santa Barbara was "sizzling with John Birch fever." This notorious, secret group is best remembered for the contemptuous and contemptible assault by its leader on the characters of great Americans like General Dwight Eisenhower, who was called a conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy; Chief Justice Earl Warren, whose impeachment was demanded; the late great John Foster Dulles, a courageous American patriot; and many others. It undertook, through various "front" organizations, attacks against American school officials, against churchmen, against people in government, and against many of our fellow citizens.

Today, as Tom Storke sees it, the political temperature of Santa Barbara is about back to normal. How did it happen? It happened simply because an undaunted American patriot informed his readers of the activities of the John Birch Society in Santa Barbara and the informed good sense of the people did the rest.

Mr. President, free speech and free press in America are part of this country's Constitutional heritage. Tom Storke and men like him across the country who are part of the free press of America, help assure this country's future. America is free. We intend to maintain our freedom. And the great body of our fellow citizens condemns all attempts at destroying the character of good Americans and of the original Constitutional system our Founding Fathers gave to us.

I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article by Senator Storke, entitled "How Some Birchers Were Birched," appearing in the New York Times Magazine for December 10, 1961, be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW SOME BIRCHERS WERE BIRCHED

(By Thomas M. Storke)

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.—A year ago Santa Barbara was sizzling with John Birch fever. Today the temperature of the body politic is almost back to normal. Why the change?

The answer is simple. The John Birch Society has been brought out of hiding. It was exposed to the judgment of the public, as it can be in every community.

It was revealed as a monolithic organization ruled with a dictatorial hand by its creator, Robert Welch, a man who sees Communists everywhere—in the White House, in the Supreme Court, in Congress, in the State Department, in our churches, schools and universities, in our press, radio and television.

It was revealed as a holding company for virulent "aginner" groups that say, as does the title of a current London show, "Stop the world; I want get off"—groups that are against democracy; against all income taxes; against the welfare and protective activities of the Government, which it calls socialism; against our participation in the United Nations; against foreign aid; against alliances for mutual protection with NATO and SEATO nations; against organized labor; against academic freedom; even against fluoridation.

In any community, the true image of the John Birch Society can be exposed to public view—the image of its reactionary rebellion against the twentieth century, as well as the face of anticommunism which it presents to the world. It can be exposed by individuals, organizations, newspapers, radio and television stations in a joint effort for public enlightenment.

The Birchers will fight back—as is their right. But out of the debate, the public will be able to make its own judgment, based on facts and open arguments.

This is what happened in Santa Barbara:

More than a year ago, it became apparent that organized effort was being put behind the activities of the ever-present radical reactionary extremists. A steady pattern of attack was emerging—against school officials, particularly in the adult education field; against churchmen; against the United Nations; against university professors and administrators. Day after day, the mails brought literature vilifying the entire Supreme Court and calling particularly for the impeachment of the Chief Justice. Most of these came in envelopes bearing Robert Welch's now familiar battle cry, "This is a republic, not a democracy—let's keep it that way."

More and more, letters to the editor followed the familiar "anti" pattern. Anonymous telephone calls charging "Communist" became commonplace. Mailings to Protestant church members cast doubts on the loyalty and patriotism of their leaders.

Santa Barbarans were seeing the manifestations of organized activity, but most of our citizens did not know what was behind it—the John Birch Society. I and my newspaper, the News-Press, decided the people had a right to know about the society that was trying to influence their thinking; just as all Americans have the right to form their own opinions from a free flow of information, and the right to promote their views in a legitimate way.

On January 22 and 23, reporter Hans Engh told the Birch story in the News-Press after weeks of digging for facts. The story was told almost entirely in the words of the society, from its founder, some of its local members and its literature. Still, it brought cries of "smear" from the Birchers, and the pattern of Birch attacks continued.

So I decided I must tell my readers what I thought of Robert Welch and his society and what they were doing to my beloved Santa Barbara. I did so in a front-page editorial on Sunday, February 26, 1961, that was accompanied by a statement of democratic principles in which I believe, and which my newspaper stands for. I introduced my editorial comments with these words:

The editor and publisher of the News-Press is in his 85th year. His entire life has been spent in this community. His memory takes him back many years and his reading even further. He lived when conditions were rugged. When West was West and men were men. He lived during periods when if a man or a group of men openly by word of mouth, or the printed word, called our President, or Vice President, our Secretary of State, the President's brother, members of the Supreme Court, and others at the head of our Government traitors, they were made to answer. Such slanders often called for a visit from a courageous and irate group which brought with them a barrel of tar and a few feathers. And such instances were particularly likely to occur if the slanderer came from New England. He lived when men were considered cowards when they hid behind their women's skirts and clothed their identity through anonymity.

It is in the light of this background that the News-Press tells where it stands on the John Birch Society.

The results were amazing. Most remarkable was the flood of support for our anti-Birch position from the moderates, both liberals, and conservatives—the people in the middle who are rarely heard from. Community leaders who had been subjected to Birch attack stood up and fought back, realizing that the newspaper and a broad segment of the public were behind them.

The air cleared and the political temperature began to drop.

We soon learned that other communities were having similar problems. Within a few weeks we filled requests for more than 15,000 reprints of the News-Press editorials and articles. The end of such requests still has not been reached.

Birch Society tactics call for the formation of front groups to carry on its program in disguise. Welch's Blue Book, bible of the society, says on page 86: "We would organize fronts—little fronts, big fronts, temporary fronts, permanent fronts, all kinds of fronts." It says further on: "We are talking about a million men, by which of course I mean men, women, and girls and boys of college age or old enough to be in the fight * * *. They are there just waiting to be recruited if we can get the story to them."

Last April the News-Press exposed, with documented evidence, the existence of a Birch front organization—the first such exposure anywhere. The front was called the Freedom Club, and it was set up on the campus of the University of California at Santa Barbara. It pretended to be just an organization of conservative students.

It was far more than that, as the News-Press revealed. At least part of its financing came from the treasurer of the John Birch Society in the Santa Barbara area. The guiding hand of both the Freedom Club and campus unit of the Birch Society was a 26-year-old man—not a student—but one of Robert Welch's paid coordinators. His primary job was to help spawn John Birch units on California college campuses.

A report signed by the leader of the campus Birch unit contained these words: "It was decided to soft-pedal the societies [sic] activities and concentrate on the Freedom Club." And the minutes of a meeting of the Birch unit said, "A further point of attack shall be subtle movements in objectives and use of the Freedom Club so that attention shall not be focused on the actual society."

Nine of the fifteen members of the Freedom Club, it turned out, constituted the entire roster of the campus Birch cell. The Freedom Club was an instrument for bringing college students into the John Birch Society.

And not just college students. News-Press disclosure of the Freedom Club-Birch Society link came just after mailings had gone out to juniors and seniors of a local high school encouraging them to join the Freedom Club, without revealing its Birch parenthood.

Since the News-Press disclosed the deception, nothing more has been heard of the Freedom Club or campus Birch unit. Exposure was all that was needed.

More recently came Birch efforts to kill the UNICEF Halloween fund drive. A front-page News-Press editorial pinpointing the lies of the Birchers and setting the record straight probably was a factor in boosting this year's UNICEF collections to a total of $6,000, compared with $4,300 last year—a sizable amount for this small community.

The John Birch philosophies have been aired so thoroughly in Santa Barbara that they have lost much of their force. Welchers and Birchers and their brethren ("I'm not a member, but * * *") continue to pressure church and school leaders. But now the overwhelming majority of Santa Barbarans—the rational moderates—take their outpourings for what they are, the unbalanced exhortations of a tiny, fanatical, highly vocal minority. California Attorney General Stanley Mosk has described the movement graphically as a collection of wealthy businessmen, retired military officials, and little old ladies in tennis shoes.

To me, Birchism—or Welchism—is a recurrence of a bad dream. My life spans 85 years of American history, and history has a way of repeating itself. Time and again I have seen people who should know better caught up in an emotional wave, following a leader as absurd as Robert Welch.

I recall a chat I had with President Roosevelt in the White House in 1934. I had just flown to Washington from Mexico City with Senator McAdoo, stopping en route in New Orleans, Jackson and Atlanta—the realms of three demagogs named Long, Bilbo, and Talmadge. I was deeply concerned about their successes, so I asked Mr. Roosevelt, "How are you going to combat such menaces?"

F.D.R.'s expression turned grave. He gestured with a rotating motion of his right arm and said, "I liken these threats to an epidemic of measles. You have to let it run its course. All we can do is keep the disease in its course and hope for the best."

The epidemic of demagoguery of which Long, Bilbo and Talmadge were the images did run its course and die down, if not disappear. The Birch epidemic, of which Welch is the image, also will run its course and die down.

But the distressing thing to me is the fact that there still is abroad in the land a paranoia so deeply rooted that it could sustain the John Birch movement—as for years it has sustained the Ku Klux Klan through periods of bold violence and longer periods of hiding and waiting. President Truman has said, "The Birch Society is the Ku Klux Klan, without nightshirts."

The parallel between Welchism and McCarthyism is obvious. McCarthy, like Welch, fed on the paranoiac fears of his followers. But the post-McCarthy period saw the paranoia grow as communism gained new victories abroad and more and more frustrated Americans began seeing Red ghosts in every high office and under every bed.

With encouragement from Welch, a new crop of Americans began to get the idea that they could thwart communism by suspecting and smearing their neighbors, plastering the "Comsymp" label on everyone in sight and discarding our democratic heritage of free discussion of all political ideas.

Welch picked up the game where McCarthy left off, but he added refinements. He lacked the advantage of a seat in the Senate, but he more than made up for it by making sure his society was well financed and tightly organized.

Welch, as he himself boasts, is not playing for peanuts. He is out to recruit 1 million members. Yearly dues are $24 for men and $12 for women—which, if averaged at $18, would mean an income of $18 million a year, if his dream were realized; this, without considering large contributions by wealthy fanatics.

In a letter accompanying his monthly bulletins to members, Welch makes an appeal for extra gifts, beyond the dues, and blandly adds, "We shall not go into any detailed accounting as to how the money is used." This is a policy he has frankly followed from the first; no public accounting of receipts or expenditures.

Smart operators could do quite a bit with $18 million plus a year that need not be accounted for. Smart operators are doing quite well already, on the fringes of the Birch Society and its fronts, with large fees for lectures, exposés and shock-talks to "freedom forums" or to secret study classes—delivered by reformed Reds, unemployed ex-Federal agents, columnists, and commentators.

No idea seemed too nutty for Robert Welch—even the idea that former President Eisenhower was a dedicated Communist who was working with his high-ranking partners-in-treachery to deliver us to the Russians.

Merely exposing such monstrous ideas—merely ventilating them in the public breeze—is enough to bring sanity (and sometimes laughter, to be sure) into the discussion of political issues. The absurdities fall of their own weight or continue to be held dear by a minority so minute that it is more troublesome than dangerous.

No instrument can perform the exposing operation more effectively than a newspaper. Congressional and legislative committees, sniffing the scent of subversion, have come close to launching all-out investigations of the John Birch Society. But there is potential danger in such inquiries.

A search for subversion can turn too easily into a probe of political beliefs. Legitimate questioning can too easily become intimidation of witnesses who hold minority political opinions. Even a character assassin is entitled to develop his own political philosophy and put the hard sell behind it.

Similarly, a newspaper doing its duty in a democratic society is entitled to bring every political philosophy into the light of day for public examination. It is entitled to discuss the sales technique being used, too—particularly if it is secret or semisecret in nature—and express its own opinion about both the philosophy and the sales technique.

I don't know what the real purposes are behind the Birch facade of anti-communism and the acknowledged but deemphasized aim of reversing the economic, social, and political trends of the 20th century in America. But it is worth pondering the possibility that the organization, unwittingly, is following a Communist-inspired line to destroy Americans' faith in their most respected leaders and institutions.

The Communists will adopt any tactic, even pseudo-anticommunism, if they see a chance to divide and weaken their enemy. And certainly the agitation and character assassination the Welchers have practiced have served only to make Americans distrust each other, undermine popular support for a strong national defense force, and weaken our ties with our allies.

In the end, the only protection against such aberrations as the John Birch Society and such ridiculous leaders as Robert Welch lies in the informed good sense of the people. Air the ideas of the radical extremists, and you will find in a hurry, as we did in Santa Barbara, that the moderates—conservative and liberal—are in control.

That knowledge makes all the difference in the world to the church and school leaders and others who have been under attack. When they realize that they have strong support behind them, they are unlikely to buckle under pressure.

In a letter to the News-Press last April, a research associate who was studying John Birch and other extremist movements for the California Teachers Association asked, "Am I correct in noting that since there has been so much publicity * * * there have been no more open attacks—at least on schools?"

He is correct, as far as Santa Barbara is concerned. School administrators have expressed their thanks to me for bringing the Birch Society into the arena of public discussion. So have ministers of the Gospel.

If John Birch meetings are being held now in the Santa Barbara area, they have not come to the attention of the News-Press. Administrators of the University of California at Santa Barbara have noted that both the John Birch cell on the campus and its front organization, the Freedom Club, have ceased to exist. Disclosure of their activities is all that was needed. Parents and the students themselves took care of the rest.

It is true that the News-Press went a step beyond disclosure, as far as the John Birch Society in general was concerned. I spoke out editorially in plain, honest language that I don't think anyone could misunderstand.

I have published my own daily newspaper in Santa Barbara for 61 years. During that time I have learned at least one lesson well—that a newspaper will not be listened to or win respect if it pussyfoots in stating its editorial beliefs.

I have learned that you can't kill a rat with a feather duster.

CASTRO AND COMMUNIST CUBA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in a few days in Punta del Este, Uruguay, the representatives of this Government and of the Organization of American States will attend an important meeting so far as this hemisphere is concerned. High on the agenda—I suppose number one—will be the policy of the free nations of the Western Hemisphere with regard to Castro in Cuba.

Earlier this month a distinguished American newspaperman, Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr., wrote his "Editor's Report," entitled "Playing Pattycake With Fidel Castro," which was published in the San Francisco Examiner, Sunday, January 7, 1962.

Mr. Hearst recalled that Castro came to the United States and spoke before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, indicating he wished to bring great freedom to the people of Cuba. Thereafter, in fact, only a few weeks ago, Castro conceded and confessed that he is a complete Communist, and always has been.

Some of Mr. Hearst's comments with respect to the position of the Organization of American States and the position of this country are, I think, required reading for the Members of Congress.

I recall that, a year ago, when we passed the mutual security bill, Congress specifically wrote into that measure authority for the President of the United States to invoke complete economic sanctions against Cuba. Since the bill was signed by the President, that is the law of this land today.

I urge on this floor that the President of the United States utilize the authority which Congress gave to him. I urge our representatives at Punta del Este to take a firm position against the common threat of continuing Communist infiltration into this Western Hemisphere.

We have friends south of the border. We wish to cement our friendships there. The American people wish nothing but the most intimate, pleasant, and profitable relations with our neighbors south of the border. Part of the hazard which is faced today by countries, large and small, situated in this hemisphere, can be traced to international communism and to Cuba.

I hope, Mr. President, that if my colleagues have not read the article by Mr. Hearst, they will read it, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAYING PATTYCAKE WITH FIDEL CASTRO—MONROE DOCTRINE SHOULD APPLY TO CASTRO'S CUBA—DANGEROUS TO U.S. SAFETY

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

LOS ANGELES, January 6.—Our State Department this past week issued a formal white paper declaring—you guessed it—that Fidel Castro has turned Cuba into a Soviet colony.

Now the point is: Where do we go from there?

I recall, 3 years ago come spring, hearing fuzzy-faced Fidel in a ballroom of the Statler Hotel in Washington, D.C., tell the American Society of Newspaper Editors what a friend of U.S. democracy he was.

A few actually believed him, because, I think, they didn't want to face up to the alarming potentials; but this column was skeptical.

Maybe Castro was all the pal he said he was, but there was some evidence to the contrary, warned the Editor's Report of April 19, 1959.

I gave it as my own opinion and that of others who knew Cuba that the jury was still out in the case of Fidel Castro.

The jury wasn't out very long. After a few months of blood baths to purge all opposition inside Cuba, and after Castro snuggled up to Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung, there could only be one verdict.

If Castro wasn't 100 percent Communist he would do for the Soviet's purposes until a more reasonably accurate facsimile came along.

It was a classic example of the old saying that if a bird looks like a duck, walks like a duck, quacks like a duck and lays duck eggs, the odds are it's a duck.

The State Department white paper listed some $100 million worth of the latest model Communist bloc arms consigned to Castro along with 800 military and technical advisers, noting that Cuba's armed forces are now second only to those of the United States on this side of the Atlantic.

It calls Cuba a "bridgehead of Sino-Soviet imperialism" and a serious threat to the American republics. Which will come as news to practically no one except possibly Herbert Matthews of the New York Times, who was with Castro's crew in the Cuban hills before they seized power but never suspected there was anything Red about them.

It may also come as news to a few deskwarmers inside the State Department itself. They have been so afraid of what world opinion—meaning the neutralist and Latin American nations—might say if we acted in our own interests, that they have shackled Uncle Sam as effectively as Delilah tied up Samson.

We've seen how ready-to-use force was that most holier-than-thou of the neutrals, India, in the seizure of Portuguese Goa. As for the Latin Americans, they have so far been reluctant to act in their own interests against Castro, although he brags that he will take over all their countries for Marxism.

Two weeks from now, the foreign ministers of the Organization of American States will meet in Uruguay. High on the agenda is a demand that they act jointly to halt Castro. I am glad to see our State Department isn't just sitting back and resting on its white paper but is pushing the OAS to give Fidel an ultimatum to break with the Reds pronto.

In the light of the Roman Catholic excommunication of Castro and his henchmen for interfering with the church, some Latin American statesmen may feel pressure from their people to act.

But if they don't, the United States should act on its own.

What all countries must respect in the final analysis, is power and the will to use it. And the United States has the legal justification and the moral obligation to use power against Castro.

To quote the Monroe Doctrine, the United States would consider interference by foreign powers in the affairs of any American country as an unfriendly act "dangerous to our peace and safety."

That surely fits the Soviet-Castro setup.

Castro has been screaming his old line about the United States getting ready to invade his Red stronghold.

It would be downright mean of Uncle Sam to disappoint him.

Maybe it didn't loom very large to some people this week when Premier Salazar of Portugal announced that his country would—at some future date—walk out of the United Nations and would meanwhile boycott the world body's activities. But to me this has an ominous ring.

Portugal is indignant over U.N. failure to prevent India's aggression against Goa. U.S. attempts to get U.N. action were blocked by Soviet veto in the Security Council and by Afro-Asian coolness in the veto-free Assembly.

My personal opinion is that the United States should have forced the issue in the General Assembly, despite a poll which showed the Afro-Asians—concerned only with European colonialism—wouldn't vote to block aggression by one of their own.

At least we could have made them go on record in their disregard of justice. There is no question that the Afro-Asian bloc—wielding the balance of U.N. power between the West and the Communists and enjoying it—is taking predictable attitudes which have no relation to the merit of cases.

Many people wonder whether this new U.N. lineup is making the U.N. impotent whenever a Western nation's rights are at stake.

President de Gaulle, of France, has long scorned the U.N. Belgium resents its actions in the Congo. British Foreign Minister Lord Home warns that blocs are negating the U.N.'s purposes and he makes it clear he means the Afro-Asians as well as the Communists.

No American who gets around can help but notice a growing opinion among our own people that the United States can hope for nothing much going our way if we pin our policy to the U.N.

I have been pro-U.N. from its start, believing that a democratic organization representing the peace-loving peoples of the world must eventually become a reality in some form or other.

Up to recently, the U.N. has done pretty well trying to fill that bill. But the emergence of many small new nations—mostly nowhere near advanced enough to vote on a par with such peoples as the Europeans—has changed the picture.

I recognize that many more Americans now are beginning to doubt this world body's effectiveness.

My belief in the U.N. in the past was further bolstered by the way it helped to serve our national interest. This was evidenced again and again by Russian vetoes and by the Soviet attempt only a year ago to render the U.N. secretariat impotent.

But the Communists have been strangely amiable about the U.N. recently. Isn't that because the Afro-Asian bloc—playing its own selfish game of balance of power—is also playing the Soviet's game, consciously or not?

Most of these new Afro-Asian nations wouldn't have their day in the sun if it were not for the U.N., which gives each of them the same voting power in the Assembly as the United States or Britain.

They couldn't even stay independent except for the power of the United States and the Western alliance which guards them. The Communists would swallow them overnight if they had only themselves to look to for defense.

If the ominous move by Portugal were to start a walkaway from the U.N. by any sizable number of other nations, the Afro-Asians would have only themselves to blame.

Where would they be without a strong U.N. backed by a strong West?

Or are they too impressed with the balance of power represented by their bloc voting to think about that?

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN J. RILEY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the nature of the spirit and the personality of Congressman John J. Riley was a clear testimony to the fact that he was an exceptional man in his devotion to country and especially in his standards of conduct in dealing with mankind and executing the high duties of the office to which he was elected eight times by the people of my and his Second Congressional District of South Carolina. Although I had known Congressman Riley for many years, my intimate association with him began after World War II when my service as Governor of South Carolina coincided with his second term in the Congress.

During the years since that time I watched Congressman Riley ably represent his district, State, and Nation in the Congress. I was impressed by his display of a steady hand and clear head in meeting some of the most perplexing and serious problems in the history of our Republic. His work on the House Appropriations Committee was admired by all those who are knowledgeable in the mountainous duties and grave responsibilities of this important committee. But beyond his duties on the Appropriations Committee, and earlier, the Banking and Currency Committee, John Riley could always be found on the floor of Congress ready and able to support the great and sound principles of Government on which this Nation was founded.

Congressman Riley's first consideration was always the welfare of his country. As a member of the South Carolina delegation for the past 15 years he served capably and faithfully and evidenced a deep reverence for principle in reaching decisions on the great and small issues he was called upon to consider in his record of public service. He rose to a place of high standing in the House because of his devotion to duty, high principles, personal integrity, absolute honesty, and unquestionable sincerity.

One of the most admirable traits of John Riley was his warm human kindness, sympathy for the needs and desires of others, and his intense determination to render a valuable service to his fellow man. This was indicated in part by his great interest in and service to young people in American Legion baseball and his favorite personal project, the Croswell Orphanage in his hometown of Sumter.

During his campaigns he never used mass-communication methods of contacting his constituents but followed the practice of personal contact which so accurately expressed his depth of human feeling and the unpretentious nature of his personality. He was a warmhearted man who in the heat of a campaign or during the deluge of duties in Washington could always find time to visit the sick and listen patiently to the problems of those who came seeking counsel and assistance.

Few men who have served in the U.S. House of Representatives have had the good fortune to have won and held such a strong measure of devotion, respect, and confidence of their people as had John Riley. He was so beloved by his people not because he was flamboyant, possessed of great oratorical skill, or because he attended to all the small political chores necessary to keep a constituency happy and satisfied. He made his way successfully in the ofttimes turbulent practice of politics by just being himself—a man of indomitable character and sincerity.

Congressman Riley was a devoted servant of the people of the Second District of South Carolina and, indeed, the Nation, and my heartfelt sympathy goes out to his widow and children. While all of us in the Congress will miss him, their loss is the greatest because as a husband and father he adhered to principles set forth by the God in which he so deeply believed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STOCK DISTRIBUTION TREATED AS RETURN OF CAPITAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8847) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that a distribution of stock made to an individual (or certain corporations) pursuant to an order enforcing the antitrust laws shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital; and to provide that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, H.R. 8847, as reported by the Committee on Finance, contains very sound and proper tax provisions relating to the forced disposition and forced receipt of General Motors stock under antitrust decrees and I expect to vote for it.

The bill is before the Senate after extended hearings and executive sessions by the Senate Finance Committee and a vote of 16 to 2. Some will argue that there is a better approach to the solution of this problem, but I do not believe anyone will contend that the forced disposition of this stock by the Federal Government does not warrant some tax adjudication to the owners.

However, I am concerned that the bill as reported by the Committee on Finance does not go far enough. My attention has been called to many cases where property other than stock and securities have been forced on the market in order to effectuate antitrust policies. The same reasons cited by the Ways and Means Committee and the Committee on Finance in support of H.R. 8847 are equally applicable to the sale of all types of property.

In the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee, on previous occasions when those committees were considering suggestions for tax relief where the antitrust laws are concerned, the American Bar Association and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce have urged that any legislation in this area apply to all types of property and not merely stock or securities. In fact, it is my understanding that the present proposal applies only to General Motors stock when distributed by the Du Pont Co. and would have no effect on any other antitrust case.

The pending bill is a step forward, but I submit that the Senate must take into account that there are other antitrust defendants who have been or will in the future be forced to dispose of other securities or other types of property. The shareholders of those companies will suffer for the same reason that the Du Pont and General Motors shareholders will suffer because the value of their investment will be reduced by the unintended tax consequences of a civil proceeding under the antitrust laws. The pending bill is obviously piecemeal legislation intended to meet the needs of a particular lawsuit.

When a similar measure was reported favorably in the House during the 86th Congress, the report of the Committee on Ways and Means stated that—

> The committee wishes to make it clear that it believes this legislation will be of

value in facilitating enforcement of antitrust laws generally and it is not the purpose to provide tax relief for any one case.

It is my hope that the Congress will give serious consideration to the harsh tax consequences of divestitures and distributions where any type of property is disposed of pursuant to an antitrust proceeding.

Extended hearings on this proposal have been held by the Ways and Means Committee of the House and I am advised that they are considering an early report on the same.

I shall not press consideration of this proposal on H.R. 8847, as I realize the Senate Finance Committee has not held hearings on it, but I would urge early hearings when the matter is presented to us by the House of Representatives.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill as prepared by the House Ways and Means Committee and studied by the staff be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H.R. 8847

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the taxation of distributions of stock and dispositions of property made pursuant to orders enforcing the antitrust laws

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subchapter 0 of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to gain or loss on disposition of property) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART IX.—DISTRIBUTIONS OF STOCK AND DISPOSITIONS OF PROPERTY PURSUANT TO ORDERS ENFORCING THE ANTITRUST LAWS

"SEC. 1112. DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY TO EFFECTUATE ANTITRUST POLICIES.

"(a) NONRECOGNITION OF GAIN.—If property is sold or exchanged solely as the result of a judgment, decree or other order of a court or of a commission or board authorized (or threat or imminence thereof) to enforce compliance in a suit or other proceeding brought by the United States or such commission or board under the Sherman Act (26 Stat. 209; 15 U.S.C. 1–7), or the Clayton Act (38 Stat. 730; 15 U.S.C. 12–27), and none of the defendants in such proceedings has been named as a defendant in criminal proceedings, such sale or exchange shall, at the election of the taxpayer, be treated as an involuntary conversion of such property within the meaning of section 1033.

"(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply if the taxpayer could have reasonably anticipated a violation of the Sherman Act (26 Stat. 209; 15 U.S.C. 1–7), or of the Clayton Act (38 Stat. 730; 15 U.S.C. 12–27), at the time of the transactions which gave rise to the proceedings brought under such Acts.

"(c) DISPOSITIONS TO AVOID FEDERAL INCOME TAX.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any sale or exchange of property which is in pursuance of a plan having as one of its principal purposes the avoidance of Federal income taxes.

"(d) REINVESTMENT OF PROCEEDS.—In the case of a sale or exchange of property described in subsection (a), the requirements of section 1033 dealing with investment in property shall be satisfied if the taxpayer during the period within which the property must be replaced under section 1033(a)(3)(B) purchases other property for use in a trade or business and such investment is not inconsistent with the terms of the judgment, decree, or order referred to in subsection (a). In the case of a sale or exchange of property described in subsection (a), the other property in which the proceeds have been invested shall not satisfy the requirements of section 1033 dealing with investment in property unless it is certified by—

"(1) the Attorney General of the United States or his delegate, if the suit or other proceeding described in subsection (a) was instituted by the Attorney General, or

"(2) by the commission or board, if the suit or other proceeding described in subsection (a) was instituted by such commission or board, that the investment in such property is not inconsistent with the Sherman Act (26 Stat. 209; 15 U.S.C. 1–7), or the Clayton Act (38 Stat. 730; 15 U.S.C. 12–27)."

SEC. 2. Section 1112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as added by the first section of this Act, shall apply with respect to amounts received and to amounts invested after December 31, 1960, irrespective of the time of the sale or exchange. In the case of a sale or exchange to which Section 1112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as added by the first section of this Act, is applicable, the period for making an election and replacing property referred to in Section 1033(a)(3)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 shall not expire prior to 90 days after the enactment of this Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 17, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 16, 1962:

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

George W. Mitchell, of Illinois, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of 14 years from February 1, 1962. (Reappointment.)

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Charles M. Conway, of Arkansas, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Arkansas for the term of 4 years, vice Charles W. Atkinson, resigned.

Nathan S. Heffernan, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Wisconsin for the term of 4 years, vice George E. Rapp.

Donald A. Wine, of Iowa, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Iowa for the term of 4 years, vice Roy L. Stephenson, resigned.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

James V. Day, of Maine, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner for a term expiring June 30, 1965.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be lieutenant commanders

Clinton D. Upham
Floyd J. Tucker, Jr.
Dale E. Westbrook

To be lieutenants

Donald W. Moncevicz
Donald R. Tibbit
K. William Jeffers
Harold E. McCall
Charles G. Elliott
Gerald C. Saladin
Raymond L. Speer
Clifford W. Randall
Renworth R. Floyd
Joe P. Pennington
Robert L. Sandquist
James S. Midgley
John M. Doherty
Billy M. Keltner
Charles H. Nixon
Melvin J. Umbach
Meinrade H. Schilly

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be general

Gen. Bruce Cooper Clarke, O16068, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

To be lieutenant generals

Lt. Gen. Donald Prentice Booth, O16395, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Emerson Leroy Cummings, O15500, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Edward Joseph O'Neill, O15952, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Ridgely Gaither, O15970, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Carl Henry Jark, O17556, U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Regular Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

LINE

Charles B. Brooks, Jr.
William B. Sieglaff
Joseph W. Leverton, Jr.
James C. Dempsey
John W. Byng
Joseph D. Black
Andrew J. Hill, Jr.
Frederick J. Becton
Francis T. Williamson
Frederick J. Brush
Joseph A. Jaap
Louis A. Bryan
Allen M. Shinn
Alfred R. Matter
Richard S. Craighill
Daniel F. Smith, Jr.
Thomas F. Connolly
Waldemar F. A. Wendt
Charles J. Palmer
Robert B. Fulton II
Charles A. Curtze

MEDICAL CORPS

Harold J. Cokely

SUPPLY CORPS

Charles A. Blick
John W. Bottoms

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

LINE

Leroy J. Alexanderson
Grant G. Calhoun

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

Alpha L. Bowser
Avery R. Kier
Sidney S. Wade
James M. Masters, Sr.
Ralph K. Rottet

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Thomas F. Riley
Frederick E. Leek
Odell M. Conoley
Philip W. John
William T. Fairbourn
Bruno A. Hochmuth
Roy L. Kline
William R. Collins

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Expanding U.S. Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, economically, the Nation, despite its record levels of productivity, still faces serious problems, both at home and abroad.

Our participation in the world market, for example, remains, in my judgment, far less than its potential.

With the greatest, most efficient production plants in the world, we find that only about 4 percent of our manufacturers are exporting their goods.

The expanding of the export trade would result in: More jobs; greater utilization of our plant capacity (now running at reduced levels in many industries); greater demand for services; more favorable balance of payments in the import-export trade; and general improvement in our economic health.

For these reasons, I believe it is especially important that we undertake new creative efforts to expand U.S. exports.

Having commented on this subject recently, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of a statement printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED: MORE DYNAMIC, CREATIVE EFFORT TO EXPAND U.S. EXPORT TRADE

Currently, the U.S. economy turns out goods at a GNP rate of about $540 billion per year.

U.S. consumers—with a personal income of about $429 billion—serve as the major customer of this great agricultural-industrial production plant.

In a shrinking, increasingly integrated world, however, we, as a nation, can—in my judgment—benefit also from a more enterprising effort to find and serve more markets elsewhere in the world.

Around the globe there are about 2 billion people outside the Communist orbit. Of these nations, only the industrialized countries of Western Europe exist on comparable—but still somewhat lower—economic levels. The lesser developed nations need literally everything for development and progress.

If the United States, then, could successfully serve more of these potential markets, the result would be more jobs; greater utilization of our plant capacity (now running at reduced levels in many industries); greater demand for services; more favorable balance of payments in the import-export trade; and general improvement in our economic health.

What steps, then, need to be taken? Certainly any program should include the following:

1. Better education of business leaders on the potentials of expanding export trade;

2. Greater governmental-free enterprise cooperation in market research and development;

3. More effective dissemination of information to U.S. firms on how to expand foreign trade;

4. Expansion of research to determine how U.S. products (often too complex for utilization in less developed economies) can be modified, and then mass produced, for export to less developed economies;

5. Greater availability of information on how to finance foreign trade ventures; and

6. Greater efforts by the Government—through bilateral negotiations as well as through the U.N.—to obtain protection against expropriation, without compensation, of foreign investments.

Over the years, however, the Department of Commerce—as well as U.S. firms individually and through their associations—have made constructive efforts toward expanding foreign trade.

As a nation, we have—in my judgment—fallen far short of our potential. Only about 4 percent of U.S. manufacturers, for example, participate in, and benefit from, the export business. For that reason I believe that:

1. Congress must take a new look at our overall trade policies and programs—including a close look at reciprocal trade agreements to see what can be done to eliminate discrimination against U.S. products and thus encourage more exports;

2. The Department of Commerce—now administering a comprehensive but too-largely unutilized trade-development program—must step up its efforts to stimulate U.S. interest in expanding international trade;

3. Leaders in business and industry, themselves, must demonstrate more dynamic, far-sighted tradesmanship in broadening commercial horizons; and

4. There must be greater international cooperation among nations to remove obstructions and encourage—on a mutually beneficial basis—a greater to-and-fro flow of commodities.

If this can be accomplished successfully: we as a nation will benefit economically; other nations—particularly the lesser developed—will find themselves able to progress more rapidly; and there will be a brightening of the economic outlook of all people—particularly the "havenots," which will help create stability and peace in the world.

More Petitions Calling for an End to the Red Mail Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have today presented to the Speaker's desk 43 additional petitions, calling for an end to the subsidy given Communist propanganda by this Nation.

These petitions, signed by 462 persons in 13 States, call for action by the Congress to stop the free distribution of Red poison in our mails.

Since March of last year, the Post Office has been forced to deliver—without 1 cent of payment—tons of Communist propaganda all over the country, most of it to persons or groups that do not want the material and are especially incensed to learn that it is delivered free.

These people cannot understand why the Congress is called upon to raise postage rates for Americans while the Post Office delivers Communist propaganda free and adds to the postal deficit. It is time for action by the Congress on this matter.

Legislation To Promote Greater Safety in River Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill (H.R. 9700) for appropriate reference which would require the inspection and certification by the Coast Guard of certain motor vessels known as towboats. This proposed legislation is an outgrowth of a long series of exchanges of correspondence which I have had with members of the legislative committee of Local 28, International Organization of Masters, Mates, and Pilots, AFL-CIO, of St. Louis, both in my capacity as a Representative of St. Louis in the Congress and also as a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House.

The bill, which I am introducing by request as a means of bringing a long-standing problem before the committee in a manner which will assure thorough hearings and consideration of the underlying issue, would extend to diesel-powered towboats the same requirements for inspection and certification now required in the case of steam-propelled towboats. Insofar as the inland waterways are concerned, I am informed that steam-powered towboats have virtually disappeared.

I am not personally conversant with the technical details of inspection and certification proceedings, but as one who was born and reared in one of America's great inland ports located on our greatest river, I am certainly aware of the importance of taking whatever steps are necessary to assure the safe use of our rivers by the mammoth trains of barges which carry tremendous amounts of industrial cargo.

In previous discussions of this problem with the Coast Guard, I was informed that accident statistics have not disclosed so far any emergency situation as regards the operation of uninspected and uncertified towboats on the rivers. Nevertheless, as long as the danger of serious accidents exist, I believe we should take appropriate steps to extend the Coast Guard's inspection requirements if that course of action is feasible and practicable. The purpose of my bill is to provide the vehicle by which the whole problem can be brought up for hearings in committee, with the expectation that if the supporters of this bill can establish the soundness of their position, we can then correct any deficiencies in present law.

Other provisions of the legislation would require licensing of pilothouse employees on diesel-driven towboats just as they are now required to be licensed in steam-driven vessels of the same type.

Exchange of Allotments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to permit the exchange between farmers of cotton acreage allotments for rice acreage allotments. The full text of the bill is as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding after section 378 the following new section:
>
> "Exchange of allotments
>
> "Sec. 379. The Secretary shall by regulations authorize the exchange between farms in the same county, or between farms in adjoining counties within a State, of cotton acreage allotment for rice acreage allotment. Any such exchange shall be made on the basis of application filed with the county committee by the owners and operators of the farms, and the transfer of allotment between the farms shall include transfer of the related acreage history for the commodity. The exchange shall be acre for acre or on such other basis as the county committee determines is fair and reasonable, taking into consideration the comparative productivity of the soil for the farms involved and other relevant factors. No farm from which the entire cotton or rice allotment has been transferred shall be eligible for an allotment of cotton or rice as a new farm within a period of 5 crop years after the date of such exchange."

For several years farmers who produce both cotton and rice have been asking authority to swap acreage allotments with each other within the county or an adjoining county. There were many reasons why the authority was asked by the holders of the rice and cotton allotments. In many areas where these commodities are produced small farms have been removed from production, which has hurt the general business activity in the communities. Also, in so many instances holders of small allotments do not have enough acreage to make an economic unit. A cotton farmer has equipment which is adaptable to the planting, cultivation, and harvesting of that crop. This same equipment cannot be used in the operation of a rice farm. The cotton farmer who is fortunate enough to have land which is suitable for cotton production and having the equipment being used in such an operation may have both cotton and rice allotments upon his land. He may want to dispose of his rice allotment and obtain in its stead a comparable amount of cotton allotment from his neighbor, or from a farmer within the county or an adjoining county. On the other hand, a rice farmer may have, let us say, a 40-acre rice allotment, and ordinarily a 60 to 70 allotment in a much more economic operation since one pump properly placed on his farm should service at least 60 or 70 acres of rice plantings. He would cherish the idea, probably, of going out of the cotton business and concentrating his efforts in the production of rice by arriving at an understanding and an agreement with a nearby farmer who desired to have additional cotton acreage and was not wanting to use his rice allotment. Both farmers are benefited by such an arrangement, as well as the community itself in which they live. The result would be approximately the same production of both crops in the affected areas where such transfers are made. The swapping of the acreage would be on the basis of comparable values.

The cotton and rice farmer differs from the corn farmer and many wheat farmers in that they are under strict controls, in which each must adhere to acreage allotments and marketing quotas. Since that situation prevails the programs for both crops should be made more palatable. Also, more flexibility in the operation of the programs is obviously most desirable.

In 1959 quite a number of bills were introduced on this subject. Hearings were held before the House Committee on Agriculture, but the legislation was not approved. Since 1959 there have been growing demands for action for legislation of this kind. Many letters have been written to Members of both Houses of Congress and to the Department urging that something be done to permit the transfer of cotton acreage allotments to rice acreage allotments and rice acreage allotments for cotton acreage allotments. This legislation can do no harm, but would be most beneficial to a major segment of farmers, who are asking that they be given this privilege of making for a more economic and logical farming operation.

Knorr Soups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today the Honorable Everett McKinley Dirksen, the junior Senator from Illinois and the distinguished minority leader of the Senate, was host to all Senators in the Senate dining room for a serving of Knorr soup. This soup is a new hydrated product, produced by the Best Foods Division of Corn Products Co., whose headquarters plant—the world's largest food processing complex—is located in the northwestern section of my district in Argo, Ill.

Other than the fact that the quality of Knorr soup is of the highest, Mr. Speaker, I think it will be interesting to the Members to learn of the origin of this soup. It was originated in Heilbronn, Germany, in 1838 and in the ensuing years became popular not only in Germany but also in all other countries of Europe. Later on, Knorr soups were brought to the United States by importers and were sold, primarily in gourmet and specialty stores under the brand name Knorr Suisse. Recently, the Corn Products Co. brought this soup to the United States for manufacturing.

Mr. Speaker, this action represents an international business action worthy of note. Bringing in this product from abroad has meant not only a new product for the American public, but it has meant new investment and new jobs here in the United States—and at a time when we hear so much discussion of foreign-made products being sold in the U.S. market. In other words, the Knorr example shows us one way that the gold outflow problem can be ameliorated.

Not only was a brand new plant constructed at Argo, Ill., but additionally these soups have already created more than 1,130 new jobs for U.S. citizens in manufacturing, selling, and marketing—and that is just the beginning.

The Citizen and International Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was my privilege last October 30 to address the students of Salem College, my alma mater in Salem, W. Va.

The occasion was a regular assembly at chapel, as part of a political science program which was designed to bring the young men and young women of that campus in touch with persons engaged in practical legislative and decision-making matters. I spoke on the theme of "The Citizen and International Affairs," indicating the role that the enlightened citizen might perform in an area which is generally assumed to be far removed from the influence of the average voter.

Events of the past 3 months have not greatly altered the context of international relations to which I addressed my remarks, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that my speech be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE CITIZEN AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(An address by Senator Jennings Randolph, Democrat, of West Virginia, at Salem College, Salem, W. Va., October 30, 1961)

The theme for the development of Salem College this year is, I understand, "the importance of academic integrity." I commend you on this selection, and I hope that each of you is able to give new and functional meanings to the term in the coming year.

For the question of the integrity of the individual, in the fundamental sense of that word, although at least as old as the Book of Job, is also an ever new and evolving one. As the world changes, it presents new demands, new challenges, and new threats to the achievement and maintenance of our integrity. And we must constantly replenish our moral and intellectual resources with new insights and new perceptions of our relationship to a changing world.

This morning I would speak of the problem of attaining and securing one's integrity as a citizen, particularly in relation to foreign affairs. This difficult area—far removed from the personal experience and knowledge of most of us—today poses the greatest test of our maturity as citizens and as a nation.

The problem was well defined in a recent article in Foreign Affairs by Henry M. Wriston, president emeritus of Brown University, when he wrote:

"There has been a growing feeling that the problems of foreign affairs have become so complicated that the private citizen cannot be expected to understand them, much less make a positive contribution to their resolution. Concurrently there has been a surfeit of demands that Washington officials should develop bold, new, imaginative policies and plans. This is tantamount to asking that those eminently desirable ends should be achieved in a vacuum. That is not only undesirable, it is impossible. We do not have a Government of experts, and if we were to try to form one it would be utterly disastrous to the whole concept of democracy to which we are deeply committed. The expert has an essential but nonetheless a subordinate role to play; he can advise, but he cannot take the place of political leadership. By its very nature political leadership loses its effectiveness unless there is a significant degree of public consensus behind proposals for action. Many a novel and constructive idea, possibly conceived by experts but responsibility for which was accepted by a political leader, has come to nought for lack of intelligent popular support."

We may not, therefore, and we must not delegate our responsibilities as citizens, for our own actions and expressions are part of the "public consensus"—or lack of it—on which the ultimate political decisions are grounded. Thus, integrity of citizenship in this respect means the fulfillment of our responsibility to achieve through knowledge and imagination and understanding of America's role in the currents and cross currents of action in the world today.

Now let me give some content to this rather abstract statement and indicate some of the hazards to its attainment. Perhaps the greatest obstacle to the achievement of a positive role for the citizen in the field of international relations is the brooding omnipresence of the threat of nuclear war.

The mind balks and the imagination stumbles in the attempt to envisage the effects of a 20-megaton nuclear bomb—a weapon equal to the explosive power of 20 million tons of TNT—or the equivalent of 8 million bombloads of the World War II Flying Fortress. Yet this kind of arithmetic does not bring us much closer to an imaginative perception of the dreadful consequences of nuclear war.

Some people, in a sense of despair and fatalism, have attempted to fill the void with the slogan, "I would rather be Red than dead." A more ethically developed, but closely related view was recently advanced by the eminent Protestant theologian, Dr. Paul Tillich, in his assertion that "a war fought with atomic weapons can ethically not be justified, for it produces destruction without the possibility of a creative new beginning: it annihilates what it is supposed to defend."

Though Dr. Tillich's position is unassailable from a purely ethical point of view, such ethical absolutism, abstracted from the total political matrix in which it functions, tends to disarm one from considering an alternative to the "Red or dead" polarity.

At the other extreme from the pacifism of Lord Bertrand Russell and the ethical position of Dr. Tillich is the shrill and meaningless cry for total victory against the Soviet Union and the occasional irresponsible talk of preventive war. Both extremes are determined by the overriding horror of nuclear conflict, and both reactions short circuit the process of reflection in their attempt to provide some substitute for the patient and persistent efforts to achieve a viable political solution to the antagonisms between the Soviet bloc and the free world. But there is no substitute for responsibility in our personal and political behavior, and we may not delegate it to chance or luck or a benificent cosmos.

In his eloquent address to the General Assembly of the United Nations, President Kennedy expressed his recognition of the long and difficult road ahead, for us and for the world, before peace and freedom can be achieved. Looking "across the world of threats to the world of peace" he acknowledged that "* * * we cannot expect any final triumph—for new problems will arise. We cannot expect that all nations will adopt like systems—for conformity is the jailer of freedom, and the enemy of growth. Nor can we expect to reach our goal by contrivance, by fiat or even by the wishes of all."

This, my young friends, is an honest statement of the reality of our time. It means that your generation as well as mine must learn to contend with the problems of achieving peace and freedom. And it means, in all likelihood, that we must continue to live with uncertainty; we must continue to live under the shadow of a potential nuclear war, and yet actively plan and work to realize the hope of a future world without war.

I would ask you to follow me now, in looking beyond our own shores and ambitions toward one of the prominent problem areas in our relation with other countries. I do not presume to be an expert in foreign affairs; nor do I pose any final solutions. Rather, I suggest a point of view which might be adopted by the interested and responsible citizen in his contribution to the public consensus which must underlie the successful execution of American foreign policy.

It was first suggested when I was invited to speak this time at Salem that I address the topic of "Berlin and Its Implications." Though one must naturally approach this subject with some trepidation, I shall attempt to indicate some of the principal considerations that must be kept in mind not only by our policymakers but by the thoughtful citizens who support American policy.

First, regardless of party affiliation, we must put aside the tendency to cry "Munich" every time the administration gives indication of the possibility of negotiations on Berlin. It is not only irrelevant to the present crisis, but it tends to place a dangerous limitation upon the President's freedom of action.

Second, we must recognize that the conflict over Berlin—which is only part of the larger "German problem"—is not solely, or perhaps even primarily, an ideological conflict between communism and democracy. It is in large measure a conflict not of ideas about society or the future, but of the way we see the facts of national life in central Europe.

The Soviet rulers and the Soviet people apparently believe quite literally that West Germany is controlled by unrepentant Nazis and militarists, a view which is shared by many Poles and Czechs as well. Before we dismiss such a belief as complete fantasy, let us recall that Germany overran Eastern Europe twice in 30 years, with a dreadful toll of life taken among the peoples of Poland, Czechoslovakia and Russia.

On the other hand, we cannot ignore the history of the cruelty and treachery of the Russian policy in Europe during Stalin's last years from 1945 to 1952. It is across this gulf in our perceptions of the facts that we must somehow make contact and reach a modus vivendi regarding Berlin and Germany.

In so doing, we must not only maintain the Western rights of access to Berlin, but we must also be assured that the city will remain a viable part of the political and economic life of Western Germany. West Berlin has achieved a miracle of political and economic reconstruction since World War II. But if allowed to be isolated from Western Germany, it will soon wither away; its young people will leave; its industries will dwindle, and eventually it will be immersed in the gray tide of communism of East Germany.

A third factor in our consideration is the acknowledgment that Western Germany is not necessarily irrevocably and eternally married to the Western allies. And the rupture of this marriage would be the highest pinnacle of achievement for Soviet policy in Europe. This is what the noted correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, Joseph C. Harsch, refers to as the "Rapallo factor." Writing from London earlier this month, he commented that "As Moscow and the West edge their cautious way toward negotiation over Berlin the word most heard in private conversation among diplomats is Rapallo."

He refers, of course, to the treaty negotiated in 1922 by a defeated Germany and the newly established Soviet Union, a treaty characterized by Ambassador George Kennan as a "triumph of Soviet diplomacy," which "detached Germany decisively and finally from the ranks of those pressing the Soviet Government for payment of the debts of previous Russian governments and for compensation for the foreign property nationalized in the Russian revolution."

This rapprochement between Germany and the Soviet Union reached its culmination, of course, in the nonaggression pact negotiated by Molotov and Von Ribbentrop in 1939 at the very time that the Soviets were also conducting negotiations with Britain and France against Germany.

To refer once again to Joseph Harsch, "Opinions differ as to whether a second Rapallo is possible. A Western pessimist is one who believes the Germans could again be tempted. A Western optimist is one who believes that whatever the provocation, West Germans are now so firmly oriented toward the West, and bear such deep scars from Soviet behavior during and after the last great war, that Germans will never again be tempted to betray the West for a deal with Moscow."

Though normally an optimist about most affairs of life, I do not believe our foreign policy can safely be predicated on one's temperamental disposition toward German political maturity. A factor which colors my normal optimism with a bit of scepticism in this regard is a letter I received earlier this month from the publisher of Der Spiegel, the largest weekly in Western Germany, accompanying a reprint of an article by the German-born British journalist, Sebastian Haffner. Mr. Haffner's article was entitled "Giving the Germans a sense of betrayal and mortal insult," and its general thesis was that if the Western allies recognize East Germany, it will give a sense of betrayal to the West Germans and turn "the most loyal, if also most exposed and endangered, member of the Western alliance and community into its bitter and vindictive enemy."

I would not hazard such a categorical prophecy; but I would suggest that the possibility of such an outcome should be kept foremost in our minds as we view future negotiations, especially in view of the obvious effort of one of Germany's leading publishers—and one who believes in democracy—to influence the opinion of American legislators.

All of these factors must be considered, and many more, in a resolution of the Berlin problem. We must maintain the political and economic viability of Berlin; we must not give occasion to the West Germans for a sense of betrayal and insult; and yet we must also establish conditions which will remove the Soviet fear—partly pathological and partly justified—of German militarism.

I have touched upon only a few of the relevant considerations of this problem, and not in order to indicate a solution, but to point to the avenues of understanding open to the individual student and citizen in regard to foreign affairs. And with the exception of the article by Sebastian Haffner, I have drawn upon no materials or sources of knowledge not open to any intelligent and interested person of an inquiring mind.

The citizen is not expected to be an expert in these matters. Indeed, Aristotle long ago, and Jefferson more recently, argued that the citizen need not be an expert in order to exercise sound judgment in public affairs. But that is not to state that it does not require effort and study and disciplined use of one's intellect and imagination.

But no one maintains that democracy offers an easy way. On the contrary, it still remains the most difficult and demanding form of government that man has created. And in the history of man's affairs, the failures of democracy far outnumber its successes. It is not a form of society decreed by a beneficient universe—but a way of life which men have won at great cost, and which will be maintained only by men and women who have the mind and will to commit themselves to something greater than their own private and personal affairs. In the final analysis, it is to this sense of commitment that we look for the meaning of the word integrity among students and citizens in a democracy.

Pennsylvania Postal Clerks Oppose Free Distribution of Communist Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the action taken by the United Federation of Postal Clerks, eastern branch of the Philadelphia region, in opposing the free delivery by this country of Communist propaganda.

I now include the text of a letter from Mr. Herman A. Dyke, chairman of the publicity committee, eastern branch, UFPC:

> We, the members of the Eastern Branch, United Federation of Postal Clerks, in meeting assembled, November 13, 1961, by unanimous vote, wish to express our strong disapproval of the distribution of Communist literature through the mails by the Post Office Department.
>
> This practice has contributed to the postal deficit and more important than that, we fear, to a deficit of American patriotism and the will to resist Communist infiltration, which, in turn, threatens the destruction of our republican form of government.
>
> We urge every Member of Congress to give this matter careful study and to take appropriate action toward the discontinuance of this policy by our Government.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of bills before the House which could accomplish the objective desired by these postal clerks and millions of other Americans who are concerned about this propaganda service and the proposed increase in American postal rates. My bill, H.R. 9004, would simply declare that no postal rate is available to material determined by the Attorney General to be Communist propaganda.

Another approach is also available to counter this flow of Communist propaganda—an amendment to the postal rate bill which will apparently come before us in the very near future. I intend to offer an amendment to the postage bill on the floor of the House if the bill has not been amended by the Post Office Committee to block the free distribution of this propaganda.

I would welcome the support of all Members who are concerned about this serious situation which confronts us.

United Nations Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, many, many persons from my district have been particularly concerned over the issuance of $200 million worth of bonds by the United Nations. Many of them have pointed out that the United States is already paying 47 percent of the total cost of the United Nations and is now considering buying $100 million worth of these bonds that the United Nations is trying to sell. One constituent puts it rather succinctly when he writes me to the effect that each time the U.S.S.R. buys $1 million worth of bonds, we, or the United States, buy $2 million worth. I think that most of my colleagues in Congress would agree that, if we use this type of a purchase plan, the U.S. Treasury would be called upon to pay out very little money.

In view of the concern within my district, that I have mentioned, I am pleased to support my colleague, the Honorable H. R. GROSS, Representative from Iowa, in his introduction of House Joint Resolution 595. This resolution provides that the United States shall make no loans or grants to the United Nations until all members of the United Nations have paid in full their assessed share of the costs of the operations of the United Nations, including the expenses of operations in the Congo and Gaza strip.

A Department of Consumers to Protect the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I introduced a bill, H.R. 9619, which provides for the establishment of a Department of Consumers in the executive branch, for the creation of a Committee on Consumers in the House of Representatives, and for various other purposes. It is an omnibus bill which calls for a broad program of protection for the American consumer and I am, therefore, entitling it "Consumers Act of 1962."

In his state of the Union address on January 11, President Kennedy made this statement:

> To protect our consumers from the careless and the unscrupulous, I shall recommend improvements in the food and drug laws—strengthening inspection and standards, halting unsafe and worthless products, preventing misleading labels, and cracking down on the illicit sale of habit-forming drugs.

I am very pleased to know that the President is taking steps to afford the American public this protection. In fact, he recognized this need during the 1960 presidential election campaign and stated on several occasions at that time his deep interest in consumer problems.

My bill, however, goes much further than improving the food and drug laws. It seeks to provide protection to the consumer not only in food and drugs, but also in safeguarding the economic interests of consumers in such areas as financial charges on installment loans, in representing consumer interests before the courts and regulatory agencies, in giving consumers greater representation and a voice in government, and in other ways.

I regard the American consumer as the biggest factor in the U.S. economy today on whom the continued growth of our economic structure depends to a very considerable extent. He is the supporter and the mainstay of our industry, commerce, agriculture, all types of services, and every other phase of our national activity. Under the circumstances, it is imperative that the consumer have a voice in government and that his interests be properly protected.

Several years ago, when I served as a member of the House Agriculture Committee, I was instrumental in the creation of a Consumers Study Subcommittee, of which I was the chairman. This subcommittee conducted studies on food prices, marketing costs, agricultural surpluses, the food stamp program, food stockpiling, and so forth. Our subcommittee served as the voice of the consumer and was effective in bringing about better understanding between farmers and consumers as to their specific problems. After I left the House Agriculture Committee, the subcommittee was discontinued, and as far as I know there is no other committee in Congress and no agency in the executive branch of the Government which is devoted primarily to the study of consumer problems and the protection of consumer interests.

I have always held a deep interest in consumer problems and still retain this interest to this very day. It is my view that Congress has a direct responsibility for safeguarding consumer interests since it not only involves the general economic situation and growth of the country, but also matters of consumer interest which come before our regulatory agencies and such Departments as Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and others.

Just as the Congress and the Government provide a voice to farmers, labor, business and industry, the armed services, the war veterans, education, science, and other segments of our national activity, so it must give a voice to the consumer, the housewife, the wage earner, the elderly and retired, and all others who struggle with the problem of how to cope with the high cost of living, with the safety of foods and drugs, with protection of health and economic security.

Think of all the instances that have come to light in recent years involving price rigging, fraudulent advertising, low standards of purity and lack of wholesomeness of foods and other articles, misleading labeling, deceptive packaging, misrepresentation in manufacturing, questionable techniques of merchandising, usurious charges of interest rates on installment purchases, and other ways to deceive the American consumer. The consumer is being completely ignored, disregarded, stepped upon, and abused.

My bill is comprised of three major sections or titles. Title I provides for the establishment of a Department of Consumers as a new department in the executive branch, headed by a Secretary of Consumers who would be a member of the President's Cabinet. The new department would assume the functions and duties of the following agencies: Food and Drug Administration of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department; the Federal Trade Commission; those areas in the Department of Agriculture which are engaged in the enforcement of the meat and poultry inspection acts; the Division of Prices and Cost of Living of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor; the Home Economics Research Branch and the Human Nutrition Research Branch of the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture; and those areas of the National Bureau of Standards which are engaged primarily in the research and testing of articles intended for consumer use.

The Department of Consumers would be provided with wide powers in the field of consumer protection. Specifically, its functions would be: to present the consumer viewpoint in the formulation of government policies; to represent the economic interests of consumers in proceedings before courts and regulatory agencies; to conduct annually a national consumers' conference, to be attended by experts on consumer education and representatives of organizations engaged in protecting consumer interests, for the purpose of advising the Department and offering suggestions for its effective performance; to assemble, evaluate and disseminate information helpful to consumers, including information on commercial and trade practices adversely affecting consumer interests, and other functions.

Furthermore, the Department shall conduct economic surveys and investigations of the productive capacity for goods affecting consumers, of the distribution systems for consumer goods, the levels of prices and the factors entering into the establishment of such prices, the quality and suitability of consumer goods, and similar other surveys.

Title II of the bill contains the "truth in lending" proposal which requires a full disclosure of financial charges on installment loans, the purpose here being to protect the consumer and small borrower in their own interests and in the interests of the national economy. The consumer receiving such credit or loans is to be provided with clear information in writing on the cost of the property or service, the amount to be financed, the financial charges, and other details.

Title III provides for the creation of a Committee on Consumers in the House of Representatives to deal with measures relating to the protection of consumer interests. This committee shall conduct studies and investigations of consumer problems, with particular emphasis on legislation needed to provide adequate protection for consumers against overpricing of medicines and drugs, misleading advertising, deceptive merchandise practices, impure foods, and related matters. It shall consist of nine Members of the House and is to submit to the House the results of its investigations, together with recommendations for legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop making an easy victim of the consumer and to see to it that he obtains his dollar's worth in the market-places of our country. The American consumer taken as a totality is too big and too vital a part of our economy. He deserves greater recognition. The establishment of a Department of Consumers in the executive branch and a Committee on Consumers in the legislative branch would provide such recognition. I hope that the House Committee on Government Operations, to whom my bill has been referred, will give early consideration to the measure.

Paul Taubman's Big Brass Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, many of us, I am sure, will recall from our youth the village bandstand, the big brass bands which were so much a part of the American scene a generation or two ago. Today they are all but gone from the American scene, except for films or television programs depicting that era.

A noted American musician, Paul Taubman, who is a composer, pianist, and conductor, has recently made an attempt to revive the old-fashioned brass band. He assembled a group of first-class wind players and percussionists in New York, now known as Paul Taubman's Big Brass Band, and an album of some of America's most famous marches has just been released. It is produced by Ernie Altschuler.

The album opens with "Stars and Stripes Forever," John Philip Sousa's best known march, and it concludes with a rich, sonorous version of "The Star-Spangled Banner." Among the more famous marches presented in this album are: Franz Schubert's "Marche Militaire," W. C. Handy's classic "St. Louis Blues" set in a rousing march tune, Sousa's famous "Washington Post March," the "Colonel Bogey March" from the film "Bridge on the River Kwai," and a half dozen others.

Let me add a word about Paul Taubman. In addition to conducting music for as many as 20 television and radio programs a week, he serves on the board of governors of the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences and has helped organize concerts by high school students in cooperation with the New York City Board of Education. He has conducted band concerts in New York's Central Park and Washington Square and has appeared with symphony orchestras in various parts of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to commend his album to all my colleagues and to the public at large. I think it should be in every American home and in every school.

The Role of Research in Managed Abundance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the question is frequently raised, among farmers as well as our Nation's food buyers, as to why we continue research to find better ways of producing and marketing better foods and at the same time carry on programs designed to cut back production of some commodities so supplies will more nearly match needs.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman came into my State recently to dedicate a new national animal disease laboratory in the city of Ames, and realistically faced up to this question. I might add, in that connection, that Secretary Freeman's ability to discuss every facet of foods and farming, knowledgeably and candidly, has encouraged Americans generally to take a fresh look at where we are and where we are going in agriculture.

Secretary Freeman explored "The Role of Research in Managed Abundance" during the laboratory dedication program and I believe Members of Congress and both producers and consumers of foods will find his comments, which follow, interesting and informative:

THE ROLE OF RESEARCH IN MANAGED ABUNDANCE

(Address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman at the dedication of the National Animal Disease Laboratory, Ames, Iowa, December 14, 1961)

Since becoming Secretary of Agriculture, I have been telling the people of the United States of the significant contribution to their welfare and to their standard of living which agriculture is making. Today, at the dedication of the National Animal Disease Laboratory, I believe we have a fitting occasion to show how research in agriculture benefits every person in every walk of life.

It is true that the American farmer is better off and has a better standard of living than farmers in most other countries, and production research has played a part in this. But, it is fair to say that the public has received a far greater proportion of benefits in terms of having available a plentiful supply of food at lower real cost than anywhere else in the world.

Let me illustrate this more specifically. In the past 50 years, our population has nearly doubled, while the number of farmworkers has been cut in half. Yet our people are better fed and better clothed today than ever before.

One farmer today can feed 26 people, but if we farmed with the same techniques and the same seeds, fertilizers, and chemicals used in 1940, we would need almost 8 million more workers on the farm.

But those 8 million workers can produce nearly half of all our manufactured goods. They can build all our new roads, new factories, and new homes; then can mine all our coal and iron, and leave more than enough manpower besides to drive our trucks and buses, run our railroads and airlines, supply our gas and electricity, and keep our telephones working.

And all the while, the productive success of those remaining on the farm has lowered food costs to the consumer from 25 percent of the average income in 1940 to 20 percent in 1960. By comparison, food costs in Western Europe take 30 to 45 percent of the average family income and in Russia food costs amount to well over 50 percent.

In this context, it would be fair to assume that the cost of this production research should be charged to the general public. Certainly, the benefits of continued research in developing more efficient and economical methods of producing food and fiber will be needed in the years ahead as our population increases and our standard of living continues to rise.

Yet, there are many people today who are puzzled by the fact that we are continuing this research in agricultural productivity.

They ask: "Why do we, on the one hand, continue research in agriculture to find better ways of producing farm commodities while on the other hand we are seeking to cut back production, to adjust farm output more nearly to the level of current need?"

Or they may phrase the question this way: "Why do we continue such practices as land drainage when we are paying farmers to take land out of production and put it to conserving uses?"

Now these are legitimate questions. At first glance there is a real and significant contradiction. And it is a contradiction which those of us in agriculture must understand more fully if we are first to show that it is a false analysis and, second, if we are to deal successfully with the problems of overproduction and low farm income.

I propose here to open a discussion which those in production research should pursue further and to attempt to clarify the role of research in a program of managed abundance in agriculture.

Let us look a little further below the surface of these contradictions. If we follow the analysis of those who raise this contradiction to its logical conclusion, they are saying, in effect, that we can better meet the challenge of agricultural abundance by making agriculture inefficient and less productive.

Without production research to make the agricultural economy more productive, the whole economy of a nation suffers. Without adequate food to feed its people, a nation cannot hope to begin raising the standard of living of its people.

I raise this point to emphasize this one fact: The primary goal of research in agriculture has been to raise the standard of living of all people by providing food and clothing at relatively lower cost, while making possible the development of other productive resources. It is the public policy in a democratic society such as ours to encourage activities which will provide the maximum benefit to the greatest number of people.

And agricultural research to increase productivity has contributed materially to the economic progress of the United States. I think it would be criminal to stop this research today because we would be stopping progress which benefits the economy as a whole.

Actually, success in terms of longrun production research is not something to be turned off and on. The present level of farm technology is the result of research which began decades ago, and in order to have adequate food supplies in the decades ahead, we will have to continue production research today—we must keep the production research pipelines full.

It is generally true that production research will not provide the answer to the problems of low farm income and overproduction, and we should be under no illusion that it will. The farm income problem is a special problem of economics which grows out of the lack of bargaining power the individual farmer has in terms of his influence in the market and on the problem of overproduction.

Thus we are dealing with two separate areas and two separate goals of agricultural research. Production research is designed to gain the maximum production in the most efficient and economical manner to provide for the future food and fiber needs of a whole nation.

Since it is difficult to obtain the precise amount of food and fiber needed at a particular time, it then becomes the task of economic research to develop methods which will lead to effective resource adjustment and supply management to insure that those who produce are not penalized for their efficiency.

When efforts are made to strengthen farm income by reducing the amount of land under cultivation, this should not lead to the conclusion that research, soil improvement and other conserving practices to make agriculture more efficient should be abandoned.

If we were to cease all efforts to make agriculture more efficient, we would interrupt the longrun progress which is necessary to insure that the general public will continue to eat better and more cheaply and from which the Nation as a whole will benefit.

We must continue to seek ways which will increase the share of the Nation's wealth which goes to the farmer, and this is an area where economic research in agriculture can play an important role. But we cannot expect a slackening in production research to help solve this problem any more than we can expect continued production research to have any appreciable benefit to the farmers as a group.

New and efficient practices will benefit, for a time, the farmer who is an innovator. By putting the product of research to work first, he gains a temporary economic advantage over his neighbor who does not act as quickly to put new technology into practice.

But eventually his neighbors adopt the same practices, and climbing production is soon followed by lower prices. The result is that the benefits of technology flow through the farmer to the consumer. This pattern is often missed by those who advocate research as the answer to the problem of low farm income, and their efforts serve only to confuse two different problems.

Research has a definite role in the agricultural program of the 1960's, both in its historic function to maximize the general standard of living and in the growing task to enable the farmer to share in the results of his productivity.

It is fitting, I believe, to turn our attention at the dedication of this animal disease research facility to this role of research in a policy of managed abundance in agriculture both now and for the future.

This group of buildings and the equipment they house represents the finest and most modern facility anywhere in the world for the study of animal diseases. From the scientists who are working here will come, we hope, some of the answers to animal diseases which today rob the farmer and the Nation of 11 out of every 100 hogs farrowed and take a heavy toll of cattle and poultry.

Thus this lab can contribute great value to the efficiency and productivity of the farmer if it can identify and cure the diseases as it has been designed to do.

But this is only one aspect of overall agricultural research for the 1960's. Today, in terms of the overall goal of Managed Abundance agricultural research should serve five ends:

It should help farmers prosper in a period of abundance.

It should help provide more and better food at reasonable cost for all Americans.

It should help protect our production potential.

It should help adjust land, water, and human resources to meet growing needs for recreation, forests, and open space.

It should strengthen our ability to use food as a major instrument of foreign aid.

Obviously, economic research, utilization research, marketing research, production research, and basic research all overlap in their contribution to these five ends. We cannot depend solely on utilization or marketing research to lift farm people to a level of prosperity in periods of abundance.

The search for new and expanded markets for farm commodities must be accompanied by production research which lowers costs and improves quality—and by economic research to mark the path of agricultural adjustment to economic growth.

It means that where we have in the past placed a major emphasis on production research, we now will be calling equally on all disciplines. Each area of research, and each research facility and each person engaged in research needs to view his role not as an end in itself, but as one part of the great single force of overall agricultural research.

It is this broad view—the new perspective of overall agricultural research—which will be most meaningful to the farmers and nonfarmers of the Nation in programs of Managed Abundance.

We should consider the overall impact of the research carried out here on animal disease as it relates to research carried out elsewhere on forages and mechanization, and further relate these programs to the economic research or agricultural adjustment such as that being done at the Center for Agricultural Adjustment here on the campus at Ames.

We will continue expanding industrial and food uses for farm commodities through utilization research. It already has brought such well established innovations as frozen foods, concentrated fruit juices, potato flakes, and other dehydrated foods.

Scientists will continue the search to improve packaging, transportation, wholesaling, retailing, and other functions of the distributing process. Research in this area can produce savings—some of which may be passed on to the farmer but most of which will go to the consumer in lower prices—and it will result in better quality products.

The basic research in dietary problems will continue because there are many questions still be to answered that could lead to healthier lives for all the people of the Nation. We need to know more about the exact role played by fats in the diet and their effect on health. We need to know more about what nutrients are actually contained in the 1,000 most commonly used foods.

It also is vitally important that we continue production research to further improve farm production practices and the use of agricultural resources. In doing this, we protect the gains in farming efficiency which already have been made while maintaining the momentum of progress in creating further efficiency and economy.

No one here today can predict with precise accuracy what our population will be in the next 15 or 20 years, or what food and clothing needs of those people will be. We do know that the demand placed on our agricultural resources will be greater than they are today.

It then follows that if we are to maintain the high standard of living which we now have—and which the citizens of this country will expect to be continually improved—we will need to continue basic and applied research in agricultural production.

We not only must continue production research for this reason, but also for the simple fact that agriculture, as a science dealing with living things, is constantly changing.

In the past 10 years, for example, we have had to completely replace our Durum wheat varieties, grown in the northern Great Plains, because of a new and more virulent race of stem rust disease. Oat producers in many areas have had to switch varieties completely three different times in the last 20 years to stay ahead of fungus diseases that otherwise would have made oat production completely unprofitable. It is the same story with livestock and other crops across the entire range of farm production.

In conjunction with production research, the continual improvement of conservation and resource management practices are equally as vital to meeting the Nation's needs in the years ahead. In many ways, they may become more important than production research since the pressure on land and forest is likely to increase even more rapidly than population will.

We should insure, within the context of conservation and land use management, that the best croplands are maintained—and improved—so that the food and fiber we will need can be produced when it is needed.

We should also be prepared to accommodate the rapidly increasing demand for recreation and leisure time activities. These pursuits which a high standard of living makes possible will require substantial amounts of land and forest areas.

I think it is apparent that overall agricultural research will occupy an important position in the agricultural programs of the 1960's. Research, in one sense, has become the power source to drive the massive agricultural machine which has developed around the democratic concept of family owned and operated farms.

It is, I believe, the public consensus that we should maintain the astounding productive vitality of this system, and I want to discuss the branch of research which will contribute most heavily to securing this goal.

There is an example of this branch of economic research at work on this campus—as I mentioned a moment ago—in the Center for Agricultural Adjustment. This unit was created several years ago to determine if a more coordinated approach to research would help bring the Nation closer to solving the basic farm problem of overproduction and low farm income.

The studies underway in the center, we hope, will shed new light on the means of developing the procedures which will be most useful in adjusting agricultural resources to produce the kind of food and fiber we want when we need it.

Economic research can address itself most directly to this task which, in itself, may provide the answer to the problems which the individual farmer faces today.

We know that, for the foreseeable future, the farmer can produce more food and fiber with presently known techniques than can be used commercially and concessionally at home and abroad. If we are going to correct this situation before it destroys those who have made our agricultural abundance possible, then we must accept the fact that we will need to develop the tools which can be applied to manage this abundance. In this effort, we will look to the scientist for help.

Scientific research is, in essence, the search for truth. Whether it is carried out in agriculture, or in nuclear energy or in the way man reacts to his environment, it is the means by which man seeks to expand the limits of his knowledge.

We often are troubled today because we don't know how to utilize the power which scientific research has given us—particularly in harnessing the atom for peaceful purposes rather than in experimenting with its destructive potential. But the progress which this research represents also gives us hope that the answer may be found tomorrow as we seek more knowledge.

We know that the search for knowledge in agriculture has produced the answer for many of our problems. Research has brought within reach the power to banish forever man's age-old fear of hunger and starvation. It has shown us how to take strontium 90 out of milk, and it has shown us how one farmer can be four times as efficient today as 50 years ago.

And so I believe that the stimulus of success in production research which has given us the power of an abundantly productive agriculture will lead, through research in economics, to an expansion in our knowledge which will enable the farmer to live with abundance as profitably as do all other people.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 17, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rabbi Jacob Handler, Temple Israel, Manchester, N.H., offered the following prayer:

Ovinu Shebashomaim: Our Father, who art in heaven, Eternal Ruler of the universe, with humility in our hearts we pour forth our gratitude unto Thee for the beneficence and loving kindness which Thou hast bestowed upon Thy people. Thou hast inspired men in the past to look for new horizons, and, discovering a land with inexhaustible material resources and precious spiritual blessings—a land now inhabited by people who, though of diversified backgrounds, are united by the bond of a common destiny—to be of service to Thee and to the United States of America for spiritual triumphs of freedom and liberty over the forces of evil and enslavement.

O merciful Father, in whose hand are the souls of the living and the dead, be with us, assembled in this great Chamber, as we consecrate this hour to the memory of a man of valor and vision, of great courage and devotion, whose deeds and action, here in the Senate and in his own beloved home State, New Hampshire, represented the highest ideals of noble living and American citizenship.

Grant that the soul of the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES, whose memory we cherish, may be bound up in the bond of everlasting life. May the reminiscences of his life stir our finer sensibilities and arouse within us a desire to emulate the splendid example set for us by STYLES BRIDGES as he served Thee and his fellow men with such great sincerity, kindness, loyalty, and devotion, in fulfilling the teaching of the ancient sages, which is that the world exists on three basic principles: Upon learning, upon service to fellow men, and upon the practice of benevolence.

O God, who art manifested in the lives of good men and in the righteousness of nations, keep our Nation forever righteous and just.

Vouchsafe unto those who have been chosen to lead our Nation wisdom equal to their strength and courage equal to their great responsibilities—to help make our land a mighty force of righteousness among the nations of the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 16, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—REPORT ON NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., January 16, 1962.
Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have approved a plan for the reorganization of the Department of the Army. This plan was recommended by the Secretary of the Army after detailed study and approved by the Secretary of Defense. A copy of the reorganization plan is enclosed herewith.

I am also enclosing for transmission to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee a communication from the Secretary of Defense reporting, pursuant to section 202(c) (1) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, the action to be taken with reference to abolition of certain statutory officers and the transfer of their functions to the Secretary of the Army.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection with the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT ON JANUARY 20

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and myself, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive on Saturday, January 20, 1962, during the adjournment of the Senate, the President's Economic Report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the distinguished majority leader will permit, I should like to ask him about the program for the remainder of the week and, so far as he can foresee, into the following week. Yesterday we discussed this matter on different occasions; and I think he may have some modifications or amplification of the statement to make at this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the query by the distinguished minority leader, let me say that it is hoped that we shall not spend too many more days on the Du Pont bill. Yesterday, after a meeting of the policy committee, I stated that following the consideration of that bill, the Senate would take up Calendar No. 891, Senate bill 2520, amending the Welfare and Pension Plans and Disclosure Act. I stated that following that measure the Senate would take up Calendar No. 815, Senate bill 230, relating to the Garrison diversion unit, in North Dakota. I must say that on the basis of the instructions given to me by the policy committee, which I misinterpreted, we should like to look a little further into that matter, to see just what financial relationship is involved in the proposal.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The Garrison diversion project is an irrigation project in which the people of North Dakota are greatly interested. Can the Senator from Montana give us some idea about when the bill may be taken up? We want the earliest possible consideration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say to my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from North Dakota, that I am unable to give him positive assurance at this time; but I do wish to assure him that at the appropriate time the bill will be brought up and given the consideration which is its due. I assure the Senator from North Dakota that I recognize how much the bill means to North Dakota and the upper plains region; and I recognize it personally, because of the steady, unyielding, and unrelenting pressure being put on the combined leadership by both the distinguished Senators from his State, which is a neighbor of mine.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is anticipated that following consideration of the bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans and Disclosure Act, the Senate will take up, on approximately January 29, Calendar No. 1053, Senate bill 1241, the college classroom bill.

In the near future the Senate will consider Calendar No. 861, Senate bill 1633, to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing; Calendar No. 959, Senate bill 404, to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps; Calendar No. 347, Senate bill 1380, relating to the death penalty in the District of Columbia; and Calendar No. 676, Senate bill 349, the postwar GI bill, sometimes referred to as the cold war GI bill.

Other measures were cleared on yesterday by the policy committee; and they will be brought up only after consideration with the distinguished minority leader, and for the purpose of taking up measures of lesser importance when the occasion warrants.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader.

MASSACRE OF ITALIAN AIRMEN IN THE CONGO, AND SO FORTH—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of the great voices of the labor movement with a rich tradition of accomplishment is the United-Italian American Labor Council. At its annual conference in New York City on December 21, 1961, that council adopted a series of resolutions relating to the massacre of 13 Italian airmen in the Congo, and so forth. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON THE MASSACRE OF 13 ITALIAN AIRMEN IN THE CONGO

Whereas the entire civilized world was shocked and horrified by the massacre of 13 unarmed members of the Italian Air Force who were in the Congo to serve the United Nations on a mission of mercy and humanity; and

Whereas all reliable information and factual evidence have confirmed that the savage massacre was perpetrated by riotous Congolese troops who were incited by totalitarian stooges like Gizenga to mutiny against the legally constituted central government of the Congo and to fanatical hatred of the Western peoples; and

Whereas efforts by the recognized premier of the Congo, Adoula, to bring to justice the barbarian perpetrators of the massacre are still being sabotaged by the followers of Gizenga, a self-admitted enemy of Western democracy and a promoter of anti-Western and anti-democratic intrigues in that tormented country: Be it

Resolved by the 20th annual conference of the United-Italian American Labor Council, held on December 21, 1961, Hotel Commodore, New York City, to—

(a) Extend our heartfelt condolences to the Government and to the freedom-loving people of the Republic of Italy and to the families of the martyred 13 airmen;

(b) Urge the U.S. Delegation to the United Nations to make unceasing efforts to make sure that the perpetrators of the horrible crime and their political mentors and instigators be brought to justice;

(c) Call on the Department of State to order a study by experts in the field, of the political intrigues by the totalitarian Communist elements in the Congo and in other newly independent countries of Africa and Asia, so that a more effective policy may be formulated to isolate and defeat these brutal enemies of human dignity and freedom; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the President of the Italian Republic, to the Secretary of the Department of State, to our Ambassador to the United Nations, to the AFL–CIO, and to the press.

RESOLUTION ON IMMIGRATION

Whereas about 140,000 Italian citizens, members and close relatives of families of American citizens in the United States, have applied for admission to our country and their applications have been processed and approved; and

Whereas they have been put in the fourth preferential quota, for which no visas are available, with the result that these applicants have been vainly waiting for the last 7 or 8 years to be permitted to join their dear ones in the United States; and

Whereas about 50,000 quota numbers are left unused annually by the northern countries of Europe; and

Whereas the President of the United States had recognized that the most urgent task of our immigration laws is to help the reunion of families that are still divided: Be it

Resolved by the 20th annual conference of the United-Italian American Labor Council,

held on December 21, 1961, Hotel Commodore, New York City, **To call upon the administration and Congress to have its next session enact a measure providing for the reallotment of the aforementioned unused quota numbers to those countries which are members of the Atlantic Alliance and which, like Italy, have an overwhelming number of already approved applications in the fourth preferential quota, but are still vainly waiting for their U.S. visas; and be it further**

Resolved, **That this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the leaders of the U.S. Congress, to the AFL-CIO and to the press.**

The United-Italian American Labor Council, at its 20th anniversary conference held on December 21, 1961, Hotel Commodore, New York City, calls on the President of the United States to renew his efforts and recommendations to the coming session of the Congress to speed up the procedure for the enactment of pending legislation to extend to our senior citizens full medical assistance through social security; urges the Members of Congress to cooperate for the early enactment of the bills providing for this necessary and highly humane reform.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

H.R. 157. An act to change the name of the Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif., to the Marina del Rey, Los Angeles, Calif. (Rept. No. 1120).

S. Res. 243. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Works to make a study of certain matters within its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 1121); referred to Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works:

Joseph H. McCann, of Michigan, to be Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KERR:

S. 2690. A bill for the relief of Mona McIsaac Downey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2691. A bill to extend the Library Services Act to American Samoa; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2692. A bill for the relief of Armand Seri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2693. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Garden Club of America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 2694. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jum Ak Marek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 2695. A bill to amend section 610 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers unless adequate charge is made for such service; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 2696. A bill to correct certain land descriptions in the act entitled "An act to declare that the United States holds in trust for the pueblos of Santa Ana, Zia, Jemez, San Felipe, Santo Domingo, Chochiti, Isleta, and San Ildefonso certain public domain lands"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 2697. A bill to amend chapters 33 and 35 of title 38, United States Code, to preserve the rights of reservists and National Guardsmen called or ordered to active duty on or after August 1, 1961; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 2698. A bill for the relief of Antonio Gutierrez Fernandez; and

S. 2699. A bill for the relief of Roswitha Seib; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 2700. A bill for the relief of Manuel Brandao Guimaraes; and

S. 2701. A bill for the relief of Lee Kwan Tee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. THURMOND (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON):

S. 2702. A bill for the relief of San-Man Inn of Manning, Inc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2703. A bill for the relief of Felicia Atkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself and Mr. JORDAN):

S.J. Res. 147. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of the North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission to formulate and implement plans to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT CHIEF CLERK, STAFF AND CLERICAL PERSONNEL FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HILL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 252), which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved, **That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963, to employ one additional assistant chief clerk, six additional professional staff members, and eight additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202(a), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.**

JACK BAER—REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 2672 TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. CLARK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 253), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, **That the bill (S. 2672) entitled "A bill for the relief of Jack Baer", now pending in the Senate, together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.**

DEATH OF THE LATE SENATOR BRIDGES

Mr. COTTON submitted a resolution (S. Res. 254) relative to the death of the late Senator STYLES BRIDGES, which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, **That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Honorable STYLES BRIDGES, late a Senator from the State of New Hampshire.**

Resolved, **That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public service.**

Resolved, **That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.**

Resolved, **That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.**

PROHIBITION OF SERVING OF FREE ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES TO CERTAIN AIRLINE PASSENGERS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill amending the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to prohibit the free serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers on airlines within the continental United States, Hawaii, Alaska, and possessions of the United States.

Mr. President, when a citizen purchases a first-class passage ticket on any airline, he expects to receive first-class transportation. Some may anticipate the dispensing of free cocktails, champagne, wines, and so forth, but there are many of us, including myself, who are seeking expeditious transportation and nothing else.

First-class passenger rates are arrived at by airlines after taking into consideration all expenses connected with the operation of the plane and its related services. There is no difference between the price of a first-class ticket of the person who drinks alcoholic beverages and those who do not drink alcoholic beverages. In short, the passengers who are teetotalers and preachers are helping to pay, under today's system, when they purchase a first-class ticket, for the imbibing of those who enjoy drinking such beverages.

This proposed legislation would require that any airline serving alcoholic beverages would necessarily have to charge for same in an amount to cover all costs relative to the serving of the beverages, including additional help, the beverage itself, and related services such as glassware, washing, transporting, and so forth. There is no reason in the world why passengers who do not drink, but who wish to travel first class, cannot do so without paying a price that covers the cost of liquor that they do not consume. This is the case under present regulations, because first-class tickets for teetotalers and drinkers are the same.

Actually, I would like to see the Congress act favorably upon one of the several bills now pending which would prohibit entirely the serving of any alcohol, free or paid, on any aircraft. I am disappointed the Congress has not acted favorably before now on these other bills, but while we await the elimination of all drinking aboard planes, I feel the Congress should correct this injustice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The 3 minutes of the Senator from South Carolina have expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 more minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON. It is not only unfair to teetotaling passengers to have to pay for alcoholic beverages served others, but it is a source of great embarrassment, harassment, and sometimes serious physical threat to other passengers. The great number of incidents aboard aircraft created by passengers who have overindulged in alcoholic beverages are too numerous, but are well known to all of us. I am sure anyone who has traveled by air probably sometime has witnessed a spectacle of tipsy passengers who harass the hostesses and create serious problems for airline personnel. Although this bill will not entirely put a stop to serving cocktails aboard aircraft, it will at least be a step in the direction of slowing down the drinking traffic by putting a price on the luxury of drinking alcohol.

I hope the Congress will support me in this measure and thereby correct this injustice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2695) to amend section 610 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers unless adequate charge is made for such service, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PRESERVATION OF VETERANS' EDUCATIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, for myself and the junior Senator from Washington, Mr. JACKSON, a bill to correct an inequity that has arisen out of the call to active duty of approximately 155,000 members of the Reserve and National Guard.

The inequity which this proposed legislation would redress can affect recalled servicemen who were already eligible for the educational programs under both the Korean GI bill and the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act of 1956. Under the provisions of the Korean program, a veteran must begin his educational program within 3 years from his discharge or release from service and must complete such program within 8 years after his discharge or release from active duty. The present law does not contain any provision to hold in abeyance these delimiting periods if a veteran is required to leave school to perform a second period of active military duty. Consequently, a Korean conflict veteran caught up in these circumstances, by the recall order of last August, might so lose his rights to educational entitlement. The Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs, of which I am chairman, has already received reports on several such cases and I feel certain that others exist of which we have no knowledge.

A similar inequity exists in the case of a military reservist entitled to educational Assistance Act. This act contains a delimiting provision which requires a war orphan who is also a serviceman to complete his education or training under the act within 5 years after discharge or separation from service. Of course, the delimiting dates might have the same end effect as with those under the Korean program in denying him the right to complete his educational entitlement, that is, the complete loss of the educational entitlement in many cases because the veteran is recalled to serve the entire Nation. Since many entitled to this educational program may have been 6 months reservists during the past few years, and the ending date of the 6 months reservists' active duty is regarded as separation from service, there likely may be more inequities arising to those under this program than under the Korean veterans program.

Mr. President, the prospective loss of educational entitlement under these two educational programs is produced by causes completely beyond the control of the individuals involved. The basic cause of the inequities is that these young people are called back to service for the purpose of defending all of us.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended for 1¼ minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The losses can be prevented, however, by the bill Senator JACKSON and I have introduced, which simply provides that active duty performed pursuant to a call or order to active duty in the Reserve or National Guard on or after August 1, 1961, shall be disregarded in computing the delimiting periods applicable to Korean veterans and war orphans educational assistance entitlement.

It is a fact of life that military reservists and their families are required to make great personal sacrifices through the recent callup program while other citizens and their families continue in their normal civil pursuits. Most of these sacrifices must be borne by the reservist and his family alone. As President Kennedy has pointed out, the overwhelming majority of our reservists and National Guardsmen are bearing their burdens and making these sacrifices with admirable and traditional devotion. In some cases, however, our young reservists find themselves in unnecessary difficulties which can be resolved easily by the Congress.

The proposed legislation does not give any new rights or privileges to the members of the military Reserve or National Guard. It only preserves rights to which they are now entitled under measures already a part of our public laws. To assure them these rights is only an act of simple justice to our young citizens who have responded loyally and faithfully to a second call to serve their Nation.

Mr. President, I ask that the proposed legislation be appropriately referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which has jurisdiction under the subject matter of the bill. I very much hope that the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs and the full Labor Committee can consider the legislation at a very early date and bring this matter back to the full Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2697) to amend chapters 33 and 35 of title 38, United States Code, to preserve the rights of reservists and National Guardsmen called or ordered to active duty on or after August 1, 1961, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, for himself and Mr. JACKSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

THE LITERACY AMENDMENT—THE RIGHT TO VOTE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on January 17, 1961, together with Senators KEATING, ALLOTT, BUSH, CASE of New Jersey, COOPER, DOUGLAS, FONG, HUMPHREY, KUCHEL, MOSS, SCOTT, and SMITH of Maine as cosponsors, I introduced the bill, S. 480, to make the right to vote available to all citizens who have a sixth-grade education, without regard to limitations of State law or administration.

In September 1961 the Federal Civil Rights Commission unanimously recommended that such a measure be enacted to avoid the abuse of literacy requirements which it found in many counties of the States. The President in his recent state of the Union message spoke also of this abuse. Because of this recommendation of the Federal Civil Rights Commission and because the right to vote is so basic and fundamental that no one can deny its validity, I have offered the bill for further cosponsorship. I now ask unanimous consent to add the following Senators as cosponsors, at the next printing:

Senators BURDICK, CHAVEZ, DIRKSEN, GRUENING, HART, JACKSON, LONG of Missouri, MCCARTHY, PROXMIRE, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, also, I wish to call attention to the fact that on September 16 last year I gave notice to the effect that I would seek to attach this particular provision as an amendment to an acceptable bill as soon after the third week in January as possible.

In this new session of Congress, I wish to reiterate what I said before; namely, that I shall seek the earliest opportunity, upon an appropriate measure, to attach the literacy amendment and offer it to the Senate, to which I believe there should be no real objection.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, at the request of the majority leadership, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 249) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Small Business, and that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS RELATING TO PUBLIC AND PRIVATE HOUSING—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, also at the request of the majority leadership, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson] be added as an additional cosponsor of the resolution (S. Res. 244) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters relating to public and private housing, when it is next printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS OF WALTER PETTUS GEWIN, OF ALABAMA, TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, FIFTH CIRCUIT; AND CLARENCE W. ALLGOOD, OF ALABAMA, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, January 24, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

Walter Pettus Gewin, of Alabama, to be U.S. circuit judge, fifth circuit.

Clarence W. Allgood, of Alabama, to be U.S. district judge, northern district of Alabama.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearings may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], and myself, as chairman.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. PASTORE:

Address delivered by Senator Dodd at testimonial dinner in honor of the Very Reverend Vincent C. Dore, at Providence, R.I., on October 22, 1961.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Remarks by Senator Randolph at the dedication of the new post office and Federal building, Martinsburg, W. Va., October 18, 1961. Speech by Postmaster General Day, at the dedication of the post office and Federal building, Martinsburg, W. Va., October 18, 1961.

Remarks by Senator Jennings Randolph at the dedication of the modernized and expanded sheet mill of the Fairmont Aluminum Co., Fairmont, W. Va., Saturday, September 30, 1961. Fairmont dedication address by Robert P. Koenig, September 30, 1961.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Article on the subject "Criteria for Free Speech for Military Personnel," written by Senator Thurmond and published in the New York Times magazine section of January 14, 1962.

REPORT OF SENATE DELEGATION TO THE SEVENTH CONFERENCE OF NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I have the honor to submit to the Senate the official report of the U.S. Senate delegation to the Seventh Conference of NATO Parliamentarians held in Paris from November 13 to 17, 1961. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the Record at the close of these remarks.

It was my privilege to serve as chairman of the joint Senate-House delegation. As such, I can report that this was one of the hardest working, most conscientious and most dedicated delegations that our Congress has sent to these annual meetings.

Moreover, the consensus among the U.S. delegates was that there was among all the NATO representatives a greater willingness than ever before to think and act together on problems of mutual concern. Everything which took place at the Conference indicated to us that the Atlantic community is stronger and more unified, and its member nations more conscious of their responsibilities and their combined potentialities.

Our Conference spoke in its strongest terms when it urged the NATO Council of Ministers to fully support the United States, Britain and France in the exercise of the rights and responsibilities they share with the Soviet Union with respect to all of Berlin and to all of Germany. In the same resolution, we condemned the "unnatural and illegal division of Berlin, symbolized by the prison wall illegally erected by the Soviets and their satellites."

But, in my opinion, one of the most worthwhile actions by this Seventh Confrence of NATO Parliamentarians was our adoption of a U.S.-sponsored resolution directed to the so-called brainchild of the parliamentarians: the Atlantic Convention of leading citizens of the NATO nations, currently being held in Paris.

Our resolution was more than a mere expression of gratification that the Convention is at last being held. Rather, it sought to encourage these citizens of the free world to cast off the inhibitions of the dead past and, courageously and forthrightly, chart new ways by which the Atlantic community nations can work together to advance the cause of freedom everywhere.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Seventh NATO Parliamentarians' Conference—Report of the U.S. Senate Delegation to the Seventh Conference of Members of Parliament From the NATO Countries, Held in Paris, November 13 to November 17, 1961 (Pursuant to Public Law 689, 84th Cong.)

SEVENTH NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS' CONFERENCE, PARIS, NOVEMBER 13–17, 1961

Organization of U.S. delegation

Public Law 84–689, as amended, approved July 11, 1956, authorizes a delegation of Members of Congress to meet with parliamentary groups from other countries which are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization "for discussion of common problems in the interests of the maintenance of peace and security in the North Atlantic area."

The Seventh NATO Parliamentarians' Conference met in Paris at the Headquarters of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization from November 13 through November 17, 1961. Two hundred and twelve delegates and alternates respresented all the NATO countries except Greece.

Delegates and alternates from the Senate were: Estes Kefauver, Democrat, Tennessee, chairman; B. Everett Jordan, Democrat, North Carolina; Howard W. Cannon, Democrat, Nevada; Quentin N. Burdick, Democrat, North Dakota; Edward V. Long, Democrat, Missouri; Lee Metcalf, Democrat, Montana; Claiborne Pell, Democrat, Rhode Island; Karl E. Mundt, Republican, South Dakota; Jacob K. Javits, Republican, New York; Hugh Scott, Republican, Pennsylvania; Jack Miller, Republican, Iowa.

Delegates and alternates from the House of Representatives were: Wayne L. Hays, Democrat, Ohio, chairman; Clifford Davis, Democrat, Tennessee; Thomas E. Morgan, Democrat, Pennsylvania; Frank E. Smith, Democrat, Mississippi; Homer Thornberry, Democrat, Texas; Victor L. Anfuso, Democrat, New York; Leonard Farbstein, Democrat, New York; Leslie C. Arends, Republican, Illinois; Frances P. Bolton, Republican, Ohio; Laurence Curtis, Republican, Massachusetts; Jack Westland, Republican, Washington; Samuel L. Devine, Republican, Ohio; John V. Lindsay, Republican; New York; Irving J. Whalley, Republican, Pennsylvania.

The joint Senate-House delegation elected Senator Kefauver chairman and Representative Arends vice chairman of the United States delegation and reelected Representative Hays as the United States member of the Standing Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference. The Standing Committee makes decisions for the Conference between annual meetings and the officers of the Conference are elected from among the members of the Standing Committee.

At its first meeting on November 12 the delegation was briefed by the United States Ambassador to France, James M. Gavin, and the United States representative on the NATO Council, Ambassador Thomas K. Finletter. At the second delegation meeting on November 15, Ambassador Gavin and Elbridge Durbrow, Mr. Finletter's deputy, were present for consultation. Members of the delegation were interviewed by the Paris press corps at delegation headquarters as the Conference drew to its close.

The following assignments to Conference committees were made; other delegates and alternates attended committee meetings in accordance with preferences:

Political Committee: Senators KEFAUVER and SCOTT; Representatives HAYS and LINDSAY.

Economic Committee: Senators METCALF and JAVITS; Representative DAVIS.

Military Committee: Senators CANNON and MILLER; Representatives THORNBERRY, SMITH, ARENDS, and WESTLAND.

Scientific and Technical Committee: Senators BURDICK and LONG; Representative ANFUSO.

Cultural Affairs and Information Committee: Senators JORDAN and MUNDT; Representative DEVINE.

The Military Committee of the Conference elected Senator CANNON as Chairman and the Economic Committee reelected Senator JAVITS as Chairman.

Summary of Conference action

The Seventh Annual Session of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference was called to order on November 13, 1961, by retiring President Nils Langhelle who made a short address placing the occasion in historical perspective and characterizing the threat to NATO caused by the demands of the Soviet Union with respect to Berlin.

The Conference adopted amendments to the Rules of Procedure, two of which were of greater importance: establishing a Drafting Committee to screen resolutions coming from Conference committees so as to eliminate overlapping and minor recommendations, and postponing the election of the succeeding year's Conference officers until near the close of each meeting so that they can familiarize themselves with Conference procedures.

The delegates were welcomed by the Foreign Minister of France, M. Maurice Couve de Murville, who praised the Conference as a necessary institution serving to assure the support of the peoples of NATO countries, through their elected representatives, for the work of the Organization.

The Secretary General of NATO, Dr. D. U. Stikker, reported to the Conference on the major political, economic, military, scientific, and cultural problems facing the alliance and, in a session closed to the press, answered questions by delegates on these topics.

The United States Secretary of the Army, Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., delivered a message from President Kennedy pledging the effort of the United States for a stronger Atlantic Community. Secretary Stahr addressed the Conference on the subject of additional defense measures needed by NATO in response to the Soviet-induced Berlin crisis.

The Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, Gen. Lauris Norstad, briefed the delegates on the state of preparedness, and the strategy of the use of the Allied land, sea, and air forces committed to NATO defense under his command. In closed session he answered questions on military topics.

On November 14 and 15 meetings of the five committees of the Conference were held and the reports and recommendations which they agreed upon were screened by the Drafting Committee for presentation to the whole Conference. On November 16 and 17 general debate in plenary session was held on the subjects of the recommendations of the five committees. On November 17 certain reports and recommendations, set forth in Appendix II to this report, were adopted by the Conference, in each case with the support of the United States delegation. Senator Pietro Micara, of Italy, was elected President of the 1962 Conference. The NATO Parliamentarians' Conference budget for 1962 in the same amount as for 1961 was adopted. The seventh annual Conference ended in the afternoon of November 17.

Related events

During the week of the Conference delegates were entertained at receptions on successive evenings given by the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, by the NATO Council, by the President of the Senate of France, by the President of the Conference, Mr. Langhelle, and by the President of the Municipal Council of Paris. After the close of the Conference a majority of delegates accepted an invitation by the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany to visit Berlin. There during November 18 through 20 they had an opportunity to tour Berlin and its zonal border and were briefed and entertained by Federal and city officials.

APPENDIX I.—FINANCIAL STATEMENT

Out of the appropriation of $15,000 for the expenses of the Senate delegation to the Seventh NATO Parliamentarians' Conference a total of $8,602.61 was expended. Detailed reports on expenditures by individuals and for the group are being filed with the Committee on Foreign Relations and with the Committee on Appropriations, respectively, as required by section 105(b) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1961 (Public Law 86-628).

APPENDIX II.—REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED BY THE SEVENTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE, PARIS, NOVEMBER 13–17, 1961

PART I. REPORTS

Report of the Political Committee

(Submitted by Mr. Frans J. Goedhart)

On the Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations

The Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations will open its first session in Paris on January 8, 1962.

The initiative which has led to this Convention was taken by the Third NATO Parliamentarians' Conference in a resolution unanimously adopted on November 16, 1957. This resolution sought two objectives, one which has already been achieved and the other which will be achieved with the Atlantic Convention.

First, this resolution instructed the Standing Committee and the Political Committee to arrange for the Atlantic Congress which met in London in June 1959, and was the birthplace of many new initiatives, including the OECD and the Atlantic Institute. Second, it recommended that our governments "bring about, in accordance with the constitutional and governmental processes of their countries, a conference composed of leading representative citizens selected on a non-partisan basis and directed to convene as often as necessary in order to examine exhaustively and to recommend how greater cooperation and unity of purpose, as envisaged by the North Atlantic Treaty, within the Atlantic Community may best be developed". The resolution further proposed that "the members of the conference should, as far as possible, be officially appointed but should act in accordance with their individual convictions."

When the Atlantic Congress met in London, June 5–10, 1959, it comprised 650 citizens of the NATO countries. One of the principal fruits of its deliberations was a unanimous resolution requesting our governments "to carry out as soon as possible the remainder of the unanimous recommendation of the Third NATO Parliamentarians' Conference * * * by bringing about not later than the spring of 1960 a special conference composed of not more than a hundred leading representative citizens, directed to convene for as long as necessary in order to examine exhaustively, and to recommend as expeditiously as possible, the means by which greater cooperation and unity may best be developed within the Atlantic Community."

Our Fifth Conference, meeting in Washington later in the same year, took further action towards this objective. On November 20, 1959, it adopted unanimously a resolution recalling the original recommendation of our Third Conference, noting its support by the Atlantic Congress and the existence of resolutions then before the United States Congress providing for such a conference, and recommending "that this special conference be brought about as early as possible in 1960." In drawing up this resolution, the Political Committee had before it a report from its Chairman, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, on the organization and operation of the special conference.

One year later, our Sixth Conference took a final step to promote this objective it had sought since 1957. At that time the United States had enacted Public Law 86-719 which implemented our successive resolutions. This legislation created a United States Citizens Commission on NATO of twenty members appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Although this Commission is thus an official body, its members are not instructed by their government and are free to act as individuals. This Commission was authorised to seek to arrange and to participate in an international Convention with similar citizens commissions in the NATO countries and directed "to explore means by which greater cooperation and unity of purpose may be developed to the end that democratic freedom may be promoted by economic and political means."

On November 26, 1960, 2 months after this U.S. legislation came into force, our Sixth Conference unanimously adopted a resolution welcoming its enactment and urging our governments "to appoint citizens' commissions similar to the United States Citizens Commission on NATO as soon as possible in order that arrangements for this convention may proceed."

Since that time these arrangements have proceeded to the point where the Convention will convene in January. The United States Commission, the Co-Chairman of which are former Under Secretary of State William L. Clayton and former Secretary of State Christian A. Herter, has taken the lead in this task. On October 26 and 27 an International Preparatory Committee, on which all NATO nations were represented, met in London at the invitation of the British Government and organised the Convention. Lord Crathorne, of the United Kingdom, and General Bethouart, of France, alternately took the chair at this meeting, which was attended by representatives from all our nations. Mr. Richard Wallace, of the United States, served as Secretary General. A list of representatives from all the nations is attached to this report as Annex I.

The preparatory committee adopted a scale of representation for the nations, based on our own NATO Parliamentarians' scale, but reduced so that the total number attending will be 98. It also adopted a scale, by which the cost of the Convention will be proportionately shared among the nations, and rules of procedure.

This brief review indicates the extent to which the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, in its successive recommendations, has stressed the urgency of the forthcoming Convention and contributed to bring it into being. As our Conference can properly claim a share of responsibility for the many constructive results of the Atlantic Congress, so it will be able to claim a considerable measure of responsibility for such constructive recommendations as may result from the Atlantic Convention.

This Convention has extensive potentialities, providing a new and unprecedented means of seeking fresh approaches to solutions of the problems of the Atlantic Community. It will bring together 98 outstanding citizens of the NATO countries for a period long enough to study these problems in depth, to elicit new ideas and to submit such ideas to careful examination.

In view of the role our Conference has played in bringing about the Atlantic Convention, it is fitting that it express its earnest hope that the recommendations of the Convention will open up new paths and lead to the forging of an adequately integrated Atlantic Community. This would be in keeping with the spirit of the original NATO Charter, which, in Article 2, opened the door to political and economic cooperation.

The Convention has only the power to study exhaustively and recommend to the governments and the legislatures which created it. It goes without saying that it cannot bind the governments.

Its work, therefore, will stand or fall according to the merit of those recommendations, which must be adapted to the context of the times in which we live. Almost 13 years have passed since the adoption of the treaty. These years have brought political, economic and cultural changes, and changes in relationship with the rest of the world. It is time that we re-examine our relationship, with the purpose of strengthening and improving it wherever and however possible.

This is a context in which the free world faces a so-called monolithic unity in the communist bloc of controlled and slave nations. We must be able to match that unity through the institutions of freedom, freely designed by free peoples. Regardless of the communist threat, this should be done anyway.

The world, which has shrunken in time and space, is beset with both new problems and increased opportunities. We face the challenge, not only of getting our own house in order, but also of speeding the progress of the peoples of newly developed nations. The new and additional responsibilty of members of the alliance requires new determination and unity of purpose. We launched this Convention, bringing together the best minds of the free world to explore these problems and opportunities in a fundamental way.

The Political Committee, in originally proposing this Convention, intended that these 98 men and women do just that. In this way they can best serve the free world and humanity.

We believe that the exigencies of the time require consideration of bold, expanded and more advanced methods for bringing about the unity and cooperation which was the spirit of the original treaty and has been ever since.

Annex I. Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations

Delegates to Preparatory Committee, London, October 26–27, 1961: Belgium, P. van Zeeland; Canada, Patrick Nicholson, Prof. Northrop Frye; Denmark, Per Markussen; France, Jean-Paul Palewski, General Bethouart; Federal Republic of Germany, Count Raban Adelmann, Helmut Schmidt; Greece, Marikos Cosmetatos; Iceland, H. F. Hallgrimsson; Italy, Senator Pietro Micara, Ivan Matteo Lombardo; Luxembourg, Marcel Fischbach; Netherlands, J. J. Fens, Mrs. J. Stoffels-van-Haaften, J. In't Veld; Norway, Reidar Brüü, J. Pettersen; Portugal, Dr. Adriano Carvalho, Dr. Vaz Pereira; Turkey, Prof. Ahmet Sukra Esmer; United Kingdom, Lord Crathorne, R. Goold-Adams; United States, Adolphe W. Schmidt, Elmo Roper, Eric Johnston, George J. Feldman, Oliver C. Schroeder.

Report of the Scientific and Technical Committee

(Presented by M. Georges Mundeleer, Deputy, Belgium, reporter)

On Behalf of NATO's Scientific Mission

In 1960, Senator JACKSON presented a striking report, in which he expressed his utmost satisfaction at the successful work of our Scientific and Technical Committee. We consequently feel that today it is not presumptuous to assert that, by its recommendations, this Committee has continued to promote the implementation of an energetic policy contributing to the economic expansion of all member nations.

The training of scientists and engineers has been accelerated and the best use has been made of scientific and technical skills.

In many fields, the NATO Science Adviser and the NATO Science Advisory Committee have successfully applied themselves to the attainment of the objective which we had set ourselves—to strengthen the means of encouraging the study of science in the western world.

To the basic activities of the NATO Science Committee, whose main objectives have thus far been the granting of scholarships, the organization of very high level summer schools and the carrying on of a scientific research programme, were added new and equally important tasks, which are also calculated to further the essential objectives of our Committee—in particular a campaign of international cooperation.

Spatial research

Thus, very soon, associated countries will all participate in spatial research for peaceful purposes and the use of satellites for weather forecasting. In the same way, the results of this work will, in the interests of neighbourly cooperation, be communicated to countries which are not members of NATO.

For after all, is it not supremely important that we should concern ourselves with the aid expected of us by technically less developed countries which are eager to obtain that scientific assistance which we ought to be able to give them?

Operational research

By means of conferences held in different countries and attended by university people, businessmen and military personnel, French, British and American experts and scientists have tried to encourage the application of scientific methods to problems of organisation, working methods and manufacturing processes.

Here again, by the intelligent use of a budget of 125,000 dollars for 1961, our working party has tried to remove the barrier separating pure science from applied technology.

International Institute of Science and Technology

With regard to the most important problem raised during our last meeting of October 6, 1961—the setting up of an International Institute of Science and Technology—it is as well to recall that since 1960 our Committee has been in favour of beginning a detailed study of the practical problems involved in the founding of such an institute and making suggestions for solving them. We welcome the fact that the Report of the Working Group set up on the suggestion of NATO's Secretary General, has now been presented to the NATO Council.

The principle underlying the proposal to set up this Institute deserves respect and understanding; the authors of the report—distinguished scientists whose authority is unanimously recognised—having given of their best to its elaboration.

The creation of an institution for developing educational and research centres on a supranational level should certainly be encouraged. It is common knowledge that, each time a new impulse is given to the scientific activity of the nations of the western world, their mutual cohesion is reinforced. First of all, however, it should be noted that NATO, because of the initiative it wants to take today—made necessary perhaps by the inertia of the international organisations responsible—seems to be trying to take the place of UNO and UNESCO, which are more competent to study and implement such projects as these.

I. Summary of the project

The importance of this project prompts us to make the following remarks concerning the financial aspect, the title of the Institute, the engagement of professors, the enrolment of students and the location of the Institute.

(a) Financial aspect: The large sums of 50 or 60 million dollars of initial costs and 16 million dollars of running costs are given as an indication only, though they could cause a considerable increase in contribution by member nations. Although important, this is a minor consideration compared with other eventualities, if we consider what economies could be made in other fields.

(b) The title: As regards the title, the addition of the word NATO, Atlantic or International to the word institute implies either that we want to limit the appointment of professors and the enrolment of students to member countries or to open such appointment and enrolment to all the nations of the world.

As the financing and the maintenance of the Institute are probably entirely supported by member nations, it seems normal that both professors and students should belong to these same nations. However, provision must be made for a small number of selected students from other countries to be enrolled as well, and in exceptional cases for professors from other countries to be invited to join the staff if their intellectual value warranted it. It would therefore appear that the title NATO Institute of Science and Technology would be the most suitable in present circumstances.

(c) Enrolment of students: Great care must be taken in connection with the number and quality of the students enrolled. Let us admit forthwith that, although the proposed total of 1,000 seems high, the number of successful candidates as compared to the hundreds of thousands of university graduates of member nations is quite low.

(d) Appointment of staff: Certain reservations should also be made in connection with the appointment of professors. In the minds of the authors of the project there are to be 400 of them—all first rate scientists. Where could they be found, if not in existing institutions which would signify stripping the latter of their best? As the new Institute will be able to pay for services rendered, it is quite possible that there will be cut-throat competition between national universities and the Institute, when the latter begins appointing its eminent staff. But it is not at all certain that, even if very high salaries and other advantages are granted, the best staff will be obtained. In reality, those who would be called upon already hold top-ranking positions in their respective countries and are, consequently, materially and morally highly compensated. They might, as is often the case, want to stay in their circle and remain faithful to the teams they have created and with which they work. In short, the appointment of staff is a major problem which is far from being solved.

(e) Location of the Institute: Nor will the problem of the location of the Institute (for it seems that the promoters have assumed that it will be concentrated in one place) be easy to solve; negotiations will be lengthy, and the competition prolonged and even ruthless, before a solution is arrived at.

Furthermore, the language difficulties which will arise, especially on the assumption that the Institute is to be concentrated in one place, must not be underestimated. Undoubtedly, there are good translators and simultaneous interpreters; nevertheless, in personal contacts between professors, assistants and student, differences as to the languages to be used are bound to arise.

II. Conclusions

The Committee recommends that the proposal for an International Institute of Science and Technology be carefully examined by the scientists of the NATO countries;

Recommends that special attention be paid towards a better understanding of the increasing interdependence between the exact and the social sciences;

Resolves that the Institute if established should complement the activities of existing Research Centers in the NATO countries.

Military Committee report

(Prepared by Gen. J. H. Couzy, reporter)

Introduction

Last year the Committee considered it necessary to restate explicitly its faith in NATO. The mounting tension in the world culminating in the most serious crisis over Berlin has now provided fresh and overwhelming evidence of the need for a strong, united, real alliance.

Once more the military threat to the western world has considerably increased, and is accompanied by the now familiar heavy psychological and ideological pressures.

To this should be added that even if an agreement were reached on Berlin leading to a reduction of the present tension—the respite would be of a purely temporary nature and of very short duration. Given the aims of communist policy, it is obvious that another crisis, somewhere else and over another matter, will eventually be engineered.

Action on Previous Resolutions

The "fire-brigade"

The nucleus of such a force has already been activated and SHAPE is now in the process of building it up.

The object of ACE Mobile Forces is to provide rapid reinforcement at any point in the NATO area where there is a potential threat and against which these forces would be effective. They could also, if instructed by the appropriate NATO political authorities, serve to demonstrate NATO solidarity and unity of purpose in a threatened area; to make it clear to an aggressor that an attack against one is an attack against all, not only in the abstract words of the North Atlantic Treaty but also in practice.

The Mobile Forces will consist of land, sea and air units which may operate separately or as a combined force. Its members will be drawn initially from the forces of some four or five nations now deployed in the Central Europe Command area.

Each land force unit will consist generally speaking of a reinforced infantry battalion equipped with light conventional artillery weapons and support arms and services, all of which can be airborne. If required, atomic support units equipped with Honest John or similar tactical weapons would also be available.

Strategic mobility will be provided by air and naval transport units earmarked for the Mobile Forces. In addition to their important transport functions, air and naval elements will be available to provide such fire support as may be necessary. Thus SACEUR will have available Mobile Forces made up of appropriate NATO land, sea and air units, trained and battle-ready.

The exact size and composition of the forces required for a particular incident or operation would be decided on a case-by-case basis. In fact, SACEUR regards the different units—land, sea, and air, conventional and nuclear—as building blocks which can be put together as needed to create a suitable force for the specific task in hand.

This concept thus provides great flexibility within the Mobile Forces; flexibility in the choice of nations providing the personnel, flexibility in the number and type of combat and support units.

Exercises involving deployment of ACE Mobile Forces units have been planned for autumn 1961 and 1962.

It is regrettable that the personnel for these Forces will have to be drawn from the Shield forces, separate units for this purpose not being available. SACEUR hopes, however, that eventually all member states will contribute, if only in the form of either support and supply units, or on a financial basis, not only to demonstrate NATO unity, but also in the interests of integration and standardisation.

Reorganisation of the NATO commands

The Conference has more than once, the last time being in 1959, pressed for an adjustment in the NATO command areas to enable the NATO commands to carry out their strategic task more effectively. A study of this problem has led to the conclusion that its solution, especially in cases where national frontiers do not correspond with NATO command boundaries, should be found in creation of an Allied general staff. Such a general staff should be manned by officers of the various member states and should be financed internationally.

The command for the defense of the Baltic should also be an Allied organization; the general agreement on this which has now been reached should be welcomed as a first step in the right direction.

Air defence

Although complete integration has not yet been reached, important progress has been made in the field of air defence.

The air defence of Europe has now been brought under SACEUR. Furthermore, a common system of detection, identification, and control has been set up.

Use of nuclear weapons

Any challenge or threat must be countered by a sufficiently powerful force. To this end the NATO forces should have both conventional and nuclear arms at their disposal. The more powerful its conventional weapons the less quickly will nuclear weapons have to be used. A potential enemy, however, should be left without any doubts that the West would not hesitate to apply nuclear weapons against a threat which could not be countered by the conventional weapons at its disposal.

Research, development, and production

In the field of research, development and production some progress—if not of a spectacular character—was made in the past year. In addition to existing projects, a few new projects were started. This development seems to justify the hope that progress will continue to be made and will increase.

NATO's present military power

Although since last year progress has been made in several fields, as shown above, it is to be regretted that most member states have still not met the freely accepted goals laid down in MC 70, with the result that the Shield forces are still under strength.

It could be argued that the modernisation of these forces is more important than increasing their manpower. It should, however, be remembered that modernisation takes time. It will be a matter of years before projects for this purpose now being carried out in various countries are completed. Apart from this, adequate personnel will have to be made available for manning and using this modern equipment. For these reasons member states must take the steps recommended by SACEUR without making any cuts. This particularly applies to one of the most important of SACEUR's recommendations, which is to bring the M Day divisions up to at least 90 percent of their strength before 1st of January 1962.

Special importance should be attached to supplying a sufficient number of qualified technicians, who are indispensable if the units are to work well.

Unless special measures are adopted, it will be impossible to increase defensive power sufficiently to meet the present threat.

This is not all. In the introduction it was pointed out that even if the present tension over Berlin were to be reduced it is to be expected that another crisis will be engineered shortly afterwards at another spot and on some other matter. Thus not only must SACEUR's requirements be met now but once established the required strength must be fully maintained, in order to meet the inevitable challenge without delay.

Psychological warfare

Last year the Military Committee drew attention to the paramount importance of psychological and ideological warfare. The committee pointed out inter alia that for years past Communists have practised psychological and ideological warfare without encountering any well organised opposition. The committee welcomed the creation of a group in the NATO Secretariat for studying this problem. It has, however, been gravely disappointed in its hopes, that this study would lead to coordinated action.

Although the committee fully recognizes the extreme difficulties involved, it would again emphasise that this study be given the highest priority so that results are reached as soon as possible that would enable NATO to make recommendations and proposals as to the proper steps to be taken.

Civil defence

It is hard for the Military Committee to assess the extent to which member states can meet the heavy outlay on civil defence in addition to the high cost of the military defence effort.

A clear distinction should be drawn between clearly prohibition measures and the provision of adequate information and the adoption of simple basic measures.

If the civil population is left in ignorance about what to expect in any future war—which, it is devoutly to be wished, will never take place—panic would be inevitable, leading to utter chaos and a needlessly high number of casualties, both of which would be extremely detrimental to morale in the armed forces. Correct information about what to expect, recommendations on ways of mitigating the hazards, and simple precautions can diminish the danger to a certain extent; they will also contribute to reducing the probability of panic.

In some quarters, nuclear armament is considered acceptable only as a means of preventing war. Information as to the danger inherent in a future war would have the effect—it is feared—of driving those who would hold this opinion into the anti-nuclear armament ranks. This argument reveals a misunderstanding of the purpose of the deterrent: if there were any question of its not being used it would cease to be a deterrent. Furthermore, it cannot be in the common interest to withhold information and fail to take precautions in order not to frighten this particular group. In actual fact, this would neither prevent panic nor lessen the danger to any extent.

The suggestions made by the Civil Emergency Planning Committee under the chairmanship of the NATO Civil Defense Adviser have met with regrettably little response from member states.

The Committee would once again draw attention to its Recommendations 3 and 4 contained in last year's Resolution V. In addition, the Committee considers it highly desirable, that recommendations by the Civil Defence Section at NATO H.Q. on the organisation of civil defence in each country, be sent to every member state.

Furthermore, the Committee strongly urges this Section to continue with its cooperation in and coordination of civil defence planning. The Committee considers such guidance and cooperation indispensable and strongly recommends it.

Economic Committee report

The Economic Committee, after 2 days of preparatory meetings on October 6th and 7th, met again this week in the course of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference. As the first official business, it unanimously reelected the following officers: Chairman, Senator Jacob K. Javits; Vice Chairman, Prof. Dr. F. Burgbacher; Rapporteur, Mr. Anthony Kershaw, M.P.

Recommendations

As a result of its work, the Committee is recommending four Recommendations to the Conference. Apart from one abstention on Recommendation 4, the Recommendations were passed unanimously by the Committee.

Preparatory Work

This satisfactory result was made possible largely through the preliminary meeting of the Committee and the essential staff work undertaken in the interim between the Sixth and Seventh Annual Conferences.

Country-by-country reviews were submitted by the following: Belgium, France, German Federal Republic, United Kingdom, United States of America.

Staff papers were also submitted by the officers and members of the Committee. The Committee notes especially in this connection the fine Economic Report made by its Rapporteur, Anthony Kershaw, M.P. It was also of considerable aid to the Committee to have the following papers:

"Sumptuary Taxes and Other Imposts on Certain Tropical and Raw Material Products, Maintained by Principal Western European Nations," prepared by Senator J. K. Javits.

"Certain Aspects of Economic Policy Toward the Communist Bloc," prepared by Senator J. K. Javits.

"The Soviet Oil Offensive," prepared by Prof. Dr. Burgbacher.

"Report on Sources of Energy in the NATO Area Emergency Problems," prepared by Prof. Dr. Burgbacher.

"Markets in the Industrial Free World Nations for the Manufactured Goods from the Developing Nations," prepared by Mr. H. T. Cowie (Committee assistant).

The formation of Advisory Groups composed of nongovernmental distinguished citizens from the private economy of the United States and Western Germany has given support and advice in connection with the work of the Committee. Advisory Groups are now being developed in other NATO countries, including France and the United Kingdom.

Recommendations

The first recommendation relates to the problem of East-West trade. In view of the importance of Soviet economic aid and trade offensives the Committee draws attention to the importance of the North Atlantic Council reviewing its existing arrangements in the coordination of policy by member countries in this field.

The second and third Recommendations relate to measures which can be taken by the NATO countries to give suitable and expanding markets for primary commodities and manufactured goods from the developing countries and to meet certain problems of industrialized nations like Japan and Hong Kong. Member countries are urged to examine their tariffs, quotas, and taxes on these commodities in order that the NATO countries may adopt policies which will accelerate the progress towards prosperity of the newly developed countries and take their fair share of exports of the others.

The fourth Recommendation recognises the importance of the negotiations between the United Kingdom and other states to adhere to the European Economic Community. The Committee believes that a successful outcome of these negotiations will greatly strengthen the solidarity of Western Europe and lead to greater unity in the Atlantic community, especially if the member governments maintain the objectives of the NATO Alliance and keep western unity in the foreground of their objectives.

The Committee also disposed of the following administrative matters:

We referred to the Military Committee that we should not deal unilaterally with the economic aspects of military and civil defence matters but should only act at the request of the Military Committee.

We referred to the Scientific and Technical Committee the question of research on saline water conversion which they included in their draft recommendations.

We authorised the Vice Chairman of the Economic Committee to confer with the Energy sub-Committee of the Council of Europe and the OECD Energy Committee in order to determine what studies are being undertaken on the problems of the energy requirements of NATO countries.

We authorised the Rapporteur, Mr. Kershaw, to inquire into the progress being made by the Council of Europe regarding the multilateral guarantee of international investment.

PART II. RESOLUTION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

General resolution

The Conference of NATO Parliamentarians:

Whereas the implementation of the Reports and Recommendations of the Conference Committees requires action by the North Atlantic Council, as well as by member governments and non-governmental bodies;

Directs the Standing Committee to transmit these Reports and Recommendations to the North Atlantic Council;

Instructs the Standing Committee to send copies of these Reports and Recommendations to the member governments of NATO and the other appropriate interested bodies, including OECD; and

Urges all individual members of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference to follow up the Recommendations by all appropriate means.

Political Committee

Recommendation I

The Conference of NATO Parliamentarians:

Recalling the many resolutions adopted by the Conference in the past;

Invites the North Atlantic Council to submit reports on the actions taken on these subjects and the results obtained.

Recommendation II

The Conference of NATO Parliamentarians:

Having studied the Soviet-created crisis of Berlin;

Urges the North Atlantic Council to pledge its full support to the three powers in the exercise of their quadripartite rights and responsibilities with respect to all of Berlin and to Germany as a whole;

Urges the Council to continue to condemn the unnatural and illegal division of Berlin, symbolised by the prison wall illegally erected by the Soviets and their satellites;

Expects the Council to stand firm against continuing Soviet attempts to impair the rights and responsibilities of the Western powers with respect to Berlin;

Urges the Council to insist that the freedom and viability of West Berlin be maintained, including access by land, water and air.

Recommendation III

The Conference of NATO Parliamentarians:

Considering that, in contrast to the peoples of the West, those of the Soviet Union and its satellites have almost no opportunity to acquaint themselves with news presented objectively, with the result that they are given a false picture of the intentions of the Free World, because they are unable to evaluate accurately the misleading reports the Soviet Government is inclined to circulate;

Recommends that all possible means should be employed to inform world opinion and, in particular, Soviet public opinion of the infamy of the enslavement of 20 nations and 140 million people by Soviet and Communist colonialism;

Recommends that the free nations seek to include the problem of the captive nations on the agenda of every appropriate international conference.

Invites the NATO Council to make a systematic study of the question as soon as possible, to determine what can be done to provide the peoples of the Soviet Union and of the captive nations with accurate and unbiased information concerning world affairs.

Recommendation IV

The Conference of NATO Parliamentarians:

Recalling its Resolutions of 1957 and 1959 which recommended that its member governments bring about a conference, composed of representative citizens, directed to examine exhaustively and to recommend how greater co-operation and unity of purpose within the Atlantic Community might best be developed;

Recalling, also, its Resolution of 1960 welcoming the provision by the United States Congress for a United States Citizens' Commission on NATO, directed to seek to bring about an international convention similar to the conference recommended, and urging its member governments to appoint such citizens' commissions in order that arrangements for this convention might proceed;

Welcomes the attainment of this objective by the forthcoming convening in Paris on January 8th, 1962, of the Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations;

Expresses the hope that the Convention will fulfil its great potentialities by recommending to the governments and peoples the changes in existing relationships, including new institutions if any, required to create an adequately integrated Atlantic Community;

Urges the North Atlantic Council to render any assistance necessary;

Requests the Convention to report to the next meeting of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference and to the Council, as well as to the national governments and legislative bodies.

Scientific and Technical Committee

Recommendation I

The Conference of NATO Parliamentarians:

Notes with great satisfaction the work of the Study Group established after the last session to study the possibility of the creation of an Institute of Science and Technology;

Recognizing the complex issues still to be resolved;

Recommends that consideration should now be given to the project by the scientists of the member nations.

Recommendation II

The Conference of NATO Parliamentarians:

Noting that the Weather Satellite Program of the United States has revolutionized the science of meteorology;

Noting the offer of the United States to assist with NATO's Programme of Space Research for Peaceful Purposes;

Recommends that a long-range weather forecast system be established in NATO, utilising the data derived from the United States Weather Satellite Program. Further, that in accordance with NATO's "good neighbour" policy, the periodic reports of the proposed NATO system be made available to the neighbouring friendly nations, not only in Europe but also in Africa.

Recommendation III

The Conference of NATO Parliamentarians:

Notes the increasing importance to the Free World of the conversion of saline water;

Recognizing the desirability of avoiding duplication of effort and making all NATO national studies available throughout the Free World;

Noting the United States offer to make available to NATO their extensive research on this subject;

Recommends that the United States Office of Saline Water be used as a clearing house for such information.

Cultural and Informational Committee

Recommendation I

The Conference of NATO Parliamentarians:

Recognizing the principle of national sovereignty and therefore responsibility for an informed public opinion;

Considering that existing efforts of the NATO Information Services and national Information Services are not adequately achieving the results desired, either within or outside the NATO area;

Recommends—

1. Increasing and intensifying NATO and national information efforts.
2. That NATO and national information efforts be supplemented and re-inforced by non-governmental, voluntary organisations, utilising all available means of communication and information;
3. That, as a matter of policy, these increased efforts be based on the assumption of the initiative of the free world in the war of ideas;

Urges recognition of the vital role of non-governmental organisations in the field of public education and opinion, and urges that their activities be strengthened and extended beyond the NATO area, through such organisations as the Atlantic Treaty Association and the Atlantic Institute.

Recommendation II

The Conference of NATO Parliamentarians:

Recalling that the idea of an Atlantic Institute originated with the Conference, welcomes the creation, progress and preliminary achievements of the Institute, as also the appointment of Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge to the post of Director-General;

Associates itself with the pleasure felt by the Cultural and Information Committee at hearing from Mr. Cabot Lodge of his projects and the ideas by which he intends to guide his action with the object of extending the influence of the free spiritual and moral forces of the Atlantic world.

Recommendation III

The Conference of NATO Parliamentarians:

Noting with approval the adoption of Recommendation III as proposed by the Political Committee and desiring to bring before the Conference and the NATO Council means unanimously recommended by the Cultural and Information Committee for strengthening the Voice of Truth and the free circulation of information in providing the people of the Soviet Union and its satellites with accurate and objective reports from the free world:

(a) Urges the NATO Council to ask member governments to press for full reciprocity behind the Iron Curtain in the free circulation of information such as the Communists enjoy in the free world;

(b) Urges, until such a worldwide agreement on the free circulation of information is attained, use of external broadcasting facilities of the member nations as an international radio network which, broadcasting regularly with powerful transmitters and on a series of established wave-lengths, will reach even the farthest corners of the Soviet Union with broadcasts in appropriate languages;

(c) Urges the Council to study the use of television as a further means to convey objective information to the people of the Soviet Union and their satellites.

Military Committee

Recommendation I

The Conference of NATO Parliamentarians:

Believing that the crisis over Berlin necessitates the reinforcement of NATO's defensive strength up to a level where this challenge can be met;

Considering that, if the tension over Berlin should ease, another crisis at another spot, over another matter, could occur shortly afterwards;

Believing that, in view of this, certain steps should be taken;

Recommends—

1. That before January 1, 1962, the strength of the divisions committed to NATO be raised to meet the requirements as expressed by the Supreme Commander in order to enable him to fulfil his mission;
2. That in the future this strength, once it has been reached, be maintained at that level.

Recommendation II

The Conference of NATO Parliamentarians:

Believing that the boundaries of the territories assigned to several NATO commands should be revised, in order to enable those commands to carry out their strategic tasks;

Recognizing that the problems pertaining to such a revision—especially where national boundaries do not coincide with the desired command boundaries—can best be solved by setting up integrated NATO commands, both staffed and financed not only by the countries immediately concerned but by different member countries;

Recommends as a solution to the question of the revision of the boundaries of NATO command areas, the creation of truly integrated NATO commands, both as regards personnel and finance.

Recommendation III

The Conference of NATO Parliamentarians:

Recognizing the progress made in the creation of Mobile Forces;

Believing that these Forces can also serve in demonstrating NATO solidarity and unity;

Believing that a considerably more impressive demonstration of NATO solidarity and unity might be achieved if all member states contributed to these Forces;

Considering, furthermore, that training exercises for these Forces will have a stimulating effect on further integration and standardisation;

Believing that such integration and standardisation are best promoted by all member states contributing to these Forces;

Recommends—

1. That contributions to, and support of, the Mobile Forces be continued and maintained at, at least, their present level;
2. That all member states should contribute, either by providing support units or on a financial basis, to the Mobile Forces.

Recommendation IV

The Conference of NATO Parliamentarians:

Recognizing that only little progress has been made in the co-ordination of research, development and production of weapons and equipment;

Believing that financial burdens can be lightened by much closer co-operation towards standardisation of arms and equipment;

Recommends urgently that further efforts be made to obtain a higher degree of coordination.

Economic Committee

Recommendation I

East-West trade

The Conference of NATO Parliamentarians:

Recommends that the North Atlantic Council review existing arrangements for the co-ordination of the policies of the member countries of the Alliance on East-West trade and on the Soviet Economic aid and trade offensive in order to determine the adequacy of their policies to meet the objectives of NATO.

Recommendation II

Primary commodities

The Conference of NATO Parliamentarians:

Recommends—

1. That the DAC (Development Assistance Committee) be called upon to consider, in all of the development plans for newly developing countries, the question of price stabilisation of primary commodities which is essential for the prosperity of newly developing countries;
2. That the OECD be called upon to draw up a forecast of supply and demand for primary commodities over the next five years, to maintain this forecast up to date and to give its value judgment as to the alternative means for primary commodity price stabilisation; and
3. That the individual NATO nations be called upon to evaluate the effect of excise taxes and duties and tariffs on the consumption of primary tropical commodities like coffee, tea, cocoa and tobacco and to undertake other appropriate means to increase such consumption.

Recommendation III

Manufacturing needs of developing countries

The Conference of NATO Parliamentarians:

Recognizes the need to give encouragement to early manufactures in the developing countries and to deal with particular trade problems of more industrialised areas, such as Japan and Hong Kong;

Recognizes that only some of the NATO countries have accommodated their trade policies in this way;

Recognizes the incidence of quota and other restrictions in other NATO countries on the manufactures of such nations and areas; and

Urges member countries to examine the tariffs and quotas which unduly restrict the import of early manufactures of the developing countries and normal trade with Japan and Hong Kong and other more industrialised areas; and

Urges member countries to adopt a policy, through voluntary action, of accepting their fair share of imports of such early manufactures from newly developing countries and from Japan and Hong Kong and other more industrialised areas.

Recommendation IV

The Conference of NATO Parliamentarians:

Recognizing that, in the nuclear age, the struggle with communism is as much economic and political as military;

Recognizing "that regional groupings tend to increase world trade and strengthen their member countries";

Recognizing (in this context) that the adherence of the United Kingdom and other states to the European Economic Community will greatly strengthen the cohesion and political stability and solidarity of Western Europe;

Recognizing further that the unity of the Atlantic Community, no less than the growth of international trade, is promoted by the pursuit of policies for the expansion of trade between nations within and outside of regional groupings;

Urges member governments to keep western economic unity in the forefront of their objectives in the Alliance, in OECD, in DAC and in GATT.

VISIT TO FORT RILEY, KANS., BY ELVIS J. STAHR, JR., SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, last week Fort Riley, Kans., was honored by a visit from our distinguished Secretary of the Army, Elvis J. Stahr, Jr.

Fort Riley is the home post of the 1st Infantry Division. That is the oldest division in the U.S. Army, and it is a division that is trained and ready for immediate duty should a national emergency require it.

The commandant at the post, Maj. Gen. John F. Ruggles, and his staff officers are entitled to much credit for the training of this division and the efficient operation at the post.

The people of Kansas and I personally were delighted that the Secretary of the Army took time out to visit this great military installation and inspect, personally, the splendid work that is being done there.

Following Secretary Stahr's visit, an editorial entitled "Thank You, Mr. Secretary," appeared in the Junction City Union, issue of January 12, 1962. I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THANK YOU, MR. SECRETARY

"I have enjoyed this trip more than most and as much as any."

With those words Secretary of the Army Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., summarized his thanks for the hospitality he had been shown during his visit to Fort Riley and Junction City this week.

But just before that, speaking at a luncheon at the officers' club, he said words which his audience perhaps appreciated more.

He said, in effect, that in all his travels, he had visited no spot, except Berlin, where morale is as high and the can do attitude as evident at it is at Fort Riley.

That is high praise, coming from the ranking civilian of the Army, and one can only surmise the cause. One reason, undoubtedly, is that the 1st Infantry Division is a proud division. It is the oldest division in the U.S. Army and there is something about belonging to such an outfit which makes a man stand a little taller and try a little harder.

Also, such a tradition is a part of the air and the heritage of Fort Riley. No arm of the service was more proud than the Cavalry and something of the old tradition of hit the leather and ride still survives.

Equally important is the inspired leadership of General Ruggles and the officers of his command.

Whatever the causes, we hope they spread to every unit in the Armed Forces.

And, now, to turn to Secretary Stahr. He was impressive.

One of the finest compliments we heard paid him came from a soldier, who watched the Secretary fire an M-14 rifle. It was: "He looks like he knows what he is doing."

As a soldier, Secretary Stahr has made the long journey from second lieutenant early in World War II to the highest civilian military position in the Army.

In the intervening years, he has done much more and achieved high honors as a scholar, as an attorney, as an educator, and in the fields of government service.

His sincerity and his courtesy are self-evident. His brilliance is demonstrated in his addresses and in his public statements. Never is he at a loss for the words, and most important, those who hear him feel his words are completely honest.

That is why "I have enjoyed this trip more than most and as much as any" carried so much weight.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary, we hope you will come again.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE FORCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Washington Daily News of January 15, 1962, there appeared a story by Mr. James O'Neil, Jr., entitled "On-Beat Saga: It Was Cold, but the Bluecoat Said to All, 'Good Morning.' "

It is a story which we see all too seldom in the press of our country. It relates the attitude, the cheerfulness, the devotion to duty of Pvt. Louis E. Martin, of the Washington Police force. This man has made the Police Department better known because of his application to duty and the way in which he devotes himself to looking after the interests of the people, whom it is his duty, as well as that of his colleagues, to support.

All too seldom do we say any good about our police departments. All too seldom do we have an awareness of the difficult jobs which they hold and the great devotion to duty which they show.

I have been very impressed with the conduct and the integrity of the police force of the District of Columbia in my 20 years in the Congress. I have been very impressed with their present chief of police, Robert Murray. I have noted, for example, that during a bus strike several years ago the policemen who were on leave returned cheerfully, worked without extra compensation, and did an extremely effective job of keeping the traffic in the District of Columbia rolling. I have observed policemen personally on a number of other occasions. In my opinion, they comprise one of the best police forces in the country. I hope this Congress will see fit, before too long, to assure that the police force of the District of Columbia is given more in the way of salaries, in accord with their arduous, difficult, and time-consuming duties.

The policemen not only put in their regular hours, but work extra hours doing extracurricular activities, such as appearing in court, and so forth.

So it gives me a great deal of personal pleasure to ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article by James O'Neill relating to the cheerfulness and devotion to duty of Private Martin.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Washington Daily News, Jan. 15, 1962]

ON-BEAT SAGA: IT WAS COLD BUT THE BLUECOAT SAID TO ALL: "GOOD MORNING"

(By James O'Neill, Jr.)

One of the nicest things about our town is the group of bluecoats led by Police Chief Bob Murray.

Sure, I know various citizens get a mite miffed when the harness bull hands them a paper for parking on the sidewalk, or maybe you run over a nice little old lady and trade a few harsh words with the law, but mostly, you've got to admit, our local gendarmes do a truly splendid job.

What brings all this to mind is the daily performance of a young man who stands, in all sorts of dismal weather, during morning and evening rush hours, at the intersection of Independence Avenue and 14th Street SW.

He's been smoothing out the mess there for about a year, keeping traffic moving at a good clip, and preventing the early sleepwalkers from unintentional suicide.

GOOD RATE

Thursday morning was colder than a welldigger's heel on the DEW line. Traffic was moving at a reasonable rate on the 14th Street Bridge, and I guess the scarcity of cars was due to power failures or sheer cowardice. The man at the intersection had on his full winter regalia, including earmuffs. But best of all he wore a grin on his kisser as big as all outdoors. Now very few people are ready to grin at 9 a.m., with the weather too cold to be admitted by the board of trade and a day's work ahead of them.

But not this cop.

He looked like he'd just hit the number for a sawbuck, had twins the night before, and had just been made corporal.

REALLY

And to top it off, he was hollering "Good morning" and waving at his customers as they drove past him.

I braved the morning chill to roll down the window to see if he really was shouting "Good morning," or "Pull over, you."

It came up "Good morning," with an 8-buck grin.

Capt. Norman Richardson, of the fourth precinct, identified the policeman as Pvt. Louis E. Martin, 23, of 3828 Second Street SE.; married, the daddy of two small children, and building a home in Virginia. Private Martin has been a policeman for less than 2 years.

"In all my experience, in any of my commands or duties, I have never known a policeman who had more commendations—by phone, by mail, or in the newspapers—than Martin. He's the best public relations man we've ever had on the force," the captain told me.

He's also one helluva fine cop.

GEN. CARLOS P. ROMULO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, shortly there will be leaving us an Ambassador of both renown and good repute. This Ambassador is the only one in the diplomatic corps in this city who has the privilege of the floor of either the House or the Senate. This Ambassador served in the House of Representatives at the same time that the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the distinguished Vice President of the United States [Mr. JOHNSON], and the majority leader of the Senate served in the House.

I refer, of course, to Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo, of the Philippines, who will be leaving this country shortly to return to his homeland.

In my opinion, no Ambassador has ever made a better impression, developed closer friendships, or will leave with so much sorrow on the part of his friends, as will both Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo and his lovely wife, Virginia Romulo.

We wish them the best of everything on their return to their homeland. We hope that sometime the Ambassador will come back and visit us, and that he will avail himself of the privilege of the floor of both the House and the Senate, because for us he has been a friend of long standing, a man for whom we have great respect, a man whom we trust and admire, a man who has always been a friend of this country. We will miss him and his family deeply.

WILL THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES FIGHT CASTRO?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the indications are that the Kennedy administration intends to seek a declaration from the Organization of American States recognizing that the Castro regime in Cuba is a Communist government controlled by the dictators of the Soviet Union, and a menace to the peace of this hemisphere. The Senate should share in this responsibility by adopting a resolution expressing our desire that the American delegation to the OAS conference at Punta del Este should seek such a declaration from the states of this hemisphere.

It is my feeling that if our delegation should fail to fight for a resolution which would declare the Soviet-controlled Castro government a menace to the peace of this hemisphere, exclude that government from any part in the operation of the Organization of American States, and invoke sanctions against Cuba, then our leadership would appear to lack the courage it takes to fight for that in which we believe.

I realize that the administration is troubled by the possibility that four large Latin American countries—namely, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Mexico—may not vote for the resolution. In fact, Mexico voted against the recent resolution which criticized Cuba, and can be expected to vote against action again. Yet, there are a great number of Mexicans who are ashamed of the spinelessness of their leaders in failing to confront Senor Lazaro Cardenas, a former President of Mexico who has had much association with Castro and Communist-controlled subversives in the past, with a determination to be part of the Western Hemisphere. Recent newspaper reports indicate that the government of Lopez Mateos is coming under criticism for its failure to stand up against the Communist menace. This criticism will continue until that government might well see fit to support the Organization of American States, if someone provides the necessary leadership.

There is no doubt in my mind that more than two-thirds of the nations in the OAS will vote to condemn Castro, if a vote is called for. In fact, it is my impression that Argentina, Brazil, and Chile may abstain rather than vote to support the Communist regime in Cuba.

It has been said that the ABCM countries—Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Mexico—constitute a majority of the population of Latin America. They certainly do not constitute a majority of this hemisphere's population. We are a part of the OAS. We are a part of this hemisphere, and if the great numbers of our freedom-loving people are added to the populations of those countries whose leaders are willing to stand up and be counted for freedom against Communist slavery, then those countries voting to condemn Cuba and kick the Communist representatives of that government out of the Organization of American States would constitute far more than two-thirds of the people of this hemisphere.

It has been suggested that Castro might claim a victory if four countries fail to vote against him. I can only ask, "How ridiculous can you get?" Naturally, the Communists will put their tongue to any lie the mind of man can fancy, and some people may be stupid enough to believe it. But, let me put it the other way around. Suppose Cuba could obtain a two-thirds vote against the United States.

Does anyone think that bearded rascal would fail to put his resolution to a vote? Any time the Communists can hold us up to condemnation, they are going to do it. We have the evidence, and can make out a case which would convince any fair-minded person that the Castro government is unworthy of playing an honorable rôle with the independent and freedom-loving countries of this hemisphere. Sanctions should be invoked. Castro should not be permitted to enjoy the respectability of an independent, freedom-loving nation.

Mr. President, the OAS had the courage to invoke sanctions against the Dominican Republic, which was no military threat to us, and in fact was a bulwark against Communist aggression. I, myself, find it difficult to explain to my constituents why this Nation would vote to invoke sanctions leading to the overthrow of a friendly government, and stand idly by when the votes could be obtained to invoke sanctions against those who would drink our blood if they had half the chance—those who are presently engaged in seeking to overthrow every democratic government in this hemisphere.

The conference at Punta del Este offers us a chance to lead and to act effectively againts communism in this hemisphere. The least the American representatives can do is to try.

A resolution urging vigorous action along the lines I have described is presently pending in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 226, passed the House on May 17, 1961, by a vote of 404 to 2. It is my hope that the committee will bring forth the resolution. If not, then I expect to offer such a resolution and ask for the immediate consideration of the Senate.

PAKISTAN LOYAL TO FREEDOM

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am among a great and growing number of Americans who are deeply concerned at the course of U.S. foreign policy, especially our relations with the new or small nations which have not alined themselves with either the Communist bloc or the so-called uncommitted nations. I am referring to nations which are openly pro-Western—such nations as Pakistan.

This nation, one of our partners in CENTO and SEATO, has remained steadfast, despite the long-term threat of Red China and the growing threat of India. The latter nation, which has but recently departed from pacifism and has tasted the blood of centuries-old Portuguese enclaves, has reportedly massed troops on the Pakistan border. So here we have in the drama three nations: one, Red China, is our avowed enemy; the second, India, is an avowed neutralist, which often seems to be benevolently neutral to the Soviet Union's point of view; and the third, Pakistan, is our proven friend.

From all reports, we are about to offend our friend to avoid alienating India. This situation was reported in an excellent analysis by Constantine Brown in his column which appeared in the Washington Evening Star yesterday. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Brown's article printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAKISTAN LAMENT OVER UNITED STATES—OFFICIAL CRITICIZES LEANING TO BIG INDIA WHILE OVERLOOKING LOYAL SMALL NATION

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME.—A highly placed Pakistani, on his way to Paris and London, lamented that "the United States uses the same method in choosing friends as a Pakistani housewife; she thinks that the bigger the fish the bigger the bargain."

This was said with a tinge of bitterness because at the time when Messrs. Nehru and Krishna Menon are rattling their sabers for the benefit of their Western neighbors, we, in the opinion of the Pakistanis, are pussyfooting. "You are more impressed," said the Pakistani official, "with the 400 million Indians than by the loyalty of 90 million in Pakistan to the cause of freedom."

Pakistan, one of the pillars of the CENTO and SEATO, is concerned over Indian aggression. Its intelligence reports massive concentration of Indian forces at the borders.

The Pakistanis feel they are being treated by Washington as a second-class ally, although they have given proof of unflinching loyalty. They are disappointed because the military assistance given them has always been governed by the fear in Washington that we should not go too far since it might offend India.

The Indians have never concealed their hostility to Pakistan. At the outset of the Korean war when we were hard pressed by the Reds, Pakistan offered to send one full motorized division. (The Pakistani Army, although only seven divisions strong, is regarded as one of the finest in the world.) All that the then President Mirza Khan asked from Washington was to obtain Mr. Nehru's formal assurance that while that division was fighting in Korea there would be no aggressive actions by India against Pakistan.

Mr. Nehru refused to grant that request, and the Pakistani division remained at home when we needed it most. When John Foster Dulles suggested the creation of the CENTO and SEATO, the government then at Karachi joined wholeheartedly not only to help the remaining free nations in Asia but also as a matter of self-defense. For, according to the judgment of the Pakistan leaders, the United States was certain to help a loyal ally when menaced by an aggressor.

Mr. Nehru and Mr. Krishna Menon have now tasted blood. They were able to invade and swallow up with immunity the Portuguese enclaves. There were some lamentations by the British and American Governments but nobody offered even moral assistance to little Portugal, one of the original members of the NATO. The Russian veto, as Mr. Nehru had been assured beforehand, killed any Security Council resolution.

The Pakistanis have no love for colonialism. But they see in the Indian action not anticolonialism, but a desire to expand at the expense of all its weaker neighbors. In recent days there has been talk in New Delhi about a final reckoning with Pakistan. Of course, the Indian Army knows that it will find its Moslem opponents tough, indeed. All the same it will find a numerically weaker army possessing less modern equipment. We have applied slow motion in providing these Asian allies with modern military tools. One reason for this is that the managed democracy adopted by the Pakistanis in 1958 when Gen. Ayub Khan took over the reins is distasteful to many ideologists in Washington.

Now that Mr. Nehru talks in terms of a crusade to recover the holy land of India, the Pakistanis are concerned. They know that the United Nations can be of no use to them. They have looked in the past to the United States as a potential deterrent of Indian ambitions. They know that India, without our economic and financial support cannot survive and they have been hoping that we would talk sternly to the New Delhi Government whenever it began to show what General Ayub calls its true face.

Our failure to use economic deterrent in the case of Portugal has aroused considerable misgivings in Pakistan. It is feared that the argument that India is a country with 400 million people which we cannot antagonize will once more be heard in Washington.

The answer to a question as to what Pakistan might do if it receives only lipservice from the West in the event of an Indian aggression was an enigmatic: "The Red Chinese have tried for some time to get on good terms with us."

RURAL RESOURCES IN THE 1960's—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FREEMAN

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on Monday of this week a National Conference on Land and People was held here in Washington by the Department of Agriculture. It was called by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman to consider ways and means of more effectively utilizing the land resources of our Nation for the benefit of all Americans.

The highlight of the conference was the address by Secretary Freeman, in which he outlined his ideas for placing greater emphasis upon recreational and conservational use of land now growing basic farm commodities in surplus supply.

The Secretary's proposals are indicative of the original thinking which he has been doing in considering solutions to the problems of American agriculture. They evidence his sincere desire to leave no avenue unexplored in the continuing search for a program which will restore agriculture to its rightful place in the American economy.

Secretary Freeman's recommendations are deserving of the most careful study and serious consideration not only by Members of Congress but, even more important, by all Americans. In order that they might be given the widest possible dissemination, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address in which they are set forth be printed herewith in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RURAL RESOURCES IN THE 1960'S

(An address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, prepared for delivery at the National Conference on Land and People, Jefferson Auditorium, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., Monday, January 15, 1962)

Each of you is here today to discuss what could be summed up in one deceptively simple question: How should public policy be designed to encourage the maximum effective use of resources in rural America to serve all Americans?

I wish to emphasize that this is a deceptive question because it involves a vast number of complex factors, all related to one another.

It involves the continued ability of the American farmer to produce food and fiber in an abundance such as the world has never before seen, more than we can effectively use; and it involves the enormous power which this abundance gives to the American people.

It involves basic moral and human values as well as economic opportunities—of making it possible for people who live on the land to stay there by moving resources to people rather than moving people to urban centers.

It involves the continuing need to conserve the soil and to speed the efforts to provide clean water.

It involves the growing gap of adequate recreational resources—the need for open green spaces to remind us of the eternal eloquence of nature.

It involves the desire to use land which now produces crops already in large surplus for other productive purposes rather than to have it lie idle.

It involves the mutual responsibility of each of us to develop and conserve the resources of land and people so that both work for the maximum benefit of each other.

I welcome you, then, to this National Conference on Land and People, and I wish to express my pleasure and that of President Kennedy for your willingness to consider one of the most important challenges which the American people will be called on to meet in this decade of the 1960's.

The responsibility of the Department of Agriculture in the field of land and water resources is large. Some three-fourths of the Nation's land area is in private ownership, principally agricultural or forest land. Equally significant, the Nation's water yield comes from watersheds which are predominantly agricultural lands or are in the national forests.

This Department, accordingly, has a major responsibility for cooperative programs with the States and their local subdivisions, and with owners and operators, to bring about the conservation, development and wise management of soil, water, grass, forest, and wildlife habitat of these private lands. In addition, the Department administers a multiple-purpose resource management program on the national forests and grasslands covering 186 million acres of land stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Mindful of that heavy responsibility, several months ago I appointed a Land and Water Policy Committee in the Department to appraise our present and prospective land and water resource situation, together with our future productive capacity and needs, to analyze the implications of their findings on Department policies, and to prepare program recommendations.

The result of this effort will be outlined in subsequent presentations by members of my staff. A copy of the committee report has been put in your hands. This study was based upon the years of research, surveys, and program experience of the Department and its cooperators, including an inventory of conservation needs that was made by some 30,000 people in the 3,000 counties under the leadership of the Department of Agriculture. Thus a broad cross section of interests and many years of experience has entered into the judgment on the potentials of our land and water resources, their use, conservation, and development.

While this resource review was being made, I had occasion to go abroad to study agricultural problems in a number of the countries of southeast Asia and the Middle East. That trip was illuminating in many ways. But, in particular, it helped very much to clarify and confirm some of my own understanding and convictions about problems and needs in our own country.

I returned from my visit to these developing countries with a better perception of why no nation can expect to progress beyond a subsistence economy unless it makes efficient use and has increasing productivity of its natural resources. We are fortunate in the United States to have so ample a supply of land, water, and forest resources—vital national assets. How we conserve, develop, and manage these natural resources has an important effect on our economic growth, on the strength of our Nation, and on the long-run status of our Nation in world affairs.

Land was a principal ingredient in the fascinating story of the making of this Nation. It was the bright hope and the promise of opportunity that brought millions of immigrants to our shores. It was the dream that pulled people westward to conquer a wilderness, to the Mississippi, across the plains and the western mountains. Land was freely distributed under the Homestead Act, the 100th anniversary of which we are commemorating this year. All at once seemingly, the land was settled.

In a relatively short time, thanks largely to the land, the United States became the fourth largest nation in the world in terms of population, supplying one-fifth of all the farm products that move in world trade.

While there was still new and undeveloped land and unused water, we were not much concerned with questions of orderly development and proper use. We exploited the land cruelly and with little regard for the needs of the generations to come.

By the time the frontier of new land and opportunity had largely ceased to exist, voices began to be heard which spoke insistently for a new concept of land use—conservation. These were great men—Theodore Roosevelt, Gifford Pinchot, and Hugh Bennett.

They spoke for millions who insisted that the land and water were priceless assets. They were called visionaries, and their words were as often laughed at as listened to. But the scars of erosion, destructive floods and dust storms convinced the American people that a new program was called for.

While there is much in this area which still remains to be done, there has been a tremendous advance forward. National Forests and National Parks today protect millions of acres of timber and rangeland while at the same time they provide realistic management of these resources. There are today more than 3,000 conservation districts in the country providing stewardship for privately owned land and water. Conservation is a byword among rural and city people alike.

Thus, land use policy in this country has undergone one dramatic and far-reaching change. There is strong evidence accumulating that the social and economic changes which are occurring in rural America today are signalling a third momentous change in the Nation's land use policies.

The technological revolution in agriculture has placed us in a position where we are producing and can produce for the foreseeable future more food and fiber than we can effectively use.

Output per worker in agriculture during the last decade has increased at an annual rate of 6.2 percent per year, compared to 2.9 percent in nonagricultural industries.

Agricultural output per man-hour has doubled since 1950. It is firmly predicted that technology and output will outrace our population in the next 10 years as it has in the last 10.

Some recent studies estimate that by 1980, when we expect our population to have grown to around 250 million people, we will be able to produce the food and fiber for all domestic and international needs on about 50 million fewer acres than we have in production today.

We have been unable, in the past decade, to find a satisfactory solution to these new challenges which will begin to guide national policy into new techniques of land use management. In the past, land has been moved in and out of agricultural production by various devices—the soil bank, acreage reserve, acreage allotments, retirement to conserving uses.

Emergency programs, such as the feed grain program, have been developed because experience has shown that it is cheaper to divert land from production than to acquire a surplus after it has been produced. But this is not the final answer. It leaves unanswered the question of how we are to obtain the greatest benefit from land and water resources for all the people.

While we still seek an answer to that question, there is today a clearer understanding of the problem than ever before. The agricultural revolution has brought us face to face with what I consider three basic questions affecting land resources:

First, there is good land which is producing crops that we cannot use effectively, thus adding to our surplus problem. About 40 percent of our farms today produce 87 percent of the total agricultural output. If adjustments in production are to be made, we will need to find ways to make better use of some of this land. What should we do about this?

Second, there is a rapidly developing appetite for recreational resources, and there is general consensus on the need for more open space—green areas—in the growing sprawl of urban areas. This relates to the need for developing alternate land uses. What should we do about this question?

Third, there is the equivalent of 1,400,000 underemployed persons in the rural economy. Over half the people in this country who live in poverty are located in rural areas. Almost 60 percent of the Nation's farms produce only about 13 percent of the agricultural output. These are not generally considered productive farmland. We need to bring new resources into rural areas to begin providing new economic opportunity for these people. What should we do about this?

As I have indicated, we have made studies and we have reviewed each area thoroughly, but we are candid to admit that we do not have all the answers. That is why we have called you here to discuss these problems affecting land, water, and people as a part of a total food and agricultural program. We ask your help, and we are eager to have your ideas and suggestions both to improve existing programs on land and water and people, and to develop entirely new approaches.

Keep uppermost in your mind while you listen and discuss these ideas and programs that this is not a conference to discuss techniques of conservation. You are asked to explore a new dimension of land-use policy which arises because this Nation is facing a totally new question: What new uses can be developed for good, productive land which is producing crops which already are in excess supply?

As you discuss the elements of a long-range policy for developing other productive uses for agricultural lands, keep these considerations in mind:

1. Every American wants to see the land used efficiently and effectively. Our national purpose is to use resources; it is not to have land lay idle. Our purpose is to insure most effective use of the land, based on particular conditions affecting each area.

If we are convinced that we are using our agricultural abundance to the maximum effective level for people in this country and in other nations around the world, then to use the land to produce beyond our total need is not the most economical application of this valuable resource. It does not serve the national interest, nor does it satisfy the qualification that this land be put to maximum effective use.

2. When we talk about land adjustment as a means of balancing production of certain crops with effective use, we are talking about land and crops from which farm families are making a living. And in recent years, not very much of a living in comparison to the nonagricultural sector.

3. These people live close to the soil, and have a greater love for it than most Americans. They want to stay. They want to be near the land their fathers and grandfathers farmed. Their roots are deeply attached to the rural community where their children go to the same school they attended, and where they go to the church their great grandfather helped to build.

4. These people are not likely, and should not be asked, to sacrifice immediate income until alternative sources of income or new income opportunities are found to compensate for reductions that will take place if land goes out of farming.

5. We will also need to maintain some good cropland in a ready reserve status so that it can be quickly called back into production in event of an emergency. This land should be that which is best suited for efficient cropping.

With these points in mind, I want to describe to you some of the proposals which have been made by many people who are concerned with the challenge of exploring this new dimension in land use policy. These proposals are directed principally at the need for new and alternative uses for good croplands. While much of what has been proposed will apply equally as well to land which is less productive, the concern with these acres is centered more on finding increased economic opportunity for those who now farm this land. While there are some 2.2 million farmers on the less productive land, they account for only 13 percent of the total agricultural output. They contribute only slightly to the problem of excess production.

The major proposals for putting land to more effective use are those which seek to encourage greater recreational opportunities for a rapidly growing urban society.

There is much evidence today that we are beginning to achieve a more active and effective partnership between rural and urban interests in the planning for urban growth, for open green spaces needed for recreation and for other land-consuming uses which a swiftly changing and rapidly growing nation will require.

I am sure that you will hear much more on this subject from Gov. Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin. As a dynamic and imaginative chief executive of a State which is grappling with many problems relating to land and people, he is forging a name as a leader in resource development.

It is, I think, reasonable that a more effective partnership be made between Federal and State Governments and private sources in this area of resource development, particularly in terms of providing to the States more financial assistance to stimulate planning and organization at the State level. This approach is contained in the legislation now before the Congress proposing river basin planning and development.

This approach also has been followed in the development of the plan for a continent-spanning system of parks, campgrounds, and recreation sites along the Mississippi River. This plan, which has been endorsed and supported by those States through which the Mississippi flows, envisages a system of freeways running from Minnesota in the north to Louisiana in the south. Described as the Great River Road Parkway, it would provide enormous recreational resources within easy reach of more than two-thirds of the people of this country. Other such interstate proposals could be developed.

We know also that the Nation's private lands hold a major potential for wildlife conservation and production for hunting and fishing and for many other forms of recreation. Is not this the time to take a closer look at wildlife habitat development and recreation as desirable and profitable alternative uses for land now dedicated exclusively to crop production?

There is special need for outdoor recreation within easy access from urban centers. More than one-third of the fishing trips made by anglers in Georgia, for example, are to farm ponds. More than 85 percent of our hunting land is privately owned or controlled and most of our game is produced on farms and ranches. We are becoming aware of the tremendous opportunity for community recreational development in and around the small lakes and ponds in the small watershed projects.

The public, if it wants to have recreational opportunities on private lands, must share in the cost of its development. Is this not the time to explore some of the methods and incentives that will help farmers to develop their lands as profitable recreational enterprises? Should we experiment on a pilot basis at selected points around the country, with arrangements that would enable local sponsors to acquire and develop, for public recreational use, lands around small reservoirs, flood plains and other lands that are released from crop production?

In addition to the increasing popularity of recreation and leisure time resources, there will be a continued increase in lands needed for highways, military reservations, institutions and other public facilities.

While I have described here some of the proposals for nonagricultural use of land now in cultivation, I also would like briefly to cover some others which deal with developing alternate agricultural uses.

These proposals would principally seek to shift some croplands into trees and grass. Many competent observers predict that the consumers' taste for meat products will continue to increase and therefore we can expect over the long run to see some land gradually being taken by the livestock industry as meat consumption rises.

Present predictions also indicate a continued rise in demand for forest products, although it is very likely that better management and cultivation of woodlands in private ownership will enable existing commercial forest lands to fill future requirements with only a small increase of additional acres.

The major increase in forest lands probably will be to provide additional recreational areas within easy reach of urban areas.

Related to the expansion of land resources devoted to trees and grass is the need for well-balanced programs for upstream watershed development. Increased vegetation and more adequate water supplies will result from the integrated development of the watersheds. This is important to the farmer, forester, sportsman, and water user.

The fact that watershed development also will help provide adequate and stable water supplies for urban needs while yielding recreational benefits and increasing wildlife propagation is an indication of the importance which the Department is placing on this particular program.

Watershed development will affect highly productive farmland as well as those lands which are less productive, just as any overall program to develop more effective use of land resources will affect both because both kinds of land are intermingled.

In the case of the less productive lands, continued cultivation of millions of these acres aggravates erosion and flood problems such as continued pollution of streams, shortening the useful life of water reservoirs, disturbing fish reproduction and silting up of harbors.

We have the necessary technical knowledge and equipment to identify such cropland, which should be diverted to other agricultural or nonagricultural uses, and we can see the effectiveness of such an effort in the experience thus far with the Great Plains conservation program.

If it is to be public policy to encourage more effective use of land resources, then land on which continued cultivation will result in destructive economic conditions should be encouraged to go into other uses.

Obviously, what we are proposing in terms of developing new and alternate uses for land will require a companion effort to provide a wider range of economic opportunity for those living in rural areas. This is the crux of the third question which I posed to you earlier: What should we do to create greater economic opportunity for rural America?

The policy which finally is developed to reflect public consensus on this most difficult question will not be the harsh proposal, set forth by some people, to drive what they call the inefficient farmer off the land. I for one cannot condone the use of the economic "cat-o'-nine-tails."

Such an attitude, first of all, is poor economics. The farmer against whom such a policy is aimed does not contribute significantly to the problem of excess production. According to the latest figures available, some 2.2 million farmers produce only 13 percent of the total agricultural product while the remaining 1.5 million farmers produce the remaining 87 percent.

Those who say these farmers are inefficient fail to realize that, in terms of efficiency, the man who leaves his farm to go to the city for a factory job likely would be even less efficient if he lacks the necessary skill to compete in a market which demands increasingly skilled workmen.

The only sensible answer to this challenging question is to devise policies which bring new resources to the people in rural America rather than attempt to move the people of rural America to the cities.

There are a number of proposals currently being considered which we hope will lead in this new direction.

We know that the process of change in American agriculture has left idle land and unused buildings on thousands of small tracts in low-income areas. This situation calls for positive assistance in redirecting these land resources into farm ownerships of family size and into recreation, forestry, and other new uses.

One means which might be considered is an expansion of the credit authority of the Department to provide loans to local public corporations through which the affected lands could be acquired, redeveloped, and resold. As with urban renewal, a large portion of the costs of this rural renewal could be largely recovered as redeveloped lands are resold.

In addition to efforts to make farms large enough to provide an income adequate for the needs of the farm families, we are encouraging the establishment of factories and commercial enterprises, including recreation facilities and tourism, which will provide alternative job opportunities in the rural community to give employment where it is needed.

We also are establishing training programs in order that the normal flow of people from the rural areas can compete in accordance with their capabilities and not be required to take a low-paid job because of lack of training and education.

We are carrying out this program in cooperation with the States, counties, and local communities. Local leaders decide themselves what is to be done. To assist these local leaders, we have made available all of the resources of the Department of Agriculture through the rural areas development program. This program of economic development of rural areas has been in full swing for only a few months.

You have not been invited here to discuss the problem of implementing an agricultural program, but you should be familiar with such efforts since any proposals to provide more efficient and effective use of land and people are vital to any overall agricultural program.

The use of land is only one basic element of a broad agricultural policy, what we might describe as a triangular program, involving also food abundance and commodity management, and a triangle which concerns the people, both on the land and those who depend on its products for their daily food.

With food abundance, we must search for realistic and practical methods of using food and fiber at home and abroad to fulfill commercial obligations and those obligations of moral responsibility to share our abundance with those who do not have enough.

Through commodity management, we seek to adjust production, to balance it more effectively against what we need and can use, recognizing that even with programs to use our food abundance and to find alternative land uses we will still produce beyond effective demand.

It is my hope that from these meetings will come stimulating and creative ideas and suggestions for using land resources effectively and wisely. I hope, too, that you will take with you a broader understanding of the achievements of American agriculture, of its place in the national economy, and of its role in American leadership in the world.

Thank you, once again, for accepting my invitation to meet here to help resolve the question of finding maximum use of our land resources. We are working together for the best interests of 185 million Americans as we attempt to restore prosperity and economic opportunity to rural America.

SEMINAR ON AMERICAN STRATEGY, ATLANTA, GA.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on yesterday, Tuesday, January 16, a seminar on American strategy was held in Atlanta, Ga., under the sponsorship of the board of regents of the university system of Georgia. It was the first in a series of such conferences to be held for the purpose of presenting to the officials, teachers, and general public of the State of Georgia the facts about the strategy and tactics of international communism.

This significant educational program was attended by some 800 Georgia officials, educators, and members of the General Assembly of Georgia and was televised to a wide audience throughout north and central Georgia. The principal speakers were the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and the able Representative from the Fifth District of Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]. Georgia's beloved senior Senator [Mr. RUSSELL] was moderator.

The forceful and informative address of the eloquent Senator from Connecticut was enthusiastically received and demonstrated the keen understanding which this outstanding American has of the ramifications of the Communist conspiracy. It is a treatise which should have the careful reading all Americans, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of it be printed herewith in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD

When I received your invitation to come to Atlanta, I was grateful for the opportunity to take part in a significant and perhaps historic event. Here, for the purpose of studying the Communist menace, are gathered the principal leaders of this great State in the fields of government, jurisprudence, education, and journalism.

This distinguished assembly is both a demonstration and a symbol of the deep concern that is spreading throughout this land, concern about the continuing failure of the free world to defend itself successfully against the ceaseless onslaught of Communist aggression.

Some of our esteemed pundits scornfully dismiss this concern and lay it to the inability of simple-minded, ignorant people to adjust to the new, mysterious complexities of foreign affairs. But this meeting is further proof, if any were needed, that the discontent with our posture in the cold war stems from responsible, enlightened men and women who are deeply disturbed, not by the mysteries of the cold war but by the clear, simple, demonstrable fact that our policy is failing, and we are losing.

My purpose today is to lay before you three propositions which I believe explain why we are losing.

First, world communism and Western civilization are totally opposed to one another in everything that is basic and important; freedom cannot survive a major infection by communism, and communism certainly cannot survive any injection of freedom.

Second, because of this total irreconcilability, because of the dedication to destruction which is at the heart of communism, because the continued flourishing of Western society makes a mockery of Marx, communism is compelled to destroy us to justify, to fulfill itself, and to save itself from contradiction and collapse.

Freedom and communism therefore cannot coexist together under the same roof; and the Communists will not permit us to exist apart from them if they can help it, for to do so will result in their own undoing.

Third, the long and gloomy series of free world defeats, incredible in the face of our overwhelming superiority in wealth and in power, has resulted from our refusal to accept these truths as the bases for our policy.

Let me attempt to demonstrate my first proposition, that of the irreconcilable conflict between civilization and communism.

We believe in God. We believe in a Creator who ordained the physical laws governing the universe and proclaimed the moral laws which should govern the conduct of man. We believe that He has revealed to us the purpose of society and the eternal destiny of each human being.

The Communists contend that God is a myth, that belief in Him is a fraud intended to assist in the exploitation of the working classes. They insist that society has no God-given purpose and that man has no eternal destiny.

Thus we are in total disagreement over the most important matter of our lives.

We believe that man has an ingrained knowledge of right and wrong and a free will enabling him to choose either, and upon this concept of free will we have built a structure of rights and freedoms to safeguard and implement the sacred principle of free choice.

They contend that free will does not exist, and that free choice must not exist, because man has neither the knowledge to act wisely nor the virtue to act honestly.

We believe that man is essentially good and that the just society aims at encouraging that goodness, developing it and benefiting from it. They contend that man is essentially evil and that unless he is remolded and rigidly controlled by the state he will only seek to exploit and debase other men.

We believe that the growth and fulfillment of the individual human being is the all-important end and that the institutions of our society are but means to this end. They contend that society is the all-important end, that the individual is but a means toward that end, and that the self-fulfillment of the individual is hostile to the welfare of society.

We believe that our policy toward nations, like our attitude toward individuals, should be to help them work out their own destiny in peace and justice, through the process of free choice.

They contend that independence is an illusion, that revolution, bloodshed, and fratricidal wars are inevitable and desirable and that non-Communist nations must be destroyed, enslaved, and rebuilt on the Communist pattern.

The reigning idea of Christian civilization is love; the reigning idea of communism is hate.

We are thus involved, not in just a conflict between nations or power blocs or economic or political theories. What is at stake here is everything that has made us what we are, as individuals, as families, as a nation, as a civilization.

To lose is to lose everything.

My second proposition is that this basic irreconcilability compels the Communists to work ceaselessly toward our destruction.

Our world haunts the Communist. He cannot be content just to deride us and wait for our collapse. He has invested his whole life, his whole being, in communism. He will live in jungles or deserts, accept the most cruel and odious discipline, commit any crime, betray any friend, surrender even his hope of eternal life to advance the world revolution.

If our truths are real, then his life is a senseless nightmare.

He abhors the present world and is driven on by a desperate inner compulsion toward its destruction.

The only priority ahead of the destruction of our system is the building and preservation of his own. The only restraints upon his designs against us are his fears for the safety of his own system.

The threat of Communist subjugation, therefore, differs from all previous attempts to conquer the world. Here is no tyranny which seeks domination only for the sake of power, or spoils, or exploitation, or even the gratification of limitless ambition. Here is a depraved Samson who seeks to pull down the pillars of the present world and raise in its place a structure such as man has never seen.

We need not trace the history of this previous aggression to prove this point. We need only cite the present, in Berlin, in Laos, in Vietnam, in Cuba, in Tibet, in the Congo, along the Indian border. We need only cite the subversion being carried on in every nation of the free world. We need only cite the demonstrations and riots which erupt wherever it serves their cause, even in our own country.

All of this seems to me so obvious as to be self-evident. The Communists have reaffirmed their intentions to destroy us by a thousand words and a thousand deeds. Yet our policy has consistently refused to recognize both the utter irreconcilability between communism and Western civilization and the compulsive necessity which drives the Communists on to bury us.

Our leaders ignored this when they charted a postwar policy based upon the assumption that the Russians were prepared to live at peace with the rest of the world.

Our leaders ignored the fact that communism and freedom cannot coexist together when they sponsored coalition governments which inevitably fell one by one under Red control.

Our hasty demobilization after World War II certainly indicated a complete failure to see in the Communists an aggressive conspiracy more dangerous even than that of the Nazis.

Our folly in entrusting the freedom of Eastern Europe to the good intentions of the Russians could only have resulted from a complete failure to see the Communists as they were, and as they had always been.

As old illusions were dispelled by the cruel logic of events, new ones were invented to take their place.

When the Reds made their bid to take China, we did not treat it as merely the latest chapter in their book of aggression. We talked of agrarian reformers, and of waiting until the dust settles.

We fooled ourselves into believing our conflict arose from misunderstandings that could be resolved through summit conferences only to find that each summit conference resulted in a carefully planned propaganda victory for the Russians.

We deluded ourselves into believing that the Russians would observe in good faith a nuclear test ban moratorium, and halted our own development in this crucial field, only to find that they first tested in secret, and then in the open, gaining substantial scientific advantage over us.

We deceived ourselves into believing that Castro was a latter-day Simon Bolivar who would deliver his people from a hated dictatorship, only to see him establish a Communist base 90 miles from our shores.

And we are convincing ourselves at this very moment that Cheddi Jagan in British Guiana is another agrarian reformer, only to find, as I am quite certain we will, that he is building still another Communist base in this hemisphere.

And so, the first step toward the building of an effective foreign policy, the indispensable step, is to accept the basic facts of our existence as they are, and to clear away the illusions that have obscured those facts.

If we can free ourselves from the illusion that communism and Western civilization can get along, we will give up vain hopes of an easy way out and begin to make the stupendous effort in the field of free world armament and mobilization that must be made.

If we can free ourselves from the illusion that the temporary easing of this or that individual crisis will bring about an era of good feeling or another spirit of Camp David, we will scrap the patchwork foreign policy of the past which has been essentially a policy of short-term reactions to Communist initiatives, and adopt instead a consistent long-range program aimed at the expansion of freedom and the defeat of communism.

If we can free ourselves from the illusion that communism is accepted by its subject peoples, we will institute policies aimed at encouraging resistance behind the Iron Curtain with the consequent demoralization of the Red empire.

If we can free ourselves from the illusion that Polish Communists or Yugoslav or Cuban Communists are any less the enemies of freedom than Kremlin Communists, we will stop pouring out our substance in aid to Red dictatorships, which have received more than $4 billion from the American people in recent years, and instead divert that aid to those allies who are manning the frontlines of freedom.

Freed from the illusion that the hard-core Communists who rigidly dominate the Communist world can be influenced by friendly demonstrations on our part, we will bring to an end all practices which blur and obscure the nature of the life-or-death struggle that has been forced upon us.

Freed from the illusion that we improve the world climate by soft-pedaling our criticism of Communist infamy, we can for the first time institute an effective program of bringing to the world the truth about Communists by each day dragging them before the bar of world opinion, indicting them again and again for the atrocities and crimes they have committed in enslaving 1 billion human beings, and convicting them in the minds of men for what they have in fact made of themselves, the moral outcasts of humanity.

Freed from the illusion that the way out of each enemy aggressive act is a coalition government which includes Communists, we will at last recognize that the government which includes Reds today will be controlled by them tomorrow, and that there is no substitute for standing firm against aggression from the beginning.

Freed from the illusion that the Communists are seriously interested in negotiating a just peace or indeed in seeking any honorable common objective with us, we will never again fall for such a ruse as the nuclear test ban negotiations which paralyzed our own technological development for 3 years while our enemies secretly moved ahead.

Freed from the illusion that the Communists can take part in any international organization or court without either poisoning it or subverting it to their ends, we will begin to think less and less in terms of divisive worldwide international organizations and more and more in terms of free-world cooperation and unity.

Freed from the illusion that there is some easy way out of the present crisis of civilization, we will adopt a policy of strength, of risk, of sacrifice, of effort for every American.

I have tried to outline some beginnings of an effective foreign policy.

No one can predict with certitude that his set of policies will give us the victory over world communism that will save Western civilization. No one, least of all myself, can foretell the hour or the manner or even the generation in which this victory will be achieved.

Our task is to stop losing. Our task is to start the tide running in our favor.

If we can do that, if we can bring to bear upon the cold war the inherent superiority of our system, then we will have set in motion the triumph that we ourselves may not see. What will save us, in the end, is this:

A free man is better than a slave; a free economy is more productive than a slave economy; a free university, in the long run, will achieve more than an indoctrination center; a free nation which governs through consent is stronger than a dictatorship which governs through fear; a coalition of independent states banded together through a common cause will, in the end, prove stronger than an artificial slave empire held together with bayonets.

We meet here today to try to find a path that will lead us to the victory that the justice of our cause deserves and the superiority of our civilization makes possible.

I am confident that through this meeting and through thousands like it across this land, we will find that way because we have now begun to do what must be done. We have begun to look.

NASA NEED FOR SCIENTISTS SURE TO STRAIN NATION'S ALREADY LIMITED SUPPLY OF GRADUATE ENGINEERS AND SCIENTISTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Monday and Tuesday I invited the attention of the Senate to the crucial need for educational improvement in the interests of national defense.

The National Science Foundation report on Russia's immense progress in scientific education and the President's powerful plea for a stepup in our science educational program at his Monday press conference expressed the urgency of this need.

Mr. President, a clear demonstration of the importance to our Nation of encouraging more of our young people to persist in graduate studies in the sciences was a revelation late last week.

In an article in the Washington Post and Times Herald it was stated:

> At the very least, the manpower requirements for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's lunar program could deplete the country's available trained scientists and engineers.
>
> At the very most, these requirements could seriously hamper many of the Nation's other scientific efforts, and perhaps even cripple its graduate education program.

Mr. President, to emphasize once again the need for action to accelerate the education of scientists and engineers, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Washington Post and Times Herald be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 11, 1962]

Cry Is for Scientists—Moon Aims Strain Manpower Supply

(By Howard Simons)

The Nation's commitment to send a manned expedition to the moon will strain U.S. scientific and engineering manpower resources to the breaking point.

This is the view of many manpower experts who, even before the moon venture became a national goal, were warning that the Nation had inadequate numbers of trained professionals to meet its continuing needs. Now, the situation threatens to worsen.

At the very least, the manpower requirements for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's lunar program could deplete the country's available trained scientists and engineers.

At the very most, these requirements could seriously hamper many of the Nation's other scientific efforts, and perhaps even cripple its graduate education program.

NASA NEEDS 13,000

To meet its needs, it is estimated NASA itself will require approximately 13,000 or more additional scientists and engineers. How many more scientists and engineers will have to be added by private industry working under NASA contracts—which will be an estimated 85 percent of the NASA budget—is unknown.

Just where these scientists and engineers will be found is also an unknown. NASA is already engaged in a massive recruiting program throughout the country. As a result of this drive there is evidence that NASA recruiters have been pirating personnel from private firms. There also is evidence that private firms working on the moon program have been pirating from NASA.

BIGGEST CHALLENGE

There now is danger that space program recruiters will begin to entice scientists and engineers away from other Government agencies and laboratories and then from the universities.

NASA officials concede that finding topflight manpower is their biggest challenge. One official says, "At our current rates of pay we are not going to hurt anyone too badly." Nonetheless, NASA officials seem to be optimistic that the needed personnel can be found.

Whether this optimism is warranted is questionable. One expert says that the "Nation has never before been faced with a problem parallel to this one." During World War II, he explains, it was possible to turn thousands of scientists and engineers loose on a billion-dollar project such as the Manhattan project to build the atomic bomb, even though this effort disrupted education and all but stopped graduate education.

NO SHARP INCREASE

This wartime experience has given planners a dangerous "we did it before, and we can do it again" confidence. But today there is a difference. The multibillion-dollar, long-term space program comes at a time when there are already shortages of scientists and engineers for other massive programs.

Manpower experts are also concerned because there has been no sharp increase in the number of scientists and engineers being trained. Rather, in some cases such as engineers, enrollment has fallen off of late. And the number of Ph. D. students being graduated in the physical sciences has remained almost constant between 1950 and 1960, while the demand for such students has continued to outpace the supply.

One short-term solution being explored is a crash program of upgrading junior scientists and engineers. This would require scientific and engineering personnel to take night courses or on-the-job graduate work. NASA, itself, already follows this approach by subsidizing on-the-job graduate education.

Another longer range approach being explored is to convince industry and the universities that they must enter into a real partnership to provide almost half-time graduate education for employees.

For the longer pull, however, manpower experts are convinced that only a new and greatly expanded program to support graduate study will help the United States to overcome its continuing shortage of adequately trained scientific and engineering manpower.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK DAMON

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, since taking office nearly 2½ years ago in this very Chamber, I have had a very outstanding young man, Attorney at Law Frank Damon, heading my senatorial office staff. He served first as legislative assistant and then as administrative assistant to me.

There are few in this body—our President Pro Tempore Carl Hayden, the junior Senator from Hawaii, and my colleagues from the 49th State, Alaska—who know at firsthand the many duties attendant to the transition from territorial status to statehood.

Although the Capitol represented a completely new world to me and my staff, in short time with the cooperation of Frank Damon, the office was successfully established. Now after 2½ years in Washington, Frank Damon has decided to return to the private practice of law.

Mr. Damon is a native Honolulan and a member of a distinguished kamaaina family in Hawaii. A graduate of Punahou Academy, he served in the Navy for 2 years during World War II.

After the war, he attended Yale University, which is traditional in his family, and then matriculated at the University of Colorado School of Law at Boulder. When he graduated from law school, he returned to Hawaii and was admitted to the bar the same year.

He was associated with the law firm of Smith, Wild, Beebe & Cades in Honolulu when Hawaii became a State. Upon my election, Frank agreed to assist me in Washington.

Frank Damon is one of those rare individuals who comes upon a scene without fanfare, works diligently and long hours without seeking recognition, has a facility for getting along with people, and can give direction yet be able to be directed. In everything he undertakes, Frank Damon exerts 100 percent effort, careful not to overlook the minutest detail.

I am most appreciative of his services. The State of Hawaii, I know, is appreciative of his services. We are all indebted to him for his legacy of a well-organized and smoothly operated office. With all sincerity, I thank Frank Damon for his devoted service. My staff wishes also to join me in my tribute to him. We all wish him success, Godspeed, good health, and aloha in all of his future endeavors.

SOFT ON RIGHTISM?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial entitled "Soft on Rightism?" published in the Washington Star, issue of January 16.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Soft on Rightism?

California's Gov. Pat Brown didn't quite put it in so many words, but he might as well have done so. For in his Press Club speech he said in effect that Richard Nixon, his probable opponent for the governorship, is soft on John Birchers and rightism.

This brings to mind the cries of outrage that went up from the liberals a few years ago when Mr. Nixon said that certain Democrats were soft on communism. This was denounced as un-American, as preaching guilt by association, etc. What will these liberals now say by way of rebuke to Pat Brown? Nothing, we suspect.

THE LATE SAM RAYBURN, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, "Some men die ingloriously. Some men die gloriously. And some men are discerning enough to note the difference between."

The above is the first paragraph of an article by Myrtie Barker which appeared in the November 29, 1961, issue of the Indianapolis News. The article, entitled "Late Great Mr. Sam Rode Tall in Saddle," reflects upon the manner in which Sam Rayburn lived and died.

I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of myself and my senior colleague from Indiana [Mr. Capehart] that this meaningful article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Late Great Mr. Sam Rode Tall in Saddle

(By Myrtie Barker)

Some men die ingloriously. Some men die gloriously. And some men are discerning enough to note the difference between.

A letter came today.

It's the kind of letter from which a minister might wangle a sermon. As I read it, I thought of Thanatopsis. Incidentally, William Cullen Bryant, who wrote that poem, was not even 18 years old when he penned his classic view of death.

I keep thinking of that one particular line: "So live, that when thy summons comes."

In its way, the letter that has arrived is just that eloquent. And I hope that somewhere in the Great Beyond, Mr. Sam is looking on pleased and proud.

The reader who took time out of this busy life to write, had viewed over television the funeral service of Mr. Sam Rayburn, the late Speaker of the House.

It was a very dramatic experience, witnessing the deep respect bestowed upon a man beloved even by those of opposing political faiths.

The Chief Executive, President John F. Kennedy, was there; former President Truman, former President Eisenhower, Senators, Congressmen, Supreme Court members. The great assembly, plus maybe 50 million others, observing the funeral on television, evidenced the high regard of everyone for the departed.

As our correspondent watched the solemn ceremony, the lives and deaths of other people of history were compared with that of Mr. Democrat. Listen:

"There was William the Conqueror, who subdued all England. He gained great earthly glory for himself.

"He originated the feudal system in England in furtherance of his personal gain; he established the curfew to control the people, he set aside large estates for his hunting grounds, destroying houses and villages for this purpose, providing the same penalties for trespassing on his hunting preserves as for murder * * *.

"When he died, there was only one poor knight by the name of Herloun to attend him. Even his owns sons did not attend his funeral. His own monument was arranged for by himself, before he died. There were no friends to mourn his passing.

"His son, William Rufus, who succeeded him to the throne, met with similar treatment at his death. He was refused religious burial.

"George III was King of England for 60 years—the longest reign in English history.

"He died in 1820—an insane, convulsive, blind old man, without friends.

"Kaiser Wilhelm, who tried to conquer the world, was another who came to a dishonorable end. There were Hitler and Mussolini—remembered only as butchers of the human race.

"And, of course, we couldn't forget Napoleon. For a time he ruled all Europe. He is said to have been responsible for the death of 8 million human lives, all sacrificed to serve his ambition to rule the world. But his power came to an end, a tragic end.

"At age 52, he died in St. Helena with only two or three of his military cronies attending him."

Two words from Thanatopsis seem to be the only answer to it all. "So live."

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE LOUIS C. RABAUT, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on November 12, 1961, the Honorable Louis C. Rabaut, Member of Congress from Michigan's 14th District, suffered a fatal heart attack.

His untimely death brought to a close a long and distinguished career in the Congress. Mr. Rabaut was dean of the Democratic congressional delegation from Michigan. First elected to the Congress in 1934, when the Nation was in the grip of the great depression, he was in the midst of his 13th term at the time of his death.

Louis Rabaut was a kindly man, with deep religious instincts and a host of friends. His political philosophy and his record in the Congress were marked by an unusual concern for the unfortunate, the helpless, and the afflicted.

He represented not only the people of his home district, but the interests of the entire State of Michigan. He was a leader in the successful fight for the St. Lawrence Seaway. He was a friend and champion of social security, public housing, and small business. He had a deep and continuing interest in the improvement of public education.

Louis Rabaut served his district, his State, and his Nation faithfully and well. He will be sorely missed and most favorably remembered.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, it is my regretful and sad task to join with my distinguished senior colleague from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] in announcing to the Senate the death of a dedicated and honored legislator, the late Representative Louis Rabaut, of Michigan.

Mr. Rabaut served as a member of the House of Representatives for 13 terms, representing the 14th Congressional District of Michigan. His devotion to the American people and to freedom's cause over this long period was clearly evident. He is sorely missed by both Michigan and the Nation.

Representative Rabaut served faithfully on the House Appropriations Committee for many years. He devoted special zeal to the fiscal affairs of the District of Columbia. His every action and vote was in the best interest of his constituency and his country.

Mr. Rabaut authored the amendment which inserted the words "under God" to the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America. Each time we voice this pledge, we are reminded that faith and trust in God is the foundation of our democracy and at the same time pay silent tribute to the Congressman who incorporated this basic ideal in the pledge.

Words cannot express in full measure my respect and esteem for our late, good friend. I do not believe there was anyone who knew him well who was not impressed with the genuineness of this man.

Although Representative Rabaut was elected to the House of Representatives from Michigan, he represented the best interests of each and every citizen of this Nation. His memory shall remain vivid.

The passing of Representative Louis Rabaut is a great loss—to his district, to his State, and to his country. Representative Rabaut was a gentle man, an able legislator, and a patriotic American.

PROPOSED NEW YORK CENTRAL-PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD MERGER

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am personally very concerned about the proposed merger between the New York Central and the Pennsylvania railroads, announced a few days ago. In my opinion, such a merger if allowed by the Interstate Commerce Commission would eliminate vital and effective rail competition between major industrial and shipping points and would be a giant step toward railroad monopoly in the United States.

I am fully cognizant of the present financial plight of the railroads, and especially that of the Pennsylvania and the New York Central. And I am indeed sympathetic to the cause that something must be done promptly to strengthen their financial conditions and improve their efficiencies. I do not feel, however, that combining the Nation's first and second largest railroads into one near-monopoly system servicing the largest and most concentrated industrial area in the country is the best solution to these problems commensurate with the public interest. Certainly, such a merger as this should never be allowed to be consummated until we can be satisfied that it conforms to an overall transportation merger policy designed to protect every section of the country, preserve competition wherever possible, and make absolutely certain that the needs of national defense are amply met.

In the first place, the merger would result in a company with great financial size and power with combined assets of over $5 billion and potential operating revenues of almost $2 billion a year. This is not merely a merger between the Pennsylvania and the New York Central, but it includes in the proposed system the Norfolk & Western, the Wabash and the Lehigh Valley, all apparently controlled by the Pennsylvania. In addition it will include various roads which may be controlled by, or influenced by, the Alleghany Corp. which controls the New York Central. The present boards of directors of the two merging companies are replete with members who hold directorships on boards of banks and investment institutions which may control or influence the policies of other transportation companies. Likewise, there are interlocking directorates between the merging roads and major shippers and receivers. The development of this regional power by a merged Pennsylvania and New York Central will give the company a tremendous leverage in dealing with other roads at interchange points, and put it in a position of being able to make demands by threatening to change the allocation of traffic to a competitor road.

These are only a few of the serious problems of this proposed merger. The very least that they do is to point up the fundamental requirement that every facet of this proposed combination be analyzed in the light of its effect on the whole broad national transportation picture.

When the first announcement was made that this merger application might be filed, some 2 months ago, I sent a letter to the Assistant Attorney General, Judge Lee Loevinger, calling his attention to my concern with respect to the impact of this proposed merger, and requesting him to make a prompt and thorough investigation of the anticompetitive and monopolistic effects the merger might have on both rail and nonrail interests. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have my letter printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOWER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KEFAUVER. The merger application is now about to be filed. Because of its magnitude, its resulting elimination of competition, its obvious effect on the whole merger program, and its impact upon the military defense of this country, it seems to me that it is imperative that the Department of Justice not only intervene in this proceeding but also give serious thought to taking a strong and active role in opposition to the merger right from the beginning of the case.

This merger by its scope and impact puts into sharp perspective the compelling need for the Interstate Commerce Commission to formulate and put into effect a national transportation merger policy. Such a policy should provide guidelines and directions for mergers based upon the retention, to the best extent possible, of competition between major points across the country and the equalization of competitive economic power. If the Commission does not have sufficient powers or funds to determine and effectuate such a policy, then the Congress must act promptly to correct this deficiency. The arrival on the scene of this gargantuan merger proposal of the Pennsylvania and New York Central Railroads is just about the last straw. We cannot go further on these rail merger applications unless we know where we are going and how we are going to get there.

Up to now, the only approach of the Commission to proposed mergers has been to consider each application on a case-by-case basis, primarily with respect to the merger's effect upon the area served by the merging roads and the economic benefits to be derived by the applicants. In other words, it has left it to the roads to determine their own merger directions as they feel they would best suit their financial purposes. This, in turn, has resulted in merger proposals which tend toward regional monopolies rather than the extension and strengthening of competitive systems in the public interest. Strong lines seek to become stronger. Weak lines tend to be ignored, then swallowed up. Where some sections of the country may be benefited, other areas may be discriminated against. Most of these regional merger proposals are met with requests by the remaining roads in the area to be included in the merger as a matter of survival. Such inclusion would only make the regional monopolization more severe and the elimination of rail competition more complete.

The mergers approved by the Commission in recent years have not been appreciably extensive in scope or broad in economic impact, and because of this, they may have lent themselves more readily to the piecemeal, area impact, approach.

However, the situation before the Commission today is a far different matter. There are some 14 merger applications pending, most of which involve the largest railroads in nearly every major area of the country. Topping this list will be the behemoth of them all, the Pennsylvania-New York Central application, which, like most of the others, concerns the elimination of competitive lines and the development toward regional control. These are not special area situations deserving case-by-case treatment without regard to their places in any national merger scheme. They are, in fact, superconsolidations of economic power, the approval of any one of which will have an immediate and far-reaching impact upon the other roads which surround the new merged system and will lead to additional merger approvals as a matter of precedent as well as economic necessity.

Should we allow these mergers and consolidations to go forward for approval and consummation without any consideration of the applicant's role in any national policy—a policy based upon what is really the public interest—competition, maximum service, industrial development, innovation in handling, research and development, and most important, balanced economic power among carriers rather than monopoly?

It is preposterous that we are moving ahead today without such a policy, and without any consideration of the total effect which these regional consolidations will have on the country as a whole. Further, by going ahead on a piecemeal basis before any such policy is determined, we may completely frustrate any benefits that such a policy or program could afford, because it may well become too late to go back and rearrange the pieces without serious economic and financial effects.

Of particular importance is the effect which these rail mergers will have on our continued strength and ability to arm and defend ourselves in the event we are once again brought into a shooting war. Nearly all of the merger applications talk about the millions of dollars which can be saved by ripping up tracks, abolishing terminals, cutting down on equipment, eliminating schedules and terminating the employment of many thousands of workers whose entire lives and experience have centered around the railroad. Certainly before these merger approvals go ahead, we should determine whether this proposed shrinking of our vital rail transportation system may not put us in a posture of weakness, if, as, and when an emergency arises.

It is my understanding that the Commission has assured the Congress that, although it intends to conduct the individual, piece by piece, hearings on these merger applications, it will hold off any decisions until the end of this year. Such a moratorium is by no means a satisfactory solution to this problem, especially when nothing is being done effectively to bring about a national transportation merger policy. The New York Central and Department of Justice specifically requested the Commission to make a general investigation leading to the development of basic standards and directions for rail mergers, but the Commission flatly rejected their requests. There has been some consideration of this problem by certain congressional committees but as yet no official policy recommendations appear to have been made. The time is indeed late for procrastination, we must move ahead promptly.

Accordingly, I most strongly urge that the Interstate Commerce Commission defer decision on all major rail mergers indefinitely until a national merger policy and program with proper safeguards can be developed and put into effect by the Commission, if necessary, with the help of Congress.

I further suggest that the President establish a special Commission composed of representatives from industry—that is, management and labor—the Government, and the public, to begin without delay a thorough study of this problem, and to make recommendations both to the Interstate Commerce Commission and to Congress in connection with the development of this national transportation merger policy.

In particular, I suggest that the Department of Justice be represented on the President's Commission to insure that the antitrust and anticompetitive aspects of this problem be fully presented. And I also suggest that the Department of Defense be represented to make certain that any policy recommendations are consistent with a strong military defense program.

In conclusion, I should like to state, Mr. President, that I see in this railroad picture a trend which I have observed in a number of other large industries in this country—a trend toward eliminating competition and countervailing power, so that one, or a few, companies can control the market and dictate the terms without fear of opposition. I see in these railroad mergers just another facet in the overall growth of financial and economic concentration of power in the hands of a few. I am indeed afraid of this kind of growth, as it affects our basic principles of freedom.

EXHIBIT I

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST
AND MONOPOLY,
November 10, 1961.

Hon. LEE LOEVINGER,
Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JUDGE LOEVINGER: I want you to know that I am deeply concerned over the recent announcements in the press that the Nation's two largest transportation companies, the Pennsylvania and the New York Central, have agreed to seek approval of a merger of their systems as soon as possible.

This proposed merger raises serious questions not only with respect to the elimination of substantial rail competition in the heaviest industrial area of the country, but also with respect to the future pattern of mergers in the railroad industry, and in the airline and trucking industries as well.

In particular a merger of this magnitude puts into sharp perspective the compelling need for the Interstate Commerce Commission to come up with a general merger plan, rather than to consider each merger application separately as it has done in the past. Certainly any determination of the pending merger applications of the Chesapeake & Ohio, and of the Norfolk & Western, and even that of the Atlantic Coast Line, would have to take into account the total effect which this giant new merger will have on rail competition east of the Mississippi River. Perhaps there lies behind this extraordinary merger proposal a desire to press the Commission into an overall merger study. The New York Central petitioned for such a study 2 years ago and its request was turned down by the Commission.

Whatever the intentions of the managements of the Pennsylvania and New York Central, this proposal has spotlighted some basic issues which should be of real concern to those of us who are dedicated to preserving business freedom and the benefits of competition.

In the first place, the merger would create substantial financial size and power with combined assets of $5.7 billion and operating revenues of over $1.6 billion. The new company would be almost twice the size of the Chesapeake & Ohio, the Baltimore & Ohio, and the Norfolk & Western combined. There is every likelihood that the merger, if approved, would force a combination of all remaining eastern railroads into a second system, but one wonders whether this system would be large enough to contain the power of the Pennsylvania-Central combine.

Second, I am informed that the merger may concentrate management control in the hands of certain large financial groups which have managing interests in a number of large shippers in the eastern region, and which also control or influence the operations of certain railroads in other parts of the country. At the very least, under this situation a competing shipper is in a potentially uncompetitive position vis-a-vis the shipper which is a part of the financial complex behind the merged railroad. Interlocking directorates presently exist between each of the merging companies and shippers, or banks which control or influence the operations of shippers. There is no reason to believe that such interlocks will not continue. Nor is there any reason to believe that the new company will not favor those other railroads which are affiliated through these financial interlocks to the detriment of competing roads. Of particular concern will be the enhanced position of the Norfolk & Western, Wabash, and Lehigh Valley, which are controlled by the Pennsylvania and the Missouri Pacific, and other roads in which the Alleghany Corp. has substantial interests.

Third, despite the arguments made by the railroads that mergers are essential to increase earnings, improve efficiency, eliminate wasteful duplication and attract new capital, should not the shippers be protected with competitive routing between major points across the country? Is not this as fundamental a part of the public interest as any of these other factors? Yet a combination of Pennsylvania and the New York Central is a giant step toward regional monopoly and the elimination of vital competition between major points where traffic is sufficient to support such competition. This leads to the suggestion that perhaps three transcontinental systems (by end-to-end mergers) would be vastly more effective in protecting competition and at the same time enhancing the financial condition of the railroads. At the very base of such a plan, should there not be the arm's-length separation between the Pennsylvania, the New York Central, and the Baltimore & Ohio in the East, just as there should be the separation between the Southern Pacific, the Santa Fe, and the Union Pacific in the West? However, under the present merger pattern, exemplified by this Pennsylvania-New York Central proposal, the trend is to regional combines resulting in only one, or at the most two, carrier choices between major points.

Fourth, the development of a regional power such as the Pennsylvania-New York Central will give it substantial leverage through its increased traffic in dealing with other railroads at interchange points. Where formerly these interchange roads competed for Pennsylvania and New York Central traffic, they would, under the merger, be practically at the mercy of the giant combine for their appropriate share. This might be strong inducement for competing companies at interchange points to merge in order to get out from under the leverage.

I know that the Department of Justice has intervened in a number of these railroad merger proceedings, and that it has recently opposed the Atlantic Coast Line-Seaboard merger application before the Commission. It is encouraging to know that the Department, and more specifically the Antitrust Division, is analyzing each of these mergers and will point out to the Commission where their anticompetitive effects are not commensurate with the public interest.

The reason for this letter, however, is to indicate my deep concern over a new phase in the merger development—the supermerger directed toward regional monopoly, which may have a serious and rapid snowballing effect throughout the country, and force the Commission into a general investigation. It is because of this that I urge you to make a prompt and thorough investigation of the anticompetitive and monopolistic effects of this proposed Pennsylvania-New York Central merger, not limited to its effects on rail competition, but covering those effects on nonrail competition through its interlocking financial overlay and ownership. Such an investigation might well indicate the desirability of intervention by the Department in the Interstate Commerce Commission proceeding in opposition to the merger.

I have directed the subcommittee staff to make a continuing study of developments in this merger trend, and I hope that you will keep us apprised of the Division's actions in this case which is of such vast importance to antitrust.

Sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER,
Chairman.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has in effect expressed disapproval of the proposed merger of the Nation's two largest railroads—the Pennsylvania and the New York Central. Those two railroads carry more passengers than any other two railroads in the United States, but they are losing money every month on their passenger business.

Twenty years ago the largest single item of revenue of the Pennsylvania Railroad was received from the transportation of coal. At the present time the Pennsylvania Railroad carries only one-third the amount of coal it did 20 years ago. The same problem exists in respect to the loss of passengers in the case of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad.

IMPROPER FINANCING OF THE NEW YORK, NEW HAVEN & HARTFORD RAILROAD BY THE ICC

Mr. President, the Joint Committee on Defense Production, of which I am chairman, had the responsibility of inquiring into a loan guarantee request made by the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad on June 5, 1961, under authority of the Defense Production Act. This railroad had previously obtained loan guarantees in the amount of $23,159,400 under the authority of the Interstate Commerce Act. From the studies conducted by the staff of our Joint Committee after the filing of the DPA loan application, it appeared that the effort to switch from the loan guarantee authority of one act to that of another was due to the restrictive provision in the Interstate Commerce Act which provides that no guarantee shall be made—

> (4) unless the Commission finds that the prospective earning power of the applicant carrier, together with the character and value of the security pledged, if any, furnish reasonable assurance of the applicant's ability to repay the loan within the time fixed therefor and reasonable protection to the United States.

It was understood at that time that a request for additional guaranteed funds for the New Haven by President George Alpert from ICC was being denied.

Although the amount of $16 million had been guaranteed under the DPA authority in connection with rebuilding the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad following the flood in 1955, there was clearly no authority to guarantee a loan under the Defense Production Act for operating this railroad. As chairman, I so advised the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization—now OEP—in a letter dated June 22, 1961. On July 6, 1961, the White House made public a letter of the same date from the Director of OCDM to the Secretary of the Treasury stating that he was unable to certify the loan as essential under the terms of the statute.

During the course of these studies considerable information has come to my attention with regard to the irregular manner in which the guaranteed loan program of the Interstate Commerce Commission is being administered. The improper administration of this program is due to the failure of the Interstate Commerce Commission to recognize and carry out the law as it is written. This Commission has a responsibility not only to the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, but also to the taxpayers, to the Congress, and to the remainder of the transportation industry. The testimony in March of 1961 was to the effect that this one railroad had received 23 percent of all of the funds expended from the $500 million loan guarantee authority which was set up for the entire railroad industry.

As of the end of 1961, the Interstate Commerce Commission had guaranteed loans to this railroad in the amount of $35,659,400 and had announced its intention to guarantee an additional loan of $7,500,000 in April 1962. The bill presented to the Secretary of the Treasury on July 11, 1961, under the back-door financing plan on the 1955–56 loans amounted to $11,797,198. This means that when the ICC has carried out its announced intention, the New Haven Railroad will have obtained a total of $54,956,598 in Government guaranteed funds while the total repayments on ICC loans amount to only $868,960.

This railroad is now in receivership, has not operated at a profit since 1956, and its deficits have increased substantially each year since 1956. Even though this railroad has lost more than $50 million since it has made an annual profit, the Interstate Commerce Commission was willing to act favorably upon a $7.5 million loan guarantee as late as December 8, 1961. Yet, this Commission was required to make a finding under the law that there was reasonable assurance that this railroad would repay the loan.

They are proposing to make more loans today, when the Commission knows that the railroad has no present prospect of being able to repay them. We have the problem of keeping afloat a railroad which carries a great many commuters between Boston and New York, and we have the problem, already mentioned, of the merger of the New York Central Railroad and the Pennsylvania Railroad, which is primarily a passenger problem.

The finding in this instance of a "reasonable assurance of repayment" of the loan is inconsistent with the Commission's press release of August 30, 1961, asking for direct Federal grants of $7,300,000 for the New Haven Railroad, and stating in the press release:

> It is highly improbable that the New Haven can emerge from reorganization and continue to render essential transportation services in the absence of direct Federal grants.

It is equally inconsistent with the subsidy program advocated by the Interstate Commerce Commission, in its annual report released last week.

The following facts were available to the Commission when it made the finding on December 8, 1961, that there was a reasonable expectation that this bankrupt railroad would repay the loan: The ICC knew that the trustees had not been successful in arresting the out-of-pocket losses, that there was an estimated deficit of $21.8 million for 1961, that the earnings estimates were increasingly pessimistic, that the railroad had long suffered from the deferred maintenance policy and mismanagement of former presidents, Patrick J. McGinnis and George Alpert, that the forecast for 1962 was for a deficit of $20.6 million, and that the trustees were talking in terms of saving a mere $750,000 per year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 16, page 21022, I made a statement to the Senate regarding a request of the Interstate Commerce Commission for a supplemental appropriation of $14.7 million to cover defaulted loans of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad. I stated at that time that I was astounded that any Government agency would guarantee the repayment of $14.7 million in loans as the ICC had done under the then existing circumstances coupled with the fact that the railroad still owed the Government most of the $16 million in loans guaranteed under the Defense Production Act.

On page 230 of the hearings on this item before the Subcommittee on Deficiencies, House Appropriations Committee, on August 14, 1961, it was brought out, as I had previously stated, that the president of this railroad, George Alpert, was a member of the board of directors when Patrick J. McGinnis was trafficking in the company stock and evidently knew about these details, that prior to becoming president he was a Boston lawyer without previous experience in operating a railroad, and that he secured a contract from the directors to pay him a total of $600,000 in salary and retirement benefits for services for a period of only 5 years. In addition, my staff has obtained figures that reveal that during the time that George Alpert has been president of this railroad, the law firm of Alpert & Alpert received at least $387,017, that an associate law firm received $182,363, and that his son, William Alpert, received at least $47,192 from 1957 to 1959 in legal fees. It is understood that William Alpert is continuing to receive fees from this railroad. The state of the records of the Interstate Commerce Commission is such that complete figures to date are not available.

In the hearings before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, on September 20, 1961, on the $14.7 million item, Commissioner Tuggle acknowledged on page 514 that the House Appropriations Committee had cautioned the ICC to be more careful in making loans in the future. The actions by the ICC to date indicate that the warnings of the Congress on the improper administration of the loan program have been ignored.

In guaranteeing the most recent loan for $7.5 million in December 1961, the ICC was willing to lend funds under the pretense of buying additional time to determine from surveys whether this railroad can be restored to a profitable basis. That question the ICC had already answered when it concluded in the same report that the earning power even under the most favorable circumstances could not be considered encouraging. These continued statements of the Interstate Commerce Commission regarding the future earning power of this bankrupt railroad are very similar to the earlier statements of Patrick J. McGinnis and George Alpert. The railroad officials and the ICC either knew or should have known long ago that these loans would never be repaid. Their actions have constituted nothing less than a determination to transform a loan program into a subsidy program contrary to any provision of law.

The Congress has not authorized direct Federal grants for the New Haven Railroad as requested by the ICC, and the ICC should administer the guaranteed loan program in accordance with the language contained in the Interstate Commerce Act rather than in accordance with their own personal desires. In my statement of September 23, I pointed out that the House Appropriations Committee had emphasized that funds advanced under the Interstate Commerce Act are loans and not subsidies, saying:

> The committee has not made a final recommendation on the budget request for $14,700,000 to honor guarantees on loans made by certain banks to the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad. These loans are now in default and the committee realizes that the debt will have to be paid. The law authorizes $500 million back-door spending for loan guarantees to railroads for equipment and improvements. The members of the Interstate Commerce Commission who presented the case to the committee were of the opinion the loans when made were good; but the committee is of the opinion it is highly doubtful from the facts available or presented to the ICC if the loans were consistent with good business judgment. These were repayable business loans and not subsidies. The committee failure to make recommendation to the House that the loans be repaid at this time is to point up to the ICC the need of giving more consideration to these back-door spending loans in the future.

When the ICC loan program was first considered in 1958, it was stated in Senate Report No. 1647, dated June 3, 1958, that—

> The subcommittee is desirious of preventing bankruptcy for those railroads that are in a precarious financial condition, but at the same time does not contemplate that this should constitute a giveaway program.

In the hearings before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on March 1, 1961, a letter dated January 24, 1961, was inserted into the record by a member of the committee which Chairman Hutchinson of the ICC had written to the six States concerned with the continued operation of the New Haven. In this letter the Chairman of ICC pointed out that the New Haven Railroad had received 23 percent of all guaranteed loans and that this amounted to $18,159,400 in comparison with $79.3 million in total guaranteed loans. He stated further that the loan guarantees in October and December 1960 were based in considerable part upon the expectation that the New Haven would receive substantial financial aid at the State and local levels early in 1961. He continued by stating that in the absence of such expectation, the Commission would have been unable to make the required statutory finding of reasonable assurance of the applicant's ability to repay the loan within the time fixed therefor and reasonable protection to the United States. Chairman Hutchinson further stated in his letter of January 24, 1961:

> We believe that we should advise each of you at this time that unless such financial assistance is actually afforded New Haven promptly, it is difficult to see how we can make the required statutory finding for the guarantee of any further loan to the New Haven.

It is evident from this language that Chairman Hutchinson knew on January 24, 1961, that the required legal finding could not be made to justify further loans to the New Haven Railroad, that he was speaking for the Interstate Commerce Commission, but that in spite of this clear understanding of the legal requirements the ICC was willing to guarantee four loans after the date of this letter amounting to a total of $17,500,000 which they either knew or should have known could not be repaid from earnings. Chairman Hutchinson, in writing the letter of January 24, 1961, recognized that the authority contained in title V of the Interstate Commerce Act provides for the lending of funds and that it was never intended as a subsidy program, for he stated at that time:

> We are sure you will appreciate the Congress has not empowered us in title V of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide a recurrent subsidy to any railroad.

Mr. Hutchinson emphasized this point by stating that the fact that the loan guarantee provisions had an early expiration date was further evidence that Congress did not intend by this legislation to empower ICC "to subsidize continuously any railroad."

The closing paragraph of this letter does not indicate there was any lack of understanding as to the conditions under which loans were to be made or as to the responsibility of the States, for Chairman Hutchinson concluded this letter by stating:

> Although the New Haven's future is not the exclusive responsibility of the State and local governments involved, we must again emphasize the necessity for prompt State and local assistance in an adequate amount and point out that we cannot recommend or approve any further assumption of Federal responsibility without prompt and positive assurances that State and local communities are ready and willing to assume a substantial part of the burden.

The Interstate Commerce Commission appears to have abandoned its effort to place a reasonable and proper interpretation upon the provisions of law covering these guaranteed loans between January 24, 1961, and March 1, 1961.

By March of 1961, Chairman Hutchinson had little to say about safeguarding the interest of the Government in his testimony requesting an extension of this lending authority. Instead of emphasizing that this is not a subsidy program as he had written in January, he emphasized that ICC was not required to follow banking standards in making loans. Mr. Hutchinson had left no doubt that there must be a reasonable assurance that loans will be repaid in his January letter, but by March he was more concerned about eliminating the necessity of coming to the Congress for annual appropriations than in a sound lending policy—another evidence of the inherent impropriety of backdoor financing of which the vast sum of $28 billion is now authorized outside of the budget and beyond congressional control.

In connection with the continuation of loan guarantees to the New Haven following the January letter, Mr. Hutchinson was asked to state the basis of his finding that the situation had changed. One would expect the head of a commission charged with lending $500 million to give some justification closely related to the ability of the borrower to repay the loan. The answer was that the principal change was in the extremely adverse weather conditions in the seaboard area and a strike of certain railroad marine workers in New York.

The record indicates that the Interstate Commerce Commission is determined to ignore all banking precedent and all safeguards generally followed by lending institutions. It is inconceivable that a Government agency charged with the responsibility of lending and safeguarding public funds would ignore all practices and standards for arriving at reasonable values and substitute therefor a meaningless book value from the files of the New Haven Railroad.

The placing of a valuation of $431,077,981 on this bankrupt railroad for lending purposes by an agency charged with the performance of duties so closely related to the public interest is a shocking revelation. For example, the balance sheet of this railroad in receivership sets forth a valuation of $156,462,642 for the capital stock; whereas, the market value of the common and preferred stock of this railroad on the basis of the closing quotations on January 10, 1962, amounted to only $3,627,750.

In its annual report, released on January 10, 1962, the ICC requested, among other legislative changes, legislation which would authorize limited Federal grants of direct aid to rail and passenger service for the purpose of preserving adequate essential passenger service. Before that authority is granted to the ICC to administer a multimillion dollar program of back-door financing which the Appropriations Committees had neither authorized nor could subsequently review, it will pay the Congress to take another look at the manner in which the ICC is subsidizing the present operations of the New Haven Railroad without the legal authority it now requests the Congress to give it.

As emphasized by the objection this morning to the merger of the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central Railroad, if the New York Central is forced into bankruptcy—and that is where it is headed—we will have that problem added to the present problem of the New Haven. If Congress passes a law to authorize a subsidy program, we ought to know how the ICC plans to administer it.

SIX-POINT DAIRY PROGRAM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the years dairy foods have proved a mainstay in the diet of the public. Despite this, however, an imbalance of production and consumption—with a resulting surplus—has adversely affected the dairy economy.

In 1961, the Nation produced about 125 billion pounds of milk. Of this amount, the output of Wisconsin—the No. 1 dairying State—amounted to about 18 billion pounds.

For 1962, the output will, according to experts, climb still higher, from 125 to 127 billion pounds. This stepped-up production is expected to result in stockpiling still more surpluses.

Action is needed now, not after more surpluses are stacked in the warehouses, for greater efforts to find outlets for cheese, milk, butter and other dairy products. As long as there are people, especially children, suffering from malnutrition, milk, in my judgment, is not surplus.

Recently, I proposed a six-point dairy plan which, if adopted, would better serve the American public; reduce, as possible, the cost of the price support program; and brighten the outlook for the dairy industry—an important segment of our agricultural and national economy.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have the following items printed in the RECORD:

First. The six-point dairy program; and

Second. A splendid editorial by the Green Bay Press-Gazette of Green Bay, Wis., one of our outstanding newspapers, reflecting upon the merits of the ideas presented in the dairy program, particularly the need for expanding research to find more commercial-industrial uses for constituent parts of milk.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIX-POINT DAIRY PROGRAM

1. A new dairying-governmental cooperative effort to increase consumption levels.

2. Carrying forward and, as necessary, expanding, the special school milk, school lunch, food for the needy, and similar domestic programs which can serve as useful outlets for the surplus dairy foods.

3. Greater utilization of dairy—as well as other food surpluses—as strategic weapons in our foreign policy. In a hungry world, food can be a more effective persuader than a gun.

4. Explore for new markets abroad and at home.

5. Expand research by the dairy industry itself to find new more effective ways to step up consumption and utilize dairy products.

6. Enactment of the Wiley bill, S. 2414, to establish a dairy research laboratory at Madison, Wis. The purpose would be to find more commercial-industrial ways to utilize dairy products.

WE NEED TO SELL MORE MILK

Senator WILEY notes that of the 125 billion pounds of milk produced in the United States in 1961, Wisconsin as the No. 1 dairying State produced about 18 billion pounds. He says that the 1962 output is expected to go still higher from 125 to 127 million pounds nationally. Since the production and sale of milk is an important concern of all residents of Wisconsin, the projected increase in milk production is a matter of interest to all. It is of national concern also because the Senator points out the higher production may be expected to add an additional $400 million to $500 million to the cost of the price support program.

Quite obviously the dairymen cannot go on forever piling up larger and larger surpluses of milk and expect the taxpayers to buy it for the purpose of maintaining milk prices. The day will surely come when taxpayers will balk at this proposition and for that reason all persons interested in dairying are anxious to find new markets for milk.

A six-point program has been proposed by the Senator to increase the use of milk and to improve the distribution of milk to those needing it as a means of keeping this useful product out of Government warehouses.

His principal proposal is the last one which calls for the enactment of his bill to establish a dairy research laboratory at Madison. The purpose of the laboratory would be to find more commercial-industrial ways to utilize dairy products. There are of course now many industrial and commercial uses for dairy products but it is quite certain that many more could be found if a skilled group of scientists put their mind to the problem. Another proposal by the Senator is that a new dairying-governmental cooperative effort be made to increase consumption levels. There is much to be said for this and Senator WILEY has put it very well in his statement that "as long as there are people—especially children—suffering from malnutrition, milk, in my judgment, is not surplus." The American Dairy Association (ADA) is apparently in agreement with Senator WILEY on the need for increasing consumption. The ADA recognizes that limiting the dairy industry's research efforts to production is forcing increasing amounts of dairy products into Government hands.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman has called upon the dairymen to halt overproduction or run a risk of losing price supports. However, the ADA in a report to its members indicates that they prefer action to increase consumption. The statement says, "An obvious obstacle in the path of a better future is the dairy industry's hesitance about 'tampering with milk.' Milk as it comes from the cow should be looked upon as a raw material to be converted into the most salable form.

"If we can improve the taste and nutritional values of milk, for example, by using some of our tremendous surplus of nonfat dry milk to fortify fluid milk as we now fortify fluid skim milk and 2 percent fat milk, we certainly would be able to tell a much stronger story to our consumers."

The farmers and dairymen in the past have fought for stringent rules regulating the sale of milk. It is perhaps unfortunate that they have insisted upon the standard for good milk being based upon the fat content. This practice is gradually coming into question because it is not a true test of the value of milk. Many of the nonfat solids in milk are as important as the fat in determining the value of milk as a food. However, tests and the price are based upon the fat content and because this is so there is a continual emphasis on the amount of fat contained in milk and milk products.

In this day and age when a great many potential milk customers are seriously concerned with dietary problems, this constant advertising of the amount of butterfat in milk or cream may lose customers rather than entice them.

Obviously the ADA suggestion that efforts to improve the palatability and nutritional values of milk by adding more nonfat milk solids is a wise one. The farmers and dairymen who have in the past fought so hard to maintain the picture of "milk as it comes from the cow" as one of nature's most nearly perfect foods, may have to change their attitude and permit it to be improved as it surely can be. The dairymen would be well advised to follow the advice of the ADA and direct their interest away from the single field of producing more and more milk to the field of improving their product from the viewpoint of the consumer.

FOCUS ON FOREIGN TRADE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as we in Congress begin the difficult and urgent task of building sound trade legislation, we are aware that our debate in Congress is part of a debate going on all over the United States.

The quality of our legislative product will ultimately be decided by the quality and outcome of that debate. What we produce in the way of plans and programs can be little better than the programs the people of the country are ready to support.

That is why I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a handbook which has just come to my attention. It is included in the current issue of the Foreign Policy Association's information bulletin, Intercom. Its purpose is to help citizens and civic organizations meet their responsibilities for building an informed public opinion on this crucial issue.

This issue of Intercom is valuable in two ways. First, it gives a summary view of how American organizations—trade, labor, and civic groups—are organizing to take their part in the formulation of a truly national trade policy.

Secondly, it provides an effective stimulant for citizens' groups who have not yet given this issue their attention and who do not know where to begin to find out about the problems involved.

Any man or woman who is planning a club program for this year, whether in a church group, a chamber of commerce, a PTA, a labor union or a grange, can find in Intercom an informed and objective guidance through the vast mass of material recently published by Government, international, educational, and other voluntary agencies, on every aspect of the world trade problem.

Many Members of the Congress should also find it a useful device for helping constitutents to educate themselves about the many aspects we are obliged to consider in developing the pending legislation.

I believe that most of us agree with the Intercom appraisal of the importance of this trade issue when it says:

> A trade policy must be beaten out between now and the end of June 1962, and its quality may well determine whether the Khrushchev boast that he will "bury us" looks to the seventies like dire prophecy or comic arrogance.

This same article also states:

> Only the alert activity of the full range of voluntary organizations can express all the urgent interests of all Americans: Their interest as earners and as consumers, as well as their overriding interests in the Nation's continuing economic power to meet all challenges. The decisions which must be made in the next 6 months present a special challenge to American voluntary organizations and civic groups all over the United States. For in this debate, the articulate public opinion they mobilize or fail to mobilize can be decisive.

I believe Intercom's guide to sources of information on the trade debate can make a valuable contribution to an informed and articulate public opinion during our deliberations in the next 6 months.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the introductory article of this issue of Intercom, published by the Foreign Policy Association-World Affairs Center, 345 East 46th Street, Now York, N.Y.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOCUS ON TRADE

The United States now faces a crossroads in the history of the free and open society. A trade policy must be beaten out between now and the end of June 1962, and its quality may well determine whether the Khrushchev boast that he will bury us looks to the seventies like dire prophecy or comic arrogance.

URGENCY OF TRADE DEBATE

This is not a matter of choice. It is a fact, dictated by events. The present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act lapses on that date. Meanwhile, the world in which we are trading has become radically different from the world in which that legislation was enacted, and movements are already under way which will lead to even more radical changes in the nature of the markets we serve or seek and in the competition we face both for markets and supplies.

Facing changes in its market, changes in its competition, changes in its sources of supply, any sound enterprise, public or private, must necessarily reconsider its policies, its products, its financing, its whole way of doing business.

PUBLIC OPINION DECISIVE

The decisions which must be made in the next six months present a special challenge to American voluntary organizations and civic groups all over the United States. For in this debate, the articulate public opinion they mobilize or fail to mobilize can be decisive.

Only the alert activity of the full range of voluntary organizations can express all the urgent interests of all Americans: their interests as earners and as consumers, as well as their overriding interests in the Nation's continuing economic power to meet all challenges.

WHAT ARE ALTERNATIVES

It is the job of these voluntary organizations—agreeing with one another and disagreeing, in cooperation or in conflict—to keep the debate on the ground of real alternatives, with wishful thinking clearly offside.

We are not, for instance, asked to approve or disapprove of the Common Market, of the new independence of many commodity-producing countries, of the Communist economic offensive with its tempting credits and vast markets. These are facts which we must decide how to deal with.

We are not asked whether the world's technological skill should continue to develop at accelerating speeds, or whether we should have launched into the world our revolutionary doctrine that all men may hope for a life of decent human dignity.

We are asked to decide how we will run our affairs to maintain our high leadership of the forces of freedom in a world which is rapidly learning the lessons we ourselves have taught, in which even the Communists use our present standard of living to define their highest hopes for the future.

UNCHANGING NATIONAL PURPOSES

The debate is not between the status quo and change in trade patterns. It is a debate about what changes we must make to serve our unchanging national purposes.

It is not a debate between free trade and protectionism. It is a debate about what kind and degree of protection can be most helpful to affected areas and industries, with least damage to the larger world interest of these and all other American groups.

It is not a debate between free enterprise and Government intervention. It is a debate about what kind of legislation, what kind of executive authority is needed to keep the channels of trade open, and to alleviate the effects of changing trade patterns where they are most acutely painful.

A sound trade policy must balance a whole series of regional and special interests against the long-term interest of all of these groups and of the country as a whole.

A sound and constructive trade policy must also take account of the organic ties which bind our own security and prosperity to those of our allies. It must support and enhance, and certainly not counteract, national security programs designed to strengthen our alliances by helping our allies to strengthen themselves.

It must express and justify our national faith in our free enterprise system and in the constantly renewed productivity of fair and open competition.

TEST FOR DEMOCRATIC PROCESS

Donald K. David, former dean of the Harvard School of Business, in a letter to the American businessman said, "the most important struggle in the world today is the competition between systems of decisionmaking."

The trade issue poses a crucial test for the democratic process of decisionmaking.

The urgent need for trade policies to meet new trading conditions, touching as it does on the most sensitive nerves and affecting the most vital energies of our society and coming at a time of general international crisis, will be a severe test of our whole democratic machinery. How it works in this coming encounter will be a measure of its capacity to survive in a world of violent and accelerating technological and social change.

The press and airwaves will be flooded with arguments and with statistics to support all of them.

The Congress has already before it a whole series of specially commissioned studies and has begun a long series of public hearings.

This Focus describes the publications and attitudes of many voluntary organizations now tooled up to take their part in this vital discussion. Some are actively engaged in support of administration proposals, some in opposition, some promoting various modifications and alterations and some seeking, as we do, only to assure a sound and thorough debate.

In the battle for the attention, understanding, and support of the American people, the voluntary organizations—those which plead for particular policies and those which do not take any positions—have a crucial job to do.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a summary of monthly personnel reports on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government issued during the recess of the Congress. These reports were concerned with employment and payrolls during the period July to November 1961, inclusive.

In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent that the summary, together with a statement by me, be printed in the body of the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Personnel and pay summary, July through November 1961

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In November numbered—	In July numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In October was—	In June was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,437,668	2,435,804	+1,864	$1,186,951	$1,171,937	+$15,014
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,377,331	1,392,621	−15,290	653,840	648,606	+5,234
Department of Defense	1,060,337	1,043,183	+17,154	533,111	523,331	+9,780
Inside the United States	2,273,924	2,277,043	−3,119			
Outside the United States	163,744	158,761	+4,983			
Industrial employment	569,208	559,345	+9,863			
Foreign nationals	170,317	168,659	+1,658	25,165	24,789	+376

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

Table I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1961, and comparison with July 1961, and pay for October 1961, and comparison with June 1961*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	November	July	Increase	Decrease	October	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	94,216	103,767		9,551	$45,586	$45,769		$183
Commerce [1,2]	28,783	30,618		1,835	17,815	16,571	$1,244	
Health, Education, and Welfare	72,747	71,844	903		35,995	35,662	393	
Interior	54,546	59,525		4,979	29,867	30,095		228
Justice	30,998	31,582		584	19,425	19,419	6	
Labor	7,728	7,636	92		4,396	4,208	188	
Post Office	587,042	588,082		1,040	252,581	249,605	2,976	
State [3,4,5,6]	39,254	39,110	144		17,641	18,194		553
Treasury	80,498	81,752		1,254	44,406	44,028	378	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	419	418	1		254	273		19
Bureau of the Budget	453	473		20	380	404		24
Council of Economic Advisers	43	41	2		32	32		
Executive Mansion and Grounds	73	71	2		36	32	4	
National Security Council	44	51		7	35	46		11
National Aeronautics and Space Council	16	4	12		10	4	6	
Office of Emergency Planning [7,8]	525	1,838		1,313	489	1,245		756
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations [9]	33	13	20		12	9	3	
Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission						3		3
American Battle Monuments Commission	414	446		32	85	85		
Atomic Energy Commission	6,813	6,973		160	4,790	4,791		1
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	609	612		3	379	375	4	
Civil Aeronautics Board	778	774	4		556	542	14	
Civil Service Commission	3,867	3,800	67		2,258	2,268		10
Civil War Centennial Commission	6	7		1	4	5		1
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6			5	4	1	
Commission on Civil Rights	56	77		21	32	60		28
Development Loan Fund [3]		152		152	101	111		10
Export-Import Bank of Washington	261	265		4	177	174	3	
Farm Credit Administration	239	235	4		168	161	7	
Federal Aviation Agency	43,279	43,229	50		27,363	26,375	988	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			5	4	1	
Federal Communications Commission	1,366	1,461		95	900	891	9	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,275	1,303		28	793	788	5	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,138	1,145		7	713	704	9	

See **footnotes at end of table.**

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1961, and comparison with July 1961, and pay for October 1961, and comparison with June 1961*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	November	July	Increase	Decrease	October	June	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued								
Federal Maritime Commission [2]	134		134		$86		$86	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	360	357	3		297	$293	4	
Federal Power Commission	905	932		27	609	590	19	
Federal Trade Commission	976	904	72		643	584	59	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	61	57	4		45	43	2	
General Accounting Office	4,813	4,960		147	2,959	2,971		$12
General Services Administration	30,713	30,365	348		14,010	13,709	301	
Government Printing Office	6,887	6,750	137		3,814	3,819		5
Housing and Home Finance Agency	12,069	11,612	457		7,231	6,900	331	
Indian Claims Commission	20	17	3		18	15	3	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,397	2,401		4	1,535	1,536		1
James Madison Memorial Commission	1	1			1		1	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	18,630	18,055	575		12,428	13,002		574
National Capital Housing Authority	424	406	18		182	171	11	
National Capital Planning Commission	56	54	2		37	36	1	
National Capital Transportation Agency	65	36	29		35	14	21	
National Gallery of Art	311	327		16	127	142		15
National Labor Relations Board	1,830	1,847		17	1,216	1,187	29	
National Mediation Board	153	136	17		117	123		6
National Science Foundation	846	723	123		470	468	2	
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission	47	55		8	35	36		1
Panama Canal	14,426	14,365	61		4,604	4,570	34	
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	39	34	5		25	15	10	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,133	2,279		146	1,111	1,148		37
Renegotiation Board	259	270		11	212	215		3
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	164	160	4		97	95	2	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,158	1,097	61		738	707	31	
Selective Service System	6,826	6,598	228		2,121	2,059	62	
Small Business Administration	2,858	2,714	144		1,909	1,577	332	
Smithsonian Institution	1,156	1,173		17	556	547	9	
Soldiers' Home	1,031	1,051		20	333	346		13
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	56	52	4		41	38	3	
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	26			25	23	2	
Tariff Commission	267	278		11	186	196		10
Tax Court of the United States	149	147	2		110	107	3	
Tennessee Valley Authority	18,759	17,707	1,052		11,179	9,894	1,285	
Texas Water Study Commission	33	47		14	23	32		9
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency [10]	53		53		34		34	
U.S. Information Agency	11,030	10,907	123		4,460	4,402	58	
Veterans' Administration	177,026	175,773	1,253		72,786	73,972		1,186
Virgin Islands Corporation	652	631	21		106	147		41
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,377,331	1,392,621	6,234	21,524	653,840	648,606	8,974	3,740
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			15,290				5,234	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense [7] [11]	3,211	2,032	1,179		2,306	1,485	821	
Department of the Army	398,059	390,919	7,140		192,160	189,875	2,285	
Department of the Navy	353,644	347,410	6,234		189,238	181,425	7,813	
Department of the Air Force	305,423	302,822	2,601		149,407	150,546		1,139
Total, Department of Defense	1,060,337	1,043,183	17,154		533,111	523,331	10,919	1,139
Net increase, Department of Defense			17,154				9,780	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [12]	2,437,668	2,435,804	23,388	21,524	1,186,951	1,171,937	19,893	4,897
Net increase, including Department of Defense			1,864				15,014	

---

[1] November figure includes 132 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

[2] Pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961, the Federal Maritime Board in the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, was abolished and its duties and functions were transferred to a new independent agency, the Federal Maritime Commission created thereby. The transfer was effective Aug. 12, 1961, and involved 107 employees.

[3] Effective Nov. 4, 1961, pursuant to Executive Order 10973 dated Nov. 3, 1961, and Public Law 87-195, the Agency for International Development was created and assumed the functions and duties of the International Cooperation Administration and the Development Loan Fund abolished thereby.

[4] November figure includes 14,875 employees of the Agency for International Development and their pay. This November AID figure includes 3,432 employees paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose.

[5] July figure includes 14,867 employees of the International Cooperation Administration and their pay. This July ICA figure includes 3,580 employees paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose.

[6] November figure includes 417 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 312 in July and their pay.

[7] Pursuant to Executive Order 10952, dated July 20, 1961, 1,106 employees of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and their duties and functions were transferred to the Office of the Secretary of Defense effective Aug. 1, 1961.

[8] Public Law 87-296, approved Sept. 22, 1961, changed the name of the "Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization" to "Office of Emergency Planning."

[9] Agency abolished.

[10] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 87-297.

[11] November figure includes 1,118 employees of the Office of Civil Defense.

[12] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1961, and comparison with July 1961*

Department or agency	November	July	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	93,178	102,735		9,557
Commerce [1] [2]	28,171	30,016		1,845
Health, Education, and Welfare	72,240	71,380	860	
Interior	54,034	59,022		4,988
Justice	30,665	31,246		581
Labor	7,643	7,540	103	
Post Office	585,654	586,708		1,054
State [3] [4] [5] [6]	10,065	10,036	29	
Treasury	79,916	81,176		1,260
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	419	418	1	
Bureau of the Budget	453	473		20
Council of Economic Advisers	43	41	2	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	73	71	2	
National Security Council		44	51	7
Executive Office of the President—Continued				
National Aeronautics and Space Council	16	4	12	
Office of Emergency Planning [7] [8]	525	1,838		1,313
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intragovernmental Relations	33	13	20	
American Battle Monuments Commission	10	11		1
Atomic Energy Commission	6,781	6,941		160
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	609	612		3
Civil Aeronautics Board	777	773	4	
Civil Service Commission	3,865	3,797	68	
Civil War Centennial Commission	6	7		1
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6		
Commission on Civil Rights	56	77		21
Development Loan Fund [3]		152		152
Export-Import Bank of Washington	261	265		4

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1961, and comparison with July 1961*—Continued

Department or agency	November	July	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued				
Farm Credit Administration	239	235	4	
Federal Aviation Agency	42,320	42,263	57	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7		
Federal Communications Commission	1,363	1,459		96
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,273	1,301		28
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,138	1,145		7
Federal Maritime Commission [2]	134		134	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	360	357	3	
Federal Power Commission	905	932		27
Federal Trade Commission	976	904	72	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	58	55	3	
General Accounting Office	4,747	4,894		147
General Services Administration	30,712	30,365	347	
Government Printing Office	6,887	6,750	137	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,908	11,461	447	
Indian Claims Commission	20	17	3	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,397	2,401		4
James Madison Memorial Commission	1	1		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	18,618	18,045	573	
National Capital Housing Authority	424	406	18	
National Capital Planning Commission	56	54	2	
National Capital Transportation Agency	65	36	29	
National Gallery of Art	311	327		16
National Labor Relations Board	1,799	1,818		19
National Mediation Board	153	136	17	
National Science Foundation	836	716	120	
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission	47	55		8
Panama Canal	157	167		10
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	39	34	5	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,133	2,279		146
Renegotiation Board	259	270		11
Independent agencies—Continued				
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	164	160	4	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,158	1,097	61	
Selective Service System	6,669	6,441	228	
Small Business Administration	2,819	2,679	140	
Smithsonian Institution	1,146	1,164		18
Soldiers' Home	1,031	1,051		20
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	56	52	4	
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	26		
Tariff Commission	267	278		11
Tax Court of the United States	149	147	2	
Tennessee Valley Authority	18,753	17,699	1,054	
Texas Water Study Commission	33	47		14
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmanent Agency [9]	46		46	
U.S. Information Agency	2,976	2,872	104	
Veterans' Administration	175,980	174,732	1,248	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,317,158	1,332,744	5,963	21,549
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			15,586	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense [7, 10]	3,153	1,988	1,165	
Department of the Army	346,378	341,534	4,844	
Department of the Navy	330,210	324,474	5,736	
Department of the Air Force	277,025	276,303	722	
Total, Department of Defense	956,766	944,299	12,467	
Net increase, Department of Defense			12,467	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,273,924	2,277,043	18,430	21,549
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			3,119	

---

[1] November figure includes 132 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.

[2] Pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961, the Federal Maritime Board in the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, was abolished and its duties and functions were transferred to a new independent agency, the Federal Maritime Commission created thereby. The transfer was effective Aug. 12, 1961, and involved 107 employees

[3] Effective Nov. 4, 1961, pursuant to Executive Order 10973 dated Nov. 3, 1961, and Public Law 87-195, the Agency for International Development was created and assumed the functions and duties of the International Cooperation Administration and the Development Loan Fund abolished thereby.

[4] November figure includes 2,287 employees of the Agency for International Development.

[5] July figure includes 2,204 employees of the International Cooperation Administration.

[6] November figure includes 380 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 302 in July.

[7] Pursuant to Executive Order 10952, dated July 20, 1961, 1,106 employees of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and their duties and functions were transferred to the Office of the Secretary of Defense effective Aug. 1, 1961.

[8] Public Law 87-296, approved Sept. 22, 1961, changed the name of the "Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization" to "Office of Emergency Planning."

[9] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 87-297.

[10] November figure includes 1,118 employees of the Office of Civil Defense.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1961, and comparison with July 1961*

Department or agency	November	July	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,038	1,032	6	
Commerce	612	602	10	
Health, Education, and Welfare	507	464	43	
Interior	512	503	9	
Justice	333	336		3
Labor	85	96		11
Post Office	1,388	1,374	14	
State [1, 2, 3, 4]	29,189	29,074	115	
Treasury	582	576	6	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	404	435		31
Atomic Energy Commission	32	32		
Civil Aeronautics Board	1	1		
Civil Service Commission	2	3		1
Federal Aviation Agency	959	966		7
Federal Communications Commission	3	2	1	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2		
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	3	2	1	
General Accounting Office	66	66		
General Services Administration	1		1	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	161	151	10	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	12	10	2	
National Labor Relations Board	31	29	2	
National Science Foundation	10	7	3	
Panama Canal	14,269	14,198	71	
Independent agencies—Continued				
Selective Service System	157	157		
Small Business Administration	39	35	4	
Smithsonian Institution	10	9	1	
Tennessee Valley Authority	6	8		2
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency [5]	7		7	
U.S. Information Agency	8,054	8,035	19	
Veterans' Administration	1,046	1,041	5	
Virgin Islands Corporation	652	631	21	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	60,173	59,877	351	55
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			296	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	58	44	14	
Department of the Army	51,681	49,385	2,296	
Department of the Navy	23,434	22,936	498	
Department of the Air Force	28,398	26,519	1,879	
Total, Department of Defense	103,571	98,884	4,687	
Net increase, Department of Defense			4,687	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	163,744	158,761	5,038	55
Net increase, including Department of Defense			4,983	

---

[1] Effective Nov. 4, 1961, pursuant to Executive Order 10973 dated Nov. 3, 1961, and Public Law 87-195, the Agency for International Development was created and assumed the functions and duties of the International Cooperation Administration and the Development Loan Fund abolished thereby.

[2] November figure includes 12,588 employees of the Agency for International Development. This November AID figure includes 3,432 employees paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose.

[3] July figure includes 12,663 employees of the International Cooperation Administration. This July ICA figure includes 3,580 employees paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose.

[4] November figure includes 37 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 10 in July.

[5] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 87-297.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1961, and comparison with July 1961*

Department or agency	November	July	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,844	4,019		175
Commerce	5,592	5,713		121
Interior	8,120	6,793	1,327	
Post Office	246	247		1
Treasury	5,219	5,200	19	
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	243	268		25
Federal Aviation Agency	1,892	1,825	67	
General Services Administration	1,624	1,474	150	
Government Printing Office	6,887	6,750	137	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	18,630	18,055	575	
Panama Canal	7,381	7,362	19	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	126	127		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	15,866	14,750	1,116	
Virgin Islands Corporation	652	631	21	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	76,322	73,214	3,431	323
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			3,108	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 141,500	[2] 141,041	459	
Outside the United States	[1] 4,600	[2] 4,539	61	
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	206,410	200,838	5,572	
Outside the United States	457	447	10	
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	138,525	137,851	674	
Outside the United States	1,394	1,415		21
Total, Department of Defense	492,886	486,131	6,776	21
Net increase, Department of Defense			6,755	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	569,208	559,345	10,207	344
Net increase, including Department of Defense			9,863	

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of November 1961 and comparison with July 1961*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force		National Aeronautics and Space Administration	
	November	July	November	July	November	July	November	July	November	July
Australia	1	1							1	1
Canada	35	35					35	35		
Crete	50	49					50	49		
England	3,681	3,299			49	25	3,632	3,274		
France	21,488	21,079	18,296	17,816	11	9	3,181	3,254		
Germany	80,988	79,461	67,614	66,638	85	87	13,289	12,736		
Greece	265	271					265	271		
Japan	54,181	54,832	19,486	19,956	14,732	14,612	19,963	20,264		
Korea	6,226	6,216	6,226	6,216						
Morocco	2,733	2,767			829	844	1,904	1,923		
Netherlands	50	42					50	42		
Norway	24	23					24	23		
Saudi Arabia	4	5					4	5		
Trinidad	591	579			591	579				
Total	170,317	168,659	111,622	110,626	16,297	16,156	42,397	41,876	1	1

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government increased 1,864 during the period July through November 1961. The total in July was 2,435,804. In November there were 2,437,668 civilian employees.

Employment by civilian agencies of the Federal Government showed a net decrease of 15,290 during the period from July through November 1961, decreasing from 1,392,621 in July to 1,377,331 in November. Civilian employment in the Department of Defense increased 17,154 during the same period, increasing from 1,043,183 in July to 1,060,337 in November.

In the Department of Defense white-collar employment increased 10,399 from 557,052 in July to 567,451 in November, and industrial employment increased 6,755 from 486,131 in July to 492,886 in November.

In June the Federal civilian payroll was running at an annual rate of $14,063 million and in October it was running at an annual rate of $14,243 million.

These figures summarize compilations of monthly personnel reports certified by executive agencies to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures since Congress adjourned September 27, 1961.

In addition to this regularly reported civilian employment, there were foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from usual personnel reporting, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid. These numbered 168,659 in July and 170,317 in November, an increase of 1,658.

THE POWER TO CHANGE TAXES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "The Power To Change Taxes," written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Evening Star of January 17, 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POWER TO CHANGE TAXES—SOME STRANGE CONSEQUENCES VISIONED IF PRESIDENT GETS SUCH AUTHORITY

(By David Lawrence)

With all the advisers, experts, economists, and politicians, as well as veteran officials supposed to be familiar with tax problems available around the White House it is surprising to find President Kennedy quite casually recommending that Congress give up its constitutional power to fix tax rates and let the Chief Executive do it.

Before any proposal as far reaching as this could find its way into the state of the Union message of the President, it would seem that such a drastic change in tax policies and procedures would be thought through and given to the public only after a most thorough study of all its ramifications.

But the idea here seems to be to toss into the hopper as many ideas as possible to give the impression that the administration isn't standing still. The comment heard from administration circles is: "At least, we're moving." But nobody, unfortunately, can foretell in what direction the movement is headed.

To permit a President overnight to reduce or raise taxes would be something of an innovation to Americans, though the idea of a flexible tax was proposed long ago by Lord Keynes, the British economist whose theories since have been severely criticized. In Britain sudden tax changes can be made by the government in power, but this is because they have the parliamentary system. The people, however, can immediately throw out the cabinet ministry that taxed them unwisely. No such remedy is today available to the American people.

Apart from the wisdom or unwisdom of sudden tax changes from a political viewpoint—for certainly there would be little protest when taxes went down and a big howl if they went up—there are some practical barriers. Supposedly the tax changes are to be made when business conditions would seem to the theorists to require such a shift. Where is the expert to be found who is wise enough, upon waking up some morning, to decide that taxes should be reduced to stimulate consumer spending or raised to stop inflation as he rushes to the White House to persuade the President to sign the appropriate Executive order?

Nobody seems to have thought about the problem of how to change suddenly all the tax forms and how to provide a procedure for taxpayers to revise in the middle of a tax year the estimates they have already submitted and on which they may have made payments. The mere task of checking returns in a year when an abrupt change in tax rates has taken place would be a colossal job.

But, even though the administrative difficulties could be surmounted by paying out a few millions of dollars for extra clerks and revised forms, the remedy could prove worse than the disease. There is no certainty, for instance, that a sudden stimulus to consumer spending would come at the right time. Who knows when a recession has run its course or when one is about to begin? The formula could easily result in amounts of change in tax receipts that would be either too small or too large to fit the conditions prevailing.

Congress would be in a hot spot no matter what happened. First, there is the criticism that Congress would be surrendering its constitutional powers. It has been argued that Congress could always nullify a tax change it didn't like because it would have 30 or 60 days in which one House could exercise a veto of the President's action. This might occur just before an election, and the uncertainty produced between the time the President made his proposal and the time it was rejected or took effect could bring on such chaotic conditions as to defeat the ends sought.

It would not cause so much of a fuss if taxes were always being reduced, as everybody likes a tax reduction. But if the President asked for a change in the basic rate, what about the clamor of the people in the other tax brackets for additional reductions? And what would happen if a President asked for a rise in taxes, especially in an election year? The experts might argue that theoretically all this would improve economic conditions, but the average voter would certainly take it out on his Congressman if it turned out that the recession was acually deepened.

A quick tax cut could result in a bigger deficit than expected. Also, there are some paradoxes to complicate the whole problem. Today, for example, the country is supposed to be in the midst of a business boom, but the budget is unbalanced and unemployment is 6.1 percent of the labor force. Should taxes be cut, raised, or left unchanged?

It certainly is strange that the President should have fallen for this wierd gimmick of the theorists without telling the American people at least the exact circumstances under which he would use the power to reduce or raise taxes if such authority were given him. That's why half-baked proposals and recommendations that are not thought through can hardly be considered to be characteristic of a sound administration charged with the task of coping with the challenge of economic changes which constantly face the world today.

THE DU PONT BILL

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record an editorial entitled "Wild Blue Yonder," published in the Washington Evening Star of January 17, 1962.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Wild Blue Yonder

If Columnist Drew Pearson is right, it follows that Virginia's Senator Byrd is a scoundrel and that the bill to regulate the tax bite on Du Pont's divestiture of its General Motors stock, as decreed by the Supreme Court in its recent antitrust ruling, is a thoroughly iniquitous piece of legislation.

Mr. Pearson, however, is not right. In this particular flight into the wild blue yonder he is about as far off the beam as a man can get.

He says that the bill which Senator Byrd is sponsoring as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee "would reverse the antitrust case and the Supreme Court." This is complete nonsense. He also says that Democratic Senator Byrd is "championing Federal relief for millionaires," that the biggest tax break under the bill would go to members of the Du Pont family through a holding company called Christiana, and he implies that the Virginia Senator is trying to perpetrate this outrage to reward Du Pont and General Motors executives for political contributions made to Republicans.

Among pertinent facts which the columnist ignores are these: This bill is not a measure that Senator Byrd personally is trying to "ram" through Congress in the dark of the night. A nearly unanimous House Ways and Means Committee, after hearings, reported it out at the last session and it was approved overwhelmingly in the House. The Senate Finance Committee endorsed it with only two dissenting votes. The Treasury and Justice Departments, while presumably not enthusiastic about the measure, have said they have no objection to it provided it is made clear, as has been done, that there is no intent to impose any particular method of stock divestiture on the courts.

What about the millionaires? Under this bill the big stockholders in Christiana, according to Senator Williams, Republican, of Delaware, will pay practically all of the tax in event of divestiture to its stockholders. Also according to Senator Williams: "The more than 50,000 employees of the Du Pont Co. who purchased stock under their company's stock purchase plan—and most of that stock has been purchased since 1950—will be exempt from all taxation under this bill. Under this bill we shift the tax burden to those who the committee feels are best able to pay the tax—that is, those who have the least cost factor and the largest amount of gain."

This is a complex measure and there are, of course, arguments against it, such as those advanced by Senators Gore and Douglas. It is also a very important measure, however, and it should be voted up or down on its merits—not on the baseless suggestion that it is something dreamed up by Senator Byrd to further line the pockets of a handful of Republican millionaires.

STOCK DISTRIBUTION TREATED AS RETURN OF CAPITAL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 8847) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that a distribution of stock made to an individual or certain corporations pursuant to an order enforcing the antitrust laws shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital; and to provide that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE EICHMANN VERDICT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to make some observations with reference to a historic trial, one of the most historic events of our times, which occurred in Israel, called the Eichmann trial.

The trial was conducted with impeccable justice, as the world had a right to expect from Israel. However, much more was involved. What came out of the trial was the single important fact that the individual is entirely responsible for his acts in respect to the laws of humanity; that he cannot escape his personal responsibility for violation of the laws of humanity by incriminating others by claiming superior orders or by pleading fear. That is the major significance for the civilized world of this historic trial.

This trial will long be studied and will long remain an object lesson to remind mankind of the depth of barbarism to which whole peoples may sink through the self-justification of blind ultranationalism. It will be considered a landmark in the efforts of mankind to bring about the rule of law to replace the rule of force as the final arbiter of our destiny.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Verdict Against Eichmann," which appeared in the Chicago Daily News of December 12, 1961; an editorial in the New York Herald Tribune of the same date, entitled "Justice Is Done in Jerusalem," and an editorial in the New York Times of December 16, entitled "The Eichmann Sentence."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News, Dec. 12, 1961]

Verdict Against Eichmann

There could have been little surprise, even for Adolf Eichmann, in the verdict returned by the three-judge court in Jerusalem. The mass of testimony had established beyond a reasonable doubt his key role in the program intended as the "final solution to the Jewish problem."

Eichmann had sought to diminish the importance of his role. "To my regret," he testified, "I was a tool in the hands of powers stronger than myself." At the same time he freely admitted knowingly sending to their deaths thousands of men, women, and children whose only "offense" was being Jews.

The verdict of guilty on all 15 counts, principally of crimes against the Jewish people and against humanity, brings into sight the final resolution of the Eichmann case. Twelve of the specific counts of the indictment are punishable by death.

Whether the death sentence is mandatory under Israeli law is still being disputed by Eichmann's counsel and the prosecution. And the question of whether Israel had proper jurisdiction under international law after kidnaping Eichmann in Argentina will be argued for years to come.

Beyond question, however, is the court's sanction under Israeli law to condemn Eichmann to death by hanging. The sentence is expected by the end of the week; Eichmann is expected to appeal to the Israeli Supreme Court, and, in that case Eichmann's fate will finally be decided by early spring.

What was evident from the beginning, however, was that Eichmann, the man, is only a minute symbol of a problem which will remain to challenge mankind long after Eichmann is gone.

If the Eichmann trial was a grim and sickening pageant it was deliberately so, to remind all humanity of the incredible depths of bestiality to which some millions of members of the human race had descended. These were not primitive savages conducting gruesome tribal rites, but people with a long tradition of civilization resorting to the systematic and senseless extermination of fellow humans.

It was a considerable service, we believe, to stage this vivid reminder for a rising generation that knew of nazism only from books. But still another generation will soon rise in a world as ripe for hate as when nazism thrived. For a solution that will serve them and their successors, the search has barely begun.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Dec. 12, 1961]

JUSTICE IS DONE IN JERUSALEM

"All who hear the news of you clap their hands over you,
For upon whom has not come what unceasing evil?"

If there were a Biblical text to express the world's reactions to the conviction of Adolf Eichmann for crimes against humanity, it might be the foregoing, from the Book of Nahum, in which the prophet rejoices over the downfall of one of ancient Israel's persecutors.

Yet it is not with a sense of vengeance accomplished but of justice done that one receives the news from the modern state of Israel. Vengeance is the Lord's, justice is man's—at least insofar as he, in the deepest honesty of his mind and soul, can rote it out. And in the sense that a man who has never really denied his complicity in the Nazi extermination operation has been brought to the bar, there can be no doubt that justice has been accomplished in Jerusalem.

In the reading of the court's findings which began yesterday, and which grew from the 4-month trial of last summer, it was possible to relive again the crimes—of murder, torture, deportation, and degradation—which Eichmann was accused of participating in, and which will live forever as a reproach to the 20th century. More than 100 witnesses, most of them survivors of the Nazi years in Germany and elsewhere in Europe, appeared to describe the crimes and to associate Eichmann with them; document after document was introduced to spell out the evidence in cold type.

Eichmann never attempted to deny that such crimes were committed, nor did he persist very long in his contention that he did not know what was happening to the people he was transporting on trains according to the schedules in which he took such pride. The sole contention upon which he rested his defense was that he was a small unimportant cog in a vast, death-dealing machine and to this argument the judges of Israel gave a stern but truthful reply:

"Such crimes are committed by people. The laws of humanity are binding on individuals. The gift of Germany as a state does not detract one iota from the personal responsibility of the accused."

And so the great trial, conducted with scrupulous fairness and with its powerful emotional impulses held admirably in restraint, has come to an end. It has been a long road for Adolf Eichmann—years of power in wartime Germany, followed by years of concealment and disguise in Argentina. That it would all end in a courtroom in Jerusalem before a tribunal of the people he had so cruelly and inreparably wronged could never have crossed his mind in his days of glory and might. And yet it has come to pass just so, and this may be the ultimate justice of all.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 16, 1961]

THE EICHMANN SENTENCE

Abhorred by all mankind and cast off by his own people, a cadaverous-looking, but still arrogant, former Nazi official named Adolf Eichmann has been sentenced by an Israeli court in Jerusalem to die on the gallows for his part in the unparalleled crimes of the Nazi regime.

Adolf Eichmann was Adolf Hitler's "transportation minister of death" who did not kill with his own hands but shipped, like so much cargo, millions of Jews to meet their horrible fate in the extermination camps of the Nazis. But as the court made clear, he was sentenced not only for crimes against the Jewish people but also for crimes against humanity in general and for war crimes as well. In the broad context of history this verdict marks one more condemnation of the whole Nazi regime and all it stood for—a condemnation already inscribed by many war crime trials beginning with Nuremberg.

Yet, with full recognition of all the elements involved, we still hold with Prof. Martin Buber, the Israeli philosopher, that Eichmann's crimes are so enormous that there is no possible punishment to fit them and that as expiation for them his hanging becomes meaningless. Let Eichmann live as a prisoner at hard labor condemned to witness to the end of his days the miracle of Israel's resurrection, which—in one of those supreme ironies of history—the crimes of Eichmann and his colleagues did so much to bring about.

MOBILIZATION OF RESERVES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I know that many Senators have been aware of the criticism regarding the implementation of the mobilization of Reserves which was inspired by the Berlin crisis. On this subject I have had a most informative exchange of letters with the distinguished Secretary of the Army, Hon. Elvis J. Stahr, Jr. I should like to share this exchange with Senators.

The letter of Secretary Stahr shows that the arguments and discussions which have been engendered concerning the difficulties which many of us have pointed out have been beneficial to the Army. The Army has learned some very important lessons from the experience of the previous mobilization, which will be very useful if there is any occasion for another mobilization. I hope very much that other Members of the Senate may with profit read this exchange of correspondence.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the exchange of correspondence be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 15, 1961.

ELVIS J. STAHR,
Secretary of the Army,
The Pentagon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know, I supported fully the mobilization inspired by the Berlin crisis, and I still believe it was a wise and necessary step.

I have been concerned, however, in recent weeks by the increasing public dissatisfaction with the implementation of the buildup and by the widely publicized stories of low morale among the new troops. The complaints have included: Unfair method of selecting those called up; inadequate program to explain to reservists the purpose of the callup; failure to establish draft quotas which would permit early release of reservists; misuse of reservists' time; inadequate health care; bad housing; poor equipment; and general disorganization.

I have no doubt that some of these stories are exaggerated, but there appears to be substantial evidence to indicate that the mobilization was not carried out with the degree of efficiency we should expect. I do not believe it proves anything to minimize the extent of these complaints or the weaknesses in buildup procedures. For example, the Army's recent statement that it has received only 1,000 letters of complaint, however that may be defined, seems incompatible with the fact that my office alone has received nearly that number of letters.

I believe it would be well to analyze the weaknesses exposed in the handling of the callup so they may not be repeated. If a mobilization of 156,000 can cause such difficulties, the people have a right to ask what a greater mobilization would cause should there be no improvement in our mobilization procedures.

You may, of course, be assured of my full support in any undertaking which is necessary to maintain the Nation's maximum defense capability. But it would be of deep interest to me to ascertain what lessons the Army has learned from this mobilization and whether steps are being taken to assure Americans that the Nation's mobilization machinery is being improved.

With best wishes of the season,
Sincerely,

JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senator.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., January 5, 1962.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: This is in reply to your letter in which you expressed concern over the implementation of the partial mobilization of Army Reserve component units and personnel.

I am sure that you are well aware that the Army did not have sufficient forces to meet its worldwide commitments in the summer of 1961. The callup of Reserve Forces, the increase in the draft, the conversion of three training divisions to combat-ready forces, and the strengthening of our forces in Europe have served to place the Army in a better position to meet these obligations. Obviously the immediate need was for trained individuals and units and these could be obtained promptly only from the Reserve components; this requirement for an immediate increase in the combat strength of the Army could not be provided in time through large draft calls.

It is recognized that many individual reservists were not happy to leave families and civilian pursuits for military service. However, the individual obligor and volunteer, with rare exception, has accepted the call of his country and has displayed an admirable spirit, willingness, and "can do" attitude in support of the President's program. The vast majority of the individuals concerned have responded magnificently in accepting and fulfilling their military responsibilities.

I do not wish to minimize the extent of the problems encountered in carrying out a recall program encompassing hundreds of units and thousands of individuals within such a narrow time frame. However, it is a source of deep satisfaction and pride to me that, on the whole, this callup has gone quite well and has been far superior to any previous mobilization.

Your letter cites a series of complaints which are essentially of a personal nature on the part of the recalled reservist. A goodly number of these complaints fall into the "why me?" category and as you may know we have issued a publication with that title which answers many of these questions. I have inclosed a copy for your use.

I am well aware that every effort must be exerted to insure that our mobilization planning, policies, and procedures are such that any future mobilization will be carried out with the greatest possible efficiency. We have learned several lessons from the current expansion and based on them I am sure we can improve our mobilization machinery.

One of the lessons learned in the current buildup was the fact that some individual reservists, particularly members of the Ready Reserve mobilization reinforcement pool, were not cognizant of the responsibilities which they incurred as obligated reservists. The Army staff has been conducting at all levels a widespread information program designed to explain the procedure by which units and individuals were called and how they may be called in the future. Regulations and publications are being rewritten to insure that each individual upon entering the Army and again upon completion of his active duty service is made aware of his future responsibilities while completing his military obligation as a reservist. Review of this matter has pointed out also the need for the development of enforcible procedures, with possible changes to legislation and regulations, which will require reservists to report changes in their status.

There were difficulties in distribution of equipment to the newly mobilized units. A large proportion of the equipment available to the Army had been issued to units of the Active Army and the Reserve components. Reserve units which came on active duty brought with them the equipment which they had at their home stations. They, of course, had not needed at home stations all of the equipment they require on active duty. Time was needed to issue equipment from depots and to withdraw it from lower priority units. This problem is well on the way to being solved. In this regard, and as you well know, the Army has been faced with a mounting problem of equipment deficiencies. Overcoming these shortages is one of our prime objectives; however, equipment shortages which have been accumulating over a long period cannot be erased at once. It will take several years and an increased level of funding to provide the Army with adequate quantities of equipment necessary to overcome fully our existing shortages. In the meantime, the Army will continue to provide the Reserve components with sufficient equipment to meet minimum essential training requirements.

As for training, recalled units have generally completed their shakedown phase and are well into the 13-week intensive combat training program. All of these units are expected to meet their prescribed combat readiness dates. Gen. James A. van Fleet, my consultant on Reserve component and special forces training, has completed his first inspection of National Guard and Reserve units at Fort Lewis and Fort Polk, the special forces units at Fort Bragg, the individual training centers at Fort Jackson and Fort Knox, and the Continental Army Command at Fort Monroe. On the basis of his wide military experience and evaluation of the conditions he encountered, General van Fleet has made certain proposals to improve the training of Reserve component units. The Chief of Staff has directed that plans be developed to carry out General van Fleet's recommendations.

In another area, the entire range of administrative procedures and paperwork is being closely scrutinized at all command levels. Updating of reservists' records, screening procedures, and record mechanization programs are being pursued vigorously to minimize hardships to individuals and turbulence created by the sheer volume of paperwork resulting from a mobilization program. Teams from the Department of the Army, including members of my immediate staff, have been conducting surveys throughout the country these past few weeks and the results of their studies are now being analyzed for preparation of corrective measures.

Troop housing at many of the training installations to which reservists were sent was substandard and consisted mostly of World War II vintage buildings. Over a period of years maintenance had to be deferred on these buildings because funds were not available for building maintenance. Fort Polk, for example, was a completely inactive installation which in only 30 days was converted to a thriving post. Within available resources, measures have been taken to make most of these World War II barracks more livable.

There may have been a lag in available medical care immediately following the military population buildup due to the limited number of medical personnel who were then stationed at the affected installations. Medical spaces were allocated to these installations in anticipation of the buildup and medical personnel were assigned to meet these local requirements as rapidly as personnel availability permitted. The few isolated complaints on this subject which have been received from reservists and their dependents were more in the nature of inconveniences to the individual then failure to provide professional care.

Every effort is being made to utilize professional medical personnel in such a manner as to sustain the high quality of medical care which has been given to every patient in a military treatment facility.

You may rest assured that the Army will continue to press forward in seeking more efficient means and methods to accomplish its mobilization objectives. However, I wish to make it clear that no one in the Department of the Army has lost faith in the mobilization system or in the Reserve system. We believe that the callup has proved that the system will work and work well. We have learned things that will allow us to make it work even better. As our Army is expanded and modernized, the National Guard and Army Reserve will continue to play an important role and the entire Reserve program will be more closely integrated with the role of the Active Army.

Your interest in and support of the Army are deeply appreciated and I trust that my response will serve to allay your concern in this matter.

Sincerely,

ELVIS J. STAHR, Jr.,
Secretary of the Army.

JANUARY 9, 1962.

ELVIS J. STAHR, Jr.,
Secretary of the Army, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thank you for your reply to my letter concerning dissatisfaction with the implementation of the recent mobilization. I appreciate the candor of your reply. It will be reassuring to every American family to know that lessons have been learned from the difficulties encountered by the recent mobilization.

It will be the duty of all Members of Congress to do everything we can to cooperate in making any future mobilization more successful and to give careful oversight to the practical application of any new methods of accomplishing U.S. mobilization objectives.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senator.

AID FOR THE ARTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in the pages of history a great nation is frequently judged by the level of its culture. In the cold war today, the measure of the free world's appraisal of the United States is often based on the quality of its artistic expression. In the struggle to persuade the uncommitted nations of the world, the cultural gap may prove seriously damaging. To close this gap Federal aid is necessary, and I have proposed legislation to establish a U.S. Arts Foundation. I have also urged that hearings be held on this and other proposals for Federal aid to the arts. Many States have already moved into this area.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article entitled "The Outlook for Federal Aid to the Arts," written by George W. Oakes, which was published in the Washington Sunday Star of December 17, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OUTLOOK FOR FEDERAL AID TO ARTS—A STATE-BY-STATE SURVEY

(By George W. Oakes)

Secretary of Labor Goldberg's call for Government subsidies of all performing arts in this country gives an impetus to a movement already started in the last session of Congress.

The idea of Federal aid was even advanced—in a slightly different form—by President Kennedy who expressed in one of his campaign speeches last year "full sympathy with the proposal for a federally-supported foundation to provide encouragement and opportunity to nonprofit private and civic groups in the performing arts."

In Congress House hearings were held during the last session on bills, sponsored by Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey, and supported by Chairman POWELL of the House Education and Labor Committee, that would establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts and also authorize Federal grants in the amount of $100,000 to each State. Similar grant legislation has been introduced in the Senate by Senators CLARK, HUMPHREY, and PELL.

THE ADVISORY COUNCIL

The plan for a Federal Advisory Council (which Secretary Goldberg endorsed) originally recommended by President Eisenhower in 1955, passed the Senate a year later. At present 14 States have an arts council, commission, or similar agency.

Proponents for Federal aid to the arts feel that such assistance will be meaningful only if Federal funds are made available. They feel that an Advisory Council would be useful but relatively ineffective.

The congressional proposal for States grants is based largely on the view that Congress will approve Government funds for the arts only if each State can share in the money. Its supporters also hope that a small injection of Federal financing will stimulate the States to increase their own efforts in the field which are more widespread than is generally known.

The State grant bills are very extensive and would allow Federal funds to be used for construction of museums and memorials, preservation of historic sites, art training programs as well as aid for existing and new performing and visual art activities. Critics of this approach contend that, on the basis of the way the States are now spending their own money for aid to the arts, too much Federal assistance would be devoted to buildings and too little to the major arts such as music, ballet, drama, and opera.

Here is the way a representative selection of States now spend their own funds on the arts:

A STATE SURVEY

Alabama: For the 2 years ending next September 30, out of a total appropriation of $169,540 the largest amount or $91,040 went to the State department of archives and history and no funds to the performing and visual arts.

California: State funds in 1960 were devoted almost entirely to arts and crafts exhibits, historical monuments and buildings, restored goldrush towns, Indian museums and the Hearst castle at San Simeon.

Florida: The three major State cultural agencies are the Ringling Art Museum at Sarasota, the Florida State Museum and the Stephen Foster Memorial Commission. For all these the State appropriated about $250,000 in 1958–59.

Illinois: This State spent $250,000 on its State museum in 1959 and nothing on performing arts.

Indiana: $370,000 was appropriated in 1960 only for memorials and monuments.

Kentucky: Kentucky is one of the few States that provided State money during 1960–62 for the performing or visual arts; $106,000 was made available for public concerts, especially for schoolchildren, by the Louisville Symphony Orchestra and $50,000 for murals in the University of Kentucky Medical Center.

ABOUT $55,000 IN MARYLAND

Maryland: In 1960 Maryland appropriated $25,000 for the Baltimore Symphony Orchestra out of about $55,000 for cultural activities.

Massachusetts: A State agency has contracted with a local drama group for the production of plays in an open-air summer theater.

New York: New York established in 1960 a State advisory council on the arts to develop ways in which the State could encourage the fine and performing arts. The New York State Arts Council has requested $450,000 in State funds to aid opera, ballet, symphony orchestras, drama and traveling art exhibits.

North Carolina: North Carolina appropriated $30,000 during 1960–61 for the North Carolina Symphony Orchestra out of more than $650,000 for artistic and cultural activities. Most funds were spent on the State's museums of history and fine arts.

Rhode Island: Rhode Island was the only State which made more funds available for the performing arts than for historical societies or State museums; $14,000 was appropriated in 1960 for free concerts for the general public and public school students, $7,000 for free public operatic performances, $2,500 for the Providence Philharmonic Orchestra, and $7,500 for Irish and Newport Music Festivals.

Virginia: $271,000 was appropriated in 1960 for the State Museum of Fine Arts including traveling exhibits of paintings and $15,000 for the Barter Theater of Abingdon.

HOW THE MONEY IS USED

This summary showing the distribution of State funds, which includes all those spent on music and drama, but not all that are devoted to museums, historical societies, monuments, etc., indicates that the great preponderance of State money is not used for the major performing and visual arts. Thus it seems reasonable to conclude that, if the States are given Federal funds to be spent at their own discretion, this pattern will be continued and the living arts will receive in most States only a small proportion of the Federal funds provided.

President Kennedy's campaign proposal of a federally supported foundation is oddly enough being sponsored most actively in Congress by Republican Senator JAVITS, of New York, who has been advocating this approach for many years.

The Javits bill would establish a U.S. Arts Foundation for the performing and visual arts with an initial budget of $5 million and $10 million annually thereafter. Senator JAVITS' major purpose is to bring the arts of theatrical and musical performances, opera, dance, ballet, and choral recitals to those people throughout this country who reside in areas where there is no opportunity to see and hear such live performances. Convinced that a bricks and mortar approach would be a mistake, he would concentrate on a living arts program.

In order to avoid local pressure groups, the proposed arts foundation would form perhaps three or four regional panels in each major arts field. These panels would decide the share of Federal funds to be given to each area for each form of art. For example, the committees of professional and public members making this determination would allocate so much money for opera in the West, or music in the South, and also judge the artistic merit of works to be presented.

The arts foundation, which would be a separate Government agency, could receive private donations and would be authorized to make loans as well as grants.

In explaining his proposal Senator JAVITS points out that it is "clearly analogous to the British and Canadian Arts Councils." In Britain, government subsidy to the arts council has risen from some $650,000 in 1946, when it was established, to $4.2 million in 1960. This amounts to about 10 cents per person and is proportionately much lower than in other major European countries and even than smaller ones like Sweden, Denmark, Belgium, Holland, and Switzerland.

THE ARTS FOUNDATION

Canada formed its arts council in 1957 with $100 million split into two equal public funds—one mainly for capital assistance to universities to expand their buildings for the arts, humanities and social sciences and the other using income of about $2.5 million per year for aid to individuals and organizations in these fields.

Music receives the largest annual Government grant of about $350,000 mainly for 10 major symphony orchestras—enabling them to perform away from their home city.

Attempting to enlist the widest possible Senate backing, Senator PELL would like to set up an Arts Foundation with a $10 million annual appropriation but allow it to grant up to $5.2 million per year to the States on a matching basis. Although Senator JAVITS does not object to this plan, he fears that it might spread the effort too thinly. Senator CLARK favors elimination of grants to the States for construction in order to concentrate the small amount of Federal money on the living arts.

OPERATION MANPOWER UNDERWAY IN NEW YORK STATE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as Senators may recall, last year a bill passed the Senate to permit the Federal Government to aid States and localities set up training and retraining programs. This bill did not pass the other body before the Congress adjourned.

One of the things that bothers me about the training for the unemployed bill—and it is true of many similar programs—is that while it looks good on paper, not enough attention has been given to finding out how it will actually work.

There are all kinds of unemployment problems. Some people are unemployed because of increased automation. Some are unemployed because of foreign competition from low-wage produced goods. Some are unemployed because they are Negroes, or cannot speak English, or are members of other minority groups. Some are unemployed because they work on farms and they do not have the skills necessary to move to the city. We must find out what kinds of training programs are needed to deal with each of these very different unemployment problems.

When the training of the unemployed bill was considered at Senate hearings last year, the Secretary of Labor was specifically asked about the possibility of a pilot or experimental training program. He contended that with unemployment at record levels there was not sufficient time to set up a pilot training program.

Since the Secretary's appearance, as many Members are aware, funds for training have been included in the area redevelopment bill which passed last year. Four million dollars was appropriated for 1962 for this program. On the basis of this action, I felt it would be most useful if the Secretary of Labor prepared a report to the Congress on what has been done to develop training programs under the Area Redevelopment Act. Such a report, I believe, could constructively discuss some of the broad problems involved in the establishment of training programs. On November 14, I wrote to Secretary Goldberg urging that this be done. Shortly thereafter, I received a most courteous and responsive letter from the Secretary indicating that his Department would prepare a report along these lines. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Secretary's letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in further response to your letter of November 14 concerning training activities under the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 to which I said I would give my immediate attention.

Let me say first that I appreciate very much your support of this legislation during the last session of Congress. It now permits us to implement programs of training and retraining for unemployed and underemployed workers in redevelopment areas. I also share fully with you your view that this affords us a good opportunity to learn from experience in this important field, especially in view of pending training legislation.

Since September 30, when funds for implementing training under the Area Redevelopment Act became available, programs calling for the expenditure of almost one-third of a million dollars have been established for the training of about 500 workers in occupations ranging from automatic transmission auto mechanics to machine tool operators. In each of these cases an examination was made by us of the training needs of the area, the capacity of unemployed workers to successfully complete the training called for, and a determination of favorable prospects for employment after completion of training.

We now have in process of examination some 25 additional suggested training programs from 15 States and we hope to move quickly ahead in determining their adequacy with a view toward initiating training programs for unemployed workers in these areas. In each case we are gaining invaluable experience in all three major facets of this kind of program; namely, an examination of the training needs of an area, the capacity of unemployed workers to take training, and a determination of favorable prospects for employment after training. All of this I am sure will prove to be significant for us in administering the new training legislation.

In all of these instances our staffs, at both the national and State and local levels, are also gaining experience in the administration of these programs. For example, we have just concluded a training program for our own State and local staffs in the Midwest on all phases of this work and we are beginning another one for the Northeastern States (including New York) this Monday.

I agree with you that the design and operation of training programs can be very complicated. Our experience to date, however, indicates that it can be done. Our Department, in accordance with your suggestion, will be ready with a report to the Congress on our program in this field in time for its consideration by the early part of next year.

Yours sincerely,

ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the immediate and favorable reply which I received from the Secretary. It is my present understanding that work on the report referred to in the Secretary's letter will be initiated in the very near future.

Mr. President, in light of the work being done on this report, I should like to point out today that the New York State Department of Labor, headed by Industrial Commissioner Martin P. Catherwood, has recently undertaken what I think is an excellent pilot training program. It is similar to the program originally recommended to Secretary Goldberg. The New York program is called Operation Manpower. It was announced by Governor Rockefeller early in September of 1961. It has recently been initiated in three communities in New York: Oswego, Utica, and Mineville. All three are areas of considerable unemployment. The program is being operated strictly as a pilot program to develop information that will be useful in setting up similar training programs in other communities throughout the State.

Recently, Mr. Ralph Vatalaro, Jr., contributed a useful and informative article on this pilot program to the November 1961 issue of the New York State Department of Labor Industrial Bulletin. It is my hope that this article will be read by Members of Congress and officials in the appropriate Federal departments here in Washington. I therefore ask unanimous consent that Mr. Vatalaro's article appear at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I should like to mention, before concluding, that the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] has done a considerable amount of important work in this field. I have discussed with him my interest in the New York program. In the consideration of this subject on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, he made a number of constructive proposals on training and retraining, including a suggestion that pilot programs be undertaken in this area.

EXHIBIT I

OPERATION MANPOWER EXPECTED TO AID COMMUNITIES WITH VITAL LABOR DATA

(By Ralph Vatalaro, Jr.)

Three upstate communities in New York are under the microscope in an attempt by the State labor department to develop and test methods for solving manpower problems.

The communities—Oswego, Utica, and Mineville—were selected as sites for an exploratory pilot program, called Operation Manpower. Each of the communities has a particular manpower problem which the pilot program is intended to help resolve. While Oswego, Utica, and Mineville will reap immediate benefits, the techniques devised and utilized in those areas will serve as guideposts for other areas throughout the State which may have similar problems.

Why these communities?

Oswego was selected in order to analyze the impact of a large new employer on a small community through evaluation of the employment needs created by the new industry.

In Utica, an analysis of the skills of a selected sample of the unemployed is underway to determine the feasibility of instituting training or retraining programs to help the unemployed get jobs.

Mineville's particular manpower difficulty arises because its major employer has ceased operations and there appear to be no existing job opportunities for the affected employees.

While all three parts of Operation Manpower are equally important and are expected to result in important and useful techniques for solving various problems, the Oswego study has aroused widespread interest among leaders in business, labor education and other groups.

Operation Manpower in Oswego has attracted this interest for two other reasons; construction of a new $32 million aluminum plant by Alroll, Inc., and a report that several large public utilities will join in building a multimillion dollar atomic powerplant there soon.

Operation Manpower was announced by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller early in September. He said two aspects of the labor market have combined to present problems which the project is intended to help solve. First, automation and technological change is creating a growing demand for more skilled and trained workers, while at the same time, is displacing other workers, many of whom are unskilled or semiskilled. Second, unemployment, arising from all sources, which fastens most tightly on the unskilled.

The State's plan to conduct a major manpower survey in Oswego is important to the entire community, because the findings may well guide the area's economic growth and progress for decades. The study will produce an overall picture of the skills of present workers, potential workers, and the unemployed. Ultimately, the survey's results will be translated into specific training and retraining programs to supply the work force with skills required and anticipated by industry now in the Oswego area, and others which may locate plants there in the future.

But exactly what is Operation Manpower and exactly how will it help Oswego? This is a question which was presented to Dr. Roy Gerard, who has been selected as the director of the Oswego project. This is his explanation:

"Our survey is aimed at promoting maximum use of manpower skills in Oswego. First, however, we must determine what skills and industrial talent are already available in the area. Thus, this study in reality becomes an overall inventory of manpower," he said.

Dr. Gerard, who is the director of the Bureau of Economic Research at LeMoyne College in Syracuse, pointed out that the inventory will produce valuable data for all major elements of the work force.

A sample of the employed as well as of the unemployed, he said, will be interviewed to determine what skills they have, the types of jobs they have worked at, and their interests and capacities for acquiring new skills through training programs.

Another part of the study will be the interviewing of housewives, who in many cases, are potential reentrants to the labor market and still another section of the community—young people not yet in the labor market—will be studied to determine how many expect to be going on for additional education, how many are now training for particular jobs and how many expect to go to work in the near future without specific job training.

The overall survey will result in a complete picture of the skills of present workers, potential workers and the unemployed. Dr. Gerard emphasized that the study also will determine what capacities these people have for learning skills not now known to them.

"In short, Operation Manpower will let us know exactly what manpower we've got available in Oswego and what training will be required to provide workers with new skills," he said.

Operation Manpower has begun already. Dr. Gerard and his small staff which includes Fred Hanga, instructor in economics and statistics at LeMoyne College, and Dr. Morris Budin, associate professor of statistics at Syracuse University, have prepared a series of questionnaires and have drawn up methods of conducting the entire program.

Briefly, here is how the survey is being conducted.

Employers in the Oswego area are being asked to list for selected occupations the present number of employees and anticipated demand in the next 2 to 5 years. This information includes the types of training required, upgrading and the needs for specific skills. This part of the study will help establish training needs for occupations most in demand now or expected to be in demand in the immediate future, Dr. Gerard pointed out. A special effort will be made by Dr. Gerard's staff to obtain data from Oswego's largest employers through personal contact. The smaller establishments will be queried through the mails.

A door-to-door survey by a staff of 10 professors and students from the State University College of Education at Oswego, covering a sample of approximately 500 to 600 households, will yield an overall inventory of labor skills in the area. It will help indicate those secondary and leisure-time skills that can be developed with a minimum of retraining. Questions will be directed at those presently employed in the immediate Oswego area, workers who commute daily to other labor markets such as Fulton and Syracuse, youngsters preparing to enter the work force, housewives who may be contemplating reentry into jobs, and the unemployed whose present or potential skills are not being utilized.

"Operation Manpower will result in a realistic and accurate appraisal of the Oswego labor force, and provide us with data that can be used elsewhere in the State," Dr. Gerard remarked. He added, "It must be made known that while Oswego is the site of this study, the ramifications will be used statewide. The good that comes of this program will affect not only Oswego but other communities in New York where, with a minimum of effort, the tested plans can be put into operation."

In addition to the employer and household surveys, the staff of Operation Manpower will take inventory of present training facilities including those available in schools, industrial firms, and labor and civic organizations.

To be sure, the residents of Oswego, a community of about 22,000 which is located on the shores of Lake Ontario at the northern terminus of the New York State Barge Canal, are encouraged by the visible evidence of economic progress: construction of the sprawling ultramodern aluminum plant by Alroll, Inc., a corporation comprised of four large industrial firms. And, the indications that the northern New York community may be the site of another major installation—the atomic powerplant—also holds promise, even though there has been no official announcement by the utilities involved, except acknowledgment that a substantial tract of land has been purchased for future use.

To point up the importance he attaches to the inventory, Dr. Gerard refers to the move into Oswego by Alroll, Inc., a combination of Aluminium, Ltd., Bridgeport Brass Co., Cerro Corp., and Scovill Manufacturing.

"Alroll, Inc., will soon make a significant change in the demand for labor in this area. Many skills needed by this new industry and others which may establish plants in the area, will not be available locally—thus, the need arises to look elsewhere," he said.

"But because Operation Manpower will help us assess Oswego's skills and industrial talent, we can determine what action can be taken to offset skilled labor shortages," he added. The "action," Dr. Gerard said, will be in the form of specific training and retraining programs, to be carried out once the survey has been completed and some direction is indicated by the results.

"The success of this program and possibly of Oswego's industrial future—from the aspect of manpower—will depend on the cooperation of the entire community," said Robert D. Helsby, executive deputy industrial commissioner in the State labor department, who is working closely with Dr. Gerard.

"If the community wants industrial prosperity," he added, "it cannot have it without a lot of hard work."

While Dr. Gerard is directing the Oswego phase of the Operation Manpower program for the State labor department, Commissioner Helsby will coordinate other phases, reporting on progress to State Industrial Commissioner M. P. Catherwood.

"Oswego is on the brink of great prosperity but it must begin to utilize its manpower. But first we—everyone concerned with Oswego's future economic growth—must learn what that manpower is. If we are to meet the needs of our ever-expanding economy, the emphasis must be on manpower. Operation Manpower is designed to give direction to programs of training and retraining," he said.

"Unlike some studies and surveys which serve only immediate purposes, Operation Manpower will provide valuable data, the usefulness of which will be felt for years to come," the commissioner added.

The program will benefit many diversified groups in Oswego including present employers, labor unions, and educational institutions. The general public, Commissioner Helsby said, cannot be excluded from any list of those who will benefit. Indeed, he added, "if any group is to benefit tremendously, it will be the masses of working men and women, who, if they are lacking in skills required by area industry, will have opportunities to obtain new talent through this State-sponsored program."

Will Operation Manpower succeed?

Dr. Gerard has already experienced the cooperation he and the State sought early in the plan when Governor Rockefeller announced it.

And Commissioner Helsby's reaction:

"You can feel that these people know what this means for them and the rest of the State. They are bending over backward to assist us in this project.

"I know the people in Oswego," he concluded. "I know how they feel about this action program and I am confident that Operation Manpower has instilled enthusiasm in the people of this community. If their initial reaction and cooperation to this project is any indication, Operation Manpower will be an overwhelming success in Oswego," he said.

STOCK DISTRIBUTION TREATED AS RETURN OF CAPITAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8847) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that a distribution of stock made to an individual (or certain corporations) pursuant to an order enforcing the antitrust laws shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital; and to provide that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in the consideration of this bill extreme statements have been made on both sides, on the side of those who are advocates of the bill and also on the side of those who are opposed to the bill.

On the one hand, the bill has been described as designed for the relief of the Du Pont Co. and as a bill to preserve and continue the Du Pont family's control of General Motors. On the other hand, it has been argued that the bill is intended to protect the innocent stockholders of the Du Pont corporation and of General Motors and that unless tax relief is granted the 200,000 stockholders in the Du Pont corporation and some of the 850,000 stockholders in General Motors will suffer severe hardship. I have serious reservations about the economic innocence of the principal stockholders of General Motors and Du Pont and doubt that many of these stockholders will suffer very severe economic hardships whether we pass this bill or whether we do not pass it.

It has also been argued that unless this bill is passed forces will be generated in the security market of the country which will go far beyond Du Pont and General Motors, that the issuance of new securities will be seriously affected, that listed securities will be weakened, and that ultimately American industrial and economic growth may be seriously hurt.

Mr. Winthrop C. Lenz, the vice president in charge of the underwriting division of Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, spoke rather movingly of his concern for the small investor who, he said, would be hard hit if this bill were not passed.

He noted for special attention those persons participating in the monthly investment plan developed by the New York Stock Exchange in 1954,, under which plant an individual can for only a little more than 44 cents a day become a part owner of an American business enterprise. Let me assure the Members of the Senate that these 44-cent-a-day investors will be little affected whether we pass this bill or whether we do not pass it.

Somewhat the same argument was made by Sumner B. Emerson of the firm Morgan, Stanley & Co. in New York City. He spoke of the economic and financial effects which would follow over a 10-year period if the court order for the divestiture of approximately 37 million shares of General Motors stocks now held by Du Pont were put into effect under existing law. The Justice Department witnesses and Treasury witnesses have, I think, effectively countered these arguments.

Under existing law the effect on the stock market and the financial market of the country could be significantly modified through the use of devices available to Du Pont and General Motors. Among the possible methods which might be used are the following:

First. General Motors requires approximately 1 million shares of stock annually for its stock bonus plan. If the market effects of divestiture were likely to be disastrous to Du Pont and to General Motors, General Motors might find it practicable to buy at least 1 million shares of General Motors stock a year from Du Pont for its stock bonus plan, and those 1 million shares would thus be withdrawn from the market. Over a period of 10 years, the purchases would total between 10 and 15 million shares.

Second. General Motors might decide to use acquired stock, rather than newly issued stock, for its stock saving or purchase plan. The use of this device could take 1 million shares of General Motors stock out of the market each year for the period of 10 years. Institutional purchases of General Motors stock for pension funds, mutual funds, and the like, according to the evidence, could be negotiated without any legal difficulty; and on the basis of an article published in the December 1961 issue of the magazine Exchange, the second most popular security with institutional investors is General Motors stock.

Third. The market itself could absorb some General Motors stock. There is a need for good issues on the market, which has been starved for some time.

Fourth. Finally, the experience with the disposal of Ford Motor Co. stock by the Ford Foundation does not really sustain the arguments of those who say that this sale of stock would greatly upset the stock market. The dollar value of the Ford offerings during the past 5 years has been equivalent to the sale of approximately 24 million shares of General Motors stock. These Ford secondaries represented something more than 30 percent of the total equity of Ford Motor Co., compared with 23 percent of General Motors equity which now is owned by Du Pont.

There is also a possibility that Du Pont can exchange some of its General Motors stock for the assets of other corporations. Du Pont also conceded that the exchange of General Motors stock for Du Pont stock itself was both practicable and feasible.

So the arguments made in regard to the possible disturbing effects of the court's order for divestiture on the financial market and the stock exchange and the financial structure of the country, in my judgment, have been greatly overstated.

The question, then, is, Why should we pass the bill?

I believe there are several justifiable reasons.

One is the reason of equity. Complete divestiture in the form of stock dividends, if that were ordered, would result in tax consequences for some stockholders which would be truly harsh; not because, as the committee report says, the stockholders were not violators of the antitrust laws and were not parties to the proceedings. In my judgment we should not easily accept that stockholders are ever wholly innocent or lacking some measure of responsibility for the action of corporate officers and directors. There must be some point at which they are held accountable.

Our disposition should be to hold stockholders responsible, insofar as we can, and if they fail to exercise their responsibilities, they must be prepared to bear some of the economic consequences of mismanagement or of illegal actions by corporate directors.

In this case, I think, there are some mitigating circumstances. It is true that Du Pont holds 23 percent of General Motors common stock, and that, in turn, 29 percent of Du Pont is held by the Christiana Corp., of which about 70 percent is owned by members of the Du Pont family.

In 1949, the Department of Justice filed a complaint in an antitrust action against Du Pont; and in 1957, the Supreme Court found that Du Pont's ownership of 23 percent of General Motors was a violation of section 7 of the Clayton Act, since that ownership might enable Du Pont to prevent other suppliers of automotive paints and fabrics from selling to General Motors. The Court issued its decision, although it said it believed, as the committee report states, that the high executives concerned in both companies had acted honorably and fairly.

A second consideration bearing upon the issue of whether this bill should be passed is that the base of approximately 60 million of the 63 million shares of General Motors stock now held by Du Pont was purchased between 1917 and 1919, and that purchase went unchallenged for a period of approximately 30 years. Because of this—at least in my opinion—there is some substance to the argument that at least those stockholders who purchased Du Pont stock and those who purchased General Motors stock in the period, let us say, from 1919 or 1920 until the Court action was begun in the year 1949, should not be held wholly responsible and could not have been expected to have taken into account the possibility that an antitrust law violation was involved in that relationship between Du Pont and General Motors.

A second argument for the bill relates to revenue. This is a matter of concern to many. If this measure is not enacted, Du Pont is prepared to follow a program of divestiture by various ways under existing law; and, following the court order, result in the payment to the Federal Government of taxes totaling approximately $450 million to $460 million. This revenue would be collected not in 1 year or 2, but over a 10-year period. If the bill is enacted, the divestiture could be made in an orderly fashion over a shorter period of time. It is estimated that the Treasury would collect at least as much revenue over a period of 3 years.

Therefore, the advantages of enactment of the bill are, I believe, the following: As regards revenue, $450 million collected over a 3-year period rather than over approximately a 10-year period.

Second, the elimination of certain harshness and inequities with respect to some of the stockholders in General Motors and in Du Pont.

Third, a rather limited possibility—and this is a relatively minor consideration—is that some disturbing effects in security markets of the country might be reduced, if not altogether eliminated.

Basically, the bill attempts to provide a reasonable and workable method by which Du Pont can divest itself of the General Motors stock. This is the important consideration. If the bill is not enacted, Du Pont will be moved to resort to certain procedures and practices which may not be sound. They might have the effect of distorting the operations of the two corporations and of distorting the investment portfolios or holdings of many persons and corporations, and of affecting some institutional purchasers who are large holders of General Motors stock.

A number of issues relating to committee procedures and unrelated to the substance of the bill have been raised. It has been argued that we should wait for the court to issue a detailed order with regard to divestiture. It is my opinion that the committee has held adequate hearings in two sessions of Congress. It has taken into account the fact that this question has been in the courts and before the Congress since 1949. It has, I think, shown proper respect for the courts both by the terms of previous postponement of action and also in the language of the bill and in that of the report. It is difficult for me to imagine that any judge or any court would be unduly influenced or prejudiced by the action we propose to take here. No judge who is attempting to determine the equity in this case should, in my judgment, feel that he or the authority of his court has in any way been challenged or been invaded.

It has been said that the committee has operated in this case in a partial vacuum.

There is a measure of truth in this statement, but it is not unusual for the Committee on Finance, or, I might say, for many other committees of Congress, to operate in a partial vacuum. We are often fortunate that we do not have to operate in a total vacuum. In any case if we were to delay on action by Congress until everything was clear and complete and full, we would in most cases never act at all.

It is my opinion that the facts insofar as they could be determined and interpreted were considered by the Finance Committee and also by the Ways and Means Committee. The witnesses were properly questioned and challenged, and there is an objective basis for the actions here being recommended.

The question of priority has been raised. It has been said that we should have taken other tax matters up in advance of this one. Here, of course, we are involved in a kind of relative argument. But the committee was in a position to act upon this bill. It had delayed action on it at the end of the last session of Congress. The Ways and Means Committee and the House have both passed upon it.

We have respected the constitutional directive that the House should act first on revenue questions, and I think we are ready to act.

This question has been in court, as I have noted, since 1949. The problem of divestiture, especially as it relates to the question of revenue, is one on which I think the Finance Committee is qualified to act. I would go so far as to say the Finance Committee is better qualified to act than a district judge in Chicago. I might note that even if we do not have this competence, we certainly should not admit it publicly. In addition to these arguments, a number of questions have been raised with reference to the bearing of this legislation upon the Christiana Corp. and beyond that on the Du Pont family and the possibility that this action may have some direct or indirect bearing on future court actions, antitrust actions relating to this corporation.

Nothing in this bill will in any way prevent the Justice Department from proceeding against the Christiana Corp., in an antitrust action or any other action, if the Justice Department feels that such action is necessary.

The Christiana Corp. case is at least in a quantitative sense somewhat different from the case against Du Pont. The court decision in the Du Pont case was based upon the fact that Du Pont holds 23 percent of General Motors stock and consequently was in a position to exercise too great a measure of control over the operations of General Motors. Christiana holds 29 percent of Du Pont.

The question for the court to decide in the event that Justice proceeds against Christiana is whether this 29 percent of 23 percent which, together with some Christiana holdings in General Motors, would give Christiana about 8 percent of the stock of General Motors and put Christiana in a position to exercise undue or improper influence over the affairs of General Motors.

The Justice Department has indicated at least an intention of proceeding against Christiana in the future. No doors are closed against such action in this bill.

The question has been raised as to why, if action is to be taken against Christiana, we should provide procedures for possible divestiture of General Motors stocks by Christiana. The only argument is the practical one. We are proposing a procedure for a divestment by Du Pont. Since the problem of divestment by Christiana is essentially the same kind of problem and based upon essentially the same situation, it is the committee's opinion that it might anticipate this problem.

There may be an argument for postponing such action in anticipation of treating stockholders in Christiana, principally the Du Pont family, somewhat differently from the treatment here recommended for stockholders in the Du Pont Co. itself.

For tax purposes there are in the United States three major classes of citizens with perhaps one or two minor classifications. There is the ordinary citizen who pays taxes as a person.

Then there is the person who has become a corporation and beyond that the person who has become a foundation. If one can become a foundation, he is for tax purposes in a most advantageous position. I am concerned about persons who become foundations and corporations for tax purposes, and I think our committee in the Congress ought to be concerned about this problem, but the problem cannot be raised by action on this bill. We should attempt not to direct this legislation against a particular corporation or a particular family, but face the basic problem and attempt to solve it.

There are great concentrations of economic and financial power in this country which have achieved a kind of independent status and have passed out of the orbit of reasonable direction and regulation even to the point of escaping reasonable taxes, in some cases the result of legal claims which run for 100 years or more into the past.

I do not think we can take action to improve the situation with reference to this problem by skirmishing around the edges of this bill but must eventually face it head on.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a couple of questions?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I have been really puzzled about how I should vote on this measure. Frankly, I have not made up my mind yet. I am much impressed with what the junior Senator from Minnesota has just said. I should like to raise three questions that trouble me, to see if I can get his reaction to them.

In the first place, I am troubled about the timing of this bill. As I have followed the debate on the floor and in the pages of the RECORD, I have wondered why it would not be wiser to defer action on this legislation, which, ostensibly at least, and I think actually, is intended only as tax legislation, and not to have any antitrust implication, until the decree of the district court has become final. Thus we would know exactly what the court ordered Du Pont, and perhaps Christiana, to do. Could we not at that time legislate, taxwise, a good deal more intelligently than if we pass the bill now, not really knowing exactly what the court will do in the way of a divestiture requirement?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think there are very limited possibilities as to what we could do, taxwise, or revenuewise, under any circumstances. I know the Senator understands that the Supreme Court has ordered the Chicago court to recommend the procedure of divestment, and has allowed a 10-year period over which to do it. I think perhaps the principal justification for this action with reference to the court proceeding is that by passing a law which establishes that these particular tax results can follow from a divestment we really make it easier for the court to order a divestment which will be fair and equitable. If we do not take this action, the court will have to make its divestment order within the framework of existing law. This is the problem. The Du Pont Co. has come up with two or three alternate plans by which they might divest under existing law, the consequences of which in terms of revenue would be that the Federal Government would collect no more taxes during the next 10 years than they would under the procedure likely to be followed if the committee bill is adopted.

Moreover, if the companies act under existing law, the corporate structures and the security market may be adversely affected. For these reasons I think we are acting quite properly at this time.

Mr. CLARK. Is is the Senator's view that this proposed legislation is timely and it would be a mistake to defer consideration, because he believes that the interests of justice and the proper enforcement of the antitrust decree would be aided if we acted now rather than to require the court to act first?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think it would be easier for the court to act in this case. This is the kind of precedent which might pave the way for more effective antitrust action in many cases. As the Senator knows, ofttimes the court hesitates to act in antitrust questions, because of financial consequences of such action. This bill, if passed, would not keep the court from acting, if it wishes, to order a divestment under existing law. It opens up a new possibility.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. This brings me to the second point which is bothering me, which is the question raised by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], in regard to the pass-through from Du Pont to Christiana to members of the Du Pont family. As I understand their contention, it boils down to this: While it has been made abundantly clear in the committee report and by statements made by various Senators on the floor that the proposed legislation is not intended to have any effect whatever on the form of the decree to be signed by the Chicago judge, nevertheless the inevitable result of passing the bill, and thus making a pass-through from Du Pont to Christiana to the members of the Du Pont family less onerous than would be the case under existing law, from the tax point of view with respect to members of the Du Pont family, cannot fail to be to give the court a guidance or an inkling, which will result in the court being far more likely to permit the members of the Du Pont family to keep the General Motors stock than would be the case if the proposed legislation were not passed.

What is my friend's view on that?

Mr. McCARTHY. It would be an entirely subjective judgment. Up to this point it appears that few arguments have been made in support of any action giving relief to the members of the Du Pont family. It is my judgment that passage of the bill should have no effect upon the action of the court itself. I hope that the judge would stand against this kind of influence.

I doubt very much whether the judge would even take this bill into consideration in passing on the Christiana issue. Other points of law and points of fact would be more important.

Mr. CLARK. That leads me to my third question. Does my friend from Minnesota agree with the Attorney General, who seems to be of the view that if the members of the Du Pont family are permitted to continue to hold the General Motors stock, they will have 8 percent of the voting stock of General Motors, and this, under the peculiar circumstances involving these particular corporations, amounts to effective control?

Mr. McCARTHY. This would be a question for the court to decide under antitrust proceedings. I do not know enough about the operation of this corporate complex, to say whether 8 percent would give Christiana that kind of control. Certainly, if it would the Justice Department should be able to make that case in court.

Mr. CLARK. Whether or not the bill is passed?

Mr. McCARTHY. Whether or not the bill is passed.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. The pass-through to the members of the Du Pont family really raises some fundamental questions of rights. This is a family of great wealth. We have to ask ourselves whether we wish to draft a law almost in the nature of a bill of attainder to reach them. I have been worried ever since hearing that one member of the family, who was 18 months old at the time of a recent campaign, contributed $5,000 to the Republican Party. It seems to me perhaps we could set some limits upon how much a person who had not reached the accepted age of reason, could contribute to a political campaign, but I do not think we ought to do it in this bill.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will yield further, and for the last time, I am of the view that members of the Du Pont family are as much entitled to equal justice under the law as anybody else, but I am strongly of the view that I do not wish to have the members of the Du Pont family control General Motors.

I am happy to have my friend's assurance that he does not think the passage of the bill would aid in effectuating that result, which I would deplore.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is my opinion it would not help them to that end, and that they would receive no more or less than equal justice under the law.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Boggs in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE LATE SENATOR STYLES BRIDGES, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The resolution (S. Res. 254) was read as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Styles Bridges, late Senator from the State of New Hampshire.
>
> *Resolved,* That, as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished service.
>
> *Resolved,* That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, before we proceed with relation to the resolution, I ask unanimous consent that remarks of the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez], who is unable to be present because of illness, be printed in the Record at the appropriate place in these ceremonies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter of J. Mark Trice, secretary of the minority, long a friend and beloved associate of the late Senator Bridges, be printed in the Record at the close of the tributes by Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the Honorable Wesley Powell, Governor of New Hampshire, delivered a eulogy at the State funeral of the late Senator Bridges in the State capital at Concord, N.H. Governor Powell was a longtime associate and administrative assistant of Senator Bridges. He is present on the floor of the Senate today. I ask unanimous consent that the eulogy he delivered at the State funeral appear in the Record, in the appropriate place after the tributes of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the Reverend Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, the beloved Chaplain of the Senate, wrote an article entitled "Night Is Not Eternal," in which tribute is paid to the memory of the late Senator Bridges. I ask that it be printed in the Record as a final tribute in these proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any Senators unable to be present at the session of the Senate today be permitted to file their tributes to the late Senator Bridges during the next 2 legislative days, and that those tributes appear at the appropriate place in the ceremonies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am sure that it is always a difficult task for a Senator to rise and attempt to express adequately his feelings and reflections upon the passing of a Senate colleague from his own State. If I may be pardoned a very brief personal word, I would say to you, sir, that as I rise to exercise my privilege to speak a few words in memory of Styles Bridges, I find myself laboring under a heavy burden of emotion.

In 1923, when Styles Bridges was 25 years of age and I was 23, we met and became associated on the staff of a State magazine then published in Concord, N.H. For a considerable period of time we worked together as very young men, and there arose a close, intimate, and abiding friendship between us that continued without a rift or interruption for nearly 40 years until his passing last November.

Little did I think in those early days that he would become the nationally known statesman and Senator that he later became. Little did I know that it would be my treasured privilege to serve in Congress with him, first, in the House of Representatives, and then, for 7 years, as his junior colleague in this body.

Mr. President, I am not going to dwell at length on his great career in this chamber. It will be adequately covered by others. Styles Bridges was first of all, a Senator of the United States. He loved the Senate. Next to his love for his own cherished family circle, nothing in his life ever meant to much to him as the Senate. He gloried in its history. He was steeped in its traditions and its rules and its associations. He appreciated fully its power in the world.

He served in the Senate for a quarter of a century, 25 years. It was his cherished ambition that he might live to serve two more years, because, had he done so, his continuous service in the Senate would have been the longest of any Senator who ever sat in this body representing New Hampshire. He was not permitted to fulfill that ambition, an ambition that was shared by thousands upon thousands of people in New Hampshire who wanted him to realize it for his sake and for theirs.

I need not remind those who served with him in the Senate of his fearless, courageous, constant service to his country. I can only repeat what I said when I first learned of his passing, that freedom is brighter and this great Republic is infinitely stronger because Styles Bridges lived.

In the few moments I wish to take, I am not going to speak of Styles Bridges the Senator, because others who served with him much longer than I, and have shared with him the responsibility of leadership in this body, can more appropriately pay that tribute. Therefore, despite the fact that one of the proud memories of my life will be the fact that for 15 years I served with him in Congress, I wish to speak for just a few additional moments today about Styles Bridges the man, Styles Bridges as I think of him today in the years of my association with him back in New Hampshire before he ever came to the Halls of Congress. I wish to speak of the qualities which he displayed then and which ripened and blossomed after he came here.

As I think of the years that I have known him, longer than any other Member of the Senate, there was one outstanding keynote of his character and his personality throughout his life. It was not his statesmanship, although he was a statesman of great ability; it was not his mental attainment, although he had to an exceptional degree the ability in a quiet, commonsense, and direct way to clear away the obstacles and to plunge straight to the heart of any problem, and with a few words uncover the bones of any issue without being diverted by trivialities; it was not even his courage, though his fearlessness commanded the respect of all who knew him. None of these qualities were the real mainspring of the character of Styles Bridges, and that made him so great.

Styles Bridges in a greater degree than any other person I have ever known in all my life had a talent, a gift, a genius for friendship. He had that kind of natural love for his fellow men that caused him throughout his life to exemplify the teachings of the Master, who said:

> Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself.

From the time I first met him as an extremely young man, his outstanding characteristic was this genius for friendship.

That friendliness was not assumed, Mr. President. There are many genial people, friendly people, people with magnetism and charm. Sometimes, however, when the going is hard, when they are tired or under stress, or involved in an intense controversy, the veneer cracks and for a moment one glimpses something cold and calculating underneath. That was never so with Styles Bridges as I knew him under many circumstances for 40 long years. I never knew the time that he lost his patience, that he lost his courtesy, that he lost his love for people. That love had to be genuine.

To be sure, he could be forthright and hardhitting, as we knew him here. However, there was always that quality of warmth in his heart and his personality which encompassed all people to a degree that I have never seen in anyone else.

I wish to take one moment to recite to the Senate illustrations of this quality which have long lived in my memory. When he was in his twenties, one night he made a speech in that same hard-hitting forthright way that was always his. Afterward he learned that an elderly man had been hurt and that he was incensed by what Styles Bridges had said. It distressed Styles Bridges to learn that, and he resolved to go to the home of this man to try to soothe the offended man. He was admonished not to do so, because the man was very strong-willed and inclined to be vindictive. He insisted, however, and, alone, went to the home of the man and told him how he regretted that in espousing a cause in which he believed, and for which he had no apologies to make, he had injured the man's feelings. Styles Bridges sat with this man through the long hours of the evening and came away his friend. That man was his friend and devoted follower as long as he lived.

When Styles Bridges was elected to the Senate of the United States, he defeated in a hard primary contest former Senator George H. Moses, who had been, and will be remembered as one of the outstanding Members of this body. It was a rather bitter contest, in which Styles Bridges' opponent, a seasoned veteran and senior statesman, was somewhat caustic about Senator Bridges' youth and inexperience. When the campaign was over, Styles Bridges defeated Senator Moses and came to the Senate. Senator Moses retired to his home in Concord. Like many who come to the end of the way and meet with defeat he was a somewhat embittered man.

Styles Bridges was not content to leave things in that way. Again, despite the advice and admonition of his friends, he went to the home of Senator Moses, even though he knew he might be repulsed by a man who had grown bitter in his disappointment, and loneliness. I do not know what passed between them, but Senator Bridges came away the friend of Senator Moses. He used to call upon Senator Moses faithfully whenever he was in Concord.

I, who worked for Senator Moses when he was a Member of the Senate, and knew him to the very end, perhaps realized more than anyone else how fond and affectionate Senator Moses grew of Styles Bridges. He began to feel a sense of proprietorship and of pride in the achievements of Styles Bridges.

Just one more example of this characteristic concern which he had for all, both great and humble. During the years of World War II, when Styles Bridges was a member of powerful committees in the Senate, bearing a heavy burden of responsibility in a great crisis in our history, he learned one day, perhaps because of his membership on the Committee on Military Affairs, that a telegram was about to be sent from the Department of War to a man and his wife in New Hampshire, transmitting the news that their only son had been killed in action. Senator Bridges was able to use his influence to stay the telegram. He left his duties here, flew to New Hampshire, and went to the home of his friend, a humble man, because he did not want the news to be broken in the cold print of a telegram. He made the journey and himself faced the sad and difficult task of breaking the news to a desolate father and mother.

Those are the little examples which I have trespassed upon the time of the Senate to mention today. I have done so because whatever may be the tributes paid to Senator Bridges for his mighty services in this body, I felt in my heart today that the picture I wish I could paint, if I had the words with which to paint it, would be of Styles Bridges back home; Styles Bridges whose capacity for friendship was so natural and unassumed that his circle of friends grew and grew throughout the years until they could not be numbered in the State of New Hampshire, but spread across the length and breadth of this land, so that, perhaps, when we lost him, it could be said that he had more personal friends than any living man. That is why the people of New Hampshire sent him back to the Senate by ever increasing majorities. That is why he received more votes from the people of New Hampshire—Republicans, Democrats, and independents—than any other man who has ever been elected as Governor or Senator in my State.

Mr. President, if you want to know how Styles Bridges lives in the hearts of the people of New Hampshire, you could journey today to the snow-clad farms on the hillsides of New Hampshire, and to the crossroads stores, and there you would find old and young, men and women, of every walk of life who do not mourn a Senator, but who mourn a friend.

Thucydides, in his "Funeral Oration of Pericles," said:

> For the sepulchre of good people is the whole earth; and their story is not graven only on stone over their native earth, but lives on far away, without visible symbol, woven into the stuff of the lives of others.

So Styles Bridges, our friend, lives on, his life woven into the stuff of the lives of thousands who are better and happier because they knew him.

Mr. President, never was his devotion to friendship so evident as in his last days. His devoted wife and his loyal staff, who are in the gallery as guests of the Senate today, endeavored during his last months and days to protect him, so far as they could, from some of the duties which could be taken care of by others, so as to leave him free to use his gradually waning physical powers in fulfilling the heavy duties and responsibilities which, in the fullness of his service here, had devolved upon him. But they were never wholly able to do so, because Styles Bridges would never turn away anyone who sought his help. It was just impossible for him to turn anyone away.

So in the silence of the morning hours, in the home which he loved, in East Concord, N. H., alone with his devoted wife, he passed quietly and painlessly in his sleep, from darkness to light eternal. Our sympathy goes out to his widow, his sons, and his aged mother.

Mr. President, I leave with you and with the Senate some words which I heard spoken many years ago, in my youth, in an hour of sadness, about a man who, too, was my friend. I do not even remember who wrote them, but these are the words. I think they are appropriate:

> When soldiers die and kings depart,
> And statesmen pass away,
> And men of gold and bank and mart
> Return to common clay;
> Our laurel wreaths we proudly bring,
> Our panegyrics blend.
> But, ah, it is a sadder thing
> When we have lost a friend.
>
> When artists lay their palettes down
> And singers mutely rest;
> When builders of a mighty town
> Lie in a narrow chest;
> We praise their genius towering tall,
> Their godlike works commend;
> But, ah, the human tears that fall,
> When we have lost a friend.
>
> Too deep for shallow-sounding phrase,
> Too full for formal bound;
> Their memories bloom where'er we gaze
> And live in every sound.
> We cannot speak our aching loss,
> Or even comprehend;
> But every byway has a cross,
> When we have lost a friend.
>
> And such was he—this friendly man,
> This man of sunny mood;
> Of happiness an artisan,
> A prince of brotherhood.
> Ah, heaven is a cheery place,
> Where such as he ascend;
> So let us go on a little space,
> And we shall find our friend.

Mr. MURPHY. "Styles Bridges, New Hampshire, senior Republican in the U.S. Senate." Behind these few words stand more than a quarter of a century of dedicated service to State and country.

Today, Members of this great body pay tribute to one of its best loved former Members, and our hearts go out to the members of his family.

It is with a sense of deep humility that I now pay respect to the memory of STYLES BRIDGES.

As the youngest Member of this body I feel humble, for his distinguished service as U.S. Senator from New Hampshire can best be reviewed by his colleagues of long standing; but as successor to STYLES BRIDGES, I feel proud and honored, because as history unfolds, STYLES BRIDGES will stand with the greatest of U.S. Senators.

No person could fill the void caused by the passing of Senator STYLES BRIDGES. It is now my task to carry on his work; and with the help of Almighty God, I shall do so to the best of my ability.

In the beautiful White Mountains of New Hampshire stands our trademark, settled against the sky and resisting the elements of time and storm. These rugged features have been the hallmark of our people since the days of Webster. Like the "Old Man of the Mountains," STYLES BRIDGES stood throughout his life, immovable against the elements of cowardice and compromise and unwavering in his determination to fight for right as God gave him the understanding.

STYLES BRIDGES loved the State of New Hampshire and respected all of its people. Though occupying a high seat in our Government, his helping hand was ever extended to the least of those he served. Perhaps more than any other quality of his greatness, this respect for the integrity of every man was the substance of his eminence.

And so all the people of New Hampshire mourn the passing of their illustrious son. The people of New Hampshire and of our land have lost a champion. Even beyond our borders, wherever there is freedom or hope for freedom, people know a valiant captain is gone.

As the Ship of State sails on, Senator BRIDGES' profound words, his courage, his wisdom, and his love of freedom should shine forth like a beacon to those whose duty it now is to help pilot the ship in these troubled waters.

The motto of his beloved Granite State held full meaning for STYLES BRIDGES. He would have that motto inspire each of us as it did him: "Live Free or Die."

Mr. DIRKSEN obtained the floor.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, because of the fact that the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] has to leave for a distant journey, I ask the Senator from Illinois to yield to him at this time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Hampshire and also the Senator from Illinois for this indulgence. It is necessary for me to leave immediately, to catch a plane; and if I did not speak now, I would have to file a statement for the RECORD.

Mr. President, today I am saddened, along with all our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, at the occasion which calls upon us to state—all too inadequately—our deep sorrow and grief at the passing of our friend and colleague, STYLES BRIDGES. When great men pass on to the future, usually it is impossible—and certainly it is beyond my meager ability—to say the things we really feel about them or adequately to express our concept of their contributions to our life and times.

I have known STYLES BRIDGES for almost 25 years. During that time he has proved himself, not only from a public standpoint, but also from a private standpoint, a true and reliable friend, one who never in the slightest degree gave occasion for any question as to his motives, his attitude, or his willingness to help his friends and his associates, and in so many cases even to help those who were not necessarily at the time his friends.

In the field of public life, the only field in which I have known STYLES, he was not necessarily unique; but he was in the top echelon of great public servants whom this country has produced from time to time, over the years of its history.

Mr. President, if one took the time—and I suggest we do so with frequency—to examine STYLE BRIDGES' prophetic utterances, throughout his experience and his service here in Washington, as to what might or might not happen, as to what might result from certain actions, policies, and procedures, I think all of us would be astounded at the accuracy and the perception he brought to his studies and positions on public matters. I know that a number of years ago, and since my more intimate acquaintance with him, in the last 17 years, he has time and again pointed out matters which he believed would affect the interests of the country, and he has done so with an uncanny accuracy which we shall miss greatly in the days to come.

Of course, friendship does not end because someone passes from a present physical association to another state, any more than it does when a friend leaves to go to another city or another area. The memory of that friendship, the memory of the affection we have for that person, continues to keep that person alive. And so it is, I know, with those of us who knew STYLES.

It is tragic that he had to be taken from us at this time, and yet the great stimulus which his association and his life brought to us have been of inestimable value, and will continue to be of inestimable value.

As has been pointed out by the senior Senator from New Hampshire, STYLES BRIDGES had the highest concern, regard, and loyalty to and for the Senate of the United States and its responsibilities, not only to this country but to the free world. There had been times when his voice stood almost alone on issues when he knew that stand to be in the best interests of his country and which at the time was opposed by overwhelming differences of opinion, but which proved in the long run to be right, sound, impartial, and fundamentally nonpolitical and in the interest of his country.

He truly was a great U.S. Senator. He truly was a great citizen of the United States and a great son of New Hampshire.

Today we pay, in some meager way, our respects to him; but, as I said at the outset, it is impossible, certainly for me, to give any satisfactory expression to the feeling of loss. I can only say, in closing, as I said in the beginning, that we can express ourselves only within whatever capacity we have.

Not only was STYLES a close friend of mine, but he and Doloris, his wife, had been wonderful friends of Mrs. Hickenlooper and myself for all these years.

Our mutual condolences go out to them, to their sons and their families. All of us regret that we cannot be of more comfort than we may be able to be. We can only say that we wish we could be of as much comfort at this time as we would like to be.

I am reminded, in the transitory period in which we live our lives, of what the poet said:

> The moving finger writes; and, having writ,
> Moves on; nor all your piety nor wit
> Shall lure it back to cancel half a line,
> Nor all your tears wash out a word of it.

This is a sad day. It is a day of loss. But the life which STYLES BRIDGES brought into association with all of us can also make it a day of stimulus for a better and a more constructive America, in the public interest and the interest of posterity.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in those days when the country was beset with the grim verities of World War I, some obscure and unknown person, at least within my knowledge, initiated the practice of having a service flag hanging in the windows of those homes in America where a son or father or brother may have been surrendered to the country to do military service. If the one in service was still alive, the flag bore a blue star, and if the one who had been surrendered to service had laid a life upon the altar of his country, that flag was inscribed with a gold star.

The Senate of the United States has a service flag of its own. Unfortunately, it has been reduced to form. But if it had not been reduced to form, and if it could adorn this Chamber, and if it were given to me to design, I think at the top I would show 100 blue stars for the living Senators serving their country, and then I would have a great, uncounted galaxy of golden stars to observe the service and contribution of those who were here in this Chamber, or wherever the Senate may have met, in order to serve their country.

As I think of it, and think of all those great personalities who have gone, one could pick any Senator here and refresh himself on the name of some political forebear who was here before. If I saw, for instance, the Senator from Connecticut, I would think of Oliver Elsworth, who served here and later went to the Supreme Court of the United States.

If I saw the gracious lady from Maine, I would think of Hannibal Hamlin, who not only was Vice President under Lincoln, but who graced the U.S. Senate.

If I saw the Senator from Kentucky, out of a feeble memory there would come the name of Clay, and the name of Carlisle, and of others who once upon a time did service here.

If I thought of the Senator from South Carolina, I would think of Calhoun.

If I thought of the Senator from Virginia, I would think of Randolph, and others.

If I saw the Senator from Georgia, I would think of the star in that galaxy to commemorate the service of Walter George.

There would be a star there for Bob Taft.

If all of them were to be mentioned, and there were brought together all their contributions, we would have one of the most intimate histories of this Republic, where one could drink at the fountain and gather in the glory, greatness, and achievements of those who served this country over a long period of time.

So today we place another illustrious star in that galaxy of the Senate's service flag, and that is the star for our friend, Styles Bridges. As I think of him, I would testify to only two things, as others devote themselves to other virtues and attributes. The first is his fidelity—his fidelity to his country in an age when fidelity seems to become a little amusing to some of our citizens. That is an unhappy thing to say. I think of the country as an entity which has a divine rendezvous. If I did not feel it, my whole faith in any achievement which advances the cause of the country would go out. Others can serve only with an intense passion and a great fervor of fidelity to the United States. Whether Styles Bridges stood alone, or whether he intoned in unison with others the pledge of allegiance "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all," it was not merely a concatenation of words, because into it went the spirit, the purpose, and the faith of a friend and a colleague, Styles Bridges.

I am reminded of a story I encountered, which I think was documented, of a New Hampshire soldier who served in the Civil War. He received a rather long furlough and went back to New Hampshire. Knowing, of course, the fortuities of conflict, he went to the stone mason to have his tombstone designed and made. To the stone mason, he said, "On one side put the statistics; my name, my age, when I was born, when I served, and then when I die the usual note. On the other side, put an inscription." I understand there is inscribed this sentiment: "This side of my monument I dedicate to liberty and union. May they endure and survive forever."

That was Styles Bridges.

There is one other attribute to which I would refer. He was one of the kindest people I ever knew in my life. I have often seen him tremble because of a deep conviction when he made a statement on the floor of the Senate, and yet one could not help but feel, when one saw him tremble with emotion, that somehow his face always mirrored a kindness under every circumstance.

It has been said that justice is truth in action, and I believe that kindness is the very essence of Christian faith in action, for when one is kind one is unselfish and undertakes, among all the great goals and objectives in life, to make people happy. I cannot think of a greater thing for which to be remembered than that. He was what he was.

This brings to mind a stone in an English cemetery which bears the inscription, "Here lies Peter Bacon, born a man and died a grocer."

Styles Bridges always was a man, with all the wonderful attributes of kindness, faith, and hope. That is the reason he was so deeply endeared to his colleagues and why we pay testimony to him today.

So, behold on the Senate wall this great flag. There are the blue stars for those of us who are here. There is that lustrous galaxy for those who were here. There is space at the bottom for us, when the blue stars are transferred into golden stars.

I say this not as a reminder that all of us have an appointment with immortality, but rather as a reminder of our responsibility while we are here and charged with the authority of office.

In that great galaxy today we insert a golden star. For me and for all of us it is a little more golden because he was such an integral part of the lives of us, the living who serve here today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the latter part of November I was a member of a committee making a study trip through Latin America. The committee was headed by our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], and included the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. Smith], the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. Dworshak], the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], and me.

On the arrival of that committee in Santiago, Chile, we received our first word of the passing of our beloved colleague, the senior Senator from the State of New Hampshire. On behalf of all of us our distinguished chairman sent a message of condolence to Mrs. Styles Bridges.

The announcement of the passing of Senator Bridges created a pall over that committee. Regardless of our politics, of whether we were Republicans or Democrats, we all had a deep affection, a great respect and admiration for this man who served his party, his State and his country so well.

The name Styles Bridges means something in the history of this Nation. Of course, he was the senior Republican in this body, and as such achieved great prestige and understanding, but he was more than the senior Republican in the U.S. Senate. He, perhaps above all others in modern times, held more positions of responsibility in the Senate than any other member of his party. He was the Republican leader in the second session of the 82d Congress. He was the President pro tempore of the Senate in the 83d Congress. He was the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the 80th and 83d Congresses. He was the chairman of the Republican policy committee. He was the ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the ranking member of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, and the ranking member of the Senate Office Buildings Commission. These are only a few of the many positions which he held during his quarter of a century of service to his country in this body.

The thing I shall remember most about Styles Bridges is not the positions he held or the prestige which was rightfully his. I shall remember Styles Bridges as a friend belonging to another party, to whom I could always go and from whom I could always get good advice and sound counsel. We disagreed on a number of occasions, but we disagreed on the table, and I am sure that he made allowances for my disabilities. Certainly his understanding was without bounds.

Styles Bridges will be missed in this body because he was a great Senator. He was not merely a Senator from the State of New Hampshire; he was a Senator of the United States. We always knew where Styles Bridges stood. He always made his position clear; and, as some Senators have already said, sometimes he stood alone. But he believed in what he was doing. He was a credit and an asset to this institution, to which have come so many great men from the State of New Hampshire and the New England area to serve the Nation as a whole.

So in my own way I wish to express my sorrow and the sorrow of my family on the passing of a great and beloved friend, and to express the prayer, which I am sure will be granted, that his soul may rest in peace.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in moments like these we like to think of our personal experiences with the man we honor.

My first recollection of our beloved colleague Styles Bridges was in 1935 when he was Governor of New Hampshire and I the speaker of the house of representatives in Massachusetts. I went to Concord to make a speech. I paid my respects to him in the Governor's office and he generously presented me to the senate and house in New Hampshire who were then in session. I was very pleased to have him do so. I have never forgotten it and our friendship which started then lasted throughout his life.

Between 1935 and 1945 when I became a Member of the U.S. Senate, we had occasional contacts and some discussion on mutual problems in New England.

After the first year or so here, our committee assignments were identical: Armed Services, Appropriations, and for a short time, Space. We sat side by side at these committee meetings, and I enjoyed many helpful comments from him as matters came before us.

Senator Bridges was a prodigious worker. I joked with him occasionally about the two heavy envelopes he constantly carried: one contained letters that required his signature, the other correspondence that his staff had given him to read. During lulls in committee work, he at once opened one envelope or the other and studied the documents therein. Incidentally, I know of no one who scanned more thoroughly each day through the Congressional Record. As he did so, he would mark the items that he wished his office to note for his future reference. He told me several times that if one read the Appendix of the daily Congressional Record quite thoroughly, he would be a very well informed man on many, many subjects. And in this I certainly agree with him.

Senator Bridges had a faculty for hitting the high spots in legislation in which he believed the country's security or its economy or its citizen's freedom of action were of importance. He did not speak on the Senate floor often, but when he did it was with force, eloquence and a thorough review of the subject under discussion. His colleagues were always impressed. Even more I believe his ability to accomplish results centered in the respect in which his colleagues held him and his ability to impress them in private conversations. He knew the government of our country, he knew quite completely the workings of the Congress and the executive departments, he knew how to contact Members of the Congress and members of the executive departments in ways that would be helpful to the cause that he sponsored. He was an effective legislator in the full sense of that word as it affects our Government. In essence, his point of view was that of a New Englander who believed thoroughly in the Constitution and its interpretations for improving the lot of freemen under a democratic system of government.

We shall all miss his pleasant smile, his sympathetic word in time of trouble, and his advice and judgment on problems of importance to us all. I personally have lost the company of a friend in whom I had confidence and for whom I had respect and affection. Our sympathy goes to Mrs. Bridges, to his mother, his sons and grandchildren. Theirs is the loss not only of a fond husband, son and parent, but also the loss to every citizen of New Hampshire and of our country whom he served so many years so ably in public life.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am one of the few Members of this body who was here when Styles Bridges took the oath of office as a Senator of the United States. His committee assignments and mine happened to be parallel. We were brought together in very close association in much of the work of this body.

I soon learned that Senator Bridges believed that local problems can be better solved in the town hall by the people of the community affected than by a bureaucrat in Washington who knows nothing about either the problem or the community. He believed in keeping the government close to the people and with a minimum of interference by the Federal Government in the private affairs of our citizens. A great deal of his philosophy has been that which I have espoused throughout my career.

We soon formed one of the finest and sweetest friendships that I have ever known and enjoyed. That friendship grew richer and warmer through the quarter of a century that we worked together in this body.

The record that Styles Bridges made will, of course, be discussed by others. It has already been outlined in eloquent words by other Senators who respected and loved him. I have never known a man who had more complete faith in the basic American system of government as a means of protecting human freedom on this earth, as a means of preserving the standards of living that we enjoy, and maintaining the free enterprise system, than had Styles Bridges. He was an old-fashioned man who believed that energy, genius, capacity, and a will to work, to exert oneself, was more certain to be recognized and rewarded under our system than under any other system ever devised on this earth.

Styles Bridges was passionately opposed to any philosophy or trend toward socializing this country or establishing a monolithic state which would seek to cast all men in a common mold and destroy the opportunities for those who were willing to sacrifice to find them. He was a jealous guardian of the oath that he took here to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.

Styles Bridges was of a breed that is not so nearly as numerous in this country today as we might hope it should be. He was of the tribe possessing real standards of honor and respect for duty. Duty as a word, and whatever effort might be implied in the discharge of that duty, did not frighten him.

He was a man of conviction. What is more, he was a man who had the courage to defend those convictions. It mattered not what forces were mobilized on the other side. I sometimes thought he was quicker to defend and quicker to speak when the odds were against him than he was when the lines were more closely drawn.

He was intellectually honest. He was honest with himself. He was incapable of dissembling or deceiving any man.

I worked with him very closely on matters affecting the defense of this country, both on the Armed Services Committee and on the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations. There was never the slightest tinge of partisanship in his approach to any problem of national defense. He believed in a strong America. He believed in an America that had the might to maintain and preserve those things that go to make the American way of life.

I have seldom felt a deeper sense of personal loss than I experienced when I received word that this man had passed from this mortal scene into the other world. I admired him. I have seen it here in the Senate when the courage with which he grasped some thorny problem caused men of similar belief but of lesser courage to stand up and do that which they wanted to do but might have been prevented from doing by the pressures—political and otherwise—to which we are all subject to some degree in the Senate.

I cannot do more than say that this man was a Senator in the great tradition, in his ability, in his loyalty to his country, and in his courage to stand up for that in which he believed. He ranks with the great giants of the past, illuminating the history of the Senate of the United States.

He was a Senate man. He was jealous of the prerogatives of the Senate. He appreciated the fact that this was a body unique in all of the parliamentary history of the world. He did not propose that any act or any word of his would detract from the position of the United States Senate by one jot or tittle. He was a Senate man.

I know there will be times in the days that lie ahead when I will unconsciously look over to where he sat when he adorned this body. I know I will look in vain to his empty seat for the reassurances and the inspiration that I have gathered from my association, contact, and friendship with him in the past. When I do so I will feel personally bereft because he has been taken from us.

He had a rich life. His State showed him every honor that it could possibly confer upon him. He had a devoted family—a wife, children, mother, and staff. I can only say that I sympathize with the people of New Hampshire on their loss of one of their greatest public servants. I share the grief of the members of his family. He paid the penalty that men pay for representing small States in the Senate. If he had been from a more populous and politically powerful State, he undoubtedly would have been called to the national ticket in campaigns for even higher offices.

I feel personally blessed—and I know that the members of his family feel that they are blessed—by the recollection, of a quarter century of close association and friendship with this great American.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I rise to join my fellow Senators in paying tribute to a highly respected and esteemed Member of the U.S. Senate, our friend and colleague, Styles Bridges.

For years he sat next to me here, and throughout that whole period of our service together, I marveled at his ability and of the way he worked. As a Member of the Senate for 26 years, he carved for himself a unique place, as has been said many times today, in the history of the Senate and the Nation.

Victory at the polls, time after time, reflected the confidence of the people of New Hampshire in his ability to serve his State and the Nation.

As ranking minority member, the only Senator senior to myself, he exercised a strong voice in the design and execution of policy in the Republican Party.

Over the years, my association with the senior Senator from New Hampshire, Styles Bridges, has been long and profitable.

In 1939 I came to the Senate with five other Members of the Senate: Rufus C. Holman, of Oregon; Clyde M. Reed, of Kansas; Robert A. Taft, of Ohio; Warren Barbour, of New Jersey; and Charles W. Tobey, of New Hampshire.

They are all gone. Now STYLES BRIDGES is gone. He has gone ahead on the journey that all of us must make. As he was a busy individual, or, as someone has said, a busy soul, we know that he is not loafing now. He is active in the world ahead.

He was a dedicated Republican. His career was replete with patriotic deeds, symbolizing love of country above party and self.

In this country, Mr. President, what a marvelous thing it is that you can go to your church and I can go to mine, and we can be friends; you can have your economic philosophy and I can have mine, and we can be friends; you can belong to one line of political thought, and I can belong to another, and we can be friends. Why? Because it all exemplifies the wisdom of the Fathers when they set up a government of checks and balances. It applies not only to politics; it applies to every human endeavor. The result is that when we disagree, we do not shoot at each other; we simply listen; and if there is light, we get it.

STYLES BRIDGES was a strong character. He was over to the right in the Republican Party. But no one disagreed with him because of that. That was his right. He was, as I have said, a dedicated Republican. He loved this country. He dedicated his life to the preservation of the Nation. When I say "preservation of the Nation," I mean that he was dedicated to the ideals which make this country great.

While our hearts are saddened today, and while we sense that in the physical world STYLES BRIDGES is no longer with us, we know that in another sense there is no loss. He has gone ahead. The observances, the tributes, and the unspoken words in the hearts of many of us reflect the high esteem in which, individually and as a body, he was held for his service to his country and his State.

In accordance with the faith which many of us profess, the recognition of his long and outstanding record should lead us to a sense of understanding and perhaps of quiet satisfaction. Yes, he has gone ahead in the journey. It is with satisfaction that we can pay tribute to the man. While our sympathy goes out to the widow and the family, we know that they will carry on as STYLES BRIDGES would want them to carry on—with their chins up, meeting the challenges of life as he met them.

Mr. President, STYLES BRIDGES was successful in fulfilling his personal ambitions and, more important, a higher cause, that of service to his country.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, it is with a very sad heart that I rise to pay tribute to one of my most beloved friends. My warm friendship for STYLES BRIDGES began when he came to the Senate of the United States from his beloved State of New Hampshire nearly 25 years ago.

I shall miss him personally, and I shall miss the practical wisdom which he counseled; and so will the Senate. Mrs. Bridges and their family have my deepest sympathy.

STYLES BRIDGES was a native of Maine, but he served New Hampshire, first as Governor, and then as U.S. Senator for more than a quarter of a century.

He was a teacher and a businessman before he entered public office. In the Senate he rose quickly to positions of party leadership which he used in the interest of his country.

His basically sound intellect combined with intense patriotism won for Senator BRIDGES a well-deserved national recognition, political affiliation notwithstanding.

I knew him as a man of fine courtesy and delightful personal charm; a man of enviable patience and fortitude; a man of vigorous courage and independence; a man of stanch patriotism.

He was a man of great capacity and perseverance. He loved his State and his country; and loving them, he never failed to deliver his best effort in their behalf.

I have seen him work here, in the Capital of the Nation, to a point of physical exhaustion. His devotion to his constitutional duties cannot be forgotten by those who served with him.

Countless Americans are the beneficiaries of his work, for he was a champion of sound federal government confined to the functions of its proper sphere.

Regardless of partisan loyalties, the absence of Senator BRIDGES will be mourned by all. He was a practical man, not beset by illusions.

He was a genial man, whose friendship was warm and whose compassion was deep. He was a man of zeal, dignity, and simplicity, always willing to listen to the views of others.

But when he spoke, you knew there was something worthwhile to be said: and when there was something to be done he acted promptly and forthrightly. His voice will no longer be heard in this historic chamber, and his vote will no longer be counted. But his sound counsel will continue to serve his country.

I shall forever treasure his memory.

I feel I was very fortunate to enjoy an intimate, personal relationship with him. I loved him dearly as a friend and greatly admired him as a statesman.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, living, as I do, in the hills of northern New England, with only the Connecticut River lying between my State and our companion State of New Hampshire, and sitting, as I did for many years, alongside the Senator from New Hampshire, STYLES BRIDGES, it is only natural that I think of him as a friend and neighbor rather than as the great statesman he truly was. I think this is the way that STYLES BRIDGES regarded himself, too. He never let greatness overwhelm his humility. Even after he had achieved greatness in the political field, and the captains of industry and the statesmen of the world were beating a path to his door, seeking his approbation and approval, he always remained a man of humble character. This was probably due not only to his innate character but also to his early training and experience.

For several years he was a county agent in New Hampshire. His duty as county agent was to help people in trouble, to help them to solve their problems. When one has experienced that life for several years, he never gets over it; it stays with him throughout his entire life.

Although STYLES BRIDGES mingled with the great people of the world, he never forgot the other people, either. I think this is amply demonstrated by the devotion and loyalty which were demonstrated by his own immediate staff. They were intensely loyal. I do not know of any office staff in the entire Capitol that was more loyal to its representative in this body than was the staff of STYLES BRIDGES.

Perhaps many persons do not realize the great friendship he had for and with the employees of the Senate and the Capitol. I know that when any one of them had trouble and needed a friend, he knew where to find one, and went to STYLES, who always was willing not only to listen, but also to work actively to help get things straightened out.

STYLES BRIDGES was not one to hide himself from the people. He always was accessible. I noticed that at his home at East Concord. I thought that symbolic of his way of life. I noticed on the mailbox alongside his home just the name "STYLES BRIDGES"—meaning that he was accessible to his neighbors and to all the people. He never forgot the trust they had placed in him, and he never forgot his own plain beginnings. I join with everyone else in extending our sincere sympathy to his beloved and devoted mother, his wife, his son, his grandchildren, and to all the people of New Hampshire. In particular, I wish to say to his wonderful mother that although her sorrow is very great, she should be very, very proud that she had so much to give to her country and to the world.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is with a heavy heart that I lend my voice, along with that of other Senators, in lamenting the death of STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire. For me, his passing is a personal loss, for STYLES BRIDGES and I became Members of this distinguished body on the same day, January 3, 1937. We were 13 freshman Senators, 11 of whom were sworn in for the first time on that day, and 2 who had been appointed during the 74th Congress, who had been sworn in, but who previously were unable to take their seats, because Congress was not then in session.

Of that total, STYLES BRIDGES and I were the last Members to serve during the 1st session of the 87th Congress. Today, I am the only survivor of that group still serving in the Senate.

I may point out, Mr. President, that there were many distinguished Members of that freshman class—Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts; Edwin Johnson, of Colorado; Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island; Claude Pepper, of Florida; Guy Gillette, of Iowa—to name only a few. One of the Members of our group was William Smathers, of New Jersey, the uncle of the distinguished junior Senator from Florida who today serves with us in the Senate.

Mr. President, I mourn the passing of STYLES BRIDGES more than a personal loss, for he will be missed not only by the Members of this body, but also by our Nation. It is true that we sat on opposite sides of the aisle for 25 years, and we differed on some occasions; but I always felt that every stand that STYLES BRIDGES assumed was based on honest conviction. I never once questioned his motives, for I believe that his votes were cast in the belief that they served the best interests, not only of the people of New Hampshire, but also those of all the people of the United States.

In the death of STYLES BRIDGES, our Nation has lost a valued servant; and I am deeply grieved at his passing. I extend to his mother, to his widow, and to all other members of his family my sincere regrets.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, any attempt to appraise in full measure the late STYLES BRIDGES as a gentleman, as a citizen, as an American, and as a public servant is a well-nigh futile task. Only a complete history of the United States, and, indeed, of the world, since STYLES BRIDGES entered public life, can adequately record the tribute he so well deserves. That history may well be vastly different than it would have been had not STYLES BRIDGES lived to provide the leadership played so important a part in the making of it.

The leadership of STYLES BRIDGES in forging that history was in the fashion envisioned by the framers of our great Constitution which he loved. He set his goals for the betterment of his country. He attached himself to the political party which most nearly had the same goals and the same philosophy. Then STYLES BRIDGES devoted his almost limitless energies and his life to fighting, through the party of his choice, for achievement of the goals which he believed his America should attain. Many battles he won. Some he lost, as we all do; but even his defeats always demonstrated the effective BRIDGES leadership.

National and international stature was his reward. It is a tribute to any man who served in public life as long as STYLES BRIDGES did that he never was defeated when he sought public office.

Those of us who served with him in the Senate mourn for the Nation and extend our sincerest sympathies to Mrs. Bridges and to the others of his family.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, it is with the utmost sincerity that I join with the Members of the Senate who already this afternoon have spoken in tribute to our beloved and lamented colleague, Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire. Although I do not possess the eloquence of those who have preceded me in speaking here, I wish to say I fully share all the reverent and beautiful sentiments they have so movingly and tenderly expressed.

I know my feeble words will be wholly inadequate and lacking in fullness to record the high esteem and admiration I had for Senator BRIDGES as a person and as a friend, nor shall I be able to command language which will convey to those who hear me or to those who may read these humble remarks the deep sense of personal loss I feel and that all of us and all in the State and the Nation have suffered by reason of his departure from our midst.

I sorrow and grieve with all of them and with his devoted wife and family, whom he so dearly loved.

Mr. President, I count it my great and good fortune to have known STYLES BRIDGES, and to have had the privilege of being associated with him, and to have worked with him here in the Senate for the past 19 years. It was a genuine pleasure to serve with him on the Senate Appropriations Committee and on the Senate Special Committee To Investigate Political Activities, Lobbying, and Campaign Contributions, and also to serve with him on the second Hoover Commission for the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government; and it was always most pleasant to work with him here on the floor of the Senate.

Although our political affiliations were different, and although we came from different sections of the Nation, we more frequently voted alike than opposite on major issues involving the more important affairs of state and the welfare of the Nation.

Yes, Mr. President, I have listened to the remarks made by other Members who were as closely associated or perhaps more closely associated with Senator BRIDGES than was I. Universally, those who knew him had the same opinion of him—that he was a man of deep convictions, who adhered in his philosophy to the basic principles and ideals upon which our Nation was founded.

Indeed, I often conferred with him and profited from his counsel and his wisdom. I had profound respect for his ability and judgment, for his dedication and for the high ideals and purposes that motivated him not only in the performance of his official duties here in the Senate, but in the daily activities of his life as well. He had great strength of character and met the myriad challenges which fall to those in public positions of authority with firm resolve and unwaivering courage. He was a hard worker, strong in his convictions, forceful in debate, and an ardent and unyielding defender of constitutional government and of the principles upon which our Government was founded and upon which our liberties rest.

Mr. President, STYLES BRIDGES was a good man, a recognized statesman, and a great American. He shall be sorely missed by all of us.

Mrs. McClellan joins me in expressions of condolence and deepest sympathy to Mrs. Bridges and the family.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in paying respect to the memory of a great man and a respected Member of the U.S. Senate.

STYLES BRIDGES was a stanch defender of our free enterprise system. He was dedicated to our American system of government. He was a true American.

His outstanding record of public service, both to his own State as well as to our country, will long be remembered.

His passing represents a great loss to his family, but they can be consoled in the knowledge that his State and our country are better places in which to live as the result of the outstanding contributions of STYLES BRIDGES as a public servant.

During his career many honors were conferred upon STYLES BRIDGES, but I know that there is no honor which he would appreciate more than to be referred to as a loyal American and a friend of his fellow man.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, for 15 years I had the rare privilege of serving as a colleague of the late Senator STYLES BRIDGES. I loved to serve with him. I found him to be one of the most courteous and helpful men with whom I have ever been thrown in contact. He was courteous and helpful to me as a newcomer, as a freshman Senator, and that same attitude prevailed throughout all the 15 years.

His second quality I would mention was his courage. I never knew him to fail to take a stand for an issue which he thought was right. The fact that I did not agree with him on all those issues did not make a bit of difference. He never reproached me. He always seemed to understand that I was trying to stand for what I thought was right. He was kindly and tolerant along with his courage and courtesy.

Another quality he had was his sincere conservatism. So many people these days seem to feel it is necessary to apologize if one is a conservative. I found him to be an open, avowed, and proud conservative, not one of the type who fears to take a step forward if one is needed, but one who does not believe in change for the mere sake of change.

I found him in the Appropriations Committee standing for economy on issues which were appealing, but which, nevertheless, he felt were not necessary to our country's best interest.

I have nothing but the kindest memories of STYLES BRIDGES, and I feel enriched because of the fact that I knew him.

I think of him always as having been one of the real fundamentalists in connection with our Constitution, in connection with our form of government, in connection with the concept of what it means to be a Senator of the United States.

He was a Senator's Senator, and was always standing up for the prestige, traditions, and honor of this body in a way which reflected credit not only upon him but upon the Senate as an institution.

Mr. President, most of the things I would like to have said have already been better stated, and I subscribe to them. I simply say, for Mrs. Holland and myself, that we voice our affection for STYLES BRIDGES, and our deep and affectionate sympathy to Mrs. Bridges and other members of his family. We shall always feel that our lives were enriched by the fact that we knew him and he was our friend.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I would, first of all, like to salute the new senior Senator from New Hampshire on the inspiring, eloquent, and extraordinarily effective tribute which he paid to his late colleague in the Senate, STYLES BRIDGES.

Like other Senators, I have heard a great many tributes expressed on the floor of this body, but I must say, in simple candor, I have heard nothing which was more moving or which was said with more fervency than that expressed by Senator COTTON about our good friend, the late STYLES BRIDGES.

I suspect that Senator COTTON was inspired, as we all are, by virtue of the fact that STYLES BRIDGES himself was such an extraordinary Senator in every way. For almost a quarter of a century, STYLES served as an active, articulate, and influential Member of this most significant parliamentary body in the world.

As a Senator, I think he was without a peer. As the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has said, he was a Senator's Senator. He was also a man's man. And I predict for well over a quarter of a century of ensuing history, Americans will recall with genuine remorse the void which has been left in our midst by the untimely and unexpected passing of this great American.

Perhaps the words "pure American" best describe the actions, the political philosophy, the attitudes, and the legislative positions of STYLES BRIDGES. He weighed every decision in the American scales in order to determine which course he deemed to be the better for his country. When that decision conformed with the prevailing policy and attitude of the great party to which he belonged, he was the happier; and when that decision also conformed to the attitudes and ideals of the people of the great State of New Hampshire, he was the happiest. However, when, as on occasion it happened, that decision found him in conflict with the members of his party, or the leaders of his party, or the people of New Hampshire, STYLES BRIDGES never hesitated to express himself in conformity with those convictions. There was a Senator who always put America first.

I can recall many personal experiences with STYLES, as can many other Senators, because he had that great capacity for friendship so frequently referred to by Members on the floor of the Senate today.

He was a friend of the great and the small, of the known and of the unknown. He was a friend of every Senator, regardless of whether he agreed or disagreed with his political philosophy or his position on a given measure.

STYLES BRIDGES also was a tried and true and tested friend of freedom. He never permitted himself to become imprisoned by party loyalties or geographic considerations when it came to making a decision involving the freedom and the security of this Republic.

By his very nature STYLES was a considerate, friendly, unselfish human being. I saw him often, as other Senators have seen him, go out of his way to help a younger Senator, a colleague, or a staff member in meeting some problem or in the solution of some situation with which he was confronted.

Through it all STYLES fought hard for his convictions, but he nourished no grudges. He considered vengeance a vice to be avoided.

Despite the aches and the pains and physical discomfiture which plagued him so frequently the last few years he was with us, he was unvaryingly cheerful and put himself with great enthusiasm into any contest meriting his talent.

Our colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] mentioned the interesting anecdotes, from the early experience of Senator BRIDGES, related to those who came to him to profit from his counsel. I myself have benefited from his counsel many, many times.

I recall the occasion when a culmination of circumstances, combined with the decisions of the then Senate leadership, cast me in an unwanted role in what has been referred to by some observers as the most excruciating episode in the history of the U.S. Senate. I found myself named as chairman of the so-called Army-McCarthy hearings. This was indeed an unwanted distinction. I suspect it is one of the few times in history that a committee chairmanship, which appeals to Senators so greatly, was most reluctantly accepted by the one elevated to that post.

I went to STYLES, a tried and trusted adviser, and said, "Look; this is what I am up against." This happened to be in 1954, which was a year of election time for me. I was then running for my second Senate term. It looked like an impossible situation to confront. I said, "What am I going to do with a situation of this type?" STYLES sat down with me, and in that great New England direct and crisp manner of his, and said, "KARL, let me talk to you a while." He said, "In this business of the Senate you have to do those things which you are supposed to do. If this happens to be your assignment you have to undertake it." I said, "STYLES, I have friends in every aspect of this controversy. I have close personal associations with the people on both sides of the acrimonious accusations." He said, "All you have to do is to try to call them as you see them as they come over the plate, and while you will not make anybody happy you will at least survive and the facts will speak on themselves. This is a job which must be done and you have been selected to do it."

I accepted the responsibility. I went to STYLES frequently for counsel and suggestions along the way during that dramatic period of 71 sessions of nationally televised hearings consuming over 350 hours of air time during that most embittered controversy. His calmness, his judgment, his counsel stood me in good stead during the period of that ordeal. I have never regretted my decision.

I say this because I think much of the influence of STYLES BRIDGES on the record of our times was never recorded in the headlines nor reported by the press of America. I think historians will at some time learn from other sources and convey to future generations the significant decisions which STYLES BRIDGES helped to formulate and the actions he helped to originate in the private meetings and conferences he so frequently held in his Senate office or in the off-the-record sessions which were held with colleagues and other citizens, well hidden from the eyes and the ears of the general public. Here his great New England candor, his persistent persuasiveness, and his calm counsel were at their best. Here, too, I think his great talents for leadership achieved the maximum results.

To STYLES BRIDGES it was always the job to be done rather than the headline to be read which counted the most. As one who on occasion was privileged to work with STYLES in the privacy of a luncheon meeting, or in a conference in his Capitol hideout, marked only by the simple identification "P-49," or sometimes in a private room of his suite in the New Senate Office Building, I can attest to the influence he wielded, to the forces which he initiated or supported, to the decisions which he helped to formulate, which sometimes served to alter the course of the history of our times.

The United States is much the better because of the energy and the erudition displayed by STYLES BRIDGES, and the free world is much the loser by his passing. All of us are much the richer because of the opportunity we had to associate with this unusual man.

Mrs. Mundt and I were close friends of STYLES and his wife, Doloris. We saw them frequently socially. We have visited in their Concord home. The deepest sympathies of Mrs. Mundt and I go out to his devoted widow, his constant helpmate, Doloris; and to his mother, who, as the Senator from Vermont pointed out, has great cause to be proud of her contribution to her country's welfare. Our solicitude goes forward to the entire family of STYLES BRIDGES. We do not soon expect to see his like again. We doubt we shall ever know a Senator who will be his superior.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I fully share the sentiments which have been expressed by my senior colleague concerning the loss of our friend, a distinguished Senator, STYLES BRIDGES. I wish to express my sympathy to the people of New Hampshire because of their loss and to say that I share their grief because I have lost a personal friend.

The people of New Hampshire first selected Senator BRIDGES to be their Governor, and in 1936 they chose him to represent them in the Senate of the United State. I have been privileged to serve with him since 1947. I knew him as a Senator of great ability, of high integrity, and as a man with great capacity for friendship.

New Hampshire, like Virginia, is proud to be one of the Thirteen Original States, and proud of the fact that her representatives participated in the writing of our Constitution. True to the wisdom which has come down to us from the earliest days of our Nation, Senator BRIDGES agreed with our Founding Fathers that the Federal Government was a government of delegated powers and therefore limited powers, with all other powers reserved to the soverign States or to the people thereof.

He was, Mr. President, a courageous and fearless defender of our Constitution and of American constitutional liberty.

I express my deep sympathy to the people of New Hampshire and to the family of Senator BRIDGES. I shall greatly miss my friend and former colleague.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I can add nothing new to the very appropriate tributes that have been made, and will be made, to our deeply respected and much-beloved colleague, the late STYLES BRIDGES.

But I do believe that I can express views from a position that no other person can—and a position that perhaps gave me a unique insight in, and perspective of, STYLES BRIDGES.

The uniqueness is in the fact that we served on the same committees—the Appropriations Committee, the Armed Services Committee, the Aeronautical Sciences and Space Committee and the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee.

We were the only two Republicans serving on those committees. The only other Senator serving on those same committees is a member of the other major party—the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

There were some issues on which STYLES BRIDGES and I disagreed—and disagreed deeply and fundamentally—such as the controversy over the late Senator Joseph McCarthy.

But there were other issues on which we agreed most emphatically and stood together almost alone in the Senate—such as our vigorous and unrelenting opposition to aid to Communist Yugoslavia.

Whether STYLES BRIDGES agreed with a person or not, his way and his manner were such as to create friendship even with those with whom be disagreed.

He had a simple but magic formula that is far too rarely found—that very, very rare ability to disagree agreeably.

It was this rare trait plus the fact that STYLES BRIDGES was an unrelenting fighter for what he believed in that caused even his enemies to respect him—and even to like and admire him just as did the liberal columnist who recently described him as the "much beloved" Senator.

What more can be said of a man than this?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the tributes to our late friend and colleague have been very sincere and well deserved. As one of the colleagues of the late Senator BRIDGES, I extend my deepest feelings of sympathy and condolences to Mrs. Bridges, to his fine sons, to her who I am sure is a truly great mother, and also to the fine people of New Hampshire.

The Senator From Maine [Mrs. SMITH] has referred to service on Senate committees. It has been my privilege to share with the Senator from Maine and our late friend Senator BRIDGES identical committee assignments. Even though I knew him socially and associated with him in the Senate, perhaps it was in those committees and in the making of the major decisions they had to make that I knew him best. Many times, after all committee discussion had been completed, Senator BRIDGES, who was often detained in connection with many other problems on which he so ably worked, would be absent. Often some member of the committee would say, "Let us wait and see what STYLES thinks about it."

Senator BRIDGES always got to the committee meeting, and he always had some pertinent and enlightening remarks to make. At those committee tables, Senator's from both sides of the aisle were intensely interested in what STYLES might say, because we knew he would speak not only as a Senator from his State—although no Senator that I know was more devoted to his State and to his people—not only as a New Englander, not only as a Republican, although he was loyal and devoted to his party, but with sound logic and as a patriotic American.

As all of us know, he seldom addressed the Senate, but Senators seldom failed to consult with him on major questions. Perhaps, after all, one of the truest and soundest tests of a Senator is the recognition by fellow Senators of the soundness of his thinking and his solid approach to the problems of our great country.

I mention quite briefly only a few of the typical human qualities that I saw in Senator BRIDGES. I do not personally know this to be a fact, but I have heard it said by those who do, that, busy as he was—and even in the last few years of his life when he did not have great physical strength—he would return home to New Hampshire as often as he possibly could to consult with people in humble walks of life. He would exchange ideas, and try to help those who were distressed, or in need, and those who had special problems. He never forgot their problems and their viewpoints.

Senator BRIDGES and I were frequently together in the gymnasium. I know of the sincere grief on the part of the men who worked there when his illness became so serious. When he passed away, I happened to be with those men and heard their touching expressions.

Not only in the Senate Chamber, not only in high places of government, here or in New Hampshire, but everywhere else, this man had something in common with the people—the great human touch.

Only last year, busy as he was, he went to great pains to gather the facts concerning a small item which concerned a State across the continent from where he lived that had been omitted from an appropriation bill. The omission amounted to what he thought was a discrimination. Even though a Senator from the State in question was on that committee, Senator BRIDGES himself went to the trouble of trying to right what he thought was a wrong.

I endorse the sentiments which have been expressed in the Senate, to the effect that STYLES BRIDGES was a Senator's Senator. He had great respect and love for the Senate as a major institution of our Government and as a group of men.

I came to the Senate as a class of one. There was nothing about me that would attract Senator BRIDGES to me. But during the first few days of my service he stopped long enough to talk with me for a few minutes. I was impressed by one thing he said to me. "You are the newest man here, but you are a full-fledged Member of the Senate and you are entitled to all the prerogatives and consideration accorded to any other Senator. The representation of your State through you is equal to that of any other State, no matter how long other Senators may have served in this body."

Mr. President, in conclusion I wish to mention one thing—and I do not believe it has been mentioned—and that is that those of us who attended the funeral of STYLES BRIDGES were very much impressed, and most favorably impressed indeed, not only by the tributes but also by the variety of them. The sincere expressions on the part of the people who lined the streets, as well as by those who were able to get into the building, and the way the entire presentation was made, were a splendid tribute to the man and his memory.

First there was a reading from the Bible of appropriate verses. Then there were some remarks by a man of the cloth. Then there was a tribute from the Governor of the State, speaking for the people as a whole and representing the government at the State level. Then there was a fine tribute from the gentleman who is now the Speaker of the House of Representatives, speaking for the House of Representatives at the National Government level. Then the minority floor leader of the Senate spoke. He had never been more eloquent than he was when he presented his remarks on behalf of the Senate itself. Then a man of the cloth, a man of God, closed the services.

During those services there were two renditions by a magnificent choir, which I was not able to see because it was back somewhere in the cloister, but which I understood was the choir of the University of New Hampshire, although I am not certain of that. It was beautiful to hear their voices. The first hymn they sang was the "Battle Hymn of the Republic." The second hymn was "Onward Christian Soldiers." These hymns themselves typified the man. It was a great tribute to him and to his life's work and to his cherished memory.

The words of those hymns, like New Hampshire granite will endure for a long time, and the work of this man will live just as long.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, one of our colleagues, the very distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is unavoidably absent from the Senate today. He was a very close personal friend of Senator BRIDGES. He has asked me to submit for the RECORD his eulogy of our departed friend. I believe that unanimous consent was obtained for Senators to have their remarks inserted in the RECORD. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the Senator from Kansas may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EULOGY BY SENATOR SCHOEPPEL

Aside from its importance in the workings of our American governmental system, the beginning of a new session of Congress brings the happiness of personal reunion. But it can also bring sadness—for today we mourn the final departure of a Senator whom we had come to consider as part of this body in which we are privileged to serve. As Senators pass the desk once occupied by the great Webster, they know that another famous occupant, Styles Bridges, is gone from us forever. He was a friend and colleague who served his State and Nation well.

Styles Bridges' early life was far from easy. This developed in him a toughness, a strength and a courage reflected in his entire career. He was born on a Maine farm, and when he was still a boy his father died. He knew the hard handwork necessary to wring a living from a New England farm. For, although New England is a place of natural beauty, it has none of the great stretches of gentle, fertile soil to which I became accustomed as a child, land from which enormous harvests can be reaped by large, mechanized operations.

As he grew up, the necessity of continued manual labor was inescapable for this young man. He paid his way through the University of Maine by milking cows at the pay rate of 15 cents an hour. After graduation he taught in high school and, later, on the staff of the extension service of the University of New Hampshire. Then, he became secretary of the New Hampshire Farm Bureau Federation, and finally served 4 years as a member of the New Hampshire Public Service Commission.

NOT AFRAID OF CONTROVERSY

When he entered politics, Styles Bridges quickly demonstrated that he was not afraid of controversy, nor afraid to challenge the powers that be. In 1934, at the age of 36, he was elected Governor—the only Republican Governor elected in America in that year. His career as Governor attracted a wide recognition for he pushed through legislation enabling his State to become the first to qualify for old-age and survivors insurance, and the second to provide for unemployment compensation insurance, under the new Social Security Act. Two years later—1936—he was elected to the United States Senate—at 38, one of the youngest and one of the few new Republicans to be elected in that year.

I suppose a measure of Styles Bridges' character was his opposition as a Senator to the Court-packing proposal of 1937, and his championing of American rearmament and a change in foreign policy from 1938 onward—when the armies of Hitler began to move in Europe and Japan threatened the peace of the Far East. This was not a popular cause at the time. Nor did he hesitate to speak out against communism and the Russian menace when this was not yet a fashionable thing to do.

But Styles Bridges did not court popularity in the Nation at large. He was proud of his oft-demonstrated popularity in New Hampshire, and was realistic enough to see and to plan for that influence in national affairs which came to him through long and dedicated service in the Senate.

After his apprentice service on the lesser Senate committees, Styles Bridges began to make his mark as a ranking member of Appropriations, of Armed Services, and the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee. He was twice chairman of Appropriations, and he held every office that his Republican colleagues could bestow: President pro tem, minority leader, and chairman of the Republican Policy Committee. No one surpassed him in his concern for the strength and security of our country, nor in his unrelenting insistence on a tough policy toward the Soviet Union. At times he felt that this required hard criticism of our national policies no matter who the President.

CHAMPION OF OUR FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

Nor could anyone be said to have more faith and confidence in our free enterprise economy. He made no bones about his views here. Even his critics respected him as one who walked down his own side of the street with dignity and with no apologies for his views.

Styles Bridges was the epitome of kindness. Many people on Capitol Hill, no matter how important or how humble their jobs, knew at first hand of this quality. His concern to alleviate human suffering was shown in his establishment of a cancer study clinic while Governor of New Hampshire, and his interest while in the Senate in helping to initiate programs for the study of heart diseases at the National Institutes of Health.

What we are trying to do today is to give our estimate of a fellow Senator, who this year would have celebrated his 25th year in the Senate, had he not died, worn out by gruelling years of service here.

Of necessity, we cannot be objective as historians are objective, for our own lives have been touched by contact with this man. He had already served two full terms in the Senate—12 long years—when first I took the oath of office as Senator from my own State in 1949. He was a tower of kindly strength even then, but generously willing to go far out of his way to help the newcomer. Twice since then, we shared the anxieties of contending politics, for Styles Bridges and I were of that third of the Senators who run for reelection in identical years. We also shared a philosophy of government, and his wise counsel helped me in my own task of trying to build that philosophy into the fabric of our laws.

It is easy for the journalists of our day to speculate on whom the mantle of Styles Bridges will fall. It will fall on no other Senator. It was a mantle of his own weaving, patiently put together thread by thread, and possessed of such magic that upon his passing, it dissolved into memory. Our time will not likely see another.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, among the many tributes paid to our late esteemed colleague, Styles Bridges, none is more fitting than that of a distinguished citizen soldier from my home State, and keen observer of world events, Maj. Gen. Julius Klein, retired, of Illinois, who has also served as national commander of the Jewish War Veterans.

I know of the close relationship between Senator Bridges and General Klein that flourished through the years. I recall that Senator Bridges, as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, assigned Julius Klein to make a survey of European political and economic developments during the crucial year of 1954. I also recall that Senator Bridges commended Julius Klein then for a job well done, as reported in the Congressional Record, volume 101, Nos. 57 and 58, of March 30 and April 1, 1955.

Julius Klein was on hand when the mantle of political leadership passed from his good friend, the late Senator Bob Taft, to Senator Bridges.

At that time, Julius Klein declared "Bob Taft, like another Lincoln, now belongs to the ages."

When his close friend and our beloved colleague Styles Bridges passed to his reward last November 26, General Klein gave a moving eulogy.

I ask unanimous consent that the eulogy may be printed in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator Styles Bridges, Patriot-Statesman, Taft's Closest Friend

A few minutes after the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire passed away in his sleep and the news reached President Kennedy, the President at once telephoned Mrs. Bridges to express his own and the Nation's sorrow. In his public tribute the President eulogized the late Senator as a great patriot and statesman.

General Eisenhower, former Presidents Truman and Hoover, and party leaders from both sides of the aisles saluted the memory of their close friend and associate, and great leader.

Senator Bridges will go down in history as one of the most courageous statesmen and Senate leaders. He fought for his convictions and at all times put his country's welfare above party politics. A typical New Englander and a dedicated unselfish public servant, he never abused the political power which was his. He used that power solely to fight for the principles and ideals for which he stood and which were in the best interest of our country.

Uncompromising in his fight against communism, phony left-wingers and fellow travelers as well as radicals to the left or to the right, he was a genuine liberal in the true meaning of the word. He stood for rugged individualism, for good old-fashioned Americanism, and for personal economic and political freedom of the individual. He was the champion of a strong national defense system and responsible for the appropriation which assured for the United States a powerful military striking force in the air, on the sea, and on land as the sole deterrent of Communist aggression.

I have known Senator Bridges intimately for many years, ever since he and I were active in the American Legion in the late 1920's and early 1930's. On various occasions he honored me with assignments to carry out crucial missions, such as the fact-finding mission to Europe on behalf of the Senate Armed Forces Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee in 1954.

I was privileged to be present when he yielded his Senate seniority to the late Senator Taft. Thus, the late great Senator from Ohio was able to assume the Republican leadership in the U.S. Senate and became affectionately and reverently known throughout the world as the United States "Mr. Republican." Before he went to the hospital, knowing that he was a dying man and might never return, Bob Taft confided in his administrative assistant Jack Martin (now a distinguished U.S. judge in Washington) and me: "Stand by Bridges, help him. He has the courage and integrity needed in these critical times to carry on."

Styles Bridges carried on indeed in the great tradition of his predecessor. He earned the respect of all his colleagues on either side of the aisle. Our Nation and the free world has lost a great courageous leader and statesman. He will be missed by all, and it will be hard to fill his place. But the spirit of Styles Bridges will live on and the example he set for those who must carry on will inspire his successor and his colleagues. The principles and ideals of Bob Taft and Styles Bridges, one of our country's greatest teams, will make a better America for us and for future generations.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a moving tribute to the late Senator Bridges which recently appeared in the widely read magazine National Review be printed in the Congressional Record. It is eloquently written by Forrest Davis and Alex Hillman.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Tribute to Styles Bridges

(By Forrest Davis and Alex Hillman)

When Styles Bridges died in November of 1961 he had been almost to a day a U.S. Senator for 25 years; a quarter century during which the Republic underwent what history may well record as its severest trials. In later years he had been the Republican doyen of the Senate. He had been President pro tempore, majority and minority leader. To

Washington he was "a Senator's Senator." To his party he was a wise, resourceful leader. Yet to the country, Senator Bridges' skill at the parliamentary art, his mastery of the creaking machinery through which the Congress appropriates the huge Federal budgets, his intimate knowledge of our involved military affairs were only apprehended and not wholly appreciated. Nor did the published obituaries disclose his true essence or his worth to the cause of orderly, rational government and the survival of the American society and the West.

The reason is not obscure. He was a quiet man, unmoved by personal passion or rancor, in a time when public affairs increasingly are conducted at a shrill pitch. He had the sober sanity of the State of Maine farmfolk from whom he sprang and the New Hampshirites among whom he rose in public life from county agent to Governor and then to the Senate. His speech retained the crisp angularity of the New England rural dweller. The humor which moved him to mirth was country humor. The frugality, the neighborliness, the sense of bound and mete, of what is becoming to a man characteristic of New England, remained with him in the cosmopolitan world of the Capital.

Bridges never shrank from unpopularity. The lines of that other New Hampshirite, Robert Frost, applied to him when the poet wrote:

> "I shall be telling this with a sigh
> Somewhere ages and ages hence;
> Two roads diverged in a wood, and I—
> I took the one less traveled by,
> And that has made all the difference."

Concerning totalitarianism, Styles was forever consistent in his alarm and repugnance. As early as 1934 when serving as Governor of New Hampshire (the youngest Governor of his time), he deplored Roosevelt's recognition of Stalin's Russia. As early as 1943, Bridges noted and spoke about the fact that Stalin was waging two, if not three, wars. He was defending Russia against the Nazi invader militarily, but he was conducting a diplomatic offensive against his Western allies in obedience to his imperialistic ambitions and, of course, engaged also in his repressive war on his subjected people.

To few men in public life, certainly not to President Roosevelt, was it given to see that Stalin was using the assistance supplied him unstintedly by the Anglo-Saxon powers with a view to the enslavement of what Churchill termed "the old and famous peoples of Eastern Europe." Bridges correctly assessed the harm done to the cause of the West by the Rooseveltian concessions in the wartime summit conferences.

Opposing the sustained expansion of Soviet Russia's power, witnessing the decline of America's world prestige and influence from the heights commanded by our military and industrial power at the end of World War II, Bridges accurately estimated the inroads being made on our morale by Communist subversion and agitation.

As with the expansion of Stalin's empire, so it was with the series of American blunders, or worse, which helped deliver mainland China to the Yenan Communists. Bridges, who often retired to the simplicities of Concord and his summer place, was never taken in by sophistries. He knew, what was but the truth, that U.S. policy toward our loyal ally, the Republic of China, contributed in major part to the Communist conquest of China. In his speeches, in private conversation he steadily manifested a clear understanding of the fateful drift of the United States away from self-assurance, sensible understanding, and resolve in the face of the enemy.

As a conservative, Bridges seldom roiled the liberal establishment. His good-humored sanity was hard to fault. It would not be plausible to categorize him as a representative of the "radical right." His respect for the organic values of the West and for the skeptical humanitarianism of the founders, nourished in the New England countryside, was instinctive but informed by study. Perhaps the best expression of his conservatism came in a thoughtful speech delivered at Dartmouth College in 1955, where he said:

"The conservative knows that man is a bundle of paradoxes—the brave and the cowardly; the kind and the cruel; the generous and mean; the noble and ignoble—all wrapped into one. The best and ultimate purposes of society are to make possible the emergence and triumph of the noble and the final defeat of the ignoble. This is the humanist approach. It is likewise the realistic approach, founded on a belief that men are not the creatures of a blueprint made by visionary liberals insisting that he conform to some a priori concept but takes man for what he is, conditioned by the knowledge that because man is God's creature, he is capable of responding to the divine spark."

Bridges knew with Burke that human societies cannot be arbitrarily charted by parties or committees but that instead they evolve from experience, from precedent, from living with, and that when ideologues seek to map the perfect society they leave man out of the calculations.

SOMETIMES NOT NEUTRAL

Bridges frequently compromised in matters of practical procedure. He will be missed on both sides of the Senate aisle for his mollifying voice in rash conflicts of faction or party. In internal party affairs circumstances sometimes required him to be neutral. In issues bearing on his views as to the country's welfare, he could not be neutral. Nor did he hesitate to break with a chief executive of his own party as when, in 1953, he was one of only six Senators to vote against confirmation of Charles E. "Chip" Bohlen as Ambassador to Moscow. He had what to him were good and sufficient reasons for believing that Mr. Bohlen lacked depth perspective on the overwhelming menace of world communism. For somewhat similar reasons, he voted in the early days of the Kennedy administration against confirmation of Chester A. Bowles as Under Secretary of State.

As chairman of the powerful Appropriations Committee when his party was in power and ranking minority member otherwise, his Yankee prudence rebelled against the welfare statists' wholesale levies on the Federal Treasury. Yet, given the decline of the congressional prerogative witnessed by him in his long tenure, and the growing desire of politicians to purchase votes with public funds, he could do little to stay the extravagance of budgets that far outmatched the national growth and capacity. By nature, he opposed big government, resenting the remorseless spread of the Federal bureaucracy into the day-to-day concerns of the people.

The local and State governments are close to the people in New Hampshire. The legislature, with something more than 450 members, is something of a glorified town meeting. Few New Hampshiremen are unacquainted with their legislators or lacking in plain statement of their wishes and apprehensions. It was from this angle of vision that Bridges reprehended the estrangement of the citizen from a Federal Government grown too vast for his comprehension and unresponsive to his desires unless expressed by an organized bloc.

Bridges knew as a sensible man that there could be no reversion to times when, as Grover Cleveland had it, "the people supported their Government, not the Government the people," nor was he unsympathetic with the plight of citizens left behind in the rush of an ever more complex industrial society. New Hampshire, under Bridges and other earlier Governors, had adopted many measures for the relief of the indigent unfortunate and the redressing of social wrongs well before the New Deal.

Bridges as a proper and principled conservative believed in an open society, open to talent and industry, but a society restrained by the wisdom of the past, by a certain enlightened pessimism as to man's nature and the precepts of natural law. He is an exemplar of what is worthy in the conservative tradition.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, as we pause today to pay tribute to New Hampshire's late illustrious Senator, Styles Bridges, nothing would be more appropriate than to emphasize the record of life's achievements as not so much how many battles have been won as how vigorously the battles were fought.

For more than a decade I was privileged to serve on the Appropriations Committee while Styles Bridges was the ranking Republican member of that committee. I observed his reactions under all kinds of pressures. Because of his integrity and his firmness, he commanded my profound respect. Because of his compassion and his understanding, I acquired a deep affection for him.

There never was any doubt in his mind about the imperative need of greater economy and efficiency in the operation of the Federal Government.

While some assumed a demagogic viewpoint, he recognized that representative government and the free enterprise system are contingent upon sound and constructive operations. Styles Bridges at all times reflected the traditional New England characteristics of commonsense, realism, and austerity. He never faltered in the face of overwhelming opposition. He never compromised his convictions. Actually he seemed to be inspired and fortified when he entered political controversies where he was aware he was alined with the minority.

Those who have served with Styles Bridges know that he fought relentlessly against Communist infiltration by supporting not only strong military defenses but also by preserving a stable, solvent government. His sterling leadership and indomitable courage will be a constant reminder that winning the battle for national survival will require steadfast devotion as turmoil engulfs most of the world today.

While our former colleague will no longer be present to give us encouragement and wise counsel, his long record of faithful service and his unyielding vigor and constant patriotism will stimulate us to greater achievements.

New Hampshire has lost an outstanding public servant. Our country will long commemorate his quarter century of dedication to preserve constitutional government for our Republic.

Styles Bridges leaves a rich heritage for his family, for his State, and for his country.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, it was one of the precious privileges of service in the U.S. Senate to have known Styles Bridges—and now it will be one of our sweetest memories.

Styles Bridges had rare gifts of friendship. Even when you disagreed with him you liked him. And in those matters in which you were in agreement you loved him.

He had a marvelous capacity for cooperation. In the many areas in which we made joint effort as Senators from New England, I had many a gratifying experience in evidence of that. He made common cause with you. His constituents to him were more than merely interested citizens. They were his neighbors—and he made them your friends.

Textiles, for instance, were of immediate concern to Senator BRIDGES. But in our field hearings which brought us to New Hampshire, STYLES BRIDGES was helpful and considerate beyond the call of duty.

The problems we discussed came to life from the printed page in the straightforward testimony of workers and in the human understanding of industry translated into flesh-and-blood men. All of them, STYLES BRIDGES knew—and all of them he made known to us. All of them give to New Hampshire its character. It made it easier for us to appreciate the abiding love of our colleague for his State—and the abiding loyalty of his neighbors to our friend and associate.

STYLES BRIDGES never lost this intimacy in all the world range that his responsibilities required although his innate patriotism never permitted him to be merely parochial.

He remained the good neighbor as his friendships transcended State lines—and even the grave. For we are all aware of his eternal devotion to a colleague who long since has departed this scene. The monument that stands upon the Capitol Grounds, where Robert Taft served so sincerely and so well, is mute testimony to the friendship bond that was the character of STYLES BRIDGES.

I stood by his side—a guest in the dwelling of his heart in East Concord—and I sensed the deep affection and warm love of STYLES BRIDGES for his family and his home.

I stood another November day by his catafalque in the State capitol at Concord—as the high and the humble came in their sorrow—and I sensed again the deep affection and warm love that STYLES BRIDGES commanded in his neighbors.

Those neighbors that sad day had to share STYLES BRIDGES with the great and grateful of the world. The world expressed its sorrow in the most beautiful floral tributes I have ever seen. Their magnitude and magnificence was testimony to the far-reaching influence of this man of New Hampshire.

Thus the world expressed its loss in the passing of an able statesman. The Nation's great came in personal grief and in personal eulogy. The State of New Hampshire gave its Hall of Flags as a place of honor to its faithful servant—and we said our farewells to this modest man in his quiet resting place so near to his earthy home and his beloved.

To his wife and family goes the most sincere sympathy of each of us. May the memory of STYLES BRIDGES be ever their pride and solace.

May this Senate Chamber ever reflect the qualities of patriotism and service, statesmanship and friendship that we recognized in him and now revere in the memory of STYLES BRIDGES.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, we who had the privilege of serving with STYLES BRIDGES in the legislative field learned to know and appreciate his outstanding ability and his dedication to the welfare of his Nation.

The test of a man is in his deeds. His deeds usually reflect his philosophy. STYLES BRIDGES' life was truly one of devoted service to his country and to his State of New Hampshire.

Calvin Coolidge, another distinguished and honored New Englander, once stated:

> No person was ever honored for what he received, honor has been the reward for what he gave.

STYLES BRIDGES went about his work unassumingly and without desire for great credit or great acclaim, but ever thorough and devoted to his work.

My acquaintanceship with him goes back to 1937, when he first came to the U.S. Senate. I was a Member of the House of Representatives at that time, and from then on, STYLES and I were close friends.

One can begin to realize the length of his service when he checks the present roll of the Senate and finds that only 4 other Members of this body out of 100 have served longer. During all these years of service in the U.S. Senate, no one ever had to question where STYLES BRIDGES stood on an issue. While he was always firm in his views and convictions, and did not hesitate to express them, he always respected the views of those who might differ with him.

STYLES BRIDGES was a true gentleman and was highly regarded by all of his colleagues. We miss him, we miss his sound judgment, and we miss his stabilizing influence.

Mrs. Carlson and I extend our sincere sympathy to Mrs. Bridges and the family.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, it has been the privilege of all of us to sit here this afternoon and, in the shared memories of our colleagues, recapture our own memories of our friend and the tremendous service he rendered to his country and to this body for more than a quarter of a century.

In such a situation, we are inclined to believe that necessarily this service has been rendered to those of us who have talked about the heritage which he has left to his friends and his country, and sometimes to think of it as an accumulation which has ended and in which there is no further future power.

I should like to suggest, and as a background bring back to the minds of all of us, concerning the things which have been said about the man and his ability, that this heritage is in fact a spiritual one which will continue.

The distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] said that it will remain for the historians to attempt to evaluate the effect of the life and activities of this man upon our Nation's history. There are many immeasurable values in his 25 years of service that the historians will never be able to discover, values represented by the immeasurable and intangible changes that he made in the pattern of legislation through his power and his influence with his fellow men, influence of which there are no records anywhere.

Since ours is the responsibility to make laws, the effects of these contributions have passed out of this body into the experiences and pattern of life of all Americans upon whose lives these laws will continue to have profound effects for many years to come.

It is true, unfortunately, that our good friend, STYLES, will not walk onto this floor physically any longer, but he literally walks onto it with every one of us who had the privilege of working with him, because over these 25 years, with his ideas, inspiration, friendship, and counsel, he has served to change the lives and attitudes of each of us to a greater or a lesser extent. As we reflect in the future the effects on our friendship with this man, his influence will continue to be felt on the deliberations and activities of this body he loved so well and served so long.

So I wish to pay my respects to STYLES BRIDGES not merely in terms of what has happened up to this point, but in terms of the continuing influence of his example and character and of our memory of his friendship, so long as any of us who served with him in this body may continue to have that privilege. These are immeasurable values and intangibles, things which cannot be counted or described. But this is one of the enduring values which STYLES BRIDGES has been able to contribute, through us, to the country he loved and served so well.

I am proud to have had the privilege of working with him. I am certain I cannot measure the effects of that friendship upon my thinking and upon my ability to meet my responsibilities. Nevertheless, I feel gratitude to our Father in heaven, who gave us life, and through whose goodness, perhaps, we all have the privilege of serving here, that we have had, over the years, the privilege of serving with a man like STYLES BRIDGES.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I am honored to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the life, service, and memory of STYLES BRIDGES. He was one of the strong men in the Senate when it was my privilege to come here in January 1949. It was my privilege to become acquainted with him and to develop an association which ripened into friendship early and which grew through the years.

We all admire courage. We all respect patriotism. We all pay homage to integrity and loyalty. STYLES BRIDGES had all of these qualities in great abundance. As we make our way along the pathway of life, we become more acquainted with responsibility. We learn more about the problems with which we are surrounded. We find ourselves building a greater desire to meet and solve those problems in a manner fitting to our position and responsibility and to our hopes and aims for the country we love.

Styles Bridges was a man who inspired confidence in those who knew him.

It was early apparent to me that he was accustomed to responsibility and was equal to the responsibility placed upon him and given to him. That is easy to understand when we remember that even at the very tender age of 9 years he was almost the man of the house, in the family of which he was a part. To know his great mother and her character enables us to have a better insight into his personality and the aims and ideals with which he was so early and closely associated, and which became so much a part of him. But whether then or in the years which came later, he was given responsibility; and although he seemed to bear it lightly, he bore it well.

It was his privilege to be among the leaders of the Nation during the 25 most important years of its history. He saw the storm clouds gather around the world soon after he arrived here. He saw the thunderheads of war gather on the far horizon, spread over Europe, and move with increasing force and ferocity until they struck in all their fury in his own homeland. He was a part of the wisdom, the courage, and the patriotism which welded and mobilized the forces and powers of this Nation into the mighty strength which saw it through World War II and through the decade and one-half which followed it, with all its tensions, strains, and requirements; and always with courage and wisdom he shouldered even larger portions of the responsibility necessary for the leadership of our country than those which either could have been required of him or were carried by most. Thus, Mr. President, as he came to the end of that quarter of a century, he could say, like the one in fabled song and story, "All of this I saw, and a part of it I was."

Mr. President, I admired Styles Bridges as a man, as a patriot, and as a Senator; and I had a deep affection for him as a friend. I loved him because he was a personal friend and because even though he came from an area about as far removed from my native State as any portion of our great country, there never was a problem which affected Oklahoma that I did not feel free to discuss with him, and not once did he decline to give me the benefit of his attention, his wisdom, and his cooperation.

So, Mr. President, as I express my feeling of respect and my tribute for him, I do so, not only for myself, but also for the State which I seek, strive, and try to represent.

I also learned to know and to admire his gracious wife, Doloris. Knowing her, I understood a part of his greatness, because it was apparent that through those years she made great contributions to him.

Mr. President, I am reminded that although physical life ceases and although each man in his own day and in God's own time moves on to take his place alongside his fathers in the places which men prepare for the human body, what men do are the seeds they plant in the soil of the environment from which they have sprung, of which they are a part, and which they help to create and build. The life that Styles Bridges lived in his native State of Maine and in his adopted State of New Hampshire, in his beloved country, and here in this body, the contributions he made, and the seed he planted will grow on in this soil, which he enriched by his devotion, his patriotism, and his unfailing loyalty and fidelity to duty and to his friends.

We have been impoverished by his death. We were enriched by our associations with him. Our country has been strengthened by the contributions he made; and throughout all the days of our lives we shall know that we are living in a country that is better than it could have been without the benefit of what he was and what he did.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the tribute by the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Butler].

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Tribute to Styles Bridges by Senator John Marshall Butler

I personally will miss him, the distinguished Members of this Chamber will miss him, the people of New Hampshire will miss him, and, most important of all, the citizens of this Republic will miss him.

For nearly 25 years, Styles Bridges was a U.S. Senator; and during that quarter of a century, he grew surely in stature until he became, beyond dispute, the most important Republican in the Senate. Others might capture more headlines, utter more eloquent speeches, elicit more admiring glances from the galleries, but Styles Bridges remained the man to whom we all turned for counsel and support.

It is probably true that a good many Americans did not appreciate the worth of Senator Bridges. As National Review commented in a moving tribute to the Senator:

"The reason is not obscure. He was a quiet man, unmoved by personal passion or rancor, in a time when public affairs increasingly are conducted at a shrill pitch. He had the sober sanity of the State of Maine farmfolk from which he sprang and the New Hampshiremen among whom he rose in public life from county agent to Governor and then to the Senate. His speech retained the crisp angularity of the New England rural dweller. The humor which moved him to mirth was country humor. The frugality, the neighborliness, the sense of bound and mete, of what is becoming to a man characteristic of New England, remained with him in the cosmopolitan world of the capital."

Senator Bridges was a conservative in the Burkean sense of the word. In 1955, he offered an outline of his conservatism in a speech at Dartmouth College:

"The conservative knows that man is a bundle of paradoxes—the brave and the cowardly; the kind and the cruel; the generous and the mean; the noble and the ignoble—all wrapped into one. The best and ultimate purposes of society are to make possible the emergence and triumph of the noble and the final defeat of the ignoble. This is the humanist approach. It is likewise the realistic approach, founded on a belief that men are not the creatures of a blueprint made by visionary liberals insisting that he conform to some a priori concept but takes man for what he is, conditioned by the knowledge that because man is God's creature, he is capable of responding to the divine spark."

Quietly, calmly, intelligently, Styles Bridges labored for 25 years in this Chamber for freedom and against totalitarianism in every form. He was among the first citizens of this Nation to perceive the abiding menace of communism and he fought against it unrelentingly. And he could not accept and would not accept the collectivist's theory that the Federal Government can manage the individual's affairs better than he can. Senator Bridges was, at all times, a "proper and principled conservative" who believed in "an open society" restrained "by the wisdom of the past."

He might have taken for his guide the words of Herbert Hoover, who once said: "A splendid storehouse of integrity and freedom has been bequeathed to us by our forefathers. In this day of confusion, of peril to liberty, our high duty is to see that this storehouse is not robbed of its contents."

Styles Bridges was a vigilant guard at the gate, a gate which we now, out of respect for him and for what he believed in, must not allow to swing open.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I join with my distinguished colleagues in extending the warm sympathy of Mrs. Bush and myself to Doloris Bridges and the Bridges family.

Like Senator Stennis, of Mississippi, I recall so well the funeral of Styles Bridges on a very cold day in New Hampshire last December. I had never seen such a funeral in my life, and I was deeply moved by that occasion. It was a tribute, indeed, to an all-American Senator in the great rotunda of the capitol of the State of New Hampshire, where there were gathered 23 Senators of the United States, Members of the House of Representatives, including the present Speaker of the House, representatives of the President, his own brother, diplomats, State officials, representatives of the armed services and the Cabinet, and others. As the Senator from Mississippi has said, there was beautiful music by an unseen choir who sang the "Battle Hymn of the Republic" and other religious and patriotic music.

I shall always remember that last tribute to Styles Bridges as we went to the cemetery and heard a company of soldiers, representing the Army of the United States, play "Nearer My God to Thee" and taps.

Mr. President, Senator Bridges was not a tall man physically, but he was 10 feet tall as a Senator of the United States. I marveled at his grasp of problems and issues. He seemed to have a legislative background that could be automatically drawn upon, no matter what the issue that would come before us might be. He had a deep grasp and a great understanding of issues. He enjoyed the respect of Senators on both sides of the aisle, and he enjoyed particularly the affection and warm feeling and regard of those who had the privilege of knowing him well, and many, many indeed did.

He presided over the Republican Senators for 9 years with grace, understanding, and patience. He gave good advice to all of us, and many of us needed it. He was always tolerant of our decisions if we did not agree with him. Nevertheless, he was always willing to give advice out of long experience and a wise head.

I hope I shall be forgiven for being somewhat partisan when I speak of him as a Republican leader of great note in this century. I remember when STYLES BRIDGES was elected to the Senate in 1936. At that time there were only 16 Republican Senators in this body, and 80 of the opposing party. In the next 10 years he was one of the great Republican leaders, who kept our party alive and kept it growing, who led it as a responsible party of the opposition, a loyalty party of opposition, and who helped increase its stature and prestige in the public mind so that in 1946 the Republican Party was able once more to control the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Again, in 1952, the same thing happened. It was then that I had the honor to come to the Senate and then that my friendship on a more intimate basis with STYLES BRIDGES began.

Senator SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, has spoken of personal recollections that come to mind on an occasion like this. Some of them I have just mentioned. Another one I value particularly is the memory that just before the State convention of the New Hampshire Republican Party, held, I believe, in September or late August of 1960, when STYLES BRIDGES was nominated for the fifth and last time to be a U.S. Senator, he telephoned me and asked me to come there and address that convention. I regarded it then, and shall always regard it, as a particularly pleasing and heart-warming tribute. I was happy that in my eight or nine previous years of association with him in the Senate he had acquired enough confidence in me to ask me to make that kind of address before the State convention, which was about to nominate him for the fifth time as a Senator of the United States.

So, Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in expressing my sadness and my deep regret at losing this fine leader, this fine friend, this loyal Senator, and this great American.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, STYLES BRIDGES was called a friend by perhaps as many, if not more, Members of this body as was any other man with whom I have ever served in the U.S. Senate. He had a quality of loyalty to his friends and his colleagues, a quality of kindness and understanding, that endeared him in a very personal way to almost all of us, if not all of us, who had served with him.

I first knew Senator BRIDGES when I was a Member of the House Appropriations Committee. To conference committees I came as a representative of the other body and there worked with Senator BRIDGES. I found him understanding even of the problems of a Member of Congress whom he had not known and who was from a distant State. All that was typical of the man as I came to know him better as a colleague here in the Senate.

He was gentle, he was kind, he was compassionate, understanding, and courteous. He was loyal to the traditions of the Senate, as the senior Senator from Georgia earlier said. He respected this institution. He loved the Senate and the legislative branch of the Government. He wanted to see it maintain its proper place in the balance of powers, to will its certain greatness, and to exercise its power to preserve its prerogatives.

Loyal to his State always, he was nevertheless willing to consider the problems of every State and the problems of his country, and did so.

As the senior Senator from Oklahoma has said, it was the privilege of Senator BRIDGES to live in an era of great challenge to America. Challenges, crises, dangers, triumphs—Senator BRIDGES shared in them all. He was concerned about the dangers. He was troubled by the crises. He exalted in the triumphs and victories.

His passing leaves a void in the hearts of his friends which will never be filled, a void in this Chamber which will long be remembered. To his wife and to other members of the family I extend my deepest personal sympathy.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, there are two things particularly which come to my mind as I think of STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire. One is that Senator BRIDGES' congressional career and mine began on the same day. I was elected to serve in the House of Representatives on the 3d of November 1936, the same day STYLES BRIDGES was elected to serve in the Senate. We were sworn in, I assume, on the same day. Our congressional careers, though mine was in the House and his was in the Senate, covered the same span of history. It was given to me to know something of his service from the outset. As the Senator from Tennessee has said with respect to himself, I also came to know Senator BRIDGES first through work on the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives.

Senator BRIDGES came to a Senate which, as we look back today and recount who served, we know was filled with men of great ability, the intellectual and political giants of the day. On the Democratic side there were Alben W. Barkley, Joseph T. Robinson, Carl Hayden, Kenneth McKellar, Harry F. Byrd, Carter Glass, and others who had covered a span of years prior to what happened after 1936, and certainly what happened after 1939, when war broke out in Europe. On the Republican side of the aisle there were men like Charles L. McNary, of Oregon, Hiram Johnson, of California, Warren F. Austin and Wallace H. White from the eastern part of the United States, and George W. Norris and William E. Borah from the trans-Mississippi west. At the time of his election, from my own State there were: Peter Norbeck, a Republican, and William J. Bulow, a Democrat, both of whom ranked high among those who have served in this body.

STYLES came into that group of Senators and established for himself a reputation which grew as the years went by for the characteristics which I think can be ascribed to men who come from New Hampshire.

There is another reason why I have respect for men who come from New Hampshire. Two men who have entered largely into my personal life were from New Hampshire. My mother's father—and her mother—came from New Hampshire. The family name was Grannis. Some years ago I had the privilege of visiting Claremont, N.H., and going to the cemetery, there looking for some of the family names. I also looked for some of the family of Graves, because that happens to be the family name of my wife's father. He and his forebears came from New Hampshire.

There were two characteristics I knew were associated with men who came from New Hampshire, judging from my personal knowledge of Mr. Graves and Mr. Grannis long before I came to Congress. Those two characteristics were honesty and loyalty. They were men who loved their country and put their country first in their considerations.

As I have known the service of STYLES BRIDGES through a quarter century in the Congress of the United States, seeing him first when we met as conferees on appropriation bills, I representing the House and he the Senate—and I speak from personal conviction when I say this—I know that the taxes of the country through the years have been less than they would have been had it not been for his conscientious service in trying to assure that when appropriations were made they were needed and were proper levies upon the pocketbooks of the country.

The second thing I have observed and on which I have a specific conviction is that the country has been more secure because of the service of STYLES BRIDGES, both on the Committee on Appropriations and on the Committee on Armed Services, in the latter of which I had the privilege of being one of his colleagues in service in the Senate.

I do not know what more I can say so far as the contribution of a Senator to his country is concerned, than that the country is more secure because of his having served and that the levies upon the pocketbooks of the taxpayers have been less because of his service. Certainly those two things can be honestly and fairly said as legacies of the service of STYLES BRIDGES in the Senate of the United States.

In October, when I noted that STYLES had been obliged to return to the hospital, for Mrs. Case and myself I wrote a little note to Doloris and expressed our best wishes for his early recovery. We were delighted to receive from Doloris a note saying that while he had been desperately ill he was making progress and they were then confident of his recovery. I think we received that in November. In any event, it was a great shock when the word came that STYLES was gone.

With all the others who have spoken here today, I wish to say that our memories of a great American have been enriched by our knowledge of, our acquaintance and friendship with, STYLES BRIDGES.

To Mrs. Bridges and to STYLES' sons we extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, it was most appropriate that New Hampshire should have been represented in the Senate of the United States by STYLES BRIDGES. This is true because there was in STYLES BRIDGES much of the stability and strength which characterizes the rock ribbed hills of that great State.

I think Styles Bridges was the first Member of the Senate whom I met after coming to this body, other than those with whom I had served in the House of Representatives. This was true because he was then President pro tempore in the Senate and had expected, until the last minute, to be called on to administer to me the oath of office.

I had the privilege of serving, since January 1955, on the Armed Services Committee of the Senate with Styles Bridges, and I had many occasions to appraise him as a man and as a Senator. I had deep admiration for Styles Bridges for the qualities of his head and I had profound affection for him for the qualities of his heart.

Styles Bridges was perhaps as free from pretense as any man I have ever known. It was inevitable that this should be so, because he possessed to an unsurpassed degree the quality which we may call most appropriately intellectual integrity. Styles Bridges was honest in thought and deed. His intellect brought him to honest conclusions. He added to the quality of intellectual honesty another quality which enabled him to be of the highest service to his Nation; namely, the quality of unsurpassed moral and political courage.

As was mentioned by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Bush] a moment ago, Styles Bridges was a leader of the Republican Party. He loved his party. He did what he could to preserve it as a fighting force in America. But Styles Bridges was a man of profound convictions. On occasion when there was a divergence between the policies of his party and his convictions, he stood by his convictions, proving what all of us know to have been one of his fundamental traits; namely, that he loved his country more than he loved his party. I think that is about a fine a statement as we could make about any Senator, because in the last analysis our supreme obligations as Members of this body should be to our country.

From my long service with Styles Bridges on the Committee on Armed Services, I am able to testify to the fact that our Nation is better prepared to defend itself at this hour because of his devotion to his country and his insistence, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services and as a Senator, that our country be kept strong from a military standpoint.

I should like to close my brief statement concerning this friend on a personal note. In his passing I am reminded again of the tragic truth embodied in the words of the Persian poet, Omar Khayyam:

> For some we loved, the loveliest and the best
> That from his Vintage rolling Time hath prest,
> Have drunk their Cup a Round or two before,
> And one by one crept silently to rest.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the untimely passing of the late distinguished senior U.S. Senator from New Hampshire, Styles Bridges, has left a wide and grievous chasm in the ranks of the Senate. New Hampshire may be eternally proud of its most distinguished citizen. So, indeed, will the people of the Nation. His devotion and his high services to his State, to his country, and to the Republican Party have added a most impressive chapter to the annals of Americana. His presence will be sorely missed in this Chamber by all who served with him.

This Nation and the cause of free people face travail and trouble in the gloomy and melancholy days through which the world is passing. I have no doubt that the American system will be vindicated and that the American people will keep their freedom in what sometimes unhappily appears to be a never-ending struggle against those who would enslave the world and destroy the freedom which we in this country, thank God, continue to know. We will maintain our freedom with vigilance and with strength. That principle constituted the byword of the late Senator from New Hampshire in his conduct in this Chamber. As a Senator he considered the preservation of the Republic his basic, bounden duty.

I remember one of the last debates in which he participated, about a year ago. He rose and addressed the Senate with vigor and clarity. He had an unyielding opposition to pouring out the treasure and the largesse of America to any country dedicated to our own enslavement and destruction. I participated in that debate with him. He left the Senate, never to return. But he left the Senate with the high esteem and respect of Senators who voted with him on that occasion and those of equal patriotism who opposed him, precisely as he would walk out of the Senate Chamber on any other occasion after participating in debate.

Styles Bridges' record of public service is longer than that of any other Senator on this side of the aisle. He became the youngest Governor of New Hampshire. He was elected to that office in 1934, when he was only 36 years of age. Only 2 years later, in the face of a landslide by the Democratic Party across the country, he was elected to the U.S. Senate. The Republican Party—my party and yours, Mr. President—was then going through one of its gloomiest periods. Only 16 Republican Senators were serving here in the year when the late distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire first arrived. At the time of his passing, Styles was serving his 25th year in the Senate. He had handily won his fifth consecutive term in 1960, never having suffered a defeat, standing before the people in recurrent elections. Only four present Senators have served here longer than he served.

Styles Bridges has well served his nation and the people of his State in addition to his party. He was chairman of the Republican Senate policy committee. He was ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, although he stepped aside for his Republican colleague from the State of Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall]. During his career he served as President pro tempore of the Senate and also as Republican majority leader.

I had the privilege of working with the late respected Styles Bridges on the Appropriations Committee, and I shall be eternally grateful for the many acts of kindness with which he favored me in my quest adequately to represent the people of the State of California. There I observed him most closely. He was constructive in his comments. He was prudent and perceptive in all phases of his work. Above all, he demonstrated there, as here, a high degree of leadership.

Our Nation has lost a public servant of the highest ability and of the deepest convictions. Senators were all proud to call him friend. I deeply regret his untimely passing, and I feel sure that all of us who have known him and who have served with him will long miss him. Mrs. Kuchel and I extend to his gracious and devoted wife Doloris, to his dear and sweet mother, and to all other members of his family, our deep and abiding sympathy.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in November, along with nine other Members of the Senate, I attended a meeting of the NATO parliamentarians in Paris, at the time of the passing away of our beloved friend, Styles Bridges. The news of his passing came to us when we were in a meeting. We were distressed, shocked, and sorrowed. I am sure that every Member of the Senate delegation in Paris would like to have attended the funeral services of Styles Bridges, but it was impossible for us to do so because of our having to be in Paris at that time.

I wish to take this opportunity of paying my high respect to him and to comment upon the outstanding character, public service, and record of this great, good man.

While serving in the House of Representatives, back in the early forties, a matter came up in which I had some interest. I came to see Senator Bridges. That was the first time that I met him. It so happened that he had taken a position which prevented his helping me with the problem. However, I will always remember how kind and courteous and thoughtful and pleasant he was on that occasion, and how intelligently he diagnosed the problem in which I was interested. I must say that after talking with him, the interest and enthusiasm for what I thought was a good idea diminished considerably.

Since that time it has been my privilege to know and to be associated with Styles Bridges and his wonderful, intelligent, and thoughtful companion, Doloris, over a period of years.

I believe that in spite of the fact that Styles Bridges would take his position and maintain it with conviction, a position which might be different from the position of many other Members of the Senate, including myself on occasions, and in spite of his intense partisanship and leadership of the Republican Party, I do not believe that any Member of the Senate had more friends on both sides of the aisle than did Styles Bridges.

As has been said here so many times, STYLES was always a kind man. He was always thoughtful. No matter how busy he might be or how poorly he might feel on a particular day, he would always give one a good smile and a pat on the back. He was always willing to talk over any problem of government or personal matter and to be helpful.

I remember on one occasion—and this occurred on some other occasions also—I had a matter in which I thought a constituent of mine had been unjustly dealt with by one of the administrative agencies. I talked with STYLES BRIDGES about it. He was convinced that I was right. He asked no questions about who the person was or what he did or what his political belief might be. He did all he could to see that any wrong was undone, and it was.

STYLES was always thoughtful of the office staff of the committee with whom he worked.

I served with him on the Armed Services Committee for many years, and on the Appropriations Committee. I do not believe that any man was more aware of the defense needs, of the necessity of being able to defend the freedom of this country and of the free world, than this great Senator. It did not make any difference what the position of the administration might be, whether Democratic or Republican, or who it may be that was proposing some program in the connection with the defense of the United States, if STYLES BRIDGES thought some other program would be more adequate, he would speak up and speak up effectively and vigorously, as he did on so many, many occasions.

I join in feeling that the increased strength of our Nation, the fact that we are strong today, is due in no small part to the tenacity, to the vision, and to the effectiveness of STYLES BRIDGES.

It has been said that STYLES BRIDGES knew and was associated with many important people. Of course, that is true. He received many honors at the hands of the U.S. Senate, and of the Government of the United States, and his party. In spite of that he truly could walk with kings and keep the common touch. No one was too insignificant, nobody was too small for him to be kind to. I have always found that he had some way of intuitively knowing when a Member of the Senate or anyone else was having distress or for whom things were not going well. His counsel and encouragement has meant so much to many of us.

My wife Nancy and I extend our deep sympathy to his lovely campanion and wife, Doloris, who has always been a pleasant, intelligent, and indeed, a most important part of the Bridges team; and to STYLES' mother, who guided and directed him to the great life that he has led and was his inspiration always; and to his sons, and other members of the family, of whom he was so proud, as we are also.

Indeed, I believe the life of STYLES BRIDGES and his service here in the Senate should be a guide and an inspiration to all of us. It demonstrates that one can take a position if he believes in it and defends it and pushes it, even though it might be vigorously contested by another Member of the Senate, without losing the friendship of that Member and without being vindictive.

He also is an inspiration to us in showing that a man can be important and have great responsibilities, but still can have time to be an inspiration and a help to everyone with whom he comes in contact.

We shall always remember STYLES BRIDGES and respect him. His life will always be a guide and a light to many of us who are carrying on.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I would not let this opportunity pass to pay tribute to the memory of one of the truly great men of the United States Senate of our time.

STYLES BRIDGES possessed in great abundance all of the fine talents and qualities necessary for statesmanship. He was a very intelligent man, a tireless worker, a man of judgment, a hard fighter for the things he believed in and the kind of personality everyone loved and respected. He conducted himself at all times in the finest tradition of the U.S. Senate.

STYLES BRIDGES believed the Senate and the Congress of the United States are key institutions in our Republic. He defended and protected its rights and prerogatives militantly all during his quarter of a century of devoted service.

In his quiet, pleasant, and friendly way STYLES BRIDGES became not only one of the most influential leaders of the U.S. Senate and the Congress but the Republican Party of which he was a most ardent advocate.

It is difficult to realize even now that STYLES has passed from our midst. He was one of the best friends I ever had. As his seatmate, I had the opportunity to visit with him very often. He was a most human and kindly person. Even when hard pressed in his work he always took the time to extend a friendly word or greeting. His passing is truly a tremendous loss to all of us.

May I extend to his good wife, Doloris, his grand mother, and to all of the Bridges family my deepest sympathy. I grieved with them in his hour of sorrow.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the untimely passing of Senator BRIDGES removed from this great body one of its most illustrious members and robbed America of a gifted and remarkable citizen.

It was my pleasure to have known STYLES BRIDGES long before I became a Senator, meeting him first in 1940 when he came to Reno, Nev., for the funeral of the late Senator Key Pittman of my native State. Our brief acquaintanceship ripened into a warm friendship that continued until his death.

STYLES BRIDGES was a tower of strength, not only in his own party, but in the broader affairs of government. A man of deep and unshakable convictions, his views on domestic and foreign affairs inevitably gained the serious attention of whatever administration was in power. He was a devout student of our Constitution, and he was an articulate spokesman in protecting it from onslaughts from any source.

In saluting the memory of this great man, I am reminded of the thought expressed by Cicero: "Nor, in truth, would the honors of illustrious men continue after death, if their own spirits did not make us preserve a longer remembrance of them."

The name of STYLES BRIDGES will be long remembered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, some 16 years ago, when I first came into the Government, the late distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire, STYLES BRIDGES, was chairman of the committee before which I appeared for the confirmation of my nomination. From the first time we ever met until the day he left us, I felt that we became steadily better friends. He was the closest friend I had on the other side of the aisle, and I was proud of that fact. I think he was fond of me, and I was completely devoted to him.

In past years, he and his gracious and lovely wife, Doloris, and my wife and I have traveled together. We visited Europe in 1954. He was a wonderful companion. He was clear in his concept of the position of America with respect to the rest of the world. Above all, he was a loyal and dedicated patriot.

We who disagreed with him at times, as representatives of other parts of the country, or because of a difference in philosophy, always found him sympathetic, understanding, and invariably constructive in his analysis of our position.

Speaking for myself, the Senate will never be the same for me without STYLES BRIDGES. All of us who knew him, loved him, and respected him, know that something has passed from this body, just as it did when the late great senior Senator from Georgia, Mr. George, left us. It can never be regained.

My wife would want me to include her in expressing deep sympathy to STYLES BRIDGES' widow, the devoted and lovely lady whose friendship we all cherish today.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is natural that any member of this body should clearly remember the day he first served in the Senate. It happened that on the same day on which that memorable event occurred for the Senator from Nebraska, there preceded me to take the oath that day the present senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. There have been many occasions since that day when I have been gratified and proud of the fashion in which the senior Senator from New Hampshire has contributed to the annals and progress of this body. But this afternoon that pride and gratification have been as great as on any other occassion that I can recall.

The eulogy he paid to Senator BRIDGES was superb and eloquent. I take this occasion to say so. It was an outstanding tribute, bottomed upon almost four decades of personal friendship, of mutual respect and of constant cooperation in the official duties of the Senate, as all of us have witnessed so many times, in addition to the very fine respect and esteem held by one for the other.

Mr. President, in the death of STYLES BRIDGES this body has lost a remarkable legislator, a revered leader, and a dear friend. All of us know that the loss is not limited to this Chamber. With his passing, our entire country has lost a great man.

He had many admirable qualities and notable attainments. He was possessed of courageous devotion to principle, a passionate resolve to do right, a deep understanding of men and affairs, and, with all of these, a gentle firmness.

These many attributes in themselves would have brought him to a natural position of leadership wherever he served, including the Senate of the United States. But in six general elections in his State, once for the governorship and five times for the Senate, his fellow citizens recognized these many qualities and thus conferred upon him a tenure and continuity of service which confirmed his entitlement to the preferences which he received at the hands of his fellow Republicans, his fellow Senators, and innumerable citizens who from time to time assumed active roles in the governing of our Republic.

STYLES BRIDGES loved politics. He had an unusual zest for the art of self-government. He relished the opportunity which political service gave him to practice the principles and the convictions which he held so firmly.

His abilities and competence as a legislator in the vast range of the national scene are well known. Perhaps the best demonstrated of his capabilities in this regard were in the fields of the Nation's finances and its national defense. His keen perception of the intricacies of funding our Nation's activities were best known to those who served with him on the Appropriations Committee, a privilege accorded to me in the last several years of Senator BRIDGES' senatorial career. It was there that he displayed the wisdom gained through the years and where he exercised the patience so sorely needed in the shaping and making of decisions which were so far-reaching.

He had a sense of fairness which was never more clearly demonstrated than in the years he served as floor leader and later as President pro tempore of the Senate.

He was honored by his party in his election as Chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, a post he held for a long time.

He exercised his responsibilities with scrupulous respect for the vast variety and sometimes conflict of the individual views held by his colleagues. In all his assignments and throughout his long service he put the Republic's welfare above party considerations, above his own personal predilections whatever they might have been, thus revealing the deep love of his country that is so strong a tradition in his native New England heritage.

Characterized as a conservative, he nevertheless held the respect and won the admiration of those with widely divergent political viewpoints.

He was closely associated with the late Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, whose political philosophy was akin to his own. They counseled together and shared the heavy burdens of leadership, each in his own sphere.

In the years that followed Senator Taft's death, it remained for the late senior Senator from New Hampshire to carry forward the fundamental features and objectives of Republican philosophy in government and national action.

Among the many tributes paid to Senator BRIDGES in the days immediately following his leaving us, is the following, which I believe is so well taken:

> BRIDGES as a proper and principled conservative believed in an open society, open to talent and industry, but a society restrained by the wisdom of the past, by a certain enlightened pessimism as to man's nature and the precepts of natural law. He is an exemplar of what is worthy in the conservative tradition.

It was also stated that one of the best expressions of his conservatism and his political philosophy came in a thoughtful speech delivered at Dartmouth College in 1955, where he said:

> The conservative knows that man is a bundle of paradoxes—the brave and the cowardly; the kind and the cruel; the generous and mean; the noble and ignoble—all wrapped into one. The best and ultimate purposes of society are to make possible the emergence and triumph of the noble and the final defeat of the ignoble. This is the humanist approach. It is likewise the realistic approach, founded on a belief that men are not the creatures of a blueprint made by visionary liberals insisting that he conform to some a priori concept but takes man for what he is, conditioned by the knowledge that because man is God's creature, he is capable of responding to the divine spark.

To these excerpts and their essence I fully subscribe. To Forrest Davis and Alex Hillman, who brought these excerpts to my attention, I make due acknowledgment.

Senator BRIDGES revealed a profound understanding of the respective roles of each party in our two-party system of representative government. He realized that a minority party, in the federated Republic of States which this Republic is, may on many occasions demonstrate no greater loyalty to the country than to dissent vigorously from certain programs and policies. But STYLES BRIDGES never allowed the vigor of dissent to outrun the bounds of courtesy. He was ever a gentleman.

This patriot from New Hampshire was well known and well beloved in my native State of Nebraska. Perhaps his earliest and closest contact with it came through his firm friendship and alliance with another great U.S. Senator, a predecessor of mine in the line of Nebraska Senators, the late and beloved Kenneth Wherry, who also served in positions of leadership in the Republican Party and in the Senate.

They also shared many convictions, beliefs, and objectives. They were somewhat alike in their stature and in their appearance. They gloried in the battles in which they engaged together for the things they deemed so highly necessary if we were to survive and progress in the tradition of a truly representative and constitutional government.

In later years, it was my privilege to help sponsor Senator BRIDGES' appearances in my Cornhusker State. It was my privilege to witness there the admiration and the reverence held by my fellow Nebraskans for this truly great leader and great exponent of American constitutional principles and government. It was on such occasions as those that I was able to pay him tribute and express my gratitude for the encouragement, the support, and the many kindnesses he had extended throughout many years to the Senator from Nebraska. I now take occasion once again to express that gratitude and to make those acknowledgments.

Thus it is that in the passing of this patriot I am bereft of a close personal friend, one to whom I could always turn for advice and guidance when they were sorely needed. It is a deep loss. I shall always be grateful for the opportunity to have served with STYLES BRIDGES in the U.S. Senate, and to be able to say that he was my loyal, longtime friend.

We have been left a great heritage by his unselfish service in the Senate.

We can best do him honor and do honor to his memory by renewed devotion to the causes of the Republic which he loved and served so well.

To all members of his family, and particularly to his own beloved Doloris, Mrs. Hruska and I extend the very deepest of sympathies and condolences, but with our assurances, however, that all of them can glory in the record and the generous contribution STYLES BRIDGES made to the cause of good government and to the advancement of humankind, and in the knowledge that the influence of his deeds and his personality will last in this Chamber and in the Republic for many, many decades to come.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in a few words of tribute to our late, departed friend, Senator STYLES BRIDGES. My remarks will be brief, because Senators who previously have spoken today have so adequately paid their tributes to him.

I entered the House of Representatives on the same day when STYLE BRIDGES entered the Senate. I came to know him rather early. I never had the privilege of serving with him on a regular committee, but I did have close associations with him in several different ways. For instance, for several years he and I were members of the Senate Office Building Commission. That required a great deal of work and frequent meetings. I always was impressed with the earnestness with which he discharged the obligations of that rather thankless job. I was also associated with him on the Inaugural Committee of 1956–57, and again on the same committee in 1961. That also is a job which entails a great deal of detailed work. I always marveled at the attention he gave to all the duties he had to perform in his positions of party leadership and in his positions of seniority on two of the outstanding legislative committees.

From time to time I had the distinct pleasure of debating with him on radio and television programs. I remember that on one occasion, during a presidential campaign, when I was asked to appear in New York, to represent the opposition, on a nationwide network with

Senator Bridges, I said at the time, "I wonder whether you realize that although Senator Bridges represents one party and I represent the other, yet in regard to so many of the things you will be discussing, there will not be the area of disagreement between us that you might think there would be." That was entirely the situation.

More than once I told Styles that I always enjoyed debating with him, because he was always frank, open, objective, and fair.

Mr. President, Styles Bridges was a very able Member of the Senate. I have read something about his life, and it is one of inspiration. His accomplishments here were great. His service was dedicated and able. He will long be missed in the Senate. His passing is a great loss not only to his State, to the Senate, and to the entire Congress, but also to the entire country.

Mrs. Sparkman and I extend our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Bridges and to the other members of his family.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to one of the really great Americans of our generation. The columnist, George Todt, very aptly described the late Senator Styles Bridges as "Mr. American."

Mr. President, it would take all day and more for me to mention by topics alone the long list of accomplishments of our departed friend and colleague, the Senator from New Hampshire, Styles Bridges. Much has been said and much will be said about his wide influence and outstanding accomplishments. For me to undertake to do the same would be a cumulative effort; moreover, others are far more gifted than I to paint word pictures of this great man. Therefore, I shall speak of but one of his many virtues.

Styles Bridges was a patriot. He was American through and through. His patriotism was genuine, sincere, and deep. During the last quarter of a century there have been times when the popular course of action in Washington was to go along with the Russian Communist line and join in the denunciation of the individuals and groups who displayed the old-fashioned love of country. But it was not so with Senator Bridges.

Senator Bridges loved his country. He fully understood what made it great. He had an appreciation of the American dream that was brought to this continent by the first settlers, defended at Valley Forge, proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence, and established in the Constitution of the United States. This American ideal has been defended and preserved through all the crises down to our time. In our time no greater defender of our Republic appeared on the political scene than Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire.

When our system of courts was in jeopardy in 1937, because of President Roosevelt's Supreme Court packing bill, Senator Bridges denounced the proposal and left no doubt as to where he stood. He condemned every other proposal of that time if, upon examination of the facts, he found the proposal to be a detriment to America's free-enterprise system.

A man's record is made by his deeds. However profound his integrity, however deep his virtue, these qualities may never be known outside his own temple unless they are committed to deeds.

No deed better identifies those qualities in Styles Bridges than his immediate, forceful, and successful opposition to a gross error of judgment on the part of the Pentagon officialdom during the latter part of World War II. It was, I am sure, an unwitting error on the part of responsible officials, and I attach nothing insidious to their omission. A decision was made to destroy security files compiled from investigations made by military-security personnel. Styles Bridges' reaction was immediate; he was thorough; he put his case before the Secretary of War and the Secretary of State. Official telephone wires hummed late into that night.

The next day, Styles Bridges took his case to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. A bipartisan majority gave him ready support; and on the next day Styles Bridges guided a three-member subcommittee through one of the quickest investigations ever known to Capitol Hill.

The result was the preservation of information vital to the security of our country. Granted that much of the file material was of no value, yet there was saved the accumulation of data needed in order to forge a link in the chain of activity which identified the enemy within.

That one act in an illustrious record of many acts helps us to know how immortality touches men of rare gifts and records their greatness.

Senator Bridges was unrelenting in his fight against communism. Before World War II was over, Senator Bridges had opposed the transfer to the Soviet Union of an American cruiser. At that early date he said, "Russia is the great roadblock to the peace of the world." He opposed the further transfer of material to the Soviet Union, warned against continuing lease-lend after the war, and assailed the Yalta agreement. At the time of Maj. Gen. Patrick Hurley's charge that career diplomats had sabotaged American missions to China and Iran, Senator Bridges demanded a thorough investigation of the State Department. In 1946 he denounced the recognition of Tito's government of Yugoslavia, and at that early date called for the halting of aid to that country.

Mr. President, Senator Bridges' patriotism was an informed patriotism. It was real and it was abiding. His was a living devotion to country, not a parade of patriotism for political or financial gain. This meant that he had great influence on the floor of the Senate. He used that influence to oppose the Communist conspiracy and to defend the land he loved—your country and mine, Mr. President—from the day when he entered the Senate until the final gavel.

Senator Bridges never "played footsie" with either communism or socialism. He never was a fair-weather patriot. He stuck to his principles at home and abroad. Millions of Americans applauded when in the fall of 1947 Senator Bridges advised the Premier of France to "take strong action against communism and Communist-led strikes."

Mr. President, time and space do not permit our enumerating all of Senator Bridges' patriotic efforts. I firmly believe that if the dominant minds in the executive branch of the Government throughout World War II and the years that followed had had the insight, the loyalty, and the patriotism displayed by Senator Bridges, the subsequent history of the world would have been much different and this world would have been a much happier and safer place in which to live. Senator Bridges did his part, and more.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, in connection with my remarks, an article entitled "George Todt's Opinion," on Senator Bridges' passing. Mr. Todt gave it a heading taken from scene 5 of act 5 of "Julius Caesar," by Shakespeare, "This was the noblest Roman of them all."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hruska in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

George Todt's Opinion—Styles Bridges' Passing

This was the noblest Roman of them all—Shakespeare, "Julius Caesar," act 5, sc. 5.

The man I considered to be the real titan of the U.S. Senate passed quickly and easily from an untroubled sleep into the life beyond last Monday at 5 o'clock in the morning.

He was "Mr. American" in my book. He was probably the greatest Republican Senator since the death of Robert Taft. He was Styles Bridges of New Hampshire—a patriot to be esteemed and revered by all who love the Republic.

May his magnificent spirit and fighting American heart point the way to future leadership in our Nation. He was superb.

I have known and corresponded with Senator Bridges over most of the past decade and considered him a warm, personal friend. Perhaps more than that—an ideal.

TIME OF GRIEF

In him were mirrored the rugged, wonderful traits of a real New England Yankee, the kind who played such a tremendous role in fashioning the world's most powerful nation out of a handful of people, moderate resources, a bleak seacoast—and one more inevitable ingredient, the most important of them all: character.

If New England never produced any resources than that particular one, she has already done more than her share in the history of our Nation. Character is the stuff of which titans are made and Styles Bridges had it in abundance. If ever a man rightfully deserved the accolade "100 percent American," it was him.

The Senator was moderate—and effective—in his conservative American ideology and ought to serve as a universal model.

Senator Bridges was a big man, never petty or mean—not even to those who opposed him most vigorously upon occasion.

WE OFTEN FIND

But he was death on such items as Communists (whom he scorned as rank traitors to our Republic), aid to Yugoslavia (he thought Tito was a mountebank, charlatan and cheat), and muzzling of the U.S. military (which he considered a national disgrace).

Upon these typical and ideologically related subjects, the New England Yankee spoke often and tellingly—not always winning his point, but invariably presenting his efficient ideas with such intelligence and reason that this writer never found it possible to doubt his judgment.

In fact, I was often stimulated to find that sometimes I seemed to come quite close to his thinking in matters of mutual interest. We noted this in our letters to each other over the years and I often sought out his advice. This great man, so generous and so wise, always had time to spare for a younger man who asked his counsel. In due time he encouraged me by placing a dozen of my columns in the Congressional Record. I admired and respected him very much. He was magnificent.

THAT OUR BELIEF

A few weeks ago, I wrote my friend a cheery get-well note asking him to take good care of himself and please become restored to normal health as quickly as possible—because the Nation needed him so much in this critical hour. Came back this considerate reply:

"The Senator was pleased to receive your thoughtful letter. He also enjoyed reading the newspaper clippings that you enclosed with the letter. He has been desperately ill and cannot respond himself, but I wanted you to know how much we both appreciated your thinking of him at this time.

IS OF ONE MIND

"You will be interested to know that he is making satisfactory progress. He has returned home from the hospital and, though we know his convalescence will be lengthy, we are looking forward to his complete recovery.

"Thank you for your concern over him, and he joins me in sending to you our warm personal regards."

It was written November 17 and signed by Mrs. Doloris T. Bridges, the Senator's wife.

Ten days later, I walked into the Herald-Express office—after a 5-day bout with influenza at home—to get my mail.

This was the letter on the top of the pile. I read it first. A few hours earlier I had learned of the Senator's passing on.

He will always remain an American ideological hero to me.

This was a great and noble patriot. God bless him. Now and forever.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, in reference to another great man of our country, these lines were written:

> He who saves his country saves all things,
> And all things saved will bless him.
> He who lets his country die lets all things die,
> And all things dying will curse him.

The record written by Senator Styles Bridges in the support of our beloved Republic will stand for all time as a monument to him. Blessed is the memory of Styles Bridges.

Styles Bridges lived for his country. He died for his country. "Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friends."

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of one of the most distinguished and respected Senators ever to serve in this body, Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire, a man whose friendship, counsel, and cooperation I valued most highly.

Styles Bridges possessed all the basic qualities which are so vital in winning and holding the respect and confidence of his fellow man. He never hesitated to place principle above expediency, country above party, and honor above profit. Indeed he was a man of great intellect, wisdom, judgment, industry, integrity, sincerity, and courage. In addition, he bore the distinction of being one of the most handsome and personable gentlemen in public life.

Of all the qualities I have mentioned in describing our late colleague, there is one upon which we must place a premium in our country today, especially for public servants, and that quality is courage. Winston Churchill has well said that "courage is rightly esteemed the first of all human qualities because it is the quality which guarantees all others."

I know of no man who demonstrated this priceless quality to a greater extent in performing his duties as a U.S. Senator than did Styles Bridges. During his 14 years of service in this body, he was a gallant and respected fighter for principle. He opposed the demands of special interest groups when their demands were not in the public interest. He moved to expose and correct corrupt practices, whether they be in business, labor, or public office. He fought to protect and preserve personal liberty during a period when conformity appeared to be the order of the day. He defended our great free enterprise system and our republican form of government against assaults from both majorities and minorities. As the senior Republican on the important Appropriations Committee, he was a tireless watchdog of Federal expenditures and a champion of fiscal integrity. In his service as the senior Republican on the important Armed Services Committee, he advocated and supported a program of national defense which would insure adequate strength and readiness to cope with the aggressive intentions of any enemy power. And, as an astute student of foreign affairs, Styles Bridges recognized long ago the threat posed to the free world by the forces of godless communism, and he early raised his voice in warning and gave his support to bold policies which would seek victory in this protracted conflict which threatens the future of freedom everywhere.

Styles Bridges was a devoted servant of the people of the State he had the honor to represent in the U.S. Senate. Indeed, he was a valuable servant to the people of the entire country. My heartfelt sympathy goes out to his gentle and devoted mother, and to his wonderful and able helpmate, Doloris Bridges, who did so much to inspire and assist him in his great record of public service, and also to his three fine sons. While we in the Senate and the people of New Hampshire will miss him, his family's loss is the greatest because as a husband and father he adhered to principles set forth by the God in which he believed so deeply.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, 25 years ago last summer I had the opportunity to meet a young man who was then Governor of the State of New Hampshire, and during the years that acquaintanceship ripened into a friendship which has endured, and which, through a stroke of fate, brought me also to the U.S. Senate with him.

The tributes heard in this Chamber today and the glowing remarks made about him in the other body yesterday are fitting proof of the mark he made and of his stature. Most appropriate, it seems to me, are the following words written by one of England's poet laureates, Robert Bridges:

> Man, in the unsearchable darkness, knoweth one thing, that as he is, so was he made: and if the essence and characteristic faculty of humanity is our conscient reason and our desire of knowledge, that was nature's purpose in the making of man.

This is a fitting description of Styles Bridges, the exemplification of a man who sought knowledge. His quiet, modest demeanor concealed, for those who did not know him, a sharp intellect and a wide range of information.

In these latter days when such words as "patriot" and "fidelity" and "loyalty" are regarded with cynicism by some of our people, we who served with him have reason to thank our Maker that in Styles Bridges we had a man who could embrace these qualities without any cynicism and only with the frankness and freshness with which a youth would embrace them.

Styles Bridges was a man who realized what was meant when it is said, "What we have given you is a republic," and nothing that Styles Bridges ever did diluted in any sense the basic nature and structure of our country and our Constitution.

He saw, thank God, with a clarity which was characteristic of his own New Hampshire hills on a cold, brittle New England morning, that there is no compromise in the structure of our Government and in the principles of our Government. I shall always remember him not only as a friend, but for his unyielding struggle to keep the basic structures of our Government sound.

Both Mrs. Allott and I send to his mother, our very warm and close friend, Doloris, and his three fine sons our deepest sympathy in this hour of sorrow. We shall all miss Styles Bridges.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, in the few years it was my privilege to know Styles Bridges, I came to admire him as a man of character and integrity and to cherish his friendship.

He had strong convictions and never failed to demonstrate the courage of them. Even those who might not agree with him on any given issue never failed to respect the sincerity, determination, and effectiveness with which he espoused his viewpoint.

His was a life dedicated to service of the public good. He served his State and his Nation well. He believed strongly in the principles upon which our Government was founded and he worked as strongly as he believed to advance them.

In the death of Styles Bridges, the State of New Hampshire has lost an illustrious native son and the United States has lost a great patriot. The memory of his loyal and dedicated service to his people, his State, and his Nation long will inspire those who follow him in positions of public responsibility.

Mrs. Talmadge joins me in extending to his mother, to his lovely wife Doloris, and to his children our deepest sympathy.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, my colleagues who have spoken this afternoon have in many cases known STYLES BRIDGES longer than I have, both in this body and in their associations before they came to the Senate.

My own acquaintance with STYLES really began when I first assumed my position in the Congress in 1945. Very quickly I came to realize the reasons why he had become almost a legend in the Senate of the United States. The reasons were the very same ones which have been so clearly, and almost repetitively, expressed this afternoon: The love he had for his country, the love he had for his native State, and the love he had for his fellow men.

I experienced at firsthand, as all of my colleagues have done, as they have this afternoon testified, the evidences of that love for his country, for his State, and for his fellow men.

On one committee I had the privilege of serving with STYLES BRIDGES for a few brief months, the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. I very quickly came to know the meaning of the words "intelligence," "clear thinking," "commonsense," and "patriotism," which have been applied to him and to his service in the Senate. He will be greatly missed by every one of his colleagues. His place in the Senate and in the whole structure of our Government will be impossible to fill. We shall have to do the best we can without that peculiarly Yankee blend of commonsense, taciturnity and yet eloquence and affection he brought to the service he rendered to his country.

To us as individuals he gave kindness which made it impossible for him to do an unfriendly act, which made it obligatory upon him to treat people who disagreed with him, as indeed I did on occasion, even more generously than those with whom he was always in complete agreement.

He gave assistance to us junior Members as we sought to fit into this body in an effective way and to discharge our responsibilities.

All these will be among my most precious memories.

Mrs. Case and I extend to Mrs. Bridges, his wife, to his mother, and to all his family our warm and affectionate condolences as we in some measure share the great grief which is theirs.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, 10 years ago when I was elected to the House of Representatives I first met STYLES BRIDGES. I was impressed at once by his great patience, by his warmth of heart, and by his essential kindness.

After I was elected to this body I was privileged to serve on the Appropriations Committee with him for 2 years, which gave me a good opportunity to know this great man. I consider that the opportunity of enjoying his friendship has greatly enriched my life. This is why I am deeply saddened and deeply distressed by his passing.

I have noted, as I have listened this afternoon to one after another of my colleagues, the references to his gentleness and kindness. Certainly this was remarkably true in this wonderful human being. None of us, of course, overlooks his great qualities of mind, but the warmth of heart and gentleness he had is something not only this body and this Congress but also the whole world badly needs at this hour of history.

We know he fought hard and brilliantly for his viewpoint, but I was thinking this afternoon, as I listened to the wonderful tributes, that in the decade I was privileged to know him I never knew of a time when he said a harsh word of abuse about any man. I never heard him scandalize an opponent, yet he was able to carry on as a great Senator and as a great American. He was strong and brave in battle, but he was generous in victory.

I deeply believe that his name will always remain high on the list of great Americans. I am equally as confident that the recollection of his kindness and his gentleness will lie deep in the affection of his friends and of his family.

We have lost a great Senator and a great American at a grave hour in our history, when he is sorely needed. What he did and said here remain, to encourage us to do and say what we should to preserve this great Nation to which he was so deeply devoted and so deeply dedicated.

I want Mrs. Bridges, his mother, and his family to know that my wife and I share the burden of their grief with them, and that we shall always remember him as a kind friend and as a great man.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the offices to which our former colleague, STYLES BRIDGES, was elected over the years speak more truly than any words of the respect and affection in which he was held by the people of New Hampshire, whom he served and who knew him best. Certainly all of us who served with him in the Senate knew he was a strong leader of the Republican Party, of the Senate itself, and of our country. I believe that his leadership came from the strength of his convictions, from his fighting spirit, and, above all, from his deep patriotism and his love for our country and for freedom.

The country will not forget his public service, and we shall not forget the human qualities which gave him stature as a man and which caused us to give him our respect and affection. He was dignified in demeanor, simple in manner, courteous, generous in his help, and he kept his word when it was given.

So today, while we meet in sadness, we meet also with pride in his achievements and his life and with gladness that we knew him.

His passing is a loss to the Senate, to his State, to our country, and to his friends, but most of all it is a loss to his mother, to his devoted wife, who stood with him always, and to his children. Our hearts and thoughts are with them today.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I desire to join in the outpouring of heartfelt tributes to our late colleague STYLES BRIDGES. Speaking as one who spent some of the happiest years of his boyhood in New Hampshire, and from time to time revisited that beautiful State, who climbed to the summits of its mountains, swam in its lakes and came to know and grow fond of some of its people, I feel, indeed, I know, that STYLES truly represented the sturdy, rugged virtues and likewise the simple kindliness which we properly associate with the folks who live in what is appropriately called the Granite State.

Concerning STYLES BRIDGES' long incumbency in this body and of his firm and consistent stands on the many crucial issues that in this turbulent and unprecedented quarter century came before the Senate, many have spoken feelingly and will again. My colleagues have done this today with a far greater perspective and with the advantage of far longer association and familiarity than I possess.

But two aspects of STYLES BRIDGES' performance in the Senate as I have observed it in the relatively brief 3 years that I have served here were his unwaivering adherence to his principles on the one hand and the kindliness and good nature which characterized the presentations of his point of view on every issue, no matter how controversial or perhaps not currently popular. Indeed, he radiated kindliness and friendliness. In that important sense—namely, the complete compatibility of vigorous espousal of the causes and doctrines that he believed in, and the courtesy and comity with which he presented it, he lived up to and incarnated, indeed enriched, the finest of all Senate traditions.

One of the unique distinctions of the Senate is that here we can disagree—disagree profoundly—on measures and policies, and yet preserve all the amenities of civilized beings. This is one of the glories of the U.S. Senate. No one embodied this unique distinction better than Senator STYLES BRIDGES.

So we shall miss him. We shall miss him in the Senate and in the National Capital as indeed the people of his beloved New Hampshire will miss him.

Our deep sympathy goes out to his mother, to his distinguished widow, to his sons. While no words can offer effective solace in the face of so irremediable a loss, those of his family who are thus tragically bereaved, cannot but derive solemn pride in the length and quality of STYLES' service, repeated evidence of the confidence which his constituents reposed in him, and in the affection and esteem in which the people of his State and his colleagues held him and will continue to hold him for the remainder of their lives.

Let me conclude by saying: We shall miss you STYLES. We shall miss your smile. We shall miss your warmth. We shall miss your generous and outgiving spirit. We shall miss your quiet humor. We know that the Senate is poorer without you.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, the death of STYLES BRIDGES is a loss to the Nation, a loss to New Hampshire, a loss to the Senate, and a sad loss to his family and his thousands of friends. It is not for me, a junior Senator, to recount the golden milestones of his rich career of self-service. That has been done eloquently. It is not for me to catalog the qualities that built his stature of greatness. This, too, has been eloquently done. My own personal close relationship and friendship with STYLES BRIDGES began after my service in the House of

Representatives, and when I became associated with the late John Foster Dulles in the Department of State in January of 1953. Our problems then were many and were made no easier by the fact that the Republican Party had been out of power nationally for 20 years.

It was Senator STYLES BRIDGES to whom I turned for advice and guidance during the trying and hectic early months of the Eisenhower administration. The advice I got was sound and the friendly guidance effective. The respect that I developed then for his capacity and judgment has risen constantly through the years.

During the 5 years that I have served in the Senate I have had his advice and counsel when I sought it, his strong encouragement when I needed it, his warm friendship always.

Belle Clay joins me once more in extending our deep and affectionate sympathy to Doloris.

Mr. President, I humbly salute the memory of a Senator's Senator, a patriot's patriot, a man's man.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I join with some sadness and some sense of honor in this tribute to a very distinguished Senator and a very dear friend. This is a day when much has been said, and all of us can contribute, so many sided was this personality, from our own recollection of him and what we consider to be his national and his personal significance.

To me, STYLES BRIDGES was the embodiment of the unity of the party of which I am a member. He expressed fairness and reasonableness—in my view, an important point of view, in that party—and beyond that he showed an accommodation and an understanding for all the other diverse points of view in the Republican Party, which was unique.

We had a vote the other day on the question of who would replace STYLES BRIDGES as chairman of the policy committee of the Republican Party in the Senate. We voted and elected a distinguished Senator who we feel will carry that responsibility effectively, honorably, and well. But it was borne in upon me, as we heard the discussion and did our duty in respect of our colleague who replaced him, and for whose success we have high hopes, that there was no replacing STYLES BRIDGES. It was not the job that made STYLES BRIDGES; it was STYLES BRIDGES who was unique. There will be no replacing of this man to whom all could repair, knowing that they would have understanding, justice, and, beyond everything else, they would have a great effort at reconciliation, which was the very embodiment of STYLES BRIDGES' service to his Nation and to his party.

STYLES BRIDGES was a very vivid man, a New Englander but by no means a reserved man, a man full of affection, full of warmth, and full of color in his personality, which made so many people feel, as one of the attachés of the Senate said to me at lunch today, "He was a very good friend of mine." STYLES BRIDGES really felt that way. He was a very good friend of every person whom he touched, because he had immediate sympathy for the needs and the feelings of the person with whom he was dealing.

STYLES, too, had another great attribute. He had toughness of spirit. He was a very kind man, a very warm human being with a sweet temper and a sweet disposition. But he had toughness of spirit. In the Senate he advocated some very tough measures, and he was never known to quail from what was required in his honest judgment and conscience to meet the national need and what he considered to be the security of freedom in the world.

We talk about sacrifice in high places in the world today, but there are few men who have the resourcefulness and the conviction to recommend measures which take a great sacrifice and great pain in order to attain those objectives upon which so many agree. STYLES BRIDGES had that kind of courage.

Mr. President, I have a vision of STYLES BRIDGES meeting Bob Taft in that Valhalla to which both have now gone, and it seems to me that the relationship of those two men ought to be mentioned here today. They were great patriots, dedicated to the objectives of their party, men of enormous service to our country, and yet men who showed—and STYLES BRIDGES was a full partner in that—a unique genius for getting along together and not having that sense of competition which often destroys the effectiveness of two such great partners in great endeavors. That again was a great tribute not only to the skill but the magnificent character of STYLES BRIDGES.

Finally, no tribute can be paid to a friend more than the tribute with relation to what one sees in adversity. Notwithstanding the fact that STYLES was in pain and was ill, time and again we saw that that illness did not destroy or change his fundamental dedication.

He was here when all of us knew he should not be here. He came back when we knew he should not come back. He did so because he felt the need for his presence here. When he was ill, there was not the remotest change in his disposition toward any of us or toward the tasks in which he was engaged. Never was a bitter word uttered or a bitter thought entertained, no matter how deep or sincere was his conviction upon an issue on which he expressed himself so forcefully.

For those of us who are married and have children—and that includes practically every one in the Senate—the relationship between STYLES and Doloris was a true inspiration. Here were two very vital beings, thoroughly expressive in their own intellect, yet with a deep concord of spirit and deep understanding and warm and affectionate relationship which inspired me, Mr. President, as I saw it at close range and which, I am sure, was very meaningful to everyone in the Senate.

So here is a man who deserves our tribute as a friend and for his great service to the Nation, for his inspiration to the Nation, and also in a very warm and human sense for his inspiration to us.

We will have no difficulty remembering STYLES BRIDGES. I will not have any difficulty, and I do not believe any other Member of the Senate will, and because what he did in his life was such a fine object lesson and will live with us, we shall not forget.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, each of us who proudly called him friend and colleague is deeply saddened by the death of STYLES BRIDGES. Our loss is very personal. As our distinguished colleague from New Hampshire pointed out, he was foremost and first of all a friend to each of us and displayed that friendship in many ways. Comment has been made about his great tolerance to those with whom he differed on a particular issue. That was a marked quality of STYLES BRIDGES.

At the same time, his loss is one which we share with the many whose lives he touched and brightened in the long years of dedicated service he gave to the people of his beloved State of New Hampshire and in the cause of a better America and a better world.

The quarter century of STYLES BRIDGES' service in the Senate stands as an eloquent tribute to his memory. Over that impressive span of years he spent his time and his talents fully and unstintingly and, as has been said at times, when his health really did not permit him to give to all of us and to the country as much as he did insist upon giving.

No American in public office was more deeply and completely committed to the maintenance of our national strength and to the preservation of our cherished freedom than was STYLES BRIDGES. In times that called imperiously for an awareness of peril and for the vigilance which is freedom's first weapon, the late distinguished Senator from New Hampshire rendered unforgettable service to his Nation and to the free world.

As he served his State and country with rare distinction, so was STYLES BRIDGES a leader in his party, a tower of strength whose qualities of mind and heart and energy contributed most significantly to the successes of the Republican Party.

Our sorrow today knows no lines of political division, is undiminished by any partisan loyalty. We join, all of us, in a common tribute of remembrance to a friend and colleague who enriched humanity by his life, and whose death impoverished all who knew him. Our sympathy goes out in a very deep and special way to his beloved wife and family. May their sorrow be lightened by the knowledge that so many share its heavy burden with them.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, it has been my solemn privilege this afternoon to sit in this Chamber and with pride to listen to the very reverent, very eloquent, and stirring tributes to a great U.S. Senator. I, too, would like to rise and join the many distinguished Senators who have preceded me in paying homage and respect to one of America's most beloved and dedicated sons, our friend and colleague, STYLES BRIDGES of New Hampshire.

His, Mr. President, was an untimely death, for it came in the prime of a distinguished career and it came in an hour of his country's peril when his sound advice and good counsel still were sorely needed.

His life of service to his countrymen, forever recorded on the pages of American history, is STYLES BRIDGES' finest eulogy. Indeed, the proceedings of this august body, in which he proudly served for nearly a quarter of a century, bear eloquent and immutable testimony to his unflinching patriotism, to his steadfast courage, and to his foresight and sagacity on matters of national and international import.

Yet the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD conveys only a fraction of the story of STYLES BRIDGES. It does not adequately reveal all those human qualities which endeared him to others and which unquestionably accounted for his immense personal popularity.

Once a poor farm boy, he reached the heights of success attained by few men. Yet he remained truly humble.

One day soon after I became a U.S. Senator, STYLES BRIDGES noted my nameplate on my office door, promptly walked in and surprised me with a visit. Normally, a senior Senator waits for junior Members to call on him, but STYLES BRIDGES, the most senior of Republican Senators, did not stand on stuffy protocol. This was typical of his innate graciousness and humility.

He was a hardheaded realist from Yankee territory. Yet he was a man of infinite compassion for the sick, the needy, the victims of misfortune. They are legion who are beneficiaries of his quiet assistance and generosity.

He was a practical man who brooked no nonsense with fuzzy-minded proposals or ideological fantasies. Yet he was an intense idealist regarding liberty and love of God and country.

He knew firsthand the shortcomings of democracy.. Yet he sustained unquenchable faith in our constitutional Republic and in the American people to surmount these obstacles and to progress to even greater heights of liberty and abundance.

He early perceived the inherent dangers of fascism, nazism, and communism to America's freedom and independence. Yet he never wavered in his conviction that freedom would ultimately triumph over tyranny.

He was as firm in his beliefs as the granite of his own New Hampshire. Yet he fully respected the right of others to disagree with him.

He was not one to provoke a fight. Yet he never ran away from one.

Of all his manifold attributes, kindness was certainly outstanding. I was impressed by this when I first met STYLES BRIDGES 8 years ago.

I had come to Washington as speaker of the Hawaiian House of Representatives, seeking support for Hawaii statehood among the leaders of Congress. STYLES BRIDGES was then President pro tempore of the Senate and chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, as well as ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services. But, despite his crowded schedule, he consented to see this emissary of America's faroff islands in the Pacific. Immediately he put me at my ease and gave attentive ear to my entreaties for Hawaii. I left our interview thinking him one of the kindest men I had ever met.

I rejoice to note that he later voted to admit Hawaii to the Union of States. Without the support of leaders like STYLES BRIDGES, Hawaii might still be a Territory without representation in the U.S. Senate, and I might not be here today.

So it is with a sad and heavy heart that I bid one final farewell, one last aloha, to my friend and compatriot, STYLES BRIDGES, diligent guardian of our Nation's safety, tireless defender of our people's freedoms, and warmhearted benefactor of his fellow man.

My wife Ellyn and I convey to his dear mother, his beloved wife, Doloris, and his three fine sons our personal condolence. We hope they may derive some solace from the knowledge of the universal esteem and affection accorded STYLES BRIDGES. His memory is enshrined in our hearts to eternity.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, both Mrs. Miller and I wish to record our deep sympathy with Mrs. Bridges and the late Senator's family over the great tragedy that has befallen them and our Nation.

The late beloved Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, took considerable pleasure in counseling with newly elected Members of the U.S. Senate. It was my privilege, as a result of assuming my seat in this Chamber for the first time a year ago, to partake of some of his wise counsel, friendship, and fellowship. To me, STYLES BRIDGES was a truly professional lawmaker of the caliber which has made the high office of U.S. Senator worthy of aspiring to and working hard for. Knowledgeable, alert, articulate, principled, even-tempered, and possessed of a warm sense of humor, he, throughout his many years of dedicated service in the U.S. Senate, served as an inspiration to all of his colleagues; and this was particularly true of the new Members to whom he felt not only a sense of personal responsibilty but a genuine affection.

I know that Senator BRIDGES had the reputation for being a strong conservative. However, his was a conservatism which was built around a desire for true progress, the kind of progress which is lasting and not merely designed to serve as a temporary palliative to a problem requiring a long-term, sustained solution. It is with interest that one can find that in his very first year of service in the Senate, he made known very clearly his support for lasting solutions to such important problems as Federal crop insurance, wages and hours, child labor, and unemployment. But at the same time, he was for progress based on sound principle. In what probably would be considered his maiden speech on the floor of the Senate, on July 29, 1937, he expressed his concern over excessive delegation of legislative powers during the debate on a wages and hours bill, when he said:

> Congress is dodging the issue when it delegates that responsibility. Let us have minimum-wage and maximum-hour legislation, but let us meet the responsibility. Let us put it upon our statute boks as a straightforward statute that is clearly definable. Let us not create any more executive boards with wide discretionary powers in view of the fact that probably, upon the Chief Executive making the appointments, we may have another biased board. Let us provide definite standards, both as to minimum wages and as to maximum hours, but preserve the right of collective bargaining above those standards.

Senator BRIDGES was deeply concerned over excessive concentration of power in the Federal Government, knowing that this would mean a weakening in the balance of power that must exist between the States and Federal Government if the American Republic is to continue. He abhorred the hiring of thousands of Federal employees as part of a program to reduce unemployment. Almost 25 years ago, he called the Senate's attention to the fact that in the 4 years since President Roosevelt had taken office the number of Federal employees had increased by 252,000 to a grand total of 835,000, and he did so in warning that under a bill then before the Senate this number would be vastly increased. Were he here today, he would be sounding similar warnings. If one looks at the record he will find that from his first day of service in the Senate throughout his last, STYLES BRIDGES faithfully adhered to the principles he believed in, because, as a dedicated American, he believed that these principles spelled the American way of life.

On February 12, 1937, STYLES BRIDGES gave his first Lincoln Day speech as a U.S. Senator before the National Republican Club of New York City. This was, of course, following the 1936 elections, which the Republican Party had lost. As a loyal member of the party of his choice—one who believed in the principles of that party and that they would eventually prevail, STYLES BRIDGES had only begun to fight. His words then should be well heeded by prophets of gloom and doom for the future of the Republican Party merely because of the 1960 elections. He said:

> The Republican Party has just been through a national political battle. It lost that battle, and because of that defeat there are those who are ready to bury it in its political grave. Those people are either timid and unimaginative, or uninformed of all the facts, or are unwilling to face the facts and act accordingly. The loss of that battle is a challenge to keep on fighting for the principle that progressive ideas can be put into effect on solid foundations and on a sound financial basis without upsetting our economic balance. This, the Republican Party submits, can be done for the Nation.
>
> The Republican Party finds itself in a position comparable to that in 1856, when its first standard bearer, Gen. John C. Fremont, was overwhelmingly defeated. After that defeat and during the days following that election, do you suppose the head of Abraham Lincoln was bowed? Do you think that he despaired for the future of the party? Do you think that he tolerated suggestions and counsel that the newborn party be buried and that a still newer party be created to take its place? Of course, we all know the answer to those questions. Lincoln knew that the party had been built on a solid foundation; that it was the only party that was soundly progressive; that it was the only party that had the vision, the boldness, and the will to fight for "the rights of man." With a faith that behooves us to imitate, he fought back and led the Republican Party to a glorious victory in 1860. With such a heritage, the Republican Party can again come back in the future and fully vindicate its principles and ideals.

Senator Bridges liked to point out that he was an optimist. This he did on the occasion of another of his memorable speeches later the same year, on April 26, over the radio. The subject of the address was: "Will Real Democracy Survive?" It seems almost uncanny that the same question is being asked today. Indeed, Mr. President, the same speech could well be made today. I shall not insert his speech in the Record, but I would point out that it appears on pages 969 through 971 in Appendix Volume I of the 1937 Congressional Record. Attention should be called to a few passages from this speech, however. Senator Bridges said:

> True liberals, as distinguished from noisy self-proclaimed liberals, are warning the American people against an encroaching personal government. They are beseeching the people to halt Executive domination over the legislative and judicial departments; they are urging the American people to cease sowing the seed of Executive mastery lest they reap a dictatorship. No dictator ever ran on a platform calling for a dictatorship, and it is no sufficient answer to deny that a dictatorship is the aim of a group in control.
>
> Informed people feel that we are speeding toward a disastrous inflationary era because of the administration's unsound fiscal policies. Will not the American people heed these warnings and force the administration to reverse its fiscal policy? Has not the time come when the test of sincerity is the way things are done and not the way in which they are said?
>
> The American people want security, and to have security they must get stability in their Government. Security of jobs, social security, old-age assistance or pensions, security of homes, security of farms—all are predicated on the financial stability of the Government. They become myths and illusions when the Government is imperiled by an administration which is so reckless in its spending operations that the value behind this security is diminished or menaced.
>
> The people want the better things of life which we have demonstrated that we can produce, but our ability to attain them is limited by our ability to pay for them. A beneficent government which oversteps the ability of its people to pay for these things invites ultimate disaster instead of promoting a more abundant life. And the people who suffer most in inflationary times are not the rich and well-to-do people but—and here is the tragedy of it—the people who suffer are the ones on the lower rungs of the economic ladder. The wage-earner, the small-home owner, the man on security wages—all of these, if you please, are the ones who will first feel the cruel results of the administration's imprudent fiscal policies. How will they feel it? They will feel it by sharp increases in the prices of necessaries of life; they will feel it by having their purchasing power sharply reduced.
>
> During last October and November the American people heard from high and mighty places that recovery was here; that the wheels of industry were turning again; that the economic train had been put back on the track and that smiles were on the faces of all the people; and that we were going forward to the promised land. There were some speakers, however, who were bold enough to issue a warning. They were denounced as alarmists.
>
> All my life I have been an optimist. I have never sold America short. If there are some who choose to class me as an alarmist, let me say that the administration's financial practices and legislative proposals have forced me to be one. But there are some things to be said for an alarmist.
>
> Paul Revere was an alarmist. He carried the alarm through every Middlesex village and farm, and partially as a result of that contributory action, this Nation won its freedom. Surely one cannot be condemned for sounding an alarm in a constructive way so that real democracy may survive.

Mr. President, Styles Bridges waited a long time, but he saw his faith bear fruit in the survival of democracy during World War II and in the Republican victories in the elections of 1952 and 1956. His thousands of friends will miss this great statesman, and those of us who are Republicans regret that he will not be with us when his words of optimism for our party come true again.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, when I came to the Senate 5 years ago this spring, Senator Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire, greeted me in a most courteous and friendly way. That courtesy and that friendliness lasted throughout every month of my service with him. He set an example of personal courtesy and consideration that is worthy of emulation by this and succeeding generations.

We miss him here; we miss here on the floor of the Senate; we miss him in the cloakroom; we miss him in the corridors of the Capitol.

Those of us who have been privileged to serve with him will miss his friendly smile and his warm welcome all the rest of our lives.

All the members of his family have our families' continuing sympathy and our continuing esteem for his character, of which they were a part.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise to pay my respects to Senator Styles Bridges. To my mind, he epitomized many of our New England qualities, and his loss will be a loss to our whole area of the country.

While as a new Member of this body I have only recently had the pleasure of knowing and working with Senator Bridges, I know that I enjoyed the association we had together, as did my revered and beloved predecessor, Theodore Francis Green, who came to the Senate on the same day as did Senator Bridges.

Moreover, in the death of Senator Bridges we have lost a leader in the battle against communism and one who fought his battles in a fair way.

All of us of the New England delegation will miss his wise counsel, but I am confident that the spirit of this sturdy son of New England and his devotion to this body will live on.

I extend my sympathy and deep regrets to his wife, his sons, and his mother.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may read into the Record a statement prepared by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Smith], who would speak at this time if he were not otherwise detained on business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Rhode Island may proceed.

Mr. PELL. The statement by Senator Smith of Massachusetts reads as follows:

Statement by Senator Smith of Massachusetts on the Death of Senator Styles Bridges

> With the death of Styles Bridges, America lost a great leader and patriot. All of us in the Senate will miss his counsel, based as it was on long experience and profound wisdom.
>
> Styles Bridges was most effective in representing the interests of his native New England. The people of New England appreciated the work he did, and shared our sense of loss upon his death.
>
> In the affairs of the Nation as a whole, in which he was deeply interested, Styles Bridges was a consistent advocate of an old and honored concept of Americanism. He judged public issues from the viewpoint of America's interests. He was always zealous that America distinguished its friends from its enemies in the world, that America protected its security at home, and that our Nation be strong militarily.
>
> These were the principles in which he believed, and to which he dedicated a long and rich life in the public service. He will be missed. His example and his principles will remain with us always.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I shall always value the friendship of Styles Bridges. It first came to me in 1934 when he was the only Republican Governor to be elected in the Nation.

There was a bounce in his stride and a vigor in his voice that seemed to tell all young men "there is a place for you in the public service if you but have the courage to earn it."

Nothing in life was handed to Styles Bridges on a silver serving dish. He knew work as few men now living know it. His father died while Styles was just a boy and when other lads were tucked fast asleep in bed he was up doing chores.

As the youngest Governor in the United States Styles turned the forces of his office against the terrible affliction caused by the depression. Under his leadership there was developed State aid for the unemployed, widowed mothers, and old folks who had little or no food for the kitchen shelf. Swift action against the enemy, which was to be his guiding theme in later days on other issues, was the keystone of his policies as Governor and the enemies then were disease, hunger, and despair.

In 1937 Styles Bridges left behind him in New Hampshire a brilliant record and came to the U.S. Senate. His rugged New England virtue and steadfastness of conviction brought him national as well as State esteem.

Styles served notice on the people that he wanted America to be eternally vigilant and perpetually prepared to meet the threat of any alien power. Long before Pearl Harbor he voted for measures to strengthen our military forces and stockpile strategic defense materials. He saw the need for military conscription and the necessity of strengthening the Reserve and National Guard. How prophetic—how invaluable his counsel was.

At the height of World War II, Styles Bridges played a significant role in winning our conflict with the Fascist enemy. He was one of four Members of the Senate who knew of the President's plan to construct the first atomic bomb and was one of a very few men charged with responsibility for providing secretly money needed for the bomb project.

Always thinking of the future, STYLES was one of the driving forces behind the effort to put the United States up front in the space race. Indeed he had much to do with the establishment of the new standing Senate Space Committee on which he served as ranking member.

Whatever ism threatened America, be it from the left or right, STYLES BRIDGES was always on guard.

In the confusing days ahead when America will be faced with alternating promises of peace and threats of war, the voice, vigor and mind of the New Hampshire Senator will be sorely missed.

In the eyes of virtually every citizen in the Union, STYLES BRIDGES was regarded as a good statesman. In Vermont we think of him not only as a good statesman but a good neighbor as well.

Whenever I view the ruggedness of the granite and marble in New England, I shall always think of STYLES, for this is the stuff of which he was made.

I know that the heart of the Senate goes out to his bereaved wife, Doloris, and to his three sons.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, STYLES BRIDGES was a friend of mine. I say this proudly.

Back in January 1943, when I came to Washington as a Member of the House of Representatives, I became acquainted with STYLES, who was then starting his second term in the U.S. Senate. I was impressed with his geniality and genuine friendliness. Our friendship ripened through the years, particularly after I was elected to the Senate. We served together on numerous standing committees and special committees, and his logical reasoning was always in evidence. His wise counsel was a help to all searching for solutions to problems. His outstanding ability was recognized by his colleagues, as evidenced by his elevation to the chairmanship of his party's powerful policy committee. Senator STYLES BRIDGES was a natural leader, and in everything and in every way was fair and generous.

The Nation gained much by the life and work of this dedicated man. I personally gained much by the warm friendship and counsel of this wholesome man. With his passing, the Nation has lost a great leader and I have lost a good friend.

I join with my colleagues in expressing my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Bridges and their sons.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it would be difficult to imagine a more regretted loss than in the passing of my friend STYLES BRIDGES from the American scene.

Universally respected and trusted, not only by those who had the great privilege of knowing him, but by all who had come to read of him and hear of him as a courageous and outspoken American.

We will sadly miss our good friend, and those of us who looked to him for advice and guidance recognize that his place in our affections is and will always remain as a void which no other can fill.

I join with my colleagues in condolences to his wife and to wish for her and for those others who were close to him, that the healing grace of time's passing will ease their grief even though it can never dim his memory.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I did not have the opportunity to know Senator BRIDGES well or intimately for I was privileged to serve with him for just 1 short year. I cannot begin to equal in eloquence the speeches which have been delivered this afternoon by his colleagues who served with his so long and knew him so well. I can only join with them in those expressions.

While the country and the State of New Hampshire and the Senate of the United States have suffered a great loss, I feel that I, too, have suffered a personal loss, for I shall never have the opportunity to enjoy the friendship and comradeship of this great man nor shall I have the opportunity to take advantage of his great wisdom and understanding of the problems of the world today.

STYLES BRIDGES was truly a great American for though he was strong in his partisan approach to matters in the Senate, he was even stronger in his support of those policies and programs which he felt best served the interests of the American people and the people of his beloved New Hampshire.

Mrs. Boggs joins me in extending to Mrs. Bridges and his family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I join with those who mourn the passing of our beloved colleague, STYLES BRIDGES. Few among the many men with whom I have been associated in my lifetime had the capacity to command and as wide and devoted coterie of friends as did STYLES BRIDGES. He had a deep and genuine love for his fellow man that was always reciprocated.

There is a very select group of men who can truly be said to have held the destiny of this great Nation in their hands in the time of our greatest crisis. As a member of the political party not then in power, STYLES BRIDGES was one of the few upon whom the very existence of this Nation depended. Before, during and subsequent to World War II he was the shining example of nonpartisanship in effective action. He was a chief architect of that character of united front that this Nation must display to win all-out war. For this service to this country and humanity, the people not only of the United States but of the free world are eternally and forever in his debt.

As the titular leader of the Republican Party in the U.S. Senate for years, almost until the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, he has demonstrated that the operation of the two-party system does not have to depend on acrimony, distrust, and discord; that reasonable and intelligent men can have honest differences of opinion on basic and fundamental issues and maintain amongst themselves at the same time the highest degree of mutual respect, friendship, and confidence.

STYLES BRIDGES has been a power and influence in so many different fields of achievement that it is impossible even to begin to list the areas in which his contributions have been made. His influence extended far beyond the immediate reaches of the legislative branch of our Government in which he served so long. It is inevitable that history will rank him as one of the most influential and dynamic leaders of our country throughout the entire course of the mid-20th century.

The people of the State of New Hampshire are most fortunate in having had for so long a period of time a man of such high character and consummate ability to represent their State and interests in the Congress of the United States.

It is a fashion of this day and time to define "patriots" and "patriotism" with new and different nuances. STYLES BRIDGES' life and works are the living example of the kind and character of patriotism to which I personally subscribe and would recommend to all people of this country to seek to emulate. We can only pray that more men be born to this earth in the mold and character of our beloved departed friend.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the untimely passing of STYLES BRIDGES last November removed from the U.S. Senate a most effective public servant, a highly intelligent man, and a very gracious gentleman.

STYLES BRIDGES was an easy man to work with across the aisle. He always kept his word and stated his position with the utmost candor. His country came first—and when the interest of the Nation was involved, he placed partisanship in second position. STYLES BRIDGES was a warm and personable human being who always found time to listen to anyone who needed his help. This gracious spirit he combined with a ruggedness of character that won the abiding admiration and respect of his adversaries as well as his allies. His colleagues in the Senate already miss him very much and will miss him for a long time to come. His constituents in New Hampshire will never forget him. My deepest sympathy to his mother, Mrs. Bridges, and to their three sons.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the late Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, who, when he left our midst, was the ranking Republican of the Senate, having served in this body for a quarter of a century.

The Senate has lost a sincere, friendly, capable, and genuine conservative Member. The State of New Hampshire will long miss his distinguished service, and our Nation will be lacking for the absence of his political philosophy and contributions to our Government.

STYLES BRIDGES was no self-styled conservative, and never once voted or spoke in the Senate, or at home, or when abroad under a false label. He was a fountainhead of genuine, honest, conservatism in his party and in this body.

I shall always feel that I was a better representative in the Senate because I knew STYLES BRIDGES, and because we were friends and worked together in the best interest of our Nation, regardless of our differences of opinions on individual issues.

I extend my sympathy and regret over the passing of this distinguished Senator to his wife, his family, and his State of New Hampshire, all of whom he loved dearly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we here today realize that our comments will fail to pay full tribute to a man who has served his State and Nation in so many ways for so many years both in New Hampshire and in the Senate he loved so well. STYLES BRIDGES will certainly be remembered in the history of our Nation as a man who gave generously of himself to the conduct of its Government.

Many here have already described some of his contributions as a Senator: They have told of his understanding, skill, and vast senatorial experience since his election in 1936. It has been my good fortune to see this great Senator at work in this Chamber.

It had been instructive when he disagreed with positions taken by me and others who opposed his views on occasion, and it had been heartwarming and rewarding to find, on those occasions when we did agree, that STYLES BRIDGES could and would add the weight of his argument and knowledge to our cause.

My colleagues here today have described much of his history in the Senate. I would like to close these remarks with a few words about STYLES BRIDGES as a good neighbor. New Jersey is my home State, but I have often visited New Hampshire for holidays. I practiced law there briefly before settling down in the Garden State. Two years ago I became a part-time resident in a summer home in Tamworth, N.H. As soon as Senator BRIDGES found that a resident of New Jersey had settled down in his State, he opened the floodgates of his vast hospitality. He took special notice of my New Hampshire residence and even mentioned it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. His greeting made me feel more at home in New Hampshire than ever. I feel, during today's tributes, almost as a resident of that State must feel on this occasion.

The gesture that STYLES BRIDGES made in my direction was typical of his warmth and friendship. Like others who had known him for many more years than I have, I feel a sense of personal loss today. A good friend and a great legislator has left this Chamber, and we miss him deeply.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the Senate is honoring today the memory of a native of Maine who served his adopted State of New Hampshire with ability and vigor. I join in paying tribute to STYLES BRIDGES, a man of capacity, determination, and devotion to the cause he espoused.

Those of us who served with him knew him as a brisk and direct spokesman for conservatism in his party and in the Nation. He gave no quarter and asked none in debate or in campaign.

We shall miss the challenge of his views, the force of his personality, and the contribution of his experience. Mrs. Muskie and I extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Bridges in her loss.

EXHIBIT 1

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CHAVEZ

I wish to extend my condolences to Mrs. Bridges and other members of the family for their grievous loss through the death of my colleague and good friend, the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES, former senior Senator from the State of New Hampshire.

I feel that a close association, which goes back over many years, qualifies me to say that STYLES BRIDGES served his State and country with distinction in many fields, but in the Senate he served with the greatest distinction.

His numerous important contributions to the deliberations of this Assembly were made possible by his devotion to his high ideals of public service coupled with a trained ability to give the utmost of his mind and heart for all the tasks to which he set himself or was assigned.

Due to his passing, the Nation has lost a great leader and statesman and I have lost a friend.

EXHIBIT 2

U.S. SENATE,
January 17, 1962.

HON. NORRIS COTTON,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building.

DEAR SENATOR COTTON: It is now 10:40 a.m., and the thought keeps running through my mind that in 3 hours eulogies will begin for one of the greatest men who ever lived. To me, STYLES BRIDGES still lives. He possessed qualities, traits, whatever you might call them, which are the mark of a great man.

He was always humble, never too busy to listen, always there at the other end of the telephone. Whether it was your personal problem or a political one to be discussed, you felt that he was eager to give his time and attention. Somehow your problems became his. It made you feel good to have him with you. His presence radiated security, substance, and stability. It was easy to work with him. Immediately you knew his thoughts, and by stating brief facts he would grasp immediately your argument. As you trusted him, he trusted you.

To a hundred men and women another stalwart has left their midst, but to me STYLES BRIDGES still walks these halls he loved so much.

Sincerely yours,

J. MARK TRICE,
Secretary for the Minority.

EXHIBIT 3

REMARKS OF GOV. WESLEY POWELL AT THE FUNERAL OF THE LATE U.S. SENATOR, STYLES BRIDGES, NOVEMBER 29, 1961

Search has been made in the book of our records and no brighter volume is found than that which tells the achievements of our friend and neighbor, STYLES BRIDGES.

It is recorded for us, and for all time, that this man was rebellious against wrong, against tyranny. It is likewise recorded that he was joyously devoted to right, to liberty. Be it known that it is gratefully recognized that we of State, and of Nation, and of world are the beneficiaries of his rebellion and his devotion.

Had STYLES BRIDGES not deeply loved and humbly served an Eastman Street, a mountain road, a statehouse, he could not have loved so completely and served with such dedication the sometimes lost people of his precious country, the masses of the Nation wherein the liberty he cherished was endamaged.

This man who walked humbly in New Hampshire, learning well our strengths and our weaknesses, knew that if the poor of the Nation and the world are to have hope then there must be care for them in each village. He knew that if his country and good people everywhere were to be saved from the sword of the mighty, then expressions of patriotism on a town common must be from the heart, that the individual citizen must be provoked to willing sacrifice.

From walking humbly here in New Hampshire among those whose suffrage he enjoyed, he learned and he never forgot that people elect a leader to lead and that they will follow knowledge and devotion even when the path is very thorny.

In the constancy of his humble walk with the least of those he served, STYLES BRIDGES learned and never forgot that the people move away from a leader only when he moves away from them. He learned and never forgot that a citizen and a nation grope in the noonday only when leadership itself resorts to the devices of the crafty and forsakes allegiance to the pillars of truth.

STYLES BRIDGES as citizen of New Hampshire, as Governor of his State and as Senator of the United States never made right and liberty and freedom complex. These blessings were of his inner spirit and he knew, therefore, they were of the inner spirit of good men everywhere.

In the darkness which stems from high persons uninformed or filled with fear, this New Hampshire man's clear thinking and simple words fearlessly uttered would stir up a thunder of thought among the people until the lightning of courage awoke leadership itself. You see, our Senator knew there is no peace in bondage. He knew that freedom is lost when it is compromised. He knew that liberty is more precious than life.

STYLES BRIDGES told us that the issue of our time is not the survival of his life or ours, but the survival of the way of life which men like him from century to century have made the hope of the world. Then on Sunday last he laid down his life for his friends. And who were his friends? Every man of every town and every State and every nation who is free or would be free.

Yes, New Hampshire and America and all everywhere who believe in human dignity loved STYLES BRIDGES since for us all he lived, and died.

EXHIBIT NO. 4

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—NIGHT IS NOT ETERNAL

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate)

As Congress comes back into session, among national legislators who have passed on since adjournment are two towering public servants. One outstanding leader from the Senate, and one from the House were not present as the respective gavels called the bodies to order. The statesman who will be sorely missed on the House side is SAM RAYBURN, of Texas. The statesman whose passing is deeply mourned on the Senate side is STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire.

Across the long years of their national service these distinguished Americans stood valiantly in the midst of crisis after crisis which, for the time, dominated the Nation's outlook and which wrote the black headlines of the passing periods.

Without minimizing the importance of any questions which at any one time colored the Republic's sky, both of those now gone from the national stage and who witnessed the raging of many legislative tempests under the white dome, had a calm philosophy with regard to recurring times of stress and strain. The one who presided in the Speaker's chair and the one who sat at Daniel Webster's historic desk both knew that no storm lasts forever, and that today's crashing thunder and forked lightning will pass.

When, during World War I, things seemed blackest, Albert, King of the Belgians, stood one evening at a palace window as the curtain of darkness was being gradually lowered. Finally the last glow of the day had faded and it was night. The King stood for a while in pensive silence, thinking of his nation's woes; then turning to one by his side, he said, "But the night is not eternal, and when it is gone there comes a bright new morning with splendor in its wings."

As a Christmas greeting an honored Member of the House sent to her constituents and to her hosts of friends across the Nation words written in the 16th century by St. Teresa of Avila, "Let nothing disturb thee; let nothing dismay thee: all things pass; God never changes. Patience attains all it strives for. He who has God finds he lacks nothing; God alone suffices."

In a thousand troubled eras, when the hearts of men turned to water in them for fear, always the dark clouds have been big with promise of a new epoch, of larger prospects, and new hope. In no generation has the future belonged to the blatant and the spectacular. They pass.

Three months before he died, Woodrow Wilson, broken in body but with head unbowed, on Armistice Day, greeted a group of faithful followers who had gathered in front of the new home on S Street to which he had come from the White House. The recent death in that same house of his widow who stood by his side so heroically has turned back the leaves of history to those days. Before her death she deeded that house to the Nation as a memorial to her great husband. On that Armistice Day of 1923 some even knelt on the pavement. In response to the pleadings of these friends the stricken war President, with the aid of a cane, dragged himself to the door. How his appearance had changed since the day he strode confidently down the center aisle of the Senate, bringing the huge text of the Treaty of Versailles. For this last appearance he wore a high hat, and summoned all his ebbing strength for a dignified impression. One who was there relates that after apologizing for his initial emotion, he fired up and spoke like an implacable Old Testament prophet. Here exactly are his closing words, "I cannot refrain from saying just one word more. I am not one of those who have the least anxiety about the triumph of the principles I have stood for. That we shall prevail is as utterly sure as that God reigns." Woodrow Wilson's valedictory to his countrymen was virtually "This, too, shall pass."

Always upon the desk of the late Arthur H. Vandenberg was that quartette of monosyllables. For him that desk motto was a constant reminder that the day's shouting headlines are likely to make a noise all out of proportion to their importance. When close associates asked about those words on his desk which were "This, too, shall pass," the Senator explained that they reminded him that it is well to remember that both criticism and praise are transient phenomena of public office, and that by keeping those four words in mind the twin dangers of deep depression because of hostility, and of excessive exultation because of praise may be avoided.

When the end of this public servant's pilgrimage was nearing, it was mine to sit by his side as he trod the Via Dolorosa of his dear companion's translation, and at his request to conduct her funeral service. In those dark hours we talked together of that Holy One who, in the shadowed garden with the red cup in his hand cried, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me." But soon he was hanging dead on two crossed beams of wood. Yet that, too, passed into the most radiant glory of the ages—the Reign of the Risen, over whom death has no dominion. And so—

When some great sorrow, like a mighty
river,
Flows through your life with peace destroying power.
And dearest things are swept from sight
forever
Say to your heart each trying hour: This
too shall pass.

For no night is eternal, and however dark the hour, morning is on the way.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the pending resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 254) was unanimously agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 18, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Testimonial by Senator Dodd to the Very Reverend Vincent C. Dore, O.P.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17, 1962

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on October 22, 1961, the Providence College Alumni Association conducted a testimonial dinner in Providence, R.I., in honor of the Very Reverend Vincent C. Dore, O.P., the seventh president of Providence College.

The principal speaker at this testimonial dinner was the junior Senator from Connecticut, the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD, a graduate of Providence College in the class of 1930.

Senator DODD's address was truly magnificent and I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of his remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was truly a most deserving tribute to one of the country's outstanding educators.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD AT THE TESTIMONIAL DINNER IN HONOR OF THE VERY REVEREND VINCENT C. DORE, SHERATON BILTMORE HOTEL, PROVIDENCE, R.I., SUNDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1961

There is something about the inauguration of a new college president that makes it a significant event in the lives of many thousands of people and of society itself. For it marks the commencement of a new leadership that will influence, for good or for ill, the mental growth and the approach toward life of thousands of young students. And it means a new impact, for better or worse, upon the intellectual and academic life of our Nation.

Happily those of us who know of Father Vincent Dore are confident that his influence will be for the good and his impact for the better.

Father Dore is in himself an embodiment of the ideal of the "whole man" which true education seeks to develop. As an athlete, as a student, as a man, as a teacher, as an administrator, as a civic figure and above all, as a spiritual leader, he has left upon all things he has touched the mark of his zeal, his character and his great ability.

Those of us who love Providence College and who are concerned with its welfare were cheered and heartened to hear of Father Dore's appointment as the new president. We confidently look forward to his administration as a period of unparalleled growth and achievement.

Father Dore follows in the footsteps of some remarkable men. It was my privilege to know and to regard as friends two presidents of Providence College. I well remember Father Lorenzo McCarthy, who built a tradition of intellectual excellence here and left a heritage in the hearts and minds of the students of that time which continues to bear fruit. And all of us revere the memory of Father Robert Slavin. He maintained and improved academic standards here. He led the way to a great physical growth so that an improved curriculum could be made available to more and more students. Through his writings and his lectures, he made an ever broadening range of people aware of and interested in Providence College.

For those who are returning to Providence College after some absence, this event evokes the deepest sentiment. Certainly it has greatly affected me. For it was here that I came into contact with philosophy, with theology, with the great minds of the past.

I have always felt a debt of gratitude to the Dominicans who taught here and who by their example and by their precept opened to me and to so many others a vision of what life ought to be and what it can be.

One cannot be among the Dominicans without feeling again the influence of the two greatest figures of the Dominican Order. And in reflecting upon them, it seems to me that they, and the order they served, offer the answer to the terrible challenge that faces 20th century man.

St. Thomas Aquinas showed us the philosophy and the system of logic by which we can seek and find the truth. His teachings remain the basic guides not only in theology and philosophy but in economic, social and political questions.

St. Dominic demonstrated for us the zeal for conversion which the Western World must find again if it is to overcome the new barbarism that threatens to engulf it.

And the Dominican Order itself offers to the free world the tools which it desperately needs: the true intellectual and moral life and the passion for propagating it.

A vast and crucial struggle is raging across the earth between freedom and communism. At bottom, this is a continuation of the ancient conflict between civilization and barbarism and between good and evil.

Some people find it naive and unsophisticated to describe this world struggle in terms of good and evil but the more I see of it the more I am convinced that at bottom this is a moral struggle.

The conflict is more critical today than ever before. For in the new barbarism of the Communists, the force of evil has at its disposal enormous resources that it has not had before; a fantastic capacity for organization, a gigantic apparatus of terror and propaganda, a perverted zeal, a false but self-sufficient system of logic which is its own judge and which admits of no higher tribunal, the incredible tools of modern technology, the inestimable resources of whole continents and the forced labor of 1 billion slaves.

All of this has been harnessed and is now turned against Western civilization which, whatever its grave and tragic faults, represents and defends the force of good in the world.

And while the enemy is at its strongest, Western civilization is at its weakest state, for it is infected with an internal disease which threatens to destroy its roots and thus pull it down.

As those of us who were schooled in the teachings of Thomas Aquinas look out upon Western society, we see a strange paradox. Its people are enjoying the fruits of the most successful of all civilizations, fruits which have their origin in certain fundamental spiritual and intellectual beliefs. Yet in large measure Western man either ignores or actually rejects those truths that form the basis of our civilization.

Western man once believed in the existence of objective truth and in the capacity to discover truth through the use of his reason, and so he embarked upon those intellectual adventures which revolutionized human existence, through the study of the nature of man, through the development of rules of reason, through the mastery of the arts and sciences.

Western man once believed that he had a free will and was a responsible being, endowed by his Creator with freedom to choose, and thus a network of political freedoms and civil rights was woven to protect and encourage this free choice, thereby liberating an incalculable amount of creative energy and incentive.

Western man once believed that every human being possessed an inherent dignity, not the shallow thing that passes for dignity today, prestige, status, social grace, but an intrinsic worth arising from his nature as one created and redeemed by God and destined for eternal life in accordance with His plan; therefore, a humanitarianism evolved which spread its beneficent effects throughout the structure of society, largely eliminating the ancient cruelties and degradations.

At critical hours in the struggle against barbarism some Western men believed that some things were more important than life itself, and they gave their lives to throw back successive waves of invaders, preserving our chance to receive from our fathers and to pass on to our children the blessings of more than 2,000 years of endeavor and growth.

The civilization which was based upon these fundamental beliefs is now under a double onslaught, beset from without by the mobilized forces of communism, which already control one-third of the earth, and undermined from within by ignorance of its origins, doubt of its essential truths, and rejection of its root ideas.

Against the Communists we must develop superior organization of our men and resources, superior technology, stronger armies, more effective propaganda. This is a matter of political leadership, of military budgets, of industrial production, of foreign aid, of alliances, of diplomacy. It is a tremendous task, and our immediate survival hinges upon it.

But in the end, how successful Western man will be in defending what he has will depend upon what it is that he is defending, or what he thinks it is.

Those who are struggling to preserve only their conveniences and pleasure will cease struggling when the battle causes inconvenience and pain.

Those who are defending only our superior material abundance will prove to be summer soldiers when faced with the threat of unparalleled material destruction.

Even for those who are defending their lives, their homes, and their families, the struggle may lose meaning when it threatens mass destruction on so vast a scale that individual survival appears hopeless.

And so we see growing up all around us groups who fear the bomb more than the loss of Western values, and who march under the miserable slogan, "Better Red Than Dead."

If we try to combat the Soviets on the ground that they offer the world a brutal and tyrannical form of materialism, whereas we offer mankind a humane materialism softened by democracy, then our stand is futile and ultimately self-defeating.

It is only when Western man realizes that he must struggle, not for the material fruits or the scientific achievements or the political refinements of Western society, but for its spiritual origins, its eternal truths, that he will be prepared to make the heroic, sustained endeavor that must be made.

If Western man believes in a Supreme Being, whose will he serves, then he is clothed in a certain armor of courage and confidence which is essential to victory.

If he believes in the immortality of his soul, then he is no fearful weakling whose goal is mere survival under any circumstances; he is a man who will lay down his life for those values which we are trying to preserve.

If he believes that there is such a thing as objective truth and that he is endowed with the capacity to know it and the duty to seek it, then he will be a purposeful citizen and a resolute defender, for he has the strength that goes with knowing his side is the right side.

If he believes in the dignity of man, properly conceived, then the thought of 1 billion slaves behind the Iron Curtain, deprived of their basic human rights, will be a constant thorn in his side and a spur to action.

So long as he grieves over their enslavement, he will never be fooled about the nature of communism, he will never acquiesce in any agreement which consigns others to perpetual slavery, he will never invite the enslavers to his shores to be received as honored guests, he will never join in the diplomatic recognition of gangster regimes as legitimate governments. And for the same reason, he will strive constantly toward the elimination of those forms of discrimination and injustice and degradation here at home which deny men the rights and opportunities and patterns of growth which are their just inheritance.

If Western man believes in inalienable rights and in the inalienable responsibilities that go hand in hand with those rights, then he will be a bulwark of our system of free government and he will accept the painful obligations which must be accepted if any free society is to survive, the duty to sacrifice, to take risks, to bear arms, to pay taxes, to forgo individual interest in behalf of the common good.

The question before us then is, can we in the Western World develop even a significant minority of men and women who are mentally and morally equipped to do battle with both the frontal attack of Communist barbarism and the internal corruptions of Western materialism, atheism, and agnosticism.

The leaders in this effort must be men like yourselves, products of our finest traditions, students of Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas, followers of St. Dominic. But if these traditions are to be preserved only as academic curiosities in ivory towers and cloistered halls, we are done for, we have already lost.

The task of our time is to restate these truths, to apply them to current events, to imbue a large part of our intellectual community with them and make them intelligible and acceptable to the people.

The role of an institution like Providence College in a task of this kind is central.

If each day, its faculty and graduates can make a contribution to the mainstream of American thought; if each year we can send out into the world from Providence College and those many other institutions dedicated to our common ideals, new legions of young people, grounded in religious beliefs, equipped with the tools of logic, and infected with a zeal for converts, then there is a chance that Thomistic philosophy may be for our age what it has been in the past: a leaven spreading its elevating influence throughout the social structure and cleansing society of internal weaknesses. This is a goal grand enough to fire the imagination and enlist the efforts of each of us.

If the fate of the West hung upon what men alone will do, then the outlook would indeed be dismal. Left entirely to our own resources, we should surely fail. But we are sustained by the faith that God still rules the world.

We stand in much the same position as did Charles Martel before the battle of Tours, or Don Juan of Austria on the eve of Lepanto, or Jan Sobieski before the gates of Vienna, or indeed Winston Churchill in the summer of 1940.

At these climactic periods of history when the West seemed destined to be engulfed by barbarism, pitifully inadequate forces led by resolute men with spiritual faith and moral courage turned the tide and saved civilization. We cannot therefore know the mighty result that can come from the dedicated efforts of a few men acting in harmony with the laws of God.

If we of the West can stand up to the Communists now, if we can hold the line in Berlin, in Vietnam, in Quemoy, and all around the perimeter of freedom, if we can gain the time for that intellectual and moral resurgence in the West of which we now see many signs, then we will win the struggle.

We will win because man's higher needs are the very things that Western civilization answers and which the cold dogma of communism cannot supply. Man has needs and appetites that no material order or philosophy can satisfy. Whatever may be our weaknesses, we have one great strength. Our universities are free, and our churches are free. The people of the West remain free to seek the truth and to worship God. I believe that in the end the church and the university will save us.

Both of these great institutions are represented here by Providence College.

It has been my privilege and great fortune to attend Providence College during its early years, to watch it grow into a great institution of learning, to see it make a contribution to the life of our time and now to see it embark upon a new period of growth and of service.

Most of us have our own ideas about the future course Providence College should take. I have one ambition, one hope which I would like to see realized and that is the establishment of a great library of Thomistic literature and a great institute of Thomistic studies at Providence College.

To those of us who believe with Pope Leo XIII that the teaching of the scholastics is a necessary basis for the future restoration of the social order, such a center for Thomistic learning is essential.

Others have already begun the work. At the University of Toronto, the Order of St. Basil has established the Pontifical Institute as a center of medieval culture, scholarship and research. And here in our own country at the University of Notre Dame, the Medieval Institute has been established and has already become a center for students of the Middle Ages. Even in lay circles there is a resurgence of interest in the scholastic heritage.

And where can this task better be done than here at Providence College? This is the one Dominican institution of higher learning on the North American Continent and it is here that the traditions of the Dominican schoolmen should be preserved, reinterpreted and restated for the people of our generation.

I hope that the establishment of such a library and center will become the objective of Providence College and of its alumni, for I think it is a cause to which we shall all be willing to give our best effort and support.

As those of us who have returned to Providence College for this occasion look at what has been wrought here, as we meet again these great and good Dominicans who work and teach here, as we reflect that other institutions and other men across this country and throughout the world are laboring in the same vineyard, then we can leave with renewed confidence that there are forces working for the triumph of good which shall not be denied the victory.

Dedication of the U.S. Post Office and Federal Building, Martinsburg, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on October 18 last year in the city of Martinsburg, W. Va., Postmaster General J. Edward Day presented the principal address at the dedication of the new post office and Federal building.

This event was the source of a sense of deep personal gratification for me in that it represented the fulfillment of efforts which I initiated more than 20 years ago when serving as Representative from the Second Congressional District of West Virginia. The construction of this building, which was interrupted by World War II, has now been completed, and the modern facilities serve a vastly altered postal system and the greatly expanded business and commercial interests of the Martinsburg area. It was a happy event for Marlin Eckerd, the efficient postmaster, the postal and Federal employees, and the citizens of this splendid city.

Postmaster General Day delivered on this occasion a most interesting and enlightening address on the historical highlights of the postal system. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks and the speech by Postmaster General Day be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks and speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, IN DEDICATION OF THE U.S. POST OFFICE AND FEDERAL BUILDING, MARTINSBURG, W. VA., OCTOBER 18, 1961

Postmaster General Day, Representative Staggers, Mayor Golliday, Postmaster Eckerd, and ladies and gentlemen, my pleasure in participating in this dedication is a particularly keen one and more than merely ceremonial. For this building represents the final fruition of efforts which I initiated more than 20 years ago as Representative of the Second District.

I do not now recall whether the site accepted in 1940 is the present one, but I do vividly recall the pleasure which attended my receipt of the knowledge that it had been approved by the General Services Administration. Unfortunately, the creation of the War Production Board in January 1942, and the subsequent termination of all nondefense Government construction postponed the fulfillment of the original contract for construction.

But now, 20 years and the accompanying growth in economic and commercial significance of Martinsburg have made this building a reality. It is a testimonial not only of the progress of Martinsburg and this section of West Virginia, but also a sign of a larger process at work in our society—the growing responsibilities of the Federal Government and the extension of the physical presence of the Government into such regional and local offices as this.

In dedicating such a structure, therefore, it is appropriate for us to give thought to the question of the broader purposes to which we commit not only this building but our Government and our society as well.

Contrary to the presumptions of some critics, the increased scope of governmental responsibilities and action is not due to an insatiable thirst for power by so-called bureaucrats. It has been due to the inevitable growth in complexity of modern industrial society and to the greater number and variety of problems which transcend State boundaries.

It is our eternal debt to the wisdom of the founders of the Constitution that they established a framework within which the Federal Government might grow to meet these problems without diminishing the personal and civil liberties which animate the spirit of democracy.

We hear much today from some quarters about the encroachment of the Government upon these liberties. Yet a dispassionate reading of American history would reveal, with occasional temporary lapses, that progress in the essential civil liberties—freedom of religion and of speech, freedom of the press and assembly, and extension of the right to vote—has been augmented by the Federal Government, rather than lessened.

True, the power of the Government has grown, especially within recent decades, and with it governmental authority. But the principal growth has been in control of the external conditions of our society which render more secure the internal life and liberty of the human spirit.

This then is the proper division of authority between the individual and the state, between liberty and control. In those areas where spontaneity, creativity, and the free interchange of ideas are involved, liberty must reign supreme. In those areas where men must be restrained from doing injury to their fellows and where we are moving toward an increasing awareness of our collective responsibilities, the state rightfully exercises its authority for the benefit of all.

Thus, such Federal actions as maintenance of certain mutual restraints in trade and economic competition, enforcement of minimum wage and working conditions, and provision for the years of retirement—among many others—have not encroached upon, but rather, they have enhanced the development of individual freedom and the life and liberty of the mind. It is to these values that this building, our Government, and a free society are dedicated.

REMARKS OF POSTMASTER GENERAL J. EDWARD DAY AT THE DEDICATION OF THE U.S. POST OFFICE AND FEDERAL BUILDING, MARTINSBURG, W. VA., OCTOBER 18, 1961

In its leading editorial of May 16, 1896, the New York Times said of a distinguished public servant: "There is not at this moment a single man in public life in the United States who has rendered more practical, difficult, and enduring service."

The object of this editorial accolade was William Lyne Wilson of West Virginia—Postmaster General of the United States.

As we meet here today to dedicate a new link in the vital communications chain of America, it occurs to me that your State has had a unique role in the development of the U.S. postal system.

Not only did you produce one of our great Postmasters General, but it was in this State that rural mail delivery service was born.

It was John Wanamaker who, as Postmaster General in 1891, first officially proposed the establishment of a national rural delivery system.

But not until your own W. L. Wilson was appointed by President Cleveland to head the postal system were the first rural routes actually put into operation.

Rural mail delivery service was first established in the United States from Charles Town, Uvilla, and Halltown, W. Va., effective October 1, 1896.

The annual salary of each carrier on these routes was a meager $200.

From this humble beginning in West Virginia, the rural delivery system has progressed to the point where it now boasts 31,341 routes, stretching for nearly 2 million miles across these United States, serving more than 9 million rural families.

In West Virginia alone, your mailmen daily cover 15,740 miles in making their rounds over 400 rural routes.

And from this beautiful new building, the Martinsburg Post Office and Federal Building, these carriers will go forth each day to serve the needs of nearly 2,000 families who reside outside the city.

Free city mail delivery had its start July 1, 1863, when Congress authorized the establishment of carrier service at offices where the income from local postage was more than sufficient to pay all expenses of such service.

Only 49 cities met the requirements of the act, when free city mail delivery service went into effect. No West Virginia communities were among them. Wheeling became the first city in this State to get free city mail delivery service, and it began there August 1, 1873.

Today the Post Office Department handles some 65 billion pieces of mail a year, an increase of 13 times the volume handled in 1890. Yet, today, we have less than 6 times as many employees as the postal service had in 1890.

We in the Post Office Department are proud of the fact that the massive increase in mail volume that has occurred since those early days has been accompanied by a corresponding increase in operational efficiency.

The design and engineering of the building which we are dedicating today is indicative of the progress that has marked the postal system since the days of its inception, when Benjamin Franklin was tapped by the Continental Congress to be the first Postmaster General.

When rural free delivery was established, horses and mules were the main conveyance for these routes. Today most of our rural carriers are motorized. However, horseback riders still carry the mails on 68 routes in the United States, including 3 in your own State—Stouts Mills, Harmony, and Wilsondale. In Alaska we even have a dogsled route. Elsewhere our carriers utilize motorboats, helicopters, jeeps, and mailsters in covering their appointed rounds.

Your State may lay partial claim to another important forward step in the postal system's march of progress.

For it was also Postmaster General Wilson who first instituted a policy of basing promotions upon merit in the Post Office Department and in the railway mail service. Unfortunately, this policy was often forgotten in the decades that followed his administration. But we who now operate the postal system have borrowed this page from Mr. Wilson's book of achievements. One of our first major policy statements was that under this administration all promotions to and within the supervisory ranks of the postal service will be founded strictly on merit, without regard to race, creed, color, or political intervention. Through policies such as this, we hope to instill in our 580,000 postal employees an esprit de corps unmatched in Government service anywhere in the world. And through improved morale and better working conditions our goal is to provide the American public with the finest service of which any postal system anywhere is capable.

We do not plan to do it with gadgets and gimmicks, with rockets or coaxial cables or other departures from our basic mission. Our aim is steady progress rather than ballyhoo or talk about "bouncing mail off the moon."

Your city has played a historical role in West Virginia's postal progress.

It was here in Martinsburg that the first post office for what is now West Virginia was established on June 30, 1792.

On that date, David Hunter was appointed postmaster for this community, or deputy postmaster, as they were then called.

In these early days the cost of mailing a letter from Martinsburg to Charleston—a distance of 276 miles—would have been 20 cents. By 1834, the rate had decreased to 18¾ cents. However, in that same year a full course dinner at New York's fashionable Delmonico's restaurant could be purchased for only 12 cents. Of course, this was before the advent of the postage stamp. The system then in practice was that all letter mail was handled c.o.d., with the addressee footing the bill if he desired receipt of the letter.

The first post road established over West Virginia's hills was one from Alexandria, Va., by Salisbury and Leesburg, in that State, to Shepherdstown and Martinsburg. This route was put into effect on June 1, 1792, by an act of Congress. On June 1, 1794, Congress authorized another post road here, between Martinsburg and Liberty.

Both nationally and in your own State, the postal service has come a long way since W. L. Wilson was Postmaster General.

The Post Office Department's annual report for the year 1896 indicates that in that year your post office took in gross receipts amounting to only $8,878. Last year your gross annual receipts totaled $342,018.

For the entire State of West Virginia, gross receipts in 1896 amounted to $1,457,407. Last year the State's postal receipts came to $12,472,302—an increase of about 750 percent.

Sixty-five years ago, all postal workers in this State were paid a grand total salary of only $77,500 a year. Your postal establishment in this State now employs 4,658 persons, who are paid an annual aggregate salary exceeding $22 million. This represents an increase of more than 28,000 percent.

They work out of 1,330 post offices, including this fine new Federal building which we are dedicating today. Annually your West Virginia post offices hire about 460 new employees. We utilize a fleet of some 254 vehicles in this State to serve your postal needs. From these statistics it is easy to see that an important portion of your State's economy depends upon the Post Office Department and its operations here.

The $22 million which we pay out in postal salaries in West Virginia is but a fraction of the huge sum of money the Federal Government puts in circulation in your State. Through its post office lease program the Department provides local communities with much needed economic booster shots by putting local and Federal money into construction and operation of postal facilities.

It provides thousands of jobs for local workers, building and maintaining postal establishments.

This is particularly true since last spring when President Kennedy ordered a speedup in post office construction and in the letting of postal procurement contracts in States hard hit by economic depression.

Through your local post office you can purchase stamps, mail letters and packages, buy money orders, and salt away money for a rainy day through the postal savings system.

The Post Office Department insures your packages against breakage, guarantees—by its registered and certified mail program—protected transportation of valuable documents and articles, offers a cash-on-delivery service, sells duck hunting stamps and internal revenue stamps for Federal taxpayments on property transfers and stocks.

Its Postal Inspection Service provides you with a nationwide network of the world's finest law enforcement officers whose lives are dedicated to protecting you from schemes to defraud and other violations of postal laws.

In short, the Post Office serves more people in more ways in more communities than does any other branch of the Federal Government.

This splendid new building which we are dedicating here today—and others like it throughout the Nation—will better enable us to provide you with this kind of service.

It stands as a million-dollar monument to American postal progress.

We are proud of it. We know that you are too.

Criteria for Free Speech for Military Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17, 1962

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in the January 14, 1962, issue of the New York Times magazine section is an article authored by our colleague, the Senator from South Carolina, STROM THURMOND, in which he sets forth his position on the subject of troop education in preparation for fighting the Communists in the cold war. In this article Senator THURMOND has set forth the criteria which he feels should be used. His criteria do not infringe on the right of the President to determine foreign policy or any other policy of any administration. He sets forth only criteria which all good Americans should know so that they can recognize the techniques and methods of our common enemy in the cold war which is costing the American taxpayer untold billions of dollars.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no obection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRITERIA FOR FREE SPEECH FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL

(By Senator STROM THURMOND)

WASHINGTON.—Perhaps the most jealously regarded right of Americans is that of free speech. Not only has our freedom of speech been buttressed with legal safeguards but, as a review of the periodicals of any era will show, it has been extensively exercised. Efforts to impose censorship, originating either within or without the Government, have traditionally met with vigorous opposition from practically all segments of our society.

In recent months, a pattern of censorship of the statements of military personnel has been revealed, which, although usually subtle, can only be characterized as infringement of free speech. In this instance, however, there has been lacking the usual unanimity of protest. Indeed, some of those who have on previous occasions taken the lead as champions of free speech are to be found among the defenders of this censorship.

What underlies the acceptance, and even defense, of censorship in these cases? Overtly, this acceptance of censorship is based on the military status of those censored. This leads, of course, to the question of whether a distinction hinged on military status is valid at all; and if so, to what degree?

The constitutional prohibitions against the suppression of free speech make no distinction between citizens in and out of uniform. The protection of free speech is extended equally to all citizens. Military personnel, insofar as the Constitution is concerned, are subjected to no limitations other than those imposed on all citizens.

Statutory provisions dealing with free speech are equally nondiscriminatory toward military personnel. Under provisions of the Hatch Act and related statutes, persons employed by the Federal Government are generally prohibited from using their official positions to engage in political activity, and this prohibition is, of course, applicable to military personnel. In the Hatch Act, however, there is a specific disclaimer from any prohibition of free speech in "private" statements. This disclaimer reads: "All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express their opinions on all political subjects and candidates."

There can be little question that from a constitutional and statutory standpoint there is no valid distinction between the rights of free speech enjoyed by civilian and military citizens.

Regardless of the constitutional and statutory provisions, it must be recognized that from a practical viewpoint there does exist a distinction. Some of the limitations on the free speech of military personnel are necessitated by the need for disciplined organization, essential to an efficient military force. These limitations are effectuated primarily through a self-imposed sense of responsibility and the sparingly used—until recently—power of control over an individuals' military career residing in his superiors, military and civilian.

The limitations on the exercise of free speech by military personnel which have arisen from practical, rather than legal, considerations are shaped largely by custom and practice, and are, therefore, difficult of precise definition. Obviously, the limitations fall primarily in the area of official, rather than private, statements.

Not all military personnel are subject to the same limitations. For instance, a chaplain must have the greatest latitude in order to perform his mission, while a public information officer, who by the nature of his job speaks officially for his service, would probably have the least latitude. The limitations vary similarly with subject matter, for while almost any official expression on a partisan political subject might be within the limitation, almost any nonclassified expression on a scientific subject might be untouched by the limitation.

While it is difficult, if not impossible, to define the extent of this practical and justifiable limitation of the right of free speech of military personnel, it is possible to define specific areas where such a limitation does not and cannot justifiably apply. By the application of such a process, it is clear that the current widespread censorship of the statements of military personnel goes far beyond justifiable limitations and, indeed, poses a serious threat to freedom as Americans have enjoyed it.

Currently, military personnel are being subjected to prior restraints on their remarks dealing with the nature, methods and tactics of our enemy in the protracted conflict—Sino-Soviet imperialism and the worldwide Communist conspiracy. A few specific examples show the complete lack of justification of such censorship. Censored and deleted from the proposed speech of one person within the Department of Defense was the following statement: "There is no reason to believe that the Communist conspiracy will abandon its goal of world domination or alter the basic strategy contrived to obtain that goal."

Another statement prohibited: "It [communism] represents a combination of the worst aspects of atheism, Hitlerism, and godless materialism." And still another statement deleted from a proposed speech was: "In fact the big question of our day is just simply this: Will the future world, that is, the emerging world order, be in our image, the image of the Western World, or will it be in the image of world communism?"

These three examples are illustrative of the degress of censorship which is applied to personnel within the Department of Defense on the subject of communism. The existing pattern of censorship should and must be judged on the basis of such statements as these, rather than on sloganized characterization of the statements.

Such statements about communism are not "forays into the field of partisan politics." Surely at this late date there is none among us so naive as to consider communism a matter of political partisanship within the United States. Even the Supreme Court has held that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is not a political party, but rather an agent of a foreign power. Communism is a false ideology, contrived to mask the terroristic power lust of its leaders and their efforts to enslave humanity.

It is generally conceded to be inappropriate for military personnel to make statements which are inconsistent with the foreign policy of the United States. Were statements such as the three I have listed above inconsistent with or contradictory to the foreign policy of the United States, then it is possible that censorship of such statements would be justifiable. According to the Secretary of Defense, the foreign policy of the United States can be determined from the statements of the President and of the Secretary of State and from policy papers prepared by the National Security Council.

My research has failed to reveal any statement by the President, or his predecessor, or the Secretary of State, or his predecessors, which contradict the foregoing censored statements. Policy papers of the National Security Council are, of course, classified and unavailable to most military personnel. Are military personnel to assume that the classified policy papers of the United States conclude that there is reason to believe that the Communist conspiracy will abandon its goal? Such would have to be the case if censorship of remarks such as those aforementioned is to be justified on the ground that such remarks contradict our national foreign policy.

It should also be apparent that the threat of communism is a matter within the cognizance of the military. The threat which communism poses is total in nature and cannot be characterized as either exclusively military or exclusively nonmilitary. Today's military personnel are never confronted by an exclusively military onslaught, for Communist thrusts are invariably a mixture of closely interwoven and interdependent moves utilizing military, economic, political, subversive and psychological methods.

For this reason the military cannot prepare exclusively to defend against military attack and be successful in performing the mission with which it is charged. To be adequately prepared, our military organization must prepare to defend itself and our country in terms of the total threat and in full awareness of the nature of the enemy and all of his devious tactics.

Only the most naive could believe that one could consider the military potential of Sino-Soviet imperialism in the abstract without taking into consideration the nature of the insidious ideology which spawns the inhuman and barbaric tactics through which its military potential is utilized.

Even by the standards promulgated by the Department of Defense, statements on communism by military personnel are not legitimately censorable. Directives of the Department of Defense prescribe that statements by military persons should not touch the field of partisan politics, should not conflict with national or foreign policy, and should be confined to matters within the cognizance of the Department of Defense.

From the occurrences which have taken place in recent months, it is obvious that the Department of Defense and the administration have so interpreted these criteria as to suppress to the maximum extent possible any statements of military personnel on the subject of communism. No matter how broadly interpreted, however, these criteria cannot legitimatize the censorship of such remarks as those cited.

Unfortunately, not all Americans have had the opportunity to judge impartially this outbreak of censorship since news media covering the subject have only infrequently carried the actual text of the censored remarks, although numerous examples have been made public. All too often the news media have merely given a characterization of the remarks of military personnel as political remarks or the remarks of right wing officers or as speeches of right wing extremists in the military.

If such statements as one which asserts that the goal of communism is to dominate the world constitute extremism or rightwing radicalism, then the time has come to examine the standard by which such remarks are judged. If such a remark should be classified as extreme, what then is the moderate position on the Communist goal? Is it that the Communists do not intend and strive to dominate the world?

Let us examine the statement: "In fact, the big question of our day is simply this: will the future world, that is, the emerging world order, be in our image, the image of the Western World, or will it be in the image of world communism?"

This phrasing of the issue states the conflict that confronts us in an either/or concept. The word "extremist" is a superlative and indicates a position oriented far from an objective view of the issue. What would be the middle-of-the-road view of the challenge facing us compared with the above-quoted "extremist" position? Could the moderate view be that there is a third alternative for the image of the world—perhaps in the form of an international government which presides over a socialistic system which is conceived to lie midway between communism and freedom? Or is the moderate position one that holds that, in fact, communism and freedom can peacefully coexist?

If one of these, or some similar position, is the moderate or middle-of-the-road course, then surely either the majority of Americans or the Government policy must embrace such an outlook, for otherwise it could not be characterized as "moderate" or "middle-of-the-road" in comparison with which the either/or concept would be extreme.

It is hard to believe that a substantial portion of the American public would disagree with the statement that the issue facing us is whether the future will be in the image of the Western World or in the image of world communism. It is even harder to believe that any sizable segment of the American public would characterize this statement of the challenge facing us as extremist or rightwing. It seems much more likely that the third force proponent or the peaceful coexistence advocate is the one who characterizes such censored statements as extremist or rightwing radicalism.

Many reports have even gone so far as to cite the desire to make such statements as those above mentioned as evidence that military personnel are attempting to usurp civilian control of policy in our Nation.

Nothing could be more patently absurd. Civilian control over policy in our country is firmly established and has never been challenged in the slightest by the military. Indeed, the military traditionally has strongly supported civilian control over policy. At no time in our history has civilian control been more firmly entrenched than it is today. In postwar years, new levels of civilian administration have been superimposed over military personnel. Today in the Pentagon and related buildings in Washington, there are almost 33,000 civilians, compared with slightly more than 12,000 officers and enlisted men.

Only recently it was reported that a statement of the U.S. military position prepared by a civilian in the Department of Defense and transmitted through the State Department to all of our NATO allies was never even transmitted down the line far enough to be known to the Joint Chiefs of Staff; and, according to the report, it came to the official attention of military personnel only when inquiries were made by the governments of our allies to the general in command of NATO.

Additionally, State Department political advisers—or should they be called political commissars?—are now being assigned to senior military commanders. Not only do civilians have absolute and complete control over policy in our Government, but it is beginning to appear that a case could be made that civilian personnel are now, or shortly will be implementing policy within the Department of Defense.

While public discussion of the threat posed by communism can never be a substitute for purposeful national policies in defeating communism, general knowledge and accurate information concerning its nature, its purpose and its tactics can serve to build our national strength by reducing our vulnerability to Communist assaults. Suppression of discussion about communism, whether by censorship or by smearing those who discuss this subject as rightwing radicals or extremists, will contribute nothing to the solution of our problems. We cannot sweep the Communist menace under the rug, pretend it does not exist and expect it to go away.

Censorship and suppression of anti-Communist discussion may well be politically expedient, but it is expediency which free people should never tolerate. Suppression of free speech is a characteristic of dictatorship, and suppression of discussion of the Communist menace multiplies our vulnerability to that menace.

Dedication of New Facilities of Fairmont Aluminum Co. Offers Additional Evidence of Industrial Development in West Virginia

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, we are all heartened by reports in the press and by our own observations of the economic recovery of America during recent months. And, though much remains to be done to achieve full employment and assure all Americans of a decent standard of living, I rejoice at the progress that has been made during the past year.

I am particularly encouraged by the signs of economic resurgence in West Virginia. Among those events which offer hope for a strengthened economy of our State was the dedication last September of the expanded and modernized facilities of the Fairmont Aluminum Co., a subsidiary of the Cerro Corp.

Fairmont Aluminum Co., one of the oldest rolling mills in the country, joined the Cerro Corp. 5 years ago. With the new facilities provided by the greater financial resources of Cerro, Fairmont Aluminum will be able to equal the production rate of the most modern plants in the industry.

It was my privilege to speak at the dedicatory ceremonies, which were also addressed extemporaneously by Representatives CLEVELAND M. BAILEY and ARCH A. MOORE. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks and the principal speech by Robert P. Koenig, president of the Cerro Corp., be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks and speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH AT THE DEDICATION OF THE MODERNIZED AND EXPANDED SHEET MILL OF THE FAIRMONT ALUMINUM CO., FAIRMONT, W. VA., SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1961

This is an auspicious moment in the economic and industrial life of Fairmont and West Virginia.

This dedication is the culmination of a modernization and expansion program of the Fairmont Aluminum Co.'s sheet mill which represents a new capital investment of well over $8 million.

I am privileged to share your pride in this complete and modern facility, and in the impressive array of production equipment which has been brought to this community.

A pledge has here been fulfilled to make this establishment thoroughly competitive in the aluminum industry. And, in so doing, Fairmont Aluminum Co. and its parent organization have also registered their faith in the people of this section and in the future economic and industrial development of our State.

Not only has this reliable firm been revitalized, but, also, it has been placed in a stronger position to supply an even larger portion of West Virginia's and the Nation's needs in the future.

The importance of these facilities extends well beyond this community and beyond the families supported by them. It is important, also, in offering another sign of the vigor and foresight of American enterprise. And for those of us—and there are many—who have worked to attract new capital to West Virginia, it is a vindication of our faith in the industrial potential of our State.

The initiative and leadership exhibited by the management and personnel of Fairmont Aluminum Co. are the sort that once served to place West Virginia in the vanguard of the fuels and minerals industries. I have no doubt that the same kind of leadership will bring our State to the fore once again in the future with a more diversified and firmly grounded economy.

It is worth noting, in this respect, that no matter how dynamic and forward looking our leadership at the national level, no program of national goals will be achieved if these aims are not embraced and carried forth by the actions of individual men and women at the community and local level. One of the main sources of strength of the American system of enterprise is that it offers the flexibility and freedom for such initiative to operate.

We have good reason to be delighted by the considerable investment in modernizing Fairmont Aluminum's facilities here in order to provide it with a healthy and promising future—for itself, for the industry it serves and, most important, for the community of which it is such an important part. And it is my further hope that this may be seen as part of a trend of other industries to expand their facilities.

It is almost axiomatic these days to think of our industrial development in relation to the unremitting contest between international communism and a democratic way of life. I believe we will all agree that our Nation is more secure every time a basic industry invests in new, modern plants and equipment. for, although hotspots will continue to flare up in the cold war, the fundamental and underlying struggle with the Soviet Union will, we pray, remain largely political, ideological, and economic.

If this be so, a central factor in our eventual success in the conflict will be our capacity to maintain the industrial and economic development necessary to supply the increasing needs of our own people and also help bring the emergent nations into freedom and independence.

Though it is only one aluminum plant of the substantial number in the United States, this expanded Fairmont facility has its part, and an important one, to contribute in this great power struggle. And we know that, through modernization, the Fairmont Aluminum Co. is assured more years of prosperous and productive life. This is our wish—and with it we extend our congratulations.

FAIRMONT DEDICATION ADDRESS BY ROBERT P. KOENIG, SEPTEMBER 30, 1961

During the years I have been coming to Fairmont, I have been struck by the new attitude that has taken over among these rolling hills. Where once there seemed to be an air of inertia and resignation to economic fate, there now has entered a restless spirit. The people of Fairmont and its neighboring communities have taken on a determination to lift themselves up from the doldrums brought about by shifts in the coal industry.

Some months ago I had the pleasure of speaking before a meeting of the Fairmont Regional Development Committee. At that time I noted the need for improved roads and other transportation facilities in the area, that, along with other steps, would serve to stimulate industrial development and help fill the gap left by the passing of coal as king. Now I see that in the ensuing time new locks are under construction on the Monongahela River, deeper oil wells are being drilled, new civic parking facilities and even golf courses are being planned. And the new wide roads have been pushed ahead and some of the hairpin curves have even been taken out.

I don't wish to imply that my words have brought any of these changes about. I am simply reporting to you my observations that your community and your State have not stood still.

Nor have we at Cerro been standing still. When the Fairmont Aluminum Co. saw fit to join with us in the new and growing major industry that is aluminum, Cerro was a company with only 2 plants and 750 employees in the United States. Only a third of our total sales volume was derived from U.S. operations. The remainder came from our mines and affiliated companies in Latin America.

In the intervening 5 years, Cerro has sought to employ its increasing economic and management resources not only in Peru and Chile. It has also added, in the United States, 7 plants and some 3,400 employees, exclusive of Fairmont Aluminum. More important, we have undertaken to bolster the strength and insure the survival of these plants and the welfare of their people by expanding facilities and installing modern equipment. This has been done so these operations may move forward in a metal-fabricating industry that is each year becoming increasingly more competitive.

Here at Fairmont, your citizens and your resources have joined with us in undertaking a program of modernization and expansion that we trust may permit the Fairmont Aluminum Co. to stand up against its large, integrated competitors.

The new facilities that you see before you will be able to produce aluminum sheet at a production rate equal to the best in the industry. The quality of product should set new standards. The location of West Virginia in the aluminum sheet market, the skills and training of the Fairmont area, and our own resources, have all combined to strengthen this organization and give it new vigor.

However, the changes made here and the objective that we envision in the aluminum industry must be seen in their proper perspective. Since Fairmont originally entered the industry, and even after Cerro joined Fairmont Aluminum, there have been a succession of changes in the industry which today still confront us with big problems and leave us with questions that must be answered before we can consider this expansion successful.

Let me take a few moments of your time to review a bit of the history and comment on a few of the problems that have developed in this industry and that must be solved in one way or another.

THE CHANGING ALUMINUM INDUSTRY

In 1920, the city of Fairmont saw its first nonferrous metal venture, a brass mill that never operated and was converted 6 years later into aluminum rolling to become the Fairmont Aluminum Co. Over the ensuing 35 years which encompass Fairmont's participation in aluminum—for this is Fairmont's 35th anniversary—the industry has gone through a series of rather distinct phases.

For the first 13 years, there was a period of gradual growth. The number of companies in the industry was limited to a handful, all dominated by one large concern that was largely responsible for pioneering the industry. These companies developed new markets and gradually extended the use of the light, bright, formable metal into all sorts of new uses.

This first period was terminated in 1939, with the outbreak of war in Europe and its gradual spread to our own shores. The half decade of World War II saw a period of emergency growth in aluminum, as both primary refining facilities and fabricating plants were expanded to meet the extraordinary needs of the defense effort.

Then, with the relatively abrupt cessation of arms production, the demand for aluminum sank to a mere fraction of its wartime output and only a very farsighted few predicted anything but glut and vast unneeded capacity for the wonder metal from which our giant airfleets had been formed.

However, by the Korean war in 1950, pessimism in the aluminum industry had rapidly disappeared, and the original primary U.S. producer had been joined by two others that were growing with dazzling speed. The new period of post-World War II growth was off to a phenomenal start, sparked by the sudden defense needs of the Korean conflict.

Action by the Government in the early 1950's in the form of accelerated tax writeoffs, favorable power contracts, guaranteed loans, and so-called put contracts brought in new producers of primary metal and expanded fabricating facilities. By the end of the first postwar decade in 1956, there were five primary aluminum companies in this country alone—Alcoa, Reynolds, Kaiser, Anaconda, and Ormet (a combining of Revere and Olin). These five were joined by Harvey later in the decade. All of these are integrated, in that they fabricate a major portion of their primary metal output.

The breathtaking, if at times erratic, advance of aluminum in all its many forms began to falter, and with it quickly faded the impressive profit margins and phenomenal growth rates of a decade. The trend of ever-increasing production figures broke at a time when the new facilities and the new producers were just starting production and concentrating their efforts on building sales to turn to account the staggering capital costs of their new refineries and mills.

Clearly, the industry was in a fourth and new phase. This phase has lasted for the past 5 years—we are in it today.

It has been a time of intense competition; it has also been a time of continuing growth for the industry. But this growth has been in sales volume and not in profits; and even volume has advanced at a greatly reduced rate.

The many new sheet producers—there are now 29 fabricators, excluding a number of captive sheet mills, compared with 6 in 1946—have not been the sole factors in changing the conditions of the industry. Not only has the tremendous demand for goods and services brought on by war and the postwar boom been partially satisfied, but the capacity of competing materials to produce has also grown to a point where it has far surpassed demand. No longer do steel, glass, copper, and zinc remain inert to the penetrations of aluminum into their own bailiwicks—they have learned to fight back. And on top of this reaction by competing materials has come the rising import of aluminum products from other industrialized countries of the world.

This combination of circumstances by itself does not fully explain the condition of the aluminum industry of today. Automation of facilities, about which all of us hear so much, has also come to aluminum and brought with it the desirability of maintaining high production rates at almost any price in order to try and make the new equipment pay off. This factor has been one of the major causes of the profitless prosperity that has descended on the aluminum fabricating industry.

PROFITLESS PROSPERITY

The principal problem of all aluminum manufacturers is the relentless deterioration of profit margins for fabricated products. Prices have been cut again and again both officially and unofficially by big producers and small, with the result that few of the companies are earning an adequate return for their stockholders. Some are finding it difficult if not impossible to meet their interest and amortization on borrowed funds. For example, one of the large primary producers in 1955 returned in operating profits before taxes 20 percent on its net assets; in 1960, the return was only about 4½ percent. For the small nonintegrated producer, the situation is far more serious, to the point where many have been caught on the hip and have had either to sell out or to close their doors.

Among the principal controllable causes of the situation has been the compulsive expansion from which, particularly major aluminum companies, seem to suffer. Their eyes are bigger than their stomachs, and their insatiable appetites for markets beyond their economic reach carries suicidal implications.

Examples of this phenomenon of expansion simply for the sake of expansion are found in the manufacturing of building siding and sheet for the can industry. In both of these we hear strident publicity from all sides about the rapid future growth of aluminum. Yet, the price of this growth can be absurd. Let me illustrate.

For those of you unfamiliar with the industry, refining of primary aluminum into ingot is the first stage in which the metal becomes recognizable. The ingots are the raw material from which the independent fabricators—sheet rerollers, extruders, casting shops and so on—generally obtain their raw material.

Aluminum ingot until last week sold for 26 cents per pound: yet certain primary companies who are integrated in the fabricating field are selling at 28 cents per pound metal that has been cast from pig into rolling ingots, then rolled down in a series of complex operations into coiled sheet. That this sheet can be processed and carry its share of operating, overhead and sales costs, let alone depreciation, for 2 cents per pound is fantastic; but this is the price at which primary producers are offering rolled aluminum stock to the large container manufacturers.

From our experience at Fairmont, we know that it is impossible to roll and ship any type of aluminum sheet to a customer for 2 cents per pound over the metal cost and still pay overhead, much less earn a profit. What justification do primary producers find for invading the can field on this basis?

The argument is advanced that this is being done to promote the market for aluminum. However, in the long run such practices can only have detrimental effects, since they destroy the logical pricing basis for all the products of the aluminum sheet industry. The fabricating end of the business should show a profit based on the margin between the selling price of the sheet and the buying price of raw metal. The recent reduction in the price of primary metal is a trend in the right direction, but the spread is still insufficient to cover the costs of rolling.

Other such commodity pricing schemes are rife in the sheet fabricating industry until it has become an economic "Alice in Wonderland."

Coiled siding sheet, which is the aluminum strip material used to fabricate the siding that we are beginning to see on many new homes, has been handled similarly. Its price has been cut to the point where profit margins on the production of the sheet are nonexistent. Without dwelling on technical details, siding stock is a product that requires special manufacturing care to insure that it is straight and that its width is held within very close margins. It is also specially packed. Notwithstanding the extra attention that must be taken in its manufacture, it has been priced far below the reasonable economic level that allows the fabricator to obtain a proper profit. And the burden of this special price has fallen on the smaller nonintegrated producer, because he must obtain all of his profit from transforming the purchased ingot or reroll stock into the end sheet product.

I could cite other examples of such price cutting, but there are other devices used by the major aluminum producers which also threaten the survival of the nonintegrated producer and therefore deserve mention.

One such device is the use of special credit terms to certain customers. Payment for most aluminum products is required 1 month after material is shipped. However, for certain products like furniture tubing, large producers have instituted 3-month payment terms. This is clearly an enticement to buy—most buyers are interested in operating with their suppliers' money. However, most smaller companies that sell in these fields do not have the financial resources to offer similar terms. If they try, they place themselves in financial jeopardy.

In certain of the areas mentioned above, minor corrective action has been started by one or more of the major producers. The chaotic schedule of prices for special sheet products has in recent weeks been modified to some minor extent. A tiny step in the right direction has been taken, but it is only a start.

THE INGOT VICE

The companies that produce aluminum in its various stages, starting with bauxite and running through primary ingot to the highly fabricated items, hold the whip hand over their smaller and less powerful brethren. The latter are forced to buy from these producers the ingot from which they must fabricate their products—at the same time, they must compete in the marketplace for business for their finished products. Thus, the destinies of the small companies are closely controlled by the integrated producers, who have it in their power to set the prices at which the small companies must buy as well as the maximum price at which they can sell. In this light, it is noteworthy that the price of aluminum ingot is today the same as it was 5 years ago. For sheet aluminum, however, the selling prices are by no means as high as they were 5 years, or even 4 years ago, since the horde of special price arrangements on one commodity or another has reduced the average price sharply. At the same time, the special cut prices on such items as can stock have caused buyers to demand similar prices for material, modified only slightly, further eroding the average selling price.

Parenthetically, the big companies are the ones that, at the bargaining table, set the pattern for basic labor rate increases for the whole industry. In this manner, they influence another important aspect of the welfare of the smaller nonintegrated producer.

In short, the large producers can take their profit on the pig and let the little guy worry about trying to make a profit on the fabricated products. Fairmont has been one of these little guys, and that is the reason it has been essential that we improve our position. It has depended too much on a high degree of responsibility and economic maturity on the part of the integrated aluminum producers—responsibility and maturity that, unfortunately at present, appear to be lacking.

One move that Cerro, and consequently Fairmont, has taken toward greater independence was participation in Alroll, the aluminum hot rolling mill venture at Oswego, N.Y., in conjunction with three other major North American metal companies. This undertaking is designed to supply reroll stock—like the heavy gage coils you see over there—to our new tandem cold mill here at Fairmont. The joint mill will, of course, similarly supply mills of other participants.

We are also studying, together with another important nonferrous metal fabricator, the feasibility of building our own primary aluminum reduction plant in the State of Oregon. Access to its own primary ingot supply clearly would put Fairmont in a more favorable position, by freeing it from one end of the economic vise in which independent fabricators find themselves.

Barring such moves which Cerro's access to long-term capital may make possible, Fairmont will continue to fight an uphill battle against the pricing policies that have been foisted upon the industry. It would remain outside the umbrella of the fixed ingot price, which the primary companies maintain; at the same time it would have to thrust its way through the economic jungle of end product pricing created by these same companies.

Perhaps it is time for the integrated aluminum producers to examine their present pricing policies in view of the narrow profit margins from which most aluminum producers, large and small alike, are suffering. It is time that action be taken to return an adequate reward to stockholders. Accordingly, I suggest that the primary aluminum producers return to a sound and just pricing schedule for semifabricated products.

I have dwelt long enough on the problems that confront the aluminum industry and, therefore, affect the citizens of Fairmont. We of Cerro are proud to be part of converting one of the Nation's original aluminum fabricators into one of its most modern. For myself and my associates, let me extend a note of sincere thanks to all of you that have helped make this project possible. We are also grateful to those of you who have taken the time to come here today to participate in an occasion that, to us, is very significant. As you can see, we are trying to do our part to strengthen the industrial foundations of Fairmont and of West Virginia in keeping with the new spirit that we find here.

SENATE

Thursday, January 18, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we are conscious that we spend our years as a tale that is told, and told quickly.

Yesterday the thought of those chosen to sit in this Chamber was "in memoriam," as the dedicated public service of one whose work is done here was passed in grateful review in a panorama of vanished yesterdays.

As gaps appear in the ranks of patriotism, no matter how pure and undefiled, even in the sadness of farewell may those who remain hear Thy voice calling to march forward, to work while it is called day, to fill sunny hours with labor, knowing that the night cometh when no man can work.

In these tense days, whose decisions are molding the far future, make our national leaders calm and serene because they are anchored in Thy truth, though ringed about with lies. May the courage of the prophets be in their souls.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 17, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

THE BUDGET—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the President of the United States has transmitted to the Senate today the budget for fiscal year 1963, which is now being read in the House. In view of that fact, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the letter of transmittal in the Senate be dispensed with and that it, with the accompanying document, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection with the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—THE DU PONT TAX BILL

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I should like to ask a brief question of the distinguished majority leader. I find myself—and I suspect that some other Senators do—in a situation in which, over the months, I have been receiving many letters about the Du Pont bill from persons in my State. I do not feel that I should miss voting either one way or the other on the question of passage of this bill.

There have been rumors that a motion to recommit the bill or a motion to lay it on the table might be made, in order to bring this matter to a head.

I have speaking engagements in New Hampshire tomorrow; but I would cancel them instantly if I thought that necessary in order to be able to participate in the vote on the Du Pont bill.

Can either the majority leader or the minority leader state whether it will be safe for some of us to leave following the session today, or whether we should remain?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be delighted to comment on that matter. It is the intention of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] and myself to ascertain whether some arrangement can be made either today or tomorrow. We have previously discussed this matter. As soon as we can make such an arrangement, if one is possible, we shall notify the Senate, so that the Members will be able to prepare themselves accordingly.

I wish to thank the Senator from New Hampshire for calling this matter to the attention of the leadership. I assure him that we shall give it immediate consideration and shall try to work out an agreement, if possible, so that every Member can be informed about when the vote on the bill will be taken.

I understand there is at least one amendment at the desk, and there may be others.

I have heard rumors that a motion to recommit may be made, but I do not know anything about it. However, we shall try to work out all these things when the Senator from Illinois and I get together with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], and other Senators who are very much interested in this proposed legislation.

Mr. COTTON. Probably before the plane leaves late this afternoon we shall know whether it will be reasonably safe for us to leave then or whether it would be wise for us to remain.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope so, although I cannot guarantee anything in that connection. But if not today, we shall try to do it tomorrow.

Mr. COTTON. Tomorrow would be too late for me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall try to do what I can before then.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator from Montana.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Agreement With Australia, Relating to Space Program

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on cooperative agreements with the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia for the establishment and operation of various tracking facilities at Woomera, Australia; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Report of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, for the year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Appropriations for Aircraft, Missiles, and Naval Vessels for the Armed Forces

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper;) to the Committee on Armed Services.

Publications of Federal Power Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of its publications entitled "Statistics of Natural Gas Companies, 1960," "Steam-Electric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1960," "Hydroelectric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1960," "Statistics of Electric Utilities, 1960, Privately Owned," and "Principal Electric Facilities, 1961" (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Commerce.

Application for Permanent Residence of a Certain Alien

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order granting the application for permanent residence filed by Simon Braude, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to the subject, and the reasons for granting the application (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Suspension of Deportation of Certain Aliens

Four letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of National Mediation Board

A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, including a report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Resolution 254

"Resolution relative to extending the commendation of the people of Guam to Gov. Bill Daniel for his notable achievements as Governor of Guam in such short period since he assumed this high office

"Whereas the Honorable Bill Daniel was appointed Governor of Guam on or about the 20th day of May 1961, and thereafter assumed the highest office in the territory of Guam; and

"Whereas various and many unforgettable and oftentimes amazing achievements have been made to and for Guam and its people all of which are attributable to Governor Daniel, a few of which are as follows:

"(a) The general cleanup of the city of Agana from the ravages of the tangantangan trees, weeds, and other unsightly junks and scraps located therein;

"(b) The centralization of functions and responsibilities within the department of labor and personnel as it pertains to the recruitment of personnel for the department of education;

"(c) The noticeable improvements and repairs of our highways;

"(d) The continued request for the elimination of the so-called dual-wage system as practiced by the military commands on Guam;

"(e) The invitation extended to outside capital to establish new ventures and new businesses within Guam;

"(f) The return to the soil program of the people of Guam and the tremendous results of such program;

"(g) The importation of new livestock to replenish Guam's existing breed;

"(h) The energetic and vigorous advertisement initiated to attract tourists and visitors to Guam;

"(i) With the cooperation of the military commands, the cleanup and disposal of explosives;

"(j) Last but not least the suspension of Executive Order No. 8683 as it pertains to the territory of Guam; and

"Whereas, in addition to the foregoing, other programs and plans of the legislature, all for the benefit of the territory and its people, are being carried out by our Governor, all of which required our Governor's unselfish devotion and energy and sincerity as the chief executive of our territory, although he has occupied this high office for such a short period of time, and comparing the longevity of service as Governor, he has far exceeded the achievements and results of previous chief executives of our territory, and for this reason Gov. Bill Daniel merits the acclaim and commendation of the people of Guam: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Sixth Guam Legislature, on behalf of the people of Guam, does hereby humbly applaud its Governor and thus hereby extend a well-earned commendation from the people of Guam to Gov. Bill Daniel for a tremendous job done during the first 7 months of his administration as Governor of Guam; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the speaker certify to and the legislative secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and to the Governor of Guam."

RESOLUTION OF KANSAS WOMEN'S REPUBLICAN CLUB

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, last fall the Kansas Women's Republican Club, at its meeting in Emporia, Kans., adopted a resolution expressing its concern over the spread of communism.

Communism is an ever-increasing threat to our Nation and only an informed citizenry will be able to combat it.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas we recognize the serious threat that the spread of communism presents to our country, its allies, and the great institutions of freedom and opportunity which are the foundation of our liberty and representative form of government; and

Whereas a better opportunity for knowledge and understanding of the evil purposes and policies of communism to destroy our rights and privileges as American citizens should be provided our students and citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Kansas Women's Republican Club in meeting at Emporia, Kans., That our public officials and especially those responsible for the courses of study and curriculum of our public schools, be urged to provide information to students on our American heritage, principles, and methods, and to alert students to the designs of communism upon our form of government in the United States. This alert and this information should be furthered to include the community; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the superintendent of public instruction, to our Senators and Members of Congress, and to all State officials in the government of Kansas.

Dated at Emporia, Kans., September 23, 1961.

Lulu K. Baum,
Secretary, Kansas Women's Republican Club.

RESOLUTION OF STEVENS COUNTY, KANS., SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Stevens County, Kans., Soil Conservation District last fall adopted a resolution in regard to the soil conservation reserve program.

In this resolution they urged Congress to renew the present conservation reserve contracts.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

While our topsoil is blowing and washing away and thousands of farmers are going broke because of depressed prices caused by a huge surplus the Federal Government is spending millions of dollars putting new land into production at tremendous cost, more millions for production payments, and more millions to store the surplus.

That production can be stored in the soil for our children and grandchildren cheaper than it can be stored in concrete elevators where it is usually lost forever.

Whereas the purpose of the farm and conservation programs is to conserve soil and water for future generations and reduce production; and

Whereas after 25 years of so-called production controls and conservation programs we have more surplus and less soil and water than we had 25 years ago; and

Whereas the conservation reserve program is the only program that has accomplished 100 percent what the farm and conservation programs are supposed to do. It has stopped all production, erosion, and depletion. After several years in good grass with no harvesting or grazing that land will help feed our increasing population when it is needed; and

Whereas the conservation reserve program does not create ghost towns, but has a stabilizing effect on the economy of the community, especially in the Great Plains area; and

Whereas the most urgent problem this country faces is true conservation of our soil and water for the future. Most of the civilizations that have risen and fallen died from within. They lived only for the present and gave no thought to the future generations. The good soil made this country rich; the loss of its topsoil will make this country poor:

Therefore, for the future of our country and the present and future generations, we, the undersigned of the Stevens County, Kans., Soil Conservation District Board urgently recommend the renewal of the present conservation reserve contracts, at the present rate of payment, and enlargement of the program.

Are we going to take land out of production in one program and put land back into production in another program?

What we do for ourselves dies when we do, what we do for future generations lives on forever.

Board Members: R. W. Packer, Samuel W. Bozone, Lawrence W. Brower, Ross C. Teeter, Carl N. Broiler. Assistant Board Members: Walter E. Demuth, Lyle A. Powers, Wilbur W. White, Darrell Skinner, B. W. Brubaker.

RESOLUTIONS OF WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE COOPERATIVE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the days ahead, the Congress will be considering a variety of legislative proposals, including recommendations by the administration, for improving the agricultural outlook. In considering problems in this complex field, naturally, it is absolutely necessary that we obtain authoritative, firsthand analyses and recommendations from the farmers, themselves.

At its annual meeting, the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative, an authoritative voice of agriculture, adopted a series of resolutions reflecting realistically and constructively upon major features of the farm picture. Believing that these resolutions deserve the thoughtful consideration of Congress, I request unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE 33D ANNUAL FARMERS' GET-TOGETHER CONFERENCE HELD AT THE HOTEL LORAINE, MADISON, OCTOBER 27, 1961

RESOLUTION 1—TAXATION OF PATRONAGE SAVINGS

The Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative reaffirms its position that the net proceeds of a cooperative returned to patrons on a patronage basis in any form—cash, certificate of equity, or allocated book credits—is income in the hands of the patron and not income of the cooperative making the distribution. It is our conviction that such proceeds are not taxable to the cooperative, but should be included in the computation of the recipient's personal income tax. We believe this is in accord with the clear intent of Congress in the tax law and no way represents avoidance of our tax responsibilities. It is likewise consistent with the basic concept of a cooperative as a nonprofit institution in which any income over and above the costs of operation rightfully belongs to the member patrons and is returnable to them on a patronage basis.

Therefore, be it resolved, that the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative ask Congress to spell out the intent of the 1951 law, so that our courts will have clear instructions regarding cooperative patronage refunds.

* * * * *

RESOLUTION 3—FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE

Whereas cooperative marketing, purchasing and farm business service associations contribute to farmer prosperity, and whereas the development of good principles and practices in cooperative organization and management are essential to strong cooperative growth, and whereas the Farmer Cooperative Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture has contributed effectively to the information available to farmers for organizing and managing their cooperatives; we now, therefore, commend the Farmer Cooperative Service for the assistance which has been provided, and we ask the Wisconsin representation in the Congress and the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture to provide necessary funds to further strengthen this cooperative service activity.

RESOLUTION 4—PROTECTION OF THE CONSUMER FROM DAIRY SUBSTITUTES

Wisconsin farmers are suffering a sharp loss in the market for butterfat to various products made from other fats in imitation of dairy products. For protection of the consumer, we urge the continuation and strengthening of present regulations on oleomargarine and all other imitations of dairy products.

RESOLUTION 5—AGRICULTURAL PRICE AND PRODUCTION POLICY

We recognize that the attainments under the present price support program, though highly commendable, fall short of solving the dairy production and utilization problem.

The continued presence of excess supplies of dairy products has been a deterrent to price improvement under this program and this situation is predicted to continue into the indefinite future. The results of research efforts on this problem carried on over the past 2 years have indicated that direct efforts to adjust milk production to market demand through marketing allotments is essential if price improvement is to be achieved.

Therefore, the council will continue study and work on programs to improve the dairy price support program giving positive consideration to methods of adjusting supply to market demand. Any such price program considered should be, in addition to the basic objective, applicable to all dairy producers in the country, provide incentive and opportunity for efficient milk production, provide for democratic expression of choice through a producer referendum and be in the best long-run interest of the dairy industry.

We believe that the best way to do this may be through the machinery of a national milk marketing order for all milk, leaving present milk marketing orders function within the total national milk marketing order.

We therefore urge that the marketing agreements act be amended in such a way as to permit this.

We strongly urge that a food-for-peace program be adopted of sufficient magnitude to bring diets of the world's population up to minimum subsistence levels.

RESOLUTION 6—FOREIGN TRADE

The Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture are to be praised for continued progress in the development of foreign markets.

We urge extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and activity under Public Law 480 with appropriate revisions, especially those which will help us compete within the common markets of Europe and Latin America.

RESOLUTION 7—COOPERATIVE STRENGTH AND LEGAL STATUS CLARIFICATION

Farmer cooperatives need to become stronger structurally and financially, because many farmer cooperatives have need to merge or consolidate to serve their members better. Mergers or consolidations may be subject to possible prosecution by the Department of Justice on the grounds of what might happen as a result of possible restriction of competition.

Resolved, That the council encourage and work with member cooperatives on the strengthening of them through member participation, and support and encourage cooperation with other cooperatives on a local, regional, and State level; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress be urged to amend the Capper-Volstead Act so that mergers or consolidations shall not be deemed illegal unless such is an accomplished fact as decided by authority of the Secretary of Agriculture.

RESOLUTION 8—FOOD, YOUR BEST BUY

Contrary to general consumer opinion, food is an excellent buy. Two to three times as much food can now be bought with 1 hour of industrial wages as was true 30 years ago. Any increase in the cost of living attributable to the price of food or returns received by farmers has been negligible.

We commend agricultural editors, educators, and others for having brought this to the attention of urban and rural people and recommend that this type of publicity be provided on an expanded basis in the future.

RESOLUTION 9—RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

(a) Evaluation of vocational agriculture program: During the past year the council of agriculture initiated a meeting of representatives of farm organizations, educational agencies, and lay groups to give thought to the evaluation of the program of vocational agriculture and to recommend procedures which such study might indicate. Excellent progress has been made with a number of small working committees which were set up at the original meeting and it is urged that the activity be continued until final results have been achieved.

(b) Marketing emphasis: Continued research and other help will be needed in production of farm products but with the rapidly changing and highly competitive methods of moving farm products to the consumer, the council of agriculture urges the college of agriculture and vocational agriculture to give greater emphasis in the area of marketing research and educational programs.

(c) Product research: Research is playing an ever increasing role in the development of new and improved uses of agricultural products, not only for food, but in many other uses.

We recommend that appropriate State and Federal agencies, particularly our own University of Wisconsin, be urged to continue and step up their research programs on development and uses for agricultural products. We also urge our legislative bodies, both State and Federal, to provide such funds as may be necessary to finance such activities.

(d) Council policy in educational programs: The council will continue its policy of promoting the study of and participation in cooperative activities by rural youth through an award recognition program. We will also continue the development of educational meetings for vocational agriculture instructors, veteran instructors, extension leaders, cooperative directors, managers, regional bookkeepers and others.

RESOLUTION 10—LIVESTOCK MARKET NEWS SERVICE

Accurate and reliable market information is of great value to farmers. The reliability of such information available in Wisconsin should be improved.

We encourage the legislature to provide funds to the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture for the development of adequate livestock market news reporting services for Wisconsin's livestock producers.

Such a program may be operated in cooperation with the State-Federal crop reporting service as has been done in several other States.

RESOLUTION 11—PESTICIDE RESIDUES

We commend the Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture for establishing facilities and a program for the detection of pesticide residues in dairy products, foods, and other agricultural products. The testing of such products for residues is essential to the continued well-being of the agricultural economy of this State. Therefore the council pledges its support in securing the continuation and expansion of the pesticide residue work of the department.

RESOLUTION 12—LABOR LEGISLATION FOR FAMILY FARMS

The family farm business poses unique problems with respect to meeting labor needs. With no way of protecting the employer by establishing a minimum income, a minimum farm wage law can work hardship in many instances. Farmers cannot add increased costs to price of their products.

Such a law makes it difficult for inexperienced, handicapped, aged, or common farmworkers to secure suitable employment, thus reducing employment opportunities for these people.

Therefore, the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative urges special consideration in the rules governing the employment of inexperienced and handicapped persons on family sized farms.

RESOLUTION 13—FACING THE PRESENT INTERNATIONAL CRISIS

As representatives of many different farm organizations gathered here to consider various problems and decide on courses of action, we are cognizant that more than all else, the seriousness of the present world conditions transcends all other concerns. We recognize that civilized man's scientific achievements have far out-distanced his understanding and maturity in human relations at the world level.

America has never faced a more serious international challenge than she is confronted with today. The utmost caution, backed by firmness, is essential. With deepest understanding among all our people in various walks of life, fortified with unity of approach on a non-partisan basis by our elected officials, is paramount.

We believe that the United Nations, as an international vehicle by which diverse and conflicting concepts may be reconciled, should be supported and strengthened. To the extent that the United Nations grows in stature and responsibility, so hope for a more peaceful world based on law as contrasted with a world victimized by despotic authority, comes closer to realization.

We condemn the totalitarian agressiveness and spirit of intimidation practiced by Communist dominated governments. As farm organization people, we pledge our moral and physical support to America's position in the United Nations. We urge that our country be kept militarily strong while continuing its longstanding policy of consideration for under-privileged nations. We in the field of food and fiber will continue to give our utmost by word and deed to help meet the present colossal challenge of war and peace.

We direct that copies of this resolution be forwarded to our American ambassador at the United Nations, to Wisconsin's representatives in the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives and to President Kennedy.

RESOLUTION 14—CONSERVING NATURAL RESOURCES

Whereas the conservation of our soil, water, forest, and wildlife resources is essential to the welfare and well-being of our people, of our Nation; and

Whereas Wisconsin historically and currently has achieved an enviable reputation in the conservation of these natural resources; and

Whereas Federal agencies, namely the U.S. Soil Conservation Service and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, operating through locally elected soil and water conservation district supervisors and county agricultural stabilization and conservation service members, have contributed materially to the progress of the conservation program in Wisconsin; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative commends these agencies for their cooperative efforts and endorses the philosophy of local leadership in the achievement of this important work.

RESOLUTION 15—MILK A SAFEGUARD AGAINST NUCLEAR FALLOUT

Sudden resumption of nuclear testing in violation of previous agreements is clear evidence of Premier Khrushchev's plan of terror and intimidation. It is known that prolonged bomb testing above the ground will result in nuclear fallout that can be a major threat to human health. However, at present there is lack of definite information as to the degree of damage or level of exposure that can be tolerated. We, therefore, strongly urge the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to do everything possible in the way of scientific research in this field.

Unfortunately Premier Khrushchev's design to develop nuclear phobia has been accomplished to some degree as a result of scare headlines in the press and news articles that have added to the public's general misunderstanding, confusion, and fear. Milk has gotten a major share of this adverse public attention. Such publicity has wrongly given the impression that milk is an important carrier of radioactive material.

In reality milk's most important connection lies in its ready availability at all times in all sections of the country, making it a convenient food to analyze as an indicator of fallout levels. It is a most significant fact that the cow is a natural filter and selectively removes much of the strontium 90. According to scientists at the University of Wisconsin, there is from 7 to 11 times more strontium units in the food that cows eat than is present in the milk that they give.

The requirements for calcium in the human diet and the fact that milk supplies 85 percent of the calicum in our diet, is well known. If calcium is not supplied in sufficient amounts, the body will utilize any element which resembles calcium. Strontium resembles calcium. Therefore, it is the ratio of calcium to strontium in our foods that is most important. A well-balanced diet which supplies adequate calcium offers less opportunity for the utilization of strontium by the body. Present evidence indicates that populations receiving their calcium primarily from milk, even though they live in areas of highest fallout, are accumulating relatively lower levels of strontium in their bones than those who receive their calcium primarily from vegetable and cereal sources.

Therefore, rather than being considered hazardous with respect to fallout, milk is actually a safeguard to health. Accordingly, the public should be urged to consume adequate amounts of milk and dairy products in a well-balanced diet to cope with the growing hazard of nuclear fallout.

RESOLUTION 16—EFFECT OF CONCENTRATED BUYING POWER ON FARM PRICES

The Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperatives appreciates the enforcement work done in the past by the Packers and Stockyards Division, USDA, at posted terminal markets with respect to discriminatory prices, unfair advertising, kickbacks to dealers and practices tending to manipulate prices. We commend the Division for its present determination to investigate the influences of concentrated buying power on the prices of livestock, poultry, and farm products generally. Such change in emphasis is necessary in view of the decline in terminal market volume and because of the rise of concentrated buying power by giant food store chains and groups.

Restraint of competition resulting from vertical integration in the meatpacking industry and from chainstore contracts with commercial feeders, warrants thorough investigation. Chainstore purchases direct from country feeders, based on somewhat depressed weekend terminal market prices, often appear to have the effect of weakening the price structure on which their own purchases are based.

Packer purchases of livestock at a price adjusted to meet the demands of large-scale retailers, merits full and complete investigation. Price concessions resulting from the controlled effects of large-scale buying power, instead of resulting from increased efficiency, presents a real threat to free and normal market trends based on supply and demand relationships.

We urge the Packers and Stockyards Division to press for full and complete investigations into the ways by which concentrated purchasing power may be adversely affecting livestock, poultry, and farm produce prices generally. We ask that every possible effort be made to weed out those practices that seriously restrict normal competition and adversely influence the prices of farm products.

RESOLUTION 17—EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION

We express our thanks to the various chairmen, speakers, and all others who contributed to the outstanding program of the 33d annual get-together conference. Those who served on committees and donated so freely of their time and services in various ways are hereby accorded special appreciation. To the press and other news media for their coverage of the convention, to the management and personnel of the Loraine Hotel for the services and facilities which contributed to the success of the conference, we also express appreciation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. Res. 233. Resolution to investigate, and make expenditures in connection with, certain matters within its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 1122); referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. Res. 252. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to employ temporarily an additional assistant chief clerk and additional staff and clerical personnel; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. Res. 244. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters relating to public and private housing (Rept. No. 1123); referred to Committee on Rules and Administration.

STUDY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 256) to study administrative practice and procedure, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study and investigation of administrative practice and procedure within the departments and agencies of the United States in the exercise of their rulemaking, licensing, and adjudicatory functions, including a study of the effectiveness of the Administrative Procedure Act, with a view to determining whether additional legislation is required to provide for the fair, impartial, and effective performance of such functions.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $115,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 257) to study revision and codification of the Statutes of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1962 to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That, if more than one counsel is employed, the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings together with its recommendations, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $26,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 258) to investigate antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a complete, comprehensive, and continuing study and investigation of unlawful restraints and monopolies, and of the antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States, their administration, interpretation, operation, enforcement and effect, and to determine and from time to time redetermine the nature and extent of any legislation which may be necessary or desirable for—

(1) clarification of existing law to eliminate conflicts and uncertainties where necessary;

(2) improvement of the administration and enforcement of existing laws; and

(3) supplementation of existing law to provide any additional substantive, procedural, or organizational legislation which may be needed for the attainment of the fundamental objects of the laws and the efficient administration and enforcement thereof.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $450,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 259) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendments, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional amendments.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $48,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 260) to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $140,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

CONSIDERATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO GOVERNMENT CHARTERS, HOLIDAYS, AND CELEBRATIONS

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 261) to consider matters pertaining to Government charters, holidays, and celebrations, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to consider all matters pertaining to Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $7,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY AND EXAMINATION OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 262) to study and examine the Federal judicial system, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a study and examination of the administration, practice, and procedures of the Federal judicial system with a view to determining the legislation, if any, which may be necessary or desirable in order to increase the efficiency of the Federal courts in the just and expeditious adjudication of the cases, controversies, and other matters which may be brought before them.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis professional, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of departments and agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $90,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 263) to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION, OPERATION, AND ENFORCEMENT OF INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 264) to investigate the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to the authority of the committee hereunder, to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of (1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended; (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and (3) the extent, nature and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its territories and possessions, including, but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organizations controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $325,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 265) to investigate juvenile delinquency, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts; and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation, as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $178,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 266) to investigate national penitentiaries, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and inspect national penitentiaries.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXAMINATION AND REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE PATENT OFFICE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 267) to examine and review the administration of the Patent Office, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and a complete examination and review of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $120,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 268) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to the revision and codification of the statutes of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under section 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a further examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, and consider proposed legislation affecting said Acts.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $45,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY BY COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES ON VARIOUS AREAS OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 270) to authorize a study by the Committee on Armed Services on various areas of national defense, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) common defense generally;

(2) the War Department and the Military Establishment generally;

(3) the Navy Department and the Naval Establishment generally;

(4) soldiers' and sailors' homes;

(5) pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces;

(6) selective service;

(7) size and composition of the Army and Navy;

(8) forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards;

(9) ammunition depots;

(10) maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone;

(11) conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves;

(12) strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense;

(13) aeronautical and space activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $220,000, shall be paid upon the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

NATIONAL FUELS AND ENERGY STUDY BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, at the end of the first session of this Congress, the Senate agreed to Senate Resolution 105, which provided $25,000 for the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to conduct a study of fuels and energy. This study has been underway during this past fall and I believe it is progressing very well. Fortunately, moneys expended were utilized from the committee's regular funds, and none of the amount requested was used. Like all such resolutions, the authority to expend the funds ceases on January 31. Therefore, I am reporting another resolution requesting $25,000 to be used if and when necessary during this coming year for the purpose of this study.

Since the authority under Senate Resolution 105 will cease on January 31, section 2 of this present resolution refers to the appointment of three Senators who shall serve on the Interior Committee in an ex officio capacity. This section was added to insure the continuation of the services now enjoyed by the committee of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], and the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE]. This section was inserted on the advice received from the parliamentarian.

The resolution (S. Res. 269) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified in rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to—

(a) make a full and complete investigation and study (including the holding of public hearings in appropriate parts of the Nation) of the current and prospective fuel and energy resources of the United States and the present and probable future rates of consumption thereof; and

(b) make a full and complete investigation and study of the existing and prospective governmental policies and laws affecting the fuels and energy industries with the view of determining what, if any, changes and implementation of these policies and laws may be advisable in order to coordinate and provide an effective national fuels policy to assure the availability of fuels and energy adequate for an expanding economy and for the security of the United States, taking into account the investment by private enterprise for the maintenance of efficient and adequate fuels and necessary related industries and the necessity for the maintenance of an adequate force of skilled workers.

SEC. 2. The President of the Senate, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, shall appoint three Senators, none of whom shall be members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to participate in the study authorized herein and the Senators so appointed shall serve with the committee in an ex officio capacity.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized through January 31, 1963, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and, (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 4. The committee shall report its finding, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

SEC. 5. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, from the date of its agreement through January 31, 1963, shall not exceed $25,000 and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2704. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain surplus Federal lands to the State of Illinois for wildlife, conservation, and recreational purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 2705. A bill to change the name of Whitman National Monument to Whitman Mission National Historic Site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2706. A bill for the relief of Lee Soon Him; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2707. A bill to facilitate the application and operation of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 2708. A bill to provide for certain bridge and highway construction as part of the Glen Canyon unit of the Colorado River storage project in order to enable highway traffic to cross the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area and Lake Powell; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. BENNETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2709. A bill for the relief of Ernst Fraenkel and his wife, Hanna Fraenkel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2710. A bill to place the Archivist of the United States on the Civil War Centennial Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2711. A bill for the relief of Tasia Demetropoulou (Dimitropoulos); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 2712. A bill to amend the provisions of law relating to longevity step increases for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks fo Mr. JOHNSTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2713. A bill for the relief of Jordan Tomicic (Giordano Tomicich); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 2714. A bill for the relief of Dr. Nourollah Shadi; and

S. 2715. A bill for the relief of Man-Pan Hui; to the Comimtee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2716. A bill to amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to certain organizations for judicial reform; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF SENATE ON PROJECT HOPE

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 255); which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY, which appears under a separate heading.)

STUDY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 256) to study administrative practice and procedure, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

STUDY OF REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 257) to study revision and codification of the Statutes of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INVESTIGATION OF ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 258) to investigate antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 259) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendments, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 260) to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

CONSIDERATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO GOVERNMENT CHARTERS, HOLIDAYS, AND CELEBRATIONS

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 261) to consider matters pertaining to Government charters, holidays, and celebrations, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

STUDY AND EXAMINATION OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 262) to study and examine the Federal judicial system, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 263) to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION, OPERATION, AND ENFORCEMENT OF INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 264) to investigate the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full, when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 265) to investigate juvenile delinquency, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 266) to investigate national penitentiaries, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

EXAMINATION AND REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE PATENT OFFICE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 267) to examine and review the administration of the Patent Office, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 268) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to the revision and codification of the statutes of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

NATIONAL FUELS AND ENERGY STUDY BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 269) authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to conduct a national fuels and energy study, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. ANDERSON, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

STUDY BY COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES ON VARIOUS AREAS OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 270) to authorize a study by the Committee on Armed Services on various areas of national defense, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. STENNIS, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN SURPLUS FEDERAL LANDS TO STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the conveyance of certain surplus Federal lands to the State of Illinois, for wildlife conservation and recreational purposes.

On October 31, 1961, the Department of the Army reported to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives that 3,847 acres of the Joliet Arsenal were excess to the needs of the Department of Defense, and were to be transferred to the General Services Administration. Included in the 3,847-acre tract are 1,591 acres which until recently have been used as an Army Reserve training area, and would be ideal for wildlife, conservation, and recreational purposes in the Joliet-Des Plaines area.

The Kankakee ordnance works and the Elwood ordnance plants were established in 1941 in Will County, Ill., 10 miles south of Joliet. In 1945, the facilities constituting the Kankakee ordnance works and the Elwood ordnance plant were consolidated, and were redesignated as the Joliet Arsenal, which currently comprises 31,391.44 acres of land. The arsenal is contract-operated on a reduced basis, to meet currently the requirements for the manufacture of high explosives and to provide a production base for mobilization requirements. Following agreement with the Committees on Armed Services, the anhydrous ammonia storage facilities have been leased for a 20-year period for commercial use in the manufacture of sulfuric acid, with the current annual rental rate at $350,000. Approximately 22,893 acres of land at the arsenal are leased for agriculture purposes, for a total annual rental of $75,516.

A review of the requirements by the Department indicates that there is no need for the retention, either for arsenal use or any other Army use, of the 3,847 acres involved, which originally were acquired as a site for expansion of the Kankakee unit. Since the Departments of the Navy and the Air Force have no other current or foreseeable requirements for the 3,847 acres of land, this area is excess to the current and foreseeable needs of the Department of Defense. No acquisition of similar property in the vicinity is contemplated by the Department of the Army, and retention of the land would have no effect on its budgetary requirements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2704) to authorize the conveyance of certain surplus Federal lands to the State of Illinois for wildlife, conservation, and recreational purposes, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

BRIDGE AND ROAD CONSTRUCTION IN GLEN CANYON NATIONAL RECREATION AREA NEAR HITE, UTAH

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize certain bridge and road construction in the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area near Hite, Utah.

I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the bill prepared by the Utah State Road Commission be placed in the Record following my remarks, and that the bill remain open for cosponsorship until the close of business Tuesday, January 23, 1962.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the Record, and the bill will remain at the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 2708) to provide for certain bridge and highway construction as part of the Glen Canyon unit of the Colorado River storage project in order to enable highway traffic to cross the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area and Lake Powell, introduced by Mr. Bennett, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The explanation presented by Mr. Bennett is as follows:

Need of High-Level Bridge Over the Colorado River Near Hite

The Colorado River cuts through Utah for a distance of 250 miles, bisecting five southeastern Utah counties. These counties have a total land area of 23,000 square miles; 42½ square miles of this area is occupied by some 12 small Utah towns. The remainder of this area is mostly Bureau of Land Management, forest, and Indian land.

For many years, the 23,000 population of these five counties have utilized the Hite Ferry for crossing of the Colorado River. This is the sole east-west crossing for over 200 miles along this river. The abandoning of this ferry at Hite due to the Glen Canyon Dam and the impounding waters of Lake Powell imposes a very serious economic hardship on the population of these five counties fronting on the Colorado River.

UTAH PLANNING

The State of Utah has been improving the east-west highways, U–95 and U–24, using the present Hite Ferry; while this crossing is inadequate, it serves Utah needs for the present and would serve for some time in the future. The withdrawal of the Hite crossing for Lake Powell will take away all of Utah's rights and destroy the crossing. The only alternate is for Utah to build a 600-foot span high-level bridge, two 300-foot span bridges, one over the Fremont and one over White River, and 16 miles of approach road at a cost of $4 million before highway traffic can be resumed. The State of Utah is unable to assume this cost, yet the necessity for a crossing of the Colorado River in the vicinity of Hite is most urgent. Utah Highway U–95 is being used as a connecting route between the national parks of Mesa Verde, Bryce Canyon, Zion, and Grand Canyon, as well as national monuments of Arches, Monument Valley, Capitol Reef, Natural Bridges, and Hovenweep, also recreational areas, Hole-in-the-Rock, Bull Frog, and Hite on Lake Powell.

The livestock, uranium mining, and petroleum industries of these five counties are a tremendous economic asset to the State of Utah and are in need of a crossing of the Colorado River for their intercounty connection such as U–95 through the Hite area; otherwise, local people and the tourists interested in southeastern Utah will be forced to travel hundreds of miles around Lake Powell to visit the areas made available by a road across the river in the vicinity of Hite.

CONCLUSION

A high-level bridge and approaches across the Colorado River in the vicinity of Hite would allow a connection on State Route 95 and serve the present and future development of southeastern Utah. The U.S. Government is the principal owner of a tremendous land area, national parks, and recreational areas in these five counties that will be affected by the closing of the Hite crossing on U–95 over the Colorado River by the impounding waters of Lake Powell.

It is inconceivable that such a tremendous project as the Glen Canyon Dam, with its power revenue possibilities, and its recreational potential for tourists, should overlook the responsibility of the U.S. Government to build a high-level bridge and approaches over the Colorado to replace at least within the withdrawal area the present crossing at Hite. The State of Utah has done and is willing to shoulder its part in the development of Utah Highway 95 outside the withdrawal area, but it could not at this time or in the near conceivable future finance the cost of the higher-level structure and other structures required to make this connection, even using Federal-aid highway funds. Federal-aid highway funding falls far short of meeting our other urgent highway needs throughout the State.

Estimated cost to construct high-level bridge and approach road to replace the present ferry at Hite, Utah,[1] December 20, 1961

	Cost
Bridge over the Colorado River (600 feet)	$1,000,000
Bridge over the Fremont River (300 feet)	350,000
Bridge over the White River (300 feet)	350,000
Approach road to bridge (16 miles)	1,800,000
Total	3,500,000
Plus preliminary and construction engineering	500,000
Total	4,000,000

[1] The above estimate includes only the work necessary to restore a crossing of the Colorado River and approaches and does not include approach roads to the recreational areas proposed by the National Park Service on Lake Powell.

AMENDMENT OF LAW RELATING TO LONGEVITY STEP INCREASES FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill that passed in the Senate last year after full discussion without a word of opposition, and later in the House by a vote of 358 to 4, but which was disapproved by the President on October 3, 1961.

The bill was designed to place postal employees on a comparable basis with Federal employees subject to the Classification Act with respect to longevity increases. To this end, the bill provided for longevity increases in an amount equal to the regular periodic step increases provided by existing law for the grade level of the employee's position at the completion of 10, 13, and 16 years of service, instead of after 13, 18, and 25 years of service, as now provided under existing law.

The bill I am reintroducing is identical in every respect to the measure approved in both the Senate and the House last year. It is my intent to schedule early hearings on the bill, using it as the vehicle to obtain the views of the administration, employee organizations, employees, and the public on not only the subject of the bill but on the related question of needed adjustments in the pay schedules for postal workers and other Federal employees.

As to the subject of postal rates, I intend to schedule hearings on this matter when and if the House acts on such a bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2712) to amend the provisions of law relating to longevity step increases for postal employees, introduced by Mr. Johnston, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

JUDICIAL REFORM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would amend the revenue statutes to give exemption to a State, territory or possession thereof, political subdivision, or a nonprofit organization which deals with the matter of providing information and recommendations, and seeking support in connection with judicial reform. In connection therewith I submit a short statement to follow the bill. I ask that the bill in its entirety be printed at this point in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and the statement may be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2716) to amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to certain organizations for judicial reform, introduced by Mr. Dirksen, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 170(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to charitable contributions) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) A State, a Territory, a possession of the United States, or any political subdivision of any of the foregoing, or the United States or the District of Columbia, or any non-profit organization created and operated exclusively to consider proposals for the reorganization of the judicial branch of the government of any of the foregoing to provide information, to make recommendations, and to seek public support or opposition as to such proposals, but only if the contribution or gift is made for exclusively public purposes."

Sec. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The statement presented by Mr. Dirksen is as follows:

Federal Income Tax Deductions for Contributions for Judicial Reform

The organized bar of Illinois and civic groups throughout the State, through an organization known as the committee for modern courts, are about to launch a campaign for the adoption of a proposed revision of the present judicial article of the Illinois constitution. The judicial article under which the Illinois courts are now constituted and operated was adopted almost 100 years ago and has not been revised since; the vast changes which have taken place in Illinois during the last century have made the court system, as established in the 1870 constitution, wholly outmoded and inadequate to meet the current needs of the State. As Albert J. Harno, court administrator of Illinois and former dean of the University of Illinois College of Law, has said: "Our judicial framework, with its multiplicity of courts, which often overlap in jurisdiction, each operating in administration in its own orbit, demands immediate attention. The present system is confusing, it produces delays in justice, and it is needlessly expensive."

Sustained efforts over a long period of years to obtain the adoption of a modernized judicial article resulted in the adoption of a proposed judicial amendment by the legislature in 1957 for submission to the voters in 1958 (which narrowly missed obtaining the required two-thirds vote of those voting on the issue) and in the adoption by the legislature in 1961 of another similar proposal to be submitted to the voters of Illinois at the November 1962 general election. The need for comprehensive reorganization of the State's judicial system is even more acute today with the ever-increasing backlog in the courts and solution of this problem is imperative. To this end and to assure adoption of the amendment, it will be necessary to prosecute a vigorous statewide campaign and it will be essential to obtain substantial funds in order to educate and inform the voters. Past experience in Illinois indicates that adequate funds cannot be obtained unless contributions for such purpose be granted income tax deductibility as charitable contributions.

In the prior efforts for constitutional revision in Illinois, a citizens' committee, organized as a not-for-profit corporation, was active in publicizing the need for constitutional reform and in urging the support of the public therefor. In connection with these activities through 1958, favorable rulings had been issued by the Internal Revenue Service, holding that contributions thereto were deductible as charitable contributions under the provisions of section 170 of the 1954 code. However, in 1958, although allowing deductibility for that year, the Revenue Service changed its position with regard to the future status of the citizens' committee, and since then has indicated that contributions to such an organization would not be deductible. This position has apparently been based on the conclusion that the activities of the citizens' committee constituted "carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation," in violation of the restriction in section 170(c)(2)(D). Equating a constitutional amendment to legislation, the Revenue Service reasoned in a 1958 revenue ruling (Revenue Ruling 58-255, 58-1 C.B. 91) that "inasmuch as a constitution is a general or fundamental law, an attempt to influence the adoption or rejection by the general electorate of a constitutional amendment is basically an attempt to promote or defeat legislation." Subsequently, in 1959, the U.S. Supreme Court in *Cammarano* v. *United States* (358 U.S. 498) applied a provision in the Treasury regulations under the 1939 code denying deductions for lobbying expenses to expenses incurred for the purpose of defeating an initiative measure on a prohibition issue. Shortly thereafter the Internal Revenue Service gave a similarly broad interpretation to the statutory restriction against lobbying activities in section 170(c)(2)(D), and the applicable Treasury regulations were amended to state expressly that the term "legislation" in the statute included "action by the public in a referendum, initiative, constitutional amendment, or similar procedure," section 1.501(c)(3)-1(c)(3). Accordingly, an organization created and operated for the principal purpose of supporting constitutional revision would be denied the benefit of deductions for contributions made to it.

The deductibility of contributions toward passage of the new judicial article is vital to judicial reform in Illinois. In order to permit contributions from the general public to be deductible when made for the purpose of the reorganization of the Illinois judicial system, the Illinois State Bar Association and the Chicago Bar Association urge the Congress to adopt legislation along the lines of the bill attached hereto. This bill would amend section 170(c)(1) of the code to permit deductions for contributions made to a nonprofit organization created and operated exclusively to study and develop proposals for the reorganization of the judicial branch of Federal, State, or local governments, to issue educational material with regard to such proposals, to make public recommendations and to seek the voters' support (or opposition) thereon.

To be entirely equitable, the proposed bill would cover both organizations which sponsor plans for judicial reform, as well as those which may oppose them. However, the present statutory restriction to the effect that all contributions under paragraph (1) must be "for exclusively public purposes" would also apply to the newly added organizations so that no deductions under the bill would be allowed for contributions made to advance purely private interests.

The type of reorganization proposal to be sponsored by the organizations covered by the bill may be accomplished either through constitutional revision or amendment (as in Illinois), or through legislation, initiative, and referendum.

In view of the fact that the Illinois judicial amendment will be presented for approval to the Illinois voters at the next general election in November 1962, it is crucial that passage of the attached legislation be expedited so that the funds essential for a strong educational program will be available to assure the adoption of the new judicial article.

Although the problem in Illinois is critical and immediate, it is by no means an isolated situation. In 1962, four States other than Illinois will submit constitutional amendments to their voters aimed at improvement of their State judiciary machinery. These are (with dates of voter referendums): Colorado, November 6, 1962 (general election); Iowa, June 4, 1962 (special election); Nebraska, November 6, 1962 (general election); North Carolina, November 6, 1962 (general election).

Bar and citizens' groups have been working in other States toward formulation of measures for modernizing their courts, but have not reached the stage of submission to the voters.

The attached draft of legislation is identical with S. 2166, by Senator Dirksen, and H.R. 7930, by Congressman Mason, except that those bills would also apply to organizations for reorganization of the executive and legislative branches, as well as the judicial branch, of Government.

COMMENDATION OF PROJECT HOPE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution on a subject which we all know about and have admiration for. This is the work of Dr. William B. Walsh and his humanitarian organization, Project Hope.

Dr. Walsh and the American physicians, nurses, dentists, pharmacists and medical personnel who have served have shown the people of southeast Asia that all Americans are concerned for their health and their welfare and their freedom. As Dr. Walsh has said:

> A person who is healthy is less likely to be turned by the hollow promises of the Communists.

I wish to outline for my colleagues in the Senate, and for all Americans to know, the work that was accomplished by the SS *Hope* and her medical and health personnel during their first year in Indonesia and South Vietnam—a year which showed millions of people in these two nations that Americans are truly interested in their health and their welfare; a year in which more than 1,200 major operations were performed bringing health and relieving pain, bringing sight, straightening limbs of adults and children alike in these two nations.

This great image of American concern for other people accomplished the first mass inoculation program for children in South Vietnam; 200 Indonesian doctors and 300 of that nation's nurses were trained in modern medical and health practices, while 28 South Vietnamese medical residents and interns spent the entire tour at Saigon aboard the SS *Hope* and 200 Vietnamese nurses were rotated through for observation, teaching, and demonstration.

Mr. President, for the life of me I cannot understand why this great country of ours does not do more in the area of visible, tangible education service such as is manifested by Project Hope on the ship the SS *Hope*. I have said on this floor before that all too often the ships which carry the American flag, which anchor in foreign ports, are battleships. I know these great battleships of our Navy are dedicated to the cause of peace, but our enemies, the Communist propagandists, try to make them appear otherwise. There is no propagandist who can distort the meaning of a hospital ship. There is no enemy propagandist who can convince people who have been healed by doctors and nurses and medical personnel aboard a hospital ship that such a ship is there for any purpose other than the well-being of the community.

We have literally dozens of these ships in reserve, unused, costing the taxpayers money to keep them unused. They could be equipped, staffed, and supplied, and they could be put to sea to do a great job of service for humanity.

I have recommended, along with many other Senators, what we call the Great White Fleet—a fleet of ships, or at least a task force of ships, ready and available for emergency assistance in any part of the world; particularly medical education ships or hospital ships, which are outpatient clinics, so to speak, which can dock at any harbor and treat the sick, train the native doctors, retrain nurses, and upgrade medical education. All this can be done.

I say that a nation which feels it can put a vehicle of some kind on the moon, can put a man there and return him to earth safely—and this is the purpose and the objective of American policy in the scientific research on outer space—ought to be able to equip a number of ships for the purpose of improving the health and the welfare of millions of people throughout the world.

I know the general argument against the project is that it is too costly, and that we could do the same thing for much less in dollars. I think there is some truth to the cost argument. But I say that there is a greater truth in the visible evidence of a great hospital ship in the harbor of any city in any country in the world carrying the American flag. It is a ship that does not have a single gun upon it. It carries no missiles and no rockets, but carries with it the critical drugs of the modern pharmacy, and the most competent and technical medical personnel the world has ever known, namely, members of the American medical profession. Along with the doctors go the technicians, the nurses, the pharmacists, and the medical aides. Aboard these ships can come native doctors, as well as nurses to be trained and retrained; and we can establish out-patient clinics that will leave a mark of charity, compassion, and humanity for years to come. That is what Project Hope means.

There is only one thing wrong with Project Hope, namely, that it consists of only one ship. We need many like it. I commend Dr. Walsh, and I commend those who have had the courage to undertake this project. I ask that our Government look on this project with keen interest, sympathy, understanding, and support, even though it is essentially a people-to-people program and is sponsored by the citizens of this country.

The work of Project Hope has been retained in both the nations I have mentioned, in Vietnam and in Indonesia, not only by reason of the thousands who were made well and whole, but also because the medical and health experts of those nations, both men and women, now know more about coping with the complexities of modern-day medicine.

Project Hope was asked by Indonesian President Sukarno to help staff and train Indonesian personnel at the new Ibu Sukarno Hospital at Djakarta. This is now being done on a constant basis. An orthopedic rehabilitation center has been opened at Saigon, it being jointly operated through Project Hope, and I am also proud to say with the aid of the Mayo Clinic at Rochester, Minn., which, in my mind, is one of the greatest medical clinics in the world. Project Hope will maintain this center and provide an orthopedic training program.

Oral surgery was introduced to Vietnam for the first time, and Project Hope is maintaining a continuous program in that specialty.

This great image of American concern and the desire of our people from every walk of life to help those less fortunate than we here at home has provided the people of these nations with much more than hundreds upon hundreds of dollars of financial and military aid could have done. The American medical diplomats of the SS *Hope* showed their compassion, their understanding, their vast experience and knowledge and left these lands the winners for humanity.

Now Dr. Walsh announces that the SS *Hope* will visit South America, especially Peru. He says that the decision to visit Peru was based on the many opportunities for cooperation with the new University of Trujillo Medical School located 300 miles north of Lima. But he also adds that the *Hope* staff will probably perform field missions in neighboring countries while the SS *Hope* is based at Salaverry, the port for Trujillo.

Now in order for the SS *Hope* to sail from San Francisco to Peru in time to be prepared to begin work April 1—which by the way is the beginning of the school year at the medical school—then it behooves all Americans to pitch in and help support the magnificent work of this floating American medical center with their financial contributions.

It costs approximately $3,500,000 a year to operate the SS *Hope*. This is much less than we appropriate each day for small items of much less intrinsic value than helping others to help themselves, than bringing health and opportunity to others, and having dedicated Americans succor and heal in a calm, dignified and quiet manner. We all can, and must be, a part of Project Hope, and the work of the dedicated men and women who serve this free enterprise American institution.

The resolution I offer today commends Project Hope, its founder, Dr. Walsh, those who have worked with the organization, those who will serve in the future, and various segments of American life, enterprise, and labor for their contributions to such a worthy cause. I hope that they will continue with their support and expand it so that HOPE may continue and expand with other floating medical centers for the other needy areas of this troubled world of ours today.

I hope that every Senator will see fit, in any newsletter he may send home to his constituents, to mention the work of this very fine ship, and urge the people of America to help, because that is the kind of foreign aid that does not come from the Treasury through a mechanical check-writing machine, but rather from the pocketbooks and savings of individual citizens of America. It comes from the heart and for $3¼ million we can operate this fantastic laboratory of modern medical science and healing in any part of the world.

Compare that cost to one shot of a small nuclear weapon for an underground test. Compare it with the fantastic cost of one shot from any one of our missile bases or any one of our testing platforms for outer space vehicles. The cost of operating this ship is small, and yet its good is immeasurable. I do not hesitate to use the floor of the Senate to urge the people of America to aid in this worthy, charitable, and philanthropic endeavor.

I hope the people will continue with their support and expand the program so that Project Hope—now represented by the ship SS *Hope*—may continue to expand, with other floating medical centers, for the other needy areas of this troubled world.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution that I now offer be printed at this point in the RECORD. I send to the desk the resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution may be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

The resolution (S. Res. 255) to express sense of the Senate on Project Hope, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. RES. 255

Whereas the need for ever-increasing peaceful, humanitarian cooperation between the people of the United States and the peoples of other nations of the world is apparent; and

Whereas, under the authorization of the President of the United States, the United States Navy has furnished a mothballed hospital ship to the People-to-People Health Foundation, Incorporated, under private charter; and

Whereas the People-to-People Health Foundation, Incorporated, also known as Project Hope, has engaged and staffed and equipped the naval hospital ship *Consolation*—now known worldwide as the steamship *Hope I*—as a floating medical and health teaching-training center which late in 1961 completed an extremely successful 1-year tour of Indonesia and South Vietnam with a staff of volunteer American medical and health personnel and will spend 1962 visiting our South American neighbor, Peru; and

Whereas the chief purpose of Project Hope is to bring to the medical and health professions of the nations that the SS *Hope I* visits the latest skills and techniques developed by our American medical and health professions; and

Whereas the floating medical center is staffed with American men and women selected from among the top of the medical, dental and health professions; and

Whereas the moneys needed to staff and operate this hospital ship are raised from private sources throughout our Nation; and

Whereas Project Hope has received the enthusiastic support of government, industry, business, labor, the medical, pharmaceutical, and dental professions and private citizens throughout the Nation; Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate, That Project Hope be commended as another step in increasing good will throughout the world and in bringing the peoples of all nations together in a bond of mutual trust, friendship and cooperation.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING REPORT BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on January 11 I submitted the resolution (S. Res. 238) to extend the time for filing the final report of the Special Committee on Aging to January 31, 1963.

I had assumed this measure, a simple extension of the special committee, would be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which had handled the original resolution last year.

However, it was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which normally has jurisdiction over the subject matter.

When the original resolution was submitted last year, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare [Mr. HILL] graciously gave his consent to its direct referral to the Rules Committee.

The chairman again informs me that he has no objection to a similar procedure. The majority and minority leaders also indicate they have no objection.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be discharged from further consideration of Senate Resolution 238, and that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary.

Robert D. Smith, Jr., of Arkansas, to be U.S. attorney, eastern district of Arkansas;

Charles M. Conway, of Arkansas, to be U.S. attorney, western district of Arkansas, 4-year term, vice Charles W. Atkinson, resigned; and

Nathan S. Heffernan, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. attorney, western district of Wisconsin, 4-year term, vice George E. Rapp.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, January 25, 1962, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Address entitled "The Government's Role in Health Care in the 1960's," delivered by Senator MORSE at the Alumni Institute in Hospital Administration on October 26, 1961.

By Mr. MORTON:

Statement by himself, presenting at the annual quotas meeting of Kentucky Tobacco Producers, submitting recommendations to the Department of Agriculture concerning burley tobacco acreage allotments for 1962.

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts of statement by him relating to utilization of our national wealth.

NEW PASSPORT REGULATIONS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, recently there appeared in the Federal Register new regulations covering the issuance of passports, insofar as Communists, subversive agents, and those suspected of disloyalty are concerned. It seems to me this matter poses a very serious problem for the security of the country, because the purport of the new regulations is, according to my interpretation of them, that the Passport Office would face the dilemma of having almost automatically to issue passports to Communists, subversive agents, and disloyal persons of all types, or in lieu thereof be forced to request the security agencies to confront those whose passport applications had been denied with the sources of their information.

Of course that would do violence to the entire basis of our security program, because it would force the FBI and other security agencies to disclose the identity of their undercover agents. This creates a very serious situation; and I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a news release on this subject which I issued for today's publication. It includes a letter to the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, in which his attention is called to the imperative perils involved in the new regulations, and it is suggested that immediate correctives be taken.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESS RELEASE FROM OFFICE OF SENATOR KARL E. MUNDT, REPUBLICAN, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 17, 1962

Following is a copy of a letter Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, is sending Wednesday, January 17, to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, concerning the new passport regulations issued by the Department of State. Senator MUNDT's interest in these regulations stems from his work as a coauthor of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (the first 17 sections were initially presented as the Mundt-Nixon bill) which is to be implemented by these regulations. A similar letter is also being sent to Attorney General Robert Kennedy. The letter follows:

JANUARY 17, 1962.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This letter concerns the regulations recently promulgated by the Department of State, establishing the administrative procedures for the denial of U.S. passports to members of the Communist Party.

I have carefully studied these regulations as they appeared in the Federal Register for January 12, 1962, and I am obliged to state that I view their final adoption with grave concern. My concern centers on that portion of section 51.138, which provides that an applicant, who contests a tentative denial of a passport, shall be fully informed as to the sources of adverse evidence and granted the right to confront and cross-examine all adverse witnesses.

While I am fully aware of the infinite importance attaching to the coordinate rights of confrontation and cross-examination in criminal proceedings under our Anglo-American legal system, I am, nevertheless, dubious as to the feasibility of making a strict transference of these rights to administrative proceedings, especially when national security is at issue. I am certain that many occasions will arise when the FBI, the CIA, and other intelligence agencies will understandably be strongly opposed to disclosing the identity of sensitively placed confidential informants; and if the testimony of these informants had determinative weight in the consideration of a passport application, the newly promulgated regulations will have the effect of compelling issuance of a passport to an individual, whom the Passport Office knows or has reason to believe is a member of the Communist Party. In matters involving our national security it is my earnest conviction that the Federal Government should not be compelled into the position of having to choose between two alternative courses of action, when both are inimical to our Nation's best interests.

This matter is further complicated by the fact that under the Internal Security Act of 1950 it is unlawful for any officer of the United States to issue a passport to an individual whom that officer knows or has reason to believe is a member of an organization which is registered or under final orders to register in accordance with the registration requirements of that act.

It would seem that the newly promulgated regulations will place in an impossible legal circumstance those officers in the Department of State, who are responsible for passport issuance. Recognizing that the intelligence and investigative agencies will be unwilling to identify valuable confidential informants, will these State Department officers henceforth refuse to read confidential investigative reports for fear of gaining knowledge which might at some future date make it unlawful for them to approve the issuance of a U.S. passport? If this will be the result (and I do not see how such a result can be avoided under the new regulation) should we not then turn the responsibilities for passport issuance over to a room full of clerk-typists thus stripping away any and all pretense of a security system, which in fact will not exist?

Had this strange and irreconcilable conflict between statute and regulation come about through inadvertence or honest mistake, my concern would be minimal. But since the regulations in question were specifically drafted to implement the statutory commands of the Internal Security Act of 1950, it must be assumed that this conflict is not the byproduct of haste or inadvertence but instead is the calculated end product of forethought and premeditation. As the coauthor of the first 17 sections of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (initially presented as the Mundt-Nixon bill) I view with grave concern the final adoption of these regulations, which render inoperable the passport security features of the act; and I, therefore, urgently request that you provide me with a detailed explanation of the legal reasoning which prompted the Department of State to issue these regulations in their present form.

Assuring you that your early attention in this matter will be deeply appreciated, and with warmest personal regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

KARL E. MUNDT,
U.S. Senator.

NATIONAL PRINTING WEEK

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, this is National Printing Week. It is appropriate that we pause momentarily to recognize one of the most indispensable industries of our time—the printing industry.

On yesterday, January 17, we observed the birthday of Benjamin Franklin, the patron saint of American printers, a founding father of the printing industry, and a Founding Father of our Nation.

Across the United States, in schools, in scientific and patriotic organizations, and in governmental bodies, Benjamin Franklin is being honored this week for his contributions to the printing industry and to our Nation.

Here, at the seat of the government which he helped establish, we have a special obligation to pay tribute to Ben Franklin, and to all printers, lithographers, and suppliers, across the Nation, and particularly here in the District of Columbia.

The Government Printing Office regularly performs miracles of production for Congress and the Federal Government. Frequently our publications are needed even before an order for their production can be prepared. Often, the overnight production of 300-page documents is required. Miraculously, the Government Printing Office consistently provides this essential service. The difficult they do immediately; the "impossible" takes them only slightly longer.

In 1961, District of Columbia printing plants purchased more than $10 million in equipment to keep pace with the growing demand for printing in the Washington area. Unquestionably, this has provided additional employment in the industry—and thereby increased the printing industry's contribution to the economic well-being of our Nation's Capital.

Figures just released by the Department of Commerce show that production workers of the printing industry of Washington, D.C., rank second only to the State of Illinois on the basis of average annual wages for the printing craft. I am also proud to note that the great State of Montana ranks third, nationally, in average annual wages paid to production workers in the printing industry.

In conclusion: The printing industry is essential to everything mankind cherishes. Today, international communism is concentrating its full effort and resources upon the destruction of freedom. To meet this challenge, we must keep our democratic Government functioning at maximum efficiency. And there is no more indispensable weapon than the printed word in our fight against totalitarianism.

Our liberty and prosperity, our individual advancement, and our national achievements, our very way of life, depend upon mass communication, and particularly the printed word. Members of the printing industry, you may take pride in your historical contributions to our Nation, and in your indispensable position in our society.

WALTER LIPPMANN ON THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in his column in today's issue of the Washington Post, Walter Lippmann, our Nation's greatest columnist and one of the outstanding thinkers of our time, clearly sets forth my views and the views of millions of my fellow Americans regarding the United Nations.

President Kennedy has reaffirmed our Government's faith in the future of the United Nations by requesting Congress to authorize the purchase of a substantial portion of a $200 million United Nations bond issue. The working capital of the United Nations has been reduced, and money is urgently needed to carry on vital operations. This organization is too important to the preservation of world peace to allow a lack of funds to bring its work to a halt.

As Mr. Lippmann points out in his article, if the United Nations serves a good purpose in the pacification of the world, it is fabulously cheap at this price. I commend this column to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVESTIGATE THE U.N.

(By Walter Lippmann)

The mounting controversy about the U.N., though it turns on the proposed purchase of $100 million worth of U.N. bonds, is plainly not a money question. By comparison with our expenditures for defense, or for agriculture, or even for foreign aid, the sums involved are very small. The total budget of the U.N. for last year was $231.7 million and our share of that was $102.1 million. That is one-third of 1 percent of what we are spending on defense. Our share of the proposed bond issue is to be $100 million and if these bonds were never repaid, this would be a minute sum in our public expenditures.

The fact is that if the U.N. serves a good purpose in the pacification of the world, it is fabulously cheap at the price.

The real question at the root of the controversy in Congress and in the country is whether the U.N. today, in this year 1962, serves a purpose which the United States has good reason to support and promote, or whether the U.N. is out of hand and should be cut down or even broken up. The movement to cut down the U.N., if not to dissolve it, is led by two great powers, the Soviet Union and France. The Soviet Union has the support of the countries of the Communist bloc and on the other side along with France are Portugal and until recently Belgium. The United States is the great power which most actively supports the U.N. Recently it has had qualified and reluctant support from Great Britain.

Our rather lonesome eminence among the great powers has aroused, naturally and properly enough, much uneasiness and questioning even among the old friends of the U.N. in this country. All this cannot and should not be hushed up. On the contrary, the activities of the U.N. and our own part in them should be investigated thoroughly and publicly, and the question of the kind and degree of our reliance on the U.N. should be thoroughly discussed.

What is called for is in effect a vote of confidence by Congress to determine what we should do and what we should not do in the U.N. as it now exists. Such a review and vote is in fact overdue. For the U.N. today is a very different organization from the one which the Senate, with only two dissenting votes, voted to join in 1945.

The U.N. today is the creation, in which we played the leading part, of those who in 1949 carried through amendments to make the General Assembly, where a two-thirds vote prevails, the dominant organ over the Security Council where the great powers have a veto. From that amendment, sponsored by the United States, have developed the anxieties which now disturb European and American opinion.

With the admission of the excolonial nations to the General Assembly a majority is able to exert strong pressure on the West European countries—Britain, France, Belgium, in a measure. The Netherlands, and above all Portugal—which have not yet completed the solution of the problems of colonialism.

It is being said that the President and Ambassador Stevenson have allowed the Afro-Asian majority in the Assembly to dictate our foreign policy and to alienate our old European allies. This is misleading. For it does not take into account the real balance of interests and of forces within which, given the worldwide responsibilities of the United States, we have to act. The United States has inherited the role Great Britain occupied for a century. We do not have the option, which has been exercised recently by Britain and France, of abstaining and standing aside.

We cannot take the view that our allies in NATO have a blank check which requires us to support all their foreign policies, even those on which we are not consulted and over which we have no control. There are, I know, highly placed Americans who believe it is our interest and duty to support the Portuguese position in Goa, in Mozambique, in Angola. But can we and should we support Portugal in resisting all change? Should our attitude to Portugal be the same as our attitude toward the enlightened nations of Western Europe—Britain, France, the Netherlands, and now, I hope and believe, Belgium? We cannot do this. Dr. Salazar's colonial policy is the same kind of menace to the public peace as was Marie Antoinette's inability to understand why the hungry people of Paris did not eat cake. We cannot pursue a moderate and conciliatory policy in the General Assembly if every zig and every zag we make in such a turbulent situation is to be subject to veto by Dr. Salazar or the Katanga lobby.

What needs most to be investigated, exposed, explained, and debated, is the Congo affair. The U.N. intervention there has been a big and dangerous experiment, and whether it succeeds—as is now conceivable—or whether it fails, which is always possible, the Nation must face the question of whether there was any alternative, which would not have been infinitely more dangerous.

In entering upon this debate about the U.N. it is useful to remind ourselves of what Senator Vandenberg and John Foster Dulles said about the Charter when it was before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Mr. Dulles said:

"Now, of course, I recognize that this Charter does not do what many people would like—to guarantee at a single step perpetual peace. But the world does not move at a single step from a condition of virtual anarchy to a condition of well-rounded political order. Those steps are made falteringly. There are missteps; there have been missteps. This, for all I know, may again turn out to be a misstep. But when a previous witness said that he did not himself know what to do, I say that here is, at least, a step which presents itself to us, which may be, or which has a good chance to be, a step forward, onto new, firm, and higher ground." That is the language of an experienced and reasonable man.

This is what Senator Vandenberg said to the Senate about ratification: "You may tell me that I have but to scan the present world with realistic eyes in order to see these fine phrases often contemptuously reduced to a contemporary shambles, that some of the signatories to this Charter practice the precise opposite of what they preach even as they sign, that the aftermath of this war seems to threaten the utter disintegration of these ideals at the very moment they are born. I reply that the nearer right you may be in any such gloomy indictment, the greater is the need for the new pattern which promises at least to try to stem these evil tides. If the effort fails, we can at least face the consequences with clean hands."

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, we Americans should be doing everything possible to strengthen the United Nations, for it remains the world's great hope for a just and lasting peace. Yet some Americans not only oppose our purchase of U.N. bonds, but are foolishly demanding that we withdraw from the U.N.

This organization is one instrumentality of our foreign policy, along with bilateral diplomacy and multilateral alliances such as NATO, the Organization of American States, and the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. Each has its own uses and purposes. Like all political instrumentalities, the United Nations is imperfect, often unwieldy, and its uses are limited. However, those uses can be very important in the pursuit of some of our national objectives which cannot be achieved as effectively, if at all, by other means. For this reason, if for no other, we must support its continued existence. The purchase of these bonds will help strengthen the United Nations, which we should not permit to deteriorate into a mere debating society.

Mr. President, the United Nations should be measured in view of the alternative. It has worked, and will function when it must, when bilateral or multilateral diplomacy cannot succeed. If it has not solved all mankind's problems, it has on occasion helped in preventing a confrontation and in relieving tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union. This in itself is justification for its continuance.

Mr. President, the United Nations will continue to be a vital instrument of our foreign policy. We cannot allow it to die or atrophy. In this emergency, we can well afford to lend it what amounts to less than 50 cents per capita of our population. We should support our President in his request for authority to purchase the U.N. bonds. In fact, we cannot afford not to do so. To abandon the United Nations would be, as another writer put it, like shooting the sheriff because the desperados refuse to obey the law.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN J. RILEY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on January 2 South Carolina's Representative John Jacob Riley passed away suddenly at his Myrtle Beach home. It is with a deep sadness and a profound sense of loss that I stand here and recall the unfortunate passing of this distinguished and able Congressman.

In this connection, I invite attention to a fine testimonial editorial which appeared in the January 3 issue of the State newspaper.

For 16 years John Riley toiled in the House of Representatives, working unselfishly and unfailingly for the people of South Carolina. During that time he rendered meritorious and courageous service, and earned the respect of his colleagues.

John was a practical man, with warm human qualities and a rare dedication to his district, to his State, and to his Nation. This devotion by John Riley to righteous principles and to humanity will be long remembered.

His place will be difficult to fill, and his good works will remain throughout our State and country as a lasting monument to his tireless efforts.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed together with my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN J. RILEY

John J. Riley was a Member of the National House of Representatives who kept the faith with the prevailing views of his constituency. It was easy for him, and inevitable, since they were his views, too.

Mr. Riley was an unostentatious, sound, sincere and dutiful representative of his district and of his country, and his quiet, correct and ever-prompt services will be missed.

He had long been subject to the illness which took his life, but remained the cheerful, courteous and serviceable public official. He was never given to boasting or blatancy and in this was distinguishable from many men in public life.

Mr. Riley's last public appearance in Columbia was at a luncheon and at a dinner on November 28, both given in honor of James F. Byrnes. At the luncheon he made a talk in which he quoted fellow Members of the House who had served in the Congress with Mr. Byrnes, Members who spoke in the highest terms of Mr. Byrnes. Mr. Riley appeared to be in the best of health and his intention was to offer again this year for his seat in Congress.

People all over his district, remembering his faithfulness and responsiveness and his loyalty to tradition mourn the death of Mr. Riley.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

STOCK DISTRIBUTION TREATED AS RETURN OF CAPITAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8847), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that a distribution of stock made to an individual (or certain corporations) pursuant to an order enforcing the antitrust laws shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital; and to provide that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The **VICE PRESIDENT** laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By **Mr. DOUGLAS**, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

George W. Mitchell, of Illinois, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Joseph H. McCann, of Michigan, to be administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, the President will be so notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE BUDGET

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, President Kennedy's promise of a balanced budget, as submitted today, is about as phony as some of his earlier campaign promises.

His fiscal 1963 budget calls for expenditures of $93 billion, or $11 billion over the present year. This represents an increase of nearly $1 billion per month over the present rate of spending, and this year's expenditures were at an alltime high.

Increased appropriations are promised for every Department. He proposes to add 46,000 more employees to the Federal payroll during the next 12 months. Figuring that the Government operates on a 5-day workweek it means that the New Frontiersmen plan to add 175 new Federal employees to the public payroll every day during the next 12 months.

This additional padding of the Federal payroll comes on top of their record of already having added approximately 40,000 extra employees during their first year in office.

His phony claim that all of this can be paid for and the budget still balanced is not based upon suggested savings in any Department, but rather upon the forlorn hope that the income of corporations and individuals will increase next year enough to give the Government an additional $9.6 billion revenue, plus another billion dollars which he hopes to raise in postal rate increases and in increased taxes on dividends.

He has estimated next year's income from individual income taxpayers at $49.3 billion, or an expected increase of $4.3 billion. To achieve this, the earning capacity of the workers must increase approximately 7 percent.

He is estimating that corporation income will increase sufficiently to provide a tax revenue next year of $26.6 billion, or $5.3 billion in extra taxes over the present year. To achieve this goal American corporations would have to earn 25 percent more than they did during 1961. This represents an unrealistic and overly optimistic prediction. Unquestionably both of these estimates are too optimistic even with the expected normal increase in business activity.

On the other hand, the only savings which the President suggests in the 1963 budget are a proposed reduction of $500 million in agriculture payments and a $274 million reduction in veterans' benefits, neither of which is expected to materialize unless present commitments are ignored.

The best evidence that the President himself recognizes his claim for a balanced budget as just political propaganda is evidenced by the fact that he is asking Congress for an increase of $10 billion in the ceiling of our national debt. If it were true that our budget for next year was going to be balanced, then he most certainly would not need this large increase in the debt ceiling.

Our Federal budget can and should be balanced during this period of relatively high prosperity, but, unless a more conservative attitude is demonstrated at the executive level, this is not going to be achieved. Continued deficits mean another round of inflation, and eventually the American dollar will be in serious trouble.

The chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator BYRD, has announced that before the Finance Committee will act on the President's request for another large increase in the debt ceiling, a thorough examination of the expanded Government spending at all levels will be conducted. As a member of that committee I wholeheartedly support him in this step.

The time is long past due when the American people should be alerted to the fact that our Government cannot spend itself into full employment and prosperity on borrowed money any more than a drunkard can drink himself sober.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks an editorial entitled "Battle of the Bulging Payroll," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BATTLE OF THE BULGING PAYROLL

"I am especially desirous," said President Kennedy in his statement last October to Cabinet officers and agency heads, "that the number of Government employees be limited to the minimum consistent with getting the job done. There is no question that employment can be held substantially below the levels which would be possible under the funds authorized by the Congress, if strong efforts are made to achieve increases in productivity and efficiency and to staff each activity with only the minimum number of employees needed to carry out our objectives. I expect each of you to make such efforts."

But somewhere along the way the deeds called for by those fine words have not been forthcoming. As our Mr. Nelson reported the other day, "almost all signs suggest payrolls continue to inch upward despite the President's economy intentions."

Perhaps it is understandable. In view of the Government's desire to advance U.S. space explorations with all speed, that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, increasing its staff by 30 percent annually, now is busily recruiting 2,000 additional engineers and scientists. Less comprehensible, however, is what is happening among more pedestrian agencies.

For instance, the Agriculture Department's payroll by midyear will be 7,000 bigger than it is now; the Interior Department has gained 5,000 employees since January 1961; the Health, Education, and Welfare Department's announced reduction of more than 600 jobs turns out to be a cutback in positions that have never been filled; Federal Aviation Agency and Bureau of Public Roads staffs are increasing.

Some of this growth, to be sure, can be blamed on programs launched by the previous administration. But in the wake of the President's October message the push upward has not even shown signs of leveling off. The taxpayers will be looking, in Mr. Kennedy's budget message this noon, for something with more muscle than the "I expect every man to do his duty" sort of approach to payroll limits.

If they do not find it there they can only assume that in the battle of the bulging Federal payroll, the administration is surrendering without losing a single man.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEDICATION OF MEMORIAL TO ADM. RICHARD EVELYN BYRD

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and I were both elected to the State senate in November of 1915 and have been closely associated in our political careers ever since. Throughout that period, it was my happy privilege to know my colleague's younger brother, Adm. Richard Evelyn Byrd, whose achievements in the field of exploration will rank with those of the alltime great.

On the occasion of his untimely death, I outlined his remarkable achievements, and those remarks can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 3, page 3444.

On November 13, 1961, there was dedicated to the memory of Admiral Byrd a memorial sponsored by the National Geographic Society and located on the Virginia side of the Potomac River near Arlington Cemetery.

I ask unanimous consent to have published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the remarks that were made by the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, and the president of the National Geographic Society on that occasion.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEDICATION OF MEMORIAL TO ADM. RICHARD EVELYN BYRD, NOVEMBER 13, 1961

MELVILLE BELL GROSVENOR. Mr. Vice President, Mr. Secretary, ladies, and gentlemen. I welcome you to the dedication of a memorial to a great American—Rear Adm. Richard Evelyn Byrd.

Ladies and gentlemen, "The National Anthem."

Captain Ham, of the Navy Chaplains Corps, will deliver the invocation.

Captain HAM. Eternal God, our Father, whose way is in the sea and whose path is upon the mighty waters, whose command is over all, and whose love never faileth, let us be aware of Thy presence and obedience to Thy will in this ceremony in which we dedicate a statue of remembrance to Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd of the U.S. Navy, and grant our God and Father that the qualities we remember in this memorial of daring and of courage and of steadfast devotion to country shall be a common possession of all our people that we shall walk in ways of peace and lead all the nations of the earth therein. Amen.

MELVILLE BELL GROSVENOR. As you see, we are honored by many distinguished guests, shipmates, and even classmates of Admiral Byrd's. Among our guests are Admiral Byrd's family. I have the honor to present to you the gracious lady whom many of us consider almost as much a discoverer as the admiral himself because she was his inspiration and loyal backer through these many years and right up to this day. Mrs. Marie Byrd, will you stand a minute? [Applause.] Thank you. Admiral Byrd's daughters are here and I will ask Mrs. William A. Clarke and four grandchildren to stand—Lynn, Marie, Lee, and Ricky. [Applause.] Mrs. Lawrence J. Stabler, Jr., and two grandchildren—Ann and David. [Applause.] Mrs. Robert G. Breyer and two grandchildren—Bobby and Amy. [Applause.] Another brilliant and able naval officer, Admiral Byrd's son, who accompanied him on a number of expeditions and has devoted his life to the memory of his father—Lt. Cmdr. Richard E. Byrd and four grandsons, Dickie, Levy, Ames, and Harry.

I also greet the admiral's brothers, two of Virginia's first citizens, Mr. Thomas E. Byrd who couldn't come. [Applause.] Oh, Mr. BYRD, I'm sorry you're supposed to be up here—and of course, Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD. [Applause.] And I certainly want to introduce to you the world-famous sculptor who conceived this beautiful memorial and got the marble from Italy, a solid block of the same Carrara marble that Michelangelo used and produced this wonderful statue which represents the admiral breasting the elements. We think it has caught the spirit of the admiral beautifully—Mr. Felix DeWeldon. [Applause.]

And now Mr. Vice President, Mrs. Byrd, Senator Byrd, Secretary Connally, ladies and gentlemen, I have the honor to formally welcome you to the dedication of this beautiful lasting memorial. And it is especially appropriate that this memorial to Mr. Antarctica should stand on the soil of Virginia, the home State of Admiral Byrd and his distinguished family. Also I might say it is the first monument on this great avenue which eventually will be lined with heroes of exploration, and science, and military, and all our great heroes of the past or the future—the admiral is the first. Of course, we owe deep gratitude to Mr. Conrad Wirth, the Director of National Park Service, for his wonderful assistance of all his people and himself in making this space available, and helping us erect the monument, and of course the National Park Service who will have charge of the memorial in the future. I call Dr. Conrad Wirth. Will you stand, sir? [Applause.]

With the passing of Admiral Byrd in March 1957, the world lost one of the greatest of all explorers. No man contributed more to our knowledge of the Arctic and Antarctic than he. The first man to fly over both poles, he will live in history as the Admiral of the Ends of the Earth. [Applause.] With the passing of Admiral Byrd the National Geographic Society lost a beloved friend, a life trustee, and an ally in the cause of discovery. But his courageous spirit lives on in our hearts and every one of our readers and the board of trustees. We have the inspiration of his wonderful expeditions and it's a wonderful thing for us all, this association.

I remember well the day in 1925 when Lieutenant Commander Dick visited the society's headquarters for the first time. He had come to see my father, Dr. Gilbert Grosvenor, then president of the society, to ask his backing for a new kind of exploration. The first use of the airplane in the Arctic. I had the honor of welcoming the young naval officer to the Geographic, and immediately I liked the cut of his jib. He was straight as a jack staff, handsome, and forthright. He had an enthusiasm and warmth that we of the National Geographic found instantly to our liking. We were greatly attracted by his bold plan to take planes into polar wastes.

Now today with jet liners flying across the Arctic and hundreds of thousands of people going up there it doesn't seem like anything. But in those days it was fantastic—just the thought of it. The expedition proved beyond a doubt that aerial exploration of the frozen north and the frozen south was feasible. It began an association between Admiral Byrd and the National Geographic that lasted the rest of his life. For three decades the society sponsored and supported Admiral Byrd in the explorations and daring adventures of his astonishing career. Admiral Byrd carried the society's flag on his historic flights over both poles.

The admiral showed his friendship in many ways. He named mountains in the Antarctic for both Dr. Gilbert Grosvenor and the late Dr. John Oliver LaGorce. Admiral Byrd contributed a long series of notable articles to the National Geographic magazine. They are among the most popular we have ever published. With his winning personality and unique exploits, Admiral Byrd was destined to become one of the brightest stars of the American lecture program. Audiences all over the United States thrilled to his talks and his superb films. On all those trips across the continent there were terrific campaigns. Mrs. Byrd followed him. I remember so well when he came to Washington he showed his lecture the first time to the National Geographic, she was always with him, looking out for him—a wonderful thing.

An avalanche of honors was heaped upon Admiral Byrd in his lifetime. The society presented him with its Hubbard Medal for his first flight over the pole in 1926. The Society struck a special Gold Medal for his aerial conquest of the South Pole and for his contributions to Antarctic knowledge.

Admiral Byrd could easily have basked in his early glories. To an ordinary man, successful flights over both poles might easily have been enough for a lifetime. But the admiral was not a man to deny the call of adventure or services to his country. No sooner had he returned from one expedition than he was preparing and hounding us to death, to tell you the truth—to go on another expedition to the Antarctic. It's marvellous.

Now this statue shows the determination in his face. With the assistance of Mrs. Byrd and Richard Byrd, Jr., the National Geographic Society undertook the planning and execution of this memorial designed by Felix DeWeldon. Dr. Conrad Wirth, a valued trustee of our society, and his National Capital Park Service gave their enthusiastic approval and aranged for this magnificent situation. The memorial will be in the keeping of the Park Service. The statue, ladies and gentlemen, is a symbol of our affection and esteem for our beloved Admiral of the Ends of the Earth—Richard Evelyn Byrd. Now ladies and gentlemen I have the honor to present a man who will tell you something of Admiral Byrd's unique naval career, the able Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable John B. Connally, Jr. [Applause.]

Hon. JOHN B. CONNALLY. Dr. Grosvenor, Mr. Vice President, Senator Byrd, Mrs. Byrd, members of the family, it's a great privilege and a high honor for me to be here today to represent the Navy in paying tribute to one of the great men of this country. May I at this time in behalf of the Navy say thanks to the National Geographic for erecting this monument—the first—to the admiral, to one of the outstanding men who ever wore the Navy blues. I know that you are familiar with Admiral Byrd's exploits after he made his historic flight over the North Pole in 1926. The record of his daring flights and pioneering Antarctic explorations forms an imperishable epic.

Today it seems fitting to recall some incidents from Admiral Byrd's early naval career. I believe they will give you an even deeper appreciation of this extraordinary man. From the very beginning he demonstrated the courage and determination that were to serve him so well when he faced the later hardships of polar expedition. Richard E. Byrd entered the U.S. Naval Academy in 1908. As a member of the football squad young Byrd broke his right foot. He fractured the same foot and ankle again in a fall while performing a difficult stunt he had devised for the flying rings which he later ruefully described as his first aerial adventure. Because of the injury, Midshipman Byrd missed his semiannual examinations. For 5 months he struggled with his lessons and lame leg. All except one bone in his ankle healed, and it clicked as he walked. In spite of excruciating pain, Byrd kept exercising his bad leg, and it gradually improved. He caught up with his studies and graduated with his class. Characteristically, years later Admiral Byrd wrote: "This terrific struggle I had made to graduate taught me a great lesson, that it is by struggle that we progress." The young officer reported in August 1917, to the Naval Aeronautic Station in Pensacola, Fla., for aviation instructions. And just 8 months later on April 17, 1918, Byrd became naval aviator No. 608. He conceived the idea of flying the Navy's new NC-1 flying boat across the Atlantic, with a stop in the Azores, to deliver it for service in Europe. The Armistice Day occurred and arrived before the idea could be put into practice, but it was typical of the imaginative planning that animated Admiral Byrd throughout his life. He once wrote: "From the moment I became a fullfledged Navy pilot, my ambition was to make a career out of aviation. Not merely in the sense of routine flying but rather in the pioneering sense." Few men have so well fulfilled an ambition. The young officer's career as a polar explorer began when he was given command of the Naval Aviation Unit that accompanied the 1925 Arctic Expedition of Donald B. MacMillan. During this distinguished career, Admiral Byrd led five expeditions to Antarctica. His conquest of the South Pole by air and the discovery of Marie Byrd Land climaxed his 1928–30 venture.

More than 450,000 square miles of land and surrounding waters were explored and mapped via ship and plane by the 1933–35 party. The 1939–41 journey delineated the hitherto shadowy Pacific coastline of the great continent. World War II halted work in the Antarctic, and Admiral Byrd returned to active duty in the Office of Chief of Navy Operations. It was at this time as a young naval ensign that I had the great privilege of meeting Admiral Byrd on several occasions. To be in his presence was a great inspiration and I stood in awe then as I now stand in awe on his magnificent accomplishments for his country. From 1942–45 he led important missions to the Pacific, including surveys of remote islands for airfields. Within a year after the war ended, Admiral Byrd—as might be expected—was back in the Antarctic—in force. The Navy's Operation Highjump in 1946 and 1947 was the biggest exploring expedition ever organized. Highjump fliers covered an area more than half as large as the United States and recorded 10 new mountain ranges. Admiral Byrd was officer in charge of our Nation's vast Antarctic program for the International Geophysical Year. In his new role, Admiral Byrd paid his last visit to Antarctica during Operation Deep Freeze I of 1955 and 1956. In farewell, he flew over the South Pole for the third time. The Navy demonstrated its high regard for Admiral Byrd's achievements with a host of awards and citations. These included the Navy Cross, the Distinguished Flying Cross, and the Distinguished Service Medal with a gold star. Not long before his passing, Admiral Byrd received his final award, the Medal of Freedom in recognition of his outstanding accomplishments as officer in charge, U.S. Antarctic programs, and his humanitarian contributions to the world. In beloved recognition of Admiral Byrd's great contributions to the Navy, to aviation, to exploration and to science the guided missile destroyer, U.S.S. *Richard E. Byrd* will be launched in February. I am confident that this splendid ship will do honor to the memory of this outstanding Naval Officer as she makes her way along the sea lanes of the world. And to express to people of all nations the prize the United States holds for one of its most distinguished citizens. Thank you. [Applause.]

MELVILLE BELL GROSVENOR. Thank you, Mr. Secretary, for a most inspiring and interesting talk. Now I have the pleasure and honor to present the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Dr. Grosvenor, Mrs. Byrd, and members of the Byrd family, my beloved friends—Senator Byrd and Secretary Connally—and my fellow Americans, in the halls of eternity where the recorders of history enshrine the memories of brave and superior men, there is a very special place reserved for those who strike out into the unknown.

As the years go by, all of us acquire a perspective on life which shatters some of our early dreams and some of our earlier illusions. But even though maturity may bring lessened enthusiasm and sometimes even cynicism, it never destroys our proper respect and reverence for those who courageously break new trails.

There is deeply embedded in the souls of every man and woman a desire for growth and a yearning to reach out for far horizons. Somehow, we instinctively sense that we must either grow or perish.

Most of us find ourselves imprisoned in the workaday cares of everyday life and early dreams of adventure fade with the passing of time. But every once in a while there comes a rare individual who pioneers the wastelands and sets the feet of his fellow human beings on new lands.

We have come here today to dedicate a memorial to such a man, his name was Richard Evelyn Byrd. I do not have to recount the life and times of this man because both are already a permanent part of the history of this country.

My only real task is to give some expression to the feelings of this generation toward Admiral Byrd, so that future generations will know that we were never insensitive to his greatness.

Admiral Byrd was one of those restless, striving souls who without, mankind would still be living in caves and gnawing at bones, half cooked over an open fire. He respected—but he was not content with the achievements of the past.

To Admiral Byrd, life was a glorious adventure which could be met adequately only by men who met it without fear and joy over the challenge of the unforeseen. He did not shrink from danger. Instead he faced peril with sure confidence and soul of immortal man was so strong that it would triumph over any hazard or any adversity.

I will always treasure his words when he explained why he was returning to the Antarctica for his fifth and last mission, and I quote them:

"Well, I like it there," he said, in response to a question. "I like the endless reaches of the wind-rippled snow, the stark peaks, the awesome glaciers."

"I like the clatter of the tractor chains, the whir of helicopters and the shouts of men wrestling with vehicles and gear. Yes, and the howling of huskies; they are still needed for rescue work. I like the symbols of life's triumphs in a lifeless land; the squawking skua gulls, the comical penguins, seals wheezing at their blowholes; the arching backs of whales."

"Most of all, I guess, I like the challenge of it, for America still plays for keeps. And I believe, as the scientists do, that the things we can learn there will have a profound effect upon the lives of us all."

These were the words of a man who lived life to the hilt; who enjoyed the conflict of man against nature; who had discovered the eternal truth that happiness comes only from great striving in a worthwhile cause. These were also the words of a man whose passing would be mourned, but whose life would serve as a perpetual inspiration for men who respect and honor their manhood.

Even before Admiral Byrd discovered Antarctica, the Byrds, of Virginia, had been serving this land we love. It is very very doubtful whether any other family has produced more statesmen from the beginning of our history to the present day.

From the original William Byrd, who arrived on these shores in 1671, up to my close and cherished friend who is here on the platform with me today, the Byrd family have displayed an independence and integrity of mind that has always made them outstanding in every generation.

I know the grief that befell upon Senator BYRD when his brother died. But I know also that the thought brought solace and healing comfort to him and to all the Byrd family.

It was that the man who had conquered the airspace over the Atlantic, who had mastered the North Pole and the South Pole, could never really die. And so it is a great honor and a high privilege and it is with a real sense of deep pride in myself as an American and as a friend of all the Byrds that I am privileged to come here with the family and those who served with him—Admiral Byrd—and with other Americans to dedicate this beautiful memorial, and to you, Dr. Grosvenor and the National Geographic, America owes you a deep debt of gratitude, so I take great pride in dedicating this memorial today to one of the great Americans of our time. [Applause.]

MELVILLE BELL GROSVENOR. Thank you, Mr. Vice President. I am sure that we will all go away with a wonderful feeling of appreciation of the admiral. I know that his grandchildren and his children will never forget your lovely tribute.

We are honored that Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD has consented to speak to us and now I have the pleasure in presenting Senator BYRD. [Applause.]

Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD. Mr. Vice President, the Secretary of the Navy, Dr. Grosvenor, and friends of Dick Byrd, and distinguished guests, I am so overcome by the tributes that have been paid to my brother that I cannot adequately express the appreciation of the Byrd family.

It is with a feeling of both honor and humility that we of the family are privileged to be here for the presentation of the Richard E. Byrd Memorial by the National Geographic Society.

I think it may be said if I may be permitted, that my brother Dick had four great dedications in life: He was dedicated to the family whom he loved; he was dedicated to his country which he cherished; he was dedicated to the Navy which he served; and he was dedicated to the National Geographic Society which he esteemed.

In this ceremony, representatives of all four have participated, and for the family I wish to express our profound gratitude to:

The Vice President of the United States, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, for whom we have such long standing devotion and respect and I have such a beloved personal friendship.

The Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable John B. Connally, Jr., for whom we have a great and growing admiration; and to the National Geographic Society which is now under the direction of another of its unbroken lines of distinguished presidents—Dr. Melville B. Grosvenor.

To you, Dr. Grosvenor, may I repeat what my brother Dick has said before. Perhaps you will recall the great occasion.

Addressing the members of the National Geographic Society, he said, "Other than the flag of my country, I know of no greater privilege than to carry the emblem of the National Geographic Society."

I know how deeply grateful he was for the society's assistance and interest in his projects on more than one occasion, and I know the pride with which he served on your board of trustees.

In the past you bestowed upon him your highest awards:

Both the Hubbard Medal and your special Medal of Honor, and you now dedicate the greatest honor of all—this Richard E. Byrd Memorial.

It is difficult for one of his family to find words as I have said to describe our feeling at this time. We know well the great mission of the National Geographic Society and its fine record for constructive achievement.

From its beginning under the great Gardiner Greene Hubbard and Alexander Graham Bell, the society has done a wonderful work unequaled in human history in its promotion of geographic research and dissemination of information in a manner that can be understood by all.

In more recent years, during the administration of Dr. Gilbert Grosvenor, Dr. John Oliver La Gorce, and now Dr. Melville Bell Grosvenor, and Dr. Thomas W. McKnew, the society has become the greatest scientific and educational organization in the world, with nearly 2 to 3 million members.

Certainly, no other private institution has done so much to support bold hands when they have sought to draw the veil from the mysteries of the world.

And over the years the National Geographic Society has developed the art and the means for describing what the world has to offer in a manner that has opened the eyes of all to the dazzling spectacles of science and sound speculation.

It has stimulated intellectual energy and excitement in the search for the exact knowledge of the sciences. And in addition it has contributed immensely to the creation of an insatiable curiosity as to the source and direction of great developments and their universal significance.

The memorial unveiled before us, the acts of this occasion, and the words of those spoken before me, indeed, constitute great honor.

We are pleased, immensely pleased, that the setting of the ceremony is on the soil within the geographical borders of Virginia and that the significance of the memorial has been recognized by resolution passed by both Houses of the Congress of the United States.

We feel that the occasion and the memorial are symbolic of the will and the courage to open even vaster horizons for the benefit of all mankind.

We know that this is the objective of the National Geographic Society. We know this is the national objective of our country; and certainly it is the hope of our family.

To all who have contributed to this event, please be assured that you have our deepest gratitude.

I thank you. [Applause.]

MELVILLE BELL GROSVENOR. Thank you Senator BYRD for those wonderful remarks. May I say on behalf of our National Geographic Society trustees and many of the young staff here, we will strive to carry on in the future what you have said about our predecessors.

Thank you sir, very much. Now may I thank you all again, especially those who have come from afar to honor Admiral Byrd, and to tell you how much we appreciate your coming—and I speak on behalf of Mrs. Byrd, the family—and it is appropriate now to conclude this meeting with this tribute to the "Admiral of the Ends of the Earth." [Applause.]

SUPPORT FOR CONGRESSIONAL TRADE VETO

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on Monday I addressed the Senate and urged that the President include in his new trade bill provision for a congressional veto. A congressional veto would serve two purposes. One, it would assist in the development of balanced trade legislation, reserving to the Congress some portion of its constitutional power in trade matters; and, two, it would help win over the wide support needed in the Congress to pass forward-looking trade legislation.

Mr. President, I am extremely serious about this proposal. I think it would have real meaning. In brief, the President would submit new trade agreements or modifications thereof to both bodies of the Congress. If they did not act before a period of 60 days had expired, the agreement or modification would automatically go into effect. However, if both bodies, by a two-thirds vote, indicated disapproval, which would only be likely in extreme instances, then the agreement or modification in question would be returned to the President.

The very act of submitting agreements or modifications to the Congress would have a useful purpose. Bringing the Congress into the process of reviewing and studying trade agreements is certainly desirable. Even if the Congress did not act at all, the views of interested Members and committees would very likely be transmitted, either formally or informally to the relevant executive agency. I hope that the administration will give long, serious consideration to including congressional disapproval provisions in the proposed 1962 Trade Extension Act.

Mr. President, let me make one additional point. There would be no serious timelag involved in having new trade agreements and modifications lay over for 60 days on Capitol Hill. I point out that the agreement announced this week which was negotiated with the Common Market took 16 months to negotiate. If we can negotiate for 16 months, as we must, certainly we can afford to give the Congress a 60-day opportunity to think it over.

Mr. President, I was delighted recently to read an editorial which appeared in the New York Daily News on December 30 supporting a two-thirds congressional trade veto. The Daily News has taken a constructive position in support of needed trade improvements in an orderly way. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial appear in the Record.

There being on objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Right You Are, Senator

President Kennedy intends to ask the upcoming Congress (convenes January 10) for power to make across-the-board tariff-cut deals with other nations, or with international trading blocs such as the European Common Market.

THE PRESIDENT AS TARIFF DICTATOR

This would greatly dilute Congress power to "lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises," as granted in article 1, section 8 of the Constitution.

Senator Kenneth B. Keating, Republican of New York, counterproposes that the President be given broad tariff-cutting powers, but that Congress keep a right to veto by a two-thirds vote any individual tariff agreement the President may make. That, or something along that line, looks reasonable to us.

True, the Common Market may build up into a considerable threat to the U.S. economy—which would make it advisable to give the President a good deal more tariff-adjusting leeway than he has under the reciprocal trade agreement law.

But it's hard to imagine any world-trade emergency which would justify Congress in giving the White House virtually dictatorial powers over duties collected on imports.

SENATOR SCOTT URGES ALLIANCE FOR LIBERTY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to an article written by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] who voices sentiments about American foreign policy which are shared by many Members of this body.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], who recently returned from an official assignment as a U.S. delegate to the NATO Parliamentarians Conference in Paris, questions the wisdom of present U.S. policy in dealing with so-called neutralist nations. He suggests as an alternative that the United States should give more attention to our allies in the struggle against communism through an alliance for liberty.

These feelings are shared by many Members on both sides of the aisle. They express a philosophy similar to my own when I proposed in the 87th Congress an amendment which was enacted and which stated:

> It is the sense of Congress that in the administration of these funds great attention and consideration should be given to those nations which share the view of the United States on the world crisis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article which appears in the current issue of the Shingle, the publication of the Philadelphia Bar Association.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Needed: An Alliance for Liberty

(By U.S. Senator Hugh Scott)

"The Trouble With Harry," according to the motion picture of that title, was that he was dead. And the trouble with American foreign policy today is that parts of it are dead and our Government has not yet devised new and dramatic policies to deal with conditions around the world.

Many of us in Congress believe that the American policy of dealing with neutralist countries needs a thorough overhauling.

Neutralist is the not wholly accurate term applied to certain nations which refuse to identify themselves with either the free or the Communist countries. The would-be leader of the neutralists is India. Other members of this bloc include most of the Arab countries, several nations in the Far East and Africa, and such Red "bedfellows" as Yugoslavia and Cuba.

These countries are not neutral in the sense that Switzerland is neutral because of its long history of nonbelligerance, or in the sense that Finland is neutral because geography forces it to look down the barrels of Russian cannon. But rather the neutralists fancy themselves as a third bloc or third force of nations which attempt to act as counterweights in the East-West struggle.

In a world of peaceful competition between peace-loving nations there would be room for this sort of Venetian diplomacy. But in a world where barbed wire separates slave states from free nations, national leaders who fail to distinguish between the principles of freedom and the principles of Lenin seriously undermine the strength of the free world.

For years a considerable body of opinion in the United States urged us to understand and accept the position of the neutralists. Most of these countries, being newly independent, seemed preoccupied with domestic problems. Their leaders professed to think of freedom in its purest terms and criticized the major powers for compromising on certain issues.

Their concern about the immense nuclear power which four big powers possess was natural.

But many Americans disregarded the fact that some neutralist leaders played both sides against the middle for their own national or personal advantages. Some Americans were bluffed by those neutralists who threatened to turn to the Soviets if we did not provide them with financial help.

Many people overlooked even the one-sided neutralist reasoning on atomic tests. For 3 years neither we nor the Russians tested nuclear weapons and we met regularly with the Soviets to reach agreement for a permanent ban on testing. But the neutralists castigated the United States for insisting that before there could be a permanent agreement there must be adequate inspections to be sure that no one was cheating.

Suddenly last summer Nikita Khrushchev announced that he would resume aboveground nuclear tests. The day he made this announcement the heads of 24 neutralist nations were meeting in Belgrade. The world waited to hear what they would say.

Their opportunity for leadership had arrived. The uncommitted people of the world had an opportunity that had not been theirs before—and may never be theirs again. One of the great powers had broken its word. Russia was now triggering off the armaments race which the neutralists in prior years had decried in speech after speech. Soviet nuclear fallout would soon fill the atmosphere.

This was a time for greatness. A unanimous declaration condemning the Soviet action could have galvanized public opinion around the world like nothing had done since the end of World War II. But there was no greatness at Belgrade. Some neutralist leaders spoke briefly of their regret. Others said they understood why Russia had to take this action. This sounded to a dismayed free world like Tweedledum who said to Alice: "I'm very brave generally, only today I happen to have a headache."

When the gathering of neutralist heads of state adjourned a few days later they issued a curious declaration. It called for peace, but said not a word about the Soviet Union's nuclear testing.

It criticized the United States for maintaining its naval base at Guantanamo Bay in Cuba, but said nothing about Soviet enslavement of Hungary and other eastern European nations.

It demanded the evacuation of French armed forces from Tunisia, but not Chinese armed forces from Tibet.

What little idealism there ever had been in neutralism died suddenly last summer in Belgrade, and it is incumbent upon our Government to reevaluate our policies toward neutralists and to deal more realistically in the interest of the free world.

From the end of World War II until March 31, 1961, the United States gave and loaned more than $6 billion to the 24 neutralist countries. The following table gives the totals of loans and grants:

[In millions of dollars]

Yugoslavia	2,081
India	1,906
Indonesia	479
United Arab Republic	346
Cambodia	257
Morocco	168
Tunisia	142
Afghanistan	116
Lebanon	83
Ethiopia	79
Burma	73
Iraq	69
Ceylon	63
Cuba	54
Sudan	31
Nepal	27
Saudi Arabia	27
Congo Republic	19
Yemen	10
Cyprus	7
Somali Republic	7
Ghana	5
Guinea	2
Mali (figures not available).	
Total	6,051

Tito of Yugoslavia, who accepted $2 billion in U.S. aid, now is blaming the West for all international tensions and wants us to accept the Russian solution for West Germany and West Berlin, which could only mean certain capitulation in Europe.

India, which also has benefited by some $2 billion in U.S. aid, has almost an unbroken record of voting with the Red bloc at the United Nations or abstaining on issues which might embarrass Moscow.

Nasser of Egypt, the frustrated fuehrer of the Pharaoh's land, has received $346 million from the United States. But just last month an American correspondent reported from Cairo: "Most observers and, one might safely say, most Egyptians are unaware of the extent of U.S. aid since the Nasser revolution of 1952.

If our hope had been to encourage freedom that hope has been in vain. When neutralists call for liberty and self-determination, they mean for members only. We cannot have a national policy that disregards all the other people on the earth.

The United States should now offer the world an alliance for liberty dedicated to the principle that all people have the right to be free and that all nations have the right to be sovereign. We should invite like-minded nations to join with us in this alliance, not to accept our economic or our political system, but to pledge allegiance in joint convenant to the ultimate freedom of mankind everywhere.

Great cracks and fissures are opening within the Communist bloc of nations. There is fighting in the cockpits of Marxism, but it is conflict over what kind of communism is to rule the world. They are back to their old games of rewriting history, tearing down statues, and now exhuming graves. Perhaps by the time this article appears, the secession of Albania from Russia may have opened up new cracks elsewhere in the system.

Now is the time for the free world to show its greatness. When people are asked to choose between our way of life and the Communists they must know that we will share our strength with them if they opt to go with us. Our loyalty to liberty is our most persuasive and compelling argument. We will not compromise it.

As President Kennedy has suggested our treatment of nations who share our views in times of crises should differ considerably from dealings with the others.

Neutralists for profit or power are not natural allies of activists for freedom.

RED STRENGTH IN UNITED STATES DOWN 90 PERCENT SINCE 1944

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, to meet the challenge of Communist aggression from the Soviet Union and Red China in this grim period of international anarchy, our country needs the harmonious accord of all our citizens.

As Walter Lippmann, America's greatest and most respected columnist, said so eloquently in his outstanding speech before the Women's National Press Club dinner earlier this month—

> We shall lose our power to cope with our problems if we allow ourselves to become a stagnant, neurotic, frightened and suspicious people.

It is unfortunate that at a time when a united America is more necessary than ever before in our history, some of our fellow citizens enjoy seeing Communists under their neighbor's beds. Years ago I remember as a boy in Norwalk, Ohio, being told of an old maid who would hoist her skirt and scream at an imaginary mouse. Those right wing fringe eccentrics who imagine Communists infiltrating our free press, our college faculties, the State Department, clergy, and all branches of our State and Federal governments remind me of the couplet:

Last night I saw upon the stair
A little man who wasn't there,
He wasn't there again today;
Oh, how I wish he'd go away.

In the Washington Post of December 24, 1961, there appeared an excellent, well-documented article by Edward T. Folliard headlined "Red Strength in United States Down 90 Percent Since 1944." I commend this outstanding example of newspaper reporting to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED STRENGTH IN UNITED STATES DOWN 90 PERCENT SINCE 1944

(By Edward T. Folliard)

The Communist Party in the United States has lost something like 90 percent in membership since it reached its peak numerical strength 17 years ago.

This is an official estimate, prepared for the Washington Post by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, the arm of Government responsible for keeping an eye on Reds at home.

The FBI says that the Communist Party in the United States reached a top strength of 80,000 in 1944. That was a year when the Western Allies and Russia's Red Army were driving to crush Hitler's Wehrmacht, a year when there was extraordinary tolerance for homegrown Communists.

NOW NEAR 10,000

The FBI estimates that the numerical strength of the Communist Party in the United States has now nosedived to between 8,000 and 10,000.

It is a paradox that, as the Communist Party in this country has grown weaker, the uproar against it by rightwing extremists has grown louder. Robert Welch, founder of the John Birch Society, has been saying, for example, that "our danger remains almost entirely internal, from Communist influence right in our midst and treason right in our Government."

President Kennedy, in recent speeches on the west coast, tore into the extremists—"fanatics," as he called them—who look suspiciously at their neighbors and their leaders and who find treason in our churches, in our highest court, in our treatment of water. He said that the extremists, by their clamor, "inspire uncertainty among our allies" and give a dangerously wrong impression to our foes.

His brother, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, says that the rightwing extremists are "a tremendous danger and a tremendous disturbance to our system of government."

He says that he has no sympathy for "those, who in the name of fighting communism, sow seeds of suspicion and distrust by making false or irresponsible charges, not only against their neighbors, but against courageous teachers and public officials and against the foundations of our Government—Congress, the Supreme Court, and even the Presidency itself."

HOOVER BACKS STAND

Attorney General Kennedy says he is backed in this stand by a man who is a glamorous hero in the eyes of the John Birch Society and other extremist outfits, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI.

In a speech before the Associated Press managing editors at Dallas, Tex., on November 15, Kennedy said:

"As a vigilant, experienced American, who has real credentials as a Communist fighter—J. Edgar Hoover—has said, such actions play into Communist hands and hinder, rather than aid, the fight against communism."

The Attorney General says that the greatest problem in the United States is not the Communist Party here.

"The Communist Party," he says, "is directed and controlled by the Soviet Union. That has to be a matter of concern, but that is being studied and watched continuously by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

"An even greater problem is the espionage that goes on by representatives of Iron Curtain countries here in the United States. There's nothing a vigilante group is going to do about that."

FBI WATCHING SPIES

Kennedy says that the FBI is watching the spies from behind the Iron Curtain and doing a good job of it.

As for Robert Welch of the John Birch Society, Kennedy says he has claimed to have found only one Communist—former President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Why has the Communist Party in the United States lost such an immense part of its membership?

The FBI gives a number of reasons—the prosecution of Communist Party members by the Government under laws passed by Congress, desertions by party members who have become disillusioned, effective work by the FBI, and other agencies in the field of internal security, and a purging of those party members that the Red leaders in this country felt were not dedicated to the ideology of Marx and Lenin.

Although the FBI doesn't list it, the chief reason for the Communist Party's weakness in this country is that the climate is not congenial for Reds. The United States is a prosperous country, made up of people who for the most part cherish its freedoms, and who look upon the harsh, oppressive Communist system as hideous and abhorrent.

DANGER IS STRESSED

The FBI says that the Communist Party in the United States is dangerous in spite of the great shrinkage in its membership, and adds:

"The Communists operate on Leninist principles of organization; namely, that the party must be a small, select, hard-core group dedicated to violent revolution. The party through the fanaticism of its members and strategic placement in key industries and groups, is able time after time to wield an influence far out of proportion to its actual numbers.

"Moreover, in times of emergency, Communist parties have the power of swift growth when ex-members may be reactivated. The party today consists of hard-core members with the weaklings, halfhearted and fainthearted winnowed out.

"Another point might be mentioned: At times when party membership is small, an increased emphasis is placed on front groups. These fronts then become ever more important to the party as transmission belts to non-Communists."

Attorney General Kennedy has been saying in various parts of the country that the FBI is well able to handle the Communist threat.

REJECTED BY PEOPLE

"If we think that the great problem in the United States now is the fact that there are 10,000 Communists here," he said in Dallas, "if we think that that's what's going to destroy this country, we are in very bad shape."

He said in Columbia, S.C., more recently that the Communists have no political power in the United States because "they have been rejected by the American people." Anyway, he said, the FBI could handle the Communist Party and also the problem of Communist spies from overseas.

"A vigilante group cannot deal with it," Kennedy said. "It takes expertness in the field of law enforcement. If any individual or group has information about Communists they should make that information available to the FBI.

"That seems to me an adequate way of dealing with the problem, not running around with guns and figuring that there are Communists in every corner. It is just not true.

"The great problem is strengthening our country so that we are going to be able to stand up to the Soviet Union."

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. Folliard cites FBI estimates that membership in the Communist Party of the United States has dropped from a peak of 80,000 in 1944 to between 8,000 and 10,000 members today. Although the Communist Party is still dangerous in spite of its shrinkage, Edward Folliard pointed out that as it has become smaller and weaker, the uproar against it by rightwing lunatic extremists has grown louder and louder. Communists in the United States seek to further the cause of the international Communist conspiracy as tools of the Kremlin. In the huge municipal stadium in Cleveland watching the Cleveland Browns, or at the Ohio State stadium in Columbus watching that great championship team playing a Big Ten opponent, of 80,000 spectators in attendance only 4 might be Communists. This on the basis of FBI estimates. Shades of Valley Forge, Gettysburg, or the Normandy beachhead. Do we need self-appointed vigilantes of the John Birch Society to reinforce our police departments, FBI, and our Armed Forces?

I suspect that if the truth were known, many extremists bemoan the fact that Communist influence and membership has declined markedly. These demagogs of the rightwing fringe are finding it increasingly difficult to cloak their real ambitions for a Fascist-like totalitarian form of government in the United States.

Radicals of the "right" practice character assassination without regard for the truth, threaten merchants with boycotts, and threaten college professors and school principals with dismissal. They spread fear, hatred, and suspicion. They ignore the very real menace of aggression from Communists in the Kremlin and from Red China.

These are the tactics required to undermine a free society and democratic institutions. In their attempt to spread fascism, a sister ideology of communism, leading John Birchers are in reality furthering Communist aims. In my judgment, the John Birch Society and others of a like ilk unless fully exposed might be as serious a threat to our security and way of life as is internal communism.

The President has strongly denounced these extremists. Attorney General Robert Kennedy has called them a tremendous danger—a tremendous disturbance to our system of government. J. Edgar Hoover has stated that their actions play into Communist hands and hinder, rather than aid, the fight against communism. Our leaders and the press are performing a great service in informing Americans of the dangers inherent in the activities of these rightwing lunatics.

With the people informed, this totalitarianism of the right will be rejected and our traditional American way of life will continue to flourish.

Mr. President, we must hold fast to our heritage as free men and women. We must renew our confidence in each other, our tolerances, and our sense of being good neighbors.

We must repudiate the lunatic fringe of the right and of the left—those men of small faith, or none whatever, plotting to overthrow our free society.

PASSPORT PROCEDURE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this morning there appeared in the Washington Post an editorial entitled "Passport Procedure." It is one of the finest, one of the most able and, in my judgment, one of the most penetrating analyses of this problem that I have ever been privileged to read in any newspaper in this country. As one who for years has tried to be a student of the Constitution, I wish to extend to the writer of the editorial on the editorial staff of the Washington Post, whoever he may be, my very sincere congratulations. I think the editorial helps to clear the public opinion atmosphere in regard to this problem. A great public service has been rendered by the editorial.

I do not feel that the editorial, in fact, violates the spirit and the intent of the policy, custom, and rule of the Congress in regard to insertions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of any material that comments critically upon other Members of Congress. I do not think that my friend Representative WALTER would disagree with that observation, although this editorial comments upon his position on an issue which is contrary to my position on the issue. Therefore, subject to the advice of the Parliamentarian, which I have not had time to seek, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the editorial be printed in the RECORD which makes no reference to any other Member of Congress. But if it would be within the rules to have printed in the RECORD the entire editorial, I would like to have it all in, because I think in its entirety it will be very much more helpful to the reader.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PASSPORT PROCEDURE

"The right to travel is a part of the liberty of which the citizen cannot be deprived without due process of law under the fifth amendment." So said the Supreme Court of the United States when it decided the Kent case in 1958. In deference to the Supreme Court, the Department of State a few days ago issued new passport regulations providing a due process hearing and appeal for anyone to whom a passport may be denied. For this deference to judicial authority, Representative FRANCIS WALTER accused the Department of violating law and contemptuously disregarding Congress.

The Department's new passport regulations provide that in the hearing and appeal available when a passport is denied, the applicant shall be accorded the right to appear, to be represented by counsel, to present evidence, to be informed of the evidence against him and the source of such evidence, and to confront and cross-examine adverse witnesses. These are the essential elements of due process. Rooted in experience, they afford indispensable means toward the rendering of fair and reasonable judgments.

Mr. WALTER wants the Department of State to abandon these procedures. He wants the Department to deny passports to citizens of the United States on the mere say-so of anonymous informers, without allowing the applicant to confront the informers and cross-examine them, without allowing even the officials of the Department to know the identity of the informers. Apart from the fact that the Supreme Court has expressly declared that such procedure is forbidden by the Constitution, it is forbidden by commonsense as well. For decisions based on such evidence are not judgments at all; they are nothing more than capricious and arbitrary guesses.

No one can question Mr. WALTER's zeal to protect American security. But what kind of America will he have made secure if its citizens can be denied constitutional rights and deprived of liberty by the mere whim of administrative officers? We congratulate the Department of State for restoring fairness to its passport procedures. "For," as Judge Charles Fahy put it recently in an essay on "The Right To Travel," "liberty is precious and one may be deprived of it only by methods which are fair and for reasons which are sound and rest on the common good, on a good so great as to outweigh in some circumstances the great good of individual liberty."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was so moved by the editorial that I saw fit to send a letter to the Attorney General of the United States this morning on the subject of passports because, as Senators know, for years I have taken a very definite position in the Senate in regard to the constitutional questions that have been involved in the passport controversy. I wrote to the Attorney General as follows:

Hon. ROBERT KENNEDY,
Attorney General.

DEAR MR. KENNEDY: This letter is to advise you of my gratification with the regulations you worked out with the Department of State to govern the issuance of passports to persons believed to be Communists. In my opinion, it is long past time for the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government to observe the provisions of the Constitution which too often are left to the courts alone to protect.

I know from my own experience that this area of domestic security against the Communist conspiracy is one of the most misunderstood issues of the cold war. As you know, after the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the State Department could not withhold passports in the absence of legislative authority to do so, the previous administration tried to get Congress to pass such legislation. Unfortunately, it also sought congressional sanction of the use of star-chamber methods in determining whether a passport should be withheld.

The use of secret information available only to the official making the decision and denied to the individual who is exercising a given right is nothing but a police-state procedure. Whether the practice is used in connection with passports or any other official matter, it is the earmark of totalitarianism. It certainly is one of the principal abuses of Executive power from which our constitutional forefathers tried to save the American people.

The right to know the identity of an accuser, to know the nature of the accusation, and the right to offer rebuttal are basic to due process of law. It is always astonishing to me that some people would destroy these Constitution guarantees of due process of law in the name of defending the Constitution.

It was for this reason that I opposed this legislation in 1958 and again in 1959. I especially objected to the attempt to rush a bill through the Congress in the closing days of the 85th Congress, with only a few days of hearings. I therefore objected to the holding of hearings while the Senate was in session, and as a result, no final action was taken. It was rather shocking to me that when members of the Foreign Relations Committee proposed legislation authorizing the withholding of passports with proper procedural safeguards, the Department of State declared: "Moreover, the Department must oppose any provision which might require the Secretary to make his determination on a particular passport application only on the basis of information and sources thereof which could be disclosed in open court."

Obviously, to make the determination on any other basis is repugnant to the terms and to the principles of our Constitution. I am pleased that you have now made this perfectly clear. I am also pleased that this battle I waged against police-state methods has been vindicated, and I am so informing Mr. Roger Jones, the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, as well as yourself.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. President, this announced policy of the administration represents a very important contribution to constitutional guarantees on the part of this administration. It is a reaffirmation, with no question of doubt, with no equivocation, that these precious constitutional rights of due process will be respected by this administration. I congratulate the President of the United States that under his administration this very clear and unequivocal position in regard to the passport issue has been announced.

THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am one who is very much disturbed and concerned about the discussions which have been carried on in the press with respect to the nomination of Mr. McCone as Director of the CIA. I have reached no final determination as to my own position on that nomination, because all the facts are not in. Before I make my final decision, I shall await the hearings before the committee, the report of the committee, and my own analysis of the record as it is finally presented to me as a Member of the Senate.

I do most respectfully say, however, in view of the information which has already been publicized, that the burden of proof is on the administration to justify this nomination. Every shadow of doubt as to the qualification of this nominee ought to be removed.

Mr. President, we are dealing here with an operation of an agency which also gives me great concern as a constitutionalist. We are dealing here with an agency in which the people do not have very effective checks as of now. We are dealing here with an agency whose operations are conducted in complete secrecy, even so far as the elected representatives of a free people in the Congress of the United States are concerned.

I hold to the point of view that in our Republic the adoption of procedures of complete secrecy are difficult to justify under our constitutional system. I have never been one who holds to the point of view that the CIA should be allowed to operate as it now operates, in complete secrecy with respect to the attaining of knowledge of its actions by the elected representatives of a free people in the parliamentary body in our form of government, which is the Congress of the United States. Why do I say that? I say it as a constitutionalist. I find great difficulty reconciling the granting of such power to the CIA with that basic safeguard of freedom guaranteed to our people by the Constitution known as the check and balance system.

Where is the check on the CIA? Mr. President, do not tell me that the check is to be found in the office of the Presidency of the United States. I speak quite impersonally. It makes no difference to me who occupies the Presidency of the United States when we deal with a question of constitutional power and constitutional guarantees. I say, as I have said before, it is not safe for freedom to grant any agency of government, no matter how much it is attempted to cloak it under the name of security, the unchecked power now vested in the CIA.

Therefore, when the nomination for Director of CIA comes to the floor of the Senate, as long as that unchecked power remains vested in the CIA, it is incumbent upon us to see that the greatest care be exercised by us under the advise and consent clause of the Constitution in respect to that nomination. Unless every shadow of doubt is removed from this nominee as to his qualification, the senior Senator from Oregon will not possibly be able to vote for the confirmation of the nomination.

More than that, I believe that when the nomination is under consideration may be a fitting time to raise this whole question of unchecked CIA power on this side of the aisle. Much has been heard on this side of the aisle in recent years, when a representative of the party of the opposition occupied the White House, in respect to the CIA. As far as I am concerned, these issues are always two-way streets. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the Democratic side of the aisle in the Senate in this session of Congress to take a long, hard look at the question as to whether we are going to continue to permit the CIA to function with unchecked power, so far as the legislative branch of the Government is concerned, which is irreconcilable, in my opinion, with the very precious constitutional guarantee of checks and balances.

Mr. President, do not tell me that it is not safe to permit the elected parliamentary officials of a free people to take a look at the activities of the CIA, but that it is perfectly safe to allow a considerable number of unelected people, who never had to meet the challenge of a free ballot box in this Republic—not only on the staff of the CIA, but down in the Pentagon and in the State Department and at the White House staff level—to have knowledge as to the operations of the CIA. It is difficult to justify permitting appointed staff members of the executive branch to have access to CIA information and then say that the elected representatives of a free people must not have access to the activities, the maneuverings and, yes, sometimes, as I am satisfied, and as we already know and the record shows, manipulations in the field of foreign policy by CIA.

With the issue of war and peace so nip and tuck in our time, it is all the more important that we see to it that the check and balance policy of our Constitution be carried out in full.

Therefore the senior Senator from Oregon will continue to support, may I say to my Democratic colleagues—and I hope there will be sufficient Republican support—the passage of legislation in this session of Congress which places a congressional check on the CIA.

The time to consider it is now, when we have before the Senate of the United States the question of the confirmation of the nomination of the head of the CIA.

What are we afraid of? Freedom? What are we afraid of? The constitutional principles of the organic law of this land, which become meaningless if we sacrifice the check and balance system?

I am for as much check on the congressional branch of the Government as I am for a check on the executive branch. However, here in respect to the CIA we have an unchecked executive power that ought to be brought to an end.

We need to keep in mind that foreign policy is not the property of the President. The foreign policy of the United States is the property of the American people—all of them. All the President is, as I have said many times before, is the administrator of the people's foreign policy. I am concerned about being confronted with after-the-fact situations—after the CIA has created problems, as it has in the past—in certain foreign lands, which, in my judgment, have caused embarrassment to the United States. I speak as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs. It is well known by members of my subcommittee that I am not too happy about some of the manipulations by the CIA in Latin America in times gone by. I think the policies of the CIA ought to be changed. What is wrong with that? What are we afraid of?

Do not tell me, Mr. President, that to preserve freedom, we must adopt the police state methods of communism or fascism. I renounce that theory. However, I see no escape from the premise that if we continue to tolerate the unchecked power of the CIA, we are adopting a police state procedure.

Let the record be clear as to what the operations of the CIA, in part, are. They deal with the whole question of espionage. They deal with the whole question of spy activity. This is necessary. I have joined in voting millions of dollars for such activities of the CIA and shall continue to do so in the interest of security. However, I only insist upon the exercise of the constitutional right of Congress to check upon the work of that agency, which deals with espionage and spy activities. Apparently we have come to the pass where today it is necessary to have legislation for that purpose. That was not true in the early history of the Republic. What is needed is to review the relationship between Congress and the Executive in the early history of the Government. Would we have told Webster or Calhoun, or any of the other great forefathers who trod the carpet of this great parliamentary Chamber, that it was necessary to have legislation to enable the legislative branch of the Government to find out what the executive branch of the Government was doing in some cloak-and-dagger operation somewhere in the world which might very well involve the suffering and the lives of tens upon tens of thousands of American boys? What would Jefferson have said about such an unchecked power at the time of his Presidency? All of these forefathers and many more would have thrown up their hands in horror at the suggestion that this was not an inherent right of Congress, ingrained in our constitutional system. As a matter of right, Congress should know what the CIA is doing, has done, and contemplates doing in connection with its operations in any foreign land.

I am one who believes that in this year of 1962 we may very well determine the whole future, if there is to be one, of the history of the United States.

I say most respectfully to my President—and I use the word in its proper sense—I truly love him for his great statesmanship and leadership. However, I say to my President, from the floor of the Senate today, that the greatest defense weapon which the American people have is the Constitution of the United States, with all the guarantees of procedural rights specifically spelled out and clearly inherent in it, and unanswerably implied, as well. With the utmost respect for the President of the United States, I raise the question: Why continue, under your administration, this unchecked, unreviewable policy of the CIA in the field of foreign policy? It is such unchecked power that can cause a war. Once the war situation is created and the incident has occurred, even though it might constitute a second "sinking of the *Maine*," there is no question as to what the action of Congress has to be.

We are in a situation in which we shall probably never again see Congress pass a declaration of war prior to the beginning of war. I think the probabilities are much greater that war will have started and that Congress, after the fact, will declare war. That is why this Senator is so much concerned about the unchecked power, exercised by the CIA or any other agency of Government.

So I raise my voice today with this warning, because a full discussion of the facts of the problem should not be avoided in the consideration of the McCone nomination.

I close by saying that I shall make my final decision on the McCone nomination when the whole record is in. But my administration has the burden of proof on that record, because from the objections and such documentation as I have already read, the administration cannot escape that burden of proof. We have been reading in recent days allegations, supported by documentation, which has been offered us for our consideration, but which, I hasten to add, should be subjected to the most thorough cross examination and analysis, in the form of a series of columns written by Drew Pearson. I have referred to Drew Pearson on other occasions, even when he has dipped his pen in my blood, as well as that of other Senators, to be undoubtedly the most able and effective muckraker of our time. But let us also recognize that the muckrakers throughout our history have performed a great public service to the American people. They are needed. Sometimes I think their breed should multiply. Be that as it may, I think the columns of Drew Pearson concerning McCone certainly place upon the administration the burden of proof of answering them, because we are hearing from home about them. What do we read in the letters which come in, as they are coming in to me? "Is this true? Is that true? Is this true about this nominee as I read today or yesterday or the day before yesterday, in a Pearson column?"

I understand that as of January 17, 1962, Mr. Pearson wrote a column on the McCone nomination which was rather heavily edited by clipping shears by many newspapers. By that I mean that his article was not printed in full. I shall offer that column for printing in full at this time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire column written by Drew Pearson, and published by the Bell Syndicate on January 17, 1962, printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JOHN MCCONE DID NOT SELL HIS STOCK WHEN HE BECAME AEC CHAIRMAN—HIS SHIPPING LINES DID PROFITABLE BUSINESS WITH AEC CONTRACTORS—THE LAW DOES NOT PERMIT ANY CHOICE ON CONFLICT OF INTEREST

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—In June 1958, John A. McCone, the new would-be Central Intelligence Chief, wrote a letter to Sherman Adams, later kicked out of Government for a conflict of interest, to see whether he, McCone, might have a conflict of interest as new Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Ignoring the fact that the Goldfine charges against Adams had not made him the best man to act as judge, McCone listed the Utah Construction Co., Kaiser Engineers, Dow Chemical, Union Carbide as doing large business with the Atomic Energy Commission, and simultaneously doing business with his own privately owned shipping companies.

Significantly, two of these companies, Kaiser and Utah Construction, showed the pattern of business links McCone has kept with his old associates and war profiteers. McCone was president and a partner with Henry Kaiser and associates in running the California Shipbuilding Co. during the war when they rolled an investment of $100,000 into an overall profit of $44 million.

Later, when he was Under Secretary of the Air Force, McCone gave his old partner a quickie Flying Boxcar contract at three times the cost the Air Force was paying Fairchild. Incidentally, Senate hearings conducted by the late Senator Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire, showed that Kaiser and his subsidiaries got a total of $219,011,919 in Government RFC loans; received $6,568 million in Government contracts, and got approximately half a billion dollars in quickie tax writeoffs.

BIG AEC CONTRACTORS

Kaiser has also been one of the biggest contractors with the Atomic Energy Commission including the period when Kaiser's old partner, John McCone, was AEC Chairman.

The company which operates under the all-inclusive name of Utah Construction Co. is also part owned by Kaiser and actually is a big seller of uranium to the AEC through its subsidiary, Lucky Mc Uranium Corp.

Union Carbide is one of the biggest contractors with the Atomic Energy Commission. It not only sells uranium to the AEC, but operates AEC plants at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Paducah, Ky. Both Union Carbide and the Kaiser interests benefited from the AEC's decision not to buy uranium from "underdeveloped countries." This obviously played into the hands of established American companies such as Union Carbide and Kaiser.

Yet McCone, before he became Chairman of the AEC in 1958, admitted that his personally owned shipping line, Joshua Hendy, handled "intercoastal and coastwise transportation of chemicals, transports products for Union Carbide, Dow Chemical, Standard Oil of New Jersey, Standard Oil of California, and others."

"I have some business relationships with Kaiser," he also testified, "inasmuch as a jointly owned company, 25 percent of which is owned by Hendy and 50 percent by Kaiser

Aluminum, has a long-range contract to transport Kaiser's bauxite."

"Would your firm continue to deal with these firms in the atomic energy field, such as Union Carbide?" asked Senator Clint Anderson of New Mexico.

"Yes, I would expect they would continue," replied the future AEC Chairman.

"Union Carbide is a large customer of Hendy's" Anderson reminded him.

"Yes, they are," McCone agreed.

ADAMS GIVES HIS OK

However, he insisted that placing the stock of his shipping companies in trust with the Bank of California, in which he is also a stockholder, cleared him of any conflict of interest. This left him, however, with the profits which would accrue from the contracts his shipping companies made from Union Carbide, Kaiser, and the other firms which did business with the AEC of which he was Chairman. In other words, while he was AEC Chairman, his shipping companies would benefit from business with AEC contractors.

On the basis of this, Sherman Adams, that great judge of conflict of interest, OK'd the arrangement; and the Senate, diverted by the Sherman Adams-Goldfine headlines, also OK'd it and confirmed McCone as AEC Chairman.

However, now that McCone is coming up for another, even more important, post, head of Central Intelligence, the Senate might take time to review the record and study the law.

The conflict-of-interest law gives no choice either to McCone or to the Senate. McCone said he had done "a great deal of soul searching" and had concluded he could handle the AEC Chairmanship without any favoritism. However, the AEC law does not permit a man to search his soul and make the decision. The law makes the decision for him. It gives no alternatives other than get out of any conflict with private business interests.

"No member of the Commission," it reads, "shall engage in any business, vocation, or employment other than that of serving as a member of the Commission."

The law was passed not to be rationalized after soul searching, but to make sure that men like McCone did not serve on this powerful Commission with the power to make tremendous profits for certain companies, unless they gave up their stock in the companies which benefited. This McCone did not do, and in an early column, one significant result affecting McCone's private shipping line will be reported.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I say to my administration: Take a look at it. I want to know what the answers to it are. If those charges cannot be supported with facts, I want to know it. If the charges can be supported with facts, I do not see how I could possibly vote in favor of confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. President, I have taken the time to discuss the nomination in the entire framework of CIA power because I do not believe the two can be separated. I ask my administration to take another look at the question of whether this is the time for Congress to pass legislation setting up what frequently has been described as a congressional watchdog committee, with authority to find out, in behalf of the American people—which I believe is a constitutional obligation of the Congress—the facts about the CIA operations the world around.

UNITED STATES IN A CHANGING WORLD OF TRADE; RIGHTWING RETREAT FROM FREEDOM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record, as part of my remarks, two very interesting leaflets issued by what I consider to be a very effective lay educational organization in the country, one which is on a footing, in my judgment, with another great lay organization, the League of Women Voters, which is also a great study group. The National Council of Jewish Women is another of the great lay educational organizations, and I believe it carries out rather well the observations, published yesterday in the New York Times, in an article written by James Reston, in connection with the duty of the women of America to proceed immediately to take a careful look at some of the great public issues which confront the Congress, and to be heard from, as is not only their right, but also, I believe, is their duty.

So I ask unanimous consent that if the article written by James Reston has not already been ordered printed in the Record, it be ordered printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 17, 1962]

How To Save Kennedy From Congress

(By James Reston)

Washington, January 16.—President Kennedy has started the new year by emphasizing the importance of improving the education of the American people, but it is the theme of this epistle that he won't get very far unless the women of the country come to his rescue.

What the President wants is to stamp out illiteracy (beginning presumably in the Congress and the press) and get through a program of Federal aid for public school construction, teachers' salaries, and college buildings and scholarships, with special emphasis on the training of scientists, engineers and technicians.

It is a demonstrable fact that we cannot control the scientists, engineers and technicians we already have and therefore need more philosophers, teachers, diplomats and nonatomic statesmen, but let that go for the minute. The point is that the President is ringing the school bell again, and needs help.

He is not likely to get much from the politicians. His bill to aid the colleges is in pretty good shape, but his general bill to help the public schools is hopelessly lost in a tangle of political and religious controversies. Somehow the present angry dialog has to be changed. Somebody has to find a new way to get around old men and old problems, and since women have been doing precisely that for several thousand years, why not pass the problem to them?

THE MUFFLED FACTS

The difficulty at the moment is that the facts have been obscured in a torrent of emotional arguments over Federal aid leading to Federal control of the classrooms; over the constitutionality of giving Federal funds to parochial schools; over racial integration in the public schools; and over State and local rights.

These are the things that have dominated the news of the education debate for years. By the time the story of the President's education bills gets out over the news wires into most local communities it is usually a report of conflict between Republican versus Democrat, North versus South, public versus parochial schools, Federal versus State or local control. There are exceptions, but this is the shorthand of it.

The question is whether there is a way to get the whole problem of modern education discussed calmly in all the communities of the country, large and small; not only the emotional, religious, racial, regional, political, and constitutional issues, all of which are important, but the facts as well.

The growth of the population is a fact. The shortage of classrooms and teachers is a fact. The replacement of unskilled labor by automatic machinery is a fact. The movement of kids from poorly educated communities into the competition of highly educated urban communities is a fact. Finally, the educational need of the Nation in the cold war is a very solemn fact.

From the days of the frontier in this country, the women have been civilizing their men and educating their kids (when they could catch them). In the little town, it is the women who have organized and attended the monthly book clubs and tried to cultivate the baboons they married and bring a little gentility into the house. In the larger cities in more recent years, it is the women again who have run the world affairs councils and brought the poets and lecturers to the community.

HOW TO DO IT

The educated women who are bored with the old man's lockerroom, barroom, and commercial shoptalk are the greatest unused natural resource in this country today.

If it weren't for the teachers' union, which operates on the preposterous assumption that raising children isn't a form of education both ways, the intelligent middle-aged women of the United States, with or without a lot of phony teaching skills, would solve the teacher shortage overnight.

At least they are quite competent to study this education problem. They are interested in it, but they do not have access to a simple account of the facts and a clear statement of the problem, together with the alternative suggestions of dealing with the problem.

This case study method of analyzing political problems has proved effective in the colleges since the war. Political opponents have been able to agree about what the facts were and what the alternatives were and get them into a manageable pamphlet as a study guide.

The problem is to get somebody to prepare and distribute such a pamphlet throughout the country and organize the study groups. And with all the foundation money around for studying underdeveloped peoples these days, why not the undereducated American people?

Maybe Secretary Abraham Ribicoff is right in saying that the American people don't "give a damn" about education, but then again maybe he's not. Let the women study this problem for a month and even the Rules Committee of the House might get some interesting mail. There would be problems, of course. Here and there in the country a few men might want to get in on the act, but that wouldn't happen very often.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, following the printing of the James Reston article in the Record, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a leaflet entitled "United States in a Changing World of Trade." The leaflet was issued by the National Council of Jewish Women.

There being no objection, the leaflet was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

United States in a Changing World of Trade

Everyone has noticed that in recent years there are more imports than ever before available in the stores. We consumers welcome this wider range of choice now within reach of our pocketbooks. We are delighted to find Italian shoes and sweaters, British woolens, Japanese opera glasses and radios, French wines, Danish flatware and furnishings, of good quality and styling with added foreign appeal—often at the same or even lower prices than similar items of American make.

But what does this new competition mean to American business and labor? Is this a serious threat to the Nation's economy? Should we resist this flood of imports and foreign competition with a "buy American" campaign? Should we protect our industries and employment opportunities with high tariff walls and new restrictions on competing imports? This is one view being advocated in the big national debate now going on about America's foreign trade policy. It is the restrictive or protectionist view which is being heard more loudly today than at any time since the isolationist 1920's.

The other view sees the problem of new emerging world trade patterns, which offer increased trading opportunities as well as more competition, as a challenge and potential for United States and world economic growth. It is a challenge which can be met, according to leading economists, Government, business, and labor spokesmen, only by opening trade channels more widely and lowering existing trade barriers among nations.

Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges has stated this positive approach to new trade problems as follows: "We have the natural resources, the human skills, the industrial technology, and, I am confident, the vision to make our free enterprise system a continuing dramatic example of economic progress at home and in the markets of the world." The President of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce spoke for most of American business when he promised "some real competition to meet the competition coming our way, rather than resorting to protectionism."

Anyone scanning the newspapers in recent months or listening to news or public affairs programs on the air will find the trade debate very much in the foreground. Many of us tend to turn away from this issue as too complex for the average citizen, especially the average woman citizen. We feel we cannot begin to understand what it is all about without technical knowledge of such formidable matters as the Common Market, balance of trade, balance of payments, tariffs, reciprocal trade agreements—and such mystifying terms as "peril point" and "escape clause."

WHY ALL THE TRADE TALK TODAY?

Yet this is one of the most important issues confronting the Nation today. It cannot be left to the experts, real or self-styled. For the outcome of the trade debate in our public forums and in this session of Congress will have far-reaching effects on America's position of world leadership, on our national security and the soundness of our economy. Public understanding of the major issues in the trade debate is essential if the broad long-range national interest is to be served, rather than narrow, special short-term interests. Public understanding and expression will be particularly needed to offset the expected rise in volume of the special interest voices when the issue is joined in Congress in the coming months—voices which will speak with an expertise as narrow as the interests they represent.

There are basically two urgencies which make the question of American foreign trade policy of top national concern today:

One is the approaching expiration of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, the law which gives the President authority to negotiate reciprocal agreements for trade with nations. This law makes it possible to reduce trade barriers and permit a freer flow of export and import trade for mutual benefit of the nations concerned. If the law is allowed to expire in June, the President will no longer have authority to negotiate trade agreements.

The other closely related development is the growing economic vitality and strengthening trading position of regional trading groups, especially the Common Market in Western Europe. This means that the United States is no longer in a position of dominance in the international market. We are entering a new era of more open competitive trading with equally strong economic powers. The action of Congress in the next few months on a new trade law will determine whether this country will be in a position of flexible strength or restricted weakness in this new kind of world market. It will determine whether we can keep channels of trade open for our own benefit and for the continued vitality of a free world economy.

TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Twenty-seven years ago, the United States committed itself to a more open trade policy with the enactment of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934. The aim was to lower our trade walls through negotiation with other nations, to cut tariffs on imports in exchange for equal concessions on our exports. The depression of the thirties had clearly demonstrated that high grade barriers were disastrous to our economy. High tariff protection against import competition had brought retaliation against our exports and a deepening of the depression here and in other countries.

This commitment to opening channels of international trade has been renewed in 11 extensions of the act. However, restrictive amendments have been added through the years, demanded by American industry as protection against increased foreign competition. This has amounted to a backward trend, impeding the President's negotiating power with cumbersome and complex restrictions and holding back the flow of trade.

Two important restrictions in the present law are the peril point and the escape clause. We will be hearing these phrases often in discussion of American trade policy in the months ahead. What do they mean? The peril point provision, added to the Trade Agreements Act under a 1951 amendment, says that the tariff must not be lowered on a particular product if American manufacturers of the same product demonstrate to the Tariff Commission that further reduction of the tariff would significantly injure the industry. The escape clause, also added in 1951, provides for an increase of the existing tariff rate or for a quota on imports which threaten to injure American industry. Decisions on appeals by domestic industry for relief or escape is made by the Tariff Commission.

These special hardships provisions, designed to protect relatively small segments of American industry and business, have proved to be serious hurdles in recent years to broad, flexible trade negotiations. To meet the new realities of emerging world trade patterns, such special interest problems and hardships will need to be handled by an internal adjustment program rather than as part of basic U.S. trade policy.

There will be strong pressure by special interests to retain and strengthen these restrictions, as well as the present cumbersome system of negotiating tariff reductions on an item-by-item basis. Additional protection for American industry will also be sought, primarily the setting of rigid import quotas to curtail the amount of particular competing imports. The textile industry is taking the lead in the current campaign for import quotas. On the other hand, liberal trade advocates led by the administration will press for substantial broadening and reshaping of the Trade Agreements Act in 1962 to meet the new challenges and opportunities of a radically changed trading world.

THE COMMON MARKET

The most significant new challenge is the Common Market, known officially as the European Economic Community. The main question raised by this increasingly vital trading bloc is whether it is basically a threat to the American economy or a potential benefit.

What is the Common Market? As originally formed in 1957, the European Economic Community consisted of six Western European nations, sometimes called the Inner Six, which decided to join together for mutual economic benefit through a common trade policy. This policy aims to remove all trade barriers among member nations and adopt uniform trading agreements with other countries. The six charter members of the Common Market include: France, Italy, West Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg.

The economic growth and vitality of these nations in the past 4 years has been remarkable. The initial impetus to this development may be traced to the success of U.S. postwar rehabilitation aid under the Marshall plan. Essentially, however, the new vitality of the economy of these nations is due to their determined use of untapped resources and the adaptation of industry and business to new requirements and new marketing patterns and opportunities. It was not accomplished easily. A major obstacle, it is significant to note, was a strong initial skepticism by European businessmen toward the Common Market idea of reduced trade barriers and more open competition among member countries.

Negotiations are now in progress for bringing Great Britain, Ireland, Denmark, and Norway into the Common Market, which will then become an economic community of over 300 million people—the largest economic union and trading unit in the world.

What does this mean for the United States? In the words of Under Secretary George W. Ball: "The postwar dependence of Europe upon the United States has now become an interdependence." A strong, prosperous, and united European community has been a consistent aim of American postwar policy, essential to the vitality and stability of the democratic world. An increasingly prosperous Europe has become the most reliable and profitable customer for American exports and American enterprise abroad.

However, the competition to some parts of American industry and business is significant, and dislocations of certain segments of the American economy are inevitable. This is a necessary adaptation to change and growth, which can be taken in stride by a dynamic industrial economy. Substantial tariff reductions, or even the complete elimination of industrial tariffs, would require "relatively small" adjustments in the economy as a whole, according to Secretary Ball. These would have less nationwide impact than adjustments regularly made to such "normal" developments as population shifts, changes in public taste, automation, and other technological change. The answer, as Mr. Ball sees it, is to "shift American manpower, as swiftly and painlessly as possible, out of the industries which cannot stand up to foreign competition [to] have a labor force more fully devoted to pursuits with a future."

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS

It may be stating the obvious to say that both imports and exports are essential to the U.S. economy—that it would be as impossible today for a modern industrial nation to thrive in economic isolation as it would be to return to a "safe" political isolation in this nuclear age. Yet, this is the backward step being advocated by those who would meet growing foreign competition with protective devices such as higher tariffs and import quotas.

What are the major imports into this country and how important are they? About 70 percent of all goods imported consists of raw materials, crude and manufactured foods, and semimanufactured materials such as paper, newsprint and important industrial chemicals which are not available here in sufficient quantity.

Raw materials imported include such key industrial and strategic materials as metals and ores, petroleum, industrial diamonds and rubber. The only major mineral we have in surplus for export is coal. The Automobile Manufacturers Association lists 38 imports necessary to motor vehicle production. The telephone companies list 20 imports from every part of the world essential to their operation. Leading food imports which reach the tables of American families every day include coffee, tea, cocoa, spices and bananas, to name only the most commonly used items in our diet supplied by other countries.

The remaining 30 percent of imports into the United States are made up of manufactured goods that supplement domestic products. These offer to the American consumer a wider range of selection in purchasing clothing, in selection of household furnishings, appliances and decoration, in finding the kind of automobile best suited to the family or the individual. These imports also offer an important challenge and stimulus to the efficiency and imagination of American business and industry.

What are the major U.S. exports, and how important are foreign markets to our economy? American exports cover a wider range of products than imports, but more than half are manufactured goods. Most of our major manufacturing industries sell a substantial part of their total output in foreign markets, with some American producers exporting half or more of their annual production.

One of our most important exports—important both to the continued development of the American economy and of other nations—is machinery and industrial equipment of all kinds. About 25 percent of all construction and mining equipment made in this country, for example, is exported yearly. Reports from the automotive industry indicate that export business has spelled the difference in recent years between a profitable or unprofitable year.

Foreign markets are as important to American agriculture as to American industry, especially for our basic farm products, such as cotton, grains, fats and oils. From one-fourth to one-half of total U.S. cotton production has been exported in recent years, more than half of our wheat and over half of our rice crop.

It is estimated that nearly 5 million American workers owe their livelihood to international trade. They are employed in producing goods for export, in processing imported raw materials and semimanufactured goods, or transporting and distributing imported commodities.

The benefits of exports to the American economy are more readily apparent than are the benefits derived from imports. But we cannot export unless we import, so that other countries can earn the dollars to pay for our goods. Moreover, imported raw materials, as indicated above, have become increasingly essential to modern American industry and to our national defense. And the competition from foreign goods stimulates important improvements in domestic production, as well as serving as a significant brake on the inflation spiral.

This country has for years maintained what is known as a "favorable balance of trade," which means that export earnings exceed import payments. Such a plus on our export-import ledger is important to maintain so that the United States may carry on its foreign economic aid programs and pay for overseas military expenditures, and private companies can make foreign investments without impairing the strength of the dollar. The U.S. balance of payments deficit of recent years—which means that the total outflow of dollars in trade, Government oversea aid, military expenditures, and private investment has been greater than the number of dollars coming into the country—has focused attention on the need for a substantial increase in our exports. This is seen as a positive way to reduce the balance of payments deficit, in contrast to other proposals such as "buy American" steps, cutbacks in our foreign aid programs, and import restrictions.

TOWARD A NEW TRADE POLICY

The basic choice confronting the United States in meeting the problems of a rapidly and radically changing trade world is a choice between the illusory protection of further trade restrictions or the promise and opportunities of trade expansion.

The heart of the matter was stated recently by the President when he said: "This is no longer a matter of local economic interest but of high national policy. If the West is to take the initiative in the economic arena, if the United States is to keep pace with the revolutionary changes throughout the world, if our exports are to retain and expand their position in the world market, then we need a new and bold instrument of American trade policy."

The long-range aims of such a policy, the President has indicated, will be directed essentially toward two goals: maximum interaction and cooperation between the expanding industrial societies of the West to assure mutual prosperity and accelerated economic growth; and promotion of economic progress and stability in the less developed nations of the world. Important bipartisan support for a liberalized, more flexible U.S. trade policy has been expressed in Congress and by such leading Republicans as former President Eisenhower and his Secretary of State Christian A. Herter.

Three main points of "minimum specifications" for a "new and bold instrument of American trade policy" have been outlined as follows by Under Secretary of State George W. Ball.

1. New authority to the President to negotiate trade agreements on an across-the-board basis, rather than the current product-by-product arrangement. This new method would open the way for cutting tariffs on whole categories of products, essential for effective negotiation with such trade groups as the Common Market, which use this broad approach to trade agreements.

2. Some form of Federal aid for a limited number of domestic industries most seriously affected by increased foreign competition under freer trade arrangements. Such adjustment assistance would be directed to rechanneling production into new fields, retraining and relocating workers, accelerating tax writeoffs on obsolete machinery and financing plant modernization.

3. Extension of mutual concessions agreed upon between the two main international trade markets, the United States and the Common Market, to other countries, in order to lower world trade barriers on a nondiscriminatory basis and "increase opportunities of all nations to weld a close-knit trading system in the free world."

These are the tools for trade considered essential by those who look outward to new challenges on the world scene and ahead to hopeful change and growth at home. The answer to the challenge will be significant to our own economic progress, to the development and stability of the entire free world and to America's position of world leadership. A backward, so-called protective move at this time would, as Mr. Ball has put it, "do irreparable harm to the whole free world but would hurt us most of all. We would give up any claim to a role of leadership. We would deny the strength and vitality of the system for which we stand."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a leaflet entitled "Rightwing Retreat From Freedom." This leaflet was also issued by the National Council of Jewish Women.

There being no objection, the leaflet was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Rightwing Retreat From Freedom

The resurgence of the extreme rightist movement on the American scene is giving cause for increasing concern in recent months. In the name of defense against communism, these groups are reviving the McCarthy era of fear and suspicion—a time when the right to differ and discuss, freedom to think, to question, and to move forward toward new social goals were seriously undermined.

The public spotlight has been turned most sharply on some of the more sensational distortions of the most successful newcomer to this movement, the John Birch Society and its founder and absolute chief Robert Welch. Everyone has read or heard by now that the Birchers and Mr. Welch see a steadily growing influence and control of the U.S. Government by the "Communist conspiracy"—with former Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower, former Secretary of State Dulles, and Chief Justice Warren named among the knowing instruments of this conspiracy.

But the significance of the John Birch Society and similar groups is not to be found in these absurd accusations. It can be understood only by looking at the broad program and approach of these groups and at the way they work on the local level. The basic theme of the movement is that Communist influence and control in the guise of liberal or social welfare measures are increasingly undermining America's way of life and national fiber. Cited among these "subversive" programs and policies are: Social security, minimum wage laws, all Federal aid programs, "forced integration," foreign aid, reciprocal trade and international agreements, U.S. membership in the United Nations. Supporters of such measures are viewed as furthering Communist aims, wittingly or unwittingly.

Such turn-back-the-clock ideas would seem to have little serious meaning to any thinking citizen of the 20th century. Increasing world tensions, economic dislocation and social change have, however, lent appeal to a movement which gives a simple "answer" to today's complex crises. In the place of hard thinking and hard work, the Birch Society and similar groups substitute a red labelled target for release of mid-20th century fears and frustrations. And where fear, suspicion and caution take hold—in a neighborhood or a city, in a public school or on a college campus, in a local legislature or in the nation's courts—the ferment of discussion and dissent is stifled and social progress slowed.

To get some idea of the nature of the revived ultra-right and how it works, some of the most active groups and operations on the current scene will be examined.

THE BIRCH SOCIETY

Spearheading the rightist revival is the John Birch Society. After working quietly for over 2 years in a number of American communities through small semi-secret groups, closely guided from headquarters, the society has achieved national notoriety in recent months with the exposure of some of its extremist charges and tactics. Members of the Birch Society, who include prominent influential citizens in many communities, generally have avoided identifying themselves publicly.

The Birch Society actively opposes a wide range of local and national social welfare programs and international efforts—from fluoridation and urban renewal to foreign aid—all termed as steps in the Communist "takeover." National letter-writing campaigns are organized—one protested to the Boy Scouts of America because the President of the National Council of Churches, which the Birchers say is Communist controlled, addressed their National Jamboree. The big current letterwriting drive aims at the impeachment of Chief Justice Warren, because he has been helping the Communist cause by such subversive actions as the school desegregation decisions. "Front" groups are set up to promote particular campaigns, such as the Committee Against Summit Entanglement.

On the local scene—the major field of action—Birch chapter members are directed to infiltrate community organizations and PTA's "to take them away from the Communists"; to harass speakers at church meetings and public forums who express liberal—equated with Communist—ideas and positions; to write and phone public officals, leading citizens, and newspapers to oppose local progressive measures or to "expose" those with "suspect" views. Other activities include regular phone calls to the public library to make sure that the books recommended by Leader Welch each month are available in the library; and sustained efforts to influence textbook selection in the public schools.

Frequent targets of Birch Society attack are teachers whose ideas are not conservative enough and who encourage free discussion of current issues. Student members and their friends report such "suspicious" classroom discussions, and complaints follow from parents or influential citizens. Telephone and whispering campaigns are used to discredit those too outspoken or active in behalf of forward-looking programs.

Membership of the John Birch Society—which is named for an American intelligence officer and missionary said to have been killed by the Chinese Communists 10 days after the end of World War II—is estimated at about 60,000. Chapters, which are limited to about 20 to 30 members, have been reportedly formed in some 35 States, with strong concentrations in such widely distributed areas as southern California and Washington in the West, Houston and Phoenix in the Southwest, Wichita, Indianapolis, and Chicago in the Midwest, and Boston in the East. Although the Birch Society has no formal link to other rightist groups operating in America today, it is rapidly coming to the fore as a leader in the movement. Some of its leading members are often active in similar groups, such as Rev. Billy James Hargis, head of the evangelist rightwing Christian crusade, who is a member of the Birch Society advisory board. The society is the only such group known to have a solid, dues-paying working membership. It seems to have the potential to unite other ultra-right elements into a significant political and social force.

CHRISTIAN ANTICOMMUNISM CRUSADE

Under the leadership of an Australian physician named Fred Schwarz, a self-styled expert on communism, the Christian Anti-communism crusade has taken upon itself the job of educating the American public about this problem.

The crusade operates intensive 4- or 5-day anticommunism schools which have been successfully conducted on a fee basis in such communities as St. Louis, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, Dallas, and Chicago and have often attracted the support of influential citizens. In St. Louis, for example, sponsors of the program included the mayor, the chief of police, and the publisher of a leading newspaper, as well as manufacturers, merchants, bankers, and two local directors of the Birch Society.

The "course of study" includes lectures by Dr. Schwarz and other "experts" such as Herbert Philbrick, former undercover agent for the FBI, purporting to give a scholarly history and analysis of the Communist movement and its tactics. These are supplemented by a brisk sale in books and pamphlets, mostly by Fred Schwarz.

The thread running through the program is the implication that Communist influence and control underlies most social welfare and international programs which are seen as steps toward a Communist "takeover." The course points up that this influence is most strongly evidenced on college campuses, among Protestant clergy, and in the policymaking levels of the Federal Government. All national and international difficulties are attributed to internal Communist infiltration.

The Christian anticommunism crusade limits itself to educational activity, unlike the Birch Society which stresses action. However, fears and suspicion aroused by its teachings have often resulted in similar vigilante action and damaging antiliberal campaigns.

NATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

The creator and president of the national education program doubles as the president of a small Arkansas college which is the headquarters of this humming rightwing propaganda operation. Working from the campus of Harding College, President George S. Benson publishes and distributes pamphlets and newsletters, writes a column for weekly newspapers, produces school study outlines in "American Citizenship Education," runs an annual seminar or "freedom forum" and goes out on lecture tours. All of these activities are directed toward educating the public about Communist encroachment in American life. Dr. Benson's definition and view of this danger is identical to those of the Birch Society.

The major contribution of this group to the rightist movement is the production of propaganda materials. These are used and promoted through various channels. The most widely used of the NEP's current materials is the technicolor filmstrip "Communism on the Map" which has been viewed by an estimated 10 million persons in schools, service clubs, military establishments, industrial plants, and various meetings throughout the country in the past year. The theme of the filmstrip and its highly dramatic narration is the peril of the United States in a world being rapidly engulfed by communism or socialism. Among those depicted as already "lost" are all of the NATO nations, except Portugal, and most Asian and African countries. This production has been widely criticized for its distortions of history and the current political world situation. As a result of this criticism, the official use of "Communism on the Map" in troop education programs was recently banned.

ROLE OF THE MILITARY

A recent memorandum from Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT to the White House and the Secretary of Defense cited a growing pattern of education programs throughout the country with sponsorship or active participation by military officers, which have been disseminating extreme rightwing propaganda to armed service personnel and the civilian population. Long, heated discussion has ensued in Congress and in the press on the role of the military in educating Americans about communism or any political and social issues. "The very existence of an American military program for educating the public" is a cause for concern, in Senator FULBRIGHT's view, for it represents a departure from the American democratic tradition of limiting the role of the Armed Forces to military matters.

These programs for military personnel and civilians have encouraged civilian participants to form their own groups to "educate" others about the Communist menace and to be on the alert for so-called "Communist influences" in their neighborhoods, schools, newspapers, and local government agencies.

Most of this propaganda activity has been based upon a directive or policy statement issued in 1958 by the National Security Council to use all arms of government, including the military, to educate the public about the issues of the cold war. Reconsideration and clarification of this policy is urged in the Fulbright memorandum to bring all public information and education activities of the military under effective civilian control. The Senate Armed Services Committee has authorized a study and appraisal of the "use of military personnel and facilities to arouse the public and * * * to educate armed services personnel on the nature and menace of the cold war."

OPERATION ABOLITION

The wide distribution of the film "Operation Abolition" has been an important aid to the resurgent right and its aims. Besides being used as an "educational" tool by the Birch Society and similar far-right crusading groups, it has been shown in many communities by established groups which do not share the extreme views of the ultraright. But these showings, sponsored in hundreds of American communities by PTA's, schools, churches, business organizations, political clubs, veteran and civic groups, police departments, and armed service stations, have helped to create the kind of atmosphere where the Birchers and other rightwing extremists can flourish.

The film depicts the student demonstrations against the House Un-American Activities Committee at the time of hearings in San Francisco last year as Communist-inspired. The conclusion drawn and underlined by a melodramatic narration accompanying a distorted presentation of newsreel film clips is that anyone opposing the committee, its work, or its point of view are Communist sympathizers or "dupes." Young Americans, especially college students, it is stressed, are particularly susceptible to such "duping."

The distortion of events, sequences and facts in "Operation Abolition" have been carefully analyzed and widely denounced by leading civil liberties experts, by Members of Congress, and in the press. Many national organizations, including the National Council of Churches, have alerted local affiliates and other groups to these distortions and have discouraged the use of the film, unless accompanied by full discussion of the facts and events depicted. The production and distribution of "Operation Abolition" with the active assistance of the Un-American Activities Committee has brought increased support for moves to abolish or curb the committee.

Because of the strong implication in "Operation Abolition" that American schools and colleges have been deeply infiltrated by those with Communist views, showings of the film have been followed in a number of communities by attacks upon students and teachers with controversial opinions.

LOCAL IMPACT

We can get some idea of the impact of rightwing extremists on American communities today by citing how their activities have affected a few places and people across the Nation.

In Duval County, Fla., a teachers' workshop was briefed by the legislator who authored a new State law, which requires a high school course in Americanism versus communism, on instructional materials he would recommend for the course. Prominent among his recommendations was literature of the Birch Society.

Wichita, Kans., has keenly felt the impact of Birch Society complaints about Communist influence in the classrooms. And a Wichita businessman has reported that he was forced to change his mind about a contribution he planned to make to the University of Wichita because of loud Birch Society denunciations of some faculty members and books used in some of the university courses. "My business would be wrecked," he said, "if those people got on the phone and kept yelling that I am a Communist because I give money to the school."

In the Houston, Tex., area, the impact of concentrated right-wing activity is strong and unrelenting. These are a few examples of this activity: "Operation Abolition" and "Communism on the Map" have been widely shown in the junior and senior high schools, often accompanied by comments or lectures by known spokesmen for the Birch Society and other local extremist groups. Public libraries, school and college authorities have been subjected to continuing pressures to remove "objectionable" books from the shelves or from the curriculum. And an action group formed by Birch Society members is fighting against federally assisted urban renewal and zoning efforts.

In the Chicago suburb of Glenview, a housewife who cast the single dissenting vote on a resolution by the village board commending the "school" on anticommunism then being held at the Glenview Naval Air Station, was victimized by anonymous telephone calls, demands for her resignation from the board, and a whispering campaign when she ran for reelection several months later.

In Fairlawn, N.J., a special investigation of "possible un-American activities" among students and teachers at the local high school was launched as a result of open expressions of disapproval and derision by students attending a showing of "Operation Abolition."

In Phoenix, Ariz., two teachers, holding prominent positions in the State Civil Liberties Union, were dismissed from their teaching posts after taking an active part in local efforts to promote full discussion of the facts at local showings of "Operation Abolition."

RESPONSE AND COUNTERACTION

With the memory of the McCarthy era fresh in mind, more people are speaking up today against the forces which would stifle dissent and halt social progress. They have learned to read between the lines of the red labels which are again being indiscriminately plastered on people, ideas and programs distasteful to the ultraright. A particularly hopeful sign is the response reported from college campuses to the strong implications of student gullibility in "Operation Abolition." From colleges all over the country have come strong expressions of opposition to the film and to the abuses of the Un-American Activities Committee, and defense of the students involved in the San Francisco demonstration. On many campuses, this issue has helped to revive an active concern among students with freedom of inquiry and expression, as well as other current issues.

Many national civic, religious, and educational organizations, as well as the Nation's press, have spoken up in opposition to the antidemocratic views and tactics which characterize the resurgent right's recent activities. But it is on the local scene where the major task needs to be done to counteract the impact of the rightist attack on democratic freedoms and social advance. Important allies in such an effort may be found in church groups, the YWCA and civil liberties groups.

The task may be seen as threefold:

To promote open discussion of all important issues confronting the community and the Nation, and encourage increased citizen action on local issues. This is the best general antidote to the over-simplified approach of "red-hunting" offered by the ultra-right as the solution for today's perplexities.

To sensitize public thinking to the meaning of individual liberties and the free flow of varying opinion as basic ingredients of a democratc society. And to alert the community to the rightist revival and its dangers to democratic principles and progress.

To be on the alert for smear campaigns and harassment of teachers and others with "controversial" views, for pressures on PTA's and libraries and textbook "screenings." Full open discussion of all charges made against individuals and institutions needs to be brought into the open and the facts brought to public view. This may also be applied to such propaganda activities as showings of "Operation Abolition."

Aided by the experience of Council's Freedom Campaign which helped to encourage people during the McCarthy era to "speak up—freedom needs exercise," Council Sections can work with like-minded groups to keep the channels of discussion on all issues open in their communities; to be on the alert against growing attacks on individual liberties; to keep the atmosphere clear of suspicion and paralyzing fear.

LEGISLATION AND APPROPRIATIONS TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE SENATE IN THE CURRENT SESSION—RESOLUTIONS OF OREGON STATE ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on November 8 through 10, 1961, the Oregon State Association of Soil Conservation Districts held its annual meeting in Klamath Falls, Oreg. A number of resolutions which were adopted at that time bear upon legislation and appropriations which will be considered by the Senate in the current session. I therefore ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, the resolutions to which I have alluded.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ON RESEARCH

RESOLUTION 1

The Oregon Association of Soil Conservation Districts at their annual meeting held in Klamath Falls, November 8–10, 1961, determined that—

Whereas the needs expressed by soil conservation districts for additional soil and water research have been given recognition; and

Whereas the Oregon Agricultural Experiment Station has been doing a good job of soil and water research with the limited funds available and would be able to make efficient use of additional funds to provide needed research: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon Association of SCD's go on record as supporting increased State and Federal appropriations for soil and water conservation research of the Oregon Agricultural Experiment Station.

RESOLUTION 2

The Oregon Association of Soil Conservation Districts at their annual meeting held in Klamath Falls, November 8–10, 1961, determined that—

Whereas Oregon's 59 soil conservation districts are not adequately informed of the present research being done in soil and water; and

Whereas this soil and water research is of considerable interest to these SCD supervisors: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Experiment Station, ARS, and USFS be requested to conduct the necessary meeting or meetings in the State of Oregon to inform the supervisors of Oregon's 59 districts of research now being conducted in this field of soil and water in Oregon.

RESOLUTION 3

The Oregon Association of Soil Conservation Districts at their annual meeting held in Klamath Falls, November 8–10, 1961, determined that—

Whereas Senate Document No. 59 comprehensively states the soil and water conservation research needs of the soil conservation districts of the State of Oregon and the Nation; and

Whereas progress toward implementing the needed research as obtained in the document needs further impetus: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon Association of Soil Conservation Districts reaffirm its endorsement of the principles of Senate Document No. 59; be it further

Resolved, That this association urge speedy action by all concerned on the implementation of research to solve these stated needs; be it further

Resolved, That this association and its officers, directors, and research committees keep in close touch with the various legislative and administrative branches of State and Federal Governments which are working on the numerous phases of this enlarged research program; be it further

Resolved, That the officials of this association act in an advisory capacity to these agencies on the needs of the soil conservation districts and that they urge close and energetic cooperation in implementation of this program.

RESOLUTION 4

The Oregon Association of Soil Conservation Districts at their annual meeting held in Klamath Falls, November 8–10, 1961, determined that—

Whereas the soil conservation district conservation program for vast areas of both public and private timberland in Oregon is dependent upon basic inventories involving soil, water, and plant relationships, and

Whereas these relationships currently are inadequately understood; and

Whereas there is need to accelerate the research program in order to better understand and interpret these relationships for farm and ranch planning: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon Association of Soil Conservation Districts recommend that the Agricultural Research Service, the Oregon Experiment Station, and the Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station cooperate with OASCD and other agencies to develop and undertake an adequate research program which will accelerate the collection of basic data to better understand, interpret, and apply knowledge of these soil-water-plant relationships on timberland.

RESOLUTIONS ON PUBLIC LANDS

RESOLUTION 1

The Oregon Association of Soil Conservation Districts at their annual meeting held in Klamath Falls, November 8–10, 1961, determined that—

Whereas we the OASCD favor the establishment of wilderness areas; and

Whereas we believe existing administrative agencies have demonstrated their competence to establish boundaries and administer land for wilderness purposes; and

Whereas we believe the establishment of wilderness areas is compatible with such of the multiple uses as water production, grazing of domestic livestock, hunting and fishing: Therefore be it

Resolved, That—

1. When and if wilderness areas are established, the determination of boundaries and the administration of the area be continued with existing proved competent public and managing agencies.

2. Grazing under allotment permit procedure be continued in wilderness areas with the compatible uses of water production, recreation, and wildlife management.

RESOLUTION 2

The Oregon Association of Soil Conservation Districts at their annual meeting held in Klamath Falls, November 8–10, 1961, determined that—

Whereas the Bureau of Land Management has indicated the desire to reduce livestock members on the advisory boards and replace them with representatives of other interests; and

Whereas our years of experience lead us to believe that present representation of livestock on new State and national advisory boards is presently the minimum number for proper representation for the various areas and conditions involved on lands administered under the Taylor Grazing Act: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Bureau of Land Management be requested to retain the present livestock representation, that the other interests be made as additional members to existing advisory boards, or that other interests form their own advisory boards.

EDITORIAL TRIBUTE TO J. REUBEN CLARK, JR.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, during the congressional adjournment, death came to a distinguished Utahan who had achieved positions of great leadership and responsibility in his State and his church, as well as at the level of National Government.

President J. Reuben Clark, Jr., first counselor in the first presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, died on October 6, 1961. As Solicitor General of the State Department, Under Secretary of State, and Ambassador to Mexico, he demonstrated a perception of national and international problems which will make him long remembered here in Washington. His activities in the first presidency of the Mormon Church for more than 28 years have had a profound influence on countless persons, both within and without the church.

As a testimonial to the stature of this great American, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, following these remarks, editorials from the Deseret News of October 7, 1961, and from the Salt Lake Tribune of October 8, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Deseret News, Oct. 7, 1961]

PRESIDENT J. REUBEN CLARK: A GREAT MAN AND LEADER

It is fitting that President J. Reuben Clark died in the autumn, when beauty lies on the land like a benediction, when the work is done, when the harvest is in.

Rooted in the soil, this great man knew the meaning of autumn and the harvest. He could never have been content to die before his work, his lifelong, strenuous, soul-stretching work, was fully done. It was done, fully, for this sphere. The harvest of his great life is in—though it will continue season after season as long as men are influenced by such strength and truth as he exemplified.

He was a giant of his age.

In a day when most men concern themselves with finding the easy way, he proved the worth of unremitting toil to achieve righteous ends.

In a day of easy virtue and half-truths and relative truths, he stood like a great rock of uncompromising integrity.

In a day of fuzzy thinking, he insisted on absolute clarity and precision.

In a day when timid men conform to herd thinking and herd action, he stood as a unique individual, personifying the dignity and independence God intended every individual to have.

In a day when lesser men seek security, even at the cost of their freedoms, he championed the cause of liberty as few other men have ever done.

In a day when giving up is easy, he delighted in striving against odds and seeing the job all the way through.

And with all this, he was so very, very human. His greatness lay, in part, in the very fact that he was so much a part of his people. He was no stranger to the most intimately human problem in the life of the most modest person. He was, indeed, in and of his own people, as the truly great so often are.

His death takes from the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints a great leader, and from those who knew him and associated closely with him a wise and inspiring counselor and friend.

However, it is not only the members of the church who are bereaved. Many influential men and women in world affairs are also saddened at his passing. He was a living symbol of freedom and of the worthy fight to make it secure. His public life, nationally and internationally, helped to ennoble the good cause that free men in the free world are willing to share.

Too often, perhaps, the narrative of President Clark's struggle from a small farm in Grantsville to his eventual triumph as one of the Nation's foremost statesmen has been told in the conventional success story. This falls short of the great truth.

His was not so much the triumph of a man as it was the vindication of an ideal. By his example we are obliged to believe that virtue, honor, courage, steadfastness, integrity, and great compassion can win the field against the enemies of the human spirit. Without that belief the ashes of the world's sorrows would be too bitter to bear. He made the hope of victory real and personal for all of us.

President Clark was one of the great teachers and writers of the church. He constantly exemplified in his sermons and his writings his belief that most really great ideas can be grasped by anyone who pays attention to what is said about them. As a clear and precise thinker, he knew how to translate such ideas into language that was accurate as well as comprehensible and often eloquent. He was a profound scholar who studied men and books over many years, and he was able to tell his listeners and readers where ideas and events fell into the stream of history.

It is rarely that an individual combines within himself the qualities of an original scholar, a warm and effective teacher and a first-rate administrator. Such an unusually versatile man was President Clark. As a member of the first presidency over a span of 28½ years, he gave richly to the church as an alert observer and influential interpreter of the present moral crisis, in the midst of which he stood, rocklike, as one of the most indestructible and incorruptible individuals of our difficult era.

The death of his beloved wife 17 years ago saddened him, but it never diminished his zeal to do his work fully and rightly. He was a man of kindly philosophy, of real humor, of deep seriousness, with the charm of an utterly unpretentious complexity. Though, at 90, he was the oldest of the general authorities, he was buoyantly young in spirit. His death should not be thought of as tragic, though we are sad to think that we can no longer drop in and ask him for information or counsel.

President Clark's stirring apostolic testimony of the fatherhood of God, the sonship of Jesus Christ, and the divine mission of the prophet Joseph Smith has long been one of the generation's most precious spiritual assets. The memory and marvel of his religious convictions will endure, and will sustain us.

The Deseret News is honored to express its gratitude for his life and work. To his son and daughters and grandchildren, his faithful secretary, his doctor and nurses, all of whom cared so tenderly for him, go the appreciation and condolences of the entire church. They, along with President McKay, President Moyle, President Brown, and all the others among the general authorities who have been so richly blessed by his presence, will miss him deeply. So, to a lesser extent, will church members the world around who appreciate that they are far richer for his having lived and contributed so much to his and their generations.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, Oct. 8, 1961]

J. REUBEN CLARK, JR., A GREAT LEADER

In the death of J. Reuben Clark, Jr., the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has lost a revered and forceful leader, the State of Utah a distinguished native son, and the Nation a man who served it well.

Mr. Clark was first counselor to three presidents of the LDS Church, beginning with Heber J. Grant and continuing under George Albert Smith and David O. McKay. Seven Presidents of the United States had chosen him for important positions.

That is a tribute to his ability, his integrity, his understanding, his high purpose, his steadfastness.

Indeed, if President Clark's character were to be summed up in a sentence, it could well be said: "He never wavered from any course which he believed right."

In making his career, President Clark followed a path trod by many another American of his generation. He was born on a farm. He worked hard to obtain an education, interrupting his pursuit of a law degree to earn money as a school principal. And after graduation, he worked even more diligently in his chosen profession.

He was quickly and correctly recognized as a young man who was going places.

When his law professor at Columbia University became solicitor in the U.S. State Department, he offered Mr. Clark a position as assistant. This was followed by a series of important assignments, culminating in his ambassadorship to Mexico, which established Mr. Clark's reputation as an expert in international law.

Then, in 1933, he returned to his home State to become a member of the first presidency of his church and to wield wide influence as a counselor and speaker.

He was a devout man who placed the highest value on his religious testimony. He was an earnest advocate of strict observance of the moral code. He combined deep spirituality with keen understanding of the nature of the world. His wisdom was profound, his aspirations high, his faith unbounded.

Many honors came to President Clark. Yet, nostalgically recalling his farm boyhood, he liked to refer to himself as a "Tooele County cowman." And this was not just a phrase, for his fine cattle won numerous prizes and the interests of stockmen and agriculturists were often in his thoughts.

President Clark was a conservative in philosophy, a Republican in politics. He spoke his mind on many public issues, especially those involving governmental and economic policies. Nor did he hesitate to oppose a popular trend if he believed it unsound.

In his opinion, progress depended upon close adherence to established principles.

President Clark's ecclesiastical services were the capstone of his career.

His writings and addresses as a churchman will be long remembered for his faith was illuminated by his gift of expression.

But he will be remembered, too, as a man who did his duty as he saw it, setting a sterling example for others during a long and busy life.

We mourn his passing at the age of 90. To his family we express our heartfelt sympathy.

OUTLOOK FOR EXPANDED PROGRAMS UNDER THE FULBRIGHT-HAYS ACT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, during the recess my attention was drawn to an excellent article by George W. Oakes in the Washington Star of Sunday, November 26. This article gives an assessment of the outlook for expanded educational and cultural exchange programs under Public Law 87–256, the new Fulbright-Hays Act, as it was informally designated by President Kennedy when signed last September. Such an assessment is especially valuable because of the general dearth of press comment on the act.

In bringing this article to the attention of my colleagues, however, I must add a footnote to the sixth numbered point dealing with new opportunities made possible by the act. That sixth paragraph reads as follows:

> 6. The U.S. Government has assumed responsibility for the more than 90 percent of all foreign students who are in this country under private arrangements. The new law gives the State Department authority to take a hand in improving guidance, counseling, and orientation services abroad so that more students will be placed in our colleges wisely.

It will be seen that the second sentence—which is quite accurate, mitigates the first statement and clarifies its meaning. Nevertheless for fear that the lead sentence may be taken alone and quoted out of context, I wish to stress that it more properly should read, "The U.S. Government has assumed a very limited measure of responsibility." There is no intention of substituting public funds and control for the private initiative which has contributed so vastly to the exchange program's success. Indeed, the new act is designed to encourage a continuing private effort. What was envisaged, and what the new law provides, is authority for the Government to make small expenditures to help coordinate and improve the results achieved through private means. It is a clear case where public assistance is vitally needed to overcome a problem which private enterprise has been unable to remedy.

On the larger issue of overall progress under the new law, I trust that the executive branch is making every effort to give prompt effect to such provisions. I know that Members of this body, which overwhelmingly approved the proposed legislation by a vote of 79 to 5 last July, will be disposed to take a forthcoming position when necessary funds are sought in order to implement the act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the article entitled "Outlook Under Expanded New Fulbright Act," written by George W. Oakes and published in the Sunday Star of November 26, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Outlook Under Expanded New Fulbright Act

(By George W. Oakes)

An expansion of the Government's extensive activities in international education and cultural affairs received significant congressional indorsement in the last session by the enactment of the broadest authority in this field ever granted.

The Fulbright-Hays Act consolidated and enlarged this rapidly growing area of foreign relations, and gave official recognition to the fact that international education and cultural affairs have come of age and are major and vital instruments in U.S. foreign policy. Ever since the last war when Senator J. William Fulbright, of Arkansas, inaugurated the program of academic exchanges, which has made his name honored by the university community throughout the free world, the U.S. Government and private organizations have been developing through numerous and highly successful programs this influential realm of international understanding. In 1958 private organizations contributed $9 million to carry out the Fulbright program alone—an amount equal to the U.S. Government expenditure.

In recent years new dimensions have been added because of the appeal of the underdeveloped countries—most recently the new nations of Africa—for American help in educating and training their potential leaders for new responsibilities. These countries know that education is the key to their future progress—and they are asking for American help. They rightly consider education just as essential as economic aid. Assistant Secretary of State Philip H. Coombs has pointed out that "the whole field of educational, scientific, and cultural affairs is the great underdeveloped area of American foreign relations today."

PRAISED BY KENNEDY

President Kennedy, in signing the new law in September, stated that this "new comprehensive program provides for the first time a solid base for more effective activity."

Each year 20,000 foreign students and 1,500 leader-specialists arrive in this country. Since many students remain for several years, there are at present approximately 53,000 individuals studying at 1,700 American colleges. Twenty-five of our leading universities enroll 40 percent of all foreigners studying in the United States.

Though 53,000 may seem a large number, in fact it represents only 1.5 percent of our college population. In Great Britain, for example, 12 percent of university students come from abroad.

About 16,000 Americans go abroad for study overseas each year, the large majority on private funds.

In addition to the Fulbright exchange graduate students and professors, short-term visits to this country are arranged for individuals among opinion-forming groups and specialists in various fields like labor, journalism, government, etc. In addition, U.S. Government programs in this area also include sponsorship of American schools and colleges abroad, maintenance of institutes and seminars in American studies, assistance for appearances abroad of American orchestras, theatrical and ballet companies as well as writers, artists, and athletic groups. The State Department also brings about 1,000 selected undergraduates a year from Latin America for a month's visit on American college campuses to observe the role that student leaders play in our country.

In keeping with changing conditions in Asia, Africa, and Latin America—and the increasing activities of Russia and China in international education—these older U.S. programs required revision and new planning which Assistant Secretary Coombs is now organizing.

REVISION OF PROGRAMS

For example, although there are now more than 100 countries, the Fulbright program enabling American graduates to study and teach overseas, operates in only 39 where local counterpart funds had been accumulated by the U.S. Government through sale of surplus property and food. In Latin America only 7 out of 20 countries had Fulbright programs. None existed in sub-Sahara Africa. In Europe local currencies are running out in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, Austria, and Belgium.

Administrative restrictions, such as immigration regulations, have hampered the development of exchange programs. Then, too, all appropriated funds had to be spent in the current year. This procedure failed to take into account the fact that grantees might, after their selection, be forced to postpone their study abroad for unexpected personal reasons. Until the new law was passed, no emergency medical costs could be met for those under Government programs.

The new law has corrected many of these deficiencies. But, more than that, it has opened new vistas in the field providing an opportunity for development in international education and cultural affairs in the following ways:

1. Exchanges of scholars, teachers, and students can be conducted by using dollar funds with every nation and binational commissions can be organized to direct the program in all countries.

2. Foreign countries can join the United States in financing such exchanges. Until now, Ireland alone was doing this. Greater flexibility is permitted to use either dollars or local currencies.

ATHLETIC GROUPS INCLUDED

3. Nonprofit cultural and athletic groups can be brought to the United States to be presented to the American public by museums and universities. Assistant Secretary Coombs stresses that such programs will enrich our cultural life and give foreign countries the feeling that, instead of being only on the receiving end of our aid, they can now make a contribution from their cultures to the American people.

4. The State Department can encourage private organizations to make a greater effort to choose their best qualified representatives to attend important nongovernmental conferences and meetings.

5. The U.S. Government can now expand oversea cultural and technical centers. At present the State Department sponsors and helps finance American schools and colleges abroad with an attendance of 30,000 students of which 18,000 are in Latin America. The American University in Cairo, Roberts College in Turkey and the American school in New Delhi are among the better known ones.

6. The U.S. Government has assumed responsibility for the more than 90 percent of all foreign students who are in this country under private arrangements. The new law gives the State Department authority to take a hand in improving guidance, counseling and orientation services abroad so that more students will be placed in our colleges wisely.

ADVISORY SERVICES

7. The State Department can assist by contract and otherwise American colleges and universities to establish and improve their foreign student advisory services so that the student derives greater benefit from the facilities available in the universities and communities where foreign students live.

8. A U.S. Advisory Commission on International Education and Cultural Affairs has been established to appraise these programs and report directly both to the President, who will select its members, and to the public.

9. The State Department will be able to work more effectively with some 60,000 foreigners who are alumni of American colleges and universities, many of whom occupy positions of great influence in their own countries.

STOCK DISTRIBUTION TREATED AS RETURN OF CAPITAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8847) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that a distribution of stock made to an individual (or certain corporations) pursuant to an order enforcing the antitrust laws shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital; and to provide that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution.

Mr. SCOTT obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania be so kind as to yield to me at this time?

Mr. SCOTT. I am very glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and other Senators, I send to the desk a proposed unanimous-consent agreement for which I request immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed agreement will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Tuesday, January 23, 1962, after the disposition of the Journal, the Senate proceed to the further consideration of H.R. 8847, the so-called Du Pont-General Motors stock distribution bill; that debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Ordered further, That the Senate convene at 12 o'clock on Tuesday, January 23, 1962, and proceed to vote at 2 p.m. on the motion to recommit, with the time being equally divided under the same conditions set forth above for all motions and amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed agreement? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his courtesy in yielding.

THE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, a disquieting current of thought is running through our country today. It has not reached anything near tidal proportions, but the very fact that it is there at all is disturbing. I refer to those who hold for increased intervention into all areas of our economy by the Federal Government.

Whatever their motives or whatever their arguments—and they take different approaches—these people gloss over the fact that, under private enterprise, we have become the strongest, most prosperous, most successful Nation in the history of mankind.

This, however, does not make the reasoning of these people any less faulty. For if we ignore their stand, if we are not vigilant enough to head them off wherever possible, we can allow their position to become stronger by feeding upon itself.

This is because every time we allow a free economic society to become hamstrung by increased government intervention, we lessen the ability of private enterprise to perform its functions. Then, along can come the government-intervention advocates to point out this lessened ability. The solution, they will claim, is still more government intervention.

Furthermore, I think this constant pressure for increased government intervention can help cause us, as a people, to lose confidence in ourselves, through weakening our respect for the private enterprise traditions that have brought us to greatness.

This could become a fatal flaw. For if we, as leaders of the free world, fall into the trap of losing respect for our own policies, how can we even hope to hold the respect of anyone else?

To thine own self be true, was pretty good advice when Shakespeare gave it. It is just as sound and even more important today.

The other danger is, perhaps, the most insidious of all. It entails the nibbling away, piece by piece, of the individual liberties of every one of us.

Think of it this way: Every time we surrender a prerogative to the Federal Government; every time we defer to it an additional power of decision; every time we lose to it an additional tax dollar, our own freedom of choice is diminished by just that much.

There are, of course, some areas where government must function alone—defense, for instance, or the maintenance of internal order. In these cases, we must sacrifice a degree of individual freedom to protect the common good. But under our system of government, the object is to keep such cases to an absolute minimum—not to seek opportunities to increase them.

We all learned these principles early in life. Yet, it is precisely these same principles which the government-interference and government-ownership advocates are now seeking—consciously or unconsciously—to undermine.

I think our current efforts in space communications provide a vivid illustration.

Space is big news today around the world. Much of this news has not been favorable to the United States. In areas where the propaganda benefit has been greatest, we have taken a licking in space, and we have to admit it.

One happy exception to this has been space communications. Here we have a clearcut lead over the Soviets. This lead has won us applause around the world because it is a peaceful application of space technology. We are exploring the heavens as a highway along which we can travel to bring people in closer contact with one another, not as one to blast them apart with nuclear warheads.

We must keep this lead; we must set up a satellite communications system and get it working.

The sensible way to do this is to draw upon the best efforts of both the governmental and private sectors of our economy. The Government can get the communications satellites up there, for it has properly led the way in the development of rockets for defense purposes. The privately owned communications companies, meanwhile, have led the way in the development of communications services, both on the ground and in space. So they should have the responsibility of owning and operating the system. As in all common carrier enterprises, the public interest must be protected by Government regulation.

From this kind of a program we can reap a twofold dividend. First, we can get that communications system into space early and demonstrate to the world that we are not laggard in space technology. Second, we can prove to the world once again that the enlightened private enterprise system is still the best hope for progress. Surely, more employment fairly spread throughout our country, rather than the construction by government of a concentrated complex in a given area, is in the interest of those for whom many new jobs will be created.

Overall, this approach has been accepted both inside and outside of Government. Unfortunately, the acceptance has not been universal. And we are now faced with a situation wherein the minority, by sounding its objections long and loud, may cause indecision about the program on the part of the majority, thus delaying everything.

In advocating Government ownership of our satellite communications system, the private-enterprise opponents manage to sound quite a few variations on their theme, but one of the principal ones is their alleged fear of "abuse of economic power." They would turn the satellite system over to the Government to prevent private companies from gaining supposed control over some of our "resources in space."

This "abuse of economic power" argument is a versatile one. Mr. President, you will find that Government-ownership people use it not only in space communications, but almost every time there arises an issue of who should run something—Government or business.

There have been occasional abuses of economic power on the part of business. But what these "Government first" people seem to overlook is the far greater record of major contributions made to this country by business. Moreover, abuse of economic power is extremely difficult in a Government-regulated, private-enterprise-operated industry.

Thus, in a free society, the only way to completely erase defaults is to take away freedom, which, to me, is a prime case of curing the disease by killing the patient.

No one can deny the impressiveness or the importance of the record made by communications industries to the great benefit of our people. They have given us the greatest communications system in the world.

We have still another group taking part in the space communications debate. These are the supergovernment ownership advocates. This group maintains that space communications is too big a job for anyone in America—even including the Government. It wants to turn the whole thing over to the United Nations—as if they were not in enough trouble already.

This certainly is not in keeping with either our national interest or present national satellite communications policy.

That national policy, which was set by the Eisenhower administration and concurred in by the Kennedy administration, provides a practical outline for early realization of a satellite system.

White House policy reserves rocket launching and certain other satellite communications responsibilities to the Government. But it also states that "private ownership and operation of the U.S. portion of the system is favored," provided eight conditions can be met:

First. That new and expanded international communications services be made available at the earliest practicable date.

Second. That the satellite system be made global in coverage as soon as technically feasible, including service where individual portions of the coverage are not profitable.

Third. That there be provided opportunities for foreign participation in the system, through ownership or otherwise.

Fourth. That there be guaranteed nondiscriminatory use of and equitable access to the system by present and future authorized communications carriers.

Fifth. That there be effective competition, such as competitive bidding, in the acquisition of equipment used in the system.

Sixth. That the system be owned and controlled in a way which will insure maximum possible competition.

Seventh. That there be full compliance with antitrust legislation and with the regulatory controls of the Government.

Eighth. That there be developed an economical system, the benefits of which will be reflected in lower oversea rates.

These conditions are tough, but they are fair. They are worth satisfying if we are to meet the goals we have set for ourselves in space.

Members of the private communications industry have done a remarkably good job of doing this through a satellite system plan they submitted last October 13 to the Federal Communications Commission.

I hope this plan will be speedily adopted. It meets the letter and spirit of the policy points laid down by the President.

The industry has outlined a satellite communications system which would be global in scope, with wide opportunities for foreign participation; which would preclude dominance by any individual firm; which would provide for equipment procurement on a competitive basis; and which would get a commercial satellite communications system working by 1965. The industry would accomplish all this without use of the taxpayers' money.

The last development is a most interesting one. In this day of excessive Government spending, when so many are saying, "The only way we can do this is with taxpayers' funds," I think it is refreshing to find a group which asks to tackle something and says, "I'll pick up the tab." Why require the taxpayer to pay for a service he can secure better without new tax burdens on him?

The communications companies' plan, officially termed the "Report of the Ad Hoc Carrier Committee," contains five basic points:

First. The quickest way to get a satellite communications system operating is for Government and industry to work together. Again, this point does not imply Government susbidy. What it does is recognize that the Government is the rocket expert and also has the responsibility to see that this effort dovetails into our overall space program. The Government, however, would be reimbursed for the expenses it entails.

Second. A management corporation should be established to set up and operate the satellite system. This separate corporation would operate on a nonprofit basis.

Third. The communications companies providing service via the satellites should be allowed to be joint owners of the system. Further, their investment should be put into their overall rate bases. This would keep rates over the system under the regulation of the FCC.

Fourth. Each American carrier should be allowed to build its own ground stations, either individually or jointly with other carriers, or a carrier should be allowed to rent capacity—on a nondiscriminatory basis—in the ground stations of other carriers.

Fifth. Finally, the FCC should waste no time in taking the steps necessary to making the plan a reality.

In its particulars, the companies' plan discusses the nature of communications satellites, describing them as "additions rather than replacements for present and future long-distance communications facilities, such as submarine cables and high-frequency radio circuits." This is an important point, for it refutes those Government and United Nations ownership advocates who hold that this is such a brand new, complicated, and mysterious venture that it is too big for all of us.

Let me also cite here the safeguards against dominance by any single firm, since this seems to be such a sore spot with "let the Government do it" advocates.

Under this plan, each company participating in ownership of the satellite system would be entitled to two—and only two—directors on the board controlling the system. The size of the company's investment would make no difference. Actually, it is similar to Texas and Rhode Island each being entitled to two Senators. The size of the State has no bearing on its representation in the Senate.

In addition, there would be three public directors appointed by the President, plus one more named by those companies which furnish service over the system, but are not owners of it.

This type of setup provides a more than adequate answer to those fears and charges of dominance.

There are some additional advantages to this plan. First, it can be carried out under existing legislation. The Communications Act of 1934, which established the Federal Communications Commission, recognized that American communications, international and domestic, should be carried out by private enterprise, operating under Government regulation. And the carriers' plan, which simply extends present communications services, certainly comes under the scope of that act.

Second, through its guarantees of competition, both in procuring equipment and in actual operation of the system, the plan would seem to be in full compliance with antitrust legislation and with the regulatory controls of the Government.

I favor the communications companies' satellite plan. I see no valid reason to slap new taxes on all taxpayers to pay for a system run at a deficit by an ever-changing group of political employees.

Reading between the lines of this ad hoc committee satellite report, I think what the communications companies are trying to say is simply this:

Operating as private concerns, under Government regulation, they think they have done a good job for this country. They have given it the very finest in communications services. They ask to be allowed to exercise their knowledge and experience in space as they have on the ground. They do not see anything in this new venture which should prevent them from doing in the future the same type of job they have done in the past.

And neither do I.

Mr. President, I hope that the proposed legislation will be submitted to the Commerce Committee, under the usual interpretation of the rules of the Senate. I hope that the Commerce Committee will act promptly to set hearings, will listen to witnesses, will come to its conclusions, and will report a workable bill to the Senate along the lines of the recommendations which I have undertaken to make today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles which were published in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald; one written by Walter Lippmann entitled "Investigate the U.N.," and one written by Warren Unna entitled "Thirteen of Ninety-nine U.N. Countries Pay for Costs in Africa."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVESTIGATE THE U.N.

(By Walter Lippmann)

The mounting controversy about the U.N., though it turns on the proposed purchase of $100 million worth of U.N. bonds, is plainly not a money question. By comparison with our expenditures for defense, or for agriculture, or even for foreign aid, the sums involved are very small. The total budget of the U.N. for last year was $231.7 million and our share of that was $102.1 million. That is one-third of 1 percent of what we are spending on defense. Our share of the proposed bond issue is to be $100 million, and if these bonds were never repaid this would be a minute sum in our public expenditures.

The fact is that, if the U.N. serves a good purpose in the pacification of the world, it is fabulously cheap at the price.

The real question at the root of the controversy in Congress and in the country is whether the U.N. today, in this year 1962, serves a purpose which the United States has good reason to support and promote, or whether the U.N. is out of hand and should be cut down or even broken up. The movement to cut down the U.N., if not to dissolve it, is led by two great powers, the Soviet Union and France. The Soviet Union has the support of the countries of the Communist bloc and on the other side along with France are Portugal and until recently Belgium. The United States is the great power which most actively supports the U.N. Recently it has had qualified and reluctant support from Great Britain.

Our rather lonesome eminence among the great powers has aroused, naturally and properly enough, much uneasiness and questioning even among the old friends of the U.N. in this country. All this cannot and should not be hushed up. On the contrary, the activities of the U.N. and our own part in them should be investigated thoroughly and publicly, and the question of the kind and degree of our reliance on the U.N. should be thoroughly discussed.

What is called for is in effect a vote of confidence by Congress to determine what we should do and what we should not do in the U.N. as it now exists. Such a review and vote is in fact overdue. For the U.N. today is a very different organization from the one which the Senate, with only two dissenting votes, voted to join in 1945.

The U.N. today is the creation, in which we played the leading part, of those who in 1949 carried through amendments to make the General Assembly, where a two-thirds vote prevails, the dominant organ over the Security Council where the great powers have a veto. From that amendment, sponsored by the United States, have developed the anxieties which now disturb European and American opinion.

With the admission of the ex-colonial nations to the General Assembly a majority is able to exert strong pressure on the West European countries—Britain, France, Belgium, in a measure the Netherlands, and above all Portugal—which have not yet completed the solution of the problems of colonialism.

It is being said that the President and Ambassador Stevenson have allowed the Afro-Asian majority in the Assembly to dictate our foreign policy and to alienate our old European Allies. This is misleading for it does not take into account the real balance of interests and of forces within which, given the worldwide responsibilities of the United States, we have to act. The United States has inherited the role Great Britain occupied for a century. We do not have the option, which has been exercised recently by Britain and France, of abstaining and standing aside.

We cannot take the view that our allies in NATO have a blank check which requires us to support all their foreign policies, even those on which we are not consulted and over which we have no control. There are, I know, highly placed Americans who believe it is our interest and duty to support the Portuguese position in Goa, in Mozambique, in Angola. But can we and should we support Portugal in resisting all change? Should our attitude to Portugal be the same as our attitude toward the enlightened nations of Western Europe—Britain, France, the Netherlands, and now, I hope and believe, Belgium? We cannot do this. Dr. Salazar's colonial policy is the same kind of menace to the public peace as was Marie Antoinette's inability to understand why the hungry people of Paris did not eat cake. We cannot pursue a moderate and conciliatory policy in the General Assembly if every zig and every zag we make in such a turbulent situation is to be subject to veto by Dr. Salazar or the Katanga lobby.

What needs most to be investigated, exposed, explained, and debated, is the Congo affair. The U.N. intervention there has been a big and dangerous experiment, and whether it succeeds—as is now conceivable—or whether it fails, which is always possible, the Nation must face the question of whether there was any alternative, which would not have been infinitely more dangerous.

In entering upon this debate about the U.N. it is useful to remind ourselves of what Senator Vandenberg and John Foster Dulles said about the Charter when it was before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Mr. Dulles said:

"Now, of course, I recognize that this Charter does not do what many people would like—to guarantee at a single step perpetual peace. But the world does not move at a single step from a condition of virtual anarchy to a condition of well-rounded political order. Those steps are made falteringly. There are missteps; there have been missteps. This, for all I know, may again turn out to be a misstep. But when [a previous witness] said that he did not himself know what to do, I say that here is, at least, a step which presents itself to us, which may be, or which has a good chance to be, a step forward, onto new, firm, and higher ground." That is the language of an experienced and reasonable man.

This is what Senator Vandenberg said to the Senate about ratification: "You may tell me that I have but to scan the present world with realistic eyes in order to see these fine phrases often contemptuously reduced to a contemporary shambles, that some of the signatories to this Charter practice the precise opposite of what they preach even as they sign, that the aftermath of this war seems to threaten the utter disintegration of these ideals at the very moment they are born. I reply that the nearer right you may be in any such gloomy indictment, the greater is the need for the new pattern which promises at least to try to stem these evil tides. If the effort fails, we can at least face the consequences with clean hands."

THIRTEEN OF NINETY-NINE U.N. COUNTRIES PAY FOR COSTS IN AFRICA

(By Warren Unna)

Of the 99 United Nations members obligated to help defray the costs of running the U.N. and its emergency force operations in the Gaza strip and the Congo, only 13 had paid their bills in full by the time the last accounting was made November 30.

This tally, computed from figures made available by the U.N., credits paid-up accounts to Australia, Canada, Ceylon, Denmark, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, and the United States.

Nations slow in paying their bills have been careful, however, not to let their delinquency run to more than 2 years on their regular U.N. budget assessment—for that would entail loss of U.N. voting privileges.

The U.N.'s Gaza strip and Congo operations come under special funds, however, with no penalties for delinquency. Accordingly, the Communist bloc and the Arab states have refused to contribute toward the Gaza strip operation.

And the Communist bloc, Belgium, France, Portugal, and South Africa have refused to contribute toward the U.N. operation in the Congo.

The U.N. now has asked the International Court of Justice to give an opinion on whether the special fund assessments are not also mandatory, carrying with them the vote-suspension penalty for those 2 years in arrears. International lawyers feel sure the Court will decide special fund assessments are mandatory, and the Court's decision is expected to be handed down in May.

U.N. assessments are based on a sliding scale determined by such factors as national income, income per person, temporary dislocations of national income, and the ability to secure foreign currency.

The United States is assessed for almost one-third of the U.N. expenses.

The table on this page includes only the 99 U.N. members who were responsible for payments at the end of last November.

U.N. statistics do not yet include figures for the 5 nations admitted to membership last fall: Sierra Leone, Outer Mongolia, Mauretania, Syria, and Tanganyika.

U.N. PAYMENTS AND DEBTS

The following table lists the 99 of the U.N.'s 104 members who were responsible for the payments to the regular U.N. budget, the U.N. Emergency Force in the Middle East and the U.N. operation in the Congo when the assessment list was tallied by the U.N. last November 30. United Nations statistics did not then include figures for the 5 newest members admitted last fall: Sierra Leone, Mongolia, Mauretania, Syria, and Tanganyika.

	Annual budget assessment	Arrears	U.N. Emergency Force arrears	Congo arrears
Afghanistan	$41, 217	----------	$38, 415	$26, 416
Albania	27, 478	$14, 535	33, 373	27, 298
Argentina	762, 517	736, 049	873, 930	488, 708
Australia	1, 229, 644	----------	----------	----------
Austria	295, 389	62, 036	80, 458	634, 210
Belgium	893, 038	57, 212	43, 245	1, 495, 973
Bolivia	27, 478	55, 050	37, 324	27, 298
Brazil	700, 691	----------	----------	449, 082
Bulgaria	109, 912	24, 986	125, 586	109, 190
Burma	54, 956	----------	----------	15, 899
Byelorussia	322, 867	290, 782	393, 591	693, 207
Cambodia	27, 478	24, 746	3, 722	235, 555
Cameroun	27, 478	27, 098	15, 452	2, 131
Canada	2, 136, 421	----------	----------	----------
Central African Republic	27, 478	----------	----------	7, 925
Ceylon	68, 695	----------	----------	----------
Chad	27, 478	31, 098	15, 452	8, 990
Chile	185, 477	160, 056	87, 037	118, 875
China	3, 441, 630	6, 274, 483	4, 022, 703	3, 927, 969
Colombia	212, 955	192, 212	106, 392	136, 486
Congo (Brazzaville)	27, 478	31, 098	7, 968	10, 056
Congo (Leopoldville)	27, 478	31, 098	4, 206	8, 990
Costa Rica	27, 478	30, 667	21, 660	17, 611
Cuba	171, 738	148, 757	186, 992	170, 609
Cyprus	27, 478	31, 098	4, 206	8, 990
Czechoslovakia	597, 648	112, 665	700, 019	1, 283, 171
Dahomey	27, 478	31, 098	382	935
Denmark	412, 171	----------	----------	----------
Dominican Republic	34, 348	----------	9, 356	80, 129
Ecuador	41, 217	26, 918	----------	26, 416
El Salvador	34, 348	----------	17, 150	22, 013
Ethiopia	41, 217	37, 120	64, 177	26, 416
Federation of Malaya	116, 782	----------	----------	33, 680
Finland	247, 303	----------	----------	356, 612
France	4, 396, 493	----------	----------	7, 216, 191
Gabon	27, 478	----------	----------	7, 925
Ghana	48, 087	43, 307	6, 514	30, 918
Greece	157, 999	21, 419	155, 891	101, 263
Guatemala	34, 348	207, 638	17, 134	22, 013
Guinea	27, 478	3, 000	7, 484	27, 298
Haiti	27, 478	63, 916	13, 735	17, 611
Honduras	27, 478	45, 179	7, 673	17, 611
Hungary	288, 520	476, 283	348, 802	286, 624
Iceland	27, 478	----------	3, 722	7, 925
India	1, 689, 902	139, 999	[1] 749, 138	----------
Indonesia	322, 867	----------	----------	206, 930
Iran	144, 261	----------	----------	67, 458
Iraq	61, 826	----------	74, 944	61, 420
Ireland	109, 912	----------	----------	----------
Israel	96, 173	86, 614	26, 196	61, 638
Italy	$1, 545, 642	----------	$421, 001	$3, 318, 544
Ivory Coast	41, 217	$367	----------	----------
Japan	1, 504, 425	----------	----------	1, 084, 695
Jordan	27, 478	24, 746	33, 373	27, 298
Laos	27, 478	24, 746	3, 722	17, 611
Lebanon	34, 348	30, 934	24, 498	34, 121
Liberia	27, 478	----------	3, 931	----------
Libya	27, 478	24, 746	33, 373	27, 298
Luxembourg	41, 217	----------	----------	----------
Madagascar	41, 217	27, 824	3, 154	12, 698
Mali	27, 478	----------	----------	7, 925
Mexico	487, 736	----------	513, 399	484, 530
Morocco	96, 173	158, 728	26, 879	95, 541
Nepal	27, 478	24, 746	25, 611	17, 611
Netherlands	693, 822	----------	----------	----------
New Zealand	288, 520	----------	----------	----------
Nicaragua	27, 478	40, 349	5, 754	17, 611
Niger	27, 478	31, 098	4, 206	8, 990
Nigeria	144, 261	52, 500	22, 084	41, 605
Norway	336, 607	----------	----------	----------
Pakistan	274, 781	140, 000	----------	79, 247
Panama	27, 478	23, 366	27, 506	17, 611
Paraguay	27, 478	60, 797	29, 611	17, 611
Peru	75, 565	----------	92, 582	48, 430
Philippines	295, 389	133, 013	82, 518	189, 319
Poland	941, 124	818, 569	1, 208, 150	1, 342, 070
Portugal	137, 390	----------	----------	136, 308
Rumania	233, 564	70, 347	344, 414	501, 468
Saudi Arabia	41, 217	----------	54, 012	40, 946
Senegal	41, 217	39, 504	6, 309	13, 509
Somalia	27, 478	31, 098	7, 968	10, 056
Spain	638, 865	----------	801, 444	639, 667
Sudan	41, 217	----------	69, 811	26, 416
Sweden	954, 863	----------	----------	----------
Thailand	109, 912	----------	----------	----------
Togo	27, 478	----------	4, 206	8, 990
Tunisia	34, 348	----------	----------	9, 905
Turkey	405, 302	----------	----------	----------
Ukraine	1, 236, 514	1, 113, 581	1, 479, 085	2, 654, 835
Union of South Africa	384, 693	----------	----------	825, 949
Union of Soviet Republics	9, 356, 287	8, 408, 843	12, 774, 084	20, 088, 253
United Arab Republic	219, 825	152, 738	311, 920	218, 380
United Kingdom	5, 344, 487	----------	----------	1, 926, 697
United States	22, 332, 810	----------	----------	----------
Upper Volta	27, 478	----------	7, 968	10, 056
Uruguay	82, 434	69, 327	22, 973	52, 833
Venezuela	343, 476	305, 896	46, 528	220, 138
Yemen	27, 478	45, 346	33, 373	27, 298
Yugoslavia	240, 433	----------	----------	238, 853

[1] Services of Indian contingents in the United Nations Emergency Fund will be credited toward unpaid contribution.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as one who voted for the original Charter of the United Nations and to have the United States become a member, as one who has supported it in the belief it offered greater opportunity for peace in the world, I wish to see it succeed. It will only succeed, in my opinion, if all the nations who are its members cooperate and go forward with the action it attempts to take, even though they may not be fully in accord with it, and if all the members pay their full assessments as well as the special assessments assigned to them.

Mr. Lippmann points out very clearly that at this time it would be helpful to study the United Nations present actions, and the way it is supported.

I have put the article by Mr. Unna in the RECORD for the purpose of showing what is being done financially, how few nations are supporting the United Nations to a great degree; and the thoughtful article by Mr. Lippmann to show that the whole question should be given a careful study at this session of Congress, perhaps before we pass any appropriations with relation to the United Nations, or act on the problem of the United Nations bond issue, on which there are so many divergent opinions.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES COMMISSION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, yesterday I had the privilege of testifying before a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Education of the other body on the Federal fair employment practices law, which I favor. In the course of that discussion we developed a point which I think needs to be reiterated time and again and made clear in very explicit terms.

We are very much disturbed about violence abroad, whether it is in the Congo or in some other place, but are we giving enough attention to violence at home?

It is well known that I am deeply devoted to the bipartisan foreign policy of the United States and certainly have had no fear, in terms of our leadership for peace, of any struggles in which we have to engage in order to maintain the peace, including policing actions by the United Nations. That does not obscure for me our problems at home which, I might say, have much to do with our problems abroad.

I speak specifically, Mr. President, of the configuration of our activities in the civil rights field in Government today as related to what the executive department is doing, what the President is doing, and what is happening in the country.

Again yesterday a number of Negro churches were bombed, indicating a pattern of resort to violence and extremism which is quite uncharacteristic of our country but which nonetheless demonstrates a very deep and vexing problem which continues in the country.

It is my deep conviction that the solution to this problem is being delayed, and that there is more likelihood of extremism, because we are not mustering all the functions of Government in order to deal with this issue. The President of the United States has apparently adopted the calculated policy of avoiding the Congress at this session on civil rights, and it cannot be done. Such a policy is bound to fail or, what may be even worse than failure, speaking in political terms, it is bound to fail to deal with the issue as it should be dealt with.

I have sometimes been charged with voting with Senators across the aisle and surely it is my duty to vote with Senators across the aisle when I believe that what is being proposed is the right thing for the Nation and my State. But this fact and the fact that I am on this side of the aisle and in the opposition perhaps also gives me an added right to be very critical when occasion demands. I think that occasion now exists with respect to the civil rights issue.

There is no denying the fact that campaign pledges, provisions in the party platform, and obligations to the American people solemnly undertaken, are not being kept now. Nobody is talking about good faith and bad faith. I do not think that question is involved at all, because the President has made it very clear that he is talking about "when." He is talking about timing. He does not think the proposed action should be taken now.

But I think it should be taken now. That is the reason for my speaking today. I believe that the spirit and purpose of promises in the Democratic platform, and in the Republican platform, and by the President in his campaign, can be realized only if we have administrative support now for civil rights legislation in the Congress.

I am not alone in that view. I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of yesterday entitled "Mr. Kennedy on Civil Rights," in which there is spelled out in so many words and phrases the precise point which I am making here today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. KENNEDY ON CIVIL RIGHTS

President Kennedy has indicated that his delay in signing his long-promised Executive order forbidding racial discrimination in federally aided housing stems from a belief that he should not get too far ahead of public opinion in pressing for civil rights. If this means that the President believes the surest way to move ahead in this explosive field is constantly to work for an advancing consensus of national understanding and support, his thesis is sound.

If, however, it indicates White House acceptance of the doctrine of government by Gallup poll, it marks a weakening in the concept of strong moral leadership by the President, about which Mr. Kennedy spoke so movingly in the campaign. "If the President does not himself wage the struggle for equal rights—if he stands above the battle—then the battle will inevitably be lost," Candidate Kennedy said in Los Angeles on September 9, 1960. He emphasized that the President must provide the spur for legislative, as well as executive, action. "He cannot wait for others to act," said Mr. Kennedy. "He himself must draft the programs, transmit them to the Congress and fight for their enactment, taking his case to the people if the Congress is slow."

Repeatedly Mr. Kennedy stressed the urgency of the Executive order on housing. On September 1, 1960, he issued a statement signed by himself and 22 other Democratic Senators declaring: "If the Republican administration were sincere about its pleas for civil rights, it would take action now—executive action to end inequality in all Federal housing programs, as the Civil Rights Commission unanimously proposed nearly a year ago and which the President could do by a stroke of his pen."

The President has through executive action done much to advance civil rights in education, travel, and employment on Government contracts and especially to open up the franchise to Negroes—and once again we commend him for it. Now we trust he will follow his press conference remarks with vigorous measures to develop the kind of consensus he feels necessary for further advances. As he said in his state of the Union message less than a week ago, "a strong America requires the assurance of full and equal rights to all its citizens, of any race or of any color."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, why do I feel that legislation is absolutely essential, and why do I feel that we shall not be making measurable progress in the civil rights field to which the American people are entitled unless we enact some legislation? The reason is that, with all the good will in the world, the executive department can only enforce laws—either the Constitution of the United States or the laws of the land. If there is no legal basis, there is nothing for the executive department to enforce. Perhaps the most striking example of that point in the civil rights field occurred when the Department of Justice was not permitted to intervene in the Prince Edward County school case, notwithstanding the fact that the schools in Prince Edward County of Virginia remain closed to this day, and that Prince Edward County was involved in the original school desegregation suit before the Supreme Court of the United States in 1954. If we had had on the statute books the much-debated part III of the civil rights bill, which would give the Attorney General authority either to start cases or intervene in cases, he would not have had to intervene in the Prince Edward case by leave of court. He would have moved as a matter of right by authority of a statute of Congress.

I mention that point only because that case is a striking example of what I have in mind in setting forth the fact that we must have basic law to support what we want to do.

One other example. I have said time and again that on an appropriate occasion, at the earliest moment, I shall offer an amendment to a suitable bill with respect to uniform requirements of literacy in the United States for voting, which, incidentally, was the unanimous recommendation—and I emphasize the word "unanimous"—of the Federal Civil Rights Commission.

Under the guise of applying various types of literacy tests, the Federal Civil Rights Commission itself has found that many thousands of American citizens are disenfranchised and denied their right to vote in 100 counties stretching from the Atlantic to the gulf. Again I point out that there is an insufficiency on our part in terms of law.

The hearings before a committee of the House of Representatives demonstrated a great amount of discrimination and segregation in terms of employment, again grounded upon the fact that we have inadequate law to cover that situation.

So on and on and on, with the manifold recommendations of the Federal Civil Rights Commission in the fields of justice, housing, employment, voting, and education.

Mr. President, also in respect to what the President of the United States promised the American voter, let us remember that the Executive order—that stroke of the pen which was supposed to have been made to eliminate discrimination in housing—still sits on the President's desk unsigned.

To give the Senate a little example of the difference in procedure that exists, in the State of New York we have gone forward in respect to discrimination in housing and now have a law, proposed by Governor Rockefeller and passed by our New York State Legislature, which applies the test with respect to which we have been leaders throughout the years in our State to a very considerable amount of private housing, as well as housing which is involved in some form of public financing.

So I conclude as I began. It is the function of the opposition not only to oppose and to propose constructive alternatives, which I have certainly tried to do as a Senator on this side of the aisle in all of my senatorial service, but also it is the function of the opposition, as it were, to keep the feet of the majority to the fire.

In respect of the potential promises and assurances on the civil rights issue, nothing has happened, and apparently nothing will happen this year, notwithstanding the very manifest and crying need.

Incidentally, my presentation could not be complete without mentioning also the very frightening fact that public school desegregation has slowed to a very slow pace indeed, in view of the fact that there is no evident means available through which the United States can help this process to move along with the acceleration which it deserves. There will be no legislation, I am convinced, in the Congress upon these burning issues unless the President of the United States asks for such legislation and throws the prestige, power, and influence of the Presidency behind that request. That is the only way in which we obtained any civil rights legislation in 1957 and 1960, and that is the only way we can get it in 1962.

I come now to the question of extremism. There is no question in my mind that many extremists in this field who are guilty of violent acts—breaching the public peace, endangering lives, and actually injuring people in the process—will not be deterred by executive action alone.

They will look to law. When we have law, and when the whole of the Federal Government—its judicial branch, executive branch, and legislative branch—is actively enlisted in the effort to deal with these burning civil rights problems, I think we shall find a much greater attitude of respect from extremists themselves. Moreover, such law would give the Executive the basis for action.

Indeed, one of the things that encourages those of us who contend for law is the very fact that there is an attitude of activity—a desire and a willingness to do things in this field—on the part of the executive department. Such an attitude makes law all the more necessary and desirable, because there are those in office who will actually move in, enforce, and implement the law if we enact it.

I address an appeal to the President of the United States not to avoid Congress in respect of civil rights matters, and not to assume that everything necessary can be done in the executive department, because it cannot. Sad and tragic events like those I have mentioned demonstrate that it cannot. I do not believe that such an attitude would be of any avail to the President in connection with his so-called program. It did not do him any particular good in 1961 and, in my opinion, it will not do him any good in 1962. I think our President, like other Presidents, will have to learn that what one gets must be fought for. In this country one must fight on the side of those who are with him, and he must fight on that side all the way.

I therefore believe that the effort to utilize proposed civil rights legislation as an instrument of appeasement of some elements or factions in Congress not only is unjust and in defiance of the President's own promises and assurances to the country, but will not work well.

I therefore very much hope that the President will see the light and come to us with requests for civil rights legislation at this very session of Congress.

ALASKA AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, at the Diomede Islands in Bering Strait, Russia stands only 3 miles from America's borders. The continental land areas of the two most powerful nations on earth are separated by only 50 miles of open water—a barrier so negligible that, in the days before the Iron Curtain was dropped, the Eskimos of both continents traveled across the winter ice to visit one another.

Alaska's position within sight of the Soviet Union is critically important to the national security under today's defense conditions.

Many people fail to appreciate Alaska's strategic position simply because they are used to looking at the wrong maps. On the Mercator projection, familiar to school children, Alaska is remote and isolated. But on the polar projection that shows the image of the world in the air and missile age, Alaska is at the heart of the geopolitical picture. It is a shield against air and missile attack from Russia. It is a sword ready to strike back against unprovoked attack.

Alaska is not a 586,000 square mile icebox—it is a land in which man can and does live and flourish. It is a rich land, with warm summers and winters that are cold but no colder than the winters of European Russia. It is a land in which substantial military efforts are feasible—and under today's strategic conditions, it is essential that such efforts be made in this northernmost of America's bastions.

Alaska's position in the passive defense of the United States is well known. The early warning stations of the DEW line ring the Alaska coast and stretch out along the Aleutian chain. The BMEWS station at Clear complements the stations in Greenland and the United Kingdom to give the Nation the maximum possible notice of strategic missile attack.

As long as we must prepare to defend ourselves and strike back against foreign attacks, Alaska provides an unequaled platform for counterattack weapons. The greater part of the State is still undeveloped, a wilderness in which weapons systems can be dispersed far from population centers. Land is available without cost for widely decentralized installations and facilities. Military activities stationed in Alaska are far removed from the cities of the continental United States—yet are still in territory over which the United States exercises sovereignty. This fact by itself justifies full exploitation of Alaska as a future base for the weapons which are now located in allied countries. In those countries, however friendly they may be, local political considerations inevitably impair our freedom of action and the money spent to maintain weapons and operating personnel in those countries is a foreign exchange outflow.

U.S. funds spent on defenses in Alaska remain in Alaska; the only political considerations are those which are identified with the best interests of the United States; and if our weapons systems—wherever they are located—become targets for enemy attacks, those attacks, if the weapons are located in Alaska, will not affect major friendly population centers.

But these are secondary advantages of locating our counterattack weapons systems in the 49th State. The primary advantage is the fact that Alaska by polar trajectory is thousands of miles closer to Eurasia than is any location in the continental United States. This reduced distance improves accuracy and thereby the effectiveness of missile-borne weapons. It might permit the use of somewhat less sophisticated weapons. It would give each weapon a wider target selection and thus increase the flexibility of our counterattack capabilities. It does not appear reasonable to place ICBM installations on costly real estate in the southwest United States when the same installations might as easily be placed on public lands 2,500 miles closer to the target.

Alaska's importance in military operation is not limited to the possibility of its use as a missile platform. It is an unequaled training area for ground combat forces. The 1962 USARAL winter maneuver will be held in a maneuver area 160 miles long. There is substantially no practical limit to the size of maneuver and training areas available in Alaska. It would be entirely feasible to conduct full-scale field Army maneuvers in the State, without conflict with civilian activities. And the training which the U.S. soldier receives in Alaska, summer as well as winter, is the kind of training he needs for most of the fighting he may be called upon to do in most of the world. In virgin wilderness, in summer heat and winter cold, the soldier trained in Alaska learns to take care of himself under hardship.

He learns to move without roads, to exploit air mobility, to fight in darkness, to use weather and terrain for his own advantage, and in the process, he learns independence and self-confidence. This training prepares him to fight in the jungles of southeast Asia as well as in European cold.

Since the Communist bloc lies largely in regions in which cold weather is a major environmental factor, the Army should emphasize the kind of training which the American soldier receives in Alaska today. Serious consideration should be given to establishing at least one training division in Alaska in the early future.

The Navy also has a stake in Alaska. From Alaska bases, the United States can dominate the Pacific coast of Siberia from which the Soviet Union in time of war might interdict American use of the Pacific Ocean. From Alaska, the United States can dominate equally effectively the Arctic Ocean which today has become an arena for deployment of strategic undersea weapons systems.

On land, in the air and space, and on the seas, Alaska is a factor of primary importance in today's strategic picture.

America must be as strong as possible in the face of the possible challenges of the future. Intelligent use of Alaska's potentialities will go far toward ensuring that this Nation has the strength it needs when it needs it.

THE UNITED NATIONS BOND ISSUE AND U.S. POLICY IN THE CONGO

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there will shortly come before the Senate for action two matters vitally important to the conduct of our foreign policy. The first has to do with the proposed United Nations bond issue. The second deals with our policy in the Congo.

With respect to the first of these matters, I stand foursquare with the President and support the United Nations and support the bond issue, to reaffirm our foreign policy to the effect that one of the great instruments of peace in this world is the United Nations and that it cannot be such an instrument for peace if we sit calmly and passively by and watch it go bankrupt.

With respect to the second matter, I am happy to note the presence in the Chamber of the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who is undertaking what I consider to be a very great public service in giving an airing to our Congo policy. I support that policy. I support the President. I believe that Ambassador Stevenson has done an outstandingly able job as our Representative to the United Nations, in guiding our Congo policy along the lines desired by the President of the United States. I make these comments, in part, because of two interesting columns which were published in this morning's newspapers. The first is entitled "U.N. Investigation by Congress Urged," and was written by the distinguished columnist Walter Lippmann; the second was written by the well-known columnist Arthur Krock, of the New York Times, and is entitled "The Hopeful Progress in the Congo," words which I think Mr.

Krock used, in a mildly sardonic sense, as one will see if he reads his entire article.

I commend to Senators the careful reading of these columns, the first of which, I believe, makes a very great contribution to clear thinking in the Senate on the matters I have just mentioned; the second of which, in my judgment, points to the wrong road for us to take.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both columns may be printed at this point in my remarks, the Lippmann column to be printed first.

There being no objection, the columns were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Jan. 18, 1962]

U.N. INVESTIGATION BY CONGRESS URGED

(By Walter Lippmann)

WASHINGTON.—The mounting controversy about the United Nations, though it turns on the proposed purchase of $100 million of U.N. bonds, is plainly not a money question. By comparison with our expenditures for defense, or for agriculture or even for foreign aid, the sums involved are very small. The total budget of the U.N. for last year was $231.7 million and our share of that was $102.1 million. This is one-third of 1 percent of what we are spending on defense.

Our share of the proposed bond issue is to be $100 million. If these bonds were never repaid, this would be a minute sum in our public expenditures.

The fact is that if the U.N. serves a good purpose in the pacification of the world, it is fabulously cheap at the price.

The real question at the root of the controversy in Congress and in the country is whether the U.N. today serves a purpose which the United States has good reason to support and promote, or whether the U.N. is out of hand and should be cut down or even broken up.

The movement to cut down the U.N., if not to dissolve it, is led by two great powers, the Soviet Union and France. The Soviet Union has the support of the countries of the Communist bloc. On the other side, along with France, are Portugal and until recently, Belgium. The United States is the great power which most actively supports the U.N. Recently it has had qualified and reluctant support from Great Britain.

Our rather lonesome eminence aroused much uneasiness and questioning, even among the old friends of the U.N. in this country. All this cannot and should not be hushed up. On the contrary, the activities of the U.N. and our own part in them should be investigated thoroughly and publicly.

What is called for is in effect a vote of confidence by Congress to determine what we should do and what we should not do in the U.N. as it now exists. Such a review and vote is in fact overdue. For the U.N. today is a very different organization from the one which the Senate, with only two dissenting votes, voted to join in 1945.

The U.N. today is the creation, in which we played the leading part, of those who in 1949 carried through amendments to make the General Assembly, where a two-thirds vote prevails, the dominant organ over the Security Council, where the great powers have a veto. From that amendment, sponsored by the United States, have developed the anxieties which now disturb European and American opinion.

With the admission of the ex-colonial nations to the General Assembly, a majority is able to exert strong pressure on the West European countries—Britain, France, Belgium, in a measure the Netherlands, and above all Portugal—which have not yet completed the solution of the problems of colonialism.

It is being said that the President and Ambassador Stevenson have allowed the Afro-Asian majority in the Assembly to dictate our foreign policy and to alienate our old European allies. This is misleading. For it does not take into account the real balance of interests and of forces within which, given the worldwide responsibilities of the United States, we have to act. The United States has inherited the role Great Britain occupied for a century. We do not have the option, which has been exercised recently by Britain and France, of abstaining and standing aside.

We cannot take the view that our allies in NATO have a blank check which requires us to support all their foreign policies, even those on which we are not consulted and over which we have no control. There are, I know, highly placed Americans who believe that it is our interest and duty to support the Portuguese position in Goa, in Mozambique, in Angola.

But can we and should we support Portugal in resisting all change? Should our attitude to Portugal be the same as our attitude toward the enlightened nations of Western Europe—Britain, France, The Netherlands, and now, I hope and believe, Belgium?

We cannot do this. Dr. Salazar's colonial policy is the same kind of menace to the public peace as was Marie Antoinette's inability to understand why the hungry people of Paris did not eat cake. We cannot pursue a moderate and conciliatory policy in the General Assembly, if every zig and every zag we make is to be subject to veto by Dr. Salazar or the Katanga lobby.

What needs most to be investigated, exposed, explained, and debated is the Congo affair. The U.N. intervention there has been a big and dangerous experiment, and whether it succeeds—as is now conceivable—or whether it fails, which is always possible, the Nation must face the question of whether there was any alternative which would not have been infinitely more dangerous.

In entering upon this debate about the U.N., it is useful to remind ourselves of what Senator Vandenberg said about the charter when it was before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

This is what Senator Vandenberg said to the Senate about ratification:

"You may tell me that I have but to scan the present world with realistic eyes in order to see these fine phrases often contemptuously reduced to a contemporary shambles. That some of the signatories to this charter practice the precise opposite of what they preach even as they sign, that the aftermath of this war seems to threaten the utter disintegration of these ideals at the very moment they are born. I reply that the nearer right you may be in any such gloomy indictment, the greater is the need for the new pattern which promises at least to try to stem these evil tides. If the effort fails, we can at least face the consequence with clean hands."

[From the New York Times, Jan. 18, 1962.]

THE HOPEFUL PROGRESS IN THE CONGO

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 17.—The administration is cautiously organizing a case on which to claim a triumph in the Congo of the policy of sustaining its mandates by armed force that the U.S. Government first opposed, then "reluctantly" endorsed and finally rescued from disaster by financial contributions and an internal airlift.

The caution is prudent because the actions of Congolese politicians and of the troops of the central government are unpredictable from day to day. This volatile quality has just been emphasized by the delayed report of the beatings and murder of a group of Catholic missionaries at Kongolo by troops which, despite the central government's description of them as partisans of the deposed pro-Communist provincial leader, Antoine Gizenga, nevertheless were one of its detachments.

SIMILAR GOALS

Since the common objective of the United States and the Acting Secretary General of the U.N. is to restore peace and order, and establish a stable non-Communist government in the Congo, all signs of progress toward these goals are highly desirable. But the U.N.-U.S. record of Congo policies and methods will make it very difficult for the administration to establish its claim of sound, consistent, long-range statesmanship.

This estimate is about to receive the powerful political and publicity assistance of Chairman Gore of the Senate inquiry subcommittee who, though he can be depended on to give a fair hearing to its critics, approves the U.S.-U.N. procedure. But no service to political interest or publicity power can erase from the record a number of events which badly damage the case being organized to prove that the administration was right all along in act and in foresight. Some of these occurred in the United Nations during November 1961.

SETBACK FOR U.N.

In the early part of that month United Nations forces, which had been dispatched to Katanga to bombard President Tshombe into line with the central Leopoldville regime, were routed by Tshombe's army. In this setback the U.N. saw a threat to the regime, which incidentally had been formed by an alliance with the pro-Communist Lumumba, since deceased, on his condition that Katanga be reunified with the rest of the former Belgian Congo by military force. On the same day Leopoldville ordered Lumumba's provincial successor, Gizenga, to return to the capital within 3 days, which order was followed by a rampage of the government troops at Albertville, the massacre of a U.N. Italian contingent, and a pro-Gizenga mutiny at Kindu in favor of the separatist Gizenga government.

As the U.N. in New York prepared to consider resolutions—including proposals by the United States and by a Ceylon-Liberia-United Arab Republic trio—to deal with the situation, Adlai E. Stevenson, the American chief delegate, stated that Gizenga rebels were "much more defiant and dangerous" than the Katangan, and created "a situation of no less gravity, perhaps in the long run even greater gravity," than that in Katanga. By November 16 Stevenson had entrenched this official U.S. position so deeply that the press generally forecast we would either abstain on the vote for the trio resolution, which authorized combat sanctions against Tshombe only, or oppose it.

RELUCTANT U.S. STAND

Stevenson maintained his fundamental objection to this unilateral thrust of Congo military sanctions until the Security Council delegate of the Soviet Union had vetoed our corrective amendments of the proposal. Then, after a 20-minute recess for consultation with Washington, he voted—"reluctantly," he explained—for the resolution which he had characterized as ignoring a threat in the Congo "much more dangerous" than Tshombe's resistance (which is now being politically negotiated) to the total subordination of Katanga to the Leopoldville government.

The fall of Gizenga controverts, temporarily at any rate, our official judgment of

> November 24, 1961, that his rebellion carried even graver potentials than that of Tshombe. But this tentative demonstration is cited by the State Department as proof of a U.N.-U.S. policy founded in flawless foresight. That is only one of several weaknesses in the claim. The record abounds in others, which are readily susceptible of development in the Senate subcommittee hearing.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, Mr. Lippmann points out that if the United Nations serves a good purpose in the pacification of the world—and he thinks it does, I think it does, and the President of the United States thinks it does, and I believe an overwhelming majority of the American public believe it does—then we must support it financially, or it will go down the drain. Mr. Lippmann believes that the proposed bond issue is a fabulously cheap method for us to support the United Nations. He emphasizes that:

> The real question at the root of the controversy in Congress and in the country is whether the UN today serves a purpose which the United States has good reason to support and promote.

I believe it does.

Mr. Lippmann continues:

> What is called for is in effect a vote of confidence by Congress to determine what we should do and what we should not do in the U.N. as it now exists.

I agree with Mr. Lippmann. I hope very much that the Committee on Foreign Relations will undertake just such an investigation of the United Nations as Mr. Lippmann recommends. Perhaps that investigation could be headed by the distinguished junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], who is chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organization Affairs. I believe that in terms of clarifying both congressional and public opinion such an investigation would inevitably result in a finding that our President's policy to support the United Nations is right and just and should be implemented.

Mr. Lippmann says:

> What needs most to be investigated, exposed, explained, and debated is the Congo affair. The U.N. intervention there's been a big and dangerous experiment, and whether it succeeds—as is now conceivable—or whether it fails, which is always possible, the Nation must face the question of whether there was any alternative which would not have been infinitely more dangerous.

These are facts which I am confident the junior Senator from Tennessee will develop in the course of his investigation. In that investigation, I hope the junior Senator from Tennessee will look into the background of the members of the Katanga lobby. Who are the people who are supporting plutocracy, mercenaries, and white supremacy in the Congo? Is it not true that, by and large, their support comes largely from the same groups in this country which are adamantly opposed to civil rights legislation? Is not Mr. Tshombe, a Negro himself, being glorified because of his white supremacy backers for whom he is a convenient front?

I suggest that Mr. Krock's column is legalistic and supercritical of a great American statesman, Adlai Stevenson, and is destructive of the proper purposes of our foreign policy. Mr. Krock speaks slightingly of Ambassador Stevenson's efforts during the Congo debate in the Security Council, about 6 weeks ago, to implement a resolution offered by three of the smaller countries, the United Arab Republic, Liberia, and Ceylon, to authorize the United Nations to use such force as might be necessary to pacify conditions in Katanga.

Mr. Stevenson quite properly attempted to extend that resolution so that it would apply also to disturbances created in Stanleyville by Mr. Gizenga.

My wife and I happened to be in the United Nations, listening to the debate on the day when this matter was under consideration. My admiration for Mr. Stevenson, which has always been great, was made even greater as I saw him take on Mr. Zorin, of the U.S.S.R., in debate. There was not a member of the United Nations Security Council that day, except Mr. Zorin, who was not ready, willing, and desirous of accepting the U.S. amendments to the Congo resolution, which had been presented by the three smaller powers and was then before the Security Council. The three smaller powers themselves were ready to accept such an amendment; but after an exchange, in which I was very proud indeed of the representatives of the United States, and very much concerned at the bitter and provocative tone taken by the Ambassador of the U.S.S.R., Mr. Zorin, he vetoed that resolution. Mr. Stevenson had no alternative but to decide whether he wanted to direct the United Nations' attention to eliminating one of those two areas where peace was being disturbed, namely, in the Katanga, or whether to refuse to go along with that because he could not have his way in the other area; namely, Stanleyville. He made a wise choice under difficult circumstances. I commend him for what he did.

I commend the debate to the junior Senator from Tennessee when he comes to investigate the Congo situation. I think he will find that Mr. Stevenson, instead of being criticized as he was by Mr. Krock, and the President, instead of being criticized, as he has been by Mr. Krock, should, on the other hand, be commended.

I hope that during this session of Congress we in the Senate will use our influence to support the President of the United States in his efforts to strengthen the United Nations, to bring order out of chaos in the Congo, and to implement our magnificent disarmament policy of world peace through enforceable, inspected, and controlled disarmament, under world law, which the President presented to the United Nations on September 25, 1961.

I deplore efforts inside and outside the Halls of Congress to turn our minds away from peace and toward war. I have voted for every appropriation bill which has come before Congress, as long as I have been here, dealing with increasing our military security. I expect to continue to do so. In the words of Winston Churchill, we arm, but we arm to parley; and the parley should result, in my judgment, in pacifying the world as a result of the policies which President Kennedy has so wisely laid down for our country, and which Adlai Stevenson is so gallantly carrying out.

THE UNINSURED SAVINGS AND LOAN SCANDAL

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I take the floor to sound an alarm about a most serious matter.

What appears to be a clever attempt to swindle the public has come to my attention. I am sounding the alarm on the floor of the U.S. Senate in the hope that it will receive wide publicity and thereby serve to warn Americans from coast to coast against permitting themselves to be victimized.

What appears to me to be a bold attempt to rob the unsuspecting public through the misuse of our mails, our Postal Service, is right now being made.

I became apprehensive when I noted the names of the people involved. They are some of the same people who were connected with questionable companies in the recent savings-and-loan scandal in my State.

A company which calls itself "Dollar Industrial Bank, Ltd.," with an address outside the jurisdiction of the United States, in Nassau, Bahamas, is flooding our country with solicitations seeking deposits. This so-called bank advertises 5 percent interest on deposits, and as a further "come-on," offers free tropical vacations for those depositing $5,000.

Some of the advertising is slanted toward business corporations and labor unions, inviting them to send their idle funds, holding out the bait of free vacations to be offered by them as special prizes to their employees or members. It also claims that its accounts are insured by what they call the American Reserve Insurance Co., also with a Nassau address.

I am reminded of another warning I sounded on the floor of the Senate in 1958 involving the Family Savings & Home Loan Association, which likewise claimed that its accounts were insured. We found that the insurance company had no address in the United States. We found that so-called insurance companies for several questionable savings and loan associations had addresses in Panama and in Tangiers, Morocco. Family Savings & Home Loan Association is now in receivership, its president under indictment for grand theft, and its insurance company nonexistent. Because of our warning, many people refused to deposit their savings with Family, many withdrew their funds while they could, but, unfortunately, many who did not are now the losers. I earnestly hope that the people who are now being tempted by the rosy picture presented to them through the mail will give attention to this warning today.

I understand that operators of Dollar Industrial Bank, Ltd., and American Reserve Insurance Co. are the same as those who were behind the Tangiers, Morocco, company known as International Guaranty & Insurance Co. and are connected with the Security Financial Insurance Corp., which got into trouble because of the operations of the Commercial Savings & Loan Association.

The alleged head of the American Reserve Insurance Co. in Nassau is one Stanley Borgenight. The same Stanley Borgenight, who, I understand, is an American citizen, was the "front man" for the phony International Guaranty & Insurance Co., of Tangiers, Morocco, which vanished from the scene after the California Insurance Department closed down its San Francisco office.

The letters of solicitation now being sent out by Dollar Industrial Bank, Ltd., are signed by one David Vine, as vice president. David Vine is a Toronto, Canada, attorney who is "front man" for the real owners of the Security Financial Insurance Corp.

Our people with their hard-earned savings should be protected from embezzlers using our mails. Our postal inspectors have done a wonderful job in protecting the people against mail fraud, and they deserve our gratitude. However, in this case, their hands are tied. Dollar Industrial Bank, Ltd., located in Nassau, Bahamas, is outside their jurisdiction.

We should be able to police our mails when we suspect fraud—even though a foreign company is the addressee or the sender. Here and now I call upon the Postmaster General to stop all mail addressed to either of the two Nassau companies—at least until the matter can be investigated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks a copy of a letter being circularized in this country by Dollar Industrial Bank, Ltd., and signed by David Vine as vice president.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOLLAR INDUSTRIAL BANK, LTD.,
Nassau, Bahamas.

OUR OPEN HOUSE JANUARY CELEBRATION

A tropical vacation free to our customers and friends. Now you can enjoy a 7-day-and-6-night vacation free in Nassau, Bahamas, which includes air flight and your room in Nassau's top luxury hotels. Just 50 minutes by plane from Miami, Fla., by simply opening an insured savings account that earns 5 percent interest with the Dollar Industrial Bank of Nassau.

These vacation trips are made available from April 15 to December 15 via the Delta, Pan American, and BOAC Airlines, from Chicago or New York. Our many plans listed below will appeal to corporations, unions, professional or businessmen, who will open with idle funds, savings accounts that are insured and will earn 5 percent and receive these Nassau tropical vacations free. A maximum of $25,000 will be accepted from any corporation, union or individual, allowing a vacation for each $5,000 invested.

Our plan for business corporation, could be an incentive for officers and employees for meritorious work done, by simply opening a savings account (maximum $25,000) with corporation surplus funds that are not in use.

Our plan for labor unions would certainly reward union officers, agents, and stewards when they would receive these Nassau tropical vacations at no cost to them, when you put to work union funds that are earning 5 percent in an insured savings account (maximum of $25,000 will be accepted).

Our plan for business and professional men: Here the businessman, doctor, dentist, and others can open an insured savings account with $5,000 and receive a free vacation or with a $10,000 account, you can make arrangements to spend an ideal vacation with your wife. And, remember, savings accounts receive interest every 6 months, July 1 and January 1, of each year, and our rate is 5 percent with your account being insured against loss. Now is the time to put your idle funds to work and get your Nassau tropical vacation free, where the temperature average is 70 to 80 degrees all year round.

Sincerely,

DAVID VINE,
Vice President.

P.S.—If you do not find it possible to open an insured savings account at this time, feel free to write our travel department for information or better still, let us make your reservations for you, and remember your visits to Dollar Industrial Bank are always welcome.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. BEALL. Certainly; I am happy to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senator from Maryland has taken occasion to address himself to this subject. As a matter of fact, I was planning to speak to him about having a discussion on the floor of the Senate in regard to the savings and loan company situation which has developed in the State of Maryland and also in places such as the one to which he has referred in the last few minutes—which is Nassau, as I understand.

Mr. BEALL. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. However, I knew nothing about the company to which he has referred just now.

The Senator from Maryland was not able to be present at the meeting this morning of the Banking and Currency Committee. At that time there was some discussion in the committee in regard to this situation; and I reminded the committee that in 1958, based on two bills introduced by the Senator from Maryland, the Subcommittee on Housing, of which I am chairman, and which has jurisdiction over savings and loan legislation, held hearings, which naturally dealt with, almost exclusively, the savings and loan institutions in Maryland, because of the peculiar situation prevailing there.

I wish to give full credit to the Senator from Maryland for having brought this matter to light. I regret that it was allowed to develop as long as it did. I think the Senator from Maryland will recall that at the time I was greatly surprised—and I believe all the other members of our committee were likewise greatly surprised—to find that Maryland had no law whatever regulating in any way whatsoever savings and loan institutions, or providing a requirement for insurance, and so forth. I believe he will also recall that we uncovered certain situations in regard to such insurance there. For instance, I believe he referred to the fact that one of the companies was insured in a company which had been chartered in Panama, and another one was insured in a company which had been chartered in Morocco.

Mr. BEALL. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe it would not be unfair to state that some of them smacked of being "phony" companies. Furthermore, the manner in which securities were deposited by them and other matters in connection with their operations were simply unbelievable. Yet at the same time we found that some of those companies were advertising over the radio, in attempts to entice persons to place their savings with those companies at rates higher than those paid by firms which had Federal insurance, as Federal savings and loan associations.

At that time the committee was surprised to learn what the Senator from Maryland set forth; namely, that the State of Maryland failed to regulate such companies. I believe that the Maryland Legislature at its next session began action, but it took considerable time to complete it.

I hope the disclosure of these irregularities in the State of Maryland will not adversely affect adequately protected savings and loan associations throughout the country.

Certainly people should be aware of the fact that every Federal savings and loan association and every State association that is under the FSLIC affords adequate protection to those who deposit their savings there. Furthermore, I understand that every State in the Union, with the exception of one—I am not sure about this, but I believe I am correct when I say that this is true of every State in the Union except one—adequately regulates savings and loan associations.

Mr. BEALL. Yes, at the present time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not all the States have Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation insurance; some States have set up their own insurance organizations which we found to be quite adequate. As I recall, Ohio is one State which has established an organization which is very fine.

Mr. BEALL. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. So I hope the situation in Maryland can be worked out satisfactorily; and I hope that the people will remember that there is existing law on the subject. Frankly, I have not studied it, but I certainly hope the people have adequate protection for their savings which may be placed with institutions chartered from this time on.

I am sorry that neither one of the Senators from Alaska is on the floor at the moment. Within the last day or two I have been told that Alaska does not have a law covering savings and loan associations. I received that information from only one person, who told me that. If that is actually the situation in Alaska—and I plan to speak to the Senators from Alaska about it—I hope action will be taken there. I do not know the extent to which savings and loan associations may be organized in Alaska. But certainly if there is a single one there, there should be certainty as to its solvency and the provision of adequate protection for the savings depositors.

I am glad that the Senator from Maryland has brought this matter up. I am sure he joins with me in the few remarks I have tried to make.

Mr. BEALL. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Alabama. I also wish to acknowledge and thank him for the splendid cooperation he gave in 1958. The Senator from Alabama volunteered, when we brought the matter to his attention, to have hearings to ascertain whether any Federal laws were being violated. It was shown that depositors in savings and loan associations in a number of States were adequately protected. As the Senator from Alabama has said, there are thousands of good savings and loan associations throughout the Nation, and there are plenty of good ones in my own State of Maryland—good, sound, well operated, well organized. Our purpose is to get after the rascals that are now using the mails. That is the reason we want now to bring this to the attention of everyone. These people are the same ones that were run out of the United States. Now, from a safe distance, they are offering these attractive inducements to snare the unwary. We want everybody to know the truth about these operators.

It is good that so many people save their money, but it make me sad to receive letters, as I am doing now, from good people who have deposited their savings in irresponsible companies and are now in distress.

I join the Senator from Alabama in his remarks. Again I want to thank him for the splendid cooperation he gave in 1958, and the years that have intervened, in cooperating with us in bringing this matter to the attention of the people.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] in congratulating the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall] for bringing this matter to our attention, so that it will be brought to the attention of all the people. It happens that, while I am attending my duties here in Washington, I have a home in Maryland. I have been fearful about this situation for some time. As we all know, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall] called this matter to our attention in 1958. At that time he warned us as to what might happen in the future. Here he is again calling the attention of all the people to this matter, not only to the people of Maryland, where thousands and thousands who put their life's earnings into these associations have suffered severely and will lose money because they were not protected properly by the laws of the State. I am glad he is calling this matter to the attention of any other State which does not have proper laws in that field.

Mr. BEALL. I thank the Senator.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE-MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I am most hopeful that the President's action in signing an Executive order aimed at creating a meaningful employee-management program will mark the dawn of a bright new day in the Government service.

I am personally delighted because the Executive order appears to embody many of those principles which I have fought to establish legislatively over the years. Certainly, the action of the President in seeking to establish union recognition and employee-management relationships within the Federal service is commendable. Likewise our Federal employee organizations are to be congratulated on this achievement, which is not only well-deserved, but toward which they so greatly contributed.

The Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which I have the honor to be chairman, is looking forward to reviewing the provisions of this long-awaited Executive order. We are confident that this order will mark a long step in the right direction. But, if we feel there are any omissions or shortcomings in the order, we shall work toward remedying such defects through legislative action.

I certainly believe this will be a step in the right direction. As I have often said, a poor law or a poor Executive order poorly administered is worse than a good law poorly administered. So we shall have to watch how this order will be administered by the various departments of Government.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service relating to the Executive order on union recognition and employees' union bargaining rights with Government agencies. It is a matter that has been of interest to the senior Senator from Minnesota for many years, and a matter on which I have worked closely with the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina.

I am pleased the President has seen fit to issue this Executive order. I think it will promote better employee-employer relationships. I think it is long overdue, and that the result of the order will be the improvement of the Federal service. But, like the Senator from South Carolina, we shall watch these relations carefully. If there is a need for statutory law to make the proposal of the union recognition and better labor-management relationships in the Federal Government effective, we shall attempt to write that law. I wish to commend the Senator from South Carolina for his diligence in this matter. He has been a stalwart friend of the Federal public servant. He has not only been his friend, but has in many ways been a constant guardian of the rights of the civil servant—all to the good of the public, may I add, and all to the good of more effective public service.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his remarks. For several years he was a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. He will recall that at that time he advocated measures along these lines. I am glad to hear the statement made by him at this time. I, too, think it is a step in the right direction.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEDICATION OF STREET IN HONOR OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT IN BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the highlights on the trip which I took this past fall to South America was the privilege afforded me of participating in a ceremony in Buenos Aires, Argentina, renaming a street "Franklin Delano Roosevelt." This action in honor of our beloved President Roosevelt was the result of a unanimous decision of the municipal council of the great city of Buenos Aires.

The ceremony itself was held on November 22. Participants included the children of the local school—the F.D.R. School—the municipal band, the student council of the American Community School, members of the American Chamber of Commerce, the American Society of the River Plate, the American's Men's Club, city officials, and representatives of our own Embassy and the USIS.

I add, Mr. President, there were present literally hundreds and thousands of citizens and residents of Buenos Aires, Argentina. It was a beautiful morning and a beautiful occasion. On this day the weather is not quite as warm as one might wish, but that was a warm, balmy, sunny day, fitting and appropriate for the occasion.

Following the playing of the national anthems of the two countries, speeches were delivered by Councilman Mancini, originator of the proposal to name the street in honor of President Roosevelt; Secretary of Public Works, Jorge Gómez Pineda; Secretary of the Treasury and Administration, Dr. Osvaldo Juan Tovo; the Chargé d'Affaires of our Embassy, Henry Hoyt; and myself.

I was especially honored to be able to read a message at this ceremony from President Kennedy.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these speeches which I have mentioned be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Yarborough in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Dedication of Franklin Delano Roosevelt Street, Buenos Aires, November 22, 1961

(Speech made by Secretary of Public Works Jorge Gómez Pineda)

Ladies and gentlemen, great historical personalities arising at the moment of greatest need and influencing the course of history are often judged from many viewpoints since the scope of their activities is so vast. Thus we may see only partial aspects, insufficient to explain exactly why the personality is so long remembered. It is only after the passage of time that a man's work can be measured with precision.

Today we are paying tribute to Franklin D. Roosevelt, one of the most vigorous, dynamic, and creative personalities of the United States. In evoking his many facets and deeds, we think of him first as the builder of the victory of World War II. At the height of the battle, but in time to envisage the fruits of long years of sacrifice, Franklin D. Roosevelt passed away on April 12, 1945.

After a rich experience as senator, Under Secretary of the Navy during the war of 1914–18, and Governor of the State of New York, he won the Presidency when circumstances were extremely difficult and complex, as the United States was facing one of the most serious economic crises in history. A nation with the strength of iron in the midst of expansion and progress saw its march arrested by the depression, which began with a stockmarket crash in 1929.

Roosevelt faced the problem of halting the rust that was wasting the economic and moral resources. His extraordinary talents as statesman, sociologist, and economist conceived the New Deal, a bold and decisive program to pump new lifeblood into the country. So great was the success of his economic and social initiative that, even without his other deeds, he would still be known the world over for his concept of the New Deal.

But fate reserved for the great Democrat an even greater emergency: the totalitarian aggression which launched the second conflict of the century. Freedom seemed to be totally defeated as the Axis Powers swept over Europe and the Far East. President Roosevelt was equal to the challenge, mobilizing the Nation from the smallest workshop to the largest factory in an effort of gigantic proportions.

In due time the immense might of totalitarianism crumbled before the weapons of freedom. Roosevelt was the builder of a victory, a victory that would not have been possible without the participation of the United States. This is why posterity pays him a homage of gratitude.

For four consecutive terms—1933–45—Roosevelt discharged the duties of President and enjoyed unprecedented popularity. Those were critical times in the history of the world, and this extraordinary statesman imbued the times with his own true spirit of democracy. The thinking which inspired his love for freedom was a result of his profound respect for man and for the political and institutional system which insures man's dignity.

The Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms summarized the ethical and ideological program of Western civilization. It is a program still waiting for realization. It rejects territorial conquest and proclaims the rights of all peoples to choose their own form of government, to live free from fear and want, to renounce the use of force in international relations, and to practice economic cooperation. Roosevelt nurtured the hope that man would be able to build a better world, the first step being the herculean task that led to a victory over the forces of oppression.

Ladies and gentlemen, the homage which I have the pleasure of rendering—as a representative of the mayor—to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt by bestowing his name on this street, in accordance with the ordinances of the municipal council, is not only a tribute of the city of Buenos Aires to the great President and Democrat, but also a testimony of affection and admiration from the city's population to the stanch promoter of friendship in inter-American relations; to the man who, by establishing the good neighbor policy in the hemisphere, began an era of solidarity among the American Republics.

In 1936 the people of this city had the opportunity to extend a wholehearted, moving welcome to President Roosevelt when he arrived to attend the opening of the Inter-American Conference for the Consolidation of Peace, which met upon his suggestion. The memory of the enthusiastic and spontaneous reception still lives. And we remember it today. Roosevelt is immortal because he waged the hardest battle known to centuries, defending the undeniable right for all men to live in freedom, justice, and dignity as is inherent to man's status—in fulfillment of the lofty destiny that we must realize on earth.

ADDRESS BY COUNCILMAN FRANCISCO A. MANCINI

Mr. Ambassador, diplomatic envoys, ladies, and gentlemen, the executive department and the municipal council do hereby, in a simple though significant ceremony, pay homage to the champion of democracies, Mr. Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

His extraordinary personality, which even polio could not destroy, carried him step by step through various positions in his visionary battle for the victory of democracy—first in his own country, as senator, Under Secretary of Navy, and President for four consecutive terms; then, using all his strength, intelligence and conviction, in World War II against the Axis, whose end was apparent at the time of his death. He was one of the principal builders of the Allied victory, which afforded the triumph of democracy and the liberation of oppressed peoples, even of Germans and Italians, who were subjected to regimes installed by Nazi-Fascist dictatorship.

He never thought of defeat, because of his utter faith in democracy, which he regarded as undefeatable; failure could be attributed only to ignorance or miscomprehension on the part of those who implemented democracy; for this reason his whole work for democracy was superb.

His inter-American policy, which he proclaimed as that of the "good neighbor," caused a fundamental change in relations among countries of the Western Hemisphere, and we are increasingly enjoying its benefits today. He laid the groundwork and now his democratic spirit is present in all of us, guiding our united actions, working to banish from the world those ideologies which attack liberty and lead to totalitarianism and to the overwhelming of mankind, and which endeavor in multiple ways to destroy democracy. He is the protective beacon and guide; therefore this tribute from one people to a defender of peoples is fitting and comes at a timely hour to encourage democratic faith, to enhance belief in the previous values which are representative of the free world, and to give us the necessary impetus to continue striving for the definite triumph of our deals. These are the same ideals for which such a fight was made by the man who so justly occupies today a prominent place in the history of the world. Our people loved him, love him and will continue to love him.

MR. HOYT'S REMARKS

It is fitting and proper for a country to pay homage to the memory of one of its great men. It is equally fitting and proper—but far more rare and, therefore, even more meaningful—for a nation to commemorate the name of a great man of another country. I am, therefore, honored and more gratified than words can express to represent the United States at this ceremony, in which the name of Franklin Delano Roosevelt is being given to a street of Buenos Aires by decision of the Consejo Deliberante of this great and beautiful capital city of the Republic of Argentina.

It is to be hoped that this will not only serve continuously to recall the man, Roosevelt, but also the good neighbor policy, which he formulated and which is now a cornerstone of our Alianza para el Progreso.

The motives which have inspired these two great programs and policies are based on the sincere desire of the American people and Government to strengthen the bond of friendship with our brothers of the other American Republics. We believe in the same things. We share our common heritage, our love of freedom, and our tradition. These facts were understood by President Roosevelt and, I can assure you, are also understood today by the people and the Government of the United States. We fully realize that only by working together with such great countries as Argentina as good neighbors and through such programs as the Alianza para el Progreso, will we be able to sustain the principles we believe in and bring about a better world for our peoples based on freedom and democracy. We are engaged in a most difficult struggle; our way of life is at stake. But we will win. It is therefore fitting that we are recalling in these days such great men as Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Argentina's great educator, Domingo Faustino Sarmiento, whose lives were dedicated to the fight for freedom and democracy.

By fortunate coincidence, there is with us today a man who worked closely with the late President Roosevelt. I refer to Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of the State of Minnesota, who, prior to Government service, had a distinguished academic career as professor of political science. During the Second World War, he enjoyed a close working friendship with President Roosevelt, and he was one of his election campaign managers in 1944. He is now one of the outstanding Democratic leaders in our country.

I am pleased at this time to present to you Senator HUMPHREY, who will say a few words to you in English and then read a message from President Kennedy sent on this occasion.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Sres. Pineda and Mancini, for the tribute you have just given to President Roosevelt. I am indeed honored to be here in this beautiful city of Buenos Aires and to see how industrious and energetic the citizens of Argentina are. I am very much impressed by all this, and by the singular honor of being invited to participate in the naming of one of your fine streets after Roosevelt. Upon looking at these handsome schoolchildren, I am reminded that President Roosevelt dedicated his life toward making the world a better place for children. He worked with tireless energy to protect peace and democracy in the world. This new street in your capital, bearing his name, is another testimony to the success of the good neighbor policy, which is being continued with renewed vigor.

I will now read a message that has just been received from President Kennedy. These are his words:

"In behalf of my fellow citizens of the United States I send the sincere thanks we all feel to the people of Argentina for the honor the great city of Buenos Aires has bestowed on the name and the spirit of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

"The Calle Franklin Delano Roosevelt that you are dedicating will endure in our hearts and the hearts of generations to follow.

"It is the grievous price of history that far-seeing minds rarely savor the fruits of their genius. So it was with President Roosevelt and his vision of a fraternity of American Republics working together for a fulfillment of human ideals. We no longer have the friendly and helpful hand of this good neighbor, but his spirit urges us on in our Alliance for Progress. I pray all Americans will prove worthy of this trust."

Thank you. "Al gran pueblo Argentino, Salud!"

PRESENT-DAY PROBLEMS OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the text of a speech delivered by the government secretary of the Virgin Islands, Cyril E. King, at ceremonies sponsored by the St. Croix Labor Union on November 1 of last year at Estate Grove Place, St. Croix.

In his address Mr. King gives a most interesting and informative account of the historical development of the trade union movement in St. Croix and the acceptance of the philosophy of the free press in these islands. He also points up in his speech the difficulties which working people still face in the islands despite the tremendous economic growth in recent years. I commend the article to the Senate.

Mr. King is rendering excellent service as government secretary. His action and messages have earned for him the admiration of the people of the Virgin Islands.

I take particular pleasure in bringing this address to the attention of the Senate, not only because of its substance and content, but also because Mr. King worked in my office for many years. He is a native of the Virgin Islands. He educated himself in the United States at one of our great universities, American University. He trained himself for public service and equipped himself by experience to enter the public service. He has now returned to the Virgin Islands as government secretary and is doing a remarkably good and honorable job.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that, along with Mr. King's address, an editorial published in the newspaper, the News Current, of St. Croix be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address Prepared for Delivery by Hon. Cyril E. King, Government Secretary of the Virgin Islands of the United States, Liberty Day, Estate Grove Place, St. Croix, Virgin Islands, November 1, 1961

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, officers and members of the St. Croix Labor Union, fellow Virgin Islanders, and friends, it was the middle of the year 1914 when a campaign of agitation moved into high gear to force the recall of the Danish Governor Helweg-Larsen as well as the dismissal of the Governor's friend and King's physician, the despicable Mr. Kalmar. Motivated by the indignities, yes, even the atrocities, that were being heaped on their fellow natives, a group of crusading reformers decided to do something about these transgressions. It was a reform movement in keeping with the most glorious reform movements that, throughout the history of Western civilization, have marked the end of tyrants and the beginning of popular rule.

This group designated one of their own, the illustrious native son and crusader, D. Hamilton Jackson, and dispatched him with a petition to King Christian IX. Two of the supplications are of special relevance to the cause we are celebrating here today. One asked for a grant to publish a free newspaper; the other was a request for assurances against intimidation and interference by local police and gendarmes when public meetings were held, as well as the right to conduct such meetings in public places. These pleas were granted, our historians tell us, even before Mr. Jackson had returned to St. Croix from Denmark.

It needs little emphasis that the right to hold public meetings as well as the right to publish a free newspaper augured well for the advent of the labor union although it is doubtful whether the powerful planters association, suffering from the shortsightedness with which all oppressors seem to be afflicted, had seen the handwriting on the wall.

The sugar crop of 1915 much like that of 1961 was a bumper crop. But unlike the wages earned by unskilled sugar workers of 50 cents an hour today—however deficient today's wages may be—they can hardly be compared with the 20 cents a day which native workers were earning at that time. Faced with this abundance of sugarcane but lowly paid and dissatisfied employees the planters got somewhat concerned, and perhaps agitated, sensing that all was not, as indeed all could not be, well. They called for a meeting with the Governor and asked for an increase in pay. In response, the Governor declared that the Colonial Council should pass a law pinning first-class laborer's pay at 25 cents a day, an increase of 5 cents.

Getting wind of this information, the reformers started to work diligently and to negotiate the pay of the workers. They battled the planters in a knock down, drag out fight to secure the recognition of the St. Croix Labor Union as the bargaining representative of the sugarcane workers. But this was only the beginning of a struggle that was to subsist for several years.

Despite this grudging acceptance of the representative principle, labor and social unrest continued and the new freedom of the labor movement, as incipient as it was, was accompanied by the constant threats from the planters of imprisonment which hung over Jackson's head—like the sword of Damocles—by the slenderest of threads. Although this was a substantial beginning, it was still only a beginning. And there continued to be figuratively speaking a "price on Jackson's head."

And so it was that on Monday, November 1, 1915, Liberty Day was ordained in St. Croix, Danish West Indies. Preparations were made to celebrate the occasion and an account of the mammoth demonstration that began from 5:30 in the morning and continuing to midnight was chronicled by the dean of the Virgin Islands Bar, the Honorable R. H. Amphlet Leader, in the Herald of November 4, 1915. But for today's occasion, I think you would prefer, as I do, the poignancy of Attorney Leader's letter to the editor on the birth of the Herald. It sums up, ever so succinctly, the profound meaning of the emergence of a free press and its enormous implications. Wrote he: "The word 'press' stands for the triumph of right over wrong, for justice over oppression, for uplift, progress, and liberty. It stands for all this and more."

The St. Croix Labor Union was therefore spawned, like unions elsewhere, out of the necessities of the social situation, the individual worker being obviously helpless in dealing with the plantocracy. And like the rise of labor movements elsewhere in which periods of rapid growth are generally times of disturbance, the union had at least gotten off the ground.

Today, we have come together to celebrate Liberty Day, and to pay homage to the crusaders and reformers of yesterday without whose efforts only Heaven knows where we would be now. Liberty Day then symbolizes the grant of a larger freedom which included the freedom of the workers to organize and to bargain collectively with representatives of their own choosing and the freedom to publish a newspaper and to hold public meetings. It was thus that the St. Croix Labor Union was launched.

Came 1917 and, of course, the transfer. Public unrest continued undiminished. And, in 1919, Senator Kenyon, of Iowa, was designated chairman of a commission to investigate the continuing causes.

The Commission reached the Islands in 1920. Its report is ripe with source material relating to those glorious sons who were in the thick of the fight for social and political reforms. During the 1920's the union fought on valiantly, acquiring its estates. Then there was the Woodson Commission specifically dispatched to the Islands to go into the question of the relationship subsisting between management and labor and close on its heels came the organizing activities of the A.F. of L. led by Morris Davis.

The St. Croix Labor Union survives even today, 46 years after it was born—thanks, among other things, to the dedicated and tireless efforts of such stalwarts as the present leadership headed by your President, Mr. Raymond Pedro. Its continuity affords us an opportunity to view it as well as the other unions and the workers they represent from the perspective of today's social and economic environment.

Since to speak of the labor unions is to speak of the workers who comprise them, I should like to pose the question, as indeed Hamilton Jackson and his colleagues would have posed it, how do the workers stand today in enjoyment of the liberties that were left to them? Are they earning a living wage or are they in a continuous but losing battle with the spiraling cost of living? Is labor prepared to offer a full day's work for a full day's pay? Are there sufficient employment opportunities offering a satisfactory wage? Are the bulk of them occupying adequate or substandard housing?

All of these inquiries, of course, relate to our economic policy and its aims. I would therefore submit that the basic aim of our economic policy, as Governor Paiewonsky postulated in his appearance before the Senate Insular Affairs Committee, is the development of these islands in the interest of all of our people, the raising of the standard of living by increasing individual real purchasing power, that is to say, to create the preconditions which would allow our people to buy more commodities out of the dollars they earn today, and to increase our total wealth so as to facilitate the attainment of a higher standard of social services and administration. Is this basic aim the informing principle of our expanding economy today? Let's take a look.

Our economy is buoyant, our treasury coffers are heavy with increasing public revenue; Governor Paiewonsky by authorizing an unprecedented number of public projects is putting employment opportunities at the disposal of our people and giving impetus to the circulation of more dollars as the wage bill increases; the building industry continues to expand in response to an expanding tourist trade and an expanding population.

A sample of our unprecedented prosperity can be found in three significant facts. First, the money being left in the islands by tourists has jumped from $1.8 million in 1950 to more than $24.7 million in 1960; second, public revenue from all sources, local and Federal, were approximately $8.2 million in 1954. By 1960, these revenues had reached the amount of $17.4 million; and third, full employment is now achieved or we are quite close to its achievement. That is to say, everyone who is able to work and who wants to work can get a job. The modest pride that we should take in this accomplishment is grounded in the vision of our legislature which in 1945 adopted the Virgin Islands Full Employment Act which declared full employment and full production as public policy. The Virgin Islands Employment Service has, however, cautioned restraint since this agency has found evidence of underemployment manifested in the holding of more than one job by some of our people—no doubt to help to make ends meet. And this despite the existence of a substantial shortage of labor in many occupational categories.

In the face of this truly fantastic economic development, I ask you whether our workers are receiving a fair share of this increased prosperity? Let me put it another way: Figures recently released with respect to the value of the things we import indicate that we imported merchandise to the tune of $42.3 million during 1960. How much of those imports, in terms of value, were intended for, and to improve the standard of living of, the average worker?

I put these questions in order to suggest that I do not believe our labor force is receiving a fair share of this increased prosperity.

In 1958, the Virgin Islands Employment Service published a "Job Opportunity Survey" in which it was said that "although the cost of living in the Virgin Islands is among the highest found anywhere in the United States, its territories and other possessions, the average hourly wage rates for many occupational categories are among the lowest." Available data contained in the Eighth Annual Report of the Employment Service for 1959 pointed to a "rather clear picture of sustained growth in employment and wages" yet employees worked on the average for 1⅓ employers.

Wage rates, of course, have not been static. For example, while employees covered by the Federal Wage and Hour Act in the shipping, marine transportation, ship and boat building industries were earning 40 cents an hour in 1949, they were earning at least $1 in 1959, two and a half times as much while contracts negotiated by both the Virgin Islands and the St. Croix labor unions provided for basic rates above $1. Unskilled laborers covered by our local wage and hour statute who were earning 30 cents an hour in 1948 only moved up to 40 cents around 1957 and had to depend on the legislature to increase the figure to 60 cents in 1960, twice the amount earned in 1948. In 1952, sugar workers at the unskilled level were making 40 cents an hour and although this basic rate had not been changed, Vicorp was paying 45 cents an hour in 1959.

Purely in terms of money wages, wage rates obviously have not kept pace with the vast increase of money which has been put into circulation. This situation has deteriorated further as a result of the spiraling cost of living particularly as this relates to clothing, food, and rent—the bulk of the workingman's needs.

It would indeed appear that the entire price level is also rising faster than wages. As a matter of fact, from mid-1957 to mid-1958, a period of continuing economic growth, a survey of the cost of basic commodities disclosed that since 1955, this cost had shown an average increase of approximately 38 percent. In 1959, the Virgin Islands Employment Service pointed to substantial evidence that the average wage and salary worker will find that his real wages, that is, those wages measured in terms of what items of food, rent, clothing, they would buy, as distinguished from the money wages, is decreasing. I repeat is decreasing, in a period of general economic growth in the Virgin Islands.

In other words, while the economy is expanding, your food dollars you are earning are buying less and less of your daily requirements. Industry Committee No. 7 under the Federal Wage and Hour Act has already held its hearing and so has our local wage board operating under the Virgin Islands Little Wage and Hour Act with respect to minimum wages regulated thereunder. The trade unions have been negotiating and, no doubt, shall continue to negotiate some wage increases. Yet it is doubtful whether a significant trend toward wage increases for the majority of workers in nonagricultural or agricultural employment shall result; it is even more doubtful whether the money wages of our workers shall buy today the food, clothing, and other necessaries that these wages bought as recently as a year ago.

As a short-term remedy, it is therefore recommended that a higher wage policy be applied to those industries not covered by the Federal Wage and Hour Act to close the gap between the basic wage paid by industries that are subject to the act and those that are not. In this connection, it is to be noted that at the end of June 1958, there were 41 businesses in the islands employing some 2,000 employees within the reach of wage and hours while there were 37 other concerns, employing about 1,000 employees whose activities were outside the intendment of the statute.

Wages in agriculture should be moved upward, due account being taken of the important factor of productivity. Since the Virgin Islands Corp., is the industry leader, as an aside, I should urge that we must carefully scrutinize the alternatives open to us for the ultimate disposition of the Corporation's agricultural and manufacturing facilities. After all, the cultivation of the sugarcane still remains as the most profitable enterprise for many farmers in the St. Croix, despite some evidence of shifting from cultivation of sugarcane to truck farming. In 1956, private growers received almost $330,000 for their crop, and in 1960, there were 214 of these private sugarcanegrowers right here on St. Croix. The Corporation may be able to grant wage increases on a selective basis until productivity is more in balance with wages. With this better balance the sugar industry might be able to contract in terms of employment, although this need not imply contraction in terms of volume of production. A reduction in the level of employment would substantially lessen the need for the number of foreign workers and remove some otherwise surmountable pressures on our social services and the depressing effect on wage rates.

But now that the economy is developing into three rather well-defined sectors, namely, agricultural and fisheries, light manufacturing industries, tourism and the service trades, there is a pressing need for a more fundamental examination of territorial wage policy in relation to our economic development. I will, therefore, recommend to Governor Paiewonsky that such an examination be carried out. The objective of such an examination must be the undertaking of a realistic assessment of what the levels and structure of wages should be, having due regard to the reasonable needs of our workers, the capacity of these Virgin Islands to sustain the advances necessary to achieve a satisfactory position and the requirements of further economic development. The principle that must be uppermost in our minds while such a fundamental scrutiny is taking place is that of raising the level of living of workers and securing to them a fair share of the prosperity of the Islands as a whole, inasmuch as the whole aim of our economic development is to improve the living conditions of our people.

I do not wish this suggestion to be in derogation of the principle that collective bargaining agreements between management and labor which are becoming more and more frequent, are normally the best means for the determination and adjustment of wages and should be actively promoted and encouraged. Rather, my suggestion is grounded in a recognition that in the present circumstances of the Virgin Islands the use of the statutory wage-fixing machinery can be effectively supplemented by what Justice Brandeis used to call a system of industrial self-government by local employers and local unions, a system more commonly referred to as collective bargaining.

While I am on this matter of economic diversification, wherein three main economic sectors are emerging. I should like to say a word about the imperative need of a balanced economy. We have to make sure that we do not allow ourselves to become wholly dependent on tourism, no matter how economically fruitful it may presently appear. While we hope to hold our own as the Caribbean continues to develop into a tourist playground, it is the sector of our economy least subject to our influence and control, and in line with Governor Paiewonsky's thinking we must therefore attract new industry as well as expand and improve agricultural production.

But there is yet another reason why we must be wary of becoming utterly dependent on the tourist trade. Governor Hastie warned about this many years ago in terms of the social price we may very well have to pay for an expanding tourist trade. Said he: "The influx of large numbers of persons from the mainland for various purposes and with diverse ideas is bound to bring problems which have not been acute because of our isolation. The community and its leaders will be tested as never before to maintain values of character, integrity and human dignity."

The civil rights measure which Governor Paiewonsky's committee recommended to and which was passed by the Legislature provides a solid framework within which to resist the intrusion of sociological concepts foreign both to the American Creed and our way of life in these Virgin Islands, which Governor, now Circuit Judge Hastie warned us against 13 years ago. Bermuda and Nassau in the Bahamas, household words in the tourist business, are notorious examples of what can happen when the tourist dollar becomes an end which justifies any means to get it.

To return to my analysis of our workers' needs, a corollary to the basic appraisal of our territorial wage policy, family budget inquiries to appraise the needs of our workers and their families, should be made and I will similarly recommend this to Governor Paiewonsky. They should be designed to ascertain the workers' income, expenditures and the goods and services which they secure. Cost of living indexes regularly compiled and calculated to measure changes in the cost of maintaining the pattern of consumption indicated by a fixed list of goods and services should also be maintained as an adjunct to the budget inquiries. Since St. Croix on the one hand and St. Thomas and St. John on the other are two distinct labor markets, separate inquiries may very well have to be carried out in each area.

Finally, we have to secure a reduction in the cost of living. Governor Paiewonsky already has indicated his determination to move swiftly in the area of providing more and better housing for low-income as well as middle-income families. Because the cost of food, perhaps even more than the cost of rent and clothing, is the most intractable problem, we may have to resort to unorthodox means of securing a reduction in the cost of food. In Puerto Rico, the use of government-sponsored or government-owned supermarkets has proved successful. Perhaps the report of a study of the cost of basic commodities by Mr. Francis, an economist and one of our native sons who, while on loan from the Economic Development Administration of Puerto Rico, is relevant. As I understand it, he submitted to ex-Governor Merwin, late in the 1958-59 fiscal year, a program for containing the spiraling costs of food sold in the Virgin Islands.

In this connection, it is recalled that Governor Hastie had recommended that food be purchased from the States in carload lots in the interest of passing on to the consumers the savings which would come consequentially from reduced freightage. This is an area in which our imagination and ingenuity should be given full play because this matter of high food prices is extremely close to the day-to-day needs of our workers and their families. Their freedom from want, be it in quality or in quantity, is an important part of our contemporary conception of freedom.

It is my deep conviction that the adoption of these recommendations or variations thereof would be a significant step forward in the direction of improving the standard of living of our people. It would be in keeping with the valiant and continuous efforts of the St. Croix Labor Union to improve the well-being of the people of these islands, and as exemplified by the fact that hundreds of you are today the proud owners of deeds to your land, which is one of the outstanding accomplishments of your present union leadership.

The legacy which Hamilton Jackson left to us because of his crusading and reforming zeal and that of his colleagues must not be dishonored. True to his trust, we must use the occasion of Liberty Day, today and as it comes once a year, to rededicate ourselves to the task of seeing that the liberties and freedoms which he carved out and the sacrifices which he so nobly made in the interest of improving the lot of our native workers as well as the lot of us all shall not have been in vain. We must address ourselves also to the urgent and continuing challenge of increasing man's potential. Only thus shall we have earned the right to echo and reecho Jackson's fateful words, first written on a fateful day 46 years ago, that "We have fought and conquered and now we shall have a land that is to be a heritage for our children, and a resting place for our departed selves. May liberty and brotherhood reign."

That epitaph—his epitaph—remains today as it was on November 1, 1915, the best hope of these Virgin Islands.

Thank you.

PROSPERITY FOR WHOM?

The Government Secretary for the Virgin Islands Hon. Cyril E. King, in a Liberty Day address last week, shattered a myth which has been widely recognized since the inception of the Merwin Administration—that the people of the Virgin Islands are experiencing an era of general prosperity. Mr. King pointed out that the spiraling cost of living, particularly as this relates to clothing, food and rent, the bulk of the workingman's needs, have outweighed the advances in increased income. Therefore, while the economy is expanding, the workers' take-home pay is buying less of their daily requirements.

We concur wholeheartedly with Mr. King's appraisal of the situation. As we have said before, in spite of all the delightful talk about "general prosperity," we must ask ourselves—prosperity for whom?

We firmly believe that there is a great logic in the conduct of governmental affairs, and there is an equally great logic in the conduct of economic affairs. If these two logical disciplines can be wedded, it is then possible to create a situation of maximum economic growth and stability which in turn strengthens the basic structure of government. But, if on the other hand, these two are allowed to proceed in absolute disregard, one for the other—if that happens, we then create a situation, either of doubtful economic health or of such precarious governmental stability that the orderly development of these communities is in constant jeopardy.

It was indeed heartening to learn that Mr. King was not merely lamenting the crisis faced by the wage earner because of the steadily shrinking dollar. He also had some ideas for correcting the situation. Said he: "Because the cost of food, perhaps even more than the cost of rent and clothing, is the most intractable problem, we may have to resort to unorthodox means of securing a reduction in the cost of food. In Puerto Rico, the use of government-owned supermarkets has proved successful."

While we prefer the system of free enterprise and the policy of Government nonintervention in certain areas, a basic fact cannot be ignored. We will readily agree that government should not interfere in those fields where private interests are doing the job well. But government should never hesitate to act boldly in those areas where private individuals are unable or unwilling to get the necessary job done.

It is evident that drastic action is necessary to reduce the high cost of living. And we feel that something should be done now. As the Government secretary rightly pointed out, the high cost of food is the key to this particular problem. If we surmount this problem, we will be well on our way to creating a genuine era of prosperity for all the people of the Virgin Islands.

THE PRICE OF PROTECTIONISM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the major issues confronting us during this session of Congress, if not the most important item of all, is trade. The reciprocal trade agreement expires June 30 of this year. We are charged with the task of passing new legislation which not only will serve the best interests of our domestic producers but will strengthen our world position both socially and economically.

There recently have been important developments within the European Economic Community which have a direct bearing on the United States as a country and on all of us as individuals. The so-called Common Market countries of West Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg have now put their own house in order by reducing tariffs, eliminating tariff quotas, and establishing a program for freeing capital movements within the six countries. The Common Market area has a rate of economic growth considerably higher than our own. With the accession of the United Kingdom and other European nations, it will have almost twice as many people as we do. President Kennedy has said:

> Some 90 percent of the free world's industrial production may soon be concentrated in two great markets—the United States of America and an expanded European Common Market.

It therefore is very important, it is our duty as representatives of the American people, that we pass legislation which will give the President power to negotiate with the Common Market on an across-the-board basis. He must have the authority to eliminate tariffs on a wide range of products involved in European Economic Community-U.S. trade and to cut tariffs by as much as 50 percent on many other items. We already have gotten off to a good start in our dealings with the Common Market. One of the major accomplishments was the European Economic Community's granting of tariff concessions on U.S. agricultural exports that last year had a value of from $600 million to $700 million. The door is open to future negotiations. We in the Congress must take action to assure not only that the door remains open but that it is opened wider.

Our Founding Fathers realized the importance of free trade when the U.S. Constitution was adopted 175 years ago. Our internal growth and development can be attributed largely to the Constitutional provision that commerce flow freely between our various States. We have, then, set a precedent for the European countries to let down their mutual trade barriers which in the past have been the source of suspicions and wars, throttled business, and impeded general advancement.

Mr. President, there appeared in the Wall Street Journal of January 16 an excellent editorial on the subject of trade barriers. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRICE OF PROTECTIONISM

Let us suppose that the United States decides to end its reliance on foreign coffee. A tariff is imposed at such a high level that it is prohibitive. No more coffee is imported, and an enormous incentive is given to American coffee growers.

Coffee thrives only in warmer climes, so the pro-tariff American coffee growers were few, operating chiefly in such areas as Hawaii and Puerto Rico. These growers immediately rush out to buy more land, much of it less suited to coffee cultivation than the land they are now working. Higher wages woo workers from other activities in the islands and even draw some from the continental United States. Large amounts of capital are invested in new machinery and warehouses.

The market looks so attractive that some entrepreneurs on the Southern fringes of the United States are encouraged to run the risks of recurring frosts; some producers elsewhere even put up greenhouses to simulate tropical temperatures. Again, massive amounts of capital and labor are diverted from other activities. The average cost of producing coffee is high and the retail price shoots up to around $10 a pound.

This exaggerated example illustrates the impact of tariffs and other trade restrictions, for it differs only in degree from the real world of today. It thus helps to explain why President Kennedy, in his state of the Union message, promised to ask Congress for new and broader powers to dispose of these artificial restraints on trade.

Any tariff, whether levied on British automobiles, Japanese textiles or Swiss watches, is in effect a subsidy to American producers of such products. As such, it has a significant effect on the policies and practices of those producers.

Behind a tariff wall, companies in a protected industry may and often do compete fiercely among themselves. But the tariff makes it possible for the industry to maintain a higher level of prices than would

> otherwise be feasible. Its incentive to modernize its plants and improve its products is less.
>
> Producers become accustomed to relying on the artificial fence that has been erected around their market. When foreign producers threaten to scale the existing fence, the domestic companies incline toward building it higher, rather than fighting to get their costs down.
>
> And who finances the fence? It's the consumer, of course. He pays the bill through higher prices, whether he buys domestic products or such foreign goods as can get in. The burden of this consumer tax isn't lessened one whit by the fact that its a hidden levy.
>
> But the worst aspect of tariffs is not that they impose hidden taxes and award hidden subsidies. It is that they dangerously distort and debilitate the whole domestic economy.
>
> A protected industry is able to bid capital and labor away from industries where they could be more efficiently employed. Its higher prices restrict its markets both at home and abroad; this is reflected by the problems of U.S. agriculture, which enjoys the questionable benefits both of complex direct subsidies and tariff protection. Some American farm products can be marketed abroad only after the Government pays still other subsidies to exporters to permit them to lower their prices.
>
> With the sales of protected industries thus limited and with much of the Nation's resources employed inefficiently, the inevitable result is a severe restriction on the growth of the economy. Both national output and national income are held well below levels they might otherwise attain.
>
> Admittedly, elimination of tariffs would lead to temporary economic problems in some industries. Because of this, an argument can be made for gradual removal. But however it's handled, the future health of the economy demands that a new beginning be made.

WHAT F.D.R. WANTED

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I noted in the Evening Star of yesterday an editorial entitled "What F.D.R. Wanted," which I ask to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> WHAT F.D.R. WANTED
>
> The Walter Russell statue of the Four Freedoms stands in Florida in memory of Colin Kelly, one of the first great American heroes of World War II. It matters little now, therefore, that the model originally was created as a memorial to Franklin D. Roosevelt.
>
> What does matter, however, is how infinitely more fitting and appropriate a memorial to the late President this statue would have been than the weird collection of graveyard slabs that the Roosevelt Memorial Commission wants to build in Potomac Park. According to Sculptor Russell, the concept of the Four Freedoms was selected by Mr. Roosevelt himself as one which he hoped would be embodied in his memorial.
>
> Perhaps this wish still might be fulfilled in some new form. Eventually, we suppose, the matter will have to be decided by Congress. We hope, in any event, that the final decision is more representative of the man and will be a more gracious addition to the Nation's Capital than the monstrosity now being advanced.

Mr. HOLLAND. The editorial speaks of the fact that the Walter Russell statue of the Four Freedoms now stands in Florida in memory of Colin Kelly. I had the honor of participating in the dedication and unveiling of that memorial in the gracious and inspiring little town of Madison, Fla., where it has stood since that time and will stand, I hope, forever, both as a memento of the Four Freedoms and of the fine service rendered by young Colin Kelly, one of our first heroes in World War II, who lost his life in the service of our country.

The reason for my incorporation of this editorial in the RECORD at this time, however, is that I believe the RECORD itself should show that, according to the sculptor, Mr. Russell, and I quote from the editorial:

> The concept of the Four Freedoms was selected by Mr. Roosevelt himself as one which he hoped would be embodied in this memorial.

I can think of nothing which more closely relates to his great service to our Nation and to the world than his announcement of the principles of the Four Freedoms, and the fact that those ideals became a kind of center around which our participation in World War II was formed.

I like to quote these words from the editorial, because I sympathize with them, although I do not claim to be the possessor of such esthetic knowledge and skill as to be able to choose a fitting memorial. However, I think those who are making the selection might well be reminded that Congress will have to approve this memorial in the end, and may well be reminded that apparently Mr. Roosevelt himself suggested that the memorial be built around the idea of the Four Freedoms, and that there are many who think that the present suggestion for the memorial is a rather grotesque thing or group of things.

I quote these words, then, from the editorial:

> According to Sculptor Russell, the concept of the Four Freedoms was selected by Mr. Roosevelt himself as one which he hoped would be embodied in his memorial.
>
> Perhaps this wish still might be fulfilled in some new form. Eventually, we suppose, the matter will have to be decided by Congress. We hope, in any event, that the final decision is more representative of the man and will be a more gracious addition to the Nation's Capital than the monstrosity now being advanced.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STOCK DISTRIBUTION TREATED AS RETURN OF CAPITAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8847) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that a distribution of stock made to an individual (or certain corporations) pursuant to an order enforcing the antitrust laws shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital; and to provide that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate is important legislation. It is important to the stockholders of the Du Pont Co., the stockholders of General Motors Corp., the general taxpaying public, and to the enforcement of the antitrust laws.

There are many people in America who would like to come into personal possession of money or assets now vested in corporations. They are by no means confined to stockholders in the large corporations, or to the stockholders of the Du Pont corporation, General Motors, or Christiana.

There are tens of thousands of corporations in which people hold stock which has a strong cash or near-cash backing. If this cash or its equivalent is distributed to the stockholders, the stockholders must pay taxes on this dividend income at ordinary income rates.

Therefore this bill has a precedential importance, one of its basic principles being to facilitate and effectuate the distribution of vast corporate assets. Indeed, this bill deals with the distribution of corporation assets decreed by the U.S. Supreme Court as being necessary to give effective relief from a condition which the Supreme Court has held to be in violation of this Nation's antitrust laws. Moreover, this will be the largest distribution of corporate assets in the history of this country or in the history of the world.

The bill deals not only with the distribution of corporate assets by the Du Pont Co.; it deals also with the receipt of those assets and the taxation of those assets as received by the individual and corporate stockholders of the Du Pont Co. and by the stockholders of one corporation which owns Du Pont stock. The desire of the proponents of this bill is to distribute these assets, vastly appreciated in value, to the stockholders of the Du Pont corporation without any tax whatsoever being levied on the Du Pont corporation, and with a contrived, adjusted, twisted, abnormal, unusual formula by which all the individual high-bracket income tax payers would pay a greatly reduced tax, and by which all corporations, except Christiana Corp., holding Du Pont stock, would pay the meager tax of only 16 cents a share.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would it not be helpful if we again placed in the RECORD the amount of the accretion in value in General Motors stock held by the Du Pont Co.?

Mr. GORE. Which represents profits to the Du Pont corporation from its holdings of General Motors stock.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. GORE. I think it would be well.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The record shows that 63 million shares of General Motors stock were purchased by Du Pont from 1917 to 1919 at an average price of $2.09

a share, which would be a total of approximately $132 million. Is that not correct?

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The last quotations which we had were to the effect that the price of General Motors stock now on the New York Stock Exchange is $55 a share.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Or a total of $3,465 million.

Mr. GORE. Roughly $3⅓ billion of corporate profits.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The increase in value of those shares has amounted to $3,333 million, or almost precisely $3⅓ billion.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So never, I think, in any private relief tax bill we have ever had before us, have such enormous amounts of money been involved as in this bill.

Mr. GORE. Never before. That is why I made the statement that this bill had a precedential importance. If Congress establishes a precedent in this case, then that precedent will be cited by many other persons and will be used as a justification for a repetition of this special treatment, or other special treatments. If we provide such relief for the Du Pont Co. and its stockholders, individual and corporate, and the stockholders of the Christiana Corp., how can such relief be denied the Hilton Hotel Corp.? I notice the distinguished and able junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] listening. Shall I compliment myself by describing him as listening with rapt attention? Whether it is rapt or not, we are about to rap the general taxpayer by the passage of this bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. At least, the rising of the Senator from Louisiana indicates that he was listening, with whatever degree of attention. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Tennessee knows that the junior Senator from Louisiana would not have any particular objection to the Hilton Hotel bill, even though it appears that that bill has pretty well died the death of inaction; that apparently it is more or less dead for this Congress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will it not spring to life again if this bill shall be passed? Will not the dead awaken and emerge from the tomb and stalk the earth again?

Mr. GORE. I ask the junior Senator from Louisiana, distinguished, fair, eminent, and able as he is, if, in his opinion, the owners of the Hilton Hotel Corp. would not be just as much entitled to relief as are the owners of Du Pont stock?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Hilton owners had come to Congress in the beginning, before the decree became final in their case, I think they would certainly have stood on every bit as favorable a basis for relief as the Du Pont stockholders. I think there is no doubt about that. The Senator from Tennessee and I have some difference of opinion about this, but I must say that, in my judgment, the Hilton people present a very meritorious argument. There is much to be said for their bill. I do not believe they are going to get the relief, but I think they make a good argument.

Mr. GORE. It seems to me that they stand in a better light in one respect: At least, they waited until the final court decision before they asked for relief. On the contrary, the Du Pont Co. has asked Congress to pass a bill to relieve them of a court judgment before that judgment has been finally rendered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If I had been the lawyer for the Hilton people, I do not believe I would have advised them to conduct themselves as they did by waiting. By waiting, they ended getting zero. It appears that the Du Pont people might have a chance to get something, especially if the bill comes to a vote. They might get their bill through.

Mr. GORE. A unanimous-consent order has been entered to vote at 2 p.m. next Tuesday on a motion to recommit. I call the attention of the able Senator from Louisiana and the Senate to the fact that that will be the day after the trial court in Chicago has ordered the submission of final briefs. The Supreme Court decision provided that divestiture need not begin until the expiration of 90 days after the decree of the court had been entered. So on Tuesday the Senate will be voting in the light of these facts: The final briefs will have been presented in Chicago. After the judge has rendered his decision, the Senate will then, under the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, have 90 days in which to provide relief from the decision.

Under those circumstances, what possible justification is there to proceed to act now? I ask the Senate if it is not in the interest of probity, orderly procedure, justice, fairness, and commonsense to wait until the judge has rendered his opinion before we try to provide relief from the contents of that judgment. I await an answer. I shall await an answer on Tuesday afternoon at 2 o'clock.

I think a great many persons in the United States will want an answer to that question, because this issue will not die with the taking of the vote on Tuesday. This issue is going to the American people, and we shall hear of it again and again and again. The students of taxation will read these debates.

Let me remind my distinguished young colleague from Louisiana that we are dealing here with the distribution of the greatest distribution of corporate assets in the history of the world. I dare say that my distinguished colleague from Louisiana may hold some stock in corporations, and would like to receive the dividends without having to pay taxes on them. Many persons want to find a way in which to obtain dividends from corporations without having to pay taxes on them, just as many persons wish to find a way to bring into this country money they have earned abroad, without having to pay taxes on it.

Mr. President, this matter has a precedential importance which transcends that of many of the problems which have been discussed in these debates.

The Attorney General of the United States requested the Senate to make it crystal clear that the passage of this bill was not intend to influence the decision of the trial court in Chicago. The Attorney General said the Department of Justice was concerned lest the passage of this bill—and now I am not attempting to use the exact language used by the Attorney General—cause the Government to lose its case in the court in Chicago. Therefore, he asked, in letters sent to the chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], to the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], and to the junior Senator from Tennessee, that the Senate make it crystal clear that it was not the purpose and intent of this bill to influence the decision of the court in Chicago.

Mr. President, the principal proponent of the bill in the Senate, the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], made a speech on the bill. I studied his speech, and I found that in three different ways he had demonstrated that the bill was designed to influence the decision of the court. How did he describe the bill? I shall have the Record show his exact words; but he described the bill as an equitable solution of a problem which had been fought in the courts for 13 years. Mr. President, it is still being fought in the courts.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Burdick in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Will the Senator from Tennessee read to the Senate any part of the Record which he believes shows that I said that? I think he will find that I said the bill is an equitable solution to a complicated tax problem. I do not believe he will find that I said that a tax problem had been before the courts 13 years.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator from Delaware please repeat his statement? I could not quite understand what he said just now.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I asked the Senator from Tennessee to point out any part of the Record which would show that I did say what he has just quoted. I believe he will find that I said this bill is an equitable solution to a complicated problem. But I do not believe he will find that I said anything about the tax question having been before the courts 13 years. If the Senator from Tennessee is going to quote the statements of other Senators, I suggest that he quote from the Record.

Mr. GORE. I distinctly recall the statement the able Senator from Delaware made, and he has just now confirmed the important part of the statement which I wish to quote, namely, that the bill is an equitable solution to a problem. As I recall his remarks from memory, he also described the problem as one which has been fought in the courts for a number of years. I shall have the exact quotation appear in the

Record; but the essence of the statement he made, which I wish to cite, was that he, the principal proponent of the bill in the Senate, described the bill as an equitable solution to a problem. Whether he also said that it has been fought in the courts, I do not know, although as a matter of fact it has been fought in the courts since 1949; and, as a matter of fact, it is still being fought in the courts. But the important point is that his bill is described by its principal proponent in the Senate as a legislative solution to a problem—a problem still being fought in the courts.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I did describe this bill as being what I thought was an equitable solution to a problem confronting the stockholders of this company. Does the Senator from Tennessee find fault with my advocacy of an equitable solution? Would he prefer that the bill constitute an inequitable solution? I thought that all Senators, including he Senator from Tennessee, wanted a bill which would be equitable. Does the Senator from Tennessee want an inequitable solution of the problem; is that what he desires?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware can chase rabbits if he desires to do so, but I am not willing to be diverted by such tactics. I said nothing about desiring an inequity.

I said that the Attorney General had requested Congress to make it crystal clear. The able Senator from Delaware has made it crystal clear that it is the purpose of this bill to influence the decision of the court. He made it clear in three different ways, one of which I have cited, and I am prepared to cite the others.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Tennessee yield again?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think the Senator from Tennessee will find that I repeatedly stated that we had no intention of influencing the decision of the court or indicating a preference as to whether the court would order the Christiana Corp. to distribute its stock, to keep its stock, or to sell it. That is a problem which rests with the court alone.

The Senator from Tennessee has said he does not want to influence the decision of the court. However, I understand that the Senator from Tennessee has an amendment which provides that the company must sell its stock. If so that amendment is, in effect, seeking to have the court's decision made here in the Senate on the basis of what the Department of Justice asks.

Our committee does not say the company should be forced to sell the stock or to keep the stock or to distribute the stock. That is not the business of the Congress. It is the business of the court; and only the court should decide it, and neither the Senator from Tennessee nor the Senator from Delaware should have anything to do with their decision.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I now have before me a copy of the Congressional Record for January 15, 1962, and I shall proceed to quote from page 183:

> Mr. Williams of Delaware. This subject has been debated in the courts over a period of 13 years. It has been debated in Congress for the last 3 or 4 years. We have now before us a bill which in my opinion is a fair and equitable solution of one of the most complicated tax problems to come before the committee since I have been a member, one upon which we now have agreement among the parties affected.

Is the Senator from Delaware satisfied now, with that quotation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. But I suggest that if the Senator from Tennessee would continue to read from that same Record, he would find that among the parties which are in agreement in regard to this bill, which we believe to be an equitable solution, are the Department of Justice, and the Treasury Department. The companies affected and the House Ways and Means Committee have agreed. The House has by an overwhelming majority, passed the bill, and the bill was reported to the Senate by the Senate Finance Committee by a vote of 14 to 2.

Mr. GORE. I agree that it attempts to provide a solution; that is what I have been saying, and the Senator from Delaware now confirms it. He said it before, and now he confirms it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield again?

Mr. GORE. Yes, in just a moment. First, I wish to cite what another member of the Finance Committee said yesterday in regard to the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Before the Senator quotes from the remarks made by another Member of the Senate, will he yield again to me?

Mr. GORE. In just a moment I shall yield.

Another member of the Senate Finance Committee spoke on the bill yesterday, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy]. He too made it crystal clear that it was the purpose of the bill to influence the decision of the court, and he is frank enough to say so. On page 368 of the Record of January 17, 1962, appears his statement. I quote him:

> Mr. McCarthy. I think perhaps the principal justification for this action with reference to the court proceeding is that by passing a law which establishes that these particular tax results can follow from a divestment we really make it easier for the court to order a divestment which will be fair and equitable.

Is the Senator surprised at that?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am not commenting upon what another Senator has said.

Mr. GORE. It is not against the rules to quote him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Delaware has said that this bill is offered as a solution to the tax problem, and the Department of Justice in correspondence and in testimony before our committee made it very clear that the decision as to the question of taxes is the responsibility of the Congress and not the responsibility of the court. We in this Congress should handle our responsibility, which is to fix the rate at which this stock, if divested, will be taxed. That is our responsibility. It is the court's responsibility to determine whether the divestiture should be ordered or whether the stock should be sold. The Department of Justice has clearly made the point, has emphasized it in testimony to our committee, and has repeated it again in a letter to the chairman of the committee, that it has no opposition to the enactment and consideration of the bill at this time.

Mr. GORE. Well, I have before me the letter from the Attorney General, in which he says:

> In fact, in the proceedings pending in the district court in Illinois, the Government has urged the court to decree that Christiana Securities Corp. and its stockholders be barred from receiving General Motors stock to be distributed by Du Pont.

I skip one sentence for the sake of brevity. This letter having been placed in the Record and having been quoted many times, I do not think I am subject to an allegation of taking anything out of context.

> The Government has urged the court not to authorize a so-called passthrough of General Motors stock through Christiana to its stockholders because a passthrough would permit a large percentage of the General Motors stock to be lodged in Du Pont family hands. This would mean that the Du Pont family could still effectively control General Motors as well as Du Pont.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. Let me read just a little further:

> As we have indicated in a letter to Senator Paul H. Douglas, copy of which is attached, the Department is concerned—

I wonder if the able senior Senator from Delaware heard that?—

> the Department is concerned—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, and if the Senator will read it, the Senator will find that they were concerned that in the debate on the floor of the Senate an impression might be given that we were trying to indicate that we thought the court decision should be, and they asked the chairman of the committee to emphasize or reemphasize in the debate, in the legislative record, the language which is in the committee report, which was approved by the Department of Justice at that time and which still has its approval, wherein the committee stated that the bill was being offered with no thought in any way of influencing the court. The Department asked the chairman of the committee to repeat that on the floor of the Senate. The Attorney General then said that he had no opposition to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. GORE. But the senior Senator from Delaware has made it crystal clear that it is his purpose and intent to influence the decision of the court.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I beg the Senator's pardon—the Senator can make his own position clear. My position is clear in the Record. I have repeatedly stated, again and again, what is in the committee report. The Senator can draw his own conclusion as to what he thinks it is, but I do suggest to the Senator from Tennessee that perhaps—just perhaps—he may have enough to do to interpret his own opinion without trying to interpret the opinion of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, one of the central questions here is whether or not this legislation has, as a fundamental purpose, the facilitation of the decision of the trial judge, the exercise of an influence on that decision; and the Attorney General of the United States says:

> The Department is concerned that enactment of the provisions of H.R. 8847 with respect to distributions of General Motors stock by Christiana Securities Corp. may cause the district court to refuse the Government's request that Christiana be required to sell the General Motors stock distributed to it.

Could the Attorney General make himself more explicit? And because of that concern, he has asked that in debate it be made crystal clear.

I turn again to the speech on yesterday by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], in which, in three separate instances, I think he makes it crystal clear that the purpose of the bill is to facilitate and make it easier—to use his words, "make it easier for the court to order a divestment which will be fair and equitable."

The distinguished Senator supports this point of view, as he has a right to do. This is no criticism of him. One Senator has a right to analyze and examine the statements of his colleagues without having imputed to him some unchivalrous, ungenerous act. This is central to the issue that will come to a head on Tuesday. If the Attorney General thinks this debate makes it crystal clear, and should make it crystal clear, I am sure the Attorney General, before he advises the President upon the action he may wish to take with respect to this bill, would want to examine the question of just in which direction the debate makes it crystal clear.

I quote again from the speech of the able junior Senator from Minnesota, a supporter of the bill, from page 367 of the RECORD:

> Basically, the bill attempts to provide a reasonable and workable method by which Du Pont can divest itself of the General Motors stock. This is the important consideration.

Mr. President, that is one of the remaining questions before the court in Chicago. What is the crystal clear meaning of the speech of the junior Senator from Minnesota? It is, as he has said frankly, to make it easier for the court to render a decision which the junior Senator from Minnesota describes as fair and equitable.

The divestiture of General Motors stock by Du Pont has been ordered by the U.S. Supreme Court, to provide relief from a condition which the Supreme Court has held to be a violation of the antitrust laws. The Supreme Court has not ordered divestiture to satisfy what the senior Senator from Delaware may think is a fair and equitable solution. That is not written in the decision at all. The Senator's opinion about what is fair and equitable is not at issue before the Court, but the bill which the Senator supports is directed at that decision, I submit, by his own description of it.

I wish to quote once again from the remarks of the distinguished member of the Senate Committee on Finance, my able colleague, whom I hold in affectionate regard, the junior Senator from Minnesota. I read from the third column on page 367:

> This question has been in court, as I have noted, since 1949. The problem of divestiture, especially as it relates to the question of revenue, is one on which I think the Finance Committee is qualified to act. I would go so far as to say the Finance Committee is better qualified to act than a district judge in Chicago.

I wonder what the senior Senator from Delaware thinks about that. The junior Senator from Minnesota not only proposes to act on this question, which is before the court in Chicago, but also asserts a superior competence of the Senate Committee on Finance to act upon it.

I do not wish to demean the Senate Committee on Finance or its individual members. This question, however, is a question in the final stages of litigation. The judge has ordered the submission of final briefs, I repeat, on next Monday. On next Tuesday at 2 o'clock the Senate will have a vote.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not wish to interrupt the line of argument of my distinguished colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I welcome the Senator's remarks. I shall not consider it an interruption. I shall consider whatever my able colleague says to be a contribution to the debate. He is a distinguished Senator who is chairman of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank my colleague.

I have not had an opportunity to hear all of the Senator's remarks, made today and the other day. I have read most of the remarks in the RECORD. I have read fully the remarks prepared for Monday, January 15.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. He compliments me highly.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to compliment the Senator upon the tremendous study and consideration, as is apparent from reading his remarks and listening to him, he has given to this important problem, which is quite intricate and complicated. He has given the subject a great deal of consideration, and he is most sincere in his presentation of the viewpoint he has presented.

I have always felt, looking at the Clayton Act, section 7, from an antitrust viewpoint, that trying to obtain competition as among corporations and to prevent monopolies and cartels was the main idea of section 7 both when it was passed originally and when it was amended in 1950 by the so-called Celler-Kefauver amendment.

I have always felt, also, it was not the primary purpose of the Clayton Act, section 7, to work an undue hardship or harm upon the innocent holder of stock in a corporation who had no direct part in management or in the taking of the action which resulted in the violation of the law.

I think there is room for a difference of position as to the holder of one or two shares of stock, who we know has no actual voice in the management, and the managerial holders of stock who might have taken the action which brought about the violation of the antitrust law, and that they should be treated differently.

When the problem first came up in the last Congress, the bills were introduced by former Senator Frear and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] at that time. A bill was introduced in the House also. Those were general bills dealing with trying to relieve the individual stockholder, or to take some undue burden from him. That was true of the original bill, H.R. 8847. It had a general application.

It was my feeling, as I said to Representative BOGGS at that time, and also to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], that from the antitrust viewpoint a general bill might encourage the courts to break up monopolies more readily and it was possible that in monopoly situations even the suggestions of the Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, and Federal Trade Commission would result in divestitures or spinoffs of corporations.

The bill that we have before us now is, of course, a special bill dealing only with Du Pont.

I wish to ask my colleague what his feeling is about making the bill a special bill instead of trying to deal with the problem on a general basis.

Mr. GORE. As the Senator has described it, the bill has application only to the Du Pont Co. and its stockholders. Therefore it is a special bill or, as we traditionally use the term in the Senate, a private relief bill for the Du Pont Co. It proposes to provide relief from a court decision before the decree of the court has been entered. That constitutes my answer to the last question the Senator propounded.

In the prefatory remarks of the Senator he referred to a possible amelioration of the tax consequences to the holders of small amounts of stock in the Du Pont Co.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Individual and innocent stockholders.

Mr. GORE. Individual and innocent stockholders.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. GORE. I point out to the able Senator, as I have stated repeatedly on the floor of the Senate heretofore, that vast propaganda efforts have been made to convince the small innocent stockholder that he will be hurt with harsh tax consequences unless the Senate passes the bill. What are the facts? I cite to the able Senator not my statement, but the statement of the president of the Du Pont Co., Mr. Crawford H. Greenewalt, on pages 77, 78, and 79 of the hearings before the Senate Finance Committee, in which he said that he proposes, as president of the Du Pont Co., to follow a method of divestiture under existing law which would not require any stockholder to pay any additional taxes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have read Mr. Greenewalt's testimony, and I am glad the Senator has referred to it. I should like to ask some questions about the meaning of it.

On page 78, of course, Mr. Greenewalt is reported as discussing a plan which he may submit. We do not know whether or not the plan will be approved by the court. I am not attempting to pass judgment on whether it is a good plan or a bad plan. I did ask what effect it would have on the individual stockholders.

At the bottom of the page I see——

Mr. GORE. Before the Senator goes further, let me agree with him that the plan has not been approved by the court. The fact stands out in bold relief that no plan of divestiture has been approved or ordered by the court. One of the main contentions I have been making in this debate is that we should await the plan of divestiture to be decreed by the court before we proceed to provide relief. If the court permitted the Du Pont Co. to follow the plan of divestiture which Mr. Greenewalt has proposed to follow, and which he describes on pages 77, 78, and 79, in his words, "stockholders would be paying no more than the tax they now pay on the cash dividends."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the Senator outline what would happen under the plan discussed by Mr. Greenewalt, as shown on pages 77, 78, and 79? I notice at the bottom of the page that the first step is referred to, but the Senator, being a member of the Finance Committee, is more familiar with it than I.

Mr. GORE. Readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD can refer to those pages, but if it is agreeable to the Senator, instead of quoting and reading at length, I think I can accurately paraphrase the plan of action which Mr. Greenewalt has proposed. He proposes a plan of action in three steps.

As a first step he would distribute 15 million shares of General Motors stock over a 10-year period to the Du Pont stockholders in lieu of one-quarter of the regular cash dividend which the holders of Du Pont stock have been getting.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In other words, as he said, as shown by the foregoing record, if the person is receiving a $6 Du Pont dividend, he would receive $4.50 in cash and the rest in General Motors stock. Is that statement correct?

Mr. GORE. The Senator is correct. The tax would be the same in either event. If the stockholder received $6 in cash, it would be dividend income. If he received $4.50 in cash and $1.50 value in General Motors stock, the tax would be exactly the same. That is step No. 1.

Step No. 2 is found on page 79. Mr. Greenewalt proposes at that point to dispose of 10 million shares of General Motors through essentially tax-free exchanges. In other words, if one of our constituents had 100 shares of Du Pont stock, Mr. Greenewalt might offer to exchange General Motors stock of comparable value. He has said that he thinks over a period of years he could dispose of 10 million shares of General Motors stock held by Du Pont through tax-free exchanges.

Mr. KEFAUVER. But would a trade of that kind carry no tax with it?

Mr. GORE. It would carry no tax under circumstances which would meet provisions of law which would make it tax free.

The third step is also described on page 79 of the hearings. That is a sale of 35 million shares of General Motors stock by the Du Pont corporation over a period of 10 years.

I would like to point out to my able senior colleague that neither step 1 nor step 2 would require the payment of any additional tax either by the individual stockholders or by the Du Pont Co.

Step 3, the sale of stock by the Du Pont Co. would require a tax payment which at the time of Mr. Greenewalt's testimony, in September 1961, was estimated to be $330 million. Of course, the market price of General Motors at that time was $45 a share. It is now $55 a share. The tax on the sale of 35 million shares now would represent a greater profit and, consequently, a greater tax, and that is estimated now to be about $450 million.

I wish to point out to my colleagues, since he inquired and expressed concern about the average stockholder of Du Pont stock, that in neither of these three steps would the stockholders pay any additional tax whatever. In the words of the president of the Du Pont Co., Mr. Crawford H. Greenewalt himself, the Du Pont Co. would be required to pay the tax.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Then, Mr. President, I have another question or two.

Mr. GORE. Before we go further, would the Senator be interested to know who would pay the tax under a plan which Mr. Greenewalt proposes to follow under this bill, the court permitting?

Mr. KEFAUVER. In a moment, yes. On page 4 of the prepared speech of the Senator—I do not know where it is in the record—the Senator said:

> In actuality, then, assuming the accuracy of Mr. Greenewalt's public testimony, the bill increases the tax burden and, furthermore, shifts the tax from the company to the individual stockholders directly.

Is that the point the Senator will further discuss?

Mr. GORE. Yes. I made that statement. I would like to quote again my authority: the president of the Du Pont corporation. On page 79 of the Finance Committee hearings, in the center of the page, I read the following paragraph:

> Under present law, then, tax revenues under the combination of methods of divestiture which now appears most favorable would total about $330 million.

That is under present law, under the three-step plan which we have been talking about. This estimate would have to be raised now because of the larger profits from the sale of the 35 million shares.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I understand.

Mr. GORE. Continuing to read from Mr. Greenewalt's testimony:

> A distribution under H.R. 8847 would yield tax revenues of about $350 million.

Who would pay the taxes under H.R. 8847?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I know the Senator has discussed this point, but I will appreciate it if he would outline it again.

Mr. GORE. H.R. 8847 contemplates a pass-through and provides the guidelines and the tax consequences of a pass-through, under which the taxes would be paid not by the Du Pont Co. but by the stockholders, and most of it by the individual stockholders of Du Pont and Christiana.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does the Senator mean the little fellow with one or two shares of stock?

Mr. GORE. The amount of the tax he would pay would depend upon two things: one, upon the rate of income tax which he pays; and, two, on the date of his purchase of Du Pont stock, because a modified capital gains treatment is applied in this case.

In other words, if the court in its decision follows the terms of the pending bill, the Du Pont corporation will pay no taxes whatever. Let me back up a bit and make a precise statement, as follows: If the court renders a decision which conforms to the terms of the pending bill, permitting Du Pont corporation and one corporate stockholder of Du Pont corporation to divest themselves of General Motors stock, in accordance with the pending bill, and Du Pont Co. follows that decision and the plan set out in the bill, then the Du Pont Co. will not pay even $1 in tax.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Who will pay the tax?

Mr. GORE. The stockholders, primarily the individual stockholders. I can cite for the Senator a large insurance company which owns more than 5,000 shares of Du Pont stock on which it will, if this General Motors stock is distributed to it, pay only 16 cents a share in taxes. I could not tell the able Senator exactly what the profits will be to this company, because I do not know how long it has held the stock. However, the profit on 5,000 shares of Du Pont stock is vast. Even if bought as late as last September, the increase in value of its part of this General Motors stock would be more than $60,000. Yet the pending bill provides a way in which that insurance company will be excused from all taxes through this divestiture order, if it follows the lines of the pending bill, except 16 cents a share.

That is why I say the pending bill would levy the heaviest burden upon the individual stockholders. There is one corporation which holds Du Pont stock which would have special treatment. One corporation would be required to pay—and only one corporation—more than 16 cents a share. That is the Christiana Corp.

Some people have made much of that, and have tried to use that as justification for the passage of the pending bill. As a matter of fact, only a nominal tax is imposed on Christiana for the profits that would accrue to it. The tax amounts to only $60 million—$60 million, compared with the enormous profits that have been earned through this vast holding and monopoly of General Motors, is perfectly astounding.

If the court and Congress should apply the same tax to Christiana Corp. on its General Motors stock as it applies to a citizen in the State of Tennessee or Montana or Alaska or Illinois or Delaware, Christiana would have to pay a tax of $180 million, instead of $60 million.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The general impression about the bill—and my own impression of the bill—is that it was intended to provide, as to individual shareholders getting General Motors stock or the proceeds from the sale of General Motors stock, that instead of paying on the regular income tax basis they would be entitled to pay on a capital gains basis of 20 percent, except in the lower income brackets, where it would not make any difference one way or the other, or would not make much difference, in any event. But do not the individual stockholders get some relief by virtue of being able to treat this as a distribution of capital rather than paying straight income tax, even under Mr. Greenewalt's suggested plan of distribution?

Mr. GORE. Under Mr. Greenewalt's suggested plan of action, they would not have additional income and, therefore, would pay no additional taxes. One consequence of this plan, if approved, would be the appreciation in value of the Du Pont stock, on which no taxes would be paid under present law until that stock was sold. Why do I say that? The second step was a tax-free exchange. If 10 million shares were exchanged, and if a large amount of outstanding Du Pont stock should be retired, but the assets remained and the company's earnings piled up, and, instead of a distribution of dividends in cash, some General Motors stock is distributed, the assets per share of Du Pont stock outstanding would then greatly increase. Therefore, there would be an appreciation in the value of the stock held by each individual stockholder, as well as by corporate stockholders, but no tax consequences would accrue until the sale of such stock. Do I make myself clear?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; the Senator makes himself clear. I understand. There is one other question. I have received letters, as have other Senators concerned with the passage of the bill, which say, in effect, that under the first point in Mr. Greenewalt's suggested program there would be an exchange of General Motors stock to the extent of one-fourth of the amount of the cash dividend, or in lieu of one-fourth of the amount of the cash dividend; and second, tax-free exchanges. Nevertheless, the company is required within 10 years to dispose of 35 million shares, and it is believed that this might so depress the market as very adversely to affect Du Pont and, therefore, the shareholders of Du Pont.

Mr. GORE. Quite to the contrary, the retirement of Du Pont stock outstanding, to the extent that it is retired——

Mr. KEFAUVER. No; I do not mean that it would depress the value of Du Pont stock. I mean that throwing 35 million shares of General Motors stock on the market would cause the price of General Motors stock then to be badly deflated.

Mr. GORE. That circumstance is advanced as a reason for the passage of the bill. I propose in due course this afternoon to demonstrate that that is not a valid point; that it is only an ostensible reason for the bill. It may not necessarily be true that General Motors stock would be depressed. I think I will be able in the course of my remarks to demonstrate this fact conclusively.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I shall listen with much interest to what the Senator will say, because that seems to be one of the principal arguments made. I notice that the Senator says, on page 4 of the speech he delivered on Monday:

> At least 20 million of these shares could be purchased by General Motors itself for use in existing programs for employee bonuses and stock purchase plans.

Does that refer to 20 million of the 35 million shares?

Mr. GORE. Yes. I apologize for referring to my own prepared text, or that portion of it which I have not yet reached, but for the sake of clarity, if the Senator will examine page 10 of my prepared text, to which I shall refer later in the day, I deal there in detail with this question, and I have satisfactorily—at least, in a way satisfactory to me—demolished this ostensible reason for the passage of the bill.

I should like to yield to the able and distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, who is far more learned in this field than I am, if the Senator would be willing to allow him to supplement my answer.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I certainly would be happy to do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that this is one of the issues which is under very great argument and discussion in the court in Chicago, and that the Department of Justice is contending that there will be no really adverse effects upon the price of General Motors stock if Christiana is forced to divest it by sale?

Mr. GORE. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As a matter of fact, as was brought out day before yesterday, the Ford Foundation——

Mr. GORE. Will not the Senator from Illinois spell out for my senior colleague from Tennessee the details of the market effects of this operation and compare it with the Ford Foundation secondary offerings?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I would appreciate it if the Senator would do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Greenewalt states that if the court were to order complete divestiture by the Du Pont Co., there would be only 35 million shares of General Motors which would have to be sold. The junior Senator from Tennessee has pointed out that at least 20 million shares could be absorbed by General Motors itself.

Mr. GORE. Over a 10-year period.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Over a 10-year period. General Motors buys approximately 1,100,000 shares a year for its welfare and pension funds. Over a 10-year period, this would amount to 11 million shares. General Motors also issues, on the average, 1,300,000 new shares a year, and this could be by purchase from Du Pont.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Would it be legal, under the decree, for General Motors to purchase back its General Motors stock from Du Pont?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; it could be made so by the decree. Then there would have to be sold not more than 11 million shares of General Motors stock by Du Pont over a 10-year period.

Now to come to the precedent of the Ford Foundation.

Mr. GORE. May I add one comment? Normally, between 7 and 8 million General Motors shares are bought and sold each year on the New York Stock Exchange.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. We have the precedent of the Ford Foundation, which over the course of 5 years has sold 17 million Ford shares, which are the equivalent of 24 million shares of General Motors stock. That has had no effect in depressing the price. On the contrary, the price has increased by $46 a share during the 5 years in which they were divesting themselves of the stock.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is to say, the Ford Co. stock has?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. How about the General Motors stock?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Ford Co. stock is not as stable as General Motors stock, and the Ford Co. is not as powerful a concern as the General Motors Corp. So, if the Ford Co. can dispose of the equivalent of 24 million shares of General Motors stock in 5 years, could not the Du Pont Co. dispose of 11 million shares of General Motors stock in 10 years? That is the question.

Mr. GORE. To point out what a depressing effect this is having on the Ford Motor Co. stock, let me state that a few days ago there was a stock split of 2 for 1, and the dividends were increased.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. As a matter of fact, during the time in which these shares have been sold on the market, the price of Ford stock has increased from $64 a share to $110.75 a share, or, as I have stated, a little more than $46 a share; and during that time they have disposed of Ford stock in an amount equivalent to 24 million shares of General Motors stock. In other words, in terms of the price at which the Ford Co. stock sold, that would be the equivalent of 24 million shares of General Motors stock at the present price.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It would be a few less shares, but the stock is more valuable or is higher priced than General Motors stock?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I appreciate the explanation which has been given in regard to the experience of the Ford Foundation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If I may clear up one point, let me say that the Ford Foundation now holds about 53 percent of the Ford Co. stock. It originally held 65 percent of the Ford stock. We believe it now to be the policy of the Ford Foundation to dispose of additional quantities of the stock, and that this amounts to what is technically described as an overhang of the market. But there has been no depressing effect on the price of the Ford Co. stock because 53 percent of the Ford equity is held by the foundation and may be sold. That has not discouraged its purchase by others.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee for permitting this interruption.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the explanation given by my distinguished friend.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate it, too. I understand that a few years ago, when Ford decided to become a public foundation, it decided to place a large amount of the Ford stock on the market over a period of years. How many shares were involved?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Seventeen million shares of Ford or the equivalent of 24 million shares of General Motors.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Over a period of 5 years?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Aside from the antitrust feature, I should like to know in which way the innocent, small stockholder will come out best—whether by means of the passage of this bill, or in the event Mr. Greenewalt's plan—I do not know whether it is a good plan or not—is approved, or if some other plan is approved. Is there any way to tell in which way the small stockholders will come out best, before a court decision is rendered?

Mr. GORE. To begin with, we do not know what plan the court will order. If no bill is passed and if the court approves the divestiture plan which Mr. Greenewalt has testified he would propose to follow, then no stockholder would pay any additional tax whatsoever.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Certainly that is not the general impression; it is not what I had understood.

Mr. GORE. Earlier I stated my deep and profound indignation that this huge corporation, which has reaped such great profits for itself and its stockholders, would set out deliberately upon a campaign of deception and misrepresentation, in an attempt to prejudice, misinform, influence, and frighten the thousands of small stockholders, in order that they, in turn, would write letters, send telegrams, and make telephone calls to Members of Congress, urging them to vote for the passage of a bill the purpose of which is to influence the court to provide a decree which would permit a pass-through of General Motors stock into the hands of members of the Du Pont family, and in a way which, to quote the Department of Justice, would enable the members of that family to continue their control over that company, in violation of the antitrust laws. That is reprehensible.

Furthermore, if the pending bill becomes law and if the courts finally decree a method of divestiture in conformity with the guidelines of this bill, then the entire tax burden would be transferred from the Du Pont Co. to the stockholders, primarily the individual stockholders; and also that tax burden would be increased. Even more important, it would permit a pass-through of the General Motors stock to the stockholders of the Christiana Corp., 80 percent of the stock of which is held by 65 members of the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family, 38 of whom are husband and wife.

In other words, those few members of the Du Pont family, who were parties to the action originally filed by the Department of Justice, control the Christiana Corp.; the Christiana Corp. controls the Du Pont Co.; and the Du Pont Co. controls the General Motors Corp.

So, if we reverse the order, if this plan is approved and finally is followed, then the pass-through will go from Du Pont right back to Christiana, and from Christiana to a few members of the Du Pont family. I make no personal criticism of the Du Pont family. I criticize this monopolistic control of the General Motors Corp.—monopolistic control which, as the able Senator knows, the U.S. Supreme Court held to be in violation of the antitrust laws. Therefore, the big and the paramount question involved here is whether the Senate will lend itself to an effort—to use the words of Du Pont Co. officials—to "facilitate" the efficient framing of a decree by the court, or, in the words of the junior Senator from Minnesota, to make it easier for the court to render an opinion which in the judgment of some would be equitable and fair.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for the explanations he has given, and I also thank the Senator from Illinois for the explanations he has given. As a result, the matter is much clearer to me now.

Mr. GORE. I thank the distinguished Senator.

I do not think there has been a question before the Congress—I am confident there has not been in the 22 years I have served in the legislative branch of the Government—that has gone so directly to the question of monopoly, on the one hand, and the free enterprise competitive system, on the other, as is involved in this case. I am most grateful for the attention of my distinguished senior colleague.

The ostensible reasons which have been advanced for supporting this bill do not, let me repeat, appear to be the real reasons for rushing it through. Two arguments have been advanced in support of this bill: First, that it will ease the tax impact of this divestiture on Du Pont stockholders, and, second, that it will prevent a market upheaval as a result of this divestiture, particularly for General Motors stock. As I have said in previous colloquy today, neither argument will hold water. I wish to proceed, however, to examine those arguments in detail. I think, by detailed examination, I can convince any unbiased person that these reasons are not good reasons.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to commend the Senator for his very learned and valiant efforts in the field of very complicated tax and antitrust law, and I wish to let him know that, in studying the RECORD, which we as Members of this body do and are obligated to do, I find that the remarks of the Senator from Tennessee and those of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] have surely been of great benefit and help to the Senator from Minnesota. I believe the Senator has made a very distinct contribution toward strengthening the antitrust policy of the Government and strengthening the hand of the Government in the present litigation or in the present court proceedings relating to the divestiture of stock by the Du Pont corporation.

Mr. GORE. I am very grateful for the generous remarks of the distinguished Senator. I call to his attention, as I previously did at a time when he, unfortunately, was away from this Chamber on official business, the fact that when we take the vote on Tuesday at 2 p.m., the Senate will be voting under peculiar circumstances. The motion to recommit, though it has not been reduced to writing in exact terms, will have as its purpose the recommittal of the bill with instructions to the committee to report a bill back to the Senate after the court decision has been rendered, providing such relief to taxpayers from the consequences of that decision as in its judgment may be fair and equitable. We shall vote on that question on the day after the judge in Chicago has asked for the submission of final briefs.

One provision of the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court was that no divestiture of General Motors stock need commence until 90 days after the decree of the court has been entered. So the Senate, if it passes the bill, will be in the odd position of rushing in to pass a bill on an issue that is in the final stages of litigation, to provide for relief from a decision that has not yet been rendered, when all it must do is wait, until the judge examines the final briefs and renders a decision, to determine then what relief from that decision, if any, is desirable. The Senate will have 90 days in which to consider that question before divestiture need begin.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Are not the two issues before the court in Chicago, first, whether Christiana, which owns 5.3 percent of General Motors stock, is to be compelled to divest at all; and if it does not divest, is it not true that the only tax to Christiana on a capital gain of $53 a share will be only approximately $4.29 a share?

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Second, if Christiana is permitted to divest by pass-through 5.3 percent of the General Motors stock will pass into the hands of the 65 members of the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family and this, in conjunction with their other holdings, will give them approximately 9.4 percent of General Motors stock and hence permit them continued control over General Motors.

Mr. GORE. That is not only my opinion, but that information is contained in the briefs of the Justice Department. It is contained in the letter of Attorney General Kennedy which was read into the Record on Monday.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the bill come down on the side of the company on the two issues which are really before the court?

Mr. GORE. Before answering the question I wish to read the press statement which the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Case] read into the Record on January 15:

> The Government has asked Judge Walter J. LaBuy to approve a final decree in the antitrust case as soon as possible. But Du Pont lawyers want to see if congressional action on a tax bill will affect the case.

I have read into the Record, without any criticism of my colleague whatsoever, the statement made by a distinguished member of the Finance Committee yesterday, in regard to the basic purpose of the bill. I shall read the full sentence:

> I think perhaps the principal justification for this action with reference to the court proceeding is that by passing a law which establishes that these particular tax results can follow from a divestment we really make it easier for the court to order a divestment which will be fair and equitable.

Mr. President, the Supreme Court decision remanded the case to the Chicago court to frame a decree and order to provide for effective relief from a violation of the antitrust law. That is what is before the court.

The lawyers for the Du Pont Co. have said in Chicago before the court that one of the remaining issues is whether the General Motors stock now held by Du Pont will be permitted to go to the Christiana Corp.; and, if permitted to be distributed to the Christiana Corp., whether the Christiana Corp. will be required to divest itself of that General Motors stock; and, if so, how—whether by sale or by pass-through to the members of the Du Pont family.

That is the question. That is the problem into which this Congress is asked to plunge itself by providing legislatively what the principal proponent of the bill in the Senate, the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], calls an equitable solution.

What is sought in Chicago is relief from a monopolistic condition, relief from a violation of the antitrust laws, and the Attorney General of the United States says that if the stock is permitted to pass through to 65 members of the Du Pont family whose names I have placed in the Record, then the whole antitrust action will have been vitiated because the same nexus of control will remain. In the words of the Attorney General, this will permit this same family group to exercise control over General Motors and Du Pont.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We have been making computations in the last few days as to the practical tax effect of the measure if Christiana were permitted to pass through the 18.3 million shares of General Motors stock.

Assuming that the 65 members of the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family—38 of whom are husbands and wives, as the Senator from Tennessee has said—are in the 60-percent tax bracket, which is probably a very modest statement, the bill, if passed, would reduce their tax liability from an ordinary income tax of about $33 a share to perhaps something closer to one-fourth that amount. I am not going into the question as to whether this is wise or not at the moment, but is it not clear that the reduction in the cost of a pass-through of General Motors shares by Christiana can be used with powerful effect by the Du Pont lawyers in arguing before the Chicago court that it is the intent of the Congress to give relief through a pass-through, and therefore to place its implicit blessing upon a pass-through?

Mr. GORE. The lawyer for the Christiana Corp. has already referred to the bill in his argument before the trial judge in Chicago as the new tax law. Officials of the Du Pont Co. have said, "It is obvious that prompt action by the Senate on H.R. 8847 would be of material assistance to the court in the efficient framing of a final decree."

We need not wait for the passage of the bill to find the answer to the question of the able senior Senator from Illinois. The lawyers for Du Pont are asking the judge to wait until we pass a law. The officials of the company are already describing it to the newspaper editors of the country and to their lobbyists around the Capitol as one which would materially assist the court. Indeed, the lawyers for the Christiana Corp., as I said, are already referring to it as the new tax law. They must have confidence that it will pass.

Well, we shall see on Tuesday whether the Senate wishes to wait until the order of the court is made before it passes a bill providing relief from that order. If the bill does finally pass, I daresay there will be a big question mark, though I have no specific information on this point, as to whether the President will give it his approval.

The Attorney General has said that the Department of Justice is concerned lest the passage of the bill cause the Government to lose its case, a case which was initiated in the Truman administration, prosecuted for 8 years throughout the Eisenhower administration, and now for a year during the Kennedy administration. Because the Department of Justice is so concerned, the Attorney General has gone to the trouble of writing a letter to three Senators, all of whom are members of the Senate Committee on Finance, to make it crystal clear that the bill is not designed to influence the court. But I have read statements by two members of the Finance Committee who are proponents of the bill which, to my thinking, make it crystal clear that it is the purpose of the bill to influence the court, or to attempt to do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Tennessee remember the old saying, "Your acts speak so loudly that I cannot hear what you say"?

Mr. GORE. Yes. I also remember that someone was accused of protesting too much, and another was accused of fleeing when no man pursueth. The last statement would hardly fit this case, because I am in hot pursuit and shall so remain.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would it not be well to clear up the contention of the proponents of the bill, as stated by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Kerr], that the Department of Justice is on their side, by quoting from page 183 of the Record the quotation from the Attorney General, as follows:

> We [the Department of Justice] are not in a position to argue that postponement of congressional action until the court acts is necessary to successful conclusion of our pending prayer for relief.

The Justice Department is not in a position to argue that point because in Chicago they have been contending that the action of the legislature is not binding upon the court. But the attorneys for Du Pont have been arguing there that the new tax law will have an effect on the court, which merely means that the Department of Justice cannot now suddenly reverse itself and say that passage of the bill would have an effect on the court, when in Chicago it is being contended that it should not have an effect on the court, although Du Pont is arguing that it both should and could.

Mr. GORE. It is difficult for me to understand how anyone could read the letter from the Attorney General of the United States and reach the conclusion that he would be happy to see the bill become law, at least prior to the court decision. What position the Department of Justice might take after the court renders its decision I suppose would depend upon the contents and provisions of such decision. I think it would be well for the Senate to act in the same prudent way. As I have said, the Attorney General goes so far as to say that he is concerned that passage of the bill might cause the Government to lose its case, and he petitions the Senate to make it crystal clear that it does not intend to influence the decision of the court. Yet only yesterday a member of the Finance Committee said that the basic purpose is and I shall quote again—

I notice that the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] has come into the Chamber. I ask him to turn to page 368 of the Record of yesterday. I know the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa is an able attorney.

To my friend from Iowa I repeat that what I am about to read is a statement of a member of the Finance Committee, which the Attorney General requested to make crystal clear in this debate that the bill did not have as one of its purposes an effort to influence the decision of the court:

> I think perhaps the principal justification for this action with reference to the court proceeding is that by passing a law which establishes that these particular tax results can follow from a divestment we really make it easier for the court to order a divestment which will be fair and equitable.

If the Attorney General could find any comfort in a statement like the one I have read, I should be surprised. I should think that after this debate, with particular reference to the statements of the proponents of the bill, particularly statements of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] and the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] who is the principal proponent of the bill in the Senate, the Attorney General would be more concerned rather than less concerned.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the remainder of the statement I have prepared on the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The bill now before the Senate is an important piece of legislation. It is important to the stockholders of the Du Pont Co., the stockholders of the General Motors Corp., the general taxpaying public, and the enforcement of the antitrust laws.

There are several rather unusual things about this whole transaction which intrigue and puzzle me.

In the first place, the ostensible reasons which have been advanced for supporting this bill do not appear to be the real reasons for rushing it through. Two arguments have been advanced in support of this bill—first, that it will ease the tax impact on Du Pont stockholders of this divestiture, and second, that it will prevent a market upheaval as a result of this divestiture, particularly for General Motors stock. Neither argument will hold water. Under existing law Du Pont will dispose of its stock in such a way as to bring in additional revenues of about $330 million, according to the president of the company, himself. Under the bill, Du Pont stockholders would pay additional taxes amounting to about $350 million. In actuality, then, assuming the accuracy of Mr. Greenewalt's public testimony, the bill increases the tax burden and, furthermore, shifts the tax from the company to the individual stockholders directly.

As for the market impact, under the plan Mr. Greenewalt proposes to follow under existing law the Du Pont Co. would sell about 35 million shares of General Motors stock over a period of 10 years. At least 20 million of these shares could be purchased by General Motors itself for use in existing programs for employee bonuses and stock purchase plans. This would leave only 15 million shares, or 1½ million shares per year for 10 years, to be placed through underwriters with various types of purchasers such as pension funds and nonprofit institutions. If this bill is passed, on the other hand, at least 8 million shares of General Motors stock will in all likelihood be dumped on the market in a disorderly manner by thousands of individual sellers over a period of 3 years. This will surely make for a more disorderly market for General Motors stock.

In the next place, I do not recall any other instance in which a so-called relief bill has been rushed through Congress before the alleged damage has been done. There must be a reason for this most unusual procedure, a reason which is not readily apparent.

After much study, I have reached my own conclusion as to the reasons back of this most unusual procedure. It is my firm belief that we are being pressured to pass this bill prior to final court action for two reasons, and these are not the reasons which have been advanced by proponents of this legislation. First, passage of this bill now will provide the Chicago court with guidance in framing its decisions and final order. Judge LaBuy can order a pass-through of GM stock to Du Pont stockholders with the assurance that the stockholders will not have to pay a large and, it has been argued, prohibitive tax. This includes a pass-through of General Motors stock through Christiana to its stockholders. Second, the passage of this bill now will serve as a prior political endorsement of the court's action so that the Justice Department will be discouraged from appealing from the Chicago court's decision, so long as that decision follows generally the outlines of this bill which will, if enacted, have the specific approval of the Congress and the President.

This may sound harsh. Many will, I am sure, be surprised at the conclusion which I have reached. But I believe that if my colleagues will hear me out many of them will be convinced of the correctness of the position which I have taken and my reasons therefor. After all, men must be presumed to intend the reasonable and probable results of their actions, and the results will most assuredly be as I have indicated.

Since there has been so much already said, some of it contradictory, about this bill and its background, perhaps it would be well if I were to sum up these facts.

The Du Pont Co. owns 63 million shares of General Motors common stock (about 23 percent of the total). Most of this stock was acquired about 40 years ago and, therefore, has a very low basis—an average of about $2 per share to Du Pont. Christiana Securities Corp., a company which was set up by members of the Du Pont family in order to insure continued control of the Du Pont Co., owns about 29 percent of Du Pont common stock. In addition, Christiana owns about 535,000 shares of General Motors stock in its own right. There is some outside ownership of Christiana, that is, outside the Du Pont family, although Christiana is controlled by the same people who control the Du Pont Co., the Du Pont family, members of which own about 80 percent of Christiana stock.

In 1949 the Department of Justice began an antitrust action against Du Pont on the grounds that its ownership of such a large block of GM stock might prevent suppliers of fabrics and finishes other than Du Pont from selling to General Motors. In 1957 the Supreme Court ruled that there was a violation of section 7 of the Clayton Act. Since that time, litigation has centered around getting a proper final order out of the Chicago district court (Judge LaBuy). The Chicago court resisted divestiture, and upon another appeal to the Supreme Court, it was held (May 22, 1961), that complete divestiture was required and must be completed within 10 years of the date of the final order by the Chicago court. The case was remanded to the Chicago court to frame a suitable final order. After numerous hearings, oral arguments, and briefs, the Chicago court has ruled that it must have additional briefs and has set up a schedule which runs through January 22, 1962, for the filing of additional briefs. This has been widely interpreted by the press as a move to outwait the Congress.

As has been the custom during the past few years, several Members of Congress introduced Du Pont relief bills during the 1st session of the 87th Congress. The progress of the legislation last year was somewhat confusing:

1. The Ways and Means Committee held a hearing on August 24, 1961, on several of the bills which had been introduced, including H.R. 8847 which had been introduced on August 22 by Congressman BOGGS.

2. On September 9 the Ways and Means Committee reported the bill H.R. 8847, although this was actually a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for the Boggs bill. At this point the bill was general legislation and would have applied to all of certain types of antitrust cases.

3. On September 14 the Rules Committee granted a closed rule on H.R. 8847.

4. On September 19 the House passed H.R. 8847. This bill, however, was not the amendment reported by the Ways and Means Committee, but a substitute for the amendment. Some time between the 14th and 19th the committee had reconsidered the bill and brought back to the House a completely different bill. No longer general legislation, but a private relief bill for the Du Pont situation. There was no committee report on this new bill.

5. On September 13 the Senate Finance Committee had held a hearing on H.R. 8847. This was the version of the bill, i.e., the "amendment," which had been reported by the Ways and Means Committee but not passed by the House.

6. On September 20 the Senate Finance Committee ordered reported without amendment the substitute for the amendment which had, in the meantime, been passed by the House on the very day before.

7. On September 21 the bill was reported by the Finance Committee.

8. On the last day of the session, after some discussion, it was agreed that debate on the bill would go over until January 15, 1962.

In view of the rather unusual handling of this bill, only a few know its detailed provisions. There is no Ways and Means Committee report at all on the bill in its present version, and the Senate Finance Committee report is, in my view, inadequate.

Under existing law, if General Motors stock is distributed directly to individual Du Pont stockholders the distributee would be liable for a tax at ordinary income rates on the market value of the GM stock he receives at the time of such distribution. For the retired person, the widow, or orphan, in whose names relief measures are so often granted, there may be no tax due at all. For the person in the 20 percent bracket, there would be due a tax, which might be spread out over a 10-year period equal to only 16 percent of the value of the GM stock. If the distributee is a corporation, the dividend would be computed according to the basis of the stock in the hands of the distributing corporation, in this case about $2 per GM share. With the 85 percent intercorporate dividend credit, this amounts to a tax of only about 16 cents per share to the receiving corporation, regardless of the market value of the stock.

The above discussion of existing law, however, is academic. Mr. Greenewalt, president of Du Pont, has testified, as I have already quoted, that, in the absence of legislative relief, there will be very little direct distribution of GM stock to Du Pont stockholders. Instead, Du Pont would divest itself of GM stock through a combination of exchange of GM for Du Pont stock, distribution of some GM stock in lieu of cash dividends, and sale of GM stock by the Du Pont Co. This operation would result in no increased taxes for Du Pont stockholders, but would result in the payment of a capital gains tax by the Du Pont Co. in the amount of about $330 million. The remainder of the proceeds from this sale would be invested in other property.

PROVISIONS OF H.R. 8847

Since this bill follows no well-defined philosophy or logic and treats different Du Pont stockholders differently, it is not easy to sum up in one or two sentences. The bill contemplates divestiture by direct distribution to stockholders within a 3-year period.

1. Individual stockholders (including certain trusts and other noncorporate entities) are treated as though they were receiving a return of capital from a corporation having no earnings or profits. This means that these stockholders will pay no tax upon receipt of GM stock from Du Pont unless the price paid for their Du Pont stock, when purchased by them, was less than the current market value of 1⅓ shares of GM stock. Instead, the basis of their Du Pont stock would be reduced by the current market value of 1⅓ shares of GM stock. This basis could not be reduced below zero, of course, and would subject those who have a low basis—generally speaking, purchasers who acquired their Du Pont stock prior to 1949—to a capital gains tax on the difference.

2. Corporate stockholders other than Christiana are apparently not affected by this bill. The distribution of GM stock to them would be regarded as a dividend, and would subject them to a tax of 16 cents per share.

3. Christiana is given special treatment. This corporation, under the bill, is regarded as receiving a dividend, but the value of the dividend is to be the current market value of GM stock rather than the basis of such stock to Du Pont. This means that Christiana would pay a tax of about $3.50 per GM share rather than the 16 cents per share paid by other corporations. Much has been made by proponents of the bill over this penalty which would be paid by Christiana. Actually, this may amount to no penalty whatsoever in the long run. Much will depend on the final court order which is still not in. The bill also provides that the holding period, for income tax purposes, so far as Christiana is concerned, shall be deemed to have begun when Du Pont acquired the stock. This would allow a sale immediately upon receipt with the profits taxed as a long-term capital gain. In case of a sale, too, the profit would be computed from an increased basis which would wipe out much of the so-called penalty provided in this bill against Christiana.

But, perhaps the strangest thing about this bill is that it allows a pass-through, at a reduced tax, of General Motors stock to stockholders in Christiana. This is an even more dangerous and far-reaching precedent than reducing the tax for stockholders of Du Pont. I shall have more to say about this particular point.

It may be well now to examine in more detail the ostensible reasons for this bill.

TAX IMPACT AND REVENUE EFFECTS

We may as well face the fact that some people, particularly some stockholders, do not feel that any transaction between a corporation and its stockholders, whether dividend payment or otherwise, should be taxed. This is one root of our problem here, just as it is in such questions as the dividend tax credit and exclusion. A great many people are unwilling to view the corporation as a separate legal entity for tax purposes.

It seems easy to understand the separateness of the corporation when considering its advantages—perpetuity, limited liability for stockholders, and a 52-percent ceiling on the income tax rate, for example. But when it comes to taxing a dividend, or almost any other transaction between the corporation and its stockholders, the stockholder often wants to view the corporation as something more akin to a loose collection of its stockholders, forgetting its separate identity. For this reason, many Du Pont stockholders sincerely feel that they have owned, ab initio, 1⅓ shares of General Motors stock as well as one share of Du Pont stock for every share of Du Pont stock shown on their stock certificates. Though it may be a hard thing for some to accept, the fact is that this General Motors stock is now owned by the Du Pont Co. and not by its stockholders. Under existing law these stockholders must pay a tax if they are to receive this General Motors stock directly, just as they would have to do if any corporate assets were sold and cash from their conversion paid to the stockholders.

Under existing law it is clear that individual stockholders in the Du Pont Co. must pay an income tax at ordinary income rates on the current market value of General Motors stock if such stock is distributed to them. There is no question as to what the law is. There may be some question in the minds of some as to what the law ought to be. Some feel that this is more in the nature of a capital transaction and ought to be so taxed.

Existing law has been described as harsh and this point of view has been sold to Du Pont stockholders. It may be harsh insofar as the high bracket taxpayer is concerned. It is certainly not harsh, however, when one considers the ordinary retired couple, the widow, or the orphan. For many of these, having small incomes and owning just a few shares of Du Pont stock, no tax would be due at all on a direct distribution of General Motors stock. For those in the 20-percent income tax bracket, a tax amounting to 16 percent of the value of the General Motors stock they receive would be due, but this could be spread out over a period of 10 years.

Let me make this a little more concrete. Let us consider the retired couple who own 10 shares of Du Pont stock. On a direct distribution, assuming these people are in the 20-percent bracket—and let me remind my colleagues that an elderly couple can have a net income of $2,400 per year without paying any tax whatsoever—they would pay, over a period of 10 years, a tax of about $96. This is less than $1 per month, and the greater flexibility and additional dividends they would receive would probably make them better off, even after paying the tax, than they are now.

It has been estimated that 80 percent of Du Pont stockholders own 100 shares or less. It has been further estimated that these people, relatively affluent, have an average income of between $16,000 and $20,000 per year and are in the 30-percent income tax bracket. These people own an average of about 30 shares of Du Pont stock each and would receive on a direct distribution about 40 shares of General Motors stock. They would be subject, under existing law, to a tax of about $4 per month over the distribution period.

Is it for the elderly, retired couple owning a few shares of Du Pont stock to supplement their social security income that all the pressure for immediate action has been built up? Hardly. Is it for the young couple building up an estate and investing in 20 or 30 shares of Du Pont stock that all the pressure has been exerted? Hardly. As it so happens, the insiders have convinced these people that they are going to be seriously hurt. They, in turn, have applied the pressure.

Of course, those who own large blocks of Du Pont stock would be taxed heavily in the event of a direct distribution under existing law. This fact undoubtedly was at least partially the cause for adoption by Du Pont of the plan to avoid such direct distribution under existing law, as described by Mr. Greenewalt in his testimony before the Finance Committee. It has been estimated that those individuals owning 5,000 shares or more of Du Pont stock would pay an average tax of about 80 percent of the value of the GM stock they would receive on a direct distribution. But, there are only 404 such Du Pont stockholders.

But it is really beside the point to talk about the tax effects of a direct distribution to Du Pont stockholders. The Du Pont Co. management has decided that, in the absence of a relief bill, the company would follow the plan to which I have just referred, not that it would protect the small, but the large, stockholder. This would result in a tax of about $330 million to be paid by the Du Pont Co. Under this bill, on the other hand, there would be a tax of about $350 million to be paid by Du Pont stockholders, Christiana, and Christiana stockholders on a complete pass-through of GM stock.

It would seem to me, then, that the question of so-called harsh tax impact is entirely moot. Some, however, continue to push this line of argument. This is partially due to a misunderstanding of the fact that divestiture by means other than a direct pass-through is possible under existing law.

Under the plan which the Du Pont Co. proposes to follow under existing law, and which would produce estimated additional revenues of $330 million, the company, as I have said, would pay the entire tax. The stockholder would pay no additional tax himself. But if one considers that this tax constitutes a reduction of the value of the stockholders' investment in the Du Pont Co., we should consider the effect of this tax on the company and, ultimately, on its stockholders. This tax would amount to about 12 percent of the value of the General Motors stock to be divested. This is certainly not prohibitive. Neither is it harsh. Neither is it a penalty, unless one chooses to regard any tax as a penalty. I do not so regard it.

Of course, $330 million is a lot of money, but we are talking about assets which have appreciated in value approximately $3 billion in the hands of Du Pont. Furthermore, the Du Pont Co., in the normal course of business, generates cash flows of more than $500 million per year. So a tax of $330 million on the disposition of an asset worth about eight times that amount is neither prohibitive nor harsh, particularly when it is spread out over a period of 10 years.

Under this bill, let me repeat, Du Pont officials claim that a tax of $350 million will be paid by the stockholders of Du Pont and Christiana. This is more than the Du Pont Co. would pay under the plan they say they propose to follow under existing law. Obviously, then, there is no question of pushing this bill in order to save taxes. There is certainly no point in passing it prior to the handing down of the final court order to relieve anyone of a harsh tax burden.

I would point out here, however, one tax advantage which the large stockholders in Du Pont will have if they must pay the tax themselves under this bill rather than having the company pay it. Many of these people employ foundations and other devices to reduce their taxes in certain years. Here is how that would work:

Let us assume that this bill is passed and a Du Pont stockholder receives 1,000 shares of General Motors stock. Let us assume further that he has a low basis for his Du Pont stock and is subject to a capital gains tax, under this bill, of $10,000. His Du Pont stock would have a basis of zero, but by a quirk already in the tax laws he can get credit for a so-called charitable deduction in the amount of the full market value of his Du Pont stock if he transfers it to a family foundation, over which, incidentally, he may still exercise complete control. He may even have members of his family on the payroll of the foundation, thus actually getting indirectly much of the benefit from his ostensibly donated stock. At any rate, if he is near the 90-percent tax bracket, he would have to transfer only about 60 shares of his Du Pont stock to his foundation to get sufficient credit to pay this additional tax of $10,000. This is almost unbelievable, but true. This, as I say, is existing law and is not involved in the pending bill.

The Du Pont family members employ many foundations. Following are a few from the foundation directory on a very cursory examination:

LONGWOOD FOUNDATION

Incorporated in 1937; donor, Pierre S. du Pont.

Recent activities: Support for horticulture (particularly Longwood Gardens) higher and secondary education, libraries and local philanthropies.

Financial data: None reported to Foundation Directory. But, a 1955 press report indicates receipt of a major portion of an estate appraised at $60 million.

Several Du Ponts on board of trustees: H. B. du Pont is president and Mr. Greenewalt is a trustee.

ELEUTHERIAN MILLS-HAGLEY FOUNDATION, INC.

Incorporated in 1952; donor, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Financial data: 1958 assets $8,056,500 (L)[1]; expenditures $527,800 ($8,200 in grants).

WINTERTHUR CORP.

Incorporated in 1930; most of it probably for museum. Many Du Ponts are trustees.

Financial data: 1957 assets $12,374,935 (L) [1]; expenditures $617,691 ($24,738 in grants).

THE ALFRED I. DU PONT INSTITUTE OF THE NEMOURS FOUNDATION

Incorporated in 1936; purpose is to help handicapped children.

Financial data: 1955 assets $2,520,346 (L) [1]; expenditures $638,921 ($96,278 in grants).

WELFARE FOUNDATION, INC.

Incorporated in 1930.

Financial data: 1955 assets $1,521,770 (L) [1]; expenditures $161,733 ($160,450 in grants).

THEANO FOUNDATION

Incorporated in 1955; donor, Mrs. Jean Kane Foulke du Pont.

Financial data: 1957 assets $966 (L) [1]; expenditures $45,027, all grants.

DU PONT (CHICHESTER) FOUNDATION

Incorporated in 1946.

Financial data: 1955 assets $1,764,558 (L) [1]; expenditures $159,716 ($155,932 in grants).

IRENEE DU PONT, JR., TRUST

Established in 1947.

Financial data: Assets $3,017 (L) [1]; expenditures $63,050 ($61,692 in grants).

ALFRED I. DU PONT FOUNDATION

Incorporated in 1937.

Financial data: Assets $519,900 (L)[1]; expenditures $35,118 ($34,236 in grants).

ALFRED I. DU PONT AWARDS FOUNDATION

Trust established in 1946.

Financial data: Assets $229,638; expenditures $11,225 ($3,000 in grants).

I might say here, parenthetically, that there is now on the Senate Calendar a bill, H.R. 2244, which would make this sort of giveaway even more attractive to the fortunate few who have inherited great wealth. I hope to prevent its passage by the Senate. I do not know that its presentation at this time has anything to do with this Du Pont case—I do not know that it does not have anything to do with it, either.

Incidentally, the Treasury Department has been most unhelpful in this entire procedure. Before the Finance Committee the spokesmen for the Treasury Department refused to take any sort of position and failed even to furnish any helpful statistics on revenue or other aspects of the transaction.

MARKET IMPACT

If the revenue and tax effects of this bill or of present law are not harsh, then, upon what is this unseemly haste founded? The next claim which is advanced as the reason for immediate passage of this bill is that to delay, or not to pass it at all, would have a very serious effect on the stock market, especially on the price of General Motors stock.

The market impact of this GM-Du Pont transaction is important. It is really one of the imponderables of this situation. Little can be said about it with mathematical certainty, but this much can be said: the adverse effects on the market for General Motors stock which a failure to act now would allegedly bring on have been greatly exaggerated.

As proof of this, one merely has to note that the Senate failed to pass this bill during the last session. At that time there were dire predictions about the effect on the market of a failure to pass the bill. General Motors stock has gone up about $10 per share—more than 20 percent—since that time.

Before analyzing in detail the Du Pont plan of divestiture under existing law and the market reaction to such a plan, let me say that the bill now before us is weighted against General Motors and it would not seem to me that General Motors officials would very enthusiastically approve of this approach. Under this bill, each individual stockholder of Du Pont and Christiana will receive his General Motors stock with a current market value basis. On the other hand, his Du Pont stock will be written down to about zero if he has owned his stock for as long as 12 years. This means that if a stockholder has a choice of selling Du Pont or General Motors stock to raise cash, and he will be required to pay his share of the $350 million tax under this bill, he will most certainly sell the General Motors stock, because if he sold the Du Pont stock he would be subjected to another capital gains tax. This might cause the sale of 8 to 10 million shares of GM stock. And these sales would be made by hundreds, possibly thousands, of individuals in a highly disorganized manner. This could, indeed, cause a market upheaval.

But, entirely to the contrary, it has been contended by the supporters of this bill that, without this legislation—not with it—there will be a vast upheaval in the stock market because of the large block of General Motors stock which would have to be sold by the Du Pont Co. Let us see if this is so.

Under the proposal as outlined by Mr. Greenewalt, president of Du Pont, there would be, if divestiture is ordered under terms of existing law, a 3-part disposition of GM stock by Du Pont. There would be an exchange of GM stock by Du Pont for Du Pont common and preferred stock in the hands of nonprofit organizations or others. The Du Pont stock picked up in this way would be retired, thus enhancing the value of every share of Du Pont stock outstanding in the hands of all stockholders. It has been publicly estimated by Mr. Greenewalt that as much as 10 million shares of GM stock could be disposed of in this way over a 10-year period. In view of the fact that GM stock is the second most popular investment stock in the country, some feel much more could be disposed of in this way. Some GM stock would be passed on to du Pont stockholders in lieu of a portion of regular cash dividends. This would not subject the Du Pont stockholders to any more income tax than they now pay on their regular dividends. About 15 million shares of GM stock, according to Mr. Greenewalt, could be disposed of in this way.

The remainder of the GM stock, about 35 million shares, would be sold by Du Pont. This is the part of the transaction which would generate revenue, about $330 million. The other two operations would be tax free. This, let me repeat, is the plan of divestiture proposed to be followed under existing law by Mr. Greenewalt.

It is largely because of this sale portion of the transaction that it is claimed the market disturbance would take place. But let us see what some of the possibilities are.

There are many potential customers for GM stock. The first customer which comes to mind is General Motors itself. That company has an employee bonus plan and an employee stock purchase plan—in addition to its restricted stock option plan. In carrying out these two programs. General Motors has been using over 2 million shares of its common stock each year for the past few years. It has been purchasing some of this stock on the open market and issuing some new stock.

Over the next 10 years, then, General Motors will need more than 20 million shares of its own stock for these two programs. What could be more logical and more helpful to all concerned than for General Motors to make a direct purchase from Du Pont? There would be no market disturbance whatsoever.

This, if done, would leave 15 million shares of GM stock to be disposed of through ordinary channels over a period of 10 years. This is not too big a job. The New York Stock Exchange handles about 7 or 8 million shares of GM stock each year in the normal course of business. It would not appear to me to be too disturbing to feed in another 1½ million shares each year for 10 years on a regular basis. In fact, it would probably be a most healthy development. The market is starved for good stocks, and as a result the price-earnings ratio has been bid up out of all reason.

But it is not even necessary to run this 15 million shares through the New York Stock Exchange. It can be placed through underwriters with a number of investors—pension funds, trusts, nonprofit institutions. As I have said, GM stock is the second most popular investment stock in the country.

Oh, it has been said that the GM disposal is so big a job that nothing like it has ever happened before. This is not exactly true. We might make a comparison with the Ford Foundation secondary offerings.

The Ford Foundation, several years ago, publicly announced that it would seek to diversify its portfolio. Through a series of secondary offerings over a period of 5 years, it disposed of 16,950,000 shares of Ford stock, which amounted to 30.8 percent of the total equity in the company, and to $1,095,900,000. This is equivalent in dollar value to about 24 million shares of GM stock. This does not appear to have hurt the market for Ford stock. In fact, the company announced a 2-for-1 stock split only a few days ago.

During 1961 the foundation disposed of 2,915,261 shares of Ford stock. It still owns 28,995,035 shares which constitutes an overhang. The so-called experts talk knowingly of the depressing effect which the GM overhang would have for the next 10 years under this Du Pont proposed plan. But I hear no talk about this Ford Foundation program of disposing of its Ford stock having any adverse effect on the market.

Surely, in view of the experience of the Ford Foundation, Du Pont could dispose of 1½ million shares of GM stock in each year for the next 10 years without upsetting anybody.

No, Mr. President, this is not what upsets Mr. Greenewalt.

ANTITRUST ASPECTS

I have shown, at least to my satisfaction, that the two arguments which have so often been advanced in favor of this bill do not hold water. They are contrived, manufactured mirages. There must be some other reason for pushing this bill so frantically, and especially for insisting on its passage before the final court order is rendered.

---

[1] (L) indicates ledger value. Market value is generally much higher. Difference between expenditures and grants, in most foundations, is administrative expense. This often consists partially of large salaries, perhaps even to members of the donor's family.

The thing which strikes me as being important in this whole procedure, and particularly the thing which accounts for pressing passage of this bill prior to a final court order, is the antitrust aspect of this whole operation. I see no other cause for the extreme pressure and lobby for this bill now, right now, post haste.

Very little has been said during hearings and discussions about the antitrust aspects of this GM stock divestiture. Very little has been said about the advantages which will accrue to the stockholders of Christiana under this bill. Indeed, all the emphasis has been placed on the innocence of the stockholders of Du Pont and even of its officers and directors.

Let us now look a bit more closely at this side of the coin.

To begin with, the passage of any relief measure will be an encouragement to others to violate the antitrust laws. After all, how can the Congress deny relief to others who may be ordered to rid themselves of holdings deemed to be in violation of the antitrust laws? Corporate officials faced with a questionable acquisition will now feel free to move forward knowing that a sympathetic Congress and President will bail them out if they get caught. What can we say to the Hilton Hotel people, for that matter, after we pass this bill?

But let us concentrate on the matter before us.

The passage of this bill prior to the entering of the final court order will constitute a political endorsement of whatever order the court chooses to hand down—at least insofar as the antitrust aspects of that order are concerned.

Let me state my reasons for this conclusion.

Ever since this antitrust action got underway the Du Pont Co. has looked for some way to get approval of some sort of pass-through so that effective control of General Motors would still be in the hands of the Du Pont insiders, particularly the Du Pont family. At first it was suggested that a pass-through of voting rights would suffice. When this was knocked down by the Supreme Court the campaign got underway in earnest to modify the tax laws so that the actual ownership of the General Motors stock could be passed through without the payment of what might be a prohibitive price, i.e., about $1 billion in taxes which would have to be paid by the individual Du Pont stockholders on a stock pass-through.

Now we have arrived at the point where the bill does provide for a pass-through at a reduced tax rate, a modified capital gains rate. The Du Pont people are apparently willing to pay this much to retain the power and influence of this vast block of General Motors stock. The Justice Department insists that continued concentration of ownership of this stock will vitiate the relief from the control over General Motors that has been held to be in violation of the antitrust law.

As I have demonstrated, there is no tax advantage under this bill for the average Du Pont stockholder. I think I have shown that there would probably be less market disturbance under the disposal plan which Mr. Greenewalt proposes to follow under existing law than under this bill. I am left to conclude, then, that the Du Pont family does not wish to surrender control of General Motors. This is understandable. Perhaps none of us would be eager to relinquish such a valuable grip. But such a grip by Du Pont has been held to be in violation of our antitrust laws. That, then, is the paramount question involved in this bill.

If control of General Motors has been used to pry open this great market, I am forced to concur with the contention of the Justice Department in its brief filed before the Federal trial court in Chicago that continued control of the General Motors Corp. by a few members of the Du Pont family could be used to keep the door to this treasure house open and to an entrenchment of Du Pont as the primary supplier of General Motors requirements for automotive finishes and fabrics.

I am sure that my colleagues are not ignorant of the existence of a tightly woven web of large industrial corporations centered around the Du Pont Co. General Motors is the nexus of this complex, consisting of producers of rubber, plate glass, chemicals, gasoline and other products.

This bill, if we pass it before the court order is final, would, I believe, almost certainly result in things remaining as they are and we could write off as lost to pressure and politics the greatest antitrust victory ever won in the courts.

This is so because if we pass this bill there will be a pass-through of GM stock by the Du Pont Co. and Christiana to the Du Pont family. This would result in a few members of the Du Pont family still controlling General Motors.

In this connection, there is a most interesting table which was developed by the Department of Justice and which shows the close relationship which exists among 65 members of the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family who would be left with ownership of 8 percent of the General Motors Corp., which would be more than eight times as large, I am informed, as any other bloc of General Motors stock.

Perhaps the ownership of 8 percent of a corporation does not sound impressive to some, but when one looks at General Motors and its stock holdings, one is impressed with the fact that this Du Pont block is the only large block of stock outstanding. No other block of stock is as large as 1 percent of the total common stock outstanding. I think it is inescapable, then, to conclude that this 8 percent of GM stock which will remain in the hands of the Du Pont family, if the court follows the outlines of this bill, will still make possible and likely the Du Pont Co., control of General Motors.

In this connection, it should be noted that Du Pont now exercises effective control over a series of corporations, including General Motors, in which it has a minority but substantial stockholding.

Let me emphasize that no one has been charged with any criminal action. No criminal statutes have, so far as I know, been violated—at least, no such violation has been charged or proved. The court action with which we are concerned is a civil action aimed at correcting a situation which may be injurious to our system of free competitive enterprise.

It seems strange, indeed, to me, that so many who talk about the blessings of free enterprise are unwilling to give the free enterprise system a chance to work. Whenever someone tries to stack the cards in his own favor by becoming a party to an action designed to cause a breakdown in the free enterprise system, such as an antitrust violation, and gets caught at it, he seems to be able to find plenty of itching ears willing to listen, and willing, even anxious, to help him out of the predicament he has gotten himself into.

Now, I do not like to try a lawsuit on the floor of the Senate. I am trying to avoid that. That is what the proponents of this bill are trying to do. I do not think we should try to guide a Federal judge, by legislation, in his decision or order.

I have been led, as I have said, to the conclusion that the effort to rush this bill through the Congress prior to the entering of the final court order is motivated by two considerations.

First, this action on the part of the Congress constitutes guidance to the Chicago judge in framing his final order. Of course, we do not compel the court to do or not to do anything whatsoever. But look at the facts. Judge LaBuy has consistently found in favor of Du Pont. He has been consistently overruled by the Supreme Court. This is well understood by all who have followed this action in the courts.

In this connection, I would ask my colleagues to read from the hearings before the Finance Committee on page 83.

Two very interesting points are brought out in this dialog. First, Mr. Greenewalt regards Judge LaBuy as being on the side of Du Pont in this case. Second, the order of Judge LaBuy can be appealed from by either side; in other words, even this order we have waited for all fall—in vain—is not necessarily final.

What do these facts mean, now, in conjunction with this premature action by the Congress?

Judge LaBuy, if he acts in the future as in the past, can reasonably be expected, I think, to give the most sympathetic consideration possible to Du Pont in the framing of the court's order. Passage of this bill would provide him encouragement and political endorsement along a path which he and the Du Pont family want him to take—a pass-through of General Motors stock. And, after all, he has tried to follow various types of pass-throughs before, and we are now encouraging him to try the pass-through again, this time even passing through to Christiana's stockholders at a reduced tax, paving a superhighway, as I have said, for a pass-through.

The Justice Department has tried very hard for 12 years and through three administrations to break up Du Pont's stranglehold on General Motors. The campaign has been all but won. There is one last battle which may have to be fought. That last battle may never be fought at all, however, if this bill passes. And for want of that battle the whole campaign will be lost.

A PROPER COURSE OF ACTION

What should the Senate do?

The report of the Finance Committee disclaims any desire to guide the court in framing its final order. Would not this desire be more surely realized if we waited until after the order has been framed before we legislate?

The House has already passed this bill. The bill has been reported by the Finance Committee. All that remains is action by the Senate and approval by the President. These two steps can surely be accomplished within a week or 10 days after the final court order has been handed down, if such action is then deemed in the public interest. Divestiture does not need to begin, according to the Supreme Court, until 90 days following the final order. There will, then, be no injury to anyone if the Senate waits until after the final court order has been handed down and then, if this bill is appropriate, pass it. It seems to me that it is just barely possible that the order might reveal some points which need legislative relief action which are not covered by the bill. Would we then rush through a second bill while tax reform continues to wait listlessly in the wings?

I do not intend to delay the Senate in this matter. If, despite all logic and reason to the contrary, it is the will of the Senate to pass a bill for relief before the court action is final, it can do so. I shall, within the next day or two, offer some amendments which will prevent a pass-through by Christiana Corp. of General Motors stock, should the Senate decide to proceed with the pending bill.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES AND LARGE LOANS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MILLER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this is the story of an act of Congress which has been passed by both Houses of Congress and signed into law by the President and which, in my judgment, has been almost completely flouted through the administration of the act.

This is also the story of an instrumentality which was created, which has been set up to benefit small business, but which is being used more and more, not for the benefit of truly small business, but as an opportunity for financiers and investors to make a great deal of money.

I wish to make it absolutely clear at the outset that I believe the profit motive is an excellent and laudatory motive. It is perhaps the most important driving force in our economy.

I am in favor of business, both big and small. There is nothing in the remarks that I am about to make that should be construed as an attack on business or as an attack on the firms which have been taking advantage of the law to make a great deal of money in the process.

However, the facts are a devastating indictment of the actions of those who have the responsibility of enforcing the Small Business Investment Act.

Last year, Mr. President, we passed a bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act. In doing so, we wrote into the act an amendment which I shall now read. I shall read the brief paragraph in which that amendment was incorporated:

> Without the approval of the administration, the aggregate amount of obligations and securities acquired and for which commitments may be issued by any small business investment company under the provisions of this chapter for any single enterprise shall not exceed (1) 20 percent of the combined capital and surplus of such small business investment company authorized by this act, or (2) $500,000, whichever is the lesser.

The new language is the last five words of the paragraph, following the number "(2)."

There is no further modification. Thus it seems to me quite plain that Congress in passing the legislation intended that the SBIC's, with their rich tax privileges and other advantages, should not make investments exceeding $500,000, except with the prior written approval of SBA and that that approval, in my judgment, should be exceptional.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this $500,000 limitation supplemented the existing loan size limitation of 20 percent of the combined capital surplus of an SBIC.

What the Administration did in interpreting this act of Congress was to issue a regulation which I believe seriously distorts the plain intent of the act. The SBA's proposed regulation provides:

> "(a) Without the prior written approval of SBA, the aggregate amount of funds loaned to, or invested in equity securities of, any single small business concern, or for which commitments may be made, shall not exceed 20 percent of the combined paid-in capital and paid-in surplus of any licensee (including in such licensee's capital and surplus the outstanding amount of any SBA loans under section 302(a) of the act) 'or $500,000 whichever is the lesser. Such $500,000 limitation shall apply only with respect to loans made to and equity security acquired from a small business concern by a licensee on or after October 3, 1961, but shall not apply with respect to any loans made, or equity securities acquired, pursuant to a commitment issued before such date. Furthermore, the $500,000 limitation shall not apply so long as 50 percent (amount invested, disbursed or committed) of the equity securities acquired and loans made by a licensee after October 3, 1961, meet such $500,000 limitation.' [New language in quotes]."

I call special attention to the last sentence of the paragraph, which in effect applies the act of Congress to just 50 percent of an SBIC's funds.

What this interpretation of the act states is that it is possible to escape the $500,000 limitation that Congress imposed half the time, provided that one abides by it the other half of the time.

I just cannot understand that kind of interpretation. It makes no sense to me. It is as though a legislative body were to pass a law against murder, and then having an "interpretation" issued that one could commit murder every other day, or on odd days; that one could go out and commit murder on the 2d or 4th or 6th or 8th of the month, provided that one did not go out and commit murder on the 1st and 3d and the other odd days of the month.

The language of the law stated clearly that the $500,000 limit was to be added. I believe it is particularly important to recognize that this simply supplements the previously existing restriction on the size of investments to 20 percent of the combined paid-in capital and surplus of a small business investment company.

With respect to that section there has been no policy change at all. I have asked the SBA to tell me what exceptions they have granted under it, and what criteria they have devised to handle them. Going well beyond this existing exception, they have read into the act a broad exception which permits SBIC's to invest half of their funds above the $500,000 limitation.

In order that the story can be told to the Senate clearly and fully, and without bias, I shall put into the RECORD a letter which I wrote to the Administrator, and his answer to me.

But first I should like to show why the $500,000 limitation is so necessary, and why this distortion of the legislation negates the whole purpose of the Small Business Investment Act, which was to provide capital to small business; not to middle size business or big business, but to small business.

I will now give some examples of investments by SBIC's to make clear the pattern that is being established. I then will show briefly the tax advantages, the very rich and substantial tax advantages, which are given under the law to SBIC's, and thus provide a form of subsidized capital. These subsidized funds were intended to be made available to small business. Instead, as I shall show, large amounts of this money have gone to firms which can hardly be called small business.

The examples I am about to quote come from the "SBIC Evaluation Service," published by S. M. Rubel & Associates of Chicago. It is described as "the only financial analysis and review of small business investment companies."

EXAMPLES OF BIG LOANS

My first example is the Boston Capital Corp., which made a million dollar investment under the SBIC Act in the C. L. Gould Construction Co., a nationwide pile-driving contractor, which has worldwide rights to a new sonic piledriver, and which has a net worth of $3 million.

Boston Capital also invested $780,000 in Research Specialties Co., a publicly held company. In other words, this company is not held by a family or a few individuals, and therefore might have trouble raising funds. That is not the case here. This is a publicly held company, and its stock is available to the public. The present market value of the $780,000 investment, as of November 30, 1961, is $1,426,000.

Next I cite the Business Capital Corp., which invested $650,000 in another publicly held company, the Van Dusen Aircraft Co.

Next, Business Funds, Inc. Under the Small Business Investment Act it invested $800,000 in Allvac Metals of North Carolina. The company produces high temperature and special alloys. Its sales were over $1 million during the first half of 1961. The net profit for the 6-month period was $163,000. This also is a publicly held company.

In addition, Mr. President, Business Funds, Inc., invested $1,500,000 in Unanco Corp., a national construction firm based in California. In 1962 Unanco Construction Co. is projected at $35 million of business.

Electronics Capital Corp. of San Diego, Calif., invested $750,000 in the Potter Instrument Co. a few months ago. The present market value of this investment is $9,300,000. In other words, that $750,000 is now worth $9,300,000. The value of Potter Instrument is some $30 million. Electronics Capital has a 30.8-percent equity in it. Potter already has sales of $5 million.

The terms "small business" and "small business investment company" hardly appear to apply to such undertakings.

I want to repeat that I think it is wonderful that people can make this kind of profit. It is fine and to their credit. I am sure the electronics firm of Potter is rendering an excellent service to the economy. However, I submit that it should not be subsidized in the name of small business.

Another example: Electro Science Investors has invested $905,000 in Communications Industries, a publicly held company. This gives it a 34 percent equity. The present value of the $905,000 investment is $2,255,000. In other words, it is a company with net worth of more than $6 million.

Another investment made by Electro Science Investors is in Tamar Electronic Industries. The amount of its investment is $1,417,000, and the net worth of the investment is now $13,160,000. The investment by Electro Science Investors in Tamar Electronic Industries constitutes a 60 percent equity. So this is a $20 million company. Yet this investment is made in the name of small business.

Electro Science Investors has also invested $1,425,000 in General Electronics Controls.

All three of these companies are publicly held and publicly traded, and their stock is available to investors. They are really not the kind of situations which deserve the name small business.

Florida Capital Corp. has invested $1,025,000 in Roberts Co., a North Carolina textile machinery firm which has been in operation 12 years and employs 700 persons, including 30 graduate engineers, and operates 6 plants, of which it owns 2 and leases 4.

The sales of Roberts Co. were projected to be $7 million for 1961, as of the end of November 1961. Two months ago the company reported a backlog of $8 million. The sales are projected by the management to increase at the rate of 35 percent a year during the next 3 years. The company is publicly held. This is a recent investment by Florida Capital Corp.

Florida Capital Corp. also has invested $525,000 in the J. S. C. Electric Co., which has total assets of $1.8 million. This company also is publicly held.

Florida Capital Corp. also has invested in two other publicly held companies. It has invested $650,000 in General Utilities and Industries and $650,000 in Automatic Merchandising Co. The first investment has increased in value to $750,000; the second to $961,000.

Then there is Franklin Corp., a New York SBIC. This corporation has invested $850,000 in Astrex, Inc. Not only is that company publicly held, but its stock is traded on the American Stock Exchange. The price a few weeks ago was $18 a share, and Franklin's share is worth $1,800,000.

It is apparent to me that if the stock of a firm is traded on a major stock exchange that such a concern should not come to an SBIC for investment funds. After all, the fact that a company's stock is traded on an exchange means it is in a position to sell equities to the public.

Franklin Corp. also has a total of $750,000 invested in Sperti Products, Inc., a holding company, engaged in the business of proprietary drugs and the manufacture of aircraft components.

Greater Washington Industrial Investments, a small business investment company, has invested $770,488 in CEIR, a 7-percent equity. The $770,000 investment has appreciated in 7 months to $3,539,000, and CEIR appears to have a net worth of about $50 million. Yet this investment is made by an SBIC which has the rich tax privileges and advantages that Congress has given.

Then there is Growth Capital Corp., of Cleveland, Ohio. This company has invested $850,000 in Nu Era Corp., which is publicly held. It has invested $600,000 in Doe Valley Corp., which represents a 20-percent equity. So it is a $3 million net-worth company. It is a developer of 2,400 acres of industrial land which has guaranteed income over the next several years.

Mr. President, it seems to me it is very hard to construe this as a small business. It should not have great trouble in getting public investment money.

Growth Capital Corp. has also invested $1,012,500 in Continental Airport Hotels, Inc., which is 50 percent equity. Continental Airport Hotels operates or has an interest in 3 airport hotels, each of which is of 100- to 110-room size.

Then there is Midland Capital Corp., a small business investment company, which last month increased its investment in Coyne International Enterprises by $175,000 to a level of $2,475,000. Coyne is a small business, management-held company in the industrial laundry, real estate, leasing, truckownership, and other fields.

Drug and Food Capital Corp., of Chicago, another small business investment company, has completed financing of $1 million in 15-year, 7-percent notes for Henry's Drive-In, Inc. Drug and Food Capital Corp. takes $400,000 of these, and other investment companies take the remaining $600,000 worth. In addition, there are detachable warrants for 200,000 shares at $5 a share. The current market value for the stock of Henry's Drive-In is more than $12 a share.

Henry's is a Chicago-based system of franchised drive-in hamburger restaurants. Currently, 105 units are in operation, 82 having been added in the past 3 years. The funds will allow Henry's to expand to 170 units by 1963.

Mr. President, if there is any typical small business, it is the small restaurant. There are literally tens of thousands of restaurants all over America. It is easy to get into the business with limited capital, but it is a tough business to stay in, because the competition is keen. This kind of investment provides heavy serious competition for the bona fide small business. The individual owner who operates his own little restaurant will certainly not be helped by Congress providing loans and tax privileges for chain restaurants. Yet this is exactly what has happened in the case of Henry's.

Incidentally, the funds will allow Henry's to expand, as I have said, to 170 units by 1963. It will enable the company to sell the drive-ins to its operators in an "own-as-you earn" program. The company can now finance and construct the facilities, which will be sold over a 20-year period to the operator, instead of under a lease arrangement with private property owners, which had been the previous practice. The net result could be a four-fold increase in the Henry's profit structure through profits from real estate. The operator will decrease the monthly overhead expenses by one-third, based on the company's projections.

The result will be a huge multi-million-dollar real estate deal in the name of small business, plus fierce competition from this SBIC-financed chain for small restaurant owners in Chicago.

Incidentally, the present market value of the $1 million investment, made a short time ago, is $2,500,000.

Narragansett Capital Corp., another small business investment company, has invested a total of $1,100,000, of which $150,000 is in Sam Snead All-American Golf, Inc. That is an investment of 50 percent of the equity, or 1,500 shares. An additional commitment of $950,000 in 8 percent, 10-year subordinate debentures, with warrants for 1,500 shares at $110 a share, has been made in the Sam Snead Co. This newly organized company plans to erect par-3 golf courses across the country and to lease them on a net rental arrangement to experienced operators.

Then there is the Texas Capital Corp., which loaned $540,000 to an Ohio concern to purchase seven oil and gas wells plus some acreage surounding the wells. The Ohio company has a 20-year contract to sell gas from the wells to the East Ohio Gas Co. at 27½ cents a million cubic feet, which is substantially greater than the 3 cents to 18 cents a million cubic feet received in Texas.

This is a 20-year guaranteed contract in a proved situation. Texas Capital Corp. is certain to get its money out of it. It has been able to make a $540,000 investment under those circumstances.

I next come to a Wisconsin concern, the Marine Capital Corp., of Milwaukee, which has invested $887,500 in Racine Hydraulics, which is publicly held.

The purpose of the amendment of which I was the author last year, to limit investments to $500,000, was to prevent exactly this type of investment. The amendment was adopted and signed by the President to make sure that SBIC funds should assist genuine small businesses, the kind which because of their size and needs have the very hardest time getting equity financing.

What is happening is that more and more and more of these funds are not going to small businesses at all, but are going to the big, half-million-dollar or million-dollar-and-larger investments in large business. As a matter of fact, the most recent statistics show that 80 percent of all portfolio gains are from loans of more than $500,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MILLER in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Wisconsin may plan to develop this point later; but let me ask now whether he has figures which indicate the proportion of the total loans made by the Small Business Investment Corporation which are included in the loans of more than $500,000?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, I do; and I am glad the Senator from Illinois has given me an opportunity to speak on that point at this time. In reply to my request for information on this point, I received from the Small Business Administration the response that this problem was not a serious one because less than 2 percent of the loans or investment were invested in sums in excess of $500,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield again to me?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say that when, approximately 12 years ago, with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], I was investigating the RFC, it made to us a reply which was substantially similar to the one the Senator from Wisconsin has received—namely, that, after all, only a very small proportion of its loans were in large amounts. But it did not tell us what proportion of the dollar amount of the total loans were in large amounts. Only 2 percent of the loans may be in excess of $500,000; but the question is what percentage of the dollar volume is over $500,000?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator very much.

The fact is that less than 2 percent of the loans are over $500,000, but 25 percent of the total dollar amount exceed $500,000; and for the large companies—which, under the law, are permitted to make loans over $500,000 because they have more than $2,500,000 of capital and surplus, and therefore they can comply with the 20-percent requirement—44 percent of their investments are in excess of $500,000. Furthermore, I understand that at least one of these firms has 70 percent of its funds invested in loans over $500,000, and that several others have percentages nearly as high.

It is plain that large SBIC's are putting more and more of their investments into big loans. This tendency is bound to accelerate. Something that makes this development particularly serious is that new rules and regulations are being promulgated which have the effect of restricting the formation of new small SBIC's. It is going to be more difficult to obtain a license at the minimum capital level of $150,000. Yet these smaller SBIC's are the ones which make the small loans.

Individuals planning to form new SBIC's inform me that the new regulations effectively limit the formation of the $300,000 to $400,000 capitalized companies, by requiring that the Small Business Administration must be satisfied that funds cannot be obtained from private or other sources without undue hardship before supplying subordinated debentures. This is a new departure, and obviously it will limit the smaller firms. The Small Business Administration has gone so far as to require personal balance sheets of directors, officers, and 10-percent stockholders of new SBIC's, which will also discourage their formation.

TAX PRIVILEGES

I would like now to describe the important tax advantages of SBIC's. The fact is that most of the small business investment corporations will pay no Federal income tax. Either loss reserves will be established from income, or the Small Business Investment Corporation will be taxed as a regulated investment company. As a regulated investment company, if 90 percent of its income were distributed as dividends, the tax would be assessed to the recipient, and the Small Business Investment Corporation would pay no income tax at all.

This is a very helpful and useful provision of law, because the stockholder in the small business investment company has a privilege, under the law, of treating gains which are passed on to him as capital gains, not as regular income. That means that the maximum tax he pays, if he is in the 50-percent, 60-percent, 70-percent, or 80-percent bracket, is 25 percent. But, on the other hand, on the loss side, if he loses money, he can write off all the losses against his ordinary income.

Mr. President, Dun's Review—which certainly is not an antibig businesss publication, and which is very highly respected—has published an article entitled "The Two Sides of SBIC's"; and in the article it is pointed out, among other things, just how this works. The article is quite concise.

On the second page of the article is an insert with the heading "Heads You Win, Tails You Win." It reads as follows:

> SBIC's have a great built-in tax advantage. This can be demonstrated graphically in a somewhat oversimplified fashion by taking the hypothetical example of an SBIC whose owners are in a 60-percent tax bracket. Assume the SBIC makes just two investments, each of $100,000. One turns out a dead loss; the other doubles in value. Thus the loss of one cancels out the profit in the other.
>
> Net profit, exactly nothing? Not for an SBIC. The bad investment of $100,000 is written off against regular income, reducing the aftertax loss to just $40,000. But the $100,000 profit is taxable as a capital gain at a maximum rate of 25 percent, resulting in an aftertax gain of $75,000. Result, an aftertax net profit of $35,000—or 17.5 percent on the overall investment. And this merely by breaking even:

So one who breaks even gets a 17½-percent return on this basis, if he is in a 60-percent bracket and if he has an investment in an SBIC.

I am not complaining about this provision. I voted for this bill, and I favored it, though with some reluctance because I think we should be very careful about opening loopholes in the tax laws. But I did so with the understanding that this would be used for small business, which needs this kind of financial aid.

The examples I have cited show that in case after case after case investments have been made, not in small businesses, but in large business and the kind of businesses which compete with small business.

I should like to read further from this article in Dun's Review, because it seems to me it documents the position I have been taking. I now read from the article:

> But what about small business itself? Have the SBIC's solved small business' problem of raising long-term debt and equity money? A "yes" answer here must be very much more qualified than a "yes" answer to the previous set of questions. In fact, it depends in part on your definition of "small" business.

It certainly does, Mr. President.

I read further from the article:

> Under terms of the Small Business Investment Company Act, the definition is exceedingly broad: small business can have assets up to $5 million, average annual earnings up to $250,000 or net worth up to $2.5 million.

It is clear that a number of the firms to which I have adverted do not qualify on this basis, or at least do not meet all the qualifications.

> Toward the upper end of this asset range, the SBIC must compete with more conventional financing * * *

And so forth. The article points out the difficulties and shortcomings of the way the law has operated and the way the law has been administered.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "The Two Sides of SBIC's," from the November, 1960 issue of Dun's Review, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TWO SIDES OF SBIC'S

Congressional conservatives normally can be counted on to fight any legislation likely to increase the role of the Federal Government in business. Liberals are an equally safe bet to oppose most special tax concessions for business. But neither side acted true to form when it came to the Small Business Investment Company Act of 1958. With near unanimity, all shades of congressional opinion got behind the act. On the face of things, this might seem surprising. The legislation both increased Washington's role in business financing and granted tax privileges to businessmen. It thus waved a red flag at both bulls.

Neither side charged, however. For the Small Business Investment Company Act, whatever its faults, was politically safe. It was dedicated to fostering small business—an institution sacred to all shades of democratic opinion.

Specifically, this law was intended to encourage the flow of big capital to small business. Big business, the act's sponsors reasoned, could count on its own cash flow plus Wall Street underwriters for all the capital it could possibly need. Small business, on the other hand, had only the banks and commercial money lenders for short-term capital and no regular sources at all for long-term debt or equity capital. The federally aided small business investment companies were intended to bridge this gap.

The Small Business Investment Company Act, passed with such high hopes, is now 3 years old. Has it lived up to the hopes of its sponsors? Has it attracted high-bracket risk capital to small business as intended? Has it made it easier for small businesses to start and to expand?

To the question about attracting capital, the answer is a clear and definite "yes." There are currently something like 400 Small Business Investment Companies in the United States where there were none only 3 years ago. They command a total capital of around $340 million. So far this year alone something like 223 SBIC's have been launched. Among their sponsors have been such prominent banks as Morgan Guaranty, First National Bank of Chicago, and Marine Midland.

Around 40 of the SBIC's have raised equity capital on the public markets. One of these, San Diego, Calif., Electronics Capital Corp. has been a spectacular success in the market place; its shares soared from a 1959 offering price of 10 to as high as 63 this year. Even the Rockefellers, those shrewd captains of capital, have started a private SBIC. From all this, it is abundantly clear that SBIC's have a very real attraction for big capital. As a money-raising setup they have been a considerable success.

But what about small business itself? Have the SBIC's solved small business' problem of raising long-term debt and equity money? A "yes" answer here must be very much more qualified than a "yes" answer to the previous set of questions. In fact, it depends in part on your definition of "small" business. Under terms of the SBIC Act, the definition is exceedingly broad: small business can have assets up to $5 million, average annual earnings up to $250,000 or net worth up to $2.5 million.

Toward the upper end of this asset range, the SBIC must compete with more conventional financing. Companies with $2.5 million in net worth are not entirely frozen out of conventional Wall Street financing—especially in these days when new offerings find such a ready market.

It is probably in the middle part of the "small" business spectrum that SBIC financing has been most useful. A rather high proportion of SBIC loans and investments made to date are concentrated in the $300,000 to $500,000 area. A much smaller number run from $750,000 to $1 million.

But how about really small business? Here the SBIC's can make some claims. Bridgeport, Conn.'s First Connecticut Corp. reports lending $18,000 to a funeral parlor and also an investment in a local Greek restaurant. Manhattan's big Franklin Corp. (assets $4.6 million) loaned $45,000 to a coin laundry outfit. Cleveland's Growth Capital Corp. (assets $9.9 million) put $30,000 into a small hospital supply outfit.

The fact is, however, that such relatively small commitments are the exception rather than the rule. Growth Capital Corp., for example, did make that $30,000 loan. But of its 15 investments as of a recent report, only 4 were under $100,000.

Even this does not tell the whole story about the relative lack of help that SBIC's have given to really small business. The fact is that the proportion of the smaller loans and investments is steadily decreasing. Experience has taught the SBIC's that it costs almost as much to investigate and process a $30,000 loan as a $300,000 one. The smaller ones tend to be unprofitable. Naturally, the SBIC's turn away from them—even when they look otherwise attractive. Even the smaller SBIC's have tended to upgrade the size of their average commitment.

One method they have used for doing so involves a pooling of resources. In this way several small SBIC's handle a relatively large loan together. Around Manhattan, for example, at least one lawyer has built a profitable business out of finding suitably large SBIC investments and then farming them out to several SBIC's.

Not only does this practice tend to freeze out the small claimants for SBIC investing, it tends to make SBIC sponsors lazy. Why should they laboriously process and investigate small businesses? All they need do is take a piece of a loan someone else has found for them and then sit back and clip coupons. All this has caused more than one original sponsor of the SBIC legislation to wonder whether the law has really helped the people it was supposed to aid.

Such drawbacks, however, cannot dim the fact that some SBIC's have been extremely profitable. To understand why, it is only necessary to see how the SBIC's are set up. Written into the law are two unbeatable advantages: a high degree of capital leverage; and a very considerable tax concession. To take these features one at a time:

Capital leverage. Theoretically a small business investment company can leverage its dollars 11 to 1. The rules provide that Uncle Sam's Small Business Administration will match the first $400,000 of equity capital that an SBIC raises. The SBA will then lend another $400,000 to the company.

So far, the original $400,000 is leveraged three times over. But, on top of this, the SBIC is permitted to go out and borrow up to four times its equity capital. That means the minimum-size SBIC ($300,000 capital) could theoretically borrow $1.2 million, which would bring its total capital available for investment to $1,600,000.

In practice, however, the full potential leverage has never been realized. Moneylenders have been reluctant to lend SBIC's anything like four times their equity capital. Even so, leverage of six times the original equity investment is not rare.

Taxes. Here is the real reason for the SBICs' attractiveness for highbracket investors. Put simply, every dollar a SBIC loses comes out of somebody's regular taxable income; every dollar it makes counts as capital gains. Thus, if a SBIC can break even on its investments, its owners will come out way ahead.

GOOD FOR BANKERS AND LAWYERS

These tax and leverage features are by no means the only advantages offered by the SBIC form of organization. Banks, for example, have formed them not only for their money making possibilities but because they regard them as excellent ways to nurture promising new customers. Conventional money lenders and professional providers of risk capital have found SBIC's an excellent supplement to their operations. A Florida outfit, for example, uses an SBIC to lend capital to speculative builders. Lawyers, especially those of an entrepreneurial bent, have found them handy tools.

Such advantages aside, can the SBIC's make money on their own? The odds are that they can. But in most cases it is too early to give a definite answer. Not until last year did the SBIC's get going on any very substantial scale. To date there have been only a few losses and a few very spectacular successes. Typically, these successes have tended to be good-sized investments, usually in the electronics or scientific field. For example:

Electronics Capital Corp., run by Electrical Engineer Charles E. Salik, lent $750,000 to Potter Instrument in return for debentures convertible into one-third of Potter's common stock, which is publicly held. Recently, the conversion value of the SBIC's $750,000 investment was around $10 million.

Greater Washington Industrial Investments, based in the Nation's Capital, put a bit less than $1 million into CEIR, a computer services company. At one point, Greater Washington was sitting with a paper profit of almost $8 million on that one investment.

Franklin Corp., run by Herman E. Goodman, a onetime Manhattan textile magnate, lent $350,000 to Astrex, Inc., an electronics distributor. Astrex's common stock rose so high that the warrants Franklin got as part of its loan package gave the SBIC a paper profit at one time of better than $1 million.

ENOUGH BORROWERS?

Still, it is difficult to tell at this point whether such spectacular profits were a result of the inherent advantages of SBIC's—or simply a byproduct of the heady boom in science stocks. Nor is it at all certain that the burgeoning number of SBIC's will ever find many investments of the Astrex or Potter variety.

Even today, many leading SBIC's are very far from fully loaned. In July, according to the well-informed SBIC Evaluation Service, the big Boston Capital Corp. (assets $21.2 million) had less than 20 percent of its money invested. Electro Science Investors, run by Dallas' dynamic James J. Ling, recently had found investments for just over 40 percent of its $15 million—despite the fact that it has been in existence close to 2 years. Buffalo, New York's big Midland Capital Corp., in similar fashion, had invested just a shade over one-third of its $16 million.

So far, then, indications are that well-run SBIC's may find it harder to find suitable investments than to raise money to put into them. It may turn out to be harder to lend the money out than to take it in. Not that there is any shortage of Americans with what the possessors regard as fine moneymaking opportunities. How many of them will stand the test of rigid fiscal analysis, however, remains to be seen. And some of those that do may well turn out to be too small to fit into the relatively large scale standards that the SBIC's are trending toward. As for the very best investment risks, many of them may prefer to go to moneylenders rather than dilute their equity with the kind of convertible debenture or warrant deals that the SBIC's usually demand from them.

REACHING TOO FAR?

Under these circumstances, some of the SBIC's may be tempted to reach too far to find investments. They may be tempted by the tax advantages to pour good money after bad in investments that have started to go sour. Some critics think this day may already be at hand. One such is Walter Heller, head of the big factoring and commercial moneylending firm, "There are hosts of SBIC's," says he, "but the vast majority of them can't find enough good companies to lend to. They find that more and more of the well-managed companies don't want to give up equity."

Heller, of course, is hardly an unbiased witness; SBIC's are in direct competition with his company in many fields. Still, his observations have a certain force and point up a fact that some SBIC men will admit privately. For the simple fact is this: A Government-backed and subsidized program like the SBIC's can neither create business opportunities nor turn mediocre management into topnotch management. And in a very realistic sense, it is good management and shrewd entrepreneurial skills that are in short supply, not capital.

Certainly the SBIC law was well-intentioned and has created a promising new investment medium. But to expect too much of it—or to expand it too fast—would be exceedingly unwise.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would like to call attention next to an advertisement which appeared in the New York Times, calling attention to the lucrative investment opportunities afforded by SBIC's. Referring to them as "the burgeoning SBIC's," the advertisement gives special emphasis, in underlined boldface type, to: "Extraordinary capital gains."

The advertisement counsels investors to buy into the tax-favored SBIC's.

Because I find it especially revealing, I ask unanimous consent that the advertisement which appeared in the January 14 issue of the New York Times be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW KIND OF INVESTMENT: THE BURGEONING SBIC'S (SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES)—TWO SBIC'S IN PARTICULAR ARE COMMENDED TO THE ATTENTION OF INVESTORS INTERESTED IN EXTRAORDINARY CAPITAL GAINS

Thus far largely overlooked, the publicly held SBIC's offer investors the increasingly rare opportunity to gain ground floor entry into sound new businesses in promising industries.

In the past, such opportunities have been most often the purlieu of especially wealthy investors and professional entrepreneurs. Now, however, while the tax-favored SBIC's are indeed attracting the very rich, they beckon, too, to those of more modest means.

For investors with limited capital, the SBIC's represent just about the only method that can be considered prudent of sharing in the spectacular growth that characterizes the careers of many small companies in the vanguard of technological breakthrough.

Briefly, SBIC's are companies that invest in other, but only small, companies. As such they enjoy numerous advantages, bestowed upon them by Congress to encourage the growth of small companies. Specifically, an SBIC may only invest in, or lend money to, companies which (a) are independently owned and operated, (b) are not now dominant in their fields of operations, (c) have total assets not in excess of $5 million, (d) have a net worth of not more than $2.5 million, and (e) show after-tax income for the 2 preceding years of not more than $250,000.

When you buy shares in a well-run SBIC, you of course participate in the ownership of all the businesses the SBIC has itself invested in—thereby gaining not only (1) wide capital gains potential, but also (2) broad diversification among emerging businesses—a diversification you could not otherwise obtain with limited capital (a publicly held SBIC is not permitted to invest more than 20 percent of its capital in one company), (3) breadth and expertise of management, (4) great leverage, through four times the SBIC's original capital, (5) immediate marketability, and (6) highly important special tax advantages.

THE SBIC'S RECOMMENDED NOW BY VALUE LINE

Both the two stocks recommended by Value Line, in a special report you are invited to send for, show extraordinary capital gains potential—possibly 100 percent or more.

There are also these other important considerations:

Theoretically, of course, maximum diversification among the various SDIC's now publicly owned would seem to assure the greatest chance that at least one of them will work out sufficiently to warrant such an investment. With some three dozen SBIC's already in public hands, however, such an approach is patently unfeasible. Nor, indeed, do we believe it necessary to go that far.

In selecting particular stocks, we have not only chosen two of the most promising situations from the entire group, but two that give the investor a maximum possible degree of diversification and balance. In our opinion, these two companies admirably complement each other for these major reasons among others:

1. Investment policy: One company intends to concentrate heavily in electronics and other technical industries; the other, by contrast, is spreading its investments over a wide spectrum of industrial and commercial industries.

2. Management background: In line with these divergent investment emphases, the first company's management is predominantly technically oriented by education and experimental background; the second company's team, on the other hand, consists to a large extent of financial specialists and draws heavily on the demonstrated managerial talent of a famous "parent" corporation.

3. Geographic diversification: One company is domiciled in California while the other operates primarily in New York. Both areas offer the prospect of continued regional development at rates well above the national average in economic and industrial terms.

Not least of several other practical virtues these stocks possess are the facts that they are both quoted daily in the Wall Street Journal and other leading financial papers—and they are low priced.

In other words, we conclude that a combined investment in these two companies should work out as an especially well-rounded commitment in the new small business investment company field.

GUEST SUBSCRIPTION

In conjunction with the guest subscription offered below, we will send you, as a special bonus, the six-page analysis of the SBIC business and the two particular stocks favored by the value line organization.

You will also receive additional, without charge, the new value line reports (80 full-page reports) on 80 selected stocks in 4 key industries.

Moreover, in view of what has just taken place in the market as a whole, we will also send you the new value line summary of advices on 1,000 stocks and 50 special situations. With this valuable guide, being released this week, you can make an immediate check of every leading stock you are concerned about, as to its probable market performance in the next 12 months, its appreciation potentiality over the next 3 to 5 years, its quality, and its current yield based on estimated dividend payments in the year ahead.

And for the special "guest" price of only $5 you will receive (a) the next 4 weekly editions of the Value Line survey with full page reports on each of 300 additional stocks, (b) a new special situation recommendation, (c) four especially recommended stock-of-the-week reports, (d) business and stock market prospects (weekly), (e) list of selected stocks to buy and hold now (weekly), (f) the Value Line business forecaster (weekly), (g) what the mutual funds are buying and selling, (h) what insiders are buying and selling (weekly), (i) weekly supplements, (j) four weekly summary indexes including all changes in rankings to date of publication, and (k) you will also receive at no extra charge Arnold Bernhard's new book, The Evaluation of Common Stock (regular $3.95 clothbound edition published by Simon & Schuster).

To take advantage of this special offer, fill out and mail coupon below:

Name________________________________

Address______________________________

City______________ Zone_____ State_______

Send $5 to Department T-339L

The Value Line Investment Survey, published by Arnold Bernhard & Co., Inc., The Value Line Survey Building, 5 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a series of letters which were addressed by me to the SBA Administrator and from the SBA Administrator to this Senator be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 27, 1961.

Hon. JOHN E. HORNE,
Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: I strongly object to the proposed rule issued by your Administration implementing the $500,000 loan limit for Small Business Investment Companies enacted by Congress in the most recent session. As you know, the amendment limited to $500,000 the amount that may be loaned by an SBIC to any one small business without specific Small Business Administration approval. The purpose of the restriction was to provide assurance that the rich tax privileges and capital opportunities provided SBIC's by Congress would be used for the benefit of genuinely small businesses that need this assistance.

As I understand the proposed rule the $500,000 loan limit applies only to 50 percent of an SBIC's loans. This seriously distorts the act passed by both Houses of Congress and signed into law by the President, the clear and obvious intent of which was to limit SBIC loans to any one firm to $500,000, except under extraordinary circumstances. The purpose of the limitation was clarified by extensive discussion in the conference committee between the House and Senate when the House accepted this amendment.

I strongly hope you will withdraw this proposed rule and replace it with one which more accurately reflects Congress' directive.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senator

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., December 2, 1961.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: This will reply to your letter of November 27, 1961, in which you object to the proposed regulation concerning the $500,000 investment limitation as enacted in Public Law 87-341. You state that the amendment limits to $500,000 the amount that may be loaned by a small business investment company to any one small business without specific Small Business Administration approval, and that the purpose of this restriction is to provide assurance that small business investment companies assistance would be for the benefit of genuinely small businesses.

You state also that the proposed regulation seriously distorts Public Law 87-341, the clear and obvious intent of which was to limit small business investment company loans to $500,000, except under extraordinary circumstances. You further state that the purpose of this limitation was clarified by extensive discussion in the conference committee between the House and the Senate when the House accepted this amendment. You conclude by expressing the strong hope that this proposed rule will be withdrawn and that it will be replaced with one which more accurately reflects congressional intent.

You will recall that the $500,000 limitation was not contained in the original Senate or House versions of the bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and that there was no testimony given on this $500,000 limitation at the hearings that were held in early August. The $500,000 limitation was inserted in both the House and Senate versions of the bill after these hearings.

The Senate version of S. 902, as explained in Senate Report No. 801, dated August 28, 1961, limited investments to 20 percent of the capital and surplus or $500,000, whichever is the lesser. The House version, H.R.

8670, would have applied this dollar limitation only if Government funds were involved. When S. 902 was introduced on the Senate floor, it was stated that upon application, the Small Business Administration may permit a larger amount.

The House version was introduced on the floor of the House, September 6, 1961, and a statement was made that the limitation was desirable, both from the standpoint of encouraging these companies to invest in small business concerns that need them most, and from the standpoint of spreading these funds out in a diversified portfolio.

It should be noted that the House report which accompanied the bill, Report No. 1040, stated, "In order to avoid needless problems of tracing funds and not unduly restrict the operations of SBIC's with other funds obtained from private sources, the bill provides that an SBIC may satisfy this requirement by maintaining a portfolio of investments of $500,000 or under, plus cash and Government securities, in an amount at least equal to the total amount of the unpaid balance of any loans the SBIC has obtained from SBA under section 303."

As a result of the different views contained in each bill the conference committee met, as you know, and the Senate version was adopted with a provision from the House version designed to insure that the new limitation would not apply retroactively. There is very little said in the conference report that gives one any additional insight to the adoption of this limitation.

When the conference version of the bill was introduced to the Senate, there was no discussion on this limitation except to point out that the conferees had agreed to the Senate version with the additional language inserted to insure the provision would not be retroactive.

The most extensive discussions on the conference bill, and in particular on the $500,000 limitation, were had when this bill was introduced to the House on September 15, 1961. In discussing the conference report and the bill, Congressman PATMAN discussed at some length this $500,000 limitation. Briefly summarized, his statements were that this limitation was the only controversial matter so far as he knew in the conference report; the purpose of the limitation was to make sure that the funds made available to small business concerns through this program would be available for the smaller sized businesses that need them most; that the Senate conferees made a convincing case that some of the larger small business investment companies concentrated too heavily on investments over $500,000 and thus were not serving the needs of the smaller concerns; and that the House agreed to the Senate provision with the understanding that it allows investments of over $500,000 to be made with Small Business Administration approval, since there will be cases where legitimate small businesses will need more than $500,000. He further stated that fears had been expressed the Small Business Administration approval process will require it to evaluate each single investment of $500,000 or above, a job that the Small Business Administration probably does not have the manpower to handle.

He went on to state that this was not his understanding of the provision and that the purpose of the amendment is not to interfere with the small business investment companies' job of evaluating their investments, but that the purpose is to reserve the major portion of the available funds for smaller businesses and to discourage the trend to concentrate too heavily on large investments. He then said, and I quote: "I see no reason why this purpose could not be accomplished by some formula SBA may develop, allowing, for example, a given percentage of investments over the $500,000 limitation."

Further discussions on this limitation were had on the House floor. Congressman WIDNALL called the limitation unjustifiable and said the conferees have struck a body blow at the flow of private money into small business investment companies. He endorsed Mr. PATMAN'S suggestion that a formula approach be adopted, as did Congressman BROWN. Congressman SCRANTON discussed at length his opposition to this limitation and pointed out there is no testimony on this limitation whatsoever either in the House or in the Senate.

So far as I know, this constitutes the publicly known legislative history to the $500,000 limitation. The Small Business Administration carefully studied all the information available to it as to the congressional intent and concern. From this analysis, the proposed regulation was promulgated. Not only was the formula approach specifically suggested and recommended by several Members of the House but you will recall that a substantially similar formula was contained in the House version. While it is true that the House receded from this version and adopted the Senate version which would not apply this limitation only to situations where Government funds were involved, the discussion on the House floor made clear that House Members understood that "approval of over $500,000 investments made by a small business investment company does not have to be on a case-by-case basis."

The formula in the proposed regulation requires, in accordance with what I understood to be congressional intent, that at least 50 percent of the small business investment companies' funds go into loans or investments of less than $500,000. Moreover, you will note, the proposed regulation requires, without prior specific approval of Small Business Administration, a small business investment company to make the smaller loans before it can make a loan or investment in excess of $500,000 on a matching basis. We believe this does not distort the intent of Congress, but in fact implements it in the most manageable way.

It should be noted that the House was concerned with the problem of not unduly restricting the operations of small business investment companies and thus proposed a method in the House bill. To adopt a procedure of giving specific approval to each case would, in my opinion, unduly restrict the operations of small business investment companies. Also, it would superimpose this agency's evaluation of investments over that of the small business investment companies. This proposed regulation is in keeping with the legislative history which Congressman PATMAN and other House Members made on the House floor and which is referred to above.

Senator, I have gone into this matter in this much detail in order to point out that I have given careful consideration to the proposed regulations, and that I have endeavored to comply with what I believe to be congressional intent. Of course I have no way of knowing the details of the discussion to which you refer in the conference committee, but seemingly, there is disagreement among the conferees as to what the understanding was.

The purpose of this letter is not to state that no consideration will be given to your suggestion to me in your letter of November 27. It is to say however, that the most careful thought was given to these proposed regulations and, moreover, to suggest that either Mr. Fine or I or both of us be given an opportunity at the earliest convenient time to discuss the matter personally with you. Because of prior engagements I shall be out of Washington beginning Monday, December 4 through Tuesday, December 12. Mr. Fine will be in Washington beginning Monday, December 4 for several weeks with the exception of December 5. I have discussed with Mr. Fine the possibility of his talking with you and presenting our thoughts during my absence. He wants to do so and will meet with you either in Washington or at whatever place is mutually convenient.

Thank you for your comments and with kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

JOHN E. HORNE,
Administrator.

PROPOSED DRAFT

§ 107.708. Limitation on loans, investments and commitments.

(a) Without the prior written approval of SBA, the aggregate amount of loans and equity securities acquired and for which legal commitments may be issued by a licensee for any single small business concern, shall not exceed 20 percent of the combined paid-in capital and paid-in surplus of such licensee, or $500,000, whichever is the lesser.

Said $500,000 limitation shall apply only with respect to loans and equity securities acquired by a licensee on or after October 3, 1961, except that said $500,000 limitation shall not apply with respect to any loans or equity securities acquired on or after October 3, 1961, pursuant to a legal commitment issued before October 3, 1961.

Subject always to said 20 percent capital and surplus limitation, not less than 50 percent of the aggregate amount of loans and equity securities acquired and for which legal commitments are issued by a licensee during the period October 3, 1961, to and including March 31, 1962, and during each fiscal year (beginning April 1 and ending March 31) thereafter, shall consist of loans, equity securities or legal commitments not exceeding $500,000 for any single small business concern, and not in excess of 30 percent of said aggregate amount of loans and equity securities acquired and legal commitments issued during said period and each fiscal year thereafter, may consist of loans, equity securities or legal commitments in excess of $500,000 for any single small business concern. Loans, equity securities or legal commitments in excess of $500,000 for any single small business concern may exceed 30 percent of said aggregate amount of loans and equity securities acquired and legal commitments issued during said period and each fiscal year thereafter only if the written approval of SBA was obtained by the licensee prior to the acquisition or issuance of any such excess loan, equity security or legal commitment.

(b) Subject to the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section and without the prior written approval of SBA, no more than five licensees may, by participation or otherwise, provide equity capital or long-term loans to any single small business concern unless the total financing involved is $300,000 or less.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., December 21, 1961.
Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: Thank you again for the courtesy that you extended to Phil Fine and myself last Monday afternoon.

We appreciated the frank exchange of comments and trust that you recognize that our objectives of administering the small business investment company program are similar to your stated desires.

Mr. Fine has reviewed again the entire matter of the $500,000 loan limitations and suggests that the enclosed regulation might be more satisfactory to you. He feels, as do I, that this is both in compliance with the congressional intent as stated in the 1961 amendments and with section 102 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

We would appreciate hearing from you on this matter at your earliest convenience.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

John E. Horne,
Administrator.

Small Business Administration,
Washington, D.C., January 3, 1962.

Hon. William Proxmire,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Proxmire: Thank you for your letter of December 23, a copy of which you forwarded to Deputy Administrator Phil Fine.

You will be interested to know that a total of 1,839 loans has been made by small business investment companies in business 6 months or longer, under section 304 of the Small Business Investment Act, as of September 30, 1961.

Of these 202 SBIC's, 7 made 9 loans of sums in excess of $500,000. Thus, 1,830 of the 1,839 loans made were in sums under $500,000, and the percentage of loans made by SBIC's in sums of over $500,000 was 0.0049 percent.

One hundred and sixty-four SBIC's filed reports indicating that as of September 30, 1961, they had made equity investments in small businesses. Again, these SBIC's had been in business for 6 months or longer. Of these 164, only 13 reported that they had made investments of over $500,000.

A total of 805 investments was made by all reporting SBIC's, and of these, 37 were in amounts exceeding $500,000.

Thus, as of September 30, with all SBIC's that had been in business over 6 months reporting, a total of 46 loans or investments had been made in amounts exceeding $500,000, out of a total of 2,598 investments or loans made to small businesses. These totals indicate that 1.77 percent of the investments or loans made by small business investment companies during the period ending September 30, 1961, were in amounts exceeding $500,000, or that 98.23 percent of SBIC investments or loans were in amounts less than $500,000.

Without repeating the contents of my prior letter to you, it is our feeling that the formula approach best carries out the expressed intent of Congress as carried in the Congressional Record, and as reported in the hearings transcripts on Public Law 87–341.

You will be interested in knowing that the 1.77 percent of investments or loans made by SBIC's in amounts exceeding $500,000 has been made to all manner of industries from pile driving to defense-oriented electronics factories, from communications manufacturers to fabricators of marine products; and that these loans and investments have created hundreds of jobs by making available capital and equipment for new employees.

Sincerely,

John E. Horne,
Administrator.

January 5, 1962.

Hon. John Horne,
Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C.

Dear John: I am very grateful to you for sending me such a useful and detailed analysis of the SBIC loan and equity investment program involving sums in excess of $500,000.

In order to make this report meaningful, however, there is additional information I need. This is it:

On page 1 in your last paragraph you say that 46 loans out of 2,598 investments exceeded $500,000. You further say that these totals indicate that 1.77 percent of the investments or loans made by small business investment companies during the period ending September 30, 1961, were in amounts exceeding $500,000.

Now can you tell me the total amount of the loans exceeding $500,000 and the total amount of loans less than $500,000?

As I'm sure you must appreciate, I feel this total dollar figure is extremely important. Also, there is no question that this total dollar figure will differ substantially from the number of loan figure.

For example, under the SBA program it can be and often is said that 90 percent of the loans are for less than $100,000. At the same time, nearly half the amount of the loans are involved in the 10 percent of the loans that exceed $100,000.

My second question is to secure from you the breakdown which I believe I also requested in my original letter of both the number and the dollar proportion of the loans for each of the SBIC's which had made loans in excess of $500,000 in proportion to their total portfolio.

That is, I would like to know how large a proportion of the loans made by the 20 or so SBIC's which did make loans in excess of $500,000, how large a proportion these big loans or investments constituted of the total dollar and number portfolio of each of the 20 SBIC's.

I realize that this is a big order and it may be too big. If it is impossible or extremenly difficult for you to give me these figures, I do hope that you will be able to give me the figures for two or three representative SBIC's, perhaps the two or three with the largest number and dollar amount of big loans.

I'm sure you can understand, John, how on the basis of your letter, I think the case has been made overwhelmingly that the 50-percent restriction that you had originally proposed and even the 30-percent restriction which you suggested later on loans in excess of $500,000 would be no restriction whatsoever and would have absolutely no impact on the SBIC program. Of course, it may be true that the statistics that I am now requesting may throw a different light on it. If less than 2 percent of the investments of the SBIC's are now in excess of $500,000, it would seem that a limitation of 50 percent on such big loans would be like an arms control agreement in which we limited armament by providing armament would not be expanded more than 25-fold.

Sincerely,

William Proxmire,
U.S. Senator.

January 9, 1962.

Hon. John Horne,
Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C.

Dear John: After more thought about the figures on SBIC loans and investments which you kindly sent me, I feel that a more detailed breakdown is needed for full comprehension of the situation. Accordingly, I would appreciate having a tabulation of SBIC loans and investments showing (a) the number and (b) the total dollar amount, in different size categories, such as 0 to $50,000, $50,000 to $125,000, $125,000 to $250,000, $250,000 to $500,000, $500,000 to $1 million, and above $1 million, if this would not be too difficult to prepare.

I would also like to know what procedure has been followed to handle exceptions (on the basis of "prior written approval") to the loan size limitation of 20 percent of an SBIC's capital. I assume that smaller SBIC's request exemption from this restriction from time to time, and would appreciate knowing what criteria are employed in deciding whether to approve an exception.

I would like this information in addition to that requested in my previous letter of January 5, which I hope you will send at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

William Proxmire,
U.S. Senator.

Small Business Administration,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1962.

Hon. William Proxmire,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Proxmire: By letter dated January 11, Deputy Administrator Phil David Fine, advised you that we were in the process of obtaining the information requested by your letter of January 5, last.

In that letter you requested first the total dollar amount of loans exceeding $500,000 and the total dollar amount of loans made less than $500,000. As of September 30, 1961, these figures were respectively, $39,538,917 and $116,508,321.

Your second request was for a breakdown of both the number and dollar proportion of the loans for each of the SBIC's which have made loans in amounts exceeding $500,000.

As of September 30, 1961, there were 27 SBIC's which had sufficient paid-in capital and surplus to allow them to make investments or loans in excess of $500,000 and to still be in compliance with the 20-percent restriction of the Small Business Investment Act.

These 27 SBIC's disbursed in 51 investments, each of which was over $500,000, a total of $39,538,917. These same companies disbursed in 301 investments a total of $49,136,634 in amounts under $500,000. Thus, the total number of investments disbursed for these 27 larger SBIC's was 352 for an aggregate total of $88,675,551.

Stated in percentages, the number of investments disbursed in amounts over $500,000 equaled 14.5 percent of the total number of investments of these 27 companies and the dollar amount of disbursements in this category was 44.6 percent. The percentage of the number of investments under $500,000 was 85.5 percent of the total investments and the dollar amount thereof was 55.4 percent of the total of these 27 companies.

At the same time the foregoing figures were tallied, we reviewed the SBIC's above referred to, to determine to what extent these 27 companies had utilized available Government financing. You will be interested to know that no funds were advanced to the 27 investment companies under section 302 of the act and that 2 companies had borrowed $3 million under section 303(b) of the act. These 2 companies had made 66 loans or investments totaling $16,161,196. Of these 66 investments, 8 were in sums exceeding $500,000 for a total of $5,725,000, or conversely, 58 investments or loans were made in sums under $500,000, for a total value of $10,446,196.

There is unanswered your letter of January 9 requesting still further particulars on the investments and loans by SBIC's. Our best estimate is that to collate these figures would require the investment of 250 man-hours. In the hope that this letter will answer your questions I have suggested that we hold back on obtaining the further information until you advise that you feel this further expenditure is warranted. Would you please advise as to whether you require the information requested in your letter of January 9.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

John E. Horne,
Administrator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there are two points in this correspondence to which I would like to draw special attention.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

In his letter of December 2, 1961, SBA Administrator John Horne refers to the legislative history supporting his interpretation, based on a statement on the floor of the House by Representative

Wright Patman. Representative Patman was the leader of the House conferees at the conference at which the $500,000 limitation was agreed to.

In his floor statement Representative Patman stated that it was his understanding that the purpose of the $500,000 limitation was not to stop investments of this size entirely, but to insure that the major portion of each company's funds be reserved for smaller business.

Representative Patman's full statement on this point was as follows:

> Finally, we accepted a limitation which is the only controversial matter, so far as I know, in this conference report. The House conferees agreed to a Senate provision limiting investments by SBIC's to not more than $500,000 in any one small business concern, without the approval of the Small Business Administration. The purpose of this limitation is to make sure that the funds made available for small business concerns through this program will be available for the smaller size businesses that need them most.
>
> The Senate conferees made a convincing case that some of the larger small business investment companies have concentrated too heavily on investments over $500,000, and are not serving the needs of the smaller concerns. Accordingly, we agreed to take the Senate provision, with the understanding that it does allow some of these investments over $500,000 to be made with SBA approval. Obviously, there are some cases where legitimate small businesses will need more than $500,000.
>
> Now, some fears have been expressed that this SBA approval process will require SBA to evaluate each single investment over $500,000, a job they probably do not have the manpower to handle. That is not my understanding of this provision. The purpose of the amendment is not to interfere with the investment companies' job of evaluating what investments are sound. The purpose is to reserve the major portion of the available funds for smaller business, and to discourage a trend which has been noticeable in some of these investment companies to concentrate too heavily on large investments. I see no reason why this purpose could not be accomplished by some formula SBA may develop allowing, for example, a given percentage of investments over the $500,00 limit.

Now, by no stretch of language or logic is it possible to state that subtracting 50 percent of something from 100 percent leaves a major portion, to quote Mr. Patman's phrase—yet this constitutes the key legislative backup for the SBA's interpretation. A 50 percent exemption permits an equal share of funds to go to large and small loans.

The second point in this correspondence that I want to emphasize is the draft proposal of the SBA attached to John Horne's letter of December 21.

ADMINISTRATIVE BURDENS

In his letter Mr. Horne and his deputy, Mr. Fine, state that this proposal may be more satisfactory to me, and that it is "both in compliance with the congressional intent as stated in the 1961 amendments and with section 102 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958."

Since the original proposed regulations to which I so strongly objected have not yet been finally promulgated, this alternative is of considerable importance. It provides that SBIC's may put up to 30 percent of their funds into investments and loans over $500,000. It states that 50 percent must be in commitments below that size, with no exceptions—but provides that an additional 20 percent above the 30 percent may go to above $500,000 commitments only with the written approval of the SBA on a case-by-case basis.

So this is basically a 30–70-percent formula, with a proviso that an extra 20 percent above the 30 percent may go to large loans with SBA's case-by-case OK.

I want to reiterate that I believe the plain intent of the act of Congress was to eliminate loans and investments by SBIC's above $500,000 except in rare circumstances—for example, to bail out an investment in danger of going bad unless extra funds were injected. If a formula approach is to be adopted, though, I certainly believe a 30–70 formula more accurately reflects the Congress's intent than the 50–50 formula.

But I am frankly puzzled by the SBA's proposal that the extra 20 percent be decided on a case-by-case basis. In all their statements on this subject, in Representative Patman's floor remarks, in letters and public discussion of this issue, the prime argument against the plain language of the act as adopted was that the possibility of exceptions, with prior written SBA approval, on a case-by-case basis, would amount to an exceedingly difficult administrative problem. Each case would involve a difficult choice. When is a big loan a good loan. Turndowns might lead to political interventions. In short, granting approvals case by case would be a close to impossible situation.

Since my own view is that over $500,000 loans and investments should receive approval only in rare circumstances, I disagree that such an onerous administrative burden would ensue.

But I find it totally impossible to comprehend how the SBA can believe on the one hand that exceptions to a regulation with no percentage formula can be an administrative burden of great weight, requiring additional staff, etc., and then turn around and suggest that precisely such a case-by-case determination shall be made under what could only be more difficult circumstances.

More difficult because SBIC's would be tempted to concentrate loans that they might feel less likely to receive approval in the 30-percent bracket, then propose their prime candidates to the SBA for approval as the other 20 percent. No longer would there be a simple rule-of-thumb for exceptions such as I have suggested. Rather all sorts of intangibles would come into play, and the administrative task of discriminating among the various proposals might indeed be difficult.

I therefore conclude that while a 30–70 formula has merit by comparison with the original 50–50 formula, the proposal that an extra 20 percent be approved case by case seems to me to have no advantages whatsoever. I would be most interested to know the thoughts and comments of the SBA on this point.

At this point I would like to emphasize that in no sense do I consider this a personal quarrel with John Horne, the SBA Administrator, or with his deputy, Phil Fine. I consider both men friends and have felt that our relationship has been a good one. Both are intelligent and fair men. Nothing in my remarks is intended as criticism of either of them personally. I merely disagree with their policies.

Mr. President, I think the SBIC program has a great possible future. There is no question that small business urgently needs capital. It seems to me that the only greater need of small business than additional capital is an opportunity to receive perhaps greater assistance in training, instruction, and business management.

At the same time, I think there is no question that, on the basis of the record, in the financial way, many SBIC's are helping a number of firms that do not genuinely want this kind of assistance, on the one hand, and that a large number of small businesses that can use this capital are not getting it.

I have seen projections of a study showing that there will be literally thousands of loans and investments made by SBIC's to small businesses. I earnestly hope it is true. But I think these loans, in view of the substantial tax privileges provided, should be in the small business area; and, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I intend to do all I can to make sure this happens.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

STOCK DISTRIBUTION TREATED AS RETURN OF CAPITAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8847) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that a distribution of stock made to an individual (or certain corporations) pursuant to an order enforcing the antitrust laws shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital; and to provide that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the pending measure is designed to correct an existing inequity in our tax laws, as well as to make it possible to carry out the Government's antitrust actions without doing grave injustice to millions of innocent stockholders of business corporations.

Over a period of nearly 4 years legislative proposals to remedy this situation have been the subject of two hearings before the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee.

These hearings were for the purpose of exploring the situation thoroughly in order to come up with an appropriate and just solution. The pending measure is the result. In my opinion, it is sound, fair, and equitable.

The facts involved are undisputed. Nearly 50 years ago the Du Pont Co. made an investment in the General Motors Corp. Not until more than 30 years later was the legality of this investment questioned.

In 1949, the Department of Justice brought suit charging the stock ownership had been used to obtain and perpetuate common control of these companies, and to require them to purchase goods from each other in violation of the Sherman and Clayton Antitrust Acts.

A trial of the matter was held, at the conclusion of which the Federal district court in Chicago handed down a ruling, in 1954, that the entire complaint should be dismissed. From this order the Department of Justice appealed.

In 1957, the Supreme Court of the United States found that section 7 of the Clayton Act had been violated because Du Pont's ownership of 23 percent of General Motors Common Stock was sufficient to create a "reasonable probability" that Du Pont would receive a preference in supplying General Motors' requirements for automotive finishes and fabrics.

It is significant to note that in its opinion the Supreme Court of the United States found that—

> All concerned in high executive posts in both companies acted reasonably and fairly, each in the honest conviction that his acts were in the best interests of his own company and without any design to overreach anyone, including Du Pont's competitors.

The case was then returned to the district court for determination of the equitable relief necessary and appropriate in the public interest.

Again, lengthy hearings were had, and in 1959 the U.S. district court entered a decree under which terms the Du Pont Co. would refrain from voting the stock of General Motors, and passing the voting rights of this stock on to the Du Pont shareholders. From this order the Department of Justice again appealed and on May 22, 1961, the Supreme Court ruled that complete divestiture is required and that such divestiture must be completed within 10 years.

The problem of getting rid of 63 million shares of General Motors stock without upsetting the market is by no means an easy one.

The most logical way to accomplish the divestiture would be to distribute the shares of General Motors common stock which the Du Pont Co. owns on a pro rata basis to Du Pont's more than 210,000 common stockholders. This General Motors stock is part of the equity which every one of these citizens purchased when he invested in the Du Pont Co. It is reflected in the market value of the shares of Du Pont stock—a market value which usually goes up or down and has been going up or down when the market value of General Motors goes up or down.

Each share of Du Pont common represents about 1⅓ shares of General Motors common. If a pro rata distribution should be made with General Motors selling at its current level of about $55 per share, the Du Pont stockholder would receive about $76 worth of General Motors for each share of the Du Pont stock which he owns. After the distribution, the market price for Du Pont would be reduced by $76. Therefore the Du Pont stockholder would own nothing more than he owned before, only he would have two stock certificates instead of one.

However, in 1958, the then Commissioner of Internal Revenue ruled that such a distribution would be treated as a dividend under present tax laws. This means that individual stockholders would be required to pay ordinary income tax on the full market value of the General Motors shares each received. In other words, a large tax would be imposed on individual stockholders of Du Pont who received General Motors stock, who might not have any cash in hand with which to pay it, who actually did not wish to sell the stock in the first instance and who, in the original purchase, acted in good faith.

Obviously, as frequently happens under such circumstances, the stockholder conceivably would be obliged to sell some or all of the stock which he received as a result of this compulsory distribution, but the point is that stockholders who acted in good faith in purchasing Du Pont stock on the basis of the Du Pont stock investment in ownership of General Motors stock were now to be forced to sell by order of the Court and to pay ordinary income tax on the money, rather than a capital gains tax, a privilege ordinarily allowed to all other purchasers of stock, so it amounted to a penalty for those who had invested in good faith.

Under these circumstances the members of the House Committee on Ways and Means, the Members of the House of Representatives by an overwhelming majority, and the members of the Finance Committee of the Senate concluded that this was harsh treatment, inasmuch as the shareholders individually were not violators of any antitrust laws and, with one or two exceptions, were not parties to any of the proceedings. They invested their savings in good faith.

What I wish to emphasize to my colleagues is that this is a compulsory, rather than a voluntary, distribution. In this respect, let me refer to a colloquy on page 22 of the first Finance Committee hearings on this problem held May 26 and 27, 1959.

Our able and distinguished former colleague, Mr. Frear, directed the following questions to Mr. David A. Lindsay, then assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury:

> Is there any case where the tax law provides for the taxation of a distribution which is compelled by some agency of the Government other than in the antitrust field?

Mr. Lindsay replied:

> Such a distribution would automatically be taxable unless expressly exempted by a statutory provision. I am aware now of the exceptions. I can't for the moment think of a situation other than the antitrust field where there is not an exception.

As the representative of the Treasury Department appearing before our committee, Mr. Lindsay testified that the antitrust field is the only field he could think of in which a compulsory distribution of property by the Government is taxable.

In every other area, Congress has acted to protect citizens from injustice by making an exception when there is Government compulsion of a divestiture. It has done so in the case of condemnation proceedings. It has done so in carrying out provisions of the Public Utility Holding Company Act. It has done so under the Bank Holding Company Act and the Federal Communications Act.

Is there any reason why innocent investors in American industry involved in the pending matter should be made the exception to the exceptions? Is there any reason to inflict economic punishment upon them under a forced divestiture proceeding? In fairness, I think not. The Finance Committee thought not. The House Ways and Means Committee thought not, as did the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, these citizens who are stockholders have perpetrated no wrong. They invested their savings in the American way, in the American tradition, to provide jobs, to promote industrial growth, to finance research, development, and invention, and to provide new and better products for our people; with the very natural hope, under our free enterprise system, that their investment would increase and that they would eventually make some money.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter, eminent jurist, long classified as a liberal, in his dissent to the divestiture ruling, stated that these stockholders are truly innocent.

The purpose of the bill before us is to prevent the application of the high tax rate to innocent individual shareholders of the Du Pont Co. for what is a return of capital investment to them as a result of the compulsory distribution, when under ordinary circumstances they would not have to pay the tax, as well as to prevent innocent shareholders of General Motors from having the value of their investment seriously diminished for reasons beyond their control.

The bill before us provides for a fair and equitable solution to this problem. It does not eliminate taxation of this distribution. It merely provides that the distribution shall be taxed to individual stockholders as a return of capital, which it actually is, rather than as ordinary income.

The individual Du Pont stockholder who receives $76 worth of General Motors for each share of Du Pont which he owns will have the cost basis of the Du Pont share reduced by $76.

If he sells the Du Pont share, he will be subject to capital gains tax on this lower basis. In other words, any appreciation in the value of his Du Pont share since he purchased it will be subject to tax as a capital gain on the difference between the price he receives and the amount he paid for his Du Pont share, less $76.

Any profit, therefore, that the stockholder realizes on his investment in Du Pont, including its holdings in General Motors, will be taxed. The pending measure provides no relief from capital-gains taxation. It only prevents excessive taxation of capital as income and unjust treatment to innocent investors.

If the pending bill is enacted, more than two-thirds of the common stockholders of Du Pont can receive their General Motors shares without being subject to immediate tax. These are the stockholders who have made their investments since 1950 and who have paid more than $76 per share for Du Pont. They will not escape tax, but the capital gains tax will be deferred, as it normally is, until they dispose of the stock.

The Treasury at the same time will receive substantial revenue from distribution of these General Motors shares to the Du Pont stockholders. On the basis of current market value of about $55 per share for General Motors, fewer than one-third of the Du Pont stockholders will be subject to taxes, approximating $470 million at the time of distribution—$470 million will go into the Treasury of the United States.

The stockholders who pay this tax will be those who have enjoyed the greatest appreciation in the value of their investment, those who paid less than $76 per share for Du Pont. They will have to pay tax on a capital gain representing the difference between $76 and what they paid for their Du Pont share.

In addition, when they sell their Du Pont share, they too will again be subject to tax at the capital-gains rate on the entire amount they receive, for their cost basis for Du Pont, after distribution of the General Motors, will be zero.

If the divestiture is carried out under existing law, a burden of more than $20 per share will be imposed upon more than 50,000 employees of the Du Pont Co. who have been given Du Pont stock through the company's thrift plan. The same burden will be imposed upon many thousands of employees and retired employees who have their life savings in Du Pont stock. The burden will be identical for all stockholders, rich and poor, regardless of what they paid for their Du Pont share, regardless of how much its value has appreciated.

If the pending measure is enacted, there will be no burden and no tax upon a distribution to the 50,000 employees who hold stock through the thrift plan because Du Pont has been valued at more than $76 per share since the plan has been in effect.

There has been much discussion with respect to the Christiana Securities Corp., the largest corporate shareholder of Du Pont owning about one-third of the outstanding stock. This company is comprised of some 7,000 stockholders. If the pro rata distribution is made by the Du Pont Co., Christiana will receive about 20 million shares of General Motors stock. Some 1,800 stockholders of this company, many of them members of the Du Pont family and others with substantial long-term holdings will be subject to a greater tax than would be paid by them if the divestiture is carried out under existing law.

It is my understanding that the Department of Justice will seek a court order requiring Christiana to divest itself of the General Motors stock by selling such stock. If the court directs Christiana to distribute some or all of this stock to its individual shareholders, they would be treated in the same manner as any individual investor in Du Pont. Your Finance Committee has made it very clear in its report that it expressed no opinion as to what particular method of divestiture of General Motors stock by Du Pont or by Christiana is appropriate, feeling that these issues are solely within the determination of the court, and such a determination is in no way affected by the passage or nonpassage of this bill.

I would like at this time to quote from page 5 of the report of the Finance Committee which states as follows:

> It should be observed that under the amendments made by the bill, Christiana will pay somewhat more tax on the receipt of the General Motors stock than it would pay if such amendments had not been made. Your committee believes that this is justified by the fact that Christiana's individual shareholders will receive the special 'return of capital' treatment provided for in the bill, if Christiana should be ordered to distribute to them the General Motors stock received by it. However, Christiana will pay the additional tax whether or not a distribution by it is ordered.

The issue boils down to whether we wish to treat these stockholders with a measure of the justice approaching that which Congress has accorded citizens in every other field where distributions are compelled by Government.

At this late hour, these innocent stockholders can look only to Congress for justice. Let us not deny them what they are entitled to.

My choice is clear. I shall vote for H.R. 8847, and I hope my colleagues, in justice to the investors involved, will also support this measure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, recently three editorials appeared in various newspapers with respect to the fact that Congress should act promptly in relieving the tax consequence of the forced divestiture. First, I quote from an editorial which was published in the Washington Post of May 25, 1961, entitled "Divestiture":

> Now that it has won a crashing double victory in the Du Pont case, the Government can afford to be magnanimous. There is no reason why the internal revenue laws should not be amended to allow the shareholders of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. to receive the divested General Motors Corp. stock without paying income taxes on it.

Continuing to read from the same editorial:

> The outcome of the Du Pont case reflects great credit on the Justice Department which, under three Presidents, pressed steadily onward through 12 years of litigation. But the public has no particular interest in eroding the capital of Du Pont and, indirectly, General Motors shareholders. Soaking the rich is a laudable activity in due season. But one must decide what it is, after all, that one is after. The purpose of this suit was to break up a particularly flagrant case of corporate handholding. If the Justice Department has brilliantly succeeded in that, it should not be asked to undertake the balancing of the Federal budget at the same stroke.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article, as published in the Washington Post, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIVESTITURE

Now that it has won a crashing double victory in the Du Pont case, the Government can afford to be magnanimous. There is no reason why the internal revenue laws should not be amended to allow the shareholders of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. to receive the divested General Motors Corp. stock without paying income taxes on it.

The distribution of the stock would represent a transfer of assets the Du Pont shareholders already collectively own, rather than new income. Beyond generosity, there is the consideration that tax-free transfer would permit the two companies to be disentangled at once rather than over the 10 years the Supreme Court has allowed. This would be worth a good deal, and if undue hardship to stockholders can be averted here, it may be easier to obtain divestiture orders in other cases still to be fought.

The Justice Department's first victory came 4 years ago, when the Supreme Court held that the bare fact that one gigantic corporation owned 23 percent of the stock of another gigantic corporation was enough to constitute a threat of monopoly. The second victory came Monday when the Court overturned a trial judge's attempt at a compromise. Under the compromise Du Pont would have continued to hold its $3 billion worth of General Motors stock, but would have passed the voting power to the 200,000 individual Du Pont shareholders.

With very good reason, four Justices thought poorly of this proposal. "We are not required to assume contrary to all human experience, that Du Pont's shareholders will not vote in their own self-interest," Justice Brennan said, speaking for the majority.

But Justice Frankfurter's reply for the three dissenters was trenchant. He vigorously defended the trial judge's right to weigh the impact of divestiture on the companies and on the Du Pont shareholders. "The evidence indicated that divestiture of legal title would visit upon thousands of innocent investors adverse tax and market consequences," he wrote. He emphasized that the Government's intention was to prevent, not to punish; and there was no evidence of conspiracy or criminal practices by the two corporations.

Fortunately it lies within the power of Congress to avert the great and unjustifiable loss of which Justice Frankfurter spoke. The loss would result from the heavy income taxes levied by present law on the General Motors shares received by Du Pont shareholders. The law can be changed to take account of such forced divestitures. If the recipients resell, of course, they should then pay capital gains taxes on the full difference between the average price originally paid by Du Pont, $2.09 a share, and the current market price, now about $46.

The outcome of the Du Pont case reflects great credit on the Justice Department which, under three Presidents, pressed steadily onward through 12 years of litigation. But the public has no particular interest in eroding the capital of Du Pont and, indirectly, General Motors shareholders. Soaking the rich is a laudable activity in due season. But one must decide what it is, after all, that one is after. The purpose of this suit was to break up a particularly flagrant case of corporate handholding. If the Justice Department has brilliantly succeeded in that, it should not be asked to undertake the balancing of the Federal budget at the same stroke.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I now quote from an editorial which was published in the New York Times on May 25, 1961, entitled "The Du Pont Decision":

> But, remedial tax legislation is needed. The Du Pont Co. is being forced to do something that it would not ordinarily do in the conduct of its business. The action that it will take, unless a rescuing law intervenes, will oblige it to throw many of its stockholders against the sharp spikes of the upper income tax brackets.

The principle involved has already been established by the law that makes a divestiture ordered by the Securities and Exchange Commission free of tax, with an adjustment in the base price against which capital gains taxes will eventually be figured. This provision has been in the tax code since 1939.

Extending this principle to divestitures ordered by the Supreme Court under the Clayton Act would be both fair and logical.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial published in the New York Times on May 25, 1961, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Du Pont Decision

After 8 years of litigation the Supreme Court in 1957 decided that ownership of 23 percent of the outstanding stock of General Motors Corp. by E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. violated the Clayton Antitrust Act. This week the Court has ruled that complete divestiture of the 63 million shares is necessary to remove the danger of lessened competition.

The point in law has been settled. The problem of fair administration has not. Taxpayers and Congress still have before them the economic consequences of the decision.

The Court requires Du Pont, over the next 10 years, to get rid of its General Motors stock. One way would be to offer it for sale through ordinary stock exchange or investment market channels. But when exceedingly large supplies of stock become available—and 63 million shares spread over 10 years would virtually double the average daily offerings of General Motors—the market usually marks down the price drastically.

The other way is for Du Pont to distribute most or all of its General Motors stock to Du Pont shareholders. The difficulty here is that the present law makes such a dividend taxable at the rates of ordinary income. Such action would lead to virtually confiscatory results in the high income tax brackets. Even holders of Du Pont in lower brackets might find themselves selling General Motors stock in order to raise the cash with which to pay their taxes.

At the moment the debate is on a highly emotional level. We hear slightly hysterical demands for tax relief from Congress. We hope that there will be tax relief, but we are spilling few tears for the holders of Du Pont who have known that the antitrust action has been in progress for a dozen years and who realized—or should have—that they were buying a gamble.

But remedial tax legislation is needed. The Du Pont Co. is being forced to do something that it would not ordinarily do in the conduct of its business. The action that it will take, unless a rescuing law intervenes, will oblige it to throw many of its stockholders against the sharp spikes of the upper income tax brackets.

The principle involved has already been established by the law that makes a divestiture ordered by the Securities and Exchange Commission free of tax, with an adjustment in the base price against which capital gains taxes will eventually be figured. This provision has been in the tax code since 1939.

Extending this principle to divestitures ordered by the Supreme Court under the Clayton Act would be both fair and logical.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, a similar editorial appeared in the New York Herald Tribune 2 days later, on May 27. I quote from that editorial:

For the Government to order such a distribution, then snatch it away in taxes, is clearly confiscatory. It makes no sense either in economics or in ethics.

What the Court has done, is done. But Congress can and should move promptly to prevent a grave inequity which could bring economic chaos.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial as published in the New York Herald Tribune on May 27 be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

In the Wake of the Du Pont Decision

The Supreme Court's curious performance in the marathon Du Pont-General Motors case leaves several disturbing questions hanging in the air about its future approach to such litigation. Not least of these is its cavalier dismissal of the interest of Du Pont's more than 200,000 stockholders and GM's more than 800,000.

At issue this time was not whether Du Pont's GM holdings (23 percent of the common stock outstanding) constituted an antitrust violation, but what to do about it. In 1957 the High Court found that it did, and sent the case back to District Judge Walter LaBuy, with instructions to use his large discretion in fashioning an appropriate remedy. He did, and after exhaustive hearings, issued an order designed to insulate GM from Du Pont influence without requiring the actual divestiture by Du Pont of its enormous holdings—63 million shares, currently worth some $3 billion.

The Supreme Court has now in effect reversed its earlier instructions to Judge LaBuy, holding that complete divestiture is the only appropriate remedy.

The consequences of such divestiture could be incalculably harsh. Forced sale of such magnitude would raise havoc with the market, even if spread over the 10 years the Court allows. Distribution of the shares to Du Pont's stockholders would subject these stockholders to a walloping tax blow, probably in turn forcing a mass sale to pay the taxes.

The Supreme Court dismissed these consequences as irrelevant to the central issue, which it deemed to be the public interest in assuring an absolutely effective means of restoring competition. It refused to give Judge LaBuy's elaborately safeguarded alternative a try. But these consequences are not irrelevant to the search for a just and equitable settlement of what is, after all, a civil suit.

Du Pont's GM holdings went unchallenged for 30 years; the present case has dragged through the courts for a dozen years more. The hundreds of thousands of stockholder-owners are acknowledgedly innocent of any wrongdoing.

One imperative is congressional action to alleviate what now threatens to be a grossly unfair tax burden. If the GM shares are distributed to Du Pont stockholders (the most likely course), under present law their value would be fully taxable as ordinary income. Yet plainly, the distribution would leave Du Pont as a corporation $3 billion poorer, and the value of its own shares correspondingly less; transfer of title would simply mean that Du Pont's shareholders would own their General Motors stock directly rather than through Du Pont. For the Government to order such a distribution, then snatch it away in taxes, is clearly confiscatory. It makes no sense either in economics or in ethics.

What the Court has done, is done. But Congress can and should move promptly to prevent a grave inequity which could bring economic chaos.

Mr. **MILLER**. Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments to H.R. 8847, more familiarly known as the Du Pont bill. I merely wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that these amendments are designed, in my judgment, to improve the bill considerably.

The first amendment would make the bill one of general application rather than of specific application to only one taxpayer or a group of taxpayers. I think that as a matter of tax policy, it is not only unwise but it can be very inequitable for Congress to legislate with respect to a single taxpayer. In my judgment, the relief which the proposed legislation seeks to grant the taxpayers in a situation which is not of their own making, and in which there is no intentional violation of law, is the kind of relief that ought to be extended to all taxpayers and not merely to one group of taxpayers.

The second amendment I sent to the desk would leave the bill intact with respect to individuals but would delete from the bill that portion which has given rise to so much controversy here in the Senate; namely, the portion relating to the Christiana Corp. The other day I pointed out on the floor of the Senate that I had no particular qualms about the portion of the bill relating to individuals because the order of divestiture had already been given by the Supreme Court of the United States with respect to the Du Pont corporation. However, I pointed out that, inasmuch as the Court had not given an order with respect to divestiture on the part of the Christiana Corp., I wondered about the advisability of Congress legislating in the tax field with respect to Christiana. The amendment would stop any wondering about the bill whatsoever, because that portion of the bill relating to Christiana would be completely deleted.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Douglas in the chair). The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. **SMATHERS**. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, January 22, 1962.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, January 22, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 18, 1962:

In the Army

The following named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Carl Darnell, Jr., O19213, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Joseph Edward Bastion, Jr., O19162, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Charles Frederick Leonard, Jr., O19829, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Ashton Herbert Manhart, O18773, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Howard William Doan, O20057, Medical Corps (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Claire Elwood Hutchin, Jr., O21092, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Joseph Davis, O18530, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Autrey Joseph Maroun, O19865, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Clifton Ferdinand von Kann, O21371, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Winston Lapsley, O19727, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Ruhlen, O19733, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Herbert George Sparrow, O19003, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. James Richard Winn, O19491, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Salvatore D'Orsa, O18866, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Bowes Evans, O19174, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. William Reeves Shuler, O20118, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Bruce Palmer, Jr., O20117, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Bradford Rosson, O23556, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Ralph Edward Haines, Jr., 019849, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Benjamin Franklin Taylor, O20779, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Harvey Julius Jablonsky, O19390, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Ramsey Pugh, O18790, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Robert George MacDonnell, O19361, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Andrew Jackson Boyle, O19924, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Francis Mark McGoldrick, O19857, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Vernon Price Mock, O19906, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Ellsworth Ingalls Davis, O18658, U.S. Army.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Ben Sternberg, O21286, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. David Bennett Parker, O20571, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Jaroslav Thayer Folda, Jr., O21193, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Raymond Peers, O21366, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Seth Lathrop Weld, Jr., O19772, U.S. Army.

Col. William Welby Beverley, O21107, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Frank Alexander Osmanski, O19745, U.S. Army.

Col. Samuel Knox Eaton, O21132, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Henry Lynch, O21237, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John William Dobson, O21851, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Howard York, O21341, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Arthur Sylvester Collins, Jr., O21260, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Carl C. Turner, O31909, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Carroll Hilton Dunn, O21427, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Richard Wayne Whitney, O31855, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Henry Schuldt Murphey, O19338, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Thomas Jay Hayes 3d, O20134, U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Ray Williams, O22962, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Woodrow Wilson Stromberg, O20728, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Frank Wade Norris, O21110, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Kelsie Loomis Reaves, O20777, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William York Frentzel, O19026, United States Army.

Col. Andy Archer Lipscomb, O21333, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles Peter Stone, O21376, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Charles Fremont Tillson 3d, O21196, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Clarence Earle Beck, O21239, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Jefferson Johnson Irvin, O21217, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Edwin Arthur Machen, Jr., O21284, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles Joseph Denholm, O21293, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. David Owen Byars, Jr., O21273, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S Army).

Col. John Dixon Lawlor, O19536, U.S. Army.

Col. Lynn Davis Smith, O29741, U.S. Army.

Col. Charles Stuart O'Malley, Jr., O20682, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Milton Finn, O21252, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Joseph Wilson Johnston, O30462, U.S. Army.

Col. Howard Edward Michelet, O21131, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Francis Johnstone Murdoch, Jr., O19853, U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Leaning Ashworth, O21308, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Wheeler Godfrey Merriam, O30759, U.S. Army.

Col. William Thomas Ryder, O20298, U.S. Army.

Col. Ward Sanford Ryan, O21339, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Frank George White, O21378, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James William Sutherland, Jr., O24202, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Mellard Connor, O20137, U.S. Army.

Col. Harry William Osborn Kinnard, O21990, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William McGregor Lynn, Jr., O21120, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Gamble Schermerhorn, O20610, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Benjamin Otto Turnage, Jr., O20360, U.S. Army.

Col. Oscar Glenn Goodhand, O51511, U.S. Army.

Col. James Thomas McGibony, O20406, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Gen. Charles P. Cabell, 70A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code.

The following-named officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the rank of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code:

*Maj. Gen. Bruce K. Holloway, 1336A, Regular Air Force.

*Maj. Gen. James Ferguson, 1530A, Regular Air Force.

*Maj. Gen. Harvey T. Alness, 1085A, Regular Air Force.

*Maj. Gen. Thomas S. Moorman, Jr., 644A, Regular Air Force.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force to the grades indicated, under the provisions of chapter 835, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. John S. Hardy, 1502A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James V. Edmundson, 1863A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Benjamin O. Davis, Jr., 1206A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Albert P. Clark, 1218A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Lewis L. Mundell, 1286A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert J. Friedman, 1397A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert A. Breitweiser, 1406A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Fred M. Dean, 1450A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Waymond A. Davis, 1470A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Cecil H. Childre, 1551A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Frank E. Rouse, 1595A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Hewitt T. Wheless, 1609A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Henry R. Sullivan, Jr., 1655A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Osmond J. Ritland, 1731A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

---

*These officers were appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Maj. Gen. Keith K. Compton, 1849A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Joseph R. Holzapple, 1897A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. David A. Burchinal, 1936A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James F. Whisenand, 1945A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Glen W. Martin, 1955A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William W. Momyer, 1964A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Richard L. Bohannon, 19067A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force, medical), U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Gordon H. Austin, 1207A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Frederick R. Terrell, 1221A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Frederic H. Miller, 1273A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. J. Stanley Holtoner, 1283A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard P. Klocko, 1327A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Ivan W. McElroy, 1338A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Paul W. Scheidecker, 1354A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William G. Hipps, 1358A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John N. Ewbank, Jr., 1381A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Paul T. Preuss, 1407A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William B. Kieffer, 1409A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Walter E. Arnold, 1478A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert F. Worden, 1510A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Clyde Box, 1535A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert G. Ruegg, 1620A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert H. Curtin, 1643A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert B. Miller, 1646A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert E. Greer, 1672A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John B. Bestic, 1682A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Perry M. Hoisington II, 1694A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. George B. Greene, Jr., 1736A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William E. Creer, 1742A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Horace D. Aynesworth, 1771A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Philip H. Greasley, 1821A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph H. Moore, 1836A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John A. Dunning, 1855A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Melvin F. McNickle, 1891A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Gilbert L. Pritchard, 1974A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Reginald J. Clizbe, 2004A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jerry D. Page, 2052A (colonel Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William E. Leonhard, 18095A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles H. Terhune, Jr., 3424A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert N. Smith, 3783A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Harold E. Humfeld, 3857A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Selmon W. Wells, 3991A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William T. Seawell, 4034A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. George S. Brown, 4090A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Seth J. McKee, 4279A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John C. Meyer, 4496A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jack J. Catton, 4719A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Theodore C. Bedwell, Jr., 19101A (colonel, Regular Air Force, medical), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Benjamin A. Strickland, Jr., 19097A (colonel, Regular Air Force, medical), U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Don Coupland, 1766A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. George B. Dany, 1061A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Dwight O. Monteith, 1205A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Curtis R. Low, 1349A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Henry G. Thorne, Jr., 1514A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James C. McGehee, 1746A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James E. Roberts, 1846A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Aubrey L. Jennings, 19073A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Brig. Gen. Frederick R. Terrell, 1221A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard P. Klocko, 1327A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Paul W. Scheidecker, 1354A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William B. Kieffer, 1409A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Walter E. Arnold, 1478A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Clyde Box, 1535A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert G. Ruegg, 1620A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. George B. Greene, Jr., 1736A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph H. Moore, 1836A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Melvin F. McNickle, 1891A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jerry D. Page, 2052A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles H. Terhune, Jr., 3424A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Harold E. Humfeld, 3857A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Selmon W. Wells, 3991A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Seth J. McKee, 4279A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Lee W. Fulton, 1107A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Emmett B. Cassady, 1095A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Godfrey T. McHugh, 1257A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Duward L. Crow, 18061A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Albert L. Pearl, AO350203, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Norman C. Spencer, Jr., 1220A Regular Air Force.

Col. Harry E. Goldsworthy, 1631A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Joseph L. Dickman, 1656A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Lewis W. Stocking, 1709A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Charles G. Chandler, Jr., 1842A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Hubert S. Judy, 2032A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John B. McPherson, 2068A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Prentiss D. Wynne, Jr., 1699A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William D. Greenfield, 1899A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Alonzo A. Towner, 19158A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. Kenneth E. Pletcher, 19136A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. Robert W. Manss, 2713A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Lawrence F. Loesch, 4300A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Winton R. Close, 4343A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John D. Lavelle, 4359A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Donald W. Graham, 4361A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Otto J. Glasser, 4368A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Louis B. Grossmith, Jr., 4430A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Harry L. Evans, 4619A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William W. Wisman, 4990A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Jay T. Robbins, 5029A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Joseph J. Cody, Jr., 5126A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Gordon M. Graham, 7761A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William J. Crumm, 8663A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John W. Vogt, Jr., 8709A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Lucius D. Clay, Jr., 8956A, Regular Air Force.

Col. James H. Weiner, 33425A (lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Col. Joseph R. Deluca, 33749A (major, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Col. Richard H. Ellis, 36867A (major, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 18, 1962:

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Joseph H. McCann, of Michigan, to be Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 18, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Romans 13: 7: *Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; honor to whom honor.*

Almighty God, may this be a day of fragrant memory and tender solemnity, as we gather in this Chamber to give tribute and honor to the beloved Speaker whom we will always remember with sincere and grateful affection.

Our hearts are invigorated and inspired with joy and courage as we think of his nobility of character, his conduct as a good man, his patriotic statesmanship, and his generous good will toward his friends and all mankind.

We rejoice to acknowledge that when we try to compute and appraise the exact value and true measurement of his years among us, we find that he served to perceive this truth clearly and manifested it grandly: that a life of noble character and dedicated service is the only one that is big with eternal significance and of immeasurable worth to Thee, to one's country, and the whole universe.

Help us to appreciate the words of the poet who proclaimed this truth with deep understanding when he wrote:

> "We live in deeds, not years; in thoughts,
> not breath;
> In feelings, not in figures on a dial.
> He most lives who thinks most, feels
> the noblest, acts the best."

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord in whom we have the pattern of life for ourselves. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 16, 1962, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a resolution as follows:

S. Res. 254

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Styles Bridges, late a Senator from the State of New Hampshire.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public service.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

The message also announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 258) entitled "An act to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to increase the rate of tax imposed on certain gross receipts, to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942 to transfer certain parking fees and other moneys to the highway fund, and for other purposes," and agrees to a still further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Bible, Mr. Smith of Massachusetts, and Mr. Beall to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. Johnston of South Carolina and Mr. Carlson members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the U.S. Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 62-8.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

Congress of the United States,
House of Rebesentatives,
Office of the Democratic Whip,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1962.

The Honorable the Speaker of the House.

Sir: I herewith submit my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture.

Very truly yours,
Carl Albert.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1962.

The Honorable Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives.

Sir: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency and the House Committee on Government Operations.

Very truly yours,
Martha W. Griffiths.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1962.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: I hereby tender my resignation from the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs effective immediately.

With kindest regards, I am,
Respectfully,
G. Elliott Hagan.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1962.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: I hereby tender my resignation from the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service effective immediately.

With kindest regards, I am,
Respectfully,
G. Elliott Hagan,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee.

Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service,
January 17, 1962.

The Honorable the Speaker of the House.

Sir: I herewith submit my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Respectfully yours,
John Lesinski,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1962.

The Honorable the Speaker of the House.

Sir: I herewith submit my resignation as a member of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives.

Respectfully yours,
John Lesinski,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1962.

The Honorable the Speaker of the House.

Sir: I herewith submit my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Very truly yours,
John J. Flynt, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1962.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: I hereby submit my resignation as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, to take effect immediately.

With all good wishes,
Sincerely yours,
Jacob H. Gilbert.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1962.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
The Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: I hereby offer my resignation as a member of the Committee of the House of Representatives on House Administration.

Sincerely yours,
Hugh L. Carey,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 508

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: G. Elliott Hagan, Georgia.

Committee on Appropriations: John Lesinski, Michigan; John J. Flynt, Jr., Georgia.

Committee on Banking and Currency: Hugh L. Carey, New York; Henry B. Gonzalez, Texas.

Committee on Government Operations: Richard E. Lankford, Maryland; Ross Bass, Tennessee; Lucien N. Nedzi, Michigan.

Committee on House Administration: Lucien N. Nedzi, Michigan; Joe D. Waggonner, Jr., Louisiana.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Morris K. Udall, Arizona.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Horace R. Kornegay, North Carolina.

Committee on the Judiciary: Jacob H. Gilbert, New York.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Lindley Beckworth, Texas; Walter H. Moeller, Ohio.

Committee on Science and Astronautics: Thomas N. Downing, Virginia; Joe D. Waggonner, Jr., Louisiana.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes immediately following the President's message on the budget, and to include appropriate tabulations and statistics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next, January 24, 1962.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when are we going to learn other than through the newspapers the program for next week?

Mr. ALBERT. The program will be announced today, I will advise my friend.

Mr. GROSS. There will be a program for next week?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes, and the program will be announced today.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1963—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 265)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I present with this message my budget recommendations for the fiscal year 1963, beginning next July 1.

This is the first complete budget of this administration. It has been prepared with two main objectives in mind:

First, to carry forward efficiently the activities—ranging from defense to postal services, from oceanographic research to space exploration—which by national consensus have been assigned to the Federal Government to execute;

Second, to achieve a financial plan—a relationship between receipts and expenditures—which will contribute to economic growth, high employment, and price stability in our national economy.

Budget expenditures for fiscal 1963 will total $92.5 billion under my recommendations—an increase of $3.4 billion over the amount estimated for the present fiscal year. More than three-quarters of the increase is accounted for by national security and space activities, and the bulk of the remainder by fixed interest charges.

Because of the increasing requirements for national security, I have applied strict standards of urgency in reviewing proposed expenditures in this budget. Many desirable new projects and activities are being deferred. I am, moreover, recommending legislation which will reduce certain budgetary outlays, such as the postal deficit and the cost of farm price and production adjustments.

It would not, of course, be sensible to defer expenditures which are of great significance to the growth and strength of the Nation. This budget therefore includes a number of increases in existing programs and some new proposals of high priority—such as improvements in education and scientific research, retraining the unemployed and providing young people with greater employment opportunities, and aid to urban mass transportation.

Budget receipts in fiscal year 1963 are estimated to total $93 billion, an increase of $10.9 billion over the recession-affected level of the present fiscal year. These receipts estimates are based on the expectation that the brisk recovery from last year's recession will continue through the coming year and beyond, carrying the gross national product during calendar 1962 to a record $570 billion.

The administrative budget for 1963 thus shows a modest surplus of about $500 million. Federal accounts on the basis of the consolidated cash statement—combining the administrative budget with other Federal activities, mainly the social security, highway, and other trust funds—show an estimated excess of receipts from the public of $1.8 billion over payments to the public. And in the terms in which our national income accounts are calculated—using accrued rather than cash receipts and expenditures, and including only transactions directly affecting production and income—the Federal surplus is estimated at $4.4 billion.

By all three measures in current use, therefore, the Federal Government is expected to operate in 1963 with some surplus. This is the policy which seems appropriate at the present time. The economy is moving strongly forward, with employment and incomes rising. The prospects are favorable for further rises in the coming year in private expenditures, both consumption and investment. To plan a deficit under such circumstances would increase the risk of inflationary pressures, damaging alike to our domestic economy and to our international balance of payments. On the other hand, we are still far short of full capacity use of plant and manpower. To plan a larger surplus would risk choking off economic recovery and contributing to a premature downturn.

Summary of Federal finances

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	1959 actual	1960 actual	1961 actual	1962 estimate	1963 estimate
Administrative budget:					
Budget receipts	$67.9	$77.8	$77.7	$82.1	$93.0
Budget expenditures	80.3	76.5	81.5	89.1	92.5
Budget surplus (+) or deficit (−)	−12.4	+1.2	−3.9	−7.0	+0.5
Consolidated cash statement:					
Receipts from the public	81.7	95.1	97.2	102.6	116.0
Payments to the public	94.8	94.3	99.5	111.1	114.8
Excess o receipts (+) or payments (−)	−13.1	+0.8	−2.3	−8.5	+1.8
National income accounts—Federal sector:					
Receipts	85.4	94.1	94.8	105.6	116.3
Expenditures	90.2	91.9	97.0	106.1	111.9
Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	−4.8	+2.2	−2.2	−0.5	+4.4
New obligational authority (administrative budget)	81.4	79.6	86.7	95.7	99.3
Public debt, end o. year	284.7	286.3	289.0	295.4	294.9

Under present economic circumstances, therefore, a moderate surplus of the magnitude projected above is the best national policy, considering all of our needs and objectives.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES

The total of budget expenditures—estimated at $92.5 billion in fiscal 1963—is determined in large measure by the necessary but costly programs designed to achieve our national security and international objectives in the current world situation. Expenditures for national defense, international, and space programs account for more than three-fifths of total 1963 budget outlays, and for more than three-fourths of the estimated increase in expenditures in 1963 as compared to 1962. Indeed, apart from the expected increase in interest payments, expenditures for the so-called domestic civil functions of government have been held virtually stable between 1962 and 1963.

Within this total there are important shifts in direction and emphasis. Expenditures for agricultural programs, for the postal deficit, and for temporary extended unemployment compensation are expected to drop. The fact that funds for these purposes can be reduced permits us to make increases in other important areas—notably education, health, housing, and natural resource development—without raising significantly total expenditures for domestic civil functions.

Budget expenditures

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Function	1961 actual	1962 estimate	1963 estimate
National defense	$47.5	$51.2	$52.7
International affairs and finance	2.5	2.9	3.0
Space research and technology	.7	1.3	2.4
Subtotal	50.7	55.4	58.1
Interest	9.0	9.0	9.4
Domestic civil functions:			
Agriculture and agricultural resources	5.2	6.3	5.8
Natural resources	2.0	2.1	2.3
Commerce and transportation	2.6	2.9	2.5
Housing and community development	.3	.5	.8
Health, labor, and welfare	4.2	4.7	5.1
Education	.9	1.1	1.5
Veterans benefits and services	5.4	5.6	5.3
General government	1.7	1.9	2.0
Subtotal, domestic civil functions	22.4	25.3	25.4
Civilian pay reform	--------	--------	.2
Allowance for contingencies	--------	.1	.2
Deduct interfund transactions	.7	.7	.7
Total budget expenditures	81.5	89.1	92.5

National defense: This budget carries forward the policies instituted within the past 12 months to strengthen our military forces and to increase the flexibility with which they can be controlled and applied. The key elements in our defense program include: a strategic offensive force which would survive and respond overwhelmingly after a massive nuclear attack; a command and control system which would survive and direct the response; an improved antibomber defense system; a civil defense program which would help to protect an important proportion of our population from the perils of nuclear fallout; combat-ready limited war forces and the air and sealift needed to move them quickly to wherever they might have to be deployed; and special forces to help our allies cope with the threat of Communist-sponsored insurrection and subversion.

Increases in expenditures for the Nation's defense are largely responsible for the rise in the budget of this administration compared to that of its predecessor. For fiscal years 1962 and 1963, expenditures for the military functions of the Department of Defense are estimated at about $9 billion higher, and new obligational authority at $12 to $15 billion more, than would have been required to carry forward the program as it stood a year ago.

For the coming year, the budget provides for further significant increases in the capabilities of our strategic forces, including additional Minuteman missiles and Polaris submarines. These forces are large and versatile enough to survive any attack which could be launched against us today and strike back decisively. The programs proposed in this budget are designed to assure that we will continue to have this capability in the future. This assurance is based on an exhaustive analysis of all the available data on Soviet military forces and the strengths and vulnerabilities of our own forces under a wide range of possible contingencies.

To strengthen the defenses of the North American Continent, this budget proposes additional measures to increase the effectiveness of our antibomber defense system, continued efforts to improve our warning of ballistic missile attack, and further research and development at a maximum rate on antimissile defense possibilities.

The budget for the current year provides for identifying and marking available civilian shelter space for approximately 50 million people. This phase of the civil defense program is proceeding ahead of schedule. For 1963, I am requesting nearly $700 million for civil defense activities of the Department of Defense, including $460 million for a new cost-sharing program with State and local governments and private organizations to provide shelters in selected community buildings, such as schools and hospitals.

Although a global nuclear war poses the gravest threat to our survival, it is not the most probable form of conflict as long as we maintain the forces needed to make a nuclear war disastrous to any foe. Military aggression on a lesser scale is far more likely. If we are to retain for ourselves a choice other than a nuclear holocaust or retreat, we must increase considerably our conventional forces. This is a task we share with our free world allies.

The budget recommendations for 1963 are designed to strengthen our conventional forces substantially. I am proposing:

An increase in the number of Regular Army divisions from 14 to 16. The two new divisions would replace the two National Guard divisions now on active duty and scheduled to return to reserve status prior to October 1962.

A substantial increase in the number of regular tactical fighter units of the Air Force and in the procurement of new fighter and reconnaissance aircraft. These steps will provide more effective air support for our ground forces.

Revision of the programs for organization and training of the reserve components so they will be better adapted and better prepared to serve in any emergency which requires mobilization.

Significant increases in procurement for all of our conventional forces. These forces must be equipped and provisioned so they are ready to fight a limited war for a protracted period of time anywhere in the world.

International affairs and finance: A significant change has taken place in our international assistance programs in recent years. Military assistance expenditures are declining to an estimated $1.4 billion in 1963 compared with $2.2 billion 5 years earlier. The more industrialized European countries have almost completely taken over the cost of their own armament. In less developed countries, the military assistance program continues to provide essential maintenance, training, and selective modernization of equipment, with increased emphasis on internal security, including antiguerrilla warfare.

On the other hand, expenditures for economic and financial assistance to the developing nations of the world have been increasing and are estimated at $2.5 billion in 1963. These expenditures, largely in the form of loans, will rise further in later years as development loan commitments being made currently are drawn upon. A corresponding increase is taking place in the contributions of other industrialized countries.

The new Agency for International Development has been providing needed leadership in coordinating the various elements of our foreign aid programs throughout the world. A consistent effort is being made to relate military and economic assistance to the overall capabilities and needs of recipient countries to achieve economic growth and sustain adequate military strength. To make our assistance more effective, increasing emphasis is being placed on self-help measures and necessary reforms in these countries. The authority provided last year to make long-term loan commitments to developing countries will be of invaluable assistance to orderly long-range planning. Efforts will also be made to foster more effectively the contribution of private enterprise to development, through such means as investment guarantees and assistance for surveys of investment opportunities.

In August 1961, the United States formally joined with its neighbors to the south in the establishment of the Alliance for Progress, an historic cooperative effort to speed the economic and social development of the American Republics. For their part, the Latin American countries agreed to undertake a strenuous program of social and economic reform and development through this decade. As this program of reform and development proceeds, the United States is pledged to help. To this end, I am proposing a special long-term authorization for $3 billion of aid to the Alliance for Progress within the next 4 years. In addition, substantial continued development loans are expected from the Export-Import Bank and from U.S. funds being administered by the Inter-American Development Bank. These, together with the continued flow of agricultural commodities under the Food for Peace program, will mean support for the Alliance for Progress in 1963 substantially exceeding $1 billion.

Space research and technology: Last year I proposed and the Congress agreed that this Nation should embark on a greater effort to explore and make use of the space environment. This greater effort will result in increased expenditures in 1962 and 1963, combined, of about $1.1 billion above what they would have been under the policies of the preceding administration; measured in terms of new obligational authority, the increase is $2.4 billion for the 2 years. With this increase in funds there has been a major stepup in the programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in such fields as communications and meteorology and in the most dramatic effort of all—mastery of space symbolized by an attempt to send a man to the moon and back safely to earth.

Action is being taken to develop the complex Apollo spacecraft in which the manned lunar flights will be made, and to develop the large rockets required to boost the spacecraft to the moon. The techniques of manned space flight, particularly those of long-term flight and of rendezvous between two spacecraft in earth orbit, are being studied both in ground research and in new flight programs.

Our space program has far broader significance, however, than the achievement of manned space flight. The research effort connected with the space program—and particularly the tremendous technological advances necessary to permit space flight—will have great impact in increasing the rate of technical progress throughout the economy.

Domestic civil functions: Despite the necessary heavy emphasis we are giving to defense, international, and space activities, the budget reflects many important proposals to strengthen our national economy and society. It has been possible to include these proposals without any substantial increase in the total cost of domestic civil functions mainly because of proposed reductions in postal and agricultural expenditures. Some of the more important proposals in domestic civil programs are mentioned below.

Agriculture and agricultural resources: In the development of farm programs we are striving to make effective use of American agricultural abundance, to adjust farm production to bring it in line with domestic and export requirements, and to maintain and increase income for those who are engaged in farming. The steps taken thus far, including the temporary wheat and feed grain legislation enacted in the last session of the Congress, contributed significantly to the rise in farm income last year and to some reduction—the first in 9 years—in surplus stocks. However, new long-range legislation is needed to permit further adaptation of our farm programs to the rapidly increasing productive efficiency in agriculture and to avoid continuing high budgetary costs. The reduction in agricultural expenditures in this budget—from $6.3 billion in 1962 to $5.8 billion in 1963—reflects the proposals to this end which I shall be presenting to the Congress in a special message.

The 1963 budget also provides for expansion of the food stamp plan into additional pilot areas, and for a substantial increase in Rural Electrification Administration loan funds—to permit financing of additional generation and transmission facilities where that is necessary. The adequacy of the funds recommended will depend on the willingness of other power suppliers to meet the requirements of the rural electric cooperatives on a reasonable basis.

Natural resources: Estimated expenditures of $2.3 billion in this budget for the conservation and development of our natural resources are higher than in any previous year.

The 1963 budget makes provision for the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Tennessee Valley Authority to start construction on 43 new water resources projects with an estimated total Federal cost of $600 million. The long-range programs for the national parks and forests are also being strengthened.

One of our most pressing problems is the adequate provision of outdoor recreational facilities to meet the needs of our expanding population. The Federal Government, State and local agencies, and private groups must all share in the solution. By the end of this month the comprehensive report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission is expected to be available. The Secretary of the Interior, at my request, is preparing a plan for the Federal Government to meet its share of the responsibility for providing outdoor recreational opportunities, including those related to fish and wildlife.

Commerce and transportation: Budget expenditures for commerce and transportation programs are estimated to decline from $2.9 billion in 1962 to $2.5 billion in 1963. This decline reflects mainly a drop of $592 million for the postal service, based on my legislative proposal to increase postal rates to a level that will cover the costs of postal operations, except for those services properly charged to the general taxpayer.

Outlays for the Federal-aid highway program are financed almost entirely through the highway trust fund and are not included in the budget total. Combined, Federal budget and trust fund expenditures for commerce and transportation programs in 1963 will amount to almost $6 billion.

Substantially increased expenditures are provided in the 1963 budget for the new program to assist the redevelopment of areas with persistent unemployment and underemployment and for the expanding development and operation of the Federal airways system.

Housing and community development: The long strides forward in housing and community development programs authorized by the Housing Act of 1961 are making it possible to accelerate progress in renewing our cities, in financing needed public facilities, in preserving open space, and in supplying housing accommodations, both public and private, within the means of low- and middle-income families and elderly people. The major new proposal I expect to make in this field will extend the authority for Federal aids to urban mass transportation.

Health, labor, and welfare: Budget expenditures for health, labor, and welfare programs are estimated at $5.1 billion and trust fund expenditures at $21.6 billion in 1963. The budget includes increased funds for health research and for a major strengthening of the programs of the Public Health Service, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, and the Food and Drug Administration. The budget and trust accounts also reflect the legislative recommendations which are pending in the Congress to provide a substantial increase in aid for medical education and to enact health insurance for the aged through social security.

I have given particular attention in this budget to strengthening the labor and manpower functions of the Department of Labor and related agencies. In addition to increased funds for the U.S. Employment Service and for other existing Federal programs, the budget includes funds for the urgently needed legislation providing for Federal aid for training or retraining unemployed workers, and for the training of our young people through an experimental youth employment opportunities program.

Many American families rely for help and for a new start in life upon the public assistance programs. Yet these programs frequently lack both the services and the means to discharge their purpose constructively. This budget includes substantial increases for public assistance. I am also proposing a significant modernization and strengthening of the welfare programs to emphasize those services which can help restore families to self-sufficiency.

Education: Expenditures for existing and proposed education programs are estimated to be $1.5 billion in 1963, an increase of $327 million over 1962. A strong educational system providing ready access for all to high quality free public elementary and secondary schools is indispensable in our democratic society. Moreover, able students should not be denied a higher education because they cannot pay expenses or because their community or State cannot afford to provide good college facilities. This budget therefore includes funds for the legislative recommendations pending before the Congress to provide loans for the construction of college academic facilities and funds for college scholarships, and assistance to public elementary and secondary education through grants for the construction of classrooms and for teachers' salaries. The budget also includes funds for a new program of financial aid to improve the quality of education by such means as teacher training institutes. Continuing our policy of building the research effort of the Nation, funds are recommended for the National Science Foundation to expand support for basis research and the construction of research facilities, particularly at colleges and universities, and to strengthen programs in science education.

Veterans benefits and services: Our first concern in veterans programs is that adequate benefits be provided for those disabled in the service of their country. The last increase in compensation rates for service-disabled veterans was enacted in 1957. To offset increases in the cost of living since that time, I again recommend that the Congress enact legislation to establish higher rates, particularly for the severely disabled. The 1963 budget provides $64 million for this proposal.

NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY

Before Federal funds can be spent, the Congress must enact authority for each agency to incur financial obligations. For the current year, it now appears that $3.8 billion of new obligational authority over the amount already enacted will be required. Of this amount, $2 billion represents standby authority for lending in case of need to the International Monetary Fund—in accordance with the recently concluded agreement under which other countries will make available twice this amount of standby authority. This will make a total of $95.7 billion of new obligational authority for fiscal 1962.

For 1963, my recommendations for new obligational authority total $99.3 billion. This includes substantial sums needed for forward funding of programs—such as those of the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—under which commitments are made in one year and expenditures often occur in later years.

BUDGET RECEIPTS

The estimate of budget receipts for fiscal year 1963 rests on projections of economic recovery and growth which will be discussed in the Economic Report. In brief, the revenue estimates are based on the assumption that the gross national product will rise from $521 billion in the calendar year 1961 to $570 billion in calendar 1962. At this level of output, corporate profits in calendar 1962 would be about $56.5 billion and personal income about $448 billion. These figures do not reflect the additional stimulus which would be given to investment and incomes in the economy by the investment tax credit now pending before the Congress.

Since the spring of calendar year 1961, the average gain in gross national product has been about 2½ percent per quarter. The economic assumptions underlying the budget estimates will be realized with a somewhat more modest rate of gain of approximately 2 percent per quarter. This pace of advance would reduce the rate of unemployment to approximately 4 percent of the civilian labor force by the end of fiscal 1963.

There are, of course, uncertainties in any estimates of economic developments so far ahead. If private demand gains greater strength than we now foresee and the current expansion accelerates, there would be a larger Federal surplus, which would be a valuable means of restraining potential inflationary pressures. If, on the other hand, the economic recovery unexpectedly halts or is reversed, revenues would fall below the current estimates and a deficit would inevitably result, moderating the economic slowdown.

Budget receipts

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Source	1961 actual	1962 estimate	1963 estimate
Individual income taxes	$41.3	$45.0	$49.3
Corporation income taxes	21.0	21.3	26.6
Excise taxes	9.1	9.6	10.0
Estate and gift taxes	1.9	2.1	2.3
Customs	1.0	1.2	1.3
Miscellaneous receipts	4.1	3.5	4.2
Total	78.3	82.8	93.7
Deduct interfund transactions	.7	.7	.7
Total budget receipts	77.7	82.1	93.0

Aside from revenue gains based on economic expansion, there will be larger revenue collections as a result of strengthening the Internal Revenue Service with additional enforcement personnel. Collections are estimated to be increased $300 million during 1963 because of this effort.

Tax reform proposals: Extensive and careful consideration has already been given to the proposals enumerated in my special tax message to the Congress last April. These tax reform proposals, as I noted last year, represent a first step in improving our tax system. The House Committee on Ways and Means has made action on a similar set of recommendations its first order of business this year. I hope they will be enacted early in this session.

I particularly urge enactment of the tax credit for investment in depreciable equipment. The 8-percent credit as formulated by the Committee on Ways and Means, together with administrative revision of guidelines for depreciation now underway, will encourage modernization of productive equipment in private industry desirable alike to improve the Nation's potential for economic growth and the ability of our producers to compete with those abroad.

Any net reduction in fiscal 1963 revenues resulting from adoption of the investment credit is expected to be offset by additional revenues resulting from the enactment of measures to remove defects and inequities in the tax structure, including:

Corrective legislation with respect to the tax treatment of gains on depreciable property, including both real and personal property, which would prevent abuses that now occur and permit greater flexibility in the rules for salvage value in determining depreciation.

A system of tax withholding on dividend and interest income, needed to overcome the serious loss of revenue and the unfairness resulting from the failure of some individuals to report these types of income on their tax returns.

Repeal of the exclusion from an individual's taxable income of the first $50 of dividends and the credit against tax of 4 percent of additional dividends.

Statutory provisions to cope with the problem of business deductions for entertainment and gifts and other expense account items.

Legislation to eliminate unwarranted tax preferences now received by several special types of institutions. Earnings of cooperatives reflecting business activities should be currently taxed either to the cooperatives or to the patrons; special provisions now applicable to mutual fire and casualty insurance companies should be repealed; and the tax deductible reserve provisions applicable to mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations should be amended to assure nondiscriminatory taxation among competing financial institutions.

Revision of the tax treatment of foreign income to serve the overall objective of tax neutrality between domestic and foreign operations. This requires eliminating tax deferral privileges except in less-developed countries, and tightening up on other preferences given to foreign income under existing law. These involve (a) tax haven operations, (b) taxation of foreign investment companies, (c) taxation of American citizens who are resident abroad, (d) estate tax on real property abroad, (e) computation of allowances for foreign tax credits on dividends, and (f) taxation of foreign trusts.

Extension of present tax rates: The budget outlook for 1963 requires that the present tax rates on corporation income and certain excises be extended for another year beyond their scheduled expiration date of June 30, 1962. Existing law calls for changes which would lower the general corporation income tax rate from 52 percent to 47 percent; reduce the excise rates on distilled spirits, beers, wines, cigarettes, passenger automobiles, and automobile parts and accessories; and allow the tax on general telephone services to expire. I recommend postponement of these changes for another year to prevent a revenue loss of $2.8 billion in 1963.

Transportation tax and user charges: Under existing law, the 10-percent tax on transportation of persons is scheduled for reduction to 5 percent on July 1, 1962. This tax poses special problems for common carriers which must compete with private automobiles not subject to the tax. At the same time it is clearly appropriate that passengers and shippers who benefit from special Government programs should bear a fair share of the costs of these programs.

Accordingly, I recommend that the present 10-percent tax as it applies to passenger transportation other than by air be repealed effective July 1, 1962. I also recommend enactment of new systems of user charges for commercial and general aviation and for transportation on inland waterways.

More specifically, I recommend that the following user charges be enacted, effective January 1, 1963, with the receipts to be retained in the general fund: (a) a 5 percent tax on airline tickets and on airfreight waybills; (b) a 2-cents-per-gallon tax on all fuels used in commercial air transportation, including jet fuels; and (c) a 3-cents-per-gallon tax on all fuels used in general aviation. The January 1, 1963, effective date will allow time for review by the Civil Aeronautics Board of fare adjustments that might be required by these user charges.

Pending the proposed tax changes, the present 10 percent tax on air transportation and the 2-cents-per-gallon aviation gasoline tax should be continued until December 31, 1962.

To extend the principle of user charges to inland waterways, a tax of 2 cents per gallon should be applied to all fuels used in transportation on these waterways, effective January 1, 1963.

PUBLIC DEBT

Changes in the public debt from year to year reflect mainly the amount of the budget surplus or deficit. With a budget surplus of $500 million proposed for 1963, the public debt on June 30, 1963, is expected to be $294.9 billion compared with $295.4 billion at the end of the current year.

Public debt

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	1961 actual	1962 estimate	1963 estimate
Public debt at start of year	$286.3	$289.0	$295.4
Change due to budget deficit (+) or surplus (−)	+3.9	+7.0	−.5
Change due to other factors [1]	−1.2	−.6	
Public debt at close of year	289.0	295.4	294.9

[1] For details, see table 8 in pt. 2 of this document.

The limit on the public debt now stands at $298 billion until June 30, 1962, after which the permanent ceiling of $285 billion again becomes effective. The present temporary limit was established last June before the Berlin situation required additional defense expenditures which used up the margin of flexibility included in the $298 billion limit.

The current limit would impose serious operating difficulties on the Treasury during the remainder of fiscal 1962. The critical stage in functioning under the present limit is upon us and the Treasury is without any margin to meet unexpected contingencies. Although the total debt will decline to $295.4 billion after the receipt of taxes in June, customary seasonal patterns of expenditures in excess of receipts can be expected to raise the total debt above the present $298 billion temporary limit at times during the intervening months.

Despite the expectation of budget balance for fiscal 1963 as a whole, with the debt expected to return to the $295 billion level on June 30, 1963, seasonal requirements will temporarily raise the outstanding debt during the course of the year to nearly $305 billion. To make the usual allowance for a margin of flexibility in fiscal 1963, and to restore immediately needed flexibility for operations over the remainder of fiscal 1962, I urge prompt enactment of a temporary increase of the debt limit to $308 billion, to be available for the remainder of this year and throughout fiscal 1963.

BUDGET AND FISCAL POLICY

Beyond the specific elements of budget expenditures and receipts, it is necessary to consider the relationship of the budget as a whole to the national economy. Three aspects of this relationship have been given particular attention in the preparation of this budget.

The budget and economic growth and stability: Our national economic policy is to achieve rapid economic progress for the Nation, with the benefits widely distributed among all parts of the population, to achieve and maintain levels of employment and output commensurate with our growing labor force and productive capacity, and at the same time to maintain reasonable price stability.

The Federal budget has a major role, to play in achieving these objectives. Basic investments and services of large importance to the Nation are provided through the Government. Striking evidence of this contribution is that the Federal budget today supports about two-thirds of all the scientific research and development going forward in the Nation. The budget also supports education, transportation, and other developmental activities contributing to national growth.

Federal budget policy also has a major role, to play in economic stabilization. This role was evident in fiscal years 1961 and 1962, when deficits were incurred in turning the business cycle from recession to recovery, as had been true in 1958–59 and in earlier recessions.

We do not expect another economic recession during the period covered by this budget. However, experience has taught us that periodic fluctuations in the economy cannot be completely avoided, and that Federal fiscal policy should work flexibly and promptly in such situations. For this, we need standby plans, the merits and mechanics of which have been explored ahead of time by the Congress and the administration.

Three proposals particularly merit congressional consideration at this time:

First, the President should be given standby discretionary authority, subject to congressional veto, to reduce personal income tax rates on clear evidence of economic need, for periods and by percentages set in the legislation.

Second, he should have standby power to initiate, when unemployment rises sharply, a temporary expansion in Federal and federally aided public works programs including authority for new Federal grants and loans for State and local capital improvements. The legislation providing for such an antirecession program should insure that projects to be financed will meet high-priority needs, will be started promptly and completed rapidly, and will result in a net addition to Federal, State, or local expenditures.

Third, legislation should be enacted to strengthen considerably the Federal-State unemployment insurance system, including a permanent system of extended unemployment benefits for workers whose regular benefits expire—in good times or bad for workers with long work experience and in recession periods for all workers. These recommendations will be discussed in the Economic Report.

The budget and the balance of payments: In formulating this budget, careful consideration has been given to the impact on our international balance of payments of Federal expenditures abroad for defense, foreign assistance, and the conduct of foreign affairs. During the coming year, U.S. Government expenditures abroad are estimated to be $4.4 billion, compared with $4.6 billion in the current year, mainly for construction and procurement of goods and services for U.S. military and civilian operations abroad; military and civilian salaries; and the fraction of foreign assistance which does not directly finance U.S. exports. The 1963 estimate reflects many actions which have been taken to reduce the level of Government expenditures abroad. We are managing to strengthen our military defenses overseas without increasing our foreign exchange outlays, and with respect to economic aid we are stressing even further the procurement of American goods and services.

This budget also reflects other measures we are taking to improve the balance of payments, including tax measures to encourage the modernization of productive equipment and consequent increases in our competitive ability in world markets, stepped up export promotion activities, greater encouragement to foreign travel in the United States, and reduced tax inducements to invest in developed areas abroad rather than at home. To improve further our balance of payments position, we are continuing negotiations with other industrialized countries with the objective of increasing their purchases of defense materiel in the United States and their contributions to the economic advance of the developing countries.

Basic improvement in our balance of payments will depend primarily upon our ability to continue a high degree of overall price stability and to improve the competitive position of U.S. goods in world markets. The dynamic development and prospective expansion of the European Economic Community are resulting in fundamental changes in world commerce. This pattern of growth presents us with unparalleled export opportunity as well as a continuing challenge. We must meet these changes boldly, confident in our continuing ability to compete on the world markets and to participate in the enormous benefits to all concerned which accrue from the worldwide division of labor and expansion of trade. These are the objectives of the legislative recommendations concerning trade expansion which I shall be sending to the Congress shortly in a special message.

The budget and Federal capital outlays: In contrast with the practice of many businesses, State and local governments, and foreign governments, the budget of the U.S. Government lumps together expenditures for capital investment and for current operations. Nevertheless it is clearly of importance, in analyzing the significance of the Federal budget to the Nation, to recognize that the budget includes substantial expenditures for loans, public works, and other durable assets and capital items which will yield benefits in future years.

Furthermore, increasing attention has been given in recent years to the significance of "developmental" expenditures—outlays for education and training, and for research, which have the effect of adding to the Nation's level of knowledge and of skill, and thereby increase the capacity to produce a larger national output in future years.

In the 1963 budget, expenditures for Federal civil public works are estimated to be $2.5 billion, and another $1.5 billion is estimated for additions to State, local, and private physical assets. About $7 billion of loan disbursements, to be repaid later, will be made in 1963—including mortgage purchases; repayments in 1963 of loans previously made are expected to total $5 billion, resulting in net budget expenditures of $2 billion for civil loans. An estimated $4.8 billion will be spent for civil developmental purposes such as education, training, health, and research and development.

Certain trust fund transactions add to the Nation's assets, as well. For example, in 1963, $3.2 billion will be spent for grants to States for highways through the highway trust fund.

EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE

The effort to increase the degree of efficiency with which the public business is conducted requires constant and unremitting effort on many fronts. This budget reflects continuing improvement in many agencies in productivity per employee, brought about through better training, better supervision, more effective organization, and more efficient equipment.

The first requirement for efficiency and economy in Government is highly competent personnel. In this regard we face one very important problem on which I am placing a new recommendation before the Congress.

This is the urgent need to achieve a reform of white-collar salary systems to enable the Government to obtain and keep the high quality personnel essential for its complex and varied programs. Such a reform should bring career employee salaries at all except the very top career levels into reasonable comparability with private enterprise salaries for the same level of work, and provide salary structures with pay distinctions more adequately reflecting differences in degree of responsibility. These two fundamental standards have been widely supported in the past as proper objectives in determining Government salary structures and I now urge that they be given practical effect.

The legislation I am proposing provides for some adjustment in nearly all salary grades, but it is clear that the higher grades have fallen furthest below the level of reasonable comparability and must therefore be given the greatest percentage increases to make the Government competitive.

There is also a need for more equitable recognition than is presently provided for postal employees, most of whom spend their entire careers in a single pay level. The proposed reform meets this need directly by increasing the number and size of in-grade steps and by replacing the present longevity increases with additional step increases. The proposal takes into account the career character of the large postal carrier and clerk employee group, recruited at grade PFS-4, by linking their pay with employees paid under the Classification Act at GS-5.

To ease the budget impact, and to provide ample time for the Congress to study the matter in the light of additional information which will become available annually, I am suggesting that the new pay scales take effect in three annual stages, beginning January 1, 1963.

Important steps to improve the military pay structure, particularly for higher ranking officers, have been taken in recent years, first in 1955 and, more significantly, in 1958. However, the adjustments now being recommended in civilian compensation require study of the possible need for further changes in military compensation. Consequently, I am directing that a thorough review be made which will permit an up-to-date appraisal of the many elements of military compensation and their relationship to the new proposed levels of civilian compensation. There is one area, however, which has already been adequately reviewed. To reflect an acknowledged rise in housing costs, I am proposing legislation to provide selective increases in the basic allowance for quarters payable to military personnel. As in the case of the civilian pay adjustments, these increases should take effect January 1, 1963.

Pay adjustments alone will not assure high standards of employee competence. There must be scrupulous fairness in recruiting and assigning personnel—and we have given renewed emphasis to equality of opportunity in the Federal service. There must be absolute integrity in all dealings with the public and with policy questions—and we have established clearer and stronger guides on ethical standards and recommended improvement in the conflict of interest statutes. There must be careful attention to the views of employees and their organizations—and we are placing into effect the recommendations of the task force on employee-management relations in the Federal service.

Efficiency and economy require also steady improvement in the organization of the executive branch. Notable advances were made this past year, with the cooperation of the Congress: new and stronger organizations for foreign aid, for disarmament, for civil defense, and for maritime activities were established; a number of regulatory commissions were substantially strengthened; and new centralized agencies were established in the Department of Defense for intelligence and for supply activities. A number of further recommendations are pending in the Congress, notably the proposal to establish a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, on which I urge early action.

Finally, increased efficiency requires systematic study of ways and means to accomplish the public business more effectively and at less cost. This work goes forward continually in all fields. I cite by way of illustration a few current examples:

The study, now well along toward completion, of the use of contracts with educational institutions, nonprofit corporations, and private business concerns for the management of Government research and development activities. This study of "contracting out" is being made by the Bureau of the Budget with the cooperation of the principal agencies concerned, and is expected to provide much more information on these matters than has been available heretofore.

Studies, recently completed or in progress, of the operations and management of the Export-Import Bank and the Federal Communications Commission. These studies are made by management consulting firms, and are similar to those completed in recent years for the Federal Trade Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Interstate Commerce Commission, all of which produced recommendations of considerable value.

The study, organized at the request of the Department of State by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, of personnel requirements—and ways of meeting those requirements—for U.S. activities overseas in the light of present-day conditions in the world.

Studies of this kind normally do not produce headlines, but they are typical of the effort continually underway to raise the efficiency and reduce the cost of conducting the public business.

CONCLUSION

This budget represents a blending of many considerations which affect our national welfare. Choices among the conflicting claims on our resources have necessarily been heavily influenced by international developments that continue to threaten world peace. At the same time, the budget supports those activities that have great significance to the Nation's social and economic growth—the mainsprings of our national strength and leadership. In my judgment, this budget meets our national needs within a responsible fiscal framework—which is the test of the budget as an effective instrument of national policy. I recommend it to the Congress for action, in full confidence that it provides for the prudent use of our resources to serve the national interest.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

JANUARY 18, 1962.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. JENSEN (interrupting the reading of the President's budget message). Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 3]

Abbitt
Addonizio
Alford
Andersen, Minn.
Ashbrook
Bailey
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Cannon
Casey
Celler
Chiperfield
Clancy
Coad
Collier
Corbett
Derounian
Devine
Dorn
Dulski
Dwyer
Edmondson
Elliott
Fallon
Fino
Fogarty
Garmatz
Glenn
Granahan
Gray
Griffin
Hagan, Ga.
Hansen
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Henderson
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Hosmer
Huddleston
Ichord, Mo.
Inouye
Jarman
Jones, Ala.
Karth
Kearns
Kee
Kelly
Kowalski
Kunkel
Latta
McSween
Macdonald
Martin, Mass.
Miller, George P.

Miller, N.Y.
Moulder
Multer
Nedzi
Norblad
Norrell
O'Konski
Passman
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Riehlman
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rostenkowski
St. Germain
Saund
Saylor
Scott
Scranton
Sheppard
Smith, Miss.
Stratton
Thompson, N.J.
Ullman
Van Pelt
Westland
Wickersham
Wilson, Calif.
Wright
Yates

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 338 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

(The Clerk concluded reading the message.)

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, supplementing the President's message, I submit the following statistical summary:

Net budget receipts, expenditures, and deficits (−) or surplus (+), 10 years, 1954–63

[In billions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Budget receipts	Budget expenditures	Deficit (−) or surplus (+)	Public debt, beginning of year
1954 (from July 1953)	$64.4	$67.5	−$3.1	$266.1
1955	60.2	64.4	−4.2	271.3
1956	67.8	66.2	+1.6	274.4
1957:				
(a) Including highway trust fund	72.0	69.8	+2.2	
(b) Without it	70.6	69.0	+1.6	272.8
1958:				
(a) Including highway trust fund	70.6	72.9	−2.3	
(b) Without it	68.6	71.4	−2.8	270.5
1959:				
(a) Including highway trust fund	70.0	83.0	−13.0	
(b) Without it	67.9	80.3	−12.4	276.3
1960:				
(a) Including highway trust fund	80.3	79.5	+0.8	
(b) Without it	77.7	76.5	+1.2	284.7
1961:				
(a) Including highway trust fund	$80.5	$84.2	−$3.7	
(b) Without it	77.6	81.5	−3.9	$286.3
Total, 8 years:				
(a) Including highway trust fund	565.8	587.5	−21.7	
(b) Without it	554.8	576.8	−22.0	[1] (289.0)
1962 (revised estimates in 1963 budget):				
(a) Including highway trust fund	85.2	92.3	−7.1	
(b) Without it	82.1	89.1	−7.0	289.0
1963 (budget estimates):				
(a) Including highway trust fund	[3] 96.4	[4] 95.9	+.5	
(b) Without it	[3] 93.0	[4] 92.5	+.5	[2] 295.4

[1] At June 30, 1961—end of the fiscal year.

[2] Estimated in 1963 budget at $294,900,000,000 at end of fiscal 1963.

[3] Including effect of proposed revenue legislation—both new and extensions of $2,900,000,000 (see list, p. 48, pt. 1 of Budget).

[4] Proposed postal rate increase legislation, estimated in the budget at $595,000,000 for 1963, is treated as an offset to these expenditure figures rather than as a budget receipt.

DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE SPENDING

The genesis of much of the distress of the dollar; the tenuous condition of our gold supply; the unattractiveness of our long-term Government bonds; the increasing cost of setting the dinner table, buying a home, educating the children; the budget deficits; the increases in the national debt—all these critical situations can be identified with ever-increasing expenditures over the years for domestic purposes. It is not the necessary defense and security expenditures that have unbalanced budgets and hiked the national debt and inflated the dollar and precipitated the outflow of gold. It is the nondefense items, as documented time and again. And we borrowed the money to cover them. We lacked the self-discipline to pay as we went along. The House, the press, and the country are increasingly aware of this fact.

In the 8 fiscal years 1954 through the last completed year, 1961, national defense spending increased only $500 million, but all other expenditures were up $16,200 million—an increase of 80 percent.

The budget received today proposes further increases—but, hopefully, the proportion between the two is more nearly even and, challengingly, within a budget in balance. The situation again underscores the urgent necessity of cooperating with the President to keep the balance. We owe it to the President in these critical times. We owe it to the people. We owe it to generations to come. We owe it to free men everywhere.

I include official figures in elaboration:

Defense and nondefense—Net budget expenditures

[In billions of dollars]

Fiscal year	National Defense		All other programs		Total net budget expenditures	
	Defense, military	Total	As per budget	Including highway trust fund	As per budget	Including highway trust fund
Fiscal 1953 (Korean war year)	$43.6	$50.4	$23.7	$23.7	$74.1	$74.1
Fiscal 1954 (from July 1953)	40.3	46.9	20.6	20.6	67.5	67.5
Fiscal 1955	35.5	40.6	23.8	23.8	64.4	64.4
Fiscal 1956	35.8	40.6	25.6	25.6	66.2	66.2
Fiscal 1957	38.4	43.3	25.7	26.5	69.0	69.8
Fiscal 1958	39.1	44.1	27.3	28.8	71.4	72.9
Fiscal 1959	41.2	46.4	33.9	36.6	80.3	83.0
Fiscal 1960	41.2	45.6	30.9	34.0	76.5	79.6
Fiscal 1961	43.2	47.4	34.1	36.8	81.5	84.2
Increase during the 8 years 1954–61	+2.9	+0.5	[1] +13.5	[2] +16.2	+14.0	[3] +16.7
Fiscal 1962 (revised, as shown in 1963 budget of January 1962)	$46.8	$51.2	$37.9	$41.1	[4] $89.1	[4] $92.3
Fiscal 1963 (budget of January 1962)	48.3	52.7	39.8	43.2	[4] 92.5	[4] 95.9
Comparisons:						
1963 budget estimates compared with 1961	+5.1	+5.3	[5] +5.7	+6.4	+11.0	[6] +11.7
1963 budget estimates compared with latest 1962 estimates	+1.5	+1.5	+1.9	+2.1	+3.4	+3.6

[1] Represents 65 percent increase, 1961 over 1954.

[2] Represents 80 percent increase, 1961 over 1954.

[3] Represents 25 percent increase, 1961 over 1954.

[4] Includes estimates for items of supplementals to come for 1962 and for later transmittal for 1963 (1962, $971,000,000; 1963, $245,000,000).

[5] Represents 16 percent increase, 1963 over 1961.

[6] Represents 13 percent increase, 1963 over 1961.

NOTES.—(a) Years prior to 1962 not adjusted to shift "Civil defense" to the "National defense" category; (b) highway trust fund began with fiscal year 1957.

COST OF LIVING—VALUE OF THE DOLLAR

In his state of the Union address, the President ranked inflation in the forefront of the enemies of freedom. Debasement of the dollar cannot be afforded at any price. And beginning in this session we might well heed the warning signs before it is too late. The President's recommendation that we live within a balanced budget is one of the most heartening features of today's message. We cannot live beyond our income indefinitely. That is the principal reason our dollar has become worth less and less. If we do not show some respect for our currency, how can we expect other nations to have faith in it?

These last several years we have repeatedly lived beyond income—and as a result the dollar has steadily declined in buying power.

In consequence, every businessman, every factory worker, every farmer, every family, has had to meet relentlessly higher living and operating costs with a cheaper dollar.

In calendar year 1960, the official consumers cost-of-living index hit new high water marks in 9 of the 12 months. And the buying power of the dollar has shown a persistent decline matching the corresponding increase in the cost of living. It now is worth only 46 cents.

In calendar year 1961, the official index moved up a bit further and the value of the dollar slipped a bit, though not as much as in the year earlier. The wholesale price index declined. The President advises that this is the best record of overall price stability of any comparable period of recovery since the end of World War II. And he submits the assurance that he means to maintain stability and growth in a climate of freedom from controls.

The following chart illuminates the situation:

Consumer Price Index and purchasing power of the dollar

Years	Consumer Price Index (1947-49=100)		Purchasing power of the dollar [1] (calendar year 1939=100 cents)
	All items	Foods	
1939	59.4	47.1	100.0
1940	59.9	47.8	99.2
1941	62.9	52.2	94.4
1942	69.7	61.3	85.2
1943	74.0	68.3	80.3
1944	75.2	67.4	79.0
1945	76.9	68.9	77.2
1946	83.4	79.0	71.2
1947	95.5	95.9	62.2
1948	102.8	104.1	57.8
1949	101.8	100.0	58.3
1950	102.8	101.2	57.8
1951	111.0	112.6	53.5
1952	113.5	114.6	52.3
1953	114.4	112.8	51.9
1954	114.8	112.6	51.7
1955	114.5	110.9	51.9
1956	116.2	111.7	51.1
1957	120.2	115.4	49.4
1958	123.5	120.3	48.1
1959	124.6	118.3	47.7
1960	126.5	119.7	47.0
Selected months:			
1946—June	79.8	72.1	74.4
1950—June	101.8	100.5	58.3
1952—December	114.1	113.8	52.1
1958—December	123.7	118.7	48.0
1959—December	125.5	117.8	47.3
1960:			
June	[2] 126.5	120.3	47.0
July	[2] 126.6	120.6	46.9
August	126.6	120.1	46.9
September	[2] 126.8	120.2	46.8
October	[2] 127.3	120.9	46.7
November	[2] 127.4	121.1	46.6
December	[2] 127.5	121.4	46.6
1961:			
January	127.4	121.3	46.6
February	127.5	121.4	46.6
March	127.5	121.2	46.6
April	127.5	121.2	46.6
May	127.4	120.7	46.6
June	[2] 127.6	120.9	46.6
July	[2] 128.1	122.0	46.4
August	128.0	121.2	46.4
September	[2] 128.3	121.1	46.3
October	[2] 128.4	120.9	46.3
November	128.3	120.3	46.3.

[1] As measured by the BLS Consumer Price Index.

[2] New record high.

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Office of Debt Analysis, Dec. 22, 1961.

THE BUDGET AND GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

In recent years we have heard much about the "gross national product"—the production of goods and services—and the relation of the Federal budget to it. There is a growing tendency for some to explain away, to justify ever-increasing budgets in statistical relationship to the gross product; growth of the product justifies growth of the budget. Obviously, a country that grew from 131 million people in 1939 to 185 million people in 1962 generates more demands, requires a larger volume of public services, and boosts the national product.

But when we do not pay our own way—when we live beyond income—when we pay for public necessities by borrowing from generations not here to call us to account, as we have been doing, then we play into Khrushchev's hands.

At the heart of our public finances is a simple, inescapable fact, easily grasped by every Member—and by everyone else. It is that our Government—any government—like individuals and families, cannot indefinitely spend more than they take in without courting disaster. An inescapable lesson of history is that debasement of a nation's currency inevitably leads to chaos. We have been on the highroad toward the borders of fiscal insanity.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are glad to have a balanced budget. The cooperation the President urges will keep it in balance.

I include comparative charts of official figures bearing on the point:

Gross national product, budget expenditures, surplus or deficit, cost of living, and value of dollar, 1949–62

[In billions of dollars where applicable]

Year	GNP in then current prices (calendar year)	GNP in 1960 prices (calendar year)	Net budget expenditures (fiscal year)		Surplus or deficit (fiscal year)	Federal public debt (end of fiscal year)	Consumer Price Index (1947-49=100)	Purchasing value of dollar (1939=100 cents)
			Amount	As percent of GNP				
1949	$258.1	$334.2	$39.5	15.3	−$1.8	$252.8	101.8	58.3
1950	284.6	362.3	39.5	13.9	−3.1	257.4	102.8	57.8
1951	329.0	391.8	44.0	13.4	+3.5	255.2	111.0	53.5
1952	347.0	406.6	65.3	18.8	−4.0	259.1	113.5	52.3
1953	365.4	425.2	74.1	20.3	−9.4	266.1	114.4	51.9
1954	363.1	416.6	67.5	18.6	−3.1	271.3	114.8	51.7
1955	397.5	449.6	64.4	16.2	−4.2	274.4	114.5	51.9
1956	419.2	459.1	66.2	15.8	+1.6	272.8	116.2	51.1
1957	442.8	467.6	69.0	15.6	+1.6	270.5	120.2	49.4
1958	444.5	459.5	71.4	16.1	−2.8	276.3	123.5	48.1
1959	482.8	491.0	80.3	16.6	−12.4	284.7	124.6	47.7
1960	504.4	504.4	76.5	15.2	+1.2	286.3	126.5	47.0
1961	521.0	(1)	81.5	15.6	−3.9	289.0	[2] 128.3	[2] 46.3
1962 estimate	[3] 570.0	(1)	89.1	15.6	−7.0	295.4		
Change	+121%		+125%		−$43.8	+$42.6	+26%	−20%

[1] Not available.

[2] November, 1961.

[3] From 1963 budget message.

Sources: various official documents.

Percentagewise, budget spending has slightly outdistanced the gross national product—125 percent to 121 percent on the basis shown. But the Federal debt, on the same basis, increased by $42.6 billion. We did not comply with the doctrine of balancing the budget over a so-called cycle of economic ups and downs. And as we failed to do so, we hiked the cost of living by 26 percent in the same period and robbed the dollar—and every paycheck, every savings account, every bond, every pension—by 20 percent. That is just since 1949; the 1939 dollar is now worth only 46 cents.

In the final analysis, a pertinent question is, Do we owe more or less—aside from how much we spent or what percent of our income we spent? The statistics are arresting, and I include them here: For each person in 1960, Federal, State, and local public debt—let us include it all because the same people owe all three—the debts on a per capita basis were four times larger in 1960 than in 1940.

Federal, State, and local tax receipts, expenditures, and debt—On a per capita basis, selected fiscal years

Year	Per capita				Percentage distribution			
	Total	Federal	State	Local	Total	Federal	State	Local
1. Tax receipts:								
1940	$109	$43	$32	$34	100	39.2	29.2	31.6
1946	370	286	45	39	100	77.3	12.2	10.5
1950	369	255	60	54	100	69.1	16.3	14.6
1953	576	433	77	67	100	75.2	13.3	11.5
1960	715	499	114	102	100	70.1	15.5	14.4
2. Expenditures:								
1940	156	77	35	44	100	449.3	22.3	28.5
1946	602	502	47	53	100	83.5	7.7	8.8
1950	473	301	86	86	100	63.7	18.2	18.1
1953	707	514	90	103	100	72.7	12.8	14.5
1960	864	548	153	164	100	63.2	17.6	19.2
3. Gross debt:								
1940	483	328	27	128	100	67.9	5.7	26.4
1946	2,154	2,034	18	102	100	94.4	.8	4.8
1950	1,893	1,731	36	127	100	91.4	1.9	6.7
1953	1,925	1,708	50	167	100	88.7	2.6	8.7
1960	2,010	1,617	105	288	100	80.5	5.2	14.3

Source: Tax Foundation "Facts and Figures," 11th edition.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. Speaker, I also include official data on the trend and other selected significant figures relating to the public debt. These are timely data on the situation, especially in view of the request, forthcoming presently, to increase the debt ceiling to $308 billion for the period ending June 30, 1963.

And especially are they timely when the official estimate is that the annual carrying charge—the interest—on the Federal debt is expected to be $9.3 billion, or $400 million more than the current-year estimate. Especially so when you realize that the interest alone now takes 10 cents of every budget dollar. It has reached the point of costing us $17,690 every minute, every hour of the day and night of the year—an incredible fact.

For several years the Treasury has been on a treadmill in refunding the debt. And it is still there—and will remain there until a way can be found to lengthen the maturity of the debt. As it is, the Treasury is in the market every week of the year refinancing a part of the debt. Too much of it is in short-term paper. Right now, 75 percent of this marketable debt is due in 5 years or less. The average age of the debt is only 4 years and 7 months—essentially unchanged in the last 8 years. And this situation will remain unless means can be found to make long-term bonds more attractive.

The best hope of the moment—perhaps the only hope—is the President's request that the Congress cooperate in keeping the budget in balance in order to contribute to price and dollar stability.

THE PUBLIC DEBT—10 YEARS, 1953–1963

[In billions of dollars]

July 1953	266.1
July 1954	271.3
July 1955	274.4
July 1956	272.8
July 1957	270.5
July 1958	276.3
July 1959	284.7
July 1960	286.3
July 1961	289.0
Increase, 8 years	+22.9
July 1962 (estimated in 1963 budget)	295.4
July 1963 (estimated in 1963 budget)	294.9
Increase, 2 years	+5.9
Increase, 10 years	+28.8

NOTE.—The old debt ceiling of $275 billion has been raised 8 successive years. Currently, the ceiling is $298 billion ($285 billion is permanent and $13 billion is temporary).

President's 1963 budget message proposes a new ceiling of $308 billion, to be effective in fiscal 1962 and throughout fiscal 1963.

Federal debt on significant dates

Date	Classification	Total direct and guaranteed debt	Per capita [1]
	WORLD WAR I		
Mar. 31, 1917	Prewar debt	$1,282,044,346.28	$12.36
Aug. 31, 1919	Highest war debt	26,596,701,648.01	250.18
Dec. 31, 1930	Lowest postwar debt	16,026,087,087.07	129.66
	WORLD WAR II		
June 30, 1940	Debt preceding defense program	48,496,601,692.96	367.48
Nov. 30, 1941	Pre-Pearl Harbor debt	61,363,867,932.26	458.47
Feb. 28, 1946	Highest war debt	279,764,369,348.29	1,989.75
June 30, 1946	Debt at end of year in which hostilities ceased	269,898,484,032.56	1,911.14
Apr. 30, 1949	Lowest postwar debt [3]	251,553,319,739.98	1,690.29
	SINCE KOREA		
June 30, 1950	Debt at time of opening of hostilities in Korea (hostilities began June 24, 1950)	257,376,855,385.01	1,696.74
Dec. 31, 1952		267,445,125,544.96	1,687.90
Nov. 30, 1961	Highest debt [4]	297,325,028,223.84	[2] 1,607.31
Dec. 31, 1960	Debt a year ago	290,372,753,566.68	1,593.20
Nov. 30, 1961	Debt last month	297,325,028,223.84	[2] 1,607.31
Dec. 31, 1961	Debt this month	296,060,517,477.52	[2] 1,598.36

[1] Based upon estimates of the Bureau of the Census.

[2] Subject to revision.

[3] Represents the lowest point of the debt at the end of any month following World War II. The lowest point of the debt on any day following that war was on June 27, 1949, when the debt was as follows:

Direct debt (gross)	$251,245,889,059.02
Guaranteed debt (not including obligations owned by the Treasury)	23,876,001.12
Total direct and guaranteed debt	251,269,765,060.14

[4] Represents the highest point of the debt at the end of any month. The highest point of the debt on any day was on Nov. 24, 1961, when the debt was as follows:

Direct debt (gross)	$297,408,813,551.00
Guaranteed debt (not including obligations owned by the Treasury)	306,129,625.06
Total direct and guaranteed debt	297,714,943,176.06

INTERNATIONAL PAYMENTS DEFICITS AND TOUCH AND GO GOLD SITUATION

In the last few years, abuse of the dollar by indulging in inflationary spending was sharply called to our attention when foreign creditors demanded gold in payment. Our supply dropped over $5 billion between January 1958 and January 1961. It declined nearly $900 million more in the year just closed. Our deficits in balance of international payments lays the groundwork, but the steady erosion in the value of the dollar precipitated the outflow. They were apprehensive as to what we were going to do.

Though the President's state of the Union report on the matter is encouraging in that the outflow has subsided to a comparative trickle, he not only does not minimize the situation—it is so tenuous as to defy that—but advises in the message today that basic improvement in our balance of payments hinges to a large extent on our ability to continue a high degree of overall price stability. That can mean but one thing: Avoid further inflation. Stop cheapening the dollar. Live within income. Pay as we go. Stop spending money we do not have for things we can get along without or defer until we are willing to pay for them.

Here again, then, is a call for cooperation by the Congress in staying within the budget. The alternatives can carry us further down the high road to fiscal chaos.

I include several pertinent statistics. For instance:

Our gold supply is down to $17,000 million.

All but $5,700 million is now earmarked as backing for our money supply on a 25-percent basis.

There are possible foreign claims of $20,000 million against it.

That leaves a potential shortage—an outside extreme—of $14,300 million after allowing for the 25 percent backing provision.

Gold assets of the United States

Date or period	Assets	Change during the year or month
Dec. 31, 1957	$22,780,675,342	
Dec. 31, 1958	20,534,104,913	−$2,246,570,429
Dec. 31, 1959	19,456,135,794	−1,077,969,119
Dec. 31, 1960	17,766,797,708	−1,689,338,086
Decline in gold holdings in the 3 years 1958–60		−5,013,877,634
Dec. 31, 1961	[1] 16,888,905,838	−877,891,870
Decline in gold holdings in the 4 years 1958–61		−5,891,769,504
Trends during calendar year 1961:		
Jan. 31, 1961	17,440,954,133	(−325,843,575)
Feb. 28, 1961	17,372,724,944	(−68,229,189)
Mar. 31, 1961	17,387,999,932	(+15,274,988)
Apr. 28, 1961	17,389,617,266	(+1,617,334)
May 31, 1961	17,403,054,122	(+13,436,856)
June 30, 1961	17,550,069,960	(+147,015,838)
July 31, 1961	17,526,867,491	(−23,202,469)
Aug. 31, 1961	17,451,043,350	(−75,824,141)
Sept. 29, 1961	17,376,766,017	(−74,277,333)
Oct. 31, 1961	17,300,897,304	(−75,868,713)
Nov. 30, 1961	16,974,648,554	(−326,248,750)
Dec. 31, 1961	[1] 16,888,905,838	(−85,742,716)

[1] It was $16,838,975,978 on Jan. 12, 1962.

Source: Daily Treasury Statements.

Our touch-and-go position on gold

[In billions of dollars]

End of calendar year—	U.S. gold stock	Gold stock (above required 25-percent backing for currency and deposits)	Possible foreign claims	Potential shortage of gold with present 25-percent backing provision
1957	$22.9	$10.8	$14.9	$4.1
1958	20.6	8.5	15.6	7.1
1959	19.5	7.3	17.7	10.4
1960	17.8	6.1	18.8	12.7
3-year change	−5.1	−4.7	+3.9	+8.6
1961:				
January	17.5	6.2	18.4	12.2
February	17.4	6.2	18.4	12.2
March	17.4	6.1	18.7	12.5
April	17.4	6.2	18.4	12.2
May	17.5	6.4	18.6	12.2
June	17.6	6.2	18.9	12.7
July	17.6	6.2	19.1	12.9
August	17.5	6.1	19.6	13.5
September	17.5	6.0	19.9	13.9
October	17.3	5.7	20.0	14.3
November	17.0	5.3	(1)	(1)
December	16.9	(1)	(1)	(1)
Change, December 1957 through October 1961	−5.6	−5.1	+5.1	+10.2

[1] Not available.

Source: Department of Commerce.

U.S. balance of payments data

[Millions of dollars]

Period	U.S. receipts (recorded)		U.S. payments (recorded)					Balance on recorded transactions [net payments (−) or receipts (+)]	Unrecorded transactions—errors and omissions (net receipts)	Increase in foreign gold and recorded liquid dollar assets through transactions with the United States
	Exports of goods and services	Foreign capital other than liquid dollar assets (net)	Imports of goods and services	U.S. grants and capital (net)						
				Total [1]	U.S. Government grants and capital	Private capital				
						Total	Direct			
1954	$17,949	$210	$16,088	$3,788	$1,554	$1,619	$664	−$1,717	$167	$1,550
1955	20,003	351	17,937	4,007	2,211	1,211	779	−1,590	446	1,144
1956	23,705	576	19,829	6,017	2,362	2,990	1,859	−1,565	643	922
1957	26,733	428	20,923	6,451	2,574	3,175	2,058	−213	748	−535
1958	23,325	−27	21,053	6,153	2,587	2,844	1,094	−3,908	380	3,528
1959	23,709	709	23,537	[2] 5,152	[2] 1,986	2,375	1,372	−4,271	528	3,374
1960	27,300	200	23,327	7,454	2,750	3,856	1,694	−3,281	−648	3,929
				Seasonally adjusted annual rates						
1960: 1st quarter	26,260	724	23,700	5,896	2,328	2,776	1,376	−2,612	132	2,480
2d quarter	27,312	372	24,096	6,672	2,780	2,440	1,040	−2,484	−568	3,052
3d quarter	27,416	68	23,496	7,588	2,420	4,340	1,624	−3,600	−848	4,448
4th quarter	28,212	−364	22,016	10,260	[3] 3,472	[4] 5,868	[4] 2,736	[3, 4] −4,428	−1,308	[3, 4] 5,736
1961: 1st quarter	28,464	796	22,076	8,468	3,476	4,156	2,000	−1,284	−100	1,384
2d quarter	27,528	1,100	22,088	3,912	32	3,060	1,320	2,628	−1,636	[5] −992
3d quarter	27,884	−8	24,112	7,700	3,736	3,120	1,652	−3,936	500	[6] 3,436

[1] Includes remittances and pensions not shown separately.

[2] Excludes $1,375,000,000 increase in U.S. subscription to International Monetary Fund.

[3] Includes U.S. subscription to International Development Association of $74,000,000 ($296,000,000 at annual rate).

[4] Includes single direct investment transaction of $370,000,000 ($1,480,000,000 at annual rate).

[5] Includes advance debt repayment and interest payments on U.S. Government loans of $774,000,000 ($3,100,000,000 at annual rate).

[6] Before adjustment for receipts of principal and interest on Government loans paid in the previous quarter.

NOTE.—Data exclude goods and services transferred under military grants.

Source: Department of Commerce.

NEW AUTHORITY TO OBLIGATE THE GOVERNMENT

The most important longrun figure on the spending side of the budget is the appropriation total—the authority to first make an obligation against the Treasury. The authority comes first. Spending follows. The more familiar figures are the receipts and the expenditures; they are publicized. But the obligating authority shows the trend. The rough rule of thumb is that actual expenditures—payments—in any year will approximately divide two-thirds from appropriations for that year and one-third from unexpended carryovers of previous years.

Total new obligational authority proposed in the budget today crosses the $100 billion mark. I include a table going back several years. It includes all items—front-door, back-door, and trapdoor appropriations—everything:

Authority to obligate the Government (new obligational authority)—which precedes budget spending

[In billions of dollars]

Fiscal year	New authority as per budget basis	Highway trust fund	Grand total
1954	62.8		62.8
1955	57.1		57.1
1956	63.2		63.2
1957	70.2	2.6	72.8
1958	76.3	3.7	80.0
1959	81.4	3.5	84.9
1960	79.6	3.0	82.6
1961	86.7	2.9	89.6
Increase, 1961 over 1954	+23.9	+2.9	+26.8
1962:			
(a) Already enacted	92.0	3.3	95.3
(b) Total including proposed supplementals	[1] 95.7	3.3	99.0
1963 total proposed (in budget)	[2] 99.3	[3] 3.6	102.9

See footnotes at end of table.

Authority to obligate the Government (new obligational authority)—which precedes budget spending—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

Fiscal year	New authority as per budget basis	Highway trust fund	Grand total
Comparisons:			
1963 total compared with 1961	+12.6	+.7	+13.3
1963 total compared with 1962 total proposed	+3.6	+.3	+3.9

[1] Including $2,000,000,000 proposed supplemental for standby loan authority for the International Monetary Fund.

[2] Includes a net of $1,350,000,000 for "later transmittal," mostly for proposed new legislation, and including allowance for contingencies.

[3] Includes $950,000,000 for "later transmittal" for proposed legislation.

THREE WAYS TO STATE SIZE OF 1963 BUDGET

Mr. Speaker, the conventional budget totals—those used in the President's message and widely reproduced in the press—do not disclose the full magnitude of the ebb and flow of money in and out of the Federal Treasury primarily because they exclude several large so-called trust segregations of income and outgo, such as social security, unemployment, highway, railroad and civil service retirement, and the like. These special funds derive from and operate under various special laws and distinguish themselves from the generally unsegregated "budget" revenues and expenditures. And they represent a considerable share of total Treasury business volume.

The following synoptic tabulation is accordingly included.

3 ways to state the size of 1963 budget

[In billions of dollars]

	Receipts	Expenditures	Estimate of surplus
1. The administrative budget: This is the one most commonly used. Its ingredients are net budget receipts and net budget expenditures. It shows net budget expenditures against what might be termed general, unsegregated Treasury receipts. It is the one which shows the $500,000,000 surplus projection.			
The administrative budget totals are	$93.0	$92.5	+$0.5
2. The cash budget: This is the term applied to what the budget message refers to as "Receipts from and payments to the public," an effort to portray the magnitude of the ebb and flow of funds between the Government and the public. Briefly, this principally combines budget figures (the administrative budget) and trust fund receipts and expenditures, and then eliminates intragovernmental and intrafund transactions which do not represent flow of funds either to or from the public. (See table, p. 281 of budget.) As explained below, this method, as used in the budget, does not disclose the full magnitude.			
The cash budget totals are	116.6	114.8	+1.8
3. A 3d method: The cash budget calculation (No. 2 above) understates the full scope of Federal income and outgo. This is because budget receipts and budget expenditures are stated, as in the past, on a net basis. This is to say, certain receipts are not shown as "budget receipts," but rather are offset against			

3 ways to state the size of 1963 budget—Con.

[In billions of dollars]

	Receipts	Expenditures	Estimate of surplus
3. A 3d method—Continued gross budget expenditures, thus arriving at net budget expenditures. These receipts are collections of interest, repayment of loans, postal revenues, and other income (primarily from outside the Government) of Government corporations, the postal service, and various revolving funds. The budget makes the distinction in this respect basically because such receipts are available for use or reuse (respending) by the corporation or other enterprise concerned and thus are not available for general appropriation purposes. (In the case of postal receipts for services rendered, budget totals, reflect only the net deficit or surplus). Counting such receipts as receipts, rather than as offsets to expenditures, the following tabulation more fully reflects the ebb and flow of funds:			
Net budget receipts (same as item 1)	$93.0		
Receipts treated in the budget as offsets to gross budget expenditures. (See p. 359)	15.8		
Trust fund receipts (p. 271)	27.5		
Gross budget expenditures (net budget expenditures plus receipt offsets mentioned above)		$108.3	
Trust fund expenditures (p. 272)		26.6	
Subtotal	136.3	134.9	+$1.4
Deduct intragovernment and intrafund transactions not directly involving the public (same items as are referred to in "cash budget" calculation in No. 2 above (p. 281)	−3.9	−4.7	+0.8
Total (ebb and flow between Government and public)	132.4	130.2	+2.2

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, may I say in conclusion, that in response to the necessity for early adjournment of the Congress, the Committee on Appropriations has already begun consideration of the spending features of the budget assigned to it. We began hearings last Monday on several bills. We expect to expedite the bills to the floor. We urge and welcome any suggestions in respect to any item within our jurisdiction. And we want to respond to the President's request to cooperate with him and his budget recommendations. He did not ask us to raise his spending plans—he asked us to cooperate to keep the budget in balance. That is an imperative national necessity. So, we urge Members, in the national interest, at least for this session, to refrain from hammering the Committee on Appropriations to exceed the budget. We would prefer constructive suggestions that we can incorporate in the bills within the strictures of cooperation urged by the President.

And we especially ask that the legislative committees refrain from processing any "back-door" appropriations. It is spending in the dark. It is appropriating in the dark. It keeps the Congress in the dark. And it keeps the press and the country in the dark. The left hand does not know what the right hand is doing. It ties the hands of the President in the ability to coordinate his budgets. And it flirts dangerously—as the past several years so well demonstrated—with the constitutional prerogatives and supremity of the House in money matters. The other body has never been bashful about arrogating the appropriation powers to itself.

The several revenue proposals on which the budget balance also hinges are, of course, matters for the legislative committees. But as to the appropriation items, we hope the membership will advise us by page and line, of specific ways to cooperate with the President.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has submitted a Federal budget for 1963 calling for the expenditure of $92.5 billion. He anticipates budgetary receipts of $93 billion. If both of these figures are realized we will have a 1963 budget surplus of a half billion dollars.

But one of the most significant requests in the President's budget message is for prompt action by the Congress to increase the limit on the public debt to the highest figure in the history of this Republic. It will exceed by $8 billion the limit placed on the debt by the Congress in the last years of World War II. The $300 billion debt at that time was enacted when this country was engaged in the most expensive and crucial military conflict in its history. Now in a time when there is no active military conflict we are asked to raise the debt limit promptly to $308 billion. And, as I will point out later, current military spending is not the primary cause of the deficit for the current fiscal year.

Under the President's proposal this limit will be temporary, expiring June 30, 1963. As we all know, the permanent statutory debt limitation is $285 billion. A year ago at the request of the Kennedy administration the Congress enacted legislation providing for an additional temporary statutory limit of $13 billion for a total of $298 billion. We are now being asked to increase this overall limit by $10 billion.

I think it is essential that we examine the record to determine what has prompted President Kennedy and his administration to request the highest debt limitation in our history.

When President Eisenhower submitted his 1962 budget he anticipated budgetary receipts at $82.3 billion and expenditures at $80.9 billion or a 1962 surplus of $1.5 billion. When the Kennedy administration assumed control of the Government, the new President likewise stated that anticipated revenue would be just a little over $82 billion or to be exact, $82.1 billion.

President Eisenhower predicted expenditures in 1962 at $80.9 billion. Five months after the Kennedy administration came into office the estimate for expenditures in 1962 had risen to $85.1 billion. The present estimate for expenditures this fiscal year is $88.9 billion. The estimated receipts remain at $82.1 billion, leaving an anticipated deficit of $6.8 billion this year.

I think it is most significant to note that the estimated budgetary receipts of both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy were practically the same.

Likewise, it is significant that the estimated receipts of fiscal 1962 as of this date are $82.1 billion, only $200 million under the estimate submitted by President Eisenhower before he left office.

The present anticipated 1962 Federal deficit, therefore, is definitely not due to any reduction in anticipated revenues. The 1962 deficit is due solely to a great increase in anticipated expenditures.

The Committee on Ways and Means submitted a report on June 16, 1961—Report No. 549—in connection with H.R. 7677, the bill providing for temporary increase in the debt limit of $13 billion. On page 5 of that report the committee states:

> The Secretary of the Treasury in his appearance before this committee in executive session estimated that there would be a deficit for the fiscal year 1962 of $3.7 billion, assuming all of the revenue and expenditure estimates of the President are enacted.

The committee then goes on to say:

> The $3.7 billion deficit is based upon the following estimates of budgetary revenues and expenditures: Expenditures $85.1 billion, revenues $81.4 billion, deficit $3.7 billion.

That report is dated June 16, 1961.

We are told in the budget message today that anticipated 1962 receipts have come up to $82.1 billion, or an increase of $700 million over the June 16 report.

We are also told in the budget message that anticipated expenditures in 1962 have come up from $85.1 billion to $89.1 billion, for an increase of $4 billion. This leaves an overall budget deficit for 1962 of $7 billion.

Now I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the record demonstrates that the Kennedy administration has taken in more money than it anticipated in June of last year but has practically doubled the anticipated deficit. The deficit which the Kennedy administration reports, therefore, is not due to any reduction in revenue but is due entirely to greater expenditures than were anticipated even as late as last June.

Likewise, Mr. Speaker, the record will show that the increase in expenditures under the Kennedy administration was primarily in nondefense, nonmilitary activities. Expenditures for the national defense were not the leading cause for the increased deficit of 1962.

According to the statement of "Cash Deposits and Withdrawals" in the daily statement of the U.S. Treasury for January 12, 1962, the Defense Department for military purposes—includes military assistance—withdrew from the Treasury to date in the current fiscal year a total of $24.9 billion. For the corresponding period in fiscal 1961—beginning July 1, 1960, and extending to January 12, 1961—withdrawals for the same purpose totaled $23.4 billion. We have, therefore, in the current fiscal year spent $1.5 billion more for military purposes than we did 1 year ago.

But in the same period all other withdrawals from the Treasury have increased by $6 billion. In fiscal 1961, the withdrawals from the Treasury for nonmilitary purposes totaled $27.5 billion. In fiscal 1962, the amount was $33.9 billion. The Kennedy administration from July 1, 1961, to January 12, 1962, withdrew from the Treasury for military expenditures $1.5 billion more than did the Eisenhower administration in a comparable period a year ago, but at the same time withdrew $6 billion more than did the Eisenhower administration for nonmilitary purposes.

The lesson, Mr. Speaker, is extremely clear and simple. Deficit financing with the resultant request for an increase in the debt limit by the Kennedy administration has been due to excessive nonmilitary spending rather than to a reduction in taxes collected or to the defense requirements of our country. The increase in expenditure, largely nonmilitary, by the Kennedy administration has caused the $7 billion deficit this year. The increase in expenditures, largely nondefense, by the Kennedy administration has brought about the demand for an increase in the debt limit.

Mr. Speaker, we may have become so calloused to the sound of hundreds of millions and billions of dollars that when we speak about the total national debt, we fail to comprehend the significance of this obligation in our private lives. It seems to me that any discussion of the debt requires a consideration of the enormous burden placed upon every American worker by the interest charges on the national debt. The President has estimated that these interest charges in 1963 will exceed $9 billion. During this present fiscal year they will total $8.9 billion, or nearly $9 billion. This $9 billion cost to the Federal Government in interest charges alone is equal to $40 a year for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

But putting it more realistically, this $9 billion interest charge per year means that every one of the 73 million men and women 14 years of age and older in the U.S. labor force—including those in the Armed Forces—is responsible in Federal taxes for an average of $122 a year to meet the interest on the national debt alone. This $122 is a realistic thing; it comes out of the pockets of every employed person. It is an additional charge by the Federal Government for its services over and above all those being paid for on a current basis.

The President points out that 10 cents on every dollar collected in taxes is going in 1963 for fixed interest charges. This item in the budget has been increasing over the years, and unless we make a determined effort to hold the line on expenditures, or radically increase taxes, these interest charges will continue to advance.

I submit, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the request of President Kennedy for prompt enactment of a temporary increase of the debt limit to $308 billion, it is incumbent upon the Congress to take equally as prompt steps to hold down and reduce nonessential, nonmilitary expenditures. This must be done vigorously and extensively until we can make a substantial reduction in the national debt and interest charges upon it.

MINORITY PAIR CLERK

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following communication:

December 31, 1961.

The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: I hereby resign my position as minority pair clerk, created by House Resolution 15, 87th Congress, effective December 31, 1961.

Sincerely yours,

James P. Griffin.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman's inquiry, Monday is District Day. There is no District business. For Tuesday and the balance of the week there will be consideration of the bill H.R. 7927, the Postal Revision Act of 1961.

May I advise the Members that the rule on this bill was adopted on September 15 last year. It provides for 2 hours' general debate and is an open rule.

I make this announcement with the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further business will be announced later.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

THE LATE SPEAKER SAM RAYBURN: A TRIBUTE

The **SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] is recognized.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks and including extraneous matter in the body of the Record today in connection with the memorial services for the late Speaker, Sam Rayburn, and also that the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], may extend his remarks at the close of these proceedings and include therein an article by Bascom N. Timmons.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, as senior Representative from Texas, it is my sad duty to lead this assembly in our memorial service for the late Sam Rayburn. On November 16, 1961, our beloved Speaker, colleague, and friend died in Bonham, Tex.

Today, in the historical shadow of Mr. Sam's career, we find ourselves faced with an almost impossible task—that of expressing in adequate terms our thoughts of his greatness.

Sam Rayburn would not wish us to come here in a spirit of mourning and sorrow, although our sentiments will bespeak of our great loss. Rather, he would wish us to bend our efforts at the beginning of a new session of Congress toward the legislative duties which he considered to be paramount in his life and in the life of each Member of the House of Representatives.

To Sam Rayburn life was a privilege. To him we owe a debt of gratitude for demonstrating to us the values of discipline without rancor, duty without resentment, friendship without falsehood, and honesty without vanity. To a man of this caliber the entire Nation is indebted for his tireless energy and devoted service as an exemplary public servant.

Amidst the trials, tribulations, and ambitions of the 20th century here emerged a man who had an abiding faith in his country, in his fellow man, in the two-party system, and in the Congress of the United States. Here was a man who knew the meaning of democracy.

As a boy, he worked in the fields of his family's 40-acre cotton farm in north Texas. In his youth he developed a deep love for things political and decided that his goal would be to enter politics. At an early age his thoughts turned toward the challenges of the office of Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives. Years of diligent effort preceded the accomplishment of that dream and on September 16, 1940, Sam Rayburn was elected to succeed the late William Bankhead, of Alabama, as Speaker. Mr. Sam exceeded the record of Henry Clay for length of service as Speaker on the 30th of January 1951, and by June 12, 1961, he had doubled Mr. Clay's record of 8 years, 4 months, and 11 days.

Mr. Rayburn was born in Roane County, Tenn., on January 6, 1882, the son of W. M. and Martha Waller Rayburn. He was a graduate of East Texas College; studied law at the University of Texas, and served 6 years as a member of the Texas Legislature from 1907 to 1913. The last 2 years of his service in the Texas Legislature he was speaker of the house of representatives.

His service in the Congress of the United States began in 1913 when he was elected to the 63d Congress, and he was elected to each succeeding Congress; his last service terminated during the 87th Congress.

It would be an impossible task to list or mention the numerous beneficial legislative acts passed by the Congress since 1913 in which Mr. Rayburn's talents were contained. It was my privilege to be intimately associated with my fellow Texan, Sam Rayburn, for half a century. I profoundly cherish the memories of his contributions to our way of life. His thoughts and efforts were directed toward the people and his firm resolve was to help those who justly needed and deserved the benefits of legislative action. There was the Rural Electrification Act, the Railroad Holding Company Act, the Securities and Exchange Act, the Federal Communications Act, and farm-to-market roads as contained in the Highway Act of 1944.

I am particularly reminded of two of the great pieces of legislation with which Mr. Rayburn's efforts were intimately associated.

First, the Rural Electrification Act. Statutory provision for the agency was made in May of 1936 when Sam Rayburn served as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives. The law authorized loans for facilities to bring electric service to rural people who did not have it. His skillful debate, his solid knowledge of the issues at stake in the legislation, his desire to give honest and direct replies to his colleagues on the floor of the House during the days of debate on the REA legislation—all are a matter of public pride on the pages of the Congressional Record. It was his purpose to assist in bringing more ease, more comfort, and more happiness to the people on the farms of America. To Sam Rayburn the farmer and his family were not a forgotten group. During extensive debate his words, as always, were firm and true. I give you a few of his own statements made on the floor of the House on April 9, 1936:

> Something must be done out there on the farm where people can live quietly and make their bread and meat. This will induce those who are there now to stay and will probably attract a few others, who can never have a job in a town, to move out there and stay there and make a living. * * * We want to make the farmer and his wife and family believe and know that they are remembered as part of—yea, they are the bulwark of the Government.

Sam Rayburn never lost touch with the backbone of America, whether it was farmer, city laborer, or youthful student.

Second, I am reminded of his efforts in behalf of farm-to-market roads, and I have told on previous occasions of my close association with this particular legislative incident. It bears repeating at this time.

This occurred in 1944 when our colleague was serving as Speaker in the 78th Congress. I was in Sam Rayburn's office in the Capitol when Congressman Robinson of Utah came in. Bill Robinson was chairman of the House committee dealing with roads and highways. He had come to ask the Speaker to permit floor consideration of the highway bill. At once Sam Rayburn asked what was contained in the bill for country roads. Robinson replied that at present nothing had been definitely designated, but it was expected that a part of the authorized funds would be spent on secondary roads.

Mr. Sam replied without hestitation and with firm conviction in his voice that the bill should be returned to the committee, 30 percent of the funds should be earmarked for farm-to-market roads, committee agreement reached, and then the House would give favorable consideration to the bill. On that day in 1944 the bill was agreed upon and shortly thereafter passed. Its advantages have continued. Hard surface roads to the farms of America have indeed benefited the entire Nation and especially eased the burden of those who produce our food.

We know in truth, my friends, that the late Sam Rayburn was possessed with a generous quantity of wisdom. It has often been said that his techniques of leadership were far more productive than an authoritarian, uncompromising, or militantly partisan approach. Mr. Rayburn has said, and I quote:

> You cannot lead people by trying to drive them. Persuasion and reason are the only ways to lead them. In that way the Speaker has influence and power in the House.

His loyalties are well known to this gathering. High regard was fittingly observed for him in the funeral services in his hometown of Bonham, Tex. Many Members of this body journeyed to Bonham for the sorrowful occasion in token of their respect and grief over his passing. By their personal attendance, they also honored Texas for giving such an illustrious man to the Nation.

Truthfully it may be said that the death of Sam Rayburn is a great loss to the Nation and the world. Indeed, in these times when freedom-loving peoples everywhere look to the United States for leadership, the loss of Mr. Rayburn is especially lamented. Peace, security, freedom, and opportunity for all men of good will were uppermost in his heart and mind.

Among the citizens of Texas, among his friends and neighbors in his beloved State, the loss is felt most keenly. He was known as a friend, as a good neighbor. He was ever ready to give a hand in a worthy cause.

Mr. Rayburn's statesmanship was reflected by the attitudes of his colleagues in both Democratic and Republican Parties. His sound advice to new Members will remain in the activities of those who listened and took heed. He was a politician of soldierly courage, a friend and brother. His pathway was weaponed by a sense of right and sweetened by the spirit of genuineness, surpassing the frictions of life. He labored on until the eveningtime. His spirit will continue to walk with us and inspire us.

History will record Sam Rayburn's career as one of the most distinguished to hold office in the Congress of the United States. He held high rank in the councils of his beloved Democratic Party. During foul weather, as well as in fair, all during his career he fought the battles of his party with dignity and honor.

Sam Rayburn was a distinguished parliamentarian and was from the outset of his career one of the ablest debaters in the Congress. His philosophic turn of mind helped him to overlook the faults of others, but he could profoundly evaluate and magnify and appreciate the good traits of friend and foe alike.

Such a man was Sam Rayburn. He has gone from our midst. To his family we extend our heartfelt sympathy. May the spirit of heaviness be lifted from their hearts in the knowledge that to his country he gave his entire being. His devotion to duty and his great value as a public servant will live without diminishing in the memory of mankind.

Funeral Services for Speaker Sam Rayburn, by Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., Chaplain of the House of Representatives and Elder H. G. Ball, Pastor of the Primitive Baptist Church, Tioga, Tex.

SCRIPTURE READINGS BY THE CHAPLAIN

Psalm 95: 6: "O come, let us worship and bow down; let us kneel before the Lord, our Maker."

Psalm 27: 14: "Wait on the Lord; be of good courage, and He shall strengthen thine heart; wait I say, on the Lord."

Psalm 90: 1–2: "Lord, Thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations.

"Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God."

Psalm 23: "The Lord is my Shepherd; I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; He leadeth me beside the still waters; He restoreth my soul; He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake.

"Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for Thou art with me; Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me.

"Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies; Thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over.

"Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever."

PRAYER BY THE CHAPLAIN

Most merciful and ever-blessed God, in the life of each of us, there are times and experiences when all our feelings seem to impose silence but encouraged by every gracious invitation in Thy Holy Word, we are approaching Thy throne of grace through the old and familiar way of prayer which is never closed to those who come unto Thee with a humble spirit and a contrite heart.

Gratefully and humbly we worship and adore Thee as the Author and Disposer of our life, from Whom our spirits have come, and to Whom they shall return, confidently acknowledging that in Thy divine keeping and control are the coming in and the going out of all our days.

In these hours of sacred memory, we are earnestly beseeching Thee to put Thy arms of love around the members of the bereaved family, drawing them to Thyself with the cords of love and clothing them with the garments of praise for the spirit of heaviness.

Our hearts are filled with rejoicing that they are not murmuring and complaining nor turning their eyes upon the ground, whence no help can come, but lifting them heavenward and unto Thee for Thou art the God of all consolation and too wise to err and too kind to injure.

May they daily avail themselves of the companionship of our blessed Lord, who sticketh closer than a brother; placing their hands in His and hearing and heeding His voice of gentle stillness saying unto them, "This is the way, walk ye therein for My ways are the ways of pleasantness and My paths are the paths of peace."

We thank Thee for the life and character and ministry of Thy servant whom Thou hast called to dwell with Thee in eternal blessedness. We shall miss him for his place will be empty but Thou hast opened unto him the gateway to the larger and more abundant life and received him unto Thy nearer presence. As Thou didst not lose him in giving him to us, so we have not lost him by his return to Thee.

We rejoice that whatever was noble and beautiful in his life, in Thy sight and in ours, will abide forever. Accept our praise for Thy grace which kindled within his heart a love for his Saviour and that he will forever be remembered among those who do justly, love mercy and walk humbly with the Lord and seek to serve their generation according to Thy holy will.

Our hearts are filled with gratitude for the testimony of his colleagues whose lives were enriched by his friendship and who daily had the joy and privilege of walking and working with him. They are continually calling to mind his many years of service and finding themselves inspired by his genius and skill in the business of statecraft, his faith and fortitude, his patriotism, his devotion to the duties of his high vocation, and his generous good will to all mankind.

We have not said, "farewell" to him, but only "good-night," assured that on some blessed morning we shall meet and dwell with him in hallowed union in that fairer land whose language is music and where joys are unceasing. Help us to live out each day in faith and in faithfulness so that at the eventide of life we also may receive the diadem of Thy praise and a glorious welcome to that kingdom which Thou hast prepared for the faithful and all who love Thee.

"May the Lord bless us and keep us; the Lord make His face to shine upon us and be gracious unto us; the Lord lift upon us the light of His countenance and give us peace." Amen.

A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE SAM RAYBURN, BY ELDER H. G. BALL

We are paying loving tribute of respect and honor to one who has been a friend to us all. Words are found inadequate, and yet they have a meaning. Flowing words of men and platitudes and pens have described some of the greatness of our good friend who has been drawn from the walks of this life; and yet, we feel in our hearts, as individuals, there is something we, ourselves, would like to say in the passing of God's child from the walks of life in this world. Death inevitably brings a depth of sorrow to the hearts of loved ones and to the extent that their lives have reached out to the multitudes of people, such as our good friend's life has. It makes us realize that not only are we sorrowful in our hearts, but that the world—most of it—is weeping with us. There are few people in the world whose lives have touched the lives of so many. There are few people who have been fortunate enough with health and training to give the compassionate loving kindness to those who were less fortunate than themselves. Such was the life of our good friend, Speaker of the House of our United States.

The poor, the lowly, and the less fortunate of life were objects of his consideration and compassion, and many a time have they felt the touch of his kindness, his kindly words, and the realization of a faithful and devoted life. Such men are not born; they are made.

So, we realize, as the apostle has told us, "Him that is great among you, let him become your servant." In the field, on the farm not far from this place, the inspiration in the life of this man began. He climbed into the realms of higher things in life until he attained the place that he loved to live and labor. He lived and served in the capacity that he served so many years. He was a servant to so many people in the world. It is not a dreadful and fearful thing to be a servant. He served those whom he loved in the cause of freedom that our hearts seek after.

I think of the expression of the Apostle Paul, "I am now all things to all men." Paul was able to meet the great of the earth or the poor, the noble or the agnostic, and he was able to bring himself in harmony with them and their life so that they might be of service to the classes of men in the world. And so, our good friend made himself a servant, not of the classes but of all the men and women and the boys and the girls and the children who have fought and loved the freedom that our great country affords us. He maintained this out of his energy. Now he can say, in the language of the Apostle Paul in his letter, "I have fought a good fight." Of the people who knew our good friend, they know he has fought a good fight. In the liberties and freedom of our country he has fought a good fight. For the friends in this community and all those he represented, he has fought a good fight. He has been a fair and loyal man. He has kept faith, not only with the people of Fannin County, but the adjoining counties. He has kept faith with the democracy of our country. I think it can be truthfully and nobly said, "He has finished his course."

I am sure that had it been the Lord's will to lengthen his life, even for another 10 years, he would have been happy to fight our battles and fight for the rights that he so nobly stood for. He was ready for his going. The time of his departure was at hand. He has met it nobly, not fearing the consequences of death nor of the hereafter. He not only met the national and community obligations, but he met it as a faithful servant of God. I think no man could have been able to have faithfully served so well without the love of God in his heart to administer and to lead to righteous conclusions.

The achievements of his life have been rehearsed by some of our hearers. Some of the great, noble things that he has done has been commemorated time and again, but it has been said that the most noble thing that he has done was to aline himself with the church and the Father that he so much loved. He accomplished many objectives and achievements, but I am sure there is no achievement or honor that has come to us in life as great as following the Lord Jesus Christ. He has been an example of faithful devotion because of his conviction in faith and in the reality of the training of his early years. In this, we realize that God's child has a bright future, which is eternal.

I am reminded in my thinking of the Lord when he led the children of Egypt. The Lord, I am sure, was the light that lighted the path, but it was the Lord Himself who darkened the way to prevent the children of Egypt from being taken into bondage. So, death brings to us a deep penitence of grief and the realization that our loved ones are separated from us for a time. It may seem that darkness is over us in that respect, but to our good friend, the sunshine of God's everlasting love has lighted his path into eternal glory where there will be no strife, nor war or destructions, but where all will be eternal peace. These are promises that the Lord has made for us, "when our earthly tabernacle is gone, we have a place in heaven." This is God's promise to his children. Though the soul has taken its last flight, the mortal soul that made him the loving man that he was, has gone back to God to bask in the everlasting sunshine until the morning of the resurrection.

In the 15th chapter of I Corinthians, He tells us that our bodies are natural, but they will be raised spiritual; that they are corruptible, but they shall be raised incorruptible. This is God's promise. The fulfilling of the promise of God by your good friend and mine has lived and died. I would like to leave with his very devoted family these words. He said: "Let not your heart be troubled. You believe in God, believe also in Me. In my Father's house are many mansions. If it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you, and if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto Myself that where I am, there ye may be also."

I would like to emphasize one thought. Jesus said: "I go to prepare a place for you." To some, we think He was talking to our friend. Suppose that when He was a boy the Lord had said: "SAM, I go to prepare a place for you, and if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come and receive you unto Myself." So, when you come to think of your loved one, try to think of the glories that the Lord has prepared for him into which we all hope, by the goodness of God, to enter.

In the abiding faith that we have in God, and in His unerring spirit, we continue to live and trust in Him.

CHAPLAIN'S SERVICE AT THE GRAVE

"I am the resurrection and the life, saith the Lord; he that believeth Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live, and whosoever liveth and believeth on Me, shall never die for we know that, if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.

"For as much as Almighty God hath taken unto himself the soul of our brother departed, we therefore commit his body to the grave, earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust, looking for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come, through our Lord, Jesus Christ.

"I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, 'Write, blessed are the dead, who die in the Lord, from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors and their works and follow them.' "

BENEDICTION BY THE CHAPLAIN

"The peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God and of His Son Jesus Christ, our Lord; and the blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, be among you and remain with you always.

"Now unto Him who is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy; to the only wise God, our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever.

"The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, be with us all." Amen.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, some months have passed since the death of Speaker SAM RAYBURN on Thursday, November 16 of last year. Yet we all continue to be affected by his passing and, of course, I shall be to the end of my days. The loss in terms of personality is, as I see it, a national calamity. For it is precisely in this decade—the decade of the sixties—that I had hoped to see the application of his experience, his wisdom, and his leadership for the good of this House and of our country and of world peace exercised in the effective manner that he was so capable of doing.

It is up to us all here to see to it that the loss—while irreparable—is not total. We must continue to think of the life of SAM RAYBURN as a fountain source at which we can, each of us, replenish our own strength for the tasks in the Nation's service that confronts us. It is to his memory, to the example he set, to the integrity he upheld with such granite determination that we should go for guidance as we move up the path of our country's future.

For me, it will be impossible to rise at the podium where he stood for so many years, to wield the gavel he held in his hand, to address this House without somehow, through the influence and the chemistry of memory, deriving a spiritual and an intellectual substance from this extraordinary American.

There is a contact that even death cannot break.

I hardly knew an hour, in the relationship of a lifetime, when my thinking and his, my sense of strategy and his, were not pulling together. There was hardly an hour that his instinctive wisdom and his philosophy of free government and his decision were not mortised with whatever contribution I was able to make. He had that unusual gift of leadership that invited the opinions of others and knew how to produce remarkable results by the generous and effective implementation of the judgment of his lieutenants and his colleagues—even sometimes of the opposition.

Sam Rayburn and I worked together as friends and as a team.

There are certain relationships among men giving rise to decisions of great moment that simply cannot be detailed because of their deeply personal qualities. There was much of this in the deportment of Sam Rayburn not only toward me, and particularly with me, but with all men. He did not talk merely as a legislator—as another legislator—or even to put it another way, as a lawyer with a client or a lawyer with another lawyer or an associate with a colleague. And, yet, there were all of these elements. For he was a legislator's legislator. But, there was also a far more effective and compelling quality which he conveyed and which transcended all the others. This was the quality of talking man to man. For me it was one of the prime secrets of his success as a leader. Wisdom was one of his greatest possessions—wisdom as the result of years of study and experience from which there developed an unerring sound judgment. How often have I seen his words of wisdom settle what to others present was a difficult and most complex question. There is an old saying, the soundness of which cannot be contradicted, and I quote, "There is no substitute for experience." This had particular application to Speaker Rayburn.

When, finally, after a wholesome and an immensely productive life he passed from us, he left behind him among his fellow legislators in this House, a simply incredible store of faith, of confidence in his word, and in his integrity. He left a legacy of admiration and friendship and affection. This is a legacy of affection and respect for which I can find no parallel anywhere in the history of this great institution of Government, the House of Representatives. Great men have stood on this spot and as Speaker administered the affairs of this House. Of them all, Speaker Sam Rayburn was without the shadow of a doubt the greatest. Moreover, I go back to the beginning, to the first Speaker, Frederick A. C. Muhlenberg, of Pennsylvania, and 1789. To say that Speaker Rayburn was the greatest of them all is in no way to diminish the stature of the distinguished Speakers who have graced this office.

The record of public service of Speaker Rayburn was a most notable one. As others have referred to his great record, I shall not do so. But for almost a full half century he exercised monumental influence over the destinies of our country.

Sam Rayburn had an intense love for the House of Representatives. During his lifetime as Speaker, more than twice as long as any other Speaker, he never permitted his great abilities, his amazing knowledge of the rules and of parliamentary law to carry him beyond the rules of the House or the dictates of the Constitution. Sam Rayburn would never in his life for as much as a single moment have violated the established practices of the House, and he always insisted that the dignity and the prerogatives of the House be maintained.

The respect for Sam Rayburn, the Democrat, leader of his party, and Sam Rayburn, the Speaker, always impartial, made an immense contribution to the history of the House of Representatives. For Sam Rayburn raised the dignity of the House, a dignity that has always been high. He drew closer in our own time to the immense awe and honor which we accord the Founding Fathers, and with the help of his colleagues he made the House of Representatives an institution that is a monument to the pride all Americans take in self-government.

Nobody can have lived as long as I have without having suffered great bereavements. This is the eternal tragedy of the human condition. Yet the death of Sam Rayburn left a void that I find overwhelmingly personal, deep, and beyond repair. I look back over the years and over history with an enormous pride in my country, in its leadership and the leadership that succeeds leadership, and in the American people. I look back over whole generations of Americans whom I have personally known through an era of world-shaking wars, revolutions, depressions, panics. No single circumstance so focused my mind and my heart on this tumultuous age in world history as the personality, the character, and the life of my friend and my mentor, Sam Rayburn.

Finally, I would like to quote a line I used in the foreword to House Document No. 247, ordered by this 87th Congress in its 1st session. The document is a compilation of tributes to Speaker Rayburn made in this Chamber. I then said:

> Congressmen see in Speaker Rayburn what they most want to see in themselves—the sublime expression of the true patriot.

Mr. Speaker, to his sisters and his brother and other loved ones left behind, Mrs. McCormack and I extend our deep sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. Speaker, the following are communications I have received from heads of legislative bodies of other countries, from Ambassadors and other diplomatic representatives of other nations, as well as resolutions passed by city councils and local governing bodies in the United States, and professional organizations such as bar associations and so forth:

December 8.

Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

In name of the Honorable Chamber of Deputies of the Argentine Republic I [sic] express sorrow at the demise of Sam Rayburn, whose passing is mourned by the democracy of America [sic].

Guillermo Gonzalez,
Secretary.

Federico F. Monjardin,
President of the Chamber of Deputies of the Argentine Nation.

Embassy of Australia,
Washington, D.C., November 21, 1961.

The Honorable John McCormack,
The Acting Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Acting Speaker: I have been requested by the Honorable John McLeay, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Australian Parliament, to convey to you and all Members of your House sincerest condolences on the death of Mr. Speaker Rayburn.

I should like to add my own deepest sympathy for the grievous loss which Congress and the Nation have suffered.

With kind regards.

Yours sincerely,

Howard Beale.

Washington, D.C.,
November 16, 1961.

The Honorable John W. McCormack,
Speaker pro tempore, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

My Dear Congressman McCormack: The president of the German Bundestag, Eugen Gersteinmaier, has asked me to transmit to you the following message of condolence upon the death of Speaker Sam Rayburn: "The German Bundestag sincerely share the sorrow about the death of the meritorious Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America, Mr. Sam Rayburn. It gratefully remembers the merits for the cause of freedom and justice in the world which the late Speaker has earned far beyond the borders of his own country.

"Gersteinmaier,
"President of the Bundestag."

Permit me, Mr. Congressman, to express at the same time my own feelings of sympathy.

Sincerely,

George Von Lilienfeld,
German Chargé d'Affaires.

Jerusalem, *November 17, 1961.*

Mr. John W. McCormack,
Acting Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of Knesset Parliament of Israel extend sincere condolences to bereaved family and to colleagues in U.S. Congress on the great loss you have sustained at the passing of Speaker Sam Rayburn.

Kadish Luz,
Speaker, Israel Knesset.

Tokyo, *November 17, 1961.*

Mr. John W. McCormack,
Speaker of the House of Representatives pro tempore, Washington, D.C.:

On the decade of Speaker of the House of Representatives Mr. Sam Rayburn I tender my profound condolence to you and through you to the members of the bereaved family.

Ichiro Kiyose,
Speaker of the House of Representatives of Japan.

The Ambassador of Spain,
Washington, D.C., November 25, 1961.
The Honorable John W. McCormack,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives, U.S. Congress.

Dear Congressman McCormack: The President and the Secretary of the Spanish Group at the Interparliamentary Union, Mr. Royo Villanova and Mr. Fraga Iribarne, have asked me to transmit to the U.S. Congress the expression of their profound sorrow at the demise of the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

In so doing, I wish to add the renewed expression of my own deeply felt regret for the passing of this great figure from the scene of your legislative branch of Government.

Please accept the assurances of my highest consideration and respect.

Yours sincerely,
Mariano de Yturralde.

Ankara, *November 17, 1961.*
The Acting Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

It is with deep sorrow that I have learned of the death of the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America. The death of this illustrious American statesman is indeed a great loss. I wish to offer friendly and allied American Nation our deep sympathy in the sad loss which they have suffered; and on behalf of the Members of the National Assembly of the Republic of Turkey and myself, I send to you and through your obliging kindness to the relatives of the late Speaker our sincere condolences.

Fuat Sirmen,
President of the National Assembly of the Turkish Republic.

House of Commons,
London, November 16, 1961.
Mr. John W. McCormack,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

May I express to you my sincere condolences on the death of Speaker Rayburn.

Harry Hylton-Foster,
Speaker of the House of Commons.

Saigon, Republic of Vietnam,
November 18, 1961.
To Hon. John W. McCormack,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: It is with deep sadness that my colleagues and I have learned of the death of Speaker Sam Rayburn. Please accept our sincere condolences and convey our deepest sympathy to Speaker Rayburn's family.

Respectfully,
Truongvinhle,
President, National Assembly.

Philadelphia City Council,
November 21, 1961.
Hon. John W. McCormack,
Acting Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman McCormack: Enclosed herewith are certified copies of Resolution No. 208, entitled "Resolution relative to the death of the Honorable Samuel Rayburn, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives," unanimously adopted by the Council of the City of Philadelphia at the meeting held on November 16, 1961.

Respectfully yours,
Nathan Wolfman,
Chief Clerk of the Council.

Resolution 208

Resolution relative to the death of the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives:

Whereas on November 16, 1961, the death of the Honorable Samuel Rayburn, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, plunged our entire Nation into mourning; and

Whereas Mr. Rayburn served in Congress for 49 years, more than twice as long as any predecessor, and for 16 years he presided as Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

Whereas during his years as Speaker, because of his devotion to the best interests of our country and his great talents in the field of legislative processes, he was responsible for having enacted many measures which have been of inestimable benefit to the Nation and its people; and

Whereas "Mr. Sam," as he was affectionately known, had the respect and admiration of all of his colleagues, regardless of political affiliation, and he was recognized as the most powerful figure in Congress in shaping the course of national legislation over many years: Therefore

Resolved by the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby join the Nation in mourning the death of the Honorable Samuel Rayburn, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, one of the most respected and devoted public servants of our time, whose passing is a great loss to our country in this crucial period of its history.

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Acting Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Members of Congress from Philadelphia.

Resolution of City of Fargo, N. Dak.

Whereas the Honorable Sam Rayburn has endeared himself to the citizens of the United States of America through his patriotic services to our Nation during his lengthy and distinguished career in the Congress of the United States, during which time he has served as Speaker of the House of Representatives twice as long as any other man in our Nation; and

Whereas the Honorable Sam Rayburn has recently been hospitalized and has been on temporary leave of absence from his duties as Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

Whereas the people of Fargo, N. Dak., regardless of political party affiliation, have a great feeling of affection, admiration, and wholesome respect for the beloved Sam Rayburn: Now, therefore, be it resolved, That the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Fargo, on behalf of the people of Fargo, does hereby wish to express deep affection, admiration, and respect for the Honorable Sam Rayburn, our beloved Speaker, and does hereby wish him a speedy recovery and an early return to his post as the Speaker of the House of Representatives where he has been performing so magnificently on behalf of the people of the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be made a part of the permanent records of the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Fargo, and that Mayor Herschel Lashkowitz, president of the board of city commissioners, be authorized and directed to transmit the herein resolution, with an appropriate covering letter, to the Honorable Sam Rayburn, the Honorable John W. McCormack, majority leader, and the Honorable Charles Halleck, minority leader, of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Herschel Lashkowitz,
Mayor and President, Board of City Commissioners, City of Fargo, N. Dak.

Whereas Sam Rayburn at the height of his career as an outstanding Democrat and world leader has answered the great call and is no longer with us; and

Whereas the South and entire Nation deeply mourn his passing; and

Whereas democratic government and especially the Democratic Party has lost a great leader; and

Whereas he was born in the neighboring State of Tennessee and was a true southerner: Therefore be it hereby

Resolved, That the Etowah County Bar Association, through this committee duly appointed by its president, Hon. Rowan Bone, deeply mourns the passing of our friend and leader Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, and extend to his family our deepest sympathy; be it further

Resolved, That we now call upon our leaders, Senators, and Congressmen, to rededicate themselves to a life of public service as our departed friend Speaker Sam Rayburn dedicated his life; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this organization, and a copy to be delivered to the newspapers, and that a copy be sent to the family of Hon. Sam Rayburn.

Done this 16th day of November 1961.

William W. Rayburn,
Chairman, Resolution Committee.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, any effort on my part to further enhance the distinction enjoyed by our late beloved Speaker Sam Rayburn of Texas as a giant among other historic champions of our constitutional government would be a poor addition to the testimony we who knew him so well have offered through the years.

Many men are eulogized only after they have left this earth; Sam Rayburn, by our sincere words of praise in his presence, was one of those fortunate mortals who knew beyond all doubt of the deep affection and genuine respect of his friends and colleagues.

Every man leaves a heritage.

The heritage of Sam Rayburn is a manual of qualities for any Member of this House aspiring to a position of useful leadership.

In that manual are many lessons.

There are the lessons of integrity, of fairness and justice, of courage and tenacity of purposes.

There are lessons that can be taught only by one with a deep understanding of the science of government as we practice it.

There is the lesson of the necessity to find common legislative denominators—the lesson of compromise without desertion of principle—so essential to the successful operation of the Congress under a two-party system.

And there is the lesson of realism; of recognizing facts and circumstances and learning that life is a mixture of successes and failures.

I spoke of our respect and affection.

Why did we respect Sam Rayburn?

We respected him because we knew him as a man of his word who asked only that others accord him the same assurance of good faith.

We respected him for the dignity with which he conducted himself and for his intense dedication to his responsibilities to both sides of the political aisle as Speaker.

We respected him for the deep pride he took in the traditions of the House of

Representatives and we stood with him in his zealous guardianship of House prerogatives.

And what was the basis for the deep affection we all felt for this grand American?

His stern demeanor certainly was no veneer to hide a shy and timid nature.

But neither was his rugged manner the mark of antipathy toward his fellow man.

The SAM RAYBURN I knew for so many years was inherently a gentleman with a genuine fondness for people he could respect.

And I can attest that he had a healthy sense of humor, that balance wheel no one who would lead can long be without.

Finally, our affection for SAM RAYBURN was borne of a feeling that this great House of Representatives, of which we are all a part, was his very life, and as he was devoted to us, we were devoted to him.

SAM RAYBURN is assured an eminent position in the history of our Republic.

And he is assured an eminent place in the hearts and memories of all of us who were so privileged to serve here with him.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the Honorable CARL ALBERT of Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following my remarks I may insert a tribute by a distinguished former Member of the House and former majority leader of the Senate, Scott Lucas, of Illinois.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it was most appropriate that the distinguished dean of the Texas delegation should have yielded first to our beloved Speaker, then to the distinguished leader of the Republican Party in this House, because if ever there was an issue on which there was bipartisan agreement it was the matter of the affection and love and admiration and respect which each Member of this Chamber had for our late beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN.

I feel humble in following these distinguished men who worked with Speaker RAYBURN for so many years so closely. With them I extend my own condolences to his family—his brother, his two sisters, his many nieces and nephews and collateral relatives. To the people of his district we all extend our thanks for the quality of representation which they have furnished this House for so many years.

With the entire Nation we mourn the passing of one of the great legislative geniuses of all time. Volumes have been written praising "Mr. Speaker," the great leader of this House, "Mr. Democrat," the man who symbolized the principles of his party. "Mr. SAM," a great and good man.

But no biographer could ever have known SAM RAYBURN, the legislator, as we, his colleagues, knew him.

His long and active life spanned a period of dynamic history during which some of our Nation's most critical decisions were made.

Few men have lived to see their judgment vindicated on so many important questions. Still fewer have received the accolades of a grateful people with such humility and grace.

SAM RAYBURN attained the pinnacle by fulfilling his own highest desire.

He always said, "The greatest ambition a man can have is to be known as a just man," and he was that.

We are all familiar with the background of our own beloved SAM RAYBURN.

He was born to the land and never lost his love and respect for the soil.

As a youngster, he knew hard times and never forgot the problems—and the joys—of farm life.

He believed a man needed a goal in life, that it should be determined early, and that everything should point toward its achievement.

His personal heroes, Robert E. Lee and Joseph Weldon Bailey, a local congressman who later became a U.S. Senator, personified his purpose.

Young SAM was only 13 when he set his sights on being Speaker of the House of Representatives and chose to follow his heroes in a career of public service.

To the everlasting credit of the people of Texas' Fourth Congressional District, they chose him as their representative in 1912 and returned him to this Congress for 25 consecutive terms.

It did not take Washington any longer to recognize this young man of ability than it did Texas.

Within a few short years, he gained respect as an able legislator.

During the early days of the New Deal, he served as the architect of many of the Roosevelt administration's programs: the Railroad Holding Company Act, the Truth in Securities Act, the Securities and Exchange Act, the Utility Holding Company Act, the Rural Electrification Act, and the Federal Communications Act.

These measures stand today as monuments to a great legislative builder.

He grew in wisdom and judgment under the tutelage of the notable Nicholas Longworth and fellow-Texan John Nance Garner.

In 1940, he realized his boyhood dream as he ascended the Speaker's chair.

This is the well-known record of Mr. Speaker, the leader of the House of Representatives and Mr. Democrat, the symbol of his party.

But it does not tell the story of Mr. SAM, the man.

That story is etched in the hearts of all who knew him.

SAM RAYBURN was like a father to me and to all of us who have grown up in the "Rayburn School of Political Science."

I doubt there is a Member of this House, on either side of the aisle, who did not at some time benefit from his kindness.

He loved people and, most important, he believed in them and their inherent goodness and wisdom.

He loved the House of Representatives and respected every Member as a representative of the people.

He viewed election to public office as the highest honor conceivable and a sacred trust.

He was a model of the principles he espoused.

In my close association with him as part of the leadership, I never saw him ask a man to compromise his principles.

Many times, I saw him offer advice and assistance, politically and personally, with the understanding and compassion born of greatness.

The death of Mr. RAYBURN came as a tremendous personal loss to me, as it did to most Members of this House.

In my own case, I had the honor of meeting and knowing Mr. RAYBURN before I ever sought a seat in this body.

His district and mine face each other across the Red River. His home was less than 10 miles from the district which I represent. He represented a land where my people have lived for generations. My maternal grandfather was born in the city of Sherman in his congressional district in 1858. Hundreds of his former constituents are now constituents of mine. He had close personal friends all over my congressional district.

We, the people of Oklahoma, loved him as he was loved in his own great State and district.

He was widely referred to in my State as the Congressman at Large from Oklahoma, a fact to which he himself often personally alluded.

He was our friend; he was my friend. We shall long miss him.

I cannot but believe Mr. RAYBURN would be touched by the sadness of the colleagues he loved on this occasion.

But I believe he would ask that we temper our sorrow with the admonition that we look to the future, that we move ahead with the progressive spirit that characterized his long and brilliant service here.

It is with heavy hearts that we bid farewell to Mr. SAM.

We will no longer have him physically with us, counseling, advising, cajoling, leading. But spiritually SAM RAYBURN always will be with us and with every future Member of the House.

His spirit lingers, his influence pervades, his goodness encompasses this House as surely as justice, integrity, and duty are its cornerstones.

SAM RAYBURN symbolized these qualities and his memory will live as long as they remain the hallmark of America. With God's help, that will be forever.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include a tribute paid to the memory of our late friend, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, by the Honorable Scott W. Lucas, former Member of the House of Representatives, and former Member and majority leader of the U.S. Senate.

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF THE LATE SAM RAYBURN BY SCOTT W. LUCAS, FORMER U.S. SENATOR

Melancholy winds of freedom deftly touched the keys of sorrow as the people of this beloved Republic laid a wreath of tears over the bier of the late, lamented SAM RAYBURN.

One of the brighest lights in the political life of this Nation has shuffled off this mortal coil.

The name of SAM RAYBURN is one of the most illustrious in the annals of American history.

Throughout his long and distinguished career as a loyal and patriotic public servant he never faltered in his devotion to duty.

He never betrayed a righteous cause, nor a friend.

His keen judgment and inflexible integrity in national and international affairs stand forth like the solid rocks that guard the aged seashores.

His concept of what was good and what was evil was based upon the eternal principles of elemental justice.

He earned a lasting reputation for fairness and tolerance, and his heaven-born personality kept his friendship with people of all political faiths in constant repair.

To every Member of the Congress, Mr. SAM was known as a warmhearted Speaker who for 16 years wielded a friendly but firm gavel in upholding and defending the true symbols of democracy. No small portion of his unparalleled success lay in his unaffected simplicity.

Through my 25 years' acquaintance with Mr. Democrat I was privileged to observe these noble traits of character. I reached the apex of admiration for them when for 2 years I listened to his same advice and wise counsel in the Monday morning meetings at the White House while the Honorable Harry S. Truman was President. It was there that the Speaker, the House majority leader, Mr. MCCORMACK, the late Vice President, Mr. Barkley, and myself, as majority leader of the Senate, eventually reached a program of progress upon legislative problems.

Ah, yes. If one could weave and fashion the matchless and inspiring words of the great poets into a garland of eulogies it would add but little to the silent gratitude and speechless reverence already given him by a grateful Nation.

Today this great and good American rests in deep and dreamless sleep, careless of the whispering winds and the moaning pines. His earthly career is ended, and his mortal remains are securely blanketed through the years of eternity in Texas soil, the soil he loved and cherished.

So, to Mr. SAM I say:

Farewell. Recline in peace in this new and great adventure.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this session of Congress begins in an atmosphere of profound sadness. For the first time in many years, a familiar and beloved face fails to look down upon us from the Speaker's rostrum. For the first time in 48 years, we do not have mingling with us a man whom we all admired, loved, and respected.

With the passing of our beloved Speaker RAYBURN, one of the greatest Americans of this era, or any other era, departed this earthly life for another world, where we are sure he will find the happiness and contentment which should come to one who has lived a good and fruitful life.

SAM RAYBURN's career was dedicated to the service of his country. Although a stalwart Democrat, who strove mightily to advance the interests of his party, his constant and his principal concern was the welfare and progress of his country. Above party loyalty was his love of country. The interests of America were uppermost in his mind and heart, and in these days when there is so much selfishness in the world, it is refreshing to recall the good works of one who lived solely to make America a better land to live in.

One could consume hours in reciting the vast contributions Speaker RAYBURN made to the march of progress of America. While time is not available for such a narrative, it is, indeed, unnecessary because his great works are familiar to all.

He lived a good life and it can truly be said he left "footprints on the sands of time."

We shall all miss his warm friendship, his desire to help his colleagues whenever he could, and his delightful comradeship.

In a personal sense, his death was a tremendous loss to me. It ended a close friendship of 37 years, a friendship that became stronger and firmer with each passing day. This friendship was never marred in the least by conflicting views which sometimes arose over issues of the day. If we disagreed, we were never disagreeable to each other.

As life goes on and we grow older, we develop a keener sense of friends whom we trust and love. SAM RAYBURN was such a friend.

The State of Texas and all America have lost a great and devoted statesman. His name will shine through history as one of the great men our country has produced. The world is better for his having lived.

My deepest sympathy goes to his fine family.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, who succeeds our late Speaker as dean of the House of Representatives, the Honorable CARL VINSON.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, when the free world suffers a grievous loss; when our Nation loses an irreplaceable patriot; and when the Congress loses one of the stalwart pillars of its very foundation, it is difficult to find words that can adequately explain the tragedy that has occurred.

And in addition to the loss that mankind and the Congress has experienced in SAM RAYBURN's death, I have suffered a heartfelt personal loss.

SAM RAYBURN and I came to the House of Representatives in the same Congress—he in 1913, at the beginning of the 63d Congress, and I in 1914 toward the end of the 63d Congress.

For 47 years I observed SAM RAYBURN's stature grow in the eyes of the Congress, in the hearts of the American people, and in the opinion of the free world.

My affection for him grew with each year of our association. My respect and admiration for him was, and remains, unlimited. My life has been enriched by a friendship that lasted almost half a century.

His integrity, his fairness, and his wisdom were the personal characteristics that made him great; but beyond that, he had an understanding of people, an amazing knowledge of the legislative system, and the satisfaction of knowing that he played a vital role in the incomparable heights which America attained during his lifetime.

In his veins flowed the blood of patriots and the unfailing confidence of the pioneers who developed this Nation to heights unparalleled in the growth of civilization.

This heritage and these virtues, these personal attributes, this knowledge, all combined together to produce an American who was molded in the same clay that produced Andrew Jackson and Robert E. Lee.

His life was dedicated to America. He devoted every moment of his waking hours to espousing the causes which have made our Nation the unchallenged leader of the free world.

He was not afraid of progress, instead he advanced it; he was not afraid to venture into new fields simply because they had never been tried before, instead he approached each new cause with an amazing intuition for separating the practical from the idealistic.

He had boundless energy, and the courage of his convictions.

When the history of the 20th century is finally written, Sam Rayburn will take his place high on the list of the few very great men of this century.

Whenever American heroes and the true giants of America are discussed in the years to come, SAM RAYBURN will be among those who will never be forgotten.

We have all suffered a heavy loss, but I know that if he were here today, he would urge us, with all of his might, to maintain the traditions of those early American patriots whom he emulated in thought and action.

America can be very grateful that he lived on this earth. The amazing story of his life and his contributions to the might of America, will become indelible in the minds of persons yet unborn.

SAM RAYBURN raised the dignity of the Congress; added great respect to the office of the Speaker; and left behind him a legacy to be nurtured and cherished by all who are privileged to follow him in the vital role of Speaker of the House of Representatives.

He has become a part of our American heritage.

His life, and his achievements will be emulated—but they will never be surpassed.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time in almost half a century that the Congress of the United States foregathers without the presence of SAM RAYBURN.

And it is the first time in a quarter of a century that the House of Representatives convenes in a new session without our beloved late Speaker in some role of leadership in either the Democratic Party delegation or the House itself.

Among all of the 43 Speakers who preceded him in that exalted position—back to the first session of the first Congress in 1789—none served with greater distinction.

SAM RAYBURN fulfilled completely the pledge he made when first elected Speaker on September 16, 1940, to uphold "the prerogatives and powers of the House of Representatives."

He restored this body to its proper eminence and position in the structure of Government established under our Constitution by the Founding Fathers.

He elevated the speakership to a new high level of prestige and public respect.

The simple dignity of the man, his granite integrity, the restraint with which he exercised his vast power, the kindness and consideration for all with whom he came in contact—from the most distinguished personages to the humblest employee of this House—won for him a place in the hearts of all Americans. In his own lifetime he became a legend and a symbol, beloved as Mr. Democrat and Mr. Congress.

In the 173 years' history of this body no other man served longer as a Member or longer in the speakership than SAM RAYBURN. However, his greatness does not rest alone upon that record tenure of 49 years in the House and 17 years as Speaker, but, rather upon the caliber of his leadership.

Over the years the character of that leadership and the philosophy upon which it was based became clear to those of us who were fortunate enough to have had the opportunity of working closely with him.

To Mr. RAYBURN the U.S. House of Representatives epitomized the American way of political life—a free forum, operating under a body of traditional rules and precedents, for the expression of the will of a free people. One of the few such parliamentary bodies remaining upon this earth—and he preserved it.

What was the secret of SAM RAYBURN's success in his masterful operation of the House? How, even in the face of normal human and political obstacles to the enactment of legislation, not to mention his other multiple duties, did he consistently manage to bring about the enactment of major legislation, much of it controversial?

He was able to do it, first, because his colleagues trusted him. He earned that faith by honoring his promises. There was nothing of higher value than Mr. SAM's word.

Second, he respected every Member's right to his own convictions, regardless of party. He might question a man's judgment on an issue. He might try to persuade him to his own point of view, or seek his vote in a matter that did not adversely affect the Member in his own district, but he never pressured or "drove" people, or pushed them in order to try to get his own way.

When a Member whose vote he sought could not conscientiously go along, SAM RAYBURN did not alienate him by overinsistence. He accepted him at his word. This understanding of another man's position was appreciated and always sooner or later was reciprocated in good will that paid off in the form of support on another critical occasion.

A third factor in the Speaker's success was the helping hand and advice which he gave to new Members. They appreciated it and over the years this interest and assistance in their problems—this bread upon the waters, if you please—was returned in manifold degree.

Fourth, and finally, Speaker RAYBURN was a plain, unadorned, and unhyphenated Democrat, with a big capital "D." He defied any label of conservative, liberal, moderate, or middle-of-the-road. He was above the clamor of divisive cliques, blocs, factions or coalitions. He put his country first, his party second. He judged legislation on whether it was good for the country. He followed the simple belief that if a Democratic Congress gave the people good and beneficial legislation they would return a Democratic majority. This proved true.

And he did not think that compromise was necessarily an ugly word. He tried to persuade all whom he could of the rightness of his stand. But—he never sacrificed the principle.

His view of the problems and ills of the world and of this Nation was summed up in the phrase he often used:

> A little applied Christianity would help.

And so he felt to the very end.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our late beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, of blessed memory.

SAM RAYBURN came to the Congress in 1913, the same year that Woodrow Wilson became President of the United States and we had our first billion dollar budget.

From 1913 to 1921, SAM RAYBURN saw and helped America grow into a great world power. He was destined then to become one of the great leaders of our country.

When President Franklin D. Roosevelt came to the Presidency in the depth of the great depression, SAM RAYBURN, as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, was a tower of strength to him. SAM RAYBURN loved the House of Representatives and was devoted to duty. He was responsible for putting many acts on the statute books that brought security and confidence to the American people.

Yes, SAM RAYBURN was Speaker of the House longer than any other man before him, but he was never too busy to stop for a kind word, he was always available to lend his sound advice, words of wisdom, and counsel to both new and old Members of the House.

SAM RAYBURN was one of the greatest public figures this world has ever known. He has left a fine heritage to the American people and to the Members of Congress now serving and those who will follow in the years to come. I shall always be grateful for the many years of my life that I was privileged to spend under his leadership and guidance.

It is my fervent prayer that from his peaceful heavenly abode, SAM RAYBURN will smile down upon the Members of the House, and that he will continue to lend his guiding hand as we carry on our duties. The world is fuller and richer for the life of SAM RAYBURN, his devotion to God and man. I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his loved ones in these saddened days.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority whip of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it was less than a year ago, on June 12, 1961, that many of us took the well of the House to support a resolution introduced by the then distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], now the Speaker, honoring the occasion of Speaker RAYBURN's having served at that time twice as long as Speaker of the House of Representatives as any man who had preceded him in that office. I took the liberty at that time of checking some of the records of some legislators and I discovered then, and I repeat now, that Speaker RAYBURN had not only served twice as long as any other man in the high office of Speaker, but few men in the history of mankind have exceeded his service in any legislative body. He ranks in time of service with men like Balfour, Churchill, and Gladstone.

On that occasion those of us who loved him—and I think that included every Member of this body—while he was still alive—sought to take a look at him in the flesh. Now that I have thought some more about it I, too, would like to add just a few more sentences about what made this extraordinary American leader what he was. We have heard these beautiful tributes paid by the leaders of this House. There are few new words that can be used, because these words are the ones which define the man.

My colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], talked about character; and he did have character, and he had rugged honesty—he despised the phony.

No one ever thought of questioning his word. When a Member said, "The Speaker said this," nobody even thought it might be otherwise.

The distinguished majority leader referred to his judgment and he quoted a phrase Mr. RAYBURN so often used himself: "That if a man has the finest education in the world but lacks judgment he cannot be a leader."

Mr. RAYBURN had magnificent judgment. Some time ago I read an analysis, and I thought it was a rather keen analysis, of the functions of leadership in the House. Some people seem to think that the great function of the Speaker, the majority and minority leaders, and others in leadership, is simply to echo one opinion; namely, that of the administration that may be in power. Those of us who have served here know that is not so.

The function of leadership is much more important and much more complex because it is to translate the mood of the House which we know reflects the mood of the Nation. Speaker RAYBURN had almost a second sense about this. He could translate to the many Presidents with whom he served as Speaker, as majority leader, as a distinguished committee chairman and as a Member of our body, the sentiment of our body, and in doing so he conveyed to these Presidents the sentiment of our Nation and contributed immensely and immeasurably to the strength and the freedom of America.

There are so many instances that come to my mind about the judgment of this man. One I recall vividly which will live with me as long as I live. I was in Los Angeles when the present President, Mr. Kennedy, was nominated by the Democratic Party. On the next morning he offered the Vice Presidential nomination on his ticket to the distinguished majority leader of the other body, the present Vice President, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In typical manner the now Vice President said to the now President, "The man whom I must consult is the man with whom I have been closest throughout my life, the Speaker of the House of Representatives." By a gratuitous event it became my lot to talk to the Speaker, stressing my belief that this was in the interest of the United States of America. As always his good judgment prevailed. He clearly saw the wisdom of the course, and it was upon the use of that judgment that Mr. JOHNSON became the vice-presidential candidate and ultimately the Vice President of the United States.

He had many other qualities, Mr. Speaker. As the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] said a moment ago, he had compassion and understanding. Men may have many qualities but if they lack compassion they may as well have none. Of course, to separate compassion from understanding is an impossibility. Mr. RAYBURN had both. He never pressed a Member beyond the point of no return. He understood the position of a Member regardless of how difficult it would make his own life, and in return therefor he earned the undying friendship, the love and affection of the Members of this body, regardless of how much they may have disagreed with him on specific issues. He had incomparable knowledge, but with it great humility.

The majority leader referred to his association with the Speaker's district. I happened to have been present with the new majority leader in Sherman, Tex., on a day late in December 1959. There the citizens of Mr. RAYBURN'S home district gave him a testimonial luncheon. It was quite obvious that though he had associated for many years with Presidents, monarchs, heads of states, Cabinet members, and had been the third ranking member in the Government of the United States, he had never lost touch with the ordinary man. The love and devotion which was demonstrated on that occasion is something I shall remember always.

This was illustrated in so many ways. You have heard a recitation of great acts in which he was interested, the SEC, the Railroad Holding Act, and countless others. But despite all that, he never lost interest in rural roads, in the REA, in the farm programs, and the things which most intimately touched Bonham, Tex., and the area nearby. Yet this man had not one iota of provincialism about him. He was the most unparochial man I ever knew. He thought about the United States as one great, vast Nation.

Sectionalism was something completely foreign to his nature. I remember when we passed the resolution here commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Civil War, or the War Between the States, and someone wanted to reenact that bloody struggle to create publicity. He almost winced when he said, "Lord, can't we forget this mistake into which we were led 100 years ago rather than rekindle and revive the sectionalism and the hatreds which went with it?"

He understood the speakership. You know, the word "Speaker" is an interesting word. It comes from the ancient parliamentary practices and early parliamentary system of Great Britain. The Speaker was a man who was selected by his peers in the Commons to appear before the King and his Ministers, and there present the views of the Members of the Commons, so that the Speaker was literally the representative speaker, the man who spoke for the representatives of the people. There was never a man who more eloquently or more perfectly met this definition. Mr. RAYBURN knew how to articulate representative government. He was the very essence of the institution. He said many times that "The House of Representatives has been my life, my love, my romance" and he meant it and he lived it. Because of him and because of this understanding and because of this dedication, we are a greater Nation.

Finally, he had faith. He had faith in himself and in his colleagues. He did not overemphasize his ability, but he well understood his talents and his ability. He used to say that people will never lose confidence in you except for what you yourself do. He had faith in his country. He served during two great World Wars. He lived to bridge the time from the horse and buggy to the jet planes and the intercontinental missiles, and yet in an interview which appeared in a national magazine printed just a day or two before it was announced that he was suffering from incurable cancer, he reiterated this faith in the future of the United States and pointed out that we enjoy today more freedom, we have greater prosperity, greater abundance, than at any time in the recorded history of mankind and in all the history of all the peoples of mankind.

This faith was notable in his confidence in young people. How many of you had the experience of taking a group of school children into his office here, watching him as he took time from a busy schedule to talk to them and to quietly enkindle in them love of country, love of our institutions.

So this, my colleagues, was a great and a good man. I personally have suffered a tremendous loss. I think the last trip that he took was one arranged by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER]. I had the great honor of being on that trip. He went to his native county, Roane County, Tenn., where a dam was dedicated and named for him. I remember sitting in a little boat fishing on a beautiful lake in the Tennessee Valley country, and he reminisced there about his boyhood and his early days, and he used again that expression that so many of you have heard so many times when he said his father told him, as he left to enter a small college in Texas, "Son, be a man."

This was a man, a man whom we shall miss, but whose imprint upon this country will be one for good and strength long after all of us have left this earth.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, when any of us loses an old and dear and trusted friend, it is natural to use the strongest and most superlative words we can think of to describe that beloved friend. Our personal associations and attachments cause us to speak of him in the highest terms.

But today we are paying tribute to one for whom no superlative is adequate, or an exaggeration.

We cannot but think at first of our own sadness at being deprived of his living presence. Last year I had the acute pain, as a physician, of watching his strong physique week by week go downhill. Until he finally had to return to his Texas, he pretended that it was not serious. But any doctor knew that a man who is 79 years old and has never been sick, and then begins to melt away before your eyes, is mortally afflicted.

But actually we should turn from our sadness at our own loss to concentrate, rather, on the extraordinary good fortune—and give thanks for it—which we in this House have had in being privileged to know and work under and with a man of the greatness of SAM RAYBURN, a man whose bigness, if I were to use one word for it, in every situation equaled surpassed that of anyone we have known.

Mr. Speaker, I have sat here on the minority side for 15 years with Speaker RAYBURN in the chair, and right beyond him in our line of vision is the portrait of George Washington. I have often thought of the complete uniqueness of each of these men in his own strong way. I do not know any American since George Washington who has made a greater impact and left a deeper imprint on the development of this Republic than Speaker SAM RAYBURN.

Those men at the Constitutional Convention wrote:

> We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union.

It was the work of Washington to guide the formation of the Union and the work of Lincoln to preserve it, but no man has wielded greater influence on the steady growth, strengthening and development of that Union—striving ever to make it more perfect than has Speaker RAYBURN.

Mr. Speaker, as a man he was one whom we admired beyond our capacity to describe.

As a friend, all of us—we on the Republican side, quite as much as you on the Democratic side—were aware of his human qualities, his genuineness, his kindliness, his interest in us, his faithfulness to friend on every occasion.

I want to add—and perhaps I can say this more appropriately than you of his own party—that I greatly admired and appreciated his partisanship, if you wish. He was a proud party man, a superb politician—this word which has been so often loosely used as if it represented something unworthy but which, properly understood, represents so utterly essential a quality of leadership if a Republic of this sort is to be maintained and to grow into an ever more perfect Union. He loved his party, and he operated openly as a partisan—for that is the way effective men in government get things done. I watched with admiration the way he worked with his party, persuading, organizing, jockeying, maneuvering—to get his party to take the position that he felt was right.

But, while I admired his skill as a party man—and only wished we had him on our side—I admired still more the transformation that took place when he walked from the Democratic side of the House, or the desk of Democratic leadership over there, up into the Speaker's chair. He never was a Democrat there; he was Speaker of the whole House of Representatives. He had a genuine reverence for this body. He guarded so jealously and zealously its integrity and its institutions and its traditions, which he properly saw, not as something sentimental, but as something vital, if this stalwart bulwark of a man's freedom is to be preserved and grow stronger.

Mr. Speaker, never once in the years I have sat under him—and everyone here will testify to this as being true through all his years in that exalted office—never once as Speaker did he shade a decision or cut off a Member or take advantage of an interruption or a misunderstanding to gavel through a measure without utmost judiciousness, even though that measure was very dear to his heart and he had worked long and hard to develop support for it.

Never once did he use his position in the Chair as Speaker to achieve that which it was his proper desire and duty to seek to accomplish as leader of his party.

Surely as someone has already said, here was a giant whose equal we shall not soon see again. Indeed, we shall never see his equal again. Fortunate is the country that has one such man in a century. All I want to do now is to express my deep personal appreciation for the extraordinary privilege of having had the opportunity to sit here in this Chamber and to get to know and to be counted a friend of the gentleman from Texas, our departed Speaker.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Hon. GEORGE MAHON.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to realize that Speaker RAYBURN is no longer among us. He had been so permanent—so enduring—so indestructible through the years. But, actually, the image of the late Speaker and his influence do remain with us today. This is good. We need his wholesome and sturdy spirit among us in these continuing days.

The Speaker loved the House of Representatives as an institution, and he loved the Members of the House as individuals. One of the proud recollections which I shall always treasure is the memory of his warm friendship through long years of service here.

We can best, Mr. Speaker, memoralize Speaker RAYBURN by carrying on in the House of Representatives the high standards of public service which he, himself, set.

Let us today solemnly resolve in our public duty to do honor and credit to the House which the late Speaker RAYBURN loved, and let us resolve as legislators to measure up to the highest possible traditions and standards of public service.

This would be the wish, in my opinion, of the late beloved Speaker RAYBURN whom we humbly seek to honor this day.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statements of the other members of the Texas delegation follow immediately after the address of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT]. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate the opportunity to pay tribute to our warm friend, the late SAM RAYBURN. Following the example that Mr. RAYBURN set for us all, my remarks shall be brief.

One of the reasons our country has survived as the oldest continuing democracy in history is that our people have been able to raise up great leaders to help guide our destiny. SAM RAYBURN, from Bonham, was one of those leaders.

Historians tell us that it is too early to judge the impact of SAM RAYBURN'S life on America, but when the chapters are finally written I believe history will not find 10 men whose contributions to our country rank with SAM RAYBURN'S.

Each citizen of the free world owes much to SAM RAYBURN and those of us who served in Congress under his leadership know that his contributions have not ended with his death. His perceptive interest concerning others has left us with outstanding leadership which ably will continue to serve in the highest traditions of the Congress. And his abiding love for young people has left them a heritage rich in compassion and understanding.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I would like to insert a letter I have received from a former colleague in the House of Representatives and now chief judge of the U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, the Honorable Eugene Worley. Judge Worley includes with his letter a copy of a theme his son, Sam Rayburn Worley, wrote during Mr. RAYBURN'S illness entitled: "My Friend, the Speaker."

Because Judge Worley's letter and the theme are deeply moving tributes to our late friend, under unanimous consent, I include them in the RECORD at this point:

U.S. COURT OF CUSTOMS AND
PATENT APPEALS,
Washington, January 17, 1962.

Hon. JACK BROOKS,
Chairman, Texas Delegation, House of Representatives, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JACK: As a friend and former colleague of the late SAM RAYBURN, I would like to join in the tributes to his memory.

Many years ago he lent me a book of which he never tired called "Eben Holden." The enclosed excerpt, which he knew by heart and kept framed on his desk at home, sums up the philosophy he lived by about as well as anything could.

His interest in and affection for the younger generation was deep and genuine. He was never too pressed but what he could find time for the "young 'uns" as he called them. That his affection was returned manifold is reflected in a school paper our youngster, Sam Rayburn Worley, wrote during the Speaker's last illness.

At the risk of appearing immodest, I am enclosing the paper, errors and all, primarily to reflect the strong bond between two widely separated generations, but also because it would be mighty hard for me to better describe my own feelings for one who was so genuinely loved, admired, and respected for so long by so many.

Sincerely,

EUGENE WORLEY.

EBEN HOLDEN

"I ain't afraid.
'Shamed o' nuthin' I ever done.
Alwuss kep' my tugs tight,
Never swore 'less 'twas nèc'sary,
Never ketched a fish bigger'n 'twas
Er lied 'n a hoss trade
Er shed a tear I did n't hev to.
Never cheated anybody but Eben Holden.
Goin' off somewheres, Bill—dunno the way
nuther—
Dunno 'f it's east er west er north er south,
Er road er trail;
But I ain't afraid."

MY FRIEND, THE SPEAKER

Mr. SAM RAYBURN is the type of person who makes you feel glad you're alive whenever you are around him. He has the ability of making you feel good all over, no matter what the trouble is.

Since he has known my parents for a long time, I have gotten to know him as a friend. He never uses the big words most politicians use, and most any person can understand him, no matter what their ages are. Most of the time, whenever Mr. RAYBURN came over, he would always bring me some gum or candy mints. He has great faith in the "younger generation," and he has never said a harsh or unkind word about them.

Mr. RAYBURN is a very smart person. He knows a great deal about the Government and history of the United States. But no matter how smart he is, he never makes you feel dumb whenever talking to him. He also makes you feel proud of your country.

He holds a very important and powerful job in our Government. But no matter how important or powerful, he is always interested in a football or baseball game or a boxing match. He's not only been to be with, but kind and generous too.

He gave me a cow once and kept it on his ranch in Texas. When it had a calf he sold it and gave me the money. Through such business transactions, he is responsible for about one-fourth of the money I now have.

Mr. RAYBURN is now very ill, and some people say he won't recover. But as far as I'm concerned he will never die. He will live forever in the hearts of millions across the world, especially mine.

SAM RAYBURN WORLEY.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the mere idea of attempting to say anything which will add to the luster of SAM RAYBURN'S name is, of course, ridiculous on its face. As Abraham Lincoln so well said, "We cannot consecrate; the world will little note or long remember what we say here," but it will never forget what SAM RAYBURN did here in this House of Representatives.

Probably all that we can do this afternoon is to attest our confidence in, and our admiration for, our great and universally revered Speaker.

Although the chilling hand of death—this time in my immediate family—requires that I be in Texas rather than in Washington at the time of delivery of memorials to our great Speaker, I have asked my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] to include my heartfelt tribute to the greatest of modern political leaders, the friend of every Member of this House and leader of forward-looking legislation for more than two generations, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN.

Mr. RAYBURN was a politician in the best sense of the word; he was a statesman, probably the greatest of his day and generation; and above all, he was an outstanding American and a man, respected by all his fellows.

I am proud that I was able to call him my friend for more than 25 years.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, it seems almost presumptuous for me to attempt to say anything about our great and beloved former Speaker, SAM RAYBURN. Both in life and in death, sentiments from thousands have been expressed in eloquence and in simplicity.

Some men and women in the history of our country must have been deceased for a considerable period of time before their greatness was realized and before their contribution to our Nation was recognized. Such is not the case of SAM RAYBURN. For a long period he had his place in the sun. Those of us who had opportunity to observe his day to day actions in the affairs of our country, were aware of history being molded under his able and efficient leadership.

One of the most significant characteristics of Speaker RAYBURN was the fact, and I believe it to be indisputable, that he knew how to exercise authority. He had a great influence in the affairs of our Government. His influence did not altogether emanate from the authority of his position as Speaker of the House of Representatives. It flowed to him by virtue of his ability and his wisdom to exercise that influence and authority. He used it carefully, considerately and yes, even sparingly. He guarded it wisely and judiciously because he knew the power it could wield and because I know he felt that authority and influence without the highest degree of responsibility was a dangerous thing.

This was the great source and the great inspiration of his influence. This was the springwell for the tremendous respect and esteem that those of us who served here with him held for Speaker RAYBURN.

Under our system of government no man is or should be, indispensable. We have able and dedicated leaders but SAM RAYBURN's passing off the scene, leaves a place which can never be filled exactly. His passing was the passing of an era. His passing was a loss to our Nation and to the world. His passing is the loss of a friend of all of us.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, no mortal words which I might say here can add to the illustrious memory of the great and beloved SAM RAYBURN.

The first time I ever saw Mr. RAYBURN was in September 1948; the last time I saw him was in the hospital in October of last year. During that period I was afforded the privilege of what I like to believe was a close friendship which occurs only a few times in a man's life. His was more than a fatherly interest in me. As you know, he sought the association of younger men. And somehow, while I respected him as a great man with more maturity, more wisdom, and more experience than others, I just never thought of him as being old.

Mr. RAYBURN loved children, too. And I know from the reaction of our children, that young people returned that affection. Mrs. Thornberry, our three children, and I have been enriched by his friendship and his interest in us.

Mr. Speaker, when the news of Mr. RAYBURN's passing was announced, there came a solemn and sober moment in the lives, not only of those of us who knew him and loved him, but in the lives of countless people throughout this Nation and the world who never knew him personally. While we were staggered by an overwhelming sense of loss, a new sense of values took charge of our minds and heart.

Mr. RAYBURN has rightly been called a magnificent parliamentarian, unexcelled and unequaled. He was recognized as a leader of his political associates. Now in retrospect we remember the many times in this Nation's history he rose above the political and partisan differences of the moment to fight with courage for the security of our country and the enduring freedom of men, women, and children everywhere. Some of the greatest periods in our history have unfolded here under his leadership.

Mr. RAYBURN walked with kings and notables in high places during his lifetime—and yet never lost the common touch.

He talked with crowds and never lost the simple dignity which earned for him the affection, admiration, and devotion of all who ever knew him.

And now he is gone to that great place where, as we have been taught since childhood, he takes his immortal place among the great spirits who have earned their heavenly reward.

I could not conclude without a tribute to his great loyalty and devotion to his family. He never forgot his father and mother—what they had done for him. He loved his brothers and sisters. He talked of them often. To his sisters, Mrs. Thomas and Mrs. Bartley; his brother, Mr. Dick Rayburn; his nephews and nieces, Mrs. Thornberry and I extend our sympathy with the knowledge that they have received and are receiving comfort and understanding because of the noble life he lived among them and among all of mankind on this earth.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when Mr. SAM RAYBURN passed away, America and the world lost one of the greatest human beings that ever lived. He was one of the most honest, honorable, and patriotic men I ever hope or expect to know. I had the privilege of enjoying a rather close association with him, and his presence will always be missed in this Chamber.

It was often said of Mr. RAYBURN, that he was a friend of Presidents, having served in the House of Representatives longer than any other individual, and having served as Speaker longer than any individual. But more than that, he was a friend of the people. Above anything in the world, he often expressed his personal desires of seeing that the people of America were the best cared for people in the world. He had the utmost faith in the judgment of the American people and always abided by their choices. He had a distinctive appreciation for the American system and respected above all else the office—not necessarily the man—in our political system.

It has often been said that the true mark of a man is the manner in which he wields the power he holds. Because of the office Mr. RAYBURN held, and the long period of time in which he held this high office, it can be truthfully said that he was probably the most powerful man in the United States. But in the many years that I had the pleasure of knowing and associating with him, he has in all ways used this power both wisely and judiciously, never to benefit himself, but always in behalf of others.

His loss was mourned by many around the world, and we in this body share this loss; but his memory and influence will be felt in the Congress for years to come.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, eulogies have been spoken from the well of this House in memory of SAM RAYBURN. Books will be written in tribute to his life and career. None can fully do him justice.

By any standard of measurement, SAM RAYBURN ranks as the greatest lawmaker in the history of this Nation. More truly significant legislation bears the stamp of his authorship than that of any other man. He served longer in the Congress than any other man in history, and presided over this body twice as long as any other Speaker in the history of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Because of legislation sponsored by him, the average people of America live more comfortably and work more productively. Because of his concern, the blessings of our national prosperity are shared by the humblest family on the most unpretentious farm in America.

It was his lone vote that extended the draft in 1941 and saved us from being caught wholly unprepared by the sneak attack of the Japanese which catapulted us into World War II. It was his singular influence which prevailed upon the Congress to finance the development of the atomic bomb without divulging its secret, and thus hastened the end of that conflict with the attendant saving of untold thousands of American lives.

With the death of SAM RAYBURN, who filled the speakership longer than most of us have served in the Congress, an era has come to an end. Nothing will be quite the same. The stern visage, the courtly manner, the firm hand, and the painstaking fairness which were the Rayburn hallmarks had seemed inseparable parts of the House Chamber—as much so as the mace, the microphones, the galleries, and the cloakrooms.

No man or group of men can take his place or fill the void his passing leaves. For Sam Rayburn was more than a personality, and the leadership he exercised was more than inhered in the office he occupied. Mr. Rayburn was an institution, unique in the history of American government.

I remember a lazy Sunday in late summer, just before he left Washington for the last time. Eight or ten of us had gone out to Jefferson Island near the mouth of the Potomac for an abbreviated weekend away from the telephones, a weekend of fishing and visiting with the Speaker.

He sat there on the screened-in sun porch of the lodge dressed in his Sunday's best—dark-blue suit and vest. The others of us just sat around and listened while Sam Rayburn talked. Occasionally someone would interject a question, but essentially it was a monolog, little vignettes and episodes called up out of the rich store of his memory.

Mr. Rayburn did not preach, but it was one of the finest sermons I have ever heard. It was almost a reverie, and throughout his reminiscences of the great and the near great there ran the threads of his own great kindliness, his great faith in America, and his great hope for the future. I think the rest of us knew, although we did not want to admit it, that this was probably the last such opportunity we might have. Maybe he knew it too.

Two years ago, on his birthday, he spoke to a small group of the things he held nearest his heart. Mainly, he spoke of Bonham and of Windom and of Flag Springs. He burned through to the very seat of man's folly, as he related how, when he was a boy, the people of Windom thought those of Flag Springs to be fundamentally different from themselves in nature, because Flag Springs was 8 miles away. With his sweeping view of history, he applied this to man's view of the world in 1959.

He spoke of Bonham, and it was easy to tell that this was where his heart truly lay. Sam Rayburn said he loved Bonham because it was a place where people know it when you are sick and where they care when you die.

To what may we attribute the unprecedented success as a lawmaker experienced by this plain-spoken and unpretentious man from Bonham? There might be as many answers as there are people who knew him. For my own part, I have tried to analyze the secret of the immense Rayburn influence. Essentially, I think it boiled down to three or four things.

The first was an almost uncanny judgment of people. The Speaker could pretty well size up a person and the person's intentions. Maybe this came from experience and a great deal of it. But it was a tremendously important asset in the job he held. He was seldom deceived by glib talk, false exteriors, or specious reasoning.

Secondly, he had a marvelous facility for burning through the outer dross to the heart of a matter. Often have I heard Speaker Rayburn utter a few sentences which summed up the matter at hand after others had spent many precious hours beating around the perimeter of the issue. He almost never wasted words, and so succinctly could he state the single overriding consideration involved in a question under discussion that the rest of us often found ourselves nodding in agreement and thinking, "That's just what I was trying to say."

But principally I believe the secret of Sam Rayburn's greatness lay in his reputation for dealing in complete honesty and fairness and his devotion, amounting almost to consecration, to the United States. These were the qualities which so endeared him to his colleagues that, in a body of 435 self-styled leaders and not a few prima donnas, Sam Rayburn was chosen unanimously time after time to be the spokesman and leader for his fellow Members.

You never had to guess where Mr. Rayburn stood. His word, once given, was as good as gold. You could count on it and never look back. Members knew this, and it meant more than almost anything else. He never forgot the people, the plain average people who put their trust in him. Nor did he ever once lose faith in America and its future. Patriots have died for their country, and such devotion awes us. Sam Rayburn did a less dramatic but perhaps even more difficult thing. For the better part of a century, he lived for his country.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, let me borrow from the late Speaker Rayburn's own language used when presenting a head of state to the House—in his words, "It is my great privilege and I deem it a high honor" to be one of the more than 3,000 individuals who served with Sam Rayburn in this House. He was a man whose deeply human quality of spirit was never blunted by the hard responsibilities of leadership. In this, I think, lay the secret of his genius—and Sam Rayburn was, in simple truth, a genius in statesmanship.

Mr. Rayburn said many times that he loved the House of Representatives. It was characteristically, a statement of fact. He did not engage in exaggeration. His love for the House as an institution was reflected, every day, in his contacts with Members of the House. He knew us and understood our problems, and through this knowledge and this understanding he reached out with a sure grasp to wield a mighty influence in the affairs of the Nation.

We of Texas were proud, of course, that Mr. Rayburn was a Texan. Although the weighty problems of the world came before him, he was—as he himself might have said—never far from his upbringing. That Fourth Congressional District of Texas, which he represented here for so many years, always was close to his mind and his heart. He remained close to the people he represented because he remained one of them, in spite of all the power and glory that in the case of a lesser man might have removed him from them.

Our pride as Texans that Sam Rayburn was one of us is magnified by the knowledge that he belonged not just to Texas but to the United States. He left a mark that will endure so long as this remains a nation of freemen.

There is no tribute I can pay that will increase his stature in the minds of men or on the pages of history. The story of this warmly human man—this farsighted legislator—this leader of other men—cannot be told adequately in words. But it is told, and lastingly told, in his own deeds. It is a story that will not be forgotten by those who knew him and worked with him and loved and respected him—the story of Sam Rayburn, great American.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I know no words to tell the depth of feeling I experience in knowing with awful finality that Sam Rayburn is forever gone from these legislative halls. There is no way to describe the sense of loss we all feel, nor the heartache I knew at his passing. He was a great man and a good man. I am proud that for 7 years I could know him in the Congress, and I am proud that he was a Texan and that he was my friend.

This House was Sam Rayburn's love and life. He would not want us to lose ourselves in idle mourning. He would want us to be up and doing, in the public service. He would want us to attend to the public business in this House as he attended it for almost half a century.

Sam Rayburn extended a helping hand and a good heart to thousands of men and women in the Congress, and to free people everywhere. His legislative accomplishments, his wisdom, his fairness, his contributions to democracy and freedom of justice, will be remembered long and well. The good that Speaker Rayburn did will live long after him and this House will always be the better for the touch of his hand.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I know the Members of the House must have shared the sadness in my heart as the 2d session of the 87th Congress convened.

Gone was a familiar face, a beloved friend. Death had claimed Sam Rayburn, and this great American now belongs to the ages.

I know that nothing said here today can add to—or diminish—the luster that surrounds the memory of the greatest Speaker of the House of Representatives our country has ever known. His place in history is secure, for it is etched in the hearts of our people by the love and respect they had for "Mr. Sam." I know the people of our country will pardon the justifiable pride we Texans have for the memory of our great son, for they share our feeling. While he represented the State of Texas in Congress, he was a fiercely loyal American who served our whole country with equal fervor and dedication.

To me, it is fitting that consideration be given by this body to naming the new office building here after the late Speaker Rayburn. It was in this House, which he served so well, that he knew greatness. His love and respect for the House of Representatives is well known. The House was to him, and is to us today, the greatest legislative body the world has ever known.

I like to think that through our close association, perhaps we members of the Texas delegation in Congress became imbued with some small portion of the character and integrity of Speaker Rayburn. Here was a man on familiar terms with the great and near-great of our world for nearly half a century, and yet, his heart was with those he truly loved, the people. Few men will ever wear the mantle of greatness with such dignity, and such humility, as Sam Rayburn.

Mr. Speaker, I mourned the death of Sam Rayburn as a friend, as well as a lawmaker, and shall cherish forever the few warm moments of comradeship we had together. I shall always regret that death has stilled forever the gavel of the greatest Speaker in the history of our Nation. May God give us the strength and the courage to follow the example that he set as a Member of the House, as a leader, and as a man.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to a great American and a Christian gentleman, who was one of the greatest parliamentarians and lawmakers the world has ever seen. Others have spoken of this man's unique quality and ability in the field of legislation, and of the sterling qualities of character that made him an outstanding man among outstanding men. I will not try to add to those eloquent presentations. I simply want to say here, as simply and as succinctly as I am able, that the Honorable Sam Rayburn was, I think, one of the most contented men it has ever been my pleasure to know.

In spite of the great weight of cares and responsibilities that rested upon his shoulders, he was a happy man and completely satisfied with life and his lot in it. His contentment was the deep contentment that can be experienced only by one who is completely honest—with himself and with all others. On many occasions we have heard Mr. Rayburn proclaim publicly that he would be forever grateful to the people of his congressional district and the people of the Nation, for they had given him everything he had ever wanted out of life. This is indeed true for, as we all know, all he really wanted of life was the opportunity to devote his immense talents to the service of the country he loved so dearly; and this he did with a skill and devotion seldom witnessed in the annals of human history. Mr. Speaker, as one of Mr. Rayburn's closest friends, I know that you agree when I say we will miss him sorely within the precincts of this body, but his loss to our country is incalculable.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, echoes of the sound of the gavel in the hand of the late Honorable Sam Rayburn will reverberate through these halls for so long as any one of us who served America with him still lives. In all of us, on both sides of the aisle, there will remain for all time, some mark of the man we eulogize here today. As a Texan, he was a source of pride to all his colleagues, for as proud as Texas is, and rightfully so, of accomplishments and contributions to the heritage of America, none exceeds the pride we enjoy that Texas gave Mr. Sam to America. As a representative of his people, he had no peer. In his own words on the subject of his long tenure as Congressman from the Fourth District of Texas, he said: "It takes a while for a man to learn, and get established, and gain his full influence. He don't reach his full usefulness his first term or two. And the worst thing a district can do for itself, if it's got someone here doing the job, is to keep changing its Congressmen. A man makes a record here about the way he does in business or the law or anything else; it's hard work that makes the difference." The people of his district heeded his words, and he remained to serve longer than any man in history. As the Speaker of this august body, he enjoyed the distinction of being the second most powerful influence on our Government for longer than any man in the past. His was a unique experience, not only in the 21 years he so ably occupied the highest chair in the Chamber, but, too, by his composure to accept difficult situations he could not change, his courage to change for the better in spite of opposition, and his wisdom in being able to discern between the two.

On his leadership of this bipartisan body, volumes might be written, but I believe the most apt description of his methods was his own appraisal: "You can't really say how you lead. You feel your way, receptive to those rolling waves of sentiment. And if a man can't see and hear and feel, why then, of course, he's lost. You cannot lead people by trying to drive them. Persuasion and reason are the only ways to lead them. In that way the Speaker has influence and power in the House. A Speaker has to be fair. Otherwise they'll tear him to pieces." In this characteristic, the gentleman from Bonham, Tex., was without equal. In his achievements as legislator, strategist, parliamentarian, and Speaker, his predecessors, Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, could but greet him on their meeting, "Welcome, good and faithful servant. Yours was a job well done."

In his role as Mr. Democrat, Sam Rayburn was an all-time all-American. In the years of Democrat majority he led his team in flawless unison and accord, and in the time of party minority he used his powerful influence to retrench, rebuild, and strengthen his forces for the day when the leadership might be regained. His tactics on the chessboard of politics did credit to his idol of the battlefield, Robert E. Lee. As a conciliator of divergent views he was respected and admired, emulated and unchallenged.

His exceptional insight into the future, analytical perception of the nature and style of factors, comprehension of detail, and understanding of human affairs were a constant source of amazement to his friends and associates. Few, if any, among us could challenge his masterful ability to see through the mass of detail in the business of government to define the cause and effect of legislation, appraise its weaknesses and prescribe remedial actions for the betterment of America and mankind.

Ours has been a privilege, to be a part of and participate in the shaping of the future of America under the guidance and genius of such a man. Through five decades of war and peace, his influence has been a cloak of assurance in repeated crises. Unquestionably, his achievements will go down in history as the outstanding major individual contribution to the events that have shaped the destiny of America.

Sam Rayburn was born on the banks of the Clinch River in Roane County, Tenn., January 6, 1882. In 1887 his family settled on a farm near Windom, Tex. He attended the country school at Flagg Springs, Tex., received his degree from Mayo School at Commerce, now the East Texas State College, studied law at the University of Texas, and cut his teeth in politics in the Texas Legislature in 1907, where he served, too, as speaker of the house from 1911 to 1913. He was elected to the 63d U.S. Congress from Bonham and the 4th Congressional District in 1912, and since taking his seat here on March 4, 1913, spent the remainder of his life in this Chamber. He became the first Texan to serve as Democratic majority leader of this body, and the second Texan to be honored as Speaker.

To the world, Sam Rayburn was "Mr. America"; to his political body, he was "Mr. Democrat," to more than a thousand Members of this body, he was "Mr. Speaker"—but to Texans he was "Mr. Sam." By the dint of his endeavors and labor, the world is a better place for all mankind. By his dedication to the ideals of advancement and progress, America is a greater nation. By his leadership he made this body and assembly more effective to the cause of humanity. By his friendship and devotion to his fellow man he has made us better men. In our time there shall not be another like him.

On being honored in his home State of Texas many years ago, he said: "I dedicate my life now and in years to come to humanity in the hope that I may justify this honor which you have bestowed upon me." My friends, Sam Rayburn fulfilled his promise.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is generally known among Members of this body that Speaker Rayburn was a particularly close friend of mine. Just why this blessing came to me I do not know, but for it I shall always be thankful.

The many fine things which will be reflected in the Record of today's session tell the story for each one of us, and it is needless for me to repeat the expressions of Speaker Rayburn's countless friends and admirers.

For myself, I merely want to say that ever since this session of Congress began, the first in many, many years to convene without the presence of Sam Rayburn, I have felt his spiritual presence in a manner which I can only describe as vivid. It seemed, sometimes when I have been seeking for guidance, that he was beside me almost physically, and I could feel coming into my mind and heart the message which he surely was sending me from that spiritual place, that house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. As long as this House endures and as long as our free Government prevails, the spirit of that great man will guide us. He has truly left footprints on the sands of time.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, whether in life or in death, will live as a perpetual monument to the freedom and dignity of man as an individual. His own personal career is the clearest evidence of the greatness of the political philosophy upon which our country was founded. He rose from a boyhood in a family not possessed of great material wealth, but with an ample supply of the type of wealth man needs—love for one another, fear of almighty God, and basic, pure honesty. These traits, together with tireless industry, were the tools with which SAM RAYBURN moved from the cotton fields of northeast Texas to become the most powerful man in the Nation. But for some quirks of fate and the self-sacrificing attitude of SAM RAYBURN, he could and would have been the President of the United States. His lack of that title did not detract from the great power to which he aspired and which he attained. Under no other government or under no other political philosophy in the history of mankind could this same story have been written.

Hence, the history books that record the life of SAM RAYBURN can serve as a beacon light to those who come after.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in 1932 when I was a student at East Texas State Teachers College, I heard Hon. SAM RAYBURN speak. Incidentally, he attended this college. The district I have the honor to represent joins the Rayburn district. I was born in his district shortly after he became a Member of the House of Representatives.

It has been a rich and rewarding experience in my life to have followed closely for nearly one-third of a century the illustrious and matchless career of one of the greatest men in the history of our country. I have know well what the people of his district, neighbors of mine, think of him. They held him in the very highest esteem.

Some 24 years ago I became a Member of this House—about the time Mr. SAM became majority leader.

We all knew Mr. SAM to be friendly, considerate, sincere, humble, courteous, and helpful to us all.

As a Member, as majority leader, as Speaker, he was a most constructive legislator and outstanding leader of his party and truly a great statesman.

Many times I have heard Mr. SAM say, "If a man has commonsense, he has all the sense there is." Indeed, he, Mr. SAM, was richly endowed with commonsense. He was a true student and a very accurate observer. His judgment was the very best and this judgment has benefited and is today benefiting Americans and certainly will continue to benefit the people of our country. Moreover, the cause of liberty and freedom around the world has been strengthened because of his service.

It is my opinion that on the most vital issues that confronted America during the time Speaker RAYBURN served here he seldom if ever was mistaken.

To his wonderful family and to his many friends I once again express my profound sorrow in the passing of Mr. SAM.

Our great Chaplain of the House of Representatives, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, when Congress opened this year with his prayer used these words which I feel are most appropriate. I quote:

> We are calling to mind with deep and fond affection the life and character of the beloved Speaker. As Thou didst not lose him in giving him to us, so we have not lost him by his return to Thee.

I believe these words for I know our great Speaker RAYBURN loved God.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS].

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, SAM RAYBURN now belongs to history. He no longer is a man of flesh and blood whose compelling personality and persuasive leadership manifested itself daily among us. We no longer have him to turn to for advice and encouragement. He has gone from us, but in spite of that fact his presence and influence are felt in some ways more than ever before. There can be no doubt that those who knew him and worked with him throughout the years now ask themselves the question, "What would SAM have done if he were here? How would he have acted? What would he have thought?" Indeed, many who never knew him at all are asking these questions. May it ever be thus.

There can be no doubt that history will treat Mr. SAM well and recognize his sound character, his love for mankind, and his devotion to our country. Historians will record his association with many Presidents, the calm and sound advice he gave them, the acute political talent he was endowed with; his sense of humor and his capacity for friendship.

Those of us who knew this great man will never forget him. Each one of his many friends can recall a variety of incidents where Mr. SAM made a lasting and loving impression. Such anecdotes depicting his greatness, his breadth of view, his knowledge of history, and his faith in simple justice are legion. History will be filled with them, and may the future generations grasp and hold onto these examples of this good American citizen and emulate his character and ideals. Many will do just that, and so SAM RAYBURN's influence will be felt down through the ages and our country will continue to promote truth, justice, peace, and the pursuit of happiness because of the work he did. What a fitting reward for such a man.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Tennessee joins with Texas and the other States of the Nation in paying tribute to one of the greatest men ever to serve in this House.

As we assemble for this session it has been generally recognized by all that something—someone—in this Chamber is missing and that it is not quite the same without Mr. SAM in our midst. Certainly this body has lost one of its greatest Members and the Democratic Party and the Nation have lost one of our great leaders. We must accept the fact that Speaker RAYBURN is gone but his memory will live forever.

Mr. Speaker, one of our finest endowments is that of treasured memories. Those of us who have been privileged to serve with Speaker RAYBURN will always carry with us treasured memories of his friendship and association.

Speaker RAYBURN served as Speaker of this House more than twice as long as any man in history. This alone attests to his greatness, his stability, steadfastness, and endurance. His place in history is assured.

But we who served with him respected him for more than his length of service. He was a great Speaker because of the bigness of his heart and his love of his fellow man.

Mr. SAM's bigness of heart and his sincere feeling for his fellow man is illustrated by a conference which I had with him just about this time last year. I was seeking the Speaker's support of a bill I had introduced to waive the tax liability and indebtedness of Sgt. Alvin C. York, the great World War I hero. After studying the matter, the Speaker said:

> To my mind just waiving the tax indebtedness of Sergeant York is insufficient—we should form a committee and raise a substantial sum of money, not only to pay off his tax liability but to present to Sergeant York and his family because our Nation owes so much to him.

The Speaker volunteered a $1,000 contribution and offered to serve as chairman of a fundraising committee. He was sure that the American people would willingly and generously respond.

Thus, from this meeting was born the method of relieving the great war hero of his tax burdens and Mr. SAM followed this drive to success with great interest.

This not only illustrates the bigness of Mr. SAM's heart but it was just one of the many favors that he has done for many friends throughout his life.

Mr. SAM was born in Roane County in Tennessee, adjacent to the district which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, and although he rose to be one of the most powerful men in the Congress and Nation, he never turned his back on any good man. He was dedicated to wise legislation which favored no special group but looked always to the public interest.

In a personal way, Speaker RAYBURN befriended me many times. He appointed me repeatedly to special and select committees of the House and his interest and helpfulness will always be remembered.

Tennessee claims Speaker RAYBURN along with her most illustrious sons, Andrew Jackson, Andrew Johnson, and James K. Polk.

While we shall all miss his wise counsel, his steady patience, his guidance and leadership, we will still have the example of his service, the inspiration of his life, and the benediction of his memory.

The legacy of Speaker Rayburn left us is a precious one if we but remember the example of his long and useful career of dedicated public service. True to his ideals and friends and devoted to our country, his memory will live in the highest traditions of statesmanship of this Nation.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Baker].

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, Sam Rayburn was born in Roane County, Tenn., in the district which I have the honor to represent in this body. He loved the hills and the hollows, the fields and the streams of east Tennessee. We all loved him.

This great man was an inspiration to me. He sometimes recognized me on the floor of this House as "the gentleman from east Tennessee." I am going to tell you a story that Mr. Sam Rayburn told a group of us last summer when, as the gentleman from Louisiana said, he did us the great honor of accompanying a group of us to Tennessee to dedicate a bridge over the Fort Loudon Dam that was named the Sam Rayburn Bridge. The next morning we were fishing, fishing for bluegills, everyone talking. He said: "You know, when you are fishing, you think. I was out fishing one day with a lifelong friend in Texas who had made a great business success and had accumulated millions and millions of dollars, a man of great ability but of little education.

"I asked him, calling him by name on the riverbank, 'To what do you contribute your great success? You have made an outstanding success, we all know that.'

"He said, 'Sam, you know I did not have much education, but I learned early in life that you do not learn nothing while you are talking.'"

That is a great lesson from this great man. It was typical of Speaker Rayburn.

To the Members of this great body, Speaker Sam Rayburn will always hover over this chair. But Speaker Sam Rayburn now belongs to the ages.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bolling].

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, nearly everything has been said, and said extremely well, about our departed great friend. It seems to me, however, that one should point out that from one single quality apart in this great man sprang all his other great qualities. I believe without any sentiment that the one word describing his greatness is the simple word "love."

Mr. Speaker Rayburn loved his family. He loved the people who sent him to Congress for so long. He loved the people of the United States. And, more than that, he loved the people of the world. From this great strength there came a return, a return which I believe made it possible for him to render the tremendous service that he rendered to his people in Texas, to all of our people in the United States, and to all of the people of the world. We loved him too.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Chenoweth].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of our former beloved Speaker, Sam Rayburn. I extend my sympathy to my colleagues from the State of Texas in the great loss they have sustained. Mr. Rayburn's passing was not only a heavy loss to the State of Texas but an irreparable loss to the entire Nation.

I came to the Congress in January 1941, and saw Mr. Rayburn take his oath as Speaker for the first time. It made a lasting impression upon me. I recall a part of the speech he made that day. He said his election as Speaker of this House was the realization of a dream of a lifetime. That is what he had worked and hoped for, in the many years of his devoted service in this body.

Sam Rayburn will go down in history as one of our greatest statesmen. He guided this House on a steady course through some of the most perilous days in the history of our Nation.

I recall that during World War II the House was confronted with many difficult problems. It was the responsibility of Sam Rayburn as Speaker to see that the necessary legislation was passed. Many of the bills were highly controversial and Members of his own party were sharply divided in their positions.

Mr. Rayburn through his great ability, sound diplomacy, and good judgment was able to get this legislation passed with a minimum of delay and friction.

I always enjoyed a visit with Speaker Rayburn. I visited with him on many occasions. We would talk about politics and other matters. I thought that Mr. Rayburn should go on to the White House, and talked to him about that possibility several times. He gave me the political picture in Texas and some of the developments which prevented him from being considered as an active candidate for President. I am not sure that he was too anxious to run for President, but I thought it would be a fitting culmination to his long and brilliant career in the House.

It was a great privilege to know Sam Rayburn and to serve with him in the House. His influence will always remain in this body. No one who served with Sam Rayburn will ever enter this Chamber without thinking of him.

Let us hope that we can maintain and preserve the high traditions of the House that Sam Rayburn cherished and loved so deeply, and for which he fought without compromise for almost half a century.

I extend my deep personal sympathy to the members of his family in their great sorrow.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Bonner].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, among the great privileges and blessings that I have enjoyed in life was the friendship of our beloved former Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn. To know him and observe him on the floor of this House was not only an honor but an opportunity so rare that only those who have served here can fully appreciate it. To know him and to have had the opportunity to be with him in privacy was a great privilege and a high honor that few men, other than those who have served here and have been connected with the Government, ever enjoyed.

He was wise in his counsel. He was demonstrative in his friendship and he demonstrated application of friendship and loyalty greater than is generally seen between men. Visits with him late in the afternoon, hearing his wise counsel, when the formalities of the floor of this House were done away with and a group sat around and man spoke to man as men only do when they are closely associated together, remain with me, now and forever, as cherished memories of the high spots of my life.

To go fishing with him and to enjoy recreation with him was a privilege that I will remember as years go on. Annually he visited with me on the coast of North Carolina where we fished and enjoyed the refreshing ocean breezes.

He, as has been said here today, was the great Democrat. And, as he often said, he wished his time would permit him to accept more invitations, to go out and speak to the people not only for the principles of the Democratic Party and its precepts, but for the opportunity to get close to his fellow man. He visited my State quite often, and his addresses before the State gatherings of Democrats at our annual Democratic rallies have been remembered and will be remembered down through the years; appreciated and cherished by those who had the opportunity to hear him and those who had the honor to shake his hand.

Throughout the rest of my life, Mr. Speaker, I will cherish and remember this friendship that is dear to my heart and that has had a great influence on my life as a legislator in this body, a friendship that I know has molded character and developed understanding in me that I appreciate to the highest degree. All of us express our deep sympathy to his family and to the Nation in the loss of one of the greatest men I think this country ever produced.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schwengel].

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, when the magnificent role and accomplishments of Mr. Rayburn are read in the history books that have been written and in biographies that should and will be written about him, they will reflect great credit and honor on this the greatest legislative and deliberative body in the world. Fortunate indeed are we and the other 3,000 American citizens who have had the opportunity to serve with him in the Halls of Congress. Our lives with and under his influence have been enriched and the legislative record in that time as we who served it during some critical times, was better because of it.

Millions of words will be spoken today and written in the future about him. It is fitting and proper that we set aside this time today to pay tribute to this great American whose mortal life has passed from the physical to the higher and sublime realms where with our encouragement and help, his record will shine brighter and be nobler as we reflect on it and as we think about it. All of us can and will testify to a personal loss, I am sure. And I want to add my word in this regard by saying that I will miss him almost beyond measure. He was such a help and encouragement to me in some of my special interests in history and it was with his help that it was possible for us to revive some interesting and dramatically worthwhile centennial moments in our history. In addition it was my great privilege to sit down with him on occasions to visit about the significance of American history, usually with relation to the work of the Congress of the United States and very often about the Capitol Building itself. His feeling for history will be missed and the future prospects of personal visits I have had will be a distinct loss to me.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to present a quote familiar to Mr. SAM and to his intimate friends:

SAM RAYBURN

> It is now my sole purpose here to help enact such wise and just laws that our common country will by virtue of these laws be a happier and more prosperous country. I have always dreamed of a country which I believe this should and will be, and that is one in which the citizenship is an educated and patriotic people, not swayed by passion and prejudice, and a country that knows no east, no west, no north, no south, but inhabited by a people liberty-loving, patriotic, happy, and prosperous with its lawmakers having no other purpose than to write such just laws as shall in the years to come be of service to humankind yet unborn.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate in a memorial to SAM RAYBURN, to begin with the remarks I have just quoted. SAM RAYBURN began with them; they are taken from his first address before this House of Representatives on May 1, 1913—almost 50 years ago. Not only did he begin with them, Mr. Speaker; he maintained these high goals and ideals therein noted until the last. And, consequently, a commentary on these things, so simply and so justly stated, will be a commentary on his life—so simply and so justly lived.

Mr. SAM dreamed of "a country that knows no east, no west, no north, no south," and he dreamed as one who was raised in the aftermath of the war which threatened to split this country forever. He dreamed as the son of a brave Confederate soldier. Knowing the horrors of disunity, he dreamed of union. A man who gives his life for a whole which his father had risked his life to divide is a man with the personal integrity to transcend the prejudices of environment and background, to work for his beliefs not as it is convenient, but as those beliefs demand. With a sense of history that told him what his ideals demanded, Mr. SAM gave his life to this Union.

As he had hoped to do, he served the people by the writing of just laws. His part in establishing the Rural Electrification Administration, for example, helped not only to modernize farming in the South and Midwest, but also to relieve the burden on such cities as our Federal Capital by making suburban living more practical. Typically, its chief benefit was to the common man, its chief demands upon those who could meet them, and who, by meeting them, contributed to the benefit of all. He matured during the Populist movement, and he retained its best aspects throughout his life. He was never inflexible or doctrinaire, but he maintained his ultimate goals and never lost sight of their value. He tailored the means of achieving these ends to fit a volatile and changing world; and the world has changed, Mr. Speaker, since SAM RAYBURN came to Washington.

His single career connects us with a world entirely foreign to our own. When he was born, Tennessee and Texas were far west, and what we call the West was wild. During his youth, our Nation pushed its way across the continent, and Mr. SAM was stretching, growing, and flexing his muscles along with the United States itself. As he reached his manhood, the pulsating energies of national expansion and consolidation were achieving all that had been expected or hoped for; the country had established itself, and no more new States were to be added until near the end of his career. We were tentatively probing the mysteries of international politics—even as now, at the hour of his death, we are probing the mysteries of outer space. Not during his life, Mr. Speaker, but during his service in this Congress, he saw us through two World Wars more horrible than anyone thought conceivable. He saw his country through boom and depression, while he himself never daunted, never overconfident, but always on the job, working to make our country the best place possible, according to those circumstances he could partly control or greatly influence.

Mr. Speaker, SAM RAYBURN saw a lot of history, and he learned from what he saw. He saw that only through the strength of unity could our country survive in this world of chaos and disunity. He saw that only by a government of laws could we achieve unity, and he strove, as he had promised to do, to assure stability by the passage of just laws—laws which controlled freedom without curtailing it; laws which would "come to be of service," to use his words, "to humankind yet unborn." I would be remiss, however, to imply that SAM RAYBURN was merely a legislator—that he put his faith in laws alone, or restricted his faith to any other single institution. Mr. SAM was also a teacher, with a teacher's love of youth and a teacher's knowledge of the importance of youth. For only by the young can justice and wisdom be transmitted to the "humankind yet unborn" which we, whatever our wisdom, shall never see and never know.

His favorite people were young people: students and interns, for example, here in Washington. I think he would have liked it to be said that in the minds of the young men and women whom he counseled he left his richest contributions. "If you are here in Washington," he would say to them, "if you are lucky enough to be working in your Government, do not just observe it. Study it. Learn about it. And as you come to know it you will come to love it. And with the love for your country which comes from knowledge, you will be better citizens." Mr. Speaker, can there be a truer and more moving patriotism than this? What could be less cynical or more forthright? As you know your country truly, so shall you love it; and as you love your country, so shall you serve it also. This is what SAM RAYBURN gave our children—what he gave the youth he loved to gather around himself—and it is the best he had to offer. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that this was the source of his legislative success: the conviction that by knowing the past we would see the value and the means for improving the present, that we might have a better future.

At 12 o'clock noon on every Saturday of the year there is an awful wailing in downtown Washington, on Capitol Hill, and indeed in cities throughout our land. The air-raid warning sirens are being tested. Any man, while that dismal sound is in his ears, who does not reflect upon our national peril—who is not compelled to think of our danger, and of his own responsibilities to his country in time of danger—is deaf to the whispering of the human conscience. And yet, while this mournful sound offends the ear, and while its meaning offends the spirit, there is in it also, as it sounds across the continent, a note of hope. We are testing our horns and we are making ready. In our understanding of impending danger—and in our willingness to face it, to stand and listen to the fearsome wail—there is an index of our tenacity. Our strength, Mr. Speaker, our perseverance, and our will to live enable us to pause, to hear the awful sound, and to continue on. SAM RAYBURN heard it, and he heard it often. He heard it, and he listened to it, and he knew the meaning of it; that we must strengthen ourselves by building force, but that we must strengthen our inner selves also, and our institutions.

His love of American institutions extended to the most important symbols of those institutions. It is in this light that his effort to improve and extend the east front of our Capitol Building must be seen. There are few structures in the world which symbolize as much as does this building. A way of life and the Government that makes it possible are the wonderful realities for which this building is a sign. How shocking, then, it was to watch our Capitol decline, to see this noble structure crumble. SAM RAYBURN was shocked, and, Mr. Speaker, he shocked the Congress into doing something about it—and into doing it right. The noble facade of the east front is an addition according to appropriate tradition. It is entirely just and a source of pride for all of us that our new House Office Building is to bear his name. Always with a sense of the historical and emotional importance of our monumental Government buildings, Mr. SAM worked actively to improve Capitol Hill. He helped to remove the slums, to make the congressional Chambers as adequate as possible for the conduct of our Nation's business. And his only reward was the satisfaction of participating in progress.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that in his work on the east front we can see the nature of SAM RAYBURN's greatness. Out of a knowledge of his country's history grew a love for the country which led him to smooth over any rough places, wherever they might be. He was a man with a faith in very great principles, and he had the ability to make us realize those principles, to help us put them into practice. In this way he led the Congress, Mr. Speaker, and he led the Congress well—as well as any other man. He is dead; but he has left us many things which will never die. Somewhere in literature there is this pertinent observation: what a man does for himself dies with him; what a man does for his community and country lives forever. SAM RAYBURN will live forever in the hearts of those who read about and study the history of this great Nation. He will never be divorced from the greatness of the United States. I should, because there are some significant similarities in their contributions, like to close with a passage from Seward's biography of another great Congressman, John Quincy Adams. "Old man eloquent" they called him, and he was eloquent in his way just as SAM was eloquent in his way:

> We are in the midst of extraordinary events. * * * The * * * Congress assembles in this conjuncture, and the debates are solemn, earnest, and bewildering. Interest, passion, conscience, freedom, and humanity all have their advocates. Suddenly the council is dissolved. Silence is in the Capitol, and sorrow has thrown its pall over the land. What means this abrupt and fearful silence? An old man * * * has fallen into the swoon of death.

The life of SAM RAYBURN is one that leaves no gaps in philosophy and of truth. But it is a history that sheds marvelous confirmation on maxims which all mankind know, and yet are prone to undervalue and forget. The exalted character before us was formed by the combination of virtue, courage, assiduity, and modesty, under favorable conditions, with native talent and genius, and illustrates the truth, that in morals as in nature, simplicity is the chief element of the sublime.

Edwin Markham in his now famous poem, "Lincoln: The Man" used these lines to describe his greatness. They come to mind as I think about this great American who we honor today and they read: "Here was a man to hold against the world. The man to match the mountains and the sea."

No more significant or meaningful tribute can be given to any man than to say that he will be missed and this becomes more of a tribute to Mr. SAM because he will be missed by so many people, especially in the Halls of Congress.

With the three cardinal principles of true greatness which he possessed so well—courage, wisdom, and goodness—goodness to love the right, wisdom to know the right and courage to do the right.

He becomes a part of our cherished heritage which can and will be used as a seed for the present and future. Truly he belongs to the future.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished dean of the Texas delegation for this opportunity to say a few words concerning our late Speaker. As a freshman Member of this body, I am, perhaps, the least qualified to speak of the man who was senior to all of us. I speak of the late Speaker not out of great knowledge or long friendship, but out of admiration and out of simple appreciation that I, too, was one of those privileged to have known him.

For almost half a century, he served in this House, a man loved for his towering prestige, his integrity, and for his tenderness. He served as few men are endowed or privileged to serve, and it was he—as much as any man—who led America from the last days of the winning of the West to the first days of the nuclear age. As much as any man, he molded America as it exists today for us and for our children and our grandchildren. I do not need to describe him to the Members of this body. I do not need to tell any Member of this House or any person in America about his abilities as a patriot, master parliamentarian, old-school statesman, Democrat, and skilled politician.

Installed as Speaker in 1940, he grasped the legislative reins and presided over this House with unmatched fairness. He was a great Speaker, but he also was great as a man, great in his compassion, in his warmth, and in an affection that seemed to include everyone, from a new Member of Congress to small children.

Last year on one of the first days of the session, I sat down, I remember, to have lunch with our colleague, Congressman BROOKS from Texas. Much to my surprise, I was soon surrounded by Texans, and then, even more to my surprise, Speaker SAM RAYBURN sat down beside me. Texans are often formidable, but to a new Congressman, Speaker RAYBURN was more than formidable. But, with that warmth and interest that was one of his great characteristics, he welcomed me to Congress—and in a sense, I believe, to Texas.

Some of you may have forgotten your long ago first sessions in this House. Because of SAM RAYBURN I shall never forget mine. I remember the last day when the Speaker was in the chair. On that day I happened to bring my little daughter into the House. She was 7 years old, and I took her up to meet the Speaker.

We know now that the Speaker was in great pain, but he smiled at Polly and he said to her: "Polly, you are such a pretty little girl. If I were not in this chair, I would kiss you."

SAM RAYBURN's generation will never forget him; we will never forget him. The next generation will not forget. His life and work are written in American history.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was understood in the beginning that each Member would have the privilege of extending his remarks in connection with this service and include therein extraneous matter. Unanimous consent was granted for that.

At this time I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, from my vantage point of being a new Member in the Congress I note the great pinnacle of achievement this beloved man, Mr. RAYBURN, attained. This is at once to a new Member an inspiration and a challenge. With all the words here spoken, the great thoughts expressed by the outstanding leadership of this body, the older Members of this body who testify to that great achievement, that great inspiration that we face as new Members, I wanted to add just a little mention of one of the experiences I had with the Speaker, for, indeed, he did not have a lot of time to visit with everybody, and so my visits were few in number. But one visit was an hour long. On that occasion my older brother Ralph—I call him my big brother—was down here visiting me in Washington. I asked if the Speaker could meet my brother. We were ushered into his office. He related some history to us for quite a little while of his experience in lawmaking. Then I spoke to him about a project that would be beneficial to western Montana, and his question was whether or not it was for the folks, and he expected me to describe in detail how useful it would be for the folks. Upon that explanation being made I had his assistance from that time on. I was impressed as was my brother for I did not expect to have that much time with him. When we left and as we went into the corridor my brother turned to me and said: "ARNOLD, that man truly loves his fellow men." And so it is with the greatest in this body, or the visitor, my brother, who had only an hour with Mr. SAM, to know him was to know that he truly loved his fellow man.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Utah [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of profound humility and inadequacy that I add my voice and deeply felt sentiments to the many eloquently moving tributes already paid to our late beloved Speaker whom God in His inscrutable wisdom has taken from us.

As one but newly come to this august body, I am all too mindful that it was not given to me to have enjoyed the long, cordial, and helpful association with Speaker RAYBURN, so treasured now by my numerous bereaved senior colleagues who were privileged to spend years with him here, preoccupied with the concerns of the Nation.

If my association with Mr. RAYBURN was relatively fleeting, as worldly time is measured, it was, nonetheless, memorable. I found him benevolent, understanding, a patient source of assistance, tolerant of those uncertainties which seem the peculiar lot of a neophyte in these halls, and, of course, many more things—a great and gifted human being.

It will take some future genius to do the whole man full justice. It will be the historians of the future, working with the advantage of perspectives denied to us, who will arrive painstakingly at the whole, true measure, of Mr. SAM's stature as a remarkable national figure, and one who merits so much from the country he so loved.

I have mentioned that my associations with the late Speaker were, unfortunately, relatively short. Before they had spun along for not too many months, there appeared indications that all might not be going too well with him. At first, optimism prevailed, although some amongst us had misgivings. As apprehensions grew, the business and the routine of this House proceeded according to the requirements of developments, in a sense not unlike a quiet drama with its appointed lines, its acts and scenes, its entrances and exits.

But there was something different now, and in melancholy course we came to suspect its implications. A very gallant gentleman confronted what could be a most formidable fight. In a lifetime of political battles he was not one to quail at the face of adverse odds, or be intimidated, so there would be no stepping out of character at this grim pass. Characteristically, he stood his ground as long as ebbing physical stamina would sustain him.

The times I saw him during his last weeks with us here, I could not but marvel at his incredible fortitude and spirit. I do not doubt that he recognized his antagonist, did not underestimate his own desperate position, but meant to fight on defiantly. I was reminded of the lines from one of John Donne's poems in which that same antagonist is addressed in language, perhaps a bit too poetic for Mr. SAM, but in sense most fitting for his valedictory—

> Death—be not proud, though some have called thee
> Mighty and dreadful, for thou art not so.
> For those whom thou think'st thou dost overthrow,
> Die not, poor death, nor yet canst thou kill me.

Of all the memories the late Speaker bequeathed me, by far the most memorable will always be the magnificent valor with which he met his ultimate antagonist and set us an example of how a stout heart behaves.

Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully suggest, that in the case of Mr. SAM, "Death be not proud."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the Members being allowed the privilege of extending their remarks and inserting extraneous matter in the RECORD of today, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with this service any Member of the House may have 5 legislative days hereafter to exercise that privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I could not let this occasion pass without adding very humbly my grateful appreciation for the life of Speaker RAYBURN and my profound sorrow because of his passing. It would be in poor taste to attempt a lengthy statement on an occasion like this, but I would, as I reflect upon the life of our late Speaker, observe that he was a superior man from the standpoint of his knowledge and his administrative ability.

He was a superior man because of his integrity. I think so often what we need in America is not more knowledge but better men to provide us with the course of action that we ought to take, based upon that knowledge.

Speaker RAYBURN was a good man. America will never cease to be a great Nation so long as we have enough good men and women. America will always be the great Republic that she is so long as we have people who not only know what is right but, like Speaker RAYBURN, do that which is right.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, our beloved friend was a man of faith. He often expressed the desire that he might pass, as he used to say, wielding the gavel. No one except a man of faith could have carried on as he did in face of the grievous and devastating illness which was his.

Truly this good man, this man of faith, did that which the poet admonished when he said:

> So live, that when thy summons comes to join
> The innumerable caravan which moves
> To that mysterious realm, where each shall take
> His chamber in the silent halls of death,
> Thou go not, like the quarry slave at night,
> Scourged to his dungeon, but, sustained and soothed
> By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave,
> Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch
> About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, on returning to the House for the opening of the 2d session of the 87th Congress, I was cognizant that the scene would be different in the Chamber. There is a face missing which was so familar during the time, the years, I had served in this body. A personality to be remembered—Speaker SAM RAYBURN had crossed over the river. His death was a distinct and tragic loss to America. He left a record of accomplishments unparalled in the history of the Republic. The Fourth District of Texas had sent him to the House as its Representative for 25 consecutive terms. During many of those years he occupied a position as presiding officer, the Speaker, for more than double the service in that office than any other of his predecessors. Few men have attained the position or stature of Speaker RAYBURN, none could wear that toga with the humility which he possessed. He could, as Kipling expressed it, "Walk with Kings, nor lose the common touch."

His virtues of patriotism, great wisdom, and integrity was, and is, an inspiration to all of us. He knew that the greatness of a nation was accomplished by the quality and moral fiber of the people. He was genial in manner and spirit and considerate at all times of the views of others.

It was my privilege to attend two mammoth meetings in Little Rock and one in Kennett, Mo., in the last year and a half. Speaker RAYBURN was the featured speaker on each of those occasions. He spoke for 45 to 50 minutes at each appearance and did not refer to a manuscript or a note. He knew his subject full well when he spoke. I do not recall that he ever referred to an outline or memorandum in any of the many floor speeches I have heard him make. He was equipped and ready on any subject that arose in the House to offer his observations and views. When he did so they were concise, forceful, and convincing. These are the attributes of leadership and greatness.

At the funeral for Speaker RAYBURN which was conducted in his home city at Bonham, Tex., great throngs of Texans tried desperately to enter the First Baptist Church sanctuary. On arrival there well in advance of the stated time for the service it was a trying and difficult effort for me to enter the church even with an accompanying police escort. These were grief-stricken townspeople and constituents who had come to say farewell to a friend, neighbor, and outstanding national leader.

The loss of "Mr. SAM" is well expressed by Walt Whitman in these words:

> O captain, my captain, rise up and hear the bells;
> Rise up—for you the flag is hung—for you the bugle trills;
> For you bouquets and ribbon'd wreaths—for you the shores a-crowding;
> For you they call, the swaying mass, their eager faces turning;
> My captain does not answer, his lips are pale and still, he has no pulse nor will;
> The ship is anchor'd safe and sound, its voyage closed and done;
> From fearful trip the victor ship comes in with object won;
> Exult, O shores, and ring, O bells; but I with mournful tread,
> Walk the deck my captain lies, fallen cold and dead.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, when news came of the passing of SAM RAYBURN, I was in Paris at a meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentarians' Conference. Speaker RAYBURN honored me by appointment to this committee for a number of years and I am very proud of the fact that one of his last official acts on the day he left Washington was to submit my appointment to the House.

Our Nation has sustained a great and irreplaceable loss in the death of SAM RAYBURN. He was one of the giants of our age. No man in the past century has left a larger imprint upon the legislative history of the country.

Despite his age and long service, he retained youthful imagination and dedication throughout his life. He was proud to be called Mr. Democrat, and to recall his sponsorship of many of the great economic reform measures of the 1930's, but I think he took the greatest pride in recalling those occasions when he successfully led the fights to uphold the foreign policy and military security decisions of the Presidents of the United States, both Democratic and Republican.

All of us who have served in the House of Representatives under Sam Rayburn can be proud of that privilege. His record and his service will be forever distinctive in the history of our country, and our association with him will be one of the hallmarks of our public service.

The privilege of sharing his personal friendship and confidence in the House of Representatives is a memory that I will always cherish.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Sam Rayburn, dean of the 44 Speakers who have presided over this House since 1789, has gone to his eternal reward. He passed away back home in Bonham, Tex., on November 16, 1961.

During his long and constructive tenure as Speaker, he raised the prestige and effectiveness of that office to a peak that had never been reached before.

This House was his life. His faith in representative government, and its ability to fulfill its responsibilities, brought order, reason, and dignity to the work and the accomplishments of this chamber.

The standards he set as presiding officer, have strengthened the traditions of the U.S. House of Representatives. The human understanding and the decisive leadership that characterized his management of the House will be a valuable example for Speakers of the future.

From 1913 through 1961, his uninterrupted service in Congress spanned the administrations of Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, and Kennedy. He became the second most powerful man in the Government of the United States. No other Member of this century has served with such fidelity and such distinction.

By choice, he passed up the opportunity to become President. At the Democratic National Convention of 1944, his many friends made him the leading candidate for Vice President but he graciously declined in favor of Harry Truman, who was nominated, elected, and succeeded to the Presidency upon the death of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

To Sam Rayburn, the position of Speaker was the greatest opportunity that a man could have to express his devotion to freedom, and to fulfill his responsibilities to his fellow men.

After a long and honorable career, his last days were blessed with the prayers of a grateful nation.

The pioneering courage and commonsense of the man from Texas guided the legislation that developed the United States into the strongest power on earth, using that power to protect freedom, and to advance the future of mankind.

Sam Rayburn gave the riches of his mind and heart and conscience to that cause.

The memory of his faith in us is a priceless heritage that will inspire us to go forward.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress in February 1940, Speaker Bankhead swore me in. Soon after that Sam Rayburn was elected Speaker. Ever since then, he was always kind and considerate to me. I was an obscure new Republican from upstate New York but it made no difference with him. He helped me a lot. He was a great American and I cherish his memory.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of each day we, who held our late beloved leader—Speaker Sam Rayburn—in such high esteem, seem to sense a deeper and fuller realization of the great and manifold contributions he made not only to the House of Representatives but to our Nation as a whole.

From the day I was accorded the honor and privilege to serve with Mr. Sam in 1947, I have always known and found him to be an American first, friend and counsellor always, and constant exponent of justice and fairness in everything he undertook or associated himself with; and, whenever the occasion warranted his advice, he was not only available but graciously willing to give of himself and his years of experienced wisdom to those who sought it, particularly in legislative matters. Truly, therefore, in his death, we have lost a trusted friend, adviser, leader, and devoted colleague.

Very rightfully, others have eulogized Mr. Sam with eloquent tributes. To theirs, I would humbly add my thought that Mr. Sam would perhaps like to be remembered for, and would choose as his legacy if the opportunity were his, the hope that the boys and girls—the young people of this Nation—would discover in his decades of distinguished and dedicated service to our country, a goal to achieve—an example to follow—a career to emulate—in preserving our way of life as he did. Yes, by his devotion to duty and conscientious labor, Mr. Sam gave not only to our youth but to all Americans, the greatest heritage any citizen would hope to imprint on the pages of our country's history.

May the spirit of Speaker Sam Rayburn overshadow these hallowed Halls of the Congress of the United States, rising as a tower of reassurance to those who legislate therein, making them secure in the knowledge that the greatness he achieved will live on and be reflected in their service to the United States of America.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the loss of Sam Rayburn is a blow from which the House will not soon recover. It is a dual loss—that of both a master statesman and a splendid human being. Time may dull the pain of his departure, but until that occurs his absence shall rankle in the hearts of all who knew and loved and respected this remarkable man.

To few persons is given the privilege of favorably affecting the lives of millions of others. With the powers of the speakership at his command, Sam Rayburn had such a privilege. Because he used and discharged it wisely, faithfully and humbly, the world is better off today.

Sam Rayburn served the country longer than any other Speaker in our history, and in so doing became part and parcel of the useful legislation that passed the Congress during his tenure as Speaker of the House of Representatives. In this way millions of people throughout the world felt the impress of Mr. Rayburn's career. The hearts of each and every one of them is with him today.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, Sam Rayburn was my friend.

I could speak a million words and still not say enough in praise of his greatness, of his devotion to his duties, of his loyalty to his party and his friends, and of his love of this country and its citizens.

Sam Rayburn believed in and appreciated brevity. He was a great man. This world is a different place now that he is gone.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, we deduce the greatness of our Nation when we review our capacity to produce heroic leadership in every generation. We are preeminent, the greatest of all nations when we can cite those leaders whose qualities immortal span all generations and are etched in the stone of history. Mr. Sam Rayburn, of Texas, the late and greatest Speaker in the House of Representatives, is now among those who have given us this distinction.

He endowed those of us who survive and follow with a new stature to meet and measure. As we emulate and approach his attributes of integrity, independence, fairness, love of nation, and love for people, we move in his footsteps. We know his guidance when we show faith in God and adherence to principle and dedication to the service of the governed. It has been my privilege to serve with him for just 1 year in the 87th Congress. He talked with me and taught me as he taught all of us who knew him. He once said that he, as one of a family of 11 children, well remembered the happiness of a large family in an American home. In a sense he made us his family as well as his colleagues and we can, therefore, sense the grief that burdens his kinfolk, his neighbors and his State. That grief must be tempered when we assess not the loss we suffer but the gain in greatness we sustain as a nation and a free people because he lived with us so long, he led us so well, and left us so much.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, every man treasures the memory of even a passing acquaintance with a truly great individual. When life gives to anyone the opportunity to become a friend and colleague of a great man, it bestows a treasure beyond price.

No man in this House, whatever may be his party affiliation, will question the greatness of Sam Rayburn. His distinguished record as a Member of the House and as its presiding officer has never been equaled in the life of this Republic.

The measures which Sam Rayburn authored in the Congress are great monuments to his memory today, and the life of every farmer, every working man and almost every American is richer because there was a SAM RAYBURN, of Texas.

As a law student in Washington, more than 20 years ago, I came to admire this masterful but gentle Texan.

As a candidate for Congress for the first time, 10 years ago, I had the great privilege of welcoming him to the Second District of Oklahoma, and I will never forget the powerful speech which he delivered in Muskogee's Spaulding Park on that occasion.

As a freshman Member of the Congress, in 1953, I heard his words of wisdom, commonsense, and friendly counsel as he addressed our freshman organization.

He was one of the few men I have known who continued to grow in vision, in warmth of heart, and in love for humanity with every passing year.

America has lost its greatest legislator.
The House has lost its strongest pillar.
Oklahoma has lost its finest neighbor.
I have lost a dear friend.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, a statesman, leader, and patriot has departed and with his passing an era has ended. Mr. RAYBURN, who served longer as Speaker than any man in the history of our country, had the natural quality of leadership as a speaker and parliamentarian and he was the peer of any man in the U.S. Congress. He had amassed a wealth of affection and esteem in this body as all of us acknowledge the qualities of the true greatness of the man. One thing that contributed to his greatness were his strong convictions and he adhered to the truth of his convictions at all times. As a leading spirit in the Nation's councils for 48 years, Mr. SAM was known personally or by reputation by practically every American interested in public affairs. I am sure that the citizens of our Nation unite in spirit with Members of this House today in paying tribute to his memory as the outstanding figure of our generation. As leader and later Speaker, Mr. SAM expended superb courage and indomitable energy throughout many years and late last summer when the boundary line of human limitations was reached, he went home to Bonham and finally his physical endurance came to an end.

He was actually the victim of his intense devotion to duty and he died in triumph, leaving behind him a rich heritage of honor for future generations.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay solemn tribute to the memory of the Honorable SAM RAYBURN.

Mr. RAYBURN was respected by all; a man who was a great legislator and Speaker of this body; a dedicated Texan and above all a great and dedicated American.

I considered it an honored privilege to have known Mr. RAYBURN, to have worked with him and to have served under him in the House of Representatives. At all times, I found him most kindly, considerate, generous, and fair.

As we look back over his legislative record, we find many of his accomplishments that will be written indelibly into the history of the United States of America.

His was a record achieved in 48 years as a Member of Congress, more than 16 of which he served as Speaker of the House. It was a span of service that covered more than one-quarter of the entire constitutional history of our Nation. It was a span of years that saw our Nation and its people move through eras of prosperity and depression and periods of disastrous wars and cherished peace.

May the soul of this great man forever rest in peace.

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the convening of the 2d session of the 87th Congress has been marked with great sadness. Today, as Members of the House pay tribute to the revered memory of our late beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, there will be no one here who does not realize that he or she has sustained a profound loss with the passing of Mr. SAM. His spirit will always be with us and his great influence will continue to be felt here in the House and elsewhere. Never has the death of one man in public life so personally affected so many people.

Speaker RAYBURN was truly an amazing man. He was constantly under great pressure. He carried an awesome responsibility, yet he always had time to listen patiently to the problems of others and he always found time to help out if he possibly could.

He was a strong man of indomitable will. Yet, he was kind and gentle and he was understanding.

SAM RAYBURN was a man of intense loyalty. He was a fierce fighter for the Democratic Party and for those things in which he believed. He neither asked for nor gave any quarter when engaged in a political struggle. But, he was never unkind or unfair and when the fight was over he could resume a strong, personal relationship with the men he had fought. His long friendship with JOE MARTIN, for so many years the leader of the Republicans in the House, is an example of how his friendships crossed party lines.

There are no indispensable men, but SAM RAYBURN came as close to being indispensable as anyone who has ever served this Nation in its long history.

Mr. Speaker, I shall always cherish my friendship with and memory of SAM RAYBURN, and I shall always be grateful for the opportunity to serve as a Member of the House during the time he was Speaker.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, there is little that one can add to the many magnificent tributes which have already been paid to our late, great, and distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, SAM RAYBURN. It has been perhaps truly said that no generation can accurately evaluate the sweep of history which it experiences, but that a number of years must pass for a perspective to be gained for such evaluation. There are exceptions to this rule, as there are exceptions to other rules. Each of us who has had the privilege and high honor of having served under SAM RAYBURN in the House of Representatives through his unequaled tenure as Speaker, knows in his heart that SAM RAYBURN will take his place among the great statesmen of this century, regardless of from which vantage point in time of history he may be viewed.

As has been truly observed, SAM RAYBURN was actually an "institution." He was an institution which personified integrity, honor, and leadership of the highest order. He guided this House and participated in the guidance of this Nation through some of our most crucial years in history. He sat at the helm of this House through the perilous course of World War II. He continued to wear the mantle of responsible leadership through the years after World War II, through the cold war, and through the pressures of our nuclear age. His length of service as Speaker of the House of Representatives is unequaled and I dare say may not be equaled in this century.

Those who have preceded me have described in detail his lengthy service as a Member of this body and as our leader. There are none who are now Members, or who have been Members, who displayed more faithful devotion to duty than Speaker RAYBURN. His rugged patriotism and loyalty are matters of record, and we all knew him to be a fierce protector of the powers and integrity of the House of Representatives. But as has been truly said before, the deeper qualities of mind and heart, in the long run, stand out as most significant to those of us who had the high privilege of serving under him, and I know that I speak the sentiments of all the Members when I say that the friendship of Speaker RAYBURN has enriched the life of every man who has served with him.

As we today sorrowfully and with heavy hearts observe the passing from the scene of this great and honorable man we can take solace in the fact that we have had the high distinction of knowing him as a friend, benefiting from his wise counsel, and serving under his leadership. This should be an inspiration to all of us here and indeed to all Americans who follow in his footsteps.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Washington last January as a freshman Congressman, I naturally was interested in getting acquainted with the leadership of the House of Representatives and particularly the leadership of my own party. I consequently took advantage of my first opportunity to stop by the Speaker's office to pay a courtesy call.

Frankly, I was somewhat doubtful that the Speaker would be in at the time, and more doubtful that he would have time to do more than extend a formal greeting even if he were, but luck was with me and Mr. SAM was in his office.

It is still surprising to me to think back and realize that a man as busy as Mr. SAM was then would insist that I come into his private office for an extended chat. Thirty minutes had passed before I realized it, and when I did insist on leaving for fear of imposing unduly on his time, I got a cordial invitation to stop in for a chat anytime.

Such a man was SAM RAYBURN. He was truly the type of man Kipling described as able "to walk with kings nor lose the common touch." Despite the staggering burden he carried as Speaker of the House of Representatives during one of the most critical periods of our history, he never lost interest in the everyday problems of young Congressmen; he never missed an opportunity to extend to them a helping hand nor placed them in an embarrassing position.

I believe one of the things that brought me to a realization of the seriousness of my responsibility as a Member of the House of Representatives was the fact that I was serving with a man who had been Speaker of the House almost as long as I have been old enough to vote, and who became a Member of the House long before I was born. At 79, he had more vigor, more enthusiasm, more intellect, more perception, and more ability to get the job done than most men half his age.

His long years of service to his congressional district, to the House of Representatives, and to the Nation had given him a feeling for Congress and its work that is hard to describe. Suffice to say that Sam Rayburn loved the House of Representatives as some men love their wives and families. He loved the House as some men love wealth. He loved the House as some men love hobbies, athletics, or other avocations. For him the House was more than a job, more than a profession, more than a hobby. It was a career which spanned nearly half a century. In a real sense, the House was the very life of Sam Rayburn, for he spent well over half his life as a Member of it and what many men consider their retirement years as its Speaker.

The loss of Sam Rayburn is a loss to his congressional district, a loss to his State, and a loss to the Nation, but it is not a complete loss to the House, for Mr. Speaker left upon all of us who remain as Members an indelible stamp which will endure for many years to come. We pay tribute today not to one who is forever gone, but to one whose spirit will continue to live and dwell among us.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, an era in American history passed with the passing of Speaker Sam Rayburn.

As a new Member of Congress I will always feel that I was privileged to know Mr. Sam and to have served the first session of the 87th Congress while he presided over the House.

There have been great men in the past who were honored by their party and elected to this high post, and the pages of history reveal many great acts and deeds. Perhaps the highest compliment a man can pay another is to say that he was fair. Fair in his dealings, honest in his word, dedicated in belief and loyal to his principles. This, I believe, is my summation of Speaker Sam Rayburn.

The Supreme Being was good to Mr. Rayburn, for to the end he was able to accomplish his goals and ambitions. Mr. Sam had many rewards during his life and I feel sure that should the gavel fall in the hereafter calling to order a body of good people, our former Speaker will respond to the call.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, the people of Hawaii were extremely saddened over the death of our late and beloved Speaker, the Honorable Sam Rayburn.

Speaker Rayburn was truly one of God's great noblemen. He was a friend of all, especially to the incoming freshmen Members. He was never too busy to give a helping hand to us as we groped through the legislative maze.

Hawaii will miss him. I will miss him. I feel that today I am a better man for having known Speaker Sam Rayburn.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, there is a new star in the heavens. All of us in Congress and in the Nation feel the earthly loss of our late Speaker, Sam Rayburn, and I cannot perhaps express myself as well as you did, Mr. Speaker, who was so intimately connected with him over the past 22 years both in the organization of the House of Representatives and as a personal friend. I have been here 10 years and I do say he was my personal friend and I loved him.

Mr. Sam earned the respect and devotion of both sides of the aisle and also the people of America. He earned this because he devoted his entire life to public service, one of the greatest vocations that a man can offer to his country. To be trite, I suppose I could use the words, honest, wise, and fair, but if I study the dictionary for appropriate words, I could not evaluate the feeling that I have in my heart, for Mr. Sam had an additional quality, hard to express and yet be understood, one which followed the new commandment given to us by our Savior—love. Love for his fellow man.

Naturally his wisdom and his tenacity throughout his entire career was shown to us daily and like our heroes who have fallen on the battlefield he gave his life to his country.

I telegraphed Mr. Sam late in August in which I expressed the hope that he could be well enough to join us before the session ended in September. He made the reply, probably one of the last letters he wrote, in which he stated that his lumbago had been bothering him, and that he thought he could rest and get the care from his own doctor. This, in my mind, was an extremely courageous statement, but also displayed the great faith he at all times personified.

If I were standing in the Halls of Congress, and I failed to see him I soon felt a little nudge in my ribs as he passed by indicating to me that even though I had failed to see him he had seen me. I shall miss him tremendously. I can remember when I returned to Congress in 1957, the senior Members of the State delegations were introducing the new Members. As you know, Mr. Speaker, I served in the 81st and 82d Congress and was then out for 4 years. When the rollcall came to the State of Nevada and I being the only Congressman from the State, therefore, not having any senior Members to introduce me, Mr. Sam jumped to his feet instantly and said "This one I want to introduce. He is not a new Member, he is an old friend from the 81st and 82d Congresses and he is back for the 85th, and I hope the 86th, 87th and thereafter."

In one of his marvelous speeches I recall that he said "I love people and why shouldn't I?" If only this doctrine of love for our fellow man as preached by our Saviour 2,000 years ago could be understood all over the world today, what a strength it would give the forces of good. If only the forces of self-expressed godlessness could recognize the golden rule in action the world would have the peace on earth for which God gave His only begotten Son.

Sam Rayburn was a godfearing man, he not only was courageous, but he was a man, with all the strength and courage of a disciple of goodness. His final hours of suffering are now ended, but the good that he exemplified to his Nation over so many years will live on, and I join the others today in the sad eulogy for my friend, the late Speaker Sam Rayburn.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, Sam Rayburn was one of our greatest Americans. Born in frontier circumstances, he rose through his own efforts, character, and ability to the third highest position in the Government of the United States and the leadership of the greatest legislative body in the world.

I shall always treasure my friendship with Sam Rayburn and I shall always consider my relations with him to have been one of the most rewarding experiences in my life.

While I am not unaware of the great and formal achievements of Sam Rayburn's life, such as the accomplishments of the committee which he headed, or the legal monuments constructed through his leadership of the House, it is the memory of his personality which remains most strongly in my mind and which I should like to mention today.

Although he affected a gruff exterior, Sam Rayburn was a kind man. His kindness was most in evidence in his relations with new Members to whom he was always available and to whom he was prodigal with advice.

His sympathy with children was a rather surprising characteristic and was unexpectedly warm for a man who had no family of his own. I shall never forget the memorable way in which he greeted my son Charles one day when I availed myself of a Member's privilege of bringing a child to the floor of the House. Sitting in the Speaker's chair, he greeted my son cordially and then presented him with the gavel which he was then using, emphasizing at the same time its historical importance in its use by the officer "presiding over the greatest legislative body in the world."

Another evidence of his love of children and of life itself was embodied in a letter he directed to our new daughter Susan on September 27, 1961, only 50 days before his own death. He wrote:

> Dear Susan: I want to welcome you into this big, wide, wonderful world, and I know you will make your fine parents very happy and very proud of you in the years to come.
>
> This world in which you are a newcomer has plenty of worries and trouble, but no generation has ever had such wonderful opportunities as yours will have, and it is hard to imagine what strides the human race may take during your lifetime.
>
> I trust your life will be one of service and great happiness, and I wish for you all the good things of life.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> Sam Rayburn.

In view of his own condition, this letter which was probably one of the last that he wrote was a poignant and touching testimony of SAM RAYBURN's great spirit and it is a document which I shall always treasure.

SAM RAYBURN was simple and direct. He was fair and he was intensely devoted to the welfare of the United States of America. It is perhaps in his restraint and lack of partisanship in joining with an administration of the opposite party in fostering measures dedicated to protecting the security, defense, and foreign policy of our Nation that he demonstrated democratic statesmanship at its finest and reached his highest peak of achievement.

I am privileged to have known SAM RAYBURN and to have worked with him. I am grateful for this opportunity to touch the stream of American history through this acquaintance with one of our great national figures. I am happy to acknowledge his secure spot in the legislative story of our country and to share with my colleagues in expressing our affection for Mr. SAM and our irreparable loss in his death.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is poorer indeed with the death of the able and beloved SAM RAYBURN, who had served as Speaker of the House for more than twice as long as any other man in the history of our country. On June 12 of last year, he doubled the length of service record as Speaker which had been set by Henry Clay before 1850. Altogether, Mr. RAYBURN served for 17 years as Speaker of the House.

He also set new records for tenure in the House. In 1958, he broke the previous record of 45 years of continuous membership in the House. The following year, he broke the record of 46 years of noncontinuous membership.

Mr. RAYBURN's distinguished career of public service spanned nearly five decades which saw more changes than any similar period. Throughout those years, he amply demonstrated that he could meet the challenges of these rapidly changing times. In Wisconsin's Ninth District, as in the other predominantly rural congressional districts of the Nation, he will be long remembered as coauthor of the Rural Electrification Act, which brought central station electricity to rural America. He had made it clear on numerous occasions that he considered rural electrification as his greatest legislative achievement.

In his 48 years in the House, Mr. RAYBURN had been friend, patron, and advocate of many other worthwhile causes. And in addition to this, he had been for most people a living symbol of representative government and the continuity of policy in the American democracy.

The Speaker of the House carries on his shoulders a heavy load of duties and responsibilities which go with this high and responsible post. Despite this fact, Mr. RAYBURN always found time to help individual Congressmen with their problems, giving freely of his time, his wisdom, and his long experience in the field of government.

Mr. RAYBURN's record in Congress, as Speaker of the House, and in everyday encounters with his fellow men, will stand as a lasting monument to the greatness of the man.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the interval between the passing of our respected and distinguished former Speaker and the convening of the Congress has been one of contemplation and impatience—contemplation of the life and service of this great American and impatience over the necessary delay in putting this testimonial to our loss in the RECORD.

There are many things to which the average citizen looks as symbols of the greatness of this Republic: our flag, the Capitol, the White House, the monuments to Washington and Lincoln, and all those things that attest to our historic past as well as to our acceptance of the responsibilities of this turbulent present. And in the forefront of these symbols of the Nation's dedication to liberty and justice, under the law, stands the speakership of this House, to the enhancement of the dignity of which no man in history has contributed so much as our late lamented leader.

Coming to the House in a Congress in which Speaker RAYBURN had temporarily surrendered the reins of office to his opposite political number I was nevertheless aware of the character and influence of this great American and I stood in his presence with the same respect and deference I have always assumed in the presence of the President of the United States. And when in the succeeding Congress he was returned to office the fact that the candidate I supported was defeated was softened by the realization that the House was continuing in strong hands and that our democratic processes were under the guidance of a stalwart protector.

The record will show that I separated from Speaker RAYBURN on most of the important political issues that came before this House in the years that he graced the speakership. In each such instance I took my position with strong convictions but I was always aware that the opposition was undergirded by a wealth of legislative and political tradition and that our Speaker would see that the rights of the minority would be scrupulously protected.

A few days after Mr. SAM took his last weary way back to his beloved Texas I wrote him a little note as a member of his "loyal opposition" extending my heartfelt good wishes for his speedy and complete recovery. A few days later I received his gracious and friendly acknowledgment, which will always have a place among my cherished souvenirs, a memento of a great citizen, a great American, a beloved and respected colleague.

All of America stood with bowed heads as our esteemed associate was laid to rest and as we marked his place of final repose we turned to contemplate a great and thriving democracy which his legislative ingenuity and forthrightness had helped to build. The great and free institution of American legislative process is his enduring monument but ultimate tribute to Mr. SAM will reside in the hearts of those who served with him and who will always recall his name as symbolic of American citizenship at its best. May the loved ones who mourn his passing find their grief intermingled with solemn pride in the privilege that family relationship and intimate association with this great patriot has brought them.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN's death, while a great loss to the country, is a personal loss to me because he gave freely of the advice I sought from him since I first came to Congress. I will miss his good counsel. My relationship with him was more than political. It was deeply personal.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I join with others on this occasion to pay tribute to one of the grandest men I have ever known. He was a great man, a true friend, and a loyal American. The world is better by his having lived in it.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in this Chamber is a void that is felt by all within its walls. SAM RAYBURN is no more. He is lost forever to the human vision of our eyes. Yet he is an indestructible part of what we are as legislators, of what others yet unborn will be when they come to take our places, an eternal part of his country and her destiny.

The moral fabric of a nation is not the weaving of one generation. SAM RAYBURN was among the immortal weavers of the garment of freedom. He will live in the garment he has helped to fashion. He will live in the souls of his countrymen and of all freemen in all the ages, in all the climbs from one pinnacle to a higher one.

What we have lost in the human associations with a friend we loved, a leader upon whom we leaned when strength we needed, has now become the heritage of the ages. Invisible, save in the sense of presence deep within us, SAM RAYBURN lives on.

Mr. Speaker, every member of this body during the speakership of SAM RAYBURN and prior to the 87th Congress, long will remember the remarks of Speaker RAYBURN at the close of each session. Because of the illness that had stricken him he was not with us when the first session of the 87th Congress adjourned sine die. Thus, his remarks on September 1, 1960, on the adjournment of the 86th Congress constitute his farewell to the House.

Because they embody so much that was the spirit and the purpose of SAM RAYBURN's life, his burning love of country, his dedication to upholding the dignity and the prerogatives of the House, his keen sense of the responsibility of the Congress to keep our country strong and free, it deserves preservation in this generation and constant reading and rereading by the men and women of succeeding generations as they come to this historic Chamber to take the seats that now we occupy.

Here is SAM RAYBURN's farewell address to his colleagues in the House of Representatives that was his life and love:

> We have come to the close of one of the busiest and, in my opinion, one of the most fruitful sessions of Congress it has ever been my privilege to serve in. I am winding up my 24th term. Throughout all the years in which I have served with something like

3,000 men and women in this House, I can look back on each and every one of them as men and women of high character, splendid people, and true representatives of their people. In being true representatives of their people they have served not only their people but the people of our beloved country.

I shall never cease to hold in grateful memory the kindnesses and the compassion with which you have treated me. As Mr. Halleck said, this is an arduous and onerous position. Just 44 men have held it. Through the kindness of my folks back home and through your favor, I have served as Speaker longer than any other man in the history of the country, and on September 16 I will have wound up 16 years in this position. I want to say again to you, as I have said so often, that the House of Representatives has been my life and it has been my love. I never had any ambition to be a Governor or a Senator. I wanted to come to this body and stay here as long as my people favored me. They have been kind and fine to me as you have been.

We have a great and glorious country. It does not have a long history, but it has a glorious history. No people on the face of the earth who live today or who ever did live have ever lived under a government where the people, the individual man and woman, boy and girl, has as much liberty or enjoys as much freedom. It has been my purpose, and I trust in some way that I have lived up to it, and from the first time that I ever took this gavel, it was my hope, my trust and my ambition that I would uphold the dignity and the prerogatives of the House of Representatives against all winds—it mattered not from where they came. So today my heart is full of gratitude to you. I know you have worked hard—each and every one of you. I know you deserve some rest and change, and I trust that you get it to the fullest degree. I trust that when you come back here on the 3d of next January, you will be in good health, ready to go to work in doing the world's great work, because the Members of this House of Representatives are challenged to do the world's great work and part of that work is to keep our country strong, that it may remain free. We are faced with people throughout the earth, and especially in one part of it, whose people know no freedom and whose rulers acknowledge no God.

That makes it a dangerous world in which we live, I think the most dangerous which the civilization, yes, the Christian civilization that we know and love, has ever faced. It stands in greater danger today than it has at any time in the Christian era.

I know you are determined, have been in these past sessions, and that you will be in the sessions to come, and dedicated to keeping this country strong and keeping it free.

As you go home I wish you everything that is good. I wish that your people will receive you as you should be received, and that they will show appreciation for the great and the fine work you have done.

God bless you and keep you every one.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great feeling of emotion that I offer a few most inadequate words in recognition, respect, and admiration of our late Speaker, the Honorable Sam Rayburn. These few words can serve only as a very minor complement to the great feeling of remorse that is expressed by not only every American citizen, but by people throughout the world, over the loss of this great American statesman. These words are coupled with an equally great feeling of gratitude generated by the benefits which will accrue to all mankind as fruits of his dedicated efforts.

The stature and proficiency of Speaker Rayburn's service is most clearly indicated by the enviable length of time his constituents demanded his service in the U.S. Congress and by the demand of his colleagues to serve them as Speaker of the House, a demand that carries with it the highest honor and respect ever paid to a Member of this House.

I am personally grateful, and will forever be benefited by, the honor and distinction of having served in the House of Representatives during the late Speaker's closing years of service to his Nation.

He will be missed. But certainly his resourcefulness, dedication, and patriotism will long live as an inspiration and guide to Members who remain and are to follow in charting the course of American history.

The name Sam Rayburn has been indelibly etched into our illustrious history. Time will never dull it.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, during 9 of the 13 years which I thus far have served as the Representative of the Second Connecticut District, Mr. Sam Rayburn was the Speaker of this House.

When I first came here, in the 80th Congress, I was a freshman in a jubilant majority, and we enthusiastically elected a fellow New Englander, Joseph W. Martin, Jr., as Speaker. He was an able Speaker, and when once more we were in the majority, in the 83d Congress, we elected him again.

This year, when we came back for the 2d session of the 87th Congress, the majority of the House elected as Speaker another New England colleague, John W. McCormack.

During all of the rest of the time that I have been a Member of this House, it has been to the Representative of the Fourth Texas District that I looked with respect and admiration as the Speaker.

Had Speaker Rayburn lived until the 6th of this month, he would have been 80 years old. He almost made it; but he did make many other records, perhaps the most important of which cannot be expressed in statistics.

I cannot speak about the 42 great Americans who preceded Sam Rayburn in the office of Speaker of the House of Representatives, and it may be that of some of them this also could be said, but Sam Rayburn was outstanding among those whose destiny it is to assume and assert leadership in government and in politics, in the fact that he had no enemies.

As a Representative, and as the leader of his party, he was a hard fighter and a tough opponent. As Speaker, he not only was eminently fair, but he wielded all of the vast powers of the office to which he was elected by his colleagues with courtesy and with dignity.

Although I was a member of the opposition party, and when he was Speaker was, of course, of the minority party, I enjoyed, as have all of the Members of this House, a personal friendship with him. On numerous occasions, I sought his counsel. He always gave it, not only with kindliness, but with good effect.

Sam Rayburn was no backslapper; and I doubt if he ever slapped any backs, in the familiar fashion of political camaraderie, himself.

On several of the occasions, as I sat in the House when he was elected Speaker, he said that "the House of Representatives is my life." Those of us who have been privileged to serve with him will agree that he so regarded it.

Our country is fortunate to have had Sam Rayburn for so long in the office which has become in our time third highest in our Government.

More than any one man, he has protected, defended, and perpetuated the House of Representatives as the Founding Fathers in writing the Constitution intended it to be—not "the lower House," in terms either of geography or status, but as the House in whose Members were reposed the most representative functions of our Government—the legislative body that per se is closest to the people.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, last June when the House paid tribute to Sam Rayburn's long and distinguished service as Speaker, one of the Members present said, "his work is not yet done."

Today, just months later, as we join to mark and mourn the passing of this great man, I still find those words truly prophetic.

Sam Rayburn lives with and beyond us to inspire. Today, our colleagues will list the many ways in which his life and record offer guidance to all those who serve in public office. I should like to emphasize just one of these attributes, his stubborn love of country. From the first, Mr. Sam accepted public office with a determined and realistic understanding of its consequences. He learned to forget the part for the benefit of the whole. If at times he felt his country was lost, he never doubted that it could be found again. Sam Rayburn could evaluate the shortcomings of his beloved country with sharp tongue and searing clarity but he never downgraded America.

If his example teaches us all to be as proud of America as we were of him, I am sure that somewhere Sam Rayburn will gently drop his gavel and say, "The Nation is in order."

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my tribute to those already given for the late Speaker of the House. The fact that my personal acquaintance with Sam Rayburn was less than one year, does not diminish my high regard and deep respect for him. We represented differing political philosophies. However, his fairness and his consideration, and his help to new Members of the House of Representatives is something which I shall never forget.

Sam Rayburn leaves a large and important imprint upon the history of this Nation. It is easier to aspire to a position of statesmanship than it is to achieve it. Sam Rayburn's success in attaining it is rare indeed among the annals of history. He became a legend in his own lifetime. His preeminence among the great Speakers of the House of Representatives is guaranteed.

We mourn his loss in the House of Representatives, to which he dedicated his long life in the service of the people of our Republic.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this is the first session of Congress since 1913 that the House of Representatives convened without the beloved SAM RAYBURN as a Member. When Speaker RAYBURN was sworn in as a young freshman Congressman, he had already been a member of the Texas Legislature for 6 years. During the last 2 years in the Texas Legislature, he served as speaker of that body. When he was elected Speaker of the House of Representatives in September 1940, he had already enjoyed 30 years experience as a legislator. During that period of time, he had served as chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for 6 years and our majority leader for 3 years. No leader in the House of Representatives in our history ever was more qualified, for the office of Speaker, through practical legislative experience, than SAM RAYBURN. He demonstrated results of his long legislative experience by unquestionably making a record as Speaker which was unequaled by any predecessor since the origin of our great Republic.

Since he was first sworn in on March 4, 1913, SAM RAYBURN enjoyed the friendship and respect of thousands of Members of this House who have come and gone during this almost half-century of legislative service to his country. Members of this body for generations to come will read and study the great record and legislative achievements of the man whose memory we are commemorating today on the floor of the House of Representatives.

One of my outstanding memories of Speaker RAYBURN will always be the talk he made to the new Democratic Members of Congress at a luncheon when I came to this body in January 1943. He gave to us freshmen Congressmen sound and valuable advice which proved to be of great service to all of us during our years in the House of Representatives. He recounted his years as a new Congressman back during Woodrow Wilson's administration and the trying period of congressional service during the days of World War I. He also reviewed the problems and legislative duties he experienced during the administration of Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover in the 1920's. He recounted in detail the trying days during the first term of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the outstanding legislative programs enacted by the House of Representatives which succeeded in bringing our Nation back from the depths of economic depression, unemployment, and discontent throughout the Nation. SAM RAYBURN, during his 20 years as our Speaker and leader, was always willing to help and aid new Members of Congress with advice and suggestions that resulted in their avoiding the pitfalls and disappointments which would otherwise occur to new and inexperienced Members of this body. During my 19 years' service in the House, I, with others, have observed him as Speaker, successfully handle difficult and critical situations which have developed from time to time on the floor of this House during the heat of debate on important legislative matters. He was a tower of strength in maintaining the dignity of this, the greatest legislative body in the world, during his service as our leader. We who have served with him for a number of years, will always be conscious of the great loss this legislative body has suffered, and the Nation realizes that it has lost a great leader in his passing.

I was present at Bonham, Tex., last November, during the funeral of Speaker RAYBURN, and witnessed the great outpouring of friends and neighbors from all over that State to pay a last tribute to this great legislator, statesman, and patriot. Two former Presidents, the President of the United States, the Vice President, 200 Senators and Congressmen, Governors, and State leaders joined on that day with the citizens and folk in his native State in extending homage to a great American.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to pay our respects not only to a great American but one of the greatest men ever to be elected to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. SAM' was chosen by party colleagues in the Congress for the highest office it is their privilege to bestow, that of Speaker of the House, for a period twice as long as any other man in American history. I have had the good fortune of serving in this Chamber throughout the entire period of his stewardship as Speaker of the House.

I was also closely associated with SAM RAYBURN when we both served on the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. RAYBURN will be an inspiration to every young man and woman who will read the history of America during the past 30 years.

I know no finer tribute could be paid our beloved Speaker SAM RAYBURN that to state what seems dear to me, that here was a man of decisive mind, of keen intelligence, of almost inexhaustible energy, who, nonetheless, loved his neighbor as himself.

I have lost a dear friend, and the country has lost a great statesman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, our Nation was saddened with the passing of Speaker SAM RAYBURN. In losing him we have truly lost "a man." It was Rudyard Kipling who wrote:

If you can keep your head when all about you
Are losing theirs and blaming it on you,
If you can trust yourself when all men doubt you,
But make allowance for their doubting too;
If you can wait and not be tired by waiting,
Or being lied about, don't deal in lies,
Or being hated, don't give way to hating,
And yet don't look too good, nor talk too wise:

If you can dream—and not make dreams your master;
If you can think—and not make thoughts your aim;
If you can meet with Triumph and Disaster
And treat those two imposters just the same.

If you can make one heap of all your winnings
And risk it on one turn of pitch-and-toss,
And lose, and start again at your beginnings
And never breathe a word about your loss.
If you can talk with crowds and keep your virtue,
Or walk with Kings—nor lose the common touch,
If neither foes nor loving friends can hurt you,
If all men count with you, but none too much;

If you can fill the unforgiving minute
With 60 seconds' worth of distance run,
Yours is the Earth and everything that's in it,
And—which is more—you'll be a Man, my son.

"SAM, be a man," his father said, and quite "a man" was he. Speaker RAYBURN gave his life so that this Nation might be a better one. He was dedicated to the proposition that politics deals with the great issues of right and wrong and with the nature and destiny of man. He realized that men are interdependent and not independent; that they must walk together if they are to make any great strides forward; that the triumph of evil requires only that good men do nothing.

His energies were those of the rugged pioneer. His service as creative as that of the finest sculptor. His courage as great as that of David. Waste time he would not. His efforts and skills were bent for the public well-being and guided by good judgment. Once a deed was undertaken, it was done well—it was done forever—for they alone fail who have not striven.

SAM RAYBURN had an undying respect for our constitutional democracy. He had faith in the people and respect for their voices. He knew, as Andrew Jackson said:

> It is not the function of our Government to keep the citizen from falling into error; it is the function of the good citizen to keep the Government from falling into error.

The Speaker loved history and he made it. Early in his career, he was elected the youngest speaker of the Texas House of Representatives to his time. Throughout the years, his great legislative skills were called upon in war and in peace, in panic and in prosperity. His record as Speaker of this House may never be equaled. It most certainly can be said that upon assuming public office, SAM RAYBURN became public property.

This House of Representatives was his life and his love. Since his boyhood he had dreamed to be its Speaker. His mission is complete and the House is a better place for his having served in it, but now he has moved to a higher House where he will dwell with the Lord forever.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to include as a part of my remarks the news release written immediately after the death of SAM RAYBURN by William P. Arbogast of the Associated Press. Mr. Arbogast was a close friend of our late Speaker. His articles are noted for their clarity and sincerity of purpose:

(By William F. Arbogast)

BONHAM, TEX., November 16.—House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Mr. Democrat to millions of Americans, died today.

Death ended the colorful political career of the 79-year-old Texan in a bed in Risser Hospital which he helped build in his little hometown. It denied to the man who had been Speaker of the House more than twice as long as anyone else one of his final wishes.

"I want to die with my boots on and with my gavel in my hand," the venerable dean of 20th-century politics told friends when he left Washington last August for what was to be his final departure.

"They're going to have to carry me out of here, God willing. I love this House."

The official cause of RAYBURN's death was cancer. It was detected shortly after he entered the hospital on October 2 for a series of tests to determine what was causing a chronic back ailment. The ailment, originally described by RAYBURN as lumbago, forced him to abandon his post as boss of the House almost a month before the last session of Congress adjourned. It was an unprecedented thing for Mr. SAM to do, and friends immediately suspected that RAYBURN himself feared the worst.

Before returning to his Bonham farm for a rest, RAYBURN arranged for his majority floor leader, Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, to take over the speakership on a temporary basis. That act put MCCORMACK in line for formal election as Speaker when the House reconvenes on January 10, 4 days after what would have been RAYBURN's 80th birthday.

With RAYBURN in his final hours were the few remaining members of what once had been a large family and several close friends.

A bachelor—his only marriage was dissolved several months after it took place in 1927—RAYBURN was a homeloving man. He detested Washington's social whirl of which he had to be a part and preferred to spend his leisure evenings in his homey rooms in a Washington apartment hotel. There he would sit for hours with friends, nibbling at a steak and sipping bourbon in moderation while watching television. He was an avid boxing and wrestling fan. He loved good food and good drink and enjoyed sharing it with his intimates.

RAYBURN considered the fancy victuals served at most Washington social affairs as "stuff for the birds."

Friends suspected that RAYBURN would have been a good, if doting, father. He loved children, especially boys.

"God," he once confided to a friend, "what I would give for a towheaded boy to take fishing."

Fishing was his favorite form of relaxation. He would go anywhere the fish were reported biting. To him, landing a scrappy bass was an accomplishment.

He was sensitive about two things, his lack of hair and his ill-starred marriage. He often accused photographers of focusing cameras in such a way as to emphasize his complete baldness.

He would not discuss his marriage to Miss Metze Jones, of Valley View, Tex., a sister of former Representative Marvin Jones, of Texas. They were married on October 15, 1927, and several months later the marriage was dissolved.

If RAYBURN ever had another romance, few people knew about it. He seemed in his later years to have the same feeling of "loneliness that breaks men's hearts" which he said he experienced as a boy on a Texas cotton farm.

Although a God-fearing man and a respecter of all religions, RAYBURN did not publicly embrace any religion until he was 74 years old. At that age he was baptized into the Tioga, Tex., Primitive Baptist Church.

Early in life, he recalled in reminiscent moods, he had an unforgettable experience with the Bible. He engaged in a Biblical argument with his father, lost the argument and had to eat standing up for a spell.

"I never argued the Bible after that," he said.

In a private hideaway in the Capitol, RAYBURN spent many sociable hours with his intimates. Known as "the board of education," the hideout was a gathering place for a select group of friends at the close of almost every daily session of the House.

Discussions covered a wide range of subjects—politics, family matters, sports, current events, legislative strategy. The high and the mighty in Washington were among visitors to "the board of education." Harry S. Truman was enjoying a sociable drink there late in the afternoon of April 12, 1945, when he received word that President Franklin D. Roosevelt had died.

Two Rayburn-imposed rules were enforced in "the board of education": all discussion was completely off the record, and jokes based on sex were frowned on.

RAYBURN enjoyed so-called "shaggy dog" stories but did not like jokes "that reflect on womanhood."

RAYBURN's down-to-earth political philosophy could be summed up this way:

"In politics you have to know how the people feel and what they are thinking. If you do not feel what you cannot see, you are dead. You have to be fair. You have to have vision. You have to learn to give and take. You must compromise when necessary. You have to work hard and keep in touch with your people. You have to have faith in the people because they are good and fair. Having good, commonsense is not enough; you have to exercise it."

It was this philosophy which made RAYBURN's name synonymous with American politics and helped him scribe a lasting page in congressional history.

His records were not only those of longevity—he served in the House more than 48 consecutive years and was its Speaker more than twice as long as the previous recordholder, Henry Clay.

He left his imprint on far-reaching legislation. The Rural Electrification Administration, the rural highway program, the Securities and Exchange Act, the Federal Communications Act and antitust laws were among his legislative children.

RAYBURN loved a good political fight and never ran from one. He was at his best as chairman of Democratic national conventions.

He broke even in his last two major battles. He lost his fight to win the Democratic presidential nomination for LYNDON B. JOHNSON, a political protegé, but, always the loyal Democrat, he gave his wholehearted backing to the man who beat JOHNSON, President John F. Kennedy.

He started the year 1961 with what he considered the biggest political test of his career, a move to break a conservative coalition's hold on the House Rules Committee and thereby help the Kennedy legislative program. RAYBURN staked his personal prestige on the outcome. On the showdown vote of the 437 House Members, RAYBURN came out on top by the slim margin of 5 votes.

It was his final big political fight.

The House will, in routine manner, replace RAYBURN as its Speaker. It will have difficulty replacing the image he left in its historic chamber.

"I love the House," RAYBURN once said in a sentimental farewell talk at the end of a session.

The House loved RAYBURN, too, as it respected him. It will miss him for a long time. The place will not be the same without him. A piece of it died with him.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sad heart indeed that I take the floor of the House of Representatives today to say a few words of tribute to the man whom I considered the greatest American of this generation, SAM RAYBURN. SAM RAYBURN loved his country and he said that the House of Representatives was his life. I do not believe it would be possible even in a matter of weeks or months to reiterate or remind the people of this Nation of all the contributions SAM RAYBURN made to his country. To me, he was not only a great American and a great statesman, he was a friend. He was never too busy to discuss matters of state or personal problems with a Member of the House of Representatives and even with his tremendous burdens and responsibilities he never lost his love or affection for the children of our Nation and always derived a special pleasure in the happiness of a child.

The people of New Mexico join with me in this tribute to a great American from our neighboring State, SAM RAYBURN.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, on November 16, 1961, a great tragedy befell the American people, a tragedy which seemed to hold a special and personal meaning for all Americans. On that day there passed from among us our great and beloved Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas—known to all, high, and low, as Mr. SAM.

His passing was not in itself a great surprise. For most of the late summer and fall the American people had watched, prayed, and hoped as the valiant warrior fought his last fight against the kind of odds no man could surmount.

Although not a great surprise, it was nonetheless a shock, both to those of us who had served with him in the Congress, and to those in this Nation who had for so long depended upon him for the kind of leadership and statesmanship which was so uniquely his.

This great quality of leadership grew to fruition, slowly, and painfully nurtured by Mr. SAM himself over a long period of years. He served in the Congress for 48 years—nearly a half century—longer than any man before him in the history of the Republic. He served as Speaker of the House for over 16 years, more than twice as long as any man before him.

And yet, very early in his career—in fact, before he came to the Congress—this quality of leadership was apparent to those who knew and served with him. Back in 1907 he was first elected to the

House of Representatives of the State of Texas by his friends and neighbors in Fannin County. He had not yet at the time passed the bar examination, but his spirit and capability were quickly recognized. By 1912 he had so well served in the Texas Legislature that he was elected its speaker.

In 1913 he was elected to the House and had served continuously in this great deliberation body since that time.

In the Congress his was not a meteoric rise. His claims to leadership were built slowly, but built solidly and his claim to an outstanding place in American history will be a lasting one.

As a legislator, we who come from predominantly rural areas, have much we owe him. For it was Sam Rayburn who steered through the House of Representatives one of the most important pieces of legislation ever to affect the lives and homes of our American farmers—the Rural Electrification Act.

The men and women whose daily lives involve them in the commerce of the Nation, in its communications, or in its transportation, also owe him a great debt. For, as a legislator, he steered through the House the legislation setting up the basic laws governing our stock markets, our radio and television stations, our telephone and telegraph companies, our railroads, and our utilities.

The Nation as a whole owes him a great debt of gratitude for, during the trying and perilous times of World War II, he stood as a symbol of calm, dignified leadership as Speaker of the House.

The people of the free world owe him a great debt, too. For as Speaker and as a parliamentary leader of this House he has helped to build the framework upon which the defense of our Nation and of the free world is based during these crisis-ridden times of the cold war against world communism.

Mr. Speaker, during these times of crisis, the American people will miss the calm courage, the wise counsel, the leadership and the statesmanship of the late, great Speaker Sam Rayburn.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, today as the House pauses to pay tribute to the memory of our late beloved Speaker Sam Rayburn, I wish to join my colleagues in saying again that I was deeply saddened at the passing of this great and good man, for whom I held warm and enduring personal affection and limitless respect.

Speaker Rayburn was undoubtedly one of the greatest of all Americans. His legislative influence was broadly and wisely exerted through two World Wars, a major depression and several minor ones, periods of intense economic expansion and social change, and national crises without end.

The most eminent Member of Congress and one of the foremost public officials and men within the entire history of our Nation, Mr. Sam served the House of Representatives of the United States and our country with unwavering devotion and integrity, outstanding ability, and matchless distinction for nearly half a century. During almost 17 years as Speaker, more than twice as long as any of his predecessors served in that illustrious position, this revered dean of 20th century American Government made countless contributions to our country which have been, and shall continue to be, of inestimable worth. His deeds were indeed abundant.

A vital symbol of America's most challenging era, a profoundly sincere and dedicated public servant—whose wisdom and counsel and effort counted so long and so heavily in our Nation's affairs—Mr. Sam will surely occupy an esteemed place in America's history.

This Congress is not, and will never be, the same without Speaker Rayburn, and the loss to our Nation of his wise and steadfast leadership is one of immeasurable gravity.

My prayer today is that each one of us may be guided by the precept and example which Speaker Rayburn bequeathed to us, and that his immortal soul may rest in peace.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, no matter what criteria are applied, Mr. Sam Rayburn ranked high: as a Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, as a Congressman, as a Democrat, as a dedicated public servant, as a friend, adviser, and confidante of Presidents, Congressmen, public officials, and private citizens.

Many men and women of both high and low station, of modest and great responsibilities, will miss him and the wisdom he so generously dispensed. I would like to join my colleagues of the House of Representatives who express their deep sorrow at the death of our beloved leader and friend, Sam Rayburn. His notable contributions made over a period of 53 years of public service in the Texas House of Representatives and the U.S. House of Representatives have seldom if ever been equaled in American legislative history.

The extent of Speaker Rayburn's influence and respect, moreover, was not merely a product of long service and high office. The greatness of his contribution was increased by his character, integrity, loyalty, dedication, and wisdom. These qualities enabled Speaker Rayburn to occupy the decisive position and role in American National Government which he created.

Speaker Rayburn was remarkably alert to the desires, needs, and hopes of the American people and the ways these needs could be satisfied by the U.S. Congress. I would like to underscore the fact that the benefits of his benevolence and wisdom will be missed by millions of Americans who have never met or been acquainted with him.

To those who knew Sam Rayburn personally, his death leaves a void which must be accepted but cannot be filled. One can only acknowledge that the U.S. Congress and American people have lost a leader of statesmanlike stature. We can be thankful that it is men like Sam Rayburn who have contributed importantly in augmenting the confidence, trust, and admiration which is placed in our Nation's leaders.

Sam Rayburn will no longer contribute his knowledge and experience to national political life. He will be remembered by many colleagues with whom he served so well. He will be missed by no small number of Washington friends, associates, and assistants. Sam Rayburn, however, now belongs to the annals of American legislative history and to the ages.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our beloved former Speaker, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, of Texas, saddened my heart, as it did millions of other Americans.

It was my privilege to serve under his fine leadership here in the House for a period of 20 years, during which time I learned to know Mr. Sam well and thus to know him was to honor and respect him.

The day Mr. Sam had served as Speaker of the House of Representatives twice as long as any other Speaker, I said this on the floor of the House about this great and good man.

Mr. McCormack. Mr. Speaker, with pleasure I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Jensen].

Mr. Jensen. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a great honor and privilege to stand here in the House of Representatives and say to our Speaker the things I have in my heart. If I could have the time to express my deep thoughts of our great Speaker, it would take hours upon hours. I join in all the things that have been said on behalf of the Honorable Sam Rayburn, of Texas.

I shall never forget one of the first years I served in this body. A housing bill was before the House of Representatives for consideration. The bill was debated, the time came for the offering of amendments, and having been in the lumber business for 24 years before I came to Congress, I saw in that bill a mistake which I felt should be corrected. So I offered an amendment to the bill. I stood on the very spot where I now stand and offered that amendment.

A point of order was raised against the amendment on the ground it was not germane to the bill. Our Speaker, Mr. Sam Rayburn, a Democrat, I, a Republican, vacated his Speaker's chair, put another Member in his place, and came to my side while I was standing here, red faced. I did not know what to say or what to do because I had not anticipated that a point of order would be raised against my amendment. Mr. Sam said then, "Ask unanimous consent to withdraw your amendment to this section of the bill and offer it to section 9. It will be germane to section 9. You have a good amendment, and I want to see it passed."

And he resumed the chair.

I asked unanimous consent that my amendment be withdrawn to that particular section and at the proper time I again offered my amendment and it was agreed to by the House of Representatives.

You can imagine how I appreciated that help.

I know Sam Rayburn to be fair, reasonable, courteous, and helpful to new Members. For that we love him. Among the many other attributes that Mr. Rayburn has is his great ability.

I read in the paper the other day that his physician had given Mr. Sam a thorough physical examination. After the examination his physician said "Mr. Sam, you are going to live to be 106 years old."

Mr. Sam Rayburn said, "I will settle for 104."

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed feelings of profound sadness and joyful appreciation that I rise to pay tribute to the memory of one of the greatest leaders of this greatest of all deliberative bodies, the late Speaker Sam Rayburn.

We reflect with sadness on the absence from this Chamber of a statesman who served America and the Fourth District of Texas with unsurpassed dedication in the House for almost half a century.

And it is with sadness that I must accept the loss of a generous counselor and true friend whose interest in me personally I will cherish as long as I live.

Few men in the history of Congress have possessed Speaker RAYBURN's broad grasp of national goals and problems, his legislative acumen, and his abiding faith in the democratic process, which he so effectively guarded during his years at the helm of this House. At this ominous hour in the history of our Nation, we can poorly afford the loss of this great American.

And yet we know with joy that Mr. SAM has gone to a greater reward than this world could give him and that he has found the peace which this world has never known.

We can derive a feeling of joy from having known him and shared in his wisdom and friendship.

I well remember that even in his busy hours, with the momentous business of the Congress weighing on his mind, he always had time to shake the hands of our constituents when they toured the Capitol and offer advice or tell an anecdote to our young visitors. He gave unselfishly of his time and energy in advice and counsel not only to other Members of the House but all with whom he came into contact.

His ability, courage, dignity, kindness, and his unmovable integrity will flourish as a source of inspiration and guidance to the Members of this Congress and every Congress to follow as long as this Nation shall exist.

Mr. Speaker, of all the many tributes which have appeared concerning the late Speaker SAM RAYBURN, none has been more poignant than that written by a native of his beloved Bonham, Tex., the editor in chief of that excellent magazine, the Diplomat, Hope Ridings Miller.

Knowing that many Americans will appreciate this intimate insight into the character of Speaker RAYBURN, I, include the article herewith:

AS THE EDITOR SEES IT

(By Hope Ridings Miller)

IN MEMORIAM: MR. SAM

"I feel as though a part of the Capitol has fallen down," said a tearful Washington cave dweller on the afternoon they laid Speaker RAYBURN to rest in the sandy land of Willow Wild Cemetery near his Texas home.

She was expressing the thought of many mourners for the veteran legislator who served 48 years in Congress and was Speaker twice as long as any other man.

He had no instinct for personal publicity; no flair for projecting to strangers the kind of man he really was. Casual acquaintances often considered him just another conscientious public servant who lacked color and reached high rank through luck and seniority; a rather shy bachelor who sidestepped society as such because he felt out of place in it; an innately cautious politician with a mulish devotion to the Democratic Party; and a sometimes cantankerous character who barked and balked at photographers.

To those of us who really knew him, none of these labels were apt in the least. We understood him, we loved him, and we admired his complete lack of side, his level head, Texas whang, and homey turn of phrase—in a city seething with subterfuge and pretense. We knew something of the startling contrasts and vivid facets in the background to which he was true all the days of his life.

He called himself a Texan, and he was Texas at its best—even though he was born in a mud-chinked log cabin in Roane County, Tenn. When he was 5, his family moved to the 40-acre north Texas farm, where he and his three sisters and seven brothers grew up. (Like Sam Houston, SAM RAYBURN not only went to Texas from Tennessee, but he also had an unhappy marriage that lasted exactly as long as Houston's first—2 months and 23 days.)

He never went on a congressional junket. In 1913, he was in a group of Representatives who sailed down to Panama. "But it wasn't a junket," he insisted. "We paid our own way. Since then, I've never had time to go abroad. You can't legislate and be a world traveler at the same time."

His Capital living habits, taste and pleasures were in keeping with his simple background. For the past quarter of a century his Washington house was a modest, three-room hotel service apartment at the Anchorage, Connecticut Avenue at Q. The waiter who served his breakfast from the Pierre restaurant across the street also was his valet.

He often recalled impoverished years when he rang the class bells, swept floors and taught in a country school to earn his way through college. "I had only one suit in those days," he said not long ago. "It was frayed at the elbows by the time I graduated. I take pains with my clothes now. I appreciate 'em."

His conservative, carefully chosen suits and topcoats were of the best quality. Tailor made, too. "I can't buy my clothes off the rack," he would say, half apologetically. "Hand-me-downs don't fit. I'm too thick through the chest."

Yet he was no sartorial spendthrift. As late as the inaugural in 1957 he wore the same pair of striped trousers he purchased for the first inauguration he ever attended as a Member of Congress—that of Woodrow Wilson in 1913. He bought a new outfit for Kennedy's inauguration.

Like all unattached men who achieve high position in Washington, Mr. SAM was avalanched with social invitations, but he was one beachhead never captured by many Capital hostesses.

For almost a decade before the death of Evalyn Walsh McLean, he consistently declined her dinner bids. Not that he disliked the lady whose Hope diamond palpitated at some of the most lavish parties ever given in Washington. "She was all right," he said. "I went to some of her big dinners years ago, but I never felt she knew, or cared, whether I was there or not * * * so I stopped."

His aversion to "impersonal parties" accounted for the impression that he avoided society as much as possible. Actually, this natural, self-contained solon was the most gregarious of men. His bald dome bobbed happily at annual soirees at which Texas Representative and Mrs. CLARK THOMPSON feted him. He beamed with a wholly new brightness at the first formal dinner given in his honor by Mrs. Perle Mesta, and periodically at repeat engagements for years thereafter. ("Perle hails from Oklahoma; she knows how to make us Texans feel at home," he said.) Year after year, he happily greeted shoals of friends, and even smiled at the barrage of photographers, at the Dale Millers' annual reception on his birthday.

He gave lots of parties, too; mostly, small buffet suppers at which guests dined on Texas beef or chili and tamales. Occasionally, at the home of friends (never in his own kitchenless apartment), he donned a chef's apron, and fried chicken for the whole company.

Although he was as beloved by colleagues as any man who ever served on Capitol Hill, he had his detractors. Some of us can remember when liberals called him a hopeless conservative, while conservatives, deploring his relentless struggle to battle administration bills through the House, labeled him a New Deal rubberstamp. During his final months in Washington—the toughest, in many ways, of his entire career as Speaker—he was at the height of prestige, having been elevated shortly after the inauguration to third in Government rank. Yet, to the last, critics mumbled about his slavish adherence to the White House and peccadilloes that in a man of less envied position would have been overlooked.

He loathed to be photographed when wearing his eyeglasses, and he deplored the way cameramen consistently caught him at unflattering angles or, as he said, "cluttered up the place with all their paraphernalia and blasting lights when you're trying to talk." He fumed when anybody kept him waiting, for promptness was a fetish with him. He was impatient with global thinkers who aired ideologies he considered a threat to the democratic way of life.

For example, at an embassy dinner last spring, he showed his displeasure when an American pundit over after-dinner coffee expounded on the remarkable achievements of Red China. Mr. SAM heard him out; then, with characteristic dignity, he stood up and observed in measured tones, "Anybody who feels that way about Red China ought to go there and live."

Mr. SAM's inflexible stand against televising House committee hearings led to the rumor he could not abide TV because it was a newfangled contraption. Actually, he doted on television; watched baseball games and newscasts regularly; slipped away from parties early in order to see a favorite program; and was rather proud of two or three TV interviews-in-depth on which he starred. His expressed reason for his unalterable opposition to televising House hearings: "When a man has to run for reelection every 2 years, the temptation to make headlines—any headlines—is strong enough * * * without giving him a chance to become an actor on television. The normal processes toward good law are not even dramatic, let alone sensational enough to be aired across the land."

Mr. SAM had an inviolate dignity that forbade probing into certain secret recesses of his life. Most Washingtonians thought of him as a bachelor. Not more than half a dozen of his intimates know anything about his marriage in 1927 or why the union was dissolved so quickly. But the experience did not embitter him. He was avidly interested in the romances of his friends; delighted when they married. He adored youngsters.

His interest in his friends' children sometimes predated their birth. Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON was a Member of the House when he confided to the Speaker that the stork was scheduled for a second visit to the JOHNSON home. Mr. SAM proffered congratulations, and then inquired about the arrival date.

"Oh, about 6 months from now," JOHNSON replied.

With evident concern, RAYBURN asked, "What about your wife? Is she all right?" Not waiting for a reply, he said, "Go call her, this minute, and see how she's feeling."

From then on until Lucy Baines was born, JOHNSON recalls, Mr. SAM never saw him without ordering him to the telephone to get an up-to-the-minute report on Lady Bird.

Mr. SAM could be tightlipped about his own personal life, but he was voluble about the House and the men who comprised it. The last time I talked with him, I asked if he was worried about the inroads of Communists within our country. "No," he answered thoughtfully, "Communists should be watched, of course, but not worried about. Throughout all my years in Congress, I haven't known more than three legislators who could be suspected of being Communists or serving the purposes of communism. And, since Congress is a most reliable cross section of America, I'm not going to be worried."

He went on to talk about the House as "the finest legislative body in the world," and added, "Men in the House are not supermen, of course. They're patriotic, average men, with average commonsense, and that's good enough. It's the greatest privilege on earth to be their Speaker * * * for I, too, am just an average man; no better, I know, and no worse, I hope, than other average Americans."

George Donovan, chauffeur to the Speaker for years, once said of Mr. Sam, "There may be a few men as good, but there's none his better. He was just what he was—and that was all there was to it."

He was * * * just what he was. A gentle man, who sometimes hid the kindest of hearts under a bushel of brusqueness; a distinguished statesman, as impervious to aggrandizement and as incapable of pretense as if he never left his Fannin County, Tex., home.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the passage of time has tended to soften the harshness of sorrow evoked by the death of Speaker Rayburn. What remains—and what will remain for many years to come—is a feeling of profound sadness at the loss of a great leader, a devoted American, and a true friend.

I know that all of us here, and the entire Nation, share in that loss and in that sadness.

We have been privileged to know a truly great man. Among public figures of the past half a century, some were held in higher popular esteem, and some have achieved more prominence than did Sam Rayburn. And yet, in that critical period, few have equaled his contribution to the public cause.

In his 49 years in Congress, Speaker Rayburn had probably done more than any single man to shape our country's response to the grave challenges which faced us as we reached our national maturity and entered into the arena of world politics.

His efforts, his convictions, and his achievements are embedded in the legislative bedrock of our key domestic and international programs.

Mr. Speaker, few men are blessed with the honor of working with and sharing the friendship of a person who becomes a legend in his own lifetime.

Such a man was Mr. Sam.

He was a great legislator, a loyal counselor of Presidents, a tower of strength to his countrymen.

I am proud that I had the privilege of serving with him in these halls. I mourn his passing, but I know that our country is better for his life and his work among us.

May God grant him eternal rest.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the Record, and commend to the attention of the membership of this body, two editorials from the Milwaukee newspapers.

The editorials follow:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Nov. 18, 1961]

Mr. Sam

Sam Rayburn was of the old frontier.

He was born near Kingston, Tenn., in 1882. When he was 5, his family moved to Texas and settled near Bonham. He knew the wind of the prairie, the bitter cold, the desolation, and the loneliness.

After 6 years in the Texas Legislature, at the beginning of Woodrow Wilson's administration in 1913, Mr. Sam took his seat in the House of Representatives. He served without interruption through the administrations of Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and into Kennedy's, a period that covered more than a quarter of the present life span of the House.

Mr. Sam became Speaker of the House at the age of 58 in 1940. Early in 1951, he passed the record for a Speaker's service set by Henry Clay more than a century before. When the House opened its session last June, Mr. Sam had been Speaker twice as long as Clay.

How can his contribution be assessed?

Consider the diversity, as a nation, of our origins; the variety of our cultures, our creeds, and our races; the disparity in our circumstances and our needs, the complexity of our interests, both personal and regional. Somewhere, if terrible divisions are not to destroy our free Republic, there must be compromises made and a workable consensus achieved. The place where that is done is in our political system, and nowhere in it is the focus of conflict sharper than the House, where often narrow sectional or group interests are articulated and the crucial power to initiate revenue raising measures lies.

Mr. Sam's talent as Speaker was not for flamboyance or rhetoric. He specialized in getting things done, sometimes under difficult circumstances. He preferred to work quietly in the background and to avoid doing injury to the institutions or Members of the House. His methods sometimes frustrated more liberal and impatient men, but politics is the art of the possible and Mr. Sam was its master. He made the Speaker's job into one second in importance only to the President's.

Mr. Sam revered the House as it revered him. He was a partisan man, not a neuter. He was a plain, sensible man, skilled in the art of government. He did not make many speeches, although when he made one, the House listened closely. He had no store of small talk and not much patience for it. His scowl was forbidding. But those who got to know him found him warm and on occasion sentimental.

Mr. Sam left the country only once, but no man could call him insular.

Mr. Sam was one of the last of his breed of frontier politicians, close to the land and its institutions. At their best—and Mr. Sam was of their very best—they were great men who built a great nation.

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel, Nov. 17, 1961]

As We See It: Mr. Sam

Sam Rayburn was a great pro in the tough game of politics. He was a great legislative strategist. He was a great Democrat.

But above all these, he was a great American.

Mr. Sam, he was called and how well that exemplifies the regard in which he was held. Not just Sam. That was too intimate. Not Mr. Rayburn. That was too formal. Mr. Sam exactly expresses affection and respect.

And it is with affection and respect that we of the Hearst Newspapers pay tribute to service and his fierce loyalty to his country, and bid him our sad farewell.

It is of course a truism that Mr. Sam was one of the most powerful influences in Government outside the White House in the long years he presided as Speaker of the House. He was Speaker more than twice as long as any other man in our history, and he was unquestionably right in saying he served "with" Presidents, not "under" them.

He could be tough when it was necessary. He was a master parliamentarian. But Mr. Sam never permitted himself to be cemented in his own point of view. If he were convinced that changing conditions demanded it, he would change his position accordingly, openly and without niggling equivocation.

"Be reasonable. Be fair," he would say to neophyte Congressmen.

Mr. Sam was always reasonable. He was always fair.

We join our fellow Americans in their sorrow at his passing.

The needs of our political system—and we are sure Mr. Sam would agree—call for the naming of a successor as soon as possible after Congress convenes in January.

It is our belief there is no one better fitted or more deserving than Representative John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts.

McCormack has been Democratic floor leader 17 years, longer than any other man. He served as Speaker pro tem during Mr. Sam's absence in the closing weeks of the past session.

He, too, is a tested and loyal American. He has the respect both of fellow Democrats and Republicans.

On the basis of experience, length of service, intelligence and leadership, McCormack merits the speakership.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, our country suffered a deep and immense loss with the passing of our former beloved Speaker, Sam Rayburn. A man of the people, dedicated to the people and to this House, which was his life and his love, his absence will be felt for many years to come. Mr. Sam thoroughly understood the principles upon which our Government was founded, for he himself was the living example of what can be achieved by hard work and devotion to duty in a free society under a freely elected Government. Coming from a poor, hard-working and honest family, he rose in rank to the third highest post in our Government. He did this by diligently working for the people who elected him, for his party, and for the Nation as a whole always with their best interests in mind.

We Members of the House who so often benefited from his counsel and advice will especially miss him.

To his bereaved family, I extend my deepest sympathy and condolences.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues, in a few words of tribute to our late Speaker. Speaker Rayburn will always live in the history of a grateful Republic as one of her greatest servants. He was a man of true integrity and of great ability. He always protected the best interests of this House in every way possible.

No one could surpass his devotion to our great Nation, and no one could surpass his desires to uphold the principles which have made this Nation great. His courage, foresight, fairness and sound judgment have contributed to the strength of the House of Representatives and to the strength of the Nation as a whole.

He will ever be my example of a true statesman, one who was thoroughly human, who was endowed with real ability and sterling honesty—all dedicated to secure the best interests of the country he loved and served so long. He will be missed by this Nation as long as it exists.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I hasten to join my colleagues, on this sad occasion, to pay honor to a late and beloved American, Speaker Sam Rayburn. I would almost say Sam Rayburn, of Texas, but while we all know of his Texas birth, his love for his native State, his pride in his heritage, the late Sam Rayburn was Sam Rayburn of the United States, Sam Rayburn of the Democratic Party, Sam Rayburn world figure, and now, like Lincoln, Sam Rayburn "belongs to the ages."

At the same time that our beloved Speaker belongs to the ages because of his untimely passing, he also belongs, indelibly, to all of us who were privileged to serve with and under him. The memory of his life, and those times when we were privileged to talk with him, or have audience with him, or just watch him preside, gives us comfort against distress, confidence against adversity, unceasing pride in the great Nation, and its people, whom he served so nobly and usefully. The very manner in which he presided was, and continues to be, an inspiration to all of us.

He recognized the fact that the Democratic Party was and is made up of many facets, that this alone proved that that party, which he loved so much, was and is a party of all the people. And so it was that, time after time, his influence was used to maintain harmony. He never once participated in, or encouraged, any prejudice, and he looked at the Nation as a whole, and at the party as representing, and serving, a whole nation.

I repeat here what I have so often said in public and in private: Speaker Sam Rayburn, great and busy man that he was, always had time for you. I have never asked an audience but what I received one, and was always greeted and treated cordially. This, to me, was just another evidence of his greatness.

While he loved his party, he always put his country above party, above self, exhibiting inspiring patriotism at all times. I feel certain history will spotlight his service as the greatest example of bipartisan patriotic legislature service of his time.

I salute those who rise to do him honor.

To his family, his legion of friends, I offer my deep and continuing sympathy.

Amid the great grief which accompanied and survived his passing, I cannot but inject a note of gratitude. For my part I am grateful that he lived, grateful that he served, glad that I knew and served with him; I consider it one of the great privileges of my service here.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, this Nation will not produce another Sam Rayburn. His life span links the primitive life of the pioneers of this country with the present age of space. His knowledge of the country, his understanding of the people, coupled with the superior vision with which he was endowed, made him a great leader in Government.

History will record his contributions to the public welfare among the most important made during our march from pioneer hardships to an economic position unexcelled in the world, but I think he would have been great in any other field in which he might have chosen to work. He could have been a great lawyer and I am certain that he would have been a great teacher for, although he was not one by profession, he did, by his actions and his examples to others, teach in the real sense that men learned by being associated with him.

In measuring the true greatness of those who attain heights like Mr. Rayburn, we sometimes think in terms of the big things which they did and the world-shaking events in which they participated. While there is an abundance of such accomplishments by which we could measure him, I believe that the human quality of genuine sincerity in the interest of people and their problems is the one characteristic which destined him to become the great leader that he was. I never saw him too busy to lend an understanding ear to a problem of a new, inexperienced and obscure Member of the House of Representatives. No matter how pressed for time or how simple and insignificant the request, he was always anxious to be of help to everyone. I recall an occasion shortly before it became necessary for him to leave Washington and go home for the last time when I had two young ladies, each 16 years of age, visiting in the gallery, one of whom had known him and had expressed a desire to have her visiting friend meet him. I told him of this while he was presiding over debate in the House and asked him if, at such time as he was able to leave the Chair, he would mind stepping into the corridors and give these young ladies the pleasure of meeting with him. His immediate response was, "Why wait? Bring them into the Speaker's offices," and there, for more than a half hour, he recited the history of this country as he had seen it develop during his long years of public service, telling them of his library and the legislative history stored in that memorial at Bonham. Twice during this discussion with these young ladies I suggested we had taken enough of his time and, on the second occasion, he commanded me to sit down that I also needed to hear some of what he was saying. It was during this visit that I concluded Sam Rayburn would have made a great teacher for, while he discussed his associations with the growth and development of America, I saw two young ladies not yet out of high school enthusiastically attentive to a lesson which even they recognized as extraordinarily great. As he embraced these young girls upon leaving his office, I thought of the phrase from Carl Sandburg in his description of Abraham Lincoln and said to myself, "there too is a man as soft as the drifting fog and yet as firm and hard as the steel which supports the Capitol he so dearly loves."

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, Sam Rayburn will always be remembered for his complete dedication to his country and his fellow man. In his 55 years in public service he was devoted and espoused to give all of energy to the welfare and enlightenment of his America. None of us, here, who have known him can ever forget his full effort and energy to be able to give of his all to protect and keep democracy alive. History gives note of many leaders and great men who have built great nations.

But Sam Rayburn gave all he had to be able to assist in the great problems that confronted his State and his country from 1906 to the day of his death.

The duties of the office of Speaker of the House call for a strong and agile body, a quick and able mind, an' ability to determine many differences, the sagacity of Solomon and the graciousness of the finest host.

To lead the House of Representatives through the many wars and the major trials since 1913 called for courage and great acumen.

Gentlemen, we could carry on this eulogy for many days but it would sum up to an acknowledgment that in the death of Sam Rayburn the country and, yes, the free world lost one of its greatest exponents and warriors.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to find the right words to describe the late Speaker Rayburn. Small words of faint praise are obviously inadequate; and yet, because he was a simple and unpretentious man, flamboyant rhetoric seems equally inappropriate. Nor, perhaps, should a junior Member of the opposite party presume to speak in the midst of those who have known Mr. Sam so well, and worked with him over a long period of time.

And yet we cannot remain silent, for it is seldom indeed that we are privileged to serve with a man on whom the judgment of history is even now being pronounced. It is as though—the trial being completed—the jury did not choose even to leave the courtroom, but instead had simply instructed its foreman to rise and deliver the verdict. And if Speaker Rayburn's full role does not appear in the history books of our country, it is only because those books have not yet been written. But the day is not distant when children throughout the land, as they study the history of this House, will learn the name of Sam Rayburn in the same breath with Henry Clay, and Joe Cannon. For our part, we who were his colleagues can say with quiet pride in years to come, "I served in the House when Sam Rayburn was Speaker." And that indeed is no small thing.

Mr. Speaker, I will not try to recite the many personal qualities which set Mr. Sam apart. It is proper, I think, to leave that task in the good and able hands of other friends who have already today paid such eloquent tribute. Yet in this regard, I would like to close with four lines from Alexander Pope, who says so briefly and so well what we might struggle all day to express. And although this passage was written over 200 years ago about another man, it applies equally today to our late and honored Speaker:

> Statesman, yet friend to truth; of soul sincere
> In action faithful, and in honor clear;
> Who broke no promise, serv'd no private end,
> Who gained no title, and who lost no friend.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Speaker RAYBURN, the country has lost one of its foremost citizens. Not only was SAM RAYBURN one of the greatest Speakers of the House of Representatives, but he was also one of America's greatest statesmen.

Speaker RAYBURN won his spurs the hard way in the real American tradition which permits even a poor country boy to rise to one of the most important positions in our Federal Government. Speaker RAYBURN understood the longings and desires of the common man because he was a common man himself. He was honest and sincere, and he spent the better part of his life serving his fellow man. What greater tribute can be given to any man?

Speaker RAYBURN was a loyal Democrat, but as Speaker of the House of Representatives, he was fair and impartial to Democrats and Republicans alike. The House of Representatives was his first love, and he was the greatest champion of its rights and prerogatives. His name will go down in history as one of the greatest Speakers in our day.

SAM RAYBURN and I were good friends and I greatly appreciated his many acts of kindness which came my way throughout the years. I mourn his passing and can only take consolation in the fact that as a Christian gentleman, Speaker RAYBURN served well his day and generation.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, on November 16, 1961, the council of the city of Philadelphia paid its tribute to the late Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, in a unanimously adopted resolution, and it seems to me fitting that it be included here.

As the resolution states, Mr. SAM had the respect and admiration of his colleagues. To this I would add, he held our devotion and affection.

There were many reasons for this, but no doubt the warmly human characteristics he evidenced stand high on the list. He never failed in an opportunity to raise a member in the eyes of that member's constituency, nor to give us of his wisdom and aid.

The resolution adopted by the City Council of Philadelphia is as follows:

RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE SAMUEL RAYBURN, SPEAKER OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Whereas, on November 16, 1961, the death of the Honorable SAMUEL RAYBURN, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, plunged our entire Nation into mourning; and

Whereas Mr. RAYBURN served in Congress for 49 years, more than twice as long as any predecessor, and for 16 years he presided as Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

Whereas during his years as Speaker, because of his devotion to the best interests of our country and his great talents in the field of legislative processes, he was responsible for having enacted many measures which have been of inestimable benefit to the Nation and its people; and

Whereas Mr. SAM, as he was affectionately known, had the respect and admiration of all of his colleagues, regardless of political affiliation, and he was recognized as the most powerful figure in Congress in shaping the course of national legislation over many years; therefore

Resolved, by the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby join the Nation in mourning the death of the Honorable SAMUEL RAYBURN, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, one of the most respected and devoted public servants of our time, whose passing is a great loss to our country in this crucial period of its history.

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Acting Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Members of Congress from Philadelphia.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity today to rise to pay tribute to a great American, the late Speaker RAYBURN of Texas. Speaker RAYBURN's career stands clearly as an example of what all Americans should aspire to be—a leader and a great citizen. Speaker RAYBURN was one of the most effective citizens this Nation has ever known, and his life stands as a model and an inspiration to us all.

Mr. RAYBURN was born in 1882 and moved to Texas shortly thereafter. His background was simple and unpretentious, and he attended the public schools. Speaker RAYBURN was a lawyer by profession and was admitted to the bar shortly after graduation from law school.

As you all know, his great career of public service began in 1907 when he was elected to the Texas State House of Representatives, and his career in legislative leadership was launched when he was elected State speaker in 1912.

Elected to the 63d Congress of the United States in 1913, Speaker RAYBURN began a career as a legislator which has known no parallel in this Nation's history. He served as majority leader in the 75th and 76th Congresses and finally, in 1940, was elected Speaker of the House—the House he loved—and as you know, he holds the extraordinary record of maintaining the speakership of this House longer than any other man.

I am privileged to serve on the same committee, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of which Speaker RAYBURN was a member and chairman. His traditions of fair play and concern for public interest may yet be seen in the legislation it dealt with during his service.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Florida join me in paying tribute to Mr. RAYBURN, for he did much to lay the groundwork for the growth our State now undergoes. His loss is mourned and felt, though his spirit lives on.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, there is so very much that can be said today about the loss to America in the death of our beloved Speaker, the late SAM RAYBURN. History, however, will take a less personal viewpoint than we here today and will proclaim the great gains enjoyed by America as a result of Mr. SAM's service to his country. But, being mortal men subject to human emotions, today we express and record forever our love and respect for SAM RAYBURN, the man.

Speaker RAYBURN's forte—the vital quality for success as Speaker—was the ability to translate a legislative need, via the Members of this House, into effective law. So his business dealt in men—knowing them and acquiring an adequate degree of their cooperation, agreement, and goodwill to create our intricate product, the law of the land.

He put his mark on this House of Representatives and made it greater in many ways, one of which was by freely assisting its newly elected Members to better fulfill their responsibilities to the people. He gave us access to his vast experience at any time, but he was never aloof or above lending a human touch to a situation. Perhaps I am tempted to speak too personally about my relatively short association with him, but often experiences that are passed off as insignificant at the moment of their occurrence are, in the final accounting, revealing. We sometimes allow these incidents to go unmentioned at a time such as this in the fear that they will be considered inappropriate. To the contrary, though, I view them as an insight into SAM RAYBURN's character and greatness.

I remember one day during my first year as a Member of this great body, I was guiding two elderly constituents, lovely and impressionable ladies, through the halls of the Capitol, pointing out the sights—still somewhat unfamiliar to me. In one corridor we met the Speaker walking briskly toward us. He greeted us heartily, as was his manner, and I responded respectfully. He immediately picked up the conversation, and, before I realized it, he was leading us all down the hall to his office, continuing the tour as we went. The ladies were entranced; the Speaker was enchanting; and I was amazed and grateful. Mr. SAM had not been cornered; he had given freely of his irreplaceable time, not only to a freshman member of the opposition party in the Congress, but to two ladies from a faraway State. Mr. SAM was never too busy or too prepossessed to spend a moment with each of us. When he did so, we always came away more familiar with the complexities of this House and enriched by a lesson in its workings.

And so today we feel not just an impersonal loss to the Nation in the passing of SAM RAYBURN. We have experienced the removal of an integral part of our daily lives. We grieve as Americans and as friends.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of a great leader.

Few men, under the stresses that accompanied his long service in the Congress and his long tenure as Speaker and leader of the House of Representatives, could have maintained the mental balance that SAM RAYBURN did. That he served constructively in this House through two world wars, through periods of giddy boom and dismal bust, as well as through periods of evolution bordering on revolution, would be credit to any man. But Mr. SAM did more than that. He led—and his steady hand on the helm of legislation will be recorded in history.

Let us remember SAM RAYBURN as we proceed into the future and maintain the sanity that the times require.

My own personal sympathies go out to the Rayburn family although they will all be sustained and soothed by the knowledge of the great good he did for the country he loved.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, no man loved the House of Representatives more than SAM RAYBURN, and no man was more beloved by the House. His death is a great personal loss to each of us.

Nothing we say here today can add to the stature Speaker RAYBURN earned for himself during his lifetime of service to his country. His position was unique in the long history of the House and his achievements live on in the large body of law under which our country has grown to greatness.

There can be no finer monument to this man whose half century of public service gave him a deep sense of history and of the continuity in American public affairs. A man who participated in the decisions of great crisis, he also knew that democracy flourishes best in the day-to-day effort to improve man's lot.

Americans everywhere share in his family's sense of loss, for he was first and foremost a great and good American.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, like most of us present today, this will be the first session of the Congress in which I will serve while the office of Speaker of the House is occupied by someone other than Mr. SAM RAYBURN, of Texas. Custom decrees that we should refer to him as "the late Speaker RAYBURN" but I feel that such a reference implies a dilution of his influence which is not supported by the evidence all around us.

As the years pass by we are all privileged to know individuals who stand head and shoulders above their contemporaries within the range of a particular profession. It has been often noted that the capacity to encourage the development of such individuals is one of the deep-rooted sources of our national strength. Viewing the pattern of events during recent years we must inevitably conclude that Speaker RAYBURN was that most remarkable of all individuals—one who could maintain a marked superiority of stature by comparison with not only his contemporaries but also by measurement against the rising leadership of several new generations.

All of us have been taught that ours is a government of laws and not of men; however, like most such statements it is subject to some qualifications when applied to the realities of a fluid situation. The ever-changing needs and objectives of our growing American Nation requires that our Government remain fluid and flexible, responsive to the people as they encounter successive problems and as they signify a desire to reach new goals. An understanding of this circumstance was, to my mind, the key to the greatness of Speaker SAM RAYBURN.

His career emphasizes how well he understood the first requirement for a successful representative government. That requirement is simply for the legislative process to be organized productively. As a center post around which contending voices and forces could revolve while they measured their strength and arrived at a decision, he had confidence that firmness and fairness in his chair would give direction to the energies of all of us, and we would thereby arrive at acceptable decisions most of the time.

We have been diminished by his passing, but he would be the first to tell us that others will rise to an equal height of respect in this Chamber, and that his legacy to us is a will to work, to be fair, and to remember always that we cannot avoid our obligation to play a role in the writing of history.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, we meet today to eulogize one of the greatest Americans of our time, one of the most renowned public servants ever to serve in the Congress of the United States, a man who will be acclaimed by history to be one of the greatest Speakers of the House of Representatives, as we who had the privilege to serve with him now acclaim him; a man dear to all of us, and held in high esteem by millions of people throughout our country, our late Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, of Texas. There is sadness in our hearts and we deeply mourn him.

Our President spoke our sentiments when he said:

> Mr. SAM RAYBURN is gone; neither this House nor the Nation is the same without him.

We have suffered a great loss; our entire Nation has suffered a great loss. SAM RAYBURN devoted all his time, all his talents, his life, to his arduous duties in behalf of his people and his country. We who benefited by his leadership in his capacity as Speaker, have knowledge of his brilliant statesmanship, his fairness and integrity, the confidence he instilled, his loyalty, the tremendous contributions he made to the well-being of our people, the preservation of our liberty, and the ideals of democracy. Many thousands of magnificent tributes have been paid to SAM RAYBURN throughout the years; he was highly deserving of them all.

Mr. SAM RAYBURN is gone—but the memory of his inspiration and the fine examples he set for us to emulate will remain.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in their expressions of sorrow at the loss of former Speaker SAM RAYBURN. He was a great American and a man who believed fervently in the procedures and responsibilities of this House. He has left his mark upon the Congress and upon our Nation.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, when many of us were at the White House this morning there was a universal feeling of deepest regret that our dear and tried friend, Speaker SAM RAYBURN was no longer with us; in fact, this was the feeling of the whole country when he was taken from us. No public servant in the past decades has been more universally respected than our beloved, now deceased, leader, Mr. RAYBURN. There was in his presence a well earned feeling not only of respect but also of confidence. Partly, this was the result of his able mind; but more certainly it was the result of the absolute integrity of his life and deeds. There is no doubt that the most important quality in public service is integrity. Speaker RAYBURN had this quality through every portion of his life and being. Free government in our country and throughout the world is stronger because of the life he led. No man could want a better memorial than that.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the everlasting memory of a great man—Speaker SAM RAYBURN.

No words of mine can adequately express my affection and respect for our former Speaker. To me, he was a man among men. As a man he always seemed to me to be a tower of confident strength. No responsible person ever questioned his word or his motive. He was a man other men loved and respected. He was a man who loved and respected his fellow man. Perhaps this was the cornerstone of his greatness. He could associate with kings and queens and yet he had the common, gentle, and kind touch that endeared him to the hearts of all who knew him. As with every other man, he must have had frailties, but they were uncommonly few.

The good Lord blessed Speaker RAYBURN with great talents and they were used as He intended.

The author is unknown to me, but the following words will express the feelings of many Americans:

> The tall Cedar fell
> And left a lonely place against the sky.

My deepest regret is that I did not have the opportunity to know him sooner and longer.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, as we assemble today to pay our respects to the memory of the great Speaker SAM RAYBURN, I am sure that we are all aware of our inability to express in words the deep sentiments which all of us feel. The shock which we experienced in the passing of this great American from earthly existence is still with each of us and will remain throughout our lifetime.

I count it one of the great privileges of my life to have had an opportunity to know this great man. To have served with him in the Congress of the United States was a privilege which I shall always cherish. The warm friendship which he displayed toward me for many years before my becoming a Member of the Congress will always be a fond memory, but the privilege to have been associated with him in the important affairs of our Nation heightened my love and respect for him.

It was in 1940 that I first met Speaker RAYBURN. At that time he came to my community to speak to the Gastonia Junior Chamber of Commerce while I was serving as president of that organization. At that time Mr. RAYBURN was majority leader in the House of Representatives. The impression that he made upon our community remains today in the hearts and minds of all who had the opportunity to meet and hear him speak. During the intervening years and on my visits to Washington I always made it a point to come by and visit with the Speaker briefly. In spite of his onerous duties I always found that he had time to exchange greetings and in many cases to sit down and talk to me and give me the benefit of his counsel.

Upon my entering upon my service in the House of Representatives in 1957 Mr. Rayburn went to considerable inconvenience to visit with me and my family in the Capitol. His kindness toward my mother and the expressions which he made at that time will always be remembered by her with deep gratitude and will remain in my mind as marked evidence of the generosity of this great man to those with whom he came into contact.

In every community in the Nation Mr. Rayburn's passing was a great shock to the people. In North Carolina I suppose every newspaper carried an editorial upon his life and service. Under unanimous consent I ask that the editorials of the Charlotte Observer and Shelby Daily Star of November 17, 1961, and the Gastonia Gazette of November 16, 1961, be made a part of my remarks at this point in the Record:

[From the Charlotte Observer, Nov. 17, 1961]

A Political Era Nears End With Death of Mr. Sam

The words "Mr. Rayburn is up" always had an electrifying effect in the cloakrooms and corridors of the Capitol.

Members of the House of Representatives would crowd back into the Chamber to hear him. They expected no bombast, and got none. The stocky, bald Texan would state his argument succinctly. The rapport between the Speaker and Members of the House often did the rest.

They respected his fairness, his judgment, and his integrity. They were conscious of his matchless experience, both as a Member and Speaker of the body to which they belonged. And they hesitated to take him on in a no-holds-barred legislative fight.

The death of Sam Rayburn in the north Texas farming community of Bonham practically spells the end to a dramatic and crucial era in the history of the United States.

We are now living in the age of those who were born in the 20th century. The New Frontier is the hallmark of Washington. The days of Wilson and Hoover, the trials of Roosevelt and Truman have faded as the larger dangers of the nuclear age have come to confront the Kennedys and the Nixons.

But we look back in nostalgia at the molding of a country's character and purpose, from the moment Sam Rayburn claimed his House seat in 1913 under President Wilson, to the day in 1961 that the sun set the last time for him beyond the prairies of his beloved Texas.

Rayburn was in a large measure the embodiment of standard, if largely passé, American political traits in the early days of the century.

By dint of hard work, thrift, personal sacrifice and determination, he rose from his poor and unpromising beginning as the eighth of 11 children in a Texas farm family, to one of the most powerful positions in the Government of the United States.

At the age of 12, Rayburn stood unobtrusively in the rain at Bonham to hear a speech by Representative Joseph W. Bailey, later to become a U.S. Senator from Texas. He marked that day in 1894 as one of resolution to follow in the footsteps of the Congressman whose words paled in the aura of dignity and importance surrounding him.

This impressionable lad was in the Texas House 12 years later. He invested his legislator's fee of $5 a day to study law at the University of Texas in Austin. Five years later he was speaker of the State house and in a year more he was elected to the 63d Congress.

Rayburn's steady climb to the congressional summit culminated just before World War II. Elected Speaker of the U.S. House in 1940, he went on to more than double Whig Speaker Henry Clay's record of service in that position.

His effectiveness lay not only in his basic faith in the judgment of the American people and those who represented them—given the facts upon which to base their decisions—but in his conviction that people who can't lead by persuasion can't lead at all.

His dedication to his job was complete. His aspirations, if they lay beyond the Speaker's gavel, were shunted aside as he threw his support to others within the party. As one of its leading architects, he became, in fact, the party's Mr. Democrat—a title worn neither haughtily nor intolerantly.

Sam Rayburn was an American who made the most of the opportunities in his path. He was the confidant of Presidents, but he was unpretentious and ungregarious. He was, at the core, solid as a rock—not perfect—but good for this country.

A fitting epitaph might be the words quickly passed in the Capitol when he arose to speak:

"Mr. Rayburn is up."

[From the Shelby Daily Star, Nov. 17, 1961]

Mr. Sam Epitomized Faithful Service in a Public Office

A soft-spoken Texan rode herd on the House in the person of Sam Rayburn.

A Texan who knew how to use the spur, but seldom had to.

A Texan who knew what blinders were for, but never felt it necessary to shutter anybody's eyes.

A Texan who knew all the rules and how and when to use them, who time and time again corralled the votes to implement legislation vital to the Nation.

When he fell on sleep in the Texas town he loved Thursday morning, he was a man honored as few men have ever been.

It would be hard to imagine Sam Rayburn not among friends. For with a gentleness of spirit and a steel-hard quality of conviction, he had lived a lifetime in the thick of partisan politics without earning the bitterness of any man, Democrat or Republican.

His longevity in political life and his rise to exalted position rested on his knowing how to get along with people. His favorite advice to new Members of Congress was: "Be reasonable. Be fair."

The House speakership represented the pinnacle of his aspirations. He never wanted to be a Senator, never sought a governorship, though he unquestionably could have had either.

Impeccably dressed, usually in a dark suit, Mr. Sam was immensely dignified as presiding officer of the House. He would lean back in his tall, brown leather swivel chair and seem to take only a passive interest in the endless drone of debate. But if any opponent thought the Speaker was woolgathering and wouldn't detect a well-camouflaged attack, he soon found out differently. The Speaker was ever on the alert.

Sam Rayburn held many records, both for years in service, and for tenure in the office of Speaker. Often the very length of his years in the House tended to overshadow the role he played in all those years in the passage of legislation of far-reaching significance.

He sponsored the Securities and Exchange Commission bill, the Federal Communications Act, the Rayburn-Wheeler Holding Company Act with its "death sentence" clause and the Rural Electrification Act.

The dramatic power of his office was seldom as forcefully shown as when, in the twilight months before Pearl Harbor he saved virtually single-handedly, the Selective Service Act. House sentiment was running with that of the Nation against extension of the draft. Shortly before the roll call, the Speaker stepped down from the rostrum to speak for it. It squeaked through by a single vote—203 to 202. Before any member could change his mind, the Speaker banged his gavel and declared the result. Had the measure lost, a million men would have been discharged from the U.S. Army, whose strength then was just 1,400,000. The Japanese struck 4 months later.

He stands as a model for American youth of choosing early in life a goal for living, and living up to it. All that he became he worked for, from the early boyhood years of poverty when, he would later recall, he sometimes experienced "the loneliness that breaks men's heart."

He rose from humble beginnings to position surpassed in power only by the Presidency itself and, at times, was equal to that of the Chief Executive. He held it as a public trust and never departed from his devotion to duty.

Last June, when Rayburn opened the House session, he had been Speaker twice as long as any man in history—16 years and 273 days.

On that occasion, President Kennedy joined in the tribute of Rayburn's congressional colleagues to write that service records may be measurable, but "immeasurable is your devotion to cause and country."

The President's words are now a fitting epitaph to Sam Rayburn.

[From the Gastonia (N.C.) Gazette, Nov. 16, 1961]

A Tribute to Sam Rayburn

Sam Rayburn had the philosophy that it's better to die on your feet than to live on your knees.

If he believed in something, he fought for it until there was no hope. And then he kept on fighting.

It was like that when he died.

A weaker man would have given up many weeks ago. But Speaker Sam, hollowed out by the deadly knife of cancer, struggled just as valiantly with death as he had struggled with hundreds of opponents in the hardened art of Washington politics.

Men like Sam Rayburn come along about once in a lifetime. This is not to say that Mr. Rayburn was perfect. No man is. He might have had many shortcomings.

But, from what we have read and heard, here was a man who, once seeing what was the evident right, would turn in that direction and work with the determination of a bull to bring it about.

To gain the admiration and respect of both Democrat and Republican at once is no little accomplishment. Speaker Sam did.

He held to the belief that success is never final * * * and failure never fatal.

So he won his victories—was that the end?

So he lost some battles—was that the end?

Never.

When you have dedicated yourself to your country, there is never an end to the task of making it better, improving it for the next generation.

Sam Rayburn is dead.

Although he would scoff at it, we mourn his passing.

Mr. Speaker, I shall miss Sam Rayburn. Each member of the House of Representatives will miss him. Furthermore, every American will miss him.

His life of service was noteworthy because of his consideration of the welfare of all of the people. The legislative mark that he made will perhaps never be equaled in the history of our country. This mark was made not merely by length of service, but by the high purpose and lofty ideals which this great man translated into action.

On these occasions it is customary for us to extend to the family of a departed colleague our sentiments of deep sympathy. To be sure, I extend my sympathies to the family of Speaker Rayburn, but I feel that this would not be adequate to cover those to whom we should extend our sympathy on this occasion. And so, Mr. Speaker, I would broaden my remarks to extend sympathy to all Americans and to free people everywhere who have lost a fearless leader in the cause of humanity, the late Honorable Sam Rayburn, of Texas.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, on June 12 of last year in this Chamber we celebrated the occasion which marked the date on which Sam Rayburn had served as Speaker of the House of Representatives twice as long as any of his predecessors.

At that time, Mr. Speaker, your remarks were the first of many tributes which eloquently expressed the deep regard and affection in which Sam Rayburn was held.

Today we express our sorrow that he is no longer with us, and that the country which he loved so devotedly will no longer have the benefit of his great experience and his leadership.

We shall remember Mr. Sam as a friend. No matter what pressures he was under, his door was always open to any Member who sought his guidance and counsel—and there are few of us here who did not do so on many occasions.

He will be remembered as one of the great Americans of all time. His integrity, his dedication to his country, and his long and unparalleled service in this House was an inspiration to all who had the privilege of knowing him over the years and will inspire future generations of our countrymen.

We mourn Sam Rayburn's death with a sense of great loss, but we are grateful for all that he contributed to the national life and to the world.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sam was my friend. He had the knack of making each Member of the House feel that he was his personal friend.

I will never forget the first day I came to Washington, 18 years ago, and I went to see the Speaker. He said, "Adam, everybody thinks you're coming down here with a bomb in each hand. Maybe you are, but don't throw them. Feel your way around. You have a great future."

It is my feeling that he said that or something like that to every freshman Member of the House of Representatives. All through the years he maintained this fatherly attitude. When I was wrong, he chastised me and sometimes would even punish me. When I was right, he covered me with praise.

The last time I spoke with him was the day he was leaving. I was talking to John McCormack by phone. I said, "John, is the Speaker there or has he left?"

John said, "Here he is, Doc."

I said, "Mr. Speaker, take it easy, relax, and have a good rest."

And so he has gone to the land of the good rest. He served his God, his country, and his fellow man with greatness and dignity.

"Go thou and do likewise."

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join the many Members who have here today expressed their sorrow at the passing of Mr. Rayburn. My acquaintance and friendship with Mr. Rayburn, predates my service in Congress by many years. I very fondly recall that in 1958, while serving as the national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, that I called on our Speaker many times. I discussed our problems with him, especially those pertaining to our national defense posture, and needed remedies concerning our Nation's ex-servicemen and women, and our veterans. He always lent a very sympathetic ear to the problems that I advanced in behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and never failed to give good advice and encouragement. A very proud moment in my life was the presentation of that organization's highest award to Mr. Sam, during the legislative banquet here in the city of Washington, D.C., February 1958. Mr. Rayburn was a great American, and a fine and good man. His absence here in this Chamber will be a loss to this Nation and to the world.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that the Members of the Congress of the United States, as well as citizens from all walks of life across our Nation, learned of the death of Speaker Sam Rayburn. He was loved and respected by all who knew him personally and by those who knew of his lifelong service to his country.

The contributions that our late Speaker made to his State, to his country, and to the world, indeed, are too numerous to mention. He was noted for his deep convictions and he had the courage to fight for those convictions.

It has been previously pointed out that after a distinguished career in the Texas Legislature, Sam Rayburn came to the Congress from the Fourth District of his native State. Through his abilities to debate, to understand, to delve into the heart of the vast national and international problems before him, he advanced to the position of Speaker of the House of Representatives. In this Chamber he justly gained the high regard of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. He was always a counselor and friend.

Speaker Rayburn was a believer in our constitutional system. He respected our two-party system of government, and yet, though a strong and fair partisan, he placed his country above his party. These characteristics of true statesmanship became known throughout the length and breadth of our land and the name Sam Rayburn became a symbol of the American way of life.

When I first came to the House of Representatives in 1945 from the 11th District of Pennsylvania, to me, Sam Rayburn was one of the leading figures in the United States. His words of sound advice, his friendly demeanor, his firm but courteous conduct of the affairs in the House of Representatives, were impressive, and brought to this legislative assembly strength and prestige.

Mr. Rayburn never feared to accept responsibility. His reasoning was sound; his words were honest and forthright.

It is appropriate that on this occasion we recall the words of Speaker Rayburn which are taken from his speech at the Democratic National Convention held at Philadelphia in 1948. He was elected permanent chairman of that convention and I quote his words which hold timeless advice to this Nation:

> Never before have free governments had to face a war which so drained the material resources of nations and, more important, the souls and confidence of men. Never before have free governments had to face such an aftermath of war. Mountains of problems must be met; mountains of expectations cannot fail; mountains of confidence we must instill in the hearts of our own people and the peoples of the earth.
>
> All of this leadership was thrust upon us and was not of our choosing, but leadership of the world has been handed to us. We must accept the challenge. We must accept the responsibility if we are to live in a world that is worth living in.

Today we bow in solemn remembrance of the man who gave us this advice. To his family we extend our deep and sincere sympathy. The late Sam Rayburn was, indeed, a revered product of his beloved Nation.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 4, 1961, Sam Rayburn spoke at the centennial celebration of Abraham Lincoln's first inauguration as President of the United States. He delivered a brief but eloquent and moving address, the words of which caused me to compare the circumstances of Lincoln's inaugural with those of our more recent past—the months just previous to the entry of this country into the Second World War. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read some excerpts from Mr. Sam's address, before going on to make this comparison in greater detail.

> Prejudice, hate, agitation brought about the Civil War. I have always thought that if it had not been for hotheads in the South and the inane and insane agitators of the North that Abraham Lincoln, by his justice, his fairness, his great statesmanship, would have prevented the Civil War which destroyed the flower of our young manhood in this country that at that time was so sorely needed.
>
> As the son of a Confederate soldier, who did what he thought was right, I say for him and for myself after that was over, he was proud our Union was preserved.
>
> The saddest thing that ever happened to the border States and the Southland was for an insane man to assassinate Lincoln. Lincoln was strong enough in the hearts and minds of the people in the North that he could have prevented, and would have prevented, some terrible things happening in some parts of our beloved country.

Now these are serious words, coming as they do from the man, who of all the proponents of extending the Selective Service Act in 1941, most influenced its passage.

I am not suggesting any facile comparison of our late Speaker to Lincoln. Rather, I do suggest that Sam Rayburn's deep understanding of history gave him the vision to look ahead of his own times toward the possibilities of crisis and catastrophe. Without his effort, our country would have entered World War II with an army of 400,000—1 million less than the already inadequate force which the draft extension preserved.

But my point, Mr. Speaker, is this: any man with the compassion displayed in the centennial speech I have quoted, with a true sense of the tragedy of war, commits an act of statesmanship when he calls to arms young men—his fellow citizens not fully grown. Of course, Mr. Sam bore a different responsibility from that of President Lincoln; but he rose to the major crisis of his day with a similar kind of courage and he exerted a leadership of sufficient strength to raise a reluctant and unwieldy Congress with him.

He was, as he remarks, the son of a Confederate soldier. Yet he did as much as any man of this century to strengthen our Union by giving it a strong Congress. For the most part, he worked quietly, and his achievements were unspectacular, and I single out his work on the draft bill only as a dramatic example. It exemplifies the farsightedness of his patriotism, and his willingness to make the sacrifices necessary to maintain our national integrity. It exemplifies, Mr. Speaker, that Sam Rayburn was a great man with whom all of us are honored to have served.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, a mighty oak has fallen. Its roots were deeply imbedded in the traditions of America for many years. The sound of its fall reverberated throughout the United States and cast a gloom over the land. Sam Rayburn exemplified the highest qualities of our civilization. A man of absolute integrity he scorned everything that was mean and low. His long and distinguished service to his district, State, and Nation has indelibly etched his name in the Hall of Fame as one of the great statesmen of all time. There is little that we can say today to add to his memory, but with my colleagues I mourn his passing and thank Almighty God that he gave to the world Mr. Sam, Mr. Democrat, and Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in sorrow on this occasion. The passing of Mr. Rayburn is a great national loss and a great personal loss to me. In my opinion, he was the outstanding American of his generation.

His services to the Nation have been noteworthy. Not only the obvious ones he performed as Speaker for so many years, but in many other subtle, less well known ways. He was the intimate and respected adviser of Presidents, the worthy and able representative of his people, the friend, counselor and trusted leader of a long series of Congressmen, of whom I am one.

Sam Rayburn's influence on the course of legislation and on the legislative branch of Government was without parallel. Through the many years as Speaker and as party leader, he has always wisely used his great influence for the highest type of legislation in keeping with his personal integrity and traditions.

The loss of his guiding hand will be very great. To a Member who has served with him and under him, the loss is even greater. He was a rare combination of wisdom, integrity, and absolute honesty. His passing leaves in me a personal sorrow and a place which never again can be filled.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I know of no man who more richly deserves the many wonderful, heartfelt expressions of sympathy which have been expressed here today than does our late beloved Speaker, Sam Rayburn.

When I received the news of his death, it was as if I had lost a member of my own family. Certainly, I had lost a friend.

I think Mr. Speaker, that the one thing I remember most vividly about this great man was his friendliness. He was an extremely kindly man. I imagine that at one time or another, in one way or another, he extended the hand of friendliness or helpfulness to every Member of this House, irrespective of party, region, race, religion, or creed.

I always marveled at how he managed to find the time, in the course of a busy day during which the burdens of state bore down on him, to do so many things for so many people.

Another eternal testimony to the greatness of this man is the fact that not one person can say that Sam Rayburn ever failed to live up to a promise or to a commitment. His word was truly his bond. He would no more think of going back on his word than he would of telling an untruth—and the whole world knows that he was a scrupulously honest man. He was indeed the gentleman from Texas.

Sam Rayburn was a great American. His love of country, and his devotion to the principles and ideals upon which this Nation was built, was the great force which sustained him during the many years that he played a prominent role in world affairs. He was a great patriot.

When the history of the period during which Sam Rayburn lived and served his country so faithfully and honorably is written, the name of this great man will be set down in large type, for he was a man who helped create that history and helped shape the course of world events. Without his strong, unyielding hand at the helm of this House, during times of great stress and great peril to the Nation, the course of history could very well have been altered.

I join all of my colleagues, today, in paying tribute to this great man—to this great legislator, whose love of the House was surpassed only by his love for his Nation—to this great patriot—to this great American—to my friend, Sam Rayburn.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my many colleagues in the House of Representatives who are today paying tribute to the memory of the greatest Speaker the House of Representatives has known, certainly in this generation, the late Honorable Mr. Sam. It is with a sad heart that we today pay tribute to his memory, and again give recognition to the magnificent statesmanship of one of the great leaders of history. Mr. Sam served in the highest position in the House of Representatives, the third ranking man in the U.S. Government, for more than twice as long as the longest service of any Speaker who preceded him.

The record of Speaker Sam Rayburn has been reviewed today in great detail by those who have preceded me. However, as a Tennessean, and as one who represents a section of Tennessee not too far removed from the birthplace of Sam Rayburn, it is my special honor to refer here again to the fact that we Tennesseans claimed Sam Rayburn as one of our own. As was true of so many of the great leaders from Texas, Sam Rayburn had his roots in the State of Tennessee. He, therefore, joins other great illustrious Texans such as Sam Houston and David Crockett in assuming his place in history as one who first came from the State of Tennessee and then became a national leader from the State of Texas.

Numerous comments have been made concerning Sam Rayburn as a statesman and a patriot. I join in all those comments. I am confident that no one has surpassed the devotion of Sam Rayburn to our great Nation. We know Sam Rayburn was a simple man, and a man of great personal dignity. Mr. Sam would have been the first to disagree if anyone would have charged him with being perfect. He had human limitations, human likes and dislikes, just as everyone else, but I believe he came as near to being the perfect Speaker of the House of Representatives as we may know in this generation. He had remarkable sense of timing and above all an acute sense of good judgment with respect to the pulse of the Nation and the readiness or receptiveness of the Nation to legislative enactment of various kinds.

I have no doubt that Sam Rayburn, in the judgment of future historians, will be deemed to have been one of the truly great men of this century.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I think most Members of Congress feel as I do about the qualities in men which give them the capability for leadership. Personally, I regard leadership as one of the most admirable traits in a human being, particularly when that leadership involves the responsibility for the justice, security, and safety of millions of other human beings. When I think of the word "leadership," the name of one man immediately flashes into my mind: the Honorable Sam Rayburn.

Like many others in this Chamber, the first impressions I had upon entering the Congress of the United States included the feeling of competence which Mr. Sam inspired in all Members, from the newest freshmen to the most seasoned veterans. The Speaker's calmness and confidence was a reassuring influence upon most new Members during their early days of adjustment within the Nation's senior lawmaking body.

One could not help but feel that Congress, even America itself, was in capable hands. While observing the great leader as he directed the flow of Congress' important tasks, I invariably absorbed the Speaker's own confidence.

SAM RAYBURN administered his duties as Speaker with dignity and fairness, in spite of the vast power of his position. He demonstrated his impartial wisdom each time he dealt with the minority. I have heard and read innumerable tributes to his fairness by Members of Congress whose political party was opposite that of our late Speaker.

I am sure that I will always associate the name of SAM RAYBURN with leadership because he has been a living symbol of authority throughout my 18 years in Congress. The Rayburn image has symbolized authority with justice, not tyranny with power. That image will remain within the halls of Congress far beyond the half century of his actual physical presence.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, the passing of the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, the beloved Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, known throughout the land as Mr. SAM and Mr. Democrat has touched me deeply. It has been my privilege to have known SAM RAYBURN since 1941 when I first came to Washington as a secretary to Congressman Ross Rizley of Oklahoma, throughout all these years we have been warm personal friends.

Mr. SAM served in his position of leadership twice as long as any other man in the history of our Nation. He accepted the sacred trust of the second most powerful office in the land with a profound sense of duty and responsibility. He loved the House of Representatives and was always proud of his membership in it. This great American was always dedicated to our representative form of government and with his passing the country suffers the loss of a great soldier and patriot.

SAM RAYBURN lived by the rules of reasonableness and fairmindness. I have always been impressed by his fairness, reasonableness, courtesy, and helpfulness; he has always been accessible to every Member of the House, whether they were of the majority or minority party.

Our Mr. SAM has indeed left his mark on all of us who have known and loved him. Texas can well be proud of one of her truly great sons who has gone home to stay.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is in the spirit of highest tribute that we hereby commit to our generation and to posterity, the history of the life and leadership of a truly great man, SAM RAYBURN. All of us feel that we have lost a brother and friend.

Last fall while I was in Europe, leaders and citizens from Turkey, Greece, Great Britain, Spain, France, Italy, Switzerland, and West Germany were inquiring with sincere interest about our Mr. SAM's condition.

This interest, this genuine concern, speaks more clearly than our heartfelt eulogies. For a simple man from Bonham, Tex., to be recognized by our friends not only here in the United States but also over the world is the supreme tribute.

Words said here will be but echoes of the strength of character, the intellect, and the will of the greatest legislator, and one of the great Americans of the 20th century.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the group which began service in the House of Representatives under SAM RAYBURN was large, and I am one of them. All in this group are grateful to him for his guidance, advice, and admonitions. His activities are now so much a legend that we salute this afternoon one who needs no salute, the 43d Speaker of the House of Representatives. SAM RAYBURN is gone—and gone with him is part of our hearts and part of the hearts of the citizens of our country.

Fifty-four years of public service—48 years as a Member of this House and 17 years of service as Speaker—longer than any Speaker in the history of the House.

Some knew him for decades—others of us for only a few years. Countless thousands knew him for just a moment or two, and millions knew him only via the communications networks, but all knew him as a friend; a friend of the Constitution, a friend of fairplay, a friend of loyalty and of progress and of devotion to his America. Those millions are the silent millions who join us in our salute to one who needs no salute—one who will always occupy an important and favorable place in history—SAM RAYBURN, the 43d Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, from time to time all of us experience the sorrow that accompanies the loss of a friend. From time to time the Nation has to adjust to the loss of a great leader. I doubt whether the death of any one great national figure was ever accompanied by the feeling of sorrow and deep personal loss on the part of so very many individuals as that which was caused by the passing of the great Speaker RAYBURN.

As a freshman Member of this body 15 years ago, when Mr. SAM was serving briefly as minority leader, I learned the warmth of his friendship and the magnetism of his personality. My immediate respect for his knowledge, experience and leadership developed into an ever increasing appreciation for the privilege which was mine, of serving and associating with him. I share with my colleagues in the House not only the sorrow caused by the death of our outstanding leader and statesman, but also the loss of a kind and helpful personal friend.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, our late Speaker, the beloved Mr. SAM, was a man whose sterling qualities are so well known to the American people that no words of eulogy can add to the great stature he earned in his long career of service to the people of his country.

If we may be forgiven for a personal reference, we would observe that coming to the Congress to fill an unexpired term shortly after the commencement of the 86th Congress it was our high honor to be given the oath of office in the well of the House by our late Speaker, which was followed by an enjoyable visit in his office. During the year that followed, we discovered that his birthday, January 6, was the same as that of our only daughter, Mary Patricia Randall, and the discovery of another fact brought even greater pleasure when it was found the late Speaker was born out in his native Texas on exactly the same day, January 6, 1882, that my father-in-law, Patrick J. Layden, was born in County Clare, Ireland. Accordingly, January 6 for the last few years has become a day of added significance in our family, knowing we celebrated not only two birthdays of our own, but had the feeling we were just a little bit closer to our late Speaker, knowing that we were also observing the birth date of one of America's greatest statesmen.

Mr. RAYBURN's greatest achievement was that he was a leader of men, a proven leader for years and years of his colleagues in the House of Representatives. This was a quality that radiated from his person, once you met him face to face, in spite of his quiet and reserved nature. He will be greatly missed even by the thousands and thousands of those in this country who never had the privilege to know the man personally. But think for a moment of the great privilege we, the Members of this House who served under his leadership, have enjoyed, and the very great experience to know the man personally. I feel certain all Members of the House regarded it as a high honor to have served as a fellow Member with Mr. SAM as our Speaker. He was a true friend to every Member and always ready and willing to listen to the special problems of each of his fellow Members.

If one had to portray the man in the very few words contained within one breath it would be to say he was a real friend and a great statesman.

His friendship can, of course, be known only to those who were personally acquainted with the man and had the great honor to enjoy that friendship. His statesmanship, the other outstanding characteristic of his makeup, was evident to all of the great American public who have lived under the Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy administrations. While this statesmanship is best known to those who are careful students of government and to those who are close observers of the American scene, the entire public has well fixed in its mind the image of the late Speaker as a great statesman. But what is probably more important is that his stature as a statesman will grow in future years in the minds of those who study by review the significant years the House of Representatives was under his leadership. It will be the lot of but very few men to leave an imprint on the pages of our country's history as large as our beloved SAM RAYBURN.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, it is one of the inscrutable mysteries, if not lamentable tragedies of life that when a man reaches the zenith of his knowledge, wisdom, power and influence, "that he is cut down" and is returned to his mother earth.

Such is true of Speaker RAYBURN.

It is safe to say, I believe, that no man in America was possessed of as much knowledge, wisdom and understanding of the intricate problems of government of statecraft and statesmanship as was our departed leader.

His death marked the end of an era. Other than Winston Churchill he is the last of the great statesmen of the era of Roosevelt.

For me to recount here his achievements for the benefit of the American people is to record practically all of the good legislation which has been enacted by the Congress of the United States in the last 35 to 40 years.

During all the years that I knew Speaker Rayburn, he lived and moved in a realm of greatness—a world leader, beloved by the people of our country, and yet with all he was a simple, unassuming, unpretentious person.

Along with many of my colleagues, I attended his funeral in his beloved small hometown of Bonham, Tex. I saw the thousands gathered to pay their last tribute of respect to their neighbor, their friend and the great statesman. I was impressed with the sorrow and sadness evident on the face of young and old among his friends, and neighbors. I was impressed also with the evidence of gratitude and devotion to the man who had for so long been their friend and the Nation's legislative leader.

Sam Rayburn had a fierce pride in his origins and in the thousands of Texans like him whose roots were actually in other Southern States. Himself a native of Tennessee, he shared with such early pioneers of Texas independence as Sam Houston and Davy Crockett a type of frontier courage rarely seen in politics and which, when dramatized as it was in Sam Rayburn's career, can inspire a whole nation.

I recall a speech he made last spring at a Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in North Carolina.

"My feeling for the people of North Carolina is almost a family feeling," Sam Rayburn said. "Much of my native State of Tennessee was populated by brave and restless North Carolinians who poured over the mountains to push back the wilderness and to start a new life. A few of those people and tens of thousands of their descendants went on to Texas, the State where I have lived and which has been so fine and kind to me. You and I come from the same kind of stock."

The kind of stock to which our late Speaker referred is the kind of stock which defended the Alamo to the last man and who are so well depicted in a new book by Walter Lord entitled "A Time to Stand." Here we see the kind of stock which Sam Rayburn came from and which was always a source of pride to him. The brave South Carolinian, James Butler Bonham, the determined and proud William Travis, from my own State of Alabama, the homespun sharpshooter, Davy Crockett, from the Tennessee mountains, these and many lesser known heroes possessed one bond in common but it was of such a power as to transcend all other things they might have shared. It was the will to achieve liberty, whatever the price.

Thus was the heritage of Sam Rayburn. Over the decades that he served in Congress he transmitted that heritage greater than it was when he received it. This is the legacy that he bequeathed to the Congress and to the American people.

Last March Sam Rayburn participated in the Lincoln inaugural commemoration program here on the steps of the Capitol. On that occasion he said, "As a son of a Confederate soldier, who did what he thought was right, I say for him and for myself that after that was over he was proud our great Union was preserved."

Today I say that our Nation is stronger because Sam Rayburn has been here and because he knew when it was "a time to stand."

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have been able to serve in these Halls with the beloved Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives Sam Rayburn.

Sam Rayburn was more than just the Speaker of the House; he was the guide and guardian of every individual Member who served in this great body. He was always willing and anxious to help a new Member with sound and practical advice.

Mr. Sam's impartiality, integrity, and outstanding parliamentary skill in presiding over the House of Representatives enhanced the dignity and traditions of the speakership.

Mr. Rayburn was a man of remarkable intellect, and my colleagues will agree that he had a distinguished career in the House.

Our Nation has indeed suffered a great loss, and in these times we can ill afford to lose men of the caliber of Sam Rayburn.

I was saddened by his death, but there is some degree of solace in recalling that America is better for having had his high and dedicated services through the years.

History has already recorded Mr. Sam's accomplishments, and the historians will have much to add to this unique record.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, in the path of the many great tributes paid to the late Sam Rayburn, my remarks as to my high esteem for him will sound extremely ordinary and perhaps commonplace. Mr. Sam was a great man—a leader among leaders, a giant among giants, but to my judgment the source of strength for this greatness was his keen interest and sympathy for every individual with whom he came in contact. He was great because he was Mr. Sam to everybody. To him the ordinary and commonplace were the source of solution to every problem. What anyone believed or felt, regardless of his station or pursuit in life, was important. To these things I can give personal testimony. Upon the many occasions as a freshman Congressman when I needed help and direction, in Mr. Sam I not only found an interested listener to details but also active assistance. What I am saying is not news to you, my colleagues, who have had the same experience, but it is fitting, I think, that the Record show that Speaker Rayburn was the friend of everyone who was privileged to come in contact with him.

He has made a great contribution to this body, this State, and the Nation. He rose to great heights of power and prestige but his feet were always on the ground, his ear tuned to his associates, and his heart to the needs of his fellow men.

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sam was a truly great and good man. He was one of the best friends I have had in life.

I shall never forget the advice he gave to the group of freshmen Congressmen in 1957. He gave us encouragement when he said "your colleagues in Congress will do everything they can to keep you here if you will let them." Then he urged upon each one of us the necessity of our presence in the House of Representatives in order to learn the rules of the House. He said there was no other way.

He taught me the lessons of humility and perseverance. I recall how he came to sit next to me several times, put his arm around my shoulders and said "Judge, if you need any help, you know where to come." I appreciated that highly and I do not remember an occasion when he did not give me wise counsel and valuable assistance in connection with my duties.

He was a great leader. The people of the United States will miss him as one of the greatest patriots and most dedicated servants who ever lived in these United States of America. May God bless his soul.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we can add little today to embellish the monumental record of public service which our late beloved Speaker Sam Rayburn made during his lifetime here in the House of Representatives. Each of us who were privileged to serve with him during a part of his long service to our Nation recall his tireless devotion to the national good, his strict code of personal conduct and its wholesome effect on all Members, the fairness which he uniformly applied as Speaker to parliamentary situations regardless of party, the persuasive magnetism of his personality, and his deep and abiding love for the Members of this body and its historic traditions.

In a large sense, the life of Sam Rayburn from his humble beginnings throughout his record 48 years of service here in the House is symbolic of the modern histry of our Nation. Sam Rayburn has had a leading role in the progress made by our country during the past 50 years. As he used to put it, he served "with" the last eight Presidents—from Woodrow Wilson through John F. Kennedy, serving as Speaker twice as long as any other person in our history. During this period, our country rose to its present position of world leadership, from the horse and buggy era to the nuclear age, our modern industrial system was developed, our population has mushroomed, and our greatest era of social progress has taken place.

He bore the pain of his fatal illness with the same courage which marked his career as a legislator. Uncomplaining, he devoted his few remaining months of life to the enactment of important parts of President Kennedy's legislative program in which Mr. SAM believed so strongly. The key role which he played in the enactment of New Deal reform legislation as committee chairman during the Roosevelt administration is a matter of history. As Speaker during the crucial period of World War II, and later during the Truman administration, his was a tower of strength and an outstanding example of responsible legislative leadership for his colleagues in the Congress.

SAM RAYBURN's personal attributes are well known to us all. Friendly and sympathetic to our problems as legislators, he also possessed a reserved dignity and rare human quality which set him apart as a true leader, and which inspired the Members of this body. The genuine affection and respect which he commanded on both sides of the aisle is the mark of this man of the people.

We have lost a good friend, a national and world leader, and a man whom we all loved. SAM RAYBURN's place in history is secure. It is up to us to fulfill the legacy of devotion to the national interest which, by example, he has taught us. This is the monument which we can all help erect to the goodness and greatness of this outstanding American.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is with a very heavy heart that I rise here today to pay my final respects to our great departed leader and my beloved friend, SAM RAYBURN.

Despite the short time were were associated as contrasted to so many of my colleagues, I came to count Mr. SAM as one of my best friends because of the warmth with which he welcomed me to the Halls of the House of Representatives and because of the wisdom with which he advised me each time I sought his counsel.

Meaning no disrespect to our present distinguished Speaker, this House will long suffer for the towering strength of Mr. RAYBURN's leadership. We will miss the kindly patience of this great man. We will miss his understanding of the problems that are so common to all of us.

Speaker RAYBURN was a molder of men. Many of us stand taller in stature today because we walked with him and talked with him and were counseled by him.

Mr. RAYBURN loved my native State of Arkansas, probably next to his own Texas, and visited with us each time an opportunity presented itself. I recall that on the last occasion of his visit to our State, he put his arm around my shoulder in a fatherly way, and gave me his observations on the political facts of life. This was the type of thing that endeared him to all of us.

Yes, we will miss our beloved late Speaker for many years to come. We will walk in sadness because he is gone.

There is no replacement for our beloved Mr. SAM.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, sorrow is one of the least articulate of human emotions. On November 16, 1961, our country lost a great man and I lost a living inspiration. Speaker SAM RAYBURN has left us and left a great void in our hearts and in our Chamber.

In 1957 when I came to Congress I heard SAM RAYBURN speak for the first time in the Democratic caucus. I said to myself inwardly that while SAM RAYBURN and men like him live, our country will be safe and will survive. Time has strengthened that feeling and that impression. With every passing session I marveled at the patience of the man, the uncanny ability to find the solution to a knotty problem, the depth of knowledge, the inspirational quality of his voice, the equality of presentation of foreign dignitaries, the mastery of the situation, whether in joint or in House session, and his eternal and meaningful expression, "I thank you from the bottom of a grateful heart."

I shall never forget his words of encouragement and praise to me after my maiden debate in the House of Representatives on a deeply controversial issue. When he patted me on the back in a fatherly fashion and said, "Well done, Saint. Keep it up." In times of distress when I had a problem and approached him, he was affable and encouraging. Many men knew him better than I, but none admired him more. Just as he said to me in his last conversation that he was honored to be associated with me, I say that it was an honor to have known him, to have talked to him, and to have been in his presence. The honor of association was more mine than his. I was proud and glad to follow his leadership.

Speaker SAM RAYBURN has made an indelible impression on me in these past 5 years. His impression on the country and the world is far greater. His length of service as Speaker has created a record, but his deeds and inspiration are more permanent. They live in the hearts and minds of not only his colleagues, but also of the American people and the world. About the time most of us were reaching our first milestone in our educational career, SAM RAYBURN was already guiding the destiny of our country in the House of Representatives. When the clarion voice of Franklin D. Roosevelt called upon the American people to cast aside fear, SAM RAYBURN was guiding the social legislation of the first 100 days of the New Deal. The American farmers who enjoy lights on the farms know that his vision, the rural electrification program, has made their lives more tolerable, their nights more pleasant, their cares less burdensome. When Winston Churchill asked us for tools so that England might win the war, SAM RAYBURN, with only a few men, was already working to end the war by development of the greatest and most devastating instrument of all—the atomic bomb. His leadership saw to it that after the war was over, atomic resources were harnessed and utilized for the benefit of all mankind. Through three world wars and countless crises under eight Presidents, SAMUEL TALIAFERIA RAYBURN stood firm as the Rock of Gibraltar against fortuitous change, against storm and accident.

His greatest moment which demonstrated his regard for our Government of three separate departments came when he refused the nomination in a sure election as Vice President, running with Franklin Roosevelt. His paraphrasing of the words of Henry Clay also shall endure, "I'd rather be Speaker of the House than Vice President of the United States." The House was to him a coordinate branch of Government and not the lower House. He pointed out that membership in the House of Representatives could never come by appointment, but only by election. Our President, John F. Kennedy, has lost an inspirational adviser, who possessed the wisdom of the years, a dedicated love for our country, and the ability to protect it. Texas has lost its greatest son. Our Nation has lost the greatest Speaker of all times. The world has lost a truly noble man.

I extend my sympathy to his sister, and his family on their loss, but yet he lives. He lives in the hearts and minds of all. He shall always be "the Bonhomme from Bonham."

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, many wonderful tributes have been written in memory of the immortal SAM RAYBURN since his death. I have read none which impressed me more than that from the pen of Chan Guffey, editor of the Prague (Okla.) News-Record, on November 22, 1961, which follows:

GUFFEY'S CORNER

I hereby propose the formation of a Sam Rayburn Society. The country needs one.

SAM RAYBURN was a political giant.

When he died last week the President of the United States, two former Presidents, the Vice President, 25 Senators and 120 Congressmen gathered in the Texas town of Bonham for his funeral.

SAM RAYBURN was Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives and had held the office twice as long as any other man. He had passed Henry Clay's record years ago.

He was known as Mr. Democrat. He was one of the most politically powerful men in the United States and had been for decades.

SAM RAYBURN in politics was like the towering redwoods of California—phenomenal. But to exclaim simply over height or power and turn away without pondering how giants are grown is to remain simple.

SAM RAYBURN was a practicing politician.

He knew that the art of the possible is politics and that politics is the art of government. He knew that there can be no government without politics and good government can be attained only after passing through politics—through and beyond, but through.

He knew that democratic government is a delicate mechanism that most one-issue reformers would wreck in their clumsy passion.

He knew that pressure and compromise are equal tools in politics and that timing may often be more important than either.

The man from Texas learned these things, mastered the techniques and spent a lifetime making government work.

Like the redwoods, SAM RAYBURN grew under special conditions. The soil was right and so was the climate.

When he died he had served in Congress longer than any man in history. He served for 48 years. Forty-eight years means 24 terms and 24 terms means 24 elections in the Fourth Congressional District of Texas.

To say that he won 24 elections is to mask the importance of political climate—the mind of the citizen.

Prairie-fire excitement or change for change's sake did not sweep the minds of

Fourth District voters and destroy the unglamorous greatness of Sam Rayburn.

The voters in the Fourth Congressional District were steady in their judgment. They gave him time to grow in the legislative forest.

The society that I propose in honor of Sam Rayburn would be dedicated to the study and appreciation of level-headed, working politicians.

It would underscore the need and importance of political skills, particularly in the legislative area.

It would lay the groundwork for a public understanding of these skills by honoring men who practice them.

The country needs a Sam Rayburn point of view almost as badly as it needed Sam Rayburn.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, there rarely has been a time in the history of the Congress, indeed in the history of our Nation, when the death of one of our country's legislators has occasioned such a sense of personal loss as the passing of our beloved Speaker, the late Sam Rayburn.

Those of us who were privileged to associate with him in determining the course of our national affairs are deprived of our faithful counselor, to whom we have all turned for the fruit of his wisdom and for the inspiration of his indomitable spirit. I, personally, shall be forever deeply indebted to Speaker Rayburn for his understanding guidance to me in my first term in the House of Representatives.

Both here and abroad people from all walks of life are dispossessed of a friend whose heart encompassed all of humanity, who walked in humility among the lowliest, and towered among the giants.

Still, in our sorrow we are blessed by the memory of this devoted servant of God, of country, and of his fellow men.

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, on this sad day, when we pay tribute to our late distinguished and beloved Speaker Sam Rayburn, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial, written by my good friend, Mr. A. S. Barksdaer, Jr., of Bluefield, W. Va., which was published in the Sunset News-Observer, of Bluefield, on Saturday afternoon, November 18, 1961:

SAM RAYBURN

Thousands of words have been written about Sam Rayburn, who is being buried this afternoon in a little town in Texas.

We can add only this thought to the expressions of love and tribute for this fine and dedicated man: It is devoted service such as his that has made America the Nation it is and that holds our greatest hope for the survival of human dignity and freedom.

What a contrast in his life and work with, for example, a Khrushchev. If one would know the difference between the United States and the U.S.S.R., one need look no further than Mr. Sam and Mr. K.

Mr. Sam made his way to the top, and to one of the most responsible positions in the world, because he knew and loved and practiced the democratic political way—democratic with a small "d" even more than with a capital "D." He earned respect and admiration, even from his political antagonists, and he earned the enduring thanks of his people for his uncommon ability to attain solid legislative accomplishments through the give and take of democratic processes. The Russian got to the top by relentlessly crushing his opposition, by suffocating the rights and needs of minorities, by terrorism and fear. The difference between two men is the difference between two nations. America is the land we know and love because of the devotion to principles and ideals and the unselfish service of men like Sam Rayburn.

We watched him in the House of Representatives, heard him on the political platform, talked to many who knew him intimately, and our personal verdict was the same as that of so many others. He was, indeed, one of this country's great men.

We are proud of the fact he was a Democrat, prouder still of the fact that he put his country far above partisanship. In his life is a lesson for all who would serve the people. Few can ever match him, but all can profit by his example.

Sam Rayburn was a statesman. The Nation and the free world have lost a pillar of strength.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is most appropriate on this occasion to call attention to an exchange of letters between Mrs. Florence Rose and Mr. Bert Hodges which appeared in the Okmulgee Daily Times shortly after the death of Speaker Sam Rayburn.

I think we will all agree with the conclusion reached by both writers in this instance—America has not lost Sam Rayburn. Like Lincoln, now he belongs to the ages.

The full text of the tribute paid to Speaker Rayburn follows:

[From the Okmulgee Daily Times, Nov. 23, 1961]

"MR. SAM" IS REALLY NOT LOST

Dear Editor: The letters of commemoration from Bert Hodges are good things—for the community to read, for him to write, and for the Times to publish.

The one regarding Mr. Rayburn—"Mr. Sam"—was especially timely and well written but may I say the writer himself will probably agree that America and the world has not really lost that great citizen, nor ever will. The words spoken of Lincoln when he died surely apply to Sam Rayburn: "Now he belongs to the ages."

We first became truly conscious of the statesmanlike quality of the Speaker of the House during the first televised Democratic Convention—and wished aloud that he might be President—yet now our feelings are that no President ever served the country better than the man who went to Washington's lower House of Congress and stayed there.

No, Mr. Hodges. America has not lost Sam Rayburn. Your own letter attests to that. The future will surely prove it. Death well may be the exclamation point that emphasizes any life.

Sincerely,

Florence Rose.

[From the Okmulgee Daily Times, Nov. 30, 1961]

MR. RAYBURN WAS NOT LOST

Mrs. Florence Rose was right when she said that Mr. Sam Rayburn was not lost to the world by his passing. I thank her for reminding me, in her well written letter to the Times, that in reality, the great statesman from Texas will live on, as has Abraham Lincoln who belongs to the ages.

It was Edwin Stanton, Secretary of War in Mr. Lincoln's cabinet, who made that statement concerning the great Emancipator at the time of his death.

However, Mr. Sam's leadership in the Halls of Congress is lost, and it will be years, if at all, that a man of his experience and ability may be trained to do the job he has done so well for so long a period.

When Congress meets again, after the recess, there will be memorial addresses in a session to pay proper homage to the man they have loved, regardless of political differences and it is my hope that somewhere in those solemn proceedings when Mr. Sam's name is being spread across the minds of men and over the pages of the Washington records, as another one of America's immortals, that Mrs. Rose will be recognized as having been the first to submit his name with that of Abraham Lincoln as being also a great American patriot who belongs to the ages.

Bert Hodges.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a great and honorable man has passed this way.

Such is my epitaph to the late and venerable Speaker, who has left this Chamber, never to return.

It was my distinct privilege to personally know Mr. Sam for the past 16 years. He has left upon me an indelible impression that time will not erase. He has also left to posterity a distinguished and exemplary record of dedication to the highest principles of good government, and implemented these principles by devotion to progressive legislation that benefited the common people, who are the Government.

In addition to his record for longevity as the Speaker of this House, Mr. Sam was a man of great fortitude. He recognized a friend and never flinched from an aggressive enemy in the heat of parliamentary battle. Withal, he was a humble man, despite the many honors bestowed on him.

He was never too busy to discuss a controversial issue with the experienced opposition, nor to give counsel to the new Member who trod into his Chamber with trepidation aforethought.

We, who knew and loved him, were well aware that beneath that crusty shell and salty manner lay a heart of great benevolence, that bespoke of human kindness and understanding of the many problems that beset us all.

Mr. Sam was one of the pioneers of liberal legislation that spoke for the many. His accomplishments will survive his memory on the statute books and history will record his works in this field.

Mr. Speaker, may I conclude my thoughts with an inspiration:

A man is as great as the dream he dreams;
  As great as the love he bears;
As great as the values he redeems;
  And the happiness he shares.
A man is as great as the thoughts he thinks;
  As the worth he has attained;
As the fountains at which his spirit drinks,
  And the insight he has gained.
A man is as great as the truth he speaks;
  As great as the help he gives;
As great as the destiny he seeks;
  As great as the life he lives.

That was Mr. Sam.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, most of my service in the House of Representatives until this session has been during the tenure of the Honorable Sam Rayburn as Speaker of this great body.

The saga of Speaker Rayburn has been an inspiration to all who have had the honor and privilege of serving with him.

His life and career exemplify in the finest way what our American heritage can mean to all of us. Born in Roane County, Tenn., January 6, 1882, of poor farm parents who moved to another farm in Texas during his early childhood, Sam Rayburn secured his education by working his way through East Texas Normal School, sweeping floors and doing odd jobs for his room and board. He later attended what is now East Texas State College and subsequently won a law degree at the University of Texas.

Sam Rayburn was elected to the Texas House of Representatives at 24 and became the youngest Speaker in the history of the Texas Legislature at the age of 29. When 30 years old, in 1912, he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives. The same genius for hard work and perseverance which enabled him to gain his education and win promotion in the State legislature characterized his activities in the Congress. He rose to the chairmanship of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and attained recognition as a distinguished legislator. Mr. Sam, as he was affectionately referred to by his host of friends, became the Democratic leader January 4, 1937, and he was the natural selection for the post of Speaker when he became the 42d Member to hold that high office on September 16, 1940, retaining it more than twice as long as Henry Clay, the previous recordholder.

I have cited these high points in Mr Sam's great career as illustrative of the opportunities available to us as Americans if we apply ourselves as diligently and persistently as he did in the discharge of his responsibilities.

Early in my own service in the House I came to esteem, admire, and like Mr. Sam. I learned to esteem him for his fairness and impartiality, to admire him for his great ability, and to like him for his constructive use of his talents to promote the well-being of his fellow Americans. I am proud to number myself among those who cherish the memory of a strong and mutual friendship with this great American. Our Nation is blessed when men like Sam Rayburn hold high public office. They are the men who get the job done. They are the men who make democracy work and a nation which can produce men like Mr. Sam will always maintain greatness.

Sam Rayburn passed on in his 49th year of continuous membership in the House of Representatives, having devoted more than half a century to public service. It was my privilege often to see him in action when he would take the floor to use his powerfully persuasive oratory to help in the passage of important legislation. He was a man profoundly versed in American history and political lore. Although a stanch Democrat, he had that all-pervading spirit of fairness which led him to express admiration and sincere regard for leaders of the other party, and on matters relating to foreign affairs he was the leader of those who insisted that "politics should end at the water's edge."

Because of his tremendous contributions to the progress of our Nation, Sam Rayburn will be recorded as one of the truly great statesmen in our history.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, in the spot he cherished so dearly, and which his presence adorned, in the atmosphere of love, affection, and admiration which abounds here for him, I rise to add my tribute to our late, beloved Speaker, the Honorable Sam Rayburn.

The accolades of praise to him are, and ever shall be, abundant. Mr. Sam was an outstanding man who was a Member of Congress longer than any other person. He served as Speaker far longer than any other man and twice as long as our own late, beloved Henry Clay, of Kentucky.

The evidence of his astute judgment, his sagacious counsel and the keen penetration of his insight is all around us. We, here, who were fortunate enough to serve with him, knew, and will always treasure, the value of his leadership. However, his influence and the significance of his work will continue for many years to come and, therefore, the full measure of this remarkable man cannot be known until history has had a chance to assess accurately the greatness of his service.

Somewhere beyond the sunset,
  Where loneliness never lies,
He lives in a land of glory
  Amid the blue and the gold of the skies.

Not dead to those who love him,
  But only gone before,
For he shall live with us in memory,
  And he shall forever more.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to one of America's great men.

I shall count among the treasured experiences of my life the fact that I had the honor and privilege of a personal acquaintance with Speaker Rayburn and served with him in this great legislative body.

I wish to be counted among those who attest to his great leadership and his warmth of heart and abundant kindness, these being based on his personal interest in the Members of this House.

Speaker Rayburn's passing was a great loss to our country, prompting mourning the length and breadth of our land.

The Bangor Daily News, the principal daily newspaper serving the Third Congressional District in Maine, expresses an ideal and appropriate tribute in an editorial appearing in a November 17, 1961, issue, an article which I submit to the Record.

Mrs. McIntire joins with me in expressing our deepest sympathy to all members of the Rayburn family.

MISTER DEMOCRAT TAKEN BY DEATH

Sam Rayburn's biography in the Congressional Directory contains only 14 lines. Of course, they do not begin to tell the story of his political greatness and his accomplishments in his long service to the country. Historians will write volumes about him.

This famed and personable Texan was a fixture in the House of Representatives for 48 years and its Speaker or minority leader for the last 21 years.

Presidents came and went. Various politicians came into prominence as Members of Congress, and then faded away. But Sam Rayburn remained as an influential guiding hand; helping to steer the Nation through two World Wars, a depression and the cold war—until felled by cancer. He then returned to his beloved native State to die.

It is difficult to say what makes one man a leader and another not. But Sam Rayburn had the confidence of those about him in Washington and of the American people. He was admired and respected by Republicans as well as Democrats.

A clue to his greatness may be found, perhaps, in his political philosophy, as described by himself.

"In politics," he once said, "you have to know how the people feel and what they are thinking. You have to learn to give and take. You must compromise if necessary. You have to work hard and keep in touch with your people. You have to have faith in the people because they are good and fair."

Perhaps the last sentence is the most significant. Sam Rayburn believed in his fellow Americans. They, in turn, believed in him.

"Mr. Democrat" will be sorely missed by the Nation and the party he served so well and so long.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay humble tribute to the memory of my friend, Sam Rayburn.

Few men, in any walk of life, have attracted so large a share of public attention or maintained for so long a period of equal degree of mental distinction. His death has removed from this world one of America's greatest statesmen.

Words are inadequate to fully appraise Sam Rayburn's tremendous capacity for loyalty—his concept of public trust was without parallel and never did he hesitate to champion a program or cause that he felt was sound and would bear fruit for those coming within its scope.

Certainly in undertaking to give his measurements, it can truly be said that, despite the countless honors and successes that came to him, Mr. Rayburn remained always a man's man and did indeed keep the common touch. There was no littleness in the man but rather patience, tolerance, and goodness that worked as though a magnet to draw to him genuine esteem and affection from all of those privileged to come within the radius of his genial influence.

Mr. Speaker, though the House of Representatives is still filled with the poignant sorrow that was created by the passing of our distinguished friend, his memory will live forever because his deeds and creed are above and beyond the word "finis."

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I shall always be grateful that I was elected to the Congress at a time when Sam Rayburn was serving as Speaker of the House.

While he will mainly be remembered for the many years he was in this body and the momentous decisions in which he participated, what I will always remember about him is the great humility of this powerful leader.

Paraphrasing Kipling, it can aptly be said of Sam Rayburn that though he walked with kings, he never lost touch with the common man.

Last year at the time the House was heaping tribute after tribute upon this great leader on the occasion of his having served as Speaker twice as long as any of his predecessors in the history of the United States, I remember wondering how he might respond to such praise.

The real measure of this man was revealed in his brief acknowledgment of these tributes—that he was serving in the House, as we were, only because the people of our districts chose to have us serve.

He never forgot this fact in his many years of public service and it was because of this loyal devotion to the people, his bigness of spirit, his rugged patriotism that he will forever remain one of our greatest Americans.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, along with many of my colleagues, I consider it a rare privilege to have served in the House with former Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, known affectionately to us all as Mr. SAM. In serving his country as Speaker of the House for 17 years, more than twice as long as any of his predecessors, SAM RAYBURN earned the admiration and respect of all because of his fairness and humility in administering one of the highest offices in the land. He held the chair of Speaker with dignity and authority of command, but with never an abuse of that tremendous power. With the legislative gavel, he helped to forge some of the most important laws of the United States, and his fingerprints are on every important bill passed in the House for nearly a half century. During his long and honorable tenure, Mr. SAM saw some 3,000 Congressmen come and go and watched history being shaped as he served with eight Presidents. It seems particularly significant to me that Mr. SAM's fairness in dealing with his colleagues was never confined to party lines, and affection for him followed, on both sides of the aisle. In that trait, I feel, is contained part of his measure of greatness. One of the greatest tributes I can extend to his memory is to quote in eulogy words spoken of Mr. SAM by former President Eisenhower, who called him a distinguished American. Under leave to extend my remakrs in the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial which appeared in the Flint Journal of Flint, Mich., on November 17, 1961, the day after Mr. RAYBURN's death.

The editorial follows:

AFFECTION FOR SAM RAYBURN CROSSED ALL PARTY LINES

SAM RAYBURN is dead at age 79 after devoting 48 years of his life in the service of his country.

As the Speaker of the House of Representatives for 17 years, he was established as a national institution. A dyed-in-the-wool Democrat, Mr. SAM earned the respect of Government heads from both sides of the political fence while wielding the House gavel twice as long as any of his predecessors.

"His public service stretched from the administration of Woodrow Wilson to the present day, but it was the quality of that service more than its length that was so distinctive," President Kennedy said in leading the Nation in mourning.

"The United States has lost a devoted servant and its citizens an unflinching friend."

Indeed, Mr. SAM, as he was referred to with reverence, established a record distinguished for far greater reasons than longevity. He exerted a singular influence on the House because of his personal integrity, his legislative knowledge, his political acumen and his ability to command.

He exercised more power than any other man in the House. In fact, it was said he was the second most powerful individual in our Government, second only to the President. Still his was, for the most part, an invisible power.

You can search the House records and not find his name on legislation. But he was a major force behind much of it. His speeches were few. He worked behind the scenes where he could work best in head-to-head talks—and in knocking heads together without public show or humiliation—since he had strong friends and admirers in both parties.

It is no exaggeration to say that he is irreplaceable as far as the Kennedy administration is concerned. His authority was built up over a long period, so that it was real, not nominal. Whoever is chosen to succeed him as Speaker will need time to establish a reputation for trustworthiness and fair dealing, as well as to sharpen and prove his skill. This cannot be done overnight.

But the loss is not Mr. Kennedy's alone. The Nation can ill afford to lose such a tower of strength in its leadership. He worked hard for his beloved Democratic Party, but his zeal and devotion for his country was above political affiliation. His innate belief in the American people never faltered.

In a recent U.S. News & World Report interview, he was quoted as saying:

"I have absolute faith in the American people. I believe that more than 95 percent of them have more good in them than bad. And, when properly appealed to, they will respond—now as they have in the past."

The American people likewise had faith in the wisdom, leadership and political skill of Mr. SAM. His death is a tremendous loss to the country that he served so tirelessly for nearly half a century.

In the words of former President Eisenhower, "the title 'A Distinguished American' is rightfully his."

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, America has produced many great men but it has reserved for only a few the distinction of outstanding national leadership. SAM RAYBURN was such a man. The history of 20th century America is closely intertwined with his life and his accomplishments.

SAM RAYBURN came to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1913 when this great body was 124 years old. He served continuously for 48 years—more than one-fourth of the total life of this Republic.

They were critical years—these RAYBURN years between 1913 and 1961—the Nation faced crisis after crisis including two World Wars and history's most disastrous depression. The period has been climaxed by the advent of the nuclear age coupled with the postwar Communist threat around the world.

SAM RAYBURN held a position of key leadership in the House from 1931 until his death, first as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, then as majority leader, and since 1940 as Speaker of the House, except for two terms when he was minority leader. The RAYBURN footprints are deeply imbedded in the political and economic history of our time.

Although he came from an interior district with conservative inclinations, he always took the larger view on national issues. His support of key New Deal legislation and his support of our vital international postwar programs were in many cases the measure of their successful enactment.

From the very first speech that SAM RAYBURN delivered on the floor of the House until the day he died, his abiding passion was to bridge the differences between North, South, East, and West; to find the common denominator for national unity. He believed intensely in America and in the principles on which this Nation was founded.

SAM RAYBURN was truly a man of the people. For all his power and influence, he never lost the common touch. His door was always open and he was always ready with a helping hand. He wore his authority with great dignity but always with a touch of humility.

His introduction of Presidents and national leaders to the joint sessions of Congress will never be excelled in grace and eloquence. I can hear him say again those simple words that he so often used: "The leader of a great, friendly, and free people." When spoken by him they came alive with a depth of meaning and a feeling of national reverence not soon to be forgotten.

The House of Representatives was SAM RAYBURN's life. He gave everything he had to it. There was no divisive loyalties or conflicting efforts.

To those who served under him in the House, he was "Mr. Speaker," spoken with affection, respect, and loyalty. To millions of Americans, he was "Mr. SAM," a man who sat in the seat of the mighty but for whom the word "Democrat" was spelled with a small "d" as well as a big one.

SAM RAYBURN was my friend. His death was a deep personal loss. I extend to his family and loved ones my heartfelt sympathy in their great loss.

SAM RAYBURN, however, belonged to all Americans. The greatest loss is to his countrymen and to the Nation he served so long and so well.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I join my distinguished colleagues in paying final tribute to our late Speaker, perhaps the most eminent of Americans in our time, SAM RAYBURN, of Texas.

I am also pleased to include herewith the following letter from a former Member of this body, the Honorable Byron L. Johnson, of Colorado, which speaks most eloquently of Mr. RAYBURN:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *January 18, 1962.*

The Honorable ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER,
Member of Congress.

DEAR BOB: As a former Member of the House, I count it one of the highest points of my life that I was able to serve under the distinguished leadership of Speaker SAM RAYBURN. He was without question one of the truly great patriots of our generation.

No man in our time so completely epitomizes a deep and abiding faith in the United States of America, nor a greater willingness to accomplish its great purposes. As a newcomer to the Hill, I appreciated not only his unfailing courtesy but his quiet helpfulness and wise counsel. All of us who served with him will prize all his life the many memories of our own contacts with Mr. RAYBURN.

The Nation is the poorer in ways beyond number for his loss, but I take heart in the belief that every person who came to know him was the richer for the experience.

I realize that words cannot adequately express the exceptionally high regard of the Members for Mr. SAM, but I cannot pass this day without adding a word of sincere appreciation and heartfelt tribute to one of the finest Americans ever to serve our country.

Sincerely,

BYRON L. JOHNSON,
Member of Congress (86th).

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the late and beloved Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN, of Texas. In the passing of Speaker SAM RAYBURN our Nation suffered an irreparable loss. Serving as Speaker of the House for over twice as long as any other man in American history, SAM RAYBURN has left an indelible imprint on the life of the Republic, and has made a monumental contribution to the advancement of democracy.

During the time he served in this House, our Nation was involved in two World Wars, the country experienced a grave depression, and the Republic after the Second World War became the undisputed leader of the free world. During all of these trying years, Speaker RAYBURN was one of the most influential leaders of our Nation in the formulation of both domestic and foreign policy which has brought us to the position of responsibility and power which we hold in the world today.

SAM RAYBURN was an outstanding leader and a most distinguished statesman. He displayed extraordinary ability during the years in which he was so much a part of the House of Representatives. His impact on legislation was tremendous. His understanding, his tireless devotion to duty, and his vision enabled him to help shape wisely the course of this Nation. His impact on American history and on the course of world events is imperishable. He will be remembered and honored as long as men love liberty.

Speaker RAYBURN will be keenly missed, not only by every American but by all people everywhere who cherish freedom. His period of service in this House spans over a fourth of our national life and his unparalleled and unequaled record in helping to make the United States of America what it is today is one of which we are all proud.

SAM RAYBURN was a great and a good man. I cherished his friendship and help over the years, and his passing is to me, as it is to all who knew him, a great personal loss. We who have served with him in this House loved and admired him for his great qualities of fairness, of friendship, of helpfulness, and of understanding. He had a keen interest in every Member of this body and never failed to assist whenever he could do so. He loved this House and his colleagues loved him.

I consider it a great honor and a great privilege to have served under Speaker SAM RAYBURN, and any words which are said in his praise and as a tribute to his memory are feeble indeed in comparison to the monument which he has erected in the form of the work he accomplished—a monument which will stand as one of the great beacon lights in man's struggle to build a better and a finer nation and a better and finer world. Speaker RAYBURN is no longer with us physically but his spirit will guide this House in all its activities and deliberations during the years to come.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I number myself among those who have been fortunate enough to serve in this House under our late, beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN. Although I am not a member of the Speaker's political party, I was nevertheless unfailingly impressed by the innate dignity of the man, by his fairness, his strength and courage of conviction, by his firm leadership.

The SAM RAYBURN story is the story of America. His leadership covered periods of national and international crisis, of unparalleled social progress, of endless industrial expansion, of the making of decisions that are even now historic in their impact and import. Mr. SAM, as he was affectionately and respectfully known, was often the rock upon which a shaky ship of state depended for guidance. Mr. SAM had the vision to be the architect of programs now considered necessities of life. Mr. SAM had the courage to do what he was convinced was best at all times.

He had a legendary ability to lead. He respected other's opinions, even when they were contrary to his, but he had absolute faith in the rectitude of his program.

He was a master tactician and strategist, with a rare combination of a politician's ability to sense the pulse of the people and a statesman's ability to interpret, act, and lead.

His life, his love, was the House of Representatives. He never sought other offices or high Government posts, because he believed in his House, in the mandate it carries to act as that arm of the Government closest to the people.

Mr. SAM's father was a Confederate soldier who served valiantly throughout that tragic war. The senior Rayburn fathered 11 children, and when Mr. SAM was very young, moved his family from Tennessee to Bonham, Tex. Mr. SAM was a farm boy and he never lost his love for his native land. When he was not farming, he was fond of recalling, he read everything he could find—especially books about the great men in our country's history. He was an ardent admirer of these leaders and their devotion to principle, and throughout his life, dedication to duty was his creed.

Mr. SAM once said he knew all of his life that he wanted to be Speaker of the House. Throughout his early education in a two-teacher country school, working his way through East Texas Normal, he prepared for this position. He was elected to the Texas Legislature at the age of 24. When he was 29, he was speaker of the Texas House. The next year he was elected to Congress. From there he rose rapidly, impressing all who worked with him with his perception and uncanny ability.

He was, of course, Speaker twice as long as any other man, earning for himself the permanent appellation—the Speaker.

His legislative record reads like a history of social progress and industrial growth. He was truly a man of the people. He knew their problems and their needs. As long ago as 1917, the youthful RAYBURN was the House sponsor of President Wilson's War Insurance Act, a legislative milestone that created the first insurance program for servicemen, the first allotment program for their families, and the first disability payments.

Upon being sworn into the House in April of 1913, Mr. SAM was appointed to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, rising to become ranking minority member in 1927 and chairman in 1931. He never forgot the lessons of his youth. He knew that the farm areas desperately needed electricity—hence he sponsored the Rural Electrification Act. He knew of the problems of people who were victimized by crooked stock deals and who lost life savings in the tragic days of the Wall Street crash—therefore, he sponsored the Securities and Exchange Act. To him also belongs the credit for such measures as the Federal Communications Act and the Railroad Holding Act. And, throughout the years, he was continually insistent on legislation which would protect the rights of the little men.

He became majority leader of the House in 1936 and was elected Speaker by acclamation in 1940, following the death of William Bankhead. He relinquished the Speaker's chair only twice from that date to his untimely death last fall—and then to become minority leader in the 80th and 83d Congress.

Mr. SAM was more than a man, more than a leader of men. He was a legend in his own time—one whose significant and important work, whose intrinsic greatness will stand forever as a majestic memorial to the man himself and the institution he personified.

A man like this can never die. Too much of him lives on eternally.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is almost impossible to conceive of this House without SAM RAYBURN. It was virtually his whole life, and he served it and its Members with dignity and devotion.

I have had great affection, admiration, and respect for Speaker RAYBURN throughout the 5 years I was privileged to serve with him in the House, especially for his skill and for his fairness. He was kind and gracious and helpful to me as he was to so many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Some of the finest memories I have of my time in the House are of his truly inspiring remarks during the final minutes of each session, which I always stayed to hear. He addressed his words to Republicans and Democrats alike, telling us of his own deep feeling for the House and bringing home to each of us the meaning and significance of service in this great institution of representative government.

He helped make us proud to be here.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, as tribute is paid today to our late Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, words fail to measure up to the fullness of the greatness that he possessed and of what history will say of him in the years ahead.

Today we are unanimous in our praise and the annals of the House of Representatives over the past 48 years are filled with the record of the courageous statesmanship, the wise counsel, and brilliant leadership of our departed Speaker. This record will live long after our words are forgotten.

Two newspapers in Speaker RAYBURN's home state very ably summarized, editorially, what we are trying to say here today. The Dallas Morning News said "Mr. RAYBURN's career was the epitome of the practical functioning of democracy where such intangibles as loyalty, friendship, and individual persuasion shape events more surely than the oratory of a Roosevelt or a Kennedy."

The Fort Worth Star-Telegram said "Few men have had the character to muster such understanding and courtesy in a role that required purpose and firmness."

I am glad that I had an opportunity to serve in the House of Representatives during a part of the time that Speaker RAYBURN wielded the gavel. Even though many of our political philosophies differed I learned much of parliamentary procedure by observing his skillful management of the affairs of the House.

The shadow of Mr. SAM did not end with the closing of the grave but because of his greatness it will be cast on many Congresses of the future.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, it was a very sad day for our country, particularly for those of us here in the House of Representatives, when the word was flashed that our friend, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, had been called from this earth. It was not only a sad day for us on the Democratic side but it was just as sad for our Republican friends, for Mr. RAYBURN was respected, revered, and loved by everyone, irrespective of political affiliation.

Mr. RAYBURN, serving twice as long as any other Speaker of the House of Representatives, attained a place in history and in Government that probably will never be equaled by any man. During his long tenure in this high office he was eminently fair and unusually diligent. As a Speaker he was among the great.

Possessed of a warm and friendly spirit, he always welcomed Members to his office who sought his counsel and assistance. It has been my good fortune to have served in this body with him for 19 years. I frequently visited his office and on several occasions sought his assistance. In most instances he gladly accommodated. When he could not, he always made it known that his inability to do so was not personal and he would assign his reason therefor. I always departed his office with a feeling that I had had a fair hearing and that my appeal had been sympathetically received.

To have served here with Mr. SAM, as we all knew him, has been such a privilege. It has enriched my life. His friendship, which I was so pleased to have had, was greatly treasured. It seems so strange, so impossible, that he is not with us today. This House just does not seem to be the same place without him. He so indelibly impressed himself upon the people of our land and of the world, and particularly upon this House, that the ages of time will have difficulty enveloping his memory. For decades and decades to come references will be made to SAM RAYBURN and his service. And, indeed, his memory will live forever in the heart of the House of Representatives.

We mourn his passing with regret and with deep sorrow.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues who are today paying tribute to our late Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN. Having served more than twice as long as any of his predecessors in the history of our country, Mr. SAM was recognized throughout the Nation as one of the most outstanding political figures of our time.

He was, first of all, a great American and a great believer in our system of government. He was likewise a believer in the people and once said "it is an honor to be elected to anything by the people."

While one might not have always agreed with him in legislative matters, he was nevertheless at all times courteous to his colleagues; he was friendly and willing to extend himself for the benefit of his friends. I am sure history will record Mr. SAM as one of the greatest of our great men.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late, great Speaker RAYBURN.

I shall not take the time of the Members to repeat the story of his great service to his congressional district, to the Congress, the Nation, the cause of democratic government, and to the cause of mankind.

I will only say that I will ever be grateful that, to use Mr. SAM's words, it was "a high honor and distinct privilege" to serve as a Member of the House of Representatives under his leadership. I know all of us will agree that his leadership and example helped, encouraged, and guided us in our efforts to better serve the cause of freedom and government by the people, for the people, and of the people.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, our Nation lost a world figure in the passing of Speaker SAM RAYBURN. Very few statesmen in the entire world were as well known as he was. Through his years in the Congress he was in touch with the leaders of every nation.

He served with Presidents Woodrow Wilson, Warren G. Harding, Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and John F. Kennedy.

His career in the Congress was longer than that of any other Member, just as he was Speaker longer than any previous Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN was a great statesman, but he was also a master politician.

He was often criticized by members of his own party because of the way he worked with President Eisenhower from 1953 to 1961 to advance the best interests of our country.

He was my friend and my teacher.

There was no meanness and no pettiness in Mr. RAYBURN. He was big like our country is big, and with him passed a pioneer America which will never return.

President Kennedy spoke for all of us on both sides of the aisle when he said of Mr. RAYBURN:

> This country has lost a devoted servant and the citizens of this country an unflinching friend.

Recently I introduced legislation providing that the New House Office Building, on which construction was begun while he was Speaker, would be dedicated to him and would be named in his honor. This proposal has bipartisan support and, since you, Mr. Speaker, have approved of it, it will undoubtedly come to pass. There is no better way to keep our Nation's history alive than to name this great building in honor of Mr. RAYBURN.

Even when we disagreed on matters this did not disturb our basic friendship. I opposed the destruction of the two blocks of beautiful homes just east of the Old House Office Building, and I urged that the John Philip Sousa Home be saved from destruction and maintained as a memorial to honor Mr. Sousa, one of America's greatest composers—as other nations honor their great composers.

While we were in opposition on this matter, he was genuinely pleased that my plan was so well received by patriotic Americans throughout the country, and he took the trouble to tell me so.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of our beloved leader, SAM RAYBURN, all Americans in and out of Congress have suffered a great loss.

President Kennedy has said that while Mr. RAYBURN's service extended from the administration of President Woodrow Wilson to nearly the end of the 87th Congress it was the qualiy of that service more than its length that was distinctive.

He added that Mr. RAYBURN was "a strong defender of constitutional responsibilities of the Congress, he had an instinctive understanding of the American system and was a loyal counselor and friend of Presidents of both parties on the great matters which affected our national interest and security."

The President pointed out that he had singular opportunities, as a young Congressman and as President, to appreciate Mr. RAYBURN's temperament and character. "Both were bedded in rock and remained unchanged by circumstances," said the President.

The President spoke for all of us when he said of Mr. RAYBURN:

> This country has lost a devoted servant and the citizens of this country an unflinching friend.

Mr. RAYBURN served with eight Presidents of the United States. His career in the House was longer than that of any previous Member and he was Speaker of the House longer than any of his distinguished predecessors in that post.

His life spanned the years 1882 to 1961, from the period following the Civil War through the two great World Wars to the atom bomb, the nuclear-powered submarine, and the jet airplane.

It covered the times that saw America's passage from the frontier period of the West to that of world leader, and grow from a largely rural Nation of 50 million people to a powerful industrial and urban civilization of 180 million people.

His life covered a time of great ordeals and great achievements for our Nation, and during his active terms in the Congress he participated in all or most of them.

Mr. RAYBURN believed in States duties as well as States rights. He believed in a strong Federal Government, one that could stand up to the Fascist and Communist powers, one that could unite and lead the free nations of the world in the greatest combined power ever known to history.

But he also believed in a Federal Government that would, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, do for all the people what they could not do by themselves.

SAM RAYBURN in his political faith walked hand in hand with Presidents Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, and John F. Kennedy.

In honor of Mr. RAYBURN I have introduced a House resolution to provide that the House of Representatives Office Building which is being constructed pursuant to the provisions of the Additional House Office Building Act of 1955 shall be known as the Sam Rayburn House Office Building.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, many words have been spoken here today as a memorial to the late Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN. But the true monument to his greatness is the fact that America is a better place today for SAM RAYBURN having lived.

For this, the people of Idaho and of the Nation are deeply grateful.

During my years in the Congress, I came to immensely respect his integrity and judgment and his sense of fair play. I never called on him for advise but what he was most willing and eager to help. When it came to Idaho matters, he always showed a keen interest and understanding and was quick to offer counsel and concrete help on how to get legislation affecting the State through the legislative mill.

As chairman of the 83d Club in 1953, I remember, I went to Mr. RAYBURN for advice on mapping a program of activities for new House Members. I asked him about getting speakers at club meetings, and recall him saying, "There's Jack Kennedy—now he's a bright and coming young man. He should address your group." His advice, as events have turned out, was prophetic. And Mr. Kennedy did address our club and gave a most inspiring talk.

History will judge Mr. RAYBURN as one of the great men of our day. Schoolchildren 1,000 years from now will remember his name. His footprints are, indeed, imbedded in the sands of time—for all time.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, with my colleagues, I, too, rise to express tribute to the life and unselfish services of the late Speaker Mr. SAM, of Texas. I know that I speak for my fellow San Franciscans and Californians in noting his contributions to the American democracy.

Mr. Speaker, SAM RAYBURN was born in Roane County, Tenn., on January 6, 1882. He was one of 11 children.

At the age of 5 he moved with his family to Texas where they settled on a farm near Bonham.

He worked his way through East Texas Normal School, teaching school a year to pay for another year of college.

Elected to the Texas Legislature when he was 24, he studied law in Austin at the University of Texas. At 29 he was chosen speaker of the Texas House, the youngest legislator ever to be so honored up to that time.

He was elected to the 63d Congress and served without interruption in the House of Representative until his death last fall. No Member in history has ever served this long in the House.

He was elected to the 63d Congress of Representatives on September 16, 1940 and, with the exception of the Republican 80th and 83d Congresses, filled this position for the remainder of his life.

He held the speakership for longer than 17 years, more than twice as long as any other occupant of that office.

SAM RAYBURN died in his hometown of Bonham, Tex., on November 16, 1961. He was in his 80th year.

These are the basic facts about SAM RAYBURN. They are all true, but they do not begin to add up to all the truth.

They give us the picture of an exceptional man, a successful man, a man who dedicated a long life to useful public service.

But these plain facts, simply stated, cannot by themselves describe a great man, and Mr. SAM was a great man.

I know that greatness is an overworked and frequently misapplied word. But in the case of SAM RAYBURN it fits. It belongs. It comes naturally. No other word will suffice.

The qualities of greatness cannot be expressed in facts and statistics. A man's character—those elements which are exclusively his own and which differentiate him from other men—is as immeasurable as it is real and important.

Above all, SAM RAYBURN was a man of integrity. This was, perhaps, his richest source of strength as Speaker. His word was a bond. He did what he said he would do; he delivered what he promised; a trust, a confidence, was to him a sacred and inviolable thing. He was without capacity for deceit or trickery.

A profound sense of fairplay was one of his attributes that he most cherished. No finer tributes have been paid to him on this quality than those from Members who have disagreed with him politically.

It is merely a statement of the obvious to say that SAM RAYBURN was a very intelligent man. There are many intelligent men, but far rarer are those who combine with their brainpower, as he did, such a wealth of commonsense and sound judgment.

Mr. Speaker, how can we place a value on his experience? What is the value of nearly half a century of service in this Chamber he loved so dearly with some 3,000 men and women who were Members of this body during this period? To what place in history do we assign a man who knew and worked closely with every President since the administration of Woodrow Wilson, a man who enjoyed the confidence and trust of many of the most important political figures in America during this century?

Because of his long tenure and his stature as Speaker, we are sometimes inclined to overlook Mr. SAM's service as a regular Member of this House.

He came into national prominence during the early days of the New Deal as chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee. In this capacity he sponsored some of the most important and enduring legislation to come out of these bleak depression years—the Securities and Exchange Act, the Federal Communications Act, the Rayburn-Wheeler Holding Company Act, and the Rural Electrification Act.

But no one can really say, nor can history ever record, how much significant legislation SAM RAYBURN was really responsible for to a greater or lesser degree.

It is the Speaker's duty to preside over the deliberations of the House of Representatives. But a really skillful Speaker—and the country has never had a better one—can and should do much more.

He can do much to clear away obstacles to legislation. He can explain the problems to other Members. He can persuade them. He can work out such compromises as are absolutely essential to the operation of democratic government.

Mr. Speaker, in performing these tasks, SAM RAYBURN was supreme. His strength lay partly in his office, of course, but those intangibles—his honesty, his experience, and the respect in which he was held—were the real sources of his power.

On June 12, 1961, the day on which Mr. SAM's tenure as Speaker had extended to twice that of any other Speaker in history, we in this House paused to extend our sincere congratulations and pay him some richly deserved tributes.

He received some letters, too, on this day. One of them read, in part:

> Attention will be called today to other records which you have equaled and exceeded to other measurable accomplishments. Immeasurable, however, is your devotion to cause and country; and immeasurable is the respect, esteem, and affection which all of us who have served with you hold for you today.

This letter was signed:

> With warmest regards and best wishes,
> Sincerely, John F. Kennedy.

All of us felt toward Mr. SAM the respect, esteem, and affection expressed by President Kennedy.

Today, January 18, 1962, we are aware above all of our great loss. Many of us have lost a dear personal friend. All of us have lost a great leader.

SAM RAYBURN is gone, but he has left his imprint indelibly and forever upon this House.

As we mourn his passing we should also remember that our institutions of government and our ideals of democracy are stronger because of his long and faithful service to them.

I think this would be all the tribute that SAM RAYBURN would ask for.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the remembrance of SAM RAYBURN in this House is an occasion neither for weeping nor for praise. Those who knew him well have wept in private. Praise comes too late to touch his ears. Rather, we are here to talk to one another—to compensate, by drawing together, for the loss of this one man, to share our thoughts about him—so that we may, even without him, carry on. We are many, but he has left us alone. We draw together, however, not only out of need; for it is also our solemn obligation to contemplate his great example, to learn from it, and to speak as those who knew him best so that all may know him well. We must speak of SAM RAYBURN; we must recognize that part of him—his great service to this country—which still lives on. We have no right to be silent.

It is especially true, I think, in times as confusing as ours—when both the forces of chaos and the forces of order have reached such bewildering complexity—that a single man can fulfill himself, can achieve his purpose, only by subordinating himself to something which transcends his individuality. SAM RAYBURN was not the sort of man whose achievements were personal and, therefore, as transitory as the flesh. SAM RAYBURN left the speakership, the House, and indeed the Union itself, stronger than he found them. He was a southerner whose father fought the Union, yet his sense of the times was acute enough so that he himself helped to preserve the Union. He once remarked that as a Congressman:

> You have two constituencies; the people who sent you here and the colleagues with whom you must serve. You must please the people in your district if you want to stay here; and if you want to be in a position which enables you to help and please the people of your district you must also please your colleagues in the House.

Such insight into the relationship of institutions to one another, and of people to institutions, was both the source of his power and the index of his wisdom. He insisted that the House reflect the people, and he made the people take pride in the House. During his long tenure as Speaker, he had a greater opportunity than any other man to influence the course of legislation. That he is remembered both for dignity and for humor is high praise and testimony to the manner in which he chose to exercise that influence.

"The greatest ambition a man can have," Mr. SAM once said, "is to be a just man," and it is finally, of course, the man which we must assess. But it is most significant about our late Speaker that the man and his achievement are inseparable. If justice, in an assembly based upon compromise, is the equitable balancing of diverse alternatives, Mr. SAM was a just man. Because of the balance in his own character of dignity and humility, of leadership and respect for that which is led, our House under his rule was a just House. His personal ambition was to fulfill his ambitions for the House, and he achieved it. Because he was ambitious he gave his life to us; but because his ambition was for something outside of himself, he was never selfish in attaining it. His enthusiasm was never excessive; he had no unmeasured confidence. He usurped nothing, but took his due.

The death of a man of such stature brings upon his fellows the realization of his importance. It is, however, the measure of Mr. SAM's success that we need him less exactly in proportion to his own great contribution to this House. But this is no paradox, for the House was not his. He belonged to the House. We have, then, perfect consolation—because he left it to us. Still, we grieve. Mr. Speaker, I quote the Speaker himself: "God bless his memory. God comfort his loved ones. God comfort me."

SPEAKER (HONORABLE) SAM RAYBURN

A smile of content
A smile of peace
A halo hovering
Throughout

A gentle gentleman
Now silenced—but yet
His voice resounds
A mute shout

And all who knew him
Wo knew him well
Deeply felt
His quality rare

No need for him
To be made heard
That gavel alone
Spoke an eloquent word

And every gentleman
Will still thrill to that word
When again and again
It will be heard

Resounding—reverberating
Throughout the House—
His greatness and justice—
His fair play espouse

Now—from Up There
Looking down—he will see
His beloved fellow men
And forever he'll still be

Wielding that gavel
With royal command
With a prayer for America—
His beloved land.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, since his death there have been thousands of written and spoken tributes to our beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN. He deserves—and more—everything that has been said of his character, service, and achievements.

As one of many Members who benefited from Speaker RAYBURN's counsel and help; who admired and respected his courage and integrity; and who will count the experience of serving with him as one of the greatest opportunities of my life, I join today in these eulogies to the greatest of Speakers and an outstanding American.

These comments will be of a personal nature, because Mr. SAM became very much like a father to me during the years I have been privileged to represent the Ninth District of Virginia. It was with a deep sense of personal loss and sadness that I learned of his death; it was a sad journey to Bonham, Tex., to bid him farewell. But, and it was known from the Speaker's own words, he had reached his goal in life and was satisfied. Last June, when we paid tribute to Mr. SAM's long service as Speaker, he said:

> My career is crowned. I have achieved everything I ever hoped or desire. When I leave here I will leave without any regrets.

We in Virginia, as did all people in all of the States of the Union, reaped the benefits of Mr. SAM's diligence in promoting legislative programs for the good of all.

Our late Speaker was a Democrat without any ifs, ands, or buts. As he put it, "without prefix or suffix." Underlying this strong political affiliation, however, he was first of all an American. It was this characteristic, of a strong partisan and a stronger American, that made him beloved and respected in my district, the "Fightin' Ninth" of Virginia. We have partisans—of both political parties—in my district. And, they admired Mr. SAM for his support of party and his devotion to duty and country.

Mr. SAM came to the Ninth District back in 1954 to speak in my first campaign. He was right at home in our mountains, which are very similar to the adjoining mountains of nearby Tennessee where he was born. His help in reclaiming the district from the loyal opposition continued when I reached Washington. He offered helpful guidance, as I know he did for countless other Members of this body.

At a meeting of the Democratic 84th Club, which I headed for one term, he outlined his personal philosophy and stated some of the principles that made him revered in the eyes of his colleagues and his countrymen. Among them were the admonition to: work hard; listen; do not talk too much; learn the House rules; know and master the issues; and know when to follow party leadership.

"The way to get along is to go along," he reiterated.

And, every Member of this body remembers his advice on truth and honesty:

> There is no degree of honesty. * * * You don't have to take back something you never said. * * * If you tell the truth the first time, you don't have to remember.

Speaker SAM's first speech in the House, back in 1913, included a statement of goals for every new Congressman. In the course of his remarks, he said:

> It is now my sole purpose here to help enact such wise and just laws that our common country will by virtue of these laws be a happier and a more prosperous country. I have always dreamed of a country which I believe this should be and will be, one in which the citizenship is an educated and patriotic people, not swayed by passion or prejudice, and a country that shall know no East, no West, no North, no South, but inhabited by a people liberty loving, patriotic, happy and prosperous, with lawmakers having no other purpose than to write such laws as shall in the years to come be of service to humankind yet unborn.

We, as a Nation, could pay no finer tribute to Mr. SAM than to continue striving for these goals.

Back in 1955, soon after coming to the Congress, I made some remarks titled, "Thanks, Mr. Sam." I wish to repeat these today:

Thanks, Mr. Sam

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include a summation of the thoughts I have had as a freshman Member of the House about the Honorable Sam Rayburn, who has been Speaker of the House longer than any other man in the history of the United States.

Speaker Rayburn was honored by the members of his party last weekend, and these honors, plus the fact that I have had great respect for our beloved Speaker over the past several years, have moved me to write down some observations which I occasionally pass along to constituents in conversation and by letter.

As a young man in southwest Virginia, which borders east Tennessee, where our Speaker was born, I often heard of Mr. Sam from Hon. John W. Flannagan, who served the Virginia Ninth District for many years in the House, and later from Hon. Tom B. Fugate, who followed Mr. Flannagan as the ninth district Representative. They spoke of Mr. Sam with praise in every respect.

Later, when I started my campaign for Congress, numerous citizens came to me and said, in essence, "You see Mr. Sam when you get to Congress and he will help you out." Those friends of mine, who had followed our Speaker's illustrious career through the years, were absolutely correct in their advice.

Even before I was elected, Mr. Sam came to my district and made a speech, met many of the citizens who have been his supporters over the past years, and discussed with them the phases of government which were of interest.

I have found in the short time that I have been a member of this great representative assembly that our Speaker serves in his high position with dignity, calmness, and ability in every respect. He is a statesman with the qualifications of wisdom, patriotism, and devotion to duty. He uses wisely and effectively the powers of the high and honorable office he occupies.

I have already learned to love and respect him as one of the greatest Americans I have ever known.

This brief but sincere tribute cannot be ended without mention of his help and fatherly advice which he readily gives to the newcomer to Congress. On several occasions I, as I am certain many other freshmen have in the past, turned to him for counsel and guidance. He has never been too busy to discuss problems with me nor to give me the benefit of his many years of experience in the House.

So, Mr. Sam, I say "thank you" for your aid in the past. I express the wishes of hundreds of my constituents when I wish for you many more years of service in the House. You have our love, our respect, and our heartfelt thanks for your great contributions to the welfare of this Nation through the past years.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I will include an editorial from the Bristol, Va., Herald-Courier, dated November 19, 1961. This newspaper serves both the nearby area of Tennessee where Mr. Sam was born and the adjoining area of Virginia:

He Served Best in Chosen Post

Sam Rayburn was no stranger to Bristol and the mountain empire of east Tennessee and southwest Virginia. He had been here with us on several occasions—all of them political and all of them designed to enhance the probability of victory for Democratic candidates.

On these trips into the "hinterlands," which he made faithfully over half a century, Mr. Sam did little and said little to endear himself to the Republican Party. He was, as he often noted, a "Democrat, without suffix, without prefix, without apology." He did not pretend to be anything else.

But, perhaps more than any other Democrat of the 20th century, Sam Rayburn had the respect, the admiration, the affection of his political opponents. They knew him as a just man, particularly when he sat—as he so often did—as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This career of Mr. Sam's was of his own choosing and of his own making. He was satisfied with his position of power in the House and, as a consequence, in the Nation. Had he not been content, he would have sought—and most certainly gained—higher office.

There are some who regret that Sam Rayburn did not climb the ladder to the peak. But, in truth, his service to the country in the position he chose was of far greater value than it would have been in the White House, where tenants are short-lived and invariably retire when they leave the Nation's highest office.

There are too few men of Sam Rayburn's caliber in public service—men who are dedicated to their profession, who are dedicated to the welfare of the men and women they represent, who serve steadfastly, giving themselves to the enormous tasks which confront national leaders in every area.

It was far, far better, then, to have Sam Rayburn's services in Congress for half a century than it would have been to partake of them only briefly in the Presidency. As a Member of Congress, and as Speaker of the House longer than any other man in history, he gave our Government a sense of continuity which Presidents cannot give it. In so doing, Sam Rayburn truly earned his place as one of the great men in American history.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I recall that one newspaper editor said of Mr. Sam's service:

> The greatest tribute that can be paid to Speaker Sam Rayburn is to be found in the realization all over this land of the large vacuum in the U.S. Government that his passing has created.

The people of this Nation, in whom Speaker Sam Rayburn had unshakable faith, would endorse every tribute spoken here today.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, to define the term "greatness" in American history and politics, one would only have to mention the name of our late, beloved Speaker, Sam Rayburn.

If man could be compared to the giant, sturdy oak that grows on the rolling hillsides of Tennessee, we would have had, in Speaker Rayburn, the tallest, most imposing giant of all that ever sprang forth from our State.

Tennessee has had many native sons who have reached the summit of public life, but none of whom she can be more proud than Sam Rayburn, who left the Volunteer State at an early age to bring honor also to the Lone Star State of Texas.

My friend and leader, for whom I had the highest esteem, was, at the time of his death, rounding out 56 years of legislative service to his State and Nation, having served 6 years in the Texas Legislature, including being speaker of its house before being elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1912. He served in the U.S. House of Representatives longer than any other person in the history of our Country. He served as chairman of legislative committees, Majority and Minority Leader of the House and served as Speaker twice as long as any other man.

He occupied that exalted position until his untimely death, as well as being second in line of succession to the Presidency of the United States.

It would be possible to continue for hours, citing the records this great man set in public life. But to do justice to his memory and the history of his achievement, one must go well beyond the realm of longevity.

Few men become legends during their own lifetime; but, through outstanding service and leadership, during two tragic World Wars, the Korean conflict and countless international crises, he became a legend in world affairs.

As a great legislator and leader during the early and formative years of the Franklin Roosevelt administration, which lifted this Nation from the bottomless pits of economic chaos, he became a legend in domestic affairs.

As the sponsor and father of Rural Electrification Administration, he became a legend in the most remote rural sections of America.

The love, admiration, and respect of the American people for this man was legendary, but I think it was never more exemplified than in the past 7 years; for, during that time, when the then occupant of the White House was receiving the greatest majorities of all time in being elected President, the American people sent to Congress a Democratic majority to work under the tutelege and leadership of our late Speaker. This is another record which also made him a legend with his colleagues and in legislative circles throughout the world.

My personal love, admiration, and respect for this man was so great that I thank God for the privilege of having been one of his contemporaries in the hallowed Halls of Congress.

My confidence in his ability and leadership was so great that I thank God for having this man to steer my course in the Congress. Yes, I knew when I was following the course of our late Speaker, I was going in the right direction—yes, we in Congress knew when Mr. Sam daily rapped his gavel for order at high noon, that the greatest deliberative body in the world was in the most capable hands available for the difficult task of Speaker and presiding officer.

Using the words that I have so often heard him use in presenting the great leaders of the world to the Congress—"I deem it a great privilege and a high honor" to have been a friend of Mr. Democrat, Mr. America, Mr. Sam, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, of Texas, former Speaker of the House of Representatives.

On behalf of the people of Tennessee, and particularly the citizens of the Sixth Congressional District, I express our deepest sympathy to the late Sam Rayburn's beloved family.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, Sam Rayburn had already been a Member of this body 3 years when I was born. Eleven years ago, when I first met him I was naturally impressed. He was an inspiration to all, but particularly to those who knew him. The world is a better place because there was a Sam Rayburn. He was not an ordinary man.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, so many words have been spoken of the great life and achievements of our late, beloved Speaker Sam Rayburn that it is difficult for me to add to them.

Let me only say that like the other Members of this House, I miss him too, and am grateful for having had the opportunity of serving here with him, and of catching from him some of the sense of dignity, some of the inspiration, and some of the dedication to the public good that his long and distinguished service in this House so aptly represented.

I had the privilege of first knowing Speaker Rayburn back in 1941 when I was a secretary to a Member of this House. What a thrill it was for me to come back here in 1959 as a Member myself and have the opportunity of serving again under this great man who had become himself a tradition in our national life.

But for all of his eminence, Sam Rayburn never lost the common touch. He was never too busy to spare a moment to advise a new Member. I am sure all of us when we first come to Congress feel something akin to awe about the Speaker of the House. But Sam Rayburn's outwardly gruff exterior covered a warm and understanding heart, and I shall always be deeply grateful to him for the help and consideration he gave to me, as he did to so many others.

Sam Rayburn will be deeply missed, not only by this House, but by the people of the whole Nation. We can take comfort in his life of service and in his dedication, and we can be proud of this great example of the finest in our American tradition. For Sam Rayburn was indeed America at its finest.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Speaker Rayburn deeply touched every Member of the House and brought to all of us profound feelings of grief and sorrow for the loss of such a dear, beloved colleague, outstanding Member of the House for almost 50 years and famed Speaker who held that exalted office longer than any man in the history of American parliamentary institutions.

The Nation and the world joined in mourning the passing of this illustrious legislative leader and truly great American, who was known and honored throughout the length and breadth of the land and throughout the world for his enduring contributions to free government and the cause of the common people.

Speaker Rayburn played a leading role in one of the greatest chapters of American history—a period which covered two great World Wars, the bloody Korean conflict, economic depressions, fabulous growth and unparalleled national advancement in every field.

Confidant and adviser to the Presidents of his time, wise and sagacious in the ways or statescraft and parliamentary procedures, devoted to human progress, international peace and order, peerless interpreter of the rules of the House, noted for his fairness and impartially, renowned for his loyalty to party, country, and God, profoundly entrenched in the affections of his friends, colleagues and the people, Mr. Sam's career indelibly marked him as one of the greatest political and parliamentary leaders this Nation has ever known.

Speaker Rayburn possessed many noteworthy personal qualities too numerous to recount here, that won for him deep respect, high esteem and the sincere love of his colleagues and his people.

Endowed with a facile, well-stocked mind and a sympathetic heart, of rugged integrity, deep humility and personal modesty, the Speaker was a man of simplicity and lack of ostentation. Down to earth in his personal relationships, as well as in his political judgments, impatient with pretense and sham, he possessed a strength of character that stood out and marked him as a real leader.

Notwithstanding his lofty position and the many honors that had been bestowed upon him, he clung tenaciously to his own code of simple unpretentious demeanor, plain, direct expression and the courage and intelligence to face every issue placed before him with assurance and confidence.

Mr. Sam was instinctively warmhearted, generous, understanding, sympathetic and considerate, always willing to recognize the other fellow's point of view. While he fought hard for his programs, he relied on argument, persuasion, and the friendly approach.

A fine gentleman in every sense of the word, adhering to a high code, exemplifying appealing personal qualities, effective powers of persuasion, sound sensible judgments, and sure mastery over political questions and the affairs of the House, he was able on very many occasions to turn defeat into victory.

The House and the Nation will miss this great leader, this great American, and his name will go down in history with everlasting luster and face. We have all lost a dear friend and valued counsellor. The House has lost one of its greatest Speakers, the Nation has lost a faithful, dedicated public servant, and the people of America have lost one of their most effective champions in the legislative annals of the country.

He was a team worker, as well as a team leader, and respected the Members of the House. He loved the House as few, if any, ever have and he interpreted its rules with a fierce impartiality, with fidelity, knowledge, and ability that in turn won for him the deep respect, confidence, and gratitude of his colleagues and the admiration of the Nation and the world.

His friendship with the great man destined to succeed him, our cherished and esteemed colleague, Speaker John W. McCormack, was one of the most unusual and edifying, as well as most fruitful in American history. Such profound mutual trust, admiration, affection, and effective cooperation as marked the relationships and labors of these two great American leaders would be difficult, if not impossible, to find, if we searched the pages of the past. Here was highly skillful, professional leadership at its best—deep in understanding, broad of reach, noble of purpose and gloriously productive of great, epoch-making results—for the House, the Nation, and the world.

To his bereaved family, district, and State, from a heart deeply moved by sorrow and overflowing with gratitude for this good and great life, I extend most heartfelt sympathy, and pray that Speaker Sam Rayburn, honored and beloved in death as he was in life, may find rest and peace in his heavenly home.

The memory of this noble son of Texas will long remain as a shining beacon of hope and inspiration for the members of this and succeeding sessions of the Congress. His influence will long be a warming and elevating spirit in the minds and hearts of people—here and throughout the world. May the good Lord keep him forever.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, every Member who served in the House of Representatives with Sam Rayburn, of Texas, remembers him for some particular personal reason. Some will remember his quiet but forceful leadership, his dedication and love of country, his native State and his beloved House of Representatives. Others will recall his deep faith and conviction concerning the rights and dignity of human beings, his fairness and forthrightness, his understanding and his charity. For Sam Rayburn was many things to many men. His qualities were myriad, his attraction universal. He was, however, one thing to all men—the symbol of fair play and pure Americanism.

I personally remember Mr. Rayburn because of his kindness, his thoughtfulness and his generosity. My first speech in the House of Representatives was made on the 17th of March, 1959. Being of Irish descent, I had selected that day for my maiden speech and had selected as a topic, "St. Patrick's Day." Representative Gordon Canfield, who was then the dean of the New Jersey delegation, learned that I was about to address the House for the first time. Without my knowledge, he spoke to Mr. Rayburn and told him that the newest member of the delegation was about to make his first speech in the House. He reminded Mr. Rayburn that it was St. Patrick's Day and pointed out that the newest member of the New Jersey delegation was Irish. As I stood in the well of the House that day, more than 50 other Members stood with me. On the Democrat side I observed many Members with many years of seniority among whom were distinguished chairmen of various House committees. On the Republican side I also saw many distinguished Members with long years of service in the House, It was, therefore, a great shock to me to hear Mr. Rayburn acknowledge me as the first speaker on that day. The shock must have been evident during my short speech. While the shock has been forgotten, the pleasure and appreciation I felt on that day have continued and will continue for the rest of my life for it was indeed the Speaker's kindness, thoughtfulness and generosity which made that novel and happy privilege possible.

As a result of Mr. Rayburn's kindness, the front page of the Congressional Record of Tuesday, March 17, 1959, will reflect for all time that a Republican freshman Congressman was the recipient of the kindness, generosity and thoughtfulness of an understanding Speaker.

This Record, together with a photograph of Mr. Rayburn which hangs in my office will continue to be demonstrable reminders to me and my family of his generosity and kindness.

Mr. Rayburn's death has been a tremendous loss to the Congress, to the United States and to the world. So long as there is a world, Mr. Sam will be remembered in history as one of the truly great Americans of all time.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, the privilege of coming to know and to serve here in the House of Representatives of the United States with the late Speaker, Sam Rayburn, was an experience which I shall never forget and for which I shall always be grateful. Our acquaintance ripened into friendship based upon mutual respect and high regard for each other. The untimely passing of Speaker Rayburn left me with a deep sorrow in the realization of having lost a good and personal friend.

Frequently, of course, we disagreed on matters of a partisan political nature but we disagreed without rancor or anger because we fully respected the rights of each other to our views and opinions.

Speaker Rayburn was always available to confer with Members of the House and to permit us to inquire into or discuss with him matters pertaining to the operations and the work of the House of Representatives. When his opinion or advice was sought on some such matter or some personal or other request was made, Speaker Rayburn never hesitated to give a forthright answer. If a personal request was granted it was not necessary to have it confirmed in writing because Speaker Rayburn would remember and would honor any commitment he made. Speaker Rayburn never questioned the word of a Member when it was given to him in honesty and good faith. Speaker Rayburn had a deep and abiding interest and faith in the youth of our Nation because he fully recognized that the entire future of our Nation depends upon these youth. Therefore, as he had the time and opportunity to meet with youthful constituents of mine and other Members of the House, he would talk with them freely. He would encourage them to take an active interest in the affairs of their Government, know its history, its philosophies, its principles, and its purposes. Thus Speaker Rayburn would impress upon them the need for constant understanding, and for devoted and patriotic service to our American way of life.

These, Mr. Speaker, are but a few of the many memories I shall always cherish which grew and flowered during the 10 years of association it was my privilege to have with our late Speaker, Sam Rayburn, here in the House of Representatives of the United States.

The House of Representatives has lost a great leader, our Nation has lost a great American, and I, Mr. Speaker, have lost a good friend.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on the afternoon of last November 18, with the President of the United States, Members of the House and the Senate, the great and near great from many walks of life, I stood by the open grave of Sam Rayburn, a plain crypt in a modest family plot in a small cemetery in the little north Texas town of Bonham, and listened to the last words of a simple service and as I did so I thought back on the remarkable life and career of one of the greatest Speakers ever to mount the rostrum of this Chamber.

I saw him as an earnest lad, trudging a rutted wagon road to a rustic one-room school where he first glimpsed, within the covers of the few books available, a new world. A world far removed from the 40 acres of barren cotton land that had tied his family inexorably to a life of poverty, drudgery, and hardship. I saw him, humble but determined, working his way through college, ringing the college bell, sweeping out classrooms, making fires, doing any odd job that was available. I saw him as a teacher in Bonham planning ahead to a career in greatness. I saw him take the first step toward his boyhood goal of entering public life when he was elected to the Texas House of Representatives. I saw him become speaker of that body at the age of 29—then the youngest man ever to be so honored in the Texas Legislature. I saw him elected to this House in 1912, coming to Washington at the outset of the Woodrow Wilson administration to start a House career longer than any other in history. I saw him achieve his boyhood ambition in the fullest sense where this House elected him to succeed William B. Bankhead as Speaker on September 16, 1940. He had indeed come a long way. He was to go much further. He was to serve as Speaker twice as long as anyone else. More importantly, he would be a great Speaker.

Sam Rayburn summed up his distinguished career in one short and meaningful sentence. He said, not long ago, "I am one man in public life who is satisfied, who has achieved every ambition of his youth."

Few men are blessed with the character, ability, unswerving devotion and loyalty to family, friends and country that enabled Sam Rayburn to rise from obscurity and poverty to one of the most powerful positions to which an American citizen can aspire in this great land; second only to the Vice President in line of succession to the office of Chief Executive, Sam Rayburn had the qualities in abundance. He loved the House of Representatives as few men have loved it. He contributed to preservation of representative government as essential to good government as few men have done—here or anywhere in the world. His lifetime spanned an amazing period in American history. He was born before electric lights and automobiles and lived to see missiles orbiting the earth. He felt his mark as few have done and the mark he left is that of a good man grown to greatness; a friend to man who never forgot how to be a friend, or tired of being a friend.

But I reflect in the sadness that all of us feel that here was a great leader struck down by a dread killer which claimed lives in the year Sam Rayburn was born with the same cold and impersonal finality that it claimed his life many, many years later. There is double tragedy in such a realization.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this America—this country which Speaker Rayburn loved so well is a young country—a changing country.

For more than one quarter of the years of the independence of the United States of America, one man served in the Congress.

One man served in 25 of the 87 Congresses that have represented the people of America in the House of Representatives.

One man served for 17 years—far longer than any other man—as Speaker of that House.

One life has spanned the period from the Old Frontier to the New Frontier. One career of public service has included service to the Nation with the 28th to the 35th President.

No man in the brief history of the United States has had greater influence over a longer—a more changing—period of our national history.

When Speaker Rayburn was 8 years old, in 1890, the rural population of America outnumbered the urban by almost two to one—40,841,449 on the land; 22,106,265 in the towns. Now the population is almost three times as large as in 1890, and the ratio has switched: 125,268,750 in the towns and cities in 1960 and 54,054,425 on the land.

During the years the Speaker served the House of Representatives the United States converted from a simple agrarian society to the largest and most complex free society the world has ever known.

What manner of man could span and influence these changes?

It could not be a small man who refused to recognize change and thought of America in 19th century terms. It could not be a man whose idealism clouded his judgment.

No—it required a man like Sam Rayburn whose idealism, tough-minded honesty and ability to make up his own mind inspired the House of Representatives and the entire Nation.

His philosophy of government was often expressed to us in the House, but in my 3 years of service in the Congress, never more clearly than during consideration of major labor reform legislation. In that difficult time the ideas that Speaker Rayburn expressed should be a guide to all legislators of all countries and all times. He said:

> Legislation should never be written to punish someone. It should always be written in a spirit of fair play, justice, and equal opportunity. * * * This middle road—the road of reason and fair play—is a hard one to walk, but more often than not it is the path of commonsense and justice.

On this solemn occasion dedicated to the memory of a great man, let us resolve that his memory will be forever before us guiding us in our duties as public servants. As Speaker RAYBURN said:

> As a public official who for almost half a century has tried to serve you by helping to pass laws that would make your path a little smoother and your burdens a little lighter, I invite you to join with those of us who believe in following the middle path—the road of reason and fair play—as we come to grips with this great national problem.
>
> Let us reform without punishing. Let us cure without crushing.
>
> Let us take the path of justice and commonsense, for down that road lies the America of our dreams, with peace, and plenty, and justice for all.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, there has long been debate over whether the times produce great men, or men produce the times; but the world, our country, and future generations of freedom-loving people are reverently thankful for whatever fortuitous set of circumstances gave us the leadership of our beloved Mr. SAM.

Speaker SAM RAYBURN embodied the seldom-found attributes of brilliance, warmth, devotion to principle, and dedication to the good of the people. He was a fantastically able leader of men. To his country, he was a man who commanded respect; who helped plot the path of the Nation; who spoke with wisdom and compassion. To the world, he was a farsighted, able leader whose devotion to his country was exceeded only by his devotion to the cause of freedom. To his party, he was the symbol of loyalty, of accomplishment—an eloquent spokesman for the historic principles of the Democratic Party.

To the House of Representatives, he was a wise counsellor and an able leader who won the love and respect of every Representative fortunate to serve with him. Mr. SAM loved the House. He truly believed in the democratic principles upon which it rests. He was convinced that the House is and ought to be the voice of all the people.

Today, one cannot review the record of Mr. SAM's accomplishments without reciting the history of our great country for the past half century. The life of Speaker RAYBURN was closely intertwined with the life of his country. The mark of his leadership can be seen in the programs that have made the United States the leader of the free world. During periods of grave crisis, of historic decisions, he was the unflinching champion of the cause of freedom, of the historic rights of the people.

Mr. SAM will be sorely missed. But his lessons were well taught. So long as freedom lives and this House stands, Mr. SAM will be remembered.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, although I served but one term under our beloved Speaker, Mr. SAM, I feel that I knew him well, and I loved him for his personal qualities and appreciated him for his splendid worth and leadership. It was a wonderful privilege to have been a Member of Congress with Mr. SAM at the helm of the House, and in this period I had opportunity to feel the warmth of his genial disposition and to be the recipient of his kindness and cordiality. I shall always cherish this privilege and my memories of this great statesman.

Along with many North Carolinians, I shall always cherish the memory of the two visits Mr. SAM made to our State in recent years. The first visit was to the Sixth North Carolina District rally, during the campaign of 1960, where he was keynote speaker and where he received an ovation of such magnitude and warmth as I have seldom seen. Although he came to our State for the express purpose of addressing the Sixth District rally, when other invitations were inevitably pressed upon him, he was generous beyond the call of duty and visited three other points in our State before arriving at Burlington for the dinner preceding the evening rally. What a fine, stirring speech he made and what a wonderful reception he received.

This visit was in October 1960. In May of 1961, he complied with our earnest request to make the keynote speech at the annual Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner. People from all over the State of North Carolina converged on our capital city of Raleigh, most of them motivated by the desire to hear Mr. SAM speak. Again he turned in a most magnificent performance and again he was given a thunderous applause and welcome. I have the feeling that this was perhaps one of the last, if not the last, major political speeches he made before illness necessitated his departure for his home in Texas prior to adjournment of the first session.

Mr. SAM left such an indelible imprint of his personality and dedication to his country that I believe in the annual North Carolina Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinners we will hold in the future, there will be a silent partner present in everybody's mind and heart, and we will think of the occasion as the Jefferson-Jackson-Rayburn Day celebration.

He was loved by Members on both sides of this House, as we all know, and today as we memorialize him, we think of him not only as Mr. Democrat himself but as a great citizen of the Nation and of the world. His enormous prestige affected not one iota his inborn humility and his devotion to his day-by-day heavy responsibilities. In no sense did he ever rest on his laurels, but rather he continually strove to keep this House the greatest and most responsible legislative body in the world, and to maintain America's traditional place of leadership in the community of Nations.

Mr. SAM's many faceted personality and his inner spark which illuminated every endeavor he undertook combined to make him one of the strongest images of his time. He will ever be remembered in these halls, and in the hearts of all of us who knew him will be his eternal monument.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to reconcile ourselves to the fact that our beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, has passed away. His political career is unparalleled in the history of his country. He served as Speaker of the House for 17 years, longer than anyone had previously served in this most important office, the incumbent of which is third in succession to the Presidency of the United States.

Speaker RAYBURN had those outstanding moral and intellectual qualities necessary for the presiding officer of the House of Representatives of the greatest free government of the world. He also had those qualities that are essential for leadership—sound judgment, patience, perseverance, and unyielding adherence to the principles and policies advocated by his party for the welfare of the country. He presided with dignity and firmness, yet he was patient, considerate, and kind to the Members of both parties and his decisions were accepted without protest which expedited legislation and brought tranquility to the Members.

I had the privilege of voting for him when he first became Speaker and I have seen his influence increase and the admiration for him by his colleagues grow year by year. He had become an institution, a symbol of the power and the achievements of the House of Representatives. His rulings were fair and just and even when partisan spirit ran high he rendered justice according to law, "whose seat is the bosom of God and whose voice is the harmony of the world." His many fine qualities of kindness and helpfulness to young Members of Congress and his justice and fairness to all will never be forgotten. Not only the House of Representatives, but the Nation has sustained a great loss. He will have a high place in the history of his country and in the hearts of his countrymen. His character, his achievements, and his faithful service will be an inspiration to generations yet to come. The elements were "so mixed in him, that nature might stand up and say to all the world, 'this was a man.'"

May God let the light of his countenance shine upon him and give him peace.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion of tribute to the memory of beloved Speaker RAYBURN, we are expressing for posterity our devotion and respect to a great national leader—a citizen who had great influence upon the life of each and every member of the House, as well as any other American.

The Speaker kept Congress on an even keel for four Presidents, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, President Harry Truman, President Dwight Eisenhower, and President Kennedy. His loyalty to the President stifled partisanship during the Eisenhower years. Presidents had come to rely on Speaker SAM RAYBURN to "keep House." The progress and even the security of the United States depended greatly on the wisdom and vigor of the Speaker.

The House of Representatives is a large and cumbersome legislative body. Without strong leadership, the legislative process could easily become snarled and indifferent. Speaker RAYBURN, during his long years of service, developed an effective formula which produced essential legislative action on schedule without impairment to the right of an individual member to amend, revise, comment, or complain. The RAYBURN years have implemented and improved procedures under which this large legislative body could effectively conduct its work.

Speaker Rayburn leaves a rich legacy of honor, wisdom, and statesmanship to the House of Representatives and to the Nation. Each of us who have served with him live on to serve in the bright light of his inspired leadership.

The test of a great leader is revealed in his capacity to develop other leaders. Speaker Rayburn prepared for his departure by sharing grave responsibilities with the then majority leader, Hon. John W. McCormack and Hon. Carl Albert, the party whip. In this way, the shift in party leadership in the House was quickly made in an orderly manner so that the Congress could continue its business without delay.

The House will not be the same without Speaker Rayburn, but in his memory, it will continue to do its business with honor, dispatch, dignity, and decorum.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, before we become too involved in the hurly-burly of this session, it is well to reflect on the loss we have suffered in the death of Speaker Rayburn.

Mr. Sam's record tenure as Speaker was only one of his distinctions—one which was overshadowed by distinctions of a qualitative nature. I think every Member of the House during the last 20 years was impressed by the great dignity, effectiveness, and impartiality with which he presided.

It is hard to conceive of any other job in which there would be so many temptations to be impatient, partial, or arbitrary. The legislative sessions of this body sometimes consist of spirited debate and the actions of some Members at times border on the unruly. In the conflict created by the intense drive of differing beliefs and convictions, a detached, fair chairman is of great value.

Sam Rayburn was able to divorce his personal views from the demands of his official position. Although strongly partisan in his private convictions, he did not abuse the power of being Speaker by attempting to win for his point of view through parliamentary domination.

The job of Speaker is perhaps made even more taxing by the knowledge that every action takes place under close public scrutiny, and today even seemingly minor incidents on the floor of the House may have reverberations around the world.

Throughout his association with the House and as its Speaker, Mr. Sam showed a deep understanding of the legislative process in our country and a complete devotion to it. Certainly his record helped to raise the standards in the Congress, and his influence will be felt for many years.

Something would be vitally wrong with our free society if the persons of either political party were not able to recognize ability, integrity, and dedication even in those with whom they frequently disagree. Republicans generally had a great respect for Sam Rayburn and recognized him as a fine American, an able leader, and a gifted legislator.

Even with all of his force and directness, Mr. Sam was a kindly man. Insults were not a part of his nature. His greatness of stature, his unselfish dedication to the welfare and destiny of his country and its people will in years to come become a part of our national heritage.

Shortly before leaving the House of Representatives to return to his Texas home, Mr. Sam said, "I love this House." I hope that he knew the depth of admiration and affection in which this House held him.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my respects to our distinguished former Speaker of the House of Representatives, the late Sam Rayburn.

He loved the House of Representatives, he served it faithfully and during his tenure as Speaker he protected its traditions. Mr. Rayburn gave outstanding service as the Speaker of the House, a position he held longer than any other man in the history of our Nation.

Sam Rayburn loved his State of Texas and he loved the United States; he dedicated his life in their service. He believed in the American way of life and he fought to maintain our institutions.

His career was long and distinguished. Only history can measure and judge the true role he played in the destiny of our country.

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, to record the achievements as an individual, the achievements as a legislator, the achievements as a statesman, and the achievements as a leader, of our beloved late Speaker would take volumes. To each and every Member of the House he was a beloved person, strong and firm yet filled with courtesy, consideration, and reflecting the dignity and honesty commensurate with his office.

Mr. Sam was not only a friend and neighbor of his own district, he was a friend and neighbor of the Nation.

Coming into a chair of leadership during the midst of unrest, strife, and turmoil incident to the most hectic days of the so-called New Deal—Rooseveltian—era, he blazed the trail which led to the enactment of the many laws that remain today on our statute books from which all America has benefited. His final day of leadership saw him again in the forefront marshaling the forces of the Nation in support of domestic recovery and military strength and the preservation of the dignity of our country amongst its allies and other foreign nations.

Simply, Mr. Sam's life could be opened and closed by saying he was a man truly, wholly dedicated to his country and his fellow man.

I close the books upon a personal friend as a nation closes it books upon a personal friend.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the immortal Sam Rayburn, our beloved former Speaker. His entire life has symbolized the noble ideals and aspirations upon which this great Nation was founded.

The untimely demise of Speaker Rayburn is a grevious loss to every one of us in this House and to the Nation and all its people. At a time when crisis has become normalcy, when national misjudgment may spell national disaster, strong men are needed to keep the ship of state on a steady and even keel. At a time when voices of extremism are undermining national unity, sowing the seeds of suspicion and distrust, dispassionate men like Sam Rayburn are needed to preserve our domestic freedom and parry the forces of totalitarian tyranny throughout the world.

Speaker Rayburn, to be sure, was a big man. He was a towering giant in many ways. He was a true and stanch patriot which was evident in his deeds rather than in self-acclaim. The death of Speaker Rayburn meant the loss of a strong, fair and respected national leader, an able lawmaker, and a man whose word and commitments were always honored. In Sam Rayburn's death, the Nation and the free world has lost one of its most courageous and talented champions of liberty and democracy.

Through his fairness and sympathetic understanding, Speaker Rayburn was able to find unity among the great diversity which exists in this body and channel it into a common effort for orderly progress. Through his quiet personal manner, he could effect a fair and equitable compromise between conflicting individuals and parties whom others would have thought irreconcilable. In these qualities of personal leadership lies the genius of Sam Rayburn.

It is a great honor for any of us to have the respect and confidence of our fellow citizens and constituents in being elected to this House and to have the opportunity to be a part of this greatest legislative body in world history. It is an especial honor to have served in this great body under Speaker Rayburn. When I first came here as a Member of the House, I can well recall the cordial treatment I received from Mr. Rayburn and his help and guidance to me as a freshman in the Congress.

On many occasions he had rendered valuable assistance to me and my constituents when difficult problems arose.

Speaker Rayburn was a practical idealist. His vision, integrity, patience, and devotion to the best interest of his party and, most of all, his country, give inspiration to us all to carry on in the tradition of this great American. His name will be honored and cherished forever as one of America's great men.

We are indeed fortunate to have as his successor the former majority leader, the Honorable John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts.

Together, under his leadership, may we move forward in these serious, dangerous and changing times. Inspired by the memory of Sam Rayburn, we can successfully meet the many tasks that lie ahead in our efforts for a strong and united America in a free and peaceful world.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my distinguished colleagues in the House on both sides of the aisle who are today eulogizing our late Speaker, Sam Rayburn.

Few men in the history of the Congress have had the privilege of serving with such distinction over so long a period of time. For half a century Sam Rayburn made his presence felt not only throughout the Halls of Congress but throughout the Nation. He was responsible for the motivation of many important pieces of legislation which have had a profound effect on the development of the entire country.

The thing that impressed me, as a Republican, about this great Democrat, was his quality of absolute fairness in all his dealings. His decisions on parliamentary questions in the House reflected his highly-developed intellect and won the admiration of all his colleagues regardless of their political persuasion.

The State of Texas was the first to recognize the superb qualities which Mr. Sam possessed, and the Nation will not soon forget him. He had a sense of history without being histrionic, and a sense of the fitness of things which made him respect even those who opposed him.

Few men have rendered greater service to our country than Sam Rayburn, and those of us who knew him pride ourselves for having had his friendship.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that I was permitted to serve in Congress as a colleague of Sam Rayburn, who is being honored today as one of the great legislative leaders of all time.

Sam Rayburn became the most experienced legislator in the world. He probably had more influence on Congress than any other person in the history of this great Nation, yet 18 months ago when I was sworn in as a new Member of this body, he had time to call me to his office and offer advice, answer questions, and extend a warm welcome.

Sam Rayburn often visited my home State of North Carolina where he had many close personal friends. His last public appearance was at the annual Jackson-Jefferson dinner in Raleigh last spring. The people of North Carolina loved Sam Rayburn and held him in high respect and esteem. One of my constituents stated, "If there is anything bigger than Texas, it is Sam Rayburn's heart."

His fairness and fine qualities of character made him a friend of Congressmen of both political parties. He established a standard of excellence in public service which all of us might well try to emulate. He added dignity, respect, and integrity to politics. For decades the memory and monumental influence of Sam Rayburn will bring us closer together as Members of Congress and will enable us better to serve the country which he loved.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, words cannot adequately express the appreciation of the people of America for the achievements of the late Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

He was a great humanitarian, dedicated to making democracy serve as an effective instrument to promote human happiness.

His life was devoted to serving the people through constructive legislative action.

He played a most prominent role in advancing every cause that made America strong on the domestic front and a powerful force to promote the cause of permanent peace.

He served his country admirably in the most crucial period of our history. Sam Rayburn saw a great deal of American history. He served as a Member of Congress for nearly half a century. He saw three wars, depressions, peace, prosperity, and the great struggle against Communist domination that confronts us today.

He never once lost faith in the principles of duty and devotion to the causes of freedom. If we are to keep faith with the memory of Sam Rayburn we must continue to fight as he would have.

Sam Rayburn's place in history would have been assured by any one of his many contributions to our Nation. His country was his life, its greatness his dream. Sam Rayburn will have a place in history in the hearts of all Americans.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker—

> There is no test of a man's ability in any department of public life more severe than service in the House of Representatives; there is no place where so little deference is paid to reputation previously acquired or to eminence won outside; no place where so little consideration is shown for the feelings or failures of beginners. What a man gains in the House he gains by sheer force of his own character, and if he loses and falls back he must expect no mercy and will receive no sympathy. It is a field in which the survival of the strongest is the recognized rule, and where no pretense can survive and no glamor can mislead. The real man is discovered, his worth is impartially weighed, his rank is irrevocably decided.

So spoke James G. Blaine in February 1882 in his eulogy of President James O. Garfield. Surely all who have served as Members of this House know the deep truth of every word. All of us who had the privilege of serving with Speaker Rayburn know how truly he became the greatest among us, beloved and respected by all.

Few men have set their eyes upon their star as early as did Mr. Sam. Still fewer reach the goal without bitterness or arrogance or pride. Few so successfully use the power given them by the people with such heartfulness and justice. It seemed that Mr. Sam must have had deep in his very being the words of Cicero—in the year 40 B.C.:

> No one has power except from the people. * * * This is the condition of a free people * * * to be able to give or to take away by their votes whatever they see fit.

Knowing his worth, his people sent him back and back and back; and the Congress kept him as Speaker longer than any man in our history. How kind he was, how fair, how just. Yet he could be stern; he could be hard; he could be ruthless. But one knew that his love was given unswervingly to his country and its House of Representatives, his whole life consecrated to their service.

How fortunate we have been, those of us who served with him. For me the knowledge that I had the privilege of his friendship and of his affection has been and always will be a heartwarming experience. To have him write me as he did on January 8, 1960, "to me life has been full and satisfying," will be a joy to me always.

Now that he has gone from us it will be well for us to recall the ancient words so beautifully translated from the Sanskrit by Sir Edwin Arnold:

> Never the spirit was born; the spirit shall cease to be never;
> Never was time it was not; End and Beginning are dreams!
> Birthless and deathless and changeless remaineth the spirit forever;
> Death hath not touched it at all, dead though the house of it seems.

> Nay, but as one who layeth
> His worn-out robes away,
> And taking new ones, sayeth
> "These will I wear today."
> So putteth by the spirit
> Lightly its robe of flesh,
> And passeth to inherit
> A residence afresh.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, upon coming to Washington as a Member of Congress, I, like millions of my fellow Americans, knew our late Speaker only as a newspaper image. Freshmen Congressmen entered this Chamber with a feeling that the Speaker was cold, firm, and hard. We had heard of him as a man who ruled firmly and was at the very pulse of this Chamber. The public, the millions of Americans who only knew Mr. Sam through secondary sources, could not know the man behind that image.

Contrary to the public image of our late Speaker he had a heart that ran with the warmest. I remember the many times that Members of the House brought youngsters to this hall. In the midst of the deepest of debate on the most serious of issues, Mr. Sam had time to say "hello" to the youngest of citizens and, as was the case with my own daughter, bring them up to the rostrum and set them upon his knee. The oldest was no mightier than the youngest, for our late Speaker found in the young the future hopes and aspirations of our Nation. Speaker Rayburn knew the pulse of our country as well as that of this Chamber.

Whether one has been in the House for 1 year or for several decades, one could not but admire, respect, and revere Speaker Rayburn. He devoted himself entirely to our democracy and this Chamber.

Our late Speaker's guiding hand has often led the way during some of the most trying hours of our Nation's recent history. He began his service in the House as America was becoming aware of the world beyond its shores. He gave counsel and consolation to the Nation during two world wars. In these struggles to preserve democracy Speaker Rayburn helped guide an America that has emerged as the leading nation of the world. His wisdom, strength, and encouragement has helped to keep our Nation progressive, prosperous, and free.

The image of our beloved colleague was partially true. He had the insight and the sense and feeling for this House which few others have matched. He chaired this Chamber as only one who loved it could. He stood as a symbol to the world that a democracy does not lose contact with its people, that a democracy is but half a breath from the will of its citizens. He stands as a symbol of the best that a democracy can produce and no nation has ever produced a finer man.

This Nation, and free peoples throughout the world, will long remember this man, his words and his works. I feel it a singular honor to rise in tribute to our late Speaker. We will do well to follow his principles, ideals, and aspirations.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, when the gavel fell at 12 noon on January 10 the House of Representatives was not the same. It will never be the same again without SAM RAYBURN.

Whenever a great American passes away the column inches of tribute run into miles. So there is little I can add except to say that, like all Congressmen, I respected Mr. RAYBURN as a political opponent and loved him as a man.

Speaker RAYBURN deeply respected the House as one of the great institutions of the Republic. He realized that a republic depends on differences of opinion and compromise to produce a policy that is best for America. For this reason he was a strongly partisan Democrat. But always he was respectful of opposition and insured its expression.

I served 7 years under SAM RAYBURN as Speaker, and can honestly say that not once did he ever do an unfair thing to me. If I deserved recognition under the rules of the House I got it even when a Democrat might be standing. Not once did he use his great power to deny me or any opponent the right to express the opposition which he would try to defeat but would always respect.

This is not to say that SAM RAYBURN was not the most rugged of fighters nor the most skillful. Many is the time I have seen almost sure victory snatched away on one of the rare occasions when he would leave the rostrum and take the floor to win his point with quiet dignity and without raising his voice.

Because the House of Representatives is the great body SAM RAYBURN made it, the business of the Nation will go on. It will not be the same but will always bear his mark. It will always be the House that Mr. SAM built.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I will never forget the morning when Mr. SAM invited the new Members of the 86th Congress to breakfast in the old Supreme Court chambers in the Senate. All of us present were thrilled at the opportunity to meet and get acquainted with this fabulous man who was making United States history when many of us were still in high school. Unassuming, direct, he did not take long to give us our basic instruction in the manners and customs of the House. His advice will always be affectionately recalled. It was sound and as we listened we knew we were hearing it from a true leader of men.

In the course of my service in this great body, I shared with my colleagues the great privilege of working with Mr. SAM. Without exception he had the affection, admiration, and respect of every Member. His outstanding accomplishments will live in our history as the most fitting tribute to his memory.

Mr. Speaker, I shall always regard it as one of the great moments of my life experience to have had the privilege and great honor to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives with Mr. SAM RAYBURN.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with all the good things that have been said here today about our late and lamented Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN. History will undoubtedly record him as one of the truly great Speakers who have served here. In terms of longevity, he excelled all his predecessors. Always fair, considerate, and judicious as a presiding officer, he commanded universal respect. As a strategist in debate and procedure, he was outstanding.

Perhaps few if any have served here who were more dedicated and devoted to this body than was SAM RAYBURN. He was often heard to say "I love the House of Representatives." And he proved it by his constant attendance and by his driving leadership in the furtherance of legislation in which he was interested.

It is therefore my honor to join in the eulogies that have been paid this great and good man. His influence and his handiwork will be felt for generations to come.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our great Speaker has saddened us all. His leadership will be sorely missed. However, as he would wish it to be, the House of Representatives will close ranks and continue to be the greatest deliberative body on earth. As we do this, however, each of us will from time to time recall with a feeling of warmth the fairness, devotion to duty, and kindness of SAM RAYBURN.

Speaker RAYBURN was a partisan in every sense of the word. He would fight hard, long, and effectively for his point of view and his party. However, those of us who found ourselves in opposition to him many times could not but admire these qualities, and to be grateful for the fact that he always knew the rules of the game and played accordingly. No one ever needed to wonder whether he would receive every consideration deserved by him as a Member of the House at the hands of Speaker RAYBURN, because such consideration was always forthcoming.

We can all be grateful for the zealousness with which Speaker RAYBURN guarded the prerogatives of the House and its Members. His stewardship in this area as well as in other phases of his duty as Speaker, was of outstanding quality.

To his family I express my sincere sympathy at the loss of a relative who was also one of the great men of his time. The pride which they must feel in the life he lived and its accomplishments will be a continuing source of pride and comfort to them through the years.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I join the membership of this House and of all America in paying tribute to our late beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN. His death was a most serious loss to this Nation and a distinct shock to all of us in this body. To those of us who had the opportunity to so closely observe his capable and dynamic leadership, it was a rewarding experience.

I had the privilege of serving under him for the entire 22 years of my congressional career. Early in my service I came to a full realization of the inherent greatness of this man. Over the intervening years I noted the growth in his effectiveness and capabilities.

The Nation has lost a dedicated and respected leader. His long and fruitful life has been a continuous history of service to America and the American people. The scores of years of his public life were marked by a devotion to the highest ideals and the furtherance of those ideals by constructive and responsible action. SAM RAYBURN was a man whose mind and heart were attuned to his country's needs. He will be sorely missed by all of us for many years to come.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, historians will record the high place in American history mankind has reserved for SAM RAYBURN. I am also sure that there will be a niche in the history of the world marked for Mr. SAM. His call to the representation of the American people in Congress, to rally to the support of the Presidents under whom he served, guarantees a unique place for Speaker SAM in any historical record. He did not hold the highest office in the United States—that of President—but he was one step away from that position had anything happened to the President or the Vice President. He was next in line for the Presidency.

In his public service as a Representative from Texas, he served 17 years as Speaker of the House of Representatives. He left a mark on all of the legislation enacted. He left a deep impression on the lives of those with whom he served. His work was so constructive that his daily actions helped preserve and make stronger the resources of our Republic, its institutions, and its very foundations. All of these were rocked many times in the era of history during which he served. His constructive leadership helped to steady the course of the American ship of state on many occasions.

I consider myself most fortunate to have served with Mr. SAM RAYBURN in the House of Representatives. My life is richer for having known him. He was a gentleman. He was a true American. He had faith in all Americans. He inspired others to carry on, to act judiciously, carefully, but always firm. The latter was a stoic quality which I am sure was derived from his native background and heritage of that great State of Texas.

I shall never forget my last words with Mr. SAM. It was near the adjournment of Congress. Several of my colleagues were having lunch in the Members' dining room. We were all tired from the long, hectic session, all worried about Speaker SAM concerning whom one spoke in a whisper because of his illness. He passed our table and put his hand on my shoulder and said, "Edna, I am going home." We all looked at him and each wished him well but as I looked into his eyes the words of the song by William Arms Fisher "Goin' Home" crossed my mind. I am sure these words are more symbolic of Mr. SAM than any closing remark I could make.

Goin' home, goin' home, I'm a-goin' home;
Quietlike, some still day, I'm jes' goin' home.
It's not far, jes' close by, through an open door,
Work all done, care laid by, gwine to fear no more.
Mother's there 'spectin' me, father's waiting, too;
Lots o' folk gathered there, all the friends I knew,
All the friends I knew. Home, home, I'm goin' home.
Nothin' lost, all's gain; no more fret nor pain.
No more stumblin' on the way, no more longin' for the day
Gwine to roam no more.
Mornin' star lights the way, res'less dream all done;
Shadows gone, break o' day, real life jes' begun
Wide-awake, with a smile goin' on and on.
Goin' home, goin' home, I'm jes' goin' home;
It's not far, jes' close by, through an open door.
I'm jes' goin' home. Goin' home.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that those of you Members of this great legislative body that were here promptly at 12 noon today, when our beloved Chaplain was called upon to offer prayer at the opening of the House for work this day, were quite cognizant of the fact that our Chaplain, too, was participating in a humble and very appropriate prayer in memory of our beloved former Speaker, Hon. SAM RAYBURN. For it was crystal clear that, in the beautiful and significant wording of his prayer, the Chaplain was also joining with us in memorial tribute to Mr. SAM.

I suggest that each of us read our Chaplain's memorial prayer to our beloved, departed Speaker as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tomorrow morning.

To undertake to follow you very much elder Members of this great legislative body in time of service, who have so magnificently and inspiringly spoken of your many, many years of personal association with Mr. SAM, and of your loving and factual appraisal of his place in history, and yet to endeavor to add a few words of significant contribution, is a feat of humble words which I find it most impossible to accomplish. Yet, I did have the great inspiration and pleasure and day-to-day benefit, of sitting in this legislative Chamber for going on 16 years during most of which period Speaker SAM presided over this deliberative forum. And because immediately upon my coming here from one of the great congressional districts in my native State of California, elected to the Democratic side of this aisle, I instinctively and forthwith sensed his love and dedication to render service to every Member of this body regardless of political party affiliation, and because I had the personal experience of being welcomed by him into the warmth of his affection and best wishes too, I this day feel that, even though they be entirely inadequate, I must add a word at this time on this very appropriate memorial occasion.

Being daily conscious of the indelible contribution he made to my awareness of duty and privilege during my eight terms, most of which I sat under his speakership, yet I say to you men who have already spoken of him and have served so many more years than I under his friendly and fair and just and dignified leadership, all of you have thus been blessed far more than have I. And you, and each of you have spoken truly and beautifully and inspiringly of your experiences in the high tributes extended to him by you.

Perhaps I should relate a few words I gave to the press in the great 23d Congressional District, Los Angeles County, Calif., when on November 17, 1961, I was asked for a statement of my thought about his untimely death. So, if you will pardon me, I will read it to you:

> The death of Hon. SAM RAYBURN yesterday at Bonham, Tex., causes me the loss of a man I dearly loved and had the honor of serving in Congress with him for about 15 years. He served in the House of Representatives 48 years and has been for 16 years its beloved and distinguished Speaker.
>
> It was at his urgent request that I accepted appointment to the House Committee on Un-American Activities, of which he was always a valiant, consistent supporter, tirelessly in the best interest of our beloved Nation. He was always trusted by all of us in Congress, regardless of political party; he was always fair and just in his decisions.
>
> He was always a great personal inspiration to my wife and me and our two grandsons, all of whom had met him personally, and to whom he was always most gracious.
>
> For me, and all other Members of the House of Representatives, he has bequeathed a legacy of unstinted, vigorous, valiant, humble, and persistent dedication to the best there is in American life, and to dedication of self to love and defense of the American flag and all it stands for.

Mr. Speaker, it is well that during his lifetime and in his immediate presence, and when he could sit in our midst and hear us speak of him and the joy we have had in serving as Members of this House while he was Speaker—I say it was well—that we then paid to him in his immediate presence and on the occasion of his anniversary of having served longer as Speaker of this body by twice as long as had any other Speaker who had preceded him; it was well, that we gave him flowers while he could smell their fragrance. This is always good to do, is it not? And today, as we again gather and while knowing he is not actually here in physical presence yet, I am sure we all feel that his love and affection and kindness and generosity and graciousness surround us and continues to make us better men and women because we are in the continued presence of all the characteristics which he not only emulated but put into practice. In this connection, I respectfully request that each of you who have so beautifully and pertinently and knowingly spoken of him as your great friend and leader for so many more years than I had that pleasure and experience, allow me to state that I adopt and approve and include each and everyone of these beautiful tributes which each of you have given as and for my own.

As I close, may I relate just two personal experiences which I and my immediate family membership had with him: First, he was always most gracious and pleasant and kind to my wife, Lydia, and in her presence was thus; and, when she was not able to be present at any social occasion or function where the wives of other Members of the House were present, he never failed to say to me: "CLYDE, how is Lydia Doyle?" And so it was naturally always very pleasant to her for me to be able to thus take his cordial greeting home to her.

Then another occasion, which I always recall his generosity and understanding, is when one day before, I had presided a bit over the House by reason of his courtesy to me, I had used a certain gavel; the next day I introduced my eldest grandson to him, Danny Doyle Stanton. Immediately he presented my grandson with the very gavel which I had used the day before and which he had used that immediate day and then the Speaker autographed that particular gavel. My grandson, Dow Doyle Stanton, who, the first half of this 87th Congress, was a House page, cherishes that autographed gavel beyond any value in dollars; he took it to his high school class and proudly exhibited it and told of the gracious "Mr. Speaker." And similarly did he present a gavel which he had used to my youngest grandson, Clyde Doyle Stanton.

Another enriching experience that I had with him on dozens of occasions during my several terms was that, no matter how busy he was, if a congressional constituent from my congressional district was here in the Halls with me and I had opportunity to present said constituent to Mr. Speaker, he in turn always took at least the time necessary to say a gracious word of my work and services as a Member so that a very large number of my congressional constituents will always remember that "Mr. Speaker" spoke kind words to them about their very own Congressman.

Mr. Speaker, in closing my entirely inadequate remarks, may I respectfully state that the best and most permanent and most appropriate tribute we can make to our beloved friend and distinguished departed Speaker and leader, is that we ourselves, exemplify his fairness and his affection for people and his love of his duty and his bigness of heart and his granitelike character and his love of mankind and his decency of action and his righteousness of thought and attitude toward the Creator of all mankind.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I join with the membership of this House and, in fact, with the citizens of the United States whom we represent to pay tribute to the memory of a great American, SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, late a Representative from his State and Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. RAYBURN's 49-year tenure of continuous service as a Member of this House and a total of more than 17 years as Speaker are both unique in the history of the Congress.

All of us who served with him and all who knew him mourn his loss. The House of Representatives was served by him loyally and faithfully as a Member, as a great committee chairman, as majority leader, and finally as Speaker. Our Nation was served by him throughout his life as a patriotic American and as a noble man and citizen.

Not too long before his death, at the invitation of the Georgia Bar Association extended through me, he accompanied me to the State of Georgia, and there made the principal address to the annual convention of the Georgia Bar Association. He seemed to enjoy the occasion which carried him into Georgia, and he endeared himself to those who heard him and those with whom he chatted and visited on this occasion.

The impact of his wisdom, his judgment, his legislative talents, and his loyal devotion to his country will long be felt in a way which has caused and will continue to cause our Nation and its people to grow from strength to greater strength.

The people of the Fourth District of Georgia, including Mrs. Flynt and our three children, join me as I participate in this tribute and memorial service to our late great Speaker, and also join me in extending our heartfelt sympathy to each member of his family.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, with honest candor ruled and guided the House of Representatives through a momentous period of governmental transitions and great world events that threatened the very existence of our Nation. Together with the legislative services of great legislators—contributed much to place our country at the peak of its historical greatness among nations.

There are few leaders in political life that hold personal friendships and party loyalty as a basic principle as did he in his political philosophy.

He was considerate of the problems of others and stood by, firmly, in support of the members of his team. This trait gave strength to his every effort to bring to a successful conclusion needed legislation of highly controversial import.

Speaker Rayburn kept his stalwarts on either side of the House well in mind, honoring and promoting all of them. This he could do because of his long experience and familiar knowledge of the fitness of Members for their respective legislative duties. He had implicit confidence in their respective abilities to relieve the Speaker of his heavy burdens. He commanded such high respect of the membership that, upon taking the floor in debate in support of critical legislation, he turned defeat into victory. No one can deny that he was the "Mr. Democrat" of the Nation.

He was alerted and informed in every phase of legislation and had firsthand knowledge of the most intricate political situations that in cause or effect spelled telling influence upon the business of the House. Mr. Sam knew everything.

His simple approach and distinctively straight and direct thinking upon complex problems confronting the Nation edified even those of the opposition.

His leadership measured in its effects, especially in the field of welfare, changed the destiny of millions of Americans—giving each a new hope, a new ambition, and a renewed will to seek a better life. His memory is honored by his surging strength of realistic patriotism, through a persistent policy of greater protective national defense, to make America the strongest nation, militarily and economically, among the nations of the world.

The American people love and venerate his name. The memory of his greatness will live on through the ages in our land. His every expression bespeaks the philosophy of the common man. He was strong in the support of legislation to aid liberty-loving nations.

The rules of the House and established precedent of rulings in previous sessions, on matters affecting the House business, were as basic to him as his Biblical teachings.

God has seen fit to take him beyond the gate of mortality to the future destiny of his soul. May he be blessed to enter the portals of immortality in the life beyond. To us, his immortality rests in the hearts and minds of his countrymen and future generations preserved in the monuments of our time.

A Texas Eagle with wings outspread
Flew to other shores;
It was God's will 'twas said
When soul this world abhors.

To leave this troubled teeming earth
And seek more restful shores
Far from its selfish turmoil
And man's ungracious chores.

A giant of thought and noble mien
Who followed Godly Justice
And brooked no plan or scheme
To mitigate against us.

He gave God's gifts to others
That none may rise to rule
So men may live like brothers
Not as charlatans and fools.

He drew the sword of righteousness
Against the poisoned minds
And struck down the subversive
Whose hate for God was blind.

His balanced thoughts on biblical beam
With the lordly touch of truth
To feed man's fires of freedom's dream
That "isms" take not root.

So shall he live with glorious deeds
And let his record stand
For others blind to freedom's needs
In this a sacred land.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in the House, indeed I join all America, in paying tribute to the memory of our late beloved Speaker. This eminent American, whose influence upon the American scene was so great, had a strong hold upon the affections of every citizen. His passing leaves a great void in all of our hearts.

When I reflect upon the qualities which made Sam Rayburn one of our great statesmen, I think of many but two in particular stand out. One was his consideration and sense of fairness to others and the second was his great love for this House and his unswerving efforts to preserve its dignity and prestige.

One of my warm personal memories of Sam Rayburn is the friendship and encouragement he gave to me when I entered these Halls—a raw freshman member of the opposition party, with a feeling of considerable awe for the power and remoteness of the distinguished Speaker. Sam Rayburn, however, went out of his way to make me feel at home and he reinforced this feeling throughout the years with his kindness, his consideration, and his unwavering fairness in judging matters where partisan considerations involving the conduct of House business were involved. The great prestige he gave to his office was the sum total of the dignity, friendliness, and even treatment he accorded Members of both parties in his day-to-day dealings with them.

Just as Sam Rayburn won prestige for the office he held longer than any man in our history, so did his actions protect and preserve the historical prestige and dignity of this body. His love for this House became one of his best-known characteristics and he may perhaps be longest remembered for his unceasing efforts to assure that this body always spoke with a strong voice, a reasonable voice, and a responsible voice. He understood that representative government is always under attack and he was determined that this House, one of the world's great representative bodies, would meet its responsibilities, not only with dispatch and with intelligence, but with dignity. Now that he is gone, we can pay him no finer tribute than by so conducting ourselves that we, too, preserve and protect this Chamber and its reputation.

Sam Rayburn will live in American history as a great statesman and a great American. We who served with him will remember him as a great friend and a great Speaker who taught us to love this House as he did.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in tribute to a great American, the late Speaker, Sam Rayburn.

Those of us who came to the House in the 87th Congress had the privilege of serving with him only one session, and yet in that brief time I am certain each of us developed the same respect and affection held by those of you who had the good fortune of serving with him for many years. Mr. Rayburn's abilities, plus his unlimited willingness to help new Members adjust themselves to the complexities of services in the House, were invaluable to me, as they were to us all.

Above and beyond this, Mr. Rayburn treated each Member of the House not as a junior or neophyte, as certainly I was in this first session, but rather as a Member of the House, representing half a million Americans with a voice in the Government equal to each of the other Members.

On or off the floor, he was an inspiration to those who served with him. History will record him as the greatest American to have been a product of our branch of the Government.

As a man, my life is richer because of my association with this notable gentleman, as a legislator, I believe I am better able to cope with the problems that face me because of it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, sadness prevails today as it has for the past few months ever since the Nation learned of the tragic illness of one of the greatest men in our Nation. We, who were fortunate indeed to serve with Mr. Rayburn, will never forget the deep impression left upon us by our beloved Speaker.

We pay tribute to Mr. SAM and know that history will be kind to the man who served as Speaker of this House for twice the time of that served by any Speaker preceding him.

I shall always recall my first days in this House and I shall always be grateful that they came in that period of history when the distinguished Member from Texas was serving as Speaker, for by his very presence he inspired us; in his wisdom he counseled us, and by his words he encouraged us. He has helped me and many hundreds of other Members find our proper place in the great legislative body. If we have succeeded, it is in large measure—in my case, at least, and I am certain, in the instance of so many others—because of the leadership and the guidance of Mr. RAYBURN. If we have found satisfaction in our service in this House, it is because he has guided us. I cannot count the times he has paused in his day to counsel me and to encourage me.

I know our Nation is grateful and fortunate that out of the great State of Texas came to the House more than four decades ago a man possessing the wisdom and the courage to guide the United States through its most crucial years. His imprint on the history of the United States is great indeed, and it is reflected in the glory of our country. Mr. RAYBURN is gone but will never be forgotten.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, it was a rare privilege to have had the opportunity to serve in the House of Representatives with our late Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas. His long and impressive service in this Chamber will certainly rank as one of the historical highlights of the 20th century.

His fierce patriotism for his Nation is a matter of record, as is the durable imprint he has left on our Federal Government.

In addition to having served nearly a half century in the House of Representatives and as Speaker twice as long as anyone else, Speaker RAYBURN distinguished himself through his outstanding leadership that was sparked by undisputed strength and effectiveness. He piloted this body of Congress through many challenges and emergencies, standing always as the strong protector of its powers and integrity.

I am sure he would want us to remember always his great love for the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the loss of SAM RAYBURN has filled this House with a sorrow reflecting the grief of the American people as a whole.

Everyone familiar with the American political scene over the past half century has been familiar with the name of SAM RAYBURN—a name so generally revered as to bewilder the student of politics.

A look at record of this remarkable man is all that is required to understand his phenomenal popularity. A reformer, yes. But one to whom reform was justifiable only in instances when it was not necessary, in the process, to burn the house to the ground. Moreover, despite his reputation as a politician par excellence, he in no way employed any of the methods generally associated with that grossly misunderstood term. He was, beyond question, the prototype of the southern gentleman in politics, and as such was respected on every hand.

In the days ahead we undoubtedly shall prosper under the leadership of Mr. RAYBURN's worthy successor. Of that there is no doubt. Yet the name of RAYBURN shall nonetheless be remembered for many years to come. For it is men such as he—SAM RAYBURN, the farmer-lawyer from the black clay country—of whom legends are made.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, SAM RAYBURN was certainly, unquestionably one of the greatest world figures of our time. When future generations think of this era of world history, they will list among the great men, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, Harry Truman, Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and Speaker Sam Rayburn. He served not only the great State of Texas and the United States, but he was a world figure and a world leader. He served the cause of freedom throughout the world. He was a symbol of true representative government.

Mr. Speaker, I will always remember Mr. RAYBURN's love for and devotion to this House. He believed in it as a great institution. His life was devoted not only to this country and to the cause of freedom, but to the House of Representatives. He agreed with the Founding Fathers that this body should be kept close to the people and should be the people's most direct contact with their Federal Government. The people of my section of the country will always remember also the fair and impartial way in which Mr. RAYBURN presided over our Democratic conventions. He held the party together. He performed a lasting service to this Nation by being one of the all-time greats in the Democratic Party. This House will miss Mr. RAYBURN. The American people will miss him and his wise counsel will be missed in the Democratic Party.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in my deepest sympathy to his family and to the people of Texas.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, the human language is a frail instrument to fully express one's deepest feelings as he attempts to speak on the life, the character, and public service of a great American, whose passing has touched all America.

My elders in this body, who were associates of the former Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, much longer than I, have endeavored with their greatest skills and eloquence to speak appropriate words in eulogizing this great man. For one who has had the privilege of serving with him for only a brief period of 3 years, the task is even more difficult. For in that brief time we suddenly found ourselves in the company of a man whose political ingenuity, whose skill in dealing with controversial issues, and whose magnanimous character in dealing with personalities will remain unsurpassed in his generation.

Although I considered myself only a casual acquaintance of the former great Speaker, his brief acquaintance with me did not prevent him from listening to my problems and thoroughly understanding my concerns. I found that no problem was too small nor insignificant for such a busy man.

In the functions of his office, others have and can far better give him his proper and just dues. However, I was deeply impressed with his humble character and unimpeachable honesty; such attributes stem from one source—faith. His unassuming manner, his forthright integrity reflected the soul of a great man who lived close to his God. On one occasion, faith became the subject of conversation. He said, "I cannot describe it, I know it is in me and I live by it."

His life clearly demonstrated the power of humble Christian faith. We all feign, would emulate a man of such stature in the realm of politics and statesmanship but if one day it may be said of us that we, like he, were "men of great faith," we will have profited immeasurably by the life of this great American statesman.

To his survivors, I convey my feeble condolences with a conviction that their sorrow is made lighter by the beauty of his character.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, today during the course of these eloquent and deserving eulogies of the life and character of our late distinguished Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, my mind goes back to the afternoon last November when he was buried in the little cemetery in his hometown of Bonham, Tex. The admiration, love, and respect for him, as well as their sadness at his passing was clearly evidenced in the faces of all his fellow citizens of Bonham, regardless of their age, color, or creed.

As has previously been said, SAM RAYBURN was a truly remarkable and fair man, a leader among men. I shall always remember him and owe him much for the many nice things he did for me since I came to the U.S. House of Representatives. When I was first elected to the House, I sought his advice, which he gladly and patiently gave. I have tried my best to follow his advice over the years. I shall also remember the kindly and down-to-earth advice he gave on a number of occasions to the members of the senior class of St. Francis Preparatory School of Brooklyn, N.Y., when they came to Washington on their annual Capitol tours. They always looked forward to a visit with Mr. SAM. Let the perpetual light shine upon him.

On November 16, last, the editorial page of the Washington Daily News, in a tribute to Speaker RAYBURN, had this to say about him:

> Probably the best way to distinguish Speaker SAM RAYBURN from his contemporaries is simply to cite the name by which he was respectfully and universally known—"Mr. SAM."
>
> Mr. SAM died early today. He had been a Member of Congress longer than anybody else. He had been Speaker of the House longer than anybody else—more than twice as long. He had been a power in the Government for 25 years. He was an institution, the same as the Capitol Building, or the Lincoln Memorial.
>
> But when people spoke of Mr. SAM they spoke of more than this remarkable record. They spoke of a sometimes irascible politican, who also was a dedicated public official.

They spoke of a grumpy, curt old man, who also had the humor and sprightliness of a carefree blade. They spoke of a flinty ruler of his domain, who under the crust was much more a realistic conciliator, a maker of agreement.

Mr. Sam's mannerisms belied his mellow nature. For essentially he was a man of sentiment. He had an immense capacity for loyalty, and an eternal devotion to the career he made for himself. He was a fierce defender of the Congress, and an unflinching partisan. He was a man who spoke his mind sharply, without quibble or mere nicety.

Yet Mr. Sam was ever the gentleman. His sense of propriety and good taste was well cultivated. His courtesy and fairness were plain to see under that veneer of crustiness.

Mr. Sam, more than anything, was a believer. He believed in the American system of government. He believed in liberty and freedom and personal dignity. He believed in people and in the ultimate good wisdom of the people.

"It is an honor," he said, "to be elected to anything by the people."

And he never forgot that.

He built his own monument, the Sam Rayburn Library, in his beloved hometown, Bonham, Tex.

It was intended as a monument to Congress. Here would be books and documents telling of the men who had made the story of Congress.

"The way to study history," he once said, "is to read the lives of men."

There is a great sweep of history in the life of Sam Rayburn and this will live on.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the entire United States suffered a great loss on November 16, 1961, when the Honorable Sam Rayburn passed away. No place will he be missed more than here in the Halls of the House of Representatives.

Speaker Rayburn was more than a mere man—he had become an institution, an inspiration, a great leader, and a statesman. On November 16, it was almost impossible to imagine the House of Representatives without Mr. Sam at the helm.

I am thankful that I was elected to the House while Speaker Rayburn lived. Although I had only 1 year here prior to his passing, I know that I was fortunate in having the year. As a freshman Congressman, I found the Speaker to be a kind and friendly person, willing to take the time from his busy schedule to welcome me to this body, offer constructive advice, and, in general, make me feel at home. Multiply my experience by the hundreds of new Members of the House who have received this treatment and you have the picture of a true leader, the Honorable Sam Rayburn.

America has lost a great force, but Sam Rayburn will never die—he lives on in the lives of all who knew him.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed fitting that we take time out from our business today to pay tribute to one of the greatest Americans of all time, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, who presided over this House longer than any other man in history.

So much has already been said in praise of Sam Rayburn and words fail me when I try to add my sentiments to those already expressed by his many friends and colleagues.

Sam Rayburn—or Mr. Speaker as most of us called him—was a Democrat but more than that, he was an American first, last, and always. He loved this country of ours with an unsurpassed intensity. He had profound respect for our Constitution which established a government of laws and not of men. Sam Rayburn honored and respected the law and it is through the efforts of great men like him that these United States have continued to be a government of laws, rather than of men.

It has been my privilege to know Mr. Sam for 9 years and I consider it a real honor to have served under his great leadership. He earned the respect of all his colleagues by his fair and impartial rulings as Speaker. Although he was a Democrat, political affiliation did not count when it came to recognizing the rights of all the Members of the House and discussing our problems with us.

Although Sam Rayburn served in the House of Representatives longer than any other man and served as Speaker of the House twice as long as any of his predecessors, these will not be the outstanding facts in the record he compiled. Sam Rayburn will be remembered as one of the giants of American history for the part he played in molding that history and for his contributions toward achieving greatness for the United States of America.

Mr. Sam was truly the most dedicated of public servants. He devoted his life and all his energies to making our country a better place for all of us. He will ever remain my example of a true statesman; a man of honesty, integrity and outstanding ability.

I feel a personal loss of a sincere and true friend and the country has lost its greatest champion. No one will ever be able to replace Mr. Sam but his life will continue to be an inspiration for all of us.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to a great American who has passed into history.

In the short span of a human lifetime, he realized his highest ambition and became Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States. He is so indelibly a part of this House, it seems incredible he is not actually present here among us any longer.

Sam Rayburn's career in Congress covered decades of history which helped to bring America to prominence as a world power. He served with Woodrow Wilson, Herbert Hoover, Franklin Roosevelt, and he was an integral part of America's expansion and development. The good people of Bonham, Tex., deserve the thanks of a grateful Nation for having the wisdom to see his talents fulfilled. Three generations of voters recognized his capacity for leadership and they willingly sent him to serve the Nation.

The qualities which made up his character and temperament will be models for legislators for generations to come. His loyalty to truth and a well-defined code of honor, his basic integrity, his ability to inspire confidence, and above all his sincere love of this giant and varied land are symbols of statesmanship which have been willed to each of us and to all those who will follow after us.

We have inherited a legacy of greatness. It is to Sam Rayburn's everlasting credit that he placed the highest importance upon serving these United States with the best of himself. We, who are entrusted with carrying on the burdens of statecraft, will dishonor his memory if we fail to live up to his confidence in us.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the great and distinguished former Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Sam Rayburn. Sam Rayburn was a grand and wonderful man, dedicated and patriotic. His wisdom and devotion to the public interest are visible in the great legislative enactments which he fathered. We miss him for his friendship, help, guidance, and wise counsel. He will live long in the memory and affection of not only those who had the privilege of serving with him in the House of Representatives, but also in the affection of those who benefit from the great works he did in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker on High has had the last word.

He has called home our Mr. Sam. Mr. Sam's body has gone but his spirit will preside over us forever.

Many will talk of our late Speaker's long, tireless, and devoted service. His successors will no doubt strive to meet the high standards which he has set. I doubt whether any will ever exceed his length of service.

But length of days alone is meaningless. What is meaningful as a part of the history of our country is that Sam Rayburn used his long years of service to acquire knowledge and wisdom from a vast experience.

But the Bible also tells us that the mere acquisition of knowledge and wisdom weighs as nothing in the eyes of the Lord. It is the use to which that knowledge and wisdom is put that counts. It is in the use of his knowledge and wisdom that we find the real greatness of our late beloved Speaker.

He has been more than just the No. 1 man in the U.S. House of Representatives. He has done more than lead the Congress as a legislative body.

He has been guide and guardian of every individual Member who has served in this great body during the tenure of his leadership.

He has been ever ready to assist in the solution of any and every problem. In fact, many of the problems have been made to disappear because of his sympathetic understanding and guidance.

Here truly was a man who gave of himself, without stint, to the service of his fellow man.

I join all of our colleagues in extending our heartfelt sympathy to his dear ones whom he left behind.

May his memory be for a blessing forever.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is a high privilege, indeed, to join with my fellow Members here in paying tribute to our late and beloved colleague and leader, Sam Rayburn.

Considering the record and service of this great legislator and statesman, it is safe to prophesize that his legislative learning, wisdom, knowledge, and guidance will forever remain unsurpassed in the annals of our history.

In the darkest and most serious hours of legislative challenge in this Chamber, all of us have witnessed the great spirit of this mighty man enlighten and encourage this body toward the patriotic discharge of our full and common responsibility.

This Nation and the world is grateful that divine providence, in eternal design, granted us the genius of this man for direction, on this side of the Congress, in the fight for freedom's preservation through one of the most difficult periods of civilized history.

His wise counsel, sympathetic understanding, and friendly encouragement to Members of this body, over nearly a half century, will remain a byword in this Chamber forever and his great spirit can never be removed from the atmosphere of this Hall.

The greatest tribute we can pay to Mr. Sam is to continue to live and work here in his spirit and example, while we humbly pray the Almighty to insure his eternal happiness in His heavenly chamber.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, today we are assembled to pay honor and respect to the late Speaker of the House of Representatives, Sam Rayburn, of Texas. Our tribute to him is not offered merely in recognition of the high position among us which he attained and held for so long—longer than any previous Speaker. Nor do we gather to honor him merely because of his long and continuous service to his country here in this House—longer than any Member here present. But rather we gather to take note of all these things. So recall again the essential greatness that was in the man, Sam Rayburn. He possessed a warmth of personality, a humility of spirit, and a quality of strength that is rare in men of this life. He was, in every sense, a great man; we honor him accordingly.

Sam Rayburn's life was dedicated, as Lincoln defined, "to the proposition that all men are created equal"; not equal, perhaps, in physical power; not equal in intellectual endowments; not equal either in moral fiber; but without regard to differences of race, color or religion; equal in the right and opportunity to enjoy the blessings of freedom in a nation whose laws and systems undertake to guarantee the equal enjoyment of every right to those who support and defend it. Sam Rayburn's life was dedicated to these principles for future generations as well.

Before I became a Member of the Congress, while serving in the executive branch, I remember well the contribution of Chairman Sam Rayburn as the author and architect and ever vigilant guardian of such great measures as the Rural Electrification Administration, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and other so-called New Deal measures that perhaps saved America in those days from disintegration and losses which might have been irretrievable.

To Sam Rayburn, too, must go a word of credit for his ability to keep us, the Democrat Party, a united national party. Under his leadership, election after election, Democratic majorities were won in the House even when we lost presidential elections. He was a Democrat, yes, a partisan one, who never lost the respect and trust of every member of the opposition party.

Sam Rayburn's love for his country and its ideals was certainly great, but no less great was his love and respect for this body. He served long in the Halls of this House of Congress and his love and devotion to this House and to its purpose grew with each day of service. The House has lost in him a great Member, and we, as Members of this body, have lost a great and good friend.

In our grief, let us take new courage on this day of sadness; with unity and determination let us move forward to the attainment of the goal which he set for us and toward which he led us, not only here but throughout the Nation and the world.

As we contemplate anew the humane purpose in the lives of men, let us remember that gentle spirit, now departed, and his purpose, and let us renew our efforts toward that end.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the tributes that have been offered today to our great and beloved former colleague and leader of this body.

Though I had known of the record of Mr. Sam all my adult life, it was not until I came to the Senate in 1953 and to the House in 1957 that I came to appreciate his true measure. To observe his able leadership, his dedicated service, and the respect he commanded was a constant source of inspiration to me.

No more capable and esteemed statesman ever served in these Halls. Mr. Sam's abilities could be lengthily extolled, but I feel I can pay no worthier tribute than to express my sincere conviction that our country and our lives are infinitely richer because Mr. Sam lived and served.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, this is the first session of Congress which any present Member of the House of Representatives has ever attended without having Sam Rayburn as a colleague. He preceded every one of us to the House—and he helped in innumerable ways every one of us.

When we spoke what was in our hearts in the last session, and told him how much we appreciated what he had done for us—the counsel and guidance and help and support and understanding he gave us—we were sorely afraid that Sam Rayburn would not be back in the Congress this year. And yet we hoped and prayed that God would spare him for further service to the country he loved and the Congress he loved and the people for whom he performed so many great legislative accomplishments over the many decades of his service.

We have all been privileged to know and serve with a truly great American, one of the giants of American statesmen. His spirit pervades this Chamber and lives forever in our hearts.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed knowing Sam Rayburn and my pleasant years of happy association with him in Congress.

Sam Rayburn was a good man. He instinctively impressed you as an institution even when he lived. His judgment was excellent in arriving at a good balance for our times.

Presidents proposed plans in messages to Congress, but Sam Rayburn knew the high art of implementing programs through people. His judgment was careful and precise in arriving at just solutions, molding and blending conflicting interests, and resolution of disputed claims. In this, by tacit and common consent in the House, Sam Rayburn sat as judge and jury, and in many cases assessed how far and in what directions could go the various Presidents and sundry—and to him quickly changing—Cabinet members, and department and agency heads. It should be remembered that these officials did not argue publicly with Sam Rayburn. He somehow seemed to be the spirit of the House.

I remember Sam Rayburn saying of the House of Representatives: "The House is my life, and my love." This is true.

One of my friends and constituents, Mrs. Helen G. Ainsworth of Pittsburgh, Pa., wrote me recently, when she saw Sam Rayburn presiding in one of his last appearances as Speaker: "My, didn't he whack his hammer"—meaning gavel.

I voted to continue Speaker Sam Rayburn's power in 1961 on the enlargement of the House Rules Committee vote at the beginning of the present 87th Congress. It was not a simple vote, but defeat would have moved the power in the House away from Sam's balanced judgment and moderate positions. On reflection, I am glad to be one of the three Republicans from Pennsylvania who made this vote of confidence in Sam. It was the right decision.

There are not many people for whom I would make a trip of several thousand miles to a town and an area I had never seen. But I did go to Bonham, Tex., to pay a last and friendly tribute to Sam Rayburn at the services, as so many of his friends did, from positions high and low. He was a good and likeable friend.

I hope you people in the future who read this day's Congressional Record, will realize the times of turmoil and times of drastic change through which Sam Rayburn presided over the House of Representatives in Congress assembled. We have come through safely and successfully, and I look ahead with a sure optimism.

The Congress, the Union, and the American people are stronger, happier, and more prosperous than ever before. Our laws are more just.

Sam Rayburn believed this surely, and certainly do I. It is true.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, to those of us who came to this House when Mr. Rayburn was presiding, he soon became a legend. He inspired respect, and he took little time in letting us know what was expected of us—to do the work assigned, to abide by the rules and traditions he upheld so strongly, and to work for the best interests of the country.

I find it difficult to go beyond the magnificent tribute paid by Speaker McCormack in his introduction to the document of tributes published at the end of last year. All of us knew and honored Mr. Sam. We knew of his tremendous record in the Congress, and the many legislative battles of world importance into which he had thrown his weight. We knew his fairness as an arbiter and, at the same time, his loyalty to country and party which made him impatient of anything he regarded as frivolous or detrimental.

Not long ago, the Touchdown Club of Washington held its annual dinner, and mention was made of the many ways he had helped pay tribute to the sport. A particularly fine tribute was paid to him in the invocation. And once again, to those present, it seemed impossible that he was gone. His austere and yet benevolent interest was felt in the hall, just as it is felt so often here.

I would not want to end this tribute without remarking on the very human qualities he displayed so often. He was also a modest man, whose association has enriched us all.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, few in the long history of our Nation have made a more lasting impression upon the House of Representatives than our former Speaker of the House, the late Sam Rayburn. His place is not only in history, but also in the hearts of each of us who had the privilege to serve under him in these Halls.

Statesman he was, in the most noble sense of the word. But equally important, he was teacher, counselor, adviser to all of us no matter what our political party, no matter what our particular belief on issues which confronted us.

Not only in length of service, but in quality of service, he was without peer. He stood for what he believed, he fought for what he believed, and in most instances, he not only was victorious, but the rightness of his decisions soon became apparent.

The heat of argument, the smokescreen of triviality he never permitted to cloud reason and truth. He was a realist, a practical man who would not compromise principle. He believed in the House of Representatives, in its integrity, in its purpose and in the wisdom of the decisions of its Members. Some of that belief, some of that faith in the House has rubbed off on each of us. Our task here has been made a little easier, the decisions we must make a little less difficult to comprehend because of Mr. Sam.

He will live in our hearts, in our history books and here in these Halls of the House of Representatives as long as we are a free nation, as long as the ideals, the principles and the beliefs he cherished so dearly continue to play a part in the lives of our citizens.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, for all of us, the passing of Speaker Sam Rayburn marked the end of an era. It was under Speaker Rayburn's tutelage that most of us present began our service in the House. It was under his guidance that we absorbed the intricacies of the legislative process and felt the influence of the high moral principles that guided him throughout a long and distinguished career.

Sam Rayburn aspired to be a just man, and he realized that ambition to the fullest. His integrity and sense of fairness shone throughout all his actions—in his respect for the rights of the minority party, in his warmhearted support for progressive legislation, in the courtesy he extended to all his colleagues. His high ideals, combined with extraordinary political skill and devotion to office, made him one of the outstanding Speakers of American history as well as an inspiration to those who worked with him.

We have double cause to mourn the loss of Sam Rayburn in that we have lost both a personal friend and a great legislative leader.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, much has been said today about Mr. Rayburn and I certainly concur in all the fine and fitting tributes paid to this great American.

Few men in our history have contributed more to their country than did Mr. Sam. He was admired on both sides of the aisle for his absolute fairness and his devotion to the House of Representatives which he so loved.

In 1955 when I first came here from Ohio's 23d District as a fledgling Congressman, I remember well and with much gratitude his kindly courtesy and helpfulness. That pattern never changed. He was ever ready throughout my 7 comparatively short years of service in the House to be cooperative and encouraging.

May his memory be revered and his principles be honored forever.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with my colleagues in paying this final tribute of love and respect for one of the most able Members of Congress, the late Speaker of the House of Representatives, Sam Rayburn.

The long and colorful congressional career of the late Speaker Rayburn serves as an example for all Americans who respect honesty, integrity, and sincerity of purpose in their elected representatives.

Speaker Rayburn in reality needs no eulogy for his life was an open book upon whose pages were recorded for posterity in letters of gold his many achievements as a loyal citizen and as Member and Speaker of the House of Representatives.

From a personal standpoint, I count it a great privilege to have served in Congress with Sam Rayburn. Although we were not of the same political faith, in my opinion he was one of the greatest living examples in this century of a public servant devoted to the rugged American ideals of honesty and integrity in the affairs of Government.

On this occasion, I join in the fine tribute being tendered the memory of our former beloved Speaker Sam Rayburn. I am certain that those of us who were privileged to know him well are conscious of the fact that his depth of character and intense love of country have enshrined his memory in the hearts of the American people. May his noble soul rest in peace.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Sam Rayburn was a man I am proud to have called a friend. He was not only a dedicated public servant, but also a great American. Our country is a better one in many respects because of his unusual contributions. The mere fact that he was Speaker longer than anyone in our history is ample evidence of his worth.

In mourning his passing, we can take pride in the fact that he did so much to make the United States a finer example of constitutional government.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our departed Speaker, the Honorable Sam Rayburn. It is with a sad heart that I do so.

We all know that he fills a place in the heart of every man in this great body.

It was a privilege to know this great American whose name will be enshrined forever in the history of our country; a man whose impact on the destiny of this Nation and free people everywhere can hardly be measured. Needless to say he was a Democrat, because he was known everywhere, affectionately, as Mr. Democrat. He was elected to the Congress of the United States from his beloved Texas and took his seat on March 4, 1913. He served with distinction until the time of his death and held the post of Speaker of the House of Representatives twice as long as any other man in the history of this country.

It has been a great honor and distinct pleasure to serve in the Congress with this great American—his counsel has been wise and his profound interest in the welfare of all the people has been an inspiration. To know him was to love him and to serve under him was to know greatness.

Mr. Speaker, twice in the past 10 years our departed friend came to the Ninth District of North Carolina and spoke in my behalf. I wrote to him soon after he went to Texas last summer, wishing him a speedy recovery and good health, and I shall ever cherish his reply which was written in longhand and sent to me just before he was taken seriously ill.

To his family and loved ones I extend my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Sam Rayburn will always stand out in my mind as a person of total humility and exacting honesty. These are the qualities which won for him the complete respect and admiration of all of us who were fortunate enough to have been associated with him.

He was to me one of the great examples of Americanism. In these days of increasing tension in international affairs, made more serious and complicated by domestic needs and domestic differences in points of view, Sam Rayburn could always be counted upon for wise and sound judgment in weighing the merits of an issue. He was interested in facts and how those facts could be related to the best interest of our country, regardless of what emotion, political benefit or self-interest might dictate. He bore with pride and magnificence the tremendous responsibilities he held in the third highest post in this country.

Sam Rayburn spent his life in the service of his Government. His record of achievement and fame is an enviable one; his method of performance one which all of us could well emulate.

The American people have lost an outstanding public servant; the Congress has lost a great leader. I feel I have lost a true friend. I extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, a great American has left our midst. In life he exemplified the quintessence of public service. This House was his earthly altar, where he performed to advance the commonweal of his fellow Americans. Year by year the vintage of his wisdom improved, because he adjusted to the changing times and the exigencies of his day.

The speakership was the niche which he had carved with the hard toil and determined perseverance which ornamented his high sense of duty. This was the acknowledgment of a grateful membership for the high quality of service rendered by this great American. He revered the office of Speaker with the fervor of a patriot who had sought it as the zenith of accomplishment. On occasions he emphasized to me that he would rather be Speaker than hold any other office in the land. This he sincerely believed and practiced.

Although he was mortal, his legacy has enriched us even after his departure. Historians will keep him alive as an institution on the American scene; we who were his colleagues shall treasure the good fortune of having known and observed him in the great coliseum of legislative combat where he was a towering giant. The shadow of his fruitful tenure shall remain with us, and this is why there shall be no vacuum.

America has lost a great public servant, the State of Texas a revered son, and, as our Nation continues its trek to greater heights, the pathways toward these goals will bear the imprints of the Honorable Sam Rayburn, the great American, the towering giant among men of high ideals, the human whose earthly labors have enriched posterity with the great legacy which he has bequeathed to all of us.

To his family and to his constituents, I extend my most sincere condolences.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most of us, as we listen to the many warm and sincere tributes which are being expressed in memory of our dear friend and leader, are reminded of the personal experiences which we had with Mr. Rayburn which will be treasured in our memories for the remainder of our lives. While I had met Mr. Rayburn on two or three occasions before I came to Washington as a Member of this body, I knew that he could not possibly have remembered me. Yet, he did make me feel good when he welcomed me as the successor of his late friend and my predecessor, the Honorable Orville Zimmerman, and proceeded to inquire about conditions in the 10th Missouri District, with which he appeared to be most familiar despite the fact that he had never been in that immediate area. He knew about our rich alluvial soil, the fact that we produced a lot of cotton, and that it was one of the predominantly strong Democratic districts, and he mentioned some of the personalities with whom he was acquainted in that part of Missouri. He seemed to want to impress me with the important job I had of representing these people, and he assured me that my first duty was to "my" people. How much influence he exerted upon my career in this House I will never know, but it seemed from the very first that his was the same kind of political philosophy that I had always tried to follow. It was indeed a rare occasion when I found myself differing with the things for which Mr. Rayburn seemed to stand. On those rare occasions when there were differences, I never found it difficult to discuss those issues with him, and never did I experience the application of pressure. I distinctly remember one of those occasions, when his parting remark was, "Do what you think is right, and God bless you." Another thing stands out in my memory, and that is when on various occasions he would allow me to occupy the Speaker's chair during a rollcall or quorum call, and on his return he would always express his gratitude and make you feel that you were doing him a great favor. Gracious, kind, and considerate—those are the qualities that stand out most in my mind. His sense of duty and obligation to his friends and his party could be described by all in recounting the personal experiences we enjoyed with Mr. Rayburn. I will always be most grateful for his only visit to my hometown during the campaign of 1960, when he addressed an area Democratic rally. The graciousness with which he met all of the people, the manner in which he answered questions at a small press conference at which he put his interviewers at ease, and the time he was willing to take in meeting and shaking hands following the meeting—all of these things contributed toward creating the image which remains in the minds of all those who met him, that here was a man in whom we could place our trust and confidence, one who retained the touch of the common man, with no pretense or intimation that he had been affected by the honors which came to him from those in the highest places. I can pay no higher tribute than to say that no person outside my immediate family has had a greater influence on my life. His was a full life, the influence of which will be felt for years to come as we revere his memory.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on the death of Sam Rayburn, the Nation lost the services and counsel of one of the great Americans of this century. The House of Representatives lost its ablest and most dedicated champion. All of us here today lost a fine and valued friend and confidant.

During the period of our late Speaker's illness and following his death, I had frequent occasion to ponder the consequences of his death upon the Nation and to attempt, out of my short experience in the House, to determine the source and basis of Sam Rayburn's greatness. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the quality which, added to Mr. Rayburn's natural ability and long experience, created the unique station in our Nation's affairs he occupied was his tremendous love for his country and for the House of Representatives. He devoted himself with singleminded intensity to the enhancement of the dignity of the House. Nearly all of his energy was concentrated to the end that the House should become a more responsible and a more responsive legislative body.

It was my privilege to confer with Speaker Rayburn on Wednesday of the week in which he left Washington to return to his home in Texas for the last time. Even then, ill though he was, he thought and spoke of nothing but the House of Representatives, its future organization and its effectiveness.

The House of Representatives of the United States was for many years a much better place than it otherwise would have been because of Speaker Rayburn's service here. And because of it, America was and is a better place to live.

Mr. Speaker, Sam Rayburn's memorial will be found in the hearts of the millions of Americans who today enjoy an added measure of dignity and liberty as a result of Sam Rayburn's long career of public service. There could be no finer memorial than this.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that today we recognize the tremendous loss this House and this Nation has experienced in the passing of our beloved colleague and Speaker, the Honorable Sam Rayburn. It was a distinct honor and privilege to know and associate with this great American. To him duty was just as sublime as it was to Robert E. Lee. His work and responsibilities as a Member and Speaker of the House were literally his life. No man was ever more conscientious and diligent in representing his congressional district and his country.

He left his indelible mark on the legislative machinery of this land. His influence was felt in every corner of the globe. Countless millions who never saw him in person respected, admired, and loved him, because they knew of his great desire to make this world a better place for all mankind. His life brings to mind a story Sir Harry Lauder used to tell about his boyhood days. This famous Scottish singer and comedian said:

> From the window of his house, he used to watch the lamplighter as he went up and down the cobblestone streets in Scotland lighting the street lamps on either side. When he first began to light the lamps, the boy could see him clearly, but as the twilight turned into darkness, his form was no longer visible. "But," said Harry, "I could easily tell where he had been by the light he left behind him."

The legislative leadership in the U.S. House of Representatives, through many years, is one of the lights Speaker Rayburn left behind him, one of the many monuments to his memory.

Sam Rayburn was a son of Texas; a citizen of this Nation; a Member of Congress; and Speaker of the House. He possessed high and noble qualities. He was brave. He was courageous. He believed in his country and his fellow man. He had hope, faith, and love.

We can never cease to be grateful for the vision of that preeminent statesman, for his public service and his faithfulness to every trust.

Mr. Sam has heard that "one clear call" and there was no "moaning of the bar" when he "put out to sea"—no "sadness of farewell when he embarked"—perhaps just one august moment of tryst with his Heavenly Father and he had entered into the fullness of eternal life.

May the Lord richly bless and comfort his family during these days of separation as they look forward to the time of glad reunion, as they cherish the beautiful memories of a wonderful and fruitful life. Speaker Rayburn's life will live on and on in the years which lie ahead. In the words of Robert Frost:

> Lovely are the woods, dark and deep,
> But I have promises to keep
> And miles to go before I sleep.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in this universal tribute to the memory of our late great Speaker, the Honorable Sam Rayburn. I consider it a signal honor and a privilege to have known him and worked with him in the Halls of Congress during the past decade. He was truly one of the great men of our generation, and perhaps one of the greatest of all times in our Nation's history.

His passing has saddened all of us and is a personal loss to me as I had a genuine love and respect for him. We have lost a wise and courageous leader, a patriotic American, and a personal friend. His loss is being deeply felt all over the Nation by all segments of our people who revered Mr. Sam. He was a fortress of great national strength, a source of tremendous loyalty, and an inspiration to all of us.

It is sometimes said that while death destroys a mortal being, it presents him to us in boldest relief. The living man is often too close to us, too much a part of our daily life and activities, to be viewed objectively. Death, however, reveals him to us in his entirety, particularly the nobility of his soul and the value of his deeds. Thus, we can now visualize in its fullness and grandeur the unique and outstanding personality that we knew as Sam Rayburn. How rich and how beautiful was the life and the soul of him whose achievements meant so much to so many of his generation.

We who knew him personally and closely will always remember him for his sincerity, his unselfishness, his wise counsel, his able leadership, and his valued friendship. He was a man of keen intellect, a person of good judgment, and who had a deep love for his country and people. His name will always occupy a foremost place of honor in the history of this Nation, and of love in the hearts of his countrymen.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with you and my colleagues in tribute to a great American and our beloved former Speaker, whose untimely passing has rendered a severe loss, not only to the House of Representatives, but to all the American people as well. His great contributions will, I am sure, go down in history to mark him as one of the outstanding leaders of our century. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

Today, we pay tribute to a memory that is still so close to all of us that it is difficult to realize that it is only in memory that Sam Rayburn now is living. Sam Rayburn's life and career as a public servant spanned almost half a century in Congress during a period of great ordeals and achievements for our Nation, and he participated in most of them. He held the position of Speaker of the House more than twice as long as any other person.

But it is more for the quality of his service to our country, than for its length, that we honor Mr. Sam. His service in this House, both as Member and as Speaker, was marked by his unshakeable faith in the judgment of the American people, his loyalty to his own constituents, and his life and respect for this House, its Members, and its traditions.

Speaker Rayburn extended to each of us at sometime in our service with him many courtesies and kindnesses. He was eminently fair, tolerant and understanding, and held the respect and regard of everyone who knew him. We are all proud to count him as a friend. This House and the Nation have lost much in the passing of Sam Rayburn, and we stand greatly in debt to his memory for the enduring example set for all of us by his devoted public service.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in participating in these solemn eulogies today for our late and beloved friend, there is happiness in my heart that we did not wait until his passing to express here on the House floor the high regard in which we held him as a leader and as a person—as a friend. We told him of our love while he was here among us to hear our tributes and recognize their genuineness and sincerity.

There is little to be said now which was not said then. The House of Representatives will continue to serve the people of this country and the cause of freedom as it served those causes during the many years of his leadership, for he imbued all of us with the grandeur of the work we are privileged to do and his influence will persist throughout our service here and throughout our lives.

Sam Rayburn bridged the gap in American political life here in the Congress from the start of the Wilson administration to the Kennedy administration, and served longer in the House than any other American. Similarly, he served more than twice as long as Speaker than any other American. Length of service is in itself impressive. What was much more impressive, however, was his powerful influence in world affairs, based on greatness of character, wisdom, and love for humanity. God rest his soul.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, the sadness of Sam Rayburn's passing from this life will be with us for a long time. The greatness of this man was with us for a long time and the influence of his life will be with this country forever. His greatness and his place in history has been, and is, respected by all, from the man on the street to the man in the White House, by men, women, and children of every part of this great country, by world leaders and people living in far places.

Sam Rayburn touched and influenced many lives. Those people who had the opportunity to know him, to work with him and to serve under him are better men and better women because of him. He exemplified the American spirit and inspired others to new heights of faith, hope, and patriotism. My own purpose in life and my faith in my fellow man, and my own love of country have been strengthened because I knew Sam Rayburn. I am deeply grateful that fate guided me into a close association with this great American.

This country is greater because Sam Rayburn did, for over half a century, exert influence over it. It is greater because he determined that it should be a better place and that it should have a greater destiny in the affairs of man. His very first speech before this body, the House of Representatives, expressed a philosophy which apparently guided Sam Rayburn through his legislative career. He said:

> I have always dreamed of a country which I believe this should and will be, and that is one in which the citizenship is an educated and patriotic people, not swayed by passion and prejudice and a country that knows no East, no West, no North, no South but inhabited by a people liberty loving, patriotic, happy and prosperous, with its lawmakers having no other purpose than to write such just laws as shall in the years to come be of service to humankind yet unborn.

This is the kind of country he helped to build and preserve. May God grant each of us a strength, a belief, and a patriotic spirit equal to Sam Rayburn's.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the tests of greatness is the unselfish concern which a man shows toward those who may not appear able to help him. One of the real marks of Speaker Sam Rayburn's greatness was the deep and personal interest which he took in young people.

I recall vividly in the early 1940's, when I was a young and green instructor at Columbia College and Barnard College, how I used to bring groups of college students to visit the Capitol and we would stop in to see Speaker Rayburn. Whatever matters of state were on his desk, he would push them aside to talk, to counsel, to stimulate these youngsters whom he had never before met. Then from Princeton University in the late 1940's I brought other groups of students, and Speaker Rayburn was unfailingly willing to devote his time and energies to answer their questions, to urge them to read and study certain aspects of American history, and to reminisce about his own experiences.

One day in August of last year I invited a group of high school boys and girls from Parkersburg, W. Va., to come to Washington. They were members of a newly formed organization known as the Youth Government Club. About 40 students accompanied by some of their parents made the all-night bus trip to Washington. They told me that one of the real highlights of their trip was the opportunity to see and speak with the Honorable Sam Rayburn.

The Speaker was already suffering considerable pain on that particular day in mid-August. He had been silently stealing away to see the doctor and take treatments while he stoically remained at his post. Just the day before I had brought some more young people from Huntington in to see him, and to be photographed with him, and he remarked to the photographer: "You had better snap this in a hurry; I cannot smile much longer."

On the morning when our Parkersburg group was to see Mr. Rayburn, he had a leadership meeting with President Kennedy. He returned after a strenuous meeting and as he entered his office there were many callers waiting for him, and telephone calls were piled up. He must have been in great pain. But he insisted on the chance to see the Parkersburg students.

As the members of the Parkersburg Youth Government Club and their parents entered his office, he arose from behind his desk and with great dignity advanced to the center of the room to greet his guests. Many of them he shook warmly by the hand and asked their names. Then he returned to his place behind the desk.

Softly, but with a touch of a low growl, he complained a little about his back. He told about having gone to see Dr. Travell, and he brushed off his discomfort by telling how lucky he had been all his life to be endowed with such a rugged constitution.

Then he described with striking detail the history and meaning of every important object in his office. He spoke feelingly of his plans for the Rayburn Library at Bonham, Tex. He made everyone in the room feel and understand the great traditions which go to make up the speakership of the House of Representatives.

Soon he shifted to a favorite topic: how to learn and appreciate American history. He urged the Parkersburg students to read biography, and he described in glowing terms the way in which the great events in our Nation's history will come alive through the biographies of its great men.

The morning wore on. The callers piled up in John Holton's outer office. The telephone calls, unanswered, mounted. But Speaker Rayburn in his unhurried way gave these Parkersburg students a bit of the last measure of his physical strength. Finally, as the time for the meeting of the House approached, he arose slowly and bade us all goodbye. The students did not dream it was a last goodbye as they filed out.

Many times I have reflected on the meaning of that meeting which Speaker Rayburn held with the members of the Parkersburg Youth Government Club. Here was a man who dedicated his life to service to his country and his God. Yet he found the time, and summoned up the energy despite his affliction, to share the great gifts he possessed with youngsters eager to learn. Long after other tributes to Speaker Rayburn have faded, he will be remembered as one of the truest servants of the Lord.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, Sam Rayburn made an indelible mark in the history of his Nation and his work enriched the lives of millions of Americans during his own time and for the future.

Sam Rayburn is in firm place among the American immortals. Because of his labor, millions of Americans now are living better than their fathers and are assured of greater opportunities for their children.

A statesman, Sam Rayburn will be acknowledged always as one of the shapers of the 20th century. As a wise counselor of Presidents, he was one of the first to see clearly the role, the burdens and the promise of the United States as the leader of the free world.

His name will always be linked with that of Henry Clay, who was the first to win equal prestige for the House of Representatives with the other constitutional branches of government.

Sam Rayburn, more than any other individual, supplied the steady hand at the helm of the House, during exceedingly difficult eras of our history. He not only preserved, but enhanced the dignity and the effectiveness of the House as a vital arm of our democracy.

The life and times of Sam Rayburn will attract future historians. His name will grow in greatness with the years. It is safe to predict that the essence of all that will be written and remembered about him will be: The United States and all Americans gained because he lived in and among them.

Surely, no man could have a better and more deserving epitaph.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege, as well as an honor, to be permitted to participate today in paying tribute to the memory and services of a truly great American, the former Speaker of the House, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, of Texas, whose untimely death last autumn shocked and distressed all American people, as well as all Members of Congress.

Divine Providence has permitted me to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives for 23 years with Mr. Sam, as we all lovingly called him. In most of those years he was Speaker of the House, and, as is well known, served in that official capacity twice as long as any other person in our Nation's history.

Speaker Rayburn was a man of strong character, and even stronger faith in this Republic and its institutions. While his political affiliation was the opposite of mine, never in his long tenure of office did he use his high position for partisan advantage. Instead, he always saw to it that the rights and privileges of those of us in the minority were fully protected, whether we might have agreed or disagreed with his position and beliefs on the issue involved.

Sam Rayburn was a kindly man. He loved the Congress of the United States, to which he gave his life. He was a good man. Never, throughout the years of our acquaintance and friendship did I ever know of him doing a little or a small thing. Instead he unselfishly extended his understanding, his help, and his friendship to all of us who served with and under him.

Speaker Rayburn has gone from our midst to preside in a greater chamber than the one over which he presided here on this earth. Already he has become an American tradition. As long as our Republic lasts he will live in the fond memories of the American people whom he served so long and so well. In his going he has left behind for all of us in this body, the desire and the inspiration to try and measure up to the high official and personal standards he so constantly maintained throughout his lifetime.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in the splendid tributes which have been paid here today to our late, beloved Speaker, Sam Rayburn. Truly he was a great Speaker—judicious and courageous, with the ability to strike straight through to the point. His word was good; his rulings were fair. In the history of this Nation he will be listed as one of the ablest and most sincere leaders this Nation has ever produced. Certainly the statements made here today by his colleagues show the personal feeling and love which all of us had for him, even in those times of difference of viewpoint.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the most divine and most sublime compensation of life is that luxury of enjoyment which comes only from duty well and faithfully performed. Certainly our late beloved Speaker enjoyed all the sweetest compensations of a life well spent.

I enjoyed his friendship for more than a quarter of a century and I shall cherish the memory of our moments together throughout the remaining days of my life.

Sam Rayburn lived magnificently and by his life and labor he enriched the world. In the golden hour of his great life he passed from the Shores of Sound to the Great Realm of Silence.

Prompted by the impulses of sincere friendship, I join with my colleagues in paying a brief tribute to the man who meant so much to all of us and gave so much to the welfare of the people of the world. He will long be remembered by the simplicity of his life, the nobility of his soul, and the eloquence of his actions. By his life he exemplified all the fine and tender virtues of true manhood. He wove no illusions of grandeur on the looms of life. His life was a life of rich and rare reason. His character was a tower of strength, and his heart the core of his greatness. From his lofty abode he is looking down on this place in which he labored so long.

Although the great Beethoven charmed the world with the majesty and beauty of his "Moonlight Sonata," becoming deaf, he continued to compose the world's greatest symphonies. Although he was never able to hear the melody of his greatest composition, his "Ninth Symphony," it will live on in the music world forever. Although he was never able to hear the applause of the world—when he came to his last struggle with death, his last words were: "I shall hear in Heaven."

So today, Mr. Sam "shall hear in Heaven" the words of praise uttered here by his colleagues.

Those of us who are left behind can be comforted by the thought that we knew and loved him, and we know that a humble mound of grass in the land he loved so well marks the last resting place of our honest and faithful friend.

I extend my warm and sincere sympathy to all of his loved ones.

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Congressman, my acquaintanceship with Speaker RAYBURN was necessarily very brief, yet one of the most richly rewarding experiences of my life, and I will be forever grateful for having had the privilege and honor of this association.

SAM RAYBURN lived his life as a man, a great man. It was no accident or inherited advantage that brought to him the true greatness which touches few men in any age, rather it was his constant dedication to our national principles of justice and liberty tempered by love and compassion for mankind. Every use of his position and authority was made with humility and respect for his fellow man, regardless of his station in life.

Though it was not my good fortune to have had a close personal friendship with SAM RAYBURN, such as was enjoyed by many of my distinguished colleagues in the House of Representatives, I have learned much from his excellent example and deeply feel the sharp loss of this strong leader and gentle guide.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, those of us of the House of Representatives have possessed a special honor and privilege in that we were permitted to serve with that great departed American, Speaker SAM RAYBURN. While we knew him intimately, the entire Nation knew him well for his life is now an historical tribute to the vast good he did for this country. The entire Nation respected Mr. SAM as one of America's greats, ranking him with the long lineage of those who have placed a steady hand at the helm.

With the passing of Speaker RAYBURN, America and the entire free world have lost a friend and stalwart supporter. But Mr. RAYBURN built well as he traveled the course of life's events and in this building he made certain that there were those adequately capable of leadership about him who would take up when he lay down the command.

It was my privilege to know Mr. SAM as a friend and a counselor. Many were the times that I visited with him about matters which were relevant only to my State or to me personally but always his door was open and always he was understanding and would counsel in wisdom.

I am confident that this House will long feel the presence of our late beloved Speaker. I am confident that this Nation will long remember his contribution to its progress and welfare. I am confident that freedom in this world is a bit nearer for his having lived among us. Surely this strength will remain with us to encourage us all as we labor in the time ahead that we will be better enabled to carry out those dreams which Mr. SAM made into realities along the way.

In this House, in this Nation, in this world we will miss Speaker RAYBURN. We must each one, therefore, be stronger and more diligent to attempt to carry through this loss.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on an occasion such as this there is little one can really say about such a man as SAM RAYBURN; an American, a Congressman, a Speaker of the House of Representatives, and a true Democrat. Eulogies to the career of this great man already have said it all. The feeling of the American people, both the feelings of those who knew him personally and those who know of him only by his reputation, has been set down for posterity in words far better than I can say. What little I have to say is this:

It has been my privilege to be a Member of this great body for 28 years. During that period of time I came to know and respect and cherish the friendship of Speaker RAYBURN both as a man and as a truly great leader.

SAM RAYBURN was a unique individual. He was that type of person who appears but once in a generation. He was one who by his actions and his words left his mark for all time on all that he came in contact with and in this case that which he influenced was this House of Representatives which he loved so much. Under Speaker RAYBURN the House reached a position of eminence as a legislative body. His effect on it will be felt for many generations beyond his own lifetime. SAM RAYBURN understood the House and its Members and the House and its Members understood and loved SAM RAYBURN.

I am proud to have been able to serve these many years under Speaker RAYBURN and I know I join with many others who say quite simply and honestly SAM RAYBURN was a great man, a great American, but most of all a great human being.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it was with a deep sense of personal loss that I learned of the passing of our beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN. He has left a marked impression on my memory as one who guided me and advised me well when I became a freshman Member of this House. His advice was always excellent and wise, and I feel fortunate in having had the benefit of his tutelage in my earlier years here. His was a personality which made him beloved, and his eminent fairness in all his dealings are well known to all of us. We shall certainly miss him, but in respect to his memory we shall continue to carry on the business of the House with the dignity and orderliness which is our inheritance from him. My deepest sympathy goes to Mr. SAM's family and to the people of the district which he so very ably represented.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege as well as a great honor for me to be able to honor today the memory and the service and the patriotism of the former Speaker of this House, a truly great American who now belongs to the ages, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Bonham, Tex., whose untimely death last autumn shocked us all and deprived the Nation of a true, good, and willing servant.

It was my good fortune to serve in the House for almost 20 years with Mr. SAM, and it was from him I received much advice and counsel that always, without exception, stood me in good stead. For most of the time I knew him, he was the Speaker of this House, and I would like to say that no fairer-minded man ever occupied the Speaker's chair.

Mr. SAM cared not whether a Member was a Democrat or a Republican. If that Member had a legitimate cause he knew that the Speaker was always willing to lend a receptive ear. His word was his bond—when Mr. SAM told you what he was going to do you could rely on that word and proceed accordingly. I never knew of a promise he made that he didn't keep to the letter.

That Speaker SAM was a man of strong character is well known. That he was a man of great and strong faith in our republican institutions is even better recognized. While his political faith is opposite mine, I never knew of him to take advantage of his high position for partisan advantage. In his mind, the Nation came first, this House came second, and party considerations had to wait.

Kindly and good are overworked words, but Speaker RAYBURN was both of these. He was also a forgiving man and never held a grudge, even after heated battle on the floor of this House. His help, his advice, his understanding were always available to all of us who served with him.

Speaker RAYBURN was accorded the rare privilege of becoming an American tradition—a legend, if you please—in his own time. That legend can now grow even larger and the tradition that was SAM RAYBURN can be perpetuated for history. He has left us, now, but I would hazard a guess that he has gone to sit in a chamber far greater than ours.

He has left a legacy for all of us—his own high official and personal standards, so consistently maintained, to which we all must aspire now and in the future.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, 65 years ago, in the quiet of an east Texas cotton field, a teen-aged farm lad named SAM RAYBURN decided he wanted to be Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives. That ambition, conceived in frontier America, was fulfilled in modern America. This week the House formally paid its tribute of respect to his nearly half century of service in the House, and to his 17 years of service as Speaker.

Before he was elected Speaker, SAM RAYBURN was a great Congressman. He sponsored the Rural Electrification Act, the Public Utilities and Railroad Holding Company Acts, the Securities and Exchange Act, the Truth in Securities Act, and the Federal Communications Act. These laws meant adequate electricity for rural America; safeguards against the concentration of corporate power; protection of investors from the unscrupulous few who would manipulate the stock market; and guaranteeing that the airwaves—which belonged to all the people—would be used for the benefit of all the people.

As Speaker, SAM RAYBURN was inspired by a deep sense of humanity. He was guided by mature judgment. He was the master of all time of parliamentary procedure. His reservoir of skills, insights, and friendships met the legislative challenges of the great depression, World War II, the Korean war, and most recently the deadly cold war.

I had the pleasure of meeting Sam Rayburn on September 20, 1940, when he came to my hometown to attend the funeral of William B. Bankhead, his predecessor in the office of Speaker and for 24 years the Representative in Congress from the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, which I have the privilege to represent.

Sam Rayburn was a southerner by birth, and by heritage. Yet, he, as few men, understood the aspirations of the North, South, East, and West. He understood the men chosen to represent all selections of our common country. His personality was both subtle and straightforward. His mind was flexible but was unyielding in its dedication to principle and to fair play. Speaker Rayburn was faithful to the Biblical injunction: "For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required; and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask more."

I had the privilege of enjoying the friendship and respect of Sam Rayburn from the beginning of my service in the House. I went with him through many great legislative battles where I thought the people's interests were involved. We did not always see eye to eye. We did not always agree. Our friendship was bigger than the kind that requires day-to-day agreement or day-by-day adjustment.

Men who have known Speaker Rayburn will distill for themselves, in their own way, some essence or central message from his life. To me, his life was a fulfillment, in our own times, of a pledge made by the patriots of 1776, when they vowed:

> And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it was only a short time ago—on June 12, 1961, to be exact—that it was my privilege to stand here to join with others to extend to our beloved Speaker Sam Rayburn congratulations upon his having served longer as Speaker than any other of our distinguished Speakers. I am glad we had that opportunity to tell him personally how highly and how affectionately we regarded him. Our words then were "flowers for the living" and are more meaningful than anything I can say now.

And with the passing of this truly great statesman, his own words and deeds in his many years of service to God and country, are more meaningful than anything I can possibly say. As the minority whip it was my good fortune to work closely with him. While we were frequently on opposite sides of an issue, he always gave recognition, as our Speaker, to minority rights in the legislative process.

His place in history was attained long before he attained the distinction of having been Speaker longer than any other. Whether or not he ever became Speaker, he would have attained a place in history. His election to Speaker was merely recognition of the innate greatness of the man himself.

I am one of millions throughout the world that mourn his passing. But no one can more deeply feel this loss than I. My deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, we were all shocked and distressed to learn of the passing of our distinguished Speaker. I am certain that there will never be another man connected with the Federal Government during my lifetime who will enjoy the complete respect and authority held by our late Speaker.

Mr. Rayburn, as has been stated on numerous occasions, held the position as Speaker of the House of Representatives twice as long as any other person who has ever been privileged to hold the position as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I know and every Member of this House fully realizes that the Presidents serving during the time Mr. Rayburn was Speaker must give credit to the late Speaker Rayburn for making their programs a success. I consider it a high honor to have had the opportunity to serve under the leadership of the late Speaker Rayburn, as he was one of the best known parliamentarians in the United States. He was also one of the outstanding legislators of our time and powerful in every respect.

The late Speaker Rayburn will be missed by every person in the United States and throughout the world who was privileged with his acquaintance. His service as a legislator will be missed by our President, all the legislators in the Congress, and the people of the United States.

My sincere sympathy goes out to his relatives. Mr. Rayburn will go down in history as one of our greatest statesmen who did as much or more to preserve our form of Government than any other person who has lived since our Constitution was adopted.

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in paying deserved tribute to that great American, the Honorable Sam Rayburn. He has served as Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives more than twice as long as any other person in the history of our Nation.

His patriotism and integrity has served as a guiding light to Americans everywhere.

Mr. Rayburn will be greatly missed by all of us.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, little can be said about the late, beloved Sam Rayburn that would not be mere repetition of the consensus of praise, admiration, and affection expressed by all familiar with the life and work of this outstanding man. His deep sensitivity, coupled with an awareness of the aspirations and rights of people, provided the basis for the pervading reputation of greatness proclaimed by all.

The entire Nation feels indebted for his ceaseless work and devotion to the betterment of the commonweal.

Mr. Sam's realistic appraisals of the circumstances affecting passage of important legislation and his ability to find common denominators among diverse positions has gained him lasting distinction among the great legislative leaders of our history.

The best measure of his contribution is his indelible mark on the vast body of great law enacted under the guidance of his invisible hand.

This plain living, selfless individual was not an average man. His counsel was respected by all. like an uncle he offered me sage advice whenever needed or asked. No greater tribute can be uttered than to say that everyone loved and respected this exceptional man.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the previous order heretofore agreed to, the articles which I referred to are as follows:

[From the Houston Chronicle, Oct. 11, 1961]

My Years With Mr. Sam: Texan Set More Records Than Any Other in Congress

(By Bascom N. Timmons)

(The lives of two Washingtonians have run almost parallel for nearly half a century—those of Speaker Sam Rayburn and of newsman Bascom N. Timmons. Following is the first of series by the veteran reporter.)

Washington.—For many years I have thought of Sam Rayburn as indomitable, indestructible and imperishable.

I came to regard him as indomitable in the early days of our friendship when he came to Washington a stockily built, wavy-haired young man just 2 months past his 31st birthday to take the oath as Representative from the Fourth Texas Congressional District.

I came to think of him as indestructible and imperishable in his long congressional service as he broke record after record. First it was Henry Clay's tenure as Speaker; Rayburn more than doubled it. Then he surpassed by more than 2 years the longest previous continuous service in the House.

When he entered a hospital at Dallas in his critical illness Mr. Sam had been in Congress 48 years, 6 months, and 3 days.

He set other marks, too, such as being the Democrat to preside as permanent chairman over the most Democratic National Conventions. There have been 12 presidential elections and 8 Presidents since he came to Washington. He was a colleague of more than 3,000 House Members. Nearly half of the present Senators served with him in the House.

Except for Senator Carl Hayden, of Arizona, who came to Washington a few months prior to Rayburn, no person remains in public life who was here when the Texan arrived in 1913.

Annual Federal expenditures in Rayburn's first year in Congress were $724,511,963. They will be more than 100 times that this fiscal year. Federal receipts for the fiscal year were $724,111,230; there was a deficit of $400,733.

I preceded Sam Rayburn to Washington by 8 months. My first big assignment here however, was to cover the first inauguration of Woodrow Wilson on March 4, 1913. It was Rayburn's first day, too.

Marching with the West Point cadets that day was young Cpl. Dwight D. Eisenhower, who became the first native-born Texan ever to be President. I shared with Eisenhower and Rayburn at least one thing—we came from adjoining north Texas counties, Rayburn was from Fannin County, Eisenhower from Grayson, and I from Collin.

Rayburn did not take the oath of office until April 7, 1913, when President Wilson convened the New Freedom session of Congress.

INDUCTED BY CLARK

Speaker Champ Clark administered the oath to Rayburn as he entered the House which contained men who would make headlines for four decades and more.

The future congressional celebrities who accompanied Rayburn over the threshold of history that day and the members already there had the makings of:

Two future Vice Presidents: Garner and Barkley.

Five future Speakers: Gillette, Garner, Rainey, Byrns of Tennessee and Rayburn.

Six Cabinet members: Burleson, Glass, Good, Shackelford, Palmer, Hull.

Four tariff bill authors: Payne, Underwood, Fordney and Hawley.

An antitrust law author: Clayton.

An 8-hour-day creator: Adamson.

The prohibition amendment and enforcement act writer: Volstead.

The Federal Reserve Act architect: Glass.

The writer of the largest number of Roosevelt New Deal laws: Rayburn.

A Supreme Court Justice: Byrnes of South Carolina.

A future Democratic presidential nominee: Davis.

MANY ORATORS

Also there were the last of Civil War Congressmen: Gen. Isaac Sherwood, Ohio, Union, and Maj. Charles M. Stedman, North Carolina, Confederate.

There were orators, such as Finis Garrett, of Tennessee, Daniel E. Garrett, of Texas, and J. Thomas Heflin, of Alabama, and great legislative writers such as Lenroot and Esch, of Wisconsin, Mann, of Illinois, and Sherley, of Kentucky. "Big Tim" Sullivan, of Tammany, N.Y., sat on the Democratic side and "Boss" William Vare, of Pennsylvania, on the Republican side.

Two alltime Republican congressional greats had gone down to defeat in the Republican split which elected Wilson: Ex-Speaker Joseph G. Cannon, of Illinois, and Speaker-to-be Nicholas Longworth, of Ohio. But both were returned for the 64th Congress and Rayburn, though an ardent Democrat, cherished his friendship with Cannon and Longworth.

WATCHED RAYBURN RISE

As a Washington correspondent I watched Rayburn rise. He was fortunate that John Nance Garner, of Uvalde, who had been in Congress for 10 years, too, had a special liking for him. Garner was colorful, popular with both Democrats and Republicans, and no man was in a better position to obtain favors from the leadership.

He told Rayburn that as the House was organized then, the most powerful committees were Ways and Means, Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Representative Choice B. Randell, whom Rayburn succeeded in Congress, had been a Ways and Means Committee member and Garner himself wanted that post. He helped Rayburn get Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee was Representative William C. Adamson, of Georgia. Adamson became fond of Rayburn and another rookie member of Congress, Representative Alben W. Barkley, of Kentucky. He assigned to Rayburn a great deal of work on the Adamson 8-hour law, which averted a nationwide railroad strike in 1916.

Although Barkley was a notch higher in seniority on the committee than Rayburn, Adamson made more use of the hard-working Rayburn. Rayburn never had a committee assignment other than Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

He became the committee chairman in the last 2 years of the Hoover administration. In the Roosevelt administration, he authored much of the regulatory legislation put on the statute books.

His colleagues of his early days in Congress did not regard him as brilliant. But he was friendly, able, honest, industrious, serious, unhurried and calm. He was regarded as a possessor of all the solid rural virtues in a Congress in which nearly all the leaders were of rural origin.

Rayburn made his first speech in the House May 6, 1913, just one day before serving a month in that body. He spoke in favor of the low Underwood tariff bill, which was to go on the statute books repealing the high Payne-Aldrich tariff law. An amendment to the Underwood bill provided for an income tax in accordance with the recently adopted 16th amendment.

"As a new Member of this body, I, of course, feel that I should have regard for the long-established custom of the House, which in a measure demands that discussion of questions shall be left to the more mature Members," Rayburn said. "But I feel that as a representative of more than 200,000 citizens of the Fourth Congressional District of Texas I should be allowed to break in a measure whatever of this custom remains, and exercise my constitutional right to speak my sentiment on this floor and refuse to be relegated to that lock-jawed ostracism typical of the dead past."

OUTLINES AMBITION

In his speech, Rayburn said:

"I came to this body a few weeks ago with childlike enthusiasm and confidence. It has always been my ambition to live such a life that one day my fellow citizens would call me to membership in this popular branch of the greatest lawmaking body in the world. Out of their partiality and confidence they have done this.

"It is now my sole purpose here to help enact such wise and just laws that our common country by virtue of these laws will be a happier and more prosperous country.

"I have always dreamed of a country which I believe this should be and will be, one in which the citizenship is an educated and patriotic people, not swayed by passion or prejudice, and a country that shall know no east, no west, no north, no south, but inhabited by a people liberty loving, patriotic, happy and prosperous, with lawmakers having no other purpose than to write such just laws as shall in the years to come be of service to humankind yet unborn."

[From the Houston Chronicle, Oct. 12, 1961]

My Years With Mr. Sam: Youthful Solon Had Few Dates, Took No Junkets

(Second of a series)

(By Bascom N. Timmons)

Washington.—Two rookie Texas Representatives, Sam Rayburn of Bonham and Hatton W. Sumners of Dallas, came to Congress together and for years were the closest of friends. Both got good committee assignments—Rayburn on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Sumners on Judiciary. Both eventually became chairman of their committees.

Rayburn and Sumners took adjoining offices 543 and 542 in the old House Office Building, which had been built when Uncle Joe Cannon was Speaker. Each had one room, which he shared with a secretary.

Rayburn got a Congressman's pay—$10,000 per year. (The Federal income tax didn't apply then.) He got an allowance for office help of $1,500 per year and hired one person at $125 per month. He represented a five-county district with a population of a little over 200,000. It was largely rural and made few demands on him.

He had won over an 8-man field in the primary and his majority, as I recollect it, was only 405. He was almost a teetotaler. Two of his Texas colleagues, John Nance Garner and James P. Buchanan, were the ace poker players. Rayburn was not a card-player. He played dominoes at night with Representative Cordell Hull of Tennessee and other colleagues in the homey lobby of old Congressional Hotel.

He introduced Hull to the woman who later became the wife of the future Secretary of State.

He seemed little interested in women and had few dates. He took no junkets, went home when Congress adjourned and fixed political fences. He "always ran scared," yet when he had opponents he won handily.

Rayburn in our early acquaintance told me a great deal about his closely knit family.

Rayburn's father, William Marion Rayburn, had been a Confederate soldier who came home to Roane County, Tenn., and married Martha Waller.

Ten children were born to them in Tennessee. In 1887 the family (seven boys and three girls) moved to Texas and settled near Windom in Fannin County. The elder Rayburn used his resources to buy a 40-acre black land cotton farm.

An 11th child, a son, was born in Texas. Sam, the 8th child, was christened Samuel Taliaferro. He had shortened it to Sam long before he came to Washington.

The Rayburns had rough going for a long time in Texas. They lived for 30 years in the little framehouse where they settled. In his early years in Congress, Rayburn was building the new family home which became a showplace in Texas. It originally cost, I think he told me, $2,800 in the low building costs of those days, but it was modernized and enlarged. Rayburn also added to his lands and eventually developed the purebred stock farm which became his great pride.

Rayburn attended the little school near Windom, then Mayo College at Commerce (predecessor of East Texas Normal) and after 2 years of college taught school for 4 years. He ran for the legislature at 23, served 6 years in Austin, the last 2 as speaker, the youngest Texas ever had. In 1912 made his winning campaign for Congress.

Rayburn told me that his desire to come to Congress was whetted by a speech by the great Texas orator, Representative Joseph Weldon Bailey, who represented the Fourth District which Rayburn later was to represent. Rayburn rode horseback in mud and rain 11 miles to Bonham to hear Bailey, who later became a controversial U.S. Senator. Bailey was always Rayburn's political idol.

REACHED GOAL

His ambition, Rayburn said, always was to come to Congress and become its Speaker; that he never had any ambition to be a Governor, a Senator, a President or a Vice President. Years afterward, in 1940, he did wish to be Franklin D. Roosevelt's vice-presidential running mate, but Roosevelt tabbed Henry A. Wallace.

In the latter days of the Wilson administration and the early days of Harding's; Rayburn with Hatton W. Sumners and Marvin Jones, Texas Congressman, and later Silliman Evans, a newspaperman, established bachelor quarters. They hired a famous cook, but Rayburn himself was an accomplished cook, specializing in fried chicken.

More than 30 years ago he moved to kitchenless bachelor quarters in the Anchorage Apartments. He lived there all the rest of his Washington life.

He had become an ardent fisherman and it was his principal recreation. He had a hobby of collecting pocket watches, the most prized of which was one given to him by his colleagues when he was speaker of the Texas House. For a long time he was a collector of Robert E. Lee books and photographs.

STUDIED LAW

While a member of the Texas Legislature, RAYBURN studied law and graduated from the University of Texas Law School.

One day in 1916, when RAYBURN had been a Member of Congress for 3 years, Speaker Champ Clark beckoned to the Texan to take over a seat beside him in the private corridor outside the House Chamber.

Clark told RAYBURN he had been watching him, was convinced he could attain any place in Congress, including the speakership, but that he ought to enlarge his horizon. Clark asked RAYBURN to jot down a course of reading. It included some writing of Thomas Jefferson, the biographies and writing of Presidents John Adams and John Quincy Adams, President Andrew Jackson, and Senator Thomas H. Benton.

Clark also told the Texan to do certain reading on Presidents James K. Polk and William McKinley, and to learn all he could about the legislative methods of both Polk and McKinley, who had been distinguished House Members.

RAYBURN did all of the prescribed reading. Many times he, a convinced partisan Democrat, surprised me by admiring references to McKinley, an arch conservative Republican. RAYBURN told me McKinley came close to being the ideal legislator and was a much underrated President.

There is little doubt that of all the Presidents who were in Office during his long Congress tenure RAYBURN had the greatest admiration for Woodrow Wilson. In the first Wilson inaugural address, which he had heard as a freshman Congressman, he had found the principles by which he was to live, and the course he thought his party ought to follow.

Yet it was to Wilson that he revealed his qualities of independence. He went to the White House one day in 1915 to discuss with the President a bill pending in the committee which RAYBURN headed. Wilson asked him to hold up action.

RAYBURN told the President he would continue to press for action.

"I'm sorry I can't go along with you, Mr. President," he said brusquely as he picked up his hat and left.

The bill sought to control the issuance of railroad stocks and bonds. The bill finally became law by Wilson's signature, but it was passed by a Republican Congress in 1919.

In after years when he had become a master at placation RAYBURN would recall the brush with Wilson as an evidence of his tactlessness when he was a fledging legislator.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Oct. 13, 1961]

MY YEARS WITH MR. SAM: YOUNG TEXAN WON HIS SPURS IN WORLD WAR I

(Third of a series)

(By Bascom N. Timmons)

WASHINGTON.—My closest association with SAM RAYBURN was in the 1920's and 1930's. This, I think, was because these were years in which we both had considerable leisure. For RAYBURN, that period saw his emergence as an important voice in his party and a very effective leader.

RAYBURN by the end of the Wilson administration had won his fifth straight congressional term. He nearly always had opponents, yet the Fourth Congressional District was selecting him more or less automatically.

He had won his spurs as a party wheel in World War I but his congressional advancement was checked by his party's lean political fortunes.

In 1918, midway in Wilson's second term, Republicans won the House of Representatives and held it for 12 years. The Harding landslide in 1920 swept even into the South to strike down such Democratic lights as Representative Cordell Hull, of Tennessee. RAYBURN moved far up in overall House seniority and became the top Democratic Member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Representative John Nance Garner had become the big figure in the Texas delegation and during the 1920's Garner also became the Democrats' choice for their House floor leader.

Garner bypassed some senior House Members and formed a young strategical and tactical group; RAYBURN was the senior one. Others in the group were Representative Fred Vinson, of Kentucky, later Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court; and Representatives John McDuffie, of Alabama, Lindsay Warren, of North Carolina, John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, and John F. Carew, of New York.

Frequently Garner asked me to sit in on their planning sessions, of which they had relatively few. Most of his high lieutenants worked directly with Garner. One RAYBURN duty was to keep close liaison with Representative Fiorello H. La Guardia, of New York, an irregular Republican. Sometimes (notably in the Mellon tax bills fights) the Democrats drew to their side enough Republicans to win important amendments.

RAYBURN also took part in fights against the Fordney-McCumber and Smoot-Hawley tariff bills. Of the three Republican Presidents who followed Wilson, RAYBURN's relations were cordial with Harding and Hoover and especially good with Coolidge.

On his visits to the White House, sometimes for Coolidge breakfasts, he said he found that "Coolidge talked enough." RAYBURN quoted with approval Coolidge's reply to a criticism of his silence. Coolidge said: "Well, I found out early in life that you didn't have to explain something you hadn't said." Hoover was "a grand man, a hardworking President," says RAYBURN. "I doubt if anybody who might have been President could have prevented the debacle of 1929, which took him down with it."

RAYBURN had less dealing with Harding than with any President who served after he came to Washington, but found Harding "gracious." Of Harding's ill-starred presidency, including the Teapot Dome scandals, RAYBURN said:

"I never thought Mr. Harding was a dishonest man. I don't think there has ever been a President of the United States who was a dishonest man. I think Harding was trusting. Some people who were not honest imposed upon him."

Republicans won their seventh straight congressional election in 1930. But it was so close that before Congress met in December 1931 (this was before the lame-duck amendment to the Constitution advancing congressional and presidential terms), deaths had so thinned the Republican ranks and augmented the Democrats that Garner was elected Speaker by three votes. RAYBURN became chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for the last 2 years of the Hoover administration.

With Democratic control of Congress in 1931 began the era of RAYBURN's ever-increasing importance in party councils. Garner as Speaker became the Nation's top Democrat and almost automatically an available candidate for the 1932 presidential nomination.

The Texas Democratic Convention, meeting in San Antonio, instructed for Garner and elected RAYBURN his campaign manager and chairman of the Texas delegation to the Democratic National Convention at Chicago. Garner, in a three-way primary contest, won the California delegates, defeating Alfred E. Smith and Franklin D. Roosevelt. His fellow Texan's campaign was not too easy for RAYBURN to manage, as Garner showed scant interest in it.

At Chicago, Garner's strength never exceeded the 46 delegates from Texas, the 44 from California, and a few scattering from other States. But RAYBURN made the Garner candidacy a very important factor in the final outcome.

ROOSEVELT UNEASY

Roosevelt was far from assured of the two-thirds majority then necessary to nominate. Garner had told RAYBURN that he would not be a party to deadlocking the Democratic convention as it was in 1924 at Madison Square Garden.

The third ballot—all three taken at an all-night session—found Roosevelt short of the nomination, but Garner's Texas and California delegations could be enough to put him over. How to get them was a question. RAYBURN was for Roosevelt as his second choice after Garner, but it was doubtful if he could win the Texas delegation, in which there was strong sentiment for Newton D. Baker.

From Washington, Garner called RAYBURN and said curtly, "I think this thing has gone far enough." RAYBURN agreed, but he faced the fact that, if he could not win Texas for Roosevelt, forces of the New York Governor would begin to disintegrate on the fourth ballot. A long deadlock undoubtedly would ensue.

"Do you authorize me to release the Texas delegation from voting for you?" RAYBURN asked.

"Yes," Garner replied.

RAYBURN was now on his own and the keyman in the convention. If he could switch Texas to Roosevelt, California would follow suit, and Roosevelt would be in.

RAYBURN, who always valued an 8-hour sleep, did not go to bed when the convention, after an all-night session, adjourned at 9:15 Friday morning. His soundings convinced him that it was nip and tuck between Roosevelt and Baker in the Texas delegation and with many delegates determined to go on voting for Garner even in the face of his withdrawal.

TEXAS DOUBTFUL

RAYBURN felt the surest way to get a majority of the Texans for Roosevelt was for Garner to go on the ticket as Vice President. A conference between RAYBURN and James A. Farley, Roosevelt's manager, agreed that Garner could have second place. Roosevelt, from Albany gave enthusiastic approval, but it still was doubtful Texas could be won for Roosevelt.

The San Antonio convention had sent 180 men and women to Chicago to cast 46 votes.

Late Friday afternoon, RAYBURN decided to take his big gamble. He suddenly called a caucus of the delegation. The call was so sudden that only 105 of the 180 showed up. It developed into a howling mob scene. RAYBURN finally got a semblance of order and took a vote. The tally showed 54 for going Roosevelt, 51 against. What would have happened if the other 75 Texans had arrived, RAYBURN often speculated, but the 3-vote margin was enough to give Roosevelt Texas under the unit rule. California followed Texas into the Roosevelt camp to give him the nomination on the fourth ballot.

Garner had told RAYBURN and Senator Tom Connally: "I don't think I should give up the speakership for the Vice-Presidency." He never did say he would take it, but the convention gave it to him.

IMPORTANT FIGURE

RAYBURN, who had stuck so closely to his congressional job in Washington and devoted himself so exclusively to his own congressional district that his voice had hardly been a potent one in Texas party councils, came out of the 1932 Democratic national convention a very important figure in Texas and in the Nation. Thereafter his shadow lengthened.

Garner's reluctance to give up the speakership was because he had won it only 2 years before, satisfying a long ambition. Garner was 62, from a district where he was entrenched, and thought he should hold the speakership as long as he wanted, and his party stayed in power. He thought the speakership second only to the Presidency in importance. The Vice Presidency he considered "an office of little importance."

Garner's departure from the House, after his election as Vice President, opened the way to advancement for ambitious Democrats. Rayburn and other Garner lieutenants failed narrowly in their effort to elect Representative John McDuffie as Speaker to succeed Garner. The post went to Representative Henry T. Rainey, of Illinois, with Representative Joseph W. Byrns, of Tennessee as majority leader.

As chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee Rayburn pushed through more New Deal legislation than any other Congressman. He authored the Federal Communications Act, the Securities Exchange Act, the Rayburn-Wheeler Holding Company Act and the Rural Electrification Act, among others.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Oct. 15, 1961]

My Years With Mr. Sam: Texan Had Hard Battle To Be Dem House Chief

(Fourth of a series)

(By Bascom N. Timmons)

Washington.—Sam Rayburn's election as Democratic leader in the House on January 4, 1937, marked the high mark of his eminence to that date. It was a sort of birthday present, his 55th birthday was 2 days later.

He was in the excellent health he had always enjoyed. He was capable of working long hours. He was heavier and blockier than when he came to the House 24 years before and his black hair had vanished. He was the baldest man on Capitol Hill.

A movement for Rayburn for the speakership had been started by his House friends in December 1934, following the death of Speaker Henry T. Rainey before the Roosevelt administration was 2 years old.

Representative Joseph W. Byrns, of Tennessee, had been the majority leader under Roosevelt. Moreover, Byrns had been chairman of the 1934 congressional campaign committee and had helped many Members to be elected. They felt under obligations to the Tennessean.

Rayburn got out of the race in a characteristic statement of just 19 words. He asked me to look at it before he issued it. It could not have been improved upon. He wrote:

"I am no longer a candidate for Speaker. There are no alibis. Under the circumstances I cannot be elected."

Byrns won the speakership and Representative William B. Bankhead, of Alabama, was chosen majority leader. Rayburn evinced no interest in the latter post then. Pending before his powerful Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee were three important bills: reorganization of the National Recovery Administration (the Supreme Court later ruled NRA unconstitutional); railroad rehabilitation, and the future Federal policy on oil control, the latter being of prime importance to Texas.

Speaker Byrns died on June 4, 1936. Bankhead was elected Speaker, but as Congress was adjourning in 2 weeks no majority leader was elected. Representative John J. O'Connor, of New York, chairman of the Rules Committee, filled in.

Rayburn managed the speaker's committee of the Democratic National Committee in 1936 when the Roosevelt-Garner ticket carried all States except Maine and Vermont. He announced his candidacy for the majority leadership, and found that he was the apparent underdog.

O'Connor had conducted an intensive campaign and President Roosevelt seemed to be in his corner. O'Connor as chairman of the Rules Committee had blocked some New Deal legislation. But he was a brother of Basil O'Connor, who had been Roosevelt's law partner.

Rayburn's campaign was managed by Representative Fred Vinson of Kentucky, later Chief Justice of the United States, and by Carl Vinson, of Georgia.

When it looked dark for Rayburn, Vice President Garner arrived in Washington and went to work for him. When Garner was criticized for intruding in House affairs, he retorted:

"I'm for Rayburn 200 percent and I am going to keep working for his selection."

Representative John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, announced his support of Rayburn and brought eastern seaboard support. Pennsylvania swung to him. With his almost solid southern backing he pulled up even with O'Connor.

The White House did not make the expected fight for O'Connor, even seemed to be on Rayburn's side. He won other northern and eastern support.

It was a bitter fight but when Representative Hatton W. Sumners on January 4 nominated Rayburn in the Democratic caucus it was only a question of the size of a Rayburn majority. Rayburn got 184 votes, O'Connor 127.

TURBULENT YEAR

Rayburn's first year as majority leader was turbulent. Republican membership had shrunk so low that it could not be an effective minority. There was, consequently, little incentive for party solidarity among the huge Democratic majority

Rayburn had been in office only a few weeks when Roosevelt sent his bill to enlarge the Supreme Court. Democrats split wide open. Representative Hatton W. Sumners, Rayburn's closest friend and chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, refused to introduce the bill, calling it Court packing. Representative Maury Maverick of San Antonio introduced it.

Rayburn made known his determination to pass the bill if he could get it out of committee, but it remained lodged there. Relations between Rayburn and Sumners cooled.

CONNALLY OPPOSES

On the Senate side, Senator Tom Connally of Texas was one of the most vociferous opponents of the legislation. When it was apparent that the bill was doomed in the Senate, Roosevelt asked Garner to liquidate the fight in the interest of party harmony. The bill ended up dealing only with procedural reforms in Federal district and circuit courts, with the Supreme Court section eliminated.

There were administration reversals on the House side. The man who was later to be acclaimed as a great leader and great Speaker did not get an auspicious start. There was criticism that he was too mild. Even Garner told him:

"You've got to get your knuckles bloody once in awhile, Sam."

PERSONAL APPEAL

But Rayburn was patiently practicing the arts of persuasive personal appeal which later he used so effectively.

Rayburn had other troubles. Speaker Bankhead was in uncertain health, and had to be absent for long periods. Rayburn carried a double load. On July 5, 1939, Rayburn was elected Speaker pro tempore to serve until Bankhead's return to health. With Garner presiding in the Senate, Texas for the first time had the presiding officers of both branches of Congress.

In 1938 Rayburn consummated a project of immense importance to the entire Red River watershed, but especially to his own congressional district. A combined flood control and hydroelectric installation on the Red River had long been a dream.

DENISON DAM BILL

On June 1938 he got through legislation providing for the $75 million Denison Dam.

Lake Texhoma, which the dam created, has a shoreline of 580 miles. Approximately 6.7 million persons visited it last year.

On the Texas side of the lake, the Fish and Wildlife Service has established the Hageman natural wildlife refuge consisting of 11,427 acres. On the Oklahoma side, a similar refuge called Tishomingo has 16,620 acres.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Oct. 16, 1961]

My Years With Mr. Sam: Texan Made Unhappy by Roosevelt Purge Effort

(Fifth of a series)

(By Bascom N. Timmons)

Washington.—Efforts of President Franklin D. Roosevelt to purge the 1938 Democratic primary Senators and Representatives who had opposed administration policies and measures certainly were not calculated to make Sam Rayburn's life as House Democratic leader more serene.

Rayburn himself at the end of the session had sent letters to all House Members, praising them for their work, regardless of their stand on controversial administration measures.

Rayburn said he favored the reelection of all House Democrats, adding that the party was broad enough to tolerate a few "fractious" members. He made it clear that he thought it bad policy for Democratic leaders to oppose Democrats seeking reelection.

But Roosevelt went ahead with his purge efforts. One of those chosen for ousting was Representative John J. O'Connor of New York whom Rayburn had defeated for the leadership. Of all Democratic Senators and Representatives whom Roosevelt sought to oust, he was successful only against O'Connor.

Rayburn put through a wage-hour law, relief measures, an amendment of the neutrality act and various bills to begin building up defense for a threatened World War II.

By early 1939 it became evident that basic disagreements on administration policies were developing between Roosevelt and Vice President Garner. It also was coming to be believed that Roosevelt desired a third term. On one of the Sunday night gatherings in Garner's hotel apartment, which Rayburn, I and others regularly attended, Garner said:

"If Roosevelt runs, I will oppose his nomination in every way I can. I would be against a third term on principle even if I approved every act of Roosevelt's two terms."

Rayburn expressed no opinion. Garner intended to go back to private life. Rayburn expected to continue as House Democratic leader, whoever might be President.

Early in August 1939, Rayburn announced he favored Garner for President in 1940. Rayburn did not then believe Roosevelt wanted a third term.

* * * * *

There still was no announcement of Roosevelt's intentions when the Texas Democratic convention met at Waco in May.

The State convention instructed its delegates for Garner. The convention named Rayburn chairman of the Garner delegation in Chicago. I was a delegate at large. Just before I left for Chicago, Garner told me he wished me to serve as his proxy in the Democratic National Committee and to be his spokesman at Chicago if any occasion arose for it. He said I was to take whatever action I thought best without consulting him.

Garner had been felt out on whether he would be receptive to making it the same old team—a Roosevelt-Garner national ticket for a third time. Garner gave me a letter with the understanding that if it became a convention floor matter I was to go to the chairman's stand and read the letter telling the convention Garner would not again take the nomination for Vice President.

GARNER GOT FEW VOTES

President Roosevelt still had not announced his third term attitude when the national convention opened in Chicago, but it was now certain that he would be nominated, as he was, on the first ballot. The names of Garner and James A. Farley, however, had been formally presented as presidential candidates but except for the solid support of Texas, Garner received only a few convention votes.

Following Roosevelt's nomination, Rayburn sought and obtained from a caucus endorsement of his candidacy for Vice President. Later Roosevelt telephoned Rayburn that he wished Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace as his vice presidential ticket mate.

Roosevelt asked Rayburn to second Wallace's nomination. Rayburn agreed, withdrawing his own candidacy.

Many at the convention rebelled against Wallace. Efforts were made to bring Federal Loan Administrator Jesse H. Jones, of Texas, Gov. Paul H. McNutt, of Indiana, and others into the race; all declined.

Speaker William B. Bankhead, of Alabama, however, entered the race and sought Rayburn's backing. Rayburn could never understand why Bankhead, with his uncertain health, wished the nomination. Moreover, Rayburn already had pledged his support of Wallace.

TEXANS FOR BANKHEAD

Rayburn moved to have a Texas caucus endorse Wallace, but instead the Texans went for Bankhead.

At a bitter, howling night session of the convention on July 18, Wallace was chosen over Bankhead, 626 to 329.

Rayburn came back to Washington to resume his duties for the session of Congress which continued the rest of the year. There were many national defense measures to be considered, including the controversial extension of the drafting of men for military service.

Less than 2 months later Bankhead was dead and Rayburn was Speaker.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Oct. 17, 1961]

My Years With Mr. Sam: Solemn House Members Elect Texan as Speaker

(Sixth of a series)

(By Bascom N. Timmons)

Washington.—Sam Rayburn became the 42d Speaker of the House of Representatives on September 16, 1940.

A solemn, saddened body of men elected him as presiding officer without a dissenting vote in a 2-minute session.

With the casket bearing the body of his predecessor, William B. Bankhead, in front of the Speaker's dais, Rayburn held up his right hand and quietly said "I do" as the oath was administered by Representative Adolph Sabath, of Illinois, the oldest House Member in years of service.

Rayburn was nominated by Representative John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, who explained that it was necessary to elect a Speaker so that the House might function properly.

No other name was placed in nomination. Republicans joined Democrats in a chorus of "ayes."

Rayburn made no acceptance speech. The House immediately held a state funeral for Bankhead.

Three Speakers—Rainey, Byrns and Bankhead—had died in the 6 years before Rayburn's election, a few days more than 21 years ago.

It was then written of Rayburn, that he once had a head of hair and a middle name, but had dropped both; that he had one of the baldest and most-level heads in Congress.

He was the fourth man from west of the Mississippi to be elected Speaker, others being John Garner of Texas, Champ Clark of Missouri and D. B. Henderson of Iowa.

When I first saw Rayburn after his election to what had always been his goal he had just returned from Bankhead's funeral in Alabama.

"IT'S A FUR PIECE"

"Well," he said, "it's a fur piece from Flag Springs."

"Fur piece" was a favorite Rayburn colloquialism for "great distance"; Flag Springs was the one-room school in the Texas blacklands which Rayburn had attended.

"And," he continued, "I still can't realize I'm Speaker."

SPEAKER POWERFUL

The Speaker is powerful. He is the real leader of the majority party in the House if he is a strong man, a policy consultant and legislative chieftain for the President and the next official after the Vice President in presidential succession. Only in protocol and presidential succession does a Speaker rank behind the Vice President. His powers are second only to those exercised by the President.

He is House spokesman and by tradition is expected to uphold its dignity and independence against all comers. The House must have felt strongly that Rayburn did not fail it there, for it became the custom twice a year—on his birthday and the anniversary of his elevation to the speakership—for party lines to vanish as Republicans and Democrats showered encomiums on him.

Only twice in the 21 years after he ascended the Speaker's rostrum did Rayburn surrender the gavel. In 2 years each in the 80th and 82d Congress, Joseph W. Martin of Massachusetts, Rayburn's close personal friend, presided over Republican Houses.

MOST RESPONSIBILITY

In that long period Rayburn was many times the center of momentous happenings. Rayburn said that the day he probably felt his responsibility the most was on August 12, 1941.

On that day the question of extending the Selective Service Act was up for a vote in House. Most of the thousands of soldiers who had entered the Army had done so with the understanding their service would be for only 1 year. There was war in Europe, but this country had stayed out of it.

The War Department's plea, that it would be catastrophic for the Army to disband, was met by a demand of thousands of parents that the Government keep its contract.

MOTHERS PROTEST

Flag-carrying mothers called on House Members as the Draft Act was debated, asking them to oppose extension. The galleries were filled as the rollcall began. It was nip and tuck.

Those of us in the press gallery found our tally sheets in disagreement. Even Rayburn did not know which side had won. The tally clerk handed him a slip of paper.

FREEZES SITUATION

"On this vote," the Speaker announced, "203 Members have voted 'aye,' 202 Members have voted 'no,' and the bill is passed." By this quick action Rayburn had frozen the situation, for no Member can change his vote after a rollcall result is announced.

One other maneuver remained for opponents of draft extension—to ask for a recapitulation. This, Representative Dewey Short of Missouri, demanded. Because the vote was so close, Rayburn allowed it. Again the roll was called. When finished, Rayburn quickly announced: "No correction in the vote, the vote stands, and the bill is passed, and without objection a motion to reconsider is laid on the table."

Again Short demanded reconsideration. That move was stopped by Rayburn's announcement that "without objection the motion is laid upon the table."

"BEG TO DIFFER"

Representative H. Carl Andersen, of Minnesota, got the floor to say: "I beg to differ with the Speaker. The Speaker did not announce that a motion to reconsider had been tabled."

"The Chair has twice stated that he did make the statement," the Speaker replied.

"I beg to differ with you—" the Minnesotan began. Rayburn cut him short, with:

"The Chair does not intend to have his word questioned by the gentleman from Minnesota or anyone else."

JAPANESE STRIKE

By one vote the House had kept the Selective Service Act. Less than 4 months later the Japanese struck at Pearl Harbor.

Of the $350 billion we spent in fighting World War II, much of it was for secret purposes and Rayburn would go before appropriation committees to ask for the funds. One case was the atom bomb. Rayburn at first did not know what the money was for. Many Congressmen did not know of the atom bomb development until the first one had been dropped in Japan.

Until after World War II, Rayburn attended few Washington dinners or social affairs. He once said:

"One reason I don't go to these society dinners is that they don't serve chili."

He liked to give chili and tamale dinners for small groups of congenial people.

There are some social functions in Washington that a Speaker is forced to attend, others that he cannot gracefully avoid.

The Speaker's dinner at the White House is a fixed state event. During her life, his spinster sister Lucinda (Miss Lou) went with him to these dinners. After her death his widowed sisters, Mrs. Thomas and Mrs. Bartley, went with him.

His annual birthday party on January 6 was another ritual. He gave a few big parties himself.

PINING FOR CRUMBIN

After a social season during Miss Lou's lifetime, he would say he was pining for some "crumbin."

Crumbin was a Lone Star species of cornbread that Miss Lou was skilled in baking.

Rayburn has never crossed either ocean. He made one trip to Panama, his first year in Congress. He also spent a vacation in Mexico City. But year after year when his colleagues scattered to far away places Rayburn headed back to his Texas farm.

HESITANT ABOUT PLANES

Rayburn was slow to take up air travel. Asked in the 1940's if he was going to fly to his Texas home for Christmas, he said: "I am going, but I won't fly. I like to travel by train. Takes two nights and a day to get home that way, and the best rest I ever get is during that time. I spend most of it reading a wild west magazine. I went up in an airplane once, back in 1935. Made up my mind never to do it again."

During the 80th Congress when he was not Speaker he made the trips in a big, black Cadillac. In 1947 every Democrat in the House contributed $25 to buy the auto for their leader.

In his latter years he began to use airplanes exclusively for his trips home.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Oct. 18, 1961]

MY YEARS WITH MR. SAM: HISTORY WILL FIX TEXAN'S RANK AS HOUSE SPEAKER

(Last of a series)

(By Bascom N. Timmons)

WASHINGTON.—SAM RAYBURN's rank among Speakers of the House will be for history to fix.

The two who prior to him got the highest ranking were Thomas Brackett Reed and Joseph G. Cannon. Henry Clay, who before RAYBURN, had served longest, was never ranked as a great House presiding officer.

Reed served a broken 6 years—two each in the administrations of Benjamin Harrison, Grover Cleveland, and William McKinley.

A huge mountain of a man, a downeaster from Maine, Reed, a brilliant lawyer, was the possessor of a devastating tongue, and could wither an opponent with a word, or with a sentence at most.

Cannon, an Illinois man, although born in North Carolina and of southern stock, served 8 years in the Theodore Roosevelt administration. He undoubtedly was the most colorful Speaker in history.

I, of course, never saw Reed. With Uncle Joe Cannon I had a delightful friendship when he was no longer Speaker and a very old man. He was then no longer gladiator. He was left-handed and did wonderful things with his southpaw when he spoke.

Reed and Cannon were Republicans and arch conservatives—"stand-patters" in the idiom of their day. Both ruled the House with a tight rein. John Nance Garner was somewhat in the Reed and Cannon image, but Garner was Speaker for only 2 years.

There was no doubt RAYBURN was House leader, but he had a method of his own—an appearance of being a leader among and not of the House Members. It worked well.

Reed constantly clashed with Presidents. Cannon could tell Theodore Roosevelt, as he did, that "the House can take care of its reputation and its dignity in its own way." RAYBURN had good relations with the four Presidents who served while he was Speaker.

THE BEST WAY

"The best way to get along is to go along," is widely quoted advice given by RAYBURN to young Congressmen. The inference might be that they should bend gently to leadership orders.

RAYBURN stated it better when 400 Texans in Washington honored him at a dinner when he was elected majority leader: "I expect to tell the President my convictions and at times may argue with him, but when he and the leaders of Congress have agreed upon a definite program, I will be for it 100 percent," he said.

On another occasion RAYBURN said: "I have never asked a man to cast a vote which would violate his conscience or wreck him politically. In an overwhelming majority of the cases, the Members in the House vote for what they think is the best interest of the country."

PRAISED BY NIXON

RAYBURN got credit for running the House with firm but fair hand, persuasion rather than coercion. He once said: "The greatest ambition a man can have is to be known as a just man." Richard M. Nixon, when he was Vice President, said: "There has never been a better or a greater Speaker than SAM RAYBURN."

Nixon made that statement March 12, 1959, when he and 46 Senators presented to RAYBURN a silver tray bearing their inscribed signatures to be placed in the Rayburn Memorial Library at Bonham.

It is a novel experience to see a contemporary live to become a patriarch as RAYBURN did during my time in Washington.

The most valuable thing RAYBURN got from Garner was "savvy"—an understanding of the House and the men and women in it. Most of them have fierce personal ambitions and nearly all feel they themselves have all the qualifications of leadership. All have constituencies. Year after year RAYBURN became the counselor and father-confessor of House Members. He saw nearly all of them privately at some time each session in his formal office.

SMALLER "BACK OFFICE"

There was also the smaller "back office" where he relaxed with friends. Vice President Harry S. Truman was in this little hideaway with RAYBURN and a kindred group when he was summoned to the White House to be told that Franklin D. Roosevelt was dead and he was President.

There are persons of all professions in Congress. RAYBURN, a lawyer, said it made no difference what their calling, if they had character and commonsense.

"When a person has commonsense, he has all the sense there is," he said. "It all depends upon what is done with it."

Into this office daily also came prominent private citizens, Cabinet officers, committee chairmen, and party leaders, large and small.

A rather sad-faced man, some visitors got the idea RAYBURN was a worrier. He said he wasn't, that when he went to bed he went right to sleep: "If I can't do my job standing on my feet, I sure can't do it lying in bed worrying."

MAN OF FEW WORDS

An aid once told how RAYBURN managed to see so many people and do so many things in a day. A telephone call took him 3 minutes, even if it was with the President. Five or ten minutes was enough for a conference, even on a complicated problem. He never wrote letters longer than a page.

He became affectionately known to the Nation as Mr. SAM. It started this way: There was still at home in Bonham a large Rayburn family. There was unmarried Lucinda. SAM always called this sister "Miss Lou," even when he was speaking to her. The neighbors took to designating the brothers as Mr. Tom, Mr. Jim, Mr. Sam, and Mr. Dick.

Hope Ridings Miller, a young woman from Sherman, came to Washington and became the writer of a social column. She began to refer to the Speaker as "Mr. SAM," as she had always heard him called back home.

Then a decade or so ago everyone seemed suddenly to like the appellation. He became Mr. SAM.

When an effort was made to boom RAYBURN for Vice President in 1944, he showed no desire to change from the speakership, although most persons believed that if Roosevelt were reelected he would not live out his fourth term. The nomination went to Truman, who did quickly succeed to the Presidency.

BACKED JOHNSON

There was a move among Texans and others from other States to offer him for President in 1952, he gave no assistance to it. In 1956 and 1960 he strongly backed the presidential candidacy of Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

He refused the offer of permanent chairman of the 1960 Los Angeles Democratic national convention to work for JOHNSON's nomination and to make the speech placing his fellow Texan in nomination.

Although RAYBURN never admitted it, he became convinced soon after he reached Los Angeles that Kennedy had the nomination sewed up. He sat in his seat, second from the aisle, among Texas delegates, when JOHNSON was defeated by Kennedy. The next day JOHNSON was chosen as Kennedy's ticket mate.

The one native Texan he saw elected President was Dwight D. Eisenhower, a Republican. RAYBURN, as a Democrat, naturally did not like that, although Eisenhower always referred to himself as RAYBURN's "constituent."

On RAYBURN's 79th birthday Eisenhower sent him a telegram, saying:

"I am happy to have been born in your congressional district (at Denison) because I prize your friendship and respect your many years of outstanding service to our country."

NO LIBERTIES LOST

RAYBURN recently scoffed at a statement that this country has lost many of its ancient liberties.

"What liberties have we lost?" he asked. "The American boy and girl today can say what he pleases, think what he pleases, and choose his way of life freely as long as he does not trespass on someone else.

"We have amended our Federal Constitution 23 times, but we have every single liberty we had when the Constitution was written in 1787."

His love for the Capitol Building has been well known. He fought for years, against formidable and vocal opposition, to change the east front.

The RAYBURN-directed extension of the Capitol's east front, which moved the familiar east exterior 32½ feet east of its original location, will be completed January 1 at a cost of $15 million.

An $86 million new House Office Building, rising to the west of the present two House Office Buildings, will owe its construction mostly to RAYBURN. It is to be completed by late 1963.

Representative WALTER JUDD, Republican of Minnesota, has introduced a bill to name it the Rayburn Office Building. This probably will be done.

MISSED IN CONGRESS

Speaker RAYBURN came back for the opening of Congress in January peppery and vigorous. At the start of the session he succeeded in enlarging the Rules Committee as a means of easing the way for administration bills.

But the House rebelled at some of the Kennedy bills and it was a thorny session for RAYBURN. By its end, after he had gone back to Texas ill, the administration was taking a steady beating in the House.

RAYBURN thought his ailment was lumbago and to most of Washington it was inconceivable that he would not come bouncing back in 1962. Then came his serious illness.

The National Capital misses him.

"Speaker RAYBURN always will live in the history of a grateful Republic as one of the greatest public servants we have ever had," said Representative CLARENCE BROWN, Republican of Ohio.

That, I think, is the way most of RAYBURN's contemporaries feel.

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF THE LATE SAM RAYBURN, BY SCOTT W. LUCAS, FORMER U.S. SENATOR

Melancholy winds of freedom deftly touched the keys of sorrow as the people of this beloved Republic laid a wreath of tears over the bier of the late, lamented SAM RAYBURN.

One of the brightest lights in the political life of this Nation has shuffled off this mortal coil.

The name of SAM RAYBURN is one of the most illustrious in the annals of American history.

Throughout his long and distinguished career as a loyal and patriotic public servant he never faltered in his devotion to duty.

He never betrayed a righteous cause, nor a friend.

His keen judgment and inflexible integrity in national and international affairs stand forth life the solid rocks that guard the aged seashores.

His concept of what was good and what was evil was based upon the eternal principles of elemental justice.

He earned a lasting reputation for fairness and tolerance, and his heaven-born personality kept his friendship with people of all political faiths in constant repair.

To every Member of the Congress, Mr. Sam was known as a warmhearted Speaker who for 16 years wielded a friendly but firm gavel in upholding and defending the true symbols of democracy. No small portion of his unparalleled success lay in his unaffected simplicity.

Through my 25 years' acquaintance with Mr. Democrat I was privileged to observe these noble traits of character. I reached the apex of admiration for them when for 2 years I listened to his sane advice and wise counsel in the Monday morning meetings at the White House while the Honorable Harry S. Truman was President. It was there that the Speaker, the House majority leader, Mr. McCormack, the late Vice President, Mr. Barkley, and myself, as majority leader of the Senate, eventually reached a program of progress upon legislative problems.

Ah yes; if one could weave and fashion the matchless and inspiring words of the great poets into a garland of eulogies it would add but little to the silent gratitude and speechless reverence already given him by a grateful Nation.

Today this great and good American rests in deep and dreamless sleep, careless of the whispering winds and the moaning pines. His earthly career is ended, and his mortal remains are securely blanketed through the years of eternity in Texas soil, the soil he loved and cherished.

So, to Mr. Sam I say: Farewell. Recline in peace in this new and great adventure.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. Lindsay (at the request of Mr. Barry), for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, January 23, 1962.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Baldwin and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Toll in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Findley (at the request of Mr. Barry) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Bow.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Fallon.
Mr. Anfuso.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Carey.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Barry) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Alger.
Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Beermann.
Mr. Van Zandt in five instances.
Mr. Westland.
Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Roudebush.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 22, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1548. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report relating to the Puerto Rican hurricane relief loans, pursuant to Public Law 692, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1549. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation pursuant to the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1550. A letter from the Secretary to the Board of Visitors, U.S. Naval Academy, transmitting the report of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy, 1961; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1551. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property owned by the District of Columbia located in Prince William County, Va., and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1552. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of automatic data processing (ADP) activities at Department headquarters and ADP installations at the New York and Richmond offices of the Post Office Department, March 1961; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1553. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting the 27th Annual Report of the National Mediation Board, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1554. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1555. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1556. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order granting the application for permanent residence filed by Simon Braude, A10255888, pursuant to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1557. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation in the case of Mon Kee, A7189102, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1558. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1559. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Auburn-Folsom South Unit proposing expansion of the Central Valley project in California, pursuant to section 9(a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), and section 2 of the American River Basin Development Act of October 14, 1949 (63 Stat. 852) (H. Doc. No. 305); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1560. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1561. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to change the name of Whitman National Monument to Whitman Mission National Historic Site"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1562. A letter from the Director of Personnel, U.S. Department of Commerce, transmitting a report concerning positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 in the Department of Commerce, pursuant to section 503 of title IV of Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1563. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a report relating to positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1564. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives, pursuant to 75 Stat. 216, and rule XL of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALGER:

H.R. 9718. A bill to incorporate the Federal Dental Services Officers' Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 9719. A bill to prohibit admission charges at the Statue of Liberty National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9720. A bill to prohibit admission charges at the Washington Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 9721. A bill to deny the use of the U.S. postal service for the carriage of Communist political propaganda; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 9722. A bill to extend and amend the conservation reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 9723. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 9724. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the sale of his principal residence by a taxpayer who has attained the age of 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 9725. A bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 9726. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for certain amounts paid for the education of the taxpayer, his spouse, or his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 9727. A bill to prohibit the application of unreasonable literacy requirements with respect to the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT:

H.R. 9728. A bill to amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 9729. A bill to extend and amend the conservation reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 9730. A bill to provide for the desegregation of public schools, with all deliberate speed, including nationwide first-step compliance by 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9731. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9732. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9733. A bill to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:

H.R. 9734. A bill to amend section 701(a) of the Housing Act of 1954; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9735. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to assist the States of Maryland, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia to reestablish their common boundaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 9736. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to permit certain property to be used for State forestry work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 9737. A bill to amend section 641 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that deductions shall not be made from Federal payments to a State home because of amounts collected from the estates of deceased veterans and used for recreational or other purposes not required by State laws; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.R. 9738. A bill relating to the occupational training, development, and use of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 9739. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1962 so as to insure that the Congress will have an adequate opportunity to examine and study any proposed reprograming of construction items by such Administration; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 9740. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9741. A bill to provide assistance to business enterprises and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 9742. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to provide greater coordination among departments and agencies of the United States in carrying out functions leading to the establishment of just and lasting peace; to establish a Peace College; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 9743. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to increase the number and amount of loans to medical and dental students, to lengthen the period of repayment for such loans, and to provide for loans to interns in certain hospitals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 9744. A bill to designate the lake formed by the Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia, as Lake Eufaula; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.R. 9745. A bill to amend section 641 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that deductions shall not be made from Federal payments to a State home because of amounts collected from the estates of deceased veterans and used for recreational or other purposes not required by State laws; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 9746. A bill to place the Archivist of the United States on the Civil War Centennial Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 9747. A bill to amend section 514 of the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940 to provide that where personal property taxes may not be imposed upon property of a serviceman located in a State, such taxes may not be imposed upon such property after he is transferred out of such State; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 9748. A bill to make more uniform the laws governing the coastwise trade of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 9749. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Garden Club of America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL:

H.R. 9750. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to require persons entering U.S. lands under Federal mining laws to either obtain consent of the surface owner or post a bond prior to conducting prospecting, location, or mining operations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 9751. A bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9752. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in Greece in 1963; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 9753. A bill to amend sections 3(7) and 5(b) of the Internal Security Act of 1950, relating to employment of members of Communist organizations in certain defense facilities; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 9754. A bill to amend section 6, title I, of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 9755. A bill to deny the use of the U.S. postal service for the carriage of Communist political propaganda; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 9756. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital at Jackson, Miss., as the John Elliott Rankin Memorial Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 9757. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 9758. A bill to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to permit the waiver of such section under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DURNO:

H.R. 9759. A bill to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to permit the waiver of such section under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 9760. A bill to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to permit the waiver of such section under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 9761. A bill to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to permit the waiver of such section under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 9762. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 9763. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 9764. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 9765. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 9766. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 9767. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 9768. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 9769. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 9770. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.J. Res. 600. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish literacy test qualifications for electors in Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.J. Res. 601. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish tax and property qualifications for electors in Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.J. Res. 602. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. Res. 509. Resolution providing additional employees for the Committee on Ways and Means; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 510. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of part I of the hearings held before the Committee on Education and Labor on the impact of imports and exports; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. Res. 511. Resolution to designate, name, and identify the House Office Buildings as the Joseph Gurney Cannon, the James Knox Polk, and the Sam Rayburn Buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H. Res. 512. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct an investigation and study of the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments, and personnel practices of the Department of State; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Res. 513. Resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 9771. A bill for the relief of Christos Dimitrakopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 9772. A bill for the relief of Almerinda Tedesco Bernardo, Adelia Bernardo, and Grace Bernardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H.R. 9773. A bill for the relief of Rosina Carpanzano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9774. A bill for the relief of Chin Dhul Yon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 9775. A bill for the relief of Nihat Ali Ucuncu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 9776. A bill for the relief of Branco da Gloria Franco Freitas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KITCHIN:

H.R. 9777. A bill to amend Private Law 87–197; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOX:

H.R. 9778. A bill to provide for the free entry of certain steel and steel products donated for an addition to the Chippewa County War Memorial Hospital, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 9779. A bill for the relief of Teofila Bernecki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 9780. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Irene Ruelan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9781. A bill for the relief of Claude A. Bangs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 9782. A bill for the relief of Col. A. A. Watson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9783. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Angelo Jarosin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 9784. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Reskin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9785. A bill for the relief of Kenneth L. Ostrander; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.R. 9786. A bill for the relief of Yaakov Shulmeister; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 9787. A bill for the relief of William O'Connor Swainson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9788. A bill for the relief of Wesley McL. Stephenson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9789. A bill for the relief of Victoria Ingrid Cobb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 9790. A bill for the relief of Anastasoula E. Tryfona (Anastasia Efstathios Trifonas); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 9791. A bill for the relief of Helena Rams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9792. A bill for the relief of Matilde Moretti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 9793. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Giuseppa D'Aquanno, Maria D'Aquanno, and Benedicto D'Aquanno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL (by request):

H.R. 9794. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Angelina Cardellina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 9795. A bill for the relief of H. S. (John) Chelico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL:

H.R. 9796. A bill to grant reserved mineral rights in certain lands in the county of Pima, in the State of Arizona, to the present owners of these lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9797. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yvonne Marie Marks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 9798. A bill for the relief of Faud Anton Salman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 9799. A bill for the relief of Juliet Martinez and Danny Martinez Trahan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

225. Mr. CUNNINGHAM presented a petition of 1,005 persons in 16 States calling for an end to the Red mail subsidy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

United Nations Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday President Kennedy delivered his state of the Union message to Congress. One of the recommendations made by the President was that Congress should pass legislation authorizing the United States to purchase $100 million of a pending United Nations bond issue. This is a highly controversial proposal. I have devoted considerable study to this proposal, and I cannot convince myself to vote for the purchase of these United Nations bonds. I might say that I speak not as someone who has opposed the United Nations, but as a House Member who has voted for every appropriation for the United Nations that has come before the House of Representatives in the 8 years I have been here.

Let us analyze why this United Nations bond issue has become necessary. It has arisen out of the operation of the United Nations military police force in the Congo. This U.N. police force was authorized by vote of the membership of the United Nations. It was determined that assessments should be levied against all U.N members to pay the cost of this military police force. Assessments totaling $48,500,000 were levied in 1960 and assessments totaling $100 million were levied in 1961 up to October 31. However, the United Nations has no means of enforcing the payment of such assessments. If a U.N. member fails to pay its basic dues, it loses its right to vote. However, this is not true with special assessments of this type. Therefore, there is no penalty whatsoever for failure to pay.

Now let us see what has happened. Of the $48,500,000 assessment levied for 1960, only $25,651,017.75 had been paid as of December 31, 1961. Of this sum, the United States had paid its full assessment of $15,745,211, or three-fifths of the total paid by all nations. Sixty-four nations never paid a dime. The situation with the 1961 assessment of $100 million is even worse. Of this amount, only $49,275,727.60 had been paid as of December 31, 1961. Of this sum, the United States had paid its full assessment of $32,204,061, or two-thirds of the total paid by all nations. Seventy-eight nations never paid a cent.

The United Nations deficit on this Congo operation was increasing so rapidly last year—1961—that President Kennedy submitted a recommendation to Congress last summer that we appropriate an additional voluntary sum of $15,305,596, above our assessment of $32,204,061, to keep the United Nations solvent. Your Representative reluctantly voted for it, because I felt that we should not let the United Nations go into insolvency.

However, this deficit on the Congo operation has continued to mount. The United Nations has now voted to launch a $200 million bond issue to offset this deficit. The bonds would bear 2-percent interest and would be repaid in 20 years. President Kennedy has recommended that Congress authorize the United States to purchase one-half or $100 million of these bonds. This means that the United States is being asked to pay, for the United Nations Congo operation, not only our original 32-percent assessment plus our voluntary additional contribution of $15,305,596, but an additional sum of $100 million to buy U.N. bonds made necessary by the Congo deficit. And who were the majority of nations that voted in the United Nations to issue these bonds, hoping that the United States would buy them? They are the nations who themselves have not contributed a dime toward the Congo operation.

It seems to me that Congress should not allow this course of action to continue any further. If we always step forward to pay all United Nations deficits, no other nation will feel any necessity of paying any special assessment. It seems to me the United States should meet this situation head on, and insist that the United Nations Charter be changed so that if a nation does not pay a special assessment, that nation will lose its right to vote. We will never solve this problem by "picking up the check" every time there is a deficit.

You might be interested in the major nations that have refused to pay their assessments for the Congo operation. Soviet Russia is the biggest offender. Its unpaid assessments for 1960 and through October 31, 1961, amount to $20,088,253, upon which it has not paid a nickel. This unpaid assessment is twice as large as that of any other nation. None of the other Communist bloc nations have made any payments on these Congo assessments. In addition, Belgium, France, Italy, Nationalist China, and other nations also have not paid their assessments because they did not approve of the actions of the United Nations police force in the Congo.

It seems to me that if the United States were to buy $100 million of U.N. bonds to make up this Congo deficit, we would indirectly be making a loan of $20,088,253 to Soviet Russia at a subsidized interest rate. This is because we would be making up a deficit caused in part by the failure of Soviet Russia to pay its $20,088,253 assessment. In addition, we would be buying U.N. bonds paying only 2 percent interest, but to raise the funds to buy these bonds the United States would have to increase our national debt as we are currently operating at a deficit. The United States has to pay over 3 percent in interest on our national debt. Therefore, we would be indirectly subsidizing Soviet Russia by indirectly loaning her money at 2 percent interest which our country has to itself obtain by borrowing at more than 3 percent interest. I do not see any valid reason why we should be such a Santa Claus.

For the above reasons, I plan to vote against the proposal that the United States buy $100 million in United Nations bonds.

Hungarian Freedom Fight Rally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the heroic struggle of the Hungarian people in 1956 to throw off the yoke of international communism captured the sympathy and admiration of free people throughout the world.

The Philadelphia Chapter of the American Hungarian Federation, desiring to commemorate the bravery and spirit of independence of these unforgettable people, held a Freedom Memorial Rally on the fifth anniversary of the historical event. The rally took place in Flanagan Auditorium of St. Joseph's College in Philadelphia on Saturday evening, October 21, 1961.

Bela H. Backskai was the master of ceremonies, and Dr. Leslie E. Konkoly, president of the chapter, welcomed the audience. The Honorable Joseph Kovago, mayor of the city of Budapest during those glorious days of freedom in 1956, was the speaker in the Hungarian language. It was also my privilege to speak at this memorable occasion, and I am including my remarks below.

FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

I find myself this evening deeply honored to be able to share so glorious a moment as a memorial tribute to the Hungarian people who fought so heroically 5 years ago.

When the free world first heard the news that the Hungarian people were in revolt against their Communist oppressors, it experienced an overwhelming feeling of joy and optimism. The Iron Curtain was being torn asunder at last. Once more we felt that the people of the Russian satellite countries could enjoy the freedoms which we here so cherish. October 23, 1956, the day when the Hungarian revolt began, was the day we heard that fateful news. It will be remembered by our generation. This day must also be instilled into the minds of succeeding generations, never to be forgotten. This day must be preserved even after the Hungarian people have won their freedom to worship, their freedom to speak, their freedom to vote. October 23 should pass into history as Freedom Day, a day when all free persons should give thanks for being allowed to share in the special privileges permitted by freedom.

The Hungarian people have always fought valiantly and courageously for their homeland. It was they who were able to stem the tide of the Tartar hoard from overrunning Western Europe. With their aid, although Hungary had become a part of the Ottoman Empire, the combined Western European forces were able to stop the westward Moslem expansion. The Hungarian people fought to free themselevs from Ottoman rule only to find themselves under Austrian domination.

Therefore, the revolution of March 1848 which attempted to throw off the yoke of Austrian Hapsburg tyranny was a natural expression of the wishes of the people. But the Free Hungarian State which emerged was short lived. Caught in a visor-like grip by advancing Russian and Austrian armies, Hungary was again subjected to rule by great powers. Twenty years later she won nationalistic status by proclaiming a kingdom, still under the Austrian Empire, but at least having partial autonomy.

The spirit of the 1848 revolution was never crushed. The initial movement 5 years ago began at the foot of the poet-hero of 1848, Sandor Petofi. His words had inspired a surge for freedom in 1848; his statue in 1956 was to do the same thing, to act as a catalyst to the Hungarian freedom fighters. There were many heroes, too, in this struggle. Pal Maleter, a commanding officer and inspiration to the freedom fighters, a member of the Imre Nagy Cabinet, fought so bravely only to be treacherously abducted by the Russians during truce talks with the Russians. Cardinal Mindszenty, the prelate of the church, who had defied from the beginning the Communist leaders. Although kept in prison until he was released during the revolt, his presence was continually felt in Hungary. His freedom was short lived. Suspecting treachery he fled to the American Embassy in Budapest for refuge. And he is still there, unable to leave, at least savoring some freedom, the little left to him by the Communists who patrol the Embassy waiting to take him into custody should he ever step foot from his American sanctuary.

The free world rejoiced to hear the news which flowed from strife-torn Hungary on the 23d of October, and for the next 8 days, when the revolution appeared to have succeeded. The treachery of the Soviet Government on November 1 stunned once more the hopeful well-wishers. Four days later, Soviet tanks and guns had won the battle for Budapest. The city lay broken on the bank of the Danube, a reminder to the world that Russian superior force shows no mercy. Over 120,000 refugees managed to escape to Austria, afraid to stay and live under anarchy. Behind them lay 25,000 dead, with countless thousands of their young comrades shipped to Russia in cattle cars, slave laborers in an age where slavery is regarded as a thing of the past.

These refugees left behind them, too, a reminder to the conquerer: 7,000 Russians dead, over 300 tanks destroyed with homemade bombs and mines, a spirit unextinguished, waiting to burst once again into a raging fire.

Some of these refugees are with us tonight. They can tell you of their heroic fight much better than I am able to do so. And they can tell you of their continued determination to free their homeland from Russian imperialism. The U.S. Government has sped thousands of the freedom fighters to these shores, to give them a chance to live again under democracy. Many had relatives or friends waiting for them, to help them start a new life again. They have become a part of American society—laborers, students, teachers, technicians, doctors. They have joined their counterparts, those Americans of Hungarian origin who have helped to make the United States the great Nation she is.

There was Janos Xantus, who traveled into the unknown West of last century to help explore the Kansas frontier and southern California. Angelo Heilprin contributed much to advance the prestige of the United States in regard to the polar regions with his studies on geology and paleontology. Then there was Joseph Pulitzer, whose name is synonomous with great journalism and literature. The theater has also experienced Hungarian talents—Ferenc Molnar, creator of "Liliom"; Adolph Zukov and William Fox, movie moguls; and Paul Lukus, an actor of rare stature. Bela Bartok, noted composer, made his home here and died here. Eugene Ormandy, with his Philadelphia orchestra, has been seen and heard around the world by appreciative audiences. David Lilienthal, prominent in public affairs, guided the Government's undertaking in the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Those remaining in Hungary did not give up resistance although the major fighting had been completed. Guerrilla bands, abetted by farmers, continued to harass Soviet troops. Factory and mine workers struck, disabling the industry of the Communist regime. Many continued to be arrested and executed for his resistance. But with 50,000 to 80,000 Russian troops still patrolling and protecting their puppet regime, armed with the latest destructive weapons, most resistance has become passive, rather than overt.

The free world had attempted to aid in the fight by bringing the crisis to the U.N. This august body, sabotaged time and again by the Russians, had been appealed to by the freedom fighters. One of the last messages to come from Radio Csokonyai called on Radio Free Europe in Munich to relay a message to the U.N. In this message, the people of Hungary appealed to the U.N. to decide the life or death of their nation. "While your sons are at peace and happy, we sons of the Hungarian nation are falling under the cruel firing of Soviet tanks and bombers. Our country has been attacked by armed forces from the outside. We turn to you, for you are our last citadel of hope * * *."

U.N. troops were urged to be sent to Hungary. The Russians were told to withdraw their forces. But each move by the United States and the other free nations was blocked by the Soviet Union in that world body. The Russian veto was all powerful. An appeal to send U.N. observers into Hungary was denied. Even today, Sir Leslie Munro is still active in his investigation of the Hungarian crisis 5 years ago. He is still being denied access to Hungary. By an overwhelming majority, a resolution of condemnation of the Soviet Union was passed, branding the Soviet Union forever as butchers and annihilators of freedom.

By this condemnation, too, the free world knows the sacrifice made by the Hungarian people. The free world knows of the deportations of its young people to Russia, of its massacred workers, of its slain freedom fighters. And the free world knows that this sacrifice was not in vain. The Russian leaders can no longer claim inviolability as being a noncolonial power. Those nations who are attempting to aline themselves with neither power bloc need only be reminded of that infamous Russian attack in November 1956 to proceed with caution and distrust toward the Soviet Union and its overtures. The tragedy of Hungary pounded home once more the savageness and cruelty of communism.

Hungary will one day experience those liberties which you are now enjoying tonight. The people will be able to speak out against Soviet tyranny as I am doing now. The Iron Curtain will shatter completely one day, never to be built again. There will no longer be barbed wire borders as there are now on the Austro-Hungarian border and in Berlin. We shall be able to walk freely through these barriers as if they never existed. Until that day, though, we must be like Anna Kethly, the only member of the free Hungarian Cabinet to escape to the West. She has not given up hope. She knows that the flame of freedom has not been extinguished. She has expressed to the world the sentiments and the will of the Hungarian people as well as those of the free people of the world on the final outcome of their struggle against despotism and slavery, when she proclaimed: "My country will yet be free."

Veterans Day Dinner Sponsored by Barracks No. 2191, Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, Scranton, Pa., November 11, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the first Veterans Day dinner in the history of Scranton Barracks No. 2191, Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, was held November 11, 1961, at the Koch-Conley American Legion Post in Scranton, Pa.

During the interesting program it was my privilege to deliver the following address:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE VETERANS DAY DINNER SPONSORED BY BARRACKS NO. 2191, VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC., SCRANTON, PA., ON NOVEMBER 11, 1961

It is a great pleasure to join with the members of Scranton Barracks No. 2191, Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, Inc., at their first dinner to be held on November 11.

It is also pleasing to observe that Scranton Barracks has invited all veterans, their wives and friends, to join in commemorating Veterans Day, an occasion on which every American is inclined to feel a little more humble and at the same time more conscious of the debt owed to those who have defended Old Glory in every war in which this Nation has been engaged.

The traditions surrounding Veterans Day; namely, pride in American courage in battle and the search for peace through strength, are accorded high standing in virtually every American home.

Personally, I revere these traditions with such fervor that the honor of addressing you on this occasion is one that impresses and inspires me.

Those of us who are veterans of World War I are well aware of the relationship between this occasion and that great conflict.

Veterans Day was established by Congress in 1954, to take the place of Armistice Day, an outgrowth of World War I.

The establishment of Veterans' Day does not mean that the current American generation is inclined to belittle the importance of World War I.

On the contrary, Americans continue to respect and to honor the gallant American Expeditionary Forces of 1917–18 affectionately referred to as the AEF.

What has been done is merely to recognize that the armistice on November 11, 1918, terminating World War I, the so-called war to end all wars, turned out to be something else again.

It developed that instead of ending international conflict, the 1918 armistice had merely restrained the aggressor nations for that moment, and that moment alone.

In the brief 16-year history of the Armistice Day celebration—from its inception in 1938, until its demise in 1954, we as a people, were required to send off our sons to participate in two more grueling global conflicts: World War II and the so-called Korean police action.

For this reason, we came to see that the hopeful significance of Armistice Day was lost.

We therefore sought to establish a new symbol, Veterans' Day, upon which we placed renewed hope, that peace through strength might be established, once and for all.

But let us return, for a moment, to the spirit of Armistice Day, since that after all, is the basis of the Veterans' Day tradition.

I would like to point out that much of the Armistice Day spirit lives on under the banner of Veterans' Day.

All that has happened is that names such as Belleau Wood, the Marne, and Flanders Field, are now combined with other names, equally as glorious, such as Corregidor, Okinawa, Anzio, and Pork Chop Hill.

So far as individual glory is concerned, nothing shall ever detract from the luster of those who turned the tide in France in 1918.

Wars may come and wars may go, but that event, the rout of the mighty German Army by raw American troops, shall stand forever as one of the most remarkable achievements in military history.

In this regard, as you know, there is determination in the effort to increase congressional interest in the proposal to pension the heroes of that occasion, the veterans of World War I.

As a Member of Congress who has spearheaded the effort to secure approval of World War I pension legislation, it is my intention to continue my efforts to achieve our goal.

On each observance of November 11 World War I veterans recall their service in that great conflict.

Yet, aside from the courage displayed, what must we remember as the foremost features of World War I?

What, in fact, was the legacy it left to mankind?

In the military sense, World War I produced numerous mechanical and technological innovations.

Aerial bombardment for one, poison gas for another, tank warfare, and above all, the machinegun.

These were deadly military developments, all of which appeared, for the moment, certain to turn the tide of battle in favor of one side or the other.

As it ultimately worked out, however, none of these developments proved a crucial addition to the fighting capacity of either side.

In the final analysis it was plain old manpower, personal heroism, and spiritual strength that decided the issue.

So it has been since the dawn of history.

Over and over again, military innovations have appeared upon the scene to frighten and flabbergast the enemy of those who possess them.

Yet what have they amounted to in the long run?

In general, it is safe to say, that they have provided no more than a temporary advantage.

For faced with new weapons of destruction, the freedom-loving people of the world have constantly effected countermeasures to equalize the military situation, thereby enabling themselves to go on to victory, on the strength of moral principle.

Notice, if you will, what has happened to the great military aggressors of the past.

How do they stand in the world today, or in the eyes of history?

And what did they achieve as the result of their military innovations?

The Bible makes mention of the Hittites, a fierce tribe of desert fighters operating out of Turkey.

Egyptian records tell of them also, describing their entrance into Egypt upon armored chariots, riding down the Egyptian forces, who knew nothing of chariots or how to cope with them.

What else do we know of the Hittites?

Well, their rulers wrote autobiographies, which our scholars have read.

They tell of only one thing: military conquest.

By 200 B.C. however, at the height of the Egyptian empire, the Hittites were no more.

To them goes one honor, if you would call it that.

They introduced the war chariot.

No music, no statesmanship, no art.

Just chariots.

In the end it was the Egyptians who rose to power, and the Hittites who passed, unhonored, from the political and social scene.

When Athens and Sparta, the Greek city-states came into existence, the first to attract the notice of the world was Sparta, founded upon military might.

Yet all we know of Sparta today is what we are told by the Athenians, whom Sparta defeated in battle.

Militarily strong, the Spartans showed strength in no other respect, and consequently lost their power about as rapidly as they secured it in the first place.

What the freedom-loving nations of the world were finding out was that they too could utilize the machinery of war, the same as their aggressive neighbor states.

Until then, regardless of their talents, they were powerless to defend themselves.

Knowledge breeds knowledge, however, and through the study of literature, science, and religion, the freedom-loving peoples of the world were able to conceive means by which to defend themselves.

This, then, was the answer to the military aggressors: that for every diabolical weapon they conceived, their enemies could conceive a counterweapon or a practical means of defense.

When Rome perfected army organization, and thereby was able to subjugate all of southern Europe, her enemies were for a time at a loss to cope with the situation.

But then came the era of the battleax, the atomic bomb of its day.

Mastering its use the barbarians of central Europe fell upon the Roman legions, drove them back to the confines of Rome and ultimately overran them.

To offset the battleax the longbow was invented.

To overcome the longbow gunpowder was invented, and so on, each invention more terrible than its predecessor.

With the passage of time the machines of war have improved so much as to revolutionize military thinking and even, to a certain extent, the thinking of everyone.

Our own Civil War for instance saw the end of one military era and the beginning of another.

In this war you will recall, the "stand up and fight" method was employed by both sides in the early battles, with comparative safety.

At that point the soldiers involved were armed with muskets, unable to hit anything with accuracy beyond a comparatively close distance.

But midway in the war the rifle appeared, aim was perfected, and the death toll tripled overnight.

It was then that the "stand up and fight" method disappeared forever from infantry procedure.

In World War I the machinegun surpassed the rifle for the moment, as a means of defensive warfare, until both sides learned to deal with it in a less direct manner.

In World War II the people of England were subjected to the horror of constant bombing, until at last, with American aid, the Luftwaffe was driven from the British skies.

Yet in all these instances, there was a moment, and sometimes a dreadfully long moment, when the freedom-loving people involved were required to undergo untold sacrifice, until at last they were delivered from the jaws of aggression.

In the meantime they were required to hang on in the hope of success—with all the signs pointing to failure.

It is in this respect in which the cause of freedom holds an everlasting advantage, one that is yet to be overcome by any military innovation yet conceived.

It is the knowledge that every assault on freedom is a step in the direction of corruption, that to be free and to promote the freedom of others, is to defy corruption.

On this knowledge our Nation was founded almost two centuries ago.

On this knowledge it has flourished ever since.

Specifically, it was this knowledge that brought us here today to honor the men who, in the name of freedom, marched to the cannon's mouth, never to return.

In this regard it is perfectly clear how we, as veterans, can best uphold the traditions for which the fighting men of America have risked and so often, given their lives.

Ours is the responsibility of promoting the cause of loyalty to American traditions, of hailing American achievement, proclaiming our love and respect for American goals.

In discharging our responsibility we will receive the full-fledged support of the great mass of the American people who agree with this point of view.

Leadership, however, is needed and I can think of no group of men in this Nation more suitable to the task of leadership than yourselves.

As veterans of one of the greatest military undertakings in American history you faced the danger and discomfort of military life to insure the safety of our cherished principles.

Now, no less than in 1917–18 those principles need protection, and who, more than yourselves, knows how to provide protection of this nature?

In the face of Communist propaganda we must respond with proof to the world that our concept of liberty and freedom is more than just a kind of political ballyhoo.

It is shocking to listen to the repeated declarations of the so-called neutral nations, suggesting that the cold war is merely a struggle between two big bruisers of equally wicked nature.

Apparently they regard the cold war struggle as something they can view from above, as if riding in an aerial balloon.

Yet we know well enough that many who have sought to remain above the struggle, have ultimately fallen beneath it, and we therefore must somehow, in some way, convey this message to the so-called neutral nations.

One way is to make clear the fact that Americans stand united in their deep faith in God and in their respect for the human dignity of mankind—that regardless of politics, of race, color, or national origin, we are a unit in approving the ideals expressed in the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence.

Have no doubt the world will know that we feel this way if only we speak out.

I have heard it cynically remarked, that while the whole world is watching the United States, the United States is watching television.

This, of course, is a gross overstatement.

Yet in fact the whole world is watching us, and whenever we express ourselves in chorus, the whole world knows at once how we feel, and proceeds to act accordingly.

An outstanding feature of the Communist creed is that of loyalty to their peculiar designs.

That is a fact and we must give the devil his due.

Under the circumstances, is it safe for us to underplay our own source of loyalty to our own set of principles?

What sort of picture would we present in the eyes of our Western allies, not to mention the so-called neutrals of the world, if we allowed the Communists to beat their drum with vigor, while we stood idly by taking our nationalism for granted?

Would that not suggest to them that we were listless and indifferent?

Would it not lead them to conclude that the Communists were more alive to the moment, and therefore, more worthy of cooperation?

Not, of course, if the neutrals recognized the basic fallacy of communism in contrast to the basic wisdom of the American concept of liberty and freedom.

But many of the neutral nations have not yet arrived at these realizations and it is therefore necessary to appeal to them constantly, in terms they do understand.

One of these terms unquestionably, is a vocal patriotism on our part, as a portrayal of American faith in American institutions.

To my way of thinking Veterans Day stands forth as a symbol of American zeal, of American love for principle, and for that reason is deserving of the utmost attention.

For that reason it is a pleasure to come to Scranton and to have been able to join you in expressing respect for American heroes of all our country's wars.

Their deeds shall live forever in the American heart, their faith shall stand forever as the basis, the foundation, and the fulfillment of the great American dream, "One Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice to all."

In Memoriam of Dr. Thomas Dooley on the Anniversary of His Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, today is the first anniversary of the death of Dr. Tom Dooley, the story of whose life and sacrifice is one of the finest chapters in our Nation's history. Anyone who might doubt that this generation is equal to the challenge of our times will do well to read the work of James Monahan, "Before I Sleep: the Last Days of Dr. Dooley." The proceeds from this work have been signed to Medico, Inc., for the continuation and support of the work to which Tom Dooley devoted the last years of his life. The requiescat from that work describes the sermon of Father George Gottwald and his quotation from Robert Frost's poem entitled "Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening," which Tom had loved and lived by:

> The woods are lovely, dark and deep,
> But I have promises to keep,
> And miles to go before I sleep.

The promises of Dr. Dooley are fulfilled, said Father Gottwald. Dr. Dooley fulfilled his promise—we have one to make and keep. This Nation has the capacity to bring better health and hope for survival to the diseased, the impoverished and unsheltered of any land which joins us in the cause of freedom.

Federal Highway Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the apportionment of Federal-aid grants from the highway trust fund for improvements to the Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban systems for fiscal years 1964 and 1965.

The highway systems referred to are those commonly known as the A-B-C highways, including approximately 230,000 miles of rural primary routes, 575,000 miles of rural secondary routes, and 35,000 miles of urban roads and streets. These roads extend into every county of the United States and affect the life of every citizen to a significant extent.

As is customary, this biennial A-B-C bill also authorizes the appropriation of funds from the general fund of the Treasury for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, national parks roads and trails, national parkways, Indian reservation roads, and public lands highways.

Last year, when the Highway Act of 1961 was under consideration, thought was given to a proposal that a schedule of authorizations for the A-B-C highways be enacted as a part of that legislation, to provide for annual authorizations through fiscal year 1971. The Subcommittee on Roads was unanimous in the opinion that the custom of reviewing the A-B-C program biennially should continue to be a part of the authorization process. Accordingly, the consideration of A-B-C authorizations was deferred until 1962.

It is important that this review and consideration by the Subcommittee on Roads be undertaken early in the session because, in order to maintain the continuity of the program and to provide ample opportunity for orderly planning, the apportionment for fiscal year 1964 should be made this summer.

As introduced, my bill provides for an authorization of $950 million for fiscal year 1964 and $975 million for fiscal 1965, to be allocated among the primary, secondary, and urban systems and apportioned to the States in accordance with the statutory formulas. The policy for increasing the A-B-C authorizations by annual increments of $25 million was first recommended by the House Public Works Committee in 1956. The practice has been followed since, with one exception.

On the basis of information presently available, I hold the opinion that the proposed increases are feasible within the framework of present highway trust fund revenue law, and are needed to maintain an adequate level of construction on the A-B-C systems. The Subcommittee on Roads will schedule early hearings on the bill to bring together current information on the basis of which the necessary judgments can be made.

The last quarterly report of the Bureau of Public Roads shows that 11,252 miles of the Interstate System were open to traffic on September 30, with work underway on an additional 15,000 miles. As completed segments of the system are linked up, the Nation is beginning to collect significant economic dividends from the system, and these dividends will multiply as a truly connected system of high-standard freeways emerges.

The continuing program of improvements to the A-B-C roads is dovetailed with the Interstate program. The A-B-C roads must serve as connectors and feeders to the Interstate System, serving farms, homes, offices, and factories. Since the start of the accelerated highway program on July 1, 1956, construction projects costing approximately $8 billion involving more than $4 billion in Federal funds, have been completed on more than 125,000 project-miles of the A-B-C systems.

Substantial progress is being made toward meeting the requirements of our growing human and automobile populations. Many lives have been saved because of the engineered safety built into modern roads. Travel has been made more convenient and speedier. Nevertheless, our national highway system has serious deficiencies which must be corrected.

The purpose of the bill, simply stated, is to insure that the A-B-C program will go forward.

Ninety-four More Petitions To Stop the Red Mail Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, each day I receive additional petitions calling for an end to the subsidy for Communist propaganda. Today I have submitted 94 more petitions to the Speaker's desk for referral.

These petitions are from the following States: California, Colorado, Florida, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, people are justified in their concern over this situation. It just does not make sense for the Congress to consider raising the postage rate for Americans while the taxpayer has to make up the deficit caused in part by the free delivery of Communist propaganda.

How can Congress raise postal rates without acting on the subsidy for Communist propaganda?

The Postal Rate Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, in the January 16 issue of the Washington Evening Star, I learn the administration has asked for an increase of $10 billion in the national debt limit, or an increase from $298 billion to $308 billion. I believe the reason given for this increase is contained in a statement by Secretary of the Treasury Dillon who stated it would have to be made if we are to meet our future obligations.

On the other hand, I learn also that one of the first measures to be considered by the House of Representatives is the postal rate bill, H.R. 7927, which is expected to bring postal receipts somewhere in line with postal expenditures.

It is indeed a novelty when this administration comes to the Congress concerned about a deficit. Those of us who through the years have advocated a balanced budget and an end to deficit spending in Government might be expected to take heart over administration support for H.R. 7927, to increase postal rates.

However, I, for one, find little encouraging about this proposal. H.R. 7927 does not really advance the cause of fiscal responsibility in Government. In fact, its enactment would serve only to blur the true issues involved in Government spending policies.

When all is said and done, this bill would place still another burden on the American people and on a vital segment of our economy. We are being asked to add to the spiral of rising costs and, in effect, to write a death warrant for scores of American newspapers and magazines.

For make no mistake about it, the proposed increase for second-class users contained in this bill was further decimate the ranks of American newspapers and magazines. In the last decade alone, 80 magazines have closed shop, not to mention the large number of newspapers, dailies and weeklies, which have been shut down by rising costs.

It would seem that instead of jeopardizing the existence of our Nation's newspapers and magazines, the administration and the Congress ought to be searching for ways to halt this decline. These publications are a vital part of our national heritage. They represent the lifeblood of American thought and culture.

Yet the administration appears to have singled out America's newspapers and magazines for its version of a "get tough" fiscal policy.

No matter that newspapers and magazines today are paying nearly twice what they paid for postal service a decade ago. No matter that they are spending additional millions to relieve the Post Office workload. What matters, says the administration, is simply that there is a postal deficit which must be eliminated.

The posture is one of stern fiscal responsibility, but the appearance is deceiving. What is proposed by H.R. 7927 is not sound and balanced Government financing, but discriminatory treatment of American business and of a basic American institution—one protected by the first amendment of our Bill of Rights.

I use the word "discriminatory" advisedly. It seems a paradox to me that this administration is urging Congress to "get tough" with America's newspapers and magazines, while we are being asked simultaneously to offer up additional funds for foreign aid recipients.

Is it not bad enough that the U.S. Government is subsidizing Communist totalitarian regimes which do not tolerate a free press? Must we do Mr. Khrushchev's work for him and bury our own?

Consider that the United States to date has given $2.4 billion to the Dictator Tito to shore up his Communist government in Yugoslavia.

Consider that the United States to date has given $900 million to the Dictator Gomulka to shore up his Communist government in Poland.

Consider that the United States to date has given $700 million to shore up the totalitarian pro-Communist government of Dictator Sukarno of Indonesia, and some $138 million to assist Kwame Nkrumah's dictatorial take-over in Ghana.

Consider that the great and good friend of peace and nonviolent means, India's Nehru—and I should add, Goa's Nehru—has received nearly $3 billion of U.S. aid, in exchange for which he has sent us Krishna Menon.

And what of our $600 million to Egypt's Nasser? And our $350 million poured into Laos in a fruitless effort to stem the Communist tide there?

I believe that such expenditures must be considered before we proceed to add new and crippling burdens to a vital American enterprise.

I am all for fiscal toughness. However, I do not propose to cut the throat of America's newspapers and magazines with one hand, and to subsidize Poland's and Yugoslavia's state-controlled press with the other.

Yet is this not the end result of the administration's double-standard fiscal and postal policies?

We are providing aid funds to totalitarian governments which suppress the free exchange of ideas, regimes with state-controlled presses. Are we not then subsidizing tyranny over the peoples of those countries?

We are giving aid to regimes dedicated to our overthrow—as are all Communist regimes, whether they operate out of Moscow, Peiping, Warsaw, or Belgrade. Are we not then subsidizing our enemies' attack upon us?

Further, as my esteemed colleague, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska, points out, existing Post Office policy regarding distribution of foreign Communist propaganda through the U.S. mails constitutes an added subsidy for our enemy's propaganda arsenal.

Through foreign aid we are paying for the printing, and through postal policy we are paying for the distribution of Communist propaganda. Indeed, if our Government is to adopt a "get tough" fiscal approach to the printed word, it would seem that Communist propaganda, rather than our own free American press, would be the proper place to start.

But this line of reasoning, however apparent, does not conform to current administration thinking. As I have said, we seemingly operate on a double standard nowadays.

To illustrate how this double standard works, let me quote the Postmaster General concerning the need for an increase in postal rates. In his testimony before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Mr. Day declared:

> If the Congress decides that second-class rates shall not be raised substantially, then, by that decision Congress will have determined that the fair price for delivering newspapers and magazines must continue to be paid, in part, by the taxpayers of our Nation.

Now, although I believe that Mr. Day is sincere in his solicitude for the American taxpayer, I submit that his statement is unique in the annals of this administration's legislative appeals to the Congress.

In what other legislative area has any administration spokesman, imploring Congress to do its duty, asked that we consider the interests of the taxpayers of our Nation?

Certainly, amid all the incantations currently being invoked in behalf of the United Nations, and our need to stake that organization to another $100 million of U.S. credit, I have heard not one word concerning the interests of the American taxpayer.

And when the administration recently went through the motions of reappraising our aid to Tito and Nkrumah, I heard much learned chatter about self-determination, nonalinement, and the like, but hardly a murmur about how the interests of the taxpayers of our Nation would be affected.

Yet an administration which sees nothing wrong with the use of our tax dollars to subsidize Communist totalitarian propaganda now expresses alarm over the prospect that American tax dollars might help this Nation's free press.

Actually, contrary to Mr. Day's implications, considerable evidence exists that our newspapers and magazines are paying their fair share of the postal bill, and then some. Certainly, even the Postmaster General must concede that these publications make a substantial contribution to postal revenues each year.

Moreover, it is questionable whether the administration's proposed postal rate increase will accomplish its own purpose. Increased rates will inevitably lead to the sharp curtailment of the distribution of print, even among those publications which can survive the added costs.

These survivors of the postal increase will be able to stay in business only by raising the price of their publication or by increasing their advertising rates. In either case, there will be dropouts which will reduce circulation, earning power, and production of postal revenues.

But aside from the economic aspect of this issue, there is one vital matter of the educational and cultural contribution made by newspapers and magazines to the community and the Nation.

From the early days of the Republic, we have sought to encourage the growth of a free press through reasonable postal rates. There is no need to recite the important role newspapers and magazines have played in the growth and development of this free society.

If only for this reason, we should carefully consider any legislation which threatens to diminish this role. In other words, even if Mr. Day were correct and the American taxpayer were supporting some part of newspaper and magazine distribution, a valid case exists that this represents an investment in America's free institutions.

Consider too that the proposed postal rate increase will have its most harmful effect on our small weekly and daily newspapers, on agricultural, educational, religious, and similar specialized publications which contribute so greatly to keeping a free people informed.

How then should the administration's "get tough" fiscal approach to American newspapers and magazines be viewed?

From the perspective of newspaper and magazine publishers, they can only envy from afar the privileged fiscal status of U.S.-subsidized state-owned presses in Poland and Yugoslavia. Well might American publishers wonder why no member of the administration has questioned whether Tito's publication Borba is giving the U.S. taxpayer a fair break for our $2.4 billion.

From the perspective of the Communists, they can find encouragement in the fact that while the United States is aiding in the printing and dissemination of Red propaganda, it is sharpening its fiscal knife to whittle down the ranks of free American newspapers and magazines.

From the view of the American taxpayer, he might well look forward to a day, not too distant, when his favorite newspaper or magazine is no longer being published, although copies of U.S.S.R. and other privileged Red publications are still available.

Indeed, cultural exchange is enlightening—although its cost comes rather high.

As for myself, I do not intend to support legislation which will endanger the existence of American newspapers and magazines, so long as this administration squanders billions of dollars supporting alien and enemy countries and institutions.

If the administration is sincere in its concern for the taxpayer, then let our leaders turn their attention toward a real reassessment of where our foreign aid money is going, and whether the American people are getting their money's worth out of it.

Finally, let the administration reassess its attitude toward our own American newspapers and magazines, taking into consideration their traditional importance to a free society.

Unless such a reassessment takes place, this administration may well be known to future generations not as one which encouraged America's cultural tradition, but rather as the leadership which stifled it.

By Their Votes Ye Shall Know Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in presenting this report it is not my intention to prove which view is right or wrong. No Member need apologize for his position on legislation, whether it be liberal or conservative. It is important, however, that his position be truly presented to the people and that is the purpose of this compilation which makes clear the relative positions of the two parties.

The voting record in the Senate and House of Representatives proves the difference between conservatives and liberals. Every vote analysis leads to the same conclusion, that the Republican Party is controlled by conservatives and the Democratic Party is in the hands of the liberals.

The course Congress will take is determined on the first vote of every new Congress, the vote to organize the House and Senate. This is the vote to elect the Speaker of the House and the majority leader of the Senate and it is always decided on a straight party line. On this vote every Democrat, no matter how conservative he claims to be, will vote for congressional leaders and committee chairmen for the majority of committees, Senators and Congressmen with the most liberal voting records on welfare state legislation, pork barrel bills, and legislation calling for more and more centralization of government. The only way the people can be sure Congress will enact conservative legislation is to make sure the machinery of Congress is in the hands of conservatives and the record proves that the Republican Party is far more conservative.

The people decide whether Congress is liberal or conservative on election day according to which party they put in control of the Congress. By urging the election of a conservative Congress I do not intend that we should change the present procedures of Congress. I suggest that we change those who control those procedures to more nearly reflect the attitude of the people.

This report is presented so the voter may know the facts concerning the liberal and conservative voting records of the key Members of Congress. Regardless of the individual citizen's conviction, he will be in a better position to assure that his point of view will be represented in Congress.

The following tables show the voting records according to the Americans for Constitutional Action—conservative—AFL-CIO Committee on Political Action—COPE—Human Events—conservative—Americans for Democratic Action—ultraliberal—and the Congressional Quarterly—impartial. Regardless of which table you use, from the right, left, or middle of the road, the results are the same—Republicans are conservative and Democrats are liberal.

Compare overall Republican and Democratic votes in the House of Representatives. Which party is conservative?

Human events poll on 10 key issues in 1st session of 87th Congress. The issues: First, enlarge the Rules Committee; second, administration's emergency feed grain program for 1961; third, fair labor standards amendments; fourth, Area Redevelopment Act; fifth, Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961; sixth, Housing Act of 1961; seventh, stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands; eighth, Emergency Educational Act of 1961; ninth, Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961; tenth, public works appropriation for fiscal 1962: 167 northern Republicans, voted conservative, 85.8 percent; 7 southern Republicans, voted conservative, 90.5 percent; total 174 Republicans, 86 percent. One hundred and sixty-three northern Democrats, voted conservative, 4.8 percent; 96 southern Democrats, voted conservative, 49.3 percent; total, 259 Democrats, 21.2 percent.

AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

ADA rated 97 southern Democrat Congressmen and 7 southern Republican Congressmen in 1961. According to ADA, judging Members on their liberal voting record, ratings for 1961: 97 southern Democrat Congressmen received a total of 317 plus ratings; 7 southern Republican Congressmen received a total of 2 plus ratings.

AFL-CIO COMMITTEE ON POLITICAL ACTION—COPE

The following data is compiled on the basis of how COPE rated Members of Congress for the 80th through the 86th Congresses. This record is based on 61 key votes in the House from 1947 through 1960, covering the 80th through the 86th Congresses:

The overall House Democrat average support rating for liberal COPE, 69.7 percent; the overall House Republican rating, 23.9 percent; 91 southern Democrats had an average support rating for COPE, 38.8 percent; 5 southern Republicans, 8.8 percent; 41 border State Democrats average support rating for COPE, 76.1 percent; 6 border State Republicans, 26.9 percent; 45 big city Democrats average support for COPE, 97.9 percent; 20 big city Republicans, 39.8 percent; 102 other Democrats average support for COPE, 94.7 percent; 121 other Republicans, 29 percent.

Comparison of ADA ratings of Republican and Democratic Party leadership in the Senate and House

Year	U.S. Senate				U.S. House of Representatives			
	Democratic		Republican		Democratic		Republican	
	Majority Leader Mansfield	Majority Whip Humphrey	Minority Leader Dirksen	Minority Whip Kuchel	Majority Leader McCormack	Majority Whip Albert	Minority Leader Halleck	Minority Whip Arends
1947	[1] 92	[2]	[1] 9	[2]	100	92	17	17
1948	[1] 92	[2]	[1] 18	[2]	83	85	15	15
1949	[1] 92	100	[2]	[2]	92	85	0	0
1950	[1] 93	100	[2]	[2]	87	67	0	0
1951	[1] 92	100	0	[2]	100	53	7	0
1952	[1] 83	100	27	[2]	92	100	0	0
1953	87	100	8	21	100	64	27	27
1954	85	100	33	31	78	67	33	11
1955	78	100	11	20	100	90	50	30
1956	86	100	21	64	100	57	67	57
1957	58	100	58	67	100	67	56	56
1958	100	100	25	42	83	75	17	17
1959	77	100	0	33	89	78	25	22
1960	75	100	17	58	100	89	22	22
1961	80	100	10	60	90	90	10	10
Average	85	100	18	44	93	77	23	19

[1] Served in U.S. House of Representatives.

[2] Prior to election to U.S. Senate.

Comparison of ACA ratings of Republican and Democratic Party leadership in the Senate and House

U.S. Senate	Consistency index on 963 Senate votes 1955–59 (84th, 85th, and 1st sess., 86th Cong.)	Consistency index cumulative total, 1955–61	U.S. House of Representatives	Consistency index on 280 House votes, 1957–59 (85th and 1st sess., 86th Cong.)	Consistency index cumulative total, 1957–61
	Percent	*Percent*		*Percent*	*Percent*
Majority Leader MANSFIELD (Democrat)	8	10	House Speaker McCORMACK (Democrat)	0	0
Majority Whip HUMPHREY (Democrat)	1	1	Majority Whip ALBERT (Democrat)	8	5
Minority Leader DIRKSEN (Republican	79	80	Minority Leader HALLECK (Republican)	87	86
Minority Whip KUCHEL (Republican)	58	52	Minority Whip ARENDS (Republican)	89	88

Standing committees of the U.S. Senate

Committee	Present Democratic chairman		Potential Republican chairman	
	Name	1961 ADA rating	Name	1961 ADA rating
1. Aeronautical and Space Sciences	Kerr, Oklahoma	60	Bridges, New Hampshire	0
2. Agriculture and Forestry	Ellender, Louisiana	20	Aiken, Vermont	50
3. Appropriations	Hayden, Arizona	60	Bridges, New Hampshire	0
4. Armed Services	Russell, Georgia	10	Saltonstall, Massachusetts	20
5. Banking and Currency	Robertson, Virginia	0	Capehart, Indiana	10
6. District of Columbia	Bible, Nevada	60	Beall, Maryland	20
7. Finance	Byrd, Virginia	0	Williams, Delaware	0
8. Foreign Relations	Fulbright, Arkansas	67	Wiley, Wisconsin	25
9. Government Operations	McClellan, Arkansas	0	Mundt, South Dakota	0
10. Interior and Insular Affairs	Anderson, New Mexico	89	Dworshak, Idaho	10
11. Interstate and Foreign Commerce	Magnuson, Washington	100	Schoeppel, Kansas	0
12. Judiciary	Eastland, Mississippi	10	Wiley, Wisconsin	25
13. Labor and Public Welfare	Hill, Alabama	80	Goldwater, Arizona	0
14. Post Office and Civil Service	Johnston, South Carolina	50	Carlson, Kansas	13
15. Public Works	Chavez, New Mexico	80	Case, South Dakota	20
16. Rules and Administration	Mansfield, Montana	80	Curtis, Nebraska	0
17. Select Small Business	Sparkman, Alabama	80	Saltonstall, Massachusetts	20
Average		50		13

NOTE.—According to the ADA (Americans for Democratic Action) "the voting record is offered as a guide for liberals in judging the performance of their Senators on issues of importance. A vote which ADA believes to be in harmony with liberal principles" is marked "plus." Thus, a rating of 100 percent shows complete agreement with the liberal position on key votes. As a rating approaches zero, it indicates a more conservative position.

Standing committees of the U.S. House of Representatives

Committee	Present Democratic chairman		Potential Republican chairman	
	Name	1961 ADA rating	Name	1961 ADA rating
1. Agriculture	Cooley, North Carolina	56	Hoeven, Iowa	0
2. Appropriations	Cannon, Missouri	56	Taber, New York	0
3. Armed Services	Vinson, Georgia	88	Arends, Illinois	10
4. Banking and Currency	Spence, Kentucky	80	Kilburn, New York	11
5. District of Columbia	McMillan, South Carolina	11	Auchincloss, New Jersey	10
6. Education and Labor	Powell, New York	100	Kearns, Pennsylvania	20
7. Foreign Affairs	Morgan, Pennsylvania	90	Chiperfield, Illinois	0
8. Government Operations	Dawson, Illinois	100	Hoffman, Michigan	0
9. House Administration	Burleson, Texas	10	Schenck, Ohio	0
10. Interior and Insular Affairs	Aspinall, Colorado	80	Saylor, Pennsylvania	40
11. Interstate and Foreign Commerce	Harris, Arkansas	30	Bennett, Michigan	50
12. Judiciary	Celler, New York	100	McCulloch, Ohio	0
13. Merchant Marine and Fisheries	Bonner, North Carolina	50	Tollefson, Washington	60
14. Post Office and Civil Service	Murray, Tennessee	13	Corbett, Pennsylvania	60
15. Public Works	Buckley, New York	100	Auchincloss, New Jersey	10
16. Rules	Smith, Virginia	0	Brown, Ohio	0
17. Science and Astronautics	Brooks, Louisiana	20	Martin, Massachusetts	44
18. Un-American Activities	Walter, Pennsylvania	80	Scherer, Ohio	0
19. Veterans' Affairs	Teague, Texas	22	Ayres, Ohio	10
20. Ways and Means	Mills, Arkansas	50	Mason, Illinois	0
21. Select Small Business	Patman, Texas	80	McCulloch, Ohio	0
Average		58		16

NOTE.—According to the ADA (Americans for Democratic Action) "the voting record is offered as a guide for liberals in judging the performance of their Congressmen on issues of importance. A vote which ADA believes to be in harmony with liberal principles" is marked "plus." Thus, a rating of 100 percent shows complete agreement with the liberal position on key votes. As a rating approaches zero, it indicates a more conservative position.

COMPARISON OF CONSERVATIVE-LIBERAL VOTING RECORDS OF HOUSE MEMBERS OF WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

The Constitution, article 1, section 7 states:

> All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills.

To exercise its authority as specified in the Constitution, the House of Representatives created the Ways and Means Committee.

The Ways and Means Committee is the revenue-raising committee. Every money-raising bill, all bills dealing with tariffs and trade, all bills dealing with income taxes, excise taxes, imports, and social security taxes come before this committee. All but one of the major programs called for by the President in his state of the Union message will be handled by the Ways and Means Committee.

Money bills in the Senate are handled by the Senate Finance Committee, but the Senate is always extremely careful not to intrude upon the authority by which the House originates tax legislation and invariably postpones any hearings on money raising bills until after the House Ways and Means Committee has completed its work on these measures.

The following tables, prepared by the impartial and objective news service, Congressional Quarterly, compares the conservative-liberal voting records of Members on those committees on key

issues affecting our economy from 1945 through 1961:

KEY VOTES, SCORES OF WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

1. H.R. 3240. Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act. Knutson, Republican, of Minnesota, motion to recommit Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension bill to Ways and Means Committee with instructions to report a 2-year extension of existing law. Rejected 181–212 (Democrats, 13–204; Republicans, 167–7; American Labor Party 0–1; Progressive 1–0), May 26, 1945.

2. H.R. 6556. Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act. Doughton, Democrat, of North Carolina, motion to recommit Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension bill to Ways and Means Committee with instructions to report a 3-year extension of existing law. Rejected 168–211 (Democrats, 150–6; Republicans, 16–205; American Labor Party 2–0), May 26, 1948.

3. H.R. 1211. Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1949. Simpson, Republican, of Pennsylvania, motion to recommit trade agreements extension bill to Ways and Means Committee, extending trade agreements program until June 12, 1951, and repealing Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948. Rejected 151–241 (Democrats, 7–235; Republicans, 144–5; American Labor Party 0–1), February 9, 1949.

4. H.R. 1612. Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951. Simpson, Republican, of Pennsylvania, amendment to Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 directing Tariff Commission to determine minimum tariff rates for protection of U.S. industries, and require that if tariffs are lowered below that point, or if already lower and not raised to the minimum, full information shall be filed with Congress. Agreed to 225–168 (Democrats, 42–163; Republicans, 183–4; Independent 0–1), February 7, 1951.

5. H.R. 1. Reciprocal trade extension. Reed, Republican of New York, motion to recommit trade agreements extension bill to Ways and Means Committee with instructions to require the President to comply with recommendations of the Tariff Commission, except when national security is involved. Rejected 199–206 (Democrats, 80–140; Republicans, 119–66), February 18, 1955.

6. H.R. 2151. Wool import duties. Passage of bill to suspend for 3 years the import duties on certain coarse wools. Passed 250–129 (Democrats, 147–52; Republicans 103–77), February 4, 1958.

7. H.R. 12591. Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, providing a 5-year extension of the President's authority to enter trade agreements. Reed, Republican of New York, motion to recommit the bill to the Ways and Means Committee, without instructions. Rejected 146–268 (Democrats, 61–160; Republicans, 85–108), June 11, 1958.

8. H.R. 12591. Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958. Passage of the bill. Passed 317–98 (Democrats, 184–39; Republicans, 133–59), June 11, 1958.

9. H.R. 1217. Amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to remove for 2 years the duty on amorphous graphite valued at less than $50 per ton. Passed 278–116 (Democrats, 151–95; Republicans, 127–21), February 2, 1960.

10. H.R. 84. Authorize a 4-year subsidy program for small lead and zinc mines. Passed 196–172 (Democrats, 169–49; Republicans, 27–123), August 24, 1961.

[N record vote against (nay); Y record vote for (yea); √ paired for; ? absent, general pair, "Present," did not announce or answer poll; X paired against; — announced against, CQ poll against; ‡ announced for, CQ poll for]

Ways and Means Committee members	Trade votes, 1945–61										Federal role			
	1 1945	2 1948	3 1949	4 1951	5 1955	6 1958	7 1958	8 1958	9 1960	10 1961	Larger, 1961	Smaller, 1961	Larger, 86th Cong.	Smaller, 86th Cong.
Democrats:														
Mills (Arkansas)	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	√	N	70	30	67	33
King (California)	N	√	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	100	0	100	0
O'Brien (Illinois)	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	100	0	100	0
Boggs (Louisiana)	----	Y	N	N	N	?	N	Y	√	Y	70	20	83	17
Keogh (New York)	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	100	0	100	0
Harrison (Virginia)	----	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	X	20	80	8	92
Karsten (Missouri)	----	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	100	0	100	0
Herlong (Florida)	----	----	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	20	80	25	75
Griffiths (Michigan)	----	----	----	----	Y	Y	—	‡	Y	Y	100	0	100	0
Thompson (Texas)	----	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	80	20	75	25
Frazier (Tennessee)	----	----	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	70	30	58	25
Green (Pennsylvania)	N	----	N	N	Y	‡	N	Y	Y	Y	90	0	92	8
Watts (Kentucky)	----	----	----	----	N	N	N	Y	?	Y	70	30	75	25
Ullman (Oregon)	----	----	----	----	----	N	N	Y	N	Y	100	0	100	0
Burke (Massachusetts)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	Y	Y	100	0	83	17
Republicans:														
Mason (Illinois)	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	0	100	0	75
Byrnes (Wisconsin)	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	0	100	0	100
Baker (Tennessee)	----	----	----	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	40	60	58	42
Curtis (Missouri)	----	----	----	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	0	100	17	83
Knox (Michigan)	----	----	----	----	Y	N	Y	N	Y	X	0	100	25	75
Utt (California)	----	----	----	----	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	0	100	8	92
Betts (Ohio)	----	----	----	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	0	100	0	100
Alger (Texas)	----	----	----	----	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	0	100	0	100
Derounian (New York)	----	----	----	----	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	0	100	0	100
Schneebeli (Pennsylvania)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	Y	10	60	[1] 0	[1] 100

---

[1] Not eligible for all 12 test rollcalls.

KEY VOTES, SCORES OF SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

1. H.R. 12381. National debt ceiling increase. PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, amendment to establish a 20-percent withholding tax on income from interest and dividends. Rejected 34–62 (Democrats, 22–31; Republicans, 2–31), June 20, 1960. President Eisenhower did not take a position on the amendment.

2. H.R. 12961. MCCARTHY, Democrat, of Minnesota, amendment to repeal the 4-percent tax credit on dividend income exceeding $50 from domestic corporations. Agreed to 42–21 (Democrats, 39–12; Republicans, 3–29), June 20, 1960. A "nay" was a vote supporting President Eisenhower's position.

3. H.R. 12281. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, amendment to prohibit tax deductions for business entertainment expenses, except for food and beverages, to limit to $10 per person the amount of a business gift that is tax deductible and to prohibit deductions for dues or initiating them to social, athletic or sporting clubs. Agreed to 45–39 (Democrats, 36–14; Republicans, 9–23), June 20, 1960. President Eisenhower did not take a position on the amendment.

4. H.R. 12580. Social Security Amendments of 1960. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, substitute for pending ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, amendment (see below) providing a choice of specified minimum medical benefits, financed by Federal-State matching grants, for persons over 65 choosing to participate in the program. Rejected 28–67 (Democrats, 0–62; Republicans, 28–5), August 23, 1960. President Eisenhower did not take a position on the amendment.

5. H.R. 12360. ANDERSON, Democrat, New Mexico, amendment providing medical benefits for all social security retirees 68 and over, to be financed by an increase in the social security payroll tax. Rejected, 44–51 (Democrats, 43–19; Republicans, 1–32), August 23, 1960. A "nay" was a vote supporting President Eisenhower's position.

6. H.R. 3935. Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961. GOLDWATER, Republican, Arizona, amendment to require the Secretary of Labor to recommend import quotas or tariffs, which the President at his discretion could put in effect, if after investigation the Secretary determined that imports from low-wage countries were endangering the living standards of U.S. workers whose wages were regulated by State or Federal law. Rejected, 39–55 (Democrats, 15–46; Republicans, 24–9), April 19, 1961. President Kennedy did not take a position on the amendment.

7. H.R. 12591. Senate committee version of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958. Payne, Republican, Maine, amendment to provide that Congress may override the President's disapproval of a Tariff Commission recommendation within 60 days by a majority vote of each Chamber. Rejected, 34–57 (Democrats, 8–36; Republicans, 26–21). July 22, 1958. A "nay" was a vote supporting President Eisenhower's position.

8. H.R. 12591. Passage of the trade agreements extension bill. Passed, 72–16 (Democrats, 36–6; Republicans 36–10), July 22, 1958. A "yea" was a vote supporting President Eisenhower's position.

[N record vote against (nay); Y record vote for (yea); ? absent, general pair, "Present," did not announce or answer poll; * term expires in 1963; X paired against; ‡ announced for, CQ poll for; — announced against, CQ poll against]

Finance Committee members	Taxes			Medical care			Trade		Federal role			
	1 1960	2 1960	3 1960	4 1960	5 1960	6 1961	7 1958	8 1958	Larger, 1961	Smaller, 1961	Larger, 86th Cong.	Smaller, 86th Cong.
Democrats:												
Byrd (Virginia)	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	0	100	0	100
Kerr (Oklahoma)	N	?	N	N	N	N	N	N	50	50	79	21
Long (Louisiana)*	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	50	50	64	36
Smathers (Florida)*	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	20	80	43	50
Anderson (New Mexico)	N	Y	Y	N	Y	X	Y	Y	80	10	86	14
Douglas (Illinois)	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	100	0	79	21
Gore (Tennessee)	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	70	30	79	14
Talmadge (Georgia)*	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	20	80	21	71
McCarthy (Minnesota)	N	Y	N	N	Y	N			90	10	100	0
Hartke (Indiana)	?	‡	‡	N	Y	N			90	10	100	0
Fulbright (Arkansas)	N	Y	Y	—	X	N	N	Y	30	60	57	43
Republicans:												
Williams (Delaware)	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	20	80	0	100
Carlson (Kansas)*	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	20	50	14	86
Bennett (Utah)*	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	0	100	7	93
Butler (Maryland)*	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	0	90	7	93
Curtis (Nebraska)	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	0	100	7	93
Morton (Kentucky)	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	30	70	0	100

Bruce Alger, Republican, of Texas, Fifth District; age 43; House 1955–61; committee, Ways and Means; previous committee, Public Works; profession, real estate development (head of Alger Development in Dallas); experience, aviation cadet in Army Air Corps in World War II.

Steven B. Derounian, Republican, of New York, Second District; age 43; House 1953–61; committee, Ways and Means; previous committees, District of Columbia, Interstate and Foreign Commerce; profession, lawyer; experience, Infantry officer, World War II, Purple Heart, Bronze Star, and foreign service ribbons in European theater; councilman, North Hempstead, N.Y.

Herman T. Schneebeli, Republican, of Pennsylvania, 17th District; age 54; House 1960–61; committees, Ways and Means, Public Works (resigned); previous committee, Banking and Currency; profession, business (Gulf Oil); experience, World War II veteran, head of civic fundraising groups, school board, Grit award for meritorious community service.

Martha W. Griffiths, Democrat, of Michigan, 17th District; age 49; House 1955–61; committees, Banking and Currency, Government Operations, Joint Economic; profession, lawyer; experience, Michigan Legislature 1949–52, judge of recorder's court 1953, legal adviser for Business & Professional Women's Clubs of Michigan.

Clark W. Thompson, Democrat, of Texas, Ninth District; age 65; House 1933–35; 1947–61; committee, Agriculture; previous committee, Merchant Marine and Fisheries; profession, business; experience, veteran of World Wars I and II, president of Galveston Chamber of Commerce, public relations counsel for American National Life Insurance Co. and National Hotel Co. of Galveston.

The President's Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the President's budget message with fear and misgivings for the future. This budget request calls for an expenditure of $93 billion in round figures, an amount which the mind of man cannot comprehend and which I am sure will result in a 1963 fiscal year deficit of at least $5 billion, added to the 1962 fiscal year deficit of at least $10 billion, making $15 billion to add to our Federal debt now a reality of $300 billion in round figures. This is more than all the other nations in the world all put together owe their federal bondholders.

As a member of the House Appropriations Committee for 20 sessions of Congress, I have seen this country of ours rolling down the bankrupt route full speed ahead. We are bound to crash and sooner than we think, I fear.

I can only promise that I shall, as always, exert my very best efforts to reduce this unconscionable budget by the billions. To be worthy of my place I can, nor will I do less.

Budget Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, as I listened today to the reading of the President's budget message, I could not but think of a statement once made by the patron saint of the Democrat Party, Thomas Jefferson. He said:

> I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers. We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy.

Also, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jefferson must have read different history than those of the Democrat Party who have followed him, for he, Jefferson, said:

> My reading of history convinces me that most bad government results from too much government.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jefferson foresaw that such a budget message as this might come to the Congress when he said:

> The natural progress of things is for liberty to yield and government to gain ground.

But, as you know, he also said:

> That government is best which governs least.

Mr. Speaker, listening to the President's budget message, I like what Mr. Jefferson had to say.

U.S. Lumber Mills Lose Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the lumber industry in my district, the State of Washington and the Pacific coast is faced with the serious problem caused by an invasion of the east coast markets by British Columbia lumber mills.

The seriousness of the situation is evident when you look at a few figures. In 1951, west coast producers held 93 percent of the east coast market. Last year, the west coast share dropped to 43 percent, with British Columbia rising to 57 percent.

One of the contributing factors is the Jones Act which requires that our west coast mills must ship their lumber to Atlantic coast ports on American-flag ships. On the other hand Canadian mills can use ships registered under foreign flags. The higher costs of American shipping have given the Canadians an estimated $7 to $11 per thousand-board-feet competitive advantage.

These higher costs are caused by higher wages paid American shipping employees, wages that are subsidized by the taxpayers. Our lumber mills in the Pacific Northwest, Mr. Speaker, only want a chance to meet Canadian competition on reasonably equal grounds. But when, by virtue of a subsidy paid by the Federal Government, the costs of shipping lumber are so far out of proportion as to cause unfair competition, then that cause must be eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which, I believe, would eliminate this cause. My bill would amend the Jones Act to provide that the Secretary of Commerce shall have the authority to waive provisions of the act as it applies to any American industry when he finds after hearings that such industry is losing a substantial part of its business to foreign competitors through the application of such act.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that early hearings will be held by the appropriate committee so that action can be taken during this session of the 87th Congress. This problem to which I have referred needs to be solved if we want to keep our mills at full employment.

Needed: Good Stewardship of National Wealth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the President's budget message today again focuses the spotlight of national thinking upon our fiscal affairs.

The $92-plus billion budget prepared for 1963 represents, if adopted by the Congress, a whopping increase in expenditures.

As we recall, the proposed budget for fiscal 1962 was about $80 billion. According to best estimates, however, spending is running at a rate of about $89 billion—but still below the budget presented today.

In view of the skyrocketing Federal budgets, the Congress will want to take a microscopic look at the proposals and hold expenditures down to absolute essentials.

Overall, I believe that we, as a people, need to take a new look at the direction and purpose of all U.S. expenditures—both governmental and nongovernmental.

In such critical times, our Nation needs not only farsighted leadership in Government, but also a deep sense of citizen responsibility in directing and utilizing all our national wealth to best serve us individually, and as a nation.

Recently, I had an opportunity to comment in further detail on this aspect of our national spending. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of these comments printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY URGES 1962 GOOD STEWARDSHIP OF NATIONAL WEALTH PROGRAM BY U.S. CITIZENS

Today, U.S. citizens earn and spend more money; live, eat, play, and work on higher standards; (a) than ever before in history; and (b) than any other people in the world.

In 1960, we, as a nation, had a gross national product of about $504 billion, and national income of $417 billion. (For 1961, the rates are higher: $540 billion GNP and $426 billion national income.)

Of U.S. annual income, about $80 billion plus are siphoned off for Federal taxes.

As taxpayers, we attempt to require, and rightly so, responsible handling of funds by Uncle Sam.

In these times of great national challenge, however, I believe it is equally necessary that we as citizens reevaluate our utilization or dissipation of our share of the Nation's resources.

In 1960 (the latest year for which complete statistics are available), general categories of expenditures (in round figures) were as follows:

[In billions of dollars]

Food	70.0
Household operations	45.0
Housing	42.0
Clothing, accessories, and jewelry	34.0
Transportation (private and public)	40.0
Medical care	20.0
Personal business (interest, insurance, etc.)	20.0
Recreation	20.0
Alcoholic beverages	10.0
Tobacco	7.0
Private education and research	4.5
Religious and welfare activities	4.6
Foreign travel	3.0

In our free Nation, every citizen, of course, has a right to spend income, without direction or accountability, to serve his own need, inclination, or goods.

As stewards of the resources of the richest nation in the world, however, we must ask ourselves: Are we using our resources for the best purposes? What changes can, or should be made for more effective utilization of our national wealth to better serve individual and national interests?

The American people and the Nation, I believe, could well benefit from a soul-searching analysis of our dollar-by-dollar spending programs. The purpose would be, as possible, to more effectively utilize annual income of U.S. citizens (which, incidentally, far exceeds in value the annual gross national product of any other nation in the world). If this were done, it would help to: (1) Benefit us individually; (2) enable citizens to assume a larger share of responsibility now generally shouldered by Uncle Sam; and (3) provide the Nation with greater strength in meeting the challenge of the times.

Launching of U.S.S. "Joseph Strauss" (DDG-16) by New York Shipbuilding Corp., Camden, N.J., December 9, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, December 9, 1961, the U.S.S. *Joseph Strauss*, the fifth of six guided-missile destroyers built by the New York Shipbuilding Corp., was launched with Mrs. Lawrence Haines Coburn of Wellesley, Mass., a granddaughter of Admiral Strauss, as its sponsor.

This new guided-missile destroyer honors the late Adm. Joseph Strauss, who graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy in the class of 1885 and retired in 1925, after 40 years of distinguished service.

It was my privilege to participate in the launching program and to deliver the following address:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE LAUNCHING OF THE U.S.S. "JOSEPH STRAUSS" AT CAMDEN, N.J., DECEMBER 9, 1961

Launching a new warship is always a great day for the Navy and for the Nation.

That day is made even more noteworthy when the name assigned to this ship is the U.S.S. *Joseph Strauss*.

Admiral Strauss served his country well and honorably for a period of time which stretched over 50 years.

The touchstones of his long and distinguished career in the Navy were a devotion to duty, integrity, and indisputable professional skill.

He demonstrated these qualities in every post he held.

At sea he served on 14 ships with distinction and eventually rose to the command of the Asiatic Fleet in 1921 after commanding the mine force of the Atlantic Fleet during World War I.

In this latter capacity Admiral Strauss was responsible for laying the North Sea mine barrage.

This operation contributed to the defeat of the German submarine campaign and to the breakdown of German morale at home.

With characteristic energy and competence, Admiral Strauss also directed the clearing of U.S. mines from the North Sea after the downfall of Prussian militarism.

Completion of this task earned him an extraordinary commendation from the Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels, who noted that sweeping of the North Sea of mines was "one of the greatest and most hazardous tasks undertaken by the Navy" and a work which would "go down in the annals of naval history as one of the Navy's greatest achievements."

Admiral Strauss' accomplishments on land were no less important.

He discharged his duties as Inspector of Ordnance in charge of the Naval Proving Ground at Indian Head, Md., and as Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance with consummate skill and enterprise.

In the field of ordnance, where he is best remembered, Admiral Strauss designed the first spring recoil gun mount used in the Navy and the first disappearing mount for dock guns of submarines.

He also developed the 12-inch gun which became the forerunner of the big gun main batteries and was a pioneer in the area of smokeless powder development.

Furthermore he was responsible for important innovations in submarine safety devices and salvaging operations.

Besides these admirable achievements Admiral Strauss served as a valuable and respected member of the general court-martial of the Navy General Board and of the 1937 Board on Battleship Plans.

He also distinguished himself as a Navy representative to Congress for naval appropriations from 1923 through 1925.

In sum, Admiral Strauss served where and when his country needed him most.

He provides an example of steadfast and honorable service equaled by few naval officers in the history of our Nation.

The Navy, too, deserves to be commended for recognizing the work and achievements of Admiral Strauss by naming this fighting ship after him.

It is appropriate indeed that a guided missile destroyer was chosen to bear his distinguished name.

Admiral Strauss was one of the most versatile and adaptable naval officers of his time. He could do many jobs—and do them well.

Like its sister ships in the fleet the U.S.S. *Joseph Strauss* is equipped to do a great number of jobs and, we trust, it will do them well.

The guided missile destroyer possesses the very latest long-range antisubmarine warfare weapons.

These sub killers are notable additions to our naval defense structure.

Reliable intelligence reports estimate that the Soviet submarine fleet is composed of more than 400 vessels.

It is necessary that we have an effective antidote to Russian submarine strength.

Without it our control of the seas will be challenged and perhaps ultimately undermined.

The destroyer is one of our principal answers to the submarine threat facing us—and it is a key weapon in maintaining our power over the seas.

You will recall that in the dark days of 1940 Great Britain begged for more destroyers—not cruisers and battleships—to protect herself against the devastating attacks of German U-boats.

It was the plea of a nation which had already been saved by destroyers in World War I.

We also look to these destroyers for help in escorting our amphibious forces against enemy strongholds and for supporting them after they have landed.

They can provide indispensable protection for the cargo ships which are the backbone of any effective military engagement across the seas.

Or, they can screen for our battle fleet against enemy torpedoes and aircraft—traditional destroyer functions.

Moreover, these new types of destroyers possess command, communications, and control capabilities which enable them to coordinate with and for multiple forces under various battle and weather conditions.

The missile destroyer is unquestionably a definite step forward in destroyer design.

It is an ingenious response to the requirements of modern warfare.

The Nation owes a vote of praise to the Navy for the development of this highly useful fighting ship.

The guided missile destroyer, of course, is only one aspect of the Navy's rebuilding program since World War II.

Over the past 15 years Navy experience, foresight, and resourcefulness have produced the *Forrestal* carrier, the Polaris submarine, guided missile cruisers, and a host of smaller craft for strategic and tactical purposes.

These weapons demonstrate that the Navy is here to stay—that seapower is still the key to survival in the nuclear age.

The Nation can be thankful that Navy spokesmen were not discouraged by skeptics and critics who would have scrapped the Navy in 1945.

If they had been, our present deterrent force against the Soviet Union might be severely limited in its strength and effectiveness.

The Polaris submarine and its complement of 16 Polaris missiles represent an awesome answer to any Soviet attack against the United States or its vital interests.

Already 80 of these missiles, stacked in five Polaris submarines, are on station.

They are ready to hit Communist targets as soon as they receive orders from the President.

Powered by nuclear energy, these submarines are swift and silent in the water. They are difficult to detect and make our strategic striking force almost invulnerable to enemy attack.

It is good news to hear that the Navy will have 29 of these submarines patrolling the waters of the world by 1964.

Navy carriers, too, are important strategic and tactical weapons which should not be overlooked in assessing our naval strength.

These ships can be quickly sent to any part of the globe without violating sovereign national boundaries.

Their aircraft can carry nuclear weapons in megaton ranges or deliver conventional bombs against tactical targets in support of land operations.

The splendid achievements of the Navy during the Korean war proved the usefulness of the Navy's carrier force in limited war engagements.

The daring exploits of Navy fliers kept the Chinese and North Korean Communists from sweeping across South Korea which would have challenged our forward position in Japan.

In these troubled times—it is comforting to know that the Navy has retained the tradition of excellence and service which was established and carried forward by the ability and character of such men as Adm. Joseph Strauss.

If the past, indeed, is prolog to the future, we can continue to expect much from the Navy.

This guided missile destroyer which we launch today assures us that our expectations are not vain and empty.

We are also certain that the officers and crew of the U.S.S. *Joseph Strauss* will serve their ship and their service with the same devotion to duty that informed the life and action of Admiral Strauss.

We are proud of them.

It is with no small amount of emotion that we conclude our remarks here by wishing them Godspeed.

Burley Acreage Tobacco Allotments for 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, it was again my privilege to join with my colleagues from the great tobacco State of Kentucky and other tobacco-producing areas this morning in submitting to the Department of Agriculture our recommendations concerning burley tobacco acreage allotments for 1962.

I ask unanimous consent that my prepared statement, which was presented at the annual quotas meeting, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR THRUSTON B. MORTON ON 1962 NATIONAL MARKETING QUOTAS FOR BURLEY TOBACCO, JANUARY 18, 1962

I appreciate having the opportunity of meeting here today with my colleagues from burley-producing States to submit my recommendation for the 1962 national marketing quota for burley tobacco.

The essence of my recommendation is that acreage allotments be increased from 5 to 7 percent for 1962. The results of the current marketing season vindicate the decision to increase allotments by 6 percent for the 1961 crop. Farmers have received top prices for their burley, and most of the crop has gone into normal trade channels, with only about 1 percent going to the associations under the loan program. This exceptionally strong demand clearly indicates that the tobacco farmers' customers want burley and will pay premium prices to get it.

The 1961 production was based on a national marketing quota of 536 million pounds, which made approximately 329,000 acres available for allotment. Of this total acreage, it is estimated that only 318,000 acres were harvested, but an unusually heavy crop now makes it likely that net production will be in the area of 570 million pounds.

However, authorities in the industry estimate that the total volume of useful tobacco, that is, the net yield for manufacturing purposes, will run about 550 million pounds because of the above-average moisture content of the tobacco. These moisture estimates, I am advised, will run from 4 to 5 percent higher than usual.

It is important that the customers of burley tobacco, both at home and abroad, continue to be provided with adequate leaf supplies from the standpoint of volume and selectivity if the industry is to remain healthy and prosperous. At the same time, adequate care must be exercised to protect the producers' interests from the dangers of excessive production of the magnitude which existed for several years after the 1954 crop. It is also imperative that we avoid incurring a repetition of the increase-decrease cycle.

There are several factors which I feel strongly support another acreage increase in 1962:

1. Cigarette production in 1961 rose to an alltime high of 537 billion units, a 4-percent increase over 1960.
2. Gains in domestic disappearance of leaf tobacco indicate that manufacturing technology has about reached maximum utilization of the leaf. Thus, we may expect further anticipated increases in cigarette production to demand the use of more leaf tobacco in the future.
3. The carryover on October 1, 1961, was the lowest since the 1952-53 marketing year. It has dropped each year since the high point reached in 1955-56.
4. The total supply of burley tobacco has dropped for the seventh consecutive year.
5. Total disappearance increased for the third consecutive year.
6. Manufacturing companies still are unable to purchase full requirements, even on a replacement basis, when the 2-year lead-time basis of usage is considered. Since manufacturers will not use burley at a rate they can't replace, they must necessarily spread their available burley a little thinner and make up the difference from other types. Substitution for burley represents a market loss which could be difficult to recapture.

The industry has indicated that its manufacturing requirements in 1964 will approximate 587 million pounds, which will come largely from the 1962 crop. I believe that the statutory formula, allowing for the trend for greater consumption of burley, will support a 1962 marketing quota of from 575 to 585 million pounds.

In converting to acres, I have applied a per-acre yield of 1,670 pounds, which is 32 pounds greater than the most recent 5-year average and higher than any single year on record with the exception of the 1961 crop, whose yield is estimated at 1,725 pounds per acre. This would give a 1962 allotted acreage of between 344,000 and 351,000 acres, an increase of between 5 to 7 percent above 1961.

I would also like to reaffirm my full support of legislation which would require all growers participating in acreage increases to share equally in future reductions, using 1960 allotments as a point of departure. This, in my opinion, would be a most constructive modification of the burley program, and I hope that something can be accomplished this year.

Burley Tobacco Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the importance of tobacco to the farm economy of southern Indiana has long been recognized. It is one of the area's leading money crops and has been a prime source of income to farmers for many years.

Just today, in Madison, Ind., the most successful burley sales season ever held in my district was completed. More pounds of tobacco were sold, more money was realized by growers there than ever before. It was a banner year for all concerned.

But even as the present year closed, next year was opened at a meeting held today at the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The meeting was held to discuss next year's burley acreage allotments with Members of Congress from the tobacco belt.

I am proud to say that these Members of Congress unanimously recommended an increase in the acreage allotments for next year. I was happy to join other of my distinguished colleagues from several States in support of these increases.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include my presentation to the Department of Agriculture on behalf of the acreage increase at this point in the Record:

Statement of Congressman Earl Wilson, Republican, of Indiana, Before Burley Tobacco Outlook Meeting Held at U.S. Department of Agriculture, January 18, 1962

Mr. Chairman, although my distinguished colleagues Mr. Watts and Mr. Chelf represent most of the tobacco growers in the State of Kentucky, I believe that I represent an even greater percentage of the tobacco growers in the State of Indiana. Over 8,000 tobacco growers are located in my district.

Tobacco means much to the rural economy of this area. It is one of the biggest money crops and the biggest cash crop in terms of farm-to-market money that is realized.

The tobacco farmers in my district for whom I speak are almost all satisfied and happy with the present burley program. They are just today completing a wonderful sales season during which tobacco brought higher prices than ever before.

The reason for the record prices are readily understandable. Boiled down, it is this—the American people are using tobacco at an ever-growing rate; export markets are demanding more and more of the crop. But, while disappearance of tobacco grown has been increasing, production hasn't kept pace.

In 1957 there was a total of 217 million pounds of burley in the hands of cooperative associations. Today that supply has dwindled until there are some estimates of less than a 2 days' supply on hand. The 1961 crop report shows 88 million pounds in the association storehouses. That figure, which has dropped dramatically, isn't going to go back up, it seems. The associations have been getting only about 1 percent of this year's crop.

This means that if we are to protect the industry, if we are to continue the excellent economic progress we've been making, we must guarantee continued production at increased levels. We must make sure the tobacco farmer can supply burley for both domestic and export markets. We also need a stock of tobacco on hand as a cushion against a short crop.

Last year the United States recorded an alltime high manufacture of cigarettes—516 billion, a 22-percent increase over totals for a period 10 years ago. The export business also increased 4 percent last year while the cooperative associations got less tobacco.

This continuing increase in demand causes a constant acceleration of the disappearance of tobacco stocks. We use more each year as we grow more each year and there is less and less carryover. The total available supply of burley has now dropped for 7 years in a row.

With supply totals shrinking and demand totals expanding, the only answer is in increased production on a conservative basis.

Estimates furnished my office show the industry will need about 585 million pounds of tobacco in 1964—and that poundage must come from the crop that will be grown in 1962. With an average yield of 1,670 pounds per acre, an increase in acreage to above 350,000 acres is indicated and necessary.

These factors make an increase in tobacco acreage allotments imperative and the facts I have cited here bear out my contention that the needed increase in production will best be realized by an acreage allotment of 6 percent.

I am happy to join with my colleagues from Kentucky, Mr. Watts, Mr. Chelf, Mr. Natcher, Mr. Stubblefield, and Mr. Perkins, with the distinguished Senators from Kentucky, Mr. Cooper and Mr. Morton, and with my colleagues from North Carolina and Virginia in recommending this increase.

In conclusion, I should like to state that the tobacco industry has been so successful, in my opinion, because of the willingness of the tobacco farmers to cooperate with and help formulate the legislation that governs this program and because of the excellent jobs being done by the Department of Agriculture, the cooperative associations, and all connected with the industry.

A Quick Easy Way To Save $150 Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, this date I have written to the President of the United States urging him to take direct action to prevent needless waste of $150 million on "phantom acres" in the administration of the 1962 feed grains program.

"Phantom acres" caused approximately $150 million waste in the program last year, and a similar waste will occur this year if nothing is done.

I invite your attention to this correspondence which explains the nature of "phantom acres," shows how they were permitted and the quick and easy remedy to prevent this unfortunate waste in 1962.

In view of the President's budget message this date, action to avoid a repetition of this glaring waste seems especially desirable.

The correspondence follows:

November 1, 1961.

The Honorable John F. Kennedy,
President of the United States, the White House, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: I read with interest the Associated Press news report of October 29, indicating you are disappointed that the feed grains program has not materially reduced surpluses and alarmed at the continued high cost of farm programs.

The failure of the feed grains program is no surprise to me. Since it was first introduced, I have predicted it would not materially reduce surpluses nor improve farm income, and it would hike USDA costs. USDA reports already bear out the accuracy of these predictions.

More important, I predicted it would give Government absolute power to manipulate feed grains prices, and thus weaken what is left of the marketplace economy which, historically, has served American agriculture so well.

The accuracy of this prediction was borne out by excessive dumping of Government-owned corn on this year's market—more than twice last year's volume—which effectively drove down the price of corn. I wholeheartedly concur with Secretary Freeman that cheap corn means cheap livestock. In fact, as a result of this dumping, most livestock items are today selling below last year, and next year's prices are expected to be even worse.

Now comes the USDA news release of October 27, giving the philosophy behind plans for funding certificates acquired under the "money in the springtime" feature of the feed grains program.

The first-listed objective is "to honor the Department's general understanding with cooperators that they can expect to benefit by diverting their feed grain acreage to conservation uses." In other words, certificate sales will be paced to keep market prices low, as a reward to those who signed up and punishment to those who did not.

Congress intended the certificate arrangement to be simply a means of financing part of the feed grains program cost. Curiously, in announcing the new sales policy, USDA does not even list this among the stated objectives.

Three out of five corn producers did not sign up under the program. With farmers' costs continuing to rise, it is shocking to me that the Department would continue deliberately to punish the majority of corn growers.

From the tone of the October 29 news report, you seem to be puzzled as to what to do in farm legislation.

I respectfully urge that you:

1. Order Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman to handle the funding of certificates in a manner that will provide the least adverse influence on market prices, and to desist from these callous market-breaking sales of Government-owned grain.

2. Order Secretary Freeman to keep "phantom acres" out of the 1962 feed grains program. Sloppy administration of the 1961 program resulted in $150 million waste. Farmers were paid to retire 20 million corn acres, but the reduction in corn acreage only amounted to 15 million. In other words, taxpayers shelled out $150 million for about 5 million acres that were not actually corn

acres. My bill, H.R. 9329, to prohibit paid retirement of such "phantom acres," would stop this sloppy administration in 1962, but you could accomplish this by direct order to your Secretary.

3. Enact a program to get Government out of the grain business, so farmers can once more produce for the marketplace, instead of Government bins. I invite your attention to my proposal, H.R. 8306, which would end the surplus grain headache by selling stocks back to farmers at attractive prices in exchange for short-term land retirement.

As a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I am deeply interested in the welfare of the American farmer and would welcome the opportunity to discuss these ideas with you personally.

Sincerely yours,

Paul Findley,
Representative in Congress,
20th District, Illinois.

December 19, 1961.

The Honorable John F. Kennedy,
President of the United States, the White House, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: On November 1, I wrote to you in regard to the feed grains program which I suspect is a disappointment to both of us. Certainly it is to me.

In my letter, I suggested three courses of action which could improve the feed grains situation next year. So far, I have not had acknowledgment of my letter, and I want to repeat my desire to work with you for the improvement of American agriculture.

I look forward to your reply and to the opportunity to consult with you personally about this grave problem.

Sincerely yours,

Paul Findley,
Representative in Congress,
20th District, Illinois.

The White House, *December 21, 1961.*

Hon. Paul Findley,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman: The President has asked me to thank you for your letter of December 19 in further reference to the feed grains situation for next year.

Upon receipt of your previous letter, the President requested that it be brought to the attention of Secretary Freeman for direct reply to you. I am sorry that you have not received an acknowledgment.

However, we will again take the matter up with the Department of Agriculture and again request that the matter be checked into immediately and a further reply be sent to you. I am sure you will be hearing from his office in the very near future.

Sincerely yours,

Lawrence F. O'Brien,
Special Assistant to the President.

Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C., December 28, 1961.

Hon. Paul Findley,
House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Findley: The White House has requested that we reply to your letter of December 19 concerning the feed grain program. On checking into the matter we have found that your letter of December 19 to the President was a followup of an earlier letter of November 1. It is our understanding that the letter of November 1 was also referred to this Department by the White House. However, we have been unable to locate this letter in the Department or to determine why it was not answered promptly. In order to prepare a comprehensive reply to your letter of December 19 we requested your Washington office to supply us with a copy of the earlier communication. We obtained the copy on December 27 and are now in a position to reply to both letters.

Your earlier letter was written at a time when much misinformation and distortion of facts concerning the 1961 feed grain program had been appearing in the press. Your letter to the President was evidently prompted by some of the same press reports which caused us to issue on November 9 a statement to correct some of the then current misinformation. A copy of this press release is attached. Fortunately, stories which have appeared in the newspapers in the past 45 days have corrected some of the original misinformation. However, as is usually the case in such situations the correction is never brought to the attention of all of the people who received the original erroneous information.

It is evident from your letters that you are under the impression that actions of this Department have been designed to or have had the effect of punishing corngrowers who did not participate in the 1961 feed grain program. This is not correct.

In order to determine just how the farmer who elected not to participate in the feed grain program has made out it is appropriate to attempt to determine what would have happened if the 1961 feed grain program had not been enacted. Secretary Benson had reduced the corn price support level for 1960 6 cents below the 1959 level. Accordingly, with no program we would have expected the market price for the 1960 corn to average about 6 cents per bushel below 1959 for the first part of the marketing year and for this spread to widen as it became apparent that weather conditions for 1961 would be ideal and that record yields per acre would be produced. The market price data indicate, however, that the prices at which farmers sold their 1960 crop corn have been fully as high and perhaps a little higher than could have been expected without the 1961 feed grain program. Preliminary data indicate that farmers have received an average of $1 per bushel of 1960 corn sold as compared with an average of $1.04 per bushel for 1959. Any objective analysis with complete statistical information available will indicate that farmers have received more not less for 1960 corn than would have been the case if no new legislation had been enacted.

There is one other erroneous assumption indicated in your letter which I should correct. You indicate that "phantom acres" could be kept out of the 1962 feed grain program by good administration and that your bill H.R. 9329 would prohibit payment for "phantom acres." In any voluntary program some of the participation will be offset by persons who remain outside of the program and increase their corn plantings. This was true with respect to the 1961 feed grain program. It will be true to some extent with respect to the 1962 feed grain program, and would be equally true with respect to the program you proposed.

I hope you will read the complete press release of November 9 which corrects some of the misstatements made by enemies of the farm program and shows that the 1961 feed grain program has not been a failure but has achieved its purposes. One of the most gratifying aspects of our efforts to date is the fact that the decline in farm income has been arrested and a substantial increase will take place this year. It is also gratifying that for the first time in many years there will be a reduction in the CCC feed grain inventory and a start has been made in eliminating the storage costs which were brought about by the buildup of commodity surpluses in the period from 1952 to 1960.

If you have any additional questions I will be pleased to answer them. I again wish to express my regret over the delay in replying to your letters.

Sincerely yours,

Orville L. Freeman,
Secretary.

January 18, 1962.

The Honorable John F. Kennedy,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: I have received a letter dated December 28, 1961, from Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, in response to my letters to you of November 1 and December 19, 1961.

Secretary Freeman has failed to understand my concern over the so-called "phantom acres." In his letter, Mr. Freeman stated:

"You indicate that 'phantom acres' could be kept out of the 1962 feed grain program by good administration and that your bill H.R. 9329 would prohibit payment for 'phantom acres.' In any voluntary program some of the participation will be offset by persons who remain outside of the program and increase their corn plantings. This was true with respect to the 1961 feed grain program. It will be true to some extent with respect to the 1962 feed grain program, and would be equally true with respect to the program you proposed."

Mr. Freeman misses the point completely. Payment for "phantom acres" has nothing whatever to do with increased planting by those who remained outside the 1961 program.

The simple fact is that the 1959–60 average corn acreage planted, according to official U.S. Department of Agriculture statistics, equaled 82.2 million acres, but the base acreage assigned to corn producers last year, according to an official report to the President of the Senate dated June 21, 1961, equaled 87,047,000 acres. Both figures related solely to average annual planting history for the 2-year period, 1959 and 1960. The figures should be the same, not 5 million acres apart.

In administering the 1961 program, the Department apparently made no serious attempt to distinguish between actual history and what the history was claimed to have been.

Just how did the 5-million-acre difference, real "phantom acres," come about?

When I first wrote to you on November 1, I was inclined to think the $150 million waste on "phantom acres" was due to a combination of loose administration and overzealous efforts by the army of USDA fieldmen conducting the signup.

Since then, I have discovered an item in Department of Agriculture regulations which makes this waste appear to be invited.

On page 5358 of the Federal Register dated June 15, 1961, you will find this item among regulations covering administration of the 1961 feed grains program:

"In those counties where the Department of Agriculture has established the average adjusted corn and grain sorghum acreage produced in the county in 1959 and 1960 for use as a guide in determining the feed grain base for farms in the county, the total feed grain bases for all farms in the county, excluding any increase in farm feed grain base resulting from corrections, requests for reconsideration or appeals, pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 495.13 to the extent practicable, shall not exceed 105 percent of such average adjusted corn and grain sorghum acreage."

This is a clear invitation to 5 percent exaggeration in crop histories. Here is the clue to "phantom acres," because 5 percent of 82.2 million acres is 4.1 million acres. That represents over 80 percent of the 5 million elusive acres.

Please advise me under what authority the Secretary authorized the county committees to exceed official county acreage base by 5 percent plus the amounts needed for corrections and appeals.

In both the 1961 and 1962 programs, the law clearly requires adherence to the official 1959-60 planting histories.

When cotton was once more placed under controls in 1954, the USDA spent considerable time "squeezing the water out" of individual farmer's recollection of their historical acreage data.

Similar care has been exercised in administering tobacco, peanuts, rice and wheat programs, in order to avoid exaggerated histories.

Indeed, the invitation to "phantom acres" under the feed grains program seems to be a first. I can find no record where any previous Secretary of Agriculture allowed a 5 percent overstatement of planting history.

This regulatory invitation accounts for most of the $150 million waste last year on "phantom acres."

A similar waste will occur in the 1962 feed grains program unless my bill H.R. 9329, prohibiting payment for "phantom acres," is enacted—or, unless you direct your Secretary of Agriculture to stop this waste himself by striking from 1962 regulations the authority for 5 percent overstatement of planting history.

The country faces serious budgetary problems, and I am sure you will welcome this quick and easy way to prevent needless waste of the $150 million this year.

It's not too late, and I hope you will find it possible to give this your personal attention.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

Veterans Day Program, Altoona, Pa., November 11, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was a privilege to participate in the observance of Veterans Day, November 11, 1961, at Altoona, Pa., at which time I delivered the following address:

VETERANS DAY ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA AT ALTOONA, PA., NOVEMBER 11, 1961

It is a privilege to return home on Veterans Day and to participate in the annual program in tribute to the veterans of all wars in which this Nation has been engaged.

Veterans Day, 1961, should be a most solemn national holiday.

Today we are linked especially close with the veterans organizations of the Nation as we observe November 11 with appropriate ceremonies.

No matter when or where such services are being conducted I believe that the same basic desire is lodged deep in the hearts of all Americans.

We wish to remember our past with respect and honor.

We wish to bring the meanings of the past—into the light of present day problems—so that with the old and the new—we can press forward with renewed hope in our hearts for a better tomorrow.

The beautiful granite and marble memoriials in our towns and cities from coast to coast—bear the names of the men and women who gave their lives in past wars.

These stand as constant reminders—of the sacrifices made by many people for the causes of freedom—for which we—as a nation—have contended.

Each memorial or historical marker has a beauty all its own—and is especially precious to the people—whose loved ones are remembered thereby.

Someone has said that a nation is known by the character of the men it crowns.

Measured by this standard our Nation may claim the highest honor because of the coronation observance on this Veterans Day.

The crowns we bring here are not those that adorn the brows of kings—they are not jeweled with precious stones—but they are made of respect—eternal gratitude and loving remembrance.

Veterans Day endeavors to do a necessary and important thing in the life of America.

At the same time—Veterans Day endeavors to do a difficult thing.

The type of patriotism that stirs us today is not an every day emotion.

It is—in the words of John Galsworthy—a secret lamp—hardly to be seen when the world is at peace.

All the finest and most generous emotions of American citizens are of this type.

The most sensitive affections of human beings for one another, however, rise and fall, and such affection may be ignored, in the rush of our active lives.

However, our affections do flare up in the hour of danger, the hour of disaster.

It is when one's country is faced with the gravest of problems, that many turn to her aid with increasing desire to sacrifice.

To state in so many words, the degree and quality of patriotism we feel today is not possible.

Yet Veterans Day surely deserves no less of our support.

If the feeling of remembrance and honor, for those who served in war, wanes as each war recedes in time, and the perils of those wars are forgotten, the monuments erected throughout the Nation will serve a vital purpose in helping us remember.

Furthermore, the significance of Veterans Day will never be lost if all our fine veteran organizations, together with other responsible citizens, cooperate to stir our grateful patriotism to action.

It is common knowledge, that each generation tends to forget the war fought by the previous generation.

The failure of this country to prepare for conflict on several past occassions, bears cynical witness to this fact.

This great country of ours was founded upon certain basic and unchangeable principles.

Our Founding Fathers had long years of experience with English tyranny.

They came to the shores of a new nation that they might reestablish the dignity of man.

They founded this Nation on a doctrine of liberty and a belief in God.

They recognized another fact, that man was not a supernatural being, that he had a mortal soul.

They recognized that liberty was not a license to be stored away and forgotten, filed away like a paid-off mortgage.

Our Founding Fathers recognized that liberty implied responsibility.

We became involved in the First World War at the sinking of the *Lusitania*, and we went into that war, because we believed in making the "world safe for democracy."

We wanted to bring self-determination to all nations of the world.

After that struggle, we looked with doubt upon certain situations, that developed in the peace that followed.

But we soon learned that we could not live in peace, unless we were prepared to defend it.

No matter how we may look upon war, the great causes served, and, at the same time, the evils involved in the execution of war, there is this fact to remember: Those who died have given their lives for the sake of others.

So, we recall on Veterans Day the deeds of sacrifice, the ideals of those who died, and the causes for which they gave their lives, even though the causes may not have been clearly defined at the time, in the minds of all Americans.

War is an awful thing.

The inhumanities of war are beyond description.

Therefore, the people of the world should look upon the waging of war as the greatest of evils.

Nevertheless, those who have fought and died for the sake of great causes, are to be remembered for their sacrifices, and honored for their service.

They have given "the last full measure of devotion."

It is recalled that 15 years and more, following the outbreak of World War II, the people of Poland, Germany, France, England, Japan, the Philippines, and Africa, were laboring to clear away the destruction brought to them by the ravages of war.

After over 15 years, evidence still remained.

The skeletons of great buildings, stood as stark and gruesome reminders of the tragedies and suffering of war.

In this connection, I am reminded of the words of a London physician spoken during the war years:

"It takes all our time to keep ourselves fit to live—and perhaps die—for something more glorious than life."

As we look at the war memorials across our Nation—and hold our service of dedication—we are reminded of the spirit of sacrifice.

We are also reminded that they went forth—they did not always ask us why.

To complete the purpose of Veterans' Day we must in turn dedicate ourselves to the causes for which those we honor gave their lives.

We must give something of ourselves—for the causes to which they gave themselves—or else they will have died in vain.

Today our obligations are set in a strange new kind of world.

At times they represent a combination of three world-challenging situations:

1. The revolutions of those who would be free.
2. The space age.
3. The gigantic horror of the explosions of atomic bombs by the Soviet Union.

The truth is, we have been thrust into this awesome era of human history, through varied developments.

Consider the fact that the peoples of the world have plunged into a period of revolution unparalleled in global history.

In technological change, for example, the past century has brought more advance than the 1,000 years which preceded.

One man who has discussed this idea, David Sarnoff, president of the Radio Corp. of America, has emphasized the increasing speed at which new powers, new products, and new processes, have been developed.

Mr. Sarnoff has said this, and I quote: "It is not merely a case of continued increase, but of continued acceleration of increase."

In rapid order old orders of society are swept away and new ones are struggling to be born on every continent.

Old empires and kings have fallen.

New nations and forces are rising to change life on earth.

Revolution, sometimes quiet, sometimes violent, has become the hallmark of our time.

The world was blasted into the nuclear age with the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945.

Through atomic fission, power was multiplied 1,000 times over conventional explosives.

Through atomic fusion in hydrogen bombs since then, power has been multiplied another 1,000 times.

Thus in a few short years man has multiplied possible power by 1 million times.

This almost incredible increase in power can be used for construction and for a better life, or it can be used for destruction and death.

Humanity was launched into the space age when the first manmade satellite was hurled into orbit around our planet in 1957.

Man's life entered new dimensions of space, and also of fear and hope.

All the potentials for good or evil are multiplied by the millionfold increase of power available through nuclear energy.

Now humanity trembles from day to day. We fear and hope. We think of life and death.

But we continue to rush into the nuclear space age.

The decisions we will make in international relations in the days ahead, and years ahead, are fateful.

They may well mean the difference between nuclear destruction of much of the human race or, by the grace of God, a world with new potentialities for human good, for more knowledge, for further exploration of the mysteries of the inner human world and outer space among the planets.

This, my friends, is the world picture we face.

But it is especially appropriate, as well as urgent, that, on this Veterans' Day, we should be particularly concerned about international relations.

Once known as Armistice Day, November 11 continues to be a time for exploring ways to develop peace with justice and freedom.

Even as we recall the sacrifices of the past, we must turn our minds to our responsibility in this nuclear space age.

We must not think of Altoona, Pa., as far removed from the troubles of mankind in our other 49 States, or far removed from the troubles of mankind in the countries around our globe.

This is a privileged spot to call home.

Located as we are in the mountains of Pennsylvania, we enjoy in Blair County some of the most marvelous mountain scenery that can be seen anywhere.

From their inception, Altoona and Blair County have always maintained an enviable record for the patriotic fervor of their populations in national emergencies.

In short, we are the possessors of a great and good heritage, which must be shared with future generations.

The security of the succeeding generations who will occupy this county in the years ahead is in our hands.

The ability of Blair County to remain in a haven for law-abiding people to work and live in, is quite dependent upon the ability of the entire United States and the other nations of the world to maintain freedom in the future.

As I stated a few minutes ago, in order to complete the purpose of this Veterans' Day, we must dedicate ourselves anew to the causes for which those we honor gave their lives.

We must give something of ourselves for their sake and for the sake of the entire world.

In my judgment, there is no person who so completely neglects his duty in this troubled world as one who fails to discharge his obligations of citizenship.

Let us never forget that the sovereign power of the United States is vested in its people.

Law and the discharge of law is not, or should not be, the sole obligation of those officials of government who write the laws and put them into force.

It is rather the responsibility of all citizens of this great country to see that the laws which are adopted are those which they believe express the desires of the voting power of the country.

Our country was founded on a doctrine of liberty.

Every citizen should not only appreciate the many advantages which are the heritage of an American—but also should recognize the responsibilities which are his, responsibilities necessary to preserve the advantages.

You can do so by studying the principles of freedom, by absorbing the ideals of our country's patriotism, by voting your honest convictions, and by intelligently expressing your views on subjects of national and international importance.

Preparedness for a good future must come in many ways.

It must come not only in adequate weapons but must be nourished in the hearts and minds of a responsible citizenry.

The task before us as we commemorate Veterans Day 1961 is challenging and clear.

The battle for freedom against false doctrine of world communism is ever with us.

It is more than a battle for the minds of men.

The demands of the day are great.

Russia claims to be ready to make every sacrifice to fasten her regime upon areas of the world that are now demanding freedom and a new way of life.

Our thoughts on this Veterans Day in 1961 must conclude with a dedication to the causes of freedom, education, and justice for all people.

If we neglect to dedicate ourselves to strive with increased vigor in preserving the human dignity of mankind we shall not honor the veterans of all wars.

For in the final analysis, a listless and indifferent attitude in combating the evils of world communism can destroy any hope for a bright and peaceful future for the family of nations.

This is a challenge hurled by the Communist world which we cannot escape.

Therefore, on this Veterans Day 1961, let us fervently ask Almighty God to help us to never deliberately ignore it—lest we perish as a nation through our indifference and stupidity.

Rather let us implore from the innermost recesses of our hearts:

"Lord God of Hosts be with us yet—lest we forget.

"Lest we forget."

The Birthday of Benjamin Franklin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia congressional delegation calls attention to the birthday of a great Philadelphian, the birthday of Benjamin Franklin.

Benjamin Franklin, whose 256th birthday was celebrated yesterday, is remembered with grateful affection and admiration in Boston, the city of his birth, in Philadelphia, the city enriched by his residence for the greater part of his life, and in the foreign capitals of London and Paris, where his personal popularity and prestige contributed vastly to the general estimate of the United States of America in the formative years of the Republic. So many sided was Ben Franklin's genius that the Dictionary of American Biography requires seven words to categorize his career, "printer, author, philanthropist, inventor, statesman, diplomat, scientist." He was not a compartmented man, following these different vocations at different times, and in different circumstances, but a whole and many-sided man, who astounded those who knew him best by the depth of his knowledge and the scope of his activities in each field.

It is appropriate that printing is mentioned first among Franklin's activities, for printing was the first trade and profession by which he made his living, and he never ceased to think of himself primarily as a printer. As a boy of 17, when he came to Philadelphia, he was already a printer of practical experience and of outstanding skill and competence. That he looked upon himself as a printer is demonstrated dramatically by his famous epitaph on himself, with its typical mixture of sincere solemnity and quizzical humor:

> The body of Benjamin Franklin, printer (like the cover of an old book, its contents torn out, and stripped of its lettering and gilding), lies here food for worms. Yet the work itself shall not be lost, for it will (as he believes) appear once more in a new and more beautiful edition corrected and amended by the Author.

Throughout his life Franklin maintained a constant interest and activity in printing, and in matters connected with printing, such as the publishing of magazines and books, his famous Poor Richard's Almanack, and the fervent support of any enterprise in furtherance of the dissemination of knowledge through reading. Libraries, learned societies, educational institutions—all owe much to the enthusiastic sponsorship of Dr. Benjamin Franklin. One of the most apt commemorations of this great Philadelphia printer and publisher is the annual celebration of his birthday by a portrait on the cover of the Saturday Evening Post, successor to a paper he had founded.

Franklin's career as an author also began early. When he was working for his brother, as an apprentice printer, between the ages of 12 and 17, he became an avid reader, not only of the pamphlets and magazines he helped to print, but of all the books he could get hold of. Fascinated by Addison's Spectator, he began of his own accord the literary apprenticeship later so enthusiastically recommended by Stevenson, and wrote essays in imitation of Addison's literary style. In this medium, so eminently suited to his own temperament and mode of thought, he soon became proficient. His earliest essays, signed with the pseudonym, "Silence Dogood," were slipped secretly under his brother's door, and, much to his delight, appeared in print. From Addison he had learned to combine elegance of expression with simplicity, and he soon mastered the art of leavening serious thought with touches of wit and facetiousness.

Franklin's reputation as a writer is great, and well deserved. His autobiography has served for the entertainment and instruction of youth for many generations, and will so serve for many a century to come. His home truths, as succinctly phrased in "Poor Richard's Almanack," and his witticisms as gleaned from his conversation and letters, are still in the common language of all of us. It is probable that Mark Twain is his only rival for the post of most quoted American author.

We are all beneficiaries of Franklin's philanthropic thoughts for the general benefit of mankind, for the establishment of governmental services, and for the education of youth, as well as for local institutions of a more specifically philanthropic character. It was he who initiated projects for establishing the city police in Philadelphia, for paving the city streets, and for improving their cleaning and lighting. He also was largely instrumental in establishing the circulating library in Philadelphia, which was the first in America; the city hospital, and the Academy for the Education of Youth which has since become the University of Pennsylvania. The eyesight of many is greatly assisted by Franklin's invention, the bifocal lens, and even after two centuries the Franklin stove remains a common object in our country places, supplying a cheery and efficient heat, with little expenditure of fuel and great ease of management.

As a scientist, Franklin was chiefly remarkable for his investigations and discoveries in the field of electricity, in which he not only worked out some important fundamental concepts, such as the relationship betwen lightning, static electricity, and electricity in its other forms and uses. His experiments, and the fascinating accounts of them in Peter Collinson's book, "Experiments and Observations on Electricity, Made at Philadelphia in America, by Mr. Benjamin Franklin," inspired immediate interest and emulation, and Benjamin Franklin was thenceforth admired and his company sought by the scientists and inventors of Europe and America.

Franklin's position as a statesman was high, even in that age of great philosophers of statecraft, and masters of eloquence and political practice. The combination of his quiet wisdom, wide renown, and humility of manner, made him deeply influential in the affairs of the American Colonies, and in the discussions and occurrences leading up to the Revolution. Even during his long residence in London, his opinions were looked to at long range, and despite the lapse of time necessary for communication at that period, as wisdom essential to the proper conduct of our affairs.

As a diplomat, Franklin was certainly one of the most outstanding successes the world has ever seen. Deeply loved in France by the philosophers and rulers, and equally by the common people, he swerved not an inch from loyal service to the interest of his country, and in a time of difficulty and tension within the French kingdom, he managed to maintain his position, and the position of the United States, as friend and ally to all. John Adams said of Franklin's reputation in France:

> His name was familiar to government and people * * * to such a degree that there was scarcely a peasant or a citizen, a valet de chambre, coachman, or footman, a lady's chambermaid, or a scullion in a kitchen who was not familiar with it, and who did not consider him as a friend to humankind. When they spoke of him, they seemed to think he was to restore the Golden Age.

When you mail or receive a letter, remember, it was Benjamin Franklin who inaugurated the postal service. When you reflect upon the fact that we live under a free and stable Government, remember, Benjamin Franklin was one of the chief influences in the Convention that built up our Constitution out of the interplay of forces of order and liberty. When you look back upon the young heroes and fire-eaters that inspired the American Revolution, remember the quiet thinker and epigrammatist who did as much as any to bring a powerful and self-sufficient country out of that conflict.

Constitution Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, during the 86th Congress the Honorable JAMES A. BYRNE introduced a bill—House Joint Resolution 605—providing for the creation of a Federal Commission to prepare plans for the celebration of the 175th anniversary of the creation of the Federal Constitution. It was my privilege to submit the report of the Committee on the Judiciary, which considered the bill, to the House of Representatives. The bill was passed by the Congress, signed by the President, and became Public Law 86-650.

An elaborate year-long celebration of the 175th anniversary of the U.S. Constitution will be held during 1962 in Philadelphia, where the document was conceived and ratified.

The flags of the 50 States will fly from Independence Hall during the year, and each State will be honored for a full week in order of its acceptance into the Union. All 50 will be honored during Freedom Week, June 27 to July 4, and during Constitution Week, beginning September 17.

The Governor of each State, or a representative, will attend weekly ceremonies throughout the year at Independence Hall, as one flag after another is raised. The mayor of the city will be the host.

The first program took place on Wednesday, January 3. The remaining flag raising ceremonies will be held on Tuesdays, except during Freedom Week and Constitution Week.

The Governor of Delaware, which was first to ratify the Constitution, was present at the opening ceremony. The Governor of Pennsylvania, second State to ratify, participated in the second week events.

At the end of the year will come Alaska and Hawaii, admitted to the Union in 1958 and 1959, respectively.

The ceremonies will be under the direction of the Philadelphia Committee for the 175th Anniversary of the Constitution.

Each week's ceremonies will feature a color guard, representing the different branches of the armed services. During January, there will be a Navy color guard for the flags. A band and bugler will play.

Among organizations participating will be the Sons of the American Revolution, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Descendants of Signers of the Declaration of Independence, and the Colonial Dames of America.

The Boy Scouts of America, Girl Scouts of America, the National Commission of the 175th Anniversay of the Constitution, and the National Park Service, which operates Independence National Park, also will take active parts in the weekly ceremonies.

Altoona, Pa., Community Chest Campaign Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on October 5, 1961, it was a pleasure to participate in the opening kickoff dinner of the Altoona Community Chest campaign, Altoona, Pa., and to deliver the following address:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE 1961–62 ALTOONA COMMUNITY CHEST CAMPAIGN DINNER, PENN ALTO HOTEL, ALTOONA, PA., OCTOBER 5, 1961

It is a privilege to be with you this evening for the 1961–62 community chest campaign dinner.

You have to your credit two consecutive over-the-goal campaigns in the last 2 years.

Under your able campaign chairman, Roy K. McDaniel, you can expect to make it three successes in a row.

I understand that the dollar goal for this year's drive is going to be almost a quarter of a million dollars—$232,250 to be exact—and that is only as a minimum.

That is a high mark to shoot for.

And when you do achieve it—when you do go over the top—then you will be glad you set yourselves that challenging task and your satisfaction in success will be that much greater.

As I say, you have a winning streak going.

Another victorious drive this time will generate more public response next time.

Success is contagious.

Everyone is pulling for you and the more often these drives go over the top and by a big margin the harder it will be for the community to let you down.

I understand also that the possibility of a united fund for all of Blair County is under discussion.

Altoona is the focal point for this possibility.

If you do well again this year then the chances for a united fund for the entire county are that much better.

As you begin this 1961 campaign keep in mind there are 23 agencies giving health, welfare, and youth services to this community—to the people whose doorbells you will be ringing.

If these agencies have sufficient funds to support the best kind of service they know how to give; if people can be made to see the good works they are doing; then future successes for the community chest idea are assured—in Altoona and in the larger community of Blair County.

There's another point I want to make about the dollar goal you have set up for this year.

I said that this will be a challenge and a source of satisfaction when you do attain it.

The second point is this: This high mark to shoot for must elicit the full support of the whole community.

There will be a premium on 100-percent participation by all members of the community; because it is not enough that the generous donors continue to give the way they have in the past.

Their full support of this campaign cannot take up the slack which results when other members of the community for one reason or other fall far short of the contributions they should be making.

The New York Yankees are in the world's series again this year and part of the reason is that their batting lineup from the leadoff man down through the No. 8 position can be depended upon.

It is not just a case of Roger Maris and Mickey Mantle holding up the rest of the batting order.

There is also the matter of Yogi Berra and Bill Skowron.

And of Elston Howard, hitting high in the .300's, and of men like Bobby Richardson, Tony Kubek, John Blanchard, and Cletus Boyer.

These men can be counted upon to help each other out; pick each other up when necessary; and to put out a team effort which is hard to beat.

The same type of cooperation, the same working together, is what is required for a successful community chest campaign.

The effect of a sizable and generous contribution from one person is diminished when his next-door neighbor cannot be reached—or fails to understand—that he too has a duty to give.

When everyone realizes that his neighbors are depending on him, then the task—be it in baseball or in your community chest campaign—is far, far easier for all concerned.

So your duty is to reach every person, every household, every organization, and every businessman in Altoona and show him that he must get on this bandwagon; show him that his neighbors are putting out a full effort and that he must too if this year's campaign is to be successful.

I know that these good citizens want to hear your message.

They know when they think about it how much better off this or any other community is when it can have the benefit of the humanitarian services which the 23 health and welfare agencies of the Altoona Community Chest make available.

There is always something particularly exciting and satisfying in a community project of this sort.

Part of the excitement is in the simple fact of a group of citizens getting together to achieve a useful and noble purpose and above all the great joy in achieving it.

But there is something else worthy of consideration.

Too often, it seems to me, we let our daily lives settle into a routine.

We see the same friends, engage in the same activities week after week, maybe even take the same night out for relaxation week after week.

We even begin to classify ourselves as members of certain clubs, of a certain profession, of a certain church, of a certain economic group, and we tend to overlook the fact that we have other wider loyalties or should have.

One of these wider loyalties is the town or community we are a part of.

The community chest calls this to our attention each year and gives us a new opportunity—even forces us—to meet new people and to enlarge our interests to break out of our fairly narrow circles and to become involved with other members of the community whom we might otherwise overlook and never meet.

This experience often proves to be both enjoyable and eye opening.

And it more than makes up for the occasional distress and panic-button pushing which volunteer work entails.

Maybe I can give you some idea of what a layman thinks of the community chest.

What does the name mean for the fellow on the other side of the doorbell?

What I am about to say should encourage you.

I hope it doesn't make you overconfident.

I hope it simply reinforces your personal convictions about the work in which you are engaged.

Because if each volunteer worker on his rounds can make his own conviction felt by the persons he comes in contact with, he will do a marvelous job in this year's campaign.

For one thing the man on the street knows the name of the community chest and he trusts it.

You may have been around before and if so he remembers you.

He also knows that the essence of your program is the single campaign for several worthy causes.

He thinks this is an intelligent way to operate and he respects you for considering his own desires not to be bothered by repeated and disorganized appeals for his help.

He knows that the community chest idea has brought a good deal of order, organization, and commonsense into charitable giving.

While he knows this, I sometimes wonder whether he translates it into a money contribution of sufficient and appropriate size.

We can only hope he does recognize by his donation the sensible and businesslike way in which the community chest drive is carried out.

There have been scandalous reports lately of rackets in the charity field; of organizations which swallow up in salaries and publicity fully 50 percent and more of donations collected.

These reports only serve to increase the high regard in which the community chest is held.

Your administration costs are extremely low.

As volunteer workers you are respected members of the community who simply put on a different hat and put extra hours and extra energy into this worthwhile campaign.

That is something else which the housewife and her husband—the people on the other side of the doorbell—appreciate.

So in this year's campaign for the community chest—with the high standards of performances you have set for yourself—you have every reason to be confident.

You have a fine organization with an enviable reputation.

People want you to talk to them with conviction about the part they can play in helping you reach your goals.

People are pulling for you, and with the knowledge of such confidence it is my ardent hope it will serve as an added incentive in reaching the goal in this year's community chest campaign.

Equality for Women of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in his state of the Union address to Congress, President Kennedy said:

> America stands for progress in human rights as well as in economic affairs, and a strong America requires the assurance of full and equal rights to all its citizens, of any race or of any color.

The President said his administration has shown as never before how much could be done through the full use of executive power—through the enforcement of laws already passed by Congress—to secure the constitutional rights of all.

President Kennedy said he issued a comprehensive order last March to guarantee right and equal employment in all Federal agencies and contractors. He said the Vice President's committee has done much to achieve success in opening to all races new professional, supervisory, and other job opportunities.

It is shocking that the President did not pledge his support for equal job opportunities for women. It is doubly shocking that discrimination against women is tolerated within the White House, and that President Kennedy is aware of this.

I refer to the White House Correspondents Association composed of men and women reporters accredited to the White House and to the President's press conferences. Men and women reporters pay the same dues. The women members of the White House Correspondents Association have been judged equal professionally by their peers, their fellow members.

It seems incredible, but women members of the White House Correspondents Association have never been permitted to attend the White House Correspondents Association dinner for the President. In 1961, President Kennedy, his Cabinet, including Secretary of Labor Goldberg—the man who has so often lambasted private clubs—other New Frontiersmen, and Members of Congress attended the White House Correspondents Association dinner from which women members were excluded.

Beautiful Broadway and Hollywood women stars generously gave their talent to entertain at the dinner, and they were welcomed at predinner cocktail parties attended by the New Frontier. According to press reports, the President attended one of these parties.

Not one of the New Frontiersmen, nor the liberal newspapermen, who are resigning from private clubs, has ever spoken up for the women reporters of the White House Correspondents Association, who have to earn their livings. I also note that New Frontiersmen and other liberals do not seem to be resigning from their other clubs and lodges which are segregated but outside of Washington, a notable example of which is an exclusive and segregated fox-hunting club in nearby Virginia.

The 1960 Democratic and Republican platforms call for equal job opportunities for women. Do these pledges have meaning, or are they hypocritical mouthings?

Women everywhere in the United States should be informed of these circumstances and should come to the aid of other employed women.

Premier Nehru told one woman reporter in Washington that he did not know until 3 days before he was to speak at the National Press Club that women reporters were not to be admitted to cover his speech on an equal footing with men. When he spoke, he chided the NPC by saying that India has cast aside purdah—the exclusion of women—and that he was astonished to see it practiced in the United States of America.

It is ironic that Premier Khrushchev had to speak up for American women reporters when he came to Washington. He refused to speak at the National Press Club unless some women reporters were permitted to attend the luncheon.

When President de Gaulle came to Washington, he insisted upon holding a press conference to which men and women reporters were admitted.

Let us be honest. Are people equal only in race? Are women second-class citizens? Will President Kennedy right the wrong in the White House Correspondents Association? What can he do? He can refuse to attend the traditional dinner in his honor unless women reporters are given a new deal, a fair deal, on the New Frontier.

The Government's Role in Health Care in the 1960's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, last October the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] visited Minnesota and spoke at the Alumni Institute in Hospital Administration which was held in Minneapolis. His speech, "The Government's Role in Health Care in the 1960's," contains a review of the various programs already supported or provided by Government in health care and lists reasons why he believes the social security program will be extended to provide medical insurance for the aged.

This address is so comprehensive and so thorough a review of this case that, in my opinion, it would be helpful and useful to Members of the Senate, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the address of the Senator from Oregon may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN HEALTH CARE IN THE 1960'S

(Remarks of Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, at the Alumni Institute in Hospital Administration, Minneapolis, Minn., October 26, 1961)

President Wilson, and friends of the University of Minnesota, a return to one's alma mater is always a time for nostalgia and fond memories, and I always bring many of them with me when I visit this campus.

President Wilson is a warm friend from the more recent days when he served as president of the University of Oregon. I know he is now providing this great school with the kind of academic leadership he gave us at Oregon, and while we regret his departure from the Oregon campus, he surely has our best wishes in his new post.

The subject matter of my remarks covers the entire range of Government's role in health care, or Government's role in medicine, if you please. I know that this conference is mainly concerned with the financing of medical care for individuals. But this subject is so fraught with fears and charges of "socialized medicine" that it is well to give some attention first to the general role of Government in medicine.

It will readily be seen that we already have a good deal of socialized medicine. Most of it is at the municipal or State level, where every individual and every family is governed by dozens of statutes and regulations telling them what they may not do and what they must do. The general impact of these governmental activities is in the area of preventive medicine, but it is surely a more socialized form of medicine than is contemplated in any present plans for financing medical care.

Is it not socialized medicine, for example, which requires vaccination against smallpox, diphtheria, and certain other contagious diseases? Is it not socialized medicine when a State health officer comes around to tell a family that its septic tank is defective and must be replaced? Is it not socialism of some sort or another which prescribes numerous and detailed regulations for the operation of a public eating place, or in fact any establishment where food is sold either in a prepared or unprepared form?

A municipal water supply and a municipal sewage disposal system are accepted forms of socialized medicine, and even the Federal Government is assuming an increasing share of this burden of insuring a pure water supply for a rapidly increasing population. This year, $80 million was provided for this purpose by the Federal Government. Every quarantine of a child with measles is a form of socialized medicine. The entire concept and practice of public health is pure socialized medicine.

There is another area of preventive medicine aimed at accident prevention which also comprises a very large area of public regulation. Industrial safety laws, traffic laws, and even the requirement that a homeowner remove snow from his sidewalks within a prescribed time are not so far removed from social medical care as one might think. Pure food and drug laws and statutes requiring the labeling of poisonous or hazardous substances must also be mentioned.

Right now one of the hottest political issues in the field of medicine—second perhaps only to the Forand bill—is the issue of fluoridation of public water supplies. Yet the doctor or dentist who thinks the Forand bill is socialism will very often be the leading voice in his community for fluoridation of water.

There are at least three other medical fields in which governments at all levels play a very large role, mainly through financial subsidy. They are in hospital construction, medical education, and medical research. All three are heavily supported at the State and local level, with additional support coming from the Federal Government.

There is not a hospital administrator in the country who is not familiar with the Federal Government's role under the Hill-Burton Act. Under this legislation, the Congress appropriated for fiscal 1962 alone $21½ million, though this figure is small compared to the money for hospitals that comes from local taxes and bond issues.

Medical education is one field where the Federal Government does not play a very active direct role, except through fellowships and research grants. However, it did provide a great deal of medical education through the military services, and even more under the GI education bills. At the State level, there is much more subsidizing of medical education through public medical schools, which accounts for almost half our 85 medical schools.

The activity of the Federal level of Government in medicine is probably most notable in medical research. The National Institutes of Health this year received $738,335,000 for research in cancer, heart disease, arthritis, mental illness, allergies, and neurological diseases to mention the major fields of study, plus $30 million more for construction of buildings and facilities.

This is not to say that the Federal Government has been the principal governmental participant in medicine, because the States, their county and municipal subdivisions do much more in the field.

But even this brief and incomplete mention of some of the things Government is already doing makes the question of "socialized medicine" a very uncertain one. Research is considered an appropriate area of medicine for governmental activity; so is medical education, support of hospitals, and public health with all its ramifications.

Is it any wonder that the financing of medical care is also considered by so many Americans to be an equally legitimate field of governmental activity? Here again, there is already considerable governmental activity. Local public assistance has long provided some essentials of medical care for the indigent, and the Federal Government has made a small contribution to this cost. The Kerr-Mills law of last year put the Federal Government even more completely into the health-financing picture by authorizing a more substantial Federal financial contribution to State medical programs for the elderly, along the lines of public assistance.

I am among those who believe that the bugaboo of socialized medicine will not long prevail as an argument against the addition of medical insurance to the social security program. For one thing, the social security program itself is a tremendously popular one. Every Member of Congress will tell you that the most consistent subject matter in his mail from home relates to social security. The complaints about the program are constant; but they are complaints of its inadequacies. The demand for improvements in social security is a continuing demand of the American people, even with the accompanying increases in payroll taxes which constitute the "premiums" of the social security program.

A second reason why I believe this program will be adopted is that it meets a need. Remember that it deals with only one segment of the American people—the elderly, and more specifically those who have retired from active employment. The voluntary health plans which have proved to be one of the most popular and effective means of insuring medical costs for working people and their families, are hard pressed to provide equal benefits at the same premium the individual paid while still employed. Some expansion of the voluntary insurance plans into coverage of retired people has occurred. But the needs of these people are not as likely to be met by voluntary programs as are the needs of people of working age.

There are several reasons for this, all of them probably well known to you. One is that old age brings more chronic illness, and chronic illness means longer illness and more disabling aftereffects. People 65 and over have two to three times as much chronic illness as the rest of the population. And while they are only 9 percent of the population, they include 55 percent of all persons of limited mobility due to chronic illness. The length of stay in the hospital for people 65 and over is twice the average days spent in the hospital by the general population.

Their expenditure for health services is 90 percent greater than expenditures on health by the rest of the public; for hospitals, it is 120 percent higher and for drugs it is also 120 percent higher.

This impact of increased health costs comes at the very time when the individual's income drops markedly. Census Bureau estimates of 1958 indicated that 60 percent of all people 65 and over had incomes less than $1,000 a year; only 12 percent have incomes in excess of $3,000; of the couples, half had incomes below $2,600 a year.

These facts have led to the suggestion that the social security system—which is an insurance program relating entirely to costs incurred when the breadwinner is not earning any income—include insurance against hospitalization which may come after retirement. But its benefits would be paid for while the individual is still working.

Many opponents of this proposal have called it socialized medicine, but have not hesitated to recommend substitutes which also bring the Government into the health care field. The Kerr-Mills law, endorsed by much of the medical profession as a substitute, is far more direct Government participation in the financing of medical care than the so-called Forand bill. Another substitute calls for payment by the Government of those premiums on voluntary insurance which the aged individual cannot pay himself. Is this any less socialized than social security?

When the issue gets down to what role the Federal Government should play in financing health care it should deal with how the Government can most effectively and efficiently help. The social security program has been expanded because it has proved effective and efficient.

In December of 1949, the American Medical Association opposed disability benefits under social security with the statement, and I quote: "Initiation of a compulsory Federal disability program would represent another step toward nationalization of medical care and socialization of the practice of medicine." Yet the disability insurance part of social security has worked so well that the original 50-year age limit was removed last year by Congress, without any increase in social security taxes, and without any opposition from members of either political party.

It was my privilege to have been an early Senate sponsor of the disability provision, and to have introduced the first Senate version of the Forand bill in 1958. In my opinion, the health benefit proposal will be adopted; the only question is how soon. As you know, its present version extends only to insurance against hospitalization and home nursing care. This is a minimum protection for the elderly people of America which is often desired as much by their children and other relatives as by themselves.

I do not expect it will come with the help of much of the American Medical Association because advances in the financing of medical care even through voluntary means have come in spite of its original position and not because of it. The same is true of the existing social security program. But I do expect it will come as a result of the insistence of an American population which is growing older, and which is less and less tolerant of inadequate and insufficient medical care, especially for the elderly.

U.S. Struggle With the Communist Conspiracy To Enslave the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, millions of American are today worried, perplexed, and vitally concerned with the negative trend of the U.S. global struggle with the Communist conspiracy to enslave the world.

At the heart of this discontent lies the wish of the American people for a more forceful, realistic, and positive application of American foreign policy, based on a firm determination of victory, not appeasement or accommodation, of the Communist conspiracy.

I believe that the majority of the citizens of our country are wide awake to the fact that our struggle for communism has resolved itself to a life-and-death status—whether we like it or not.

For the destruction and enslavement of this Nation is without question the Soviet master plan.

It has become abundantly clear that communism offers no new experiment in government or politics, but is the instrument of a power-mad knot of fanatics in the Kremlin who have as their goal world domination.

Communism is no new political ideology to be tried by a nation and discarded if found unworkable; but a despotic, criminal type of dictatorship that once imposed cannot be changed or refuted or voted away.

It is impossible for nations to just try out communism, and if it does not work, return to some previous form of government.

In its plan for world conquest, communism is also seeking to reshape the earth in a godless image where every strata of society pays forced allegiance to the state and its atheistic leaders.

All of our ideals, values, and customs are part of the hated capitalistic system communism seeks to destroy.

Our belief in God, our family circle, our freedoms and liberties will vanish and be replaced instead with the twisted dogma of Marx, Lenin, and Khrushchev if we fail to halt the Communist threat to this Nation.

Important as they are to the overall Communist scheme, the control of Ghana, Cuba, Laos, Vietnam, or West Berlin represent only steps in the ultimate Red plan for conquest and subjugation of the last, strongest bastion of capitalism and the free enterprise system—the United States of America.

There is no question that communism has crossed the ocean and is now lapping at our very shores.

We hear and read almost daily of Red subversion, infiltration, and incitement to riot within the borders of our neighbors to the south, in Latin and South America.

I believe that the American people, awake to the danger, desire to see their Government respond with swiftness, sureness, and firmness to the Red challenge wherever it appears.

The responsibility for the American response to communism lies with our Department of State.

There has been open and honest criticism from many segments of our population, questioning the wisdom of this department in bringing the full American capability into action against our greatest foe in history.

Limiting ourselves to recent development only, we are reminded of the U.S. setbacks in Laos, Cuba, Berlin, Vietnam, and other trouble spots.

There is also much concern about the granting of foreign aid to Communist countries which profess independence of Moscow.

Americans are also disturbed about some aspects of American participation in United Nations activities which often reflect programs and policies detrimental to our interests.

With these developments in mind, it appears that a close scrutiny of State Department planning and personnel is in order with the aim of insuring that the best interests of America is obtained at all times in the continuing struggle with our Communist enemies.

In this endeavor I have submitted a House resolution which reads as follows:

> That the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments, and personnel practices, of the Department of State, with a view to making such recommendations as may be necessary in order to implement more advantageously and rapidly the response of the United States to world developments, and to insure that the best interests of the United States are being served in its struggle with communism.
>
> For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, or elsewhere, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.
>
> The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations

as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

This resolution authorizes an investigation of the State Department by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the committee best suited by knowledge and preparation to handle such a program of review and examination.

It will entail small if any additional appropriations and offers a swift implementation without lengthy resort to joint, select, or standing committee application.

I respectfully urge this body to vote swift approval to this resolution.

The One-Way Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, recently the President spoke. He gave his usual fine presentation. He called upon Congress for action in many fields. He left no field unplowed, no furrow unturned. Now the burden is on Congress to accept or reject his proposals "for the good of the Nation."

Congress, of course, must in the final analysis make the decision as to which proposals it believes to be "for the good of the Nation."

This has been the procedure under all Presidents. Sometimes Congress passes all the main proposals but seldom puts any bills through in exactly the form requested by a President.

That is as it should be. Under our system of government each division of government has its part to play.

The President represents the executive branch, the courts the judicial, and Congress the legislative.

When each branch acts independently but cooperatively, the Nation gets its best government.

Some of us already see a move to set the domestic issues second to the foreign trade issue. This would be a tragic mistake. Nothing is more important than a strong, solvent domestic economy.

A strong military and defense program must be sustained and behind it there must be a strong economy. The economy of our country has made some major changes in the last decade. However, one fundamental truth still prevails. Our production of goods and services must keep pace with our growth or we find ourselves with unemployment, distressed areas, high taxes on individuals and production and a stagnation in our efforts to better and strengthen our social, educational, and economic well-being.

There are differences of opinion on just where the greater emphasis must be placed in order to keep and enlarge our system of freedom for individuals as well as enterprises.

It is already apparent from remarks, statements, and actions of our leaders in both the executive as well as the legislative branch that they consider the liberalization of the tariffs as the main issue.

This I predicted as long ago as 1958 when the 4-year extension was voted for reciprocal trade agreements.

As an observer and as a student of our trade policies I said then that the extension would not achieve the end results the proponents predicted.

I may not have the right answer but this much I am sure of, the overall drive for complete control of the tariffs and customs by the executive branch is the result of the failure of two significant moves which I opposed. Many of us fought these proposals:

First. The extension of the trade agreements for a longer period than 1 year without congressional action.

Second. The tax concessions to private investors to invest in production facilities in foreign countries with the right to export to the United States products made abroad in competition with their domestic plants and workers.

Let us see how these moves have turned out. First we were told that if we had 4 years to plan and promise we would achieve the goal sought by our Government, the lowering of tariffs and trade restrictions and the great boost in our export trade volume.

The facts are and the record if honestly told will show that more industries have been forced to reduce production, curtail expansion and research, and more chronic industrial unemployment has been created since the passage of the 4-year extension.

This is the reason another extension would be difficult to get through Congress, so a new bold approach is being made to cover up the failure of the old law and to pass a new law with greater promise.

When I was just a young man in the house of representatives in Harrisburg, I was working so much that one of my colleagues, Clint Sowers, of Philadelphia, who had been a member for many years stopped me one day and asked why I was working so hard. I told him I was trying to keep my promises to the people so I could be reelected. His answer was a classic. He said, "Young man you don't get reelected on keeping the old promises, it's the new ones you make."

Simply put that is what we are about to do on the trade issue. The Reciprocal Trade Acts reduced our effective tariff from 46.7 percent in 1934 to less than 11 percent in 1961. This is even lower when you count the additions on the free list. In fact the overall tariff rate if applied against all imports would be less than 5 percent.

Only one other competitive nation has a lower rate. This is Japan and any student knows that Japan is an importer of foodstuffs, fuel, raw materials, and machine tools for production purposes. It is natural, therefore, for Japan to have an overall lower rate than a country where most of these items are on a free list or not required by the economy. Japan only imports products for two reasons, to eat or to sell to other nations.

Even so the records show that as Japan becomes self-sufficient or even partially independent of outside items its tariff walls go up. Witness the recent increase on machine tools from 15 to 25 percent ad valorem and the frank statement in defense of this action was that "its own industry had to be protected against imports that could undersell the homemade product.

Is this an isolated case? It is not, amongst nations this is the rule not the exception. For instance, our greatest friend and neighbor is Canada and yet Canada has an automatic tariff rule which increases the tariff on all items imported if any Canadian producers reach a production of at least 10 percent of the countries needs. Why, simply to protect their industries and jobs.

Let us look at Germany—a nation that was devastated by the bombings in World War II. With our help this nation has become the number one world economy success story. What does Germany do in the matter of tariffs? We in Pennsylvania and West Virginia know because we are the victims squeezed between the United States cuts in tariffs and imports of fuel oil and Germany's $5.08 a ton tariff on our coal. What was Germany's answer when questioned about the exorbitant 100-percent tariff on coal. We have unemployed miners—8,000—and must protect our high cost production and the jobs of our miners in Germany. Allowing this to be logical and it was considered logical in this country for over 150 years, what logic can Germany give for placing a 75 cents a pound tariff on coffee which is not even produced in Germany?

Let us for the sake of the record look at tariffs as they were last reported in a public document showing the ratio of tariffs to total imports:

	Percent
United Kingdom (Great Britain)	25.6
Chile	46.0
Australia	9.6
France	10.6
India	17.3
Ireland	13.2
Israel	7.6
Italy	8.4
Mexico	20.6
Venezuela	17.8
Switzerland	8.1

These are 1951 figures and we have since reduced our tariffs 40 percent.

These figures tell only a minor part of the protectionist story because all nations have other means of restricting imports and protecting their own industries. Tariffs are the lesser of the restrictive covenants. The more restrictive measures take the form of embargoes, licensing for imports, nonconvertibility of money, and quotas.

The favorite protection measure of most countries is the quota and import license setup. For instance, the Japanese reduced tariffs on bourbon whisky from the United States from 45 to 35 percent but restricted total imports to $300,000 through the license deal and total quota setup—about as much as required for a respectable Irish wake.

This is common practice and in most of our reciprocal trade deals we cut tariffs and the foreign countries put on quotas or restricted import licenses.

The measure before Congress is just a front runner for a drive to enter our Nation in the Common Market.

I for one am not opposed to the Common Market and I will be the first to promote our entry into the market, when our economies become compatible.

In the meantime let the Common Market create a consumption market to match their production. If the workers cannot earn enough to buy their own production how can they earn enough to buy our goods?

It might be interesting to have a count on how many European factory and farm workers buy American cars, radios, shirts, suits, shoes, washers, dryers, and so forth.

Until they can buy their own products produced at their wage levels how can the Nation expose its high cost market to their production?

We enjoyed a prosperous and expanding economy because of our high incomes, not because of low prices. How many American automobiles can the Japanese electrical workers buy earning about 30 cents an hour as against an American automobile worker's purchase of Japanese transistors, radios, binoculars, and so forth. These are hard simple facts but they are basic.

It is my humble opinion that our economy rests upon five pillars of equal strength and equal importance.

These pillars of economic reason are:

First. Investment: creates production.

Second. Production: creates payrolls.

Third. Payrolls: creates consumption.

Fourth. Consumption: creates profits.

Fifth. Profits: creates investment.

At this point the process starts all over again and this has been true since man first invented the wheel and learned he could hire or use another man to push it. When all the pillars are equal the economy is balanced.

Today too much emphasis is placed upon consumption. Too many economists measure retail sales as the barometer of our economic welfare.

It is true in a sense but the volume of retail sales must reflect the production, payrolls, profit, and investment in the area of the sales.

When a percentage of our retail sales is produced elsewhere we find the depreciation shows up in the balance of our economy and the other four pillars cannot adjust to meet the upward thrust of the consumption pillar which endangers the level of the whole economy.

When any pillar is out of proportion, the economy becomes unbalanced. When the economy becomes unbalanced, it is susceptible to further damage from every breath of foul weather, whether it is a local storm or a hurricane from overseas.

You will note that the upthrust of the pillar of consumption pushes the economy out of balance.

It is a simple but true economic fact that as the overconsumption of foreign goods increases, production is raised through automation and the payrolls suffer by being attacked from both underconsumption of domestic production and automation.

The next step is a disproportionate destruction of the profits. Profits flow more to trade than they do to producers, labor, and industry.

The ultimate outcome of overconsumption of foreign-produced goods means the eventual weakening and in time the crumbling of the pillars of payrolls, profits, investments, and production in exactly that order.

It has been said that imports are only 3 percent of our gross national product. This is a false picture because we use volume dollar figures and ignore the import at the retail level, the production, payroll, investment and profit level.

I have said and repeat that I am not unmindful of our part in the world's economy. We prove this by helping other nations build their economy to a position of soundness and independence. We cannot do it by weakening our own economy.

When we hear arguments to the effect that we can outproduce and therefore undersell other countries in their own markets we fail to mention the products involved.

Can we outproduce costwise, Japanese and German and other exporters tied to the Soviet Union in transistors, shoes, shirts, suits, ceramics, tile, glass, oil, rubber goods, leather goods, steel, aluminum products, autos or any number of consumer goods?

The Japanese say they create 200,000 jobs in America buying cotton, minerals, coal, machine tools, foodstuffs, and so forth, but they do not tell you how many jobs are lost by imports of the manufactured goods from Japan.

The story of most recent date to tell the graphic and pitiful plight of American workers displaced by foreign production involves General Electric and its lamp workers at East Boston, Mass. For the record I will only give the newspaper account without comment:

> BOSTON.—The City Council of Boston has unanimously denounced as "heartless" the announced decision of the General Electric Co. to shut down its East Boston lamp plant in a formal resolution adopted at its December 18 meeting.
>
> THE CITY COUNCIL CONDEMNS THIS HEARTLESS ACT THE RESOLUTION DECLARED
>
> In its formal action the council calls on the administration to protect the jobs of these 450 workers.
>
> It calls on the Massachusetts congressional delegation to take whatever steps are necessary to convince General Electric to rescind this heartless move.
>
> It directs that copies of the resolution be sent to the manager of GE's East Boston lamp works and to Ralph Cordiner, chairman of the board, General Electric Co., and to the Governor, attorney general, and to appropriate city, State, and National officials.
>
> TAKE FIGHT TO PEOPLE
>
> Last week workers at the East Boston lamp plant, members of UE Local 224, carried their fight directly to the people of Boston with a distribution of many thousands of leaflets at key points throughout the city.
>
> Headed "Fired for Christmas," the leaflet told of GE's pre-Christmas action against them and declared:
>
> "Wages in Japan's lamp industry are 20 percent of our American wages, and prices of their lamps on the American market are 80 percent of our price. Profits on GE lamp production in the United States are enormous. Profits on Japanese production are even bigger. That's why GE is forcing us into unemployment."
>
> RELIEF?
>
> EAST BOSTON, MASS.—In announcing its plan to shut down the East Boston lamp plant in 1962, the General Electric Co. told its employees that it would spare no effort to see that they received suitable jobs either in GE or elsewhere.
>
> To date the company has posted on its bulletin boards as suitable jobs for displaced lamp workers advertisements for dishwashers, babysitters, carhops, and domestic servants.

This has happened many times from coast to coast and border to border. Tomato growers in California down from 35,000 acres to 2,000 acres. Mushroom packers in Pennsylvania faced with serious threat from foreign imports. Mexico embargoes U.S. cars—Goodyear buys largest tire factory in Germany. Ford buys English auto plant—aluminum plant sold to American companies. Cement dumping causes labor layoffs in Pennsylvania and New York. Glass imports close U.S. plants. Eight hundred American-financed production facilities built overseas in the last 3 years.

We were advised that by investing overseas we would cut the need for foreign aid from our Government. This is not the case and the real result was a lessening of our exports of manufactured goods and an increase of imports of these items, in many cases from our own investments.

Let us see how we are helping our friends with our foreign investments.

Dollars invested abroad and the income the United States gets back

[In millions]

	Investment	Income[1]
1956-61 (totals):		
Investments in Western Europe	$5,141	$2,261
Investments in underdeveloped areas	5,552	8,794
Investments in Latin America	3,057	4,379
1960, a typical year shows the following:		
Investments in Western Europe	1,322	427
Investments in underdeveloped areas	608	1,474
Investments in Latin America	267	641

[1] Income to Americans from these investments.

When we talk about investments by year are not we really putting back into the countries about what we took out the year before? No American corporation operating in our economy would operate in like manner. It is no wonder that profits added to low wages and Government unions make oversea investments attractive.

Do these thousands of investors help our good neighbor policies or do they make a mockery out of high-sounding idealistic foreign policy? One wonders how many of the "Go Home Yank" cries came from the underpaid workers in American factories abroad.

The strangest thing in the whole trade and tariff fight is the belief by labor that it will be benefited and counts on the cutting of industry profits to meet foreign competition while on the other hand industry believes it will be benefited by increasing production and holding wages at present levels.

First an analysis of the trade balance is needed before any intelligent person can use this as a base for a vote one way or the other on the new trade program.

I refuse to take the large sum figures as any criteria of our success or failure in our trade policies.

You can get any results you want, depending upon which basis you are using to get the results you want.

For purposes of giving a seldom exposed view of our trade balances I will attempt to break down the figures in language that we can all understand.

Before I start let me assure you that I have authority for my figures.

We shall use the figures that best suit the purposes of the proponents of so-called free trade policies and accept them regardless of disagreements on the totals by some of us who have made studies that show the import figures are low and the export figures are high.

The Government figures show exports, $21 billion—minus; with imports $14 billion—plus—to use rounded figures.

If we are to evaluate the importance and effect of this trade volume we must first remove from these figures the amounts that do not reflect true trade but rather represent the volumes of trade that is generated because of actions by our own Government and which cannot be maintained without the gifts, loans, and financing by American taxpayers then the U.S. Treasury.

Of the $21 billion of exports approximately 30 percent is the type of trade. This means that over $6 billion of our exports are in fact not free trade or normal trade but rather trade that would not be possible under a true trade policy.

We therefore can honestly say that our true trade balance measures about the same with exports and imports equal, give or take 10 percent.

Using this as a true base we can say that measured by dollar volume our trade policy is economically sound.

However, does the dollar volume truly reflect the impact upon employment and industry?

Let us take a few examples of trade, item by item.

A foreign country buys $2 million worth of hides and sells this country $2 million worth of leather bags, shoes, gloves, and other items.

Which country gained employment and which country weakened its industrial economy?

Next let us analyze the export item. Whether the foreign country bought the hides or the domestic industry bought the hides, the producer of hides would have the same economic benefit measured in jobs and profits.

The difference is this. We import $2 million worth of products produced at a cost in labor of one-third the wage paid in the United States. Using the norm of 50 percent of cost of production to be wages it means that $1 million of foreign wages reduced payrolls in the United States by $3 million. This $3 million loss is first felt by the workers, second by the public treasury in tax losses, third by the industry in profit losses, again by the tax authorities in their second bite, and next by the whole communities' business, professional and personal services.

The loss in the services is seldom felt in less than 4 years except in a single industrial community such as Niland, Calif. In this community 5 years ago, 5,000 people lived and earned a livelihood entirely within the American economy of the United States. This earning was purely agriculturally based, the planting, cultivating, processing, shipping, and marketing of 35,000 acres of tomatoes.

Today, less than 1,000 people live in Niland. Only a few of these earn their livelihood from tomatoes since less than 2,000 acres are now planted.

What caused this breakdown. Simply put the competition of 80 cents a day labor in Mexico as against $1 an hour labor in California could not be overcome. Added to the labor differential was the additional cost to the California growers in payroll taxes, fuel, power, transportation, packaging, local taxes, and so forth.

The freetraders argue that the Mexicans purchased farm machinery, tools, and other American made products which in turn they paid for with the money they got for the tomatoes. In theory this is sound. In practice the naked truth is seen when the "for sale" signs, the dilapidated public buildings, the loss of income by the workers, the loss of investment by the farmers, and the loss of the productivity of the farms measures the net effort of this trade. Dollar volumes may be the same or even in our favor but what about the community—where does it fit in.

Time will not allow a complete breakdown and a coverage of the thousands of products adversely affected by our trade policies.

One thing we can say without contradiction. For every dollar of consumer goods purchased abroad, a minimum of $1½ is lost by wage earners in America. For our exports to equal this wage loss without regard to taxes, and so forth, exports must be at least three times as great as imports dollar wise for our economy to survive.

In plain words, if wages paid to workers amount to $7 billion by imports, it takes $21 billion out of our wage economy.

Let us look at another fixed cost that U.S. production must carry that is completely out of line competitively. Let us look at Japan for instance.

Japan has 70 million people with a national budget of $6 billion. The United States has 180 million people and a budget of $93 billion. The budget must come from wages, profits, and internal taxation and unless products imported are taxed at customs in the same amount that taxes add to the cost of a domestic product, that product becomes noncompetitive because of Government taxes, forgetting wages and other differentials already in excess of foreign costs.

When we talk about competition with foreign products and export-import balances let us talk less theory and nonsense and more dollars and cents.

The administration this year is using agriculture and textiles as bait in getting support for the new program.

It is stated that we export $2 billion worth of farm products to the Common Market and we only buy $500 million from the Common Market.

However, we are not told that the $2 billion worth we sell costs the American taxpayers about $500 million in taxes in the form of farm subsidies whereas the $500 million of farm products we buy displaces farm products not subsidized, high in labor and wage costs and privately grown and marketed.

We sell wheat, corn, cotton, and so forth, all subsidized, and we buy farm products that compete with our self-sustaining and self-supporting agriculture.

In this regard let me quote from the California Farmer, January 6, 1962:

> During the past 10 years, we have spent $26 billion on farm programs. During that same period, we have imported $42 billion worth of agricultural commodities.
>
> That's free trade. We import to store.
>
> There are no farm problems, except those created by the planners of this Nation through unfair, unequal and unjust import competition.
>
> This sounds fantastic, but if the American farmer were permitted to raise and market a major part of the food and fiber that is consumed by the American people we don't have acres enough today to produce it. The problem is that agricultural imports have created an agricultural surplus.
>
> Furthermore, agriculture has been so commingled with foreign aid, foreign trade, foreign relations, Government programs and State Department planners, that a bad public image of the farmer has been created. Free enterprise and agriculture markets have virtually been destroyed.

The Congressional Record dated April 18, 1961, states as follows:

> From 1949 to 1959, we imported twice as much barley as our surplus grew during that period. In fact, we imported more during that period than we had on hand as surplus at the end of 1959. In oats, we imported four times as much from 1949 to 1959 as our surplus grew during the same period—imports approximately equaled the surplus on hand at the end of 1959. The situation in rye is even more vivid. From 1949 to 1959, we produced 46.5 million less bushels than the amount of the total of this crop. Yet during this same period, our surplus increased by 4.5 million bushels, due to the fact that we imported 52.7 million bushels.

Perhaps there are some farmers in the United States who feel that the trade policy is not injurious but the record shows that not only are nonsubsidized farm products in danger but that all agriculture is suffering from these unsound trade policies.

In closing let me read from the New York Times, December 27, 1961:

> The National Committee for an Effective Congress, a bipartisan organization of 35 members, gives financial and other support to liberal and internationally minded candidates for the Senate and House of Representatives. Sidney H. Scheuer, a New York industrialist, is chairman and George R. Donahue, a New York labor-management consultant, is vice chairman.

Maurice Rosenblatt, of Washington, chairman of the committee's advisory board, said the committee planned to contribute about $250,000 to congressional candidates in the 1962 races, largely on the basis of their records on the foreign-trade issue. He said the campaign funds had been supplied by 20,000 donors.

The bulletin suggested that a shift in administration tactics for dealing with Congress would be necessary to win favorable consideration of major recommendations in the international economic field.

They said the administration in its congressional liaison had relied on the wheeler-dealer spokesman, the courthouse type of politico.

They contended that it should substitute the legislative craftsman who would work with key legislators in drafting legislation.

As the issue of free trade develops, the rightwing coalition may suffer a shotgun divorce, it asserted. For the economic unity of the free world is a proposition that no clearheaded advocate of capitalism can deny—and it is a proposition that no emotional isolationist or a xenophobe can accept.

First, let me say that if the type of outright purchase of votes is put on a bidding basis we can expect the complete destruction of our system of government.

Second, the proposal to substitute "legislative commissar" for the legitimate system of contacting Congressmen spells of communism in its worst form.

Third, I find myself in the same position as the fellow who was arrested for hitting a man who had called him a hyena, 3 years before.

In explanation over the passage of time he said "I just found out what a hyena looked like."

I am in the same fix, I just learned what a xenophobe looks like.

Science Committee Chairman George P. Miller Answers the Question Why We Want To Go to the Moon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, I take this opportunity to extend greetings and warmest wishes to our new chairman, the Honorable GEORGE P. MILLER, of California, upon his assumption of leadership of this very important committee. I am certain that under his capable leadership the committee will attain a most successful record of achievements in the years ahead.

On Tuesday, January 16, 1962, Chairman MILLER addressed the American Astronautical Society. His address is centered primarily around the question: "Why do we want to go to the moon?" It is presented in a very interesting and absorbing manner and I believe that our colleagues, our scientists, and the American public generally will find it of great interest.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD Congressman MILLER's address, which reads as follows:

ADDRESS BY CHAIRMAN GEORGE P. MILLER, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS BEFORE THE AMERICAN ASTRONAUTICAL SOCIETY, JANUARY 6, 1962

As chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I am pleased to have this opportunity of speaking to a group of outstanding specialists in a field which today has become essential for survival and in the never-ending quest of mankind for a brighter tomorrow.

As a boy, I was fascinated with the fiction then published, dealing with fanciful adventures in the universe which surrounds us. Despite my close association with the Nation's astronautical program, it is often startling to realize that today, these flights of fancy have become hard, practical realities of vital concern to you, to me, and to every citizen of the world on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

Our committee is the Committee on Science as well as Astronautics. While we may have spent more time in the Committee on Astronautics, our jurisdiction and responsibility include the scientific work and endeavors of the Government.

We appreciate, despite the cost of research, development, and produtcion of space vehicles and supporting instrumentation and ground facilities, that the byproducts of this effort will have economic, social, and defense values far in excess of the original cost.

Our need to lead in space exploration is not merely a matter of survival; it is not simply the result of a normal impulse to surpass our competitors, nor is it the result of a selfish desire for the yet undreamed-of conveniences and luxuries which the mastering of space technology can create. It arises from a broader and nobler purpose which has existed in the hearts and minds of men since the first human thought occurred—the need to know, the need to grow, the desire for fulfillment of the ultimate destiny of mankind.

We know even at this early stage of development and research that space exploration is of such immense importance to man's total knowledge that it will benefit and alter the course of his existence in ways no more foreseeable today than those which resulted from the invention of the wheel.

And yet, despite the long-term goals which underlie the space program, and the fundamental desire of our Nation to develop and share with the world the benefits arising from the exploration of space for peaceful purposes, many Americans do not yet fully comprehend its significance.

Citizens who have no difficulty in understanding the significance of the ICBM, or other defense aspects of the program, ask me, "Why do we want to go to the moon?"

Considering the fact that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration will spend more than $1,600 million this year, and that the estimated cost of putting men on the moon will amount to $20 billion or more, they certainly deserve an answer to their question.

In his state of the Union message on May 25, last year, President Kennedy ignited the fuse of what may become the world's fourth great scientific revolution. He said:

"Now it is time to take longer strides—time for a great new American enterprise—time for this Nation to take a clearly leading role in space achievement. * * *

"* * * I believe that this Nation should commit itself to achieving the goal, before this decade is out, of landing a man on the moon and returning him safely to the earth."

The Congress, American industry, and American scientific and technical personnel, within and outside the Government, responded promptly to the President's challenge. Today, although less than a year has elapsed, those in charge of our space program are confidently predicting that this goal will be met, possibly in advance of the deadline which the President set.

Great progress has already been made in Project Mercury—initial steps along the path of space exploration. Last September 13, the United States launched an unmanned spacecraft into a single orbit, returned it from space, and recovered it from the Atlantic Ocean. A little more than 2 months later, on November 29, the chimpanzee, Enos, earned his place in history by orbiting the earth twice before he was recovered from the Atlantic. Today, we are on the eve of the first manned orbital flight in the Mercury program.

From these flights our scientists are accumulating basic knowledge about the achievements possible for man in space—how well he can operate controls and instruments, what he can learn that cannot be obtained from electronic devices, how the human body reacts to prolonged weightlessness.

Initially, manned orbital flights will be limited to three trips around the earth, but as the program develops, they will be extended up to 18 orbits—27 hours in space.

Utilizing the knowledge gleaned from these manned orbital flights, the lunar exploration will be undertaken, as a part of Project Apollo, in a three-man capsule for which development contracts have already been let.

As in the case of its less refined predecessors, the Apollo capsule will first be flown in orbits around the earth, to test its components, train its crew, and develop operational techniques. Gradually, the distances from the earth and the duration of flights will be increased, culminating in manned flight around the moon which will accumulate information and experience of value in subsequent landings on the moon itself.

We are beginning to gain experience with the larger boosters which will be required in Project Apollo. On October 27, NASA launched the first Saturn vehicle—a 460-ton structure 10 feet taller than the Statue of Liberty, with eight engines which generated 1,300,000 pounds of thrust. It is the most powerful rocket stage known to exist in the world. In later flights this thrust will be increased to 1,500,000 pounds, and in orbital missions a second stage will be added.

Less than 10 days ago, I was at the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Ala., where the scientific and technical development of the Saturn is being carried on. On that trip I also visited the Michoud plant in New Orleans where several stages of the Saturn will be manufactured by private industry for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Flight around the moon will be accomplished with a three-stage vehicle generating 7.5 million pounds of thrust in the first stage, capable of placing 175,000 pounds in orbit around the earth and 70,000 pounds around the moon.

A lunar landing may be accomplished by bringing together two of these vehicles in space. The potentialities of such a rendezvous approach are being carefully considered. This would require two launches of the advanced Saturn. The first would place into orbit a large, fully fueled rocket stage. Once its orbit had been established, a second Saturn would launch the Apollo spacecraft and its auxiliary rockets into the same orbit and the crew would join it with the first orbiting stage. The largest rocket would then launch it into a flightpath to the moon.

Contracts have already been awarded for the development of a two-man spacecraft, to be called Gemini, to experiment with the rendezvous technique. Launched by a modified Titan II missile, it will be capable of remaining in orbit for a week or more. Eventually it will rendezvous with an Atlas-boosted Agena stage. Two-man flights will precede Project Apollo, which will begin with orbital flights, advance to circumlunar flights, and culminate with actual landings on the moon.

A direct flight to the moon will require an even larger launch vehicle with nearly double the thrust of the advanced Saturn. About 350 feet in height, it is called the Nova.

One of the major benefits being gleaned from this vast effort to conquer space is the stimulus which it is providing for scientific research in new and uncharted areas.

The scope of space research may be judged from the resources which it involves. Other industrial revolutions have been based upon efforts by relatively few individuals. For example, when Edison invented the first high-voltage electric bulb, there were only 2,000 industrial scientists and engineers in the United States. Today, however, it is estimated that there are more than 700,000 such individuals contributing to progress in the age of space.

This work is not related solely to our progress on the path to the moon. Much of it derives from the new knowledge of materials and techniques which has application in our daily lives.

Our accelerated scientific research in space has already produced useful knowledge which otherwise might not have been discovered in a decade, or even a century. These advances are being experienced by the housewife in her kitchen, the farmer in his field, the doctor in his operating room.

Let me give you some examples.

One of man's great concerns has long been to know more about weather, whether merely to plan a picnic, or to aid in planting a crop. Despite great advances in the process of gathering meteorological information, forecasters are still handicapped by the fact that only one-fifth of the globe is covered by land-based weather reporting systems.

Since the launching of the Tiros satellites, a wealth of new information regarding weather conditions around the world has been made available to meteorologists.

Tiros I, launched April 1, 1960, provided television coverage of the earth's cloud patterns. Subsequently, Tiros III, orbited in July 1961, to coincide with the hurricane season, is still gathering information on the origin, development, and movement of these massive tropical storms. In fact, the Weather Bureau used photographs taken from Tiros III to analyze and track storm Eliza in the Pacific and Hurricanes Carla and Esther in the gulf and the Atlantic. In the case of Esther, the Tiros satellite provided 2 precious days of advance warning before the giant wind was observed by aircraft.

The Tiros series will be succeeded by the Nimbus satellite, scheduled for launching late this year. An advanced design, which will be placed in polar orbit, Nimbus will be able to view every area on earth twice a day. Meteorologists believe this new information will ultimately permit accurate long- and short-range weather forecasting for periods as long as a month or even a season.

A second area of great progress is that of communications.

Citizens of almost every nation have already sighted Echo I, the huge passive communications satellite launched by NASA in 1960. Echo I demonstrated conclusively that, used as communications relays or reflectors, satellites can extend line-of-sight transmissions to intercontinental ranges.

With the world's growing need for communication facilities, and for cheaper and more reliable methods of transmission, the use of satellites holds forth enormous promise. During the past decade, the number of oversea telephone calls made or received in the United States grew from 1 million to nearly 4 million a year.

It is estimated that some 5,000 or more circuits will be needed in the next 5 years. An industry expert has estimated that a single communications satellite, costing about $40 million and placed in a 22,300-mile equatorial orbit, could accommodate as much traffic as a $500 million cable system.

A number of private companies have shown interest in commercial satellite communications. For example, the American Telephone and Telegraph Co. is negotiating with NASA for use of a rocket to launch a satellite which would relay signals across the Atlantic and amplify them with power from the sun. The company has announced its willingness to spend up to $25 million this year on experiments leading to an earth-orbiting communications system.

With satellites in orbit, the postman can anticipate less difficulty with "snow, rain, heat and gloom of night." Only last November, NASA assisted the Post Office Department in an experiment with Speedmail. A letter, urging the public to send Christmas presents early, was bounced off the satellite Echo from Stump Neck, Md., to Newark, N.J.—the first letter to be processed through outer space.

Research in space may also some day be responsible for saving your life. For example, people with some types of cardiac condition already are wearing a rhythm-control device to keep their hearts functioning while they live a normal life. This device, miniaturized by space scientists, is powered by tiny mercury batteries so small that it can be sewn into the patient's body.

Space research has led to miniature instruments which continuously measure a hospital patient's heart action, brain waves, blood pressure, and breathing, permitting him to be watched by remote control. Any change in condition is instantly recorded and a warning flashed.

One drug, developed from a missile propellant, is being used to treat mental ills. The problems involved in maintaining astronauts aboard spacecraft have led to a new method of rapidly lowering blood pressure during operations.

The search for new materials of lighter weight, greater strength and resistance to high temperatures and radiation—all necessary for use in space vehicles—is leading to countless new or improved products which will add to the pleasure of life in the future.

Pyroceram, a material originally devised for nose cones, now provides the housewife with pots and pans which can be taken from the freezer and immediately put in the hottest flame without damage. A fluxless aluminum solder can now be used to repair eavespouts, flashings, and utensils which formerly would have been discarded.

Miniaturization has produced radios as small as a lump of sugar. Research in electronics for space has brought remote control television switches. It is even possible to buy a wristwatch powered by the same mercury batteries that operate a timing mechanism developed for the Explorer satellite.

The byproducts of space research seem to be almost limitless, and are certain to change the course of our lives. Most important, however, is the fact that because of the impetus of space requirements, these new materials and new products will be available for use in our own lifetimes, not decades hence.

Other space research of more basic nature will certainly produce major changes in the way we live, and offer solutions to the many problems which confront the world and its growing population.

Future spacecraft will require new sources of power, and the research now being undertaken to find these sources may very well change the methods by which we heat our homes, power our automobiles, or cook our food. Among those being studied are the fuel cell, which converts fuel directly into electrical power without machinery or moving parts. Another is plasma power, generated through use of hot ionized gas. Still another potential source is photoelectric power, to say nothing of atomic energy.

Space research may also produce new sources and uses of water. It will lead to new discoveries with respect to noise—a vital factor in human engineering. The highly specialized computers required for launching and guiding satellites have already produced electronic mechanisms capable of functions which are beyond the limitations of a human being.

All of these efforts will lead to vast changes in our economy. They already are producing new employment and new leisure opportunities. As the program advances, these opportunities will grow.

We can count ourselves fortunate that space research will pay such large dividends in scientific knowledge and practical applications, since it would probably be necessary even without them.

Man must go to the moon, and getting him there offers a challenge to every nation.

In our position as leader of the free world, the United States cannot fail to meet that challenge, for failure could only mean victory for those who seek to change our way of life.

All of us share a heavy responsibility to make certain that this is not our fate.

Dedication of New Post Office at East Freedom, Pa., October 21, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, at East Freedom, Pa., on Saturday, October 21, 1961, it was my privilege to participate in the dedication of the new post office and to deliver the following address titled, "The Postal System Is Indispensable in Its Mission of Public Service":

THE POSTAL SYSTEM IS INDISPENSABLE IN ITS MISSION OF PUBLIC SERVICE

(Address by Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Member of Congress, of the 20th District of Pennsylvania, at the dedication of the East Freedom Post Office at East Freedom, Pa., on October 21, 1961, 2 p.m.)

It is a pleasure to be here this afternoon to participate in the ceremonies dedicating a new post office building to the service of the community of East Freedom.

Those of us privileged to call Blair County our home county are highly pleased that it is regarded as one of the most beautiful areas of Pennsylvania.

In addition we recall with pride that many of the communities of Blair County have played important roles in the history of our Nation and its expansion westward.

This dedication program reminds us that one of the most important institutions of the Nation is the postal service, composed of many parts, including post offices both large and small, the importance of any one of which cannot be truly measured by size.

The nationwide communications system known as the postal service is only as strong as each of its parts.

One weak link would weaken the entire service.

Although this new East Freedom post office is dwarfed in size my many of the large Federal buildings, such as we find in the Nation's Capital, it is no less important to the people it serves or to the postal system.

Someone may question whether the moving of the post office to this new building warrants a dedication ceremony.

True, this building does not house a new factory to bring employment and other economic benefits to this region.

Some may say: It is only new quarters for the post office and why the excitement about that?

After all, there has been a post office at East Freedom for 120 years or more.

In reply I would emphasize the fact that this is a unique occasion in the long history of the East Freedom Post Office because it is the first time that it has moved into a brandnew building.

Besides being the first occupants of the new building, the post office has available more than twice the space of the old post office quarters.

This fine new building we dedicate today to the postal service of this community, is an example of community enterprise, having been constructed with private funds and privately owned with the post office renting the space.

At this point I wish to congratulate Mr. Kenneth Claar, of East Freedom, who was successful in securing the contract to provide this new and modern post office building.

It is a credit to the community and an example of cooperation between the Federal Government and the private citizen.

The post office will occupy 1,000 square feet of space instead of the former 400 square feet; 100 square feet of platform will contribute to handling arrival and departure of the mails.

It is altogether fitting and proper that we should mark the completion of this building and its occupancy for public service with dedication ceremonies.

Such an occasion offers us an opportunity to pause and reflect on the significance of the services rendered by the post office, a symbol of man's freedom and progress.

We all tend to take the many vital services of the post office for granted in our daily lives.

We are prone to forget it has been here from the earliest beginnings of the community.

It is so much a part of the community and its services so dependable as to seem commonplace.

No one thinks about it, but everybody uses it.

Therefore, I am happy to join with you in this joyous occasion marking the beginning of a new phase in the history of the post office of East Freedom.

After several years of constant effort to improve postal facilities in my congressional district—it was pleasing to me to be able to announce on August 23, 1960, that a new post office building had been authorized for East Freedom.

Today, 14 months following the date of its authorization, this fine new post office building has become a reality.

On this happy occasion I wish to extend congratulations to the patrons of the East Freedom Post Office and to Postmaster Lloyd J. Burket and the staff of dedicated postal employees of the East Freedom Post Office who, with new modern lighting and equipment, are now able to provide even more efficient postal service to this community.

This occasion forcibly reminds us that the beginnings of things are matters of interest as well as importance.

Doubtless the majority present here are familiar with the history of this community, its beginnings, its people and institutions.

But I would like to recall, briefly, some of the earlier events and people concerned with this community.

The first settlers took land grants about 1787, before we were a nation.

Until 1838 the site which was to become East Freedom was part of the landholdings of Edward McGraw, Esq., and Valentine Lingenfelter.

As proprietor, Edward McGraw laid out a village plot in about 1839 or 1840.

The earliest building was a one-room log schoolhouse built in 1835, designated locally as being at Johnstown and Bedford crossroads.

Many roads met and crossed in this vicinity over which traveled a multitude of people and a large volume of goods moving westward across the Alleghenies to Portage, Johnstown, and Pittsburgh.

A building was erected to serve these crossroads' travelers known as Freedom House.

The first stage service, through what is now Blair County, was established in 1804, running from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh.

The first house built on the site of East Freedom appears to have been in 1838, when Joseph McCormick constructed a residence and saddler shop, a frame building which later became part of the Freedom Hotel.

Soon afterward a shoemaker, George Yinger, built a dwelling and George Kephart opened the Freedom Hotel, establishing the nucleus of the village.

Other pioneers included two merchants, a tanner, and a physician.

The village of East Freedom predates the county of Blair, which was established in 1846.

At that time there were 13 post offices in the county.

The community had a post office established at Three Forges in 1829, the predecessor of the East Freedom Post Office which was opened at the new village in 1840, with Robert Todd serving as postmaster.

In 1831, the postmaster at Three Forges was John McGee, who received an annual compensation of $8.05.

Ten years later Postmaster E. F. Schoenberges was paid $15.70 and the net proceeds of the post office were $26.91.

Postmaster Robert Todd, who served at East Freedom from its establishment until the last quarter of the year 1855, earned $40.82 in 1843 when net proceeds of the post office were $72.01.

William Anderson became postmaster in the fourth quarter of 1855 and served until May 4, 1861, when J. B. Kephart became postmaster.

The combined compensation paid to postmasters for the year 1861 amounted to $58.81 and there was noted a "balance due the United States" of $48.58.

The East Freedom Post Office receipts for the year 1960 amounted to $3,472 and it is rated as third-class post office.

The space and facilities which are now available to Postmaster Burket and his staff of dedicated postal employees are a far cry from the time when the early day postmasters conducted the business from home or store.

Important in the early development of this area was the completion of the main line of the Pennsylvania Railroad in 1854, which superseded the Juniata Canal and Portage Railroad facilities for transporting goods and people, including the mail, making Altoona the main distributing point for mails in Blair County.

In 1910 the Bedford and Hollidaysburg branch of the Pennsylvania Railroad was completed, serving the East Freedom Post Office and others in Blair and Bedford Counties along the line to Bedford and Cumberland.

Almost all the post offices of Blair County at one time had star route service.

The branch line of the railroad was discontinued in the county and the automobile became the mail transportation agency.

Contracts were made with individuals to transport the mails and the routes they used became known as star routes.

Now there is airmail service from airports located within the county to supplement other methods of transporting the mails.

The importance of adequate postal facilities to a community cannot be overestimated.

No other institution touches the life of each one as does the post office.

Though the postal service is a vast organization, it is made up of many local units such as the East Freedom Post Office, each a part of the community in which it is located, staffed by friends and fellow citizens of the people of the community.

The standards upheld by the local post office service make possible the high level of service attained by the whole postal system.

Innovations and improvements have marked the progress of the postal service from its beginning.

Although it is one of our oldest institutions it has kept pace with the growth of the Nation.

As early settlers pushed across the Alleghenies westward to the Pacific, the postal service followed them.

The post office of the 19th century did not merely follow the pioneers but was in the vanguard of the movement.

Where several families chose to settle in the same locale, one of the first steps in establishing a village or town was to set up a post office in one of the homes or stores.

It is recorded that in 1829, when the predecessor to the East Freedom Post Office was established, there were 8,050 post offices and 115,000 miles of post roads to serve a population of 12 million.

The Post Office Department handled nearly 14 million letters during the year.

Service was slow by modern standards; the only means of transportation available were horseback, stagecoach, ships and boats, and in some regions mail was carried on foot.

Despite all reforms possible under existing conditions, in 1837 stagecoaches were still the principal means of transporting the mails though a large part of the service was by means of post riders and sulkies.

Postage rates were still essentially the same as 100 years before when Benjamin Franklin was postmaster in Philadelphia.

Envelopes and postage stamps were unknown.

In addition to innovations in the transportation field, the post office has introduced many new services over the past 150 years, a period which nearly coincides with the existence of the East Freedom Post Office.

In 1847 the first adhesive postage stamps were issued, providing a more efficient method of paying postage.

Although prepayment of postage was made compulsory in 1855, the use of the adhesive postage stamps was not made obligatory until 1856.

During the period when postage was collected from the addressee, or later when prepaid postage was collected by both money and stamps, imagine the complications for the postmaster.

Also picture the inconvenience if, today, it should be necessary to collect the money for each piece of mail sent through our post office as the early postmasters did.

Stamped envelopes were first issued in 1853 and envelopes bearing the purchaser's return card were authorized in 1865.

Registry service became an added convenience in 1855, which did not speed the mail but made it more secure.

During the years since its establishment, the East Freedom Post Office has witnessed and been a part of the progress of the postal service.

Many of the modern postal services had their origin in the legislation of 1845, including the star routes.

Although East Freedom was not directly concerned with the pony express which was inaugurated in 1860, this service played an important part in speeding settlement of the West and was responsible for experiments which led to the railway post office car in 1862.

Rural delivery service, which started in 1896, made the post office even more important to this community as well as to many others.

We are all aware of what this service has meant and continues to mean to many people.

There is no measure of the convenience of having personal and business letters, magazines, and newspapers delivered daily to us at our homes.

Parcel post service increased the value of rural delivery to many citizens.

This rural delivery service means we are not obliged to make calls at the post office so frequently.

Perhaps this very service has caused the significance of the post office to become less apparent than in the days when everyone was required to call in person for his mail.

The list of services rendered by the postal service is far too long to detail here.

Briefly, I will mention some of the duties added to the work of postal employees aside from the handling of the mails.

Over the years these include the sale of U.S. bonds and Treasury certificates, sale and redemption of various types of bonds such as the liberty and savings bonds, sale of revenue stamps and duck stamps, collection of custom duties on parcels, registering of aliens, forwarding donations for a long list of charitable organizations, taking deer or grouse census, giving information on civil service examinations, display of posters for the armed services and of pictures of criminals wanted by Federal authorities.

The post office assists almost every other department of Government in some way and in many instances is the only representative of the Federal Government in the community.

The post office of East Freedom is part of the Nation's postal service, a service which has contributed so much to the progress and welfare of the people. Like the national postal service, the post office of East Freedom has been and continues to be a vital and significant institution in the lives of the citizens of this community.

Therefore, as a Member of Congress who has consistently sought to help modernize some 12,000 post offices considered obsolete or providing inadequate space, I share your joy on the acquisition of this new and modern post office building, and I am pleased to be here with you today to participate in the dedication ceremonies.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Joseph J. Fedorek, rector, St. Michael's Ukrainian Catholic Church, Shenandoah, Pa., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Almighty, all loving, and eternal Father, we Thy children humbly bow and acknowledge Thy divine benevolence and offer our profound gratitude for the abundant blessings Thou hast bestowed upon America and her children.

We beseech Thee, our Creator, to look favorably upon our beloved President John Kennedy and to guide, strengthen, and assist him in the arduous duties and obligations that daily confront him. Bless our Vice President, Lyndon Johnson; grant wisdom, understanding, and courage to the Members of this 87th Congress and divine guidance to the new Speaker of this House, John McCormack.

Merciful Father, we recommend to Thy clemency the souls of the heroic dead of our Armed Forces; hold not against them any of their iniquities, but grant them eternal rest with the company of Thy saints in heaven.

Cognizant and deeply grateful for the freedoms which we enjoy in these United States of America, we pray to Thee, our Heavenly Father, for all enslaved peoples and nations, whose names and sufferings are invoked in the Captive Nations Week resolution enacted by Congress.

Our Father, in whose image we, Thy children, have been created; Thou hast instilled in our hearts at birth the desire to live as free human beings; we implore Thee today on the 44th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, to turn Thy benevolent countenance on this enslaved nation and her children and to sustain them with hope, they, who were the first to feel the lash of liquidations and inhuman tortures of the Kremlin.

O God, in spite of the many crosses borne by your Ukrainian children in slave-labor camps, in prisons, Siberian wastelands, death marches, and starvation, yet, Thy children remain steadfast and are sustained in their faith, recalling frequently the Good Friday endured by Thy divine Son prior to His glorious resurrection on Easter Sunday.

May the end be in sight of the Good Friday being endured by the Ukrainian Nation. May its resurrection as a sovereign nation be swift in coming to pass, we pray and beseech Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord, Thy Son, who with Thee liveth and reigneth in the unity of the Holy Ghost forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 18, was read and approved.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

JANUARY 22, 1962.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's office at 1:15 p.m. on January 20, 1962, and said to contain the Economic Report of the President together with the annual report of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 278)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Joint Economic Committee and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I report to you under the provisions of the Employment Act of 1946 at a time when—

The economy has regained its momentum;

The economy is responding to the Federal Government's efforts, under the act, "to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power";

The economy is again moving toward the central objective of the act—to afford "useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work."

My first Economic Report is an appropriate occasion to reemphasize my dedication to the principles of the Employment Act. As a declaration of national purpose and as a recognition of Federal responsibility, the act has few parallels in the Nation's history. In passing the act by heavy bipartisan majorities, the Congress registered the consensus of the American people that this Nation will not countenance the suffering, frustration, and injustice of unemployment, or let the vast potential of the world's leading economy run to waste in idle manpower, silent machinery, and empty plants.

The framers of the Employment Act were wise to choose the promotion of "maximum employment, production, and purchasing power" as the keystone of national economic policy. They were confident that these objectives can be effectively promoted "in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare." They knew that our pursuit of maximum employment and production would be tempered with compassion, with justice, and with a concern for the future. But they knew also that the other standards we set for our economy are easier to meet when it is operating at capacity. A full employment economy provides opportunities for useful and satisfying work. It rewards enterprise with profit. It generates saving for the future and transforms it into productive investment. It opens doors for the unskilled and underprivileged and closes them against want and frustration. The conquest of unemployment is not the sole end of economic policy, but it is surely an indispensable beginning.

The record of the economy since 1946 is a vast improvement over the prolonged mass unemployment of the 1930's. The Employment Act itself deserves no small part of the credit. Under the mandate and procedures of the act, both Congress and the Executive have kept the health of the national economy and the economic policies of the Government under constant review. And the national commitment to high employment has enabled business firms and consumers to act and to plan without fear of another great depression.

Though the postwar record is free of major depression, it is marred by four recessions. In the past 15 years, the economy has spent a total of 7 years regaining previous peaks of industrial production. In 2 months out of 3, 4 percent or more of those able, willing, and seeking to work have been unable to find jobs. We must do better in the 1960's.

To combat future recessions—to keep them short and shallow if they occur—I urge adoption of a three-part program for sustained prosperity, which will (1) provide standby power, subject to congressional veto, for temporary income tax reductions, (2) set up a standby program of public capital improvements, and (3) strengthen the unemployment insurance system.

These three measures will enable the Government to counter swings in business activity more promptly and more powerfully than ever before. They will give new and concrete meaning to the declaration of policy made in the Employment Act. They will constitute the greatest step forward in public policy for economic stability since the act itself.

As the Employment Act prescribes, I shall in this report review "economic conditions" in the United States in 1961 and "current and foreseeable economic trends in the levels of employment, production, and purchasing power"; set forth "the levels of employment, production, and purchasing power obtaining in the United States and such levels needed to carry out the policy" of the act; and present my economic program and legislative recommendations for 1962.

PROGRESS IN 1961

Last January the economy was in the grip of recession. Nearly 7 percent of the labor force was unemployed. Almost one-fifth of manufacturing capacity lay idle. Actual output was running $50 billion (annual rate) short of the economy's great potential. These figures reflected not only the setback of 1960–61 but the incomplete recovery from the recession of 1957–58. The task before us was to recover not from one but from two recessions.

At the same time, gold was leaving the country at a rate of more than $300 million a month. In the 3 previous years, the Nation had run a total deficit of $10 billion in its basic international accounts. These large and persistent deficits had weakened confidence in the dollar.

In my message to the Congress on February 2, I stated that this administration's "realistic aims for 1961 are to reverse the downtrend in our economy, to narrow the gap of unused potential, to abate the waste and misery of unemployment, and at the same time to maintain reasonable stability of the price level." In a message on the balance of payments on February 6, I added a fifth aim, to restore confidence in the dollar and to reduce the deficit in international payments.

These five aims for 1961 have been achieved:

(1) The downtrend was reversed. Gross national product (GNP) grew from $501 billion (annual rate) in the first quarter to a record rate of $542 billion in the last quarter. In July, industrial production regained its previous peak, and by the end of the year it showed a total rise of 13 percent.

(2) These gains brought into productive use nearly half the plant capacity which was idle at the beginning of the year. The growth of GNP narrowed the overall gap of unused potential from an estimated 10 percent to 5 percent.

(3) Unemployment dropped from 6.8 to 6.1 percent of the labor force. The number of areas of substantial labor surplus declined from 101 in March to 60 in December.

(4) Price stability has been maintained during the recovery. Since February, wholesale prices have fallen slightly, and consumer prices have risen only one-half of 1 percent.

(5) Confidence in the dollar has been restored. Our gold losses were cut from $1.7 billion in 1960 to less than $0.9 billion in 1961. The deficit in 1961 in our basic international transactions was about one-third as large as in 1960.

The program to restore momentum to the American economy which I proposed to the Congress on February 2 resulted in prompt legislation to—

Extend unemployment insurance benefits on a temporary basis;

Make Federal aid available, through the States, to dependent children of the unemployed;

Liberalize social security benefits;

Promote homebuilding under the Housing Act of 1961;

Raise the minimum wage and extend it to more workers;

Provide Federal aid under the Area Redevelopment Act, to revitalize the economies of areas with large and persistent unemployment.

Prompt executive action was taken to accelerate Federal purchases and procurement, highway fund distributions, tax refunds, and veterans' life insurance dividends. The administration raised farm price supports, expanded the food distribution program, and established eight pilot food stamp programs.

Monetary and credit policies responded to the dual demands of economic recovery and the balance of payments. On the one hand, the Federal Reserve System maintained general monetary ease; Federal Reserve open market operations, complemented by Treasury management of the public debt and of Government investment accounts, assured an ample supply of credit which served to counter upward pressures on long-term interest rates; reduction of FHA ceiling rates, supported by FNMA mortgage purchases, eased mortgage credit and stimulated homebuilding; and the Small Business Administration made its credit more widely available at lower cost. On the other hand, both monetary and debt management policies countered downward pressures on short-term rates, with a view to checking the outflow of funds to money markets abroad.

The Federal budget played its proper role as a powerful instrument for promoting economic recovery. The measures to relieve distress and restore economic momentum expanded purchasing power early in the year. Subsequently, major increases in expenditure for national security and space programs became necessary. In a fully employed economy, these increases would have required new tax revenues to match. But I did not recommend tax increases at this point because they would have cut into private purchasing power and retarded recovery.

The increase of GNP—$41 billion (annual rate) from the first to the fourth quarter—reflected increased purchases of goods and services by consumers, business, and governments:

Consumers accounted for nearly half. As household incomes rose, consumer expenditure expanded by $18 billion.

Residential construction and business expenditures for fixed investment responded promptly to the recovery and to favorable credit conditions. By the end of the year, they had risen by $8 billion.

Business stopped liquidating inventories and started rebuilding them. This shift, which occurred early in the year and helped get recovery off to a flying start, added $8 billion to the demand for goods and services by the fourth quarter.

Federal, State, and local government purchases rose by $8 billion.

Although exports were somewhat higher in the fourth quarter than in the first, the rise in imports in response to recovery lowered net exports by $1 billion.

Labor, business, and farm incomes rose as the economy recovered. Wages and salaries increased by $19 billion (annual rate) from the first quarter to the fourth. Corporate profits after taxes recovered sharply, receiving about 15 percent of the gains in GNP. With the help of new programs, farm operators' net income from farming increased from $12 billion in 1960 to $13 billion in 1961, and net income per farm rose by $350. The after-tax incomes of American consumers increased by $21 billion, or $92 per capita, during the year. Since consumer prices rose by only one-half of 1 percent, these gains in income were almost entirely gains in real purchasing power.

One million jobs were added by nonagricultural establishments during the expansion. But employment did not keep pace with production and income. Productivity rose rapidly as capacity was more fully and efficiently utilized. And more workers on part-time jobs were able to work full time.

The record of 1961 demonstrated again the resiliency of the U.S. economy with well-timed support from Government policy. Business responded to the expansion of purchasing power by producing more goods and services, not by raising prices. Indeed, the record of price stability in three quarters of expansion was better than in the three preceding quarters of recession. The rates of advance of production and income compared favorably with the two preceding periods of expansion. Production grew rapidly without straining capacity or encountering bottlenecks.

As 1961 ended, actual output was still $25 to $30 billion short of potential, and unemployment was far too high. But much of the industrial manpower, machinery, and plant that lay idle a year ago had been drawn back into productive use. And the momentum of the 1961 recovery should carry the economy further toward full employment and full production in 1962.

GOALS OF ECONOMIC POLICY

Though we may take satisfaction with our progress to date, we dare not rest content. The unfinished business of economic policy includes (1) the achievement of full employment and sustained prosperity without inflation, (2) the acceleration of economic growth, (3) the extension of equality of opportunity, and (4) the restoration of balance of payments equilibrium. Economic policy thus confronts a demanding assignment, but one which can and will be met within the framework of a free economy.

OUR GOAL OF FULL AND SUSTAINED PROSPERITY WITHOUT INFLATION

Recovery has carried the economy only part of the way to the goal of maximum production, employment, and purchasing power. The standing challenge of the Employment Act is not merely to do better, but to do our best—the maximum. Attainment of that maximum in 1963 would mean a gross national product of approximately $600 billion, wages and salaries of over $320 billion, and corporate profits of as much as $60 billion, all in 1961 prices. The material gains are themselves staggering, but they are less important than the new sense of purpose and the new opportunities for improvement of American life that could be realized by maximum use of the productive capacity now lying idle and the capacity yet to be created.

Involuntary unemployment is the most dramatic sign and disheartening consequence of underutilization of productive capacity. It translates into human terms what may otherwise seem merely an abstract statistic. We cannot afford to settle for any prescribed level of unemployment. But for working purposes we view a 4-percent unemployment rate as a temporary target. It can be achieved in 1963, if appropriate fiscal, monetary, and other policies are used. The achievable rate can be lowered still further by effective policies to help the labor force acquire the skills and mobility appropriate to a changing economy. We must also continue the cooperative effort, begun with the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, to bring industry to depressed areas and jobs to displaced workers. Ultimately, we must reduce unemployment to the minimum compatible with the functioning of a free economy.

We must seek full recovery without endangering the price stability of the last 4 years. The experience of the past year has shown that expansion without inflation is possible. With cooperation from labor and management, I am confident that we can go on to write a record of full employment without inflation.

The task of economic stabilization does not end with the achievement of full recovery. There remains the problem of keeping the economy from straying too far above or below the path of steady high employment. One way lies inflation, and the other way lies recession. Flexible and vigilant fiscal and monetary policies will allow us to hold the narrow middle course.

OUR GOAL OF ECONOMIC GROWTH

While we move toward full and sustained use of today's productive capacity, we must expand our potential for tomorrow. Our postwar economic growth—though a step ahead of our record for the last half-century—has been slowing down. We have not in recent years maintained the 4- to 4½-percent growth rate which characterized the early postwar period. We should not settle for less than the achievement of a long-term growth rate matching the early postwar record. Increasing our growth rate to 4½ percent a year lies within the range of our capabilities during the 1960's. It will lay the groundwork for meeting both our domestic needs and our world responsibilities.

In November of last year we joined with our 19 fellow members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development in setting a common target for economic growth. Together we pledged ourselves to adopt national and international policies aimed at increasing the combined output of the Atlantic community by 50 percent between 1960 and 1970. The nations of the West are encouraged and enlivened by America's determination to make its full contribution to this joint effort.

We can do our share. In the mid-1960's, the children born in 1943 and after will be arriving at working age. The resulting rapid growth in our labor force offers us an opportunity, not a burden—provided that we deliver not only the jobs but also the research, the training, and the capital investment to endow our new workers with high and rising productivity as they enter economic life.

OUR GOAL OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

Increasingly in our lifetime, American prosperity has been widely shared and it must continue so. The spread of primary, secondary, and higher education, the wider availability of medical services, and the improved postwar performance of our economy have bettered the economic status of the poorest families and individuals.

But prosperity has not wiped out poverty. In 1960, 7 million families and individuals had personal incomes lower than $2,000. In part, our failure to overcome poverty is a consequence of our failure to operate the economy at potential. The incidence of unemployment is always uneven, and increases in unemployment tend to inflict the greatest income loss on those least able to afford it. But there is a claim on our conscience from others, whose poverty is barely touched by cyclical improvements in general economic activity. To an increasing extent, the poorest families in America are those headed by women, the elderly, nonwhites, migratory workers, and the physically or mentally handicapped—people who are short-changed even in time of prosperity.

Last year's increase in the minimum wage is evidence of our concern for the welfare of our low-income fellow citizens. Other legislative proposals now pending will be particularly effective in improving the lot of the least fortunate. These include (1) health insurance for the aged, financed through the social security system, (2) Federal aid for training and retraining our unemployed and underemployed workers, (3) the permanent strengthening of our unemployment compensation system, and (4) substantial revision in our public welfare and assistance program, stressing rehabilitation services which help to restore families to independence.

Public education has been the great bulwark of equality of opportunity in our democracy for more than a century. Our schools have been a major means of preventing early handicaps from hardening into permanent ignorance and poverty. There can be no better investment in equity and democracy—and no better instrument for economic growth. For this reason, I urge action by the Congress to provide Federal aid for more adequate public school facilities, higher teachers' salaries, and better quality in education. I urge early completion of congressional action on the bill to authorize loans for construction of college academic facilities and to provide scholarships for able students who need help. The talent of our youth is a resource which must not be wasted.

Finally, I shall soon propose to the Congress an intensive program to reduce adult illiteracy, a handicap which too many of our fellow citizens suffer because of inadequate educational opportunities in the past.

OUR GOAL OF BASIC BALANCE IN INTERNATIONAL PAYMENTS

Persistent international payments deficits and gold outflows have made the balance of payments a critical problem of economic policy. We must attain a balance in our international transactions which permits us to meet heavy obligations abroad for the security and development of the free world, without continued depletion of our gold reserves or excessive accumulation of short-term dollar liabilities to foreigners. Simultaneously, we must continue to reduce barriers to international trade and to increase the flow of resources from developed to developing countries. To increase our exports is a task of highest priority, and one which gives heightened significance to the maintenance of price stability and the rapid increase of productivity at home.

POLICIES FOR 1962

PROSPECTS FOR 1962

The Nation will make further economic progress in 1962. Broad advances are in prospect for the private economy. The gains already achieved have set the stage for further new records in output, employment, personal income, and profits. Rising household incomes brighten the outlook for further increases in consumer buying, particularly of durable goods. Business firms will need larger inventories to support higher sales, and improved profits and expanded markets will lead to rising capital outlays. The outlays of Federal, State, and local governments will continue to increase as we work for peace and progress.

In the first half of 1962, we may therefore expect vigorous expansion in production and incomes, with GNP increasing to a range of $565 to $570 billion in the second quarter, employment continuing to rise, and the unemployment rate falling further.

In the second half of 1962, business investment in plant and equipment should pick up speed and help maintain the momentum of progress toward full employment—and toward future economic growth. Rising output should push factory operating rates closer to capacity and raise profits still further above previous records. To these incentives for capital expenditures will be added Treasury liberalization of depreciation guidelines and, if the Congress acts favorably, the 8 percent tax credit for machinery and equipment outlays.

For 1962 as a whole, GNP is expected to rise approximately $50 billion above the $521 billion level of 1961. This would be another giant stride toward a fully employed economy. The record of past recoveries and of the U.S. economy's enormous and growing potential indicates that this is a gain we can achieve. In the perspective of our commitments both to our own expanding population and to the world, it is a gain we need to achieve.

BUDGETARY POLICY

Prosperity shrinks budgetary deficits, as recessions create them. Budget revenues are expected to rise 13 percent between the fiscal years 1962 and 1963; revenues rose 14½ percent between 1959 and 1960 in the previous upswing. Such sensitivity of budget revenues to business activity is desirable because it moderates swings in private purchasing power.

I have submitted to the Congress a budget which will balance in fiscal 1963 as prosperity generates sharply rising tax revenues. The budget is appropriately paced to the expected rate of economic expansion. It will give less stimulus to business activity as private demand for goods and services grows stronger and shoulders more of the responsibility for continued gains. But the shift will be moderate and gradual. We have learned from the disappointing 1959–60 experience that an abrupt and excessively large swing in the budget can drain the vigor from the private economy and halt its progress, especially if a restrictive monetary policy is followed simultaneously. This will not be repeated. Budget outlays will rise by $3½ billion from fiscal 1962 to fiscal 1963, whereas they fell by more than that amount from fiscal 1959 to fiscal 1960. The 1963 budget starts from a much smaller deficit and will move to a moderate surplus as the recovery strengthens.

With support from increased Government expenditures and other Government policies, the momentum of the recovery is expected to raise GNP to $570 billion for 1962 as a whole. Prompt enactment of the proposed tax credit for investment would give the economy further strength. Economic expansion at the expected pace will yield $93 billion in budget revenues in fiscal 1963 to cover $92.5 billion in budget expenditures. If private demands for goods and services should prove to be weaker in 1962 than now anticipated, less private purchasing power will flow into taxes, and budget revenues will fall short of the $93 billion figure. If private demands are stronger, tax receipts will rise further and budget revenues will exceed expectations.

A surplus of $4.4 billion in fiscal 1963 is expected in the national income accounts budget, a budget constructed to measure the direct impact of Federal expenditures and receipts on the flow of total spending. The surplus would be several billion dollars higher if the economy were operating steadily at a level high enough to hold unemployment to 4 percent.

Either surplus—prospective or potential—is both a challenge and an opportunity. A Government surplus is a form of saving—an excess of income over expenditure. Like any other form of saving, it releases labor and other productive resources which can be used to create new investment goods—plant, equipment, or houses. If investment demand is not strong enough to use the resources and labor, they will be wasted in unemployment and idle capacity, and the surplus itself will not be realized. But if the necessary investment demand is present, the surplus will make possible the acceleration of economic growth by enlarging the future productive power of the economy. The Government is seeking to help American industry to meet this challenge and seize this opportunity, through such measures as the 8-percent investment tax credit and revisions of depreciation guidelines.

We face 1962 with optimism but not complacency. If private demand shows unexpected strength, public policy must and will act to avert the dangers of rising prices. If demand falls short of current expectations, more expansionary policies will be pursued. In 1962, vigilance and flexibility must be the guardians of economic optimism.

MONETARY AND CREDIT POLICIES

Monetary, credit, and debt management policies can also help to assure that productive outlets exist for the funds that the American people save from prosperity incomes. The balance foreseen in the budget for fiscal year 1963, and the surplus which would arise at full employment, both indicate that fiscal policy is assuming a large share of the burden of forestalling inflationary excesses of demand. With monetary and related policies relieved of a substantial part of this burden, they can more effectively be used to assure a flow of investment funds which will transform the economy's present capacity to save into future capacity to produce.

At the same time, monetary and debt management policies must continue to protect the balance of international payments against outflows of short-term capital. As in 1961, domestic expansion and the balance of payments confront these policies with a dual task, requiring continued ingenuity in technique and flexibility in emphasis.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

The program launched last year to reduce our payments deficit and maintain confidence in the dollar will, I am sure, show further results in 1962. I am hopeful that the target of reasonable equilibrium in our international payments can be achieved within the next 2 years; but this will require a determined effort on the part of all of us—Government, business, and labor. This effort must proceed on a number of fronts.

Export expansion: An increase in the U.S. trade surplus is of the first importance. If we are to meet our international responsibilities, we must, increase exports more rapidly than the increase in imports which accompanies our economic growth.

Our efforts to raise exports urgently require that we negotiate a reduction in the tariff of the European Common Market. I shall shortly transmit to the Congress a special message elaborating the details of the proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and explaining why I believe that a new trade policy initiative is imperative this year.

To encourage American businessmen to become more export-minded, we have inaugurated a new export insurance program under the leadership of the Export-Import Bank, and we have stepped up our export promotion drive by improving the commercial services abroad of the U.S. Government, establishing trade centers abroad, planning trade fairs, improving the trade mission program, and working with business firms on export opportunities through field offices of the Department of Commerce and the Small Business Administration. Foreign travel to the United States, which returns dollars to our shores, is now being promoted through the first Federal agency ever created for this purpose.

Prices and productivity: Our export drive will founder if we cannot keep our prices competitive in world markets. Though our recent price performance has been excellent, the improving economic climate of 1962 will test anew the statesmanship of our business and labor leaders. I believe that they will pass the test; our Nation today possesses a new understanding of the vital link between our level of prices and our balance of payments.

In the long run, the competitive position of U.S. industry depends on a sustained and rapid advance in productivity. In this, the interests of economic recovery, long run growth, and the strength of the dollar coincide. Modernization and expansion of our industrial plant will accelerate the advance of productivity.

Foreign investment: To place controls over the flow of private American capital abroad would be contrary to our traditions and our economic interests. But neither is there justification for special tax incentives which stimulate the flow of U.S. investment to countries now strong and economically developed, and I again urge the elimination of these special incentives.

The new foreign trade program which I am proposing to the Congress will help to reduce another artificial incentive to U.S. firms to invest abroad. The European Common Market has attracted American capital, partly because American businessmen fear that they will be unable to compete in the growing European market unless they build plants behind the common tariff wall. We must negotiate down the barriers to trade between the two great continental markets, so that the exports of our industry and agriculture can have full opportunity to compete in Europe.

Governmental expenditures abroad: Military expenditures form by far the greater part of our governmental outlays abroad. We are discussing with certain of our European allies the extent to which they can increase their own military procurement from the United States to offset our dollar expenditures there. As a result, the net cost to our balance of payments is expected to be reduced during the coming year, in spite of increased deployment of forces abroad because of the Berlin situation.

To curtail our foreign aid programs in order to strengthen our balance of payments would be to sacrifice more than we gain. But we can cut back on the foreign currency costs of our aid programs, and thus reduce the burden on our balance of payments. A large percentage of our foreign aid is already spent for procurement in the United States; this proportion will rise as our tightened procurement procedures become increasingly effective.

We have sought to induce other advanced countries to undertake a larger share of the foreign aid effort. We will continue our efforts through the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development to obtain a higher level of economic assistance by other industrial nations to the less-developed countries.

Short-term capital movements: Outflows of volatile short-term funds added to the pressures on the dollar in 1960. Our policies in 1961 have diminished the dangers of disruptive movements of short-term capital. For the first time in a generation, the Treasury is helping to stabilize the dollar by operations in the international exchange markets. The Federal Reserve and the Treasury, in administering their monetary policy and debt management responsibilities, have sought to meet the needs of domestic recovery in ways which would not lead to outflows of short-term capital.

During the past year, we have consulted periodically with our principal financial partners, both bilaterally and within the framework of the OECD. These consultations have led to close cooperation among fiscal and monetary authorities in a common effort to prevent disruptive currency movements.

Strengthening the international monetary system: The International Monetary Fund is playing an increasingly important role in preserving international monetary stability. The reserve strength behind the dollar includes our drawing rights on the Fund, of which $1.7 billion is automatically available under current practices of the Fund. An additional $4.1 billion could become available under Fund policies, insofar as the Fund has available resources in gold and usable foreign currencies. Recently, the Fund has diversified its use of currencies in meeting drawings by member countries, relying less heavily on dollars and more heavily on the currencies of countries with payments surpluses. However, the Fund's regular holdings of the currencies of some important industrial countries are not adequate to meet potential demands for them.

In a message to the Congress last February, I said: "We must now, in cooperation with other lending countries, begin to consider ways in which international monetary institutions—especially the International Monetary Fund—can be strengthened and more effectively utilized, both in furnishing needed increases in reserves, and in providing the flexibility required to support a healthy and growing world economy."

We have now taken an important step in this direction. Agreement has been reached among 10 of the major industrial countries to lend to the Fund specified amounts of their currencies when necessary to cope with or forestall pressures which may impair the international monetary system. These standby facilities of $6 billion will be a major defense against international monetary speculation and will powerfully reinforce the effectiveness of the Fund. They will provide resources to make our drawing rights in the Fund effective, should we need to use them. Moreover, the U.S. standby commitment of $2 billion will augment the resources potentially available through the Fund to other participants in the agreement, when our balance of payments and reserve positions are strong. I shall shortly submit a request to Congress for appropriate enabling legislation.

PRICES AND WAGES

Prices and production need not travel together. A number of foreign countries have experienced both rapid growth and stable prices in recent years. We ourselves, in 1961, enjoyed a stable price level during a brisk economic recovery.

While rising prices will not necessarily accompany the expansion we expect in 1962, neither can we rely on chance to keep our price level stable. Creeping inflation in the years 1955–57 weakened our international competitive position. We cannot afford to allow a repetition of that experience.

We do not foresee in 1962 a level of demand for goods and services which will strain the economy's capacity to produce. Neither is it likely that many industries will find themselves pressing against their capacity ceilings. Inflationary pressures from these sources should not be a problem.

But in those sectors where both companies and unions possess substantial market power the interplay of price and wage decisions could set off a movement toward a higher price level. If this were to occur, the whole Nation would be the victim.

I do not believe that American business or labor will allow this to happen. All of us have learned a great deal from the economic events of the past 15 years. Among both businessmen and workers, there is growing recognition that the road to higher real profits and higher real wages is the road of increased productivity. When better plant and equipment enable the labor force to produce more in the same number of hours, there is more to share among all the contributors to the productive process—and this can happen with no increase in prices. Gains achieved in this manner endure, while gains achieved in one turn of the price-wage spiral vanish on the next.

The Nation must rely on the good sense and public spirit of our business and labor leaders to hold the line on the price level in 1962. If labor leaders in our major industries will accept the productivity benchmark as a guide to wage objectives, and if management in these industries will practice equivalent restraint in their price decisions, the year ahead will be a brilliant chapter in the record of the responsible exercise of freedom.

MEASURES FOR A STRONGER ECONOMY

The final section of my report is summary of my recommendations for legislative action (1) to strengthen our defenses against recession, (2) to strengthen our financial system, (3) to strengthen our manpower base, and (4) to strengthen our tax system.

A PROGRAM FOR SUSTAINED PROSPERITY

Recurrent recessions have thrown the postwar American economy off stride at a time when the economies of other major industrial countries have moved steadily ahead. To improve our future performance I urge the Congress to join with me in erecting a defense-in-depth against future recessions. The basic elements of this defense are (1) Presidential standby authority for prompt, temporary income tax reductions, (2) Presidential standby authority for capital improvements expenditures, and (3) a permanent strengthening of the unemployment compensation system. These three measures parallel important proposals of the Commission on Money and Credit, whose further recommendations are treated under the next heading.

In our free enterprise economy, fluctuations in business and consumer spending will, of course, always occur. But this need not doom us to an alternation of lean years and fat. The business cycle does not have the inevitability of the calendar. The Government can time its fiscal transactions to offset and to dampen fluctuations in the private economy. Our fiscal system and budget policy already contribute to economic stability, to a much greater degree than before the war. But the time is ripe, and the need apparent, to equip the Government to act more promptly, more flexibly, and more forcefully to stabilize the economy—to carry out more effectively its charge under the Employment Act.

Standby tax reduction authority: First, I recommend the enactment of standby authority under which the President, subject to veto by the Congress, could make prompt temporary reductions in the rates of the individual income tax to combat recessions, as follows:

(1) Before proposing a temporary tax reduction, the President must make a finding that such action is required to meet the objectives of the Employment Act.

(2) Upon such finding, the President would submit to Congress a proposed temporary uniform reduction in all individual income tax rates. The proposed temporary rates may not be more than 5 percentage points lower than the rates permanently established by the Congress.

(3) This change would take effect 30 days after submission, unless rejected by a joint resolution of the Congress.

(4) It would remain in effect for 6 months, subject to revision or renewal by the same process or extension by a joint resolution of the Congress.

(5) If the Congress were not in session, a Presidentially proposed tax adjustment would automatically take effect but would terminate 30 days after the Congress reconvened. Extension would require a new proposal by the President, which would be subject to congressional veto.

A temporary reduction of individual income tax rates across the board can be a powerful safeguard against recession. It would reduce the annual rate of tax collections by $2 billion per percentage point, or a maximum of $10 billion—$1 billion per point, or a $5-billion maximum, for 6 months—at present levels of income. These figures should be measured against the costs they are designed to forestall:

The tens of billions of potential output that run to waste in recession;

The pain and frustration of the millions whom recessions throw out of work;

The budget deficits of $12.4 billion in fiscal 1959 or $7.0 billion this year.

The proposed partial tax suspension would launch a prompt counterattack on the cumulative forces of recession. It would be reflected immediately in lower withholding deductions and higher take-home pay for millions of Americans. Markets for consumer goods and services would promptly feel the stimulative influence of the tax suspension.

It would offer strong support to the economy for a timely interval, while preserving the revenue-raising powers of our tax system in prosperity and the wise traditional procedures of the Congress for making permanent revisions and reforms in the system. I am not asking the Congress to delegate its power to levy taxes, but to authorize a temporary and emergency suspension of taxes by the President—subject to the checkrein of congressional veto—in situations where time is of the essence.

Standby capital improvements authority: Second, I recommend that the Congress provide standby authority to the President to accelerate and initiate up to $2 billion of appropriately timed capital improvements when unemployment is rising, as follows:

(1) The President would be authorized to initiate the program within 2 months after the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate—

(a) Had risen in at least 3 out of 4 months (or in 4 out of 6 months); and

(b) Had risen to a level at least 1 percentage point higher than its level 4 months (or 6 months) earlier.

(2) Before invoking this authority, the President must make a finding that current and prospective economic developments require such action to achieve the objectives of the Employment Act.

(3) Upon such finding, the President would be authorized to commit—

(a) Up to $750 million in the acceleration of direct Federal expenditures previously authorized by the Congress,

(b) Up to $750 million for grants-in-aid to State and local governments,

(c) Up to $250 million in loans to States and localities which would otherwise be unable to meet their share of project costs, and

(d) Up to $250 million additional to be distributed among the above three categories as he might deem appropriate.

(4) The authority to initiate new projects under the capital improvements program would terminate automatically within 12 months unless extended by the Congress—but the program could be terminated at any time by the President.

(5) Grants-in-aid would be made under rules prescribed by the President to assure that assisted projects (a) were of high priority, (b) represented a net addition to existing State and local expenditures, and (c) could be started and completed quickly.

(6) Expenditures on Federal projects previously authorized by the Congress would include resource conservation and various Federal public works, including construction, repair, and modernization of public buildings.

(7) After the program had terminated, the authority would not again be available to the President for 6 months.

The above criteria would have permitted Presidential authority to be invoked in the early stages of each of the four postwar recessions—within 4 months after the decline had begun. Furthermore, no false signals would have been given. Were a false signal to occur—for example, because of a strike—the authority, which is discretionary, need not be invoked.

The first impact of the accelerated orders, contracts, and outlays under the program would be felt within 1 to 2 months after the authority was invoked. The major force of the program would be spent well before private demand again pressed hard on the economy's capacity to produce. With the indicated safeguards, this program would make a major contribution to business activity, consumer purchasing power, and employment in a recession by utilizing for sound public investment resources that would otherwise have gone to waste.

Unemployment compensation: Third, I again urge the Congress to strengthen permanently our Federal-State system of unemployment insurance. My specific recommendations include—

(1) Extension of the benefit period by as much as 13 weeks for workers with at least 3 years of experience in covered employment;

(2) Similar extension of the benefit period when unemployment is widespread for workers with less than 3 years of experience in covered employment. This provision could be put into effect by Presidential proclamation when insured unemployment reaches 5 percent, and the number of benefit exhaustions over a 3-month period reaches 1 percent of covered employment;

(3) Incentives for the States to provide increased benefits, so that the great majority of covered workers will be eligible for weekly benefits equal to at least half of their average weekly wage;

(4) Extension of coverage to more than 3 million additional workers;

(5) Improved financing of the program by an increase in the wage base for the payroll tax from $3,000 to $4,800;

(6) Reinsurance grants to States experiencing high unemployment insurance costs;

(7) Provisions which permit claimants to attend approved training or retraining courses without adverse effect on eligibility for benefits.

Wider coverage, extended benefit periods, and increased benefit amounts will help society discharge its obligation to individual unemployed workers. And be maintaining more adequately their incomes and purchasing power, these measures will also buttress the economy's built-in defenses against recession. Temporary extensions of unemployment compensation benefits have been voted by the Congress during the last two recessions. It is time now for permanent legislation to bring this well-tested stabilizer more smoothly into operation when economic activity declines.

In combination, these 3 measures will enable Federal fiscal policy to respond firmly, flexibly, and swiftly to oncoming recessions. Working together on this bold program, the Congress and the Executive can make an unprecedented contribution to economic stability, one that will richly reward us in fuller employment and more sustained growth, and thus, in greater human well-being and greater national strength.

STRENGTHENING THE FINANCIAL SYSTEM

Proposals of the Commission on Money and Credit: The report of the Commission on Money and Credit, published last year, raises important issues of public policy relating to (1) the objectives and machinery of Government for economic stabilization and growth, (2) Federal direct lending and credit guarantee programs, and (3) the structure and regulation of private financial institutions and markets. The Commission's report represents the results of thorough analysis and deliberation by a private group of leading citizens representative of business, labor, finance, agriculture, and the professions. The Commission's findings and recommendations deserve careful consideration by the Congress, the Executive, and the public—consideration which should result in legislative and executive actions to strengthen government policy under the Employment Act and to improve the financial system of the United States. The subjects covered by the Commission can—for the purposes of discussion and action in the Government—usefully be divided into four categories.

(1) To strengthen the instruments of policy for economic stabilization, the Commission recommends permanent improvement of unemployment compensation, flexibility in government capital expenditures, and flexibility in adjusting the basic Federal individual income tax rate. These key proposals are reflected in the three-part antirecession program just described.

(2) In its comprehensive new look at existing financial legislation, the Commission concludes that the following financial restrictions no longer serve the purposes originally intended and unnecessarily complicate or obstruct other government policies: the ceiling on the public debt, the ceiling on permissible interest rates on U.S. Treasury bonds, and the required gold reserve against Federal Reserve notes and deposits. I am sure that the Congress will wish to examine carefully the Commission's recommendations on these points.

(3) The Commission reexamines the structure of the Federal Reserve System and its relationship to other arms of the Federal Government. The desirability of proposed changes in the structure which has evolved over the years can be determined only after extensive consideration by the Congress and by the public.

There are two reforms of clear merit on which there appears to be sufficiently general agreement to proceed at once, and which are of direct concern to the President in the exercise of his responsibility to appoint the members and officers of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The first is to give adequate recognition in the simple matter of salaries to the important responsibilities of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. The United States is behind other countries in the status accorded, by this concrete symbol, to the leadership of its central bank, and I urge that the Congress take corrective action.

The second is to revise the terms of the officers and members of the Board so that a new President will be able to nominate a Chairman of his choice for a term of 4 years coterminous with his own. This change has the concurrence of the present Chairman of the Board of Governors. The current situation—under which the 4-year term of the Chairman is not synchronized with the Presidential term—appears to be accidental and inadvertent.

Provision should be made now for smooth transition to new arrangements to take effect in 1965. I suggest that, on the expiration of the present term of the Chairman in April 1963, the next term expire on January 31, 1965. In order that, starting in 1965, the President may have a free choice when he begins his own term, it is also necessary to provide that the terms of members of the Board—which now begin and end on January 31 of even years—begin and end in odd years. This change can be accomplished very easily by extending the terms of present members by 1 year.

(4) Several of the Commission's recommendations require careful appraisal by the affected agencies in the executive branch as a basis for future legislative recommendations:

(a) Banks and other private financial institutions: The Commission proposes significant changes in the scope and nature of Government regulations concerning reserves, portfolios, interest rates, and competition. I shall ask an interagency working group in the executive branch to examine the complex issues raised by these proposals. This interagency group will keep in close touch with the relevant committees of the Congress, which will no doubt wish to study these issues simultaneously.

(b) Federal lending and loan guarantee programs: It is clearly time for a thorough review of both their general impact on the economy and their effectiveness for the special purposes for which they were established. Again the Commission's report has performed a valuable service in illuminating basic problems. One important question is the appropriate role—with account taken of both effectiveness and budgetary cost—of direct Federal lending, loan guarantees, and interest sharing. I shall ask a second interagency group in the executive branch to examine these programs.

(c) Corporate pension funds and other private retirement programs: It is time for a reappraisal of legislation governing these programs. They have become, in recent years, a major custodian of individual savings and an important scource of funds for capital markets. The amendment to the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act which I recommend below will be an important step toward insuring fidelity in the administration of these plans. But there is also need for a review of rules governing the investment policies of these funds and the effects on equity and efficiency of the tax privileges accorded them. I shall ask a third working group of relevant departments and agencies to recommend needed actions in this field, taking into account the findings of the Commission as well as other studies and proposals.

A revision of silver policy: Silver—a sick metal in the 1930's—is today an important raw material for which industrial demand is expanding steadily. It is uneconomic for the U.S. Govenment to lock up large quantities of useful silver in the sterile form of currency reserves. Neither is any constructive purpose served by requiring that the Treasury maintain a floor under the price of silver. Silver should eventually be demonetized, except for its use in coins.

(1) As a first step in freeing silver from Government control, the Secretary of the Treasury at my direction suspended sales of silver on November 29. This order amounted to the withdrawal of a price ceiling on silver which had been maintained by Treasury sales at a fixed price.

(2) The next step should be the withdrawal of the Treasury's price floor under domestically produced silver. Accordingly, I recommended repeal of the acts relating to silver of June 19, 1934, July 6, 1939, and July 31, 1946; this step will free the Treasury from any future obligation to support the price of silver.

(3) I also recommend the repeal of the special 50-percent tax on transfers of interest in silver; this step will foster orderly price movements by encouraging the development of a futures market in silver.

(4) Finally, I recommend that the Federal Reserve System be authorized to issue Federal Reserve notes in denominations of $1; this will make possible the gradual withdrawal from circulation of $1 and $2 silver certificates, and the use of the silver thus released for coinage purposes.

STRENGTHENING OUR MANPOWER BASE

The labor force of the United States is its most valuable productive resource. Measures which enhance the skills and adaptability of the working population contribute to the overall productivity of the economy. Several legislative proposals to serve these ends have already been put before the Congress.

(1) I urge speedy passage of the proposed Manpower Development and Training Act. A growing and changing economy demands a labor force whose skills adapt readily to the requirements of new technology. When adaptation is slow and occupational lines rigid, individuals and society alike are the losers. Individuals take their loss in the form of prolonged unemployment or sharply reduced earning power. Society's loss is measured in foregone output. These are losses we need not suffer. A few hundred dollars invested in training or retraining an unemployed or underemployed worker can increase his productivity to society by a multiple of that investment—quite apart from the immeasurable return to the worker in regaining a sense of purpose and hope. Both compassion and dollars-and-cents reasoning speak for this legislation.

(2) For the same reasons, I urge enactment of the Youth Employment Opportunities Act. This bill provides three types of pilot programs to give young people employment opportunities which would enable them to acquire much-needed skills. These programs include training, employment in public service jobs with public and private nonprofit agencies, and the establishment of Youth Corps Conservation Camps. In the current decade, young men and women will be entering the labor force in rapidly growing numbers. They will expect, and they deserve, opportunities to acquire skills and to do useful work. The price of failure is frustration and disillusion among our youth. This price we are resolved not to pay.

(3) I have already made my recommendations for improvement of the Federal-State unemployment compensation system.

(4) I am asking the Congress for more funds to increase the effectiveness of the

U.S. Employment Service. This important agency has already strengthened its operations, improving its staff and placement services particularly in the largest urban centers, and concentrating on labor market problems of nationwide significance—especially those connected with technological displacement of adult workers and the employment of youth. But the matching of jobs and workers is especially difficult and especially important in a rapidly changing economy, and more can be done. When unfilled jobs and qualified unemployed workers coexist—but do not make contact because the flow of job information is not sufficiently free—the employer, the worker, and the country lose. I urge the Congress to reduce that loss in the most effective way—by revitalizing further the agency charged with disseminating information about job opportunities and willing workers.

(5) I ask for enactment of the pending proposal to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act so as (a) to provide adequate penalties for embezzlement and (b) to vest authority in a responsible Federal agency to enforce the statute by issuing binding regulations, prescribing uniform reporting forms, and investigating violations. Almost 90 million people rely on some welfare and pension plan for part or all of present or future income. These plans are a major support of the economic security of the American people. We are derelict if we do not provide adequate administrative and enforcement provisions to protect the tremendous financial interest of participants in these funds.

STRENGTHENING OUR TAX SYSTEM

The tax system of the United States has consequences far beyond the simple raising of revenue. The tax laws are a vital part of the economic environment; their effects may be equitable or inequitable; they create incentives which may help or handicap the national interest. We cannot safely ignore these important effects in the comforting illusion that what already exists is perfect. We must scrutinize our tax system carefully to insure that its provisions contribute to the broad goals of full employment, growth, and equity.

My legislative proposals in the tax field are directly related to these goals and the corollary need for improvement in the balance of payments. In particular, I urge the earliest possible enactment of the tax proposals now before the House Committee on Ways and Means. The centerpiece of these proposals is the 8-percent tax credit against tax for gross investment in depreciable machinery and equipment. The credit should be retroactive to January 1, 1962. The tax credit increases the profitability of productive investment by reducing the net cost of acquiring new equipment. It will stimulate investment in capacity expansion and modernization, contribute to the growth of our productivity and output, and increase the competitiveness of American exports in world markets.

The tax credit for investment is in part self-financing. The stimulus it provides to new investment will have favorable effects on the level of economic activity during the year, and this will in turn add to Federal revenues. My other proposals for tax reform are designed to improve the equity and efficiency of the tax system and will offset the remaining net revenue loss:

(1) Extension of the withholding principle to dividend and interest income;

(2) Repeal of the $50 dividend exclusion and the 4-percent dividend credit;

(3) Revision of the tax treatment of business deductions for entertainment, gifts, and other expenses, to stop abuses of "expense-account living";

(4) Elimination of the special tax preference for capital gains from the sale of depreciable property, real and personal;

(5) Removal of unwarranted preferences (a) to cooperatives, (b) to mutual fire and casualty insurance companies, and (c) to mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations; and

(6) Revision of the tax treatment of foreign income, to remove defects and inequities in the law. Removal of the unwarranted incentive to the export of capital will be consistent with the efficient distribution of capital resources in the world and will aid our balance of payments position. Tax deferral privileges should be limited to profits earned in less-developed countries, and opportunities for "tax haven" operations should be eliminated.

In addition, I recommend that the corporate income tax and certain excise taxes again be extended at present levels for another year beyond June 30, 1962, except that the structure of taxes and user charges in the transportation field be altered as proposed in my budget message.

In considering tax revision in the United States, we must not limit ourselves simply to Federal taxation. Our States, counties, and municipalities collect nearly half as much tax revenue as the Federal Government. There is great potential for equity or inequity, for incentive or disincentive, in their highly diverse tax systems. In addition, the effectiveness of Federal tax policies can be enhanced by harmonious coordination with State and local fiscal systems. There is wide latitude for improvements in the coordination of tax systems and in operations with intergovernmental implications. In this effort, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is performing a valuable service. I urge careful study of its recommendations at all levels of government.

Later this year, I shall present to the Congress a major program of tax reform. This broad program will reexamine tax rates and the definition of the income tax base. It will be aimed at the simplification of our tax structure, the equal treatment of equally situated persons, and the strengthening of incentives for individual effort and for productive investment.

The momentum of our economy has been restored. This momentum must be maintained, if the full potential of our free economy is to be released in the service of the Nation and the world. In this report I have proposed a program to sustain our prosperity and accelerate our growth—in short, to realize our economic potential. In this undertaking, I ask the support of the Congress and the American people.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

RESIGNATION AS LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 16, 1962.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit my resignation as legislative counsel of the House of Representatives, United States, effective at the close of January 31, 1962.

Sincerely yours,

ALLAN H. PERLEY.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reply to the letter just read into the RECORD of the Speaker of the House be included at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1962.

MR. ALLAN H. PERLEY,
Legislative Counsel,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PERLEY: I am in receipt of your letter of January 16 resigning as legislative counsel, House of Representatives, United States, effective at the close of business on January 31, 1962. While I respect very much the reasons which prompted you to take this action, I regret very much you are doing so.

I am well aware of the fact that you have been associated with the office of the legislative counsel since 1925 and from 1949 until the present you have been the legislative counsel. I thoroughly understand the great responsibility of that office, and the tremendous duties devolved upon you. Your life has been dedicated through the House of Representatives in the service of our Government. There is no man who could perform his duties more effectively than you. You have had the respect throughout the years of several Speakers and Members of the House of Representatives. You have my complete respect as you had my confidence.

In accepting your resignation, reluctantly as I do, but respecting your wishes, I want to highly commend you for the outstanding character of service that you have rendered in your most trying, sensitive and important position. I cannot too highly commend you. Speaking for myself, and for the Members of the House of Representatives, I express to you my sincere thanks for service well done. I also extend to you and Mrs. Perley my very best wishes for many future years of happiness, and in any activities in which you might engage, many years of success to you.

With kind personal regards to you and Mrs. Perley, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has just read to the House the resignation of Allan H. Perley. I know all Members of the House of Representatives join me when I say that we regret sincerely that our good, able, and devoted friend, Allan H. Perley, Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives, is retiring. I personally have known Allan for more than 21 years. Some Members of the House have known him longer than I.

Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to pay tribute to Mr. Perley for the many, many years of faithful, capable, efficient, and devoted service he has rendered to the House of Representatives and most every Member of this House who has served in this body since 1925.

Allan Perley was born and reared in the District of Columbia. He attended public schools here in the District. He was born December 23, 1898, the son of Morrison Waite and Florence Gertrude Hall Perley.

In 1922 he graduated from the National University Law School which was later absorbed by the Washington University Law School. He was admitted to the bar of the District of Columbia in 1923. He did postgraduate work at George Washington University Law School in 1923 and Columbia Law School, in New York, in 1924 and 1925. While at Columbia University, he worked in the Legislative Drafting Research Fund. In the fall of 1925 he was appointed as law assistant in the Office of the Legislative Counsel here in the House of Representatives.

He was appointed Legislative Counsel of the House by Speaker Sam Rayburn in 1949, upon the retirement of Middleton Beaman, who had held that position since the Office of the Legislative Counsel was created by the Revenue Act of 1918. He married Mary Ellen Dalghleish. They have one child, a daughter, Jane.

Mr. Speaker, the Office of the Legislative Counsel was created by provisions inserted in the Revenue Act of 1918.

For several years prior to that time the creation of some such office had been considered in bills before the House Committee on the Library, but these proposals failed of passage.

In 1911, Columbia University received from Joseph P. Chamberlain a gift for the establishment of a Legislative Drafting Research Fund. The original trustees of the fund were Professor Chamberlain, professor of public law at Columbia, John Bassett Moore, recently judge of the Permanent Court for International Justice, and Harlan Fiske Stone, Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, and then dean of the Columbia Law School. These research activities were placed under the direction of a staff headed by Middleton Beaman, at that time Law Librarian of the Library of the Congress.

The directors of this fund subsequently determined that a demonstration of the value of a legislative drafting bureau should be offered to the Congress, and in 1916 Mr. Beaman came to Washington and assisted in the drafting of legislation creating the U.S. Shipping Board. Thereafter the Ways and Means Committee availed itself of the services of "the professors" and the volunteer services furnished by the fund thus for sheer lack of time were confined chiefly to matters before this committee.

During the preparation of the Revenue Act of 1918, Representative John Garner, then a member of the Ways and Means Committee, took the view that the committee should not be dependent upon favors from Columbia and that provision should be made for the establishment of an official agency to render aid on legal phases of legislation. Thus it was that the Office came into being through this revenue legislation. Middleton Beaman became the Legislative Counsel for the House.

The functions of the Office have been to supply aid to Members and committees in drafting of bills and amendments. In practice, this is much more complex that might be indicated in that simple statement, for involved is knowledge of constitutional and administrative law, and the problems involved in the form in which the law may be executed and in the judicial review of the law. In addition the Office has assisted in preparation of legal arguments to be included in committee reports to support the validity of proposed legislation, and at times, in the preparation of legal opinions.

In all of this the Office has been consistent in being of technical help only. It has not had any concern with substantive policy, nor intruded any views in that area. Its personnel consistently has been dedicated to the purposes for which the Office was created, and has constantly enjoyed the confidence of the Members of the House and of its committees.

For the 40-odd-years since its creation, the Office of the Legislative Counsel has had only two heads: Middleton Beaman, and since 1949, Allan Perley. Both of them faithfully and conscientiously carried out the work of that Office. Now, with Mr. Perley's retirement, it is very gratifying to note that the direction of this Office will be assumed by Edward Craft, who has been in that Office for some 20 years, and is well and ably equipped to carry out its splendid traditions.

Mr. Speaker, Allan has carried out his job with devotion and understanding. He was interested only in technical matters and never has he tried to impose his own views on the Members of the House or the committees he has served.

Mr. Speaker, Allan Perley has virtually served as technical adviser to our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. To me he has been of tremendous help. To the chairmen before me he has been of tremendous help, as well as to all the members of the committee. He has worked under the chairmanship of Messrs. Parker—that goes away back—our beloved and recently departed Speaker of the House, Mr. Rayburn, when he was chairman of the committee, Mr. Lee, Mr. Wolverton, Mr. Crosser, Mr. Priest, and now me.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be appropriate to indicate some of the important work to which he has contributed on this committee, which indicates the tremendous contribution he has made to the welfare of our country. This includes the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934, the Public Utilities and Holding Company Act of 1935, the Motor Carriers Act, the Water Carriers Act, the Transportation Act of 1940, the Civil Aeronautics Act, the Communications Act, the Federal Aviation Act, the Food and Drug Act amendments, the Natural Gas Act, the War Claims Act, the Wool Labeling Act, the National Science Foundation Act, the Transportation Act of 1950, and many others.

Mr. Speaker, Allan Perley is one of the most devoted employees that I have ever had the privilege of working with. He is a genuine individual of outstanding personality. He is a man of high character, and a man that we all appreciated and learned to love. We will miss him very much. I regret that he finds that after these more than 36 years of devoted service to this House he is going to retire. But he certainly is entitled to retirement in order that he and his very lovely wife may enjoy some relaxation in life during future years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I shall now be glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished gentleman yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has taken this time to enable the House to pay tribute to one of its most competent and illustrious officials, Allan H. Perley.

It is doubtful that anyone in or out of Congress has had a greater impact on more important legislation during the last 37 years than Mr. Perley.

First as assistant counsel and then for the past 13 years as chief legislative counsel, he has served as the right hand man in legislative drafting and assistance to some of the most distinguished Members of this century, including not only the gentleman from Arkansas but the late Speaker Sam Rayburn.

In addition, we have all benefited from his invaluable aid in drafting bills, resolutions, and amendments.

He has ably performed the very important functions of the office of the legislative counsel.

Men like Allan Perley who back up the Members and the committee of the Congress are indispensable to the legislative process.

Mr. Perley's work has been outstanding; he has served the House long and well. We commend him and we offer him our heartfelt appreciation.

It is our prayer that in his retirement he will have a long and happy life and that he will maintain these associations which have been so pleasant and beneficial for us all.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

I am glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, speaking for myself and, I am very sure, for all of the Members of the House of Representatives on my side of the political aisle, I want to commend the gentleman from Arkansas for the words he has so well spoken about a great public servant and a person who has been most helpful to this House of Representatives, Allan Perley. As the gentleman knows, it was my great privilege to serve on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce starting in 1937 and continuing until I became the majority leader of the 80th Congress in 1947. Of course, it will be understood that during all of that time I was in the minority, which permits me, perhaps, to say this much about Allan Perley: that he never was interested in the politics of any situation. He was not interested in the divisions that sometimes appear among us when matters of great domestic concern are before us. His was always an objective approach helping majority and minority alike whenever he was called upon to offer an opinion.

Mr. Speaker, he was a person of complete fidelity and dedication to the responsibilities that went with that great job that he held.

One thing further: in my time I have participated in the drafting of some of the important legislation to which the gentleman has referred. I have never ceased to be amazed at the complete necessity for understanding of the business of drafting legislation. I used to be something of a lawyer myself. I have seen efforts of other lawyers trying their hand at this very unique business of drafting legislation for us. It is a highly specialized operation, and in Allan Perley we had one of the greatest specialists I ever saw in any field of activity.

So, while we shall miss him and I, for one, dislike to see him go, I can only say that I am sure his decision was the right one; and I wish for him the best of everything in the years to come.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I might say for the information of the Members that we are glad that Mr. Perley and his lovely wife are in the gallery at the time this very deserved tribute is being paid.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who has also had the opportunity to observe the very fine and efficient work of this great public servant.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to subscribe to everything that has been said by my chairman and the majority and minority leaders in their deserved tributes to a great public servant, Mr. Allan Perley.

It was my pleasure to meet Mr. Perley soon after I came to Congress in 1947, and even though I was a freshman Member at the time, I found him most courteous, anxious to help, and most cooperative.

Like most of the other Members of this body, I feel a deep sense of personal obligation to him for the great help he has rendered to me as well as to the Congress during my service here.

Since I have been a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, it has been my privilege to work very closely with Mr. Perley. The more I worked with him, the more impressed I became with his tremendous capacity and competence.

Indeed, I regret his decision to resign, as I know the great contribution he has made to the legislative processes of this body. While I hate to see him leave us, I know he can do so with the satisfaction that comes from having done his job well.

I am sure everyone here joins in wishing for Allan Perley and his charming wife a full measure of happiness throughout the years to come.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad at this time to yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown], who has also served on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at the time Mr. Perley was working on many of these highly important and highly technical legislative proposals.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, it is a real privilege to be permitted to join with the chairman of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Mr. Harris, and others in the House today in paying a well-deserved tribute to one of the greatest and most able public servants it has ever been my privilege to know.

A quarter of a century ago, or nearly so, I came to this House and became a member of the Committee on Interstate adn Foreign Commerce, where I served for 10 years. One of the first individuals with whom I became acquainted was Allan Perley. I soon found that he was not only a great lawyer, and a splendid tactician in preparing legislation, but that he was also an honest, courageous individual who would give us the exact facts as he saw them, regardless of anything else.

To this day I do not know whether Allan Perley has ever voted, or if he has voted whether he voted with or for the candidates of one party or the other.

He has been a dedicated public servant and has done only that which his judgment and his conscience, and his extremely great ability, told him was in the best interest of the Congress and of his beloved Republic. So I join, Mr. Speaker, in wishing Allan Perley well in his days of retirement which he has so deservedly earned. I hope divine providence will keep watch over him and his family throughout the years ahead.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Flynt].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in joining with the gentleman from Arkansas and others of my colleagues in paying tribute to Mr. Allan Perley, legislative counsel of the House of Representatives, on the occasion of his retirement. I have been privileged to work very closely with Mr. Perley during the entire period of my service in the House. I have found him always to be a pleasant, competent and able individual with whom to work. He has worked most graciously at the request of any Member of this body. He has responded at all hours of the day to make the work of the committee on which I served, and the work of the entire House of Representatives, more pleasant indeed and an easier task.

Mr. Speaker, I join with those who have preceded me in expressing to him our gratitude for his valuable service to the House of Representatives and to this Nation. I wish for him and Mrs. Perley every happiness in the years of his well deserved retirement.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Younger] who is also a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to join in the tribute to Allan Perley. I can say from personal experience since I came to this body that I owe a greater debt to him for legislative help than to any other individual. He has always been ready and willing to advise and be helpful on all legislative matters.

There is another feature about Mr. Perley that I would like to mention, because we hear so much today about neutralists. I want to say in all of my experience, I have never seen as true a neutralist as Mr. Perley has been. He has never tried in any way, shape, or form to impose his own views in regard to legislative content other than to corrections, additions, or changes for better wording. He has never tried to argue anyone that I know of out of their position or to take a different position. He has consistently and persistently carried out the full functions of his office, and in doing so he has not only improved the context of the legislation passed by this House but has in many cases offered legislative word corrections in the House of Representatives on legislation passed in the other body.

I certainly wish long life for him and his good wife. I know of no one who better deserves retirement in peace and harmony than Allan Perley.

Mr. HARRIS Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thornberry].

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris], chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, for giving those of us here the privilege of paying a well deserved tribute to Mr. Perley and to express our thanks to him for his distinguished services to the House of Representatives.

It was my privilege to serve on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and to come to know Mr. Perley while I was a member of that committee. As other Members have said, he is not only an able lawyer and an able draftsman, but one of the things you must say about Mr. Perley is that he is a gentleman of the highest order.

His was the type of public service that enables us to carry out our responsibilities as Members of the House. I have heard our beloved late Speaker, Mr. Rayburn, pay tribute to Mr. Perley. He talked about him as one of the finest men he ever knew, and he had a high personal regard for Mr. Perley.

I join in wishing for him and for Mrs. Perley a good life in their retirement.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr.

BONNER], chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and other Members of the House, in paying well-earned tribute to one of the great aids of this Congress.

As legislative counsel of the House, Mr. Perley has filled, with great ability and distinction, one of the most exacting and responsible posts in a legislative body. The legislative counsel must be available at all times; frequently called upon on short notice to work on highly complex and controversial matters. He must be totally impartial and objective. He must be an artist as well as an artisan in the employment of the English language. Allan Perley has proven all those qualities. The magnitude of the work of this House requires that the legislative counsel have a highly trained and efficient staff under his responsibility. Under his leadership and direction, the fine gentleman to whom we pay tribute has developed a splendid and dedicated staff of which we all may be proud.

My first acquaintance with Mr. Perley was shortly after I became a Member of this body on one of the most controversial bills I ever sat on in a committee. The bill came before the Committee on the Election of the President, Vice President, and Members of Congress, and dealt with soldiers' absentee ballots. The committee held session after session. It was most controversial, especially as to the constitutional effects of the bill, and the effects of the bill on various parts of the country. Mr. Perley demonstrated more leadership and guidance during the construction and the writing of that piece of legislation, I think, than any other member of the group.

I learned from him many things that have stood me in good stead throughout the years I have enjoyed in this House.

I hope for him and his wife pleasant living and enjoyment the remainder of their lives. My thanks and best wishes go with them.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman for his most appropriate remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the younger members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but it could not escape anyone's attention who serves on that great committee that this man's service was exemplary service, the kind of service we would hope for from anyone whose talents are employed for the good of the Nation. If others would employ their talents in the way this great man has and give the kind of service this man has given we need have no fear for the future of this Nation or the efficiency of its administration.

I also want to say that he not only gave exemplary service himself but that he was always quick to get members of his able staff to assist in the same way. I am certain that not only we on the committee on which I am privileged to serve will miss this man as a fine public servant, but we will think of him also as a friend and be glad we enjoyed his confidence.

I know we can look forward to working with the fine staff he accumulated, trained, and inspired. The staff is composed of able personnel and will carry on in the same high tradition and capable service he exemplified.

I thank my chairman for giving me the opportunity to join with other Members of this body in paying tribute to this gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is certainly an honor for me to stand here on the floor today and pay tribute to a man who has done so much in the legal work in the House of Representatives, especially in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

It has been my pleasure not only to have watched this man work with great finesse and as a true artist in legal procedure, especially in the preparation of bills with which we were going to be required to live, but I have had occasion to travel with him on matters of great importance to this Nation where his great legal mind could keep those of us on the committee fully advised at all times.

He has done a splendid job throughout the years. I think it is wonderful that we have an opportunity here today to pay tribute to a man who has devoted much of his life and who has contributed so much to the laws that have been passed before they went to the floor and before the Members of Congress were required to vote on them.

I am glad to pay tribute to him and I wish him well in the years to come.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN].

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, I feel privileged to add my voice to that of my colleagues in paying tribute to Allan Perley, now retiring from his 37 years with the legislative counsel's office in the House.

During this period, Mr. Perley has been most helpful in his chosen field, and much of the legislation which has gone through this honorable body bears the mark of his research and knowledge. His legal advice has been most helpful to all of us and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, on which I, although one of the younger Members, am privileged to serve, has been helped very materially on many occasions, by this capable attorney.

I, together with his many friends, wish him well in the years ahead.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. LOSER].

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed grateful for the privilege of saying just a few words in reference to Allan Perley.

When I first came to Congress I had the honor to serve on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and for a period of 2 years I served on that committee I heard his very fine words and became convinced that he was a lawyer with fine talent. I came to know him during that period as a gentleman and a scholar.

I went on a trip some 4 or 5 years ago with Mr. Perley and other members of this great committee. For a period of about 3 weeks I was with Allan Perley day and night. It was then that I came to know him as a courteous, cultured, and refined gentleman.

So I am happy to be privileged to say just a few words about this distinguished man. May I say when he comes to the end of this toilsome journey and he lays down the working tools of life it will be his high privilege to hear from him who sitteth as the Judge Supreme the welcome words:

> Well done, thou good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joys of thy Lord.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from Arkansas has done a very wonderful thing here today in arranging this tribute to a distinguished man, because, in a sense, what we are doing is to remove some of the wrappings and revealing the structural steel, if you will, of the legislative processes.

I think it is men like Mr. Perley who give continuity to this process, and in paying tribute so well deserved by him we are paying tribute also to all of those who make so many of us look good.

It has been my personal experience that Mr. Perley had at his fingertips a vast reservoir of ability and accumulated knowledge. I found, too, when some of us junior members of the committee went there for the bucketfuls of knowledge that we needed they were supplied by Mr. Perley, and when the distinguished chairman of that great committee, much more able than the rest of us, went there for the thimbleful he required, he was supplied also.

I am personally grateful to Mr. Perley for all his kindnesses, and I wish for him and Mrs. Perley all of the best in the years to come.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], of our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, when I learned that Mr. Perley is retiring, I was extremely sorry to hear it, because I knew that we were losing the help and the assistance of a very able, fine gentleman. I am very grateful to Mr. Perley for his wise and very capable service to all of us through the years. I am also, of course, very glad and happy that Mr. Perley can retire while he can enjoy life and I wish for him and his family many, many years of healthful and enjoyable life.

The entire legislative staff associated with our good friend, Mr. Perley, has been extremely helpful to each of us on our committee many, many times. Some of our questions are often quite complicated, and to have someone well prepared, well able to give such excellent counsel and well informed advice and technical information, is extremely valuable service and extremely helpful to each of us. Mr. Perley and his associates have always been more than willing to do everything they could, so I would like to join with my colleagues of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in expressing our deep appreciation to Mr. Perley for his devoted and long and able service and also our very good wishes for his continued good health and happiness.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House, I am sure, know that our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reports a great deal of legislation, most of which is highly technical and complicated. This is because of the tremendous jurisdiction of the committee and the broad coverage of so many phases of our life and the lives of the people throughout the United States, dealing in commerce and all of those matters related to it.

Mr. Perley has been efficient in his work with us in the development of this type of technical and highly complicated legislation, and I think I could not express it more correctly than to repeat to you what our beloved and late Speaker Rayburn said on one occasion when we had a highly complicated piece of legislation on the floor, and difficult to understand by most Members. The Speaker said that if Mr. Perley helped the committee in developing this legislation, it was developed well and it is right.

I regret that Mr. Perley will not be with us any more as a member of the office of legislative counsel and to assist our committee. I personally am going to miss his very valuable service as I know other members of the committee and other Members of the House will. I know, however, that we can take pride in the fact that the responsibility of this office will go to Ed Craft. Ed and other members of the office will continue the valuable work and I know will render to the Members of this House the assistance we need from time to time.

But, I must say, speaking for myself personally, Allan, I am going to miss you. I know I speak for the other Members of the House. I also have a feeling that this is not going to end the valuable service that you will render to the people of America. I know that a man of your ability and your devotion to public service, even in retirement, which you have deserved after all of these many years, will find some way of making a contribution to the betterment of this country and to the welfare of our people.

So I say to you on behalf of our committee and the Members of the House, we thank you for the valuable services that you have rendered. We appreciate the services that you have rendered to us. You carry with you our best wishes, you and Mrs. Perley and Jane, for many years of happiness and many years of enjoyment as you continue on your life's journey.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, many individuals, employees on the Hill, supply the oil and lubrication which keep the complicated legislative machine operating.

The man we are honoring today is certainly an important part of this machine. In fact, in my opinion, he is one of the main gears. Allan H. Perley is the legislative counsel of the House who is retiring, after 43 years of Government service, at the end of this month. He is truly a great and devoted public servant and one who has made the greatest contribution in the formulation of our laws during his long period of service. For at least a 30-year period it would be difficult, if not impossible, to mention an important law on our statute books in which Allan Perley has not had an important and decisive hand.

The world has changed greatly in the 43 years of Mr. Perley's service but this modest, unassuming, thoughtful man has remained steadfast in his devotion to the House of Representatives and to its Members whom he has so ably served.

The beloved former Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn, would have been the first to speak today if he were here because no Member of the House held Mr. Perley in higher esteem or greater regard than did our former Speaker.

I have heard it said by the former chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, John Elliott Rankin, that Allan Perley could have made half a million dollars a year in practice outside the Government had he chosen to do so. I am inclined to agree with Mr. Rankin's estimate.

I have only had the good fortune to know and work with Mr. Perley and his associates since I came to Congress 15 years ago, but I have nothing but the highest regard for him and the greatest respect for the office he so ably heads. His assistants, George Skinner, James Menger, Jr., and Robert Guthrie have all worked on legislation originating in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Mr. Skinner and Mr. Menger spent literally weeks with the staff of the committee and representatives of the Veterans' Administration, the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of Education in the drafting of what became Public Law 550 of the 82d Congress, the Korean GI bill of rights, which I had the honor to sponsor. It is a tribute to the art and craftsmanship of the legislative counsel's staff that there have been no major amendments to that act and no major corrective measures necessary.

The same can be said of H.R. 9700 which became Public Law 85-857, and provided for the codification of all Veterans' Administration laws into title 38, United States Code. Mr. Menger did nearly all of the drafting for that monumental job and it, too, is standing the test of time in a very splendid fashion. There have been many compliments received by the committee on this work and most of them must be attributed to Mr. Menger's fine draftsmanship.

I wish for Mr. Perley the happiest sort of retirement and one which I am sure will be fruitful and most enjoyable for a man who has devoted his life to serving others so long here on the Hill. I am sure that he will continue to find many worthwhile fields of endeavor.

To his successor and long-time associate, Edward Craft, I offer my congratulations and best wishes and also an appreciation of the fact which I am sure he is aware of the fine tradition in which he is following.

MORAL HEALTH NECESSARY TO STRENGTHEN NATION

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the pages of history warn us of once-powerful nations that succumbed not to military assault, but to moral deterioration. Today, the United States is concentrating on the military strength that is necessary to hold the enemy outside in check, but little attention is paid to the enemy within; the temptation to take the easiest way of self-indulgence that weakens the moral fiber of the Nation.

Corruption, sensationalism, greed, juvenile delinquency: these are but a few of the symptoms that identify moral decay.

When people lose confidence in the integrity of government; when police officers in some of our larger cities have to travel in pairs for their own protection; when young hoodlums act more like animals than as human beings; when the pursuit of pleasure and profit stills the voice of conscience; then we are in danger of defeating ourselves.

Perhaps the Communists are counting on this, confident that, when we lose the spirit and the character that made our Nation great, we shall collapse from within.

Let us heed the warnings and take steps to cure the disease before it becomes fatal.

I bring to your attention the editorial, "O Tempora, O Mores!" from the Washington Star of November 21, 1961. It comments approvingly on the latest annual statement of the Roman Catholic bishops of the United States in these words:

> The Catholic bishops are undeniably right: The United States, not less than the world in general, is in need of a spiritual catharsis that will revive the kind of God-fearing morality that marked its character until relatively recent years. Otherwise, in due course, it may well go the way of the old Roman Empire, declining and falling of its own hedonistic excesses, not with a bang but with a whimper.

Under unanimous consent, I wish to reprint this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

O TEMPORA, O MORES!

The latest annual statement of the Roman Catholic bishops of the United States constitutes an eloquent warning that deserves to be listened to most carefully by all Americans, regardless of creed, who are adult and patriotic enough to be concerned about the future of their country. For the warning is very much to the point, and nobody with eyes to see and ears to hear can shrug it off, or belittle it, as if it were a comment of minor consequence on a subject of no great importance.

Actually, the subject is truly basic and vast in its significance, and this is so because it has to do with nothing less than the moral health and the moral survivability of our Nation. As the bishops' statement indicates, the problem involved is global in character, and at the root of it "has been the influence of secularism—the banishment of God from public and private life and the enthronement of human nature in His place." A consequence of this, in the statement's words, is that many modern men find themselves "on a lonely eminence of their own making forced to determine for themselves what is good and evil, right and wrong."

As far as our own country is concerned, here is something quite new in our history. Despite certain decisions by the Supreme Court in recent years (such as the one outlawing voluntary interdenominational religious instruction in public schools), the Founding Fathers of our Republic were God-fearing men who believed in the abstract moral law and favored (as did Thomas Jefferson at the University of Virginia) a solid education in religion. Yet today, as the Catholic bishops have asserted, "our national ideal no longer rests upon a foundation of broad and solid popular morality. Ignorance of moral principles and the rejection of the very notion of morality are on the rise today and threaten to undermine our Nation and its most sacred traditions." This does not seem to us to be an exaggeration. Anyhow, again to quote from the prelates' statement:

"The evidences of our moral decline are everywhere to be seen: In the alarming increase in crime, particularly among the young; in the sensational treatment of violence and sexuality in literature, on the stage, screen and television; in the disclosures of greed and cynicism in government, labor and business; in the stubborn continuance of race prejudice and injustice; in the multiplication of divorce and in the rapid disintegration of the family; in a harsh and pagan disregard of the sacredness of human life. This present moral deterioration cannot be interpreted as a mere temporary relaxation of standards. The conditions we face are unique; for them, the past gives neither precedent nor guide."

It seems clear enough that in our time, which surely has been one of the most tumultuous in human history, there has been a sort of stupid tolerance of decadence here in American and abroad. Nor can there be any doubt that large numbers of moral illiterates and educated ignoramuses—including some in Hollywood and the publishing world—have poisoned our society with productions equating liberty with license and licentiousness. The Catholic bishops are undeniably right: The United States, not less than the world in general, is in need of a spiritual catharsis that will revive the kind of God-fearing morality that marked its character until relatively recent years. Otherwise, in due course, it may well go the way of the old Roman Empire, declining and falling of its own hedonistic excesses, not with a bang but with a whimper.

OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE POSTURE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the space age has dawned, but how many Americans comprehend its challenges or know what progress the United States is making to develop missiles for defense and the space vehicles to explore the moon and beyond?

It is difficult for earthbound men to stretch their understanding and grasp the meaning of this new dimension. As members of a free society, however, it is necessary for Americans to keep up with the expanding frontiers of knowledge, so that they will be able to encourage and support Government and science in their development of space technology.

The immediate military applications concern us most, for our very survival may depend upon superiority in this field. Mr. Speaker, as majority leader, you were in close contact with all phases of our missile, and related space programs. Day by day they are becoming more important to our security and our progress.

Drawing upon your extensive knowledge of these subjects, and moved by your belief in the people's right and obligation to know, you have written an excellent report on "Our National Defense Posture," published in the January 1962 issue of V.F.W., the magazine that speaks for the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Under permission granted, I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of the public at large:

OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE POSTURE

(By Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK)

The United States of America is dedicated to a policy of peace through strength, with honor. These principles go hand in hand. Peace alone could not be worth having. In the world of today, with the evil intents and purposes of international communism, military strength is vitally necessary. Honor without peace—in an age of weapons of mass destruction—would also be empty.

Our policy of peace with strength and honor has several elements. One necessary part is to meet the threat of aggression from abroad with an effective system capable of both offense, as well as deterrent action. But having our weapons in being gives us a power for peace in those parts of the world where only armed strength is respected.

Another element in our national policy of peace with honor is to develop a stronger and growing economy. It is not that material progress is to be equated with human happiness, but it is important so long as some segments of our population are inadequately housed, fed, and clothed. Our problems are small compared with most parts of the world, but we can see room for improvement, including the assurance of employment to all those who need it.

A stronger economy makes it easier to carry the tax burden of our national defense. A stronger economy also lays a part of the foundation of a necessary element in our policy of peace through strength, with honor. We seek a better life for our people. If they have their economic needs met, we can also improve their education, increase leisure time, support the fine arts, and aesthetic improvements in our cities and countryside, and do other things which make for what people call a better life.

Another element in our national policy is one of cooperation with the rest of the world. In the moral sense, all men are our brothers, and the world has become too small a place for us to be able to disregard what goes on in other parts of the world. Trade, technical assistance, cultural interchange, travel, and a sincere interest in other peoples make the world a better and safer place and make the United States more deserving of the leadership which its great capacity and strength has thrust upon her. For many practical reasons, we need allies, both in peace and in war, if it should come. For these reasons, international cooperation in its many forms is an element in our national policy of peace through strength, with honor.

We are interested in the national security of the United States because our individual well-being and even survival is dependent upon the protection of the Nation, and because the Nation is the embodiment of values important to our hearts and minds. National security is a broader concept than national defense, which is an important element in national security. Our security is a result of comparing our defenses, military, political, social, and moral, with the several threats which confront them. Thus our national security is affected not only by the strength of our Armed Forces, but also by our position of economic and political leadership in the world. It is affected also by such moral leadership and respect as we may have won, and certainly by the mood and resolution of our people. It is within this conceptual framework that we can assess our national defense posture with particular reference to the missile and space programs.

Our national space program, which is still in its early stages, is the product of cumulative forces at work throughout our society, particularly in the technical area. But it is more than this, for the fundamental knowledge required to start a space program has been present for many years longer than the national decision to pursue such aims. Dreamers in several parts of the world have conceived in their minds how man could be free from the bounds of earth to explore the vast reaches of infinity. But space received its first strong start in the area of military innovation. The Germans pushed experimental rocketry to a practical level which included the penetration of space by ballistic missiles.

After World War II, these technologies were further developed in several parts of the world, but particularly by the Soviet Union. Our own leadership in nuclear weapons and in heavy bombers reduced the urgency of developing long-range ballistic missiles until a fairly recent date. However, in 1954 there came a breakthrough in the size of possible missile nuclear warheads. For the first time, such missiles represented a logical course of weapons development by the United States. The Soviet Union, for reasons which are not altogether clear, decided some years earlier, before small warheads were available, to develop long-range ballistic missiles. These required great size if they were to perform any useful military task.

The consequence was that we started toward an efficient size of ballistic missile for the intercontinental range in 1954 and 1955, while the Soviet Union demonstrated a much larger missile in actual test as early as 1957. In turn, they have been provided automatically with a large space booster of well-tested efficiency for putting up very large space payloads. Only much later have we begun the process of designing large boosters for space purposes, although our work on smaller efficient missiles has continued without abatement since 1954.

Incidentally, even the fact that we have missiles now is based upon a series of experimental rocket developments carried on in this country between 1946 and 1954. Without these we would have lacked the technological base for the ballistic missile effort.

We were fortunate to have both the Army work carried on at White Sands and Redstone Arsenal, and the Air Force work carried on principally in California. This work led to a moderately large rocket engine and the type of structure copied in our present-day operational missiles. The Navy made its contributions, too, in this earlier period, especially in its experiments with solid propellants and guidance techniques.

Gradually as our techniques improved, military leaders and scientists joined in urging a real assault on space by the United States. But these pleas were not too seriously taken by the people or by the Government until the IGY started a scientific satellite program in 1955 and the Soviet Union electrified the world with the launching of Sputnik I, followed by increasingly large payloads carrying the hammer and sickle label. Leadtimes are so long that many months or even years must pass between the time of making a decision and seeing the results in space flight. Patience is not one of our national virtues, since all of us are so eager to see progress in the U.S. space program.

Moving with great effectiveness in 1958, the Congress and the executive branch, in a most successful cooperative, bipartisan effort, created the means for pursuing a vigorous space program by the passage of the National Aeronautics and Space Act. This act dedicated our development of outer space to peaceful purposes while at the same time protected our legitimate defense interests in space. I was chairman of the House committee responsible for this legislation.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration was created as a civilian agency to develop our space know-how and to find uses for these techniques. The results are beginning to become apparent. Space is paying off in many directions, as was intended. There is a new demand for improved education, particularly in technical and scientific fields, to meet the growing needs for new skills related to space and to our industry across the board. Advances in science brought about by space research are increasing not only our understanding of the universe, but also are finding application in medicine to save lives, in power generation to cut costs, in computers to revolutionize many parts of present-day life, and so forth down a long list of fields.

To meet the challenges of space technology, our industry is having to work with new materials to closer tolerances, and thus gaining a versatility which will richly reward us with its new found strength and vigor. Just the new investment in plant and facilities for space is creating more jobs. For money spent for space is spent here on earth. Space is enhancing the national security by its opportunities for us to cooperate with friendly nations in such areas as weather satellites and communications satellites, in navigation, and tracking. The work being pursued by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is leading toward a broad based capability to travel in space and do what we wish in space for whatever purpose is necessary.

I mentioned that the Congress protected the military interest in space when it passed the Space Act in 1958. This was because we realized that in the world of today, the threat of naked Soviet power is very great. We, in Congress, even strengthened the hand of the Department of Defense in its right to engage in space activities over what was originally proposed by the administration. The Department of Defense is given jurisdiction over space activities which relate primarily to or are peculiar to weapons systems. But more than that, the Department of Defense is permitted to pursue any other space research and development important to the defense of the Nation. Of course, means were also provided to coordinate the space work of the NASA and the Department of Defense and prevent needless duplication through the President's National Aeronautics and Space Council. It was placed on a detailed day-to-day basis through a Civilian-Military Liaison Committee (now replaced by the Aeronautics and Astronautics Coordination Board).

Our military power in space has several elements, and conditions are changing so rapidly that what exists today may be quite different in a very few years. Particularly, our long-range missiles can be regarded as space devices. This is because they travel through space on the greater part of their flight, and partly because they use the same vehicles. These long-range missiles have been used in modified form to launch most of our space satellites and probes.

Already, satellites are serving experimentally as navigation aids, for geodetic purposes, for weather reporting, and for communications. Note that all of these purposes have civilian as well as military values. Much of the division of effort between NASA and the Department of Defense is one of administrative convenience. Later, there may be military uses for space which are more uniquely in that category, such as missile detection, reconnaissance, satellite inspection, and so forth. Even these, though classed as military, support the peace by lessening the chance of surprise attack, and hence strengthening our deterrent against general war.

If new military needs arise in space, they will be identifiable and available for development because of the provisions written into the Space Act which permit the Department of Defense to pursue such research even in advance of formal designation of any weapons system.

Today we have already in place and in operation several complexes equipped with the Atlas missile of full intercontinental range. Coming along are new installations for later model Atlas missiles which are in partially hardened sites, giving them increased survivability against surprise attack. Also there are Titan missiles of full intercontinental range, being emplaced in hardened sites, and these will be joined a little later by the Titan II. The Titan II will carry storable propellants instead of using liquid oxygen and kerosene. This means they could be fired in a minute or so of the time a decision was made to do so, instead of the minimum countdown time of about 15 minutes on the earlier models.

These several types of liquid-propelled missiles will be joined in the next couple of years by considerable numbers of completely hardened Minuteman launching silos, carrying the solid-fuel Minuteman of intercontinental range. Our deterrent as well as offensive power will be further diversified and be given a new invulnerability by Skybolt, a ballistic missile which can be carried under the wings of a B-52 bomber for air launch from directions no enemy can anticipate in detail.

Actually, our strongest missile deterrent this last year has been Polaris. By the fall of 1961 it had reached the level of five submarines on patrol carrying 16 Polaris missiles each. They are able to guarantee certain destruction to the main centers of power of any enemy foolish enough to attack us, even if the enemy had been able to catch all of our continental missile sites and all our aircraft by surprise (an unlikely event in itself). Polaris has the further advantage of requiring an enormous defensive effort on the part of those who have reason to fear a retaliatory blow from the United States. And if, God forbid, war should ever be forced on us, Polaris would draw a portion of enemy strength away from our own shores.

The latest estimates reach the somewhat surprising although gratifying conclusion that the United States is presently ahead in the number of long-range ballistic missiles on station. Apparently the Soviet Union, for reasons unknown, did not or could not press the advantage of production in their earlier start. Even if this assessment is correct, and absolute proofs are hard to come by, this is no excuse for any relaxation in our efforts to prepare strong defenses. Conditions can change, and what is adequate today can be neutralized later through further advances in weapons.

The Congress has shown itself to be especially sensitive to the dangers of a technological upset. We have pushed vigorously for the most rapid development and production of an effective antimissile missile, embodied in the Nike-Zeus project. The first nation which can perfect a defense against ballistic missile attack will overturn much of the present power position in the world. There is some evidence that the Soviet Union is working very hard on missile defenses, and it is vitally important that we do at least equally well in this most difficult technical task.

Congress has also urged greater support for the B-70 bomber, a revolutionary aircraft of great versatility which will cruise at three times the speed of sound. Congress has urged more support for the Dyna-Soar, a manned maneuverable space ship which can glide back to a field of its choosing rather than fall back in pure ballistic flight. Congress has supported the new administration in providing funds for an increased airborne alert of the Strategic Air Command. This is an interim measure to keep an important percentage of our bombers out of the reach of any surprise Soviet attack by missiles during the time that our own missile bases are still striving to reach their planned goals of adequate numbers, dispersion, hardening and quick reaction time.

In keeping with the broad concepts of national security which I have offered, we have undertaken an enormous task as a national mission. This was the President's call for an all-out effort to place an American expedition on the moon during the course of this decade, preferably ahead of any such feat by the Soviet Union. Such a program is an official executive branch recognition of policies urged in a succession of congressional reports dating back to 1958. This great project includes within its purposes virtually all the elements of national security which I have outlined. It will be the basis for a great expansion of our industry, employment, and scientific knowledge. It will enhance our international prestige and sense of national purpose. It will provide a steady fallout of economic applications of space technology to make the program pay for itself in benefits. And it will provide a new versatility in the use of space to meet any future military threats which emerge there in the years ahead. It is hard to imagine a program which is more worth doing and which will make a greater return to every part of our national life.

In short, the missile and space age is bringing great challenges which our Nation is prepared to meet with resolution. The way will not be easy, but in net balance, we have no other choice. The rewards will be in proportion to the effort we make.

PENDING POSTAL RATE REVISION BILL

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, when the pending postal rate revision bill, H.R. 7927, is taken up tomorrow I intend to strongly support the amendment, which the distinguished chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has informed all of the Members he will propose, except with respect to the 1 cent added charge on second-class mail as it applies to newspapers.

I am supporting the Murray amendment, with this one exception, because I am convinced that it is necessary and proper if we are to meet the issue of fiscal responsibility. At the appropriate time, however, I will offer an amendment to the Murray amendment to make a highly desirable and equitable change in the second-class rates as they apply to newspapers mailed beyond county of publication.

My amendment will exempt these newspapers from the proposed rate increase of 1 cent per piece. I am convinced that if the 1-cent surcharge is imposed on newspapers, as provided by the Murray amendment, it could sound the death knell to some small weekly and daily newspapers in the rural areas of the United States. These are the community newspapers which serve such a valuable purpose in farm and rural areas—tying together the economic and the social and the cultural life in the less heavily populated areas from Maine to California and from Minnesota to Florida. Most of them, as our committee members will recall from the testimony, operate and perform their valuable service with an extremely narrow margin of profit.

By operation of the proposed 1-cent surcharge, all of the small newspapers would pay an extra 1 cent per piece, on top of the regular pound rates already provided by law. The great mass-circulation publications would be subject only to this identical 1 cent per piece surcharge, and would not feel nearly so heavy an impact.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the newspapers of America—and especially those in rural areas—are an invaluable part of our American way of life and that it would be dangerously adverse to the national interest to risk the virtual certainty that many of them would be forced out of business by this 1 cent surcharge. The additional postal revenue that might come from the surcharge is many times outweighed by the value of keeping this important segment of our free American press a vigorous and flourishing part of our economic, social, and cultural life. I believe that it will be well worth our while to forego the small additional revenue that the 1-cent surcharge would gain from newspapers in order to assure this objective. As a matter of fact, it is very evident to me that the surcharge would force so many newspapers either out of business or to some other method of delivery that in no event would the added revenue from the surcharge be a material factor in the postal revenues.

I hope that this highly equitable amendment that I intend to present will receive general support and I want to emphasize that it is entirely consistent with the basic principles of the Murray amendment. The Murray amendment, with my amendment thereto, still will provide added revenues sufficient, with the postal policy provisions, to eliminate the postal deficit—our chief objective in meeting the issue of fiscal responsibility and in providing sound financing for the postal establishment.

I strongly urge the approval of my amendment and the adoption of the Murray amendment after my amendment is made a part thereof.

PAYING OFF THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to again urge that action be taken upon my bill, House Concurrent Resolution 43, to authorize the Federal Government to begin paying off our national debt by at least 1 percent a year.

I call the attention of the House to the continued, prolonged failure of the Federal Government to practice fiscal realism in the face of the most overwhelming national debt ever charged to any country since the dawn of history.

Apprehension regarding this constantly increasing debt is shared by many thoughtful, thrifty Americans—as well it should be.

One of the oldest rules of economics is that no individual, family, business—or government—may continue indefinitely to spend more than it earns—to run up huge and unmanageable debt. There must always be a day of reckoning.

The pages of history show that debt and its inevitable partner, inflation, have wrought the collapse and fall of governments. Some of these fallen governments were replaced by totalitarian regimes. Nazi Germany was born out of the fiscal chaos of the Hindenburg government, when a loaf of bread cost two and a half billion marks and the American dollar was quoted at four and a third trillion marks.

Not even the strongest nation can long continue to roll up huge debt without inviting inflation, the debauchery of the dollar, the erosion of confidence in our monetary system.

But this is exactly what the United States is now doing—and has been for the last three decades. In 25 of the last 31 years we failed to live within our income, balance the budget or pay anything at all toward reducing the national debt.

Correspondingly, the national debt has grown from a manageable $19.4 billion in 1932 to the present $296 billion. This is an increase of more than 1,500 percent. And today we are face to face with the practical certainty that the Federal debt this year will reach and surpass the $300 billion figure for the first time in our history.

The figure 296 billion is incomprehensible; it defies imagination almost.

But the size of the national debt can be placed in perspective when we consider that it is some $50 billion more than the combined debts of all the other 132 countries of the world—when we consider that it exceeds by $4 billion the total amount spent for all purposes, in peace and war, by the Federal Government from the day President George Washington took office in 1789 through the year 1943.

The runaway national debt cannot be blamed entirely on the great depression of the 1930's or even on the Second World War, as some excuse makers would have us believe.

The Federal indebtedness during the whole of the 1930's increased only from $16.1 billion to $40.4 billion. And during World War II, when we were financing our own vast military forces, when we were contributing an estimated $60 billion in lend-lease to our allies, when we were mass producing ships, planes, tanks, and guns—even then, the national debt never came within $27 billion of what it is today.

The national debt has increased $40 billion since 1950; since 1958 it has increased $26 billion—which is a sum greater than the total increase during all the depression years of the 1930's; the national debt has increased $10 billion in just the last year.

Now, there are some who defend these dangerous increases as the price we must pay to build up and maintain our national security in this era of maximum danger from the Communist world. The record does not sustain this claim.

In the period from 1955 through 1961, defense spending increased only 17 percent—but spending for purely domestic-civilian purposes advanced 43 percent, or more than three times as fast as military expenditures.

In the last 7 years civilian domestic spending doubled to $34.6 billion. And this Congress is now being called upon to authorize a long, new line of costly and unnecessary Federal aid programs.

Even if some of these domestic spending programs were desirable, they still would have to yield to necessity. And more than ever before in our history, that necessity is for rigid economy in domestic affairs. Financial solvency is just as vital to the security of the United States as military strength.

The advocates of big spending, the promoters of the welfare state claim that deficit financing is harmless, that a little inflation is a good thing, that our national economy is robust enough to withstand the normal enervating effects of massive debt.

This claim is not supported by fact. It is not supported by commonsense.

It is true that our national gross product—which measures the Nation's output—stands today at an estimated $503 billion. This is an impressive figure. In 1939, the final year of the depression, the national gross product amounted only to $84 billion.

But look at the other side of the coin. Inflationary pressures exerted by prolonged deficit financing have reduced the buying power of our dollar from a base of 100 cents in 1939 to only 46 cents today. Thus, 54 percent of the apparent dramatic increase in the gross national product has been watered down and absorbed by inflation.

Furthermore, inflation is estimated to have cost the Nation's thrifty citizens some $200 billion in the last 20 years. For example, a $5,000 savings bond purchased with a so-called 100-cent dollar in 1939 is worth only about 2,300 of today's cheapened dollars.

Something is substantially wrong when the Federal Government, through ill-advised fiscal policies, penalizes and punishes the thrifty while paying out billions upon billions of dollars to individuals and nations alike who feel that thrift is to be avoided at all cost.

Because we of the present have refused to listen to the past, to plan for the future, the American people are being compelled to carry an almost unbearable tax burden—a tax burden that is confiscatory in nature, that stifles incentive, that retards and discourages industrial expansion, a debt that our generation is not going to pay but that will be handed down to our children and even to generations yet unborn.

Since 1939, our rate of national growth has increased six times. But in the same period Federal tax collections have gone up almost 90 times. On a per capita basis, the average tax bill in 1940 was barely $40 per person. Today, the average American pays an estimated $517 a year in Federal taxes alone.

Business is being hit particularly hard by Federal tax rates. Fifty-two percent of every dollar that is earned by corporations goes to the Federal Government. Without a fair profit, business cannot expand, open new plants, inspire creativeness, devote sufficient revenue to vital research, give incentive rewards, or create the 1 million new jobs a year that are demanded by our growing population.

The ill-advised fiscal policies of the Federal Government also are impairing confidence abroad in our monetary system. Because of this lack of faith in our ability to protect the integrity of our currency, foreign markets more and more are depleting our gold reserve.

It is because of this lack of confidence that our gold reserve has been declining steadily since 1949. Today, foreign claims against this gold supply actually exceed our reserves.

Still, we have failed, and are failing to heed the danger signals that are so obvious both here and abroad.

The administration has submitted a budget calling for the expenditure of $92.5 billion for the fiscal year beginning next July 1. We are being asked to commit billions of dollars to so-called welfare state programs—programs that are not essential and could be left off.

If business remains good, if personal incomes remain high, if there are no labor strikes, if so-called temporary excise taxes are continued for yet another year, if postal rates are increased—if all these "iffy" things occur in concert, then the administration promises a surplus of $500 million.

Actually I do not believe there will be any surplus. I believe instead there will be another deficit—the 26th in the last 32 years.

The city of Albany, Ga., on last Saturday, January 20, set the Nation a splendid example of economy and self-reliance. The city officials declined an offer by the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency to furnish Albany $2,000,103 in urban renewal funds, and suggested that the money be applied to the national debt, or to the $52 billion defense budget for the coming year. Albany city officials wrote the Housing and Home Finance Agency:

> The decision of a majority of the Board of City Commissioners of Albany, Ga., is that necessary programs can be accomplished more expeditiously and economically with use of purely local funds. That, we feel, is the desire of community public opinion.
>
> Without attempting to appear presumptuous, may we ask that the total of $2,000,103 set aside for planning and capital improvements in Albany, Ga., under Project No. Ga. R–52 be applied to one of two areas of the Federal 1963 budget as proposed by the Honorable John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States, either to the defense effort, which will cost the Nation $52 billion during the fiscal year 1963, or to the national debt, which will rise above $300 billion during fiscal 1963.

Unless the Congress reasserts itself and draws the line on reckless spending, I am pretty confident that the budget will not be balanced. Certainly, such promises of a balanced budget have turned sour many, many times in the last 30 years.

The national debt is now $296 billion. We are being asked to raise the so-called temporary ceiling on the debt limit to $308 billion. This is the ninth time in just the last 8 years that we have been called upon to bail the big spenders out of an emergency of their own making.

Actually, the liability of the Federal Government is far greater than the national debt indicates. The Government has piled up huge unrefunded commitments and liabilities for future years that are not reflected in the national debt. It is estimated that these hidden debts total almost $500 billion additionally.

These are commitments that were obligated by this generation. But they are commitments that will not be paid off in our lifetime. This burden will be passed along to the next generation—to the young men and women who are just getting out of school and beginning their jobs and careers.

Seldom, if ever, has any generation faced the heavy, discouraging burdens of debt that—through no fault of their own—confront our young people. It has long been my conviction that it is the duty of each generation to pass on to the succeeding generation a government that is solvent; a government whose fiscal policies do not create heavy and oppressive debt, a government that does not tax people to the breaking point.

This generation has not kept the faith.

This generation has adopted the fraudulent philosophy that it is the duty of Government to provide everything we need from cradle to grave. The evils of this philosophy are compounded by the fact that we are passing on to our children—and our children's children—the bill for our own extravagance.

Is this to be our gift, our legacy to the coming generation? I say no. I say we must at least begin to halt and reverse the reckless fiscal policies that threaten our economy, that penalize thrift, that disproportionately tax success, that hold future generations liable for debts not of their own making.

We can begin by drawing the line on massive spending programs that are socialistic in nature. We can begin by making a real effort to reduce the national debt.

This can be done best by paying a fixed amount each year to the principal of the national debt. To those who say that this cannot be done, that we cannot afford to pay our debts, I remind you that just since 1950 we have paid $77.2 billion in interest alone on the national debt. We are going to pay another $9.5 billion this year.

The interest on the Federal debt is the second largest item in the budget. It is exceeded only by the amount we are setting aside for national security. This interest is costing the taxpayers almost four times what we spend on space research on technology; it is costing us one and a half times what we spend for veterans affairs and benefits.

I urge as strongly as I can that my resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 43, to authorize the Federal Government to begin paying at least 1 percent annually toward the national debt be reported out of committee and adopted overwhelmingly by this body.

We cannot begin to meet our obligation to our children and coming generations until we do an about-face and seek to lift at least part of the heavy burden that we have stamped upon them. We cannot in good conscience do less.

A NEW ABC ACT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York,

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill revising the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act of the District of Columbia.

During the course of the hearings on several bills amending that act conducted by the subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be the chairman, of the House District of Columbia Committee, I announced that we were reviewing the entire act with a view to modernizing it and bringing it up to date. No such effort had been undertaken since the original enactment of the act in January 1934.

Everyone interested in the subject matter was invited to submit their suggestions and recommendations for the improvement of that law. We have had many valuable informal conferences and discussions with representatives of the many agencies having jurisdiction over the subject matter, as well as with representatives of the various industries affected. We have heard from officialdom, management, labor, and the general public.

The committee staff, with the aid of the legislative counsel and under the fine supervision of the clerk of the committee, William McLeod, have worked hard and diligently on the matter.

I would like to make it clear that the bill is not by any means the last word on the subject. It has incorporated into it changes recommended by the agencies, and by those interested as well as the amendments proposed by the bills of several Members.

I hope that full hearings will be conducted on the bill in the near future, which will develop the pros and cons as to each proposed change, and that the bill as finally reported to the House will reflect the best thinking on the subject. In that way we hope to not only modernize the local law but enact a workable statute which will best serve the public interest, at the same time protecting the rights of all concerned.

PAKISTAN CONTRIBUTES RUPEES FOR LOCAL LABOR TOWARD COST OF CONSTRUCTING AMERICAN EMBASSY BUILDING AT KARACHI

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in reading through the President's proposed budget for 1962, I was struck by a small but significant and heartwarming footnote. It was this:

> The Government of Pakistan agreed to contribute rupees for local labor toward the cost of constructing an American Embassy building at Karachi. The cumulative amount committed by the Government of Pakistan is equivalent to $357,000. The project was largely completed in 1961.

I thought how refreshing it was, in going through this massive budget of some 1,200 printed pages—a book the size of the Metropolitan Washington telephone directory—to find this mention of another nation's contributing something to the United States. It is the only instance so mentioned.

I am informed that this contribution was made by the Government of Pakistan as a goodwill gesture and that it is the only contribution of this type ever made by a foreign nation to the United States. Pakistan is a proven friend and ally in south Asia—a member of both the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and the Central Treaty Organization, two of the free world's bulwarks against Communist aggression. This gesture on the part of the Government and people of Pakistan should not go unnoted.

I hope this story will become known to every American traveler who passes through Karachi. It should be pleasing to all Americans as we face our tax obligations this year that at least one nation in the world appreciates U.S. aid and assistance, and has proved such by its actions.

AID TO EDUCATION BILL

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I have just placed in the hopper an education bill.

The bill provides for equal educational opportunities for every American child, regardless of race, color, or religious belief. It preserves the parents' freedom of choice in education.

It authorizes, for a 2-year period, an annual grant for financial assistance for each child attending school, whether public or private. In the case of children attending a public school, the grants would be issued to the local school agency of the political subdivision in which the school is located. In the case of a private school child, the grant would go to the parent or legal guardian, and would be honored for payment only when endorsed by the payee to the school of the pupil's attendance and then endorsed by an authorized official of that same institution.

To insure the welfare of our country, it is imperative that our educational systems operate at their fullest capacity. Our greatest national asset is the development of the minds of all the children of our country.

While talented students in institutions of higher learning should be given Federal support, the primary and secondary schools form the basic foundation of American education, and they must be reinforced from the ground up. Loss of talent in the sciences, as well as in other vital fields, begins in these schools, and it is here that the chain reaction of either national growth or decline will begin.

Today, as never before, because of the Soviet threat, the national interest requires that every child be educated to his highest potential. In the American-Soviet battle of the classroom we cannot afford to deny better educational opportunities to 7 million potential scientists and leaders in other fields simply because in addition to secular subjects they receive some religious training.

If we deny freedom of education to millions of American children, we are playing with national suicide. We must allow our children under their parents to have freedom of mind and freedom of religion in the pursuit of truth. We cannot regiment the minds of our children and hope to retain our freedom as a nation.

In this country, we believe in competition. We think that rivalry is healthy. We do not like monopolies. They stultify, especially when they control the thoughts and beliefs of men. That is why I think diversity in education is essential to a free and open society, and why it is essential to America.

The education of children in science, mathematics, reading, languages, literature, geography, history, civics, economics, sociology, and other school subjects serves a public purpose. The local community, the Nation and Western civilization profit when all children are given the best education possible. Society and the American Nation suffer when 7 million children are deprived of equal educational benefits because of their religious beliefs.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF AMERICANS MUST BE PROTECTED

The parental right to choose the education of his offspring is a natural, civil, and constitutional right, protected by the first, fifth, and ninth amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

The U.S. Supreme Court in *Meyer* v. *Nebraska* (262 U.S. 390 (1923)) struck down, as unconstitutional, a Nebraska statute which made it a crime for any teacher to teach any subject in any elementary school in any language other than English. Under this statute, Meyer, a teacher in a school maintained by the Lutheran Church, was convicted of reading, in the German language, Bible stories to a child. The Supreme Court in declaring the statute unconstitutional declared that individuals had certain fundamental rights which must be respected.

Subsequently, in the case of *Pierce* v. *Society of Sisters* (268 U.S. 510 (1925)), the U.S. Supreme Court declared unconstitutional an Oregon statute which required all children to attend public schools. The Supreme Court again emphasized the natural, civil and constitutional right of a parent to educate his children in a school of his own choosing.

It is significant that the United Nations, in General Assembly, proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights set forth in subdivision 3 of article 26:

> Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given their children.

The 14th amendment includes the equal protection of the laws clause. This concept of distributive justice should bar any discrimination so that all American children will benefit under any Federal aid to education.

PRESENT STATE OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

At the present time there are many Federal programs for aid to education. For the most part, these are limited to Federal aid to higher education on the college level. In addition to the some 29 programs administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which are set forth in the Department's memorandum dated March 28, 1961, addressed to Senator Morse, Federal aid to higher education is also included in several military programs—for example, the ROTC and similar programs.

In addition, legislation was enacted which provides educational benefits to page boys of the Supreme Court and Congress. This enactment permits the boys or their parents to choose the schools they wish to attend, including parochial schools.

In all of these programs there is no discrimination insofar as children or students attending church-related institutions are concerned. In all of these programs the principle of freedom of choice of education is recognized.

The extent to which Federal aid to higher education has developed may be illustrated by a few examples.

Harvard University in its annual report stated that 25 percent of its total budget for the year 1961 represented funds appropriated by the Federal Government. Howard University is supported mainly by the Federal Government. Allied with these institutions of higher learning are schools of divinity and religion.

Although no Federal grant is involved, another example where amounts of public funds are placed under the jurisdiction of a religious institution is Yeshiva University in the city of New York. The parent school in Yeshiva University is a Jewish orthodox seminary and, by a contract between it and the city of New York, the medical school organized by Yeshiva University has jurisdiction over and the responsibility of nominating members of the clinical and other professional staff of a $45 million Bronx Municipal Hospital Center.

No one can deny the value of the great contributions all of these three institutions of higher learning have made to our national life.

NEED OF EXTENDING FEDERAL AID TO PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Throughout the country many school areas feel that they cannot continue to keep abreast of local needs without Federal aid. This situation has developed primarily because of three factors:

First. The population bulge which has occurred in this country beginning in 1941 and continuing to the present time.

Second. The development of our tax structures so that local communities can no longer bear the increasing cost of education.

Third. The threat and competition of the Soviet Union.

EXTENSION OF FEDERAL AID TO PRIMARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION SHOULD BE PATTERNED AFTER FEDERAL STATUTES ALREADY ENACTED

As already indicated, the various Federal aid programs to higher education now in force and effect respect the principle of freedom of choice in education and the parental right to choose the education of their children.

Both the GI bill and the Page Boy Education Act serve as exemplars of the type of statute which should be enacted to extend Federal aid to primary and secondary education. Both of these acts have worked well and neither of them discriminates against any American nor do they encourage a monolithic or totalitarian school system.

Secular subjects taught in church-related schools are, of course, the same as secular subjects taught in our public schools. There is no Jewish multiplication table. There is no Catholic Boyle's law in physics. There is no Protestant alphabet.

My bill is a GI bill for junior. It treats every child alike and penalizes none of them because they study secular subjects in a Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish school. I should like to emphasize, however, that my bill does not provide aid for the study of religious subjects.

The bill merely follows the approach used in the GI bill of rights and the page boy bill, both of which have worked successfully and without criticism.

It is definitely a step in the right direction.

It is the commonsense solution to this problem.

RAISING THIRD-CLASS RATES

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, all of us have had the experience of having our mailboxes crammed with unwanted circulars, promotion schemes, worthless material, and sheer junk which goes directly to the wastebasket. I daresay I have had more protests about junk mail than on any other single issue.

It is bad enough that we have to put up with this junk mail, but it is adding the proverbial insult to injury when the taxpayers have to support the cost of carrying much of this type of mail.

H. R. Pinckard had a telling statement on this subject in the Huntington, W. Va., Herald-Advertiser of January 21, 1962, which under unanimous consent I would like to insert at this point in my comments. Mr. Pinckard rightfully points the finger not only at business organizations but also at the nonprofit organizations who take advantage of the cheaper rates to release the floodgates of this material. Oh, if we only had some means of enforcing birth control on the outfits which spawn the teeming millions of junk-mail pieces.

The people are fed up to the teeth with junk mail. They expect the Congress to act.

Personally, I feel that the only fair thing to do is to raise rates on third-class mail steeply. I will work toward that end. Probably it would be easier to confine the increase at this point to those classes of mail which do not include nonprofit organizations. I believe the latter eventually should be raised also, but we should face the practical realities of the legislative situation and put through a higher rate first on the more objectionable types of mail.

I know it will be said that billions of dollars and many jobs are tied up in this business, and that such action might hurt business. Well, businesses that depend for their profit and employment on distributing such junk probably deserves some curtailment. I hope that my colleagues will join in an effort to boost third-class rates and provide a new declaration of independence for the overburdened mailman and the overstuffed boxholder.

The article referred to follows:

A PERSONAL COLUMN

(By H. R. Pinckard)

Short takes: Complaints about the junk mail problem are heard on every side. Solutions to the problem are fewer and the distance between them is greater. (That is to say, they are few and far between.)

The problem in newspaper offices is terrific. In some batches of mail as many as 4 out of every 5 pieces are worthless. They come from advertising agencies, public relations firms, associations of this kind and that, foreign embassies and do-gooder groups, colleges and other public institutions, trade organizations and industrial groups, labor unions and chambers of commerce, and goodness knows what else.

We often wonder when, if ever, the mailing lists of some of these groups are checked. Some of this stuff comes addressed to people who have been dead for 15 years or more. Other addressees parted company with these newspapers nearly as long ago, and they may be receiving the same mailing pieces at their newer locations.

None of this material—or at best only a minute portion—is ever read. Some of it is opened and instantly discarded. Much is thrown away because the addressee or the return addressee reveals that it is inconsequential.

What do the people who send this material through the mails think about Do they have any illusions that it is useful, or that it is ever printed?

I always visualize the people who prepare and mail this junk as a group of quiet, almost faceless individuals, sequestered in some dim corner of a big building.

They never seek to attract attention, but rather to avoid it. They've been there so long that nobody knows precisely what they're doing or what they're supposed to do.

Their address plates are so ancient they blur with each impression, but they hesitate to revise them. It might turn up the real destination of most of the stuff they send out.

I could tell them that the destination of most of it is the wastebasket, but they must realize this, on those rare occasions when they permit themselves to think about it.

OUR RELIGIOUS LIBERTIES

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, in this world of turmoil and injustice, with the teeming millions of hopeful humans suppressed in their religious concepts of worship by godless leaders, we Americans are proud of our religious liberties.

Our Government protects, and with humble dignity honors, the servants of God at whose altars we are all exhorted to perfect the solidarity of the family strengthened by prayer; the love of God and country fused together by the eternal fires of love for the church and as defenders of the Nation. The spiritual leader accentuates the undeviating laws of God, instilling discipline and profound respect for all laws.

Just such a follower of Christ is Msgr. Edward P. McAdams, presently pastor of the St. Joseph Catholic Church in Washington. His diamond jubilee was celebrated Saturday, January 4. He received the papal blessing of Pope John XIII, from Archbishop O'Boyle, who also celebrated a mass of thanksgiving. Msgr. John K. Cartwright, rector of the St. Mathew's Cathedral, gave the sermon. Msgr. Joseph T. Kennedy, pastor of St. John's Church, Forest Glen, attended, who had served as Monsignor McAdams' assistant at St. Joseph's Parish 37 years ago. President Kennedy sent a congratulatory message.

As an important leader of the faith in the Washington diocese, in natural sequence he, influenced by historical surroundings, became an avid student of U.S. history. It is commonly known that the monsignor ranks as an authority in this field—and the history of the church and the diocese, as well.

A true religious scholar in his sacred responsibility, God entrusted, bows in humility to the divine will and accepts, with devout fervor, the lofty mission of his religious life.

Many years are spent in devoted study to instruct the faithful in the mysterious designs of the Lord's will, and to explain many intricacies of the diverse paths of religious thought. He must impart to others theological truths that, in themselves, contribute to the strength of their religious beliefs. Through all the years of his life he must concentrate on his mission and gather strength to combat the forces of evil, not only for others, but proximate to his very person, to keep alive the graces of his heavenly aims.

The sermon referred to follows:

SERMON DELIVERED BY THE RIGHT REVEREND JOHN K. CARTWRIGHT AT THE DIAMOND JUBILEE OF THE RIGHT REVEREND EDWARD P. MCADAMS, NOVEMBER 4, 1961, ST. JOSEPH'S CHURCH, WASHINGTON

The church's eternal priesthood is composed of a multitude of individuals whose single lives are fractions of her total history. Today we gather to do honor to one priest whose ministry has covered the unusual space of 60 years. His life as a priest began with the century and has continued in valued and honorable service through about one-thirtieth of the entire record of the church on earth. Now the oldest of our diocesan clergy, 10 years older than the next in seniority, his career is memorable not only for its length but for its usefulness. Today he can look back on the reaping of many harvests and we all rejoice with him as he holds up for perhaps the 20,000th time the host and chalice which perpetuate the sacrifice of his Master. It has been the will of our Lord to keep him for so long a time as His servant in the vineyard and as the herald of His word. Hundreds and thousands of his beneficiaries are thankful to Christ for the ministries of grace through this man's priesthood. This is for them, for us, and for him a day of benediction.

What have been the characteristics of this long career?

First, as with all good priests, fidelity. Always, as when he first began, dedicated to the daily round, always obedient to the promises he had made in ordination, always accepting and administering the duties laid upon him by his three archbishops, always devoting himself to the spiritual welfare of the souls thus placed under his leadership, always offering the mass, always providing the sacraments, always preaching the eternal truths, always guiding, directing, inspiring, always keeping the flame of faith alive in the midst of outer darkness, always pointing out to men, amidst the Babel confusion of earthly aims, the supreme and lasting significance of life, always maintaining in the vicissitudes of earth the primacy of the spiritual.

This faithfulness, this tenacity of will and purpose, this refusal to get lost or be diverted, is the great quality of the Catholic priesthood. We are human and therefore imperfect. As St. Gregory says, it is inevitable that even spiritual minds should be soiled somewhat with earthly dust. "Necesse est de mundano pulvere etiam religiosa corda sordescere."

Sometimes use and custom tarnish the glory and pride of the priesthood. But always the charge and the duty remain in the inmost citadel of the soul, and the true priest never gives up the custody of that citadel. Monsignor McAdams has kept that honor of the priesthood, that fidelity which is quintessential to Christ's church, that unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. He shares it, thank God, with all of us. But he has sustained the charge much longer than any of us, and we his fellow priests look upon him with admiration and with pride.

But this is what might be said at any jubilee. Each priest, however, has his own manner of understanding and carrying out his office. Perhaps we might all agree that in Monsignor McAdams' case his chief way of being a priest and of imitating the Master is his ready and unvarying kindness, his striking gift of friendliness. Sometimes we of the clergy are so impressed with our responsibility for carrying the Tablets of the Law that we take on a certain mask of sternness to the ordinary ways of men. But the First Priest was not of that sort. He ruled and rules by kindness. In His court all the courtiers are volunteers. And that priest speaks best for Christ who carries out Christ's courtesy to souls. Those obey his guidance most surely and dependably who obey it willingly and gladly. The strongest priestly authority is always the most gracious. In the many places of this priest's ministry, in Baltimore, in the Maryland counties, in the U.S. Army, in Westernport, in Washington, he has not only served souls, but he has been the friend of souls. He has known how to combine zeal for salvation with the quality of mercy and human affection. His congregations have been the sheep of his flock, but they have also been his friends.

As pastor of his church, he has been distinguished for his love of the beauty of God's house. When he first came to St. Joseph's he had the building renovated and adorned, putting into the work much of his own thought and taste. There has been in our time a very considerable improvement in this matter all over the United States. When monsignor was young the old-fashioned wedding-cake altars and the tasteless vestments were still the rule. His generation was among the first to set up new precedents. And he was in full accord with the much needed changes that have now become widespread.

He loved not only his people but the Church as such. This was reflected in the interest in history of the church for which he is so celebrated. Particularly the history of this archdiocese was an absorbing concern to him as was also the history of our country and of our Capital City. He was deeply and continuously interested in Maryland and her traditions. He understood the fact which is so much forgotten that the first place to proclaim and establish religious freedom was that beloved State under its Catholic settlers. When the freedom train went through the country with its exhibition of documents, this fact of the Maryland Catholic primacy in religious freedom was ignored. If everybody in Maryland took an interest in her history like that of monsignor such an omission would not have been possible.

His residence has always been a sort of historical museum and he has contributed to St. Mary's, Baltimore and to Mount St. Mary's, Emmitsburg, much of his valuable collection of books. The latter college has a splendid new library and a conspicuous adornment is a large painting of the first mass in Maryland. This painting was done at monsignor's order and was originally in this church. It now serves wider use in its present location. It helps to point up the first glory of Maryland's history and it will remain a monument to Maryland and to one of Maryland's finest sons.

And so, dear monsignor, we greet you today and thank you for these and many other reasons. We are happy that you have been granted so long a day to stay with us. We hope that your time with us will still be long and happy. "Mane nobiscum quoniam adverperascit." May God grant us the favor of your remaining with us until it is very late.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 hour on February 14 and again for 1 hour on February 15 at the conclusion of all other legislative business and following any special orders previously entered.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that I do not intend to talk on both occasions. February 15 is the anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine*, and if we are in session on the 15th I shall talk at that time; if not, on the 14th. I am asking unanimous consent on both February 14 and 15.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

RENEWAL OF THE RECIPROCAL TRADE ACT

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, with the time approaching for the renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Act, I believe it is timely to call attention to the desperate situation in which the wool industry finds itself. Among the textile group, wool is the worst off and if this important industry is to survive, it must have immediate relief. The wool industry is important to the economy and the defense of this country and I believe that it must and should be saved.

Briefly stated, the textile problem is an import problem.

In woolen goods, imports have reached a higher proportion than in any other branch of the textile industry.

Yet no action whatever has been taken for the relief of the wool sector of the industry under the President's textile program. No plans have been made for it, and the State Department has declared that at present it intends to do nothing about it. And this despite the studied conclusions by many Members of the House and Senate, transmitted to the President June 27, 1961, emphasizing the gravity of the textile and apparel import problem and stating that the continued absence of limitations on imports "will insure the continued deterioration of the U.S. industry"; and despite the reply of the President on June 30, 1961, that "the State Department has been instructed to get the best possible relief not only for cotton but for all other fibers."

The State Department has sought on the following grounds to justify this failure to implement the President's textile program on wool: That tariff adjustments on certain classes of woven cloths of wool had been made effective January 1, 1961, and that since the consequence of these changes might be to reduce the volume of imports of wool products, the Department preferred to "wait and see."

The reasons alleged for failure to follow the President's instructions are mistaken and unsupported by fact.

The tariff adjustments relied upon affect only a minor part of the total volume of wool imports. To most wool textile classifications they are irrelevant.

These tariff changes are also irrelevant to the President's textile program. They were made merely to overcome administrative difficulties in the application of an old trade agreement provision of 1956 on wool cloth. The duty adjustments had already been made when the President issued his instructions to proceed with the best possible relief for wool and other fibers.

These modifications of the wool cloth duty cannot be relied upon to arrest the continuing rise of wool product imports.

The need for relief is urgent. The serious readjustment which the wool and worsted industry has experienced since 1947 has entailed the liquidation of 314 mills and the loss of employment of over 100,000 persons. Over 50 percent of the productive capacity and jobs in the U.S. industry has been lost, while the woolen and worsted industries of all other countries have increased wool consumption by 50 percent.

During this same period imports have been rising rapidly, having increased by 327 percent since 1948. In 1960, imports amounted to over 15 percent of domestic production of woolen and worsted broadwoven fabrics.

The President in presenting his program last May said:

> It is time for action.

It should be brought to his notice that his instructions have not been complied with and the ensuing delay has been seriously prejudicial to the wool industry.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks and the insertions I shall make, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS] be permitted to extend his remarks at that point; I make the same request in behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA], and the gentlelady from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and others for whom permission has been asked, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the same subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject, following my own.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with Americans of Ukrainian ancestry in celebrating the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day. The history of the Ukrainian people during the last 1,000 years is the history of a struggle for independence against overwhelming odds, an attempt that was repeatedly made impossible by foreign invaders. The northern and western parts of the Ukraine are the ancient territories of the earliest medieval Russian state of the 9th through 13th centuries, having Kiev as its capital and the valley of the Dnieper River as its principal economic artery. These populous and flourishing territories were completely devastated by the Mongol invasions of the 13th century. Many of the present day inhabitants are descendants of these people, the original population of Kievan Russia.

The people of the eastern and southern Ukraine are for the most part descended from Ruthene immigrants from the north who, to escape the oppression of the area princes and nobles, escaped to the frontier, where they formed free and democratic communities and came to be known as Cossacks. Then in 1667 the portion east of the Dnieper River was ceded to Russia and then the Ukrainians were once more divided, the left-bank Ukraine belonging to the Poles, while the Turks controlled the southern steppes. In 1794 the major portion of the Ukrainian people came under Russian rule, as a result of the second partition of Poland, although many Ukrainians remained scattered in the Austro-Hungarian Empire and in Rumania.

The modern political movement whose ideal was the union of all Ruthenes in a Ukrainian nation is associated above all with the names of the Ruthene scholar Kostomarov and the poet Shevchenko. This movement, which started in the middle of the 19th century, gathered force especially after the outbreak of World War I.

During his short life Taras Shevchenko touched every chord of the Ukrainian heart. He shared the fortunes of his people and during his unhappy life suffered all the hardships of serfdom, of exile, and of police supervision that was the fate of the greater part of his compatriots. Seldom has a poet lived and suffered to the full as did Shevchenko and rarely has a man so fully incorporated all the aspirations of his people. Truly it can be said that the poetry of Shevchenko represents the entire nation of 40 million Ukrainians who have so far failed to receive that independence which they so richly deserve.

Shevchenko experienced the hardships of 19th century Ukrainian toil as a young serf from a broken family. His artistic inclinations never had a chance to develop. Later, through the efforts of influential Russian artists who purchased his freedom for 2,500 rubles—an exorbitant sum—he returned to the land of his birth and saw the evils under which the Ukraine was suffering through the eyes of an enlightened, progressive, and successful man of the world. In various poems, including one called "Epistle To My Dead, Living and Unborn Countrymen in Ukraine and Not Ukraine," he expressed his bitter indignation at the denial of independence and liberty to his people. But in 1848 Shevchenko's poetry was regarded as treacherous to Russia, and he was exiled to the life of a soldier for almost a decade. After his release, the poet wanted to settle in his native Ukraine and look after his friends, but he was soon arrested by narrow-minded landowners and was then forced to settle in St. Petersburg to avoid further trouble with the government. He died at the age of 47, still working for the improvement of the Ukrainians. Shevchenko's life was filled with tribulation and sorrow; after his death, his body was carried back to his native Ukraine by triumphant admirers.

The ideals of Shevchenko were not destined to be realized, although the collapse of the Russian empire in 1917 and the downfall of the Habsburg Monarchy which followed seemed to be the opportunity for which Ukrainians had long been waiting. In March 1917 a formal demand for the recognition of Ukrainian autonomy was made to the provisional government at Petrograd, and in April a Ukrainian national convention met at Kiev to elect a council. As the Bolshevik revolution broke out in Petrograd on November 20, the rada—council—of Ukrainian patriots proclaimed a Ukrainian People's Republic, whose independence was accepted in principle by the Bolsheviks. This council became what has been called the first modern Ukrainian government. Professor Hrushevsky, V. Vynnychenko, and Simon Petlyura were the leaders in this government. By this time the suffering Ukrainian people had been under the rule of the czars for more than 250 years and that of the Habsburg Monarchy of Vienna for some 150 years. During all that time they retained the hope of freeing themselves from alien oppression.

The Provisional Government of Russia, set up after the overthrow of the czarist regime, was alarmed by this separatist movement in Ukraine. Efforts were made to conciliate the Ukrainian leaders, and apparently the Ukrainians were willing, at that time, to remain within the Russian realm. But the overthrow of the Provisional Government in Russia in November and Lenin's rise to power changed the situation. Some Ukrainian leaders were seemingly impressed by Lenin's claim that he favored self-determination, which he preached throughout his revolutionary career. They decided to assert their independence, but the move was rejected by the Bolshevik government in Moscow headed by Lenin. Lenin's government ignored all claims to independence on the part of the Ukrainian people, and proved determined to deny them by force if necessary. Subsequently the Red army attacked Ukraine, occupied its capital city of Kiev in January of 1918, and began to carry out mass executions there.

In the midst of these events, on January 22, 1918, Ukrainian leaders proclaimed Ukraine's independence, and asked Austria and Germany for help. With the aid received from Germany, Ukrainians reorganized their forces and were able to expel Russian Bolsheviks from most of Ukraine by April. Late in April a constitution was adopted and Hrushevsky was elected President.

In the meantime factious strife was developing among Ukrainians, and this was encouraged by the Germans. At about the time when Hrushevsky was elected President, Gen. Pavlo Skoropadsky, supported by the Germans, proclaimed himself the ruler of Ukraine. This remained a problem until the end of the war; then General Skoropadsky fled to Germany.

On November 15, 1918, Ukrainian leaders reasserted their rights and revived the suppressed Ukrainian National Republic. On January 22, 1919, 1 year after the original proclamation of independence, the Government proclaimed the Union of Western Ukraine. However, neither this memorable event nor any other step taken by isolated Ukrainian leaders could save their independence. This became evident when the newly born Ukrainian National Republic found itself under insuperable political and economic handicaps. It was attacked by the resurgent Red army. Early in 1920 the Red army moved against Ukraine, and by June its massive onslaught had led to the capture of virtually the entire country. In an armistice signed in June, there was no mention of an independent Ukraine. The Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic was set up and became part of the Soviet Union. Thus in the course of 2 eventful years independent Ukraine had vanished and once more the Ukrainian people were brought under Russian rule, this time as part of the U.S.S.R.

After reciting this tragic narrative of a people's unfulfilled yearning for independence, I would like to recall a few lines of Shevchenko's verse. During the first years of his service in the Russian Army, his mind was filled with longing for the Ukraine, and although he was able to write only with great difficulty, some of his poems of this period are among his finest personal lyrics:

> Songs of mine, O songs of mine,
> You are all I have.
> Do not leave me now, I pray,
> In this dreadful time.
> Fly to me, my little dovelets,
> With your wings of gray.
> From the spreading Dnipro fly here
> To the steppes and stay
> With the poor and needy Kirghiz.
> They are really poor,
> Yes, and naked, but in freedom
> They can pray to God.
> Fly to me, my darling thoughts,
> With calm words and true,
> I shall greet you as my children
> And shall weep with you.

Mr. Speaker, since last March, when I introduced House Resolution 211 to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations, I have provided considerable evidence of the popular nationwide support that exists in behalf of this proposal. This support will have to be reckoned with sooner or later.

As the record clearly shows, this popular support of our proposal is extensive and deep. All major national organizations directly concerned with this primary problem are fully behind it. Forty similar resolutions have been offered in favor of it. The nationwide observance of Captive Nations Week highlighted it. Thousands of letters have underscored the necessity of it and articles, editorials and commentaries in a variety of organs have emphasized the need to concentrate on Moscow's colonialism and imperialism. I am certain that my colleagues are vividly aware of all this.

The resolution follows:

H. Res. 211

Whereas on the issue of colonialism the blatant hypocrisy of imperialist Moscow has not been adequately exposed by us in the United Nations and elsewhere; and

Whereas two Presidential proclamations designating Captive Nations Week summon the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations"; and

Whereas the nationwide observances in the first anniversary of Captive Nations Week clearly demonstrated the enthusiastic response of major sections of our society to this Presidential call; and

Whereas following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 by the Congress of the United States and again during the observance of Captive Nations Week in 1960, Moscow displayed to the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in all of the captive nations, and particularly the occupied non-Russian colonies within the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the indispensable advancement of such basic knowledge and interest alone can serve to explode current myths on Soviet unity, Soviet national economy and monolithic military prowess and openly to expose the depths of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout the Red Russian Empire, especially inside the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas for example, it was not generally recognized, and thus not advantageously made use of, that in point of geography, history, and demography, the now famous U-2 plane flew mostly over captive non-Russian territories in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas in the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our times is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom, we commence to win the psychopolitical cold war by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and other subjugated nations; and

Whereas the enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding of the fate of these occupied and captive non-Russians nations would also give encouragement to latent liberal elements in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic—which contains Russia itself—and would help bring to the oppressed Russian people their overdue independence from centuries-long authoritarian rule and tyranny; and

Whereas these weapons of truth, fact, and ideas would counter effectively and overwhelm and defeat Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and specifically among the newly independent and underdeveloped nations and states; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon us as free citizens to appreciatively recognize that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom in a struggle which in totalistic form is psychopolitical; and

Whereas in pursuit of a diplomacy of truth we cannot for long avoid bringing into question Moscow's legalistic pretensions of "noninterference in the internal affairs of states" and other contrivances which are acutely subject to examination under the light of morally founded legal principles and political, economic, and historical evidence; and

Whereas in the implementing spirit of our own congressional Captive Nations Week resolution and the two Presidential proclamations it is in our own strategic interest and that of the nontotalitarian free world to undertake a continuous and unremitting study of all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new approaches and fresh ideas for victory in the psychopolitical cold war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby established a committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The committee shall be composed of ten Members of the House, of whom not more than six shall be members of the same political party and of whom five shall be members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sec. 2. (a) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(b) The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. In the absence of the chairman, the vice chairman shall act as chairman.

(c) A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

Sec. 3. (a) The committee shall conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which includes those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspirations to regain their national and individual freedoms.

(b) The committee shall make such interim reports to the House of Representatives as it deems proper, and shall make its first comprehensive report of the results of its inquiry and study, together with its recommendations, not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times within or outside the United States to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

SEC. 5. The committee may employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, the anniversary today of the independence of Ukraine has an added significance to me and the people of my district for it was my privilege and honor to escort to the House today to offer prayer, the Reverend Joseph J. Fedorek, rector of St. Michael's Ukrainian Catholic Church, Shenandoah, Pa., which is in my congressional district.

Father Fedorek was designated by Metropolitan Senyshyn, of Philadelphia, to deliver a prayer on the occasion of this annual tribute in the House to one of the captive nations, particularly since the Congress adopted the captive nations resolution. For the largest captive non-Russian nation in Eastern Europe such an opportunity is given with the observance of the 44th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine.

There is no speculation as to how colonial Moscow reacts when truths about captive Ukraine are raised. The evidence is substantial, clear, and indisputable. Khrushchev suffered a nightmare when for the first time the 86th Congress listed this nation in the captive nations resolution. At the recent 22d Party Congress Khrushchev again attacked the resolution. In 1960 Canada's Prime Minister dwelled on Ukraine in a United Nations address and Moscow maligned him for weeks. In a memo of November 25, our U.N. Ambassador stressed Moscow's colonial domination over Ukraine, and the Russians were stunned. The confession by Moscow's agent, Bogdan N. Stashynsky, to the murders of patriotic Ukrainian leaders in exile—Dr. Lev R. Rebet in 1957 and Stepan Bandera in 1959—gives further proof of Khrushchev's terrorism and his fear of Ukrainian nationalism. Amazing, is it not, for one who would bamboozle the world with his missiles, and so forth.

If we seek to gain the offensive in the cold war, these few examples show why it is so necessary to spotlight the captive status of Ukraine. Our part here today in focusing worldwide attention on the Ukraine will help enormously in the cause of freedom and truth, and will inspire both hope and gratitude in the souls of millions.

This 44th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine brings the minds and souls of all Americans, and freedom-loving people everywhere, together in the common objective that the day will soon dawn when the freedom-loving Ukrainians will have the joy and happiness in their hearts which is just as much their God-given heritage as is yours and mine.

Who amongst us, or, for that matter, men and women everywhere who have their souls and spirit turned to the eternal light, can but hope and pray that Ukraine will soon have its tyrannical Soviet bonds broken, and the myth of enforced Communist coexistence buried in the depths of the unknown.

It is incumbent upon us to do everything within our earthly powers to help restore the independence of Ukraine in a manner which will bring peace on earth to those who are even willing to give their lives so that the freedom of others can be restored and perpetuated in future generations.

In the hard coal regions of Pennsylvania, which I have the honor and privilege to represent, we have what you might call a crucible—a melting pot of people of all nationalities. They came there, hundreds of thousands from foreign shores, where they could establish themselves to work and worship as they saw fit.

A great majority in yesteryear came to our region not in search of a free and easy life, but to enter the bowels of the earth where they sweat and toiled to make themselves independent, and to insure the future of their offspring. Among the thousands and thousands of these offspring we have those of Ukrainian descent.

These children of former Ukrainian immigrants are now amongst the leaders in our business, our industrial, our civic, our cultural, and our religious life. They are freedom-loving people. They have inherited this great blessing from a strong and sturdy race that brought them to our shores. Is it any wonder that they are joined together today in helping to reestablish in the homeland of their forebears the liberty and freedom which they enjoy in our country today?

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to all citizens of the United States and our liberty-loving allies, that we are again united with our Ukrainian brothers in the hope, work, and prayers that Ukraine must be liberated from the yoke of Communist tyranny and its independence restored. This is our common objective—our common pledge.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], who for many years in this House has been particularly active in all matters dealing with minority problems of countries under the oppression of Communist domination.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my appreciation and compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the splendid exposition he has made with reference to this great nation of the Ukraine on the 44th anniversary of its independence.

I want to congratulate the gentleman particularly on his foresight in bringing to this Congress the resolution calling for the establishment of the Captive Nations Committee. I think it is extremely important that this committee be established at once. Such a committee would be a factfinding group. It would, by the process of hearings and studies, permit a continuous and systematic study of all the captive nations of Europe and Asia. Such a committee could make available to our Ambassador at the United Nations information that would present forcefully and accurately the situation with reference to these Russian-occupied and Russian-submerged nations.

I think that when the true facts are properly disseminated it will advance the cause of peace and freedom. When the vast empire which the Russians have established by terror, armed aggression, and subversion is clearly defined and exposed to the world, it will demand justice for the many non-Russian nations submerged in the empire.

In my opinion we will not have permanent peace until all nations, large and small, are free and independent again.

I wish to congratulate the gentleman on his presentation.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCRANTON] in whose district there are many Americans of Ukrainian extraction.

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for yielding and I wish to express at the outset my deep appreciation for his taking this time today. Many people in my district had the honor and privilege of listening to a speech he made last September in the city of Scranton to the Convention of the Ukrainian Youth League of North America. It was a fine speech, dealing primarily with the problems of the captive nations and the necessity for having a Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives.

This splendid speech covered the subject better than I ever heard it covered before. I commend him for that as well as for his leadership and his efforts with regard to the captive nations and the people behind the Iron Curtain.

Second, may I say I was particularly pleased to have the gentleman refer today to that great poet, Taras Shevchenko, who is not only a tremendous person in the history of the Ukraine but is also one of the greatest poets in the history of the entire world, a man whose poetry I have been privileged to read and have found truly inspiring.

January 22 may mark no special anniversary in American history, but it should be a day of inspiration for us all, nonetheless. For on that day, 44 years ago, an independent Ukrainian state was proclaimed at the ancient capital of Kiev, to the sound of Russian guns across the Dnieper.

It was a day of triumph for the Ukraine, but it was a triumph that was destined to be short lived. The Communists, both then and now, vociferously claim to support the principle of self-determination; even Lenin himself had recognized the Ukraine's right to independence in unequivocal language. Yet simultaneously the Bolsheviks were preparing to crush the fledgling Ukrainian democracy. Communism early wore the mask of treachery.

The swirl and confusion of events as revolutionary and counterrevolutionary armies marched across Russia cannot be detailed here. The young Ukrainian state was beset by enemies. It struggled valiantly, but by November of 1921 it had fallen victim to the Soviet armies and the indifference and even hostility of the victorious Allied Powers of World War I.

For Americans, January 22, 1918, can only serve to reinforce our well-founded mistrust of the Communists. For Ukrainians, it is a day to honor the memory of those who aspired to restore the Ukraine to her ancient independence. For the whole world it is a reminder that the Soviet Union pays lipservice to the principle of self-determination, but uses it only to advance the interests of world communism. Even as we recall the significance of this day, we renew our faith in the eventual freedom of all peoples held captive by the Soviet Empire.

And this is the prime reason why I have supported and continue to support the House resolution for the establishment of a Captive Nations Committee. We must continue to demonstrate our faith in those behind the Iron Curtain who wish to be free.

The State Department personnel are somewhat inhibited from doing this, for they must daily concern themselves with the so-called presently constituted governments of the captive nations. Thus it is appropriate and necessary that the Congress take up this task. The best vehicle for promoting this effort would be a Captive Nations Committee.

I include as part of my remarks the following letter from the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., whose chairman is the distinguished Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, INC.

Hon. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCRANTON: Whatever section of the country you formally represent, on matters of foreign relations, you really represent the entire Nation. In every State and district, responsible and thinking Americans are manifesting a deep interest in all the captive nations, particularly those in the U.S.S.R. itself. There is a growing appreciation of what the Soviet Union really is and how crucial its internal captive nations are to the security of our country.

You have doubtless sensed this yourself. I believe that for our total national interest and goodwill, understanding of all nations and peoples, you would seize every opportunity to express the freedom aspirations of each captive nation. For the largest captive non-Russian nation in Eastern Europe, such an opportunity is given with the observance of the 44th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine on January 22.

There is no speculation as to how colonial Moscow reacts when truths about captive Ukraine are raised. The evidence is substantial, clear, and indisputable. When for the first time the 86th Congress listed this nation in the captive nations resolution, Khrushchev suffered a nightmare. At the recent 22d Party Congress, he again attacked the resolution. In 1960 Canada's Prime Minister dwelled on Ukraine in a U.N. address, and Moscow maligned him for weeks. In an unprecedented memo of November 25, our U.N. Ambassador stressed Moscow's colonial domination over Ukraine, and the Russians were stunned. The recent confession by Moscow's agent, Bogdan N. Stashynsky, to the murders of patriotic Ukrainian leaders in exile—Dr. Lev. R. Rebet in 1957 and Stepan Bandera in 1959—gives further proof of Khrushchev's terrorism and his fear of Ukrainian nationalism. Amazing, isn't it, for one who would bamboozle the world with his missiles, etc.

If we seek to gain the offensive in the cold war, these few examples show why it is so necessary to spotlight the captive status of Ukraine.

Sincerely yours,
LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Chairman, Georgetown University.

Mr. FLOOD. I am very grateful to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his very kind words about my efforts, and I appreciate his contribution to the remarks today, more particularly those words in which he encourages action in the Committee on Rules for the adoption of a resolution on captive nations.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI], who at one time served as my chief clerk and my chief investigator and my chief cook and bottle washer, I would say, without whose valiant service as interpreter the investigation by the Katyn committee of the massacre of some 7,000 Polish officers by the Russians would never have been the success it was. I am also very happy that a few years after that great work of his the people of his district saw fit to send him to join us as a Member of this body.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to join the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] in paying tribute today to the great people of the Ukraine on the 44th anniversary of their declaration of freedom. I think it is extremely important that we observe these ceremonies here in the House. I would like to particularly commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for arranging today's tribute to the people of the Ukraine.

The speaker immediately preceding me discussed briefly the significance of these observances. I agree it is important that at least we here in Congress give assurance to the world that our Nation is not forgetting the plight of those millions of people now living in oppression behind the Iron Curtain. I think that these observances which we conduct here in the House are important. They help again dramatize the full meaning of the treachery and the deceit of the Communist system.

The Ukrainian people have a long history of dedication to the principles of freedom and the dignity of the individual, and certainly our voices should be raised in their defense. I am particularly grateful to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for his emphasis today on the need for the creation of a Captive Nations Committee here in Congress. There is no question in my mind that the continuous subjugation by the Communists of millions of people in Europe, in the Ukraine, in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, in Rumania, in Hungary, in Bulgaria, in Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia constitutes to the Soviet Union a real Achilles' heel. There is no question in my mind that if the Kremlin thought for one second that they could count on these subjugated peoples as allies, the Communists would certainly have violated the peace of the world a long time ago. I think the Captive Nations Committee, proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], would certainly help keep the spirit of freedom alive among those in the captive nations and it would help bring to the world the full ugly record of Communist deceit.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has conducted a great public service today in arranging this program. Permit me to point out, in concluding my remarks, that without his sincere and dedicated effort on the Katyn committee, on which I had the privilege of serving as chief investigator in 1952, without the assistance, without the skill and the knowledge of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] I am sure we would not have been able to write the first significant international indictment against the mass crimes committed by the Communists during World War II against Allied soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, during the Katyn massacre investigation we uncovered indisputable proof that the Soviet Union was guilty for this monstrous crime; that the orders were given by Joe Stalin to murder these 15,000 Polish Army officers in the Katyn Forest in Soviet territory because the Communists knew that these were the people who in the postwar period would have led the opposition to the Communist takeover of Poland.

Mr. Speaker, during that investigation we came across another horrible massacre where the Communists also massacred thousands of Ukrainian citizens at Venetza, simply because these people refused to give in to the Communist doctrine. The same technique of execution was used by the Communists against the Ukrainian victims as was used against the Poles in Katyn.

So, the whole scope of Communist infamy is written across the continent of central Europe, including the Ukraine, and the other captive nations.

Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I wrote a letter to the Premier of Poland, Mr. Gomulka, in which I called upon him not as Premier of Poland but as chairman of the Communist Party in that country to admit and denounce the part that Joe Stalin played in ordering the massacre of 15,000 Allied army officers in the Katyn Forest. It is significant to me that Mr. Gomulka has not responded to this appeal, simply because we know that these atrocities, these infamies, these crimes that the Soviet Union and the Communists have perpetrated against mankind not only in the Ukraine and Poland, but all the other nations of Europe, are today the greatest threat to their survival, even though in Moscow they are today denouncing Stalin and trying to erase his brutality from Communist history. The fact remains that the Soviet-dominated leaders in countries of central Europe are afraid to admit that it was Stalin who was guilty of those atrocities in Katyn and the Ukraine, even though the Katyn committee whose chairman was our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], had proved beyond any doubt that the Communists were responsible for those crimes.

Mr. Speaker, it is only by these memorial services that we who are here in this House can remind the world again of the full scope of Communist treachery.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for arranging today's tribute on the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian people.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on this 44th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine my thoughts and my prayers are with the men, women and children in the captive nations of Europe who look forward to the time when the heel of the tyrant will be removed and again they can find dignity and contentment under their own free, independent, and sovereign nations.

I am happy that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] has arranged time for us in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States to observe, as properly we should, the Ukraine's Independence Day. I join with him; with my distinguished and beloved friend from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN]; with my good and close friend, my colleague from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI]; and with the many others in this body in renewing our pledge that we shall stand steadfast with the peoples of the captive nations until the night of tyranny is over and again they are free.

Mr. Speaker, the night under Russian tyranny has been long and cruel to the peoples of the brave Ukraine and the other captive nations. That night it is within our power to shorten by prompt passage of the resolution creating a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. I trust that very early in this session the special House committee will be authorized.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, on this memorable day, January 22, 1962, we celebrate the 44th anniversary of Ukraine's independence. It is important that we keep alive the memories of this anniversary in the United States, especially in that we include Ukraine as an extension of freedom's frontier.

The many Congressmen have entered in the RECORD of our proceedings their sincere feelings toward captive nations and their leaders. The 86th Congress reflected this greatest of suppressed desires in the passage of the captive week resolution, Public Law 86-749, when a statue was authorized to commemorate the memory of Europe's great freedom fighter, Shevchenko: House Document 445. This was truly a measure of hope to those nations behind the Iron Curtain, and proved to the world that American thought for the struggles of liberty-loving people was not lost nor abandoned in our materialistic and economic struggle for supremacy.

We have not been miserly with our riches but, rather, have supported, by enormous appropriations, our contributions to aid the many underdeveloped countries of the world.

To be sure, some may assert that we did this from a selfish point of view; namely, to keep these peoples on our side and, thus, to counteract the support of communism. But, in reality, we have accomplished a great deal in improving the standard of living and the opportunities for greater progress in the development of individual and national pride of accomplishment, giving realistic proof that the institutions and principles upon which our Government was founded are the best security for protecting the freedoms that we enjoy.

The freedom-loving patriots in these captive nations, armed with the truth and realistic proof of what we are doing for other nations, including several of those under Soviet domination, will someday feed the fires of patriotic ambitions among those persons, to rise up against the common enemy of mankind. This aroused populace will, someday, flex its muscles of freedom and establish for themselves a government, modeled after their early governments, and realistically celebrate the anniversary of their independence as a free people. This will truly be the end of the cold war and result in the independence and freedom among all nations of the new, extended frontier of peace.

The celebration of this anniversary will give confidence and hope to a suppressed nation.

The United States salutes Ukraine on the anniversary of the celebration of independence.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] has always been more than kind and eloquent in espousing this cause.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE], who from time to time since I have introduced this resolution has appeared in all our debates, and I see him willing again.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I certainly would like to join in commending the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for his perseverance and his dedication to this important cause. Certainly, the history which he has outlined of the Ukrainian people and the events that are transpiring today stress the importance of our continual emphasis upon the spirit of the millions who have been enslaved by the international Communist conspiracy.

Mr. Speaker, as he traced the history of the Ukraine, certainly those who have spent time in studying this matter recognize that the tactics that were used to bring about the subjugation of the Ukrainian people are no different than those being used today by the butcher of the Ukraine, Mr. Khrushchev. We all recall, as we read through the pages of history that the cry then was the cry of peace from the leaders of the Bolshevik movement, when the Western World was in a position to crush the threat. It is the same today—the cry of peace, the dialectic of peace of the Bolshevik tyrants—so that today the leadership of the Western World is needed to give the strength necessary to prevent the butchery and exploitation not only of the Ukrainian people but of other millions. The cry is still the same today. The cry is the Communist cry of peace, but they do not mean live and let live, and self-determination, which has been clearly indicated. They mean the swallowing bit by bit of people who have lived with the traditions and heritage of freedom. This heritage may or may not be exactly as we understand it, but it is still a heritage that is their own self-determination.

Mr. Speaker, certainly the perseverance of the gentleman from Pennsylvania in every year raising this cry again, obviously in the face of a feeling of frustration since action has not followed here at the congressional level as far as this resolution is concerned, certainly that feeling of frustration one of these days, sooner or later, is going to be replaced with a feeling of satisfaction that there are those of us who understand the very nature of our enemy and who understand the necessity of exploiting what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] calls the Achilles' heel of communism, the people who are enslaved by this ruthless tyranny presently headed by the butcher of the Ukraine, Mr. Khrushchev, with his wringing of his hands and cry of peace. Certainly, we hope success will come to these attempts to establish this Captive Nations Committee.

Perhaps we will be able in our outlook on world affairs to substitute for the errors that have taken place here through changing administrations the establishment of a movement which may give some hope to these people that there will come a day of liberation.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank most sincerely the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the eloquence of the gentleman from Indiana is always most helpful. Mr. Speaker, I have the opportunity now of remembering the day I took the floor here first to oppose and attack Castro, when everyone at that time thought he was quite a charming friend. And at my right hand then as today was the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] who hastened to join me in that first attack, in this memorable Hall, against the bearded marvel from Havana. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I joined the gentleman against Castro, because the gentleman from Pennsylvania was the first one to recognize that Castro was a Communist, from the beginning. This was over 2 years ago. He was not only a prophet, he was a superprophet. But, anyway, he was a prophet then and he is a prophet now.

These are pages of history, Mr. Speaker, that should not be forgotten. I do not have any of these great people living in my part of the world, but we know of them and we know of the great trials through which they have passed and the infamies visited on them by these godless people who have captured the whole state of Russia. Not enough people know about this page in history.

The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] has been in the forefront of the battle against communism, in Central America, in Cuba, in South America, indeed all over the world. He has always been the first to raise his voice against communism and this House and the Nation owes him a debt of gratitude. The Nation should know again and again, should be told again and again what happened to these great people. They say that less than 3 percent of the people in Russia are Communists and yet the Communists have captured over 200 million people. The point the gentleman is making today is what has happened to those people could happen here. And it must not happen here. So we owe the gentleman a debt of gratitude. The State of Pennsylvania should feel honored in having him here as a Representative in this branch of the Congress.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, without those flattering words from my cousin from South Carolina this day would not have been a success.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, it was 44 years ago that the people of the Ukraine joyously proclaimed the Ukrainian National Republic, after centuries of subjection to the rule of Russia. We rise today to commemorate this significant occasion in the history of this great people, in the hope that the tribute which we gladly pay will serve to strengthen their spirit of freedom.

One of the first peoples to establish their independence following the fall of the czarist regime, the Ukrainians, on March 17, 1917, established their own governing body, the Rada, and in July of that year drafted a constitution. It was on January 22, 1918, that the Republic was officially proclaimed.

We recall with sorrow how short lived was their independence. Here, again, the Russians—this time, the Bolsheviks who had gained power—used brute force to suppress a young Republic. Mass deportations, forced famines, and other unspeakable tortures were inflicted by the Communist imperialists. No oppression, however, has been strong enough to quench the yearning for freedom that lies deep within the Ukrainian heart.

Today, these vigorous, hard-working people, over 40 million strong, compose the largest ethnic group behind the Iron Curtain and represent one-fifth of the population of the Soviet Union. Their lands extend from the Black Sea to the Carpathian Mountains, to the Donets Basin and the Don River, and comprise one of the most productive farm areas in the world. Their subjugation was accomplished only through military force, terror, and deceit, a pattern familiar in all Communist-dominated countries. Their rights of personal and political freedoms are flagrantly disregarded—they are, indeed, captive people. Nevertheless, the relentless effort throughout generations to integrate these people into the Russian culture and to destroy their political freedom has not lessened or eradicated the boundless love of the Ukrainians for their homeland and for their own culture. In no way has their hope diminished that soon again they will stand as freemen. Our thoughts and prayers are with them today, as once more we pay tribute to their courage and acknowledge their contribution to the cause of freedom everywhere.

It seems fitting also, at this hour, that we remind ourselves of how rich a gift Americans of Ukrainian descent have made to the culture and political heritage of our own country through demonstrated devotion to democratic ideals and strong belief in justice and liberty. We share with them their aspirations for the freedom and independence of the land of their forefathers.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. On the 22d of January, people of Ukrainian background all over the world will be acknowledging the 44th anniversary of independence. Independence is more than a word, more than an expression to these people. It represents hope, a desire, an aspiration. It remains an aspiration today because these people are not free. They are not independent. Yet, Ukrainians take note of an independence day.

This date commemorates their independence which was declared after the czarist regime in Russia was overthrown. The brave Ukrainians did not have the weapons nor the organization that was necessary to defend themselves against the overwhelming number of Bolshevik troops sent to conquer them. Thus after only a short-lived independent period, the Ukraine became part of the Soviet Union.

Throughout much of its history, the Ukraine has been overrun by rulers who attempted to incorporate the area into their own nations. In spite of this, the courageous people of the Ukraine have been able to maintain a spirit characterized by their own definitive culture and language. This is exemplified today as the Ukrainians strive to maintain a distinction between themselves and their Soviet oppressors. Today, the people are living under a tyranny far more oppressive than any that they have ever experienced. Communist rule has endeavored to stamp out the flame of freedom that burns in their valiant hearts. The Soviets are attempting an impossible task. The Ukrainian yearning for independence is much stronger than Soviet oppression. On the surface, the Communists seem to be sovietizing the Ukraine. However, underneath, these people, experienced in giving lipservice to foreign rulers, have that same spirit that enabled them to achieve independence in 1918.

I salute Americans of Ukrainian heritage who have continually demonstrated fine citizenship in this country. I also want to express the sincere hope that someday the people of the Ukraine will be citizens of a free, truly independent nation.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 44th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. This independence was short-lived, however, lasting only a little more than 2 years, and for 42 long years Ukraine has been the largest captive non-Russian nation both in the U.S.S.R. and behind the Iron Curtain. Ukraine was the first victim of the Russian Communist aggression. Therefore, her tragic fate should serve constantly as a warning for the free nations throughout the world.

But, it must also serve as a constant reminder to us of our own duty. Those who now live under tyranny look to us, as leaders of the free world, to maintain and strengthen the cause of freedom everywhere. This we must strive to do, so that these oppressed peoples may continue to hope and work and fight for the blessings and joys of real liberty.

The continuous pressure for freedom by more than 40 million Ukrainians cannot be ignored. The desire and longing for national freedom in the Ukraine have never been extinguished through 40 years of tortures, famine, purges and deportations. Valiant efforts have been frustrated time and again, but the determination of the Ukrainian people remains strong and powerful in their epic struggle against the evil of Soviet imperialism and tyranny.

The free world must continue to hold out the hand of support to these courageous people. Our own dedication to liberty should be strengthened by the knowledge that Ukrainians have not forgotten the sweetness of freedom—though their experience with it was tragically short.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this January 22, 1962, marks the 44th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Ukrainian Republic—an independence too briefly enjoyed and of which it has now been deprived by Soviet totalitarian communism.

The Soviet Union continually reproaches the free world nations for colonialism. Let us in answer refer to the Ukrainian people and other peoples today held in bondage by Communist tyranny. Let us not only answer back, let us give these people in bondage reason to keep up their hopes. American policy does not recognize the present Soviet domination of these captive nations as permanent.

Despite the hardships suffered by the Ukrainian people, their spirit of freedom remains alive. We join with the sons of the Ukraine in their hopes and prayers that the longed-for better life for the millions of Ukrainians behind the Iron Curtain will in good time be won and enjoyed in full measure.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, today, January 22, Americans of Ukrainian descent and their kinsmen in other countries are observing the 44th anniversary of the independence of their ancestral homeland, the Ukraine.

The Ukraine, unfortunately, is one of the captive nations of Eastern Europe. It is a nation of some 40 million people, who were among the earliest victims of communism and are still enslaved by the ruthless rulers of Moscow.

Despite this long interval of time, the people of the Ukraine have not relinquished their desire for freedom and independence. This yearning and desire on their part must be kept alive for their own sake and for the sake of the free world. We can give them heart and encouragement by demonstrating to them that they have not been forgotten in this very bleak period in human affairs.

There will—and there must—come a day when they will again have the opportunity to rehabilitate their national life, their culture and religion, their way of life and dignity as human beings. It is, therefore, imperative that we do all in our power to keep those sparks of hope alive in these very trying and difficult days.

For us it is extremely important to continue to focus the spotlight of the world on the subjugated status of the captive nations struggling under the yoke of communism, if we ever hope to gain the offensive in the cold war. The more we do this, the more we stress the extent of Communist imperialism, the sooner we shall place Russia on the defensive and subject her to worldwide criticism.

On this day of the anniversary of Ukrainian independence, the American people renew their moral support and their prayers that the day of liberation for the Ukraine and all other captive nations will soon arrive.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, January 23, 1918, is a memorable event in Ukrainian history. On that date the Ukrainian people signed a pact with the Russian Czars granting them freedom. Unfortunately, these happy people were to enjoy the blessings of liberty for only the short period of 2 years. Early in 1920, the Red army occupied the country and by the end of the year the Ukraine was made a Soviet Socialist Republic. The freedom for which these brave people had so gallantly struggled was quickly extinguished. The tactics of arrests, trials, executions and deportations adopted in an attempt to eliminate Ukrainian nationalism horrified the free world. To this day there is evidence that the Soviets are continuing to employ these measures to keep the Ukrainian people under the firm grip of the Kremlin.

We in America are conscious of what the Ukrainians can accomplish in an atmosphere of freedom and justice. Ukrainian-Americans have played an important part in the building of our Nation. They have diligently worked in our factories, mines and on our farms and railroads to strengthen this great land of ours. In addition, they have contributed much to the spiritual and cultural growth of our country. We will always be thankful for their contributions to the American way of life.

Today we know that Ukrainian-Americans will be thinking of their friends and relatives behind the iron curtain. They know that there will be no opportunity for open observations of their independence day. Consequently, it is proper that all Americans join with them in speaking for the silenced Ukrainians. It is just that we assure the Ukrainians that we will continue to demand the right of all people to choose the form of government under which they desire to live.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this day, January 22 marks the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian independence. On this date in 1918, the Ukrainian National Republic began its short-lived period of independence—an independence period of only 2 years which it had struggled to gain after being oppressed for 300 years. At the end of these 2 years of freedom, the Ukranian National Republic was savagely swallowed by the greedy and powerful Soviet Union.

The 40 million Ukrainian people today are not free in fact; they are held captive within the imperialistic grip of Communist Russia. We know that the spirit of freedom still burns brightly for these downtrodden people because of their unrelenting resistance to the forced collectivism of the Red masters.

We understand the plight of the conquered Ukrainian peoples and on this anniversary we vow renewed dedication to the efforts of these people to break their bonds of enslavement to the U.S.S.R.

We confidently look forward to that day when once again the Ukraine will renew its birthright as a free and independent nation and when the Ukrainian people may again celebrate this day as free people in a free country.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this somber anniversary of Ukrainian independence gives the free world another opportunity to pledge its unceasing efforts toward the goal of freedom for the Russian captive nations.

While Russia tries to propagandize the world about colonial powers, the Soviet Union itself is the greatest colonial power in the world. Hundreds of millions of citizens of formerly free countries now are forcibly held behind the Iron Curtain of fear, tyranny, and oppression.

Let us once more renew our pledge of everlasting support for the people of Ukraine until the joyous day when the Russian troops and commissars leave their land. We are bound together in our determination to free that nation and all other Russian colonies from the armed control of the Soviet Union.

I believe it is imperative that the House of Representatives establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations to call continuing attention to this tragic situation which exists today. We must never allow the world to forget the subjugation of these free nations.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, few peoples have suffered so cruelly under the yoke of alien despots as have the Ukrainian people. For three centuries their only respite came during the years 1918–20, when their burning for freedom and independence came alive and glowed briefly, like a candle in the eye of a hurricane. The collapse of the decrepit czarist regime gave the Ukrainians their cherished opportunity. On January 22, 1918, they proclaimed their independence and established the Ukrainian National Republic. The next 2 years were perilous. The Ukrainians struggled to consolidate and protect their freedom. But the Russian Red Army grew stronger, and more and more threatened the valiant Republic. The Ukrainians fought bravely against overwhelming odds. Finally the Communist forces proved too strong, and in the latter part of 1920 the Ukrainians' precious freedom was snuffed out. All opposition was cruelly suppressed and the area was incorporated into the U.S.S.R.

Today, over 40 years later, we are witnesses to the fact that the yearning for a peaceful and independent homeland still burns in the hearts of the Ukrainian people. Communist totalitarianism has not stifled their passion for liberty; it has fed it. Today I am proud to join with Americans of Ukrainian ancestry in celebrating this 44th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day. The Ukraine will never die.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, today we are living in a world that is being increasingly torn asunder by strife. We are living in an era where the conflict among the forces of democracy and those who would overthrow democracy becomes more and more acute with each passing day. Today millions of people lie oppressed and subjugated behind the Iron Curtains and Bamboo Curtains of communism. Today we are faced with the greatest challenge to our form of life since the inception of this great American Republic, and today January 22 stands out as an exceptional one in this battle against communistic tyranny. Today marks the 43d anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine.

That independence no longer exists for the people of the Ukraine who like millions of others toil and live under the heavy cloud of dictatorial communism. These people were among the earliest victims of communism. These people know full well through many bitter years of living with communism how cruel and unrelenting the masters of this evil system can be. Despite this there still burns within the souls of the Ukrainian people a true love for freedom and a true desire for their own self-determination which makes them serve as a shining example to all of us in our continuous battle to see that all mankind will one day have the right to determine its own existence on this earth and its own form of government.

Over the years I have been privileged to salute the people of the Ukraine and their leaders. I am proud today to stand here in the well of this House and once again raise my voice in a deserved tribute to the freedom loving people of the Ukraine. It is my fervent hope, and I am sure it is the wish of all true believers in democracy, that one day the people of the Ukraine will have the right to choose their own destiny in the manner that they desire. When that day is finally reached then I am sure not only the people of the Ukraine but every man and woman on the face of this earth will be able to live in the manner that God intended—freely and without fear of any form of tyranny.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, at a time when this country and the rest of the free world are engaged in a life and death struggle with the evil Communist world conspiracy, it is reassuring to note that millions of freedom loving people behind the Iron Curtain still maintain faith in an eventual liberation from Communist-Soviet tryanny. At the forefront of these courageous legions striving for freedom are the Ukrainian people.

Not since January 22, 1918, when the Ukrainian National Republic was established, have the Ukrainian people wavered from their goal of freedom and independence.

On that day, now 44 years ago, the Ukrainian people issued a proclamation at the Sophian Square of Kiev declaring the following:

> Let it be known, that from this day forward, the following states, Galicia, Bukovyna, Karpato-Ukrainia are now united in one independent Ukrainian National Republic.

Following the Russian-Ukrainian war, the freedom loving peoples of the Ukraine became subject to the ruthless domination of their Bolshevik conquerors. This apparent defeat, however, never succeeded in quenching the valiant spirit and the love for freedom of the Ukrainian people.

Today's celebration of the anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence evidences the undying determination of Ukrainians everywhere for eventual victory over the Soviet oppressors. The United States will continue to lend its assistance to the people of that great nation in once again achieving the status of a free people.

I would also like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, an organization which represents some 60 fraternal, social, cultural, and political groups whose membership is comprised of Ukrainian people in the United States. The goal of this committee is to present a common, united anti-Communist front for people of Ukrainian extraction now living in America.

I am convinced that the patriotic thoughts, feelings, and actions of these thousands of Ukrainian-Americans represent the same beliefs in the ideals of true democracy that is cherished by the captive Ukrainian people. I am honored to salute loyal Ukrainians everywhere, for the blood they have shed, and the blood they will shed, if need be, to once again restore freedom to their beloved land.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, for 300 years the Ukrainians have cherished but one goal: freedom and independence in their historic homeland. Although they have been opposed at every turn by oppressive Russian totalitarianism, no alien despotism could stifle their passion for liberty.

When the rotted czarist regime crumbled in 1917, the Ukrainians realized that the long-awaited moment had arrived. On January 22, 1918, they proclaimed their independence and established the Ukrainian National Republic. Tirelessly they worked to consolidate their new freedom, but finally in 1920 the valiant Republic was overcome by a new Russian tyranny even more cruel than the last.

Today some 42 million Ukrainians suffer under the yoke of Russian Communist inhumanity. Deplorable though their lot is, few can be optimistic about their future. But as we saw in 1918 the valiant Ukrainians will proclaim their love of freedom whenever circumstances give them the opportunity. Let us hope that the future will fulfill their worthy goals. I am truly proud to join loyal Americans of Ukrainian ancestry in celebrating today the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainian people will celebrate this month the 44th anniversary of their independence. The story of that independence depicts the political, ethnic, cultural, economic, social, and religious slavery which has been imposed behind the Iron Curtain since formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The population of the Ukraine is estimated at 41,893,000, 80 percent of whom are Ukrainian and only 20 percent Russian.

Concerning the Ukraine, Lenin said in 1917:

> Russia cannot exist without the Ukrainian sugar. The same can be said regarding coal, grains.

Ukrainian religion, culture, history, and language have been distorted by the Russians. The Russian past itself is not immune from distortion. The Ukrainians are among the nationalities who have objected to Communist dictatorship and to the imposition of the Russian language and culture upon them.

The Ukraine was the scene of many uprisings against communism in the twenties and thirties, and its underground reappeared in full force constantly fighting against the oppressors. Resistance to Soviet rule even continues in the Ukraine today.

It is a sad commentary that the struggle for freedom, which was fought so bravely, was so ruthlessly crushed, and that Ukraine independence must be observed in foreign countries while the Ukrainian people themselves are enslaved.

Here in the United States there are approximately 1 million Ukrainian refugees who own their homes, churches, social, political, scientific, and educational institutions, businesses, and other essentials for a life of freedom that was denied them in their country.

But it is heartening to realize that despite the years of suffering Ukrainia has endured, its spirit of independence still lives.

I am particularly happy to pay tribute to the great Ukrainian people for their devotion to liberty. I think it is well at this time to reiterate that behind the Iron Curtain, in the most oppressed of all lands, there glows the spark that someday may set the world ablaze with a newer and nobler freedom because the love of freedom and the devotion to human liberty of so great a people well could provide the inspiration for all free peoples.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure I join all America in saluting the Ukrainian people and the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, one of the groups which speak for them in this country.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, in this country we celebrate our Independence Day on July 4. It is a day of patriotic rededication, but it is also a day for the enjoyment of life. What a difference there is for the Ukrainian people on their independence day, January 22d. Only those Ukrainians living in exile will pause to note the anniversary. For them, it will be a day of sorrow, a day to dwell on the might-have-been. There will be no parades, no dancing in the streets; for the Ukrainian Republic born on January 22, 1918, died in infancy. Its life was snuffed out by the Soviet Government, with no noticeable protest from the rest of the world.

The Soviet myth makers have long since rewritten the story of the Ukrainian Republic, where they have not expunged it altogether. Composed of democratic elements, and supported by the great majority of the Ukrainian people, it dared to oppose the Communists, who have placed the stamp of opprobrium on it ever since.

The fate of the Ukraine should be a warning to us all to pay no attention to Communist propaganda. For years the Soviet Union has boasted about its nationalities policy, under which its various nationalities within Russia supposedly enjoy cultural freedom. But this so-called freedom allows no play for genuine nationalist sentiment. There is no easing of rigid Communist control. There is no political freedom worthy of the name. What there is is merely window dressing, behind which the Communists suppress all national manifestations which do not serve their interests.

On January 22, and every day of the year, democratic Ukrainians need no reminder of these facts. They are there for the rest of us, particularly those young nations attracted by the siren song of communism, to ponder.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, on this 44th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the courageous Ukrainian people who have struggled ceaselessly and so valiantly to regain their independent status as a free nation.

On January 22, 1918, the people of Ukraine for the first time realized their dream of independence at the close of World War I, when the Ukrainian leaders proclaimed their national independence from the oppression and cruel domination of Russia.

This marked the formal and official restoration of the independence of the Ukrainian nation.

Unfortunately, freedom was short-lived, and in 1920, after a brief span of only 2 years of independence, Ukraine was attacked by the Russian Communist forces, overrun by the Red Army in a fierce and bloody struggle, and incorporated against the will of the Ukrainian people into the Soviet Union.

In spite of all the efforts of the Communists to destroy the Ukrainian national identity, the Ukrainian people have refused to submit to Russian enslavement and have stood firm in the faith expressed in their historic national anthem, "Ukraine Will Never Die."

Today the 40 million Ukrainian nation is held in bondage, the largest captive non-Russian nation in the U.S.S.R. and behind the Iron Curtain. The plight of these people is a matter of grave concern not only to the United States but to all the people of the free world.

On this 44th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, we join with the Ukrainian people and with those of Ukrainian descent everywhere in the fervent hope and prayer that the sacrifices and valiant courageous struggle of the people of Ukraine will be victorious, and that the liberation of the Ukrainian people will come, and the independence of Ukraine will soon be reestablished.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, there is a particular significance in the notice given to the 44th anniversary of the Ukraine, not only here today in this Chamber, but throughout our country, and throughout the world.

For the times are breeding the dissolution of the last expanses of empire, and the whole world knows that the Soviet Russian empire is the cruelest, the most illegal, and the biggest empire in the world today.

The largest captive non-Russian nation, with some 40 million people, continues only by force and subversion to be a part of the Soviet empire. It is just as certain that the people of the Ukraine once again will be free and independent as a nation, as it was a generation ago that, sooner or later, India would be independent of the British Empire.

When 25 new nations have broken their way out of empire and taken their seats in the parliament of man, how can Russia expect to much longer hold Ukraine and the other nations behind the Iron Curtain in bondage?

A definite answer to this question cannot be supplied just now; but the answer is on the way.

Soviet Russia has demonstrated through the years that it cares nothing about morality, about ethics between the peoples of the world, about international law. But in these critical times—and there is evidence that the times are more critical behind the Iron Curtain than they are in the free world—Russia has demonstrated that she does want to maintain a favorable world opinion, no matter by what means.

Khrushchev becomes enraged at any reference to the plight of Ukraine and all the other captive nations. He is particularly nervous about the disclosures by Moscow's agent, Stashynsky, about the murders of Ukraine leaders in exile in 1957 and 1959.

The day will come when Soviet Russia and its leaders must come to judgment for its crime against freedom-loving people everywhere.

So, on this 44th anniversary of the day that means so much in the illustrious past of Ukraine, let us here pour it on, in our exposure, in our denunciation, and in our determination to seek the good offices and to join with all of the free nations of the world, in bringing about in time the disgorging by the Soviet colonial colossus, of Ukraine and the other captive nations.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate for us to pay tribute today to Ukrainians everywhere on the 44th anniversary of their nation's short-lived independence. The peoples of the Ukraine, whether they now reside in Western Europe, the United States, or any other part of the world, hold one cause—the renewed independence of their country—deeply within their hearts. We Americans take this opportunity to reassure them and their Communist masters that a free Ukraine is our cause as well. There is no difference in our conception of their right to freedom than there is in the right of Hungary, Poland, or Lithuania to self-determination. The nation was subjugated, its unique characteristics mostly destroyed, and the will of the people controlled by a foreign power.

During these, the beginning days of the 2d session of the 87th Congress, it would be well for us to rededicate ourselves to another closely related effort—the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations within this House of Representatives. Such a committee will be of concrete aid in providing official evidence of America's continuing concern for the plight of peoples subjected to Communist imperialism. Furthermore, it will indicate our serious intent to point out to the new nations of the world that imperialism must be recognized as a major facet of Russian foreign policy. Through a Committee on Captive Nations the detailed record of Russian imperialism can be assembled and disseminated. A great lie can be dissected, and the truth can be known. To create a Committee on Captive Nations this year would be a proper way in which to honor the people of the Ukraine and to give new hope to all similarly oppressed peoples throughout the world.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the commemoration today of the 44th anniversary of the Ukrainian Independence Day brings vividly to mind the plight of the 40 million or so peoples in the Ukraine now living as a captive nation.

Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., of Georgetown University, asserts:

> There is no speculation as to how colonial Moscow reacts when truths about captive Ukraine are raised. The evidence is substantial, clear, and indisputable. When for the first time the 86th Congress listed this nation in the captive nations resolution, Khrushchev suffered a nightmare. At the recent 22d Party Congress he again attacked the resolution. In 1960, Canada's Prime Minister dwelled on Ukraine in a U.N. address, and Moscow maligned him for weeks. In an unprecedented memo of November 25 our U.N. Ambassador stressed Moscow's colonial domination over Ukraine, and the Russians were stunned. The recent confession by Moscow's agent, Bogdan N. Stashynsky to the murders of patriotic Ukrainian leaders in exile—Dr. Lev R. Rebet in 1957 and Stepan Bandera in 1959—gives further proof of Khrushchev's terrorism and his fear of Ukrainian nationalism. If we seek to gain the offensive in the cold war, these few examples show why it is so necessary to spotlight the captive status of Ukraine.

In my own State of North Dakota, we have many fine, outstanding citizens of Ukrainian descent who are holding big celebrations today in the Belfield and Wilton, N. Dak., areas. Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, of Steel, N. Dak., president of the North Dakota branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America has prepared the following release which I would like to quote to further emphasize the importance of this event to the free Western World lest we forget these captive souls in the Ukraine who are behind the bars of Soviet domination and slavery:

> UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY
>
> On January 22, 1962, it will be 44 years since a free and independent state of the Ukrainian people was established, which was on January 22, 1918, in Kiev, the capital of the Ukraine.
>
> On January 22, 1918, a free and democratically elected parliament and government, issued a solemn act and proclamation of the reestablishment of the Ukraine as a sovereign independent nation, called the Ukrainian National Republic.
>
> On this occasion we would like to recall that on November 25, 1961, the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. representative to the United Nations, addressed the U.N. General Assembly, in which he expressed the views of the U.S. delegation on the Soviet memorandum regarding colonialism and imperialism, and it was one of the finest and best U.S. presentations in the United Nations yet on Russian Communist colonialism in the U.S.S.R. Mr. Stevenson said that the Soviet Union has been waging a war on "colonialism" in the U.N. but only against the so-called Western colonialism, while in fact, Mr. Stevenson contended, the U.S.S.R. today is the greatest empire in the world where millions of enslaved peoples are denied the right of self-determination and independence. Citing a declaration of rights issued by the Russian Bolsheviks in 1917, which proclaimed "the right of the nations of Rusia to free self-determination, including the right to secede and form independent states," Mr. Stevenson stated:
>
> "How did this 'right' work in practice? An independent Ukrainian Republic was recognized by the Bolsheviks in 1917, but in 1917 they established a rival republic in Kharkov. In July 1923, with the help of the Red army, a Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic was established and incorporated into the U.S.S.R."
>
> We recall these pronouncements on Ukraine by the highest U.S. official at this time as this month Ukrainians in the free world will observe the 44th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic.
>
> The young and democratic Ukrainian state was recognized by a number of governments, including the Soviet Russian Government, and it endeavored to pursue its own free course in harmony and peace with other nations. But Communist Russia began a war of aggression against Ukraine, despite the fact that it officially recognized the independence of Ukraine and pledged itself to respect the sovereignty of the Ukrainian nation. For almost 4 years the Ukrainian nation gallantly defended its newly established state, but deprived of military, economic, and diplomatic support by the Western nations, it succumbed to the

superior military forces of Communist Russia. By the end of 1920 Ukraine was occupied by Russian Communist troops which helped to establish a puppet Communist regime, which eventually proclaimed itself a "Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic" and in 1923 it was made a part of the Soviet Union.

But the Ukrainian people have never accepted the Communist yoke imposed upon them by Moscow and have continued to fight for their liberation. In the past four decades the Ukrainians have given ample proof of their love of freedom and their desire for genuine independence. Russian Communist persecution and oppression of Ukraine has evoked worldwide protests and indignation. We recall that during the 1960 session of the U.N. General Assembly a number of Western statesmen, including the Honorable John G. Diefenbaker, Prime Minister of Canada, raised their voices in protest against the oppression and enslavement of the Ukrainian nation by Communist Russia. Both the U.S. Congress and the President of the United States of America have recognized the plight of the Ukrainian people by respectively enacting and signing the Captive Nations Week resolution, which listed Ukraine as one of the captive nations enslaved by the Soviet Union.

Today, the Ukrainian people everywhere are celebrating the memorable date of January 22, 1918, as their greatest national holiday. The Russian puppets who pose as a "Ukrainian Soviet Government" in Kiev are neither representatives of the Ukrainian people nor the Ukrainian patriots. The true Ukrainian Government exists to this very day in exile, while millions of Ukrainian patriots are either in the underground resistance, exiled in Siberia, or genocided en masse by the Russians.

But there is a lesson to be drawn from this Ukrainian independence anniversary. The West has played an ignominious role by blindly rejecting all the Ukrainian pleas for help. Instead, it supported anachronistic and antidemocratic Russian generals and admirals who aimed to restore what could never be restored: czarist despotism. Instead of giving tangible assistance to the Ukrainians and other non-Russian nations, which alone were fighting the Bolsheviks, the West procrastinated.

Today, after 44 years of unrelenting struggle against Moscow, the Ukrainians have made much progress, and their cause is known in the world as never before.

The cause of Ukrainian freedom and independence is no longer a patriotic desire of the Ukrainians. It has become a political necessity, for a free world, since independent Ukraine means a substantial weakening of the Soviet Communist empire, and therefore the permanent Soviet threat which hangs over an intimidated humanity.

Americans of Ukrainian descent in the State of North Dakota are planning to celebrate the forthcoming 44th anniversary of Ukraine independence on January 22, 1962, in Wilton and Belfield, in a fitting and appropriate manner. And since the United States of America remains a true citadel of freedom and a hope for oppressed peoples everywhere, the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian independence provides a proper occasion for the people of the United States to demonstrate their sympathy with and understanding of the aspirations of the Ukrainian nation to freedom and independence.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my remarks to those of my colleagues in calling attention to this day as the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

If we are ever to regain the offensive in the psychological propaganda arenas in the cold war, we must emphasize to the world the captive status of the Ukraine and other previously free nations held by the Soviet Union.

The Ukraine is extremely important in this instance since it is the largest captive of non-Russian nations in Eastern Europe and the spirit of Ukrainian nationalism still beats deeply in that vast area of Europe despite four decades of Communist persecution. The Ukrainian people represent an outstanding example of the beastly manner in which communism has held millions of people in bondage. We must never forget the legitimate aspirations of these brave people to once again enjoy the blessings of their own government, to maintain their culture, language, religious freedom, and to enjoy the prominent place they deserve in the family of nations.

Even though the Ukrainian nation enjoyed but a brief period of independence and through that entire period was under pressure from Communist forces, it displayed the ability and sound operation to maintain a government dedicated to the fundamental interests of the Ukrainian people.

Certainly it is fitting that we as individual Members of the House of Representatives pay tribute to the spirit of Ukrainian independence in joining Ukrainian patriots throughout the world, and especially those suffering under Soviet domination in their homeland, in urging an aggressive, affirmative action on the part of our State Department in consistently calling the attention of U.N. sources and other international agencies to the true nature of Soviet colonialism in the Ukraine and other areas of Eastern Europe.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, today, January 22, marks the 44th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukraine National Republic. On that date in 1918 the people of the Ukraine, for the first time in over 250 years, tasted the sweet fruit of liberty. The czars, who had ruled their country since 1667, had been overthrown by the Russian populace and it seemed as if the Ukraine would finally join the community of nations as a free and independent state. But, as in Russia, the dictatorship of the Communists soon replaced the tyranny of the czars. Only 2 short years after the Ukraine Republic was established it was overthrown by the Red army and the Ukrainian people were once again under foreign rule.

Neither the years under the czarist yoke nor the more recent period of Communist oppression, however, have dimmed the Ukrainians' hope and yearning for freedom. For the realization of this dream they, and all the other peoples subjugated by the Communists, look toward the United States and its free world allies for support. The captive nations behind the Iron Curtain take strength and courage from our firm resistance to the Communists in West Berlin, in Laos, and in Vietnam. On the anniversary it is fitting that we Americans rededicate ourselves to the ideals of freedom and democracy and pledge ourselves to their unswerving defense. Only thus can we give the Ukrainian people the hope that they will soon be free.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the history of the Ukrainian people, like the histories of the other East European peoples, is full of miseries and misfortunes. Since the signing of a compact between the Russian czar and the Ukrainian leaders in 1654, stouthearted and liberty loving Ukrainians have not been allowed, except for a brief 2-year period between 1918 and 1920, to enjoy the normal benefits of a free and independent life in their historic homeland. The 40 million Ukrainians have been left at the mercy of the turns and twists of fateful international events. For more than 300 years they have been held down under the oppressing yoke of alien despots. They have endured hardships, privations, and indescribable miseries. They have been ruthlessly persecuted for clinging to their national ideals, for dreaming and cherishing their independence and freedom. Yet no oppressive measures, no amount of severe persecution could compel them to give up their yearning for freedom. Instead, oppressions and persecutions have united the Ukrainians against their foes and held them together. Then toward the end of the First World War, when the decrepit czarist regime was overthrown, and Austria's hold over the western Ukraine was broken, the Ukrainians proclaimed their independence and established the Ukrainian National Republic.

This historic event took place on the memorable 22d of January 1918, a day which has become a landmark in the history of the Ukraine and remains the brightest spot in their struggle for freedom and independence. Unfortunately, the newly born Republic was suffering under severe handicaps. It was surrounded by powerful foes, ready to pounce upon it and put an end to its existence. And that is what happened, even before the joy and jubilation had ceased. Before the Ukrainian people had any time to recoup their losses, they were attacked by their inveterate foe, the Red army. Early in 1920 enemy forces entered and occupied the eastern part of the country; soon the whole country was overrun, and all Ukrainian opposition was ruthlessly crushed. In the fall of that year Ukraine became part of the Soviet Union.

Since those fateful days, for more than 40 years, Ukraine has been submerged in the Soviet empire, and the Ukrainian people suffered grievously under Soviet totalitarianism. For all practical purposes the country is sealed off from the free world. The people of Ukraine are not allowed to travel abroad, nor are the people of the free world, except under carefully guided Communist supervision, permitted to go to Ukraine. Thus the country has become a large prison house for its people. Their most cherished possession is their spirit of freedom. Inhuman Kremlin agents have resorted to every devise to deprive the Ukrainian people of this possession, but fortunately they have not succeeded in their task. Today, even under the most relentless of Communist totalitarian tyrannies, the sturdy and stouthearted Ukrainian clings steadfastly to his national ideals and still preserves his fervent love for freedom and independence.

The Ukrainian people, in and out of their homeland, have been a boon to the communities in which they lived. In this country they have been noted for their industry, ingenuity, and tenacity for hard work. They have never shunned heavy labor in preference to something less arduous. In this respect their tough and resilient physique, and their tenacious nature have served them well. Hundreds of loyal, patriotic, and hardworking Americans of Ukrainian origin have always given excellent account of themselves in this country. I can say this because I have known many of them in my congressional district, and have seen them at work. In certain parts of my State they constitute the core of sturdy and stouthearted laborers who perform heavy but necessary tasks with distinction. These people of solid character have contributed to their full measure to the free and democratic way of life and this great Republic. They have been a positive force in the building of our democratic institutions, and they have always been ready to fight and die for the preservation of these institutions. In the words of the immortal Ukrainian national poet, Taras Shevchenko: "They are really poor; yes, and naked, but in freedom they can pray to God." Today on this solemn occasion, I am happy to join them in the celebration of the 44th anniversary of the Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 23, the Ukrainian people will celebrate the 44th anniversary of their independence.

Ever since 1654, when the Ukrainian leaders signed a pact with the Russian czar these unfortunate people have not known freedom but for a brief 2-year period, 1918–20.

The memorable event took place soon after the Russian revolution of 1917. At that time the Ukrainians were under the combined rule of imperial Russia and the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. The overthrow of the czar in Russia coupled with the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy enabled the Ukrainians, on January 22, 1918, to finally obtain their freedom. This period of freedom, unfortunately, was to be short-lived. Early in 1920, the Red army entered the eastern part of Ukrainia, and by the end of the year they had occupied the entire country. The Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic was made part of the Soviet Union.

The hardships that the Ukrainian people have had to endure under Communist rule is common knowledge. The Kremlin attempted to obliterate all vestiges of Ukrainian nationalism. Ukrainian history and literature were revised to show how dependent the Ukrainians were in past and future on their "benefactors," the Russians. To this day, trials, execution, and deportations characterize the Communist attempt to keep the Ukrainians under the grip of the Soviets.

Unable today to express their desire for freedom in their enslaved land, these unfortunate people look toward their Ukrainian friends and relatives in the free countries of the world to speak for them. In our country this is being done chiefly by the Ukrainian Congressional Committee. This organization made up of native-born Americans, naturalized citizens, and recent immigrants from the Ukraine, has been working unceasingly for eventual Ukrainian freedom and independence.

Consequently, it is appropriate particularly on this the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian independence that all Americans join with the Ukrainian Congressional Committee in voicing their concern for the subjugated Ukrainian people. For it is only by keeping the fate of these enslaved people constantly to the forefront of human consciousness that we can ever hope that the force of world opinion will aid in the eventual freedom of not only the Ukraine, but all the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad fact that for four decades, some 42 million stouthearted and gallant Ukrainians have suffered under their ruthless taskmasters, Communist totalitarian tyrants, as their forefathers had toiled under czarist Russians for 250 years. Indeed, in more than 300 years the liberty loving Ukrainian people have known freedom for only the brief period of 2 years, between 1918 to 1920. But these cruel facts do not tell the story of the Ukrainian people's struggle for freedom and independence. That struggle culminated in the birth of the Ukrainian Republic in January of 1918. The date of that event, January 22, became a turning point in the history of the Ukrainian people, and this remains in their annals as a national holiday.

Since the birth of the Ukrainian Republic 44 years ago, and particularly since its destruction by the Red army in 1920, the people of Ukraine have suffered even more than their ancestors had under callous czarist agents. They have been dispossessed of their worldly possessions and reduced once again to the status of serfs. They have been denied all forms of freedom in their historic homeland, and driven to hard work for the benefit of their alien overlords.

However, despite all this suffering and misfortune the Ukrainians have kept faith wtih their tradition. They still fervently cherish their ideals of freedom and independence in their homeland. In the sad history of the Ukrainian people during the last several decades this is the most encouraging fact. On this 44th anniversary of their historic independence day we in the free world wish them more power in their struggle for their righteous cause—peace, happiness, freedom, and independence in their homeland.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, our hearts go out today to the victims of the international Communist conspiracy who are living under the heel of dictatorship in Ukraine.

We wish they might have the privilege of openly celebrating Independence Day—it was 44 years ago today that Ukraine acquired its brief period of freedom—just as we celebrate our Independence Day on July 4.

Instead of celebrating, however, the brave people of this small country live under the cloud of the Kremlin. The country is merely another colony behind the Iron Curtain dominated by the lords of Moscow who vociferously proclaim against colonialism.

We have within our shores a million Americans of Ukrainian descent and we join them on this occasion in paying tribute to those brave countrymen who made their brief independence possible. We hope that in the not too distant future the people of Ukraine can really celebrate another and true Independence Day.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic, which was proclaimed on January 22, 1918.

I would like to join my colleagues in commemorating this occasion, and honoring the Ukrainian people who for 2 short years from 1918 to 1920 established and maintained a free and independent state, and who after four decades of subjugation to Soviet tyranny and oppression are an inspiration to freemen everywhere in their dedication to freedom and their hope for independence.

The people of the Ukraine, who have been endowed with great courage and an ambitious spirit, are unable to celebrate their own independence today because of this Soviet oppression. But we, as trustees of their cause, can do so for them in the fervent hope that their spirit and determination will be rewarded.

On this occasion, let the Ukrainian people be assured that we will plead and fight for them, and that their courage and hope will not be in vain.

The American people, many of whom are relatives and descendants of the Ukrainians, share their hopes, and on this day we must rededicate ourselves to the year-round task of leading the cause for the right of self-determination for all nations, and for the freedom of all men.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, in years past, I have joined my colleagues in this House in paying tribute to the indomitable people of the Ukraine who, although subjugated by a succession of tyrannical empires, have never lost their love of freedom.

I have never ceased to be impressed by the history of these people, who have suffered oppression at the hands of the czar, and the commissar, with but a brief 4-year period of freedom from 1918 to 1921.

It is the 44th anniversary of this short-lived but long-remembered period of independence that we salute today. And in so doing we pay tribute to the Ukrainians' deep-seated love of freedom, which decades of Soviet terror have failed to erase. In their frantic effort to weld together an empire, the Soviets have attempted to stifle the dignity of the individual and his pride in his heritage.

We can never forget that it was Mr. Khrushchev himself who was dispatched by the tyrants in the Kremlin to ruthlessly and bloodily crush a Ukrainian attempt to gain independence. While his cruel methods kept the Ukraine enslaved, he could not completely erase the hope for freedom.

In the Ukraine the Soviet tyranny has demonstrated its determination to stamp out individuality, and in the Ukraine resistance to the Communist plan has never faltered.

Last fall, a subcommittee of which I am a member, had the occasion to tour part of the Soviet Union, observing its educational system. We visited Moscow, and we visited Kiev—the capital of the Ukraine. The difference in the spirit of the people was apparent.

In Moscow, we saw a sullen, gray, ugly, cold city, dedicated to nothing save the triumph of communism. Kiev, by contrast, was colorfully warm, its tree-lined streets and impressive architecture paying tribute to a populace who will never forget its heritage or its place as the cradle of Christianity in Russia.

The Ukrainians are a noble people—their respect for freedom undiminished, their pride unquelled even by centuries of oppression.

On this 44th anniversary of their independence, let us remember these brave heroes of freedom's fight. Let us continue to fan the spark of freedom and self-determination that still burns within the captive nations of Europe.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today, January 22, marks the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic.

I am certain that the commemoration in the United States of this important date will serve as an inspiration to the millions of Ukrainians behind the Iron Curtain.

Words are inadequate to describe the tragic plight of the people living under the yoke of communism. Deprived of their basic rights and freedoms, they frequently live in abject poverty, in fear, and in terror. In spite of this, we know that oppression has not succeeded in eradicating from their hearts their love of freedom and justice. The courage and sacrifices for freedom of the peoples of the Communist-dominated nations are an inspiration and an example for all of us.

Today, as we consider the early indications of progress in our arduous struggle with the Communist menace, we should reaffirm our sympathy for the Ukrainian people's quest for freedom. We earnestly hope that this thirst for freedom and justice will be fulfilled before long and we pledge our continued efforts to this end.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today is the 44th anniversary of hope for the people of the Ukraine. On this date in the year 1918, the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic was announced and a new sovereign nation was born.

But liberty, independence, and the blessings of self-determination were short lived for the Ukrainian people. The invading hordes from the Soviet Union overran the Ukraine and turned its people into vassals whose lives were as closely controlled, as arbitrarily regulated as the lives of any serfs during the days of feudalism.

For all these years, the Ukrainian people have suffered under the burden imposed on them by their Communist masters. They had been behind the Iron Curtain for decades before the Honorable Winston Churchill uttered the phrase.

It is fitting that we in Congress, that our Nation, pay proper recognition to the brave people of the Ukraine, who still strive for their freedom, who still have not lost hope that the day will come when they once again will be free to manage their own lives, to elect their own government, and to make their own decisions for the future.

Let us join in this hope that this day of liberation, of freedom for the Ukrainian people, is not too far off, and let us help to strengthen this hope to see that it one day becomes a reality.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join my colleagues in commemorating this anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

On occasions such as this one we of this distinguished legislative body have the opportunity to point out once again the colonial and imperial character of the Soviet system.

A year ago I vigorously supported the proposal to establish a committee in the House of Representatives to be concerned with the problems of the captive nations. I supported this proposal because I am deeply committed to the notion that Congress has a duty to do all within its power to call universal attention to Soviet imperialism and colonialism.

The Soviets have persistently asserted that they are opposed to imperialism. A dominating theme in their propaganda is their so-called opposition to colonialism.

However, the truth must be emphasized again and again that the Soviet Union is itself the most oppressively imperialistic and colonial power of modern times.

The U.S.S.R. is a multinational state consisting of ethnic groups variously estimated from 177 to more than 200. One hundred and twenty-five languages and dialects are spoken and 40 different religions practiced. There are Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Armenians, Jews, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Tatars, Uzbeks, Kazakhs, Azerbaijani, and many others—all individual ethnic groups with separate historical, cultural, political, religious, and social traditions and institutions. Soviet Russia is far from being a melting pot of nationalities; it is a forced union of people who resist assimilation in the Soviet mold. It is a "prison house of nationalities."

Thus, it is our task as Members speaking from this mecca of world democracy to point out to the world the profound contradiction in the Soviet Union. And that contradiction is this: while the Soviets attack the West for colonialism and imperialism, their country, the U.S.S.R., is the greatest of all colonial and imperial powers today. More than that, Soviet ambitions continue to be colonial and imperialistic—they seek to rule the world.

Few times during the year could be more appropriate than this one—the commemoration of Ukrainian independence—to point out these facts. The Ukrainian people have been victims of Bolshevik oppression. Decades ago they demonstrated their desire for freedom, but that was denied them.

On this anniversary of Ukrainian independence, therefore, I join with all other Members of this body to hail a people noble in their aspirations, but above all noble in themselves.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the celebration of the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine is occasion of retrospect and a hopeful future. That a nation which knew only 3 years of complete independence can maintain its individuality, its perspective, and its hope is indeed a cause for wonder and praise. Of course the secret of this achievement lies in the fact that these 3 years were but the fruition of an age-old dream, a dream with the very concrete background of centuries of superior development culturally, politically, economically, and a very real continuance of the independence of spirit and durability of character which marks the people of the Ukraine wherever they may be.

This strength of purpose, the proud and independent spirit, has endured in spite of centuries of domination, of oppression and suffering of their forefathers, and a similar fate in our own times of the Ukrainian people. Their determination has but intensified under the enforced "Russification" under generations of czars and repeated exploitation of their superior culture, resources, and economy by the Soviet Union. Such resistance lends confidence to their hope for a return to the state of political independence which we honor today.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I wish to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for allowing me the opportunity to say something about a subject which is very close to the heartbeat of the American people. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is to be congratulated for his continual and unceasing efforts to bring this commemorative day to the attention of the American people. I rise not only to praise his efforts to give recognition and dignity to people all over the world who are struggling for freedom but also to commend him for being relentless and untiring in his determination to see that the American people do not allow themselves to forget these people who want to be free.

I have the following observations to make concerning the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian independence which we celebrate this day, January 22:

First. As Americans we do recognize that the people who now live behind the Iron Curtain and who once knew a greater freedom know full well that there is no such thing as coexisting with communism. Since I have been in Congress, I have had the privilege of seeing a great number of these people who have lived behind the treacherous Iron Curtain in Yugoslavia, Hungary, Cuba, East Germany, Rumania, the Crimea, and many other areas or countries. These people all work tirelessly to explain to Americans how absolutely impossible it is to negotiate or in any way compromise with the Communist conspiracy as it exists today. I think they ought to know, because they have lived under the thumb of this criminal conspiracy.

Second. Many of the people who have come to our country after living under communism are convinced that

America is the last stronghold of freedom and that we must do everything within our power to avoid making the mistake of capitulating economically, psychologically, and militarily, as they admit their respective countries did. They learned the tragic error of believing that there can be coexistence only after they were helplessly trapped in the snare of the international Communist conspiracy. These people emphasize over and over again that we seem to be making the same mistake in this country by mentally capitulating inch by inch—that we must avail ourselves of their knowledge of how to meet this challenge and go on the offensive.

Third. Let us recognize our friends in the Ukrainian areas who wish to be free by at least taking the time to educate ourselves completely as to what this mesmerizing, gigantic, fraud actually is. We must learn how communism clandestinely moves into a given country well in advance of actual physical takeover to mentally condition the people of that country to capitulate a little bit at a time. We are told by these fine refugees—many of them are now American citizens—that the Communists accomplish this by tearing down the sense of patriotism, the concepts of constitutional laws, the strong implications of local government, the firm belief in spiritual and religious values, the concepts of private property and free enterprise, the well-kept tradition of the family serving as the basic unit of society, and finally and most important, the fiercely held precept that certain inherent rights of the individual cannot be taken from our citizens by any group or state.

Fourth. Several escapees from the grip of the Communist tyranny have warned us that we are not vigilant. They feel we make light of the statements of policy emanating from Communist Party meetings, such as the October 18, 1961, "Report on Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union" presented by Nikita Khrushchev in Moscow. On that date under the title "Communism: Goal of Party and People" Mr. Khrushchev said, and I quote from the November 1961 issue of Political Affairs, a publication identified as the basic Communist publication in this country:

> Yet all our programs are interlinked. Taken as integral parts of a single whole, they yield a clear-cut and time-tested Marxist-Leninist theory of socialist revolution, the construction of socialism and communism.
>
> The programs of the party may be compared to a three-stage rocket. The first stage wrested our country away from the capitalist world, the second propelled it to socialism, and the third is to place it in the orbit of communism. It is a wonderful rocket, comrades.

In other words we have been told time and time again that the Communists plan to undermine and mentally condition us to accept communism. As a nation we have not been willing to admit that one major technique they use to their advantage is socialism. This does not mean that socialism is communism, but as Mr. Khrushchev has said, they use "socialism as a transition stage on the road to communism." Further, William Z. Foster in his book, "Toward Soviet America," has made the same point:

> There are stages of development to be gone through. The first of these is the transition period from the overthrow of capitalism to the establishment of socialism; then there is the period of socialism, which is the first phase of communism. The complete realization of socialism and communism in any country implies the defeat of the world bourgeoisie.

I personally feel, as one Congressman, that the best way for us to begin to move toward freeing the people behind the Iron Curtain is to know best how to resist communism at home. That means resisting the so-called tantalizing concepts of socialism, which many times pave the way for the Communist state.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, 44 years ago, on January 22, 1918, the independence of Ukraine was declared. This marked the end of a long period of unwilling subjugation to alien rulers and the fulfillment of the aspirations for freedom which had sustained the Ukrainian people throughout many adversities. Unfortunately, its nearness to the avaricious Soviets forewarned of a short life for the nascent republic.

Scarcely had a constitution been adopted, a president elected, and the work of constructing a democratic state begun when the forces of destruction of the republic took shape. In November 1918, contrary to the armistice agreement, Joseph Stalin in Moscow set up a Ukrainian Soviet Government composed of Communist leaders of whom only one was Ukrainian. By December 1, a manifesto had been declared proclaiming the Soviet Government and threatening with death anyone who obeyed the laws of the legal Ukrainian Government. The legal Ukrainian Government declared war on Soviet Russia but by November 1920 the troops of the Ukrainian National Republic had been forced into retreat by the Communists. Subsequently Ukraine was incorporated into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Although they have been forced to endure Communist tyranny and the suppression of basic civil rights, the Ukrainian people have not given up their hope that someday they will live in freedom once again. Ukrainian Independence Day is commemorated to sustain that hope and encourage the peoples living under the Communist government imposed by Moscow. It is commemorated here on the floor of Congress to show that the people in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic have not been forgotten and to reaffirm that a major goal of United States foreign policy is the strengthening of freedom everywhere.

Finally, I should like to take this occasion to congratulate the Americans of Ukrainian descent for their contributions to this Nation, their concern for the welfare and future of their relatives behind the Iron Curtain, and their devotion to the cause of freedom all over the globe.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, we salute the courageous aspirations of Ukrainians to free their native land from the scourge of tyranny. Although the Communists have ruthlessly suppressed the independence of the Ukraine, we know that they can never extinguish the light of freedom that burns in the heart of every Ukrainian nationalist.

Commemoration of a day of independence for a nation that is now under the yoke of totalitarian rule brings sadness rather than joy. But this is a day for remembering, for encouragement, and for resolution. We are reminded that freedom is everywhere threatened and that to protect our freedoms we must pursue with vigor policies that will extend the frontiers of freedom to the oppressed.

We must encourage those who would otherwise despair. We have not forgotten the brave people of the Ukraine. We must never let them think that we have forgotten, or that we have accepted their present unhappy fate as permanent. The pursuit of freedom is a common goal; in this we are united.

So let us resolve to make every day an independence day. Let not a day go by when we do not issue a declaration of independence for the enslaved peoples of the Communist world. Today we say to the people of the Ukraine: "We are with you in spirit; do not despair; the Communists cannot win a contest against the human spirit."

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian independence. It is, therefore, fitting and appropriate that we pause to commemorate this anniversary. More importantly, this historic anniversary compels us to renew our message of support and dedication to the aspirations of the millions of Ukrainians who continue to seek independence and freedom from Soviet oppression.

The 1918 declaration of Ukrainian independence was short lived. The Ukrainian National Republic attained freedom for a mere 2 years after a 300-year struggle against oppression. But that spirit and quest remains despite Soviet captivity. Time bespeaks loudly of the indomitable spirit of these people, and it is obvious that Soviet military might will never contain that spirit.

I join my colleagues on this historic occasion to salute these courageous people, and I look forward to the day when we will join the free and independent Ukrainian people in marking this important event.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, for four decades, some 42 million stout-hearted and gallant Ukrainians have suffered under the yoke of their ruthless Communist taskmasters, as their ancestors had done under czarist Russians for 250 years. This liberty-loving people has known freedom and independence for only 2 years, from 1918 to 1920, when their lengthy struggle for freedom and independence culminated in the birth of the Ukrainian Republic. The 22d of January 1918 thus became a turning point in the history of the Ukrainian people, and it remains in their annals as a national holiday. But in 1920 the young Republic was ruthlessly destroyed by the Red army, and since that date the people of Ukraine have suffered even more severely than their ancestors before them. Their worldly possessions have been taken from them and they have once more been reduced to the status of serfs, denied all the natural joys of their historic homeland, and driven to hard work for the benefit of their alien rulers.

But the Ukrainians still cherish the ideals of freedom and independence in their homeland, which were immortalized in the words of the great Ukrainian national poet, Taras Shevchenko. In the sad history of the Ukrainian people this is a most encouraging fact. On this 44th anniversary of Ukrainian independence I am happy to join my countrymen of Ukrainian origin to wish them well in their struggle for freedom, independence, peace and happiness in their homeland.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when we hail the anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day we do not have in mind the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic of today. We honor that which declared its independence on December 27, 1917, and achieved it January 22, 44 years ago. The so-called independence of that area, insisted upon at the United Nations by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to gain support for what was to be a series of Soviet vetoes, is a travesty upon the true independence of the Ukrainian people. That has been maintained not because of, but in spite of, the Soviet Union.

Overrun for centuries by the Russians, the Ukraine was never willingly a part of their territory or sympathetic with the neighbors to the east. It turned more to the west. Its superior development and culture was more in tune with that of Western Europe; its civilization much older than that of the Russia which sought to absorb it.

Despite all efforts of its neighbors at domination, the Ukraine has remained all but superficially apart. Torn asunder as it has been, not only by the Russians to the east but by envious neighbors to the east, west, north, and south, it has yet remained an entity. Though its richer agricultural and mineral resources have been the envy of the rapacious on its boundaries, they have also been the basis for a higher degree of civilization, a superiority in social, economic, cultural, and religious development. The spirit of individuality, of independence, and of resistance to almost overwhelming odds is likewise a product of this refinement.

It was this true love of freedom and loyalty to ethnic origins and native characteristics which led to real independence 44 years ago. The consciousness of a rich and distinct heritage, a spirit of liberty have remained despite all outward political adversity. The independence of the Ukrainian people is as alive today as it has ever been; and it will ever remain. That is the true independence we celebrate.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, 44 years ago today a new republic was born on the Eurasian Continent. The shifts and tides of the First World War, combined with the final collapse of the decrepit czarist empire, gave the Ukrainian peoples the opportunity they had been awaiting for 250 years. On January 22, 1918, they announced their love of liberty and independence and established the Ukrainian National Republic. From its inception the valiant young Republic fought bravely against overwhelming odds. Powerful forces to the northeast were determined to trample this flower of liberty, blooming on the borders of the Russian totalitarian colossus. Finally in 1920 the stouthearted Ukrainians could hold out no longer and the Communist Russian Army swept in upon them. All freedoms of the Republic were wantonly suppressed and the nation became fused with the U.S.S.R.

Today there is no freedom in the Ukraine. But the just love of a brave people for their historic homeland cannot be crushed out of existence. Although 42 million Ukrainians are now called citizens of the Soviet Union, we must never forget that before all else they are the people of their land, which is the Ukraine. Terror and oppression cannot stamp out their love for independence. It can only inspire the noblest strivings for freedom. Truly, the Ukraine will live as long as mothers whisper to their sons, and men stand strong against tyranny. A nation like that can never die.

I am proud to have this opportunity to join loyal Americans of Ukrainian ancestry in this celebration of the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, during this week of January 22, millions of Ukrainians, as well as freedom-loving people everywhere, are celebrating the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine.

In 1920 Soviet imperialism extinguished liberty and enslaved the people of the Republic of the Ukraine. But liberty, recognizing no boundaries, no race, no nation, and no master, could not be extinguished in the hearts of the people. Ukrainians have courageously maintained their goal of freedom and independence and are an inspiration to all of us.

They, unlike many freemen, recognize that colonialism, despite the vogue to think otherwise, is not a malignancy peculiar to Western civilization. They, unlike many freemen, realize that Communist-dominated peoples are not immune to the spark of freedom that glows eternal in the human heart. They, unlike many freemen, know that there is nothing permanent nor inevitable about Communist colonialism except as complacent freemen make it so.

That is why we must continue to keep alive our contacts with the captive peoples, thereby encouraging internal pressure upon the regimes for domestic changes. The clear voice of liberty helps create conditions for a further growth of diversity in the monolithic Communist structure. Such diversity, increasingly visible with the passage of time, gradually cultivates the seeds of liberty and independence. And independence is a universal right as valid for Europe as for Africa and Asia.

Thus, in keeping faith with our best traditions, all Americans on this anniversary join in the prayer that the Ukrainians, as well as all captive peoples, will soon achieve liberty and independence.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, 44 years ago, on January 22, 1918, the people of the Ukraine declared their independence and established the Ukrainian National Republic.

It was a time of strife and bloodshed. The great war was still in progress and the Bolsheviks were consolidating their rule of terror in Russia. Kiev, the capital city of the Ukraine, had been occupied by the Red army, and the Communists were carrying out mass executions there.

In the midst of this gloom and despair the courage and faith of the Ukrainians stood out as a beacon of light. They were an example to the world of the unconquerable desire for freedom that lives in the hearts of all mankind.

Unfortunately, the Ukrainian National Republic was short lived. Two years after it had been proclaimed the new state was overrun by the Russians. However, the past 40 years of Communist suppression have not broken the spirit of the Ukrainian people. They still maintain their firm belief in their right to national freedom, and on this anniversary of their independence day I salute them.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week Americans of Ukrainian extraction and friends of liberty everywhere will observe the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian independence with pride and sorrow.

The democratic Ukrainian Republic which was established in 1918 was indeed a landmark in that nation's long and bitter struggle against czarist and Russian rule. It is tragic that this candle of liberty was so quickly to be stamped out by Soviet oppression and brutality.

Yet, despite all the suffering and hardship, the Ukrainian people have shown great strength and resourcefulness, and their desire for liberty burns as fiercely as ever in their hearts. That this spirit of liberty can still burn so brightly, in spite of the cruel oppression, executions, purges, and deportations, should be noted by people everywhere.

To those of us who are free and secure, the flame of Ukrainian liberty should give us strength in the heavy burden of defending freedom in its most perilous hour. To those who are among the new and independent nations, the evidence of Soviet colonialism and tyranny in the Ukraine and other captive nations should well reveal the mockery which the Soviets make of such pure words as self-determination, democracy, and freedom. And for those who are living under the cloak of dictatorship, let the spirit of freedom still flaming in Ukrainian hearts give evidence to the old adage that man was made to live in freedom and not in slavery.

I would like to join my colleagues in noting the anniversary of Ukrainian independence and reminding the captive peoples everywhere that we in America do not accept their slavery as final, that we are confident that freedom will again shine in their lands, and that they will take their place, as is their God-given right, among the community of sovereign nations.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to rise in tribute to the people of the Ukraine on the 44th anniversary of their Independence Day. It is an irony of our time that this great people, as well as those in other parts of Eastern Europe, are enslaved beneath the yoke of despotism after two wars fought to preserve democracy and the right of all peoples to freedom. It is an irony of our time that we salute the people of the Ukraine, and those throughout the satellite nations for their love of freedom, their search for justice, and their faith in the Almighty while the people themselves can give no expression to that love of freedom, that search for justice, that great faith.

The struggles of the Ukrainians and their hopes for the future are of great personal interest to me. My maternal heritage is Ukrainian and my association with this great people began in my home when, as a child, I learned the folklore, traditions, ideals, and history of the people and their homeland. It is a proud tradition with a great heritage. I learned of the struggles of the people for independence, their yearning for the freedom they had so seldom known, and their hopes for a future when their nation could take its place in the world of free states.

I am certain that the seething emotion in the hearts of the Ukrainian people will be given expression in the future. History has shown that when a people have the yearning for freedom this yearning cannot be subdued even by attempts to eradicate and destroy its culture, language, or religion. The forces that urge men to be free go beyond the external. The urge for freedom is part of the inner core of man that can only be subdued by the subjugation of the mind.

The Soviet Union has attempted to erase any traces of a Ukrainian cultural life. This had been attempted several times by the czars before them. It failed when tried by the czars and it will fail as the Soviets attempt the erasure. They cannot succeed because their principles are antithetical to the basic desires, hopes, and ambitions of all peoples.

My colleagues gave mention, in the past few days, of the history of the Ukraine and of its desire for freedom and justice in a world which has seen much injustice in the past two decades. They have spoken, and I speak today, in this Chamber to let the world know that the people of America have not forgotten their fellow men who are behind the Iron Curtain. The people of this Nation salute the courage and perseverance of those who remain hopeful when the passing events seem so hopeless.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the people of the world, that the people of this Nation cannot and will not be complacent nor satisfied until all peoples are given the opportunity for a life under a free and just form of government.

Mr. BECKER. Today we pause to honor the brave people of the Ukraine on the 44th anniversary of their independence. Their freedom lasted only from 1918 until 1920 when it was snuffed out by the forces of Soviet Russian totalitarianism. Since then this conquered land has been a constant reminder of Soviet imperialism and disregard for the nationalistic sentiments of the peoples that border the Soviet state. The experience of the Ukrainian nation manifests the hypocrisy of Soviet claims to be the champion of national self-determination and the advocate of freedom for all peoples that live under colonial rule.

The American people, throughout their history, have been true advocates of freedom for captive peoples. The continued growth of democracy in America is influenced by our defense of freedom elsewhere in the world. If Americans ever close their ears to the cries of others who call out in the name of liberty they will also become insensitive to the threats to individual liberty that might arise in their own communities. Let us pray that this shall never happen because the defense of individual liberty and national self-determination are part of the very heart of the democratic faith which we all affirm. Today we renew our pledge of allegiance to the flag of freedom as we stand together in this commemoration of Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am most anxious to join many of my colleagues in the House in commemorating the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine, which was attained in January 1918 but has been lost to these brave people under the tyrannical heel of the Soviet Communist Government for many, many years. The fact is obvious that we do not have to go beyond the Soviet Union's own borders to find people who are truly enslaved. Thus, for these many years, the Ukrainians have been a "captive nation" within the Russian borders, and the leaders in the Kremlin are well aware of the restless spirit and the great desire for liberty which smoulders unsatisfied in the hearts of the people of the Ukraine. I think it is right that we Americans should point up to the world the fact that the people of the Ukraine are enslaved. Khrushchev and his cohorts behind the Iron Curtain do not like to be reminded that all is not well in their own backyard; our reminding them of their misdeeds is a positive stroke in gaining the offensive in the cold war, and we should do so at every opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the people of the Ukraine soon will know once again the joys of liberty, and the bountiful rewards which come with freedom. In the spirit of our country's Founding Fathers, we should strive to this goal in the service of enslaved men everywhere. To do less would be to neglect our responsibilities as the leader of the free world.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the independence of the Ukraine which we celebrate is far different from that of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic of today. The farce of the establishment of that state for a vote in the United Nations sympathetic with the Soviet Union is apparent to no one more than the Ukrainian people themselves. Domination by the Soviets has been more brutal, more intent even than that of the czars. But, like that of old Russia, it is merely superimposed.

The state of independence which we honor was short lived; it lasted but a few years after World War I, but it was real; and it was the expression of that true independence of spirit, of culture, of superior economic and political development which had characterized the Ukrainians for centuries. The separateness of this people and of their area in the western part of Russia was marked by and envied for its superiority. From far back in history their civilization, based upon rich resources and an ability to develop them, had been much closer to that of Western Europe than to that of the Russian hordes that overran them. They never succumbed to Russification except nominally. Nor have the Soviets been able to eradicate either the spirit or the hope of true independence. That we salute.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, throughout these early months of the year there fall a number of sad anniversaries. They are the anniversaries of the birth of a number of small nations, composed of freedom-loving peoples, who found in the chaotic and kaleidoscopic events of many years a chance to forge their own affairs in liberty.

They are sad anniversaries because their freedom and liberty as nations were short lived. Indeed, tragedy stalked them, first through counterrevolution and the imposition of tyranny, then through repressive government, through war and punishment. On January 22, the Ukraine marked the 44th anniversary of its independence—but an anniversary of the type I have described above.

The spirit of freedom lives on in the Ukraine and in the minds and hopes of many who have escaped from tyranny and look forward to the day when freedom will return to their native land. I hope that day can be soon.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, during the week of January 22, 1962, we celebrate the 44th anniversary of the proclamation of the Ukraine as a free and independent Republic.

We recall the high hopes for freedom of the Ukraine people resulting from the historic action of their National Council of Kiev in 1918. The years of independence for this proud people were tragically brief, for in 1920, the Russians brutally subjugated the citizens of the Ukraine and have held them in bondage since that time.

Despite determined Kremlin efforts to suppress liberties and to brainwash the populace, these freedom-loving people have never accepted the Communist yoke. During these past four decades, they have written an indelible record of fierce opposition to Soviet dictatorship.

The Ukraine is the largest non-Russian nation under Soviet imperialism with a national history originating in the 10th century. Our remembrance of this fact means much to them and serves to put the Kremlin on notice that the principle of self-determination remains a fundamental part of our foreign policy—not only for the Ukraine—but for all Communist-enslaved peoples of the earth.

AIR RESERVE FORCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say a word for some of our Reserve Forces who have been called to active duty.

We have read numerous reports in the press about problems in connection with the callup of certain Reserve component personnel to active duty.

Without seeking to judge the validity or possible misplaced emphasis of some of those reports, I would like to call the attention of the Congress and the public to the Reserve Forces of at least one service which have gone about their job without any fuss but with outstanding success.

I am referring to the Air Reserve Forces—the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve.

With only 27,000 men called to active duty, they have added the equivalent of 11 wings to the Active Air Force. They have substantially augmented the Air Force's combat fighter strength on duty in continental Europe. Their huge cargo and troop carrier planes have increased the mobility of our ground forces and the cargo and passenger-carrying capacity of the Military Air Transport Service.

The people of my home State of South Carolina are particularly proud of our own 169th Fighter Group and 157th Tactical Fighter Squadron now on duty in Spain as an element of the U.S. Air Forces in Europe.

They are at a place in the southern part of Spain, not far from that wonderful city that we all like to visit down there just outside of the olive country. It is one of our most important bases. We are equally proud of our 77th Troop Carrier Squadron, at Donaldson Air Force Base, which is flying airlift missions for Tactical Air Command.

I only mention this, Mr. Speaker, because I know that all of this is representative of all of the reserves in the service.

To appreciate just what these Air Reserve Forces have helped to accomplish, let us recall, for a moment, the events of last summer.

President Kennedy had just returned from his meeting with Khrushchev in Vienna, where the Soviet dictator had reiterated his determination to force us out of Berlin before the end of the year. It was a very serious situation and, as you may recall, the President in his report to the people on television made it clear just how serious the situation was.

Late in July, the President came before the Congress, with an extraordinary state of the Union message, to recommend a number of actions to step up our military readiness for the expected showdown over Berlin. The actions he recommended included recalling a number of Reserve Forces of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The Congress quickly passed a resolution to give the President this authority, and the Department of Defense soon issued orders to recall more than 160,000 members of the Reserve components.

I have gone in to some details on these events to help you recall the sense of urgency and concern we all felt at that time on the likelihood of war over Berlin.

But here it is January. Khrushchev's deadline for his threatened action over Berlin has passed. We may be no nearer today than we were last summer in building the foundations for peace. But, thank God, we are not at war.

The recall of our Reserve Forces in this crisis has set an historic precedent for, as the President has said, they were called not primarily to fight a war but to prevent a war. They are doing the job for which they were recalled.

The first assignment for the Air Reserve Forces was to build up our conventional air combat strength in Europe. On October 1, six Air National Guard tactical fighter wings, one tactical reconnaissance wing, two air transport wings, and a tactical control group, plus five Air Force Reserve troop carrier squadrons, entered on active duty.

Before the month was out, 11 Air Guard fighter squadrons left their home stations to fly over the Atlantic. More than 200 single-engine jet fighters took part in this historic mission—by far the largest deployment of jet fighters in history, and the biggest ocean crossing since World War II. Despite the fact that very few of these pilots had any previous experience in long overwater flights, and that the range of their aircraft allowed very little margin for error, every plane reached Europe without mishap. That is exactly 1,000 percent.

In 1951, during the Korean war, it took 3 months for the first Reserve aircraft and crews to reach Korea after being recalled. Yet, in 1961, more than 200 Air Guard planes were on European soil just 1 month to the day after the units were called up.

But even this outstanding record was not to stand for long. To strengthen our air superiority fighter force in Europe, the Air Force on November 1 called up three Air National Guard groups equipped with the high altitude F-104 Starfighter. One of those groups was the 169th from McEntire Air National Guard Base at Congaree, just outside Columbia, S.C.

Just 3 days after they came on duty, an advance party left for Spain to prepare for the deployment of South Carolina's aircraft. The F-104 does not have sufficient range to make the Atlantic crossing, so it was necessary to partially disassemble the planes to be loaded into transport aircraft for the trip overseas. The first plane was on its way by November 10. By November 24, the day after Thanksgiving, South Carolina Air National Guard pilots were flying missions in Europe—just 24 days after being recalled to active duty.

I am sure you will agree that there is perhaps no better authority on the Berlin situation than Chancellor Konrad Adenauer of Germany. I would like to quote a statement made by the Secretary of Defense in a visit last month to one of the Air National Guard wings on duty in Europe.

> I think you should realize how extremely important this movement has been," the Secretary said. "Chancellor Adenauer wrote President Kennedy that, in his opinion, the prime factor influencing Khrushchev in his slowdown on the Berlin crisis was the swift, decisive buildup of American forces, including this wing, standing at the ready in France. We are all proud of you and your magnificent performance."

I might add that our South Carolinians in Spain almost immediately found an opportunity to demonstrate southern hospitality as well as their military capability. Severe floods in the area of Seville, near the base where our people are stationed, had made thousands homeless, without adequate food or clothing. Our squadron commander, Lt. Col. Bob Corbett, called home to Columbia to ask the wives of squadron members to collect food and clothing. Our newspapers and radio and television stations soon joined in and the people of South Carolina contributed more than 16,000 pounds of food and clothing for the homeless people of Seville, flown to Spain by planes of the Strategic Air Command which regularly deploy between Hunter Air Force Base and Savannah and bases in Spain.

What could have been greater, what finer service could have been rendered to these poor people, and think of the fine public relations that these boys have created for themselves and the Nation.

I am proud that the members of the 169th Fighter Group and its 157th Tactical Fighter Squadron are from my home State. I am proud that all members of the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve are competent and highly motivated citizens. I am proud that the Congress had a major role in assuring that we built up and will continue to maintain strong Air Reserve Forces to meet any threat to our peace and security.

It sickens me to see dedicated Americans maligned and their patriotic motives impugned.

I passed through the Azores recently and saw the Air Guard and the Air Reserve as their planes stopped for fuel, and I read in their eyes that dedication motivated by the highest of American ideals. I saw Americanism at work. I resent, and resent vigorously, any reflection made on the motives of these great Americans. This is the exemplification of the spirit of Washington, Teddy Roosevelt, and that long line of airmen who carved immortal history in World War I, World War II, and in Korea. These men represent the traditions of this great Nation and I do not like them to be talked about, I resent it. They are serving their country and God knows we owe them a debt of gratitude.

The demonstrated capability of these units is evident proof of the effectiveness of the planning and execution of their training. The response of individual members of the Air Reserve Forces is gratifying in the extreme and indicates a clear understanding of the responsibilities of citizenship and the obligations of military service.

Let me quote briefly from a New Year's message by Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, the Air Force's distinguished Chief of Staff, to the families of Air Reserve Forces personnel:

> Never before has the U.S. Air Force depended so heavily on the ability of the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve to respond so quickly and effectively. Never before have the Air Reserve Forces met a challenge with such speed and efficiency.

Let us not allow the weeping of a disgruntled few to obscure these remarkable accomplishments of the overwhelming majority. I give humble thanks for the patriotism and professional competence of the members of the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve. They are ready now to help defend us and our allies. Let us resolve not only to give adequate recognition and aid to the members of our Reserve Forces for their service in this time of need but also to assure that they are given the resources and encouragement to continue to stand ready whenever they may be needed in the future.

SPECIAL ORDER PUT OVER

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the 30-minute special order I have for today be put over until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the end of the proceedings today I may insert a resolution passed by the State Senate of Texas concerning our new Member from San Antonio [Mr. GONZALEZ].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE INVESTIGATES FOUNDATION-CONTROLLED ENTERPRISES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that the Select Committee on Small Business has undertaken a study of the impact of tax-exempt foundations and charitable trusts on our economic structure—dealing, in part, with problems facing small business as a result of competition from foundation-controlled enterprises. Such a study is important to small business as well as to the whole economy.

On August 14, 1961, I, as an individual member, wrote to about 500 foundations requesting certain information as to their operations. My list was comprised mainly of the larger foundations and company-sponsored foundations. Shortly before the close of the 1st session of the 87th Congress, the committee agreed to carry on the study initiated by me. A resolution was drawn and presented to the members at the committee's first meeting of this session. On January 18, 1962, the committee adopted the following resolution unanimously, one member voting present:

> *Be it resolved,* That the Select Committee of the United States House of Representatives, to conduct studies and investigations of the problems of all types of small business, deems it necessary that it conduct studies and hold hearings on the impact upon small business of the activities and conduct of tax-exempt foundations and charitable trusts and in connection therewith to require the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents, and as a preliminary to the issuance of any subpenas, the chairman may request the voluntary submission of such information, books, papers, and documents, or copies thereof, as he deems necessary, all of the foregoing in accordance with and pursuant to the terms and provisions of House Resolution 46, as adopted by the United States House of Representatives at the First Session of the Eighty-Seventh Congress on February 6, 1961.

The present Select Committee on Small Business was created by House Resolution 46 "to conduct studies and investigations of the problems of all types of small business, existing, arising, or that may arise, with particular reference to first, the factors which have impeded or may impede the normal operations, growth, and development of the potentialities thereof; second, the administration of Federal laws relating specifically to small business to determine whether such laws and their administration adequately serve the needs of small business; third, whether Government agencies adequately serve and give due consideration to the problems of small business; and fourth, to study and investigate problems of small business enterprises generally, and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation."

To date, we have gathered a substantial amount of information, of a type that has not been collected heretofore. The material includes copies of exemption applications, copies of charters or articles of incorporation, balance sheets as of date organization, tabulations of income and expenditures, copies of Form 990-A filed with the Internal Revenue Service since 1951, accountant's annual financial statements, names of officers and trustees, names of investment advisers, and book values as well as market values of securities held.

It has been pointed out to us that certain foundations not only engage in money lending on a large scale but have substantial interests and, in many cases, control of business in the following fields, among others: soft drinks, mortgages, real estate, gasoline service stations, oil and gas, baking, utilities, retail, textiles, lumber, meatpacking, restaurant, insurance, coal mining, and commercial laboratories.

One thing is already quite clear in the first stage of our study. Tax-exempt status for over 45,000 foundations is in itself a major national problem, when so little is known about the effect of that exemption on such a large scale. Last August, I informed the Members that the number of tax-exempt foundations filing Form 990-A had increased from 12,295 at the close of 1952 to 45,124 at the end of 1960, an increase of 367 percent. The number of exempt foundations increases daily. It is the duty of Congress to know the resultant effects on our Nation's economy and to determine what should or should not be done about it.

BIG BANKS ARE THREATENING TO RAISE THEIR LOAN RTES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the signs are growing that we are in for a new round of increases in interest rates. The Wall Street Journal reports that a number of bankers in major cities expect an increase in the banking industry's prime lending rates almost anytime.

The prime rate is the fee charged the biggest borrowers with the best credit rating. Usually, one of the New York banks initiates the change in prime loan rates and then all of the other major banks in the country step into line, and most other bank lending charges are scaled upward in relation to the change in the prime loan rate. The net effect of changes in the prime loan rate is that business borrowers, large and small, have to adjust to a new scale of rates.

NEW INCREASE IN PRIME LOAN RATE TIED TO FEDERAL RESERVE RAISING CEILING ON COMMERCIAL BANK SAVINGS AND TIME DEPOSIT RATES

In past years, changes in the prime loan rate have often been explained or justified by the bankers by shifts in the Federal Reserve discount rate, or by increases in the business loan demand coupled with a decline in free reserves available for lending. The situation today, however, is that there has been no increase in the Federal Reserve rediscount rate, the demand for business loans is quite spotty throughout the country, and free reserves during the past 3 weeks averaged $465 million, as compared with the recent peak of $696 million reached a year ago, when business was at a low ebb.

But one factor stands out as a handy excuse for the big banks to use as a justification for initiating a new increase in the prime loan rate. This is the action taken by the Federal Reserve to raise the ceiling on interest rates commercial banks may pay on savings and time deposits.

FEDERAL RESERVE REASONS FOR RAISING CEILING ON INTEREST RATES FOR SAVINGS AND TIME DEPOSITS

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to review the reasons given by the Federal Reserve for increasing the interest rate ceiling on savings and time deposits. The reasons are three in number.

In the first place, the Federal Reserve said it wished to permit commercial banks to better compete for savings and time deposits. According to the Federal Reserve:

> For some time, a number of commercial banks have contended that the 3-percent maximum rate has restricted them in their efforts to compete for savings and time de-

posits. One effect of the action will be to increase freedom of competition and to enable each member bank to determine the rates of interest which it will pay in the light of the economic conditions prevailing in its area, the type of competition it must meet, and its ability to pay.

The second reason given by the Federal Reserve was to moderate pressures on the balance of payments. This is the way the Fed explained it:

> Another effect of immediate significance will be to enable member banks so desiring to compete more vigorously to retain foreign deposits that might otherwise move abroad in search of higher returns and thereby intensify an outflow of capital or gold to other countries. Thus, today's action is in line with previous steps taken to moderate pressures on this country's international balance of payments.

The third reason was to provide an added incentive for savings to finance economic growth and expanding job opportunities. This was spelled out by the Federal Reserve in the following words:

> A further, longer range effect should be to give member banks all the scope that may be needed for a considerable period ahead to provide an added incentive for the savings that will be required in financing the future economic growth that will be essential to expanding job opportunities for a growing population.

What the Federal Reserve did not say was that the increase in the maximum permissible rates of interest payable by commercial banks on savings deposits and time deposits actually is, for all practical purposes, an increase in the minimum rates payable. It also did not say that the increase in interest payable by the banks on savings and time deposits would also signal an increase in loan rates charged by the banks, initiating an upward spiral in interest rates throughout the economy.

PAST PATTERN OF CHANGES IN PRIME LOAN RATES

Monetary matters appear to be very complicated to the average person in this country. Most people can readily understand when they hear that the price of bread or the price of steel has been raised. A few months ago, the Secretary of Agriculture sharply challenged as unjustified an increase in the price of bread. Last fall, the President spoke out against an increase in the price of steel.

It is just as crucial to our economy that strong opposition be raised to the prospect of increasing interest rates. Increasing interest rates boosts costs all up and down the line in financing business and agriculture. Increasing interest rates add to the heavy burden of Government expenditures. There can hardly be any more significant cost item in our economy than the cost of interest.

Nevertheless, changes in the prime loan rate—the harbinger of business loan interest rates—take place in much the same manner as changes in the price of bread or steel.

As I have indicated, usually one of the New York banks leads off with a change in the prime loan rate and all the other banks in the country follow suit. It is said that the prime loan rate was born in the depression decade of the thirties. During the past 15 years or so, there have been 19 changes in the prime loan rate—15 increases and 4 decreases. Changes in the prime rate are given top priority in the news columns in the financial press and the Dow Jones financial news wire flashes the announcement across the country of a change made by a major bank.

NEW YORK BANKS ALMOST ALWAYS INITIATE CHANGES IN PRIME LOAN RATES

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include herein a tabulation showing the effective date of each change in the prime loan rate during the years 1934 through 1960, indicating the rate, whether it was an increase or a decrease, and the bank initiating the change:

Changes in the prime rate

Effective date[1]	Rate (percent)	Increase	Decrease	Bank initiating change
1934 to December 1947	1½			
Dec. 15, 1947	1¾	+		Bankers Trust Co.
Aug. 10, 1948	2	+		Irving Trust Co.
Sept. 22, 1950	2¼	+		First National City Bank.
Jan. 5, 1951	2½	+		Bankers Trust Co.
Oct. 17, 1951	2¾	+		First National City Bank.
Dec. 18, 1951	3	+		Chase Manhattan Bank.
Apr. 27, 1953	3¼	+		Bankers Trust Co.
Mar. 17, 1954	3		–	Morgan Guaranty Trust Co.
Aug. 4, 1955	3¼	+		Chase Manhattan Bank.
Oct. 14, 1955	3½	+		First National City Bank.
Apr. 13, 1956	3¾	+		Chase Manhattan Bank.
Aug 20, 1956	4	+		First National Bank of Boston.
Aug. 7, 1957	4½	+		Bankers Trust Co.
Jan. 21 1958	4		–	Chase Manhattan Bank.
Apr. 21, 1958	3½		–	Morgan Guaranty Trust Co.
Sept. 11. 1958	4	+		Chase Manhattan Bank.
May 18, 1959	4½	+		First National City Bank.
Sept. 1, 1959	5	+		Do.
Aug. 23, 1960	4½		–	Manufacturers Trust Co.

As announced by bank initiating the change in rate.

Source Bank Stock Quarterly, June 1961 (p. 12), published by M. A. Schapiro & Co., Inc.

Bank rates on short-term business loans average for 19 large cities, 1934–1961 (percent per annum)

	Rate
1934	
March	3.69
June	3.35
September	3.29
December	3.21
1935	
March	3.06
June	2.93
September	2.79
December	2.85
1936	
March	2.77
June	2.71
September	2.63
December	2.58
1937	
March	2.57
June	2.57
September	2.56
December	2.52
1938	
March	2.48
June	2.56
September	2.53
December	2.60
1939	
March	2.95
June	2.91
September	2.68
December	2.59
1940	
March	2.65
June	2.59
September	2.68
December	2.59
1941	
March	2.58
June	2.55
September	2.60
December	2.41
1942	
March	2.48
June	2.62
September	2.70
December	2.63
1943	
March	2.76
June	3.00
September	2.48
December	2.65

Bank rates on short-term business loans average for 19 large cities, 1934–1961 (percent per annum)—Continued

	Rate
1944	
March	2.63
June	2.63
September	2.69
December	2.39
1945	
March	2.53
June	2.50
September	2.45
December	2.09
1946	
March	2.31
June	2.41
September	2.32
December	2.33
1947	
March	2.31
June	2.38
September	2.21
December	2.22
1948	
March	2.46
June	2.47
September	2.60
December	2.64
1949	
March	2.70
June	2.74
September	2.63
December	2.65
1950	
March	2.60
June	2.68
September	2.63
December	2.84
1951	
March	3.02
June	3.07
September	3.06
December	3.27
1952	
March	3.45
June	3.51
September	3.49
December	3.51
1953	
March	3.54
June	3.73
September	3.74
December	3.76

Bank rates on short-term business loans average for 19 large cities, 1934-1961 (*percent per annum*)—Continued

	Rate
1954	
March	3.72
June	3.60
September	3.56
December	3.55
1955	
March	3.54
June	3.56
September	3.77
December	3.93
1956	
March	3.93
June	4.14
September	4.35
December	4.38
1957	
March	4.38
June	4.40
September	4.83
December	4.85
1958	
March	4.49
June	4.17
September	4.21
December	4.50
1959	
March	4.51
June	4.87
September	5.27
December	5.36
1960	
March	5.34
June	5.35
September	4.97
December	4.99
1961	
March	4.97
June	4.97
September	4.99
December	4.96

Source: Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System.

It is interesting to note that with but one exception—August 20, 1956—the changes in the prime rate have been initiated by a major New York City bank.

The prospect now is that the new increase in the prime loan rate may originate outside New York, for, according to the Wall Street Journal of January 10, it was the chairman of the First National Bank of Chicago that "predicted an increase in the banking industry's prime lending rate could come almost any time."

The banking industry may feel that it needs another exception to prove the rule that the New York banks set the prime loan rate. But, of course, the statement from the chairman of First National of Chicago may be just his way of indicating that his bank is ready for any boost in the prime loan rate to be announced by a New York City bank.

The president of the Bank of America, S. Clark Beise, also says he expects an increase in the prime loan rate during the spring months. According to the Wall Street Journal of January 17:

> He said this, along with increased loans, will help offset the costs of higher rates paid savers.
>
> The Bank of America president is the latest banking official to predict a rise in the prime interest rate in coming months, but many others have indicated they expect the boost before next spring. The prime rate, currently at 4½ percent, is the fee banks charge their biggest borrowers with the best credit standings.
>
> Pressure has been on bankers to raise rates following an increase in savings interest rates in many cities January 1. This followed boosts by the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in the ceiling rates on savings-type deposits in commercial banks to as high as 4 percent. Bank of America raised its rates from 3 percent to 3½ percent on deposits left with the bank less than a year and to 4 percent on funds on deposit a year or more.

Thus, the bankers are tying the new increase in prime loan rates directly to the Fed's action raising the ceiling on interest for savings and time deposits.

Actually, over the years a group of 6 prominent New York City banks have alternated in 18 of the 19 changes in the prime loan rate since 1934. The two largest Wall Street banks—Chase Manhattan and First National City—shared equally in the initiation of 10 of the 19 changes. Bankers Trust initiated four of the prime loan rate changes. Morgan Guaranty initiated two changes. Manufacturers Trust and Irving Trust initiated one change each.

The only bank outside New York City to initiate a prime loan rate change was First National Bank of Boston.

Some might interpret the follow-the-leader pattern of prime rate changes as a typical administered price. Certainly prime loan rates exhibit many of the recognized characteristics of an administrative price—such as bread or steel. Changes in the rate are made infrequently upon initiation of one of the industry leaders, and quickly adopted by the other leading bankers. The rate then holds for a considerable period of time before a new change is announced. The prime rate is not a volatile rate, changing from day to day, or even month to month, in quick response to conditions in the money market.

But whether the prime loan rate is an administered price, I would not know. There may be more to the setting of the rate than meets the eye. In this connection, the London Economist of January 13 made the following observation:

> Uniform lending rates and service fees—for checking accounts, managing trust funds, acting as custodian—are common in many communities, although there are variations between regions. Bankers, however, contend that this uniformity is the result, not of price fixing, but of competition and that this has the effect of forcing interest rates down. Nevertheless, commercial banks in many rural areas pay much less on savings accounts than do those in major cities and the Department [of Justice] suspects that price fixing is taking place.
>
> If the Antitrust Division can prove that conspiracy exists it may seek to challenge the major commercial banks on their uniform prime lending rate—the minimum rate charged on loans to the biggest and most credit-worthy corporate customers. This rate has been attacked in Congress as being an administered price adhered to by all the major lenders and the department would have political backing for any attempt to abolish it.

In any case, it is clear the changes in the prime loan rate have a pervasive effect on rates charged throughout the country. This is demonstrated by a comparison between changes in the prime loan rate and changes in the average rate on all short-term business loans in 19 large cities, as compiled by the Federal Reserve Board.

Thus, a series of boosts from early 1951 through 1953 raised the prime loan rate from 2½ percent to 3¼ percent. Average business loan rates in 19 large cities jumped from about 3 percent to 3¾ percent. A drop in the prime loan rate in 1954 from 3¼ percent to 3 percent was accompanied by a decline in business loan rates from about 3¾ percent to slightly above 3½ percent.

Between 1955 and August 1957, the prime loan rate rose from 3 percent to 4½ percent, and the average business loan rate advanced from slightly more than 3½ percent to more than 4¾ percent.

Again, when the prime loan rate dropped from 4½ percent to 3½ percent during the first half of 1958, average business loan rates fell from above 4¾ percent to below 4¼ percent.

The rise in prime loan rates from 3½ percent in mid-1958 to 5 percent in September 1959 was accompanied by a rise in average business loan rates from 4¼ percent to about 5¼ percent—and a peak of 5.4 percent in December 1959.

The drop in the prime loan rate in August 1960 from 5 percent to 4½ percent was paralleled by a decline in average business loan rates from about 5.4 percent to just below 5 percent.

In short, a few Wall Street banks have been setting the pattern of loan rates charged to business, large and small, across the country.

FEDERAL RESERVE JUSTIFICATION OF INCREASE IN TIME AND SAVINGS DEPOSITS FAULTY

A bit of analysis quickly reveals that the Federal Reserve Board would not have a leg to stand on in lifting the interest rate ceiling on savings and time deposits if it had not fallen back on the standard excuse—the balance of payments problem. And in my considered opinion the balance of payments is a "pegleg" the Fed stands on, and no real justification for the increase at all.

But before we get into the balance of payments matter, let us first consider the other two justifications supplied by the Fed.

Will the increase on savings and time deposits increase freedom of competition for savings and time deposits by members banks?

First of all, the effect of the member bank increase is only to stimulate higher interest rate—or technically dividend—payments by the financial intermediaries, the savings and loan institutions, and others. As the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] recently pointed out:

> It takes no expert knowledge to predict the inevitable outcome—savings and loan associations will have to raise their rates to maintain a competitive position and we will have just moved one step higher up the interest rate ladder with no appreciable addition to the overall supply of savings.
>
> To meet these higher dividend payments, mortgage lenders will have to exact a higher charge from their borrowers—in fact, a substantially higher charge, since any increase in dividends immediately goes into effect for an institution's entire holdings of savings but its existing portfolio is already committed at past interest rates. Therefore, new loans made have to pay a disproportionate share of the burden of higher rates ("Savings and Economic Growth," address by Repre-

sentative ALBERT RAINS, Democrat, of Alabama, before the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks in New York City, December 12, 1961 (p. 9, mimeographed copy)).

The gentleman from Alabama is chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee, and knows whereof he speaks.

The Wall Street Journal of January 16 reports:

> Many banks quickly pushed their rates up to the new ceiling, putting pressure on their competitors to pay still more. Some California savings and loan associations have lifted their rates to as much as 4¾ percent.

COMMERCIAL BANKS HAVE POWER TO CREATE MONEY—SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS DO NOT

But even more significant is the fact that the commercial banks, because of the fractional reserve system, are in the unique position of creating the money they need through making loans. As former Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Anderson, has pointed out in the U.S. News & World Report, of August 31, 1959, page 68:

> Banks are different from other lending institutions. When a savings and loan association, an insurance company, or a credit union makes a loan, it lends the very dollars that its customers have previously paid in. But when a bank makes a loan, it simply adds to the borrower's deposit account in the bank by the amount of the loan. The money is not taken from anyone else's deposit: it was not previously paid in to the bank by anyone. It's new money, created by the bank for the use of the borrower.

The commercial banks do not have to accumulate savings for commercial lending; they create the money they lend, just with a stroke of a pen. When a commercial bank makes a loan to a business firm of to an individual, it creates the money loaned. When a commercial bank buys a Government security, it creates the money to buy it. When a commercial bank buys debt obligations of the State and local governments, it creates the money it uses to buy obligations.

Moreover, the fact is that commercial banks expand on their reserves against time deposits just as much, if not more so, as they expand on their reserves against demand deposits. Reserves against demand deposits and time deposits are commingled and mixed. In point of fact, when a commercial bank computes its required reserves, it computes a single amount which is a weighted average of its required reserves against both demand and time deposits. In other words, when a commercial bank has an increase in time deposits, the reserves set aside against those time deposits permit the bank to create new money in the form of demand deposits.

INCREASE IN COMMERCIAL LENDING RATES SHOULD NOT BE TIED TO HIKE IN SAVINGS DEPOSIT INTEREST

The crux of the matter is that commercial lending rates should not be tied to savings deposit rates. The commercial banks can expand loans and thus create deposits. Their free reserves are more than ample. There is no cost justification for raising commercial loan rates, for the commercial banks do not—and should not—depend on savings deposits as a source of funds for commercial loans.

WILL THE INCREASE IN COMMERCIAL BANK INTEREST ON SAVINGS AND TIME DEPOSITS INCREASE THE VOLUME OF SAVINGS?

It seems strange indeed that the Fed, with a straight face, would claim that an increase in commercial bank interest on savings and time deposits would increase the volume of savings. I am sure the learned economists at the Board would acknowledge that there is a great inelasticity to the savings function. In other words, any modest increase in the interest rate paid by commercial banks on deposits would have practically a negligible effect on the level of savings in the country.

As a matter of fact, the Fed seems mixed up. It is getting the cart before the horse. Savings are created as a product of increasing national income. Such increasing savings, in turn, provide the source of further economic growth and expanding job opportunities for a growing population.

The real and present danger is that the Fed's action may propel us into a snowballing upthrust in interest rates which will throttle business borrowing and cut off the recovery—even before we have reached full employment.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS WILL BE CURED BY INCREASING THE SCOPE OF OUR FOREIGN TRADE

Now we come to the balance-of-payments bugaboo. It is true that for a number of reasons we have seen the traditional favorable American balance-of-payments picture change to one of touch and go.

I do not care to get into the intricacies of the balance of payments problem at this time, but I would remind the members that, first, increasing interest on commercial bank savings and time deposits—standing alone—will have little favorable effect on the balance of payments. So-called hot money will not stand still long enough in American banks to earn the higher interest rates of member banks.

The real solution to the balance of payments problem is to increase our exports.

As the President so eloquently stated in his state of the Union message:

> Above all, if we are to pay for our commitments abroad, we must expand our exports. Our businessmen must be export conscious and export competitive.

In order to be export competitive, costs and prices must be held under restraint. Interest is a crucial item of cost which permeates the whole economy. It is imperative that we not get into a new cycle of increasing interest rates, which would enter into the cost of the items we produce for export, bringing pressure for higher prices, with the consequent loss of foreign market opportunities.

The lessons of 1959 to 1960 remain painfully instructive. At that time, recovery was retarded and eventually stalled well short of full employment—in part by the fastest rise in interest rates in the past century in a comparable phase of the business cycle.

Whether or not we enter into a new phase of increasing interest rates lies largely in the hands of a few New York banks and the Federal Reserve. If the Federal Reserve takes further steps toward monetary restraint, the result is inevitable. On the other hand, if New York bankers, acting upon their own, lead off with a boost in the prime loan rate, again the result is inevitable. The pressures are great, but the consequences are clear.

Americans everywhere—including the prominent Wall Street bankers—are asking what it is they can do for their country in this time of crisis. This is their opportunity. They can restrain their natural appetite for increasing interest rates, for the purpose of promoting a more prosperous America.

The President has called upon labor to exercise restraint in its wage demands and upon industry to exercise restraint in the pricing of its products. The banking community must likewise exercise restraint in the establishing of interest rates.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

S. RES. 271

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, late a Senator from the State of Kansas.

Resolved, That a committee of Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 40 minutes.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION NOW

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss a vital problem facing our Nation, one which goes to the very heart of our democratic system and one which, unless solved, casts doubts upon our national commitment to liberty—civil rights. I purposely raise this subject at the beginning of this session, for I strongly feel that the Congress must act, and act now.

The issue of discrimination is a national issue and must be dealt with on the national level. This is true for several reasons. First, racial discrimination involves the basic moral concepts upon which our Nation was founded. We believe in equal opportunity for all peoples, regardless of accident of race or color. We hold out the promise of the development of every human being to his greatest potential because he is a person, not because of his ancestry or the color of his skin. This is what makes America great—this is what makes us know that democracy will prevail in the world struggle against ruthless totalitarianism. This brings us to the second reason why this is a national question. It involves the picture we present to the world—whether we, in fact, live up to the high standards set forth in the Declaration of Independence where we boldly proclaimed that all men were created equal.

The repercussions of segregation can be readily seen by examining the reports of the press overseas. After the wave of violence last May by those determined to deny their fellow citizens' constitutional rights, Edward R. Murrow, Director of the U.S. Information Agency, described oversea press reaction to the events, as follows:

> Strong and predominantly negative coverage ran the scale from immediate horror and disgust to longer range concern that American world policy was being seriously compromised.

The Murrow report dated June 21, 1961, had this to say about Far East press reaction to racial discrimination in this country:

> Despite generally restrained comment in the Far East press, the recent racial incidents have damaged America's detractors with the obvious usable material. * * * Public opinion surveys and informal conversations in Indonesia, Burma, and Thailand have revealed that racial discrimination is one of the least admired aspects of American political and social life.

Responses of this nature were reported in the Near East, Asia, and Latin America. Of course, we literally write the script for Radio Moscow every time racial incidents occur in our country.

I point out the international implications of discrimination to indicate that this problem concerns all of us as a nation. I would emphasize again and again, however, that the correction of these situations must stem first and foremost from our own belief and dedication as Americans to the concepts of individual dignity, the worth of every man, and equal justice under law as embodied in our national documents which set forth the tenets of this Nation.

Finally, it is a national problem because discrimination in housing, public facilities, employment, and other areas of our social and economic life occurs in varying degrees in all of our States—subtly or openly. The problem exists to some extent everywhere.

Because this is a national problem, it is a national responsibility—a responsibility of both the Congress and the Executive. And because this issue involves the basic rights of our citizens to vote, learn, earn a living, live in decent housing, use public facilities and live equally with their fellow citizens, the Congress must face this issue without further delay.

At the executive level this administration has been more active in the field of civil rights than any other. We all know that the President has been vigorous in the field of Federal employment and has demanded that firms with Government contracts do not discriminate. I hope that the President will soon sign an Executive order prohibiting discrimination in federally assisted housing. I have urged him to do so.

The Attorney General has intervened in school desegregation suits and is active in the area of voting rights. He also asked the Interstate Commerce Commission to issue regulations prohibiting racial discrimination in interstate bus travel. I was fortunate in being able to appear and testify before the ICC in support of such proposals. The ICC has approved the proposed regulations, a positive step forward.

The administration has also appointed Negro citizens to high positions. Recently, one of the leading constitutional lawyers in the United States, Thurgood Marshall, was designated as a judge on the Federal Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

A recent report of the Leadership Conference stated:

> Indeed, we believe that it would be fair to say that the Kennedy administration has been more active in the defense of civil rights than any previous administration in a comparable period.

Although civil rights battles are being won, the war must continue. Congress must play its role in this fight for democracy. The need for legislation in this field is recognized by both the Democratic and Republican national platforms. During the 1960 presidential campaign the then Senator Kennedy stated:

> Much legislation is needed. We must grant the Attorney General power to enforce all constitutional rights—not just the right to vote. We must wipe out discriminatory poll taxes and literacy tests, and pass effective antibombing and antilynching legislation. And we must continually strengthen the legal framework which will allow us to move toward economic, educational and political equality (Sept. 9, 1960, Los Angeles).

The necessity of civil rights legislation is known to all of us. It is distressing that, as we approach the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, young Americans who participate with dignity, decency and determination in freedom rides and sit-ins dramatically prove that equal rights for all our citizens have not been achieved.

School desegregation is proceeding with all deliberate obstruction. Eight years after the historic Supreme Court decision the Civil Rights Commission reports that at the close of the 1960-61 school year only 775 out of 2,827 biracial southern school districts were desegregated—1961 Civil Rights Commission Report No. 2. In many of these there is only token integration.

The 1961 Commission on Civil Rights Report on Education concluded:

> The Nation's progress in removing the stultifying effects of segregation in the public elementary and secondary schools—north, south, east, and west—is slow indeed.

The Commission recommended legislation requiring every local school board which excludes pupils on the basis of race to file a plan for desegregation within 6 months after its adoption. This plan would call for at least first step compliance with the Supreme Court's decision at the beginning of the following year. Congress would direct the Attorney General to take appropriate action to enforce this law.

The Commission also recommended that the Congress enact legislation authorizing a Federal Agency, upon request, to provide technical or financial assistance at any time within 5 years after the initiation of a desegregation program to local school systems or to local citizens' groups attempting to help solve problems arising from desegregation in any of the following ways: First, financial aid to school districts for the employment of social workers or specialists in desegregation problems, or of inservice training programs for teachers or guidance counselors; second, technical assistance to school districts or citizens' groups to train school personnel or community leaders in techniques useful in solving desegregation problems.

The Commission proposed that the President or Congress direct the Attorney General to take such action as may be appropriate, in any case where a school system is operating under a plan to bring it into conformance with the requirements of the 14th amendment, to protect the school board members carrying out the plan, supervisory officials and teachers in school systems executing the orders of the school boards, school children of both races attempting to attend schools affected by the plan and their parents, and citizens helping the children or their parents.

The firm base of democracy is education. Equal opportunity is meaningless without equal education. We cannot claim to be the greatest democracy in the world when a substantial number of our citizens are denied on the basis of race the right to attend the same school as their fellow citizens. For too long we have waited patiently for decency and reason to prevail upon those who refuse to comply with the basic law of our land. Congress must insure that schools are desegregated. In the last session I introduced a bill, H.R. 9012, which would accomplish this. Congress has the responsibility to act. Now it must show the will.

In other fields of our social and economic life discriminatory practices prevail. In the field of employment legislation is badly needed. There are some employers who will hire no Negro for any position. There are other employers who will hire Negroes only for the most menial jobs no matter how qualified the applicants are. When Negroes are hired, their chances for promotion are either nonexistent or much more limited than they would be were it not for their race. In some areas of the country discriminatory practices in employment are used not only against Negroes but against other minority groups—Puerto Ricans, other Latin Americans, Chinese or Japanese or Indians. They are practiced against Catholics or Jews. The effect on our economy of job discrimination is obvious. It is no secret that minorities comprise a disproportionate percentage of the lowest income group. Because of discrimination we are not fully utilizing the talents and energies of many of our citizens.

In addition, the affront to human dignity in being denied a job because of color or origin or religion is incalculable.

The employer is not the only factor in employment discrimination. The 1961 Civil Rights Commission Report on Employment states:

> As the craft unions generally control admissions to apprenticeship training programs, racial discrimination policies also operate to exclude Negroes from these programs. Existing civil rights machinery within the AFL-CIO has not eliminated discriminatory practices and policies of some local unions.

Discrimination pervades other areas as well.

The 1961 Civil Rights Commission Report on Housing states:

> A considerable number of Americans, by reason of their color or race are being denied equal opportunity in housing.

Discrimination in housing results not only from the prejudice of landlords and owners but from the discriminatory practices of real estate brokers and lending institutions. The Civil Rights Commission Housing Report not only recommended that action be taken against discrimination in publicly assisted housing but also in regard to discriminatory practices of financial institutions engaged in the mortgage loan business.

Discrimination is not confined to social and economic matters. The long arm of prejudice extends to the ballot box. The 1961 Civil Rights Commission Report on Voting states:

> The right to vote without distinctions of race or color—the promise of the 15th amendment—continues to suffer abridgement.

The Commission found:

> Some denials of the right to vote occur by reason of discriminatory application of laws setting qualifications for voters. Other denials result from arbitrary and discriminatory procedures for the registration of voters; still others occur by reason of threats and intimidation, or the fear of retaliation.

In evaluating present voting laws the Commission said:

> Although the provisions of the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts are useful, however, they are necessarily limited means for removing racial discrimination from the franchise. Suits must proceed a single county at a time, and they are time consuming, expensive and difficult. Broader measures are required if denials of constitutional rights in this area are to be quickly eliminated.

I have attempted to show that the civil rights issue is our responsibility as National Representatives and that discrimination affects the social, political, and economic affairs of our Nation. Now we come to the question of whether we have the power to act commensurate with the obligation to act. I believe we do.

The due process clause and the equal protection clause of the Constitution provide that no State may deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law nor deny to any person equal protection of the laws. When State officers arrest customers who are peacefully waiting to be served, regardless of their race, in a public establishment, I believe the Constitution is violated.

The 15th amendment provides:

> The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous servitude.

The commerce clause of the Constitution confers upon Congress the power to regulate commerce among the States. Today that clause is broadly interpreted. I believe that it is crystal clear that Congress has the full power to regulate in the area of discrimination and segregation practiced in any business dealing with the general public which is either interstate in nature or has any impact upon interstate commerce.

Armed with the Constitution, Congress must declare war on discrimination.

The Civil Rights Commission should be a permanent institution empowered not only to investigate deprivations of basic rights but also to protect these rights. Wherever a person is denied the right to work, the right to live in a place of his own choosing, the right to vote, the Commission should have the power to issue a cease and desist order which, if not complied with, can be enforced by the Federal courts.

I have introduced H.R. 7143 which describes unfair discriminatory practices—discrimination against persons because of race, creed, color or national origin in the fields of employment, insurance, labor relations, housing, and public accommodations. Under H.R. 7143 when the Civil Rights Commission finds that a person or organization is guilty of an unfair discriminatory practice, the Commission would have the power to issue a court enforceable cease and desist order. Violations of a Federal court order for compliance would constitute criminal contempt punishable by fine or imprisonment or both.

In addition, the Commission under H.R. 7143 would also have the power to investigate deprivations of voting rights. When a deprivation occurs, Federal enrollment officers would be appointed to register those whose constitutional rights have been denied. The Federal enrollment officers would be able to supervise the election to make sure, by Federal court order if necessary, the votes are cast and counted.

Under this proposal the Civil Rights Commission would not have to wait until some brave citizen filed a complaint but would be given the power to investigate on its own initiative.

Congress has vast unfilled responsibilities in the field of civil rights. These responsibilities must be met immediately, so that all of our citizens can enjoy the benefits of our land and partake fully in our national life. Until equality of all our people is assured in every area—economic, education, housing, voting and social—we must press onward to secure civil rights for all. I call upon Congress this session to pass meaningful civil rights legislation and send forth a message of hope for the vital cause of freedom in its titanic struggle throughout the world.

ARCHIVIST OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to put the Archivist of the United States on the Civil War Centennial Commission. The number of the bill is H.R. 9746. It seems to me that this measure needs no justification because it meets an obvious need.

The measure would simply make the Archivist of the United States or his representative a member of the Civil War Centennial Commission. Like all other members of that body, he would serve without compensation.

The Archivist or his representative should be a member of the Commission for reasons that are not only obvious, but compelling. For one thing, the National Archives has custody of the most important single collection of official records of the Civil War to be found anywhere. These are original records, the ones that came into being during the war and that reflect official decisions and action. They include Confederate as well as Union records.

Moreover, these records are in constant use. They are not dead papers in dead storage. On the contrary, students from all parts of the Nation use them in preparation of useful and scholarly research. State governmental units, including many of the State Civil War centennial commissions, also depend heavily on these records.

This is good. And a good consequence of the increasingly heavy use of these original records is the fact that those members of the Archivist's staff who service the records are of necessity experts in the history of the Civil War and its documentation. These splendid staff skills and talents could become even more useful if the Archivist were a member of the Civil War Centennial Commission, for he could then coordinate the work of his staff more closely with that of the Commission.

He could also contribute immeasurably to the Commission's work of stimulating and sponsoring the preparation of much-needed guides to source materials about the Civil War.

These are concrete reasons for adding the Archivist of the United States to the roster of the Civil War Centennial Commission.

There is also another reason, somewhat less specific but no less persuasive. I refer to the fact that of all Federal agencies, the National Archives is perhaps the one most closely associated with the Nation's historians. This is especially germane because the Commission itself will henceforth be linked closely with historians for its new program will emphasize Civil War scholarship of a high order.

Under these circumstances, what could be more appropriate than placing the Archivist of the United States on the Civil War Centennial Commission?

It is my hope that the Judiciary Committee will give immediate consideration to this legislation and bring it to the floor for our consideration.

A NATIONAL SECURITY AND PEACE COUNCIL

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ostertag] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, during the 1st session of the 87th Congress, we took an unprecedented and giant step toward strengthening our efforts for world peace by enacting legislation to create the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. I was pleased and proud to cast my vote for this new Agency, and have watched hopefully, as I know our Nation has, the initial efforts of this Agency.

However, Mr. Speaker, I felt at the time we considered the Disarmament Agency bill, and I have continued to feel, that we must do something more—something beyond disarmament—to respond to the longing of a troubled world for a true peace and freedom from destruction. To be sure, progress has been made, but, with all due respect to steps already taken, I believe we must recognize that the waging of total peace is necessary—not merely as the answer to a regime that wages total cold war—but as the answer to the needs and aspirations and prayers of all mankind—and indeed, as the imperative for mankind's survival.

To most of us, Mr. Speaker, the two words "security" and "peace" go together—they are meaningful words—and go hand in hand.

At this time in world history, we face the reality of a great struggle between freedom and totalitarianism. In this struggle, the United States of America is the recognized leader of the free world. Although the Communists have developed and maintain terrific destructive power, which presents a real threat and grave danger to our national and free world security, we possess superior military might and strength.

Our scientific development of powerful weapons systems, coupled with our balanced forces, have continued to provide us with a relatiatory capability of such magnitude as to deter aggression and to make it unprofitable for any enemy to attack.

Under existing circumstances, I am convinced that we must continue to possess this superior military capability in the interest of our security; and I believe that our strength has been primarily responsible for maintaining the peace of today, uneasy as it appears to be.

I am confident that the possession and continued development of our great strength and military power will prove to be of immeasurable value in achieving acceptance of a realistic and workable international agreement for arms control and ultimate disarmament.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, it is my firm conviction that we must also place increased stress on the other word in this pair; namely, peace.

And so, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 9742, to bring together at the very top level of our Government these two words—security and peace. My bill would enlarge the function of the National Security Council to include policy guidance and coordination of the peace-oriented programs of our several Federal Government agencies. Our National Security Council is already charged with responsibility for advising the President with respect to our national security. My proposal would charge the Council with the additional responsibility of advising and recommending policies associated with our efforts toward achieving a just and lasting peace.

To carry out this objective, this measure would amend the National Security Act to change the name of the National Security Council to that of National Security and Peace Council. In addition to the current membership of the Security Council—the President, the Vice President, the Secretaries of State and Defense, and the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning—I propose that we include as members of the new National Security and Peace Council, the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Director of the U.S. Information Agency, and the Administrator of the Agency for International Development. These officials carry responsibilities so closely allied with our efforts toward the achievement and maintenance of peace that I believe their policy guidance and coordinated efforts to be invaluable to the aims and purposes of the National Security and Peace Council.

Also, Mr. Speaker, under the National Security and Peace Council, my bill would establish a National Peace College. The stated objectives of the college include, but are not limited to, the "study and examination of the conditions which lead to and sustain amity between and among people and nations, and conversely, of the causes and means of prevention of international tensions and conflicts." The college shall report the results and findings from its research to the National Security and Peace Council to assist it in the formulation of policies and programs.

The National Peace College would also train personnel of appropriate Federal agencies and persons under the international educational exchange program, both U.S. citizens and those from abroad, in the scientific, economic, political, legal, social, psychological, military, and technological factors essential to the achievement of a just and lasting peace.

The college would be administered by a National Peace Board of seven members appointed by the President. Included in the responsibilities and duties of the Board are the establishment of rules and regulations for the conduct of the college, the formulation of curriculum, and securing facilities and personnel. The Board will also work closely with the many dedicated private organizations in this field.

In the past, I sponsored legislation to establish a Department of Peace, as well as a National Peace College. However, Mr. Speaker, I have departed from this concept in my new bill because I am convinced that the establishment of a totally new and separate department, however large its authority, is not enough. We must recognize that comprehensive, top level guidance and coordination is essential. Many agencies of our Government have for years carried on functions and programs which are peace oriented—intended to promote peaceful purposes in our relations with other countries, and designed to project to peoples throughout the world our dedication to the achievement and maintenance of world peace. But, despite the existence of these programs, and the fact that each one, by itself, may have been vigorously administered and pursued, we have failed to achieve our goal of a peaceful world.

It is my earnest hope, Mr. Speaker, that this bill will receive serious and prayerful consideration by the Congress during this session. Through passage of this measure, I believe we will be taking another "giant" step forward in making possible the widest use of reason and human intelligence in seeking international accord.

CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE CONSTITUTION AND LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Johansen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully direct attention of the House to several provisions of the Constitution and laws of the United States:

Item No. 1:

> The Senators and Representatives before mentioned * * * and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution.

Item No. 2: The statutes describe the form of oath as follows:

> I, , do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and

> allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

Item No. 3:

> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Item No. 4:

> All bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.

Item No. 5:

> The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises.

Item No. 6:

> Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it becomes a Law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his Objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the Objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If after such Reconsideration two thirds of that House shall agree to pass the Bill, it shall be sent, together with the Objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two thirds of that House, it shall become Law.

Except for the second item mentioned above, all of the foregoing quotations are from the Constitution of the United States. The second item quotes the statutory oath which all officers of the United States are required to take. As a Member of Congress I have taken this oath of office. The President takes a special oath, prescribed by the Constitution, to "preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States."

The following is an excerpt from President Kennedy's state of the Union message of January 11, 1962:

> We need Presidential standby authority, subject to Congressional veto, to adjust personal income tax rates downward within a specified range and time, to slow down an economic decline before it has dragged us all down.

This is a proposal to grant the President legislative authority—whereas the Constitution vests all legislative powers in the Congress.

This is a proposal to grant the Congress veto power—whereas the Constitution vests the veto power in the President, subject to congressional authority to override the veto.

This is a proposal to grant the President authority to adjust tax rates downward—whereas the Constitution vests in the House of Representatives sole authority to initiate legislation "for raising revenue."

This is a totally unconstitutional proposal.

A corollary of Presidential authority to reduce taxes—a dangerous power at any time and doubly dangerous in an election year—is Presidential authority to raise taxes. And this power has already been suggested by some advocates of the first proposal. I warned of both such proposals in weekly letters to my constituents on January 20 and June 23, 1961.

There is only one method by which these recommendations may be properly considered, namely, by a proposed constitutional amendment. Such an amendment would become effective only if proposed by a two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress or on an application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the States—plus subsequent ratification by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States.

I would oppose such an amendment. But I would, at least, respect a proposal which recognized and honored this constitutional procedure, rather than advocating Executive usurpation.

SENSIBLE MEDICAL CARE PLAN

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the major items in the President's state of the Union message was his open advocacy of the inconsistent administration medical care proposal.

Quite in contrast to that approach is the recent proposal through which the utmost effectiveness of our free enterprise system could be used to meet this important social problem. The Chicago Sun-Times editorial, appearing today, January 22, points out the practical aspects of the free enterprise type proposal.

Sensible Medical Care Plan

As long ago as last February, we advised opponents of the Kennedy administration's medical care for the aged program to have a program of their own to advance during congressional debate. "We are confident," we said, "that such a program can be drafted that meets both the humanitarian need and the basic American principles that are deeply involved here. Opposition for the sake of opposition is not enough."

Now with Congress again facing the issue, it is encouraging to note that the foes of the administration plan have produced an alternative proposal which is well worth examining. It may not be the final answer. It is a step in the right direction.

The new proposal was formulated by the medical profession, the Nation's hospitals and the two most widely used private insurance health plans. It would offer voluntary, low-cost hospital and doctor care for the aged through Blue Cross and Blue Shield. The principle of ability to pay with the most assistance being provided for the needy is the foundation of the overall program.

This is a sound concept, clearly distinguishable from the administration's proposal for a compulsory program putting the social security system into the business of providing medical care for the aged where the system does not belong.

For one thing, the administration program would discriminate against 3 million Americans over 65 who are not covered by social security. And it would force millions of others, already covered by private insurance, into a Government plan whether they like it or not. Finally, it would force on younger people the immediate double burden of financing through their social security taxes the care of everyone, rich and poor, now over 65 while paying their own expenses as well.

The latter is a basic flaw in the administrations' program, representing a radical departure from the principles of a free society as they have been known in this country.

Two separate means have now been proposed by hospitals, doctors, and private insurance plans to provide complete sickness care for the aged.

On hospitalization, the American Hospital Association and Blue Cross have agreed on a plan for private hospital insurance for retired persons over 65 to cost $10 to $12 per month. The Federal Government would pay the premiums only for all those unable to do so.

On doctor care, the American Medical Association and the Blue Shield have agreed on an insurance plan covering medical and surgical treatment for persons over 65 which would cost $3 per month for individuals with an annual income of $2,500 or less and $6 per month for a married couple with a combined income of $4,000 or less.

The doctor care insurance does not call for a Federal subsidy. The premiums would be paid by the individuals. However, the agreement on this portion of the program is a plus for the elderly because the administration's medicare program would not pay doctors' or surgeons' fees.

Proposals similar to these for solving the medicare problem have also been made by Senator Jacob Javits, Republican, of New York. There have been other suggestions that Government financing of benefits might come from tax credits, a special payroll tax, or an excise tax. The wisdom of administering a program through Blue Cross and Blue Shield is plain. Both are highly qualified through experience and close connection with the Nation's hospitals and medical profession.

There is no question but that Americans can and should provide assurance against disastrous medical costs for their elder fellow-citizens who need and want such assurance. The ideas and possible alternatives now coming forward offer fresh avenues of approach to the problem.

It is hoped that they will also have the effect of lifting the debate on this subject above the vote-buying level at which the Democratic leaders are operating. Whether a bill passes or not, they have said bluntly they regard the question as the foremost issue of the fall election campaign with the votes of 17 million citizens over 65 at stake.

As we have said before, this is a cold-blooded viewpoint. The question is one of need and human sympathy for the less fortunate. It is not a vehicle on which greedy politicians can ride into office. The obligation of both parties is to devise a workable, sensible plan under the American system. The proposals of the medical and hospital worlds are a good start toward that objective.

CARL ALBERT

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Steed] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, among the many editorial tributes on the occasion of the election of Congressman Carl Albert as majority leader was an article by Samuel G. Whitaker, editor and publisher of the Marlow, Okla., Review.

Mr. Whitaker was a classmate of Congressman Albert at the University of

Oklahoma, and his article is therefore of particular interest:

CARL ALBERT

(By Samuel G. Whitaker)

The 2d session of the 87th Congress convened Wednesday.

An Oklahoman was chosen majority leader of the House, the highest legislative honor ever paid to a citizen of the Sooner State.

CARL ALBERT, Congressman from Oklahoma's Third Congressional District, thus was elevated to a position which, in the thinking of many people, is the fourth most powerful in the United States.

Carl was born some 53 years ago in the hills of Pittsburg County in southeastern Oklahoma.

He lost his mother at an early age. His father was a day labor coal miner for the Samples coal mine near McAlester for many years, trying as best he could to provide a living for himself and five minor children.

In 1927 CARL represented McAlester High School in the national oratorical contest on the subject of "The United States Constitution."

CARL won the State championship, and also the regional championship in Kansas City. In the finals at Washington, D.C., he placed fourth in the Nation.

Going on to college CARL won many oratorical and forensic honors at the University of Oklahoma, where he was ultimately selected as a Rhodes scholar.

Returning home after World War II, CARL was elected to Congress from Oklahoma's Third District, a position in which he has continued to serve with honor and distinction to this day.

It is with the greatest joy and admiration that those who have known CARL since his boyhood days now witness such great honor and recognition bestowed upon that little freckled face barefoot boy from the coal mines of eastern Oklahoma.

It is a great day for CARL. Fortunate indeed are those of us who have lived to see it.

CARL's father, who died a number of years ago, and his mother, whom he lost in early childhood, were not present to witness the signal honors bestowed upon their boy.

But somehow we feel that even they can look down and feel rewarded on this day because their son has gone on, in a manner so nobly set by their precept and example, to so richly represent the land of Sequoyah and the Red man, those Oklahoma hills where he was born.

Past and present, on this day Oklahoma salutes CARL ALBERT.

SEVER DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH THE CASTRO GOVERNMENT

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, much time has passed since the United States severed diplomatic relations with the Castro government. That date was January 3, 1961, over a year ago. Shortly before that action was taken, this Nation withdrew the Cuban sugar quota, which for many years had amounted to a generous subsidy of the Cuban economy, and imposed a partial economic embargo, allowing only the export of foodstuffs and medicines for humanitarian reasons and placed sugar as the only restriction on imports.

And since that year which has just passed we have witnessed the Castro government follow a course which takes it farther and farther away from the freedoms and liberties which characterize this Nation and this hemisphere. In fact, the doctrines common to the Western World have little parallel in the Castro regime.

We have seen the ties of Communist Cuba become stronger with the Soviet bloc. Castro now maintains diplomatic relations with every Communist nation except East Germany, with whom he has established close economic and cultural ties. Communist Chinese and Soviet advisers are at this moment hard at work in Cuba, hastening the transformation which has turned Cuba into another Communist satellite.

Cultural and economic exchange programs are now in full swing between Castro and his new comrades, and more than 2,400 Cubans are studying Communist methods firsthand in the Soviet bloc. Communist youth farms have been established to teach collective farming methods similar to those used in the Ukraine and Red China to Cuban children, who are taken from their parents before they are 8 years old. In the period between January and June, 1961, more than 2,000 Cuban children were sent to Russia for this training.

Castro has many weapons to control his people, and he uses the methods which have been tried over the years since the Bolshevik revolution. The police state is evident in Cuba, an efficient, tightly controlled spy organization has been set up to report any anti-Castro, anti-Communist movement. Recent drives for recruits to spy on neighbors and friends may well amount to over 500,000 persons, and they will be trained, then eventually stationed in offices, factories, schools, residential areas, and churches.

Castro's armed forces have grown from a small band of guerillas marching into Havana that July in 1959 to an army with an estimated strength of between 250,000 and 400,000 soldiers. In addition, he is equipped with some of the latest Soviet, Czech, and Red Chinese weapons. Certain of these weapons were displayed in January 1961 in a parade through the streets of Havana which lasted for more than 8 hours. This display included 14 Soviet 51-ton tanks, 19 Soviet SU-100 assault guns, 15 Soviet T-34 35-ton tanks, 78 Soviet made 76 millimeter field guns, and 108 Soviet heavy machineguns. This is only a partial list, and each of the estimated 50,000 soldiers who marched in review did so with a Czech-made submachine gun across his back. The estimated value of Soviet-made arms now in Castro's possession is nearly $100 million. Cuba has become the arsenal of the Antilles, rather than the Pearl.

The Castro regime knows well its purpose—that of fostering discontent and eventual overthrow of law, order, and decency in the Western Hemisphere. In a speech made May 8, 1961, Che Guevara explained "how the process of overthrowing established governments in this hemisphere would be carried out." He said that the Cuban revolution has given the Latin American people an example. He said that Latin Americans now know of a form of revolution which has demonstrated its effectiveness. He said that form of revolution is guerrilla warfare.

All signs point to the fact that Cuba is engaged in a wholesale program to export its revolution and disrupt this hemisphere. Each month Cuba plays host to hundreds of Latin American intellectuals, labor leaders, students, and dissident political figures. It pursues its aim by offering indoctrination courses to malcontents ripe for radical, impassioned fodder. In addition to a widespread Communist educational campaign, Castro distributes tons of Communist political propaganda throughout the Western Hemisphere, and included in this propaganda is Che Guevara's guerrilla warfare training manual.

Fidel Castro has betrayed the ideals which he inspired in his fellow campesinos during the early days of his revolution. When fighting first began in the mountains of Oriente Province in 1958, the Communist Party was outlawed, and operated only in underground meetings. Now, prominent members of this once illegal party have taken full advantage of Castro's Red alliance, and have moved into official government positions. Castro has not only betrayed the revolution he once headed, he has wrecked the entire economy of Cuba, once one of Latin America's most prosperous nations. He has spread discontent throughout the hemisphere, and has been formally branded by the U.S. State Department as a "clear and present danger" to the security of this hemisphere. He has sent thousands of his fellow countrymen to the wall, and ordered their murders in cold blood.

Finally, Fidel Castro has openly proclaimed himself to be a Communist—a dedicated follower of Marx, Lenin, and Khrushchev. Yet the United States continues to trade with this self-professed Communist. We have cut all exports to Cuba save food and medicine. We have halted imports of Cuban sugar. Yet, there is no restriction placed on other goods imported from Cuba, and they have been flowing into the United States at the rate of over $2 million per month. Tobacco remains the chief import, and the United States pays more than the world market price for Cuban tobacco.

I introduced legislation to halt this trade, and it was cosponsored by Members of Congress from States all over America. That legislation was reported unanimously from the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and was referred to the House of Representatives shortly thereafter. It passed the House without a single dissenting vote, giving proof that the American people no longer want to do business with this self-professed Communist.

This bill, H.R. 8465, is now before the Senate Committee on Commerce. Trade with Cuba must be halted, and by doing so the United States can cut the flow of American dollars Castro uses to further the cause of international communism.

We as a nation must exercise our position as leader of the free world. I have been reassured by the Secretary of State and our Ambassador to the OAS that the U.S. support is growing in Latin America. Latest reports indicate that many of Latin America's more influential newspapers, labor leaders, and university students now favor a hard line in dealing with Cuba.

Certainly the American people favor a hard line in dealing with Cuba. They are tired of the policy of "wait and see." Their patience is exhausted, what little patience they had left after indications of Castro's true color were shown. The passage of legislation banning trade with Cuba by the House of Representatives gave clear expression to the will of the American people because the House reacts quickly to the will of the American people.

When the question of censuring Fidel Castro was first posed before the OAS late in 1960, the United States did not have the support of a majority of member nations. Now, nearly a year and a half later, we are in a stronger position. Thirteen of the twenty-one OAS nations have broken diplomatic relations with Cuba, and latest reports say that of the remaining seven, only three nations maintain full diplomatic facilities in Havana. Furthermore, this Nation's drive to gain stronger measures against Castro received encouraging support last December when the Council of the Organization of American States met here in Washington. The Council, an official and appropriate body of the OAS, met to vote on the proposal to call a meeting of the foreign ministers from each OAS member nation. The purpose of this meeting has been clearly understood—to consider the question of outside intervention by an extracontinental power, and to determine what to do about it. Mr. Speaker, it is the vote on this question which has resulted in the conference this week at Punta del Este, Uruguay.

The hopes of the American people ride with our delegation at Punta del Este. If I am informed correctly, similar hopes are to be found and expressed through the delegations representing most of Latin America.

Mr. Speaker, the nations of this hemisphere should apply strong sanctions against the Communist government of Fidel Castro as soon as possible. The case against him has long been drawn and documented. For over 2 years now I have called for a ban on U.S. trade with Cuba, and a complete embargo on hemispheric trading with Cuba. With strong leadership on the part of Secretary Rusk, Ambassador Morrison, and the rest of the U.S. delegation to the conference of foreign ministers at Punta del Este, Uruguay, strong sanctions could become a reality. If we continue to be weak and coddle the fears of those who reject responsibility, then we shall cease to become leaders.

This Nation was built with courage and fortitude, and I know it is still capable of exercising its convictions. If the United States is unable to obtain measures toward Castro which meet the satisfaction of the American people, then it is clear that action must originate from the U.S. Congress.

We have stood idle too long. In order to retain our position as the directive force in the destiny of freemen, the United States must do all in its power to see that the will of freemen is carried out. It is our responsibility to carry out that will with decisive action and clarity of purpose.

Fidel Castro once remarked that his acts were fully justified when he remarked "history will absolve me." This man has the murder of countless thousands to atone for. He stands as an advocate of international communism. He is admittedly its agent, and has pledged to subvert and destroy the very foundations of decency and order. Each day he is allowed to continue becomes a further implication that what he does has the approval of this hemisphere. To stand still—to do nothing—is nothing more than absolving him. The time has come to move.

THE PRESIDENT'S REQUEST FOR STANDBY TAX CUTTING AUTHORITY: SOME ALTERNATE SUGGESTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in his state of the Union message, the President has requested standby authority, subject to congressional veto, to reduce income tax rates in order to shorten or forestall a threatened business recession.

While this proposal deserves the study of Congress, I think such a measure might well aggravate our long-range fiscal and budgetary problems. We should not create the machinery for instant deficit without some accompanying program which will insure a compensating surplus in later fiscal years.

In the hope of stimulating discussion and consideration of the broad field of revenue and appropriation procedures, I have introduced today four alternatives to the President's proposal. These are H.R. 9813, H.R. 9814, H.R. 9815, and H.R. 9816.

In the last 31 years the U.S. Government has raised the taxes to pay for its expenditures only five times. This is a sorry record which weakens our country in many important ways.

Worse, the existence of this huge and growing public debt, and burdensome interest payment, poses a threat to the social and economic measures we have passed during the last 30 years. These measures have been generally good. They have been designed to help the individual overcome catastrophic misfortunes, to help provide a minimum of comfort and security to those who are not blessed with wealth or skills in demand. These measures have strengthened the free enterprise system by ironing out the violent swings of the business cycle.

While discussing the extent of present public spending, Walter Lippmann recently said:

> It is evidenced that creeping socialism has not crept very far. The so-called socialism which is supposed to be creeping upon us is in fact nothing more than the work of making life safe and decent for a mass society collected in great cities.

None of the programs directed at better health, housing, education, highways, and so forth, were repudiated or repealed by the Eisenhower Republicans even when they controlled the executive branch and the Congress.

We will probably continue to have this general level of civilian expenditure and in all likelihood we will continue to have a national security burden of more than $50 billion each year. I believe President Kennedy's administration is making strides toward giving taxpayers the best return for their dollar and is showing vigor in attempts to find more equitable ways to distribute the tax burden. But I also believe that the American people can be told the truth, and that they are willing and ready to ante up the price of national defense and essential nondefense programs on a pay-as-you-go basis.

In the entire history of the world there has never been a nation with our wealth and resources. There is no logical reason why we cannot establish a regular and permanent machinery to guarantee that the Federal budget is always in balance. We can and we should gradually reduce the national debt. Unless we devise an orderly means to these ends the American people may vote for a return to Calvin Coolidge.

Since 1954 we have had budgets varying from $64 billion to $90 billion. We have had years of prosperity and years of recession. We have had years of international crisis and military buildup and years of the "spirit of Geneva." Yet the tax rate for every one of these years has been the same. There has been no essential change since 1954. No self-respecting school district would think of having an identical tax rate for years of radically differing needs and costs.

The American people are almost unanimous in wanting a regularly balanced budget. This desire is not affected by the fact that many economists assure us that today's national debt, because of our climbing gross national product, has become less important. Even if we accept the thesis of these economists—which I do not—that this debt is more of a menace psychologically than financially, we ought to find ways to eliminate it on psychological grounds alone.

Under our present budget machinery we can be almost certain that the national debt will never be reduced and that budget surpluses will only rarely and accidentally occur. My proposals would correct this situation without crippling any proper function of Government. I believe they are simple, workable, and necessary.

No single issue contributes more to public distrust of our Government and the Congress than its failure to adopt new fiscal machinery for the complicated affairs of a $90 billion Federal Government. Continued deficits will further lessen confidence of our people in our Government, decrease the purchasing power of the dollar, aggravate our balance-of-payments problems, and force us to raise some $9 billion each year merely to pay interest on the debt.

Why is it that our Federal machinery only works 1 time in 5? Let us contrast State procedures, for I think there is a lesson to learn. Few of our States ever have budget deficits. My State of Arizona, for example, has almost never had a deficit and in each of those rare instances it was repaid the following year. Why? The answer is simple. In Arizona the legislature meets and appropriates funds for all State purposes and then goes home. Then, and only then, the tax officials meet and fix a specific rate for that year which will produce the amount of revenue necessary to pay for the appropriations. State and local taxpayers expect their tax rates to vary with expenditures. My school property tax rate may be $8 this year and $9.25 or $7.50 the next.

In theory the Federal system is supposed to work the same way. But in practice it does not. The Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate throughout each session of Congress consider and approve expenditures for defense, veterans, national resources, and all the other items making up our budget. The House Ways and Means Committee, an entirely separate group, is in theory required to recommend tax rates sufficient to produce a balanced budget every year. There is no statutory or congressional authority for a deficit. But tax rates rarely change. They are inflexible and rigid. The slightest change involves tremendous effort and debate.

Each of my proposals is bottomed on the theory that there should be either (a) for each year a tax rate adjusted to the expenditures and demands of that year; or (b) if, we are to accept the cyclical budget theory, a series of varying tax rates over the course of each 4 years to produce a balanced cyclical budget. Our present rigid tax rates will guarantee continued deficits; flexible rates will not.

Each of the four proposals would provide permanent administrative-congressional machinery to adjust Federal tax rates to Federal spending. All four bills limit the adjustment of rates to 10 percent up or down. All four provide for congressional veto of any rate adjustment. All four would achieve a regular reduction of the national debt. This machinery would be mandatory except for war or other serious national emergency.

Here is a brief outline of the proposals:

H.R. 9813. This measure would direct the President to proclaim between September 30 and December 1 of each year the increase or decrease from present basic rates necessary to insure that receipts exceed expenditures by at least $1 billion. New rates would apply in the calendar year following proclamation. This proposal would balance the budget every year. We can anticipate that this kind of machinery would meet serious objections from those who believe that economic growth and prosperity are hampered by insisting on a balanced budget in years of recession. While the validity of this economic theory is not subject to precise proof, it is widely held. But those who favor deficits as an antirecession tool ought to be willing to provide for a compensating surplus in years of prosperity. The fiscal 1962 deficit will approach $7 billion, yet many of my fellow Democrats seem satisfied with proposing only a $500 million surplus for fiscal 1963, and a similar token surplus for fiscal 1964—both of which may well be years of economic boom. If we are to accept the cyclical theory let us be honest about it and provide for boomtime surpluses as large as the recession deficits. Thus I offer a sound cyclical approach in my next proposal.

H.R. 9814. Under this proposal Congress declares its policy to balance the budget and reduce the national debt by at least $4 billion over the 4 years of each Presidential term. The authority and the responsibility for this achievement would be placed squarely on the President. He would be given the authority and the duty to take economic conditions into account and to proclaim rates for each year of the 4-year period so as to achieve an overall balance during his 4-year administration. Thus he could adjust the Federal budget, within these modest limits—and subject to congressional veto—so as to end his administration with an overall balance. No President could blame the Congress for a deficit administration, as has frequently occurred in the past. He alone would have the burden.

Many persons will object to giving the President the right to set rates—even subject to veto—claiming that, no matter how well intentioned, he would be unable to withstand political and election year pressures. If this contention is sound we need not abandon the search for permanent, effective machinery. My remaining two proposals offer a similar but nonpolitical approach.

H.R. 9815. This would achieve a balanced budget—and a $1 billion surplus—every year, through adjustment of rates 10 percent up or down and subject to congressional veto. The adjustment, however, would be proclaimed not by the President but by a new U.S. Tax Commission. The Commission would have five members. Four would be appointed by the President—two from each major political faith—and confirmed by the Senate. The commissioners would have 8-year staggered terms and would be experts in economic and fiscal matters. The fifth member would either be the Secretary of the Treasury or the Budget Director, thus giving the administration an important voice in these vital matters.

H.R. 9816, the final proposal, would provide for the same U.S. Tax Commission, but would require the Commission to take the state of the economy and the business cycle into account, adjusting rates to balance the budget, not annually, but over the 4 years of each Presidential term.

CONCLUSION

Many respected economists and statesmen believe our national debt is neither unwieldy nor a dangerous burden on the country. The trouble is that a vast majority of the American people think otherwise. I strongly doubt that many Americans will ever be convinced that a $300 billion plus debt—with an annual interest charge of more than $9 billion—is a good or necessary thing. It violates basic American ideas of thrift and money management. These strong public feelings cannot be ignored forever.

A built-in budget balancing program would have many beneficial long-range benefits. Since tax rates would fluctuate with Federal spending, Congress and the Executive would be more responsible on money matters. As things now stand a Senator or Representative can vote against tax measures and for vast expenditures. His constituents never feel in their tax rates the direct effect of this irresponsible approach.

If those of us in the Congress were required at each election to justify the then current rate we would be more careful with public funds. Likewise, we would have a powerful incentive for the necessary and difficult job of tax reform. The unjustified postal deficit is unlikely to continue if the alternative is additional general taxes reflected in increased rates.

I have offered these four varying approaches in a constructive spirit and as a basis for discussion. I make no claim that any one is perfect; I concede that better alternatives may exist. The present system, however, is disastrously wrong. I hope that we can have a great debate on this whole problem; that out of our discussions will come a new, sound program of fiscal responsibility.

THE HONORABLE HENRY B. GONZALEZ

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, as dean of the Texas delegation, it was my honor to present to the House the new member of the Texas delegation, the Honorable HENRY B. GONZALEZ, Representative from the 20th Congressional District of Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ is a man of real ability, a Representative who will do an outstanding job for the people of his district. The members of the Texas delegation are pleased to have him as one of our number, and we look forward to working with him.

Mr. GONZALEZ has served long and well in the Texas State Senate, and his former colleagues of that body share our opinion of Mr. GONZALEZ. I today have received a copy of Senate Resolution 22, which sets forth the high esteem in which Mr. GONZALEZ is held by that body:

> Whereas our former colleague from Bexar County, the Honorable HENRY B. GONZALEZ, has been elected to the Congress of the United States from the 20th Congressional District; and
>
> Whereas he served in the Texas Senate during the 55th, 56th, and 57th sessions of

the Legislature until his election to the U.S. House of Representatives in November 1961; and

Whereas he is a man of outstanding ability who distinguished himself as a member of this Senate; and

Whereas he possesses the true qualities of a statesman—integrity, tenacity of purpose, and a strict adherence to the principles of democracy, and has demonstrated at all times his devotion to his office and his responsibility to the people he represents; and

Whereas it is our desire to congratulate the Honorable Henry B. Gonzalez: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the 57th legislature, 3d called session, congratulate our former colleague on his elevation in office and extend to him our best wishes for his success in the Congress of the United States, and convey to his fine family our affection and hope for their happiness; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded under the seal of the Senate to the Honorable Henry B. Gonzalez and to the members of the Texas delegation in the Congress of the United States.

Charles F. Herring,
President Pro Tempore of the Senate.
Charles Schnabel,
Secretary of the Senate.

This resolution was introduced by Senators Spears, Rogers, Kazen, Willis, Dies, Moore, Schwartz, Owen, Baker, Krueger, Reagan, Fuller, Martin, Smith, Secrest, and Patman.

I am naturally pleased that my son, Senator William Neff Patman, is one of the sponsors, and to note that he shares my own very high regard for Representative Gonzalez.

REMARKS OF W. B. MURPHY, PRESIDENT, CAMPBELL SOUP CO., AT TEXAS A. & M., COLLEGE STATION, TEX., JANUARY 18, 1962

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Campbell Soup Co. has long been noted for its outstanding program of agricultural research. For this reason the people of the First Congressional District were particularly pleased when, after an extensive field investigation, this forward-looking company decided to construct its new plant at Paris, Tex. This plant will be a valuable addition to our area, it will bring new markets, new growth to our part of Texas. We are most pleased to have the Campbell people with us. All of us in the First Congressional District wish them every success and look forward to working with them. I, personally, have enjoyed working with them during the decisionmaking process on the Paris plant.

Recently, W. B. Murphy, president of the Campbell Soup Co., spoke at Texas A. & M. upon the importance to all of us of a continuing program of agricultural research. Mr. Murphy, by citing actual examples, showed the necessity of cooperation between grower and processor in research and other fields if future progress is to equal the great strides taken during the last decade.

Mr. Murphy illustrated the importance of research in plant location, using the new Paris plant as an example.

It has been my privilege to visit Texas many times, but I must say that I feel more at home here now since we are underway in our program to construct a processing plant near Paris, Tex. This is to be a plant of something over 900,000 square feet—a major one for us—so our presence in Texas becomes an important factor for our future.

In the food business, when considering a plant location, one does not just look at the map, make a routine study of employee availability, utilities, taxes, land cost, freight schedules, and the like. A business such as ours requires a long period of agricultural experimentation to be certain that a substantial portion of the food ingredients needed for our products can be grown successfully in the nearby areas.

It is particularly appropriate that this talk be given in Texas because agricultural research has played such a important part in our decision to build a plant in Texas and agricultural research is an important part of my subject tonight.

I would like to tell you (1) what agricultural research has meant to us in the past and how we look on it for the future, (2) the vital importance to the grower, the processor and the consumer of contract growing of many crops, and then (3) discuss with you something about the threat to this magnificent, constructive grower-processor relationship and to agricultural research that is rising on the horizon in the form of Government-sponsored marketing orders.

In Texas, an extended series of experiments has been conducted, beginning in 1954, on two key vegetable crops—tomatoes and carrots. We have had a great deal of help from members of the staff of Texas A. & M., and, in connection with some of the necessary genetic research work, we have had the help of the Earhart Laboratories at Caltech.

While our agricultural research work for the new Paris, Tex., plant has been going on for years, the commercial crop development work, which is necessary to establish indexes of productivity for various crops, has been underway for the past 3 years and has covered a number of different ingredients.

The point now has been reached where we believe that it will be practical to contract with Texas farmers, most of them near to the plant, for the growing of a considerable number of the high quality ingredients we shall require when this new plant is in operation—including carrots, celery, white potatoes, sweetpotatoes, cabbage, lima beans, okra, peppers, onions, asparagus, red beets, and parsley. The growing of tomatoes and of other crops will probably be added to that list. Beef, poultry, rice, eggs, milk, butter, and several other major ingredients have always been readily available in the Southwest.

The Campbell Co. president described the "agricultural revolution" taking place and showed its basic cause to be research.

It is no secret to you that we are in the midst of an agricultural revolution of dramatic proportions. Since 1937, farm productivity has increased about 180 percent as compared to about 100 percent for industrial productivity. Much of this phenomenal progress can be traced to agricultural research.

It is estimated that the combined Federal and State agricultural research expenditures last year were about $250 million. Industrial expenditures were somewhat higher, perhaps $280 million. This $530 million agricultural research total is less than 5 percent of the Nation's aggregate research and development expenditure whereas food represents 20 percent of our gross national product. Obviously, agriculture must use its research expenditures wisely.

Considering this fact, it is certainly an anomaly that the climate for agricultural research is not particularly favorable at this time. There is the general feeling in some circles that agriculture is overly efficient because there are so many crop surpluses which are costing the taxpayers billions of dollars. It does not take a mental giant to note that those surpluses should not be charged to research, but rather to the many attempts that have been made to sidestep the inexorable laws of economics. In view of the crucial necessity of keeping our economy competitive with those of other countries, it is indeed strange that there should be doubt thrown on the desirability of aggressive furthering of agricultural science.

President Murphy predicted a continuing need for more research.

There is also some belief, and this has been expressed recently on a number of occasions, that the research job in agriculture is largely done. I would like to take this opportunity to emphatically deny that this job is done and in this talk tell you why we feel there is a long way to go and to relate the specific benefits that accrue to the grower, the processor, and the consumer through research in food crops. I also shall want to point out why agricultural research and the grower-processor relation must be closely coordinated.

Despite current surpluses in some crops, we know that the population of this country and of the world is growing and that we shall be faced in the future with food-supply problems. So, things cannot stand as they are when so much remains to be done, not only for reasons of food supply but just as important, because the food industry of North America must keep itself competitive in the world markets.

I have pointed out that industry is investing rather more heavily in agricultural research than are public agencies. The nature of some of this research can be indicated by telling you about the agricultural research activities of the food-processing industry in terms of some contributions that have been made by Campbell Soup Co.

Our agricultural research department consists of six laboratories in the United States, two in Canada, and five laboratories overseas. Our research activities are partly fundamental in character and partly related to practical growing problems and developmental work. Developmental work is particularly important in new areas incident to the starting of new processing plants where we usually find it necessary to introduce agricultural practices and quality standards essential for the ingredients we use.

In addition to a research group, we have an agricultural service department staffed with men who have both scientific and practical knowledge of farming. This department has the assignment of working with growers with whom we have or hope to have crop contracts.

He described his company's program of research and gave specific examples of work done concerning certain crops.

Our research activities involve (1) the development of new varieties, (2) new disease and insect control procedures, and (3) new cultural practices leading to higher crop quality and greater farm productivity.

Several of the studies we have made of different crops might be of interest to you since they indicate the way our research activities are carried on.

Tomatoes: the quantity and quality of tomatoes needed by our plants require that the crop be grown on a contract basis with individual growers. By developing better production practices and better varieties, it has been possible to increase yields, improve quality and to continue marketing Campbell's tomato soup, for instance, at a price that has increased only a cent or two per can in over 50 years.

During the 10-year period from 1937 to 1946, yields of tomatoes obtained by our contract growers in the New Jersey-Pennsylvania area averaged 5.8 tons per acre. Following the introduction of an insect and disease control program which we developed, the average yield of tomatoes was increased to 8.6 tons per acre, or 65 percent.

After the development of the fungicide and insecticide program, it became apparent that there were substantial reductions in tomato yields because of the fusarium wilt disease and because of fruit cracking. Fusarium wilt is caused by a fungus which lives in soil. It invades the roots of tomato plants where it produces a toxic substance which kills plants. Over half of the tomato producing soils in the area serving our Camden, N.J., plant are infested with this fungus. The disease cannot be economically controlled by the use of fungicides. Another source of loss was the widespread cracking of tomato fruit when rains fell during the harvest season. Losses are sustained by the growers because cracked fruit spoils quickly. The processor also sustains losses because cracked fruit must be trimmed by hand, or discarded entirely. The cost of the tomato loss can be very high.

Several years ago it was decided that we would need a processing plant in the Southwest. Preliminary studies with vine-ripened tomatoes in Texas showed yields rarely averaged over 4 to 5 tons per acre—too low for economical growing of tomatoes for processing. We found that these low yields were the result of high night temperatures. Most varieties of tomatoes will not set fruit unless night temperatures are between 55 and 68 degrees. Night temperatures in Texas in the summer commonly exceed 70 degrees during a large part of the fruit setting period.

In order to try to solve this problem, a series of studies was started in the phytotron facilities of Caltech. In this laboratory we could control all growing conditions including any kind of night temperatures desired. Tomatoes were collected from foreign countries that were known to have high-temperature nights. Among the strains tested, one variety from the Philippine Islands was found to set fruit freely at night temperatures well in excess of 70°. Breeding work with this heat-tolerant material has been in progress for 5 years and already strains have been developed that produce yields in the order of 15 to 18 tons per acre in Texas. While several years of additional work will be required before varieties will be developed which meet our quality standards, the back has been broken on what is probably the most difficult problem.

Mr. Murphy set forth the principal areas his company considers as most needing additional research at this time.

There are four principal areas where we think there is a tremendous need for more research work. Naturally I have consulted with our agricultural research staff in the preparation of these points. These are not listed in order of importance and, of course, they are to some extent interdependent.

1. Research into the physiology of plant life at the molecular level as related to photosynthesis, growth, and inheritance. This is exemplified by recent investigations on the role of plant proteins and hormones. It is apparent that here is the well-spring for some of the things we need to know about how plants develop as a prelude to knowing how to create crops of superior form, health, flavor, color, nutritive value, and growing ability.

2. The control of plant diseases, insects and weeds by genetic techniques or by chemical and biological methods. A great deal of research has been devoted to pest control by chemicals with some spectacular results, although in some cases effects have been transitory. Pest control by heritable resistance and through biological means has been relatively less exploited. These are promising fields for future development and of course there is still much more to be achieved using chemical methods.

3. The adaptation of plants to unfavorable environments. One could rhapsodize over this prospect were it not so apparent that a prodigious amount of painstaking, time-consuming, frustrating, hard work is required. This is a necessary field of research for the future if for no other reason than that population growth will require that the climate and geographical range of crop production be extended.

4. The determination of the cultural techniques, nutrients, and water requirements necessary to obtain maximum agricultural yields. Much has been done here—in fact, most of the past agricultural research on plants has been in the field of cultural techniques and nutrition plus, of course, genetics. Just when we think we know our stuff, we find new ways of growing things and new ways of supplying nutrients to plants. It is our belief also that there is a great deal to learn about the function of water on plant development and nutrient utilization.

To keep his business moving ahead, the enlightened processor finds it necessary to take every practical step to maintain and improve the values he offers the consumers. And being burdened with an economy that tends constantly to be inflationary with all that that means in increased costs, the processor must concentrate all practical means to limit the unit costs of his ingredients and of his processing.

He knows that with inflation, the grower's income must go up and, of course, that the grower must make a fair profit. It is our judgment that this can be accomplished while still holding or even lowering unit growing costs and at the same time doing a better job of growing quality products, providing results of an aggressive agricultural research program are followed.

It is apparent that in this fight to make headway in an inflationary economy, the grower-processor relationship is a matter of vital importance. This is the reason our company has been expending rapidly in the matter of contracting with farmers for the growing of many of the ingredients we need.

The company I serve utilizes over 150 different agricultural products including vegetable, fruits, cereals, meats, poultry, dairy products, nuts, and seasonings—possibly as wide a list of agricultural ingredients as any one company.

We have purchased these products by contracting and on the open market. We have purchased products that were under marketing orders or handled under cooperative marketing arrangements, so our experience has been fairly wide. It is our conclusion that for many crops, direct contracting with selected growers, supported by skillful crop service and aggressive research work is by far the most satisfactory method over the long term for the grower, the processor and the consuming public. When there is a sound contract between the grower and processor, the grower has a guaranteed price, a guaranteed market, a great incentive to do a good job and the help of an alert research team and up-to-date crop service. Of course, he is free to contract or not as he chooses. The grower still must contend with the weather, but even here, for some crops, there is a measure of assistance through the development of weather-resistant varieties. And, of course, the grower must do his job well.

Our experience is such that we can say without hesitation that the new Paris, Tex., plant would not be a practical thing without direct contracts with farmers unhampered by artificial barriers.

This system of crop contracting—and the market it provides the grower—is truly a unique segment of our agriculture. The vegetables that are grown under contract have provided the farmer with relatively high returns in comparison with other crops. Without any subsidies, support prices, marketing orders or other artificial government controls, these crops have averaged a higher percentage of parity than have the prices for other major farm commodities.

THE ROLE OF THE PRIVATE LITIGANT IN ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to be able to present the remarks of Mr. Everette MacIntyre, Commissioner of the Federal Trade Commission. He combines knowledge of antitrust and trade regulations with a power of analysis and ability of lucid expression, which is all too rare.

In his address to the antitrust sections of the Illinois and Chicago Bar Association, Mr. MacIntyre with his usual insight, has given a probing analysis of the rationale for, and proper role of, private litigation in antitrust enforcement.

THE ROLE OF THE PRIVATE LITIGANT IN ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT

(Address by Hon. Everette MacIntyre, Commissioner, Federal Trade Commission, before the Joint Meeting of the Antitrust Sections of the Chicago Bar Association and Illinois State Bar Association on January 18, 1962)

Congress, when it enacted section 7 of the Sherman Act[1] and subsequently sections 4[2] and 16[3] of the Clayton Act, had a broader object in view than merely making provision for the alleviation of individual grievances resulting from violation of the antitrust laws. In fact it was the legislative intent that the individual, by securing redress for himself would thereby supplement governmental enforcement in the antitrust field.

The courts have taken judicial notice of the Congress' intent to provide "in the most comprehensive way * * * against combinations or conspiracies in restraint of trade or commerce,"[4] and have recognized the legislative intent to give the private treble damage litigant an important role in the enforcement scheme of the antitrust laws, holding that:

"The treble damage action was intended not merely to redress injury to an individual through the prohibited practices, but to aid in achieving the broad social object of the statute."[5]

The seventh circuit has succinctly summarized the private litigant's role in the following terms:

"This grant to persons damaged—a cause of action for treble damages—was for the purpose of multiplying the agencies which would help enforce the act and therefore make it more effective."[6]

---

[1] 26 Stat. 210 (1890), repealed 69 Stat. 283 (1955), effective Jan. 7, 1956.

[2] 15 U.S.C. 15; 38 Stat. 731 (1914) providing for treble damages.

[3] 15 U.S.C. 26; 38 Stat. 737 (1914) providing for injunctive relief.

[4] *Karseal Corporation* v. *Richfield Oil Corporation*, 221 F. 2d 358, 365 (9th Cir., 1955).

[5] Ibid.

The Supreme Court has recognized "* * * the public interest in vigilant enforcement of the antitrust laws through the instrumentality of private treble-damage action * * *,"[7] and has also stated:

"Congress has, by legislative fiat, determined that such prohibited activities are injurious to the public and has provided sanctions allowing private enforcement of the antitrust laws by an aggrieved party."[8]

This view of the quasi-public role of the treble damage litigant has been accepted by both the incumbent Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, Lee Loevinger,[9] and his predecessor, Robert A. Bicks,[10] the incumbent Mr. Loevinger going so far as to state that there is foundation for the belief that as between governmental enforcement and that of private parties, that private relief is both more desirable and more effective.[11] In this connection he advised a congressional committee that "Congress should enact a straightforward and unequivocal declaration of policy stating that primary reliance for antitrust enforcement is upon private action."[12]

The Federal Trade Commission recognizes that private antitrust actions supplement its own activities in the antitrust sphere, making it unnecessary for the Commission to take action in many instances. As a result, considerable savings are realized by the Government and the Commission is enabled to concentrate on hard core cases thus maximizing the effectiveness of its proceedings.[13]

Congressional sentiment, as well, runs strongly in favor of the supplemental enforcement of the antitrust laws afforded by the private litigant. Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Small Business Committee, in his statement supporting H.R. 10243 gave expression to this view in the following terms:

"You and I have recognized that we need a strong and effective antitrust policy to preserve competition. We have recognized that a necessary and integral part of any such policy is full and effective enforcement of our antimonopoly laws. For many years it has been recognized that the Government alone is not able to provide all of the necessary enforcement. The help of all citizens is needed. We know that private parties will help in this endeavor if we afford them rightful opportunities. In other words, we can expect this help if we give them the right to proceed, and see to it that they are treated reasonably respecting recoveries of damages and costs of litigation."[14]

The legislative intent to enlist the private individual in enforcement of the antitrust laws was largely unrealized until after World War II. As of 1940 in a half century of private litigation, only 175 cases of this nature had been filed and of these only 13 resulted in judgment.[15] The number of private suits in the period, according to one comment, assumed a comparatively futile insignificance taking into consideration the large number of businessmen and the extent of corporate consolidation by certain of their number.[16]

The private antitrust litigant, however, assumed importance after World War II; reported recoveries from 1945 to 1951 amounted to one and a half the number in the entire previous period.[17]

The statistics of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts for antitrust cases filed since 1941[18] graphically document this point. The first significant increase in the number of private actions filed took place in 1949 when the 162 suits filed registered an increase of 131.4 percent over the 70 private suits filed in 1942. Thereafter, in the period 1950 through 1961, there is a steady upward trend in private antitrust litigation, disregarding fluctuations in certain years. For example, the 378 private suits filed in 1961 showed an increase of 133.3 percent over treble-damage litigation filed in 1949 and an increase of 440 percent over corresponding litigation in 1942. (See app. A.)

The growing importance of private litigation is made even more obvious by comparing the number of private suits filed for various periods in the 20-year interval between 1942 and 1961. The years 1942 through 1948 involving a period of 7 years saw 397 private actions filed; in the next 7-year period, 1949–55, 1,373 such actions were filed, while in the last 6 years, 1956–61, private litigants initiated 1,541 antitrust suits.

Another comparison further drives home the indispensable role that the private suit has played in the antitrust field in recent years. In the 20-year period 1942–61, the U.S. Department of Justice filed 986 criminal and civil suits; in the last 5 years of the period, private parties initiated 1,314 actions. Private actions in the 5-year period exceeded by 328, therefore, the total number of Government suits filed for the entire 20-year interval. (See app. A.)

In 1958, the increasing significance of the private litigant's role in suppressing unfair methods of competition received a setback when the Supreme Court in *Nashville Milk Co.* v. *Carnation Company*,[19] and in *Safeway Stores, Inc.* v. *Vance*,[20] by 5-to-4 decisions, held that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act was not one of the antitrust laws coming within the scope of sections 4 and 16 of the Clayton Act. As a result, private parties may not sue for redress for injuries stemming from violation of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, prohibiting sales at prices for the purpose of destroying competition or eliminating a competitor. Consequently, enforcement of section 3 is presently limited to Government criminal action.

Justice Douglas, speaking for the dissenting minority of four, argued that the majority has "[resolved] all ambiguities against the grant of vitality to section 3" and forgotten that the treble damage technique has been designed as an effective method of deterring violation of the Clayton Act,[21] and concluded that the opponents of the Robinson-Patman Act had achieved in the court what they could not do in the Congress.[22]

Representative PATMAN, the author of the Robinson-Patman Act, immediately introduced H.R. 10243 designed to expressly redefine the antitrust laws so as to include section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act within their scope by an amendment to section 1 of the Clayton Act.

In his argument in support of the bill, Mr. PATMAN stressed the fact that governmental action to enforce section 3 had not been effective, the Department of Justice having little sympathy for this act as a criminal law against predatory pricing practices.[23]

Evidently, Mr. PATMAN felt that the decisions in the Nashville and Safeway cases, supra, had deranged the statutory scheme for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, for he summed up his statement in favor of H.R. 10243 with the argument that—

"We have strengthened the antitrust laws to prevent undue concentration in American industry resulting from mergers and consolidations. The results of concentration are equally bad whether obtained by the way of mergers or by the way of monopolistic practices. * * * Some small businessmen are saying today that we are preventing them from selling out to large concerns, but on the other hand, are permitting large concerns to discriminate in prices and run small business concerns out of business."[24]

Obviously, Mr. PATMAN introduced H.R. 10243 because he felt that the small businessman as a private litigant has a vital role to play in assuring the unfettered competition which is the object of the antitrust laws.

On this point, it may be noted that Lee Loevinger, then a prominent member of the private antitrust bar, endorsed S. 3079, 85th Congress, 2d session, which paralleled the provisios of H.R. 10243, noting in this connection the dissent's argument that the majority decision in the Nashville and Safeway cases, supra, had in effect repealed section 3.[25]

The surge of private antitrust enforcement beginning in the post-World War II period and continuing to the present, however, resulted primarily from prior governmental action,[26] and it is clear from the statutory scheme as a whole that it was the legislative intent that this should be the case for by section 5 of the Clayton Act[27] Congress provided that a judgment or decree in behalf of the United States entered after the taking of testimony would be prima facie evidence of the issues decided in the Government action.

---

[6] *Maltz* v. *Sax, et al.*, 134 F. 2d 2, 4 (7th Cir., 1943), *cert. denied* 319 U.S. 772 (1943); see also *Weinberg, et al.* v. *Sinclair Refining Co.*, 48 F. Supp. 203, 205 (E. D. N.Y., 1942), and *Quemos Theatre Co., Inc.* v. *Warner Bros., Inc., et al.*, 35 F. Supp. 949, 950 (D. N.J. 1940).

[7] *Lawlor, et al., Trading As Independent Poster Exchange* v. *National Screen Service Corp., et al.*, 349 U.S. 322, 329 (1955).

[8] *Radovich* v. *National Football League, et al.*, 352 U.S. 445, 453 (1957).

[9] Loevinger, Private Action—The Strongest Pillar of Antitrust, III Antitrust Bulletin 167, 168 (1958).

[10] Robert A. Bicks, the Department of Justice and Private Treble Damage Actions, IV Antitrust Bulletin 5 (1959).

[11] Statement of Lee Loevinger, Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. Senate, on the Role of Private Antitrust Enforcement in Protecting Small Business. 85th Cong., 2d sess. (1958), p. 7.

[12] Id. at 16.

[13] Statement of Hon. John Gwynne, Hearings Before a Subcommittee on Small Business, U.S. Senate, on the Role of Private Antitrust Enforcement in Protecting Small Business. 85th Cong., 2d sess. (1958), p. 175.

[14] Statement of Representative WRIGHT PATMAN before the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, on H.R. 10243, Aug. 6, 1958.

[15] Statement of Victor R. Hansen, Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. Senate, on the Role of Private Antitrust Enforcement in Protecting Small Business. 85th Cong., 2d sess. (1958), p. 122.

[16] "Fifty Years of Sherman Act Enforcement." 49 Yale L.J. 284, 296 (1939).

[17] Statement of Hansen, supra, p. 122.

[18] These statistics are the basis of a fiscal year ending in June.

[19] 355 U.S. 373 (1958).

[20] 355 U.S. 389 (1958).

[21] *Nashville Milk Co.* v. *Carnation, supra*, at 387.

[22] Id. at 388.

[23] Statement of Representative PATMAN before Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary, op. cit. supra, note 14.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Statement Lee Loevinger, op. cit. supra, note 11, pp. 22, 30.

[26] Statement Victor R. Hansen, op. cit. supra, note 15, pp. 122, 141.

[27] 38 Stat. 731; 15 U.S.C. 16.

Clearly, prior to the enactment of this section, President Wilson urged the Congress to facilitate the partnership of governmental and private enforcement of the antitrust laws when he advocated:

"Giving private individuals who claim to have been injured by these processes the right to found their suits for redress upon the facts and judgments proved and entered in suits by the Government where the Government has upon its own initiative sued the combinations complained of and won its suit. * * * It is not fair that the private litigant should be obliged to set up and establish again the facts which the Government has proved. He cannot afford, he has not the power, to make use of such processes of inquiry as the Government has command of. Thus shall individual justice be done while the processes of business are rectified and squared with the general conscience."[28]

As of 1952 approximately 90 percent of private suits filed followed Government action and although the percentage had declined somewhat by 1958, 76 to 78 percent of private antitrust action could still be traced to successful Government suits.[29]

The Federal Trade Commission is desirous of supporting this additional form of antitrust enforcement whenever possible, and has expressly recognized its obligation to facilitate private enforcement by Commission proceedings. In this connection, the Commission ruled recently in H. P. Hood & Sons, Inc.,[30] that evidence should not be put in camera merely because treble damage actions might arise therefrom, stating in pertinent part:

"Certainly the exposure of the respondent to possible treble damage actions is not the type of injury which would constitute 'good cause' for secreting this evidence. Placing documents 'in camera' for this reason would constitute a direct attempt to frustrate and defeat the will and intent of Congress. In enacting section 4 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 15), * * * Congress intended that such private suits would supplement and bolster the antitrust enforcement efforts of Government prosecution. * * *"

"Thus, in our view the secretion of evidence for the purpose of frustrating possible treble damage plaintiffs would be opposed to the public interest and the clearly expressed will of Congress. Our efforts should be directed to aiding, not hindering, private enforcement of the antitrust laws."

The two single areas of the economy which most dramatically exemplify the interaction of private and governmental enforcement in the antitrust field are possibly the movie industry and the manufacture of heavy electrical equipment.

In the case of the movie industry, the decree secured by the Government in *United States* v. *Paramount Pictures*[31] generated a great deal of private enforcement activity and, in fact, the assertion has been made that all of the private movie litigation followed successful Government antitrust proceedings.[32] The fact that plaintiffs were able to use the Paramount decrees as prima facie evidence in their own suits resulted in the filing of hundreds of treble damage actions against the Paramount defendants.[33]

The following figures for a 7-year period best document the extent to which private enforcement has supplemented governmental action to correct restrictive practices in the movie industry.

Treble damage actions in the motion-picture industry[1]

Year	Suits filed	Suits with damage claims	Amount of claims
1951	55	51	$94, 829, 101
1952	86	76	116, 505, 366
1953	67	59	248, 074, 460
1954	38	38	55, 349, 000
1955	42	31	61, 329, 750
1956	30	22	50, 929, 000
1957	33	25	21, 838, 707

[1] Id., p. 179.

Private suits have been successful in securing alteration of practices in the movie industry and in adjudicating exhibitors' rights.[35] Further, private suits have been influential in inducing the movie industry to comply with Government decrees.[36]

The recent Government victory in the so-called Philadelphia or electrical equipment price-fixing cases, which consisted of 20 related proceedings involving as defendants 29 separate companies, as well as certain of their employees and officers,[37] completed February 1961,[38] has already given rise to a very large number of private damage actions, and the end is by no means in sight.

To date, possibly the most significant of these actions were the 12 suits on purchases totaling more than $750 million, filed in the district court for southern New York by 44 plaintiffs on December 4, 1961, against 21 makers of heavy electrical equipment involved as defendants in the preceding Government criminal suits in Philadelphia.[39]

The importance of this suit in enforcing adherence to the antitrust laws and advancing the public interest is readily apparent from the identity of the plaintiffs who are 44 investor-owned electrical utilities, serving 14 eastern States and such metropolitan areas as Boston, Baltimore, Hartford, Providence, Cleveland, Toledo, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, and Richmond, Va.[40] Obviously these suits, if successful, could have the effect of both raising the dividends on plaintiffs' stock and lowering prices to consumers in these areas.

The plaintiff utilities, alleging they had been overcharged because of conspiracies dating from 1948 relating to prices of electrical equipment, did not specify the amount of damages in the complaint pending additional information to be secured in the course of pretrial.[41] It has, however, been estimated the damages involved in these suits could run into 10 figures.[42]

A striking feature of the treble damage actions filed on December 4, 1961, is the fact that all plaintiffs in that case are members of an antitrust investigation group organized by more than 150 investor-owned utilities to combine their investigative efforts.[43] The legislative intent to supply an ancillary force of private investigators to supplement the Department of Justice in law enforcement has been obviously realized in this instance.

The treble damage actions filed December 4, 1961, were the largest in the series of more than 160 damage actions growing out of the Federal suits,[44] but the preceding actions against the Philadelphia defendants are of considerable importance. For example, a public utility district in the State of Washington sued three of the major defendants, Westinghouse, General Electric, and Allis Chalmers, for $25 million. Other treble damage actions have been filed from coast to coast by municipalities and utilities, including the cities of Philadelphia, Pa., and Fort Pierce, Fla., the State of New Jersey, 11 rural Ohio cooperatives, the Northwest Electric Power Cooperative of Kansas City, the Los Angeles Department of Water & Power; and in Illinois, by the Commonwealth Edison Co. of Chicago.[45] In many of the suits, the damages for which recovery was sought were unspecified, but the potential drain on defendants is obviously grievous.

In the period 1952 to the latter part of 1958, plaintiffs in private actions won 8 out of 17 cases for injunctive relief; in the same interval, plaintiffs in private treble damage actions gained decisions in 20 cases as compared to a loss of 124; the ratio of victories for the period was, therefore, approximately 6 to 1 in favor of defendants. The Government, on the other hand, from 1953 to the end of 1958, had a record of 31 victories to 39 defeats, resulting in a 60–40 ratio in favor of defendants.[46] Nevertheless, the private suit may have greater deterrent effect on prospective antitrust violators because the potential recoveries from treble damage litigation is more nearly related to the harm done, if not to the profits derived by the antitrust violator, than are the fines levied as a result of Government action. The real sanctions of Government action, it has been noted, are the stigma of criminal prosecution and the inconvenience of operating under injunctive order.[47]

In this connection, the district court for the southern district of New York, in an opinion denying defendant's motion to enter a nolo contendere plea, expressly held that the purpose of permitting treble damage actions was punitive, stating:

"Another purpose in permitting an injured party to recover threefold his actual damage was that substantial verdicts against the wrongdoer would constitute punitive sanctions—to act as a deterrent against a repetition of the offense and to serve as a warning to potential violators."[48]

Judge Hansen stated in an appearance before Congress on the same point that private recoveries by heightening the financial penalty increased the deterrent value of both civil and criminal Government actions.[49]

---

[28] Woodrow Wilson, Special Address Delivered at a Joint Session of Congress, January 20, 1914, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. XVI, Bureau of National Literature, Inc., p. 7918.

[29] Robert A. Bicks, The Department of Justice and Private Treble Damage Action. IV Antitrust Bulletins, 7 (1959).

[30] Docket 7709.

[31] 66 F. supp. 323 (S.D. N.Y. 1946), 70 F. Supp. 53 (S.D. N.Y. 1947), modified and remanded 334 U.S. 131 (1948), 85 F. Supp. 881 (S.D. N.Y. 1949).

[32] Comment, Antitrust Enforcement by Private Parties: Analysis of Developments in the Treble Damage Suit. 61 Yale L.J. 1010, 1060 (1952).

[33] Conant, Antitrust in the Motion Picture Industry, University of California Press, p. 199 (1960).

[35] Comment, 61 Yale L.J. op. cit. supra, note 32, at 1045, 1046.

[36] Id. at 1046, quoting testimony of H. Graham Morrison, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, hearings on H.R. 3408, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power of the House Judiciary Committee, at p. 12.

[37] CCH Trade Reg. Rep. par. 8801 (1961).

[38] Wall Street Journal, Dec. 5, p. 3.

[39] Ibid. and BNA ATRR, No. 21, p. A7, Dec. 5, 1961.

[40] Wall Street Journal, Dec. 5, p. 3.

[41] Ibid.

[42] BNA, ATRR No. 21, A–7, Dec. 5, 1961.

[43] Id., at A–8.

[44] Wall Street Journal, Dec. 5, 1961, p. 3.

[45] BNA, ATRR, No. 1, A–6, 7, July 18, 1961. BNA, ATRR, No. 2, B–2. 3, A–16, July 25, 1961. BNA, ATRR, No. 3, A–14, Aug. 1, 1961. BNA, ATRR, No. 11, A–6, Sept. 26, 1961. BNA, ATRR, No. 21, A–7, Dec. 5, 1961.

[46] Bicks "The Department of Justice and Private Treble Damage Actions," op. cit. supra, note 10, at 11–12.

[47] Loevinger "Private Action—The Strongest Pillar of Antitrust," op. cit. supra, note 9, at 168–169.

[48] *United States* v. *Standard Ultramarine and Color Co.,* 137 F. supp. 167, 171 (S.D.N.Y. 1955).

The amount of treble damages assessed in certain of the movie cases highlights the punitive and deterrent aspect of private litigation as a method antitrust enforcement; plaintiffs, who as of 1952 had been successful in securing damages in over 50 percent of the reported cases in which there had been final disposition, amassed damages in amounts from $60,000 to $1,125,000; [50] e.g., *Milwaukee Towne Corp.* v. *Loew's, Inc., et al.* ($941,000 damages); [51] *Twentieth Century Fox Film Corp., et al.* v. *Brookside Theatre Corp.* ($1,125,000 damages); [52] *Theatre Investment Co.* v. *RKO Radio Pictures, Inc., et al.* ($60,000 damages).[53]

High damage assessments, near the million mark, in private damage suits, of course, are not confined to litigation concerning the movie industry; for example, in *Kiefer-Stewart Co.* v. *Seagram & Sons,*[54] a suit involving the liquor industry, plaintiff recovered damages of $975,000; in *The Sager Glove Corporation* v. *Bausch & Lomb Optical Co., et al.*[55] a suit in the optical industry, plaintiff secured a like amount.

Private suits in the heavy electrical equipment field, of course, bid fair to surpass the amount of damages previously recovered in all other segments of the economy.

The punitive aspect of treble damage litigation is not limited to the mere recovery of damages by plaintiffs. The amount of attorneys' fees recovered by plaintiffs in certain actions suggests that this item too is of sufficient weight to have cautionary effect.[56] For example, the Ninth Circuit, while remanding a case for further consideration of damages, ruled as follows on the item of attorney's fees:

"While it is the duty of this court 'to protect against vicarious generosity in the matter of attorneys' fees' * * * we cannot say as a matter of law that in a case like this, tried at great length below; argued twice on this appeal; and now to be reversed partially so that a new trial must be had below on the issue of damages, that before counsel for appellees obtain satisfaction of judgment for their client that $195,000 is too large a sum, or a figure that would shock the conscience. * * * When [the amount recovered by plaintiffs] * * * is determined, finally, the sum heretofore awarded as attorneys' fees may be too large, or conceivably too small." [57]

The costs involved in defending treble damage actions is another form of financial punishment to which defendants are subjected in private actions. A 1952 survey of defense counsel indicated that in cases where the damages claimed exceeded $150,000, this being the case in over one-half the cases filed, defense costs ranged from $17,000 to $250,000 and even where settlements were effected, defendant's expenses could run into five figures.[58]

The impact of private enforcement is, therefore, much wider than would be indicated merely by the statistics relating to cases in which plaintiffs have recovered subsequent to litigation,[59] for the threat of high damages, attorneys' fees, and the expenses of defending a suit are undoubtedly of critical importance in providing incentive for a large number of settlements.

"The inescapable investment of time, effort, and money in any antitrust case is so great that * * * it is not only improper but economically suicidal for any lawyer to get either himself or his client committed to litigation unless he is reasonably convinced in his own mind on an objective appraisal of the evidence and the law that there is a better than even chance of prevailing." [60]

The foregoing considerations, although originally directed to the filing of private suits are, of course, equally pertinent to the defense's determination of the advisability of settling private litigation.

The private antitrust suits, however, do more than merely duplicate Government work.[61] For private litigation frequently adjudicates practices not covered by Government decrees [62] and in some instances help close the breach left by necessarily incomplete Government policing of decrees.[63]

Possibly, the unique contribution of the private suit to antitrust enforcement is its preventive function in gray areas which are neither clearly unlawful nor lawful. Indictment under criminal action in such cases is unlikely and in these areas the threat of treble damage suits more than the possibility of Government action, deters business from carrying out the proposed acts. A leading member of the private antitrust bar has estimated that for every act or practice actually resulting in actual private litigation hundreds of others had been considered and rejected because of the fear of treble damage claims.[64]

Many of the benefits flowing from private enforcement of the antitrust laws as opposed to government enforcement are therefore intangible. For example:

"The method of freedom is the method of private action, as opposed to the tendency of government enforcement to become authoritarian. It seems indisputable that law enforcement through private action is both more flexible and less authoritarian than enforcement by a central government agency." [65]

There can obviously be no entirely objective estimate of the degree to which the public interest has benefited from private litigation. That benefit, however, has been substantial, even though the extent to which private proceedings have furthered the objectives of the antitrust laws may never be fully known.

---

[49] Hansen statement, op. cit., supra, note 15, at 141.

[50] Comment, 61 Yale L. J. 1010, op. cit., supra, note 32, at 1044.

[51] 190 F. 2d 561 (7th Cir. 1951), cert. denied 342 U.S. 909 (1952).

[52] 194 F. 2nd 846 (8th Cir. 1952), cert. denied, 343 U.S. 942 (1952).

[53] 72 F. supp. 650 (Wash. N.D. 1947).

[54] 340 U.S. 211 (1951), reversing 182 F. 2d 228 (7th Cir. (1950)).

[55] 1950–51 Trade cases, par. 62, 956 (N.D. Ill. 1951).

[56] *Twentieth Century Fox Films Corp, et al.* v. *Brookside Theatre Corp., supra* ($100,000 *Loew's Inc., et al., supra* ($75,000 attorney fees); *Kiefer Stewart Co.* v. *Seagram & Sons, supra* ($50,000 attorney fees); *The Sager Glove Corporation* v. *Bausch & Lomb Optical Co., et al., supra* ($132,000 attorney's fee).

[57] *Sunkist Growers, Inc.* v. *Winckler & Smith Citrus Products Co.,* 284 F. 2d 1, 34 (9th Cir. 1960), cert. granted, 7 L. Ed. 2d 22 (1961).

[58] Comment, 61 Yale L. J., op. cit., supra, note 32, at 1060.

[59] Ibid. at 1059.

[60] Loevinger, "Handling a Plaintiff's Antitrust Damage Suit," IV Antitrust Bulletin 29, 37 (1959).

[61] Hansen statement, op. cit., supra, note 15, at 141.

[62] Comment, 61 Yale L. J., op. cit., supra, note 32, at 1061.

[63] Hansen statement, supra, at 141.

[64] Communications to Yale Law Journal from Jerrold S. Van Cise, Jan. 2, 1952, cited by Comment, 61 Yale, L. J., supra, at 1061.

[65] Loevinger, Private Action—The Strongest Pillar of Antitrust, op cit. supra, note 9, at 168.

APPENDIX A[1]

Antitrust cases commenced

Fiscal year, June—	Total	U.S. Department of Justice		Private
		Civil	Criminal	
1942	105	35		70
1943	104	24	40	40
1944	75	12	13	50
1945	56	20	9	27
1946	101	18	15	68
1947	108	33	11	64
1948	115	19	18	78
1949	228	39	27	162
1950	233	42	34	157
1951	262	37	16	209
1952	293	20	12	261
1953	244	16	16	212
1954	194	21	10	163
1955	258	33	16	209
1956	281	30	24	227
1957	244	38	18	188
1958	325	33	22	270
1959	315	23	42	250
1960	315	60	27	228
1961	441	42	21	378

[1] Sources: Annual Reports of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, 1960 and 1961; H. Doc. 240, 85th Cong.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. NORRELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today through Wednesday, January 24, 1962, on account of official business.

Mr. SELDEN (at the request of Mr. MAGNUSON), for 7 days on account of official business.

Mr. MERROW (at the request of Mr. WHARTON), for 7 days on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN, for 45 minutes today, on two subjects, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. HEMPHILL, for 1 hour, on Wednesday next, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RYAN, for 40 minutes, today.

Mr. COAD (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 30 minutes on Thursday, January 25, 1962.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, for 1 hour on February 14 and 1 hour on February 15, 1962.

Mr. UDALL (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI), for 5 minutes today.

Mr. HEMPHILL (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI), for 1 hour on January 24.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $182.25.

Mr. LANE.

Mr. TOLL.

Mr. BAILEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. WALTER).

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. FRIEDEL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BARRY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN.

Mr. MACGREGOR.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana.

Mr. NYGAARD.

Mrs. WEIS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. BARING.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania.

THE LATE SENATOR ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, on 51 separate occasions since I was first elected to the House in 1955, the flag over the Capitol Building has flown at half-mast, signifying the death of a sitting Member of the House or of the other body. In walking over to the Capitol Building today I felt a special pang of sorrow and regret at observing the flag at half-mast, because it was signifying the death of the senior Senator from Kansas, the Honorable ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, on yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, Senator SCHOEPPEL was what might be described as a Senator's Senator. He was tall; he was handsome; he was rugged; he reflected vigor and integrity and dedication to duty. And he was all of those things. He was further a Senator's Senator because he was the kind of a man you would like to have represent you in the Senate of the United States.

In 1922 he received first national recognition as an outstanding football player on the team of the University of Nebraska, mentioned for All American, and was responsible for the defeat that year by Nebraska of the famous Four Horsemen of Notre Dame, one of the first defeats in their experience. He has been in the public spotlight more or less from that time on.

I think it is interesting to observe, Mr. Speaker, that in 1922, when ANDY SCHOEPPEL, as a football player at the University of Nebraska was receiving special recognition, that in that same year a young man whom he did not know but later came to be a very dear friend of his, a former Member of the House, the late Richard Simpson, from Pennsylvania, was also receiving national recognition as a football player. And, by a strange coincidence—and I think this is interesting to observe here today—in the same year that Dick Simpson, from Pennsylvania, was charman of the House congressional campaign committee, Senator SCHOEPPEL was chairman of the senatorial campaign committee for their party. And, I think what a coincidence it was that their lives were channeled in the same direction and they found themselves playing not exactly on the same team but playing to win the same as they had over 30 years before.

Mr. Speaker, I think it probably is generally known by most Members that Senator SCHOEPPEL has been in public service most of his life, mostly in response to a draft, shall we say, from the citizens of Kansas. He served at the county level as county attorney and then went to the State capitol as chairman of our State corporation commission. Then in 1942 he was elected to the highest office in the State of Kansas. He was elected Governor. He served in that capacity for two terms or 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate to observe also that in his reelection for his second term in 1944 he carried 103 out of the 105 counties in Kansas, a record that has never been equaled by any other candidate. Again, I point this out to illustrate what a fine public servant he had been, and how much recognition he had received, both at the State capital in Topeka, Kans., and also in Washington, D.C., and in many other States to which he had traveled many, many times in behalf of the cause of his country, of his committee, and, yes, of his political party.

Mr. Speaker, you may not have agreed with Senator SCHOEPPEL on all the positions he took. There are probably Members present on the floor today on both sides of the aisle who may not have been in agreement, Mr. Speaker, with the final position taken by the senior Senator from Kansas, but let me tell you this: There was never any doubt in anybody's mind in the Senate Chamber or in the State of Kansas on the position that the Senator was standing on, and after he took that position he was willing and always eager to defend that position against anybody who might contend it was not right and not in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is another symbol of a great public servant, and it is perfectly in harmony with that same spirit that he had when he played football back in 1922—that whatever team he was on he was going to play for the good of that team, and he was going to play it hard right down to the last whistle.

I think his public service was performed in that same spirit and conviction. He passed away at Bethesda Naval Hospital, still a Member of the U.S. Senate, ranking member of the Senate Commerce Committee, a member of considerable rank on the Appropriations Committee, a former member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, and still serving as ranking member of the Small Business Committee of the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, Senator SCHOEPPEL's record of public service may have been equaled by other servants of Kansas, and perhaps by other servants of the United States of America, but certainly I think upon reflecting on the record my colleagues could only agree that he has never been surpassed.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, nearly 20 years have gone by since I first met Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL. At that time I was a relatively young Member of the Congress and Senator SCHOEPPEL was a newly elected Governor of Kansas.

Well do I recall the friendly, cordial greeting he gave me on my arrival in Topeka to speak at a Kansas Day celebration.

During the intervening years we became good personal friends, working together in many ways, and particularly in the cause of Republican Party affairs.

His untimely death is for me a real personal loss.

As a matter of coincidence, my last speaking engagement of the past year was in Senator SCHOEPPEL's hometown of Wichita, and it was typical of his thoughtfulness that he wanted to do everything he could, although even then hospitalized, to make my visit to Kansas a pleasant one.

Like so many big, tough-minded men, ANDY SCHOEPPEL was inherently a kindly, gentle person, quiet and even somewhat reserved in his manner.

His long and consistent loyalty to sound principles, and his unimpeachable record of integrity brought to him many honors and many opportunities to serve his fellow men in positions of public trust from local to national levels of government.

He was a great son of Kansas and every bit an All-American in his dedication to our country.

ANDY SCHOEPPEL will be sorely missed by all who knew him.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman from Indiana. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] representing the Fourth District of Kansas which contains the Senator's hometown of Wichita.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of personal loss that I join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to a great Kansan and a great American—Senator ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL—who departed this life suddenly on Sunday.

I have lost a personal friend. The people of Kansas have lost a dedicated public servant. The Nation has lost a great patriot.

ANDY, as he was known to all of his friends and close associates, was a man who was always willing to take a firm stand. It has been said that he was a man who believed in standing up and being counted whether it was being loyal to a cause or to an individual. ANDY SCHOEPPEL retained that Midwest characteristic of saying what he meant and meaning what he said.

I had observed Senator SCHOEPPEL from the days of his service as Governor of our great State until he left us yesterday. I found him to be a man of tremendous energy whether working for a cause in behalf of Kansas, or for our Nation.

He was a successful attorney who could have practiced law and earned considerable financial rewards. However, he chose to dedicate himself to public service. He found happiness and satisfaction in serving the people first in his native Ness County, later as Governor and for 13 years as our State's senior Senator.

The confidence which the people of Kansas had for ANDY SCHOEPPEL is best illustrated by their decisions at the polls which were overwhelmingly in his behalf in six statewide elections at which his name appeared on the ballot either for Governor or U.S. Senator.

Senator SCHOEPPEL and his wife, Marie, were residents of my hometown at Wichita. In recent years he had devoted a great deal of his unlimited energies to the industrial development, particularly the great aviation industry, of our community. He also had worked tirelessly for the development of essential water resources.

Earlier, I stated that I had lost a personal friend. I shall always be grateful for the assistance and counsel which Senator SCHOEPPEL rendered to me last year when I first arrived to assume my new responsibilities as a Member of this House. He always had the time to discuss the problems facing a freshman legislator; and he always had a friendly suggestion to offer.

We should not fail in this tribute to pay special praise to ANDREW SCHOEPPEL's great and dear wife, Marie. Through the years she was always a tower of help, strength, and purpose on whom he relied.

We think of her as we honor him, and we shall always cherish both.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] who represents the Sixth Congressional District of Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I join my Kansas colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of Senator ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL.

His death is a tragic loss to his wife, his family, his party, a multitude of friends in and out of Government, and hundreds of thousands of ANDY's fellow Kansans who loved and respected him because he was a public servant with the courage and conviction to do what was right and best for his State and country, not what may have been politically desirable or expedient.

It is not difficult to measure the mark of a man who has been honest, sincere, forthright, and, above all, consistent in his views. Our Senator was a firm believer in, and a practitioner of, conservative principles, always alert to Federal encroachment, and in all ways a champion of individual rights and freedom. This record of public service is legend in Kansas and symbolic of the quality of his characteristics in rising from relative political obscurity in 1939 to become Governor of Kansas in 1943 and win reelection by a record vote and with an unprecedented majority in nearly all of the 105 Kansas counties. Election to the U.S. Senate in 1948 and reelection in 1954 and 1960 conclusively indicated the admiration and wide respect people of Kansas had for our beloved Senator.

In one of the Senator's first speeches as a Member of the Senate on May 4, 1949, he said:

> We have seen the innocuous beginnings of Federal control and authority within the States.

On September 16, 1961, in perhaps Senator SCHOEPPEL's last speech on the Senate floor he again reminded colleagues:

> As this session draws to a close and we total the costs of legislation enacted, it once again becomes obvious that there must be more effective control of Government spending if we are to avoid financial bankruptcy.

This, then, is a record clearly reflecting constant and consistent concern for the rights of the people.

Much more could be and will be said. We have all lost a true friend; our country a patriot and great statesman; Mrs. Schoeppel a devoted husband, but I shall always retain, as a result of his friendship and counsel, a simple philosophy which in his own words is, "call them as you see them."

May he be blessed to enter the portals of immortality in the life beyond.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the Member from Kansas, representing the Third Congressional District [Mr. MCVEY].

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to Senator SCHOEPPEL.

We Kansans are deeply grieved by the death of our great senior Senator ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, a man who in early life dedicated himself to serving mankind. Known to most as ANDY, the measure of our devotion to him is best demonstrated by the fact that he was the only candidate to win every single precinct in our entire State when running for Governor. More recently, our high regard for him was reflected by a majority of over 100,000 votes cast for him in his senatorial race.

Our entire Nation is affected by the loss of this great American patriot and statesman, whose courage of convictions and strength of character were typified by his own words, "I'll call them as I see them."

Both tall in stature and proud in spirit, his appearance was majestic. So shall his memory be recorded in history.

ANDY was my personal friend and wise counselor. His death saddens me deeply.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlemen from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH and Mr. BREEDING] may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it was with a profound sense of shock that my family and I heard over the radio yesterday afternoon of the death of our friend, Senator ANDY SCHOEPPEL. We have been next door neighbors of the Schoeppels during our time here in Washington, and had been following ANDY's struggle over the past several months with deep and friendly concern. We had been hoping and praying that he was on the road to a measure of recovery; now our grief and disappointment, at losing a friend, are heavy indeed.

Senator SCHOEPPEL has of course been a mighty leader in the public affairs of the State of Kansas, and of the United States of America, for a long time. His leadership in our State and Nation has been acclaimed and cataloged by many who have known him better and longer than I. He was a fearless fighter for what he felt was right. In his own words, "I call the shots as I see 'em." You could always count on ANDY SCHOEPPEL.

The State of Kansas and the people of America have suffered a tremendous loss; my family and I have suffered a deep personal loss. Our hearts go out to the gracious and lovely lady he leaves behind.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues from Kansas in expressing deep regret at the death of the senior Senator from Kansas, ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL. His untimely death will be mourned by friends from all sections of our State.

Although Senator SCHOEPPEL and I represented different political parties, this in no way affected the personal friendship which I am happy to say existed between us. I admired him for the deep and sincere convictions he held on governmental matters and the fact that he fought for these matters with all the vigor at his command. He was a forceful champion for the causes in which he believed and the philosophy of government he espoused.

Senator SCHOEPPEL served his State and its people well. He was Governor for two terms and then he was elected to the Senate in 1948.

I wish to extend to his family my deepest sympathy. Further, I wish to say to them that all Kansans, Republicans and Democrats alike, mourn his loss.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of pride to the remarks of my colleagues here today in memory of an old friend, Senator ANDREW "ANDY" F. SCHOEPPEL, of Kansas.

Nebraska, I believe, can claim some reflected honor from Senator SCHOEPPEL's presence here in Washington. Senator SCHOEPPEL received his law degree from the University of Nebraska in 1922. Consequently, I am sure that he is listed on that university's scrolls as one of its graduates to achieve distinction and greatness in the service of his country.

Aside from academic proficiency, Senator SCHOEPPEL also endeared himself to thousands of Nebraskans by his prowess on the football field. He played the game so excellently, that he was selected for honorable mention on one of Walter Camp's early All-American football teams while a student at the university.

Here, I might point out that in addition to his liking for Nebraska education and football, the Senator also found our State's fresh and wholesome womanhood to his style. A year after graduation, he married a Nebraska girl, Miss

Marie Thomsen, of Tilden, Nebr., who returned to Kansas with him. Needless to say, she was his cherished companion the rest of his life.

Apparently, the Nebraska friendships that Senator SCHOEPPEL formed in his university years were lasting ones, since in his work as a Senator, he often felt a kinship with Nebraska representatives and materially assisted them in many ways.

His greatest help to our great State came in his assistance to the passage of Public Law 480 during the 83d Congress. I am sure that if the Senator's assistance had not been extended then, the legislation would have foundered. I need not point out that since that time this law has been the salvation of some of our Nation's farms in that it works directly to reduce the problems of farm surplus.

So I want to join the host of my colleagues here today to note with great sadness the passing of Senator SCHOEPPEL. I make this statement in full realization that Nebraska never had a better friend, a friend whose help she will often miss in countless sessions to come.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly shocked and saddened when I learned of the passing of Senator SCHOEPPEL. I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to his memory. I extend sincere sympathy to our colleagues from the State of Kansas in this irreparable loss, which not only the State of Kansas, but the entire Nation, has sustained.

It was a privilege to know Senator SCHOEPPEL, and I greatly valued his friendship. I first became acquainted with him when he was Governor of Kansas. I have always had great respect for his ability and integrity. He had an outstanding record of public service, as evidenced by the splendid vote of confidence the voters of Kansas gave him in 1960.

Senator SCHOEPPEL was not only an able Senator, but was also a great American. We need more men like him in public life today. He will be mourned by all who believe in constitutional government and in preserving our American heritage.

Mrs. Chenoweth joins me in extending our sincere sympathy to Mrs. Schoeppel.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying tribute to the memory of ANDREW SCHOEPPEL, the distinguished Senator from Kansas, whose death yesterday saddened all of us who were privileged to know this generous, warmhearted American.

Kansas has lost one of its most devoted public servants and the Nation has lost one of its most conscientious and able legislators. His long service to the people of his State, in local and State government, cluminating in his election as Governor of Kansas, and his dedication to the public interest as a U.S. Senator, constitute a remarkable record of devotion to the welfare of the land he loved.

It was my privilege to come to know ANDY SCHOEPPEL well over the years of our service together in the Congress and I feel a deep sense of personal loss at the news of his passing. Mrs. Byrnes joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Schoeppel in her hour of sorrow.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce to the House that arrangements have now been pretty well finalized for the last services for the late Senator.

There will be services here in Washington on tomorrow at 10 o'clock at the Joseph Gawler's Sons Funeral Home at 1756 Pennsylvania Avenue NW.

The family, together with the body of the late Senator, will depart from Washington on Tuesday afternoon for Topeka, Kans.

The Senator's body will lie in state in the rotunda of the State capitol from 9 a.m. Wednesday until 4 p.m. on that afternoon, January 24, 1962.

The National Guard of Kansas will serve as an honor guard at that time. The last services will be in Wichita on the following day which is Thursday, the 25th of January, at 2 o'clock p.m., at the First Methodist Church at 330 North Broadway, Wichita, Kans.

Interment will be in Old Mission Cemetery, North Millside Street, Wichita.

Mr. Speaker, I further would like to ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to insert their remarks in the RECORD concerning the late Senator SCHOEPPEL.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 518

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, a Senator of the United States from the State of Kansas.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That a committee of six Members be appointed on the part of the House to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. AVERY, Mr. BREEDING, Mr. DOLE, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. MCVEY, and Mr. SHRIVER.

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 23, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1565. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the rural electric and rural telephone programs of the Rural Electrification Administration for the fiscal year 1961; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1566. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report relative to stating that an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands in the Dalles project, western division, Oregon, has been completed, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1567. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the 27th Annual Report of the Federal Communications Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1568. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of each of the following: "Statistics of Natural Gas Companies, 1960"; "Steam-Electric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1960"; "Hydroelectric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1960"; "Statistics of Electric Utilities, 1960, Privately Owned"; and "Principal Electric Facilities, 1961"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1569. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands at Antietam National Battlefield Site"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1570. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to validate payments of certain special station per diem allowances and certain basic allowances for quarters made in good faith to commissioned officers of the Public Health Service"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1571. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, transmitting certain information in connection with the annual report relating to four GS-17 positions, pursuant to section 1105a of title 5 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1572. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission, transmitting the 45th Annual Report of the U.S. Tariff Commission, pursuant to section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1573. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1962 in the amount of $151,200,000 and proposed provision for the Veterans' Administration (H. Doc. No. 306); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1574. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (H. Doc. No. 307); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1575. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report relative to stating that an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands in the Emery County project, Utah, has been completed, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1576. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, relative to the number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government as of December 31, 1961, pursuant to section 2031(c), title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1577. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report which contains the results of our continuing review of the outstanding voluntary agreements and programs established under section 708(e), pursuant to the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1578. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to remove the ceiling on the authorization for appropriations for the government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1579. A letter from the administrative assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report relating to the progress that has been made in carrying out the helium program, pursuant to Public Law 86–777; to the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs.

1580. A letter from the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

1581. A letter from the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize appropriation for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 9800. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the Disabled American Veterans; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 9801. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 9802. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide accounting procedures whereby dealers in personal property may exclude from gross income amounts withheld by banks and finance companies on notes purchased from such dealers employing the accrual method of accounting; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 9803. A bill to authorize a 2-year program of Federal financial assistance for all elementary and secondary school children in all of the States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 9804. A bill for the relief of Cuyahoga County, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 9805. A bill to change the name of Whitman National Monument to Whitman Mission National Historic Site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 9806. A bill to provide assistance to business enterprises and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9807. A bill to provide free postage for first-class letter mail matter sent by members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9808. A bill to revise the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H.R. 9809. A bill to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to permit the waiver of such section under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 9810. A bill to amend section 521 of title 38, United States Code, to provide an exclusion from annual income in determining eligibility for pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9811. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 9812. A bill to prohibit nepotism in Government employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL:

H.R. 9813. A bill to provide that the President shall adjust the rates for the Federal income taxes so that each year the budget will be balanced and the national debt reduced; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9814. A bill to provide that the President shall adjust the rates of the Federal income taxes so that for each 4-year period Federal receipts will exceed Federal expenditures by at least $4 billion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9815. A bill to establish a U.S. Tax Commission which shall adjust the rates for the Federal income taxes so that each year the budget will be balanced and the national debt reduced; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9816. A bill to establish a U.S. Tax Commission which shall adjust the rates of the Federal income taxes so that for each 4-year period Federal receipts will exceed Federal expenditures by at least $4 billion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 9817. A bill to amend section 23 of the United States Code to provide an additional 400 miles of highway in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 9818. A bill to provide that the lake formed and to be formed by the Walter F. George lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River, Ala. and Ga., shall be known and designated as Lake Roanoke; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 9819. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 9820. A bill to encourage domestic industries injured by the requirement to ship on American-flag vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H.R. 9821. A bill to encourage domestic industries injured by the requirement to ship on American-flag vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H.R. 9822. A bill to provide that lands within the exterior boundaries of a national forest acquired under section 8 of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315g), may be added to the national forest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 9823. A bill to amend the General Bridge Act of 1946 with respect to the vertical clearance of bridges to be constructed across the Missouri River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 9824. A bill to amend the act of August 30, 1890, to eliminate the provisions thereof authorizing Federal contributions for the maintenance of schools of higher education in which racial segregation is practiced; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.J. Res. 603. Joint resolution designating May 15 of each year as National Teachers' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.J. Res. 604. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim a week in March of each year as Community Health Week in the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H. Res. 514. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the problems involved in the fluoridation of potable water; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 515. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 514; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 516. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the administration of certain laws of the United States under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 517. Resolution providing for the payment from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives certain expenses of the U.S. Constitution 175th Anniversary Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H. Res. 519. Resolution creating a nonlegislative select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the aged and aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H. Res. 520. Resolution providing for an International Castings Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 9825. A bill for the relief of Christos John Smyrniotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 9826. A bill for the relief of Nicolas Martinez-Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9827. A bill for the relief of Barbara Bukowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 9828. A bill for the relief of Patti Jean Fulton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H.R. 9829. A bill for the relief of Antonio de Almeida Santos, also known as Antonio de Almeida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 9830. A bill for the relief of John B. Hogan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9831. A bill to provide relief for the heirs and devisees of Fly and Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 9832. A bill for the relief of Jack Shandler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 9833. A bill for the relief of Wo Jin Gin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUCK:

H.R. 9834. A bill for the relief of Estelle L. Heard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL:

H.R. 9835. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Gardiner and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 9836. A bill for the relief of Jan (Krysztopa) Michniewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 or rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

226. By Mr. BARING: Resolution of the Sun Women's Forum on Preparedness, Las Vegas, Nev., that the Federal Government immediately undertake the construction or acquisition of storage facilities in each inhabited local area for publicly owned agricultural surplus so that these foodstuffs can be readily available when needed in spite of massive transportation destruction or other havoc resulting from thermonuclear detonations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

227. Also, resolution of the Sun Women's Forum on Preparedness, Las Vegas, Nev., that the Federal Government take the leadership in establishing an urgent program of neighborhood fallout-shelter construction, that these facilities be available to all citizens regardless of economic status, race, creed, or national origin, and that governmental tax and fiscal policies be adjusted to permit this construction with the least strain upon the Nation's economy and its military preparedness; to the Committee on Armed Services.

228. Also, resolution of the Sun Women's Forum on Preparedness, Las Vegas, Nev., that the President be petitioned to direct the Department of Defense to proceed with the full integration of civil defense at the national level into the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

229. Also, resolution of the Sun Women's Forum on Preparedness, Las Vegas, Nev., that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of the United States be urged to assign, as a minimum, three additional civil defense emergency hospitals to Clark County and that these be distributed to the Goodsprings or Blue Diamond sector, North Las Vegas, and Moapa Valley; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

230. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of persons from 33 States, Washington, D.C., and Puerto Rico, a total of 176 petitions calling for an end to the Red mail subsidy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

231. By Mr. DOOLEY: Resolution of the Westchester County, N.Y., AFL–CIO Central Labor Body, urging the selection and issuance in 1962 of a postage stamp commemorating the 25th anniversary of the National Apprenticeship Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE

Monday, January 22, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Father Bohdan S. Zelechiwsky, Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the U.S.A., South Bound Brook, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, as we bow with reverence within the walls of this historic Chamber, as we stand before Thee in this temple of freedom, in peace and quietness, let us lift our hearts in prayer for the brethren of ours who are denied freedom, peace, quietness, and the right to praise Thee, our Lord.

On this day of anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Ukrainian people 44 years ago, let us fill our hearts with deep concern for this unfortunate nation and many other nations whose short-lived liberty was destroyed and drowned in blood by the powerful and most ruthless enemy history has known.

Let us, Almighty God, come to the high altar of Thy everlasting mercy with our deepest gratitude for the countless blessings which Thou hast bestowed upon our American Nation, for the glorious destiny of freedom, prosperity, and leadership unto which Thou hast called us as a nation.

But let us never be content with passive gratitude, nor forget our founding principles through self-content or pride; let us never disgrace Thy great gift of liberty by misusing it for our own selfish purposes. Make us, O Lord, more worthy of Thy grace by opening our hearts and minds to the immensurable sufferings of our Ukrainian brethren and all other captive nations, by holding high the flaming torch of freedom handed to us by our gallant ancestors, so that its fire may light the darkness of the world which endures in the night of captivity, despair, injustice, and denial of Thee, our Lord.

Let this torch of freedom be the symbol of our Nation's leadership, under which, with Thy blessing, may we win this crucial struggle for the future of the world and of mankind.

As we bow here in this shrine of our patriots, let us pay tribute to the millions of patriots of the Ukraine and of all other nations in captivity, who readily gave their lives for liberty, the right of self-determination, for freedom from oppression and fear, for freedom of thought and conscience and of worshiping Thee, our Lord.

Father of all nations, we pray to Thee that the Ukrainian Nation and all other nations in captivity may soon have a new birth of freedom, that they may take their rightful place among the free nations of the world, under the spreading canopy of Thy universal love and care. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 18, 1962, was dispensed with.

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT (H. DOC. NO. 278)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his Economic Report, together with the annual report of the Council of Economic Advisers, received by the Secretary, under an order of the Senate, on the 20th instant; which, with the accompanying document, will be referred to the Joint Economic Committee:

The White House,
Washington, D.C., January 20, 1962.

The Honorable the President of the Senate.

The Honorable the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sirs: I am presenting herewith my Economic Report to the Congress, as required under the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report, I have had the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers, who, in turn, have had the assistance of members of the Cabinet and heads of independent agencies.

Together with this report, I am transmitting the annual report of the Council of Economic Advisers, which was prepared in accordance with section 4(c)(2) of the Employment Act of 1946.

Respectfully,

John F. Kennedy.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar, under the rule, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, there will be no morning hour today.

WHY THE DU PONT TAX RELIEF BILL, H.R. 8847, SHOULD BE POSTPONED

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, there are three basic arguments against this bill:

First. Since the Court has issued no final order, it is unknown what relief, if any, is needed for the Du Pont Co. stockholder. Hence, the bill should be deferred until the Court has acted.

Second. The basic argument of the proponents of the bill—that H.R. 8847 is necessary, because of the adverse consequences on the market of divesting of 63 million shares of General Motors stock—is without merit. In fact, the purpose of the Justice Department's brief of December 29, 1961, is to deny this assertion. The argument is without merit, because Du Pont neither would sell nor would have to sell such a large amount of General Motors stock.

Third. The basic purpose of the bill is to attempt to substitute a legislative judgment on the key issue at stake in the litigation; namely, whether Christiana, the family holding company, will (a) divest, and (b) whether it will divest by selling its 18.3 million shares of General Motors stock, or whether it will divest by "passing through" these shares to the individual Christiana stockholder.

The Justice Department insists that Christiana should divest, and that it should do so by sale; but the bill would give a considerable legislative mandate and a large tax advantage for a divestiture by pass-through. Not only is this the Du Pont Company's position, but it would leave effective control of General Motors in the hands of the Du Pont family.

Du Pont, by this bill, is attempting to win its antitrust case, which supposedly it has lost; the Justice Department stands to lose all that it has won; and Du Pont is asking for a tax break while doing so.

Before I develop these points, certain facts should be placed in the RECORD:

DU PONT FACT SHEET

First, General Motors has 274 million shares of common stock.

Second, Du Pont owns 23 percent of General Motors stock, or 63 million shares.

Third, on January 12, 1962, General Motors stock was at $55.00 a share.

Fourth, $55 times 63 million is $3,465 million.

Fifth, Christiana owns 29 percent of Du Pont.

Sixth, Christiana's share of General Motors stock is thus 29 percent of 63 million, or 18.3 million shares of stock of General Motors.

Seventh, the Du Pont family owns or controls 80 percent of Christiana.

Eighth, the Du Pont family's share of General Motors stock held by Christiana is therefore 80 percent of 18.3 million shares, or 14.6 million shares of General Motors stock.

Ninth, 14.6 million shares of General Motors stock which is owned by the Du Pont family through Christiana equals 5.3 percent of General Motors stock.

Tenth, in addition, individual members of the Du Pont family own the equivalent of another 3.4 percent of General Motors stock by their direct holdings in the Du Pont Co. Another .6 or .7 percent is owned by various family trusts, etc.

Eleventh, thus, the Du Pont family, both through their holdings in the Du Pont Co. and their shares in Christiana, hold the equivalent of at least 9.4 percent of General Motors stock.

Twelfth, the average purchase price of General Motors stock to Du Pont was $2.09. The increase in values was therefore approximately $53 a share or a total of $3⅓ billion.

WHY THIS BILL SHOULD BE POSTPONED

The Du Pont bill should be postponed until such time as the Chicago court has made its judgment.

There are various reasons for this, and they include:

First. It is impossible to know that, if any, relief is needed, until the court has made a judgment.

Second. The Treasury Department, in its testimony before the Finance Committee, was unable to say what the actual tax consequences of this bill would be, because there is no final situation against which its provisions can be applied.

Third. The bill attempts to interfere with the court's decision, for it, in effect, makes a legislative judgment about the key legal issue before the court, namely, whether Christiana should divest by passing through its General Motors stock, or by selling its General Motors stock.

The Justice Department insists that Christiana should divest, and that this be done by a sale of its General Motors stock.

The company's position appears to be that, while it is reluctant to have Christiana divest, if it is done it should be done by passing through the General Motors stock to the Christiana stockholders. This bill, by reducing the tax on a pass-through from the ordinary income-tax rates of the existing law to a modified capital-gains rate under the bill, is firmly on the side of the company and the pass-through procedure. Hence, the basic purpose of the bill is to affect the judgment of the Court and to interfere in the judicial process, as well as to confer a tax break in the process.

THE ARGUMENT THAT THIS BILL IS NEEDED BECAUSE OF THE ADVERSE EFFECT WHICH THE DIVESTITURE OF 63 MILLION SHARES OF GENERAL MOTORS STOCK IN 10 YEARS WOULD HAVE ON THE MARKET IS UNTRUE

When the president of Du Pont, Mr. Crawford Greenewalt, was before the Senate Finance Committee, he testified that the total tax effects of the bill and the total tax effects of present law would be about the same. He said:

> Under present law, then, tax revenues under the combination of methods of divestiture which now appears most favorable would total about $330 million. A distribution under H.R. 8847 would yield tax revenues of about $350 million.

He went on to ask this question:

> Why, then, you may ask, if the taxes are approximately the same, am I here urging enactment of this legislation?

I may say that this is a question which many of us have asked. We see no immediate need for this legislation.

But Mr. Greenewalt answered this question by saying that he was "seeking protection for a million innocent stockholders from unwarranted economic penalties. In the absence of corrective legislation the various means of divestiture that Du Pont might use would all have a substantially depressing effect upon the market value of General Motors stock."

The company argues that the bill is needed, to avoid the adverse effects to the stockholders of divesting itself of 63 million shares of General Motors stock over a 10-year period. This argument has little merit, even though it is the basic contention of the company and is the basic argument used by the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee in presenting this bill to both houses.

In fact, the Justice Department's brief of December 29, 1961, to the Chicago court is largely aimed at rebutting this false contention.

In the first place, in testifying before the Senate Finance Committee, the president of Du Pont, Mr. Greenewalt, said that in the absence of such a bill, the company would follow a certain plan of divestiture under the present law in disposing of its General Motors stock. He stated first:

> Stockholders would be paying no more than the tax they now pay on the cash dividends.

Second. In addition, he pointed out that the Du Pont Co. will get rid of approximately 25 million of the 63 million shares by exchanges.

Third. He stated, on page 7 of his prepared testimony, that—

> We could dispose of as many as 25 million shares of General Motors stock by methods which would produce no additional tax revenues.

Among the methods would be the exchange of General Motors shares for shares of Du Pont common and preferred stock, which then could be retired. This would leave approximately only 35 million shares to be disposed of in the 10-year period. However, General Motors itself buys 1.1 million shares a year of its own General Motors stock as additions to its own pension funds. Over 10 years, this is 11 million shares of General Motors stock, for which there is a ready market.

That reduces to 24 million shares the number of shares to be disposed of in 10 years.

In addition to this, General Motors issues, on the average, 1.3 million shares a year of new General Motors stock. Over 10 years, this would amount to 13 million shares. This would reduce to approximately 11 million the number of shares to be sold.

In fact, it is estimated that General Motors could save from $700,000 to $1 million a year in brokerage fees by taking these General Motors stocks from Du Pont, rather than by buying them on the market or issuing new stock.

The Ford Foundation, in a period of 5 years, disposed of 17 million shares of Ford stock, or the equivalent of 24 million shares of General Motors stock, without any undue market consequences, and with a more volatile stock, that is, Ford, than is the more stable General Motors stock. Not only were there no undue market consequences, but Ford stock rose from a price of about $64 to $110 during the period.

If Ford could sell 17 million shares of Ford stock, or the equivalent in Ford stock of 24 million shares of General Motors stock, in 5 years, without any adverse market consequences, surely Du Pont can divest itself by the sale of 11 million, or 24 million, or even 35 million shares of General Motors stock in 10 years without any adverse market consequences.

Suppose, however, that the sale of one million to three million shares of General Motors stock a year did initially affect the market.

Suppose, for example, that the market price for General Motors stock fell from the present level of $55 to, say, $50. The General Motors dividend is $4. This would mean that the stock would be more attractive, for the dividend would increase from $4 a share on $55, which is a price-earning ratio of 14 to 1, to $4 a share on $50, which is 12½ to 1. Hence, the price-earnings ratio would decrease and the rate of return per share would increase. This would make the stock more attractive, increase the demand, and raise the price of General Motors stock.

MARKET OVERHANG ARGUMENT

The Du Pont Co. argues that there is a market "overhang" of 63 million shares of General Motors stock. As we have seen, that much need not be sold at all on the market, but this amount could be reduced to a minimum of 35 million shares, and more likely to 24 million or 11 million shares.

But there is very little to this argument, anyway. The Ford Foundation still retains 53 percent of the Ford stock. This is about 29 million shares of Ford stock, or the equivalent of over 40 million shares of General Motors stock.

This Ford overhang has certainly not depressed the price of Ford stock. In fact, as we have seen, Ford stock has risen from $64.50 per share to $110 per share in the last five years, although there was an even larger "overhang".

THE REAL PURPOSE OF THE BILL IS TO INFLUENCE THE COURT TO MAKE A DECISION ON DIVESTITURE WHICH WOULD ALLOW THE DU PONT FAMILY TO CONTINUE TO CONTROL GENERAL MOTORS

The key points in dispute before the Chicago court at present are two:

First. Shall Christiana be required to divest itself of its General Motor stock?

Second. If so, what method of divestiture will be required?

Christiana now owns 29 percent of Du Pont stock, or the equivalent of 18.3 million shares of General Motor stock. Sixty-five members of the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family own or control 80 percent of Christiana. Hence, the Du Pont family's share of General Motors stock which would be held by Christiana is 14.6 million shares, or 5.3 percent of General Motors stock.

In addition, individual members of the same branch of the Du Pont family own the equivalent of another 3.4 percent of General Motors stock by their direct holdings in the Du Pont Co. Another six-tenths or seven-tenths percent is held by various other family-controlled trusts, etc.

The Justice Department is asking the Chicago court not only to order divestiture by Christiana, but divestiture by the sale of the stock.

The Du Pont Co.'s position is that Christiana should be allowed to pass through the stock to its stockholders. If Christiana's stock is sold, the Government will certainly have won its antitrust suit. If Christiana's stock is passed through, the Wilmington branch of the family will still hold 9.4 percent of General Motors stock. Because no one group now controls as much as 1 percent of General Motors stock, the control of 9.4 percent of General Motors stock, or about $1.2 billion of General Motors stock, would keep effective control of General Motors in the hands of the Du Pont family.

TAX EFFECTS OF THE DU PONT DIVESTITURE OF ITS GENERAL MOTORS STOCK

Mr. President, let us turn now to the tax effects of this bill, as compared with present law. Let us first concern ourselves with the tax effects on the Du Pont shareholders.

FIRST STAGE—TAX EFFECTS ON DIVESTITURE BY DUPONT

Sixty-three million shares of General Motors stock are now held by Du Pont. At $55 a share, they are worth $3,465 million. The Du Pont Co. must divest itself of these shares. This has already been settled by the court; and the Du Pont Co. will probably be free to exercise its own judgment as to the methods of divestment, and combination of methods, most advantageous to it, its stockholders and General Motors' stockholders, consistent with complying with the antitrust laws and judgments.

The proposed final judgment submitted by the company provides that Du Pont shall divest itself of its General Motors stock by distribution to its stockholders or by such other means as it may select, again consistent with the antitrust provisions of the law and judgment.

Under the bill, the best estimate of the company last fall, with the stock at $45 per share, was that the total tax for both individual and corporate stockholders would be in the neighborhood of $350 million.

Under the present law, technically speaking, the tax would be higher; but the company has pointed out to the Senate Finance Committee that, under its plans, it could dispose of its General Motors stock in such a way that the total tax revenues would be about $330 million. Consequently, so far as the tax on the divestiture of General Motors stock by Du Pont is concerned, the tax revenues under present law or under the bill are approximately the same. These figures are from the Senate Finance Committee hearings, but were based on the assumption that General Motors would sell at $45 a share.

SECOND STAGE: TAX EFFECTS UPON CHRISTIANA'S RECEIPT OF GENERAL MOTORS STOCK

Now let us turn to the tax effects under the bill and under present law on Christiana, the family holding company of Du Pont, when it receives General Motors stock from Du Pont.

Christiana will probably receive 18.3 million shares of General Motors stock. On the average, Du Pont purchased this stock for $2.09. Its present value is $55. The gain, therefore, in appreciated value on this stock is about $968 million, or almost $1 billion.

Under the present law, Christiana would pay an ordinary intercorporate dividend tax based on the original cost of the stock. Under the regular intercorporate dividend tax, a credit of 85 percent is given, and the tax is at the rate of 52 percent of the remaining 15 percent. The average original cost was $2.09. Consequently, under the present law, the tax to Christiana on a gain of $52.91 per share would be 16 cents a share, or about three-tenths of 1 percent a share. The tax would be about $3 million on a gain of $1 billion.

Under the bill, this tax is raised, and the tax is based on the market value of the shares, rather than on the original cost. This would mean that with the market value at $55 a share, there would first be an 85 percent credit, and the tax would be at 52 percent of the remaining 15 percent, or $4.29 a share. This would be a total tax of about $79 million, on stock worth $1,006,500,000, or a total tax on the value of the holdings of about 8 percent.

TAX STILL AT A VERY LOW PERCENTAGE

Much has been made in this debate about how Christiana will pay, under the bill, $79 million, instead of $3 million, due to this change in the law applying only to Christiana with respect to the intercorporate dividend. But it is fair to point out that a tax of 8 percent on stocks valued at over $1 billion, which have had an appreciation in value or capital gain of $968 million, is not an onerous tax.

Mr. President, the average wage earner pays a 20-percent tax on the first $2,000 of his wages. No one can really say that for Christiana to pay a tax of about 8 percent on a gain of almost $1 billion is a burdensome tax. When the proponents of this bill point with pride to this provision, it should be judged on the fact that it is still a very, very small tax in proportion to the huge gains which the company has made.

DOUGLAS AMENDMENT

Mr. President, if the court does not order Christiana to divest at all, as is the position taken by Du Pont before the court, Christiana will never pay more than this 8 percent on a gain of almost $1 billion. This is 17 percentage points less than the ordinary capital gains tax of 25 percent which is applied to gains in value received by individuals.

Because it is possible that the court will not order Christiana to divest, I am offering an amendment which would apply to Christiana and other corporate stockholders the same capital gains tax that the Du Pont Co. insists is the proper tax to be applied to the individual stockholders of Du Pont who will receive General Motors stock.

The company has argued before our committee that the funds received by individual shareholders should not be treated as ordinary income, but are in the nature of a capital gain. Its argument is quite convincing on this aspect of the bill. So the bill provides such a capital-gains treatment. Thus, whereas the ordinary income tax is high, the company wants a capital gains treatment, which is lower.

But in the case of Christiana and other company stockholders, Du Pont argues that the funds should be treated as ordinary income, not as capital gains. The ordinary income tax on intercorporate dividends is extremely low, whereas the capital-gains tax in this case is relatively high.

Du Pont cannot argue both ways—that is, on the one hand, that it is a capital gain when the ordinary income tax is relatively high and the capital-gains tax on individuals is relatively low; and, on the other hand, that it is an ordinary income tax when the capital-gains tax is relatively high and the ordinary income tax on companies is relatively low.

I say it is either a return of capital or ordinary income. It cannot be both. My amendment would treat all stockholders alike, and would apply a capital-gains tax across the board, to individuals and companies alike.

THIRD STAGE: TAX EFFECTS IF CHRISTIANA DIVESTS

Mr. President, we now turn to the key purpose of the bill and to what are the most complex tax provisions with which we must concern ourselves either under present law or if the bill is passed.

As we have seen, the key issue before the Court is whether Christiana will divest; and, if so, whether by sale or by passing through the stock to the individual Christiana stockholders.

The Justice Department is urging that not only should Christiana divest itself of its 18.3 million shares of General Motors stock, but that this should be done by a sale of those stocks. If it is not done by a sale, then the Du Pont family will receive 14.6 million shares of General Motors stock which, along with the shares of General Motors they already own, and which they will receive directly from the Du Pont Co., would give the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family a 9.4 percent total ownership of General Motors.

TAX EFFECTS OF A SALE BY CHRISTIANA

Now let us look at the tax effects per share of General Motors stock if Christiana divests by sale under the present law and under the bill, or by pass-through, under the present law and under the bill.

I have here a table which shows these amounts per share of General Motors stock. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TABLE I.—*Tax effects of divestiture by Christiana per General Motors share* [1]

	Divestiture by sale (capital gains tax)	Divestiture by pass-through (leaves 9.4 percent of General Motors stock in hands of Du Pont family)
Under present law.	[2] $13.23	$33 for 60 percent bracket taxpayer.[3] $38.50 for 70 percent bracket taxpayer. $41.25 for 75 percent bracket taxpayer. $44 for 80 percent bracket taxpayer.
Under H.R. 8847	[4] 11.25	$8.76.[5]

[1] Based on present market value of $55 per share for General Motors.

[2] $55 reduced by the original cost of $2.09; $55−$2.09=$52.91×25 percent capital gains tax=$13.23.

[3] Taxpayer could reduce amount by present dividends-received exclusion and credit.

[4] $55.00 reduced by the original cost of $2.09=$52.91; $52.91×15 percent=$7.93+$2.09=$10.02, the new base of the stock; $55.00−$10.02=$44.98×25 percent=$11.25.

[5] Calculated on average basis or original cost of Christiana stock to Christiana stockholders of $27 per share. Under the bill original cost is subtracted from value of 1.37 shares of General Motors stock, or $75 ($55×1.37). $75−$27=$48×25 percent÷1.37=$8.76. Christiana stockholder who bought Christiana, presently selling at $208, for $75 or more would pay no immediate tax. Christiana stockholder who bought Christiana stock for $10 would pay tax of $11.86 per General Motors share received. Christiana stockholder who bought Christiana stock for 16 cents a share, would pay $13.66 per General Motors share received.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if Christiana divests by sale under the present law, the tax on a stock worth $55 per share would be $13.23 per share. If Christiana divests by sale of its General Motors stock under the bill, the tax on stock worth $55 per share would be $11.25 per share.

Inasmuch as a somewhat higher tax would already have been paid by Christiana under the bill when it received its General Motors stock from Du Pont—stage 2—than would be the case under present law, the total tax effects per share are substantially the same. No particular advantage is given to a sale under this bill; and, in fact, the total tax consequences of a sale under the bill are slightly greater than those under the present law.

Thus, for all practical purposes, the bill does not change the law or the tax effects for a divestiture by sale on which the Justice Department is insisting.[1]

In the case of a sale by Christiana of its General Motors stock, the treatment under present law and under the bill would be the ordinary capital gains tax, on an adjusted basis.

The principle is the same. The percentage tax, namely 25 percent, is the same. The amount would differ only because under the bill the company had previously paid a higher intercorporate dividend tax, and hence would pay a somewhat lower capital gains amount, because the gain to the company at this stage would be less.

Since the company had previously paid a higher tax, it obviously could subtract from its gain the amount on which this higher tax was based.

Hence, there are virtually no tax changes under this bill for a sale by Christiana, as compared with present law.

TAX EFFECTS OF A PASS-THROUGH

But when it comes to the tax effects of a pass-through this bill is anything but neutral.

Compared with present law, a big tax advantage is given in the case of a pass-through of General Motors stock to the Christiana stockholder. Not only would a pass-through leave 9.4 percent of the General Motors stock in the hands of the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family, but it would result in defeat for the Justice Department in its attempt to break up the monopoly of General Motors by the Du Pont family.

Under present law, a pass-through of General Motors stock from Christiana to its stockholders would be taxed at ordinary income tax rates. Eighty percent of this stock is owned or controlled by the Du Pont family. As individuals, they are in very high income tax brackets. It is estimated that their average marginal tax is in the 70- to 75-percent bracket.

Under the present law, a pass-through, which the Du Pont Co. wants, would therefore be taxed at very high ordinary income tax rates. These would amount to $33 per share for the 60-percent-bracket taxpayer, $38.50 per share for the 70-percent-bracket taxpayer, $41.25 per share for the 75-percent-bracket taxpayer, and $44 per share for the 80-percent-bracket taxpayer.

Although the company wants a pass-through, it obviously does not want the Du Pont family shareholders to pay these high bracket taxes on a pass-through.

This bill would reduce these amounts from $33, or $38.50 or $41.75 or $44 a share to an average level of $8.76. This figure is the amount which the Christiana stockholder, who bought Christiana stock at the average original cost of the stock now outstanding, would pay. This figure of $27 is computed from the testimony of Mr. Greenewalt as to what the tax incidence on Christiana would be under the bill. Thus, the average original, or basis cost, of the Christiana stock now selling for about $208 is $27.

CONCLUSION

We can sum up the tax effects of this bill with respect to divestiture by Christiana of its General Motors stock in the following ways:

First. The bill makes no particular change in the tax effects of a sale by Christiana of its General Motors stock, as compared with the effects of the present law. Both under the bill and under present law the tax would be at the capital gains rate. The percentage tax and the principles applied to the gain by Christiana would be the same.

---

[1] However, under present law, the company would pay a tax on the difference between (a) the basis cost, and (b) the market price. In this case it would be $2.09, the basis cost, subtracted from the market price of $55 times 25 percent, or $13.23.

On a divestiture by sale, under the bill, the company would pay the capital gains tax at the 25-percent rate, but on the adjusted basis which is affected by the higher intercorporate dividend tax—stage 2—under the bill. Consequently, the tax would be the basis of the stock—$2.09—adjusted by 15 percent of $52.91—$55 minus $2.09. The latter comes to $7.93; $7.93 plus $2.09 is $10.02. The 25-percent capital gains tax would then be applied to $55 minus $10.02, or $44.98. The tax would be $11.25.

Second. The bill greatly reduces the tax effects of a pass-through by Christiana to its stockholders of its General Motors stock.

Third. The bill changes the tax effects of a pass-through under present law from a large, relative tax disadvantage to the Christiana shareholder—$33, or more—as compared with a sale—$13.23, to a relative advantage for a pass-through—$8.76—as compared with a sale—$11.25. The bill therefore gives a distinct lead to the court to decide the case in favor of a pass-through of the Christiana holdings, rather than a sale.

I ask unanimous consent that table II, which I have prepared, be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE II.—*Tax effects of the bill*

	Under present law	Under bill
Stage I: Du Pont divests of its 63,000,000 shares of General Motors stock.	Tax under company plan would largely fall on company at capital gains rate (total revenue effects under company plan about same as for bill).	Tax to individual shareholder of 25 percent of his gain provided he paid less than $73.15 for his Du Pont share now selling at $232. No immediate tax on those who bought Du Pont at $73.15 or more.
Stage II: Christiana receives 18,300,000 shares of General Motors stock from Du Pont.	Tax at 16 cents per share, or $3,000,000 on gain of $968,000,000. Rate of 3/10ths of 1 percent.	Tax at $4.29 per share on stock worth $55 per share or $79,000,000 on stock worth over $1,000,000,000=about 8-percent rate.
Stage III: Christiana divests of General Motors stock—		
(1) By sale to market	$13.23 per share	$11.25 per share.
(2) By pass-through of General Motors stock to individual Christiana shareholders.	$33 for 60 percent tax bracket; $38.50 for 70 percent tax bracket; $41.25 for 75 percent tax bracket; $44 for 80 percent tax bracket.	$8.76 for Christiana stockholder who bought Christiana stock at average basis cost of $27.

DEATH OF ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, it is my sad duty to inform the Senate of the death of my colleague, the Honorable ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, the senior Senator from Kansas.

Senator SCHOEPPEL passed away yesterday at the U.S. Naval Hospital at Bethesda. All of us were aware of his illness, but we had hopes that he would regain his health and would be back with us.

His death is a great loss to the State of Kansas and to the Nation. During his lifetime, Senator SCHOEPPEL held many positions of honor and trust on behalf of the people of our State. The people of Kansas honored and respected him for his ability, his courage, and his integrity. No one ever needed have any doubt where Senator SCHOEPPEL stood on any issue.

During his service in the U.S. Senate he had won the admiration and the respect of Members on both sides of the aisle. He will be sadly missed in this body.

Mrs. Carlson and I extend our sincerest and deepest sympathy to Mrs. Schoeppel and the other members of the family.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a short biography of Senator SCHOEPPEL printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, Republican, of 115 South Rutan Avenue, Wichita, Kans.; born on a farm in Barton County, Kans., November 23, 1894, the son of George J. and Anna Schoeppel; attended the district school in Ness County, Kans.; graduated from Ransom High School in 1915; attended Kansas University 1916 and 1917; left school during World War I and enlisted in the Naval Air Service; following the armistice entered the University of Nebraska Law School in 1919 and graduated with LL.B. 1922; married Marie Thomsen of Tilden, Nebr., June 1, 1924; served as county attorney of Ness County, Kans.; mayor of Ness City, Kans.; appointed and served as chairman of the Corporation Commission of the State of Kansas from 1939 until May 1942 when he resigned; elected Governor of Kansas in 1942 and again in 1944; chairman of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission of the United States 1943–45; in January 1947 joined the law firm of Foulston, Siefkin, Schoeppel, Bartlett & Powers, Wichita, Kans.; received honorary degree LL.D., Baker University, Baldwin, Kans., in 1946; received honorary degree LL.D., Waynesburg College, Waynesburg, Pa., June 7, 1953; is a Methodist; 33d degree Mason; KCCH; Shriner; member of Sigma Nu fraternity; Phi Alpha Delta; American Legion; Forty and Eight; member of Sedgwick County, Kans., Kansas State, and American Bar Associations; elected to the U.S. Senate November 2, 1948, for a term of 6 years; reelected November 2, 1954, for a term of 6 years.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the leadership of the Senate will at a later date set aside a time when Senators may deliver their eulogies in memory of our late colleague Senator ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, of Kansas.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution relating to the death of Senator SCHOEPPEL.

The resolution (S. Res. 271) was read and was unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Honorable ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, late a Senator from the State of Kansas.

Resolved, That a committee of Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the second resolving clause of the resolution, the Chair will appoint at a later date the members of the committee to attend the funeral of the late Senator SCHOEPPEL.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, to say that I was shocked and saddened by the passing of our good friend, Senator SCHOEPPEL, is to understate my feelings in regard to this most distressing and most important event. The death of Senator SCHOEPPEL will leave in this body a void which will be hard to fill.

Senator SCHOEPPEL was a hard-working and vigorous Senator who always made his position known and always stuck by his guns, but at the same time always understood the reasoning of anyone on the other side of any question in which he was interested.

It is the intention of the leadership—the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and myself—to discuss with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] an appropriate time when eulogies can be delivered on the floor of the Senate by the colleagues of the late beloved Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it seems incredible that ANDY SCHOEPPEL's presence will no longer grace this Chamber. The news of his passing brought me a distinct sense of shock when I heard it yesterday morning. It is hard to believe that his personality will no longer intrude itself into the conversations in the cloakroom. It is hard to believe that no longer shall we have the benefit of his intense presence in the committee rooms; and it is hard to believe that no longer shall we hear him respond in his clear, firm voice when the roll is intoned—because he has answered to the final rollcall.

Life for him was a great adventure. It was a rich and rewarding adventure to find happiness for others, and, in the doing, to find happiness for himself.

It was a varied adventure, because he served his country, he served his State as chief executive, he served the Nation in this body. And what a tragedy his death is, because he had so much to look forward to, since he was virtually in the first year of his third term.

Mr. President, to know a man, one needs only to campaign with him, and I campaigned with ANDY SCHOEPPEL in Kansas.

As I thought of something fitting to say I thought of an old neighbor of mine who is 90 years old. His father served in the Civil War, and when the father passed away the son had inscribed upon his father's marker this simple sentiment: "Every inch a man."

ANDY SCHOEPPEL, rugged and robust, was every inch a man. I went outdoors in the country yesterday, to ponder, and a couplet kept going around in my mind. I thought of the expression, "Like the quarry-slave at night, scourged to his dungeon."

At the moment I could not remember whence that line came. Later I found it. Those are lines set down by William Cullen Bryant when he was only a young man, in the countryside, filled with frustration, wondering about the verities of death and life. He set that imperishable poem on paper.

The name of the poem is "Thanatopsis"—the word "thanatos" from the Greek meaning death, and "opsis" from the Greek meaning view. This was his view of death. In the poem he put down on paper a wonderful expression of it, for he said:

> So live, that when thy summons comes to join
> The innumerable caravan, which moves
> To that mysterious realm, where each shall take
> His chamber in the silent halls of death,
> Thou go not, like the quarry-slave at night,
> Scourged to his dungeon, but, sustained and soothed
> By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave
> Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch
> About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams.

I think that is the way Andy Schoeppel must have approached the final hour.

God rest his soul.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I now move that, as a further mark of respect to the memory of my deceased colleague, Senator Schoeppel, the Senate adjourn until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 23, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 22, 1962:

Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization

Raymond F. Farrell, of Rhode Island, to be Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization. He was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

In the Navy

Rear Adm. Carl F. Espe, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following-named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate them for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving:

*Vice Adm. William A. Schoech, U.S. Navy.
*Vice Adm. Roy L. Johnson, U.S. Navy.
*Vice Adm. Rufus E. Rose, U.S. Navy.

In the Coast Guard

The following-named persons to be lieutenants in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Richard F. Eiden
William P. Penney
Rudolph T. Sommer
Roger F. Frawley
Richard M. Connor
Lee I. Levy
Charles H. Jehle
Costa J. Alton
John C. Hanson
Karl F. Welty, Jr.

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Robert A. Janecek
Oliver W. Barber, Jr.
Alan C. Peck
Kenneth F. Franke
Ernest Bizzozero
Bobby G. Kingery
Richard C. Walton
Hugh J. Milloy
David H. Freeborn
Marvin N. Bromen
Bruce G. Lauther
Lawrence Graham

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officer, W-4, in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Clavis W. Baum
Frank J. Recely
John T. Dailey
Raymond L. Barnett
Eugene Linnemann
Robert P. Stalcup
Elton W. Grafton
Homer E. S. Williams
Jack K. Ridley
Marion G. Rubado
Fletcher R. Peele
Manuel L. Bent
Leon A. Anderson
George B. Schack
Albert DeCosta
Albert J. Bates
Malcolm Versaw
William H. A. Herbst
John W. Colby.
Irving T. Bloxom
Ernest L. Killian
Robert H. Burn
Leonest L. Tillett
Leroy H. Harmon
Gilbert W. Coughlan
Joseph J. Dobrow, Jr.
Henry A. Cook
Alfred M. Livingston
John Chartuck
John P. Ryan
William E. White, Jr.
Suell R. Grimm
Roland R. Davis
James W. Freeman
Edward E. Lewis
Oliver F. Rossin
Louis M. Piermattei
James W. Lockhart
Russell M. Young
Ellis M. Moore
Kenneth E. Payson
Martin J. Connolly, Jr.
Harvey J. Hardy
Gene D. Vecchione
Harry V. Hardy
Robert E. Sadler
Robert H. Kollmeyer
Henry L. Cotton
Roy L. Singleton
Andrew Kirkpatrick
Alexander M. Grant
Oliver T. Henry, Jr.
Foister E. Blair
William Keokosky
Nevette A. Gardebled
John E. Giles
George A. J. Michaud
Edward Petroski
Meredity D. Hazzard
Earlie W. Shelton
Frank Jakelsky
Robert H. Wiggins
Lawrence E. Wagner
Henry E. Ask, Jr.
Roy V. Sogaard
Norris D. Hickman
James T. Mead
Robert P. Ellard
Philip E. Barnard
Harold H. Rohr
Kenneth G. Sherwood
Elwood S. Hudson
Harold Eveld
Clinton A. Gregory
Walter R. Terry
Lloyd L. Franklin
Francis C. McCracken
Howard A. Carande
Charles U. Staska
Edgar W. Thomas
Stanley J. Salabor
David D. McCormick
Sterling Fulcher
Byron A. Barr
John A. Packard
Robert F. Anderson
Melvin H. Eaton

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officer, W-3, in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Kenneth L. Heinzen
George A. Knapp
Mark Fitton, Jr.
William H. Bellow
Frank H. Steinheiser
William H. Fraser
Leslie M. Furst
John H. Olsen
John H. Coppens
Eugene E. Moore
Raymond W. Gifford
Jay E. Law
Richard "M" Burdick
Frank A. Coleman
Eugene B. Cox
Robert E. Mooring
Donald O. Nelson
Charles W. Wicks
Eugene D. H. H. Willett
William F. Miller
Joseph J. Zagiba
Richard G. Thompson
Fred Permenter
George E. Rongner
John T. Renfroe
Albert DeBrase
Andrew Pietrykowski
Hugh B. Houston
George E. Carriveau
Donald E. Phillips
Karl M. Ashby
Elmer E. Johnson
John H. Bettis, Jr.
Maurice T. Hedgecock
James F. McLaughlin
Bob Nelson
Edward B. Eaton
Paul R. Cornell
Howard R. Tarr, Jr.
Eugene K. Kindschi
Robert E. Gardner
Clayton W. Collins, Jr.
Ralph G. Isacson
Joseph J. Bookout
John Rekuc
Harold R. Margrave
Francis W. Sullivan
Horace F. Hey
Leo Frey
Gordon W. Ault
Eric G. Bragg
Leonard L. Bouler
Robert L. Wilson
James B. Gill
Clifton Cuthrell
Cleo Hack, Jr.
Albert V. Carver
Mack E. McGuffin
Hubert F. Midgett
Hull O. L. Tanner
John E. Simpson
Wilson F. Jones
Boyden B. Bonnicksen
Oscar A. Erickson
Claude A. Broadus
James D. Toler
Donald C. Davey
William A. Shaffer, Jr.
Roy M. Schwanekamp
Kirven L. Dunn
Robert L. Walters
Darrell "B" Sinift
Joseph F. Baranowski
Edmund A. Novak
Lester H. H. O'Neil
Jerome R. Morton
Richard R. Anthony
Jack W. McDonald
Charles F. Potter, Jr.
William W. Muessel
George R. Brower
Robert L. Hatfield
Euclid L. Wade
Clark A. Johnson
Eugene W. Darcy
Dorris L. Steele
Eugene R. Lockhart
Ivan J. Anderson
Richard A. Krueger
Ernest N. Yaroch
Duane A. Force
Wallace N. Anderson
Joseph C. Waldrop
Daniel L. Knauss
Floyd J. Mulheren
Jack G. Smith
Charles W. Oldham
Mortimer Jeffords

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W-2, in the U.S. Coast Guard:

James F. Coen
Louis R. McDowell, Jr.
Kenneth G. Allen
Lawrence R. Fillinger
Charles A. Carroll
William P. Goldwire
Jerry H. Hedgecock
Thomas B. Lain
William H. Goetz
Loyal Walley
Eugene D. Freeman
Warren K. Wordsworth
Louis J. Lusson
Hugh J. Milloy
Robert A. Ray
Roland E. Huggins
Emanuel Schneider
Alex Z. Walker, Jr.
Karl K. Drum
Russell A. Cahill
Seaborn W. Jones
Earl D. Johnson
Robert D. Askew
William B. Sobeck
Archie Brookshire
William J. Irrig
Austin C. Mee, Jr.
Edward P. Lewy
Robert V. Ricard
James R. Ingram
Edwin M. Custer, Jr.
Jimmie J. Davis
Jack A. Massey
Harry D. Smith
Fred V. Reed
Paul J. Bouchard
Daniel C. Mania
Richard H. Hicks
Marvin N. Bromen
Bruce G. Lauther.
Robert E. Potts
Robert E. Diller
Harold E. Stanley
Billy R. Mull
John A. Donnelly
Charles R. McFarland
Leroy W. Peterson
Carl W. Snyder, Jr.
Philip M. Lebet
Edward A. Walsh
Samuel T. Buckman, Jr.
Ronald H. Youngman
Dean L. Webster
Hubert T. Blomquist
John D. Drewer
Robert L. Barr
Jackie R. Gore
James E. Mitts
Peter D. Van Horsen
Russell F. Mills
Ronald E. Wille
William F. Hunter
Harvey R. Little
John D. Ransom
Francis J. Honke
Robert M. Terkelsen
Peter F. Sterbling, Jr.
Richard H. Hill
Cecil L. McManus
Raymond H. Spoltman
Richard C. Tims
James F. Tutwiler
Elbert W. McKinney
Kenneth E. Wadman
Ernest R. Gronlund
Robert G. Carnilla
Willis A. Roderfeld
Paul W. Bicking
Alfred K. Rausch
Edward L. York
Francis W. Kelly
Edward B. Midgette
Douglas H. Derr
Robert L. Thompson
James E. Smith, Jr.
Ellsworth N. Slater
Richard J. Kilroy
Jack W. Dugan
Warren B. Barrett
Frederick W. Cressman, Jr.
Marvin J. Portwood, Jr
James O'Connell
Arthur L. Jayroe
Elwood T. Elder.
Patrick J. Flynn, Jr.
James N. Hodges
Dewey E. Sutton
Parker J. Pennington
Edward W. Kostbade
Charles D. Mills
James K. Beebe
Carl F. Baker
Charles L. Francis
John T. McGilly
Colt Rodgers
Cluese Russell
Robert E. DeMichillie
Charles R. Wilson
James H. Tyner
Charles R. Finn
Edward Schertzer
Harry F. Sanborn
John R. Alford
Albert R. Bennett
Paul R. Harp
Raymond J. Gorman
Glendon Grantham
Earl A. Ericksen
Robert A. Jones
Richard R. Terhune, Jr.
Charles F. Coolidge
Donald E. Grant
Robert C. Hilker
Cordus C. Bough
Eugene E. Doyle
Earl L. Dickson
Glenn E. Basham
John A. Marino
Robert A. Murrell
Arthur M. McIver
Omer L. Foster
Kenneth C. Garrison
Franklin L. Fountaine
Donald E. Dean
Dale T. Butler
Lyman R. Oliver, Jr.
Frederick R. Cooper, Jr.
Donald L. Conlon

---

*Indicates ad interim appointment issued.

Charles D. Pearson
Richard D. Bundy
Robert Casale
Harry V. Walker
Thomas E. Hilton
James F. Kaneaster
Gerald E. Palmer
Stephen Peckiconis
William T. Vanderberg
Richard A. Gill
Lennox A. Johnson
John H. Wiechert
Ivan B. Aiken, Jr.
Donald D. Luedke
Robert V. Bouck
John T. Watson
John W. Gates
George P. Spaniol
Blanchard M. Pierce
Truxton W. Payne
Robert D. Goodenough
Dalton L. Burrus
Elwyn C. Evans
Richard E. Eastman
John D. Kakalia
Edwin L. Mapp, Jr.
Robert D. Bowen
Richard J. Harding
Stanley W. Mead
William W. Southern, Jr.
William L. Broadwell
Francis V. McMahon
Charles W. Brandon
Fred E. Grombacher
Sewell G. Loggins
Jesse E. Sparks
Forrest W. Ringsage
Paul L. Cargile
Earl R. Schattenberg
George E. Prather
William H. Bacon
Franklin H. Doughten
Kenneth W. Bates

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Melvin G. Minyard, Brookside, Ala., in place of Joe Slatsky, Jr., deceased.

ALASKA

Thomas L. Jackson, Sr., Kake, Alaska, in place of R. R. Martin, resigned.

Frederick J. Baughn, Sitka, Alaska, in place of L. O. Tilson, retired.

ARIZONA

Marion L. Massey, Jr., Claypool, Ariz., in place of J. S. Raymond, retired.

Nellie I. Freihage, Fort Huachuca, Ariz., E. C. Ryan, retired.

Katherine L. Wallace, Mammoth, Ariz., in place of Annie Marquez, retired.

R. Odie Shipp, Miami, Ariz., in place of H. P. Williams, retired.

Nancy L. Terry, Oracle, Ariz., in place of L. K. Basteen, retired.

William C. Capps, Harrison, Ark., in place of R. R. Rea, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

Thomas J. Lawlor, Beverly Hills, Calif., in place of A. C. Richmond, resigned.

Lewis J. Gray, Crockett, Calif., in place of P. D. Lucey, Jr., resigned.

Clarence H. Rengstorff, Felton, Calif., in place of R. H. Kingham, resigned.

Howard E. Bradley, Hamilton Air Force Base, Calif., in place of C. W. Seely, retired.

Charles R. Parker, Lynwood, Calif., in place of L. T. Lane, retired.

James V. Praino, Malibu, Calif., in place of J. A. Elliott, retired.

Winifred L. Lausten, Mount Eden, Calif., in place of M. D. Jennings, retired.

George R. Fortney, Standard, Calif., in place of O. O. Wiseman, transferred.

COLORADO

Dale E. Pralle, Burlington, Colo., in place of M. E. Vogt, retired.

William J. Smith, Craig, Colo., in place of E. E. Sullivan, retired.

Bill L. Bowden, Dolores, Colo., in place of C. H. Rash, deceased.

William H. Farnum, Jr., Glenwood Springs, Colo., in place of J. B. Schutte, retired.

Clara W. Dennison, Hesperus, Colo., in place of Ethel Dunn, retired.

Adelyn R. Burdick, Lyons, Colo., in place of L. A. Drage, retired.

Goldie L. Simpson, Monument, Colo., in place of W. W. Carrothers, resigned.

Frank A. Batman, Jr., Pierce, Colo., in place of E. F. Huitt, retired.

Manuel T. Lovato, Saguache, Colo., in place of E. M. Fuson, retired.

Robert B. Mitchell, Salida, Colo., in place of W. W. Wieck, transferred.

Hugh L. Grauerholz, Yuma, Colo. in place of P. L. Kohlmeier, transferred.

CONNECTICUT

Walter M. McGinniss, Brookfield, Conn., in place of V. C. Geddes, resigned.

Ruth C. Soracchi, Columbia, Conn., in place of L. W. Beck, retired.

Joseph A. Whalen, Lakeville, Conn., in place of F. E. Constantine, retired.

Eugene D. Lynch, New Milford, Conn., in place of J. J. Berger, resigned.

Joseph R. Kasper, Terryville, Conn., in place of D. P. Hurley, retired.

Louis P. Gage, Washington Depot, Conn., in place of J. F. Connerty, retired.

DELAWARE

Lillias E. Carson, Clayton, Del., in place of J. B. Thompson, Jr., retired.

Hazel D. Grier, Woodside, Del., in place of H. M. Jones, deceased.

FLORIDA

Rosa A. Nash, Belle Glade, Fla., in place of G. P. Farnall, retired.

Charles H. Hendrix, Cantonment, Fla., in place of M. C. Booth, retired.

Earl R. Hooker, Haines City, Fla., in place of C. H. Pillans, deceased.

Blanche B. Clyatt, Micanopy, Fla., in place of F. H. Clyatt, deceased.

Warren W. Parrish, Pompano Beach, Fla., in place of S. H. Wallace, removed.

GEORGIA

Thomas H. Mills, Fort Gaines, Ga., in place of W. C. Chambers, Jr., removed.

Howard L. Crews, Hoboken, Ga., in place of Banner Thomas, retired.

Charles R. Sprayberry, Trion, Ga., in place of C. S. Bell, deceased.

Mary C. Townsend, Wildwood, Ga., in place of R. S. Townsend, deceased.

ILLINOIS

Hazel M. Craig, Alma, Ill., in place of Myron Craig, retired.

Charles E. Resch, Anna, Ill., in place of Frank Keistler, Jr., declined.

Clemit T. Peifer, Beecher City, Ill., in place of V. U. Barr, retired.

Rudolph E. Beranek, Berwyn, Ill., in place of J. J. A. Borkovec, retired.

Joseph F. Alfeld, Carrollton, Ill., in place of M. D. Dowdall, retired.

Allen L. Cline, Clayton, Ill., in place of R. E. Gibbs, retired.

Mabel J. Atkins, Dawson, Ill., in place of C. B. Stanton, deceased.

John R. Frymire, Enfield, Ill., in place of C. M. Jordan, deceased.

William A. Guthrie, Farmington, Ill., in place of Owen Kelly, retired.

Raimason F. Smith, Galva, Ill., in place of J. L. Haines, retired.

Frank P. Yost, Godfrey, Ill., in place of H. E. Calame, retired.

Edythe A. Grover, Hamburg, Ill., in place of E. F. Day, retired.

Walter L. Randall, Lewistown, Ill., in place of E. D. Henry, retired.

Donald W. Ferris, Marshall, Ill., in place of Leroy McNary, retired.

Ora K. Reid, Media, Ill., in place of R. E. Sullivan, deceased.

Theodore C. Geocaris, Mount Prospect, Ill., in place of Joseph Knuth, retired.

Max Martin, Newman, Ill., in place of J. R. Goodson, retired.

Wenscel A. Bieschke, Oswsgo, Ill., in place of G. C. Bartholomew, resigned.

Lawrence H. Dryer, Percy, Ill., in place of J. L. McCuen, resigned.

Norbert W. Haberer, Pocahontas, Ill., in place of H. F. Mounger, transferred.

Henry W. Roehrkasse, Red Bud, Ill., in place of A. H. Brandt, retired.

Walter D. Stephens, Rushville, Ill., in place of H. R. Markell, retired.

Leonard M. Koeberlein, Saint Elmo, Ill., in place of P. E. Ball, retired.

Charles H. Roberts, Salem, Ill., in place of C. H. Roberts, transferred.

Thomas D. Neal, Sandoval, Ill., in place of M. M. Hawley, retired.

John B. Rushing, Simpson, Ill., in place of C. V. Kerley, retired.

William J. Murphy, Stockton, Ill., in place of F. C. Niemeyer, deceased.

Dorothy E. Maier, Thomasboro, Ill., in place of A. J. Ulrich, retired.

John R. Graves, Virginia, Ill., in place of C. R. Wilson, retired.

Warden D. White, Wayne City, Ill., in place of Ira Dezouche, retired.

James T. Shinnebarger, Williamsville, Ill., in place of G. T. Hobkirk, retired.

Harold G. Minor, Windsor, Ill., in place of D. M. Wallace, resigned.

Ruth P. Spraggins, Yale, Ill., in place of R. J. M. Howard, transferred.

INDIANA

Noel A. Booher, Albany, Ind., in place of F. E. Sheller, transferred.

John F. Johnson, Beech Grove, Ind., in place of Mary Rutledge, resigned.

Arthur E. Hiester, Bremen, Ind., in place of H. G. Carbiener, retired.

William C. Summers, Hardinsburg, Ind., in place of Mildred Maxedon, retired.

James W. Chase, Lagrange, Ind., in place of H. G. Groat, retired.

Wilbur W. Amick, Scottsburg, Ind., in place of Avis Carlile, retired.

Charlotte L. Hudson, Spencerville, Ind., in place of M. I. Ward, declined.

Dorothy M. Jiles, West Terre Haute, Ind., in place of E. G. Turner, retired.

IOWA

Edward E. Nugent, Decorah, Iowa, in place of O. A. Jaeger, retired.

John P. McNerney, Des Moines, Iowa, in place of E. M. Johnson, removed.

Joseph F. Whelan, Elberon, Iowa, in place of G. B. Dolezal, retired.

Iva M. Mauck, Garwin, Iowa, in place of E. L. Ochs, retired.

Thomas E. Higby, Lehigh, Iowa, in place of R. E. Whipple, deceased.

Chester B. Judd, Lineville, Iowa, in place of H. L. Casey, retired.

Orval A. Kennedy, Milo, Iowa, in place of D. B. Kimzey, retired.

Cornie J. Huigen, Monroe, Iowa, in place of M. K. Wilson, retired.

Glen L. Penniman, Sac City, Iowa, in place of F. J. Ehrhardt, retired.

Floyd P. Collins, Tracy, Iowa, in place of E. D. Johns, resigned.

KANSAS

John L. Ruff, Attica, Kans., in place of L. F. Heath, transferred.

Mildred L. Staats, Coats, Kans., in place of G. E. Harville, resigned.

Norbert F. Eisenbarth, Corning, Kans., in place of L. E. Kempin, retired.

Milton H. Christian, Lindsborg, Kans., in place of H. E. Lindahl, transferred.

Lorn R. Lahey, Sr., McCune, Kans., in place of C. E. Mansfield, retired.

Douglas G. Porter, Peabody, Kans., in place of C. E. Slaymaker, deceased.

Lois M. Bleidissel, Scranton, Kans., in place of S. P. Bell, resigned.

Paul J. O'Connell, Jr., Shawnee Mission, Kans. Office established August 1, 1960.

KENTUCKY

David S. Miranda, Ashland, Ky., in place of H. D. Shanklin, retired.

Dillie C. Hutton, Berry, Ky., in place of C. F. Vest, retired.

Florabelle H. Wells, Bloomfield, Ky., in place of L. H. Muir, retired.

Thomas B. Tichenor, Brandenburg, Ky., in place of T. W. Wilson, resigned.

Robert S. Reed, Cynthiana, Ky., in place of J. M. Magee, retired.

Bernell D. Gifford, Eubank, Ky., in place of Walter McKenzie, retired.

Edna C. Everidge, Garrett, Ky., in place of Willis Conley, retired.

Julia W. Garvey, Glencoe, Ky., in place of M. B. Garvey, retired.

Charles E. Cecil, Hazel Green, Ky., in place of D. C. Rose, retired.

Fay J. Hampton, McRoberts, Ky., in place of M. B. Johnson, deceased.

S. Orbin Stallard, Science Hill, Ky., in place of W. L. Tarter, deceased.

Leonard G. Gooch, Waynesburg, Ky., in place of Gilmore Blair, deceased.

James E. Thomas, Wilmore, Ky., in place of C. W. Mitchell, retired.

LOUISIANA

Ella T. Ewing, Batchelor, La., in place of E. M. Ewing, retired.

Lola K. Frusha, Newllano, La., in place of J. H. Smith, transferred.

MARYLAND

Edward W. Young, Pocomoke City, Md., in place of J. T. Smullin, Jr., retired.

William E. Schwartz, Reisterstown, Md., in place of W. H. L. Slade, retired.

Emory L. Leonard, Salisbury, Md., in place of J. B. Rawson, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Richard J. O'Neil, Acton, Mass., in place of E. H. Peterson, resigned.

John L. Brown, Assonet, Mass., in place of G. A. Davis, retired.

Arthur H. Boutiette, South Grafton, Mass., in place of E. J. LeMaire, retired.

Thomas D. Lawrence, West Falmouth, Mass., in place of L. D. Burke, retired.

MICHIGAN

Leo G. Ealy, Stanton, Mich., in place of L. J. Fare, transferred.

Francis J. Donohue, Union Lake, Mich., office established January 7, 1961.

William J. Marinelli, Vulcan, Mich., in place of J. R. Haferkorn, retired.

MINNESOTA

Raymond G. Meier, Bird Island, Minn., in place of E. H. Beckman, transferred.

Cecil W. Sundquist, Hopkins, Minn., in place of I. C. Elmquist, retired.

Ralph A. Nelson, Spring Park, Minn., in place of Marguerite Linquish, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

John T. Lingle, Crystal Springs, Miss., in place of W. H. Magee, retired.

Louise N. Prowell, Jonestown, Miss., in place of F. G. Wimberly, retired.

Mary L. Castle, Kilmichael, Miss., in place of C. W. Johnson, retired.

Thomas F. Stevens, Noxapater, Miss., in place of T. J. Barnes, retired.

McHaven Clanton, Slate Spring, Miss., in place of M. L. Odom, retired.

Jack D. Mullen, State College, Miss., in place of H. E. Wamsley, retired.

Ruth Black, Tutwiler, Miss., in place of A. C. Hamilton, retired.

MISSOURI

John K. Timlin, Fenton, Mo., in place of E. C. Lawrence, retired.

NEBRASKA

Robert L. Hoins, Fairfield, Nebr., in place of B. P. Palmer, retired.

Alfred A Jorgensen, Fairmont, Nebr., in place of G. W. White, retired.

Ronald D. Hostetter, Murray, Nebr., in place of M. L. Brendel, retired.

Vern C. Hendricks, Plattsmouth, Nebr., in place of L. W. Niel, retired.

NEVADA

Walter L. Neal, Hawthorne, Nev., in place of E. E. Swindler, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Gerard C. Laperle, Colebrook, N.H., in place of R. A. Hicks, retired.

Richard W. Taylor, Londonderry, N.H., in place of E. M. F. Hayward, retired.

NEW JERSEY

William D. Hand, Edison, N.J., in place of Edward Collins, resigned.

George P. Johnson, Lake Hiawatha, N.J., in place of R. F. Barra, transferred.

Joseph A. Amorosa, Raritan, N.J., in place of Dominic Soriano, deceased.

Richard M. Johnson, Ridgefield, N.J., in place of H. J. Formon, deceased.

Ruth M. Visick, South Dennis, N.J., in place of L. A. Stiles, deceased.

NEW MEXICO

William Fitch, Jr., Grants, N. Mex., in place of M. B. McBride, transferred.

NEW YORK

John P. Frey, Atlantic Beach, N.Y., in place of Catherine Damme, retired.

John J. Biondolillo, Avon, N.Y., in place of J. L. Light, deceased.

Edward K. Sutryk, Bradford, N.Y., in place of F. R. Schuh, retired.

John F. Larkin, Brewster, N.Y., in place of S. B. Howes, retired.

Frank W. Palange, Camillus, N.Y., in place of B. F. Griffin, retired.

Margaret E. Bolton, Candor, N.Y., in place of C. L. Baker, deceased.

James D. Curcio, Chappaqua, N.Y., in place of J. J. Harrigan, deceased.

John M. Edwards, Chester, N.Y., in place of J. J. Diffily, deceased.

Donald F. Andrews, Conklin, N.Y., in place of N. S. Andrews, retired.

Walter A. Glynn, Craryville, N.Y., in place of F. A. Glynn, retired.

Donald J. Fitzpatrick, Dannemora, N.Y., in place of Jacob Tolosky, retired.

Thomas J. Dolan, Dover Plains, N.Y., in place of K. C. Lasher, removed.

Marie M. Olds, Freeville, N.Y., in place of W. F. Moore, retired.

John L. Kress, Jr., Galway, N.Y., in place of J. T. Hunter, retired.

Helen S. Victor, Grand Gorge, N.Y., in place of A. V. Joslyn, retired.

John W. Carroll, Jr., Great Neck, N.Y., in place of E. F. Higgins, retired.

William E. Vaughn, Greenville, N.Y., in place of W. P. Stevens, retired.

James P. Hamill, Groton, N.Y., in place of C. R. Gleason, retired.

Steven M. Douglass, Hammondsport, N.Y., in place of J. F. Richards, retired.

Ruth M. Whitney, Henderson, N.Y., in place of Matilda Whitney, retired.

Raymond O. Barker, Hudson Falls, N.Y., in place of L. F. Howland, retired.

Carl J. Barry, Kent, N.Y., in place of R. K. Fishbaugh, deceased.

George L. Longyear, La Fayette, N.Y., in place of I. B. Locke, retired.

Alton E. Briscoe, Laurens, N.Y., in place of M. D. Taylor, deceased.

Gerard R. T. O'Grady, Malverne, N.Y., in place of K. R. Brewer, retired.

Donald E. Van Vliet, Niverville, N.Y., in place of G. L. Crausway, retired.

James D. Donahue, North Creek, N.Y., in place of M. R. Rattigan, retired.

Grant D. Morrison, Northville, N.Y., in place of P. H. Griffing, retired.

Audrey L. Manzo, Ocean Beach, N.Y., in place of E. C. Nolin, resigned.

Francis P. Secor, Otego, N.Y., in place of R. A. Southard, declined.

Joseph J. Farrell, Paul Smiths, N.Y., in place of R. J. Longtin, retired.

Michael L. Odak, Red Hook, N.Y., in place of J. S. Hobbs, deceased.

Walter F. Schiener, Sardinia, N.Y., in place of M. C. Cudoba, deceased.

Merle C. Leonard, Savona, N.Y., in place of E. E. Mulliken, deceased.

Helen H. Kirker, Seneca Castle, N.Y., in place of M. P. Leadley, deceased.

Maurie G. Flanigan, Slingerlands, N.Y., in place of W. P. Degenaar, retired.

Kessler B. Baldwin, South Otselic, N.Y., in place of C. B. Baldwin, deceased.

Dorothy L. Varley, Thomson, N.Y., in place of G. E. Varley, retired.

Thomas J. Reilly, Warsaw, N.Y., in place of Parke Higgins, retired.

Robert A. Nussbaum, West Hurley, N.Y., in place of L. E. Joyce, retired.

Clarence M. Pulling, West Lebanon, N.Y., in place of R. E. Watkins, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

Albert K. Dickens, Castalia, N.C., in place of A. K. Dickens, transferred.

Roy H. Cartner, Mocksville, N.C., in place of Daisy Holthouser, transferred.

Henry B. Fountain, Rocky Mount, N.C., in place of H. C. Rountree, retired.

D. Herman Jones, Jr., Smithfield, N.C., in place of E. S. Stevens, deceased.

Edwin A. Howland, Sr., Tillery, N.C., in place of J. S. Marks, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Dale C. Nesemeier, West Fargo, N. Dak., in place of K. A. Peterson, deceased.

OHIO

Joseph R. Wysocki, Avon, Ohio, in place of J. P. Shumway, retired.

Fred H. Bonker, Northfield, Ohio, in place of M. N. Agee, transferred.

Ruth B. Hartsel, Polk, Ohio, in place of G. C. Swartz, retired.

Raphael J. Reasbeck, Salem, Ohio, in place of L. D. Beardmore, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

Grady F. Cope, Hollis, Okla., in place of B. E. Braswell, retired.

Hobart G. Waters, Sayre, Okla., in place of G. W. Sewell, retired.

OREGON

Lyle J. Chase, Rainier, Oreg., in place of A. R. McCall, retired.

Frank G. Ryan, Tillamook, Oreg., in place of H. W. Anderson, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Thomas P. Lowry, Blue Bell, Pa., in place of C. B. DeHaven, removed.

Edward L. Thomas, Drifton, Pa., in place of N. E. Breslin, retired.

Agnes M. Smith, Dunlo, Pa., in place of M. J. Musilek, retired.

Dorothy R. Karpyn, Egypt, Pa., in place of E. A. Breinig, retired.

Bertram L. Ream, Elizabethtown, Pa., in place of E. M. Miller, retired.

Frank Tulak, Finleyville, Pa., in place of E. E. Caseber, retired.

David C. Miller, High Spire, Pa., in place of M. M. Wilson, retired.

Kathryn L. Fessler, Muir, Pa., in place of E. I. Unger, retired.

Luther D. Clewell, Nazareth, Pa., in place of J. U. Fetherolf, retired.

Marie A. Leo, New Albany, Pa., in place of F. J. Murphy, retired.

Robert A. Feinour, New Tripoli, Pa., in place of F. D. Weiss, retired.

Stanley T. Wagner, Penns Creek, Pa., in place of J. C. Showers, retired.

John J. Bocinec, Tarentum, Pa., in place of J. W. Venables, retired.

Esther T. Williams, Thorndale, Pa., in place of L. E. Port, retired.

Edward A. Lynch, Titusville, Pa., in place of L. P. Seep, retired.

Glen E. Cluck, Waynesboro, Pa., in place of C. L. Johnston, retired.

Ross P. Petrone, Jr., Wildwood, Pa., in place of E. C. Hardt, retired.

PUERTO RICO

Moises M. Graniela-Ramirez, Boqueron, P.R., in place of P. P. Toro, retired.

RHODE ISLAND

Ellen L. Costanza, Bradford, R.I., in place of T. F. Eldridge, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Huron A. Gray, Allendale, S.C., in place of J. M. Riley, retired.

Mozelle M. Thompson, Inman, S.C., in place of J. G. Waters, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Ernest C. Kub, Ipswich, S. Dak., in place of C. R. Blank, Jr., removed.

John M. Johnson, Madison, S. Dak., in place of S. A. Tommeraasen, deceased.

TENNESSEE

Robert W. Johnson, Enville, Tenn., in place of L. E. Parker, retired.

Fred R. Lockett, Jr., Mountain Home, Tenn., in place of A. B. Thomas, removed.

TEXAS

William M. Patterson, Ballinger, Tex., in place of K. V. Northington, deceased.

James Q. Pennington, Bluegrove, Tex., in place of R. O. Childs, removed.

Harold D. Miller, Earth, Tex., in place of M. E. Kelley, retired.

Harry A. Tinsley, Henrietta, Tex., in place of Lem Ashinhurst, retired.

Henry T. Paul, Kerrville, Tex., in place of G. L. Gibson, retired.

James W. McMillan, Kingsville, Tex., in place of P. D. Cauley, Sr., retired.

Junius P. Ray, Llano, Tex., in place of A. P. Box, retired.

Millard E. Guess, Millsap, Tex., in place of A. T. Spear, removed.

Mickey L. Cochran, Moore, Tex., in place of O. C. Littleton, retired.

C. Max Ohr, Ranger, Tex., in place of A. E. Crawley, retired.

Doretha D. Taylor, White Oak, Tex., in place of B. T. Simmons, deceased.

UTAH

Carmela P. Peterson, Castle Gate, Utah, in place of J. W. Nielsen, retired.

Ethel N. Jones, Corinne, Utah, in place of M. C. Hatch, retired.

Grace H. Parker, Hooper, Utah, in place of F. M. Manning, retired.

VIRGINIA

Ernest R. Johnson, Alberta, Va., in place of F. L. Elmore, retired.

John H. Glass, Dewitt, Va., in place of L. R. Bolte, retired.

Walter L. Waleski, Glenallen, Va., in place of A. S. Trevvett, separated—disability.

J. Spencer, Rogers, Melfa, Va., in place of F. L. Harmon, deceased.

Virgil S. Abel, Jr., Quantico, Va., in place of O. M. Sisson, retired.

Horace B. Ridenour, Williamsburg, Va., in place of M. W. Foster, retired.

WASHINGTON

Ada M. Conboy, Glenwood, Wash., in place of M. J. Vanhoy, retired.

Elvin L. Jorgensen, Onalaska, Wash., in place of W. B. Stonex, retired.

Harold C. Cochran, Snohomish, Wash., in place of J. H. Meyer, retired.

Florence C. Blaisdell, Snoqualmie Falls, Wash., in place of L. E. Metzler, transferred.

Lillian R. LaRue, Steilacoom, Wash., in place of E. B. Leech, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

John W. Waskey, Sandyville, W. Va., in place of D. P. Currey, retired.

WISCONSIN

Glenn M. Mattison, Amberg, Wis., in place of A. S. Port, retired.

Robert G. Colburn, Benet Lake, Wis., in place of S. A. Odenbratt, resigned.

Robert J. Amo, Black River Falls, Wis., in place of P. W. Dickey, retired.

William A. Sikora, Bonduel, Wis., in place of A. W. Kallies, retired.

Robert M. Tabat, Dousman, Wis., in place of L. P. Mundschau, retired.

Arnold B. Clausen, Granville, Wis., in place of H. M. Pfeil, resigned.

Patrick J. Shereda, Medford, Wis., in place of E. G. Henline, retired.

Chester J. Skelly, Milton, Wis., in place of E. M. Rumpf, deceased.

Jack Rantz, Minocqua, Wis., in place of E. T. Abraham, retired.

Walter A. Post, Mount Horeb, Wis., in place of C. J. Sorenson, retired.

John B. Ver Weyst, Stanley, Wis., in place of W. L. Hanley, retired.

James N. Pomes, Three Lakes, Wis., in place of Gaylord Helmick, retired.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, today, January 22, we celebrate Ukrainian Independence Day. The cynical among us may be amused that we should honor the Ukrainian people and that we should applaud their continuing, albeit unsuccessful, efforts to gain their freedom. What independent Ukriane they ask? The Ukraine, they taunt, is a part of the Soviet Union.

Well, the people of the United States will not be taken in by the retorts of these cynics and pessimists. The American people know that freedom exists in the heart and in the mind. They know that the freedom they enjoy here in this great country of ours is a birthright of humanity in which the Ukrainian people share with all other people of this earth. Indeed, the Ukrainian people, through their long and difficult years of suffering under Communist rule, teach us how important freedom is in the life of men. The Ukrainian people show us the way. Their Independence Day is our Independence Day. Freedom is not safe until every vestige of tyranny is swept from the face of the earth. The Ukrainian people help the cause of freedom by keeping the hope of freedom high for themselves. Ukrainian Independence Day is a tribute to that noble hope.

Independence Day also reminds us that this Nation has been uniquely blessed. The Ukraine, unfortunately placed between jealous and greedy neighbors, has been attacked and conquered again and again. We have been, until now, protected by our oceans. Today, the Soviet Union and the insidious hand of Communist dictatorship clutches at the throat of this proud and courageous land.

If past is prologue to the future, we can rest assured that despite communism attempts to choke liberty in Ukraine, the people of this land will not permit its spirit to die among them. They will rise again, as they did after World War I. They will throw off the painful shackles which presently bind them. And a new day of freedom symbolized today by Ukrainian Independence Day will break forth across the land. Freedom for the Ukraine will strengthen our freedom.

The people of the United States of America are therefore happy and proud to join their Ukrainian brothers in celebrating January 22 as Ukrainian Independence Day.

One Hundred and Seventy-six More Petitions Calling on Congress To End the Red Mail Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have placed on the Clerk's desk 176 more petitions from persons throughout the country, calling on Congress to end the subsidy given Communist propaganda. For the information of our colleagues, may I say these petitions come from persons in the following areas and States: Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Puerto Rico, and Washington, D.C.

The time for the House of Representatives to act on this serious problem is fast approaching. Tomorrow the postal bill will be before the House. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee has included effective language to deal with Communist propaganda which enters this country.

I hope all Members will seriously consider the situation in which we are asked to approve higher postal rates for Americans, and I hope that my colleagues will agree with me that this is the time and place—if we must raise postal rates for our own people—to put an end to the subsidy given to Communist propaganda.

Ukrainian Independence Day: A 44th Anniversary Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, 44 years ago, on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian Republic proclaimed its independence. Lying in the southwest of Russia, that broad and fertile territory, with its hardy population, was heir to a tradition of independence and democracy going back to medieval times.

The collapse of the Russian Empire in 1917 afforded the national and democratic leaders of the Ukraine the opportunity to realize their goal of a Ukrainian national state. The machinery of an independent government was set up, with the support of a great majority of the people. But the Soviet Government, despite its pose as a defender of self-determination, would not permit its realization in the Ukraine. The Red army eventually crushed the infant Ukrainian Republic, and the Soviets set up their own republic in the Ukraine.

Today Ukrainians living under the Communist yoke may not celebrate January 22. But let us recall it here, on their behalf, with a reaffirmation of our belief that in the fullness of time the Ukrainian people, and indeed all people, will live in the light of freedom.

Anniversary of the Polish Insurrection of 1863

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on the night of the fateful 22d of January 1863, the Polish Central National Committee, in the name of the aged revolutionary General Mieroslawski, and under the leadership of Stefan Bobrowski and Zygmut Padlewski, announced the unconditional and permanent emancipation and the complete enfranchisement of every person in Poland, without regard to race, religion, or previous condition of bondage. On that night there occurred simultaneously all over Poland uprisings of Polish soldiers within the Russian Army. The insurrection extended all over Poland and late in March and all through April it looked like it might succeed.

In the meantime Lithuania had taken up arms for a reunion with Poland. On April 1, the czar proclaimed an amnesty to all Poles who would by May 1 lay down their arms and swear loyalty to the Imperial Russian Government, but the patriotic Poles stuck firmly to their demands. However, the diplomatic efforts of the Western Powers to aid the Polish cause were unsuccessful, for the czar refused to deal with the Poles until the insurrection had been put down. The heroic resistance of the peasants eventualy collapsed. In August 1864 the Polish insurrection came to a tragic and bitter end, with its beloved military commander, Romuald Traugutt, hanged publicly in Warsaw with four of his colleagues. It was the end of the most heroic armed uprising in all of Poland's long history of suffering.

The uprising of 1863 was the result of hopes arising from the lenient treatment of the Poles by Alexander II, who had succeeded Czar Nicholas a few years earlier. It was supported by Polish soldiers, exiled Poles in Paris and all over the world, and—above all—by the students. But the insurrection of 1863 was no more successful than the earlier attempt in 1830–31. The czar attempted to convince the Polish peasantry that he was their friend, and sowed seeds of distrust against the Polish landlords.

But neither the Polish temperament nor the Polish character nor the high quality of Polish homelife changed appreciably under the terrible lesson of 1863—nor, for that matter, have the three partitions which have been forced on Poland in recent centuries by the swirling currents of European history caused any diminution in the loyalty of the great Polish people toward their ancient homeland. Ninety-nine years after the insurrection of 1863 the Polish people are still under the iron control of their Russian overlord. I am proud to join with my fellow Americans of Polish descent in commemorating this solemn anniversary.

Bill Eliminates Racial Segregation Feature of the Land-Grant College Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to eliminate a racial segregation feature of the Land-Grant College Act, the so-called Morrill Act of 1862.

The second Morrill Act of 1890 amended the basic 1862 statute ostensibly to prohibit States receiving land-grant college aid to practice racial discrimination in admissions. But the amendment provided a loophole in the form of authorization to receive funds as long as separate-but-equal colleges for white and colored students were maintained. It is this loophole that I propose to eliminate.

Mr. Speaker, I think it appropriate on two counts to introduce my bill this year.

First, the legal barriers to equality of opportunity in education are falling. The separate-but-equal doctrine whether it be in the field of education or travel or public accommodations has been shown to be a fraudulent one. It is a device that under a seemingly plausible rationale permits the pernicious practice of discrimination against certain groups of our fellow Americans to continue. This glaring vestige of segregation in an otherwise admirable and fruitful program should be eliminated. Not only is it held contrary to sound public policy but the Supreme Court in May 1954 struck down this doctrine in declaring as unconstitutional enforced segregation in the public schools.

Mr. Speaker, my bill is appropriately introduced in this year of 1962 for a second reason.

This is the 100th anniversary year of the Morrill Act. The act is regarded as a major act of accomplishment in the field of education in the United States. It provided revenue from 11 million acres of the public domain for aid and support of colleges and universities for the teaching of agriculture and mechanic arts in each State. Subsequently, it was amended to provide for direct appropriations for land-grant college States. It must be regarded as a conspicuous example of a beneficial partnership of the States and the Federal Government. It represents an effort to provide a type of higher education within the reach of and adapted to the needs of the agriculture and economy of this Nation. The act played a role in encouraging the growth of higher education at a cost within reach of students without affluence. It exemplifies an effective relationship between research, campus instruction, and adult education. And today 68 land-grant colleges and universities in the 50 States and Puerto Rico constitute a vital part of our public institutions of higher learning. More than 500,000 students are enrolled in these colleges for degree credit. Distinguished Members of Congress hold degrees from these colleges.

And, Mr. Speaker, enactment of the land-grant college proposals culminated years of discussion for some uniform method of giving Federal assistance to States for higher education. Now, Mr. Speaker, does this not sound familiar, as the Morrill Act enters its second century? Soon, I hope, Members of the House will have before them a bill to provide further assistance to higher education in the form of loans and grants for academic facilities. Subsequently, I hope, legislation for scholarship aid to worthy students will be enacted by this Congress. The Morrill Act was passed by Democratic and Republican legislators and signed into law by a Republican President and a great American, Abraham Lincoln. Now in the complex space age, another Congress, this Congress, will be called upon to act similarly in the interests of the United States.

Independence Day of Ukrainian Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues in this observence of the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic.

It is altogether fitting that we, as Members of the Legislature of one of the great free and democratic nations of the world, take time from our deliberations to commemorate the courageous efforts of other freedom-loving peoples to throw off the yoke of oppression.

The gallant people of the Ukraine are such a people, for despite the incredible sufferings which have been thrust upon them during decades of Russian Communist domination, the spirit of liberty burns as brightly as ever in their hearts.

The people of the Ukraine should have a very special place in our hearts and in our prayers. For well over a million Americans of Ukrainian descent have brought to this country their love of freedom, their individual self-reliance, their deep spiritual values and the riches of a distinctive culture. I have seen the importance of these contributions in my own congressional district, and I am well aware of the wonderful efforts which are being made constantly by the Ukrainian-American Congress Committee of America to assist and lend encouragement to those in their homeland.

It is my hope that our remarks here today will find their way to the people of the Ukraine, so that they may know we are awake to their cause and are looking forward eagerly to the day when they will join us in the family of free nations.

Forty-fourth Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1692

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as freedom-loving Americans, who are imbued with an abiding sense of justice and equity, we take full cognizance that today, January 22, 1962, marks the 44th anniversary of the Ukrainian Independence Proclamation. It is not so much the fact that this day is an anniversary of an important document, but more especially, we note that more than 42 million people are virtual captives of their cruel, inhuman and atheistic Soviet Russian overlords and taskmasters.

The serious plight of these fellow human beings strikes a responsive chord in our hearts when we recall their very short-lived freedom after centuries of oppression and foreign domination. The history of the brave Ukrainian people, as we know, reflects the centuries-long struggle of man to attain individual freedom. It must not be forgotten that the Ukraine is a people by itself. The Ukrainians have their own language, their own customs their own traditions, their own history, and yet they are held in bondage by the Reds—a veritable large prison camp in their historic homeland.

The Communist enslavement of nations through the medium of totalitarian dictatorships is unfortunately well known. The Russians proceeded in this way to execute their policies of plunder and exploitation in the Ukraine. A reign of bloody terror was instituted in an attempt to destroy these brave people. It will be to their everlasting glory and credit that, notwithstanding unspeakable torture and untold suffering, Ukraine will never die.

The United States became the great Nation it is through the work and genius of countless peoples whose forebears came from distant lands across the seas. Today, among the loyal, industrious, God-fearing, and best American citizens, are men and women of Ukrainian origin. We are justly proud of them and gratefully acknowledge their lasting contribution in enriching our own economy and culture.

To the entire world, we give notice that it is never too late to recognize the historic claim of Ukraine to be considered as independent. We, of the United States, join with those who remember and celebrate this historic occasion. We share their legitimate hope that Ukraine, and all the other enslaved people, will become truly free and independent and that the Communist menace will be wiped off the face of the earth.

We can best show our concern for these unfortunate victims of communism by passing the resolutions presently pending before the Congress to establish a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. Such action by this body will show the world that we are willing to give more than lipservice to the cause of freedom.

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HJALMAR C. NYGAARD

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, Americans of Ukrainian descent are today celebrating the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence. It provides a proper occasion for the people of the United States to demonstrate their close ties with the Ukrainian nation, and their quest for freedom and independence. Although they have been oppressed for over 250 years—first by czars, and now by commissars—they still firmly hold the hope of eventual freedom and independence for their beloved land. Their hopes are strengthened in the knowledge that the United States supports their aspirations for liberty. They can be certain of our friendship. We will not rest until the yoke of Communist despotism is lifted from the shoulders of the Ukrainian people.

Anyone familiar with history of the Ukrainian people must be inspired by their relentless struggle to remain free. If we reflect for a few moments on that history, we will be encouraged to double our efforts in the fight against Communist imperialism. We will also achieve a deeper insight into the nature of the Communist threat facing us.

After the overthrow of the czarist government in Russia, Ukrainian leaders saw an opportunity to free their country from foreign domination. These leaders organized a central council in Kiev which has since been called the first modern Ukrainian Government. While attempts were being made to aline the Ukrainian nation with the Kerensky government on a free and equal plane, the Bolsheviks under Lenin seized control of Russia. The Red government in Moscow rejected the Ukrainian desire for freedom. Lenin ordered the Red army to attack the Ukraine. It occupied the city of Kiev in January of 1918 and began to carry out mass executions of Ukrainian leaders.

With German assistance, the Ukrainian people once against reasserted their right to liberty and expelled the Bolsheviks. On November 15, 1918, 4 days after the armistice of World War I, the Ukrainian people revived the previously suppressed Ukrainian National Republic. One year later, in the wake of much hard work and sacrifice, the Ukrainian Government proclaimed the union of western Ukraine. That memorable day was January 22, 1919.

But the Soviet Union would not permit this beacon light of freedom to shine so closely to its borders. Again it attacked the Ukraine with the massive forces of the Red army. Although the Ukrainian people defended themselves bravely and to the limit of their material and human resources, the assault of the Red army proved to be too powerful. By force of arms the Soviet Union absorbed an independent and proud Ukraine.

The Ukrainian people have suffered a great deal under Communist dictatorship. They have known hunger and poverty. They have seen their nation's lands ravaged. They have felt the oppressive boot of Communist dictatorship. The suffering of the Ukrainian people provides us an example of fortitude and patience that we should follow in these bitter days of the cold war.

On this Ukrainian Independence Day we rededicate ourselves to continue the fight for freedom. If we are victorious—and, indeed, we must be—we will owe much to the Ukrainian people who have given us the courage to fight on.

Education Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks which I made today before the economic and legislative conference of the AFL-CIO held at the Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C.:

EDUCATION PROGRAM

I am torn by two emotions this morning.

I am flattered that you have asked me to talk to you.

On the other hand, I am keenly disappointed that it is necessary for you to have me or anyone else come here to talk about the prospects of general Federal aid to education.

This was a matter that should have been settled long ago.

But it hasn't been. So here we are once more, searching, seeking for the magic formula that will permit all who believe in the proposition to muster the strength to pass a bill in the House of Representatives, get it to conference, and send it to the White House.

During my service in Congress, the Senate has on four separate occasions passed such bills. In the House, we managed to pass but one bill. And that was prevented from going to conference by a handful of men.

It is not necessary for me to review the reasons why we in the House failed in 1950, in 1956, in 1957, in 1958, in 1959, in 1960, and again in 1961.

A congressional report from the Washington office of the National Committee for an Effective Congress, issued last December, has them all up as "Reds, race and religion—the three R's of modern education." The report has pointed out, very significantly, that opponents of education have always been alert to exploit one or another of these issues.

On the other hand, the friends of education have been going off on too many tangents, political and/or personal.

Through it all, material wealth has increased and schools have declined.

Last summer, on the day the House Rules Committee tabled the administration bill, I was returning to my office from the floor. I was obviously in a depressed mood. One of my colleagues joined me and made this overture:

"CLEVE, you look unhappy. Let me cheer you up."

Whereupon he told me a slightly ribald joke. It did the trick. After the relieving belly laugh, my perspective was restored. As a former college and high school football and baseball player, I remembered the favorite adage of coaches:

"A team that won't be beaten, can't be beaten."

I realized that this was not the time to quit the fight. I began to think. When I reached my office, I called in a captive sounding board—a member of my staff. I began talking. This went on for days. When I returned from the floor, I talked; he listened. He had to.

Gradually some definite and simple facts began to take shape.

To begin with I knew, as you know, that a very large group exists who believe it is imperative that the Federal Government give the States and local districts a lift in their efforts to improve educational systems.

Both major political parties have endorsed the principle of Federal aid to education. As far back as the Hoover administration, the attention of the White House was directed to this proposition. Franklin D. Roosevelt was for it. Harry Truman was for it. Dwight Eisenhower was for it. As a candidate, Richard Nixon was for it. As a candidate and as President, John F. Kennedy was for it. Members of Congress were for it. Last session, nearly 50 of my colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, introduced bills calling for some type of Federal grants-in-aid program.

Labor has been for it. Such business groups as the Committee for Economic Development have been for it.

Men who represent widely separated political philosophies are for it. The bill that came a cropper on the House side in 1950 was a Senate bill that had been cosponsored by Elmer Thomas, of Utah, and Bob Taft, of Ohio.

Gallup and other leading opinion samplers tell us that the majority of people are in favor of Federal aid to education.

With all of this strength in back of Federal aid to education, it is just incredible that reasonable men could not get together to enact a bill. Something was wrong, very wrong, when the opposition was able to divide and conquer us.

I began thinking of all of the pitfalls that have beset bills in the past. As a result, I launched a trial balloon on a new approach in the form of remarks in a postadjournment issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I suggested that if reaction to it were favorable, I intended to translate the new approach into legislation.

I was and am delighted at the reception the proposal has received. Educators, the press, lawyers, Senators, and Congressmen are among those who have expressed favorable interest. Included are some of the most outstanding names in the Nation.

Since I am convinced that one of the ways we can muster maximum strengths is to have bipartisan sponsorship, I am consulting with some colleagues on the other side of the aisle. In any event, a bill will be introduced. I will not go into specific details, because they remain somewhat unsettled, depending upon the result of my current negotiations. However, I can talk about the basic provisions.

We have in the past developed allocation formulas based upon numbers of children, and this has always involved us in charges of discrimination. In my proposal, I plan to base the allocation formula on dollars spent in each State for public elementary and secondary education. Thus we would be assisting taxpayers, and that includes all of us, no matter where we go to church, nor to what school we send our children.

Furthermore, it is based upon State and local effort.

I propose to allocate to each State a sum equal to 2 percent of the amounts spent within that State.

Also, I propose to authorize additional sums to be made available, on a graduated basis, to States where personal income is below the national average. While one or two bugs remain to be worked out, this would mean generally that we would be helping all States by at least 2 percent, and the State—Mississippi—where financial resources are the least, would be assisted by about 6 or 7 percent.

The Federal grants would go to each State to be spent for those public educational purposes where the need is most critical in each State. In many States, according to information which has reached me, final decision will be made at the local level. Thus, we remove the issue of Federal control.

In order to further stimulate and encourage the States, I shall incorporate a variable matching formula, and provide for a reduction in the Federal grants if any State relaxes its own effort.

I will include a second title which will provide additional grants to the States for special urban educational projects. This section will have its own authorized appropriation. Each State agency will have responsibility for determining which projects within each State shall have priority. Thus I hope we can attack the dropout problem, as well as other similar and related problems that beset our central cities, and which have received so much attention from Dr. James B. Conant and others.

The total cost of this proposal, including the central city title, probably will not exceed $500 million. Thus it is a modest proposal, well within the limits of President Kennedy's budget estimates. It compares favorably with the bill submitted by the administration last year, which authorized appropriations of $666 million, $766 million, and $866 million for each of 3 years.

The bill will be offered as an emergency, 3-year program, in the hopes it will get our educational systems up to the levels required, and enable the States to carry on from there.

I started this whole proposal on my own, as CLEVE BAILEY. I was not speaking and do not speak for the administration on this matter, only to the extent that we both seek the same goal.

On several occasions, Secretary Ribicoff has publicly seen fit to mention my proposal in favorable terms.

I am convinced, however, that it will be a bill that will attract wide bipartisan support in and out of Congress. I believe it avoids the religious issue with which we were involved last year, and with which we were involved in 1950.

The bill does not discriminate. We do not say to the parochial schools:

"The door is shut."

What we do is put the whole educational policy area squarely at the State level. We say to the private schools, in effect:

"There is a tradition in this country, as firmly rooted as if it were spelled out in the Constitution, that educational policy is determined at the State level, period. The Federal Government may grant funds to the States for the support of public elementary and secondary educational purposes within each State. Within the framework of the Constitution, your pleas should be directed to the States."

I am proposing a States rights education bill.

I am convinced, based upon reaction so far, and providing interest continues to mount, the bill stands a 50–50 chance.

I believe, if the House were to pass it, there are no insurmountable problems when we meet with the Senate in conference.

I do not believe there is anything in this proposal that would result in a Presidential veto.

Whatever the fate, I believe firmly the effort must be made.

If we fail this year, we must come back again and again.

A cause that won't die, can't be killed.

The Administration's Fiscal Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it has already been estimated in many circles that Government expenditures this Congress will approve this year will top those of any previous year but 1945—the year of peak spending for World War II. It has also been stated that the administration's prediction of a budget surplus is predicated on so many "ifs" and "maybes" that it must be viewed with something other than "high hopes," if I may borrow the title of the New Frontier's campaign song.

We are told by pollsters that the President's personal popularity soars undiminished. We are wooed with reports from every source about his glamour, his intelligence, his breeding, his charm, his keen insight, and his political acumen.

We are not, however, told anything about the public's reactions to the spending programs, the foreign policy failures, or the welfare-state schemes of his administration.

Since we do not receive the pollsters' sanctified word on these matters, we Members of this House have to rely on other sources from our districts to test reaction to them. We must rely on letters and vocal expressions of sentiment from our constituents and on newspaper editorials appearing in our areas.

It is especially from this latter source that I have recently been getting some pertinent, arresting, and detailed opinions. Newspapers in and near my district are voicing opposition to the administration's loose fiscal policy. These opinions prove to me that while the President may be personally popular, his policies and his programs are causing serious reservations, if not outright discontent and opposition.

Some of the newspapers to which I refer are small weekly publications; others are small or medium-sized dailies; another is a mass circulation daily. All have taken the same stand.

For example, let us first just scan the titles of editorials that appeared in five different newspapers on January 17 and 18 of this year:

From the Seymour (Ind.) Tribune of January 18, 1962, "Another Deficit Ahead."

From the Salem (Ind.) Leader of January 18, 1962, "Congress Should Keep Taxing Power."

From the Versailles (Ind.) Republican of January 18, 1962, "The Super Boom."

From the Mitchell (Ind.) Tribune of January 18, 1962, "There's a Hand in Your Wallet."

From the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star of January 17, 1962, "The U.S. Debt Emergency."

Even the titles tell a story. The writers of the editorials, after sounding out public opinion in their areas, are worried about the course our economy is taking. They are concerned with the increase in the national debt, the Federal-aid-for-everything approach to government, the reckless way in which tax money is being budgeted, and the callous disregard the administration seems to have for the public's pocketbook and economic well-being.

Let us go under the titles of the editorials and see what the editorial writers are saying, what the people are thinking.

The Seymour Tribune, for example, says:

> There is a confusion of economic tongues on whether a big consumer buying surge is going to undergird a sharp increase in the rate of business growth. Some see that stimulus as substantial and others do not.
>
> The budget sent to Congress by the White House tops any peacetime year and is exceeded only by two World War II years.
>
> Presidential predictions of a balanced budget in fiscal 1963 are based on an estimated $11 billion jump in revenues * * *.

This estimate is disputed by many.

> Claims of a balanced budget probably are unrealistic unless Congress takes the situation firmly in hand. What the effects of an almost unvarying deficit financing on an already unstable dollar and the Nation's world trade will be is one of the most challenging questions of the times.

The Salem Leader has another approach to the same general topic:

> A couple of weeks ago we congratulated two new citizens of Washington County—the first babies of 1962. But we failed to note one important "gift" these babies get. These first babies are saddled with their share of our huge public debt—$1,603 for each baby. Isn't that a hearty welcome to any new baby, wherever born?
>
> Yet there has been a demand made that Congress boost the limit of debt which the U.S. Government can take on. It isn't enough that our Nation is already the most deeply in debt of any nation in the world. In fact, we are reportedly in debt more than the nations we continue to help all the time. Our Federal debt and guaranteed obligations are $295 billion. It surpasses by $42 billion all the debts of all other countries in the world. This is something for every one of us to think about, for Uncle Sam's load is really the load of the taxpayers of the Nation. Every dollar that our Government gives to the States or to communities, or to other countries, in whatever guise, is the taxpayer's dollar. The Federal Government does not have a dime that it has not collected from the taxpayers in one form or another.
>
> Now President Kennedy is asking Congress for the power to control taxes and tariffs. He wants the White House occupant to be able to raise or lower taxes as he wishes. The President says it is to enable the President to lower taxes when a recession occurs, to act as a boost for our economy. But when in history has the power to tax ever been accompanied by a reduction in taxes? Never. It has always resulted in boosts.
>
> Our Congressmen are elected by us in our respective districts. They are more "local" people and, coming up for election every 2 years, they are more mindful of what the people want. They are more prone to heed the demands of the people than can one person in the White House, surrounded by bureaucrats, whose only interest is to "tax and tax and elect and elect and elect."
>
> Congress should never surrender its jurisdiction over taxes. It should never delegate authority to one man or to another branch of Government.
>
> The taxpayer can be compelled to pay his taxes, but he cannot compel his Government to stop useless spending and balance the budget. But a concerted effort by a large number of taxpayers can stop it if it is up to Congress. If our spending continues unabated, the taxpayers will be compelled to do something about it to save themselves from Government serfdom. And it's later than our Government officials would have us think. This is one Congress the people need to watch—and closely.

Evidently, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Howard Grossman, the editor of the Salem Leader, has not been won over by the results of the popularity polls. He is thinking, as are millions, about the direction our Nation is taking rather than the cut of any man's suit or the chic design of any woman's dress or coiffure.

Now let us look at the editorial in the Versailles Republican. What is this "super boom" the editor talks about?

> There's at least one place where a super boom is underway. It's in the Federal Government as disclosed in the President's recent message to Congress. Unfortunately, it's a boom that the taxpayers, including taxpayers-to-be, not yet born, will have to pay.
>
> Federal spending for the year will pass $90 billion, a new peacetime record. Next year's budget deficit will exceed $5 billion regardless of what the President says.
>
> We're supposed to be prepared to make sacrifices in the name of national defense and of national survival. When will Washington provide even a minor example? Not until the people vote "no" to candidates and public officials who promote higher taxes by advocating give-away programs financed by taxpaying dollars.
>
> Instead of giving up, saying there is nothing you can do, start writing your Congressman, or someone else's if you don't like yours, and tell him what you think.

Apparently, Mr. Speaker, someone forgot to tell this editor to pay attention only to the flowery rhetoric from the White House to which we are treated from time to time.

The Mitchell Tribune editor takes a dim view of medical care for the aged proposals and other economic proposals of administration:

> Today we are besieged on every side by proponents of something for nothing. The siren song of the welfare state is heard in ever-increasing volume. With no thought for the ultimate cost or the weakening effect on the moral fiber of our people, supporters of larger and larger Government benefits plunge merrily on.
>
> We believe it is high time people took a look at the facts for themselves, rather than have those facts misinterpreted by others to serve their own ends.
>
> Remember, the only money available for distribution from Washington is the money that has already been extracted from those who labor in our factories and offices and on our farms. The money to support these programs comes from you. There's a hand in your wallet.
>
> "You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred. You cannot help the poor by discouraging the rich. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn. You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative and independence. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves." Abraham Lincoln.

In reaching back into history for words, I think no better job could have been done than that performed by Lowell Davis, editor of the Mitchell Tribune, when he quoted Lincoln's words of 100 years ago.

Let us look now at a metropolitan newspaper with high circulation in my district—the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star.

> At the top of the congressional work schedule is dramatic reminder that the national debt limit does not limit the national debt. The Government can't pay its bills and can't even borrow enough under the present limit of $298 billion.
>
> In this emergency Chairman Harry F. Byrd, of the Senate Finance Committee, is trying dramatically to alert an electorate which has tolerated the big spending projects of pressure groups, even when there is no money to pay the bills.
>
> As he says, "This financial emergency is the direct result of the Government's continuing failure to exercise reasonable financial discipline.
>
> "It is not necessary to be an expert," says Senator Byrd, "to recognize the fact that we cannot continue to spend and spend, tax and tax, and borrow and borrow much longer."
>
> The inevitable end result is more inflation, plus weakening of the dollar in world affairs, plus rising crisis in our balance of international payments, plus further drain on our gold reserves.

There, Mr. Speaker, are editorial expressions of opinion from five newspapers—all known for their moderate editorial approaches. None castigate—none calumniate—none throw political barbs. All, however, express one feeling—a growing trepidation that our

Nation is being weakened dangerously by disastrous fiscal policies.

All hit at one theme—that the time has come for the Government gravy-train to be stopped dead in its tracks before it runs us all over the brink of the financial cliff and into the abyss of national bankruptcy and economic disaster.

It is this sort of opinion which is coming from the grassroots, Mr. Speaker, and this sort of opinion which should be listened to and heeded by every Member of this House and by the executive department as well.

Proposed New Agency Would End Home Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter, and attached article from Nation's Business of November 1961, which I sent to every Member of the House of Representatives and the Senate. I feel very concerned about this issue and believe my letter and enclosure should be published so that the people of this country can draw their own conclusions:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 15, 1962.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I am enclosing a reprint of an article which appeared in the November 1961 issue of Nation's Business and which pertains to certain legislation before the Congress; namely, H.R. 8429 and S. 1633. Both of these bills propose the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. Both bills have been reported out of committee and will soon be scheduled for floor action by both the Senate and the House.

As you may know, I am a great believer in States rights, and I am firmly convinced that the enactment of the proposed legislation would result in too great a concentration of power within the proposed new Department. I have no doubt that the new Secretary and his staff would administer their responsibilities and duties with integrity and sound judgment; however, there is a grave possibility that ultimately this newly established Cabinet post would attract those with more selfish motives. Should this come to pass and should the proposed Department become infiltrated by people of questionable motives, the best interests of our Nation could be severely jeopardized. The proposed new Department would effectively put an end to home rule and States rights.

I am afraid that those who have proposed this centralization of control would be the first to rue its consequences. A new Secretary of Urban Affairs could pull strings in all of the cities throughout the United States, and then the mayors and city officials would be merely puppets directed by the new Department. Power to control city governments would be vested in Washington. People would lose personal contact with local governments which are most intimately concerned with their welfare. The proposed new Department would be powerful, and no doubt tremendously large new spending programs would evolve and sweep across the country.

There are too many such programs in this country today. In my home city of Reno the urban renewal program has resulted in absolute chaos. It has been labeled, and rightfully so, a real estate man's delight because it has been in the hands of appointed officials rather than elected officials. This naturally has created a very dangerous situation. Hundreds of homes have been condemned for resale and profit.

I have just returned from Nevada where I represent an entire State, and my people are getting tired of paying taxes to support domestic rat-hole spending and foreign aid giveaway programs. I cannot help but feel that a large majority of the American people today feel the same way.

Frankly, I have been worried for several years over an ever-increasing tendency on the part of both Republican and Democratic administrations to centralize power and control in Washington. Nikita Khrushchev said 3½ months before his visit to the United States, "We cannot expect the Americans to jump from capitalism to communism, but we can assist their elected leaders in giving Americans small doses of socialism, until they suddenly awaken to find they have communism."

Big government and centralized control is certainly leading this Nation into socialism. I have opposed many so-called liberal bills. I consider H.R. 8429 and S. 1633 to be by far the most liberal proposals ever introduced into Congress. I feel that since 1932 the Congress has departed far too far from the basic principles set forth in the Constitution of this country, and fear and frustration have been embedded in the hearts of its people. The truth has been withheld from the people. They have been encouraged to dig holes in the ground for shelters and bury themselves like moles to escape annihilation. Would it not be better for the press and public officials to question what would happen to the Russians if our missiles were to land on Russian soil. We are not a Nation of cowards. Let us keep America American.

Let us turn again toward those basic Jeffersonian Democratic principles upon which this Nation was founded and resist that influence expounded by Khrushchev. Let us preserve States rights and lessen the tendency to turn to central government for every fringe benefit. Let us remember that statement made by an American patriot following the Revolutionary War, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute." Let us give our children as much if not more of what America stands for than that which we received so that they may have an incentive in life and the will to continue to fight for those principles upon which this Nation was built. Let us turn from vast spending programs to building a strong basic economy in this country for our children and our children's children to enjoy.

I wish you would read the accompanying reprint and then I know that in all good judgment H.R. 8429 and S. 1633 will be defeated.

Sincerely,

WALTER S. BARING,
Congressman for Nevada.

WASHINGTON REACHES FOR YOUR CITY HALL: PROPOSED NEW AGENCY WOULD END HOME RULE

Control of city governments could move to Washington if Congress votes next year to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

It's likely your city would then be less responsive to your individual needs. You would lose personal contact with the level of government which affects you most.

The new Cabinet-level agency is recommended by the Kennedy administration, strongly backed by city officials and, among others, the AFL-CIO.

By establishing a direct line of communication from the mayor's office to the center of the Federal Government, it would soon become the most powerful and expensive Cabinet post. The authority of Governors, State legislatures, and other local levels of government would be demolished.

Although the backers of the proposed department put most of their stress publicly on the need for Federal coordination, planning, and research, they have in recent years been in the forefront of every fight to enlarge present Federal welfare programs—housing, urban renewal, community facilities, water treatment plants, airports, schools.

They've battled vigorously to get Uncle Sam deeply involved in dozens of new areas: Helping depressed communities, combating juvenile delinquency, expanding public health facilities, modernizing and renovating hospitals, subsidizing commuter facilities, acquiring park lands. They've suggested the Federal Government take on such other chores as helping cities to relocate industry, planning public works, fire prevention, even snow removal.

Opponents of the new department put its real purpose bluntly: To pressure within the administration, with Congress, and with the public for big new spending programs the cities have long wanted.

MOST EXPENSIVE DEPARTMENT

"To say that the bill merely conveys status to the present housing agency without transferring any functions in or out of the agency," say five Republican members of the House Government Operations Committee, "only describes the first step of the long-range strategy—a strategy apparently designed to bring the solution of the day-to-day problems of community life under the direction of centralized government."

Declares a minority report by two southern Democrats and two Republicans on the Senate Government Operations Committee: "A department of Government which will carry out the functions envisioned by the supporters of (this) plan will be the most powerful cabinet post—and it will be the most expensive."

The fight for the Department of Urban Affairs has been gathering momentum in recent years. President Eisenhower resisted it, warning that "nothing is really solved, and ruinous tendencies are set in motion, by yielding to the deceptive bait of the easy Federal tax dollar."

But the 1960 Democratic platform and Democratic presidential candidate John F. Kennedy made the Department of Urban Affairs a key campaign promise.

Shortly after Mr. Kennedy's election, some of his advisers started having second thoughts on the idea, and wished the administration weren't committed quite so firmly, but it was too late—particularly in view of the way the big-city leaders had delivered votes. The administration last spring recommended the plan, the two Government Operations Committees held hearings, and both approved the measure. It is ready for floor action early next year in both Senate and House.

The proposed bill would set up a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. It would immediately absorb the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency, including the Public Housing Administration, Federal Housing Administration, Urban Renewal Administration, Community Facilities Administration, and Federal National Mortgage Association.

In addition to administering these existing housing programs, the new department would be directed to study and advise the the President on new problems in housing and urban development, provide technical assistance to States and cities, encourage comprehensive State and local planning on community development, and coordinate Federal, State, and local programs for urban aid.

The bill has been caught in a slight crossfire because all indications are that President Kennedy intends to appoint as Secretary of the new department his present Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Robert Weaver. Mr. Weaver would thus become the first Negro Cabinet member, and this prospect has obliged some southerners who might ordinarily have supported the new department to oppose it. At the same time this prospect has brought support for the bill from some Republicans who might otherwise have opposed the department but now fear being placed in an anti-civil-rights position. Unless its opponents rally between now and the time the bill will be voted on in early 1962, the odds strongly favor its enactment.

Establishment of the new department would climax a trend that has been growing steadily in recent years—a trend of cities turning to Washington for financial help.

City officials claim this is the natural result of the Nation's increasing urbanization. Today, they point out, some 70 percent of all Americans live in about 200 metropolitan areas, and practically all future U.S. population growth is expected to be in urban areas. These new metropolitan areas, they continue, expand rapidly across city, county, and State lines. Their needs for new and enlarged local services outstrip the availability of local taxes, the argument goes.

So they turn to the States, and what do they find? According to city officials, they find a legislature whose membership was set back in the days when the States were predominantly rural rather than urban areas.

Even where the States are sympathetic, the cities say, they have run out of resources or lack the power to do anything for metropolitan areas that cut across State boundaries.

So the answer is to turn to the Federal Government.

Sponsors of the bill suggest that all they want for the cities is the same sort of representation other groups already get. They say the Agriculture Department represents the farmers, the Commerce Department represents business, the Labor Department represents workers, but no one represents the city dwellers.

Over and over they promise that the only purpose is to coordinate and help plan. "No new programs would be established by the bill, nor would existing provisions of substantive law be altered," the official Senate report on the bill goes out of its way to proclaim.

"There is considerable research being carried on today," asserts Mayor Richard Daley of Chicago, "but such studies are made in bits and pieces. The results are often not widely publicized, and a Federal department could not only develop its own program of essential information but would have channels available to distribute basic research studies to city, county and State officials."

Declares Senator JOSEPH CLARK, Pennsylvania Democrat and Senate sponsor of the new department: "State or city officials with complaints will have someone to whom to turn. A local official with an inquiry will be able to get one-stop service instead of being bucked around from one Federal agency to another."

Not only do the bill's sponsors protest their innocence of new spending aims; they assert it will make things more efficient and even more economical.

Senator KENNETH KEATING, New York Republican, another sponsor, argues: "The creation of a new department to deal with urban problems does not necessarily mean the Federal Government is going to spend more money. By bringing together under one department a number of separate agencies that now, in many cases, overlap, we may actually be able to realize considerable savings."

But opponents remain skeptical. They point to the past history of new departments, which rapidly become advocates and lobbyists within the Government for the groups they represent—the Agriculture Department fighting for bigger farm spending; the Labor Department pushing for more spending for workers; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare constantly supporting enlarged outlays in its areas. Appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the newest Cabinet post, have jumped from something under $2 billion in the year ended June 30, 1953, to more than $3.8 billion in the year ended June 30, 1961, while civilian employment in the agency has climbed from some 36,600 workers to almost 63,200.

It's far more than history and normal bureaucratic trends that worry the opponents of the Department of Urban Affairs. They're more concerned over the records of the chief backers of the new department.

The two main sponsors—the American Municipal Association and the U.S. Conference of Mayors—last year asked the Democratic and Republican nominating conventions to adopt urban affairs planks "endorsing the principle of Federal grants-in-aid as an appropriate method through which the National Government with its broadly based tax resources can fulfill its duties and obligations in helping local governments."

Specifically, the proposed plank called for Federal-city cooperation on "urban renewal, highways, mass transit, airports, water supply, air pollution, juvenile delinquency, hospital construction, atomic energy, civil defense, area redevelopment, payments in lieu of taxes, and public works."

In almost every bill considered by Congress this year in the welfare field, these groups fought for enlarged programs. For example, they called for a 5-year program of $100 million a year for airport help, with the Administrator having far more leeway in the type of projects to be helped. The previous program was $63 million a year. Congress authorized a new program of $75 million a year for 3 years.

The National Housing Conference urged that $1 billion a year be voted indefinitely for urban renewal; Congress actually voted $2 billion for a 3- to 5-year period.

Congress authorized $75 million of aid for commuter facilities and $50 million of Federal help for cities to acquire open spaces for parks, recreation, conservation and scenic areas; the urban groups suggested a $500 million, 10-year program of transportation help and a $500 million, 5-year program of open space support.

City officials urged not only continued and enlarged aid for new hospital construction but a $150 million annual program to modernize and renovate older hospitals. The municipal groups led a successful fight for more than double past Federal spending for community health services and facilities.

Advocates of the Urban Affairs Department have supported new programs of Federal spending—some large, some small—to combat air pollution, provide special housing for minority group members, build arterial streets, construct libraries and cultural facilities, subsidize public works planning, and help in locating and relocating industry.

The International Association of Fire Fighters even argued that "fire prevention in this day and age is no longer solely a matter of local concern, but is a serious national problem," and urged the Federal Government to provide technical assistance and planning aid to local communities in this field, help standardize equipment and appliances, and promote regional and interstate cooperation among fire departments.

NEED TO CUT DEFICIT

"There is a steady stream of pious protestations in Government," says the Senate minority report, "that we need to cut down the deficit and the public debt, but we will, in one sweeping gesture, create a Goliath which will drain our Treasury and which will keep a watchful police eye on every urban community and its citizens, planning, spending, directing, until citizens will not call city hall when streets need repair or a water main needs replacing, but will notify their Congressman to contact the Cabinet member handling such problems, seeking repairs and services."

Establishment of the Urban Affairs Department, opponents predict, will encourage groups pushing other new departments to lobby for their interests within the Government. Bills already are pending to set up a dozen other new Cabinet posts, ranging from a Department of Transportation and a Department of Science to a Department of Peace and even a Department of Public Relations.

Opponents use other powerful arguments, too. To the contention of the bill's backers that they want coordination, the opponents point out that two Federal agencies contributing from half to two-thirds of all residential mortgage financing are omitted from the new department—the Home Loan Bank Boards and the Veterans' Administration. The bill's critics suggest these have been deliberately omitted for the time being to avoid stirring up opposition from veterans and housing groups, but that once the bill is passed, the new agency will grab for them. The same argument is made about many other programs which logically could be expected to go into the new department but which are being left for the present in other agencies.

Thus, while the sponsors proclaim they want to give city officials one-stop service in Washington, they've carefully left in existing departments a long list of urban programs ranging from roads and airports to schools and water pollution treatment facilities.

The bill's backers have for the most part been carefully guarded in public about programs that might later be transferred to the new department, but every once in a while some clues are dropped. Thus Representative J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, the California Republican who was one of the department's first proponents, told the House Government Operations Committee that he thought such programs as helping cities to fight smog and polluted water "would be included, normally" in an Urban Affairs Department, and that aid for education "could well be transferred to this new department."

When the bill's adherents argue that cities deserve Cabinet representation, opponents counter that other Cabinet members such as the Attorney General, Secretary of Labor, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and others already serve urban interests, and that this new department would be the first setup on geographic rather than functional lines.

They suggest that cities should use the facilities of existing departments and, if something more is needed, it could be provided by a coordinating official in the Budget Bureau or White House—without any huge new bureaucracy set up to lobby for new spending. Cities can do far more to help themselves solve what are and must remain primarily local problems.

Finally, opponents make a major stand on the argument that the new department would undermine the traditional American Federal system. Cities, they say, would turn more and more to the Central Government, bypassing State and other local units. These would atrophy, and ultimately the cities themselves would be swallowed up by the Central Government.

"A powerful Cabinet department of this type would tend to weaken existing relationships between States and their political subdivisions and would materially accelerate the dependency of local government upon the National Government," the executive committee of the Governors' conference declared in opposing the proposed new department.

CITIES MIGHT DOMINATE

Said the National Association of County Officials: "We feel establishment of such a department may well empower large metropolitan cities to deal directly with the Federal Government, bypassing not only the States but local communities as well: Those of us at the local government level have grave concern that the proposed department, once set up, might strengthen the hand of the metropolitan core city to the extent it would be in a position, because of its close association with the Federal Government, to dominate other local municipalities which operate contiguously to or within the periphery of the core city's metropolitan area."

The Senate minority report warns that "a line of communications will be set up directly from the city mayor's office to the center of the Federal Government. County commissioners, State legislatures, Governors will be ignored." And as for the cities themselves, "If Washington pays the bill, Washington will direct the action. More than hopscotching over State and county government, this new department can eventually nullify local city government."

Naval Reserve Excellence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the President of the United States is calling up citizen reserves to strengthen our resistance to Communist aggression, we may well proudly note the outstanding achievement of one Naval Reserve Unit from my home area of Queens County, New York, Surface Division 3-76.

I was honored to be present on November 14th last, when this achievement was recognized at ceremonies attended by high-ranking military and civilian leaders, at the Whitestone Naval Reserve Center, Whitestone, N.Y.

This unit, comprised of 12 officers and 186 enlisted men, won not only the coveted Forrestal Trophy as the best Naval Reserve surface division in the country, but also three other regional and national awards for attaining the highest proficiency and mobilization readiness standards, in competiton with 177 similar divisions throughout the United States. This award is based upon achievement in the areas of on-board strength, attendance at drills, active duty for training, petty officer participation and advancement in rating. It is also notable that the companion Whitestone unit, Surface Division 3-77 at Whitestone, placed second in this national competition.

We must take our hats off to the able commanding officer of the winning unit, Comdr. Joseph C. Boyd, U.S. Naval Reserve. He is one of our community's finest citizens and one of the Navy's finest officers. Comdr. A. D. Oder, the commanding officer of Battalion 3-22, under which the two award-winning divisions operate, is likewise to be highly congratulated. This is the third year running that he was either the commanding officer of the winning surface division or of the battalion under which the winning division operated.

Credit should likewise go to Comdr. G. B. Lovejoy, who heads the Whitestone Naval Reserve Center, and his active duty station personnel, whose splendid support of both Whitestone surface divisions was an essential element in placing them at the top of the list.

Commending Commander Boyd and his unit, the Secretary of the Navy wrote:

> That your division has achieved top honors nationally is a tribute to the total effectiveness of the division's operations and to your own devotion to duty, professional compentence, and leadership ability. Besides achieving a commendable honor, you and your men have served your country well in increasing the mobilization readiness of your command and, therefore, the defense posture of the Nation.

Adm. George W. Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations, in a letter of congratulations to Commander Boyd, said:

> I, too, am indeed proud that you are being honored in this manner, not only because of the spirit, loyalty, zeal, and devotion to duty which won you this distinction, but also because you represent a strong and dedicated force which is so vital to the Navy and to our country in these critical times.

The commanding officer of the 3d Naval District, Adm. George Wales, likewise expressed his "well done," which is the Navy's highest compliment.

It is very gratifying to know that our Naval Reserve is strong and alert and standing by in readiness, and I cannot but feel proud that the best units come from my home county of Queens.

I hope that the Navy will give merited recognition to these dedicated officers and men who have done so well, and on whom so much depends.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of January 20, 1962:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

The U.S. budget fiscal year 1963 (July 1962 through June 1963), a summary of the President's recommendations for expenditures and estimation of receipts, reached Congress this week. Previously, as usual, each department and agency submitted requests for money, based on fulfilling existing law, previously passed by Congress and reflecting additional proposals by the President. The President proposes and Congress disposes. So now the Appropriation Committees of the House and Senate will make their respective studies and findings, and present appropriation resolutions which Congress will trim, add to, or defeat.

Some of the ironies and faults of our system include: (1) There is little, if any, real liaison between congressional committees relative to any sort of spending-income blueprint, including the budget. Rather, it is a piecemeal operation. (2) Government agencies pad their requests knowing Congress will trim to show fiscal responsibility and frugality. Result is confusing—more is spent than ever before but is less than requested, so Congressmen can have it both ways. (3) Backdoor spending, direct automatic withdrawals from the Treasury, violating constitutional procedures of going through congressional committees, now account for one-fifth of the budget ($20 billion last year though the President requested $29 billion). (4) There is no constitutional limitation to spending not exceeding income. The Chief Executive merely estimates the anticipated receipts but proposes the spending of whatever amount he desires.

The budget is not a reliable guideline, therefore, for these reasons and others, but it is a semblance of one. So we should note these particulars: (1) The cash budget shows proposed spending of $114.8 billion (not $92.5 billion of the administrative budget), and estimated receipts of $116.6 billion (not $93 billion); (2) the estimated receipts must go up $11 billion in the administrative budget, $14 billion in the cash budget just to break even. That means the gross national product, total U.S. business income, must jump from the approximate $520 billion level of 1961 to the forecasted $570 billion or Federal tax income will fall short and thus create a deficit. (I predict a deficit this year of several billions at least.) (3) Additional expenditures most assuredly will be asked by the President as the year progresses. (4) In our most prosperous year (a) no provision is being made to reduce our gigantic debt on which interest cost alone will be over $9 billion; (b) no tax reform and cuts, needed so badly, such as depreciation reform and reduction of each bracket, are planned. Indeed, the Korean wartime taxes are being asked for extension again. Further, tax increases are in prospect as well as postal rate increase.

This budget signals a rocketing into further Government tax, spending, and control. The Fabian Socialists surrounding the President obviously do not believe in individual initiative and freedom from tax and Government regulation. Fortunately, Congress has the option of cutting the spending, and the people can influence Congress, if not the Presidential aids.

The Dallas Federal Building was omitted from the budget, although approved and reapproved by the House and Senate. An oversight, of course, since the yearly rentals now paid exceed the cost of the new building by an estimated $990,000 a year. The administration, pledged to fiscal responsibility, cannot afford to overlook this economy. Nor is the convenience of central location to citizens and Federal personnel to be overlooked. I have called this to the attention of the Appropriation Committee chairman and ranking members.

The Ways and Means Committee of the House has the responsibility for both House and Senate of originating all revenue measures; that is, tax bills. Coincidentally, the key proposals of the President's program will come before this 25-man committee. Texas is fortunate to have two members on this key committee—with the Democratic election of CLARK THOMPSON—joining me. The tentative lineup of bills includes, first, the President's 10-point tax proposal, public assistance welfare changes, trade and tariffs extension and alteration, public debt increase, and medical care for the aged under social security. As I see it, elements in all five of these violate constitutional principles and, therefore, must be even more closely examined. (See last week's newsletter, Alger seven-point positive program.)

The weekly television series this year will include Ways and Means Committee personnel to inform further Dallas constituents and taxpayers.

Among CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statements I presented this week is the danger confronting all U.S. citizens in the right of association as found in private clubs. If Government can prescribe such association, logically there can be no freedom of association left, including within the home.

Additional legislation I shall support this year (beyond Alger bills already in the hopper) are: (1) U.S. withdrawal from the United Nations. (2) Withdrawal of U.S. subsidy of Communist propaganda distribution in the United States. (3) Foreign aid only to nations of free people, with democratically chosen governments (and then only on a self-help basis). (4) Withdrawal of U.S. recognition of any nation taken over by the Communist conspiracy; Yugoslavia, Poland, etc. (5) Reinstate the Monroe Doctrine in this hemisphere. (6) Reunification of all Germany. (7) Protection for U.S. citizens throughout the world from bodily harm and their property from expropriation.

To all my constituents I want it clearly understood that I shall continue to defend my proclaimed legislative principles, in terms of the great issues of the day, asking no quarter, giving no quarter. I shall not engage in personal recriminations nor attempted character assassination. I shall protect all taxpayers in my district, my State, and the Nation from the selfish desires of any individual, pressure group, or groups that want their way in Federal aid or control, but are unmindful (intentionally or unintentionally) of what is best for our Nation as a whole. This course of conduct alone will preserve our Republic in a democracy and the self-respect, dignity and freedom of our people. The contrary course will only downgrade our form of Government and our free society, if not destroy it.

So it is in keeping with this policy that I believe it is vital that the people know and understand the voting records of key Members of Congress as a guide to the liberal or conservative complexion of the two parties. I inserted a comprehensive report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this week, not to challenge the right of a Member to vote his convictions, but to put an end to the confusion which exists in the minds of some because the waters are often muddied. Copies of this report are available by writing my office.

BILLS INTRODUCED BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, 1ST SESSION, 87TH CONGRESS, 1961

There are several approaches a Member of Congress may use in introducing legislation. Some believe it is more effective to be identified with a volume of bills and, therefore, they sponsor measures on a variety of subjects. They increase the total by cosponsoring bills with which they are sympathetic and by introducing companion bills on the same subject.

My own approach is to limit the introduction of bills to those reflecting the basic principles in which I believe, the strengthening of constitutional government and the rights and liberties of the people. I cosponsor legislation or introduce companion bills only when I believe that by attaching my name to such a bill I can materially further its cause. Consequently, the measures I personally introduce are carefully selected according to this formula and are strictly limited in number. I do, of course, work closely with Members who sponsor bills in which I believe (1) in the Ways and Means Committee, (2) by testifying before other committees and, (3) on the floor of the House, and do all possible to help get them enacted.

In my opinion, this is the manner in which I can be most effective as a legislator. It should be kept in mind, too, in assessing the success of a Representative in affecting the enactment of legislation, that it is accepted practice in the House for the chairman of the committee handling the bill to attach his own name to it when it is reported from his committee.

In order to keep you informed, I am including, herewith, a list of the public bills and resolutions I introduced in the 1st session of the 87th Congress:

H.J. Res. 11. Calling for a constitutional amendment which would make it mandatory to balance the Federal budget each year.

H.J. Res. 138. Seeking a constitutional amendment which would prohibit the Federal Government from engaging in business in competition with private enterprise.

H.J. Res. 448. A declaration by the American people that the Government pursue such policies as will insure a victory over the worldwide Communist conspiracy.

H.R. 2200. Cosponsored with Congressman SID HERLONG, of Florida, and Congressman HOWARD BAKER, of Tennessee, for amending the Internal Revenue Code to bring about personal income and corporate tax reform.

H.R. 4573, H.R. 8407. To make labor unions subject to antitrust law. The second bill (H.R. 8407) is an amended version of the first to clear up any misunderstanding as to interpretation.

H.J. Res. 512. Calling for an amendment to the Constitution to protect the sovereignty of the United States by prohibiting treaties which will supersede the Constitution of the United States. (The Bricker amendment.)

And others of more specific nature dealing with particular problems within the framework of these same basic beliefs.

Address by Hon. Thomas J. Lane Before the National Legislative Committee of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I had the honor of giving before the National Legislative Committee of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., on January 22, 1962:

Mr. Chairman, Melvin D. Eddy, national legislative director, John Bashara, Sr., national commander, Michael J. Dwyer, national research consultant, George LaVorce, department of Massachusetts commander, and all department commanders, members of the National Legislative Committee of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., and invited and distinguished guests, friends of the Veterans of World War I, may I extend to your national commander, John Bashara, Sr., my sincere thanks and grateful appreciation for the kind invitation extended to me to speak before this National Legislative Committee of the Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Inc., at this meeting here at the Bellevue Hotel in Washington this morning.

I have had the greatest respect and admiration for your national officials and legislative officials for their work and their efforts in behalf of your organization, not only during the past year but in all previous years. They have worked untiringly and unselfishly in behalf of not only the organization and the veterans of World War I but the veterans of all wars here in the National Capital. They have presented to the Members of the Congress a constructive and worthwhile program which warrants the serious consideration of each and every Member of the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate in behalf of legislation to benefit these veterans.

It is difficult to understand why one administration after another in Washington suddenly becomes economy-minded whenever the subject of veterans' pensions comes up for consideration.

On the other hand, their generosity can hardly be restrained when it comes to giving out foreign aid, on which the United States has spent more than $100 billion since World War II.

Now most of us agree that foreign aid is essential for the strengthening of the free world. Some of those billions, however, have been given to Communist Yugoslavia, Communist Poland, and to so-called neutralist nations who take our money and then support the Communists in the United Nations.

Recently, our Government indicated that it would ask smaller appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and would cut back on funds necessary for the operation of the Pure Food and Drug Administration, and would curtail on cancer research.

At the same time, it proposed that the United States should underwrite half of the $200 million bond issue to save the U.N. organization from financial collapse. No mention was made of exerting pressure on the Soviet Union and some other nations to pay up their dues to the United Nations, which would make this extra gift on our part unnecessary.

Again, no one questions the need to maintain a strong defense force. Of the $50 billion spent each year for national security, a few billion could be salvaged for other programs through better planning and better management.

The callup of 120,000 reservists and National Guardsmen is a case in point. This will cost several hundred million dollars, with the prospect that these men, most of whom had already served a tour of active duty, will be released later on this year.

The Army has had the honesty to admit its mistake. There was faulty paperwork that caused hardship cases, a lack of medical care and housing in some cases, and faulty distribution of equipment.

What the reservists and many other Americans could not understand was why these men were mobilized for the second time, while millions of young men who had never served their country, were available through selective service.

These are some examples of the executive department's wastefulness on some programs, while it practices pennypinching economies at the expense of the veterans. Field contact offices of the Veterans' Administration have been closed down.

The legislative branch of our Government must share responsibility with the executive branch for these shortcomings.

In most of the States, persons on public welfare receive as much as $100 per month, and are provided with hospital and medical care. By contrast, the Federal Government shows less consideration for the veterans of World War I. Many of them never received disability compensation. They suffered hardship and disabilities that they could not prove as service connected because the Government was careless in maintaining health records covering their time in military service.

Now that our comrades have reached the average age of 67, too many of them have no social security protection, or only qualify for limited benefits. To support themselves they must depend on a small non-service-connected pension of $66.15 or $78.75 a month, with the exception of some who, under the law which became effective July 1, 1960, are entitled to a little more. World War I widows, again with some exceptions, are receiving pensions limited to $50.40 per month.

We have justice and precedent on our side in advocating a $100 a month pension for all veterans of World War I and their widows, with income limitations high enough to provide them with security and dignity in their years of retirement.

More than 15,000 of our comrades are passing away each month. If our Nation is to provide a decent measure of security for veterans of World War I, as proof of its gratitude, and to bring happiness to their last few years, it must act without further delay.

Over 200,000 members of World War I Veterans of the U.S.A., united and determined, remind the Congress that April 7, 1962, will mark the 45th anniversary of World War I.

As a member of Lawrence, Mass., Barracks 126, I shall work with you, and with my comrades of World War I in the Congress, to persuade my colleagues in Washington that this is the year to enact H.R. 3745 into law, and other bills.

The main objective of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. is to secure the enactment of a service pension, consistent with the pensions that have been awarded to the veterans of previous wars.

We have precedent and justice on our side in asking Congress to vote for H.R. 3745. In that bill we provide reasonable ceilings on additional income, in recognition of the fact that the pension itself is the irreducible minimum for those of our comrades who must depend upon it alone to support themselves.

In speaking to the department commanders from every State who form our national legislative committee, I do not have to repeat the reasons justifying a service pension for all qualifying veterans of World War I. Neither you nor I have any illusions about the difficulties of the fight ahead of us. But we shall go forward, more than 200,000 strong, certain that our cause is right, and confident of eventual victory toward enactment of our pension bill.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 21, my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, LUCIEN N. NEDZI, addressed the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., Hamtramck and northern Detroit branch, on the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include Congressman NEDZI's thoughtful remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

I welcome the opportunity to be here today to share with you this observance of the 44th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic.

Probably no ethnic group within the Soviet Union has suffered more, suffered longer, and resisted harder than the Ukrainians. The wall which today divides Berlin dramatizes to the world the oppressive nature of the Soviet state. A fact not nearly as well known is that 40 million people of the Ukraine have been walled in for over 40 years.

In my judgment, it is the duty of American Government officials to speak soberly and fairly about the realities of the world politics. They should not raise false hopes in the course of once-a-year speeches. Freedom for the Ukraine does not appear within reach, short of an all-out nuclear war which no responsible person advocates.

Is there any hope, then, or anything that can be done? Yes. We live in days when enormous social, economic, political, and scientific forces are at work, shaking our universe to its foundations. What appears hopeless today may become possible tomorrow. There may be light at the end of the long, dark tunnel.

History teaches us that the spirit of freedom cannot be starved. The will to resist is a stubborn thing. Three centuries ago the Ukraine was independent and comparatively rich. Then, despite hundreds of years of domination by the Russian and Austro-Hungarian Empires, the hunger for freedom was maintained, Ukrainian culture and language was preserved, the nationalist drive remained alive. In 1918 freedom was briefly achieved and independence declared.

But the freedom of a nation, when newly achieved, is often as delicate as a new-born baby. It needs time to strengthen itself against outside dangers. Precious time was denied to the Republic of the Ukraine. Hunger, disease, subversion, and war choked this young nation and tragedy was the result.

We know that, despite constant persecution, the restless Ukraine still causes the Soviet Union much concern. The Russians admit it. Khrushchev, at the 1956 Party Congress, disclosed that Stalin even considered total physical extermination of the Ukrainian people.

These 40 million people need a voice. Groups such as yours, good and worthy citizens of the United States and Canada, have given them a voice. And that voice is not forlorn. The world saw, in the highly agitated Russian reaction to the Captive Nations Resolution of July 1959 which included the Ukraine for the first time, that a tender nerve had been struck.

In this country we sometimes give the Communists more credit than they deserve in the arts of propaganda and diplomacy. Although we have our problems in the Congo, Berlin, Laos, and South Vietnam, the Soviets have their problems, too. They are not 10 feet tall. Their efforts to penetrate Africa have been largely unsuccessful; they face continuous crises in agriculture; internal doctrinal disputes are shaking the Red bloc to its roots; and satellite and captive nations are restless under governments which rule by force rather than persuasion. Let it not be forgotten that 45 percent of the Soviet Union is made up of non-Russians.

Our observation of Ukrainian Independence Day is a valuable thing. On this day (1) we show the people of the Ukraine that they are not forgotten; (2) we keep faith with what is morally right; (3) we reaffirm the principle of self-determination; and (4) we help remind the newly-emerging nations of Africa and Asia, whose leaders are often unfamiliar with all but recent history, that the Soviet Union is the last big remaining colonial empire on earth.

In doing these things we serve the cause of freedom.

Thank you for inviting me to share this occasion with you.

Analysis of the American Economy by Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for a thorough and balanced analysis of the present status and future prospects of the American economy, I commend to my colleagues the remarks of the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, at the 1962 Savings Bonds Conference on January 19, 1962:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AT THE 1962 SAVINGS BONDS CONFERENCE, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 19, 1962

I want to thank you for your interest in the savings bonds program. We value it as one of the Treasury's most important tools in managing the public debt, as well as a most effective way of encouraging individual citizens to share in the financial affairs of Government. It is also one of our country's most successful volunteer undertakings. Through the years, it has enlisted the patriotic support of hundreds of thousands of people, under the leadership of distinguished individuals like yourselves. With your help, the savings bonds program will make an ever greater contribution to the economic strength we urgently require to fulfill the heavy responsibilities history has thrust upon us.

Our economic policy plays a vital role in meeting those responsibilities, for it will determine whether the future finds us weak or strong—idling along at half speed—or running at full throttle, powered by our tremendous productive potential.

To achieve that potential, our immediate economic goals are these:

First, to reduce unemployment. We simply cannot afford the misery and waste of having a large part of our labor force idle.

Second, to reach a rate of economic growth sufficient to assure jobs for the millions of workers entering the labor market in the years ahead, to guarantee to our citizens the benefits of a thriving economy, and to build the capacity to meet our international obligations.

Third, to eliminate the deficit in our international balance of payments, and its accompanying gold loss, for a sound dollar is as essential abroad as it is at home.

And, finally, to maintain reasonable price stability, so that our citizens may enjoy the full fruits of their savings, so that our economic gains are not wiped out by inflation, and so that our goods can compete successfully in world marketplaces.

We made considerable progress over the past year toward these objectives. At the close of 1961, our domestic economy reached record highs in terms of gross national product, personal income, industrial production, and manufacturers' sales and new orders. Unemployment has finally begun to drop, and we expect it to decline further in the months ahead. Our gold loss in 1961 was just half the 1960 figure, the basic deficit in our balance of payments was cut by two-thirds, and the overall deficit by more than a third.

These gains were achieved in good measure because our fiscal and monetary policies were geared to the requirements of last year's recession and early recovery.

Largely because of increased defense needs, coupled with recession-level revenues, our national budget was in deficit—a deficit that, because of the recession, was both acceptable and inevitable. However, the economic growth forecast for 1962, with resulting higher revenues, makes it both desirable and possible—barring unpredictable international emergencies—to achieve a fully balanced budget in fiscal year 1963, as the President has recommended.

One of our most urgent national needs is a heavily accelerated flow of private investment into productive channels. A balanced budget stimulates such investment because it makes it unnecessary for the Government to tap the savings and credit that would otherwise be available for private investment. A balanced budget also facilitates the task of our monetary authorities, who strive to assure an adequate supply of funds for private investment at the same time that they guard against inflation.

Our policy of balancing the budget and simultaneously stimulating the flow of funds into private channels, reflects our firm belief that Government spending is not a satisfactory substitute for private investment. We look to private funds to finance the new factories, new tools, and new machinery that create more, better, and cheaper goods. A substantial and increasing flow of private investment is essential to economic growth in our free society.

It is disturbing, therefore, that our present level of investment is far from adequate. Over the past decade, nearly all of the major industrial nations of the free world had a substantially higher rate of domestic investment than the United States. Furthermore, their ratio of productive investment to total output has been growing, whereas ours has been declining. Investment sparked the phenomenal growth of Japan and the Common Market countries of Western Europe, by contributing to rapid modernization of productive machinery and equipment. More modern equipment means more efficient production, and lower unit cost—hence more competitive capacity. As a result, friendly foreign nations are providing increasingly stiff competition for American manufacturers, both here and abroad.

For the future, then, a major goal of our economic policy is a sharply increased level of productive private investment, because it will:

Help our balance of payments by making our manufacturers more competitive, thus increasing our export surplus.

Help speed economic growth by increasing our productive capacity.

Help reduce unemployment by providing more jobs as new markets create new demand, and increased research and technology penetrate new manufacturing frontiers.

Finally, and most important, heavier investment will help to maintain price stability through lower production costs and higher productivity.

In addition to presenting a balanced budget, we are also proposing changes in our tax treatment of depreciation to stimulate business investment in productive machinery and equipment. Our program of depreciation reform involves both new legislation and the full use of existing administrative authority. On the legislative side, we are asking for an 8 percent tax credit for new investment in productive equipment. On the administrative side, we are updating depreciation schedules to take account of technological advances which have altered previous standards of obsolescence. This has already been largely accomplished for the textile industry, and we plan to announce revisions in depreciation guidelines for all other major industries this spring.

Such use of tax policy to stimulate the modernization and expansion of productive equipment is a major part of our effort to accelerate the long-range economic growth we need to achieve our true potential and to improve our balance of payments.

The heart of our balance of payments problem is this: We must generate a large enough commercial trade surplus to counterbalance our essential expenditures abroad. These expenditures include, in relative order of magnitude: First, the cost of our military forces overseas; second, private American investment in other countries; and third, that portion of our foreign aid not spent here for American products or services.

Our trade surplus—the excess of commercial exports over imports of goods and services—is substantial. But in recent years it has not been large enough to offset the balance of payments impact of our overseas operations. That shortfall constitutes the basic deficit in our international payments.

Preliminary figures indicate that last year our basic deficit was no more than a third of the basic deficit of $1.9 billion in 1960, and was far below the $4.3 billion in 1959. During the first 6 months of 1961 we actually ran a surplus in our basic accounts, as imports shrank because of the recession. During the third quarter, a sharp rise in imports brought with it the renewal of a substantial basic deficit which continued in the final quarter of the year—although at a diminished rate. With the sole exception of 1957, when the Suez Canal was closed and we exported unusual quantities of oil to Europe, 1961 provided the best record since we started running deficits in 1949. True, advance repayments of long-term debts—amounting to $650 million—were unusually large last year. However, the improvement was still substantial.

But improvement in our basic deficit is not enough. We must bring it under complete control so that we can look forward to full balance—and to surpluses whenever they may be required in our overall national interest. We can accomplish this only by enlarging our export surplus, and by reducing outpayments when we can do so without curtailing activities vitally important to our Nation's future.

Our own security and our responsibilities to the free world require us to keep our troops abroad. We cannot endanger our security by withdrawing them in order to balance our international accounts. But we can and must find every possible way of limiting or offsetting the dollar outflow that inevitably accompanies the stationing of troops overseas. We are doing just that through a combination of economies and cooperative arrangements with certain of our allies. As a result, we can look forward to a substantial reduction in the dollar drain of our oversea forces.

In the case of private investment, we do not desire to reduce the flow abroad by imposing controls that would run counter to the principles of free trade and free competition so basic to our national purpose. We can, however, lessen the special inducements to American investment in other industrial countries that are part of our present tax system. That is why we are urging tax legislation to minimize such incentives.

Although our foreign assistance programs contribute to our annual dollar outflow, they do so to a far lesser degree than their overall amount might suggest. Two-thirds of all foreign aid expenditures are now being made here in the United States. Only the remaining third affects our payments position. We are making vigorous efforts to cut the balance of payments impact of foreign economic aid still further, and we hope to get it down to approximately one-fifth.

In the long run, however, the only way to eliminate our basic deficit is by increasing our export surplus. This will require the combined efforts of management, labor, and Government. Management, and labor, must work together to assure reasonable price stability so that our exporters can maintain their price competitiveness—and, we hope, improve it. Industry must modernize at a rapid rate. I have already told you what Government is doing in the field of depreciation reform to assist modernization. Government must also help to assure a supply of export credit to our traders as good as that available to their oversea competitors. We will very soon be in a position to do so for the first time through the operation of an export credit insurance program developed jointly by the Export-Import Bank and the insurance industry. Finally American business—of which only a small percentage is now in the export field—must aggressively search out foreign trading opportunities wherever they may be. This is in the best tradition of our trading forebears, and it has never been more necessary than today.

Fortunately, the possibilities for increasing our oversea sales are excellent. The world is entering an entirely new trading era that holds out great promise for our exporters. In the case of our existing markets, we have only to look at the scope of the resurgent prosperity of Western Europe, and the emergence of the European Common Market, to see Europe's potential for our exports. And, although our markets in less-developed areas are limited today, as these countries grow and prosper, their demands for our goods will also grow.

Furthermore, in Europe and other parts of the world, thousands of American products are still virtually unknown. American business is just beginning to probe huge potential markets for them. Success in developing these markets will require bold enterprise and skillful competition.

If American business is to find new customers in Europe, we must deal with the Common Market on the matter of mutual tariff reduction. Congress must grant the President power to negotiate on a broader basis than present legislation allows. If Congress fails to provide this authority, American producers will be seriously handicapped in their efforts to retain and to expand their share of this large and rich trading area.

Now, let me turn to our overall payments deficit, which reflects both our basic deficit and short-term capital flows. Through 1959, short-term flows were small and usually favorable to our balance of payments. This was natural, since the currencies of other industrialized countries were not generally convertible, hence, not too attractive to foreign holders. However, with convertibility, money began to flow from one financial center to another in search of higher interest rates or speculative profits. The result was a substantial outflow of short-term funds from the United States, which in 1960 amounted to $2 billion.

This large short-term outflow obscured the dramatic improvement in our basic balance during 1960 and led to an overall deficit of $3.9 billion. Although altered in nature, substantial short-term outflows continued during 1961.

These short-term flows can be caused by various factors—a lessening of confidence or disparities in interest rates—as in the fall of 1960, or credits related to trade—as was largely the case this past year, when a substantial part of the outflow was in the form of bank loans to Japan to finance her growing imports.

Such short-term flows, when carried to excess, can be unhealthy—even dangerous. We have worked hard to neutralize them. We have held our short-term interest rates at levels that largely negated the attraction of foreign market rates. The Federal Reserve has increased the legal limit on the interest that may be paid on time deposits, thus enabling American banks to compete more effectively with their foreign counterparts. Our most recent step was taken earlier this month when the United States and nine other members of the International Monetary Fund agreed that $6 billion in additional resources should be provided for standby lending commitments to the Fund. These supplementary resources would be used to protect the world payments system, and would be available to the 10 participating countries, including the United States.

One aspect of our balance-of-payments deficit is worth stressing: The balance of payments is an accounting of transactions that affect the gold and liquid liability of the United States. It does not reflect long-term claims represented by U.S. investment abroad. For the 3 years 1958 through 1960, for instance, our payments deficits totaled $11 billion, of which about $5 billion represented our gold losses and $6 billion represented liquid dollar gains by foreigners. However, this loss was to a large extent matched by increased U.S. holdings of both short-term and long-term foreign assets.

Total foreign assets and investments of all sorts in the United States rose by about $13 billion from the end of 1957 to the end of 1960. During the same period, total U.S. Government and private loans and investments abroad (excluding loans repayable in local currency) increased by about $14.5 billion—a net gain to the United States of $1½ billion. However, we also lost $5 billion in gold. Thus our overall gold and international investment position showed a loss for the 3-year period of only about $3.5 billion net, in contrast to the deterioration in our current position of $11 billion as measured by our balance-of-payments account.

While this demonstrates that our long-term position is considerably stronger than balance-of-payments figures alone indicate, it in no way reduces the importance of putting an early end to the substantial payments deficits we have had since 1949. We must get our current balance in order so as to end the drain on our gold stocks.

I have outlined the principal elements of our foreign and domestic economic policy. Our prospects, both at home and abroad, are good, but we have much to do to insure that they remain so.

At home, I think everyone agrees that our first obligation is to reduce the unacceptably high level of unemployment. To be sure, for the last 2 months, unemployment has dropped close to 6 percent, after hovering near 7 percent most of the year. And we expect it to drop below 5 percent by the end of the year, as long-range expansion takes hold. However, there is a hard core of unemployment which continued expansion may not touch. That is why we urgently need a manpower retraining bill, to ease the lingering human misery and chronic economic waste that such unemployment represents.

In addition, nearly a million young people in our country are neither earning nor learning. This dismal fact illustrates the need for a Youth Employment Opportunities Act, to insure that such frightening waste of our national potential does not continue.

And finally, although we look forward to prosperity, we cannot guarantee that there will never be another recession. To prepare for that possibility, President Kennedy has asked for three major countercyclical measures: broadened unemployment insurance, a standby program of public works, and the authority to promptly initiate limited and temporary tax reductions. These are needed in the earliest stages of recession—when quick action can accomplish effective results.

The achievement of our economic goals will not be easy. But it is our responsibility to demonstrate to the world the economic vitality of a free nation, and the value of a free enterprise society where labor, business, finance, and Government work together within the framework of a competitive price system, responding to the market forces of supply and demand.

The stimulus of competition has brought us the world's highest standard of living. Let us use our economic strength to develop our Nation to its true potential, to distribute the benefits of growth among our people, and to share our way of life with all the peoples of the world who choose the path of freedom.

It's Time for Atlantic Alliance—Two Republicans Say Kennedy Set Sights Too Low

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, my conferences with government leaders in Western Europe last October convince me that the issue of extension of our Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act provides both Congress and the President an opportunity to re-assert American leadership throughout the free world.

Senato Prescott Bush of Connecticut and Congressman Thomas Curtis of Missouri have made a constructive and bold effort to develop a much broader approach than has been evident to date—an approach which does give real meaning to the critical need for American leadership.

The Minneapolis Star for January 16 prints a synopsis of the comprehensive Bush-Curtis treatise, and I recommend it highly.

It's Time for Atlantic Alliance—Two Republicans Say Kennedy Sets Sights Too Low

(By Senator Prescott Bush, Republican of Connecticut, ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee, and Representative Thomas B. Curtis, Republican of Missouri, ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy)

The President's announced determination to forge closer links between the United States and the nations of Western Europe merits the approval of all Americans.

Certainly, we of the Republican party are fully aware of the importance of a greater degree of unity and agreement upon common purposes in the free world. We are pleased therefore that the present administration is continuing the effort made by the previous administration to achieve these ends.

Indeed, we believe the present administration may have set its sights too low. Has not the time now come to work vigorously to form a concert of free nations within which all other freedom-loving friendly countries and the United States may work in harmony to counter the challenge of the Soviet Union, Communist China, and the Communist bloc satellites?

Now is the time, we believe, to press for the formation of such an alliance. Freed of the frustrations which beset the free world in the United Nations, it could accomplish much toward winning the cold war.

We do not recommend abandonment of the United Nations, but it is painfully evident that it is an ineffective instrument for achieving the objectives America shares with Western Europe. As a forum in which tensions between the East and West may be relieved, or in which the newly developing nations may voice their aspirations, the U.N. may continue to serve a useful purpose.

We share, however, the views expressed by John J. McCloy (the President's disarmament adviser), Senator Fulbright, and others that a new alliance of free nations is needed to meet the challenge of world communism which the U.N. Assembly majority has evaded.

As a start toward formation of such an alliance, we urge the administration to seek to expand the framework of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization so as to provide for closer ties between them and free nations outside the Atlantic Community.

The NATO treaty provides, in article 2, that members will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any and all of them.

Here without further ado or legislation, we already have the authority and foundation for wide economic negotiation and collaboration. The administration should press for full implementation of this provision.

The issues involved in the administration's vaguely-outlined proposals that Congress give to the President new broad and sweeping power to negotiate tariff reductions are of such gravity that partisanship centered on domestic political considerations must be rigidly excluded. These issues must be fully explored.

It would be extremely unfortunate if the debate on extension or revision of the Trade Agreements Act were to be conducted in the black-and-white terms of "free trade" versus "protectionism."

We deplore the tendency, already evident in some quarters, to picture those who refuse to accept blindly proposals which the administration itself has yet to specify as advocates of retreating to a Fortress America, allegedly cowering behind exclusionary tariff walls.

Major questions raised by the subcommittee's hearings include:

1. Is it necessary at this time to give the President broad new powers to negotiate tariff reductions with the European Economic Community (Common Market)?

2. Can increased exports solve the U.S. balance of payments problem?

3. Will American industry's ability to compete really be increased by mutual across-the-board tariff reductions by the United States and the Common Market?

4. Will Western Europe accept increased imports from Japan and other low-wage countries?

5. Can the United States and Western Europe agree on a mutual program to provide adequate markets for the products of the developing tropical countries—in Latin America and Africa?

6. Are the United States and Western Europe presently prepared to press for free trade in agriculture and in energy resources?

7. Can and will Western Europe and the United States agree on a joint policy respecting trade with Communist bloc nations?

8. Will a "trade and life adjustment" program, as hinted in vague terms by the administration, be effective in relieving the admitted hardships forced by tariff cuts?

These questions need to be fully answered. Certainly they cannot be swept under the rug in the great debate which will inevitably result from the administration's request.

Our major objection to the program as discussed to date is that it tends to focus public attention on only one problem among the many related problems which confront the United States in the task of forging closer unity among the industrialized nations of the free world.

The questions we have raised outline some of these problems, among which we would underscore the following for which solutions deserve higher and more urgent priorities:

1. The need for vigorous action by the United States toward formation of a new alliance of free nations outside the framework of the United Nations.
2. The need for a more equitable sharing of the burdens of the common defense against Communist imperialism.
3. The present lack of a unified free nations policy respecting trade with the Soviet Union, Communist China and the Communist satellite nations.
4. The persistent and dangerous deficit in the U.S. balance of payments.
5. Rigid protectionism by the United States and Western Europe in agriculture and energy resources.
6. The need for Western Europe to accept a greater share of the increasing industrial output of Japan and other lowest-wage countries.
7. The need for the United States and Western Europe to agree on the provision of adequate markets for the products of the developing nations of Latin America and Africa.
8. The need for improvement in the competitive position of American industry in world markets.

There are other problems, notably that of preserving industries and industrial skills which are essential to the national defense and whether, and to what extent, subsidies are necessary for this purpose, as in the case of the merchant marine. This vital question received little attention in the subcommittee's hearings.

We believe that instead of myopic concentration on the limited field of tariffs on industrial goods, the administration should broaden its vision to encompass the whole wide range of problems which must be resolved before the industrialized free nations can more effectively pool their resources to insure victory in the cold war.

Again, we urge the administration to take dynamic and vigorous action toward the formation of a new alliance of free nations in which these problems can be considered in proper perspective and steps taken toward a more equitable and widespread sharing of the burdens of the common defense against Communist imperialism. In such action, we believe, lies the ultimate triumph of freedom in the cold war.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 23, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, again in Thy great mercy the white scroll of a new page unfolds before us. We pray that this day our record may be kept unstained by any word or act unworthy of our best.

Once more a seat in this Chamber to which nevermore will return the one who has so faithfully occupied it reminds us with a new urgency of how short and uncertain is our stewardship of the Nation's weal. We thank Thee for public servants of the character and caliber of Andrew Schoeppel, who has served his State and his Nation with selfless dedication and unsullied integrity. We ask for the consolation of Thy sustaining strength upon the dear companion of the years, as the one is taken and the other left.

Leaving an enduring record of public devotion and the benediction of a noble character, now that for our colleague the busy world is hushed, vouchsafe to him, O Lord, light and peace and joy in the life everlasting. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 22, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Andrew F. Schoeppel, late a Senator from the State of Kansas.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it the understanding of the Chair that the time limitation is in effect as of now?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that without application of the time limitation, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] be recognized at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE TO ATTEND FUNERAL OF THE LATE SENATOR SCHOEPPEL

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I submit a resolution for which I request immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 272) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed to arrange for and attend the funeral of the Honorable Andrew F. Schoeppel, late a Senator from the State of Kansas, on vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

FORTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE UKRAINE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, notwithstanding the application of the time limitation under the unanimous-consent agreement, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may proceed to address the Senate for 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, January 22, 1962, marked the 44th anniversary of the proclamation issued by the National Council at Kiev, declaring the Ukraine to be a free and independent Republic. But the people of Ukraine had a very short time to rejoice in their newfound freedom, for in 1920 Communist Russia brutally subjugated the people of Ukraine, and have contained and tormented them within the Iron Curtain since that time. The Ukraine territory now under domination of the Soviet Union is a much larger territory than that of many of the free nations of the world. The people are farmers, and the territory is known as the breadbasket of the Iron Curtain. Like many other wonderful people in Europe and Asia under the domination of communism, the Ukraine people have lived under the darkest hours in the history of mankind because of the great crimes and brutalities created against them during the era of Stalin, and continuing up to now by his successors. If the crops had gone bad, untold brutalities would have been perpetrated against these people. This is only one of the many examples of the great suffering that prevails. However, the Ukraine people never gave up their hope of freedom. Just like the peoples in other captive nations behind the Iron Curtain—Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Albania, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, to name a few—the Ukraine people dream of the day when freedom will again come to them. It is these dreams of freedom that motivate these peoples behind the Iron Curtain and give them the determination to move forward toward freedom.

Mr. President, there have been initiated in the Congress numerous resolutions pertaining to the designation of a Captive Nations Week honoring those who have shown dedication to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain, that they may some day become free; and one of these resolutions became law—Public Law 86–749. It authorized a Shevchenko statue, in honor of the great hero of the Ukrainian people. The Congress of the United States also issued House Document No. 445, "Europe's Freedom Fighter," which powerfully counteracts the Communist distortions about bourgeois nationalism in Ukraine and other captive non-Russian nations in the "Union of Soviet Slave Regions."

Even in the face of the action taken by the Congress of the United States to highlight the grim determination of these captive peoples to become free, the Communist leaders have been stretching their sphere of influence into southeast Asia, into Africa, and to the island of Cuba, 90 miles away from the southern tip of the Florida shore, which also penetrates across the Gulf of Mexico; and there is always that constant threat of Communist influence reaching the countries in South America and other countries south of our borders.

Mr. President, we should be ready at every possible opportunity to show to the world the false philosophy of the Communists, who take the initiative on the colonialism issue, when mountains of evidence sustain the undisputable fact of Russian imperialism and colonialism both within and without the Soviet Union.

If the free nations throughout the world would only apprise themselves of the false designs that communism has toward their nations, then they would be less prone to listen and be taken in by the promises of communism.

Father Bohdan S. Zelechiwsky, Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the United States of America, South Bound Brook, N.J., offered the prayer in the Senate on January 22, 1962, and I join him in his plea:

> Father of all nations, we pray to Thee that the Ukrainian Nation and all other nations in captivity may soon have a new birth of freedom, that they may take their rightful place among the free nations of the world, under the spreading canopy of Thy universal love and care.

Mr. President, just as a personal observation, I believe that in the city of Chicago there probably reside between 30,000 and 40,000 Ukrainian people. Never have I encountered finer citizens, never have I seen a more redoubtable people, never have I seen a people who take better care of their educational and their religious needs with the building of schools and churches, and without resort to any public funds, than the Ukrainian people, courageous and independent; and no people has a greater devotion to the cause of freedom.

I recall that on one occasion, when I addressed their annual picnic and sought to interpret their flag—gold and yellow, like the wheatfields of the Ukraine under an azure sky—never have I seen a greater emotional response in all my life. I salute them; and I join them in the hope that one day they, too, will retrieve their freedom.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, January 22 was the 44th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. This year, more than ever before, we in the United States must proclaim our continuing hope that the Ukrainian people will again be free.

The Ukrainian people proclaimed their independence on January 22, 1918, after a long struggle that began in the mid-17th century when the Ukrainians were brought under Russian rule. But by 1920 Red army troops, in a pattern that was to be repeated time and again throughout much of Europe and Asia, crushed the new republic and brought the people under Communist rule. For more than four decades they have been held down by heartless overlords who have conducted reigns of terror and oppression that are almost without parallel in human history.

Each year people in the free world have called attention to this oppression and expressed their sympathy for the people of the Ukraine. In recent years these expressions have brought more and more violent replies from the Russians. We have good reason to believe that our constant reference to this tyranny has had its effect.

Today the monolithic Communist empire is giving every evidence of cracking. Not only are the Soviets and Red Chinese engaged in a bitter ideological debate, but national leaders within many of the Communist nations seem to be coming more restive under the rule of the Kremlin.

So we must say again that we in the United States do not recognize the oppression of once free people who are now captives. We must declare with new vigor that there may come a day when these men and women will regain their national sovereignty. And we can say that the day may be closer than anyone realizes when these people may rejoin the family of free nations.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, an anniversary was celebrated yesterday that should receive the attention of all men and all governments, especially those of the so-called neutrals which court the favor of the Soviet Union or the Chinese Communist Republic.

The occasion is the 44th anniversary of the proclamation by the National Council of Kiev declaring the Ukraine to be a free and independent republic. The span of freedom enjoyed by the people of the Ukraine was only 2 years and terminated tragically in 1920 with the complete domination of that nation of about 40 million persons by the ruthless Bolsheviks of Russia.

We must remember that the people of the Ukraine are different than the Russians ethnically, they have a separate and distinct social and cultural heritage, and a distinct religious adherence. They had, in 1918, all the attributes of a separate people and they had the resources and the talent to be one of the great independent nations of the world.

These facts did not stop the Bolsheviks, however. They suppressed the Ukrainian people and proceeded to force them into the Marxist mold. This was done in such a brutal manner, under the direction of Lenin and Stalin, that almost 5 million people in the Ukraine reportedly died in the forced famines and over 2,400,000 Ukrainians were forcibly removed from their homeland to other parts of the Soviet Union.

Khrushchev himself has described in part the mass murders and other crimes of Stalin. Left to be described are the crimes of Khrushchev himself in the long series of events that led to his advancement to the Premiership of the Soviet Union.

The record of the years since the Bolshevik revolution should serve first, in the context of this statement, as a tribute to the brave people of the Ukraine who have never lost hope for regaining independence, and secondly, as a reminder to those nations, especially the new nations, that in toying with the Communists and their philosophy they too may be engulfed as was the Ukraine and the other captive nations.

We join with the millions of Americans of Ukrainian descent and freedom-loving people everywhere in expressing the hope that the future will see the Ukraine once again free among the family of nations.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, yesterday, January 22, marked the glorious and sorrowful anniversary of Ukrainian independence. Forty-four years ago the Ukrainian National Republic came into being. The glorious anniversary of that event was made a sorrowful occasion when the Ukraine was crushed by Soviet military power.

The Ukraine and its people have a long and deep history, a history of glory and tragedy. The glory shines steadily from the aspiration and efforts for national freedom. The tragedy arises from the constant presence and pressure of an autocratic Russian neighbor. The immediate factor which permitted Ukrainians to declare their national independence in 1918 was the slackening of pressure from the Russians, disrupted and weakened by war and revolution. Unfortunately for the Ukraine and for all of us, the Communist regime of Russia soon recovered its military strength and retained the aggressive dream of empire of its czarist forebears. The Ukraine was one of the first to suffer in a process which now has become only too familiar in other parts of the world.

The cause for sorrow on this anniversary of the Ukraine is that those within the country cannot join their fellows outside in free celebration. But this sorrow need not be permanent. For if the long course of Ukraine history has brought much tragedy and sorrow, it has also proven the enduring aspiration and will of men, and of Ukrainians in particular, to be free and to be masters of their own destiny.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, freedom-loving people everywhere yesterday celebrated the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. Although these gallant people maintained their Republic for only 2 years before being overrun by Soviet Russia, the ideals represented by their struggle live on as a source of courage and inspiration to countless unfortunate individuals presently enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

The president of the North Dakota State Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America is my longstanding friend, Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, of Steele, N. Dak. The organization he represents includes many outstanding Americans of Ukrainian descent. These citizens have always given forceful expression to the rights of national self-determination as opposed to Communist totalitarianism. As part of the observance of this anniversary, the North Dakota Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America issued a press release for use by news media in my State. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the Record as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Ukrainian Independence Day

On January 22, 1962, it will be 44 years since a free and independent state of the Ukrainian people was established, which was on January 22, 1918, in Kiev, the capital of the Ukraine.

On January 22, 1918, a free and democratically elected parliament and government issued a solemn act and proclamation of the reestablishment of the Ukraine as a sovereign independent nation, called the Ukrainian National Republic.

On this occasion we would like to recall that on November 25, 1961, the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. representative to the United Nations, addressed the U.N. General Assembly, in which he expressed the views of the U.S. delegation on the Soviet memorandum regarding colonialism and imperialism, and it was one of the finest and best U.S. presentations in the United Nations yet on Russian Communist colonialism in the U.S.S.R. Mr. Stevenson said that the Soviet Union has been waging a war on colonialism in the U.N., but only against the so-called Western colonialism, while, in fact, Mr. Stevenson contended, the U.S.S.R. today is the greatest empire in the world where millions of enslaved people are denied the right of self-determination and independence. Citing a declaration of rights issued by the Russian Bolsheviks in 1917, which proclaimed "the right of the nations of Russia to free self-determination, including the right to secede and form independent states," Mr. Stevenson stated:

"How did this right work in practice? An independent Ukrainian Republic was recognized by the Bolsheviks in 1917, but in 1917 they established a rival Republic in Kharkov. In July 1923, with the help of the Red army, a Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic was established and incorporated into the U.S.S.R."

We recall these pronouncements on Ukraine by the highest U.S. official at this time as this month Ukrainians in the free world will observe the 44th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic.

The young and democratic Ukrainian State was recognized by a number of governments, including the Soviet Russian Government, and it endeavored to pursue its own free course in harmony and peace with other nations. But Communist Russia began a war of aggression against Ukraine, despite the fact that it officially recognized the independence of Ukraine and pledged itself to respect the sovereignty of the Ukrainian nation. For almost 4 years the Ukrainian nation gallantly defended its newly established state, but, deprived of military, economic, and diplomatic support by the Western nations, it succumbed to the superior military forces of Communist Russia. By the end of 1920, Ukraine was occupied by Russian Communist troops which helped to establish a puppet Communist regime, which eventually proclaimed itself a Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and, in 1923, it was made a part of the Soviet Union.

But the Ukrainian people have never accepted the Communist yoke imposed upon them by Moscow and have continued to fight for their liberation. In the past four decades the Ukrainians have given ample proof of their love of freedom and their desire for genuine independence. Russian Communist persecution and oppression of Ukraine has evoked worldwide protests and indignation. We recall that during the 1960 session of the U.N. General Assembly a number of Western statesmen, including Hon. John G. Diefenbaker, Prime Minister of Canada, raised their voices in protest against the oppression and enslavement of the Ukrainian nation by Communist Russia. Both the U.S. Congress and the President of the United States of America have recognized the plight of the Ukrainian people by respectively enacting and signing the Captive Nations Week resolution, which listed Ukraine as one of the captive nations enslaved by the Soviet Union.

Today, the Ukrainian people everywhere are celebrating the memorable date of January 22, 1918, as their greatest national holiday. The Russian puppets who pose as a Ukrainian Soviet Government in Kiev are neither representatives of the Ukrainian people nor the Ukranian patriots. The true Ukrainian Government exists to this very day in exile, while millions of Ukrainian patriots are either in the underground resistance, exiled in Siberia or genocided en masse by the Russians.

But there is a lesson to be drawn from this Ukrainian Independence anniversary. The West has played an ignominious role by blindly rejecting all the Ukrainian pleas for help. Instead, it supported anachronistic and antidemocratic Russian generals and admirals who aimed to restore what could never be restored; czarist despotism. Instead of giving tangible assistance to the Ukrainians and other non-Russian nations, which alone were fighting the Bolsheviks, the West procrastinated.

Today, after 44 years of unrelenting struggle against Moscow, the Ukrainians have made much progress, and their cause is known in the world as never before.

The cause of Ukrainian freedom and independence is no longer a patiotic desire of the Ukrainians. It has become a political necessity for a free world, since independent Ukraine means a substantial weakening of the Soviet Communist empire, and therefore the permanent Soviet threat which hangs over an intimidated humanity.

Americans of Ukrainian descent in the State of North Dakota are planning to celebrate the forthcoming 44th anniversary of Ukraine independence on January 22, 1962 in Wilton and Belfield, in a fitting and appropriate manner. And since the United States of America remains a true citadel of freedom and a hope for oppressed peoples everywhere, the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian independence provides a proper occasion for the people of the United States to demonstrate their sympathy with and understanding of the aspirations of the Ukrainian nation to freedom and independence.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian people proclaimed the establishment of the Ukrainian Republic. This happy event was the culmination of a struggle of centuries for independence of the Ukrainian people from czarist Russian domination.

Mr. President, this marks the 44th anniversary of the birth of the Ukrainian Republic. But today we find the Ukrainian people deprived of their independence, deprived of their liberty, deprived of their legitimate nationalistic aspirations by the imperialistic domination of their country by Soviet Russia.

The Ukrainian Republic proclaimed in 1918 was short-lived. In 1920 Red Russian armies invaded the Ukrainian Republic and with fire and sword imposed a Communist tyranny upon the Ukrainian people.

But the spirit of the Ukrainian people was unbroken. It remains unbroken today. The Ukrainian people today still dream of the day when freedom and national independence will be theirs.

Americans of Ukrainian background have not forgotten their brothers behind the Iron Curtain. They have preserved the language, the music, the customs and the ancient culture of the Ukraine. And they constantly remind their fellow Americans of the plight of the Ukrainians suffering under the repression of Soviet imperialism.

It is well that we today here in this Senate announce to the world that the legitimate national aspirations of the Ukrainian people are not forgotten, that we remain concerned with the desires of all peoples to be free and to preserve their historical and cultural heritages; and that we reaffirm the principle that all peoples have a right to be free of imperialistic domination and to be masters of their own destinies.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, yesterday was the 43d anniversary of Ukrainian independence, and I think it befits the American people to pay tribute to this proud and freedom-loving people who for centuries have suffered severe hardships under a succession of alien rulers.

The Ukrainian people have a distinct language and culture which is quite different from that of Russia; in addition, the Ukraine has a long and honorable history of democratic institutions and an understanding of individual liberty.

Yet, for more than six centuries, the Ukraine has been devastated and ruled by one invader after another, until, at the end of the 18th century, the area came under the heel of that most oppressive of all colonial powers, Russia.

During the 19th century, Russian colonial rule used the Ukraine as a breadbasket for the rest of Russia, administering the area through the cooperation of vast landowners, who progressively expropriated the peasants' holdings, oppressed tenants, and paid obeisance to the czars. Indeed, as the Ukrainian population became restive toward the middle of the 19th century, the vast majority of them were made serfs by imperial decree, being thus bound to the estates of their landlords.

The Ukrainian secessionist movement of the 19th century, led by such men as the scholar Kostomarov and the poet Shevchenko, was brutally suppressed; prominent members of the movement were either executed, assassinated, or sent into exile in Siberia. All attempts to teach the Ukrainian language, culture, and traditions were severely punished.

The fate of the Ukrainians under Soviet rule has been no better than it was under the czars; indeed, Soviet oppressive measures against the Ukrainians are distinguished by the increasing refinement of their brutality.

The Ukraine has the unenviable distinction of being the first country invaded by the Soviets, in clear violation of previous solemn agreements to respect the area's sovereignty. The Ukraine became independent in 1918, following Lenin's sanctimonious acknowledgment of the principle of national self-determination, only to become a Soviet colony in 1923, when the Kremlin again asserted colonial powers over the area.

Since then, Soviet colonialism has taken every repressive measure imaginable. As the czars had done, the Kremlin deprived the farmers of their land, and forced them into cooperatives—a polite name for enormous estates on which the workers become serfs, bound to the land.

The enforced institution of collective farms, of course, is intended to assure that the Ukraine remains what the Russians conceive it to be—a Russian colony. And to assure the success of this colonization, hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians have been deported—or resettled, as the term goes—to Siberia, particularly as the result of the separatist movement during the Second World War, when more than 2 million Ukrainians surrendered rather than fight for their hated masters.

Religion has been increasingly suppressed in the Ukraine during the past 40 years, until now Ukrainians can only hold religious services in secret. The metropolitan, Joseph Slipij, has been imprisoned at hard labor, and there has been no sign for several years that he will be released. The monasteries of this deeply religious people are closed; the orders of the Basilian Fathers and the Sisters of St. Basil have been proscribed, and their religious property has been confiscated.

A great many Ukrainians are now in the West, and particularly in the United States. While we rejoice in the fact that they have become valuable and indeed indispensable citizens of this country, we must yet mourn with them the loss of their homeland and the fact that so many of them are separated from their families still under the oppressive colonial rule of communism.

Let us hope that the spirit of freedom and democracy will prevail unbroken in the Ukrainian people, and that the day may not be far when they finally can assume their rightful place in the family of nations, free from the shackles of colonialism which now bind them.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the independence of the Ukrainian people was proclaimed on January 22, 1918, and I am proud to join in the observance marking the 44th anniversary of that historic day. Though that independence quickly succumbed to the might of the Soviet armies, the Ukrainian people have kept bright the hope of one day regaining their liberty.

America's love of freedom and our adherence to the principle of self-determination are well known to the whole world. National self-determination is a principle of international justice; and during World War II it was restated by the leaders of the Allied cause. They proclaimed their respect for the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and the wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

This principle was also included in the draft covenant prepared by the Commission on Human Rights of the United Nations, in 1952; and it applies to the Ukrainians, as well as to all other peoples who are striving to keep alive the light of liberty and the hope of independence. In the fight against Communist imperialism and to help the oppressed peoples behind the Iron Curtain, all the resources of diplomacy, morality, and our friendly relations with other peoples must be brought to bear in support of this principle and others which have served us and the free world.

The Ukrainian people have kept fresh and alive their hope for freedom from Communist enslavement and for complete independence.

That principle is included in the United Nations Charter, and it applies especially to the Ukrainian people, who have been enslaved by the Communists and have almost been decimated by the Fascists and the Nazis. The Ukrainian people understand the meaning of freedom better than most people in the world do, and I take great pride in joining in calling attention to their independence day. I deem it a privilege to be able to add by my voice in some small measure to their heroic struggle for national identity.

PUBLIC FACILITY LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. For what purpose does the Senator from Virginia rise?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to ask unanimous consent to have an insertion made in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have no objection, provided the time required for this matter is not taken from the 2-hour allowance under the agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the public facility loan program has been in existence for a number of years. It was designed to help small communities develop their water and sewer systems. Last year, the program was greatly enlarged and the funds for back-door financing were increased from $150 million to $650 million. But the previous law that no loans of that character should be made unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available on reasonable terms was not changed.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement indicating how the Administrator of HHFA has ignored that limitation upon his lending powers. I also request that there be printed in the RECORD my correspondence on the subject with HHFA, a statement made by the Municipal Director of the Investment Bankers Association of America, and a memorandum containing the recommendation of the Investment Bankers Association.

There being no objection, the statements, correspondence, and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERTSON ON INTEREST RATES UNDER THE PUBLIC FACILITY LOAN PROGRAM

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to an interpretation by the HHFA of a provision of the Public Facility Loan Act which prohibits loans if funds are available from private sources on reasonable terms. In my judgment HHFA's interpretation of this provision is wrong, it does not carry out the intention of the Congress, and it gives the HHFA free rein to take over the financing of all public works in hundreds of small communities throughout the country. Private financing of such facilities could soon be a thing of the past, if this interpretation is permitted to continue.

The public facility loan program has been in existence for a number of years. It was designed to help small communities, which needed basic public facilities but which were too small to float public loans on reasonable terms, get money from the Federal Government at a moderate rate of interest, somewhat above the cost of funds borrowed by the Federal Government. Preference was given to very small communities with less than 10,000 inhabitants which needed such facilities as water and sewer systems, and the program was pretty much limited to loans for such purposes.

The Housing Amendments of 1961 expanded this program greatly. The method of computing the interest rate was changed. Instead of the interest rates of 4⅛ percent on general obligations bonds and 4⅜ percent on revenue bonds effective on loans entered into at the time of the 1961 amendments, under the new formula CFA is charging 3⅝ percent generally and 3⅜ percent in areas designated under the Area Redevelopment Act. Instead of being limited in practice to very small communities of less than 10,000, the new law invited applications from communities up to 50,000, or up to 150,000 in redevelopment areas designated under the Area Redevelopment Act.

In order to take care of the increased number of applications which were contemplated, the authorization for the program was increased from $150 million to $650 million.

These changes were substantial. But they were written into the law by the Congress.

However, the Housing Amendments of 1961 did not amend—on the contrary they left unchanged—the following provision in section 202(b)(1) of the act:

"No financial assistance shall be extended under this section unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available on reasonable terms."

No suggestion was made in the committee reports or in the conference report, or anywhere else that I know of, that there was any intention whatsoever to change the meaning or the effect of this provision. I question whether the other amendments to the section would have been adopted unless the section had continued to prohibit public facility loans if private financing was available on reasonable terms.

Before the 1961 amendments, the HHFA interpreted this provision as did other agencies of the Government which were subject to the same or similar restrictions—the Small Business Administration, the minerals discovery exploration loan program, the ICC loan guarantee program, the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and the business loan program of the Treasury's Office of Defense Lending. The reasonableness of the terms on which financing was available from private sources was related to general market conditions for comparable loans by comparable communities. This was, I think, what Congress intended.

HHFA, however, has not followed its earlier interpretation of the provision relating to the availability of private financing on reasonable terms. Instead, HHFA has now taken the position that private financing at interest rates higher than 3⅜ percent in areas designated under the Area Redevelopment Act or higher than 3⅞ percent in other areas is not reasonable. And these figures are for 30-year loans—each 5-year reduction in the length of the loan reduces the reasonable interest rate by one-eighth of 1 percent, down to 3⅛ percent and 3⅝ percent, respectively. Many public facility loans run for no more than 20 years, and at that maturity the interest rate must be as low as 3⅛ or 3⅝ percent to be reasonable.

These interest rates are below the recent and current markets for such maturities based on Moody's average for "Baa" municipal bonds, which on January 11, 1962, was 4.04 percent, and during this present fiscal year has not been below 3.93 percent. (A "Baa" rating is defined as "lower medium grade" and is one of the top four ratings for municipal bonds eligible for bank investment.)

In other words, HHFA has taken the position that the average yield on "Baa" municipal bonds during this current fiscal year has been unreasonable, and HHFA will attempt to undercut the market on such bonds issued by cities under 50,000, or 150,000 in redevelopment areas. In doing so, HHFA will charge 3⅜ percent and 3⅝ percent interest rates.

These interest rates should be compared with current yields on U.S. bonds. These are also unreasonable, it would seem. Moody's average for taxable U.S. bonds as of January 9, 1962, for 10-year maturities was 4.13 percent, and the new Treasury bonds offered last week are priced to yield 4.04 percent.

I realize that under the statute the interest rate to be charged by CFA has been fixed for the full fiscal year 1962. No matter how high municipal bond rates may go, no matter how high interest rates on savings may go, and no matter how high the interest rates paid by the Federal Government may go, CFA will charge 3⅜ percent and 3⅝ percent the rest of this fiscal year.

But I do not think that HHFA is compelled to go on indefinitely saying that funds are not available from private sources on reasonable terms unless they can be obtained at 3⅜ percent or 3⅞ percent for 30-year maturities. It seems to me clear that the HHFA has interpreted the statute incorrectly and should change its interpretation.

The effect of this interpretation on the private market is shown by what happened at Charleston, W. Va. Charleston needed $4 million for sewer bonds. It asked for bids and received them on July 31, 1961. Bids from seven syndicates were opened. The low bid provided an average interest rate of 3.9453 percent. The city was about to accept this bid when an HHFA employee, who was present, suggested that a public facility loan might be obtained from CFA at a lower interest rate. The city thereupon rejected the private bids and got its financing through a public facility loan from CFA on November 20, 1961. The results are shown in the Weekly Bond Buyer for November 27, 1961:

Bidder	Amount of bonds	Net interest cost
		Percent
Private	$195,000	2.93
Do	290,000	3.621
HHFA	3,515,000	3.375

The city of Charleston saved some money by borrowing from CFA. Private bidders could not match the Government's 3⅜-percent offer, though they did pick up the first small maturities.

But Charleston's gain was the Federal taxpayer's loss. On November 21, 1961, Moody's average yield on taxable U.S. bonds of 10-year maturities was 4.01 percent.

And the U.S. bond yield of 4.01 percent is above the private bid submitted to Charleston of 3.9453 percent.

In my judgment, this Charleston incident is clear proof that the HHFA interpretation of the Public Facility Loan Act is incorrect. If the HHFA interpretation is allowed to continue, it seems clear to me that the Federal Government, through HHFA and CFA, will take over the financing of a major portion of the financing of public facilities for smaller, and many medium-sized communities. To go on this way, borrowing at more than 4 percent and lending at an average of 3½ percent, in increasingly large amounts, will make it very difficult to carry out the President's pledge to balance the budget.

I also desire to insert in the RECORD at this point my correspondence with HHFA on this subject, a copy of a statement on the subject made by Mr. Gordon L. Calvert, municipal director of the Investment Bankers Association of America, and a memorandum containing the recommendations of the Investment Bankers Association on the subject:

AUGUST 4, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT C. WEAVER,
Administrator,
Housing and Home Finance Agency,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. WEAVER: My attention has been brought to a situation which has arisen under the provisions for public facility loans authorized under title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended.

I have been advised that the city of Charleston, W. Va., requested bids on $4 million of sewer revenue bonds to be opened on July 31; that bids were received from seven syndicates which were opened, and it was found that the low bid provided an average interest rate of 3.9453 percent; that an employee of the Community Facilities Administration, either voluntarily or in reply to questions, advised that the Community Facilities Administration could buy these bonds at an average interest rate of 3⅝ percent; that the Philadelphia office, being consulted by Charleston officials, reported that loans could be made at 3⅜ percent interest because Charleston had been designated as a redevelopment area under the Area Redevelopment Act; and that the city of Charleston thereupon rejected all bids which were submitted on July 31 in accordance with its request.

I enclose a copy of a statement by the mayor of Charleston on this matter which has been supplied to me. I should appreciate a report on this matter from you giving a full statement of the activities of employees and representatives of the Community Facilities Administration, together with your policy with respect to participation in municipal bids and bidding procedures, particularly where municipalities have requested bids from private sources.

My review of this situation leads to a further question with respect to the Public Facility Loans Program, and its relation to private financing. Section 202(b)(1) provides in part as follows:

"1. No financial assistance shall be extended under this section unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available on reasonable terms."

I should like to have a report from you as to your interpretation of this clause.

The material which has been issued concerning this public facility loans program is not, in my judgment, consistent with the statutory provision above quoted. For example, in a leaflet entitled "Facts About Public Facility Loans as Expanded by the Housing Act of 1961," dated July 1961, the following paragraph appears:

"Community Facility Administration, a part of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, has been set up to help meet the public facilities needs of small communities by providing long-term loans at reasonable interest rates. The law requires that private investors be given a chance first to provide the needed credit at a rate comparable to that paid by larger cities. When a project has been approved, after meeting all requirements, the bonds by which it is to be financed must be advertised for public sale. CFA buys them only when private investors are unable to take them on terms at least as good as CFA's."

This leaflet also states that the current interest rate, which I understand will be effective throughout fiscal year 1962, is 3⅝ percent generally and 3⅜ percent in areas designated under the Area Redevelopment Act. I understand that the form of offer made by the Community Facilities Administration (CFA–721) specifies that the municipality will offer its obligations for public sale and that the Government will not purchase the bonds if the municipality receives a bid at terms equal to or more favorable than the Government's bid. I understand that the manual applicable to this program refers in this context to financing on comparable terms and conditions, to loans at equal or more favorable terms, and to reasonable terms.

In this connection it seems appropriate to point out that the college housing program provides that loans under that program will not be available from the Community Facilities Administration where financial assistance can be obtained otherwise on terms and conditions equally as favorable as those provided under the program.

It would appear from the fact sheet of July 1961 and other materials issued in connection with the public facility loans program that the program may be proceeding on the basis that "on reasonable terms" means the same thing as "on equal or more favorable terms." This would in effect mean that the provisions with respect to obtaining financial assistance otherwise in the public facility loans program and the college housing program had the same meaning and effect.

If this is true, it would also involve, I take it, a conclusive finding that any interest rate over 3⅝ percent for municipal bonds in areas designated under the Area Redevelopment Act is unreasonable and any interest rate over 3⅞ percent in other areas is also unreasonable.

Under these circumstances, I should appreciate it if you would review the provisions of the public facility loans program dealing with the availability of other financing and advise me of your interpretation of the meaning and effect of the provision relating to obtaining assistance elsewhere on reasonable terms.

Sincerely yours,

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman.

STATEMENT BY MAYOR JOHN A. SHANKLIN, MAYOR OF CITY OF CHARLESTON

In response to a request by the Investment Bankers Association of America for information regarding the circumstances in rejecting all bids on $4 million of city of Charleston sewer revenue bonds on July 31, Mayor John A. Shanklin, of the city of Charleston made the following statement:

"At 11 a.m. on Monday, July 31, a committee of city council together with the mayor, ex officio chairman of the sanitary board and two members of the board met in the council chamber of the city building to open bids on the sewer revenue bonds pursuant to notice of sale. Seven sealed bids were presented to the mayor who presided as chairman.

"Up to this time neither the mayor nor any member of the council or of the sanitary board had any intimation that any governmental agency was interested in buying the bonds or lending the money to the city. There had been no contact of any character with any governmental agency relative to the subject.

"At about the time the bids were being opened at approximately 11:10 a.m. word was passed on to the mayor and to a sanitary board member that a representative of some governmental agency was present in the room and that he had represented to some person or persons that the governmental agency represented by him was in a position to lend the $4 million to the city of Charleston at an average interest rate of 3⅝ percent.

"The bids were promptly opened and tabulated. A lower bid was submitted by First Boston Corp. at an average interest rate of 3.9453 percent. In order to verify the accuracy of the computations in the bids and to ascertain the identity of the Government representative present, and to learn from him the facts as to whether or not Government money was available at 3⅝ percent interest or at any rate less than the lowest bid received, the sanitary board adjourned to the mayor's office. The Government representative was invited to be present. He turned out to be Mr. Hummel, with whom the mayor was acquainted but whose governmental connection was unknown to the mayor.

"He explained that he was the West Virginia representative of the Community Facilities Administration. He stated that he had learned just that day that the Community Facilities Administration was in position to purchase the $4 million revenue bonds at an average interest rate of 3⅝ percent. He advised that in order to take advantage of this it would be necessary to readvertise for bids. He suggested that the mayor telephone the Philadelphia office of the Community Facilities Administration for verification. The mayor promptly called the Philadelphia office and at approximately 1 p.m. e.s.t. the mayor talked with Mr. Doidge of that office. Mr. Doidge advised that because Charleston had been designated as a disaster area, the money would be available at 3⅝ percent. He said he would send a representative to Charleston immediately. The representative is scheduled to arrive in Charleston 11:30 a.m., Thursday, August 3. As the mayor and the sanitary board understand it, this representative will be qualified and authorized to explain all the details of the procedure by which the $4 million would be made available to the city at an interest rate of 3⅝ percent.

"In view of these representations by representatives of the Community Facilities Administration, the mayor, the council committee and the sanitary board were of the unanimous opinion that they had no choice other than to reject all of the bids submitted. Since it was uncertain, and is still uncertain, whether the requirements of the Community Facilities Administration can be complied with by the city, the council committee and the sanitary board were of the opinion to recommend rejection of all bids on the broad ground that it was hoped that readvertisement would result in an interest rate more favorable to the city. It was so recommended to the council and the latter at its meeting held at 8 p.m. on the evening of July 31 followed the recommendation and rejected all of the bids submitted at 11 a.m. on that day.

"This is the way the matter stands at this moment, 2 p.m., Wednesday, August 2. Mr. Jack Lincoln, representative of the Federal HHFA, is expected to be in the office of the mayor of the city of Charleston shortly after 11:30 a.m. on August 3."

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., September 15, 1961.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in further reply to your letter of August 4, 1961, concerning the public facility loans program authorized under title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended.

With respect to the recent rejection of bids by the city of Charleston, W. Va., on $4 million of sewer revenue bonds, I am enclosing a copy of a page of the Daily Bond Buyer of August 7, 1961, which published a statement by the Community Facilities Administration. As will be noted, the Daily Bond Buyer concluded that the confusion arising out of the rejection of bids appears to be dispelled by this statement and that "the misunderstanding was one of semantic differences and that none of the parties involved was engaged in the usurpation of the prerogatives of any other."

Section 501(d)(1) of the Housing Act of 1961 established a statutory interest rate formula for public facility loans which for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, produces a maximum interest rate of 3⅞ percent. In order to achieve consistency between the loan authorization provided in section 501(e) of the Housing Act of 1961 and the Area Redevelopment Act, with respect to loans for public facilities to communities situated in an area designated as a redevelopment area, I determined that all public facility loans to communities located in redevelopment areas would bear an interest rate equal to that obtainable under the loan authorization provided under section 7 of the Area Redevelopment Act. In effect, public facility loans to communities located in redevelopment areas would therefore carry an interest rate of 3⅝ percent during the present fiscal year.

Prior to enactment of the 1961 Housing Act, the interest rate on public facility loans was established on the basis of an administratively determined formula based on then current municipal market interest rates. As of June 30, 1961, the basic interest rates for public facility loans were 4⅛ percent for general obligation bonds and 4⅜ percent for revenue bonds with maturities of 30 years or more. For loans maturing under 30 years the interest rate was decreased by one-eighth percent for each full 5-year reduction of the loan. The 1961 Housing Act materially reduced the interest rates for public facility loans and set a maximum rate which may be charged, based on a statutory formula. This congressional action occasioned a reexamination of the policy for determining whether private financing is otherwise available on reasonable terms. As a result, the method for determining "reasonable terms" is being revised.

The following excerpt from instructions to the field staff of the Community Facilities Administration summarizes the revised policy:

"For a bond issue secured upon the same terms and conditions as the Government loan, an interest rate is to be deemed reasonable if it does not exceed 3⅞ percent, if the loan is repayable over 30 years or more. For shorter term loans, the 'reasonable' interest rates is to be reduced by one-eighth percent for each 5-year reduction of the length of the loan, provided such interest rate is not less than 3⅝ percent. If the borrower is located in an area designated as a redevelopment area, the benchmark for reasonable interest rates would be 3⅝ percent."

It has been the basic financial policy of the Community Facilities Administration, which administers the public facility loans program, to develop sound loans that are reasonably assured of repayment and to take such steps as are necessary to improve the marketability of such loans. These steps include requiring that the loans be evidenced in the form of bonds; that the transcript of bond proceedings be prepared by acceptable bond counsel; that the issues incorporate the various financial terms and conditions that meet the standards and conventions of the capital market; and that the bonds be offered for sale in normal marketing channels.

The Community Facilities Administration requires each borrower to advertise its bond offering in a financial newspaper of national circulation so that other investors may become acquainted with the issue and bid therefor. In this connection, most borrowers are required to prepare an Official Notice of Sale and Statement of Essential Facts for distribution to interested dealers and investors. The Government will purchase all bonds of the issue for which funds are not otherwise available on reasonable terms.

I might note that in the case of the college housing program, which has a statutory interest rate formula that results in an interest rate lower than that applicable to public facility loans, the Community Facilities Administration has been quite successful in developing a private market for college housing bond issues. During the first 6 months of 1961 some 17 bond issues for $37.7 million were sold in whole or in part to private municipal bond underwriters. Many of these bond issues involved participating arrangements, with the Federal Government financing the remainder of the project cost. Four of the issues involved private purchase of the earlier maturities, with the Housing Agency purchasing the later maturities. Perhaps the most notable achievement has been the success of the Community Facilities Administration in arranging for a bond rating service to rate college housing bonds. Enclosed is a tabulation of such ratings that have been achieved during the past 2 years.

I am hopeful that similar success can be achieved for the public facility loans program so that municipalities and other local government units can finance their public works needs on terms and conditions that are both reasonable and moderate.

Sincerely yours,

JACK T. CONWAY,
Acting Administrator
(For Robert C. Weaver).

Ratings accorded to college housing revenue bond issues by Standard & Poor's Corp.

Issuer	Loan security	Rating
Bowling Green University	Revenues	A
University of California: Union.	Student fees	AA
University of Illinois:		
Dormitory	Revenues and fees.	A
Student union	Service charges.	A
Illinois State Normal University.	Revenues	A
Northern Illinois University	Revenues and fees.	A
Southern Illinois University	Revenues	A
Western Illinois University	do	A
University of Indiana	Fees and revenues.	A
University of Kentucky	Fees	A
Kent State University	Revenues	A
New York Dormitory Authority.	Rents and fees.	A
Ohio State University	Revenues	A
Miami University	do	A
Pennsylvania State University.	do	A
University of Washington	Fees and revenues.	A
Washington State University	Revenues	A
University of West Virginia	do	A

STATEMENT BY CFA IS MADE TO CLARIFY CHARLESTON ISSUE

WASHINGTON, August 7.—The confusion arising out of the rejection of all bids on a $4 million city of Charleston sewer revenue bonds on July 31 appeared to have been dispelled today with a statement by the Community Facilities Administration.

The CFA statement, coupled with that given to the Bond Buyer yesterday by Mayor John A. Shanklin, of Charleston, seems to indicate that the misunderstanding was one of semantic differences, and that none of the parties involved was engaged in the usurpation of the prerogatives of any other.

CFA REMARKS

The clarifying statement from the CFA, which in the main, dovetails with Mr. Shanklin's, follows:

"Community Facilities Administration sent Mr. R. S. Hummell its West Virginia field engineer, to Charleston to assist the city in coping with problems which caused major damage and led to the declaration by President Kennedy of a state of emergency.

"Prior to the opening of the bids on the bonds, Mr. Hummell was working with the city's disaster director, R. L. Stubblefield, on estimating the probable cost of replacements of the destroyed sewer lines and other public facilities. Mr. Hummell mentioned to Mr. Stubblefield that this was a type of construction that has in the past qualified for public facility loans.

"The discussion naturally turned to the rate of interest, and Mr. Hummell told Mr. Stubblefield that the rate was 3⅝ percent and that in areas designated for area redevelopment the rate was 3⅜ percent. Mr. Hummell suggested that this rate be checked with the regional office of HHFA in Philadelphia. Mr. Stubblefield promptly passed this information to Mayor Shanklin. The mayor checked by phone with the Philadelphia office and confirmed the information regarding rates that had been given to Mr. Stubblefield by Mr. Hummell. It should be noted here that the discussion here was about new replacement needs and not related to the bond issue for which bids had already been solicited.

NO URGING BY CFA

"With the information given him by Mr. Stubblefield, the mayor must have questioned the wisdom of accepting a bid of 3.94 [sic] percent when a public facility loan might be available at a lower rate. However, this was surely his own decision and was not urged upon him in any way by any spokesman of the CFA.

"It is not and never has been the policy of the CFA to solicit applications. When inquiries are made we respond promptly and advise of any aid which has been authorized and which we are in a position to supply."

SEPTEMBER 16, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT C. WEAVER,
Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. WEAVER: On August 4 I wrote you requesting a report on the activities of employees and representatives of the Community Facilities Administration in connection with the opening of bids at Charleston, W. Va. In addition, I requested you to give me your interpretation of the provision in section 202(b)(1) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 that financial assistance should not be extended under that act if it is "otherwise available on reasonable terms."

* * * * *

In addition, I should like to have a list of the loans which you have made under this program since the date of my letter, together with a statement of the terms on which financial assistance was otherwise available in each case.

Sincerely yours,

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., October 4, 1961.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in further reply to your letter of September 16, 1961, concerning the public facility loans program authorized under title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended.

During the period of August 4 through September 16, 1961, the Housing and Home Finance Agency purchased 10 bond issues under the public facility loans program. A list of these loans is detailed in the enclosed table. In accordance with the Agency's instructions, each borrower was required to advertise its bonds for public sale in a financial newspaper of national circulation such as the Bond Buyer. However, if the total bonds to be issued for a project are less than $100,000, and the borrower is required by State law to advertise in a newspaper published within the State, this requirement may be waived, provided that the borrower advertises its bonds in a publication that has statewide circulation.

For each of these bond issues the Housing Agency submitted a bid in accordance with the terms specified in the outstanding loan agreement for the respective loan. The Government's liability to purchase these particular bond issues expired with respect to any obligations for which the borrower received a bid or bids to purchase at terms equal to or more favorable than the Government's bid. As will be noted from the attached tabulation, the loan agreements which set the interest rates at which the Government undertook to purchase these bond issues were executed during the period from March 1959 through April 1961. At that time the Agency's standard for determining availability of private financing was on the basis of "terms equal to or more favorable than the Government bid." As noted in my letter of September 15, 1961, we have since changed the method for determining "otherwise available on reasonable terms."

I might note that the Housing and Home Finance Agency was awarded the entire amounts of each of the 10 bond issues listed since there were no private bids for these bonds, even though the interest rates range from 4.25 percent for a 20-year maturity to 4.75 percent for a 40-year maturity. Even at these relatively high interest rates, there was no interest on the part of municipal bond underwriters in these 10 bond issues

I trust that the foregoing answers the remaining point raised in your letter of September 16, 1961.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. WEAVER,
Administrator.

Public facility loans program, bonds purchased by HHFA, Aug. 4 to Sept. 16, 1961

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Public agency	Type of bonds	Bond award date	Bonds awarded	Interest rate	Date of acceptance of loan agreement	Term (years)	Purpose
			Thousands				
Water Improvement District No. 1 of Pangburn, Ark	Revenue	Aug. 11, 1961	$58	4.625	Mar. 1, 1961	30	Water.
Water Improvement District No. 1 of the City of Lamar, Ark	do	Aug. 14, 1961	53	4.375	Apr. 16, 1959	30	Do.
City of Lamar, Ark	do	do	16	4.625	Mar. 2, 1959	13	Do.
	do	do	73	4.375		34	Do.
Town of Daleville, Ala	do	Aug. 21, 1961	133	4.375	Mar. 31, 1961	30	Do.
New Waterford, Ohio	do	Sept. 5, 1961	160	4.625	Feb. 2, 1960	40	Sewer.
Town of Winifred, Mont	General operating	do	24	4.25	Aug. 2, 1960	20	Do.
	Revenue	do	47	4.75		40	Do.
Noble, Ill	do	Sept. 7, 1961	128	4.75	Oct. 3, 1960	40	Do.
Town of Petrolia, Tex	do	Sept. 15, 1961	76	4.375	Apr. 26, 1961	35	Do.

October 7, 1961.

Hon. Robert C. Weaver,
Administrator,
Housing and Home Finance Agency,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Dr. Weaver: I now have received replies dated September 15 and October 4, 1961, in response to my letters of August 4 and September 16, 1961, concerning the Community Facilities Administration loan program for public facilities.

The letter of September 15 stated that the Housing Act of 1961 established a statutory interest rate formula for CFA public facility loans. This resulted in a lending rate of 3⅝ percent for the entire fiscal year 1962. The letter indicated that, as a matter of discretion, you established a CFA lending rate of 3⅜ percent for projects in redevelopment areas. The letter further stated that the creation of the statutory lending rate under the Housing Act of 1961 "occasioned a reexamination of the policy for determining whether private financing is otherwise available on reasonable terms." The latter phrase relates to section 202(b) (1) of the public facilities loan legislation, which reads in part as follows:

"(1) No financial assistance shall be extended under this section unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available on reasonable terms."

According to your letter of October 4, until recently the Community Facilities Administration followed a policy of judging whether private financing was otherwise available on reasonable terms by determining whether or not private bids were on "terms equal to or more favorable than the Government bid." It appears that terms of the Government bid were closely related to average yields in the private market. The revised policy, as stated in the letter of September 15, was quoted as follows:

"For a bond issue secured upon the same terms and conditions as the Government loan, an interest rate is to be deemed reasonable if it does not exceed 3⅞ percent, if the loan is repayable over 30 years or more. For shorter term loans, the 'reasonable' interest rate is to be reduced by one-eighth of 1 percent for each 5-year reduction of the length of the loan, provided such interest rate is not less than 3⅝ percent. If the borrower is located in an area designated as a redevelopment area, the benchmark for reasonable interest rates would be 3⅝ percent."

The revision in the CFA policy with regard to reasonable terms raises a number of questions which I hope you will seriously consider.

1

My fundamental objection to the CFA policy on "reasonable terms" is that it appears to relate the test of reasonableness to the CFA lending rate rather than to rates of interest in the private capital market. Under the revised policy, any interest rate over 3⅞ percent for a 30-year loan would not be reasonable, regardless of the prevailing level of private market interest rates, except that if a 30-year loan were made in a redevelopment area, any interest rate of over 3⅝ percent would be judged as not reasonable. Each of these rates is one-fourth of 1 percentage point, or 25 basis points, higher than the CFA lending rate.

The CFA policy, in other words, seems to base a judgment of the reasonableness of a private bid on the extent to which the interest rate bid varies from the CFA lending rate. Conversely, under the CFA policy the reasonableness of a private bid has no relationship to interest rates prevailing in the market for similar risks and comparable projects.

2

The revised CFA policy leads to at least three results which appear questionable:

(a) One result is that the policy calls for lower rates of interest on private bids in areas with higher, rather than lower, risks.

A bid of 3⅞ percent for a 30-year loan on a project located in a prosperous area with high employment would be considered to be under reasonable terms. On the other hand, an identical bid of 3⅞ percent for a 30-year loan on a project located in a redevelopment area with a high unemployment rate, where the economic situation is so bad that Federal aid is needed, would not be reasonable because CFA stands ready to lend there at an even lower rate providing even greater subsidy. Ordinarily, it is the rule in the private market that the greater the risk, the higher the interest rate. Under the CFA policy formula, however, the greater the risk involved, the lower the interest rate must be in order that a private bid may be judged as reasonable.

(b) A second result of the CFA policy is that an important share of current municipal financing, as well as all of CFA loans made in recent months, are ruled as being not on reasonable terms.

During the present fiscal year, State and local government bonds—initially issued to finance not only water and sewer facilities but many other types of projects as well—have yielded about 3.70 percent for general obligations rated "A" by Moody's Investors Service. Average yields on "Baa" bonds have not been below 3.93 percent in any week of fiscal 1962. These yields, it should be noted, exclude revenue bonds, since they relate only to general obligations, and pertain to issues whose average maturity approaches 20 years.

The CFA policy, therefore, would judge as not reasonable the average yields on all "Baa" municipal bonds during fiscal 1962. Even yields on all "A" municipal bonds during fiscal 1962 would be judged as not reasonable for projects located in redevelopment areas.

Under the former CFA policy, CFA lending rates were about in line with private market rates and, at least for the loans included in the table attached to your letter of October 4, were in a range of 4.25 to 4.75 percent. Accordingly, it is presumed that if private bids equal to or more favorable than these rates had been received, CFA would have considered them to be on reasonable terms. In this case the projects in question would not have been eligible for CFA loans.

Under the revised CFA policy, however, all private bids at interest rates exceeding 3⅞ percent on projects outside redevelopment areas would be ruled as unreasonable, not from the point of view of prevailing private market rates, but from the viewpoint of CFA's new formula. Even the rates, ranging from 4.25 percent to 4.75 percent, charged by CFA itself on bonds awarded as recently as August and September would be classified as not on reasonable terms.

(c) A third result of the CFA policy is that the CFA lending rate, on which the test of reasonableness is based, remains fixed for an entire fiscal year, whereas market rates of interest fluctuate.

The CFA lends at 3⅝ percent outside redevelopment areas, and its formula takes the position that any private bid submitted during the year with an interest rate in excess of 3⅞ percent is not reasonable for a project in this location.

Wide variations may occur in municipal bond bids and yields in private markets during the course of 12 months. The difference between the highest and lowest average monthly yield on "Aaa" municipal bonds was 22 basis points in fiscal 1961, 30 basis points in fiscal 1960, and 58 basis points in fiscal 1959. On "Baa" bonds, the difference between the highest and lowest average monthly yield was 31 basis points in fiscal 1961, 19 basis points in fiscal 1960, and 49 basis points in fiscal 1959.

If yields on municipals should go up during fiscal 1962 as much as they increased in fiscal 1959—58 basis points on "Aaa" bonds—then even "Aaa" bonds, which now yield 3.3 percent, would not be reasonable on the average. Accordingly CFA public facilities loans would supplant private capital, in a market where more than $1 billion of water and sewer bonds were sold over each of the past 4 calendar years.

3

You are no doubt aware that a number of other Federal programs operate subject to a provision which prohibits lending of public moneys unless funds are not available elsewhere on reasonable terms. For example, section 7(a) (1) of the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, provides that "No financial assistance shall be extended pursuant to this subsection unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available on reasonable terms."

The provisions of part 120.4 of the rules and regulations of the Small Business Administration, supplemented by verbal inquiries from the SBA, suggest that "reasonable terms" is interpreted principally with reference to prevailing market rates of interest, considering the nature of the business and the type of financing ordinarily available.

Besides the Small Business Administration, I understand that in the case of the loan program of the Office of Minerals Exploration of the Department of the Interior, the loan guarantee program of the Interstate Commerce Commission under the Transportation Act of 1958, the program of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and the business loan program of the Office of Defense Lending in the Treasury Department, policies have been followed by which "reasonable terms" or comparable standards have been defined from the point of view of interest rates and other terms prevailing in the private market. I further understand that none of these agencies, in determining whether or not a private bid is "reasonable," makes primary reference to its own lending rates.

In conclusion, it seems to me that the interpretation which you have given to the terms of section 202(b) (1) is not a reasonable one. It leads to at least three questionable results, and it is inconsistent with the interpretation given to identical language in several other statutes. I should appreciate it if you would review the CFA policy carefully in the light of the points raised in this letter and let me have your comments at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely yours,
A. Willis Robertson,
Chairman.

Housing and Home Finance Agency,
Washington, D.C., November 1, 1961.

Hon. A. Willis Robertson,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: This is in reply to your letter of October 7, 1961, concerning the policy followed by this Agency in administering section 202(b) (1) of the Housing Amendments of 1955, which prohibits public facility loans "unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available on reasonable terms."

In substance your letter points out three results of the construction given to section

202(b)(1) by this Agency which appear to you to be undesirable. First, that public facility loans may be made in redevelopment areas unless private bids are available in these areas at rates of interest lower than those required in other areas to meet the administrative test of the availability of financial assistance on reasonable terms. Second, that the current market rate for municipal financing of public facilities is above the interest rate administratively established to determine the availability of financial assistance on reasonable terms. Third, that the lending rate established for public facility loans remains fixed for an entire year, while market rates fluctuate.

The construction given by this Agency to section 202(b)(1) is based upon our judgment of the meaning of this provision in the context of the expressed intent of the Congress in connection with the public facility loan program. As you know, the 87th Congress dealt with the public facility loan program in its consideration of the Housing Act of 1961 and in the Area Redevelopment Act. In both acts, Congress, for the first time, established a statutory interest rate formula for public facility loans. The statutory formula adopted in the Area Redevelopment Act produces a maximum interest rate of 3⅝ percent during the current fiscal year. The statutory interest rate formula adopted in the Housing Act of 1961 produces a maximum interest rate of 3⅞ percent for the present fiscal year.

As I indicated to you in my letter of September 15, 1961, it seems clear that Congress intended that the interest rate on public facility loans made in redevelopment areas should be one-fourth of 1 percent lower than the rate on loans in areas other than redevelopment areas. To further this intent, two administrative steps were taken by this Agency. First, the interest rate for public facility loans authorized by the Housing Act of 1961 to be made to communities in redevelopment areas was set at the rate authorized by section 7 of the Area Redevelopment Act for public facility loans in redevelopment areas. Second, public facility loans have been authorized in redevelopment areas unless private bids are available in those areas at rates of one-fourth of 1 percent lower than those required in other areas to meet the administrative test of the availability of financial assistance on reasonable terms. This, of course, has brought about the result indicated in your letter (i.e., bids which might be construed as providing financial assistance on reasonable terms in nonredevelopment areas are considered too high for redevelopment areas). However, it appears to me that the Congress intended this very result as a means of giving special aid to public facilities in redevelopment areas.

Prior to enactment of the Housing Act of 1961, the interest rate on public facility loans was established on the basis of an administratively determined formula based on current municipal market interest rates. However, section 501(d)(1) of the Housing Act of 1961 established a statutory interest rate formula. The intent of Congress in establishing this formula seems to us to be expressed in the House report on H.R. 6028, which, speaking of the provisions which established the statutory interest rate formula, states:

"As noted, the administration recently reduced the interest rate on public facility loans by one-quarter of 1 percent. However, the present interest charge of 4⅛ percent on general obligation bonds and 4⅜ percent on revenue bonds are still too high and discriminate against worthwhile projects undertaken by small towns compared to the rates available to larger communities. Therefore, the bill would set the interest rate on these loans through a formula which fully reflects the cost of money to the Federal Government.

"This provision establishes the rate to be charged at the average interest rate on all outstanding Federal debt, plus one-quarter of 1 percent to cover cost of administration. For the current fiscal year this produces a rate of 3½ percent. This is the same formula now employed in the college housing and housing for the elderly programs and is also the formula used for community facilities loans in the area redevelopment legislation. Thus, no subsidy is involved in this rate since it covers the actual rate paid by the Tresaury and also administrative costs, and yet, at the same time, benefits smaller communities by giving them rates lower than they would generally have to pay in the private market."

Speaking of this provision, the Conference Report on the Housing Act of 1961 notes:

"The House bill provided that the interest rate on public facility loans would be set at the average interest rate paid by the Treasury and on outstanding Federal debt, plus one-fourth of 1 percent for administrative costs (the college housing formula). There was no comparable provision in the Senate bill. The conference substitute conforms to the House bill except that one-half of 1 percent (instead of one-fourth of 1 percent) would be added for administrative costs."

In the light of congressional action in establishing a statutory interest rate formula for public facility loans and the expressed congressional attitude with respect to interest rates of 4⅛ percent on general obligation bonds and 4⅜ percent on revenue bonds which were deemed still too high, it seemed to me necessary to reexamine the policy for determining whether private financing is otherwise available on reasonable terms within the meaning of section 202(b)(1). Guided by congressional intent and studies conducted by this Agency, I concluded that a 3⅞ percent interest rate is a fair benchmark for determining the availability of private financing on reasonable terms.

Your letter refers to interpretations of other agencies with respect to provisions that condition the making of Federal loans under their programs on the nonavailability of other funds at reasonable terms. The determinations by those agencies are made in the light of statutory language and the expressed congressional intent with respect to the programs they administer. There is no indication that in the programs you cite Congress established a statutory maximum Federal lending rate or clearly expressed itself as to the reasonableness of a specific existing interest rate. These factors alone sufficiently distinguish the public facility loan program from those mentioned by you.

Let me also comment on your reference to fixing the lending rate of community facility loans for an entire fiscal year. The provisions of section 501(d)(1) of the Housing Act of 1961 require that public facility loans "bear interest at a rate determined by the Administrator which shall be not more than the higher of (A) 3 per centum per annum, or (B) the total of one-half of 1 per centum per annum added to the rate of interest paid by the Administrator on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in section 203(a)." The rate of interest paid by the Administrator is fixed by section 501(d)(2) and is presently based on "the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States * * * forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year * * * and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum."

As you can see, the requirements of these provisions are such that it is administratively almost impossible to fix other than an annual rate.

I appreciate your interest in this area and the benefit of your thoughts with respect to the action we have taken.

Sincerely yours,

Robert C. Weaver,
Administrator.

Federal Municipal Loans Based on Fictitious Premise

(By Gordon L. Calvert, municipal director, Investment Bankers Association of America, Washington, D.C.)

(Investment bankers' spokesman protests the Federal Government's undermining of free enterprise in offering unreasonably low loans to municipalities. He points out that such loans undercut reasonable rates arrived at competitively in the marketplace. Mr. Calvert describes the Federal community facilities loan program and the companion area redevelopment lending, and finds that their arbitrarily arrived at reasonable rate norm fails to even distinguish between general obligation and revenue bonds. He also berates the HHFA and the ARA Administrators for not carrying out the law's intent of providing Federal loans only when financing is unavailable from other sources on reasonable terms, and notes the contradiction between the President's appeal for an economy drive and the usurpation of a private industry function which can provide advisory services and funds at reasonable rates.)

The Federal community facilities loan program as presently administered is a shocking example of the Federal Government taking over a function of private industry in substituting Federal financing for financing which is readily available from other sources at reasonable interest costs. The Federal community facilities loan program administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, authorized under the Housing Amendments of 1955 as a substitute program previously administered by the RFC, provides Federal loans to municipalities for community facilities if the financing is not available from other sources on reasonable terms. The 1955 act authorized an aggregate of $100 million. In 1960, an additional $50 million was authorized. The Housing Act of 1961 amended the program to authorize an additional $500 million for Federal loans for any community facilities except schools ($50 million earmarked as available only for loans for urban transportation facilities or equipment). Such loans, except urban transportation loans, may be extended only to municipalities with a population not exceeding 50,000 (or in the case of a community situated in a redevelopment area, with a population not exceeding 150,000). The loans are made at an interest rate determined annually under a formula in the law, which fixed the rate for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, at 3⅞ percent (or for communities in redevelopment areas at 3⅝ percent). The law still provides that no financial assistance shall be extended under the program unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available on reasonable terms.

There is a companion program under the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 administered by the Area Redevelopment Administration in the Department of Commerce. The programs authorized under this act include (a) $75 million in Federal grants for public facilities in qualified redevelopment areas if there is little probability that the project could be undertaken without the assistance of such a grant (with a requirement that the entity requesting the grant shall contribute to the cost of the project in proportion of its ability to contribute) and (b) $100 million in Federal loans for public facilities in qualified redevelopment areas with maturities up to 40 years, if the funds are not otherwise available on reasonable terms, at an interest rate determined annually under a formula in the bill which presently would be 3⅛ percent. At present over 1,000 counties throughout the country have been certified as qualified redevelopment areas and a list of those counties is available from the Area Redevelopment Administration.

ELIGIBILITY FOR THE PROGRAMS

Eligibility under either of these programs depends on the interest rate which is determined administratively as a reasonable rate, because municipalities are eligible for a Federal loan under the programs, only if they cannot obtain financing from other sources at that rate. If the interest rate set as reasonable by the administrative agencies is too low in relation to current market rates, a large volume of municipal financing is unable to obtain financing at that rate from other sources and is eligible under these programs.

In August the IBA submitted to the administrator of the community facilities loan program a suggested yardstick for establishing reasonable terms, which would establish the reasonable rate monthly in a realistic relationship to current market rates at a level high enough that only a small proportion of municipal financing would be eligible under the program.

However, the community facilities administrator adopted the following basis for determining whether financing is available from other sources on reasonable terms:

"For a bond issue secured upon the same terms and conditions as the Government loan, an interest rate is to be deemed reasonable if it does not exceed 3⅞ percent, if the loan is repayable over 30 years or more. For shorter term loans, the reasonable interest rate is to be reduced by one-eighth percent for each 5-year reduction of the length of the loan, provided such interest rate is not less than 3⅝ percent. If the borrower is located in an area designated as a redevelopment area, the benchmark for reasonable interest rates would be 3⅝ percent" (i.e., 3⅝ percent for 30-year or longer maturities or 3⅜ percent for 20-year or shorter maturities in a redevelopment area).

The Area Redevelopment Administration adopted as a reasonable rate under its program the same rate adopted by the CFA as a reasonable rate for redevelopment areas.

The interest rates presently established under these programs as reasonable terms are too low in relation to current market rates. This is easily proven because the rates established by the HHFA and the ARA would classify as unreasonable:

(a) The interest cost on outstanding U.S. Government bonds of comparable maturities, on the basis of current market yield on outstanding bonds (presently above 4 percent for the best credit in the world.)

(b) Over 25 percent of the number of new issues of municipal bonds sold during the first 6 months of 1961 with maturities not exceeding 20 years; over 42 percent of the number of new issues of municipal bonds sold during the first 6 months of 1961 with maturities from 21 through 25 years; over 48 percent of the number of new issues of municipal bonds sold during the first 6 months of 1961 with maturities of 26 years or longer.

The Research Department of the IBA keeps a record of the details of every reported sale of a new issue of municipal bonds and the figures above are based on a check of each of the 3,610 new issues of municipal bonds sold during the first 6 months of 1961, aggregating over $4,569 million. The breakdown into three classifications is based on the rate established by the HHFA and the ARA for the indicated maturities.

CRITICIZES FAILURE TO JUDGE BOND'S QUALITY

As a further factor demonstrating the failure to relate the reasonable rate under these programs to current market rates, it should be observed that no distinction is made between general obligation bonds and revenue bonds, although the statistics clearly indicate that a reasonable rate for revenue bonds would generally be about one-half of 1 percent higher than a reasonable rate for general obligation bonds.

It appears that the present policy of the HHFA and the ARA in determining the interest rate which constitutes reasonable terms is contrary to the intent of the law which specifically provides that the Federal loans may be provided only when the financing is not available from other sources on reasonable terms. This conclusion is supported by recent reports in the press that Senator WILLIS ROBERTSON, chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency (which has jurisdiction over housing legislation including the community facilities loan program), has stated that the rates presently established as reasonable by the HHFA are too low in relation to current market rates.

CITES RECENT CHARLESTON, W. VA., UNDERCUTTING

Particular attention focused on this program when all seven bids on $4 million Charleston, W. Va., sewer revenue bonds were rejected on July 31, although the best bid provided a reasonable net interest cost of 3.945 percent, after a representative of the HHFA present at the meeting advised that the funds might be obtained from his agency at a lower rate. The HHFA approved the $4 million loan to Charleston on October 19, with the usual requirement that the bonds be advertised again in a financial newspaper of national circulation and an agreement that the HHFA will purchase all those bonds for which bids are not received from other investors on reasonable terms.

It is the policy of HHFA to require that bonds be offered in blocks of maturities so that private investors might purchase one or more blocks of the shorter maturities at an interest rate below the reasonable rate based on the maximum maturity. This policy is constructive in making it possible for at least a portion of many issues to be purchased by other investors.

The principal effect of these programs, with the interest rate presently established as reasonable by administrative policy too low in relation to current market rates, is to substitute Federal financing for financing which is readily available from other sources at rates reasonable in relation to current market rates—with the Federal Government thereby taking over unnecessarily a function of private industry. It is doubtful that little, if any, construction of community facilities are being financed under this program which would not be financed from other sources if the programs were abandoned.

SMALL TOWNS DO BORROW AT REASONABLE TERMS

One of the assumptions on which both programs are based is that small municipalities cannot obtain financing at rates as favorable as those obtained by larger municipalities. This assumption is not well founded. A draft report by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations on "State Constitutional and Statutory Restrictions on Local Government Debt," rebutting the premise that small governments and bond issues commonly involve somewhat higher rates of interest than the larger issues of widely known governmental units, observed that "Extensive recent studies tend to discount earlier impressions about the prevalence of any such size-related differential." Furthermore, a brief review of new issues of bonds sold by municipalities with population under 10,000 for water or sewer facilities during the first 3 months of 1961 indicates that small municipalities can obtain very favorable rates of interest. A partial list of such issues is attached for illustrative purposes. It should be observed that 22 of the 51 issues on this list, which were financed without Federal assistance, would presently be eligible for Federal loans under the program (in addition to any qualifying in redevelopment areas) because they were sold at an interest cost in excess of the presently established reasonable rate for the maturities involved.

In this connection, it is also appropriate to observe that sales of new issues of municipal bonds to finance construction of public facilities have reached record levels in recent years. Over $6.8 billion of such bonds have been sold during the first 10 months of this year and it appears probable that a new record for sales of such bonds will be established this year, close to $8 billion—without Federal assistance.

THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMY DRIVE

The IBA vigorously opposed the expansion of this program when it was under consideration this year in Congress, through a statement submitted to members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency when the proposal was under consideration by that committee, through letters addressed to all Members of the House immediately prior to consideration of the proposal in the House, and through notice to Members regarding the proposal.

President Kennedy on October 26 ordered a Federal economy drive and asked agency heads to exercise the maximum care in tightening requirements, postponing the initiation of deferable projects, and phasing out any acceleration of spending which was instituted as an antirecession measure. On October 30, the IBA suggested to the administrator of the program that he could do much to carry out the President's order by restricting eligibility for Federal loans under the program by raising the rate of interest established as the reasonable rate under the program.

The Housing Act of 1961 also amended the community facilities loan program by adding the following provision:

"SEC. 207. The Administrator is authorized to establish technical advisory services to assist municipalities and other political subdivisions and instrumentalities in the budgeting, financing, planning, and construction of community facilities. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, together with any fees that may be charged, to cover the cost of such services."

This authorization also provides an unnecessary intrusion of the Federal Government in furnishing professional services which would be provided more properly and more effectively by professional financial advisers. We believe that much advice furnished by representatives of the Federal Government will be designed principally to qualify for assistance under various Federal programs, rather than for the best long-term interests of the community.

In conclusion, in this country where we speak so proudly of our free enterprise system and where so much attention is focused on demonstrating the superiority of our system over an alien system based on governmental ownership, we are compelled to protest that the Federal Government in the community facility loan program is taking over a function of private industry in substituting Federal financing for financing that is readily available from other sources at reasonable rates. Consequently:

(a) The provision authorizing Federal advisory services to municipalities in budgeting and financing should be repealed.

(b) The provisions extending the application of the community facilities loan program to communities in redevelopment areas under special terms should be repealed because they create an unnecessary and undesirable duplication with Federal loan and grant programs authorized under the Area Redevelopment Act.

(c) The interest rate determined as "reasonable" in establishing eligibility for Federal loans under the program should be fixed at a level in relation to current market rates for comparable maturities and types of securities (general obligations or revenue bonds).

(d) The acts authorizing the community facilities loan program and loans to municipalities under the area redevelopment program should be amended so that loans under those programs may be made only when the financing is not available from other sources at rates reasonable in relation to current market rates for comparable maturities and types of securities (general obligations or revenue bonds).

Partial list of new issues of bonds sold by municipalities with population under 10,000 for water or sewer facilities during the 1st 3 months of 1961 (January–March)

Issuer-purpose	Amount	Maturity range	Net interest cost
Maumee, Ohio, street and sewer	$125,000	2–10	2.760
Farmingdale, N.Y., water system	150,000	1–15	2.990
Wappingers Falls, N.Y., water	90,000	1–15	3.090
Sudbury, Mass., water district	35,000	1–15	3.130
Belleair, Fla., sewer	500,000	3–12	3.154
Golden, Colo., water	270,000	1–15	3.169
Radford, Va., water and sewer	1,100,000	1–20	3.187
Westminster, Mass., water	125,000	1–15	3.240
Britt, Iowa, sewer	96,000	1–19	3.257
Little Rock, Iowa, community school district	140,000	1–18	3.273
Spencer, Iowa, sewer	350,000	1–19	3.321
Dalton, Mass., sewer	695,000	1–29	3.350
Oak Harbor, Ohio, sewer	69,000	1–20	3.370
Morris, Minn., sewage	340,000	2–21	3.373
Greenville, Mich., sewage	300,000	1–20	3.391
North Baltimore, Ohio, sewer	100,000	1–19	3.450
Perrysburg, Ohio, sewage	295,000	1–20	3.460
Medina, N.Y., water	700,000	1–29	3.480
Buhl, Minn., sewage	112,000	2–13	3.487
Strasburg, Va., sewer	170,000	1–20	3.528
Medina, Ohio, waterworks	150,000	2–21	3.566
Medina, Ohio, sewage	650,000	2–21	3.566
Medina, Ohio, waterworks	200,000	2–21	3.566
Fairfax, Minn., water and sewer	49,000	2–16	3.570
Liberty, N.Y., water	120,000	1–27	3.630
Wells, Minn., sewage	190,000	3–20	3.645
Bedford Heights, Ohio, sewer	$398,000	1–20	3.650
West Carrollton, Ohio, sewer	175,000	2–21	3.680
New Windsor, N.Y., water	198,000	1–29	3.710
Salem Heights, Oreg., water district	486,000	1–23	3.726
Enfield, N.C., water	100,000	3–21	3.743
Bloomfield Hills, Mich., sewer	1,330,000	1–29	3.778
St. Helens, Oreg., sewer	125,000	1–20	3.778
Wesson, Miss., waterworks	60,000	2–21	3.802
St. Joseph, La., sewer	86,000	1–25	3.809
Seaside, Oreg., sewer	271,000	1–19	3.817
Belleair, Fla., sewer	750,000	2–31	3.877
Hazlehurst, Miss., sewer	395,000	4–30	3.916
Riverdale, N.J., water	175,000	1–30	3.920
Winsboro, La,, Sewer District I	275,000	2–25	3.930
De Quincy, La,, improvement sewer district	157,000	2–20	3.940
Somerdale, N.J., sewer	162,000	1–18	3.940
Old Town, Maine, water district	800,000	1–20	3.950
Granite Falls, N.C., sewer	50,000	1–18	3.978
Bernice, La., sewage	65,000	1–20	4.010
Cookeville, Tenn., waterworks revenue	600,000	6–24	4.088
Blaine, Minn., water	533,000	3–21	4.141
White Cloud, Mich., sewage	150,000	3–29	4.168
Arden Hills, Minn., sewer	400,000	1–20	4.220
Fuquay Springs, N.C., sewer	230,000	2–31	4.235
Hugo, Minn., waterworks improvement	160,000	2–20	4.322

On November 30, 1961, the Board of Governors of the IBA approved recommendations that:

1. The interest rate determined as reasonable in establishing eligibility for Federal loans under the program be fixed at a level in relation to current market rates for comparable maturities and types of securities (general obligations or revenue bonds), which reasonable rate would be higher than the current yield on outstanding obligations of the United States of comparable maturity.

As a yardstick for a reasonable rate, for purposes of this program only, we suggest that the rate be set monthly as the rate which is in the Bond Buyer 20-Bond Index for the last week of the preceding month, plus one-half of 1 percent for general obligation bonds or 1 percent for revenue bonds, in both cases for 20-year maximum maturities, adjusted up one-eighth of 1 percent for each full 5 years' longer maturity or down one-eighth of 1 percent for each full 5 years' shorter maturity.

2. The provisions extending the application of the community facilities loan program to communities in redevelopment areas under special terms be repealed because they create an unnecessary and undesirable duplication with Federal loan and grant programs authorized under the Area Redevelopment Act.

3. The provision authorizing Federal advisory services to municipalities in budgeting and financing be repealed.

The IBA has submitted the following tabulation which shows for a 20-year maximum maturity general obligation municipal bond the rate of interest during the last 6 months of 1961 (a) which would have been deemed reasonable under the yardstick recommended by the IBA and (b) which was established as reasonable by the Housing and Home Finance Agency for loans outside of redevelopment areas, compared with the Morgan-Guaranty Index for fully taxable U.S. Government bonds of 20-year maturity for the last week of the preceding month (note the close relationship between the IBA yardstick rate and the rate on U.S. Government bonds of the same maturity):

	IBA proposal	HHFA rate	Morgan-Guaranty Index for U.S. bonds
July 1961	4.04	3.625	3.94
August 1961	3.99	3.625	3.90
September 1961	4.04	3.625	4.03
October 1961	3.99	3.625	3.98
November 1961	3.89	3.625	3.97
December 1961	3.98	3.625	4.02

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time there be a morning hour, limited to 15 minutes, and that the time required for it be charged equally to the time available to both sides under the unanimous-consent agreement—in other words, one-half of such time to be charged to each side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then the vote will be taken at 2 o'clock?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report of Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on rural electric and rural telephone programs of the Rural Electrification Administration, for the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on Puerto Rican Hurricane Relief Loans

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the Puerto Rican hurricane relief loans, as of December 31, 1961; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Amendment of Section 6 of Agricultural Marketing Act, Relating to Reduction of Revolving Fund

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 6 of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended, to reduce the revolving fund available for subscriptions to the capital stock of the banks for cooperatives (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on Judgments Rendered by U.S. Court of Claims (S. Doc. No. 70)

A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of all judgments rendered by that court, for the year ended September 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Report of Director of Selective Service

A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, his report, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Army, Navy, and Air Force Prime Contract Awards to Small and Other Business Firms

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms, for the period July–November 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report of Federal Communications Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of U.S. Tariff Commission

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

Extension of Renegotiation Act of 1951

A letter from the Chairman, the Renegotiation Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

Audit Report on Farm Credit Administration

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Farm Credit Administration, for the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Audit Report on Export-Import Bank of Washington

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Export-Import Bank of Washington, fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Crooked River Project Extension, Oregon

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the Crooked River Project Extension, Oregon, dated November 30, 1961 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Upper Division, Baker Project, Oregon

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Upper Division, Baker Project, Oregon, dated January 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Auburn-Folsom South Unit, Central Valley Project, California

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Auburn-Folsom south unit proposing expansion of the Central Valley project, California, dated December 1961 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Certifications of Adequate Soil Survey and Land Classification

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands to be benefited by the Dalles project, Western Division, Oregon (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Emery County project, Utah (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Determinations Relating to 1961 Construction Payment Due the United States From Belle Fourche Irrigation District, South Dakota

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, his determinations relating to the 1962 construction payment due the United States from the Belle Fourche Irrigation District, Belle Fourche project, South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Removal of Ceiling on Appropriations for Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to remove the ceiling on the authorization for appropriations for the government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Exchange of Certain Lands at Antietam National Battlefield Site

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the exchange of certain lands at Antietam National Battlefield Site (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Change of Name of Whitman National Monument to Whitman Mission National Historic Site

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to change the name of Whitman National Monument to Whitman Mission National Historic Site (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report of Helium Program

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress made in carrying out the helium program, dated December 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Validation of Payments of Certain Special Station Per Diem Allowances and Allowances for Quarters to Certain Commissioned Officers of Public Health Service

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to validate payments of certain special station per diem allowances and certain basic allowances for quarters made in good faith to commissioned officers of the Public Health Service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Tort Claims Paid by U.S. Department of Justice

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, during the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of National Labor Relations Board

A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Reports on Positions in Certain Grades of Classification Act of 1949

A letter from the Director of Personnel, U.S. Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in that Department in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in that Office in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Appropriations to Atomic Energy Commission

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Appropriations to Atomic Energy Commission, Relating to Acquisition of Real Property

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to be made to the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction or expansion, for continuation of the cooperative power reactor demonstration program, and for the Euratom program (with an accompanying paper); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, and so forth, were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Sixth Guam Legislature; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Resolution 253

"Resolution relative to respectfully petitioning the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing and empowering the appropriate department to reopen land condemnation cases which have been stipulated into for the taking of lands within the territory of Guam

"Whereas as a result of the establishment within the territory of Guam of military bases and military facilities, hundreds of acres of real property have been condemned by the U.S. Government for military uses, roadways, and other military facilities; and

"Whereas as a result of such takings, hundreds of landowners, without proper representation and advice, and without knowledge of their rights, particularly before the enactment of the Organic Act of Guam when such landowners were not American citizens but nationals of the United States only, executed stipulations with representatives of the U.S. Government for the taking of their lands, which stipulations call for payments to these owners of ridiculously low amounts for the taking of such lands by the military; and

"Whereas many representations have been made by the landowners to their representatives in the Guam Legislature that had they known their rights, they would not have executed such stipulations for the taking of their lands; and

"Whereas in the majority of cases, the landowners could not even read or speak the English language with the result therefor that they did not understand the full implication of the documents they signed; and

"Whereas these landowners, Americans all, should be justly compensated for the takings of their lands in accordance with the Constitution of the United States and the Organic Act of Guam, because the moneys received by them represented but a small fraction of the true market value and just compensation for such takings: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Sixth Guam Legislature does hereby respectfully petition and memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing and empowering the appropriate department to reopen land condemnation cases which have been entered into by stipulations by the former landowners thereof and authorizing such appropriate department to renegotiate with such landowners the true and reasonable value of the properties so taken; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the speaker certify to and the legislative secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House, to the Department of Interior, and to the Governor of Guam."

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] and myself, I present a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of South Carolina urging the Federal Communications Commission not to cancel the license and franchise held by WIS–TV, Columbia, S.C., for television transmission over VHF channel 10. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 457

Concurrent resolution urging the Federal Communications Commission not to cancel the license and franchise held by WIS–TV, Columbia, S.C., for television transmission over VHF channel 10

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission is proposing the removal of the only wide-range television facility granted to our State capital, namely channel 10 licensed to WIS–TV at Columbia, S.C.; and

Whereas other cities about us, including Augusta, Ga.; Charlotte, N.C.; and the South Carolina cities of Charleston, Florence, Greenville, and Spartanburg all have, and will retain, one or more VHF television stations each; and

Whereas citizens of South Carolina beyond the immediate environs of Columbia are equipped to receive only VHF television transmissions; and

Whereas to delete channel 10 would impose a financial outlay of from $30 to $50, or more, upon each such home before it could receive television programs from Columbia; and

Whereas we evaluate with highest commendation the performance of WIS–TV, channel 10, particularly for its alert, fair, and comprehensive news coverage of the affairs of our State government, its initiative in bringing thought-provoking discussion to enlighten our citizens on the problems of our State; and

Whereas there is urgent and compelling public need for the continuation of this praiseworthy performance by WIS–TV and its highly trained personnel; and

Whereas Columbia, our capital and largest city, would suffer irreparable harm through being deprived of communications with vast numbers of persons residing within its normal trade area; and,

Whereas many citizens of South Carolina whose allegiance, loyalty, and civic pride naturally flow to Columbia will be compelled to form an unnatural devotion to out-of-State television stations to learn of news and events which affect Columbia and their own communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina does hereby voice to the President of the United States, to the U.S. Congress, and to the Federal Communications Commission its objection to the proposed removal of VHF channel 10, and does most urgently ask in the name of fairness to our State, in light of the dominant interest and convenience of our citizens, and in furtherance of good government, that VHF channel 10 be retained in Columbia, S.C., to the end that our capital and largest city, and the people surrounding Columbia, will enjoy television service comparable with other cities of its size and importance; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the two U.S. Senators from South Carolina, each Member of the House of Representatives from this State, to the President of the United States, and to the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

RESOLUTION OF THE NEW YORK BOARD OF TRADE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I call attention to a resolution of the New York Board of Trade calling for the repeal of the 10 percent transportation excise tax. I have long believed that this emergency levy should be eliminated. I hope that this year the Congress will act. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution by the New York Board of Trade be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the New York Board of Trade's transportation section is vitally interested in the preservation of all transportation systems servicing the port of New York; and

Whereas the 10-percent tax on passenger transportation in the United States imposes an excessive and unnecessary burden upon all who travel in the pursuit of business vital to the national economy and welfare; and

Whereas this levy, imposed as an emergency wartime measure nearly 20 years ago to discourage nonessential use of an overtaxed transportation system, has long since ceased to serve any part or semblance of its purpose; and

Whereas the similar wartime excise tax on the transportation of goods was repealed in 1958; and

Whereas this unnecessary and inequitable excise tax, by adding to the cost of travel and thereby discouraging use of transportation, poses an immediate and serious threat to common carrier services essential to the health and well-being of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the transportation section of the New York Board of Trade does support the railroads, the airlines, and the buslines in their earnest request for the needful elimination of the 10-percent Federal transportation excise tax immediately and in its entirety, as this is in the public interest and essential to the national economy and places the board on record as favoring that repeal; and

Whereas this immediate and complete repeal is incumbent upon the Congress of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That the position of the transportation section of the New York Board of Trade favoring the repeal of this tax be made known to the Congress, and that the Congress be urgently petitioned to take immediate corrective legislative action.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. Res. 235. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ an additional clerical assistant (Rept. No. 1125); referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration; and

S. Res. 236. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate the postal service and civil service systems (Rept. No. 1126); referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment:

S. Res. 251. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Commerce to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction, and providing funds therefor; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT ENTITLED "11TH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION" (S. REPT. NO. 1124)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, from the Joint Committee on Defense Production, I submit the 11th annual report on the activities of that committee. I ask that the report be printed, with illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Virginia.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

William A. Crawford, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Rumania; and

William E. Stevenson, of Colorado, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Philippines.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Clinton D. Upham, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and

Richard F. Elden, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the U.S. Coast Guard.

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

John A. McCone, of California, to be Director of Central Intelligence.

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Fred Korth, of Texas, to be Secretary of the Navy.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Neil E. Harlan, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2717. A bill to authorize certain improvement of Hurricane Creek for flood control purposes in the vicinity of Hillview, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 2718. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Juana Christopetrou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 2719. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in Greece in 1963; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KERR (for himself, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 2720. A bill to authorize reimbursement to the States or the designation of additional Interstate System mileage for certain free or toll highways now on the Interstate System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHURCH (by request):

S. 2721. A bill to provide relief for the heirs and devisees of Fly and Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottees; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 2722. A bill for the relief of Miss Livia Sernini (Cucciatti); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 2723. A bill to provide that lands within the exterior boundaries of a national forest acquired under section 8 of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315g), may be added to the national forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 2724. A bill to amend section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the disposal of surplus property for use in the development, operation, and maintenance of State parks and State recreational areas; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 2725. A bill to provide for a special additional appropriation for the purpose of accelerating research with respect to the causes, prevention, and cure of cancer, heart disease, and mental illness; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2726. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Citizens' Council for the Spread of Freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 2727. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Permanent Commission on Governmental Operations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 2728. A bill for the relief of Chan Wing Cheung, also known as Bill Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 2729. A bill for the relief of Hom Wah Yook (also known as Hom Bok Heung); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 2730. A bill to waive the limitations and restrictions of section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the holding of court at Fayetteville, Ark., by the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Arkansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2731. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide vocational rehabilitation, education and training, mustering-out and loan guaranty benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, to provide that mustering-out pay shall be paid at increased rates for persons recalled to active duty since August 1, 1961, to provide loan assistance for persons so recalled who were compelled to liquidate their business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 2732. A bill for the relief of Yoon So Shim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2733. A bill to amend section 20b of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appeared under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 2734. A bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. RUSSELL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2735. A bill for the relief of John R. Devereux; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 2736. A bill for the relief of Arie Abramovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MORSE, and Mrs. NEUBERGER):

S. 2737. A bill to encourage the use of American-flag vessels by domestic industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 2738. A bill to deny the use of the U.S. postal service for the carriage of Communist political propaganda; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 2739. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Merlin division, Rogue River Basin project, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ) (by request):

S.J. Res. 148. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of the National Capital Parks Memorial Board; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. KERR when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

Mr. CARLSON submitted a resolution (S. Res. 272) relative to funeral expenses of the late Senator Andrew F. Schoeppel, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. CARLSON, which appears under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON MIGRATORY LABOR OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 273); which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to migratory labor including, but not limited to, such problems as (a) the wages of migratory workers, their working conditions, transportation facilities, housing, health and educational opportunities for migrants and their children, (b) the nature of and the relationships between the programs of the Federal Government and the programs of State and local governments and the activities of private organizations dealing with the problems of migratory workers, and (c) the degree of additional Federal action necessary in this area.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT ON HURRICANE CREEK, IN VICINITY OF HILLVIEW, ILL.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize certain improvement of Hurricane Creek, a tributary of the Illinois River, for flood control purposes in the vicinity of Hillview, Ill.

The purpose of the bill is to provide flood protection for agricultural areas and related work in the Hartwell Drainage and Levee District and the Hillview Drainage and Levee District of Greene and Scott Counties, Ill.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors of the Department of the Army in its report on the Illinois River and tributaries recommended the enlargement of the levees in both drainage districts to provide much needed flood protection for the village of Hillview.

It is understood that the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of the Army has been petitioned by local interests to provide construction of headwater reservoirs under the provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 566, 83d Congress, as amended. The proposal is under consideration by the Governor of Illinois and if approved by him may lead to further action by the Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD communications from the boards of commissioners of the Hartwell Drainage and Levee District and the Hillview Drainage and Levee District, together with one from the board of aldermen of the village of Hillview, Ill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the communications will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2717) to authorize certain improvement of Hurricane Creek for flood control purposes in the vicinity of Hillview, Ill., introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The communications presented by Mr. DIRKSEN are as follows:

HARTWELL DRAINAGE &
LEVEE DISTRICT,
Hillview, Ill., December 7, 1961.

Hon. EVERETT DIRKSEN,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SIR: We wish to bring to your attention a problem that exists here in the village of Hillview, Ill.

Our village is located in Greene County along the banks of Hurricane Creek, which drains a large watershed reaching as far east as Roodhouse, Ill.

After the river levees were built, levees were also constructed to contain this creek. Over the years this creek bed has filled with silt and no longer furnishes adequate protection for the village. This also endangers our drainage district and the levees that protect us.

It is the thinking of the area Corps of Engineers that if this creek were properly dredged these faults could be corrected and the community once again safe from these periodic floods.

There have been four of these floods within the past few years that have caused untold property damage and suffering to the inhabitants of this area. Upon each occasion the Red Cross and other relief agencies have come to our assistance but no action has been taken to correct the cause of these floods.

We, the commissioners of the Hartwell Drainage and Levee District, representing the landowners and tenants in this district appeal to you and your office to render whatever assistance possible to help us correct this problem.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH SHILD,
President.
JOHN D. LONG,
Secretary.
NEIL CARTER,
Member.

HILLVIEW DRAINAGE AND LEVEE
DISTRICT OF GREENE AND SCOTT
COUNTIES, ILL.,
Hillview, Ill., December 7, 1961.

Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: Some 25 years or so ago the Government Corps of Engineers constructed levees along the Illinois River protecting lands therein from high river stages. To complete this protection they built levees from the river up tributary creeks. In the process of this work to complete the protection for the Hillview Drainage and Levee District and the Hartwell Drainage District, respectively, the Government engineers built levees on both sides of Hurricane Creek from the Illinois River upstream to the village of Hillview, a distance of 3 miles or so. This Hurricane Creek drains a vast watershed adjacent to the towns of Roodhouse and White Hall.

At the time and for several years after the levees were built this Hurricane Creek tributary had a large and clear unimpeded channel and took care of the many floodwaters. However, during the ensuing years this creek has become clogged and choked up with sediment and debris and there simply isn't any quick passageway for the floodwaters to reach the river. Thus any abnormal rainfall in the above watersheds plunges down into the valley over tops and washes out the levees and G.M. & O. R.R. Co.'s right-of-way and pours into the village of Hillview, inundating a score or more of homes and business establishments, causing untold damage and distress and even threatening loss of life. These floods after going through the village pour down into the Hillview Drainage District destroying the crops on thousands of acres and causing an unbearable tax on our pumping facilities.

There have been four of these disastrous floods in a past number of years. The latest two coming on successive days of last August 9 and 10.

The U.S. Corps of Engineers have been alerted of these flood conditions. They are very sympathetic and cooperative in their numerous inspections and studies of the situation.

It is the universal conviction and opinion of everyone, who is in the position to know, that if the Hurricane Creek channel could be restored to its original carryoff capacity, that all future flooding conditions would be taken care of for years to come.

We would like to point out that there is precedent for Government help in such conditions. Several years ago the neighboring village of Pearl, Ill., had disastrous floods of a similar nature. Hill Creek poured down devastating floods of water and sand over the State highway into the village. The Corps of Engineers and the State of Illinois came to their assistance and by channel and levee work corrected the trouble. Also our neighboring drainage districts of Eldred and Macoupin have had relief assistance on Macoupin Creek and Main Canals.

Therefore, we, the undersigned commissioners, representing some 40 or more landowners and their tenants, owning and operating some 12,395 acres in the Hillview Drainage and Levee District, respectfully petition and ask for your good offices and assistance for relief in the above described disaster area.

We appreciate and thank you for your help in the matter and beg to remain,

Very truly yours,

WALTER W. BEAMS,
I. H. BOWMAN,
J. H. DANIELS,
Commissioners.

HILLVIEW, ILL.,
December 11, 1961.

Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DIRKSEN: As representatives of the people of the village of Hillview, we feel that it is important for you to be aware of the true facts, and imperative that some immediate action be taken.

The village lies approximately 3 miles from the Illinois River. A tributary of that river, Hurricane Creek, flows through the town. In the 1930's the U.S. Corps of Engineers constructed levees along this tributary to protect the farmlands from river floodwaters.

All went well until, due to lack of maintenance, the creek filled with silt and debris. Due to insufficient funds, this condition has become more and more acute. With every heavy rainfall the town is flooded. Many homes and businesses are damaged, not to mention the utter distress of the entire community.

This has been going on for 15 years. We have made appeal after appeal for aid. Apparently all appeals have fallen upon deaf ears. Not one shovel of silt has been removed, and our situation becomes worse with each flood.

This entire situation has been brought to the attention of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. In a letter a few days ago, they reported their recommendations for correction of conditions based on discussions and field observation. They are unable, at this time, to do anything, because no funds have been made available or authorized for this work.

Whom must we contact, what must we do to open the eyes of our representatives so that they will provide assistance for us? We would appreciate it very much if you would please consider our problem, and do everything within your power to give us aid.

Respectfully,

BOARD OF ALDERMEN,
VILLAGE OF HILLVIEW.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE NATIONAL FOREST

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide that lands within the exterior boundaries of a national forest acquired under section 8 of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended, 43 U.S.C. 315g, may be added to the national forest, and for other purposes.

This bill was submitted as an executive communication with a recommendation that it be enacted. The communication and bill were referred to the Interior Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Secretary of Agriculture accompanying the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2723) to provide that lands within the exterior boundaries of a national forest acquired under Section 8 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended, 43 U.S.C. 315g, may be added to the national forest, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter presented by Mr. ANDERSON is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington D.C., December 28, 1961.
THE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed for the consideration of the Congress a draft bill, "To provide that lands within the exterior boundaries of a national forest acquired under section 8 of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315g), may be added to the national forest, and for other purposes."

We recommend that this draft bill be enacted.

The proposed legislation would provide that lands within the boundaries of a national forest heretofore or hereafter acquired under section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315g), may be added to the national forest by public land order, by the Secretary of the Interior. Such additions would be subject to determination by the Secretary of Agriculture that the lands are suitable for national forest administration. These lands, after being set apart and reserved by the Secretary of the Interior, would be subject to the laws, rules, and regulations applicable to lands set apart and reserved from the public domain within said national forest.

In order to promote the purposes of the grazing districts or to facilitate the administration of public lands, section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to accept donations of land or make exchange of grazing district or other public domain land for State or privately owned land inside or outside of grazing districts. Exchange authorities applicable to the national forests ordinarily do not authorize acceptance of title to lands outside national forest boundaries.

From time to time, in exchanges made under the Taylor Grazing Act, some of the State and private lands received by the Department of the Interior have been located within the boundaries of national forests. Frequently, they are lands of the same character as or similar to the national forest lands presently adjoining them within the national forest boundaries and are suitable and valuable for national forest purposes. Because they are so closely related to national forest lands, they should be retained in public ownership and managed as national forest lands under the principles of multiple-use and sustained yield.

In some States, public land may be added to and made a part of a national forest by public land order, upon agreement of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture. However, in the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, New Mexico, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming additions may not be made to national forests except by act of Congress (16 U.S.C. 471, 471a). This restriction applies to lands within national-forest boundaries acquired by the Department of the Interior under the authority contained in section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act.

Because of this restriction, it was necessary for Congress to enact special legislation to give national-forest status to some 13,600 acres of land suitable for national-forest purposes, acquired through exchanges by the Department of the Interior under the authority of the Taylor Grazing Act within the boundaries of the Lincoln National Forest in New Mexico. This special authority is contained in the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 540).

If the draft bill were enacted, national-forest status could be given to over 3,300 acres of land within national-forest boundaries in some of the above listed States, which have now been acquired by the Department of the Interior by exchanges under the Taylor Grazing Act. These lands are intermingled with and generally similar in character to adjoining national-forest lands. These Taylor Grazing Act lands within the national forests constitute small islands of public domain land which are widely scattered and isolated from other public domain lands. They consequently are difficult to administer as public domain lands. The public interest would be benefited from their addition to the national forests within which they are located. They then would be managed for multiple use, in conjunction with the adjacent national-forest lands. Consolidation of the national forests for greater efficiency and economy in administration would result, as would assured conservation of the land and resources.

The draft bill would enable similar action to be taken with respect to any lands within national-forest boundaries which might be acquired in the future through exchanges under the Taylor Grazing Act.

Under the provisions of the act of June 11, 1960 (74 Stat. 205), there were transferred from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Agriculture certain functions in connection with national-forest land exchanges. The land adjustment programs for the national forests, through the acceptance of private land within the boundaries of national forests, can be simplified by providing for the transfer to the Department of Agriculture of the base lands outside the national forests to be exchanged, and by making the exchange of such lands subject to the provisions of the act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), as amended and supplemented.

A similar letter is being sent to the Speaker of the House.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,
ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

ACCELERATION OF RESEARCH WITH RESPECT TO CAUSES, PREVENTION, AND CURE OF CANCER, HEART DISEASE, AND MENTAL ILLNESS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for a special additional appropriation for the purpose of accelerating research with respect to the causes, prevention, and cure of cancer, heart disease, and mental illness.

This bill, it is hoped, will receive the immediate attention of the 87th Congress.

Today, about 45 million Americans now living will eventually have cancer; 1 in 4 persons, according to present rates. Cancer will strike over the years in about two of three American families. This year about 800,000 Americans will be under medical care for cancer.

In this year alone, 1962, there will be about 520,000 new cancer cases diagnosed for the first time with 13,000 of these coming from my home State of Indiana. It is estimated that about 87,000 cancer patients will probably die in 1962. This would be, in Indiana, the equivalent of wiping out communities like Terre Haute and Muncie.

Some other facts on cancer we should not ignore include the stark statistic that almost half of all cancer deaths in 1961 were among persons under 65 years of age.

Each year cancer costs the national economy nearly 50,000 man-years of productivity; about $215 million in services and salaries; almost $189 million in estimated spending earnings; at least $26 million in income taxes; plus loss of other tax moneys at least equal to that.

Cancer also costs American business and industry such intangibles as the loss of valuable executives at the peak of their efficiency and the loss of trained workers at the height of their productivity, plus the general loss that occurs when the disease strikes in an employee's family.

Further, cancer is no respecter of age, sex, or profession.

We in the Senate are painfully aware of the sadness and tragedy which cancer can bring. We have seen that dread disease take the lives of two men—colleagues of ours—whom we all knew and respected. A few weeks ago the Nation mourned the loss of House Speaker Sam Rayburn. Now we have lost another friend, Senator Andrew Schoeppel.

The disease has snuffed out the lives of other great leaders and well-known personalities such as the former Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles; Dr. Tom Dooley; scientist Marie Curie; sports stars Babe Ruth and Babe Zaharias; actors Gary Cooper and Humphrey Bogart, and Broadway lyricist Oscar Hammerstein 2d, and Richard Skelton, the son of Hoosier comedian Red Skelton.

It has taken the lives of other Americans, also, not as well known, who nevertheless, left loved ones who grieved their passing.

Cancer will continue to take its toll unless we quickly find the causes and cure.

Startling as these facts are about cancer, we must not forget that heart disease is the No. 1 killer in America today. More than 900,000 men, women, and children are destroyed annually by heart and circulatory diseases. They afflict more than 10 million Americans and over half are between the ages of 25 and 64.

I should like to point out that in Indiana, 853.4 men out of every 100,000 between the ages of 45 to 64, who died between 1949 and 1951, died of heart disease.

These men were killed during their prime—during their most productive years.

Although Americans realize cancer and heart disease are killers, it has just been within recent years that our citizens have accepted mental illness in its true perspective; that is: It may not kill instantly, but the disorder is just as heartbreaking as death itself.

R. S. de Ropp has made the point very clear to all of us with great literary force:

> Madness severs the strongest bonds that hold human beings together. It separates

> husband from wife, mother from child. It is death without death's finality and without death's dignity.

We should seek to understand and accept the mentally ill, and we should do something about their plight.

In order to do the job of placing cancer, heart disease, and mental illness in their proper places in society—that is in the pages of medical books as diseases of yesteryear, this measure I am introducing calls for an authorization to appropriate $498 million to drastically step up the amount of research being done in these fields.

My colleagues, since the ravages of cancer, heart disease, and mental illness are taking every year a heavier toll on the lives and health of the American people; since existing research programs have thus far failed to produce substantial results in discovering the causes of, or means for the prevention and cure of cancer, heart disease, and mental illness, and since it is of primordial interest to the American people that every reasonable effort should be made to eliminate, or at least to decrease, the terrible threat imposed by such dread diseases, I urge and I pray that the Senate will begin hearings on this measure at the earliest possible date.

Action is needed. It is needed now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2725) to provide for a special additional appropriation for the purpose of accelerating research with respect to the causes, prevention, and cure of cancer, heart disease, and mental illness, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CITIZENS' COUNCIL FOR THE SPREAD OF FREEDOM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Citizens' Council for the Spread of Freedom. The Communists have been engaged for over 40 years in a continuous offensive to extend their control over more and more people. A most important part of this offensive is the battle for men's minds.

The U.S.S.R. has set up the most gigantic machinery ever known for the purpose of enslaving world public opinion, for weakening our own resistance, and for spreading doubt and confusion in the minds of the free nations. It is to this machinery, as much as to their military might, that the Soviets owe their principal successes. The Communist propaganda, spreading falsehoods and distortions around the world, repressing the true facts about communism and intentionally blackening the image of democracy, costs them from 10 to 20 times more than what we spend to spread the word of freedom.

The purpose of this Council would be to reevaluate the adequacy of our policies and programs in the cold war of ideas against communism. The goal would be to make greater use of our free enterprise know-how in the fields of communications, radio, television, publications, and so forth, in order to present a more real picture of U.S. life and ideals to the world.

The Council would include the best minds in America and would be composed of eight experts from private life, four legislators—two from each party—and three members representing the U.S. Information Agency, the Agency for International Development, and the Central Intelligence Agency. The Council would make an extensive survey and would report to the President and the Congress in 6 months as to how our ideological battle can be made more effective, and how we should proceed to place in the minds and hearts of people all over the world a picture of the American free way of life which is not only truthful but also translatable to their needs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2726) to provide for the establishment of a Citizens' Council for the Spread of Freedom, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOOVER-TYPE WATCHDOG COMMISSION ON FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a permanent Hoover-type Watchdog Commission on Federal Expenditures.

Annually, the Nation is experiencing ever-increasing costs of operating its Federal Government. For fiscal year 1962, the proposed budget was $80.9 billion. However, according to best estimates expenditures are running at a rate of about $89 billion. For 1963 the administration has recommended a budget of about $92.5.

Because of these trends, I believe the establishment of such a Commission would help to hold down Federal costs to absolute essentials and promote greater efficiency and economy in Government.

I request unanimous consent to have the following items printed at this point in the RECORD: First, a copy of the bill; and second, a statement on its purposes.

In addition, I request unanimous consent that the bill be allowed to lie on the desk for 1 week to enable the Senators, who might wish to do so, to join in cosponsoring the measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The bill (S. 2727) to provide for the establishment of a Permanent Commission on Governmental Operations, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that:

Whereas the Nation's one hundred and eighty-five million population is expanding at a rate of three million people per year; and

Whereas the operations of the Federal Government have become increasingly complex and far reaching—with Federal expenditures increasing annually; and

Whereas the U.S. national debt, now approximately $296 billion, has been growing increasingly—without successful effort to substantially reduce such debt; and

Whereas the high level of Federal expenditures places an ever-greater burden on the American taxpayer; and

Whereas there has been evidence, from time to time, of the need for more efficiency, and economy in Government operations, therefore the Government shall make a renewed effort to—

(a) avoid costly waste and duplication;

(b) eliminate unnecessary competition among Federal agencies or services;

(c) eliminate activities that are nonessential, or that can better be performed by State or local governments, or private enterprise;

(d) constantly reevaluate the operations of the Federal Government to promote more—

(1) efficiency in administration; (2) realistic policies governing extensions and limitations of governmental activities; (3) effective staffing of—but not empire building in—Federal agencies; (4) elimination of agencies or activities after need has expired; and

(e) generally to promote greater efficiency and economy to serve the public interest.

The purpose of this Act is to provide for the continuous surveillance of such operations by a permanent commission comprised of leaders from public and private life which is empowered to make recommendations in the interests of achieving maximum efficiency and economy in the conduct of operations of the Federal Government.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 2. There is hereby established a commission to be known as the Permanent Commission on Governmental Operations (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall be composed of 12 members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President, two from the executive branch of the Government and two from private life;

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life; and

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.

(b) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(d) Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

DUTIES

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission shall conduct continuing studies and investigations of governmental operations as they are carried out in the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the executive branch with a view to determining ways and means for—

(1) reducing expenditures consistent with the efficient performance of functions;

(2) eliminating, by consolidation or otherwise, duplication and overlapping of services, activities, and functions;

(3) abolishing services, activities, and functions that are (A) not necessary to the efficient conduct of government, or (B) of a type which could be performed more efficiently and effectively by State or local governments or by private enterprise; and

(4) otherwise effecting increased efficiency and economy in the conduct of such operations.

(b) The Commission shall submit to the President and to the Congress an annual report on its activities under this Act. Such report shall be filed on or before January 15, of each year, and shall include such recommendations as the Commission is prepared to make as a result of its studies and investigations. The Commission may also submit additional or interim reports from time to time setting forth such recommendations, based on its studies and investigations, as it deems proper.

POWERS

Sec. 5. (a) The Commission may, in carrying out this Act, sit and act at such times and places, hold such hearings, take such testimony, administer such oaths, procure such printing and binding, and make such expenditures as the Commission deems advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission.

(b) The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The Commission may also procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

(c) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99), or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

(d) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality of the Federal Government information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purposes of this Act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

Sec. 6. (a) The members of the Commission who are Members of the Congress shall serve without additional compensation. The members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve without additional compensation, but shall continue to receive the salary of their regular position when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission. All other members of the Commission shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) All members of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

EXPENSES

Sec. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

The statement presented by Mr. Wiley is as follows:

Statement by Senator Wiley

As a nation we face an ever-greater responsibility for strengthening our economic system; to meet the needs of a 185 million population—growing at the rate of 3 million per year—to successfully compete against the Communist system, now attempting to pass us by; to obtain a fair share of the free world markets; and to fulfill the ultimate potential of our free enterprise system—the greatest in the history of the world—but not now operating at full capacity.

Briefly now, let's take a look at the facts of fiscal life for the country.

Annually, we as U.S. taxpayers are experiencing ever-increasing costs of operating our Federal Government. For 1963, the reported budget, if approved, will amount to about $92½ billion.

Overall, this amount—raised from personal, corporate, excise, and other taxes—represents a terrific cut in our incomes. In 1961, for example, Wisconsin's share alone of the Federal budget amounted to over $1 billion. For next year, the cost will be higher.

For these reasons, then, I am planning to introduce legislation to establish a Permanent Watchdog Commission along the lines of the previous Hoover Commission. The Commission will be comprised of 12 members: 4 appointed by the President, 2 from the executive branch of the Government and 2 from private life; 4 appointed by the President of the Senate, 2 from the Senate and 2 from private life; and 4 appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives 2 from the House of Representatives and 2 from private life.

The purpose of extra governmental body will be to analyze and evaluate—as well as make recommendations for improving—the operations of Government in the following ways: hold Federal expenditures down to absolute essentials; promote greater efficiency; discourage empire building with Federal agencies; avoid costly waste and duplication;

Eliminate unnecessary competition among Federal agencies or services, as well as nonessential activities or those which could better be performed by State and local governments, or private enterprise; and

Generally promote greater efficiency and economy.

According to reports, the adoption of recommendations of previous Commissions resulted in savings of $3 to $4 billion annually.

The creation of a permanent Commission, serving as a year-in-year-out watchdog on Federal expenditures can, I believe, do much toward promoting efficiency and economy and serving the interest of the American taxpayer.

Therefore, I shall be introducing such a bill this week in the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 20b OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would amend section 20b of the Interstate Commerce Act. This bill is introduced at the request of the American Bar Association's committee on railroad reorganizations and readjustments.

The American Bar Association believes that in the light of experience under section 20b of the Interstate Commerce Act, which was enacted in 1948, changes to increase its usefulness in affectuating the voluntary modification of railroad financial structures thereunder should be made so that—

First. Section 20b would be applicable not only to railroad corporations but to all carriers subject to paragraphs (2) to (11) of section 20a of the Interstate Commerce Act, that is, at present, motor carriers;

Second. The assent of the holders of 75 percent of the outstanding securities of each affected class now required under section 20b would be reduced to 66⅔ percent;

Third. The Commission would be authorized, as it deems appropriate, to consolidate proceedings under section 20b with merger proceedings under section 5(2) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2733) to amend section 20b of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, AND NAVAL VESSELS FOR THE ARMED FORCES, FISCAL YEAR 1963

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to the armed services. This bill is requested by the Department of Defense. I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, relating to the bill, be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2734) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Russell (for himself and Mr. Saltonstall), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The letter presented by Mr. Russell is as follows:

The Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1962.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate.

Dear Mr. President: There is forwarded herewith a draft of proposed legislation "to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the armed forces, and for other purposes." This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 87th Congress and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that its enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

This legislation is identical in form and effect to the provisions of Public Laws 87–53, approved June 21, 1961, and 87–118, approved August 3, 1961, providing the authorizations for appropriations as required pursuant to section 412(b) of Public Law 86–149, approved August 10, 1959 (73 Stat. 322).

As in the case of previous legislation, this proposal would provide for the authorization of appropriations in each of the categories of aircraft, missiles, and ships for each of the military departments in the amount of the new obligational authority being requested for such purposes in the President's budget for fiscal year 1963. The amounts requested for fund authorization have been developed on the same basis as, and are comparable to, those included in the amounts for which fund authorization was granted for fiscal year 1962.

The action of the Congress in providing fund authorization for major procurement programs in the Department of Defense on this basis, coupled with the agreed upon reprograming procedures, provides the device for achieving flexibility in the execution of the programs while, at the same time, retaining a firm basis for congressional control over the programs. The understanding and cooperation of the cognizant committees in expediting the necessary program changes under these procedures in the past year have been significant factors in the accomplishment of the procurement programs.

In support of the legislation, the Committee on Armed Services will be furnished, as before, detailed information with respect to each program for which fund authorization is being requested in a form identical to that being submitted in explanation and justification of the budget request. Additionally, the military departments will be prepared to submit any other data that the committee or its staff may require in connection with the review of the proposal.

It is, of course, assumed that the Armed Services Committees, as in the past, will desire that the top civilian and military officials of the Department of Defense be prepared to make presentations covering the programs and plans for the ensuing year and the request for funds necessary to support such programs.

For ready reference, there is attached hereto a table showing for fiscal year 1962: (1) the amounts for fund authorization by category and by service; (2) the amounts appropriated; and (3) the amounts requested for fund authorization for fiscal year 1963.

Sincerely yours,

Roswell L. Gilpatric,
Deputy.

Fiscal year 1962 amounts authorized versus amounts appropriated

[Thousands of dollars]

	Authorized, fiscal year 1962	Appropriated, fiscal year 1962	Requested, fiscal year 1963
Aircraft:			
Army	247, 700	242, 700	218, 500
Navy and Marine Corps	1, 867, 000	1, 829, 660	2, 134, 600
Air Force	4, 135, 300	3, 601, 218	3, 135, 000
Missiles:			
Army	584, 570	572, 894	558, 300
Navy	868, 600	851, 228	930, 400
Marine Corps	27, 000	26, 981	22, 300
Air Force	2, 800, 800	2, 744, 784	2, 500, 000
Ships: Navy	2, 998, 000	2, 937, 860	2, 982, 000

DENIAL OF POSTAL SERVICE FOR CARRIAGE OF COMMUNIST POLITICAL PROPAGANDA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would deny the use of the U.S. postal service for the carriage of Communist political propaganda.

In 1960 the total volume of known Communist propaganda coming into this country—14 million packages—was more than twice the amount of that of the 6 million packages of 1959.

The main source of this anti-American and pro-Communist material is behind the Iron Curtain. Cuba also is both a point of origin and a transfer stop for much of this literature.

The youth of this country is subjected to a barrage of propaganda originating in Communist-dominated countries. A great majority of our people who have relatives in foreign countries now under the Soviet dictatorship receive weekly, if not daily, anti-American literature.

They do not want it and understand that our postal system is unwillingly being used as a conveyor of falsehoods and lies. "We will bury you," said Khrushchev, and he is attempting to further that threat by this means.

Although open and frank intellectual study of Soviet philosophy is useful, we should not confuse our encouragement of academic freedom and study with the encouragement of a Communist propaganda barrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2738) to deny the use of the U.S. postal service for the carriage of Communist political propaganda, introduced by Mr. Scott, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS MEMORIAL BOARD

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution providing for the establishment of a National Capital Parks Memorial Board. This joint resolution has been requested by the Secretary of the Interior, and I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary relative to the joint resolution be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 148) providing for the establishment of the National Capital Parks Memorial Board, introduced by Mr. Kerr (for himself and Mr. Chavez), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The letter presented by Mr. Kerr is as follows:

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., November 29, 1961.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed joint resolution, providing for the establishment of the National Capital Parks Memorial Board.

We recommend that the enclosed resolution be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and that it be enacted. We believe that enactment at the present time is urgent.

The joint resolution creates a National Capital Parks Memorial Board which will prepare and recommend to the Secretary of the Interior Board criteria, guidelines, and policies for memorializing persons and events on Federal land in the National Capital parks system. The Board will examine proposals made for memorials and make recommendations thereon to the Secretary of the Interior.

The Board will be composed of nine members, as follows: Five appointed by the President of the United States; the Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission; the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission; the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; and the Director of the National Park Service. The members of the Board will receive no salary but may be paid expenses incidental to travel while engaged in discharging their duties as members of the Board.

Memorializations place a constant demand on park land of the Nation's Capital. There are 96 memorials of the monument or statue type already existing on land in the National Capital parks system. A number of others have been authorized but not yet constructed. In the 86th Congress alone seven public laws were enacted authorizing the construction of memorials. At least 17 bills were before the last Congress to authorize the construction of memorials on park lands in the Nation's Capital. It is evident that, if the concept of open space and dignity which contribute so much to the beauty of the Nation's Capital is to be preserved in the face of constant pressures to use the land for memorials, sound guidelines for the control of this use must be formulated, a comprehensive plan must be developed, each proposal must be carefully evaluated, and sound criteria must be steadfastly followed. In fact, such a plan offers the only assurance that sites will be available for future memorials that in all respects merit a location in the parks.

We recommend the establishment of the Memorial Board as a means of meeting the critical situation which confronts the National Capital parks system. The Board will provide an effective method for focusing attention on the problem, and will help all concerned to view the numerous proposals in proper perspective.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that the enactment of this proposed legislation would be consistent with the administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

John A. Carver, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

AMENDMENT OF WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS DISCLOSURE ACT, RELATING TO METHOD OF ENFORCEMENT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TOWER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2520) to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. McNAMARA submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 2520, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS TO, AND REPRINTING OF, JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, late last session I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 142, the so-called equal rights amendment. Because of the lateness of the session, several Senators who wanted to cosponsor the resolution missed the opportunity. I ask unanimous consent that the following names be added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 142; and since the resolution is out of print, I ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted.

Senators Chavez, Gruening, Long of Missouri, Bible, Hruska, Moss, Case of South Dakota, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Bush, Beall, Bartlett, Morse, Smathers, Talmadge, Dworshak, Carlson.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nominations of Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, Francis T. P. Plimpton, of New York, Charles W. Yost, of New York, Philip M. Klutznick, of Illinois, and Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York, to be representatives of the United States to the 16th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF GRIFFIN B. BELL TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, FIFTH CIRCUIT

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 30, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Griffin B. Bell, of Georgia, to be U.S. circuit judge, fifth circuit.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], as chairman, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], and myself.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF TALBOT SMITH TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, January 31, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Talbot Smith, of Michigan, to be U.S. district judge, eastern district of Michigan.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Carroll], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS OF CHARLES G. NEESE TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE, AND FRANK GRAY, JR., TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled for Thursday, February 1, 1962, at 10 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

Charles G. Neese, of Tennessee, to be U.S. district judge, eastern district of Tennessee.

Frank Gray, Jr., of Tennessee, to be U.S. district judge, middle district of Tennessee.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearings may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Carroll], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Wiley], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Clinton N. Ashmore, of Florida, to be U.S. attorney, northern district of Florida;

John M. Imel, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney, northern district of Oklahoma;

Joseph W. Keene, of Louisiana, to be U.S. marshal, western district of Louisiana; and

Richard J. Jarboe, of Indiana, to be U.S. marshal, southern district of Indiana.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Tuesday, January 30, 1962, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Introductory remarks by Mr. Randolph. Address by Senator Jennings Randolph, Democrat, of West Virginia, at West Virginia State College, Institute, W. Va., December 8, 1961: "Federal Aid to Education and Separation of Church and State."

Introductory remarks by Mr. Randolph. Remarks by Senator Randolph in introduction of Dr. Yi-Seng Kiang, Plenipotentiary of the Embassy of the Republic of China. From Martinsburg, W. Va.: "Featured at U.N. Local Observance" and "Nationalist China Minister Makes Red China Ban Plea" (Martinsburg Journal newspaper).

Introductory remarks by Mr. Randolph. In commemoration of the 138th anniversary of the birth of Gen. Thomas Jonathan "Stonewall" Jackson, January 21, 1824.

By Mr. KERR:

Address entitled "Oil and War," delivered by Senator Monroney before the annual convention of the American Petroleum Institute, at Chicago, Ill., on November 13, 1961.

By Mr. HART:

Address on "The Water Crisis in America," delivered by him before Michigan Association of Soil Conservation Districts on January 19, 1962.

By Mr. ENGLE:

Letter dated January 22, 1962, from himself to Vernon L. Talbertt, who retired at the end of last year after more than 51 years of devoted service to the Senate.

THE LATE SENATOR STYLES BRIDGES

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I certainly was not as well acquainted with Senator Styles Bridges as many of my colleagues who have spoken here to express their sorrow at his death. Even so, I should not want to leave unrecorded on this, perhaps the last opportunity there will be to speak out, a personal opinion that America is much the poorer for Styles Bridges' passing. He was a man of strong convictions. He held them resolutely, and projected them ably. He was always a strong advocate of the causes in which he believed. With him there was no trimming or hauling. No one could remain in doubt of Styles Bridges' position on any public subject in which he interested himself.

Mr. President, coupled with this there was always evident—even to a comparative newcomer in the Senate such as myself—a kindliness, a good humor, and an understanding of others that were especially distinguishing marks of Styles Bridges. In addition to everything else, he was a fine human being.

My wife and I express our deepest sympathy to his widow and the other members of his family.

IN MEMORY OF STYLES BRIDGES, A FRIEND

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it is man's unhappy lot to experience the loss of friends. It then becomes an additional burden to live without that friendship. I believe the most difficult thing to express in words is the feeling this loss carries with it for it is a feeling of the heart and it is not responsive to the vocabulary of man. Styles was a close friend of mine and that friendship was treasured as is its memory. I often sought his advice and counsel when it was needed and he never refused me. I likewise often sought just reassurance by talking with him and he stood ever ready to offer it to me. It, therefore, is doubly difficult to find words to use today; but I came across a note given to me by a friend long ago, and this friend never told me its source but it expresses better than I can the feeling I hold for my friend, Styles:

> Once I received gifts of gold and frankincense and myrrh from three very wise men

> who wished to pay tribute to a Child just born. They were fine gifts and they were brought with reverence and love, and all the world will someday tell of them to show to what extent men went to pay Me honor.
>
> Gold and frankincense I have received from three wise men. And yet the wisest of them all tied up his loyalty and faith and friendship, and brought them to Me when I needed most to know there were such gifts still left upon the earth.
>
> There will be men always who will not recognize your gift. There will be men always who have no faith in it. But some will see and some will know, as I do, of its value. So long as these men live and bring your gift to other men, in any land or time, then there shall be no fear of death for them and I shall live, and you shall live, and we will meet again.

The gift that Styles brought to all of us was friendship, and as long as men bring that gift to other men, then there will be, in truth, no fear of death, for we will live and we will meet again.

STATE-CHARTERED SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS IN ALASKA

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to correct a statement I made on the Senate floor on last Thursday, January 18, 1962, which appears in the Record on page 439.

At that time the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall] and I were discussing the laws of various States as they pertain to State-chartered savings and loan associations.

I stated I had been informed by one person that the State of Alaska did not have laws covering State-chartered savings and loan associations. I now find that the State of Alaska does have such laws. In fact, the actions of the legislature of that State in this regard are hailed in certain savings and loan circles as the outstanding legislative achievement of 1961.

The measure establishing the Savings and Loan Act was signed into law by Governor Egan on April 5, 1961. In general, this act follows the provisions of the latest edition of the Model Savings Association Act, which was developed by the U.S. Savings & Loan League, with the added provision that all State-chartered associations in Alaska must have their accounts insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. I might add that the act follows the insurance pattern set in the State of Alaska for State banks, which are required to carry Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation coverage.

While it is true that there were no savings and loan laws governing State-chartered institutions when the territory became a State, it is now apparent that my informer was not cognizant of the action taken by the Legislature of Alaska in 1961.

I was willing to point a finger toward the State of Alaska on last Thursday for not having laws governing State-chartered savings and loan associations. Perhaps today I should point a finger toward that State's laws in this area as an example for others to follow.

COMPENSATION BY GERMAN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO VICTIMS AT GERMAN CONCENTRATION CAMP

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in May of 1959 a number of Polish ladies, who were victims at the Ravensbrueck, Germany, concentration camp, visited the United States. On May 19, they visited the U.S. Senate. These women were from Poland. They were the survivors of medical and surgical experiment by Nazi doctors in World War II. For a number of years a number of private organizations and our own Government were interested in securing a just compensation from the German Federal Government for these women.

I called the Senate's attention to this problem on May 19, 1959. Other Members of the Senate joined in the discussion—including the distinguished majority leader, Mr. Mansfield; the Senator from Maine, Mr. Muskie; the Senator from New York, Mr. Javits; the late Senator from Oregon, Mr. Neuberger; the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. Dodd; the Senator from Michigan, Mr. McNamara; the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. McCarthy; and the Senator from Alabama, Mr. Hill.

I am pleased to inform the Senate that action providing compensation for these women was taken last fall by the German Federal Government. This settlement on the part of the German Federal Government is appreciated by all those who were concerned about the welfare of these women.

Much credit goes to the devoted and continued efforts in behalf of these women by Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review. He worked on this problem for many years, contacting Government officials both in Germany and the United States, as well as Members of Congress and private organizations.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record a letter which I have addressed to the Ambassador from Germany, the Honorable Wilhelm G. Grewe, expressing our appreciation for the settlement of this problem.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> January 22, 1961.
>
> The Honorable Wilhelm G. Grewe,
> *Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, German Embassy, Washington, D.C.*
>
> Dear Mr. Ambassador: On my return to Washington for the opening of the 2d session of the 87th Congress, I learned that the German Federal Government had made compensation to a number of Polish ladies who were victims at Ravensbrueck.
>
> This was a commendable action on the part of your Government and on behalf of myself and other Members of the Senate who have been interested in this settlement, I want to express our sincere thanks and gratitude.
>
> This matter was discussed on the floor of the Senate on May 19, 1959, and a number of Senators took part. In view of that discussion, I am going to call the action taken by your Government to the attention of the Senate and include this letter as a part of my remarks.
>
> With kindest regards, I am,
> Sincerely yours,
>
> Frank Carlson.

IMPORTANCE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, this morning I received in the mail an auto bumper sticker which reads as follows:

> Help get the United States out of the U.N.

The brief letter which accompanied the sticker reads as follows:

> Fellow Patriot, please push this item.
>
> The U.N. issue means life or death for America.
>
> There can be no coexistence on the battlefield nor in the U.N.
>
> No man can serve two masters;, neither any patriot, two governments.
>
> Every true American is a patriot, proud to display this sign.
>
> Copies available free for patriots' use. Order now.
>
> John T. Hedrick.
>
> Orange, Calif.

Mr. President, I only observe that no one would subscribe to that slogan and that letter more ardently than the Soviet Union; and I believe it is time that these so-called patriots take another look at what they are doing to the national interest of our Government.

Former President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and our distinguished Vice President, have made it abundantly clear to the American people that one of the many things we must do if we are to survive is to see whether we can make the United Nations work.

I suggest that everyone who receives one of these bumper stickers or is able to obtain one by writing for it, tear it up, for it is not in the interest of the Government and the people of the United States, who seek freedom.

IMPROVEMENT OF TELEVISION

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the Record of today an excellent article about a set of hearings by the Federal Communications Commission beginning this afternoon on the status of our communications industry, and the networks in particular. It points out the aggressiveness and foresight of Mr. Newton Minow, FCC Chairman. I also ask unanimous consent that Mr. Minow's address to the National Press Club be included in the Record. It is a speech in which he says that what is needed is more television, not less.

There being no objection, the article and address were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> [From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Jan. 21, 1962]
>
> ### FCC Hearings a Milestone—Beginning a Drive To Improve Television
>
> (By Albert Warren)
>
> The most important suppliers of American television programs are the three networks—ABC, CBS, and NBC. About one-half of all programing comes from them.

During peak viewing hours in the evening the figures rise to some 90 percent.

Is this too much control? And do networks pick programs more for money than for merit?

On Tuesday, the Federal Communications Commission starts a hearing to learn just how the networks choose what programs and why. The top network officials will appear and describe the whole program-selection process. The hearing is probably the most important conducted by the FCC in recent years.

This inquiry is no sudden idea of the New Frontier, as epitomized by the FCC's controversial and energetic, young, new Chairman, Newton N. Minow.

Rather, it's part of an FCC study of networking which has been going on since 1955. From time to time, since then, the Commission has stopped and weighed the information it had gleaned to date and adopted new rules designed to improve competition, give non-network program producers greater opportunity to get their output on the air and give individual stations more freedom in program selection.

THE PROGRAMS THEMSELVES

Most of these hearings have involved business relationships. Last June, however, the hearings got closer to the programs themselves. The networks stewed, mostly silently, awaiting a chance to get in their lick, while the Commission gathered testimony such as this:

David Susskind, with his great talent for publicity and controversy, spoke of the "death grip of networks on programing" and a "paranoic race" for ratings.

Worthington Miner, veteran producer, said that NBC and CBS were competing "at a high intellectual level in public-affairs shows but not in entertainment."

David Davidson, chairman of the Writers Guild of America, stated: "Never in history has the writer been paid so much for writing so badly."

The networks have plenty of answers to these accusations, and they will now have the opportunity to let themselves go.

What business is it of the FCC to ask any station or network about programing? Isn't that censorship—forbidden by the Constitution and the Communications Act? It's well conceded, however, that the FCC can ask virtually any question it chooses. What it can do about programing is something else.

DIVERSITY OF VOICES

The real question is this, according to the FCC: Can the FCC produce conditions under which more program producers can have more access to the TV air? The basic assumption is that the public interest is served by the greatest diversity of voices. Unlike radio, which has some 4,500 stations on the air, TV has only about 600. Thus, relatively few producers have access to the viewer's eye—and the networks have succeeded in offering stations the most attractive packages of programs.

But have the networks achieved this prominent program position fairly, solely on the merits of their shows? The FCC has heard a lot of bitter testimony to the effect that a program producer must play the game the networks' way or his show will never see the light of the picture tube.

Hollywood film producers, particularly, have testified that networks apply pressure to acquire ownership in their shows as the price for putting them on the air. In addition, they asserted, networks seek to share in subsidiary earnings—such as foreign sales and merchandising rights (toys, etc.).

The FCC wants to know some very basic things—such as the networks' reasons for telecasting the programs they do. In its letter to the networks, telling them what areas the upcoming hearing will explore, the Commission stated:

"As you doubtless know, there has been much testimony in our inquiry from persons engaged in various capacities in television programing that, in recent years, network television schedules have lacked the diversity and balance necessary adequately to serve the tastes and needs of substantial segments of the national television audience. For instance, as one example among several, there is testimony in the record that networks have not provided adequate programs designed to serve the needs and interests of children.

PROCUREMENT PRACTICES

"Several such persons testified that this lack of diversity in programing stems from the operation of network program procurement practices which are said to result in the selection of programs principally on the basis of their utility as advertising vehicles for those advertisers who seek the largest audience. Doubtless you will wish to address yourselves to this subject. In addition, we shall ask you to describe in detail the operational mechanics and day-to-day implementation of your policies in this regard and their results in terms of program service."

Such questions as the foregoing—according to some in the TV industry—is "censorship by the lifted eyebrow." The Commission has no right even to seek such information, they say, because it implies that the FCC considers some types of programs better than others and therefore is seeking to impose its programing preferences on networks and stations.

One of the largest targets of critics is program ratings—the assertion being that networks fight for the greatest number of viewers per program, and the quickest way of getting them is by appealing to the strongest emotions, particularly emphasizing sex and violence. Here's what the Commission says about ratings in connection with the hearing:

"While the Commission obviously cannot and should not seek to prescribe or advise the networks with regard to the details of their commercial operations, it is important for us thoroughly to understand the use made by the networks of such information in selecting their programs and the effect of such use on the ultimate composition of the schedules."

SPONSOR INFLUENCE

Sponsor influence on programs intrigues the FCC. Most sponsors have testified previously that they're in TV to sell goods—and this means they don't want to be associated with controversial or unpleasant programs, for fear that such characteristics will rub off on their products and depress sales. A few sponsors, not many, give networks a completely free hand, asserting that their sales have improved despite sponsorship of difficult themes.

Networks are not licensed or regulated directly by the FCC. However, the Commission has two quite effective controls on them. First, FCC does license the stations carrying network programs—the affiliates which are not owned by the networks. Second, networks own five stations each in the Nation's largest cities—licensed precisely the way affiliates are—and these generally produce more profits than networking itself. Networks won't unnecessarily jeopardize the stations they own.

The FCC believes that it should regulate networks directly, however, and is asking Congress to give it that power, on the grounds that the present indirect method is awkward, slow or ineffective. Congress will conduct hearings on the subject this session.

The network spokesmen are well prepared for this hearing. They've studied the testimony as it has developed over the years. Most are quite experienced at handling controversial and complex questions from FCC, Congress, and other agencies. The leading witness of each network are: ABC, Oliver Treyz, president of the ABC television network; CBS, Frank Stanton, president of CBS, Inc.; NBC, Robert W. Sarnoff, president of NBC.

POWER NOT AT ISSUE

The hearing isn't designed to explore whether FCC has the power to judge if a station is programing in the public interest. The Commission has already gone through that, in 1959 and 1960, taking 5,000 pages of testimony from 100 spokesmen from the industry, educational groups, religious organizations, etc.

FCC did conclude, as it always does, that it has certain powers and responsibilities regarding programing. Basically, it decided that it should require broadcasters to show that they've surveyed their communities and determined their broadcast needs. Second, it reasserted that it has the authority to require broadcasters to match their programing promises with performances—or produce a reasonable explanation for not doing so. The Commission cites a long list of court decisions as proof of such authority. Its opponents in the industry argue that courts would today rule otherwise, would strike down such action, labeling it "censorship." The Commission, however, is satisfied that its powers could be upheld in any new test case.

Despite the importance of the network investigation, it's most unlikely that any serious revision of network operations will finally emerge. "Frankly," as one of the most experienced FCC members put it last week, "'the networks are too important to the public. They do produce the best programs. Neither the public nor Congress would stand for any FCC action which would reduce their contribution."

Some intraindustry relationships may be changed eventually, as a result of the long FCC investigation. These may be important to elements of the industry—but it's most doubtful that they'll produce major changes in what networks offer to the public.

THE PUBLIC'S TASTE

As always, it can be expected that networks will both lead and follow the public's taste—offering mostly what most of the public will watch, while gradually seeking to elevate the public's taste.

It's generally agreed, by the Government, by the critics and by the industry, that this elevation process has accelerated in the last few years and that substantial audiences exist for programs offering material other than pure entertainment.

As a matter of fact, the networks are going to televise their own FCC hearings. NBC, for example, will offer special TV programs of their hearings on three Sundays, 6:30–7 p.m., January 28 and 5–5:30 p.m. February 4 and February 11. On radio, NBC will feature coverage 9:05–9:30 p.m. on the same days. ABC and CBS may also do specials.

Who knows? The sessions may produce some entertainment, too. Commissioner Robert E. Lee doubts it. He's in charge of TV-radio coverage arrangements, wonders why so many stations are interested in carrying the proceedings. "I don't understand it," he said last week. "A lot of it is going to be plain boring."

ADDRESS BY NEWTON N. MINOW, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, BEFORE THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 11, 1962

With this new year we start the second decade of national, coast-to-coast television. It is stretching the facts only slightly to say we also are starting the second decade of coast-to-coast debate about television and its responsibilities. This debate has been rising in intensity, and one of the most hopeful signs for the future is that the public's voice is being heard with increasing volume. Indeed, it's becoming almost as loud as the commercials.

In this thoughtful national discussion, no one has seriously advocated that we alter the underpinnings of our television system. No one I know of has proposed governmental control or ownership of television. We are determined to preserve our own unique mixture: a television industry based on freedom of expression, privately owned, and operated for a private profit—but which, because it uses scarce channels on the public's airwaves, must also operate in the public interest.

We wind up with a quasi-public industry regulated by a quasi-judicial agency called the FCC. When we search for ways to improve our television system we often wind up with quasi-solutions.

The line between private right and public interest is often difficult to draw. But, even so, after 10 years' experience with television, and after nearly a decade of private and public discussion about its role and its future, we should be reaching some fundamental conclusions about what must be done to realize the full promise of this powerful and effective means of communications.

What I want to discuss with you today is one particular fundamental conclusion I have reached. Although the details will take some explaining, the conclusion can be stated quite simply:

What this country needs is more television, not less.

Now, on first hearing, I would not expect to get a favorable endorsement of that conclusion from anyone whose life is devoted to the printed word. And I admit there are some king-size statistics which suggest that we need more television about as much as we need more acid indigestion or "tired blood."

For example: Americans now own 55 million televisions sets. More homes have television sets than indoor plumbing. Television this day will reach an audience of 100 million people. From the time they woke you up this morning until bedtime tonight, children under 12 will spend 70 million hours in front of sets, and on January 11, 1962, the average family will consume almost 5½ hours of its time watching television.

Perhaps you think—enough already, that's plenty of television.

But all these statistics concern only the audience—and they don't tell the whole story. We can marshal another set of figures that point to serious scarcity of television. These statistics involve the industry, rather than the audience, and they are the ones I find compelling.

Since 1952 the FCC assigned enough frequencies to television to accommodate more than 1,900 commercial stations and 275 educational stations. Twelve channels (Nos. 2 to 13) were assigned in the VHF (Very High Frequency) range and 70 channels (Nos. 14 to 83) were assigned in the UHF (Ultra High Frequency) range.

The plan provides for 591 VHF and 1,362 UHF commercial stations. Yet today we have only 543 commercial stations, 458 in VHF and 85 in UHF.

In the case of the educational stations, the plan envisaged 92 VHF and 184 UHF. Yet today we have only 44 educational VHF stations and 18 educational UHF stations.

The reason for this gap is the failure of UHF broadcasting to develop alongside VHF. And that's the heart of the problem.

We have about reached saturation on the VHF band. There are, in general, no more unused VHF channels in the populous areas.

The case with UHF is diametrically opposite. We have an abundance of UHF channels available for assignment, but in the absence of a substantial number of homes equipped to receive UHF there is little demand for these channels.

Let's be specific and take an example: Recently, in a readjustment of VHF frequencies, we did manage to open up the third VHF channel in Syracuse, Rochester, and Grand Rapids. At last count, we had 6 applicants in Grand Rapids, 10 for Syracuse, and 12 for Rochester—so we have 28 applicants going into comparative hearings for three licenses, each saying "Give the license to me."

Let's put it in more general terms. In language used by the industry, the country is divided into 272 television markets. Of the 272, 132—or almost half—are 1-station markets; 69—or about one-fourth—are 2-station markets; 54 are 3-station markets; and 17 are markets with 4 or more stations. Under these industry marketing terms, three-fourths of the television markets do not even have a choice of three stations.

The markets with the most stations are naturally in the larger population centers.

Even so, only 56 percent of the population has a choice of four or more channels.

As you all know, we now have 3 networks, and despite efforts to squeeze the 12-channel VHF system to the limit to provide room for all 3 of them, there are still sizable communities like Toledo, Ohio; Augusta, Ga.; or Jackson, Miss., where you cannot now obtain the full range of programs that the 3 networks offer, simply because one or two stations cannot broadcast 3 network schedules.

Again, let's be specific: Six weeks ago, one network put on an hour interview with President Eisenhower. It was on at the same hour as two popular entertainment shows. As it happened, President Eisenhower was then in Augusta, Ga.—a two-station market—and his program was not to be seen there. At the last minute, when it was realized that President Eisenhower was in Augusta, some special arrangements were made.

So if President Eisenhower had not happened to be in Augusta that day, the 280,000 television homes in the Augusta area would never have had a chance to see this splendid public service program.

This is one example of why we need more television in this country, more stations, more outlets, more voices.

Fortunately, this is not a hopeless case.

We have, in the UHF section of the television spectrum, 70 channels which we can use and the time has come to start using them fully. We are currently using some UHF channels in certain parts of the country with great success, success enough to show that UHF is feasible, practical and not to be put off. Fort Wayne, South Bend, and Elkhart, Ind.; Peoria, Ill.; Wilkes-Barre and Scranton, Pa.; and Youngstown, Ohio, are all cities in which the local channels are all in UHF.

We are trying to achieve the same success in other cities. Moreover, if we were not using UHF in the cities I've just named, the people living there would have no local television service because there are just no VHF channels available.

Well, why haven't those 70 UHF channels been put to use? I've brought some television sets here today to show you.

Look at the VHF television set on the stage. This is the television set most of us own—there are 45 million in American homes. See the dial? No room for anything more than 12 channels.

The next set shows a minor cure for the existing VHF set. It is called "strip conversion." One single UHF channel is routed through the set, making it capable of receiving 13 channels. It's used when a community finds a way to open up such things as educational television—or one commercial UHF broadcaster decides to take a chance. But Americans move about—and certainly Washingtonians move as much as most. And the conversion for, say, channel 20, is useless if the next town has channel 44. The set, in effect, returns to 12 channels—unless the owner has a new strip conversion done.

So we try again. We take a regular VHF set and this time we add a little black box, to achieve what is called a "converted receiver." This is the next set to the right on the stage. Here, a converter has been added, to bring in all UFH signals operating in the area and to convert each of them to an impulse suitable for VHF reception. What you see is channel 26, Washington's new educational channel. The program in progress is being watched in 8,000 schoolrooms right now and about 7,500 homes.

But to do this, it was necessary to bring about a major cure—the addition of a converter.

Why? Because almost all the television sets being manufactured today leave the factory with a part missing.

Right here in my hand is the part left out. It's the UHF tuner—a simple key to the full, rich promise of television.

Now when this key is put into the set at the factory on the assembly line, we then have the set you see on the right of the stage.

No strippers and no converters. Just 83 channels of choice. We call this the all-channel receiver, and you can buy it right now. The all-channel set is born complete to serve every station in every market.

Why should any television set leave the factory incapable of receiving 85% of American television allocations? If we could have all-channel sets, we can fulfill the promise of the FCC's 1952 plan:

A total of 2,229 television stations in the United States: 683 on VHF, 1,546 on UHF.

I've brought with me today copies of that plan, as it would be worked out for cities all over the country. This is the document attached to copies of my address.

Actually, it is all of Section 3.606 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations, and is called the "Table of Assignments". Most of your own home towns are listed there, all decked out with numbers. These are the channels assigned to them many years ago. Most of them are not in use, of course. Indeed, it may surprise some long-time Washingtonians to learn that Channels 14, 20 and 50 are waiting to be used here along with 4, 5, 7, 9 and 26.

Before I joined the FCC, the Commission reached the conclsion that we should seek legislation to help achieve this plan. This legislation would unlock UHF by requiring that future television sets be manufactured to receive all channels.

I wholeheartedly agree with this view, and our chief legislative proposal for 1962 is the All-Channel Television Receiver bill.

Best estimates are that in mass production, the all-channel set will cost about $25 more than the 12-channel set—varying with the style and size of the unit. This is a small price to pay for unlocking another 70 channels.

Last year, bills were introduced by Chairman MAGNUSON and Chairman HARRIS in the Senate and House. These bills—S. 2109 and H.R. 8031—would require that every set manufactured for interstate shipment be capable of receiving all the television spectrum and not just a part of it.

Since you entered this room about an hour and a half ago, around 3,000 television sets were sold in this country.

That will indicate why we think this is the solution. We believe that if this proposal becomes law we will in a reasonable time solve the fundamental problem of television.

We will broaden the viewer's choice—by lighting up the vacant channels.

A great deal is at stake.

First, the future of educational television is tied to UHF.

Educational television now holds 92 VHF assignments. But the educators estimate they will need a total of 158 VHF channel assignments to develop a national educational television system through a fourth network devoted to classroom instruction during the day and to adult programming during the evening hours.

We want to bring such an educational network to life, but most of the remaining channels assigned for educational use are UHF channels. We can pinch, pry, and prod the 12 channel VHF system, but we will not get educational stations into more than a fraction of the communities that want and need them.

Second, the communities now served by less than three stations have a stake in the development of UHF. It is their only chance of getting more service.

There are now some 83 areas in which one or more UHF stations were once in operation but are now silent because of lack of UHF sets to receive their signals. Twenty-five of those areas now lack any local station, and fifty-eight lack the choice of service which a second, third or fourth station once brought. If you are a candidate for local office in Allentown, or a proponent of a local school bond issue in Atlantic City, or a local advertiser in Battle Creek—you could no longer turn to a local television station.

And there are scores of other communities where capital has never been risked to build a local station because of the chilling example of the Allentowns, the Battle Creeks and the others. Communities such as these will never have a fair chance—unless UHF gets a fair chance.

Finally, the fundamental future of commercial television is at stake. The present tight 12 channel system is already too small. Yet, the country has already grown by 3½ million people since President Kennedy was elected.

We will in just a few years have a nation of 200 million people, and if we do not expand television, we will have unnecessarily few people deciding what larger and larger numbers of people will be seeing on television.

And this is just inconsistent with the way our country has grown.

A free, open, competitive system has brought us to the highest standard of living. It has given us the opportunity to achieve the highest standard of life. I think that all of us would insist that the sinews of this system be extended to every phase of our lives—and I see no reason why television should be excluded from its benefits.

Today, in television, we find a situation where we are physically able to go a lot further toward free enterprise, and I fail to understand why so many otherwise stanch defenders of our way of life resist this direction.

Surely the broadcasters who are most sensitive to what they regard as tightening regulation should welcome this growth and should be willing to accept this competition. A wider field means a rich variety of services for many tastes—and more voices to share the resistance to Government.

But to resist both competition and regulation is indeed shortsighted.

For just as surely as a commercial is wrapped around a station break—the television industry in the long run faces one result or another: more competition or more regulation.

My own vote is for more competition. And my faith is in the belief that this country needs and can support many voices of television—and the more voices we hear—the better, the richer, the freer we shall be.

TWO U.S. NURSES DEFY VIETNAM DANGERS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Times of yesterday, January 22, by Homer Bigart, applauding the courage of two American nurses in Vietnam, where daily existence is very difficult. They are braving the dangers of Communist guerrillas and serve the cause by their interest in increasing the health, and the opportunities for health, in Vietnam.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO U.S. NURSES DEFY VIETNAM DANGERS—THEY TAKE DUTIES CALMLY DESPITE RED GUERRILLAS

(By Homer Bigart)

SAIGON, VIETNAM, January 21.—Two American nurses bravely continue their roving assignments in South Vietnam despite rising activity by Communist guerrillas.

"We can't let them chase us all out," Margaret Racz, of Mercer, Pa., said as she prepared to depart today for the provinces over roads often cut by guerrillas.

Miss Racz, who is nursing service adviser of the Agency for International Development, and Tirzah M. Morgan, of San Jose, Calif., chief nurse of the Agency's public health division, probably are the most widely traveled Americans in South Vietnam. They have been in all but 3 of the 39 provinces.

Once in Camau, a plane carrying Miss Morgan was hit by Communist ground fire, but no one was hurt. Americans generally find themselves more and more cut off from the countryside. The tragedy of the U.S. nonmilitary assistance to this embattled nation is that it is reaching fewer and fewer people in the rural areas.

PROGRAMS CURTAILED

Several agricultural programs have been curtailed by the spread of Communist activity. Even the missionaries, and there are about 100 American Protestant missionaries here, have had to abandon visits to many rural churches.

"We are gradually losing contact with the country," one said. "We are pretty much restricted."

An American irrigation engineer said he could not "even get off the road without an armed patrol escort."

But Nurses Morgan and Racz said they were too busy to worry about the encroachments of the Communist Viet Cong guerrilla units.

They said that they always checked with provincial chiefs before going out into the countryside and that the chiefs always gave them an adequate military escort because of the desperate shortage of nurses.

But they have not been to some villages in more than a year. Their current chore is the setting up of surgical suites in the hospitals of 30 provincial capitals. This project has priority because of the prospect of mounting casualties once an expected government offensive gets underway.

SAME CARE FOR REDS

Miss Morgan said captured Communists got the same treatment as government troops. The other day she stopped at the bedside of a Communist guerrilla with several chest wounds.

"You are lucky," she told the youth. "You are lucky you are here when the Americans are bringing in medicine and surgical supplies and providing money for hospitals. You will recover."

The two Americans also supervise the training of Vietnamese nurses. About two-thirds of these nurses are men.

Miss Morgan explained that Vietnamese women were too interested in marriage and children. The men, she said, are good learners but a nurse shortage persists because of the long working hours and low pay of $30 to $40 a month.

Miss Morgan and Miss Racz took their masters' degree in New York—Miss Morgan at Columbia University and Miss Racz at New York University. Both are veterans of World War II and are self-reliant.

Last year, Miss Morgan was in a jeep that went over an embankment in the highlands and overturned three times. Suffering several broken ribs and severe facial injuries, she patched up her torn cheek with adhesive tape and gave first aid to another passenger before losing consciousness.

Both women are out of Saigon most of the time. A provincial chief warned Miss Morgan recently that if she persisted in riding in her black Mercedes car behind a military escort, the guerrillas might mistake her for some important official. He suggested that she ride in a jeep.

Miss Morgan declined. "If I am to be shot," she said, "I would rather be shot in comfort."

NEW YORK POINTS THE WAY TO MORE EFFECTIVE HANDLING OF NARCOTICS ADDICTION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the need for a more flexible and scientific approach to the problem of narcotic addiction has been widely recognized by law-enforcement agencies, bar associations, and many other civic and public groups.

Last year Senator JAVITS and I joined in sponsoring legislation which would, first, establish a new Federal-State program for the construction and operation of narcotic hospital facilities and for the provision of technical assistance to the States; second, permit the civil commitment of narcotic addicts to the custody of the Surgeon General under specified conditions; and, third, call for a White House conference on narcotics. The impetus for most of this legislation came from the New York State District Attorneys' Association, and the bills were designed to complement similar proposals under consideration in New York.

Prior to their introduction, we discussed our proposed bills with the Attorney General, Secretary Ribicoff, and other administration officials. We were greatly encouraged by their interest and general support for our objectives and have been hopeful that early hearings and action would be forthcoming. Unfortunately, however, despite many subsequent requests, Congress has not yet received the recommendations of the executive agencies on any of our bills.

Yesterday a bill was introduced in the New York Legislature on this subject which has the full backing of Governor Rockefeller and other State leaders. We have been advised that this legislation reconciles the disagreements which prevented passage of similar legislation in the last session of the State legislature. The New York State District Attorneys'

Association will give this new bill its powerful backing, and prospects for its passage in the very near future appear to be excellent.

This development emphasizes the need for prompt action by the Federal Government to do its part in the combined Federal-State program to cope with the narcotics menace. The drug traffic has always been considered a matter of special concern to the Federal authorities. The application of new mandatory treatment concepts and the availability of suitable facilities for noncriminal addicts appears to afford the best hope of preventing the spread of this disease by those it has already cruelly victimized. We must not relax the severe penalties against the evil, sinister purveyors of these drugs, but we must certainly do all we can to prevent its innocent victims from turning to crime and spreading their misery in desperation. Such a program will not benefit just one locality or State, but the whole Nation.

Today's New York Times commends Governor Rockefeller's enlightened approach to this subject and gives its strong support to the legislation introduced in the State legislature. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Sick Addict

Governor Rockefeller in his annual message to the legislature expressed anew his concern with the problem of narcotics addiction. His promise of new legislation on this problem has been kept with introduction of bills notable for their humane, enlightened nonpunitive approach.

The legislation would allow young persons charged with less serious narcotics crimes to choose treatment in State hospitals instead of going to jail. A new narcotics office to direct and coordinate the State's expanding programs in research, treatment, and aftercare rehabilitation would be established within the State department of mental hygiene. A State council on drug addiction, to advise on program and administration, would include private citizens as well as officials.

It is evident that the Governor sees the greatest role of State usefulness in the medical-social field, pioneering in new and better methods of dealing with a sickness (as distinguished from a crime) in which cure is difficult and relapse frequent, a fact he recognizes by requiring that aftercare be mandatory following release from commitment.

PROPOSED CONGRESSIONAL TRADE VETO

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I recently proposed that the administration include in its recommended 1962 extension of the Trade Agreements Act provisions for a two-thirds congressional veto of trade agreements or modifications thereof.

One of the most persuasive editorial comments on this proposal that I have seen is from the Winston-Salem Journal, Twin City Sentinel, of Winston-Salem, N.C. Their editorial is entitled "Liberal and Conservative, Too." It makes the point that expanded trade is liberal in the sense that it moves forward in developing new and broader trade contacts between the United States and our friends overseas. The editorial goes on to stress that expanded trade contacts would also have a conservative importance, because they would provide incentives to make American industry more competitive, wherever this is possible, and thereby strengthen our free enterprise system.

The Winston-Salem Journal, Twin City Sentinel supports the inclusion in new trade legislation of congressional veto provisions. They base their position on the fact that there are some industries and communities that cannot absorb too rapid or too extreme a cutback in our present tariff arrangements.

This editorial quite accurately reflects my personal feelings on this issue. I ask unanimous consent that it appear at the end of my remarks.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to include in the Record an excellent column by Mr. Roscoe Drummond along these same lines, in which he indicates that expanded free trade merits support from Members of the Congress who are conservative in their voting and in their general point of view.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Winston-Salem Journal, Twin City Sentinel, Winston-Salem, N.C., Dec. 31, 1962]

Liberal and Conservative, Too

Senator KENNETH KEATING's announcement that he will support the President's bid for a new trade policy for the United States goes another step toward clearing the ideological air around the current international trade issue.

Senator Keating is a Republican from upstate New York. His voting record is conservative enough to have won him during the past year a citation from the rightwing Americans for Constitutional Action. Yet the Senator apparently does not feel that he will betray his record by supporting the administration's request for broader Presidential authority to cut tariffs. And by the same token some Members of Congress who call themselves liberals might think it consistent with their records to oppose broadened tariff-reducing authority for the President.

It has been said often in recent months that the President is seeking the enactment of a "liberal" trade act. The word "liberal," used in this sense, is convenient. But it has little to do with the word "liberal" when used in the description of a fight over welfare legislation or a bill having to do with Federal activity in some area such as education or civil rights. Certainly most of the Nation's liberal forces—organized labor is an example—are likely to support the President. But major conservative forces, including some industrial organizations, also will support him. The administration is arguing that the authority it is seeking will lead in the long run to sounder economic health for Americans at all levels and that in addition it will provide the basis for stronger political ties throughout the West. The argument is valid, and leaders of many political shadings recognize it as such.

It is safe to predict that many who will oppose the writing of a broadened trade policy will do so not because they fail to understand the opportunities involved, but because they are fearful of what might happen to certain industries and groups of workers if the United States moves too far toward free trade too quickly. Their fears are real. Senator Keating, in urging that Congress retain the right to veto individual trade agreements, recognizes that reality.

The adoption of a new trade policy which would allow freer trade patterns would be liberal because it would look to the future and inspire stronger ties between the United States and groups of nations which share U.S. views and goals. It would be conservative because it would force industries to operate on a paying basis in an alliance built on the idea of rugged free enterprise.

Trade Policy—Conservative Support Enlisted

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Respected and influential conservative opinion is rallying behind a more liberalized U.S. trade policy.

The objective is to strengthen the economic ties and widen the channels of trade among the countries of the free world.

The U.S. Reciprocal Trade Act comes up for renewal at the most opportune moment, at the very time when the American Government must determine its relation with the expanding and prospering European Economic Community.

The decision which Congress will make in the next few months is whether both sides—the United States and Europe—will reduce tariffs to promote mutual competition or raise tariffs to fend off competition. The choice is whether to embark upon a healthy rivalry to take advantage of tremendous trading opportunities or to launch a trade war in an effort to wall off these trading opportunities.

It seems logical that conservative leadership in the United States should begin to aline itself behind the goal of constructive competition between the common market of the United States and the Common Market of Western Europe.

Conservative leaders who have already taken their stand in recent days include former President Eisenhower, Alf Landon, the 1936 Republican presidential nominee, Christian Herter, a former Republican Governor of Massachusetts who succeeded John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, whose spokesmen have been testifying before the Boggs committee in favor of amending the Reciprocal Trade Act to give the President adequate powers to negotiate with the Common Market.

It is noteworthy that these conservative leaders support the competitive trade policy not only in the national interest but in the conviction that it is an essential and very possibly a decisive initiative in organizing the free world to win the cold war.

Former Governor Landon puts the issue precisely and in its largest terms when he says:

"The tremendous release of energy—raising wages, improving working conditions—generated by the European Common Market is a more explosive shock to the economic and political policies of the world than the Russian thermonuclear bomb testing.

"Legislation of sufficient scope must be enacted to give the President authority to construct a bridge to working relationships between America, the European Common Market, and other great nations where we have highly important trade and political relationships."

The question Mr. Landon raises is whether we are going to seize—or throw away—the opportunity which the European Common Market puts into our hands to create a more powerful bloc for peace than the Communist bloc which intend to bury us. His own answer is:

"Let me say to the leaders of American labor, agriculture and industry that it would be the height of folly to be more concerned about attempting to maintain the American wage scale or American profit scale than girding our loins to meet a more dangerous foreign foe than Hitler and the Nazis. Yet by pursuing Common Market policies we can have our cake and eat it, too. The history of the Common Market of Europe gives evidence that removal of barriers to trade, commerce, and industry all over the world will open a greater market for U.S. products than we have ever known."

What impresses me about General Eisenhower, Mr. Landon, Mr. Herter, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce spokesmen and others likeminded, is that here are conservatives who are not content merely to complain about the West's being on the defensive in the cold war. When they see a momentous opportunity to take the initiative, they seize it rather than run away from it as too adventurous.

The reason that associating the common market of the United States with the Common Market of Western Europe is conservative is that it rests on the principles of competitive enterprise. It is, at the same time, a bold and progressive initiative capable of reversing the adverse trend of the cold war, an initiative which ought to galvanize the support of Americans who have so loudly been saying that we have too long been on the defensive.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ANDERSON ON MEDICAL CARE FOR AGED

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I am privileged to be a cosponsor with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] of the administration's medical care for the aged bill, S. 909. Senator ANDERSON, in his efforts on behalf of this important legislation, is displaying the high qualities of leadership so characteristic of him. This morning, at the Economic and Legislative Conference of the AFL–CIO, Senator ANDERSON made some very timely and cogent remarks about the status of the medical care for the aged bill. I should like to call his remarks to the attention of all of our colleagues in the Senate, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that his address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR CLINTON P. ANDERSON BEFORE ECONOMIC AND LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE, AFL–CIO, SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 23, 1962

This morning I start on the assumption that those people who are covered under social security and railroad retirement should have deductions made from their paychecks and matched by equal contributions from their employers to guarantee that, once they have passed the age of 65, they shall have adequate health care, have it as a matter of right not as an item of charity, and have it without the indignity of a means test.

Perhaps the first question we should ask this morning is: What need is there for any sort of legislation in this field? President Kennedy expressed it well in his state of the Union message to the Congress. I found an adequate answer in a statement prepared by my good friend, Wilbur Cohen, Assistant Secretary in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Here is his summary:

Paying for health services by older people is complicated by four factors:

1. Older persons have more days of illness. They go to the hospital more frequently and stay longer.
2. Older persons have less income.
3. Stays in the hospital are expensive and are becoming more costly.
4. The proportion of hospital bill covered by private insurance is much less for older persons. It also decreases as the length of stay increases.

But in any legislative consideration of the King-Anderson bill this year, we no longer have to prove that there is an aged health-care problem. We need only point to the fact that the American Medical Association and the National Association of Blue Shield Plans have come forth with a program of their own to provide surgical and medical care benefits for persons 65 years of age and older. This is an admission on their part that all the time we have been right as to the need, and that now the only debate is on the method by which it shall be attained.

That forward step is welcome. Only a year ago, some people claimed that the health needs of the aged were being met. Others pointed to retirement plans which, they asserted, provided the aged with sufficient money to pay their doctor and hospital bills. We were told that the aged had children who are happy to help their parents even if it meant great deprivation for their own families. We were advised to proceed in accordance with "the free enterprise system which made America great," which was another way of saying: "Don't look at this problem, and, like the little man on the stairs, it may go away."

Now this is changed. AMA and Blue Shield—realizing that without any health-care hearings in the House or Senate the vote in the Senate a year and a half ago was reasonably close—have now come forward with their own plan, as if to admit that a well-developed national program of health care for the aged is now necessary and they would like to have a part in it.

I have no exact knowledge of what benefits there may be under the Blue Shield plan. The announcement states, in general terms, that Blue Shield will offer to cover surgery costs and some medical care in a hospital or a licensed nursing home for a premium of about $3 a month per person or about $36 a year. Of course, I recognize that the coverage need not exactly duplicate those services we contemplate under the King-Anderson bill. What interests me more is that AMA and Blue Shield still want to hold on to a means test. It is not as obvious as the medical indigency required by the Kerr-Mills bill, but the Blue Shield benefits are to be available only to those single individuals who have income of less than $2,500 a year and those married persons who have income of less than $4,000 a year.

I hope that this fine body of organized labor, representing a great segment of our population, will meet the challenge head on and will insist: not that new bottles be found for old medicines, not that new nostrums be hastily mixed, not that new cures be advanced by the very large and well-financed propaganda machine of the AMA, but that the Congress decide once and for all whether working people can be permitted to take care of their old-age health needs as a matter of right. They should not be forced to produce, prior to their admission to a hospital or their care by a physician, their most intimate papers. They should not be required to discuss before some actuary whether the savings they have been able to make through their lifetime, plus the amount they receive in retirement through social security, plus any additional amounts they receive from pension plans, do or do not total as much as $2,500 if single, and $4,000 if married. On this we should stand fast.

To me the supreme indignity is to say to a worker who has contributed a lifetime of service to a firm or a trade that, once he or she reaches 65, his or her business is no longer private but must be subject to constant, exhaustive and revived scrutiny every time a visit to the hospital appears to be necessary.

I have been in the insurance business nearly 40 years. If I live to August of this year, I shall have been president of an insurance company for 25 years, meaning, in fact, from the very first day that it was organized. I know that insurance people depend upon statistics and actuarial calculations. I know that fire insurance rates on a dwelling are low because statistically a house is not expected to burn down except about once in 400 years. Therefore, by spreading the hazard and dividing up the risk, your insurance agent can charge you a modest premium to guard against the fire hazard on your home.

Likewise, I understand the reason for the means test which AMA and Blue Shield have proposed.

If their policy reduces the possibility that the buyer will claim its benefits and that only a few will avail themselves of the surgical and medical care provisions made possible by the payment of $36 a year, then the rate will be lower than it might be if every person received needed health care regardless of private means. The means test is put in to weed out a large share of the claims. It represents the hope that a man who thinks he needs only modest hospital care would prefer to pay for it himself rather than go through the humiliating experience of parading his bank accounts, his social security checks, his pension plans, and any interest he may get from E-bonds and other savings, before he can phone the doctor or enter the door of a hospital.

I stand firmly behind the guarantee in the King-Anderson bill that health care shall be available to those people who are under social security and over 65 as a matter of right; that they shall have the privilege of contributing to the fund in their working years and shall enjoy its benefits in their retirement. Our whole 25 years of experience under the social security system attests to the fact that no other program works as well or costs as little to administer. Best of all in these days of deficit spending, it costs the Federal Treasury nothing.

To be sure, there are ways of providing retirement income other than by payroll deductions of employees plus contributions of employers. This is a system of enforced saving; but it has worked well. To be sure, old-age retirement checks are going to some people who today do not need the money; but, through the years, they made the contributions and their employers matched them, and now they are entitled to the rewards of their savings—whether the AMA likes it or not.

I say, "whether the AMA likes it or not" because when social security was started, many professional groups stayed out of it. Engineers, architects, accountants, lawyers, dentists, doctors, funeral directors, and a host of self-employed, remained out. With the passage of time, the lawyers, the dentists, the funeral directors, the engineers, the architects, the accountants, and other professional groups, have come in—all but the doctors. Apparently, only doctors think it is bad to have a system of enforced saving through social security.

And yet the doctors—at least the spokesmen for organized medicine—are very vocal in their support of another item of legislation now on the Senate Calendar. This bill, H.R. 10, the Keogh bill, would allow physicians and other professionals to set aside 10 percent of their annual income for retirement purposes. This would involve a deduction from current income taxes. In reality it would be a degree of tax forgiveness because when after retirement these people finally pay taxes on this income, their taxes on it could be expected to be less because their income would be less.

Now I find it ironic that these physicians could speak so favorably before the Senate Finance Committee and the Ways and Means

Committee about the virtues of setting income aside for their own retirement needs when before these same committees they condemn the principle of workers setting income aside for their health-care needs after retirement.

What is that old statement about—"What is sauce for the goose * * * "?

Secretary Ribicoff made a good point in commenting on the Blue Shield offer. He said:

"The Blue Shield plan would do nothing whatever to meet the staggering problem of high cost of hospital care in a serious illness which faces all the aged—and which swiftly wipes out the savings of a lifetime."

As one who has spent many years in business, I agree with him.

I have been reading in the Washington newspapers about the peculiar financial antics of some officials of savings and loan associations in an area very near at hand. These stories tell how second, third, and even fourth mortgages, were placed on properties where the first mortgage was barely justified. All these bad investments were made with savers' funds. Many workers whose money might have been involved in these transactions will not have quite as carefree an old age as they would have had if their money had been in Government bonds or other gilt-edge securities. The same thing can happen to the savings of any person in this audience.

What happens to the working man who loses his life savings? He can still live with the aid of social security if he is past 65, but what does he have left to guarantee the payment of his medical bills? When you answer that question, you see the necessity for fighting this year to pass, in this session of Congress, the King-Anderson bill.

Many people think that pressures being put on Members of Congress by the AMA and the American Farm Bureau Federation against this bill might make it dangerous politically, but I have news for them: Supporting health care for the aged is not politically dangerous.

One of the hardest working legislators in behalf of aged Americans is the senior Senator from Michigan, PAT MCNAMARA, who came out of the ranks of this organization.

In 1960—after he had voted for passage of the Anderson-Kennedy amendment—PAT won reelection by a majority of over 120,000 votes. That was more than 81,000 votes over his majority in 1954. And he had the opposition in 1960 of an archconservative radio commentator who would go on the air every night about 6 o'clock and rap PAT for wanting to help the elderly through social security. I think PAT owes that commentator a note of thanks for keeping the public informed of who its friends are.

There was a campaign by doctors against me in New Mexico in 1960 because I had introduced the Anderson-Kennedy amendment in the Senate and pressed for its passage, and had announced my continuous support of a program for health care for the aged through social security. The election results were confusing. The Democratic candidate for Governor was defeated; the Democratic candidate for President carried our State by a handful of votes; but the Senator, who sponsored health care for the aged, won by the greatest majority any candidate ever had in the history of our State, and three times the majority which he got in 1948 and 1954. Tell your friends in Congress that supporting health care for the aged is not politically dangerous.

There are additional cases I can give you, but let me use one more. Senator CLIFFORD CASE, of New Jersey, was the only Republican Senator to vote in August 1960 for the Anderson-Kennedy amendment carrying provisions almost identical to the King-Anderson bill. The Republicans had a caucus and agreed almost unanimously to support the Nixon program for medical care. Everyone lined up but CLIFFORD CASE. He wouldn't and he didn't. His was the only Republican vote we got.

How did he then come out in the 1960 election? He had won in 1954 by 3,370 votes; in 1960, while President Kennedy was carrying his State, Senator CASE won by a margin of 332,447 votes, a record for the State and almost exactly 100 times as much as his previous majority. To be sure, he won because of the kind of man he is and the way in which he votes, but he did not suffer at the hands of the voters because he had the courage to stand up for health care for the aged. I think he profited—profited greatly—by the fact that he was the only Republican in the Senate who voted for the Anderson-Kennedy amendment. I saluted him then; I salute him now.

So I say to you in organized labor that you have a real chance to make 1962 a year of decision in health care. I believe we have the votes to pass the King-Anderson bill in the Senate—and I am not afraid to try. If the measure does not come up in the usual orderly fashion, surely some opportunity will arise to give Senators a chance to vote on this issue this year.

If it passes the Senate, the hurdles in the House of Representatives can be high and difficult, but I doubt if they are impossible. Much depends on your ability to tell your friends in Congress that the opponents of this bill are not more numerous than its friends, that supporting it is not politically dangerous, that half measures will not suffice, and that you are unwilling to accept any denatured substitutes. I truly believe that this fight can be won this year. May we go forward together in a worthy cause.

ADDRESS BY HON. ELVIS J. STAHR, JR., SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, ON SUBJECT "UNITY THROUGH DIFFERENCE"

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, on Wednesday evening, January 17, it was my good fortune to be among those who attended the congressional dinner given at the National City Christian Church in honor of Members of Congress who are associated with that religious organization. It was a most enjoyable gathering. The speaker for the occasion was the Honorable Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., Secretary of the Army. His address was inspiring and imparted to his great audience something of his confidence in the Nation and the hope which he bears in relation to the future of our way of life.

Because his remarks deal with those considerations that are fundamental to America, I am pleased to share his statement with Members of Congress. I therefore ask unanimous consent that his address, entitled "Unity Through Difference," appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITY THROUGH DIFFERENCE

(Remarks by Hon. Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., Secretary of the Army)

I am grateful to the National City Christian Church for the opportunity to meet once again on such a pleasant occasion with fellow members of the Disciples of Christ. I had the great pleasure of addressing the International Convention of Christian Churches last September, and I assure you that I look forward to each new opportunity to join in Christian fellowship with old and new friends.

Since becoming Secretary of the Army, I have had many occasions to think about a striking similarity that exists between one of the fundamental principles of the Christian Church and a concept which has had and is having a controlling influence in the lives and government of freemen everywhere. I am thinking of our right to form our own opinions and of the miraculous way it has of drawing us closer together.

When those two immigrants from northern Ireland, Thomas Campbell and his son Alexander, together with Barton W. Stone, began to plead and plan in the early part of the 19th century for the unification of Christian denominations, they were fully aware that there could be no true unity without the freedom to differ. In a conviction that led eventually to the establishment of the Disciples of Christ, they preached that an enduring basis for Christian fellowship could not be established through complete agreement on a fixed system of religious doctrine, but must rather be built around those essential principles of gospel teaching which all Christians recognize. An earlier writer had expressed it in these now familiar words: "In essentials, unity; in nonessentials, liberty; in all things, charity."

Whether consciously or not, Thomas and Alexander Campbell were applying a principle that has proved to be essential to unity in every field of human endeavor—the right to differ. History has shown that, although there must be a main body of belief and agreement if anarchy is to be avoided, there must be also be freedom of thought, expression, and action or tyranny will take over.

How appropriate it is for us to remember this principle as we face the challenge of our time. With the forces of a godless tyranny once again on the march, strengthened by the absolute authority to concentrate the natural and human resources within its grasp on the maintenance of a powerful fighting force, the free nations of the world are faced with the alternatives of being defeated in detail by the Soviet colossus or of standing in unity against it. It is a pretty well accepted fact that the Soviet bloc has the military power to defeat and the potential economic ability to bury any other single nation, with the exception of the United States. It cannot hope, however, to match either the military strength or economic power of free world nations working together. It might be worth our while, therefore, to examine how this matter of unity through difference works by analyzing the part it plays in some of our current affairs.

No finer example of the strong unity that freedom to differ can create could be found than the Government of the United States. With its Constitution and Bill of Rights as the central core of agreement, this Nation has grown strong in unity by encouraging the voices of dissent through free speech, an untrammeled press, and open debate. As many of you gentlemen know well of your own experience, no more violently divergent opinions have ever existed than those which are freely expressed on the floors of the Senate and the House of Representatives. Those Chambers have echoed to everything from the finest orations in history to the most vicious philippics ever hurled at a near-captive audience. Men have dared to speak there against parties in power, out of power, and on the ascendancy—yet not one of them has ever been shot, hanged, beheaded or posthumously banished to historical oblivion because of it. Through difference—though some may have been wrong—and the right to express it—though some may have done it badly—they brought strength to the Union.

The unity which has made us strong—the kind that is based on a hard core of essential principles and a recognition of the right to differ on details of execution—must be carried over with the highest degree of tolerance and understanding into the various alliances between nations. To hear the fears and doubts that are expressed when member nations of an alliance happen to bump heads on some matter, one would conclude that there is no hope for a workable agreement of any kind between nations. We sometimes seem to expect nations to eliminate all causes for conflict and disagreement and live together like the fabled one big happy family. This, of course, is a ridiculous and unrealistic expectation. Nations—even those most closely allied—will have conflicting needs and aspirations as long as they have people in them, so what we really need to work on is the strengthening of the fundamental bond that unites and makes free nations willing to stand shoulder to shoulder—in battle, if need be—when the chips are down.

Although the charters, pacts, and agreements that formalize our alliances are the work of professional statesmen and diplomats, the real foundation on which they rest is that bedrock of international morality to which each of us adds or detracts by the way we live as members of the human family.

Like individual integrity, international morality is a blending of many fine qualities—such as honesty, loyalty, tolerance, faith, and good will. It is a canon of unwritten world law—an unspoken code of ethics that exists in some form in every reputable creed and belief, and makes it possible for a member of one to work in harmony with the members of another. Woodrow Wilson, architect of the first working plan for cooperation among all the peoples of the world, put the same thought in these words:

> "What we seek is the reign of law, based on the consent of the governed and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind."

We contribute to international morality—and hence to the bond that ties the free world together—when we adhere to high standards of moral integrity in our own country, beginning with our individual lives and extending through our schools, social institutions, and all levels of government. We detract from it each time we adopt the "So what?" attitude toward foul business practices, low professional ethics, and the compromise of principle for convenience.

A striking example of strength and unity achieved through exercise of the right to differ can be found throughout our Armed Forces. Many drastic differences of opinion are aired and vigorously defended during the process of hammering out the defense recommendations that end up on the desk of the Commander in Chief, President Kennedy—differences of opinion that arise, you may be sure, out of the firm convictions of professional military men and are inspired by a common determination that this Nation shall have the most effective means for its defense.

Once a decision has been taken and a policy adopted, it is executed the more willingly and enthusiastically because all differences of opinion were thoroughly considered in its formulation, rather than suppressed—because the realities were fully explored in frank discussion. Our present unified defense policy, by which we seek to attain a measured and balanced degree of military power capable of coping with any form of aggression, any place on earth, evolved from quite divergent views, in many cases, among individuals and services, but it is a more broadly acceptable as well as a more effective policy than could have been created by any one person alone, or any one group with identical views, since it represents a synthesis of the outspoken wisdom of many trained minds.

An illustration of the fact that honest differences of opinion lead in the long run to the most realistic defense is Admiral Rickover's powerful and constant advocacy of the nuclear submarine despite strong opposition—a difference of opinion that led to the creation of our Polaris submarine striking force, now a major element of our vital strategic nuclear deterrent.

Another case in point is the recognition, reflected in our present defense policy, of the Army's long-term and consistently argued belief, which also encountered strong and insistent objections, that lesser forms of aggression than all-out thermonuclear attack would require a response by more limited means; that we must be armed in such a manner that we are not limited to a single course of action—forced to choose between waging all-out thermonuclear war or allowing an aggressor to achieve his purpose by piecemeal conquest.

Because able and dedicated men exercised the right to differ, not only among themselves but with time-honored concepts, we have also broken away from the tradition of peacetime unpreparedness which in the past tied the hands of the military services until hostilities were practically underway. We have raised our military forces over the past several months to a level of balanced strength and readiness unprecedented except in time of actual war. Furthermore, we have adopted for the first time in our history a policy of strength maintained over the long term. In short, we have put ourselves in a better position than ever before to fulfill our national purpose to deter war or win a decisive victory should war be thrust upon us.

If we succeed in our determination to preserve freedom without war, it will be because those who threaten freedom can see that our intention to stand firm is backed by the military ability to do so. For the Communists respect strength—and little else. And their determination to dominate the world is something they don't even try to hide.

Right here, because of my particular responsibilities as Secretary of the Army, I would like to add a special word or two in passing about the necessity for constancy in our national attitude toward defense—the new dimension of our security. It has at last become obvious to most Americans, I hope and believe, that we must forgo the dangerous practice of setting our sails according to the volume and direction of the latest hostile wind and steer our course instead by the constant stars.

Although our present buildup was sparked by the Berlin crisis, and one of the simplest facts of today's complicated world is that we must be prepared to respond to that problem militarily if that should become necessary, even if some solution there were possible this very hour, we must be prepared to cope with other and new crises which the Communists have created and are capable of creating. At any moment they could quickly build up pressure in parts of the world where we have no forces, or only token forces, stationed at present, and where indigenous forces are inadequate to contain or defeat a Communist military sortie without our help. Moreover, we cannot, in any case, hope to attain our long-term goal by utilizing our strength merely to meet recurrent crises as they arise. We must, rather, prevent crises by making it perfectly obvious in advance that we have the strength in being, and the unflinching determination, to take whatever positive action may be required.

To allow our military strength to deteriorate in response to lessened tension at one point or at one moment would, in effect, make it possible for our adversaries to call the signals and manipulate our defenses to suit their own aims. It would make us vulnerable to being hit hardest when our defenses were weakest and the warning shortest. It would whipsaw us economically because of the tremendous waste involved in alternate increases and decreases in the force levels we maintain. It would also be extremely and unnecessarily disruptive to the lives of great numbers of our people.

A genuinely farsighted view of preparedness is imperative. Both our resolution and our ability to defend ourselves must be both evident and permanent. While adjusting quickly to new situations and developments, our capability must also clearly reflect underlying constancy of purpose—for it is underlying constancy of purpose that faces us across the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

In closing, let me say that it should be the constant determination of all Americans to remain united and steadfast in support of our Nation and its highest interests in these critical times, and to insure the survival of the freedom to differ, which is a foundation stone of true unity and strength. I am confident we shall work together to this end, and doubly sure that the Christian community, concerned as it has always been with mankind's loftiest aspirations, will continue to lead the crusade for human understanding, mutual good will, and the liberty of mind and spirit on which our ultimate hopes for a just and lasting peace are based.

A RECOGNITION OF THE MEN'S WEAR INDUSTRY

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, most men take the clothes they wear for granted. Yet we know the American male is the best dressed in all the world. The standard of American apparel habits is far ahead of any other nation, and yet I am told the American male spends less on clothing than the male in any other of the modern nations. Behind this achievement credit should go to the manufacturers and retailers of men's apparel.

My attention to this economic phenomenon has been called by the fact that the men's wear industry of America will hold its annual convention for the first time in Washington from February 11 through 14, 1962. This is the 44th Annual Convention of the National Association of Retail Clothiers and Furnishers which for nearly 50 years has been serving the merchants who sell men's wear and working with the manufacturers and their associations in the advancement of the important, although often overlooked, industry.

Naturally, I have a keen interest in this particular event because the president of the association, who will be presiding at the events in Washington, is Lawson H. Riley of Honolulu. Fondly and familiarly known as "Jack" Riley, he is president of McInerny's, one of the oldest and finest retail establishments in Hawaii; operates seven stores, the oldest of which was established 112 years ago. Jack is not only a successful merchant; he is also an outstanding citizen who has contributed much to civic and philanthropic movements in our community. He is a past president of the Honolulu Rotary Club and Chamber of Commerce and now is serving in the highest position a merchant can achieve in the men's wear industry, that of president of the National Retailers Trade Association. This association has nearly 3,000 members, numbering among them the finest of the men's wear merchants in all States of the Union.

This industry is an important one, numerically and economically. According to the 1958 Census of Business there are over 24,000 men's wear stores in America doing an annual volume in excess of $2,596,639,000, and employing 111,353 people. American men's and boys' tailored clothing manufacturers total 1,286 and have a value of production of $1,295,362,000, and employ 122,205 people. The other and even bigger segment of the industry which produces all men's and boys' apparel other than tailored suits and coats includes 2,789 manufacturers, employing 369,380 people, with an annual volume of production totaling $3,703,083,000. Thus, we have a substantial, important industry.

Obviously, from these figures, by comparison with other great industries, this is typical American small business manufacturing and retailing. Here is one great example of the American free enterprise system, successfully working at the grassroots level, in all of the States of our country. Here is an industry in which competition is keen, yet the standards of business morality are high. This trade is not constantly appealing for Government aid, but rather is in the forefront among contributors to patriotic and philanthropic programs. For instance, in the last year under President Riley's leadership, members of the national association solicited over half a million fellow Americans for contributions to Radio Free Europe.

I am impressed with the comradeship of the typical men's wear retailer. Back in the old days the gathering place of the citizens was the corner drugstore, the country store, or in some metropolitan communities the pool hall. These have now substantially passed from the scene being replaced by the chainstore, the self-service establishment, and the supermarket. The men's wear store is now, in many instances, the poor man's club where a bit of respite can often be obtained from the busy world. There exists a great loyalty between the individual customer and his men's wear merchant, and in this industry the same situation exists between the merchant and the manufacturer with whom he deals. It is a stable and constructive trade.

This reflects itself in the resistance the trade itself has placed upon the inflationary trends. While the cost of living, according to Labor Department recent statistics, has gone up 28 percent, the cost of men's apparel has lagged way behind and has only gone up 11 percent. As a matter of fact many items, among them men's shirts, are selling at the same if not lower prices than they were 10 years ago. And all of this is despite the fact that manufacturing processes have been improved resulting in better fitting, longer wearing, and more comfortable garments.

Some figures compiled several years ago from Government statistics gave this interesting picture. The American male works 24 hours to obtain enough money to buy a suit of clothes. In Russia, he works 112 hours. In England he works 50 hours, and in Italy 57 hours. This, obviously, contributes to the original statement that American men are the best dressed in the world.

With this background, I think it only proper to recognize in this fashion the fact that this important convention is coming to Washington for the first time. The event will be held at the Shoreham and Sheraton Park Hotels from Sunday, February 11, through Wednesday, February 14, and in excess of 5,000 members of the industry are expected to gather. For the industry this is going to be an exciting 4 days with many business meetings and social events and with important Government and trade speakers. A highlight, of course, is the exhibits, which, incidentally, are the largest number of exhibits ever to be housed in the Shoreham Hotel. On display here will be over 400 lines of the finest and newest in men's wear fashions, fabrics, and services.

To President Riley and his National Association of Retail Clothiers and Furnishers goes my congratulations on an industry job well done and best wishes for an outstanding and successful gathering.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, in his recent state of the Union message, President Kennedy gave considerable attention to the balance-of-payments problem and the need for increased international trade. In his presentation he just could not refrain from indulging in the political profligacies which sometimes crop out when salesmen overdo their pitch and fear that the merits of their product need embellishing. He began the trade section of his message by stating:

> Above all, if we are to pay for our commitments abroad we must expand our exports.

He then proceeded to call for authority to be vested in a single person, himself, to reduce tariffs by 50 percent, in the same breath indicating the necessity of this if we were to expand our exports. Then he said:

> If we move decisively, our factories and farms can increase their sales to their richest, fastest growing market. Our exports will increase. Our balance-of-payments position will improve.

I cannot help calling attention, as his advisers should have done and apparently did not do, to the fact that if we reduce tariffs in a reciprocal arrangement, our imports will increase, perhaps even more than our exports, and the balance-of-payments will remain static at best and possibly deteriorate. I might ask the question here and now, "If the Common Market, the United States and the rest of the world suddenly wiped out import restrictions, would our balance-of-payments problem be solved, or would it be radically accentuated?" I suggest that restrictions in the rest of the world are far above those of the United States—including those of the Common Market—and we ought to get to a common negotiating level before we start on the question of reciprocal concessions.

With all the advantages of increased foreign trade—and I have always been in favor of the largest volume of foreign trade compatible with the welfare of our economy—I simply must point out to the President that equal increases in imports and exports would leave the dollar balance exactly where it was, without an iota of change; and he slipped rather badly when he indicated that cutting tariffs was the way to correct our dollar shortage.

Another statement which the President apparently made without thinking about is this:

> If, on the other hand, we hang back in deference to local economic pressures, we will find ourselves cut off from our major allies. Our farm surpluses will pile up. Our balance-of-payments position will worsen.

The prestige of the United States abroad cannot help but suffer under such careless handling of the facts. There is not the slightest evidence that, if the President does not get what he asks for, the dictatorial power to wipe out domestic industries and domestic jobs, our major allies will cut us off. We are far from cut off now, with trade at an alltime high; and to tell the American public that our friends abroad no longer need us and our trade and will cut us off if we do not embark on a free-trade binge sounds more like a second-rate State Department freshman than the leader of our country. It just is not so.

Now I am not even hinting that we can relax or fail to move forward in the field of competition and progress; I am merely pointing out that the Members of Congress are not neophytes in this matter; and telling only half the story in the hopes that it will slip by and no one will notice is not the way to get things done—certainly not with this Congress.

The President indicated that unless he assumes the congressional function of regulating tariffs "millions of American workers in your home States and mine will see their interests sacrificed." Even the most gullible will know that this is farfetched and incapable of proof and only very few will be taken in by it. Certainly, the astute farmers and industrial workers of the progressive State of Nebraska are not going to whip themselves into a frenzy over this kind of oversalesmanship. It smacks of some of the doom-and-gloom type of diplomacy that overenthusiastic proponents of the old and defunct International Trade Organization used in forecasting that if we did not approve it, cataclysmic and horrifying disaster would overtake us.

The Common Market countries need and want our trade as badly as we need and want theirs. They are even now in the process of planning their external tariffs, quotas, embargoes, import restrictions of all kinds, and have been most forthright in indicating that it is their purpose, regardless of commitments under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, to set their trade regulations sufficiently high so that we will have to pay the price to get them down to where they should be and would be if we acted diplomatically in the matter. I would say to President Kennedy: "Your trade plan may not be entirely without merit, and my colleagues and I will study it when you have it in studi-able form, and give it the benefit of every doubt, but oversalesmanship serves only to jeopardize it and make us suspicious about it."

Honesty would compel us to admit that if we cut tariffs on some items to encourage imports, these industries are going to suffer increased competition so that other industries can prosper through increased exports. There just is not any other answer. In the year 1961 we imported approximately 550 million pounds of fresh or frozen beef and veal valued at about $190 million. After 20 years of reducing tariffs, our exports deteriorated, in 1960, to about 10 million pounds valued at under $6 million.

In 1961 imports of canned beef amounted to almost 100 million pounds valued at $35 million. During the same period, exports probably did not exceed those of 1960 when they amounted to 2 million pounds, valued at less than a million dollars.

Mr. President, how can I sell more of this reciprocity to the thousands in the State of Nebraska who see their markets traded away so that others may enrich their coffers?

Experience teaches a lesson most difficult to forget even in the face of threats on one hand or oversalesmanship on the other.

The request of the President for a delegation of power to further lower tariffs should be carefully viewed and examined. There are some basic questions to be answered. If the wage level in the United States in any particular industry is substantially higher than it is in foreign countries, shall that business be handed over to the foreign producer? Is the State Department capable of determining the future of any particular business or industry in the United States? Does a reasonable amount of protection create the ill will of foreign nations against the United States? Should we not respect the right of foreign nations to impose reasonable tariffs to protect their own industry as well as provide revenue for them?

Mr. President, the New Frontier is playing the same old record started by the New Deal. It is a continued request for a delegation of power to the President as a solution to all ills, foreign and domestic. We shall examine every request carefully.

THE RECURRENT PHENOMENON OF EXTREMISM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CASE OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have read the text of a splendid, thought-provoking address delivered Saturday, January 13, by the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case].

"Extremism, of the right or left, is a threat to our free institutions, our whole way of life, and we are rightly concerned," says the Senator. Indeed, all of us are concerned, and most of us agree with him and his conclusions. He develops that theme in a very logical and persuasive fashion.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the Senator's address be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by Senator Clifford P. Case at the Annual Meeting of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Hotel Savoy Hilton, New York City, Saturday, January 13, 1962

A Senator's mailbag always provides an interesting slice of American thought. If it is a rare day that someone somewhere is not moved to consign one to a place of uncomfortable warmth, the same mail may also produce a heartening note from an enlightened citizen who happens to share one's views. Whether Congress is in or out of session, there is a constant flow of correspondence and an unending stream of printed material, of books and pamphlets, of bulletins and releases, of exhortation and solicitation. Much of this is informative and sound, a little of it hysterical, even mad.

Over the years a pattern emerges that remains pretty much the same, barring variations in volume and topic according to the times. Of late, however, there has been a noticeable change. Increasingly my mailbag, and I am sure others' too, has been filled with printed matter of one sort or another which asserts that the United States is in peril, indeed, its very existence is threatened by communism. Few would argue with this; indeed, most of us have so held for a long time.

But there is a new note of insistence that the real danger comes, not from external communism, but from communism here at home. The writers pound unceasingly on the theme that operating from the top, Communist conspirators or sympathizers are taking over in every important area of our society, in education, in the communications media, in our churches, and most particularly in Government.

In the words of a well-known worker in the extremist vineyard, "The thousands of Americans who write me (and who are typical of other thousands who never heard of me) are not primarily interested in fighting Communists in Laos or Berlin. They are primarily interested in resisting, and reversing, the policies of their own Government. This distrust of Government means that American individuals are regaining confidence in their own judgment." As he summed it up, "The only real threat to American survival is from within." This is the basic and strident theme, whether the particular literature deals with the United Nations, the abolition of the income tax, or fluoridation of water.

One's first inclination is to laugh at the patent absurdity of charges that President Eisenhower, like Roosevelt and Truman before him, has all his life been a dedicated and conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy, or that the AMA and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce are soft on socialism and unreliable allies in the struggle against it.

It is easy, too, to explain the recurrent phenomenon of extremism, whether of left or right, in terms of the appeal of the conspiratorial or devil theory to account for the manifold difficulties of our times. When things are not going well, it must be because of sinister plots or treason in high places.

Further, it has been demonstrated many times that whenever there are problems which society at the time is not meeting, whether because of indifference or because of their enormous difficulty, a sense of frustration leads many to the search for drastic and simple solutions. After all, the 19th century had its Know-Nothings. Thus, too, the attraction of the far left for many persons in the face of the social injustices and economic distress of the thirties.

Similarly, since World War II, the growing menace of Communist power and the enormous difficulties, complicated by the development of nuclear weapons and the possibility of world destruction, of coping with it, have fed a yearning for all-embracing solutions of the sort that the extremists purport to offer.

Then, too, the very sweep of the "reforms" advocated by today's extremists of the right makes it hard to take their programs seriously. You and I know that Congress is not going to repeal, for example, the Social Security Act nor abolish the income tax. Nor is there really any doubt in our minds that the Federal Reserve System as well as Federal assistance in such fields as housing and urban renewal are here to stay.

Despite the insistence of some people that social progress is synonymous with socialism and socialism with communism, most Americans, to use Lincoln's phrase, are still able to distinguish between a horse chestnut and a chestnut horse.

Finally, at a time when Khrushchev has flatly predicted that he "will bury us," when the leader of Red China openly proclaims support of war and revolution as the "most noble obligation" of Communist countries, when we confront Communist arms in Laos and Berlin, it seems incredible that any considerable number of people could find the chief, indeed, the only threat to America a domestic one.

If all this is so, as I believe it is, why then all the fuss over the utterances of a relatively few self-appointed leaders of the ultraright?

Are we in danger, as one of the Nation's leading newspapers has suggested, of "being extreme about extremists"?

For one thing, real students of Communist infiltration—people like J. Edgar Hoover and the Reverend John F. Cronin, S.S., of the National Catholic Welfare Conference—have warned against the danger of exclusive preoccupation with anticommunism at the expense of constructive thought or action. As Mr. Hoover stated succinctly in a recent report to the Internal Security Subcommittee:

"Because communism thrives on turmoil, the party is continuously attempting to exploit all grievances—real or imagined—for its own tactical purposes. It is, therefore, almost inevitable that, on many issues, the party line will coincide with the position of many non-Communists. The danger of indiscriminately alleging that someone is a Communist merely because his views on a particular issue happen to parallel the official party position is obvious. The confusion which is thereby created helps the Communists by diffusing the forces of their opponents.

"Unfortunately, there are those who make the very mistake the Communists are so careful to avoid. These individuals concentrate on the negative rather than on the positive. They are merely against communism without being for any positive measures to eliminate the social, political, and economic frictions which the Communists are so adroit at exploiting.

"These persons would do well to recall a recent lesson from history. Both Hitler and Mussolini were against communism. However, it was by what they stood for, not against, that history has judged them."

Of course, there is still room for dissent in this free land. Of course, national unity does not preclude a broad spectrum of opinion from left to right.

If the editorial warning were directed against abridgement of the rights of free speech, association and the like, all of us would agree, I am sure, that resort to such suppression would be not only wrong but self-defeating. But if we are being admonished not to be so concerned over the activities of the so-called "superpatriotic" groups, that is something else again.

For extremism, of the right or left, is a threat to our free institutions, our whole way of life, and we are rightly concerned.

It is not in itself the fact of criticism of our political leaders, of our foundations, of our schools and universities, of our corporations and our churches that concerns us. Rather it is the nature of the assault and the techniques which are employed as well as the underlying refusal of the extremist to accept the basic premise of our social and political structure.

It is axiomatic that the extremist believes that the end justifies the means. Thus he does not shrink from lies, character assassination, the anonymous phone call, the secret organization which seeks to infiltrate and manipulate other groups, calculated disruption of meetings and "dirty tricks" of every sort—all of them deeply offensive to the American sense of justice and fairplay and utterly antithetical to the respect for the rights of the individual which animates the whole of the Constitution.

In his article in the August Commentary, "The John Birch Society, Fundamentalism on the Right," Alan Westin has pointed out a number of characteristics that distinguish the extremist from both liberal and conservative. I have already indicated several—the assumption that all major problems could be readily resolved were it not for an evil conspiracy, the refusal to believe in the integrity and patriotism of our leaders in virtually every field, the slavelike adherence to a dogma that does not permit the application of orderly tests of truth regarding any flaws or inadequacies either in philosophy or its application as expounded by an absolute leadership. The organization and tactics of the ultraright brings to mind George Orwell's telling line describing the leftwingers of the thirties who wanted to be anti-Fascist without being antitotalitarian.

Finally, as Westin demonstrates, the extremist, unlike American liberals and conservatives—who accept the political system, acknowledge the loyalty of their opponents and employ the orderly political techniques—rejects the very basis of our political system and the mutual trust on which it rests. He finds abhorrent the whole concept of consensus; he not only denies any need for compromise and mutual accommodation, he positively denounces it.

It is, I believe, the American genius for adjustment, the give and take characteristic of our political life, that has made possible a degree of domestic order and peace which is little short of a miracle in a country as large as ours, with so great multiplicity of conflicting interests and with a people so diverse in racial, religious and cultural background.

Success in composing differences is due in great part to the fact that the process takes place within each of our two great parties and not in conflict between them. But to the extremist, the very absence of any fundamental division between the major parties is a betrayal. To him the strength of our two-party system—the fact that one party can and does succeed the other without disruption or drastic revision of our national course—is a weakness, and hence the avowed attempt of the extremist to take over, in whole or part, one or both of our parties.

To many of them the Republican Party is a tempting target. And there are a few Republicans who may be tempted. But I am certain that most Republicans are agreed that to permit the party to be intimidated or seduced by the ultraright would be a grievous mistake. It would threaten the usefulness, if not the very existence, of the Republican Party as an effective member of the two-party system.

As for the Democratic side, there may be some who watch with a certain glee the attempt to make over the Republican Party in the image of the Birch Society. But surely they cannot contemplate with equanimity the possibility of any degree of success by the extremist, nor can they be pleased by the prospect of any alliance between the segregationists and the political-economic extremists in their own heartland of the South. It is the avoidance of a drastic either/or choice that has been the great safeguard of our way of life. Neither Republican nor Democrat can afford to forget that, if history teaches any lesson here, it is that any gain by extremism of whatever ilk is made at the expense not of other extremists but of the middle.

The extremists will not, I am sure, succeed in taking over either of our majority parties. But this does not dispose of the problem. Far more to be feared, because more possible, is the rise of the extremist to a position of any substantial influence in the body politic, an influence unrealized by those who respond to it, which will inevitably be negative in nature.

Already there have been disturbing suggestions that racists, for example, could make common cause with the ultrarightists. It is true that these suggestions have been coldly received by some extremist spokesmen. The founder of the Birch Society, for example, has taken some pains to disassociate himself from this thinking. Alan Westin reports that the society's founder, Robert Welch, "seems to be personally without bias toward Jews and he wants the society to reflect this position." Professor Westin concludes that "it is a testimony to American maturity and the activities of Jewish defense agencies that open anti-Semitism is seen as a dead end today for any 'middle-of-the-road rightwing organization'." No finer, or as I believe, more justified, tribute could be paid to the effectiveness of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

But in other areas, notably the international sphere, the outcome is perhaps less certain. Certainly it cannot be taken for granted.

We live in a world in which it is no longer possible for us as a nation to be a bystander. Whether we like it or not, the United States is today a participant, with all that term implies. Neither can we, by ourselves, direct and control the course of the world.

To the extremists this presents an intolerable dilemma. They insist that we should withdraw and at the same time unilaterally control the tide of world events. Our failure to accomplish this impossible task is in their minds clear proof of Communist infiltration and subversion in high places. The remedy to them is simple—root out communism from American leadership.

The patent absurdity of this approach may not always protect us from it. As tensions heighten and frustrations continue we may weary of the struggle to keep the free world together and moving forward in a common defense against its enemies and in a common attack upon its economic and social problems. We may tire of our efforts to help the emerging nations achieve their legitimate goals in independence.

Then the constant reiteration of the extremists' theme that the struggle is not necessary—even that it is irrelevant—may by slow degrees erode, at first our understanding of the problems which we face, and then our will to meet them in rational ways. The result could be disastrous for America and for mankind.

The struggle for freedom is a never-ending one. Freedom can never be finally achieved. Each generation must contend for it anew, must nurture and defend it. Each of us, as an individual, as a member of a community, as a citizen of the Nation, has a responsibility here, a responsibility which we cannot shift and must not shirk.

It is a responsibility to reject the deceptively easy solution, the simple big answer, to any of our problems, whether on the world scene or at home, a responsibility to reject the methods which extremists employ to compel others to accept their views of the problems we face. Above all, it is a responsibility to reject the absolutism which lies at the heart of their thinking. Man is, at best, a fallible creature, but of all the errors of which he is capable, none could be greater, since it is less reversible, than that of absolutism.

I am confident we will meet our responsibility. As a people, Americans have shown relatively little affinity for ideological argument. But we do have a deep-rooted blend of commonsense and basic decency that while it tolerates extremism, also assures its repudiation.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MANSFIELD

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, in a recent issue, the Lewistown (Mont.) Daily News paid well-deserved tribute to our distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Under the heading, "A Man Among Men," the editorial writer noted the burden of the chief participants in the often cruel and relentless crucible of debate and decision. Despite these burdens, he said:

> Senator MANSFIELD remains a man of our people, from whom he derives inspiration and strength even as he himself reflects the steadfastness and grandeur of our shining mountains.

Despite the national recognition accorded Senator MANSFIELD he continues to watch vigilantly every need for Montana. And no junior Senator ever had a more sympathetic and understanding senior colleague than I.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial from the January 17 issue of the Lewistown Daily News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MAN AMONG MEN

As the second session of the 87th Congress convenes, the eyes of the Nation and the world focus, among other top American governmental leaders, upon Montana's senior Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, majority leader of the U.S. Senate.

But while the rest of the world dispassionately views the chief participants in the often cruel and relentless crucible of debate and decision, Montanans observe with heart as well as hope. For Senator MANSFIELD, while he belongs to the whole country, is our Senator.

We want him to know that we are very proud of him.

We want him to know that we are with him.

We want him to know that he can count on us to understand that there are human limitations and that no one can do everything.

No one envied Senator MANSFIELD last January when his colleagues elected him to succeed the able, astute and colorful, not to mention powerful, LYNDON JOHNSON as majority leader. Senator MANSFIELD didn't ask for the job and this fact armed him to be independent and effective during the first session.

Even some of the most hard-bitten and cynical commentators have conceded after the first year that Senator MANSFIELD more than filled the big shoes left behind by Vice President JOHNSON.

No one can participate as a leader in an arena such as the U.S. Senate without controversy and criticism. There are times when Senator MANSFIELD, good soldier that he is, must be committed to administration programs as his party's leader in the Senate, which he would not support perhaps were he just another Senator. There are times when the administration finds it excellent to have the majority leader send up a trial balloon, which viewpoint may or may not be that of Senator MANSFIELD. Therefore, Montanans should understand these facts as they read about their Senator on the national and international scene.

Last year, by all accounts, Senator MANSFIELD achieved outstanding success in his first year as majority leader.

This year, we can expect even more accomplishment, even more recognition and stature for him.

Senator MANSFIELD is already being classed as the peer of any Senator ever sent from this great State, which is noted for sending great men to Washington. He is writing a record as majority leader which will rank among the very best in American history.

But despite the burdens of responsibility he carries during these crisis-filled and terrible times, he remains untouched by them. He remains a man of our people, from whom he derives inspiration and strength even as he himself reflects the steadfastness and grandeur of our shining mountains.

So, we hope our readers will occasionally take time out and drop the Senator a word of encouragement. And, busy as he is, this will be most welcomed and do him as much good as anything.

MUZZLING THE MILITARY

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] recently prepared a series of eight articles on the subject of "Muzzling the Military," and these articles are being printed in a number of newspapers across the country. These articles were written for the purpose of giving the American people background information on the investigation which the Special Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee began today. In view of the timely nature of the information contained in these articles and the fact that they relate to a Senate investigation, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUZZLING THE MILITARY—WHAT'S BEHIND THE GAG—I

(By U.S. Senator STROM THURMOND)

On January 23, the Special Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee will begin one of the most vital investigations undertaken on Capitol Hill in some time. The subcommittee is authorized to study and appraise the use of military personnel and facilities to inform military personnel and the public of the total menace which the forces of world communism pose to the free world.

The investigation will cover three areas: censorship of speeches and periodicals, troop information and education programs (including films), and cold war seminars. It is possible that the investigation could run for most of the congressional session.

The purpose of the investigation is not to promote sensationalism, spotlight Communists, or persecute individuals. Rather, it is to go to the source of the policy which authorizes or is responsible for (1) soft-pedaling statements on communism in speeches and articles, (2) shelving or deemphasizing troop training programs designed to acquaint military personnel with our insidious cold war enemy and his brainwashing techniques which worked so well in the Korean war because our troops were ill-prepared, and (3) discouragement of utilization of military personnel and facilities in cold war seminars designed to give the public a better appreciation of the enemy, as authorized in a 1958 National Security Council directive.

Americans should have a full examination of these policies so they can decide whether they want present policies continued or modified. The study I have made thus far of these policies convinces me that they have a deep underlying purpose which has not been readily apparent to the American public. This purpose is to combat the enemy in the cold war with a strategy which can be best defined as a no-win policy. We don't propose to win the cold war because we abhor only the aggressive, totalitarian aspects of communism.

In fact, we seem to be determined to join their professed revolution by adopting for ourselves and many of our allies the same social and economic measures which the Communists use as bait to attain their goal of world domination.

Mr. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., administrative assistant to the President, has described experimentation in these social and economic proposals as democratic socialism.

If the American people desire a no-win foreign policy and a domestic policy of democratic socialism, then they should have full information on such policies. Above all, they should have complete information on the enemy we face in the cold war so they can determine, as they have a right to do, whether these policies best fit the most effective prescription for maintaining our constitutional Republic and the many blessings of liberty it has been able to preserve for us through the years.

If, however, our military leaders are suppressed in their anti-Communist statements and seminars and everyone who speaks up against communism or the hidden policy changes in this country is to be labeled a fanatic, extremist, or superpatriot, then the American people will be robbed of their right to make the choice with full facts necessary to make such an important determination.

In the next article in this series, I shall discuss the lack of adequate knowledge of communism and the importance of increasing rather than decreasing dissemination of information on Communist tactics and goals.

MUZZLING THE MILITARY—KNOWLEDGE OF COMMUNISM IS SPARSE—II

(By U.S. Senator STROM THURMOND)

The right to know our enemy is not new. It is a right held and exercised by our forebears, from the time they identified King George III as the enemy of their day and discussed and criticized his aggressive acts.

Today, however, the right to know our enemy has assumed new proportions of importance. The present enemy poses not only a military threat, but also engages in psychological, political, economic, social, diplomatic, and subversive attacks against us and other free peoples. The war communism wages against us is total in nature. Its form at a given time and place has for the most part been chosen by the enemy for his advantage and convenience.

In such a war, our unfamiliarity with the nature of the enemy and the tactics utilized by him, constitutes our primary vulnerability. Military power, although essential, cannot alone meet the Communist assault. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Director and author of "Masters of Deceit," has stated: "We cannot hope to successfully meet the Communist menace unless there is a wide knowledge and understanding of its aims and designs."

Implicit in Mr. Hoover's statement is the realization that there is no wide knowledge and understanding of Communist aims and designs.

The events of recent years provide unimpeachable proof that we do not understand the nature or methods of Communists and communism. Had we understood and appreciated the menace of communism, we would not today be suffering from the losses of our blind negotiations at Yalta and Potsdam. We would never have been bamboozled into characterizing the Red Chinese as "agrarian reformers." Castro, now a self-admitted Communist of some years and a sympathizer since school days, would not have had our support in establishing a Communist dictatorship over the Cuban people 90 miles from our shores.

If we as a people had understood communism we would never have fallen prey to subversion at the hands of Alger Hiss, the Rosenbergs, Greenglass, Fuchs, or Harry Dexter White, and the many other Communist agents who were caught—not to mention those who remain undetected and unapprehended. The postwar years in America prove beyond doubt that Americans, by and large, do not fully understand communism and its tactics in trying to achieve world domination.

Knowledge of the enemy, if possessed and turned on the enemy, is a weapon of equal or superior potential to a nuclear-tipped ICBM. Such knowledge constitutes an impregnable defense against enemy propaganda and brainwashing efforts in the type mind warfare attacks directed against free peoples by the Communist conspiracy. It can blunt the enemy's political, economic and diplomatic offenses and impair the effectiveness of his subversive efforts. Most important, knowledge of communism reveals its fallacies and weaknesses, thereby bolstering the self-confidence of free peoples and their will to emerge victorious from the struggle against communism.

The National Security Council directive of 1958 authorizing military participation in cold war seminars was designed to help meet the need of public information on communism and its tactics. This directive has in the past year been modified by a series of Defense Department actions which give the appearance of stifling rather than advancing public information on the enemy.

In the next article in this series, I shall explain the background facts leading up to the increased emphasis during 1961 on censorship of anti-Communist actions and statements.

MUZZLING THE MILITARY—THE ROOTS GO WAY BACK—EVEN TO MOSCOW—III

(By U.S. Senator STROM THURMOND)

The Communists themselves are aware of the immense potentiality of widespread knowledge of the wiles of communism as a weapon to be effectively used against them in the cold war. Unfortunately, the Communists have had relatively little to fear from America in this regard until recent years.

Largely as a result of a National Security Council directive issued in 1958, organized efforts were undertaken to establish a defense based on knowledge against communism and its propaganda. This directive authorized use of military personnel and facilities to conduct seminars on the cold war, particularly for Reserve officers. These seminars, such as those supported by the Richardson Foundation and the Institute for American Strategy, have proved to be very responsible and successful. They have met with enthusiastic public reception, filling in part the vast public hunger for information on communism and the cold war.

In December 1960, representatives of Communist parties of 81 countries, meeting in Moscow, issued a manifesto which not only acknowledged the existence of efforts to inform the American public about communism, but directed the implementation of immediate countermeasures. Here is one quote from the manifesto: "To effectively defend the interests of the working people, maintain peace and realize the socialist ideals of the working class, it is indispensable to wage a resolute struggle against anticommunism—that poisoned weapon which the bourgeoisie uses to fence off the masses from socialism."

The nature of the countermeasures was subsequently revealed in the writings of Gus Hall, secretary general of the Communist Party, U.S.A. Since the military services were, by virtue of the 1958 National Security Council directive, supporting the anti-Communist educational movements, the focus of the attack was to be on our military establishments. Indeed, Hall stated that the primary target is the military and its anti-Communist statements and seminars.

This attack was camouflaged behind a fabricated controversy over civilian versus military control of policy. Simultaneously, all groups emerging in anti-Communist educational activities, of whatever shade of responsibility, along with the military, were to be smeared as "ultraright," "neo-Fascists," or "Birchites." The attack was launched.

In fact, articles in the Worker, official publication of the Communist Party, U.S.A., have stated that an alliance, into which even the Kennedy administration must be brought, must be forged against anti-Communists. An editorial in the December 1961 issue of Political Affairs, another party publication, refers back to Gus Hall's suggested alliance and gloats over the success attained in pressuring the administration into the attack on the "ultrarightists." Here is one quote from Political Affairs:

"The President's speeches were occasioned by the widespread concern in the country over the growing menace of the war-bent ultraright forces. Many leaders, organizations, and periodicals—reflecting opinion in broad public and religious circles—expressed real concern over the Fascist menace."

The same publications in this country which picked up the Worker-originated line against anti-Communists last summer have continued to blast away with innuendos and invectives which imply—some state directly—that anti-Communists constitute a graver threat to our country than do Communists. Some of the publications following this line have been the New York Times, the Washington Post (and lately its subsidiary, Newsweek), the Nation, the Reporter, and the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists. Even Norman Thomas, the long-time Socialist leader in this country, has published two attacks on anticommunism.

All of these events, from the Moscow meeting in December, through the original articles in the Worker and on to the use of the line in non-Communist publications, have been carefully and expertly documented in sworn testimony of Edward Hunter unanimously released by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on August 27, 1961.

In the next article in this series, the so-called Fulbright memorandum, which recommended increased censorship of the military and kicked off a series of 17 speeches in the Senate by me, will be discussed.

Muzzling the Military—Unveiling of Fulbright Memorandum Kicks Off Counteroffense—IV

(By U.S. Senator Strom Thurmond)

On the morning of July 21, 1961, I read articles in the Washington Post and the New York Times which reported that a secret memorandum had been sent from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to the President and the Secretary of Defense on the subject of military anti-Communist statements and seminars. I was shocked to read some of the quoted excerpts from this memorandum and was even more amazed that such a communication on the armed services would be secretly sent from the Foreign Relations Committee. Immediately I tried to obtain a copy of the memorandum. I was informed that it was not a committee document but was prepared by the chairman of the committee as an expression of his own views.

Being unable to obtain a copy of this document, especially as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I began a series of speeches in the Senate on the basis of the information which had been made available to the reporters.

Subsequently, I obtained a copy of a document which I described as conforming in minute detail to the excerpts from the Post and Times articles. I inserted this document into the Congressional Record. Late in the day the Senator from Arkansas placed his full memorandum in the Record. When this had been done, the press and the public began awakening to the intensity of the campaign to quiet anti-Communists. A flood of mail protesting the memorandum and other actions then began descending on Capitol Hill.

The mail continued to come by the thousands. In fact, in a 2-month period a few hundred thousand communications—mine running almost 1,000 to 1 for an investigation were received on the Hill. The tenor of the communications indicated without question that the vast majority of these people were writing spontaneously and out of a deep sense of concern. These communications from so many Americans in every State and from every segment of society constituted an effective expression of American grassroots sentiment and played an important part in finally winning approval on September 21, 1961, of the investigation into muzzling the military.

The Fulbright memorandum was lengthy and contained many inaccuracies (even spelling and typing mistakes) and made many sweeping allegations.

It expressed the alarming view that rather than needing to be alerted to the cold war menace, the American people needed to be restrained in their desire "to hit the Communists with everything we've got, particularly if there are more Cubas and Laoses." The memorandum gave the general impression that the people could not be trusted to determine properly their country's course in the cold war.

In the memorandum were several far-reaching recommendations which in essence were: (1) Consider repeal or modification of the directive authorizing cold war seminars; (2) increase censorship through general directives under the broad principle of civilian control which was viewed as being difficult to disagree with; (3) study the idea of increased civilian control over the National War College; (4) reexamine the relationships between private foundations supporting seminars and the National War College for elimination of aggressive views; (5) study the possibility of graduate studies at universities as a condition to high military ranks; and (6) study the possibility of bringing unit level troop education activities under civilian control and operation.

This memorandum should be studied by every American, particularly any who still have the misapprehension that this fight is merely one of civilian control over the military. Military leaders are subject to civilian control. In fact, a recent check shows that civilians outnumber the military almost 3 to 1 in the Pentagon and related control agencies in Washington. There has never been an attempt by an officer or group of officers to seize control of this Government. I know of no officer even remotely interested in such a fantastic idea. In fact, the only place I have seen mention of this has been in the Worker and publications parroting the line against anticommunism.

In the next article of this series, I will discuss actions of the Defense Department to suppress anti-Communist statements and seminars.

Muzzling the Military—Anti-Red Films Banned, Seminars Canceled—V

(By U.S. Senator Strom Thurmond)

Many indications of determination to muzzle military personnel and encumber their effectiveness against communism have been manifested in Department of Defense actions during 1961.

As far back as March 10, 1961, a Defense Department memorandum prohibited the use of the film "Operation Abolition" by the services in training military personnel, restricting it to an "on call" basis. This film is a documentary of actual Communist-led rioting against the House Un-American Activities Committee in San Francisco in May 1960.

I witnessed this despicable rioting by Communist-duped students and teachers. I saw a known Communist, Archie Brown, inciting students into irrational actions. J. Edgar Hoover has vouched for the fact that the riots were Communist-inspired and led. The House Un-American Activities Committee has recently published a document entitled "The Truth About the Film 'Operation Abolition'" in answer to attacks by the Worker and by many leftist groups and publications.

The March 10 directive countermanded an Army directive of October 11, 1960, prescribing that "Operation Abolition" be utilized in the troop information program to the maximum extent possible. A subsequent order issued on May 19, 1961, further restricted the film to an on-call basis for internal use only.

Some officers did not realize that the technical language used to ban the film was really a way of saying that the film was strictly taboo. On June 14, 1961, two officers in Seattle were reprimanded and relieved of duty for allowing the film to be shown. The film was requested to be shown by Reserve officers attending a collateral training drill period.

In addition to "Operation Abolition," other effective anti-Communist films have been banned or shelved. In place of these anti-Communist films, the Department of Defense substituted what I have described as a namby-pamby, gutless film, "Challenge of Ideas."

This film conveys the false impression that military aggression is the only threat posed by communism and that we don't oppose communism itself.

More evidence of success of the campaign to gag anticommunism can be found in directives dated July 10, 1961, and October 5, 1961. The former is pregnant with censorship powers for Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs. The other puts military officers on notice that they speak on the subject of communism at risk of grave peril to their military careers. In effect, it has all but ruled out military participation in anti-Communist seminars and has even scared off some retired officers who have caught the true import of the directive.

Actions taken either directly or indirectly by the Defense Department resulted in the canceling or postponement in Louisiana, Indiana, Illinois, Virginia, and the Canal

Zone of several planned seminars and discouragement of others in the embryonic stage.

The sum total of all actions taken against anti-Communist statements and seminars, more of which will be discussed in subsequent articles, strikes at the very heart of what should be our principal strength in the war against the godless ideology of communism. This strength is the morale of both the armed services personnel and the civilian American public. Without good morale, the will to win, and the belief in our ability to win, the protracted conflict with communism cannot be resolved in our favor.

In the next article I shall discuss inadequate troop information and education programs to teach the troops about the enemy and his brainwashing techniques which worked so effectively in Korea because our men were ill prepared.

Muzzling the Military—Red Brainwashing Ignored in Teaching Troops—VI

(By U.S. Senator Strom Thurmond)

No one gets any pleasure out of recalling the successes scored by the Communists in Korea by brainwashing POW's and promoting "bugouts" by GI's who had not been sufficiently impressed with the nature of the enemy, American ideals, or why it was necessary to fight in that far-off, rough and cold terrain. We realize that we cannot, and must not, recriminate against those individuals who were so unfortunate as to succumb to the skillful techniques employed against them while they were prisoners in Korea. The fault lies not just with these individuals, but with our system of training, and, indeed, with our society's relaxed emphasis on absolute values over a period of many years.

When in 1955 the studies of our Korean war experiences were completed and the serviceman's code of conduct was promulgated, it was assumed that our Defense Establishment would follow through and insure the maintenance of a program of information and education which would remedy the glaring deficiencies of the Korean war. It is now clear that no such comprehensive and effective program has been maintained. Indeed, there are indications from numerous sources that those weaknesses still prevail and, in many cases, are even more pronounced than they were 8 to 11 years ago.

An Air Force officer who served on the Advisory Committee on Prisoners of War for the Secretary of Defense has expressed this concern over inaction on the committee's recommendations: "Once the documents were signed and proclaimed, they were filed away, then that was the end of them. I never thought it possible. The program that was to restore American stamina and teach our forces to understand the wiles of communism has been sabotaged."

There is no indication that any serious effort has been made to impress commanders at all levels with either the necessity for maintaining T.I. & E. programs, with the needs of service personnel for training in our system of government and the nature of the Communist menace. There has been little, if any, emphasis on the most imperative need, a strong sense of individual responsibility.

My studies have revealed only slight efforts to acquaint troop commanders with the materials and devices available for use in conducting T.I. & E. programs. From a review of T.I. & E. materials made available, one cannot escape the conclusion that the Defense Department has been reticent in facing up to the problem of brainwashing techniques. In fact, it is easy to conclude that the word "brainwashing" is consciously avoided.

In a recent speech, Vice Adm. Robert B. Pirie gave good evidence on the job that needs to be done on T.I. & E. programs with these remarks: "Here are some statistics about the present day enlisted recruits revealed by a recent Marine Corps survey, a survey of the highly motivated type of young American who volunteers for the rigors of Marine Corps recruit training. Only half of the boys recruited can make a rational explanation of the meaning of the Fourth of July. Only a pitiful small number of them can make an intelligent discrimination among the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the Declaration of Independence. In fact, only one out of three knows which came first, the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution. Only 1 in 10 can give a reasonable comparison between the basic characteristics of communism and the opposite concepts of our free system of government."

With Defense Department leadership giving the impression of discouraging efforts to alert the American public and troops on the many facets of the Communist threat it is easy to understand why our T.I. & E. programs are mostly impotent and are rarely pursued by commanders with vigor and effectiveness. After all, the T.I. & E. programs are diluted by such actions of censorship and suppression and by the official reluctance to face up squarely to our proven vulnerability to brainwashing techniques and gullibility to Communist propaganda.

Muzzling the Military—Censorship of Speeches Reveals Lack of Savvy About Reds—VII

(By U.S. Senator Strom Thurmond)

Censorship is a serious matter which is antagonistic to the American concept of society. Even in the area where security requirements make some of it essential, the greatest care must be taken that the censorship not be capricious or excessive. It is also necessary for military personnel to refrain from speaking in official statements contrary to foreign policy, against national policy, and engaging in partisan political matters.

It is essential that foreign policy not be so broadly interpreted in applying censorship as to prevent statements being made on any subject which, regardless of by whom made, might conceivably influence a person in his thinking on foreign peoples or nations or our relations with them. Such an interpretation leads to a complete gag.

Certainly our military leaders should not be prohibited from speaking on the subject of communism. J. Edgar Hoover says that communism should not be a controversial subject. In fact, he has repeatedly warned that we need to know more about communism. Our military people should know the enemy better than any other group, for it is most essential to their profession.

During the past year there has developed an increasingly strict pattern of censorship of all statements of military personnel. The following are examples of the type statements deleted from proposed speeches:

1. Communist conspiracy directed toward absolute domination of the world.
2. Soviet infiltration menacing this Nation and extending throughout far corners of the globe.
3. The steady advance of communism.
4. The Communist challenge.
5. Insidious ideology of world communism.
6. Nothing has happened to indicate that the goals of international communism have changed.

This pattern of censoring out penetrating phrases on communism is relatively consistent wherever such material is submitted and is performed usually by State Department personnel. There appears to be complete consistency in the deletion of any use of the words "victory" or "war."

Indeed, these are carried to rather ridiculous extremes. In a speech of a technical nature, an officer proposed to use the following sentence: "The X-15 is the 'Man of War' of the stable of research aircraft today." The phrase was deleted, and the censor wrote in the margin: "Let's use another steed—Zev, Gallant Fox, etc., but not this one."

These are a few indications of our secret no-win strategy for fighting the cold war.

Mr. Khrushchev comes in for special "kid-glove" treatment by the State Department. A mention of Mr. Khrushchev banging his shoe on the table in the U.N. was blue-penciled. Also censored was his oft-quoted remark that "we will bury you." The censor wrote in: "He has denied that he meant this literally."

In appearances before Congress, military personnel must be permitted to speak without restrictions. I have found, however, that a high-ranking officer's remarks were heavily censored in giving testimony to the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Similar censorship has taken place in service journals which disclaim any connection with national policy and which require free exchange of ideas to promote professional proficiency. Even articles by civilians outside the Defense Establishment who contribute articles are censored.

The Defense Department's answer to criticism of such censorship is that extra care is needed during periods of "sensitive negotiations." In a speech on September 18, I analyzed censored items and dates and refuted this contention by showing that such items were deleted fairly consistently during the year, particularly when we were not negotiating with the Communists.

Such a policy should be exposed and changed. It reflects an abysmal ignorance of communism and Communist methods. Communist tactics do not change or react according to the words spoken by our own people or leaders. If it suits the Communist purpose to negotiate—and they have been much more successful in this area than we have—they will negotiate even if we spit in their faces. If they do not intend to negotiate, no sweet words from Western officialdom will induce them to negotiate. The Communists react only to raw power, never to words.

Muzzling the Military—In Conclusion: Why Not Give the People the Facts About Communism?—VIII

(By U.S. Senator Strom Thurmond)

The instances of censorship of speeches and service journals, inadequacies of troop information and education programs, and discouragements of cold war seminars, if examined in the context of the single, specific instance, might in many cases appear to have no far-reaching consequences. The sum total of all these, however, builds up to a definite pattern. When considered in its entirety, this matter goes to the heart of our ability to survive as a nation against the threat of international communism.

Make no mistake, it is communism which is our enemy. Its threat has many facets—military, political, economic, psychological, diplomatic, subversive. Its aim is domination of the world under a totalitarian rule which will seek to reduce all people to one level, pegged to the lowest common denominator. Communism recognizes no god except materialism and the worship of man. Even man, however, has been relegated to the status of an animal. To the dedicated Communist, everything was formed by accident, not by divine design of a Supreme Being.

In less than half a century a small band of dedicated Communists has extended its control from Petrograd to many parts of the world. They now control 26 percent of the world's land mass and 36 percent of the world's population. Since World War II, 15 countries and 900 million people have gone behind the Iron Curtain. This enemy is in dead earnest. How much more proof do we need?

If Mr. Khrushchev were asked what has helped the Communists most in their thus far successful drive to communize the world, no doubt he would answer: American apathy, lack of knowledge of our operations and goals, and—above all—refusal to believe that we mean what we have said and written for years.

World communism has made its biggest gains through use of the powerful art of psychological warfare and propaganda. Unfortunately, many Americans have bought the Soviet line that since we can't beat them we should join their world revolution. Too many times we have fallen for the Red line and later translated it into our own national policies.

In a recent appearance on "Meet the Press," former CIA Director Allen Dulles warned that too often the Soviet line had been picked up and parroted by various of the news media in this country. Mr. Dulles, by the way, is no conservative, no extreme rightwinger or fanatic.

The Communist line against anticommunism in America specifically had its origin in Moscow in the Communist manifesto of December 5, 1960. In part this manifesto stated: "To effectively defend the interests of the working people, maintain peace and realize the Socialist ideals of the working class, it is indispensable to wage a resolute struggle against anticommunism—that poisoned weapon which the bourgeoisie uses to fence off the masses from socialism."

Gus Hall, secretary general of the Communist Party, U.S.A., took his cue from this meeting. He laid down the line of attack against military anti-Communist statements and seminars in a policy statement in the Worker. In a subsequent interpretative article, a Communist writer said Hall meant that an alliance must be formed against the anti-Communists, into which even the Kennedy administration must be brought.

Another Communist publication, Political Affairs, in its December issue, gloats that the party has pressured the administration into attacks on the ultrarightists, in which description they include the military-industrial complex.

These are facts—facts that the American people must have, regardless of where the chips may fall. Censorship and suppression shield behind a smokescreen of civilian control policies on which the American people have too few facts. If these policies—among them the no-win strategy and democratic socialism—cannot stand the spotlight of public attention and discussion, then they should be rejected.

The investigation into muzzling our military leaders will be a good one which will serve the best interests of the American people. As the assigned advocate on the subcommittee in this investigation, I shall be fair, factual, but unrelenting. I hope every American will follow these hearings with interest and objectivity.

HENRY FORD II ON TRADE—A BUSINESS LEADER SPEAKS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the long expected, great debate on U.S. trade policy has begun. In Congress and its committees, in the Nation, and in lands overseas the debate is rising. The central issue of the debate is sometimes obscured by the data presented and by the interests represented. The central issue is the survival of freedom in our time.

A most remarkable contribution to the debate has been made by one of the Nation's leading businessmen, Henry Ford II. In an address before the Advertising Council, at the Waldorf, in New York, on January 17, 1962, Mr. Ford made what I think is, for American business leaders, a historic speech with respect to business in the public interest and what ought to be the attitude of business leaders toward the expansion of the trade of the United States. Mr. Ford's address is replete with statements so significant about the enormously constructive role that the business community can take in the struggle for freedom through its position in the trade debate.

Pointing to what is at stake in this great debate, Mr. Ford said:

> I am profoundly convinced that this is our national destiny: to engage in friendly and mutually beneficial commerce with the outer world; to help other countries toward their economic goals; to share in their progress, not as capitalist or colonial exploiters, but as working partners who respect and understand their needs.

He said further:

> The dream and the reality of America's role in an expanding free world economy is perhaps the brighest dream on our horizon. We must not dim it now by a fearful, careless, or cynical response to our short-range difficulties. We must embrace this great challenge to our strength and our imagination and give it everything we've got.

What do we have to work with? To start, we have the industrialized nations of the Atlantic Community, with an annual product approaching $1 trillion.

> Together, we can, if we will, easily outperform communism on the economic front. To the extent that the United States and the European markets are brought together, and later linked with the coming markets of the emerging nations, the whole free world will benefit—with accelerated economic growth, greater productive efficiency, higher employment and faster-rising living standards.

What are some of the hard realities with which we must deal?

> I, for one, would like to see us get back from Europe some of the one-sided concessions that we made at a time when they were in desperate need. We should realize that liberalizing trade alone will not automatically produce a whopping export surplus and magically solve all our problems. If we are to get the maximum national benefit from expanded trade, we must keep our costs competitive.

Labor and management action and cooperation are vitally needed in this field.

Further, Mr. Ford said:

> On the subject of commercial relations, I want to point out that tariffs are only one of many means of limiting competition. Some people seem to feel that you can be liberal on tariff policy and protectionist on other matters. I mention this because there has been some evidence that a new protectionism is rearing its ugly head along the New Frontier.
>
> This new protectionism would artifically restrict and direct the outflow of dollars by discouraging private investment abroad.

Mr. Ford points out that:

> America's export surpluses have been greatest where our investment is greatest, and that America's annual income from investment has regularly exceeded its outflow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of Mr. Ford's address may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY HENRY FORD II, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, FORD MOTOR CO., AT THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY DINNER OF THE ADVERTISING COUNCIL, WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 17, 1962

I want to thank Mr. McElroy for his much-too-generous comments, and the members of the Advertising Council for the equally undeserved honor they have bestowed upon me this evening.

When Mr. Bristol suggested I might like to discuss our trade relations with the European economic community, I had a sneaking suspicion he was thinking of the administration's new tariff proposals. While I was trying to dream up a graceful way around this one, I recalled a recent event at Ford of Germany—one that reminded me, most emphatically, that there are few things of deeper concern to American business today than this whole European unification movement.

What happened at Cologne was nothing spectacular in itself. Some Italian employees at the plant wanted to get home to Italy for Christmas. A quick count revealed that there were not 100 or 500, but more than 2,700 Italians employed there, and special trains had to be scheduled to handle the load.

It was a small thing, but significant—one of thousands of events occurring daily in Europe that add up to something incredible—the beginning of the fulfillment of the utopian vision of Jean Monnet and others: the unification of Europe.

Who could have believed, 10 or 15 years ago, that Europe would ever move so far toward economic and political unity; that good will and sanity could so triumph over nationalism and ancient rivalries; that economic commonsense could win out over Europe's traditional protectionism?

With England's decision to join the European Common Market, an economically unified Europe becomes a strong probability. Many serious problems remain to be solved. But the unification movement now has a force and logic of its own that is almost unstoppable.

Through much of Western Europe there is already a quickening flow of capital, goods, and labor. Employment shortages and surpluses are easing. Standards of living are rising as productivity increases. Prosperity is on the march. This is the beginning of what, in a decade or two, could be the world's greatest single market, surpassing even the United States.

European integration means a radical alteration in the world economic power balance—and a major gain for our side in the economic cold war. Unified Europe and the United States together account for a major share of the world's production of goods and services. Together, we can, if we will, easily outperform communism on the economic front.

Equally important, Europe's integration promises to boost the flow of trade and commerce throughout the world. To the extent that the U.S. and the European markets are brought together, and later linked with the coming markets of the emerging nations, the whole free world will benefit—with accelerated economic growth, greater productive efficiency, higher employment, and faster rising living standards.

This peaceful European revolution has immediate meaning for all of us. It is not remote. It already affects the lives of all Americans—the kinds of jobs they have and the prices they pay for most things they buy. It will affect them more and more in the future. It presents us with immediate opportunities and with problems demanding action now.

Basically, we must now decide whether we move aggressively to strengthen our commercial relationships with Europe, or sit back on our status quo and watch the rest of the world go by.

We have little real choice.

Europe united is a far more formidable force in every respect than Europe divided. Its power in dealing with other great powers—ourselves included—is growing fast. If the United States is to be influential in the economic, political, and military decisions of Europe, it must become a near partner in European affairs, not a distant cousin. Our relations with Europe are changing from day to day, and this change commands attention.

If we want to assure the best use of American and European resources in the economic development of Asia, Latin America, and Africa; if we want to be in a position to influence the external tariff and other commercial policies of a united Europe, we must be closely engaged with Europe and Europe's affairs. We can't do it at arms length.

Furthermore, if we want to share in this great and fastest growing of all markets, we are going to have to work and fight for our share.

Trade patterns are being set that will affect our mutual commercial and political relationships perhaps for years to come. Our influence in Europe will be directly increased or diminished by the course we now take in our commercial policy.

We will not achieve closer commercial ties with Europe by speeches or pious protests. We can achieve it only by hard, practical day-to-day negotiation of tariffs and of other elements affecting our trade with Europe.

Basically, the administration must have from the Congress a mandate to go all out to minimize Europe's external trade barriers, and it must be empowered to bargain effectively. It must have far greater freedom than the present law provides—freedom to wheel and deal, to offer concessions to get concessions.

Existing authority to trade in this manner was just about exhausted by the tariff negotiations just completed with the six-member European Common Market. These negotiations, as far as they went, appear to offer promise of some gain—and more to come—for U.S. industry. It is in our interest to pursue such negotiations on an even bigger and broader scale.

If our decision is to seek a closer relationship, and I think it must be, then we come to the specific and practical question: What kind of commercial policy is required for the job?

As a matter both of justice and of political realism, I think a liberalized trade program must contain an effective, clean and simple mechanism that will rationally protest American institutions against cruel punishment by imports, but will not be so broad or loose as to undermine the larger purpose of the program or to insulate the American economy from the disciplines of competition.

I, for one, would like to see us get back from Europe some of the one-sided concessions that we made at a time when they were in desperate need.

I have suggested in the past that the U.S. tariff on imported automobiles be eliminated. Today, I would ask for the elimination of the much higher tariffs, quotas, use taxes, license fees, and other devices that virtually exclude U.S. automobiles from many European countries. They are unjustifiable and inconsistent with the whole new direction in European trade.

It is high time, too, that similar barriers to other American consumer and industrial products be lifted. As the world's most efficient producer, by far, of agricultural products, we should strongly encourage our friends in Europe and elsewhere to share in our abundance.

Let's also make sure that our textile and chemical products are not excluded by tariffs from countries whose like products have relatively free access to our own market. And at the same time, let us not, as in the past, burden the competitive position of our textile industry by charging domestic producers 8½ cents more per pound for U.S. cotton than we charge their foreign competitors.

Almost 10 years ago I made a speech beamed to American business in which I said: "The free world can't trade on a one-way street." I say today, this time not alone to businessmen, but to our Government negotiators and to our friends and competitors abroad, "America can't trade on a one-way street. Let's make it really reciprocal."

We should realize, however, that liberalizing trade alone will not automatically produce a whopping export surplus and magically solve all our problems. If we are to get the maximum national benefit from expanded trade, we must keep our costs competitive. An effective commercial program therefore requires action by industry and labor to get costs more in line with those of Europe.

In the present circumstances, we may not be able to do this in all commodities. If we earnestly try, however, I have no doubt that we will do well enough, on balance, at least to hold our own.

On this subject of commercial relations, I want to point out that tariffs are only one of many means of limiting competition. Some people seem to think you can be liberal on tariff policy and protectionist in other matters. I mention this because there has been some evidence that a new protectionism is rearing its urgly head along the New Frontier.

This new protectionism would artificially restrict and direct the outflow of dollars by discouraging private investment abroad.

The new protectionist says that foreign investment, particularly in industrially mature areas, means exporting jobs—a phrase borrowed from protectionist union circles. Such talk gives comfort only to the enemies of liberal trade. It will be hard, I fear, to rally eager support for a program that appears to be half protectionist, half free.

Any effort to liberalize trade presents dilemmas to the Government, as well as to industries facing important competition. We now have, for example, areas of chronic unemployment, some of them in industrial areas affected by imports. We have rising wage costs at home and competition from increasingly efficient producers abroad. Further confusing the issue is the recurrent payment problem that now and then threatens a run on our gold reserve, and a possible monetary crisis.

In such circumstances it is natural to seek a villain, on whom to blame all the country's troubles. A politically tempting target is offered by American investments abroad. They have been rather broadly pictured to the public as tax havens—a term that properly applies only to a small percentage of such private investment. Blocking off capital investment—particularly in Europe—might temporarily ease the payments problem, but in the long run, it would make it worse.

Ford Motor Co. earnings would be affected by some of the measures proposed, and possibly that fact affects my objectivity. But I am certain that restricting the free flow of productive capital investment is bad economic policy, directly opposed to our deepest national interests. This is not the way to solve recurrent balance of payments or chronic unemployment problems.

I particularly question a recent legislative proposal to tax foreign income at the source. Such a move would immediately put many American investments abroad at a serious competitive disadvantage vis-a-vis other foreign investors. It would establish a revolutionary tax principle of unpredictable consequences. It involves a far-ranging change in law to achieve a short-term result. In short, it is a tortuous means of achieving a bad end.

It is bad economics because, among other reasons, it ignores the fact that, historically, America's export surpluses have been greatest where our investment is greatest, and that America's annual income from investment has regularly exceeded its outflow.

To give an example, since the start of 1950 Ford Motor Co.'s transactions alone have brought a net plus contribution to the U.S. balance of payments of about $2 billion.

It is not my purpose to defend Ford Motor Co., but to point out that those who would impede the natural flow of foreign investment seem to miss completely the nature of the opportunity that lies before us. I believe that our foreign investments will add to—not subtract from—the jobs we can offer to American workers.

It is no secret that America is a great consumer of goods, and an even greater producer of goods. Europe is a great producer of goods, but potentially an even greater consumer of goods. Bring these two equations together in an intimate trading relationship, and what do they add up to?

In my book, they add up to a very advantageous situation for the United States, its industry, its agriculture, its employment, as well as for the broader interests of the free world. They do, that is, if we can increase our foreign investment as well as our two-way trade.

Of what does an intimate trading relationship consist? It is not just an exchange of finished goods, but a constant two-way flow of raw or semifinished goods, parts and components. It consists also of the freest exchange possible not merely of goods and agricultures, but also of capital, technology and people.

Those who say that investing capital abroad is the same thing as exporting jobs assume that the capital would otherwise have been invested at home. This is not a tenable assumption. Domestic or foreign investment is limited not only by availability of capital, but also by the attractiveness of incentives to invest. Foreign investment is a necessary and desirable factor in a solid international trading relationship.

The same can be said of international sourcing.

To give just one example, Ford of Germany recently placed a substantial order for shock absorbers made by an American firm—Monroe Auto Equipment Co. If there were no Ford of Germany, it is probable that there would have been no sale of these American-made shock absorbers in Germany.

American industry and European industry must, and I am certain will, increasingly source abroad and shop the world for the most economical values not only in finished products but, just as importantly, in parts, materials and accessories. Today, for almost the first time, U.S. automotive suppliers are intensively studying the export markets to see if they can't sell parts, bits or pieces, subassemblies or components to Japanese or European or Latin American auto manufacturers.

If we keep ourselves competitive in world markets, we have everything to gain from selective international sourcing. The powerful demands of growth markets abroad can and should mean net added sales, added jobs and added profits for American business for many years to come.

By the same token, what U.S. industry buys abroad may also be helpful to the American economy. In many instances, importing a low-cost part or component may make it possible to manufacture in our country a complete product that otherwise would have to be produced abroad, or not at all. In such cases, imports actually create jobs.

I have thus far emphasized the rewards to be achieved from a growing exchange of capital, goods, services, and technology with Europe's fast-growing market. This market is dwarfed, however, by the potentials of Latin America, Asia, and Africa.

America has a tremendous mission to perform in this second half of the 20th century. It is to join with Western Europe in exporting to these areas a new, richer, more productive and more secure way of life. Together we could not begin to produce the goods, the tools, the foodstuffs that would quench the desires of these vast markets, even if they had the means to buy all they needed.

Our role is to help them build as quickly as possible a base from which they can begin to supply their own needs. Our great opportunity is to so assist in this process that we shall benefit both from the political stability that will emerge and from the tremendous capacity to consume that must inevitably be generated. It is another example of that happy process known as "doing well by doing good."

As these nations prosper, if we have earned our welcome there by solid contributions to local progress, America can be kept busy for years to come just meeting their demands for the things they want to buy from us.

I am profoundly convinced that this is our national economic destiny: to engage in friendly and mutually beneficial commerce with the outer world; to help other countries toward their economic goals; to share in their progress, not as capitalist or colonial exploiters, but as working partners who respect and understand their needs.

We will do these things best and quickest if private capital is left free to pursue its natural course in seeking the most advantageous investment opportunities. We will do them best by encouraging the unification rather than compartmentalization of world markets.

The dream and the reality of America's role in an expanding free world economy is perhaps the brightest dream on our horizon. We must not dim it now by a fearful, careless, or cynical response to our short-range difficulties. We must embrace this great challenge to our strength and our imagination and give it everything we've got.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GOLDWATER BEFORE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks an address delivered by me before the Republican National Committee meeting at Oklahoma City, Okla., on January 13, 1962.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address By Senator Goldwater

I didn't ask for a head count when I entered this room—besides most of the statisticians are working for the New Frontier. Their assignment is to make 2 and 2 equal 6—so I don't know precisely how many members of the Republican National Committee are assembled here today.

At most, including State chairmen who are also members of the national committee, I suspect the figure would not exceed 135. To you, who are Republican national committeemen and national committeewomen and Republican State chairmen, I acknowledge my indebtedness.

The future of the Republic hangs in the balance for freedom is in danger. And if freedom is to be preserved and the Republic continued, the Republican Party is, in my opinion, the only political instrument which can accomplish that objective.

You who are assembled here in this opening month of the 1962 election year are challenged by an awesome responsibility. We who are your elected representatives in Congress share that burden, but you are the field commanders on the firing line. Your decisions, your dedication, your efforts, will in this year of decision give this Nation new hope if you succeed—if you fail, men of good conscience across this land will read in your failure a lessening of liberty, a diminution of freedom.

President Kennedy and the spokesmen of the New Frontier have, in recent weeks, suggested that this Nation has lost its purpose, that we are unsure of our national goal, that we are torn with disunity and internal strife, that we are no longer the spiritual descendants and the sons of liberty who brought forth upon this continent a new nation.

Now, to my mind, it is not at all remarkable that the New Frontier chorus should be chanting this dirge of defeat. For I must reluctantly confess that in the past 12 months little has been done to lead this Nation forward, to emphasize the national goal. Confusion and indecision and expediency have, to this date, become the identifying characteristics of the Kennedy administration.

The brave, bold rhetoric of the New Frontier—the magnificent phrases—stand naked and shivering. The young men who promised to lead us forward on a dead run have been running in circles. The transfusion just didn't take. The tired old panaceas of the depression thirties, despite their chrome ornaments, aren't working any better today than when they were first tried.

Deficit spending, governmental aids to this and that, have not cured the patient. The new look in foreign policy, the bold new look, resulted first in the loss of Laos, and this has been followed by the tragic act of indecision which doomed the uprising in Cuba to failure, the President's first attempt at personal diplomacy with Khrushchev, the tragic intervention in Katanga, and the revelation that the United Nations was totally inadequate to halt the takeover of Goa by the armies of that great pacifist neutralist, Mr. Nehru.

The Berlin crisis is over. Khrushchev presented the world with a fait accompli when he was allowed to build the solid wall. And anything which now may be negotiated will be meaningless.

Russia resumed its nuclear testing and revealed what some of us had believed all along—that Russia had never, in fact, stopped nuclear experimentation, and never intended to do so.

These are not pleasant memories I have recalled. Yet I suggest it is necessary to review our failures if we are to adopt a policy which will reverse the flow of world events and lead ultimately to a victory for freedom.

If it is true that our Nation has lost its national purpose—is no longer sure of its national goals—then you and I share a part of the blame for this dismal truth. As architects of the policy of the Republican Party we should face the past without bitterness and without any attempt to point our finger in denunciation at the party which now controls the administration of the United States.

Jack Kennedy was elected President by a popular margin of less than 200,000 votes, and this Nation through its representative form of government still must reflect the thinking and the aspirations of a majority of the American people.

There is little profit to be made from name calling or from attempting to cast the blame for all past mistakes on the present administration or on those presently in control of the Demorcatic Party.

We have not come together as a corps of medical examiners assembled in the morgue to determine why the patient has died.

We are, I suggest, required to offer to the people of this Nation, Republican and Democrat alike, a philosophy and a program which will successfully correct the errors of the past and provide a valid basis for new hope and ultimately satisfy the aspirations of mankind to be free.

Let us then turn to an examination of the Republican Party—of ourselves—of our own failures—and of the opportunities now available to us for redressing the errors of the past.

I, for one, am sick and tired of hearing this party described in hyphenated language. We are the Javits-Republicans, and the Rockefeller-Republicans, and the Midwest-Republicans, and the Modern-Republicans. And when our detractors are in a particularly vengeful mood they describe some of us as Goldwater-Republicans.

My friends, if it is fair to claim that the Democratic Party is schizoid, torn by internal dissension, struggling to find a middle way between the extremes of Hubert H. Humphrey and Harry Flood Byrd, it is also fair to say the Republican Party has failed to present to this Nation a solid political organization unequivocally committed to an easily definable political philosophy.

Small wonder the Nation is confused. Small wonder people ask themselves What should we do? Where should we turn? How do we find the answer?

I am not so naive as to believe that any words of mine will be so compelling as to cause any of you to alter the particular viewpoint you brought to this conference. Yet I am bold enough to suggest that if the Republican Party is to serve the Nation, if constitutional government is to survive, if free enterprise is to continue to provide us with adequate goods and services, it is first required that this political instrument in whose service we have enlisted, accept and then articulate with boldness and vigor a political philosophy so easily understood, so crystal clear in all its manifestations as to permit the American people to recognize us for what we truly are.

You don't like the term "conservative" because, you say, it carries with it the deliberatively fostered connotation of pinch-fist moneybags fighting selfishly to maintain a position of privilege and power?

You don't like the term "liberal" because it suggests reckless experimentation and utter disregard of the lessons of the past?

My friends, it is not necessary for the Republican Party to qualify its basic philosophy with either of these descriptive limiting terms. The Repubican Party always has been and I pray always will be a group of men and women who are determined to preserve all that is good in the past, reject all that has been proven of little value, moving forward with strength and determination to create a better world tomorrow.

Republicans are opposed to socialism and so, indeed, are the majority of the people of the United States.

Republicans have reverence for the Constitution and so, indeed, does the majority of the people of the United States.

Republicans recognize that as governments increase in size and cost the sovereignty of the individual is diminished and there develops a dangerous concentration of power in the hands of government. And so, indeed, does the majority of the people of the United States.

Republicans believe the Federal Government was created to "form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and posterity." And I would suggest the majority of the people of the United States accept this language from the preamble to the Constitution as an adequate description of what they desire in the Federal Government.

If qualifying descriptive terms are required, then I would suggest the Republican Party has been, and will, I hope, continue to be, a conservative political instrument.

Abraham Lincoln chose to be called a conservative.

Reactionary? Clinging to the status quo? Incapable of forward movement? Unresponsive to the needs of the people, you say?

Abraham Lincoln held the Nation together during that period of great agony when we, as a people, moved to redress the moral wrong of human slavery. But more than this, Congress in Lincoln's first term established the Department of Agriculture, adopted the Homestead Act, passed the Morrill Act, donating land for agricultural and mechanical arts colleges, and voted aid for a transcontinental railroad.

Insensitive to civil rights? Unwilling to practice the equality we preach? Is that what they say? Under the administration of Andrew Johnson the Republican Congress submitted to States the 14th amendment for the protection of Negro rights and the 15th.

President Grant resisted the inflationists of his day and reestablished the integrity of the currency. By 1882 Republican administration had paid off the war debt, created in the Treasury a surplus of more than $145 million, and cut the postage rate on letters from 3 to 2 cents.

It was under a Republican President and a Republican administration that the Sherman Antitrust Act became law—interested in only preserving economic privilege, are we?

Under Republican President McKinley we successfully prosecuted the open-door policy for China and added immeasurably to world trade.

Under Theodore Roosevelt there were prosecutions of big-business monopolies under the Sherman Anti-Trust Act. Some of the corporate giants were forced to dissolve. The Department of Commerce and Labor was established. The Food and Drug Administration was created. Meat inspection became a Federal function and the Bureau of Reclamation and the Forest Service were brought into being. Backward are we? Mossbacks? Afraid of change? Unwilling to move forward?

Under Theodore Roosevelt we built the Panama Canal and successfully negotiated a peaceful settlement of the Russo-Japanese War.

Under Republican President Taft the amendment was passed authorizing direct election of Senators and a separate Department of Labor was created. I might remind you that in the area of international affairs it was a Republican, Calvin Coolidge, who, when the negotiations over limitations of naval armaments deadlocked, gave the order for increased naval building, functioning as a President properly should to provide for the common defense.

It was under Coolidge that the Railway Labor Act was passed. Antilabor, are we? Always wanting to go back to the prior century?

Herbert Hoover became the victim of the great depression and the special victim of an opposition party which would not support any of his well-grounded proposals for reform. The Hoover proposals to reform banking, the issue of new securities, the regulation of power companies, and the revision of railway regulations were all blocked by the unreasoning opposition of Democrats in the House of Representatives.

We do not need to be ashamed of the Eisenhower administration. Taxes were cut, business improved, disastrous war in Korea was ended and a sort of fitful uneasy peace was maintained throughout the world.

In the 101 years since Abraham Lincoln was elected, Republican Presidents have occupied the White House 64 years; and Democrat Presidents only a total of 37 years.

And I suggest to you that those 64 years of Republican leadership saw this Nation in every area where men desire progress outstrip all the other peoples of this earth until today we have become the greatest military and industrial power in the world, enjoying a standard of living which exceeds that of the people of any other nation on earth. With the exception of our armed intervention to free the Cuban people, these 64 years of Republican leadership were years of peace.

If we as a people have lost sight of our national goal, if we are confused, if we are floundering and groping, might we not find an explanation for this confusion in the two-faced images both national parties have presented at the polls in recent years?

Is it not possible that we can recognize in the defeat of 1960 that we failed not because we were Republicans, but because we were not Republican enough?

You men and women who live and work with this party in the precincts and polling places where political decisions are made must remember the great glow of confidence shared by almost every one in this land when President Eisenhower was elected in 1952.

And what of 1954? Had the Republican enthusiasm lessened? Is that why we lost in the congressional bielections? And did you hear the voices I heard in 1956 when we again lost seats in the Congress? Voices saying, "You can't tell much difference. We thought there would be some great changes made in 1952."

Did you hear those voices? I heard them and I have felt the frustration over our failure to merit the continued confidence of those voters who rejected the Truman administration because they were tired of experimentation and tinkering and excessive spending and growing bureaucracy

Some 25 years ago in Phoenix, Ariz., an enterprising Dutchman opened a French restaurant at a downtown hotel. The cooking was delightful, the salads were magnificent, and printed across the top of every menu in bold letters were these words:

"There is no such thing as a little garlic."

My friends, in the action of the Federal Government there is no such thing as a little socialization; no such thing as a little subsidy; no such thing as a little control; no such thing as a little direction. For these things feed on themselves and grow without nourishment and produce $90 billion budgets, Federal farm programs that don't work, and all sorts of well-motivated innovations which provide special advantage to selected beneficiaries.

Let's reject the hyphenated definitions and unite as Republicans in the tradition of the party which has brought to this Nation its greatest achievements.

You ask me what is the difference between the Republican Party, as I see it, and the group presently in control of the administration and the Congress? Let me spell it out for you. We divide on our understanding of the nature of man and the possibility of his perfectability.

We Republicans believe that men and women should be given an unlimited opportunity to be responsible for the development and utilization of their own abilities. We believe that as men and women become more responsible and more competent, they must perforce become more sensitive to the needs of their fellows and thus a better society is produced.

It is my opinion those currently in control of the administration and the Congress confidently believe that it is possible to perfect man in the mass by employing statute law, subsidy, controls, and artificial stimulation. Theirs is a from-the-top-down philosophy; ours is from the individual up. For they see man in groups and classes and component parts of a highly organized skillfully directed productive industrial complex; while we see man as a unique, important, significant, individual personality—a child of God who is not to be treated as a member of a class, or described as a group, responsible to his fellow man on a personal, individual basis.

The existing imperfections of man are responsible for all the misery in our world today. And if the purpose of government is to serve man, then it is surely first required that government achieve an adequate understanding of the nature of man.

The Congress can enact a thousand laws, but these laws will not make men just or peaceful or wise or good or kind or productive. The government can confiscate all the treasures of the rich and distribute them equally to the poor, but this will not wipe out poverty or misery.

History is filled with examples of from-the-top-down social experimentation, and I suggest these pages are written in failure. Yet there has been progress and this progress has come as a result of the individual's instinctive outreach for that which is noble and good.

And I say to you it is the responsibility of government to create and maintain a climate where individual responsibility is demanded, where the rights of others are respected, and the needs of others recognized not by exercising the compulsive power of the omnipotent state, but by fulfilling our personal obligations.

Liberty and freedom are indivisible. I have approved on numerous public occasions the President's statement in South America where he insisted that the people enjoy the ownership of private property. Man cannot be free unless their property rights are protected, and the three essentials for freedom are life, liberty and property.

And if by this time some voice is raised in this audience to challenge me and to say—"What you have been expressing here, BARRY, what you've been talking about is nothing more than the basic philosophical premises of the conservative political thinker."

And to that charge I must say yes. Yes, that's what I've been talking about. If a label is necessary, use a label. For all that I've been truly voicing is my understanding of the performance record of the Republican Party.

Are we not ready now to again fly that banner? Should we not in this year once again raise that flag and march proudly forward trusting in the truth of our faith, proud in the achievements it has brought to this society, confident that the people of America in their good judgment will recognize that this is truly freedom's flag? That this is the goal—one nation under God, with liberty and justice for all.

For freedom's sake I urge you to search your conscience, to review the events of the past 50 years, to examine your own concept of the nature of man, to resolve that this Republican Party of yours shall, in the year 1962, become a political instrument clearly recognizable as something apart and different from that collection of promises and panaceas which parades across the scene behind the Democrat donkey.

Preserving and zealously protecting all that is good in the past, rejecting all that which has been proved to be of no lasting value, moving forward with courage and charity to provide for the people of this Nation a government determined to deliver an equality of opportunity at the same time equally determined not to penalize initiative and ability.

A nation whose goal is not security or prosperity or peace at any price, but a nation determined to provide for each citizen a maximum of freedom of choice and to require from each citizen the acceptance of the proud obligations of freedom. A nation not afraid of victory, a nation strong in its moral belief, equal to any sacrifice required for maintenance of freedom.

In those dark days when there was doubt the gentlemen at Philadelphia could ever agree on the form our national government was to take, George Washington spoke these words: "If to please the people we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hands of God."

I thank you.

LACK OF PLANNING AND OVERALL PURPOSE IN GOVERNMENT FISCAL AND MONETARY POLICY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks excerpts from an address delivered by me before the National Retail Merchants Association in New York City on January 11, 1962.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Among the foremost problems faced by American business interests today is the lack of planning and overall purpose in Government fiscal and monetary policy. At a time when our continued world leadership may well be at stake, we are following a makeshift course which seeks to remedy one economic ill without regard to others which it compounds. On the one hand, the Government professes great concern for expansion of the economic system to provide a growth rate which will take up unemployment slack and provide greater tax revenues; on the other hand, it ignores the need for fundamental reforms and indulges in piecemeal monetary expediencies which will result in a contraction of business.

On one hand, it pushes through an increase in the minimum wage structure; on the other, it urges business to hold down prices to prevent further inflationary pressures. On one hand, it proposes balancing the national budget; on the other hand, it proposes a vast schedule of new Government spending projects which would make such a balance impossible to maintain.

Now there is nothing particularly new about the administration attempting to be all things to all economic groups. But there is a new motivation discernible in recent months, and that is the necessity for the Government to assume a certain economic posture for the benefit of foreign nations. This, more than anything else, is responsible for the present lipservice being accorded by the administration to such items of fiscal responsibility as a balanced budget. Certainly, even the mention of a balanced budget signifies some kind of a change in thinking. Let me remind you that during the last session of Congress, Budget Director David Bell told the Joint Economic Committee that a consistent effort to balance the national budget would not only be difficult but positively harmful. He said that budget deficits for 2 years are clearly essential to economic recovery and that it would be a serious error to reject public spending programs simply because we cannot afford them.

But that was before the concern of foreign governments over the continued soundness of the American dollar was adequately felt. Now, interestingly enough, this oversea concern is beginning to have an effect on Government thinking that all the warnings voiced on the domestic front failed to produce. In other words, the administration's casual attitude toward inflation is not shared by other countries whose monetary systems are tied to ours. They are deeply worried and they aren't at all timid about letting us know it. For example, it is now an open secret that Treasury Secretary Dillon had to promise England and France that the administration would submit a balanced budget in 1963 if the United States was to receive help from abroad on its balance-of-payments problem.

Now from present indications it appears likely that the administration will offer a balanced budget of some $93 billion for the fiscal year 1963. But, it is also apparent that this will be a reluctant gesture predicated on continued economic gains and greatly increased Government revenues.

In other words, it will not be the determined, austerity-type budget balancing that is sorely needed to get this country back on a sound fiscal footing and attack the fundamental weaknesses in our economic system. Administration backers already are explaining that the President is not committed to a balanced budget at all costs; that any number of circumstances could arise to warrant further deficit financing, etc. In fact, I have no hesitancy at predicting that the Kennedy administration will wind up with a deficit in 1963 regardless of what kind of a tally sheet it presents in budgetary form to the Congress. To balance the national budget at approximately $93 billion would require undiminished economic expansion and increased tax revenues of some $10 billion. Any kind of an interruption in the present pace of our economic system—such as, say, a prolonged steel strike next summer—would throw all administration estimates into a cocked hat. Even without such an interruption, it is safe to assume that the New Frontier's penchant for reckless spending will present the Nation with another Federal deficit for fiscal 1963.

Now, as I have pointed out, the international concern over the stability of the dollar is forcing the administration into some uncharacteristic fiscal and monetary moves. One of these was the recent Government order permitting 13,100 commercial banks to boost interest payments to 3½ percent on all savings and time deposits of 6 months or more and to 4 percent on all such deposits left in the banks for a year or more. This was required to help our big city commercial banks hold some $17 billion in short-term foreign deposits and, consequently, buy some time on the gold outflow problem. And the administration had to do it, even though the action runs counter to the inflationary, easy money policies with which it has been attempting to promote economic growth.

I'm sure I don't have to tell this audience what this disciplinary action dictated by the international monetary situation will mean to commercial banks which do not specialize in foreign deposits and to businessmen who depend upon such institutions for loans. The action will benefit the thrifty, but will also increase bank operating costs and boost the interest rates on business loans and home mortgages. It will also put a damper on retail sales and slow down economic activity generally throughout the United States. This is part of the price we are now beginning to pay for the fiscal irresponsibility and extravagance of the past three decades.

The plain fact of the matter is this: We are now the world's foremost banker and the dollar is the world's principal reserve currency. And because of this, we cannot afford even a little additional inflation without further loss of gold and without further weakening of our international position. This is the stark fact of economic life which the administration is just beginning to grasp. The situation throughout the world, where competitive conditions have changed radically in the past 10 years, is now such that we can no longer fool ourselves into thinking that the only money we owe, we owe to ourselves and, consequently, we can go on piling up one national deficit on another.

Inflation is now a worldwide threat. And it is fully evident in our international balance of payments, in the increased competition from foreign goods, in the fear of other nations over the continued soundness of our currency.

But even so, we perhaps have never been so little disposed to do something fundamental and lasting about the condition. Here is a threat which, if allowed to go untended, could hand international communism a final victory over the Western Powers without a single shot being fired. Here is a threat which goes to the very roots of our strength, to the economic foundations of our social, political and military systems. But here also is a threat about which our Government temporizes in deference to economic political promises.

If we are to meet the threat of inflation adequately, the administration must adopt a well-rounded program of fiscal and monetary reform which takes into consideration not only the problem of our international position but also the problem of sustained domestic growth. In this, fiscal and monetary policies must be coordinated and not allowed to work at cross-purposes as they are right now. It stands to reason that a tight-money policy can be nullified by budget deficits. And, by the same token, it is clear that a firm fiscal policy looking to balanced budgets and surpluses can do no good if steps are accompanied by irresponsible money measures.

Now there is no question that proper monetary and fiscal policies are essential to the maintenance of price stability. But these, by themselves, will not be enough to meet the situation unless the Government does something about the continuing demands for higher and higher wages. This wage drive is a prime factor in the inflationary problem, just as it is in the problem of competition from foreign producers. It stands to reason that if the labor unions continue their reckless pressure, this Nation is in for another wage-price spiral and the trouble we encounter in competing with foreign countries will deepen. We hear a great deal these days from administration forces about the challenge presented by the rise of the Common Market in Western Europe. Well, I suggest that a huge part of that challenge stems from the fact that the countries of the Common Market, as well as all other countries with whom we do business, have wage scales far below those which American producers must meet. This is a problem which must be faced realistically or it will do absolutely no good to talk of bargaining with the Common Market on a traffic-reducing basis.

Ironically enough, the latest warning against the inflationary threat comes from Harvard, an institution which we usually associate with such inflationary policies as continuous credit expansion, increased Government spending, unbalanced budgets and cheap money. This warning was voiced by Gottfried Haberler, a Harvard professor, past president of the International Economic Association and incoming president of the American Economic Association. In a booklet entitled "Inflation: Its Causes and

Cures," Professor Haberler warns of the consequences of continued wage-push inflation. Here is what he has to say:

"Unions have acquired over the year numerous immunities and exceptions which go far beyond anything accorded to business and other private associations. It is difficult to believe that legal reforms restoring a more balanced power equilibrium between the parties in wage bargains, and eliminating violence and other abuses, would not have some effect in relieving inflationary wage pressure.

"Secondly, and probably more basic and important than legal reform, is a change in the attitude of public opinion and of all branches of the Government. It should be possible to arouse public opinion to the dangers of wage inflation and to bring its weight to bear on unions which by force of crippling strike and intimidation impose inflationary wage increases on the economy. Then the aroused public opinion could force the Government, in its executive branch, to pick up some courage."

But despite this warning from Harvard, we see little indication today that official Washington is picking up the kind of courage which will have a bearing on the problem. President Kennedy has gently suggested that it might be a good thing for unions to exercise some restraint in their future wage demands, but this has been forgotten already and we find unions striking to obtain a 20-hour workweek.

I suggest that a great many things need to be done if we are to hold our own and prosper under the present economic conditions. These are not easy things that can be done through a quick overnight order from one government department. They require planning and coordination and a rigid adherence to sound economic and fiscal tenets.

And the big question is: Will the administration face up to the problem and follow the course of responsibility demanded by the economic requirements at home as well as conditions throughout the free world? Or will it attempt something else by which it hopes to continue its policy of heavy Government spending and stave off the threat of a depleted gold supply at the same time?

As I have already shown, a collision is now taking place between internal policies of inflation and external requirements for stability. It is fair to say that the administration is faced with the rapidly growing dilemma which will test its best efforts and set the future economic course both of the United States and the entire free world.

I can't emphasize too strongly the gravity of this situation. For, if the administration takes the easy way out and continues its national policy of inflation, it will be forced to go in for a massive program of controls. It will be required to push for wage and price controls at home and exchange controls abroad. It will have to go in for economic regimentation on a scale never before attempted in the United States.

DANGER ON THE LEFT

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Danger on the Left," written by myself and published in the current edition of the Saturday Evening Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Danger on the Left

(By Senator Barry Goldwater)

The real danger to our country in these days of crisis does not come from the right side of the political spectrum, but from a direction more closely alined with Communist objectives. It does not come from military commanders, like Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker, who want to make sure their troops and the American people are informed of the true nature of our enemy, but from forces which would deny such instruction. It does not come from patriotic Americans who wish to remain vigilant to the threat of internal communism and to Socialist trends, but from people who would blunt that vigilance.

Today a great many military officers, organizations and individuals have been alerted by events. They have been taught by shocking experience. They have been goaded by official indifference to the true dangers which face us in a particularly perilous time.

To argue that our troops do not need ideological information is a waste of time when such an argument is presented to military commanders who remember the disgraceful spectacle of American soldiers embracing communism in Korea. It is pointless to insist that there is no threat from domestic Communists when the audience is made up of people who remember the damage done by the atomic spy rings—the Alger Hisses, the Harry Dexter Whites, the Rosenbergs, the Fuchs, the Sobels, and the Greenglasses. It goes against the American grain to be told that there is no internal threat from communism while FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover and others in positions to know tell us otherwise.

No; I believe the great threat, the real danger to our Nation, to our way of life and to the cause of freedom throughout the world comes from the leftists in our midst who even today counsel a soft attitude toward communism, both at home and abroad.

I believe it comes from the muddleheaded do-gooders, from the intellectual theorists, from the appeasers and the accommodators, from the professional collaborationists and pacifists. It comes from organizations like the Americans for Democratic Action, whose 1961 policy statement reads like a brief for Red China and Castro's Cuba, and the American Civil Liberties Union, which would like Americans to think that the Senate Internal Security Committee and the House Un-American Activities Committee are more dangerous than Soviet espionage agents.

I feel we have here both a right and a duty to question the influence wielded by the radical leftists ADA in the councils of the U.S. Government. According to newspaper accounts, this strange organization has no less than 37 members in key policymaking positions of the New Frontier—despite the fact that its nationwide membership is less than 50,000. As Robert T. Hartmann, writing in the Los Angeles Times, puts it:

"When any 14-year-old organization numbering no more than 50,000 citizens, with a budget of less than $200,000 a year, regarded as an albatross by many Democrats and as anathema by most Republicans, holding no I O U from the presidential winner for his nomination—when such an organization can staff a new administration with 3 White House aids, 3 Cabinet officers, and 31 key administrators in vital areas of finance, labor, civil rights, public works, power, housing, and foreign policy, it is worth looking into."

And looking into this organization, we find that in 1961 it called for total disarmament under United Nations controls, the inclusion of Red China in nuclear talks, an immediate start on negotiations for U.S. recognition of Red China and the latter country's admission to the United Nations as China with a Security Council veto, and a plebiscite on Formosan independence or reunion with Red China. We also find that ADA advocates removal of all U.S. trade and passport barriers with Red China, wants less stress on military aid for free Asia, urges a neutral Laos as part of a buffer zone.

People who suggest such actions would let us lose the global struggle by default. It is the leftists in our midst who rigorously oppose any use of force, or any show of strength in a conflict where our antagonist understands only the element of power. These leftists support an intense internationalist propaganda line which downgrades American patriotism as something smacking of isolationism and foreign-policy adolescence. We are told by none other than Senator J. William Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that the victories of our early history—the victories won by determined, hardbitten men against stupendous odds, were products of our reckless youth when we were favored by an improbable run of luck. We also are told by Senator Fulbright that we must come of age in the world and devote our time to civilizing international relations rather than striving for victory over an enemy bent on the destruction of the United States and the enslavement of the entire world.

On the left also are the forces which, in the interest of accommodation, suggest that we junk our opposition to the admission of Red China to the United Nations, that we forswear our policy of massive retaliation—the only shield we have in practical terms against annihilation by the forces of international communism.

It is the leftists who argue against the development of a national purpose of victory over the forces of international communism. It is the leftists who have saddled us with an outmoded, weak-kneed foreign policy which has proved to the tune of almost $100 billion that the promotion of social and economic reform on a worldwide basis is not a realistic means of stemming the Communist tide.

This indictment is not mine alone. To reinforce it I quote an enlightened liberal, writing in a liberal magazine. His name is Eric Sevareid, and this is what he had to say in an article titled "The Facts of Life" which appeared recently in Reporter magazine:

"They (the Communists) must love the large school of American liberals who assume that any given country, however barren and illiterate, however profound its background of violence and chieftainship, is capable not only of economic modernization but of parliamentary democracy.

"They must love the liberals with social-worker mentalities who do not grasp that illiteracy, low wages, concentrated landownership, and so on are not social problems but integral parts of a system of life and therefore enormously resistant to quick change by anything less than the totalitarian disciplines the same liberals abhor."

Mr. Sevareid warns his liberal-leftist friends that frightened people in desperate countries want to be on the winning side in the current East-West struggle, not necessarily on the moral side. And he tells them that the United States must start fighting and winning, regardless of reproving editorials in the Manchester Guardian and no matter what the temporary backlash of world opinion may be.

There can be no denying that all the winds of appeasement blow from the left. On that side of the political spectrum reside the voices which interminably counsel negotiation in nonnegotiable situations where discussion would only lead to the sacrifice of our own or our allies' strategic interests.

It was the spokesmen on the left who hailed the rise of Castro in Cuba and obscured his early Communist dedication. They have also been in the forefront of those who today claim that any direct action in Cuba would offend opinion in other Latin-American countries. Never mind a Communist bastion only 90 miles off our southern coast, they contend, because this is preferable to hurting somebody's feelings. And, of course, the leftwing in American politics certainly sparked the rediculous and ill-fated effort to submit to Castro's prisoner-tractor deal.

One of the traps the leftist-minded have led us into in foreign relations is the development of an official preoccupation with so-called neutral nations. Only in the light of the Soviet Union's resumption of nuclear testing and the failure of the neutral nations, while meeting in Belgrade, to do anything but bring pressure on the West are we beginning to wake up. The Soviets have long understood that the first step in turning a country toward communism is to turn it against the West. Thus, typically the first stage of a Communist takeover is to neutralize, while in fact turning the country into an active advocate and adherent of Soviet policy.

The Kremlin's goal is the isolation and capture not of Ghana but of the United States—and this purpose may be served very well indeed by countries that masquerade under a neutralist mask, yet actually are dependable auxiliaries of the Soviet Foreign Office. What difference does it make if a neutralist chieftain is not a disciplined Communist so long as his public policies and intrigues help to accelerate Soviet ascendancy?

Another favorite misconception of the American leftists is an exaggerated belief in the existence and power of world opinion—which never seems to call Russia to any stern account for her transgressions, but which constantly puts pressure on us to ease international tension. Leftists apply this world-opinion concept to everything the United States does or proposes, despite the fact that the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) reports that 70 percent of the world's population lives without knowing what is going on either at home or abroad. In their preoccupation the leftists fail to recognize the fact that the Communists themselves—our devoted enemies—formulate a large part of what passes as world opinion.

There are many reasons why this deference to world opinion is harmful to American interests. First, it is self-defeating, because the very respect we covet is denied to us the moment we ask for it. The would-be beneficiaries of our concessions construe them as weaknesses and want more. Second, a long history of trying to prove good faith when it had never really been open to question has the paradoxical effect of raising doubts about our good faith. When we with our record enter into a propaganda contest with the Kremlin and its record, when we try to match Soviet professions of love of freedom and peace, and hatred for armaments and colonialism, we invite the world to look upon us—as it looks upon the Soviets—as propagandists with something to hide. Thus we find ourselves forced to make a new plea before the bar of world opinion every time Pravda opens its mouth.

In another area it was the leftists who argued hardest for the United States to continue the nuclear test ban long after there was more than a reasonable doubt that the Soviets had ever honored it and long after it was evident that the Soviets would end the ban the minute it became advantageous for them to do so. How much damage this did to our security and the cause of freedom throughout the world we can only guess.

On the domestic front the leftists have moved us so far along the road to economic socialism that high taxes and inflation are threatening our ability to resist the accelerated advances of Communists. The drive for more and more central Government control over the lives, affairs, and liberty of the American people is eating away at the individuality, the determination, industry, and incentive upon which our greatness as a nation was built.

This process of erosion is a tremendous threat to the cause of freedom because a sound economy is fundamental to our strength in all other spheres—especially the military. Government control and paternalism such as we have seen in agriculture go to the taproots of our national character. Our strength becomes so sapped that we lose sight of our national heritage and go groping around for new national goals. I suggest that we don't need new national goals. We have one which was written for us by Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence: "Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." This is the supreme goal of all Americans. And it endures as a goal because its achievement takes constant effort.

There can be no doubt that American leftists are out to replace the judgment of the individual with the judgment of the state. Almost every bit of legislation they espouse in the domestic field contains dangers of more power for the bureaucrats. It has become clear that, whether we like it or not, central control—which I think of as socialism—will be the result of these efforts. American leftists are squeamish about being called socialists, but that is the term we come to as we recognize what the results of their efforts will be. As collectivists, they have changed their strategy but not their objective—the subordination of the individual to the state. They have found that socialism can be achieved through welfarism as well as through nationalization.

Government interference—a principal tool of leftists—has reduced our States to mere vassals of Washington and has eaten into our free-enterprise economy. We have reached the point where our economic supremacy is threatened and our ability to keep abreast of world developments is challenged.

The leftists, with their dedication to irresponsible fiscal policies and deficit spending, stand in the way of a balanced budget, always holding forth new and bigger programs for increased spending of taxpayers' dollars. It makes no difference that these programs are invariably sought in the name of welfare and humanitarianism and always propelled by shouts of crisis and emergency. They all entail spending far beyond our capacity to pay and they all will become part of the final economic reckoning.

These leftist spending programs are playing right into the hands of the Kremlin leaders who long have argued that they could bleed America white. Higher taxes and more inflation are precisely what Khrushchev and his advisers want for the United States—and the leftwing forces in this country are rushing to provide them. The leftists clamor for the expenditure of additional billions for Federal aid to education, Federal aid to the aged, Federal aid to depressed areas, Federal aid to anything and everything. But there is no mention of what these vast new programs will cost in terms of our ability to resist aggression or mount even a limited war if we should be forced to do so. I suggest that it will make no difference if we are the best-educated, the best-housed, best-clothed and best-fed people in the world, if our economic underpinnings are compromised. The military realities of today are such that our capacity to fight is directly related to our ability to produce, and our ability to produce rests on the performance of a sound economy.

Thus, through advocating a soft policy on the international front, American leftists comprise the genuine danger to our country at this critical period in history. They have sown the seeds of appeasement abroad and fundamental weakness at home. They have shown themselves to be incapable, philosophically and practically, of coming to grips with militant, ruthlessly aggressive communism. They prefer to bury their heads in the sand or, like Don Quixote, spend their time jousting with windmills they call the radical right rather than come face to face with the issues which will determine the destiny of America and the future of the world.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF MANAGEMENT, LABOR, AND GOVERNMENT TO THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an address entitled "The Relationship of Management, Labor, and Government to the Free Enterprise System" delivered by myself before the National War College, in Washington, D.C., on December 14, 1961.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My subject today, "The Relationship of Management, Labor, and Government to the Free Enterprise System," is, I realize, nearly all-inclusive. It certainly encompasses most of the facets of our modern-day life—whether they be social, economic or political. And it has a very direct and important bearing on this Nation's military capability and defense posture. And because it is such a broad subject, I won't attempt to present a detailed analysis of this highly complicated relationship. Rather I shall sketch the broad outline of its interplaying forces and discuss some of the problems which I believe are holding back our economic development at a very crucial period in the history of America and of the entire free world.

I'm sure it is not necessary for me to explain to you military men the vast stakes in terms of our national security that we have in the proper functioning of the American free enterprise system. This system is our root strength. It is the economic expression of the individuality, the enterprise, the industry and the initiative which have enabled us, as a people, to overcome all military obstacles in the past. This system is what has given us the strength to outproduce the entire world in war materiel and armaments in times of military crisis. It has provided the guns, the ammunition, the supplies in unending streams when the occasion demanded such outpourings. This system also has provided us with the inventions, the technology and know-how to keep ahead of the world in the development of new weapons systems. It has done all of this in the past and our big concern today is to make sure this great system of ours retains its irrepressibility and its vitality for whatever emergencies the future may hold for the United States and the free world.

Now management, labor, and Government all play integral parts in the functioning of our free enterprise system. It is for us to determine whether they are playing their parts well, whether they are doing all that they should—or being allowed to do all that they should—to make for a robust and prosperous American economy.

We must begin, I believe, with the assumption that there has to be a reasonable balance of power and responsibility on the part of all three if we are to have a healthy, smooth-functioning system of enterprise. And this assumption should lead to a careful examination of management, labor, and Government in relationship to the overall performance of our business system. We must consider such questions as: Are our corporate entities growing too big? Are business profits unreasonably high? Is business functioning at its efficient best? We must ask ourselves if organized labor, as represented by unions, is becoming monopolistic? Are unions becoming unreasonable in their wage, hour, and fringe benefit demands? And where Government is concerned, we must discover whether our public policies and officials are helping economic growth or retarding it; whether Government is interfering with management and labor; whether it is following sound tax and fiscal policies.

These, of course, are only a few of the questions to which such an appraisal should be addressed. But I believe they are sufficient to give us a working basis for consideration of a problem that is beginning to take on grave implications for America's ability to resist aggression.

In considering the management role, we must remember that business has in the past 28 years been subjected to more than its fair share of abuse, harassment, and interference. Justly or unjustly the management segment of our economic system bore the brunt of the blame for the depression of the 1930's. For a considerable period of years it became politically popular to berate free enterprise while extolling the virtues of unionized labor. Government was encouraged to tamper with the natural laws of supply and demand and to embrace the aims of labor union bosses without question. Now there may have been some reason, in those days, for correcting an imbalance of influence and economics, between management and labor. In fact, I believe there was reason for curbing corporate power and practices in the 1930's, just as I believe there is now reason for curbing the power of labor unions. The proper balance of powerful forces in our economic system is vital to the Nation's health. And just because one segment once wielded too much power doesn't mean that the situation couldn't reverse itself. I believe it has. I believe that labor unions today are enjoying far too much power for their own good or for the good of the Nation. I believe developments in foreign trade and in the domestic economy are rapidly bringing us face to face with the need for correcting this imbalance or of losing more and more of our world markets.

Now one of the arguments we hear quite often with regard to American business today is that it is too big. And while I am a great proponent of small business as an institution and as the backbone of the American enterprise system, I do not believe corporate largeness is a crime, per se, as some people would like us to believe. In fact, I believe that we need large, integrated corporate structures to handle the needs of a growing population and our increased responsibilities throughout the world. One of the greatest reasons why we need big business today is because of the demands placed on our economic system by military and defense requirements. And while I'm at it, let me say that I believe we need big unions too. But size in corporate and union affairs carries with it a requirement for a degree of responsibility which is not always met. This responsibility extends not only to stockholders and union members, but to the general public as well. All too often in contract contests between the giants of management and labor the rights and prerogatives of the consumer are overlooked. And very often they are overlooked because Government has taken sides in the dispute for partisan political reasons.

This political partisanship in the last several decades has been heavily weighted on the side of the unions. Through preferential treatment and immunities granted by Government, union power has grown out of proportion with that of management. The results are fully apparent in the economic climate which exists today. By the same token, Government's role in economic affairs has increased thereby placing unnatural restraints on the performance of the business system.

And the so-called profit problem of today is not one of surplus as many union partisans contend in their continuing drive for higher wages. It is a question of American business not having enough profits to expand properly.

Proportionately, profits have not increased to the same degree as wages and other business operating costs. There is not as much left after taxes as there should be to spark adequate economic growth and provide for an ever-expanding job market in the United States. And, a great deal of this is attributable to a calculated Government policy of coddling the union segment of our national economy. We have the picture, for example, of Government officials pressuring industry and labor to reach wage settlements on one hand, and of these same officials exhorting business not to increase prices on the other hand.

It is a basic fact that no effective battle can be waged against inflation and unemployment and foreign competition unless we hold the line against unearned wage increases for large segments of the working force. The key to this, of course, is productivity and there is nothing new about the axiom that a worker is either worthy of his hire or he isn't; that he is either worthy of a wage increase on the basis of what he produces, or he is not. This has been the formula for employment and advancement in every workable economic system the world has ever devised. Yet the great power which industrywide labor unions are permitted to exercise today enables them to virtually dictate wage rates and fringe benefits without regard to gains in productivity or economic conditions. And any resistance to the exercise of union power is answered by long, costly and exhausting strikes.

Now the upshot of this situation is that more and more employers are being caught in a tight squeeze between unearned wage increases on one hand, and market resistance to higher prices on the other. And this union wage structure is a rigid cost factor in the economy, moving always in just one direction—up. When market conditions won't permit prices to climb in relation to these wage costs, profits dwindle, risk capital disappears and job-creating business expansion grinds to a halt. I suggest that this is the biggest single reason for unemployment today.

These economic facts of life seem to be lost on the leaders of organized labor in this country. In a time of great stress and greater danger, they go right on pressuring for more and more wage increases, a shorter workweek, and restrictive measures aimed at business. They show no tendency to recognize that the weight of economic events and changed world conditions places a responsibility on their shoulders as well as on the shoulders of the public, Government, and management. And this is a situation which we will ultimately have to face, and face squarely, if this Nation is to maintain an economic progress that will keep pace with demands at home and abroad. I believe it is a situation which cries out for legislation to equalize the power now held by labor with that of the public, the Government, and management.

Now, let us not forget that when there is a profit squeeze in the economy, everybody suffers—and the worker most of all. For there is no way to increase job opportunities without capital, and capital is derived from corporate profits. This problem strikes deep at the core of our economic growth problem. Increased production facilities are financed in large part from business profits. And if the profits aren't available to finance these additions, the capacity needed to provide a growth rate equal to present-day challenges will not be built. Lower profits, such as the business world is now experiencing because of wage costs, tougher competition, and other factors, have many pyramiding effects. For example, lower profits mean lower tax collections for the Federal Government and presents the problem of either cutting back Government services or indulging in deficit spending. Lower profits also make for investor timidity and this dries up the risk capital needed to keep the wheels of business spinning at an accelerated rate. And when investors, as a group, shy away from risking their money, the result is to force many marginal producers out of business. This, of course, aggravates the unemployment problem and has an adverse effect on the entire economy.

Now, how bad is the profit squeeze? An indication can be seen in a recent study by the Research Institute of America. It reports that American business as a whole since 1956 has experienced a sales increase of 12.5 percent. But during the same period, dollar earnings before taxes dropped 7.6 percent and profit margins on sales dropped 17.5 percent. Thus, we have a situation where sales increase and profits on those sales fall off. The effect can only have a dangerous, perhaps even disastrous, effect on incentive to increase sales and provide for a constantly growing economy.

At the present, this situation is aggravated by the very real possibility that we are about to witness a new wage-price spiral in the coming year. The forthcoming contract talks between management and labor in the basic steel industry will tell the story. Although the contract between the United Steelworkers of America and the industry does not expire until June 30, the Government already has intervened in these all-important negotiations. President Kennedy, for example, has written to the heads of all the major steel companies in the country appealing to them to hold the line on any price increases.

In this, the President's concern is inflation, and it seems to me a curious concern when we explore the disastrous effect of Government fiscal policies on the problem of inflation. I suggest that in the past year the Federal administration's overall domestic program has contained more built-in inflation than any we have ever before witnessed. But I shall return to this very fundamental economic problem later in my remarks.

The economic fear of another wage-price spiral is very real. And it should be in the light of the wage contracts written for the automotive industry during 1961. In these, the workers obtained more monetary concessions than they did in both 1955 and 1958. And why? Well, the generally accepted reason is that the automotive companies felt the Government was more interested in labor peace than in the cost of purchasing it. Throughout the negotiations both sides received repeated demands from the President and Labor Secretary Goldberg to settle their differences.

And, of course, this raises the question of Secretary Goldberg's possible role in the steel talks. I doubt if it will be forgotten that the Secretary of Labor formerly served as chief strategist for the Steelworkers Union and, of course, possesses a special knowledge in this area of industry.

As I indicated earlier, the Government would be well advised to look to its own policies, rather than to the performance of management and labor where the whole problem of inflationary pressures is concerned. For the Government, through its endless preoccupation with deficit spending, is the primary source of inflation.

And there is nothing that drains away our economic strength like the constantly shrinking worth of the American dollar. This is a grave concern right now because it is beginning to affect our fiscal integrity throughout the world. And, I suggest, that when foreign governments begin to question the soundness of the dollar and to wonder at America's continued monetary capacity then we are in serious trouble. It is the kind of trouble that should bring about a complete reappraisal of Government spending and tax policies. Now, in this connection, I am not suggesting—as some of my critics like to contend—a cutback in military or defense expenditures. I firmly believe that we can meet fully our present and future needs in this sphere without indulging in ruinous deficit spending provided we cut back the waste and some of the nonessential spending in other areas. But we certainly cannot go in for all of the old type of Government expenditures and a multitude of new ones while trying to meet our military obligations. That is, we can't do all this and still protect the integrity of our financial system.

And this makes the persistent and growing adverse balance of our international payments the most pressing and serious economic problem we have ever faced. These deficits have resulted in heavy gold losses and large increases in short-term debts to foreigners since 1958. They have caused President Kennedy to declare: "If we are not able to export substantially more than we import, we are going to either have to cut off all assistance to countries abroad or begin to withdraw our troops home."

It is important to understand that this is not a new or a sudden development. We have shown an unfavorable balance of payments every year since 1950 with the exception of 1957 when the Suez Canal episode created unusual conditions. During the first 7 months of this year short-term liabilities to foreigners increased by over $400 million. And in recent weeks our gold supply has declined by $146 million. The drop since December 31, 1960, has amounted to $491 million.

Now while I share the President's concern, I cannot agree that the situation can be corrected by simply expanding our export surplus by several billions of dollars a year. The problem is more fundamental than that. We have to face the reality of a truly competitive industrial world—a world in which wage differentials play an ever-increasing part to our disadvantage. We must begin to realize that we are no longer the only Nation that can supply other countries with a long list of their needs. In fact, we must face the reality that there is a long list of our own needs that can be supplied by other industrial countries at lower prices. And we must understand that the advantage of superior quality of American-made goods is rapidly disappearing.

No, the cure for our dangerous balance of payments problem and the threat to our currency does not lie in temporary measures. Nor does it lie in a tariff-cutting spree accompanied by massive Government assistance for injured domestic industries. Permitting unfair competition for American products in the name of free trade is a mistake our Government shows every indication of embracing right now in connection with its drive to replace the Trade Agreements Act. This will only aggravate and deepen an already dangerous trade balance situation.

At a glance, the situation is somewhat like this:

The Government is urging businessmen to sell more abroad so that American exports can be boosted in line with the President's wishes. But they are not told how this can be accomplished. They are not told how to overcome the fact that wage rates in Europe are about one-third what they are in this country. They are not told how to overcome tax costs which are much higher in this country. They are not told how they can equalize much higher depreciation allowances in foreign countries. They are not told how their products are expected to overcome higher trade walls being erected by the European Common Market.

Faced with such problems, it is scarcely encouraging to American business to hear the administration threatening a determined effort to reduce U.S. tariffs in the next session of Congress. Is it any wonder that American businessmen begin to wonder just where this foreign giveaway program is going to end? At the present time, we are sending aid to some 97 countries in the world at a prohibitive cost in American dollars. And now the Government proposes to give away more of the protection which remains to American producers against grossly unfair advantages held by their foreign competitors.

I know that the administration's theory is that if the Congress gives the President much broader powers to reduce tariffs he will be in a position to bargain with the countries of the European Common Market to lower the barriers they have erected against American goods. This places great faith in the process of reciprocity and I would remind you that reciprocity is the alleged basis of our trade agreements program and has been from the very beginning.

But our experience has shown that, in large measure, our tariff-reducing efforts have not produced the desired reciprocity from other nations. In this, I am inclined to agree with Senator PRESCOTT BUSH, of Connecticut. He has recommended that before we engage in a new program of tariff reduction, the administration should suggest to European nations that we helped rebuild that they lower their tariffs to the level of ours. What could be more reasonable, both in the light of our own hard-pressed industries and in the light of true reciprocity from nations which we have helped over a long period of years at a prodigious cost to our own economy?

Under the tariff authority the President has now—and which he says isn't enough—the United States has made continuous cuts in our import duties over wide areas of world trade. Figures obtained by the staff of the Joint Congressional Economic Committee for example, show that the average American tariff on industrial goods has been lowered over the years until it is now 11 percent. This compares with 19 percent in Japan and Austria; 17 percent in the United Kingdom and New Zealand; 16 percent in Italy and Canada; 15 percent in France, and 14 percent in the Common Market.

The tariff concessions we have already made are having a disastrous effect on many American industries. They are contributing to a slowdown in economic growth and an aggravated unemployment situation. They are beginning to worry labor unions as much as they do management groups.

But the New Frontier tells us that we must take a bold approach to the entire problem. This means we are supposed to accept the unfairness of our present 11 percent position and make even further concessions—presumably in the hope that foreign countries will suddenly lose their historic affinity for barriers against American goods. What's more, the administration proposes to place this bargaining effort on the basis of entire categories of American goods rather than on specific items. It also would jettison the peril point and escape clause authority now wielded by the Tariff Commission as safeguards against unfair competition with American producers. As President Kennedy has stated, he doesn't want an extension of our present Trade Agreement Act—he wants it replaced.

Now I suggest there are other more direct ways to attack the balance of payments problem with governmental action but so far we have seen little indication of serious intent on the part of our policymakers. For example, one important area where this problem could be eased is in the area of foreign economic aid. We do well here to scale down the export of American dollars for hazy purposes such as the social and economic reform of foreign governments. The benefit we have derived from such efforts has been largely imaginary, but there is nothing imaginary about the continual draining off of American dollars and the rising demands on our gold supply. This is a very real problem and it is reaching the danger point.

The Government could also do something about the depreciation allowance disparity. The need here is for a liberalization which will enable American industry to begin replacing approximately $90 billion in aging and obsolete equipment. If the President were to propose to Congress that the tax laws be liberalized to permit individuals and corporations to fix their own schedules of depreciation and allow them to arrange their own writeoffs over a period of time, it would be a tremendous boon to the economy. In effect, it would amount to a program for regearing the entire economy and streamlining our industrial plant at a time when such a program is not only necessary but essential. It would give us modernized equipment and enable us to compete more realistically and efficiently with foreign producers.

The importance of this type of incentive to our industrial expansion, as well as the threat we face from foreign competition, can readily been seen by comparing the rates of economic growth and depreciation allowances of the United States with those of other countries. We find the United States is lagging behind seven other countries in terms of economic growth since 1953. Industrial production levels, for example, have risen 25 percent in Japan, 181 percent in Italy, 180 percent in West Germany, 172 percent in France, 134 percent in Sweden, 128 percent in England and 127 percent in Canada.

And against this, our own industrial production went up only 119 percent despite our head start and our highly vaunted technical and industrial know-how.

The comparison shows that only one of the seven countries that out-stripped us in economic growth has depreciation write-off rates as low as those permitted in the United States. And that country was West Germany, which deliberately reduced her depreciation rates in 1960 to head off an investment boom which threatened to become excessive. Consequently, we find the rates in the United States—the world's leading exponent of free enterprise—are the same as those adopted by another country to discourage too much enterprise.

Now an interesting corollary to this situation is the effect it is having on the quality of goods with which American products are competing. You know, there was a time when the only danger we faced from foreign competition was in the price area and this stemmed from the fact that labor costs in other countries are so much lower than ours. But more and more today we find that improved quality in foreign-made goods is becoming a factor. This is because manufacturers in other countries are equipping themselves with new and modern machinery while our depreciation policy is forcing American producers to limp along with outmoded equipment. The result is that in many areas, foreign countries are not only producing cheaper goods but also higher quality goods than American firms can offer. In fact, I might say, that I find the quality factor in this troublesome economic equation more frightening from a business standpoint than lower prices.

Let me emphasize that reduction of foreign aid expenditures and liberalization of depreciation allowances come under the heading of immediate requirements to meet a serious situation. But they won't, of themselves, correct the basic faults we find in our economic system. To do this, we must put our fiscal house in order and inject sound business and economic practices into our governmental operations.

The place to begin, of course, is with a balanced budget. This is just plain economic sense, perfectly understandable to any businessman who must meet his obligations and any American family which must live within its income. It stands to reason that if you and I and our neighbors can't spend money we don't have without inviting dire consequences, neither can the Federal Government. And the dire consequences invited by irresponsible Government fiscal policies are upon us right now. We can see that in the adverse balance of payments, in the threat to our gold supply, in continuing unemployment, in still-rising prices, and in the ever-growing floods of cheap imported goods. These problems are direct results of deficit spending.

No matter how you debate it, the fact remains that attaining a balanced Federal budget is the starting point on the road back to fiscal reason and a strong national economy. From this start, we could move ahead to other steps of responsibility—to budget surpluses, to payments on the national debt, to tax reforms, and to monetary stability. We could put our fiscal house in order and reinstitute the necessary underpinnings for a vigorous, dynamic economy—an economy which would guarantee to meet all of our needs both now and in the future.

And it would be no great problem to balance the Federal budget—even to guarantee a sizable surplus—because there are literally scores of places where expenditures could be cut. And let me emphasize that this could be done without impairing our national defense. There has in the past been a concerted effort to sell the American people on the idea that unbalanced budgets and deficit financing are only caused by our military requirements.

While it is true that the demands of keeping ahead in military preparedness are heavy, the increase we face today is primarily in the welfare categories of the nondefense budget. I say that we can easily maintain and even expand our essential military expenditures and still have ample budget surpluses if we wield the ax in the right places to prevent nonessential expenditures and hold the line against further unnecessary increases. There is positively no excuse for deficit financing at the present time. In fact, deficit spending should only be resorted to in the face of an overriding national emergency which can be handled in no other way. Even then, it should come only after the entire Federal budget has been scrutinized and every existing spending program has been examined with an eye to determining whether it can be cut down or eliminated. There is no doubt that there are many items in the Federal budget which are relatively so unimportant or unnecessary that they can speedily be reduced or discarded without any harm to the public welfare. And, there is no reason why such a process of Government cost cutting cannot provide the necessary Federal funds for other more important, essential programs which would otherwise force us to levy new taxes on the already overloaded taxpayer, or to inflation-spawning deficit spending.

In conclusion, let me say, that the proposals I have outlined here today do not cover all that needs to be done if we are to unleash the full potential of the free enterprise system. However, they are the fundamental requirements which, if adopted would gear this Nation's economy for a level of astounding performance. They would enable us to achieve a military superiority so great that no nation or collection of nations would dare to challenge or threaten us. They would help us provide employment for every man and woman in this country who wants to work. And they would give us a higher standard of living than anyone ever believed possible.

On the other hand, if we continue to ignore these basic needs by persisting in a policy of deficit spending, repressive taxation, Government control, and unreasonable trade concessions, we will deepen and compound our economic troubles. We will be charting an erratic course fraught with peril in an era when economic growth and progress are not only desirable but imperative. We will be risking our Nation's future and freedom's cause throughout the world for the sake of political expediency.

CONDUCT OF THE COLD WAR AGAINST COMMUNISM

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an address prepared for delivery before the Air War College, Maxwell Air Force Base, at Montgomery, Ala., on January 19, 1962, on the subject of the conduct of the cold war against the forces of international communism. Bad weather, however, prevented my reaching this base so I released it to the press. There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gentlemen, it is a special privilege for me to be here today and to discuss with you some of the problems which I believe confront our Nation with unusual challenge at this particular period in history. Some of you will remember that it was just over a year ago—I believe the exact date was November 14, 1960—that I spoke before this group and outlined some fundamental concepts with regard to American foreign policy. And it was on that occasion that I emphasized the growing need for a national policy of victory in the conduct of the cold war against the forces of international communism which have declared their intention to bury us in a tidal wave of tyranny. Basic to my remarks at that time was the contention that we must establish in our public policy a determination to win the cold war.

Since that time my convictions have not changed. Indeed, they have deepened with the constant trend of world events which have advanced the cause of communism and further confined the freedom of human beings. And in this I believe they have kept pace with the ever-growing concern of the American people. In my travels throughout the country, I find more and more conscientious Americans wondering why this Nation does not declare victory over the forces of international communism as our cold war purpose. I find growing dissatisfaction with a foreign policy based on the optimistic but naive conception that we can have peaceful coexistence with an enemy which has sworn to destroy us. I find open resentment at the insistence of foreign policy spokesmen that a national program of foreign aid, disarmament and extreme deference to the United Nations is sufficient to the challenge that faces freedom in the world today.

Now this growing awareness of the American people is translating itself more and more into a sense of public frustration which is far too widespread to be simply the work of extremists who disagree with the policies and objectives of our Government.

I believe that it is the gradual dawning of a realization that we are today engaged in a deadly conflict of a different nature—one that does not lend itself to the conventional diplomatic, political, and phychological weapons of the past and one which we are not waging with either the right spirit or the right strategy. And I suggest that leaders who attribute this concern solely to the work of radicals are underestimating the temper and intelligence of the American people and deluding themselves at one and the same time. Nor is this any time to decry an excess of patriotism among the American people. It is important for us to understand that our Communist enemies are fully aware of the obstacles that patriotic nationalism places in the path of their worldwide designs. Consequently, one of their important tactics is to use every possible means to destroy love of country and concern for strategic national interests among the Western nations. And when we become so engrossed with world affairs that we lose sight of our national interests and begin to equate patriotism with a form of discredited isolationism we are playing the enemy's game.

Now I'm sure that I don't have to explain to this audience that in any struggle, whether it is the kind we waged years ago to gain our independence or whether it is a vast new contest of ideologies and power balances covering the entire world, the will to win is an essential factor. Without this, we flounder in confusion, following first one course of action and then another. We lose the cohesiveness of a common purpose to which can be related every conceivable facet of our effort.

But this will to win is diluted today through a conglomeration of public policies which work at cross purposes or work at no purpose at all in relation to the struggle. It is weakened by a refusal on the part of our Government to proclaim victory as our goal and by attempts on the part of some well-intentioned but misguided spokesmen to relate a policy of victory in the cold war with a declaration of nuclear hostilities.

Let me say that those of us who argue for a policy of victory in the cold war argue for the only policy that can insure against war and the only policy that can guarantee the future of freedom in the world. Our very failure to proclaim victory as our purpose is, of, and by itself, a defeat for the side of freedom. It amounts to an open admission that we do not know what we are doing; that we don't really want to bring about the end of slavery; that we believe that communism is divisible and that if it is not directly associated with Soviet Russia, it is something less than a godless conspiracy of force and violence and terror. But, perhaps more than anything else, this singular lack in our policy stance denotes timidity and reluctance bordering on obsession to make the proper use of our power in a world where strength is the one recognized common denominator.

Here we are the world's most powerful nation—both economically and in the military sense—yet we feel exposed and insecure and unsure. With the other leading free nations we have formed alliances which are capable of almost any endeavor, but we find ourselves losing one position after another throughout the world. Freemen everywhere have shown repeatedly through word and deed that they do not want to live under communism and yet the Communist forces have engulfed hundreds of millions of human beings. Why has this happened? Why are we losing? Why are we paralyzed in a posture of global ineffectiveness? The answer is that we have prepared our defense and offense for one kind of war while the enemy is fighting a wholly different kind of war—a war for which we have as yet devised no overall design or strategy.

Our wars in the past have all sprung from clashes of interests between nations. They have involved international power rivalries and have concerned all the ingredients of such power, things like boundaries, territories, spheres of influence, armaments, and prestige. In these conflicts, military war became the ultimate ratio of power. A shooting war, in this context, was meant to lead ultimately to peace, that is, to the reestablishment of normal relations with the enemy country. Consequently, these wars were never total in the sense that they aimed at relative power and not at the enemy's actual existence.

We are conducting the cold war today as though it were a clash with the power drive of an ambitious nation, namely Russia. And, in this, we have done all the conventional things. We have strengthened our military system, evolved alliances with our friends, sought to contain the enemy and even striven to outmaneuver him at the conference table. We have done everything but understand how to use our power in a new kind of war.

Now if the cold war were a conventional struggle, the measures we have taken ought to be sufficient to yield some dividends on the side of freedom. But because this is not a conventional struggle, and because we have not devised a total strategy aimed at victory, we are falling ever further behind. The trend is running against freedom, not only in the Middle East, in Africa, and in Asia, but also in our own hemisphere where once our power and influence were unquestioned. Because of shortsightedness on one hand and indecision on the other, we have been forced to acquiesce in the conversion of Cuba into an enemy satellite. Other countries in Latin America are in danger from Communist influence. While holding the cease-fire line in South Vietnam, the political foundation of formerly friendly regimes in Laos and Cambodia are being undermined. And South Vietnam itself is shot through with Communist infiltrations. Berlin is threatened and could be stolen from under our very noses, and without a formal violation of the border we are still guarding, with the exception of the airlift in 1948, we have never had a victory in this vital area. And worst of all, in our own midst there are signs of dissatisfaction with our possession and testing of nuclear weapons and continued agitation for policies of disarmament. In this connection, I would remind you that official Communist policy now urges rebellions aimed at unilateral disarmament in Western nations as a permissible substitute for full-fledged Communist revolution.

So here we are. A nation fully armed with powerful weapons, surrounded by powerful allies, but still a nation threatened by a seemingly endless series of setbacks, defeats, humiliations and material losses—all without open changes of territorial boundaries and without over military hostilities.

We are losing the struggle today because we are mistaking both the enemy and the cold war for something they are not. The conflict in which we are engaged is not limited to a dispute between great nations over boundaries and territories, because the enemy is not in any real sense the government of a nation. Where we are inclined to think in terms of territorial losses, the Communists think in terms of destroying the institutions and tenets of freedom. True enough, the Communists rule Russia. But this is a power structure that transcends national boundaries and looks primarily to other interests than those of the territory under its government. The leaders of the Communist Party not only rule Russia but they are, in actual fact, the directors of a militant worldwide enterprise aimed at destroying existing social orders throughout the world in order to make room for the establishment of Communist rule. In this context, their allies become chaos and confusion no matter who generates it, whether it be U.N. troops in Katanga, or Indian troops in Goa. For the Communists, Russia has become a power base and an effective instrument for their designs and this is the reason why the interests of the Communist Party always become identified with those of Russia. And it is this kind of a pragmatic merger of the party's interests with those of a nation that has produced in the West the illusion of being caught up in another great power conflict which can be handled with the same kind of strategy and the same kind of weapons that were used in the power struggles of the past.

The Communists view their war as something more than just the temporary destruction of a rival nation's power. Theirs is a war aimed at the social, economic, political, and military fiber of all non-Communist societies as such. And they do not regard this war as an abnormal break in peaceful relations; a temporary pursuit aimed at a temporary objective. They believe that all human society is split into small warring elements, that this warfare will continue indefinitely and that it can be used by them to further the destruction of freedom wherever it exists. To them peace has only one value—as a useful stratagem for lulling anti-Communist societies until such time as the Communists wish to return to other devices such as terror, intimidation, and aggression.

Now in the struggle which we call the cold war, the Communists use the power and resources of Russia but not merely for the sake of Russia's national interests nor for the traditional objectives of international power conflicts. The aim of their drive is not the boundary that separates them from other nations but rather the cement that holds these other societies together. Unlike the traditional power conflict in which the ultimate ratio is war, the Communists look to the ultimate ratio of terror for the purpose of manipulating people. This was their purpose when Russia shook the world with its sudden resumption of nuclear tests and its explosion of high megaton bombs.

Now please understand me, I don't want you to think that territorial control is of no interest to the Communists in their conduct of the cold war. My point is that territorial control to them is merely one of a number of power positions, of which at times others might interest them to a more pronounced degree. Military force also is a means to an end with the Communists, but it never is considered alone as decisive. It invariably is employed in combination with political methods for subjecting of people's wills. And this is particularly confusing to us because in the conventional manner of our thinking we are inclined to regard international war as a decisive move after which we would expect to enter into normal, if strained, relations with our opponents. The Communists see things from an entirely different point of view. They hold that the conflict can end only when our public order is totally destroyed, our institutions thoroughly subverted, our loyalties completely adjured, our values fully denied, and our communal identity forever wiped out. They do not conceive of a reconciliating peace with us either as the aftermath of war or through some other kind of fundamental adjustment of viewpoints and objectives. They are conducting a total war of total negation for which the experience of international relations has not prepared us. They aim at people, individual people, whom they seek to deprive of all protective layers of institutions, loyalties and companionship in order to deliver them naked and isolated into the hands of the party's dictatorial rule.

We must, therefore, realize once and for all that our enemy is not a nation but a political movement made up of ideologically possessed people who have organized themselves as an armed force and secured control over entire countries. They have cadres in every country and use Moscow as their command post. We miss the point if we see our opponents merely as aggressor nations or potentially aggressor nations. A Communist occupying a position of power in the Congo is just as much our enemy as the power clique ruling Soviet Russia or Communist China because he is an agent of that power clique. And, we subvert our own cause when we exert military and monetary pressure on pro-Western leaders to make them submit to coalition arrangements with Communists. We have made this mistake in Katanga by supporting military action to force Tshombe to join a government which includes the Communist Gizenga. We are also making this mistake in Laos where pressure is being brought on the anti-Communist Prince Boun Oum to force him into a coalition with a Communist leader and a pro-Communist neutral. This amounts to making book with the enemy, for such coalitions are at the very best merely way stations on the road to Communist domination. Every time we insist on a coalition government with a Communist and a neutral we automatically set up a 2-to-1 situation against freedom.

Victory in the cold war demands that we recognize that we are in a deadly life-and-death struggle with the worldwide Communist movement as such. We must know this movement for what it is—a destructive, irrational, totalitarian force which seeks the eradication of freedom in any shape or variety. Our objective must be the destruction of the enemy as an ideological force possessing the means of power. Our purpose must be the worldwide defense of human society against a nihilistic force. Where the Communists seek to destroy the live tissue of social order, we must seek to destroy the decomposing virus. And our effort calls for a basic commitment in the name of victory which says we will never reconcile ourselves to the Communists' possession of power of any kind in any part of the world.

Strategically, our program must be directed toward the removal of Communists from power whether they hold it 90 miles off our southern coast or in distant Laos and South Vietnam. It must be a combined operation utilizing variegated and flexible methods which are adjustable to the possibilities of different times and places. We must mount an intellectual counterattack against the enemy's ideology and this must combine legal and organizational methods designed both to hold disputed areas of society and advance into enemy-held positions. We must act boldly when military action is indicated and direct it, not against nations, but against Communists in power. Our armaments, thus, should include the tools for this kind of pinpointed action as well as the nuclear power to deter the Communists from making an attempt to use the Russian or Chinese nations for the advancement of the party's designs.

In this we can clarify much of the confusion that stems from a belief that the cold war is a contest between two opposing systems of government. When we begin thinking of the international Communist conspiracy as a system that merely sees things differently from us, we automatically give it a status and dignity which it does not deserve and which can only result in our underestimating the threat. Communism and the slavery which it seeks to impose on the world is not a system to be dealt with in the conventional, time-tested manner of the past. It is a disease attacking and eating away at a human society and human freedom. It must be attacked as a scourge with all the weapons that we possess—economic, political, psychological, and military. As I have already pointed out, communism is the sum of total negation in human society. The efforts we bring against it must, consequently, have a totality of both design and execution.

When we present this struggle as merely struggle between the Communist system and our own, between dictatorship and democracy, we succumb to the desire to remake the world in our own image. It is not the way of freedom to supplant Communist coercion with a more benevolent type of persuasion aimed at imposing a political system which may not be the popular choice of independent men. Yet, we are conducting ourselves as if it were our business to see that justice is done everywhere in the world, that all people have an adequate standard of living, that all political and social and economic conditions be put right. Nor does it help any to adopt the false notion that communism is spawned by poverty, diseases and other similar social and economic conditions. Communism is spawned by Communists and Communists alone. When we adopt the idea that the only way effectively to halt the spread of communism is to terminate social and economic conditions that do not make for universal ease and comfort, we are adopting defeat. For, we will never even make a dent in these conditions, no matter how much foreign aid and technical help we spread around the world. All we do when we make this consideration pivotal in our cold war efforts is to diffuse our strength and weaken our assault on the prime target which is Communist power. I certainly don't think for one minute that there is anything unworthy in a goal which envisions a world without poverty, disease, and filth and where all international relations are humanized and conducted in good faith. But this is not the practical objective which we should be pursuing in the cold war. It is a dream for the future of mankind, a dream which can never come to pass if we do not apply ourselves immediately to the first objective—the removal of Communist power.

Now when we make the disease of communism our enemy, always recognizing that the disease has corrupted many governments, we make it abundantly clear that we do not seek the changing of boundaries or spheres of influence in our favor. We seek rather the removal of Communists from positions of power where they are able to thwart the natural will of peoples and impose a despotic and tyrannical system which denies all the basic tenets of human freedom and decency.

This must be our basic purpose in a resolute, never-changing strategy for victory. This is what I believe is needed to give overall direction and reason to our efforts. It is the funnel through which every move we make in the cold war can be brought to bear on the enemy with maximum force and effect. It would remove the confusion, the working at cross-purposes which is inherent in our present policy and which has so deeply frustrated the American people.

With such a purpose and strategy, we would quickly see the fallacy in lending any kind of aid to the enemy. We would understand that the enemy is just as much an enemy in the Communist government of Yugoslavia as it was some years ago in Korea and as it is today in South Vietnam. We would see the wisdom of halting all aid to Tito and other Communist or semi-Communist regimes in recognition of the fact that such funds and such supplies could much better be used in the cause of freedom elsewhere. I suggest that we have been duped too long by wishful thinking that Communist governments which disagree with Moscow are potential allies and, as such, must be fed billions of dollars in American aid. We are at war with an evil and the evil is communism. That evil must be opposed and fought at every turn regardless of whether it happens to be in the Kremlin's good graces. At the very least it must be denied our help, either directly in the form of economic and military aid, or indirectly in the form of increased trade with the Communist bloc, if we are to truly direct our best efforts to the cause of winning.

And with such a purpose and strategy, we would be through with half measures such as we used in the Cuban invasion and which gave communism a victory and left us looking ridiculous before the entire world. We would never embark on any venture against Communist power without using all the strength necessary to make it succeed. We would rid ourselves of blind devotion to the United Nations and the joining of costly and disastrous adventures against our own best interests. We would be alerted in advance to possible Communist moves which—taken while we attempt to arrange negotiations—place walls against human freedom. We would stop guessing at how much of a nuclear weapons gain the Communists had achieved in recent months and begin our own atmospheric tests immediately. We would face up quickly and finally to the fact that the whole idea of disarmament is ridiculous because the Communist masters can't even think about disarming while revolt lies just beneath the surface of life in their satellite nations. And, we would certainly stop assisting the economies of undependable and aggressive neutral nations and begin strengthening our own economy.

These are only a few of the things that a policy of victory in the cold war would mean. There are many more that would stem from a proper marshaling of our great strength into a master design for winning over the Communists at each and every point of contest, whether it be in Laos, Cuba, or Berlin.

But we can accomplish nothing if the policymakers in our Government stand paralyzed by the thought that a policy aimed at victory would run the risk of war. We can do nothing but continue to follow a policy of drift and indecision and confusion which leads only in the direction of defeat.

In summary then, let me emphasize the following points:

1. Whether we like it or not we are engaged in a death struggle with an enemy which is waging a new kind of total war and which has declared its intention to bury us.

2. The conventional attitudes and weapons of the past must be revised and drawn into a new strategic design if we are to meet the threat posed by a tyrannical force of global dimensions.

3. The will to win is vitally important to our effort and this cannot be developed to the right degree until the Government proclaims once and for all that our purpose is to achieve victory in the cold war.

4. That the enemy is Communist power, as such, and must be opposed with a total concept whether it exists in Yugoslavia, Moscow, East Berlin or South Vietnam.

5. That coalition government in today's world is a tactic of the enemy. When the Communists join in any kind of a coalition government, it is always with the intention of dominating and talking over that government.

6. That we do nothing but assist the enemy when we pressure pro-Western leaders to join coalition governments with Communists and neutrals.

7. That the last thing we should do is assist the enemy by sending money, weapons, food, and other goods to Communist nations regardless of whether they have had a falling out with the power clique in the Kremlin.

These are just a few of the thoughts I should like to leave with you today. I'm sure you realize that there are many more that deserve mention when we speak of reorienting our purpose and our strategy with regard to the Communist war we are engaged in. However, time does not permit me to deal more comprehensively with the subject, much as I should like to.

In closing, let me say that I believe the American people have the right to know the truth, as unhappy as that truth is, in the light of current world developments. I suggest that it is insulting and dangerous for men in influential positions to run around arguing that communism hasn't gained since 1945 and that the West is, in fact, winning the cold war.

The tragic fact is that during 1961 communism made its greatest gains since the fall of China. And it will make greater gains in the immediate future if we don't recognize the enemy for what it is, proclaim victory as our goal, and adapt our strength to the task of opposing Communist power wherever it exists.

Thank you.

EXERCISES COMMEMORATING THE 155TH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF GEN. ROBERT E. LEE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on Saturday, January 20, 1962, in Statuary Hall in the U.S. Capitol Building, under the auspices of the District of Columbia Division, United Daughters of the Confederacy, exercises were held commemorating the 155th birthday anniversary of Gen. Robert E. Lee.

A part of the impressive exercises upon that memorable occasion consisted of an eloquent address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG].

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a copy of the program, together with the address of the Senator from Hawaii.

There being no objection, the program and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM OF EXERCISES COMMEMORATING THE 155TH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF GEN. ROBERT E. LEE, STATUARY HALL, U.S. CAPITOL, SATURDAY, JANUARY 20, 1962, 11 A.M.

(Under the auspices of the District of Columbia Division, United Daughters of the Confederacy, Miss Alice Böhmer Rudd, president, presiding)

Invocation: The Reverend Paul H. Grosclose, minister, the Francis Asbury Methodist Church.

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America: Led by Mrs. Richard L. O'Bannon, third vice president, District of Columbia Division.

Salute to the Confederate flag: Led by Mrs. Mary McCall Imes, honorary president, District of Columbia Division.

Welcome: Division president, Miss Rudd.

Presentation of distinguished guests.

Introduction of speaker: Mrs. J. H. White, Jr.

Address: Hon. OREN E. LONG, U.S. Senator.

Placing of wreaths at the statue of General Lee.

United Daughters of the Confederacy, Mrs. Robert Bochman, president general, by Mrs. Maude Howell Smith, past president, District of Columbia Division.

District of Columbia Division, Miss Alice Böhmer Rudd, division president.

Gen. Robert E. Lee, chapter No. 644, Mrs. J. H. White, Jr., chapter president.

Children of the Confederacy, Mr. Morgan Morgan, of the Fairview chapter of District of Columbia Division, Children of the Confederacy.

Benediction: Reverend Grosclose.

Pages: Miss Cheryl Burroughs, Miss Claudia Burroughs, Miss Sharon Lee Dennis.

ROBERT E. LEE: AMERICAN

(By OREN E. LONG, U.S. Senator)

We meet in this historic chamber today to pay honor to a great man, a great American.

By any standard of personal or public worth, whether it be ability, integrity, qualities of leadership, a sense of duty, devotion to principle, Robert E. Lee must be regarded among the great men of his generation.

It is significant that with the passing of time, he has grown in stature and favor with the people of the Nation, both North and South. His place in history is secure.

Of greater importance today, Robert E. Lee has a place in the heart of the Nation. For just as the people of the South revere the unique qualities of Abraham Lincoln, so the people of the North have a growing appreciation of Lee.

The rich heritage which these leaders have bequeathed to the American people forms a strong bond of national unity.

While their environment was different to an almost startling degree, we should never forget that their common bonds far surpassed these differences.

Each grew up in an atmosphere that breathed the strength, the confidence, the energies of a nation that was youthful, idealistic. Each had an almost fierce devotion to that country.

Each thought of it as a unity. From the days of their youth, they had been aware of the common struggle for freedom. They knew the strength of the mystic chords of memory stretching from every battlefield and grave to every living heart—the sacrifices that had welded the people into one Nation. Each had served that Nation in peace and in war.

It is tragic that under the pull and stress of the economic and political complexities on the eve of the Civil War, they could not work together to save their countrymen from the agonies of a fratricidal struggle.

The record shows clearly that this was the devout wish of Lee. As the clouds of secession gathered and the issue of slavery inflamed the minds of men, Lee said: "If I owned 4 million slaves, I would cheerfully sacrifice them for the preservation of the Union."

Lee wrote to his son, George Washington Custis Lee: "I am not pleased with the course of the Cotton States as they term themselves."

And in a letter to his distant cousin, Markie Williams, he confessed: "I wish for no other flag than the 'Star Spangled Banner' and no other air than 'Hail Columbia.' "

In spite of these sentiments, his commitment to States rights and his devotion to Virginia caused him to leave the Union and to serve the Confederacy valiantly to the end of the trail at Appomattox.

Happily, Appomattox was not an ending. It was a beginning. It opened a new road of life to every soldier in the field, Confederate and Union alike. To Robert E. Lee, it also opened a new life.

Lee was exhausted in body, heavy of heart, and troubled for the future of the South. But there were for him no moody musings, no reproaches, no despair. In a short time, the whole bewildered life of Richmond began to revolve about his house. People came to him, to comfort him and to be comforted. To all who came, he counseled peace and urged them to rebuild the South and their own lives through any work they could find.

That was the course he had decided upon for his own future. His opportunity came unexpectedly in August 1865 when John W. Brockenbrough, rector of Washington College, Lexington, Va., called on him. To the complete surprise of Lee, he stated that on August 4 the trustees of Washington College had unanimously elected the general president of the institution and wished to know if he would accept. Judge Brockenbrough presented a letter from the committee of the board in which the invitation was extended formally.

Lee had never contemplated accepting a college presidency. As he considered the idea, however, it seemed to him that the summons was providential, in that it offered both a livelihood and an opportunity to serve the southern people He, therefore, accepted the offer and entered the academic world.

The effect on Lee was immediate. Idleness and uncertainty were at an end. He had a task, and he would discharge it. In his correspondence, he began even more vigorously than before to set the example he thought the South required. He may have been prompted also to a more positive course because he saw the gloomy portents of the troubled times.

If wartime enmity and hatred were to continue between the sections, the future was dark indeed. Were they allayed, and unity and good will substituted for them, General Lee reasoned, prosperity and happiness would come again to the South. He feared that any public activity on his part might react against the cause he wished to aid, and therefore he avoided making public his views on many major issues.

Especially as the head of a college, he should avoid controversy and submit to constituted authority. In the distress of the day he saw his duty. This much he could and should do: On all those who asked his counsel, in person or by letter, he would continue to urge patience, diligence, and courageous acceptance of the consequences of war. To this he turned himself with a will. Lee, the warrior, became Lee, the conciliator.

To former Governor Letcher of Virginia, he wrote: "The questions which for years were in dispute between the State and the General Government, and which unhappily were not decided by the dictates of reason, but referred to the decision of war, having been decided against us, it is the part of wisdom to acquiesce in the result, and of candor to recognize the fact. The interests of the State are therefore the same as those of the United States. Its prosperity will rise or fall with the welfare of the country. The duty of its citizens, then, appears to me too plain to admit of doubt. All should unite in honest efforts to obliterate the effects of war, and to restore the blessings of peace."

In a letter to another correspondent, he declared: "I have too exalted an opinion of the American people to believe that they will consent to injustice; and it is only necessary, in my opinion, that truth should be known, for the rights of everyone to be secured."

The optimism of this sentence appeared in many of Lee's messages to discouraged Confederates. The letters were not meant for publication and appeared in no newspapers, but copies were passed from hand to hand, and Lee's position became well known.

General Wise had said, on the retreat of the Confederate Army from Appomattox, that in the eyes of the army, General Lee was the Confederacy. His advice now became the law of public conduct for men of moderate mind in the South. They were quicker, also, to enter upon hard, unremunerative employment, when they heard that he had accepted, at a salary of $1,500 per year, the presidency of a small college.

The South was inspired by Lee's choice as president of Washington College, and so were the men who had elected him. After voting unanimously to offer the position to him, they had sat for a few minutes as if stunned by their own temerity. Now that they had his acceptance, they prepared to work with him and to raise funds for the restoration of the college, which was deeply in debt.

At the same time, they may well have felt that their new president was out of scale with their institution. Washington College was, at that time, a small body of faithful men, and little besides. Its first principal was William Graham, who had been a Princeton classmate of "Light Horse" Harry Lee.

Under Graham and his early successors, the school was established and maintained on the old frontier, and looked westward, training many youths from Kentucky and Tennessee (although a majority of its students were Virginians).

In the recent hostilities, many Washington College students fought in the Stonewall Brigade of Gen. Thomas J. Jackson, the right arm of General Lee. But, typical of southern institutions in general, the glory of the college had waned with the progress of the war.

Prospects for attendance in the fall of 1865 were as gloomy as for everything else. Few had any money to pay for college training, and some of those who had the means had been touched by the turbulence of the times and had no desire to settle down to the quiet of academic life. But with Lee as their leader, the trustees were willing to carry on.

On September 18, 1865, General Lee rode into Lexington. Two days later, the trustees met and welcomed him to the fold, and on October 2 he was sworn in as president.

In a short time, he was hard at work. When the faculty came to know him better, some of the members would protest against the amount of work the general performed. He always insisted, in reply, that he owed it to the boys at the most critical times of their lives. Besides, he argued, daily administration was required for the success of the discipline he established when he came to the college.

So far as is known, General Lee had no plan for enlarging the curriculum when he assumed charge of the college, but his own training, his long experience in construction work (as an Army engineer), his 4 years of war, and his knowledge of the needs of the South soon combined to give him definite opinions regarding the curriculum.

Prior to his presidency, it had covered six subjects, embracing only the classics and the pure sciences. But Lee did not believe that these, of themselves, sufficed to meet the needs of the impoverished South. Accordingly, he inaugurated a plan to provide training in five additional subjects: practical chemistry, experimental philosophy, applied mathematics, modern languages, and history and literature.

In the face of glaring poverty and an enrollment of but 50 students, the trustees adopted Lee's plan and undertook expansion. To help in meeting the expense of the new departments, the trustees promptly began to solicit endowments, and General Lee wrote several letters to support the undertaking. The fund drive received a surprisingly wide response, considering the poverty of the times. For southerners who possessed any means at all were certain to listen when an appeal was made for General Lee's College, as it soon was called.

Taxing as was this new kind of life, General Lee found time to correspond with many of his admirers throughout the South. In all his letters, if the occasion permitted, he preached his doctrine of reconciliation, nor did he allow the growth of political hostility to dissuade him from his course. In counseling a southern minister on one occasion, he wrote: "I would suggest that you leave out all the bitter expressions against the North and the U.S. Government. I think such expressions undignified and unbecoming."

Funds appeared in sufficient quantity to prevent the collapse of Washington College in the hard winter of 1865-66. Increasing fees paid by the students, who were coming in ever-increasing numbers, also eased somewhat the school's distress. Before the end of the session, enrollment had almost tripled.

In 1866, $5,000 was contributed to the college by Cyrus W. McCormick, a former publisher of the Chicago Times and inventor of the famed McCormick reaper. Other gifts, including valuable books, were received.

New instructors—some of great ability—were employed; and at last the college appeared to be engaged in a marked state of improvement. In scope, its curriculum was virtually doubled since General Lee had first appeared. Schools of engineering and law had been established. For the inquiring student, the library had been partially restored. The election of courses had been made the privilege of everyone, and the honor system in its fullness had been established.

Aside from his academic role, the chief postwar interest of General Lee was of course the restoration of the South, economically, culturally, and politically. His mail, which was immense, was crowded with requests for advice. And this he continued to give till the end of his life, in the interest of national reconciliation.

On his few lengthy journeys—especially on a tour of the south Atlantic seaboard for his health in the spring of 1870—he was welcomed with a measure of affection no southerner since Washington had received.

The news of his death, in September 1870, put every southern community in mourning. And after 90 years, the southern reverence for his name has, if anything, increased. No other American has ever had an influence on the old Confederate States comparable to his. In all matters on which he expressed himself, he is still regarded as the final authority. In him, the South still sees the embodiment of all its best ideals.

And, with the passage of time, the same tendency is becoming discernible throughout the Union as a whole. For here, indeed, was a man of genius, a man of courage, and a man of honor, in whom every American has a right to pride.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The 15-minute time limit has expired.

STOCK DISTRIBUTION TREATED AS RETURN OF CAPITAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8847) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that a distribution of stock made to an individual (or certain corporations) pursuant to an order enforcing the antitrust laws shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital; and to provide that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have sent to the desk a motion to recommit the bill, with instructions, and I ask to have the motion read by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion will be read by the clerk.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Mr. President, I move that the pending bill, H.R. 8847, be recommitted to the Committee on Finance and that the committee be instructed to report to the Senate at such time as a final order prescribing the terms of divestiture of General Motors stock by E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. shall have been entered, a bill providing such tax relief as the committee may deem appropriate and equitable.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Christian Science Monitor, January 16, 1962, there appears an editorial which points out the quiet initiative which is being taken by Secretary Rusk and the Department of State to deal with some of the difficult situations which confront the Nation in its foreign relations. It is clear, from the editorial, that important decisions have been made with respect to the Congo, the Common Market, Latin America, Laos and other areas, and that they represent new or modified lines of policy. This effort to unfreeze policy, Mr. President, may not always work. But it seems to me most laudatory that the effort is being made. I ask unanimous consent that the article be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUT THROUGH THAT FOG

Secretary of State Rusk doesn't say much but he and his colleagues work hard. This is a moment when the foreign policy of the United States is cooking on all burners and the contents of many pots are at a rolling boil.

The least one can say is that things are moving. But that is already a lot. The standard complaint was that the United States did not start anything; it merely reacted to what the Communists did.

This is not the case now. Risks are being taken. Decisions have been made to go ahead—not with perfect plans because there are few such, but on what looks to the policymakers like the best route available.

Item: The Congo has been held together and remains independent.

Item: Europe's Common Market and the United States are moving rapidly toward a partnership.

Item: Latin American pressure, despite much resistance, is being slowly developed against communism in Cuba.

Item: In Laos the Government is being reorganized on a broader basis. The result, if it succeeds, will test whether a neutral regime can remain independent.

Item: In Vietnam an urgently needed military reform has come about. Political and economic reform are still ahead.

Item: At the United Nations, American diplomacy has begun urging the new nations to act with responsibility.

Item: At Moscow, Ambassador Thompson is pressing the Russians on a larger settlement for Berlin.

These are typical cases. There are many others.

In some the United States is the prime mover. In others it is supporting countries or groups of countries which are taking action.

In some cases the situation is explosive. If one line of policy does not work it may be necessary to shift in a hurry and try another. But at least something will have been learned—that the policy which failed was not the right one. That couldn't have been learned by sitting still.

In fact by sitting still when the Communists were moving it would be possible in many of these cases to lose by default. That is much worse than moving ahead by doing the best one can at the moment, and standing ready to shift course.

It is always difficult to generalize about foreign policy. There is no telling where many of the present initiatives will lead. But pressure is being applied toward what looks like good ends. If there is any unifying thread, it is a desire to broaden the base of government everywhere in the independent world.

Policy is becoming less frozen, more supple. This is good.

PRICING THE MAIL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Baltimore Sun of January 19, 1962, contains an article by the eminent columnist Mr. Thomas O'Neill entitled "Pricing the Mail." It is a most interesting and revealing piece on the problems of pricing in the Post Office, the subsidized carriage of magazines and so-called junk mail, and the vast array of nonpostal functions which are performed by the post office, which range from annual census taking to collections for charities.

Mr. O'Neill refers in his column to the knowledge of these matters which is possessed by the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee [Mr. JOHNSTON]. As the Senate knows, the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina is an outstanding authority on the complexity of postal operations and rate problems and has given a great deal of thoughtful attention in a dedicated effort to bring about more order and fairness to the public in the postal system.

Mr. President, the problem of the deficit in the Post Office Department takes on a somewhat different complexion in the light of Mr. O'Neill's column. It is obvious that we are dealing with a many-sided question and that if we are to put this operation on a businesslike basis we should take a careful look not only at the rates for first-class postal service but also at the countless other functions and subsidized services which have been loaded onto the Post Office by legislation and precedent. I ask unanimous consent that the article referred to be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRICING THE MAIL

(By Thomas O'Neill)

Higher postal rates, needed to protect a precarious balance between governmental income and outgo, appear to be on the way to approval by Congress but only after a donnybrook over which users of the mails are to foot the higher costs.

Along the way the administration is expected to acknowledge that a substantial share of the chronic postal deficit is run up by a whole catalog of catchall activities that have nothing to do with carrying the mail, and to agree to pin the costs of these on the agencies for which they are performed. A promise to this effect appeared in the Democratic platform on which President Kennedy was elected.

Lobbyists for magazine publishers and direct-mail advertisers have swarmed to the Capitol, making the dubious argument that first-class letters are the culprits behind the postal losses and should bear all the added charges.

Post Office bookkeeping is an awesome thing. It can be used to demonstrate that first-class mail produces a surplus for the Department, or that it involves staggering losses. The current Postmaster General, J. Edward Day, figures that it falls slightly short of meeting the cost of carrying it and that airmail brings in a small profit.

Magazines are carried at a reduced rate that would be uneconomic if there were no other mail, but is justified on the dual ground of spreading public enlightenment and that it is handled only after the post office staff has handled first-class letters and has nothing else to do. The latter argument is also advanced by the direct-mail advertisers responsible for the avalanche of junk mail. Both are putting up a stern fight to preserve their special status.

In its early days when its only function was to carry letters the Department paid its own way.

Losses set in at a time when the country was expanding, in 1838. They became the rule, except, curiously, in time of war. The Pony Express, for example, cost many times the revenue it returned. The first letters to Alaska, delivered at regular rates, cost the

Department $450 each. The expansion of services began in 1855 (the year stamps were introduced) with the inauguration of registered mail, a money loser. Rural free delivery came along in 1896, adding to the drain.

Over the years an array of other jobs has been handed to the Department by other agencies. It offers, for example, a notary public service to pensioners and witnesses in the execution of pension vouchers. In many such instances the reason is convenience and economy, since the Department spreads to every nook and cranny of the Nation.

An authority on the scope of these extrapostal odd jobs is Senator Olin Johnston, chairman of the Senate Post Office Committee. An angry glint appears in his eye as he recites the list, to which he objects because it makes the Department responsible for costs properly chargeable to other governmental branches. He is standing astride any raise in postal rates until there is agreement to change the bookkeeping system to assign these costs to the appropriate agencies.

Some of the nonmail tasks are astonishing. The Post Office takes a census of deer and grouse populations, helps the Federal Housing Administration make vacancy surveys. It issues wildfowl shooting permits (Interior Department). It provides hometown offices for Congressmen. It sells and redeems saving bonds for the Treasury, registers 3 million aliens annually for the Immigration Service, sells documentary internal revenue stamps, gives information concerning civil service examinations and must have a clerk available to answer questions about the examinations.

Flags to drape the caskets of war veterans are supplied by the Post Office. For the Justice Department it posts pictures of wanted criminals, and recruiting posters for the armed services. It collects customs duties on parcels, and sells money orders in competition with private agencies. It makes weather reports for Agriculture, has a hand in registering powerboats, and operates a censorship.

Beyond its helping hand to other Federal departments, the Post Office performs for private agencies outside of collecting and delivering the mail. Contributions for many charity drives are handled by the postal service, and the charities advertise "just hand or mail to your postmaster."

At one time it was charged with airline subsidies, and was relieved of these only in 1954. Congress a few years ago complied with a Hoover Commission recommendation and agreed to reimburse the Department for congressional franked mail and that carried for other branches of the Federal Establishment. The move contributed nothing to economy in Government. The additional accounting added 10 percent to the prior cost.

Even with prospective higher rates, the Post Office faces growing costs of simply delivering the mail as a million new households spring up yearly, demanding extended delivery service.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SAM RAYBURN BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Saturday last the Democrats met in celebration of the first anniversary of the inauguration of President Kennedy, and also for the purpose of raising funds for campaigns to be undertaken in the future.

One of the best addresses I have ever heard in my life was delivered on that occasion by the distinguished Vice President of the United States. The address was referred to as a sentimental assignment. It was all of that. It was sentimental because of the close friendship which existed between the late great Speaker of the House of Representatives, Sam Rayburn, and the present Vice President of the United States.

I was very much impressed by this address, which I knew, and which everyone in the hall knew, came from the heart. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be incorporated at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Tribute to the Late Sam Rayburn by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson at the Inaugural Anniversary Dinner, National Guard Armory, Washington, D.C., January 20, 1962

Mine is a sentimental assignment: to pay tribute, on behalf of all of you, to the memory of Sam Rayburn.

Like many others at this dinner, including the President, it was my great privilege to walk a way down the road with him. For the Speaker, the end of the road came last November 16. But it is not the end of the road for the lessons he taught and the heritage he left.

Everyone who knew Sam Rayburn cherishes the moments they shared with him, whether it was in the hushed silence of the House before the tally of a vote is announced—during the unvarnished talk of the board of education—amidst the hubbub of a Democratic convention—or on quiet walks around Texas' old Fourth District to talk to the men and women of those flat black lands he loved so well.

The House of Representatives was his great love. He was, at once, its master and its servant.

There wasn't anyone in the United States who couldn't see the Speaker, if they were willing to sit a spell. To the dismay of his staff, he made his own appointments—often on the back of an old envelope in his hip pocket. And he read his own mail. "When someone writes me on tablet paper with a lead pencil," he once told me, "I figure what he's writing me about is pretty important to him."

Authors for years to come will analyze this man who held sway over the House longer than any other mortal. They can turn to him for their text.

"You can't really say how you lead. You feel your way, receptive to those rolling waves of sentiment. And if a man can't see and hear and feel, why then, of course, he's lost."

Speaker Rayburn could see and hear and feel. He was part of this good earth.

He furnished Democrats some of their most straightforward thinking and talking.

"I'm a Democrat without a suffix, without prefix, and without apology."

He was younger than any of us. There was one thing he disliked more than old fogies, and as he put it, that was "young fogies."

He knew the Democratic Party because he was the Democratic Party. Remember what he said: "I say that the Democratic Party is merciful. I say that it is humane. I say it is compassionate. I say it is for the people and the people know it."

When you think of Sam Rayburn, you think at once of the plain, sturdy, homespun statesmen of the early republic—the men who worked with Jefferson and Jackson to establish the American Republic on the foundations of democracy.

If our Democratic Party is the oldest organized party in the world, it is because men like the Speaker have kept it forever loyal to old traditions—and forever alert to new ways to serve social progress and human freedom.

Let me sum it all up by saying that Sam Rayburn was a man who was as old as Thomas Jefferson—and as young as John F. Kennedy.

The last speech he made to the House came the day be doubled Henry Clay's record as Speaker. He stood in that familiar well and said: "I have so much faith in human beings. I know that people are good folks."

In a reflective mood one evening with a group of friends he put it so well. He recalled how good people had always been to him. He talked of Flag Springs, the little town where he had gone to the one-room school.

"All of us are just a little way from Flag Springs," he said, adding, "You know, I just missed being a tenant farmer by a gnat's heel."

All of us are just a little way from Flag Springs. May it ever be.

TRIBUTE TO DR. M. K. WYLDER, OF ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point an article entitled "Pioneer Physician Dr. Wylder Dies," published in the Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Tribune of January 17, 1962, being a tribute to Dr. M. K. Wylder, who went to Albuquerque on a visit more than 58 years ago and remained there to practice medicine during a long and distinguished career.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

Pioneer Physician Dr. Wylder Dies

A man who came to Albuquerque for a 2-week visit and stayed more than 58 years to practice medicine, died unexpectedly Tuesday night in St. Joseph Hospital after suffering a stroke.

He is Dr. Meldrum K. Wylder, 84, who delivered more than 15,000 babies during his long career as a pediatrician. He lived at 501 Laguna Boulevard SW.

The author of "Rio Grande Medicine Man," Dr. Wylder was honored by Albuquerque for his book which related his adventures as a doctor in this area.

Dr. Wylder, who was born May 15, 1877, came to Albuquerque in April 1903, and liked it so well he decided to make his home here. He had been living in El Paso, where he went to cure his tuberculosis.

He was born in Macoupin County, Ill., on a rural farm, the son of a pioneer Methodist minister. Dr. Wylder obtained his early education in Illinois public schools and completed academic and premedical schooling at Marion College, Marion, Ind. He received his medical degree at Washington University at St. Louis, Mo., in 1901, and, although it was not required at the time, he served a lengthy internship in the St. Louis City Hospital.

After recovering from his tuberculosis, Dr. Wylder opened his office here in 1903. He made his first calls by bicycle and horse-drawn carriage.

In 1904, he helped build the Franciscan Hotel and became active in civic and fraternal organizations. For many years he was active in the medical circles of the State. Dr. Wylder was a member of the American Medical Association, the New Mexico Medical Association, and the Bernalillo County Medical Society.

He was awarded the Bernalillo County Medical Association first 50-year scroll of honor in 1951, and in 1953 the Albuquerque

City Commission proclaimed "M. K. Wylder Day," commemorating his 50th anniversary in the city.

The octogenarian physician, who retired in May, 1961, was most proud of his association with the American Academy of Pediatrics and his service as chairman of the State Board of Health from 1939 to 1945. He also was a member of the American College of physicians.

Dr. Wylder was county chairman of the Republican Party in 1929 for 2 years and served as chairman of the board of county commissioners from 1918 to 1920. He also was a member of the city school board from 1908–14.

A member of the First Methodist Church, he was active in the YMCA organization movement here. He was a life member of the Sons of the American Revolution, Elks Lodge 461, Kiwanis Club and Masonic Lodge No. 60.

He is survived by a son, Bill, of Denver, here; two daughters, Mrs. Warren Rempel, Manhattan, Kans., and Miss Deana Wylder, Riverside, Calif., who arrived here Wednesday night; a brother, Earl, Ft. Smith, Ark., and a sister, Mrs. Dan Stein of Columbia, Mo.

The body will lie in state at Strong-Thorne Mortuary from noon today until noon Friday. Funeral services will be held Friday afternoon at 3 in First Methodist Church. The Rev. Warren Rempel will officiate. Interment will be in Fairview Park Cemetery.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time used by the Senator from Montana will be charged to the opposition to the motion to recommit.

CONTINENTAL SHELF OIL REVENUES

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, many Members of the Senate serving today will recall vividly the prolonged battle over the so-called—and miscalled—tidelands oil bills in the 83d Congress. They will remember that under the able leadership of the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] the Senate adopted an amendment which would have dedicated the revenues from the mineral resources of the subsoil of the continental shelf off our coasts to public education. This was popularly referred to as the "oil for the lamps of learning" provision.

The other body did not concur in the "oil for the lamps of learning" amendment sponsored by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the provision was lost in conference.

Recently, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee received the report of the Secretary of the Interior on receipts and expenditures connected with mineral leasing operations on the continental shelf for the fiscal year 1961, together with the total revenues received since the effective date of the legislation. This figure comes to the truly impressive total of nearly $800 million.

In view of the keen interest in education in this Congress, and the long and spirited debate in the 83d Congress on the use of tidelands oil revenues for educational purposes, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Department of the Interior, which is brief, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico?

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., September 29, 1961.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Pursuant to the requirement of section 15 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1343), following are the receipts and expenditures of this Department in connection with the administration of the act for the fiscal year 1961:

Receipts:	
Rentals	$3,276,925.23
Royalties	47,747,236.75
Shut-in gas wells	43,400.00
Rights-of-way	2,590.00
Total	51,070,151.98
Expenditures:	
Salaries	216,408.62
Travel and per diem	8,515.59
All other	28,725.78
Total	253,649.99

Total collections to June 30, 1961, including bid bonuses, amount to $797,829,156, of which $442,032,866 has been covered into general funds of the Treasury. The balance of $355,796,290 is being held in escrow receipt accounts pending decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of *United States* v. *Louisiana et al.*

Sincerely yours,
D. OTIS BEASLEY,
Administrative Assistant Secretary.

MEDICAL CARE INSURANCE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the National Association of Blue Shield Plans and the American Medical Association recently proposed a plan to provide the aged with insurance covering surgeons' and physicians' fees. The proposal was welcomed by those of us who believe that the social security approach offers the most practical way to deal with the problem of health care for the aged. It indicates recognition by these groups that a serious financial problem exists for many elderly Americans when it comes to paying for hospital care and medical services.

Although some of the details of this new proposal have not been announced, some questions can be raised about the proposed premium of $3 a month. The cost of medical care has been rising rapidly and is expected to continue to increase. Data for 1960, for example, show that for aged couples, with one or the other member hospitalized, the total medical bill during the year exceeds $500 in more than half of the cases. The total medical bill is under $200 in only 5 percent of the cases.

The chronic and prolonged character of the illnesses of the aged creates questions about the adequacy of a $3-a-month premium.

It would be extremely useful in producing solutions to this problem to have the Senate Finance Committee conduct hearings on the health care legislation introduced in the first session of this Congress. The House Ways and Means Committee completed its hearings last summer. Accordingly, I have asked the distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee to schedule such hearings soon so that Senators might have the latest information.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post and Times Herald be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPER INSURANCE

At the commencement of a congressional session which is expected to debate administration proposals for a medical insurance program for the aged as a part of the social security system, the National Association of Blue Shield Plans and the American Medical Association have come forward with a program of their own to provide surgical and medical care benefits for persons 65 years of age or over. We congratulate them on a constructive contribution to the solution of an urgent national problem.

Their proposal deserves to be considered on its merits, in pragmatic terms, as compared with administration proposals. Very little service is rendered to this kind of consideration by American Medical Association spokesmen who denounce the administration proposals as leading to socialized medicine or by the Blue Shield spokesman who intoned that medical insurance for the aged can more properly be met under the auspices of private initiative than under a Government-financed program. What in the world is there about the one that is more proper than the other? The question is which is the more practical.

The benefits of the Blue Shield plan have not yet been announced in any detail. It is said, in general, that they will cover surgery costs whether in a hospital or in a doctor's office and medical care in a hospital or in a licensed nursing home. But with a premium of $3 a month per person it is hard to see how the benefits can be comprehensive or enduring enough to cover prolonged terminal illnesses. Indeed, it is hard to see how any private plan depending upon current payment by the aged themselves can provide adequate benefit. Prepayment under the social security system, on the other hand, spreads the burden among persons in their productive, earning years.

To the American Medical Association and the Blue Shield it may seem proper that participation in a medical insurance program should be entirely voluntary; but to the children of aged parents who have neglected to participate and who are afflicted with a catastrophic and financially ruinous illness this freedom to be irresponsible may not seem proper at all. We regard it as a decided virtue of the administration proposals that they would require everyone to provide against the hazards of illness in old age by prepaying the costs systematically out of earnings while young. This requirement will be a boon to the elderly themselves, to their children and to the community.

One additional aspect of the Blue Shield-American Medical Association proposal is disturbing. It would entail something very like a means test because its full benefits would be available only to single persons whose annual income is under $2,500 and to couples whose annual income is under $4,000. A means test, or income test, of this sort is not only humiliating; it operates to discourage savings and earning on the part of the elderly. It is, in short, an improper interference with the freedom and dignity that ought to accompany old age.

A HIGH ORDER OF ENGLISH

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, our American language, properly used, is a pleasure to read and a joy to hear.

President Kennedy's use of the language has often been called to attention. Is there a Kennedy literary style? I find that the Eugene, Oreg., Register-Guard editorial department think there is. In an editorial of January 18, 1962, they write:

> Whatever historians may someday write of John F. Kennedy's record as a President, the verdict of literary scholars should be quite favorable. As the first professional writing man to occupy the White House since Theodore Roosevelt, the President is sending a high order of English over the airwaves and into public prints.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the editorial, "Pulling Apart the Kennedy Style," appear in the Record at this time.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Pulling Apart the Kennedy Style

In the last year much, maybe too much, has been written about the Kennedy style. Usually these words have had to do with Jackie's hair-do or big families or Ivy League suits or a quick informality that can be as disarming as it is deceptive. But there is also another kind of style, a literary style. Jack Kennedy has one that is quite distinctive. Americans began to gather this when, in his inaugural address a year ago, he said, "Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate." In the same speech he admonished us, "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

In last week's state of the Union address there seemed to be some familiar stylistic devices. And sure enough, they're the same ones. We curled up with the state of the Union message and began pulling sentences out of it. Here seem to be the characteristics that put that special literary mark on the words of Jack Kennedy:

He uses alliteration: "not rivals for power but partners for progress"—"tangled, turbulent Congo"—"We acted not in panic but perspective."

However, he uses it judiciously: "stressing services instead of support, rehabilitation instead of relief, and training for useful work instead of prolonged dependency."

A speaker with a tin ear would have stretched out to find a word to match "training." Kennedy didn't. He knew when enough was enough.

He has a genius for picking words that sound well together, that make almost a catch phrase: "we are gratified, but we are not satisfied"—"a free community of nations, independent but interdependent."

He doesn't mind repeating words, heeding perhaps H. W. Fowler's tip that the obvious is better than obvious avoidance of it. He said: "to a single goal, the goal of a peaceful world."

"Our businessmen must be export-conscious and export-competitive."

"America's glory, and sometimes America's shame * * * fulfill the world's hope by fulfilling our own faith."

Most distinctive is his use of contrasts, the not this, but that device: "Nor are we abandoning our non-European friends. On the contrary * * *. But it is not our military might * * * it is our belief that the state is the servant of the citizen and not his master.

"The Atlantic community grows, not like a volcanic mountain, by one mighty explosion, but like a coral reef."

"We acted not in panic but perspective."

These devices often appear in combination, as these examples show. Overall, his stuff marches straight ahead. It has cadence or swing. And the sentences, generally, are either quite short or are broken up by dashes, indicating a pause in delivery.

Now, the cynics will ask, is this Kennedy or is this Ted Sorensen, his chief ghost? It's probably both. Sorensen is very close to the President and has been for several years. He is credited with doing the research, but not the writing, for "Profiles in Courage," the President's Pulitzer-prize-winning study in biography. It is likely that the two men have worked so closely together that they write alike. That's understandable. Literary style doesn't spring full blown from one's head. Rather, it is the sum total of all one has read and heard. It is influenced most by what one reads or hears most.

Whatever historians may someday write of John F. Kennedy's record as a President, the verdict of literary scholars should be quite favorable. As the first professional writing man to occupy the White House since Theodore Roosevelt, the President is sending a high order of English over the airwaves and into the public prints.

PROBLEMS OF THE CONGO

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in the Sunday issue of the New York Times appeared a brilliant article on the Congo, written by a renowned reporter, Mr. David Halberstam. Not only is the article an excellent one, but the reporter has also given to the thousands of people who read his writings a prescient understanding of the many tangled problems of the Congo. I congratulate Mr. Halberstam upon his great journalistic achievement. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Gizenga Is Moved to Leopoldville—U.N. Guards Ousted Official—His Former Troops Are Said To Slay Five More

(By David Halberstam)

Leopoldville, the Congo, January 20.—Antoine Gizenga, deposed Vice Premier of the Congo, was brought here today from Stanleyville on a United Nations plane. He went immediately, under United Nations protection, to quarters provided by the world organization.

Mr. Gizenga's arrival went almost unnoticed by the Congolese public. It was ignored by the central government, which sent no representative to the airport to greet the plane.

From the moment the transport landed, Mr. Gizenga and his party were protected by Danish military policemen and a platoon of Nigerian infantrymen from the United Nations forces in the Congo.

Mr. Gizenga had asked the United Nations to bring him here from his headquarters in Stanleyville, the scene of recent fighting between troops presumably loyal to Mr. Gizenga and those of the central Congolese Government.

The United Nations apparently fearful of the tense situation in Stanleyville, where Mr. Gizenga's status had been almost that of a prisoner, agreed to the change. The organization said today, however, that Mr. Gizenga was being brought to Leopoldville at the request of the central government.

It was revealed here that rebel Congolese troops once loyal to Mr. Gizenga, but now outlaw, had fired on a United Nations jet and had attacked another village in north Katanga.

United Nations jets, on a reconnaissance flight in the Kongolo-Sola area, found the village of Kilubi in flames. It is just south of Sola. The pilots reported that several smaller settlements between Sola and Kilubi were in flames.

On the road between Kilubi and Kongolo, one jet came upon a column of troops. They opened fire on the jet.

PILOT WITHHOLDS FIRE

The pilot did not return the fire. A United Nations spokesman said he did not know whether the pilots had orders not to fire on the rebel troops.

The pilots saw no troop activity of any kind at Sola, which was presumed to have been attacked by the outlaw troops. The reconnaissance flights were started yesterday after the United Nations was told by the Red Cross representative in Elisabethville that rebel troops were mounting an attack on the large Roman Catholic mission at Sola.

The pilots arrived, sighted two Congolese soldiers and two military vehicles at the mission but saw no sign of the priests or nuns assigned there.

Catholic church sources in Leopoldville say they did not believe there were any priests or nuns left at the Sola mission by the time the Congolese troops arrived. The sources noted that the massacre in the Kongolo of 19 priests and Catholic workers had been reported more than 2 weeks earlier, giving the officials at Sola time to flee.

The renegade troops reported at Kongolo were originally from Stanleyville and went into Katanga Province as part of an invasion force. They are believed to be responsible for the slaying of 13 Italian airmen in Kindu in November. Their commander, Col. Alphonse Pakassa, a close personal friend of Mr. Gizenga, was arrested 2 days ago in Stanleyville by Gen. Victor Lundula.

AID AGAINST REBELS VOWED

The United Nations has pledged all possible assistance, including military aid, to the central government in stopping and apprehending the rebel troops. But the United Nations spokesman said there were no new developments on possible retaliatory action against the rebels.

At the airport to greet Mr. Gizenga, the political heir of the late Premier Patrice Lumumba, were about 30 members of his divided political party, who cheered and pushed forward to shake his hand.

Mr. Gizenga was met at the airport by Ahmed Abdoun, a Sudanese member of the staff of Dr. Sture C. Linner, the United Nations chief of the Congo operation.

Mr. Gizenga was driven to his guarded quarters in a United Nations car, protected by an escort.

Mr. Gizenga, who has been in defiance of the central government since early October was censured by the Congolese Parliament this week and then deposed as vice premier. Premier Cyrille Adoula said earlier this week that legal proceedings were being started against Mr. Gizenga.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Tennessee withhold his request until the Chair makes an announcement?

Mr. GORE. I withdraw the request.

DESIGNATION OF SENATORS TO ATTEND THE FUNERAL OF THE LATE SENATOR ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair designates the following senatorial delegation to attend the funeral of the late Senator Andrew F. Schoeppel, at Wichita, Kans.:

Senator FRANK CARLSON, Kansas, chairman.
Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, minority leader.
Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Washington.
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, North Dakota.
Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Delaware.
Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, Utah.
Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Oklahoma.
Senator NORRIS COTTON, New Hampshire.
Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Nebraska.
Senator CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska.
Senator GORDON ALLOTT, Colorado.
Senator E. L. BARTLETT, Alaska.
Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, Florida.

STOCK DISTRIBUTION TREATED AS RETURN OF CAPITAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8847) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that a distribution of stock made to an individual (or certain corporations) pursuant to an order enforcing the antitrust laws shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital; and to provide that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes in opposition to the motion to recommit.

NEED FOR PASSAGE OF DU PONT BILL

The question presented by H.R. 8847 is one of simple justice. Under a new interpretation of section 7 of the Clayton Act, the Du Pont Co. is now required to divest its 63 million shares of General Motors stock, most of which it has held for nearly half a century. This stock has a current market value of nearly $3½ billion. Although its legal owner is the Du Pont Co., the actual owners are the 210,000 common stockholders of record of Du Pont, and beneficial holders representing many thousands more.

There is no dispute over how Du Pont shall divest. The proposed judgments submitted to the trial court in Chicago by both the Department of Justice and the Du Pont Co. agree that within 10 years after the effective date of this judgment Du Pont shall completely divest itself of all General Motors stock, by distribution to its stockholders and/or by such other methods or combination of methods as it may select, subject to the provisions of this judgment.

NO EFFECT ON ANTITRUST LAWS

Nothing in this legislation, therefore, will affect the antitrust considerations in this case. It is settled that Du Pont must divest, and that the management of the Du Pont Co. is to have discretion as to methods used in carrying out the divestiture. What the Senate does with respect to H.R. 8847 will not have one iota of influence upon the court, but it will vitally influence the decisions which will have to be made by the management of the Du Pont Co.

Our tax law is such that if Du Pont owned 80 percent of General Motors, instead of 23 percent, it could distribute these shares to its stockholders without tax. Since Du Pont only owns 23 percent, such a distribution under present law would be taxable to individual stockholders as a dividend, at effective ordinary income rates ranging from 16 to 87 percent of the market value of the shares received. The president of the Du Pont Co., Mr. Greenewalt, told the Finance Committee—hearings, page 77—that—

> The very size of the tax and, associated with it, the staggering capital losses through depression of market values, clearly rule out such a distribution when other methods of divestiture are available.

Mr. Greenewalt advised the committee that if H.R. 8847 is not enacted, the Du Pont Co. will use other methods than a pro rata distribution. He presented estimates indicating that the use of these methods would yield about the same amount of tax revenue to the Treasury over a 10-year period that the enactment of H.R. 8847 would produce over a 3-year period, and these estimates were not challenged by the Treasury representative at the hearings on the basis of the assumptions utilized. The issue of revenue, therefore, is no longer relevant.

QUESTION OF JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS

Instead, I repeat, we have a question of simple justice. I believe the fairest method of divestiture would be a pro rata distribution to Du Pont stockholders. They would own no more than they own today, except that they would hold their General Motors stock directly instead of indirectly, and would have two stock certificates instead of one. They would receive dividends on this stock from General Motors directly instead of through the Du Pont Co. Their dividend from Du Pont, and the value of their Du Pont stock, would be correspondingly reduced.

If H.R. 8847 is enacted, this could, and Mr. Greenewalt indicated it would, be done. The bill before us would treat this compulsory distribution as a return of capital to individual stockholders, rather than as a dividend. Here is the way it would work, assuming the current $55 market value for General Motors at the time of distribution.

COMPUTATION OF TAX

An individual stockholder who paid $200 for his Du Pont share would receive $76 worth of General Motors stock. He would then subtract $76 from $200, which would leave $124 as the new cost basis for his Du Pont share in computing his capital gain or loss if and when he sells the share. Neither income nor capital gains tax would be imposed at the time of distribution upon stockholders who paid more than $76 for their Du Pont share, but this $76 would be taken into account for capital gains tax purposes when they sell the Du Pont share. More than two-thirds of the Du Pont stockholders—all those who have purchased their shares since 1950, are in this category.

On the other hand, the fewer than one-third of the stockholders who acquired Du Pont for less than $76—and this includes most of the large holdings—would pay a capital gains tax at the time of distribution on the difference between $76 and what they paid for their Du Pont share. Moreover, the cost basis of their Du Pont share would be reduced to zero for computation of their capital gains tax when they sell this share.

It is plain, therefore, that the enactment of H.R. 8847 would not permit any Du Pont stockholder to escape one penny of capital gains tax to which he otherwise would be subjected. Any appreciation in value due to Du Pont's investment in General Motors would be taxed just as it would be under existing law upon the stockholder's realization of the gain. But if H.R. 8847 is enacted, these 210,000 stockholders could receive the General Motors shares which are rightfully theirs without being subjected to what in effect would be a capital levy under existing law.

TAX ON CHRISTIANA WOULD BE INCREASED

The bill we are considering provides special treatment for a corporation which is a party to an antitrust proceeding and receives stock in an antitrust distribution. The intercorporate dividend tax payable by such a corporation would be based on the market value of distributed stock, rather than on market value or cost to the distributing corporation, whichever is lower, as provided by present law. This provision would increase the tax payable by Christiana Securities Corp., which holds about 30 percent of the Du Pont stock, from 16 cents to about $4.30 per General Motors share. If Christiana, in turn, should distribute the General Motors shares it receives from Du Pont to its own individual stockholders, they would receive the same return of capital treatment that the bill provides for individual Du Pont stockholders.

There was considerable discussion in the Finance Committee over whether Christiana, in fact, would pass through to its shareholders the General Motors stock received from Du Pont in a distribution. I would suggest to the Senate that this question is one which the courts properly will decide. The Department of Justice has asked the trial court to require Christiana to dispose of any General Motors shares received by any method except distribution to its shareholders. This is an antitrust consideration which the courts, rather than the Congress, should and must decide in the public interest. But whether Christiana distributes the stock or sells it, the revenue to the Treasury will be about the same.

PREFER GENERAL RATHER THAN PRIVATE BILL

Certain opponents of this bill, Mr. President, have been hopping around like a cat on a hot tin roof trying to find new objections to raise as fast as their original objections are discredited. In all frankness, I must say that I would have preferred to have before us a bill dealing generally with the taxation of all antitrust divestitures, rather than one specifically with the Du Pont-General Motors case.

Mr. President, I have some feeling that if we go forward and pass the pending bill as a private bill, it will come back to plague us, because the day may come when another divestiture may be required by court order. If the tax terms which Congress provides on that occasion are less generous than it has provided for Du Pont, we will be accused of favoring a giant corporation; if they are more generous than we provide here, we will face the charge that we have deliberately chosen to treat this one company more harshly than we are willing to treat all other companies.

We are confronted, however, with an urgent need for action to protect nearly 1 million American investors—stockholders of these two great companies—from unwarranted and unjust economic harm. The Department of Justice made it plain to the appropriate committees of Congress that it would object to any legislation unless it were confined to this case—hearings, page 61. This is a special bill only because the Department has insisted that it be a special bill. It is the best we can hope to get enacted into law and signed by the President.

I am also impressed that during the first session of the Congress, H.R. 8847 was approved almost unanimously by the Ways and Means Committee of the House, the Rules Committee of the House, and the House itself, as well as receiving approval by a vote of 14 to 2 in our own Finance Committee.

If we are to hope to have the strong and healthy economy which we must maintain to meet the threats of Communist aggression, we must provide fair treatment for investors in American industry, just as we must provide equally fair treatment for other segments of our society, and we should not be respecters of persons. I shall vote for H.R. 8847 in the firm belief that it is just to my fellow citizens and is in the public interest, even though, as I said a moment ago, I would have preferred to vote for a bill which would cover all cases of divestiture, rather than one limited to the situation with which we are dealing now.

Mr. KEFAUVER rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator from Tennessee that the Senate is now operating under a time limitation agreement. The Senator will have to have some time yielded to him.

Mr. BENNETT. How much time does the Senator require?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to have about 3 minutes.

Mr. BENNETT. Who controls the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore].

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am authorized to hold the time temporarily for my colleague from Tennessee. I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. President, I rise to give my support of those Senators who have argued so effectively in favor of the motion to recommit H.R. 8847 to committee, pending Judge LaBuy's decision on the Du Pont-GM divestiture plan. Frankly, I find their arguments irrebuttable.

I am strongly in favor of tax relief for innocent shareholders, caught in the web of antitrust divestiture decrees. But how, Mr. President, are we to know which plan of divestiture will provide the most effective relief to innocent Du Pont—and GM—shareholders until we have given the court in Chicago a chance to speak?

The Du Pont Co. and its president, Mr. Greenewalt, contend that a divestiture accomplished without the aid of H.R. 8847 will cost innocent shareholders less than one achieved with H.R. 8847's assistance. They say that without this bill, the corporation will bear the burden of additional taxes; not the innocent shareholders. If these arguments are correct, innocent shareholders will be injured both directly and indirectly by H.R. 8847's passage at this time.

I am not saying that Mr. Greenewalt's argument is correct or incorrect. All I am saying is that we cannot know whether or not Greenewalt is right until the court in Chicago has had a chance to speak.

It is improper for this Congress to attempt to influence in any way—no matter how subtle or how indirect that influence may be—the decision of a duly constituted Federal court, acting in its constitutionally delegated judicial capacity.

Now some will argue that our debate on H.R. 8847 has made clear beyond a shadow of a doubt to the district court in Chicago that we are not trying to influence its decision by passing H.R. 8847. Frankly, this seems rather naive to me. The mere fact of our rushing this bill to passage before that court has an opportunity to make its decision, speaks more eloquently than all the words of the able proponents of the bill.

I fail to see how any reasonable man can construe such action on our part as anything other than an instruction from the U.S. Senate as to how the Du Pont-GM case is to be decided.

The only way in which we can make entirely clear to Judge LaBuy that the U.S. Congress is not an advocate on behalf of any of the parties involved in the litigation before him is to give him a chance to speak first.

Moreover, I note with great interest the remarks by Assistant Attorney General Oberdorfer, made during the course of his testimony before the Senate Finance Committee, last August. At that time, Mr. Oberdorfer indicated that the Tax Division was currently drafting legislation which would apply to situations such as this. It would be based on a tax deferral plan, rather than on revision of the basis of taxation as in H.R. 8847.

Mr. Oberdorfer suggested that the income received by innocent shareholders as a result of a divestiture plan could be treated in much the same way as the Internal Revenue Service currently treats blocked currency income of corporations doing business abroad.

Such a proposal would have the effect of difusing the market impact of a divestiture order—as I understand it, one of the basic reasons for the claimed necessity of passing H.R. 8847 at this time—by making it possible for taxpayers to avoid the immediate tax necessity to sell their stock.

Such legislation would, of course, raise knotty technical tax problems. How can we pass on such legislative problems without first having the opportunity to carefully study any proposals which the Department of Justice may have?

However, it does seem clear to me that if the Department plans to introduce legislation later in the session which has a direct bearing on this problem, we would be most ill-advised to rush a bill to passage without the benefit of whatever thoughts and ideas they may have on the subject. Surely, waiting would be the wiser legislative course for us to follow.

The proponents of H.R. 8847 most articulately contend that it is not designed to influence Judge LaBuy in any way. If this is true, I can see no possible objection to awaiting the proposals of the Attorney General before deciding what sort of bill should be the final fruits of our already Herculean consideration of this important problem. The people of the United States have waited years for the sort of bill we are now considering. Surely they can continue to wait for the few extra weeks it will take Mr. Oberdorfer to make his ideas known to the Congress.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I wholeheartedly support the motion by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee to recommit H.R. 8847 to committee until such time as a final decision is reached by the courts as to how the Du Pont-GM divestiture plan is to be carried out.

Mr. President, I also feel—and I have expressed myself previously—that any plan to give relief to individual stockholders, so as to put them on a capital gains basis rather than on a straight income tax basis, ought to be in the form of a general bill. I feel that a general bill, setting forth a simple law for situations of this kind, would be a good antitrust policy if it would make the courts less reluctant to order divestitures. A general bill would have this effect insofar as it would assure a court that innocent stockholders would not be harmed by a divestiture order. I would even go so far as to provide some relief in cases of monopoly if a recommendation were made by the Attorney General or the Federal Trade Commission to spin off a corporation so as to prevent a monopoly condition.

I can readily see that there should be, perhaps, some distinction between individual, innocent stockholders, and the management responsible for the unlawful activities which resulted in the antitrust violation. Of course, this is difficult to spell out, and would require a good deal of consideration.

The able junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] has an amendment pending, the aim of which is to make this general legislation. I, too, have prepared such an amendment. I send it to the desk and ask that it be printed, if there is still time to have it printed, for consideration by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Iowa or a similar amendment, or I shall offer my own in due course, in the event the motion to recommit is not agreed to.

I feel that with all the confusion and uncertainty as to whether the bill offers the best plan or Mr. Greenewalt's plan would be better for the individual stockholders—for it is they about whom we should be concerned—we ought to wait until this question has been determined in the courts before we act.

I notice that the motion of my colleague from Tennessee provides that the bill is to be reported back after the final judicial determination. It seems to me that we would be on safer ground at that time.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is the Senate scheduled to vote at the hour of 2 o'clock; and up to that time is the time controlled?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** That is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wonder if any Senator wishes to speak now. If no Senator desires to address the Senate at this time, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum, to determine whether any of the proponents of the pending motion desire to return to the Chamber.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, who is in control of the time?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the mover of the motion and the majority leader control the time. If the distinguished Senator from Ohio wishes to speak in favor of the motion, and if the mover of the motion is temporarily not in the Chamber, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio be yielded 5 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. No; 2 minutes will be sufficient.

Mr. KERR. From the time of the proponents of the motion?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall vote in favor of the motion to recommit. Basically, I have a strong antipathy toward the passage of special legislation in the midst of judicial proceedings. I have been involved in such a situation on a number of occasions and have always looked upon such a practice with disdain.

Litigation is pending in Chicago, and in the midst of that litigation a bill has been introduced, not to change the law dealing with the antitrust proceedings, but to change the tax provisions of the Federal law. I recognize that involved in the antitrust suit are many innocent stockholders who may be prejudicially and unjustly affected in the event they are compelled to pay a tax on the basis of earnings rather than on the basis of a capital gain. However, I fail to see how we will not be in a position to cope with that problem after the court has pronounced its decision.

I have read the arguments which have been made on the floor of the Senate, and I see rather clearly an ability to equitably dispose of the various rights which are involved. It seems to me that the actual participants in the monopoly operation and in the establishment of the monopoly trust should be placed in a different category from that of the innocent stockholders who purchased practically on the basis of an estoppel which ought to be applied against the Government. In other words, for 30 years the Government said by its silence, "There is no monopoly"; but at the end of 30 years this challenge has been made. In the study of equity, I remember a discussion of the doctrine of estoppel: "He who does not speak when he should, will not be permitted to speak when he would."

So, Mr. President, with regard to these persons, wholly separate and apart from the participants in the monopoly, in my judgment they should eventually be treated differently from the way those who were participants are treated.

I find myself in an impasse when I contemplate what should be done with this stock of General Motors, if and when it reaches the Christiana Corp. Shall it be distributed as stock to the stockholders of Christiana Corp.; or shall it be ordered sold, so as to ramify the holdings of this stock among the citizens of our country?

In my judgment we can justly wait; after the decree has been rendered, we can achieve what is sought honestly to be achieved, in my judgment, by both the proponents and the opponents of this bill.

Mr. President, while I am considering that thought, I wish to say I give no subscription to the argument that the chairman of the Finance Committee or the other members of the Finance Committee acted in any manner other than to serve the most legitimate purpose to perform their duties as they saw them. I think it rather tragic that we permit ourselves to be sidetracked into a collateral discussion.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time available to the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I have another minute? I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute more.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, we have no objection.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the Senator from Ohio may proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I was saying that I believe it rather tragic that we have permitted ourselves to be sidetracked into a collateral discussion which has diverted the minds of Senators from the primary issues, and has directed them to a matter which is entirely collateral.

Mr. President, I repeat that basically I oppose the passage of special legislation while judicial proceedings are being had. After the decision of the judge is rendered, I believe we can deal with this problem.

It is argued, on the one hand, that there is no purpose to influence the court. But the opponents say the net result will be to influence the court. Because of my purpose not to influence the court, I shall resolve that doubt by voting in favor of the motion to recommit the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. How much time remains available and under the control of the mover of the motion, on the one hand, and the majority leader, on the other hand?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has 29 minutes remaining under his control. The opposition side has 26 minutes remaining under its control.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, apparently no Senator on our side of the aisle desires to speak at this time. I would suggest the absence of a quorum unless some Senator on the majority side desires to speak now.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I intend to speak before the motion of the Senator from Tennessee is voted on. Let me ask whether there are no more proponents of the bill who wish to speak? I believe they have 26 minutes remaining under their control.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Twenty-nine minutes.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Chair previously stated that the opponents have 26 minutes remaining.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Chair state what time remains to each side?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Twenty-six minutes remain available to the proponents, and 29 minutes remain available to the opponents.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I believe the situation is just the opposite to that.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair stands corrected. Twenty-nine minutes remain available to the proponents, and 26 minutes remain available to the opponents.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is to say, to the proponents of the motion?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then I suggest that the opponents of the motion—who are the proponents of the bill—therefore take some of the time available to them, before those of us who seek to defer action on the bill speak. I await with interest to see whether some proponents of the bill are ready to speak at this time, to defend the bill.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that the opponents of the motion to recommit have consumed more time than have the proponents.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time taken by the Senator from Illinois in orienting himself in regard to the parliamentary situation not be charged to the time available to either side under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair state the amount of time which has been consumed by those who support the motion to recommit, and also the amount of time which has been consumed by those who oppose the motion to recommit, so that we may have the benefit of a clear and definite statement on that matter.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I would not wish to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement which would result in having the scheduled vote taken after 2 p.m. If the intent of the request of the Senator from Oklahoma is to postpone the time of the taking of the vote, I would wish to object.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. How much time has been consumed by the proponents of the motion to recommit, and how much time has been consumed by the opponents of the motion to recommit?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-seven minutes have been consumed by the proponents.

Mr. DOUGLAS. By the proponents of the bill, who are the opponents of the motion to recommit? I wish to know how many minutes have been consumed by both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-one minutes have been consumed by the proponents of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. By the proponents of the bill or by the proponents of the motion to recommit—because the motion to recommit is being proposed by the opponents of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And 24 minutes have been consumed by the opponents.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The opponents of what?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The opponents of the motion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The opponents of the motion have consumed 24 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; and the proponents of the motion have consumed 21 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then I suggest that the debate be resumed.

Mr. President, this is an extremely important bill, and I believe it would be very judicious——

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry: Does the Senator from Illinois yield time to himself; and, if so, how much time?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], I shall manage the time available to our side.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, let me ask whether the Senator from Illinois yields time to himself; and, if so, how much time?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall yield such time as I may require.

Mr. KERR. Very good.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Du Pont suit now being heard in Chicago is a tremendously important one. It involves the question as to whether the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family will continue to control General Motors Corp. At present they control it because they control Christiana, owning or controlling 80 percent of Christiana, which in turn owns 29 percent of Du Pont, which in turn controls 23 percent of General Motors. This gives them multiplied power inside the General Motors Co.

The issue in Chicago is whether Christiana will be compelled to divest—and the Government is saying it should divest—and if so, how it should divest; and the Government is, of course, maintaining that it should be a divestiture by sale rather than by pass-through to the Du Pont family as individuals.

The 65 members of the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family own as individuals 3.4 percent of General Motors stock.

There are various trust groups which administer General Motors stock for them, which own seven-tenths of 1 percent of General Motors stock in addition. The possession of those shares of stock is not at issue, and the 4.1 percent will continue to be in the hands of the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family.

What is at issue deals with the 5.4 percent of the General Motors stock which is held by Christiana. That is the point. Du Pont is maintaining, first, that Christiana should not divest, or, if it must divest, that it should divest by pass-through, which would largely permit the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family as individuals to control General Motors, because their aggregate holdings would amount to 9.4 percent. In view of the fact that no other single holding exceeds 1 percent, this would give them virtual control of the company.

As the Senator from Tennessee has said, the question is whether the Du Pont family, which thus far has lost twice in the courts—not in the decisions of the district court, but in the decisions of the Supreme Court—is to win on the floor of the Congress by getting a tax bill through which would give a strong lead to the court as to how it should decide these issues still before the court.

On yesterday I went into this question at some length, and in the speech, which is contained on pages 633 to 636 of the RECORD, I dealt with the tax effects which are involved.

In the first place, the present bill provides that the tax to Christiana, if Christiana does not divest, will amount to only about $4.29 a share. Of course, we realize in all this discussion that Christiana bought General Motors stock at an average price of $2.09, and that the stock is now worth $55 a share. The appreciation in value has been approximately $53 a share. On the value of some 18.3 million shares held by Christiana, the appreciation has been almost precisely $1 billion, and the appreciation in value of General Motors stock in the hands of the Du Pont Co. is $3⅓ billion, including the $1 billion of Christiana.

There is a powerful inducement in the bill to indicate that Congress is making the tax effects much lighter if there is no divestiture by Christiana than if there is divestiture, the tax being only, as I have said, $4.29 a share if there is no divestiture.

In the table which I prepared, and which appears on page 635 of yesterday's RECORD, we have the respective changes which the bill makes with respect to the tax effects if there is a sale by Christiana or a pass-through. In brief, this table shows that if there is divestiture by sale under the present law, the ordinary capital gains tax will apply, approximately $13.25 a share, namely, 25 percent of the $53 increase in share value. That is under the present law. But under the bill as presented, there would be a capital gains tax of $11.25, a slight reduction.

But notice that there is both a greater relative and an absolute reduction in the case of divestiture by pass-through under the bill, and this would leave 9.4 percent of General Motors stock in the hands of the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family.

If there is a pass-through by Christiana under the present law, assuming that the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family are in the 60-percent tax bracket, they would pay the ordinary income tax rates, or $33 a share.

If they are in the 70-percent tax bracket, they would pay $38.50. If they are in the 75-percent tax bracket, they would pay $41.25. If they are in the 80-percent tax bracket, they would pay $44 a share.

That would apply under the present law. But if there is a pass-through under H.R. 8847 they would pay only $8.76 a share, calculated on the average basis or the original cost of Christiana stock to Christiana stockholders, which is approximately $27 a share.

Notice, therefore, in the first place, that the relative reduction in the tax for Christiana which is effected by this bill is much greater in the case of divestiture by pass-through than in the case of divestiture by sale. And, secondly, that the absolute tax is less under divestiture by pass-through than under divestiture by sale, namely, $8.76 as contrasted with $11.25.

So I think we can sum up the tax effects of this bill with respect to divestiture by Christiana of its General Motors stock in the following ways:

First. The bill makes no particular change in the tax effects of a sale by Christiana of its General Motors stock, as compared with the effects of the present law. Both under the bill and under present law the tax would be at the capital gains rate. The percentage tax and the principles applied to the gain by Christiana would be the same.

Second. The bill greatly reduces the tax effects of a pass-through by Christiana to its stockholders of its General Motors stock.

Third. The bill changes the tax effects of a pass-through under present law from a large, relative tax disadvantage to the Christiana shareholder—$33, or more—as compared with a sale—$13.23, to a relative advantage for a pass-through—$8.76—as compared with a sale—$11.25. The bill therefore gives a distinct lead to the court to decide the case in favor of a pass-through of the Christiana holdings, rather than a sale.

Mr. President, this is why the Senator from Tennessee and I have been contending the Senate should postpone consideration of the tax bill until after a decision has been rendered by the courts in the General Motors antitrust case. If we act as the majority of the Members seem to be bent on acting this afternoon, we shall be putting into effect tax favors which give a great advantage for no divestiture by Christiana at all, and which give absolute and relative advantages for a divestiture by pass-through rather than a divestiture by sale. We are, therefore, placed in the position of lining up fairly and squarely on the side of the Du Pont Co. in the contentions which are being made in Chicago, and we can be certain that the able attorneys for the Du Pont Co.—and they are able, indeed—will use the action which we are taking as a distinct argument that it was the intent of the Congress to favor either no divestiture at all or, if divestiture should occur, a divestiture by pass-through rather than by sale.

That is the issue. It may have been made somewhat difficult to understand because of the fact that there are corporations within corporations, but anyone who has read the Record very carefully—and I hope my colleagues have done so—will understand what is the issue.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, without the time being taken from the allocated period, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would that in any way interfere with a vote on the motion at 2 o'clock?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. To make that very plain, I withdraw my request, although that is not needed, because we agreed to vote at 2 o'clock, and I ask that the time necessary for the call of the roll be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hickey in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as is required out of the time remaining on the part of the opponents of the motion to recommit.

It seems to the Senator from Oklahoma that at this stage of its consideration it would be futile to recommit the bill to the Senate Committee on Finance for further consideration or deliberation by the committee.

The bill in one form or another has been before the committees of the House and the Senate for nearly 4 years. It has been considered by the Senate Finance Committee for many weeks and, of course, has had the consideration of members of the Finance Committee for years.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KERR. Who is the author of the motion to recommit?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore].

Mr. KERR. It seems to the Senator from Oklahoma that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore] has had a wide range of mixed emotions, opinions, and sentiments with reference to the bill. He now wishes to recommit the bill to the committee that has had it in one form or another for many years, during all of which time he has been a member of the committee. When the bill was before the committee last year, and immediately prior to its being acted upon by the committee, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee wanted to postpone consideration of the bill by the committee. In other words, at the time it was before the committee he did not want to have it considered by the committee. In fact, the chairman of the committee postponed the consideration of the bill, I believe, approximately 2 weeks—if I am in error, I am sure the Senator from Tennessee will correct me—while the Senator from Tennessee was not in Washington, and requested that the bill not be considered by the committee in his absence. The request was granted, and the committee gave no consideration to the bill during his absence because of his request that it not do so.

When the distinguished Senator from Tennessee returned, the chairman of the committee called the bill to the committee's attention for its consideration and deliberation. The time of the session of Congress was growing short. I recall quite vividly the day the bill was before the committee for action. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee will recall that he and the Senator from Illinois, one of the principal opponents of the bill, and the Senator from Oklahoma took a good deal of the committee's time that morning in talking about other matters. However, the time approached on that memorable day when the committee was about to act on the pending bill, and the hour of noon was approaching with equal speed and momentum. The Senate was due to go into session at 12 o'clock noon that day.

The distinguished chairman of the committee had asked the majority leader to request unanimous consent of the Senate that the Finance Committee be permitted to sit in session that afternoon to consider the bill. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee, as was his right and privilege, left the committee about 5 minutes before 12. He came to the floor. When the request was made that the Finance Committee be permitted to sit that afternoon to consider the bill, the request was objected to by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. Thus, while the bill was before the committee by reason of the action of the Senator from Tennessee, the committee was not permitted to sit in deliberation over and consideration of the bill. It was necessary in the minds of the committee, in order that it might deliberate on it and still meet the objections and the desires of the Senator from Tennessee to postpone their deliberations on it, to meet that evening after the Senate had adjourned.

That evening the Committee on Finance considered the bill again. It was considered over a considerable period of time, but one of numerous times that the committee had considered the matter. The committee reported the bill to the Senate.

The Senator from Tennessee advised the Senator from Oklahoma, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], that the Senate would not have an opportunity to vote on the bill in the closing days of the 1961 session, even though it was the pending business. Due to the objections of certain Members of the Senate, including the Senator from Tennessee, due to the time that was taken, and the indication of the time that would be devoted to it, it became apparent that the Senate would not have the opportunity to vote on the bill in the 1961 session.

Unanimous consent was given that when the Senate returned in January of this year, the bill would be the pending business, and that beginning on January 15 it would be before the Senate for its consideration. Now the Senator from Tennessee wants to move to recommit the bill to the Finance Committee. He says this is a matter which is pending in a Federal court, and that we should not vote on it while it is before the court.

It is interesting that the Senator from Tennessee, from the great Volunteer State, should feel thus tenderly about the Federal court. It is especially significant in the light of the debate that took place later in the Senate in June 1960, when the Senator from Tennessee had an amendment before the Senate seeking to amend the tax laws of our country. He offered an amendment, which appears in the Congressional Record, volume 106, part 10, page 13216.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore] offered an amendment to the first committee amendment, and sent it to the desk. It was reported to the Senate. It had to do with determining or fixing the point or stage in the processing of raw materials at which the depletion allowance provided by law would apply. It was a matter that the Senator from Tennessee felt very strongly about. On page 13217 he said to the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington]:

> This is an amendment, I may say to the able junior Senator from Missouri, which Congress should have enacted a long time ago.

In the course of the debate and discussion the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson] called attention to the fact that the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee had been before the Ways and Means Committee of the House and had been before the Senate

Finance Committee, and had not been acted on by either committee favorably. At page 13218, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico said:

> That is why, frankly, I said in the committee that I thought the Senator from Tennessee had performed a valuable function. I thought the proposal he made was extremely important. The only reason why I, for one, was willing to withhold action was that the High Court might conclude that the lower courts were wrong. If the High Court ruled that the lower courts were wrong, then the matter would be solved by that decision. If the High Court should hold to the contrary, then I am quite certain that the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance would have to address themselves to this question immediately and diligently.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] replied at page 13219, as follows:

> The Senator from New Mexico has made an entirely fair and frank statement. I wish, however, to differ with him as to the advisability of legislative action. In essence, the Senator is proposing to let the Supreme Court legislate. I doubt if Members of the Senate, upon careful consideration, want to abdicate their responsibility in writing the tax laws, and then await an effort to get an interpretation from the High Court, the Court of Last Resort. That, in essence, is what the able Senator from New Mexico has said: "Let us not legislate on this subject; let us wait to see if the Supreme Court will not do so."

There was some more discussion between the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. Then the Senator from Tennessee made what I thought was a very pertinent remark, a very able remark, and I should like to read it:

> Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am not a Harvard Law School graduate.

Mr. President, then I knew there was a community of interest between me and the Senator from Tennessee. I had practiced law for a number of years, and I was not a Harvard Law School graduate either. I had never had the benefit of such education, but, like the Senator from Tennessee, I felt I had never been handicapped or shackled by it.

Continuing, the Senator from Tennessee said:

> I obtained my education in law at the YMCA night school.

I never inquired into that, but took the statement at face value.

Continuing, the Senator from Tennessee said:

> But based on my limited learning and on my experience as a legislator, I believe it is properly the province of the legislative branch of the Government to lay down the guidelines for our tax laws, rather than to await, petition, and beseech the judicial branch to lay down the guidelines. That is a very basic point in connection with this matter. So in that regard I wish to disagree with my able friend.

Mr. President, I can only say that I never agreed with a statement by a Member of this body more than I do with what the Senator from Tennessee said on that day in June 1960, namely, that the matter of legislation on taxes is a responsibility of Congress, not a function of the court. The interpretation is the function of the court, yes. The legislation, as was so ably stated by the Senator from Tennessee on that day, is a function and responsibility of the legislative.

It has been made clear in the report of the Committee on Finance that the action of Congress in this matter is in no way to influence the courts or to suggest what their ruling shall be on the divestiture of stock with respect to the enforcement of the antitrust law. The legislative intent has been made clear by the chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], by the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Oklahoma, who now speaks. It is, however, the responsibility of the Senate—and of Congress—to legislate with reference to taxation.

I was interested in the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. I remember that when this proposal was before the Committee on Finance for deliberation, one of the exhibits read was a letter from the Senator from Tennessee to the chairman, which is as follows:

> Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
> *Chairman, Senate Finance Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is my understanding that your committee will hold hearings tomorrow on legislation to reduce the economic hardship on shareholders of Du Pont stock arising out of the divestiture of General Motors stock. Although the divestiture resulted from antitrust action, I believe that it would work undue hardship on shareholders. Therefore, I wish to be on public record in favor of the legislation in principal and hope you will make this letter a part of the record of the hearings.
>
> With kind regards,
> Sincerely yours,
> ESTES KEFAUVER,
> *U.S. Senator.*

So the senior Senator from Tennessee in his letter recommended and urged favorable action on the bill and its passage by Congress.

Mr. President, under these circumstances, I urge that the motion to recommit be rejected and that the Senate proceed with its deliberations on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. My time has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time remains to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Tennessee has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am grateful that my colleague, friend, and fellow committee member, the able senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], has reviewed the long fight in which I have taken a part, and the various steps which I have taken, in trying to prevent the enactment of the pending bill. I am proud of all those steps. The keen disappointment I feel today, bordering upon heartbreak, is that I have not been able to reach a larger number of Senators on this difficult, technical, and complicated subject. Few more important questions will be before the Senate for a long while to come.

The heart of the question is not how much will be paid in taxes or which particular class of taxpayers will pay those taxes, but rather whether the effort to enforce the antitrust laws will succeed or fail. That is the important question.

There is another very important aspect in which the bill sets a precedent. It provides for the distribution of corporate assets whose aggregate value is the largest ever distributed, with only nominal taxes to many taxpayers. The tax will be as low as 16 cents a share to some corporate shareholders, this being the total tax paid by these shareholders on receipt of their pro rata share of General Motors stock now held by Du Pont.

However, I wish to address my remarks in this brief time to the antimonopoly issue. I wonder where other Senators are who have made eloquent speeches about our free competitive enterprise system. Let me read what the Federal Trade Commission said in a report entitled "The Du Pont Complex," which it made after an investigation.

> This report presents an analysis of the Du Pont complex. In this complex are to be found some of the largest corporations in American industry, representing a tremendous aggregation of economic power.

Because of the brief time allotted to me, I shall have to read only briefly from the report. I read further:

> Briefly, the report reveals the existence of a system of preempted, closed markets of significance to all business units seeking to engage in the manufacture and sale of the same or competing products. It reveals the apparent existence of a division of markets between large sellers and large buyers for a number of important products.

I close with these two sentences:

> Of all the problems involved in the concentration of economic power, none is more difficult of solution than this problem of the interest group or complex of giant corporations. Yet none is more important of solution if a free, competitive economy is to be maintained.

The distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma has again stated that it is not the purpose of the bill to influence the decision of the court. Yet the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], a member of the committee, said on the floor of the Senate that the primary purpose of the bill was to make it easier for the court to render its decision. What kind of decision? In my view, the bill makes it easier for the court to render the kind of decision which the Du Pont Co. and the Christiana Corp. want the court to render. There is evidence of that. There has been much propaganda about how hundreds of thousands of stockholders would benefit by the bill. Are Senators aware that unless the court renders a decision in conformity with the terms of the bill, not one benefit will flow from the bill to any stockholder whatsoever? Is not that designed to influence the decision of the judge? If it is not, then why pass the bill?

In the 16 minutes used by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma in his speech just now, he recalled a number of instances in which I have opposed the bill; but I submit that he did not give one reason why we should pass the bill. The court in Chicago is in its final sitting on the case now. Final briefs have been called for. The issue that has been in litigation since 1949 is in the final stages of litigation. Yet we are asked to provide a legislative solution. This bill is not on all fours with the bill passed in 1960 to which the Senator from Oklahoma referred. That was prospective legislation. It did not undertake to deal with a case in the courts.

I ask Senators to consider this as the serious question that it is and to vote to return the bill to committee with instructions to act on the bill after the decision of the court has been rendered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Burdick in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Chair state the pending motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the motion that the pending bill, H.R. 8847, be recommitted to the Committee on Finance and that the committee be instructed to report to the Senate at such time as a final order prescribing the terms of divestiture of General Motors stock by E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. shall have been entered, a bill providing such tax relief as the committee may deem appropriate and equitable.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I trust that the Chair will restate the pending motion in its entirety, and also will state the name of the author of the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending motion will be read.

The Legislative Clerk. It has been moved by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore] that the pending bill, H.R. 8847, be recommitted to the Committee on Finance and that the committee be instructed to report to the Senate at such time as a final order prescribing the terms of divestiture of General Motors stock by E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. shall have been entered, a bill providing such tax relief as the committee may deem appropriate and equitable.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, let me state that a copy of the pending motion has been placed on the desk of each Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez] is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maine would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Butler] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] is absent on official business, to attend the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of American States.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Butler] and the Senators from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper and Mr. Miller] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 67, as follows:

[No. 3 Leg.]

YEAS—25

Bartlett
Burdick
Carroll
Church
Clark
Douglas
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hayden
Humphrey
Jackson
Kefauver
Lausche
Long, Hawaii
Magnuson
McGee
McNamara
Metcalf
Moss
Neuberger
Pell
Proxmire
Smith, Mass.
Yarborough

NAYS—67

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Bush
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Capehart
Carlson
Case, N.J.
Case, S. Dak.
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dworshak
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hartke
Hickey
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Javits
Johnston
Jordan
Keating
Kerr
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pastore
Prouty
Randolph
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith, Maine
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Wiley
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—7

Butler
Chavez
Eastland
Hickenlooper
Miller
Morse
Muskie

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the motion to recommit was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up my amendments identified as "1-16-62—A," and ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendments be dispensed with, that they appear in the Record at this point, and I ask for the yeas and nay on the amendments.

There being no objection, the amendments were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

On page 2, lines 7 and 8, strike out ", to a qualifying shareholder (as defined in subsection (b))" and insert "to a shareholder".

On page 2, strike out lines 12 through 16.

On page 2, line 17, strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)".

On page 3, after line 2, insert the following:

"(3) Amount distributed to corporate distributees.—Notwithstanding section 301 (b)(1) (but subject to section 301(b)(2)), for purposes of this section the amount of a distribution of divested stock received by a corporation shall be the fair market value of such stock.

"(4) Basis of divested stock received by corporate distributees.—Notwithstanding section 301(d), the basis of divested stock received by a corporation in a distribution to which subsection (a) applies shall be the fair market value of such stock."

On page 3, line 3, strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)".

On page 3, line 12, strike out "(e)" and insert "(d)".

On page 2, line 7, strike out "(e)" and insert "(d)".

On page 5, beginning with line 4, strike out all through line 21 on page 12 (sections 2 and 3 of the bill).

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that a distribution of stock made pursuant to an order enforcing the antitrust laws shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital."

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time on this amendment is 2 hours.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I shall take only about 15 minutes.

Mr. President, under my amendment, everyone would pay a capital-gains tax. Under the bill in its present form, if Christiana does not divest, Christiana will pay only about one-third of what a capital-gains tax would be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield to himself?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield myself such time as I may require, but I do not expect to take more than 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, under the bill which is now before us, and which the Senate has refused to recommit, individual shareholders of Du Pont will pay a capital-gains tax. If Christiana is not ordered to divest, Christiana will pay only about one-third of what a capital-gains tax would be. The question as to whether or not Christiana will divest is one which is very much in dispute.

The Du Pont attorneys are maintaining that Christiana should not be compelled to divest. Then, only as a secondary evil, are they saying that if Christiana is compelled to divest it should be by a pass-through, largely to the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family, rather than by sale to the general public.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. Do I correctly understand the amendment of the Senator to apply to all Du Ponnt stockholders the same return of capital treatment, which is a modified capital gains treatment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GORE. May I inquire of the Senator, unless this is done are there not numerous corporations which will pay a tax of only three-tenths of 1 percent on the value of the General Motors stock they receive?

Mr. DOUGLAS. There are corporations other than Christiana which will pay a tax of only 7½ percent on original cost. If the original cost were the same to them as in the case of Christiana, this would be a tax of 16 cents a share on an apreciation of $53 a share.

Mr. GORE. Thus, the bill would levy a modified capital gains tax on individual stockholders, yet it would permit all corporate stockholders except Christiana to escape with a tax of 15 or 16 cents a share, which is about three-tenths of 1 percent?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct, assuming that the cost of the shares was the same as the cost of shares to Christiana.

Mr. GORE. The Senator's amendment would aply the same return of capital treatment, which is a reduced, modified capital gains tax, to all stockholders of Du Pont.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. President, it has been testified by Mr. Greenewalt, the very able president of Du Pont, that Du Pont bought its shares in General Motors at an average price of $2.09 a share. The stock is now worth $55 a share. There has been an accretion in value, therefore, of $53 a share.

On the 63 million shares held by Du Pont, there has been a total accretion in value of approximately $3⅓ billion. Upon the 18,300,000 shares of General Motors which would be Christiana's share, the total accretion in value has been almost precisely $1 billion. We are dealing, therefore, with enormous magnitudes.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I should like to complete my argument, if I may. I know that if I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma we shall get off on all kinds of subjects and it will be very difficult to get back to the subject under consideration.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for the compliment to my ability to divert his attention.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Oklahoma is the greatest expert at diversionary tactics and "muddying up" the record who ever graced the floor of the U.S. Senate. I mean that as a compliment, and I am sure he will appreciate it as such. I shall yield to the Senator later.

Mr. President, the bill would impose a tax of approximately $4.29 a share on the stock held by Christiana. That is a tax of 52 percent of 15 percent of the present market price, the market price being $55.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I am sure the Senator does not wish to leave the record in that shape.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the case of Christiana, based on the present market value, this is 52 percent of 15 percent of present market value.

Mr. KERR. Is not the Senator aware of the fact that the bill would require Christiana to pay a corporate tax on the full market value of the stock, when received?

Mr. DOUGLAS. What I am saying is that Christiana is to be taxed at the intercorporate rate, 52 percent of 15 percent but on the present market value. This is a change from the rule which applies to other corporations and in general to intercorporate dividends at present, of 52 percent of 15 percent of original cost. To this degree there has been a change and improvement.

What I am proposing is that Christiana should pay the 25-percent capital gains rate, which individuals would pay, for the increase in value which it has enjoyed. This would mean Christiana would be treated the same as individuals are treated, and would pay 25 percent, and other corporations would be treated in exactly the same way and would pay 25 percent of the increase in value. If the stock were purchased at $2.09 and is now worth $55, in each case that would amount to a tax of approximately $13.25 per share.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will yield in a moment. We are proposing that the treatment should be uniform to all corporations as well as to individuals.

Now I shall be glad to yield for a question, but I think perhaps I should yield first to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. PASTORE. I thought the Senator had done so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Well, I have.

Before the Senator asks me a question on this point I wish to point out that if Christiana is not ordered to divest this involves approximately $8.50 added tax per share, or a total of approximately $150 million on the shares held by Christiana, so there are enormous amounts at stake under the amendment.

Now I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. KERR. Under existing law, if Du Pont passed out a share of stock in General Motors to Christiana as a dividend——

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, we would like to hear the Senator. This is a very interesting question.

Mr. KERR. Under existing law, if a dividend of General Motors stock were to be passed to Christiana, Christiana would pay a corporate tax on 15 percent of the cost.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of the original cost; that is correct.

Mr. KERR. Of the original cost of the General Motors stock.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Or a tax of 16 cents a share. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. The calculation of the figure is something in which we could indulge.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would be 16 cents a share.

Mr. KERR. But it would be on the basis of a corporate tax of 15 percent of the cost to Du Pont.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. The average cost to Du Pont has been testified by Mr. Greenewalt to be $2.09 a share. The result is 16 cents a share.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Under the present law.

Mr. KERR. That is the existing law.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. Under the bill which is before the Senate Christiana would have to pay a corporate tax of 15 percent of market value.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of present market value, which is $55 instead of $2.09. This would result in a tax of approximately $4.29 a share.

Mr. KERR. That is in the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. Yet under the bill Christiana is the only corporate stockholder of Du Pont stock which would have to pay on 15 percent of market value. Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. I am proposing that the treatment be uniform and that there be paid a capital gains rate, by Christiana and other corporations exactly as individuals would pay a capital gains rate.

Mr. KERR. If the Senator is willing, I should like to continue. I do not wish to use the Senator's time. Any time I take may be charged to the other side.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is all right.

Mr. KERR. If the Senator is uneasy about the time factor we can do that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not at all. It is always a delight to converse with my charming friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. That is entirely mutual.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure it is.

Mr. KERR. Under present law or under the bill, any other corporate stockholder who had received any of the General Motors stock as a dividend as a result of divestiture from Du Pont would be taxed upon 15 percent of the original cost which, as the Senator has said, would be 16 cents a share.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have made that statement several times. The Senator is correct, if the stock were bought at $2.09.

Mr. KERR. That cost is that at which the Senator from Illinois said Du Pont had bought it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, but not necessarily the other corporations.

Mr. KERR. That is immaterial. The Senator from Illinois said it would be based upon what the stock cost Du Pont. If that statement is not correct, let us get it correct as we go along.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The principle is the same in both cases. It would be 52 percent on 15 percent of the original cost to the company involved.

Mr. KERR. Du Pont is the company involved, and General Motors is the stock involved.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The other companies are somewhat mysterious and it is not quite known whether they made direct purchases or not.

Mr. KERR. If they made direct purchases, they would not be getting the stock as a pass-through from Du Pont. I am addressing my question to what other corporate owners of Du Pont would pay under existing law or the bill on the stock passed through to them from Du Pont.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What the Senator has said is correct.

Mr. KERR. So Christiana would pay about $4.75 a share income tax. Other corporate stockholders would pay the 16 cents per share that the Senator has mentioned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Given those assumptions, the Senator is correct. I think they all ought to pay 25 percent on the accretion in value. That would be approximately $13.25, which is the same percentage tax that individuals would pay.

Mr. KERR. If the stock were passed through to Christiana, Christiana would keep the stock, pass it through to the stockholders, or sell it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Under the bill, if Christiana should keep the stock, it would pay approximately $4.29 a share.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is what I said.

Mr. KERR. The Department of Justice is asking the court to order Christiana to sell the stock.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KERR. If Christiana should sell the stock under a court order, Christiana would immediately owe a capital gains tax on whatever they receive above the original cost to Du Pont, plus 15 percent of the market value of such stock when passed through.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct. Under the bill it would be $11.25 a share. That is the point I make. The present bill would give such a great advantage, so far as Christiana is concerned, not to divest that the Du Pont attorneys could use that point as an argument before the court in Chicago that it was the intent of Congress to favor nondivestiture. I am trying to remove that implication by providing that Christiana pay approximately the same tax should it hold the stock as it would should it decide to divest by sale.

Mr. KERR. Is it the Senator's position that Christiana should pay a capital gains tax on that transaction whether they sell or not, or whether they pass through or not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct—the same as individuals would pay.

Mr. KERR. If they passed through to the individual stockholders, the stockholders would have to pay a capital gains tax, would they not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Under the bill they would pay a modified tax.

Mr. KERR. They would pay a capital gains tax in the same identical amount.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; not in the same identical amount.

Mr. KERR. In the same identical amount that Christiana would pay if Christiana should sell under a court order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If Christiana should divest by sale, there would be no added tax——

Mr. KERR. If Christiana should divest——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator permit me to finish the sentence?

Mr. KERR. I suggest that if the company should divest——

Mr. DOUGLAS. If Christiana should divest by sale, under my amendment there would be no added tax above the $13.25 that Christiana would originally pay. Under my amendment there would be no added tax.

Mr. KERR. I say that point is not significant to the debate.

The Senator from Illinois has said he wants all treated alike. The Senator from Oklahoma believes in treating all alike. But the record is that immediately upon pass-through of stock from Du Pont to Christiana, they would pay——

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator means under the bill.

Mr. KERR. Under the bill they would pay a tax of $4.29 a share, while any other corporate stockholder receiving stock would pay 19 cents a share tax.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Sixteen cents.

Mr. KERR. Sixteen cents a share.

Mr. DOUGLAS. My amendment would change that. I never believed in that 16 cents tax; and when the Du Pont people tried to put that point over 2 years ago in the Finance Committee—and I think the Senator from Oklahoma supported their position—the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and I fought that effort and, thank the Lord, by a narrow margin of 1 vote, by a vote of 8 to 7, the committee defeated the 16-cent tax.

Mr. KERR. I believe the Senator is entirely in error at that point. The committee reported the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am speaking of the action 2 years ago, not that of this year.

Mr. KERR. Under the bill as it came to the Senate and is now before it, Christiana is the only corporate stockholder which must pay on a basis other than that provided in present law.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KERR. If the court should permit Christiana to keep the stock, neither Christiana nor any other corporation would owe such tax until the stock is sold.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator mean under present law?

Mr. KERR. Under the present law and under the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator repeat what he said?

Mr. KERR. If the court should permit Christiana to keep the stock——

Mr. DOUGLAS. And not compel divestiture.

Mr. KERR. And not compel divestiture, Christiana would owe no further tax so long as it keeps the stock.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct. Under the bill it would pay $4.29.

Mr. KERR. Above the $4.29 it would owe no further tax.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would pay $4.29, and under the bill the company's obligation would be discharged if it were not required to divest.

Mr. KERR. Other corporate stockholders would pay but 16 cents.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Sixteen cents if the original cost was $2.09. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KERR. If the court should order Christiana to divest by sale, then, in addition to the $75 million or $80 million that Christiana would pay as an income tax, it would pay a capital gains tax on what it would receive from the stock above the basis of its cost.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Eleven dollars and twenty-five cents.

Mr. KERR. A share.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KERR. If the court should permit them under the bill to pass that stock through to their stockholders, they immediately would owe the identical capital gains tax.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; not quite.

Mr. KERR. To what extent would it differ?

Mr. DOUGLAS. As the Senator knows, there is a modified base, and the average base cost of Christiana stock to the individual Christiana stockholders is $27. Working with these average figures, it would be one-quarter of $27, or approximately $8.75.

Mr. KERR. But the stock that Christiana would receive from Du Pont would have the same cost base if passed through to the stockholder as it would have if Christiana should keep it and not be compelled to sell it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; the tax at this stage is related to the basic cost of the Christiana stock, not to the Du Pont or General Motors stock, as the Senator should realize.

Mr. KERR. The technical staff of the committee is present in the Chamber. I think in order to have the RECORD clear and accurate, since I know the Senator from Illinois is as anxious as the Senator from Oklahoma for the RECORD to be clear, I suggest that we ask a member of the staff that question.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma has called attention to the pass-through. I ask the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois if the bill does not propose a special tax advantage for a pass-through of General Motors stock through Christiana into the hands of a few members of the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family, in whose hands, as the Attorney General of the United States has said in a letter to the Senate, it would constitute continued control of both General Motors and Du Pont.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As contrasted with a sale.

Mr. GORE. As contrasted with a sale.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. That is what the Senator from Illinois said in his speech and what he said earlier this afternoon in discussing the bill. On a Christiana divestiture by a pass-through, the tax would be $8.76 a share. Under divestiture by sale, it would be $11.25 a share. That is why the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Illinois have been contending that the pending bill in its present form gives a lead to the court, first, for Christiana not to divest at all and, second, if divestiture is ordered to divest by pass-through rather than by sale. The effect of any one of these would be to give control of General Motors stock into the hands of the 65 members of the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family.

Mr. GORE. Has that not been alleged for 13 years, including the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, as constituting monopoly control of both of these companies?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. What the Senator from Illinois has tried to do has been to eliminate the tax advantage of nondivestiture on the part of Christiana, so that Christiana would pay the same taxes that individuals would pay, and so that there would not be any advantage for a pass-through as compared with a sale.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is what we are trying to effect. Approximately $150 million is at stake in the amendment, because under the proposal of the committee the tax would be approximately $79 million; whereas under my proposal it would be approximately $230 million.

Mr. KERR. I should like to ask the Senator my other question, because I know he wants the Record to be accurate, just as I do. Any private stockholder receiving the Du Pont stock——

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator means——

Mr. KERR. General Motors stock——

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator means divestiture by Du Pont to an individual——

Mr. KERR. Of stock that is now in Du Pont.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. If it gets to the individual stockholder——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Who is not a stockholder in Christiana, of course.

Mr. KERR. Well, whether it gets to one who is or is not——

Mr. DOUGLAS. It makes a great deal of difference.

Mr. KERR. But it comes by divestiture.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is no question that Du Pont must divest. The question is whether Christiana must divest.

Mr. KERR. I understand. However, I am asking the Senator from Illinois if it is not a fact that any individual stockholder, if he gets the stock, will do so by reason of divestiture.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; he may get it in any event by divestiture by Du Pont. The question is whether he will get it also by divestiture of Christiana.

Mr. KERR. He does not, unless he is a stockholder in Christiana.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The 65 members of the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family own 80 percent of Christiana. Therefore, the issue is localized.

Mr. KERR. But they still would get the stock by reason of divestiture of stock by Du Pont.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If we take the 65 members of the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family as individuals by virtue of their direct ownership in Du Pont, they own approximately 3.4 percent of General Motors stock. They are going to get that as individuals. The Government is not trying to take it away from them. They also own about 0.7 percent of General Motors stock which is held in trust. So they will get 4.1 percent of General Motors stock as individuals from the Du Pont Co. and from trust. In addition to this, they control Christiana. They own or control 80 percent of Christiana. Christiana has approximately 8.1 percent—I think it is—of General Motors stock, and the family members' share of Christiana stock would entitle them to about 5.4 percent of General Motors stock.

What we are trying to do is to see to it that they get treated approximately the same as the ordinary stockholders themselves would be treated if Christiana does not divest, or, if it divests by a pass-through.

Mr. KERR. If the individual stockholder in Du Pont gets his General Motors stock under the pending bill, it is treated as return of capital and he pays a capital gains tax on any amount above the cost of the stock he owns.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. However, in the case of corporations——

Mr. KERR. The same is true of stockholders in Christiana. It is the identical situation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; it is not identical, because the value of Christiana stock which is——

Mr. KERR. But that applies only with reference to stock that goes through Christiana.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I finish?

Mr. KERR. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is a technical difference, which the Senator from Oklahoma does not appreciate, apparently; that in the case of divestiture by pass-through, the adjusted capital gains tax levied is not upon the price of General Motors or Du Pont but on the cost at which Christiana was acquired. That is the point.

Mr. KERR. I will ask the Senator to yield to me later.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would like to finish. It is very easy for this record to be muddied up. I will try to clear it up. Then I shall yield. The bill which was pushed 2 years ago and which was nearly approved by the Finance Committee was a proposal that Du Pont was to divest, and under which the individual family stockholders of Du Pont and the corporations would pay a tax of only 16 cents a share. That was on a capital gain which then amounted to $43 a share. That proposal was so outrageous that the Senate Finance Committee did not approve it. I am sorry to say that was only defeated by the narrow vote of only 8 to 7. I wish to pay tribute to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], because he comes from the State in which the home office of the Du Pont Corp. is located, and undoubtedly the pressures upon him were tremendous. Yet he voted against the 16-cent provision. I want to say that that was one of the most courageous votes I have ever seen cast in the Senate in the 14 years that I have been a Member of the Senate. I wish to pay tribute to him, as I have many times. His was the deciding vote. We were 7 to 7, and the Senator from Delaware voted against it and killed the proposal at least for the time being.

Mr. GORE and **Mr. WILLIAMS** of Delaware addressed the Chair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to finish. That was so outrageous that the Du Pont people knew they never could get by with it again. This time they came up with an increase in the tax for Christiana, but it was 52 percent of 15 percent, not of the original cost but of the market value. Now the sponsors of the bill are pinning medals all over themselves by saying, "We have increased the tax from 16 cents to $4.29." That is a concession, but it was wrung out of them over their opposition.

The Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Illinois may properly claim some credit for it, because they were unflagging in their opposition to the proposal and led the fight against it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will yield in a moment. I wish to finish first. Why should Christiana—and that means really the Du Pont family—have to pay a tax of only $4.29, when individual shareholders have to pay a tax of approximately $13.25 a share? Why should they be given this favored treatment? I see no reason why they should be given that treatment. They have been compelled by the action of the Senate Finance Committee—at least by eight members of the Finance Committee—to come up from 16 cents to $4.29 per share. It is our contention that they should be treated on the same basis as individual stockholders are treated and pay a capital gains tax on the increase in value, 25 percent of $53, or approximately $13.25 a share.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does not the Senator propose that all corporations holding Du Pont stock, including a large life insurance company, which holds more than 5,000 shares, be taxed on the same basis as individual stockholders?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. I ask the Senator one further question: Why is there a special provision in the bill affecting divestiture by Christiana? The Supreme Court has not directed divestiture by Christiana. The Supreme Court remanded the case to the Chicago court with instructions to provide effective relief from the monopolistic conditions. The one issue remaining before the Chicago court is the Christiana Corp. and its stockholders.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct: First, whether Christiana will divest at all—and the Du Pont Co. is saying it should not be compelled to divest at all; and second, whether, if it does divest, it should divest by sale or by pass-through.

Mr. GORE. Is it not, then, the Senator's opinion that the real purpose and intended effect of the bill is to provide a tax incentive for a pass-through of General Motors stock all the way from Du Pont, through Christiana, to Christiana stockholders, thereby creating a situation which the Attorney General has stated would effectuate continuation of monopolistic conditions?

Mr. DOUGLAS. As the Senator from Illinois pointed out yesterday, and as he tried to point out earlier in the general debate today, the bill now under consideration gives an advantage to Christiana to divest by pass-through under the bill as compared with present law in a ratio of at least $8.76 to $33, and a pass-through rather than by sale in a ratio of $8.76 to $11.25; but it gives a still greater advantage to nondivestiture by Christiana, because in that event the tax per share is only $4.29.

What is proposed in the bill is that the tax on Christiana's portion will only be at 8 percent. I am proposing that they pay a capital gains tax of 25 percent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not for one moment question the good intentions of the Senator from Illinois in offering his amendment; but is he aware that under the amendment, if it is incorporated in the bill, the effect would be to impose, in several instances, two capital gains taxes on the same share of stock before the individual stockholder got possession of the stock? Is that the Senator's intention?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is not true. If it is divestiture by sale, there is no added tax.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct, on sale.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We agree upon that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If there is divestiture by pass-through, there is an added tax on the individual of approximately $8.76, or a total tax of approximately $21.96 a share. But compare that with the tax under the present law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Senator will yield further, we are not dealing with averages. If the stock came to Christiana under the Senator's proposal Christiana would pay a capital gains tax of approximately $13 a share.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Twenty-five percent of the increase in value, which was $53.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. Now, suppose they have an order to divest themselves of the stock, and the stock goes out to the individual shareholder.

Mr. DOUGLAS. How? By sale or by pass-through?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. By pass-through.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator will admit that on a sale there is no added tax, aside from the capital gains tax.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. On a sale, there would be no difference; but under the Senator's amendment on a pass-through there would be a vast difference.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There would be some difference.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am speaking of a pass-through. We agree that there would be a capital gains tax at the Christiana level.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then the stock is passed out, and stockholder A owns stock at $1 a share.

Mr. DOUGLAS. He would pay a bigger tax for he would have larger than average gain.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But in that instance under the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] the fact that the corporation had already paid $13 a share on the General Motors stock would in no way be credited to him. He would get the stock and would again pay a capital gains tax of $54.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Because his capital gains increase is larger. But I am pointing out the average case, which is calculated on an original or basis cost of the Christiana stock of $27.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But as I have outlined there would be instances in which there would be two capital gains taxes computed on the same share of stock.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We are much more generous to the Du Pont family than under present law. Assuming a member of the Du Pont family was in the 60-percent bracket, he would pay about a $33 tax.

Under the present law, if he were in the 70-percent bracket, he would pay $38.50; if he were in the 78-percent bracket, he would pay $41.25; if he were in the 80-percent bracket, he would pay $41.44. So this amendment gives members of the Du Pont family relief from the present law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Assuming there would be a pass-through, is it not also true that under present law if Christiana is ordered by the court to divest itself of the stock, Christiana can elect to sell it and pay 25-percent capital gains instead of distributing it and paying regular income tax rates? Is it not reasonable to assume that they would elect the 25-percent capital gains treatment which is available under existing law rather than to pass it out and pay 75 or 80 percent?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That might be fine. It would encourage Christiana to sell, and that would be extremely desirable.

Mr. GORE. Is not that what the Senator from Illinois is proposing?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would have that effect.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Now we have come to the point I wish to make. The amendment of the Senator from Illinois would have the effect of forcing a sale, which is what the Department of Justice has asked the court to do but which the committee said is a matter to be decided by the court and not by Congress. The Senator from Illinois, by his amendment, is trying to decide the court case on the floor of the Senate, which is something he said the Committee on Finance should not do.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What I am doing is wiping out the premium on a pass-through—the premium in the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is putting a stockholder in a position of having to pay two capital gains taxes on the same share of stock unless they sell it. He would impose a penalty if he does not sell it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Delaware is advancing the theory that if a corporation has paid a capital gains tax or a corporate income tax, then the individuals who receive dividends from that corporation should be exempted from tax. That is the real theory which the Senator from Delaware is espousing. I do not hold to that theory. I hold that it is income to the individual when he gets it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; surely.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I believe the Senator has a copy of the letter which the Treasury Department sent to me in connection with the pending amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I received it a moment ago, just before the debate began.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In his letter, the Treasury Department opposes the Senator's amendment, saying that the amendment would be discriminatory in its taxation of Christiana.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That would not be the first time the Treasury Department was on the wrong side.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The letter was signed by Mr. Knight on behalf of the Treasury Department. The Treasury Department is opposed to the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wear no one's collar. I do not wear the collar of the Treasury Department. I wear my own collar. Even though the Treasury Department takes the side of Du Pont in this case, that does not mean that I must follow in their wake. Not at all.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Assuming that the Senator's amendment is not adopted and that the bill is enacted as it stands, it would then, as I understand, draw a distinction between an individual taxpayer and a corporate taxpayer.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. What would there be to prevent an individual stockholder today, if he were advantaged taxwise by so doing, to convey his stock to a corporation? Would he not thereby get the benefit of a corporate tax rather than an individual tax?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator speaking of a stockholder in Du Pont or a stockholder in Christiana?

Mr. KEATING. A stockholder in Du Pont today. If he felt he had a tax advantage by doing so, could he simply transfer his stock, before the bill became law, to a corporation, and thereby get a benefit?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I think that the suit in Chicago specified that at least for personal holding companies which receive the intercorporate dividend treatment that that could not be done after September 1961.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, the suit speaks as of a date before that time?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. I had the same fears. At least, in respect to personal holding companies as of that time it could not be done. I will put it this way. There may be a loophole in the case of corporations which are not personal holding companies; but the Government tried to close that possibility by fixing a cutoff date as of the 1st of last October on personal holding companies.

Mr. KEATING. In any event, it would close it for all holding companies if the Senator's amendment were adopted?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is exactly correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. As a preface to his question, the senior Senator from Rhode Island is very much interested in the proposed legislation, not so much with respect to what it has to do with Christiana Corp. or the Du Pont family, because I believe they are big enough and powerful enough to take care of themselves.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think they have demonstrated that.

Mr. PASTORE. I am very much interested in the individual stockholders in the State of Rhode Island. I have received about 200 letters from various persons in Rhode Island who have urged me to support this bill because they believe there is an inequitable or an unjust tax burden on them because of something over which they have no control. That is fundamentally my concern about this legislation.

I understand the Senator from Illinois to say that insofar as the individual stockholders are concerned, the amendment of the Senator from Illinois will not in any way affect them any differently from the way they will be affected by the bill which already has been reported by the committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct; and the Senator from Tennessee showed, in his speech, that the individual stockholders would not benefit under the provisions of the bill, as compared with the provisions of existing law, but, as a matter of fact, might lose.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the Chair.) Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. If the pending bill is enacted, and if the court order follows its terms, a tax will be imposed on the stockholders, whereas the president of the Du Pont Co. testified that he proposed to follow a plan, under present law—and without the passage of this bill—whereby no stockholder would pay any additional tax.

Mr. PASTORE. In other words, is it correct for me to assume that without the passage of any new law at all, when the divestiture takes place——

Mr. DOUGLAS. From the Du Pont Co. to the individual——

Mr. PASTORE. As I was saying, is it correct for me to assume that if this bill is not enacted, the individual stockholder will have to pay a dividend tax equal to the market value of the stock as earned income? Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, if the matter were handled in that way.

Mr. PASTORE. I mean if this bill is not enacted. I am trying to have the pending issue stated clearly, in understandable terms, so that the individual stockholders will be able to understand this matter clearly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But the president of Du Pont Co. has testified that the Du Pont Co. would not do it in that way.

Mr. PASTORE. But insofar as the individual stockholder is concerned, one who now holds a share of stock which is evidence of that much ownership in the Du Pont Co. and, as a result, that much ownership in General Motors Corp., he will receive two pieces of paper, instead of one; and each piece will indicate ownership both in the Du Pont Co. and, proportionately, in General Motors Corp. I understand that unless the pending bill is enacted, when the shareholder receives the piece of paper which is evidence of ownership by him of that much General Motors stock, he will have to pay a tax, as a dividend tax, on the full amount of the market value.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The Senator from Rhode Island is absolutely correct; the stockholder would pay a tax just as if he got the dividend in cash.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Under the bill he would pay no immediate tax at all if he had paid more than $75 a share for his stock.

Mr. PASTORE. I am talking about the situation which would exist in the absense of enactment of this bill. Despite all the talk, for some days, about the pending bill, we become more and more confused by the minute. My problem is to ascertain what will be the situation if the proposed law is placed on the statute books.

Let me say that of course I do not have the floor; but if any Senator will yield time to me, I shall be glad to make a speech on my own behalf.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, who has the floor?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, I should like to clear up this point by referring to the table which is to be found on page 636 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for yesterday. Under the present law, the divestiture by Du Pont, in stage I, would cause the tax under the company's plan to fall largely on the company, at the capital-gains rate.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I should like to point out to the Senator from Rhode Island——

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, I am not interested in the Du Pont family or in the Christiana Corp. I am very much interested in the small investor in Rhode Island. A number of the small stockholders in Rhode Island have written letters to me, asking that I protect them. I wish to know whether this bill, if passed, will protect them or will not protect them. My problem is very simple accordingly.

Some Senators have become confused by the discussion of Christiana and Du Pont. But those companies can take care of themselves. So instead of speaking of them, let us speak of the small investor in Rhode Island.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, this is one of the issues we discussed in connection with the motion to recommit. But the pending amendment will not change the status of such stockholders, as compared with their status under the provisions of the pending bill. The pending amendment will not change the status of the individual stockholder who receives General Motors stock from the Du Pont Co. The pending amendment deals only with the Christiana Corp. and other corporations and with the stockholders in Christiana Corp. and in other corporations. Confusion has developed in the course of the debate, because of the frequent references to the Christiana Corp. or the Du Pont Co., as compared with the individual, small stockholders, and vice versa.

Mr. PASTORE. Then it is fair for me to assume that insofar as the pending amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois is concerned, it has to do only with corporate ownership of stock, and has nothing at all to do with the stockholding of a small investor in Rhode Island?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. So am I correct in assuming that if I vote in favor of adoption of the pending amendment and, subsequently, if I vote in favor of passage of the bill as thus amended, the bill as thus passed will cause no harm at all to the small investors in Rhode Island?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Well, the second part of the Senator's question involves quite a leap in logic. [Laughter.]

Mr. PASTORE. But I want to know what the results will be.

Mr. DOUGLAS. By voting for my amendment, the Senator from Rhode Island will not be voting to hurt the small stockholder. In other words, adoption of my amendment will not hurt the small stockholder. The effect of my amendment will be neutral, insofar as the individual owner of Du Pont stock is concerned, other than a corporate owner.

Mr. PASTORE. Let me say that I have received the following letter:

> DEAR SENATOR: I am writing on behalf of Nickerson House Settlement House, in Olneyville, R.I.—

Mr. DOUGLAS. The widows and the orphans. They always appear, and here they are again.

Mr. PASTORE. Well, what is wrong with the orphans? Should we not take care of them a little, too?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly. They are always "trotted out" on these occasions.

Mr. PASTORE. I am a great supporter of the orphans; I am not here to fight for Christiana or for Du Pont, but

I am here to help the orphans of Rhode Island.

But apart from orphans, I wish particularly to introduce this letter from Nickerson House:

JANUARY 8, 1962.

Re H.R. 8847.
Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE,
U.S. Senator,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing on behalf of Nickerson House Settlement House in Olneyville, R.I., and urge you to favor the adoption of H.R. 8847.

While it is true that a large percentage of the operating expenses of Nickerson House is obtained through the United Fund, a large sum is obtained from income on endowments which charitable and kind benefactors have given to Nickerson House during more than 75 years of its existence.

In its endowment fund, there are some shares of the Du Pont Co. and, it is in the interest of Nickerson House and of the community in which it serves, that these shares maintain their value and maintain their earning power.

The subject bill seems to me to be the best means of complying with the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court and at the same time preserving the value of these shares. For this reason, I urge you to support passage of the bill.

Very truly yours,
DANIEL J. MURRAY,
President, Board of Managers, Nickerson House.

Mr. DOUGLAS. All right, good.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator from Rhode Island is interested in orphans then I advise him to vote against this bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Well, I do not know about that. The Senator from Tennessee will have to convince me of that. But he has not convinced me of it yet. That is just the point. I asked a question, but no Senator has given me the answer to it.

Mr. GORE. We have been here on the floor of the Senate for a week, trying to get a few Senators to listen.

Mr. PASTORE. I am listening, and I asked the question categorically.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, if the Senator from Illinois will yield——

Mr. PASTORE. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee a question, if I may.

Mr. GORE. Certainly, if the Senator from Illinois will yield for that purpose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I am interested in a person in Rhode Island who today owns one share of Du Pont stock. Under existing law, when the court orders divestiture, that person will receive another piece of paper, which will show ownership in General Motors stock. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. That has not yet been determined. The court has not rendered its judgment in regard to a plan of divestiture. That is what makes this bill so utterly premature. We are leaping in the dark, and the Senator from Rhode Island cannot now correctly leap to that conclusion. The divestiture plan has not been ordered.

Mr. Greenewalt, the president of the Du Pont Co., testified before the committee that under existing law he proposed to follow a plan that would not involve giving two pieces of paper to each stockholder by a pro rata distribution. He proposed—under existing law—to distribute only a portion of the General Motors stock in lieu of cash dividends, which, in his own words—and I refer to page 78 of the hearings, and this is quite contrary to what the distinguished Senator from Virginia said—and I wish to quote——

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Madam President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that I said that under existing law if an owner of Du Pont stock were to get one and one-third shares of General Motors stock——

Mr. PASTORE. If he does.

Mr. GORE. Yes, if he does. The "if" has been the smokescreen that has been used throughout this entire debate. There have been constant references to "if he does." But the Du Pont Co. does not propose that that happen.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The Du Pont Co. does not enter into this question. The question is, What will occur under existing law? Under existing law, the individual stockholder would have to pay a tax just as if so much cash, instead of the piece of paper, had come to him.

Mr. GORE. But that result has not been proposed by either the court or the Department of Justice or the Du Pont Co.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. But let me point out that I made an absolutely correct statement in regard to what will be the effect of the present law.

Mr. PASTORE. In other words, if the court does not order Du Pont divestiture of its stock, we shall have had a big fight over really nothing.

Mr. GORE. It is not over nothing; the issue is really big. The small stockholder in Rhode Island will be very definitely affected, depending on whether this bill is passed or whether it is not passed. Let there be no confusion about that.

I hold in my hand a table which has been prepared by experts, and the Senator from Rhode Island may examine it. The tax effect of this bill on the small stockholder is zero, if we take at face value the statement made by Mr. Greenewalt. It is set forth on pages 77 to 79 of the committee hearings. I invite the Senator from Rhode Island to read it.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not have to read that statement, because I have a question ready to ask the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. All right.

Mr. PASTORE. If an individual in Rhode Island is in the 30-percent tax bracket, he stands to lose 5 percent. The difference between 25 percent on capital gains and 30 percent on earned income is 5 percent.

Mr. GORE. No.

Mr. PASTORE. Of course it is. Twenty-five from thirty is five. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORE. Yes, but the Senator began his sentence with a hypothesis. All of this depends upon the plan of divestiture that is followed. If the Senator will read the record, he will find that the president of Du Pont Co. has said that he proposed, under present law, to follow a plan of divestiture in three steps, none of which would impose upon any stockholder, in his own words, any additional tax whatsoever. That plan would require the Du Pont Co. to pay $460 million in taxes over a 10-year period. But under the terms of this bill, if the judge follows them, the Du Pont Co. will not pay $1 in taxes.

I appreciate the Senator from Rhode Island's being here. I wish we could have had more Senators present for the past week. This is a tremendously important bill. Its enactment would be adverse to the public interest. I am delighted today that more Senators are listening to the debate.

Mr. PASTORE. May I ask a few categorical questions if the Senator has time?

Mr. GORE. Yes, I have the time. The Senator from Illinois has yielded.

Mr. PASTORE. If the court should decree that the individual owner of Du Pont stock shall receive, in divestiture proceedings, a share of stock in General Motors, in order to break up this combination between Du Pont and General Motors——

Mr. GORE. In lieu of cash dividends or not?

Mr. PASTORE. In lieu of cash dividends.

Mr. GORE. Very well.

Mr. PASTORE. And he is given this share of stock which, for the purpose of a hypothetical question, let us say is worth $100——

Mr. GORE. Which is in lieu of $100 in cash dividends to which he would otherwise be entitled?

Mr. PASTORE. Am I going to ask the question or is the Senator from Tennessee going to ask the question?

Mr. GORE. I am trying to follow the Senator's hypothesis. We need to understand there is a vast difference whether the stock——

Mr. PASTORE. There is a vast difference between whether one gets cash or a piece of paper. I am talking about a case where a person gets a share of stock. The Senator says in lieu of cash dividend. Of course, if one gets cash, he gets cash; and he has to pay the full amount of tax on the dividend as earned income. I am talking about a share of stock. If the individual holder of Du Pont stock today, which includes ownership of both Du Pont and General Motors, under a plan of divestiture, received a share of stock in General Motors which is worth $100, for the sake of the question——

Mr. GORE. In lieu of dividends?

Mr. PASTORE. In lieu of dividends? Very well, in lieu of dividends. That stockholder in Rhode Island is in the 35-percent tax bracket. Do I make myself clear?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. When he gets this share of stock which is worth $100, under existing law today how much income tax would he pay?

Mr. GORE. The exact amount he would pay if he received $100 in cash dividends.

Mr. PASTORE. But he has only a piece of paper.

Mr. GORE. He has stock that has a marketable value of $100.

Mr. PASTORE. No. When a stockholder holds a piece of paper which evidences ownership in both companies, he has to pay a tax only when he sells it.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has left his example.

Mr. PASTORE. I have not left mine; the Senator has left his own.

Mr. GORE. Here is the example the able Senator gave. If I state it incorrectly, I hope he will correct me. He submitted this hypothetical proposition: A stockholder in Rhode Island, holding a share of stock in the Du Pont Co. receives $100 in value of stock of General Motors in lieu of $100 in cash dividends, to which he would otherwise be entitled in consequence of ownership of Du Pont stock. The Senator then asks, What would be the tax, as a consequence, to this taxpayer in the State of Rhode Island? My answer to the Senator is, whether the taxpayer be in Rhode Island or in any other State, the taxes are exactly the same as if he had received a cash dividend, and it is exactly this kind of plan of divestiture that the president of the Du Pont Co. has proposed to follow, which, in his own words—and I have been trying to read it for the last hour—are as follows: "There would be no additional revenue to the Treasury Department because stockholders would be paying no more taxes than the tax they now pay on cash dividends."

But if the Senate passes this bill and the court follows it, then the Du Pont Co. will pay no taxes at all; the stockholders will pay the additional taxes; and it paves the way for a pass-through not only through Du Pont, but through Christiana, thereby preserving the monopolistic control.

Mr. PASTORE. I am not worried so much about Du Pont or Christiana. All I am saying is that many small people have brought Du Pont stock, which includes evidence of ownership in General Motors. Now the court is going to break this combination up, and the court is going to give the Du Pont stockholders another share of stock, which will represent only a portion of the original value of the stock which included ownership in both companies. All that individual will have is evidence of ownership. If I am wrong on this, I ask sombody to correct me. I understand that when a stockholder sells either Du Pont stock which is only for Du Pont or General Motors stock which is only for General Motors he pays a capital gains tax.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, I ask for time on the bill.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, the first day of this debate I raised a question as to the desirability of legislating when an issue was pending before the court. I have followed the debate as much as committee duties would permit. I came to the conclusion that, notwithstanding the undesirability of legislating while a related question is pending before the court, it was far better to do it than it was to have the court deliberating under the hammer of an uncertain legislative fate for his decision.

Broadly speaking, the responsibility of the legislature is to make the laws, and the responsibility of the courts is to apply the laws. I had understood—and I may have been in error—that the basic issue in the case pending before the court in Chicago is whether or not antitrust laws were violated; and I had been under the impression—and I may have been wrong—that the Supreme Court had directed, in effect, that divestiture be made because of a conviction that the principles of the antitrust laws were violated in a continuation of the large holdings by Du Pont of General Motors stock.

It seems to me, therefore, that we ought to dispose of this question. We ought not to refer it back to the committee. That is why I voted as I did on the question before the Senate a short time ago.

When it comes to trying to deal with the amendments, the average Member of the Senate who is not a member of the committee finds the opinions and the information given a bit confusing.

I fall back upon the fact that basically our responsibility is to write the law and to let the judges apply it. For that reason I think we ought to make clear what is the law and then let the judge make the determination. If the judge at Chicago does not make the correct determination, we then can leave it to the Supreme Court to pass upon the question, if the case goes to the Supreme Court again.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. GORE. There is no question as to what is the law. The law with respect to the case is clear. The bill proposes changes in the law in contemplation of a possible decision permitting a pass-through. Why is there a reference in the bill to the Christiana Corp. and to the stockholders of Christiana Corp.?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the bill mention the Christiana Corp.?

Mr. GORE. The bill makes specific reference to and provision for the Christiana Corp., not by name but by definition. Its application is perfectly clear. That has been one of the principal subjects of debate. The committee report is also clear on this point.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, the Senator from South Dakota read the committee report and noted it was specifically stated it was not the intention of the action in the Congress to influence or to determine the action of the court. Therefore, I gathered the intent of the proposed legislation was to spell out what is the law and what the law would be, under whatever amendments are agreed to, if a certain situation arose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes allocated to the Senator from South Dakota have expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator yield me 3 additional minutes?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If no legislation were passed, it is my understanding there would be the possibility of considerable tax injustice to people who had purchased the stock at a low price and who had no desire to sell it. I understand they would be affected by the order for divestiture.

The Senator from South Dakota is not familiar with the pleadings in the case at Chicago, but he would assume that the pleadings were based largely upon whether there was a violation of the antitrust laws, the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Not for a moment yet.

Consequently it would seem to me that the determination of the court then would be restricted to the issues which have already been pleaded and are involved in the case before the court. If the proposed legislation would create some new conditions, I do not understand that the pleadings could be changed in the court in Chicago. I think the court would be bound to apply the provisions of the antitrust laws, and my understanding is that the committee and the Congress have sought to provide a tax situation which would produce the greatest possible equity.

If it should be true that the creation of what the opponents of the proposed legislation have called a pass-through would create a new monopolistic situation, one which would be in violation of the spirit if not the actual provisions of the antitrust law, it seems to me that the decision of the court in Chicago would be guided by the impact on the antitrust law rather than by the impact of the change on the tax law.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I hope the Senator will permit me to express once again my appreciation for the attention and consideration given to the bill by Members of the Senate. If the Senator will turn to page 3 of the bill he will find a definition of "divested stock."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Madam President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GORE. Only the holders of "divested stock," as defined in the bill, will be entitled to the tax treatment provided in the bill. If the Senator will read the definition of "divested stock" on pages 3, 4, and 5, technical though the language is, he will find that unless the judge follows the outlines of the bill with respect to "divested stock," then no tax consequences will flow from the bill. In other words, unless the judge renders a decision within the bounds of the bill, then none of these vast benefits which have been heralded and propagandized over the country will be available to anyone.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Can the Senator from Tennessee state whether the pleadings in the case pending in Chicago are broad enough to cover, or could be changed or modified to take cognizance of, the provisions of the bill?

Mr. GORE. They not only can, they already have been.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. How?

Mr. GORE. The lawyers for both the Du Pont Co. and Christiana Corp. have already cited the bill. The Senator himself read into the RECORD during the debate last week a statement from Chicago that the lawyers for Du Pont were asking the judge to postpone his decision until the Senate passed the bill. I quoted statements from the lawyers and officials of both Du Pont and Christiana, pleading for the bill. In fact, the lawyers for the Christiana Corp. are already referring to the bill as "the new tax law."

Not only can they, but they already have done so.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator is speaking on my time, so I hope he will permit me to get a question across.

Mr. GORE. I surely will.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is the case in Chicago a tax case or is it an antitrust case?

Mr. GORE. The case in Chicago is an antitrust case which involves the largest corporate assets distribution in the history of the world. One of the considerations which the Chicago judge has repeatedly cited in his decisions—most of which, up to now, have been reversed by the Supreme Court—is the fact that he has placed great emphasis upon the tax consequences of whatever plan of divestiture may be ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the Supreme Court has reversed the Chicago court, has the Supreme Court not given some guidelines and suggested to the court in Chicago that its decision should be based upon the antitrust laws rather than upon the tax laws?

Mr. GORE. The Supreme Court decision was specific on the following point: It remanded the case to the trial court with instructions——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. To determine the tax consequences or to determine the monopoly consequences?

Mr. GORE. To enter an order providing effective relief.

What is the effective relief sought by the Government and ordered by the Supreme Court? It is relief from a violation of the antitrust laws—specifically the Clayton Act.

The question remaining before the court in Chicago is whether Christiana Corp. shall be permitted to receive General Motors stock. If it is permitted to receive General Motors stock, the question is then whether it will be required to divest. If it is required to divest, the question then is whether such divestiture shall be by sale or by passthrough.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, may I have one additional minute?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield an additional minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The point I am trying to deal with goes primarily to the question of a possible violation of the antitrust laws. It seems to me that the court, in dealing with the Christiana aspect of the problem, would have the same problems of monopoly to consider that the Supreme Court indicated should control so far as Du Pont is concerned.

Mr. GORE. That has been the position of the Government through the Eisenhower administration, and it is the position of the Government now. The Senator has stated the matter correctly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Virginia for yielding time to me.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield such time as the Senator from Delaware requires.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, I wish to express opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois. First, I should like to quote the language of the Treasury Department in a letter which was sent to me and to the Senator from Illinois. In a conversation with Mr. Knight, General Counsel of the Treasury Department, he reaffirmed the fact that the Treasury Department is opposed to the amendment. The letter outlines their reasons for opposing the amendment as follows:

> Our second comment—

That is the pending amendment to which they refer—

> Our second comment relates to the discriminatory nature of the burden proposed to be imposed. Section 2, as now drafted, would increase the intercorporate dividend tax payable by Christiana from approximately 16 cents per share of General Motors stock received to approximately $4.29 per share. The return-of-capital proposal would further increase the tax burden to approximately $13 per share, a very substantial increase. While it could be claimed, under other circumstances, that application of section 2 only to Christiana is discriminatory, this aspect is alleviated by the fact that Christiana has categorically stated that it believes the bill in its entirety, including section 2, would benefit itself and its shareholders by reason of eliminating the adverse impact on the market value of General Motors stock which would otherwise result. Therefore, Christiana has undertaken not to contest the application of section 2 as discriminatory legislation. The Treasury Department is not aware that the same considerations would apply to the return-of-capital proposal.

In discussing the provisions of H.R. 8847, a number of Senators have referred to the fact that the bill would substantially increase the intercorporate dividends tax payable by Christiana Securities Co. under present law from $3 million to approximately $79 million. As I said on the Senate floor last week, in other circumstances such a tax might be considered by some to be discriminatory. I am advised, however, by representatives of Christiana, that Christiana will not contest the validity of the additional intercorporate dividends tax if the bill is passed.

Christiana believes that enactment of H.R. 8847 in its present form will prove to be of benefit to it and its shareholders in lessening the losses attributable to the market impact it believes would follow from a divestiture of General Motors stock under present law.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] raised a question as to whether the Douglas amendment, if agreed to, would increase the tax liability of a small stockholder in Rhode Island or in Delaware over and above what is provided in the bill. I believe he received an answer that it would not. I must disagree with that answer. The pending amendment would definitely increase the tax upon every stockholder, whether he be in Illinois, Rhode Island, Tennessee, or Delaware. I shall point out the reasons for my statement.

Under the bill as reported by the committee practically all of the 60,000 employees of the Du Pont Co. who are buying stock under the company's stock purchase plan would be exempted from all tax liability. Over two-thirds of the stockholders of the Du Pont Co.'s 200,000 stockholders would pay no tax under the committee bill.

If the pending amendment were agreed to the Christiana Corp. would pay approximately $13 a share based upon the estimate of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. Certainly, as the corporation pays a tax at the corporate level it depreciates the asset value of the stock for all of these stockholders. That is only common reasoning.

Such a tax as the Senator from Tennessee suggests would be charged against each share of stock. If under the amendment a corporation were required to pay a tax of $13 a share then $13 a share would be charged against every share owned by every stockholder in America, including stock owned by charitable organizations, pension funds, as well as all individual stockholders.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall yield in a moment, if the Senator wishes to take exception to my statement. If Christiana were to be required to pay this prohibitive corporate tax certainly the stock would be depreciated in value to that extent, and a charitable organization which owns Christiana stock would definitely be affected. If the Senator from Tennessee has a different opinion, I will yield to him to state it.

Mr. GORE. The Senator certainly knows that a charitable organization does not pay income tax. The Senator has made statements which in my opinion are utterly insupportable.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Senator has followed what I have said he will know that I am correct.

Mr. GORE. Oh, I did follow the Senator. I followed exactly what the Senator said.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Charitable organization as such would not pay the tax, but under the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois the tax would be paid by the corporation, which payment would result in a reduction of the value of the stock owned by the charitable organization.

Mr. GORE. Which corporation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. By Christiana. Under the proposed amendment there would be a tax paid on every share of stock at the corporate level, and therefore there would be a depreciation of assets. This would affect the value of every share of stock, no matter who owns it. To that extent the amount of the tax would be subtracted from the value of the assets of all charitable organizations. The argument that the amount of tax which a corporation is required to pay does not make any difference to the individual stockholder is ridiculous.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Under the kind of logic suggested by the Senator, Congress should not require taxes of corporations at all. The same statement that the Senator has made with respect to the provisions of the pending amendment would apply to any tax whatsoever on a corporation, with one exception. The Senator is now referring to an amendment which refers and applies only to corporate stockholders of the Du Pont Corp. The amendment of the senior Senator from Illinois does not propose any additional tax on the Du Pont Co. It does not propose any additional tax upon individual stockholders of the Du Pont Co. It proposes one thing and one thing only, which is that the corporate stockholders of Du Pont should pay the same capital gains tax that is provided in the bill for the individual stockholder.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I repeat that to the extent that a tax is increased at the corporate level the stockholders are affected. Certainly as corporations pay taxes, charitable organizations which own such corporate stocks to that extent do pay taxes. No one argues with that proposition. As the tax is increased the value of the shares is affected. Surely the Senator would not dispute that point.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will yield in a moment. I should like to make another point. Under the amendment there would in many instances be a double capital gains tax on the individual stockholders. We cannot escape such a result because under the amendment when the corporation received the stock it would pay a capital gains tax on practically the full value of the General Motors stock because there would be a relatively low cost factor.

A stockholder in Rhode Island or Delaware who owned Christiana stock would, when he received the dividend, owe another capital gains tax on the same stock. Some owners of the stock have it at prices as low as $1 a share. In America there is nothing wrong with that. I am sure that the Senator from Tennessee wishes he had it at 50 cents a share. But why should we charge any stockholder two capital gains taxes on the same share of stock?

The Treasury Department has said that the tax proposed under the pending amendment would be discriminatory. I agree with that. The Senator from Tennessee knows full well that I objected to a bill at the last Congress which I thought would give the bulk of the benefits to the stockholders who had the largest gain on their stock. The chairman of the committee was also among those who objected to that earlier bill. It was our position that the benefits of any legislation should benefit the small stockholders.

If the present bill were passed in the form in which the committee reported it, approximately 120,000 of the 200,000 stockholders of Du Pont Co. would pay zero tax. They would pay absolutely no tax under the provisions of the bill as reported by the committee because they have a cost higher than the $75 on the General Motors shares they would receive. That is true of the stockholders of Christiana to the extent that they have a higher cost factor than the value of the stock dividend which they may receive should the divestiture be ordered.

There is a precedent for the proposed action. I gave the following example before. Under existing law—and no one has ever suggested that it be changed—suppose the Senator from Rhode Island owned a farm for which he paid $10,000 and I owned a farm for which I paid $5,000, and suppose further that the power company went through our farms with a 99-year right-of-way lease. If the power company pays each of us $6,000, under present law the cost of his farm would be reduced from $10,000 to $4,000 and he would not owe any tax. When he later sold his farm he would compute his tax on the basis of a $4,000 cost.

I would reduce the cost of my farm from $5,000 to zero, and by having received a thousand dollars more than the original cost I would pay an immediate capital gains tax on the $1,000. Then when I later sold the farm I would pay tax on the full amount received since my cost had been reduced to zero.

That is exactly the formula that we put into the pending bill in treating the stock to be distributed by the Du Pont Co. to its stockholders. To the extent that the value of General Motors stock exceeded the original cost of the investment, they would pay an immediate capital gains tax.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I should like to ask a question of the Senator. When does the individual taxpayer pay the capital gains tax?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. When he receives the stock dividend.

Mr. PASTORE. When he receives the stock; not when he sells it. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. When he receives the stock. To the extent that its market value exceeds his original investment he would pay a capital gains tax. For example, Du Pont owns 1.37 shares of General Motors stock for each of its outstanding shares. At current market this is worth $75. Suppose he paid $60 for Du Pont, he would write the cost of Du Pont down to zero. Then he would pay a capital gains tax upon $15, or on that portion by which the market value exceeded his original cost.

Mr. PASTORE. The argument that is being made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] with reference to his amendment is that he wants to put the corporation in the same position as an individual. Why is that wrong?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Because we have always on an exchange of intercorporate dividends allowed a corporation an 85-percent dividend credit on the basis that corporation A has already paid 52 percent corporate tax before the dividend goes to corporation B. If before corporation B passes this dividend through to the stockholder another 52 percent were charged it would be prohibitive. I do not know of anyone who has suggested that we go to that extreme. So we allow an 85-percent exclusion. The second corporation, which gets the dividend from corporation A, pays 52 percent on the remaining 15 percent, or about 7.8 percent. That is done on the theory that ultimately as it goes to the stockholder there will be a straight tax paid.

This formula has been in existence for many years, and it is this formula which the Senators from Illinois and Tennessee are now trying to change. If we adopt the Douglas amendment and treat this corporate dividend as a return of capital, which is a capital gains tax, then Christiana would be severely penalized. I have always argued that Christiana should pay its proportionate share of the tax, and this bill so provides; but I will not support a proposal that places an unjust penalty on them merely because the company has been successful. Under the proposal of the Senators from Illinois and Tennessee it is not inconceivable that for some taxpayers in the 87 percent bracket the Government would take almost a hundred percent of the value of the stock. Under the pending amendment 25 percent would be taken at the corporate level and then another 87 percent would be taken of what would be left when the stock is distributed to the stockholder. This would be confiscation.

This amendment should be defeated by an overwhelming vote.

This bill already puts the bulk of the tax—about $470 million—on the officials of the Du Pont Co., because they are stockholders who have had the stock over the longest period of time and therefore have the lowest cost factor. These people were not necessarily singled out. It is simply that the mathematics works out that way with respect to those who own the low-cost stock; those people would pay the tax.

Why should the man who paid $225 a share in the open market have to pay the same tax as the man who bought it at $1 a share, If we do not pass the pending bill that is what would happen under existing law.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would like to have the Senator from Rhode Island hear this statement. The question was asked as to why we were giving an 85-percent deduction on intercorporate dividends and transfers. It is because the corporation that earns money, corporation A, must pay a tax on it. It then passes the money down to corporation B. Corporation B then pays a tax on that dividend, whether it is a stock dividend or a cash dividend. Then that corporation declares a dividend, and it gets the money down to the stockholder. It is taxed, first, as income to corporation A, then as income to corporation B, and then as income to the stockholder. It is triple taxation of income.

That is why only 15 percent of the income that goes from corporation A to corporation B is taxed. What is more, we must keep in mind that when the second corporation passes the money on to the final shareholder, every nickel of it is subject to taxation at ordinary income rates. That could be at a rate above 80 percent or more.

That is why the 85-percent intercorporate dividend deduction exists. That would be the law as far as the distribution that Christiana or any other corporation of stock is concerned. They would pay at the 52-percent rate on the 15 percent, which is not exempt. That would mean about a 7½-percent tax, to get the stock from the Du Pont corporation into Christiana or any other second corporation.

The Douglas amendment would increase that rate three times. It would impose a 25-percent capital gains tax, and then the tax on 52 percent on 15 percent, which works out to about 7½ percent. It would more than double the taxes that a corporation holding Du Pont stock would have to pay to get General Motors stock under existing law to the ultimate shareholder.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There has been some confusion with respect to this. If the Senator will permit me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have yielded to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should like to conclude with this statement. What impels me to vote against the amendment is the fact that the amendment at the corporate level would tax an involuntary distribution to someone who does not want to change things at all, a thousand or 2,000 percent over existing law.

It seems to me that someone petitioning Congress for redress from an unfortunate situation would say, "Please do not hurt us. If you cannot help us, please do not hurt us. Just leave us alone. Just turn us loose. Let us go home."

If we pass the Douglas amendment many of the people who are trying to get some relief would beg us to kill the bill. That may be what the author of the amendment had in mind.

Mr. KERR. Madam President, how much time remains for the proponents and the opponents of the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time of the proponents has expired; the opponents have 30 minutes remaining.

Mr. KERR. Madam President, I ask the Senator from Virginia if he will yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Madam President, I feel that certain Senators want to do what is equitable and just with respect to the proposed legislation. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] has just called attention to a very pertinent fact. The bill has to do with how taxation shall be handled for taxpayers who are doing what they are doing because they are compelled by a court to do it. Statements or insinuations which have been made to the effect that the court found that a monopoly existed are in error. In this case, the stockholders are, in the words of Justice Frankfurter, "truly innocent." Those were his words. In this unique case there was no finding of monopoly. There was no finding of intent to monopolize. There was was finding of restraint of trade or conspiracy.

The Supreme Court, by a vote of four to two, adopted a new interpretation of section 7 of the Clayton Act, and found the Du Pont stock ownership created a reasonable probability. Those are the words of the Court. The Court said that at some future time Du Pont might monopolize General Motors purchases of automobile paints and fabrics. In so doing, however, the Court stated explicitly that "All concerned in high executive posts in both companies acted honorable and fairly, each in the honest conviction that his actions were in the best interests of his own company and without any design to overreach anyone, including Du Pont's competitors." That is the fact.

The Court made no finding of monopoly; it made no finding of intent to monopolize; it made no finding that there was restraint of trade or conspiracy. The Court held that Du Pont stock ownership created a reasonable probability that at some future date a certain situation of undue influence might arise. In order to guard against what it said was a probability with respect to what might happen at some future date, the Court said that Du Pont must divest itself of that stock. Du Pont did not want to sell the stock; Du Pont did not want to divest itself of it. Neither the individual stockholders nor the corporate stockholders wanted to receive it. But the Supreme Court of the United States said they must divest themselves of it; and in the process, the stock will go to the corporate and individual stockholders.

Congress has passed many laws to alleviate the condition of a taxpayer who is compelled by condemnation or other process of law to divest himself of property, so far as profit is concerned. We even passed a bill which provided that the owner of land in a reservoir site, being compelled in a condemnation suit to dispose of the property, would not pay any tax if within the next 2 years he reinvested the proceeds in a similar piece of property.

In this instance, we are dealing with stockholders who are in the position they are in by reason of the parent company being compelled to divest itself. With reference to Christiana, Christiana is being compelled under the bill to pay $85 million in taxes—a $80 million or $85 million corporation income tax—whereas under existing law Christiana would pay less than $4 million. That was on the recommendation of the Treasury Department and the Justice Department. However, the Justice Department contemplated the possibility that by reason of the discriminatory provision against Christiana, which does not apply to any other corporate stockholder of Du Pont stock, that provision might be thrown out in litigation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes yielded to the Senator from Oklahoma have expired.

Mr. KERR. Madam President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes, under the authority of the chairman of the committee, who is in control of the time.

The Department of Justice is concerned lest even the language in the bill, compelling the payment of an income tax by Christiana on a different basis than for any other corporate stockholder, might enable Christiana to have that provision thrown out in a legal action. The Department consulted with Christiana; and in order to draft the bill in the condition which the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department asked for it, Christiana agreed that it would raise no such point in a court action, and that it would accept the result of the discrimination against it as the only corporate stockholder in America which would be so taxed, and would make no contest of it.

Bear in mind that Christiana is in this position because of an action of the court compelling it. Under existing law, if Du Pont passed this stock out as a dividend, the cost to Christiana would be less than $4 million. The proponents of the amendment are not satisfied with that penalty against Christiana, which the Department of Justice asked for, and which is all it asked for, and which the Treasury Department asked for, and which is all that it asked for. The proponents of the amendment seek to add an amendment which would more than double the amount of tax which Christiana would have to pay, but with reference to which, under existing law, no other corporate stockholder in America would have to pay.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. Not for the moment.

Even the Treasury Department is opposed to the amendment. The Treasury says that the amendment would cause discrimination.

The distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] and the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], having seen the language from the Treasury, in which the Treasury indicated that view, have, within the past hour, asked Mr. Knight, of the Treasury Department, how he felt about the pending amendment. Mr. Knight says that the Treasury is opposed to the amendment because it is clearly discriminatory. In other words, Christiana would be compelled to receive this stock against its will and against the will of Du Pont, which is compelled to divest itself of the stock and to pass it to Christiana. However, the opponents of the bill are not satisfied with the extra $75 million of taxes to be paid by Christiana, as to which the Department of Justice expresses concern that it is discriminatory. The opponents of the bill want to more than double that tax. To do so would, in the opinion of the Senator from Oklahoma, make the tax discriminatory; and even the Treasury Department says it is against it because it is discriminatory.

The committee placed in the bill everything that the Department of Justice asked for. The committee placed in the bill everything that the Treasury Department asked for. So when Senators attack the provisions of the bill, they attack not only the Committee on Finance; they attack—if they are on this side of the aisle—their own administration. They attack the Department of Justice of their own administration; they attack the Treasury Department of their own administration; because representatives of those two Departments have said that the bill is eminently satisfactory to them, and that to add further provisions would make the bill even more discriminatory than the provisions which are already in it make it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KERR. I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The able Senator from Oklahoma has told us that the bill contains everything that the Department of Justice desired. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. I said the Department of Justice advised the Committee on Finance that the amendments which are in it are acceptable. So far as I know, they are the amendments that the Department of Justice asked for. I was at all the hearings of the Committee on Finance, even those which the Senator from Tennessee did not attend. He himself has the letter from the Department of Justice which has been read into the RECORD. The chairman of the committee has read into the RECORD a letter from the Treasury Department, in which the Treasury says it has no objection to the bill. However, the Treasury Department says it objects to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I submit to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that the real meat of the bill is now becoming clear. The Department of Justice asks for more than is contained in the bill. I read from the letter addressed——

Mr. KERR. I do not yield for the purpose of enabling the Senator to read from a letter. I made that point the other day. If he wishes to read from the letter of the Department of Justice, it is in the RECORD. I ask him to read it on his own time.

Mr. GORE. Then is the Senator aware of the fact that in his letter the Attorney General states that Justice has asked the court to bar Christiana even from receiving General Motors stock?

Mr. KERR. I know what the Department of Justice is asking the court to do in the antitrust case; and it has been made clear in this RECORD that nothing in the bill seeks to influence the court in its decision in regard to the antitrust divestiture.

Madam President, nothing in the bill directs or indicates to the court what Congress wants the court to do in regard to enforcing its decision under the antitrust law. There is nothing of that sort in the bill or in the action of the Finance Committee. In fact, the report of the Finance Committee clearly states that under no circumstances is this bill to be construed as a suggestion to the court as to what shall be its decision in the antitrust case; and that is all that the Attorney General asks for. In the letters which are before the Senate, the Attorney General has asked that it be made abundantly clear that nothing in the bill would be an indication that Congress wants to influence the court's decision; and that has been done.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would it be going too far to say that the purpose of the bill is to create a tax legal situation whereby innocent purchasers or innocent holders of the stock would not be unduly penalized if the court in the application of the antitrust laws felt that the application of those laws required a certain decision to be made?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from South Dakota is eminently correct, and that is the sole provision of the bill.

Madam President, I repeat what I said the other day—namely, that under the provisions of the bill the Treasury Department will receive approximately $430 million in taxes within 3 years. Under the decision of the Supreme Court—which is that the company divest itself of the stock in 10 years—under existing law the Federal Government would receive approximately the same amount, but would receive it over a 10-year period, instead, of over a 3-year period, as will be the case under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator has said there is nothing in the bill which says that the court should order divestiture. Insofar as a tax is involved, would any provision of the bill place the court in a straitjacket, regarding the disposition to be made?

Mr. KERR. Nothing whatever. The Supreme Court cleared that hurdle when it ordered divestiture under existing law.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available to the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KERR. Madam President, I yield myself 10 additional minutes, in order to be able to answer the Senator's question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 10 minutes more.

Mr. GORE. Madam President——

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Unless the court orders divestiture——

Mr. KERR. The court has already ordered divestiture.

Mr. GORE. To be exact, the Supreme Court has ordered divestiture, but has remanded the case to the trial judge, to enter an order as to the plan of divestiture.

Mr. KERR. As to how it may be accomplished.

Mr. GORE. Unless the decree for a plan of divestiture requires divestiture within a 3-year period, what effect will this bill have?

Mr. KERR. Let me ask the Senator from Delaware whether the bill requires that the stock pass through Christiana Corp. to its stockholders.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It does not; it does not say in any way what the court's decision shall be.

Mr. KERR. That is my impression.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Department of Justice will debate that question before the court. This bill only provides that if the company is ordered to divest itself of the stock and to distribute it to the stockholders they will get the same treatment that would be accorded under title I to the stockholders of the Du Pont Co. If there were no court order to divest, this bill would not apply to the stockholders at all.

If, on the other hand, the court orders the Christiana Corp. to sell the stock it would pay capital gains tax both under the pending bill and under existing law.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. A moment ago the Senator from Rhode Island asked whether this would attempt to place the court in a straitjacket. Is it true or is it not true that the court might find that under existing circumstances certain action was justified but that, in view of the extreme circumstances or hardships which would be imposed on certain persons, the court might be constrained not to order certain things which the court might feel otherwise should be done, and that, therefore, the passage of the bill might have an influence on the court, because of such hardships on certain persons?

Mr. KERR. I cannot answer the Senator's question as to whether such inhibitions would exist. The record indicates to me that the Supreme Court has decided this matter solely on the basis of its interpretation of the antitrust laws, not on the basis of the applicable taxable result; and I am of the opinion that the trial court will do the same thing. If it does not, the Department of Justice has requested that we leave it in a position to be free to appeal again to the Supreme Court, free from any possible intimation by Congress that Congress is directing it as to how to handle the tax features of the Court's order of divestiture under the antitrust provisions of the law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Tennessee has raised a question about the 3-year limitation under the bill. Under the Supreme Court's decision, the Court ruled that the distribution should take place during a 10-year period.

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. And it gave the company 10 years in which to work out the plan. Under that decision and under present law the Department of Justice would have no choice except to allow the company the 10 years. The Department of Justice and the Treasury reasoned that if the pending bill in its present form were passed 3 years would be adequate. The company also agreed to this period. Therefore the Departments asked our committee to write the 3-year limitation into this bill, and the company has agreed that if the bill is passed and if the court requests 3 years it will have no objection to the 3-year period. The langauge of this bill has been approved by both Departments.

Mr. KERR. That is correct—with the result that Christiana and the Christiana stockholders and the larger stockholders in Du Pont will pay most of the $430 million taxes to be received by the Government in 3 years, whereas under the order of the Supreme Court and under existing law that tax would be paid by the nearly 300,000 stockholders of Du Pont, but would be paid over a period of 10 years. But if the Court's order and if the present law continue, Christiana will pay less than $4 million total tax, instead of $80 million, to begin with, plus another $150 million, if the court orders it to divest itself of this stock by sale.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KERR. Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GORE. I shall be glad to yield time on the bill to the Senator from Oklahoma, if he will yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired, and he has yielded the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me ask how much time the Senator would like to have.

Mr. GORE. Ten minutes or so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, I am delighted—really delighted—that there are so many Members of the Senate listening, particularly Members of the Senate who are lawyers.

Now I ask a plain, simple question of my distinguished friend, the able senior Senator from Oklahoma, who himself is a lawyer, with eminent capability, and an expert on taxation. I ask him a simple question, and I will yield for him to answer it. The question is, Unless the court orders divestiture within a 3-year period—which provision Senators will find at the bottom of page 3 of the bill, beginning with line 23 and ending on line 4, page 4—what effect would the bill have?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. Let me complete the question. I shall yield in a moment.

Let me point out to my friends in this body who are lawyers that this is a part of the definition of "divested stock," and no stockholder except a holder of divested stock will receive any benefit under this bill. The tax consequences do not touch him. Therefore, the answer to the question I submitted to the able senior Senator from Oklahoma is that, unless the court renders a decision pursuant to what the senior Senator from Delaware has described as limitations in the bill, unless the court renders a decision pursuant to the definition of divested stock contained in the bill, the entire definition—there are no "or's"; there are "and's"—read them——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. In just a moment. I am going to nail down the point that the purpose of this bill is to tailor-make the decision of the judge. If my lawyer friends will follow me, I will prove it by the terms of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. In just a moment. The Senator has made a number of statements. So have I, but I have the floor just now.

Unless a stockholder holds stock that meets the requirements of "divested stock," as defined in the bill, then no benefit will accrue under the bill. If this does not prove conclusively that the purpose of the bill, in the words of a member of the committee, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], is to "make it easier" for the court to render its judgment, I submit that logic of the order of 2 and 2 making the sum of 4 is invalid.

Since I have referred to the Senator from Oklahoma, I yield first to him, with apologies to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. KERR. I did not rise in order that the Senator might yield to me. I rose to answer a question, if the Senator ever asked it, but I never heard him ask the question.

Mr. GORE. I will submit to the Senator the same question I asked of him earlier when he had the floor, and to which he did not supply the answer.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma did answer the question. The Senator from Oklahoma asked the Senator from Delaware if a certain question raised was not correct, and the Senator from Delaware said it was. The Senator from Oklahoma agreed with that answer. Therefore, he agreed with the answer given by the Senator from Delaware to the question.

Mr. GORE. Yes; but it was not in response to the question. I will ask the Senator from Oklahoma the question again. Unless the decree for divestiture provides for divestiture within a 3-year period, will this bill have any legal effect on anyone?

Mr. KERR. It certainly will.

Mr. GORE. Very well. Show me. I yield to the Senator for a reply.

Mr. KERR. Immediately upon receipt of this stock——

Mr. GORE. By whom?

Mr. KERR. Well, by Christiana, they pay the $75 to $80 million tax instead of a $3½ million tax.

Mr. GORE. The able Senator is not responding to the question.

Mr. KERR. The only purpose of the bill is to alleviate the penalty on innocent stockholders of excessive taxes which would become due under carrying out of the divestiture order of the Supreme Court in the antitrust proceeding. That is the only purpose of the bill.

Mr. GORE. I am not talking about the purpose.

Mr. KERR. But even to the extent of the relief granted, certain stockholders will pay far more taxes than they would without the bill.

Mr. GORE. I am not talking about what would happen without the bill. I am asking the Senator a simple question.

Mr. KERR. And the Senator has answered it.

Mr. GORE. Unless the court decrees a plan of divestiture which is to be carried out within a 3-year period, as spelled out on pages 3 and 4 of the bill, which provision I understand was suggested by the Justice Department, will the bill have any effect? The Senator from Oklahoma is an able lawyer. Before he answers in the affirmative, I suggest he had better study that language very carefully.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma has examined the bill very carefully and has answered the Senator's question.

Mr. GORE. I ask any lawyer on this floor to read the bill. This is a special relief bill. It applies only to the Du Pont case. It applies to divested stock as defined in the bill. If Senators will look at page 3, they will see the definition of "divested stock." All of the definition must be complied with—all parts of the definition. I maintain that unless the court renders a decision within the specifications of the bill, the bill is null and void and without effect.

Unless the bill is intended to tailor-make the decision and to encourage the court to render a decision in conformity with the terms of the bill, what is the purpose of it?

Mr. KERR. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Assuming that the Senator's statement is correct——

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KERR. Assuming that the Senator's statement is correct——

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KERR. Then the order of the Supreme Court that the divestiture take place in 10 years under existing law would certainly be in effect.

Mr. GORE. What was the order of the Supreme Court? I want to quote a line from the Supreme Court decision.

Mr. KERR. The Supreme Court ordered that divestiture take place——

Mr. GORE. Within a certain period of time.

Mr. KERR. Within a period of 10 years.

Mr. GORE. Very well. Now we are getting to the question. The Senator has in the last instance stated the situation correctly. But the bill provides, in the definition of "divested stock," a stock pursuant to a divestiture order—let me read the language:

> (C) fixes the period of time within which the distributing corporation must divest itself of all stock to be disposed of by it by reason of the suit, and such period expires not later than 3 years from the date on which such order becomes final (appeal time having run or appeal having been completed).

Madam President, I do not raise the question as to whether it would be in the public interest that the divestiture be ordered within 3 years or be permitted with a 10-year period. That is not the question I raise. I am talking about a simple provision of the bill, and am refuting the statements made continually on the floor, and contained in the committee report, that the bill does not have as its purpose the tailor-making of the decision of the court.

I say to my friend that several members of the Senate Committee on Finance have confirmed to me that that is the purpose. I shall read to the Senator the statement of one member of the committee, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], to be found on page 368 of the Record for January 17.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time yielded on the bill has expired.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes from the time on the bill.

This quotation is from the remarks of the junior Senator from Minnesota:

> I think perhaps the principal justification for this action with reference to the court proceeding is that by passing a law which establishes that these particular tax results can follow from a divestment we really make it easier.

Let me repeat that. This is exactly what the Senator from Illinois and I have been saying. This is a come-on for a pass-through.

> We really make it easier for the court to order a divestment which will be—

In the opinion of the junior Senator from Minnesota—

> fair and equitable.

This is exactly what the Du Pont lawyers are pleading for. The bill has certain specifics. I am delighted finally to come to the point of debating specifics. I have asked a specific question and pointed to a specific provision of a bill, a part of the definition of "divested stock."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware rose.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, there is an interesting feature of our system of government, which is that the judge must be a lawyer, the prosecuting attorney must be a lawyer, the counsel for the defense must be a lawyer; and then, after all these lawyers get the case sufficiently confused they call on 12 laymen to straighten them out. [Laughter.]

As a layman I should like to answer the Senator from Tennessee, an eminent lawyer, and tell him very simply, first, that the language with which he is finding fault was put in the bill upon the request of the Department of Justice. Second——

Mr. GORE. Madam President——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Does the Senator wish to have a complete answer or not?

Mr. GORE. I will nail that statement down now.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is the trouble with some lawyers—they never listen.

Mr. GORE. I will nail that point down now. The Senator has made a statement.

The bill has several stipulations. There are several parts of the definition of "divested stock." The Senator from Delaware did not draft the terms of this technical bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Department of Justice working in conjunction with the Treasury Department drafted the language of the bill as reported by our committee.

Mr. GORE. I have heard that statement a number of times; and yet no one has said who, by name, drafted the language. I know that the Attorney General has written to the Senate a letter, saying that he is concerned lest the passage of the bill might cause the Government to lose its case in the court.

Mr. KERR. I challenge that statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree that there is no such statement in the letter.

Mr. GORE. I know the Attorney General has gone so far as to say——

Mr. KERR. I challenge that statement.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I shall be glad to respond to that challenge as to whether or not I fairly paraphrased the statement of the Attorney General. If I did not, I shall certainly be the first to acknowledge it.

I wish to read from the letter addressed to the junior Senator from Tennessee by the Attorney General:

> As we have indicated in a letter to Senator Paul H. Douglas, copy of which is attached, the Department is concerned that enactment of the provisions of H.R. 8847 with respect to distributions of General Motors stock by Christiana Securities Corp. may cause the district court to refuse the Government's request that Christiana be required to sell the General Motors stock distributed to it.

Madam President, I gave my own interpretation, to the effect that the Attorney General was concerned lest the passage of the bill might cause the Government to lose its case in the court. Now I have read the statement. He is so concerned.

I shall read another sentence, which I attempted to read earlier and for the reading of which my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Oklahoma, would not yield. It is as follows:

> In fact, in the proceedings pending in the district court in Illinois, the Government has urged the court to decree that Christiana Securities Corp. and its stockholders be barred from receiving General Motors stock to be distributed by Du Pont.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GORE. I wish to read another sentence, and then I shall yield.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time yielded on the bill has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I yield the Senator from Tennessee 10 additional minutes.

Mr. GORE. I read further from the letter:

> It is proposed that this be accomplished by requiring either that Du Pont distribute cash instead of stock to Christiana or that Christiana be required to sell any General Motors stock which is distributed to Christiana by Du Pont.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The query I should like to make is this: Assuming that the tax returns under either the 3-year mode or the 10-year mode of distribution will be practically identical, is it a fact that the Attorney General takes the position that if the bill were passed it might induce the court not to respect the plea that Christiana divorce itself from the stock and let it flow into the market?

Mr. GORE. I have read the statement. I ask my aid to deliver to the distinguished Senator from Ohio a copy of the Attorney General's letter.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let me put the question this way: Will the Senator from Tennessee identify specifically what the Attorney General fears he will not be able to obtain if the bill is passed?

Mr. GORE. I shall read the language again. I read a part of a sentence:

> The Department is concerned that enactment of the provisions of H.R. 8847 with respect to distributions of General Motors stock by Christiana Securities Corp. may cause the district court to refuse the Government's request that Christiana be required to sell the General Motors stock distributed to it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That confirms the premise of my question.

Will the Senator read the last clause again, as to Christiana distributing the stock?

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator allow me to read the entire sentence?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. I read the entire sentence:

> As we have indicated in a letter to Senator Paul H. Douglas, copy of which is attached, the Department is concerned that enactment of the provisions of H.R. 8847 with respect to distributions of General Motors stock by Christiana Securities Corp.

The issue is whether the Christiana Securities Corp. is to be permitted to receive the stock or to be required to divest, either by sale or by pass-through. That is the question. All the conversation about orphans and widows, and the smokescreen about what the tax would be if there were a wholesale distribution of General Motors stock, is irrelevant.

The question involved in the fight in Chicago concerns the Christiana Corp. The fight is over whether the Government shall be granted the relief from existing conditions which it has been seeking since 1949.

Since so much has been said to the effect that nobody was found guilty of anything by the Supreme Court, I shall read what the Supreme Court said. This is to be found on page 606:

> But the wisdom of this business judgment—

I am not reading from minority or dissenting views. I am reading from the opinion of the Supreme Court—

> But the wisdom of this business judgment cannot obscure the fact, plainly revealed by the record, that Du Pont purposely—

It is not by accident—

> purposely employed its stock—

To do what? Listen to this statement, my friends—

> to pry open the General Motors' market, to entrench itself as the primary supplier of General Motors requirements for automotive finishes and fabrics.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Returning to my original question, the Senator began to read from a letter addressed to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] by the Attorney General.

Mr. GORE. No; that letter was addressed to me. A similar letter was sent to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Attorney General wrote that he had feared that the enactment of the provisions of H.R. 8847 with respect to distribution of General Motors stock by Christiana Securities Corp. may cause the district court to refuse the Government's request that Christiana be required to sell—the word "sell" is the important word in that sentence—the General Motors stock distributed to it.

Mr. GORE. So the question with reference to divestiture by Christiana is whether it shall be by sale or pass-through.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There are two modes of distributing the stock. One is by selling it and by doing so, it would be taken out of the hands of a few and put into the hands of the many.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Attorney General wishes it sold, putting it into the hands of the many and taking it out of the hands of the few.

Mr. GORE. Yes. I wish to point out to the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio, who only yesterday in closed session of our subcommittee demonstrated that he has practiced a great deal of law, that the Attorney General took the unusual step, because of his concern, to request the Senate to make it "crystal clear" that the bill—I do not have his exact words—was not designed to influence the court. I submit to the senior Senator from Ohio that I have shown what is, in the words of the senior Senator from Delaware, a specific limitation in the bill. Unless the judge complies with that limitation, the bill will be null and void. It will be useless, worthless, and of no effect at all. There are other limitations. But I wanted to pin that one down, because some, I fear, have thought that, because I kept making the assertion that the bill is designed to influence the court, I was unwilling to accept the statement to the contrary in the report of the Senate Committee on Finance.

I wish to say a word about that report. I do not know who wrote the report. The custom is for the staff of the committee to write the report. The terms of the bill itself do not support the statement in the committee report.

I now yield to the senior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I do not ask the Senator to yield. I will ask the Senator from Montana to allot me 5 minutes to document the statement I made.

Mr. CARROLL. Madam President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. GORE. Madam President, will the Senator from Montana yield additional time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I believe I heard the able Senator from Oklahoma say that the bill has been approved by the Treasury Department.

Mr. GORE. I think I would like to say right here that we have a Republican Secretary of the Treasury. I have not heard him say that he approved the bill, but I would certainly not be surprised that he does approve it, if, in fact, he does.

Mr. CARROLL. What I seek to do, at least for my own information, is to bring the debate into its proper context. I understand that since the adjournment of Congress, the Department of Justice has filed a new brief in the Chicago court where the case is still pending. The Department has now taken a strong position, as has been so ably set forth by the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore].

The able Senator from Tennessee has said that counsel for Du Pont are pleading with the court not to pass judgment on the case until we get through with the proposed legislation.

In view of this occurrence in the Federal court it seems to the junior Senator from Colorado that the Senator from Tennessee is correct in his position. The proposed legislation might affect the outcome of that case. Make no mistake about that point. If that were not true, why did counsel for Du Pont plead with the court to hold its final judgment and order in abeyance until the Congress had acted. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that the proposed legislation might have an effect upon the judge of that Federal court.

By the same token, I have taken the position that the proposed legislation is premature. For this reason, I cannot accept the other amendments that have been offered.

The proposed legislation is premature. I intend to vote against the amendments. I intend to vote against the bill on the question of its final passage in this body. There is no doubt at all that the question is as stated by the Senator from Ohio. There is pending litigation before a court that has jurisdiction under a Supreme Court decree. To do what? To formulate a plan. And what plan is being formulated? Based upon the recent brief of the Department of Justice and the recent brief of the Du Pont Co., it is a plan for divestiture under the antitrust laws of this country. It is a plan with which this legislation could interfere.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is so correct. What the bill proposes to do is to provide legislatively a solution to this contest which has been underway in the courts since 1949.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the able Senator from Tennessee for yielding to me.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, I wish to use the 2 or 3 minutes remaining to me to talk about the amendment which the senior Senator from Illinois has offered. I shall later develop in more detail other specifics in the bill. The amendment of the senior Senator from Illinois proposes one point, which can be stated simply. It would provide that all stockholders of the Du Pont Co., corporate and individual, be treated exactly alike. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois if my statement is correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is absolutely correct. Each stockholder would be taxed at capital gains rates on the accretion in value of each share.

Mr. GORE. The junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] said that the amendment would increase the proposed tax on some taxpayers threefold. Such a statement would be but a beginning of a summary of the results which would follow. I can cite to the Senator an example of one large life insurance company, without using its name, which has heavy holdings of Du Pont stock. That company would pay only a fraction of 1 percent of the value of the GM stock it would receive in taxes under the pending bill, but under the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Illinois it would pay the same modified, reduced capital gains tax that an individual stockholder in Louisiana, Tennessee, or Delaware would pay.

The amendment can be stated simply. It provides tax relief. It gives modified capital gains treatment to every stockholder of the Du Pont corporation. It treats the corporate stockholder exactly as it treats individual stockholders.

Again I ask my friend from Illinois to state if I am correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Can the Senator tell me whether the particular insurance company he has in mind would wind up, under the Douglas amendment, paying a great deal more in taxes than that insurance company would pay if we pass no bill at all?

Mr. GORE. The answer is "Yes." If the amendment is adopted, that is.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. GORE. Of course.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I understand that the Douglas amendment would require the insurance company, and the average company holding Du Pont stock, other than Christiana, to pay much more in taxes than they would pay under existing law.

Mr. GORE. Well, it is proposed to change existing law with respect to several taxpayers—for the Du Pont Co., for the stockholders of Du Pont, and for Christiana. It is proposed to change it for Christiana stockholders. However, the Senator resists changing it for corporations other than Christiana.

Of course the amendment would require the insurance company I have cited to pay more taxes. That insurance company has had an appreciation in the value of its share of this GM stock of about $50,000 since the Senate has been debating this bill. Yet the Senator would let it pay a tax of about three-tenths of 1 percent of the market value of this GM stock it is to receive. Yet the Senator would require a capital gains tax to be paid by the individual stockholder. Where is there justice in that? The present law ought to be changed not only with respect to this situation; it ought to be changed, period.

Here we have a specific bill, a private relief bill for the stockholders of Du Pont. Why not treat all stockholders alike? What is the reason for not doing that?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. What I cannot understand is why the Senator would feel, if someone comes in asking for relief from a harsh, inequitable situation, we should pass a bill so as to charge him two or three times as much tax as he would have to pay under existing law.

Mr. GORE. The insurance company has not come in here and asked for anything. It is happy to be left alone.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. What bothers me about the position of the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Tennessee, very warm friends of mine whom I would very much like to support, is that what we are doing is passing an ex post facto law. We are changing the rules in the middle of the game.

Mr. GORE. That is what the bill does.

Mr. CLARK. Let me suggest to my friend from Tennessee that his statement is not quite accurate. What the bill does is ameliorate taxes on certain corporations and certain individuals on the ground that an involuntary distribution is to be forced on them and, therefore, it is not fair to make them pay what would ordinarily be required to be paid in taxes.

With that I am in general sympathy, although I thought it would be wise to send the bill back to committee in order to await the decree of the court.

Now, what the Senator is proposing is not to give any tax benefit because they have an involuntary acquisition of stock forced on them, but the Senator is going to penalize them against their consent by changing the law in the middle of the game.

While I realize that it is proposed to penalize the rich and corporations, who can afford to pay, it does not seem quite fair to me.

Mr. GORE. We tried to postpone consideration of the bill which, as the senior Senator from Pennsylvania has stated, provides tax relief, because of a lack of a decision by the court. We proposed to postpone providing that relief from the decision of the court until the decision has been rendered. However, the Senate decided that it wanted to proceed with the bill, that it wanted to write rules, and to rewrite the rules, in the middle of the game.

The Senator from Illinois and I are saying, "If you are going to rewrite the rules in the middle of the game, then we want to write some equity into those rules." In other words, we do not believe that corporations should get by with paying three-tenths of 1 percent in taxes while individuals are required to pay a capital gains tax.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 10 minutes to the senior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma challenged a statement of the Senator from Tennessee that the Attorney General had advised him or the Senate that if we passed the pending bill we would jeopardize his case and he would lose it.

The Senator from Tennessee then started to read from the letter which he had received. As he did so, he said, "Therefore I paraphrase what the Attorney General said." I must say that he was very liberal in his paraphrasing of the letter. I wish to read to the Senate the language of the Attorney General, on which the Senator from Oklahoma based his challenge of the statement made by the Senator from Tennessee. The Senator from Tennessee read this sentence:

> As we have indicated in a letter to Senator Paul H. Douglas, copy of which is attached, the Department is concerned that enactment of the provisions of H.R. 8847 with respect to distribution of General Motors stock by Christiana Securities Corp. may cause the district court to refuse the Government's request that Christiana be required to sell the General Motors stock distributed to it.

Then the Senator halted. Then he paraphrased. That is when the Senator from Ohio came into the discussion.

The next sentence in the Attorney General's letter to the Senator from Tennessee is this:

> We have concluded, however, that we must, and the courts should, accept the statement contained in the Senate Finance Committee report on the pending bill that provisions of the bill with respect to a pass-through by Christiana are not intended to be an expression of opinion as to "what particular method of divestiture of General Motors stock by Christiana is appropriate. It is contemplated that all issues dealing with the manner of divestiture are to be determined judicially, solely with reference to the antitrust principles announced by the Supreme Court in the Du Pont case." Senate Finance Committee Report No. 1100, page 5 (1961).

The Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Tennessee tried the best they could to get the Justice Department to tell the Senate that the pending bill would hurt their case. However, the Attorney General declined in his letter to the Senator from Tennessee, in his letter to the Senator from Virginia, and in his letter to the Senator from Illinois. I now read from the Justice Department letter to the Senator from Illinois, which appears in the Congressional Record at page 183 of January 15, 1962:

> We also note your request that the Department take the position that this bill be postponed until such time as the court finally acts.

The Senator from Illinois asked the Justice Department to take that position. The Justice Department said:

> We also note your request that the Department take the position that the bill be postponed until such time as the court finally acts.
>
> The Department has vigorously urged the court to act on our prayer for relief without regard to pending legislation but in view of the statements of the Supreme Court and of the Senate Finance Committee, we are not in a position to argue that postponement of congressional action until the court acts is necessary to successful conclusion of our pending prayer for relief.

That is what the Justice Department said. That is the reason the Senator from Oklahoma challenged the statement of the Senator from Tennessee that the Justice Department had said if we passed the pending bill we would jeopardize their position and lose the case for them. The Justice Department said exactly the opposite. The Attorney General said:

> I also note your request that the Department take the position that this bill be postponed until such time as the court finally acts.

The Attorney General said that he could not do so. The language of the bill and the language of the report, clearly refutes that, and he accepts it.

That is what the Justice Department said. The Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Illinois cannot let the Justice Department accept the Justice Department's responsibility.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. They cannot let the court accept the court's responsibility. They want Congress to assume the responsibility not only for the Justice Department but also for the court. I do not believe the Senate will do so.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question. I rose to document my statement. I have done so, and I submit the record.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator know of any other instance in the history of the U.S. Congress in which the Attorney General took such action as to request, in letters to three Members of this body, that it be made crystal clear that the Senate does not seek to influence a court? So far as I am concerned, I have never heard of such a thing. The statement the Senator read was that the Attorney General said he was not in a position to argue so and so. I do not know about the position, but I submit that the paraphrase I gave of the Attorney General's letter, to the effect that he was concerned lest the passage of the bill might cause the Government to lose its case, is an accurate one. I went on to say that the Attorney General was so concerned that he took the unprecedented step of asking members of the committee to make it crystal clear that such was not the intent of the members of the committee.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Tennessee interprets it that way; no one else does. I have not made legislative inquiry or research to answer the Senator's question about what the Attorney General has done in other cases. I did make legislative research with respect to what the Senator from Tennessee said in June 1960, when he had an amendment before the Senate with reference to the matter pending in the Supreme Court. I placed the result in the RECORD today. When the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] said that the court would decide these questions, the Senator from Tennessee was outraged. He said this was a legislative responsibility; and that we should not abdicate our responsibility and let the court settle the question of taxation. The Senator from Tennessee said that the question of taxation was the responsibility of Congress. Today, to my utmost surprise, the great Senator from the old Volunteer State of Tennessee said, "Let the Supreme Court settle the question for me and my constituents." I say, "Heaven forbid."

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I believe my time has expired.

Mr. GORE. I think the Senator can get a little more time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How much time does the Senator wish?

Mr. KERR. I suggest that the majority leader yield the time to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I ask for 1 minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Oklahoma is not describing a comparable situation at all. The legislation which I proposed—and, by the way, let me remind the Senator that it received 2 votes in the Committee on Finance and was finally passed by this body by a vote of 86 to 0—was general legislation. It did not seek to tailor-make a court decision. It was positive legislation, dealing with the tax structure. What this bill provides is something entirely different. It sets up, specifically, a limitation and guidelines for a court decision; and unless the decision follows those guidelines, no one will receive any benefit under the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, I have been somewhat impressed by the Senator's statement that the bill was tailor made for certain purposes. Anyone who reads the committee report should understand that much of the tailor making was by the Department of Justice. Read the first page of the report. This is from the second paragraph of the committee report. The report is not long; it is short enough for anyone to read it.

> At the request of the administration, the bill has been limited to distributions in the Du Pont antitrust case.

In effect, neither the Treasury Department nor the Department of Justice desired to say that they cared to have general legislation drawn to meet this particular situation. They felt this was a situation in which some adjustment was in order. Why should that be so? Because the divestiture is being required under an antitrust law, which predated the personal income tax law. It predated by over 20 years the corporate income tax law. So when the Department of Justice undertook to require this type of divestiture, there were two laws which had to be considered, namely, the antitrust law, which makes one divest himself of property, and the income tax law, which imposes an unforeseen consequence.

Those concerned came to Congress, as they are entitled to do under the Constitution of the United States, to seek redress for their grievance in a certain situation. No one could have said, unless he was a tax expert, just what the tax consequence would be under divestiture.

The Government insists on divestiture under the antitrust law. That we know. That was the Government's object. What the Government would get in the way of taxes by virtue of the divestiture would be a pure byproduct. That is not what the Government has been seeking.

So what have we? We have an effort to write a tax law that would somewhat relieve the harsh consequences of two laws which, working together, result in a consequence that no one could have anticipated at the time the antitrust laws were first written.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I have heard used on the floor of the Senate many times this afternoon the expression "in lieu of cash dividends." Does the individual stockholder have any choice as to whether he will receive cash or a certificate of stock?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. He has no choice whatever.

Mr. PASTORE. When we use the words "in lieu of cash," that is not a choice being exercised by the taxpayer himself as to whether he will receive cash or a piece of paper, depending on which plan is ordered by the court. Is not that so?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct. The individual has little standing in court to say what the Du Pont Co. will ask for as a plan of distribution nor what the court will order.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not true that if he gets a certificate of stock and does not get cash, it is no more than right that he should not pay a tax on the cash value of that according to earned income rates?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Is not that the question before the Senate today? If a person gets a certificate of stock, but does not get actual money, he will pay a capital gains tax, and will not pay a tax as though he had received earned income.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is generally the idea. There is precedent beyond end for Congress to write tax laws which recognize such problems and the hardships imposed upon individual taxpayers.

I recall three times when the Committee on Finance has recommended to the Senate, and the Senate has passed without a single dissent to this particular provision of tax law, a provision that a corporation might voluntary dissolve without paying any taxes whatever on the dissolution. Bills were passed in 1950, and in 1942, recognizing that Congress would act to impose heavy and harsh taxes upon businesses in time of war, and also to give small corporations, particularly, a chance to dissolve tax free, and for shareholders to take their assets in kind, based upon what they had paid for their shares of the corporation.

On a number of occasions Congress has passed similar laws to relieve problems which existed for taxpayers.

So the Government is achieving its objective to bring about divestiture. However, in doing so, it is getting something else. Instead of getting divestiture in 10 years the Government is getting divestiture in 3 years. Who do we think asked for the 3-year period which is provided in the bill? We do not find that the Du Pont Co. asked for it. We do not find that the shareholders asked for it. We do not find that General Motors asked for it. The Attorneys General have been asking for 13 years to obtain a divestiture. As one of the conditions for tax relief, the Government insists on an earlier divestiture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is where the tailor-making comes into the picture. So far as limiting the bill to this particular situation is concerned, it was done in that way because the administration wanted it done in that way. The Department of Justice wanted it done in that way. So did the Treasury Department.

The idea that the 3-year period, for example, was some sinister effort by the Du Pont stockholders or by the Du Pont Co. to tailor-make the bill is not correct. What they wanted was the capital gains treatment which is available in the bill, treatment which we have accorded to a vast number of stockholders across the country, and for which a good case can be made.

The pending amendment seeks to have corporate shareholders who hold Du Pont stock pay a tax at a rate higher than that under existing law. Madam President, when someone asks the Congress to provide redress of a grievance—which the Constitution gives the citizens of the United States the right to request of Congress—imagine his disappointment if Congress doubles the tax which the complaining citizens would have to pay. Is that to be the redress we give these taxpayers? Yet that is what is proposed in this case.

The antitrust features of this matter have been studied time and time again. Far from having the bill provide the same advantage as that provided by the antitrust laws, this provision has been requested by the Department. As has been stated, the bill has been drafted in that way at the request of the Department, in order to bring about a fairer treatment in connection with the stock divestiture and the ensuing tax.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Louisiana has related the history of the provision in regard to a 3-year divestiture. I thought he followed that by saying that this is where the tailormade feature comes in. I wish to ask the Senator from Louisiana the same question I previously asked the Senator from Oklahoma, as follows: Unless the court's divestiture order meets all the conditions of the bill—including this one—in regard to the divested stock, will the bill have any effect?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In my judgment, the answer is that the bill will have no effect unless it meets those conditions.

Mr. GORE. Very well; that is what I have been saying.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But in answering the question and in stating that the bill will have no effect unless the conditions to which the Senator has referred are complied with, I also wish to state that, far from being provisions which were included at the request of the Du Pont Co., in seeking some special advantage, those provisions are insisted upon by the Department of Justice, in order to expedite the divestiture by Du Pont, insofar as it holds General Motors stock.

The Senator from Tennessee used the phrase "tailor made"; I was not the first to use it. But that point is referred to in the committee report, which indicates that at the request of the Department of Justice, that provision has been included.

Mr. GORE. I understand, and I am not complaining about this particular stipulation and limitation. But I am saying that the bill is intended to influence the decision of the court; and the Senator from Louisiana has just stated—entirely contrary to the answer I received from the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]—that unless all these requirements are complied with by the decree of the court, the bill will have no effect. The Senator from Louisiana is correct in making that statement, and that is what I have been saying. In fact, there are other stipulations, in addition to this one. I find no fault with this one——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available to the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, in order to allow the author of the amendment to explain the amendment—not the bill—I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Montana, because for the last hour and one-half the debate has been almost entirely directed to the bill, rather than to the pending amendment, which I have proposed.

The pending amendment aims to change the tax status of the stock held by the Christiana Corp. and other corporations. The pending amendment would not affect in the slightest the tax provisions in the bill to be paid by individuals who are stockholders in the Du Pont Co. I wish to make that point perfectly clear.

It is also well to keep in mind the basic facts: The accretion in value of the General Motors stock held by the Du Pont Co. has been from $2.09 to $55 a share—in other words, an accretion of approximately $53 a share; and on 63 million shares, the accretion in value of the General Motors stock in the hands of the Du Pont Co. therefore amounts almost exactly to $3,333 million. Since the Christiana Corp. holds 29 percent of the Du Pont Co. stock, the Christiana Corp.'s share of the accretion in value is almost precisely $1 billion. This is the basic economic fact to be kept in mind.

One legal fact which needs to be remembered is that the Du Pont Co. is contesting in the court in Chicago any requirement that Christiana Corp. divest itself of this stock; and we may find ourselves with a court ruling that the Christiana Corp. need not divest itself of the stock—although I hope that will not be the ruling. However, it may be the ruling. If that happens, what will be the situation insofar as the tax on the stock which Christiana Corp. will receive is concerned?

Mr. CARROLL. Madam President, if the Senator from Illinois will yield, will he restate what has happened in the Chicago court since our last recess? This is very important in connection with the debate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Chicago court is now being asked to pass on two questions: First, should Christiana Corp. divest itself of the General Motors stock which otherwise it would receive? Second, if Christiana Corp. is required to divest itself of that stock, is the divestiture to be by sale to the general public—which presumably would distribute the stock over a wide spectrum of persons—or will it be passed through to the present stockholders of Christiana Corp., with the established fact that 65 members of the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family own or control 80 percent of the Christiana Corp. stock? The Government is contending for both; namely, that Christiana Corp. divest itself of the stock, and do so by sale.

The Du Pont Co. is contending, first, that it should not be required to divest itself of the stock; but, second, that if it is ordered to divest itself of the stock, the divestiture should be by pass-through.

Mr. CARROLL. Madam President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. The Government is now taking a strong position on this point, is it not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. And that issue is before the Federal court?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it not true that counsel for the Du Pont Co. has urged in open court, that the court withhold judgment until the Congress passes on the proposed legislation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is what the newspaper accounts of the pleadings last Monday seemed to state. I have not read the transcript of the hearing in Chicago. But assuming that the United Press International dispatch is correct, that is the argument which was made.

Madam President, I point out that my amendment does not deal—except in an incidental way—with section 1 of the bill, about which there has been some discussion; but my amendment would eliminate sections 2 and 3; and the amendment provides that the corporations which receive the General Motors stock shall pay the same rate of taxation as that which will be paid by individuals—namely, a capital gains tax, in some cases modified. Under my amendment there will be no change insofar as individuals are concerned. The change will only be insofar as corporations are concerned.

I ask unanimous consent that a table I have prepared comparing the tax effects of the bill and the tax effects under my amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

Without objection the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Effects of Douglas amendment

Sec. 1	Under bill	Under Douglas amendment
Stage 1: Divestiture by Du Pont to individuals.	Modified capital gains	Same as bill.
Stage 2: Divestiture by Du Pont to corporations.	Christiana: $4.29=8 percent Other corporations: Original cost less 85 percent × 52 percent (same as present law).	Christiana: $13.20=25 percent. Other corporations: 1⅓ shares of GM=$75 less original cost to corporations of Du Pont stock. (Where original cost exceeds $75, no immediate tax. Where original cost less than $75, 25 percent of difference between $75 and original cost.) Affects no one who has bought in last 15 to 20 years.
Stage 3: Christiana divests:		
1. By sale	$11.25	No tax (already paid in stage 2).
2. By pass-through	$8.76 On individual Christiana stockholder holding stock at average base cost of $27.	$8.76. On individual Christiana stockholder holding stock at average base cost of $27.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, I point out that under the bill as it now stands, individuals are to be taxed at a capital-gains rate, but corporations are to be taxed at the intercorporate dividend rate, with a greater "break" being given to corporations other than the Christiana Corp.

As regards the tax now proposed to be imposed on the Christiana Corp.—with a capital-gain of $53 a share—the bill proposes a tax of only $4.29. Those who advocate that say that it is much more than Christiana would pay if no such provision were enacted; they say that if there were no such provision, the tax would be in the amount of 7½ percent of the original cost, or 16 cents a share. That is what the Du Pont people and some members of the Finance Committee tried to jam through several years ago; and they tried to have it apply not only to corporations, but also to individuals—which meant that on a capital gain of $3,333 million, the total tax would have been $10 million—in other words, three-tenths of 1 percent, or three-thousandths of the gain.

Of course, even $4.29 is better than 16 cents, but is it a proper tax? In my judgment, Christiana should pay the rate which individuals pay, and that is precisely what my amendment prescribes.

The Senator from Pennsylvania, whom I esteem very highly, and with whom I am generally in agreement, says it may be unfair to raise their tax during the process of discussion. I point out that it seems to be fair to reduce their tax, and I am proposing to reduce the tax compared with present law in the case of individual stockholders. Under my amendment, and the bill, individual stockholders would pay less than they would pay under present law. I think the tax under the present law if it actually applied would be unjust to them. I am proposing to reduce it. But I do not want to see the tax on Christiana made only $4.29 when they are gaining $53 a share, and when, if they were an individual, they would pay $13.25 a share. It is as simple as that.

The tax under the bill would be only $80 million on capital gains of approximately $1 billion.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. How much did the Senator say a stockholder who acquired his General Motors stock at $2 would pay?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator have in mind Christiana?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have in mind Christiana, but it could be others. What would they pay per share in taxes, under the Senator's amendment, at the corporate level?

Mr. DOUGLAS. About $13.25.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. So if a person acquired a share of Du Pont stock, and if Du Pont held stock which it had acquired from General Motors, at $2.09 under existing law that transaction would be taxed at 16 cents. The Senator would raise that tax from 16 cents to $16?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Thirteen dollars and twenty-five cents.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. About $13?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That would be an eightyfold increase over that provided under existing law.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The existing law is completely inequitable. The figures the Senator from Louisiana is introducing are, I think, a clear misuse of statistics.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me ask the Senator this question: How can the Senator justify taxing not only for Christiana, but other corporate holders of Du Pont stock at rates as high as 80 times more than the tax would be if they engaged in a voluntary distribution? Why would the Senator tax an involuntary distribution 80 times as heavily as a voluntary distribution?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] has an amendment drawn, which he intended to present after the voting on the pending amendment, which would generalize the principle of my amendment across the board for all corporations. I intended to support that amendment. It so happens that the Senator from Iowa has been delayed in coming from the delightful city whence the Senator from Louisiana comes, New Orleans, and will not, therefore, be able to present his amendment. I would have supported it, and I think the Senator from Iowa would have supported mine.

I hope the Senator from Louisiana is not maintaining that when we are considering a bill we can only decrease taxes, and not increase them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, and the yeas and nays having been ordered——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, who is in charge of the time on the bill?

Mr. GORE. The majority leader. I am in charge of the time in his absence.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator yield me time on the bill?

Mr. GORE. I yield 5 additional minutes on the bill to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, there should be no nonsense about this being a tax 80 times that under existing law. No amount of talk can obscure the fact that my amendment would apply the same tax rate to Christiana as it would apply to individual Du Pont stockholders. Let us examine the argument that my amendment would somehow be unfair.

Under the bill, the taxes for the stockholders of Du Pont would be reduced. Under the bill, taxes for Christiana stockholders would be reduced. Under the bill, taxes for Christiana would be raised. The total effect is supposedly a bill which would mitigate the tax effects of a divestiture, even though in the process some people's taxes are raised and some people's are lowered.

If my amendment is adopted, the same principles will apply across the board. Taxes for the Du Pont stockholder will be lowered. Taxes for the Christiana stockholder will be lowered. The taxes on Christiana and certain other corporations will be raised. The total effect is supposedly one of tax relief.

If the total effect under the bill is one of a general reduction of taxes brought about by decreases of taxes on some and by increases in taxes on others, and if the total effect, under my amendment, is one of a general reduction of taxes brought about by decreases of taxes on some and by increases in taxes on others, a bill with my amendment is just as fair as the bill as it now stands.

The principle is the same. It is only the amounts which differ.

What those who argue on those grounds are saying is that it is quite fair for the Congress, the legislative body of our Government, to lower taxes, but it is wrong for us in any way to raise taxes while the bill is under consideration.

If the Congress adopts my amendment, it will stand the test of fairness.

If Christiana does not divest, something like $140 to $150 million of the revenue which it is said would be collected under this bill would never be collected. All my amendment does is make certain that these amounts will be collected whether Christiana divests or not.

Incidentally, it would remove from the court the temptation not to order Christiana to divest, because it would take away a tax advantage which Christiana would receive under the bill if it did not divest.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Senators who argue that Congress should not increase taxes on a taxpayer because of an involuntary divestiture could not, by that argument, support the bill, because the bill would increase taxes on Christiana Corp.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. So what the Senator seeks is not this hodgepodge, but a uniform assessment of taxation on the distribution of General Motors stock held by Du Pont.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And the application of the capital gains principle, so far as the Du Pont divestiture is concerned, across the board, for corporations as well as individuals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas]. All time on the amendment has expired. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississipi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Butler] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. Capehart], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] is absent on official business to attend the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of American States.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Butler] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Capehart] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] has a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott].

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 72, as follows:

[No. 4 Leg.]

YEAS—18

Bartlett
Burdick
Cooper
Douglas
Gore
Gruening
Javits
Keating
Kefauver
Lausche
Long, Hawaii
McNamara
Metcalf
Moss
Neuberger
Pell
Proxmire
Yarborough

NAYS—72

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Bush
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Case, S. Dak.
Church
Clark
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dworshak
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickey
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan
Kerr
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pastore
Prouty
Randolph
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith, Mass.
Smith, Maine
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Wiley
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—9

Butler
Capehart
Chavez
Eastland
Hickenlooper
Miller
Morse
Muskie
Scott

So Mr. Douglas' amendment was rejected.

Mr. KERR. Madam President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, I have an amendment at the desk, which I call up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Tennessee will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 3, it is proposed to strike out all in lines 3 to 11, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(d) Definition of Antitrust Order.—For the purposes of this section, the term "antitrust order" means any judgment, decree, or other order rendered or entered under the Sherman Act (26 Stat. 209; 15 U.S.C. 1–7), the Clayton Act (38 Stat. 730; 15 U.S.C. 12–27), or both such statutes, in any action, suit, or other proceeding before any court, commission, board, or other agency.

On page 3, line 16, it is proposed to strike out the words "entered after January 1, 1961,".

On page 5, lines 14 and 15, it is proposed to strike out the words "after September 6, 1961,".

On page 7, lines 16 and 17, it is proposed to strike out the words "was owned by the distributee on September 6, 1961, or".

On page 8, lines 17 and 18, it is proposed to strike out the words "was owned by the distributee on September 6, 1961, or".

On page 9, lines 24 and 25, it is proposed to strike out the words "was owned by the distributee on September 6, 1961, or".

On page 11, lines 4 and 5, it is proposed to strike out the words "was owned by the distributee on September 6, 1961, or".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, the proposed legislation before the Senate started in the House of Representatives as a general bill, applicable not only to Du Pont, but to any divestiture situation that might be decreed by a court as a result of violation of the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act. The bills originally introduced in the Senate by Senator Frear and by the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] in the previous Congress were general bills.

It seems to me that this original approach was correct; that there should be the same tax treatment of the stockholders of any corporation that would be given to the stockholders of the Du Pont corporation.

The "Definition of Antitrust Order" on page 3, subsection (d), applies only to the Du Pont judgment, that is, "a final judgment rendered after January 1, 1961," in a case which was commenced before January 1, 1959. That definition applies only to this one case. My amendment would apply the same principles to all divestiture orders rendered under the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act by any court, the Federal Trade Commission, or any board that has authority to order a divestiture.

It has been my opinion that some good might come from legislation that would encourage a court, commission, or board, in a monopoly situation, to order a divestiture, by assuring that no undue tax hardship would be brought upon individual innocent shareholders.

The Clayton Act, particularly section 7, is not designed for the purpose of inflicting undue hardship upon individual shareholders.

The purpose of that act is to preserve our free competitive enterprise system.

In the bill before the Senate I should like to have differentiated between stockholders at the managerial level who are responsible for acts which constitute a violation of the antitrust law, and innocent stockholders. I would like to apply some penalty to the former, but no penalty to individual stockholders who have no part in the antitrust violation. But the Senate has decided otherwise.

H.R. 8847 is the kind of bill that we might have before us in the future to give broad, substantial relief to certain stockholders, whether they be corporate, part of management, or otherwise. It does not strike me as being fair to have a bill that only applies to the stockholders of one particular corporation.

In fairness, I thought some Department of Justice officials were in favor of the proposed idea at one time, on the ground that it might encourage divestitures to break up cartels and monopolies. I know that the present Attorney

General is opposed to the legislation I propose and has so stated, I believe, in testimony before the Finance Committee and perhaps in some letters. But what is good for the goose should be good for the gander. A smaller corporation without the ability—which Du Pont has—to secure the lengthy consideration that the pending bill has had ought to be entitled, for the benefit of its stockholders, to the same principle of tax relief that is being applied in the pending bill. That is the issue. I think it is quite clear.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point, immediately preceding the vote on the bill, there be printed a brief statement I have prepared on the bill, together with certain letters, including letters from the Treasury Department and the Justice Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, the bill before us is a fair and equitable bill both from the standpoint of the stockholders of the companies involved as well as from the standpoint of the U.S. Government.

This bill has been approved by the Treasury Department, the Justice Department, the Ways and Means Committee, and the House of Representatives by an overwhelming vote.

The bill was approved by the Senate Finance Committee by a vote of 14 to 2, and I strongly recommend its adoption today by the U.S. Senate.

This bill, H.R. 8847, would treat the General Motors dividend as a return of capital; that is, to the extent that the market value of the General Motors dividend on the date of distribution exceeded the stockholders original cost of Du Pont or Christiana, they would pay an immediate capital gains tax.

For example, Du Pont owns approximately 1.37 shares of General Motors stock for each outstanding share, and at the present market value of General Motors—$55—this is equivalent to $75 per share. If stockholder A paid $80 for Du Pont he would reduce his basic cost of Du Pont by $75, or to $5, and he would assign $75 as the cost of General Motors. He would owe no tax.

Stockholder B had bought Du Pont at $40 per share. He receives his General Motors dividend valued at $75. He would reduce his basic cost of Du Pont to zero and would owe an immediate capital gains tax of $35—$75 minus $40.

This means that all stockholders of Christiana or Du Pont who have a cost basis of Du Pont or Christiana of $75 or over would owe no tax whatever upon receipt of their General Motors stock dividend. Accordingly, the approximately 50,000 employees of the Du Pont Co. who have purchased Du Pont stock under the company's thrift plan would be exempt from practically all tax liability under this bill. Of the company's 200,000 stockholders, approximately two-thirds of them would pay no taxes under this bill upon receipt of their General Motors dividend because their cost of Du Pont is in excess of $75.

Under this bill the Government would collect $470 million in taxes, and this tax in its entirety would be collected from those stockholders who have the lowest cost basis of Du Pont, which group primarily represents the management of the company.

There is a precedent for treating this General Motors stock dividend as a return of capital. Under our existing law, suppose two farmers each owned a farm. Farmer A paid $10,000; and farmer B, $5,000. Each farmer received $6,000 as payment from a utility company purchasing a 99-year right-of-way through his respective farm. Farmer A reduces the cost basis of his farm from $10,000 to $4,000 and would owe no tax. Farmer B would write the cost basis of his farm down to zero for future tax purposes and would owe an immediate capital gains on the additional $1,000 which he received.

This is exactly the same formula under which the General Motors dividend would be taxed to the stockholders of Du Pont and Christiana under the provisions of this bill.

The bill has erroneously been labeled as a bill to aid the rich. It is quite the contrary. In fact, the $470 million in revenue which will be raised under this bill is collected in its entirety from the Christiana Corp. and from those stockholders who own Du Pont and Christiana stock at exceptionally low cost.

The Treasury Department has confirmed that under H.R. 8847 the tax on Christiana Corp. will be raised to $79 million whereas if this bill is defeated the tax on Christiana Corp. will only be around $3 million. In other words, this bill will increase the corporate tax liability of the Christiana Corp. from $3 to $79 million. This increase results from the correction of an unintentional loophole which has been found in the present law wherein Christiana Corp. would receive its approximately 20 million shares of General Motors stock, valued at approximately $1 billion, upon which under existing law they would only have to pay approximately 16 cents per share in tax.

Under title 2 of the bill we would correct that unintentional loophole, which correction would have the effect of raising the Christiana tax from 16 cents per share to $4.29 per share of General Motors stock. This increase is justified since under this bill the stockholders of Christiana Corp., if the court orders the divestiture of its General Motors stock, would receive the same return of capital treatment as the bill extends to the stockholders of the Du Pont Co. under section 1.

At this point I insert my telegram to the Treasury Department along with their reply thereto confirming my statement that under the committee bill the tax on Christiana would be increased from $3 to $79 million:

JANUARY 15, 1962.

Hon. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.:

Under the Supreme Court order that the Du Pont Co. divest itself of its General Motors stock, assume the market price of General Motors is $55 per share. Under such circumstances what would the corporation tax to Christiana Corp. be under existing law and what would its corporation tax be under H.R. 8847?

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., January 16, 1962.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Your telegram of January 15 asked what the intercorporate dividends tax to Christiana Corp. would be under existing law and H.R. 8847 in the event that the Federal district court orders Du Pont to distribute its General Motors stock to its shareholders. You asked for this purpose that we assume a market price of $55 per share of General Motors stock.

Assuming that the General Motors shares distributed have an average basis of $2.09 in the hands of Du Pont, the intercorporate tax under existing law would be approximately $3 million, as we indicated earlier in our letters to the Senate Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee. You will note that this figure is not affected by the market price of General Motors since under existing law the amount of a dividend distribution of appreciated property to a corporation is not measured by the market value but by the basis of the property in the hands of the distributing corporation.

Under H.R. 8847, the amount of a divestiture distribution of General Motors stock to Christiana is measured by the fair market value. Our earlier computations, which assumed a fair market value of $44 per share, estimated that the intercorporate tax dividend to Christiana under H.R. 8847 would be approximately $63 million. However, assuming a fair market value of $55 per share, the intercorporate dividend tax would be increased to approximately $79 million.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

Madam President, in discussing the provisions of H.R. 8847, a number of Senators have referred to this section of the bill which would substantially increase the intercorporate dividends tax payable by Christiana Securities Co. under present law from $3 million to approximately $79 million. As I said on the Senate floor last week, in other circumstances such a tax might be considered by some to be discriminatory. I am advised, however, by representatives of Christiana, that Christiana will not contest the validity of the additional intercorporate dividends tax if the bill is passed because Christiana believes that enactment of H.R. 8847 in its present form will prove to be of benefit to it and its shareholders in lessening the losses attributable to the market impact it believes would follow from a divestiture of General Motors stock under present law.

As further evidence that the charge that the bill as reported by the Senate Finance Committee was designed to help the large stockholders or members of the Du Pont family is wholly without foundation. I next insert a letter dated January 9, 1962, signed by Mr. Crawford H. Greenewalt, president of the Du Pont Co., wherein he points out how under the committee bill his tax liability will be increased from about $650,000 to a total of $1,400,000, or more than doubled.

Notwithstanding this increase in his own tax liability Mr. Greenewalt as the president of the company has endorsed the bill before us on the basis that the overwhelming majority of the stockholders of the company which he represents would benefit and would be relieved of substantial liability under the committee bill.

The reason his personal tax would be so high under the committee bill is because he had such a very low cost factor, but this example clearly refutes all arguments that the committee bill was designed to help the corporation officials.

I incorporate Mr. Greenewalt's letter at this point in the Record:

E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.,
Wilmington, Del., January 9, 1962.

The Honorable John J. Williams,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: In reviewing the debate in the Senate last fall on H.R. 8847 I find that Senator Gore made a statement which is not based upon the facts of the case. For this reason I feel compelled to present the situation as it actually exists. Senator Gore said, "I believe that the pressure for the passage of this bill does not come from taxpayers in the 20-percent bracket, or the zero bracket retired workers, widows, or orphans, unless they have been misled, but comes from the corporation officials and the high tax bracket stockholders."

I think I can best set the record straight by outlining my own tax position as a stockholder of Christiana Securities Co., first, under present law and, second, as it would be under H.R. 8847. I assume that I qualify as one of Senator Gore's "corporate officials and high tax bracket stockholders," and, furthermore, my own position does not differ substantially from the great majority of Christiana stockholders in high tax brackets.

The figures which follow assume a market value of $55 per share of General Motors at the time of distribution.

Under the Supreme Court decision and present tax laws, tax revenues would arise solely from the sale by the Du Pont Co. of some 40 million shares of General Motors stock over a 10-year period. Since these taxes would be paid by the Du Pont Co., their impact would fall uniformly on every Du Pont stockholder, whether he be rich or poor.

This tax would amount to about $12 per share of either Du Pont or Christiana common stock.

Under H.R. 8847 the distribution of General Motors stock is held to be a return of capital, and the stockholder pays an immediate capital gains tax to the extent that his cost of Christiana or Du Pont is less than the market value of the General Motors stock received. In the case of Christiana there are two additional taxes. There is the intercorporate dividend tax which is levied on the basis of the market value of the General Motors stock at the time Christiana receives it. Since Christiana has no cash with which to pay this intercorporate tax, I assume that it would sell a number of shares of General Motors stock sufficient to produce the necessary funds, which of course would involve a capital gains tax to Christiana on that sale. Upon a distribution by Christiana of the remaining shares (since my cost basis for Christiana is essentially zero), I would pay capital gains tax on the full market value of the General Motors stock received.

The sum of these direct and indirect taxes is about $25 for each Christiana share I hold, whereas under present law my tax would be only $12 per Christiana share.

It is clear then that my personal tax bill would be more than twice as great under H.R. 8847 than it would be if the divestiture were carried out under present tax laws. As the Du Pont Co. proxy statement shows, I am the direct and beneficial owner of roughly 55,000 shares of Christiana common stock; hence my tax bill payable in 3 years under H.R. 8847 would be about $1,400,000 as compared with about $650,000 over a 10-year period under present law.

A numerical majority of the Du Pont Co.'s stockholders have acquired their stock since 1950 and during the intervening years the price of Du Pont common has been in excess of the likely market value of the General Motors stock to be distributed. Hence these stockholders, which include some 50,000 employees, would pay no tax under H.R. 8847 at the time of the distribution of the General Motors stock. This compares with the $12 per Du Pont share payable on their behalf under present law.

These figures should make it abundantly clear that H.R. 8847 brings substantial benefits to the small stockholder and to those who have acquired their stock recently. Inasmuch as the total tax revenues collected by the Government are about the same under present law as they would be under H.R. 8847, it is equally clear that H.R. 8847 in fact shifts the tax burden to those Senator Gore characterizes as "corporate officials and high tax bracket stockholders."

In case you should be interested in further detail I attach a sheet showing exactly how these figures were derived.

Sincerely,

C. H. Greenewalt,
President.

Tax Consequences to Crawford H. Greenewalt as a Common Stock Holder in Christiana Common Stock Held by Crawford H. Greenewalt (Value in 1915, 30 Cents Per Share)

Assumption: $55 market value per share of General Motors common at time of distribution; 1 share of Du Pont per share of Christiana common 1.4 shares of General Motors common to be distributed per share of either Du Pont or Christiana common; Du Pont sells 40 million shares General Motors over 10-year period under present law.

Tax under present law: Capital gains tax paid by Du Pont on sale of 40 million shares General Motors—per Du Pont (or Christiana) share (40/63 × 1.40 ($55 − $2.09) × .25) $11.76.

Tax under H.R. 8847 per Christiana common share:

1. Christiana pays intercorporate dividend tax—(1.4 × $55 × 0.15 × 0.52) $6.01.

2. Christiana sells 0.14 shares of General Motors per Christiana share to raise the above tax and pays capital gains tax on this transaction—($55 − $10.03) × 0.14 × 0.25) $1.58.

3. Christiana distributes 1.26 shares General Motors stock (1.40 − 0.14) per Christiana common share. C. H. Greenewalt pays capital gains tax on essentially full market value ($55 × 1.26 × 0.25) $17.33.

The total of these taxes is per share held by C. H. Greenewalt, $24.92.

Madam President, I next insert in the Record a letter dated January 23, 1962, signed by Mr. Robert H. Knight, General Counsel of the Treasury Department, wherein he outlines the objections of the Treasury Department to the amendments which were offered by the Senator from Illinois to the pending measure, followed by a letter addressed to the chairman of the Finance Committee wherein the Treasury Department clearly states that the Department has no objection to the bill in its present form being enacted into law.

The enactment of this bill will give justice to the thousands of innocent stockholders of the respective companies involved.

The General Counsel
of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C., January 23, 1962.

Hon. John J. Williams,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: You have asked for the comments of the Treasury Department with regard to Senator Miller's letter to you of January 20, and with regard to the amendments to H.R. 8847 which he and Senator Douglas have offered.

One amendment would strike section 2 of H.R. 8847. This, in effect, would allow Christiana to receive the distribution of the GM shares allocable to it in accordance with present law which measures the amount of an intercorporate dividend in kind by the basis of the property in the hands of the distributing corporation. Section 2 would measure the distribution to Christiana by the fair market value of the property distributed.

The Treasury Department would be opposed to the elimination of section 2. As you may recall, the fair market value measure of intercorporate dividends originally was proposed as general legislation to apply to all intercorporate dividends to meet what the Treasury among others considered to be a defect in existing law. When it was proposed in the House to narrow this provision to Christiana, the Treasury Department did not object on the understanding that consideration would be given in this session of the Congress to general legislation to apply the fair market value measure to all intercorporate dividends. The Treasury Department plans to recommend such a bill to the Congress in the near future. The Treasury Department believed it was important to apply the fair market value rule to Christiana, since it was Christiana's preferred situation with respect to the dividend of GM shares which focused attention on the defect of existing law and which occasioned the proposal to amend existing law in this regard. In these circumstances it would have been incongruous to have allowed Christiana to escape the new provision merely because of a question of timing.

Additionally, one of the arguments which influenced the House and the Senate Finance Committee to favor the bill was that the revenue effects could under the assumptions presented by Du Pont witnesses be roughly equal whether divestiture occurred through distributions under the bill or through sales, distributions in lieu of dividends, and redemptions under existing law. If, however, section 2 is struck, this would no longer be true since the revenue estimate under the bill would on present market values have to be reduced by roughly $75 million.

An alternative proposal would substitute, for the intercorporate dividend proposal now embodied in section 2, a return-of-capital tax treatment on the distribution of GM shares to Christiana. On this we offer two comments. In the first place section 2, as it now appears in the bill, is from our viewpoint based on the principle that the present intercorporate dividend tax provisions are defective and should be changed and that such change should be enacted now in the case of the Du Pont divestiture order. The same principle would not appear applicable to, or justify, a return-of-capital treatment for the dividend to Christiana since the Treasury Department does not believe that such treatment is warranted for intercorporate dividends generally. While the proposal might promote consistency of tax treatment within the bill, it would not further consistency of the tax laws as they apply generally to intercorporate dividends or as we believe they should apply to such dividends.

Our second comment relates to the discriminatory nature of the burden proposed to be imposed. Section 2, as now drafted, would increase the intercorporate dividend tax payable by Christiana from approximately 16 cents per share of General Motors stock received to approximately $4.29 per share. The return-of-capital proposal would further increase the tax burden to approximately $13 per share, a very substantial increase. While it could be claimed, under other circumstances, that application of section 2 only to Christiana is discriminatory, this aspect is alleviated by the fact that Christiana has categorically stated that it believes the bill in its entirety, including section 2, would benefit itself and its shareholders by reason of eliminating the adverse impact on the market value of General Motors stock which would otherwise result. Therefore, Christiana has undertaken not to contest the application of section 2 as discriminatory legislation. The Treasury Department is not aware that the same considerations would apply to the return-of-capital proposal.

A third alternative proposed is to broaden H.R. 8847, including the intercorporate dividend tax proposal, to apply to all divestitures. Solely from the standpoint of the responsibilities of the Treasury Department, this proposal would be unobjectionable. However, the bill was originally narrowed at the insistence of the Department of Justice, which indicated it would otherwise oppose its passage. I understand that the Attorney General felt that relief in divestiture cases could not be justified on the ground that antitrust enforcement would thereby be improved and, further, that a provision for general relief in such cases might well encourage antitrust violations. The Treasury Department defers to the Department of Justice with regard to this question.

Sincerely,

Robert H. Knight,
General Counsel.

The General Counsel
of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. Harry F. Byrd,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Byrd: Mr. Colin Stam has passed on to me your request for a statement of the present position of the Treasury Department with regard to H.R. 8847, which would provide tax relief to individual shareholders receiving distributions of stock as a result of antitrust divestitures and would provide new tax treatment to corporate shareholders receiving divested antitrust stock which has appreciated in value in the hands of the distributor.

The Treasury Department would not object to the bill in its present form being enacted into law. This is, of course, the same position I expressed on behalf of the Treasury Department before the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee when these committees were considering the bill last fall.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

Robert H. Knight,
General Counsel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time the question is, Shall it pass? [Putting the question.]

The bill (H.R. 8847) was passed.

Mr. KERR. Madam President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, in the matter of the Du Pont bill, which has just been passed by voice vote, it happens that a great number of people in my State had written to me with respect to the bill. I heard from more than a thousand moderate, small stockholders. I had told them all that I was prepared to vote for the bill.

The fact that it was passed by voice vote leaves the Record silent as to the position of any of us who did not have an opportunity to participate in the argument on the amendments.

I wish the Record to show, therefore, that I voted for the bill, that I believe it is a good measure, and that I believe it will protect countless thousands of innocent people who are entitled to the protection given by the bill.

CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS ON THE EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I should like to have the attention of the majority leader and the minority leader. There have been reported from the Committee on Armed Services sundry nominations, including the nomination of the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and the nomination of the Secretary of the Navy. I understand that there may be some discussion as to at least one of these nominations. I should like to inquire of the distinguished majority leader as to when he thinks consideration of these nominations may be scheduled.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, after conferring with the distinguished minority leader, and in view of the fact that at least one Senator has asked that one nomination go over for a day, and in view of the further fact that the nominations will be on Executive Calendar tomorrow, I hope it will be agreeable to the Senator to take up the nominations of Mr. McCone, Mr. Korth, and the other appointees on Monday next.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is agreeable to me. So far as the majority leader knows—and the minority leader agrees——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. The nominations will be taken up on Monday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM TODAY UNTIL THURSDAY AND FROM THURSDAY TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I should like to inquire of the majority leader about the schedule for tomorrow and next week, in view of the fact that a delegation will be going to Kansas for the ceremonies for the late Senator Schoeppel.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is the intention of the leadership to ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next. I ask such unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. On Thursday it is anticipated that the Senate will take up Calendar No. 966, S. 1760, to establish the Great Basin National Park in Nevada, and for other purposes; also Calendar No. 1065, H.R. 6025, to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of George Edward Barnhart against the United States; as well as other business of that nature.

There will be no rollcalls on Thursday.

I ask unanimous consent at this time that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, it adjourn to meet on the following Monday, at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The purpose of making this schedule so circumscribed is due to the fact that some Members of the Senate are leaving tomorrow for Topeka, Kans., to attend the lying-in-state of our late, beloved colleague, Senator Schoeppel; others will be in Wichita, Kans., next day for the funeral. In view of the fact that we are pretty well caught up with the calendar, we are making these allowances this week.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If perchance a record vote should be requested on any of the bills, I assume that the vote would go over until Monday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If there are any rollcall votes, they will go over until Monday, so all Senators will be informed and protected.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. When is it the Senator's intention to call up Calendar No. 891, the welfare and pension plans bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. So far as Calendar No. 891 and Calendar 1053, the latter providing authorization for assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education, is concerned, it is anticipated that we will take up the higher education bill probably first, on Monday or Tuesday; sometime after that, Calendar No. 891.

RESOLUTION OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS PROVIDING FOR A STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF USE OF MATERIALS IN PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. KERR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a copy of a resolution adopted by the Public Works Committee, to institute a study and investigation into the use of new materials in public works, as set forth in the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Committee Resolution Providing for a Study and Investigation of Use of Materials in Public Works

Whereas the Senate Committee on Public Works has under its jurisdiction measures relating to flood control and rivers and harbors, roads and highways, public buildings, water pollution control, waterpower and other matters relating to developments within the Nation; and

Whereas the Senate Committee on Public Works has authority to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction; and

Whereas the Senate Committee on Public Works members have been vitally interested in the development, protection, and utilization our Nation's water resources as evidenced by their active participation in the hearing and deliberations of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources; and

Whereas there are now being produced and our scientists and technicians, both in industry and Government, are working on and perfecting many new materials and new uses of known materials and it is evident that such materials can be utilized efficiently and economically in the construction of public works, in the protection and operation of such works, in the preservation and proper utilization of our essential water resources and that such materials and their development and use enhance the opportunities for industrial and business growth and strengthening of our Nation's economy; and

Whereas representatives of industry and the Federal Government have shown a keen interest in discussing and disclosing their roles in the fields of research, development, and utilization of materials: Therefore be it

Resolved by a unanimous vote of the Senate Committee on Public Works, That the committee shall institute a study and investigation into the use of new materials, new use of materials, and new designs and methods being used or which may be used in flood control and rivers and harbors, roads and highways, public buildings, water pollution control, waterpower, and other developments relating to public works, including water resources development, utilization, preservation, and protection projects, and that a committee report be prepared thereon and submitted to the Senate.

Sec. 2. Such study and investigation shall include but not be limited to metals, plastics, rubber, coal, petroleum, timber, concrete, asphalt, chemicals and their direct use, uses of their derivatives or use in combination with each other or other materials, and shall attempt to determine the following:

(a) Description of proposed use of application of the subject material;

(b) General description of the material in terms of physical and chemical characteristics and, where possible, obtain a description of the physical or chemical phenomenon responsible for obtaining the desired effect;

(c) Results of laboratory and field tests to prove that the desired effect occurs and prove the durability or duration of the effect of the material;

(d) The limitations of the materials; i.e., problems of toxicity, limitation of effectiveness under certain climate, soil, or physical conditions;

(e) Cost of materials per standard units; i.e., square foot, lineal foot, cubic foot, etc., and cost projection in terms of future production capacity, improved manufacturing techniques, etc.; and

(f) Availability of material both on a current and future basis.

THE NEW HOUSE MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, selection of Oklahoma's Carl Albert as majority leader of the House of Representatives at the opening of this session is a great tribute to Congressman Albert's standing in the House and a reaffirmation of the confidence shown in him by our beloved Sam Rayburn when he chose him 9 years ago as House whip—and a strong right arm.

We in Oklahoma are very proud of the majority leader. As a former Member of the House, I know that our State's influence and prestige there has never been higher. Some articles in the press of our area tell the story better than I could tell it. I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record at this point an editorial from a newspaper in Mr. Sam's old district, the Denison Herald; an article from a very wonderful student daily at the University of Oklahoma which I once had the good luck to edit, outlining Carl's rise from "Big Man on Campus to Big Man in Congress," and a news-feature story from the McAlester News Capital in the majority leader's home district.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Denison (Tex.) Herald, Jan. 14, 1962]

Merited Promotion

Southeast Oklahoma is to be congratulated upon the elevation of Carl Albert to majority leader of the U.S. House of Representatives. We know that his many friends in Denison and Grayson County also are happy about this well-deserved promotion in the Democratic Party.

Congressman Albert is one of the ablest Members of Congress. He has an outstanding record, including a Rhodes scholarship, and is considered quite an orator on the floor. While he is not a loud, dramatic speaker but uses a calm, studied approach, his fellow Members listen carefully when he is on the floor and his remarks carry great weight.

The Oklahoma Congressman was a close friend and coworker of Speaker Rayburn. Through his connection with Mr. Rayburn he was a frequent visitor to Denison and Grayson County and made many good friends locally.

So we can be doubly happy for this promotion that our neighboring Congressman and friend from "across the river" has gone up a big step and also that a fine man has been chosen for a higher place of leadership in our country and the Democratic Party.

[From the Oklahoma Daily, Jan. 13, 1962]

Albert Aimed High—BMOC to Congress

(By Bob West)

From BMOC to big man in Congress—the 34-year transition has his old friends on campus and over the State recalling Carl Albert's brilliant student years in Norman. This week Albert became the floor leader of the U.S. House of Representatives. The highest congressional position ever held by an Oklahoman.

In 1927–28, a freckled 5-foot, 4-inch freshman from the eastern part of the State enrolled as a freshman at Oklahoma University, bringing along an unquenchable thirst for knowledge and an ambition to be an outstanding orator. By the time he got his degree in government in 1931, the same year he was doing freshman law work, Carl Albert had won national oratorical honors and was headed for Oxford University on a Rhodes scholarship.

As a student leader, Albert not only made Phi Beta Kappa and the senior men's honor society, Pe-et, but was a varsity oratorical team member and president of the Oklahoma University men's council. He made Phi Eta Sigma scholastic society his freshman year and belonged to Kappa Alpha social fraternity.

His former Oklahoma University speech coach, Josh Lee, now a Norman attorney and U.S. Senator from 1937 to 1943, was first impressed by Carl Albert when Lee was a judge for a State high school oratorical contest and the McAlester boy won.

Once at Oklahoma University, Albert chose the oratorical team over debate. Lee recalled Friday how Albert studied conscientiously and practiced to improve his speaking ability. Under Lee's coaching, Albert won the national intercollegiate oratorical contest, speaking on "The Constitution."

"Carl Albert was a pleasure to coach," Lee said. "He had a good voice and he spoke deliberately. He always sounded like he was thinking the words he was saying. Sincerity is the key to being a good speaker, and Carl Albert was always sincere."

Lee went on to say, "He was very careful about his material and support for his statements. I taught my students to memorize their thoughts, and then the words would come easily. Carl seemed to speak in this style. He apparently was interested in statesmanship and seemed to be living for the day when he could use his oratory. That day has come."

Albert majored in government, political science, and law and one and another of his former professors spoke of him Friday. Dr. Cortez A. M. Ewing, research professor of government, counts him as one of the best half dozen students he has taught. He had straight A's in Ewing's classes.

"He seemed to want to learn everything," Dr. Ewing said. "He was a good student because he could express himself and was a hard worker and student leader. He was always chuckling and had merchants and industrialists see a grand sense of humor. Moneywise he was a 'poor' student. He's an example of what a student can do if he has the will to do it."

WAS FINE STUDENT

In Albert's senior year, as a first-year lawyer, one of his professors was Dr. Victor H. Kulp, now David Ross Boyd professor emeritus of law. Asked Friday if he recalled Albert, Dr. Kulp was quick to say indeed he does. "He was a bright little fellow, a very fine student."

Emil R. Kraettli, longtime secretary of the university and of the board of regents, knew him well. "Albert was a very fine student and a leader," Kraettli recalled. "He remembers he borrowed from the Oklahoma University student loan fund to help finance his education. He also worked while in school," Kraettli said.

The Oklahoma congressional leader's achievements in scholarship, oratory, and military are considered among the outstanding in Congress, and his rapid development at Bug Tussle, Okla., where he was born, to the position of floor leader of the House of Representatives, is regarded as a personal achievement saga.

ENTERED CONTESTS

ALBERT was born May 10, 1908, the son of a coal miner, Earnest Homer Albert, and his wife, Leona Ann, the oldest in a large family. His interest in public speaking was encouraged by an elementary schoolteacher and when he entered McAlester High School, he began competing in speech contests.

His senior high school year he won the National American Legion contest. After his years at Oklahoma University, ALBERT studied 3 years at Oxford on Rhodes grants, receiving B.A. and B.C.L. degrees.

Returning to Oklahoma, he practiced law and studied more law at Oklahoma University. He worked with oil companies in Oklahoma, Illinois, and India, where he was in 1941 when the United States entered World War II. Going into the Army a buck private, he came out a lieutenant colonel and was awarded a Bronze Star for meritorious service in the Pacific theater in 1945.

ENTERED LAW

He married Mary Harmon, of Columbia, S.C., in 1942. They have two children, Mary and David. He entered law practice after the war in McAlester, with another Oklahoma University law alumnus, Walter Arnote. In 1946 he was elected to the 80th session of Congress in his first campaign for public office. He was 38 years old.

He has since been reelected to each session and in 1955 was elected majority whip. He has been active in farm legislation, serving as chairman of the Subcommittee on Wheat.

His duties in Congress have been such as to make maximum use of his facility for communication—his friendly and interested manner. He has been called on to stir up interest in House Members for bills up for vote, and organize them for voting unity. In this position, his ability to compromise and reason has been an asset.

KNOWS DISTRICT

With all his work on the floor, ALBERT has had to keep abreast of happenings in his district. He has five secretaries in his Washington office and his executive secretary is another Oklahoma University alumnus, Charles Ward, who received his journalism degree at Oklahoma University and was editor of the Oklahoma Daily.

In ALBERT's spare time, which is little, he reads clippings from his district's newspapers and all Oklahoma City and Tulsa papers.

He is planning to run for reelection this spring.

[From the McAlester News Capital, Jan. 10, 1962]

ALBERT LONGED YEARS AGO TO GO TO CONGRESS

CARL ALBERT, who Tuesday attained one of the highest of public offices, decided 40 years ago he wanted to become a U.S. Congressman.

He was but 12 years of age, when he learned that M.C. stamped on packages of free garden seed stood for "Member of Congress." The more he checked on those M.C.'s the more awed he became.

Young CARL already was a good cotton chopper, but he had higher ambitions. So he took up public speaking. He started studying more and working harder.

Time and again the energetic Oklahoma Democrat has been rewarded for his willingness to work—and talk. The last reward came this week when he was named majority floor leader of the House of Representatives.

ALBERT's reaction was typical, for most of his talking is about others.

"He never was much of a self-booster or a fellow who likes to blow his own horn," said Bill Anderson, county superintendent of schools and boyhood friend of the House Democratic leader.

Most folk in his "little Dixie" district of southeast Oklahoma long ago started looking up to the 5 ft. 4 in., 53-year-old Congressman who studied at Oxford University in England but still talks their language. ALBERT proudly bears the title of "The Little Giant From Little Dixie."

"He's always been sort of a leader," said Anderson.

"He knows most of the people around here by their first name, and they know him," said Walter Arnote, a McAlester attorney who was associated with ALBERT briefly before he went to Congress in January 1947.

"We just love him," said Mrs. J. Paul Lane, mother of five and a next-door neighbor. "He's just like one of the family." She said the only fault of her neighbor is that he is gone to Washington so much of the time.

One of Mrs. Lane's children, 8-year-old Jacquetta, did get a little perturbed at the Congressman on Thanksgiving Day last year. She and a friend went next door to sample the goodies and chat a bit, but nobody answered the door.

Jacquetta jammed the door buzzer in and held it—until ALBERT finally opened the door and beckoned the girls in. "Be real quiet for a few minutes," he told them, "I'm talking on the telephone to the Vice President."

The kids out at the Flowery Mound School—still popularly known as Bugtussle—know that their pie suppers will be a success if ALBERT's in the area. Because that's his old school and he still joins in the programs every chance he gets.

ALBERT has two children of his own, and he's a buddy to scores of others. He has little time for recreation, but he enjoys reading history books, playing bridge occasionally and sightseeing or even persimmon picking in the hill country where he was reared. He is a Methodist.

Anderson and others described ALBERT as persuasive and yet straightforward, a man who thinks quickly but doesn't shoot from the hip, a man who is both tough and gentle.

ALBERT's first big victory came while he was a high school student here. He started debating and entering speech contests as a freshman and in his senior year he won a national oratorical contest.

He may well have charted his political course by the ideas expressed in that boyhood speech on the Constitution.

"With the bodyguard of commonsense and the weapon of reason let us flout and expose the false propaganda of those who seek to overthrow the priceless charter of our liberties," he said.

The next year ALBERT entered the University of Oklahoma and he stayed consistently at the head of his class, graduating in 1931. He won a Rhodes scholarship and studied at Oxford from 1931 to 1934, returning to McAlester later to start a private law practice.

During World War II he rose to the rank of lieutenant colonel, and it was soon after the war that he turned to politics and was first elected to Congress.

In 1955 the late Sam Rayburn of Texas and other House leaders chose ALBERT to be whip or assistant majority floor leader—a post he has held ever since.

Rayburn never regretted the selection. He once called the Oklahoman "one of the greatest whips the House has ever known and one of the most capable legislators and finest gentlemen that anybody ever knew."

President Kennedy came to ALBERT's district last October to dedicate a road. And probably the biggest applause he received was when he paid special tribute to ALBERT, calling him a courageous fighter for good government.

It was apparent the crowd agreed.

AN APPRAISAL OF THE 1963 BUDGET AS AN ECONOMIC DOCUMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, on January 16, there was issued a study of the Federal budget as an economic document, written by Roy E. Moor of the staff of the Joint Economic Committee, for the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, of which I have the honor to be chairman. The following day I spoke in the Senate to call attention to this very useful study, which is a careful, comprehensive examination of the Federal budget with special emphasis on its usefulness for purposes of economic analysis. I noted that previous Federal budgets significantly conceal the full economic impact of Government, and that certain specific improvements should be adopted to make it more useful.

A few days ago Congress received the new Federal budget for the fiscal year 1963. Accordingly I believe that it may be of interest to present an appraisal of the 1963 budget in terms of the criteria set forth in Roy Moor's study.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Without anticipating what the Senator from Wisconsin is about to say, is it not true that in many respects the categories which the Bureau of the Budget employs are very similar, if not identical, with the categories recommended by Mr. Moor and approved by the subcommittee of which the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin is chairman?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois is correct. The study by Mr. Moor anticipated a number of changes which I think are great improvements in the budget. There are a few other categories that the Bureau of the Budget agrees we can move ahead on also. There is no question that the Moor study was a useful contribution in this field.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, the Moor study was undertaken at the request of the Senator from Wisconsin. Is that not true?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Wisconsin deserves a great deal of credit for initiating a study that will lead to a more meaningful budget. He deserves the thanks of all people who are interested in sound budgetary procedure.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator very much.

The general conclusion is that the new budget document represents a substantial improvement over past budgets. I think it is fair to say that this is the first sweeping reform of the budget document since the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921. The most immediately visible improvement is the change in size. In vivid contrast to previous budgets, which had the size and heft of a big city telephone directory, this year's budget closely resembles one of the larger, scholarly paperbacks that have gained popularity in recent years.

It is, of course, necessary for the Appropriations Committees of Congress to have detailed information on receipts and spending; this information is now provided in a large appendix to the budget rather than in the budget document itself. This leaves the budget document free for the types of material which are more interesting and useful to the Members of Congress and to the general public.

Besides being smaller, the new budget is one which can be more easily read and understood. This is a major step forward because budgetary decisions are important to the entire Nation, and it is desirable that as many people as possible, both in and out of the Government, understand what is involved in these decisions.

WHAT IS THIS BUDGET?

How can the budget report be most useful? After the President's budget message, page 7 to 30, there is a section entitled "Summary Tables," pages 31 to 42. These tables contain most of the information needed quickly and generally. A footnote in each of these tables guides the reader to the pages in the budget where there is elaboration.

An innovation for rapid reference is the long table beginning on page 118 of the budget. This is a brand new table and provides, by itself, more useful information than we have ever before had summarized in the budget. For each appropriation account this table indicates one, the changes in expenditures and in new obligational authority in fiscal authority in fiscal 1962 and fiscal 1963 and two, a brief description of the reason for the change. Any member of Congress or citizen can now understand any specific change in the budget by looking at this table.

The new budget provides—for the first time—information on the obligations expected to be incurred by the Government during the forthcoming fiscal year. This information is in table 16 on page 267. This is useful because much of the economic impact of the budget occurs when obligations are incurred by the Government, rather than at the later time when the money is actually spent. If firms receive new Government contracts, these firms go out into the market and hire additional personnel and buy raw materials and capital goods in order to produce the desired products for the Government. All of these actions have important economic consequences, but they occur in large part before the Government spends money.

There are several special analyses which have not been in past budgets. For example, information is available on public works programs—page 315—grants-in-aid to States and localities—page 340—Federal statistical programs—page 348—Federal research and development expenditures—page 327—and Federal credit programs—page 304. Each of these activities represents a type of Government influence on the economy, and it is helpful to have these activities grouped by function in the budget.

The budget also provides data on Government activities which are consistent with our statistical measures of total economic activity in the Nation—pages 283 to 289. This data is helpful because it indicates the utilization of resources by the Federal Government and the timing of Federal receipts and expenditures. Most of the items in this budgetary framework are on an accrual basis and hence show the consequences of Government action at the time that adjustments are made in the private economy.

The 1963 budget also indicates—on pages 43 and 44—the economic assumptions upon which the projections in the budget are based, so that readers may assess the reasonableness of the forecasts.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

One major improvement in the 1963 budget is the provision of data on civilian employment in the executive branch—page 417. These facts have been available in the past, but have not been effectively consolidated in the budget document. It is now possible—at least to a limited extent—to obtain information on the nature and amount of Federal employment currently and as anticipated in future years.

To some extent the 1963 budget distinguishes capital from current expenditures, on pages 290 to 303. This is useful information because many of the expenditures made by the Federal Government provide services for a number of years, not simply for the current year in which the expenditures are made.

This approach is at least a tentative beginning; a brief, limited experimentation in the direction of capital budgeting, which has received a great deal of support in economic circles and also by distinguished Members of Congress. At least, it provides this kind of information simply and straightforwardly.

SHORTCOMINGS REMAIN

Despite all these improvements in the 1963 budget—and they are certainly significant improvements—there is much that can still be done to make the budget a more useful and meaningful document. The steps that have been taken—and that are reflected in the 1963 budget—are a first step in the right direction and represent a springboard from which to make further changes. I am sure the Bureau of the Budget recognizes the desirability of further changes and intends to continue the process of improvement. It may be useful, however, at this point to indicate some other types of changes which can still be made.

There are other types of economic assumptions besides those now indicated in the budget which are used in deriving the budget totals and which should be indicated explicitly. For example, the budget does not indicate the assumptions about interest rates which underlie the projections of Government interest expenditures. Similarly, interest-rate projections would be useful in appraising the future plans of various lending agencies.

One of the major shortcomings of the present budget is the inadequacy of the data on Government enterprises. Some of these enterprises are now shown in the budget—though not in the budget totals—in terms of gross expenditures and gross receipts—pages 358–361. However, a number of agencies are not included in this group, and some are included only partially. It would be useful to treat the operations of these enterprises just as though they were a part of the regular operations of Government. This comment is particularly applicable to a number of loan and guarantee programs.

TOTAL IMPACT STILL NOT SHOWN

The fact that this budget, as well as earlier budgets, does not include the full scope of Government enterprises, trust funds, and transfer payments means that the budget continues to greatly understate the actual impact of Government on our economic life. This is by far the most important point that I wish to make this afternoon.

This error—I think it is an error—is carried forward in the Budget in Brief, which I shall cover briefly in a moment.

The exact figures on the operations not in the budget are not now readily available. But if the relationship of all Government activities to those in the budget which Roy Moor's study outlined for the year 1960 continues to hold—and there is good reason to think that it does—then the total volume of Government transactions for 1963 is over $150 billion, in contrast to the $92.5 billion in the conventional budget.

That national income and product budget carries the gross amounts of Government enterprises. In other words, the total amount spent by the Post Office and the total amount received, instead of a net deficit, would be $140 billion. This would eliminate certain financial transactions in terms of comparison between the Government budget, the amount of Government spending, and the amount of Government revenues. With the gross national product, the $140 billion figure is an accurate figure, not the $92½ billion figure, which is referred to.

This is why, as I have said before, there is an unfortunate misconception. I think many persons will be deceived when they see the table in the beginning of the Budget in Brief which indicates that there has been a tendency for budget expenditures to drop to the percentage of the gross national product.

The fact is that transfer payments, particularly under the Social Security Act, and unemployment compensation payments, have enormously increased in recent years. I understand that in the past 9 or 10 years they have increased something like 150 percent. This is a far greater increase than has taken place in wages or gross national product, or any other economic factor. If this is included in the figure, I feel there is a real possibility, and I think a strong probability, that the involvement of the National Government in the economy, far from showing a fairly stable relationship, or even a downward relationship, as is indicated in the front of the Budget in Brief, will show an increase. In other words, there is more Government involvement in the economy on the basis of total or full figures than is indicated in the Budget in Brief, which is the report of the President of the United States.

If the Federal budget became the kind of comprehensive document described in Mr. Moor's study, this kind of information would be included. And it would make it possible to judge more adequately the total impact of Government on our economic life. If full account is taken of all these Government programs, the total figure amounts to more than 26 percent of our anticipated gross national product. This contrasts with the less than 17 percent of GNP represented by the conventional budget.

I think we ought to take this into account. I think there is a very proper tendency for people to observe very carefully how deeply involved the Government has become in the national economy; and how large a proportion of the total economy it represents. I submit that these figures, taking the total budget, give quite a different picture.

As I say, the Government's participation in the economy, based on the figures I suggest, is more than 25 percent. It is 26 percent, compared with the 17 percent reported in the conventional budget.

As a matter of fact, the 26 percent exceeds the amount which Secretary of the Treasury Dillon suggested—namely, 23 percent—in his "Meet the Press" discussion on Sunday night. It does so because we include all the gross activities of the Post Office Department, the TVA, and all the other Government agencies and bureaus; and I think the gross figure is the proper one, because I feel very strongly that we should include all aspects of the activities of the Government, not simply the net figure.

Madam President, the executive branch has wide latitude in administrative actions which can have significant economic effects: for example, accelerating or slowing the rate of expenditures. It would be useful for the budget document to have a section describing the type and possible timing of administrative actions which may be taken.

One of the principal problems with the budget document, even in its revised form, is that it remains an annual publication. As is well known, economic conditions can change very quickly. Government receipts and expenditures can influence the changes. It would be very helpful if two modifications were made in the budget document: First, provide a breakdown of some figures into calendar quarters, rather than simply showing them as yearly aggregates; second, publish some budgetary data on a quarterly basis. The Bureau of the Budget now publishes a Mid-Year Budget Review after Congress adjourns; such a review might well be issued quarterly.

The budget document still contains surprisingly little actual cost data. It is difficult, if not impossible, to determine what the costs of actual programs have been; and there is virtually no information on costs per unit of output, the types of costs incurred, or the changes in costs with changes in levels of operations. Presumably, much of this information is now available within the various agencies. It would be very useful to have it summarized in the budget.

Much more could be done in relating the benefits from particular programs to the costs of those programs. The principles involved in these types of comparisons have now been well established in such areas as the use of water resources. It seems appropriate to consider expanding these techniques into other activities.

In general, I think it would be desirable to expand the budgetary time horizon. The budget is still largely tied to a single year, and does not adequately view the total costs of particular projects through the course of a project's life, nor does the budget relate these costs to the total benefits contemplated. Finally, and especially, it would be helpful to the Congress, which must make so many budgetary decisions, to have some knowledge of the general alternatives to policies and the reasons for particular selections among these alternatives.

In summary, Madam President, I think we have entered a new era of budget policy. The Congress can with the document which has been placed before us perform much more effectively its task as a decision-making body. Further reforms in the same direction can raise our effectiveness and that of the entire Federal Government to even higher levels. The budget as modified can also serve to make our citizens more aware of the nature of Government operations, and hence facilitate the operations of our democracy.

Madam President, I should like to say that an extremely appropriate and timely article, entitled "The Philosophy of the Budget", was written by Walter Lippmann, and was published this morning in the Chicago Sun-Times. In the article, Mr. Lippmann points to something which I believe has been generally overlooked; he writes:

> This 1963 budget is noteworthy because for the first time in our history it states that balancing of the budget—whether with a surplus, a deficit, or with neither—is a question of economic policy and of deliberate decision. It is not, as so many regard it, a question of right and wrong.

Mr. Lippmann also points out:

> It used to be a heresy to ask whether a budget should or should not be balanced with a surplus or a deficit. In this generation to ask the question has become the new orthodoxy.
>
> Its central theme is that in the business cycles of recession and recovery, the budget can be and should be used to make the downswing short and shallow and the recoveries long and noninflationary.

Madam President, I think Walter Lippmann has touched, as he so often does, on an extremely important point; but I believe that for Congress just to accept this "new orthodoxy" would be a very serious error. I hope my colleagues will consider this orthodoxy and will debate it in great detail in the coming weeks. I feel strongly that it overstates the effects of fiscal policy in lessening unemployment, and that we get into a dangerous area when we regard deficits as good in themselves. I think there is a great deal of merit in this decision, but I believe it has not been considered with the mature and thorough examination it merits. I think it must receive that consideration in the future.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article written by Walter Lippmann be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE BUDGET

(By Walter Lippmann)

WASHINGTON.—The 1963 budget, which President Kennedy has just delivered to Congress, is likely to be remembered as a considerable landmark. That is not because of its size which, in spite of our special responsibilities for defense, as compared with the other budgets of the Western World, is about normal in relation to our population and wealth. This 1963 budget is noteworthy because for the first time in our history it states that balancing of the budget—whether with a surplus, a deficit, or with neither—is a question of economic policy and of deliberate decision. It is not, as so many regard it, a question of right and wrong.

It happens that the estimates for 1963 show a trifling surplus in what is known as the administrative budget. But what is much more significant is the President's statement that "under present economic circumstances a moderate surplus is the best national policy." It follows that if present circumstances were different, if there were not a recovery from the 1960–61 recession, a moderate surplus would not be the best national policy. On the contrary, the best national policy would be, as it has been in the past year, to choose to have a deficit sufficiently large to overcome the recession.

I am well aware that the economic philosophy of the budget is unfamiliar to many and that they look on it as dangerous and wicked. But the fact is that while Mr. Kennedy is the first President to make it the avowed official American fiscal policy, it has been the unavowed working philosophy of every administration, Democratic and Republican, since the great depression some 30 years ago. It used to be a heresy to ask whether a budget should or should not be balanced with a surplus or a deficit. In this generation to ask the question has become the new orthodoxy.

Its central theme is that in the business cycles of recession and recovery, the budget can be and should be used to make the downswing short and shallow and the recoveries long and noninflationary.

How this works is not made altogether clear by the budget we are all talking about, the budget which is called by the experts the administrative budget. There are two main reasons why this kind of budget does not tell the real story. For one thing, it states the receipts from taxes when they are collected and not when they are incurred. Yet corporations and larger taxpayers are saving for taxes and, therefore, withholding money from the economy during the whole fiscal year. And second, the administrative budget excludes the trust fund transactions because they do not require appropriations from Congress. Yet these transactions for highway grants-in-aid, for unemployment compensation and for social security payments, amount to almost $25 billion a year.

There are in use two other budgets—the consolidated cash budget and the national income budget. It is this latter budget which throws the most light on the influence of the Government's fiscal policy on the condition of business.

What does the national income accounts budget show? It shows that for the year ending July 1, 1960, the Federal Government took from the public a little over $94 billion, and paid out to the public about $92 billion. For the year we are now in, which ends in July 1962 the Government is estimated to be taking away $105.6 billion and paying out $106.1 billion. For the fiscal year 1963 (which begins on July 1, 1962), estimates are that the Government will take in $116 billion and pay out about $112 billion.

These are the significant figures about the budget and what they show is that the present fiscal policy is not inflationary; in fact, it is mildly deflationary.

The budget is being severely criticized by such meen as Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, and Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York. They are predicting that the budget will not, as the President predicts, be balanced, and that there will be a deficit which may run as large as $5 billion. They may be right. But if they are right, they will be right primarily because the President is overestimating the strength of the present business recovery. If he is doing that, then the decision to balance the budget will have come too soon.

He will have made the same kind of mistake that former President Dwight D. Eisenhower made in 1959 when he imposed deflationary measures on the economy which was recovering, but had not recovered fully from the recession of 1957–58. Mr. Eisenhower's mistake deepened the recession.

I am not intending to suggest that the President has made this mistake. There is impressive expert support for his decision. But it is reassuring to read in the budget message that he is aware that he may have made a too optimistic prediction and is prepared to take measures accordingly.

AUTHORIZATION FOR PRESIDING OFFICER TO SIGN ENROLLED COPY OF HOUSE BILL 8847

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Presiding Officer be authorized to sign, during the adjournment following today's session, the enrolled House bill 8847, as passed today by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GREAT BASIN NATIONAL PARK, NEVADA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar 966, Senate bill 1760, to establish the Great Basin National Park, in Nevada, in order that the bill be made the pending business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1760) to establish the Great Basin National Park in Nevada, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "5 miles over unsurveyed land to a point which is due east of the northeast corner of section 1, township 12 north, range 67 east;

"Thence due west 1 mile to a point; thence due north approximately 2 miles to a point which is due east of the easterly common corner of sections 24 and 25, township 13 north, range 67 east; thence due west 1½ miles to a point;" and insert "7 miles over unsurveyed land to a point which is due east of the northeast corner of section 25, township 13 north, range 67 east; thence due west 2½ miles to a point;"; on page 4, line 2, after the word "approximately", to strike out "three-quarters" and insert "one-half"; in line 4, after the word "of", where it appears the first time, to strike out "the south half of"; at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "south one-sixteenth latitudinal" and insert "east-west quarter"; in line 7, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to strike out "northeast corner of the south half of the southeast quarter" and insert "east quarter corner"; in line 9, after the word "approximately", to strike out "one-quarter" and insert "one-half"; on page 6, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "124,500" and insert "123,360"; on page 8, after line 5, to strike out:

SEC. 7. Where any Federal lands included within the Great Basin National Park were legally occupied or utilized on the date of approval of this Act for grazing purposes pursuant to a lease, permit, or license, issued or authorized by any department, establishment, or agency of the United States, the person so occupying or utilizing such lands, and the heirs, successors, or assigns of such person, shall upon determination of such lease, permit, or license, be entitled to have the privilege so possessed or enjoyed by him renewed from time to time, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe, for a period of twenty-five years from the date of approval of this Act, and thereafter during the lifetime of such person and the lifetime of his heirs, successors, or assigns, but only if they were members of his immediate family on such date, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That grazing privileges appurtenant to privately owned lands located within the Great Basin National Park established by this Act shall not be withdrawn until title to lands to which such privileges are appurtenant shall have vested in the United States, except for failure to comply with the regulations applicable thereto after reasonable notice of default. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as creating any vested right, title, interest, or estate in or to any Federal lands.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 7. Where any Federal lands included within the Great Basin National Park are legally occupied or utilized on the date of approval of this Act for grazing purposes, pursuant to a lease, permit, or license issued or authorized by any department, establishment, or agency of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior shall permit the persons holding such grazing privileges on the date of approval of this Act, their heirs, successors, or assigns, to renew the privileges from time to time subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe: *Provided, however*, That no such privilege shall be extended beyond the period ending twenty-five years from the date of approval of this Act except as specifically provided for in this section. The Secretary shall permit a holder of the grazing privilege to renew such privilege from time to time during the holder's lifetime beyond the twenty-five-year period, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, if (1) the holder is the person who held such privilege on the date of approval of this Act, or (2) the holder is the heir, successor, or assign of such person and was a member of that person's immediate family, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, on the date of approval of this Act. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as creating any vested right, title, interest, or estate in or to any of the Federal lands. The Secretary, by regulation, may limit the privileges enjoyed under this Act to the extent that they are appurtenant to the private lands owned by the persons who held such privileges on the date of approval of this Act, and may adjust such privileges to preserve the park land and resources from destruction or unnecessary injury. Grazing privileges appurtenant to privately owned lands located within the Great Basin National Park established by this Act shall not be withdrawn until title to lands to which such privileges are appurtenant shall have vested in the United States, except for failure to comply with the regulations applicable thereto and after reasonable notice of any default.

On page 10, after line 16, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 8. There are hereby eliminated from the Humboldt National Forest all those lands comprising the Snake Division of the forest which lie in:

NEVADA

MOUNT DIABLO MERIDIAN

Townships 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 north, range 68 east;

Townships 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 north, range 69 east; and

Townships 10, 11, 12, and 13 north, range 70 east.

And, on page 11, line 2, to change the section number from "8" to "9"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve for the benefit and inspiration of the people a representative segment of the great basin possessing outstanding ecological resources and significant geological and scenic values, there is hereby established the Great Basin National Park in the State of Nevada which, subject to valid existing rights, shall consist of lands and interest in lands within the following described boundary:

Commencing at the quarter section corner of sections 17 and 20, township 11 north, range 70 east, Mount Diablo meridian, Nevada; thence west 1½ miles along the south boundaries of sections 17 and 18 to the westerly common corner of sections 18 and 19; thence due west 8 miles over unsurveyed land to a point; thence due north over unsurveyed land to a point which is due east of the easterly common corner of sections 5 and 8, township 11 north, range 68 east;

Thence westerly over unsurveyed land to said easterly common corner of sections 5 and 8; thence north along the east boundary of section 5 to the northeast corner of said section; thence due north approximately one mile over unsurveyed land to a point which is due east of the easterly common corner of sections 25 and 36, township 12 north, range 67 east, thence due east one mile over unsurveyed land to a point; thence due north approximately 7 miles over unsurveyed land to a point which is due east of the northeast corner of section 25, township 13 north, range 67 east; thence due west 2½ miles to a point; thence due north approximately 3 miles over unsurveyed land to the quarter section corner on the south boundary of section 6, township 13 north, range 68 east; thence 2 miles north through the center of section 6, township 13 north, range 68 east, and section 31, township 14 north, range 68 east, to the quarter section corner common to sections 30 and 31;

Thence east 1½ miles along the south boundaries of sections 30 and 29 to the common corner of sections 28, 29, 32, and 33; thence north 2 miles along the east boundaries of sections 29 and 20 to the common corner of sections 16, 17, 20, and 21; thence east 1 mile along the south boundary of section 16 to the common corner of sections 15, 16, 21, and 22; thence north 1 mile along the east boundary of section 16 to the common corner of sections 9, 10, 15, and 16; thence east 3 miles along the south boundaries of sections 10, 11, and 12 to the easterly common corner of sections 12 and 13 on the east boundary of township 14 north, range 68 east;

Thence north approximately three-quarters of a mile along the west boundary of township 14 north, range 69 east, to the westerly common corner of sections 7 and 18, said township and range; thence east approximately one-half mile along the north boundary of said section 18 to the north quarter corner of said section 18, thence south approximately one-half mile along the north south quarter line of said section 18 to the northwest corner of the southeast quarter of said section 18;

Thence east approximately one-half mile along the east-west quarter line of said section 18 to the east quarter corner of said section 18; thence south approximately one-half mile along the east boundary of said section 18 to the southerly common corner of said section 18 and section 17; thence east approximately one-half mile along the north boundary of section 20 to the north quarter corner of said section 20;

Thence south approximately one mile along the north-south quarter line of said section 20 to the north quarter corner of section 29; thence east approximately one-half mile to the northeast corner of said section 29; thence north approximately 4.83 chains along the west boundary of section 28 to the northwest corner of said section 28; thence east approximately one mile along the north boundary of said section 28 to the northeast corner of said section 28;

Thence south along the east boundaries of sections 28 and 33, township 14 north, range 69 east, and of what probably will be when surveyed section 4, township 13 north, range 69 east, to the east quarter corner of said section 4; thence east approximately two miles along the east-west quarter lines of sections 3 and 2 to the east quarter corner of said section 2; thence south approximately one-half mile along the east boundary of section 2 to the common corner of sections 1, 2, 11, and 12.

Thence east approximately two miles along the north boundaries of said section 12, township 13 north, range 69 east, and section 7, township 13 north, range 70 east, to the common corner of sections 5, 6, 7, and 8; thence south 5 miles along the west boundaries of sections 8, 17, 20, 29, and 32, to the southerly common corner of sections 31 and 32, township 13 north, range 70 east; thence east 1 mile along the south boundary of section 32 to the northerly common corner of sections 4 and 5, township 12 north, range 70 east;

Thence south 1 mile along the west boundary of section 4, to the common corner of sections 4, 5, 8, and 9; thence east 1 mile along the south boundary of section 4, to the common corner of sections 3, 4, 9, and 10; thence south 5 miles along the west boundaries of sections 10, 15, 22, 27, and 34, to the common corner of sections 3 and 4, township 11 north, range 70 east, and sections 33 and 34, township 12 north, range 70 east; thence west 1 mile along the north boundary of section 4, to the common corner of sections 4 and 5, township 11 north, range 70 east, and sections 32 and 33, township 12 north, range 70 east;

Thence south 1 mile along the west boundary of section 4, township 11 north, range 70 east, to the common corner of sections 4, 5, 8, and 9; thence west one-half mile along the north boundary of section 8, to the quarter section corner common to sections 5 and 8; thence south 2 miles through the center of sections 8 and 17 to the quarter section corner common to sections 17 and 20, township 11 north, range 70 east, the point of beginning, containing about 123,360 acres.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior within the boundaries of the Great Basin National Park, as described above, is authorized to procure by purchase, by donation, with donated funds, or by such means as he may deem to be in the public interest, lands and interests in lands. The Secretary is authorized further to convey Federally owned lands and interests in lands within the park in exchange for non-Federal lands and interests in lands of approximately equal value within the park if, in his judgment, such exchange is in the public interest. Federal lands lying within the boundaries of the Great Basin National Park, as established pursuant to this Act, are hereby transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for preservation and administration as a part of such park.

SEC. 3. The Lehman Caves National Monument; established on January 24, 1922, by proclamation of the President pursuant to authority contained in the Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225), is hereby abolished. Lands and interests in lands heretofore comprising such monument shall, from the date of approval of this Act, be a part of the Great Basin National Park.

SEC. 4. The Great Basin National Park shall be administered pursuant to the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", as amended.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained herein shall affect any valid existing claim, location, or entry under the land laws of the United States or the right of any such claimant, locator, or entryman to the full use and enjoyment of his lands.

SEC. 6. Within the Great Basin National Park, all mineral deposits of the classes and kinds now subject to location, entry, and patent under the mining laws of the United States, exclusive of the land containing them, and minerals subject to leasing under the mineral leasing laws of the United States shall be subject to exploration and disposal under such laws, with right of occupation and use of so much of the surface of the land as may be required for all purposes reasonably incident to the mining or removal of the minerals: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe such general regulations for the control of these activities as he deems necessary to preserve the scenic, scientific, and recreation values of the area. The provisions of the Act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), as amended, shall have no application within the Great Basin National Park.

SEC. 7. Where any Federal lands included within the Great Basin National Park are legally occupied or utilized on the date of approval of this Act for grazing purposes, pursuant to a lease, permit, or license issued or authorized by any department, establishment, or agency of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior shall permit the persons holding such grazing privileges on the date of approval of this Act, their heirs, successors, or assigns, to renew the privileges from time to time subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe: *Provided, however,* That no such privilege shall be extended beyond the period ending twenty-five years from the date of approval of this Act except as specifically provided for in this section. The Secretary shall permit a holder of the grazing privilege to renew such privilege from time to time during the holder's lifetime beyond the twenty-five-year period, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, if (1) the holder is the person who held such privilege on the date of approval of this Act, or (2) the holder is the heir, successor, or assign of such person and was a member of that person's immediate family, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, on the date of approval of this Act. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as creating any vested right, title, interest, or estate in or to any of the Federal lands. The Secretary, by regulation, may limit the privileges enjoyed under this Act to the extent that they are appurtenant to the private lands owned by the persons who held such privileges on the date of approval of this Act, and may adjust such privileges to preserve the park land and resources from destruction or unnecessary injury. Grazing privileges appurtenant to privately owned lands located within the Great Basin National Park established by this Act shall not be withdrawn until title to lands to which such privileges are appurtenant shall have vested in the United States, except for failure to comply with the regulations applicable thereto and after reasonable notice of any default.

SEC. 8. There are hereby eliminated from the Humboldt National Forest all those lands comprising the Snake Division of the forest which lie in:

NEVADA

MOUNT DIABLO MERIDIAN

Townships 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 north, range 68 east;

Townships 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 north, 69 east; and

Townships 10, 11, 12, and 13 north, range 70 east.

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, on previous occasions I have called attention to the fact that the President has not honored in the way I believe he should, and as is wise for him and for the country, his campaign promises with respect to civil rights legislation. Therefore, there is something a little sardonic about an article published in the New York Times on Sunday, January 21, which includes a dispatch from Memphis, Tenn., to the effect that an Assistant Secretary of State—Carl T. Rowan, a Negro—was refused service and was asked to leave a restaurant at the Memphis Municipal Airport; and following that dispatch there is a dispatch from Washington, D.C., which states:

> It was the second time in 2 days that a top Negro official of the Kennedy administration had been involved in a discrimination controversy. George L. P. Weaver, Assistant Secretary of Labor, said yesterday that he had been denied a room at the Shamrock-Hilton Hotel in Houston because of discrimination.

Madam President, I call attention to these embarrassments to our country because they illustrate what I have been arguing constantly; namely, that the job which needs to be done, in terms of the segregation and the discrimination picture which unfortunately still obtains in this very important part of our country, the South, cannot be done unless Congress is brought into the effort, and that there simply will not be acceptance of the fact that we are determined to get on top of this problem in an effective way unless Congress does its part. I call attention to the fact that here we find that two distinguished officials of the Government—and, Madam President, I stress the point that one of the proudest claims of President Kennedy's administration, for which I pay it all honor and respect, is that Negroes have been appointed to high Federal offices—have themselves been submitted to embarrassment, because of the fact that there are areas, such as Houston and Memphis, where people still do not believe we mean it.

I deeply believe that if the President went forward with recommendations to the Congress in respect to civil rights legislation, as did President Eisenhower, we would have a much better opportunity to come abreast of this problem.

In the days ahead I shall press for action on this matter, as I promised to do at the time when the session was concluded last September, by offering, first, a literacy amendment—as I promised—to a bill which I believe will be before the Senate very shortly; and I shall do my part in having the Congress take action—which I consider essential—in regard to this very vital issue.

THE NEW HAVEN RAILROAD

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I invite attention to an editorial in the New York Herald Tribune on Thursday, January 18, 1962, on the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, which is important in New York, as it is in other States. The editorial points out the urgent need for Federal Government participation in an effort to do something about the grave consequences which face the commuter roads.

Madam President, it seems to me, if there is to be a hope of enabling these railroads to carry through in this very grave transitional period for them, it will be necessary for our Government, as the Herald Tribune editorial says, to be quicker to appreciate the handicaps of high taxation, overregulation, and consistent favoring of the railroads' competitors, from which the New Haven is suffering so very seriously.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Band-Aid Isn't Big Enough—U.S. Rescue Needed for the New Haven

What happens next with the New Haven Railroad?

Well, according to the bankruptcy trustees' prognosis, the road will begin folding up this summer unless new forms of assistance develop from somewhere.

Cash is running out fast. New borrowings seem unfeasible. Outgo exceeds income. All of it sounds bad.

At Tuesday's four-State huddle there was some talk of merger as a long-range solution, but none of the participating Governors (or Mayor Wagner either) seemed to know of anybody wanting to merge. And as for increased State aid, nobody was bidding just yet. In fact, Governor Rockefeller commented that the States had already helped considerably, but that this was "only a band-aid."

So the net result is that everything tried so far—new management, State and local concessions, bankruptcy trusteeship—has proved inadequate. If the natural course is allowed to run, the New Haven would seem to be headed straight for liquidation and demise.

But in this final emergency there is still a great deal of hope. Certainly the railroad is essential to commuters, cities, commerce. Help must come from the great remaining source—the National Government. It should have come long ago in the enunciation of national transportation policy to make all railroads strong and able to meet rival methods on equal terms.

If Government had been quicker to appreciate the handicaps of high taxation, overregulation and consistent favoring of the railroads' competitors, the New Haven for one wouldn't be crying the mortuary blues now.

But since the crisis has been so long and so largely of Washington's making, it is only fair to expect the cure from that source. And indeed there is no other place left to look.

Which is why President Kennedy's soon-to-come message to Congress on transportation is highly important.

UNITED NATIONS ISSUES

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, the spirit of bipartisanship in foreign affairs should not preclude critical examination of our policies and actions at the United Nations. Clarification of issues such as the question of the Congo and the proposed U.N. bond issue will help to strengthen the United Nations rather than weaken it. I have consistently advocated support for the U.N. because I believe it is one of the strongest forces available for the maintenance of international peace and human rights. The spirit of beneficial scrutiny is advocated by Roscoe Drummond in his column entitled "Three Issues in Dispute: New Look at the U.N. Is Needed."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record his column, which appeared in the Washington Post, January 21, 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Three Issues in Dispute—New Look at U.N. Is Needed

(By Roscoe Drummond)

It is all to the good to have a congressional investigation of foreign policy with special reference to the Congo and the United Nations.

U.S. foreign policy will be kept under searching scrutiny. We need more and better debate. A thorough congressional investigation is one of the best means of getting it.

Bipartisan foreign policy should not mean adjourning debate over the conduct of foreign policy. When there is wide agreement between the two parties on the objectives in foreign affairs, a recurring reexamination of methods and means is all the more needed.

This is why the hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the Congo, on the plan to purchase U.N. bonds and on our whole relationship to the U.N. is healthy.

Such an investigation is a good means of reshaping policy—if it needs to be reshaped—and of clarifying public opinion on issues which become confused through lack of debate.

There are three major issues now in dispute:

1. Has the U.N. exceeded its mandate in using force against Katanga to prevent it from seceding from the central Congo government?

The original U.N. resolution was approved by all the big powers and by the overwhelming majority of the General Assembly. Its purposes were to avoid civil war and internal chaos, to prevent the competing military intervention by the United States and Russia—which we want to avoid—and to help the Congo get ready to govern itself.

These are desirable objectives. The U.N. has shown itself just as firm in acting to curtail the secessionist course of pro-Communist Gizenga as in curtailing the anti-Communist secessionist Tshombe. But isn't the U.N. going too far in forcing the provincial leaders of the Congo to accept particular terms of federation? Isn't this an improper interference in the internal affairs of the country? I think the answer is "Yes."

2. Should the United States buy a substantial share of the $200 million of U.N. bonds to keep it from bankruptcy?

The U.N. treasury is nearly empty largely because some nations, including Russia and France, have refused to pay their share of the special assessments to defray the military operations in the Congo and the Gaza strip. It is a fair question whether the bond issue is the best way to retrieve the U.N.'s solvency, but I would doubt that the U.S. would want to see two U.N. operations, which it has supported from the beginning, precipitately fold up for wrong reasons.

3. Is the United States resting its foreign policy too heavily on the U.N., turning to it to accomplish ends the U.N. is too weak and divided to accomplish?

This question will be raised again and again in the Senate investigation. It arises, because the way it is now organized, the U.N. permits the selective use of national force contrary to the principles of the charter. The Security Council could not act against the use of Soviet force against Hungary, but it did act against the British and French use of force against Nasser. The Soviet veto permitted India to use force against Goa.

It is evident that many, if not most, of the newly independent African and Asian nations are disposed to support the use of force when they like its purposes (as in the case of Goa) and oppose it when used by Western countries.

But we are no more shackled by the U.N. than any other great power. The U.N. Congo operation goes forward because the United States believes that on balance it is desirable, not because we are forced to support it. We could have brought it to an end.

A whole new look at the U.N. is needed, but nothing could be more harmful than for the United States to desert the U.N. in a huff.

STOCK DISTRIBUTION TREATED AS RETURN OF CAPITAL

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, because there was no yea-and-nay vote on H.R. 8847, the so-called Du Pont bill, and therefore my vote was not recorded, I wish to make my position clear.

I voted for the Douglas amendment because I thought it would give equal treatment to all groups of stockholders, but I wish to point out that I supported passage of H.R. 8847 in the final action on the bill.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY NEXT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, in accordance with the agreement previously announced by the majority leader, and the order entered, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), in accordance with the previous order, the Senate adjourned until Thursday, January 25, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 23, 1961:

UNITED NATIONS

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the 16th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois.
Francis T. P. Plimpton, of New York.
Charles W. Yost, of New York.
Philip M. Klutznick, of Illinois.
Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

J. Robert Elliott, of Georgia, to be U.S. district judge for the middle district of Georgia, vice T. Hoyt Davis, retired.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Almeric L. Christian of the Virgin Islands, to be U.S. attorney for the Virgin Islands for the term of 4 years, vice Leon P. Miller.

U.S. MARSHALS

Harry D. Mansfield, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Tennessee for the term of 4 years, vice Frank Quarles, deceased.

Daniel T. Donovan, of Washington, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Washington for the term of 4 years, vice Darrel O. Holmes, term expired.

The following-named persons to the position indicated for the term of 4 years. They were appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Joseph T. Ploszaj, of Connecticut, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Connecticut.

Tully Reynolds, of Texas, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Texas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 23, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

John 10: 10: *I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.*

Most merciful and gracious God, in the plan and work of this day, may we be inspired to give democracy that larger expansion for service and human good which is inherent in the very principles which it professes and proclaims.

May our Nation never be guilty of stifling and stultifying the potential and creative abilities of any segment of society but seek to open the gates of opportunity more widely to all.

We pray that there may be confidence and cooperation among the executive, the legislative, and judiciary branches of our Government in the high vocation of statecraft and in our longings and labors to give to all the members of the human family the blessings of the more abundant life.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

A NATIONAL LOTTERY

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, in spite of all the partisan claims that the President's proposed budget of $92.5 billion is a sound and constructive budget, the fact remains that the American taxpayers are an unhappy lot.

Nowhere in this peacetime budget—the biggest and highest in the history of this country—is there a scintilla of hope offered for a tax cut or a reduction of our ever-mounting national debt.

This, Mr. Speaker, is indeed a sad day for every American wage earner.

It should be apparent by this time that, despite the tremendous prosperity we enjoy, all hope for tax relief or reduction of our debt is gone.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, all hope is gone unless we have the intestinal fortitude to provide the legislative means of raising painless and voluntary revenue for this purpose.

For 10 years, I have repeatedly urged the Congress to give serious and favorable consideration to a national lottery as the only means of bringing relief to our heavily burdened taxpayers. A national lottery in the United States would provide $10 billion a year in additional income which can be used to reduce our gigantic debt and cut our high taxes.

Mr. Speaker, is it not time that we give a little consideration to Mr. and Mrs. American Taxpayer?

YEAR OF THE GREAT DEBATE OVER WORLD TRADE

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, we have been told over and over again that this is the year of the great debate over world trade; that it is vital for Congress to make the right decision; that every voice of responsible leadership in the Nation ought to be raised in responsible debate, over America's position as a leader in world trade.

Listening to the 6 o'clock news over the radio last Friday night, I was astounded to hear what purported to be a reproduction of the voice of our President, saying that if our exports were to rise by 10 percent, and our imports maintain their present level, our balance of payments problem would be solved. This is, strictly speaking, true, as a matter of theory—but it is masterfully misleading in fact, because in fact our imports cannot possibly be held to their present level—they must rise—in order to finance an expansion of exports.

The reason why the statement was made is clear: To draw the listener's attention away from the impact of the import problem, so as to avoid facing the tough consequences of lower tariffs, and to glamorize the possible pleasant consequences.

For the President to have done this is, to say the least, counterproductive of America's chance to make the right decision in this, our great debate of 1962.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 4]

Blitch
Boykin
Cannon
Celler
Chiperfield
Coad
Cooley
Curtis, Mo.
Davis, Tenn.
Finnegan
Fogarty
Green, Oreg.
Harvey, Ind.
Hoffman, Mich.
Hosmer
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McSween
Macdonald
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Meader
Merrow
Miller, N.Y.
Morrison
Norrell
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rostenkowski
Rousselot
St. George
St. Germain
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Smith, Va.
Tupper
Ullman
Van Pelt
Winstead

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 390 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

POSTAGE REVISION ACT, 1962

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7927) to adjust postal rates, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7927, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that H.R. 7927, the postal rate bill reported last year by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and now before us, is completely unacceptable to the membership of the House. It is a drastically watered-down version of the original Henderson bill and was reported hastily in the rather remote hope of passing at least some kind of rate bill before the end of the first session. The large vote by which the House rejected the closed rule on this bill last September merely emphasizes the weakness and inadequacy of the bill.

That bill not only fails by a wide margin to meet the need for adequate postal financing but—and this is of vital concern—if the serious deficiencies in the bill are not corrected it will have such an extremely adverse effect on the entire national budget as to endanger progress in critical defense and other major Government programs.

Accordingly, at the proper time following general debate, I will offer an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause of H.R. 7927 and substitute provisions for fair, realistic, and adequate postal rate adjustments and a firm public service policy—in short, a bill of the kind which must be approved if we are to meet the issue of fiscal responsibility and wipe out the tremendous postal deficit that now burdens the taxpayers. The rate adjustments, when all are placed in effect, will yield $621 million added postal revenue a year—the minimum required for a balanced postal budget. The new rates, together with the improved public service policy, will provide a postal rate structure based on fair and reasonable distribution of postage rates and fees to all classes of users of the mails covered by the bill, taking into consideration the value of the services they receive and the costs incurred in the rendering of such services.

The additional revenue provided by my amendment is a keystone of the President's program for a balanced budget for the fiscal year 1963 and he personally assigned it top priority among all new revenue measures when he said, in his state of the Union message:

> I am submitting for fiscal 1963 a balanced Federal budget.
>
> This is a joint responsibility, requiring congressional cooperation on appropriations, and on three sources of income in particular: (1) First, an increase in postal rates, to end the postal deficit.

The President in his budget message reaffirmed the necessity for the additional postal revenue provided by my amendment in these words:

> In line with the congressional policy that the users of the postal service shall pay the full cost of all other services, legislation is again being recommended to increase postal rates enough to cover such costs. * * *
>
> Budget expenditures for commerce and transportation programs are estimated to decline from $2.9 billion in 1962 to $2.5 billion in 1963. This decline reflects mainly a drop of $592 million for the postal service, based on my legislative proposal to increase postal rates to a level that will cover the costs of postal operations, except for those services properly charged to the general taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, that is the fifth time in the last 8 months that President Kennedy has called for additional revenue to reduce the postal deficit. In his special message to the Congress on May 25, 1961, he said:

> Finally, our greatest asset in this struggle is the American people—their willingness to pay the price for these programs * * * to pay higher postal rates.

In a press conference on July 20, 1961, he said:

> I will suggest, however, while we're on it, that both the previous administration and this administration recommended nearly $840 million of tax increase in postal payment.
>
> This is a matter which * * * I'm hopeful the Congress will deal with.

In his radio-TV state of the Union speech address on the Berlin crisis 5 days later he said:

> The luxury of our current post office deficit must be ended.

During my entire period of service on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee since it was created, and before that on the old Post Office and Post Roads Committee, more of my personal time and attention has been devoted to strengthening the financial operations of the Post Office Department than to any other endeavor. The postal deficit has developed entirely in the period since World War II. Each year since 1947 has seen postal deficits ranging from $200 million to nearly $900 million, and the total of these deficits now has passed $8 billion—an astronomical figure when we consider it has to be financed by the taxpayers, rather than by the users of the mails.

From 1900 to 1940 the Postal Establishment operated in the black, if we exclude the former airline subsidy and costs of mail handled for other Government agencies, and there was even a modest surplus during the World War II years. This favorable balance has been sharply reversed in the last 15 years by spiraling costs for salaries, transportation, equipment, and supplies—while postal rate adjustments have lagged far behind.

We faced the same condition in the 86th Congress, when the former Postmaster General recommended rate increases well above those in my amendment today and I sponsored a bill for the purpose. The bill was not even reported, and the deficit problem was turned over unresolved to the new administration on January 20, 1961. Shortly thereafter I introduced H.R. 6418, based on the official recommendation of our present Postmaster General, to increase postal revenues by $741 million annually and eliminate the postal deficit.

The amendment I offer today was developed after careful review of our committee deliberations throughout most of the first session and in cooperation with the White House and the Post Office Department. The President also has consulted me in this connection and strongly supports my amendment. The amendment is a fair and reasonable compromise which gives full consideration to the sharply divergent views on postal rates and is identical in substance to H.R. 7927 when it was introduced by my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON], on June 29, 1961—before it was watered down to its reported form in September 1961. The Henderson bill was thoroughly considered by our committee in a number of executive sessions and failed of approval by only one vote—primarily because of an assertion which apparently convinced a number of Members that the other body would not take up the bill if it were to be reported and passed by the House.

The situation has undergone a marked change—and a considerable improvement—in that respect during the recess period, and the chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee has announced that he will schedule prompt action on H.R. 7927 as soon as it passes the House. He has been fully advised as to the provisions of my amendment and I am confident agrees with me that the amendment will receive overwhelming approval.

The postal rate hearings and executive sessions conducted by our committee last year are the most comprehensive, informative, and productive ever held on the complex and difficult problem of postal rates. The hearings began April 25 and ended June 7, and were followed by no less than 11 separate executive sessions extending up to September 6—the most ever held on postal rates.

The Postmaster General has submitted an official report dated January 16, 1962, urging approval of my amendment today, and the President has again given assurance of his strong support for the amendment. The Postmaster General's report summarizes the value of my amendment and the necessity for its adoption in these words:

> Enactment of the proposed [Murray] amendment to H.R. 7927 would be an important milestone in the history of postal finances. It would carry out the spirit as well as the substance of the Postal Policy Act by providing a fair apportionment of postal costs between taxpayers and users of the mail. In addition, costs ascribed to mail users would be assessed equitably among all mail classes. The proposed rate increases give due consideration to the value of service furnished to each mail class. Also, they recognize and provide fair reimbursement to the postal service for recent cost increases.

In order that the membership might be informed in advance with respect to my amendment, a committee print including the amendment, explanatory material, and the Postmaster General's favorable report was sent last Thursday to each Member of the House with a personal letter from me. I believe that additional copies of the print are available here on the floor today, if needed.

The amendment which I will offer is identical to that in the committee print, except that it incorporates the provisions of section 11 of the committee bill, under the heading "Communist Political Propaganda," beginning at line 6 on page 15 of the committee bill. This section, which is now included in my amendment as well as the committee bill, has the effect of preventing the receipt, handling, transportation, or delivery by the U.S. postal service of any mail matter determined by the Attorney General to be Communist political propaganda. It also provides that no postal rate established by my amendment should be available for the receipt, handling, and transportation, or delivery of mail matter found by the Attorney General to be Communist political propaganda financed or sponsored directly or indirectly by any Communist-controlled government.

Apart from the very desirable addition of the section on Communist political propaganda, my amendment makes changes in the committee bill which fall in two general categories.

First, the postal policy provisions of existing law are strengthened and improved. Second, rate increases are provided at levels which, with the new policy, will wipe out the postal deficit and provide the full amount of the additional postal revenues which are required under the President's budget submitted to the Congress last Thursday.

The postal policy provisions of my amendment correct certain deficiencies in existing law and establish a firm and proper formula for the determination each year of the costs of postal services which are truly public services and, as such, should be charged to the general fund of the Treasury under well-established principles of public policy and the national interest. Examples of such public services are free mail for the blind, free-in-county mail, and mailings at reduced rates by qualified nonprofit organizations. Applying this formula, an estimated $247 million of postal costs for these public services will be borne by the general fund of the Treasury for the fiscal year 1963. This is about $95 million less than the $341 million public service charged to the taxpayers under the reported bill, which improperly designates as "public services" such historically sound, efficient, and necessary postal activities as rural routes and third- and fourth-class post offices, the cost of which it would have shifted to the taxpayers with no charge to users of the mails. The public service provisions of the reported bill thus would burden the taxpayers with a highly inflated portion of postal costs while excusing users of the mails from paying their full share.

While the public service allowance under my amendment is considerably higher than that provided by the bill I introduced last year, based on my comprehensive review of the record and after consultation with the Postmaster General and other representatives of the President I have concluded that it represents the best possible compromise of many strongly conflicting views which can be worked out. With this policy my amendment then proceeds to fix postal rates at the level required to wipe out the postal deficit and to provide the added postal revenue requested by the President in order that we may have a balanced national budget in the fiscal year 1963. I earnestly believe that this public service formula, arrived at through extensive and cooperative effort of the parties concerned, is distinctly in the public interest since it will settle the problem of public service charges in the future—a problem which, more than anything else, has delayed and defeated badly needed postal rate adjustments throughout recent years.

The rates in my amendment for first-class letter mail and airmail letters, as well as post cards and postal cards, are the same as those in the reported bill. Approval of these rates is imperative in order to provide the necessary measure of additional postal revenues. The first-class postage stamp at 5 cents will still be the best bargain in America. These rates are fully justified by priority of service and the absolute privacy guaranteed for a sealed first-class letter, as well as the fact that the postal service exists primarily to render the preferred first-class mail service to 181 million Americans.

The first-class letter increase from 4 to 5 cents is only a 25-percent increase, and the airmail letter increase from 7 to 8 cents is only a little over 14 percent. The first-class letter rate remained at 3 cents from 1932 until 1958, when it was changed to 4 cents—a 33⅓-percent increase. The legislation before us adds another 25 percent, or a total increase of only 58 percent since 1932—a very moderate increase, in comparison to the heavy increases imposed on second- and third-class mail.

Second-class, or publishers', rates for mailing commercial publications beyond county were increased by 30 percent in 1951 and again by 54 percent under the Postal Rate Increase Act of 1958—a total of 84 percent to which my amendment will add another 55 percent when both of the step increases are in effect.

The most important postage rate on third-class matter—the minimum charge per piece on bulk mailings of advertising circulars and so forth—already has been raised 150 percent since 1951, and when the adjustments in my amendment become effective will have been increased 170 percent during this period.

My amendment, therefore, will overcome the chief objection—and, in my judgment, a fully justified objection—to the reported bill during the debate on the rule last September 15. The watered-down version reported hastily in the closing days of the first session placed almost the entire burden of postal rate increases on users of first-class mail, with comparatively minor upward adjustments in second- and third-class rates. That unsatisfactory rate structure was coupled with an inflated public service provision that would have charged off to the taxpayers an arbitrary and excessive minimum of 7½ percent of the total postal budget for each year in the future. My amendment will correct these serious deficiencies. As pointed out in the Postmaster General's official report, under my amendment there will be a "fair apportionment of postal costs between taxpayers and users of the mail" and "costs ascribed to mail users will be assessed equitably among all mail classes."

The new rates will become effective July 1, 1962, except that the fixed charge per piece on second-class mail will be made in two steps; one-half cent will be effective July 1, 1962, and be increased to 1 cent a year later, on July 1, 1963.

My amendment makes no change on second-class mailings within county or on mail for the blind. It also continues the present rates on educational materials, on classroom publications, and on mailings of qualified nonprofit organizations.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated earlier, I shall propose an amendment to the committee bill at the proper time in the nature of a substitute, which I strongly urge the Members to support.

Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent I insert following my remarks the full text of the letter from Postmaster General J. Edward Day to me dated January 16, 1962, which outlines in detail the administration's support of the amendment which I shall propose:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., January 16, 1962.
Hon. TOM MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request for views on your proposed amendment to H.R. 7927.

The Post Office Department is pleased to endorse the proposed amendment. We urge its adoption for it would insure full compliance with the break-even directive of the Postal Policy Act (now 39 U.S.C. 2302(c) (4)).

Enactment of the proposed amendment to H.R. 7927 would be an important milestone in the history of postal finances. It would carry out the spirit as well as the substance of the Postal Policy Act by providing a fair apportionment of postal costs between taxpayers and users of the mail. In addition, costs ascribed to mail users would be assessed equitably among all mail classes. The proposed rate increases give due consideration to the value of service furnished to each mail class. Also, they recognize and provide fair reimbursement to the postal service for recent cost increases.

The subject bill, as reflected in the proposed amendment, would modify the Postal Policy Act (now 39 U.S.C. 2303) as follows:

(a) It deletes from the present list of public services the "loss resulting from the operation of such prime and necessary public services as the star route system and third- and fourth-class post offices." (39 U.S.C 2303(a) (2).)

(b) For the enumerated public services, "loss" or "total loss" would be clearly defined as the excess of their allocated costs over revenues.

(c) By February 1 of each fiscal year, the Postmaster General would be required to estimate the public service losses for that year and the corresponding amount would then be deducted from the total costs of the Department for purposes of adjusting postal rates and fees.

The Department endorses these changes for the following major reasons:

(a) They would facilitate compliance with the Postal Policy Act (39 U.S.C. 2302(c)(4)) by recognizing total losses on public services before balancing costs and revenues. In the past 3 years, the fulfillment of the financial objectives of the Postal Policy Act has been hampered because of differences in the Congress concerning the amounts to be appropriated for public services. The subject bill corrects the underlying cause by clarifying the guidelines for computing the public service allowance.

(b) The precise amounts to be ascribed to public services would be determined routinely as a byproduct of Post Office cost ascertainment. The Postmaster General's report of February 1 each year would furnish the detailed record of public service costs necessary for an understanding of their nature and magnitude and for adjustment of the subsidies involved if the Congress determines adjustment is desirable in the public interest.

(c) Deletion of "losses" on star routes and small post offices would remove an objectionable feature from the present enumeration of public services. Star routes and small post offices are integral parts of a nationwide communications and transportation complex. Without these facilities the postal service could not fulfill its recognized responsibility, as stated in the Postal Policy Act, to "unite more closely the American people, to promote the general welfare, and to advance the national economy."

Retention of star routes and small post offices in 39 U.S.C. 2303(a) would result in a partial double accounting of public service allowances under the proposed language defining these losses. Significant portions of the cost of star routes and small post offices have been allocated to the costs of handling free and reduced-rate mail and to special services such as money orders and c.o.d.'s. The losses from these mails and services are already stipulated as public service credits under 39 U.S.C. 2303(a). To count these costs again in determining the loss on star routes and small post offices represents an unjustifiable charge against the Treasury for public service credits.

Adoption of the more liberal public service provisions of the subject legislation would serve to reduce the amount of additional revenue from higher postal rates that otherwise would be needed to comply with the Postal Policy Act.

Under the provisions of the subject amendment, we estimate public service costs in fiscal 1963 would be $248 million, in contrast with $74 million if the appropriations policy of the past 3 years continues. When fully effective, rate increases under the subject bill would yield $621 million at an annual rate, based on estimated mail volume for fiscal 1963. Adjustment of rates and conditions of mailability proposed by the Department for fourth-class mail would bring an additional net gain of $85 million annually. This adjustment is subject to the consent of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The proposed public service allowances and rate revisions will enable the postal service to cover its costs in fiscal year 1963.

In consonance with 39 U.S.C. 2302(c)(2), the subject amendment to H.R. 7927 provides first-class postage rates which are fair and reasonable based on the value received by mail users. First-class mail is the premium service of the Post Office Department, and the guidelines prescribed by the Postal Policy Act call for above-cost rates to cover the value of preferential service. Since 1959, the margin of revenues in excess of costs has narrowed steadily to the point where it is now nonexistent.

Because first-class mail is the Department's prime service, it has traditionally paid a premium rate substantially above its allocated costs. In the years prior to World War II, revenues averaged about 140 percent of cost. That revenue-cost relationship foreshadowed the present provisions of the 1958 Postal Policy Act which directs that postage for first-class mail should be sufficient to cover allocated expenses plus "an additional amount representing the fair value of all extraordinary and preferential services, facilities, and factors relating thereto."

The proposed 1-cent increase in first-class mail is necessary to enable lagging rates to catch up with cost increases. Since 1932, when a 3-cent letter rate was first approved, the Consumer Price Index has risen 118 percent and the cost of handling a first-class letter has increased 130 percent. But letter rates have gone up only 33 percent. A 5-cent rate would bring the total increases since 1932 to 67 percent.

In second- and third-class mail, the subject amendment proposes higher postage to adjust for cost increases which have arisen since rates were last modified in 1958. These further rate adjustments, together with the proposed modifications for computing public services, would result in substantially higher coverage of costs in both classes of mail.

After reflecting public service allowances, the Department's revenues would be roughly 50 percent of cost in second class and 85 percent in third class. The relatively low-cost coverage for second class, though substantially higher than in the past, is consistent with the established congressional policy of below-cost rates for newspapers and periodicals. From the very beginning of the U.S. Postal System, low postage rates for these media have reflected the belief of Congress that wide distribution of reading matter should be encouraged for the public good.

Rates for commercial-type mailings in second class (newspapers and magazines) would go up 1 cent per copy—an average increase of 55 percent. When fully effective, the increase would yield about $53 million in new revenues. There would be no increase in rates for hometown papers delivered within their counties of publication. Similarly, there would be no increases on publications for classroom use or publications of nonprofit organizations.

In third class, the minimum rate for circulars and other bulk mailings would rise from 2½ cents to 3 cents. There would be no rate increases for nonprofit organizations. In all, third class would yield $93 million of new postal revenues.

This Department approves enactment of the proposed amendment to H.R. 7927. We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that enactment of H.R. 7927, with the proposed amendment, would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

J. EDWARD DAY,
Postmaster General.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman this question: Does the gentleman's amendment have the effect of retaining the committee amendment under the heading "Communist Political Propaganda" beginning at line 6, page 15, and ending with the line immediately following line 5 on page 16 of the reported bill?

Mr. MURRAY. Unquestionably it does.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very fair bill. I do not think it will put anybody out of business. Something must be done to eliminate this gigantic deficit in the Post Office Department. I trust the Members will vote for the legislation.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the substitute amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY]. I do this with great reluctance. The situation as it confronts us at the moment is that the gentleman has introduced an amendment which will provide rates considerably below what I know he thinks are justified. I had been strictly for the committee bill, but in view of his actions in agreeing to a compromise, I felt that I must go along with this and join forces with him in order that we may move this rate bill along to the other body.

Likewise because of the decision which was made, I suppose in the last hour, that the Cunningham provision which would bar the transmittal of Communist propaganda in this country is to be included in the substitute, it makes that substitute more attractive. Without the Cunningham amendment, I do not know how anybody could support a postal rate increase. We would find ourselves in the position of calling on the postal field service to handle Communist propaganda virtually free while we are telling American citizens you have to pay more to get your mail delivered. As we go through the amending process on this bill, it is very evident there are going to be all kinds of amendments offered to increase rates in some cases and to decrease them in others. I am now announcing that with, perhaps, very few exceptions I am going to oppose any of those amendments. I am going to do so because this subject of postal rates is just as complicated as any legislation that comes before this body. We have been days and weeks and months and, in the case of many of us, years listening to testimony in the committee—hammering out amendments and trying to keep the rates in balance so that we do not have great shifts at any point which would cause the users of the mails to suffer. This subject is complicated. The committee has worked hard. The staff has worked hard. We have been in consultation with users of the mail and we have been in consultation with experts from the Department. Out of it all has come a measure that is in balance and which, I believe, after it has been worked over by the other body will be a fairly satisfactory bill from all points of view. But, as I said in the beginning, I am reluctantly supporting this bill. Its impact on the users of the mail could be very damaging. It could be as has happened before that we will have to come back here and lower certain rates. But in that spirit of compromise, I am going to join with the chairman in trying to keep this substitute bill intact and send it to the other body and eventually the whole thing should result in bringing the post office deficit into balance.

Therefore, I rise in support of the Murray amendment.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. Can the gentleman tell us what percentage of the first-class postal rate is paid by business institutions and subject to deduction on taxes?

Mr. CORBETT. Approximately 75 percent.

Mr. YOUNGER. And what about the percentage of the second-class mail?

Mr. CORBETT. I would say regarding the second-class mail, that close to 100 percent of it is paid by business.

Mr. YOUNGER. And as to the third-class mail; would it be about the same? About 100 percent?

Mr. CORBETT. Third-class mail is basically direct mail advertising but there is very much of this type of mail sent out by nonprofit institutions.

Mr. YOUNGER. So, so far as the net return budgetwise for the Federal Government is concerned, we would lose approximately 50 percent of the increase; is that not right?

Mr. CORBETT. Well, this gets into the tax business and I do not know how it would affect certain companies. Obviously, if a company were operating at a profit, I think the gentleman's position is correct.

If some of these rates are going to throw them into a situation where they have a deficit or are losing, then they will not be able to deduct; you cannot deduct from a deficit.

Mr. YOUNGER. They will not be able to add much to employment either if they go broke, will they?

Mr. CORBETT. I think the gentleman should direct these questions to the Director of the Budget and to the executive head of the Government, who have been the strongest pushers for this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not true that the proposed administration amendment to be offered by the chairman of the committee was rejected by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee last year?

Mr. CORBETT. Technically that may be right. As the gentleman recalls, the bill was reduced by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] and then we immediately started to amend it. There were all sorts of amendments to the Henderson bill; therefore, we never had a vote on the Henderson bill.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, because of a situation where we had four or five bills, and some of them came in overnight. Is that not true?

Mr. CORBETT. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. So, very few people, if any, knew exactly what was going on. Is not that correct?

Mr. CORBETT. Let us say very few people knew.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not also correct that the chairman of the committee thought so much of the committee bill last fall that he asked for a closed rule for consideration of the bill last year?

Mr. CORBETT. He probably did this for reasons similar to the ones that cause me to support his substitute bill. The only chance we had last year to get a bill through, I believe the gentleman from Tennessee so stated, was to have a closed rule and get it over to the Senate; so he agreed to that procedure like I am agreeing to this one.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield.

Mr. JOHANSEN. It is my recollection, and probably the gentleman can bear me out, that what is now referred to as the Murray substitute amendment did lose in the committee, but it lost by one vote. Is not that correct?

Mr. CORBETT. I thought that was the original administration bill that was tabled and that we did not have a vote on the Henderson bill; anyhow that is essentially correct.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has consumed 8 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS].

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, the essential provisions of this bill have been very adequately explained by the distinguished chairman of the committee and the distinguished ranking member on the minority side, so I will not impose on the time of the Committee to go into the general provisions of the bill.

Throughout the years in the past I have opposed rate increase legislation for several reasons. One was that through most of the years first-class mail was not only paying its way but paying a profit. That situation has changed now, and in order for first-class mail to pay its way now I think it is necessary to increase the rate from 4 to 5 cents an ounce on letter mail and to increase the postcard rate and the airmail rate.

I voted this year to report the committee bill out of the committee.

The bill we will be considering today, the substitute to be offered by the distinguished chairman, was not the bill reported out by the committee. It was not the committee bill. I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT]. He said he opposes all amendments. I hope he will not oppose the amendments I intend to offer, because I am offering one to amend the Murray substitute in two respects which were not in the bill reported out of the committee, and not in the original bill; one is the provision fixing a surcharge on second-class matter of one-half cent effective July 1 this year and one-half cent effective July 1 next year. That provision was not in the bill reported out of the committee, and I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania will support my amendment. I hope the gentleman from Tennessee will see fit to accept my amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Do I understand the gentleman intends to offer an amendment to strike out the surtax on newspapers now in the Murray bill?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I am offering an amendment to strike out the entire 1-cent surtax which takes effect in two stages, as it applies to newspapers.

Mr. JENSEN. I am interested in that because I have a letter here showing that many newspapers in my district will be very greatly penalized by that provision in the bill.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I intend to offer that amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. I certainly thank the gentleman, and I shall support his amendment.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I also expect to offer another amendment about which I will say a few words at this time. The substitute will carry a provision to prohibit the mailing of third-class mail matter between the dates of December 15 and December 25 each year.

The purpose of that amendment is to require Christmas cards to be mailed prior to December 15. That is not in the law at present, but it is a provision in this substitute to be offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

I have conferred with the Post Office Department and they tell me they handled the Christmas card situation this year in such a manner that this provision now is not necessary. The provision will do a great deal of damage to certain business people, one of which is in my district, the F. W. Dodge Co., which gets out daily business reports. They mail them in December as in the other months of the year. If this provision restricting the mailing of third-class matter between December 15 and December 25 is not taken out of the bill, it will do incalculable harm to business people, such as the F. W. Dodge Co. which gets out construction news reports regularly each day. They would be prevented from getting them out for that period, if the bill is passed with that provision in it.

With these two provisions I expect to support the bill. I will support the bill if these two changes can be made, and I earnestly hope that the committee and the House will see fit to support me on these matters.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROBERTS. I would like to compliment the gentleman on his amendment. As I understand it, his amendment takes care of the weekly newspapers with a circulation outside of the county of publication?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. It certainly would.

Mr. ROBERTS. Most of these are family-owned and family-operated types of newspapers. That is the purpose of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. The purpose of my amendment is to prevent this extremely heavy burden from falling on any of these small newspapers, some of which would be put out of business, so I am told by the Newspaper Publishers Association.

Mr. ROBERTS. In the absence of the amendment to be offered by the gentleman, under the Murray substitute how much of an increase would be placed on these small newspapers?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. In the absence of the amendment there would be an increase of one-half cent per copy on each newspaper mailed out of the county of publication to take effect on July 1 of this year. Then another one-half cent to take effect on July 1 of next year. There would be a total increase, when fully effective, of an additional 1 cent per copy on every copy of a newspaper mailed out of the county of publication.

Mr. ROBERTS. How much of an increase have these weekly newspapers had since 1959?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I will have to speak from recollection because I do not have the record before me, but my recollection is that in 1951 we put on 30 percent in three annual increases. In 1958 three annual 18-percent increases were adopted, making 54 percent.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Could the gentleman give me some idea as to how much revenue would be lost from the bill if his amendment is passed?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Yes. The amendment as it is in the Murray amendment would mean an increase in revenue of $53,400,000. This amendment would not take all of that revenue out. My guess would be, and it is only a guess, that it would take from this $53,400,000 maybe 40 to 50 percent.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the Murray substitute carries with it a provision preventing the mailing of third-class mail between December 15 and December 25?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Yes. The Murray substitute carries that provision.

Mr. GUBSER. May I inquire as to the reasoning behind that? Was that to encourage the mail to be dispatched at a time other than the Christmas rush?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. It was to encourage the mailing of Christmas cards prior to December 15.

Mr. GUBSER. But the Post Office Department is not required to handle third-class mail on a priority basis, and if they are burdened with other mail, they do not need to handle it at that time of the year, or is it a matter of storage?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. As a matter of practicality, they know that Christmas cards must be delivered before December 25, and consequently they have always done that. But, they have worked that out, and they say they have handled it wonderfully well last year without that provision, and they can do it this year and all other years.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. We have, I think, in the neighborhood of a thousand of these so-called shoppers' guides. They send out papers generally once a week to all the box holders in the county or trade territory, and they pay 2½ cents a copy. Now, that is third-class mail. That is about the same rate paid for a heavy magazine sent from Boston to San Diego, Calif., for example. Simple justice demands that this inequality in rate should and must be corrected.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Well, in the short time I have here, I do not think I would be able to give the gentleman complete information on that, but I would refer the gentleman to this analysis of the proposed substitute and the committee bill, and you can see the rates here on third-class matter.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes. I have seen that analysis, and am not at all satisfied with it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I personally would prefer the committee bill over the substitute proposed by the chairman if we must have a rate bill. I think it is a bill that does not please everyone, but it could be amended up or down to suit the wishes of the Congress. I favor it if it prevails, particularly because the committee in its wisdom added a provision to stop the free delivery to our people of Communist political propaganda. I am going to speak only briefly on rates, because I want to get into the other subject.

I want to say to this committee that this is a very technical and difficult problem. There are some people that say that the postal budget ought to be balanced. This is a new innovation. It was popularized by Mr. Summerfield when he was Postmaster General. I disagreed with him then and I disagree with the theory now. You are never going to be able to achieve a so-called balanced budget between outgo and income in the Post Office Establishment. It is a service institution. Following that theory to its logical conclusion, with all of the increases that are coming along—we are going to vote for a pay raise, transportation costs will rise, rent costs will rise, and so on—conceivably in 10 or 15 years we could have a 25-cent stamp.

So, you are never going to be able to balance expenditures and revenues. Therefore I discard that theory that we hear so much about. But that is not too important at the moment. We have gone at great lengths into rates at our hearings. I want to tell you that we raised the rates not too long ago. I am not going to oppose the amendment, if it includes the antipropaganda amendment, but I think there is something that we learned in our committee in which the Members of the House would be interested. You are raising the first-class rate from 4 cents to 5 cents on letters, and from 7 cents to 8 cents on air mail. This brings in the major portion of the additional revenue that is provided for in this bill. They are going to raise the rates on newspapers and magazines, which we call second-class material.

Mr. Chairman, I for one am not willing to penalize all of the little publications at the expense of the big daily papers who may be able to survive under the increase. But for every big daily that makes a lot of money there are probably thousands of little papers that are now just breaking even or losing money. Many of these little papers are run by man and wife, and they are going to be hard hit, if not put out of business.

Mr. Chairman, I have no brief for Life magazine or Time or Newsweek, or many other famous publications that we can think of which make money, but there are literally thousands of these publications that are not only losing money but are almost bankrupt. These rates can—and I think will—be the death blow to the small publications which are operated by small businessmen.

Mr. Chairman, with reference to third-class rates, which we call advertising mail, there is a story which has not been told so far as this great Nation of ours is concerned. They serve a legitimate function. Surely, perhaps you and I do not read all of the material that we receive under third-class mailing privileges. Perhaps people throw it into the wastebasket. However, figures will show, based upon testimony before the committee, that this advertising does produce business. First of all, it has to be prepared by small businessmen in a little printing shop somewhere, in a little direct-mail advertising operation somewhere, a little offset printing shop somewhere. They employ two or three pressmen or offset men. It involves the purchase of paper and materials and ink to print this.

Mr. Chairman, if only 1 or 2 people out of 10 that receive this material bought an article that was advertised, it certainly would stimulate and does stimulate business. But this increase may put them out of business. So, we are going to penalize the small businessman further. Therefore this is not a simple problem. It is a very, very complicated problem. I say that in our deliberations we should give serious consideration to this matter. There is not anybody that you are going to meet that is going to be happy about these postal rates and the increase that is proposed. This is in the form of a tax. Nobody likes to pay more taxes. We are all going back to our districts and are going to have to face that charge.

Mr. Chairman, I say that this budget can never be balanced in the Post Office Department. It never will be. It is a service institution, and it has to remain that way. Therefore I say to the Members of the House that you should give serious consideration to the very grave problem that confronts us at this moment, and which affects literally tens of thousands of small people, small businessmen.

As I said, we may believe Life and Time and a few others can pay more money, but there are only a handful of those; there are thousands of others that are on the brink of disaster. So you are going to make the richer ones richer and the little ones are going out of business. I do not think that is the trend that we should follow.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak about the anti-Communist proposal which has been mentioned, the amendment to the committee bill which from the parliamentary standpoint is before the Committee at this moment. We worked hard and long on this bill, as I said. We did not provide everything that everybody wanted, but we knew the bill could be amended up or down to suit the will of the Members. But it did have a provision that said that no longer are we going to deliver free of charge, at the taxpayers' expense, literally millions of pieces of Communist political propaganda.

Mr. Chairman, the country is in a dither, it is excited, it is mad about the free delivery of Communist political propaganda. You do not have to take my word for it. Here are letters that represent just 1 day's mail, and they are coming in like this every day. I did not count them but they are in the thousands and from all over the country. The people are incensed over the fact that they are going to be callled upon to pay higher rates and still we permit this material to come in here without any charge whatsoever.

Under President Truman, and President Eisenhower continued President Truman's program, we did have some type of effective means of screening this material. That meant that when this stuff came over it was checked and the people to whom it was addressed were sent a notice that this was evidently propaganda; did they order it and did they want to receive it? More than 90 percent of the people said no, they did not order it, did not know how their name got on the list and certainly did not want it.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] has expired.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped to get more time; I requested it, but did not get it but I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. There have been many figures about the volume of this Communist propaganda. Mr. Irving Fishman of the U.S. Customs Bureau said in 1958 there were 4,800,000 parcels, and a year later it was estimated by Mr. Fishman that 6 million parcels containing 10 million individual items came in. In 1960 it was testified that over 14 million packages or 21 million pieces were coming in.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say as a fact that nobody knows how much of this material is coming in. During the recess I spent most of my spare time checking into this, going to ports of entry, and let me say that when these figures are recited, they are only giving the amount of material that comes from Communist-bloc countries and they are only using figures for three ports of entry—New York, San Francisco, and New Orleans. First of all, more than 50 percent of this comes from Communist groups in the free world and they are not reflected in these figures. Secondly, there are 50 ports of entry in this country and there is a check made at only 3. They have checked only three of them and they do not have a staff to do a thorough job. That means that at 47 of these ports where the material may be coming in no check or inspection is made. There is no knowledge as to its volume.

There is positively no knowledge of the amount of Communist propaganda entering this country. No one in Government can supply this information, I am sorry to say.

I might add that the people are not only concerned that this material comes here but are equally, or, even more so, enraged that we should deliver it free and subsidize this inflow of Red propaganda.

I could stand here—I do not know if it is true—but I could stand here today and say 50 million pieces. I want to insist that these figures are not accurate. But nobody knows what they are, and nobody can dispute what I have just said to you here.

There have been committees of the Congress which have tried to reach this situation. They have tried to go after it through a different approach. We do not have to do that, this amendment is very simple and very clear cut and very definite. It can only come from the Post Office Committee. What we are doing here is working through the Universal Postal Union. This is a mail handling arrangement between this country and over 100 other countries throughout the world. We have a right to regulate the flow of anything that is adverse to this country. So all the anti-Communist proposal does is to place a section in that portion of the law involving the Universal Postal Union which says we shall no longer handle or deliver Communist political propaganda free of charge. I want to say this. The people of the United States are not only concerned that this propaganda is flooding this country in huge volumes—what incensed them is the fact that we allow it to be delivered free. I would not be so disturbed if we knew that what we send over there is delivered and distributed. But, ladies and gentlemen, it is not. So we are suckers here. We are distributing all their material which is going to our youth and to foreign language groups here while they are not distributing ours.

I had a man who came back from Russia just last week, just like many other people who come in and report to me because he knew I was interested in this subject. He went to three cities including Moscow. His primary purpose was to visit all of their newsstands to see what American material might be distributed or displayed. In not one single instance did he find any American literature, newspapers, or anything issued from this country except the Daily Worker. So I am saying to you, this is a matter of simple justice. This Universal Postal Union is a sort of treaty, unofficially; it is a mail handling arrangement. I am saying they have abrogated it unilaterally. We deliver their mail and we live up to the agreement, but they do not deliver and distribute our material and they do not live up to their agreement.

Mr. Chairman, there is much more to be said on this vital subject which I would like to say but unfortunately time is limited under the rule.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA].

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, Americans throughout the country are calling on Congress to end the subsidy given Communist propaganda. The time for the House of Representatives to act on this serious problem is now. Now is the time to put an end to this unholy situation. If we are going to ask the American taxpayer to pay higher postal rates—how in good conscience can we do this and not put a stop to the delivery and subsidization of such trash.

It should be obvious to everyone by now that we are engaged in a life or death struggle for survival with the international Communist movement. We cannot hope to prevail in this struggle unless all Americans in every field of endeavor are absolutely convinced beyond any shadow of a doubt that we are not engaged in a popularity contest with a competing economic system; that we are not faced with certain annoying adjustments which should be made so that we may coexist with a different system of government; but that we are now in a death struggle with an enemy the like of which we have never before encountered.

One of the most effective weapons used against us in this onslaught has been the intensive, massive, and vicious Communist propaganda assault on the United States.

Since 1948 the U.S. Customs Bureau has been under orders to screen Communist propaganda coming into this country and to intercept unwanted and unsolicited material. On March 17, 1961, this order was rescinded which now permits tons of Communist propaganda to flow freely throughout this country.

This propaganda is very cleverly and subtly written with the avowed purpose of brainwashing, warping, and destroying the minds of our citizens, both young and old. And the ironic, unbelievable fact is that you, the taxpayer, are subsidizing this effort to destroy the very thing you cherish the most—freedom.

High school and college students throughout the United States are supplied with Communist propaganda delivered free of charge by the U.S. Post Office. The House Un-American Activities Committee reported that "every school and college in the United States is directly or indirectly the recipient of some of these Communist propaganda publications." Thus, the Communists have discovered how to make American taxpayers finance a Red pipeline to the minds of our students.

The U.S. Bureau of Customs in a 12-month spot check of Moscow's literature through New Orleans counted at least 300,000 packages of Communist propaganda destined to schools and colleges. Each package contained 5 to 15 different publications of youth leadership for communism.

New Orleans is one of the lesser ports of entry from the standpoint of Communist propaganda. A heavier volume of this material is coming into the United States via approximately 50 other ports of entry.

The endless lists of our students are compiled and addressed through the World Federation of Democratic Youth, a pro-Communist front organization, and by the International Union of Students in Prague, Czechoslovakia. Both of these major international Communist-controlled youth organizations publish at least 40 periodicals which are disseminated regularly in schools and colleges.

The Communists' propaganda campaign has all the priority and impressiveness of their missile program. Russia and Red China can produce about 3,600 million books a year, more than 1 book for every person on earth. The Senate Internal Security Committee reported:

> The various forms of Communist propaganda throughout the world involve a personnel of about 500,000 and an annual expenditure of approximately $2 billion.

This propaganda has created the intellectual climate for the San Francisco student riots against the House Un-American Activities Committee, for the movement of certain Smith College students in petitioning Members of Congress to curtail the activities of this committee, and for the mushrooming on the campuses of Communist fronts in support of unilateral disarmament, Castro, recognition of Outer Mongolia and Red China, and against nuclear testing, ROTC, and loyalty oaths.

Under international postal agreements, the country of origin collects the postage, and our mailmen deliver mail from door to door without any charge in the United States and our territories. With non-Communist countries, this is a satisfactory arrangement, because we collect postage here for mail going overseas. With Soviet-bloc countries this reciprocal agreement is a farce. Does anyone believe that Soviet Russia, the master of deceit and prevarication, will deliver first-class letters from the United States without first censoring them? Certainly we are not naive enough to believe she will deliver American propaganda to Russian citizens.

Our postal deficit for fiscal 1961 was approximately $843 million. Contributing greatly to this deficit is the great volume of Russian propaganda and mail shipped into this country. Less than half of this Red propaganda actually comes from Soviet-bloc nations. The balance comes from subversive groups within the so-called free world.

During the year 1960 there was imported into the United States from Soviet-bloc countries printed matter, whether or not propaganda, averaging 1,341,298 pieces per month. To date there is no accurate count of how much comes to the United States from the free world. The lifting of the ban in March of 1961 will permit additional unsolicited tons of subversive material to be delivered to our citizens. No other country in the free world would permit Moscow's subversive material to be delivered at the expense of its own taxpayers.

Our greatest treasures are the minds of our youth. The future of America lies in their hands, and we certainly should not allow them to be unwittingly victimized by Communist propaganda subsidized and delivered by U.S. citizens and taxpayers.

To ask the American taxpayer to pay increased postal rates while at the same time permitting this Red propaganda to be distributed in this country free of charge is sheer hypocrisy.

If the free distribution of this propaganda were stopped, an increase in first-class rates would not be needed. To argue as the Post Office Department does that because we send out more mail than we receive is not a valid reason for continuing to accept Red propaganda. To accept such an argument is tantamount to saying that because we send out larger quantities of perfume we should continue to accept smaller quantities of poisonous gas.

During the balance of this session we shall hear impassioned pleas about how foreign aid is needed to defeat communism and how the President's request for authority to cut tariffs should be granted to combat communism, yet if this amendment is not accepted we will continue to subsidize the Red propaganda drive. It just does not make sense.

Members of the House, I earnestly urge your full support of this effort to stop the delivery of Communist propaganda. Let us save the minds of our citizens and youth from this destruction and at the same time help balance the postal deficit.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Harsha]. I have joined them during the past year in the fight to block Communist propaganda mail from pouring into our country and being delivered free of charge. My own bill, H.R. 9281, will be largely adopted in the postal rate bill we are considering today. It is a companion bill to those introduced by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Harsha].

I believe that every Congressman found an aroused citizenry at home during the recess last fall. People are absolutely unable to comprehend why the Kennedy administration has opened the dike to this flow of poisonous propaganda. It is but one of the appeasing overtures that have been made toward our professed and undeniable enemy, the Communist bloc. I am very pleased that we today will strike a blow which has been needed for some time and I hope the sentiment expressed will serve as a call to our State Department and administration to stiffen its posture in our dealings with the enemy.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased that the administration is so concerned about balancing the budget. It is a concern many of us have held for many years, and I, for one, am delighted to have this new and welcome company. I am tempted to take heart at this great affection for a balanced budget, but I cannot. The approach is not the right one. The amendment introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Murray] is a "spend more, and tax more" approach to balancing the budget. It overlooks completely that the Post Office needs modernization and efficiency. Last summer, the Deputy Postmaster General, Mr. Brawley, said $300 million could be saved by modernization. I would like to see that done without delay.

A businesslike operation in the Post Office does not mean only that the income balances the outgo. It means that the Post Office operation is carried on at the lowest possible cost for which the best service can be provided.

There is another thing that bothers me about this sudden get tough policy by the administration. It is a get tough policy that again is toughest on American private enterprise. There seems to be a pattern of trying to make it just a little more difficult for businessmen to operate. This pattern is all too plain in Agriculture, where the schemes of the Secretary are trying to put all farmers under the tight control of the Federal Government.

In this postal bill, we are jeopardizing a very important segment of American business—the free press. I notice from advertisements in the newspapers during the past week that both businessmen and their employees are worried about whether or not magazines and small newspapers can survive another set of postal increases. We all should know they are paying twice what they did for postage 10 years ago.

This leads to the most important point that my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham], is trying to make. The United States is subsidizing Communist countries like Yugoslavia and Poland, and very questionable neutrals like India and Indonesia, while getting tough with American business. This gets to be pretty silly. Here we are, considering a measure that seems likely to eliminate a part of America's great free press, and subsidizing through our foreign aid the controlled press in Communist countries. And if this is not enough, we are delivering free—in the United States—the very propaganda that is seeking our downfall.

I wholeheartedly agree with the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham]. Why in the world do we dare allow our Post Office Department to deliver Red propaganda at our own expense—or if you please, by using some of the money we hope to get by increasing the rates on second class mail? I will absolutely have nothing to do with a postal-rate bill until we stop delivering Communist propaganda through the mails. I think the Members should join in insisting that any consideration of higher postal rates should be based on adoption of the amendment just presented by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham].

One more thing. We should not overtake what might happen to what is left of our farm newspapers and magazines. Some, while doing great work for the American farmer, are just hanging on, and I am fearful of what the added expense of a big increase in postal rates would do.

I have been reading some university extension service surveys to find out where farmers get their information on new farming techniques. In other words, where do they learn? Some of you might be surprised to discover that in every research project, farm newspapers and magazines were the principal source of information. Farmers even relied on farm magazines more than on their county agents, and certainly more than on Government handouts.

The farm publication is the greatest ally the people have against the planners who constantly try to manipulate and control American agriculture. Here the vital area is information—not as the Department wants us to have it, but pure information. For every farm publication that disappears, there also disappears a little bit of freedom, and there is a little more dependence upon the Government's adulterated propaganda.

Farm publications are particularly endangered, because they are not sold on the newsstands. They are delivered on rural routes, and no one has yet devised a way to make rural routes pay their way. Farm publications likewise must use the mail to solicit subscriptions, and to handle renewals. They are dependent on the postal systems. They are dependent on low second class rates that have been basic to a free press in America since our country was founded.

Mr. Chairman, we must not be stampeded by the crocodile tears of the administration whose pious claims of budget balancing are misleading and which avoid the real issue. Let us join the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham] in making the elimination of Communist propaganda from our mails a prerequisite to consideration of postal rate increases.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, the balancing of the budget is important to maintain the fiscal integrity that has helped our great Republic to grow so influential and important in world affairs.

A raise in postal rates is but one step that can be taken to accomplish this objective. Another is a reduction in the operating costs of the Post Office Department. An important reduction can be effected, I believe, if the Communist propaganda that is flooding our ports of entry remain undelivered free of charge.

An important step for this Congress to take, in my opinion, is to provide the tools that will enable the executive department to legally close off the flood of unwanted, unrequested mail that our citizens are being exposed to.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Henderson].

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to support the amendments which the distinguished chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Murray] will propose when the bill is read for amendments.

The gentleman from Tennessee's [Mr. Murray] amendment, as he has explained, includes the same postal rate provisions and public service policy contained in H.R. 7927 when I introduced the bill on June 29, 1961. As explained in my statement in volume 107, part 9, page 11833 of the Congressional Record, my bill was introduced by general agreement of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service so that its provisions could be considered by the committee in detail, after I had informally discussed, at a committee meeting the previous day, certain rate and public policy revisions that I felt might be a suitable compromise in lieu of the original postal rate bill, H.R. 6418, which was based on an official recommendation of the Post Office Department.

My suggestions for compromise provisions were developed after careful review of the extensive record of public hearings and the deliberations of the committee in executive session on H.R. 6418. I felt then, as I do now, that the public service formula and the rate revisions in my bill, which are now contained in the amendment to be proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Murray], represent a fair, moderate, and effective measure to establish a firm and lasting foundation for a postal rate structure which will return postal revenues equal to postal expenses, after a suitable writeoff of expenses to public service, and will ascribe postal costs to the various classes of users of the mails in an equitable manner, with full consideration to the value of the service they receive and the costs incurred in rendering that service.

The Postmaster General officially reported last year, and again has reported with respect to the proposed Murray amendment, that H.R. 7927 as introduced, and the amendment, provide the very minimum postal rate adjustments which should be enacted. In my judgment, approval of the Murray amendment is essential if we are to meet the issue of fiscal responsibility. These proposed increases have been developed after full consideration of the many issues brought out in our public hearings last year on the postal rate question.

I am very gratified to note, also, that one of the strongest impediments to final action on postal rates last year, evidently has been removed by assurance we have received through a public statement by the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the other body that he will schedule prompt action on postal rate legislation, including an appropriate public service policy, when such legislation is passed by the House.

The amendment to be proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Murray] includes a firm, effective, and highly equitable provision which will relieve users of the mail from any burden for the costs of public services performed by the Postal Establishment such as free-in-county mail, free mail for the blind, and mailings at special reduced rates by qualified nonprofit organizations.

I became convinced while in my district during the recess that the overwhelming sentiment, of the people I represent, is that if we in the Congress find it necessary to increase first-class postal rates, we must also increase second- and third-class mail far more than is proposed by the bill, without the adoption of the Murray amendment.

I recognize that some of the second- and third-class uses of the mails will find the increases to be a heavy burden, but any postal rate increase will probably do this, and the present burden of the postal deficit upon the taxpayers is also of great concern.

I believe that when the Murray amendment is passed by the House it will be acted on promptly by the other body, so that the additional postal revenues which the President of the United States has given first priority among all new revenue measures this year will be assured as a first step toward the anticipated balanced Federal budget for the fiscal year 1963.

I hope that the membership will give its overwhelming support to the Murray amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Broyhill].

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of a balanced Federal budget. I would like to have been able to state that I rise in support of H.R. 7927 as reported by the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service, but I do not think that the bill is sufficient, that it does the job well enough. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Murray] will offer an amendment that will be an improvement. I will support that amendment, but I still do not think the bill even as amended will do the job that ought to be done.

As has been stated by previous speakers, this is a controversial and complicated measure; it is confusing, but there is no easy solution to the problem. I think that we can agree on two things. First of all, that there is no such thing as a perfect postal rate bill. It would be impossible to come up with a measure that everybody would agree with, a measure that would not affect some segment of our economy adversely or in which some industry would not be hurt. That is what suggests a compromise as a solution to the problem, and that is what we are attempting to do here today.

The Postmaster General did submit what I thought was a good bill, one that would meet the problem head on. It would raise the postal revenues in the amount of $741 million a year. But that was turned down by the committee. The committee reported a bill to the House that would raise revenues approximately $550 million, but it placed too much of the increase on the first-class users. The Murray amendment would help correct that inequity.

Another thing we can agree on is the fact that the deficit in the Post Office Department has to be met. Somebody has to pay for it. There are three ways that we can make up that deficit in the Post Office Department. One is to add it on to the national debt; two, charge it to the taxpayers in general; and three, have the users of the mail pay for it.

Insofar as adding this on to the national debt is concerned, we are now approaching a national debt of approximately $300 billion. It may be necessary at certain times to increase our national debt in order to meet any threat to our survival; but I think it is unconscionable in a time of progress and prosperity to pass on the deficit of operating the Post Office Department to future generations. That is exactly what we have been doing since the end of World War II. In fact, we have a total postal deficit since 1946 in the amount of $7½ billion. There has been an increase in the national debt since 1946 in the amount of $18 billion, not including the deficit for the current fiscal year. Regardless of how much you juggle the figures, the net effect is, we have passed on the entire postal deficit since World War II to future generations to pay.

So far as charging this to the general fund is concerned, or having the taxpayers pay for it, may I ask, Who is this benevolent taxpayer we are asking to pick up the tab? Is it the individual who has withholding taxes deducted from his paycheck? Is it the corporations? Is it to come from inheritance taxes, excise taxes? I say that there have been plently of complaints already about the inequities in our general tax structure. In fact, it is a question of whether we have reached the point of diminishing returns.

The President, I understand, has asked for authority to actually reduce some of the income taxes. The funds are not available from the general revenue to make up this deficit. That would seem to be the easy way out, but it is the wrong way.

The fairest alternative is to have the users of the mail pay for it. It makes no difference whether we consider the Post Office Department a business or service. If it is a service, then it is the best bargain that the American people can receive, regardless of whether we consider the charge for use of the mail as a tax or not. It makes no difference. There is no better way of charging for this postal service than to charge it to the mail users. It is the thing that benefits so many people. Then in direct proportion to their benefit in the use of the mail, they should pay for it. Why pass the buck? Why not charge it directly to the users of the mail service?

I think that the American people overwhelmingly support that principle. I think they are willing to pay for this postal service that they receive. That has been the historical tradition since the turn of the century. From 1900 up until World War II the average postal deficit was $33 million a year, and, incidentally, that included all subsidies—airline subsidies in the amount of about $75 million, frank mail to Members of Congress, free mail to various Government agencies. We have since that time taken that out of the postal budget, yet the amount that the cost exceeded the revenues this year is amounting to $832 million, even with all of these subsidies removed. The cost of living since 1932 has increased by 118 percent. The cost of delivering mail has increased 130 percent, but yet in the first-class mail we have only increased the rate, the charge to the users as beneficiaries, 33⅓ percent. So I think it is fair and equitable to pass on some of the increase on to the principal users, the principal beneficiaries of the mail.

Mr. Chairman, there is no easy solution to this problem, as I said before. There has to be some give and take; there has got to be some compromise. I think, again, that the amendment offered by the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Murray], is a good compromise. The administration supports it. It does not do the job, but it still helps to solve this problem somewhat. We will still have some deficit, regardless of whether we charge it as a public service or not. We will still have some deficit which today you are charging on to future generations.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen].

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I voted against the gag rule that was attempted last September. I wanted to amend upward some of the rate provisions in the bill that was presented, that is, the committee bill that was presented last fall. I had some other faults to find with that bill, and today I would be happy if we were considering the committee bill and I had the opportunity to present amendments to that bill. I do not find fault with my chairman and his procedure, but it kind of shortcuts some of the things that I would like to do. There is an increase in rates in the committee bill which I am for, but that increase is being eliminated in the Murray amendment. Mr. Murray's amendment would have no increase applied to the controlled circulation magazine. It would be the only class that would not have a substantial increase. The committee bill would increase that particular class $1.3 million. Mr. Murray's amendment would have a minimum charge on that class that would bring in perhaps an increase of $100,000.

Now, in every other class there is an increase of a substantial amount except that one. I wish that we were considering the committee bill that had been considered after all, for 7 months and had put an increase on that class and had put an increase on every class. As I say, perhaps all the Members are not content with all of the increases, but if we had the committee bill, we could increase where we wished.

Now, I think that the original committee bill, that is, the bill before us, does not increase second or third class as much as perhaps it ought to. On the other hand, I think that Mr. Murray's amendment is, in fact, a kind of Post Office Department bill that is too high in the class of newspapers that are doing business in my district.

Mr. Chairman, newspapers in my district do not have so much advertising or so much weight, nor do they receive such a revenue for a page of advertising as one of the great newspapers or magazines in more populated areas. Therefore I do not think that a 1-penny-per-piece charge—an increase, if you please, of 1 penny per piece on each newspaper in my area—should be the same as the per-piece charge of the larger, wealthier publications in a more populated area. There is a difference in the kind of service that the larger publications with a great deal more expensive advertising receives as compared to the kind of service received by the publications in my area.

Mr. Chairman, as a matter of history we have a law under which we have been increasing the rates for these kinds of publications on a per-pound basis—pound rates, if you please. There is a pound rate on the editorial matter, and there is a higher per-pound rate on the advertising material. In that way the load is with respect to the weight of the advertising and the weight of the editorial material in the respective kinds of publications.

Mr. Chairman, I think that that historical method of assessing the charge against newspapers and magazines is the one we ought to stick to, and that is the method that is in the committee bill which is before us. If there should be an increase, let us increase it by the historical method.

Mr. Chairman, I am of a mind to support the amendment that my friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. James C. Davis], plans to offer. However, if it fails, I have an amendment that will be a kind of compromise between the committee bill and Mr. Murray's amendment. My compromise would give recognition to the fact that we should emphasize the pound rates rather than the per-piece charge, and I would suggest a small per-piece charge as well. The amendment which I will offer is estimated to bring in about $41 million, according to the Post Office Department figures, as compared to the chairman's amendment of $53 million.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield for a unanimous-consent request to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Johansen].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George], who is a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, is unavoidably absent.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that her remarks in support of the Murray substitute amendment may be entered in the Record at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by Chairman Tom Murray. This amendment substitutes a more realistic postal rate increase bill than the one approved and reported by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

At the outset, I should like to explain that for several years prior to 1961, the Eisenhower administration had submitted legislation which was designed to eliminate a major portion of the postal deficit. Since 1959, this deficit has quickly risen from over $600 million annually to $832 million annually in 1963. During those years prior to 1961 those of us who supported a postal increase bill could not get the Democratic leadership of the House to permit the bill to be voted on. I am pleased, however, that conditions have changed and that the present leadership in support of its President must now agree to fiscal integrity in postal operations.

In those earlier days there were only a handful of us, including the distinguished chairman of our committee, who recognized the need to reduce the tremendous postal deficit which was increasing our national debt at the rate of from $600 to $800 million annually. Our delay in favorably acting on this legislation has meant that an unnecessary financial burden will be placed on future generations. In fact, our failure to act for more than 3 years has resulted in increasing the national debt by almost $2½ billion which is a substantial portion of the President's requested increase in the national debt ceiling. It is not my purpose to discuss the mistakes of the past or to remind my colleagues of their failures to face their responsibilities in former years.

If a postal rate increase bill had been approved several years ago when President Eisenhower requested its enactment there would not now be the need to consider the enactment of this measure which is before us today.

I have observed in the press comments to the effect that the enactment of this legislation is necessary if the President's budget is to remain in balance. I am unimpressed by this argument. It is my view that there are many items of expense in the President's budget which are unnecessary and should be eliminated. The principal reason for supporting Mr. Murray's amendment and the postal rate bill generally is because it will, in large measure, eliminate the unconscionable postal deficit and will fix rates and charges which the users of the mail should pay for the services they receive.

A large portion of the revenue raised by Chairman Murray's proposal will come from first-class mail rate increases. According to the information which we have received, for many years the principal users of first-class mail—that is, 75 percent of first-class mail—are the business people of our communities, and only a small fraction of the total volume of first-class mail is originated in the homes of our Nation. With the increase from 4 to 5 cents for first-class mail, there will be only a modest increase in the expenses of the average family which is estimated at about $1.80 a year.

Another basis upon which I support Chairman Murray's proposal is that it proposes a more fair and equitable rate increase for second- and third-class mail as compared to first-class mail. In the committee bill a greater bulk of the rate increase would fall on the first-class mail user and a disproportionate share of the increase would be allocated to second- and third-class mail. However, under Chairman Murray's proposal which failed by only one vote of receiving approval by our committee the revenue from second-class mail would be increased from $21 million to $53.4 million annually.

With respect to third-class mail which the Members know are circulars and advertisements which we all receive in quantity, the committee bill proposed a revenue increase of $57.3 million annually while Chairman Murray's proposal would increase this amount to $93 million annually. This is accomplished in large measure by increasing the minimum per piece charge for this class of mail from 2½ cents to 3 cents.

The remaining major difference between the committee's bill and the proposal of Chairman Murray is that the public service items enumerated in the Postal Policy Act would be established at approximately $248 million annually as compared to $342 million annually in the committee bill. In my opinion, Chairman Murray's proposal is more realistic and more equitable with respect to the provisions relating to public service items.

Thus, in terms of actual revenue the substitute bill of Chairman Murray would increase postal revenue $622 million annually while the committee bill would raise only $551 million. In summary I would suggest that the Members should support the measure which is proposed because it would provide a more fair and equitable rate adjustment for all classes of mail and would eliminate criticism of Congress for approving a measure which levied most of its increases in the first-class mail category.

Lengthy hearings were conducted by our committee last year at which time an opportunity was given to all the mail users to testify and present their views and, in addition, we heard the views of the Postmaster General and his staff.

It should be pointed out that the views of this administration are not unlike the views of the former administration.

I am pleased to learn of the general support which is being given this postal rate increase legislation. I hope its enactment does not provide a license for the administration to spend the new revenues which are raised in wasteful or irresponsible ways.

I should not be in favor of this measure if I felt that this would be the result. I am hopeful that those who are conducting the affairs of our Postal Establishment are firm in their belief—as were their predecessors—that the postal service should more nearly pay its own way and that the users of the mail should pay their fair share of the expenses for the services they receive.

Arguments have been advanced in favor of postal rate increases that almost every other major nation of the world provides a postal service with rates designed to pay for costs. I am not certain as to how compelling this argument is but I do feel that certainly the people of this Nation can afford a postal service without a deficit of $832 million annually in its operation.

Those of us who believe in fiscal integrity cannot turn our backs on this problem. I certainly welcome those Members and administration leaders who in the past few years have had a change of heart and now join with us in our endeavor to put the postal service of the United States on a sound financial basis. As I said earlier, I regret we could not have their help before this year because we would have relieved future generations from facing an increase of many billions of dollars in our national debt.

I earnestly solicit the Members to support the amendment of the conscientious and able chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Murray], and I hope that his substitute will be approved without any amendment which would distort the rate structure of the bill which he has proposed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly] for the same purpose.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I would be less than honest if I did not express agreement with those Members of the House who take the position that in the interest of fiscal responsibility some adjustment in postal rates is overdue. Like other Members, I have been analyzing this situation. Certainly the amount of the deficit—the postal deficit exceeds $800 million—is unconscionable.

Certain experiences, Mr. Chairman, that I have had with the management of the post office, however, indicate that higher postal rates is not the only answer to this problem. There is an angle of management policies and practices. I have very much in mind, for example, that for years, in the interest of economy, I have sought competitive bids for carrying the mail to the Aleutian Islands. Instead of that, the Post Office Department has a sorry record of negotiating with their own favored individual contractor. I might cite, for example, that at one time bids were delayed and specifications were set up in order to prevent any except the one favored bidder from entering a responsible bid. In this case, shortly after his bid was received and accepted, the Department quietly negotiated an increase in his contract. Also, the Department supported legislation that would have established by law a virtual monopoly for this one individual.

If there are other situations such as the experience that I have observed with the carrying of the mail to the Aleutian Islands, certainly politics, favoritism, and I sometimes suspect actual corruption would contribute to the Department deficit. Last year, in connection with this same route, in response to my request the Postmaster General announced that the Department would award the contract by public bidding. Subsequently, this decision was reversed and the incumbent contractor was given the contract in the face of the fact that four other individuals had advised me that they wanted to bid. What is more, the favored individual was to use a vessel which was almost identical in size and capacity with one which years ago had been declared inadequate. Of the 12 postmasters in the Aleutian Islands, all but one had indicated that service by this particular contractor had been unsatisfactory, yet the Post Office Department maintained that they had never received any complaints.

Consequently, I cannot help but feel that a substantial part of the postal deficit may result from practices such as this and ill-advised policies under political management.

However, Mr. Chairman, my problem has been also one of trying to decide in my own mind which of the respective proposals, if any, I could justifiably support, either the bill that was reported out of committee last year, H.R. 7927, or the administration's proposed amendment known as the Murray bill.

At the outset, let me say that H.R. 7927 as reported by the committee last year contains the so-called Cunningham amendment, which would reinstate the ban against distribution of Communist propaganda from abroad. In other words, on March 17, the Kennedy administration lifted the ban which had been ordered by President Truman and continued by President Eisenhower on unsolicited Communist propaganda being distributed at the expense of the American taxpayers in the United States. Personally, I favor the Cunningham amendment to the degree, and regard it as so important, that I cannot and will not vote for any bill that does not contain it, so if the Murray bill is offered as a substitute and no provision is made to ban Communist propaganda, I shall vote against the entire bill.

I have heard, Mr. Chairman, that the political situation is such that the high rates in the Murray substitute are favored by the administration under a plan whereby when this legislation goes over to the other side of the Capitol and is considered by the Senate, these rates will be cut back. Of course, Mr. Chairman, I would not infer that the administration was ever politically motivated or would stoop to such a scheme to help one of its favorite sons whose political fences may need mending. I, for one, Mr. Chairman, do not propose to aid or abet any such plan, if actually there is one, but disregarding such an undocumented allegation, I think that there is a real argument in favor of the committee bill as against the Murray substitute. Admittedly, it would not have such dire and adverse effects on certain businesses that use the mail almost completely. I have been told by representatives of the Post Office Department that the Murray substitute would put a great many small enterprises out of business, while H.R. 7927 would be less harsh by putting into effect modest increases in rates over a period of 3 years.

Mr. Chairman, I frankly do not know at this time how I am going to vote but I do want to make clear that neither bill seems to afford adequate protection to certain third-class postage users and I expect to support an amendment for a new type of bulk third-class rate for regular publishers who mail their publications at intervals as frequently as 26 times a year. This amendment, I understand, will be introduced by our colleague from Maryland [Mr. MATHAIS] and would save weekly newspapers across the Nation from being put out of business. I believe that the Post Office actually makes a profit by delivering weekly newspapers by third-class mail, because the newspapers themselves do all the preparatory work.

Mr. Chairman, as I have been informed, the administration proposal for postage increases anticipates a surplus even after allowing for a pay raise for postal workers. Now, I am the last one to object to surpluses, but I cannot feel that there has been enough thought given as to the adverse effect on business of this legislation. Of course, I have in mind that 75 percent of first-class postage is paid by businesses which in turn is tax deductible. Therefore, it seems obvious that three-quarters of the reduction in the postal deficit in the first-class category will be substantially offset by lower income taxes. Then in turn the deficit in the second and third class is all business, so again, approximately 52 percent of the postal rate increases would be offset by lower income taxes. Consequently, the overall net return to the U.S. Treasury by this legislation is not nearly as impressive as the administration would have us believe.

As for my position, Mr. Chairman, I want to reemphasize first that I am unalterably opposed to any bill that does not contain the provision to ban Communist propaganda from abroad being delivered by the Post Office Department.

Secondly, I cannot vote for a bill with provisions so harsh that it would make it impossible for many small businesses to survive. As the debate proceeds today and after amendments are offered, I shall diligently try to determine the merits of the final version of this legislation. Then, If I can in all conscience do so, I shall support legislation to increase postal rates on a fair and reasonable basis. Otherwise, I shall be forced to vote against the bill on final passage.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROUSSELOT].

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Murray substitute amendments, though I would have preferred, myself, to support the committee bill, known as the Henderson bill—H.R. 7927—which I think was a more adequate bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am especially pleased to see that we have maintained what has become known as the Cunningham anti-Communist literature section of the bill. Last year I introduced here in Congress H.R. 9455 which was very similar to the section which the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] has succeeded in placing in the bill voted out by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] has also included in his substitute provisions. I was privileged to have the opportunity to cosponsor with the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] this particular section known as section 11 at the time the committee bill was being put in its final stages in executive session. This anti-Communist mail provision will go a long way in allowing the Post Office Department and the Attorney General to prevent the continued influx of large amounts of Communist literature into this country which in many cases is directed to our youth, various church groups and other fine American segments of our society which do not realize that it is, in effect, poisonous Communist literature.

Mr. Chairman, this literature reflects the technique that the Communists constantly use, at the expense of the taxpayers of our country, in trying to mentally condition our citizens to accept their insidious propaganda.

I believe that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], myself and others have done a great deal of research to be sure that there are adequate built-in protections to prevent unreasonable censorship. This anti-Communist literature section provides for a proper method of screening this literature through the Attorney General's office at the various ports of entry in this country. There are over 50 ports of entry and unless Congress takes this strong positive action, the screening process will only continue on a very loose basis in a small number of these ports of entry. This provision in the bill places the responsibility in the Attorney General's office to set up adequate facilities to screen out and identify Communist propaganda entering this country and yet does it in a way that constitutional rights are protected.

Mr. Chairman, I heartily support the Cunningham-Rousselot section of this bill, and I believe that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has shown great wisdom in including it in the bill. I am also glad that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] in his wisdom has decided to include it in his amendments.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL].

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to see the bipartisan support for the amendment to be offered by the chairman of this committee. I think this is as it should be, because his amendment is essentially the proposal that President Eisenhower urged on the House and the Senate for many years.

Mr. Chairman, we are faced with a deficit—call it what you will. The plain fact remains that the Post Office Department takes in less, by $900 million every year, than it has to pay out. This, like the unwanted cat, is going to be on our doorstep unless we do something about it in this debate.

One of the interesting things to me about this proposal is that no one is happy about it. I do not think there is a Member of the House who says that "this is the bill just the way I want it." I agree with the gentleman from Virginia and others who would go further in the increases on he second-class and third-class mail. The first-class users point the finger at second- and third-class users and claim they are getting an unfair break. The third- and second-class users say, "You are putting us out of business, put the increase on the first class."

To me this is some indication that maybe we have a fair bill, when none of the various people who are asked to pick up a share of the burden are happy about it.

Mr. Chairman, I have been deluged, as the other Members have been, with these black-bordered ads announcing the late departure from this world of 80 magazines. I feel somewhat like a mortician today. My face is not always this long, but they have brought tears to my eyes. I do not quite know where to send the flowers or where to find the widows to whom to extend sympathy. But I will say to these people that there were 110,000 bankruptcies in this country in 1960. They do tell you in small print under the asterisk in this ad, that these are not magazines alone which have died, these are deaths and mergers. That is what they tell you in the small print. The newspapers and magazines are accustomed to give lectures on the benefits of a free enterprise society. I would say to them that this is a free enterprise society. If you have six drugstores in a community that can only support three, three of them are going to go under and the ones that remain are the efficient ones, the ones for which there is an economic need.

I do not want to sound harsh. It is harsh on the people who lose jobs; who have to go out of business. But none of us in this country, as long as we have this economic system, is guaranteed a job or that his business will succeed.

To my friends who support the first-class users and say we should not go higher, I say to you that a first-class stamp at 5 cents will be the best bargain in America. It was 3 cents in 1932. Everything else has doubled, wages and prices, but the first-class stamp has gone up only 33 percent. For 5 cents, if this bill passes, you will be able to send to any State or to any country, mail that is secret, that has priority service; and neither the President nor any committee of this House nor anyone else can open that letter. This is a real bargain. If we had no postal service and you wanted to get a message someplace you would pay much more. So I do not believe that the first-class amendment is unjustified.

Let me say to the third-class mail users that the housewives of America are tired of being the conveyor belt between the mailbox and the wastebasket. His is not a question of the special consideration we have traditionally given to newspapers and magazines; they perform an essential service in the exchange of information; they help our country to be strong. This is essentially a commercial enterprise for profit and today you only pay about two-thirds of the cost to the Postal Department for handling this mail. If the argument that the third-class interests make is good, then I suggest that they go to the man who supplies them with envelopes and tell him, "We cannot pay you $10 per thousand, your cost of the product, or even $10.50, so you can make a profit. We will only pay you $6. You must take a loss so I can make a profit." Third-class mail is essentially a commercial enterprise. I do not think the argument is valid, and I say to the third-class users, even under this bill you will still be paying only 85 percent and there will still be a 15-percent subsidy to the third-class mail industry. So, Mr. Chairman, I know it is not easy to vote for additional revenues. It is always easy to hand money out with one hand or with both hands. It is hard to impose essential revenue-raising measures and, yet, we must act and we must do our duty in this instance and do what has to be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to know that the House will have an opportunity to express itself with regard to the question of whether or not the pending postal rate increase bill should contain a provision negating the Presidential order of last year which permitted the entry into our country of Communist propaganda and the free delivery thereof by our postal system. It seems strange that while we are engaged in great ideological battle to the death with the Kremlin we should permit the free use of our postal system which together with our whole system of government the Communists seek to destroy.

I will not vote for any postal rate increase measure unless it contains language which will prohibit the free use of our postal facilities for the distribution of Communist propaganda. Whether or not I vote for any rate increase bill will depend upon the manner and degree in which rates are increased, but in any event the bill in its final form must contain the above provision so far as I am concerned.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] for such time as he may desire.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, nobody denies the need to bring this unwieldy Post Office deficit under control and, of course, the main directions we must move in are just rate increases and reduced costs of operating the Post Office Department.

However, to me, the overwhelming persuasion is the forthright section of the bill which allows un-American propaganda from all over the nonfree world to be carried free in this country.

That this arrangement is not reciprocal in its operation merely adds greater conviction to any decision in this matter.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, since the bill before us differs substantially from the proposal originally placed before the House, I feel it necessary at this time to clarify the issue. Regardless of any statements made by the Post Office Department or their congressional spokesmen here this afternoon, the bill before us will not effectively balance the Post Office operations.

The public service feature of the bill is purely fictional and basically deceives the public into thinking that through this postal rate proposal, we will end the Post Office deficit.

The facts are that the substitute offered by Chairman MURRAY will still leave the Post Office with a deficit in the vicinity of $300 million. In addition, the longevity bill vetoed by the President last fall has been reintroduced and when passed on the heels of a rate increase and approved by the President, will add over $60 million to the cost of postal operations.

In addition, this being an election year, a salary increase for Post Office employees is a certainty. Bills have been introduced calling for a 14-percent increase, which would cost the Post Office $490 million. Even if we could assume that the increase will be restricted to approximately 7 percent, the combination of increased costs plus the deficit that remains if the bill before us is passed in its entirety, will still leave the Post Office with a deficit of $600 million.

I insist that we tell the public the truth that we are raising rates on first-class and airmail since this is the path of least resistance. The increase in second- and third-class mail and the nonlegislative adjustments in parcel post are token measures in comparison to the 25-percent increase that the users of first-class mail will bear.

Mr. Chairman, the public would not object to an overall increase in postal rates if the end result is the elimination of the postal deficit. After all, the deficit comes out of their pockets as taxpayers, but I do believe that the Congress should provide the public, as I have indicated, with a clear explanation that despite the postal rate increase, our Post Office Department will continue to operate under a substantial deficit at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Personally, I feel that we would be following the wisest course of action by substituting the provisions of H.R. 6418, the original amount requested by Postmaster General Day. This would raise an additional $140 million in revenue. If we would then continue on a consistent path and develop practical salary increases based on performance and job standards, we could keep the Post Office deficit within minimum figures.

Obviously, I stand in a hopeless minority when taking this position since it is apparent that the temper of the Congress this year will be to restrict the rate increase, expand the postal salary increase, leaving as the end result a continued deficit of at least $600 million.

However, another aspect of this bill before us deserves as much if not more attention, and that is the Cunningham amendment to prevent the flow of Communist propaganda into the country through the U.S. mails. I have personally investigated this Communist propaganda and have spoken with dozens of recipients who have received this unsolicited mail containing glorious descriptions of Communist accomplishments and sharp criticism of the United States and its free world allies.

There is no reason whatsoever why the U.S. mail should be the vehicle for delivery of this Communist propaganda. I am most hopeful that the House will insist on the inclusion of this anti-Communist amendment in any postal rate increase proposal which passes this year. To delete this provision, either on technical grounds or under the argument that another bill will serve the purpose, would not be solving the situation, and would most certainly be working against our best interests.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge that we maintain the restrictions against the delivery of Communist mail as proposed by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. Chairman, the issue before us seems to be fairly clear. Everyone would like to do something about the postal deficit. Everyone has a slightly different formula. I am afraid in the debate over various formulas and in the debate over who shall and who shall not bear the burden of the Post Office deficit, we may forget one fundamental fact: that the Post Office deficit is taken from the pockets of the American taxpayers. We ought to relieve the taxpayer of this burden or tell the taxpayer that we are going to continue to stick him with a growing and consistent deficit. What we are doing here this afternoon, under the latest Murray proposal, is to continue a deficit of approximately $260 million. When we will add, in this present congressional session an increase in Post Office salaries, and when we will pass the longevity bill which the President vetoed in October, we will wind up with a new and recurring deficit in the vicinity of $600 million. I do not believe we have any right to foist on the American public an increase in first-class and airmail rates under the guise of ending the deficit when, in effect, we are perpetuating it. I believe the best bill before the Congress is the original bill which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] introduced back in March, the original bill which Postmaster General Day requested. This would raise an additional $140 million and would be of much more substantial effect in cutting this deficit. The American public will not object to paying 5 cents for a first-class letter and 8 cents for an airmail letter, if they know that the deficit had been ended. We are guilty of hypocrisy if we put through this postal rate increase and turn to the public, saying, you must pay increased postage because we are ending the deficit and then when we juggle the accounts each year, and when we use the gimmick of the postal public service feature and the postal salary increase and all the other things that enter into it, we will still tax the public with a $600 million deficit.

When Postmaster General Day appeared before our committee in the spring of 1961, he submitted a proposal almost identical to the rate increases advocated by his predecessor, Postmaster General Summerfield. I believe it is an ironic, yet revealing, situation that we see here today, the majority party forcing their Postmaster General to abandon a proposal of fiscal responsibility to accept a watered-down version of a rate increase which fails to eliminate the deficit and, as I have pointed out, deceives the public. This action on the part of the House Democratic leadership, in the expected coordination with the Senate Democratic leadership, is political hypocrisy of the worst kind. Obviously, I, as a member of the minority party, am in a hopeless position if I fought to reintroduce an amendment calling for the Postmaster General's original request. Therefore, I will reluctantly support Mr. MURRAY's pending amendment as the lesser of two evils and sweetened only by reluctant acceptance that the administration forces now give the anti-Communist propaganda provision. However, should the Senate refuse to include such an amendment and should it be rejected by a conference committee, I serve notice at this time that the battle will be fought here on the House floor to put into effect this amendment to stop the flow of free delivery of Communist mail.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I am torn between conflicting emotions as I consider this bill. As most of you know, this is a subject in which I have been deeply interested for many years. When I first came to the Congress 17 years ago I was placed on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Shortly thereafter I was transferred to the Appropriations Committee, and for the past 12 years I have been serving on the Post Office Appropriations Subcommittee.

I am one of those who feel that the users of the mail should pay their way. I believe that every class of mail should pay its way. We are not engaged in a philanthropy in running the post office; we are engaged in a public service, and the people of this country have the right to demand that this service be performed efficiently and economically. But it is a special service that the users of the mail receive and I have never believed that the taxpayers of the Nation should be called upon to pay for that service.

The Murray substitute is very much better than the bill reported by the committee, and I fear that if we do not adopt the substitute we might get worse. I must confess, however, that there are certain features of this bill that I do not like. One of them is that certainly—and I do not believe anybody will dispute it—we do have a tremendous deficit, as we all know; it now approaches $800 million a year in the postal service. To make up that deficit we are putting most of the burden on first-class mail, which is already paying its way. That, in my judgment, is not the proper way to make up the deficit. I think we ought to put higher rates on second- and third-class mail that are not paying their way, rather than on first-class mail.

Just a few moments ago reference was made to the gimmick of public service. That is a highly complicated problem. I agree that the users of the mail should not be required to pay for the cost of service that the Government gives away, but when you begin to determine the proper measure of public service that is a very difficult problem. The entire postal operation is a public service—if it were not the Federal Government would have no business in it—if it is not a public service it ought to be handled under our system of free enterprise—but when you begin to pick out certain types of the service and say "This is public service" it seems to me the only thing you can do is to say "We will classify as public service the preferred service which the Government gives to favored users of the mail." How would you measure that free service? It seems to me that you would measure it on the basis of revenue foregone. There are two theories.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The Congress has already established that in the act of 1958.

Mr. GARY. That is correct; and, what is more, they left it to the Congress each year to determine what the amount should be. This bill would take that right away from the Congress, fix a set amount not on the revenue foregone basis but on the total loss or total cost basis.

Let us take a situation of this kind: We give free service to the blind. What are we giving them? We are merely giving to them the difference between the free service and the amount a nonpreferred user would pay for that service. For example, suppose the blind send a package which would cost 10 cents to deliver, and suppose the other users of the mail, the nonfavored users, would pay 5 cents to send that same package—the Government would be giving the blind a preference of only 5 cents and not 10 cents as fixed in the Murray substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield me more time?

Mr. MURRAY. I have but 1 minute remaining.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. CORBETT. I just want to tell the gentleman briefly that we did in the act of 1958 specify the items that were to be classed as public service. That was a law passed by both branches of the Congress, and did it not specify it should be on the total loss basis not the revenue forgone basis?

So that the gentleman should not be bewildered as to what the law is.

Mr. GARY. The law left it within the discretion of the Congress to determine each year the amount to be appropriated to cover special services, and we have done it each year since that time.

Mr. CORBETT. The gentleman and his committee decided that the Congress did not know what it was talking about when they said the total loss and you appropriated on the basis of revenue foregone.

Mr. GARY. The Congress has appropriated on the basis of revenue foregone. Our committee did not say that the Congress did not know what it was talking about. The fact of the matter is the House did not have an opportunity to pass on that question when the law was passed in 1958. When the bill left the House it contained no reference to public service. The provision was inserted in the other body. The bill came back to the House and the conference committee agreed to it because it left the amount to be determined each year by the Congress. I would much prefer that it remain that way.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any legislation in recent years to come before the House that has been attended with more backing and filling than this proposal. After the short recess we had last fall, due to the extensive use of the Thursday to Tuesday club last year, we were confronted, when we came back, with a new bill, although we had a committee bill in the House which was previously supported by the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. That bill was then so satisfactory to Mr. Murray that he demanded and obtained a closed rule in an effort to get the bill through quickly. Apparently the administration was equally satisfied with the bill last fall.

So we come back in January to find the chairman sending letters to members of the committee referring to an amendment, in the nature of a new bill which he proposed to offer.

I assumed this printed proposal that I hold in my hand was what we would be considering today. But, lo and behold, apparently something else is going to be offered. Frankly, I do not know where we are today. If Members can legislate properly in this climate there is not much need for a Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I am intrigued by all of the concern I have heard expressed today about deficits. Billions are voted for foreign aid and the same Members make no mention of a deficit. But when it comes to a postal rate increase, the deficit is the main topic of conversation. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Broyhill] is concerned about the taxpayers and the postal deficit. I would remind him of the bridges that have been and are now under construction across the Potomac River, bridges that the taxpayers of the whole country built for the people of Virginia. Those contribute to the debt and deficit of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the committee bill, taking into consideration the writeoff for public service, will produce a surplus of $146 million annually. Am I not correct in that, Mr. Chairman? Silence must indicate confirmation.

And the gentleman's bill, if I am able to even make an estimate of what he is about to offer to the House by way of an amendment, will provide a surplus in the second year, when the rates are fully effective, of $122 million. I thought the House was setting out here to put the Post Office Department on a balanced budget basis; that Congress is not in the business of accumulating profit from the operation of the Post Office Department. What is the purpose of the $122 million surplus in the proposed amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Murray]? Why the surplus? Are we being asked today to provide for a pay increase when no consideration whatever has been given to a pay increase bill? What is this surplus for? Does anyone know? One of the top officials of the Post Office Department, a year ago, promised in a speech to provide economies totaling $300 million in the operation of the Post Office Department. Now, add $300 million to a surplus of $122 million and you have a lot of money other than for collection and distribution of mail. I am opposed to the amendment to be offered by the chairman of the committee, with the increased rates he proposes. Let us go back to the committee bill, and send that to the Senate.

Let me say to the Republican Members of the House that the minority of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service tried last week to get two executive committee meetings, with Department officials before the committee, to tell us why this sudden shift from the pending bill to the proposed Murray amendment in the nature of a substitute. We got absolutely nowhere; we were flatly refused and so we are here today with no explanation of why, in less than 6 months, the House is called upon to increase postal rates above the pending bill by $70 million.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Hechler].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I really wish we could face up to this problem of raising substantially the rates on third-class mail, the so-called junk mail, because one out of four pieces of mail now is third-class mail. The volume of this mail has gone up since 1928 over 300 percent. At the appropriate time I intend to offer an amendment which will increase the rate on single pieces of third-class mail from 3 to 3½ cents, and raise rates proportionately for other than nonprofit organizations.

You know, I got a letter the other day from a fellow who said he could not understand how we here in the Congress of the United States, in conscience, at the last session of the Congress, could extend our franking privileges to cover occupant mail in cities and then turn right around and raise first-class rates. Well, I cannot understand it either and I know that lots of my colleagues are in the same boat. That is something that has not been mentioned here today. But I think it is a very, very serious and pertinent question. The people will understand the necessity for raising first-class rates if we really make a genuine effort to raise rates on junk mail.

Under the Murray amendment, first-class and airmail increases would provide 80 percent of the additional revenue from rate increases, while only 20 percent would be borne by other classes of mail. So passage of the bill as proposed would perpetuate the inequities of the present postal rate structure.

It is true that there have been rate increases on third-class mail in 1959, 1961, and in the current bill and Murray amendment, but even with these increases third-class mail revenues are still below the cost of handling.

There has been a lot of bleeding by third-class mailing organizations who claim that billions of dollars are invested in the direct-mail industry, and many people would lose their jobs if Congress should raise third-class mail rates. The lobbyists are swarming around Capitol Hill, and the big organizations that say they are on the verge of bankruptcy are placing full-page ads in the newspapers. Where do they get the money to place these ads? Where do they get the money to keep these lobbyists on their payrolls? When you figure it out, they are paid for by the taxpayers as part of the subsidy which the third-class mailers receive.

The average citizen who uses first-class mail has no organized lobby out pounding the corridors for him. The average citizen cannot afford to place full-page ads in the newspapers and start a big propaganda campaign. But it is up to us as Members of Congress and it is our obligation to stand up and fight for every man who has blown his top at the amount and worthlessness of junk mail, and who has had just about more than he can take when he figures he has to subsidize this junk.

To make a long story short, I hope that when I present my amendment it may receive some support from my colleagues who want to see justice done for the oppressed citizen with the overstuffed mailbox, not to mention the overburdened mailman.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Jensen].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, there are a number of inequalities in this bill which to me, and I am sure to many Members of the House, are rank injustices to many small and some large users of the mails. The amendment which is to be proposed and I shall support it wholeheartedly, I refer the amendment to abolish the Communist propaganda free mail.

Mr. Chairman, one of the inequalities in this bill is that a heavy magazine can be shipped from Boston for example to San Diego, for the same price as a shopper's guide, a lightweight little paper mailed within a county for 2½ cents. If that is not an inequality then that word should be stricken from the dictionary. I agree with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], that there must be something wrong with some Members' thinking when we spend on an average of over $3.5 billion a year in the giveaway program to foreign countries and we are today spending the taxpayers' money to the tune of about $16 billion a year for Federal personnel just to be governed from Washington, D.C. In face of that we come here and shed great elephant tears about spending little comparatively speaking to carry on mail service, which is of great benefit and service to the people.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope that we can get at least some of these glaring inequalities taken out of this bill before the final vote comes, and I shall certainly support amendments to do so.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Johansen].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, when the annual postal deficit was some $600 million under the administration of a Republican President and that administration sought rate increases to reduce the deficit, I supported the recommendation.

A considerable number—indeed, a decisive number—of my Democratic colleagues could not see their way clear to go along. So nothing happened. And the deficit grew.

Now that the deficit is in excess of $830 million, I cannot find any valid basis for reversing my position in support of rate increases—least of all because this is a Democratic administration which now recommends a rate increase.

It seems to me that as a matter of consistency instead of deserting my own past position, I should be a member of the welcoming committee to greet some of the Democratic converts to the cause of postal rate increases. Having mentioned the matter of consistency, let me say that I make no claims of surpassing the consistency—or the consistent rightness—of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

The gentleman from Tennessee supported the rate increase under the past administration; he supports it now; he has been and remains firm in his adherence to principle. I am honored to associate myself with the distinguished chairman in this fight as I have in the past and I hope that the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle, and regardless of their individual views on this issue, will recognize and honor the stalwart consistency and courage of the gentleman from Tennessee and I hope that a majority of my colleagues will rally to his support and to the support of the Murray substitute amendment.

Now permit me to offer one or two rather broad observations regarding this subject of postal rate increases.

My first observation is that the real issue involved is very simple and very clearcut: Do we have the right, either as a matter of moral principle or sound economics, to pass a portion of our postage bills on to our grandchildren and our great grandchildren?

It is that simple.

And that is precisely what we have been doing.

Approximately one-half of the national debt increase since World War II is attributable to the postal deficit. Of course, that proportion would be somewhat reduced if the public service allocation proposed in the Murray bill were applied to the past postal deficits. But the fact and the principle remain.

The truth is that we are not only passing a part of our postage bill on to our grandchildren and great grandchildren, but we are also requiring them to pay interest on our postage bills.

I think that is unconscionable. I think that is a national scandal. I think that is a disgrace.

My second observation is that I know of no issue which seems to evoke the number and variety of expedient, popular, convenient, and self-serving allegations and alibis as to why we cannot, or should not, do anything about it. And I might add that the alibi makers have been unusually prolific in the current campaign against any rate increases.

Let us take a look at some of the roadblocks which are being thrown up against the rate increase.

First. There is, of course, the inevitable "Let George do it" argument.

This argument is employed, in varying degrees, by each class and category of mail users. They favor eliminating or reducing the postal deficit but they want the other classes and categories of mail users to do the job.

Perhaps the most popular form of this "let George do it" argument is directed against third-class mail and specifically against so-called junk mail. The popular and completely unrealistic argument runs to the effect that if the rates on this type of mail were raised to where they ought to be, it would take care of the deficit. Of course this is simply not true. The entire revenue deficiency of third-class mail is $265 million. The total deficit is $830 million plus. If rates for third-class mail were increased to absorb this total deficiency, one of two things—or a combination of the two—would occur. Either third-class mail would be priced out of the market or rates would be brought to a point which would require first-class preferential service for third-class type of mail.

The same principle applies to a rate increase which would absorb the $350 million revenue deficiency of second-class mail, and those who are now voicing such anguished protests against a reasonable rate increase would certainly have valid grounds for claiming that the Government was bent on their liquidation.

Those who object to the proposed $437 million increase in first-class rates ignore another basic fact. This increase would bring first-class revenues to 127 percent of basic allocated costs. This ratio is still below a past high of 140 percent and, of course, is in line with the historic recognition of the preferential treatment of first-class mail.

The "let George do it" argument is, of course, the sure road to stalemate. Its logic and its purpose is a do-nothing policy, and that, of course, is exactly what the advocates of this position want. The only solution is as equitable a distribution of the rate increases between the several classes of users as possible. That, in my judgment, is precisely what the Murray amendment does.

The unpopularity of any form of taxation is nothing new. George Washington summed it all up in his farewell address:

> Toward the payment of debts there must be revenue; to have revenue there must be taxes; no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant.

Second. The second roadblock to any action on the postal deficit is the argument which the magazine publishers' lobby and the third-class-mail users' lobby have been extensively promoting the last few days in full-page advertisements in Washington newspapers.

It is the cry of poverty.

It is the claim that the proposed rate increases will put the publishers and the third-class-mail users out of business.

To this line of propaganda there was added this morning a full-page ad of the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants Union of North America, AFL–CIO, with the horrendous title "A Vote for Unemployment?"

I am not clear from these ads whether the argument is that any rate increases will put them out of business or only the increase provided in the Murray amendment. I am not clear from these ads whether there is a compromise figure somewhere between no-rate increase and the Murray amendment proposal which the publishers' lobby and the third-class-mail users' lobby would find tolerable.

I shall be very interested to see whether any Member of the House will offer an amendment providing for some such compromise figure. I am advised that the parliamentary situation affords the opportunity to offer such an amendment and I am most curious to see whether it will be forthcoming.

There is, however, one aspect of this campaign to frighten Members of Congress into voting against the Murray amendment which I believe needs to be pointed out.

Believe it or not, postal rates are by no means the only production costs for either publishers or third-class-mail users. And believe it or not, postal costs are not the only costs that have increased in recent years. In fact, those increases have been substantially less than other production cost increases.

I think it comes with particularly ill grace that an AFL–CIO union attacks the rate increase proposal as "a bill to put us on the street." I have no quarrel with the efforts of organized labor to better the economic status of workers. I have a decided quarrel, however, with the kind of argument which attempts to place the entire burden of responsibility for the economic problems of any industry on the matter of postal rates, and totally ignores the possibility and the fact that exorbitant wage increases can also put businesses on the rocks and be a vote for unemployment.

When we return to the House I shall ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a chart showing comparative job pay rates in the magazine and newspaper industries for the years 1940, 1957, and 1960. These figures were provided me by the Department of Labor. They tell their own story.

Third. Another popular device for stalemating action on postal rates is that of injecting totally extraneous issues.

The same AFL–CIO page ad in this morning's Washington Post indulges in this device.

It refers to the fact that during the last 10 years, when it is alleged 100 U.S. magazines stopped publication, "we were giving Comrade Tito, of Yugoslavia, $2.5 billion" and "we were providing Gomulka of Poland with nearly $1 billion."

Now, I have always opposed this kind of foreign aid folly. However, I recall no full-page paid advertisements by the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants Union of North America, AFL–CIO, in opposition to this criminal folly when it was pending before this House. Where were those now vocal opponents of this foreign aid when it was an actual issue before the Congress?

Is foreign aid for Iron Curtain countries a pressing and relevant issue only when postal rate increases are under consideration?

Fourth. Still another roadblock is the perennial argument as to the amount, if any, which should be designated and allocated for public service.

For 7 years, as a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I have been bludgeoned with arguments by representatives of the publishers and third-class mail users lobbies that the factor of public service should be recognized in any appraisal of the postal deficit and in any process of postage rate fixing.

Repeatedly, I have heard these lobbyists say that if such a public service allocation were allowed, they would then be willing to accept a rate increase.

I am for calling their bluff. I am against buttressing and perpetuating this argument by futile and frustrating wrangling over the amount or formula for such a public service allocation.

I find no acknowledgment in the current flood of propaganda advertisements of these lobbyists that for the first time recognition is given to the public service item. So far as I am concerned, this silence is an acknowledgment that this argument is, and always has been, a phony, and that their commitment on this matter was not made in good faith.

Fifth. Let me mention one final roadblock which is being thrown in the path of any postal rate increase. I refer to the matter of a possible—if not certain—postal pay increase.

The argument is to the effect that we should not increase postal rates because it will make it easier to secure a pay increase.

Let me say first of all that those of my colleagues who offer this argument cast a serious reflection—quite unintentional I am sure—on the capacity of this House to render a prudent and reasoned decision on the subsequent independent issue of pay increases for postal employees.

Their argument seems to be that if we put our fiscal affairs in some kind of order by reducing or eliminating the postal deficit, we will have an irrepressible compulsive urge to start building another deficit. I happen to have a little higher opinion of my colleagues.

The simple truth is that if we have a postal pay increase, it will either be because there are valid reasons for it or because there are political pressures for it. It may be a combination of both. If we have that postal pay increase without any postal rate increase, we will simply be compounding the evil of the postal deficit.

I have long been one of those who has argued that increases in postal operations costs—including increases in pay for postal employees—should in all honesty and as a matter of fiscal prudence be matched by increased revenues.

I can conceive of no greater inconsistency than the argument that we should not increase postal rates—which increase by the way is in part for the purpose of offsetting past postal pay increases—simply because there may be now or hereafter some subsequent pay increases.

The issue before us remains what I stated it to be at the outset—whether we are going to continue to pass a part of our postage bill on to our grandchildren and our great grandchildren and whether we are going to embrace any alibi we can dream up for doing nothing about it.

The chart follows:

Average hourly pay rates in the printing industry

Job	1940	1957	1960
COMMERCIAL WORK			
Booking jobs	$1.13	$2.77	$3.08
Bindery women	.53	1.64	1.87
Bookbinders	1.03	2.83	3.18
Hand compositors	1.23	3.07	3.37
Electrotypers	1.43	3.30	3.64
Machine operators	1.27	3.07	3.37
Machine tenders	1.29	3.05	3.36
Mailers	1.08	2.45	2.96
Photoengravers	1.57	3.56	3.94
Press assistants	.95	2.49	2.75
Cylinder pressmen	1.25	3.04	3.33
Flat pressmen	1.03	2.74	3.02
NEWSPAPERS			
Stereotypers		3.29	3.70
Hand compositors	1.38	3.22	3.49
Machine operators	1.39	3.24	3.52
Machine tenders	1.37	3.24	3.53
Mailers	1.00	2.88	3.19
Photoengravers	1.71	3.51	3.82
Journeymen pressmen	1.29	3.23	3.52
Pressmen in charge	1.43	3.51	3.83

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I just want to remind the House of a little of the history of postal rates so that we will know what we are talking about here today.

First of all, the committee did come out with a compromise bill that did raise second- and third-class mail rates. The bill was not perfect. It was the best we could do in committee. Let us not forget that in 1926, the third-class rates were raised from 1 cent to 1½ cents and then Congress had to come back in 1928 and changed it back to 1 cent. In 1932, as the older Members of the House will remember, the Congress raised the second-class rates and in 1933, they had to come back and change them back to what they were in 1932.

Mr. Chairman, the Murray amendment, if adopted, is going to defeat the very thing that the Post Office wants and that the present administration wants. The President the other day said that he was very happy over the fact that there were a million more people working in this country than were working last year and the year before last. If you adopt the Murray amendment, those million people, if not more, are going to be out of work and I mean that sincerely because if you raise the third-class mail rates from 2½ cents to 3 cents, as is proposed here or to 3½ cents, as has been proposed by one of the Members, there will be no more third-class mail. If you raise the rates on second-class mail too high, you will destroy the very basis of America and that is the many small businessmen. If you believe in small business, do not vote for the Murray amendment.

The Murray amendment is going to take income away from the Post Office Department and it will take income away from the Federal Treasury, and it will not increase the income. Yes, there will be an increase in the first-class mail revenue, that is true. Some money will come from that source. But I just want to remind the House that the compromise bill which came out of committee last year was a very good compromise. I am one of those who believes that you should pay your way, but when you increase rates too rapidly and too much, you destroy the very thing that you are trying to do.

Mr. Chairman, as a former member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I wish to enter a vigorous warning against the move to restore to the postage rate bill, now pending before the House, the original schedule of rate increases for second- and third-class mail recommended by the Post Office Department.

Legislation which ignores the economic facts of life about a great industry like the publishing industry, or a growing business like the mail order business, is bad legislation.

The evidence before our committee established beyond a reasonable doubt that the proposed 79-percent increase on second-class mail will deal a crippling blow to the magazine industry and place heavy economic burdens upon the already pinched small city dailies, the rural press, and the farm journals.

In short, the potential harm of the Department's rate structure far exceeds its meager benefits. There is no evidence before our committee to dispute these conclusions.

First off, the Department's rate structure, if adopted, will mean a death sentence for some of the finest publications in the land. The estimated increase in revenue of $78 million on second-class mail exceeds the gross annual profits of the magazine industry. The added second-class mail costs will exceed the annual profits for many publications. If this seems surprising to some of my colleagues of the House, may I suggest that this surprise springs from a common misunderstanding of the nature of the magazine publishing field.

There are a few giants in the field called general interest magazines, and some of them report substantial earnings although far less than in former years. But the majority of the 6,000 privately owned journals which pay the full second-class rate are specialty magazines of limited circulation, barely able to get by financially, the continued publication of which is vitally important to their readers.

Our contention that the postage rate structure recommended by the Post Office Department will mean a death sentence, or financial liquidation, for many splendid publications needs documentation. These facts were adduced by witnesses before our committee.

As an example, the Curtis Publishing Co. has been preeminent in the publishing field for generations. It employs about 12,000 workers, and its operations extend across the continent. It publishes among others such well-known publications as the Saturday Evening Post and the Ladies Home Journal, which over the years have become household terms to millions of Americans.

The Curtis Publishing Co. is a heavy user of the mails. In the year 1960 its total postage bill exceeded a whopping $15 million. The rate hikes recommended by the Post Office Department would up these costs approximately $10 million. With the present cost-price squeeze affecting the entire magazine field, no firm could survive such an increase. The only alternative would be to suspend publication, or order drastic reductions with consequent rollbacks in employment and payrolls. Such a development would reduce the tax revenue, thereby offsetting any gain in postal revenue.

It would be difficult to assess the many contributions to our cultural heritage made by Harper's magazine and the Atlantic Monthly. These publications have provided the outlet and the encouragement for some of America's finest writers. The publishers of these two magazines said the rate schedule proposed by the Post Office Department would put them out of business. Their balance sheets uphold that claim. Because of a relatively limited but select class of readers, these publications cannot offset the higher mail costs by upping prices or advertising rates.

The Catholic Digest, although nominally a religious publication, must make a profit in order to survive. Since the date of inception, its fixed purpose has been to bring home to its many readers the evils of the Communist conspiracy and the Communist way of life. A spokesman for the magazine gave this picture of what would happen under the Department's rate schedule:

> It is clear that we would have only two choices; first, to curtail our operations, dismiss half our personnel, and therefore become weak and ineffective, or to continue as we are and go bankrupt.

The magazine for children was a delightful feature of family life in the early days of this century. Now it has virtually disappeared and the few surviving publications which try to live up to the splendid traditions of the past are rapidly losing ground. The publisher of three of these children's magazines, Humpty Dumpty, Children's Digest, and Calling All Girls, said his firm will have to suspend these publications if the Department's rate schedule becomes law.

In the long run, the rise of 79 percent in second-class rates may do just about as much damage to the small city newspaper, the rural paper, and the farm papers.

Mr. Guy Easterly, speaking for the National Editorial Association, which includes in its membership about 550 small town dailies and more than 5,000 weeklies, offered tables which disclosed that the Department rates would double, and in some cases quadruple, the mailing costs for these smaller newspapers. This rate hike would be heaped on publishers who have been compelled to absorb six rate increases totaling 89 percent over the past 9 years. It is difficult to figure out what national interest would be served by putting these publishers in an economic straitjacket.

Mr. Vern Anderson, speaking for the Agricultural Publishers Association, made this comment about the Post Office Department's rate proposals:

> The publishers submit that these increases by the Post Office Department are coming with greater speed, greater frequency, than their business can absorb.

Here again, it is difficult to understand what national interest would be served by piling new economic burdens on the farm publishers.

We are conscious of the fact that the operations of the postal system showed a bookkeeping loss of more than $800 million for the last fiscal year. This is a matter for serious concern. We believe in a pay-as-you-go government wherever possible, and we subscribe to the policy that every reasonable effort should be made to make postal revenue equal postal costs.

However, the factors which go into postage ratemaking are extremely complex. There are hidden subsidies for the railroads in the annual Post Office supply bills. The postal service is still carrying a host of activities for other Federal agencies. The Postal Policy Act of 1958 said in substance that $300 million should be charged off annually to public service, yet the Department ignored this and put public service at a much lower figure. Spokesmen for the publishers assert that a fair accounting will show that they are already paying their costs. The truth is that no one yet has been able to fix definitely the exact cost of transporting each class of mail.

The overriding consideration is that the rate schedule proposed by the Post Office Department would drive publications out of business, cause serious unemployment in the publishing industry, and take taxpaying corporations off the tax roll.

For Congress to adopt such a policy would be repugnant to justice and commonsense.

The dilemma which faces Members of Congress was frankly recognized by Postmaster General Day in these words:

> The American publishing industry has been built and nurtured on the present system of very low postage rates. Only the Congress can decide to what extent this system should be modified. We believe the rate proposal before you is reasonable from the standpoint of a more equitable sharing of postal costs among the various users of the mail.

In reporting the postal rate bill to the House, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee substituted a schedule of moderate increases on second- and third-class for the stiff rates recommended by the Post Office Department. We believe it would be a mistake for the House to return to the original Department rates.

Legislation which would force the liquidation of some of the best-known business enterprises in the country is not in the national interest.

The worst thing Congress can do is to vote people out of work. And on the evidence at hand, the postal rate bill sponsored by the Post Office Department will do exactly that.

As coauthor of the postal rate bill, H.R. 7927, now pending on the House Calendar I oppose the substitute measure which Chairman MURRAY proposes to introduce during the coming debate.

Our committee held 17 days of hearings, heard 250 witnesses and then spent many hours during 11 executive sessions hammering out the terms of a bill which will raise over one-half billion dollars.

Naturally, no one agreed with every line of the bill. Some would like no increase in first class rates. Others would like to drastically increase newspaper and magazine rates. There are honest differences of opinion on the controlled circulation rate. The miracle is that we succeeded in getting a half-billion dollar bill reported to the House floor by the decisive committee vote of 20 to 2.

My only fear is that any postal rate increases at this time might have an adverse impact on business. Certainly, we should not rashly change the terms of the bill without making certain it will not have the effect this administration is working to avoid—a business recession in any vital segment of the economy.

We are all aware that increased postage rates paid by business firms are a proper addition to the cost of doing business and have the effect of reducing income tax payments. Since 75 percent of all mail is used by business the increase in postal revenues from business mail will be offset by lower income taxes. Therefore, in my opinion, the net gain to the Federal Government from the pending bill may not exceed $300 million. Some newspapers of America have engaged in a bitter campaign against their principal competitor, direct mail advertising. This campaign has been going on for 10 years. It has resulted in our increasing the bulk third-class mail rate 150 percent since 1952. Our committee felt that such a steep increase—150 percent—was sufficient. The third-class rate structure is complicated, but we did readjust certain pound rates, the single piece rate, the permit fee, the odd-sized piece rate, all to the end of increasing third-class postage revenues from $532 million annually to almost $600 million.

I hope and pray the direct mail industry will be able to survive a new round of rate increases—first, third, and fourth class, not to mention those rates on special services such as c.o.d., special delivery, insured mail, and so forth, which the Postmaster General has recently readjusted upward.

This country needs the $20 billion of sales now generated by third-class mail. This country cannot afford to take away from any of the 1 million or more full-time employed Americans and over 3 million part-time employees whose jobs which are dependent upon the continuance of sales.

The creation by the Congress in 1928 of bulk third-class mail to keep valuable postal employees profitably occupied during slack periods was one of the wisest decisions taken by Congress. We should not in 1962 undo the great good of that decision by further increasing the bulk rate. That rate was increased in 1952, 1959, and in 1960.

The effect of the latest increase in third-class mail was clearly reflected in the decline of volume in 1961 as compared in 1960. Total third-class was 17,568.8 pieces in 1961, a drop of 2 percent from 1960 when volume ran 17,910.2. This drop, in what has otherwise been a steady growth, indicates we may have already gone too far, too fast, in the three rate increases on third-class in the last 10 years. In my own area, the Detroit Post Office suffered a drop of more than 5 million pieces of third-class mail. This not only hurts the area economically, but will lead to a loss of jobs for postal clerks and letter carriers.

I might say that we have had no documented word from the Commerce Department regarding the impact of the 1960 rate increase. We have no official estimates on the probable impact of a further hike in the bulk rate. Until such documentation is forthcoming, the House should not entertain a rate increase which, in my judgment, would prove to be both punitive and destructive.

All increases should be on a graduated basis so as to not adversely affect any one segment of our economy.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Barry].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, since I have served in the Congress I have been a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. During the last 3 years there has been an attempt made to get a responsible rate increase, and at last it seems that we may now have an opportunity to institute a long overdue increase in rates.

I intend to support the Murray amendment, but I hope also that it will be modified. I have an amendment to modify it in one particular. I hope also to support Mr. Olsen in one of his amendments.

I would like to ask the House to consider as it votes on this legislation, that there may be an effort made in the other body to water down what we do here, and I ask that we resolve that in the conference we not recede from what we decide during the next day or two.

With respect to the amendment I propose to offer, I invite your attention to a type of circulation which cannot, by virtue of raising its advertising rates or getting another advertisement, make up the gap that is caused by a substantial increase in postal rates; I am speaking now of that type of publication that does not carry any advertising. I think special consideration is needed here, because of the very nature of these publications as they lend themselves more to an educational type of publication because none of them include advertising. The proposed increase in the Murray amendment would be 300 percent for certain of these publications that are now in existence. These publications number some 6 million in circulation. I will name one of them, the Catholic Digest, with a circulation of a million. Children's magazines do not carry advertising, because children basically do not create markets and advertisers are unwilling to advertise in them. This is the kind of publication I am speaking about and which my amendment will benefit.

The amendment which I shall propose will double the rates on this type of publication but not triple them as the Murray amendment would. So these publishers will not get by without a substantial increase, since it will be a 100-percent increase instead of a 300-percent increase. It is our responsibility to protect these publications so that they continue to live even though we substantially increase their postal rates.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert.]

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, this is the first legislative business of the 2d session of the 87th Congress. It is much-needed legislation. It is important legislation. It gives the Members of the House the opportunity to make the fulfillment of important fiscal responsibilities the first legislative business of the session.

The importance of this measure cannot be overemphasized.

Last week the President submitted the largest peacetime budget in history.

That budget was predicated upon the enactment of this measure.

If we are to provide our Nation with the kind of government services which we must have in our expanding economy in this decade, and if we are to provide the strongest national defense in the history of our Nation, it is important that we maintain a balanced budget.

To that end, we must face up to our responsibility of reducing substantially our tremendous postal deficit now and for future years.

The great Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, upon which I once had the honor of serving, has reported a bill for which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Murray], chairman of the committee, has offered a substitute.

I hope the Committee of the Whole will accept the Murray substitute.

I favor the substitute in preference to the committee bill, first of all, because it will provide more income for the Post Office Department.

It will increase additional revenues from $551 million annually to $621 million annually.

This legislation is desperately needed to prevent a further increase in the postal deficit, which in turn contributes substantially to the national debt.

I favor the substitute because it is based upon the philosophy that the users of the mail should pay a fair share of the cost of the service which they receive.

For the first time in history the Postal Establishment is required to comply with the break-even directive of the Postal Policy Act by determining the costs of performing public services enumerated by law and charging these costs to the general fund of the Treasury.

All other costs shall be borne by the users of the mail through the payment of adequate postal rates.

Like the committee bill, the substitute increases first-class mail charges from 4 to 5 cents and airmail from 7 to 8 cents.

But the substitute will raise $53.4 million additional revenue in second-class mail, which consists largely of newspapers and magazines operated for profit, rather than $21 million as does the original bill, and $93 million additional revenue in third-class mail, rather than the committee bill's $57.3 million.

Free-in-county second-class rates and mail rates for nonprofit and classroom publications are not affected by the Murray substitute.

This will, within the framework of raising needed additional revenue, preserve a proper relationship between first-, second-, and third-class mail, bearing in mind, of course, that first-class mail received preferential treatment and that even with the increases of Mr. Murray's substitute, the Post Office Department's revenues would be roughly 50 percent of cost in second class and 85 percent in third class.

I am aware that there are some who contend that the increases in the second- and third-class mail are too much, and there are others who argue that they are too little, particularly in the light of the increases in first-class mail contemplated in both the committee bill and the Murray substitute.

But I favor the Murray proposal, because I believe it to be a fair and reasonable compromise between placing the entire needed increase in revenues on the shoulders of first-class mail users, and falling considerably short, as the pending bill does, of the recommendations made by both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy last year.

I propose to support the Murray substitute and to oppose all amendments to increase or decrease the amounts contained in it. I oppose the exemption of newspapers from the increases, as my friend Mr. Davis proposes. I oppose it, because, first, it will cost $21 million per year, and because it gives unqualified preferential treatment to one class of publication.

In this latter respect, let me emphasize the bipartisan nature of this endeavor.

During a press conference on June 20, 1961, President Kennedy stated:

> Both the previous administration and this administration recommended nearly $840 million of tax increase in postal payment.

Again, in his speech on the Berlin crisis, the President stated:

> The luxury of our current postal deficit must be ended.

This bill, as amended by the Murray substitute, has the support of the Post Office Department. It has the support of the administration. I think a majority of the Members of the House are convinced that the postal deficit requires that we raise postal rates.

It is my earnest hope that we will do the whole job and do it now.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, by reason of the bipartisan nature of this proposal, to adopt the Murray substitute and pass the bill.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. The distinguished majority leader said that the chairman of the committee will offer a substitute to the committee bill. My question is: Will the substitute be open to amendments at any point? How many amendments may be offered to the substitute, and will it be open to amendment at any point?

The CHAIRMAN. The proposed amendment being an original amendment will be open to an amendment at any point.

Mr. GROSS. To an amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. And a substitute and an amendment to the substitute.

The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Postage Revision Act of 1961".

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SHORT TITLE

"SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the 'Postage Revision Act of 1962'.

"POSTAL POLICY

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 2302(c)(4) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'deemed to be attributable to the performance of public services under section 2303(b) of this title' and inserting in lieu thereof 'determined under section 2303 of this title to be attributable to the performance of public services'.

"(b) Section 2303(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by amending the heading so as to read

" '§ 2303. Identification of public services and costs thereof';

"(2) by striking out paragraph (2) and renumbering the suceeding paragraphs accordingly; and

"(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

" 'The terms "total loss" and "loss" as used in this subsection mean the amounts by which the total allocated costs incurred by the postal establishment in the performance of the public services enumerated in this subsection exceed the total revenues received by the postal establishment for the performance of such public services.'

"(c) Section 2303(b) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

" '(b) The Postmaster General shall report to the Congress, on or before February 1 of each year beginning with the year 1963, the estimated amount by which, in the then current fiscal year, the cost incurred by the postal establishment in the performance of each of the public services enumerated in subsection (a) of this section exceeds the revenue received by the postal establishment for the performance of each such public service. The aggregate amount by which, in any fiscal year, the costs incurred by the postal establishment in the performance of each such public services exceed the aggregate amount of the revenues received by the postal establishment for the performance of such public services shall be excluded from the total cost of operating the postal establishment for purposes of adjustment of postal rates and fees.'

"(d) The table of contents of chapter 27 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out

" '2303. Identification of and appropriations for public services.'

and inserting in lieu thereof:

" '2303. Identification of public services and costs thereof.'.

"FIRST-CLASS MAIL

"SEC. 3. Section 4253 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words 'four' and 'three' wherever appearing in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof of the words 'five' and 'four', respectively.

"AIRMAIL

"SEC. 4. Section 4303 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by striking out the word 'seven' in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'eight';

"(2) by striking out the word 'five' in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'six'; and

"(3) by striking out the phrase '3 cents an ounce or fraction thereof' in paragraph (2) of subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase 'the rate of postage for other first-class mail matter'.

"SECOND-CLASS MAIL BEYOND COUNTY OF PUBLICATION

"SEC. 5. Section 4359 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by striking out so much of subsection (b) as precedes the table and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" '(b)(1) Subject to the minimum rate provided for publications of qualified nonprofit organizations and classroom publications by section 4360 of this title, the rates of postage on publications mailed in accordance with subsection (a) of this section are fixed both by the piece as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection and by the pound as provided in the following table: '[In cents]';" and

"(2) by adding at the end of subsection (b) a new paragraph (2), as follows:

" '(2) The piece rates of postage are charged on each individually addressed copy of a publication (except a publication of a qualified nonprofit organization and a classroom publication) mailed in accordance with subsection (a) of this section in addition to the pound rates. The piece rates are as follows:

" 'Publications other than classroom publications and other than publications of qualified nonprofit organizations—½ cent, effective on and after July 1, 1962, and before July 1, 1963; and 1 cent, effective on and after July 1, 1963.'

"MINIMUM POSTAGE RATES ON SECOND-CLASS MAIL

"SEC. 6. Section 4360 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

" '§ 4360. Minimum postage

" 'The minimum rate of postage is one-eighth cent for each individually addressed copy of—

" '(1) a classroom publication or a publication of a qualified nonprofit organization mailed under section 4359 of this title, or

" '(2) any publication mailed for delivery within the county of publication except when mailed free under section 4358(a) of this title.'

"CONTROLLED CIRCULATION PUBLICATIONS

"SEC. 7. Section 4422 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out '1 cent' and inserting in lieu thereof '3 cents'.

"THIRD-CLASS MAIL

"SEC. 8. (a) Section 4451(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by striking out the word 'and' at the end of paragraph (2) thereof;

"(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) thereof and inserting in lieu of such period a semicolon and the word 'and'; and

"(3) by adding immediately below such paragraph (3) a new paragraph (4), as follows:

" '(4) not mailed during the period December 15 to December 25, inclusive, of each year.'.

"(b) Section 4451(d) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out '(a)(2)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(a)(3)'.

"(c) Section 4452 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by amending the table in subsection (a) to read as follows:

" 'Type of mailing	Rate	Unit
	Cents	
(1) Individual piece	4 1½	First 2 ounces or fraction thereof. Each additional ounce or fraction thereof.
(2) Bulk mailings under subsec. (e) of this section of:		
(A) Books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions and plants:		
(i) Qualified nonprofit organizations	10	Each pound or fraction thereof.
(ii) Others	12	Do.
(B) Other matter	16	Do.'

"(2) by amending the table in subsection (b) to read as follows:

" 'Mailed by—	(In cents)
Other than qualified nonprofit organizations	3
Qualified nonprofit organizations	1¼';

and

"(3) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

" '(c) The minimum postage rate on pieces or packages of third-class mail of such size or form as to prevent ready facing and tying in bundles and requiring individual distribution is four and one-half cents.'

"(d) The third proviso in section 3 of the Act of October 30, 1951, as amended by the Act of June 23, 1959 (73 Stat. 89; Public Law 86-56), is hereby repealed.

"EDUCATIONAL AND LIBRARY MATERIALS

"SEC. 9. (a) Section 4554 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by amending that part of subsection (a) which precedes paragraph (1) to read as follows:

" '(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the postage rate is 9 cents a pound for the first pound or fraction thereof and 5 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof, except that the rates now or hereafter prescribed for third- or fourth-class matter shall apply in every case where such rate is lower than the rate prescribed in this subsection on—

"'(2) by amending paragraph (5) of subsection (a) to read as follows:

"'(5) sound recordings;';

"(3) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (6) of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word 'and';

"(4) by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following:

"'(7) printed educational reference charts, permanently processed for preservation.';

"(5) by inserting '(including cooperative processing by libraries)' immediately following 'loaned or exchanged' in paragraph (1) of subsection (b);

"(6) by striking out the word 'students' immediately preceding the word 'notations' in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) and in paragraph (2) of subsection (b);

"(7) by striking out:

"'(D) bound volumes of periodicals;

"'(E) phonograph recordings; and" in paragraph (2) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof:

"'(D) periodicals, whether bound or unbound;

"'(E) sound recordings; and'; and

"(8) by striking out 'and catalog of those items' in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof 'scientific or mathematical kits, instruments, or other devices and catalogs of those items, and guides or scripts prepared solely for use with such materials'.

"(b) Sections 204(d), 204(e)(1), and 204(e)(2) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, as amended by the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 479; Public Law 86-644), are hereby repealed.

"METHOD OF DETERMINING GROSS RECEIPTS

"Sec. 10. Section 711(c) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'Public Law 85–426' and inserting in lieu thereof 'any Act of Congress enacted on or after May 27, 1958'.

"COMMUNIST POLITICAL PROPAGANDA

"Sec. 11(a) Section 505 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after the first sentence and before the second sentence in subsection (a) thereof, the following sentence: 'In furtherance of this authority to counteract adverse usage of the mails and to reduce the domestic postal deficit, no international mail handling arrangement under which any postal rate, whether or not reciprocal, is established, shall permit the receipt, handling, transport, or delivery by the United States Post Office Department of mail matter determined by the Attorney General to be Communist political propaganda.'

"(b)(1) Chapter 51 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following section:

"'§ 4008. Communist political propaganda

"'No United States postal rate established by the Postage Revision Act of 1962 shall be available for the receipt, handling, transportation, or delivery of mail matter determined by the Attorney General of the United States to be Communist political propaganda financed or sponsored directly or indirectly by any Communist controlled government.'

"(2) The table of contents of such chapter 51 is amended by inserting

"'4008. Communist political propaganda.'

immediately below

"'4007. Detention of mail for temporary periods.'

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"Sec. 12. The foregoing provisions of this Act shall become effective on July 1, 1962."

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS (interrupting reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire as to when it will be in order to offer an amendment to the amendment which is now being read, whether it must be offered as the section is reached in reading, or wait until the entire amendment is completed?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the entire amendment must be read before an amendment would be in order.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I thank the Chairman.

(The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment makes changes in the committee bill which fall in two general categories, and also includes section 11 of the committee bill on Communist propaganda.

First, the postal policy provisions of existing law are strengthened and improved. Second, rate increases are provided at levels which, with the new policy, will wipe out the postal deficit and provide the full amount of the additional postal revenues which are required under the President's budget submitted to the Congress last Thursday.

The postal policy provisions of my amendment correct certain deficiencies in existing law and establish a firm and proper formula for the determination each year of the costs of postal services which are truly public services and, as such, should be charged to the general fund of the Treasury under well-established principles of public policy and the national interest. Examples of such public services are free mail for the blind, free-in-county mail, and mailings at reduced rates by qualified nonprofit organizations. Applying this formula, an estimated $248 million of postal costs for these public services will be borne by the general fund of the Treasury for the fiscal year 1963. This is about $95 million less than the $341 million public service charged to the taxpayers under the reported bill, which improperly designates as "public services" such historically sound, efficient, and necessary postal activities as rural routes and third- and fourth-class post offices, the cost of which it would have shifted to the taxpayers with no charge to users of the mails.

The rates in my amendment for first-class letter mail and airmail letters, as well as post cards and postal cards, are the same as those in the reported bill. Approval of these rates is imperative in order to provide the necessary measure of additional postal revenues. The first-class postage stamp at 5 cents will still be the best bargain in America. These rates are fully justified by priority of service and the absolute privacy guaranteed for a sealed first-class letter, as well as the fact that the postal service exists primarily to render the preferred first-class mail service to 181 million Americans.

The first-class letter increase from 4 to 5 cents is only a 25-percent increase, and the airmail letter increase from 7 to 8 cents is only a little over 14 percent. The first-class letter rate remained at 3 cents from 1932 until 1958, when it was changed to 4 cents—a 33⅓-percent increase. The legislation before us adds another 25 percent, or a total increase of only 58 percent since 1932—a very moderate increase, in comparison to the heavy increases imposed on second- and third-class mail.

Second-class, or publishers', rates for mailing commercial publications beyond county were increased by 30 percent in 1951 and again by 54 percent under the Postal Rate Increase Act of 1958.

The most important postage rate on third-class matter—the minimum charge per piece on bulk mailings of advertising circulars and so forth—already has been raised 150 percent since 1951, and when the adjustments in my amendment become effective will have been increased 170 percent during this period.

My amendment, therefore, will overcome the chief objection—and, in my judgment, a fully justified objection—to the reported bill during the debate on the rule last September 15. The watered-down version reported hastily in the closing days of the first session placed almost the entire burden of postal rate increases on users of first-class mail, with comparatively minor upward adjustments in second- and third-class rates. My amendment will correct these serious deficiencies. As pointed out in the Postmaster General's official report, under my amendment there will be a "fair apportionment of postal costs between taxpayers and users of the mail" and "costs ascribed to mail users will be assessed equitably among all mail classes."

The new rates will become effective July 1, 1962, except that the fixed charge per piece on second-class mail will be made in two steps; one-half cent will be effective July 1, 1962, and be increased to 1 cent a year later, on July 1, 1963.

My amendment makes no change on second-class mailings within county or on mail for the blind. It also continues the present rates on educational materials, on classroom publications, and on mailings of qualified nonprofit organizations.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Murray amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. James C. Davis to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Murray: On page 3, line 25, insert "and newspapers" immediately before "by section 4360 of this title".

On page 4, line 11, insert "and newspapers" immediately following "publication".

On page 4, line 23, insert "(a)" immediately before "'The minimum rate".

On page 5, line 6, strike out the quotation marks.

On page 5, immediately following line 6, insert the following:

"(b) The minimum rate of postage for each individually addressed copy of a newspaper mailed for delivery beyond the county of publication is one-half cent."

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, when the rule on this bill was before the House last September the membership pretty decisively expressed itself as not wanting a bill of this nature crammed down the throats of the Members without having an opportunity to express themselves in the way of amendment. I hope we are not going to see an effort made to cram a bill down our throats today without opportunity of offering amendment or due consideration given them, such amendments as may be in order to this bill.

The amendment which has just been read has this simple effect: You will see on an analysis of that part of the Murray amendment dealing with second-class mail, over in the right-hand column effective July 1, 1962, a one-half-cent-per-piece increase on newspapers mailed out of the county of publication; there is another increase of one-half cent per piece—a total of 1 cent per piece—increase on newspapers mailed out of the county of publication. The effect of this amendment would simply be to eliminate that provision as it applies to newspapers.

There are a number of small newspapers which exist just on the ragged edge. This Murray amendment, I am confident, would put some of those newspapers completely out of business. The American Newspaper Publishers Association gave me this statement: That this provision in this bill would impose a 100-percent increase on second-class postal cost of the Raleigh (N.C.) News & Observer; a 135-percent increase to the Aberdeen (S. Dak.) American News; a 66-percent increase to the Rutland (Vt.) Herald; and a 124-percent increase to the Dothan (Ala.) Eagle.

I have served on this committee for 15 years. I have heard testimony on postal rate increases year after year. I want to call your attention to the fact that newspapers have already had a very substantial increase imposed on them in recent years. In 1951 a 30-percent increase in postal rates was imposed on newspapers in the form of a three-stage increase, 10 percent per year. In 1958 there was an additional three-stage increase imposed on newspapers of 18 percent per year for 3 years, totaling 54 percent. The last annual increase just went into effect just last year. So they have had substantial rate increases, and these tremendous increases to which I have just called your attention on these small newspapers would be, in my opinion, exorbitant and almost intolerable.

This is an entirely new ratemaking proposal. We have never in the past placed any such burden on newspapers as the per-piece burden that is proposed to be placed on them now in this provision.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that to place an excise tax on anything except in time of war is a departure from congressional procedure? I do not remember of an excise tax ever before being proposed or imposed on anything in peacetime.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I do not know why it was thought advisable to place this type of increase on newspapers.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. I want to commend the gentleman for offering this amendment. I intend to support it. I think should this tremendous increase be allowed to take effect it would work a great hardship on many newspapers, especially in rural areas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS] may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it would reinstate the present rate that is now in existence on newspapers. Is that correct?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. The current rate would remain in effect. It is based on sound principles, it is based upon the advertising content in the newspaper, it is based upon the zone to which the newspaper is mailed, and it is based on factors which have a reasonable application to the business of the newspaper.

Mr. HARSHA. I want to commend the gentleman and say that I will support his amendment.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset, let me say that I will support a postal rate increase bill today. I would be happy to support H.R. 7927, reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service last year. I supported the rule in 1961. I am fully aware of the tremendous annual deficit now existing in the Post Office Department today which, I believe, amounts to something in the neighborhood of $830 million.

This gap between receipts and disbursements is unreasonable. The President says that a balanced budget for fiscal year 1963 is dependent in part on a postal rate increase. It is my considered opinion that a balanced budget is imperative. We all know that the interest on our national debt approaches $9 billion annually. However, I do not believe that a disproportionate increase in the rate exacted for the delivery of daily newspapers outside the county of publication should be exacted.

It is for this reason I support an amendment to the substitute offered by the distinguished chairman of the Post Office Committee which raises the rate about 55 percent on second-class mail. This increase is an unreasonable burden on daily newspapers. My colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], seeks to raise the rates on newspapers some $30-odd million in excess of the rates fixed in his commitee bill of last year.

H.R. 7927, now pending before the House, raises the rates on second-class mail some $57 million, and under the proposed amendment of the distinguished chairman the rate is increased in such an amount as to raise some $93 million in excess of the present rate. I repeat, this, in my opinion, is a disproportionate burden to place on our great newspapers.

In 1958 there was a 54-percent increase on second-class mail. It was estimated then that this increase would produce $77 million. However, it only produced $25 million. This illustrates rather sharply a point I want to make. It has to do with diminishing returns.

When this increase of 1958 became effective our newspapers could not stand this 54-percent increase on second-class mail. What do they do? Many of our great daily newspapers throughout the country ceased to use the postal service for the delivery of their papers outside the county of publication. They employed trucks and newsboys to deliver these papers. This was the reason for the discrepancy between anticipated revenue and actual receipts. It was a loss of $52 million. The anticipated returns from the 1958 increase diminished from $77 million to $25 million. And if the Murray amendment is agreed to the $93 million anticipated revenue will diminish to a greater extent than that which occurred after the 1958 amendment became effective.

I realize that great dailies like the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal cannot resort to Greyhound buses and newsboys for the delivery of their out-of-county papers, but our great dailies that circulate for a radius of 100 miles outside of the county of publication will not submit to this unreasonable increase in postal rates.

In my own district, the capital city and county of Tennessee, Nashville, we have two great newspapers, and their circulation extends even beyond a radius of 100 miles from the county of publication. Under present rates their postal charges now approximate $160,000 annually. A 55-percent increase over the present rates will be unbearable. The traffic will not bear it. As a matter of fact my publishers tell me that if the Murray amendment is agreed to, and it becomes the law, the delivery of their papers outside the county of publication will be done by truck and carrier. As a matter of fact, they believe such a means of delivery can be employed at a lower annual cost under present rates.

Therefore, I support an amendment the effect of which will keep the present rate for daily newspapers the same as presently.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman on offering this amendment, and I desire to associate myself with him. I hope that the Committee of the Whole will adopt the amendment he has offered.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. As I understand it, the gentleman's amendment would leave second-class mail as it relates to newspapers at the present rate, is that correct?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Has the gentleman made any study to determine what the cost may be to the newspaper, the county newspaper, that sends newspapers beyond the county line, what that cost may be?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I have made a study as to the aggregate amount of revenue to be effected in this bill by my amendment. It has been calculated by our committee staff this amendment of mine, if adopted, would only take some $21 million out of this bill which in total provides for $550 million.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. $550 million?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. The bill will bring in, as now written, $550 million. This amendment would take only $21 million out of that total, but it would be of incalculable benefit to these small newspapers which are now operating on such a small margin of profit that some of them would undoubtedly have to go out of business.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand the $21 million would be newspapers alone?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Those newspapers may be mailed beyond the county where printed?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. That is correct.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. I understand the gentleman's amendment will affect more or less those small newspapers that have a circulation of 10,000 or less?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. It would affect all newspapers. It would affect the small ones. It would have a much more beneficial effect on the small ones than the large ones because the larger ones distribute theirs by carrier.

Mr. CHELF. It would protect those in the category of the small country towns that have a circulation of 3,800, 4,000, or 5,000?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. CHELF. That is why I am going to support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Whether or not the newspapers affected by your amendment go across a county line?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. This would affect those that do not come under the free-in-county provision. It would affect that part of them which does not come under the free-in-county provision.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to get this straight in my mind, and I think others do too.

You have many newspapers in your district, as I have in mind, small newspapers, weekly newspapers for instance, that go across the county line.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I will say this, if the bill as now proposed by the Murray amendment is adopted, every one of those newspapers which goes across county lines will have to pay an additional charge of 1 cent per copy. My amendment eliminates that 1-cent-per-copy charge.

Mr. JENSEN. Good; I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman recalls my conversation with him concerning the newspaper situation. I understand your amendment will take care of all newspapers going across county lines.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. It will.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Regardless of the size of the newspaper, and the rate will remain as it is at the present time?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. That is correct.

Mr. CHENOWETH. There is no increase for papers going across county lines. I commend the gentleman for offering the amendment, and he will have my complete support.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. I am heartily in accord with the gentleman's amendment, and I hope it will be adopted. It only gives a square deal to these country newspapers which otherwise would be adversely affected.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time, I intend to offer the following amendment to the amendment proposed by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

On page 3, line 25, insert the words "or religious" immediately before "publications";

And on page 4, line 10, insert the words "or religious" immediately following "a classroom";

And on page 4, line 14, insert the words "or religious" immediately following "other than classroom";

And on page 5, line 1, insert the words "or religious" immediately following "a classroom".

The purpose of the amendment, Mr. Chairman, is simply to continue our policy of encouraging the dissemination of religious publications in the national interest. The amendment will not greatly affect the revenues which the legislation is intended to produce. It is merely a minor, but logical, extension of the policies continued in the chairman's amendment.

Although they are not supported by the great wealth of the large mass-circulation publications, these religious magazines make an immeasurable contribution to the spiritual and moral strength of the Nation. Because advertising income is so small a part of their revenues, they must rely upon reasonable subscription rates both for operating income and for sufficient circulation. Their problems in this regard are identical to those of the educational and classroom publications we exempted in 1951 because increased rates would have been so burdensome as to force their discontinuation.

At the very time when so many of our constituents are especially concerned with more stringent legislation against obscene and pornographic literature, it would be foolhardy to impose penalties on those publications which are the best preventive and the best antidote. Even apart from this important consideration, these religious magazines make a special claim upon us because of their positive commitment to the moral values we have always regarded as basic to our national life and national purposes.

Like the classroom publications already exempted, these religious publications play an enormous role in the education of youth. Here again, their continued success depends upon maintaining subscription rates that will encourage as wide a readership as possible.

Like the publishers of classroom materials, these religious corporations have willingly assumed the responsibility of paying local, State, and Federal taxes. Their primary purpose for existence is to publish and distribute religious literature and their survival depends upon mail rates commensurate with their ability to pay and the high purpose for which they are organized.

It must also be noted that these religious publications often reach into other nations and the expense of such distribution must be borne by their domestic editions. Use of such publications in other countries fulfills one of the major objectives of our national policy by effectively demonstrating a central aspect of the life and culture of the people of the United States. There is no better way to give concrete evidence of our spiritual tradition. Few publications so well illustrate the richness and depth of the American heritage. They are potent weapons in the forefront of the ideological offensive against world communism. Often printed in the language of the countries they serve, their message is carried directly to the people.

All of us know that religious and educational publications are not lucrative enterprises. They fight for survival each year, seeking only to reach more and more readers with a message that has never lost its urgency. Their corporate organization and financial structures are largely a matter of legalism imposed by the complicated society in which we live. What we must do is balance the insignificant amount of revenue involved in this amendment against the tremendous contribution the religious publications make to the common good. Viewed in this light, Mr. Chairman, I am confident that the House will accept the amendment.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. I think maybe the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Murray, could answer this, but I believe that the effect of the gentleman's amendment is contained in the Murray amendment which makes no change in nonprofit magazine rates.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, you mean profit or nonprofit magazines.

Mr. MARSHALL. I am talking about magazines that dispense religious information. Some of those are profit and some are nonprofit. Now, so far as your proposal is concerned, you talk about nonprofit organizations. Some of the most powerful and influential magazines dispensing religious information in this country are those that are profitmaking organizations and come under the guise here of being in the shadow zone. I am certain that the chairman intends to do exactly what I have in my amendment, but unfortunately at this time, in a world conflict, in a cold war, it does not do, I am afraid, what the chairman intends be done. A number of these religious organizations are using these publications to publicize the American way of life in foreign countries, and in order to finance them they are making a slight profit on their circulation in this country. This would stop that sort of thing from happening. I think one of the most powerful things that we have in this cold war, in this battle against communism, is the effect that these magazines that publish religious information have when they reach these foreign countries.

The United States of America as a Christian Nation in the cold war has a terrific responsibility on its shoulders. Mr. Chairman, the magazines that fall in the category of religious magazines are doing an immense good in this world of ours. We should not, in my estimation, cripple in a postage way the operation of those magazines.

Mr. Chairman, we are saying much about what we are doing. We are assuming an aggressive attitude in this battle against pornographic literature, against Communist propaganda, and against juvenile delinquency. This is one way in which we can do it.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard arguments here by Mr. James C. Davis and Mr. Marshall about the second-class rates provided for in this amendment. I supported their amendments. However, these are reasons why I was opposed to the Murray amendment. I did not think it was properly thought out. We in the committee turned down that very amendment offered presently by the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, we held many months of hearings in order to come up with a proper postage rate which took into consideration what the gentleman from Minnesota has said, and what the gentleman from Georgia has said.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. The gentleman does not mean that the committee turned down my amendment?

Mr. LESINSKI. No, sir. I did not intend to leave that impression. As I stated, in the committee we were very careful. The committee reported out my bill last year. It considered these very things. I happen to know what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Marshall], said about the Catholic Digest is true. This publication is sent to Panama, France, East Germany, England, and other parts of the whole world. They translated into their respective languages. Therefore I again ask the House to turn down the Murray amendment and act upon the original bill.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, although I hold the highest regard for the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. James C. Davis], my colleague on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I am opposed to his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is subject to three major objections: It would cost $21 million a year, and cut that amount out of the necessary additional postal revenue provided for by my substitute. It would be highly discriminatory as between the group of second-class mail users and would give special preference to all newspapers, including the great metropolitan newspapers. It also would create unnecessary and undesirable further complications in the already complex second-class postal rate schedule.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the amendment exempting newspapers from the rate increase provided for by the substitute should be voted down.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. The distinguished gentleman has just made the statement that this amendment would create new complications in handling second-class matter.

Mr. MURRAY. I said that it would cost $27 million; there would be a reduction of that amount of revenue.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I was not referring to that. I made that statement myself. But the gentleman just made the statement that my amendment, if adopted, would create new complications in the handling of second-class mail. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the situation that now exists would continue to exist if my amendment is adopted. Would my amendment create any new situation in handling second-class mail, or would not the situation remain just as it is?

Mr. MURRAY. It would create unnecessary and undesirable complications as I have stated. It would call for a recomputation of the rates.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if my amendment would create any complications, those complications already exist, because my amendment would simply retain the present status.

Mr. MURRAY. Our committee has been very fair to second-class publishers of newspapers and magazines. I certainly do not think that this rate, which is exceedingly reasonable for newspapers and magazines, should be lowered.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. This would not lower the rate. It would simply retain it as it is.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Davis amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think a study of the Murray amendment would indicate that the chairman of the committee has sought to assess these charges in the most equitable fashion possible. The only way one can consider the Davis amendment is to look at the whole package, not to look at one segment of the bill which is now before us for consideration.

This bill raises first-class rates, those used mostly by the housewife, the small businessman, and business generally, to the extent of almost half a billion dollars, or $455,100,000 per annum. The third-class rate would go up to raise approximately $100 million or $93 million.

In the other class, second-class mail—and this is what is under discussion in this amendment—the total amount to be raised over a 2-year period is $53 million.

The gentleman from Georgia just directed a question to the chairman of the committee in which he asked whether the adoption of his amendment would complicate the rate structure. The answer is yes, for the simple reason that what the gentleman from Georgia seeks to do is to amend only one part of the Murray amendment, namely: that having to do with newspapers. The Murray amendment is a twofold amendment on second-class rates. It deals with newspapers and it deals with magazines. What would happen if we adopted the Davis amendment to the Murray amendment would be that we would have the old rate for newspapers and another new rate to be administered by the same Post Office Department for magazines.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the proposal of the gentleman from Georgia is discriminatory on its face in that it seeks to create for the first time one rate for newspapers and another rate for magazines. Congress has always recognized the fact that magazines and newspapers serve a good and vital public purpose. Since the inception of the Republic, they have been subsidized and properly so. Today, newspapers and magazines pay only approximately 21 percent of the cost of transporting such publications in the mail. We are not saying in the Murray substitute that we are for abolishing the subsidy to the newspapers and the magazines. We are simply saying, in a two-step basis not fully effective until July 1963, that subsidy should be reduced.

The effect of the adoption of the Murray substitute would be to up the cost from a subsidy which now amounts to as much as 79 percent or more than that to approximately a 50-percent subsidy. I submit that that is a fair proposition.

Let us look at this from the point of view of revenue. I cannot believe for one moment that the great newspaper industry in this country and, mind you this makes no distinction between newspapers—I cannot believe for one moment that the newspaper industry which prides itself on freedom, and freedom from Government control—would come here and make this kind of plea for $21 million. That is what is involved here. For $21 million we move from a position of 79-percent subsidy to a position of 50-percent subsidy.

Then there is another area of discrimination which I am sure most of you are aware of. Many of the newspapers in our country have been somewhat abashed about this subsidy and they have moved away from the subsidy, they have moved to paying their own way and more and more newspapers provide their own delivery service. They do not use the Post Office. But, we are saying here, if we adopt this amendment, that we will penalize the papers that have shown that kind of initiative to cut off Government subsidies, and that we would reward those papers that have not shown such initiative. In my judgment, this is the very kind of thing that most newspapers are against, and I cannot believe for one moment that they would countenance this.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I am not here to make a plea for magazines. But, if we are going to have a rate increase, I do not know how the House of Representatives of the United States can justify an increase in the rate of magazines of 1 cent a copy and not increase the rate on out-of-county newspapers at the same time. The magazines have had full-page advertisements in the newspapers describing and pointing out their plight. I do not know whether these figures are justified or not. I suspect that they are not because the total amount involved here is $53 million. But we certainly cannot make fish of one and fowl of the other. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment will be considered in the light of the whole bill and will be rejected by the Committee.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. **ROUSSELOT**. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was delighted to hear the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana speak so vigorously on the subject of reducing subsidies in this postal bill, especially in second- and third-class mail. That is a position for which we on this side of the aisle have always fought, and I now hope that he will fight as vigorously to reduce subsidies in the farm program which I think need to be reduced also.

Many of us who sit on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee listened to the vast amount of argument by the great number of people who came before our hearings pleading special dispensation because their particular publication was different. We heard all these arguments which had the effect of proposing subsidies for the use of mails at the expense of the other users including first-class patrons. I agree with the gentleman that we should eliminate subsidies and have each class user pay their own way. I hope that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] will work as vigorously to reduce subsidies in the farm program, because those of us who live in the urban areas are tired of paying these large farm price supports.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

My unanimous consent the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. **JOELSON**. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is high time we stop passing along rising postal costs to the users of first-class mail and that we should see to it that third-class commercial mail and magazines bear their fair share of the burden. If we are not willing to do this, we should let the cost be paid out of general tax revenues.

Since the Post Office Department concedes that first-class mail at four cents is just about self-supporting, it makes sense that we look elsewhere for the revenue.

The Post Office Department also concedes that second- and third-class mail produce large deficits. Therefore, as matters now stand, the average person who sends a letter is subsidizing the costs of business circulars and magazines. Why should those who use the mail exclusively for profit get favored treatment over those who do not?

If the Congress wishes to give subsidies to mail order houses and magazines, it should do so openly by providing the funds from general revenues rather than by an unjustifiable increase in first-class mail rates.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS) there were—ayes 65, nays 106.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. **JAMES C. DAVIS**. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS to the amendment to H.R. 7927 offered by Mr. MURRAY: "On page 5, strike out subsection (a) of section 8, lines 12 through 22, and redesignate the following subsections of section 8 accordingly."

Mr. **JAMES C. DAVIS**. Mr. Chairman, I hope that I will have better success with this amendment than the one just voted on.

Mr. **MURRAY**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **JAMES C. DAVIS**. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. **MURRAY**. Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned I will accept the gentleman's amendment.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. **OLSEN**. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OLSEN to the amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY, of Tennessee: All of section 7 beginning on line 2 of page 8 and ending on line 4 is deleted and there is substituted therefor the following:

"SEC. 7. Section 4422 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out '12 cents' and inserting in lieu thereof '14 cents'."

Mr. **OLSEN**. Mr. Chairman, I think my situation presents the fundamental objection to legislating in this manner.

The committee gave real sound consideration to the committee bill that has been before us. In that committee bill there was an increase in this particular section of the per pound rate for sending controlled circulation magazines through the mail. That increase was from 12 cents per pound to 14 cents per pound. The increase was made because it would be keeping an equilibrium between the controlled circulation magazines and the magazine that has subscribers.

I have in my hand a controlled circulation magazine. That is sent without subscriptions to trades or to business people of a given class. It is a kind of catalog magazine. It has no responsibility at all to the receiver. The responsibility is entirely to the advertiser.

For many reasons the history has been that the per pound rate of the controlled circulation magazine has some relationship to the cost of sending it through the mail, and it also has a relationship to the magazine which is subscribed for. That latter magazine has a responsibility to the subscriber.

In my left hand I have such a magazine. Its editorial policy has a responsibility to the subscriber because the subscriber invites it. He pays for this magazine.

We learn from the Post Office Department that the Post Office cost ascertainment report shows an income of 6 cents per piece from the controlled circulation magazine. That is the income from this magazine on the average. Now, the cost of sending it through the mails through the Post Office Department is estimated at 8.2 cents per copy. So, on the average the Post Office loses 2.2 cents every time it goes through the mails. I understand this is unsubscribed for—well, certainly wanted in many places, but it is not generally asked for. On the other hand, the other magazine which is subscribed for and which has a responsibility to the subscriber for its editorial content, that magazine on the average, according to the J. K. Lasser & Co. study made for Associate Business Publications, pays to the Post Office Department 5.8 cents per piece. The Post Office cost ascertainment report shows it costs 5.47 cents per piece to ship it through the mails. So, as a matter of fact, the Post Office is making a profit out of this particular type of subscribed-for magazine.

Now, the subscribed-for magazine is paying an increase in its rate of 1 cent a copy for going through the mails, but the non-subscribed-for magazine is going to experience the same rate as it had, namely, 12 cents a pound. Now, if the controlled circulation magazine rate was increased to 14 cents per pound, then it would have a corresponding increase to that of the subscribed-for magazine, and what is more, that would realize for the

Post Office Department $1.3 million increased revenue. If we leave this magazine at present rate of 12 cents per pound and place the 3 cents minimum charge upon it, which is contemplated by the Murray amendment—incidentally, most of these magazines are heavy enough that they would pay more than this minimum, so for the most part there would be no increase on the controlled magazine—the Murray amendment would realize an increase of only $100,000. Now, if we are talking sincerely about increasing the rates for all the classes proportionately, as has been the case in past history, we should reinstate the increase which the committee voted. By the way, the committee considered this for 7 months. I voted for this increase that I am offering as an amendment to Mr. MURRAY'S amendment now. I am asking that we amend the Murray amendment to make it the same as it was in the committee bill that came to the floor and realize a $1.3 million increase instead of the $100,000 increase.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Olsen amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to substantiate what the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] has said. Certainly this is the type of circulation which has ample advertising in it. There is probably a maximum of advertising in this type of controlled circulation. Normally this circulation goes to one segment of an industry or to some group activity where everything contained therein is of advantage to the reader, and the reader is an advantage to the advertiser. The idea of increasing the rates on all other publications and leaving this one isolated instance with only a nominal increase of $100,000 would not be in the public interest. It is our responsibility to, first, raise revenue and, secondly, to treat all classifications of advertising media and publications equitably. I heartily encourage and urge you to support the Olsen amendment.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to correct my amendment. I sent up an amendment which was addressed to the pages of the original bill rather than the Murray amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment and address it to page 5, line 8, section 7, by striking therefrom section 7.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request of the gentleman from Montana to modify his amendment?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows: On page 5, line 8, strike out all of section 7, lines 8 through 10, and insert:

"SEC. 7. Section 4422 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out '12 cents' and inserting in lieu thereof '14 cents'."

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it refers to a category of mail known as controlled circulation. One of the reasons why the small amount of revenue to be brought in by the increase which will be placed upon this category of mail is that it is such a small portion of our mail. There are not many of these controlled circulation magazines in publication.

Mr. Chairman, several facts demonstrate that this amendment should not be adopted. Both the Post Office Department and the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, who has prepared this Murray amendment, agree that the rate carried here is the proper rate for controlled circulation magazines. It does not leave them at the current rate. This Murray amendment increases the per-piece cost of controlled circulation magazines from 1 cent minimum per piece to 3 cents minimum per piece.

Mr. Chairman, the great reason why this amendment should not be adopted is that the large magazines which have been referred to as paying so much revenue here by the proponents of the Olsen amendment actually pay a smaller percentage of postage than the controlled circulation magazines. The controlled circulation magazines now pay a rate of postage 2½ times as high as the second-class magazines. This amendment would seek to increase that rate still further. In 1958 the controlled circulation magazines had their postage rate increased from 10 cents per pound to 12 cents per pound.

Mr. Chairman, magazines such as Ladies' Home Journal, the Saturday Evening Post, and all the other magazines which do operate at a profit average now 4.5 cents per pound on their postage, whereas the controlled circulation magazines now pay 12 cents per pound, and their rate was increased from 10 cents to 12 cents in 1958.

Mr. Chairman, where is the equity when these magazines already pay 2.5 times as much as the Saturday Evening Post, which is subsidized by the Post Office Department, as the Ladies' Home Journal, which is subsidized by the Post Office Department, as Time and Life, and all these other highly profitable magazines which we all know are subsidized by the Post Office Department by millions of dollars every year? Where is the logic and justice of increasing the postage rate of these little controlled publication magazines which already pay 2.5 times the rate of postage that these highly subsidized, profitable magazines pay?

It is a matter of justice and equity. Also these profitable magazines get preferential treatment. You get your Saturday Evening Post on the same day each week. When it is put into the Post Office Department it gets what they call red tag treatment, preferential treatment. The same with Life and Time and other profitmaking magazines. These controlled circulation publications do not get that treatment. They get third-class-mail treatment, which is not preferential. They are handled when the post-office employees have nothing else to do.

With all due respect to the gentlemen who are promoting this amendment it looks like a dog-in-the-manger proposition. It is the profitmaking subsidized magazines undertaking to put out of business these smaller controlled circulation magazines which pay their own way.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, these rate problems are very complicated and I can imagine they are quite boring to a good many Members. I have been a member of the committee for 5 years, now beginning my sixth year, and we members of the committee take a deep interest in these matters. We study them. We try to understand the problems involved in our work, as each of the Members of the House becomes a specialist in the field of activity of the committee of which he is a member. This is a very technical matter. We are not talking about any so-called little controlled publications. This is big business. Let me put this to you. Life magazine and Time, have no part in this discussion of this amendment. We are talking about a group of little business magazines, the type we call trade journals. That is what this amendment is about.

These business publications have editorial material in them and have interesting articles. Let us say it is about the hotel business. People in the hotel industry will subscribe to this magazine because it is a trade journal in which they are interested. They pay a certain rate for receiving this magazine. It is a legitimate operation. These publications are small; they are not large.

They are published at second class. On the other hand, we have a category that is not second class and it is not third class. It is a special class. It is called a controlled publication. These are primarily booklets composed of advertising. There may be a few articles, but very few; just a bunch of ads stapled together. This magazine is distributed free to a particular industry. Let us say again that it is the hotel industry. You can see what disadvantage that puts the small legitimate subscription people to. Controlled magazines are distributed free whereas the business magazines are paid a subscription fee. In addition they contain much editorial and news material for the industry to which they are available.

All we are asking here is that the controlled people who are a very severe and unfair competitor of the legitimate business publication receive the same rate increase that we are going to impose on the small business magazines.

There is another reason for this amendment. We think that all ought to be treated alike. I might say that the change in the piece rate from 1 to 3 cents for controlled publications means nothing, because the magazine weighs more than the minimum weight. So it goes by the pound rate and this amendment will put the pound rate for controlled publications, the ones distributed free, at the same rate that we are going to charge legitimate business publications.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add one further statement. We are just beginning the amendments to this bill. Our President wants to raise a certain amount of money. There is a likelihood that some of these rates will be knocked down. I do not know that they will be, but that is always a possibility. It has happened before. If you adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen] who has studied this very carefully in our committee, it will bring in an additional $1.3 million in revenue to the Post Office Department.

If you are thinking about this deficit and want to do something about it, here is something that will really help. As I said, there may be some reductions in rates. I have no notion that there will be, but it is always possible since it has happened before. In that event, this amendment ought to be adopted because here you are taking in an additional $1,300,000 and we all know that is a sizable sum of money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to make this additional statement before this amendment is voted upon.

Controlled publication mail is the only class of mail besides first-class mail which pays it own way. This is not costing the Post Office Department a penny. It does not receive preferential treatment that magazines receive under second-class rates. I have just discussed this with the staff of the committee and controlled circulation pays its own way. This is the only class of mail besides first-class mail that pays its own way and it would be grossly inequitable to put on this increase and make it pay a profit to the Post Office Department.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Olsen amendment. It aims at solving some of the problems that were pointed out in the bill that was reported out last year. The points made by the gentleman from Georgia are correct, but on the other hand we, in the committee, felt that controlled circulation rates should have been raised from 12 cents to 14 cents. The reason for this is very simple. As the gentleman from Nebraska has stated, this is a special and separate advertising magazine. The manufacturers of a certain line of goods advertise in such a magazine. The magazine is then distributed to the members of that particular industry without their asking for it. It is true that controlled circulation is charged more for postage rates. On the other hand, the people receiving this mail do not ask for this magazine. That is point number one. Point number two is that controlled circulation industry is making more money than second- and third-class mail. Another point that you should consider is that second-class mail has certain concessions whereas controlled circulation does not. Therefore, it averages out. That is another point. Then still another point is that by leaving controlled circulation rates at 12 cents, it amounts to a move to put controlled circulation in second-class mail. I wish my colleagues would keep these points in mind. This is a move to put controlled circulation in second-class mail.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. OLSEN. I only wanted to make this comment concerning whether or not controlled circulation is paying its own way: The Post Office cost ascertainment report shows an income of 6 cents per piece from controlled circulation against a cost of 8.2 cents per piece to the Post Office Department for handling it. Thus by the Post Office cost ascertainment report they are not paying their own way.

Now, I want to submit the comparison with the subscribed-for, invited magazine. The magazine invited by subscription pays on the average 5.8 because it goes through many zones. When it gets to the most distant zone it is paying a higher rate by far than its competitor.

Mr. LESINSKI. That is correct.

Mr. OLSEN. So it averages out that the subscribed-for magazine is paying 5.8 to be carried through the mails, yet the cost to the Post Office Department is less than that by almost one-half percent; 5.47 cents is the cost to the Post Office Department of moving it through the mails.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. I have listened to the statements of the gentleman from Montana and I must say I am somewhat concerned by his last statement. The gentleman said that the distributors of these magazines were paying a possible charge of 8½ cents. Is that correct?

Mr. OLSEN. That is not right. It is about 5.8 cents.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman proposes to raise that, does he not?

Mr. OLSEN. It is in the Murray bill that second-class subscribed-for magazines be raised 1 cent per copy.

Mr. BOGGS. Does it not raise it on a percentage basis in comparison with other types of magazines? Is that not right?

Mr. OLSEN. No; the subscribed-for magazines are raised 1 cent per copy. The only raise in the Murray amendment wtih regard to controlled-circulation magazines is the minimum charge, for these magazines weigh so much.

Mr. BOGGS. I think the gentleman has missed the essential point which is that these magazines are already paying more than other types of magazines.

Mr. OLSEN. No, they are not. They are not paying as much as the subscription-type magazines.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Lesinski] has expired.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in reply to the statement by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen], I want to refer to the last cost ascertainment report as contained in the hearings. It shows these figures: Revenues from controlled circulation were $7,519,724; whereas the obligations, or the costs, were $10,346,288. So there is a substantial deficit on this class of mail.

I think what the gentleman from Montana is attempting to do here is to restore what the Department itself says it wanted last year, because this amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana attempts to put into this bill by an amendment to Mr. Murray's amendment the same identical thing the Department came down to our committee last year and said they wanted. This would increase their revenues by $1.2 million and would knock out part of the deficit from controlled circulation the exact loss figures being those figures which have just been read to you from the most recent cost ascertainment report of the Post Office.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Hechler to the amendment offered by Mr. Murray of Tennessee: On page 6 in the table immediately following line 4, strike out "16" and insert in lieu thereof "21"; strike out "12" and insert "18" in lieu thereof; and on page 6, in the table immediately following line 6, strike out "3" and insert in lieu thereof "3½".

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, in the first place, does not affect in any way nonprofit organizations nor does it affect second-class rates. It deals only with third-class rates for other than nonprofit establishments. It merely provides for increases in the rates of so-called junk mail from a minimum per piece of 3 cents as proposed in the Murray amendment to 3½ cents. It also provides for increases of bulk mailings of material of 24 pages or more put out by other than nonprofit organizations from 12 cents per pound as provided in the Murray amendment to 18 cents per pound. On bulk mailings, the per pound rate goes up from 16 cents as provided in the Murray amendment to 21 cents per pound.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to pay tribute to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. It has done a very fine job, working for 7 months, after which they came out with exactly the rate I am proposing in my amendment.

The Murray amendment would lower the rate on third-class mail from what had been proposed in H.R. 6418, and I believe the third-class rate should be raised to 3½ cents minimum per piece for circulars, which would produce new revenues of $100.4 million.

Let me ask a question: Would you like to make a hundred million dollars for the U.S. Government?

The last amendment offered by my very good friend from Montana [Mr. Olsen], for which I voted, will net $1.3 million in new revenues. My amendment, according to the figures I have received from the Post Office Department, will bring in something like $161 million of revenue from third-class mail as compared with only $93 million under the Murray amendment.

Under unanimous consent, I would like to insert the following table prepared by the Post Office Department to indicate more precisely how my amendment would affect third-class revenues, as contrasted with the Murray amendment:

	Hechler amendment to Murray amendment		Murray amendment	
	Rate	New revenues	Rate	New revenues
		Millions		*Millions*
Single piece rate	4 cents 1st 2 ounces; 1½ cents each additional.	$34.5	Same	$34.5
Bulk rate regular:				
Circulars, etc	21 cents per pound	7.4	Present rate	0
	3½ cents minimum per piece	100.4	3 cents minimum per piece	52.7
Books, catalogs, etc.	18 cents per pound	14.8	12 cents per pound	3.8
	3½ cents minimum per piece	3.9	3 cents minimum per piece	2.0
Nonprofit	Present rates		Present rates	
	Total new 3d-class revenues, Hechler amendment.	161.0	Total new 3d-class revenues, Murray amendment.	93.0

The people are fed up to the teeth with the junk which stuffs their mailboxes in third-class mail. The people cannot understand why we should be raising first-class and airmail rates and in effect subsidizing the third-class mailers. The third-class mailers are businessmen, small and big. I believe that when a business firm advertises in a newspaper or magazine, or over the radio or television, or puts up a billboard, the business pays the full cost of such advertising. Why, then, should business expect the taxpayers of the Nation to subsidize their advertising which they do by third-class mail? I say we should stop these third-class subsidies and raise third-class rates so such mailings will more nearly pay for themselves. Only then should we talk about raising first-class and airmail rates.

The amendment I have proposed will bring the revenues from third-class mail more nearly in line with the cost to the Government.

And so it seems to me you have here this afternoon a wonderful opportunity to strike a blow for liberty: first, to take a swat at junk mail, which none of us likes; and second, to bring in vast new revenues to the U.S. Government. New revenues of over $100 million alone will come in to the Treasury if we raise the minimum piece rate on circulars to 3½ cents.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. Chairman, I was greatly surprised that a gentleman coming from a State which is supposed to have one of the higher rates of unemployment would propose the termination of a $20 billion a year business. That is what he is proposing here.

He is attempting to put direct mail out of business by charging the industry according to his figures with some $150 million or $190 million of new postal rates. He might as well have moved to eliminate direct mail advertising.

The Secretary of Commerce in testifying before our committee pointed out that this industry, from the time the first advertising goes out until the transaction is completed, aggregates over $20 billion a year. They directly employ some 41,000 people. And to think that a gentleman, who should be familiar with the woes of unemployment, would come along here and propose that a rate go up from what we believe is an extremely high figure—from 3 cents a piece to 3½ cents a piece—is amazing to me. Let us put this in terms of dollars.

Third-class mail used to go out at $10 a thousand. Then, through a series of raises, we put it up to $15 a thousand, then $20 a thousand. It is now $25 a thousand. This is the kind of direct mail many of you folks used in your campaign, so you are familiar with it. The Murray amendment puts it up to $30 a thousand.

Now the gentleman comes along and wants to make it $35 a thousand. I would say just offhand that I have heard of no amendment yet to be offered to this bill that deserves such a sound defeat as this one.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. The gentleman referred to the fact that I was trying to drive people out of business by this amendment. I certainly do not think so. The gentleman, when he was on the committee, and who originally participated in bringing out the original bill, which was precisely the same——

Mr. CORBETT. Listen, I am glad you brought that up, because I want to correct that error. The bill reported from committee, H.R. 7927, did not raise the minimum base rate. It left it 2½ cents.

Mr. HECHLER. I was referring to this figure on the analysis of proposed postal pay revision.

Mr. CORBETT. Well, the gentleman simply stated it wrong. This was a proposal that somebody made to the committee. The committee turned it down. And, instead of taking the 3½-cent rate, they took the 2½-cent rate with other increases.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. You are speaking now about what you say is a $20 million business.

Mr. CORBETT. Billion.

Mr. BAILEY. There must be some advantage to the groups engaged in that kind of business by utilizing the cheapest kind of advertising they can get, and that is this third-class mail.

Mr. CORBETT. I am going to ask the gentleman, Do you utilize this class of mail? Do you utilize third-class mail?

Mr. BAILEY. Most of it hits the wastepaper basket.

Mr. CORBETT. Do you utilize this class of mail, is the question.

Mr. BAILEY. No, I do not.

Mr. CORBETT. You do not know much about it, then.

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly, I do know enough about it. That kind of business that can be built up to the size you say must have been taking advantage of every possible means, and if they are taking advantage of this cheap rate, let them pay for it.

Mr. CORBETT. I think the gentleman would help himself if he utilized a little bit of this and understood it better. I think this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. This is a business whose only stock in trade is the use of the postal facilities, and this is what they are in business for, using the mails——

Mr. CORBETT. I refuse to yield any further. The gentleman is just illustrating what the gentleman from Montana said. Here is something that is not understood.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LESINSKI. That is the point. The fact is that this generates millions of dollars of revenue, which is important to America.

Mr. CORBETT. It is the come-on of the Post Office.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to tell you folks a little story that happened to me one time which will give you some example of just how this mail is used. I happen to be associated with some people who are in the business of selling automobiles. They started blanketing the county with this occupant mail, and I had a lot of people send it to me during the time I was campaigning for reelection to Congress. "Is this the kind of stuff," they said, "that you are permitting to go through the mails?" It had my name on it, bless your hearts. I called up the company and said to the manager, "Why in the world are you sending this stuff through the mail?" He said, "We get a better return per dollar invested in this type of advertising than any other type of advertising we do." I said, "Well, then, if you do, you ought to pay the postage for it."

That is why I am in support of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania to the amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: (1) On page 5, immediately following line 6, add a new section 7 as follows:
>
> "SEC. 7. The amounts of postage paid on nonadvertising and advertising portions of the publication during the preceding 12 months: No publication sold or distributed through the mails under the second-class mailing privilege shall be received, handled, processed, transported, or delivered by the Post Office Department or any employee or agent thereof, unless the annual postage paid by such publication equals the annual cost to the Post Office Department (subject to the exception below) of such receipt, handling, processing, transporting, and delivering of such publication, as based on calculations resulting from the reviews, studies, and surveys of the postal rate structure required by section 105 of the Postal Policy Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 137; 39 U.S.C. 270c), and the detailed analysis of each publication's revenue and cost of handling data which may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That, during the first year after enactment of this subsection, the actual cost to the Post Office Department in receiving, handling, processing, transporting, and delivering any individual publication may exceed by not more than $5,000,000 the actual postage paid by such publication during such year: *Provided further*, That, during the second year after enactment, the cost may exceed postage paid by not more than $3,000,000; during the third year, by not more than $1,000,000; during the fourth year, by not more than $500,000, and during the fifth year and thereafter, the cost may not exceed $100,000 per publication per year. The provisions of this paragraph (5) shall become effective with respect to the 12 months preceding the first such report and subsequent periods and costs shall be based on estimates of the Postmaster General if no data are available under the operation of section 105."; and
>
> (2) By renumbering section 7 through section 12 as section 8 through section 13, respectively.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, before I discuss my proposed amendment, I want to pay a personal tribute to the committee chairman for his efforts in seeking the enactment of a fair postal rate adjustment bill.

As a former member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for 8 years, I have learned to respect the gentleman from Tennessee for his courtesy to members of his committee and for his knowledge of legislation pertaining to the Post Office Department.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is a very simple one. All it does is put a limitation on second-class postal subsidies which are a major factor in the big postal deficit. It does not hurt small publishers in any way.

Under my amendment a 5-year sliding-scale subsidy limitation formula would be established. During the first year, Department costs would not be permitted to exceed by more than $5 million the actual postage paid by any individual publication. The cost ascertainment formula of the Department would be used for this purpose. During the second year, this subsidy would be reduced to a maximum of $3 million; the third year to a maximum of $1 million; the fourth year to a $500,000 maximum; and the fifth year and thereafter, to a $100,000 maximum subsidy per year per publication.

Arguments that this proposal is unworkable are not valid. Former Postmaster General Summerfield said that administration would be difficult but that it could be done. Several years ago the House passed my amendment to limit second-class subsidies to $100,000. In the other body the limitation was raised to $1,800,000. Although defeated, it received 33 votes in the other body. My amendment today considerably modifies my former proposal.

There is widespread public support for this legislation despite the silence treatment it has received in the publications which benefit most by this kind of Government aid. However, a number of newspapers throughout the country have supported such legislation in their editorial columns, including the Philadelphia Inquirer, one of the largest and most influential dailies in Pennsylvania.

I believe that every Member of the House received a letter today, from the National Federation of Independent Business, which for many years has polled its members on legislation before Congress.

In this letter, dated yesterday, the federation opposed a postal rate increase, making particular objection to an increase of first-class mail postage. My colleagues may be interested in a poll conducted by this organization when this issue was before the Congress about 2 years ago. In bulletin or mandate No. 252 at that time, this question was asked in their membership poll:

> Are you for or against Congress requiring all large national magazines to pay their full share of post office mailing costs, the same as users of first-class mail are required to do?

The membership of the National Federation of Independent Business voted 84 percent for reducing second-class postal subsidies, only 13 percent against. In my own district, 94 percent of the members voted for reducing such subsidies.

Mr. Chairman, much of the opposition to the first-class mail increase will be eliminated if my amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES] has expired.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which should get the full support of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

It should appeal to everyone who has been critical of Federal giveaway programs and the big postal deficit. Those who receive large postal subsidies are among the top beneficiaries of Federal aid and Government handouts.

We are fully justified in enacting this proposal, for the giant magazines themselves, such as Reader's Digest and the Luce publications, have been the most powerful critics of Federal aid programs.

It may be interesting to my colleagues from Iowa if I quote remarks made over station WHO by Herb Plambeck, who was then farm director of that station, on the question of subsidies when this issue was before the Congress a few years ago:

> Life magazine and Reader's Digest and other widely read publications which have gone all out, headlining what they describe as "the incredible farm scandal"—implying, in effect, that every rural resident is a parasite and a thief.
>
> I don't recall Life in its scathing denunciation of agriculture, saying much about the $9 million or more it has received in a single year in the way of the postal rate subsidy. Nor does Reader's Digest say much about the $5 million it has acepted. Seldom is something written about the $38 million in annual subsidies estimated for just 14 of our major magazines, to say nothing of the hundreds of others.
>
> It seems to me that if the magazines are going to condemn agriculture as criminals for accepting Government help, then the publishers who condemn us ought to have the decency to admit to the same crime.
>
> I know two wrongs do not make a right, and that this sounds like the pot calling the kettle black; but I feel people who live in glass houses, even if they are on Times Square, have no right to criticize agriculture and to make whipping boys out of farm people, when they themselves are also accepting Government help, provided by you and me—the taxpayer.

What Mr. Plambeck said could be said about many other programs which these slick magazines oppose.

From the information I have received, it costs the Post Office Department $20 million annually for handling and mailing the Luce publications.

For this service, Luce magazines pay $8 million; an indirect subsidy of $12 million or a million dollars a month.

Most Members will remember the story in Life magazine dated June 6, 1960, shortly before final adjournment of the 86th Congress. Much of the story was rigged with fake pictures in an effort to discredit certain of our colleagues, including some of the most respected Members of the House. It was entitled, "How Congressmen Live High Off the Public."

Yet, few people know that the annual subsidy to Luce publications amounts to more than the combined yearly salaries of 437 Members of the House of Representatives.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that if my amendment is adopted we can all, in good conscience, vote for the rate increase.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this time to read a Department letter from the Office of the Postmaster General dated August 21, 1961, pertaining to H.R. 7361 which is substantially the same as the amendment offered by the gentleman. The letter is as follows:

> OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
> *Washington, D.C., August 21, 1961.*
> Hon. TOM MURRAY,
> *Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request for a report on the bill H.R. 7361, proposing to establish an annual limitation on publishers' second-class mail subsidies.
>
> We are opposed to the enactment of this bill.
>
> The bill fails to recognize that cost analysis and rate design are distinct and separate steps of the ratemaking process. The application of full costs as a criterion for second-class rate deficiencies would be inequitable and discriminatory in denying certain publications a rate differential for reading or editorial content.
>
> The purpose of the legislation is to exact additional postage payments on the basis of deficient cost coverage of individual publications. If this is to be accomplished, it would be necessary to undertake meticulous cost surveys for numerous individual publications of diverse size, advertising content, and geographic distribution. Since these characteristics change frequently, cost standards would have to be flexible and subject to frequent revision. Moreover, the necessity for substituting individual cost studies applicable to the several classes of mail and services would unduly complicate the Department's cost determinations and the problems of justifying adjustments in postal rates.
>
> We estimate that substantial expenses would be incurred annually to maintain an adequate system of accounting for the handling costs of individual publications. Neither the Postal Policy Act of 1958 nor the hearings which preceded its enactment indicate it was the intention of the Congress that such detailed records should be maintained by the Department.
>
> Should H.R. 7361 be enacted, the burden of additional administrative costs would not be limited to accounting functions. Publishers' protests against additional postage assessments would spark an endless chain of complaints and controversies, including lawsuits.
>
> A literal interpretation of the proposal suggests that the Postmaster General would be required to modify these rates each time a significant change occurred in salaries, transportation fees, or other cost components. Not only would these fluid rates present serious management problems to the Post Office Department, but publishing companies would be unable to budget their mailing costs with any reasonable degree of certainty.
>
> It must be recognized that the publications principally affected by the proposed bill are those of larger weight and size for which cost coverage is greater than the average for all second-class matter, or even for other "magazines and periodicals of general interest."
>
> Preferential rates have been charged for second-class mail to promote the educational, cultural, and religious development of our people. The dissemination of information over wide areas and to large groups has been considered an important unifying influence to the Nation. The proposed measure would reverse this policy established by the Congress more than a century ago.
>
> We believe the second-class rates encompassed in the bill H.R. 7927, now before the Congress, are reasonable from the viewpoint of a more equitable sharing of postal costs among the various users of this class of mail.

I might say the rate they suggest has even been increased by the rate which is before us in the Murray amendment.

The last paragraph reads:

> We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this report to the committee.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> H. W. BRAWLEY,
> *Postmaster General.*

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I shall not consume 5 minutes. I should like to reiterate that the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], has worked very diligently to perfect an equitable bill which attempts as fairly as possible to distribute these costs.

The proposal offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania would constitute a gross discriminatory approach. The notion that something is really bad because it is large is one that the people of this country have never accepted. The notion that an operation is necessarily profitable because it is big cannot be verified by fact; and finally, the notion of legislating because you may or may not like a particular publication is one I think would do great harm. So I hope we will support the gentleman from Tennessee and vote down this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot endorse the approach recommended by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

His proposal would place a ceiling on the postage concession extended to any one publication in any single year. I have several basic objections to that proposal.

First, there is implicit in it a full-cost-coverage approach for a major portion of second-class mail. I believe that is inconsistent with the intent of the Postal Policy Act. In that act the Congress directed that letter mail, like the premium services of any public utility, should pay premium rates proportionate with the preferential services it receives. The collateral conclusion is that secondary mail, like magazines and newspapers, should pay less than costs. That differential pricing approach is sound ratemaking, but it would be rejected by the proposed amendment offered by my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Second. The proposed amendment is discriminatory since it advocates a different postage rate for each major second-class publication, depending upon its circulation volume. The proposed amendment would penalize growth by assessing higher postage rates against those publishers who have the largest circulation volumes.

Third. My able colleague from Pennsylvania assumes apparently that the publications with the largest circulation are also the most profitable and, hence, best able to pay higher postage. I am quite certain it is not axiomatic that the largest magazines are invariably the most profitable. Just to mention a few that faded in recent years: American Magazine, Collier's, Liberty, Woman's Home Companion, and Coronet—all of them big in terms of volume, but apparently not in profits. Conversely, many small-circulation publications, serving specialized and limited markets, are highly profitable and better able to pay increased postage.

Fourth. In order to comply with the proposed amendment, the Post Office Department would be compelled to establish subsidiary accounting systems for numerous publications. There would be no way to avoid this onerous and costly recordkeeping system. Enactment of the proposed subsidy limitation bill would require continuous and meticulous surveillance of revenue deficiencies incurred for every large-circulation publication.

Each publication presents a unique accounting problem due to diversity of weights, density, advertising content, geographic distribution, and degree of premailing preparation by the publisher. With each issue of these publications, the Department would have to recompute its costs since publication characteristics which govern the Department's handling costs are highly fluid. Moreover, even if the publications' mailing characteristics were stable, the many elements comprising the Department's costs are subject to frequent change.

A literal interpretation of the proposal suggests that the Postmaster General would be required to modify the rates for individual publications each time a change occurred in salaries, transportation fees, or other cost components. Not only would constantly changing postage rates present serious management problems to the Post Office, but publishing companies would be unable to budget their mailing costs with any reasonable degree of certainty.

It is possible, of course, to approximate costs and revenues through less burdensome methods. But approximations can hardly serve as the basis for specific postage assessments which may amount to millions of dollars annually for some publishers. Supplemental postage charges based on estimated costs would surely invite an interminable chain of complaints, investigations, and adjudications. I believe it is no exaggeration to predict that the Department's cost justification problems would multiply as many times as there are individual records in place of the present single cost ascertainment standard. If the proposed amendment were enacted, a large share of the new postage revenues would be offset by additional administrative expenses.

It is my firm belief that the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Tennessee would be a much fairer approach consistent with the objectives of the Postal Policy Act. Through a general and uniform rate reformation, the cost-sharing burden in second class would be distributed equitably among all publications without added administrative costs and without recourse to a multiplicity of rates that single out the large publications for discriminatory and unduly heavy postage charges.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as the last two speakers have pointed out, this proposal would result in a nightmare of bookkeeping and all kinds of reevaluations every time the operation changed its salaries, prices, or whatnot. Along with that it seems almost punitive and confiscatory to apply rates like this to certain publications.

I believe, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment should be defeated for the reason that it is administratively impossible, and it is confiscatory and discriminatory.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment in order to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a few questions. How much revenue would your amendment produce?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I would say to the gentleman that in the first year the amount would not be large; there would be very little additional revenue the first year. Over the years the amount would be considerable.

Mr. GROSS. Cannot the gentleman give us some estimate of the increase in revenue?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. It depends on several factors. I understand the Murray amendment would raise the cost to Life magazine by approximately $5 million. My amendment would raise the cost to approximately $7 million the first year. There are going to be few magazines affected.

I think there is a principle involved here. We put a limitation on farm subsidies, and this matter of limitation is nothing new. It seems to me we can do the same in this field. Furthermore, I think the Post Office Department should set up some sort of ethical standards for these people who benefit from cheap rates, but that is another matter. What I am concerned with primarily is the principle involved. These people come here asking for Government subsidies for themselves, yet that is something they claim they are opposed to in other fields.

Mr. GROSS. I am surprised to hear opposition to the gentleman's amendment from his side of the aisle.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I would say that over the long run it would produce considerable revenue. In the first year it might be just several millions of dollars.

Mr. GROSS. The House increased third-class rates a few moments ago to the point where it will drive many users of the mail out of business.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I would have no objection to the gentleman offering an amendment, if he cares to.

Mr. GROSS. No; I am surprised that if it will produce the revenue indicated that there is opposition to the gentleman's amendment from his side of the aisle. I would not vote for it.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I think there is a matter of principle involved. The gentleman has always been a consistent critic of Government subsidies, Government handouts. I thought I could count on the gentleman's support on this amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman speaking of me?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I am just expressing surprise that there is opposition from those on his side of the aisle who seem bent on grabbing revenue no matter what the consequences.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I am surprised that the gentleman from Iowa is not opposed to this handout.

I might say that these same magazines benefit in the so-called foreign aid programs by receiving certain subsidies.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on my amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on my amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5:15.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, why must this bill be rushed through today? There are many Members who have amendments.

Mr. MURRAY. We are not rushing it through at all.

Mr. GROSS. If you are going to close debate at 5 o'clock, and if all of these gentlemen have amendments to offer, then you are rushing it through.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on my amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5:30.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BOGGS) there were—ayes 103, noes 59.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, is it the understanding that the Chair will apportion the time between Members having remaining amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will attempt to divide the time equally.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RYAN: Page 9, strike out all of section 11.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to section 11 which in effect establishes a program of censorship and interception of incoming foreign mail.

President Kennedy on March 17, 1961, after consultations with the Secretary of State, the Postmaster General, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Attorney General announced, "discontinuation immediately of the program of intercepting Communist propaganda from abroad." The President said that the program served "no useful intelligence function" but instead hindered "our efforts to improve cultural exchanges with Communist countries." During the Eisenhower administration the National Security Council's Planning Board unanimously recommended discontinuing the program.

Experience with the past program shows that this leads to censorship, interference and interception of the mails. The term "political propaganda" is so vague and all encompassing that a wide variety of mail would be subject to the provisions of this bill. There is no definition of the term "political propaganda" in this bill.

However, the Subversive Activities Control Act defines political propaganda as follows:

> Any * * * expression * * * reasonably adapted to * * * prevail upon, indoctrinate, convert, induce, or in any other way influence a recipient or any section of the public within the United States with reference to political or public interests, policies, or relations of a government of a foreign country or public interests, policies, or relations of a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party or with reference to the foreign policies of the United States or promote in the United States racial, religious, or social dissensions.

In the past this program has held up mail addressed to students, scholars, journalists and persons of all political hues. The columnist, George Sokolsky, on being told that some of his foreign originated mail had been held up replied angrily:

> The theory of your advice is that I am entitled to special privileges. But I do not want privileges. I want these publications because I subscribed to them. They can do me no greater harm than some American publications I buy. If I am to be saved from my reading habits, I do not want it done by the Post Office, the business of which is to deliver the mails. (The Saturday Review, Apr. 23, 1955.)

The Department of Justice has written to the House Un-American Activities Committee opposing similar legislation. Byron White, Deputy Attorney General, said:

> It is clear that it is the purpose of the proposed legislation to require filing and labeling of political propaganda imported from Soviet bloc countries, but the provisions of the proposed amendments are in such broad general terms that they are applicable as well to material imported from democratic countries. Obviously this provision would be unduly burdensome on the public.

There is a serious question as to the constitutionality of section 11. On the floor of this House on September 18, 1961, the distinguished chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, Mr. WALTER, commented on this very amendment. I should like to recall his words:

> But I am afraid if we adopt something that will not stand the test of the courts this futile gesture will delay the time when we can do something constructive. * * *
>
> Any program such as that proposed by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee would create the false impression that the American people are so naive and gullible

that they cannot be exposed to Communist propaganda without the danger of their being adversely influenced or corrupted by Communist doctrine. Such a program would also create the impression that the American people are incapable of recognizing and rejecting Communist political propaganda much of which is false and absurd on its face. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 15, p. 20052.)

I firmly believe that the citizens of the United States have the good sense and judgment to evaluate the reading material to which they subscribe or which they receive gratuitously in the mail. The supporters of this proposal in effect accept the idea that in our democracy our citizens are unable to distinguish the true from the false. What are we afraid of?

Before approving this censorship proposal, the House should demand a thorough examination of the basic premise of this proposal and learn the views of the President and the Attorney General and appropriate Government agencies. The administration is not in favor of this. Anyone with confidence in our institutions and our free and open society should oppose it and support my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Ther was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the Cunningham amendment which would grant unlimited powers to the Postmaster General and to the Attorney General of the United States to censor the mails. Under the amendment the Postmaster General "shall not permit the receipt, handling, transport, or delivery by the U.S. Post Office Department of mail determined by the United States to be Communist political propaganda."

There are no definitions, no standards, no statutory guidelines. No Attorney General or Postmaster should have such broad, unlimited powers. I doubt its constitutionality.

This kind of amendment was opposed by the Eisenhower administration, as it is by this administration. Both administrations have agreed against its practical good, as well as its constitutionality. Further, what are we afraid of? Why should not the American people judge for themselves. Under this amendment an arbitrary Attorney General could bar the London Economist from being mailed into and in the United States.

Why is it necessary that we come to this?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RYAN) there were—ayes 2, noes 127.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARRY of New York:

On page 3, immediately following "Sec. 5." insert "(a)";

On page 4, immediately following line 18, insert the following:

"(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to publications less than 5 percent of the contents of which consists of advertising.

"(c) Section 4359 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"'(f) Subject to the minimum rates provided by section 4360(h) of this title, the rates of postage on publications of which less than 5 percent of the contents consists of advertising mailed in accordance with subsection (a) of this section are fixed by the pound as follows:

"'*Rates in cents per pound or fraction thereof*

	Classroom publications	Other publications			
		Mailed during calendar year 1961	Mailed after July 1, 1962	Mailed after July 1, 1963	Mailed after July 1, 1964
Advertising portion:					
Zones 1 and 2	1.5	3.0	3.15	3.30	3.45
Zone 3	2.0	4.0	4.20	4.40	4.60
Zone 4	3.0	6.0	6.30	6.60	6.90
Zone 5	4.0	8.0	8.40	8.80	9.20
Zone 6	5.0	10.0	10.50	11.00	11.50
Zone 7	6.0	12.0	12.60	13.20	13.80
Zone 8	7.0	14.0	14.70	15.40	16.10
Nonadvertising portion	1.5	2.5	2.63	2.75	2.88
A publication of a qualified nonprofit organization		1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5'"

On page 4, immediately following "Sec. 6." insert "(a)";

On page 5, immediately following line 6, insert the following:

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to publications less than 5 percent of the contents of which consists of advertising.

"(c) Section 4360 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting '(a)' after '§ 4360' and by adding at the end the following subsection:

"'(b) The following are the minimum rates for each individually addressed copy of a second-class mail publication of which less than 5 percent of the contents consists of advertising:

"'*Second-class minimum rates*

[In cents]

	Mailed before July 1, 1962	Mailed on and after July 1, 1962, and before July 1, 1963	Mailed on and after July 1, 1963
For delivery within county of publication except when mailed free under sec. 4358(a) of this title	⅛	⅛	⅛
Classroom and nonprofit organizations publications	⅛	⅛	⅛
Other publications for delivery beyond county of publication	½	¾	1'"

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, in the general debate I mentioned that I wished to offer an amendment that pertains only to the classification of publications which have no advertising in them. I am sure that Members noticed when the Clerk read the amendment that there is a limitation of 5 percent. This 5 percent allowed in this type of classification is only so that they can advertise their own publication, because should they on one page of their publication say "Send in your renewal" that is classified as an advertisement. Therefore, my statement in general debate has not changed.

Mr. Chairman, what does this amendment propose to do? It basically preserves the children's magazines throughout the Nation, and it also, as I indicated in general debate, preserves the Catholic Digest with a circulation of 1 million copies.

Mr. Chairman, children's magazines are estimated at 6 million or 7 million monthly circulation. Now, the rate which they will pay under the proposal which I have made is double the rate that they have been paying. This prevents the rate going to triple the rate which they are now paying.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have proposed to the amendment offered by Chairman MURRAY relates exclusively to an exception from the rate increase provided for second-class publications. In my judgment, those publications with more than 95 percent editorial content should not experience the rate increase provided in Mr. MURRAY's amendment. Accordingly, I have proposed by my amendment that all periodicals with less than 5 percent advertising content should have a 5-percent pound rate increase over the next 3 years with a minimum per copy increase from one-half cent to three-fourths cent effective July 1, 1962, and finally to 1 cent on July 1, 1963.

There are a number of periodicals and publications such as Child Life, Children's Magazine, Catholic Digest, Jack and Jill, and so forth, which are almost exclusively devoted to editorial content and are not designed for the purpose of advertising. These are all fine publications and in my judgment are entitled to separate treatment.

Prior to 1958 advertising zone rates of postage were not changed on publications with less than 5 percent advertising. The flat rate for editorial matter was charged on the entire publication. In the postal rate bill of 1958 this provision was eliminated from the law.

Publishers who carry 95 percent editorial content in their publications do not depend upon advertising to finance their publications. They must depend almost entirely upon subscription revenue. These publications are performing a service to their subscribers by furnishing them cultural material which justifies lower rates of postage than the rates for publications which carry large amounts of advertising.

Mr. Chairman, I propose that we adopt this amendment which will return to the policy existing prior to this date. It is estimated that the cost of my amendment in terms of reduced revenues below the revenue provided in Mr. Murray's amendment for second-class mail would be approximately $10 million annually. I feel this is completely justified and I urge the Members to support my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Barry] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Landrum].

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Landrum to the amendment offered by Mr. Murray: On page 3, following line 16, insert the following:

"Sec. 5. Paragraph (1), subsection (a), section 4358, of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) resides in the county in which the publication is published; and".

And redesignate the following sections accordingly.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, this is a very short amendment which seeks to correct a very large inequity in the present law. Under postage rates, within county of publication, we find these provisions: One copy of each of a publication admitted as second-class mail matter may be mailed free to each actual subscriber if the subscriber first, resides in the county in which the publication is printed in whole or in part, and which it is published; and second, receives his mail at an office at which letter carrier service is not established.

Mr. Chairman, if the subscriber meets those two provisions of the law he can receive from the publisher of this county newspaper free mailing in the county. But with the increased cost for printing presses and with the great capital outlay necessary to maintain rural printing establishments, many newspapers—small weeklies—have found it necessary to go outside the county and contract for the actual printing of their paper. And, though, the paper is actually printed outside the county of its publication, it is nevertheless addressed and subscribed to through the mail and all advertising sold in the county.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that this puts an inequity on many of the small newspapers, and trust that we will correct it by adopting this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Landrum].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I announced on the floor yesterday that I was prepared to vote for the postal rate bill with the exception that the Murray substitute carried an increase of 1 cent per copy on newspapers mailed out of the county of publication, to which I am opposed. I had hoped the Murray substitute would be amended to eliminate this increase, which is going to place an extremely burdensome rate on some small newspapers.

I offered an amendment to eliminate this burdensome increase on small newspapers. It was defeated.

When I made my statement yesterday the rate on controlled circulation publications was carried in the Murray substitute at 12 cents per pound. I was willing to vote for that, although that class of magazine now pays a rate of postage 2½ times as much as magazines such as Time, Life, Look, and so forth. The Murray substitute was amended to increase controlled circulation to 14 cents. That is a great injustice, and I cannot support the bill with that provision in it.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons I cannot support H.R. 7927, and I will have to vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook].

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Ashbrook to the amendment offered by Mr. Murray to H.R. 7927: Page 3, immediately following line 16, insert the following:

"Sec. 5. (a) Section 4358 of title 39, United States Code, relating to postage rates within county of publication, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4358. Postage rates within county of publication.

"'(a) Subject to the minimum rates provided by section 4360 of this title, the rate of postage on publications admitted as second-class mail when addressed for delivery within the county in which they are published and entered is as follows—

"'(1) if mailed for delivery by letter carrier at the office of mailing:

"'(A) publications issued more frequently than weekly, 1 cent a copy;

"'(B) publications issued weekly, 1 cent a pound;

"'(C) publications issued less frequently than weekly—

"'(i) weighing two ounces or less, 1 cent a copy;

"'(ii) weighing more than 2 ounces, 2 cents a copy.

"'(2) if mailed for delivery at the office of mailing through post office boxes, general delivery, or by rural or star route carrier, 1 cent a pound.

"'(3) if mailed for delivery at an office other than the office of mailing, 1 cent a pound.

"'(b) When copies of a publication are mailed at a post office where it is entered for delivery by letter carrier at a different post office within the delivery limits of which the headquarters or general business office of the publisher is located, the rate of postage is—

"'(1) the rate that would be applicable if the copies were mailed at the latter post office, or

"'(2) the pound rates from the office of mailing if those rates are higher'."

(b) The table in section 4360 of title 39, United States Code, relating to minimum postage, is amended by striking out "except when mailed free under section 4358(a) of this title".

And renumber the succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. ASHBROOK (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, this is a rather simple amendment. We heard quite a bit of talk today about rates being too high. By this amendment I am endeavoring to increase a rate from zero to 1 cent per pound, to replace the free-in-county privilege of newspapers. Bear in mind that this is "free in county," and I emphasize the word "free." A great number of our newspapers are entitled to send all of their papers out on the day of publication free within the county of their publication.

I maintain that at a time when we are in financial embarrassment as far as our Government is concerned, it is absolutely inconceivable that we should allow any organization to send a profitmaking paper free. I happen to be a newspaper publisher. To me it is inconceivable that I should be able to send 60,000 to 70,000 newspapers a year free when I am charging $4.50 per year subscription rate.

I would also point out that this is less than what was in the original bill, H.R. 6418. I appeared on Wednesday, June 7, to testify on a bill offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Murray], which would have charged 1½ cents per pound and one-fourth of 1 cent per piece. This amendment seeks only 1 cent a pound. We have compromised quite a bit on it, but, as I said, any increase over zero is substantial. I ask your support.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook].

The question was taken and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MURRAY. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Division is demanded by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Did not the Chair state that the amendment was agreed to?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], was on his feet and demanding a division at the time.

The Chair will count.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MURRAY), there were—ayes 37, noes 91.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARSHALL of Minnesota to the amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. On page 3, line 25, insert the words "or religious" immediately before "publications".

And on page 4, line 10, insert the words "or religious" immediately following "a classroom".

And on page 4, line 14, insert the words "or religious" immediately following "other than classroom".

And on page 5, line 1, insert the words "or religious" immediately following "a classroom".

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I spoke of earlier in the day. It seeks to continue the present postal rates for religious publications just exactly as they are now. It does not make any change. The Murray amendment, unfortunately, places the future of these magazines in jeopardy. I do not think the Members of the Congress intend to do this.

Mr. Chairman, this is a question of vital importance. These religious magazines render tremendous service in the national interest, both at home and abroad. It seems to me that this amendment ought to be adopted so that these magazines will not be hindered in this most important work. I do not believe a Member of the Congress has ever received a letter from a constituent objecting to the exemption we have already granted to religious publications. These magazines make a real contribution far exceeding the insignificant revenues involved in the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. I am not opposed to the gentleman's amendment, but I would like to know how you would define a religious magazine? What portion of the matter contained in the magazine should be for spiritual guidance and what portion for other matters?

Mr. MARSHALL. I point out to the gentleman that the Post Office Department has experienced no difficulty in that respect in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman seeks to do is to change the basic law on the definition of profit and nonprofit organization. As long as these magazines are classified as nonprofit, they qualify. When the gentleman seeks to extend the definition of religion to profit organizations, it is not at all inconceivable that the Saturday Evening Post or any other magazine which runs a religious article might not seek to qualify. This would create pandemonium and I hope the amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Chairman TOM MURRAY which is in the nature of a substitute for the bill to increase postal rates which was reported by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The tremendous annual postal deficit which has now increased to $832 million annually is a condition which should be corrected immediately. Following the enactment of the postal rate bill in 1958, the Eisenhower administration recommended an increase in postal rates to eliminate the postal deficit in 1959. Again, in 1960, the Eisenhower administration recommended appropriate and reasonable increases in postal rates to eliminate the ever-increasing postal deficit. Had this action been taken by the Congress, the enactment of this postal rate bill would be unnecessary. However, those of us who believed in fiscal integrity in the postal service, including the distinguished chairman of our committee, could not find enough support for our position to have a bill considered by the Congress.

Conditions today are not much different except that the postal deficit has increased over the past 3 years to a point where further delay means not only further unbalancing the budget but it means a tremendous increase in interest payments on the national debt which is represented by the annual contribution to the national debt of the postal deficit.

The weak and completely inadequate bill which the committee has reported should be rejected and in its place should be substituted the proposal of Chairman MURRAY. The committee bill places the burden of increased postal rates almost entirely on the first-class mail users and only token increases were provided in second- and third-class postal rates.

One important difference between Chairman MURRAY's proposal and the committee's bill is that rate increases on second-class mail—magazines and profit publications—would be increased from $21 million annually to $53.4 million annually by reason of a per piece charge of one-half cent on each periodical, magazine, or publication effective July 1, 1962, and an additional one-half cent increase effective July 1, 1963.

The second important change proposed by Chairman MURRAY's amendment relates to third-class mail—circulars, advertisements, and certain books and catalogs. The revenue from rate increases on this class of mail would be increased from the committee's proposal of $57.3 million annually to $93 million annually under Chairman MURRAY's proposal. This is accomplished in large measure by increasing the minimum per piece charge for this class of mail from 2½ cents to 3 cents.

Chairman MURRAY's amendment makes no change with respect to the committee's recommendation on first-class mail which provided an increase to 5 cents per ounce for letters and 8 cents per ounce for airmail.

The other major difference in Chairman MURRAY's proposal is that $248 million annually would be allocated as the amount which represents the public service activities performed by the Post Office Department for other departments and agencies of the Government and for the mailing public generally. The committee's proposal, on the other hand, would have established the public service costs at $342 million annually. In my judgment, the proposal of Chairman MURRAY is more realistic and more accurate with respect to the provisions relating to these public service items.

In terms of actual revenue, Chairman MURRAY's proposal would increase postal revenues by $622 million annually while the committee bill would raise only $551 million annually. The proposal which I support would provide a more equitable distribution of postal rate increases for second- and third-class mail as compared with the rate increases in first-class mail. In my judgment, it is most improper for the Congress to ask the average first-class mail user which is the general public to accept the overwhelming burden of the postal rate increase and permit only token increases for second- and third-class mailers who use the postal service in their businesses and whose mailing costs are deductible as legitimate items of expense in connection with determining the amount of taxes they pay to Federal, State, and local governments.

Mr. Chairman, it is my earnest hope that the Members of the House will approve this amendment offered by Chairman TOM MURRAY and that it will reject amendments thereto which might distort the postal rate increases as was the case in the bill reported by our committee. As a practical matter, I was inclined to support the original bill introduced by the chairman which provided even higher rates than those in the amendment which he now proposes. However, after lengthy hearings on this matter, I am convinced that a rate increase such as that proposed in his amendment is fair to all of the users of the mail in view of the generous and liberal public service allocation of $248 million annually to postal operations.

In my opinion, the vast majority of the Members of the House are at last convinced that a postal rate bill is necessary. I am pleased that this appears to be the general conclusion of my colleagues, because it would be regrettable if, indeed, in this period of our history, we did not take whatever action is necessary to prevent passing this tremendous annual postal deficit on to future generations.

The enactment of this measure will merely say that the people who use the postal service should pay for that service. If they do not pay for it under these increased postal rates, all of the taxpayers of the Nation will go on having to pay the bill. In other words, revenues which are raised by the income tax and other taxation will necessarily have to pay for this postal service and thus the users of the mail will be the beneficiaries of such a policy.

The American people have the right to expect that the Post Office Department should be run on a sound fiscal basis. This legislation, particularly the amendment offered by Chairman Murray, is the only way this fiscal responsibility can be restored in the operation of the postal service. Mr. Chairman, I urge favorable action on this legislation and I solicit my colleagues to support the amendment proposed by Chairman Murray.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Roberts].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Roberts: On page 4, line 1, after publication insert "exceeding three ounces in weight which are".

On page 4, line 12, after rates, strike out the period and insert "applicable to publications exceeding three ounces in weight."

On page 4, line 14, after the word publications insert "exceeding three ounces in weight".

On page 4, line 18, after the period strike out the quotation and insert "Publications weighing three ounces and less other than classroom publications and other than publications of qualified nonprofit organizations—five-eighth cent effective on and after July 1, 1962, and before July 1, 1963; and three-fourths cent, effective on and after July 1, 1963."

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would not favor or discriminate in favor of lightweight publications but would simply afford them the same treatment as far as rate increase and getting a mail subsidy is concerned that is now applied to what we call the slick magazines. They will still take almost the same rate, since under my amendment they will take five-eighths of a cent during the first step and it will be pegged at three-fourths of a cent instead of 1 cent as in the case of the Murray amendment.

This is designed primarily to protect the small weekly and monthly papers which are primarily concerned with local happenings, and get very little in the way of paid advertisement. I think the comparison is 20 percent for these little papers whereas the other magazines go as high as 63 percent.

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield.

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Chairman, I want to evidence my strong and wholehearted support and advocacy of the amendment offered by my friend and colleague, the alert and distinguished gentleman from Alabama, Congressman Kenneth Roberts, respecting the treatment to be accorded our newspapers under this proposed postal rate increase program.

To me, it is a choice between two evils. I have no alternative.

Representing as it does, the overall, comprehensive—though oftentimes politically controlled and slanted—information medium, there is some question in my mind as to whether or not the newspapers of our country should bear the burden of any increase in postal rates. Certainly, in weighing the equities of the problem, substantial consideration must be extended the great service that the press renders the Nation and its people.

It is my personal feeling—and a most strong one it is—that no one can reasonably deny the importance of the role of our newspapers in educating and sustaining the education of an informed, alert and intelligent public which is responsive to and knowledgeable about the daily affairs of its Government.

Certainly, in a democratic society such as ours, this role cannot be taken lightly, particularly in one which includes heavy concentrations of rural areas where the newspaper oftentimes represents the sole medium of communication with the world about them. Only an informed citizenry can undertake the responsibilities as well as enjoy the privileges of representative democracy. Given the significance of the press, it is intolerable and unthinkable to impose upon it additional financial burden, a burden which could seriously affect its continued existence in many areas of our Nation.

Financially, the old adage, "figures speak for themselves," is a truism. Thus, there can be no argument against the statement that the recent past has witnessed a heavy increase in the number of newspapers which have been forced to consolidate or discontinue their operations. Such action was not because of a profitable position, nor bad management. It was primarily due to increased costs of operations, materials, supplies, equipment, et cetera, and merging was the only way out for those dedicated publishers who desired to continue to be a party to this service to public and Nation. So, can we here, in the light of the record and these facts participate in giving birth to legislative action conceived with the idea of perpetuating this trend of failures and combines, but at a greatly accelerated pace?

Though not in accord with such thinking, I would say if postal operations and a sense of equity demand that this class of mail be included, then the 50-percent increase over an extended period of time which the amendment proposed by my friend from Alabama suggests is far more practical than the treatment accorded under H.R. 7027 as amended, and/or the Murray amendment. Thus, this great media of communication, would participate with other "mails" in sharing the increased operating expenses of the Department. Though representing little significance in balancing the operating budget of the Department, when the services are placed in proper perspective and comprehensively evaluated, I have no hesitancy in saying that the increase proposed by my colleague, Congressman Roberts, is just and equitable and in proper proportion.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, are these profitmaking magazines?

Mr. ROBERTS. My amendment has nothing to do with magazines—just small newspapers. I cannot conceive, Mr. Chairman, that a magazine that would not weigh more than 3 ounces—

Mr. MURRAY. I mean the nature of the magazine; are they profitmaking?

Mr. ROBERTS. You do not understand the amendment. The nonprofits are already exempt. We have certain organizations that fall in the twilight zone where they have some paid personnel and have not been granted exemptions by attorneys general of the various States.

Mr. MURRAY. Then, of course, they are not nonprofit.

Mr. ROBERTS. Not strictly. I can name the county weeklies and some with statewide farm and rural subscribers and some other groups that would be covered under this amendment They are not strictly nonprofit. Why do you want to impose the greater rate on small, family-type papers than you ask on weighty-slick-paper magazines which enjoy national advertising?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Mathias to the amendment offered by Mr. Murray: On page 6, in the table immediately following line 4, strike out:

"(B) Other matter	16	Do."

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

'(B) Regular publications which are issued at stated intervals and as frequently as 26 times a year; which are mailed for delivery in the first zone; which are presorted and precanceled and delivered to the post office in bundles arranged in order of distribution	16	Do.
"(C) Other matter	18	Do."

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, in this motion to amend the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr.

Murray] I am offering the committee an opportunity to vote against a subsidy which has been in effect for over 100 years. We have talked a great deal about rates being too high. Here is a rate which is zero so any amount it is increased will probably seem large.

Newspaper publishers have enjoyed what is called a free-in-county mailing privilege for over 100 years. In other words, newspapers published in a county may be mailed free within that same county—regardless of number—to any subscriber providing he does not receive his mail at a post office which has letter carrier service.

In the last session of Congress, I introduced H.R. 7420 which would end this free mailing privilege. It seems inconsistent that we should allow a profit-making business to use the mails free at the same time we are asking the first-class mail user to pay for a 5-cent stamp instead of a 4-cent stamp. The provisions of my bill, H.R. 7420, are basically contained within this amendment with a few changes.

When I appeared before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on June 7, 1961, to support my bill, there was before the committee at that time H.R. 6418, introduced by the chairman, Mr. Murray, of Tennessee, which would have abolished in free-in-county privilege and instituted rates of 1½ cents per pound and one-fourth cent per piece on these newspapers. My amendment would institute only a one-cent-per-pound charge. For some reason the new Murray amendment leaves this provision of the old H.R. 6418 completely out and continues this unexcusable subsidy.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when we admittedly have a financial crisis, it is inconceivable that we should have free mailing privileges to newspapers. The subsidy, like so many, was a good one when it was enacted in the mid-19th century to encourage the dissemination of news and information to a frontier people. I would suggest that there is no basis for it now. It is an indication of what happens to most subsidies. They perform their intended use and then are continued.

The other area we should attack is the junk-mail privileges of Members of Congress. A Congress which voted itself a big increase in this unnecessary privilege in the final day of the last session would hardly take it away now so I see no need of introducing an amendment on that point but I would urge all of the Members to support this amendment which is fair and equitable.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JENSEN. How much time will be allowed in support of this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been allocated under the motion to limit debate.

Mr. JENSEN. Will I have any time in support of the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Not unless the gentleman's name is on the list.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the time of the gentleman from Maryland has already been exhausted, may I yield my minute and a half to him?

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be reread by the Clerk.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is this coming out of the gentleman's time?

The CHAIRMAN. It is coming out of the time allotted for general debate which closes at 5:30. There will be a loss of time to succeeding Members.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to define a category of third-class mail to which will be admitted community and shopping newspapers which cannot qualify for second-class privileges because they are distributed free or contain less than the required percentage of editorial matter.

Under my amendment the rate for this type of bulk third-class mailing would continue to be 16 cents per pound with a minimum rate of 2½ cents per piece. This is the present rate charged these publications and therefore is not a reduction in rates.

This type of newspaper originated many years ago to fill a need of the neighborhood merchant for an advertising medium to carry his sales message into every home in his trading area. As a specialized form of publication, they were too few in number to require special consideration by the Post Office Department. Since World War II, however, their growth has been rapid, keeping pace with the population explosion, the growth of suburban areas, and shopping centers to serve these areas.

It is estimated that there are now approximately 1,000 of these publications and it is felt that a separate mail category is now warranted.

All of these publications are strictly local in character and coverage. They carry community news, local pictures and service features. In many localities such publications are one of the limited media available to the small merchant to service his trading area with his advertisments at a cost he can afford. The fact that the same merchants use them week after week is evidence of their productivity and value to the economic life of the communities they serve.

I have been advised that postal officials and experts in the handling of mail concede that these publications pay the full cost of handling their mailings under the present rate of 16 cents per pound, 2½ cents minimum per piece. As a matter of fact, many feel that the post office actually realizes a small profit at the present rates because of the limited service these publications require.

They are mailed on predetermined days so the post office is geared in advance to handle them. They deliver their papers to the post office in the most convenient form for distribution, presorted and precanceled and in bundles by routes arranged in order of distribution on each route. The carrier merely chooses the correct bundle and distributes from the top down. The cost in time and money of sorting and racking, which is required by other third-class mail, is completely eliminated. This in itself is an important saving to the post office.

Under present postal regulations, these publications are handled as regular third-class mail, although they bear no resemblance whatsoever to other matter included in this category of mail.

These publications are mailed for delivery in the first or local zone only. Yet their cost of handling is figured as part of other third-class matter, which is mailed for delivery throughout the United States.

It is obvious that it costs the post office more to deliver a piece of mail to an address so far distant that the process of delivery requires the piece to be canceled and sorted at point of entry, sorted again and rerouted on the train, opened and sorted again at point of destination and then sorted and routed by the local carrier, than it does to deliver a piece locally with a minimum of handling.

The public has a right to know of the products and services available to it. In this day of new and improved products and services, whose production and sale promote employment, greater prosperity and a higher standard of living, advertising is news, very important news, the widespread dissemination of which should be encouraged.

I am informed that "shoppers" cannot absorb an increase in the present rate. Should they be driven out of business by failure of Congress to recognize their value to our economy, small businesses will be prejudiced, and thousands of citizens employed by these publications and allied businesses. In addition, the Post Office would lose one of the few customers which pays its full cost.

Under present regulations these publications are charged for delivery of their mail to local addresses on the same basis as third-class matter, which must be carried across the continent and handled many times before delivery to addressee. These publications want no subsidy. They want to pay 100 percent of the costs of handling their mail, but not costs for services which they do not receive.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. I would like to read a telegram which I received from a shopper's guide publisher, as follows:

> Additional raise in third-class bulk mail minimum change as proposed in Murray bill cannot be justified. I mail about 4,000 papers each mail. All delivered within 25 miles, and pay 2½ cents per copy. This same paper could be printed in Boston and all 4,000 copies mailed to San Diego, Calif., at the same rate per copy. This is unfair and demands correction.
>
> Post Office Department already makes a profit on my paper and should not raise my rate further. This applies to all shopping guides and free newspapers because all such publications are delivered a few miles from the post office where they are mailed. I repeat, Post Office Department already makes a profit on this mail.
>
> The Audubon Post Office in 1961 did total volume of $55,000, and 10 percent of this was paid by the Audubon County Shopping Guide which I publish. Is it reasonable to assume that 10 percent of the time and effort of all dozen or so postal employees here are devoted each week to handling my 4,000 papers? No reasonable person would think so.
>
> Some special consideration by the Post Office Department—repeat, must—be given to the rate charged local shopping guide or many of us will be forced out of business. There are about 1,000 shopping guides in America today. This is an urgent problem for all of us.
>
> JOE SKLENAR,
> *Publisher, Audubon County Shopping Guide, Audubon, Iowa.*

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. VANIK to the amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY: On page 9, immediately preceding the effective date section, insert a new section 12:
>
> "REFUSAL OF THIRD-CLASS MAIL
>
> "Section (e)(1), chapter 53 of title 39, United States Code, is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:
>
> "'4061. REFUSAL OF THIRD-CLASS MAIL
>
> "'The Postmaster General shall issue such regulations as may be necessary to permit a postal patron to refuse all third-class mail destined for his address.
>
> "'The Postmaster General may return such refused third-class mail to the sender under such conditions, and upon the payment of such charges, as he may prescribe, except that the charges shall not be less than an amount which will reimburse the Post Office Department for the approximate costs incurred by the Department for such special service.'"

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is very simple. It would reach most of the criticisms we find with respect to third-class mail. The recipients of unwanted third-class mail today have two alternatives: They must sort the mail and discard it, or they may mark it "Refused." It frequently happens that he discards important mail while sorting through the unwanted third-class mail. This amendment simply makes it possible for the patron to refuse his third-class mail at the post office before it is delivered to his home. The postal patrons burdened with unwanted mail would be relieved of this burden. The advertisers would in this process revise their mailing lists. This amendment will not increase the cost either to the Government or to the advertisers, but it will provide relief for those who seek it, and it may, in the long run, preserve the status of third-class mail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the gag rule applied to this bill is in keeping with the entire history of it. Here is a bill that will impose what amounts to a tax of more than half a billion dollars upon the majority of the citizens of this country with more than $400 million of this amount coming from first-class, airmail, and postal cards. Yet we are called upon to dispose of this bill in about 4 hours. I do not know whether the majority leaders have any business for tomorrow or the next day or the day after that. If so, it has not been announced, and if they have, I would like to know what it is. Why is this gag rule imposed upon the Members of the House, limiting the time for explanation of amendments to a minute and a half, with almost no opportunity for others to support or oppose amendments? Why do the Democrat leaders want to ram this down the throats of Members of the House today when there is no business scheduled for the rest of this week? I promise Members of the House here and now that if I can prevail you are going to be in session each day from now through next Friday.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO].

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. SANTANGELO: On page 3, line 5, after "respectively", strike out the period and add the following language:
>
> "Except that letters mailed for nonbusiness or noncommercial purposes shall be 4 cents an ounce or fraction thereof."

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is designed to bring equality of treatment to the users of first-class mail. We know that 80 percent of the users of first-class mail are business concerns or commercial enterprises and that 20 percent of the users are private people who use first-class mail for private purposes such as sending letters to members of their families across the country as well as in some instances paying their personal bills. But, we also know that the amount of money spent by business enterprises or commercial groups is a deductible item from income and comes off the top, and the Government stands 20 percent of the expense. This is not so with respect to the user who sends a private letter or a person who sends a letter to a friend. He absorbs the entire expense.

Now, this same issue arose in 1957 when I was a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and in asking the question of Mr. Stans, who was the aid to Postmaster General Summerfield, he said that a different rate between the two groups was administratively feasible, although somewhat inconvenient. We find that condition obtains with newspaper rates. There is a different rate for different categories of newspapers. The postal service can determine between a letter for private purposes or business purposes by seeing whether the address is written in longhand or whether the return address is in longhand, or whether the names are printed, stamped or typewritten. This amendment brings equality of treatment to users of first-class mail. Why should 180 million people pay the increase when they cannot deduct it if they are not in business and those in business can deduct it? We should encourage communication by our citizens, not discourage. Remember that first-class mail returns a substantial profit and makes up the loss on other classes of mail. I trust that this amendment will pass.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be voted down. I cannot see the need for it. It is discriminatory, as I see it. I therefore appeal to the membership of this body to vote it down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to make it very clear in the RECORD that I voted against the motion to limit debate. I spoke in favor of the Murray amendment, in spite of the exceedingly, in my judgment, unfortunate amendment that was adopted with respect to the third-class mail.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for the Murray amendment. I think the realities of the matter are that this bill in the final analysis is going to be written in conference. I do want the record very clear, however, that I opposed the limitation of time on the debate. I think it represented a most serious deprivation of the rights of the Members of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN.]

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. OLSEN to an amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY: On page 3 delete everything on line 18 through line 25 and on page 4 delete everything on line 1 through line 5 and insert in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "SEC. 5. Section 4359 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out all of section (b), including the table therein, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "'(b)(1) Subject to the minimum rate provided for publications of qualified nonprofit organizations and classroom publications by section 4360 of this title, the rate of postage on publications mailed in accordance

with subsection (a) of this section are fixed both by the piece as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection and by the pound as provided in the following table:

	" 'Rates in cents per pound or fraction thereof				
	" 'Classroom publications	Other publications			
		Mailed during calendar year 1961	Mailed during calendar year 1962	Mailed during calendar year 1963	Mailed after December 31, 1963
Advertising portion:					
Zones 1 and 2	1.5	3.0	3.15	3.30	3.45
Zone 3	2.0	4.0	4.20	4.40	4.60
Zone 4	3.0	6.0	6.30	6.60	6.90
Zone 5	4.0	8.0	8.40	8.80	9.20
Zone 6	5.0	10.0	10.50	11.00	11.50
Zone 7	6.0	12.0	12.60	13.20	13.80
Zone 8	7.0	14.0	14.70	15.40	16.10
Nonadvertising portion	1.5	2.5	2.63	2.75	2.88
A publication of a qualified nonprofit organization		1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5' "

and (2) by adding at the end of subsection (b) a new paragraph (2) as follows:

" '(2) The piece rates of postage are charged on each individually addressed copy of a publication (except a publication of a qualified nonprofit organization and a classroom publication) mailed in accordance with subsection (a) of this section in addition to the pound rates. The piece rates are as follows:

" 'Publications other than classroom publications and other than publications of qualified nonprofit organizations—one-fourth of 1 cent, effective on and after July 1, 1962, and before July 1, 1963; and one-half of 1 cent effective, on and after July 1, 1963'."

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, in support of my motion I wish, first, to cite the fact that our committee after 7 months of hearing on the committee bill did conclude by vote in committee almost unanimously—I think with two dissents—that the determination of public service of the Post Office Department should be 7.5 percent of the Department's budget and that that figure was $342 million for public service.

Mr. Chairman, now we are considering a bill which provides for only $250 million in public service. I cite that figure—and I will extend my remarks in the RECORD on that subject so that the Members of the House may examine it in detail.

Mr. Speaker, when the Congress of the United States enacted the Postal Policy Act of 1958, we thought at long last we had resolved the principle of an adequate pricing for elements of public services in the Post Office Department that should not be charged to the mail users.

I recall that as early as 1954 a Senate committee found that public services amounted to approximately 12 percent of total costs; that in 1957 the same Senate committee made a determination that these costs might run as high as 14 percent. Since 1954, of course, air mail subsidies, and penalty and franked mail have been taken out of the Post Office Department for costing purposes and charged to the various Government agencies.

I believe the 7½-percent determination of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, amounting to $342 million, is a good determination. This provision was sponsored by my colleague, Congressman GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER, and received strong support on the part of the committee. Despite the amendment which has been offered here by our distinguished chairman, curtailing public services by approximately $94 million, I am of the firm opinion that our great Postmaster General recognizes the impact of public services and the necessity for pricing them out on a "total loss" basis, as required by law.

In this connection, I should like to call the committee's attention to a speech made by the Postmaster General in Houston, Tex., on December 6, 1961. Because of its recognition of the many public services provided by our great Post Office Department, including small post offices and rural routes, I ask permission to have this statement included with my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS OF POSTMASTER GENERAL J. EDWARD DAY BEFORE THE NIMS ADVISORY COUNCIL, HOUSTON, TEX., DECEMBER 6, 1961

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, Houston is to the U.S. Post Office Department what the Oilers are to the American Football League—well, almost, anyway.

While Houston is not the largest of our post offices, it is certainly one of the best, and it ranks among the 20 biggest postal installations in the country, which make up about one-third of the national post office business.

As of the beginning of this fiscal year, Houston reported gross annual postal receipts amounting to about $21 million and an annual mail volume of 878 million pieces—including 303 million pieces of first class originating mail.

The payroll for the Houston post office covers some 3,368 persons—more, incidentally, than are employed in several entire States.

Thus, Houston ranks favorably in a national establishment which employs some 580,000 men and women, and annually handles more than 65 billion pieces of mail a year—enough to fill a train of railroad cars stretched from Boston to San Francisco.

This represents two-thirds of all the mail handled in the world. In other words, we handle twice as much mail as all the other post office departments in the world put together.

Because of its size, the U.S. Post Office Department is often referred to as the biggest business in the world.

At a matter of fact, we are the largest civilian organization in the world. But we are not a business. Many of our operations and policies cannot be equated with private enterprise. They are, and should be, different. It is certainly not unusual for a postal operation to be compared to a private business. In some countries, indeed, the similarity is very close.

For example, in England, the post office not only sets its own postal rates and operates at a profit, but it pays income taxes on its profits and real estate taxes on the buildings it owns, just as a private business would.

There are some important parallels between the Post Office Department and a private corporation. But there are equally important differences. The Department's operations and mission are quite different from those of a private business and that is as it should be. But we seek to use the best techniques and ideas of private firms in the operation of the public's business.

First, let me cite one good example of the difference between the Post Office Department's public operation and the operation of a private enterprise.

Sixty years ago, we had over 70,000 post offices, most of them to serve rural America. Since that time, about half of that total have been closed up. These were mainly post offices serving very small communities, which shrank further in size or disappeared altogether.

But a great many of our post offices are still in small villages and many of our 30,000 rural delivery routes are in sparsely populated areas where there may be as few as two house to the mile.

Now were we a distribution and communications system operated purely for profit, we would have to discontinue a great many of these small post offices and rural routes. From a strictly dollars-and-cents point of view, many of them do pay their own way. But in fulfilling our obligation to provide service to all the people in all the 50 States, we in the Post Office Department quite properly keep them going.

Were we a private company engaged in intercity transportation and delivery of packages, we probably would not attempt to provide a regular service to small towns or rural areas. Such companies often skim off the cream of the parcel business by serving locations of big volume and concentrated population and leave the uneconomical routes exclusively to the Post Office.

The Post Office Department performs many functions which are in every sense—including a legal sense—of a public service nature. We carry much mail at sharply reduced rates, at only a small fraction of our cost, for religious, charitable, educational and other not-for-profit corporations. Special types of mail for the blind are carried free. Small-town newspapers are usually carried free or for an insignificant rate.

These are public services which are not parallel to an operation for profit. We perform many nonpostal services, such as handling the registration of 3 million aliens a year, selling migratory bird stamps to hunters, and distributing forms for the Census Bureau and the Peace Corps.

The count of game birds is even conducted by our rural carriers for the Fish and Wildlife Service and we even make a livestock census for the Department of Agriculture. We are reimbursed for some of the nonpostal services, but not for others.

Unlike private business, we are unable to control our own price structure. We are currently operating at a gross deficit of some $850 million. But we have not yet been able to get congressional approval for a rate increase, even though our 4-cent first-class rate has gotten as out of date as a nickel phone call.

We are in high hopes of obtaining congressional action when Congress returns next January on this question of rate increases which we regard as vitally important.

The first-class rate has gone up only 33 percent since 1932. During that time the cost of living has increased 118 percent. The 1-cent increase in the first-class rate would cost the average household less than one-half cent per day.

Time and again President Kennedy has urged enactment of a new, more equitable postage rate, but Congress, nevertheless, did not see fit to grant such an increase during its recent session.

We cannot increase our own rates for first-, second-, and third-class mail. But we can and do improve efficiency and effect economies.

As long ago as 1890 our Department had 100,000 employees. Today we handle 13 times as much mail as we did then, but have less than 6 times as many employees.

Thus, over the years, there has been a remarkable increase in productivity.

Since 1940 the number of pieces of mail handled by the Department has increased 128 percent, but the number of employees has increased only 59 percent.

In New York City alone we handle more mail each day than does the entire British postal system, which serves 80 million people.

Our volume goes up 3 to 4 percent each year, not only because of population but because of more pieces of mail per year per person. In 1940 we handled 210 pieces of mail per year per person.

Today, the figure is 355.

By 1970 it will be 420.

We have 580,000 employees. We operate 35,000 full-fledged post offices and over 9,000 stations and branches. We have over 30,000 rural routes, covering a total of 1¾ million miles. We operate a fleet of 45,000 Government-owned vehicles.

The productivity improvement of the American postal system is even more marked when one realizes that 150,000 of our employees are city letter carriers and despite increased use of mailsters and other vehicles, where they can improve service and efficiency, the number of city carriers must constantly grow to serve an expanding population.

Another place where we differ from, say, a manufacturing corporation is in our use of mechanization.

Although the Department has been experimenting since 1922 with mechanical mail-handling equipment, mechanization has not yet accounted for any significant part of our productivity improvement.

We are moving ahead with our mechanization efforts. A large California firm, Food Machinery & Chemical Corp., of San Jose, is developing for us greatly improved equipment for mechanical mail sorting.

But there are several very important differences between use of mechanization for a manufacturing operation and for mail handling. If a firm is using automated equipment for making cigarettes or ballpoint pens, there can quite properly be a tolerance for some damage or destruction if the machinery is not working properly.

But in handling mail, we must assume that every piece is important and that it must get through with certainty and without being cut or torn. We cannot allow a margin for error to accommodate defects or temporary failures of the equipment.

Early in our administration, we issued an invitation to the Nation's industrial engineering and research talent to join with the Government in tackling the fantastic mechanical problems involved in moving and delivering the mail.

Today's volume of 65 billion pieces of mail is expected to double in the next half century. This monumental task—the task of moving this mountain of mail—demands more attention than can be given it by one organization, private or public.

We have asked private industry to send their research men to us, to find out our requirements—and to come back to us with prototypes of fresh, new mechanized answers to our problems—answers promising enough to justify the investment of public money in further development.

For example, we need, and we believe private industry could develop, a simple, durable machine to read, face and sort mail by chemical or electronic operation—flexible, reliable and variable stamp dispensing equipment—a basic sorting machine to sort mail by States—mailboxes which will stack letters as they are dropped in—equipment to sort packages without Rube Goldberg installations and squads of hovering mechanics.

We have no interest in gimmicks or gadgets. We have no interest in pie-in-the-sky projects full of ifs for the millennium of another century. We do have millions of pieces of mail to move every day and we need help to do it better today.

Should industry accept our challenge, we believe these concepts would find a broad market among the large mailers of the country. They would have application not only in thousands of post offices, but in other thousands of offices where close cooperation with the post office in preparation of mail in bulk has been recognized by multimillion mailers as the first step toward better postal service. This, I am convinced, can be a demonstration of free enterprise at its best. No subsidies, no confusion of function, no intrusion of Federal influence, no bureaucratic complexities, but as challenging an opportunity for Government-industry cooperation and the creation of new markets as exists in the Nation today.

One of our major problems in the post office is that we do not have a steady flow of work which would make it possible to make use of expensive machinery during the full day. In many of our post offices, 80 percent of the mail comes to us between 5 p.m. and 9 p.m. All the first-class mail must be worked as soon as we receive it. Because of its priority status, it cannot be backlogged or held back until the next morning.

If we put in enough mechanical equipment to handle this huge peak load on a current basis, much of the machinery would be idle the other 18 to 20 hours of the day.

To meet this problem, as you know, we have launched a high priority program to get major users of first-class mail to space their mailings so we can process their nonpriority items outside of the peak load hours.

A test in the Wall Street district of New York City showed trucks sent through at 5 p.m. picked up 6 million pieces of mail, compared with only 300,000 on an earlier pickup at 3:30 p.m.

This same experience could be repeated in the bulk of our cities.

However, to show what can be done, we were able to persuade heavy mailers to change their pattern of posting mail. The midafternoon pickup increased to 3 million letters—a 1,000 percent boost.

Similar improvements can be made—and must be made—to provide an efficient, sound postal system with resulting benefits for all of us in every city in the Nation.

Although improvements have been made through "mail early in the day" programs, further steps must be taken. For example, great quantities of first-class mail of a routine, nonpriority nature could be held over until the next morning. The big mailing rooms of large mailers could just as well be equipped with improved mail handling equipment as our post offices.

We call our current effort to reduce the peak mail load problem, through cooperative arrangements with our large mailers, the NIMS program—short for the nationwide improved mail service program.

In this city—as we have done all over the country in major commercial centers—we have established mail users councils to assist us in eliminating the problem, and to advise us on new methods of speeding mail handling and delivery. The 135 members of the Houston Mail Users Council are responsible for 41 percent of the total volume of first-class mail originating in this city.

Annually you purchase almost $7 million worth of stamps—one-third of the gross receipts of the Houston Post Office.

In addition, big mailers of the Houston area have 2,250 postage meter accounts which generates $9,604,000 in receipts annually.

Reports from your postmaster, Mr. Elder, indicate that in October some 705,000 pieces of first-class mail, or 34.6 percent of the total, were deposited in the post office daily before 5 p.m., and 1,335,000 pieces of first-class mail, or 65.4 percent, were deposited after 5 p.m.

However, a more recent survey, just completed, indicates an increase in the peakload mail volume in Houston. This latest report shows 69.2 percent of your daily first-class mail volume being dropped in the post office after 5 p.m. and only 30.8 percent deposited prior to the 5 p.m. rush.

It is my sincere hope that this is merely a temporary setback, and that we will be able to make greater progress as time passes in cutting down our peakload problem in Houston.

With the assistance of such mail users councils as you have here in Houston, we are beginning to make some progress toward alleviating the alpine heaps of mail that clog our post offices during the after-5 rush hour, jeopardizing speedy and efficient movement of important mail.

In fact, a survey after the first 4 months of this program indicated that we have already shifted upward of 5 percent of the Nation's mail volume from late afternoon or evening processing to an earlier time.

This NIMS program is just one example of our approach to improved efficiency and better service. It is a good example of the progress that can be made by mutual cooperation between business and the Government.

Another example of the Government—the Post Office Department—and private enterprise working hand in hand to provide needed services for our citizens is our commercial lease post office program.

Under authority granted by Congress, the Post Office Department often uses arrangements similar to those used by private industry in acquiring needed new facilities.

The operations of the Post Office Department, and the Federal Government as a whole, have a significant impact on the economic activity and growth of most communities in the United States.

The Government relies on the private economy to produce the necessary public revenue, and the private economy cannot produce that revenue unless it is continuously growing and making a fair profit.

Traditionally, the vigor and thrust of our society has relied upon the creative drive of our private economy; that tradition is fully maintained by this administration. Indeed, to achieve the goals set by President Kennedy—goals capable of realization under this administration—will require serious, constant, and close cooperation between business and government.

Lower profits for business leaves government with the problem of curtailing necessary public services, risking our defense posture, or suffering a deficit. In the challenging times in which we as a free people are now engaged, we want none of these alternatives.

Because of the continued lag in the national economy until the spring of this year, we have a big deficit facing us for the current fiscal year. But income after taxes for 1961 will be up by more than $12 billion over 1960; and it is predicted that this increase will be doubled for 1962. Corporate profits have also shown strong gains, reaching an annual rate of $45,200 million in the second quarter of this year—a sharp rise from the first quarter low of $39,600 million.

The gross national product for the first quarter of this year, at the bottom of the

> recession, was $500 billion. In the fourth quarter it is expected to rise to $540 billion. By the end of the second quarter of next year, it will probably be between $565 billion and $570 billion.
>
> Inventories are building up; retailers are stocking up; auto prospects are excellent, with sales up an estimated 15 percent; housing will be higher; people are stepping up their buying, for both cash and credit. Profits are up sharply, and will exceed the record rate by the end of this year or the beginning of next.
>
> Next year, profits will reach about $54 billion—topping the previous high of $46 billion.
>
> Much of this is the result of the first-year effort of an administration convinced that in this era of history our economy can only remain strong if we have faith in private enterprise as the bulwark of our country's economic future.
>
> As Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon commented in a speech in San Francisco, "Unless we achieve steady and rapid economic growth with price stability, and full employment—unless we attain reasonable equilibrium in our balance of payments—we shall not have the capacity to cope effectively with international crises or to meet our urgent national needs here at home.
>
> "The strength of our economy has a profound effect upon our future. Our place in the world of tomorrow depends upon the efforts we make today."
>
> Two-thirds of the new money committed by the recent Congress was for increased national defense and space exploration. Our overall Federal expenditures are not historically high in comparison to the gross national product. Quite the contrary—in fiscal year 1962 they are expected to amount to some 16 percent of our gross national product—a proportion that has been exceeded in 8 of the last 10 fiscal years.
>
> I am, by nature and by professional background, a businessman, as well as a lawyer. I am convinced that one of the keystones of this administration's governmental efforts is to encourage better business, not discourage it. For with a prospering economy our Nation prospers, and our Government fulfills its obligations to its citizens and to our friends in free nations throughout the world.
>
> Our NIMS program represents a down-to-earth application of cooperation between business and Government. We are deadly serious about the necessity of making this program work. We know that billions of department store and utility bills, insurance notices, bank statements, dividend checks, and other items sent as first-class mail can be brought to our post offices in the off-peak hours. It only requires a top-level decision of management to bring it about and to make it last.
>
> Our program was launched months ago. The results so far show we have only scratched the surface.
>
> We know we can count on you for stepped-up cooperation. It is a good program that will help each of you and improve service for all mailers, large and small.

Now on the second point, and I spoke earlier of the fact that I would offer this amendment. This amendment would impose the pound rate increases on the newspapers so that the small publications of rural areas and smaller cities would have a differential by reason of weight—the weight of the editorial material and the weight of the advertising material—as against the corresponding weight of editorial and advertising material in the larger publications and in the larger magazines. Therefore, the revenue received would not be too far short of that proposed by the amendment offered by Chairman MURRAY, which would cut the surcharge in half and raise $41 million instead of $53 million.

Earlier here today, I pointed up the fact that the newspapers, both daily and weekly newspapers, operating in the larger cities of Montana as well as the rural areas are smaller in size and lighter in weight. Our newspapers do not compare in advertising revenue per page or per issue with the larger magazines and newspapers of the Nation. I think it is ridiculous that the smallest publications be charged the same 1 cent-per-piece surcharge as is charged the larger magazines or newspapers for service by the Post Office Department. As a matter of history, we have had per pound rates—that is, rates which charge per pound of advertising and rates which charge per pound of editorial material. By such rates a differential is maintained between the smallest publication with the smallest circulation and the largest publication with the largest circulation.

The amendment that I offer would increase the per pound rates in three stages, one each year of 5 percent. In addition, as a compromise, the per piece charge imposed would be one-fourth cent the first year which would be graduated to one-half cent the second year. The total revenue of my amendment would be $41 million increase to the post office as compared with a $53 million increase by Chairman MURRAY's amendment.

I urge this fairer kind of increase.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I announced at the outset of these proceedings that I fully intended to support the Murray amendment, but the way it has been altered here on the floor has put me in a position where I cannot possibly vote for it. I recognize that it is pretty late in the day and the temper of the Members is such that it would be pretty hard to accomplish anything rational here. But if the Murray amendment were defeated we would go back to the committee bill as it came from the committee and that would, I am sure, be open to amendment and then possibly we could get something that would be a little saner, in my estimation. So I must say that I have to change my position in view of the amendments that have been adopted.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say to the membership that I, too, was heartily in support of the Murray amendment. But in view of the gag rule imposed here we have not had opportunity adequately to explain the various amendments that represent the fine work of 3 years of study. In view of that I have to withdraw my support of the Murray amendment and urge all others to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD].

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly in favor of the purpose of the Cunningham amendment. I believe that the gentleman from Nebraska should be commended for assuming the leadership in the effort to prevent the flooding of Communist political propaganda into the United States at the expense of the taxpayers. However, in examining the amendment I find that it only forbids the Post Office Department from receiving, handling, transporting or delivering mail that has been determined by the Attorney General to be Communist political propaganda. There is no procedure set up for the Attorney General or the Post Office Department to intercept mail before it is delivered. And, of course, it is not going to do any good for the Attorney General to determine that it is Communist political propaganda after it has been delivered. I should like the gentleman from Nebraska to comment on how he contemplates the enforcement of his amendment.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Very definitely the mail would be intercepted at ports of entry. It would be sent to the Attorney General and, through the use of what machinery he has available for other matters, such as the examination of pornographic literature, and so forth, he will determine whether it is Communist political propaganda.

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri. It will be intercepted and opened?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. At the port of entry. You see, second- and third-class mail is open mail. You can open that any time you want to.

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri. Do you not think you should spell that out in the amendment?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. No; I believe that the amendment will take care of that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. JOELSON to the amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY: Strike out section 3 in its entirety and renumber succeeding sections.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not delude myself that this amendment is going to pass, but I feel impelled to offer it nonetheless. This amendment will do away with an increase in the first-class mail rates.

The Post Office Department tells us that first-class mail is self-supporting. It tells us that second and third-class mail are responsible for the deficit. Now this being the case, why on earth should we increase the rate on the first-class mail users? It just does not make any sense to me.

If you want to give a subsidy to the magazine industry and to the mail order industry, at least give it to them out of the general Treasury, but do not soak the poor man who has no pressure groups or organizations to talk for him. If you want to give away money and if you want to subsidize magazines and mail-order houses, do it out in the open. Call it a subsidy and give it to them out of the general revenues of the country, but do not soak the man who is now paying his own way another penny for every piece of mail he sends. He is not profiting by the mail—he is communicating. Soak the ones who are profiting from the use of the mail.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Murray].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Joelson), there were—ayes 51, noes 115.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I will yield my time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Murray] when he is recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Murray] to close the debate.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Murray] as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, there is great concern on the part of the people of Florida and the Nation about the flow of subversive Communist propaganda into the United States. This vicious material enters the country and is delivered to the doorsteps of unsuspecting citizens.

Steps have been initiated by the Postmaster General to curb this flow of propaganda, but their effect has not yet resulted in a halt of this material. Current practice has the Postmaster General authorizing the display of notices in the Nation's 45,000 post offices. These notices warn that unsolicited Communist literature is coming into this country and being delivered. The warning suggests Americans receiving this propaganda to mark it "refused," and then return it to the Post Office Department.

Despite these good intentions, the latest figures show 76 million pounds of printed material sent into the United States during fiscal year 1961. The port of New York alone was a transmission point for approximately 1,341,298 pieces of printed matter from Communist bloc nations, and most of this mail was handled through the New York post offices, then distributed to American citizens.

Mr. Chairman, in 1959 this material flowed in at an increase of 40 percent above the rate of the previous year. The Supreme Court decision of last year gave strength to the constitutionality of the Subversive Activities Control Act. The FBI is doing an excellent job in combating subversion and infiltration of America by the Communists. Clearly, it is up to the Congress to now take measures which will give our Nation a three-pronged attack on international communism.

I find it comforting, as I am sure the American people are comforted, to see that the committee has exercised its wisdom and made provisions in this bill to control the flow of communistic propaganda.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Weaver] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I am not in favor of the proposed increase of postal rates which the present administration is trying to jam down the throats of the American people. I have nothing but admiration for the President's expressed desire to balance the budget, and I am aware of the fine presentation he made to the Congress only last week in this respect. However, it seems to me that he is starting in a poor place and is basing his hopes for a balanced budget not so much by fiscal responsibility as he is on a 20- to 25-percent tax increase upon those who use the mails.

It has always seemed strange to me that of all the services rendered to the people by the Government of the United States, only the postal service is expected to make money. The Post Office Department is one of the very few specifically created by the Constitution of the United States. And yet such other constitutional agencies as the Army, the Navy, or the Patent Office are not required or expected to show a profit each fiscal year.

The Post Office Department provides a real and beneficial service to the people of this country. This service is not limited by any means to those who send letters—it benefits both the sender and the receiver. In fact, it would be difficult in many instances to say which receives the greater benefit—as for example, the dealer who mails a book, or the person who receives and reads with relish and enjoyment that book. The one is using the postal service for profit in a monetary sense, and is paying in the form of stamps a direct tax for that service. The reader is using the postal service for intellectual profit but he, too, through general taxation, is paying for part of this service. The two cannot be separated and one be told, in effect, "you must bear the entire burden of carrying the mail," while the other is told that the service to him is completely free.

The same situation prevails in many other fields, such as newspapers, magazines, and the like. The mailer is using the postal service for monetary profit; the receiver is using the same service for intellectual profit or for enjoyment. The one cannot be told he and he alone must bear the full cost of the mail service while the other benefits from this same service at absolutely no cost. And yet, that is what we are being asked to do by the administration in the present bill before the House.

If the administration is so insistent that the Post Office Department show a profit at the end of each year, it would seem to me only sound and just that the President apply this same principle to all other departments. For instance, instead of asking the Congress to enact his Federal school subsidy program, financed through appropriations from the general fund, it would seem to me logical that the President would come to us and say, "give me a law making it mandatory for every citizen in the United States who sends a child to school to pay a tuition fee—over and above other taxes—of $100 or $200 per year. As the costs of school construction and teachers' salaries go up, the tuition will, of course, have to go up because we must make our school systems show a monetary profit."

This may sound to some farfetched; but it is exactly what the President is doing in his demand for a postal rate increase at this time.

Mr. Chairman, aside from the service aspect of the Post Office Department and this rate increase request, I would like to point out one glaringly unfair feature of this bill. For years we have been hearing—on the best of authority—that the first-class mail is paying its own way. The 4-cent letter, the 7-cent airmail letter, and the 3-penny post card are paying their just and honest debts. And yet, Mr. Chairman, the President is asking the people who use this type of mail to add 20 or 25 percent to their costs now. Obviously, this is designed to return a profit to the Treasury. If they were paying their own way before, why should their burden be increased now? It just does not make sense.

Mr. Chairman, the other day I received a letter from our good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Murray], chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. With that letter he enclosed a copy of an amendment to the present bill which he hopes the House will approve. I have no doubt but what that bill was carefully drawn but, to my mind at least, it has one terribly important defect. I refer to the business of the American taxpayers being asked to finance the distribution of Communist literature through our mails.

My friend and colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham], has long fought to end this disgraceful procedure. Last year he was successful in getting, as an amendment, his proposal banning such dissemination of Communist literature by our post offices. It appears now that the bill which has the administration's blessings will leave that important provision out. If the bill passes in its present form, our postal employees will be required to deliver and distribute this nefarious, subversive literature—and at taxpayers' expense. They will continue to find themselves in the weird position of bebeing forced to do during their working hours that which—if done on their own—would preclude them from ever getting a job with the Federal Government.

Now, it may be that the House will reinstate the Cunningham proposal in the bill and insist that this distribution of Communist trash and worse come to an end—at least on a free basis. I hope it does take such action and let me assure you I will support any such amendment now and in the future. However, even if such an amendment is adopted, I shall not support the bill. There is too much in this measure that is bad, is not compatible with the well-being of our citizens, to be overcome by this one good aspect.

The President blames rising defense costs and the postal deficits for the fiscal problems faced by the Nation today. And yet, communication between people and the common defense are so essential to the welfare of the Nation that the Founding Fathers took especial note of them in writing the Constitution and very specifically provided for these services.

It would seem to me the course of wisdom on the part of the administration to look elsewhere for areas in which to cut. The President does not complain about the costs of any of the special services to limited groups of people which the Government performs. In fact, he wants to expand these special services and to make them even more costly. For reasons known only to himself, the President chooses to make an issue of an essential service which is of benefit to every citizen.

Another point I would like to raise at this time is the fact that the President makes much of the rate of pay of our postal employees. He blames their salaries—in large part—for the postal deficit. And yet we find no such mention in any of the President's speeches or the speeches of his people when they talk about other departments of the Government. When the President tells us that there should be pay reform, say for the employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, he does not couple that statement with a warning that this will perhaps create a deficit. He does not ask the recipients of Hill-Burton hospital funds or the users of hospitals built by those funds to pay an extra tax so that employees of the Public Health Service might benefit by a Federal pay reform. He does not ask employers and labor unions to pay special and added taxes so that employees of the Department of Labor can benefit by a Federal pay reform. No, he reserves this gesture for the postal employees only. In my opinion this is a most unfair and unjust position; unfortunately, it is the position that the President has taken and one which he is demanding that the Congress impose upon the people.

Mr. Chairman, all in all this bill is unsound, uncalled for, and unnecessary, when it is placed in its proper perspective. I shall therefore vote against it and I call upon my colleagues in the House to do likewise.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7927) to adjust postal rates, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 464, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that further proceedings on the bill will be postponed until tomorrow.

EXECUTIVE ORDER ENDING RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN FEDERALLY ASSISTED HOUSING IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on January 12, 1962, I wrote the President of the United States the following letter on the subject of his refusal to sign and issue an Executive order ending racial discrimination in federally assisted housing in the United States. The letter follows:

JANUARY 12, 1962.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I share the disappointment of millions to whom it has become apparent that no Executive order ending racial discrimination in federally assisted housing in the United States will be forthcoming. This is an abandonment of solemn pledges made by you during the 1960 campaign, upon which many Americans relied. I can see no valid reason for the breach.

In your state of the Union message you expressed great satisfaction with your own full exercise of executive powers. I submit that the single most significant exercise of executive power, which you have chosen not to exercise, relates to housing. You said as much during the campaign, and you said further that if elected you would have the courage to move on this front by a stroke of the pen. A year has gone by since inauguration and you have allowed the matter to drift. This is not full exercise of executive powers.

Add this omission to your continued refusal to submit a legislative program on civil rights to the Congress, also promised by you as a first priority matter, and the failure is compounded.

There are hundreds of thousands of American families who because of their race or creed cannot enjoy their just share in millions of federally assisted housing units. This is a situation which cannot be disregarded any longer. The volumes of reports, both public and private, and the pleas of civic, religious, labor and patriotic organizations on this score need no further emphasis. Legislative advances in the area of civil rights made in previous years, plus the personal popularity which you enjoy, make the climate right for the immediate issuance of a truly effective Executive order barring discrimination in all housing programs which are aided in any way by the Federal Government. This would include all mortgage activities of banking institutions aided or supervised by the Federal Government in addition to public housing, urban renewal, FHA, VA, college housing and housing for the elderly. The Civil Rights Commission has recommended this. It is entirely feasible and must be done, as you have yourself pointed out on past occasions.

I respectfully urge you to live up to your promise and execute such an order promptly.

Respectfully yours,
JOHN V. LINDSAY,
Member of Congress.

Under date of January 16, 1962, I received the following reply from Mr. Lawrence F. O'Brien, Special Assistant to the President, in answer to my letter to the President:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 16, 1962.

Hon. JOHN V. LINDSAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The President has asked me to reply to your recent letter discussing civil rights legislation generally, and the issuance of an Executive order to eliminate discrimination in housing in particular.

As I am sure you are aware, the President addressed himself to those questions in his press conference yesterday, and his statement sets forth clearly his views on the subject.

Sincerely yours,
LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN,
Special Assistant to the President.

Mr. O'Brien's reply is no answer at all to my letter, any more than is the President's statement on the subject in his press conference, in which he vaguely intimated that he would issue the order when he considered it to be in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, the public interest requires that such an Executive order be issued yesterday. The public interest is not being served by permitting rank discrimination to occur in federally assisted housing in the United States. The public interest requires that the President take a leadership position and move with vigor, in order to protect the rights of millions of Americans. The public interest requires that the President redeem a solemn campaign pledge that was accepted in good faith by the American people.

And what has happened to the thunder we heard from the majority side of the aisle on this subject on the eve on the 1960 campaign? Remember, they, too, talked about a President who would act with a stroke of the pen. They shook their fingers and filled the RECORD with talk about meaningful civil rights legislation. Now, suddenly, the silence is deafening. There is neither legislation nor a stroke of the pen. Where are the Tuesday-to-Thursday liberals? Do they assume the public has forgotten those wide promises as they sit smiling behind the protection of their well-oiled, big-city political machines?

Well some of us will not forget and we shall not be silent.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to join me in urging the President to live up to his campaign pledges—to sign the promised Executive order, and to bring about legislation in order to secure equal rights, under law, for all men, still the most important subject of our time.

REPORT ON LEGISLATION AS IT AFFECTS IOWA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, we are gathered here today at the beginning of the 2d session of the 87th Congress faced with some of the most perilous problems visited upon any generation. I am proud to be a Member of this Congress, and honored to serve under your leadership. As the days of this year unfold before us the people of this vast democracy will be watching with intense interest what we do here. I am confident that our Nation, under the guidance of a great President, John F. Kennedy, will prove again that we have the will, the determination, the courage, and the resources to remain a leader of the free people.

Mr. Speaker, this is the beginning of the sixth year of my membership in this body. During this time, we have witnessed the program which this democratically controlled Congress has voted into reality, the benefits of which are being enjoyed by the people of this Nation today. I am grateful for the opportunity of having been able to contribute to the passage of these beneficial pieces of legislation.

I am proud, Mr. Speaker, that I have supported programs helpful to the farmers of Iowa. The farmers of Iowa have seen the erosion of a proud and profitable way of life, and now we are attempting once more to return this industry to a position of economic strength.

Without hesitation I have championed the causes of the men and women of Iowa who work by the sweat of their brow for a living for themselves and their families. In these days of mergers and automation the lot of the working people is not an easy one, and I stand firm in my loyalty to those programs which better their standards of living.

The small merchants of the land feel the effects of the pressures and the squeezes of the economic change taking place all about us today. Our merchants are fraught with uncertainty and, without fail, I have sought to provide wider avenues of economic opportunity to those Iowa merchants who are the backbone of our mercantile industry.

Again, I have alined myself with vital programs for our elderly, so that they are not forced to face the sunset years of life floundering in a sea of uncertainty and insecurity. We can, in this prosperous Nation, do better than this, and I have, at all times, voted to make sure we do.

Mr. Speaker, during the 1st session of this 87th Congress, certain interests entered into a conspiracy to abrogate my usefulness to the people of Iowa. Using the immunity granted to them by constitutional amendment, the press conducted a vicious attack, motivated by political influences, levied against my reputation and my character. In a deliberate attempt to smear and belittle, they caused to be printed, time and time again, accounts which were absolutely private in nature and normally privileged as personal. Other stories were carried and repeated which were so slanted and lacking in fact as to make them beyond the reason of truth. These attacks were made without regard for the emotional consequences and disregarded all the rules of the unwritten laws by which we are governed. These attacks were without decency and fairplay. These conspirators fired their atrocious blasts, not at my record of service to my people, not against my associations and commitments in Congress, not on my voting record, but, on the contrary, they struck their low blow in an area where retaliation would be impossible if one were to stand on those principles of decency which, by the very application of this standard, would preclude an answer. I committed no wrong against society. I resorted, openly, to the laws promulgated and established by courts of justice, in order that individuals can seek, legally, a change in the status of their private affairs.

Every step that I have pursued was open and aboveboard, a matter of record. And yet, these prevaricators, alined with adverse interests, designed and plotted to destroy my effectiveness in the eyes of my people in Iowa.

This attack, made in the most scurrilous and vicious manner, replete with falsities and filled with animosities, was far the lowest in the history of Iowa politics.

Mr. Speaker, I do not stand here today claiming that I am perfect. I am not perfect, and I have never said that I was. Neither have I ever met an honest man who claimed perfection. And I do not stand alone, having faced the dark hour of personal despair and difficulty. Problems in human living are not confined just to Democrats or just to Republicans, but are visited upon both. But you would hardly be aware of this by reading the newspapers.

For a long time, I have maintained my silence in the face of this unprecedented barrage of unwarranted publicity against me. But, now that the wheels of the press are turning again to further attempt to destroy the innocent; to further attempt to destroy the Democratic Party in Iowa; and to further attempt to blacken my name, I can contain my silence no longer. The people of Iowa have a right to know that this attack has been organized and is now being continued by these same perverse interests.

I must admit that, at first, I thought of retaliation, even to the point of disclosing the names of those who instigated this vile and surreptitious attack on my good name.

I have in my files pertinent information which, if exposed, would incriminate these very same conspirators.

I have positive proof that they attempted to use and did use connections and associations with high Government officials to obtain concessions which they could not have obtained on their own merits.

Mr. Speaker, thus did I debate on the wisdom of such a disclosure but I arrived at the only conclusion possible, in fairness to the innocent who would become necessarily involved.

To strike back would, in effect, put me in the position of defending allegations and distortions of fact which are better left to the more delicate domain of private conscience, into which the crude processes of inquiry should not follow.

These contemptible and despicable people would not dare to fight me on my record here, nor on my service there in my beloved State of Iowa. They dare not. These despotic and power-crazy individuals cannot go to the farmer and say that MERWIN COAD did not jealously preserve and protect his interest. They cannot approach the small businessmen and say that "your Congressman is not looking out for you." They dare not compare my voting record for the working people, the laborer, and the employees who, more and more, are dependent upon congressional initiative to safeguard their future. They cannot say that COAD is not for all the people, all the time.

No, Mr. Speaker, they must confine their contemptible attacks to matters which are only of private concern.

Had I not cast my lot with the poor, the weak, and the repressed, and had I not sponsored and supported this Democratic Congress in a sincere and conscientious effort to promote our independent way of life, giving to each and every citizen his just and proportionate share of democracy, this scurrilous attack on me would never have happened. But had I, instead, compromised my principles and ideals or moderated my program, I would not be worthy of the high honor of this office.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that the Republican-controlled State Legislature of Iowa cut up the district of Iowa which I have represented for the past 5 years so that the possibility of my continued service in Congress would be nothing short of impossible. The old Sixth District, which I represent, was cut up into four sections, so that no large segment remained intact. This was done in a flagrant effort to reduce my chances of returning to Congress, for my continued record of voting for the farmers, working people, the merchants, and the elderly was a threat to the security of Republicans in Congress from Iowa. The Republicans have been unsuccessful in beating me at the polls, so they used the only device available—they took away my district.

This gerrymandering action was not at the request or demand of the people. This was a political maneuver in its rawest sense.

But, what of the people? Do not the people have a right to the representation of their choice in the Halls of Congress? Yes, Mr. Speaker, this right is guaranteed by the Constitution itself.

And again, I say that I am proud of the record which I have established here during the 5 years of my service to the people of Iowa. My record of voting for the economic elevation of our family farmers, for the increased wage opportunities of our laboring people, for a better business climate with a more equitable tax structure for our merchants, and to ease the load of the twilight years of the elderly, is a record of achievement for my people. This is the record which threatens the Republicans of Iowa, and this is the record on which I stand.

Mr. Speaker, these are the reasons for the unprecedented and savage attack upon me by the Republican press, which was joined by the Iowa Republican machine. These are the reasons why they have launched this campaign to try to destroy me in the minds of the people of Iowa.

During the years of my service in Congress, and long before, I have been an Iowan without interruption and without deviation. I am proud to be an Iowan, for I have always found the people of Iowa fair and honest and not easily taken in by tricks of tactics in high places.

But, whatever may be my future fate in Iowa politics, I stand unashamed of my record of serving my people. With God as my judge I have maintained the sacredness of my oath of office and have been diligent to do the duties to which I have been charged.

Already, I have been warned that the mills of the Republican press and the Republican organization are being prepared to further attempt to grind away my character and to attempt to destroy the confidence of the people of Iowa in me. But, I have faith in the mentality, the fairness and the honesty of the people of Iowa to be able to divide truth from trickery and to recognize devoted service to the people when it is rendered.

I am proud that I have cast my lot with the Iowa farmer, with the Iowa laborer, with the small businessman of Iowa, and with those whose sunset years are upon them. I am proud I have voted to keep my country strong. And whether my political future lasts only 1 year, or 5, or 10, or more, I will always know that the greatest reward was the reward of serving mankind. I have constantly maintained that the Iowa people deserve more than mud and sweat and heartache. The people of Iowa deserve and must have equality of opportunity with an economy which is just and progressive. For these things I have fought and of this fight for the people I am proud.

And it is with this truth that I retaliate. With complete confidence in this Democratic administration, I continue my every effort to bring to the people of Iowa the representation they deserve. I cannot, I will not compromise.

UNCLE MICKEY

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the great Flathead country of my native Montana a youngster by the name of Uncle Mickey is celebrating a birthday. He turned a mere 93 today.

Uncle Mickey—Mike Berne—is the oldest active citizen of Columbia Falls, Mont. And by active I mean he is still fixing his own farm fences.

Uncle Mickey is also a Flathead tradition, and the unofficial historian of the area. But why should I be taking your time by telling you just a little about Uncle Mickey? Simply because I think—in contrast to him—we are often guilty of having short memories. We forget that it was not so very long ago that this country, including the West, blossomed with ugly signs, reading "No Irish Need Apply." There are still such signs in America, only other nationalities and races have been substituted for the Irish.

Well, Mickey, whose parents came from Tipperary, did "apply" nevertheless. He applied himself to starting a brickyard, and then building the town's first school, the first church, and the first hotels.

He remained a bachelor, but with his late brother, Billy, he raised two families. First were three children of a widowed sister. Then there were eight grandchildren.

Now, at 93, he is still kept busy helping to raise four grand nephews, aged 6 to 10 years.

The lore, the life, and the flavor of the Flathead are full of the tradition of Uncle Mickey.

For instance, in Bad Rock Canyon, along U.S. Highway 2, a few minutes from the west entrance to Glacier National Park and 3 miles from Columbia Falls, is Berne Memorial Park.

It is a roadside park with picnic tables nestled between canyon rocks and evergreens, with a year-round spring of mountain water.

According to Mel Ruder, editor of the prize-winning Hungry Horse News in Columbia Falls, it is Montana's nicest roadside facility.

Sometimes I think it would be refreshing if we could swap a few minutes of our crowded Washington days for a few refreshing, mediative moments in Berne Park. We might be more prone then to recall the real origins of our American pioneers.

When Uncle Mickey returned from his first trip to Ireland, the land of his folks, in 1949, he told Mel Ruder:

> From what I could see there for a man to do, I think it was a good thing the Irish came over here.

As a fellow American—though of Norwegian stock—I think it is a good thing, too—but a good thing for America.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include at this point in the Record a newspaper clipping from the Hungry Horse News, Columbia Falls, Mont., one of the finest small town papers in the country and published and edited by Mel Ruder:

Mike Berne Says: "It's a Good Thing the Irish Came Over"

The Hungry Horse News published volume 1, No. 1, August 8, 1946, and unfortunately we did not know Billy Berne, who died in March 1946.

However, we've enjoyed knowing Mike Berne, now 92, who was born January 23, 1869. Uncle Mickey has been the subject of a number of stories in the Hungry Horse News. Here's one we wrote in 1949 following his return from an airplane trip to Ireland.

Ireland was an interesting place but 80-year-old Mike Berne was glad to get back to his Flathead Sunday.

He said goodbye to the stewardess, Marnie White, and then told his nephews, Martin Ladenburg, Richard and Jimmy Simpson about the Emerald Isle.

Uncle Mickey, who settled in the Flathead in 1890 and made the bricks for Columbia Falls (old) St. Richard's Church, took his first airplane trip June 3, 1949, at the dedication of the Flathead county airport.

With his niece, Mrs. J. P. Simpson, Tacoma, there was a 12-hour flight from the east coast to Ireland June 17, and Uncle Mickey told his nephews about the plane that weighed 80 tons.

"That wasn't nothing," he added, "on the way back we left London at 11 a.m. and had supper in Boston."

There was a 20-day stay in Ireland, and County Roscommon back from Dublin, brought sessions with the Sharkeys and the Bernes, cousins. Uncle Mickey's mother was born in Tipperary.

"Rock fences were all about, just as my father's time," he told his nephews.

"They haven't got much there. It takes four Irish spuds to fill a tablespoon, and there's no future for a young man. You don't see young men about. Many households seem to run something like this: a widowed mother, a 50-year-old spinster aunt and two single girls in their 30's. The men have come to the United States or the dominions.

"From what I could see there for a man to do, I think it's a good thing the Irish came over," he continued.

In stronger, western language, Uncle Mickey told of the absence of central heating; the fireplaces used for cooking, and the kettles on the iron arms.

The observant 80-year-oldster noticed an absence of freight cars—they're small in Europe—on the railroads, and his industrial tour included one stop that showed enterprise. It was the Guiness brewery in Dublin. "Big, fine place, and good beer."

As to farming, the places had 8 or 10 acres. They couldn't grow grain, and he noted an absence of gardens. The soil was poor, and farmers seemed to be importing grain to feed to a few cattle. He hardly saw a pig. After coming from the Flathead, Uncle Mickey saw no percentage in that.

As to the beauty of the Emerald Isle, he commented, "I didn't see a single brown spot, but those Irish lakes don't compare to the mountain lakes of the Flathead."

Leaving Ireland, the visitors went to London, and they were energetic tourists seeing London Tower and other sights. They visited with Col. and Mr. Allan Clarke. He's an attaché at the American Embassy; she's the former Katherine Sauntry, a niece.

Does Mickey knock the Irish? Well, he came off the plane with a bright green tie. He told his nephews things were much better over here, but when it comes to courtesy, humor, good naturedness, Old World charm and hospitality you can't beat the Irish in Ireland.

THE NATION'S ENERGY RESOURCES AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the speech on national energy resources and economic growth which was delivered in Boston, January 18, by James K. Carr, Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior. The occasion was the banquet concluding the 16th Annual Printing and Publishing Week in Massachusetts.

Mr. Carr is a professional engineer, a former engineering consultant to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, onetime chairman of the California Water Commission, and engaged in water and power activities for the past 25 years.

His comments on the energy requirements faced by the Nation in the future are very timely and are an indication of the effort that must be made to sustain continuing economic growth throughout the Nation. His speech points out that in the electrical industry alone, investments in excess of $100 million will probably be required in the next 20 years to finance generation and transmission facilities. I am pleased to note that the Under Secretary assumes both private and public investments will accomplish this job. With an eye toward the protection of stockholders and taxpayers, he said:

> With such an enormous requirement for capital, the stockholders and the taxpayers must be protected by the best possible planning, both private and public.

His talk covers further possibilities in the coal industry and discusses oil and gas requirements. The text of his speech follows:

The Nation's Energy Resources and Economic Growth

(By James K. Carr, Under Secretary of the Interior)

A magazine advertisement this month by a leading airline points out that man has been developing speed for about 8,000 years, but only in the last 80 years—100 of the time period—has he made substantial progress. As late as 1880, the cheetah was still the speed kind of the mammals, having been clocked at 70 miles per hour. Man surged ahead in 1893, when a New York Central engine ate up a stretch of track at more than 112 miles per hour. A scant 70 years later, the experimental X-15 reached 4,700 miles per hour speed—fast enough to go from Boston to Manhattan in about 3 minutes. This burst of speed resulted largely from great advances in knowledge of fuels and energy.

The substance of the magazine ad relates to mobile energy. The bulk of the energy consumed in our economy is at stationary facilities. The advances in nonmobile energy production and use, while not so dramatic as the X-15, have, in the past 80 years, made giant strides in the task of freeing man from the bondage of inadequate energy.

You are interested in the subject of energy because the relationship of energy resources to basic raw material, whether it be for the printing business, the publishing business, or the production of paper pulp, and other wood products, will have a determined effect upon the economic health of your industry. The application of energy resources to other basic raw materials will indirectly affect the entire industry which you represent. It's for this reason that your program chairman asked me to speak to you tonight on the Nation's energy resources, which are in many ways a responsibility of the Department of the Interior.

ENERGY DEFINED

Let me define more clearly the type of energy I am talking about. In a broad sense, anything with the inherent power to perform work may be called energy, but I am speaking about the commercial or efficient forms of energy and their effect on the national economic growth. The four sources of such energy are: oil, natural gas, coal, and waterpower. As yet, nuclear power does not rank as an energy source of major economic importance.

The commercial uses of energy I am talking about should also be defined. The four uses of energy significantly affecting the Nation's economic growth are for (1) industrial purposes, (2) transportation, (3) space heating and cooling, and (4) the production of electricity, as such.

RELATIONSHIPS—BETWEEN SOURCES—BETWEEN MARKETS

Petroleum is the dominant commercial energy source accounting for about 45 percent of the Nation's energy needs. Natural gas picks up another 28 percent, and coal takes 23 percent; the rest of the commercial and efficient energy supply, except for water power which is 4 percent of the total.

The primary energy markets run something like this: Industry, 35 percent; transportation, 25 percent; space heating and cooling, 20 percent; and generation of electricity, the remaining 20 percent.

ENERGY AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

This Nation's industrial progress, social progress, and its energy revolution are so tightly interwoven that it is almost impossible to separate them. A history of the economic growth of the United States could, I believe, be translated in terms of the changes in emphasis and the changes in patterns of energy supply and use. The steel industry which was the forerunner for other massive industries in this economy was based largely on coal.

Again, consider the relationship between transportation developments and growth in the energy sector of the economy. The establishment of the vast interlocking network of railroads in this country would have been impossible had it not been for the availability of adequate quantities of coal at widely separated points. Widespread use of the automobile, which has had such an impact on almost all phases of our individual lives, moved hand-in-hand with the growth of the petroleum industry.

ENERGY USES

I should like to discuss briefly the increase in use of energy; then the specific sources—oil, gas, coal, and water power; and some of the relationships between these sources and the particular uses.

On a per capita basis, the use of energy by the United States is approaching the equivalent of 45 barrels of oil per person per year, and the United States is responsible for one-half of the world's total energy consumption. The average for the rest of the world is one-tenth as much or the equivalent of less than 5 barrels per capita.

History shows that economic progress, social progress, and standards of living move forward wherever per capita peacetime uses of energy are greater. By the end of this decade per capita consumption of energy in the United States will have increased more than 10 percent with a corresponding population increase of 35 million people. The net result is an estimated increase in total national energy consumption of more than 35 percent in the next 10 years.

INVESTMENT IN PLANT WILL BE HUGE

You can readily realize the problems that confront us as we continue to promote and to sustain economic growth if you visualize the necessary investment in generating and transmission plants.

During the past 20 years the total expenditure for new construction of generation and transmission facilities in the electrical industry, both private and public, has been about $35 billion—I repeat, billion dollars. Engineers now estimate that the total expenditure, private and public, for the next 20 years to build the necessary generation and transmission facilities will be three times that amount. With such an enormous requirement for capital the stockholders and the taxpayers must be protected by the best possible planning, both private and public. Our success in this effort will measurably affect the Nation's economic growth and our ability to compete abroad.

The magnitude of the investment problems in large measure relates to population growth. I will not burden you with numerous examples to show how fast the United States is growing, but you can gain some idea of it if you realize that the population increase of the Nation this year will be approximately 3 million people or equal to four new cities as large as Boston. Economists tell me this also means $6 billion in new spending for consumer goods.

Under Secretary of State George W. Ball told a joint congressional committee recently that the United States can compete with anyone and can prosper and must trade if it is to grow. This means, however, a relentless and vigorous attack on all factors of production cost to determine that they are as low as possible. It means, as President Kennedy said in the state of the Union message: "We cannot 'hang back in deference to local economic pressures.' "

ENERGY AND THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

At this point you possibly ask why the Interior Department is so intimately involved with the Nation's energy needs and supplies. Some people erroneously think the Department of the Interior is a "western department."

The Federal Government's responsibilities in the energy field and more specifically with oil, natural gas, coal, and the marketing of waterpower, as well as certain development of waterpower, are delegated to the Secretary of the Interior. Thus, to a great extent, the Department of the Interior is the "primary energy Department" for the United States. There are, of course, other agencies involved, including the Atomic Energy Commission and the Federal Power Commission, but Interior has important responsibilities with respect to each of the commercial types of energy mentioned. The Department's Office of Oil and Gas, Oil Import Administration, Bureau of Mines, Geological Survey, and the Office of Coal Research, all have broad responsibilities for certain segments of our energy programs. On the waterpower side, we have the Department's Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the Southeastern Power Administration—four Federal agencies that market hydroelectric power in different sections of the United States. So you can see that the activities of the Department of the Interior touch upon almost every phase of commercial energy in the Nation.

The Department is assigned certain tasks which will assure that our country's energy resources of coal, oil, natural gas, and water, make their maximum contribution to the Nation's economic health and growth, as well as the Nation's security. The energy-oriented activities of the Department, however, vitally affect the strength of our economy and contribute significantly to the ability of this Nation to maintain its place in the world. And let me say just parenthetically that Secretary Udall and the rest of us in the Department of the Interior are equally concerned over another resource—and I mean our disappearing open spaces that are so vital to this and future generations. That is why, as a conservation measure, we are proposing a last great effort to round out a system of national parks and provide aid to States embarked on similar programs. We not only owe it to ourselves, we have a responsibility to the 51 million young people in school today to see that we wisely manage this resource and hand on to them a land such as we are so fortunate to enjoy. The approval of legislation authorizing the Cape Cod National Seashore Park is a notable step forward.

CHANGING PATTERNS OF ENERGY USE

We naturally expect changes in energy use patterns over the next 10 years although the total amounts of energy used will increase considerably. Let us discuss each primary energy source separately.

PETROLEUM

The petroleum industry, until recently, was growing at a much faster rate than the total increase in energy consumption by moving into markets in competition with other energy sources. In the future, we expect a leveling out in the consumption of oil in this country, although there will continue to be rapid increases in its use in other countries.

World production greatly exceeds current petroleum requirements. Much of the new production in the world can enter markets at prices below those necessary to sustain the mature industry in the United States. Furthermore, political events in some petroleum-producing nations have injected a note of instability into the supply of oil. Against this background, we cannot afford, as a nation, to lose sight of the immense importance of petroleum in times of emergency.

In World War II, fully two-thirds of all the materials of war consisted of petroleum and petroleum products. Today, petroleum represents about 50 percent of the total waterborne tonnage in international trade. The sheer volume of petroleum requirements, and the overall situation in the world today, made it necessary for the Federal Government to institute a broad program of controls on petroleum imports into the United States. These controls are designed to provide petroleum exporting nations with access to the U.S. market, while at the same time preventing the unlimited flow of oil from abroad that could seriously injure our national security posture. This vital program is administered by the Department's Oil Import Administration.

NATURAL GAS

During the past 25 or 30 years, natural gas has grown from a stepchild of the petroleum industry to a prime source of energy. This growth has been especially impressive over the past 15 years since World War II. This year it is estimated that natural gas will approach 30 percent of the Nation's energy supply. The Federal Power Commission has the principal regulatory responsibility for the Nation's interstate commerce in natural gas. The Department of the Interior conducts a substantial program of research into natural gas production and use and is responsible for the mobilization phases of the natural gas industry.

COAL

Reserves of coal in the United States are immense—enough to serve our requirements at present rates of consumption for hundreds of years. Coal was the earliest beneficiary of this Nation's energy revolution. As other sources of power arose, coal lost its dominant position. Production has fallen and unemployment in traditional coal producing areas constitutes a serious economic and social problem.

Despite these losses in the energy market, there are two possibilities that hold promise for an early improvement in coal's position in our energy economy.

Coal is cheap at the mine compared to other fuels; its big handicap has always been the cost of transportation. For this reason, the Department is very much interested in the plan of the Consolidation Coal Co., of Pittsburgh, and the Texas Eastern Transmission Corp., of Houston, to build a 20-inch slurry pipeline from the coal fields of Pennsylvania and West Virginia to the large energy-consuming areas of Philadelphia and New York.

Coal in the form of a slurry has been moved by pipeline in Ohio for some years, from Cadiz to Cleveland. But in this operation the slurry has had to be put through a costly drying process before burning. Recently, a demonstration at South Amboy, N.J., proved that liquid coal slurry containing more than 30 percent water can be burned directly in a furnace, in much the same way as oil or gas.

It appears possible to increase the use of coal while better serving the energy needs of our country, by the construction of mine-mouth steam electric plants. Recent developments in extra-high-voltage transmission of electricity may make possible the movement of large blocks of power at lower costs. I will discuss this more fully as we talk about electric power.

ELECTRIC POWER

The development of hydroelectric power in this country had its beginning in the New England States. The first waterpower development of importance took place here in New England at Pawtucket, R.I., in 1790. By 1813, a city was created by the development of the Merrimack River at Lowell, Mass. In those early years, a canal was built around the falls and the water, or portions of it, passed successively over wheels or through turbines.

By 1900, we had learned to transmit power as far as 150 miles. In a moment, I will tell you of some of the programs our Government is now engaged in to encourage the private and public utility industry to better utilize and develop our electric power industry.

Hydroelectric power has provided a small but relatively stable portion of the Nation's energy requirements in the past 25 years—about 4 percent. This percentage, however, fails to convey the critical importance of hydroelectric power in some regions of the United States.

In the Pacific Northwest, fully 96 percent of electric power consumed in the area is produced from waterpower projects on the Columbia River, its tributaries, and coastal streams.

In years gone by, we, as a Nation, have not made sufficient use of our hydroelectric potential, a renewable energy resource that uncontrolled causes damage in many areas. This administration will not perpetuate this neglect and waste. We intend to move vigorously to develop those as yet untapped hydro resources which will yield measurable benefits to the growth of the national economy.

At the request of President Kennedy, the Department of the Interior is now reviewing the Passamaquoddy project and the potential of the upper St. John River in Maine. Department engineers are optimistic about the outcome and look forward to greater development of the water resource of New England.

EXTRA HIGH VOLTAGE—DIRECT CURRENT TRANSMISSION

The most modern and efficient transmission of electricity is vital to the ample supply of power at reasonable costs. A 5-man group drawn from the Department of the Interior has recently completed an important study on an extra-high-voltage, direct-current intertie to link the major private and public power systems in the Pacific Northwest with those of the Pacific Southwest. The study has already had a great impact on the electric utility industry and may show a way ultimately to reduce power cost in New England and other areas of the Nation.

The proposal would involve construction of lines from the Columbia River Basin to the vicinity of Los Angeles, Calif.—a distance of almost 1,000 miles. It would be a dramatic forward step, stimulating the electric industry to more efficient and effective use of the hydro- and thermal-electric power resources.

Great benefits would follow from the Pacific Northwest and southern California intertie. The Pacific Northwest's firm power supply, according to the report, can be increased by up to 400,000 kilowatts by exchanging energy.

In many parts of California peak power requirements occur during the summer months. In the Northwest, the peak energy need is during the winter months. Each of these regions now must maintain sufficient generation capacity and plant (which costs money) to meet its respective peak loads. The proposed intertie can appreciably lower the level of installed generating capacity (with investment of capital) by moving power back and forth between the two regions as required.

Also these extra-high-voltage, direct-current transmission lines might be used to take power from mine-mouth, steam-electric plant in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and other areas to eastern population centers such as Boston and deliver it at lower cost.

President Kennedy in his special message on natural resources last February directed the Secretary of the Interior to develop plans for interconnections and further cooperative pooling of electric power supplies in both private and public systems. Secretary Udall is giving leadership to the electric utility industry by encouraging this bold, new approach.

In candor, I must tell you that the United States has lagged behind in the development and use of direct-current transmission of electricity. Sweden developed and has been using it to advantage since 1954. A direct-current underwater cable beneath the English Channel now connects the power systems of England and France. New Zealand will soon use direct-current transmission for a distance of 360 miles. It is reported the Soviets have been experimenting with direct-current transmission since the end of World War II and have one 300-mile experimental line already built.

Inevitably, it seems the entire United States will need an electric power complex of extra high voltage in which private and public agencies can and will operate. The combined efforts of the private and public utilities will be necessary to bring about economies in the production and distribution of electric power. This administration will continue to encourage these joint efforts and recommend to the Congress that we participate financially in programs associated with the development of our water and power resources whenever it's in the national interest.

The combined result should be a more efficient utilization of the country's total generating facilities, reduced requirements for the construction of new generating plants and significant reductions in capital investment. Savings to consumers of power should follow naturally from these advantages.

I have emphasized that energy is one of the most important elements in a dynamic economy. Your industry directly and indirectly is affected by what we do in the development of low-cost energy for the entire Nation. We must continue as a nation to discard that which is outdated or obsolete. We must adopt new technical advances wherever they promise to decrease the cost of energy to the ultimate consumer. We must, with a sense of urgency, tackle our energy-resource problems. We must look forward and go forward.

If we proceed with this spirit, we shall continue to carry the banner of freedom throughout this fast-moving world with persuasive confidence and a widespread realization that America is still in the forefront of scientific progress.

TO GRANT WORLD WAR I VETERANS THE SAME OUTPATIENT SERVICES AVAILABLE TO VETERANS OF SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, in relation to the standards of today, we have shown less consideration for the veterans of World War I than we have for the living veterans of any other war before or since.

This is difficult to understand, and impossible to excuse. Perhaps it was due to the conservative administrations that controlled public policy during the 1920's, when the legitimate rights of veterans were thrust into the background.

Their frustration found expression in 1932 during the last year of conservative rule, when a bonus army of impoverished veterans marched on Washington in a desperate effort to secure recognition of their claims. The memory of the squatters camp they established, and from which they were driven by the tanks and tear gas of the Regular Army, comes back to haunt a nation that failed then as now to fulfill its obligations to the veterans of World War I.

Unlike the veterans of World War II, and the veterans of the Korean war, the men who came back from World War I, received no educational aid, no paid-on-the-job training to develop new skills and opportunities, no guarantee of job restoration, and no $20 per week for 52 weeks as unemployment compensation. And there were no veterans' hospitals to care for those whose health was affected by the dangers and the hardships of their military service.

Because the Allied armies were hard pressed when we entered World War I, too many of our men were rushed overseas without sufficient training or adequate equipment. Influenza, poison gas, trench warfare, the stresses and strains of military life weakened the health of many young men who did not bear the visible scars of battle.

Their disabilities originated in service, but they were not able to prove service connection and secure disability compensation because the Government, in tracing their claims, found that it had misplaced or lost their medical records.

Unlike the veterans of the previous Spanish-American War, they were not declared eligible for outpatient treatment of disabilities, including dental service, and were not entitled to emergency medical care at home.

Too early for the GI bill of rights and too late for the benefits granted to the Spanish War veterans.

The average age of the World War I veteran is 67.

Five hundred of them are dying every day. Very few of the hundreds of thousands who survive are in perfect health. They have reached that stage in life where more frequent illneses and medical care needs should receive outpatient treatment to avoid the delays that jeopardize recovery, and necessitate costly hospitalization.

These men are not second-class veterans. Only legislative neglect in providing them with benefits and services available to veterans of other wars has made it seem so.

In order to correct that discrimination, I have introduced a bill to amend section 612 of title 38, United States Code, to provide the same medical care benefits for World War I veterans as are provided for veterans of the Spanish-American War.

Can anyone, in good conscience, deny them this right?

WOOL IMPORTS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include a letter from Francis Schaufenbil, international secretary-treasurer of the United Textile Workers of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Thre was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks the following letter:

JANUARY 22, 1962.

Hon. THOMAS LANE,
U.S. House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: According to a news item in the Lawrence Sunday Sun of January 21, Assistant Secretary Frederick G. Dutton of the State Department has informed you that there was a sharp decline in wool imports from Great Britain, Italy, and Japan during 1961, as a result of a new tariff structure set up by the U.S. Government.

Assistant Secretary Dutton's optimistic statement is statistically accurate, but in my opinion it is a misleading assessment of the situation. He disregards alarming trends which warrant a conclusion opposed to his.

Three factors account for the reduced wool fabric imports:

1. The threatened boycott of Japanese worsted fabrics by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL–CIO.

2. The drop in U.S. production of tailored clothing due to the economic situation prevailing during the first part of 1961.

3. The new duties on woven cloths which were placed in effect on January 1, 1961.

Since the decline in wool imports was the greatest in the case of Italy, a study of the 1961 (January through October) Italian wool import figures is revealing:

[Total in square yards]

January	1,724,000
February	335,000
March	412,000
April	732,000
May	531,000
June	716,000
July	1,035,000
August	1,328,000
September	1,788,000
October	1,870,000

You will note that the January 1, 1961, duties at first seemed to act as a brake on imports, but we now know that this was merely a period of hesitation. The steadily growing Italian import totals indicate that Italian exporters are accommodating their products to the new duties and have already regained much lost ground.

There is growing evidence that the January 1961 duties are not as effective as claimed by the State Department.

The National Association of Wool Manufacturers claims that "there is manifest evidence that the search for loopholes in our tariff law and regulations is intensifying. The Bureau of Customs has under study the proper tariff classification for woven wool cloths on which the selvedges have been bound with braid.

"The purpose of this braiding is to qualify the cloths for entry through customs as articles in part of braid on which there is only an ad valorem duty of 42½ percent. This compares with the cloth duties of 37½ cents per pound plus ad valorem duties of 38 to 60 percent, dependent upon the value. In another case, woven wool cloths have been presented for duty-free entry into U.S. customs territory as a product of the Virgin Islands. The cloths in question were imported from Italy into the Virgin Islands where little if any further processing was performed on them other than showerproofing. Manufactures qualify as a 'product of the Virgin Islands' if foreign materials account for no more than 50 percent of their total value."

Another reason I am not impressed by the State Department's analysis of the matter is the fact that the new duties effect only a minority part of total wool imports.

Wool imports involve many categories in addition to wool fabrics, e.g., finished apparel, unfinished apparel, wool tops, wool yarns, knit apparel, etc. According to Government figures, 43,385,000 pounds of wool products were imported during the first 10 months of 1961. Of these, only 19,266,000 pounds were covered by the new tariff, and only 9 million pounds were affected by the new tariff.

The State Department cannot claim ignorance of these factors. I have the privilege of serving on the Department of Commerce Wool Advisory Committee. We met on January 8, 1962, with representatives of the State Department and the Commerce Department, and, at that time, called these matters to their attention.

On the same day the Wool Advisory Committee filed a unanimously adopted eight-point statement with the Government. Point 7 was as follows:

"The Committee has called to the attention of Government representatives present and here takes this means of noting:

(a) That the greater portion of wool textile imports do not enter under the paragraphs affected by the tariff adjustments referred to; and it is mistaken to base policy—if inaction may be deemed a policy—for the whole wool textile industry on factors which, even if valid, would affect only part of it; and

"(b) That the statistical data already on hand shows that such declines as were recorded in certain categories of wool imports in the early months of 1961 were the brief and passing effects of the domestic recession, and that, in certain conspicuous and important categories, imports for the first 10 months of 1961 are already in excess of corresponding figures for 1960, and in other categories, the rise in the latter months of the year shows that the hitherto increasing trend of wool product imports is clearly continuing even beyond the levels previously deemed excessive."

Since 1947 more than 300 woolen mills have gone out of business. Employment in the industry in the same period has declined from 170,000 jobs to 65,000 jobs.

President Kennedy, though pursuing a goal of increased foreign trade, has recognized that the wool industry requires special attention. On May 2, 1961, at a White House conference with industry representatives he said: "The problems of the textile industry are serious and deep-rooted," and that, "it is time for action."

It seems to me that the State Department pursues the same laudable goal of increased foreign trade, but with a callous indifference to the effect of its policies and recommendations on thousands of textile workers, thousands of manufacturers, and thousands of workers in related industries. It seems to me that the State Department blinds itself to the damage being inflicted upon the woolen industry of our Nation. The Department publicizes and exaggerates measures designed to help the situation, but these measures—such as the new duties of January 1, 1961, and the new textile machinery depreciation arrangement—while sometimes meritorious, are ineffective and picayune when contrasted with the overall problem. Assistant Secretary Dutton's report to you is illustrative of this tendency. To use an overworked expression, "They are willing to sacrifice the industry on the altar of free trade."

The United Textile Workers of America, AFL–CIO, and its membership, are well aware of the tremendous efforts you have expended on behalf of the wool industry. We are deeply appreciative and encourage your continued commitment to the problem which is so vital to our textile community and to our whole country.

With sincere personal regards, I remain,

Fraternally yours,

FRANCIS SCHAUFENBIL,
International Secretary-Treasurer.

REVIEW OF USE OF COMMERCIAL AIR CARRIERS

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few minutes today to discuss the report of the Comptroller General issued on January 9, 1962.

The report is entitled "Review of the Use of Commercial Air Carriers for Overseas Travel and Shipment of Unaccompanied Baggage of Department of Defense Personnel."

Many people are familiar with the general operation of military transportation. The Military Air Transport Service—MATS—is charged with the responsibility of providing the Joint Chiefs of Staff with an immediately available strategic airlift force for use in war or other national emergency. To meet its primary mission, MATS is equipped with a large fleet of military transport aircraft. Under Defense Department training and operations policy this transport fleet is required to operate at a relatively high rate of peacetime aircraft utilization. In its standard operations it provides greater airlift capability than that required for normal military peacetime carrying needs.

The Defense Department uses some of this excess capacity to provide transportation for personnel and baggage. Additionally, some commercial transport is contracted for MATS use.

The new report of the Comptroller General is a study of inefficiencies in the operation of these transportation programs.

I would like to quote at length from the report to indicate its general purpose and its general conclusions:

> The purpose of our review was to inquire into the use of regularly scheduled commercial flights at published tariff rates for the oversea movement of personnel and baggage and to compare the use of these commercial facilities with the available space on scheduled oversea flights of the military air transportation system to the same points.
>
> Our review disclosed that, in fiscal year 1960, the DOD spent over $13 million for transporting its personnel and unaccompanied baggage overseas on commercial flights at published tariff rates, while at the same time there was ample space on scheduled military and contract flights of the Military Air Transport Service (MATS) to carry a substantial portion of this traffic. MATS flights included scheduled service on military-owned aircraft and on civil aircraft under contract to MATS at rates much lower than the published tariff rates of the carriers.
>
> Our tests showed that over 50 percent of all oversea travel and baggage shipments by commercial air originated or terminated at oversea areas, and in many cases the same cities, served by MATS. We estimate that the unused capacity of MATS scheduled oversea flights in the same year was equal to about 9 times the number of DOD passengers and 20 times the weight of DOD baggage carried by commercial air to or from the areas served by MATS. Consequently, after allowing for the approximate cost of using commercial air service to areas outside the military air transportation system, we estimate that passengers and baggage moved overseas by commercial air service at a cost of several millions of dollars could have been accommodated on concurrently scheduled MATS flights at little, if any, increase in the cost of MATS operation during fiscal year 1960.

The findings of this study are printed at some length in the body of the report. There is no doubt in my mind that the research done by the Government Accounting Office is of the highest quality, and I am convinced that the wasteful practices outlined by the Comptroller General are accurately reported. I would like to commend the report to the attention of other Members who may be interested in curbing wasteful Government expenditures.

Based on this research the Comptroller General has made three basic recommendations whose aim is the institution of more businesslike practices in this aspect of the Defense Department's operation. I believe that these recommendations are worthy of the support of every Member:

> 1. Transportation regulations for the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the three military services should be revised to specifically require the use of MATS for normal oversea air travel to, from, and between countries served directly by MATS and for all other oversea air travel where MATS military and contract planes are available for a substantial portion of the trip with significant savings in transportation costs.
>
> 2. The frequent failure of transportation officers to obtain passenger spaces on MATS flights, when in fact space is available, should be subjected to a thorough study by OSD to determine the cause of this problem and to institute remedial procedures and that consideration be given to revising the practice of limiting space reservations to the minimum cabin load on flights that usually depart with higher load limits.
>
> 3. The joint travel regulations' and the implementing regulations of the military services should be revised to specifically require the use of military air transportation resources for the oversea shipment of unaccompanied baggage, when air shipment is appropriate, and that the type of air transportation resources available and the countries served be clearly described in these regulations.

The Comptroller General indicates that the Department of Defense claims to be taking steps to remedy present abuses in military transportation. However, he writes that his present limited testing of the success of these remedies has shown only moderate improvement in practices.

Mr. Speaker, after a close review of the GAO studies I am convinced that at least $7 million could be cut from this aspect of military operations alone. I believe that every effort should be made to do this.

A number of conscientious citizens and members have been disturbed at the growth of government expenditures in recent years. Many have called for cuts in Government spending. I believe there is good cause for many of these complaints, but I believe we can save a great deal of money without making cuts in essential services.

It seems to me, rather, that it would be wise to consult the excellent studies now available which indicate that there is a great deal of waste in existing programs.

The Department of Defense is notable in this regard because it is by far the largest spender in the Government. GAO studies show that it is also among the most inefficient of our Government agencies. I would respectfully urge that a more careful look be taken at the budget this year in order to take advantage of the information we already have. If we do this, I am sure that we can preserve the essential functions of our Federal Government and cut out wasteful operations such as the ones detailed in the latest report on military transportation.

THE PORTSMOUTH STORY

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HARSHA**. Mr. Speaker, as we start the new year with a program and a budget presented to us encompassing everything on this earth and the moon and promising to take care of everybody and every cause the world over, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the Portsmouth story. I am including herewith an address delivered by the Reverend E. Leslie Pritchard of the Second Presbyterian Church, Portsmouth, Ohio, at the All America City Award finals, sponsored by the National Municipal League and Look magazine, at Miami Beach, Fla., on Friday, December 1, 1961, on behalf of all the people of the Greater Portsmouth, Ohio, community.

Reverend Pritchard very ably presented the Portsmouth cause in his own inimitable way and I think the Portsmouth story points out the fact that the American people, if given the opportunity, would prefer to look after their own problems on their own initiative.

There is nothing the American people cannot have if they want it. The only prerequisite is to apply themselves using their own resources and initiative to obtain the results desired. This is exactly what occurred in the Portsmouth area, yet we were in the heart of the depressed areas in this Nation, and I am particularly proud of the part the entire community played in the effort and I commend their action to my colleagues.

I earnestly recommend that before we embark upon this program of doing all things for all people, each of my colleagues give serious thought and consideration to how the people of Portsmouth helped themselves.

The Portsmouth Story

This is the Portsmouth story. Within the framework of the past 12 months, we who live in the Portsmouth, Ohio, area have witnessed a most remarkable feat, an accomplishment so typical of the grassroot greatness that built and is America that it evoked the personal endorsement of the President of the United States.

So that you may fully appreciate the timeliness of the Portsmouth story, and grasp its full significance, I would like to begin with a quotation from the inaugural address of the President of the United States.

Challenging Americans to rise to new heights through their own individual efforts, the President said:

"Ask not what your country will do for you; ask what you can do for your country."

Nowhere, to my knowledge, has that challenge been accepted more wholeheartedly, under more adverse conditions, and been met with more success than in the Portsmouth, Ohio, community that lies along the banks of the Ohio River on the northern border of the Kentucky foothills.

If I were a movie director producing the Portsmouth story, I would begin with a series of harshly candid, deeply penetrating flashbacks.

First, I would show the community, the walled river town and the rolling countryside of southern Ohio and northern Kentucky.

Twenty years ago the scene would be a bustling city of 40,000 population—a city known nationally for its shoes and its steel—a city with a staid and solid past—with a bright and beckoning future.

The pages of the calendar fall away and it is suddenly 1960. We have lost 5,000 population. We have lost a shoe industry. And the candid camera moves in to focus on the Portsmouth of 1960. We see an area declared distressed by the Department of Commerce. We see a city where unemployment runs as high as 18 percent. We see a community where families queue up to receive their share of surplus commodities.

Slowly the candid camera moves in and we see the faces of the people, for the Portsmouth story is the story of people. We look carefully at that face and it is the face of despair, and depression and defeat.

It is at this point that the Portsmouth story begins to unfold. The need was tragically present. Something had to be done. Something had to be done to overcome the apathy of the people and forcefully and positively demonstrate that Portsmouth could come back and assume her place among the progressive cities of the Nation. All of this could be done if everyone—individually and collectively—could do his part.

Suddenly the camera moves backwards in time and we see the graduating class of Portsmouth High School in the year 1959. We look closely at their faces—pathetically aware that only 1 out of every 8 students will have the opportunity to attend college: for Portsmouth and Scioto County lie in an educational desert. The great preponderance of the available colleges lay beyond the minimum radius of 100 miles; and what opportunity was there for students whose parents had to stand in line to receive their daily allotment of food?

This was the place for beginning. Looking for progress, searching for progress, we selected the theme "Progress Through Education."

A 15 member board formed a nonprofit organization to spearhead the goal of bringing higher education to the Portsmouth area. The city of Portsmouth donated an unused school building and a minimum goal of $85,000 was established with which to renovate and modernize that unused building.

The candid camera appears again among the people of the Portsmouth area as they weld themselves together in an almost unbelievable unity of purpose.

Here is the face of a retired school teacher who gave $50: here is the face of a newspaper boy who turned in his weekly collection of over $10: here is the wrinkled face of an old colored woman as she makes her humble donation.

As the camera moves back, we see the faces of the graduating class of a county high school each one of whom made a contribution of no less than $2. This set the tone and the color of our campaign.

Quicker and quicker the camera moves and faces appear as if by magic. The PTA's, the Rotary, the Kiwanis, the Lions, the Exchange, the 4-H clubs, the Shawnee AFL-CIO Council, the social groups, the professional groups, the faces of men, women, and children from all walks of life—regardless of race, color, or creed—each intent on playing his part to meet the need and make the dream come true.

Gentlemen, this was Portsmouth's finest hour.

The result: over $100,000 raised from an area designated distressed: over $100,000 which was equivalent, per-capita-wise, to over $7½ million being raised in the city of Detroit, also a distressed area: a $100,000 which was more than enough to open the doors to Ohio University at Portsmouth and admit a freshmen class of over 150 full-time students—88 percent of whom might never have had the opportunity for higher education.

Conscious of the effort that had been made by the people of Portsmouth, the President of the United States of America, himself, sent the following telegram to be read at the dedication of Ohio University at Portsmouth.

"I want to congratulate the people of the Portsmouth area on the opening there of the new branch of the State University system of Ohio. I know that the voluntary contributions by which your community has made this educational opportunity possible for the young men and women of your region represents one of the sacrifices which Americans must and will make for the welfare and strength of our people. You have answered in a significant way what you can do for your country. Such an achievement is especially impressive in an area designated for redevelopment. I know that Secretary of Commerce Hodges, Undersecretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Nestigen, Interstate Commerce Commissioner Bush, and the Commissioner of Patents Ladd, all of whom are with you today, will personally express for me the appreciation of this Administration for your fine efforts to promote the progress of your areas and to provide an adequate opportunity for education for all our people."

THE LATE SENATOR SCHOEPPEL

Mr. **CAHILL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McIntire] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. **McINTIRE**. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Senator Schoeppel, of Kansas, is a tragic loss to his State and Nation. The public service performed over a long period of time by this great citizen of Kansas is far beyond that generally realized by the average citizen. Senator Schoeppel combined great personal integrity and courage with deep devotion to the citizens of the Sunflower State and the Nation he loved so well.

Mrs. McIntire and I treasure the memory of our warm friendship with Senator Schoeppel and extend to the bereaved widow our deepest sympathy.

REASONS FOR EXTENDING CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM CONTRACTS

Mr. **CAHILL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schwengel] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. **SCHWENGEL**. Mr. Speaker, this bill extends the term of expiring conservation reserve contracts. Here is a brief review of the conservation reserve program and some of the reasons for recommending its extension.

Five years of experience have shown that this approach to crop adjustment is attractive to many farmers and can be an effective tool for land, capital, and labor adjustment in our overexpanded agriculture. As of the end of 1960, when the program was terminated, there were more than 306,000 conservation reserve contracts in effect, covering 28.7 million acres of reserve cropland in 47 States. The average size participating farm was 314 acres compared to the average 1954 census farm of 242 acres.

Virtually all of this conservation reserve land is cropland, or at least was being used for crop production before it was placed under contract. Had it not been idled by the program, this land would have added substantially to existing surpluses. Instead, it is being held in reserve at an annual average rental cost to the Government of $11.85 per acre per year. See table 1 for details by States.

The $11.85 per acre for the 28.7 million acres under the conservation reserve compared to $27.35 per acre average—USDA estimate—for the 26.7 million acres retired under the 1961 feed grain program, demonstrates among other things that: First, jacked up price supports in 1961 caused the Government to bid against itself and led to payments 2½ times as much per retired acre under the feed grain program as under the conservation reserve program; second, retiring cropland on a long-term, competitive bid basis is more workable, will accomplish much more for the money expended, and requires less administration.

Particularly effective in production adjustment is the whole farm conservation reserve contract, under which the farmer rests all his eligible cropland and produces no commercial crops. The farm family may continue to live on the farm if it wishes, and use the buildings, orchard, woodland, and garden as it desires. Further, by retiring the whole farm the temptation to increase output on land remaining in production, thus offsetting the effect of land retirement, is eliminated. Some 20.3 million conservation reserve acres, or 71 percent of the total, are under contracts of this type.

Conservation reserve contracts will begin expiring in considerable volume in 1962 and some will terminate each year through the end of 1969. All of this land will have been well protected with vegetative cover and will have a higher production potential than when retired. A question for both farmers and the Government will be what to do about this acreage as it emerges from the reserve and is again available for crop production. See table 2.

A breakdown of the 28.7 million acres under conservation reserve contracts, made by USDA, shows about 26.2 million under grass and legume cover. The remaining 2.5 million acres have been permanently shifted to such uses as forests, shrubs, cover for wildlife, and ponds and lakes for livestock, water, fish, and so forth. See table 3.

I am happy to introduce legislation to provide opportunity for farmers to extend contracts on the 26.2 million acres of conservation reserve land which otherwise will likely come back into crop productions as the contracts expire.

TABLE 1.—*1960 conservation reserve: Cumulative participation as to number of counties, farms, payees, reserve acres, and rental payment by States* [1]

State	Counties having contracts	Farms having contracts	Estimated payees	Reserve acres	Rental obligation for 1960 [2]	
					Total	Per acre
Alabama	67	8,338	8,550	410,033	$5,080,825	$12.39
Arizona	3	66	82	7,775	104,112	13.39
Arkansas	74	9,518	10,016	604,262	7,272,459	12.04
California	46	1,089	1,265	204,666	2,657,275	12.98
Colorado	50	4,760	5,861	1,295,917	9,944,168	7.67
Connecticut	8	196	196	4,702	91,575	19.48
Delaware	3	284	304	18,420	306,854	16.66
Florida	39	2,185	2,235	229,384	2,198,919	9.59
Georgia	158	15,227	15,847	1,061,731	12,146,685	11.44
Idaho	38	1,533	1,802	293,522	3,536,909	12.05
Illinois	102	6,140	6,766	440,425	7,592,183	17.24
Indiana	92	7,924	8,280	494,338	9,093,872	18.40
Iowa	100	7,726	8,557	663,087	12,017,608	18.12
Kansas	105	12,637	15,696	1,446,586	17,220,382	11.90
Kentucky	104	5,493	5,719	386,872	6,290,139	16.26
Louisiana	49	3,279	3,520	218,257	2,965,689	13.59
Maine	16	2,671	2,689	123,243	1,419,203	11.52
Maryland	23	1,484	1,574	84,753	1,437,538	16.96
Massachusetts	12	109	109	2,854	44,037	15.43
Michigan	83	11,706	11,913	720,985	9,437,842	13.09
Minnesota	88	20,772	22,012	1,944,476	21,835,752	11.23
Miisssippi	82	5,826	5,909	335,277	4,537,377	13.53
Missouri	114	10,974	11,657	832,313	11,768,058	14.14
Montana	51	2,053	2,350	629,919	5,717,448	9.08
Nebraska	92	7,419	8,808	880,308	10,562,523	12.00
Nevada	------	------	------	------	------	------
New Hampshire	10	447	447	11,768	$156,255	$13.28
New Jersey	16	1,081	1,086	50,041	876,807	17.52
New Mexico	23	3,510	4,382	866,798	7,067,010	8.15
New York	53	9,683	9,790	508,358	6,493,472	12.77
North Carolina	99	7,831	8,067	271,207	4,123,337	15.20
North Dakota	53	12,291	15,600	2,704,754	27,053,169	10.00
Ohio	88	8,959	9,195	524,785	9,044,126	17.23
Oklahoma	77	16,974	19,851	1,491,328	15,977,045	10.71
Oregon	33	2,315	2,534	236,350	3,349,088	14.17
Pennsylvania	66	7,375	7,488	373,093	5.758.347	15.43
Rhode Island	3	4	4	62	1,233	19.89
South Carolina	46	11,891	12,237	637,943	8,146,954	12.77
South Dakota	67	10,962	13,843	1,807,541	18,551,872	10.26
Tennessee	94	7,983	8,327	499,366	7,483,892	14.99
Texas	239	33,778	40,578	3,667,420	39,006,980	10.64
Utah	22	972	1,104	237,675	2,049,973	8.63
Vermont	14	989	995	32,523	429,721	13.21
Virginia	95	2,432	2,478	117,228	1,869,921	15.95
Washington	38	2,260	2,768	340,185	4,334,449	12.74
West Virginia	51	1,820	1,859	59,208	893,610	15.09
Wisconsin	71	12,662	12,913	763,468	10,511,801	13.77
Wyoming	16	554	624	124,767	1,087,847	8.72
United States	2,873	306,182	337,887	28,659,973	339,546,341	11.85

[1] All data are as reported July 15, 1960, and are cumulative for all 1956-60 contracts in force at that time.

[2] Net disbursements are somewhat less than obligations due to violations, penalties, and terminations. Due to controversies surrounding such cases some disbursements and penalty refunds are not resolved for several years.

TABLE 2.—*1956-61 conservation reserve program: Estimated reserve acres for which contracts expire each year, by States* [1]

State	Acres released as of Dec. 31—										Total acres in reserve
	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	
Northeast area:											
Connecticut	119	29	2,838	619	36	13	53	513	461	------	4,681
Delaware	356	95	8,662	3,023	92	352	166	5,053	524	------	18,323
Maine	7,725	8,148	19,339	16,584	173	1,636	8,586	31,740	27,867	756	122,554
Maryland	7,694	2,660	43,638	13,093	185	914	1,010	10,674	4,724	------	84,592
Massachusetts	73	28	1,254	380	27	25	10	455	442	------	2,694
New Hampshire	28	25	1,307	509	------	40	177	5,116	4,561	------	11,763
New Jersey	2,367	1,297	26,260	14,675	29	249	86	2,134	2,086	------	49,183
New York	29,741	15,657	147,679	75,619	1,111	5,340	7,267	107,372	106,467	6,084	502,337
Pennsylvania	16,336	7,926	150,697	82,492	615	1,713	2,491	50,236	53,602	54	366,162
Rhode Island	18	------	11	25	------	------	------	8	------	------	62
Vermont	31	44	4,011	2,497	220	155	1,359	13,398	10,946	------	32,661
Virginia	8,173	1,436	42,838	22,567	1,178	1,496	1,106	22,921	13,600	------	115,315
West Virginia	1,260	808	22,424	11,305	292	79	1,429	13,438	7,240	------	58,275
Southeast area:											
Alabama	8,148	3,534	81,911	40,292	382	17,911	29,982	133,577	92,198	------	407,935
Arkansas	25,351	19,888	198,871	83,136	1,338	7,494	24,827	159,785	77,700	------	598,390
Florida	6,924	3,170	12,818	18,653	256	38,851	21,543	68,439	58,554	------	229,208
Georgia	16,543	11,774	103,699	71,539	1,508	74,366	152,108	372,116	255,410	------	1,059,063
Louisiana	4,011	2,258	54,528	26,942	444	6,884	30,158	69,013	24,825	------	219,063
Mississippi	27,542	21,432	127,253	28,672	1,071	12,309	14,980	65,489	25,297	191	324,236
North Carolina	3,851	3,433	70,423	59,613	309	12,858	15,457	73,354	30,337	------	269,635
South Carolina	9,367	4,898	54,759	54,921	456	21,649	60,761	201,100	227,950	------	635,861
Tennessee	12,994	12,585	152,556	78,738	1,468	8,472	14,323	134,003	80,738	------	495,877

See footnote at end of table.

Table 2.—*1956–61 Conservation reserve program: Estimated reserve acres for which contracts expire each year, by States* [1]—Continued

State	Acres released as of Dec. 31—										Total acres in reserve
	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	
Midwest area:											
Illinois	11,835	2,846	275,624	87,183	918	2,032	749	43,734	11,445	345	436,711
Indiana	18,251	4,332	267,069	118,895	4,290	1,169	437	54,322	24,520	----	493,285
Iowa	47,804	13,789	372,195	168,150	2,308	1,026	942	34,998	17,019	----	658,231
Kentucky	8,726	3,949	168,804	68,802	1,085	1,349	2,218	99,962	32,911	----	387,806
Michigan	38,913	15,614	286,739	162,434	1,410	8,100	5,330	95,804	93,726	----	708,070
Missouri	33,645	30,727	283,410	160,507	2,095	5,568	4,270	221,317	87,323	----	828,862
Ohio	21,504	6,663	246,321	140,062	1,010	1,254	792	50,552	48,411	50	516,619
Wisconsin	42,657	14,004	306,083	171,622	1,026	11,831	6,927	105,678	88,987	105	748,920
Northwest area:											
Idaho	13,397	6,421	93,620	44,255	2,507	6,535	1,485	83,748	39,347	225	291,540
Minnesota	194,766	167,131	607,352	186,368	8,894	189,556	136,809	304,267	105,984	2,049	1,903,176
Montana	29,988	14,503	142,191	59,587	2,921	13,891	14,450	224,883	124,989	----	627,403
Nebraska	42,435	17,022	349,887	144,540	2,488	10,124	7,396	218,394	83,839	----	876,125
North Dakota	199,662	130,617	513,792	402,433	8,316	199,864	129,771	571,752	548,512	----	2,704,719
Oregon	19,066	10,365	84,959	36,372	1,418	8,987	6,453	40,714	24,735	----	233,069
South Dakota	151,661	85,374	410,602	335,511	5,911	54,448	37,831	425,490	315,245	----	1,822,073
Washington	9,860	13,761	114,268	45,332	3,871	3,056	10,971	95,616	39,299	----	336,034
Wyoming	14,322	2,935	32,503	10,756	----	3,827	1,396	44,342	14,325	----	124,406
Southwest area:											
Arizona	4,676	477	438	----	----	1,739	431	----	----	----	7,761
California	16,223	7,470	89,546	36,586	3,103	1,801	1,427	32,937	11,740	----	200,833
Colorado	99,576	40,891	137,784	30,497	3,434	178,528	82,845	604,114	122,212	----	1,229,881
Kansas	72,390	79,120	344,243	110,378	11,179	78,191	94,193	412,997	247,283	----	1,449,974
Nevada	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
New Mexico	85,986	14,211	13,813	470	251,424	308,208	113,288	77,559	360	----	865,319
Oklahoma	136,561	83,952	334,079	155,760	4,938	129,087	81,612	341,844	225,842	----	1,493,675
Texas	647,503	205,321	644,624	255,606	211,250	495,680	220,696	697,746	276,691	----	3,655,117
Utah	22,352	6,399	44,201	13,955	841	45,293	10,077	66,858	24,089	----	234,065
United States	2,172,411	1,099,019	7,491,923	3,651,955	547,827	1,973,950	1,360,675	6,489,562	3,714,363	9,859	28,511,544

[1] Based on report from Data Processing Center of contracts on record Jan. 1, 1961, derived by dividing annual payment for each year of expiration for each State by the State average rental per acre for all land in the reserve in 1961.

Table 3.—*Conservation cover with cost-share assistance required under contracts in force July 15, 1960, by States, with total completions as of that date*

State	Conservation cover required to be established with cost-share assistance on contracts in force July 15, 1960 [1]						Estimated U.S. cost-share payment, dollars [2]
	Grass and legume cover, acres	Tree cover, acres	Ponds		Wildlife cover, acres	Acres flooded for wildlife	
			Number	Acres			
Alabama	165,713	218,670	112	313	1,544	25	4,162,144
Arizona	7,751	----	----	----	----	----	63,164
Arkansas	298,388	97,146	125	1,852	912	1,347	2,545,786
California	90,891	25	5	6	1,599	2,355	1,005,863
Colorado	1,272,902	826	19	35	278	20	4,840,411
Connecticut	930	312	1	1	10	----	20,713
Delaware	11,824	756	6	4	160	1	183,486
Florida	52,701	164,053	4	13	683	----	1,877,263
Georgia	308,254	694,938	85	261	2,101	9	9,827,906
Idaho	237,718	1,488	3	4	404	100	1,262,424
Illinois	329,838	4,188	99	146	2,915	----	2,901,737
Indiana	267,784	2,467	123	343	6,493	96	3,050,148
Iowa	265,715	4,616	152	633	22	----	1,708,839
Kansas	1,358,584	420	38	52	141	195	14,274,176
Kentucky	230,986	4,297	575	756	494	----	4,468,618
Louisiana	57,776	88,544	98	1,374	264	547	776,307
Maine	33,427	17,093	----	----	----	----	1,209,088
Maryland	27,059	3,366	27	25	6,021	3	448,183
Massachusetts	342	429	----	----	67	----	20,276
Michigan	148,791	31,005	45	254	4,496	115	3,271,989
Minnesota	1,160,396	28,337	3	4	124	65	6,816,070
Mississippi	192,957	65,153	24	287	1,043	111	2,021,735
Missouri	474,292	2,915	2,257	3,877	186	2,448	11,596,850
Montana	559,789	1,235	3	7	255	----	1,769,573
Nebraska	685,207	962	13	31	132	----	4,580,203
Nevada	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
New Hampshire	99	4,651	22	37	1	1	124,121
New Jersey	23,898	438	4	4	174	----	517,304
New Mexico	862,503	----	----	----	----	----	4,323,124
New York	90,370	54,088	789	1,176	306	64	3,363,048
North Carolina	74,941	108,275	391	506	1,214	19	2,714,683
North Dakota	2,371,335	5,366	1	2	76,238	871	11,374,286
Ohio	154,181	2,468	259	517	21,174	51	2,319,089
Oklahoma	1,293,390	2,312	75	179	56,463	46	8,862,142
Oregon	148,829	5,973	14	20	5,214	556	1,332,536
Pennsylvania	49,484	11,558	87	198	285	3	1,208,859
Rhode Island	25	----	----	----	----	----	408
South Carolina	135,948	360,669	52	89	830	2,173	4,506,844
South Dakota	1,432,344	2,853	19	12	13,775	32	9,347,443
Tennessee	315,585	47,717	754	1,208	555	565	4,929,877
Texas	3,078,884	65,782	182	185	41,654	----	21,343,535
Utah	213,958	72	----	----	----	----	935,676
Vermont	90	11,657	38	51	----	4	281,877
Virginia	25,354	14,370	26	55	331	6	581,777
Washington	180,141	3,771	5	15	54,734	243	1,483,841
West Virginia	4,748	4,376	52	88	44	1	186,221
Wisconsin	228,235	28,829	18	46	1,744	27	1,942,290
Wyoming	91,939	74	----	----	----	----	235,175
Total [1]	19,016,296	2,168,540	6,605	14,666	305,080	12,099	166,617,108

[1] These columns exclude 7,143,292 acres of land in satisfactory cover when contract was signed or for which cover is established at no cost to this program.

[2] Items for each State reflect latest available estimate with adjustments for costs which have been found to be lower than original estimates.

THIRD-CLASS MAIL

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Glenn] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, there have been a good many statements to the effect that people do not like third-class mail. It is also argued that nobody responds to the sales messages contained in the 18 billion pieces of third-class mail handled annually by the Postal Establishment. These arguments are pure poppycock.

As my colleagues may know, Atlantic City is a depressed labor area. The people of Atlantic City are proud to have in their community an outstanding mail order operation, Spencer Gifts. This company employs between 150 and 400 people during the year. The postal bill of Spencer Gifts is almost $1 million annually and is by far the largest customer of the post office in Atlantic City. The fact that this company sells merchandise having a value of almost $6 million each year certainly gives the lie to the statements of those who charge that nobody reads or responds to third-class mail. Spencer Gifts is a catalog house and gives full value to its many customers. The products sold through its catalogs are purchased from business firms in almost every State of the Union.

As Postmaster General Day, himself, has pointed out in press conferences, the rate of postage for third-class mail has advanced 150 percent since 1952. The Congress has legislated three increases on this category of mail in the short period of 10 years; one in 1952, another in 1959, and the last in 1960.

I firmly believe that another increase in the bulk third-class mail rate would only serve to reduce the volume of such sales literature and cause a drop in sales, something neither I nor the administration wants.

The committee bill raises various third-class rates to a sufficient degree. I do not believe we should vote for the administration substitute bill which would increase third-class mail rates even further.

The Commerce Department was supposed to conduct a survey to determine the impact on bulk mailers of the 1960 rate increase.

This has not been done.

In view of this failure on the part of the businessman's arm of Government to advise the Congress of the probable impact of another rate increase, I do not believe we would be acting responsibly if we approved the administration's substitute bill.

I will vote for the committee-approved bill and against the administration substitute.

DISABILITY INSURANCE BENEFITS

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, there is at present a requirement in the social security law that a person must be disabled for 6 months before he can be paid disability insurance benefits. The purpose of this requirement is to allow time to clear up those conditions which are essentially temporary or to allow time to show improvement in order to determine whether or not the individual will recover.

Certainly it is wise to ascertain as clearly as possible whether an injury will result in a permanent disability before benefits are paid. However, there are certain cases in which the permanent nature of the injury is obvious from the start. For example, in cases where an arm or leg is amputated, there is no doubt that the injury is permanent and that disability benefits are in order. However, under the present law no exception to the rule is made and a 6-month wait is required.

Mr. Speaker, the disability is hard enough to bear, but the attendant financial hardship to the injured person's family makes the situation even more unbearable. In instances where the nature of the injury is clear and there is no doubt that payments will eventually be made, the 6-month waiting period is unjustified.

I have therefore introduced a bill to give the Social Security Administrator authority to remove the 6-month waiting period in cases where the severity of the disability is immediately determinable. I hope that the House will see fit to act favorably on this measure, thereby allowing relief to those whose suffering is needlessly compounded by provisions of present law.

THE REMEDY FOR DEFICITS IS SIMPLE: JUST SPEND LESS

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. GARLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. May Craig, Washington correspondent for the Gannett newspapers, of Maine, has a national reputation for her shrewd reporting and analysis of the news in today's fast-moving world.

In the Sunday, January 21, 1962, Portland Sunday Telegram and Sunday Press Herald, Mrs. Craig discusses Federal spending. She concludes by saying:

> It's simple, my friend—don't spent more than you take in.

So my colleagues may have the opportunity to study this penetrating column by Mrs. Craig, I include this article in the RECORD:

THE REMEDY FOR DEFICITS IS SIMPLE: JUST SPEND LESS

(By May Craig)

WASHINGTON.—It's not just the $93 billion budget the President has sent to Congress; it's the President's request for a $10 billion increase in the national debt limit past the present $298 billion that raises the blood pressure of conservatives. Year by year the national debt increases; year by year we pay out several billions in interest; year by year we run a deficit. We spend more than we take in. When Roosevelt came in he talked about how many governments are wrecked on the rocks of loose fiscal policy. He came in at the depth of the great depression and he had to spend for relief and recovery, and we have been spending ever since, under Democratic Presidents and the one Eisenhower Republican interlude.

There is one simple remedy for deficits—spend less than you take in. Kennedy talks about a balanced budget, as others have, but, in all the maze of figures and the false way we have of reporting actual spending, the public has no idea where it really stands.

Democratic Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virgiana (often called a Republican who lives in Virginia) is chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. Very conservative, he is out of tune with Democratic spending. The increase in the debt must come first from the House, where all money bills (tax and appropriation) must originate, but BYRD is extremely important in what the Senate does and no bill can become law without both Houses. The Senator says he is willing to go along with an increase in the debt limit to $300 billion right away, because by the first of March, not 6 weeks away, we won't have enough money to pay our bills.

What a thing to have to tell Congress. The President told the leaders of both parties when they went down to the White House just before Congress met. We were not told by the White House that this is what the leaders were told, in the watery-say-nothing statement they gave out. But we hotfooted it to the Capitol and they told us there. There is so much more secrecy now about Government affairs, I don't know what we would do if we did not have Members of Congress to tell us.

This financial situation of our Government disgraces us internationally; we were so bad off a few months ago, with the drain on our gold and its consequences, that we had to ask help of our friends and allies. That makes them mistrust our financial stability, and how much they can depend upon us. What do you think they think now—when the President says we can't pay our bills, a couple of months from now, unless Congress lets him borrow a lot more?

When you keep on spending more than you take in and have such enormous debt, you just are not solvent. We are a capitalistic system. We rest on financial solvency. Dollars are part of our political bible. What do you think the Comunists are saying about the capitalistic system we are trying to get the rest of the uncommitted world to adopt? Senator BYRD is going to let the debt go up the necessary $2 billion, but he says he is going to have a sweeping investigation of our whole financial situation—and a good thing, too, and long overdue.

Senator DIRKSEN, the Senate GOP floor leader, is going along with BYRD on this. Incidentally, the "EV and CHARLIE" show is on again for the congressional season. This is Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, and Representative CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana, GOP House floor leader. Every Thursday when Congress is in session they have a press conference and it is so interesting, so sharp, that radio and TV cover it faithfully. They are both picturesque and informed speakers and they do not pull any punches, so reporters flock in to the show—which is in the old Supreme Court room in the middle of the Capitol, between the two Chambers.

The GOP is going to pick on spending and on foreign aid, billions of it, year after year, to friend and foe. They are going to ask what good it does us to help other countries, if we "go broke" ourselves. They are going to pick on the President's proposals for free lunches for school children all over the world. They will say these philanthropic schemes sound fine and may be very humane, but we can't afford to keep on carrying the world on our financial back—because that back is broken—when the President says we can't pay our bills in March if he doesn't get $2 billion more on the debt limit, and $8 billion more in the next fiscal year—then the Nation, as well as J.F.K., has a bad back.

We are all guilty together in this spending; everybody wants some of the Federal funds. But the President has the responsibility for the Federal spending. Everybody is willing to spend for defense, though the GOP and some Democrats are criticizing the President's demand for $4 billion of the $40 billion to land on the moon. "Is this trip necessary?" many Congressmen ask. Defense men say "Yes." The idiotic spending for agricultural surpluses and giving it away to everybody, friend and foe, is another thing Senator BYRD wants to ask about. It's simple, my friend—don't spend more than you take in.

VFW: GUANTANAMO BASE

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing awareness throughout the Nation that the fall of Cuba into the Red orbit has created a threat to the security of the United States, the Americas, and the Western Hemisphere which is unprecedented.

The rise of Castro and his Communist regime in Cuba, and Castro's public oath of allegiance to the Kremlin underlines the deadly seriousness of what is going on on that island so close to the United States.

These are indeed days requiring sound thinking on the part of our citizens. Our Nation must fully understand, not only the course of events in Cuba, but what these events mean in terms of our national security.

In view of this funamental requirement for strong and clear thinking concerning Cuba, I recommend to the membership of the House an article, "Course of Events Supports VFW's Cuban Position," by Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, USMC, retired, director, national security and foreign affairs, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in the Illinois VFW News of January 1962.

The Illinois VFW News is the highly regarded official publication of the Department of Illinois, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and is printed under the supervision of Department Commander Arthur J. Muller. The editor of the Illinois VFW News is Mr. Francis J. Arnold, adjutant of the Illinois VFW.

The article, I would point out, accurately reflects the views of Mr. Robert E. Hansen, commander in chief of the VFW. Commander Hansen recently returned from the Caribbean area, and a visit to the U.S. base at Guantanamo.

This article emphasizes the reasons why the U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo Bay is so vital to the United States. Not only is it of strategic importance, but, as the article explains, a determined U.S. position with respect to the Guantanamo Base is necessary because the base is, in the eyes of all Latin America, a symbol of how the United States is going to react to Castro's threats and pressures.

I believe that it is also significant, as the article points out, that the Cuban Government is creating a Communist no man's strip completely around the boundary line on the U.S. base at Guantanamo. Obviously, Castro expects that there will be eventually a flow of refugees from his police state to the sanctuary of the American base. He is taking this means to isolate the base and to block the refugees. As the article points out, it is only logical to expect that communism, both in Cuba and elsewhere, is going to increasingly demand the ousting of the United States from the Guantanamo Base. This VFW article, in setting forth the vital strategic facts with respect to the U.S. base at Guantanamo, performs a highly useful service to our Nation. It is another example of the manner in which the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States contributes so greatly to an understanding of our national security and foreign problems and thus helps strengthen our Nation.

In addition, I would like to invite attention to the fact that, as the article indicates, the disastrous course of events in Cuba were not only foreseen by the VFW, but the Veterans of Foreign Wars actions recommended through the mandates of the VFW national convention in Miami Beach in August of 1961, are completely justified by events as they have developed. Such farsightedness in national security and foreign affairs is indeed a rare occurrence, and the VFW is indeed to be congratulated.

The article, from the Illinois VFW News, follows:

COURSE OF EVENTS SUPPORTS VFW'S CUBAN POSITION—DELEGATES AT MIAMI BEACH ACTED WISELY

(By Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, director, national security and foreign affairs)

The disastrous course of events in Castro's Cuba continues to underline the farsightedness and wisdom of the national security and foreign affairs resolutions adopted by the 1961 VFW national convention.

At the time of the convention, it will be remembered, there were all too many Castro apologists in this country who were contending that Castro really was not a Communist, but a well-intentioned—if eccentric—reformer and humanitarian.

This, of course, had the all too familiar ring of the previously discredited claim that "the Red Chinese really were not Communists, but just agrarian reformers."

The VFW can take a real sense of satisfaction in that it was never misled as to the actual Communist nature of the Red Chinese. As events have proved the VFW was certainly not misled with respect to Castro and his bearded henchmen.

RECALL RESOLUTIONS

Castro's public pledge of allegiance to the Kremlin, world communism, and Marxism-Leninism establishes, beyond all doubt, the validity of the VFW resolutions urging a resolute and strong U.S. policy against the Red Cuban regime. These resolutions, by way of summary, call for strict application of the Monroe Doctrine; opposing financial or material aid to Cuba directly or indirectly through the economic development activities of the United Nations; also that the United States maintain its base in Cuba "at all costs."

These resolutions reflect a keen awareness on the part of the VFW as to the mortal danger posed by a militantly Communist government 90 miles from the United States.

The strategic implications of a Kremlin-allied government in Cuba are truly tremendous. There is very good reason to believe Red control of Cuba is the most fundamental specific threat to U.S. national security since the founding of our country. Following are two specific examples of the soundness of the VFW mandates regarding the Cuban problem:

1. Tractors for Castro. Some several months ago a deal was in the making to trade tractors for Castro's prisoners. Resolution No. 128 of our 1961 convention resolved that "We go on record unalterably opposed to giving aid to the dictator, Fidel Castro, in the form of loans, tractors, bulldozers, or any type of equipment." The VFW realized that such heavy engineering equipment could be used for military purposes just as well as for working in the canefields.

NEW DEATH STRIP

At this very moment the Cuban Government is clearing and leveling a Communist-styled no man's strip completely around the boundary line of the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo Bay. This is the same kind of "death strip" with which the Kremlin has scarred so much of central Europe. U.S. personnel who have had a chance to examine the bulldozers doing this ominous job around the Guantanamo base for the Red tyranny report they are of U.S. make. Undoubtedly these "dozers" were obtained by round-about, tricky deals, and reshipment. But, had Castro been successful in getting the hundreds of tractors he was dickering for, he would have had a much larger supply of this equipment for advancing his program of communization and oppression.

2. Retaining the U.S. base at all costs: This underlines the VFW's appreciation of the importance of the Guantanamo Bay naval base not only strategically, but also as a symbol of U.S. determination not to knuckle down in the face of Castro's threats and pressures. Also, this portion of Resolution No. 128 makes it abundantly clear that the VFW fully rejected the dangerous views that the U.S. base at Guantanamo Bay has "lost much of its strategic value." With a Red Cuba giving communism a position from which to jeopardize the Caribbean and place the Panama Canal in peril, the U.S. Guantanamo base today has an importance greater than at any time in history. It is vital to the security of the United States and the free world. To turn it over to world communism would be, on our part, an act of national suicide.

WILL CITE PRECEDENT

This issue of Guantanamo Bay is going to become more heated as Castro exerts increasing pressure and international communism focuses its propaganda on U.S. retention of Guantanamo Bay. Needless to say, Nehru's shift from idealism to militarism in attacking the tiny Portuguese holdings on the coast of India will set a precedent for Communist propaganda's insistence that the United States be ousted from Guantanamo Bay.

Thus, events of the past few months have demonstrated the intrinsic soundness of VFW resolutions with respect to Cuba. It is only realistic to anticipate that the events of the next months—and probably years—will underline even more heavily how important are the policies advocated by our resolutions. These, as other VFW resolutions, merit the energetic support of our entire membership.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution, urging that the United States refuse to purchase United Nations bonds until other U.N. members have paid their share of the organization's expenses.

Sound reasoning alone should prevent Congress from complying with the President's request that the United States should purchase $100 million of a pending U.N. $200 million bond issue. We should certainly expect other nations to pay their share rather than be the fall guy, a role becoming increasingly uncomfortable.

This joint resolution would express the feelings of millions of Americans who are raising serious objections to the U.N. bond proposal.

Why should Uncle Sam be the usual patsy? Why should we pick up the tab for those U.N. members who do not pay their share?

The payment record of many U.N. members is so shameful that they could not get credit at a 5 and 10 cent store.

Of the $48,500,000 assessment levied for 1960's Congo operation, only $25,651,017.75 has been paid. Of that sum, the United States has paid its full assessment of $15,745,211, or three-fifths of the total paid by all nations. Sixty-four nations never paid a dime. The situation with the 1961 assessment of $100 million is even more dismal. Of this amount, only $49,275,727.60 has been paid. And, of this sum, Uncle Sam has paid his full assessment of $32,204,061, or two-thirds of the total paid by all nations. Seventy-eight nations never paid a cent.

Mr. Speaker, the U.N. Congo operation's deficit was so critical that Congress only last year appropriated an additional voluntary sum of $15,305,596—above our assessment of more than $32 million. The Congo deficit is not the whole story, either. The United States is one of few who paid its share of the Gaza Strip operation and 57 nations are in arrears in annual budget assessments.

Purchase of the bonds would increase our national debt as we are currently operating at a deficit. The U.N. bonds will pay only 2 percent interest. As the United States raises funds to buy the bonds, we will be paying over 3 percent interest on our national debt. What a swindle.

AMERICAN EMBASSY BUILDING AT KARACHI

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Monagan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was interested to read in the Congressional Record of January 22, 1962, the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins] concerning the agreement by the Government of Pakistan to contribute rupees for local labor toward the cost of constructing an American Embassy building at Karachi.

He went on to state that he was informed that this contribution constituted the only contribution of this type ever made by a foreign nation to the United States.

Without in any way detracting from the contribution of Pakistan—which we all applaud—I should like to point out that this contribution is not unique.

There is an example of even greater generosity in a somewhat similar contribution by the Government of the Netherlands Antilles. When our Foreign Operations Subcommittee visited Curacao in December of last year, we were entertained by the American consul general in the charming and beautiful consular building, Roosevelt House, at Willemstad. We were pleased and surprised to be told by the American consul general, Mervyn V. Pallister, that this lovely building had been constructed and presented to the United States of America by the Government of the Netherlands Antilles to express the appreciation of the people of these islands for the efforts of the United States in protecting their territory during World War II.

I am sure that the gentleman from Tennessee will welcome this addition to the Record. ●

CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Monagan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, last year Congress passed the Fulbright-Hays Act. This important legislation codified and gave vitality to the cultural and educational exchange program. This program is an important phase of our foreign policy operations and it is based on the assumption that the exchange between countries of scholars, artists, intellectuals, and national leaders will lessen the tensions between nations; will educate other nations in the virtues of democracy and will create an improved image of the United States abroad.

One of the most effective expounders of democratic values is Hal Holbrook, the noted actor famed for his re-creation of Samuel Clemens in his celebrated solo performance of "Mark Twain Tonight." Holbrook did yeoman work in bringing his famous character portrayal to many of the countries of Europe. He had marked success in places as widely separated as Belgrade, Yugoslavia and a small country town in Finland.

A very descriptive picture of Mr. Holbrook's visit by Dick Moore recently appeared in the magazine Equity and I append this article to my remarks because of its graphic picture of the beneficial effect of this particular cultural exchange program and its emphasis thereby of the value of the Fulbright-Hays legislation.

HAL HOLBROOK

When Hal Holbrook gives his celebrated solo performances of "Mark Twain Tonight" a note on the program precedes a list of 32 selections. The note reads: "While Mr. Twain's selections will come from the list below, we have been unable to pin him down as to which of them he will do. He claims this would cripple his inspiration. However, he has generously conceded to a printed program for the benefit of those who are in distress and wish to fan themselves." The program further speculates that of intermissions there will be "one or two, probably," and dismisses the dearth of music by explaining that "a trombone player was engaged, but is unreliable and should not be expected." Then, just in case the audience is under the impression that Mr. Holbrook is permitting himself to be pinned down after all, the pamphlet goes on to caution that it is not really "official" and that the program is subject to change.

One might assume from the foregoing that Hal Holbrook is loathe to commit himself. Not true. For this 36-year-old actor-monologist-writer-ambassador has, on an exhaustive tour of Europe under the auspices of the American State Department, committed himself deeply to the task of making Americans understood, and to an attempt at understanding people in other countries, too.

Hal Holbrook's living incarnation of Mark Twain was conceived in 1953, and, after a gestation period of 2 years, was delivered in 1955 without assistance in the Greenwich Village night club, Upstairs at the Duplex, where it remained and grew for 7 months. Off-Broadway, concert tours, record albums and a 22-week Broadway sellout followed. Among Mr. Holbrook's engagements was a guest appearance at an annual birthday party given for President Eisenhower by the White House Correspondents Association.

Prior to this impressive chain of events there had been 7 years of stock; a two-person repertory company (organized with his wife) which gave 800 performances of Shakespeare for students, and a list of television credits (including a running part on a soap opera) which is respectable but not imposing.

Soon to be seen on Broadway in "Do You Know the Milky Way?" Hal Holbrook still regards his tour for the State Department as the most personally satisfying engagement of his career.

"Question. It's been reported that you're abandoning your role as Mark Twain. Is that true?

"Answer. I don't intend to give it up until I'm dead. What I would like to do is a play or two occasionally and then go back to Twain. I think the danger in doing a character like Twain is when you run it for a long time you begin to lose your spontaneity.

"Question. Will you visit other parts of the world to represent the State Department?

"Answer. Yes, I think so. I've been asked to represent them in several parts of the world and I've also received some very good offers to appear commercially all around the world. And what I would like to do in 2 years if I can be lucky enough to get what I want in the interim, is to go away for 10 months with my wife and two children and make a slow journey completely around the world, which is what Twain did, you see. I would like to re-create his trip, but add a lot more countries to it.

"Question. On your recent tour for the State Department you were completely sold out in most cases. Had your European audiences heard of your success in the United States, and what kind of preparation was made for you?

"Answer. I'm a little unsure how to answer that. My impression is that they really hadn't heard of me in most cases. For instance, in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, and even Oslo, they hadn't heard of me. But they knew Mark Twain extremely well and that's what I think drew them into the theater. However, what seemed remarkable to me was that just a little advance publicity in the form of newspaper releases, telling the public who I was and that I had been successful with this Mark Twain show, drew a whole houseful of people. They had to turn them away in many cases. That indicates two things, I think: a tremendous interest abroad in Mark Twain—they read him fully as much as we do—and that those people will go to see a live American actor on the stage the way children go to the zoo to see strange animals. An American actor, especially in a straight nonmusical play, is a strange freakish animal to most Europeans. They haven't seen many of us. In some of the European cities I visited I was the first American actor in a nonmusical production to be sent abroad by our country in 15 years. Even in a city like Vienna.

"Question. You make a distinction between actors appearing in musical and nonmusical plays. Do you feel that a straight play represents our culture better? Does it offer better communication?

"Answer. Well, the reason I make this distinction is that we have sent 'Porgy and Bess' and 'My Fair Lady' on a jaunt to Russia and we have sent many musicians over there. But until recently, we sent practically no straight theater. As for the matter of communication, I feel very strongly, especially after having taken this trip, that we underestimate the power which straight plays performed by good American casts can have in the matter of communication with those people abroad. It is not only our Government that overlooks this but our theater people, too.

"Question. Not long ago you were quoted as saying that Twain's 'satirical roasting of American foibles was taken in good spirits by the audiences.' Is this 'satirical roasting' used in Iron Curtain countries to discredit the American society, or can audiences accept it for what it is—legitimate self-criticism?

"Answer. Do you know what I think? I think that people are far more similar than most of us realize. I had never been over there before, to Europe, except for one brief little jaunt. And, naturally, when I went behind the Iron Curtain I thought the first thing somebody would do would be to rush out onto the airfield, corral me, and try to make me into a Communist. Well, nobody tried to do that. As a matter of fact, they talked very little about politics. But when we criticize ourselves—not just to show what great fellows we are or how broadminded we are—but when we honestly criticize ourselves, especially with humor, I think it's the most disarming approach America can take with other people.

"Question. You think this is understood on all levels?

"Answer. Absolutely. Those people over there are just the same as we are. They're people, they grow up, they go to college, they go out and buy groceries, they have children, their families sit around and talk politics, theater, one thing or another. They are not dumb people and just because somebody tells them something it doesn't always mean they're always going to believe it. If they go to the theater to see an American production it means they're interested in seeing an American production. That's one step already. They have an inquisitiveness; they go there to find out something, and perhaps they go there to find out something they haven't quite been told yet. It's a very hard thing to explain to anybody, but people who go to the theater, they're not dumb. Twain did criticize himself, but on a universal plane. All the time that I was playing Twain, especially in the Iron Curtain countries, my whole motivation, the whole thought in my head was, 'I wonder if you're gonna get the real point here. I'm not just talking about myself and my country. I'm talking about the human race of which you are a member.' And I think people got that very, very much. Mark Twain is tremendously popular abroad. Well, why? He couldn't be popular abroad just because he wrote pretty stories about the Mississippi River. He's popular because he's a universal spokesman for the human race. And the human race is the same.

"Question. Did most of the people who came to see you speak English?

"Answer. Most of them, yes, but not all. It's so disheartening to try to convince people in this country—startlingly enough, people in the theater—that cultural exchange is worthwhile. They have the damnedest notions about it. They know they could do it better and that it isn't being done right. Really, they have the most narrow minded vision toward the theater's role in cultural exchange, just so narrow minded that it's very disheartening to talk to them.

"Question. Could you be more specific?

"Answer. Well, take the press when I got home. I could sense from the reporters a real skepticism. 'They really understood you, huh?' This is the first question. Americans cannot quite conceive of the possibility that other nations learn another language and learn it well. Of course people over there speak English, that is, educated people, and these are the ones who would naturally go to the theater. I talked with people over there who spoke English beautifully—not so often behind the Iron Curtain, but in countries like Norway, Finland, Germany and Austria, and Holland, my gosh, they spoke wonderful English. And my show isn't just in English, it's in the American idiom. Sure, they missed some things, but you know I got the biggest response I've ever had in Oslo, Norway. Laughs.

"Question. More so than in New York?

"Answer. New York, hell. Biggest response I've ever had anywhere.

"Question. Then they got some things that Americans didn't get?

"Answer. Yes they did. They got many things American audiences didn't get. I don't like to generalize and this was only one case, in Oslo. In Warsaw I got no response at all, but at the end of the performance they gave me an ovation which was the biggest ovation I ever had, so how do you figure it? They must have gotten something out of the show. I don't know what it was, it didn't seem to me like they were getting the jokes. But they got something. I thought they didn't understand a word; maybe they didn't.

"Question. Were you able to talk with your audiences after the shows were over?

"Answer. No, except those who came backstage or arranged parties. But I did do one thing which I think artists going abroad should do, and which the Government should make it possible for them to do when they are representing us in the cultural exchange program: I took my time. We have to make money in this country and since they pay about one-fourth as much abroad for a show as they would here, in order to even clear expenses over there it seems they have to schedule at least one show a day. Well, nobody can do a good job doing one show a day, traveling from one town to another. One of the benefits of the cultural exchange program is that there's a certain amount of financial support from the Government which enables you to take care of your obligations at home while you're away. But these tours should be constructed so that the artists involved can spend some time going to universities and talking to the students, or going to any kind of group to meet people, to talk. You don't know what a cow looks like till you see the cow, inspect his fur and everything. You have to know the details and, to me the most startling revelation of the whole trip was that those people are precisely the kind of people I know. They're me. I'm them.

"Question. Did they ask you many questions?

"Answer. Well, at first they asked a lot about Mark Twain and I was anxious to get over that and talk about America. The one idea that seemed to come up more than any was that American youths are beatniks in leather jackets—knife-carrying kids. They think this is about the norm. Long live Hollywood. And they almost always refer to the 'rich people' and the 'poor people' in America. Even in places like Finland, which is a great friend of ours, the newspapers refer to our rich people and poor people as though there's a tremendous distinction. Well, this distinction has gone somewhat out of fashion in the past 60 years, let's face it, and they don't know it overseas.

"Question. What fosters these misconceptions?

"Answer. If you want to know that, then ask yourself, 'What do I know about them? What do I think about them?' We are several thousand miles away from those people. What do we really know about them? We know a little bit about what we read in the newspapers, mostly the headlines on an article. But, what do we know about them as people? We have tremendous suspicion about them, suspicion which is heightened by the very sensitive international situation. But this suspicion is an outgrowth of ignorance. They are as ignorant of us as we are of them. The minute you learn something about a thing you're afraid of you're not as afraid of it again. You never will be. Well, it's the same between people. The kids at the universities with the marvelous faces, tremendously eager, bright, leaning forward with faces sticking out, you know, looking right at you. Interested, every one of them. Packed classrooms. Asking questions, wanting to know and, underneath it all, responding to a kind of underplayed humor more than anything else. I didn't give any speeches, I just kind of ad-libbed, you know. There was this one incident at the University of Zagreb, when I was talking to the kids there. They were great, their faces. I've talked to university kids in this country, too. Students are wonderful. Their minds are still open. You can still blow a little fresh air through the hole in their heads; they haven't corked it up yet, so there are possibilities, see? And these kids were asking questions.

"And there was this one kid—I found out afterwards they were going to keep him out of the room because he was strongly communistic—he was standing along the wall and he finally interrupted me and he said: 'Mr. Holbrook, what do the youths in America break windows with these days?' That kind of shocked everybody into silence. I said: 'Bricks, what do you use?' And they all laughed. I said, 'I've found bricks are as good as anything else to break windows with. I've done it with a baseball sometimes when I was aiming at the catcher and missed, but I found bricks are pretty good. Don't you find them pretty good, too?' Well, he looked sheepish and didn't say anything. The class was enjoying it. We were all enjoying it in good humor. I wasn't trying to make a speech. So then I went into a rather lengthy explanation about what it's like living in New York, what makes people break windows with bricks. I tried to make them conceive of New York City, conceive of a place where there are so many millions of people packed together in one small place, on top of each other where there's no room, no room for emotional outlets. Why do people break windows? No place to play; kids, you know, nothing to do. We rip down a lot of old homes, real, crummy slums, to try to clean up the city. We're all the time cleaning up the city, we're building new houses, developments, etc., trying to make better conditions. And some kid whose family can't get into the new housing development—or maybe his crummy tenement building was torn down to make way for this new place and he's had to move around the block and make new friends and pull up his roots—he goes by this housing development and they've just put in those nice clean windows in the new building and, boy oh boy, he picks up a brick and, boy, he sees how many he can bust. That's what I told them.

"Question. How did they take to that?

"Answer. They took to that fine. Then this boy interrupted me again and he said, 'Why don't they move to the suburbs?' And I thought, my God, he's been reading "The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit,' and I laughed and I said, 'We would love to get them to move to the suburbs. We would love it,' I said. 'But, you know, they won't go to the suburbs. People come to America in migratory waves. Every several decades we have a wave. Right now we have a wave of Puerto Ricans. A hundred years ago or a hundred and fifty we have a wave of Irish people, or German people. Right now we are in the path of a great wave of Puerto Rican people coming to live in our country. Where do they go? They go to New York City. We would love them to leave New York City and go outside. You know, we have across the Hudson River 3,000 miles of land that's practically unexplored. There's plenty of room for everybody.' Some girl in the third or fourth row started to grin and nod her head. I said, 'But you know of course it is very dangerous to go out there because you never want to get out in Wahoo, Nebr., or Seguin, Tex., or a place like that because you can't really call yourself safe. We still have Indian wars. There's a very vicious one going on out there now, but we don't tell about that sort of thing outside of our country because we don't want a bad name, but we're really fighting these wars very hard. And our beatniks, why, even in a civilized city like Wahoo, Nebr., why you can't walk down the street at 9:30 at night because you pass a bush and some fella' or some young kid will rush out with a big knife and slit you from ear to ear.' And then those students started to look at me. They didn't know whether to take this seriously or not. Some of them started to smile and others looked terribly serious and concerned. I said, 'Oh, it's very dangerous. You don't want to cross the Hudson River.' I said, 'My kid is 5 years old. I've given him for Christmas what he wants, which is a switchblade knife with a pearl handle on it. He's been using a wooden handle one now ever since he was 3 years old and he's got six notches in it. I think that's pretty damn good for a kid his age, don't you?' Then they laughed. They just burst out laughing. They're not dumb. They're no dumber than we are.

"Question. Why in Yugoslavia would they want to exclude a Communist student from your lecture?

"Answer. Well, it's a very simple and hospitable thing to do, and those people are very thoughtful. The people in Europe, I think, are generally far more thoughtful than we are, although I do think we would do the same thing in this country in a situation like that. This particular boy who started to heckle me had caused a lot of trouble before because he heckled visitors a great deal and they asked the cultural attaché at our Embassy in Yugoslavia whether he thought they ought to keep him out. Our man said, 'No, don't. Mr. Holbrook would want to have him there. He wants that. So, don't tell him anything about it.' And it all worked out beautifully. I was very impressed with the university. The head of the American literature department there is a wonderful man, the whole staff of the literature department was there. Poor, poor, crummy, crummy building. Awful, falling down building. Unbelievable. But they were packed in there and they were learning. They were really boiling with interest and energy, and when you arrive—hospitable. Well they invite you in to have a little slivovitz—this white gasoline they drink—and some of this coffee that would stand a cow up on its back feet, and they get you all in condition before they put you out in the room. They're very hospitable. They give you a lovely introduction. After it was over I stayed and talked. I have a nice picture you might want to use, incidentally, with the kids around me. Another point I wanted to make—Oh, yes. This kid, his young heckler, he said: 'Mr. Holbrook, you are an authority on Mark Twain. What do you think Mark Twain was criticizing in the book of the Connecticut Yankee? England or America?' And I could see what was on the other side of his brain with that particular question. I thought a minute and I said, 'That's a wonderful question. I don't think Mark Twain was criticizing Great Britain anymore than he was criticizing America or anywhere else, even over here, for instance. He was criticizing inhumanity to man, injustice, the subjugation of masses of people by a small group of people who took advantage of them, cruelty, meanness. He was satirizing all those things, and it seems to me that those aren't peculiar to England or America.' I said, 'You remember that scene where the king is out in disguise and he passes a long line of slaves all chained together going off to a kind of a work camp? Now that sort of thing has even happened over here in Europe. Hasn't it?' Nobody said anything so I said, 'No, he was just satirizing what he always satirizes, which is the human race.'

"Question. Do our films have much influence over there and, if so, what kind?

"Answer. God, we hear so much of this. I suppose the comments I'm going to make now, and the ones other people make, are just water off a duck's back. They don't seem to do a damn bit of good because everybody is so damned anxious to take care of themselves and get another car and all that sort of thing, washing machines and all—but it's true. There has got to be some sacrifice if you want democracy. Because it requires it. And those movies that we send abroad are not doing a very decent job of work for us. Now, the question arises, are they supposed to do a job of work for us? Well, no, it's free enterprise. The movies are made to make money and entertain people. But American movies are shown widely in other countries, and they create an impression of America which is not fair. They are too special. They deal with people who wear lovely clothes, go to nice night clubs, have wonderful cars, live in a very pretty home. You know how it is. You look at a film about a guy who's supposed to be earning about $6,000 a year and he's living in a place that looks like his old man must be giving him an additional $20,000 a year to make expenses. It's a little unrealistic. Now, naturally, to people who don't have that, there's a certain amount of resentment. People in Europe looking at that—they envy, they envy, and once you envy you dislike, you have fear, you have suspicion. And then of course so many of our movies deal with another specialty, which is violence, mobs, people shooting each other all the time.

"Question. In view of this situation, do you think that any kind of regulation by our Government in terms of what we do export in this especially critical time would be feasible or desirable?

"Answer. Well, this is a very complicated question and it's not easy to say what I think, but I'll try. Basically, I am completely against regulation by the Government of the affairs of the individuals who are called citizens of the United States. But there's no simple answer. It seems to me that our Government which is doing a good job under enormous circumstances, could do a better job in the area of culture and ideas. But in order to do that the Government has to have the urgency of the people's desire behind it, because the Government is us. And if people just don't give a damn, or if people don't inform themselves well enough about this historic war of ideas—which is and has been going on for several years now—if they don't, if we don't take this seriously enough, then we won't win it. The French people have great logic, you know, and one of their basic points of logic is that you have to give up something for everything you get.

"Question. You recently testified before Congress on a number of arts bills and told of your experiences abroad. Do you have any feeling about the temper of the legislative body in terms of its willingness to recognize the importance of ideas?

"Answer. Oh, yes. You know, it's amazing, life is such a revelation. Europe was a revelation to me, going to Washington to testify before a subcommittee was a great revelation to me. I knew, of course, that all Senators didn't wear string ties and act like buffoons and all that sort of thing. I knew that all of them weren't ignorant of the finer things in life. But it came as a considerable surprise to me to discover real earnestness, real desire to know and great sympathy for the information they had asked me to give.

"Question. Did you find this interest keenest among the Representatives of our so-called 'culturally oriented' regions?

"Answer. No. The subcommittee before which I appear is headed by a man named **Wayne Hays** from Ohio, from the poorest district of Ohio, the mining district. There was also Mrs. **Frances Bolton**, who is also from Ohio, from Cleveland, a more culturally minded place. There was also **John Monagan**, a Congressman from western Connecticut in the farming district, and there was also **Leonard Farbstein**, from 20th Street in New York City. Those four people represented a certain geographic spread and they were all very interested in seeing this bill get a proper chance. But in order to give it a proper chance to pass they need some facts. Now those people don't know much about the theater. God, you could put in a thimble what they know about theater. It does not make them ignorant; theater is not their job. They don't know—like the fuss that was raised over Helen Hayes earning $2,500 a week overseas, which she wasn't. They don't have any idea, for instance, that an actor or actress pays an agent a commission; that a person of Miss Hayes' stature, for instance, obviously must have a secretary to handle a great deal of mail; that she loses a lot of money on a trip like that; that some actors like myself have offices, if they've gotten into a position where they've got a lot of heavy paperwork; they have press agents to pay; that a person who makes a good amount of money in the theater has got to hire a good accountant, and they don't come cheap; and he's also got to have a smart lawyer; and by the time all these things are added up, plus other things that I haven't mentioned, it amounts to quite a financial obligation of which these people are unaware. Naturally, to them an actor is somebody that comes out and acts. He gets paid like a plumber, takes the money home and gives it to his wife, or spends it on sophisticated orgies. But, I'm very encouraged by Congress' interest in our cultural exchange. It's the people in the theater that need to be a little more intelligent about what our theater has to offer and why we should offer it to other countries.

"Question. What do we have to offer?

"Answer. We have the most vital, energized theater in the world. It's slightly disorganized, but maybe that's one reason it's got so much flair. But when we send plays abroad the purpose should be to show an honest picture of the American human being and to express the hope that he has and to show what's in his mind, how he thinks. And the beauty of this is that people abroad seeing a play in which these things are expressed are going to say 'My God, they're just like me.' Now this is not to underestimate the tremendous ideological differences which exist. But perhaps it's not necessary to go to war and destroy everybody just because you think differently. Perhaps there's room for differences of thought. If you like each other.

"Question. Did you find that there is as much utilization of self-criticism in the plays of other countries as there is here?

"Answer. I wasn't there long enough to find out. We saw classics, mainly, and in another language.

"Question. What about TV abroad?

"Answer. Well, I never saw any TV while I was abroad. I don't remember anybody asking me to see it, either.

"Question. Were they interested in our television?

"Answer. Interested, yes, but always in a kind of a critical way. I mean it came up in a lot of discussions.

"Question. How?

"Answer. 'TV watchers,' you know, 'TV viewers, married to television.' You see, they take the articles that we write about ourselves without the sense of humor that those articles sometimes have. This is one reason why we must send more plays over there. We must see those people face to face. We must show them there are various sides to our nature. I remember in Helsinki, at a big press conference we had there, this newsman was asking something about TV, bringing up the usual criticism of America, all a 'bunch of TV watchers.' He was asking me why I didn't want to do Mark Twain on television. That had apparently come out somewhere in the Finnish press. So I told him why: briefly, because I was afraid I couldn't do it the way I wanted to do it, and also that I didn't feel that television is theater, and that Mark Twain, as I do him, belongs to the theater. I have to have an audience. You can't call two or three people, one of whom has to go to the bathroom, an audience. So I told him these various things and blasphemed television a little bit just to show him there was at least one American who didn't love it. Told him that I took it away from my children. And this newsman back at the rear said, 'Mr. Holbrook, I wish my wife could hear you now.' And I said, 'Oh, my God, you've got one, too.' And he shook his head and said 'Yes.' So you see, it's universal. The only difference is we've got the money to buy more of them, that's all. The best way to defeat the rest of the world, to kill their spirit, is for us to send free television sets abroad. Oh, we'd capture them then. It's a funny thing about us. We think we're too commercial, they think we're too commercial. One of the reasons they're so convinced we're so commercial is that we're constantly telling them so. And then we're proving it by everything we do. But if we think we're too commercial, why in the hell don't we do something about it? Now, not next week. Maybe the truth is, we don't think we're too commercial. Maybe we love it."

It was 5:30 and Mr. Holbrook had to leave. "Of course as I walked down the street after our interview I thought of many things I should have said," he recalled a few days later. "One of them is this: I think every great star in our theater should take 1 year out of the peak of his career and go abroad in an American production. It would represent a large sacrifice to him financially; but it would reward him with perhaps the most satisfying experience of his life." This thought on the record, Mr. Holbrook left town again—this time it was Vancouver for a tryout of his play. For Mr. Holbrook (who, like Mark Twain, has used the incisive tools of his own imagination to carve his opportunity) was preparing to return to Broadway where, for the first time, he would star with someone else.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION—REPORT OF THE ADVISORY GROUP ON HIGHER EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, JANUARY 22, 1962

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, for the last 4 months five members of the House Education and Labor Committee have been studying the unmet needs of higher education in the United States in those fields which contribute most directly to our national security and economic growth, particularly engineering, medicine, and the sciences.

The members of this Advisory Group on Higher Education of the Committee on Education and Labor were instructed to undertake this study by the chairman of the committee, the Honorable ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, and were asked to prepare by the end of January specific recommendations for congressional action in the field of higher education.

As chairman of the Advisory Group on Higher Education, I am pleased to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the report of our group and to say that the five members of the group, three Democrats and two Republicans, are unanimously agreed on the recommendations contained in the report.

The other members of the group are: Representatives ROBERT N. GIAIMO, of Connecticut, JAMES G. O'HARA of Michigan, ALBERT H. QUIE, of Minnesota, and CHARLES A. GOODELL, of New York. Four of the members of our group visited the Soviet Union during the fall of 1961 for the purpose of observing the Soviet educational system.

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that our group profited a great deal from a series of informal discussions with leading members of the American scientific and university community as well as with representatives of professional associations and of Federal agencies concerned with higher education.

I would like to call particular attention to the recommendation of the advisory group for a program of Federal grants to the States for the establishment of technical institutes for the purpose of training engineering technicians at the college level. These semiprofessional technicians, who will have 2 years of college level education, are greatly needed to meet the needs of our economy and in particular to help fulfill our national commitment to the conquest of space.

The work of the advisory group has been carried out on a bipartisan basis and I hope that our unanimous recommendations will be considered in that light.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of our report, in the form of a letter to the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, be printed at this point in the RECORD:

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION FOR
HIGHER EDUCATION,
ADVISORY GROUP ON HIGHER EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., January 22, 1962.

HON. ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Advisory Group on Higher Education of the Committee on Education and Labor is pleased to submit this report of its findings and recommendations for congressional action on higher education. The undersigned Members of Congress are unanimously agreed on the recommendations contained in this report.

In response to your instructions, we have given special attention in our work over the past 4 months to the problem of identifying the unmet needs of higher education in the fields which contribute most directly to our national security and economic growth—especially in engineering, medicine, and the sciences. Four of the five members of the Advisory Group also visited the Soviet Union during the fall of 1961 for the purpose of observing Soviet higher education in action, particularly scientific and technical education.

We feel we profited greatly from a series of informal discussions with leading members of the American scientific and university community. As a result of our study, we are in agreement that action is required to meet the following major national needs in higher education and specialized manpower:

I. The training of greatly increased numbers of engineering and other semiprofessional technicians to fulfill our national commitment to the conquest of space, to staff our vital research and development projects, to make the best use of our limited supply of engineers and scientists and to fill the rising demand for highly skilled technical workers in industry and government.

II. The immediate start of construction of classrooms, laboratories and libraries to help provide for the doubled enrollments anticipated in our colleges and universities in this decade.

III. The production of many more, better trained, new teachers and the improvement in the effectiveness of present teachers in order both to meet rising enrollments and raise the quality of instruction in higher education.

IV. The provision of new forms of financial assistance for promising but exceptionally needy students and for incentives for outstanding academic achievement.

V. The effective stimulation of high-quality basic research on the learning process itself, an important field in which research results have been disappointing.

The Advisory Group therefore presents the following findings and unanimous recommendations for congressional action:

I. TECHNICAL INSTITUTES

Recommendation (1):

"That a program of Federal grants to the States be authorized to stimulate the establishment and expansion of technical institutes for the training of semiprofessional technicians at the college level; and

"That the Committee on Education and Labor conduct legislative hearings on this subject at the earliest possible date."

We are convinced the Nation faces an alarming shortage of semiprofessional technicians, which will become increasingly acute in engineering and space technology. Because professional engineers and scientists will be in extremely short supply for the foreseeable future, we must take steps now to insure that the limited number of engineers and scientists can be utilized as effectively as possible. We therefore believe that it is essential to make immediate provisions for a program to stimulate the training of greatly increased numbers of engineering technicians, with approximately 2 years of college level training, to assist our engineers and scientists and to multiply their effectiveness.

Experts maintain that we should be training at least one engineering technician for each graduating engineer. We are now producing only about one such technician for every four engineers. The problem has become even more serious in the past few months with the mounting of a full-scale project for a space flight to the moon. Members of the university and scientific community fear that in order to recruit enough engineers for this project alone, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration will be forced to raid the Nation's universities and industrial organizations. The required engineering technicians are nowhere in sight.

The Federal Government has done much over the years to support vocational education of less-than-college grade through such programs as Smith-Hughes and George-Barden, but these programs are not suited to meet the urgent new demand for widespread technical training at the college level.

(NOTE.—The Advisory Group feels that the area vocational programs established under title VIII of National Defense Education Act to provide vocational and technical training of less-than-college grade would be made more effective in producing industrial technicians and craftsmen if the phrases "highly skilled," "scientific knowledge," and "national defense" were removed from title VIII. Because the area vocational programs provide training of less-than-college grade, we feel they are unsuited to the production of semiprofessional technicians who require training at the college level.)

The Advisory Group believes that the best way of meeting the Nation's rising requirements for semiprofessional technicians is to expand existing or create new 2-year technical institutes at the college level, whether operated as independent institutions or by universities and community colleges, and that Federal funds are necessary to stimulate the development of these institutes. We believe it is important that professional societies should have a role in approving the programs of such institutes.

II. ACADEMIC FACILITIES

A. Grants and loans for construction

Recommendation (2):

"That a 5-year program of $300 million annually be authorized in grants and loans for the construction of classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and other academic facilities by public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education;

"That the available funds be allotted to grants and loans in the ratio of 70–30; and

"That 50–50 matching of grants be required."

The Advisory Group found great concern over the problem of financing the expansion of academic facilities in all types of institutions, large and small, public and private. In our opinion a Federal program of grants and long-term loans for academic facilities at colleges and universities is clearly justified and deserves immediate action. It should be noted that the recommended ratio of 70 percent for grants and 30 percent for loans is based on recent surveys of the relative need for each type of financing.

B. Science equipment

Recommendation (3):

"That the National Science Foundation program of grants to colleges and universities for undergraduate science teaching equipment should be expanded more rapidly and appropriations for NSF increased accordingly."

The Advisory Group found general agreement that science education in colleges and universities could be considerably strengthened if the institutions had more funds available for the purchase of modern science teaching equipment. The National Science Foundation already has a small grant program ($5 million in 1962; $7 million in 1963) in operation for this purpose, but authorities say that the available funds are seriously inadequate.

C. Language equipment

Recommendation (4):

"That authorization be made under title VI of National Defense Education Act to provide Federal grants to be matched equally by institutions, to colleges and universities for language teaching equipment and that the appropriation authorization for title VI be increased by approximately $5 million for this purpose."

There is ample evidence that many colleges and universities could do a much more effective job of teaching foreign languages if they had funds for tape recorders, listening booths, and other electromechanical aids which have been proved extremely useful in language instruction. National Defense Education Act title III provides such equipment for high schools, but not for colleges. The result is that many high schools are now better equipped to teach languages than are the colleges whose job it is to train language teachers for these high schools. If this situation is not corrected the colleges will continue to produce teachers who will require expensive retraining in language institutes. Title VI of National Defense Education Act provides Federal support for language and area centers, but there are only 45 of these and they teach only the critical languages, not the commonly taught ones like French, German, and Spanish. In 1959–60, an estimated 1,675 colleges and junior colleges were conducting language training programs, but only about 700 had any substantial language learning equipment.

III. SUPPLY AND QUALITY OF TEACHERS AT ALL LEVELS

A. National Defense Education Act graduate fellowships

Recommendation (5):

"That the national defense graduate fellowship program be extended for 5 years (to June 30, 1967);

"That the number of 3-year fellowships (or their equivalent in 1- or 2-year fellowships) authorized to be awarded annually be increased to 3,500;

"That eligibility be extended to 'underutilized' as well as 'new or expanded' graduate programs;

"That the cost-of-education allowance be a flat $2,500 (instead of 'up to');

"That the Commissioner be given the power to set stipends by regulation, to appoint substitutes when fellows die or resign, and to award 1- or 2-year fellowships when appropriate;

"That special consideration be given to the field of engineering, with support going to master's degree candidates as well as doctoral candidates."

The Advisory Group believes that the graduate education of the men and women who will be the new college instructors of the 1965–70 period deserves very high priority. Existing Federal fellowship programs are already helping to attract well-qualified students into the graduate schools for programs of study and investigation which lead to the doctorate and toward subsequent teaching or research. It is our view that a significantly larger program of assistance to graduate students is warranted. We believe particular emphasis should be placed on engineering because of the urgent need for master's degree engineers in industry and government and for doctoral degree engineers in college teaching.

We have noted that the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health and the Atomic Energy Commission already have flexible authority to determine the number and kind of their fellowship offerings, as well as to set the stipends thereof, in relation to the needs of the individual and available appropriations. The Office of Education, on the other hand, in administering its graduate fellowship program under title IV of National Defense Education Act, is restricted by existing law to a maximum of 1,500 3-year fellowships each year, with stipends specified by statute.

B. National Defense Education Act language programs

Recommendation (6):

"That the National Defense Education Act Language Institutes program be extended to college teachers and those preparing themselves for college teaching;

"That more language fellowships be awarded under title VI of the National Defense Education Act, particularly to present and future college teachers;

"That the annual appropriation authorization for National Defense Education Act, title VI, be increased accordingly."

The supply of well-trained college teachers in the field of language and area studies should be augmented, and the Advisory Group has recognized that a simple change in title VI of National Defense Education Act should do much to solve this problem.

C. Faculty development programs

Recommendation (7):

"That provision be made under National Defense Education Act for a program (similar to the present NSF science faculty program) of institutes, faculty fellowships, and visiting professorships to increase the effectiveness of college teachers in all fields; and

"That matching grants be provided to institutions of higher education for support of similar faculty development programs under institutional auspices."

The Advisory Group recognizes the need for further Federal programs for the purpose of updating and increasing the effectiveness of college faculty. The National Science Foundation has made great progress in meeting this problem with respect to college science teachers, but there is a need for similar programs in the humanities, behavioral sciences, and other fields as well.

The Advisory Group also finds that NSF is doing an excellent job of bringing high school science teachers abreast of modern developments through its summer and academic year institutes. Under National Defense Education Act, title VI, the Office of Education is also making great progress in retraining high school language teachers. The members of the Advisory Group regard these types of programs as extremely valuable and are pleased to note the recent indication that the administration shares our concern for improving the quality of education at all levels.

IV. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STUDENTS

A. Expansion of NDEA student loan fund

Recommendation (8):

"That the national defense student loan program under title II of National Defense Education Act be extended for a 5-year period through June 30, 1967;

"That the annual appropriation authorization for this program be increased from $90 million to $200 million; and

"That the ceiling on the annual Federal capital contribution to an institution's loan fund be raised from $250,000 to $750,000 or eliminated entirely."

The Advisory Group feels strongly that it is of great importance to the Nation to insure that all students with the ability to do college-level work have an opportunity to do so and that the talents of able students not be wasted because they lack the funds necessary to go to college. The Advisory Group believes it is extremely important not only to get able students into college but also to encourage outstanding academic performance by students in college.

The Advisory Group views the national defense student loan program as highly successful and believes it should continue to be the primary vehicle of direct Federal assistance to students. Discussions with panel members convinced the group that requests for loans from qualified and genuinely needy students will outrun available funds at most participating institutions under present appropriation authorizations and that considerably increased Federal contributions should therefore be authorized to meet the demand for loans anticipated over the next 5 years. The group also found evidence that the $250,000 ceiling imposed on the Federal contribution to the loan fund of a single institution was penalizing students at large institutions and agreed that the ceiling should be raised or eliminated.

B. Assistance to exceptionally needy students

Recommendation (9):

"That an institution of higher education may use up to 15 percent of the annual combined Federal and institutional capital contribution to its NDEA student loan fund to make financial assistance grants of up to $1,000 a year each to promising but exceptionally needy undergraduate students and that in order to insure that these grants-in-aid are awarded only to students who could not otherwise continue their education, no student shall be eligible to receive such a grant if the income and/or assets of such student and of his family or guardian exceed ceilings to be specified under regulations of the Commissioner of Education."

The Advisory Group has sought to find a way of helping promising young people from very low-income families who do not have the financial resources to go to college. Many students are helped by NDEA loans, but some able students from exceptionally needy families, particularly girls and especially in families where there are other children who must be supported, are unable to accept the risk and burden of substantial debt in order to continue their education. To meet their expenses these exceptionally needy students require grants-in-aid.

It is the opinion of the Advisory Group that the colleges themselves have the most experience in seeking out these students and evaluating their needs. The group feels that a program of grants-in-aid to exceptionally needy students should be made part of the National Defense Education Act student loan program. Including the grants in the student loan program would save administrative costs, allow the colleges flexibility in using loans and grants-in-aid in the combinations they deem most appropriate to their students' needs and would avoid any stigma that might attach to a separate scholarship program for the neediest. Accordingly, the group favors allowing participating institutions to use up to 15 percent of the annual combined Federal and institutional contribution to their loan funds for outright grants to promising and exceptionally needy students.

C. Incentives for academic achievement

Recommendation (10A):

"That an institution of higher education may cancel a portion of an undergraduate student's loan for any year or years in which his academic achievement is deemed outstanding under criteria established by the institution and approved by the Commissioner of Education provided that the total of such cancellations in any year does not exceed an amount equal to 10 percent of the annual combined Federal and institutional capital contribution to its National Defense Education Act student loan fund;"

In order to encourage academic achievement among college students, the Advisory Group favors allowing participating institutions to cancel a portion of some undergraduate student loans in recognition of academic excellence.

Recommendation (10B):

"That the provision for cancellation of up to 50 percent of a loan for public school teaching be eliminated with respect to all students whose first loan from a National Defense Education Act loan fund is received for an academic year beginning after June 30, 1962."

It is true that the Nation needs more teachers, but it also needs more doctors, nurses, social workers, engineers, and other trained persons. Forgiving the loans of all students who enter shortage or public-service occupations seems neither feasible, nor desirable and singling out public school teachers from other needed occupations is difficult to defend logically and may have the harmful effect of reducing the incentive for communities to raise teachers' salaries. Hence, the Advisory Group favors a phasing out of the teacher forgiveness provision of the National Defense Education Act loan program.

D. Special loan provisions for professional and graduate students

Recommendation (11):

"That the provisions of the national defense student loan program be revised so that all eligible students beyond the bachelor's degree level may borrow up to $2,000 in any one academic year to a total of $8,000, in addition to any borrowing they may have done as undergraduates;

"That loans to students beyond the bachelor's level be made repayable in equal annual installments over a 15-year period beginning 3 years after the borrower ceases to be a student."

In view of the urgent national need for doctors, dentists, engineers, and many other highly trained professional persons and of the high cost to the student of advanced professional training, the Advisory Group favors increasing the amounts which can be borrowed under the national defense student loan program by students beyond the bachelor's degree level and also lengthening the repayment period for such students. (At present, no student may borrow more than $1,000 in 1 academic year, or more than $5,000 in total, and all loans are repayable over 10 years beginning 1 year after the borrower ceases to be a student.) Graduate students and professional students beyond the bachelor's level need more money than undergraduates, since their tuition is usually higher and since they are older and more likely to have dependents. Many professional students, especially medical students, have excellent future income prospects and will be able to repay substantial loans without undue hardship if the funds are made available to them and if they are able to spread the payments over a sufficiently long period.

V. BASIC RESEARCH TO IMPROVE LEARNING AND TEACHING

Recommendation (12):

"That the Committee on Education and Labor give special attention to ways of fostering high-quality basic research on the learning process with a view to improving the effectiveness of teaching and learning at all levels and that hearings be held on this subject at an early date."

The group found widespread agreement among the panelists that there is an urgent need for basic research in the learning process as distinguished from applied research in education. The resources going into basic research in education are insignificant compared to the resources going into research designed to improve health or physical standards of living. At least until very recently, basic research in the learning process has apparently not attracted the attention of the most able behavioral scientists.

The group is convinced that a major effort should be made to channel more resources into high-quality basic research in education. The Advisory Group hopes the committee will give special attention to this proposal early in the session.

The Advisory Group on Higher Education wishes to give special thanks to the persons from the university and scientific community who participated in our panel discussions. We wish also to thank the representatives of professional associations and Federal agencies whom we consulted during the course of our work. We also received valuable comments in response to a series of letters of inquiry sent out by the members of the Advisory Group to educators and scientists in their own regions.

The Advisory Group wishes to acknowledge the able staff work of its technical director, Mr. Wray Smith, and its administrative assistant, Mrs. Mary D. Pinkard; the helpful assistance of Mr. Melvin W. Sneed, of the staff of the Committee on Education and Labor, Mr. John R. Walsh, administrative assistant to Representative Brademas, and Mrs. Vivian Gordon, of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress; and the valuable advice of its expert consultants, Dr. Alice M. Rivlin and Mr. Nicholas DeWitt.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN BRADEMAS, *Chairman.*
ROBERT N. GIAIMO.
JAMES G. O'HARA.
ALBERT H. QUIE.
CHARLES E. GOODELL.

PANEL MEMBERS FOR THE ADVISORY GROUP ON HIGHER EDUCATION, DECEMBER 1961–JANUARY 1962.

H. Russell Beatty, president, Wentworth Institute, Boston.

Hilton C. Buley, president, Southern Connecticut State College, New Haven.

C. R. Carpenter, director, Division of Academic Research and Services, Pennsylvania State University.

John H. Fischer, president-elect, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Ralph W. Gerard, director of laboratories, Mental Health Research Institute, University of Michigan.

H. Bentley Glass, professor of biology, Johns Hopkins University.

Thomas S. Hall, former dean, College of Liberal Arts, Washington University, St. Louis.

Frederick L. Hovde, president, Purdue University.

J. R. Killian, Jr., chairman of the corporation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

George G. Mallinson, dean of the Graduate School, Western Michigan University.

Neal E. Miller, Angell professor of psychology, Yale University.

Paul C. Rosenbloom, professor of mathematics, University of Minnesota.

Paul A. Samuelson, professor of economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Theodore W. Schultz, professor of economics, University of Chicago.

E. A. Trabant, dean of the School of Engineering, University of Buffalo.

Byron K. Trippett, president of Wabash College.

M. H. Trytten, director, Office of Scientific Personnel, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C.

Randall M. Whaley, vice president, Wayne State University, Detroit.

Benjamin C. Willis, general superintendent of schools, Chicago.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FLYNT, for the balance of the day and tomorrow, January 24, 1962, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. FARBSTEIN (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI), for 15 minutes tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HOLLAND and include a speech by Mr. Carey, president of the IUEW, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $202.50.

Mr. **Roosevelt** and include extraneous matter.

Mr. **Dulski** and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. **O'Neill** and include extraneous matter.

Mr. **Philbin** and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. **Cahill**) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. **Dague**.

Mr. **Van Zandt** in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. **Libonati**) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. **Celler**.

Mr. **Daniels**.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 24, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS INCURRED IN TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by section 401(a) of Public Law 86–472, approved May 14, 1960, and section 105 of Public Law 86–628, approved July 12, 1960, require the reporting of expenses incurred in connection with travel outside the United States, including both foreign currencies expended and dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds by Members, employees, and committees of the Congress.

The law requires the chairman of each committee to prepare a consolidated report of foreign currency and dollar expenditures from appropriated funds within the first 60 days that Congress is in session in each calendar year covering expenditures for the previous calendar year. The consolidated report is to be forwarded to the Committee on House Administration which, in turn, shall print such report in the Congressional Record within 10 days after receipt. Accordingly, there is submitted herewith, within the prescribed time limit, the consolidated report of the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

There is also submitted a report transmitted to the Committee on House Administration by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service under date of January 19, 1962:

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. House of Representatives

[Expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961]

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Edward J. Derwinski:											
Holland	Guilder	94	26.79	106	30.21	101	28.79	31	8.84	332	94.63
Germany	Deutsche mark	114	29.07	48	12.24	44	13.22	16	4.08	222	58.61
France	Franc	194	28.80	148	29.60	40	8.00	18	3.60	400	70.00
Poland	Zloty	1,182	21.50	1,240	22.60	5,319	60.30	559	10.16	8,300	114.56
England	Pound	6½	18.33	1¼	3.50	5½	15.51	3¼	9.17	16½	46.51
Gordon L. McDonough:											
England	do	35–1–6	98.21	8–3–0	22.82	3–6–0	9.24	4–10–0	12.80	51–0–6	143.07
France	Franc	955.10	194.93	141.9	28.77	58–95	12.40	68.4	13.92	1,224.35	250.02
Albert Rains:											
Brazil	Cruzeiro	22,635.20	80.84	15,812.60	56.47			6,552.20	23.40	45,000.00	160.71
Argentina	Peso	3,508.50	42.53	2,660.63	32.26	1,100.00	13.33	3,133.67	37.98	10,402.80	126.10
Peru	Sol	950.40	35.45	377.60	14.08			325.00	12.13	1,653.00	61.66
Germany	Deutsche mark					2,909.20	727.30			2,909.20	727.30
Clarence E. Kilburn:											
Brazil	Cruzeiro	22,636.00	80.84	14,776.00	52.77	1,568.00	5.60	6,020.00	21.50	45,000.00	160.71
Argentina	Peso	3,238.00	39.25	2,887.50	35.00	1,100.00	13.33	1,608.75	19.50	8,834.25	107.08
Peru	Sol	1,043.80	38.93	390.75	14.57	958.45	35.75	164.00	6.12	2,557.00	95.37
Germany	Deutsche mark					2,909.20	727.30			2,909.20	727.30
Austria	Schillings	3,501.50	134.67	7,818.50	300.72			780	30.00	12,100.00	465.39
Robert R. Poston:											
Brazil	Cruzeiro	9,882.50	35.29	2,827.50	10.46	4,050.00	15.00	3,240.00	12.00	20,000.00	72.75
Argentina	Peso	3,474.08	42.11	2,505.52	30.37	1,704.45	20.66	1,773.90	21.52	9,457.95	114.66
Peru	Sol	631.50	23.55	355.65	13.27	2,278.85	85.00	524.00	19.54	3,790.00	141.30
Germany	Deutsche mark					3,444.00	861.00			3,444.00	861.00
Total			971.09		709.71		2,651.73		206.26		4,598.79

Brent Spence,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency.

Jan. 16, 1962.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, U.S. House of Representatives

[Expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1960]

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
August E. Johansen:											
Holland	Guilders					4,121.74	1,082.30			4,121.74	1,082.30
France	New francs	181.65	37.00	245	50.00	74.50	15.00	98	20.00	599.15	122.00
Austria	Schillings	1,560	60.00	1,040	40.00	260	10.00	390	15.00	3,250	125.00
Total			97.00		90.00		1,107.30		35.00		1,329.30

Tom Murray,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Jan. 19, 1962.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

JANUARY 11, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John J. Heimburger	Counsel	$8,772.00
Francis M. LeMay	Staff consultant	8,051.46
Christine S. Gallagher	Clerk	8,051.46
Hyde H. Murray	Assistant clerk	7,172.76
Lydia Vacin	Staff assistant	4,727.28
Betty M. Prezioso	do	4,727.28
Pauline E. Graves	do	5,854.62
Gladys N. Ondarcho	do	3,998.22
Peggy Jean Lamm	do	4,403.28
Jane C. Wojcik	do	3,593.16
Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies and Manpower:		
Martha S. Hannah	do	3,896.94
Haywood W. Taylor	do	3,306.22

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	15,579.02
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1961	17,482.15
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1961	33,061.17
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1961	16,938.83

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1962.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Kenneth Sprankle	Clerk and staff director.	$8,824.74
Paul M. Wilson	do	8,824.74
Carson W. Culp	Staff assistant	8,754.48
Samuel W. Crosby	do	8,754.48
Jay B. Howe	do	8,578.68
Ross P. Pope	do	8,578.68
Robert M. Moyer	do	8,578.68
Frank Sanders	do	8,051.46
Eugene B. Wilhelm	do	8,051.46
Robert P. Williams	Editor	7,260.60
Robert L. Michaels	Staff assistant	7,172.73
Aubrey A. Gunnels	do	6,909.12
G. Homer Skarin	do	6,337.95
Earl C. Silsby	do	5,634.96
Francis G. Merrill	do	5,634.96
Lawrence C. Miller	Assistant editor	4,605.78
Samuel R. Preston	Staff assistant	4,403.28
George A. Urian	Clerical assistant	3,188.10
James E. Moore	do	2,884.32
Stephen B. Miller	do	2,479.26
Randolph Thomas	Messenger	2,226.12
George S. Green	Clerk to the minority.	$8,051.46
Nancie Hammack	Clerk-stenographer	3,086.82
George P. Cossar, Jr.	do	3,086.82
Viola W. Grubbs	do	3,086.82
Jeanne C. Smith	do	3,086.82
Rosalind E. McGovern.	do	3,086.82
Suzanne S. Thomas	do	3,086.82
Patrick M. Hayes	do	3,086.82
Donald L. Bernard	do	3,086.82
Florence Pignone	do	2,681.76
Geraldine Watkins	do	3,086.82
William J. Neary	do	3,086.82
J. Suzanne Hubbard	do	1,517.80
Mary F. Wilson	do	2,884.32
Silas Taber	do	3,086.82
Robert Dunkel	do	3,086.82
Josephine Birdsall	do	3,086.82
David R. Hansen	do	3,086.82
Dorothy E. Sweeney	do	3,086.82
Ruth Mahder	do	3,086.82
Gayle C. Raver	do	2,985.56
John H. Murphy	do	2,884.32
William B. Gunger	do	1,475.40
Mary A. O'Connor	do	1,017.88
Elinor F. Bryson	do	96.42
Dorothy D. Borth	do	1,166.13
Catherine L. Kennett	do	1,290.27
Elinor L. Malaney	do	514.47

Amount of expenditures previously reported	----------
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1961	$211,689.49
Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1961	211,689.49

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1962.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(Investigations staff)

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Kenneth T. Delavigne.	Director, surveys and investigations staff.	$7,203.48
William B. Soyars	Assistant director, surveys and investigations staff.	7,203.48
Leonard M. Walters	do	6,944.28
Lillian M. Mackie	Stenographer	3,365.34
Helen C. Parrish	do	3,365.34
REIMBURSEMENT TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES		
Agriculture, Department of: Baldauf, T. M.	Investigator	$4,362.80
Atomic Energy Commission: Taylor, George C.	do	4,522.64
Bureau of the Budget: Miller, C. J.	do	2,328.49
Commerce, Department of:		
Jarvis, Leon H	do	3,207.95
Keister, Ralph H	do	1,606.28
McPherson, J. L	do	5,338.11
Shafer, W. S	do	1,236.00
Tiedeman, Hollie J	do	3,208.86
Corps of Engineers: Klein, Arthur A.	do	3,350.37
Federal Bureau of Investigation:		
Bennett, Carl L	Investigator	$993.60
Brent, Aubrey S	do	5,481.68
Bruninga, H. J	do	2,289.28
Chisholm, Leslie B	do	5,092.48
Cogan, J. P	do	2,931.12
Debuck, H. L	do	2,238.32
Feuer, Robert W	do	4,293.92
Foley, R. W	do	3,676.32
Franklin, R. M	do	2,695.12
Halstead, Rowland C.	do	4,579.08
Harman, R. V., Jr	do	2,448.88
Hayden, Albert C., Jr.	do	50.72
Hayes, Edward J	do	5,641.84
Health benefits fund		537.77
Herrington, R. B	Investigator	3,676.32
Law, W. C	do	3,380.32
Lewis, P. H	do	2,185.92
Life insurance fund		263.16
Lipscomb, Woodrow P.	Investigator	4,669.92
McDowell, L. L	do	2,336.32
McEliece, Richard F.	do	4,979.12
Mares, Bernard M	do	3,744.16
Martinson, Walter G.	do	5,415.12
Murphy, Peter J., Jr.	do	228.40
Neale, Alexander W., Jr.	do	4,736.48
Retirement fund		5,130.34
Roberts, A. J., Jr	Investigator	2,434.32
Wood, H. Branch	do	5,415.12
Federal Communications Commission: Thelemann, E. C.	do	1,246.26
Federal Trade Commission: Wagner, Winfield F.	do	1,136.08
Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of:		
Bing, Peter S	do	991.24
Garrison, L. A	do	4,159.98
Library of Congress: Rose, John K.	do	3,122.76
Navy, Department of the: Goode, S. O., Jr.	do	4,779.70
Post Office Department: Kopp, Robert.	do	2,278.17
Public Housing Administration: Altman, C. B.	do	3,742.40
Travel and miscellaneous expense.		45,554.57

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$550,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	----------
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1961	215,800.33
Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1961	215,800.33
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1961	334,199.67

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 2, 1962.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert W. Smart	Chief counsel	$8,824.74
John R. Blandford	Counsel	8,798.40
Philip W. Kelleher	do	8,798.40
Frank M. Slatinshek	do	8,227.20
Oneta L. Stockstill	Committee secretary.	4,676.70
Berniece Kalinowski	Secretary	4,676.70
L. Louise Ellis	do	4,676.70
M. Jane Binger	do	3,547.56
Edna E. Johnson	do	4,003.26
James A. Deakins	Bill clerk	3,547.56
Office of Special Counsel operating pursuant to H. Res. 78 and 79, 87th Cong.:		
John J. Courtney	Special counsel	8,824.74
William H. Sandweg.	Assistant counsel	6,975.00
Dorothy Britton	Secretary	4,403.28
Jane Wheelahan	do	3,456.42
Adeline Tolerton	Clerk	3,248.82
James Josey	Messenger	755.45

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	27,722.70
Amount expended from July 1, 1961, to Jan. 1, 1962	33,129.49
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1961, to Jan. 1, 1962	60,852.19
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1962	89,147.81

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1962.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert L. Cardon	Clerk and general counsel.	$8,824.74
John E. Barriere	Majority staff member.	8,824.74
Orman S. Fink	Minority staff member.	8,824.74
Robert R. Poston	Counsel	8,824.74
Helen L. Rogers	Deputy clerk	5,204.16
Mary W. Layton	Assistant clerk	5,204.16
Marguerite Bean	Secretary to chairman.	6,030.36
Alicia F. Shoemaker	Secretary to minority.	4,838.70
Roger J. Brown	Editor	6,004.02
EMPLOYEES PURSUANT TO H. RES. 143 SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING		
Kenneth W. Burrows	Housing economist	$8,249.16
John L. Fitzgerald	Attorney (Mar. 15 to Aug. 31, 1961).	1,604.76
Eleanor N. Hamilton	Research assistant	3,547.56
John J. McEwan, Jr.	Deputy staff director.	8,824.74
Grady Perry, Jr.	Clerk	5,854.62
Margaret E. Tucker	Secretary	4,307.04
Frances M. Yeakle	do	3,491.88

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$105,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	$38,858.10
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31	40,964.00
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31	79,822.10
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1961	25,177.90

BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman.

JANUARY 8, 1962.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
W. N. McLeod, Jr.	Clerk	$8,754.48
Hayden S. Garber	Attorney	8,056.46
Donald J. Turbridy	Minority clerk	5,713.92
Leonard O. Hilder	Investigator	5,942.52
Clayton D. Gasque	Assistant clerk	5,397.48
Ruth Butterworth	do	4,767.78
Ann L. Puryear	do	4,099.50
Ellen M. Coxiter	do	3,593.16
Lillian B. Hamilton	do	3,390.60
Patricia Ann Dempsey.	Stenographer	2,580.54

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$10,000.00
Total amount expended from July 1 to Jan. 1, 1962	206.33
Balance unexpended as of December 31, 1961	9,793.67

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
STANDING COMMITTEE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Louise Maxienne Dargans.	Chief clerk	$8,824.74
Russell C. Derrickson	Staff director	8,824.74
Wray Smith	Education chief	8,824.74
Howard G. Gamser	Chief counsel for labor-management.	8,824.74
Livingston L. Wingate.	Associate counsel for labor-management.	7,502.28
Teresa Calabrese	Administrative assistant to the chairman.	5,000.70
Richard T. Burress	Minority clerk	8,807.16
Melvin W. Sneed	Administrative assistant.	8,504.04
Louise M. Wright	do	4,251.36
Cabell Waller Berge	do	3,833.66

Amount of expenditures previously reported	$72,142.27
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1961	$73,198.16
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1961	145,340.43

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1962.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
(Investigating staff)

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
General Subcommittee on Education (Representative Cleveland M. Bailey, chairman):		
Salig L. Bendit	Assistant subcommittee clerk (July 19–Dec. 31, 1961).	$1,802.41
Ruth P. Ebersole	Assistant subcommittee clerk.	3,000.78
Robert E. McCord	Subcommittee clerk.	7,502.28
General Subcommittee on Labor (Representative Carl D. Perkins, chairman):		
Gertrude L. Moser	Secretary (from Sept. 18, 1961).	1,717.11
Hartwell Duvall Reed, Jr.	Counsel	7,502.28
Peggy Lia Amburgey.	Secretary (June 13–Aug. 31, 1961).	834.86
Special Subcommittee on Education (Representative Edith Green, chairman):		
Betty R. Pryor	Subcommittee clerk.	5,252.46
Nicholas Zumas	Counsel (Mar. 1–Oct. 24, 1961).	3,326.56
Special Subcommittee on Labor (Representative James Roosevelt, chairman):		
Carolyn A. Latimer	Secretary (Aug. 1–Dec. 7, 1961).	2,334.68
Don Lowe	Director (from Sept. 1, 1961).	5,001.52
Doris G. Smith	Secretary (Apr. 1–Aug. 7, 1961).	719.86
W. Wilson Young	Counsel (Jan. 3–Oct. 31, 1961).	3,751.14
Select Subcommittee on Labor (Representative Herbert Zelenko, chairman):		
Harvey B. Cohen	Counsel	5,000.70
Mollie D. Cohen	Administrative assistant.	4,959.35
Select Subcommittee on Education (Representative Frank Thompson, chairman):		
Mary E. Corbin	Secretary	3,502.02
William P. Gerberding.	Counsel (Mar. 1–Aug. 31, 1961).	2,250.32
John D. Hawke, Jr.	Counsel (from Sept. 1, 1961).	3,333.80
Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment (Representative John H. Dent, chairman):		
Barbara Dash	Clerk (Mar. 2–Dec. 31, 1961).	3,000.78
James L. Gallagher	Counsel (from July 17, 1961).	5,470.33
Stanley D. Metzger	Counsel (May 1–July 10, 1961).	416.79
Mary Orndoff	Clerk (from Nov. 27, 1961).	378.28

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the National Labor Relations Board (Representative Roman Pucinski, chairman): James McConnell Harkless.	Counsel (Mar. 1-July 18, 1961).	$750.23
Full committee staff:		
Donald F. Berens	Administrative assistant.	4,251.36
Patricia Bergman	Secretary	2,251.44
Adrienne Fields	Receptionist	2,251.44
Corrine Annette Huff.	do	1,500.80
Mary D. Pinkard	Administrative assistant.	3,750.12
Jeanne Thomson	do	4,302.00
Charles E. Wilson	Assistant education chief (Feb. 1-Aug. 31, 1961).	1,334.42
Investigative task force:		
Leon Abramson	Assistant counsel (from July 15, 1961).	6,918.77
Ida P. Bailey	Secretary (from Dec. 1, 1961).	325.34
James E. Branigan	Counsel	8,750.04
Odell Clark	Assistant chief investigator.	6,250.08
Marvin R. Fullmer	Chief investigator	7,502.28
Olive M. Gibbons	Secretary	2,392.48
Johnnie L. Graves	Secretary (from June 26-Aug. 25, 1961).	801.10
Ann I. Jordan	Secretary (from Apr. 1-Sept. 30, 1961).	1,500.39
Waldo E. Parrish	Administrative assistant.	3,000.78
Jose Lumen Roman	Investigator (from Mar. 1—July 31, 1961).	833.45
Minority staff: Beverly Pearson.	Minority secretary	3,289.38
Travel and miscellaneous expense.		35,500.74

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$633,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	122,306.06
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1961	168,514.95
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1961	290,821.01
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1961	342,178.99

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1962.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd, Crawford	Staff administrator	$8,824.74
Roy J. Bullock	Senior staff consultant.	8,723.70
Albert C. F. Westphal.	Staff consultant	8,723.70
Franklin J. Schupp	do	8,644.62
Robert F. Brandt	Investigator-consultant.	3,968.55
Harry C. Cromer	do	8,306.28
Philip B. Billings	Special assistant	6,294.00
June Nigh	Senior staff assistant.	$6,647.70
Winifred G. Osborne	Staff assistant	6,184.17
Helen C. Mattas	do	5,527.98
Myrtle M. Melvin	do	5,397.48
Helen L. Hashagen	do	5,637.03
O'Brien, Mary Louise	do	5,542.59
Ann L. Clark	do	4,003.26
Mary E. Medsger	do	2,007.06
Robert J. Bowen	Clerical assistant	3,937.44

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	21,406.05
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1961	34,954.05
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1961	56,360.10
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31	93,639.90

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1962.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it.

Expenses, July 1, 1961-Jan. 1, 1962:	
Full committee	$1,686.70
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee	30,515.16
Military Operations Subcommittee	38,767.38
Government Activities Subcommittee	20,987.31
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee	27,227.76
Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee	38,083.63
Special Donable Property Subcommittee	16,900.85
Special Government Information Subcommittee	38,247.09
Special Subcommittee on Assigned Power and Land Problems	12,867.78
Special Subcommittee on the Home Loan Bank Board	12,307.74
Total	237,591.40

Salaries, full committee—July 1-Dec. 31, 1961:	
Christine Ray Davis, staff director	8,824.74
James A. Lanigan, general counsel	8,824.74
Miles Q. Romney, associate general counsel (July 15-Dec. 31, 1961)	6,545.99
Earle J. Wade, staff member	6,294.00
J. Robert Brown, staff member (July 1-Dec. 20, 1961)	6,359.30
Dolores Fel'Dotto, staff member	4,727.28
Ann E. McLachlan, staff member	4,467.37
Patricia Maheux, staff member	4,234.47
Helen M. Boyer, minority professional staff	8,051.46
J. P. Carlson, minority counsel	7,401.18
Expenses, July 1, 1961-Jan. 1, 1962: Full committee, travel, publications, telephone, stationery supplies, etc	1,686.50

Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Hon. William L. Dawson, chairman:	
Elmer W. Henderson, counsel	8,134.94
Arthur Perlman, investigator	7,098.06
Daniel A. Kavanaugh, legal research analyst	3,750.12
Irene Manning, clerk-stenographer	3,732.40
Veronica B. Johnson, clerical staff	3,750.12
Orville J. Montgomery, associate counsel (July 1-Aug. 13, 1961)	1,695.65
Miles Q. Romney, counsel (July 1-15, 1961)	516.87
Expenses	1,837.00
Total	30,515.16

Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. Chet Holifield, chairman:	
Herbert Roback, staff administrator	$8,824.74
Earl J. Morgan, investigator	6,733.38
John Paul Ridgely, investigator	5,766.78
Douglas G. Dahlin, staff attorney	4,707.06
Robert J. McElroy, investigator	4,504.50
Mollie Jo Hughes, clerk-stenographer	3,998.22
Catherine L. Koeberlein, clerk-stenographer	3,998.22
Expenses	234.48
Total	38,767.38

Government Activities Subcommittee, Hon. Jack Brooks, chairman:	
Edward C. Brooks, Jr., staff administrator	7,699.98
L. Russell Harding II, investigator	4,570.32
Daniel L. Power, investigator (Aug. 7-Dec. 31, 1961)	2,603.14
Irma Reel, clerk	3,547.56
John E. Moore, investigator (July 1-31, 1961)	986.03
Expenses	1,580.28
Total	20,987.31

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. Fountain, chairman:	
James R. Naughton, counsel	7,743.90
Delphis C. Goldberg, professional staff member	7,743.90
William Donald Gray, research analyst	3,896.94
Eileen M. Anderson, clerk-stenographer	3,998.22
Bebe B. Terry, clerk-stenographer	3,593.16
Expenses	251.64
Total	27,227.76

Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Hon. Porter Hardy, Jr., chairman:	
John T. M. Reddan, chief counsel	7,800.00
Walton Woods, investigator	7,022.63
M. Joseph Matan, counsel (Aug. 15-Dec. 31, 1961)	5,286.59
R. D. Young, counsel (Oct. 1-Dec. 31, 1961)	3,498.48
Charles Rothenberg, investigator (Aug. 21-Dec. 31, 1961)	4,672.59
Phyllis Seymour, clerk	3,998.22
Yvonne J. Kurtak, stenographer	3,300.60
Richard P. Bray, Jr., counsel (July 1-31, 1961)	1,232.07
Expenses	1,182.45
Total	38,083.63

Special Donable Property Subcommittee, Hon. John W. McCormack, chairman:	
Ray Ward, staff administrator	8,345.58
Margaret B. O'Connor, clerk-stenographer	3,593.16
Clara Katherine Armstrong, clerical staff	3,608.34
Herbert Lee Goldblatt, clerical staff (July 1-Sept. 15, 1961)	750.40
Expenses	603.37
Total	16,900.85

Special Government Information Subcommittee, Hon. John E. Moss, chairman:	
Samuel J. Archibald, staff administrator	8,051.46
Phineas Indritz, counsel	8,051.46
Harry S. Weidberg, assistant counsel	5,648.16
Jack Howard, professional staff member	6,513.66
Helen Beasley, stenographer	3,998.22
Catherine L. Hartke, stenographer	3,998.22
Expenses	1,985.91
Total	38,247.09

Special Subcommittee on Assigned Power and Land Problems, Hon. John E. Moss, chairman:	
Sidney McClellan, professional staff member	6,452.16
Francis J. Schweerer, staff member	5,000.70
Adrienne C. Masterson, clerical staff (July 1-Aug. 15, 1961)	1,181.82
Expenses	233.10
Total	12,867.78

Special Subcommittee on the Home Loan Bank Board, Hon. John E. Moss, chairman:	
David Glick, counsel	6,294.00
Edith T. Carper, staff member (Aug. 1-Nov. 30, 1961)	2,419.06
Expenses	3,594.68
Total	12,307.74

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	640,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported Jan. 4, 1961-June 30, 1961	223,282.20
Amount expended from July 1, 1961, to Jan. 1, 1962	237,591.40
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1961, to Jan. 1, 1962	460,873.60
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1962	179,126.40

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 8, 1962.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Julian P. Langston	Chief clerk	$8,824.74
Marjorie Savage	Assistant clerk	7,612.08
Mary F. Stolle	do	3,896.94

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$30,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	12,320.40
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1961	3,839.21
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1961	16,159.61
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1961	13,840.39

OMAR BURLESON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1962.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Professional staff:		
Sidney L. McFarland.	Professional staff director and engineering consultant.	$8,359.02
T. Richard Witmer	Counsel	8,051.46
John L. Taylor	Consultant on territorial and Indian affairs.	8,051.46
Milton A. Pearl	Consultant on mining, minerals, and lands.	7,875.72
Clerical staff:		
Nancy J. Arnold	Chief clerk	7,172.76
Laura Ann Moran	Assistant chief clerk	4,808.28
Dixie S. Duncan	Clerk	3,998.22
Penelope P. Harvison.	do	3,998.22
Virginia E. Bedsole	do	3,795.66
Patricia B. Freeman.	do	3,289.38

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$60,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	9,472.87
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1961	14,242.16
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1961	23,715.03
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1961	36,284.97

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1962.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Clerical staff:		
W. E. Williamson	Clerk	$8,824.75
Kenneth J. Painter	First assistant clerk	7,322.11
Marcella Fencl	Assistant clerk	4,575.40
Glenn L. Johnson	Printing editor	6,206.12
Joanne C. Neuland	Clerical assistant	3,846.30
Mildred H. Lang	do	3,846.30
Mary Ryan	do	3,846.30
Roy P. Wilkinson	Assistant clerk	3,643.78
Professional staff:		
Andrew Stevenson	Expert	8,824.75
Kurt Borchardt	Legal counsel	8,824.75
Sam G. Spal	Research specialist	8,824.75
Martin W. Cunningham.	Aviation consultant	8,824.75
Additional temporary employees under H. Res. 108 and H. Res. 165:		
Gladys Johnson	Clerical assistant	3,846.30
Margaret J. Robinson.	Staff assistant	7,796.64
Elsie M. Karpowich	Clerical assistant	3,846.30
Robert S. Moore, Jr.	Messenger (from July 1 to 31).	362.58
James Quitman Burgess.	Messenger (from Aug. 1 to 31).	362.58
Catherine C. McLees.	Clerical assistant	3,846.30
Special Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies:		
Charles P. Howze, Jr.	Chief counsel	7,893.29
George W. Perry	Associate counsel	7,172.73
Stuart C. Ross	Consultant	8,064.64
Rex Sparger	Special assistant	5,107.49
Robert E. L. Richardson.	Attorney (from Sept. 7).	3,154.61
Herman Clay Beasley.	Assistant clerk	7,163.99
Lurlene Wilbert	Clerical assistant	4,438.69
Elizabeth G. Paola	Clerical assistant (from Oct. 1).	1,821.90
Betty J. Lantrip	Stenographer-clerk (from Aug. 3 to Sept. 2 and from Oct. 9).	2,204.22

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$585,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	59,653.18
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1961	79,725.45
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1961	139,378.63
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1962	445,621.37

OREN HARRIS,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1962.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bess E. Dick	Staff director	$8,824.74
William R. Foley	General counsel	8,824.74
Walter M. Besterman	Legislative assistant.	8,824.74
Murray Drabkin	Counsel	7,860.74
Herbert N. Maletz	Counsel (to Nov. 25, 1961).	6,910.61
William H. Crabtree	Associate counsel	7,612.08
Carrie Lou Allen	Clerical staff	3,998.22
Anne J. Berger	do	5,678.88
Jane Caldwell	do	4,099.50
Frances F. Christy	do	5,088.51
Garner J. Cline	Assistant counsel	6,294.02
Helen Goldsmith	Clerical staff	4,909.56
Velma Smedley	do	5,397.48

FUNDS FOR PREPARATION OF UNITED STATES CODE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE, AND REVISION OF THE LAWS

A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year):	
Unexpended balance June 30, 1961	$40,091.19
Legislative Appropriation Act of 1962	100,000.00
Total	140,091.19
Expended July 1–Dec. 31, 1961	19,925.01
Balance Dec. 31, 1961	120,166.18
B. Preparation of New Edition of District of Columbia Code:	
Unexpended balance June 30, 1961	67,944.00
Expended July 1–Dec. 31, 1961	13,642.32
Balance Dec. 31, 1961	54,301.68
C. Revision of the Laws 1962:	
Legislative Appropriation Act 1962	19,515.00
Expended July 1–Dec. 31, 1961	8,824.74
Balance Dec. 31, 1961	10,690.26

SALARIES PAID, JULY 1, 1961, THROUGH DEC. 31, 1961, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 56 AND H. RES. 68, 87TH CONG.

Employee	Position	Salary
Appel, Leonard	Assistant counsel	$6,953.04
Beland, Lorraine W	Clerical staff	2,985.60
Burak, Gertrude C	do	4,065.78
Eisenberg, Roberta E	do	3,896.94
Finger, Alexander E	Assistant counsel	6,381.90
Fuchs, Herbert	Assistant counsel (through Dec. 30, 1961).	5,977.30
Gary, Leon, Jr	Clerical staff (through Aug. 31, 1961).	1,101.52
Greenwald, Andrew E.	do	600.32
Haardt, Alma B	Clerical staff	2,681.76
Hyman, Joseph	Counsel (as of Dec. 11, 1961).	889.24
Jett, R. Frederick	Assistant counsel	6,645.48
Kelemonick, Michael	Clerical staff	3,593.16
Marcus, Philip	Associate counsel (as of Dec. 11, 1961).	878.50
Meekins, Elizabeth G	Clerical staff	3,896.94
Peet, Richard C	Assistant counsel	6,381.90
Rosenman, Louis	Associate counsel (as of Dec. 19, 1961).	463.54
Simms, Regina H	Clerical staff	3,390.60
Singman, Julian H	Associate chief counsel—Antitrust (through Oct. 9, 1961).	4,234.99
Sky, Theodore	Assistant counsel	4,403.28
Walden, Jerrold	Associate counsel (through Sept. 19, 1961).	3,340.86
Williams, Stephen L	Messenger	2,479.26
Zelenko, Benjamin	Assistant counsel (as of Dec. 4, 1961).	712.89

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$200,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	76,369.31
Amount expended from July 1, 1961, through Dec. 31, 1961	79,260.67
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1961, through Dec. 31, 1961	155,629.98
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1961	44,370.02

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATE TAXATION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE—SALARIES PAID, JULY 1, 1961, THROUGH DEC. 31, 1961, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 201, 87TH CONG.

Employee	Position	Salary
Ainsworth, Kenneth G.	Economist (as of Aug. 21, 1961).	$3,611.62
Bankester, Claude E.	Counsel	5,503.80
Breslow, Jerome W.	Assistant counsel	3,596.54
Dovel, Jewel B.	Clerical staff (Sept. 11, 1961, through Nov. 4, 1961).	834.91
Greess, Constance	Clerical staff	3,253.92
Hall, Patricia J.	do	3,102.00
Hammond, Martha G.	Clerical staff (as of Nov. 15, 1961).	792.73
Louria, Margot	Research assistant (as of Sept. 18, 1961).	2,003.93
Meck, Joseph P.	Economist (through Sept. 25, 1961).	1,718.28
Melville, Robert F.	Senior economist	6,500.52
Morss, Elliott R.	Clerical staff (through Sept. 15, 1961).	1,083.65
Partridge, Anthony	Counsel	6,500.52
Sutherland, David A.	Counsel (as of Sept. 18, 1961).	3,719.74
Zeifman, Jerome M.	Counsel	5,000.70

Funds authorized or appropriated for special subcommittee expenditures	$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	7,380.44
Amount expended from July 1, 1961, through Dec. 31, 1961	51,150.98
Total amount expended from Mar. 15, 1961, through Dec. 31, 1961	58,531.42
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1961	91,468.58

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1, 1962.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Drewry	Chief counsel	$8,824.74
Bernard J. Zincke	Counsel	8,227.20
Robert H. Cowen	do	2,941.58
Ned P. Everett	Assistant counsel	5,025.30
W. B. Winfield	Chief clerk	7,612.08
Frances P. Still	Assistant clerk	5,030.16
Ruth A. Brookshire	do	3,998.22
Edith W. Gordon	Secretary	3,998.22
Vera A. Barker	do	3,998.22
E. M. Tollefson	Minority clerk	4,808.28

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	9,994.49
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1961	12,706.32
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1961	22,700.81
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1961	52,299.19

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1962.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles E. Johnson	Staff director	$8,824.74
George M. Moore	Counsel	8,824.74
B. Benton Bray	Professional staff member.	8,139.36
John H. Martiny	do	7,919.64
William A. Irvine	Assistant clerk	7,414.38
Lillian L. Hopkins	do	4,909.56
John B. Price	do	4,504.50
Lucy K. Daley	do	4,504.50
Elsie K. Thornton	Secretary	3,998.22
Blanche M. Simons	do	3,643.80

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$100,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	19,652.03
Amount expended from June 30 to Dec. 31, 1961	33,377.03
Total amount expended from Feb. 28 to Dec. 31, 1961	53,029.06
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1961	46,970.94

TOM MURRAY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1962.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Margaret R. Beiter	Staff director	$8,824.74
Richard J. Sullivan	Chief counsel	8,824.74
Clifton W. Enfield	Minority counsel	8,504.04
Joseph R. Brennan	Engineer-consultant	8,824.74
Stephen V. Feeley	Subcommittee clerk	6,294.00
Helen M. Dooley	Staff assistant	7,172.76
Helen A. Thompson	do	5,854.62
Dorothy A. Beam	do	5,204.16
S. Philip Cohen	do	4,504.50
Ester M. Saunders	Clerk-messenger	3,056.46
Investigating staff:		
Durward G. Evans	Subcommittee clerk	4,909.56
John A. O'Connor, Jr.	do	4,909.56
William B. Short, Jr.	do	4,909.56
Peter M. Gentilini	do	5,397.48
Agnes M. GaNun	Staff assistant	3,572.88
Mary C. Porter	Minority staff assistant.	4,403.28
Murray S. Pashkoff	Investigator	4,003.26
Flavil Q. Van Dyke, Jr.	Minority clerical assistant.	3,289.38
Sterlyn B. Carroll	Clerk-messenger	3,056.46
Elizabeth Ann Bowen.	Staff assistant (appointed Oct. 1, 1961).	1,252.29
Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program:		
Walter R. May	Chief counsel	8,824.74
Robert E. Manuel	Minority counsel	7,809.84
John P. Constandy	Assistant chief counsel.	8,003.16
James J. Fitzpatrick	Associate counsel	6,996.96
Robert A. McElligott.	do	6,996.96
Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program:—Con.		
George M. Kopecky	Chief investigator	$7,612.08
George M. Martin	Administrative assistant.	7,344.12
Baron I. Shacklette	Investigator (resigned Dec. 3, 1961).	5,947.42
James P. Kelly	Investigator	6,469.74
John N. Dinsmore	do	6,601.56
Sherman S. Willse	do	6,131.46
Charles A. Gannon	do	6,500.52
Kathryn M. Keeney	Chief clerk	3,876.66
Mildred E. Rupert	Staff assistant	3,491.88
Jean N. Cameron	Staff assistant (appointed July 24, 1961).	3,045.70
Erla S. Youmans	Minority staff assistant.	3,339.06
Helen K. Blanks	Staff assistant (resigned Aug. 11, 1961).	683.51
Sara L. Vollett	Clerical assistant	3,000.78
Clifton A. Woodrum.	Research assistant (resigned Sept. 15, 1961).	950.75
Salvatore J. D'Amico.	Associate counsel	6,250.08
Dolores K. Dougherty.	Staff assistant (appointed Oct. 23, 1961).	1,229.26
Shirley R. Knighten.	File clerk (appointed Oct. 1, 1961).	1,176.33

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$950,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	163,437.45
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1961	374,273.81
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1961	537,711.26
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1961	412,288.74

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1962.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Ruth M. Heritage	Chief clerk (appointed Sept. 8, 1961).	$4,116.74
Henry H. Krevor	Chief counsel (appointed Oct. 1, 1961).	4,252.02
Robert L. May	Minority counsel (appointed Nov. 1, 1961).	2,730.68
Dorothy S. Martin	Secretary (appointed Dec. 19, 1961).	266.88
Meriam R. Buckley	Staff assistant (appointed Oct. 1, 1961).	1,340.88
Kathleen W. Lynch	do	1,543.41
Jack Tait	Administrative assistant (appointed Oct. 14, 1961).	2,542.08

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$150,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported	
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1961	$17,000.19
Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1961	17,000.19
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1961	132,999.81

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1962.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
T. M. Carruthers	Clerk, standing committee.	$6,733.38
Mary S. Forrest	Assistant clerk	4,605.78
D. E. Lukens	Minority clerk	4,650.78

HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1962.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Charles F. Ducander.	Executive director and chief counsel.	$8,824.74
Charles S. Sheldon II.	Technical director (to Sept. 5, 1961).	3,186.91
Philip B. Yeager	Special consultant	8,824.74
Spencer M. Beresford.	Special counsel	8,824.74
John A. Carstarphen, Jr.	Chief clerk	8,293.14
Emily Dodson	Secretary	3,658.98
Eva F. Lopez	do	3,658.98
Jane J. Zetty	do	3,658.98
Mary Ann Robert	do	3,502.02
Mary L. Myron	do	3,253.92
Investigations subcommittee:		
Raymond Wilcove	Staff consultant	8,293.14
C. Otis Finch	Assistant clerk (to Nov. 30, 1961).	3,808.60
Richard P. Hines	Staff consultant	7,163.94
Frank R. Hammill, Jr.	Counsel	7,269.42
Mary Ann Temple	Secretary	3,253.92
Eunice A. Walker	Secretary (to Dec. 18, 1961).	3,036.99
Mabel McLaughlin	Stenographer (to Sept. 15, 1961).	1,026.90
Joseph Felton	Publications clerk	3,248.82
Denis Quigley	Assistant publications clerk (from Dec. 15, 1961).	169.06

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$300,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	$45,692.94
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1961	52,622.23
Total amount expended from Feb. 28 to Dec. 31, 1961	98,315.17
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1961	201,684.83

GEORGE P. MILLER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1962.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Donald T. Appell	Investigator	$7,260.60
Juliette P. Joray	Recording clerk	5,678.88
Gwendolyn L. Lewis.	Administrative assistant.	5,971.80
Thelma S. Michalowski.	Secretary to investigators (resigned Oct. 31, 1961).	3,124.52
Isabel B. Nagel	Secretary to counsel	3,896.94
Rosella A. Purdy	Secretary to director	4,686.78
Frank S. Tavenner, Jr.	Director	8,824.74
Anne D. Turner	Chief of reference section.	5,722.80
Lorraine N. Veley	Secretary to investigators.	3,694.44
Vera L. Watts	Secretary (transferred Dec. 1, 1961).	571.85
William A. Wheeler	Investigator	7,084.86
Investigating committee:		
Sue Arbogast	Clerk-typist (July 5 to Sept. 2, 1961).	688.91
Beatrice P. Baldwin	Clerk-typist	2,681.76
John R. Benedict	Research analyst (appointed Nov. 15, 1961).	1,126.13
Gerard F. Burke	Clerk-typist (appointed Sept. 25, 1961).	1,160.26
Daniel Butler	Clerk-typist	2,175.48
Charlotte B. Carlson	Research analyst	2,888.80
Regina Marie Crissy	Clerk-typist (resigned Sept. 22, 1961).	991.05
Kathleen Fritz	File clerk	2,002.68
Raymond T. Collins	Investigator	5,010.84
Anniel Cunningham	Information analyst	3,719.70
Rosalyn B. DuVal	do	2,691.84
Elizabeth L. Edinger	Editor	3,694.44
Emily R. Francis	Information analyst	2,479.26
Helen M. Gittings	Research analyst	4,605.78
Robert Henry Goldsborough.	Investigator (resigned Aug. 15, 1961).	809.69
Sally Gorrindo	Clerk-typist (July 1 to Sept. 26, 1961).	1,039.40
Betty A. Gredecky	Clerk-stenographer	2,479.26
Kathleen L. Hagenbuch.	do	3,863.20
Katherine R. Holton	Research clerk (appointed Sept. 5, 1961).	1,614.06
Walter B. Huber	Consultant	7,172.76
Maura Patricia Kelly	Research analyst	2,965.32
Olive M. King	Editor	4,453.86
Evelyn M. Kocis	Clerk-stenographer	2,752.68
Charlotte R. Lewis	Legal research clerk (appointed Sept. 5, 1961).	2,096.96
Carolyn McGiffert	Clerk-typist (June 26 to Sept. 8, 1961).	882.28
Francis J. McNamara	Research director	7,143.44
William Margetich	Investigator	3,562.80
Vincent J. Messina	Research analyst	2,377.98
David Muffley, Jr.	Clerk-typist	2,251.44
Jane S. Muller	Information analyst	2,702.04
Alfred M. Nittle	Counsel	7,001.40
Maureen Ontrich	Information analyst	3,026.10
Alma T. Pfaff	Research clerk	2,479.26
Katharine Phillips	Switchboard operator.	2,555.22
Josephine S. Randolph.	Research clerk	2,884.32
Investigating committee—Continued		
Barbara E. Rettew	Editor (resigned Aug. 31, 1961).	$1,062.70
Louis J. Russell	Investigator	5,854.62
Olga Seastrom	Clerk-typist (resigned Sept. 1, 1961).	737.25
Lela Mae Stiles	Information analyst	3,026.10
Doris P. Shaw	do	2,702.04
Beverly E. Terry	Clerk-typist (July 1 to Sept. 26, 1961).	1,039.40
Geraldine Unangst	Clerk-typist	2,175.48
Mary Myers Valente	Secretary	3,315.25
John C. Walsh	Counsel	5,378.16
Vera L. Watts	Secretary (transferred Dec. 1, 1961).	2,859.25
Neil E. Wetterman	Investigator	4,403.28
Billie Wheeler	Clerk-stenographer	1,984.26
Regina M. Wilt	Clerk-typist	2,175.48
John A. Yohe	Staff member	5,015.64

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$331,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	123,256.64
Amount expended from July 1, 1961, to Jan. 1, 1962	199,470.83
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1961, to Jan. 1, 1962	322,727.47
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1962	8,272.53

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1962.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Full committee:		
Oliver E. Meadows	Staff director (P)	$8,824.74
Edwin B. Patterson	Counsel (P)	8,824.74
Jack Z. Anderson	Professional aid to minority (P).	8,824.74
J. Buford Jenkins	Professional aid (P)	4,063.88
George W. Fisher	Clerk (C)	8,824.74
Paul K. Jones	Assistant clerk (C)	6,294.00
Helen A. Biondi	do	5,160.66
George J. Turner	do	4,302.00
Alice V. Matthews	Clerk-stenographer (C).	4,302.00
Joanne Doyle	do	3,496.98
Helen J. Peterson	do	657.87
Investigative staff:		
Adin M. Downer	Staff member	6,720.18
Mark L. Davis	Clerk-stenographer	725.16
William F. Ikard	Clerk-messenger	543.87
Wilma Jean Johnson	Clerk-stenographer	3,496.98
William T. McDonald.	Clerk-typist	898.35
John Billie Smith	Investigator	5,397.48
Kay N. Small	Clerk-stenographer	2,539.98

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	16,918.32
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1961	31,228.96
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1961	48,147.28
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1961	101,852.72

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1962.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Full committee:		
Leo H. Irwin	Chief counsel (C)	$8,824.74
John M. Martin, Jr.	Assistant chief counsel (P).	8,666.58
Thomas A. Martin	Minority counsel (P).	8,824.74
Gerard M. Brannon.	Professional assistant (P).	8,666.58
Raymond F. Conkling.	do	7,928.46
Alfred R. McCauley.	do	7,787.82
William E. Wells	Attorney (P) (to Oct. 31, 1961).	2,500.08
Virginia Baker	Staff assistant (C) (to Aug. 31, 1961).	1,425.56
Virginia Butler	Staff assistant (C)	4,383.00
Frances E. Donovan.	do	4,276.68
Grace Kagan	do	4,383.00
June Kendall	do	4,453.86
Margaretta G. Pestell.	Staff assistant (C) (to Sept. 30, 1961).	1,687.71
Elizabeth L. Ruth	Staff assistant (C)	4,150.08
Eileen Sonnett	do	3,289.38
Susan Taylor	do	5,300.82
Irene Wade	do	4,383.00
Hughlon Greene	Document clerk	2,894.40
Walter Little	do	2,894.40

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	844.38
Amount expended from July 1, 1961 to Dec. 31, 1961	1,866.30
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1961, to Dec. 31, 1961	2,710.68
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1961	22,289.32

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1, 1962.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles S. Beller	Assistant counsel	$6,667.48
Katherine C. Blackburn.	Research analyst	4,048.86
O. B. Briggs	Administrative assistant to chairman.	6,083.33
Dorothy F. Councill	Secretary-stenographer.	1,341.18
Frances F. Crane	do	1,653.73
Victor P. Dalmas	Adviser to minority members.	8,051.46
Miriam M. DeHaas	Secretary-stenographer	$1,300.34
Dean W. Dittmer	Research analyst	2,001.34
Jean W. Fender	Administrative assistant.	3,807.50
Justinus Gould	Counsel	7,612.08
Helen C. Hitz	Secretary-stenographer.	1,250.33
Bessie C. Harding	do	1,224.72
Harrison F. Houghton.	Chief economist	7,872.54
Adele E. Jaworwaski	Secretary-stenographer.	449.06
Gertrude W. Jonson	do	3,119.53
Sylvia U. Keel	do	732.69
Carolyn A. Latimer	Research analyst	674.81
Barbara W. McConnell.	Secretary-stenographer.	3,593.16
Alfonso Everette MacIntyre.	General counsel	4,134.06
Margaret Fallon Palmer.	Research analyst	3,584.94
Audrey Irene Redwine.	Secretary-stenographer.	1,088.51
J. Brooks A. Robertson.	Staff director	8,044.90
Joseph A. Seeley	Assistant counsel	3,008.71
Baron I. Shacklette	Consultant	1,049.54
J. Allan Sherier	General counsel	8,754.48
Lois B. Shupe	Secretary-stenographer.	3,750.12
Audrey Smith	do	3,374.05
Vern L. Stephens	Assistant adviser to minority members	1,729.13
Marie M. Stewart	Clerk	4,418.46
Carole Miriam Xander.	Secretary-stenographer.	2,470.72

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$580,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	107,128.03
Amount expended from July 1 to December 31, 1961	131,659.93
Total amount expended from Jan. 4 to Dec. 31, 1961	238,788.56
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1961	341,211.44

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 8, 1962.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON EXPORT CONTROL

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the period from September 7 to December 31, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during period
Fred Hallford	Staff director	$3,100.00
James J. Ryan	Staff investigator	2,650.00
Albert C. Hayden, Jr.	do	2,650.00
Joseph A. Gwyer	Consultant	2,000.00
Blanche R. Plant	Stenographer-clerk	1,695.30

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$40,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None
Amount expended from Sept. 7 to Dec. 31, 1961	$14,549.07
Total amount expended from Sept. 7 to Dec. 31, 1961	14,549.07
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1961	25,450.93

A. PAUL KITCHIN,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1582. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting a report for the period July 1, 1960, to June 30, 1961, as prepared by the Committee on House Administration pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 476, 87th Congress, pursuant to paragraph 102, of title 2 of the Code of Laws of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

1583. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (H. Doc. No. 308); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1584. A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 6 of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended, to reduce the revolving fund available for subscriptions to the capital stock of the banks for cooperatives"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1585. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting the Eleventh Annual Report of the Director of the Selective Service System for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, pursuant to the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1586. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics) transmitting the July-November 1961 report on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms, pursuant to the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1587. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting a report containing certain information relating to the National Labor Relations Board for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, pursuant to the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1588. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1589. A letter from the Governor of the Canal Zone President, Panama Canal Company, transmitting a report of the disposal of foreign excess property by the Panama Canal Company and Canal Zone Government for the year ended December 31, 1961, pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1590. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, transmitting a report of the administrative tort claims paid by the Department of Justice during the 1961 fiscal year, pursuant to 28 United States Code 2673; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1591. A letter from the Chairman, the Renegotiation Board, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1592. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting determinations relating to the 1962 construction payment due the United States from the Belle Fourche Irrigation District, Belle Fourche project, South Dakota, pursuant Public Law 86-308; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BUCKLEY: Committee on Public Works. Fourth Civil Service Report on Disposition of Right-of-Way Improvements on Highway Projects in Florida (Rept. No. 1285). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEERMANN:

H.R. 9837. A bill to amend the General Bridge Act of 1946 with respect to the vertical clearance of bridges to be constructed across the Missouri River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9838. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 9839. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 9840. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. KEE:

H.R. 9841. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the depletion allowance for coal and lignite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 9842. A bill to amend section 612 of title 38, United States Code, to provide the same medical care benefits for World War I veterans as are provided for veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 9843. A bill to provide reimbursement to a member of the uniformed services for transportation of his civilian clothing and personal effects from his first duty station to his home; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9844. A bill to waive temporarily section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut holding court at Bridgeport, Conn., and at Stamford, Conn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9845. A bill to amend section 1613 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that periods spent on active duty pursuant to recall occurring after August 1, 1961, and before January 1, 1962, shall not be counted in determining the period within which certain education and training must be initiated or completed; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 9846. A bill to provide assistance to business enterprises and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.R. 9847. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to the retirement of firefighting personnel under the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H.R. 9848. A bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 9849. A bill to extend and amend the conservation reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 9850. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia and to lower the age of application of the Juvenile Court Act from 18 to 17 years of age; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 9851. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain surplus real property of the United States situated within Camp Swift, Bastrop, Tex., to the former owners thereof; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 9852. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the waiting period for disability insurance benefits may be waived in cases where the severity of the disability is immediately determinable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 9853. A bill to amend chapter 17 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the white slave traffic, in order to extend its provisions to males; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 9854. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual may qualify for disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze with 15 quarters of coverage, regardless of when such quarters were earned; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9855. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide minimum benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program for needy individuals who are 70 years of age or over and are not otherwise entitled to benefits under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 9856. A bill to permit the exchange between farms of cotton acreage allotments for rice acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculure.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 9857. A bill to amend section 4142 (relating to the definition of radio and television components) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H.R. 9858. A bill to permit the exchange between farms of cotton acreage allotments for rice acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 9859. A bill to provide that lands within the exterior boundaries of a national forest acquired under section 8 of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315g), may be added to the national forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9860. A bill to amend section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (43 U.S.C. 315g); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 9861. A bill to amend title II of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide alert pay for members of the Strategic Air Command; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 9862. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for surviving spouses without deduction from original annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9863. A bill to increase and equalize all rates of wartime disability compensation and to provide for payment of additional compensation to veterans with dependents when rated less than 50 percent in degree on the same basis as for those rated 50 percent or more in degree; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 9864. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.J. Res. 605. Joint resolution providing that the United States shall make no loans or grants to the United Nations until all members of the United Nations have paid in full their assessed share of the costs of the operations of the United Nations, including the expenses of operations in the Congo and the Gaza Strip; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 405. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on civil defense for the Committee on Government Operations; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. Con. Res. 406. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in regard to United Nations Charter revision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GLENN:

H. Res. 521. Resolution to amend clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that committee reports include an estimate of the cost of bills, as reported to the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 522. Resolution creating a nonlegislative select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the aged and aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 523. Resolution creating a nonlegislative select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the aged and aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Res. 524. Resolution creating a nonlegislative select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the aged and aging; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing and empowering the appropriate department to reopen land condemnation cases, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 9865. A bill for the relief of Lili Li; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUYE:

H.R. 9866. A bill for the relief of Fred R. Methered; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9867. A bill for the relief of Luisa G. Valdez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9868. A bill for the relief of Edward C. Valdez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9869. A bill for the relief of Billy Hing-Tsung Shim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9870. A bill for the relief of Jung Hi Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 9871. A bill for the relief of Maria Nessim Djeddah De Ades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9872. A bill for the relief of Hasan Ince; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9873. A bill for the relief of Luba Siedlecki Simon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 9874. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hilda Eaves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 9875. A bill for the relief of Rosaria Gurciullo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 9876. A bill for the relief of Mary M. Kawas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

In Commemoration of the 138th Anniversary of the Birth of Gen. Thomas Jonathan "Stonewall" Jackson, January 21, 1824

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Sunday was the 138th anniversary of the birth of one of America's most illustrious sons—Gen. Thomas Jonathan Jackson. History records him as General "Stonewall" Jackson.

He was born January 21, 1824, in the western region of Virginia in what is now the city of Clarksburg, W. Va. He was the son of Jonathan Jackson, of Clarksburg, and Julia Beckworth Neale. His great-grandfather, John Jackson, the first of the line in America, by birth a Scotch-Irishman, came to our country in 1748 and located in Maryland and later in the western part of Virginia.

General Jackson was graduated from West Point where he won the respect and confidence of his fellow cadets and it was said of him at that time:

"Old Jack will at some future day command an army."

The prediction was fulfilled and his name is honored and revered in every land where patriotic heroism is recognized.

I shall not enumerate the historical events associated with the era in which he lived nor recall his brilliant accomplishments on the battlefield which gained him world acclaim as one of America's greatest military geniuses.

But my heart prompts me to affirm the sincere esteem and admiration for his character which has inspired me since my youth.

General Jackson died May 10, 1863, at the age of 39. His life ended sadly and strangely as a result of wounds inflicted during the Battle of Chancellorsville by his own troops through an unaccountable and tragic mistake.

Perhaps it is of paradoxical importance to try to envision the role he might have assumed in West Virginia's early formative years, if his life had been spared. Man is prone to speculate on "what might have happened."

West Virginia was admitted to the Union as the 35th State on June 20, 1863, approximately 1 month after General Jackson's death.

Whatever part he might have performed in official life we know that his personal contribution would have included: unselfish dedication to the common good; a firm resolve and consciousness of duty; creed matched with deed, and underlining these qualities—invincible faith with absolute reliance in God.

His own words were revelatory:

> We must think of the living and those who are to come after us and see that by God's blessing, we transmit to them the freedom we have ourselves inherited.

It has been said of him:

> Stonewall Jackson was a Christian of the highest type. With him, religion was not speech, nor doctrine, nor mystic faith, nor martyr sacrifice but, rather and gloriously, love supreme to God and service unselfish to man. His was a remarkable illustration of the power that results from the union of lofty human attributes and unfailing religious faith—the prowess of the soldier and the piety of the Christian * * *.

And so it is with satisfaction that I join with many others in expressing sincere tribute to the memory of Stonewall Jackson. It is testimony to the measure of the man that both the sovereign States of Virginia and West Virginia claim him as a son.

History may do justice to him and his fame is, in degree, perpetuated in the National Hall of Fame where his tablet is inscribed with this maxim of his life:

> You may be whatever you resolve to be. Never take counsel of your fears.

But there is a monument which bears his name indelibly—and that is found in the hearts of his countrymen.

Results of a Questionnaire on the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, because of the extreme bitterness with which the United Nations has been attacked in recent weeks, in late December I conducted an "experiment" by mailing out within the 26th District of California 60,000 copies of a questionnaire on the U.N. Although in general I think very little of the value of such a poll, particularly those that require just a "yes" or "no" answer, no pretense was made that this was done on a scientific basis or was any more on my part except a desire to get an idea of how my constituents feel about the United Nations.

An attempt was made to hit all areas of my district, with no particular differentiation between men and women voters, or between Democrats, Republicans, and nonpartisans. Further, my office was more completely equipped with precinct rosters for what might be termed "conservative" areas of the district, than for the so-called "liberal" areas, so there is little doubt that, percentagewise, "conservatives" actually got more questionnaires than "liberals."

Of the 60,000 copies mailed, approximately 11 percent, or 6,600 envelopes, were returned as undeliverable. This presumably left 53,400 questionnaires actually delivered into voters' hands. Of these, 7,521, or approximately 14.1 percent, were returned, which direct-mail experts tell me is an extremely heavy return.

The questions asked and the percentage breakdowns of the replies are as follows:

	Yes	No
(1) Do you think that the United Nations offers the best hope of keeping peace in the world?	84.8	15.2
(2) Do you think the United States should continue its membership in the U.N.?	88.8	11.2
(3) Do you think that further strengthening of the U.N. would be apt to advance the cause of world peace?	87.6	12.4
(4) Do you think that the foreign policy of the United States should concern itself with attempting to achieve agreement on total disarmament under conditions of rigid international inspection?	85.0	15.0
(5) If you do, do you feel that such inspection, and the rules therefor, should be administered by a world court, backed up by an international armed force adequate to enforce the court's rulings?	87.2	12.8
(6) If you have answered these questions affirmatively, or largely affirmatively, do you think that the United States should propose such a program to the U.N., and to the world, regardless of the present intransigent position of the U.S.S.R.?	88.1	11.9

Vernon L. Talbertt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I have sent to Mr. Vernon L. Talbertt who retired at the end of last year after more than 51 years of devoted service in the Senate.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

January 22, 1962.

Mr. Vernon L. Talbertt,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Vernon: It is regrettable that the day of your retirement occurred while the Senate was in adjournment. This deprived your many friends in the Senate of the opportunity to bid you goodbye personally on your last official day with us.

The mark you have left in the U.S. Senate is indelible. There will be many moments in the turbulent years ahead when we will sorely miss your faithful and efficient services and, most of all, your kindly and gracious presence.

I want to wish you many years of health and contentment and to express the hope that you will come by often to see us.

Sincerely yours,

Clair Engle,
U.S. Senator.

Federal Aid to Education and Separation of Church and State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on last December 8 it was my privilege to address the American Affairs Forum at West Virginia State College in Institute, W. Va. The purpose of the forum is to stimulate student thought and regard for the fundamental issues which confront American civilization today.

My contribution to the program was on the subject of "Federal Aid to Education and Separation of Church and State." Regardless of what the 2d session of the 87th Congress does or fails to do on the question of Federal aid to education—and it is my most fervent hope that we will enact a general educational aid bill for the States—the issue which I explored in my remarks will be with us for a long time to come. Nothing is more fundamental to the advancement of America than the improvement of our educational system, and nothing is more basic to the maintenance of American democracy than the separation of church and state. I therefore ask unanimous consent that my address to the American Affairs Forum at Institute, W. Va., be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Federal Aid to Education and Separation of Church and State

(An address by Senator Jennings Randolph, Democrat, of West Virginia, to the West Virginia State College, Institute, W. Va., December 8, 1961)

Officers and faculty members and students of West Virginia State College, you are to be most highly commended for initiating this American Affairs Forum and for maintaining a focused concern on the living problems of contemporary society.

Assuredly, none is of more topical interest and enduring significance than that of preserving inviolate the wall of separation between church and state. There are many areas in which this wall may be breached—at local, State and Federal levels—though the one in which the most pressure is currently being generated is that involving Federal assistance to education. In regard to this general problem, I shall differentiate this morning between the specific aspects related to Federal aid to primary and secondary education and those bearing upon aid to higher learning.

If I may be excused from quoting myself, in 1938, writing in the periodical Liberty, a magazine of religious freedom, I stated that ". . . when we speak of the separation of church and state in the United States, we do not mean simply the absence of a church supported by Federal taxes, nor do we mean simply the rights of all men, regardless of religious credo, to the privileges of citizenship. If religious freedom is to be triumphant in our Republic, its spirit must live within the constitutions of all the component States. The judge of every local court must be imbued with it. And above all, no one of us can afford to lose sight of it as being one of the pillars upon which our Republic is founded. Our belief in the freedom of conscience is the very material of that structure."

I would now add to that statement the caveat that each of us must exercise constant vigilance against any intrusion of the church upon state affairs or the state upon the affairs of religion.

Since my statement in Liberty, the U.S. Supreme Court has rendered many decisions giving specific content to this general philosophy. One of the most notable of these was in the case of *Everson* v. *Board of Education* when the Court declared that:

"The 'establishment of religion' clause of the first amendment means at least this: Neither the State nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. * * * No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities, or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither State nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect 'a wall of separation between church and state.' "

In his dissent in this case, with the concurrence of Justice Frankfurter, Justice Jackson and Justice Burton, Justice Rutledge issued an opinion which is even more relevant for us today than that of the majority. Referring to the history of the first amendment and the meaning which the freedom of religion clause held for its framers, Justice Rutledge stated that its purpose:

"* * * was to create a complete and permanent separation of the spheres of religious activity and civil authority by comprehensively forbidding every form of public aid or support for religion. * * * In view of this history no further proof is needed that the amendment forbids any appropriation, large or small, from public funds to aid or support any and all religious exercises." (Ibid., at 31–32, 41.)

Those who would today attempt to breach this complete and permanent separation by offering governmental assistance to parochial and church-affiliated elementary and secondary schools justify their efforts principally on three arguments: national defense, nondiscriminatory treatment of parochial and church school students, and the public welfare concept on which some States furnish school transportation to parochial students.

I would reply that we may not allow unconstitutional practices to be smuggled in under the name of national defense or equal treatment if otherwise the first amendment would keep them out. To speak with complete candor, the national defense—in the sense that term is used in the present "cold war" context—is not involved here.

The National Defense Education Act, passed in 1958 in the wake of sputnik, was primarily a convenient and timely peg on which to hang Federal aid to education in order to overcome opposition from the conservative elements in the Congress and in the country at large. Its value is principally not in contributing to the immediate national defense, but in bolstering the foundations of intellectual life throughout the range of American culture. When viewed in these terms the role of education is seen to bear directly, not on national defense, but on the security and integrity of American freedoms—freedoms which would be put in grave jeopardy if we were to violate either the letter or the intent of the first amendment clause on the "establishment of religion."

Regarding the issue of nondiscriminatory treatment of parochial and church school students, I am not insensitive to the burden which the first amendment places upon those who choose to combine religious and secular education for their children. But this is a burden which is assumed by the free choice of the parent who determines not to send his child to public schools.

It is, therefore, not discriminatory in any legal sense to deny Federal assistance to parochial schools. The public schools are available for all who desire to attend them. And the fact that some parents do not choose to send their children to public schools does not lessen their obligation to support them any more than being childless relieves a person of this responsibility. The public school system, by providing the foundation for an enlightened and informed society, serves all its members, the parents of parochial students as well as others.

Perhaps Justice Jackson made the most trenchant observation on the question of nondiscriminatory treatment, when he declared that "* * * if these principles seem harsh in prohibiting aid to Catholic education, it must not be forgotten that it is the same Constitution that alone assures Catholics the right to maintain these schools at all when predominant local sentiment would forbid them." (*Everson* v. *Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1, at p. 27).

The third argument, which is based on what I have termed the "public welfare concept," contends that because the welfare of society as a whole is advanced by educating all our children, it is justifiable to divert tax funds to the assistance of parochial and church affiliated schools. The question inevitably arises, therefore, if the state may provide the smaller elements of educational expense—transportation, books and supplies, or laboratory facilities—why not the larger as well, and where does the process stop?

The question was also addressed by the author of the first amendment to the Constitution, when, in his "Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments," James Madison, in 1785, queried:

"Who does not see * * * that the same authority which can force a citizen to contribute threepence only of his property for the support of any one establishment, may force him to conform to any other establishment in all cases whatsoever?"

Madison then answered his own question—to his satisfaction and to mine—by declaring that "The freemen of America did not wait till usurped power had strengthened itself by exercise, and entangled the question in precedents. They saw all the consequences in the principle, and they avoided the consequences by denying the principle. We revere this lesson too much, soon to forget it."

It is my hope and my belief that the majority of the American people and the majority of both bodies of the Congress still revere this lesson too much to forget it.

One of the clearest expressions of the intent of Madison, who authored the first amendment, and of the other founders of the Constitution who adopted it, was offered by one of America's most distinguished jurists, Jeremiah S. Black, when he stated in his essay, "Religious Liberty," that, "The manifest object of the men who framed the institutions of this country, was to have a state without religion, and a church without politics—that is to say, they meant that one should never be used as an engine for any purpose of the other. * * * Our fathers seem to have been perfectly sincere in their belief that the members of the church would be more patriotic, and the citizens of the state more religious, by keeping their respective functions entirely separate. For that reason they built up a wall of complete and perfect partition between the two."

It is to the credit of West Virginia and the benefit, I hope, of the Nation that Representative CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, as chairman of the House Subcommittee on General Education, has advanced a plan which offers aid to the States while still maintaining the partition between church and state.

The Bailey plan would stimulate and encourage State expenditures for education by authorizing Federal grants to each of the States of 2 percent of its total annual expenditure for public education from State and local sources. Thus, the greater the efforts of the State to advance its educational system, the more assistance it would receive from the Federal Government. In addition, the Bailey plan would offer safeguards against cutbacks by State and local governments by decreasing the Federal grant by a like amount. Finally, in order to provide additional aid to those States in greatest need, the plan would provide an equalization formula based upon the degree to which the personal per capita income of the State falls below the national average.

For example, West Virginia would receive its base allotment—on the basis of our 1959-60 expenditures—of $2,435,440 and an equalization allotment of $3,653,160 (under one of the formulas proposed) for a total of $6,088,600. This is substantially less than West Virginia would have received for fiscal 1962 under the School Assistance Act passed by the Senate last year; this measure, had it passed in the House, would have provided between $10,658,865 and $11,189,660. However, Representative BAILEY's plan offers a good point of departure, and the general method he proposes offers, in my opinion, the best prospects for cutting through the tangled web of opinions on so-called States rights and the fear of Federal control.

To turn now to the question of Federal aid to higher education, I do not propose to set forth any specific programs. Though our Senate Subcommittee on Education conducted hearings last August on several bills for aid to higher education, it is evident that there still exists a wide disparity of opinion regarding how such aid would be best utilized.

As Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, stated in an article in the Saturday Review, in February 1961, "The absence of any widely accepted plan, up to this very moment, is to a great extent the fault of those engaged in higher education. * * * In the past, they have been immobilized to some extent by internal divisions on the basic question, first, of whether Federal aid in any form is desirable and, second, of who, if it is desirable, should get it."

Both of these questions remain unresolved, though many provocative suggestions were presented during the course of our hearings. The West Virginia Association of College and University Presidents, in its Project Unity, offers, I believe, the right approach in achieving a consensus among administrators in the field of higher learning. Having put aside the conception of private and publicly supported institutions as competitive, the association—and all the professional groups in the field of higher education—will, I hope, begin to hammer out specific plans for achieving the most effective cooperative relationship between their institutions and for clarifying the role of Federal assistance therein.

Assuming that some form of Federal assistance will be forthcoming in the near future, I would now address the problem of separation of church and State in relation to institutions of higher learning. The problem is distinctly different from that which we encounter in regard to parochial and church affiliated elementary and secondary schools.

As Patrick Murphy Malin, former executive director of the American Civil Liberties Union, stated before our subcommittee.

"Church institutions are engaged in a number of other activities beside religious activities. The problem is to discover the nature of the activity rather than the nature of the sponsorship.

"The construction of churches or the maintenance of theological seminaries is obviously at one extreme a religious function and not suspectible of congressional support or restriction. Then you come to the question of the nonreligious functions of church-related colleges and universities; for example, in the maintenance and development of scientific research facilities."

It is generally acknowledged by the courts, by the public, and by ecclesiastical authorities that elementary and secondary schools maintained by church organizations are arms of the churches and are specifically designed for the inculcation and encouragement of religious faith. They are, therefore, to be thought of as religious enterprises and must be maintained free of State support or control.

With reference to colleges and universities, the question arises as to whether there is sufficient difference in degree in their activities to warrant a difference in the kind of treatment in Federal legislation.

The American Civil Liberties Union submitted to our subcommittee suggestions for establishing tentative criteria to determine whether an institution qualifies, for purposes of Federal aid, as an educational institution or a religious enterprise:

First, are students and faculty members required to be adherents of the religious group maintaining the college or university in question? If so, then it would seem that the institution in question is part of a religious enterprise. If not, then, as the ACLU statement suggested, "the college or university in question begins at least to be properly an educational institution rather than a religious institution."

Second, there must be no indoctrination in the tenets and beliefs of the particular faith as a required part of the curriculum toward earning a degree. This is not to say that the institution may not offer courses on religion for those who voluntarily enroll for them, but that such courses must not be required for graduation.

Third, the determination of curriculum and the instructional program must be in the hands of those charged with educational responsibility—the faculty and administration—rather than those outside the educational process who are charged with ecclesiastical administration.

Admittedly, these criteria are not watertight and foolproof, but I believe they offer a sound point of departure for exploring a complex field with many areas of ambiguity. The problem is complicated by the fact that around our Constitution we have developed a wide and varied pattern of religious organizations and activities, and a manifold educational system in which the churches have played an important role. The question now is to determine the essential meaning in a multitude of concrete situations of the conceptions of no restriction and no support of religious activities by the Federal Government.

This will offer one of the major tests of the quality of our democracy in the coming years. For it will require the utmost in patient examination and good will, in dedication to the goals of education, and in enlightened support of the letter as well as the spirit of the first amendment to the Constitution.

In facing these multiple issues, we would do well to bear in mind the remark of the Roman philosopher, Epictetus, who, when commenting upon the fall of Athenian democracy as caused by educating the few, observed that "The state says that only freemen will be educated; God says only educated men will be free."

A Recession-Proof America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my fellow Members of the House of Representatives the following article dealing with phases of the administration's legislative program for 1962. This story was printed by the Tribune Publishing Co., of Massachusetts, and is one of the 24 New England newspapers that features a weekly column prepared by me.

As brought forth in this article, President Kennedy's state of the Union address offered for the consideration of Congress a legislative program, which if adopted, will keep the Nation on the path toward "A Recession-Proof America."

The article reads as follows:

A RECESSION-PROOF AMERICA

(By Congressman THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.)

President Kennedy's program, if adopted by Congress, will keep the Nation on the path toward "A Recession-Proof America."

On domestic affairs, the President has plainly given top priority to medical care for the aged, aid to education and the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs with Cabinet status.

The President correctly called attention to our economy when his message emphasized "The Nation is on the high road of recovery and growth. But improvement is still needed."

To do this Congress should approve legislation to retain workers displaced by machines and youths just entering the work force. It also should approve an 8-percent tax credit for investment in machinery and equipment as a spur to modernization and the Nation's ability to compete abroad.

MASS IMMUNIZATION

Of importance to all families, the President stressed the need for a mass immunization program against children's diseases, and promised a new program "stressing services instead of just support." This project is urgently needed and will be the first of its kind in the Nation's history. This will provide vaccine for as many as 5 million babies born each year.

A spokesman for the Public Health Service presented figures that showed "if the 5 million children born annually are vaccinated childhood diseases would virtually disappear in 25 years."

Foreign affairs: As stated by the President, the Nation's military might has improved steadily last year. In the coming year, reserve programs will be revised. The Government expects to get nearly 300 more Polaris and Minuteman missiles this year.

The President affirmed this country's commitment to "a supreme effort to break the logjam on disarmament and nuclear tests." On disarmament, the President said: "World order will be secured only when the world has laid these weapons which seem to offer present security but threaten our future survival."

President Kennedy's solemn dedication to the cause of peace may be remembered in history after many other matters are forgotten.

In rejecting any patchwork on the Reciprocal Trade Act, the President called for a new law.

The President's words—speaking of the nuclear deadlock—will be repeated time and time again and will be foremost in the minds of peace-loving people. The statement was, "The world was not meant to be a prison in which man awaits his execution."

The adoption of President Kennedy's program by Congress will be a constructive step to ward off possibilities of future recessions.

Tax Relief for High Fidelity Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in the House a measure, H.R. 9548, to amend section 4142 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from the manufacturers excise tax the following high fidelity and television components: chassis, speakers, amplifiers, phonograph mechanisms and phonograph record players.

This measure, Mr. Speaker, was occasioned by reports reaching me from segments of the electronic industry that the Internal Revenue Service was considering lifting in part the exemptions heretofore granted under the act to certain manufacturers of electronic equipment.

It has also been reported to me that the industry has reason to believe that the Government is considering imposing these taxes retroactively and that would probably have extremely disastrous results to the industry, particularly to many small manufacturing plants all over the country that are making an outstanding contribution to the important space-age science of sound reproduction and electronics.

I think that this segment of the electronic industry is in large part responsible for the recent unprecedented advance in sound reproduction that has brought consequent cultural and educational contributions difficult, if not impossible, to measure, since certain recent innovations have sparked widespread interest in quality reproduction of music from records, tape and FM radio.

In addition to current possible tax problems the industry is faced with sharp, and possibly very serious, competition from growing imports from both East and West, that have come about as the result of migration and utilization of new ideas in the electronic business.

The small segments of the industry are also under heavy competitive pressure from larger domestic manufacturers who are able to capitalize on the pioneering efforts of many of the small companies.

The proposed increased tax burdens facing the high fidelity industry comes, it is clear, as a result of proposed new interpretations of sections of the law which were not heretofore anticipated by the industry.

Section 4141 and 4142, IRC, cover the subject matter of these taxes and define the meaning of the term "radio and television components."

The tax has been imposed, not upon all the articles listed in section 4142, but on those enumerated articles which meet the further test of being "suitable for use on or in connection with, or as a component part of, an article enumerated in section 4141, that is, a radio or television receiving set, phonograph, or combination thereof."

The Treasury regulations define an item as being suitable for use within the meaning of section 4142, if it is, first, commonly used with any of the articles enumerated in section 4141; or, second, if it possess actual, practical commercial fitness for such use.

For the most part, the articles involved in my bill are not "suitable for use" because they do not possess actual, practical commercial fitness for use with radio receiving sets, television receiving sets, phonographs, or combinations of these.

The articles manufactured by the members of the high fidelity components industry are by their very nature of such a type and quality as to preclude incorporation or use with the articles enumerated in section 4141. Compared to these taxable articles, high fidelity components are too expensive, too complex, too difficult to install and operate. They also require too much skill to service and are of too high quality and too inherently limited in their applications. It would be commercially impractical to attempt to produce and sell a "package" radio receiving set, phonograph, and so forth, incorporating these articles which are designed and manufactured for use in high fidelity sound systems.

This has been recognized by the Internal Revenue Service with respect to many of these articles in a series of rulings and administrative actions. The Internal Revenue Service now apparently proposes to revoke these rulings and actions and, in a number of cases, to impose taxes retroactively. In order to spell out clearly the original congressional intent in this situation and in order to prevent a great injustice to those involved, I am introducing appropriate legislation to assist this small industry by clarifying the intent of the present law.

The high fidelity industry is made up of some 45 or 50 small companies which employ, on the average, about several hundred employees. The industry has been in existence only since the end of World War II. The equipment it makes is designed, produced, and sold primarily for radio broadcasters, experimenters and high fidelity enthusiasts.

The high grade, high precision, technical equipment has brought the science of sound reproduction to a point formerly considered commercially impossible.

Many advances in sound reproduction appearing in "package" radio, television, phonograph, and combination sets now reaching the large consumer market can be directly traced to the pioneering done by these small companies in the high fidelity components industry.

While the so-called "package" industry, benefiting from the work of these small companies, has been enjoying unprecedented sales, the components industry is struggling for survival. In addition, there is a vigorous competition within the high fidelity components industry itself—a look into the early issues of High Fidelity magazine, published in Massachusetts, presents evidence that many fine names in the industry have already disappeared.

Thus, the small components manufacturers are faced with fierce domestic and foreign competition, by all the growth and financing problems characteristic of small business and by accelerating technological change in electronics.

To top it all, this small industry is harassed by these proposed new and adverse tax interpretations. This situation is compounded, so the industry states, by inability to obtain definitions from tax officials of "radio receiving set" as listed in the law, despite general agreement on such definition among technical authorities, the minutes of previous congressional committee hearings, and common usage within the industry.

As recently as 1958, the tax-free status of the magnetic tape recording manufacturers was safeguarded by the Congress. Committee reports indicate that this congressional action was motivated by the fact that tape recorder manufacturers were suffering from a competitive disadvantage.

The committee reports on Public Law 367, enacted in 1955, show that it was the intent of Congress to tax only those radio and television components that were sold as repair and replacement parts for radio and television receiving sets and phonographs.

It is indicated that sales of these articles, from which the tax would be removed, for repair and replacement of radio receiving sets, phonographs, and so forth are virtually nonexistent. Therefore, the revenue loss would be negligible. In addition, the taxpayer would be relieved of the burden of paying taxes on articles which the Congress never intended to tax and the Internal Revenue Service would be relieved of the burden of interpreting the statute.

The effect of my bill would be to make the intent of Congress absolutely clear and plain with virtually no financial sacrifice to the Treasury. Actually, my bill may increase tax revenues over the long run by preserving this small industry and allowing it to continue making the innovations which continue to create mass interest in better music reproduction with resulting revenue gains from taxation of set manufacturers, as set forth in the law and as intended by Congress.

I urge early consideration of this meritorious measure and hope some appropriate clarifying solution may be found.

The text of H.R. 9548 is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4142 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows: "As used in section 4141, the term 'radio and television components' means cabinets, tubes, power supply units, and antennae of the 'built-in' type, which are suitable for use on or in connection with, or as component parts of, any of the articles enumerated in section 4141, whether or not primarily adapted for such use."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall apply with respect to articles sold by the manufacturer, producer, or importer on or after January 1, 1955.

Two Thousand Five Hundred and Ninety-four Residents of the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania Participate in Post Card Survey of Public Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, a recent post card survey of public opinion was conducted in my congressional district in Pennsylvania with the result that from 6,000 questionnaires mailed to the 3-county area, 2,594 persons responded by answering the 12 questions asked in the annual poll. The number of replies received represent a response from 43.2 percent of those polled. The result also discloses that the opinions voiced represent a good cross section of the residents of the Blair-Centre-Clearfield area.

The question receiving the greatest number of favorable replies was in response to the question, "Do you favor U.S. insistence of an adequate inspection system before disarming?" "Yes" answers totaled 2,548, while 46 negative replies were recorded, for an average of 98.2 percent "yes" and 1.8 percent "no."

The tabulation of the 12 questions representing the views of 2,594 persons in Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties follows:

	Percent	
	Yes	No
1. Do you favor the resumption of nuclear testing by the United States?	81.2	18.8
2. Should the United States go to war to prevent being forced out of Berlin?	76.7	23.3
3. Should the United States try to place a man in space ahead of the Russians, regardless of the cost?	14.9	85.1
4. Do you favor recognition of Red China?	6.4	93.6
5. Do you favor U.S. insistence of an adequate inspection system before disarming?	98.2	1.8
6. Do you favor revising reciprocal trade agreements to decrease the importation of foreign products?	72.6	27.4
7. Do you favor providing medical and hospital care to recipients of social security benefits and paying the cost by increasing payroll taxes?	33.3	66.7
8. Do you favor Federal aid to education?	31.7	68.3
9. Do you favor giving the President the right to veto or accept specific items in an appropriation bill instead of the present requirement that he accept all or nothing?	48.2	51.8
10. Do you believe that Government controls over agriculture should be eliminated?	83.2	16.8
11. Do you favor building the Interstate Highway System on a "pay-as-you-go" basis even if it requires higher taxes?	52.6	47.4
12. Do you favor approval of a GI educational benefits program for peacetime veterans?	37.4	62.6

Mr. Speaker, the result of the public opinion poll has given me the benefit of the views of persons in various walks of life. I am grateful to all those who took the time to record their opinion and to return the questionnaire to me.

The Water Crisis in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that remarks prepared by me for delivery January 19, 1962, to the Michigan Association of Soil Conservation Districts, in Lansing, Mich., on the subject of "The Water Crisis in America," be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WATER CRISIS IN AMERICA

(Address by Senator PHILIP A. HART, Democrat, of Michigan, to the Michigan Association of Soil Conservation Districts, East Lansing, January 19, 1962)

This opportunity to meet with the representatives of the Michigan Soil Conservation Districts is one I appreciate and welcome. In addition to the more obvious reasons of personal friendship and esteem for the objectives of the organization, I have an indebtedness to your calling which I want publicly to acknowledge.

Back in October of 1959, there appeared at the hearing of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., a witness by the name of William E. Holiway. A lifelong farmer, Bill Holiway testified in his capacity as chairman of the Minnehaha Soil Conservation District. He gave the committee an analysis, classic in its clarity, brevity, and poetic quality, of why we have a water crisis. Directing himself, naturally, to the situation in his part of the country, he told us:

"History proves to us man cannot defy nature and survive. Our domestic cash crops do not have the vigorous root systems as compared to our native grasses. This has allowed our soils to solidify and pack, thus becoming more and more impervious to water. This does not allow the water to reach the underground streams the way nature meant it to—but sends it off over the top, taking the soil and plant foods with it and sending it downstream in flood proportions, making it poisoned and polluted and unfit for any purpose, devastating our neighbors in the lowlands, silting up and destroying the effect of the flood control works on our main streams, filling them with silt, till in time, they become useless. Now we must seek substitutes for nature's way."

I wish there were time to quote Bill Holiway in full. But the point is that this soil conservationist gave the Senate committee, and me in particular, an insight into our soil and water problem that a dozen volumes couldn't have duplicated.

What did we learn from those hearings, as we went from one end of the Nation to the other?

We learned first of all that there is no State of the Union that does not have a water problem: too little water, too much water, poor quality water—one way or the other, the time has come for all of us. When the Senate committee began its work 2½ years ago, most people in this "Water Wonderland" State saw little of importance in it for Michigan. When some of us tried to suggest that even for Michigan, water troubles were just around the corner, we didn't make much headway. But just these 27 months later, the story is quite different: A public beach is closed at Monroe due to pollution; complaints come to us that our rivers are becoming fouled from municipal sewage and industrial waste; our shoreline is beginning to suffer from the increased seaway traffic and greatly expanded recreational boating, a bitter struggle is waged as to whether a piece of our shoreline shall be set aside for industrial expansion or for wildlife and recreational purposes—and I'm not talking about Sleeping Bear; a controversy develops as to whether a pickle plant or a woolen mill shall continue to operate, providing much needed employment but also spewing sewage and poisonous wastes into nearby creeks.

The examples could be multiplied many times. It is now apparent to the most casual observer that in spite of the valiant and dedicated work of our fine Michigan Water Resources Commission, Michigan is no exception to the national water picture: it is a matter with which we must concern ourselves.

Second perhaps in importance to the nationwide character of the water crisis, our committee learned that pollution resulting from municipal and industrial wastes and from siltation is the most serious water problem confronting the Nation. This is particularly true of the industrial and relatively humid eastern and north central portions of the country. Because of huge demands for water for waste dilution, the western Great Lakes region was included among the areas in which by the year 2000 full development of available water resources will be required if the projected demands are to be met.

Our present technical knowledge is sufficient to cope with about 95 percent of the wastes which pollute our lakes and streams.

We need stepped-up research to discover how to treat the 5 percent which our new industrial processes have produced and which we do not yet know how to handle. But more importantly, we need the decisionmaking machinery and the funds to deal with the 95 percent for which we do have the know-how.

This calls for decisions that will place a higher priority on the importance of water quality and will assign the needed funds to permit us to move ahead. It also calls for decisions in the realm of governmental machinery, so that industry and local, State, and Federal Governments may all be geared to making their contribution to the cleansing of our streams—with a maximum of efficiency and a minimum of redtape.

When we held our water hearing in Detroit in October of 1959, Russell Hill made a very astute observation. He said, "I think the point that stands out in the hearings to date is the fact that people seem to represent the basis of much of our problems." He was referring to the growing numbers of people, their concentration in urban areas, their increased use of water, their expansion into areas where we have the most and best agricultural land. He could have added that just as in our quest for world peace our political ingenuity is way behind our technological ingenuity, so in this field our ability to resolve conflicts between people falls far behind our engineering capacity. As the demand for water increases—it will double by 1980 and triple by the year 2000—the conflicts will become sharper and the need for sound management greater.

A third fact of life which emerged from the hearings of the Senate committee was the growing importance of water for recreation and for conservation of fish and wildlife to support increased leisure time activities of the people. In the short life of our Nation we have seen emphasis focused on water for navigation, water for agriculture, water for power, water for industry, with a continuing recognition of the need for municipal water. Our committee heard repeatedly that outdoor recreation is rapidly becoming one of the most important uses of our lakes and rivers. As we said in our report, "public expression in the committee hearings made clear that the quality of American life is important as well as its capacity for growth."

Data furnished to the committee give us the following figures:

"The report contains estimates that visits to national parks will increase from 63 million in 1959 to 240 million by 1980, and well over 400 million by the year 2000. It is also estimated that visits to national forests and national, State, county, and municipal parks will reach 8 billion per year by 1980, and 13.4 billion by the year 2000. An estimated withdrawal of 63.7 billion gallons of water will be required for National, State and county parks in 1980 and 101.8 billion in the year 2000. Although the report indicates that the total volume of withdrawal water needed is relatively minor in comparison with water needs for agriculture, industry, and other uses, the quantity and quality of water surface needed for recreational activities is great and the need is steadily becoming more and more critical."

This whole question of safeguarding the beauties of our State for future generations to have and to enjoy is not to be categorized as a question of "minnows versus industry," of "ducks versus people," or of "vacationers versus property owners." It is just not that simple. We do not diminish our concern for the one because of our concern for the other. Rather we are trying to encourage the forethought which will make it possible for both to coexist. We are seeking to avoid damage to our land and water which cannot be undone.

Few groups practice this forethought to as great a degree as do the men and women of our soil conservation districts. You understand the need to plan for the future—to assess your needs and then to take the steps that will assure proper soil and water for those needs. You realize that until our scientists solve the mysteries of weather control, the management of the raindrops will still need to start on the land on which they fall.

One of our most successful programs to provide this kind of intelligent start is the small watershed program. Last summer I was assigned by the chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee to a new Subcommittee on Watersheds. This subcommittee, composed of Senators TALMADGE of Georgia, COOPER of Kentucky, and myself was directed to consider several small watershed projects then before the committee for approval and report to the committee.

It soon became apparent to our subcommittee that this watershed program, enacted into law in 1954, has mushroomed to the point where we need more than a project-by-project green light. Twenty-six projects have now been completed; 368 have been approved for construction; 707 have been approved for planning; 1,625 applications have been filed (an average of 34 per State), and the Department of Agriculture has testified to the need for projects in nearly 8,300 watersheds covering 1 billion acres of farmland—over half of the land area of the 48 States.

Obviously, a program of these dimensions is on its way to becoming a major element in our soil and water conservation effort. Its very popularity is presenting problems: such a backlog has built up that the schedule for installation of projects after approval has been extended from 5 to 7 or 8 years, with resulting higher costs to both local and Federal participants. If this is indeed a worthwhile program, and if local initiative and interest are to be maintained, then we must devise ways to assure greater protection of local funds and effort. Since its inception, this program has had a high degree of cooperation between local, State, and Federal governments. It behooves all of us to develop ways in which its democratic character can be maintained while at the same time streamlining the procedures.

Michigan particularly would benefit from such efforts. We now have 11 applications for watershed assistance pending at the Department of Agriculture. We have a stake in seeing that personnel and funds are as available for these watersheds as they have been for other equally meritorious areas.

I hope we in Michigan will not be gun shy of Federal programs which have been approved by the Congress and the Chief Executive and which are designed to assist State and local governments and local citizens in solving problems they alone cannot solve. Rivers know no county or State boundary lines for example, nor does disease, nor ignorance. No one has put this point more effectively, in my book, than Dr. Roscoe Martin of Syracuse University when he testified at our Boston hearing. He said:

"I would like to say, first, that I regard the Federal Government as my Government. It is not a government by or for somebody else. It is a Government run by and for my neighbors and me. It is a responsible government. I suspect it might be developed that the Federal Government is as responsible as any unit of government there is, but I shan't take that one on at that point.

"I shall say just that I am not afraid to see the Federal Government do the kind of work which I think it can do best."

But in so many cases, we need not quarrel among ourselves as to whether this water job will be done by the Federal Government or by the State government or by local initiative. There is plenty for all to do. Indeed, the requirements of the future are such that they challenge us to exhaust all constructive approaches.

There are many new and useful ways of responding to this challenge. Through imaginative use of revamped and expanded Federal assistance to local governments and groups, new combinations of water programs are possible. New Mexico is doing a State water resources survey with urban planning funds. Area redevelopment and the rural development programs hold promise. The Farmers Home Administration will underwrite small community water facilities. The Community Facilities Administration and the U.S. Public Health Service are expanding their research and grant and loan programs. The really successful attack on our water problems will come as localities devise means to tap these and other opportunities in new and dramatic ways.

You are accustomed to look ahead. Ahead of us lies greatly increased demand: for soil, for water, for conservation of some of the beauty of this earth before the bulldozer crushes it. I hope we will have the vision and the strength to act responsibly.

I have toured the land together with you—have seen firsthand the product of your efforts. I am in sympathy with your cause. I congratulate you on your progress. I pledge you my full support.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement delivered by me before the AFL-CIO Economic and Legislative Conference, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C., Tuesday, January 23, 1962:

The President, at his press conference, when asked why he did not sign the Executive order concerning the prohibition against racial discrimination in housing, replied that it was his belief he should not get too far ahead of public opinion in pressing for civil rights. When the President says he does not want to hamper or delay consideration of important bills and that pressing for civil rights would wound the sensibilities of southern Members of Congress and, therefore, induce them to vote against important legislation, he may be on practical, understandable ground, but, on the other hand, the Nation has been always expectant of strong moral leadership by the President. He must bring the weight of his high office and personality to bear on public opinion. The President understands this. He understands it because he, himself, said:

"If the President does not himself wage the struggle for equal rights—if he stands above the battle—then the battle will inevitably be lost."

In 1960, when he was a candidate, he emphasized this point of view and stated that the President must provide the spur for legislation as well as executive action. He said:

"The President cannot wait for others to act. He, himself, must draft the programs, transmit them to the Congress, and fight for their enactment, taking his case to the people if the Congress is slow."

There is no doubt that the President and his administration have gone a great way toward the prevention of erosion of civil rights. He has appointed many Negroes to high office; his Attorney General has shown exemplary wisdom and practicality in protecting the freedom riders; in causing the enforcement by the judicial process of the school desegregation case. In many ways, through executive action, the administration has rendered yeoman service to the cause of civil rights, in education, travel, employment, and voting. Those are only successive plateaus on the way to the summit. The administration cannot unduly tarry at any of these plateaus. The advance must be incessant and constant. The President, in his state of the Union message, said:

> "A strong America requires the assurance of full and equal rights to all its citizens, of any race, of any color."

To bring about that assurance, much more needs to be done. There is a legislative program as outlined in the Democratic platform, which was espoused by the President, which must be carried out.

As chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, I have a duty to perform. I have offered a series of bills, together with Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, which would materially strengthen civil rights over and beyond the advance made by the administration through executive action. These measures include the following:

1. A constitutional amendment to eliminate payment of poll taxes as a requirement of voting in Federal elections;

2. A constitutional amendment to eliminate literacy tests as a requirement for voting;

3. A bill to require every school board operating a racially segregated public school to adopt a desegregation plan within 6 months of the date of enactment of the bill and to file the plan with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The plan would state how the board intended to achieve desegregation with all deliberate speed in each of its schools and include a schedule showing the time and the manner in which desegregation would be achieved in each class and school. To meet the requirements of the act, the plan would have to provide for "first-step compliance" at an early date. Technical and financial assistance would be given under the bill to desegregating school districts, and court enforcement would be authorized in the cases of school boards which violated the duties set forth in the act;

4. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to initiate civil injunction suits in the Federal courts to prevent the denial of any civil right on grounds of race, creed, or color;

5. A fair employment practice bill to provide administrative and court remedies for those persons discriminated against as a result of race or color. The bill would make it an unfair employment practice for any business or labor union employing more than 50 persons to discriminate in its hiring, promoting or firing practices on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin; and

6. A bill to make the Civil Rights Commission a permanent Federal agency with strengthened factfinding powers and a new directive to act as "a national clearinghouse for civil rights information." Of course, the Civil Rights Commission has already been extended for 2 additional years but it is my firm conviction and belief that it should be a permanent Federal agency with the powers I have just outlined.

I intend to press for the enactment of these legislative proposals. Regardless of present legislative priorities, I am confident that the time will arrive when all of these measures will be placed on the statute books of our country.

In particular, at the present time, the leading priority will be the constitutional amendment to eliminate payment of poll taxes as a requirement for voting in Federal elections. As chairman of both the full House Committee on the Judiciary and of the subcommittee which handles civil rights legislation, I will call for consideration of this proposal in the very near future. I am confident that this proposal will receive early and favorable consideration, not only in my committee, but in the House of Representatives as well.

There is a current development in the field of labor and management which involves civil rights of the laboring man. I believe that the right to organize is a civil right of labor. All of you present here today, I am sure, realize the movement which is presently taking place to amend our antitrust laws so as to bring labor within the provisions from which they have been exempted since 1914. This attack on so-called labor monopolies is designed to fragmentize and fracture collective bargaining on a national scale and force collective bargaining on local union levels.

Any such amendment to the antitrust laws falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. I can assure you here that I will vigorously oppose any such amendment and I am more than confident that this attack upon the civil rights of labor will meet defeat again as it has in the past.

Consistency requires that civil rights must be protected on all levels of American life. It would be inconsistent if they were protected on the political, housing, transportation and educational levels and not on the labor level.

Reserve Callup Program Presents a Bleak Picture of Muddled Understanding of the Nation's Reserve Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues in this House a development that has occurred during our absence which may have serious consequences. I refer to the unfortunate statements, some of them by high officials in the Defense Department, that have brought forth a plethora of slurs and misinformation relating to our Reserve programs.

I am concerned not only that such widespread comment was allowed to spread unchecked by the Department of Defense but also about decisions that are obviously being made relative to the future of our Reserve components without the knowledge of the Congress and without due process through legally constituted bodies established by the Congress only after exhaustive deliberations on the part of the Armed Services Committee.

Before going into these developments, I wish to emphasize that in my judgment the Armed Forces Reserve Act, as amended in 1955, has well withstood the test of time, and we should not be stampeded into radical changes to it because of the recent experience of the present administration with a partial mobilization that was hastily conceived and hastily executed.

Let me make it emphatically clear that I do not for one moment criticize its necessity. That decision was one of the heavy responsibilities of the President which the Congress wholeheartedly supported.

But when radical changes of national policy are made, they must be accompanied by responsible and sympathetic leadership when the lives of American citizens are suddenly affected.

The recent partial mobilization did represent a very radical change in national policy. It marked the first time in our history that Army, Navy, and Air Force Reserves were involuntarily recalled during peacetime without at least the declaration of a limited national emergency.

Even so, the Reserves of all services attached to drilling units responded magnificently.

The Army called a substantial number of units from the Army Reserve and National Guard, including three divisions. They all reported to their stations on time. An important segment of competent combat strength was added to the Army at once. Among these divisions was a Reserve training division which took over training missions which promptly freed several combat divisions for deployment.

The Navy's selected Reserve responded immediately. It provided 40 destroyer types, 18 air squadrons with 190 aircraft to the fleet. These ships and aircraft squadrons were and are manned and commanded by Reserves. They have taken their places alongside their professional contemporaries of the Regular Navy without incident and without any postmobilization training.

Some of the destroyers were off the coast of the Dominican Republic during that crisis. The naval air squadrons are antisubmarine types and commenced their ASW surveillance patrols on the day they reported. They are flying these patrols at the present moment.

This was accomplished smoothly, quickly and without complaint.

The Air Reserve Forces provided 11 heavy air transport squadrons with 88 aircraft, and 25 fighter and reconnaissance squadrons with 576 jet aircraft that became immediately operational. Many at the present time are overseas flying alongside their professional contemporaries, adding significantly to the coverage of our combat alerts and to the tonnage of our strategic airlift.

Their senior Air Force commanders have been exceptionally enthusiastic describing their competent, professional performance.

All of this marks an achievement unsurpassed in this Nation's history. It sets forth in bold relief a convincing demonstration of the readiness and effectiveness of our citizen soldiers, sailors, and airmen achieved through the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act.

The complaints which caused so much unfavorable publicity emanated from the so-called fillers who were not members of units and who were called up to bring units up to strength. They were not paid reservists and they had little reason to expect to be mobilized at this time.

They came from pools of reservists with Ready Reserve obligations under the Universal Military Training and Service Act. Many of them had just completed 2 years of active duty in the Army under the draft. Not being members of the organized units, they were, of course, not oriented and disciplined for the callup. Under these circumstances an almost certain climate for complaints was established.

This was clear enough to the Congress which cautioned against it.

Nevertheless, the complaints that were received were relatively few and were magnified out of all proportion.

The morale of these recalled reservists has remained high. Reports come in from all sides attesting to this.

One may be sure, however, that this morale has not been sustained by any leadership from the Defense Department with such statements from high-level civilian officials as "that's what we've been paying them for," "reservists have not oriented themselves to the thought that they are called up to prevent a war rather than to fight," and "we must increase the Regular forces since we cannot rely upon the Reserves."

Relatedly a "Why Me" pamphlet has been issued by the Defense Department—perhaps to offset a tempest in a teapot of their own making that got out of control.

But let us turn to even more serious matters—the future of the Reserves.

ARMY RESERVE

Rumors persist that a wholesale reorganization of the Army Reserve has been planned and approved. The President has indicated such action. This reorganization has not been processed through the General Staff Committee on Army Reserve Policy as required by law.

Section 3033, title 10, United States Code, requires that "Each policy or regulation affecting the organization, distribution, training appointment, assignment, promotion, or discharge of members of the Army Reserve shall be prepared by a committee of officers of the appropriate divisions of the Army General Staff and of an equal number of officers of the Army Reserve"—General Staff Committee on Army Reserve Policy.

This committee was not consulted even though it actually was in session during the time these decisions were being made.

This "end run" around the law has caused the Chairman of the Committee on Army Reserve Policy to write a formal letter of protest to the Secretary of the Army, according to newspaper reports.

The Reserve Forces Policy Board established by law as the advisory body to the Secretary of Defense on Reserve Affairs did not participate in this reorganization. In fact, as far as I can determine, this important statutory Board was not even consulted.

And finally the Congress, which is charged with the responsibility of raising, maintaining, and regulating the services, has not been informed.

NAVAL RESERVE

This fine component of our Reserves turned in an outstanding demonstration of professional readiness. They achieved the posture through serious, rugged drill participation. One would expect that the training of those in the Selected Reserve not yet called would be increased—but what has actually happened?

The Navy's Selected Reserve was set at 135,000. The Armed Services Committee has accepted this target established by the Secretary of Defense.

Yet, the present administration limited the Navy to a Reserve budget for 1962 to maintain its Reserve at 125,000. This marked a cut of $3 million from the 1961 budget.

This was further compounded by the use of the transfer authority by the Secretary of Defense to additionally reduce this training budget, along with endless restrictions by comptrollers at various echelons.

The result has been a reduction in drills during December for the Selected Reserve, the elimination of pay for commanding officers of the Naval Reserve officers schools and a denial of active duty for training to officers of the Navy's specialist component even though they volunteered to take this duty without pay.

From a morale viewpoint these reservists deserve better than this niggardly treatment. From a training viewpoint it is almost unbelievable that such action should be taken when the President has indicated the existence of a situation bordering on a national emergency.

THE AIR RESERVE FORCES

These splendid reservists equaled the Navy in producing a convincing demonstration of not only of readiness but also of the important position they fitted in the Air Force military posture. We all know of the manifest need for strategic airlift and these Reserves provided just that. The Air National Guard at the same time provided the essential augmentation to fighter squadrons in Europe.

Yet each year we see them slowly choked off by steadily decreasing funds for training, maintenance, equipment, and flying hours.

The Air Force Reserve has another important facet—the recovery component. This is an all-important feature which has had enthusiastic approval of the Congress. Yet several million dollars of the funds appropriated by Congress for their training has been impounded, even though other segments of the administration are emphasizing the essentiality of an overall national post-strike recovery and recomposition capability.

CONCLUSION

The succession of events, when put in perspective, presents a bleak picture of muddled understanding of the Nation's Reserve Forces. Implicit in this is a disturbing feature of constitutional evasion.

The abolition of the Assistant Secretaries for Reserve in each of the services, the hastily and poorly handled callup, the lack of leadership accompanied by ill-considered statements, the avoidance of the use of statutory boards and the inexcusable withholding of funds appropriated by the Congress are pieces that fall into a pattern of philosophy which if fully exploited may seriously weaken the Nation's mobilization base and the ability of the Congress to control it.

It is my fervent hope that the Congress will hold extensive hearings on this subject of overriding importance and restore the firm foundation of national security that lies in our strong mobilization base: the deterrent feature which its existence imposes upon any enemy, and the ability to achieve victory which its full use, if necessary, will insure.

Domestic Dictators: Our Greatest Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in our preoccupation with the important business of meeting totalitarianism around the world we seem to give scant attention to its presence right here in our midst. We are spending fifty-odd billion a year to develop the deterrent force necessary to contain Khrushchev, Mao, and their ilk. And we are spending additional billions in the guise of foreign aid to placate or win lesser fry from attaching themselves to the Communist train.

But with all this attention to the dictators who flourish beyond our borders we seem oblivious to the threat to our freedom that is posed here at home by arrogant labor leaders of the stripe of Mike Quill and Jimmy Hoffa. The men who are enrolled in the ranks of labor—whether voluntarily or under compulsion matters not—are in the main loyal American citizens who want nothing more than the privilege of working at gainful employment at a return that will keep them and their families in decent comfort. And I know from conversation with them that they realize that every time they are called out on strike by some publicity seeking tyrant they wind up with a loss in earnings that is never made up.

In the current situation, Mike Quill aided and abetted by Hoffa, has threatened to shut down all traffic over the Pennsylvania and New York Central railroads in the event that these two companies proceed with their plans to merge into one system. Indeed Quill's arrogance is so great and his conceit so colossal that he is not going to await the routine procedures that both companies must follow before the Interstate Commerce Commission, but has indicated his intention to bring all trains to a stop on February 4 on the mere assumption that some of his nonoperating unionists might be adversely affected. And, incidentally, why should not they be laid off if they are not needed? Indeed, it has been featherbedding, retaining railroad employees in unnecessary or duplicating jobs, that has helped to bring the railroads to their present plight. To say that men should be kept in any position on "made work" is also to argue illogically that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania should not now be in the process of losing three Congressmen in the face of an increase in population. And by the same token to deny to railroads every possible economy of operation—such as consolidation and a reduction of the working force—will only serve to speed the day when our primary transportation system will grind to a halt simply because the washout of bankruptcy has swept away the tracks. But Quill, who has no concern for corporate responsibility or management's pressing problem of trying to make a reasonable return to its investors, says that human factors transcend all financial considerations, totally ignoring the fact that they are inseparably bound together—no profits, no jobs.

As usual in cases such as this the public welfare is completely ignored by the labor hierarchy who seek primarily the preservation of their own despotic sway at salaries that match their opposites on the management side. Having just put the city of New York in its place with the threat of a transit strike, Quill now moves on the national scene. In this instance it is hoped that the occupant of the White House will not allow this despot to intimidate him as he did the occupant of Gracie Mansion in New York. The Railway Labor Act embodies all of the machinery necessary to an orderly review of this controversy with complete fairness to both sides as well as the much-abused public. And in the event existing statutes are inadequate the Congress has the clear responsibility to enact laws that will henceforth prevent all work stoppages in the field of transportation, which is so vital to our defenses and the well-being of all of our citizens. As I have already emphasized, what is the use of girding ourselves to keep the Communist aggressors within bounds if we are to lose the battle—and our freedom—to these homegrown dictators?

Statement of Representative John R. Pillion, Fifth Anniversary of the Hungarian Freedom Revolution, Buffalo, N.Y., October 22, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on October 22, 1961, the city of Buffalo, N.Y., saluted the fifth anniversary of the Hungarian freedom revolution. One of the speakers was the Representative of the 42d Congressional District of New York, the Honorable JOHN R. PILLION, whose voice rings out in the Halls of Congress forever warning us of the threat of the Communist regime. I commend his speech to the attention of the membership of this body.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN R. PILLION, FIFTH ANNIVERSARY, HUNGARIAN FREEDOM REVOLUTION, BUFFALO, OCTOBER 22, 1961

Dr. O'Connor, Monsignor Szabo, Reverend Buto, Congressman Dulski, Mayor Sedita, my fellow Americans, I share with each of you a deep sense of sorrow on this occasion, the fifth anniversary of the tragic anti-Communist, anti-Soviet Hungarian freedom revolution.

Although 5 years have elapsed, time has not softened the brutalities and the atrocities of Budapest. Nor has time dimmed our memories of the bravery, the supreme sacrifices of the children, the men, the women of Hungary, in their heroic struggle to rid themselves of the Communist-Soviet tyranny.

No useful purpose is served, if we look back upon the Hungarian freedom revolution as, merely, another page in world history.

The same Communist-Soviet forces that machinegunned the children of Budapest are prepared to machinegun the children of Buffalo.

The Nikita Khrushchev, who ordered military mass murder attacks upon the Hungarian civilian population is the same Nikita Khrushchev who has repeatedly threatened the evaporation of the American people, you and I, with 50- and 100-megaton nuclear bombs.

The Hungarian freedom crusade should serve as a reminder to each of us, every day, every hour, that the same diabolical forces seek our destruction, too.

The United States happens to be only a few years further away, on Mr. Khrushchev's timetable.

The Hungarian revolution is more than a reminder, it is a verification of the total global war being waged by the Communist-Soviet forces against all freemen, against all free institutions, societies and nations of the free world.

Since the organization of the international Communist conspiracy in the year 1919, one nation after another has fallen into the orbit of the Soviet: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Ukraine, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Poland, Hungary, China, North Korea, North Vietnam, Tibet, Cuba, British Guiana.

Another 20 to 30 nations are on the verge of Communist seizure, ready to follow Soviet direction and dictation.

We are confronted with crises in Laos, South Vietnam, Berlin, Iran, Ghana, and many other countries in every hemisphere.

The free world is entering its darkest hours. This Nation stands in its greatest peril.

The danger is now, today.

It increases every hour, every day.

The United States and the free world has completely failed to comprehend the magnitude, the scope, the weapons of the Communist-Soviet war.

It is a war of demoralization, disintegration and destruction; it is a relentless, incessant war; it is an unlimited war of indefinite duration, a war of orthodox and unorthodox methods, strategies and tactics; a war of total enmity, to which our enemies are irrevocably committed.

This total war has two parts—two campaigns.

The major campaign is being waged by the international Communist conspiracy.

This consists of 98 Communist parties organized in almost every nation. These parties serve under the leadership and direction of Nikita Khrushchev as First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The second phase of this total war is carried on by the Soviet and the Soviet bloc nations.

Both parts of this total war have one common purpose: our destruction.

Both campaigns have one commander in chief: Nikita Khrushchev.

Our failure to comprehend the nature, the totality of this war has resulted in one defeat after another for the free world.

The United States has been waging a unilateral campaign for peace, while the Communist-Soviet forces have been waging a unilateral campaign of economic, political, diplomatic, and psychomoral war.

We are steadily losing this war.

Our foreign policies, for the past 30 years, have completely failed to meet the realities and the practicalities of the Communist offensive.

Our foreign policies have not materially changed in the past 30 years.

They have been defensive—self-deceptive and self-defeating.

Permit me to remind you of a number of these policies:

1. Military superiority. Our heaviest losses, middle Europe, China, were sustained in the period between 1945 and 1953, when the United States had a clear military superiority.

At that time we were heavily infiltrated with pro-Communist influences in our Government and lacked a firm foreign policy to coordinate with and to match our military superiority.

2. Our military alliances, NATO, SEATO, have had some value, but they are not an effective answer to the Communist war of subversion.

3. The policy of massive retaliation has not proven to be an effective answer.

4. The United Nations is not a successful institution for blocking Communist aggression.

5. Summit meetings and negotiations have not proven effective.

6. Foreign aid, atoms-for-peace plans, international loans, disarmament negotiations are not adequate answers.

7. Peaceful coexistence is not the answer.

Our foreign policies, in the main, have been that of bribery of the Communists, direct aid to Communist countries, appeasement, negotiation, compromise, vacillation.

All of them defensive and all of them eventuating into retreat and surrender, bit by bit, nation by nation.

As a people, we have been confused, irresolute, naive, and gullible.

We have allowed ourselves to become divided, deceived, and diverted from the realities of the Communist dangers by fellow travelers, innocent dupes, and active Communists who follow the Communist mandates emanating from Moscow.

They exist in our churches, our schools and colleges, in the movies, on radio, on television, in the newspaper field, and in our Government.

It is my conviction that the steady decline of U.S. power and prestige is leading us into the desperate alternatives of either surrender or a preventive thermonuclear war.

There is a third alternative, if we have the will to accept the realities of our situation.

This third alternative is contained in my resolution, House Joint Resolution 447.

This resolution calls for a declaration of war against the international Communist conspiracy, lead by the Communist Party of the Soviet.

It would recognize every Communist, every 1 of the 98 Communist parties of the world, for what they are, sworn, implacable enemies of the United States.

This declaration would not create a new war, it merely recognizes an existing war in which we are the No. 1 target.

We cannot successfully defend this Nation, if we ignore the existence of this war against us.

We cannot survive if we limit ourselves to suffering all losses in this war and allow all victories to go to the Soviet.

We cannot formulate effective policies to counter Communist-Soviet aggressions, guerrilla wars, infiltrations and subversions, until we fully comprehend the magnitude and nature of this war, until we identify our enemies, locate the deployment of their forces.

Gentlemen, we are in a war.

Let us declare it.

Let us win it.

In the main, there are two fundamental requirements that this country must accept and adopt if we are to survive.

The first requirement is that of military superiority.

We have permitted our military power to erode until the Soviet has attained a relative parity.

The Soviet, today, is superior in the field of rocketry and intercontinental missiles.

Its army is vastly superior to that of the free world.

Although the United States excels in its Air Force, in its Navy and in its atomic capabilities, the question of overall superiority of total destructive firepower and war capability is in doubt.

Superiority depends upon the type of strategy that will be used in the event of war.

Unless we take immediate action to restore a clear military supremacy, we are inviting national and international suicide.

We should place our intercontinental missile program on a crash, 24-hour, 7-day-per-week basis.

We should proceed with full-scale atomic testing in order to further increase our lead in atomic forepower.

I have requested Chairman Seaborg and General Manager Luedecke of the Atomic Energy Commission to increase our production, not of clean bombs, but of maximum radioactive bombs with low ceilings to take advantage of the prevailing winds over Russia.

This would be a salutary answer to Mr. Khrushchev's threats to launch his 100-megaton bomb.

Our Navy is technologically obsolete.

We need a vast program to equip every vessel with nuclear power and nuclear missiles.

This program would give the United States hundreds of movable missile bases, dispersed around the world. It would divert Soviet missiles from the United States.

Our present concrete intercontinental missiles attract and invite a missile attack upon our land.

The recommendations of Governor Rockefeller and President Kennedy for the construction of fallout shelters is a confession of the gravity of our situation.

Fallout shelters may save 7 million out of 70 million. It is pennywise.

I believe in saving not 7 million but all 70 million of our citizens who might be killed in a nuclear attack.

We should not be pound foolish.

I believe that we should save every American.

We can do so only by having sufficient military power to prevent a Soviet miscalculation of our will and ability to completely eradicate the Soviet empire.

We must be prepared to not only wage a war and to win a war, but more important, to prevent against a war of any kind.

Our military superiority should be at least 1.5 to 1 over the Soviet at all times—a 50-percent superiority.

We have the wealth, the economy to maintain this supremacy.

It is the first essential for survival.

In the field of foreign policy, we need a complete reevaluation of our national goals, our foreign policies, our policymaking machinery.

There is a complete lack of orientation and coordination between our military capabilities and our foreign policies.

Our foreign policy and military capability are interdependent and must support each other to attain our national objectives.

The fiasco of Cuba is a classic example of the complete lack of coordination between the President's Office, the State Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the National Security Agency.

We cannot compete with the Soviet unless we can establish agencies for the development of coordinated, firm, offensive foreign policies to effectively counter Communist-Soviet subversions and aggressions in every nation of this world.

Our present policy of containment is wholly inadequate to meet the Communist-Soviet challenge.

A military supremacy, combined with a firm, tough, realistic foreign policy is the only hope for our survival.

It is the only hope for the liberation of the captive nations in Europe.

The sacrifices of the Hungarian people will not have been in vain, if we can remember freedom is not free, it demands vigilance, courage, and sacrifice.

Report on Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, recently one of our colleagues made a special report as a student of our trade and tariff policies.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, JOHN H. DENT, has worked for over a year as chairman of a special committee studying the "Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment."

I was privileged to sit with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] as a member of this committee during its many days of public hearings.

Since the subject of trade is one of vital importance to all of the people of our Nation, I ask that the following report by Representative DENT be inserted in the RECORD.

REPRESENTATIVE DENT REPORTS ON FOREIGN TRADE BATTLE

(By Hon. JOHN H. DENT, Democrat of Pennsylvania)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The first big fight in the 2d session of the 87th Congress will be over foreign trade and the vital question of the effect of imports from foreign countries on American jobs and American business. President John F. Kennedy is lining up his forces in the Congress—both Democratic and Republican—in support of a broad new foreign-trade program that would give the State Department virtually unlimited authority to negotiate tariff-free trade agreements without congressional approval. The forces opposing the proposed program include the UMWA, a number of other labor organizations, important segments of American business and industry, farm organizations, and top representatives of both political parties in both Houses of Congress. The spokesman for the forces in favor of protecting American jobs in the House of Representatives, where the real fight will come, is Representative JOHN H. DENT (Democrat, of Pennsylvania), chairman of the Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports on Employment of the House Committee on Education and Labor. Representative DENT, a friend of the UMWA, has prepared a special article for the Journal on the subject. The article follows.)

Recently, one of the many reports being publicized in the press by a congressional committee that is promoting the new free-trade bill in Congress contained some interesting propositions. This report apparently was prepared by a young foreign affairs expert named Sam Pisar.

This report suggests a plan of treaties between free nations that would have the U.S. taxpayers underwrite any losses sustained by our friends if they refuse to sell to Russia, if Russia undersells the free nations in the world market after a price has been set on a commodity by traditional traders or by gentlemen's agreements. We recall the case of gentlemen's agreements in the electrical industry in the United States. Some persons went to jail.

If Pisar's suggestions become law, our industries will have one code of ethics in the United States and another in world trade.

Imagine paying damages to a country based on losses because they don't sell a commodity. Who would pay the damages? The American taxpayer, of course.

Never in our history has the danger to our future been so great. No person living can even start to estimate the cost of the trade-shift program advanced by the Pisar report. His plan, simply put, means that the U.S. taxpayer would pay for losses incurred by any country that will agree to stop doing business with the Soviet bloc and if the Soviets undersell the world market price on any commodity on which the so-called free nations have set a selling price.

If ever a dead giveaway of a frameup on the American people was exposed by a premature and overly zealous rush to destroy this Nation's economic independence was presented to the people, this is it.

This trade-shift plan shows how each step must follow the other in the well-conceived plan that has suckered into its tenacles many good and sincere Americans. Most of us agreed that it was the humane and proper thing to do; yet we may have fallen into a trap by being good neighbors and good samaritans. We helped our allies to regain and then to surpass their former economic level. We then were led to believe that by helping our former enemies to regain their past stature we could build up a wall against the dreaded doctrines of communism. We forgot that man is still man just a few centuries older. The truth is that our friends have been trading with the Soviets right along.

We never stopped helping. As soon as we gave our allies as well as our former enemies economic stature and industrial capacity beyond their fondest dreams, we started giving every other country, some yet unformed, dreams of industrial capacities beyond their needs and the rich plums to be picked in the never-ending demand of the American home market.

The American worker was told that there was a "pie in the sky"; that unlimited markets for his products were being created in the faraway places. We all were told that by buying imports we created a market for our exports and riches flowed from the outside in, not the inside out. The plight of our gold supply soon exploded this fallacy. The plotters against our economy then learned another truth: Congress must be sold on this plan. The best way to keep Congress and, thus, the people lined up was to get directly to the Congress. Here, the new phenomenon appeared on the American scene.

LOBBYISTS BREED LIKE MOSQUITOES

The agents, the representatives, the native American lobbyists for foreign countries started to breed like mosquitoes in a swamp. They came from the best families, the highest echelons of the political parties, the biggest law firms and public relations experts.

Some were the friends of the powers that be, some were and are the friends or the friends of friends of Congress. Like a virus, they reached every vein and artery of the bloodstream of America.

Now we see the next phase in our walk down the one-way street to industrial, economic, and political oblivion. This phase (Pisar report) recognizes, even if the people do not, that once this country removes all restraints on imports, then the end of this Nation will be a matter of a few short years. Nothing the so-called European Common Market setup can do can stop the complete destruction of our economy by the trading deals between the Soviet bloc and the Common Market. The United States will be stuck in the middle, having to deal with the Common Market under both its favorite nation obligations and because of the antitrading-with-the-Soviet-bloc policy.

The Common Market with its free access to our market will dump consumer goods into this market while dealing with Russia. It will barter for those products needed for the European economy at prices we cannot match or meet with our free labor in competition with sovietized slave labor. Pisar recognizes that without a trade shift or economic treaty with other nations, this country will be destroyed as an economic power by the simple procedure of being squeezed between the cheap imports from the Common Market and the coal, steel, raw materials, wheat, and other American products we can produce cheaper than the Common Market but not cheaper than the slave labor economy of the Soviet bloc.

Even the expert Pisar states that one of the conditions that has made the Common Market the cause of alarm is "the currently massive procurement by the Soviet bloc from Western Europe of modern plant and equipment embodying the latest in Western industrial technology."

Where did our Western European allies and friends get their industrial technology and modern plants and equipment? From the United States, of course. What makes these so-called foreign trade experts so foolish as to believe that anything we do will stop our friends from dealing with the Soviet bloc after we enter the Common Market?

It must be assumed that our friends who, for the past decade, have been using our know-how, our money, and our markets to make themselves economically sound while at the same time trading with the Soviet bloc will not change their ways so long as there are profits to be made. Look at what happened to France. France was buying (?) 5 million tons of anthracite from Pennsylvania's hard coal region and the United States was pouring good will and American assets into creating a sizable small-tools and machine-tool industry in France.

As soon as the French were in a position to sell this equipment, they made a barter deal and now Russia supplies the coal while France sells Russia the tools. How do the free traders plan to sell France American hard coal while our market is loaded with machine tools? Or do we start buying machine tools the same as we buy the millions of consumer items which we also have in excess of our needs.

I want to see the character of the new deals with which Americans are to be saddled. Will we allow the free entry from other countries of cotton, tobacco, peanuts, wheat, and other agricultural products, and if so, who picks up the bill for the added unemployment in this country?

Any 10-year-old kid in grade school knows that production will flow to the low wage areas and trade will flow to the consuming market with the highest wage levels.

Sooner or later, the same disease that has destroyed many of our high cost communities will destroy the whole American high-income economy. Pisar and his ilk are afraid of the closed ultraprotectionist communistic economies—and insist that the consumer lay in "common ground rules designed to remove the distortions and dislocations which accompany commerce between free and competitive economies."

Does this young man—Pisar—honestly believe that Hong Kong and Japan, with their 11- to 25-cent-an-hour wages, Latin American countries emerging as industrial nations with 80 cents a day top wages and the European Common Market with $4 a day incomes to skilled workers, are free and competitive market economies, with our $1.15 an hour national minimum wage laws, our free-union economy, and our antitrust, antimonopoly industrial straitjackets?

Markets aren't measured by the size of population, but rather by the level of economy in a given market area. Asia has a great number of people; but it cannot compare with the U.S. domestic market. We are told by the free traders that the Common Market is a threat because of its size, yet these same people are adamant in their opposition to trading with Red China with twice as many people. The Common Market is not a threat. It is just what we made it. We planned it, we sold it to the European nations, we charged it off as a bulwark against communism. It is a good thing and should have been promoted; but only as a Common Market for the common good of the participating nations belonging to the same economic group.

This nation of ours prospered and grew with over 100 years of protective tariffs, trading freely in goods, services, and peoples among the States under a common bond of trade economics, language, laws, taxes, and defense. The European Common Market is made up of separate nations, each with its own laws, taxes, armies, economics, and sovereign governments. Nothing this market does can prevent any nation from withdrawing from one or more of the trade covenants if that nation's sovereign government decides it best for that nation to do so. No State in the United States can set up its own individual tariff or trade deal with a foreign country. No State can make a treaty or an alliance without the participation of each and all of the States.

But this is not and won't be true of the Common Market. The only nation that will be tied to the Common Market without the freedom of action allowed the European members will be the United States of America. If we wipe out trade barriers between the United States and the Common Market countries, how do we maintain tariff walls against Japan and other countries outside the Common Market?

Another thing that is as sure as life itself: The Common Market countries will never allow an American product to be imported into the marketplace of any of its component nations at a price below their own selling price unless that product is one not produced in the Common Market countries.

We will get the treatment we are getting on machine tools from Japan. Japan has reached a local production capacity to take care of most of its needs on machine tools up to $80,000 in value. Without too much fanfare, the Japanese have set a new tariff on machine tools up to $80,000 or 25 percent ad valorem. When a spokesman for Japanese interests was asked about reciprocity he made this astounding statement:

"The Japanese are great believers in reciprocity and while we raised the tariff on machine tools, we are lowering the tariff on bourbon whisky from 45 to 35 percent. You see, we are not unmindful of our obligations." It was pointed out that the Japanese do not import enough bourbon whisky to keep a respectable Irish wake going for 2 nights.

IMMIGRATION WALLS MIGHT TUMBLE

Unless there is a free movement of peoples, the aims of the dreamers can never be achieved by limiting freedom to the movement of goods. All Americans should be told that the tearing down of protective walls for jobs and profits carries with it the promise to the world that immigration walls will tumble in the very near future.

Does any person believe that the peoples of the world will be willing to work, to make life easier for Americans without the right to join us in our promised ease of living? Our standard of living cannot be reached by the world peoples in the measurable future unless we reduce our standards radically, while they slowly inch theirs upward.

No nation will or can respect any nation that neglects its own welfare no matter how many leaders are giving the signals. The people are ahead of the leaders and if the plans of the Pisars and other "free traders" are put into effect they will cause a political upheaval the likes of which this Nation has not seen since the depths of the depression.

In closing, consider the situation within our own free trade area of 50 separate, but united, States. You have to pay a tariff if you bring whisky from one State into another, but you can ship or bring home a gallon free from foreign countries.

Even furniture, automobiles, appliances or any other item sales taxed (tariffed) in one State cannot be purchased in another State without paying the tariff to the State in which the commodity is being moved. It's well known to Pennsylvanians that the State government adds customs officers for the holiday seasons to keep native Pennsylvanians from bringing in contraband liquors, cigarettes, etc., without properly declaring same and paying duty imposed by State law.

Why is this necessary? Simply because some States depend upon these taxes or tariffs for their payment of services rendered to the people of the State.

The new proposals which call for free movement of goods, and the payment of losses of profits for any nation refusing to do business with the Soviet bloc will make our present national debt look like a piggy bank payment on a Rolls-Royce.

United Nations Day Banquet in Martinsburg, W. Va., on October 18, 1961, Addressed by Minister Plenipotentiary of the Republic of China, Dr. Yi-seng Kiang

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on October 18, 1961, the citizens of the city of Martinsburg commemorated the 16th United Nations Day with a banquet sponsored by the Junior Board of Trade, the Kiwanis Club, the Lions Club, the Rotary Club, the Soroptimist Club, Traveler's Protective Association, and the Woman's Club.

It was my privilege to introduce the principal speaker, Dr. Yi-seng Kiang, Minister Plenipotentiary of the Republic of China, who spoke on the topic of "China and the United Nations." Dr.

Kiang discussed most effectively the contributions of that Republic to the founding of the United Nations and the maintenance of the continued integrity of that organization. He also explained with logic and clarity the reasons why the Chinese Communists should not be admitted to the United Nations as representatives of Government of China. In view of the continued significance of this issue, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks in introduction of Dr. Kiang and an article reporting his visit to the United Nations Day Banquet in the Martinsburg Journal be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by Senator Jennings Randolph, Democrat, of West Virginia, in Introduction of the Minister Plenipotentiary of the Republic of China, Dr. Yi-seng Kiang at the United Nations Day Banquet, Martinsburg, W. Va., October 18, 1961

Not in the 12 years of its existence has there been a United Nations Day observance on which we faced more somber prospects for the maintenance and viability of the United Nations itself.

The present crisis of the U.N. has been precipitated and its possible consequences accentuated, by the tragic death of Dag Hammarskjold. Yet this was not the cause. The current peril has been germinating for the past 10 years at least, and it has been acute since 1959.

The central issue—which underlies all the major problems on the agenda of this assembly—is whether the United Nations shall be a mere forum of debate or whether, acting as an agency of the world community, it will be empowered, in the language of the charter, "to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace."

It was to this end that Dag Hammarskjold worked so tirelessly and courageously, and this ideal for which he made the final sacrifice that fatal night over the Congo. Dag Hammarskjold's mission was in part—as he wrote to a friend shortly before his death—in response to the need for a "deep sense for the spiritual basis—and responsibility—of the United Nations."

At such times as now, when the United Nations is riven by the disruptive tactics of the Soviet Union and threatened by paralysis of the Secretariat, it is difficult for us to maintain the vision of this spiritual ideal to which Hammarskjold was so fully committed. Yet we must, if we are to avert the unparalleled disaster of nuclear war, maintain the vision of what the U.N. must become—an effective agency for bringing the rule of law into international affairs. Thus it is precisely at this time that the U.N. most needs the informal and vocal support of such persons as yourselves.

For there is a growing ferment of confusion and frustration among the American people when we witness the increasing complexity and difficulty of coping with the aggressive designs of the Soviet Union and Communist China. And this has generated an increasing temptation among many toward rash actions of military reprisal or, equally perilous, toward withdrawing our support from the United Nations. There is, therefore, an urgent and compelling need to communicate to the apathetic, the frustrated, and the uninformed American the significance of this "last best hope of mankind." Each of us has a place in this task of awakening our fellow citizens, for, in the words of Ambassador Stevenson, "We must all be partners, all participants in the experiment of building a civic order for all mankind."

We are extremely fortunate tonight in having as our honor guest one who represents in his own person those values on which a "civic order for mankind" must be established, and one who has worked many years to that purpose.

Dr. Yi-seng Kiang, Minister Plenipotentiary and Acting Chargé d'Affaires of the Embassy of the Republic of China, is an especially appropriate speaker for this commemorative United Nations Day. Currently assigned to the 16th General Assembly as adviser to the Chinese Minister of Foreign Affairs, he is well versed in and deeply involved with the central problems which this session of the United Nations faces.

Dr. Kiang brings to this service the background of having been a participant at the San Francisco Conference in 1945 for which he drafted the Chinese version of the United Nations Charter. As Consul General in Los Angeles for 10 years thereafter, Dr. Kiang developed knowledge and insight into American culture and he helped to strengthen the bonds which unite Americans with the free people of China.

Nationalist China Minister Makes Red China Ban Plea

Yi-seng Kiang, Minister Plenipotentiary of the Embassy of the Republic of China, stationed at Washington, made a ringing plea for the cause of his Government in its current case before the United Nations; expressed confidence that the U.N. can and will find a satisfactory solution of the issue; and pleaded for full American support for the United Nations, when he spoke here last night at the Shenandoah to the more than 350 persons—men and women—attending the annual observance of the anniversary of the birth of the United Nations.

He appeared as speaker in the place of Ambassador George Kung-chao Yeh, envoy to this country, kept from keeping the engagement because he was at home on official business. He suggested Minister Kiang to U.S. Senator Randolph, of West Virginia, who had been instrumental in scheduling the Ambassador. The speaker was introduced by Senator Randolph.

Mr. Kiang is serving currently on assignment to the Chinese delegation to the U.N. as adviser.

He said though China is at the moment divided, he has full confidence it will be reunited on Nationalist policies, and his countrymen looked to the U.N. to help.

He also expressed his Government's appreciation for the friendship of the United States.

He spoke on the theme, "China and the United Nations."

He drew certain lessons from the old League of Nations; referred to China's contributions to the drafting of the U.N. Charter; specifically referred to article 141 of the Constitution of the Republic of China pledging respect to the U.N. Charter.

He pointed out that the ROC is an original and founding member of the U.N.; article 23 provides that the ROC is one of the permanent members of the Security Council.

He also listed certain reasons his Government feels should prevent the Chinese Communists being admitted to the U.N.: They are not peaceloving; have been condemned as an aggressor by resolution of the U.N. which still stands; being un-Chinese in origin, do not represent the will of the people; their acts of subversion and infiltration in Laos and South Vietnam.

He then turned to answering certain arguments which have been advanced for admission to Communist China, and undertook to refute them point by point—such as: universality of U.N. membership; political realism; isolation of Red China leads to intransigence; peaceful coexistence (China tried it three times); disarmament (he said failure of disarmament talks is due to the uncompromising attitude of the U.S.S.R. and has nothing to do with the nonparticipation of Communist China); opinion of Asian members is overwhelmingly in favor of admission (Asia is a vast and desperate continent—no one can speak for all Asians); that the ROC is a "lost cause" (he said ROC maintains friendly relations with 50 U.N. member-states whereas Communist China has such with only 35).

He also referred to congressional concurrent resolution in the 87th session (passed unanimously in both Houses) which stated it to be the sense of Congress that the United States shall continue to meet its commitments to the people and the Government of the Republic of China and shall continue to support that Government as the representative of China in the U.N.; that the United States shall continue to oppose the seating of the Chinese Communist regime in the U.N. so long as that regime persists in defying the principles of the U.N. Charter; that the American people support the President in not according diplomatic recognition of the Communist regime.

He said the preservation of the Charter and the U.N. will be for the statesmen of the world the crucial test; for the U.N. and for the world this will probably be the final test.

He was interrupted several times by applause.

Presenting Minister Kiang, Senator Randolph recalled that the speaker had been present when the U.N. Charter was written in San Francisco and had helped in its preparation, and that his present assignment as a counselor to the National China delegation to the U.N. puts him in a position to speak authoritatively on its workings.

He also read a telegram from Ambassador Yeh, dated in Formosa, which explained that owing to an unforeseen prolonging of his stay there on official business he would be unable to keep his engagement to appear here. He said he would be glad to suggest Minister Kiang, a member of his embassy, now in charge. He wished the local meeting full success.

Mr. Kiang has been in Washington since 1960. He was born in Kiangsu in 1908, is married and has two sons. He was vice consul at San Francisco in 1931–32; held a similar post in Los Angeles 1932–37; consul in New York 1937–39; consul in Seattle 1939–46; consul general in Los Angeles 1945–46; secretary and chief, translation section, Chinese delegation to UNCIO, 1945; technical counselor, Chinese delegation to U.N. General Assembly in New York, 1946; member Good Will Mission to Central and South America, 1957; member, special mission for coronation of Pope John XXIII, 1958; member, special mission for inauguration of President Adolfo Lopez Mateos of the Republic of Mexico, 1958; director, information department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs 1956–59; Minister Chargé d'Affaires, Chinese Embassy, Santiago, Chile, 1959–60; Minister, Chinese Embassy, Washington, 1960. He has been assigned as counsel to the U.N. delegation for the current session.

Senator Randolph used the occasion on presenting the principal speaker to explain his own position on the importance of the U.N.

He said that not in "the 16 years of its existence has there been a United Nations Day observance on which we faced more somber prospects for the maintenance and viability of the United Nations itself.

"The present crisis of the U.N. has been precipitated, and its possible consequenecs accentuated, by the tragic death of Dag Hammarskjold. Yet this was not the cause. The current peril has been germinating for the past 10 years at least, and it has been acute since 1959.

"The central issue—which underlies all the major problems on the agenda of this Assembly—is whether the United Nations shall be a mere forum of debate or whether, acting as an agency of the world community, it will be empowered, in the language of the Charter, 'to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace.' "

There was also a stand of U.N. flags at the northern end of the Gold Room. Carlton B. Stuckey led the assemblage in singing "The Star-Spangled Banner" at the opening of the program, and the United Nations Hymn (written by Rabbi Raphael H. Levine and sung to the tune of "America, the Beautiful," printed on the program) at the close.

The local observances are sponsored by local committees, named by the mayors, with the cooperation of the United Nations Association. Heading the committee here this year was former Mayor Paul B. Martin who acted as master of ceremonies last night.

Prefacing the program Mr. Martin said he felt the attendance demonstrated a high interest in the U.N., a sense of civic mindedness, and recognition of the U.N. as a world agency working for peace. He added that he felt the sentiment was on the side of the Republic of China in issues involving it and Red China now being debated at the U.N.

In extending official greetings to the group and the visitors Mayor Golliday expressed the hope that the United Nations would succeed in its mission. He said he interpreted the big attendance last night as well as the responses at previous dinners—as endorsement locally of the agency. He hoped the rule of reason would prevail and suggested the Golden Rule as a guide for its deliberations.

Mayor Golliday, at the close of the program, presented Martin a plaque setting forth his service to the cause. He presented a similar plaque to Attorney Robert Steptoe who headed up the committee last year.

He expressed his appreciation to all who had cooperated in the affair this year, and particularly the Norborne Garden Club, with Mrs. William G. Schneider and Mrs. William Rapp in charge of arrangements, which took care of decorations for the affair.

Mayor Golliday also presented Minister Kiang a package of Interwoven hose and a bushel of apples.

For a program of music Miss Shirley Parsons, this city, sang two numbers—"Look for the Silver Lining" (Jerome Kern) and "Ah, Sweet Mystery of Life" (Victor Herbert). Her accompanist was Mrs. William McBride, this city. She also played for the mass singing.

The invocation and benediction were by the Reverend W. W. Beale, pastor of Calvary Methodist Church.

Introduced informally by Mr. Martin and seated at the speakers' table were: Sol Fine, ticket sale chairman; former Mayor Carlton B. Stuckey; Charles Stroh, manager of the chamber of commerce; Mrs. Pauline Boxwell, treasurer of the local group for many years; and Lou Cohen, a past presiding officer of the movement, who introduced Senator RANDOLPH. Introduced from the floor were Dr. Corma Mowrey, of Washington, a present representative of National Education Association and a past president of NEA; and former Mayor William H. Peery, who originated the local observances when he was mayor.

Senator RANDOLPH has been spending 2 days in this area. He flew in with guests of Lake Central Airlines Tuesday afternoon, attended the dinner-reception, and witnessed the races that evening at Shenandoah Downs at Charles Town, spent the night at Hilltop House at Harpers Ferry, and came here yesterday for the post office building dedication. He had as his guest Postmaster General J. Edgar Day and used the morning yesterday to show him around Harpers Ferry historic spots and other places.

In the crowd last night were a number of teachers here to attend a regional meeting of the WVEA today and tomorrow, and a number from other points in the area.

Oil and War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on November 13, 1961, at Chicago, my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], delivered an important and significant address to the annual convention of the American Petroleum Institute on the subject "Oil and War." I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL AND WAR

(An address by Hon. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Senator from Oklahoma)

This meeting of the American Petroleum Institute takes place in the most perilous time we have ever faced—perilous for your industry, perilous for our Nation, perilous for civilization. It is a time of tension and fear, when the military forces of two mighty powers face each other across a thin strand of barbed wire at the barricades of Berlin, and all mankind trembles at the prospect of nuclear war.

I come here today to speak to you about a war—not the war for which we are prepared, and which, because we are prepared and the Russians know it, will probably never come, but about the war which is already declared: about an economic war which we do not yet fully understand. I want to discusss it at this time because I believe this very lack of understanding is our greatest actual danger. I want to discuss it at this place because you control our principal weapon.

There is no need, with this audience, to dwell at lentgh on the impressive material achievements of the Soviet Union under communism, or upon the tragic spirtual and human price which the Russian people have paid for those achievements. The story of giant hydroelectric projects where once were barren wastes, of modern factories where once were villages, of huge apartments where once were cottages, of the privation and slave labor out of which all these were built—this is already familiar to Americans today. I am convinced that Khrushchev will not knowingly pursue a course which overnight would reduce this accomplishment of 40 years to radioactive rubble. I also believe that as a dedicated Communist he does not think that resort to nuclear war is necessary to accomplish Soviet objectives. We had best take at face value his widely quoted words: "We declare war upon you in the peaceful field of trade." It was not a joke. It was a deadly serious statement of Soviet policy.

I think Khrushchev means what he says. He believes that his slave state system can drive the free world and its free enterprise system into bankruptcy, and that Communists can take over with all of the productive capacity intact. I believe this is the kind of war he intends to pursue for his Communist system through your lifetime and mine.

Many of you know some of the facts which I will ask you to think about today. In discussing them, I do not mean to be an alarmist; but the time to guard the levees is when the crest of the flood appears on the upper reaches of the river. And so I would like to discuss the Soviet weapon, Soviet tactics, Soviet strategy, and America's defense in the war which is already declared.

THE SOVIET WEAPON

The weapons in any trade war are goods for export. Russia is in the midst of a massive program of industrialization and development of its resources. Shortages are the rule, rather than surpluses. It needs machine tools and machines, both for use and to copy for production within Russia. It needs the specialized products of the West which are beyond the capability of its present industrial complex. It needs consumer goods to meet the restive demands of a population whose wants have been sacrificed to build basic industry. It needs raw materials. It needs food and fiber to compensate for the failure of Soviet agriculture. These things it can get only by barter or by purchase with hard currencies, which in turn can only be earned from exports.

While some manufactured goods may be traded for purposes of prestige, only forest products and a few minerals are available for export, and the market for them is limited. There is one exception, one product in great demand and available for export in increasing quantities. The Soviet's principal weapon in the economic war is oil. The Soviet economic offensive will succeed or fail on the basis of the amount of Soviet oil which can be exported in exchange for the goods they need.

The measure of the Soviet oil threat is its effort and success in exploration and production of crude petroleum—and the record is impressive.

Working in oil-rich virgin territory between 1950 and 1960 they added five times more reserves per foot drilled than we did, increasing proven Soviet reserves from about 5 billion barrels to 25 billion barrels. And the 400 seismograph crews working today will be 1,200 crews in 1965.

While world oil production doubled between 1950 and 1960, Soviet production quadrupled, from 700,000 to 3 million barrels per day. It is expected to reach 5 million barrels per day by 1965, an even faster rate of growth.

How great an economic weapon—oil for export—will this rate of production yield? From less than 100,000 barrels per day in 1954, exports to the free world more than doubled in 4 years to 200,000 barrels in 1958; doubled again to 400,000 barrels in 1960—supplying 8 to 9 percent of the European market. By 1965, Soviet exports to the free world could rise to a level of 800,000 barrels per day, over and above the 400,000 barrels per day supplied to the Soviet bloc. Based on this projected export capability, Soviet exports would account for about 15 to 18 percent of the current West European market demand.

THE SOVIET TACTICS

Let us consider how the weapon is used. What are the tactics? The first is to seek maximum sales to Japan and the industrial countries of Western Europe in return for machinery, steel, and hard currencies. These countries are looking for markets and bargains. The Soviets take advantage of their need to expand exports and offer them a cut-rate price.

Japan is offered Soviet crude oil at $1 per barrel delivered at the Black Sea, or $2 delivered in Japan. The Western price is $1.80 at the Persian Gulf, or $2.30 delivered in Japan.

Finland is sold Soviet crude oil delivered at $2.39 per barrel, Iranian crude oil at $3.33. Sweden paid the Soviet $3.68 for kerosene which cost $4.51 from the Netherlands. West Germany paid the Soviet $3.48 for light fuel oil which cost $4.50 from Great Britain.

After maximum sales in hard currency markets, the Soviets resort to barter of oil for food, fiber, and raw materials from underdeveloped countries. This is perhaps the most insidious and dangerous aspect of the Soviet offensive. Frequently dependent on sales of one or a few commodities for their whole economy, chronically short of hard currencies with which to buy on the world market, these countries are least able to resist Soviet techniques. And a worldwide pattern emerges:

Oil for tobacco from Greece.
Oil for coffee from Brazil.
Oil for fish from Iceland.
Oil for cotton from Egypt.
Oil for jute from India.
Oil for sugar from Cuba.
Oil for rubber from Ceylon.

This is happening today. Next year and for years to come they hope to make this list grow.

THE SOVIET STRATEGY

Even from these few examples, the Soviet strategy will begin to be apparent. It is development, disruption, and dependence.

First and foremost, they are filling the gaps in their own industrial development. Each sale for hard currencies, each barter for industrial goods contributes to the development of Russian industry and Russian natural resources. It not only helps build the industrial base, but speeds the day when they will achieve an exportable surplus of industrial products. Perhaps more important in the long run, it adds resources which may permit some investment in light industry to ease the pressure of consumer demand. Finally, the sinews of industrial competition are also the sinews of war. Consider the implication of widely dispersed industrial complexes with independent sources of electrical and petroleum energy; a bombproof pipeline system capable of delivering supplies into the heart of Western Europe or a modern petrochemical industry. You remember the military value of adequate oil supplies. Gen. George S. Patton outran his oil supplies in his drive across France and had to stop. Pipelines now under construction will flow from the Urals toward Western Europe and could ultimately connect with pipelines for which we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars from our side of the world to fuel the NATO armies.

A second and equally obvious Soviet strategy is preemption of Western markets. Soviet entrance into the market has already contributed to softening the world price of oil. Most of the Western oil which goes into world markets is produced in areas which are politically volatile—the Middle East, North Africa, South America. If the surplus increases, price weakens, sales decline, and the receipts from their primary income source fall—who will be blamed? The Soviets, or the Western companies holding the concessions? What is your experience?

And the capture of Western markets can be but the first step in the campaign of economic disruption. The Soviets are emphasizing exploration and production, not refining and marketing facilities. In the free world the latter have been built by the international oil companies to handle their own products. The Soviets intend to use them to handle theirs. When American-owned Cuban refineries refused to process Soviet oil, the Cuban Government seized them. When Western companies in Ceylon refused to handle Soviet products, their terminal and marketing facilities were nationalized.

It is the third, and most cynical, aspect of Soviet strategy which is most alarming. While the actual tonnage now involved in Soviet barter deals may be small, the Soviets are making even deeper price cuts on long-term deals which will not only permanently shut the West off from the market, but lead to dependence on the Soviet Union. The Soviets are building both economic and political dependence in a twofold sense: first, they are building dependence on Soviet oil supplies; and, second, they are building dependence on Soviet markets for surplus local products and commodities which the Soviet Union will accept in exchange for its oil. In certain countries an alarming percentage of their inland demand is already being supplied by Russia: Iceland, 100 percent; Cuba, 100 percent; Finland, 99 percent; Egypt, 53 percent; Yugoslavia, 47 percent; Uruguay, 44 percent; and Greece, 23 percent. And where else can these countries sell the pulp, fish, cotton, wool, tobacco, and sugar which are their primary products?

We have recently seen a classic example of the spiral of development, disruption, and dependence. The bottleneck in the Soviet petroleum industry is transportation. Their tanker fleet is seriously inadequate. Pipeline construction is crippled by a shortage of large-size pipe. The Soviets—selling crude oil to Italy for $1.37 per barrel, delivered at Italian ports, against a Western price of $2.17 f.o.b. eastern Mediterranean ports—have now concluded with Italy a $200 million barter deal in which they will get 40-inch steel pipe. The Soviets will build a 2,800-mile pipeline capable of delivering one million barrels a day from the Urals to western Russia. Smaller lines will carry the oil through Poland to East Germany and to Czechoslovakia. But that is only the beginning. The Soviets will supply 20 percent of Italy's total oil needs for 5 years, and petroleum products extracted from $1.37 Soviet crude oil in Italy will be distributed throughout the Common Market as tariff-privileged Italian products. Are those who have joined their hearts and minds with us in freedom now to have their hands manacled to Russia with bonds of pipeline steel?

THE FREE WORLD'S COUNTEROFFENSIVE

So I say to you, the war is already declared. The weapon is already chosen. It is oil. The frontline troops are already drafted. They are the men and women of the American oil industry. The battlefield is already determined. It is in our export markets. We have only one choice: Whether to run or fight. If we run, we will find that financial, social, and political fallout can be deadly too.

But if we fight—as fight we must—we must first free ourselves from some delusions, and devise a Western strategy, not for defense, but for a counteroffensive. I would not presume to advise this group on the tactics of trade war. I will suggest some elements of our strategy, not because I am an oil expert, but because it may help to stimulate our reaching some inescapable and overdue policy decisions.

First, we must seek our natural allies in this economic war. The challenge presented by the Soviets is not to the United States alone. It is a challenge to the free world, and particularly to the oil-producing nations, present and future. The governments and peoples of Canada, Mexico, Venezuela, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Algeria, and Indonesia must be made to understand that they share our stake in free world markets, and will suffer more than we from Soviet intrusion. All of the nations of the West, whether oil producers or not, must be made to understand the nature and purposes of the Soviet offensive, for every aspect of our strategy will require the cooperation of other nations. This is a difficult task for American diplomacy, but an essential one which must be undertaken soon.

Second, we must compete with the Soviets in finding and developing reserves. I know of no more fatal error which we could make than to curtail exploration because of a current surplus of oil. Whatever the demand today, the future market is virtually unlimited. The entire free world is experiencing population growth at a rate comparable to the United States. With 10 times our population, and the same growth rate, the free world will add 250 million people in the next 10 years. Not only do more people require more energy, but the per capita consumption of petroleum is steadily rising. These nations will continue to grow. Some measure of the future market for oil is given by the fact that many nations in Africa and Asia now consume less than 1 barrel of oil per person per year. The annual consumption rate per person is only 3 barrels in Japan; only 6 barrels in Western Europe. For each person in the United States, we consume 20 barrels each year, and each year the rest of the world will come closer to that figure.

We must continue to find oil, because ultimately the greater the percentage of the total supply controlled by the Soviets, the lower their price and the greater their effect in the world market. We must be prepared to search for and develop oil in countries which now import it. It is in our long-range interest that local needs be supplied from local sources developed by American oil companies, using American equipment, trained by American technicians, rather than to find another country the oil captive of the Soviet Union.

We must seek maximum development of our domestic reserves, regardless of comparative cost, and retain or institute every incentive which will contribute to that end. We must never be dependent on others for our most vital resource for this Nation's defense.

The Suez crisis was an omen of what we may face in areas which become dependent on Soviet oil. In the last analysis, we can depend only on North American producers as a certain source of supply in an emergency, for if the Soviets cut off oil supplies to a dependent country they can be expected to use every available means to disrupt supplies from alternative sources. A healthy rate of domestic exploration will require that imports continue to be limited. We could make no greater error than to use the domestic market as an escape from the necessity to compete with the Soviets for world markets.

Third, we must compete in price. All Soviet oil is channeled through a single export monopoly owned and operated by the state. Subsidies are available from the national treasury when a decision is made to dispose of a certain quantity of oil in a particular area, whether the purpose is economic or political. There is a tendency to assume that with no shareholders to answer to and the cost of production paid out of the Government budget, the Soviets can charge whatever they please, but as a matter of economic reality there is a limit. The Soviet Union is not that rich. The Russians are offering oil today on the Black Sea for $1.10 per barrel, but that low price is subsidized by sales to Soviet bloc customers at substantially above the world price. Thus Bulgaria, Poland, East Germany, Rumania, and all the others pay substantially more than the $1.10 subsidized price.

I said we must compete on price, and I believe we can. Our operations are more efficient and our research and technology more advanced, and we are still improving. American oilmen who recently visited Russia estimated that their exploration and production costs are much higher than those in the Middle East. The average cost, without profit, of Middle East oil delivered to the Mediterranean is about $1.40 per barrel, but 73 cents of that cost is the royalty paid to the sovereign, and taxes. These are aspects of cost that we can do something about, if the producing countries can be made to understand the nature of this struggle. The direct operating costs, you can do something about, as you have in the past. As we negotiate around the world for necessary foreign oil concessions, I think it is foolish for our people and our allies in the grand alliance of NATO to be bidding against each other. It is like a man bidding against his wife at an auction sale.

I am not advocating a subsidy; but if it is necessary in the overall strategy for the economic war, then I would not shrink from that. More likely any need for subsidy can be eliminated by cooperation between members of the grand alliance, reorientation of military and economic aid, acceptance of two-way or three-way trade in raw materials tax policy, credits or credit guarantees, and by other means.

Fourth, we must compete in furnishing a market for basic commodities from underdeveloped countries. Just as in the case of oil, we cannot permit unrestricted entry into the American market for products already in surplus. But we can devise international price stabilization agreements which will yield these countries comparable income from reduced production of commodities in surplus. Not only would such arrangements eliminate their dependence on Soviet markets, but more important they would force the Soviets to pay the world price for the supplies they need.

Fifth, we must exploit Soviet weaknesses and take advantage of our own strength. We should take immediate steps to establish coordinated controls to minimize the flow of Western equipment and technology which is helpful in breaking bottlenecks in the Soviet petroleum industry. We cannot get total Western cooperation in this effort, and even if we could, it would not stop development of the Russian industry. But we can slow it down. We must develop the maturity not to publicly parade and deride the incidents of our failure, the examples of allies who would not cooperate; but to quietly celebrate the occasional success.

One key Soviet weakness is a shortage of tankers. The entire Soviet bloc has only one-third as many tankers as the United States alone, and only one-sixth our tonnage. Soviet tanker capacity is hardly sufficient even to satisfy Soviet-bloc oil transportation requirements. If the free world tanker owners refused to transport Soviet oil, it would pose an acute problem for the Soviets. Even a little selective pricing of tanker transportation would do wonders in offsetting Soviet price cuts. Yet when two American companies tried to discourage tanker owners from carrying Soviet oil to Cuba, they received the support of neither their industry nor their Government. We have much to learn—first, that we are at war.

THE CONDITIONS OF VICTORY

All of these strategic objectives require a common condition precedent: A partnership between the Government and the oil industry. Diplomacy must be marshaled in support of American oil companies. A steady flow of intelligence on Soviet maneuvers must be provided to the industry. Tax policy must give every possible assistance to American companies in meeting Soviet prices. We are spending $48 billion a year for the hardware and logistics of military war. We are spending about $4½ billion in military and economic aid abroad. We must be prepared to spend substantial amounts for oil and oil markets which are the hardware and logistics of economic war. The resources of the foreign assistance program—grants, loans, credits, guarantees—must be organized to support the economic war. Laws which interfere with the effective conduct of the war must be suspended.

Oil must become nonpartisan. The oil industry has been the political whipping boy of liberals; the Texas oilman, a political caricature; the depletion allowance, a political football. We must quickly outgrow such childishness if we are to survive as a world power.

But this is not a one-sided obligation. The oil industry has also been the treasury of the conservatives; the politician, an industry caricature; the government, an assumed enemy. This childishness, too, we must quickly outgrow if we are to survive.

But like all wars, victory will finally depend in the quality of the troops. You did not choose your place in the front lines, but neither did your predecessors in our Nation's battles. And the victory will depend on your performance—on your research, your technology, your efficiency in exploration, production, refining, transportation, and marketing And finally, it all depends on your willingness to work and fight.

I believe it was Voltaire who said: "The sound which history makes is that of wooden shoes going up stairs, and satin slippers coming down." Sometimes we take too much for granted our place in the sun, as though it were automatic and had been acquired without the hard fighting and slugging that a pioneering people did. Your fathers went into the slush pits and gambled all they had on their judgment and their skill. Will their working boots still fit their sons?

I think they will. I would like the chance to say to Khrushchev: "Let me tell you about the American oilman. He's a roughneck turned scientist. He's a machinist turned engineer. He's a gambler turned financier. He's a salesman turned diplomat. He taught you all you know about oil. And one more thing. He's a free man in a free society, and you can devise no incentive to equal his self-respect. We accept your choice of weapons. We accept your battlefield. And we declare war on you, in the peaceful field of trade."

Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy Reports to the President on Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I feel certain that every Member of Congress is vitally interested in our present unemployment problem and is anxious to find a solution.

President Kennedy also recognized the seriousness of this condition and knew that a solution must be found. In an effort to do this, he appointed the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy with representatives of industry, labor, and Government serving as members.

On January 11, this Committee released its report to the President on automation and its benefits and problems.

They stated:

> Automation and technological progress are essential to the general welfare, the economic strength, and the defense of the Nation.

However, they pointed out that—

> This progress can—and must—be achieved without the sacrifice of human values * * * and this requires a combination of private and governmental action.

Among other recommendations made in this report, one specifically states that—

> Support from both public and private organizations for retraining of workers who have been and will be displaced.

Here, I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that H.R. 8399—the Manpower Development and Training Act—is now in the Rules Committee and provides for a retraining program for these workers.

Other suggestions made by the Committee are also included in this legislation.

I am sure that my colleagues are receiving considerable amounts of mail, just as I am, asking us to enact such a program as this, for those writing me are unemployed and have little hope in returning to work without additional education and training.

I hope that every effort will be made to bring this legislation to the floor at the earliest possible moment.

The report follows:

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT POLICY REPORTS TO THE PRESIDENT ON AUTOMATION

The President's Committee on Labor-Management Policy submitted today its first report to the President. The report was presented to the President at the White House by the Committee Chairman, Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg, and by the Committee Vice Chairman, Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges. They were accompanied by members of the Committee.

Today's report deals with "The Benefits and Problems Incident to Automation and Other Technological Advances." The Committee believes it reflects the sense of common purpose which the President requested as a source of strength for our Nation in time of emergency and as a climate conducive to cooperation and resolution of differences.

There was unanimous agreement among the Committee members on three fundamental points:

1. Automation and technological progress are essential to the general welfare, the economic strength and the defense of the Nation.

2. This progress can and must be achieved without the sacrifice of human values.

3. Achievement of technological progress without sacrifice of human values requires a combination of private and governmental action, consonant with the principles of a free society.

Automation and technological progress are cited throughout the report as essential to the general welfare, the economic strength, and the defense of the Nation. This progress, it notes, must and can be achieved without sacrifice of human values, individual interests or any such social consequences due to changes created by this progress.

Unemployment, it is pointed out, has increased during the past few years although total employment has reached new heights. This is ascribed to the net effect of rising output per worker, among other factors, but the report states: "We reject the too common assumption that continuing unemployment is an inherent cost of automation."

The Committee offers 11 recommendations which it believes may permit and accelerate the necessary advancement of automation and technological change without detrimental sacrifice of human values, if considered within purview of such relevant factors as costs to individual enterprises, effect on the Federal budget and influence on general price levels. These recommendations, if carried out, would constitute a combination of private and Government action.

This first report has the overall approval of all but two of its 19 members, Mr. Henry Ford II, chairman of the board of directors of the Ford Motor Company of the Management group, and Mr. Arthur E. Burns, president of the National Bureau of Economic Research of the Public group. They have approved it in part and have filed statements of separate views which are included as part of the report.

Labor leaders, David Dubinsky, president, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union; George M. Harrison, president, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees; Walter P. Reuther, president of the International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America; Joseph D. Keenan, secretary of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; and David J. McDonald, president, United Steelworkers of America, asked for some strengthening of the wording in the section dealing with hours of work in order to make it clear that should all exigencies fail, there may have to be recourse to a shorter work period.

In submitting the report the chairman and vice chairman stated:

"We commend to you the substantial public service rendered by the members of the Committee, who have dedicated themselves to the work of the Committee.

"It is also a pleasure for us to report that the Committee has met regularly since it was appointed on February 16, 1961, and that the discussions at the Committee meetings have been most friendly and constructive. Our experience has demonstrated that your objective of bringing together top leaders of labor, management and the public to arrive at a fuller understanding on vital policy issues can be achieved. We anticipate that recommendations concerning the other major topics assigned to the Committee—dealing with industrial peace, economic growth, wage-price policy, and world competition—will be forthcoming in the near future."

This Committee, established by Executive order in February 1961 to encourage sound economic growth and healthy industrial relations in order to aid our free institutions to work better, has 19 members drawn from the public, labor, and management. It is chaired for 1-year alternating periods by the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Commerce.

This first report will be followed by others in the Committee's field of responsibility, now in preparation. Scheduled for submission next is the report on labor-management relations.

The President at the establishment of the Committee, deemed it "most important." It advises and makes recommendations with respect to policies that may be followed by labor, management, government, or the public which will promote "free and responsible collective bargaining, industrial peace, sound wage and price policies, higher standards of living, and increased productivity."

It was specifically directed to consider the matter of policies designed to insure that American products are competitive in world markets, as well as the matter of the impact of industrial automation.

Full membership of the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy is as follows:

PUBLIC MEMBERS

Arthur J. Goldberg (ex officio), Secretary of Labor; Luther H. Hodges (ex officio), Secretary of Commerce; Arthur F. Burns, president, National Bureau of Economic Research; David L. Cole, attorney; Clark Kerr, president, University of California; Ralph E. McGill, publisher, Atlanta Constitution; George W. Taylor, professor of labor relations, Wharton School of Finance, University of Pennsylvania.

MANAGEMENT MEMBERS

Elliott V. Bell, chairman of the executive committee, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc.; Joseph L. Block, chairman, board of directors, Inland Steel Co.; Henry Ford II, chairman, board of directors, Ford Motor Co.; John M. Franklin, chairman, board of directors, United States Lines Co.; J. Spencer Love, chairman and president, Burlington Industries, Inc.; Richard S. Reynolds, Jr., president, Reynolds Metals Co.; Thomas J. Watson, Jr., president, International Business Machines Corp.

LABOR MEMBERS

David Dubinsky, president, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union; George M. Harrison, president, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees; Joseph D. Keenan, secretary, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; Thomas Kennedy, president, United Mine Workers of America; David J. McDonald, president, United Steelworkers of America; George Meany, president, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations; Walter P. Reuther, president, International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America.

PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT POLICY,
Washington, D.C., January 11, 1962.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are pleased to submit the first formal report of your Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy. This report, dealing with benefits and problems incident to automation and other technological advances, was approved at a meeting of the full Committee today.

When you established this Committee last year, you expressed the hope that it would help restore that sense of common purpose which has strengthened our Nation in times of emergency and generate a climate conducive to cooperation and resolution of differences. It is a source of deep satisfaction to us that this first report eloquently reflects that sense of common purpose. There is unanimous agreement among the members on these fundamental points:

1. Automation and technological progress are essential to the general welfare, the economic strength and the defense of the Nation.
2. This progress can and must be achieved without the sacrifice of human values.
3. Achievement of technological progress without sacrifice of human values requires a combination of private and governmental action, consonant with the principles of a free society.

This agreement reflects the Committee's conclusion that automation and technological change have meant much to our country. The report as a whole has received the virtually unanimous endorsement of the Committee, while there are understandably some differences on implementation of these objectives. Statements of the separate views of two members of the Committee are appended to the report, and the positions of several members on one particular point are set out in two footnotes. Because the statement represents a consensus of the Committee members' views, their individual statements of position on various points covered would differ in some respects.

It is also a pleasure for us to report that the Committee has met regularly since it was appointed on February 16, 1961, and that the discussions at the Committee meetings have been most friendly and constructive. Our experience has demonstrated that your objective of bringing together top leaders of labor, management, and the public to arrive at a fuller understanding on vital policy issues can be achieved. We anticipate that recommendations concerning the other major topics assigned to the Committee, dealing with industrial peace, economic growth, wage-price policy, and world competition, will be forthcoming in the near future.

We commend to you the substantial public service rendered by the members of the Committee, who have dedicated themselves to the work of the Committee.

Respectfully,

ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Chairman.
LUTHER M. HODGES,
Vice Chairman.

THE BENEFITS AND PROBLEMS INCIDENT TO AUTOMATION AND OTHER TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCES

Three central propositions have emerged in the Committee's consideration of the significance and impact of automation and other technological advances.

First, automation and technological progress are essential to the general welfare, the economic strength, and the defense of the Nation.

Second, this progress can and must be achieved without the sacrifice of human values and without inequitable cost in terms of individual interests.

Third, the achievement of maximum technological development with adequate safeguards against economic injury to individuals depends upon a combination of private and governmental action, consonant with the principles of the free society.

Automation and technological change have meant much to our country. Today the average worker in the United States works shorter hours, turns out more goods, receives higher wages, and has more energy harnessed and working with him than a worker anywhere else in the world. Increasingly, machines are relieving men of heavy physical labor and of dangerous and repetitive work. Competition in the world markets has been possible against foreign countries whose standards of living are below our own, though this advantage is diminishing. Finally, in a world split by ideological differences, automation and technological change have a tremendous and crucial role to play in maintaining the strength of the free world.

For these reasons, we emphasize at the outset the imperative need for and desirability of automation and technological change. Indeed, increased productivity and fuller utilization of resources are urgently needed to improve our rate of economic growth. They are likewise needed to improve our competitive position in world markets. Failure to advance technologically and to otherwise increase the productivity of our economy would bring on much more serious unemployment and related social problems than any we now face.

It is equally true that the current rate of technological advance has created social problems and that an acceleration of this rate may intensify these problems.

While advancing technology has given rise to new industries and jobs, it has also resulted in employee displacement; and the fact that new work opportunities are eventually created is no comfort or help to the displaced individual who cannot, for one reason or another, secure comparable or any employment. While employment has expanded in some industries, the net effect of rising output per worker, of the growing labor force and of other factors, has been an increase in the volume of unemployment during the past few years—even as total employment has reached new heights.

The impact of technology on agricultural employment has been particularly great. Along with other factors, it has resulted in over 1,600,000 workers—20 percent of the total—leaving the farms since 1950. Yet farm output has increased 28 percent, making available to our people an abundance of food, while there was famine in some of the Communist countries. This increased output enabled this country to be of substantial assistance to needy people elsewhere in the world.

Our purpose, then, is to seek that course of action which will encourage essential progress in the form of automation and technological change, while meeting at the same time the social consequences such change creates.

We recognize that the subject of automation and technological change cannot be dealt with apart from two broader subjects: increased productivity in general, and unemployment.

We are preparing a separate report on economic growth, and only note here the basic importance of such growth to any consideration of the problems—and the opportunities—automation and technological advance present.

Regarding technological advance and unemployment, it is clear that unemployment has resulted from displacement due to automation and technological change. It is impossible, with presently available data, to isolate that portion of present unemployment resulting from these causes. Whether such displacement will be short-run depends to a considerable extent on our ability to anticipate and plan for programs involving technological change and to make better use of various mechanisms for retraining and relocating workers who find themselves unneeded in their former occupations. We have necessarily given general consideration in this report to some aspects of the broader unemployment problem and to the prospects of more effective use of the work force.

A long stride toward solution of the unemployment problem will be made if we first recognize the nature of the problem. We regard the following factors as important in this connection:

1. The recent rate of economic growth in the United States has been insufficient to reduce unemployment to a tolerable level.

2. The exact extent of unemployment attributable to automation and technological change is unknown, since it is greatly complicated by other factors, such as:

(a) The economic recession of 1960–61.

(b) The unusually high entrance rate into the labor market, caused by the great postwar population increase. In the next 10 years it is expected that there will be a net gain in the labor force of 13½ million workers.

(c) Chronic unemployment in distressed areas.

(d) The effects of the rapid advances which have been made by foreign competitors.

(e) Changing consumption patterns.

(f) The changing nature of jobs which often leaves a gap between job requirements and qualifications of applicants. During the 1950's there was a 58-percent increase in the number of skilled technical and professional workers. Unskilled workers, with only a limited education, found it more difficult to get, or hold, a job. In this connection, the Department of Labor projections indicate that unless steps are taken to reduce the dropout rate among high school students, some 7½ million of those new workers joining the labor force in the 1960's, or more than 30 percent, will not have completed high school, and over 2½ million of them will not even have completed grade school.

(g) Discrimination against workers on the basis of age, sex, race, and creed.

(h) Multiple job holding by individuals.

(i) The continuing movement of workers away from the farms.

3. Public employment service facilities have been inadequate as well as seriously uneven in their effectiveness with respect to helping workers find new jobs, counseling them as to the kind of jobs which are liable to be available in the future and advising them as to job prospects in other geographical areas.

4. The mobility of workers is reduced by factors running contrary to the demands of a dynamic society, and an economy in transition.

(a) The nontransferability of pension, seniority, and other accumulated rights may result in an employee's being dependent upon his attachment to a particular job as the sole means of protecting his equities.

(b) Desirable and essential mobility is affected by reluctance to leave home—because of personal ties, or because other members of the family may be working; by the cost of moving and possible losses on local property; and by the insecurity of jobs in a new locality.

5. Educational and informational facilities have been inadequate in that:

(a) The requirements for general education prior to vocational and professional training have not kept pace with the shift in job opportunities.

(b) The required types of vocational and technical training and retraining are often not available, e.g., for workers leaving the farm.

(c) There has been an inadequate liaison among school systems, industry, and Government with respect to future job requirements, and in fact there is insufficient information about the nature of such jobs.

(d) There has been inadequate financial support for needy students.

(e) Counseling facilities have been generally inadequate.

6. Proper retraining facilities, and a system of financial support for workers while retraining, have been lacking.

These are some of the relevant circumstances of a society in which automation and technological advance are essential motive forces. The operation of these forces within the social context creates serious displacement problems—not as a necessary price of progress but as the stern consequence of failure to recognize and provide for these problems. We reject the too common assumption that continuing unemployment is an inherent cost of automation.

We believe, rather, that a combination of energetic and responsible private and public action will permit the advancement of automation and technological change without the sacrifice of human values, and that such combined efforts can cope satisfactorily with the total unemployment problem—including whatever part of it may arise from the displacements which result inevitably from the introduction of new devices and processes.

We do not attempt here an exhaustive exploration or enumeration of all the ways and means of achieving maximum technological progress with the minimum of individual disadvantage. Our suggestions can be only representative of a broader set of possibilities. We recognize, furthermore, that the totality of any combination of recommendations must be viewed in the light of such relevant factors as their costs to individual enterprises, their effect on the Federal budget, and their influence on general price levels.

We recommend that serious consideration be given the following measures:

1. Adoption by the Government and others of policies which will promote a high rate of economic growth and fuller utilization of resources. A much higher rate of growth is essential and is the best device for reducing unemployment to tolerable levels. We will include in our forthcoming report on economic growth suggestions in this area.

2. Acceptance by Government agencies of the responsibility for collecting, collating, and disseminating information with respect to present and future job opportunities and requirements in a rapidly changing society.

3. Cooperation between Government and private organizations in the field of education in improving and supporting educational facilities to the end that: (a) new entrants to the labor force will be better qualified to meet the occupational demands of the future; (b) the dropout rate at grade and high school levels will be reduced; (c) better vocational, technical, and guidance programs will be available; (d) rural and depressed areas, where surplus workers reside, will be better served; (e) financial support will be available for deserving and needy students; and (f) there will be a general upgrading in the quality of our education.

4. Acceptance by management of responsibility for taking measures, to the maximum extent practicable, for lessening the impact of technological change, including: (a) adequate lead time; (b) open reporting to the employees involved; (c) cooperation with representatives of the employees to meet the problems involved; (d) cooperation with public employment services; (e) the timing of changes, to the extent possible, so that potential unemployment will be cushioned by expected expansion of operations and normal attrition in the work force (through separations resulting from retirement, quits, and so forth).

5. Support from both public and private organizations for retraining of workers who have been and will be displaced.

(a) Private employers and unions faced with automation or technological changes should make every reasonable effort to enable workers who are being displaced, and who need to be retrained, to qualify for new jobs available with the same employer, and to enjoy a means of support while so engaged.

(b) Where it is not possible for the employer to reabsorb displaced workers, appropriately safeguarded public support in the form of subsistence payments should be available to industrial and agricultural workers who qualify for and engage in retraining.

(c) Unemployment compensation laws should be liberalized to permit and to encourage retraining.

6. Support from both public and private sources, with due consideration to the circumstances of the enterprise involved, for the displaced worker who is seeking new employment.

a. The duration, coverage, and amount of unemployment compensation, where inadequate, should be increased and made subject to realistic uniform minimum requirements under the Federal-State system.

b. Employer supplementation of public unemployment compensation should be accomplished through severance pay, supplemental unemployment benefits, and similar measures.

c. Attention should be given to provision for the special case of the worker who is displaced during the period when he is approaching retirement. This may appropriately include consideration of provision for early retirement, through private arrangements or social security measures; but alternative possibilities of more constructive temporary uses of such services warrant exploration.

7. Support from both private and public sources to the end that a worker's job equities and security may be protected without impairment of his mobility. This will warrant consideration, taking into account relevant cost factors, of such measures as:

a. Financial aid in the transfer of employees to other plants in a multiplant system, and protection of existing rights for individuals so transferred.

b. The use of public funds in order to give financial aid in the transfer of unemployed workers from one area to another where the result will be to provide continuing employment.

c. The improvement of public and private protection of pension rights.

d. The recognition by unions, individual employees, and employers of the necessity of adapting seniority and other rules in order to facilitate mobility of workers, while providing protection for the equities of employees.

The Committee notes particularly the need for further exploration of this vital area.

8. Vast additional improvement of the public employment service so that it can effectively place, counsel, and relocate workers both locally and across State lines. We note with approval the start which has been made in this direction.

9. Vigorous and unremitting efforts by all segments of the population—including government, employers, unions, and employees—to eliminate discrimination in employment because of race, creed, age, or sex.

10. There are pressing national needs to be met, and an abundance of manpower available to meet these needs. This matching of manpower and national needs, which is part of the vital context of the automation and technological advance problem, will obviously be affected by various broader governmental policies. Reserving fuller consideration of this area for our economic growth report, we nevertheless note here that:

(a) When technological changes or other factors develop particular pockets of unemployment, this becomes an additional reason for the undertaking, particularly at the State and local levels but with Federal assistance where this is necessary, of public development projects for which there is need independent of the employment need itself.

(b) Every effort should be made to maintain on an up-to-date and ready-to-go basis a schedule of needed public development projects, particularly those which could be started most quickly and which would be of short or controllable duration, so that the initiation of such projects can in the future be advanced, and the flow of projects already underway can be speeded up, if the manpower situation warrants this.

(c) If the operation of the economy, including the effect of automation and technological change, creates or leaves an intolerable manpower surplus, consideration should be given to monetary and fiscal measures—including the possibility of appropriate tax reductions—which would give promise of helping alleviate this situation.

(d) Governmental action along the lines suggested here, stimulated in part by the need to meet unemployment situations, would obviously have to take account of other considerations, including particularly the maintenance of national economic stability and security. We simply assert, however, the coordinate importance of stability and growth.

11. The need for goods and services must not be left unfilled, particularly in a time of international crisis. At the same time, high unemployment is intolerable. In the light of our current responsibilities to meet world conditions, and in view of our unmet needs at home, we consider the development of programs directed at the achievement of full employment as being more significant at the present time than the consideration of a general reduction in the hours of work. A reduction in the basic work period has, however, historically been one means of sharing the fruits of technological progress, and there may well develop in the future the necessity and the desirability of shortening the work period, either through collective bargaining or by law or by both methods. In connection with such a development, consideration would necessarily be given to the extent to which purchasing power could be maintained along with a reduced work period.[1] [2]

We affirm our conviction that the infinite promise of automation and technological advance can be realized without loss or cost of human values. America can enjoy the fruits of higher productivity without having to accept, as the inevitable result, serious social consequences growing out of the displacement of workers.

The recommendations made here suggest our view of a broader pattern of possible courses of action which would necessarily have to be adapted to particular circumstances, but which permit the constructive and responsible uses of technology and automation. We see no barriers—except misunderstanding, timidity, and false fear—to the accomplishment of this purpose by a coordination of private and public programs wholly consonant with the essential concepts of the free society.

We assert the necessity of automation and technological development to the maintenance of American standards of living and to the fulfillment of this country's role of leadership in freedom's fight for survival. We assert equally the obligation and the capacity of Americans—as individuals and as a group—to use these new instruments and methods to enrich the lives of all of us.

We see no reason for alarm if out of a greater sense of common purpose we can achieve the good will and the determination to act together.

COMMENT BY ARTHUR F. BURNS ON REPORT ON "THE BENEFITS AND PROBLEMS INCIDENT TO AUTOMATION AND OTHER TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCES"

I find parts of this report highly constructive, particularly the recommendations designed (a) to achieve efficient and yet humane management of technological changes, (b) to improve the functioning of the labor market, and (c) to extend the coverage and otherwise strengthen the unemployment insurance system. Nevertheless, I am troubled by the report as a whole, and I consider it a dubious guide to economic policy.

The reasons for my dissent are as follows:

(1) The report fails to identify or to analyze or to assess the quantitative importance of the different causes of unemployment. Nevertheless, it conveys the impression that technological advances are a major, if not the major, cause of recent unemployment. I know of no evidence to support this view, and I deplore anything that adds to the greatly exaggerated fears that many people have of what is loosely called automation.

(2) The report suffers from a failure to link its proposed remedies to the causes of unemployment. Thus the report does not mention seasonal unemployment or ways of dealing with it. It does not mention the loss of exports by some industries or the policies needed for coping with this source of unemployment. It does not distinguish cyclical unemployment from other types or indicate how public policy for dealing with recessions should be improved. On the other hand, the report puts heavy emphasis on public works and seems to suggest that this kind of governmental spending is a good remedy for unemployment regardless of its cause. Unhappily, public works are poorly suited for dealing with mild recessions or with local pockets of chronic unemployment.

3. Most recommendations of the report are couched in such vague language that they may mean much or little, depending on how they are interpreted. But if experience is any guide, neither the vagueness of language nor the surrounding qualifications will prevent articulate groups of our society from claiming the authority of this Committee for programs that could prove damaging to our economy. If all or most of the recommendations were implemented fairly, promptly, and on a liberal scale, both employer costs of production and governmental outlays would rise substantially. The report passes over lightly the question of how such increases would affect business profits or the Federal budget or the general price level. I find this question very troublesome at the present time. The deterioration of profit margins during the past decade is already a serious obstacle to achieving a high rate of economic growth. The protracted rise of the price level has already put severe pressure on our balance of international payments. This year's projected rise of Federal cash outlays already exceeds the increase of any peacetime year in our history and, the international situation being what is is, military expenditures may soon need to be still larger. In view of these facts, unless great caution is exercised in pursuing programs that raise costs of production or public outlays, we may find that economic growth is curbed, that confidence in the dollar is weakened, and that our international political position is undermined.

4. Apart from these dangers, the report fails to analyze how its recommendations would affect the volume of unemployment itself. The report seems to call not only for liberalizing the unemployment insurance system, but also for extending private supplements to unemployment insurance, for providing public subsistence payments to workers who undergo retraining, for lowering the age at which displaced workers can qualify for social security, and for using public funds to aid unemployed workers in moving to areas where jobs can be found. I deem it a duty to point out that if all these measures were adopted in quick order and on a substantial scale, some individuals who now are outside the labor force will see an advantage in entering it, while there will be others

---

[1] Mr. Meany, Mr. Dubinsky, Mr. Harrison, Mr. Reuther, and Mr. Keenan are of the view that this paragraph should read as follows:

"The need for goods and services must not be left unfilled, particularly in a time of international crisis. At the same time, high unemployment is intolerable. In the light of our current responsibilities to meet world conditions, and in view of our unmet needs at home, we consider the development of programs directed at the achievement of maximum output and full employment as most significant at the present time. However, if unemployment is not reduced substantially in the near future we will have to resort to a general shortening of the work period through collective bargaining and by law. In connection with such a development, consideration would necessarily be given to the extent to which purchasing power could be maintained along with a reduced work period. A reduction in the basic work period has historically been one means of sharing fruits of technological progress."

[2] Mr. McDonald, Mr. Reuther, and Mr. Keenan comment as follows:

"We agree that, in the light of the considerations stated, the most desirable solution now to the problem of unemployment is the development of programs which will achieve full employment at 40 hours per week. Saying that this is the most desirable solution is not, however, the same thing as saying that we have in fact achieved that solution or that we will in fact achieve it in the near future. And only the fact of full employment—not a statement of its desirability—can properly serve as the premise for the statement that the necessity for shortening the work period will only develop in the future. If we fail, as we have so far failed, to achieve the most desirable solution we will have to move more quickly than we are now moving in the direction of shortening the work period."

who, having quit or lost their jobs, will be tempted to take more time in settling on new ones. In other words, unless great care and caution are exercised in implementing the committee's recommendations, the end result may well be the social misfortune of permanently higher unemployment.

5. In large part, the shortcomings of the report are traceable to the pessimistic assumption on which it seems to proceed—namely, that there is a serious possibility that our Nation's economic progress will prove insufficient to provide jobs for all those who are able and eager to work. I have greater faith in our Nation's future. A tremendous expansion of prosperity lies within our power. The degree to which we attain it will mainly depend, first, on how much work people care to do, second, on how productive they wish to be, third, on how earnestly we pursue public policies to stimulate new, creative, and more efficient economic activities by business enterprises. If the report had started from this broad but fundamental premise, it would have dealt more constructively with the economic and human problem of unemployment.

COMMENTS BY HENRY FORD II ON REPORT ON "THE BENEFITS AND PROBLEMS INCIDENT TO AUTOMATION AND OTHER TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCES"

I share wholeheartedly the concern over unemployment expressed in this report, and I applaud this committee's desire both to speed industrial progress and to spread its human benefits more widely.

Few things are as costly to our Nation, or as crushing to the human spirit, as lack of work for those who are willing and able to work.

Because I hold these views so strongly, I feel compelled to state my belief that this report does not really get to the heart of the matter.

Its major premise is the assumption that automation and technological advance are in and of themselves significant causes of unemployment—an assumption that neither history nor an analysis of current unemployment supports. Technological advance has been with us for many generations. But, popular beliefs to the contrary, technological advance has not been accelerating. Figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics show, for recent years, an increase in productivity well below the average rate for the postwar period and not much different from the average rate since 1909.

Moreover, the factual evidence strongly indicates that, while automation displaces some individuals from the jobs they have held, its overall effect is to increase income and expand job opportunities. History teaches us that, by and large, workers displaced by technological advance have moved rapidly into other employment, ultimately to better-paying jobs. This is why we have had rising personal incomes rather than mass unemployment as new technology has come into use and productivity has increased.

As Solomon Fabricant has recently pointed out (in his introduction to John W. Kendrick's "Productivity Trends in the United States"):

> "Better-than-average increases in output were usually accompanied by better-than-average increases in employment of workers and tangible capital, despite the more rapid rise in productivity. Correspondingly, less-than-average increases in productivity were usually accompanied by less-than-average increases (or even decreases) in output and in the use of labor and capital resources. * * * No one concerned with the rise and fall of industries, or, to single out a currently discussed problem, with the effects of automation on employment, may ignore these basic facts."

When the economy is prosperous, displaced workers quickly find new employment. This is illustrated by the movement of workers off farms and into industrial employment when times are good, and the slowdown in this movement when times are bad.

The Committee has recognized that the general problem of unemployment is the key problem, but its recommendations are concerned mainly with the important but secondary matters of retraining and mobility. A good employment service and unemployment compensation facilitate the transfer from one job to another, but these measures, even if accompanied by massive retraining, relief, and other social programs, will scarcely make a dent in unemployment when economic conditions are poor.

If, therefore, we would help persons displaced by technological advance, we must focus our attention not on relief or even training—though these, properly conceived and administered, will help—but on creating new jobs for people who seek them and can perform in them.

When wages rise faster than productivity in the economy, costs will rise and then either prices will go up or profits will come down—or both will happen. If profits come down, then incentive to save and to invest savings in new, job-creating plants, enterprises, and industries must suffer. Moreover, unless inflationary measures are taken to support the higher wage, cost, and price levels, demand will not be adequate to maintain production and employment. And, when the integrity of the dollar is at stake, inflationary measures cannot be taken without calamitous results.

We must find ways consistent with a free economy to keep wages and other costs from causing either unemployment or inflation.

I regret that the report does not make this focal problem the primary target of its comments and recommendations. For, when we have found and placed in operation those policies and practices that can keep costs from rising and forcing us into either unemployment or inflation, we will have done much more than could be accomplished by all other measures combined.

The recommendations in this report are concerned mainly with ways of preventing and relieving technological displacement. I personally endorse many of them and the company with which I am associated has long followed practices similar to many of those recommended in the report.

Nevertheless, I have the following general reservations about the character of the recommendations:

First, they cannot solve the problem of mass unemployment because they are directed primarily at helping people to find jobs—not at the basic need for more jobs.

Second, the massive program of public and private actions called for may have unexpected consequences that the Committee has not been able to evaluate. Indeed, I believe that the knowledge and experience necessary to evaluate this sweeping program do not now exist, and that it is, therefore, inappropriate and unwise for this Committee to place its stamp of approval upon such a program. For example, greatly expanded Federal assistance could very well destroy incentives that stimulate private economic activity and generate individual initiative.

Third, the endorsement of comprehensive, economywide programs in very general terms diverts attention from and complicates the search for carefully selected measures to meet particular problems. For example, I believe that the main result of a large-scale, nationwide program to retrain the unemployed might be to impede the development of useful local programs carefully tailored to existing job opportunities and the needs and abilities of individuals.

In addition to these general reservations, I have misgivings about some of the specific recommendations.

With respect to unemployment compensation, I believe that duration, coverage and amount of benefits must be increased where they are inadequate. In addition, safeguards to protect against abuses should be strengthened. I do not endorse Federal standards, but believe the States should continue with responsibility for fitting their particular systems to their own conditions and needs.

I agree that in the main the recommendations for improving our school systems are good. In many areas and localities, however, the most urgent need is not more money but greater public concern with what is taught in our schools.

Arbitrarily shortening the workweek in order to decrease unemployment would be a confession of defeat. Not only a poor remedy, it is also a harmful one; for it would retard the growth needed for the safety and welfare of our Nation at this point in its history. We can and should look forward to normal increases in our leisure time, but they must come as our growing economy can afford them and not as expedient solutions to unemployment problems.

In summary, I find some things in this report of which I approve, and much of which I disapprove. Its goal of making certain that high employment accompany technological improvement and increasing efficiency has my full support. However, I believe that the general direction of its recommendations is not well calculated to achieve this goal. I believe, too, that the report's basic assumption concerning the relationship between technological advance and unemployment is in error.

Therefore, I feel it necessary to say, with reluctance, that I cannot concur in the report.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 24, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

One of our Lord's beatitudes:

Matthew 5: 6: *Blessed are they who do hunger and thirst after righteousness for they shall be filled.*

O Thou who art the light of all that is true and the inspiration of all that is good, may we dedicate ourselves more eagerly to the larger life of service to which Thy love is daily calling us.

May the soul of mankind be kindled and made radiant by the lofty principles of righteousness and justice, of freedom and brotherhood, for we confess that human nature seems at times so selfish and self-centered, so brutal and inhuman.

Show us how we may contribute to the welfare of our beloved country and in all our aspirations and activities may we be determined to cultivate its spiritual resources and strengthen its religious life.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order until we receive a message?

Mr. **GROSS**. No, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman from Iowa insists on his point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 5]

Blitch
Bonner
Cannon
Chiperfield
Davis, Tenn.
Finnegan
Flynt
Gray
Hoffman, Mich.
Hosmer
Keith
Martin, Mass.
Meader
Merrow
Miller, N.Y.
Moulder
Norrell
Patman
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rostenkowski
Scott
Selden
Sheppard
Tupper
Ullman
Van Pelt
Winstead

The **SPEAKER**. On this rollcall, 402 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8847. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that a distribution of stock made to an individual (or certain corporations) pursuant to an order enforcing the antitrust laws shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital; and to provide that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution.

POSTAGE REVISION ACT, 1962

The **SPEAKER**. The unfinished business is the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill (H.R. 7927) to adjust postal rates, and for other purposes.

The Clerk will read the engrossed bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Postage Revision Act of 1962".

POSTAL POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) Section 2302(c)(4) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "deemed to be atttributable to the performance of public services under section 2303(b) of this title" and inserting in lieu thereof "determined under section 2303 of this title to be attributable to the performance of public services".

(b) Section 2303(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending the heading so as to read:

"§ 2303. Identification of public services and costs thereof";

(2) by striking out paragraph (2) and renumbering the succeeding paragraphs accordingly; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"The terms 'total loss' and 'loss' as used in this subsection mean the amounts by which the total allocated costs incurred by the postal establishment in the performance of the public services enumerated in this subsection exceed the total revenues received by the postal establishment for the performance of such public services."

(c) Section 2303(b) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Postmaster General shall report to the Congress, on or before February 1 of each year beginning with the year 1963, the estimated amount by which, in the then current fiscal year, the cost incurred by the postal establishment in the performance of each of the public services enumerated in subsection (a) of this section exceeds the revenue received by the postal establishment for the performance of each such public service. The aggregate amount by which, in any fiscal year, the costs incurred by the postal establishment in the performance of each such public services exceed the aggregate amount of the revenues received by the postal establishment for the performance of such public services shall be excluded from the total cost of operating the postal establishment for purposes of adjustment of postal rates and fees."

(d) The table of contents of chapter 27 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out

"2303. Identification of and appropriations for public services."

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"2303. Identification of public services and costs thereof."

FIRST-CLASS MAIL

SEC. 3. Section 4253 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "four" and "three" wherever appearing in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the words "five" and "four", respectively.

AIRMAIL

SEC. 4. Section 4303 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out the word "seven" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the word "eight";

(2) by striking out the word "five" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the word "six"; and

(3) by striking out the phrase "3 cents an ounce or fraction thereof" in paragraph (2) of subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "the rate of postage for other first-class mail matter".

SEC. 5. Paragraph (1), subsection (a), section 4358, of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows—

"(1) resides in the county in which the publication is published; and".

SECOND-CLASS MAIL BEYOND COUNTY OF PUBLICATION

SEC. 6. Section 4359 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out so much of subsection (b) as precedes the table and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b)(1) Subject to the minimum rate provided for publications of qualified nonprofit organizations and classroom publications by section 4360 of this title, the rates of postage on publications mailed in accordance with subsection (a) of this section are fixed both by the piece as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection and by the pound as provided in the following table:

"[In cents]"; and

(2) by adding at the end of subsection (b) a new paragraph (2), as follows:

"(2) The piece rates of postage are charged on each individually addressed copy of a publication (except a publication of a qualified nonprofit organization and a classroom publication) mailed in accordance with subsection (a) of this section in addition to the pound rates. The piece rates are as follows:

"Publications other than classroom publications and other than publications of qualified nonprofit organizations—½ cent, effective on and after July 1, 1962, and before July 1, 1963; and 1 cent, effective on and after July 1, 1963."

MINIMUM POSTAGE RATES ON SECOND-CLASS MAIL

SEC. 7. Section 4360 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4360. Minimum postage

"The minimum rate of postage is one-eighth cent for each individually addressed copy of—

"(1) a classroom publication or a publication of a qualified nonprofit organization mailed under section 4359 of this title, or

"(2) any publication mailed for delivery within the county of publication except when mailed free under section 4358(a) of this title."

CONTROLLED CIRCULATION PUBLICATIONS

SEC. 8. Section 4422 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "12 cents" and inserting in lieu thereof "14 cents".

THIRD-CLASS MAIL

SEC. 9. (a) Section 4451(d) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "(a)(2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a)(3)".

(b) Section 4452 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending the table in subsection (a) to read as follows:

"Type of mailing	Rate	Unit
	Cents	
(1) Individual piece	4 1½	First 2 ounces or fraction thereof. Each additional ounce or fraction thereof.
(2) Bulk mailings under subsec. (e) of this section of:		
(A) Books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions and plants:		
(i) Qualified nonprofit organizations	10	Each pound or fraction thereof.
(ii) Others	18	Do.
(B) Other matter	21	Do."

(2) by amending the table in subsection (b) to read as follows:

"Mailed by—	(In cents)
Other than qualified nonprofit organizations	3½
Qualified nonprofit organizations	1¼";

and

(3) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

"(c) The minimum postage rate on pieces or packages of third-class mail of such size or form as to prevent ready facing and tying in bundles and requiring individual distribution is four and one-half cents."

(c) The third proviso in section 3 of the Act of October 30, 1951, as amended by the Act of June 23, 1959 (73 Stat. 89; Public Law 86-56), is hereby repealed.

EDUCATIONAL AND LIBRARY MATERIALS

SEC. 10. (a) Section 4554 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending that part of subsection (a) which precedes paragraph (1) to read as follows:

"(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the postage rate is 9 cents a pound for the first pound or fraction thereof and 5 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof, except that the rates now or hereafter prescribed for third- or fourth-class matter shall apply in every case where such rate is lower than the rate prescribed in this subsection on—

(2) by amending paragraph (5) of subsection (a) to read as follows:

"(5) sound recordings;";

(3) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (6) of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and";

(4) by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following:

"(7) printed educational reference charts, permanently processed for preservation.";

(5) by inserting "(including cooperative processing by libraries)" immediately following "loaned or exchanged" in paragraph (1) of subsection (b);

(6) by striking out the word "students'" immediately preceding the word "notations" in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) and in paragraph (2) of subsection (b);

(7) by striking out:

"(D) bound volumes of periodicals;

"(E) phonograph recordings; and" in paragraph (2) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof:

"(D) periodicals, whether bound or unbound;

"(E) sound recordings; and"; and

(8) by striking out "and catalog of those items" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "scientific or mathematical kits, instruments, or other devices and catalogs of those items, and guides or scripts prepared solely for use with such materials".

(b) Sections 204(d), 204(e)(1), and 204 (e)(2) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, as amended by the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 479; Public Law 86-644), are hereby repealed.

METHOD OF DETERMINING GROSS RECEIPTS

SEC. 11. Section 711(c) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "Public Law 85-426" and inserting in lieu thereof "any Act of Congress enacted on or after May 27, 1958".

COMMUNIST POLITICAL PROPAGANDA

SEC. 12 (a) Section 505 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after the first sentence and before the second sentence in subsection (a) thereof, the following sentence: "In furtherance of this authority to counteract adverse usage of the mails and to reduce the domestic postal deficit, no international mail handling arrangement under which any postal rate, whether or not reciprocal, is established, shall permit the receipt, handling, transport, or delivery by the United States Post Office Department of mail matter determined by the Attorney General to be Communist political propaganda."

(b)(1) Chapter 51 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following section:

"§ 4008. Communist political propaganda

"No United States postal rate established by the Postage Revision Act of 1962 shall be available for the receipt, handling, transportation, or delivery of mail matter determined by the Attorney General of the United States to be Communist political propaganda financed or sponsored directly or indirectly by any Communist controlled government."

(2) The table of contents of such chapter 51 is amended by inserting

"4008. Communist political propaganda,"

immediately below

"4007. Detention of mail for temporary periods."

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 13. The foregoing provisions of this Act shall become effective on July 1, 1962.

Mr. ALBERT (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the engrossed copy of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, am I correct in my understanding that the Chair would not entertain a motion to recommit the bill H.R. 7927 to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with instructions to report the bill back forthwith as it was favorably reported to the House on September 7, 1961?

The SPEAKER. It is not a question of the Chair not entertaining the motion; it is a question of the motion not being entertainable under the rules of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Then the Chair is stating that the motion would not be in order.

The SPEAKER. Such a motion would not be in order at this stage.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POSTAL INCREASE BILL

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD at this point a release by the Post Office Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, bulletins in all 45,000 post office locations in the United States are calling attention to the possibility that Americans might receive unsolicited Communist propaganda and pointing out that it can be returned to post offices as refused.

The distribution of the posters by the Post Office Department was suggested by a bill (H.R. 5751) reported by the House Un-American Activities Committe and passed by the House in the last session of the Congress. Reported favorably by the Senate Internal Security Committee, this bill now awaits Senate action.

Noting that unsolicited Communist propaganda is being sent persons in this country, the poster says:

> This propaganda attempts to promote the objectives of the international Communist movement. It often appears on the surface to be innocent and unimportant.
>
> But the Communists regard propaganda as an important and necessary means for subversion of our Nation and the free world. In order to achieve the maximum impact, this propaganda often comes to unsuspecting addressees who are not associated with or in sympathy with Communist objectives.

After making clear that such materials are often not labeled to reveal origin or content, the posters make clear that it may be refused and returned but that the privacy of your mail continues to be respected by your Government and the Postal Service.

Printed material from all foreign nations is carried in this country on a reciprocal basis as other countries carry mail originating in the United States, according to the Post Office, the conventions of the Universal Postal Union covering the reciprocal exchange of mail among 112 member nations.

Under the convention, the Post Office explains, surface mail with postage paid in the country where mailed must be delivered to the addressee by the postal system of the country of destination without transfer of funds to that nation.

The advantage is clearly on the side of the United States in the reciprocal exchange of printed matter with other nations, according to the Post Office Department. Latest available figures show that 96 million pounds of printed matter were dispatched from the United States during fiscal year 1961 and only 76 million pounds were received from other nations in the same period.

This difference of 20 million pounds of printed matter delivered by other nations for Americans makes clear that the U.S. Post Office benefits from this mutual exchange of service.

Bureau of Customs' figures show a decline in incoming printed matter from Communist bloc nations, the Post Office Department said. During calendar year 1960, an average of 1,341,298 pieces of printed matter arrived monthly from Communist nations. Since March of 1961, the average has fallen to 865,636 monthly.

Confirming the contention that the United States gets much more than it gives from reciprocal delivery arrangements with Communist nations, the Post Office Department revealed that 2,500,000 pounds of letters and printed matter were sent to addressees in the eight Iron Curtain countries in the 12 months ending March 31, 1961, but during the same period only 1,600,000 pounds were received in the United States from these same nations.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE DAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to advise the House of the program for the balance of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the Members that the Committee on House Administration will call up this afternoon certain privileged resolutions which have unanimously cleared that committee.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I might say that I have inquired of the minority members of all the legislative committees involved, and the Members on our side say they have no objection but think the resolutions should be adopted.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

For the information of the House I will read the resolutions that will be considered.

House Resolution 500, providing an additional $200,000 for the Committee on the Judiciary.

House Resolution 504, providing an additional $100,000 for the Committee on Banking and Currency, Subcommittee on Housing.

House Resolution 513, providing an additional $350,000 for the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 509, authorizing seven additional employees for the Committee on Ways and Means; and

House Resolution 517, authorizing payment from the Contingent Fund of $387.73 for expenses incurred by the U.S. Constitution 175th Anniversary Commission, Hon. JAMES A. BYRNE, chairman.

LINCOLN BOYHOOD NATIONAL MEMORIAL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2470) to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the amendment of the Senate and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ASPINALL, RUTHERFORD, O'BRIEN of New York, SAYLOR, and CHENOWETH.

REUNITING OF FAMILIES BY GRANTING NONQUOTA STATUS TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, when the 2d session of the 87th Congress convened on January 10, 1962, I introduced H.R. 9493, a bill to reunite families in the United States by granting nonquota status to certain aliens entitled to a preference under the Immigration and Nationality Act. I have purposely delayed my remarks on the bill pending the receipt of vital data from the Department of State.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my bill is to alleviate the horrible conditions existing under the complicated procedure contained in the immigration law, which prevents alien members of families in the United States from coming here to join them—due entirely to the oversubscription of the quota. In particular, I have reference to the situation of the worthy people who have come here from Italy and find to their dismay that members of the families who were left behind only because there were no quota numbers available were unable to come here with them or to join them.

On September 26, 1961, it is true, a law was enacted which granted nonquota status to alien family members who were waiting for quota numbers under the second and the third preference for whom visa petitions had been filed prior to July 1, 1961. However, nothing was done about the people in the fourth preference category notwithstanding the fact that they also were the beneficiaries of approved petitions for quotas visas. Those people to whom I have particular reference are the brothers, sisters, married sons or daughters of citizens of the United States. There is no reason in the world why they should have been excluded from the law which was passed last year. They also yearn to be with their loved ones in the United States and they are entitled to come here for that purpose.

My bill, H.R. 9493, is a very simple one. It grants nonquota status to aliens who are in the second, third, and fourth preference categories, which includes parents of citizens of the United States; unmarried sons or daughters of citizens of the United States; spouses or unmarried sons or daughters of aliens now permanently here, and, the category mentioned above, the brothers, sisters, married sons or daughters of citizens of the United States. Please let it be noted that the fourth preference category, which will be benefited by my bill, also includes the spouse and children of the people in the fourth preference whom I have just designated. One of the most important features of my bill is the fact that these people will receive nonquota status if they have had a visa petition filed on their behalf with the Attorney General prior to July 1, 1962, thus changing the cutoff date enacted last year, which applied to the second and third preference classes. In other words, all of the "relatives" described in the immigration law who are in preference categories will be benefited by my bill and, depending on the efficiency of the Department of State, will be able to migrate promptly to the United States to rejoin their families here.

The Department of State informs me that under the act of September 26, 1961, 18,000 aliens became entitled to nonquota status in lieu of their previous preference position on the quota waiting list and of these 8,156 are in Italy.

I have also been advised that of that number, 4,714 have been issued nonquota immigrant visas thus far, including 2,389 in Italy.

Since my bill benefits the fourth preference category of alien relatives waiting for visas, I have inquired and ascertained from the Department of State that there are 131,260 prospective immigrants in Italy who are waiting for quota visas under the fourth preference and that the likelihood is that they will not receive their visas under the existing law for a good many years—specifically 12 years since the last fourth preference visa was issued in 1958 with the applicant holding the priority date of January 1, 1950.

Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, this simple bill is humanitarian in nature. There is nothing unusual about its purpose since legislation of this type has been enacted in the past; nothing in it will destroy the basic immigration and nationality law of this country. In fact, it is entirely in keeping with the spirit which has been exhibited by the Congress over the last 10 years in granting special nonquota status to people who must be admitted to their country to rejoin their families.

There is nothing complicated about my proposal. It is simple and clear. I hope that there will be a general rallying behind my bill and that it will be speedily enacted into law. I certainly will expend every effort to accomplish that result.

POSTAL EXCHANGE WITH COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, many of us are extremely disturbed with the fact that Communist propaganda can flow into this country freely and be distributed by the U.S. postal system free of charge. The Communists have clearly abused the mail arrangements established under the Universal Postal Union. Many thousands of tons of Communist propaganda flow into this country and are delivered under an order of the Post Office of March 17, 1961. About 99 percent of the people contacted have said that they did not order the mail and did not wish to receive it. Persons in this country are compiling lists of students and others throughout the Nation and sending them to Moscow, where the material is shipped to them. The port of New Orleans alone counted over 300,000 packages of such Communist propaganda destined for schools and colleges in 1 year. From 5 to 15 separate pamphlets were contained in each package. Under the new order, this propaganda material is no longer screened by the Customs Bureau at the port of entry, because—according to the Post Office Department—the program had no intelligence value and it interfered with efforts to improve East-West relations.

Mr. Speaker, I find this a totally unconvincing explanation for the distribution of unwanted and unsolicited Red propaganda material. As the House Committee on Un-American Activities stated in its report of September 14, 1961:

> Within recent years we have observed an acceleration of the Communist brainwash-

> ing effort directed at the free world and particularly to residents of the United States. Within recent months, there has been observed a noticeable augmentation in the quality and proportion of such propaganda disseminated by means of first-class mail, as contrasted with other means in the total effort. This observation has been confirmed by representatives of the Department of Justice, who have met with the committee in hearings as recently as September 13, 1961. With the growing power and arrogance of the Communist bloc, it is expected that Communist propaganda activities will continue to expand in the years that lie ahead.

The report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities indicates that Communist propaganda items from abroad transmitted through the U.S. postal service increased in the year 1960 to 137 percent over the year 1959, whereas the increase in the year 1959 over the year 1958 was only 18 percent. This is a development which the committee accurately describes as "astonishing." This material does not only come from Russia; during the 2 months of February and March 1961, over 162,000 packages of magazines and 11,000 packages of newspapers were addressed to the United States from Communist Cuba. This is a typical example of how the Communist theorists, now operating from their new base in Cuba, are following the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism to further the insidious purposes of the worldwide Communist movement.

It has been argued that giving the Communists greater freedom to disseminate propaganda in the United States is worthwhile in view of the increased opportunities which we have to get the American message through to the Russian people. But this claim ignores the fact that the United States sends very little mail behind the Iron Curtain in comparison with the flood of Communist materials now arriving in the United States. The bill introduced into the Congress in 1961 by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, would put much stricter controls on mail from abroad. It provides that it "shall be unlawful" for any person not within the United States to use the U.S. mails to distribute any "political propaganda" unless the foreign "person" registers with the Justice Department as a foreign agent and states on the mailed items that he is so registered. A Controller of Foreign Propaganda in the Treasury Department would be established to "maintain close liaison with the appropriate committee of Congress in order that they may be advised regarding the control of Communist and other foreign propaganda." Gentlemen, commonsense suggests that some measures of this type are needed to protect us from the insidious machinations of the world Communist movement within our own national boundaries.

Mr. Speaker, I want this use of our mail system by the Communists stopped now. It is our duty as Members of Congress to take the initiative and stop these Reds here and now.

NEED FOR MORE NURSING SCHOOLS AND MORE CANDIDATES FOR THE NURSING PROFESSION

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, not many people were aware that 1961 marked the 100th anniversary of the nursing profession.

The Post Office Department did issue a commemorative stamp. Its first day of issue was December 28, and I was fortunate to receive one through the thoughtfulness of the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., of Boston, with a picture on the envelope of the "Capping Ceremony; a Big Moment in Life of Student Nurse."

True to its traditions of public service, Westinghouse reminded us, during the season honoring the birth of Christ the Saviour, of the women who help heal the sicknesses of human beings as members of the nursing profession.

> Whose humanitarianism, self-sacrifice, and dedication have made nursing so vital to the health of our country.

It was in the Crimean War, starting in 1853, that Florence Nightingale established the first dressing stations.

The 100th anniversary of the nursing profession in the United States coincides with the 100th anniversary of the Civil War, and the first organized effort to blend "Science and a Talent for Mercy" in caring for the sick and the wounded. Since then, nursing has become one of our most honored professions.

To become an "R.N." requires extensive study and training. There is a growing need and demand for their services, both in hospitals and private homes, but not enough girls are going into training.

Lack of facilities and incentives have caused a critical shortage of registered nurses. Our President, in his state of the Union message, spoke of this shortage, as a matter of national concern, and urged Congress to take appropriate action to facilitate and encourage the training of more nurses.

Subsequently, the New York Herald Tribune reported that: "18 British nurses arrive to help shortage." They were the first of 50 nurses recruited abroad to work at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Bronx Municipal Hospital Center, which has a shortage of 100 nurses.

Dr. M. Henry Williams, associate professor of medicine and physiology was quoted as saying:

> The plan to import these nurses * * * was conceived among the faculty of the college. There is a shortage of approximately 60,000 trained nurses in this country * * *. We see this step as a practical approach to solving the immediate need in our teaching hospitals until our own school of nursing is completed.

I propose that the Congress, recognizing the essential service given by these angels of mercy in protecting the health of our people, should immediately consider practical ways and means to help overcome the shortage of trained nurses.

POSTAL RATE BILL

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, my remarks today are addressed specifically to the unreasonableness of the proposed increase on second-class postage rates. This applies to newspapers and magazines.

The Pennsylvania Farmer is published in Harrisburg, Pa., and has a circulation of more than 144,000. In 1961 this company paid $28,791 for mailing its magazine. The proposed increase of one-half cent per copy would add—and notice I said "add"—an additional $34,304 or an increase of more than 100 percent. The 1½-cent proposed increase in 1963 would add $102,912 to the cost or an increase of more than 300 percent. This would appear to be an unreasonable and very unrealistic increase and can only result in irreparable damage to an industry that has served agriculture for many years.

This and similar companies have received six rate increases in the past 9 years for a total of 130 percent. The company realizes distribution costs have risen and is willing to assume reasonable increases but this suggested increase does not appear to be in the reasonable category.

It should be noted that practically 100 percent of farm magazines are mail delivered. Very few have newsstand circulation. This simply means the impact is greater on this type magazine than those not completely mail circulated.

I stated at the outset, my remarks concerned mainly second-class mail. There is another aspect also that will add to costs if this amendment is adopted.

Most farm magazine subscriptions are renewed or new ones acquired by the use of third-class mail, thus adding additional cost to the publishers.

Farm magazines in the United States deserve a great deal of credit for our enviable production records through the dissemination of information derived from research, experiments and other types of current information. They are the logical and most simple means of supplying this information—possibly they should be penalized for helping produce surpluses. Surveys by all land grant colleges reveal farm publications do supply important information which most farm families use to put new practices into use which result in more efficient operation.

Farm investments are constantly increasing and it becomes more and more important that operators receive all information as it becomes available.

If I were to name the most asinine statement in connection with postal rate increases, the choice would be easy. It came in a letter dated January 22, 1962, which I assume each Member received. It was written by one in high position in the postal service. The following is an exact quote:

> The proposed increase for magazines and newspapers would be limited to copies delivered "outside" their counties of publication.

Note the word "outside" is quoted.

That information raises the $64 question. How long could any farm publication survive if its circulation were pretty largely confined to the county of publication? One need not be an Einstein to answer that.

ELIMINATE CHARGES TO TOURISTS FOR CAPITOL TOURS

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a concurrent resolution which would, if agreed to by both bodies of the Congress, create a Board to look into the feasibility of eliminating the charges to tourists for Capitol tours.

The proposed Board, to consist of the Architect of the Capitol, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and the Sergeant at Arms of the House, would study all aspects of the question and submit its findings and recommendations to the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, not later than January 1, 1963.

I am hopeful such a study would recommend means whereby these tourist charges could be eliminated.

I have had the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress secure information regarding the prevailing practice in other countries in showing visitors through their capitol buildings, and have found that among the major capitals of the world, we are unique in this respect.

I could understand the basis for such a practice if this building were a museum. It is, however, a living, working institution.

While the fees are nominal—25 cents for adults, 15 cents for children—and the tour is well worth many times that amount, the principle being violated over 900,000 times a year is that one should not have to pay anything to see one's own Government at work.

I would hope that this resolution would not result in any major changes in the present Capitol Guide Service, for these 24 individuals have been doing a creditable job through the years.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., January 4, 1962.

To: Hon. EDWIN B. DOOLEY.
From: Foreign Affairs Division.
Subject: Information regarding other countries' practices with regard to showing visitors through their capitol buildings.

In answer to your request, subject as above, dated December 21, 1961, this office telephoned several Embassies and obtained the following information:

France charges no admission fee to enter its Parliament. However, one must get permission from the Secretary of Parliament before he can be admitted. This is best accomplished through the good offices of a member of the French Parliament. There is no guide service, but a man at the front desk will gladly answer pertinent questions.

Italy is in a rather unique situation. Its Parliament building is controlled by the municipal government of Rome. Nevertheless, this setup does not markedly alter their practice of guide service. There is no admission fee, but one must have a special pass. A foreign visitor may obtain such a pass upon the recommendation of his respective Embassy. There is no guide service per se, but a guard accompanies all tourists, and he will attempt to answer questions and explain about the building.

The Soviet Union likewise imposes no entrance fee upon tourists desiring to see the Kremlin. All the buildings are open to the public every day. No special arrangements for gaining admittance need be made for any of the buildings except the Oruzhanaya Palata. It, too, is open to the general public, but there is generally such a long line of people waiting to get in that it would be wise to arrange for a special tour. The regular guides speak in Russian, but one can obtain an interpreter through Intourist for whatever period is desired.

West Germany charges no admission fee and provides free guide service for those parts of the Bundeshaus which are open to the public. The guide service is operated by the Bundestag administration.

Canada also charges no admission fee, and provides free guide service through its Houses of Parliament in Ottawa.

Great Britain charges no admission fee, but provides no free Government-operated guide service. Foreign tourists may obtain passes to see Parliament in session by contacting either a Member of Parliament or their respective Embassy. The Houses of Parliament are open to the public on Saturdays and on certain holidays, when Parliament is not meeting.

MEXICO

National Palace: Permission to tour building can be obtained anytime from the Intendente del Palacio whose office is in the palace. The Government provides guides to conduct visitors through apartments. A tip of 2.50 pesos (20 cents) per guide is suggested. One or two pesos for the employee of the palace. (Terry's Guide to Mexico 1948.)

ARGENTINA

According to Mr. Mathe, first secretary of the Embassy in Washington, there is no formal guide service, nor is there an admission charge to the Edificio del Congreso.

CHILE

There is no formal guide service, nor is there an admission charge to the Edificio del Congreso.

BARRY A. SKLAR.
JOHN S. GOSNELL.

[From the Evening Star, July 1, 1961]

COMMERCIALIZED CAPITOL

Senator GORE makes a valid point in attacking the commercialization of some of the sightseeing services in the Nation's Capital. But in throwing stones at the conduct of private guides in front of the White House the Senator seems to forget that he lives in a glass house himself.

We refer to the tight little commercial sightseeing monopoly which operates in the Halls of the U.S. Capitol. While the 24 Capitol guides are appointed by the Sergeants at Arms of the House and the Senate, they for all practical purposes are operating a private business. The 25 cents a head which they collect for shepherding visitors around the building is tossed into a pool and divided among them weekly. It would be unnatural, therefore, if their primary concern were anything but the size of the groups they can round up.

This, of course, is an absurd situation. Capitol guides should be on the Capitol payroll, and their performance should be carefully supervised. The tours they conduct, furthermore, should be free. It is an indignity which has been permitted to exist for too long that citizens who come here from the far corners of the Nation should be charged a fee in order to gain a working knowledge of the major symbol of American democracy.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 21, 1961]

CRITIC AT LARGE—BASIC CONCEPT OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY PREVAILS IN 25-CENT TOUR OF CAPITOL

(By Brooks Atkinson)

WASHINGTON.—For a change of mood, take the 25-cent guided tour through the Capitol.

Everybody has some grievance against the Government, contempt of Congress being practically the first article of good citizenship. But the guided tour in the company of other Americans suggests that the original idea remains unsullied. The beautiful building that symbolizes the Union, the unfailing courtesy of the attendants who meet the public and the modest manners of the tourists show that the idea of self-government is alive for everyone.

The symbol of government may be fairer than the fact. In practice, self-government may be squalid, unpredictable, and sometimes corrupt. But the tourists who wander quietly through the corridors and sit in the visitors' galleries believe in the American dream.

What the guides have to say is consistently interesting. Only experts can be as factual about the history of the various rooms, the significance of the paintings and the lore of this immense building where so many American worthies have talked and talked.

On this spot, John Quincy Adams, the old Roman, suffered the stroke that ended his long public career when, after having served as President, he served as a Member of the House of Representatives. On that spot, Abraham Lincoln attended to the national business when he was an obscure Congressman from Illinois. The building is steeped in memories.

But today's comments concern the public mood that sets this building apart from all others and continues the tradition of the original covenant. It is home for any American who comes to see it. Both the attendants and the tourists assume that every American has an equal right to be there. Egalitarianism has never been practiced with less effort or more clemency. The lovely white building with its immacuate corridors and footworn steps and its jumble of statuary silences the visitor as if it were a cathedral.

Although our guide had given her itinerant lecture more times than she could compute, she was impersonal about it. She did not try to impose her personality on the tourists or the building that contained them. Our party consisted of about 30 boys and girls of school age and 5 adults. Most of them were carrying cameras and the other impedimenta of the American sightseer. The clothes were informal and neat. Everyone appeared to be on a holiday excursion to a place of great personal interest.

As we made our way through the halls, stopping here and there to listen to the guide, and then filed unobtrusively into the visitors' galleries of the House and the Senate, I tried to think of the words that might describe the attitudes of the people. They were serious and receptive; they were willing to believe. None of the young people threw any gags around, and the adults looked both eager and respectful. The general mood was reverent, with a sense of participation in it.

Since the foundations of the Capitol were put down in 1800 for a structure that would represent the classical tastes of Washington and Jefferson, the building has grown enormously. Flanked by two huge wings, it is stupendous now. But the character has not been lost as the size has increased. Despite its grandeur, the building has a buoyant appearance, like a mansion on a hill; and the towering cupola has the grace to be also homely, as though it were confident without being proud.

What happens in the two legislative chambers is seldom on the spiritual level of the building. For the men and women who make the laws are not abstract principles but citizens; and they have to deal with commonplace realities. But many harsh and a few tragic experiences under the great dome have not contaminated the Capitol. The 25-cent tour suggests that the old idea is still pure.

THE FARM PROBLEM IS AN ECONOMIC QUESTION—NOT A POLITICAL ONE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, no solution to the farm problem will ever be found by continuing to make our farmers political pawns. I repeat what I have said, time and time again: The farm problem is an economic question—not a political one—and should be treated as such.

But Orville L. Freeman, former Governor of Minnesota and now our Secretary of Agriculture, apparently does not intend to take the objective economic approach. Having had no experience in agricultural matters, he intends to utilize his abundant experience in politics. No doubt that is why he was made Secretary of Agriculture.

At a meeting of the ASC in Springfield, Ill., all the committeemen were advised, with the Under Secretary of Agriculture present, that while they could not be denied voting as they saw fit, they were expected to support the President's program or resign. In other words, they were expected to be politically active in behalf of the Kennedy administration.

I also call your attention to the article which appeared in the New York Times of last Sunday, an Associated Press story out of Washington. It states that "the cooperative Federal-State Extension Service is being asked to enter the political arena to help shape future farm policies and programs." As the article explains, this "would impose on the service a role it has studiously avoided in its long history."

Mark you, and mark you well, what Secretary Freeman is doing when he places the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture actively into politics to advocate the administration's program. He is turning a nonpartisan educational agency into a medium for dissemination of political propaganda.

He is setting up a system for the party line conditioning of American youth. I need only to remind you that the Extension Service is the agency that administers the 4-H clubs of our young farmers. There are around 94,000 of these clubs in the United States with a total membership of 2,300,000 boys and girls.

Mr. Speaker, this type of thing must never be permitted to take place. No Secretary of Agriculture, whoever he may be or with whatever political party he may be affiliated, must ever be allowed to convert a service agency of his Department into a youth indoctrination agency of any kind.

And so, Freeman, the would-be czar of Agriculture, begins his organizational efforts to make political peasants out of our independent American farmers and America's wonderful 4-H boys and girls.

SALARY INCREASES

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, a question of a salary raise is now coming up again. Mr. Speaker, I think now is the time to hold the line. What I said then was true, and what I said then was well received by the House. What statements I made were distorted. I think now we ought to hold the line.

I have been constantly in Washington, D.C., on the job in Congress since the opening; however, over the weekend I had the privilege of attending the 21st annual meeting of the Oklahoma Electric Cooperatives in Oklahoma City. This meeting was held the evening following the presentation of the President's budget message to the Congress. The following day I visited three different towns in my congressional district, and had the pleasure of talking with hundreds of my constituents. I wish to advise my colleagues that everywhere I went my constituents were delighted that the President had presented a balanced budget to Congress. Not only did they agree that the budget must be balanced, but urged that Congress do everything in its power to increase the surplus, thus reducing the national debt. I commend the President for sending a balanced budget and I pledge to support constructive measures for increasing the surplus in order to further reduce the national debt without new taxes.

I am sure my colleagues have noticed in the past few weeks, a whole series of newspaper articles appearing in the Washington press, and in one instance in a large metropolitan newspaper in my State, which suggested that Congress will be requested to increase the salary of certain high Government officials, including members of the Cabinet, and Members of Congress.

Gentlemen, I have pledged myself to support constructive measures for increasing the surplus in order to further reduce the national debt without new taxes.

I do not intend to betray the trust placed in me by my constituents by supporting unrealistic measures to increase the cost of government when our objective should be to build up our financial reserve and develop a strong America.

Reducing nonessential spending is the most effective way. Necessary spending is a must, but unnecessary spending should not be indulged in. The international crisis that the American people face will demand not only our close personal attention, but a great deal of our financial attention in the year and years to come. The President's budget recommendations call for the expenditure of 63 cents of every dollar spent next year by our Government to go for national defense and space development. This is a situation the American people did not invite, but one that we must face up to with determination, and unity of purpose.

Congress should be seeking ways and means to reduce nonessential spending. Consideration of any measure to increase the salary of the Members of this House would be some indication to the country that the Congress has removed all restraint and is now proceeding to open the floodgates. It would signal the beginning of another round of inflation affecting both prices and wages. The President and Congress have held the line on inflation in the past session, and we cannot set these forces into motion again. The hope of a balanced budget would be dashed to pieces against such forces.

Gentlemen, the Congress voted to increase the salary of its membership 7 years ago for the first time in a decade, and the major consideration was the tremendous effect inflation had upon the buying power of the then-present salary. That is not the situation today and no such justification exists today for even considering such a measure.

Neither at that time, nor at any other time, did I ever say I could not live on the salary.

I will not vote for a salary increase for myself or my colleagues in this House.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. I have served on important congressional committees with my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] for many years. I know him intimately.

I can personally vouch for the fact that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] never did make the statement that he could not live on the salary.

I have listened with considerable interest to the statement of the gentleman from Oklahoma. And may I add that I consider it to be not only important but a courageous statement. I would appreciate knowing if my colleague has changed his position from 7 years ago?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The able gentleman from California has asked a fair question and I am delighted to answer it.

I believe what he has in mind is the distorted and overdeveloped version of my original position that was presented in my State by a certain metropolitan newspaper. I would like to clarify from the beginning that "I never said I could not live on my salary."

My position 7 years ago was that when inflation or other economic forces have destroyed the purchasing power of a Government employee's salary, it is the duty of Congress to adjust that situation. Unlike employees in private business, Government employees cannot bargain collectively or strike, and only Congress can grant them relief.

This is the current situation a segment of our Government employees face, including our postal employees, as President Kennedy stated in his state of the Union message.

Seven years ago it was the Members of Congress who found the purchasing power of their salary eaten away by inflation, and my position was in agreement with the action of this august body.

Congress is not faced with that situation today, and I repeat, I will not vote for a salary increase for myself or my colleagues in this House.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have listened carefully to the facts just presented by my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Wickersham]. I completely concur in the statements made by him. As a matter of fact, the record 7 years ago shows and the Members know that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Wickersham] did not make the statement that he could not live on his salary. Wickersham's statement has often been taken out of context and distorted. May I compliment the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Wickersham] for his presentation of the true facts at this time. He is highly regarded by the Members of this House. And, I would like to say that I too am interested in seeing our Government operate under a balanced budget. I personally doubt the wisdom of considering a congressional salary increase bill at this time.

RETRAINING FOR NEW JOB OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, on January 4 it was my very great pleasure to be accompanied by Mr. Ivan Nestingen, Under Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Mr. William Batt, Area Redevelopment Administrator in the Department of Commerce; Mr. Robert Salyers and Mr. Sam Merrick from the U.S. Department of Labor; to Mayo Vocational Training School for a day's study and observation of its instructional program. I think what we found from our visit and in our discussion with the school administrators and faculty has a great deal of significance in connection with this body's consideration of the manpower resources training bill, H.R. 8399, which was reported from the House Education and Labor Committee in the closing month of the first session.

Mayo is in the heart of the Seventh Congressional District of Kentucky which has suffered an extremely high rate of unemployment in the last decade due in large part to the substantially fewer number of miners engaged in the bituminous mining industry. Even in the face of lessening job opportunities Mayo's record of job placement to my knowledge is unexcelled by any vocational school in the country—Mayo's approximates 100 percent. Several factors could be singled out to account for this excellent achievement, but one of the most significant to my mind is the fact that Mayo is constantly gearing its machinery and equipment and its instructional curriculum to the specific needs of industry without sacrificing its reputation for giving craftsmen a solid foundation and background in their specific crafts. It might even be said in one sense of the term that Mayo's program involves on-the-job training so close is its program patterned after the actual industrial operation which will utilize the skills of Mayo's trainees. Mayo has gained the respect and high esteem of the many industries which have employed its former trainees.

A great amount of credit is due many people for the excellent operation at Mayo—George Ramey, its present director, James L. Patton, a former director, now a consultant in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and, of course, its excellent faculty. E. P. Hilton, head of Kentucky's vocational education bureau, and Fred Martin, with Kentucky's trade, industrial and distributive education program, have done much to enhance the program.

Retraining for new skills in demand is not, of course, the sole or complete answer to the high unemployment that plagues many areas of our Nation but the history being made at Mayo indicates that on-the-job training will provide many of our people with new skills with which to find employment. After all, it is difficult to argue with Mayo's 100-percent placement record.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 500 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 10, 1962, the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by H. Res. 56 of the Eighty-seventh Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $200,000 including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 504 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by H. Res. 143, Eighty-seventh Congress, incurred by the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $100,000 in addition to the unexpended balance of any sums heretofore made available for conducting such studies, investigations, and inquiries, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of accountants, experts, investigators, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 513, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walter] for the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House, requesting $350,000, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That for the further expenses of conducting the investigations authorized by section 18 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, nor to exceed $350,000 including expenditures for employment of such experts, special counsel, investigators, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and which shall also be available for expenses incurred by said committee or subcommittees outside the continental limits of the United States, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. That the official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings, if not otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in the 1st session of the 87th Congress I voted against a similar resolution. I oppose this resolution. The arguments which I advanced on this floor on March 1, 1961, apply today.

I said then that this committee has not served a useful legislative purpose. Let us examine the committee's legislative activity during 1961.

During the 1st session of the 87th Congress 9,480 bills were introduced in the House. Twenty-seven were referred to the committee. Out of the 27, 16 are identical with other bills, leaving 11 different bills. H.R. 6, the omnibus bill, includes the entire substance of 5 of the 11. This means that there were in reality only six substantive proposals before the committee.

Other bills containing language either similar or in part identical to the language in three of these six proposals were introduced in the House and referred to different committees. Let us look at the three.

Various bills containing language similar to or identical with various sections of H.R. 6 have been referred to the Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Post Office and Civil Service, and Judiciary Committees.

The second case is H.R. 2302. Four bills similarly designed to compel testimony and grant immunity were referred to the Judiciary Committee. It seems only logical that this question should be considered by the Judiciary Committee.

The third case is H.R. 5751. Nine bills similarly concerned with the question of Communist propaganda in the U.S. mails were referred to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The three remaining bills—H.R. 1845, H.R. 4700, and H.R. 7914—appear on their face to be within the province of other committees.

H.R. 1845 establishes a Freedom Academy to promote understanding of communism and methods to counteract it. It provides for the selection of both United States and foreign students and grants-in-aid to finance their studies. At first impression this proposal seems to belong in the Education and Labor Committee. But it also provides a nonimmigrant status for foreign students and outlines deportation procedures. Surely the Judiciary Committee should consider these provisions. The bill also provides that a cross-section of foreign students will be selected from the areas "in which the total political war is being fought." Under this concept the Freedom Academy would be an instrument of foreign policy, which should be the province of the Foreign Affairs Committee. The Un-American Activities Committee is hardly the place to formulate foreign policy.

H.R. 4700 provides that no Communist organization shall be allowed any deduction or exemption for Federal income tax purposes and that no deduction shall be allowed for contributions to a Communist organization. This bill clearly belongs in the Ways and Means Committee.

H.R. 7914 provides that individuals who refuse to testify before a Federal agency with respect to subversive activities shall lose their rights, privileges, and benefits under the Constitution and, for good measure, under any law of the United States. For flavor, let me quote from the bill—H.R. 7914, page 2:

> [Such individuals] shall be ineligible thereafter—
>
> (A) to hold any office or place of honor, profit or trust under the Constitution or laws of the United States of America.
>
> (B) to hold, or to be issued, any certificate, license, passport or other document, issued under authority of any law of the United States of America, which confers any right, privilege, or benefit upon such individual, and
>
> (C) to apply for or to be granted any other right, privilege, or benefit under any law of the United States of America.

Legislation denying an individual's rights under the Constitution and all laws of the United States is a textbook illustration of a bill that belongs in the Judiciary Committee.

I have pointed out how unnecessary the committee is from the point of view of legislation. Legislation now pending there comes within the jurisdiction of other committees.

Let us now look at the hearings held by the committee in 1961. There were a total of five hearings, which were held in Washington, including one which merely took testimony from three friendly witnesses. A total of 43 witnesses were called. Thirty were unfriendly and refused to give any evidence. The other 13 were friendly witnesses, who gave evidence freely. One of the 13 was on the committee staff, 6 worked for the U.S. Government, 3 were admitted ex-Communists. The remaining three were equally cooperative. One was employed by Fulton Lewis, Jr., one was president of a college conservative club, and the third worked for a city police department.

If there is little to show for last year's appropriation of $331,000 in the hearings, perhaps the appropriation financed substantial and valuable research to be found in the form of reports issued in 1961. One report entitled "Communist Target: Youth" was written by J. Edgar Hoover and issued by the committee. It appears to be part of the committee's effort to justify the San Francisco hearings of 1960 as does another report—House Report No. 1278—called The Truth About the Film "Operation Abolition." These efforts are purely defensive and make no legislative contribution. A third report—House Report No. 2237—is the committee's own Annual Report for the Year 1960, which was printed in January 1961.

In reviewing the committee's activities in 1961, it should be noted that the committee not only received an appropriation of $331,000 for 1961 but also received an estimated $62,000 for printing costs. We are now asked to appropriate $350,000 for 1962 which means a total appropriation for the 87th Congress greater than the appropriations for such committees as Ways and Means, Foreign Affairs, Judiciary, and Education and Labor.

However, we should remember that the issue involved is democracy. The Un-American Activities Committee, the atmosphere of anxiety it embodies, and the fear and suspicion it spreads are the antithesis to the spirit of democracy. The democratic spirit demands controversy, dissent, free discussion, and free association. These the committee clearly opposes. The committee itself is the high priesthood of acceptability. It alone defines what is and what is not un-American. When students oppose the committee, it accuses them of toying with treason. The committee has lost faith in the democratic process. It is vital to that process that dissent be heard and differences be argued out to be accepted or rejected by ultimate commonsense.

President Kennedy in a memorable speech at Los Angeles on November 18, 1961, spoke about the frustrations of the age we live in and the effect upon our institutions of those who spread fear and suspicion. His words should be considered by all of us. The President said:

> Now we are face to face once again with a period of heightened peril. The risks are great, the burdens heavy, the problems incapable of swift or lasting solution. And under the strains and frustrations imposed by constant tension and harassment, the discordant voices of extremism are heard once again in the land. Men who are unwilling to face up to the danger from without are convinced that the real danger comes from within.
>
> They look suspiciously at their neighbors and their leaders. * * * They find treason in our finest churches, in our highest court and even in our treatment of water. * * * But you and I and most Americans take a different view of our peril. We know that it comes from without—not within. (New York Times, Nov. 19, 1961, p. 54.)

I ask all of you to join with me in upholding the foundation principles of our great Nation by opposing this resolution.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, this appropriation, on which I understand there will be no recorded vote, is, of course, a continuation of the program the committee outlined to the House Administration Committee last year. It is well known that I opposed this program and the appropriation at that time, and I see nothing in the accomplishment of the committee so far this year to make me change my mind.

However, the decision for the 87th Congress was basically made last year, and the committee properly could expect to make its plans on the basis of that decision. It would be picayune, unsportsmanlike and ineffective, therefore, to make any considerable fight on the issue at this time. I want, however, for the record, to reiterate my feeling that the committee does not justify these large expenditures of the taxpayers' money, and in my considered opinion its proper functions could be far more effectively executed by the Judiciary Committee of the House. The entire issue, I am sure, will be a matter for early consideration in the 88th Congress.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with House Resolution 513, to provide the necessary funds for the continuation of the activities of the House Committee on Un-American Activities for fiscal 1962, I note that the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt] has expressed continued opposition to allowing these funds, stating in essence that in his opinion there was nothing in the accomplishments of the committee during the 1st session of the 87th Congress to warrant the expenditure of this money. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan] takes the same position in his remarks, declaring that the committee had no useful legislative purpose.

As a Member of Congress who has always supported the continuance and adequate funds for the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I disagree emphatically with both these colleagues. Inasmuch as I am not a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I believe I can speak very objectively as to the accomplishments of this committee during 1961, and since I spoke out strongly in favor of adequate funds for the committee last year, I feel impelled to defend its record, especially so because last year I testified in person in support of its appropriation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, let me recite briefly a few of the things that to my knowledge have been successfully undertaken by the committee during the past year and the remarkable contribution I feel this committee has made to the internal security of this Nation.

First, let me say that in these perilous days it would be a dereliction of congressional responsibility as well as the height of folly for the Congress not to investigate subversive activities. Has not J. Edgar Hoover warned us:

> The Communist threat from without must not blind us to the Communist threat from within. The latter is reaching into the very heart of America through its espionage agents and a cunning, defiant, and lawless Communist Party, which is fanatically dedicated to the Marxist cause of world enslavement and destruction of the foundations of our Republic.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that the Congress and the Nation be fully informed of the developments of the international Communist conspiracy and particularly as to its operations within our own country. The Congress must obtain up-to-date information as to the Communist movement, both national and international.

Now that the constitutionality of the Internal Security Act of 1950 has been upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States, the task of this committee in the fields of investigation and research will be significantly greater. The Communist Party will go further underground and will intensify its operations through Communist fronts. It will step up its operations into every aspect of American life, and there are indications it will renew its efforts within our important labor unions. The Communist Party will resist enforcement of that act, and it will devise cunning methods for evasion of the law.

To meet these new and greater problems, the committee will have to extend itself to the utmost toward increasing its investigations and research activities. The entire Congress and its committees, which will have to deal with various aspects of the Communist operation, must have basic and sound information upon which to make legislative judgments. It would be a mistake to believe that the legislative functions of the House Committee on Un-American Activities is solely to inform its own members; its specialized work serves to keep the entire Congress informed, and other legislative committees as well.

During 1961, I am informed, demands by Members of Congress for information from the records of the committee were greater than ever before. The committee's reference section handled more than 3,000 requests from members for information relating to 8,000 individuals and over 4,000 organizations and periodicals. Compared with the previous year, this reflects a 50-percent increase in number of subjects on which information was sought by Members of the Congress and reflects a 45-percent increase in the number of inquiries. In response to these requests the reference staff of the committee, I am told, developed information on a total of 3,428 subjects, and written reports were prepared in each case.

Moreover, representatives of investigative agencies in the executive branch of the Government made approximately 2,100 visits to check the committee's records, more than two-thirds of them on a full-day basis. The committee prepared more than 3,500 exhibits for use in its hearings and investigations.

The committee conducted intensive investigations which led to numerous executive hearings on the subject of the security procedures of the National Security Agency. The work of the committee in this respect I regard as an outstanding acomplishment. I think it may be said accurately that the committee succeeded where many others had failed. The unique efforts of this committee have been recognized by the Defense Department. The committee investigations were begun in September 1960, following the defection to the Soviet Union of National Security Agency Employees William E. Martin and Bernon F. Mitchell.

The committee's inquiry revealed that security was very lax in certain areas of National Security Agency operations, that an Assistant Director in the Agency had filed official documents fraudulent in content and that the Director of Security for the Agency had engaged in unethical practices in the course of conducting official Agency business and had tolerated similar conduct by certain subordinates. The resignation of the said persons was demanded and obtained this past November and December. In addition, as a result of leads obtained by this committee and provided to the Department of Defense, 26 other National Security Agency employees were released from employment during the last year. National Security Agency witnesses have given credit to the House Committee on Un-American Activities for changes made in security practices.

In the course of another series of executive hearings the committee interrogated officials of the National Science Foundation, which dispenses Federal funds to institutions and individuals for scientific research as part of this Nation's defense efforts. The fund has had a $263 million budget for 1961. The investigations indicated that the foundation lacked effective procedures which could have affected the use of taxpayers' money by individuals publicly identified as members of the Communist Party, as well as individuals with criminal records.

The above investigations, which are of tremendous importance to the national security clearly demonstrates one of the most important functions of the committee, mandated to it by the Congress; namely, that of legislative oversight and surveillance by the Congress over the execution of laws by the executive branch. This function alone would warrant a continuance of this standing committee. I might also point out that only a committee with continuous and long experience could effectively cope with the problems posed by the Communist conspiracy, which is secret and underground.

Other investigations and hearings were held with a view toward providing a base and understanding for remedial legislation. Among these were the hearings relating to the vital communications industry. The threat to our security posed by Communist access to radio and communications apparatus was subject to further exploration in 1961. The hearings have been published. Three officials of the Federal Communications Commission testified in relation to proposed legislative measures under consideration by the committee. Other witnesses testified freely regarding former Communist Party membership while employed with radio stations; eight communications industry employees refused to answer questions on alleged party activities in the past; and the present secretary-treasurer, and the editor of the American Communications Association, a union expelled from the CIO in 1950 on charges of Communist domination, refused to answer all questions regarding present or past party membership, despite testimony by numerous witnesses placing the two important union officials in the party's ranks.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the committee held hearings on propaganda bills designed to cope with the tremendous influx of Communist propaganda now poisoning the Nation. The hearings have been printed, disclosing a diversity of problems which the committee and the Congress are attempting to resolve. Hearings were held on H.R. 5751 and the view of the executive agencies presented to the Congress with the initial committee recommendations. The amended H.R. 5751 was passed by the House last fall and is now awaiting Senate action.

The committee has likewise instituted hearings in 1961, marking the opening of committee inquiries into the current organization, leadership and operations of the Communist Party in the United States, with particular reference to the degree of its dependence on the latest Soviet dictator, Nikita Khrushchev. Close to 100 documents, mainly from Communist sources, were introduced into the record. Witnesses who played key roles in recent Communist Party developments as a result of their positions as party officers or functionaries were interrogated at length. The inquiry, which has not been completed, revealed that the Communist Party in the United States in 1958 resolved a bitter 2-year leadership struggle. The hearings show that in the solution of this struggle there was direct intervention by Soviet Communists and that the final party leadership was the one which was directed by Soviet Communists. The hearing record also contains a roster of the identity of the party's present national leadership, the structural framework of the party, and its disciplined, paramilitary method of operation on American soil.

The committee likewise explored, in its hearings on the fund for social analysis, the utilization of Communists of a type of propaganda organization seeking to increase Communist influence within the academic communities of this Nation. The hearing was in connection with H.R. 4700, proposing various new tax policies with respect to Communist-controlled organizations.

The committee likewise made intensive investigations and conducted hearings relating to two new Communist fronts entitled "National Assembly for Democratic Rights" and the "Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties." A formal committee report on these organizations has been issued. It was clearly demonstrated in these important hearings in what manner the Communist Party of the United States, with support from other Communist groups on the international scene, has sought to influence the Congress, the Supreme Court and the American people in relation to security legislation. The hearing report which has been published in two parts and already disseminated to the Members of the House, is certainly an important and interesting study.

In addition to many executive hearings, the committee has revised its important "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications," together with preparation of a 5-year supplement to its "Cumulative Index." At least 200 organizations and projects and 44 publications characterized as Communist have been added to the guide since the previous edition of January 1957. Altogether, 818 Communist organizations or projects and 147 Communist publications are listed in the revised guide. The index is a publication of 563 pages. Moreover, the committee at the same time made a study and revision of its rules of procedures, which were printed and distributed to the Members of the House. I think these rules fully protect witnesses and justify the approval of a committee of the American Bar Association which found the procedures of the House Committee on Un-American Activities to be fair and proper.

There is more legislation pending in the committee now I am informed, than at any time in its history. In addition to the legislation previously mentioned, there have been introduced and reported to this committee during this Congress 12 bills, which does not include duplications. One of these bills is an omnibus bill which contains 37 subjects. I am advised that other important legislation will be introduced and in all probability referred to this committee during this session.

I might also note that the committee investigations and reports have been extremely useful to both Members of the House and the Senate. A review of several of the bills introduced by Members of Congress will disclose their basis on the work and information obtained for the Congress by this committee. This indeed points out the important place that the House Committee on Un-American Activities fills in the legislative work of the Congress as we attempt to cope with what is no doubt the most serious threat to its existence that this Nation has ever faced. I wish personally to pay a tremendous debt of gratitude to this small committee for its help to me. Its staff is obviously carrying a heavy burden. In saying so, I am certain that I am expressing the opinion of the vast majority of the Members of Congress.

In citing this record, Mr. Speaker, I do so because I fear too many think extra funds for the Defense Department is the only answer to national security. The knowledge of communism and Communist tactics is equally or perhaps even more essential because of the part that public opinion plays under our system.

I strongly support the $350,000 for investigational work of the Committee on Un-American Activities. The record clearly shows these funds will be well spent in the public interest.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 509 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means is authorized, until otherwise provided by law, to employ seven additional clerical employees to be paid from the contingent fund of the House at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202(c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

U.S. CONSTITUTION 175TH ANNIVERSARY COMMISSION

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 517 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives the expenses of the United States Constitution One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary Commission authorized by Public Law 86-650, as amended, in the amount of $387.73.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on House Resolution 513 my position is the same as it was in the 1st session of the 87th Congress. I am opposed to it and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks prior to the passage of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

TEXTILE IMPORTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk on the subject of textiles and textile imports because in the areas in which that particular industry is part of the basic economy, we are finding that we are still losing jobs, we are losing money, and the economy of those particular areas is being adversely affected. We find that the threat of imports from Japan and other countries continues to be an economic threat in those sections of the country. I shall continue to speak on this subject from time to time this year, and until our problems are solved and we get some relief.

We were very happy last May when the President of the United States, in keeping with platform promises made during the campaign in the fall of 1960, unfolded a textile aid plan containing seven different points. Those points he emphasized and some of those particular points have since been implemented by activities on the part of the President or people acting out his direction or in his behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a statement from a newspaper of May 3, 1961, outlining that particular program.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Blatnik). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Kennedy Unveils Textile Aid Plan—Seven-Point Program Outlined—Import Quotas Are Refused

Washington.—President Kennedy Tuesday set forth a seven-point program to aid the textile industry without—as he put it—disrupting international commerce.

Among the President's recommendations was legislation to permit industries threatened with harm as a result of increased imports to receive assistance from the Federal Government.

Kennedy did not adopt industry suggestions for import quotas by country and by category of goods. Instead he said an application for protection from foreign imports would be "carefully considered on its merits."

NATIONAL INTEREST

Kennedy said he believed his program would help the textile industry meet its problems while recognizing the national interest in expanding world trade and fortifying underdeveloped countries.

"It is my hope that these measures will strengthen the industry and expand consumption of its products without disrupting international trade and without disruption of the markets of any country," Kennedy said.

The administration program was worked out by a Cabinet committee headed by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, a one-time textile manufacturer.

TEXTILE REPRESENTATIVES

It was outlined to representatives of the textile industry by White House aids as the President's press office made it public.

TWENTY-THREE INDUSTRY LEADERS

Kennedy spoke to the 23 industry leaders as they gathered to receive his recommendations.

These are the measures which Kennedy proposed:

1. An expanded program of research by the Department of Commerce in cooperation with union and management groups. This would embrace new products, processes, and markets.

2. A Treasury Department review of depreciation allowances coupled with the credit incentives for investment suggested in his tax message 2 weeks ago, should help modernize the industry.

3. Assistance by the Small Business Administration in obtaining necessary financing for modernization of equipment.

EXPENSE DIFFERENTIAL

4. Study by the Department of Agriculture toward eliminating or offsetting the cost to U.S. mills of the differential in expense for raw cotton between domestic and foreign textile producers.

5. Legislation to permit industries "seriously injured or threatened with serious injury as a result of increased imports to be eligible for assistance from the Federal Government."

6. An early conference, to be arranged by the State Department of leading textile export and import countries to seek an international understanding on trade that will avoid undue disruption of established industries.

7. Assurance that an application by the industry for action under trade laws, such as the escape clause or national security provision of the Trade Agreements Extension Act, will be carefully considered on its merits.

IMPORT THREAT

Industry leaders have insisted their livelihood has been threatened critically by textile imports. At one point the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America announced members of the union would refuse to cut Japanese cloth for men's suits, but the threatened boycott was revoked on Kennedy's urging.

A Senate subcommittee headed by Senator John Pastore, Democrat, of Rhode Island, had recommended for the use of import quotas.

BIG EMPLOYER

Kennedy, in announcing his program, said that the textile industry is the country's second largest employer. Two million workers are directly affected, he said, and another 2 million are employed in supporting industries.

"It is of vital importance in peacetime, and it has a direct effect upon our total economy," Kennedy said. "All the studies have shown that unemployment in textile mills strikes hardest at those communities suffering most from depressed conditions."

Mr. **HEMPHILL**. Mr. Speaker, when we begin to talk about imports, to those who want to face up to some other responsibility than their responsibility to the American worker, to those who want some excuse for voting for some policy which takes textile jobs and to those who say, "It does not cost you anything, look how well you are doing," I point out that the Department of State has spent considerable money in making a survey as to how much exporting we did from various parts of the textile areas. I do not know how much money was spent in that propaganda attempt but I know that since that time I have been propagandized again by the State Department, and I have written them and dared them to tell the truth about the situation. But I fear there is no truth in them so far as the textile industry is concerned.

As I view the failures of our State Department on many of the foreign fronts and see their continued attitude on the home front it gives me great concern. I have an article from a newspaper dated October 17, 1961, in which it says that "Imports Cost Textile Industry $12 Billion" in one particular year. At a time when we are trying to raise our gross national product; at a time when we have 4 million people unemployed; at a time when we have a record budget ahead of us; at a time when we have a national debt which will reach $300 billion, how can we afford, with the future in front of us as it is, to continue to lose money such as we have lost in that particular area?

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this article at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Sales Last Year—Imports Cost Textile Industry $12 Billion—Limitation of Imports Is Petitioned

Washington.—Excessive imports cost the domestic textile industry more than $12 billion in sales and an estimated $750 million in profits before taxes last year, spokesmen for the trade reported Monday.

The figures were cited in a final industry brief submitted to the Office of Emergency Planning in support of a petition for import limitation under the National Defense section of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement.

Aside from the last sales and profits, the brief contended, the low-wage foreign shipments resulted in a loss of $497 million in Federal and State taxes which the domestic trade would otherwise have paid, and a $1.1 billion cut in wages and salaries for textile workers and executives.

"The effect of these losses on the country's economy are self-evident. They have weakened and will continue to weaken the economy until the conditions which caused them are corrected," the brief pointed out.

The presentation was filed on behalf of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute and other trade organizations representing cottons, apparel, fibers and other segments of the domestic trade to support the industry's petition of last May 15 for import limitations.

The OEP, successor to Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, has the power to recommend import curbs if it finds a defense industry is being hurt by excessive foreign import competition, but a final decision on such matters rests with the President.

To indicate the textile trade's importance to the economy, the industry brief cited the following figures for last year.

The combined textile mill products-apparel and other finished fabric product industries accounted for: $9.5 billion or 7.8 percent of national income derived from manufacturing; $7.6 billion or 8.6 percent of wages and salaries paid by manufacturing; $2.1 million or 13.2 percent of all manufacturing workers, in arguing that its petition for relief should be based solely on defense and economic issues, the textile brief said.

Mr. **HEMPHILL**. Mr. Speaker, if it were just money alone we might say, "well, we can afford that." But when you are losing money, you are losing jobs. When you are losing jobs, you are losing consumer purchasing power. When you are losing jobs, you are losing security for people who have been paying taxes—people who have been good American citizens and who want to work but whose jobs are being taken away from them because of the particular policies of this Government and because of the failure of the Department of State that is in control of the situation to secure the employment of the textile workers in America, and particularly in that part of the country from which I am privileged to come.

Mr. Speaker, just as an example, in answer to those who say, "Well, it does not have any impact on the economy," and you hear statisticians tell you, "Well, the volume is very low"—and they can quote statistic after statistic—but here is a significant article from the Rock Hill (S.C.) Evening Herald, a daily paper in my district dated October 31, 1961, and which article, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Blatnik). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The newspaper article referred to is as follows:

Lowenstein Reports 69-Percent Decrease in Net Earnings

The third quarter report of M. Lowenstein & Sons, Inc., showed net earnings decreased 69 percent for the first 9 months in 1961, as compared with the first 9 months of 1960.

Earnings for the 9-month period amounted to four-tenths of 1 cent on each dollar of sales.

These figures were revealed today by officials of Rock Hill Printing & Finishing Co., a subsidiary of M. Lowenstein & Sons, Inc. Lowenstein Chairman Leon Lowenstein announced that net income after taxes for the 9-month period ending September 30, 1961, amounted to $1,410,156, equal to 50 cents a share.

Comparative figures for the same 9-month period last year showed $4,631,586, or $1.63 a share.

Net income after taxes for the 3-month quarter ending September 30, 1961, was $446,677, or 16 cents a share. This compares with $768,292 or 27 cents a share for the third quarter of 1960.

Total sales for the 9 months in 1961 amounted to $329,300,830. Total sales for the same period last year were $343,003,834. This represents a decline of 4 percent.

Mr. HEMPHILL. This particular article goes on to say that Lowenstein reports a 69-percent decrease in net earnings in the third quarter of 1961.

Under the American free enterprise system, in order to keep running, you have to make profits and in order to give people jobs, those jobs must be productive of profits in order to pay their salaries and to profit on the investments necessary for industry—it is elementary that you have to have a return on your investment. Now it does not go on to say in this particular article how many jobs were affected or how the policies would be affected in the future. It just says that the earnings went down 69 percent. Lowenstein has a marvelous plant in my particular district and hires a great number of fine American people, and the running of this fine plant and its payroll has a great impact on the economy of my section of the country. I say it is not right—it is not right to ignore the facts of life—to let these companies go down because of the policies of any branch of government.

Somebody said, "What are we going to do about it?" I was unhappy to learn in September of last year that the United States had boosted Japanese textile exports and that they had compromised last year. I sat here for 4 years under the previous administration and I have seen compromise after compromise taking place. I have been uptown to the various departments trying to get some relief and receiving none, but instead getting a lot of promises. This is just a continuation of the betrayal of the American textile workers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this article in my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The article referred to is as follows:

NIPPON TO OBSERVE EXPORT CONTROLS—U.S. BOOSTS JAPANESE TEXTILE EXPORTS—RISE IS RESULT OF COMPROMISE BETWEEN NATIONS

TOKYO.—The United States today agreed to an increase of about 8 percent in Japan's textile exports to the United States during 1962, according to Warren P. Christopher, special U.S. representative at textile talks concluded here today.

The two countries reached an interim agreement under which Japan would be permitted to raise her U.S. textile exports from 255 million square yards this year to 275 million square yards in 1962 in exchange for a promise to observe voluntary export controls.

Japan's 1962 quotas will be increased by about 8 percent over 1961.

The number of categories will be "only slightly more than the present agreement in sensitive areas." Under the recent Geneva agreement on textiles 64 different categories were listed. Japan had been afraid the United States would insist on her exports being spread out over more categories but Christopher said the United States settled for "a great deal" less than the 64.

The two countries will hold consultations any time that the United States determines there has been "undue concentration on any item" and Japan will agree to hold exports on that item to 110 percent of the 12-month period preceding the consultations.

Each particular group of textiles will be permitted 5 percent flexibility. But increases will be permitted only in the so-called "basket category" (unspecified items).

From the U.S. standpoint, this agreement has been made in accordance with the Geneva agreement and is under the Geneva umbrella.

It also was provided that the two nations would begin negotiations October 9 on a new long-term agreement, "which will be to the benefit of all exporting and importing countries."

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, everybody who is familiar with the situation knows that we have a quota, and those who adopt the policies which have been so detrimental to our textile industry say, "Well, they have a voluntary quota and it is not going to hurt you because the quota is going to take care of you."

I think I have pointed out here before, and I will point it out here again, the method by which they eliminate some segment of our American textile industry. Three or four years ago, they eliminated a gingham mill in my particular district. I will never forget it because there were people who were employed there whom I knew and loved. Two hundred people had jobs there, and there was a large payroll involved. It was one of the better communities of this Nation. Now I find that they are zeroing in on another part of the textile industry. What they do is to take their quota and apportion a sufficient portion of it to undercut a particular market for American manufacturers, and they can just swamp that particular market. All they have to do is to swamp that market for 2 or 3 succeeding years, and soon the American manufacturer does not have the money to go on. He cannot show a net profit statement to his bank to borrow money. So the American manufacturer cannot continue in business because he cannot make money. So the factory closes—people are unemployed. Yet, the people down at the State Department say, "Aren't we good friends with the Japanese?"—which we are, I suppose. But, Mr. Speaker, I think it goes a little bit further than friendship when you betray American workers and destroy American jobs—and that is what has been taking place.

Now we can talk about programs all we want to. But programs are not enough. Promises are not enough. The only thing that will answer our problems is action. We, in the Congress, who are aware of these problems and who represent the people who are being hurt by these policies and who are losing their jobs are asking for action and we will continue to ask for action.

I have here a letter from Mr. Arthur R. Hutchinson of the J. Sullivan & Sons Manufacturing Corp., dated September 13, 1961, and another letter dated October 7, 1961.

These two letters tell in effect what is happening to that particular company which makes narrow fabrics for zippers and things of that kind. They have a plant in my district. It is a fine plant and they employ some fine American people who need their jobs. The community needs the payroll for the consumer purchasing power to be maintained. That area of our country needs these profits for the benefit of its industrial economy. Yet, the Japanese have increased their imports into this country and they are flooding the market in this particular instance to the point that these very mills are threatened.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to include in my remarks at this point these letters which outline in detail this particular problem.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The letters referred to follow:

J. SULLIVAN & SONS
MANUFACTURING CORP.,
Philadelphia, Pa., September 13, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HEMPHILL: I am the associate and partner of John K. Benfield, Jr., Sullivan-Southern Inc., York, S.C., who manufactures zipper tapes, and J. Sullivan & Sons Manufacturing Corp., Philadelphia, Pa., who finishes and sells them and our 12-year-operation in York, S.C., and our 108-year operation in Philadelphia is in trouble.

I attach copies of letters which explain the situation.

The narrow fabric industry is composed of many manufacturers who make many types of narrow fabrics. Jack and I specialize in zipper tape, in fact we are 100 percent in zipper tape. During World War II we were 100 percent in Government tape and during Korea about 50 percent. The way the narrow fabric industry is going today many of us will not be here if and when we are needed again.

Let me tell you of the plight of the zipper tape manufacturers since World War II.

The seven largest producers of this item of narrow fabrics in 1946 were:

Russell Manufacturing Co., Middletown, Conn.

Hope Webbing Co., Pawtucket, R.I. (closed—machinery scrapped).

Krout & Fite, Philadelphia, Pa. (bankrupt—machinery scrapped).

J. Sullivan & Sons Manufacturing Corp., Philadelphia, Pa.

Hoffman Tape Mills, Cheltenham, Pa. (bankrupt—machinery scrapped).

Tape-Craft Inc., Anniston, Ala.

Federal Ribbon Co., Williamsport, Md. (bad fire).

Today Tape-Craft has a small percentage of their large operation on zipper tapes; Federal I believe has some limited production and the others have closed down as far as zipper tape is concerned.

A large newcomer to the field several years ago, Bridgeport Fabrics of Davidson, N.C., shut down two-thirds on September 1, 1961, and will be shut down completely on September 30, 1961, on zipper tape.

Of the remaining manufacturers in the narrow fabric field making zipper tape, Aristocrat, Carson, Wayne, and Bux in Philadelphia; Statesville in North Carolina; and

Penn Textile in York, Pa., and Sullivan-Southern, Inc., in York, S.C., none of them I am sure are running full.

It is from these zipper-tape looms that our Government in the past has received their type I and type II when they wanted it, besides many, many other narrow fabrics. I ask you, When they want it again will they get it from Japan?

Because of the fact that our company gave 100 percent of their production to the Government during the war on a three-shift 7-day basis, we have just won back some of our customers whom we did not supply during this emergency and now we are being hurt by excessive imports. We can stand some but not, as Jack Benfield says, 30 percent of the American requirements.

An investigation by me at the Philadelphia customhouse shows that the import duty on zippers under 4 cents each is 50 percent; on zippers over 4 cents each is 40 percent; plus .01275 per pound on the brass; and on all component parts 50 percent.

Zipper imports are no problem to the zipper manufacturers. I do not know of any component parts that are imported except tape, which is taxed at 17½ percent.

If top and bottom stops and sliders are taxed at 50 percent as component parts why, I ask, is tape, also a component part, taxed at only 17½ percent?

Jack and I would like an opportunity to meet with you in either Washington, D.C., or Chester, S.C., to further discuss this matter.

The people in York, S.C., are looking for a continuation and an increase in employment, not a decrease, and with help from our Government we feel we can continue to expand.

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR R. HUTCHINSON.

J. SULLIVAN & SONS
MANUFACTURING CORP.,
Philadelphia, Pa., October 7, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HEMPHILL: I want to take this opportunity of thanking you for the time you so willingly gave to my associate, John K. Benfield, Jr., and me when we called on you the past Wednesday at your office in Chester, S.C., and following your suggestion I will attempt to put in writing the various facts, figures and information that Mr. Benfield and I presented to you at that meeting, in connection with the problem we are faced with due to increased importation of slide fastener or zipper tape from Japan.

There are three corporation, either owned or controlled by Mr. Benfield and me, involved in this matter.

J. Sullivan & Sons Manufacturing Corp., a Pennsylvania corporation operating in Philadelphia, Pa., employing at the present time approximately 50 employees, is a 108-year-old company. This corporation purchases natural woven cotton zipper tape, has it dyed or bleached by one of two companies in Philadelphia, has this tape finished and packaged and sells it to zipper manufacturers throughout the country.

Sullivan-Southern, Inc., is a South Carolina corporation, employing approximately 120 employees in York, S.C., started its operations 12 years ago in York, S.C., and purchases their yarn locally to manufacture its tape, which it sells to J. Sullivan & Sons Manufacturing Corp., as its only customer.

Crescent Narrow Fabrics Corp., a North Carolina corporation, which formerly operated in Charlotte, N.C., rents its narrow fabric equipment to Sullivan-Southern, Inc., and its real estate in Philadelphia to J. Sullivan & Sons Manufacturing Corp., as well as to several other tenants.

The narrow fabric industry is composed of many manufacturers who weave many types of narrow fabrics. Our companies specialize in zipper tape, in fact our entire production today is 100 percent on zipper tape. However, during World War II our production was 100 percent on Government tapes and webbings and during Korea approximately 50 percent.

Immediately following World War II the seven largest producers of zipper tapes, not necessarily listed in size, were:

Russell Manufacturing Co., Middletown, Conn.

Hope Webbing Co., Pawtucket, R.I.

Krout & Fite Manufacturing Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

Hoffman Tape Mills, Cheltenham, Pa.

Federal Ribbon Mills, Williamsport, Md.

Tape-Craft, Inc., Anniston, Ala.

J. Sullivan & Sons Manufacturing Corp., Philadelphia, Pa.

Since that time Russell Manufacturing Co. has discontinued the manufacture of zipper tape. Hope Webbing closed down and scrapped their machinery. Krout & Fite and Hoffman Tape Mills, went bankrupt and their machinery was scrapped. Federal Ribbon suffered a bad fire and as of today, I believe, have limited production. Tape-Craft, Inc. has only a small portion of their large operation on zipper tape, leaving us the only one of the original seven still operating on this item, as we were after World War II.

Bridgeport Fabrics of Davidson, N.C., a large newcomer in the zipper tape field for several years, shut down two-thirds of their production on September 1, 1961, and the balance was shut down on September 30.

After World War II, as well as today, Aristocrat Narrow Fabrics Co., Wm. T. Carton & Sons, Wayne Mills and J. R. Bux & Sons of Philadelphia, Statesville Narrow Fabric of North Carolina and Penn Textile in York, Pa., are practically the only narrow fabric mills still running zipper tape and from personal conversation I doubt that all of them are running full and most of them are gradually transferring their production from zipper tape to other narrow fabrics, as did Tape-Craft of Anniston, Ala.

It is from these zipper tape looms that our Government in the past has received a great portion of their type I and type II when they wanted it and further deterioration in the narrow fabric industry, caused by increasing imports, will certainly lessen the availability of this tape to our Government if and when it is needed.

In an effort to stabilize zipper tape prices in America, early in 1961 I went to Japan, but was unable to purchase any portion of the 1961 quota.

Upon my return I was able to purchase from a New York agent, through Crescent Narrow Fabrics Corp., a lot of zipper tape that was denied to J. Sullivan & Sons Manufacturing Corp. earlier in the year and I attach herewith copies of letters written to my accountant on January 5, 1961, to my agent on September 11, 1961, and to my customer on September 13, 1961, which I hope will give you a clear picture of Japan's voluntary increase of their voluntary quota.

Then there is the question of duty on these imports. Zipper tape is imported to make zippers and zipper tape is taxed at 17½ percent. An investigation by me at the Philadelphia customhouse shows that the import duty on zippers, costing under 4 cents each, is 50 percent and on zippers costing 4 cents or more it is 40 percent plus an additional duty of .01275 per pound on the metal contained therein. Furthermore the records show that the duty on all component parts to make zippers is 50 percent. Zipper imports are no problem whatsoever to the zipper manufacturers in America. Apparently, except for tape, component parts of zippers are no problem to the zipper manufacturers or to the manufacturers who specialize in component parts only, because of the 50-percent duty. Metal, which I understand is taxed at 10 percent, is of little bother to the American manufacturers because of its weight, and cotton thread, cotton bobbins and cotton cord, needed in the manufacture of zippers, have a duty of 35 percent and I know of no imports on these items.

It seems strange to me that cotton zipper tape is taxed at only 17½ percent whereas cotton cord, cotton thread and cotton bobbins are taxed at 35 percent and top stops and bottom stops and sliders are taxed at 50 percent plus and all are component parts of a zipper. From information given me by a zipper manufacturer, a 7-inch zipper, materialwise costs as follows:

Unbleached tape, duty 17½ percent	$0.00380
Metal slider, duty 50 percent	.00265
Aluminum, duty 10 percent	.00250
Cord, duty 35 percent	.00102
Top and bottom stop, duty 50 percent plus	.0009
Thread and bobbins, duty 35 percent	.0003
Total	.01117

If zipper tape were classified as a zipper component instead of under the broad coverage where it is listed, and taxed as a component part as are other component parts, our problem of Japanese imports would be alleviated.

In discussing this matter with Mr. Julius R. Bux, of J. R. Bux & Son, of Philadelphia, one of our competitors, he advised me that he was scheduled to appear before the Dent subcommittee regarding the impact of imports and exports on unemployment, on July 21 but due to an accident on July 19 he was unable to be present, but his 10-page brief was accepted in their records.

In my opinion the increased voluntary quota of Japan, standing at 900,000 pounds in 1961, represents approximately 30 percent of all of the zipper tape that all of the narrow fabric manufacturers made in 1960, which explains the reason why prices are becoming depressed and unemployment in the zipper tape portion of the narrow fabric industry is increasing.

At the present time Sullivan-Southern, Inc., in York, S.C., has not fully felt the impact of these imports and inasmuch as they have not, neither have our employees in Philadelphia, but if the voluntary quota of 300,000 pounds in 1961, which was voluntarily increased to 900,000 pounds, is further increased or not decreased back to where it was, I feel sure that come 1962 our companies will certainly have to curtail production in both Pennsylvania and South Carolina.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR R. HUTCHINSON.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Back in 1960 when the campaign was on, the then Vice President of the United States, whom the people of the country more recently discarded in his presidential aspirations, came down to North Carolina and made a lot of promises. Of course, he could not fool us. I had been up to the White House about the textile problem, talked to General Persons and some of the others up there, because it was so critical. I had been to the Secretary of Commerce of that administration. I had talked to some of the people down at the State Department. No one gave me any satisfaction. All said everything was going to be all right. Meantime I had mills closing, people out of work, continued imports, troubles, even had a little recession. Textiles were about to go soft again.

They kept on giving promises, so when Mr. Nixon came down to the area and made his promises everybody knew they were empty promises.

That has not been so with this administration. I am glad to report that we have had some relief. We have had relief in the method of depreciation and we are most happy for it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in my remarks at this time the background for this particular relief which was given to us in October of last year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

BACKGROUND TECHNICAL STATEMENT REGARDING CHANGES IN TEXTILE DEPRECIATION

In accordance with one phase of the President's program of assistance to the U.S. textile industry announced May 2, 1961, the Treasury Department has reviewed the average useful lives of textile machinery and equipment used in determining depreciation allowances. This review has produced a new set of estimated average useful lives to replace those provided in Bulletin F, as revised in January 1942.

The estimated useful lives suggested by the Internal Revenue Service for more than 80 percent of textile machinery have been revised. The new lives as well as the old Bulletin F lives are shown in the attached table. Average useful lives of 15 years will be indicated for the first 10 items, for which Bulletin F indicated lives ranging from 15 to 40 years. Finishing equipment will have a suggested average useful life of 12 years as compared to earlier composite lives of 15 to 20 years. Estimated average depreciable lives of machinery and equipment not shown in the attached table will be subject to similar review and adjustment.

The new estimated lives will be applicable to new acquisitions. It is also expected that adjustments will be made, prospectively only, to the remaining useful lives of textile machinery and equipment now in use. This will be accomplished by applying depreciation rates based upon revised useful lives to the applicable basis, reduced by salvage where appropriate; however, with respect to assets having a remaining life of 5 years or less, an adjustment to useful lives will be made only where a shorter life can be substantiated. The adjustments to remaining useful lives of existing machinery and equipment will be made only by those taxpayers who are adopting retirement policies consonant with the adjustment.

The adoption of the revised average useful lives for textile machinery and equipment will not result in the salvage on such items being treated differently than is provided by existing regulations.

For some time the Treasury Department has been engaged in a comprehensive review of depreciation allowances under the existing provisions of the income tax law. As a result of the President's directive, the study of allowances in the textile industry was accelerated. It was found that the administrative guidelines for depreciable lives in this industry required adjustment in view of technological advances and an increased rate of obsolescence. Similar studies are proceeding with respect to other sectors of industry, but conclusions have not yet been reached as to whether or in what degree administrative estimates of depreciable lives require adjustment. Decisions with respect to administrative change will depend upon conditions and practices which vary from industry to industry. The Treasury Department is moving ahead rapidly with this general and comprehensive review.

For the textile industry, the average useful lives of machinery and equipment shown in the 1942 edition of Bulletin F range from 15 to 40 years. The appropriate test for determining the useful life of an asset in a particular case is the period over which the asset may reasonably be expected to be used by the taxpayer in his trade or business or in the production of his income. A number of textile firms have been replacing their machinery and equipment more rapidly than the Bulletin F suggested lives and the Internal Revenue Service has accordingly permitted depreciation in such cases over the shorter life.

The broad review of the depreciation allowances and the practices in the industry included independent studies by Internal Revenue Service engineers, inspection trips to several textile mills and to the plants of textile machinery manufacturers, and a careful evaluation of the data relating to technological advances presented by the industry. In addition, a series of meetings has been held between officials of the Treasury and Internal Revenue Service and representatives of the industry, including the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute and the American Textile Machinery Association. Careful consideration was given to the rapid technological advances which have occurred in the industry, particularly during the past 2 or 3 years and the further advances reasonably to be expected in the near future. The industry appears to be in the early stages of a major breakthrough in technological change. New machines are now available and in limited use which are rendering obsolescent many present-day textile machines. The pressure for innovation is accentuated by the keen competition among domestic producers and from foreign mills. It is believed that recent developments and machines now on the drawing boards of domestic and foreign manufacturers will engender further technological advance which will accelerate the rate of obsolescence in the industry.

Suggested average useful life in years

Name of machine	Bull. F, 1942	Revised estimate, 1961
1. Opening, blending, feeding equipment	30	15
2. Cards	40	
3. Combers	25	
4. Drawing frames	25	
5. Roving frames	25	
6. Spinning frames	30	
7. Twisters	15-25	
8. Winders	25	
9. Slashers	25	
10. Looms	25	
11. Finishing equipment:		
Cotton bleaching	Composite 15-20	12
Washing		
Drying		
Dyeing		
Dry finishing		

Office of Tax Analysis, Treasury Department, Oct. 9, 1961.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman for the statement he is making. He well knows that I have supported the position which he takes with respect to these imports, but I still say to the gentleman that the relief which he seeks under this administration is not forthcoming and it will not be forthcoming.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I commend the gentleman for his efforts, and they are magnificent efforts, and nothing I have said was meant to be to the contrary. The gentleman has long been in the forefront of the fight for American industry. I do not agree with the gentleman in his statement about this administration's lack of interest. If I recall correctly, there were campaign promises. Some of them have been implemented. There is soon to be a program and there has been some effort in that direction. This administration has the onus upon itself to assume that burden and I feel we are going to get some relief because we certainly need to get relief.

I am not only talking about the fate of the textile industry in my area but about the situation as it applies to other industries in the general area, as I have done on so many occasions.

In the field of apparel the textile import problem continues to be a source of great concern. I have here correspondence and statistics from the apparel industry committee on imports which I would like to include in the RECORD at this point, and, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include these reports and tables at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

APPAREL INDUSTRY COMMITTEE
ON IMPORTS,
Washington, D.C., October 17, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL,
Member of Congress,
Chester, S.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HEMPHILL: Your deep and continuing interest in the import problem which faces the apparel-textile-fiber industry is greatly appreciated. We are taking the opportunity of the congressional recess to review the course of the problem in recent months. For perspective, look back to a few essential points:

Early in his administration President Kennedy set up a Cabinet-level Textile Advisory Committee to look into the effect of apparel-textile-fiber imports on the domestic industry. This Committee was unanimous that something ought to be done, but divided on exactly how to do it.

On May 2 the President issued his 7-point program. At this time he said, "The problems of the textile industry are serious. * * * I believe it is time for action."

On May 15 an application for an investigation by the Office of Civil Defense and Mobilization was filed by the 11 major apparel-textile-fiber associations under point 7 of the President's program and accepted by OCDM on June 15. This is still pending.

On July 16, 16 nations met in Geneva, Switzerland, to try and implement point 6 of the 7-point program. A short-term arrangement was agreed to which became effective October 1, 1961. It authorizes any participating country to restrain imports by unilateral action at a level not lower than the 12-month period ending June 1961, if imports cause or threaten to cause disruption in domestic markets.

In mid-August negotiations were opened with Japan for a bilateral agreement for 1962. The industry had been advised by Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, George W. Ball, that Japan would be granted an increase in imports of around 5 percent category by category. At various times, Mr. Ball adjusted the figure upward, but with assurances that the increases granted to Japan would be more than offset by a 30 percent rollback in apparel-textile imports from Hong Kong.

Now to the present: The Hong Kong negotiations are still in the preliminary stage. The apparel industry considers it important that the total imports of each category in the future be no greater than they were in the immediate past. This means that in some instances the Hong Kong rollback by category will have to exceed 30 percent to compensate for the difference between Japan's annual shipments and their new quota.

The 1962 Japanese quota on brassieres was increased 33⅓ percent. The quota on men's and women's shorts and trousers will be 66⅔ percent higher than the 1960 quota. The so-called basket provision—other woven apparel—is increased approximately 66 percent. (Attached are tables showing the increases in quotas to Japan since 1957 to date, plus comparisons of Japanese demands and U.S. concessions in the 1962 agreement.)

At the same time that the Hong Kong shipments are being rolled back, it is mandatory that a close check be placed on new emerging areas that are already imposing grave problems on the apparel-textile-fiber industry. Examples of these areas are Jamaica, Taiwan, Spain, and Portugal.

The result of all the many activities to date fails to give the apparel-textile industry any relief. On the contrary, further increases in imports appear inevitable. This situation cannot be harmonized, in our opinion, with the President's intentions as outlined by him to leaders of the apparel-textile industry at the White House Conference on May 2, 1961. Naturally, we hope, as we are sure you do too, that before the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act comes up for renewal next year this course will be reversed and the industry can look forward with some confidence to bona fide relief from the flood of imports.

The Geneva Arrangement and the Japanese Agreement were in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If you want extra copies of these documents we are pleased to supply them or any other material that will be of use to you. During the congressional recess you may find occasion to use some of this material in speeches or press interviews.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE S. PHILLIPS, *Chairman.*

Items	Unit	Original quota	Revised quota, 1957	Revised quota, 1959	Revised quota, 1961	U.S. proposal, Aug. 22	Japanese proposal, Sept. 1	U.S. proposal, Sept. 3	Japanese proposal, Sept. 4	U.S. proposal, Sept. 6
Group I:										
Cotton cloth	1,000 square yards	113,000	102,000	113,000	117,000	123,000	----------	123,000	130,000	125,500
Ginghams	do	35,000	35,000	40,000	44,000	44,000	50,000	44,000	48,000	46,200
Velveteens	do	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,625	3,500	2,625	3,500	2,750
All other fabrics	do	75,500	64,500	70,500	70,500	76,375	----------	76,375	78,500	76,500
(Combed yarn fabrics)[1]	do	[1] (26,000)	[1] (26,000)	[1] (30,000)	[1] (30,000)	[1] (31,500)	[1] (40,000)	[1] (31,500)	[1] (39,000)	[1] (33,000)
Sheeting	do	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	30,000	50,000	30,000	30,000
Shirting, 80 by 80	do	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Other shirting	do	43,000	43,000	43,000	43,000	43,000	32,000	43,000	32,000	32,000
Twill and sateen	do	39,000	39,000	39,000	39,000	39,000	39,000	39,000	39,000	39,000
Poplin	do	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	45,000	25,000	35,000	30,000
Yarn dyed fabrics	do	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	35,000	24,000	34,000	29,000
Typewriter ribbon, cloth	do	----------	----------	----------	----------	100	----------	100	----------	----------
Other fabrics	do	44,000	44,000	44,000	44,000	44,000	----------	44,000	----------	----------
Group II:										
Made up goods	do	30,000	33,000	33,000	33,000	35,000	----------	35,000	35,000	35,000
Pillowcases	1,000 dozen	400	400	400	400	420	450	420	450	450
Dish towels	do	800	800	800	800	945	(3)	840	840	840
Other towels	do	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)		(3)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Handkerchiefs	do	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,260	1,500–2,000	1,260	[1] (1,500)	[1] (1,260)
Table damask	1,000 square yards	10,833	10,833	10,833	10,833	11,375	11,375–14,000	11,375	[1] (11,375)	[1] (11,375)
Sheets	----------	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	110	----------	(2)	(2)	(2)
Other items	1,000 pounds	1,875	2,527	2,527	2,527	1,388	[3] 74,775	2,730	5,573	5,573
Group III:										
Woven apparel	Square yard	71,000	78,100	78,100	81,700	86,000	----------	86,000	106,000	89,500
Blouses	1,000 dozen	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,575	1,800	1,575	1,800	1,575
Sport shirts	do	750	750	750	750	787.5	900	787.5	900	787.5
Dress and work shirts	do	300	217	300	300	315	----------	315	[1] (400)	[1] (315)
Brassieres, etc	do	600	600	600	600	630	[4] 630–1,000	630	[1] (800)	[1] (800)
Men's shorts and trousers	do	600	600	600	800	285	1,800	285	1,300	300
Women's shorts and trousers	do					515		515		700
Raincoats	do	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	45	----------	45	(100)	[1] (45)
Dressing gowns, etc	do	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	62	----------	64	(5)	[1] (64)
Cotton coats	do	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	75	----------	[1] (93)	(5)	[1] (93)
Nightwear and pajamas	do	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	32.5	----------	[1] (123)	(5)	(5)
Dresses	do	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	65	----------	[1] (70)	(5)	(5)
Playsuits	do	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	91	----------	[1] (118)	(5)	(5)
Other woven apparel	1,000 pounds	2,321	4,263	3,864	3,864	223	(3)	3,069	7,542	6,425
"other other"	do	----------	----------	----------	----------	(6)	----------	[1] (950)	----------	----------
(Corduroy apparel)[1]	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Group IV:										
Knit goods	1,000 square yards	12,000	12,000	13,200	13,200	14,000	----------	14,000	18,500	14,000
T-shirts, white, men's and boys'.	1,000 dozen	500	300	500	500	525	----------	525	525	525(?)
Other T-shirts	do	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)	118	----------	[1] (147)	(7)	[1] (147)
Sweaters and cardigans	do	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)	21	----------	[1] (27.2)	(7)	[1] (27.2)
Knit shirts, other	do	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)	705	----------	809	(7)	809
Gloves and mittens (work)	do	450	450	450	450	472.5	550	472.5	550	472.5
Other knit goods	1,000 pounds	1,477	1,792	1,738	1,738	18	4,000	582	2,774	583
"Other other"	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	[1] (294)	----------	[1] (294)
Group V	1,000 square yards	9,000	9,900	9,900	9,900	10,000	----------	10,000	10,000	10,000
Total, all groups	do	235,000	235,000	247,200	254,800	268,000	----------	268,000	299,500	274,000

[1] ( ) "Below the line."

[2] Included in group II, "Other items."

[3] "Other made-up goods" includes apparel.

[4] Included in group II, "Other items" ceiling.

[5] Included in "Other woven apparel."

[6] Included; no figure.

[7] Included in "Other knit goods."

Mr. HEMPHILL. A short while ago in my remarks I was directing attention to what was happening to a part of the narrow fabrics industry which has a plant in my district. I have since received a letter from another plant of that particular industry, which I ask consent, Mr. Speaker, to include at this point in my remarks, a letter from the Caledonian Dye Works of Philadelphia, Pa., in which Mr. Fitch says that in the year 1960 the Japanese had a voluntary quota of 300,000 pounds of zipper tapes that were allowed to be exported to this country. Then for the year 1961 the Japanese unilaterally raised this so-called quota to 900,000 pounds, an increase of 200 percent. It shows exactly what I am pointing out, that when they get ready to zero in on an industry they can do so.

This particular letter goes on to reflect the problem, and it is my considered opinion that unless something is done this particular plant will close and those particular workers who are not in my area, but they are my friends because they are Americans, will be out of jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the letter in full at this point.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

CALEDONIAN DYE WORKS,
Philadelphia, Pa., November 13, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HEMPHILL: I would like to bring to your attention the abundance of Japanese zipper tapes that are coming into this country and solicit your aid and advice as what may be done to eliminate or alleviate this condition.

The year 1960, the Japanese had a voluntary quota of 300,000 pounds of zipper tapes that were allowed to be exported to this country. Then for the year 1961 the Japanese unilaterally raised this so-called quota to 900,000 pounds; 300,000 pounds is quite a lot of zipper tape to send into this country and with the volume going to 900,000 pounds the zipper tape manufacturers, who are located mostly in Pennsylvania, are definitely being hurt. When the zipper tape manufacturers produce less tape for domestic consumption then it means that the dyeing firms also suffer because there is less tape that has to be dyed. I know of two possible solutions to the problem:

1. Raise the duty on zipper tape from 17½ percent to 50 percent as finished zippers are now taxed. This would give the zipper tape the same status as the finished zipper and would tend to solve the problem, as very few finished zippers are imported into this country.

2. Require the Japanese to bring their quota back to 300,000 pounds of zipper tape from 900,000 pounds they have established. I cannot see what good a voluntary quota is, if one party to the agreement can unilaterally raise the quota threefold.

Undoubtedly you will be able to offer other solutions. I earnestly solicit your help on this very grave problem and would greatly appreciate any suggestions that you would care to give.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. FITCH, *President*.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield.

Mr. WHITENER. I again congratulate my neighbor and colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina, for his continuing effort on behalf of the people who earn their livelihood in American industry and particularly in the staggering textile industry, staggered because of the inordinate amount of imports of textiles from foreign countries.

I was interested to read in the Wall Street Journal of today, Wednesday, January 24, an article entitled "Protectionism's Power."

One paragraph in that article which struck me reads as follows:

Whatever the U.S. Chamber—

That is referring to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—

may say nationally, member industries which claim injury from foreign imports—textiles, glass, plywood, minerals, pottery, footwear, and many more—will demand tariff protection from their Congressmen. No matter what the staff economists of the AFL-CIO may argue, the member unions representing these same industries side with employers in opposing tariff cuts.

So, I think it is commendable that both labor and management are together in this fight to preserve American jobs in the textile industry and in other industries.

I likewise think it is a splendid thing that some of the outstanding industrial statesmen are not being carried away by the mutterings of those who seem to control the policies of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. But, I do regret that this article which we read is so typical throughout its content of the type of writing that we see by those who would continue to give away American jobs to foreigners, in that in this article, as in so many others, there is a constant needling of those who oppose attempts to do away with domestic industry. For instance, take the statement which I have just read that these people in these injured industries will "demand tariff protection from their Congressmen." Well, I am sure that the gentleman from South Carolina will agree with me that it requires no demands from anyone upon the gentleman from South Carolina or upon any other Member of Congress, because we, too, are Americans and we, too, are motivated by the same desire which should motivate all good Americans to protect the economic welfare of this country of ours and every single solitary citizen, including those who denominate themselves as freetraders—those people who want to look down their noses and point out some of us and refer to us as protectionists.

I do not mean to take up too much of the gentleman's time. I commend the gentleman, and I would like to say one other thing. It seems unfortunate that in our country there are many who will point to the success of our domestic industry in certain periods as an argument that it should be weakened in favor of foreign competition. This country of ours did not become the leading economic government or country in the world by tearing down every advance that was made. Unless this philosophy that seems to be so paramount—and, as the gentleman has well indicated, so prevalent in our State Department—unless this philosophy is destroyed, then I wonder what will happen to the economic phase of our American life. After all, these things which we do here and these things which so many people in industry and in labor demand require that there be taxpayers to foot the bills.

Mr. Speaker, in order for a corporate interest to be a taxpayer it must make a profit. Therefore I wonder just how this country can continue to grow in service to its own people—this Government of ours—in occupying a position of leadership in the world, unless others who would decry the fact that some of us want to protect America join up with us and help us to protect America.

Mr. Speaker, if I am a protectionist, and if that is something bad because I believe we should preserve every possible American job, then I will gladly carry the banner and the opprobium which they seem to feel that they are casting upon me by referring to me as a protectionist.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that I agree thoroughly with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER]. As the gentleman well knows, nobody has to demand anything from us because we live in the textile area. Our friends are in the textile business, and are working there, and it is to them that we owe the highest obligation—to men from those areas.

Mr. Speaker, insofar as name calling is concerned, every week, if you are a real American today, you will be called a lot of names. I have been called a lot of names—an isolationist and a protectionist and different other things. It is a common thing to call names. Of course, most of the name callers do not say it to our face.

Mr. Speaker, down in our part of the country we do not accept certain things, but I will stand all of the name calling and everything else, because a thought occurs to me, when I look up at the flagpole, "there is an American flag flying over the textile mills." When the Japanese looks up on the flagpole he sees the Japanese flag, and he owes no allegiance to the American flag and he owes no allegiance to the American people. You and I do.

Mr. Speaker, those people down in the State Department owe this same allegiance, and if they think they can get far enough from reality to betray this Nation on down the road and not be called to the "quilt," they have got another think coming. Some of us are going to keep talking here, and keep advising the American public as to what is taking place until we are either beaten or carried out of here dead, because it is that serious to us

Mr. Speaker, it is a heartbreaking thing to see people out of work and see the loss of dignity and see people suffering and see people hungry. I remember the depression, and I do not want to see another one. While the miseries of those hardships may have been good for some of us, when I think back on them it is heartrending to think of people who were unemployed in the winter and who were hungry in the summer and had nothing to look forward to. It can happen again.

Perhaps they think they can write the textile industry off, but I am telling them today they cannot do it. Someday there is going to be a reckoning, and I hope God in heaven will permit me to be present. Certainly, so far the policies have been detrimental to the best interest of those Americans engaged in the textile industry as workers, investors, or people dependent upon that industry for their economic well-being they are concerned.

Last year when this program was implemented to the extent that relief was promised in the way of depreciation, the textile industry and its leaders did want to hold that ray of hope.

Mr. Speaker, I have here some articles about that which I would like to insert, because I am making a record here in addition to making a speech. I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks two articles at this point, one from the Evening Herald of November 25, 1961, and another one from the Gaffney Ledger of November 9, 1961.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The articles referred to follow:

[From the Evening Herald, Nov. 22, 1961]

ORDER TO STUDY COTTON IMPORT DUTIES GIVES TEXTILISTS HOPE

American textile industries yesterday gained hope of relief from flooding of American markets with imported cotton goods with an order from President Kennedy to the U.S. Tariff Commission to study the application of duties on imports of such goods.

Kennedy's study proposal is aimed at determining whether the cotton content of foreign made cotton goods should be taxed at the same rate—8½ cents per pound—as the Government subsidy on exported cotton.

R. Dave Hall of Belmont, N.C., president of American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, said the proposed tariff would be "a logical procedure for dealing with the problem created by legal requirements that U.S. mills must pay substantially more for cotton * * * than our foreign competitors."

The Government now pays American cotton growers an 8½-cent subsidy on each pound of cotton sold to foreign countries, thus allowing them to compete in the world market.

South Carolina's U.S. Senator Olin D. Johnston, commenting on the President's proposal, said, "I have been in touch with various members of the President's Cabinet-level Textile Advisory Committee, as well as the White House, on the need for relief to the American textile industry, and I am convinced the President's request is another move in the right direction."

South Carolina Gov. Ernest Hollings, who with Johnston conferred Tuesday with White House aides, also said he felt the President's action was a step in the right direction.

Domestic textile manufacturers have complained that they face strong competition from textiles manufactured overseas from U.S. cotton sold there at prices lower than the domestic companies pay in this country.

Hall, from his ACMI headquarters in Charlotte, N.C., said yesterday that "the industry will watch developments in the case with great interest and, of course, will lend its full support in the interest of an early and successful action.

"Such action would not affect the price our farmers get for their cotton," Hall said. "It would not increase the taxpayer's burden. In fact, it would yield to our Government income that could be used to help pay for the export program."

Hall said the adoption of such a fee would serve as a restraining influence on imports of those cotton products in which cotton costs are the major part of total manufacturing costs, such as yarn and unfinished coarse fabrics, which made up about one third of the cotton product imports in 1960.

"Inasmuch as the disparity in cotton costs between American and foreign mills was increased by our Government's action from 6 to 8½ cents a pound on August 1," Hall said, "the need for offsetting the additional disadvantage to U.S. mills has intensified and merits expeditious correction."

A report on the Commission's findings was asked as soon as practicable by Kennedy. Myer Feldman, a Presidential assistant, said imports of cotton products have tripled in the past 5 years. A continuation of this trend "could lead to serious problems," the Agriculture Department has told the President.

"Cotton goods are coming into this country," said Feldman, "to such an extent at the present as to reduce the amount of products processed from cotton domestically. When less domestic cotton is used," he explained, "more cotton must go under price supports."

Hollings, who conferred Tuesday with Feldman at the White House, said "We've been working several weeks to get this letter (request for the study) from the White House to the Tariff Commission."

[From the Gaffney Ledger, Nov. 9, 1961]

Textile Industry Pleased But Demands More Action

New York.—President John Kennedy's action to cut the depreciation schedule of textile machinery from 25 to 15 and 12 years was received with enthusiasm and a demand for more action in behalf of the industry, according to a survey by Textile World, McGraw-Hill publication.

Some respondents saw the new rules as only a first step in the fulfillment of President Kennedy's seven-point program announced last May and a sure sign that his other promises would soon be fulfilled.

Others felt the new write-off schedule did not go far enough—the write-off time should be shorter. A small majority felt it would do no good at all until and unless the Government acts promptly in other directions as well—a curb on textile imports and an adjustment in the cotton-export subsidy.

Mostly, though, reaction was favorable—even enthusiastic in some quarters, says the publication.

The vast majority of respondents saw a bright, solid future ahead—a stronger and more stable textile industry, more and faster technological breakthroughs and a better break for the textile industry's customers.

"The more realistic depreciation schedules are a move in the right direction. They narrow the advantage of foreign competitors, who have enjoyed substantially more generous depreciation allowances. Progressive textile manufacturers will be encouraged to increase their equipment purchases and thereby increase their efficiency," W. J. Erwin, president of Dan River Mills, told the magazine.

R. D. Sanders, executive vice president and treasurer, Morgan Mills, Inc., said: "Until the textile industry receives concrete action on the other points in the seven-point program, many companies will have serious problems to make enough profit to cover the accelerated depreciation to make a better cash flow."

J. Burton Frierson, president, Dixie Merchandizing, declared: "Recognition by the Treasury Department that the schedule for useful life of textile machinery is antiquated is most heartening and long overdue. This action will encourage and strengthen our whole economy of the size of textile employment and the broad effect of textile expenditures."

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, these articles go on to say that they were happy with the depreciation, they were happy to see themselves being considered, but they said that is not enough. Mr. Speaker, that is not enough. That is not enough when they can come in, as we pointed out a while ago, and zero in on a part of the industry and while these various studies are being made—the textile industry—and I commend them for it in making every effort to get the information out.

Mr. Speaker, I have here an article, under date of November 27, 1961, which sets forth the problems, the difficulties, insofar as the woolen and worsted industries are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include that article in my remarks at this point.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

Views of the Woolen and Worsted Industry on a Program for Import Limitations

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of the program for import limitations is to provide a comprehensive system of limitations on imports of wool textile manufactures into the United States from all sources. Tariff rates would be maintained at not less than current levels. Such a quota system should cover all wool textiles and the products thereof and be divided by categories and countries. The total amount and the amounts for each country should be such that confidence in the industry can be restored, employment maintained, and investment increased. Such a system should be reasonably permanent to provide stability and if not established unilaterally by the United States should be so arranged that the United States can and will administer and enforce any international program.

The wool textile branch of the textile industry believes that the problem of imports of textile manufactures and apparel can be handled most effectively on an industrywide basis and urges the method of handling the problem be on a long-term basis.

Because a short-term arrangement has already been made for cotton textiles, the wool textile manufacturers urge our Government to address itself expeditiously to the import problems of the wool, manmade fiber, and silk branches of the industry. Experience has shown that limitations imposed in a piecemeal manner such as on a single country or a single fiber product tend to accelerate exports from other countries or exports of textiles made from other fibers.

2. COVERAGE

A program should cover all wool textiles from top and other further advanced manufactures including yarn, fabrics, woven and pressed felt, made-up goods, apparel, and all other wool products containing 17 percent or more of wool fibers by weight. Wool fibers include wool and similar hair whether or not reprocessed or reused.

3. CATEGORIES

Categories in each type of wool textile manufactures are essential to any system of quotas. Without an adequate number and description of categories, imports will concentrate in particular types of goods and force domestic mills and plants making such items out of business, or force them into other lines creating domestic overproduction, losses, and eventual unemployment.

A list of categories covering top, yarn, cloth, and certain products will be prepared. It is suggested that representatives of the apparel and knit branches of the industry prepare lists of categories.

4. COUNTRIES

Quotas should be established on total imports into the United States. Italy, Japan, and England are the principal exporters of wool fabrics and apparel, but in 1960 other countries accounted for 25 percent of imports of such goods, an increase of 164 percent since 1958. Among these other sources, Hong Kong, as well as West Germany are substantial exporters of apparel and West Germany and Czechoslovakia are the principal exporters of felt. Belgium and other countries export substantial amounts of yarn. Top comes principally from Uruguay and the United Kingdom.

It is, therefore, essential that any system of import or export limitations cover all these sources and potential sources of supply.

5. TOTAL AMOUNT

The total of imports of wool textile manufactures from all sources should be viewed in the light of the serious conditions which have existed and continue to exist in this branch of the industry. The woolen and worsted industry has been going through a period of serious readjustment since 1947 which has involved the liquidation of 314 mills and a loss of employment of over 100,000 workers. Over 50 percent of the productive capacity and jobs in the United States have been lost during a period when the woolen and worsted industries of all other countries have increased consumption of wool by 50 percent.

During this period imports have been rising rapidly, having increased by 327 percent since 1948. In 1960, imports amounted to over 15 percent of domestic production of woolen and worsted broadwoven fabrics. This is a much higher proportion of domestic production than is the case in cotton and manmade fiber textiles.

It is clear that a substantial rollback in total imports of wool textile manufactures is justified. The Geneva reservation of 1948 contemplated a level of imports of cloth of 5 percent of domestic production. Five percent of current domestic production of woven fabric and knitting yarns would amount to the equivalent of approximately 33 million square yards.[1] When the United States moved to restrict imports in 1956 by using the Geneva reservation, imports, not including rugs and carpets, amounted to 60 million square yards. Imports of 111 million square yards [1] in 1960 constituted an all-time high. Imports in fiscal 1961 are estimated at 89 million square yards,[1] and imports averaged 68 million square yards for 1955–60. Broadwoven fabric has constituted from 52 to 73 percent of total imports during these periods.

From the point of view of employment and investment in the industry, therefore, the amount of imports should be limited to a total not in excess of the amount imported during the year that the United States activated the Geneva reservation, or the equivalent of 56 million square yards.

6. DURATION OF PROGRAM

The program should be long range and of at least 5 years' duration. The total amount and the category ceilings should not be changed unless domestic production increases or decreases by a minimum amount, such as 5 percent, in which case quotas may be automatically adjusted, upward or downward, by the same percentage.

7. TRANSSHIPMENT, SUBSTITUTION, AND EVASION

Transshipment, substitution, and evasion create serious problems and must be met.

There should be firm provisions against transshipment and evasion applicable to exported goods not only in the original state but in subsequently processed or manufactured form. It should also be provided that the United States can and will act unilaterally to prevent transshipment and evasion by holding goods at the port of entry when necessary.

Specific provisions should also be made to prevent the substitution of textile manufactures made from other fibers.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I also have here the status report issued by the American Cotton Manufacturers' Institute of last year. It treats with special things which I shall not dwell upon, but I think the public should have it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as it affects textiles and the national security.

Mr. Speaker, we do not think of textiles as being very important in the national defense. However, if we think back in history we find that when Napoleon went to Moscow his troops were so cold they could not fight. He did not have the textiles to clothe his troops. That was one of the causes for his defeat by the Russians. You know something? History can repeat itself. I suppose, aside from those people who are making profits overseas at the expense of American textile workers and those misguided people uptown in the State Department, that the Communists are most happy about our textile difficulties, because they know the picture, and they are not suffering.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks at this point in the RECORD this article entitled "Textiles and the National Security."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

TEXTILES AND THE NATIONAL SECURITY

On October 16, 1961, the American textile-fiber-apparel industry completed the presentation of its case before the Office of Emergency Planning (formerly OCDM). The industry asked the executive agency to make a formal finding that textile imports threaten to impair the Nation's security.

The case was initiated on May 15, less than 2 weeks after President Kennedy announced a seven-point program of assistance to the industry in which he said:

"An application * * * for action under existing statutes, such as the escape clause or the national security provision of the Trade Agreements Extension Act, will be carefully considered on its merits."

Subsequently, the agency, then known as the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, undertook an investigation of the effect of imports on the national security as requested by the industry.

On July 31, in compliance with a timetable prescribed by law, the industry presented extensive documentation of the impairment of the national security by textile imports.

The industry offered proof:

"That imports of textiles are entering the United States in such quantities as (1) to impair the ability of the domestic industry to meet military and essential civilian needs in an emergency, and (2) to weaken the textile industry to an extent inconsistent with the national security interest in a strong internal economy."

It now remains for the Director of the OEP to examine all of the evidence adduced by the industry and his staff and report to the President his conclusion.

It is generally recognized that the Congress, from the inception of legislation empowering the President to enter into agreements for the promotion of world trade, intended to provide safeguards for American industries against injurious imports.

This was the purpose of the "escape clause," the language providing the legal procedures by which a domestic industry could "escape" from the impact of certain trade arrangements under certain conditions.

The textile industry, with its multiple fibers and hundred of fabric constructions along with thousands of end products, learned from experience that the escape clause is an inadequate device for achieving the relief from import harm intended by Congress.

The purpose of the national security clause was to provide the machinery by which the President can prevent imports, notwithstanding agreements entered into previously, from threatening to impair the Nation's military and economic strength.

And the Congress, in extending the Trade Agreements Act for 4 years in 1958, underscored this purpose by adopting an amendment intended to strengthen the national security provision.

The amendment, the Senate Finance Committee reported, would make action possible "whenever danger to our national security results from a weakening of segments of the economy through injury to any industry, whether vital to the direct defense or a part of the economy providing employment and sustenance to individuals or localities."

Invoking this public policy the textile industry provided the Office of Emergency Planning with proof that textile imports have reached such a level as to threaten the American textile-fiber-apparel industry's ability to meet military requirements in an emergency and, at the same time, have caused economic losses which are translated in an impairment of the Nation's internal economy.

Now, the Director of OEP is faced with a decision on the textile-fiber-apparel industry case. Under the intent of Congress he may not weigh foreign policy alternatives; he may not speculate about theoretical escape clause actions; he may not concern himself with the problems of foreign textile manufacturers or the development of the economies of other nations.

The law is clear: he is empowered only to determine whether textile imports constitute a threat to this Nation's security because of impairment of the American textile industry's ability to meet defense needs in time of emergency and to contribute to this Nation's economic vigor.

Neither does the law give the Director of OEP the responsibility to recommend remedial action; this responsibility rests only with the President.

A finding by the OEP as requested by the industry will bestow on the Chief Executive the power to determine what action must be taken to remove the threat to the Nation's security.

There is no time limit prescribed by Congress for the Director of OEP to make his finding. However, the President indicated at the outset of his administration that he shared the industry's view that the problem merited an urgent solution. A sense of urgency still prevails.

NEGOTIATIONS ON INTERNATIONAL TEXTILE TRADE

On October 1, 1961, an agreement regulating trade in cotton textiles among 16 nations in the free world became operative on a 1-year basis. On October 23 representatives of these same countries reassembled at Geneva, Switzerland, to organize a long-term arrangement.

Besides the United States, which called the original conference to implement point 6 of President Kennedy's program for the American textile industry, participants in the agreement include:

Australia, Austria, Canada, India, Japan, Pakistan, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom (also representing Hong Kong), and five members of the European Economic Community—Belgium, France, West Germany, Italy, and the Netherlands.

U.S. interests are represented at the International Conference by the Provisional Cotton Textile Committee of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). While the chairmanship rests in the hands of a designee of the Department of State, its membership includes representatives of the Departments of Commerce and Labor.

The U.S. negotiators have access to on-the-spot advice from a panel of representatives of the U.S. textile-apparel industry and labor organizations. These individuals were drawn from a Management-Labor Textile Advisory Committee established by the Secretary of Commerce at the direction of the President.

As a result of the original conference in July 1961, the participating nations reached an agreement containing these features:

1. Countries, primarily European, which have been restricting imports from such low-wage nations as Japan, Hong Kong, India, and Pakistan will increase their imports from these sources by an agreed-upon percentage of domestic production;

---

[1] Equivalent: All items converted to a square yard basis for purposes of comparison.

2. The low-wage countries, upon request, will limit their exports to the nonrestrictive nations, such as the United States and Canada.

3. Importing nations, such as the United States, will not request limitations below the import level which existed during the 12-month period which ended June 30, 1961;

4. If, during the life of the short-term agreement, shipments of cotton textiles cause or threaten disruption of an importing country's markets, the importing country may request the exporting nation to limit its shipments for any or all of the 64 categories on cotton products specified in the agreement;

5. And, if the exporting country fails to comply with the importing country's request for such export limitations within 30 days, the requesting country is authorized to take unilateral action to limit such imports.

The agreement has been pointed to by knowledgeable observers as significant in that it includes the market disruption principle as a form of trade restriction and represents a new departure in trade agreements. The principle reportedly was added to GATT's operating principles last year and, in effect, makes GATT the instrument for establishing quota arrangements.

To carry the rights and obligations of the United States under the agreement, the President directed the President's Cabinet Textile Advisory Committee to establish the Interagency Textile Administrative Committee (ITAC).

Chairmanship of ITAC will rest in the hands of an appointee of the Secretary of Commerce with other members to be designated by the Departments of State, Treasury, Agriculture, and Labor.

Any question of policy relating to the administration of the agreement can be considered by the Cabinet-level group at the request of any member of ITAC.

On the eve of resumption of the international parley the directors of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute adopted a resolution spelling out six principles which they commended as necessary to the success of any multination agreement.

The principles:

1. All textile products, regardless of fiber content, should be covered;

2. A definite ceiling on textile imports into the United States should be set at a level substantially below that attained in the year ending June 30, 1961;

3. Recognition that growth of the American textile market is not created by oversea manufacturers and that they have no vested right to any part of it;

4. The United States should not enter into any separate bilateral arrangements which would increase the aggregate import ceiling;

5. Legal authority should be clearly established for the United States to act directly against nonparticipating as well as participating nations; and

6. A long-range agreement to be meaningful should cover a period of at least 10 years.

THE JAPANESE TEXTILE AGREEMENT

As a result of 3 weeks of negotiations in September in Tokyo, the Governments of the United States and Japan entered into an agreement for control of Japanese cotton textile exports to the United States in 1962.

The pact becomes effective on January 1, 1962, upon expiration of a 5-year arrangement launched in 1957.

Under its terms Japan will be required to hold its total shipment to cotton products—including apparel—to the United States under a ceiling of 275 million square yards. At the outset of the arrangement 5 years ago, the ceiling figure was 235 million square yards. And a 1959 revision called for a ceiling of 247.2 million square yards, which was upped again in 1961.

In essence, the new quota permits Japan to have a greater share of the U.S. market.

The new terms also provided for increases in Japanese shipments of velveteens and ginghams—two fabric constructions in which serious concentrations and market disruptions already exist.

Additionally, the quotas on made-up goods—such as pillow cases, dish towels, etc.—knit goods, and apparel were boosted also.

The industry noted with regret that the U.S. negotiators conceded the overall increase to Japan in the light of these factors:

The U.S. market had shrunk to a lower level than that which prevailed at the time of the first control of Japanese shipments; and

Imports from other countries—notably Hong Kong—have skyrocketed in recent years.

Japan also insisted on breaking down its exports to the United States under only about half the number of categories which were established at Geneva for the short-term multination agreement in July 1961, thereby encouraging further excessive concentrations in the future.

It is the view of the leaders of the American industry that Japan no longer can be considered as a developing nation, but instead is the world's leading exporter of cotton goods and silk and silk products, and a foremost exporter of manmade fiber and manmade fiber textile products. Also she is rapidly expanding her wool textile product exports at the expense of the United States and other nations.

A reappraisal by our Government of Japan as a trading partner appears to be in order. Such is the industry recommendation to U.S. Government trade policymakers.

THE TWO-PRICE COTTON PROBLEM

Government policies and programs regarding cotton—production, marketing, pricing—have a great impact on the economic vigor of the American textile industry. This is because cotton is the chief fiber used by the American textile manufacturers.

Of prime importance are these factors:

1. U.S. spinners must rely on American-grown cotton for their operations; only a negligible amount of raw cotton is permitted to be imported;

2. National agricultural policy requires that the United States supply its historical share of the world market and, to meet world prices, an export subsidy must be paid;

3. Since August 1, 1961, the export subsidy has amounted to about $42.50 a bale; this means that foreign mills acquire cotton at $42.50 a bale less than that which must be paid by domestic mills.

4. The raw cotton cost differential in favor of overseas manufacturers is an additional advantage which stimulates their exports of cotton textile products to the United States.

U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

On November 21 President Kennedy directed the Tariff Commission to undertake an investigation of cotton textile imports under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. His action was based on a report by the Secretary of Agriculture to the effect that there is reason to believe that such imports are making ineffective or interfering materially with the Government's cotton programs and operations.

Hence, in keeping with provisions of the farm law, the President directed the Tariff Commission to make its investigation and finding in the light of two criteria:

1. The adverse impact caused by cotton textile imports on all Government programs affecting cotton or cotton products, including acreage allotments, price supports, and the cotton export program.

2. The extent to which such imports reduce the amount of cotton or cotton products which are processed in the United States.

In other words, the Commission is directed to take into consideration virtually every aspect of the American cotton textile apparel industry operations. For example, the 1960 volume of imports of yarn, fabric, and apparel is calculated to have been equivalent to more than 1 billion yards.

Of this total, it is generally estimated that about one-third was in the form of yarn and coarse cloth constructions where cotton cost is a substantial portion of the total manufacturing cost. The remaining two-thirds, however, was in the form of apparel, other manufactured products, and finer cloth constructions where the wage cost factor is much more significant than the cotton cost factor.

Additionally, the Tariff Commission will be limited as to the remedy it can recommend to the President. The directive said the Commission should determine only whether the setting of an import fee on the cotton content of textile imports would prevent such imports from interfering with Government cotton programs or affecting adversely the processing of cotton and cotton products in the United States.

The amount of the fee (8½ cents per pound) under consideration is that equivalent to the rate of the subsidy on cotton exports by which U.S. cotton can be sold abroad at world prices.

Although the Department of Agriculture will bear the burden of pressing the case before the Tariff Commission, all segments of the raw cotton industry are expected to join the textile industry in offering evidence and proof on the issue.

THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Inasmuch as the industry has been directly concerned with negotiations of trade agreements with other nations, it is vitally interested in the laws under which such agreements are made.

R. Dave Hall, president of ACMI, said recently:

"We feel keenly our responsibility toward our workers, our communities, and our Nation's military and economic security.

"To discharge this responsibility fully, we feel the need to examine closely all proposals regarding trade legislation, particularly in the light of other Government activity, before expressing our views."

Present indications are that the President and his advisers are now formulating the administration's position with reference to the Trade Agreements Act which is scheduled to expire on June 30, 1962.

It appears that the administration is weighing several alternatives, including the following:

1. To seek an extension of the act with or without authority for the President to make additional tariff reductions;

2. To recommend that the law be allowed to expire; and

3. To offer a complete new program for dealing with trade restrictions or safeguards here and abroad.

In any event, the subject is likely to be considered by the House Ways and Means Committee to which a number of trade bills already have been referred.

Traditionally, a trade bill requested by the administration wins approval by this key committee. Generally, those Members of the House who seek changes in the administration's bill are required to make their effort during consideration of the bill by the entire House membership.

Such efforts must necessarily be made within the bounds prescribed by the rule adopted for consideration of the bill. The rule written by the House Rules Committee covers not only the time permitted for debate of a bill but also whether Members may offer amendments to it freely or under certain limitations.

House adoption of a trade bill opens the way for the Senate to take action in the field. The Senate Finance Committee has responsibility for preparing a bill for consideration on the Senate floor. It can make any revisions of the House version it chooses, for consideration by the Senate. And Senators, once the bill is called up for debate, are free to offer any amendments they wish.

In the event the Senate version of the bill is at variance with the House version, the House usually has an opportunity to accept the Senate version or refer the legislation to a Senate-House conference committee for a reconciliation of the differences. The conference report then is submitted to each arm of the Congress for a decision.

Under the circumstances it appears probable that any or all proposals regarding trade legislation will revolve about whatever program is sponsored by the administration.

However, even if the administration elects not to move in this area, critics of the Government's present foreign trade policies and practices would still be free to propose legislation which would then become the focal point for consideration of the subject by the Congress.

TEXTILE EXPORTS

For the last decade exporters of American cotton and synthetic textiles have been engaged in a grim struggle to preserve the industry's traditional position in international trade.

Shipments of cotton goods now are about one-third of what they were in 1947 when the industry exported a billion and a half square yards. The reasons for this sharp drop are many but the chief one stems from discriminatory restrictions first imposed in the far-off years of the so-called "dollar shortage" and still retained by 52 countries which literally prohibit the importation of cotton textiles from the United States.

In 22 other countries it is almost impossible to sell American textiles because of exorbitant tariffs and hidden taxes.

The industry has petitioned the Department of Commerce and other agencies to campaign for the removal of these artificial trade barriers which, strangely enough, are jealously guarded in countries which claim a vested interest in the American market.

At a recent meeting of the ACMI Board, it was unanimously voted that the industry urge Government agencies concerned to eliminate discriminatory restrictions responsible for the worldwide maldistribution of textiles, refuse to allot American foreign aid funds for the establishment of textile manufacturing facilities or procurement of textiles from foreign suppliers.

PUBLIC STAKE IN THE IMPORTS ISSUE

Organizations representing the Nation's textile-fiber-apparel industry have made and will continue to make a determined effort to inform the public of the seriousness of the foreign trade problem, both to the industry and to the U.S. economy.

The major news media have reported extensively on the development of the problem and the steps being taken toward a solution. Numerous speeches and reports have described the impact of textile imports on the industry and how this impact is felt by workers, suppliers, investors, and the general economy.

A color motion picture on the foreign trade issue has been produced for nationwide distribution to a wide variety of public audiences.

The industry earnestly believes that the interests of the Nation's security can best be served by policies and programs intent on keeping our basic and vital industries strong.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I would be happy to yield again to my distinguished friend from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I am wondering if in his research he happened to read an address made by the Under Secretary of State George Ball to the Foreign Policy Association in late November of last year in New York in which he referred—without pointing out the textile industry, but we know that that is the industry to which he referred—that some of these, as he calls them, inefficient industries, will just have to fall by the wayside. That is my interpretation of what he said. I am wondering if the gentleman read that speech?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I read that, and I read it with great distress.

Mr. WHITENER. I might say to the gentleman that in connection with a tour of active duty that I had shortly thereafter as a military reserve officer I had occasion to be in a conference with a representative of the State Department now stationed with our NATO organization in Paris.

During that conference this representative of the State Department made almost identical statements to those made by Mr. Ball, at which time I corrected his statement and pointed out that I felt he was doing a great disservice to the textile industry when he referred to the industry in those terms.

That gentleman was not aware of the fact, as many people are not aware of the fact, that today in the textile industry of the United States 60 percent more production per man-hour is had than was had 10 years ago. That gentleman—and I am sure the same is true of Mr. Ball—would not know a comber from a lap machine or a picker from a twister. He would not know that throughout our section when you go into a textile plant today, the present technological advance is in the form of double-headed cards; we see high-speed drawing; we see spinning frames with a pound package as compared with a small bobbin in the days when I worked in the textile plants. We see automatic spooling and automatic cleaning. And just last week I read a story in the newspaper that some young engineer down at Albemarle, N.C., had actually developed an automatic sweeper.

I do not know where many of us who were raised in the textile industry sections would have gotten our start if it had not been for the opportunity to get jobs sweeping, when we were schoolboys. I feel that is an indication of the technical advance being made.

I think that we should point out here something which the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] and I have discussed on many occasions; and that is that the people who work in those textile plants, who are now producing 60 percent more per man-hour, have been burdened with the increased job loads that they have, and there is a limit to which a human being can go notwithstanding these technological advances. These folks here who would destroy this industry have no idea what they have already done to working conditions in many of these plants. And I think it is to the everlasting credit of the people who work in the plants that they, too, are aware of the competition that is so unfairly given to them for their jobs and their work. One of these days, instead of sitting in an ivory tower and making pontifical pronouncements, it is my hope that someone in our policymaking area in our Government will learn something about the practical, everyday problems confronting the people in those textile plants.

I am not talking about somebody who just lives in my district. I am talking about my own relatives and my own daily associates. I know that they are loyal Americans who are entitled to some consideration at the bargaining tables in Geneva but more particularly at the policy decision table here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I want to say that anybody who says that the textile industry is inefficient is either stupid, misinformed, or deliberately lying. That industry is not inefficient. If it were not for the efficiency of the American industry we could not compete at all. We want a good standard of living. We want high wages for our people. They say that is good in America. On the other hand, they say that in one breath and in the other they say, "We are going to cater to those people who pay low wages."

The gentleman from North Carolina and I have talked about this matter. We have been to Hong Kong and seen some of these textile problems. We have seen this and discussed it in the Far East. We have seen in Hong Kong young ladies working for $7 a week—things like that. They talk about inefficiency; the machinery that I saw overseas was American machinery.

You hear people talk about the inefficient machinery in these countries. I saw American machinery there. The best machinery was American machinery. And do you know who put that American machinery over there? It was the policymakers of the State Department who put that American machinery over there. They sold out our American workers. There is no other way to characterize it except to say that they just sold out the people who are in the textile industry in our country.

When we speak about protection—who is it that deserves protection? Is it the American who deserves protection or is it the foreigner who deserves protection? I do not like to speak of people as "foreigners" because it sounds as if one is saying something bad against them, and, of course, I do not mean it that way. But, the allegiance of Mr. Ball and those who are getting their salary from the American people—at least I reckon that is where they are getting their pay from, and I hope that is where they are getting all of it—their allegiance is supposed to be to the American people from whom they are getting their salaries. Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious thing because I remember some of these mills—I remember one of them that closed and had received an E certificate during the war. I remember the E certificates that the textile people got and how the Defense Department was so quick in giving them that efficiency award saying how much they were doing for our economy.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman has just touched upon another very vital point in this discussion. They talk about protectionism. Actually, those of us who are fighting to preserve the textile industry and the jobs of our people in the textile industry, it seems to me, can well feel that we are making a contribution to our national security. I am sure the gentleman realizes, if he had an opportunity during World War II to make visits back home, as I did while I was in the military service, that it was amazing to see in every vacant warehouse and in every vacant building or store building where anyone who could get hold of some twisting frames or any other type of textile machinery they would have it set up and running, producing yarn and cloth because of the great need in time of military conflict for accelerated production of textiles. Since World War II we are reliably informed that over 800 textile plants have closed in this country primarily because of this unfair foreign competition. I am wondering what would happen if unfortunately this country became involved in a military conflict again? Where would we go for our textiles? Where would we get the clothing for our people and for our military personnel? The gentleman knows, as does every American, that during World War II any person who was manufacturing nylon hosiery for ladies, for instance, had a terrible problem because all of his friends got mad at him because he would not parcel out a little bit of hosiery for their families. Today, we know that throughout our country the hosiery mills—that is, the full-fashioned hosiery mills—have fallen by the wayside, and you can buy such a mill now for the value of the machinery. This is the sort of thing we should think about, particularly in view of the apparent failures that we have had in recent years and with this business of giving away our country to win the friendship of people in other countries of the world.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank my colleague. The difficulty, as I see it, goes a little bit further than that. We have not bought any friends. You do not buy a friend. You just do not buy them—you can try, but you cannot do it. I do not want any friend that I had to buy and I do not want anybody to think that they can buy me. Why our Government would think like that, I cannot understand. You know the textile people are not the only people who are suffering here. Go and ask the American watchmaking people. I do not know how many companies are left now, but I do know there are mighty few of the watchmaking companies left. Go and ask what happened to their industry. When you think about this in terms of our national security, you realize that at one time we could call on our watchmakers of a half-generation ago to use their skills and techniques for the purpose of our national defense. But now we have decimated that particular segment of our population so far as those skills are concerned. This is not only true of the watch industry, it is also true of the bicycle industry. If industry after industry goes by the boards, is it any wonder that we have such great unemployment? What has happened to all those people who are in the steel mills in certain areas of our country? I wish my friends were here from the coal producing areas of the country. You know we import all this oil into our country and, of course, that puts our coal miners out of work and they have to go on the relief rolls and, thus, they lose their security.

There is nothing worse than being out of a job, especially if you have a family. If you have never been sick and in the hospital, a low wage earner, keeping your family, and you did not have any income for that particular time, you know how happy you are when the doctor said to you: "I think we are going to get you out of here next week." It is the same way when you lose your job and cannot get another one, when the man in the plant says: "I think we are going to put you back on again in a couple of days."

But by the same token you know how you feel when the man says: "The plant is shut down," or when the doctor says: "I do not know just what the outcome is going to be." The family thinks it might be cancer. It is a horrible situation to be in.

We have heard something about the expendability of the textile industry. I have here a statement from a man by the name of Floyd W. Jefferson who is chairman of the board of the Iselin-Jefferson Co., Inc., and also chairman of the executive committee of the Dan River Mills, Inc. I do not know who he is. I would just commend him for sending me this little article. I think it is directly in point with what we are thinking today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this statement at this point in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

IS THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY EXPENDABLE?

Our Government is apparently giving favorable consideration to financing additional textile installations in low labor cost countries thereby increasing textile imports into the United States.

President Kennedy advocates lowering of tariffs across the board.

The textile industry has been told that it must do everything possible to make itself competitive and increase its exports.

To make itself more competitive it would have to—

(a) Run three shifts.

(b) Spend money on rehabilitation and new equipment.

(c) Take full advantage of automation.

(d) Cut wages.

Here are the reasons it cannot be done—

(a) Textiles suffer from overproduction, and the flood of cheap imports accentuates this problem.

(b) Textile profits have dwindled, so that funds are not available for rehabilitation and expansion and there is no incentive to capital to take the risk.

(c) Labor reacts unfavorably to automation.

(d) To cut wages would bring on a general strike. Labor demands higher wages, shorter hours and more fringe benefits.

To make matters infinitely worse our Government sells cotton to foreign manufacturers at 8½ cents a pound lower than they will sell the same cotton to our mills. This cheap cotton is processed in countries where the labor costs are one-tenth to one-fourth of our standards and the product from 20 low labor cost countries has swept the markets of the world and is pouring into our own country in an inundating flood. And yet, Secretary Ball advocates increased imports and President Kennedy insists on lower tariffs.

It must be abundantly evident that the textile industry cannot endure unless it receives relief.

Under present conditions it cannot be competitive.

Under Secretary of State George W. Ball says:

"The problem is to find a way to shift American manpower as swiftly and painlessly as possible, out of the industries which cannot stand up to foreign competition into those which have stood the test."

Ponder these words.

When did it become the function of our Government to destroy a segment of American industry to please and appease foreign nations?

When did it become the function of our Government to shift manpower from one great industry to another; uproot families from their ancestral homes and move them to labor far from their communities in which they have become a part?

To apply Secretary Ball's formula to the American cotton textile industry, second only to steel in essentiality for defense, is preposterous, outrageous, and destructive. The Secretary would make the industry expendable.

The suggested switch of cotton mill labor to another industry is totally unnecessary because the U.S. Government can go far to make our cotton textile industry competitive by destroying the Frankenstein which the Government created when it adopted the inequitable and impractical two-price cotton system from which stems a great part of the trouble.

This ill-conceived legislation can be eliminated, and the President's proposed import fee is the logical solution. Foreign mills would still have the advantage of cheap labor.

The Government could take another step which would be of immense help to all American industry.

They could cut the redtape of the escape clause, and make it possible for manufacturers to get an early and just decision.

The procedure is now interminable. Out of many cases an inconsequential number have been decided in favor of the claimants.

> If our Government would adopt measures to make the cotton textile industry competitive we would greatly expand our exports, save American labor, and put into the U.S. Treasury millions of dollars through collection of income taxes.
>
> To make our country strong we must make our economy strong.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I want you to listen to this:

> Our Government is apparently giving favorable consideration to financing additional textile installations in low labor cost countries thereby increasing textile imports into the United States.

Further down he makes a statement about Secretary Ball:

> To apply Secretary Ball's formula to the American cotton textile industry, second only to steel in essentiality for defense, is preposterous, outrageous, and destructive. The Secretary would make the industry expendable.

When a person gets a big job in the Department downtown he sometimes loses a sense of balance, becomes impressed with his own power, forgets his obligations to the American people, because when you think about it it is just as was brought out in a conversation I had with some people the other day, the people who carry on Christianity, carry it on from person to person. The only obligation we have is person to person, people to people, American to American. That is the first obligation we have from the patriotic standpoint.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk just a minute about the cotton textile offset import fee. I recently received a statement through the mail that showed that the price per bale of cotton at Memphis, Tenn., was about $170. The same bale of cotton on the docks of Hong Kong was priced at $120. We have to export our cotton because the U.S. Government is in the cotton buying business. It buys the cotton at an established price, stores it, and has a loan program which is an accepted thing. But what has happened is that the cotton we are shipping overseas is coming back here. They have a $50 differential on each bale of cotton. They have a differential in the matter of wages of about 7 to 1; so, actually, you can put Japanese textiles on the dock in New York at 50 percent less than you can manufacture them for in this country, and the only thing that has kept us alive at all has been the efficiency of our production. The inefficiency of the operation abroad is the only thing that has kept us alive at all.

About a year and a half ago I brought some cloth samples back from Hong Kong with me. I wanted to make comparisons. I had a most difficult job to get those samples in, but all I wanted to do was to have my textile people look at them to see what kind of material it was. In each case the textiles were found to be inferior. But we recognize the fact that in these same mills with a little bit of improvement they can make some of the finest quality textiles that are made in this country.

I have talked with another gentleman from the Far East on this subject. He was most gracious to me. He said, as I remember, that they handled about 40,000 bales. I am not sure of the number, but for the sake of argument let us say 4,000. Four thousand bales at $50 amounts to $200,000 right there. That is a windfall that the American does not get. The Japanese company is not paying any American taxes.

He did not have to support any of the American programs. If war came, the Japanese would not have to follow the American flag. He could sit by and let us fight his battle, like everybody else has let us do it throughout the 20th century. That is the way it was there. Well, I did not ask him what he could put his completed goods back on the docks at New York for. I think he shipped through San Francisco. But, I went to one plant where they bragged about the fact that they had a $3 million order from an American concern. I could not tell you how many American jobs that $3 million meant, but I know it meant $3 million that was not going into the consumer demand in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks by asking unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a resolution adopted by the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., December 12, 1961, because I believe in the cotton textile offset import fee as a possible avenue of help.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The resolution reads as follows:

Resolution on the Cotton Textile Offset Import Fee

Under U.S. Government policies American cotton textile manufacturers have been required for several years to pay some 25 percent more for cotton than oversea mills pay.

The unfairness of the situation became aggravated as the cotton cost differential alone led to a sharp upsurge of certain categories of textile imports already stimulated by the lower cost advantage possessed by foreign manufacturers.

The disparity cries out for correction and the American industry is pleased by President John F. Kennedy's recognition of the inequity in directing the U.S. Tariff Commission to investigate the situation under the authority of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Particularly significant and gratifying is the President's instruction to the Commission which provides adequate latitude for a complete investigation. The President has specifically suggested the desirability of an offset import fee on the cotton content of textile imports at a rate sufficient to balance the raw cotton cost differential of about $42.50 per bale.

Such a fee would in no way interfere with oversea mills from continuing to buy cotton at lower prices. It would, however, deny them the competitive advantage they acquired not through their own efforts but as a result of our Government policies.

Disappointed and dismayed by the long delay since May 2 when the President called for action on this problem, the industry now looks forward to the public hearing in February 1962 and urges the U.S. Tariff Commission to expedite all phases of its investigation and deliberations and clear the way for the President to deal with the problem in accordance with long established public policy reflected in the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Let me assure those who apparently do not have the interest of the textile people and the textile industry at heart that this fight is not over; that there are not going to be empty promises. We expect the promises to be fulfilled. We accepted them in good faith, and we demand that they be fulfilled. We demand that these people in the textile industry receive not only consideration but, if necessary, protection by this Government. These textile people are great Americans; I am proud of them; I intend to continue too champion their cause.

We need help. We deserve it.

DIRECT PEACE NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN ISRAEL AND ARAB STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, within the last few weeks there have been reports that the Soviet Union has sent new arms shipments to Arab countries: planes, submarines, ships. At the same time, Arab leaders have renewed their threats to destroy Israel.

It is now 15 years since the United Nations first took up the Palestine question. During that period little progress has been made toward peace. The one great advance came in 1949, when the Arabs and Israelis met in direct negotiations at Rhodes under the auspices of United Nations Mediator Ralph Bunche. As a result armistice agreements were signed and Dr. Bunche was honored with the Nobel prize for his significant achievement. But in the ensuing days the Palestine Conciliation Commission accepted the Arab contention that they need not negotiate with Israel directly. That was a retreat. Since that day Arab leaders continue their threat to destroy Israel; and the Arab League countries persist in their efforts to strangle Israel's economy.

Our Government has been helping both Israel and the Arab States with economic assistance, but unfortunately, as long as the Arab-Israel war continues, economic progress will be disrupted in the Middle East, because of the diversion of huge sums for arms.

At the last session of the U.N. there was a proposal that Israel and the Arab States meet together in direct negotiation to settle outstanding problems, and in particular the problem of the Arab refugees. Unfortunately, that resolution, which was sponsored by 16 nations—African, Latin American, and European—failed to win the necessary majority, because the major powers did not support it.

Nevertheless, article 2, section 3, of the United Nations Charter clearly states that "all members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means," and article 3 declares that members must refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any member state.

The United Nations should be strengthened in efforts to uphold the charter and to summon its members to the peace table. The United Nations does not have the capacity to take such action unless it is reinforced by its loyal members. Our Government has always supported the Charter of the United Nations and it is the policy of the United States to strengthen that institution and to make it effective.

I regret very much, therefore, that our delegation failed to support the peace initiative when it was presented to the Assembly by 16 African, Latin American, and European nations. We have always favored direct negotiations in the settlement of all other major controversies in Asia and Africa, in Europe, and the Middle East. This has been our consistent position; and it would be most unfortunate if, as a result of a tactical vote, the impression should arise that we do not believe the Arabs and Israelis should meet together to settle their differences.

We must remain firm and vigorous in our support of all efforts to bring about an Arab-Israel settlement; and the most direct route to such a settlement is the peace conference, at which the parties sit as equals in face-to-face discussion.

This is the essential basis for any progress on any issue in the Middle East, be it refugees or disarmament. How can we get progress when one side refuses to talk to the other? How can we move forward when one side wants to destroy the other? Let them sit down and talk. Let them negotiate their differences. That is what the charter provides.

Accordingly, in my judgment, it is important that the House of Representatives make its position clear on this issue. Our Government must contribute its leadership to the promotion of direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab States in order to obtain peace and cooperation for all peoples of the region, and to that end I have introduced the following resolution calling for endorsement of that principle by the House of Representatives:

> Whereas in recent weeks there has taken place a disturbing increase in warlike threats in the Middle East, accompanied by increased arms shipments to the area from the Soviet Union; and
>
> Whereas continuing Arab-Israel conflict is a threat to the peace, menacing the security of all the peoples of the Middle East and disrupting their progress and development because of the wasteful diversion of their resources for armaments; and
>
> Whereas article II, section 3 of the United Nations Charter provides that "all members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means"; and
>
> Whereas the United Nations should be strengthened in its efforts to uphold that provision of the United Nations Charter: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the U.S. delegation to the United Nations favor direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab States as an indispensable condition toward the attainment of peace and cooperation and the settlement of all outstanding disputes between them.

THE NEED FOR A PERMANENT NAVAL HOSPITAL OF ADEQUATE CAPACITY AT LONG BEACH, CALIF.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the naval base in the Los Angeles-Long Beach area has the third largest concentration of naval ships in the country, exceeded only by Norfolk, Va., and San Diego, Calif. Long Beach is now the home port for 121 units and it is planned to increase this in the near future by 13 destroyers and 3 cruisers. There are currently over 31,000 active duty personnel in ships homeported at Long Beach and 18,700 active duty personnel ashore of all armed services within a 30-mile radius of the proposed Long Beach hospital site. A total of 49,700 active duty personnel are in the area and the number will soon be increased.

Long Beach is the hub of the large military community, afloat and ashore, in the overall Los Angeles-Long Beach area. It is the only major concentration of personnel in the U.S. Navy without a nearby hospital. The overall minimum requirement for the area is the construction of a 750-bed hospital with a 1,000-bed chassis. A facility of this size would provide for expected expansion in the event of a national emergency and could accommodate active duty and retired personnel and dependents until called upon to fulfill its primary mission. Active duty personnel alone, during peacetime, require at least 500 to 600 beds. The 1,000-bed foundation would most economically facilitate future expansion of the armed services as well as provide for the rapidly increasing retired population in the Los Angeles-Long Beach area. Of the 116,000 paychecks mailed each month to retired naval personnel alone, 36,000 are mailed to California addresses. The next State, which is Florida, receives only 9,000. Many of the 36,000 are living in the Los Angeles-Long Beach area. Many others would like to live in the area but are discouraged from doing so by the lack of adequate medical facilities.

The urgent need for a hospital in the Los Angeles-Long Beach area is generally recognized; however, it is important that the facility be built of sufficient size to meet the local active duty requirements of 500 to 600 beds. Based on naval statistics for 1961, 13 beds are needed per 1,000 active duty personnel. On this basis the 49,700 active duty personnel of all services presently in the Los Angeles-Long Beach area would require 646 hospital beds. This figure will soon be increased to 737 beds for active duty personnel by the need to care for the 7,000 additional personnel arriving aboard the 13 destroyers and 3 cruisers to be home-ported at Long Beach.

It is pertinent to recognize that the former Long Beach Naval Hospital had 550 active duty military patients when it was taken from the Navy and transferred to the Veterans' Administration in 1950. There were then only 53 ships—less than half as many as now—based at Long Beach. Additional documentation supporting the current need of at least 500 beds is the fact that when the Naval Hospital Corona was ordered closed in 1957 there were 578 active duty military patients hospitalized there. The Long Beach based fleet has expanded considerably since then.

At the present time the Long Beach based hospital ship *Haven* is overage and its limited facilities are being severely taxed to meet the medical demands placed upon them. The *Haven* is badly in need of hull repairs which will require drydocking and will curtail her service as a hospital ship for a temporary period. This drydocking is a recurring necessity. Even with the *Haven* in an operational status, an average of more than 300 patients per month are being sent to hospitals at Camp Pendleton—80 miles—or San Diego—110 miles—from the Long Beach area. In addition to the overflow from the *Haven*, this long trip is needed to obtain specialist treatment not available in Long Beach. The lack of Navy medical specialists for emergency treatment of 49,700 active duty military personnel at Long Beach is a serious handicap. The transportation cost of sending many patients long distances is significant.

In carrying out its mission of supporting the fleet, it is a normal responsibility of a naval base to provide adequately for the care and hospitalization of the sick, injured, or wounded of the forces afloat. This responsibility can be carried out almost universally throughout the Naval Establishment but not so in the Los Angeles-Long Beach area. The naval base at Long Beach, supporting the third largest number of ships of the U.S. Navy based in one area, does not include a naval hospital. The following information on travel needed to reach other naval hospitals is of interest:

Naval base	Hospital located	Approximate miles from headquarters area
Boston, Mass	Chelsea, Mass	2
Newport, R.I	Newport, R.I	0
Portsmouth, N.H	Portsmouth, N.H	1
New York, Brooklyn, N.Y.	St. Albans, N.Y	15-20
Philadelphia, Pa	Philadelphia, Pa	1
Norfolk, Va	Portsmouth, Va	4
Key West, Fla	Key West, Fla	5
Charleston, S.C	Charleston, S.C	0
San Diego, Calif	San Diego, Calif	2
San Francisco, Calif	Oakland, Calif	15-20
Bremerton, Wash	Bremerton, Wash	0
Pearl Harbor, Hawaii.	Pearl Harbor, Hawaii.	3

While there are no naval bases in the 8th or 9th Naval Districts a naval hospital is located at Corpus Christi, Tex., and Great Lakes, Ill., to serve the recognized needs of those areas.

With the mounting cost of medicare in civilian hospitals, it is believed that a Long Beach naval hospital of adequate size to handle dependents as in-patients would pay for itself in a few years. Based on information obtained from the Blue Cross office in Los Angeles, the average hospital cost to the Government for Armed Forces' dependents under medicare in the Greater Los Angeles area, since December 1960, has been $414,000 per month. This is an increase from $363,000 monthly only a year ago. In addition, the patients themselves paid $83,000 monthly as their share of the hospital expense. These amounts do not include the current cost to the Government of approximately $248,000 per month for doctors' fees under medicare. This latter sum is increasing rapidly as evidenced by the Blue Cross estimate of about $145,000 monthly less than a year ago. In summary, about $9 million per year is now being spent on medicare in the Greater Los Angeles area, and the sum is rapidly increasing. Sixty-five percent of the medicare costs in the area are incurred by Navy and Marine dependents. Much of the above cost could be saved to the Government if provisions for dependents' care were included in the facilities of the new naval hospital. A naval hospital in Long Beach would be of benefit to the Navy, Marine Corps, Army, and Air Force, all of which are without adequate medical facilities in the area.

It would appear wise to erect a hospital that could meet the current active-duty requirements of at least the 500 beds and could provide needed facilities for dependents and retired personnel. To meet all of these requirements it is recommended that a 750-bed hospital with the capacity for expansion to 1,000 beds be authorized. However, it should be emphasized that at least 500 to 600 beds are urgently required to accommodate active-duty military personnel in the Los Angeles-Long Beach area. A 500-bed hospital on a 1,000-bed chassis would be the barest minimum to meet present demands and provide reasonable capacity for expansion in the future.

It is in the interest of the Navy, the other military services, and the community to encourage a naval hospital at Long Beach.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE 1963 FEDERAL BUDGET PROGRAMS

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, early this week I had the opportunity of addressing the St. Louis Dental Society. At that time I spoke on the budget which President Kennedy had offered, a juggled budget, not a balanced budget as advertised. I should like to place this speech in the RECORD for I believe that it is important that the people of this country realize the truth about the budget which has been presented for congressional approval:

OBSERVATIONS ON THE 1963 FEDERAL BUDGET PROGRAMS

(Remarks of the Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, Second District of Missouri, to the South Council, St. Louis Dental Society, January 22, 1962)

President Kennedy has presented a juggled budget to the Congress of the United States. If a certified public accountant prepared figures as they have been prepared in this budget, he would lose his license and his client would probably go to jail.

The President states the budget is balanced. It is balanced only as long as he can keep the balls in the air. The President, in effect, is saying this: I want $99.3 billion, although we are going to take in only $93 billion in revenues, but this will balance out because I'll only spend $92.5 billion of the money which you give me.

Can we believe this? Just take one item. The President said in his state of the Union message that he wanted the Congress to vote a 3-year program for Federal grants for primary and secondary school construction and teachers' salaries in the amount of $2.1 billion. Now, if he wants this program and other new programs he is asking Congress to approve, then he must include the costs of these programs in his budget.

Did he include the item for school construction and teachers' salaries in the budget? Oh, yes; $600 million for fiscal year 1963. But he says, I will only spend $90 million of the $600 million. He also said that he wanted Congress to vote a 5-year program to help colleges build classrooms and other academic facilities in the total amount of about $1.7 billion at a rate of $332 million a year. But he says, in a whisper out of the corner of his mouth to the Congress, give me the $332 million, but I will only spend $20.8 million in fiscal year 1963.

President Kennedy can't have it both ways. He can't tell the people he is going to do all the good things for them and then tell the Congress he has a balanced budget because he won't spend the money Congress gives him to do these good things.

I know people have wondered how it is that we can start out with a balanced budget, like the budget President Eisenhower presented to President Kennedy for fiscal year 1962, and then see it become unbalanced. The answer is, there are many items put in the budgets, like those I am pointing out, over which the President has such wide discretion that he can get $600 million and just spend $90 million. Or he can get $600 million on the statement that he will only spend $90 million and end up spending the entire $600 million. Indeed, in other ways available in our cumbersome budgetary procedures he can actually commit the U.S. taxpayers for more than the $600 million.

As a matter of fact, nowhere in the President's budget or in his budget message to the Congress or to the people does he let us know how much money he has left over which previous Congresses have voted to the Executive, which has not been spent and yet can be spent in fiscal year 1963. The amount is over $20 billion and may be as high as $30 billion.

This is why we could start out the year 1961, as we did, with an apparently balanced budget and end up $9 billion or more in the hole. And why we can anticipate going in the hole even more this coming year of 1962. This is why the President in one message tells us he is presenting a balanced budget to the Congress and in another message asks the Congress to raise the Federal debt ceiling to $300 billion.

The correct way to view the budget of a particular year is to look at it both ways, from the standpoint of what the Federal Government might spend in dollars and, at the same time, how much money the President is permitted by law to spend in new obligation authority. When the President asks for appropriations to spend 99.3 billion more dollars for fiscal year 1963, along with what he has left over from previous years, and we are only going to take in $93 billion in tax collection, it is in error to say that this is a balanced budget. It is an unbalanced budget by $6.3 billion and this imbalance may be more if previously granted powers to spend are exercised and our anticipated revenues do not materialize.

Furthermore, the President's estimation of revenues in his proposed budget is unrealistic. Federal revenue estimation is an uncertain science. Until a few years ago the U.S. Treasury officials made no attempt to anticipate increased revenues resulting from increased economic activity and, conversely, they made no attempt to anticipate a decline in revenue resulting from a decrease in economic activity in the society. The failure to make reasonable estimates left the Treasury Department with some very grave under and over estimations from time to time.

I am pleased that Treasury for several years now has tried to consider the factor of economic activity in their revenue estimates, even though the range of error still remains too high. However, when I see this budding science abused simply to make a book balance for a budget which, by all reasonable standards is unbalanced, by estimating a $10.9 billion or 13.2 percent increase over 1962 revenues (which are still estimates), I am almost sorry that Treasury moved away from its conservative approach of the past.

Regretfully, what I am saying is that the Treasury estimates seem to have been made on the basis of what was needed to make an unbalanced budget have a semblance of balance, rather than upon a realistic appraisal of anticipated revenues. Time will help to tell whether this is too harsh a judgment.

It is important to correct a major erroneous conclusion the President seeks to have the people draw from his budget and the increased expenditure rate of the Federal Government that it reflects. The President states that increases in the Nation's defense are largely responsible for the rise in the budget of this administration compared to that of its predecessor. This is partisan, and it is untrue. It is designed to take the people's attention off of the greater increases that have occurred in the civilian side of the budget.

National defense expenditures, according to the President's own bobtailed figures set out in the budget brief rose from $47.5 billion (actual) in fiscal year 1961 to estimates of $52.7 for fiscal year 1963. This is a 10.9 percent increase. Domestic civilian functions, international affairs and finance, space research and technology rose from $23.6 actual fiscal year 1961 to an estimated $31.2 for fiscal year 1963, an increase of 22 percent. Even in gross figures, the nondefense expenditure increase exceeded the defense expenditures increase by $400 million.

Furthermore, it is important to observe the $6.8 part of the new obligational authority of $99.3 the President says he is not going to spend in fiscal year 1963 over the $92.5 expenditure is pretty well concentrated in the domestic programs. Only $1.9

is new obligational authority over the expenditure rate for the Defense Department (military); $51.4 new obligational authority; $49.5 expenditure rate. The Defense Department in recent years has been getting its unused authority to spend money down to a more workable level, which means that its actual expenditure rate has been exceeding its rate of new obligational authority. This makes the error of the President's statement even more glaring. The increases have not been largely the result of increases in expenditures for the Nation's defense; they have been in the President's other programs.

Finally, let me direct attention into the future on the question of balance between defense and nondefense expenditures. Table G–2 on page 328 of the President's budget is entitled, "Federal expenditures for research and development divided between national defense and other programs, fiscal years 1953–63, in millions of dollars."

In 1960, national defense was $6.6 billion and other was $1.1 billion; 86 percent to 14 percent. In 1963, the ratio had changed to 69 percent for defense and 31 percent for other; $8.572 billion to $3.793 billion. Clearly a shift away from defense, not a shift to defense.

Future activities and expenditures depend greatly upon what moneys are presently being spent in research and development.

Now, lest anyone think that space research and technology should be listed under defense, let me point out that the Kennedy administration does not so list it. Congress specifically created a civilian agency for space and made it clear that it did not believe it was properly set up under defense. The reason behind this decision is that space, for the immediate future at any rate, does not have much military significance. Ultimately, I am certain that research in space will have great military significance.

The moon shot is not geared to defense. I happen to favor President Kennedy's accelerated space program, including the moon shot, but not on grounds of defense. I also favor very strongly the proposed reforms in respect to Federal job classification and pay schedules as set forth in the budget message. It is fair to point out, however, that the leaders of the Democratic Party, which include President Kennedy and which have controlled the past three Congresses and now control the present Congress, fought both this reform, the agricultural reform and the other basic reforms which the President lists in his budgetary message as much needed. I hope the Democratic leaders will change their philosophy and get on with these badly needed reforms, but it would be more believable that this would be done if President Kennedy had presented a more forthright and less partisan budget and budgetary message.

POSTAL RATE INCREASE

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have many doubts remaining over many provisions of this postal rate increase legislation. I feel there are a number of inequities present that will create more problems for some groups than their monetary value to the postal department.

However, there is one provision that I most heartily support. That is the provision dealing with the free distribution of Communist propaganda through U.S. ports of entry. As we all know, such material has been flooding the country through over 50 such ports of entry.

It is unfortunate that the administration has, by executive order, made it necessary for Congress to include such a provision in the bill to adjust postal rates. But, regardless of anyone's estimate of the value of the bill itself, it is gratifying to see this provision on the floor of the House of Representatives.

The flow of Communist propaganda into this country could and should have been stopped long ago. Since it was not, it is hoped that the action taken by the Congress may correct this deplorable situation.

JACKIE ROBINSON AND BOB FELLER—TWO NEW WORTHY MEMBERS OF THE BASEBALL HALL OF FAME IN COOPERSTOWN, N.Y.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inform the House that Jackie Robinson and "Rapid Robert" Feller were chosen yesterday by the Baseball Writers' Association of America to become the newest members of the Baseball Hall of Fame at Cooperstown, N.Y.

As the representative from the district which includes Cooperstown, where baseball was first played and where the hall of fame now stands, I extend my heartiest congratulations to these two fine athletes on their selection. Certainly there is no greater honor that can come to a man who has played major league baseball than to be selected to the hall of fame at Cooperstown.

Jackie and Bob will be officially installed in the hall of fame on July 23 at Cooperstown in a ceremony climaxed by an exhibition game between the New York Yankees and the Milwaukee Braves. On that day these 2 great American athletes will join the select group of 90 men, chosen for their outstanding contributions to the game of baseball, whose names are now officially inscribed in baseball's highest arena of honor and recognition.

Bob Feller and Jackie Robinson are two of the finest athletes this country has produced. Bob Feller pitched for the Cleveland Indians from 1936 to 1956, except for the 4 years he served in the Navy in World War II, and he still holds many major league pitching records which he achieved with his blazing fastball. And Jackie Robinson, who for 10 years from 1947 to 1956 was an outstanding infielder for the Brooklyn Dodgers, led his team to six National League pennants and a world championship.

But more significant than that, I think, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that Jackie Robinson was the first man in history to have broken the segregation barrier in major league baseball. His courage in that exposed position is now a matter of history. His actions as a baseball player involved more than achievement in athletic prowess. He pioneered the way, with the help and support of Branch Rickey, to a practical new application of the ideals of American fairplay in our great national game. This was a great new social achievement.

In fact, something of the significance of the job that Jackie Robinson did in becoming the first Negro to be a regular major league baseball player can be appreciated by the fact that today we take an integrated policy in major league baseball completely for granted.

And so it is fitting that as the first Negro to become a major leaguer—and a topflight one at that—Jackie Robinson has now also become the first member of his race to be elected to the Baseball Hall of Fame.

I salute both of these great athletes and at the same time extend a cordial welcome to all my colleagues to join me in Cooperstown on Monday, July 23, when Jackie Robinson and Bob Feller will be officially installed in our Baseball Hall of Fame.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. BAILEY, for 20 minutes, on January 29.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DOYLE.

Mr. JENSEN.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin in two instances.

By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. CAHILL) permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter, was granted to:

Mr. MATHIAS.

Mr. WHARTON.

By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. SLACK) permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter, was granted to:

Mr. MULTER

Mr. ALBERT.

Mr. FOGARTY in two instances

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 8847. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that a distribution of stock made to an individual (or certain corporations) pursuant to an order enforcing the antitrust laws shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital; and to provide that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 25, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1593. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report on the progress of the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps flight training program covering the period from January 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 4384; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1594. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 8 of the Organic Act of Guam and section 15 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, to provide for appointment of Acting Secretaries for such territories under certain conditions"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1595. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting certain information relating to operations concerning the registration of refugees for the period July 1, 1961, through December 31, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 86-648; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1596. A letter from the Assistant to the Governor, Canal Zone Government, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to regulate archeological exploration in the Canal Zone"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1597. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 7608 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to authority of internal revenue enforcement officers"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 383. An act to provide for the acquisition of a patented mining claim on the south rim of Grand Canyon National Park, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1286). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 500. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; without amendment (Rept. No. 1287). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 504. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 143; without amendment (Rept. No. 1288). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 513. Resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 1289). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 509. Resolution providing additional employees for the Committee on Ways and Means; without amendment (Rept. No. 1290). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 517. Resolution providing for the payment from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives certain expenses of the U.S. Constitution 175th Anniversary Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 1291). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 9877. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 9878. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.R. 9879. A bill to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to permit the waiver of such section under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 9880. A bill to repeal price support subsidies and direct the sale of Commodity Credit Corporation inventory; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 9881. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to impose a license fee on radio and television broadcasting licensees in an amount equal to 1 percent of their gross receipts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KARTH (by request):

H.R. 9882. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to prohibit the hunting of the mourning dove; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 9883. A bill to authorize the San Benito International Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Los Indios, Tex.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 9884. A bill for the relief of certain officers of the naval service erroneously in receipt of compensation based upon an incorrect computation of service for basic pay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 9885. A bill to bring State vocational agriculture teachers within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 9886. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1961 and the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to permit under certain circumstances flaxseed to be raised on acreage diverted from the production of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 9887. A bill to authorize a 2-year program of Federal financial assistance for all elementary and secondary school children in all of the States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H.R. 9888. A bill to amend sections 3(7) and 5(b) of the Internal Security Act of 1950, relating to employment of members of Communist organizations in certain defense facilities; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H.R. 9889. A bill to provide that industrial furloughs during World War I shall be deemed creditable service for pension purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NIX:

H.J. Res. 606. Joint resolution designating the third Sunday in June of each year as Father's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.J. Res. 607. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H. Con. Res. 407. Concurrent resolution providing for a study and report on ways and means of establishing a free guide service for the U.S. Capitol Building; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Res. 525. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives in favor of direct negotiation between Israel and the Arab States in the search for peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H.R. 9890. A bill for the relief of Carmino di Martone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9891. A bill for the relief of Dr. Joseph S. Salama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 9892. A bill for the relief of Alice Amar Froemming; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 9893. A bill for the relief of Tadeusz Sochacki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 9894. A bill for the relief of Loretta Shea, deceased, in full settlement of the claims of that estate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

232. Mr. STRATTON presented a resolution of the Schenectady County Board of Supervisors urging the Federal Communications Commission to act favorably on the renewal of broadcasting licenses for General Electric Co. stations WGY, WGFM, and WRGB in Schenectady, N.Y., which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Importance of Milk Stressed by President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned about the decline in the consumption of milk in this Nation, not only because I represent a dairy district in the great dairy State of Wisconsin and serve as chairman of the House Dairy and Poultry Subcommittee, but also because I know that milk is a vital ingredient for a nutritionally sound diet for our citizens. I am pleased to note that President John F. Kennedy shares my feelings on the necessity of milk in the diets of both children and adults and on the safety of our milk supply from radioactive fallout.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD a summary of President Kennedy's views on the subject as expressed before the National Conference on Milk and Nutrition, held January 23 here in Washington, D.C.:

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S REMARKS AT MILK AND NUTRITION CONFERENCE

Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Ladies and gentlemen, I want to express my appreciation to all of you for participating in this conference, which I think is most important to our farmers and to our country.

And I want to say a few words this morning about a very important subject to us all. And that is milk.

Almost every State produces milk. It provides twice as much of the cash income for our farmers as any other basic crop. It's our most nourishing food.

And last year we consumed either in the form of milk or in the form of butter, cheese or ice cream, about 125 billion pounds of dairy products. But in the year before we consumed between 2 and 3 billion pounds more. At the same time, our population increased 1.7 percent. And milk production, in an effort to keep pace with population production, increased 1½ percent. And in that same time, milk consumption declined 2½ percent.

This is a serious matter for us, serious for the dairy industry, for all of our farmers and for the United States.

First, it's a matter of concern because it implies poor nutrition and a less balanced diet.

Second, it presents problems in the area of the management of our milk production. It will require adjustment. We cannot continue to accumulate dairy products in still larger inventories. Nor can we embark upon a policy that will jeopardize the economic interest of so large a segment of our farm population. For there is a close relationship between prosperity on the farm and prosperity in the city, between economic health of our farm community and the economic health of our Nation.

Third, the drop in milk consumption has a serious implication for the best use of those soil, water, and animal resources that are now involved in dairy production. I doubt that anyone can be sure of the reasons of this sudden drop in consumption. We only know that the slow decline in consumption over a period of time became immediate and precipitous last year.

I have long been convinced that milk is an important aid to good health. This has led me to direct that milk be served at every White House meal from now on. And I expect that all of us will benefit from it.

If we are to be a vigorous and vital Nation as we all desire, then of course we must depend on the consumption of a balanced diet. And milk must be a part of it.

I am aware that there has been a good deal of public discussion about the effect of radioactive fallout upon our food supply. Most of the discussion has unfortunately used milk as an example of food products that might be contaminated. This recognizes the importance of milk in our daily diet, but it has the unfortunate effect of causing an indentification in the minds of some between fallout and milk. I should like to correct any misunderstandings that may exist about this.

The Public Health Service and other agencies have been instructed to keep the problems of fallout in food under constant surveillance. Detailed guidelines to protect the health of the people against radiation have been developed by the Federal Radiation Council. It is abundantly clear that for the foreseeable future there is no danger from present amount of exposure.

The milk supply offers no hazards—on the contrary it remains one of the best sources of nutrition for our children and for adults. And I hope that the American people will appreciate this more and more as time goes on. In addition, the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council has concluded after intensive research that the association of milk consumption and coronary disease due to the increase in cholesterol level has not been sufficiently established to justify the abandonment of this nutritious element except where doctors have individually prescribed special diets for those found to be susceptible to special cholesterol or coronary problems.

In the past 50 years, our children have grown more vigorous and sturdy because of better diets and better health. Our young adults are now about 2 inches taller than they were half a century ago. I should like, and I am sure all of us would like, to see this trend continue.

A large proportion of our people now attain a physical condition once attained by a very few. But nutritionists tell us that 10 percent of our people still have an inadequate diet. The most serious deficiencies, I'm told, are in the very minerals and vitamins such as calcium and vitamin A—most prevalent in milk. I'm sure all of us would like to see this nutritional gap narrowed.

Those who are familiar with the needs and the problems of our older citizens also tell us that older people need more calcium than they now get. Again milk offers the best and most economical source of this vital mineral.

There are many schoolchildren today who do not participate in the school milk and school lunch programs because their schools do not and often cannot make them available. Last year we expanded these programs. I hope more and more children will be able to receive school milk and lunches in the days ahead. These find, I think, increasing support, these programs, among the people of other nations. We have encouraged this development and will continue to do so.

These are some of the areas which I hope this conference will cover. I do not say that it is an easy matter that we are now faced with, but we do want to emphasize that this is a great productive resource of our country. We're rich in a very basic food. We are anxious to have the consumption of it increased as our population mounts and I believe that this conference will help bring attention of the public to what a valuable asset we have and to make sure that we develop it more fully. And therefore I want to express my thanks to all of you for being here today.

The Postal Rate Raise Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, there are many inequities in this so-called Murray amendment, which in truth and in fact is a substitute for the committee bill, on which the Post Office and Civil Service Committee held lengthy hearings. The so-called Murray amendment had little or no consideration by the committee but was simply demanded as "must" legislation by the palace chiefs downtown.

America will rue the day if we, the representatives of the people, abrogate our duties and responsibilities, as we are asked to do in this instance, even to the point of shutting off debate in the House of Representatives as all present have witnessed.

The Murray substitute is replete with inequities which, if made law, would be most detrimental to many newspapers, all shoppers guides and all sorts of publications, many of which are already struggling to stay in the black.

To attempt to raise revenue by this method, which amounts to peanuts compared to the wasteful spending program by the billions of dollars of the party in power here in Congress and downtown who show not the slightest inclination or desire to save a single penny for the already overburdened American taxpayer, is more than I can swallow.

The almost 25-percent increase in first-class mail proposed here is nothing more or less than a tax increase on the American people, and which will work a hardship on many individuals and businesses of every nature, nationwide, to the end that less first-class mail will be sent, which will reduce the claimed amount of revenue.

Mr. Speaker, after weighing this proposal carefully, I simply cannot support it, even with the Cunningham amendment included, which was cleverly slipped into the Murray substitute in the belief that by so doing Members would not dare oppose the bill on final passage. Facts are that the President could stop Communist propaganda from going through the mails simply by ordering the Postmaster General to stop it, just as was done under the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. Speaker, there is no one in America more opposed to ungodly communism and all its lowdown, lying propaganda than am I; however, I will not, I cannot conscientiously abrogate my responsibilities as a representative of the American people, as we are being asked to do in this instance, which I would be doing if I voted for this sort of unfair, unwarranted legislation. Hence should the so-called Murray substitute be adopted, I shall vote "no" on final passage.

Remarks of Hon. John E. Fogarty, U.S. Representative, Second Congressional District of Rhode Island, at Annual Meeting of the Connecticut Association for Retarded Children at Sanford Barn, Hamden, Conn., on Saturday, September 23, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address which I delivered at the annual meeting of the Connecticut Association for Retarded Children at Sanford Barn, Hamden, Conn., on September 23, 1961:

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND, AT ANNUAL MEETING OF THE CONNECTICUT ASSOCIATION FOR RETARDED CHILDREN AT SANFORD BARN, HAMDEN, CONN., ON SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1961

It is heartening to see so many of you here. The fast growth of this movement to help the retarded is one of the inspiring facts I cling to in these troubled times. It gives me hope that humanity, having at last found the right way to cope with this problem, which has baffled mankind through the ages, may also muster the capacity to solve its newest problem: how to avoid destroying itself. The clue to success in both cases, I am sure, is the same—breaking down the barriers that divide us, building up the spirit of brotherhood.

No doubt many of you can recall, as I can, when the retarded child was each family's private—often even its secret—problem. Individually, every parent tried his best to solve the problem. Doctor after doctor was called upon, institution after institution was tried, until at last hope sunk into desperate resignation. There was only one ending to that private, secret road—failure.

It has been little more than a decade that a newer way has been tried on a nationwide scale—the way of cooperation, the way of banding together. Instead of the intermittent pushes of an individual parent against the hard wall of prejudice and apathy, there is now the mighty push of millions.

And the wall is crumbling. Indeed, it has already crumbled. What other area of human endeavor can show so much achievement in such a brief span of time? I can think of none.

The employers who would not consider hiring a retarded person a few years ago find many useful jobs for them now. The scientists who used to think study of mental retardation was a dead-end road have discovered it's a superhighway. Classrooms for the retarded are no longer shunned but sought by some of the Nation's finest teachers. The friends of parents of retarded children, who merely offered sympathy, now join this association and give active help. Your influence has even permeated the halls of government—Federal, State, and local.

Perhaps, in fact, one of the best ways to gage the changes you have wrought is in terms of Federal action.

Just 6 years ago, the total investment of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in programs for the retarded was less than $2 million. Last year, it was $20 million. This current year, it will be over $26 million. For many years now, whenever the appropriations committee which I chair is considering these programs, the question I ask repeatedly of the agency witnesses is: "Are you asking for enough?" To the best of my ability, I want to make sure that no important progress is being delayed for lack of money. I believe I can tell you with considerable assurance that, as the potentials for progress increase, so will the funds for realizing those potentials.

Translated into action, what has this Federal aid helped communities and States to do for their retarded?

For one thing, it has helped them to increase job opportunities. Last year, vocational rehabilitation agencies placed 2,900 retarded adults in jobs. This is four times as many as were placed in 1956 and a thousand more than were placed in the whole 5-year period of 1945-50. At the same time, techniques for fitting the retarded and the job are constantly being studied and improved. Your own association has a grant to study the vocational and social adjustment of persons who leave institutions to take jobs in the outside world. Connecticut College in New London also has a grant and is using it to study the personal, social, and economic adjustments of retarded adults who live out in the community. These are just 2 of about 50 demonstrations and research projects that are receiving Federal aid through the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. And even this is a small part of the total effort which employers, unions, schools, and agencies are putting into the problem.

Federal aid has also increased educational opportunities for the retarded. Right now, at Southern Connecticut State College there are two promising students who are getting the training that will qualify them to head programs to prepare more teachers for the retarded. In other colleges and universities throughout the country, there are 160 other students like these two. For the past 4 years, at the rate of a million dollars a year, the Office of Education has been giving fellowships to these teachers of teachers. This means that the number of well prepared men and women whom school systems like yours can obtain for special classrooms will grow at a geometric rate.

Federal aid has increased treatment opportunities. The diagnostic and evaluation clinic at New Haven is one of 83 such clinics now operating in this country and 55 of them are receiving Federal aid from the Children's Bureau.

The field where Federal aid has most conspicuously changed the prospects for the retarded is research. About $10 million a year is now being spent by the National Institutes of Health on research that holds hope for the retarded. Two institutes conduct and sponsor such research. The National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness is supporting 129 projects right now, 2 of the major ones being at Yale University. The National Institute of Mental Health has 98 projects, 3 of them here in Connecticut: 1 at Yale, 1 at the University of Connecticut and 1 at Southbury Training School.

Good research men are at last working on this problem and, as I need hardly remind this group, they are getting results.

The big breakthrough on PKU (phenylketonuria) has opened a whole new vista of glittering possibilities. We may very well find that a rather high proportion of the retarded are the victims of built-in metabolic disorders—like PKU—and that most if not all of them can be corrected by diet.

Similarly, the recent discovery that the body cells of mongoloids have one more chromosone than the cells in normal people has sent researchers hot on the chromosone trail and may lead to answers not only to mongolism but to other abnormalities as well.

I could spend the rest of the evening talking about research because so much is going on in that field. I could talk for hours about the details of the Federal programs I have highlighted. And you, I am sure, could match every one of my stories with equally impressive ones of what your own association has achieved in local programs.

But rejoicing over gains made is hardly the way to assure that additional gains will be made.

The biggest job ahead, as I see it, and the job which only people like you, individually and collectively, can do, is to see that the benefits of prograss are not limited to a few families and their childdren.

This year, 200 babies will be born with PKU and, in the years ahead, they will have brothers and sisters born with PKU. Not until all babies are routinely checked for PKU can we wipe out this dreadful and now preventable defect.

Right now, in this country, there are more than a million people who have diabetes and don't know it. Some of them are going to have babies this year and some of those babies are going to have brain damage. Here again is a tragedy we could prevent. But it won't be prevented until every community is organized to find its diabetics and to give every diabetic and prediabetic pregnant woman the prenatal care that will assure her a normal child.

I have selected these two examples of unfinished business from the hundreds of examples I might have cited for a special reason. I think they point up why this association has much to gain by joining forces with other health groups in a broader attack on our health problems.

This is a particularly propitious time to make such an effort because the Congress, just this week, passed a law specifically designed to help you. I refer to the Community Health Services and Facilities Act of 1961—a law which, in my opinion, is one of the most significant pieces of health legislation ever enacted by the Congress.

The purpose of this law is to help communities modernize their basic health structure, a structure that took form 50 to 100 years ago and hasn't changed much since. That structure worked fine when acute and contagious diseases were our prime concern, but it doesn't work so well now that long term, chronic conditions are the big health problems.

What kind of a health structure does the modern community need? My friends in the Public Health Service have a phrase for it—comprehensive health care. By that they mean a system of services provided by private medicine, by health departments, by hospitals and voluntary agencies which is so well coordinated that no gaps of neglect are left.

Such a system would assure, first of all, prevention. Just as every baby deserves a PKU check so does he deserve immunization against polio, whooping cough, diphtheria, tetanus. And when measles vaccine comes along, as I expect it will in a year or so, he deserves that too.

While the list of ills we can prevent is still rather short, there is a much longer list of conditions that can be alleviated if diagnosed early. You well know that the earlier the retarded child is diagnosed the better are his chances for a good adjustment to life. Early diagnosis is just as important for cancer, heart disease and all of today's big killers and cripplers. The modern community health structure is one that assures early diagnosis of all health impairments.

Finally, the modern health structure is one that provides the wide range of special services so many of the handicapped need. I am thinking of visiting nurses; of speech therapists, physical therapists, in fact the whole gamut of special therapists; of dietitians; of homemakers to give a few hours of freedom to those housebound mothers who have patients at home. These and many other types of services would be helpful to all sorts of people who have chronic disabilities, including the retarded.

The new law not only provides grants to States to help get such programs started but also provides project grants. These project grants are available to any enterprising group who want to test out some program that promises to be an important building block in the modern health structure.

Because your association has demonstrated so dramatically how much can be accomplished by pooling your efforts, I hope you will be among the leaders in this movement to coordinate and strengthen the community's total health effort.

The Federal Government, through this new law, makes some useful tools available to you. But, as you know, tools mean nothing unless there are people ready and willing to use them.

I know, personally, that you have some mighty effective tool users here in Connecticut, in fact right in this room. Your State director, Anne Switzer, distinguished sister of a distinguished lady, Mary Switzer, the head of your office of vocational rehabilitation; Bob Williams, your able president—but I should never have started mentioning names. Quite obviously, from your record, you are all good tool users.

They say that success breeds success and if that is true I haven't a doubt that the bright news, in a world that nowadays seems so full of bad news, will continue to be the story of your progress. Keep on proving, by your example, that when men and women of good will band together, with courage and determination, nothing is impossible.

Postal Rates Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record following the adoption of the postal rate bill by voice vote, I should like to point out that I have consistently stood for a self-supporting Post Office Department. This, especially in view of the fact that it has been repeatedly pointed out that 75 percent of all first-class mail and practically all of the other classes are business or commercial items. With the comparatively insignificant cost to the individual and with corporations and other business establishments abundantly able to carry the burden, I can see no reason for subsidizing the mails through personal income and other methods of taxation.

It would be difficult indeed to adjust each rate to the entire satisfaction of everyone and to those who object to the inclusion of Government or congressional mail, may I point out that a substantial provision for such use is reported to have been made in the departmental computation of the rates submitted.

In the interest of eliminating the subsidization of business, I think we arrived at a satisfactory bill and if a record vote had been taken, I would have supported the President's recommendation for a rate revision and voted for the bill.

I Vote To Deny the Use of the U.S. Postal Service for the Carriage of Communist Political Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, first I wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham] for authoring the bill, H.R. 9004, designed to deny the use of the U.S. postal service for the carriage of Communist political propaganda, the text of which bill has been adopted by the distinguished chairman of our House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Murray], who is the author of the Murray amendment which I voted for.

A reason I voted for the Murray amendment to raise postal rates, as specified in H.R. 7927, primarily in order to create more revenue to the Treasury of the United States and more nearly make the operations of the Post Office Department self-supporting and to eliminate a huge portion of the subsidies to certain classes of mail poundage by the taxpayers of the United States, was because the language of the proposal by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham] became an integral portion of the Murray amendment.

A few years ago I was a member of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities which held hearings at two of the ports of entry to the United States and there heard evidence and saw exhibits of the sort of junk mail and subversive mail which was coming into our ports free and without charge for distribution thereof through our mail-handling arrangements. Such mail entered the two ports we visited by the hundreds of tons any given year, and there were 10 times as many other ports of entry through which this same despicable subversive mail was freely coming. Even though the Post Office Department representatives who met with us, and advised us, were doing some sort of a job at the time to try to meet this problem, we recognized it was not sufficient.

Granting that there will be additional administrative problems and costs to put in place and in full force and effect this amendment to section 505 of title 39, United States Code, I express my vigorous hope that the Attorney General of the United States and his aides and the U.S. postal service shall be given sufficient funds and personnel to make this international subversive-mail campaign by Soviet Russia and her satellites effective in the substantial reduction, and I hope elimination, of such distribution within our borders.

Here is the text of the Cunningham amendment which was incorporated by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee in his amendment:

> In furtherance of this authority to counteract adverse usage of the mails and to reduce the domestic postal deficit, no international mail-handling arrangement, under which any postal rate, whether or not reciprocal, is established, shall permit the receipt, handling, transport, or delivery by the U.S. Post Office Department of mail matter determined by the Attorney General to be Communist political propaganda.

I compliment the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, in thus incorporating it.

Problems of Dairy Industry Affects Us All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, our Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman did an excellent job of outlining the current problems facing our dairy industry and how they affect the Nation as a whole when he spoke to the delegates to the National Conference on Milk and Nutrition on January 23. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include Secretary Freeman's speech in the Record:

SECRETARY FREEMAN OUTLINES DAIRY SITUATION AND ITS NATIONWIDE IMPLICATIONS

Abraham Lincoln, in recommending the Department of Agriculture be established, said it would be the department of the people. His words of 100 years ago were never more true than they are today. We are meeting here at a conference called to discuss a question in which the interest of all the people—the farmer, consumer, businessman, and worker—are closely entwined.

It is a question which began to be heard last spring when, for the first time, it was noticed that milk consumption on an overall basis was declining nationwide. By the end of the year, the trend was clearly established. The consumer had used about three billion pounds less of milk than in 1960.

And like all basic changes in our complex society, this one affects all the people—the farmer, consumer, businessman, and worker. It is important that we know why this happened and what its effect will be.

The dairy industry in the past decade has seen many changes, but the magnitude of this particular development was totally unexpected. Let us then stand back a step and take a careful look at what is taking place in the dairy industry and what it means.

Like all other farming occupations, dairying has undergone a quiet, but dramatic, revolution in the productive capacity of the individual farmer.

During the 5 years between 1954 and 1959, for example, 4 out of every 10 dairy farms ceased to operate as milk producers. Those farmers who remained in dairying, however, added one cow on the average for every three already in the herd. And, every one of those milk cows produced in 1959 a gallon and a half of milk for every gallon and a quarter in 1954.

Until 1961, the increase in population generally consumed the increase.

What has happened in the dairy industry is being repeated, of course, in the production of virtually every farm commodity. It has meant that while 32 out of every 100 farmers left agriculture during the decade of the 1950's, output per hour of farm work has tripled.

As a result, with fewer people and fewer acres in production, the American farmer—spurred on by the new developments in technology and the discoveries of science—can actually produce more food and fiber than ever before.

The end is not even within sight. A study made recently by agricultural experts here in the Department predicts that by 1980 American agriculture will be able to meet all its commitments at home and abroad with 50 million fewer acres than are being cultivated today.

I believe most people would concede that under such conditions as have existed and will exist, the farmer is being subjected to unique economic pressures.

But in dairying, a third force has been added. Instead of a steady, gradual increase in consumption to be expected with a growing population, the total volume of milk and dairy products used by Americans has decreased this past year.

This development has implications far beyond the immediate economic effect on agriculture, on those who handle milk and dairy products and those who look to the dairy farmer as a market for production machinery and material.

Its most serious implication may well be in the long-term effect it can have on the health and vigor of the people and the Nation.

If there are times when it may appear that the Department is overly concerned with the economic prospects of the farmer, let it be understood that our responsibility is to the whole population, with strong emphasis on the problems of the farmers.

I am concerned when a new—and unexpected—development arises which will affect a complex industry. If this development brings a change which will benefit the Nation but requires an adjustment, then we should seek ways to make the adjustment with as little disruption and dislocation as possible.

If, however, a development occurs for reasons which are not clearly established or for which there is no broad agreement scientifically, then I am concerned lest we force adjustments which we will later regret.

I am particularly concerned when anything as basic as nutritional health could be placed in potential jeopardy.

I am sure these are some of the questions which also trouble you, and I hope that through this conference today we can begin to explore them and to direct wider public attention to them.

Let me outline in brief some of the specific areas of concern.

First, we have become extremely weight conscious in this country in recent years. If the drop in milk consumption is related to this question, we ought to be greatly concerned. Weight control involves the extent to which we use our muscles as well as the amount of food we eat. Food alone should not be expected to carry the entire burden. Insofar as we reduce calorie intake, it should be of foods important chiefly for calories—not of foods that carry indispensable proteins, minerals and vitamins. The American people should not make wrong changes in their dietary habits to prevent or cure obesity.

Nutritional authorities tell us that we need to know much more than we do today about the place of butter and other kinds of fat in meeting the nutritional needs of people. They also tell us that there should be no drastic modification in diets until nutritional research can point the way with more certainty and in more detail. We know that extremes in amount used of any one kind of food may lead to trouble. Moderation and variety are two words to remember in thinking about the relationship of diet and long-term well-being.

Unquestionably, there are many people who, on competent medical advice, must certainly follow special diets. But there are countless others—both young and old—who now do not receive adequate nutrition, particularly those essential building blocks of life for which milk is the best and most convenient source. Infants and growing children especially need milk and dairy products in their diet because of the large amounts of calcium and high-quality protein required to keep up with the growth needs.

Milk contains three important nutrients—calcium, riboflavin, and protein, in addition to other essential food elements—which people get too little of for their best nutritional health, and usually because they do not get enough milk.

In fact, milk makes it easy to get the calcium and riboflavin we need. In this Nation's food supplies, milk provides about two-thirds of all the calcium, nearly half of the riboflavin and a fourth of the protein.

Another reason that milk is a necessary food source is that it contains many different nutrients in highly beneficial balance which meet one of the basic requirements of good health. The nutrients work together efficiently to meet the body's needs.

The decline in milk consumption last year was small when compared with the total supply of milk—barely 2.5 percent. But coming at a time when it is known that milk and dairy products help fill essential nutritional needs, I think everybody should be concerned.

The second area of concern relates to the basic responsibility of the Department to the generations of the future—to insure the productive capability of our farming resources and to provide adequate food at reasonable cost.

The soil and water resources of this Nation, together with the most efficient system of agriculture history has yet known—the family farm—have helped make the American the best-nourished person of all time.

The dairy industry has a vital share in the mission of American agriculture, for dairy products are a dependable and economical source of good nutrition.

The dairy farm is an exceptionally efficient means of utilizing soil and water resources to meet human needs. The dairy cow can crop the land that is too steep, too soft, too irregular for the plow and combine. Grassland agriculture yields abundant harvests of meat and milk, without the cost to the future of erosion and soil exhaustion.

The dairy industry—from farm and barn to grocery shelf and the kitchen refrigerator—performs an industrial and economic miracle. It furnishes consumers with basic food products that are highly perishable, yet reach the consumer fresh and pure and at moderate cost.

It encompasses more independent and competing enterprises than any other single industry in our economy. There are about 1 million farmers who sell milk, and over 400,000 of them receive more than half their income from dairying. Cash receipts from dairying last year were almost $5 billion. The processing and handling of dairy products before they reach the retail level provides jobs for almost 300,000 persons with an annual payroll of more than $1.3 billion.

The dairy industry is a worthy example of American agriculture, and it should be maintained and strengthened. Thus, anything which may cause it to change should be considered seriously and with cold logic, for it is a vital and highly integrated part of our national economy.

If its products endanger national health, then we should not be afraid to face that fact and the adjustments it entails; but we should not be so fearful of the unknown that we hasten to make a change which in itself may damage the physical health of our people and the economic health of the Nation.

I believe the industry already recognizes that the impact of science and technology on dairying has created a situation where the dairy farmer receives less for his investment and labor than do most other agricultural producers. For example, the return per hour of work for the operator and his family in 1960 in the major dairy regions of the country varies from less than 50 cents an hour to no higher than 67 cents.

There is a growing realization that the adjustment which will provide greater economic reward, while reducing Government expenditures to stabilize milk prices, is a program of supply management.

Thus, the industry is willing to consider changes which will improve the economic health of their industry and their community, and which will insure an adequate supply of milk and dairy products while reducing the cost of Government programs.

But, given the weight of all available evidence as to the nutritional needs of the American people, the adjustments which may be required by the current drop in consumption and the increasing productive capacity must include vigorous efforts to encourage the use of milk in the interest of good and balanced nutrition for our population.

That also is the purpose of this conference—to explore the opportunities which our abundance of milk and dairy products gives to us to raise our dietary standards, and to improve the health and vitality of our people.

I can only underscore the importance of the task you will soon undertake by saying that your concern as well as mine is shared by the President. He has felt this strongly, and we are honored that he would come personally to be with us and to speak to us.

With his leadership, we can, I believe, begin to place many of the forces now affecting the health of our people as well as the economic future of dairying in a much clearer perspective.

Agriculture: False Prophets, Hard Facts, and Commonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr.

Cooley], chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, in an address prepared for the convention of the National Wool Growers Association, at Salt Lake City, on Monday, January 22, emphasized that agriculture is a house divided against itself. He chose as the title of this address "Agriculture: False Prophets, Hard Facts, and Commonsense." He related agriculture's problems to the disunity among farmers themselves.

What the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has to say is important and is especially significant at this time, as we expect to receive from the President in the next few days a special farm message calling upon the Congress to enact new legislation to maintain stability of the farm economy and to reduce the costs of farm programs. Therefore, with the unanimous consent of the House, I am inserting the text of this address in the Congressional Record, so that its contents and its message may be available to all Members of this body.

AGRICULTURE: FALSE PROPHETS, HARD FACTS, AND COMMONSENSE

It is indeed a delight, as well as a distinct honor, to appear before this convention.

In the presence of this distinguished group, I am especially aware that you people here are exceptional legatees. You are the heirs to an industry that is as old as civilization itself. Moreover, as I read and interpret history, the origin of individual and independent enterprise—the foundation of the capitalistic system—reckons back to shepherds tending their flocks. And organized society and culture really began on the face of the earth when the shepherds and the herders ceased to roam and settled into organized communities.

You are indeed the trustees of a proud and ancient heritage.

It is, as I have said, an extraordinary delight to stand before you. It is more than that—much more. It is an opportunity. It is a challenge. For, along with the legacy and lore of the shepherd, you people in the sheep industry seem to make it a business to perpetuate, to pass from one generation to another, a propensity and a capacity for hard commonsense. Of course the years, and the centuries, have made some changes in your business, but not in the ability of people in this business to face facts. This no doubt accounts for the vital and vigorous survival of this ancient enterprise of the shepherds.

I am here today, before you, because I want to talk facts. I want to talk hard commonsense.

I have traveled almost the breadth of this continent to avail this opportunity and to accept this challenge, before this elite group, to drive home from this platform to a broader audience in the Nation, if it be possible, the facts on the problems and the promises of agriculture, as I see them; and to raise some questions on where the responsibility shall be placed—where the blame shall lie—if the farmers of this Nation fail to regain a fair share of, and an equal partnership in, the rewards of our capitalistic system.

But let us first take a quick look at your industry—the sheep and wool industry.

As we are all painfully aware, the domestic wool industry was hit rather sharply by the recession of late 1960 and early 1961. Mill activity declined, exports went down, prices dropped. The total domestic consumption of wool in 1961 is estimated at around 500 million pounds—about 7 percent less than in 1960. Domestic consumption per capita amounted to about 2.7 pounds compared with 3 pounds in 1960.

In recent months, however, recovery has been underway. Mill activity has been rising, exports are moderately larger. The outlook is for a somewhat brighter year in 1962 with moderate increases all along the line—in domestic consumption of wool, mill activity, foreign trade in raw wool and wool products, as well as in the average prices received for shorn wool.

As for lamb, we all hope that the rough period of the past 2 years is a thing of the past. The steady downward slide of lamb prices during this period has been particularly damaging. It fostered flock liquidation—and this in turn added pressure to a further slide in market prices. USDA livestock experts tell me that the reduction in numbers may be near or at the stopping point. Market prices should be better in the months ahead and peak prices next spring, I am told, may be well above those of a year ago.

I understand that some growers are looking toward marketing orders as a possible help to solve the lamb problem. It is laudable that growers are undertaking a study, spending their own money through the American Sheep Producers Council, to find out more about the problem, its causes, and what might be done about it.

The Wool Act, of course, has been the salvation of the sheep industry.

As you know, the Agricultural Act of 1961 extended the Wool Act through the marketing year that will end March 31, 1966. Producers are currently assured a total national average return of 62 cents per pound on wool marketed until the close of the coming marketing year on March 31, 1963—the same level that has prevailed since the wool incentive program was begun 7 years ago.

This incentive price is established under legislation which directs the Secretary of Agriculture to consider prices paid and other cost conditions affecting sheep production in determining a support price that will encourage an annual production of 300 million pounds of shorn wool.

When the act was passed in 1954, wool production was only 236 million pounds—a level of output considered too low to serve the best interests of the entire Nation. Gradually over the years the gap between yearly wool production and the 300-million-pound goal has been narrowed. Production in 1961 was about 264 million pounds—12 percent more than the 1954 output.

Another important feature of the program is the wool and lamb producers' self-help promotion projects, financed by deductions from the incentive payments. This enables the sheep and wool industry to carry on advertising, promotional, and other related market activities.

I recite these facts to emphasize that your program—the wool program—has a special significance. It is a program designed to meet the special problems of a particular agricultural industry. The program, in other words, is fitted to the commodity.

This is tremendously significant. It points up the basic principle that if we expect a program to work for a specific commodity, the program must fit the needs, the peculiarities, the characteristics of that commodity. No one program can be devised to cover and serve the best interests of a dozen or a half-dozen agricultural commodities. We faced up to that fact in part of the Agricultural Act of 1961. Written into the act were these words:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to encourage a commodity-by-commodity approach in the solution of farm problems and provide the means for meeting varied and changing conditions peculiar to each commodity."

While the Agricultural Act of 1961 did not provide all the authority needed for this approach, it took a long step forward in recognizing the principle.

In the past the Nation has attacked the problems of many commodities through general farm legislation. That approach served us well in helping to lift agriculture out of the great depression and maintain stability in war and in the economic aftermaths of war. Agriculture experienced its greatest era of prosperity. For 11 consecutive years we had the law of supply and demand working for the farmer, and not against him. Farm prices were at or above 100 percent of parity in each of those years.

Farmers invested their profits from this prosperity in all the tools and skills of technology and this, mixed with their genius on the land, brought forth the biggest explosion of farm production the world has ever known. Our farmers blessed America with plenty, but this has been their own undoing. We produced vastly more than we could use. Surplus piled upon surplus, and our farmers were overwhelmed by the avalanche of their own productivity. The situation demanded change—a new approach, a commodity-by-commodity treatment of the farm problem—to keep supply and demand in reasonable balance.

But as you are aware, the political situation was such that the required and essential adjustments in farm policy were not forthcoming.

Certainly we have learned by now that the accumulation of huge stocks of farm commodities in Government hands hurts not only the producers of those specific commodities but it hurts agriculture all across the board.

Everybody, in every part of agriculture, has a vital stake in seeing these huge stocks of Government-held commodities cut down to manageable and useful size.

Now there's only one way to do this—and that is to turn off the flow of surplus commodities and see to it, meantime, that the excess supplies on hand are gradually used up.

That was the purpose of the emergency feed grain legislation of 1961. It is the purpose of the feed grain and wheat programs for 1962.

The feed grain program of 1961 was a signal success. Its job was to reduce production of feed grains. It did that job. Despite per-acre yields that broke all records, production of corn was down 7 percent, grain sorghums 22 percent, and output of all feed grains 10 percent.

The feed grain program was presented to the country as a means by which the Government could begin to cut back its stocks. And the program did that job. Instead of an increase of about 600 million bushels in feed grain stocks that would have resulted in the absence of this program, we will have a cutback of about 200 million bushels.

That feed grain production has been lowered and that Government stocks are being reduced are facts that nobody can deny. The only argument that has been advanced against the program is that it cost too much. But the fact is that it was not the 1961 program that cost too much but the programs that went before—especially the corn program that was in effect in 1959 and 1960.

Actually the feed grain program cost less in 1961 than the Government would have had to pay under the old program. And in the years ahead the cutback in feed grain production in 1961 will save taxpayers at least $500 million net.

But this program was only one of the significant achievements made during 1961.

I'm proud of the $1 billion rise in net farm income. Last year farm operators had a realized net income of about $12¾ billion—the highest since 1953.

I'm proud of the vigorous and effective use made of our agricultural abundance both at home and abroad. I'm proud of the success of the pilot food stamp plans—of the expanded school milk program—and of the greatly enlarged use of U.S. food in the interests of world peace.

I'm proud of the legislative record, the highlight, of course, being the highly significant and forward-looking Agricultural Act of 1961. Besides endorsing a commodity-by-commodity approach, it gives greater recognition to marketing agreements and orders by means of which producers can adjust their output and increase their income—without excessive cost—and at the same time provide ample high-quality supplies for the consuming public. As I've already mentioned this act extended the wool program for 4 years, and authorized the feed grain and wheat stabilization programs of 1962. It also expanded and extended for 3 years the Public Law 480 authority to use food for peace and develop foreign markets for our farm products.

I'm proud of other measures adopted in 1961, for example the improved agricultural credit facilities and the hog cholera eradication program.

I'm proud of the way the democratic process has been reemphasized in agriculture through the restoration of the functions of the farmer committees.

And one of the things I particularly like is the vigorous and aggressive way in which Secretary Freeman has set out to tell the story of agriculture's contributions, problems, and potential to the American people.

Indeed, we made a good start on the road back in 1961. But agriculture still has a long way to go to catch up with the earning capacity and the prosperity of other segments of the economy.

The plain fact is that—despite all that the Nation is now doing—and despite all that it seems feasible to do to increase the use of food and fiber at home and abroad—U.S. agriculture has the ability to produce more than the market will take at fair prices to producers.

This situation confers on Government a responsibility it cannot morally avoid. In the absence of sound programs to help farmers and ranchers balance production with need, one of two things is bound to happen: Either prices and income to farmers will collapse or stocks will mount higher and higher in the hands of Government and costs to taxpayers will continue to rise.

True, we look for the 1962 feed grain and wheat programs to make sizable reductions in these stocks. But the 1962 feed grain and wheat programs are temporary, 1-year endeavors to cut down the surplus. Now—this year—we should decide what kind of programs will best serve the Nation and the Nation's farmers in 1963 and the years beyond.

There are, broadly speaking, two general alternatives. They are:

1. Turning away from Government adjustment programs, while reducing price support to disaster levels, on the assumption that low market prices will bring about a balance between output and needs.

2. Seeking new commodity-by-commodity legislation to bring about more balanced supply and demand along with fair returns for farmers and a gradual reduction in the cost of storing and handling farm surplus.

I know a third alternative has sometimes been mentioned: Get rid of price support programs entirely. But no responsible person, to my knowledge, believes that is possible in the foreseeable future. It would mean a terrible farm depression.

The prices of farm commodities would drop by about one-third and net farm income would fall even more. Wheat prices, for example, would be cut almost in half—perhaps below a dollar a bushel.

Cattle and hog prices would fall by 25 to 30 percent below existing levels.

To put agriculture through that kind of a wringer would do incalculable damage to the rural economy, to all the small towns that depend on farm spending for much of their subsistence, and to the economy of the entire Nation.

Obviously this alternative of doing away with all price support cannot even be considered as a possible solution to the farm problem. It is completely unrealistic.

The alternative to forgo all production adjustment programs and to place price support at low levels, to me, is equally unacceptable. We have only to examine what happened during the 1950's to realize what the effects of this alternative would be in the years ahead. The result would be steadily growing stocks of wheat, feed grains, and other commodities with constantly rising costs for handling and storage.

When the lid was taken off the corn program in 1958, the result was an increase in corn output of about 15 percent in 2 years.

Even with the acreage allotment lid still on wheat—and despite the tremendous efforts of the Government to move wheat abroad—Government inventories rose from 132 million bushels at the end of 1952 to more than 1,100 million bushels in 1960.

In the absence of effective adjustment programs for wheat and corn, CCC expenditures in the next few years will increase another $1 billion merely for storage and handling charges.

This is a losing game. It would be only a matter of time until the American people would throw up their hands and refuse to throw good tax money after bad.

The only realistic approach is to develop programs which will effectively cut down surpluses while at the same time help producers to get a return more commensurate with their investments, skill, and contribution to the whole economy. We need farm programs that will cut down the carryover of wheat and corn by half a billion bushels each between 1963 and 1967—programs that will decrease the annual expenditures of farm programs.

These results can be achieved by continuing the type of program that is in effect for wheat and feed grains this year. I do not say that we should continue these programs precisely as they are in detail. But this is basically the right approach, because it combines balanced production with sustained income.

A commodity-by-commodity approach for bringing production into harmony with needs, while shoring up the income of distressed agricultural producers is the basic element of a vitally needed long-range farm program.

Another essential element of such a long-range program is the wise use of our farm abundance and our capacity to produce—to promote the health and well-being of our people at home, to foster economic growth abroad, and to serve the cause of world peace.

A third element is the efficient use of land resources. We must so use our agricultural resources as to assure adequate diets for future generations. This means the conservation and building up of soil and water resources.

These are the basic requirements of a sound and sensible farm program.

The question, now, is, Will the Congress, with the cooperation of the President and the Secretary of Agriculture, be able to enact such a program?

I said at the beginning of these remarks that I wanted to talk facts—I wanted to talk commonsense. Such talk is not always pleasant. But there are some things that must be said, if we are to understand fully the predicament agriculture is in.

Agriculture is America's largest industry, by far. Our farmers have made us the best fed nation on earth. Americans pay a smaller portion of their income for food than any other people anywhere. The productivity of our farms is the greatest stabilizing economic force in the free world. Food from our fields and grazing lands has defeated or checked communism in its tracks in important areas of the world. Khrushchev rattles his missiles, talks about Russia's great industrial strides, but you never hear him boasting of overtaking the American farmer.

Yet our farmers are the poorest-rewarded workers in our capitalistic system. And some people try to cast our farmers in the role of beggars, when they ask only a parity of income with workers in other great segments of our free enterprise economy and society.

To me this is a national shame.

I might point an accusing finger at those who have been responsible for the farmer's woes, but I shall not. It is no good now to blame those who got us into the predicament we're in. Rather, the question is: Will we avail what may be our last opportunity to pull ourselves out of this mess?

The house of agriculture has been divided. We all know this. Some of us have followed the preachings of the false prophets or the witch doctors among us. They tell us it is a violation of natural law, whatever that is, and even contrary to the laws of God, if farmers use for themselves the basic tools of free enterprise that have made this the greatest industrial giant among nations. These tools and these essential requirements for success in any productive enterprise are: (1) The ability to adjust supply to demand; and (2) the power to put a price tag on the products of enterprise that reflect costs plus a reasonable profit to the producers thereof. This is what I have been fighting for in farm programs all these years, simply to place our farmers on an equal footing with industry, by making it possible for farmers to use the supply and pricing mechanisms of industry.

But the prophets of strange doctrines have gained their followings among us. They teach and preach that farmers surrender their liberty and their freedom when they seek to make the law of supply and demand work for them and not against them. They have divided us. They have confused many in our ranks.

We farmers of America have a new opportunity for our salvation, if we will but take it.

We have a President and we have a Secretary of Agriculture who want to do something for agriculture. We have a Congress that will do something. We have the opportunity to bring farmers again into a fair and equitable partnership in the Nation's economy and prosperity, if we but banish these strange prophets that divide us and present a solid phalanx before the Congress for sound and workable programs.

It should be mentioned in this connection that when industry comes before the Congress with a proposal for consideration, there is no doubt where industry stands. And when labor brings a matter to the Congress, labor has made up its mind. But when agricultural legislation is presented to us, we are often embarrassed—after the contending witnesses have been heard—we do not know who really speaks the mind and the will of our farm people.

Agriculture simply must put its house back together. You people have been exceedingly fortunate. You have gotten the program you want, and it is a program that works. The Government payments to maintain the income of wool producers at a decent level have amounted to around $330 million since the Wool Act became law some 7 years ago. But I don't want you wool producers ever to forget that a good wheat program, a workable cotton prgram, programs for farmers producing other crops, are just as important to you, in the long run, as to farmers making these other crops. Those who have workable and profitable programs cannot withdraw from the effort of total agriculture to achieve a decent position. We're all in this thing together. If we fail in our effort to lift up the income of farmers in the many crops then certainly we shall not be able to maintain special programs for producers of a selected few.

I reemphasize that the President is ready and eager to throw the prestige of his office behind legislation that is good for farmers. It is true that the Congress now is dominated by Members who represent urban constituencies. But it is just as true that there is a substantial majority in the Congress for any sound and sensible program that is presented with the unified will and support of farmers.

In these circumstances, and I hope my words may travel far, if we farmers now fail to get a fair break in sharing the blessings of this capitalistic system which is our heritage, we may have only ourselves to blame.

I say to all my farmer friends, if agriculture continues to flounder in or on the edge of poverty, don't blame the President, don't blame the Secretary of Agriculture, don't blame the Congress; but look upon those among us who constantly stir up bitterness, uncertainty and doubt in our ranks. Look into their motives, for they are depriving us of the rewards of our enterprise.

The Nation, including many friends of agriculture—people who have fought the farmers' battles down through the years—are getting sick and tired of all this bickering, bitterness, indecisiveness and irresolution.

The hour is late for farmers. We must find unity—we must restore harmony and accord among us—or we must accept poverty as our natural and abiding lot in this capitalistic system.

It is as plain as that.

And now, confident of your fellowship in the task that lies ahead, I bid you Godspeed.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson Receives Honorary Degree at Einstein College Convocation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to participate on November 19, 1961, in a convocation held at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University in New York commemorating the 10th anniversary of the inception of the college.

At that convocation the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, our Vice President, was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of humane letters for his distinguished and notable contributions to the strengthening of the precepts of democracy.

It is my pleasure to commend to the attention of our colleagues the remarks upon that occasion of Rabbi Joseph Lookstein in presenting the Vice President, the remarks of Dr. Samuel Belkin, president of Yeshiva University, in awarding the degree to the Vice President, and the reply of LYNDON JOHNSON:

PRESENTATION OF LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON FOR HONORARY DEGREE, DOCTOR OF HUMANE LETTERS, BY RABBI JOSEPH LOOKSTEIN

Mr. President, from a humble farmhouse to the vaulted dome of our National Capital; from a shoe shine boy in Johnson City to a U.S. Senator; from a roadbuilding apprentice to a master builder of American democracy, is the proud saga of our distinguished guest—the illustrious Vice President of the United States, LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON.

Growing up in a small town of the Southwest, shortly after the turn of the century, was no easy experience. Our candidate was no stranger to adversity and no alien to the stern rigors of life. But then, to such as he, humble beginnings are never an obstacle but a spur: material hardship is never a handicap but a challenge. Hence, for him, honor was not an accident but a deserved reward, and fame came not as a stroke of fortune but as a collective expression of esteem and admiration.

Before us is, indeed, a remarkable and brilliant product of American opportunity. We hail one who grasped that opportunity, who utilized it for personal growth, who exploited it for the public good, and who became one of the commanding personalities of our day.

It did not take his native community long to realize that in their midst dwelt a true hero of the spirit. Ere he reached the age of 30, he was appointed State administrator of the National Youth Administration by the immortal Franklin D. Roosevelt. Soon this favorite son of Texas was sent to Congress where, as a Member of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, he served for 25 years. His colleagues in those august bodies saw in him at once a natural leader of men with all the endowments of wisdom, courage, idealism, and supreme statesmanship.

Then followed national recognition. With the scintillating and almost legendary Lady Bird at his side, he won the hearts of all America. Now he is one of the captains of our Ship of State. It is comforting to know that during these dark and desperate days for our country and the world, there stands near the helm this steady and sturdy statesman, helping to steer a true course toward the happier havens of destiny.

Mr. President, our candidate is a native of the Lone Star State. Is it not appropriate for him to become the adopted son of our university, whose academic fortune lies under the constellation of the Star of David?

I have the honor, sir, to present LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON for the degree of doctor of humane letters, honoris causa.

REMARKS BY DR. SAMUEL BELKIN IN AWARDING HONORARY DEGREE TO THE VICE PRESIDENT

Very few people in the history of America have served more skillfully and with greater statesmanship the legislative and executive branches of our Government, than you have served throughout your mature life.

As the majority leader of the Senate, you patiently bound the wounds of your colleagues and you succeeded in inspiring them to pass legislation for the benefit of the entire country.

During the short period since you were elected to the Vice-Presidency of the United States, you have traveled to many continents so that you might interpret to the President the attitudes and strivings of the newly born nations. You have admirably succeeded in molding for them a clear image of our American democracy.

At this special convocation, we salute one of the most distinguished servants of our American heritage.

By the authority vested in me as president of Yeshiva University, I take pleasure, sir, in conferring upon you the degree of doctor of humane letters, honoris causa.

In token thereof, I cause to be placed over your shoulders the visible symbol of our high regard for you, and I hand you this diploma.

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Rabbi Lookstein, Mr. President, distinguished members of the faculty, my fellow colleagues who have received this distinguished honorary degree, ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply touched by the consideration that you have given to me and by the great honor that you do me and that you have conferred upon me.

I treasure each word. I shall prize my degree from this great institution and consider it a directive to better humane achievements. In my own humble way, I will try to be worthy of the great obligation which this advanced institution of learning has placed upon me.

TO CARE FOR THE STRICKEN

In the 10 years which have passed since the establishment of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine, there have been few periods of repose or of peace of mind in world affairs.

These have been years of change and of challenge. Yet for those who conceived the high purpose of this institution, and have served it so faithfully, they have also been years of progress and achievement.

This college has become yet another symbol of man's genius for compassion, of his desire to abridge the burden of human suffering, and of his dedication to the task of making the resources of medicine minister to the health and abundance of all nations.

These are the victories of peace which are, in the end, more significant and enduring than the pageantry of war. The progress which has filled the first decade of your labors can now be seen as the prophecy of the growth and accomplishment that will shine upon your long future.

To bear the honored name of Albert Einstein is, for any college, an incentive to excellence.

He voyaged in strange seas of thought, alone, and always he strove to bring home precious cargo that could nourish the minds and spirits of men. He said it is the first sign of genius to have the courage to begin by questioning the axioms.

Albert Einstein's audacious research plucked from science the secret of many ancient riddles and transformed our knowledge of cosmic forces. Yet he also knew that it is the first sign of a good citizen to respect the old values which add grace to our pilgrimage and nobility to our aspirations.

He was never made bitter by persecution nor soured by misfortune. Beyond the darkness of a world at strife, his vision caught the prophecy of peace. Albert Einstein, whose mind soared through the universe, could also see in tiny Isráel a spiritual triumph that testifies to the unbroken genius of an old and valiant people.

PARADOX OF COMPASSION

It is a sad paradox that this man of generous sympathies and overflowing compassion was forced, by the disorders of our own iron age, to become one of the pioneers and prophets of the atomic world. We can have no doubt that he would wish us to devote our enlarged scientific knowledge to bring new hope to a stricken world, instead of threatening it with the cooperative suicide of war. That certainly is the philosophy which sustains your work in this college, and makes your progress a matter for rejoicing to all Americans.

We do well to remember that there is an honorable tradition which makes us regard the world of scholarship and of science as exempt from the rivalries of politics and the ambitions of power. We must be loyal to that tradition, even in this age of strident nationalism.

Men and women of all races and all religions have brought their gifts to enrich the treasury of our medical knowledge. Our country has grown great because we have had, ever since the days of George Washingington, a government which has given to bigotry no sanction, and to persecution no assistance.

On this scroll of achievements, a position of distinction records the contributions of our Jewish citizens; and nowhere have these contributions been more extensive or more creative than in the arts of medicine.

There is a vast stirring of interest in medicine in the United States today. Since the beginning of this century, life expectancy has risen by 20 years. Many diseases which exacted a frightful toll, especially among children, have been conquered by medical genius. I looked into the eyes of a simple, plain but good man as he toured our country a few days ago and he spent a week with us. He had fathered 11 children, 7 of whom had died because they lacked medical attention. But that good man, the camel driver, said to me that if he had had the knowledge of medical science with his first eight children that he'd had for the last three, he's sure that all of them would have been spared. There is no shortage of problems that still await solution, and the needs of preventive medicine grow steadily more important.

NEW DEMANDS

As a result of the new demands that must be met by medical science, the American people will need the services of more doctors than our colleges and universities are now providing.

At present our medical schools are graduating 7,400 physicians each year. In the next 10 years, if we are merely to maintain the present ratio of physicians to population, we will have to obtain the services of 11,000 new doctors annually. That is an increase of 50 percent or 3,600 doctors each year—and this increase is not based on the necessity of giving our people better medical facilities.

This increase is the indispensable minimum if we are to avoid the misfortune of lowering our present medical standards.

The 85 medical schools in the United States are under constant pressure to meet medical needs that were either unknown or far less urgent a generation ago.

In 1925 our medical schools spent less than $13 million; but in 1960 this figure had risen to nearly $320 million. Costs in the last 10 years have risen almost 400 percent, and the trend toward higher expenditures still continues.

CONTRASTS

A student must pay about $10,000 before he graduates from medical school. The student as well as the medical school is caught in this tangle of higher costs and more specialized training.

No one wishes to establish preferred positions in the family of learning. All the important branches of study have their essential contribution to make to the enrichment and progress of our Nation.

But some contrasts are too glaring to be overlooked.

A medical student pays more than twice as much as a Ph. D. student for his education. Yet the man or woman being trained as a doctor receives only one-quarter of the financial help available from scholarships and fellowships.

About 80 percent of all Ph. D. students in the physical sciences and 90 percent of all graduate students in mathematics are supported by Federal scholarships. It is not surprising therefore that many students who would like to enter the medical profession are turning, for financial reasons, to other courses of study.

We, in America, cannot allow this tendency to continue without producing overburdened doctors and serious medical shortages in many parts of the country.

The Federal Government must maintain its vigilant and constructive interest in medical research. It must provide new and larger grants to medical schools to enable them to satisfy the quickened interest of the American people in improved health services. It must, as a matter of urgency, make more adequate provision for the medical needs of our aged citizens.

With equal urgency, it must provide a system of scholarships and grants for the young medical student so that no qualified American student will feel shut out of a medical school because of the barriers erected by poverty.

All these new programs and reforms will be challenged by some powerful minority interest. But they are all in the national interest and they can be made to prevail if we pledge to them our unremitting support and high courage. The time to begin our national campaign for better medical facilities and services for the American people is now and the place is here.

CAMPAIGN WITHOUT RANCOR

We can conduct that campaign without having offensive epithets flung at us by our adversaries. We are not engaged in a campaign for socialized medicine. The false charge that we wish to invade the freedom and integrity of the medical profession has no valid place in a responsible discussion of the great issues.

It will not be easy for the administration to obtain the approval of Congress for the far-reaching health program to which it is committed and for which it is ready to conduct a valiant fight. But we do have the right to ask that our proposals be examined without bitterness, be debated without misrepresentation, and be voted upon without prejudice.

In such a fair hearing, the fundamental problems will be thoroughly considered, in the context of what is in the national interest, and the ultimate decision will advance the best interests of the American people.

Let us all strive, whatever our point of view, to conduct this national debate on our health program in a manner that respects the most generous American traditions of free discussion.

We have every reason to take comfort and pride in our varied, energetic, and dedicated medical resources in the United States. But we have a long journey still to make before we can say that our medical standards and services are fully adequate to the needs and opportunities now facing the American people.

Standing here in this great hall of learning, I congratulate and salute the dedicated members of this faculty and those who labor for this great public service institution.

Standing together and working together, in unity and in hope, we can give our medical schools and our medical profession a new radiant opportunity for service to a grateful nation.

And when we engage in a slight amount of introspection, in the sunset of this day, let us remember that of the 3 billion people who inhabit the world almost 2 billion have a monthly income of less than $8 per month. Two out of three can produce less than $8 per month. We in the United States are blessed with the opportunity and with the atmosphere that will permit us to produce better than $8 per person per day. We produce more in a day than they produce in a month.

We have an obligation, if we are to see our way of life preserved, not only to provide Christian leadership and fellowship, but to see that the genius that grows in abundance and flourishes with opportunity in our own land is extended to the lands of others. No one can better lead the way than the great men you have honored today and the faculty who have made such great sacrifices in order that this convocation could be possible and that this great university could exist.

I am totally unworthy of the recognition that you have given me. But I can assure you from a grateful heart no one recognizes that more than I do and no one will strive harder to be worthy of your confidence and to give to others some of the opportunities that you have given to me. Thank you.

Commencement Address at North Kingston High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address which I delivered at the North Kingston High School commencement on June 9, 1961:

Remarks of Hon. John E. Fogarty, U.S. Representative, Second Congressional District of Rhode Island, at North Kingston High School Commencement, Friday, June 9, 1961

Distinguished guests, teachers, parents, friends, and members of the graduating class, a very wise man once said that the trouble with most speakers at commencements is that they feel called upon to sound learned and end up by being too long. What I have to say to you concerns a few simple truths which my own experience of public life leads me to believe should be stressed in our State and Nation today. And you may rest assured that I intend to express them briefly. After working for their diplomas for 4 years, the graduates deserve not to be kept waiting much longer.

I would, however, like to take just a moment to exercise the privilege of extending my personal congratulations to each and every member of this class, and to their parents. As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for Health, Education, and Welfare, I have heard a great deal of testimony about the problems of our youth and our schools in these complicated modern times. And I have devoted much time to the formation of programs of legislation which are designed to help in meeting these same problems. We need to know what is wrong in the life of our schools and our youth so that we may take practical steps to overcome our deficiencies. But as we look at this fine school and this graduating class, we can also be thankful that so much is right with our schools and our youth.

All who have had a part in making this occasion possible—teachers, parents, and the good people of this community—have a just share in the congratulations which are traditionally extended to the graduates. Our whole educational system, from the elementary schools to the universities, is a fundamental part of the defense system of American freedom. And the high school is one of its most vital links. Studies, like the famous Conant Report, have made this very clear, and today we have a better knowledge than ever before of how important it is that all of our young people should take the fullets advantage of improved high schools. Far too many drop out, and far too many—in some parts of the country—do not have schools that are adequate to their needs.

Here in North Kingstown the members of this graduating class have persevered in their studies and are now prepared to begin a new phase of their lives, either in institutions of higher learning or in the business and industrial life of our State. That is how it should be in every American community, and I am happy to be able to join with all of you in saying "Well done" to these graduates, who represent so much of our hope for the future.

That future depends upon all of us working together for a better, stronger America. What is so often said to those who are graduating, applies to our whole country today: we cannot afford to rest upon our past accomplishments. We must look to the future together, putting aside outworn group distinctions and antagonisms. We must rediscover the common responsibility of our American citizenship.

The members of this graduating class have been well trained by their teachers so that as free citizens they will in the very near future exercise enlightened judgment on public questions as full members of our democratic society. Such phrases as "We, the people * * *" or "Government of the people, by the people * * *" are still fresh in their minds. These are not new ideas to any of us here, but the trouble sometimes is that they are so familiar that we forget to take them seriously.

The privilege and responsibility of the Government of our democracy does not belong to any one of the many ethnic groups that make up America. The common good of all, and the cause of freedom itself, cannot be well served when citizens permit political life to become a self-interested competitive struggle between ethnic factions.

Those who founded this Republic repudiated the old idea that government was the limited field of a special group. They rejected the notion of distinctions based upon birth and blood. Just a few years ago, in the Second World War, thousands of Americans gave their lives fighting against the Nazi doctrine of a so-called master race.

The most fundamental feature of the American system of government is the belief that every citizen, without regard to his birth or ancestry, should participate in the process by which the community is governed. This goes beyond the idea that a career in politics should be included among the opportunities open to all in American life. It means that the responsibility and the dignity of every citizen must never be threatened nor neglected, either through the tyranny of group domination or the failure of individuals to assert and exercise their proper roles in the tribunal of public opinion. It has been well said that the character which each one of us brings to the office of citizen is the crucial test of the ability of our Nation to survive.

Mr. C. Scott Fletcher, president of the Ford Fund for Adult Education, put the issue well when he said: "Let us ask ourselves a vital question: Are the American people using our power in the service of the cause of freedom as effectively as the Soviet people are being used to achieve the goals of the Soviet state? The answer is 'No.' Most of us in our private and public roles, through our various organizations and institutions, serve our ideal only by fits and starts, with only a small fraction of our attention and energy."

One of the greatest proofs of the way in which we are not serving the democratic ideal to the best of our ability can be seen in the extent to which we allow group prejudices to govern our affairs.

Looking at our country and the world today, with its newly independent nations groping for direction, the late John Foster Dulles said: "Racial discrimination in the United States is our greatest national scandal and our most dangerous international hazard." I believe that if in racial discrimination we include group prejudices of every kind, we can heartily agree with these words of a great Secretary of State.

Recent events involving racial violence in the South have made dramatic headlines. It is evident that we still have a long way to go in winning the battle for the most elementary civil rights for all of our citizens. I am happy to be identified with legislation to help bring this about, but we all know that legislation alone is not enough. Prejudices based upon race, creed, or ethnic origin do not yield to law or to reason. They can be overcome only by a fundamental change in the hearts of men. A great writer of the last century summed the matter up when he said that the greatest single need of modern society is "the consciousness that our well-being, both material and spiritual, lies in the growth of brotherhood among all men and in their harmony with one another."

This may sound very idealistic, but I believe that without the struggle to reach such an ideal on the part of all Americans, the essence of our goal as a free people will be lost. It is a direct contradiction of the whole spirit of the American Revolution and the true meaning of our history when group prejudices are, for example, permitted to dictate the choice of candidates for public office.

Anyone who takes the trouble to study the course of our national growth can see how the evil of groupism has grown up among us. Each succeeding wave of immigration, from the earliest colonists to the most recent arrivals, helped to build this country's greatness. Yet the newest group of immigrants, wherever they came from, always is tended to be looked down upon. Seeking freedom from tyranny and want, they were, at first, willing to accept low wages and perform the most menial tasks, just for the privilege of living in America.

Here in Rhode Island, early in this century, laboring men and their families who had come here from abroad experienced housing segregation and many other social restrictions. It is no wonder that group differences based upon language, religion, and national origin developed. The various ethnic groups were, in effect, forced into competition with one another. They had to seek recognition by the combined force of their numbers.

The America of those earlier days was sometimes described as a "melting pot" of all nations. There was necessarily a good deal of heat and friction generated by the melting process, but as we look about us at the modern scene, I believe that we can say that we have reached a stage where the heat of group conflicts and competitions must be steadily diminished by a greater and more mature sense of our national unity.

Our influence abroad, especially among the newly developing nations, will be measured to a great degree by our ability to attain this sense of national unity at home. And our national defense itself cannot be separated from the firm foundation which such unity alone can provide.

Even the conquest of space cannot be regarded as of greater importance than the conquest of the unreasoning fears and competitive suspicions which create conflicts between ethnic groups in our own land. Here is a civic responsibility which no good American can rightly avoid. It rests upon those of us who are directly responsible for the conduct of public affairs. But it is equally the concern of every citizen, and especially of those who, like the members of this graduating class, will guide the destinies of our State and Nation in the future.

Young people today are being called upon to volunteer their energy and their skill for the work of the Peace Corps, and I certainly hope that some of you graduates have given this matter your most serious consideration. But I would like to suggest that each one of you is needed, in whatever work you may undertake, to join the company of men and women of good will who are doing all that they can to promote peace, justice, and a true fraternal charity among all Americans.

We need young people who are not indifferent to those areas of conflict where the democratic ideal of the common brotherhood of men is being tried and tested in American life today. Of course, we need mature political leadership which will not consider ethnic origins as a basis for determining fitness for public office. But political leaders are, of necessity, responsive to the expressed will of the people. For that reason, I believe that we will be well on the way to overcoming the injustices of group discrimination only when the majority of the people make it clear that they intend to vote for or against candidates on the basis of their records and abilities rather than on the basis of who their grandfathers happen to have been. We cannot be ruled by our ancestors. We have to govern ourselves in the light of our own best judgment.

There is, of course, a sense in which each of us should respect and value the national origins from which his own family may have come. If there are some things in the past which are better forgotten, we all have something of which we can nevertheless be justly proud. When the King of Belgium addressed a joint session of Congress last year, he remarked that America is not so much a melting pot as it is a mosaic, "for in it each nation, people or race which has come to its shores has been privileged to keep its individuality, contributing at the same time its share to the unified pattern of a new nation."

The beauty of any mosaic arises from the arrangement of each of its many pieces. Where one piece is missing, the design is broken. But the practical strength of the mosaic is in the cement which holds all of it together. We in America need and desire the rich variety of the distinguishing features of the various ethnic groups in our population. But in the mosaic of our national life we also need to make sure that the cement of American unity, which binds us all together, is not only strong but kept in good repair.

I am, as I feel sure each one of you is, justly proud of my own ancestral background. I have never thought it necessary or proper for any American to lack respect for the traditions of his own family or the accomplishments of other nations with which he has ties of blood. By the same token, I would have an equal respect for the traditions and beliefs of others and seek to improve my understanding of them.

It is in this mutual respect and understanding that all Americans must come together to meet the issues of our times. I am greatly encouraged by such things as the work of the Women's Conference on Intergroup Relations here in Rhode Island. This group, now sponsored by 66 organizations of Rhode Island women, will be holding its second annual meeting at Brown University this coming Sunday and Monday. The integrity of communication between groups is of the very heart of democracy, and that is what these Rhode Island women's organizations are seeking to achieve. As one of their leaders put it, "If we can establish lines of communication, we can break down some of the barriers."

Whenever in the past our country has been attacked by a foreign enemy, all of us have put aside ethnic distinctions to defend this good land. The bombing of Pearl Harbor, for example, was a simple challenge which all could understand. What we must get firmly in mind now is the fact that the complex operations of communism all over the world are, in the last analysis, no less of an attack upon all that we stand for and believe in. This means that the process by which old group prejudices are being overcome must be greatly speeded up. Whatever divides Americans deeply against one another cannot but serve the cause of their enemies.

The members of this graduating class will, we all hope, grow to the fullness of maturity in a country where their opportunities will not be dependent upon ethnic distinctions, a country made strong against every adversary by the inner harmony of all its many people. They themselves can help to make it so by their own efforts and attitudes, but all of us must share that responsibility, not only with them but with all the young people of America. More than ever before, our country today needs the best that each of her children can bring to her. Let no barriers of group prejudice bar the way. The well-known words of Lincoln carry the same simple truth today; the house we live in must stand united if it is to stand at all.

National Library of Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, last month the new National Library of Medicine in Bethesda, Md., was dedicated in ceremonies which included an address by the Honorable LISTER HILL, senior Senator from Alabama. This great Library represents a monumental step forward in the progress of men in mobilizing the resources of the mind and intellect.

The National Capital, the seat of American Government and the center of the free world, also merits a great reputation for its growing scientific academic and intellectual community. The dedication of this Library adjacent to the National Institutes of Health and the National Naval Medical Center in Montgomery County, Md., is an additional asset enhancing the reputation of Metropolitan Washington as a leading center of medical knowledge.

The dedication ceremonies were attended by many of the men and women who have made this new Library a reality and who will put its facilities to work. Taking part in the dedication ceremonies were Dr. Worth B. Daniels, Chairman, Board of Regents; the Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; Senator Hill; His Excellency Alexis S. Liatis, Ambassador of the Royal Greek Government; and Dr. Frank B. Rogers, Director of the National Medical Library.

I am privileged to append in the RECORD of the House the remarks these gentlemen made in connection with the dedication of the National Library of Medicine:

DEDICATION CEREMONIES, NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE, DECEMBER 14, 1961

(Remarks of Dr. Worth B. Daniels, Chairman of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, presiding)

(National anthem and invocation.)

Today we come together to dedicate a great new facility for the greatest medical library in the world, the National Library of Medicine. By happy circumstance, we are also celebrating the 125th anniversary of the institution founded in 1836 by the Surgeon General of the Army, Dr. Joseph Lovell.

The Library has had many homes during its lifetime—during the Civil War in rented rooms over the old Riggs Bank Building, then in the old Ford Theater Building, and since 1887 in the red brick building on the Mall. Now at long last the Library has a magnificent new home commensurate with its impressive programs. It is a matter of profound regret that construction has been delayed and that the building is incomplete and unfinished at this time. The actual move of library collections and operations probably cannot be completed before early spring. In the name of the Board of Regents, I call upon all those whose responsibility it is to oversee construction to see to it that this building is completed and made ready for occupancy at the earliest possible date.

We have received many messages of congratulations on this occasion from all over America and from all over the world. I cannot read them all, but there is one which I want to share with you. It is from the President of the United States, who because of the pressure of world affairs is unable to be with us on this occasion. He has written as follows:

"The dedication of the new National Library of Medicine perpetuates a distinguished history extending back to the early days of our Nation. This enterprise has my congratulations and best wishes for a new era of outstanding service to medical knowledge throughout America and around the world.

"JOHN F. KENNEDY."

For the last 10 years I have been more or less intimately associated with this Library. This has been a memorable experience, one which I am proud to have been privileged to share with many people on this platform and in this audience. It is a pleasure, on behalf of the Board of Regents, to extend our thanks to all those who have supported this institution through the years, to all those who fought the good fight and never gave up hope, to all those whose counsel served so well in planning and in bringing to fruition the programs which contribute to the Library's greatness, to all those whose efforts are imbedded in the very fabric of the Library's structure.

Many of these people are here today; I wish I could introduce them all, but obviously I cannot do that; the list is a long one.

The distinguished group at the rear of the platform is the present membership of the Board of Regents. I shall introduce by name only two of them, to represent them all.

Lt. Gen. Leonard D. Heaton, the Surgeon General of the U.S. Army. If the Army had not carefully nurtured this library for over 100 years, we would have little to celebrate today.

Dr. Luther L. Terry, the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service. Dr. Terry heads the Service which is now responsible for the stewardship of the library's activities.

We have with us today the Representative in Congress of the Sixth District, Maryland, the district in which the library makes its new home: Congressman CHARLES MATHIAS, Jr.

(Introduction of distinguished physicians and librarians.)

The Secretary of a great Department of the Federal Government is at once the most enviable and the most unenviable of men—enviable for the vast opportunities for service which are his, unenviable for the harassment and punishing load of work which he must carry. I am proud to introduce to you a great Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, a man who serves his country with passion and skill, and who does not wince at the burden. I give you the Honorable Abraham Ribicoff.

ADDRESS BY ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, DELIVERED AT DEDICATION OF NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE, BETHESDA, MD., THURSDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1961

"With pleasure and pride, I greet you on behalf of the President of the United States.

"When he was serving in the Senate, the President coauthored with the distinguished Senator from Alabama the legislation which authorized the construction of this building. And he retains a very great personal interest in this library which enriches our lives, which contributes to our growing intellectual heritage, and which improves worldwide communication in the sciences and humanities.

"We all are proud today.

"We are proud that the National Library of Medicine is part of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We are proud of the contributions of the Department to the library's development. We are proud of the interest and devotion of the Board of Regents, the library's director and staff, and its many friends who have worked so hard to make their dream a reality. We are proud for the American people in this great national resource for the public health and the advancement of medical science.

"One hundred and twenty-five years ago, as one of his last official acts, Dr. Joseph Lovell, Surgeon General of the U.S. Army, authorized a budget item which called for '$150 for medical books.' Thus simply and modestly began the amassing of the great collection which is today the National Library of Medicine. This country owes a great debt to Dr. Lovell and to generations of Army officers who followed him for their vision and perseverance.

"Great research and teaching libraries do not drop full grown from the vine. They require long, hard years of nurture—in the gathering of materials, in the assembling of a skilled staff, in the development of a wide range of facilities for the people who use the library.

"We say 'well done' to all who have carried on and who have added to the library's stature. We hope that during the next hundred years we can carry out our responsibilities with equal success.

"That will be no easy task. Medical literature has grown at an enormous rate. In the 82 years since the 'Index Medicus' was begun, the periodical literature of medicine has multiplied sixfold. There is no doubt that it will increase still further as research expands and as medical care is brought to more and more people.

"Undoubtedly librarians must occasionally wonder, in despair, how soon the time will come, as predicted by Harvey Cushing 35 years ago, 'when every tree has been felled for paper, every calf for leather, and the few long-haired and ill-nourished people left in the world will be madly making card indices of the volumes which have filled every available cranny in which they can be stored.'

"But this—or something like this—is what an institution such as the National Library of Medicine must anticipate and plan for. It must make room for an ever-growing body of knowledge. And this is why a new building, designed with an eye to the future, was such a necessity.

"In thinking about this library, I was reminded of a phrase used by the talented producing director of Arena Stage, to describe their just completed new building—'the enclosing of an idea.'

"The structure we dedicate today, like the Arena Stage, encloses an idea. This idea is nothing less than the condition of man.

This idea is a living fund of knowledge, serving health workers everywhere.

"This idea is a permanent home—of the highest quality, the finest design, furnished and equipped to meet the most modern library standards—for the world's greatest collection of medical literature.

"When we think of a library, we tend to think of a repository, a storehouse. The picture in our mind is static.

"Actually, the key to greatness in libraries is movement. The most important thing about a library is not what is there but how it is used. The great library is not a hoard of knowledge but a relay station. It is more a transmitter than a receiver.

"The National Library of Medicine has passed this test of greatness with high honors. Someone has called a specialized library such as this one 'the collective memory of the profession.' Like a human memory, it sorts, sifts, analyzes, and recalls information in a purposeful way.

"The statistics on quantity and variety of materials received here are impressive, but the statistics on materials disseminated are more meaningful. Every month, despite cramped and archaic facilities in the old building, the library staff has answered more than 10,000 separate requests.

"Each of these requests comes here because this is the best—very often the only—source. Let us consider a few.

"Researchers are designing an elaborate and complex study on a form of heart disease. Thanks to this library, they learn of work reported only in an obscure European journal, in a language familiar to none of them, which enables them to redesign their project, eliminate an area already explored, concentrate on another.

"A medical educator is in process of developing a brandnew course in a swiftly evolving specialty. Thanks to this library, his students will receive the essence of the world's total knowledge on the subject.

"A surgeon, thanks to this library, learns of a refinement of a technique with which he saves a life.

"A practitioner, thanks to this library, is able to treat a patient suffering from a disease rarely seen in our country.

"A scientist, thanks to this library, takes one clue from an Indian medical journal, another from a Greek periodical, adds them to his own experience, and pioneers an entire line of investigation.

"The National Library of Medicine broadcasts thousands of capsules of knowledge every year. Who can say where and when the vibrations stop? Who can say how many lives are touched and prolonged?

"What is more, the improvement of medical communication is high on the list of this library's objectives. A few months ago, for example, the library proposed, and I approved, a project to develop a computer-based system for its bibliographical services. Known as MEDLARS (for Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System) it will make use of the latest electronic equipment. A pioneering venture in the library field, it will be designed to process several hundred thousand pieces of bibliographic information each year. I understand that in response to a specific request for publications on a single disease category, MEDLARS will be able to sort out and reproduce a list chosen from over a million possible articles in a very short time.

"Of course, it will take a few years to develop, install, and test the new system. But this is the kind of operation that the new building is designed for and that the library staff plans to stimulate.

"Obviously the National Library of Medicine, an ancient institution by American standards, is still lively, still growing, still vigorous, ready to point the way through the jungle of medical publications. And it is ready also to think of new ways to dispense our greatest export—the export of knowledge and ideas.

"As a layman, may I say the prognosis for the next 100 years seems good.

"Mr. Chairman, congratulations to you and the present and past members of the Board of Regents who worked so hard to give the library this fine new home. Congratulations also to the farsighted legislators who here demonstrated their concern for the progress of medical research, medical education, and medical care. And congratulations to the members of the health professions on the rebirth of this marvelous facility, which belongs to them.

"And I say to the staff of the library: You have our best wishes. You carry our high expectations as you set about your tasks in this new building whose simple elegance of structure embodies at once the great importance and the social usefulness of your work to our country and to all mankind."

When, 5 years ago, the legislation which reestablished this library and which assured the construction of this new building was finally passed, it was all but inevitable that the sponsor of that legislation would be the senior Senator from Alabama. No man of our generation, no man in the history of this Nation, has done so much in fashioning the legislative bases on which major advances in health are structured. I give you Senator LISTER HILL, who will present the dedication address.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LISTER HILL, NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE DEDICATION, DECEMBER 14, 1961, NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH, BETHESDA, MD.

"On this now hallowed ground that only a quarter of a century ago was a sleepy Maryland farm we are assembled today to dedicate the new home of the National Library of Medicine.

"Although this library has been in existence for 125 years, it now takes its appropriate place among this great complex of buildings devoted to the pursuit of medical research and to the prolongation of human life.

"Five years ago, in reporting the legislation creating a National Library of Medicine, the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee summed up its importance in these words:

"'The United States of America is the fortunate possessor of the greatest library of medicine in the world. The value of its contents is truly incalculable in that if they were once destroyed they could never be replaced. Its importance is immeasurable in that its services are essential to men and women engaged in medical research throughout the world; to our medical and dental schools; to practitioners in the health fields throughout America; to scientists, to scholars, to public health workers and hospital administrators, and to our departments of Government.'

"But the library is more than this—it is the repository of medical knowledge painstakingly accumulated over the ages. Each stone of this great edifice of knowledge is solidly rooted upon the fundamental architecture of the past.

"John Morley, in his life of Gladstone, wrote that 'every man of us has all the centuries in him.' By the same token, every book in this library bears the invisible imprint of the timeless quest for medical knowledge.

"From the ancient papyri of Egypt, through the first crude anatomical drawings of the Greeks, to the early printed volumes in Europe runs the steady stream of man's slow acquisition of knowledge concerning the human anatomy and the diseases which plague it.

"There is much heartbreak in this story, for the pronouncement of new theories always runs hard into the entrenched wall of the past. A William Harvey ridiculed for his pioneer description of the circulation of the blood; a Semmelweis hounded into insanity by his colleagues who scorned his insistence upon antisepsis in childbirth; the early surgeons of America stoned by an indignant populace for dissecting cadavers in order to probe the mysteries of anatomy—these are but a few examples of the heroic struggles which led to the medical progress we celebrate today.

"In our present age of rapid communication we sometimes fail to realize how difficult, even a century ago, the transmission of medical knowledge was.

"My father, a surgeon and practitioner of medicine for more than half a century, once illustrated the importance of such chance transmission of knowledge by telling me how in 1864 Joseph Lister, then at the University of Glasgow, when walking home with the professor of chemistry, Thomas Anderson, heard of certain papers on fermentation and putrefaction which had been recently published by a then little known French chemist, Louis Pasteur.

"Lister read these medical publications and found himself convinced that minute living particles floating in the air often turned the surgery of his day into a charnel house.

"This casual meeting with Anderson, plus the reading of a medical article on carbolic acid, led in 1867 to Lister's laying down the great principles of the modern treatment of wounds.

"Although the vast expanses once separating the countries of the world have been greatly reduced through the advances of modern transportation and communications, the chance transmission of medical knowledge is still an occasional and wondrous phenomenon.

"One night in 1949, in a Boston medical library, a prominent cardiologist read a paper by an Indian physician on the tranquilizing effects of an ancient Indian snakeroot plant. Although this snakeroot plant had been used in India over the centuries for a wide variety of illnesses—epilepsy, insomnia, mental illness—it was practically unknown to the Western World until the publication in 1949 of a scientific article on it in a British medical journal. So a chain of tenuous events across thousands of miles and hundreds of years opened the way to the present development of reserpine, which is today one of the most effective tranquilizing agents against hypertension and several forms of mental illness.

"In this connection, it is interesting that the staff of the National Library of Medicine has reported that modern researchers borrow a great deal of older material: the rare books, the publications from remote portions of the globe, and in many foreign tongues.

"As Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote, not all of the old literature of medicine is dead and not all the dead literature is old.

"Without the resources of this great library, the research which the Government is undertaking to aid its citizens to aid all mankind would, we might say, be tragically delayed. Research men might unwittingly do again what some research worker had many years ago done in a faraway land; all available pieces of information might not be brought to bear on current problems.

"This library is the collective memory of mankind. Its purpose is to provide and maintain the record, for in a fundamental sense it is the guardian of the research results that may be fruitfully exploited and incorporated in new efforts, new problems, and new achievements.

"Above and beyond its task of carefully preserving the archives of medicine, the National Library of Medicine has the obligation of bringing the right medical book into the hands of the medical man at the right time. This it undertakes in its bibliographic publications, its Index Medicus, its catalogs and its other guides to the literature.

"In recent decades, as the stream of medical publications cascaded into a flood, the library faced the challenge of developing new methods to digest this knowledge and make it rapidly available to the medical profession. Under forward-looking leadership, it has adapted a number of high-speed electronic machines to cope with the avalanche of medical literature. I am told that new electronic and computer developments just over the horizon will provide additional keys to unlocking the precious treasures piled upon the miles and miles of its shelves.

"It is most appropriate that this great library does now reside in close union with the National Institutes of Health.

"Over the past quarter century, these Institutes have been expanded into what is the world's largest research center dedicated to a mighty offensive against the many diseases which beset the family of many. This great complex of buildings is a magnificent affirmation of our country's dedication to the alleviation of the sufferings of people—not only in America, but in all parts of the world.

"Today the National Institutes of Health is the Mecca of medicine—the scientific shrine to which medical men from all parts of the world make pilgrimages each year. It stands today as a physical reminder of the truly international nature of medicine, for as the great Pasteur once wrote:

" 'Science does not belong to any country, because knowledge is a patrimony of humanity.'

"In the dissemination of this precious knowledge, the National Library of Medicine plays a vital role. In a discussion with John Shaw Billings, one of the original founders of the library, a colleague remarked:

" 'Libraries are quite as necessary as hospitals, or armies. Libraries are the bridges over which civilization travels from generation to generation and from country to country.'

"Many of the building blocks of our civilization will be preserved here, and the record will celebrate man's eternal quest for knowledge. As John Milton so aptly said:

" 'A good book is the precious lifeblood of a master spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life.'

"We stand at the threshold of a mighty era—a golden age of medicine. May I predict that, within a relatively few short years, the world will see a monentous breakthrough of medical knowledge that will enable us to to overcome many of the dread diseases that have plagued and baffled man through the ages. There is reason for confidence that this breakthrough will yield many answers in the battle against heart disease, cancer, mental illness and other crippling and degenerative diseases.

"In this present time of seemingly interminable crises, when we hear much, too much of the forces of destruction, it rekindles our spirit and faith to draw refreshment from the deep well of the past in venerating the memory of those who have through the centuries dedicated themselves to improving the lot of man.

"In the last decade of the 19th century, in the preparation of his monumental 14-volume Practice of Medicine, the eminent physician and renowned scholar Sir William Osler drew extensively upon the riches of this library. Let his words speak to us this day:

" 'We are here to add what we can to, not to get what we can from, life'

"To you librarians who are the heirs of the inspired founders of the National Library of Medicine, those immortals, John Shaw Billings, Robert Fletcher and Fielding H. Garrison, to you who are the guardians of this knowledge which has been accumulated over the centuries, and to you whose proud task it will be to preserve and enshrine the advances of tomorrow we at this hour turn over this manificent building which will be a repository of ancient truths and future discoveries. May your beacon light ever be those words of beauty, those words of profound meaning from the Old Testament:

" 'Great is truth and mighty above all things.' "

The history of medicine, as Senator Hill has so well indicated, is a proud history, and we of the medical professions cherish it. We cherish it not least for the humanistic insights which it fosters, and for the glimpses into the whole development of our Western civilization which it affords, and often epitomizes. We are happy today to remember that the cradle of that civilization was in Greece. And we are happy to have with us the Ambassador of the Royal Greek Government, His Excellency Alexis S. Liatis, who will make a presentation on behalf of his government.

(Presentation of cutting from Hippocrates oriental plane tree on the Island of Cos.)

ADDRESS BY ALEXIS S. LIATIS, AMBASSADOR OF GREECE, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE NEW NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE BUILDING AT THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH, BETHESDA, MD., DECEMBER 14, 1961

"It is a privilege to attend this ceremony and, on behalf of the town of Cos, formally present to the National Library of Medicine this cutting from the venerable plane tree under whose shade, according to legend, Hippocrates—the father of medicine—examined his patients and taught his students some 25 centuries ago.

"This ancient tree of Hippocrates is an imposing sight in the main square of Cos. With a circumference of nearly 50 feet, it is said to be one of the oldest and largest living trees in Europe. Its heavy branches extend in all directions around it and pillars have been built to support their weight.

"The town of Cos, with a population of about 10,000, is the capital of the Dodecanese Island of Cos, which lies in the southeast of the Aegean Sea. A prosperous port in antiquity, it was also a center of health and medicine by reason of its salubrious climate and its renowned ferrous and sulphuric springs. Among the other centers of medical science in the Greek world of the fifth century B.C., notably those of Cnidus in the nearby island of Rhodes, Crotona in Italy and also Sicily, Cos achieved the greatest fame as the birthplace and home of Hippocrates.

"Under the leadership of this great master, Greek medicine was freed from the mysticism of the past with its reliance in supernatural forces as well as from the doctrinaire approach of philosophical theory, and developed a new system based on scientific observation and experiment.

" 'Every illness,' declared Hippocrates, 'has a natural cause; and without natural causes, nothing ever happens.' Great stress was laid on the examination of pathological symptoms. Every part of the patient's body would be examined thoroughly; the symptoms of the illness would be carefully observed and compared with those of other recorded cases. When all the evidence had been gathered and evaluated, the physician would proceed to diagnosis and treatment satisfied that he had done his best and could now make a reasonably accurate prognostication as to the future course of the disease. The object was 'to say what has been, to know what is, and to predict what will be.'

"Great emphasis was also laid on hygiene, proper body care, and diet. If necessary, and only then, the Hippocratic physician would resort to drugs, cuttings, and cauterizing.

"Hippocrates' teachings are preserved in what is known today as the 'Hippocratic Collection,' a group of about 70 treatises on various medical subjects. Experts theorize that these treatises are the work of many authors; they even classify them into three distinct schools. Seven or eight of these treatises, however, can be readily recognized as the product of genius. Their authorship is attributed either to Hippocrates or to his closest disciples.

"The achievements of the medical scientists of Hippocrates' era are remarkable, particularly if one considers the limited means at their disposal and the fact that dissection was prohibited by the morals of their time. Indeed, it took mankind several centuries to advance medicine beyond the stage where Hippocrates and his contemporaries left it.

"The most enduring contribution of Hippocrates, however, is the spirit of humanity which he imbued into medicine and the high standards of ethics and devotion to duty which he set for the medical profession.

"An international foundation dedicated to the father of modern medicine was established at his birthplace a little over a year ago. It is the International Hippocratic Foundation of Cos, a private nonprofit organization. Its charter was unanimously endorsed by the delegates to the XVII International Congress on the History of Medicine held in Athens and Cos in September 1960.

"The principal objective of the foundation is to create in the island of Cos an international medical center of research and study based on the humanitarian principles of the Hippocratic philosophy and combining the spectacular achievements of modern medical science with the Hippocratic emphasis on clinical observation and close personal relationship between patient and physician.

"The International Hippocratic Foundation of Cos aspires also to operate at its International Medical Center at Cos a permanent medical seminary for students sent there on a scholarship basis from all parts of the world. Distinguished professors of medicine from all countries will be invited to teach. The foundation also plans to convene at Cos every 5 years an international conference for the discussion of medical scientific and professional subjects.

"The foundation is administered by an international general committee composed of university professors of medical history and by an executive council whose five members are elected. Physicians from all over the world are invited to become members. No membership dues are required. Only a nominal amount of one-third of a dollar is collected as registration fee.

"In concluding I should like to say that I think it is extremely fitting that this cutting from Hippocrates' venerable tree is to be planted here on the grounds of the new building of the National Library of Medicine. This act, I believe, transcends the limits of a mere act of homage to medical history. It is actually a symbolic recognition of the leading role this great country is playing today in the ever continuing struggle to relieve human suffering and to free man from the scourge of disease and pain.

"The torch of pioneering in medical science which was lit on the little island of

Cos 2,500 years ago has now passed on to this country. Hippocrates, I am sure, would agree, as the citizens of Cos do agree, that it is in strong and able hands."

Thank you, Ambassador Liatis. In the spring we will plant this tree on the beautiful grounds outside this building. May this tree and this library flourish together for a thousand years and more, and may the long future be as great as the splendid past.

You have all received as a memento of this occasion a facsimile copy of the first catalog of the library. Another important catalog was published by the library last week. It is Early American Medical Imprints, 1668–1820, by Robert B. Austin. This impressive catalog lists 2,100 books which might be described as the medical incunabula of this country. I commend it to your attention.

I am happy to announce that the 1775 first edition of John Jones' Plain concise practical remarks on the treatment of wounds and fractures has recently been presented to the library through the generosity of Dr. D. Rees Jensen of New York City. This is one of seven copies of this work known still to exist. To all the book collectors in this audience I may add the gentle hint that I hope this gift marks the beginning of a trend.

We have also received a very fine gift from Dr. Chauncey D. Leake, in the form of personal papers and correspondence with many people who have made significant contributions to medical history. Materials of this kind are an important adjunct to the library's collections, and surely this library provides their most fitting and suitable home.

(Announcements and benediction.)

DEDICATION CEREMONIES, NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1961, 3 P.M.–FRIDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1961, 10 A.M.

PROGRAM

Thursday, December 14, 1961, 3 p.m.

Presiding: Dr. Worth B. Daniels, Chairman, Board of Regents.

Invocation: The Reverend William R. Andrew, Chaplain, Clinical Center, National Institutes of Health.

Address: The Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Dedication Address: The Honorable LISTER HILL, U.S. Senator, Alabama.

Presentation: His Excellency Alexis S. Liatis, Ambassador of the Royal Greek Government.

Benediction: Maj. Gen. Frank A. Tobey, Chief of Chaplains, U.S. Army.

Music by the U.S. Army Band, commanded by Lt. Col. Hugh Curry.

Friday, December 25, 1961
10 a.m.

Presiding, Dr. Frank B. Rogers, Director, National Library of Medicine.

"The Military Tradition of the National Library of Medicine," Maj. Gen. Joseph H. McNinch, chief surgeon, U.S. Army, Europe.

"Medical Librarianship in the United States," Miss Gertrude L. Annan, president, Medical Library Association.

"The Building Arts in the Service of Librarianship," Dr. Carl W. Condit, professor of humanities and English, Northwestern University.

"History, Science, and Librarianship," Dr. Chauncey D. Leake, president, American Association for the History of Medicine.

"Physicians and Books," Dr. William B. Bean, professor of medicine, University of Iowa.

"Three Who Made the Library":

J. S. Billings, Dr. Frank B. Rogers.

Robert Fletcher, Dr. Estelle Brodman, librarian, Washington University School of Medicine.

F. H. Garrison, Dr. Dorothy M. Schullian, curator of history of science collections, Cornell University.

BOARD OF REGENTS, NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

Dr. Norman Q. Brill, Los Angeles, Calif.

Dr. Harve J. Carlson, National Science Foundation.

Dr. Worth B. Daniels, Washington, D.C.

Lt. Gen. L. D. Heaton, U.S. Army.

Dr. Maynard K. Hine, Indianapolis, Ind.

Dr. Hugh H. Hussey, Jr., Washington, D.C.

Dr. Saul W. Jarcho, New York, N.Y.

Rear Adm. E. C. Kenney, U.S. Navy.

Mr. Thomas E. Keys, Rochester, Minn.

Dr. William S. Middleton, Veterans' Administration.

Dr L. Quincy Mumford, Library of Congress.

Maj. Gen. O. C. Niess, U.S. Air Force.

Dr. Robert M. Stecher, Cleveland, Ohio.

Dr. Luther L. Terry, Public Health Service.

Dr. William L. Valk, Kansas City, Kans.

Dr. Theodore R. Van Dellen, Chicago, Ill.

Dr. Warner L. Wells, Chapel Hill, N.C.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Father of us all, whose mercy is like the wideness of the sea, Thou art never far from any one of us; but, alas, often in our thoughts we are very far from Thee.

Take Thou the dimness of our souls away. May we be of the company of whom it can be said: "They looked unto Him and were radiant and their faces were not ashamed."

It is in Thy light that we become honest with ourselves. Before the bar of our conscience may we esteem faithfulness above the praise of our fellows.

Save us from the shirked responsibility, the easy falsehood, and the unfair retort. Arm us with the power to resist entrenched error, vested selfishness, and the attempt to smear others by unreasoning prejudice.

Across the debris of ancient wrongs may our glad eyes see the coming of the glory, as selfish exploitation in all the earth makes way for brotherhood and for man.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 23, 1962, was dispensed with.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 23, 1962,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore on January 24, 1962, signed the enrolled bill (H.R. 8847) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that a distribution of stock made to an individual (or certain corporations) pursuant to an order enforcing the antitrust laws shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital; and to provide that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 315)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, 81st Congress, I transmit herewith the 11th Annual Report of the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 25, 1962.*

REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL EXCHANGE AND TRADE FAIR PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1956—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 9 of Public Law 860 of the 84th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the 10th semiannual report of operations under the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 25, 1962.*

REPORT RELATING TO RECENT LABOR DISPUTE IN MARITIME INDUSTRY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, I am reporting to the Congress about the recent labor dispute in the maritime industry.

A strike took place at 12:01 a.m., June 16, 1961. Although only the ships in port and the employees on such ships were immediately affected, the dispute involved virtually all American shipping companies, some 70,000 employees and about 900 ships, and affected the trade and commerce of every Atlantic, Pacific, and gulf port in the United States.

On June 26, by Executive Order 10949, I established a Board of Inquiry, consisting of the Honorable David Cole, Chairman, Judge Samuel I. Rosenman, and Prof. James J. Healy, to inquire into the issues involved in the dispute and report to me on or before June 30, in accordance with the provisions of section 206 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended. I subsequently extended the time for the submission of the initial report of the Board of Inquiry to July 3.

That report concisely presented the facts with respect to the dispute and the positions of the parties as required by law.

On July 3, acting on my instruction, the Attorney General filed a petition in the District Court for the Southern District of New York seeking an injunction against the continuance of the strike. A hearing was held on the Government's motion for a temporary restraining order on July 3, and the court, after finding that the strike affected a substantial portion of the maritime industry, and that it would imperil the national health and safety if permitted to continue, temporarily restrained the strike activities until July 8. A stay of that order sought immediately by the unions was denied by Circuit Judge Clark. (*United States* v. *National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, et al.*, 292 F. 2d 190, CA 2, July 8, 1961.)

A hearing was held on the Government's motion for a preliminary injunction on July 7, and the temporary restraining order was extended until July 12. Two days before this order was to expire, the court found that it had been "abundantly and overwhelmingly established" that the strike was affecting a substantial portion of the industry, and if permitted to continue would imperil the national health and safety. In addition, it rejected the contention of the National Maritime Engineers' Beneficial Association and the International Organization of Masters, Mates, and Pilots that, because their membership consists of "supervisors," their participation in the strike could not be enjoined. (*United States* v. *National Maritime Union of America, et al.*, 196 F. Supp. 374, S.D. N.Y., July 10, 1961.)

The unions appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, which, in an opinion issued August 22d, affirmed the lower court's decision. (*United States* v. *National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, et al.*, 294 F. 2d 385 CA 2.)

Pursuant to section 209(b) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, as amended, I reconvened the Board of Inquiry. The Board held meetings with the parties and obtained the information required for its further report of the current position of the parties and the efforts which had been made for settlement, including a statement by each party of its position and a statement of the employer's last offer of settlement. This final report of the Board of Inquiry was submitted to me September 1.

On September 25, the Attorney General moved the district court to discharge the injunction, which motion the court that day granted effective September 21.

I am happy to report that settlements were reached by all parties to the dispute.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 25, 1962.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2470) to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. O'BRIEN of New York, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. CHENOWETH were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7927) to adjust postal rates, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 7927) to adjust postal rates, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

METRO HOLOVACHKA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to yield at this time to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] for the presentation of a matter which I have discussed with the distinguished acting minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution for which I request immediate consideration. The resolution would authorize a former member of the staff of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field to testify in a criminal case pending before the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, which grew out of an investigation by the select committee.

As you know, Mr. President, the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of the Committee on Government Operations, of which I am chairman, has in its possession, by virtue of Senate Resolution 255, section 5, 86th Congress, the files of the select committee. The files contain certain evidence relating to Metro Holovachka, former prosecuting attorney of Lake County, Ind., who has been charged with Federal income tax evasion. Holovachka's trial is scheduled to commence January 29, 1962.

The U.S. Department of Justice has advised that the testimony of Mr. Richard G. Sinclair, formerly a member of the staff of the select committee, will be required at the coming trial. Furthermore, certain evidence contained in the former select committee files will be needed.

The resolution which I am submitting would authorize former select committee staff member Sinclair to testify in the trial and to present certain evidence from the files of the select committee.

Mr. President, I may also state that I have consulted the leadership of both the majority and the minority; and, so far as I know, there is no objection to the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 274) was read and, without objection, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations has in its possession, by virtue of Senate Resolution 255, section 5, 86th Congress, certain evidence pertaining to an investigation dealing with Metro Holovachka, which investigation was conducted by the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field under Senate Resolution 44, 86th Congress; and

Whereas criminal action is pending in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Indiana against said Metro Holovachka, charging income tax evasion; and

Whereas the U.S. Department of Justice has advised that a criminal trial in the aforementioned matter is scheduled to commence January 29, 1962, in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Indiana; and

Whereas the U.S. Department of Justice has advised that at said criminal trial there will be required the introduction of certain evidence in the possession of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, as well as the testimony of Richard G. Sinclair, formerly an investigator for the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field and presently an investigator for the Special Federal-Aid Highway Program Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives, to appear and testify in the above proceedings; and

Whereas by the privileges of the Senate no Member or Senate employee is authorized to produce Senate documents but by order of the Senate: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations is granted leave to permit the copying and presentation of certain evidence for examination in connection with the aforementioned court case, the evidence thereupon to be returned to the possession of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations; and be it further

Resolved, That Richard G. Sinclair, former staff member of the said select committee, is authorized to appear and testify in the above-mentioned proceedings.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection with the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The **VICE PRESIDENT** laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Reserve Officers' Training Corps Flight Training Program

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps flight training program, for the period January 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Federal Contributions

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, on Federal contributions, for the quarter ended September 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amendment of Section 7608 of Internal Revenue Code of 1954, Relating to Authority of Internal Revenue Enforcement Officers

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 7608 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to authority of internal revenue enforcement officers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

Report on Balances of Foreign Currencies Acquired Without Payment of Dollars

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a semiannual consolidated report of balances of foreign currencies acquired without payment of dollars, as of June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Appointment of Acting Secretaries for Guam and the Virgin Islands

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 8 of the Organic Act of Guam and section 15 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, to provide for appointment of Acting Secretaries for such territories under certain conditions (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Refugees Under Displaced Persons Program

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, reporting, pursuant to law, on refugees under the displaced persons program, for the period July 1, 1961, through December 31, 1961 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Tort Claims Paid by Government Printing Office

A letter from the Public Printer, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Government Printing Office, for the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Administration of Public Laws 874 and 815

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration of Public Laws 874 and 815, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the **VICE PRESIDENT**:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Concurrent Resolution 8

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to limit contributions to United Nations by the United States in proportion to its pro rata share based upon population, and to prohibit the United States from making any further loans by participating in the issuance or buying of any bonds issued by the United Nations

"Whereas from information deemed reliable, the expenditures of the United Nations from its beginning through the year 1960 totals approximately $3 billion, of which the United States contributed more than 47 percent; and

"Whereas on this date there are 104 members of the United Nations with a combined population of approximately 2 billion people, of which the United States has 180 million or approximately 9 percent of the total; and

"Whereas each member nation has one vote (except Russia which has three), which gives the United States only ninety-six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the votes in the United Nations, yet it is paying approximately 47 percent of the total expense, which is ridiculous out of all reasonable and equitable proportion on the basis of wealth or population; and

"Whereas for the Congress to permit the United States to be further burdened with such a disproportionate share of such expense is unfair, unreasonable, and inexcusable: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi (the Senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby urged to—

"Limit the contributions of the United States to the United Nations to an amount equal to its pro rata share of the expense based on the ratio which its population bears to the total population of the members of the United Nations; and

"That it prohibit the United States from participating in the issuance or the buying of any bonds to be issued by the United Nations; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Mississippi delegation in Congress, the Vice President of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, January 9, 1962.

"Walter Sillers,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the senate January 15, 1962.

"Paul B. Johnson,
"President of the Senate."

RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF AMERICAN SAMOA

Mr. **ANDERSON**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, enclosing a copy of a resolution adopted by the Legislature of American Samoa, be printed in the Record.

This statement pertains to the resolution adopted by the United Nations, relating to the "Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples."

I believe that the position taken by the representatives of the people of American Samoa is particularly significant, in view of the interest in this subject.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., January 22, 1982.

Hon. Clinton P. Anderson,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Anderson: Enclosed for your information are copies of a resolution setting forth the views of the Legislature of American Samoa with respect to the United Nations General Assembly Resolution 1514, a "Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples."

The legislature's resolution was adopted on December 6, 1961, and we believe you will be interested in the vote by which it was approved. In the senate there were 14 affirmative votes, none negative, and 1 member was absent. In the house of representatives there were 15 affirmative votes, none negative, and 2 members were absent.

Sincerely yours,

John A. Carver, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Senate Joint Resolution 10

Joint resolution regarding the declaration of the United Nations General Assembly regarding independence for colonial countries

Be it resolved by the Legislature of American Samoa, That it has carefully considered the declaration dated December 14, 1960, by the United Nations General Assembly regarding the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, and

Declares that—

1. The action in 1900 by the chiefs of Tutuila and Aunu'u, and in 1904 by King Tuimanu's and chiefs of Manu'a ceding jurisdiction over American Samoa to the United States of America was freely taken and represented the will of the people. We do not regard ourselves as a people subject to alien domination or exploitation.

2. There is no denial of freedom to the people of American Samoa which constitutes a serious threat to world peace.

3. There are no armed actions or repressive measures in American Samoa.

4. The people of American Samoa value their American nationality and do not desire to take any action that would weaken the relationship of the territory to the United States of America. If there is any doubt about the subject, the legislature would be glad to arrange, upon proper request, for a general plebescite at which a representative of the United Nations would be welcome as an observer.

Rapi Sotoa,
President of the Senate.
Muagutiti'a F. Tuia,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. **MANSFIELD**, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 234. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences to investigate matters pertaining to aeronautical and space activities of Federal departments and agencies (Rept. No. 1127);

S. Res. 238. Resolution extending time for filing a report by the Special Committee on Aging (Rept. No. 1128);

S. Res. 242. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction and authorizing certain expenditures therefor (Rept. No. 1129);

S. Res. 243. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Works to make a study of certain matters within its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 1130);

S. Res. 244. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters relating to public and private housing (Rept. No. 1131);

S. Res. 245. Resolution to print additional copies of hearings entitled "Relationship Between Teamsters Union and Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers" (Rept. No. 1150);

S. Res. 246. Resolution to authorize a continuing study of U.S. foreign policy (Rept. No. 1132);

S. Res. 247. Resolution to provide assistance to Members of the Senate in connection with interparliamentary activities and reception of foreign officials (Rept. No. 1133);

S. Res. 248. Resolution to print additional copies of Senate Document 59 of 87th Congress on "The Communist Party Line" (Rept. No. 1151);

S. Res. 249. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on Small Business (Rept. No. 1134);

S. Res. 250. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make certain studies as to the efficiency and economy of the operations of the Government (Rept. No. 1135);

S. Res. 252. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to employ temporarily an additional assistant chief clerk and additional staff and clerical personnel (Rept. No. 1136);

S. Res. 256. Resolution to study administrative practice and procedure (Rept. No. 1137);

S. Res. 257. Resolution to study revision and codification of the statutes of the United States (Rept. No. 1138);

S. Res. 258. Resolution to investigate antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States (Rept. No. 1139);

S. Res. 259. Resolution authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendments (Rept. No. 1140);

S. Res. 260. Resolution to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights (Rept. No. 1141);

S. Res. 261. Resolution to consider matters pertaining to Government charters, holidays, and celebrations (Rept. No. 1142);

S. Res. 262. Resolution to study and examine the Federal judicial system (Rept. No. 1143);

S. Res. 263. Resolution to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization (Rept. No. 1144);

S. Res. 264. Resolution to investigate the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act (Rept. No. 1145);

S. Res. 265. Resolution to investigate juvenile delinquency (Rept. No. 1146);

S. Res. 266. Resolution to investigate national penitentiaries (Rept. No. 1147);

S. Res. 267. Resolution to examine and review the administration of the Patent Office (Rept. No. 1148); and

S. Res. 270. Resolution to authorize a study by Committee on Armed Services on various areas of national defense (Rept. No. 1149).

By Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 233. Resolution to investigate, and make expenditures in connection with, certain matters within its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 1152).

By Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. Res. 269. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to conduct a national fuels and energy study (Rept. No. 1153).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 512. A bill to extend the time for completion of the free highway bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada (Rept. No. 1155).

HAZEL T. CLEM

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 277) to pay a gratuity to Hazel T. Clem; which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Hazel T. Clem, widow of T. Briley Clem, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to eight months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

VONDA P. BERGMAN

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 278) to pay a gratuity to Vonda P. Bergman, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Vonda P. Bergman, widow of Harold Bergman, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to nine and one-half months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ELMO W. KEEL

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 279) to pay a gratuity to Elmo W. Keel, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Elmo W. Keel, widower of Jessie L. Keel, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to eight and one-half months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

EDNA V. McLEOD

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 280) to pay a gratuity to Edna V. McLeod, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Edna V. McLeod, widow of Scott McLeod, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ALSON J. SMITH

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 281) to pay a gratuity to Alson J. Smith, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Alson J. Smith, widower of Mattie M. Smith, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to nine and one-half months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

THOMAS R. MASSEY

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 282) to pay a gratuity to Thomas R. Massey, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Thomas R. Massey, brother of James T. Massey, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ELIZABETH J. HEFNER

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 283) to pay a gratuity to Elizabeth J. Hefner, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Elizabeth J. Hefner, widow of Wilson C. Hefner, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

GERTRUDE S. FAUCETTE

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 284) to pay a gratuity to Gertrude S. Faucette, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Gertrude S. Faucette, widow of Andrew McC. Faucette, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ISOM HENDERSON AND PRUDENCE HENDERSON

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 285) to pay a gratuity to Isom Henderson and Prudence Henderson, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Isom Henderson, father, and Prudence Henderson, mother of William W. Henderson, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum to each equal to three months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION TO MAKE EXPENDITURES AND EMPLOY TEMPORARY PERSONNEL

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 286) authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration to make expenditures and to employ temporary personnel (Rept. No. 1154); which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress;

(2) corrupt practices;

(3) contested elections;

(4) credentials and qualifications;

(5) Federal elections generally; and

(6) Presidential succession.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $150,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO INTERAGENCY COORDINATION, ECONOMY, AND EFFICIENCY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, from the Senate Committee on Government Operations I report an original resolution to continue its authority for the study of "Inter-Agency Coordination, Economy, and Efficiency."

The committee approved the resolution unanimously on January 16. The resolution is identical to Senate Resolution 26, 87th Congress—except, of course, as to the date for the study. It provides the same amount of funds—$90,000—as was approved under Senate Resolution 26 and Senate Resolution 205 in the first session.

Under the previous study, we have achieved important results for the American taxpayer. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations which has conducted the study, I am today summarizing these achievements in a memorandum to the Committee on Rules.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed at this point in the Record and that the resolution be appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 276) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior concent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $90,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 2740. A bill to provide for the detention of certain mail matter determined to be Communist political propaganda; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bush when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2741. A bill to provide for the care and custody of dangerously insane persons acquitted of offenses against the United States solely by reason of insanity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2742. A bill to designate the lake formed by the Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia, as Lake Eufaula; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 2743. A bill for the relief of Molly Kwauk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2744. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JORDAN (for himself and Mr. Ervin):

S. 2745. A bill for the relief of Richard Shao-lin Lee and his wife, Grace Fu-hwa Tang Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2746. A bill for the relief of the State of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Moss, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Bible, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Allott, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Dworshak, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Church, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Symington, Mr. Magnuson, and Mr. Wiley):

S. 2747. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 2748. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain lands by the U.S. Government that have been flooded by the Ableman Dam and Whitewater Reservoir; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 2749. A bill to provide that diplomatic privileges and immunities shall not be granted within the territory of the United States to nationals of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Anderson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself, Mr. Carroll, and Mr. McNamara):

S. 2750. A bill to protect the right to vote in Federal elections free from arbitrary discrimination by literacy tests or other means.

(See the remarks of Mr. Mansfield when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

PRESENTATION OF EVIDENCE IN TRIAL OF METRO HOLOVACHKA

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 274) relative to the presentation of evidence in the trial of Metro Holovachka in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. McClellan, which appears under a separate heading.)

JOINT HEARINGS ON CIVIL DEFENSE SHELTER PROPOSALS

Mr. JAVITS (for himself, and Senators Sparkman, Proxmire, Bennett, DOUGLAS, CLARK, TOWER, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and LONG of Missouri) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 275) providing for joint hearings by the Committees on Banking and Currency and Armed Services on civil defense shelter proposals, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JAVITS, which appears under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO INTERAGENCY COORDINATION, ECONOMY, AND EFFICIENCY

Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 276) to provide additional funds for the study of matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HUMPHREY, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

HAZEL T. CLEM

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 277) to pay a gratuity to Hazel T. Clem, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

VONDA P. BERGMAN

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 278) to pay a gratuity to Vonda P. Bergman, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

ELMO W. KEEL

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 279) to pay a gratuity to Elmo W. Keel, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

EDNA V. McLEOD

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 280) to pay a gratuity to Edna V. McLeod, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

ALSON J. SMITH

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 281) to pay a gratuity to Alson J. Smith, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

THOMAS R. MASSEY

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 282) to pay a gratuity to Thomas R. Massey, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

ELIZABETH J. HEFNER

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 283) to pay a gratuity to Elizabeth J. Hefner, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

GERTRUDE S. FAUCETTE

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 284) to pay a gratuity to Gertrude S. Faucette.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

ISOM HENDERSON AND PRUDENCE HENDERSON

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 285) to pay a gratuity to Isom Henderson and Prudence Henderson.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION TO MAKE EXPENDITURES AND EMPLOY TEMPORARY PERSONNEL

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 286) authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration to make expenditures and to employ temporary personnel; which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

DETENTION OF CERTAIN MAIL MATTER DETERMINED TO BE COMMUNIST POLITICAL PROPAGANDA

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to deny unrestricted entry into the United States of mail which the Postmaster General determines to be Communist political propaganda.

This legislation is needed to counteract the unfortunate effects of an Executive order, issued on March 17, 1961, in which the President ordered immediate discontinuation of a program, carried on under both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations, to intercept Communist propaganda from abroad.

The White House, undoubtedly acting upon the advice of the Department of State, said the program was being discontinued to help "improve cultural exchanges with Communist countries."

It is difficult to understand how subjecting the American people to a continual barrage of unsolicited and unwanted Communist propaganda can improve our relations with the Communist conspiracy, which has sworn to overthrow our free institutions. If the United States were free to disseminate information concerning our free society behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, I am confident that it would be welcomed by those receiving it. However, the Soviet Union and Red China prevent their people from knowing the truth about America.

Until the Communist dictators agree to a truly reciprocal free exchange of information, it is foolish to allow our mails to be burdened with an unrestricted flood of Communist propaganda.

Would we allow an enemy free access to our mails in any hot war? If not, how can the administration justify the granting of such a privilege to avowed enemies in a cold war situation?

This bill would permit the mail in question to be received by individuals who request delivery, and provides for unrestricted delivery to libraries, colleges, universities, and Government agencies where such material is used for scholarly studies and analysis. I hope the bill will receive the prompt attention of the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2740) to provide for the detention of certain mail matter determined to be Communist political propaganda, introduced by Mr. BUSH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred;

and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2744) to amend the Natural Gas Act, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C.

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to a recent request from your staff, there is enclosed herewith a draft bill to amend the Natural Gas Act. The amendments contained in this bill are intended to carry out a portion of the Commission's legislative recommendations set forth in its 41st Annual Report (1961), pages 2–5.

As indicated on the opening page of that report, the present members of the Commission have only recently taken office. Nonetheless, we have carefully reviewed existing statutory provisions in order to determine what tools we need in order to achieve essential regulatory objectives. We have attempted to identify gaps in our authority which we believe handicap us in doing our work. We recognize that regulation of electricity and gas—two of our primary sources of energy—must take account of many competing considerations and strike a fair balance among them. But we also stress that performance of an effective job calls for clear and comprehensive authority in the relevant areas of responsibility.

In view of our unique position as a completely new group, we believe it advisable to submit new drafts of bills to replace the bills which were introduced during the first session of the 87th Congress. Accordingly, unless otherwise noted below, we request that these drafts be introduced as substitutes for the following bills now pending before the Congress: Senate bills S. 1592 through S. 1604 and S. 1606 through S. 1609; House bills H.R. 6948 through H.R. 6955 and H.R. 6957 through H.R. 6965. No new draft is submitted to replace S. 1605 and H.R. 6956 relating to internal delegation of Commission authority. We favor this proposal and believe that the pending bills are entirely satisfactory.[1]

Our reasons for urging enactment of the various amendments submitted to you are set forth below in brief. We discuss suggested statutory changes in the order that we followed in summarizing our legislative proposals in the Commission's annual report, transmitted to the Congress on January 10, 1962. Since many of the proposals are interrelated, the sequence has been adopted for reasons of convenience, rather than to indicate priority.

I

1. Natural Gas Act—sales for resale for industrial use only: Amend section 4(e) of the Natural Gas Act so that the Commission will have full authority to suspend all rate schedules subject to its jurisdiction, including those covering sales by interstate pipeline companies of natural gas for resale for industrial use only. Section 4 of the draft would enact this proposal by repealing the proviso in section 4(e) of the act, which reads: "*Provided,* That the Commission shall not have authority to suspend the rate, charge, classification or service for the sale of natural gas for resale for industrial use only." The Commission has consistently favored proposals to remove the proviso. The lack of power to suspend new rate schedules for these sales means that we cannot take timely action to protect those affected by rates which may be unreasonable, unduly preferential or discriminatory. The rates not having been suspended, the decision of the Commission, upon completion of a hearing directed to their reasonableness, can have only prospective effect. If the Commission had the power to suspend these rates on industrial gas (as it does in the case of other types of rates), it would be in a position to direct appropriate adjustments covering the period between the filing of the rates and the disposition of the rate proceeding. We note that a proposal to delete the above-quoted proviso clause appeared in S. 1595, 87th Congress, which passed the Senate on August 14, 1961.

2. Natural Gas Act—direct sales for industrial use: Amend section 1(b) of the act so as to vest jurisdiction in the Commission over direct sales in interstate commerce of natural gas for industrial use. Technical amendments to sections 1(c) and 2(6) of the act are also necessary to effectuate the proposal. The amendments are contained in sections 1(a), 1(b), and 2(a) of the draft bill.

We believe that such an extension of the Commission's authority is desirable for several reasons:

(a) It would enable the Commission to prevent undue discrimination, prejudice, and preference.

(b) It would simplify and expedite ratemaking procedures (by doing away with the necessity of allocating costs of service between the jurisdictional and nonjurisdictional sales in question).

(c) It would eliminate the incentive to make unregulated sales—an incentive which frequently results in a diversion of gas to inferior uses. It is no answer that direct sales may be constitutionally subject to regulation by the States. Apart from the fact that the States do not generally exercise such authority, it seems plain that fully effective regulation of the rates and distribution of interstate gas cannot be achieved under a system of divided authority which separates direct and wholesale sales.

3. Natural Gas Act—extension of rate suspension period: Amend section 4(e) of the act to authorize the Commission, in its discretion, to extend the period of suspension of a proposed change in a currently effective rate schedule for a further period, not exceeding 6 months, beyond the period for which it was originally suspended under the existing provision of the section, i.e., not longer than 5 months. Section 4 of the draft bill would enact the proposal.

We believe that this amendment, coupled with an existing regulation which prohibits the filing (except with special permission of the Commission) of a change in any rate schedule during the period in which such schedule is under suspension, will alleviate the administrative and economic problems caused by the pyramiding of successive rate filings. If the maximum suspension were extended to 11 months, the Commission would be in a far better position to make rate determinations in major cases in advance of the effective date of the rate change. This would reduce the large amount of proposed increases being collected subject to refund—a situation which may be injurious to seller and buyer alike when large sums are involved—and, by the same token, relieve the ultimate consumer of the necessity of making payments at a rate which may later be determined to be excessive. The power to suspend is, of course, discretionary and the Commission does not believe that it should be automatically invoked. Moreover, the Commission may permit a portion of an increase to go into effect by inviting the filing of a substitute schedule which provides for rates at a level acceptable to the Commission, coupled with a second rate schedule providing for the balance of the increase, which would be suspended.

Several bills now pending in Congress[2] and the hearings held before a subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee during 1961 reflect the need for expedition of rate proceedings. The Commission is making major efforts to reduce its backlog and to adopt approaches which will make the burdens of rate regulation manageable. For some cases, however, a 5 months' suspension period is unrealistically short.

4. Natural Gas Act—notice and opportunity for hearing in section 7(c): Amend section 7(c) of the act to eliminate the mandatory hearing requirement, substituting in lieu thereof a requirement for due notice and opportunity for hearing. Subsection 5(b) of the draft bill would enact this recommendation.

The requirement for formal hearing in every certificate case has been found unnecessary and tends to cause delay. A hearing would be held when protests raising a substantial issue are received or when the Commission deems a hearing necessary in the public interest. The provision for notice and opportunity for hearing protects the interest of possible protestants in every case.

5. Natural Gas Act—compulsory and emergency interconnections: Amend section 7 of the act to give the Commission authority (a) to require an interstate natural gas pipeline company to construct and operate reasonable extensions or improvements of its pipeline facilities, to establish physical connection of its facilities with the facilities of one or more other persons engaged in the interstate pipeline transportation or sale of natural gas, and to sell or exchange natural gas with such other persons when, after notice and opportunity for hearing, the Commission finds such action necessary or appropriate in the public interest and that such extension, improvement, establishment of physical connection, sale or exchange of natural gas will not place an undue burden on the interstate natural gas pipeline company, require the enlargement or undue extension of its mainline transportation facilities, or impair its ability to render adequate service to its customers; and (b), in cases of emergency, either upon its own motion or complaint, with or without notice or hearing, to require such temporary connections of facilities, and such sale, delivery, exchange, transportation, or allocation of available supplies of natural gas among natural gas pipeline companies as will best meet the emergency and serve the public interest. The new subsection 7(i) here proposed is set out in section 5(c) of the draft bill.

The Commission now has limited authority under section 7(a) of the act to direct a natural gas company to interconnect with and sell gas to a local distributing company. We believe that the authority should be broadened as proposed. Interconnections of pipeline systems, like those of electric power pools, can greatly assist in the distribution of available supplies to the points where they are most needed. The restrictions on Commission action written into the draft will amply protect the interests of the pipeline companies, while the basic authority to order interconnections in the public interest, similar in substance to section 202(b) of the Federal Power Act (as we propose that it be amended), will enable the Commission to take account of consumer needs throughout the Nation. Paragraph (2) of the proposed new subsection relates to emergency situations. Like section 202(c) of the Federal Power Act, it will enable the Commission to order interconnections, without hearing, to assure a continuous flow of gas during a period of disaster or emergency.

---

[1] It should be noted here that S. 1595, S. 1606, and S. 1607 passed the Senate on August 14, 1961. Each of these bills would enact items of our present program and are discussed below. Although the language of each is included in the drafts now being submitted their passage by the House, as separate bills, would serve the same purpose insofar as the subject matter of those bills is concerned.

[2] S. 666, S. 1946, H.R. 2757, H.R. 7575.

6. Natural Gas Act—notice and opportunity for hearing and abandonment of service: Section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act should be amended to eliminate the mandatory requirements for hearing, substituting in lieu thereof a requirement for due notice and opportunity for hearing. We would also amend the section to make clear that it applies to sale and service as well as to abandonment of facilities. Section 5(a) of the draft accomplishes these purposes.

As with applications under section 7(c) of the act, there are many cases in which neither the interest of the parties nor the public welfare requires that a hearing be held.

The reason for the recommended change with respect to the applicability of the section is this: Under the present wording, it is often claimed that Commission approval is not required because no abandonment of jurisdictional facilities is involved. A crucial regulatory consideration, however, is whether there will be a change in sales, transportation, or service within the scope of Federal jurisdiction. The proposed amendment will remove any ambiguity as to the scope of the prohibition against unauthorized abandonment.

7. Natural Gas Act—safety regulations: Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act should be amended by adding a new subsection authorizing the Commission to prescribe safety regulations with respect to the construction and operation of interstate natural gas pipelines. The new subsection (j) contained in section 5(c) of the draft would enact this proposal.

At the present time there are no Federal regulations governing the construction or operation of interstate transmission facilities. Some States have enacted rules and regulations in the nature of police regulations, but scattered and nonuniform regulation of segments of large-scale interstate operations cannot be deemed satisfactory. The industry has an excellent safety record, but the necessity of avoiding dangerous conditions becomes even more important as population pressures increase and the network of pipelines spreads.

8. Natural Gas Act—regulation of security issues: Amend section 12 of the Natural Gas Act to give the Commission jurisdiction with respect to approval of security issues of interstate pipeline companies which are subject to the act. Section 6 of the draft would enact this proposal.

The Commission is of the view that it should have substantially the same authority over security issues of natural gas pipeline companies as it now exercises with respect to interstate electric companies. Similar authority has long been exercised by the Interstate Commerce Commission in relation to the securities issued by rail carriers. We also note that many of the States perform a comparable function so far as local utilities are concerned.

The Commission regards control over the security issues of regulated pipelines as important from the standpoint of maintaining the strength and stability of these companies. Surveillance is a protection even though we anticipate that it would not often be necessary to disapprove financing plans. The high rate of growth of pipeline companies gives added urgency to this proposal.

9. Natural Gas Act—comprehensive investigatory authority: Amend section 14(a) of the act so as to give the Commission broad powers to conduct investigations and collect information with respect to the gas industry similar to those now conferred upon it with respect to the electric industry by section 311 of the Federal Power Act, but without impinging upon the existing authority of other Federal agencies in areas under their jurisdiction. Section 7 of the draft would enact this proposal.

The Commission does not have complete authority to secure information relating to all segments of the natural gas industry. The result is that neither the Federal Government, the natural gas industry, nor the consuming public can turn to any single agency and obtain comprehensive information. In contrast, the Federal Power Commission is in a position to provide complete data concerning the electric power industry. Although the trade associations compile some statistical information on the industry as a whole, it is inadequate to meet the needs of the Commission and does not afford the detailed information desired by Members of Congress, other Government agencies, and the general public.

There are now more than 34 million natural gas consumers. Although a great deal of our work involves rates for natural gas in the field and at the city gate, we have very little information on what the ultimate consumer pays and so far as we know this information is not available anywhere. Of all the information we publish, the annual compilation of typical bills for household electric rates arouses the most interest and has probably been the most effective instrument in spotlighting out-of-line rates and stimulating better performance by the power industry with resulting benefits to consumers. We think that the informational technique is equally applicable in the natural gas field.

10. Natural Gas Act—additional authority as to importation and exportation: Amend sections 1(b) and 2 of the act so as to include foreign commerce within the coverage of the act and define persons engaged in the importation and exportation of natural gas as "natural gas companies" so far as their operations in the United States are concerned. Also, we would revise section 3 to provide that orders issued pursuant thereto be entered upon affirmative findings that the requested authorization "is consistent with the public interest" rather than, as now provided, that such orders "shall issue" unless the Commission finds that the authorization applied for "will not be consistent with the public interest." Sections 2(b) and 3 of the draft bill would make these changes.

Although there is one court decision to the contrary (*Border Pipe Line Co.* v. *F.P.C.*, 171 F2d 149), we believe that the language of the act indicates that it was the Congress purpose to give the Commission jurisdiction over companies exporting or importing natural gas to or from a State adjacent to the international border. If such gas is not controlled, there is a significant gap in the regulatory scheme.

The amendment to section 3 would simplify proceedings in which authorization is necessary for a proposed import or export under both sections 3 and 7 of the act.

11. Natural Gas Act—alienation of gas reserves: Amend section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act so as to require Commission approval for the transfer by an interstate natural gas company of natural gas reserves where such reserves have constituted part of the basis for the issuance of a certificate of public convenience and necessity. The amendment is included in section 5(a) of the bill.

Companies now free to dispose of gas reserves may find other more profitable uses for the gas and impair their ability to render the service certificated by the Commission based upon the existence of those reserves. As a result of the Supreme Court's decision in *F.P.C.* v. *Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co.* (337 U.S. 498), holding that the Commission, at least in certain circumstances, does not have the authority it here proposes, the abandonment provision in section 7(b) does not offer the protection that had been previously assumed—that a natural gas company could in no way bring about an abandonment or impairment of service without Commission approval.

The amendments which we are proposing to the Federal Power Act are being prepared and will be submitted in the very near future.

Sincerely yours,

Joseph C. Swidler,
Chairman.

STABILIZATION OF MINING OF LEAD AND ZINC

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators Carroll, Moss, Metcalf, Bible, Cannon, Allott, Chavez, Dworshak, Jackson, Hayden, Kefauver, Church, Long of Missouri, Kuchel, Symington, Magnuson, and Wiley, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes.

This bill provides for import taxes on imported lead and zinc ores, concentrates and metals. It is similar to a bill I introduced during the 1st session of the 87th Congress, except that this bill contains no subsidy provisions. A subsidy bill was enacted into law during the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

If enacted, this proposed legislation would provide a balance to the unstable lead and zinc markets and would help restore our domestic lead and zinc industries to a sound and healthy condition.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the bill printed at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2747) to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Anderson (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Lead and Zinc Act of 1962."

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Declaration of policy

Sec. 101. It is declared to be the policy of Congress—

(a) to promote a reasonable balance between foreign and domestic supplies of lead and zinc ores, concentrates, and metal, and;

(b) to restore to a sound and stable condition the domestic lead and zinc mining industry.

Effective date

Sec. 102. Subject to the provisions of section 4622(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended by title II of this Act, this Act shall take effect ninety days after date of enactment of this Act, and the quotas provided for by Proclamation Numbered 3257 of September 22, 1958, shall be discontinued on the effective date of this Act.

Severability

SEC. 103. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or the application of this Act which can be effected without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this Act are severable.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Amendments to chapter 38 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954

SEC. 201. Chapter 38 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended as follows:

(a) By redesignating subchapter G as H.

(b) By renumbering sections 4601, 4602, and 4603 as sections 4631, 4632, and 4633, respectively.

(c) By inserting after subchapter F the following new subchapter:

"SUBCHAPTER G—LEAD AND ZINC

"Sec. 4601. Imposition of taxes on imported lead.

"Sec. 4611. Imposition of taxes on imported zinc.

"Sec. 4621. Price determinations.

"Sec. 4622. General provisions.

"SEC. 4601. IMPOSITION OF TAXES ON IMPORTED LEAD.

"(a) There are hereby imposed upon the following articles, imported into the United States, taxes at the rates specified:

"Article

"Articles provided for in paragraph 391 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended: Lead-bearing ores, flue dust, and mattes of all kinds.

"Rate of tax

"One and four tenths cents per pound on lead content, provided that such taxes shall not be applied to the lead contained in copper, gold, silver, or tin ores, or copper mattes, unless actually recovered.

"Article

"Articles provided for in paragraph 392 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended: Lead bullion or base bullion, lead in bars and pigs, lead dross, reclaimed lead, scrap lead, antimonial lead, antimonial scrap lead, and all alloys or combinations of lead not specially provided for.

"Rate of tax

"Two cents per pound on lead content.

"(b) If the average market price of lead determined in accordance with section 4621 is less than 13½ cents per pound, there shall be imposed on the following articles additional taxes at the rates specified beginning on the first day of the calendar quarter next following such determination: *Provided*, That when the said average price of lead so determined is 14½ cents per pound or more, the said additional taxes shall cease to be imposed beginning on the first day of the calendar quarter next following such determination:

"Article

"Articles provided for in paragraph 391 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended: Lead-bearing ores, flue dust, and mattes of all kinds.

"Additional tax

"One and four-tenths cents per pound on lead content, provided that such taxes shall not be applied to the lead contained in copper, gold, silver, or tin ores, or copper mattes, unless actually recovered.

"Article

"Articles provided for in paragraph 392 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended: Lead-bullion or base bullion, lead in bars and pigs, lead dross, reclaimed lead, scrap lead, antimonial lead, antimonial scrap lead, and all alloys or combinations of lead not specially provided for.

Additional tax

"Two cents per pound on lead content.

"(c) In addition to any other tax or duty imposed by law, there are hereby imposed upon the articles provided for in paragraphs 46, 72, 320, and 397 and lead in sheets, pipe, shot, glazier's lead, lead wire, babbitt metal, solder, and type metal under paragraph 392 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, imported into the United States, taxes at the rate of 2 cents per pound on the lead contained therein.

"SEC. 4611. IMPOSITION OF TAXES ON IMPORTED ZINC.

"(a) There are hereby imposed upon the following articles, imported into the United States, taxes at the rates specified:

"Article

"Articles provided for in paragraph 214 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended: Zinc fume.

"Rate of tax

"One and four-tenths cents per pound on zinc content.

"Article

"Articles provided for in paragraph 393 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended: Zinc-bearing ores of all kinds, except pyrites containing not more than 3 per centum of zinc.

Rate of tax

"One and four-tenths cents per pound on zinc content, provided that such taxes shall not be applied to the zinc contained in lead, tin, or copper ores unless actually recovered.

"Article

"Articles provided for in paragraph 394 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended:

"Zinc in blocks, pigs, or slabs: 2.0 cents per pound.

"Zinc, old and worn out, fit only to be remanufactured, zinc dross, and zinc skimmings: 1.4 cents per pound.

"(b) If the average market price of zinc determined in accordance with section 4621 is less than 13½ cents per pound, there shall be imposed upon the following articles additional taxes at the rates specified beginning on the first day of the calendar quarter next following such determination: *Provided*, That when the said average price of zinc so determined is 14½ cents per pound or more, the said additional taxes shall cease to be imposed beginning on the first day of the calendar quarter next following such determination.

"Article

"Articles provided for in paragraph 214 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended: Zinc fume.

"Additional tax

"One and four-tenths cents per pound on zinc content.

"Article

"Articles provided for in paragraph 393 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended: Zinc-bearing ores of all kinds, except pyrites containing not more than 3 per centum of zinc.

"Additional tax

"One and four-tenths cents per pound on zinc content, provided that such taxes shall not be applied to the zinc contained in lead, tin, or copper ores unless actually recovered.

"Article

"Articles provided for in paragraph 394 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended:

"Zinc in blocks, pigs, or slabs: 2.0 cents per pound.

"Zinc, old and worn out, fit only to be remanufactured, zinc dross, and zinc skimmings: 1.4 cents per pound.

"(c) In addition to any other tax or duty imposed by law, there are hereby imposed upon the articles provided for in paragraphs 5, 77, 93, 214 other than zinc fume, 341, 380, 381, 1,634, alloys of zinc, zinc strip, and other zinc mill products under paragraph 397, brass wire under paragraph 316(a), leaded zinc oxides containing over 25 per centum of lead under paragraph 72, zinc dust under paragraph 394, and parts whether partly or wholly manufactured from zinc, provided for in paragraphs 372, 369, 353, and 368 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, imported into the United States, taxes at the rate of 2 cents per pound on the zinc contained therein and in addition to any other tax or duty imposed by law there is hereby imposed upon zinc wire under paragraph 316(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, imported into the United States a tax at the rate of 4 cents per pound on the zinc content contained therein and in addition to any other tax or duty imposed by law there is hereby imposed upon zinc sheets under paragraph 394 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, imported into the United States a tax at the rate of 7 cents per pound on the zinc content contained therein.

"SEC. 4621. PRICE DETERMINATIONS

"(a) For purposes of this subchapter, the terms 'average market price for lead' and 'average market price for zinc' mean, respectively, the average market price for common lead (in standard shapes and sizes delivered at New York City), and the average market price for slab zinc (prime western, free on board, East Saint Louis, Illinois), each determined for a period of three consecutive calendar months as hereinafter provided.

"(b) As soon as practicable after the last day of the second month of each calendar quarter following the effective date of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall determine the average market price for lead and the average market price for zinc during the three consecutive calendar months immediately ending on the second month of each calendar quarter, shall notify the Secretary of the Treasury of each such determination and shall cause each such determination to be published in the Federal Register. The first such determination shall be made and published in the Federal Register as soon as practicable following the effective date of this Act and each such subsequent determination shall be made and published in the Federal Register not later than the last day of each such calendar quarter. The average market prices so determined and published shall be the average market prices governing the imposition and removal of the additional taxes set forth in section 4601(b) and in section 4611(b) of this subchapter as to articles provided for therein entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during the calendar quarter following the calendar quarter in which such determination is made.

"SEC. 4622. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

"(a) The taxes specified in subsections (a) and (c) of section 4601 and in subsections (a) and (c) of section 4611 shall be applied on and after the date of the effective date of this Act; the taxes specified in subsection (b) of section 4601 and in subsection (b) of section 4611 shall be applied on the effective date of this Act as if the average market price for lead and the average market price for zinc had been determined, in accordance with section 4621, to be less than 13½ cents per pound, and thereafter shall be applied in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of section 4601 and of subsection (b) of section 4611.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions contained in subsection (b) of section 4621 and in subsection (a) hereof, the provisions of subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 4601 and of subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 4611 shall not apply insofar as the imposition of taxes is concerned until the effective date of this Act: *Provided, however,* That any such taxes on any of the articles specified in sections 4601(a), 4601(b), 4611 (a), or 4611(b), other than those included within paragraphs 392 and 394 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, shall not be applicable to any such articles which were entered in bonded warehouse prior to the date of enactment of this subchapter, such products upon being withdrawn from bonded warehouse during the statutory period of the bond to be subject to the rates of duty which were applicable thereto prior to the enactment of this subchapter.

"(c) On and after the date of enactment of this Act, the articles provided for or referred to in subsection (a) of section 4601 and subsection (a) of section 4611 may be duly entered for warehouse by the importer under bond. Any such article may be withdrawn from warehouse and entered for consumption during a period when the tax imposed by section 4601(b) or section 4611(b), as the case may be, is applicable upon payment of such tax, and upon payment of the applicable duty; any such article may be withdrawn from warehouse and entered for consumption during a period when the tax imposed by section 4601(b) or section 4611 (b), as the case may be, is not applicable only upon certification that the article has been sold for use. The term 'sold for use' applied to any article means that the article has been sold or otherwise transferred, or is subject to a binding agreement for sale or transfer, to a purchaser or transferee who intends to process, manufacture, fabricate, or combine it to produce a different article.

"(d) For purposes of this subchapter, the term 'United States' includes Puerto Rico."

(d) By amending the table of subchapters for such chapter to read:

"Subchapter G. Lead and zinc.

"Subchapter H. Special provisions applicable to import taxes."

TITLE III—EFFECT OF AMENDMENTS ON TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Sec. 301. (a) The treatment provided for imports of articles described in sections 4601 and 4611 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended by title II of this Act, shall, for purposes of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, be considered as having been in effect continuously since the original enactment of said section 350.

(b) The duties imposed under paragraphs 214, 391, 392, 393, and 394 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, shall cease to apply to the articles provided for in subsections (a) and (b) of section 4601 and in subsections (a) and (b) of section 4611 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended by title II of this Act, as of the date the import taxes imposed by said subsections become applicable.

DENIAL TO U.S. CITIZENS OF DIPLOMATIC IMMUNITY WITHIN TERRITORY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide that diplomatic privileges and immunities shall not be granted within the territory of the United States to nationals of the United States. This bill is designed to exclude from diplomatic immunity citizens of the United States who are employed in this country in the service of a foreign government.

I am aware that the principle of diplomatic immunity is firmly established in international law. From far back in history, diplomatic immunity has been almost universally recognized in the body of rules known as international law. Whether by custom or by treaty, diplomatic immunity can be traced back to the earliest peoples of whom we have any written records. Even primitive tribes realized that for the purposes of communication and trade with one another, their messengers or envoys must be immune from molestation while on a mission. The custom and tradition of diplomatic immunity have therefore become a principle of international law and the nations of the world recognize it as such. Our own country, as far back as April 1790, adopted legislations that embodied the idea of diplomatic immunity.

This immunity, however, does not mean that a diplomatic officer is free from the restraints of American or foreign laws and police regulations, but only that he cannot be arrested, tried or punished in the event of failure to respect them. Sanctions may be applied against him by first, complaining to his government; second, an official request to that government for his recall; and third, if such request is not granted, and if the offense is serious enough, a declaration that he is persona non grata and an order that he leave the country forthwith.

This system has worked rather well. Let me state that my bill is not designed to affect the nationals of countries other than those of the United States.

Many foreign governments find it necessary to hire citizens of the United States. Therefore, we find many American citizens who are exempt from arrest and prosecution under the laws of the United States simply because they are employed by foreign governments and can claim diplomatic immunity.

From time to time there have been complaints that Americans so employed and familiar with our national and local laws and customs flagrantly violate these laws and claim diplomatic immunity to avoid liability of debts, and to avoid arrest and prosecution for misdemeanors and criminal offenses. Mr. President, I believe that this is wrong. I believe that every American citizen, no matter where he is employed, should have to respect the laws and ordinances of this country and its communities. The mere fact that he is employed on the staff or as a domestic servant, a chauffeur, or a gardener in an embassy should not exempt him from obeying the laws of the land if he should refuse to do so.

I do not believe that our diplomats or other representatives of our Government, who while abroad employ nationals of other countries, should claim diplomatic immunity for such persons when they violate the laws of their native land. I do not believe it would harm our diplomatic activities in other countries if those countries enacted laws similar to the bill I am introducing today.

It is therefore the purpose of this proposed legislation to bring this problem to the attention of the Congress and open the subject to some investigation. I believe that there is a need to survey the situation and provide some way to deal with those American nationals who flagrantly, openly and brazenly violate laws of our country and then seek diplomatic immunity to avoid paying the penalty.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2749) to provide that diplomatic privileges and immunities shall not be granted within the territory of the United States to nationals of the United States, introduced by Mr. Anderson, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

JOINT HEARINGS ON CIVIL DEFENSE SHELTER PROPOSALS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution which would provide for joint hearings on civil defense shelter proposals. I submit the resolution on my own behalf and on behalf of eight other Senators, all of whom are members of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The resolution calls for joint hearings by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Armed Services. The other sponsors of the resolution are the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long]. My cosponsors and I may have differing views as to what ought to be done about civil defense shelters, but we are of one mind as to the fact that when hearings are held, in order to give the country and ourselves the necessary information and to insure full consideration of the merits of the proposals for a large-scale Federal fallout shelter program, they should be joint hearings by the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Armed Services, both of which committees have appropriate jurisdiction, the first in the field of Federal housing, urban renewal, community facilities, and all of its other aspects, the second in the field of national defense.

In our opinion we ought to move further in the direction of the efficiency and the lack of duplication of effort which would result from such joint hearings. So the resolution would authorize and direct both committees to conduct joint hearings upon this subject and to report to the Senate their findings during the present session with recommendations for legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution itself may be printed at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution may be printed in the Record, as requested.

The resolution (S. Res. 275) was received and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency as follows:

Whereas a civil defense shelter program is an important concern of the Federal Government and the Congress; and

Whereas the establishment of such a program involves important domestic as well as defense considerations; and

Whereas community and private shelters, including multiple-purpose structures, are important forms of public and private housing and community facilities; and

Whereas existing Federal programs to aid public and private housing and community facilities would be substantially affected by a civil defense shelter program; and

Whereas the Committee on Banking and Currency, by virtue of its responsibility for public and private housing community facilities and urban renewal, and the Committee on Armed Services, by virtue of its responsibility for the common defense, have both been concerned with civil defense shelter proposals in the past; and

Whereas civil defense shelter proposals merit unified comprehensive and continuing examination in the public interest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That (a) the Committees on Banking and Currency and Armed Services are authorized and directed to conduct joint hearings, studies and investigations on Federal civil defense shelter proposals, and to report to the Senate during the present session the results of their joint studies and investigations, together with their recommendations for any legislative or other measures which they may determine to be necessary or desirable.

(b) Joint hearings shall be held during the present session of Congress and from time to time thereafter as the committees jointly may determine to be required for the performance of their duties.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION, RELATING TO EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, at the next printing of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 142) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] be added to the list of cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nominations of C. Allan Stewart, of Arizona, to be Ambassador to Venezuela, John M. Steeves, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to Afghanistan, Vice Adm. Edward Nelson Parker, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF MICHAEL H. SURA TO BE SUPERINTENDENT OF THE MINT OF THE UNITED STATES AT PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, February 1, 1962, at 11 a.m., in room 5302, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Michael H. Sura, of Pennsylvania, to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa.

All persons who wish to appear and testify on this nomination are requested to notify Mr. Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5304, New Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3921, before the close of business on Tuesday, January 30, 1962.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FREDERICK A. DAUGHERTY TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN, EASTERN, AND WESTERN DISTRICTS OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, February 6, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Frederick A. Daugherty, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. district judge for the northern, eastern, and western districts of Oklahoma.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF L. RICHARDSON PREYER TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, February 1, 1962, at 11 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of L. Richardson Preyer, of North Carolina, to be U.S. district judge, middle district of North Carolina.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman before the National Conference on Milk and Nutrition, held recently in Washington, D.C., dealing with the role of milk in the diet of American people.

HISTORIC AND PROPER RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN MILITARY AND CIVILIAN AUTHORITIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to place in the RECORD a memorandum submitted this week by the Honorable Robert A. Lovett, former Secretary of Defense, to the Special Preparedness Subcommittee. This memorandum was filed in response to a request by the chairman of the subcommittee, the able and distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

I was so much impressed with Mr. Lovett's masterful exposition of the historic and proper relationships between military and civilian authorities, that I think his splendid statement should be given immediate further circulation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of January 25, 1962, the text of Mr. Lovett's letter of January 16, 1962, to Senator STENNIS and the attached memorandum.

There being no objection, the editorial, the letter, and the memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 16, 1962.

Senator JOHN STENNIS,
Chairman, Special Preparedness Subcommittee, Senate Committee on Armed Services, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN STENNIS: In reply to your letters of December 7, 1961, and January 6, 1962, I respectfully submit the attached memorandum in which I have attempted to respond to your request that I express any opinions or state any views I might hold, based on past experience, in certain areas which form a portion of the broader subjects your committee is studying.

With warm personal regards, I am,

Faithfully yours,

ROBERT A. LOVETT.

MEMORANDUM FOR SPECIAL PREPAREDNESS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

(By Robert A. Lovett)

ROLE OF THE MILITARY SERVICES IN GOVERNMENT

Any examination of the appropriate role of the military in our Government must conclude, I believe, that the separation of the military and civilian functions is not only well established by custom and implicit in our Constitution itself but also that the subordination of the military to civilian authority is specifically established by the provision of the Constitution which makes the President the Chief Executive and the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

From this separation has grown one of our great national military traditions: that the military should be nonpolitical and that career military officers should stick to their demanding profession and take no part in partisan activities or become involved in discussions of our political issues. This well-established tradition, which has grown more important in this century, should, in my opinion, apply equally to the civilian heads of these departments while in office for many of the same reasons which apply to the military personnel.

But, since World War II, there is a particular and an additional reason for observance of this tradition and it is of great importance. I refer to authorization by the Congress of the continued use of the absentee ballot for military personnel in reliance on the good faith of military and civilian superiors that the votes will not be influenced from Washington or by commanders in the field. I shall later refer to this quasi-trustee relationship in more detail.

One of the great virtues of the removal of our professional military services from partisan politics is that it permits the President and the Senate, representing the country as a whole, to appoint professionally trained officers based solely on judgment as to what the man can do professionally rather than on what he has done politically. As a consequence, in time of war or of great national emergencies, both the Congress and the people have found it possible to trust our military implicitly and to turn to the military services for men who are above party and who, as professional military officers, serve no faction and no special cause and seek no political advantage.

From the days of Cromwell, some of whose officers not only sat in Parliament but also dissolved it when Parliament failed to do their bidding, peoples whose form of government is based on Anglo-Saxon traditions and institutions have wisely insisted on separating the military and civilian arms of government. Although the lines between the military and civilian functions today are increasingly blurred and overlap because of new weapons of appalling destructiveness, the emergence of a new, competitive world power, and disappearance of splendid isolation, it seems important to retain the separation and to recall Professor Santayana's great warning, "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."

FUNCTIONS OF THE MILITARY SERVICES IN NATIONAL POLICYMAKING

The primary function of career military officers in national policymaking, apart from their obvious administrative, staff, and command responsibilities, is that of advising on military policies and of preparing detailed, strategic plans as part of the complex of specialized advice from which an overall national policy can be evolved. Their activities in their own professional field take place under the direction and control of the civilian head responsible for the Military Establishment and in accordance with instructions from the President. Therefore, when the governmental policy has been decided on, the President is entitled to expect from them more than the mere virtue of minding their own business. He is entitled to receive instant obedience and the loyalty which makes it their duty to avoid any activities which would tend to undermine the policies established by the Government of which the President is the head.

There are appropriate places for debating the merits of a course of action before a decision is reached. Differences in point of view can be vigorously pressed at several levels—sometimes even to the point of causing exasperation. But these debates customarily take place on a confidential basis and differences are not to be aired in public while policy is being hammered out.

As is known, the Constitution places a duty on the Congress "to raise and support" military forces and "to provide for the common defense," thereby imposing an obligation on the Military Establishments to respond to requests from the appropriate committees of Congress for such information as is necessary to enable the Congress to discharge its constitutional responsibility.

The decisionmaking process was complicated beyond belief in World War II. It was frequently necessary for General Marshall to disagree strongly with courses of action advanced by foreign and domestic military and civilian officials with powerful political backing. These differences in points of view were aggravated by the fact that the war was global in character and that our allies were numerous and vocal.

In these trying circumstances, General Marshall had a simple rule which earned him the admiration of his colleagues at home and abroad and the gratitude of his Commander in Chief as well. He felt that it was of cardinal importance that the Chief of Staff state his plans strongly, make his arguments as forcefully and persuasively as possible (but never in the form of "posterity papers") and that, if he was overruled and then felt that he could not loyally and in good conscience carry out the policy, he should resign.

He said "I think what we suffer from at times is the unwillingness of the individual to take issue on a confidential basis with his Commander in Chief. That is pretty hard to get people to do. There is where you state your case and put your own commission, or command, or position in peril." But, when the policymaking discussions had been completed and the decision had been reached, General Marshall, having had his say, gave and required the most complete loyalty in carrying out the policy which had been established. He said "when the Chief of Staff of the Army sets an example to the whole Army by disloyalty to his Chief and superior, who is the Secretary of the Army, he has just about ruined the Army in my opinion." He pointed out "you (as a general) preach loyalty all the time. You are dealing with an organization where a man receives an order, from even a captain, which leads to his death or his wound and he has to obey that order. He doesn't debate it. He obeys it and that has to be instinctive. Now, if the example at the top is contrary to that, then you have got a very serious situation."

When entering the armed services, military officers voluntarily forego certain privileges retained by civilians who are not members of a disciplined arm of government, and I cannot see how there can be any reasonable justification for the career officer attempting to influence elections or taking part in political activities, either domestic or foreign. These seem properly to be the sole responsibility of governmental officials of the legislative, executive or judicial branches, who are specifically chosen by the people and put into office as their representatives.

In this connection, it is worth remembering that the military officer holds his commission by selection and not by election.

NEW RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE MILITARY SERVICES

I have mentioned above in earlier paragraphs the conviction that military professionals should be contributors to and not deciders of final national policies and have tried to emphasize that they are trained to carry out such political policy but not expected to originate it.

It is appropriate now to consider certain enlarged responsibilities placed on the military by force of circumstances, including technological advances, vastly improved communications and annihilation of distance, and the emergence of a formidable, aggressive-minded world power to threaten us with premature burial, over which it hopes to preside. All of these matters have a direct and potent effect on the major responsibility of the military in connection with raising, training, and putting into the field combatworthy fightingmen.

A new and increasing emphasis is placed on the necessity for proper education and indoctrination of military personnel, both active and reserve, bearing most directly on the performance of troops in the field and on occupational duty. Thus, a heavy and continuing duty is laid upon military officers to discuss with troops under their command not only the use of increasingly complicated weapon systems but also certain forms of psychological warfare, brainwashing techniques, etc., and the characteristics, tactics, and wholly different philosophy of communism and of our potential enemy. This has become an important part of protection of troops from insidious methods of modern warfare.

Admittedly, the problem is complicated by the fact that there can be questions of judgment as to what is both effective and appropriate in exposing the Communist devices—particularly, their use of deceit and perfidy as part of their normal foreign policy. It is hard to do this job of exposure by use of the easily available incidents and at the same time avoid completely the rocks and shoals of comment on political beliefs which may be held by some groups in this country. But I think it can be done. It will probably require the use of carefully worked-out programs, outlining a series of curriculums suitable for all units of the Military Establishments, and prepared with the approval of the responsible military officers in command of the troops and public officials of the military departments. It does not seem to me to be either necessary or feasible to draw too sharp a line in such cases but, with appropriate forewarning and reasonable guidelines, it would appear possible to set standards which will permit the avoidance of pitfalls.

Troop training and indoctrination is, however, a far simpler subject to deal with than your question of "what is the proper function of the military in public indoctrination in the cold war field." As a general rule, it seems to me that both the military and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense should hold their public speeches to a minimum and in them deal largely with facts in the area of their direct responsibility. I cannot escape the feeling that, as a government, we tend to talk too much. To be sure we are an open society but we give the impression of being unbuttoned. Military officers on active duty in particular should, in my opinion, restrict themselves to informing the public on matters for which responsibility is placed on them by the Department of Defense and should, as indicated in earlier paragraphs, exercise care not to express partisan views or take positions contrary to the approved national political policy.

I have mentioned what seems to me to be the necessity for some system of overall review by the responsible top level departmental officials because the military clearly face a considerable problem in walking the thin line between obvious military matters and those having important bearing on the conduct of troops on foreign duty which would appear to involve, to some extent at least, discussion of relations with the foreign country acting as host or under occupation. Correct conduct of our troops, for example, in West Berlin, or West Germany, becomes of the greatest importance if serious incidents arising out of carelessness or ignorance are to be avoided. The troops are, therefore, necessarily forewarned of the customs, habits and sensitivity of the country involved, as well as the provocations, incitements, and similar traps which the enemy may be expected to spring in order to cause dissension and unrest.

At this point we enter the sensitive areas of "review," "clearance," "evaluation," etc., which have always been a red rag to a bull. It has usually seemed to me that the rag looked redder to the bulls outside the services than to those in them. If we are not to have four military services going their divergent ways and adding to public confusion concerning our foreign policy or some pending domestic matter, it seems entirely reasonable to me to require some form of higher level clearance applicable to military officers and civilian officials alike. The crux of handling the problem, in my opinion, lies in the quality, proven judgment and attitude of the individual who must do the reviewing. I believe the checking should be done at the highest and most experienced level available. If the clearance or evaluation is done routinely, or at some relatively low level, or by someone or a group who gives the impression of being unsympathetic, arbitrary or power-proud, cries of "censorship" will be deafening.

I do not propose to add to the scar tissue I have acquired in former jousts in this field by now venturing to discuss the limits of free speech by those in national service. I certainly cannot state them or precisely define them. But most people will admit that some limit must exist. I merely point out now that I believe that, in the military services, duty and loyalty impose one such limit even if self-restraint and good taste did not.

PRACTICAL REASONS FOR RESTRAINT ON CERTAIN SUBJECTS

There are at least two reasons, as mentioned earlier in this memorandum, why partisan views or political issues have, in the past, been considered improper subjects for "education" of troops. The first of these is one mentioned earlier, the fact that the Congress and the Defense Department have continued the use of the absentee ballot by soldiers on active service abroad, relying on and trusting in the traditional attitude of the professional military and particularly of the commanding officers that the services will take no part in partisan politics and will do nothing to influence the vote one way or the other.

Secretary Stimson during World War II, drawing on his knowledge of the Army gained from his tenure of the Secretary of War position under President Taft and his knowledge of foreign policy gained as President Hoover's Secretary of State, said in September 1943 in speaking of the War Department's reaction against political activities of Army officers:

"That policy is founded upon the fundamental concept that it would undermine the sound theories of democracy to permit military personnel to take advantage of their service by appealing for election to civil office, and that it would be plainly incompatible with the effective fighting of the war to allow members of the Armed Forces to divide their energies between military duty and any outside interest, whether political, business, or professional.

"The existence of the prohibition against political activities by military personnel is not new to the Military Establishment. The policy of the War Department for a century and a half has been constantly adverse to the participation by members of the Armed Forces on active duty in political affairs. The present Army regulation is nothing more than a mere collation of the various directives pertaining to this matter.

"The War Department considers the existing policy to be wholly consonant with democratic principles and procedures. Nothing could more directly expose a political system to improper intrusions by the military than to allow military personnel to exercise their civil and military offices contemporaneously. The War Department firmly believes that the present policy is essential to the maintenance of the tradition of the American people that the military and civilian branches of Government remain separated."

The American soldier is allowed freely to read the news columns and editorials in a free press. He is subject to the normal channels of information from his parents, his friends, his neighbors, and the civilian candidates for office soliciting his vote. In these circumstances, there would appear to be little excuse for the military officer to inject himself into partisan discussion on political matters. One of the most dangerous things which can happen to a government is to permit the establishment of a political party line by officers on duty.

The great tradition of the proper role of the career officer is exemplified in the conduct and record of Pershing, Marshall, Eisenhower, Bradley and, indeed, most of the great leaders of World Wars I and II, who took the view that the military should speak publicly only on military matters and that they should leave the public statement of foreign policy and national policy to the elected head of the state. Any other course, they believed, brought divided counsels and weakened the authority both of the Chief Executive and the military commanders.

A second practical and fundamental reason for avoiding any form of electioneering or partisan political discussion by the military on active duty is the invitation such acts would extend to politicians to enter the control of, say, the Army. If certain generals are identified with one party or one faction, each new administration will have to seek men who will execute its particular policy. It is difficult to imagine a more dangerous situation for the military or the country. If you have doubts on this, look at unhappy France.

CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONS

Your request that I comment on any general impressions that I may have as to civil-military relations is a very difficult one since I have been remote from specific problems in this field for some time. I will, therefore, with your permission, limit my reply to comments on an evolutionary development apparent from newspaper accounts and possible problems arising from it.

One predictable result of the extraordinary scientific breakthroughs translated into military uses by new technologies and the simultaneous emergence of a new and aggressive world power, one of whose goals is our destruction, is the increasing intermingling of military and civilian personnel and the blurring of lines between civil and military activities. A group of many skills is now needed in most of our national security activities and the differences in organization, wages, discipline, et cetera, inevitably cause some irritation. It has existed in the past where the military felt that civilian agencies were poaching on their preserves. We have seen this in the missile field a little while ago. But I think that such disputes over who does what are a common occupational disease in government and become more virulent at budget time. They are certainly not, in my opinion, evidence of anything sinister. This civil-military intermingling could, in fact, be very helpful to each if they can succeed in exchanging something other than their bad habits.

Official and personal relations between the military and civilians—looked at from the outside—seem good, judging by the moderate number of times one reads that tired old story about restoring civilian control. Alarmist cries about the lack of civilian control over the military, in our Nation, deal with a strawman issue. They are concerned with a problem that does not really exist, and they are divisive and damaging by falsely implying that the military does not accept our historic tradition of civilian supremacy. Nothing could be more wrong. I have been with the military in three wars and have worked with them in other governmental capacities and I have never heard any military commander raise the slightest question at any time as to their subordination to civilian control. The only real occasion when civilian control is in doubt is when the civilian officials themselves fail to exercise it, or neglect to use the powers legally vested in them. In my opinion there will be no such problem under the competent direction and control by the unusually able present Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense.

As a final observation, I must say that after many years of direct experience with the military services in a variety of capacities, I have the greatest admiration for our dedicated and skilled career officers and I know of no country more fortunate than we in having military services with the traditions and loyalties that ours possess. I have seen our career officers in competition with those of other countries in the ultimate arenas of war, as administrators of conquered or occupied countries, and as participants in the councils of peace—and I have been proud to have them compared with the men of any other country in the world.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Jan. 25, 1962]

MARSHALL'S RULE

The issue of muzzling of the military is complicated, but it is less complicated to large minds than to small. The largest-minded military man of our time was George Marshall. Here is what Robert A. Lovett, former Secretary of Defense, says about Marshall in a statement prepared for the Senate subcommittee hearings on charges of civilian censorship of the military:

"The decisionmaking process was complicated beyond belief in World War II. It was frequently necessary for General Marshall to disagree strongly with courses of action advanced by foreign and domestic military and civilian officials with powerful political backing. These differences in points of view were aggravated by the fact that the war was global in character and that our allies were numerous and vocal.

"In these trying circumstances General Marshall had a simple rule which earned him the admiration of his colleagues at home and abroad and the gratitude of his Commander in Chief as well. He felt that it was of cardinal importance that the Chief of Staff state his plans strongly, make his arguments as forcefully and persuasively as possible (but never in the form of "posterity papers"), and that, if he was overruled and then felt that he could not loyally and in good conscience carry out the policy, he should resign."

It is an impeccable, broad rule for all levels of command. More specifically as to the present issue, Mr. Lovett, himself a man of large mind, has this to say on his own:

"The great tradition of the proper role of the career officer is exemplified in the conduct and record of Pershing, Marshall, Eisenhower, Bradley and, indeed, most of the great leaders of World Wars I and II, who took the view that the military should speak publicly only on military matters and that they should leave the public statement of foreign policy and national policy to the elected head of the state. Any other course, they believed, brought divided counsels and weakened the authority both of the Chief Executive and the military commanders.

"A second practical and fundamental reason for avoiding any form of electioneering or partisan political discussion by the military on active duty is the invitation such acts would extend to politicians to enter the control of, say, the Army, if certain generals are identified with one party or faction, each new administration will have to seek men who will execute its particular policy. It is difficult to imagine a more dangerous situation for the military, or the country. If you have doubts on this, look at unhappy France."

Most by far of today's American military men understand what Marshall meant, and what Lovett means. They do not need to be reminded, for these are their rules, too. Each can judge for himself the limits imposed on free speech for men in uniform—limits, as Mr. Lovett says, set not only by self-restraint and good taste, but first by duty and loyalty.

The few officers who lack such judgment need to have the rules spelled out for them from time to time. Indoctrination, it might be called.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the hearings of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services designated to study and appraise the use of military personnel and facilities to arouse the public to the menace of the cold war opened on January 23.

The first statement presented was a letter from former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, invited by and read by the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who, in company with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], had visited Mr. Eisenhower a few days earlier.

This statement, coming from one who had once been the head of the Military Establishment, and later was President during 8 years of the cold war, has special value and meaning for every American today.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GETTYSBURG, PA.,
January 15, 1962.

Hon. JOHN STENNIS,
Chairman of the Special Subcommittee, Senate Armed Services Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am complimented by your invitation to comment on various matters of current interest to your subcommittee.

Because I have had no occasion to examine these issues in detail since leaving the Presidency, I shall direct my remarks to basic considerations rather than to the specifics of pending issues.

This statement therefore will deal in general terms with the public need for information on the Communist threat; extremism; the military role in providing information on communism; slurs on the military; and censorship.

WE SHOULD INFORM THE PUBLIC

I am sure that all of us would deplore any move which would restrict public access to reliable information on the deadliness, implacability, totality and cunning of the Communist assault on freedom. We should not trouble ourselves over the possibility of overinforming the public. Rather we should be watchful of any tendency to withhold releasable information.

Those of us who over the years have had to deal directly with the Communist leaders and system believe—unanimously, I think—that the more our people can be brought to comprehend the all-encompassing nature of the threat, the stronger will be our own determination to preserve freedom at home, and the greater will be our national willingness to sacrifice to advance freedom throughout the world.

Telling the stark truth about communism is the best way to make our own citizenry and other peoples appreciate the blessings of liberty.

We should encourage all individuals who are well informed on Communist tactics and strategy to expound freely and often on this subject. We should concentrate on assuring ourselves that the public has ready access to the best available information, rather than expending too much energy on deciding which persons or groups should fill this need.

One phase of this matter concerns me deeply—as it has for many years.

I refer to the tendency to impugn motives when matters of this kind enter the public arena. Because the public is, rightly, troubled by the Communist menace, the subject tends to excite fear and suspicion and is susceptible always of being exploited for political or other purposes. Thus extremism finds a fertile soil. And as charge begets countercharge, unless the Nation's leaders move with wisdom and restraint the fanatics of both the right and left so belabor each other as almost to monopolize the issue, leading the Nation to preoccupy itself with the evils of extremists instead of the evils of communism. Facts are forgotten in the extravagance of mutual accusation.

Extremism always distorts—what we need are hard facts, calmly presented and digested, so that we may act with prudence and some wisdom in defending ourselves.

Incidentally, I have noted that the fanatic thrives on publicity; he withers when ignored.

Next, I take up the matter which, so you indicate to me, engages your particular interest—the appropriate military role in helping to inform the nonmilitary in respect to the tactics, strategy, and concepts of communism.

CIVIL AUTHORITY VERSUS MILITARY

First, I mention in passing that I endorse without qualification the doctrine of military subordination to civil authority.

The armed services are not policymaking bodies. Their function is faithfully to execute the policy decisions of the properly constituted agencies of civil government. It is equally true, however, that, in this modern day, the need of civil government for the counsel and advice of military personnel in devising of policies grows more acute.

I subscribe also to the position expressed to your subcommittee last fall by the Secretary of Defense, that military involvement in the providing of information concerning Communist potential aggression—indeed its involvement in all matters—must be clearly nonpartisan, directed to subjects related to the defense of America, and in harmony with approved national policies.

This is, of course, easily said. But difficulties are inescapable when one attempts to decide what type of statement or gathering is partisan and what isn't—what, conceivably, in these times is unrelated to the Nation's strength and safety—and what, precisely, national policy really is. Such determinations are necessarily, in good measure, subjective.

I suspect that many active duty personnel could conclude from such broad guidelines that virtually any utterance before a nonmilitary group might be construed as a violation of instructions of higher authority; hence the course of prudence would be to say nothing at all.

FBI RESPONSIBILITY WITHIN UNITED STATES

It is, of course, not the function of the military services to ferret out the details of attempted Communist subversion in our Nation. This is the task of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, under Mr. J. Edgar Hoover. However, by virtue of its vital mission to defend our country, its long professional experience with Communist tactics and its highly developed educational system, our military is singularly well trained to provide to the public, as well as to the members of the Armed Forces, the implications of the extreme threat of Communist imperialism.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, if your committee should glance over the curricula of the National War College and, indeed, of all the service war colleges, you will find, I believe, that the aims, objectives, and methods of communism and its aggressive threats to our system are probed more intensively and more pragmatically in these institutions than in virtually any civilian university in the Nation.

This has long been true. The Armed Forces Industrial College, for instance, began conducting very fruitful national security seminars on matters of this kind as long ago as 1948. I believe these seminars are still in progress.

The result is that senior officers in the Armed Forces are qualified to develop among their units the necessary understanding concerning potential aggressors, and their purposes and tactics.

RESULTS FROM 1959 SEMINAR

As an example of this kind of education: In the summer of 1959, the Joint Chiefs of Staff authorized a 2-day strategy seminar of 210 selected reservists. The War College seminar presented 55 top experts as lecturers. This faculty was strictly bipartisan—including former Secretary of State Dean Acheson and other prominent Democrats, as well as Republicans.

Some of the speakers were openly critical of various policies and programs of my administration. But I thought it unwise to suppress or inhibit such discussions since I believe that the American people have a right and a need to know the alternate ways of meeting the Communist challenge.

As an indication of the caliber of students, three alumni of the first seminar are now U.S. Senators. Others were college presidents, deans, editors, publishers, Congressmen, Governors, lawyers, college and high school teachers, and businessmen. I believe that all concerned found the discussions highly provocative and useful, and that there is value in such efforts for the Nation as a whole.

The need for anti-Communist education in the Armed Forces is self-evident. Your committee recalls, I am sure, our sad experiences in Korea a decade ago, in respect to the conduct of some of our captured Americans. This gave rise to improved troop information programs designed to strengthen troop appreciation of the fundamentals of our own and the Soviet system.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

I need not remind your committee, especially that in these times military considerations and economic, political, and ideological considerations are interrelated to such a degree as to make an arbitrary dividing line between the military and the nonmilitary increasingly unrealistic—a truth, indeed, which gave rise 15 years ago to the establishment by law of the National Security Council.

Here, in the Nation's topmost planning group, the military, through the Secretary of Defense—and, by invitation, the Chairman and/or members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—directly advise in the development of America's master policies. These advisers, and their supporting staffs, are an asset of incalculable value to this Nation, and policies governing their usefulness and employment should leave a great deal of latitude to the judgment and responsibility of these men.

As to informing the public at large, I have heard statements to the effect that the use of the military in this effort stems from a National Security Council directive of 1958. This, I believe, is in error.

It is true that during my Presidency great pains were taken to coordinate the efforts of the military services in its preparations for countering hostile moves against the external threat, on the one hand, and those of the Federal Bureau of Investigation concerned in combating internal Communist subversion on the other. But to the best of my recollection there is no National Security document specifically directing military involvement in the internal problem, and unless material has been taken out of context, or general language interpreted very loosely, I think there is no basis for these assertions involving the National Security Council.

Nevertheless, both procedures—the troop education programs and the general educational program—seem to me as desirable for our country now as they did just a few years back. Each supplements and supports the other—Defense personnel takes the lead in the first, civilian agencies do so in the second.

THERE IS A RULE OF REASON

Naturally, when civilians or soldiers undertake programs of this kind, within or outside the Government, the process cannot be expected to work perfectly at all times and at all places. Faulty techniques, errors of judgment, impulsive statements, occasional excesses—these are bound to occur. As always in cases of inescapable overlappings of responsibility, the heads of affected agencies must apply judgment—a rule of reason. Such responsible heads can expect to receive the full cooperation of the military leadership in seeing to it that policies are obeyed and flaws are corrected.

Accordingly, should departmental instructions be so phrased as unduly to prohibit desirable military participation in these educational efforts respecting the Communist menace, I suggest that your committee recommend their restudy with a view to appropriate revision. The Reds are well aware of the integrity, patriotic motives, and high qualifications of our military. I suspect they would be delighted if we should prevent such people from spreading the truth about Communist imperialism.

Pertaining at least indirectly to this subject, I have heard of accusations alleging that military education is so narrow as to make service personnel incapable of grasping the whole complex of dangers confronting our country. It is hinted that the entire officer corps has become politically infected, and prone to be disloyal to the Commander in Chief. I, for one, want to be on the record as expressing my indestructible faith and pride in our armed services—even though their loyalty, patriotism, and breadth of understanding need no defense from me or anyone else.

ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL PRESSURES

The entire Nation, including the armed services, insists that in our free system, military influence must be kept within proper constitutional, legal, and administrative bounds.

Moreover, as mentioned in my final address as President, we must watchfully mind the military-industrial complex, for it tends to generate powerful economic and political pressures beyond the anticipations even of the participants themselves. But these are matters of proportion and sensible national leadership, requiring the same kind of continuing oversight and perspective that other major power groupings in our society, including business, labor, and Government itself, require in the interest of keeping our system flexible, balanced, and free.

In a half century of national service, I have yet to meet the American military officer who viewed himself as a budding Napoleon, or even a Rasputin, and I suggest it is worthy of note that in recent world history the three major dictators, Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin, came from civil life. This fact does not warrant a general indictment of civilian motivation, any more than one or two military extremists might warrant the absurdity that all the military harbors political designs dangerous to our constitutional form of government.

LET OUR INFORMED MILITARY SPEAK

I believe, therefore, that your committee will render valuable service by rejecting the recent spate of attacks upon the competence and loyalty of the military and by disapproving any effort to thrust them, so to speak, behind an American Iron Curtain, ordered to stand mutely by as hostile forces tirelessly strive to undermine every aspect of American life.

I say, let our informed military speak, always under properly established policies and the general—not petty—supervision of their civilian superiors. Should they, here or there, speak or act partisanly, imprudently, or in contravention of national policies, then hold them directly accountable, for it is a function of command to keep military personnel properly respectful of the obligations of the uniform.

At all events, I am certain of this: give military leaders a lucid explanation of the Nation's policies, and they will, with rare and easily controllable exceptions, loyally perform.

Generally in the same connection, I question the desirability of requiring the topmost Government officials, whether military or civilian, to submit their proposed public statements for what amounts to censorship of content—as distinguished from security matters—prior to their utterance.

I am aware, in saying this, that procedures in my own and in the administration of my predecessor may have functioned in this way. But, in thoughtful reassessment of this procedure, I incline to the view that when responsible and respected officials feel compelled to submit to censorship, we are smothering the concept of personal responsibility under a practice of heavy-handed and unjustified staff supervision.

COORDINATION NOT CENSORSHIP

Responsible officials, when in doubt, will voluntarily coordinate proposed public statements within their own and sister departments so as to protect the Nation, their services and themselves, but such voluntary coordination is some distance from censorship.

I would hope that all who study this problem objectively will see the virtues of such a cooperative system as opposed to censorship, except, of course, where security is involved. I have always believed—as I now do—that good faith and close understanding among the important officials of great human organizations are far more important to success than are any number of arbitrary regulations and pedantic instructions. This is really the meaning of this letter.

So viewing the problems before your subcommittee, I wish you and your colleagues well in your endeavor to maintain balance and good sense in respect to the matters receiving your current consideration.

With warm regard.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. **KUCHEL**. Mr. President, will my able colleague yield?

Mr. **CASE** of South Dakota. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. **KUCHEL**. Mr. President, in my opinion the Senator performs a service to the Senate and to the country in asking that General Eisenhower's excellent comments be printed in the RECORD. It is one more valiant and valuable public service by one of the greatest Americans in all our country's history. He has dedicated his entire lifetime to the cause of a free and strong America, and to the cause of a just peace in the world. The observations he makes with respect to the dangers of extremism in this country, those he utters with respect to his—and our—unerring faith in the American Military Establishment, and his views with respect to the application of the rule of reason in censorship are all in the high tradition with which General Eisenhower has served this country in war and peace.

I repeat, the Senator performs a service in giving the people who read the RECORD an opportunity to see the text of General Eisenhower's comments.

Mr. **CASE** of South Dakota. I hope it may be distributed widely.

MANAGEMENT-LABOR CLIMATE IN WEST VIRGINIA CONDUCIVE TO INDUSTRIAL GROWTH—SECRETARY OF LABOR ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG SPEAKS IN STATE

Mr. **RANDOLPH**. Mr. President, industries anticipating locating or relocating their plants and facilities in the State of West Virginia can be assured that a harmonious relationship will exist between management and employees, according to facts disclosed by Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg in a recent address in Fairmont, W. Va.

Secretary Goldberg indicated that some industries might hesitate in locating in sections of West Virginia because some areas have been labeled as being strike happy. However, with the use of statistics, the Secretary explained why these conditions could hardly prevail in West Virginia.

The Secretary revealed that during an 8-year period, from 1953 to 1960, industry in West Virginia lost an average of 0.37 percent of total working time as a result of labor-management disputes, or about 1 day per year per employee, on the average. This loss ratio was greatly less than most neighboring States and only slightly above the national figure.

Although these statistics were favorable, it was most encouraging to hear the results of more recent data compiled by the Labor Department.

In this respect, Secretary Goldberg said:

> Perhaps more significant in dispelling any notion of strike proneness was the record for 1960, the latest year for which data are now available. In 1960, the strike-loss ratio for West Virginia amounted to 0.10 percent, which was below the level of all States previously mentioned, and even significantly below the U.S. total of 0.17 percent.

In accounting for the improved management-employee partnership, not only in West Virginia but throughout our Nation, Secretary Goldberg cited a factor which is highly complimentary of President Kennedy's administration, the policy of using the Federal Government's good offices to promote collective bargaining, not to intervene by dictating the terms of settlement.

Mr. President, it was my privilege to accompany Secretary Goldberg when he brought forth this information in a meaningful speech. Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, Representatives CLEVELAND BAILEY

and HARLEY STAGGERS were also with the Cabinet member on his visit to Elkins, Clarksburg, Fairmont, and Morgantown.

The Secretary of Labor is the seventh member of President Kennedy's Cabinet to come into West Virginia during the past year. In addition to Secretary Goldberg, the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury; the Honorable J. Edward Day, Postmaster General; the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture; the Honorable Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce; the Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, have also made visits to my home State.

I am extremely proud of this fact because I feel it illustrates the sincerity of the citizens of West Virginia to cooperate and work with the Federal Government as well as displaying a genuine interest by the present administration in the individual welfare of each of the 50 States.

I ask unanimous consent that my introduction of Secretary Goldberg and an official release from his office be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the introduction and the release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF SENATOR RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, WEST VIRGINIA, IN PRESENTING SECRETARY GOLDBERG AT THE DEMOCRATIC BANQUET IN RECOGNITION OF LABOR, SPONSORED BY THE YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUBS AND THE WOMEN'S DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF MONONGALIA COUNTY, JANUARY 18, 1962

Our honored guest speaker is the Secretary of Labor of the United States. You know him as a national leader of great physical and intellectual energy. He is also a public official of dedication and high moral purpose. But most important, he is a man who understands people. He understands their needs and their problems, and he acts to help them.

Last February, in the early days of the Kennedy administration, when the Nation was still in the depths of recession, Secretary Goldberg visited some of the areas that were suffering heavily from unemployment and economic decline. Many individuals questions his reasons for making the trip: Could he not obtain all the information he wanted in his own Department of Labor? Could not one of his bureaus supply him with statistics on unemployment, automation, productivity, and the rest? Why did he even need to budge from behind his desk in Washington.

But Arthur Goldberg went out and talked with people. He learned firsthand their problems. He saw their suffering. He met men with families who had been out of work for many months, and even for years, and were on relief. When he returned to Washington he answered his critics.

I heard his answer when he testified before the Senate Employment and Manpower Subcommittee, of which I am a member. It was in the form of an added dimension to the unemployment story. Not only could he relate the bare statistics, but he could speak knowingly of the problem in its human terms.

"Behind these statistics," he said, "are the human beings themselves. Anyone who carefully looks at the statistical scoreboard and comes face to face with the people themselves, cannot escape the overriding importance of programs which we have submitted to the Congress which aim at ameliorating the current situation."

And this country, under the leadership of the Kennedy administration, with the help of a Democratic Congress (in which serve my esteemed colleague, Senator BOB BYRD, and our diligent House Members, Mr. STAGGERS and Mr. BAILEY), and with a vigorous assist from Secretary Goldberg, has moved toward revitalizing the economy. In the last session we extended unemployment benefits, improved and extended the minimum wage law, increased social security benefits, and enacted the Area Redevelopment Act and the Housing Act for urban renewal—all of them measures which have stimulated our enterprise system and helped place us again on the road to recovery and better living.

But there is much to do. The unemployment problem has not been solved. Congress will have its work cut out for it in the current session. I am sure the Secretary will be telling us of legislation the administration proposes to help the unemployed men and women of West Virginia become more secure.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am exceedingly happy to present the Honorable Arthur J. Goldberg.

NEWS RELEASE

FAIRMONT, W. VA.—Prospects for industrial peace in 1962 are bright, Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg said today.

He coupled that optimistic forecast with the statement that labor-management relations had improved greatly in 1961.

Secretary Goldberg spoke at a luncheon meeting at Fairmont, W. Va.

Expressing optimism over the outcome of current contract negotiations in the steel industry, Mr. Goldberg said:

"President Kennedy is hopeful, in fact quite hopeful, that there will be an amicable settlement between labor and management in the steel industry—and on terms advantageous to all interests concerned—labor, management and the public.

"The President is keeping in close touch with the situation and making every possible effort to create a climate favorable to a peaceful accord in the basic industry."

Secretary Goldberg said that in this instance, as in others involving labor-management relations, the administration has been adhering to a basic policy of "using the Federal Government's good offices to promote collective bargaining, not to intervene by dictating the terms of settlement."

"We are making greater efforts to give positive expression to that philosophy," Secretary Goldberg said, "and these efforts have contributed importantly to development of a growing partnership of labor, management and the public.

"Under the direction of the President, the agencies of Government concerned in this area have taken a series of steps to promote industrial peace.

"Partly as a result of this action, during 1961 the United States enjoyed its greatest period of industrial peace since the end of World War II. Only one-seventh of 1 percent of all estimated working time of all nonagricultural workers was lost because of strikes. The number of strikes and the number of man-days lost to them were both at postwar lows."

Secretary Goldberg praised both labor and management for the cooperative spirit they have shown in the work of the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy, which was established by Executive order last February. Its first report to the President—on automation—was submitted last week.

Secretary Goldberg cited the work of the President's Missile Sites Labor Commission, created last year, as another example of a more constructive approach to labor-management problems.

"The overall record of labor since the activation of the Commission reflects a gratifying measure of accomplishment," Mr. Goldberg said. "A no-strike, no-lockout pledge was obtained for missile and space programs. The cumulative lost time from June through November (approximately 4,260 man-days) as related to the man-days worked (approximately 1,126,000) is 0.06 percent. This represents 4.4 percent of the average time lost at missile sites during the 57-month period prior to March 31, 1961, and only 11 percent of the average time lost in the construction industry in the United States during the same period."

Commenting on labor-management relations in West Virginia, Secretary Goldberg said:

"West Virginia has had its share of industrial conflict, as have all our industrialized States. Unfortunately, conflict long past and almost forgotten often leaves an unwelcome legacy—a ghost that haunts the timid. This ghost may be described in fanciful terms: A community, so the story is told, is 'strike happy.' A pseudoscientific term now popular in some quarters is 'strike proneness.' I have been told that such distorted images have been evoked by employers to whom West Virginia might otherwise be a suitable place in which to locate.

"The best weapons for eradicating ghosts are facts. Let me recite a few. During the 8-year period 1953–60, West Virginia industry lost an average of 0.37 percent of total working time as a result of labor-management disputes, or about 1 day per year per employee, on the average. This loss ratio was substantially less than that experienced in Pennsylvania, Ohio and Indiana during this period, to mention only nearby States. It was only slightly higher than that for Kentucky and Maryland. The 8-year average ratio for the country as a whole was 0.26 percent.

"Perhaps more significant in dispelling any notion of 'strike proneness' was the record for 1960, the latest year for which data are now available. In 1960, the strike-loss ratio for West Virginia amounted to 0.10 percent, which was below the level of all States previously mentioned, and even significantly below the U.S. total of 0.17 percent."

The Secretary of Labor said that unity in the American labor movement is a major factor working for industrial peace and all other good causes. Praising the labor statesmanship shown in the achievement of a more united and stronger labor movement at the recent AFL–CIO convention, Mr. Goldberg said:

"Our country today more than ever needs a united people, and to have that, we need a united labor movement.

"Labor unity is essential to preservation and growth of the already very great role which American working people have in the stand against communism, and in the whole forward striving of our Nation. American labor amassed its strength behind each new program undertaken in 1961 to improve our social and economic system. It stands in the vanguard working for continued progress in 1962. Greater labor unity means a stronger America."

COMMUNICATIONS FROM EXTREMISTS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I received in the mail a postal card addressed "GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C." I observe that the name "U.S. Senate" in the address is printed in red; the red is meant, according to the indication, to suggest that the Senate of the United States has "sold out" to the Russians.

The face of the postal card reads as follows:

UNITED STATES OF THE U.S.S.R.

When you fill out your income tax forms, Federal and State, also your farm questionnaire, Federal census questionnaire, assessment questionnaire, and about 100 other forms of regimentation and controls, you begin to ask yourself, Is this the United States or the U.S.S.R.?

If you want it to get worse just keep on voting for the same politicians you have been voting for.

ZANE'S RADIO & TV.

Meade and Ashland.

(Hear Ronald Reagan speech to Phoenix Chamber of Commerce.)

Hear Reagan.

At the bottom, in red again, it says, "Hear Reagan."

I suppose it is a reference to Reagan, a film star of some sort or another, who is teaching this sort of thing around the country. This indicates something of the kind of hate literature and distress being sown in the midst of our country.

It is my intention, whenever and wherever possible, to publicize the sort of thing being indulged in under the guise of protecting the freedoms of democracy.

SURVEY REPORT OF J. T. BANNER & ASSOCIATES ON FALLOUT SHELTERS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Laramie Boomerang, from my hometown in Wyoming, in which there is properly applauded the alertness and the speed with which J. T. Banner & Associates, an engineering firm in Laramie, prepared estimates and drawings for public fallout shelters. The able work on the part of J. T. Banner & Associates properly merits this recognition.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST IN THE NATION

The U.S. Corps of Engineers last week accepted the survey report of J. T. Banner & Associates on public buildings which might be used for fallout shelters and will report back soon on the conclusions they draw from the report.

The Albany County report was the first in the Nation turned over to the U.S. Engineers in President Kennedy's program of providing public fallout shelters for the population of the Nation. In addition to the Albany County report, the Laramie firm had completed four other counties of the seven assigned to it.

The speed with which the Laramie architects handled the job is praiseworthy and merits the thanks of all area residents who someday may take advantage of such a shelter.

Under the national program those buildings found to be suitable for fallout shelter purposes will be converted for such use in the future. The speed with which the local firm completed its work might well mean that Albany County will also be the first in the Nation to have adequate fallout shelters for its entire population.

Many persons have given up the idea of nuclear war since the easing off of the Berlin crisis. Everything points to the fact that nuclear war would be suicide for the side starting it, and everyone knows that neither the Russians nor the United States feel that they could carry out such a war without sharing the devastation.

Yet, to rule out the possibility of such a war is indeed a fallacy. As long as the world is in a state of unrest, as long as there are incidents taking place every day in Berlin, as long as the Laos and Vietnam situations remain unsettled there is a possibility of war, triggered perhaps by an incident that started out to be a minor irritation and got out of hand.

Perhaps many of us have scoffed at the idea of fallout shelters but in the event that such shelters are available to the public we doubt that many people will be staying outside those shelters in the event that they do become necessary.

Banner & Associates are to be highly commended for their speedy work in completing their survey and getting it in to the Government for analysis. For if fallout shelters are ever needed, the sooner they are ready the better. Only in that way can we be prepared in the event an incident does touch off war.

DEALING WITH CASTRO

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I call attention to a column in this morning's Washington Post, written by the esteemed observer, Walter Lippmann, in which he analyzes some of the alternatives and urges some conclusions in terms of wise procedures for dealing with Castro.

Because the article is so stable and rational, I think it comes at a propitious moment in our calculations on that question, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON DEALING WITH CASTRO

(By Walter Lippmann)

The conference of American Foreign Ministers in Uruguay has not concluded its work as this article is written. Moreover, it is being reported meagerly in this country and it may therefore be some time before we can come to an informal conclusion about it.

But it is not too soon to say that there is being created here an artificial and misleading standard by which to judge what is going on. Much too often the issues at Punta del Este are treated in terms of the United States winning or losing—if the condemnation of Castro is very severe and is accompanied by an all-around rupture of diplomatic relations and of trade relations, we win; anything less than this is something of a defeat.

This is, I believe, much too simple a view of a great and extremely difficult, of a quite unprecedented, problem in the history of the American States. The problem is how to contain and isolate Castro's revolutionary interventions, how to turn the Cuban Government from its attempt to become a full satellite of Moscow, how to convert it into a good and reliable member of the hemispheric system.

This will not be done by strong words in a resolution. Strong words never stop any revolution. Almost certainly it cannot be done by breaking off diplomatic relations in this hemisphere. The more Cuba becomes a part of the Soviet and Chinese system, the more it will use their channels to other states. It cannot be done by a general trade embargo. For 80 percent of Cuba's trade is now with the Communist bloc and the rest is with Mexico, Canada, and Western Europe. Cuba's trade with the other American States is negligible. Castro, we must remember, is not nearly so dependent on the Western Hemisphere as was Trujillo.

There is no good reason for crying out that we have been defeated because the biggest countries in South America will not vote for sanctions that would make big headlines in the United States but could have no substantial and decisive effect on Castro's regime. What, then, can be done that is worth doing?

The first thing to do is, as Brazil has been arguing, to lay a sound juridical basis for the containment of Castro. Existing hemispheric law was drafted by men who were thinking of the Second World War. They were thinking of the threat which had been posed of a Nazi or Fascist conquest of South America. If that were the present danger, if there were real danger of a Soviet military establishment in Cuba, those old treaties would still be quite useful. But the existing law is not directed accurately against the methods of the cold war, and it takes a lot of stretching to make the existing law fit Cuba's economic relations with the Soviet Union, or Cuba's agents and infiltrators in South America.

There is very reason to think that we can work out with the active assistance of the big countries of South America a statement of hemispheric law which fits the problem of Castro.

With a law amplified and clarified, we can move with general consent to organize inter-American machinery, in which we would take an active part, to expose and counter Castro's agents in this hemisphere. Moreover, while we cannot blockade Cuba, we can establish surveillance by sea and air and, without violating Cuban airspace, we can keep close watch on the military situation for signs of active Soviet intervention. For this it will probably be better that some diplomatic relations are maintained.

This is a general policy of containment, patiently, persistently and actively administered. There is one alternative to it. That would be for the United States to occupy Cuba, overthrow Castro, and set up a Cuban Government that we like. There are many among us who favor doing this. If it were done, there would at first be very considerable rejoicing and enthusiasm among those who do not look beyond the excitement of the moment.

Once when the church bells were ringing in London to celebrate the beginning of a war, a statesman who had opposed the war said: "Today they are ringing the bells. Tomorrow they will be wringing their hands."

A United States occupation of Cuba would have enormous and far-reaching consequences. Although there are people who affect to think that there is no such thing as the opinion of mankind, or that a decent respect for it is unmanly, the uproar around the world would be tremendous. The inter-American system would be smashed. Whatever happened to Castro himself in Cuba, Castroism, fused with anti-Yankeeism, would rage throughout the hemisphere.

And we, in the meantime, would have entangled ourselves in a guerilla war nourished from outside Cuba. It would be like the British war in Malaya, like the French wars in Indochina and in Algeria. There is no reasonable ground for thinking that intervention in Cuba could be a short, swift, and clean-cut operation. It could not be. It would be a lasting entanglement.

Believing this, believing that intervention would be a calamity, I can see no alternative to a policy of vigorous and alert containment.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business and take up nominations on the Executive Calendar beginning with the Coast and Geodetic Survey, on page 2.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

William C. Foster, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency;

Adrian S. Fisher, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency;

Dr. Ansley J. Coale, of New Jersey, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations;

John O. Bell, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Guatemala;

John H. Burns, of Oklahoma, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Central African Republic;

Parker T. Hart, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Yemen, to serve concurrently as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the State of Kuwait;

William J. Handley, of Virginia, a Foreign Service Reserve officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Mali;

Ridgway B. Knight, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Syrian Arab Republic;

Henry R. Labouisse, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Greece;

Armin H. Meyer, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Lebanon;

Raymond L. Thurston, of Missouri, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Haiti;

Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, to be the President's special representative and adviser on African, Asian, and Latin American affairs, and Ambassador at Large;

George W. Ball, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of State;

George C. McGhee, of Texas, to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs;

Frederick G. Dutton, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

John M. Cabot, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland;

Executive M, 87th Congress, 1st session. International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, done at Washington on April 24, 1961 (Ex. Rept. No. 1); and

Executive N, 87th Congress, 1st session. Protocol relating to an amendment to the Convention on International Civil Aviation, dated at Montreal, June 21, 1961 (Ex. Rept. No. 2).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar under Coast and Geodetic Survey, on page 2.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Coast Guard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the U.S. Coast Guard be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislation business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

CONGRESSIONAL TRADE VETO

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGEE in the chair). The Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. In December, and on several occasions since, I have been urging that the President include provision for a two-thirds congressional veto in his trade program. I am therefore extremely disappointed that in asking for sweeping new trade powers, the President does not give the Congress any opportunity to participate.

The Constitution gives the Congress the authority over trade matters. I concede that Congress cannot today do the whole job. Flexibility is necessary to expand our trade contacts. Protectionism is our outmoded concept, but the elected representatives of the people must have some control over arbitrary or excessive action by the Executive. My suggestion for veto power seems to me the soundest proposal to insure this result, but certainly we must assure it in some manner.

DAIRY FARMERS MUST WATCH FARM MESSAGE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, dairy farmers of New York State and the Nation are anxiously awaiting the special message on agriculture which the President is expected to send to the Congress on or about January 30.

While the specific recommendations for farm program changes are still in the process of formulation, there have been enough leaks and informed source newspaper stories to indicate rather conclusively that radical changes in the present dairy price support program will be urged by the administration. The President's budget message of a few days ago further confirms this view.

It is reported that the administration will propose a new dairy program which would sharply restrict the amount of milk the individual dairy producer will be permitted to market. This is the supply-management concept which has been advocated by administration farm policy planners for various commodities, without success, during the past year and a half. It is essentially a production control operation which would, in effect, tell the farmer how many cows he could milk and how much milk he could sell.

Dairy farmers are rightfully concerned over the fact that milk production has been trending sharply higher during the last year while per capita consumption has been declining.

On Tuesday both the President and the Secretary of Agriculture indicated that Americans should consume more milk to meet their minimum health requirements. More milk consumption is a highly desirable goal. I am, of course, concerned that consumers get good safe milk at fair prices.

However, the possibility of sweeping national production controls on dairy products and other farm commodities is a new departure. I am worried about the impact which such a program would have upon our present reasonable and orderly milk marketing arrangements in the Northeast.

If we are to have production controls at all, they must come from the grassroots. They must be approved by men on the farm, not ordained by remote control from Washington. As one New York farmer put it to me, a small brain closer to the farm is better than a big brain in Washington. Before we start setting up sweeping production controls, we had best have a hard look at what we are doing.

EASTERN COLLEGE ATHLETIC CONFERENCE PLEADS FOR ACTION ON SPORTS ANTIBRIBERY BILL

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, participation in college athletics is supposed to be a way of developing a student's character, sportsmanship, and physical well-being. In recent years, however, recurrent exposés of basketball fixes have jeopardized all intercollegiate athletics and deeply shocked the public.

The National Collegiate Athletic Association and other affiliated organizations have been making every effort to rid college sports from any taint of corruption. The NCAA recognizes, as we all should, that college athletics is on trial and that the elimination of gambling inroads is essential.

Recently the Eastern College Athletic Conference organized a committee of 40 members, under the chairmanship of DeLaney Kiphuth, of Yale, to pool information on the spread of gambling in intercollegiate athletics and to recommend measures to preclude the recurrence of scandals. A copy of the report of the Committee of Forty has just been furnished to me by Asa S. Bushnell, the commissioner of the ECAC.

This report recommends strong measures to protect our college sports from corrupting influences. It also strongly endorses a bill I have proposed—S. 2182—to make a Federal crime of activity designed to fix sports events or to attempt to do so. In his letter to me, Commissioner Bushnell states:

> With Congress once more in session, the ECAC and its member colleges are hopeful that the prospect is good for early adoption of your antibribery bill, S. 2182.

Mr. President, we must not ignore this plea for congressional action.

When our Nation's leading colleges call on us for help in their efforts to drive the gamblers off their campuses and out of their arenas, we should be eager to respond. We will all have to bear some responsibility for the next scandal if we turn a deaf ear to this request for assistance.

The Senate Committee on the Judiciary requested a report from the Department of Justice on my antibribery bill last July, but no recommendations have yet been received from the Department. I am confident that the Attorney General shares my strong desire to pursue every reasonable measure to protect college sports from being destroyed by criminal elements, and that he would consider Commissioner Bushnell's pleas very sympathetically. I have, therefore, asked the Attorney General to review this legislation and have assured him of my willingness to support any effective alternative which he may recommend.

It is my hope that the Attorney General will give his strong endorsement to sports antibribery legislation. Congress certainly will give great weight to his views, and I am confident that with his support action would soon be forthcoming. The future of college sports hangs in the balance, and we must do everything we can to weight the scales in favor of honest character-building competition.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Commissioner Bushnell's letter and the report of the ECAC Committee of Forty be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter and report were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

January 18, 1962.

Hon. Kenneth B. Keating,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Keating: With Congress once more in session, the ECAC and its member colleges are hopeful that the prospect is good for early adoption of your antibribery bill, S. 2182.

Perhaps in this connection you will find the enclosure interesting. It is the report of our Committee of Forty, which was given responsibility for the development of sound corrective and preventive measures in the situation created by the collegiate basketball fixes. The report was unanimously adopted at the annual meeting of the conference on December 8 last.

Only a few days ago we held a special meeting of our executive council to implement the report's recommendations. Plans were laid for our organization's enactment of all needed legislation with a minimum of delay.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,
Asa S. Bushnell.

Report of Committee of Forty

INTRODUCTION

The startling revelations of the wave of scandals in intercollegiate basketball during 1961 has prompted educators, athletic administrators and coaches to study intercollegiate athletics with a view to taking steps which will prevent a recurrence of these incidents. This is particularly emphasized by the fact that the 1961 fixes followed by only a decade the wave of scandals in 1951. Feeling that the conference level was a most effective area in which to cope with this problem, the Eastern College Athletic Conference in the early spring of 1961 organized a committee of 40 members to pool information on the spread of gambling in intercollegiate athletics and to recommend to the executive council of the conference measures designed to preclude the recurrence of scandals. This committee has met three times, spent many hours in deliberation, made extensive investigations, and is now prepared to make its report. Though it cannot legislate on its own, the committee strongly urges the executive council to consider remedial enactments which can substantially reduce the possibility of a recurrence of these unfortunate incidents. It is the strong conviction of all members of the committee that should these incidents recur the whole structure of intercollegiate athletics would be jeopardized. College athletics are on trial in the public eye. Success in eliminating gambling inroads is, therefore, vital to the reestablishment of confidence in amateur and intercollegiate sports.

NCAA REPORT

In the fall of 1961 the officers of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the American Football Coaches Association, the National Association of Basketball Coaches, and the National Association of Collegiate Commissioners produced a special report on the problem of bribery in intercollegiate athletics. The ECAC committee wholeheartedly endorses this report. In some of its recommendations the ECAC committee has repeated with special emphasis provisions of the NCAA report. Other parts of the NCAA report are not stressed in this report. This should not be interpreted to mean that any part of the NCAA report is regarded as unimportant and it should be clearly understood that, to repeat, the NCAA report is enthusiastically endorsed.

SPECIFIC PROTECTION AGAINST GAMBLING AND BRIBERY

Measures must be taken which are designed to resist any reentry of gambling interests into intercollegiate contests and the first concern of the committee has been to recommend such measures.

It is important that all athletic administrators, coaches, and players be reminded constantly of the hazard of gambling and bribery in intercollegiate athletics. Information must be gathered and distributed to all and every effort must be made to keep fresh all available information concerning the nature of the problem. It is feared that after the 1951 scandals the hazards of gambling interests tampering with athletics were soon forgotten. This must not happen again.

To this end it is recommended that the ECAC issue periodic bulletins at regular intervals dealing with the gambling-bribery problem in all of its ramifications. This bulletin should contain case histories of athletics involved with gambling ,and bribery in 1951 and 1961, the means by which gamblers made inroads, and the disastrous results for the young men who through ignorance of the consequences become involved.

Representatives of the ECAC should meet periodically with district attorneys and with law enforcement agencies in various metropolitan areas to determine the extent of gambling activity and to be aware of interest on the part of gambling groups in intercollegiate sports.

Athletic administrators should conduct annual meetings of members of all teams at which the material issued in the suggested bulletins should be discussed in detail.

Beyond this program of orientation, measures of control must be taken in athletics which will discourage gambling activity. The committee specifically recommends, as follows:

1. Legislation be enacted to bar all outside competition in basketball. This prohibition should last to graduation for all undergraduates who have represented the member institution in the sport of basketball.
2. Wherever feasible intercollegiate competition in basketball should be restricted to basketball courts on institutional premises and not in public arenas.
3. Legislation should be enacted providing for the permanent loss of eligibility of any athlete failing to report a bribe offer or approach by gamblers. It is assumed that member institutions themselves will take steps to dismiss students who fail to report such offers, but, of course, it is not in the capacity of the conference to dismiss such students.
4. The conference should make a concerted and well organized effort to appeal to editors and sports editors of all newspapers in the conference area to discontinue the publication of information regarding odds and point spreads in collegiate basketball and football. This information aids and abets the gambler and thus indirectly involves the institutions themselves in the activities of the gambler.
5. The ECAC should urge the adoption at National and State levels of legislation now pending which would make a crime of activity designed to fix sports events or to attempt to do so.

THE PROPER FOCUS OF ATHLETIC PROGRAMS

All members of the committee have become convinced that this problem is intimately involved in the tendency for athletics to become an end in themselves. Constant efforts must be made to keep athletics in proper perspective. This is not to say that athletics do not have great educational value.

On the contrary, when properly related to the student's total educational experience they can be of most significant educational value. Certain principles must be adhered to to keep athletics in their proper position in the educational scheme.

It is urged that coaches be regarded primarily as teachers with responsibility for giving to athletes the lessons of true sportsmanship, a sense of responsibility to the team and other fundamental values of vigorous athletic activity. When a coach feels that he is being judged not by these standards but by how appealing he can make his team at the gate or by what his raw won-lost record is, he is led to practices which create abuses in athletics. The coach must feel the same kind of interest in the individual student that any good teacher feels.

Principle II of the ECAC Statement of Principles and Policies—Principle of Institutional Control and Responsibility (1961 handbook, p. 39) should be amended to require that each member institution assume responsibility that only those students be admitted who are seeking admission for educational purposes. This amendment should stipulate that member institutions design their athletic programs in such a way as to minimize or eliminate interference with academic pursuits.

It has long been realized that athletics provide a most meaningful and dramatic area for developing high moral standards in the participant. Under Principle VI of the ECAC Statement of Principles and Policies—Implementation of the Principles (1961 handbook, p. 42), it should be provided that each member institution be prepared upon request to furnish to any other member institution, statements concerning principles and policies governing its conduct of athletics. These statements should be submitted annually to the ECAC and should be part of the orientation of each squad at the beginning of its season of play.

Strong consideration should be given to means by which information can be exchanged among member colleges concerning academic standards, financial assistance, and admissions records of individual students. This exchange would be initiated for the purpose of establishing the propriety of competition between two institutions which can be fair only if similar standards in these areas are held by both institutions.

Some institutions have found that a simple pledge signed by the athlete to uphold the highest moral standards in athletics is a helpful procedure in reminding them of their moral responsibilities.

It is recommended that the rules of eligibility be amended to limit athletic eligibility for all undergraduates to the first eight terms of residence in a collegiate institution. This amendment in combination with the present limitation to a 5-year period of eligibility would effectively eliminate the temptation to extend the athletic eligibility of an athlete to the detriment of his academic program. Hopefully many boys now staying on in college with the primary purpose of extending their athletic careers would be discouraged from doing so.

The committee is convinced by its studies that many institutions in this conference have failed to emphasize ECAC principles governing financial assistance. Principle VI—Principle Governing Financial Aid to Athletes (1961 handbook, p. 40), with special emphasis on the following subparagraphs, should be brought to the attention of the presidents of all member institutions each year:

"In all cases where financial aid is given to athletes, all of the following stipulations must be met:

"1. The athlete must be admitted on the same basis as any other student.

"2. The athlete must maintain the same academic standards which are required of other students.

"3. Need or high scholarship or both must be definitely established.

"4. The basis for establishing need for athletes must be the same as that used for establishing need for other students.

"5. The academic standards which are required of a student in order that he qualify for financial aid must be definitely stated by the institution. In the case of high scholarship, it is assumed that the standard will be the same for all students including athletes. In the case where need is the basis upon which a student qualifies for financial aid, the academic standard need not be the same for all students including athletes.

"6. The amount of the grant to an athlete must not exceed the limits which are available to other students. In addition, where financial aid is granted on the basis of need, it shall not exceed the amount necessary to supplement the personal resources and employment earnings of the athlete in meeting the minimum cost of attending school as published in the official bulletin of the institution."

RECRUITING

The committee found that more than any other factor malpractice in recruiting was responsible for the erosion of the educational principles of intercollegiate athletics. At the same time this area is the most difficult in which to present specific recommendations for reform.

It is, therefore, urged that further study be made to discover ways to eliminate those recruiting practices which establish meretricious criteria upon which the student bases his selection of a college. What are these meretricious criteria? Let's identify them and eliminate them. This can be the important charge of the study we recommend.

In addition we also urge that action be taken to improve our current legislation governing recruiting.

Along this line it is recommended that Principle V—Principles Governing Recruiting (1961 handbook, p. 41) be amended by providing that each member institution make a single official responsible for all recruiting by the institution. This official should be intimately acquainted with all parties involved in any way with the institution's recruiting efforts and should make clear to all, the rules of the NCAA, the ECAC, and his own institution with respect to this activity. In this way ignorance, as an excuse for violations of rules and standards, would be eliminated.

Finally it is recommended that penalties for violation of conference or NCAA rules governing recruiting be made more stringent. It is recommended that the council disqualify any institution from competition with other members of the conference if that institution is found to have violated rules governing recruiting. The committee is convinced that the cause of many of the problems in intercollegiate athletics is recruiting malpractice. It is further convinced that these malpractices in recruiting establish a climate of opinion on which scandals can occur.

Rules governing these areas must be detailed and penalties for violations made more severe.

CONCLUSION

There was a general concensus of the committee that all of the foregoing recommended steps might be treatments of symptoms of a disease which could be controlled but not cured by these recommendations. There is a suspicion that the essential problem rests in the failure of some colleges to regard athletics as educational with a consequent unwillingness on their part to support expense for athletics as an educational cost. This leads to the demand that the athletic departments support their expenses out of gate receipts. Indeed there are many cases where gate receipts are used to support expenses in areas not related to athletics.

Until such time as educational institutions are willing to assume the expenses in athletics as an educational cost, to relieve the athletic department of the necessity of paying its way, many of the problems discussed in this report will continue to plague us. High pressure recruiting, financial aid to athletes not available to all students, double standards of admission, inordinate pressures for victory in athletics all stem from the necessity to create income out of gate receipts. These practices create an atmosphere in which gambling and bribery can operate.

The foregoing report is respectfully submitted to the Eastern College Athletic Conference assembled in annual meeting.

ECAC COMMITTEE OF FORTY

Chairman: DeLaney Kiphuth, Yale; Lewis P. Andreas, Syracuse; John W. Bach, Fordham; Everett D. Barnes, Colgate; Rev. A. B. Begley, O.P., Providence; Asa S. Bushnell, ECAC; Frank Carver, Pittsburgh; Ernest C. Casale, Temple; J. Orlean Christian, Connecticut; Eugene F. Flynn, Holy Cross; William J. Flynn, Boston College; Jeremiah Ford II, Pennsylvania; Ralph Furey, Columbia; John J. Gallagher, Niagara; Ellwood A. Geiges, ECAC; Hugh S. Greer, Connecticut; James J. Henry, LaSalle; Rev. John J. Horgan, Seton Hall; Alvin F. Julian, Dartmouth; Robert J. Kane, Cornell; Joseph Lapchick, St. John's; J. W. Liebertx, Merchant Marine; Harry Litwack, Temple; Ernest B. McCoy, Penn State; Nicholas M. McKnight, Columbia; Walter T. McLaughlin, St. John's; Paul F. Mackesey, Brown; Robert A. MacKinnon, Canisius; Arthur L. Mahan, Villanova; Donald W. Moore, LaSalle; Kenneth A. Norton, Manhattan; John P. Nucatola, ECAC; Victor F. Obeck, N.Y.U.; Ray Oosting, Trinity; John T. Ramsay, St. Joseph's; George L. Shiebler, ECAC; Edward S. Steitz, Springfield; Herbert E. Sutter, Wagner; Frank R. Thoms, Jr., Williams; Robert M. Whitelaw, ECAC.

ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a few days ago, in many communities throughout Pennsylvania and elsewhere in the United States, Americans of Ukrainian descent looked back 44 years and commemorated the 2-year period from 1918 to 1920 when Ukraine was independent.

This period was the culmination of a struggle which began in the middle of the 17th century. Although Ukrainian independence lasted only briefly, the people of this nation still think and yearn for the benefits of a free and independent life.

We in Pennsylvania know of their love of freedom, their rich sense of culture, their individual aggressiveness and self-reliance, and their respect for spiritual values. These traits have benefited our State and the Nation.

Ukrainians will not easily forget the centuries of struggle for just 2 years of independence. We all look forward to the day when all nations of the world will have the opportunity of planning their own destinies and the chance to determine for themselves the system of government under which they will live.

The domination of the people of the captive nations should be a constant reminder to all of us of the blessing of liberty. It indicates the necessity for a world in which the rights of all men are respected. It should require us to work even more vigorously for a world in which differences will be settled by rule of law, and not by the terrible weapons of war.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for the last 40 years some 42 million brave Ukrainians have suffered under their cruel rulers, the Communist dictators, just as their ancestors suffered as the slaves of the Russian czars for 250 years before that. In the last 300 years the liberty-loving Ukrainian people have known freedom for only the short period of 2 years, between 1918 and 1920. But those sad facts do not tell the complete story of the Ukrainian people's struggle for freedom and independence. That struggle reached its height when the Ukrainian Republic was set up in January of 1918. The date of that great event, January 22, was a turning point in the history of the Ukrainian people, and it has become a national holiday for all descendants and friends of the Ukraine everywhere.

The people of the Ukraine have struggled against tremendous odds to establish a national homeland, but again and again their efforts were blocked by their neighbors. The northern and western parts of the Ukraine are the ancient lands of the earliest medieval Russian state of the 9th through 13th centuries, centering on the capital city of Kiev and the valley of the Dnieper River. These wealthy territories were completely ruined by the Mongols, who invaded the country in the 13th century. Many Ukrainians and Ukrainian-Americans are descendants of these people, the original population of Kiev. These are industrious, courageous, and gifted people. The art, music, and literature of the Ukrainian people have enriched the cultural life of our country.

The people of the eastern and southern Ukraine are for the most part descended from Ruthene immigrants from the north who, to escape the Polish and Lithuanian princes and nobles who were making life hard for them, went to the border territory, an area run by the Lithuanians, where they could live in free communities. But after 1667 the Russians controlled the Ukraine east of the Dnieper River, and then the Ukrainians were divided among Russians, Poles, and Turks. One hundred and twenty-five years later most Ukrainians came under Russian rule, although some still lived in Rumania and the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

The feelings which I would like to share with you today were expressed for all time by the great Ukrainian poet, Taras Shevchenko, who, during an unhappy life, suffered all the hardships of serfdom and exile. Shevchenko reminds us of all the unfulfilled hopes of the Ukrainian people, which he described in poetry about his homeland. Like their great national poet, the Ukrainians still believe in their ideals of freedom and independence. In the sad history of the Ukrainian people, this is a very encouraging fact. On this 44th anniversary of their historic independence day I am proud to join with my fellow Americans of Ukrainian ancestry in hoping that peace, happiness, and freedom and independence for the Ukrainian homeland will be achieved and respected.

CONDITIONS IN BRAZIL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on January 15 of this year an editorial appeared in the New York Times entitled "Trouble in Brazil." This editorial is extremely critical of a number of attempts to bring some kind of order out of chaos which, unfortunately, to some extent now affects that great country, which is a prime ally of ours.

On the 19th of January, the very able and distinguished Ambassador of Brazil, Dr. Roberto De Oliveria Campos wrote a letter to the New York Times which I think is worthy of consideration by our colleagues. It replies to the editorial in the New York Times.

I ask unanimous consent that both the editorial and Dr. Campos' letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 19, 1962]

CONDITIONS IN BRAZIL—AMBASSADOR COMMENTS ON ECONOMY, STATUS OF LEFTIST MOVEMENT

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your January 15 editorial "Trouble in Brazil" constitutes an exception in the generally balanced and well-informed appraisals of events and situations in Latin America which are characteristic of the New York Times.

As an example of unqualified judgment is, inter alia, the statement that the "economy deteriorated." From all indications, the rate of growth of the real gross national product during 1961 has exceeded the 6-percent average achieved during the period 1954–60. This is hardly an evidence of deterioration, particularly if one remembers that few countries in the Western World are attaining this rate of growth, while many others are preparing multiyear plans in order to achieve rates of growth lower than that achieved by the Brazilian economy.

Inflation, of course, still plagues us. But it is not particularly enlightening to talk indiscriminately about it, without differentiating between chronic factors, such as budget deficits (which would account for a much lower rate of inflation) and sporadic factors of a nonrecurrent nature, which explain the recent sharp inflational upsurge, such as the political crisis of last August, the drought in the food producing area of the center and south and the elimination of the exchange rate subsidies for basic imports.

CONGRESSIONAL SESSION

The failure of Congress to pass the tax reform and land reform bills is held in your editorial as evidence that the new governmental system is not working out and the Congress is "floundering." Since Congress was in session for only 3 months after the establishment of the parliamentary system, and the tax proposal involves a major revamping of the fiscal system, it is no wonder that Congress preferred to make a detailed study at its next session in February, recommending in the meantime to the Executive a 40-percent cut in public expenditures.

As to land reform, it is accepted by all sectors of the population that measures must be taken to improve the access to land. Given the enormous diversity of regional conditions, not one but several methods of land reform must be used: land expropriation and redistribution, progressive land taxes, occupation of idle Government land, and colonization or resettlement schemes.

Numerous proposals have been tabled in Congress and a high-level commission appointed by the Executive to reconcile those proposals and present recommendations for a Government-sponsored bill which would take into account (a) the extreme diversity of regional conditions and demographic density, (b) the obstacle created by the constitutional provision requiring prior cash compensation in case of expropriation, (c) the fact that land taxes and several aspects of land policy fall within the purview of state and municipalities rather than of the Federal Government.

REVOLUTION AS ALTERNATIVE

In view if the foregoing, it is no wonder that the voting of the Federal land reform proposals could not be achieved as speedily as one might wish, unless we were prepared to have agrarian revolution rather than agrarian reform.

In the same issue of the New York Times, Tad Szulc published an article which calls for some comments. There seems to be throughout the article an overestimation of the importance of the leftist movement in Brazil. Since the extreme left is the scavenger of revolution and civil wars, its ideal moment was the political crisis of last August. The fact that the moderate centrist forces prevailed at that critical moment, leading to establishment of a parliamentary regime, gives no basis to presume a different behavior in the more normal conditions that now prevail.

The author seems further to identify our policy of independence with a neutralist policy. There are, however, substantial differences between the two. The typical neutralist country is preoccupied with the creation of a third bloc of powers. We are not. The neutralist countries are systematically nonalined, while we are committed to the inter-American system. Most of the neutralist countries are not committed to Western democratic institutions or to the free enterprise systems, while we abide by them.

We are not systematically nonalined, as the neutralists pretend to be, nor systematically alined as the satellite countries are. While faithful to the inter-American system, we may in specific circumstances follow independent policies, if that serves the cause of peace or the cause of our economic development.

Finally, there should be no oversimplified assimilation of economic nationalism with leftist movements. The bill passed by the lower house to control remittances of profits by foreign investors was more a misguided example of economic chauvinism than a demonstration of leftist power and it is not likely to be upheld by the senate.

ROBERTO DE OLIVEIRA CAMPOS,
Ambassador of Brazil.

WASHINGTON, *January 17, 1962.*

[From the New York Times, Jan. 15, 1962]

TROUBLE IN BRAZIL

Early this spring President Goulart, of Brazil, is going to visit Washington. Within a few weeks the spectacular ex-President Janio Quadros, who suddenly and shockingly resigned last August, is returning to Brazil from his self-imposed exile.

Meanwhile, inflation continues; the economy deteriorates; the new governmental system of a weak executive and cabinet responsibility is not working, and Congress is bitterly divided and floundering, having refused to pass a tax-reform bill last month while the Chamber of Deputies did pass a bill to penalize foreign investments. In October there will be a congressional election that has Washington deeply concerned, as a dispatch in today's Times says.

There is a disturbing background of social imbalance. In a recent report on "Rural Reform in Brazil" for the American Universities Field Staff, Frank Bonilla pointed out that 8 percent of the proprietors control 75 percent of the area in farm properties; that nearly 10 million out of a total of 12 million farmworkers own no land; that 63 percent of the population depends on agriculture, and that two-thirds of this rural population are illiterate and therefore have no vote.

This tale of woe could be extended. There was a big budget deficit in 1961; the monetary unit, the cruzeiro, has improved lately but remains very weak; there is a flight of capital, and so forth. These things are happening in the largest, most heavily populated and most naturally wealthy of the Latin American countries, the country that Washington hoped would be the linchpin of the Alliance for Progress.

The signposts point toward trouble, but we must take what comfort we can from Brazil's incredible ability to absorb colossal inequities and to survive political crises without revolutions or (with rare exception) dictatorships. In any other Latin American country a dismal but safe prophecy would be revolution. In Brazil anything can happen, including peaceful and democratic survival.

CONFERENCES OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW OF AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Special Committee on World Peace through Law of the American Bar Association for the last several months has been devoting much time and effort to holding regional conferences of lawyers in order to stimulate interest and activity among lawyers and laymen for the advancement of world peace through the extension and expansion of the rule of law.

The first conference was held in June of 1961 in San José, Costa Rica, and was attended by lawyers from the 23 nations of the Americas.

The second was held in Tokyo, Japan, from September 17-20, 1961.

The third conference of lawyers from African and Middle East countries was held in Lagos, Nigeria, December 3-6, 1961.

The final regional conference of attornies from European countries is scheduled for Rome in April.

There are tentative plans for holding a world conference of lawyers, possibly in New Delhi, in January of 1963.

The three regional conferences held to date have produced in each instance a written consensus of the participants, which reflect careful thought and a large area of agreement between the members of the legal profession of all of the countries represented. These three documents deserve the close attention of all of us, and I know that they will be of interest to my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that they be inserted in the Record at the conclusion of these remarks.

I would like to pay special tribute to the ABA committee which has done such effective work in bringing about these conferences. It is an able and distinguished group, chaired by Charles S. Rhyne, Esq., of Washington, D.C., and its members include: Messrs. Erwin N. Griswold, Arthur Larson, William J. Jameson, Philip H. Lewis, Ross L. Malone, Richard M. Nixon, J. Wesley McWilliams, Mariam Rooney, Ethan A. H. Shepley, Robert G. Storey, William S. Thompson, Lyman M. Tondel, Jr., Robinson Verrill.

There being no objection, the documents were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Conference of Lawyers of the Americas on World Peace Through the Rule of Law. San Jose, Costa Rica, June 1961

CONSENSUS OF SAN JOSE[1]

[Approved June 14, 1961]

This conference of lawyers from the 23 nations of the Americas convened in San José, Costa Rica, in June 1961, to consider a program to promote world peace through a cooperative and sustained effort of the lawyers of the world to establish the international rule of law, and to formulate plans for a world conference of lawyers, hereby declares this consensus of views:

Modern weapons of destruction must be controlled through the enlightened rule of law and converted to instruments of peace.

Law has been the only means to an orderly society of individuals. It is the only hope for a peaceful society of nations. Judgments of international courts of justice must displace resort to war. This will assure a world order that is just and a realistic "Law of Nations" to replace force as the controlling factor in the world community.

Through the international rule of law the peoples of the world can achieve dignity for the individual, equality of opportunity and legitimate aspiration for economic and cultural progress in a dynamic social order of freemen.

The rule of law puts what is righteous before expediency and wisdom above emotion, so that which is just and fair will rule the affairs of men and governments by reasonable persuasion and a minimum of force, itself controlled by law.

The need for law in the world community is the greatest gap in the growing structure of civilization. The broadest objectives of extending the rule of law to the international community are to develop an international legal system which will establish, first, law rules stating minimum standards of conduct for nations and individuals in international relations, second, law rules to facilitate international social and economic contacts, transactions and development and, finally, creative law to provide for new and adequate international institutions to achieve and maintain that order and stability which will insure rapid progress for the entire world community.

The achievement of the international rule of law requires the observance of basic concepts of morality, justice, equity and reason as tested by the centuries of legal experience of civilized men.

Universal law of mankind

In view of the foregoing, the lawyers of the Americas assembled at the American Conference on World Peace Through the Rule of Law at San José, Costa Rica, in June, 1961, declare their dedication to the cause of extending the rule of law to the world community through the progressive development of a world legal system based upon a universal law of mankind containing, among others, the following general principles, the acceptance of which is essential to an effective international legal system:

Partial listing of general principles

1. International law is the supreme law of the world community.

2. Individual persons, private organizations, nations, international organizations and juridical persons are subjects of international law in international matters.

3. Founded upon the consent of its constituents, international law embodies fundamental concepts of justice and morality common to civilized societies and represents the universally accepted customs and agreements of nations and individuals throughout the world.

4. The international rule of law is founded on the eternal principle of equality of all persons before the law. This means that every right imposes a duty to respect the rights of others, and that no person, organization or nation is above the rule of law.

5. International law and courts have no authority in matters which are within the domestic jurisdiction of States; however, tribunals for the settlement of international disputes have the power to determine according to law and applicable agreements the scope and limitations of their jurisdiction.

6. Every subject of international law is bound to fulfill their international obligations and exercise their rights in good faith.

7. All subjects of international law are legally bound to settle all their international disputes by peaceful procedures. International disputes which cannot be settled in due course by negotiations or other peaceful means must be submitted to impartial third party judgment.

8. Judges who sit on international judicial institutions must be impartial, professionally competent and free from political and other improper pressures, so that they can with integrity and judicial independence decide cases impartially according to the facts and the law.

9. All nations must abstain from the unlawful use of armed force, political subversion, economic aggression or defamatory propaganda.

10. The foregoing principle does not preclude states from exercising their right of legitimate self-defense to the extent necessary to repel a threat to their national security.

11. International obligations, including decisions of international tribunals, are enforcible by appropriate international community action.

12. Subjects of international law shall be entitled to the benefit of third party adjudication before an impartial international tribunal, before any community sanctions are imposed because of an alleged violation of international law.

13. All representative government, local, national and international, is founded upon

---

[1] This statement is the first effort to state some of the principles and a program to achieve world peace through law. This consensus results from intensive debate and discussion during which the delegates considered the contents of a working paper prepared by international law experts on the history and current status of world law rules and institutions and more than 100 written documents, national studies and reports, proposals, resolutions and statements. The consensus naturally contains many compromises as well as many new ideas which require further study. The record of the San José conference will be published in book form so as to give expression to the many ideas contained in the consensus in summary form as well as to provide a presentation of those ideas advanced by delegates but omitted from the consensus. Similar conferences will be held for the lawyers of Asia, September 17-20, 1961; for the lawyers of Africa in December, and for European lawyers in 1962. A world conference will then be held to assess the recommendations of the continental conferences and to adopt a program to so advance the rule of law in the world community as to achieve and maintain a peaceful world through the rule of law.

the consent of their constituents, while under all government based on the rule of law individual persons retain their inalienable human rights.

14. The effective protection of the fundamental human rights of the individual is the indispensable basis for the achievement of a sound legal order based on peace and justice.

Support for world rule of law

Resolves—

A. To support fully the continental conferences of the lawyers of Asia, Africa and Europe and the proposed World Conference on World Peace Through the Rule of Law; and

B. To carry on the work of this conference in each of the American nations, by pledges of the delegates to this conference to undertake the formation of Committees on World Peace Through Law for their national bar association, in cities of their respective nations, or activate those committees already existing, to contribute to the new international cooperative organization which we propose that the world conference create to stimulate the plans and programs recommended by this conference and the World Conference on World Peace Through Law; and

C. To participate to the fullest in the world-peace-through-law program by working toward worldwide acceptance and application of the rule of law in all international relations; and to that end

D. To encourage individual lawyers and existing public and private international and national organizations and institutions to engage in a coordinated and sustained effort to seek agreement on the implementation of feasible ways of achieving world peace through the rule of law.

Research, education, organization program to achieve a world ruled by law

Recommends:

I. That a world conference of lawyers be convened in 1962 with delegates from all nations participating in the continental conferences invited to attend; and

II. That the topics for discussion at the world conference include:

(1) International judicial machinery for peaceful settlement of international disputes.

(2) Arbitration and other means of settlement of international disputes.

(3) The United Nations and regional organizations as factors encouraging the international rule of law.

(4) Facilitation of international commerce and economic development through international law.

(5) The rule of lawyers in development of the international rule of law.

III. That the world conference consider designating a World Rule of Law Year during which a concentrated global effort of the lawyers of the world to advance the international rule of law will be undertaken through a coordinated program of research, education and cooperative action utilizing all existing institutions and international and national organizations, and through establishing such new institutions and organizations as may be necessary to effectuate the objectives and purposes of the world-peace-through-law program; and

IV. That the world conference approve a plan to establish on a permanent basis a World Peace Through the Rule of Law Institute which shall have the following purposes:

(1) To organize and oversee a continuous series of programs and activities to be carried on during World Rule of Law Year.

(2) To coordinate activities of lawyers and legal organizations in a cooperative effort to establish the international rule of law.

(3) To effectuate decisions and recommendations of lawyers convened at the continental conferences and world conference.

(4) To undertake an intensive worldwide educational program designed to reach citizens of all nations to impress upon them the reality of their interdependence and the vital necessity of establishing the international rule of law.

(5) To organize and administer a coordinated global research program designed to accomplish the following:

A. To expand existing knowledge of international law and its sources.

B. Identify areas of common agreement which may be the basis of needed international conventions, treaties or understandings.

C. To identify general principles of international law recognized by the community of nations which can form the basis and foundation for an improved international legal system.

D. To explore areas of possible agreement concerning principles and rules of international law on matters such as outer space, disarmament, peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and other areas of international concern.

E. To study and make recommendations in respect to development of international law rules regulating matters of aggression, including use of armed force, subversion, economic warfare, and political propaganda, and, on the other hand, organized community sanctions and the right of self-defense and reprisals.

F. To study existing national and international law with a view to developing recommendations desirable for the facilitation of international commerce and economic development.

(6) To create new and expand existing systems for the continuous reporting and digesting of decisions of international tribunals, international agreements, and materials and research on international law in order to create a complete, accessible worldwide source of information essential to further development of the international rule of law.

(7) To seek proper financing for all the above and other appropriate approved endeavors of the legal profession of the world needed to create and strengthen the legal system and law rules required to achieve and maintain world peace, and, to make from said funds grants in aid of research and other projects undertaken by law schools and other bodies throughout the world.

Some specific goals

V. That there be created a World Court of Human Rights with a carefully drafted jurisdiction which will respect the domestic jurisdiction of nations yet provide a forum to correct existing deficiencies in this important field.

VI. That a Supreme Court of Justice for the Americas be created with jurisdiction over all subjects of international law in international matters.

VII. That to insure uniformity on matters of international law, appeals from the Supreme Court of Justice for the Americas should be allowed to the International Court of Justice.

VIII. That the General Assembly of the United Nations be the sole body empowered to elect judges to the International Court of Justice.

IX. That a judge of the International Court of Justice, whose nationality is the same as that of a party to a dispute before the Court, must, upon the objection of any party, disqualify himself in said case.

X. That more importance should be given to basic principles of natural law as one of the foundations of international law.

XI. That in developing a program of world peace through law we must take into consideration the very serious social and economic problems and the discrepancies which exist in the standards of living among the different people of the world, all of which contribute to lack of harmony between nations, and such matters as unfair terms of trade for raw materials and the absence of a sufficient guarantee for investments abroad in certain parts of the globe.

XII. That arbitration procedures be unified and modernized, more effective means of enforcing decisions of arbitral tribunals be sought, and that ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards and the Pact of Bogotá be encouraged, and that a system of reporting and disseminating decisions of arbitral tribunals be established.

XIII. That other means for the pacific settlement of disputes such as mediation, conciliation, good offices and investigation should be resorted to when appropriate, and that the competency of the Inter-American Peace Committee should be expanded to allow it to act when requested by any American State.

XIV. That the governments of states should refrain from carrying out acts, be they of a physical, economic or moral character, contrary to the individual personality and the dignity of the human person; and noting with concern that in some states the rule of law does not exist because of the violation of these principles and lack of application and enforcement of existing covenants and treaties, all lawyers are urged to work toward increased respect for an effective application of the rule of law both nationally and internationally.

XV. That all nations should accept, on the basis of reciprocity, the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

XVI. That efforts be made to effect changes in the structure of the United Nations to allow it more efficiently to contribute to the maintenance of world peace and security, keeping in mind the demonstrated weaknesses in the Security Council, the fact of the increase in size and change in geographic distribution of the membership of the United Nations, and the need to insure strict adherence to the decisions made by the United Nations; and

XVII. That the International Law Commission be strengthened to better enable it to fulfill its assigned tasks of developing international law by having it become a permanent, adequately staffed organ meeting continually throughout the year.

XVIII. That programs of international educational exchange should include more law students, practicing lawyers, judges and professors of law.

Pledge to build a world law structure

Concludes

That we lawyers of the Americas pledge wholeheartedly and completely to devote ourselves to the foregoing program of sustained effort necessary to the creation of a world of law to the end that the rule of law will govern all men and all nations and any man can then walk any place on the face of the earth, or travel through endless space, in freedom, in dignity and in peace.

African and Middle East Conference on World Peace Through the Rule of Law, Consensus of Lagos, Lagos, Nigeria, December 3–6, 1961

[Approved December 6, 1961]

We lawyers attending this conference of the nations of Africa and the Middle East, being aware of our professional responsibility to utilize and further develop international law and its institutions as the most effective means of justly resolving world tension and conflict, and recognizing the imperative need for positive and immediate action by the legal profession to fulfill its obligation to promote world peace through the rule of law, hereby declare the following as our consensus:

SPECIAL CALL FOR ACTION

Be it resolved, That the body of lawyers here assembled exhort the governments of all independent states in Africa and the Middle East to call conferences for the purpose of establishing a Permanent Organization of African States and a Permanent Organization of Middle East States for the promotion of the rule of law and amicable relations between these states, for the eradication of sources of conflict, and for the peaceful settlement of disputes.

This organization for Africa should include an African Court of Justice for settlement of justiciable disputes and provision for arbitration, mediation and conciliation in appropriate cases.

In recognition of the fact that the Arab League has under consideration the establishment of an Arab Regional Court of Justice for member states, we strongly recomment that such a court be formed as soon as possible in the interest of peace and for the promotion of the rule of law.

The organizations should be related to the United Nations and the courts to the International Court of Justice.

DECLARATION OF GENERAL PRINCIPLES

In order to establish an effective international legal system under the rule of law we declare that:

I. International law must be the supreme law of the world community and no person of state is above the rule of law.

II. The rule of law in international affairs must be based upon the principle of equality of all states before the law.

III. Founded upon general consent, international law must embody fundamental concepts of justice and human dignity of societies and legal systems, and the generally accepted customs and agreements of nations and individuals throughout the world.

IV. International law in a dynamic world must constantly evolve in the light of new needs and the contributions of new states.

V. A fundamental principle of the international rule of law should be that of the right of self-determination of the peoples of the world.

VI. Individuals, juridical persons, states and international organizations should, in appropriate degree, all be subject to international law, deriving rights and incurring obligations thereunder.

VII. All who are subject to international law should fulfill their international obligations and exercise their rights in good faith.

VIII. All who are subject to international law should resolve their international disputes by adjudication, arbitration, negotiation, or other peaceful procedures. The dispute settling method should be appropriate to the nature of the dispute. Generally, the legal aspects of disputes should be resolved by legal procedures and political aspects by political procedures.

IX. Judges on international tribunals must be professionally competent and free from political, national or other improper pressures.

X. International tribunals, although having no authority in matters which are within the domestic jurisdiction of states, should have the normal power to determine according to applicable agreements and international law the scope of their jurisdiction.

XI. Decisions of international tribunals should be enforcible by appropriate and expeditious international community action. National legislation should be adopted for the enforcement of the decisions of international tribunals.

XII. Those subject to international law must, prior to the application of any judicially imposed sanctions, be entitled to the benefit of third party adjudication.

XIII. Individuals must be entitled to effective legal protection of fundamental and inalienable human rights without distinction as to race, religion or belief.

XIV. The United Nations organization is the world's best hope for international peace under the rule of law and should be supported and strengthened by all possible means.

In order to effectuate and support the foregoing, this conference now therefore

[*Resolutions of conference*]

Resolves:

I. To participate to the fullest in the world-peace-through-law program by working toward world wide acceptance and application of the rule of law in international affairs, and to that end

II. To encourage individual lawyers and existing public and private international and national organizations and institutions to engage in a coordinated and sustained effort to seek agreement on the implementation of feasible ways of achieving world peace through the rule of law, and

III. To support the program of world peace through law by encouraging the formation and support of committees on world peace through law within associations of lawyers.

IV. To support the proposed World Conference on World Peace Through Law, and all preliminary action required for that conference.

In order to implement the foregoing resolutions, and recognizing the need for immediate and specific action, this conference now therefore

Program for world peace through law

Recommends:

I. That a planning committee for the World Peace Through Law Institute proposed by the preceding conferences be established and charged with the responsibility for preparation of a draft charter for preliminary organization to be submitted to the proposed world conference of lawyers, said charter including but not limited to the following functions and purposes:

A. To effectuate by every available means the decisions and recommendations of lawyers convened at the world conference.

B. To harmonize activities of lawyers and legal organizations in a cooperative effort to establish the rule of law in international affairs, including arrangements for periodic conferences to promote international understanding and the rule of law.

C. To stimulate, conduct and coordinate a continuous series of programs and activities to be carried on during the proposed World Rule of Law Year.

D. To undertake an intensive worldwide educational program designed to reach lawyers and citizens of all nations to make them aware that international law is already a living and constantly growing system of law which is practical and accepted; and to impress upon them the inescapable logic and vital necessity of fully establishing the rule of law in international affairs.

E. To create new and further develop existing systems for the continuous reporting and digesting of decisions of international tribunals, international agreements, and research or other documents of international law in order to create a readily available source of information for further development of the rule of law in international affairs.

F. To make awards of honor to states, public or private organizations and individuals in recognition of outstanding contributions to the establishment of the rule of law in international affairs.

G. To study and make recommendations with respect to development of the rules, principles and standards of international law defining and controlling use of armed force, subversion, economic warfare, political propaganda, and defining the right of self-defense and reprisals, international sanctions, and other lawful means of countering aggression in international affairs.

H. To study existing national and international law with a view to developing recommendations for the facilitation of international commerce and economic development.

I. To further stimulate and help coordinate a global research program utilizing facilities of the Institute and existing national and international organizations to accomplish objectives including but not limited to the following:

1. Expansion of knowledge of international law and its sources;

2. Identification of areas of common agreement which may be the basis of needed international conventions, treaties or understandings;

3. Definition of general principles of law recognized by nations generally which can form the foundation for an improved international legal system and harmonization of different conceptions of international law;

4. Drafting of model codes and recommendations dealing with subjects of international concern, including:

a. International investment, to safeguard adequately the interests of both the capital importing and the capital exporting nations;

b. International trade, especially in commodities and raw materials, to protect the legitimate interests of both consumers and producers, and of both importing and exporting nations;

c. Outer space, to assure its development in accordance with principles of the rule of law and removing it from international politics;

d. Nuclear test suspension coupled with inspection, to adequately provide security against possible violations, while simultaneously assuring inspected countries that their internal security would in no way be violated;

e. International arbitration, public or private including a model clause compromissoire;

f. International arms control and disarmament;

5. Work on unification and harmonization of law in fields such as commercial documents in which unification or harmonization is practicable and desirable;

6. Engaging in a comprehensive study of existing judicial and nonjudicial international legal disputes, and of proposals for creation of regional and specialized international tribunals, taking into account varying and common legal, economic, cultural, and political interests of nations;

J. To seek proper financing for all the above and other appropriate approved endeavors of the legal profession of the world aimed at creating and strengthening the legal system, and rules of law required to achieve and maintain world peace; seeking to include grants in aid of research and other projects undertaken or to be undertaken by law schools and other bodies throughout the world.

K. To seek consultative status to the Economic and Social Council under article 71 of the United Nations Charter.

II. That special committees be constituted and charged with the task of preparing a draft convention on disarmament, a draft convention to end nuclear testing, and a draft convention on peaceful uses of outer space, said drafts to be available for the delegates at the forthcoming world conference of lawyers.

III. That special committees be constituted for the purpose of drafting agreements and conventions for the facilitation of international commerce and economic development to be available for the delegates at the forthcoming world conference of lawyers.

IV. That the lawyers of the world declare their support for and take action toward establishing a World Law Day.

V. That a world conference of lawyers be convened in 1962 with delegates from all nations in the world invited to attend.

VI. That the topics for discussion at the world conference include the following:

A. Basic principles underlying the rule of law in international affairs;

B. International judicial machinery for peaceful settlement of international disputes;

C. Arbitration, conciliation, mediation, good offices, and other means of peaceful settlement of international disputes;

D. The United Nations and regional organizations as factors encouraging the rule of law in international affairs;

E. Facilitation of international commerce and economic development through international law;

F. The role of lawyers in development of the rule of law in international affairs.

VII. That the world conference consider designating a World Rule of Law Year during which a concentrated global effort of the lawyers of the world to advance the rule of law in international affairs will be undertaken through a coordinated program of research, education, and cooperative action utilizing all existing institutions and international and national organizations, and establishing such new institutions and organizations as may be necessary to effectuate the objectives and purposes of the world-peace-through-law program.

VIII. That there be established a global system of regional chambers of the International Court of Justice, from which appeals to the full Court would be permissible.

IX. That there be established a Court of Justice for African nations with a carefully drafted jurisdiction over matters of regional concern.

X. That there be established a Court of Justice for Arab nations with a carefully drafted jurisdiction over matters of regional concern.

XI. That in international matters, individuals, juridical persons, nations, and international organizations be permitted to be parties in appropriate cases before international tribunals.

XII. That the membership of the International Court of Justice more accurately represent the areas and legal systems in the world which are not adequately represented on that body, notably African.

XIII. That efforts be made to establish a series of specialized international courts and tribunals to operate under agreements reached between nations having a common interest in matters specifically assigned to their jurisdiction. These matters could include among other things, trade in certain vital commodities or other items; international investment, public or private; water rights and related problems; and international economic activities, carried on through the United Nations and international organizations.

XIV. That international judicial and arbitration procedures be further developed; that more effective means of enforcing decisions of arbitral tribunals be sought; that ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards be encouraged.

XV. That other means for the pacific settlement of disputes such as mediation, conciliation, good offices and investigation be resorted to when appropriate.

XVI. That all nations accept, on the basis of reciprocity, the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

XVII. That the United Nations Charter be revised to take into consideration the fact that the new independent status of many nations of Asia and Africa has nearly doubled United Nations membership, and in particular, that the Security Council and Economic and Social Councils of the United Nations be enlarged to permit adequate representation of these new members.

XIII. That a concerted effort be made to find ways of making maximum use of existing provisions of the United Nations Charter which can contribute to world peace and security under the rule of law, including the further development of a strong independent Secretariat, the courageous use where necessary by the General Assembly of its powers under the Uniting for Peace Resolution, and the continued development of effective United Nations Peace Forces.

XIX. That efforts be made to achieve uniformity of law, notably in the fields of negotiable instruments, international sales and international transportation; to obtain agreement on uniform rules in the field of conflict of laws for internationally important private law and to secure more effective judicial assistance and to obtain national legislation in harmony with these objectives.

XX. That the Sixth (Legal) Committee of the General Assembly assume greater responsibility, in particular for assuring consideration of the legal aspects of matters brought before the General Assembly; and that the International Law Commission be strengthened and given more staff assistance, and that its sessions be lengthened.

XXI. That the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank) should establish regional branches in different areas of Africa and the Middle East and thereby more effectively and rapidly aid economic development in the "developing" countries.

XXII. That a world community of legal scholars be developed through expanded programs of international exchanges; the community to include law students, practicing lawyers, judges and professors of law, and that universities be encouraged to establish programs devoted to studies concerned with world rule of law.

Conclusion

We delegates attending this Conference on World Peace Through the Rule of Law, pledge our full support of the programs and principles set forth in this consensus, and the exertion of every effort to realize the ideal of the international rule of law as our contribution to the cause of world peace.

ASIAN AND AUSTRALASIAN CONFERENCE ON WORLD PEACE THROUGH THE RULE OF LAW, CONCENSUS OF TOKYO, TOKYO, JAPAN, SEPTEMBER 17–20, 1961

[Approved September 20, 1961]

We lawyers atending this conference being convinced that the establishment of the rule of law in international affairs will promote world peace hereby declare our concensus as follows:

I. Peace maintained through the rule of law in international affairs will assure a world society dedicated to justice and to fulfillment of the fundamental rights of individuals and nations. Thereby man may pursue in freedom and with equality of opportunity his legitimate aspirations for economic, social and political progress. To achieve these objectives organized law must replace organized war as the controlling factor in the fate of humanity.

II. Being gravely concerned over the threat of weapons of mass destruction and the hazards to mankind arising from existing international tensions and world disorder, we dedicate ourselves to the establishment of the rule of law in international affairs through an organized worldwide effort of the legal profession. We pledge our full and active support of the program and principles set forth in this consensus.

CALL FOR ACTION TO THE UNITED NATIONS

As an immediate step to lessen world tensions, we call upon the 16th General Assembly of the United Nations now in session to request immediately of the International Court of Justice advisory opinions concerning the following:

I. All legal questions involved in the Berlin crisis, including air corridor use, land access routes, and the walling off of East Berlin.

II. Whether any nation has a legal right to conduct nuclear tests and if so, subject to what limitations.

III. All legal questions involved in other crisis areas wherever peace is threatened.

We urge that the General Assembly request the nations involved to refrain from further prejudicial action until such time as these advisory opinions have been rendered and a legal basis for solutions identified.

We further urge that the United Nations immediately begin preparation of drafts on the following:

I. A convention to be signed by all nations dedicating the use and knowledge of outer space to the peaceful uses of all mankind.

II. A convention on disarmament to which universal adherence may be demanded thereby ending the ever accelerating arms race before nuclear holocaust occurs.

III. A convention laying down rules governing investigations and interventions by the United Nations in the interests of preserving peace, thus avoiding the misunderstandings arising from the lack of such rules.

We pledge our assistance in the drafting of these conventions and we urge the lawyers of the world to give their support to this effort as an essential part of the world-peace-through-law program.

TO GOVERNMENTS

We call upon the governments of the world to:

I. Renounce the use of armed force, political subversion, economic sanctions and defamatory propaganda for aggressive purposes.

II. Agree to resolve all disputes with other nations through peaceful means and to submit all legal issues to appropriate international tribunals.

III. Recognize the dignity of the individual and the protection of fundamental human rights as the foundation of the rule of law in the world community.

IV. Accept the supremacy of the rule of law over governments both within nations and in the world community.

V. End the ever accelerating arms race before it explodes by accident or design into atomic holocaust.

VI. End all nuclear tests under an effective inspection agreement which insures compliance.

TO THE PEOPLE

We remind mankind that:

Under the rule of law the individual may live in freedom, in dignity, and in peace. In the absence of the rule of law the individual becomes the subject of arbitrary power over all political, economic and social life. He lives under tyranny and apprehension in fear and bondage.

We therefore call upon the peoples of the world to support this program for world peace through the rule of law as the imperative of our day. In recognition of the power of public opinion in building a world of law, and to reverse the current senseless trend toward war, we further call upon all mankind to take the immediate and practical step of communicating to their government leaders and United Nations representatives, through every possible means, their full support of the above recommendations and the program of world peace through law as herein set forth.

DECLARATION OF GENERAL PRINCIPLES

In order to establish an effective international legal system under the rule of law we declare that:

I. International law must be the supreme law of the world community.

II. Founded upon the consent of its constituents, international law must embody fundamental concepts of justice, human dignity and morality common to civilized societies. It must represent the generally accepted customs and agreements of all nations and individuals throughout the world.

III. International law in a dynamic world must be constantly adjusted to changing needs. It must take account of the special circumstances of newly emerging nations.

IV. Individuals, private organizations, nations, international organizations and juridical persons should all be subject to international law, deriving rights and incurring obligations thereunder.

V. The rule of law in international affairs should be based upon the principle of equality of all its subjects before the law.

VI. All who are subject to international law must fulfill their international obligations and exercise their rights in good faith.

VII. All who are subject to international law must resolve all their international disputes by adjudication, arbitration, negotiation or other peaceful procedures.

VIII. Judges on international tribunals must be impartial, professionally competent and free from political and other improper pressures.

IX. International tribunals, although having no authority in matters which are within the domestic jurisdiction of states, must have the power to determine according to applicable agreements and international law the scope of their jurisdiction.

X. International obligations, including decisions of international tribunals, must be enforced by appropriate international community action.

XI. Those subject to international law should be entitled to the benefit of third party adjudication before an impartial international tribunal before any judicially imposed community sanctions are applied.

XII. Individuals should be entitled to effective legal protection of their fundamental and inalienable human rights.

In order to effectuate and support the foregoing, this conference now therefore

Resolutions of delegates

Resolves:

I. To participate to the fullest in the world-peace-through-law program by working toward worldwide acceptance and application of the rule of law in international relations, and to that end

II. To encourage individual lawyers and existing public and private international and national organizations and institutions to engage in a coordinated and sustained effort to seek agreement on the implementation of feasible ways of achieving world peace through the rule of law, and

III. To support the program of world-peace-through-law by encouraging the formation and support of Committees on World Peace Through Law within their national or local bar associations, and

IV. To support the proposed World Conference on World Peace Through Law, and all preliminary action required for that conference, and

V. To support the proposed new international organization to be known as the World Peace Through Law Institute.

In order to implement the foregoing resolutions by specific actions this conference Recommends:

Program for world peace through law

I. That the lawyers of the world declare their support and take action toward establishing a World Law Day, and

II. That a world conference of lawyers be convened in 1962 with delegates from all nations in the world invited to attend, and

III. That the topics for discussion at the world conference include the following:

A. Basic principles of the rule of law in international affairs.

B. International judicial machinery for peaceful settlement of international disputes;

C. Arbitration and other means of settlement of international disputes;

D. The United Nations and regional organizations as factors encouraging the rule of law in international affairs;

E. Facilitation of international commerce and economic development through international law;

F. The role of lawyers in development of the rule of law in international affairs.

IV. That the world conference consider designating a World Rule of Law Year during which a concentrated global effort of the lawyers of the world to advance the rule of law in international affairs will be undertaken through a coordinated program of research, education, and cooperative action, utilizing all existing institutions and international and national organizations, and establishing such new institutions and organizations as may be necessary to effectuate the objectives and purposes of the world-peace-through-law program; and

V. That the world conference approve a plan to establish on a permanent basis a World Peace Through Law Institute which shall have the following purposes:

A. To stimulate, conduct and coordinate a continuous series of programs and activities to be carried on during World Rule of Law Year.

B. To harmonize activities of lawyers and legal organizations in a cooperative effort to establish the rule of law in international affairs, including arrangements for periodic conferences of lawyers to promote international understanding and the rule of law.

C. To effectuate decisions and recommendations of lawyers convened at the world conference.

D. To undertake an intensive worldwide educational program designed to reach lawyers and citizens of all nations to impress upon them the vital necessity of establishing the rule of law in international affairs.

E. To study and make recommendations in respect to development of rules, principles and standards of international law defining and regulating matters of aggression, including use of armed force, subversion, economic warfare and political propaganda; and also establishing the necessary community sanctions, together with the right of self-defense, reprisals, and other means of prevention of aggression in international affairs.

F. To study existing national and international law with a view to developing recommendations desirable for the facilitation of international commerce and economic development.

G. To create new and expand existing systems for the continuous reporting digesting of decisions of international tribunals, international agreements, and materials and research on international law in order to create a complete, accessible worldwide source of information essential to further development of the rule of law in international affairs.

H. To seek proper financing for all the above and other appropriate approved endeavors of the legal profession of the world needed to create and strengthen the legal system and law rules required to achieve and maintain world peace, and to make from said funds grants in aid of research and other projects undertaken by law schools and other bodies throughout the world.

I. To stimulate and administer a coordinated global research program utilizing facilities of the Institute and existing national and international organizations to accomplish objectives including but not limited to the following:

1. Expansion of existing knowledge of international law and its sources;

2. Identification of areas of common agreement which may be the basis of needed international conventions, treaties or understandings;

3. Definition of general principles of international law recognized by the community of nations which can form the basis and foundation for an improved international legal system;

4. Drafting of model codes dealing with subjects of international concern, including:

a. International investment, to safeguard adequately the interest of both the capital exporting and the capital importing nations;

b. Commodities and raw materials, to protect the legitimate interests of both producing and consuming nations;

c. Outer space, to assure its development in accordance with principles of the rule of law and removing it from international politics;

d. Nuclear test inspection, to adequately provide security against possible violations, while simultaneously assuring inspected countries that their internal security would in no way be violated;

e. International arbitration, public or private, including a model clause compromissoire;

f. International agreement on arms control and disarmament;

g. Unification and harmonization of law in such fields as are practicable and desirable.

5. Engaging in a comprehensive study of the best and most efficacious system of specialized international courts, taking into account varying legal traditions of different cultural and geographical groupings.

[*Future objectives*]

VI. That there be established a global system of regional chambers of the International Court of Justice, from which appeals to the full Court would be permissible.

VII. That there be established an Asian Court of Justice with a carefully drafted jurisdiction over matters of regional concern.

VIII. That in international matters, individuals, private organizations, juridical persons, nations, and international organizations be permitted to be parties before the International Court of Justice and its regional chambers, and the proposed Asian Court of Justice.

IX. That the membership of the International Court of Justice be reconstituted to more accurately represent the many areas and legal systems in the world which are not now adequately represented on that body.

X. That arbitration procedures be unified and modernized, more effective means of enforcing decisions of arbitral tribunals be sought, that ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards be encouraged, and that a system of reporting and disseminating decisions of arbitral tribunals be established.

XI. That other means for the pacific settlement of disputes such as mediation, conciliation, good offices and investigation be resorted to when appropriate.

XII. That all nations accept, on the basis of reciprocity, the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

XIII. That consideration be given to changes in the structure of the United Nations to allow it more efficiently to contribute to the maintenance of world peace and security under the rule of law.

XIV. That the U.N. Charter be revised to take into consideration the fact that since it was written the world has undergone great change; that the new independent status of many nations of Asia and Africa has nearly doubled United Nations membership; that the tremendous achievements of science and technology have produced new and complex international relationships; and that

the Charter is no longer adequate to meet the new and urgent needs of the peoples of the world of today.

XV. That the Sixth (Legal) Committee of the General Assembly be given greater authority; and the International Law Commission be strengthened and authorized to meet continuously throughout the year.

XVI. That a world community of legal scholars be developed through expanded programs of international exchanges; the community to include law students, practicing lawyers, judges, and professors of law.

CONCLUSION

We lawyers attending this Conference on World Peace Through Law pledge wholeheartedly and completely to devote ourselves to the foregoing program to the end that the rule of law will govern all men and all nations so they may pursue their legitimate aspirations in freedom, in dignity, and in peace.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE M. Q. SHARPE, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, this week the people of South Dakota were saddened and distressed to learn of the sudden and unexpected death of one of our truly great Governors, M. Q. Sharpe.

M. Q. Sharpe was an attorney general in South Dakota for several terms, and then was elected Governor. He served during the war years, 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946. He had made a great record as a lawyer and as a private citizen. In fact, the confidence of the bar of the State in him was such that at one time he was designated to be a one-man commission to revise the South Dakota Code. He did a monumental work with such distinction and such fidelity that no one questioned his recasting of the several statutes and the codification of statutes, over the terms of several legislatures.

Not only was he a great attorney general, but also he was a great servant of the people of the State and of his country, serving as he did during the war years.

I recall particularly the work he did in connection with the authorization for the Missouri River program. Before he was Governor, in 1940, he came to the State capital at Pierre one cold winter day in order to testify at a hearing with respect to a resolution which I had offered in the House of Representatives directing that a study of the Missouri River be made. He presented there his vision for the development of the State of South Dakota which became a guide in the years which followed.

In 1944 he came to the Congress of the United States and here presented to the Committee on Flood Control in the House of Representatives, then under the chairmanship of the Honorable William M. Whittington of Mississippi, and in the Senate of the United States to the committee under the chairmanship of the distinguished then Senator from Louisiana, Mr. John H. Overton, the testimony in behalf of that authorization for a great and comprehensive program in the development of the Missouri River.

Mr. Sharpe was a man of intense concentration on any task to which he assigned himself, so great that seldom, if ever, did he take a real vacation.

It was characteristic of the sympathies and understanding of the man that in the spring, when the youngsters would get out to roll their marbles for the first time, this former Governor, this man who held high office, would always join the youngsters in rolling the first marbles each spring.

He had a great capacity for friendship. In a letter which he wrote to me on the 20th of June 1960, Mr. Sharpe said that he had had the pleasure of addressing the Last Round-Up Club at the stockgrowers convention at Fort Pierre recently, and that there he had read "A Cowboy's Prayer," by Badger Clark, our then poet laureate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in my remarks at this point excerpts from the letter by Mr. Sharpe, since it was written less than 2 years ago and expresses something of his philosophy of life.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I had the pleasure of addressing the Last Round-up Club at the stockgrowers convention at Fort Pierre recently. They have 52 actual members ranging in age from 70 to 94 and many of them I had known before. As the meeting had been opened by a prayer by Reverend Weirauch whom you know quite well, I decided it would be appropriate to close it with one which was the finale of my address.

So I advised them that I proposed to read the "Cowboy's Prayer" by Badger Clark and stated among other things that I had always appreciated the fact that Senator FRANCIS CASE sent it to me (which, I might say, we had placed on a Christmas card in the nature of a remembrance the yearend following the poet's death).

A nod of general appreciation went over that rather closely packed audience and I think they are going to make it kind of a continual close for their meetings hereafter. Next year they are going to hold the meeting at Yankton, I think because of its being centennial year and Yankton was the territorial capital. I was much gratified to be invited and, in fact, urged to come to that meeting and give some kind of an address and, if I do, I will probably use Badger Clark's "Cowboy's Prayer" again.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wish to conclude my remarks, Mr. President, by reading two stanzas from the poem. I ask unanimous consent that the entire poem may be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The stanzas of the poem which M. Q. Sharpe read to the Last Round-Up Club at the Stockgrowers Convention at Fort Pierre, which he said was so accepted that they invited him to give it again at the next meeting, which was held at Yankton this past year, in conjunction with our centennial, are—and this was Mr. Sharpe's philosophy, as well as Mr. Clark's:

Let me be easy on the man that's down;
Let me be square and generous with all.
I'm careless sometimes, Lord, when I'm in town,
But never let 'em say I'm mean or small!
Make me as big and open as the plains,
As honest as the hawse between my knees,
Clean as the wind that blows behind the rains,
Free as the hawk that circles down the breeze!

Forgive me, Lord, if sometimes I forget.
You know about the reasons that are hid.
You understand the things that gall and fret;
You know me better than my mother did.

Just keep an eye on all that's done and said
And right me, sometimes, when I turn aside,
And guide me on the long, dim trail ahead
That stretches upward toward the Great Divide.

That is from "A Cowboy's Prayer." It was the prayer and the philosophy of M. Q. Sharpe.

Mr. MUNDT rose.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. MUNDT. I wish to join my colleague in the words of tribute to former Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, of South Dakota. Ted Sharpe, as he was known to his many friends, I believe was the hardest working man I ever knew. He spent strenuously long hours working as Governor. He spent equally long hours working as a lawyer for his clients.

As my colleague has pointed out, he also had a great capacity for friendship, an active sense of humor, and a warm personality. I recall that one time years ago, when I was discussing some of my experiences as a former member of the Game and Fish Commission of South Dakota, Governor Sharpe and I were speaking at the same meeting. I had paid a few words of tribute to the mountain trout, whereupon he arose and challenged me to a public debate on the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may have 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator very much.

He challenged me to a debate on the subject, "Resolved, That the catfish has been of greater benefit to mankind than the mountain trout."

The position of Governor Sharpe was that the catfish provides great fun, thrill, and inspiration for youngsters who fish in rivers with a twig, a bent pin, and a piece of string, or some equally modest type of fisherman's gear. He also referred to the catfish as the exalted friend of the common man. The Governor added that the catfish and its second cousin, the bullhead, also provide necessary food for many people living in the vicinity of lakes and rivers in which these fish might abound.

My position was that the mountain trout provided a greater challenge to the fisherman and that you need to know more than a trout to catch one.

I have always regretted that the debate never came off, but I suppose I was fortunate, because the wager provided, and fitting it was, that whoever lost the debate was supposed to provide his favorite fish as food for the entire audience.

That incident demonstrates that although he had a serious side, he also had the spirited friendship and sense of humor, to which my colleague has alluded.

South Dakota and the Nation will certainly miss him greatly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of my distinguished senior colleague.

Governor Sharpe did have a great capacity for friendship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional one-half minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I shall always cherish the fact that on the 1st of last December, when we had the 25th anniversary victory dinner in Mitchell, Governor Sharpe was among four Governors, present or past, who were in attendance. Many people said to me that one of the great rewards of that particular occasion was seeing M. Q. Sharpe in probably his last public appearance before as many representative citizens from all over the State as there took place. He enjoyed it thoroughly. The pictures which were taken at that time with him and with other former Governors will occupy a place of high regard on the walls of my office, as he does in the affection and hearts of all the men and women of South Dakota.

EXHIBIT 1

A COWBOY'S PRAYER

(Written for Mother)

Oh Lord, I've never lived where churches grow.
I love creation better as it stood
That day You finished it so long ago
And looked upon Your work and called it good.

I know the others find You in the light
That's sifted down through tinted window panes,
And yet I seem to feel You near tonight
In this dim, quiet starlight on the plains.

I thank You, Lord, that I am placed so well,
That You have made my freedom so complete;
That I'm no slave of whistle, clock or bell,
Nor weak-eyed prisoner of wall and street.

Just let me live my life as I've begun
And give me work that's open to the sky;
Make me a pardner of the wind and sun,
And I won't ask a life that's soft or high.

Let me be easy on the man that's down;
Let me be square and generous with all.
I'm careless sometimes, Lord, when I'm in town,
But never let 'em say I'm mean or small!

Make me as big and open as the plains,
As honest as the hawse between my knees,
Clean as the wind that blows behind the rains,
Free as the hawk that circles down the breeze!

Forgive me, Lord, if sometimes I forget.
You know about the reasons that are hid.
You understand the things that gall and fret;
You know me better than my mother did.
Just keep an eye on all that's done and said
And right me, sometimes, when I turn aside,
And guide me on the long, dim trail ahead
That stretches upward toward the Great Divide.

HELP THE FARMERS THROUGH BEEF PROMOTION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Mr. Walter Crago, president of the South Dakota Stock Growers' Association, before the 65th Annual Convention of the American National Cattlemen's Association at Tampa, Fla., recently delivered a speech which I believe should be brought to the attention of the many people in the Congress and others in the country who are interested in a long-term solution of the farm problem.

Mr. Crago supports a longtime thesis of mine that we must increase all efforts to expand the consumer market for our farm products if we are to meet the technological challenge confronting the agricultural industry today. It seems to me that new uses, new markets, and the industrial utilization of products of the farm are the ingredients from which we must find the enduring answers to our farm problems.

I commend Mr. Crago for his forward-looking remarks to this most important segment of our agricultural economy. For nearly one-third of a century we in Congress and the people in the Department of Agriculture have endeavored to solve the very real economic problems confronting American farmers almost solely by attacking the supply end of the supply and demand formula. Virtually 90 percent of our effort in legislative matters, and well over 95 percent of our appropriations in terms of agricultural help, have gone to the supply end of the formula during all these years.

As we all know, there are two ends to the formula of supply and demand. Since there are only two ends, I have always been curious as to why we have not spent more time, effort and money to work at least a little on the demand end of the formula, because if we can expand the demand, we can do just as much to get the formula of supply and demand in balance—and thereby increase farm prices—as if we should constantly work on the idea of shrinking the supply. In expanding the demand, we would increase farm income, whereas in unrelentingly shrinking the supply, we reduce the net income of the farmer and we weaken his position in our overall economy.

In 1961, the parity price received by the farmer fell from the disappointing level of 81 percent, which it attained in 1960 under Secretary of Agriculture Benson, to 79 percent, which now prevails under Secretary Freeman. In such an era we surely recognize that something constructive and novel must be done in order to solve the farm problem. We must try something new. Eighty-one percent was inadequate and 79 percent of parity is even worse.

As Senators know, I frequently opposed suggestions presented by Secretary Benson because I felt that they would not increase parity sufficiently. I was consistently dissatisfied with the 81 percent of parity prevailing in 1960. Now, after a year of a new administration, with new personnel in the Department of Agriculture and with new programs, parity has dropped 2 additional points to 79 percent. The net result is that farmers are 2 percent worse off economically than they were under Secretary Benson. I think no one is satisfied with that situation.

I suggest that Congress and the administration devote some attention, pass some legislation and spend some money in trying to expand the demand for farm products by utilizing them industrially and by publicizing their virtues for food and as clothing. We have failed to try a host of programs which could be used to expand the use and consumption of our farm products. For far too long, indeed, we have neglected the demand end of the all-important supply and demand formula.

I ask unanimous consent that the forward-looking address by President Walter Crago, of South Dakota Stock Growers Association, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF WALTER CRAGO

It is an honor to represent, as president, the South Dakota Stockgrowers Association, and the American National Special Beef Promotion Committee. My name is Walter Crago. I have been asked to discuss the reasons the vast majority of cattlemen in my State and elsewhere favor a program of beef promotion.

The record shows clearly the average cattleman does want, and has wanted for some time, a beef oriented, voluntary, producer controlled, and producer financed method of telling the story of beef.

We have an organization, the National Beef Council, to do this one job. As you know, the American National has a stake in the birth of the National Beef Council.

A review of the obstacles the National Beef Council has had to overcome for survival, in the face of opposition from certain powerful individuals of the American National, in the last 7 years is discouraging and offensive. Details of this struggle are not the purpose of this report. However, let me say now very clearly: our cattle industry needs a dynamic, nationwide team working for survival and our benefit.

We know the American National, the National Livestock and Meat Board, and the National Beef Council on the national level are performing functions cattlemen need. On the State level, we have a few strong affiliates of the American National and Beef Council.

These national groups must become responsive to the desires of their voluntary membership. Our faltering, stumbling, action programs are largely the result of petty jealousy of men whose influence is out of proportion to formally adopted wishes of the people they represent.

We must improve the National Beef Council rather than destroy it. The American National long ago determined that the work of beef promotion is broader than its own ability to handle the job. Dairy interests, feeder interests, producer interests, and others on a wide geographic basis have rallied behind the National Beef Council and will continue to do so.

State beef councils and the National Cowbelles have contributed the most work in beef promotion. These people have worked hard on a project they believe in. Their numerical strength is greater than that claimed by the American National. We are convinced the answer is in teamwork among the three national groups, rather than the bickering of the past.

Weakening, compromising, or any action not of constructive help to the National Beef Council by the American National or any group professing to be the friend of the cattle producer, will be the death of our promotion program. We cannot, should not, and will not expect any underfinanced research and educational organization to be panicked or subverted into doing this specialized promotion job for us. The National Beef Council must depend on the National Livestock and Meat Board for basic research, and meat information and education.

All reports to the contrary, the National Beef Council has always supported the research and education programs of the National Livestock and Meat Board. It is not the intent of the National Beef Council to reorganize to include functions beyond the scope of its original purpose.

Cattle producers have been confronted with a proposal by consultants of the National Livestock and Meat Board. Now that we have for 7 years struggled with the problem of a beef promotion program and have begun to see real programs crystallizing, what are they asking us to do with the assignment of the National Beef Council?

The National Livestock and Meat Board is asking producers to abandon the 7 years of ground work and experience of the National Beef Council. The board asks for sole support of grassroots organizations now alined with the Beef Council which are presently supporting both the Beef Council and Meat Board. The Meat Board speculates a promotion program may be forthcoming with an increase of funds.

Past attacks and present confusion about the National Beef Council have cost the cattlemen of this country untold amounts of dollars. I for one am all through with the vested interests that sabotage and attack the cattlemen's beef promotien organization and program.

I am convinced, if as much money and effort had been turned in favor of the National Beef Council's program as the $30,000 allocated in a research program resulting in a recommendation favoring a "marriage" of the Meat Board and Beef Council, effective beef promotion through the National Beef Council would be a reality.

The Beef Council, the American National and the Meat Board all need the individual support of many more producers. I hope you can see any compromise of the National Beef Council from its single mission of serving the total beef industry, through paid promotion by the producer, will put beef promotion into the hands of people who have not wanted and opposed beef promotion.

More confusion on this problem may put beef promotion into the hands of Government. This we must avoid. Beef promotion is a job for which we should stand totally responsible. Beef promotion is the work of the National Beef Council.

We hope you will help the Beef Council succeed.

As president of the South Dakota Stockgrowers Association, I am proud that our State is the fourth largest in the United States in the production of beef cows. We are proud South Dakota has been near the top in financial support of the National Beef Council. Gentlemen, I am concerned over this fact. The American National has gotten farther away from beef promotion than anything South Dakota people stand for. The American National told each individual South Dakota member of this in individual letters last April. Today the American National's individual membership in South Dakota has fallen to 169—I repeat 169.

Any organization struggles at times to exist. I feel the American National's proper role is to back both the National Livestock and Meat Board and the National Beef Council.

Should, in the future, the American National, its officers and consultants, push as hard to build the National Beef Council as some of our States have in building State cattlemen's organizations and beef councils, we are convinced 1962 will see a great stride toward our common goal: progress in freedom.

Gentlemen, we can if you will.

CONCERT OF FREE NATIONS TO DEFEAT THE COMMUNIST BLOC

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Senator Bush, of Connecticut, is quoted with approval in the Stamford (Conn.) Advocate as pressing vigorously for a concert of free nations to work for the defeat of the Communist bloc.

I heartily applaud these views. They urge the same approach to a consolidation of the free nations which I have suggested in proposing an alliance for liberty, similarly constituted.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator Bush Opens Debate

The great debate for the coming decade may well be America's relationship with the Common Market nations of Europe. President Kennedy has initiated the debate by suggesting, rather vaguely, that the way to solve the problem of American competition with Europe is to give him greater powers of reduce tariffs.

Senator Bush and Representative Thomas B. Curtis, of Missouri, have taken the position that recent hearings by the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy have not shown a clear, convincing case for urgency in granting this power. They further suggest that tariff cutting is not the solution to the problem and that the administration is taking a too limited and narrow view of the entire situation. There are other problems in connection with the Common Market which deserve higher priorities, they say, than tariff cutting.

Senator Bush asks if it is not time for the administration to broaden its vision to encompass all the problems which must be resolved before the free nations can effectively pool their resources to insure victory in the cold war. Like John J. McCloy and Senator Fulbright, they ask if the time has not come to work vigorously for the formation of a concert of free nations within which all other freedom-loving nations could work for the defeat of the Communist bloc. Senator Bush spells it out. He says, "Freed of the frustrations which beset the free world in the United Nations, it would accomplish much toward winning the cold war."

Senator Bush would not abandon the U.N., but he points out that it is evident that the U.N. is an ineffective instrument for achieving the objectives which America shares with Western Europe.

In short, the U.N. has evaded the challenge of world communism to the freedom of man.

It is suggested that steps to this end can be taken under treaties already approved, and without waiting for unneeded congressional action. Both the NATO and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development are available. The whole vast area of quotas, subsidies and controls must be considered, not merely tariffs. The problem of Japan and the developing nations and their exports play a part. Our whole agricultural setup of control and subsidy is contrary to the aims of the Common Market. The different policies of the free nations concerning trade with the enemy must be studied, as must the need for improving our own competitive position in world markets. These are the details and the problems which must be solved and which would not even be touched by the granting of more tariff power to the President.

Senator Bush has started the great debate on a note of vision. His proposals are forward-looking, and, at the same time, realistic. We believe that the time will come for tariff cutting. When it does, Congress will perform its duty. Until then the Nation must be prepared for the big step. Our allies must be unified, the free world freed of the bumbling of the U.N., our industry modernized, so that, despite high wages, it can compete with Europe. The Nation waits hopefully for administration leadership in this direction.

SENATOR KEATING URGES TRADE VETO

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, my colleague, Senator Keating has made a proposal for inclusion in the President's forthcoming trade bill. He has urged that the Congress be given the power, by a two-thirds vote, to veto major trade agreements and modifications negotiated by the executive branch.

Senator Keating has given considerable thought and attention to this subject, and I was happy to read a recent column by Mr. Donald I. Rogers of the New York Herald Tribune in which he describes and discusses this proposal in some detail. I think Senator Keating has made a real contribution to our understanding of the trade issue. I therefore ask unanimous consent that Mr. Rogers' informative article appear in the Congressional Record in order that others may study and consider Senator Keating's trade veto recommendation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Safeguard Trade

(By Donald I. Rogers)

There is probably no term in the modern lexicon more vague than "free trade." Equally vague is what is intended as its opposite, the term "trade protectionism." In the former, what is usually meant is freer trade rather than free trade, a generally desirable goal.

Senator Kenneth B. Keating, Republican, of New York, said in a recent speech in Congress very probably the most far-reaching single decision which the 2d session of the 87th Congress will be called upon to make is in the field of trade. "We must decide whether we are to go forward or to go backward," he said. "And it is not an easy decision."

What we need, Senator Keating declared, is a sensible program that will permit an orderly progression toward wider trade contracts. Accordingly, as one of the leading Republicans in the Senate, he is lending partial support to President Kennedy's appeal for power to make across-the-board tariff cut deals with other nations or with international trading combines, such as the European Common Market.

Senator Keating has introduced a bill, however, which, while granting such power to the President, would retain veto power over unwise or precipitious decisions in the hands of Congress. It seems a sound proposal, one meriting the serious consideration of the Congress.

Frank in his endorsement of the President's proposal to broaden trade by eliminating or equalizing barriers, Senator KEATING is equally frank in outlining his reasons for wanting specific legislation giving the veto power to Congress. First, he believes it will expedite passage of the President's program and, second, he believes that Congress should retain a supervisory role over the entire scope of international trade.

In his introductory statement, Senator KEATING noted that, although the President has been talking about "across the board" authority, his state of the Union address referred instead to "bargaining by major categories." It makes a significant departure from his previous comments.

What Senator KEATING actually asks is that Congress be granted, by a two-thirds vote, veto authority to disapprove major trade agreements negotiated by the executive branch, assuming that the President does propose new legislation providing broader trade negotiating authority.

Such a policy should give the necessary administrative power to the executive branch and at the same time retain in Congress as much as possible of its constitutional authority in trade matters.

There is, of course, the possibility that the President, in drafting his own proposal, will incorporate the provisions Senator KEATING suggests. This might be termed "assurance type" legislation that Senator KEATING advocates.

Under his bill congressional disapproval would have to be expressed within 60 days. Before expiration of this period, both Houses of Congress, by two-thirds vote, would have to adopt concurrent resolutions disapproving a specific trade agreement, or it would go into effect as negotiated by the executive branch.

This seems to be not only a necessary but a reasonable safeguard. Article I, section 8 of the Constitution does give Congress power to "lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises." Any circumvention of that power that may be deemed necessary because of the developing conditions in world trade should at the same time seek to preserve the constitutional concept that is part of the legislative branch's heritage.

There is every likelihood that the Common Market may expand into a considerable threat to the American economy, and that, as a result, expeditious action on tariffs would be warranted. It is probable, therefore, that the President will be given a great deal more tariff adjusting authority than he has had under the reciprocal trade agreements law.

In truth, however, it is hard to imagine any emergency in the area of world trade which would justify Congress surrendering to the White House dictatorial powers over the duties on imports and exports.

Under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, Congress, by a two-thirds vote, may override the President's rejection of a Tariff Commission recommendation for escape-clause action.

Thus, Senator KEATING's bill is nothing more than an extension of this same authority (as outlined in the Constitution) to the newest proposition for dealing with the intricacies of international trade. It appears to be sound and logical corollary to the President's program.

PROPOSED MERGER OF AMERICAN AND EASTERN AIR LINES

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, a proposed merger between American and Eastern Air Lines—two giants of airline industry—raises questions as to whether either the public interest or the industry's economic problems are to be helped. The merger might aggravate the competitive imbalances and increase, rather than diminish, the problems of the industry.

The size of the proposed company seems to warrant most careful study and consideration by the appropriate congressional committees and the regulatory agencies of the executive department.

I would certainly urge such consideration.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JUDGE R. JASPER SMITH

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, all Missouri was saddened recently at the death of R. Jasper Smith of the U.S. District Court of the Western District of Missouri.

He was an outstanding legislator and student of the law; and his short term on the bench was a distinguished one.

Mr. President, the Kansas City Star recently carried an editorial that is representative of the feeling of Judge Smith's many friends. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Kansas City Star of January 9, 1962, entitled "Judge R. Jasper Smith," be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDGE R. JASPER SMITH

R. Jasper Smith, chief judge of the U.S. district court here, had the reputation as an outstanding jurist although he had been on the bench only since 1956. His death at the age of 53 cuts short what undoubtedly would have been an even more distinguished judicial career.

But R. Jasper Smith long ago achieved a high place as a student, analyst and originator of law. As a Republican State senator for 12 years he was known as the man who could tie the senate into knots—or untie it—virtually at will. He was a master of parliamentary procedure who seldom spoke from the floor but whose knowledge of the law was respected by members of both parties.

In the senate he had been majority and minority floor leader and chairman of the judiciary committee. For years he served with distinction as a member of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. He wrote the legislation that set up the magistrate court plan in Missouri, replacing the old justice of the peace system.

Off the bench or away from the senate floor, Jasper Smith was a humorous conversationalist who loved to discuss interesting legal cases and odd bits of legislation. But his mind never wandered far from the legal processes, whether he was making law as a legislator or interpreting it as a Federal judge.

WATER RESOURCES PLANNING

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on July 13 last year President Kennedy sent to Congress a draft of a water resources planning bill intended to bring about the planning of major river basins of the United States by the year 1970.

The President's bill was in response to the recommendation of our own Senate Select Committee on Water Resources chaired by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, Senator ROBERT S. KERR, which recommended:

> The Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should prepare and keep up to date plans for comprehensive water development and management for all major river basins in the United States.

The select committee also recommended a 10-year program of grants to the States to stimulate their water resources planning and to assist them in participating in the development of plans for the major rivers.

President Kennedy's bill, which I introduced as S. 2246, is a splendidly conceived proposal to achieve much desired objectives. Title I of the bill establishes a Federal Water Resources Council, which will help coordinate the water resources activities of the various Federal agencies. It is to be composed of the Secretaries of the Interior, Army, Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare. Title II of the bill provides for the establishment of planning commissions, appointed by the President and including representatives of the States involved, to develop plans for the water and related resources of each major river basin. Title III is the grant program as recommended by the Senate select committee.

The report of the Senate select committee showed that five major basins in the western part of the United States would be short of water by 1980 and three more will be short, including the Great Lakes States from Michigan west, by the year 2000 if our population increases at a medium rate.

We have been struggling since New Deal days to find a governmental mechanism, satisfactory to the Federal Government, the States, and the many subordinate agencies involved in water resources development and management through which we can successfully harness the capacities of everyone involved to achieve planning and subsequent optimum development of our increasingly scarce water supplies. Several patterns, or mechanisms, have been suggested and have either been defeated or proved unworkable. The present proposal, in which the President has closely followed the recommendations of the Senate select committee, is the most hopeful yet made.

In order to expedite action on this pressing problem the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works jointly held hearings last July 26 and August 16 on S. 2246, which was the President's bill. The bill was given a great deal of support from citizens, various organizations and representatives of State governments who were nearly unanimously in favor of the grant program. There was opposition from two or three national organizations consistently opposed to progressive measures.

The Interstate Commission on Water Resources for the Council of State Governments was unable to complete its survey of State views on the measure at the time of the hearing. This work is to be completed in mid-February. The Interior Committee has consequently set a new hearing on February 16 to permit the Interstate Commission to present its final views and recommendations on the bill. If there are others who now wish to be heard on the measure the committee will attempt to hear them at the same time. They should notify the clerk of the committee of their desire to be heard.

It is the desire of the Interior Committee to have all constructive views, criticisms and suggestions in regard to the bill. At the same time, we hope to handle it expeditiously. The chairman of the House Interior Committee has assured me that it will be handled as rapidly as possible by his group.

We will have few bills of greater importance before the Congress in the present session. The increasing threat and pressure of water shortages makes it imperative that we get our house in order to deal wisely and effectively with water problems.

In announcing this early supplemental hearing on S. 2246 on February 16, I want to assure the Senate that every effort will be made in the Interior Committee to get the matter to the floor promptly and help to make the enactment of a Water Rescources Planning Act one of the major accomplishments of the Senate and the Congress in the present session.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

GREAT BASIN NATIONAL PARK IN NEVADA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1760, which I believe is the unfinished business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1760) to establish the Great Basin National Park in Nevada, and for other purposes.

PROSPECTS FOR PEACE IN THE CONGO

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, before Congress adjourned last September, I took the floor several times to express misgivings about the course of events in the Congo and about our policy or lack of policy in this critically important area of the world.

I was troubled over the dangerous degree of leftist influence in the coalition government which was established at the so-called Louvanium Conference in early August of last year.

I was troubled by the evidence that, while we were footing the bill for the lion's share of the U.N. operation in the Congo, we had very little to say about U.N. policy in the Congo; that this policy was in fact controlled by the Afro-Asian bloc and, in particular, by Nehru's unspeakable Minister of Defense, Krishna Menon, a man who has justly come to be regarded as the personification of cryptocommunism.

I was disturbed, above all, by the U.N. military action of last September, and by the grave implications of this action for the future of the U.N. and for the future of the Western alliance.

Toward the end of last November, as my colleagues know, I visited the Congo, where I had extensive conversations with Prime Minister Adoula, President Tshombe, and members of their respective governments. Since there has been a good deal of misinformation about the purpose of my visit and about what transpired during the course of my visit, I think it might be useful, first of all, to set the record straight.

There have been some reports in the press to the effect that I had gone to the Congo against the opposition of the Department of State; that I had encouraged President Tshombe to hold out for complete independence; and that I had told him that American policy in the Congo was misdirected because there were Communists in the Department of State.

The real truth is that a major part of my purpose in going to the Congo was to try to explore the possibilities of a Tshombe-Adoula agreement in informal discussions with the two leaders.

I left for the Congo on November 21. On Monday morning, November 20, President Kennedy asked me to come to his office. We talked about the Congo situation for almost an hour. The President expressed the hope that I could help to arrange a meeting between Tshombe and Adoula.

I told the President that I would make every effort to bring about such a meeting. And the record shows that I did precisely that.

As a final commentary on the misrepresentations that have appeared in the press, I want to read the text of the letter I received on January 10 from Secretary of State Rusk.

> DEAR SENATOR DODD: Reference is made to our recent telephone conversation and to your subsequent telegram of January 4, pointing out certain statements made in a newspaper column to the effect that the administration had opposed your recent visit to the Katanga, and that an official of the Department had reported that you had made certain remarks with respect to Communist infiltration in the Department of State to Mr. Tshombe.
>
> I am happy to set the record straight with respect to both of these matters. The administration did not oppose your visit. We feel that your efforts to assist in bringing about the meeting between Mr. Tshombe and Mr. Adoula, which led to the Kitona Agreement, were beneficial. We have found no evidence that a Department official reported that you had discussed with Mr. Tshombe the question of communism in the State Department. Indeed, our Embassy in Léopoldville reports that U.S. representatives who were with you during your conversations state clearly that you did not mention this question.
>
> I hope very much that this letter will clarify the questions that have been raised.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> DEAN RUSK.

At a later date, I plan to report to my colleagues in greater detail on what I saw and learned in the Congo. As of this moment, I feel that a frank and detailed presentation may have an adverse effect on the delicately poised political situation in the Congo and on the critical discussions which are still going on between the central government in Léopoldville and the Government of Katanga.

It is because of this that I have taken the stand that the hearings now proceeding under the separate auspices of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security and of the Subcommittee on Africa of the Foreign Relations Committee, should be held in executive sessions.

But I believe there are certain aspects of the situation in the Congo which cry out for immediate consideration and understanding. It is to these aspects that I plan to address myself briefly today.

There has been a tendency to justify the U.N. military action against Katanga on the grounds that this action produced the Kitona agreement, that the Kitona agreement has laid the foundation for Congolese unity, that it has undermined the extremists and fortified the moderates in the central government.

Gizenga and Gizengaism, we are told, are now dangers of the past.

It is my profound wish that the prospect were really so cheerful and so uncomplicated.

There are, as I see it, four primary dangers in this Pollyanna approach to the Congo crisis.

The first danger is that we will be lulled into a false sense of security concerning the extremist elements in the Leopoldville Government.

The action against Gizenga is to be welcomed. But even if Gizenga is eliminated, this will not, by a long shot, terminate the danger of communism in the Congo.

Pro-Soviet extremism in the Congo has always been a many-headed monster; and Gizenga is only one of many potentially dangerous elements in the Leopoldville coalition. He is not a member of Lumumba's party but heads his own smaller party, the African Solidarity party. As Vice Premier under Lumumba, he automatically laid claim to Lumumba's mantle when Lumumba died.

There have been other claimants to the mantle of Lumumba. Most notable of these is Christophe Gbenye, Minister of the Interior under Lumumba, later Minister of the Interior under Gizenga in Stanleyville, and again Minister of the Interior in the Léopoldville Government today.

Gbenye, who is even more responsible than Lumumba for the reign of terror in Léopoldville in the summer of 1960, told me proudly that he considers himself the legitimate heir to Lumumba as leader of the National Congolese Movement. Gbenye is a force to be reckoned with since he controls the largest single group of deputies in the Parliament, and the largest single group inside the Congo's gargantuan cabinet of 44 members.

When I was in Léopoldville, I was told that sharp personal differences had developed between Gbenye and Gizenga. Apparently, Gbenye was determined to assert his undisputed claim to No. 1 position in the radical nationalist movement.

The vote of 67–10 against Gizenga in the Congolese Parliament does not signify a total victory for the forces of moderation. On the contrary, what it signifies is that the Lumumbaist bloc, under Gbenye's leadership, voted solidly to take action against Gizenga.

Gbenye told me in the course of our conversation that he was not a Communist and that he went to church regularly. I am prepared to be openminded about anyone and it is entirely possible that I was misinformed in stating that he had been trained in Prague. I told Gbenye that I accepted his statement that he had not been to Prague.

On the other hand, while I was in Léopoldville, I learned that Gbenye's newspaper, Uhuru, still pursued a persistently pro-Soviet and anti-American line; and I also learned that he had set up an unauthorized secret police force responsible to him personally, because the official sureté was under the control of Mobutu's father-in-law, Victor Nendaka, a confirmed anti-Communist.

During the December fighting in Katanga, I was further disturbed to learn that Gbenye had announced the dismissal of Nendaka and that this action had been countermanded thanks only to a threat of military action by General Mobutu.

When I first spoke in the Senate, I pointed out that according to the Moscow New Times, 23 out of 44 members of the Cabinet could be considered followers of Lumumba.

The Senator from Minnesota challenged this assertion. He said that only 14 out of 44 members of the Cabinet could be clearly established as Lumumbaists.

In reply, I said I found that this estimate was alarming enough, especially in the light of the fact that the Lumumbaists had secured for themselves the two central positions which Communists and their allies always seek in coalition governments: the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Justice.

When I was in Léopoldville, I was told that the extremists had gained considerably in strength since the coalition government had been established, that the balance was now very precarious, and that Adoula would find it very difficult to survive if he did not, in one way or another, solve the problem of the Katanga secession. Adoula's position may be somewhat more secure today. I hope it is. But, despite the welcome victory over Gizenga, leftwing extremism will remain a real and potent and highly dangerous force in the Congo for a long time to come.

I do not accept the thesis that Gizenga's downfall represents a complete and unmitigated defeat for Soviet policy in the Congo. In fact, on examining the history of the Gizenga affair, I cannot help wondering whether it does not give evidence of deliberate Communist design.

In the first phase, after the downfall and death of Patrice Lumumba, Gizenga, despite his personal weaknesses, was essential to Soviet policy in the Congo. The Kremlin was at that time playing the constitutionality game. Driven out of Léopoldville by General Mobutu, they had no alternative but to try to establish a regional base elsewhere in the Congo. And so they took the stand that Gizenga, as vice premier, had, on Lumumba's death, automatically become prime minister of the legal government of the Congo. And they assigned their ambassadors to this so-called legal government which Gizenga proceeded to establish at Stanleyville.

In the second phase, after the Louvanium Conference, I believe that it served the interests of the Kremlin to have Gizenga isolate himself in Stanleyville rather than actively assume his duties as vice premier in Léopoldville.

The public outcry in this country and throughout the free world against the U.N.'s intervention in Katanga was as dramatic as it was massive. If Gizenga had been on active duty as Vice Premier during the fateful months of last November and December, if the U.N. action against Katanga had been undertaken in the name of supporting Adoula and Gizenga, I doubt that American public opinion would have tolerated our vote for the Afro-Asian resolution in the Security Council or the subsequent U.N. military action against Katanga.

With Gizenga absent and apparently defiant, the proponents of the Katanga action were provided with a face-saving rationalization. The Gizenga secession, they were able to argue, is a very serious danger; but in order to put it down, we have first to put down the danger presented by the Katanga secession.

The third phase in the Soviet approach got underway before phase No. 2 had run its course. The Communist bloc embassies, which had been driven out by General Mobutu, had now opened up shop again in Léopoldville. The constitution of a coalition government, in which the Lumumbaist bloc had massive influence, was a situation ready made for the proven Communist techniques of infilteration, corruption, and subversion.

At this point it was not utopian for the Communist experts, working from their embassies, to think in grandiose terms of taking over the whole Congo, including the precious and recently subjugated province of Katanga.

For such a design they do not need a mass Communist Party. After all, Cuba has demonstrated that a very tiny crypto-Communist nucleus can succeed in capturing control of a nationalist movement in countries far more sophisticated than the Congo.

At the point where they began thinking in these terms, Gizenga, for all practical purposes, ceased to be the Kremlin's No. 1 man in the Congo. He was not a spellbinder like Lumumba, nor did he have Lumumba's powerful national organization. On top of this, despite his unquestioned dedication to the Communist bloc, Gizenga was a man of unimpressive ability.

In this situation, logic dictated that the Kremlin should cast about for an alternative or alternatives to Gizenga, to be selected in terms of influence within the government, organizational facilities, and demonstrated capability as a wielder or wielders of power.

That the Soviets were preparing to ditch Gizenga has been apparent from a number of things over the past several months. What individuals or groupings they have now selected as their potential instruments or dupes, is something that we shall have to decide on the basis of a careful scrutiny of events.

All of this may sound too suspicious, too neatly packaged, to some of my friends. But I submit that this is how the Communists plan, and this is how they operate. They make a practice of looking far ahead. They leave little to chance. They have no scruples about abandoning their lackeys when it serves their purposes. They regard all setbacks as temporary and they react flexibly to them. And they are past experts at inducing the free world to believe that certain actions will serve the cause of freedom, when the fact is that they have been carefully calculated to serve the cause of communism.

In issuing this warning, I do not mean to cast doubt upon or belittle the personality of Prime Minister Adoula. I must say that my impression of Adoula surpassed my expectations. I found him an exceedingly able, thoughtful, and dedicated man, and I am convinced, from certain of his statements, that he is strongly anti-Communist.

I was also very favorably impressed by General Mobutu and President Kasavubu.

But there are dangerous men as well as good men in the Leopoldville coalition; and this is something we cannot afford to close our eyes to.

The second danger inherent in any blindly optimistic attitude is that we will take no measures to curb the extremists in the Léopoldville Government in their desire to destroy Tshombe completely.

The Kitona agreement can provide the basis for an agreement that has the voluntary assent of both sides.

But this will only happen if the further discussions between the Central Government and the Katanga Government are pursued in the spirit of good will and mutual concession.

If, on the contrary, the extremists in Léopoldville insist on interpreting the Kitona agreement as a document of unconditional surrender, if they regard it as a kind of first step in a "Carthaginian peace" which culminates in total destruction, then the consequences are unpredictable.

Perhaps an unconditional surrender could be enforced if we were willing to keep a U.N. army of occupation in Katanga for the next 10 years or 20 years.

But short of this, wisdom and charity dictate that we should strive for an agreement that has validity and durability precisely because it reflects a genuine mutuality of interest.

It is my belief that such an agreement can be achieved. It is my belief, for that matter, that such an agreement could have been achieved without all the bloodshed and violence and hatred engendered by the U.N. action.

But the consummation of an agreement based on true assent will require far greater willingness than the Adoula government has thus far displayed to compromise.

It will require that we direct our pressure and influence toward both sides with equal energy, instead of exerting pressure on Tshombe only.

It will require that we unbend from our own rigidly negative attitude toward Tshombe and offer him a few concrete manifestations of our own good will.

Above all, it will require that we attempt to avoid the substitution of a Gbenye-Adoula coalition directed against Tshombe for the previous Gizenga-Adoula coalition which, by its very nature, was also directed against Tshombe.

The third danger in the Congo situation relates to the second.

Because it has concentrated 9,000 of its 15,000 troops as an army of occupation in Katanga, the U.N. has not been able to do an adequate job of maintaining public order in the rest of the Congo.

Worse than this, there is now serious evidence that the U.N., in its desire to exercise political pressure on Tshombe, has encouraged and facilitated the movement of Gizengaist troops into north Katanga.

In doing so, the U.N. has brought the chaos and bloodshed of the north Congo into areas where there was complete public order so long as they were administered by the Tshombe government.

In the Congo, everything depends upon public order and upon the maintenance of race relations.

The mayhem and rape and pillaging that accompanied the army mutiny in July of 1960 resulted in the exodus of almost 50 percent of the white technicians and administrators from the country.

Most of the Congolese army have remained in a permanent state of mutiny since that time, looting stores and banks and terrorizing the populace, both black and white. With the exception of a few disciplined units, the national Congolese army has been the chief source of national insecurity in the Congo and the prime promoter of chaos.

The scale of the chaos in the northern Congo is already terrifying enough.

In the cities, the U.N. has been able to maintain order and a semblance of social organization.

But in the jungle villages which make up most of the Congo, the bush hospitals and dispensaries and agricultural stations are closed and the doctors and missionaries have left. The jungle villages have gone back 80 years to the control of the witch doctors and sorcerers.

Tin production is down to 50 percent of prewar level; cotton production down to 30 percent; rice production down to 25 percent. And with each new massacre or racist incident, there is another exodus of white technicians and doctors and advisers—and the economy and social order of the Congo spiral down another turn, in the direction of complete chaos and an eventual Communist takeover.

In the northern Congo, the U.N. has unquestionably done some good in maintaining public order. But it has never acted to disarm the bandit army units, nor has it, until very recent days, taken any action against units owing allegiance to Antoine Gizenga.

It even failed to take action against the Gizengaist troops responsible for the massacre of the Italian airmen at Kindu.

The last few days has brought several indications that the U.N., at long last, is beginning to give some attention to the bandit army units that have been terrorizing north Katanga. But prior to this there was evidence that the U.N. forces in the Congo had provided transportation and connived with the Gizenga units that have in recent months invaded Katanga.

The situation is a complicated one because all of these units, at least theoretically, belong to the National Congolese Army and are under the control of the Léopoldville Government.

The Léopoldville Government, in fact, has appointed Vice Premier Jason Sendwe as administrator for the liberated areas in north Katanga.

Whenever news has arrived of the occupation of another town by units of the so-called National Congolese Army, the Léopoldville Government has been prone to accept responsibility for the "liberation." But whenever news has arrived of atrocities committed by these units, no time has been lost in making it clear that the units responsible for these atrocities were under Gizenga's personal influence.

The north Katanga town of Albertville was captured by units of the National Congolese Army in mid-November.

Tshombe charged publicly that the U.N. had disarmed his units there and had provided transportation for the invading forces. The London Daily Telegraph carried a detailed account of how the U.N. transported the National Congolese Army troops.

These charges the U.N. denied.

But the fact is that the two U.N. officials, Dr. Conor Cruise O'Brien and George Ivan Smith, had flown to Albertville and were on hand to greet the "liberating" army when it arrived.

Twenty-four hours later, the so-called army of liberation was rampaging through the streets, attacking whites, pillaging and raping. A large part of the white population fled from Albertville as a result of these terrorist acts.

Under the Tshombe administration, Albertville was a peaceful, prosperous city, where white people lived in harmony with blacks.

Today, I have been told, it is an economic desert, where race relations have been poisoned for many years to come by the terrible events that took place under Dr. Conor Cruise O'Brien's "liberation."

While I was in Léopoldville, I received through the Embassy, a telegram from the Indian U.N. commander in Albertville, which read, almost verbatim: "I invite you to visit Albertville so you may see with your own eyes how effectively the U.N. forces are maintaining public order there while the National Congolese Army continues its advance into northern Katanga."

The consequences of the advance of the National Congolese Army into northern Katanga, as we all know now, was the terrible massacre of 20 Catholic missionaries in the town of Congola, and the probable massacre of another five missionaries and their assistants in the town of Sola.

That the U.N. has provided transportation for at least some of the invading Gizengaist forces is now a matter of public admission. A long dispatch in the Washington Post on January 14 contained this significant paragraph:

> Diplomatic sources today revealed a closely guarded secret: that it was United Nations aircraft which transported Gizenga's forces to north Katanga 2 weeks ago in response to his request. The U.N. apparently wisely calculated that, with only the rump of his army left in Stanleyville, Gizenga would be vulnerable to Adoula pressure.

I wonder how the massacred missionaries of Congola would feel about this purported stratagem. I also wonder whose decision it was to move more Gizenga troops into north Katanga 6 weeks after the animal quality of these troops had been revealed by the rape of Albertville and by the terrible massacre of the 13 Italian airmen at Kindu.

The events that have taken place since the military "liberation" of northern Katanga got underway in mid-November, raise several important questions.

That the U.N. has welcomed and encouraged the invasion as an instrument of pressure on Tshombe is a matter of record. That the central government claimed responsibility for the "liberation" at several different points is also a matter of record.

But was the invasion ordered by Antoine Gizenga in his capacity as Vice Premier? Or was it ordered by Gen. Victor Lundula, who, as commander in chief of the Gizenga forces under the Stanleyville regime, is still supposed to be in command of the Stanleyville units that have been moving into northern Katanga and Kivu provinces? This question is all the more important because the newspapers are now publicly discussing the possibility that General Lundula may be appointed Minister of Defense in the Adoula government.

In asking this question, I do not mean to condemn General Lundula, or to close the door to him because he once displayed the bad judgment to serve under Gizenga. General Lundula is a brave officer, and it would be a blessing if he now truly realizes the dangers of pro-Soviet extremism and is willing to identify himself with the forces of moderation. We should let people like General Lundula know that the door is always open to those who have erred but who now sincerely desire to serve the cause of freedom. But we should also let them know that in the free world men are judged by their actions rather than by mere professions of good faith.

The final question I should like to ask is whether the State Department had foreknowledge of the plan to move more National Congolese Army troops under Gizengaist influence into northern Katanga. And if it did have foreknowledge, did it oppose the projected movement in the light of the unhappy experiences at Albertville and Kindu?

If it did not oppose the movement, then I say that we are at least indirectly guilty for the terrible massacres that have been perpetrated by these troops in Congola, Sola, and other centers.

The fourth danger inherent in the Pollyanna interpretation of Gizenga's decline, is that the U.N. action in Katanga, because it appears to have succeeded, will be construed as a precedent for the future. Nothing, to my mind, could be more dangerous.

If the Katanga intervention is accepted as a precedent, it will sanctify the abdication of our foreign policy to the United Nations; it will open the way to U.N. intervention in the internal affairs of member nations; and it may commit us to supporting a whole series of wars that are favored by the Afro-Asian bloc and the Soviets.

If we had the virtue of consistency, the stand we have taken on Katanga would have led us to propose that the United Nations should be authorized to intervene militarily, upon the request of any central government, to prevent the secession of any national minority or grouping. Had such a principle been incorporated into the U.N. Charter or adopted as a general resolution, the U.N. would have been involved in half a dozen wars in recent years. It would have intervened to prevent the separation of Pakistan from India, of Sudan from Egypt, of Syria from the United Arab Republic, of Senegal from the Mali Federation, and of Mauritania from Morocco.

How preposterous our position in Katanga really is becomes apparent the moment you attempt to convert this position into a general principle. And, if our position in Katanga does not flow from any general principle, then it remains to be explained why we have decided to make an exception in the case of Katanga.

Morally, Katanga had every right to secede, given the deep-rooted ethnic and cultural differences between the tribes of Katanga and those of the northern Congo, and given the incredible chaos and the serious Communist infiltration which exists in the north. From the standpoint of political realism, however, Katangese secession would certainly be inadvisable because it is true that a completely independent Katanga could not survive if the rest of the Congo went Communist. On this point I am in basic agreement with the State Department.

For that matter, Tshombe himself has never held out for complete secession. He has instead advocated a loose confederation, with the central government controlling currency, customs, foreign affairs, the army and other essential instruments of national policy, but with a very large measure of autonomy in other fields reserved to the member governments.

But, as desirable as Congolese unity may be, I remain opposed to the U.N. military action against the so-called Katanga secession. The mere fact that a political solution may be desirable does not lead, ipso facto, as some of our State Department logicians have argued, to the conclusion that the U.N. must be authorized to use military force to achieve such a solution.

I am opposed to the socially and morally unjust discrimination against American Negroes which still exists in most of our States. But I would resist with all my powers any effort on the part of the U.N. to terminate this state of affairs by sending Ghurka and Ethiopian troops into Little Rock or Washington or Hartford. This is the internal business of the United States; and any attempt to give the U.N. authority over the internal affairs of this Nation or other nations would, as I see it, spell its doom.

That is why I am so concerned over the U.N. action in the Congo. Because, despite all the pious statements to the contrary, it unquestionably did constitute intervention in the affairs of the Congo in an attempt to impose by military force a political solution advocated by the Afro-Asian nations, the Communist bloc, and, regrettably, by the United States.

There are those who regard the U.N.'s action in Katanga with joy, hailing it as proof that the U.N. is at last begining to function in its proper role as a "parliament of man." I wonder if they have ever thought through the implications of this position.

If we permit the Katanga action to be regarded as a precedent, we may soon find ourselves supplying and footing the bill for U.N. military actions all over the world that have been duly authorized by a Communist bloc-Afro-Asian coalition in the General Assembly.

Mr. President, in the interest of the Congo, in the interest of the United Nations, the U.N. operation in the Congo must return to the path of legality and propriety. It must return to its primary functions, which are the maintenance of public order, the maintenance of social services, the safeguarding of human life, and the conciliation of disputes.

There are other grave lessons to be learned from the tragedy of the Congo.

Perhaps the chief lesson to be learned is that when we abdicate control of our foreign policy to the uncertain mercies of the U.N., we get our friends into a mess, we get ourselves into a mess, and we get the U.N. into a mess.

I believe that to a large extent the errors of which we have been guilty have stemmed from misinformation and lack of information. I have been amazed, for example, to discover how fastidiously the State Department has ignored the information submitted by American missionaries of various denominations who have until recently worked in the Congo or are still working there today.

I met some 30 or 40 of these missionaries while I was in the Congo. To my thinking, missionaries are an important and proper source of information, especially in a primitive country. Not merely are they honest, dedicated men without any political axe to grind, but their vocation gives them a unique opportunity to live with the people, to learn their languages, and to understand their psychology. To my thinking, in fact, a man like the Methodist missionary, Howard Brinton, who has spent most of his 43 years in the Congo and who speaks three native languages like a native, has an infinitely greater understanding of the Congo than a State Department desk officer who may have spent 1 year somewhere in Africa.

I hope that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in the course of its current hearings on the Congo, will not neglect to take the testimony of men like Howard Brinton and Bishop Booth and the many other wonderful American missionaries I met in the Congo. I am certain that Congress will be interested in their evaluation of the situation in Katanga and of the terrible damage which the U.N. action has done to the delicate fabric of social order and race relations.

I note in passing that we once disregarded the advice of American missionaries in China, who tried to tell us the simple truth that the Chinese Communists were not really agrarian reformers. Instead, it was fashionable at the time to ascribe all such alarmist statements to the so-called China lobby. By the time we had rubbed this sand out of our eyes, China had gone Communist. I recall this precedent by way of replying to those who have in recent months raised the specter of a Katanga lobby.

I shall have more to say about the lessons of the Congo experience at a later date. But meanwhile I should like to say that I have no fear for the future of the Congo—on two conditions.

The first condition is that we no longer passively abdicate the conduct of our foreign policy in the Congo to Krishna Menon and his Afro-Asian cohorts in the U.N.

The second condition is that we pursue a policy dedicated to unifying and strengthening the precious forces of moderation in the Congo.

We must build this unity around the indispensable figures of Prime Minister Adoula and President Tshombe, whom I consider two of the greatest statesmen free Africa has yet produced.

There are those who hold up the bogie of a possible confrontation between the free world and the Communist world in the Congo if we reduce the U.N. role there. To them I say that if we are not prepared to confront the Communists in an area so remote from the centers of Soviet power, then we will not be prepared to confront them anywhere.

Once we decide that the Congo will remain free, it will remain free.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record at this point several letters and statements by American missionaries in Katanga, and a number of newspaper articles dealing with the events I have described.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Eglise Méthodiste,
Kolwezi, Katanga, November 29, 1961.

Senator Thomas Dodd,
Care of the Consulate of the United States of America, Elisabethville, Katanga.

Dear Senator Dodd: My wife and I are missionaries under the board of missions of the Methodist Church of the United States of America, and are presently stationed at Kolwezi in the Katanga. We are Americans, both born and raised in New Haven, Conn., both teachers by profession, my wife having attended New Haven State Teachers College (now Southern Connecticut State College), and I Yale University. We have been in the Katanga now for 1 year; our current assignment is with the educational and social program of the Methodist Church in the district of Kolwezi.

Like most of the American missionaries here in the Katanga, we have been deeply impressed by your efforts to bring about a change in the policy of the United States toward the territories of the former Belgian Congo. You have been a source of inspiration and hope for us during the last dismal months.

At the height of the fighting between the United Nations and Katanga forces last September, I managed to send a hurried message to my father in New Haven, in which I condemned the United Nations for preparing the way for a possible Communist takeover in central Africa. I asked my father to send copies of this message to a number of persons in the United States, among them you. Now that you are paying a visit to the Katanga, I am taking the liberty to express my views to you more fully, by means of this letter.

What follows is an excerpt, slightly altered, from a letter that I sent on November 24 to our supporting church, the Strathmoor Church of Detroit, Mich.:

"To begin with, the situation is appallingly complicated, so much so that few missionaries here—and certainly not we—feel that they can speak with absolute assurance. Nevertheless, it is true that most of the missionaries in the Katanga, along with the other whites, are strongly opposed to the policies of the United Nations. The U.N.'s resort to naked force in September was an action unworthy of the ideals of that organization, and one which ultimately will do it serious, perhaps even mortal, harm. Thus, even if we had no sympathy for the position of the Katanga Government, our concern for the future of the U.N. would oblige us to oppose the U.N. action here.

"But in point of fact we have a great deal of sympathy for the position of the Katanga Government. To be sure, it is far from being a perfect government. But you are not going to get a better government in any newly independent African country for many years to come. And you may get far worse. (You need look no further than the governments presently installed in Leopoldville and Stanleyville to get an inkling of how much worse.)

"There are two specific criticisms which crop up time and time again, and which seem to be uppermost in the minds of many of the Katanga's opponents in the U.N. First is the condemnation of the Katanga's secessionist move in July of 1960. No doubt, as the critics claim, the desire to keep the riches of the Katanga for the Katanga was a very important consideration to its leaders. It should be borne in mind, however, that at the time the whole of the Congo was falling into Communist-inspired chaos. By cutting itself off from the rest of the Congo, the Katanga did effectively preserve order within its own territory.

"The second specific criticism is that the Katanga is a puppet of Belgian capitalistic circles. Again, there is a bit of truth to this claim. The Belgian mining interests do exert considerable influence in the Government, as do individual Belgian advisers who have been placed in sensitive positions in the administration. But somebody has to help the Katanga to govern itself. There are simply not the trained, experienced leaders among the African population that every civilized country requires to run its affairs. As long as the elected African ministers retain ultimate control over governmental policies (as they assuredly do), then why should they not enlist the aid of Belgians in the shaping and implementing of those policies? Who could do a better job than the Belgians? This same argument holds with respect to the mercenaries in the Katanga Army. There have been white mercenaries—Belgians and others. They have been engaged by the Katanga Government to provide certain needed skills in the running of the army. In comparison with the number of Africans in the army, they were but a handful of men. They may have helped to maintain discipline among the African troops, but they could scarcely have forced them to fight against their will.

"Now, admittedly, one could accept all my arguments thus far, and still advocate the continued application of pressures on the Katanga in order to force it into union with the rest of the former Belgian Congo. One might reason—as many do—that the central government of Joseph Kasavubu in Leopoldville needs the support of the Katanga in order to resist the encroachments of Antoine Gizenga's leftist regime in Stanleyville. Now we are on very uncertain ground. If Kasavubu's Government is so weak that it needs substantial bolstering to stand up against the Communists, then who can say that the addition of the Katanga will give that government the strength it needs? Isn't there at least an equal chance that the only result will be the needless sacrifice of the Katanga to communism?

"Thus far, all my arguments have been negative. Can one, you may well ask, present a truly positive case for the Katanga? I shall state my view succinctly: the Katanga, with its staunchly anti-Communist government, its quite successful attempt to build a harmonious multiracial society, its solid economic base, and its strategic position in the center of Africa, is one of the most important assets the West has in Africa right now.

"Let me hasten to add that, like just about everyone else, I hope that one day the Katanga will rejoin the rest of the Congo in a unified state. Right now, however, I think we ought to settle for a loose confederation, with provision for the placing of funds from the admittedly rich Katanga at the disposal of the central government, to be used in less favored regions. President Tshombe himself has agreed in principle to such an arrangement, pointing out that such a loose confederation was the stepping stone that the newly-independent British colonies in North America used in moving toward truly unified government.

"In the meantime, let me venture to suggest that, despite what the alarmists say, the rest of the Congo does not really need the resources of the Katanga in order to survive economically. Even without the Katanga, the Congo would be very well off, in comparison with other African lands. It has rich diamond mines, as well as sizable workings of gold and tin; it has fantastic hydroelectric potential at the mouth of the Congo River; it has a well-developed agriculture, including such export crops as coffee and cotton; it has large timber resources; it has a superb natural system of communications in the Congo River and its principal tributaries. But under the Belgians, the rest of the Congo became accustomed to being subsidized by Katanga copper, and of course it wants to continue with that arrangement.

"All of this may help to explain our dismay at the persistence of the U.N. in its campaign against the Katanga. Now that the U.N. has gotten into difficulty in the Central Congo, the pressure on the Katanga has been eased momentarily. But from recent pronouncements in the U.N. we judge that the ultimate aim of the U.N., to bring the independent Katanga to its knees, has not been altered.

"A goodly number of Methodist missionaries have tried to bring some of these considerations to the attention of the American public and of American policymakers. We have been gratified to read articles and editorials in leading American newspapers and magazines expressing serious reservations about the U.N.'s policies in the Congo. But official U.S. policy seems changed scarcely a whit. The efforts of Senator DODD, of Connecticut, and Senator YARBOROUGH, of Texas, both of whom have been in close touch with missionaries here, to point out the hazards of America's unquestioning support of the U.N.'s Congo adventure appear thus far to have been to little avail."

These, then, are some of our thoughts on the current Congo crisis. We recognize that we may be wrong, and certainly welcome any and all comers who wish to debate the issue. In any case, we are convinced that it is important enough to merit the careful contemplation of all Americans.

My wife and I extend to you our best wishes for a successful completion of your African journey, and for a fruitful continuation of your important work in the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES BROUWER.

[From the Salisbury (South Rhodesia) Daily News, Nov. 15, 1961]

BISHOP BACK FROM STRIFE-TORN COUNTRY REPORTS FEDERAL FORM OF GOVERNMENT SEEN AS ONLY SOLUTION TO CONGO PROBLEM—SUBDUING TSHOMBE BY FORCE CAN HAVE TRAGIC CONSEQUENCES

SALISBURY, Wednesday.—Any attempt by the United Nations or the Congolese Central Government to secure by force a unitary form of government in the Congo will lead on to tragic results, said Bishop N. S. Booth who is in charge of the Katanga, Kasai, and Kivu sections of the Methodist Church, in an exclusive interview with the Daily News this morning.

Bishop Booth who arrived in Salisbury from the Congo yesterday said it was vital, if peace was to be maintained in the Congo, that all those concerned should recognize that a solution to the Congo troubles can come about only through the establishment of a Federal form of government.

Bishop Booth said the widespread belief that the resistance of Katanga and its determination for the maintenance of its autonomy is due to European population is a mistaken view.

"The Katangan Government is definitely an African government and the decision to resist a unitary form of government is its own, not that of foreigners. Truly there are European advisers but the basic decisions are not in their own hands but that of the Katangan Government," Bishop Booth declared.

IMMENSE PROBLEM

Asked to state what he thought was the basic problem in the Congo, Bishop Booth said the Congo comprised 1 million square miles and about 14 million people whose ethnic grouping was as diverse as it was varied. "Even under the Belgian colonial rule, no attempt was made to administer these diverse provinces on a unitary basis because of the immense problem this would have brought about," he said.

He dismissed as false, "an apparently widespread belief that all the Balubas are anti-Tshombe. In fact, four leading members in Tshombe's government are Balubas," he claimed.

Bishop Booth said, however, that despite the diversity in the Congo's ethnic groupings, the whole Congo region should, and can, work together. But an attempt to force it would be tragic and the strong concentration of power in the Leopoldville government would compromise its success.

ENORMOUS SUPPORT

Bishop Booth said President Tshombe enjoyed an enormous support from many people in Katanga than is normally recognized. "He has built a strong, stable government which is the envy of the confused Congolese central government," he said.

Dealing with the economic situation of the whole Congo, Bishop Booth said the economic interdependence of the Congo region is evident. The rest of the Congo needs the industrial development of Katanga, while, on the other hand, Katanga needs interior market of the Congo as a whole. "But I am satisfied that this economic interdependence can be possible under a federal form of government and not a unitary setup. On a point of fact, President Tshombe has called for this on several occasions. I think he is right and I am sure more people will realize, as time goes on, that his suggestion for political settlement in the Congo is the wisest."

Bishop Booth leaves this evening for Nairobi enroute to India where he is to attend the Third Assembly of the World Council of Churches. He was interviewed by the Daily News at the Methodist Church this morning.

COPY OF A LETTER SENT FROM MISS JULIA HOEL, AMERICAN SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST MISSIONARY, TO MRS. ROBERT E. BARTLETT, 2154 WOODWARD AVENUE, LAKEWOOD, OHIO

ELISABETHVILLE, *December 6, 1961.*

DEAR IRMA JEAN: Since I wrote last our plans have not materialized as I mentioned. Yesterday Dr. Schaffner (medical head of the mission), Ronnie, and I were ready to fly back to Songa (near Kamina) while Edith was going to drive her car up. Dr. Schaffner went to get Ronnie's road pass (no one can go from one town to another without one) and found the road to the (Elisabethville) airport blocked. A little later it was opened and the men from Leopoldville and Usumbura got through and went on their way. We went to lunch at Wentland's and while eating saw 17 truckloads of United Nations troops with machineguns and bazookas go by. Shortly after, the firing started.

In the morning we had been watching U.N. troops dig a fox hole across the road and called others from time to time to watch them put the guns in, and that may be the reason they fired on us with their mortars. When we heard the firing coming nearer, we came over here in the main building and took refuge in the corridor.

Edith and I have been staying at the Thomases, so was Elder Pierson, the president of the African Mission Board. He, Edith, and Elder Thomas went back over there when the firing let up a little, and we were just looking for them, when a bomb hit the bathroom and tore out the wall, and a piece flew as it exploded just over Elder Pierson's head and made a big hole in the door on the opposite side of the room. The ventian blinds were thrown clear out into the hall in a heap of junk. Plaster flew everywhere. They (Elder Pierson, Edith, and Elder Thomas) all came back quickly over here (to the main building of the mission).

While I am writing this, mortars are booming off from the United Nations camp. Mr. Wentland called Mr. Urquart and told him what his U.N. troops were doing. Urquart promised to do everything militarily possible to prevent another incident (bombing of the American mission). Just about that time the U.N. started firing into Wentland's home and the bedroom where Elder Torrey was staying was a shambles of broken glass and plaster. Elder and Mrs. Wentland were in the kitchen but they hastened over here after it quieted down a bit, with only a few mortar shots in the distance. Dr. Schaffner and Ronnie went upstairs to their apartment to finish packing. Then the machineguns started. Ra-ta-ta. So they lay down on the floor and continued arranging their suitcases. Then a mortar shell crashed out the wall between the two windows and exploded over them. It devastated the whole apartment and made such a cloud of dust for awhile that they couldn't breathe, but lay there choking for air.

Windows broke out in the chapel below, and many holes were punctured in the three cars out in the garage. It was such a crashing noise that we all fell or slid down flat. (The U.N. forces are now booming their mortars overhead with returning shots from the Katangans.) Dr. Schaffner crawled out and shouted that he and Ronnie were all right.

Mr. Wentland called Mr. Urquart again and asked him why they were bombing American missionaries, saying that we had nothing to do with their war. Mr. Urquart was shocked and cursed the U.N. troops and promised again that he would order them to stop. The U.N. shot a few more times into the Wentland's house during the night.

While I was writing that, Mr. Urquart called and told us it had all been fixed up with the troops and there would be no more firing on us. He had no more than hung up when the U.N. shot into the main office with a round of machinegun fire.

We blocked all the windows with tables and boxes of books and put mattresses in front of each door leading out into the hall. We put more mattresses along the length of the corridor and sat on them singing songs and listening to newscasts until time to have worship and go to bed. Thirty-one of us in all. Nobody did too much sleeping but there was not a great deal of shooting during the night. (There goes some that are closer.)

We really looked a sight this morning all along the length of the hall when the lights went on. The baldheaded ones asked the rest of us why we didn't comb our hair.

We went over to Wentland's for breakfast, and two men from the UP and AP came out to see what had happened. They took telegrams to send out for us. The men are trying to make plans for us to get out, but it is not safe to leave in this firing.

December 7: I finished that (the above paragraphs) yesterday before lunch and had gone over to Wentland's for lunch. We had no more than filled our plates when the firing began right around us. Elder Wentland said we had better get down on the floor. Some of us got under the table and some in the corners. The shots flew by with a zing and many of them hit on the house and roof, and some came through the windows. We ate flat on our stomachs under the table. The bullets kept zinging with a whir close by us, so we decided to crawl into the bedroom where it was more protected. It was announced over the radio that the U.N. had shot off 3,000 rounds of ammunition. For over an hour there was such a barrage of machinegun fire, recoilless rifles, and bazookas that we did not dare raise our heads. Elder Pierson said for us to keep our heads down and pray.

You cannot imagine what the combination of all of them together sound like, if you have not heard it. After it finally ceased, a bit, and splintering glass ceased to fall, we got up and started to take another cob of corn or look around a bit when a bazooka hit the bathroom ceiling from the U.N. camp. It blew the roof off. It tore off the cupboards and hit the tub making a 4-inch gash through a pipe. Water spurted out in a small geyser and soon flooded all the floors and soaked up the rugs. They probably aim at bathrooms because of the small window that someone might be hiding behind. The roof hit Elder Torrey and Wentland on their heads, knocking down the former. We called him a couple times but he did not answer. We were really frightened but the third time he answered and came out with blood running down his face and on his shirt and hands. I made pressure on the bleeders till they stopped. A rafter fell in the bedroom where we had just been crouching. We were frightened to move again till the people in the main building began to fear we had been shot, or injured in that last awful blast.

Fred Wilson came over to see if we were alive and then we gained courage to go over there again. I washed the blood off Elder Torrey and the doctor came to look at his wounds. There was nothing severe but he did have a bad headache the rest of the day and all night. We gathered together to have a thanksgiving service for having our lives spared. There have been a few shots and bombs from time to time since, but no heavy firing. Tshombe said in Paris that the United States is financing and siding this war in Katanga to appease the Communists at the price of the lives of many innocent people. What Adlai Stevenson and S. Williams said doesn't help out the Americans over here. In fact, it might close up missionary work. If we try to evacuate, it is doubtful if the Katangans will let any Americans across a roadblock. They have Hoffacker, the American consul, in house arrest already.

December 8, 1961, Queen Elisabeth Hospital, Elisabethville: Yesterday we did not go out of the building for lunch. (I wrote that and had to run to the bomb shelter here at the hospital.) I wanted to send out some cables but the telegraph office is not functioning. The day before yesterday there were many reporters who came out to see us from time to time to take pictures and interview us. I hope you get some report from it. They were wonderful to us and kept calling Urquart and the consuls. The former tried to tell us it was the Katangans who were bombing us but anyone could see that would be impossible with them just across the street where the big rifle shots and mortars were coming from. The reporters said that the more of it they went through with us, the more they felt like starting an anti-U.N. campaign. Fred and some of the others went into the front office and made the mistake of lowering the venetian blind. Immediately a shot came through the window. The men came tumbling out and we thought they were hit, but they weren't. Soon the firing increased and a bazooka hit the main office building, shaking the whole building. We saw a flash of fire and the whole front wall looked like it might collapse on us. The reporters all flattened out on the mattresses with us till it let up a little. Then they called the International Red Cross to come and take us out. They came, but were fired on, so they went back. Then a blast shattered a big hole in the apartment above, knocking out the door to the kitchen and breaking water pipes. The water is still running out there. The house was full of gunpowder smoke and dust. We crowded down further toward the end of the hall and put up a barricade of mattresses halfway down the hall. The journalists leaped up on it and over to call consuls and U.N. officials. They gave them a very straight report of what was going on and insisted that the U.N. do something about it. Thomas' house was hit again, ruining the whole building. Nothing was done about taking us out. Mr. Urquart said he would stop the firing on the mission if he had to go out into the foxhole himself. He must have had trouble getting there as it was getting dusk, and we wouldn't dare move around after dark. The journalists said they could not ask or advise us to leave because of the danger from both sides shooting at us. We decided to make a run for it though and they said they would take the lead. We started filling our cars when a bomb struck fairly close and we all leaped back through the windows and onto the floor. Then a little pause and Elder Pierson (though it sounded like the voice of God) said, "Let us get in our cars and go." We drove off with bombs still falling. I made room in the back seat for one of our faithful Africans and his small children.

Two more terrified workers came and they crowded back there, too, standing and leaning as they could. They wanted to stay there with us till the last.

Helen Devos went with me, too. We thanked God that He had kept us through the bombing and trusted He would keep us on our journey. We stayed close together as possible and heard only a few shots before arriving at the hospital. The white-robed priests came out to meet us and took us to rooms in the refectory where we slept on mattresses on the floor and ate in their dining room. We helped set tables and clean up as there were other refugees and their African helpers were afraid to come to work. There was no one to do the laundry either so Edith Amelie and I ironed priests' robes all afternoon. There were a few rounds of machinegun fire near by and each time we took shelter in a safe corner where the priest showed us, and he chatted with us there till it was safe to come out.

December 10, 1961: We just stayed in the refectory one night. The next afternoon when we were finished ironing the soutanes, we went back to join the rest. Leonard Robinson was negotiating with Tshombe to see if we could get a military escort to take us out. Fred Wilson took my car and went over to the native city to see our workers there. The natives were inflamed by Stevenson's speech in Washington (N.Y.) and demanded what tribe Fred belonged to. He knew better than to say he was an American but said he was a missionary. They were not satisfied, and grabbed the keys to the car. Another walked up and pointed a gun in his face and told him to leave. He said he couldn't when that other man had his keys. He said we were fleeing from the U.N. bombings of our mission and was trying to get some money to our pastors. Then they let him have the keys, but he had not driven far till another put a gun in his face and he went through the same experience. We could see that we hardly could hope to go overland because of the hatred that had been aroused against Americans. Mr. Pierson, Dr. Schaffner, and two others were praying that they would make the right decision while Leonard went to call President Tshombe. There was a call for him coming in, as he reached the telephone, from the American Embassy. They said for us to be ready to leave in 5 minutes and follow the leader without any comments. Elder Wentland was quickly packing his suitcases and snipped a bit of flesh off the end of his finger. He held it till it stopped bleeding, and a little later someone gave him a bandaid to put on it. He carefully bandaged the wrong finger and didn't know the difference till the next morning when he took it off. I think laughing over that one silly little incident has done more to brighten our outlook than anything else.

Just as we started out they told us we were going to the American consulate. We knew very well we could be shot if any of the Africans saw us going there. We took as circuitous a route as possible and turned on our parking lights only. The group the Schaffners and Wilsons were in was shot at but not hit. Everything was dark and gloomy at the vice consul's with only candles burning. Other refugees were there, too. Some woman sat down at the piano and played "What a Friend and How Great Thou Art." It was a lovely thing for her to do just before the most perilous part of our journey.

We were instructed to drive down to the Indian camp that had been bombing us for several days. By the way, the U.N. colonel said the reason they bombed us was because there were Katangans behind the building firing at the camp. (Note: Thus, the U.N. Indian commander admits he shelled the American mission with the missionaries in it.)

We thought they were, too, and that we were under crossfire, but it still doesn't explain to me why they had to aim their bazookas right in the building. They knew there were no Katangans inside. The first bomb that almost hit the doctor and his son was fired before any shot at all had been fired in the vicinity. The journalists could have told them there was no one in the building if they didn't believe us.

As we drove off, a Belgian man stood by the road and cursed Americans, telling us to get out. We heard that after we left he threw gas on Leonard's car and burned it. We hope that is not true.

We were to go out to the airport behind two immense armored cars, more like tanks, with recoilless rifles on top, and one of them to bring up the rear. It was really eerie with those horrible things in the darkness and the fear of death every minute. We drove out on the road where most of the fighting had taken place. We barely crept along, praying all the time. I thought to myself that to the Christian, death is a small matter and when we woke up we would see Jesus, and the thought gave me peace. Some of our party got out of the line and we felt it was sure death for them. They came to an Indian barricade and were really treated rough for awhile till they persuaded them to call headquarters on their phone. Amelie was riding with me and said she was so fearful the flesh was shaking off her bones. She said she didn't want me to think she didn't have confidence in me, but she did wish there were a man with us. Pretty soon Bob Osmunson went by and he gladly came in and drove for us. It did seem better to have him there. We crept along and stopped to check to see if all were there. We didn't know why, though, and expected to hear shooting. It seemed like the airport was never so far away. We went by the mission and looked at the gaping holes. Amelie said for me to open the door and let her go crawl under a mattress rather than take favors from the ones who had blown it up. (Note: They would have otherwise been dependent on the U.N.).

After a terrifying half hour we drove into the airport. They told us we had to stay there for the night. We slept on camp cots and sat on benches under the planes. We asked an Indian where the ladies' room was and he said we could go out behind one of the planes. (Note: In normal times the airport had ample normal facilities of this sort.)

December 10, 1961: The next morning they brought us down to Ndola in three trips in an American DC-4. We found the mission plane had been broken into and the doctor's camera gone. He patched up the window and later found it had been broken again while we were there and all the papers torn to bits on the floor. Elder Osmunson was going to fly it down but they could not get clearance for first one thing and then the other till the last trip was ready to start. He had to get in and leave our plane. The motors had started and were warming up for the takeoff when someone came banging on the door and said his clearance had just come through. He got out and went over to start it and found the microphone had been stolen and the emergency kit, too. He called the Indian colonel and told him he could not take off without a microphone. They found an old one some place and gave it to him. He came in just a little after the others arrived at Ndola. (Note: Indian troops were in control of the airport, and no one else could have done the thieving.)

We just thank God for His protection and mercies beyond number, that all of us reached here safely. It seemed in each advance step we took in our flight that He just opened the door enough for us to go through and it closed straightway behind us. Some have lost their cars and homes, but they do not complain. It only makes us long the more for Jesus soon coming. May this hope burn bright in our hearts and nothing be allowed to come between us and our Savior and the peace it gives to our hearts.

Today we heard the Katangans went into our building and launched a heavy attack against the Indian camp. The water is cut off in the whole town and people are suffering from hunger. The hospital was bombed by the Indians and 700 patients fled including one woman they were just starting to do a caesarian section on. They have not seen her since. Dr. Schaffner left a man with a colostomy. He promised to close it as soon as we returned. The man begged him to close it then, saying that we might not come back and he would have to go through life like that. The doctor could not do it because he would have to be there to see if it would function after closing.

Lovingly,

JULIA.

The Bombing of Shinkolobwe Hospital by UNO

Dr. Bekaert's report on the aerial attack against Shinkolobwe hospital on December 12, 1961:

"The fact that the Shinkolobwe hospital buildings are used for the purpose of hospitalization is indicated by an enormous red cross painted on the roof of the administrative block. This hospital is completely isolated from any other construction within a radius of 1,500 meters, except for the checkered pattern of houses in the settlement, the nearest of which is several hundred meters from the hospital.

"Upon arrival from Kambove with my medical team I was welcomed in the entrance hall of the hospital by families loudly lamenting their dead and by the wounded who lay there stoically but hopelessly.

"Two men and one child were dead. Four seriously wounded victims were evacuated to Jadotville and I took 10 more to Kambove. Several dozen other wounded were treated locally.

"The state of the buildings shows that the attack was very accurate—the more so because the air crews knew that there was no risk of any riposte. The wounded told me that at about 8 o'clock two pairs of low flying aircraft passed several times over the hospital.

"The administrative block, the left-hand row of four wards and the kitchen, dining and laundry building were attacked and hundreds of bullet holes bear witness to the machinegunning.

"In one of the wards—the maternity ward—four expectant mothers and a nursing mother were wounded, and a 4-year-old visitor was killed.

"The roof, ceiling, walls, beds, tables, and chairs are all riddled with bullets. The blood of the victims makes the place look like a battlefield. A bomb exploded in a second ward—fortunately unoccupied. The roof, ceiling, half of the walls, and the equipment have all been blasted.

"Thousands of bullet holes and bomb craters of all sizes in the buildings and equipment are proof of the attack against the other two wards, the administrative block and the kitchen-laundry building.

"The hospital, without water and electricity, had to be evacuated."

[Excerpt from the Washington Post, Nov. 9, 1961]

Central Troops In Big Move, Katanga Claims

ELISABETHVILLE, KATANGA, THE CONGO, November 8.—Katanga's armed forces commander claimed today that about 1,500 Central Congolese Army troops with 20 trucks were moving through Kivu Province toward Albertville, about 100 miles inside secessionist Katanga Province.

But Gen. Norbert Moke was unable to tell a press conference whether the troops already had crossed into Katanga.

Central government troops last week fought soldiers of Katanga President Moise Tshombe as part of the Leopoldville regime's campaign to end the secession of the province. The clashes took place in north Katanga with the invading forces being driven back to neighboring Kasai Province.

Moke also said a group of Indian United Nations troops left Albertville yesterday and were allegedly on their way to attack the town of Kongolo, which has a pro-Tshombe administration.

He also said that the U.N. in Albertville told Katangan officers there today to support and obey the Central Government or face attack by U.N. forces.

Moke claimed several persons were killed in troubles between Baluba and other tribesmen in the Albertville area. He accused the U.N. of "supporting the Balubas and provoking the trouble."

Much of the Albertville and Kongolo area in northeast Katanga is peopled by Baluba tribes hostile to the Tshombe government.

Meantime, Congolese Prime Minister Cyrille Adoula told reporters in Léopoldville that all soldiers found guilty of a reported rampage and rape of white women November 2 in the Kasai capital of Luluabourg would be severely punished. Adoula had just returned from a flying trip to the panic-stricken town for an on-the-spot inquiry with Congolese army chief Gen. Joseph Mobutu, U.N. military commander Gen. Sean McKeon, and U.N. civil administrator Mahmoud Khiari.

[Excerpt from the New York Post, Nov. 16, 1961]

Congo Mutineers Slay 13 U.N. Fliers

Léopoldville, the Congo, November 16.—The United Nations today announced that insurgent Congolese troops had "brutally murdered" 13 Italian U.N. airmen at the Kivu Province town of Kindu.

A U.N. spokesman said the unarmed fliers were shot by unruly troops shortly after their arrest last Saturday afternoon.

Some of their bodies were dismembered and hurled into the Lualaba River, the spokesman added, by soldiers who apparently suspected them of being Belgian paratroopers.

The 13 Italian airmen had flown into Kindu in 2 C-119 transports on a routine mission Saturday. Congolese troops attacked the airmen in the U.N. Malayan officers' mess, manhandled and beat them and took them off to the town prison.

Eyewitness reports to the U.N. said the men were shot before a crowd. When U.N. officials later confronted the local Congolese commander, he pleaded ignorance of the events and intimated his men were beyond his control.

"You know how soldiers are," he reportedly told the U.N. officials.

The U.N. spokesman, George Ivan Smith, said the U.N. command was presenting "specific proposals" to the central Congo government for forceful action to investigate and punish those responsible for the murder and to prevent a repetition.

If the government response seems insufficient, Smith said, the U.N. is prepared to act immediately on its own. He added that Malayan troops, prepared for any necessary action, already are being flown to reinforce the 200-man Malayan U.N. garrison in Kindu.

The U.N. already had threatened military action if the rebellious soldiers—part of a disorderly command of more than 2,000 claiming allegiance to leftist Vice Premier Antoine Gizenga—failed to give up the Italians.

U.N. headquarters here in teletype consultation with Acting Secretary General U Thant in New York throughout the night to decide on the next steps to be taken by the world body.

The murder of the Italians was announced after word that Congolese Gen. Victor Lundula had returned to Kindu for another attempt to secure the Italians' release and to quell what was described as an open mutiny against the authority of the central government. Diplomats in Léopoldville said Ginzenga himself was responsible for the mutiny.

Orders went out, too, for an end to army lawlessness in the Congolese occupation of Albertville, a Lake Tanganyika port in secessionist Katanga Province. There soldiers and their Baluba tribal allies looted homes, stole cars, arrested various whites and Africans and wandered the streets demanding money, free food and beer.

The U.N. instructed its Indian contingent in Albertville, which has about 150 combat troops, to halt mutinous and lawless acts by force if necessary. Albertville, 320 miles southeast of Kindu, fell last week to Baluba foes of Katanga President Moise Tshombe. The 100 Congolese troops who took over Sunday were met by Smith and by Conor Cruise O'Brien, the chief U.N. representative in Kantanga, giving an air of U.N. sanction to the operation.

[Excerpt from the New York Times, Nov. 16, 1961]

Mutiny in Congo: U.N. Links Gizenga to Troops' Revolt—Military Action Threatened Against Rebellious Troops Who Hold 13 Italians—Thant Orders Steps—Authorizes Every Measure Possible To Restore Law and Order in Provinces

(By David Halberstam)

Léopoldville, the Congo, November 15.—Congolese troops loyal to Eastern Province have mutinied, and United Nations officials today linked their action to an attempt by Antoine Gizenga to establish control of the Congo in defiance of the Central Government.

The United Nations threatened to take most energetic military action against the mutinous Congolese soldiers, who are holding 13 Italian airmen prisoner in the town of Kindu in Kivu Province. The United Nations said it would act promptly unless there was some positive step toward freeing the men.

The situation appeared grave. High diplomatic and United Nations officials said Mr. Gizenga, who is Vice Premier of the Central Government, was in Kindu and that 2,000 Stanleyville troops had arrived there.

CONCERN FOR AIRMEN GROWS

Concern for the safety of the Italians increased when it was learned that an attempt by Maj. Gen. Victor Lundula, commander of the troops from Eastern Province, to free the men had failed.

General Lundula flew to the area to talk with the troops, who ostensibly are his own men. But they refused to obey his orders. Later it was reported that General Lundula and Christophe Gbenye, Minister of the Interior, who also attempted to negotiate for the release of the airmen, virtually had to flee to the airport from the meeting.

The United Nations also warned Congolese National Army troops that crossed into north Katanga Province at Albertville that it would use force against them to keep law and order in that town.

The troops arrived in Albertville yesterday and apparently went on a rampage, stealing cars, looting houses, and setting up roadblocks to demand money from anyone who passed.

The United Nations said it had the support of the Central Government in its warnings to the troops in both Kindu and Albertville.

MILITARY ACTION PLANNED

Plans for a military strike against the garrison in Kindu are being made by the United Nations. It apparently will be carried out tomorrow—unless some positive word on the release of the airmen arrives here before then.

The United Nations is concerned over just what kind of military action to take to avoid jeopardizing the lives of the Italians. There is considerable support here, however, for an attack by Indian Canberra jets on the garrison.

Both Dr. Conor Cruise O'Brien, the United Nations representative in Katanga, and Gen. Sean McKeown, the United Nations commander in the Congo, left for New York for urgent meetings with the Acting Secretary General U Thant, on problems regarding the secession of Katanga Province.

It has been confirmed here that the Italians were badly beaten by Congolese on Saturday and that several of them were dragged unconscious to trucks to be taken to jail.

The troops at both Albertville and Kindu are technically under the command of General Lundula. The units at Albertville were sent into Katanga as the forerunner of an invasion force. There also has been a buildup of Eastern Province troops at Kindu, ostensibly in preparation for an invasion of Katanga.

There is some uncertainty, however, whether the buildup at Kindu was for an invasion of Katanga or to back a move by Mr. Gizenga for power.

Ironically, it was the two close associates of Mr. Gizenga, General Lundula and Mr. Gbenye, both followers of the late Patrice Lumumba, who failed in the first step of the negotiations for the release of the Italians.

Mr. Gbenye has remained loyal to the Central Government and General Lundula has just sworn loyalty to it. Mr. Gizenga, however, after pledging loyalty, returned to Stanleyville where he is believed to be leading an undeclared secession.

Mr. Gizenga is reported to be playing a major role in the Kindu rebellion, according to reliable sources. He has been there since Saturday and appears to be leading a faction in open defiance of the Central Government.

There are only about 200 United Nations troops in Kindu, all Malayan.

FEAR FELT FOR AIRMEN

No one has reported seeing the 13 Italians since they were arrested and fear is felt for their lives. The commander of the troops at Kindu told General Lundula that he himself had not seen the troops and believed it would be very dangerous to go to see them.

Last night, Central Government officials received a message from the soldiers at Kindu saying, "The mercenaries have escaped." This was presumed to be an allusion to the Italians. The word "escape" is often used here before announcing that the escapees have been killed.

The United Nations account of what happened to the Italians said they were lunching when several trucks full of troops arrived at the messhall and about 80 soldiers of the Congolese National Army rushed inside.

Apparently they had heard reports that some planes had landed with Belgian paratroops and they were looking for the so-called Belgians. The Congolese appeared to have been drinking heavily.

[Excerpt from the Baltimore Sun, Nov. 20, 1961]

Kindu Warns Planes Off—Mutinous Congo Unit Claims It Will Shoot Them Down

Usumbura, Ruanda Urundi, November 19.—The commander of Congolese Army units in Kindu, site of the massacre of 13 Italian airmen, has warned that he will shoot out of the sky any planes which appear over the town.

The commander, a colonel named Pakassa, yesterday sent out radio messages—picked up by United Nations stations elsewhere in Kivu Province and passed on to all airports in the vicinity—saying he refuses to allow any aircraft to fly in the Kindu region.

Pakassa's first message indicated he was willing to allow a plane carrying Gen. Victor Lundula, commander of the Stanleyville government forces, to land. But he asked Lundula to send a signal by radio before leaving Goma, where the general has been for the past couple of days and to announce his time of arrival. Pakassa added: "Every other aircraft is to run back to Goma or we will shoot them down."

About this time a DC-4 of Air Congo left Usumbura, capital of this neighboring Belgian trust territory, for Goma, where it planned to pick up Lundula and take him back to Stanleyville. It appeared Lundula has talked with United Nations authorities in Goma and decided to return to Stanleyville rather than risk landing at Kindu.

In any event Pakassa sent a second message which said:

"We forbid any aircraft—without exception—to fly to Kindu. They would risk great danger if they try. I refuse to change this order. My artillery will open fire without hesitation."

Two planes which had left Goma for Kindu returned on receipt of these messages. The United Nations apparently had not carried through its announced plan to ferry in Malayan United Nations battalions to surround and disarm the Kindu garrison.

[Excerpt from the New York Times, Nov. 23, 1961]

U.N. Negligence Seen in Murders—Congo Aide Is Said To Make Charge on Italians

LÉOPOLDVILLE, THE CONGO, November 22.—The Interior Minister of the Congo was reported today to have cited negligence by the United Nations as one of the reasons for the recent massacre of 13 Italian airmen.

The Italians, who flew military vehicles into the Congo for the United Nations, were slain by mutinous Congolese troops in Kindu, Kivu Province.

Informed sources said the Interior Minister, Christophe Gbenye, made his charge in a report to the Central Government after a visit to Kindu and Stanleyville, capital of Eastern Province. In Stanleyville Mr. Gbenye met with Antoine Gizenga, First Vice Premier of the Central Government.

PLANE NUMBER NOTED

The Gbenye report was said to have charged that United Nations negligence was one of the immediate causes of the murder of the Italian airmen. The sources said the report contended that the numerical identification of the Italians' plane did not tally with numbers given to Congolese troops in Kindu in advance of the Italians' arrival.

As a result, the report said, the Congolese were under the impression that the plane was landing mercenaries.

Mr. Gbenye was said to have reported that Mr. Gizenga was not responsible for the murders. Mr. Gizenga is the political heir to the slain Patrice Lumumba, leftist and former Premier.

Mr. Gbenye's report, it was said, indicated that Mr. Gizenga did not arrive in Kindu until November 11, 3 days after the Italians were murdered.

FRICTION WITH GIZENGA

There has been friction between Mr. Gizenga and the Central Government since he returned to Stanleyville for what was to be a brief visit and then remained there. The Central Government threatened to expell him from his high post if he did not return.

The Central Government still has not appointed delegates to the joint Congolese-United Nations committee that is to investigate the slaying of the Italians. This indicated there was no agreement on how Mr. Adoula's promise that the guilty will be punished was to be put into effect.

The United Nations command here indicated yesterday it would take action against the guilty soon with or without a joint commission.

[From the New York Times]

U.N. Drops Plan To Disarm Congolese At Murder Site

(By David Halberstam)

LÉOPOLDVILLE, THE CONGO, November 25.—The United Nations gave up today its plan to disarm the 2,000 Congolese troops at Kindu in a hunt for the killers of 13 Italian airmen. Instead, the United Nations announced that it would support a plan of the Congolese Government to move the guilty soldiers to another city, probably Léopoldville, for punishment.

The United Nations decision, made public here today, was contained in a letter from Dr. Sture C. Linner, United Nations representative here, to Premier Cyrille Adoula of the central Congolese Government.

In effect, it marked a change in United Nations policy for two reasons.

PLAN CALLED IMPRACTICAL

First, the feeling was growing here that the United Nations plan was tactically impractical, since it might lead to widespread bloodshed between Congolese troops and United Nations personnel.

Second, the move represented a gesture to domestic Congolese politics. If the United Nations had handled the case and punished the guilty, it was said, the already shaky Adoula government would be made extremely susceptible to pressure from the left.

There would also be charges, it was said, that the United Nations was punishing an entire garrison of brave Congolese soldiers who would thus be prevented from fighting the real Congolese enemy in secessionist Katanga Province.

It was believed that if the United Nations insisted on disarming the soldiers around Kindu, Premier Adoula might face a vote of censure in the Congolese Parliament.

In his letter, Dr. Linner conceded that it would be inopportune to attempt to disarm the Kindu garrison.

Both the United Nations and Premier Adoula retreated from earlier statements when Mr. Adoula met strong opposition in Parliament on the plan to disarm the garrison. Thus, on Thursday, Mr. Adoula sent Dr. Linner a letter that called the United Nations plan to seal off the area impractical. The Premier insisted that the Congolese Government was capable of bringing the guilty men to justice.

After the airmen were captured and slain November 11, the United Nations announced that it would take energetic action whether the Congolese Government cooperated or not.

SOLDIERS HEAD FOR KATANGA

Feeling is growing in most quarters here that with each passing day it will be increasingly difficult to find the guilty soldiers. They are known to have headed for the Katanga border. If necessary, they will shed their uniforms and head for the bush, it is believed.

Mr. Adoula has told Dr. Linner that the central Congolese Government is convinced that approximately 200 men from two units are responsible for the crime.

Dr. Linner agreed to Mr. Adoula's proposals after lengthy communications with U Thant, Acting United Nations Secretary General in New York. But he renewed the United Nations proposal for a joint United Nations-Congolese commission to investigate the case.

Mr. Adoula has said the commission is unnecessary. The United Nations has appointed its five members to the commission, but so far the Congoloese have appointed none. It is believed no Congolese wants to serve.

At Kindu, the United Nations has found itself ensnarled in a command conflict between the Malayans and Ethiopians in its force. Its contingent there is also considered too small to complete a sealing-off operation.

Tshombe Vows To Meet Force

ELISABETHVILLE, THE CONGO, November 25.—President Moise Tshombe of Katanga warned the United Nations and the central Congolese Government today that he would "meet force with force."

Mr. Tshombe replied to the resolution adopted yesterday by the United Nations Security Council that said Katanga's secession must be ended "by force if necessary."

The President called a special news conference and said: "We are prepared for any negotiation and solution of the problem by peaceful means. However, if we are attacked we will reply with force.

"Even if the whole Katanga population—black and white—has to die and our economy to be destroyed we will resist.

"If the United Nations forces a repetition of the events of September 19, it will be the United Nations' fault and the new Secretary General, U Thant, will bear more responsibility for what happens than did the late Mr. Hammarskjold."

This was a reference to an attempt by United Nations forces in September to expel white mercenaries from Katanga's army. This effort ran into unexpectedly fierce resistance. The fighting ended only with a cease-fire that favored Katanga.

[Excerpt from the New York Times, Dec. 22, 1961]

In the Nation: The Fruits of Victory Are Yet To Ripen

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, December 21.—Nothing succeeds like success except the success that is enduring. Therefore, even those who deplore the methods employed must concede that the United Nations achieved a success in the Congo when President Tshombe of Katanga signed the pact with Premier Adoula that was described today by the central Congo regime; and that Prime Minister Nehru was successful in aggrandizing Portuguese India.

Involved in these developments also was a double success for Soviet Russia, which promoted the U.N. war against Tshombe and, speaking through Premier Khrushchev, endorsed India's annexations by armed force as fully lawful and justified. By the same measurement of achievement, Nehru was another two-time winner because Indian troops on U.N. pay made an important contribution to the military result in Katanga. The Government of the United States, without whose material assistance the U.N. Army could not have subdued Tshombe's capital of Elisabethville, can lay claim to one of these victories. But its effort to have the U.N. rebuke Nehru for his aggression not only failed; it was limited to one try on the what's-the-use ground that he had "got by with it."

WILL IT LAST?

The next step will be a test of the constructive value and enduring quality of these triumphs in the attainment and preservation of world peace. Such are the proclaimed purposes of all the victors in the two acts of militancy, and such are the charted purposes and functions for which the U.N. was created. The Congo test will center largely on events after Tshombe submits to his Parliament the paper he signed under U.N. military and U.S. military-cum-political pressure. And among these events will be the future activity of Antoine Gizenga, whose Eastern Province was also in a state of secession but thus far has been excluded from the punitive military actions of the U.N. in the Congo.

It seems improbable that Gizenga's activity will include a refusal, if urged, to make whatever signed commitment Tshombe made to Léopoldville. There is no substantial reason why he should refuse. He is Vice Premier in the central Congo Government to which Tshombe has been obliged to yield, on paper at least. And Gizenga is also the protege of the Kremlin, which supported the U.N. Katanga military action with everything—except a financial contribution toward the cost. So the prospect, on his previous record, is that Gizenga will do what he can as Vice Premier to gain control of the Central Government and, as far as he is able, subvert it to the aims of Soviet African policy.

This measure of the test to come is drawn on assumptions that (1) the pact Tshombe signed with Adoula establishes the authority of Léopoldville in Katanga and the other provinces as totally as the spokesman of the central regime said it does; (2) that Tshombe, his Parliament and the tribal chieftains in Katanga and elsewhere in the area will execute this kind of agreement in full degree; and (3) that native resentments against the U.N. and the United States created by the deaths and destruction wrought by bombing and mortar-fire in and around Elisabethville, and made possible by supply transports on which the legend "U.S. Air Force" was visible to all the military and civilians under fire, will not take form in a renewal of the Congo civil war.

ONLY TIME WILL TELL

It will be days, maybe weeks, and could be months and years before the consequences, good and bad, of the recent events in the Congo and Portuguese India can be soundly estimated. But the immediate successes have been won. And the various official statements made by the governments whose acts prevailed are very naturally based on this paraphrase of the ancient axiom: "Sufficient unto the day is the attainment thereof." Also, in the list with which the Kennedy administration will seek to refute the critics of its U.N. policy there can be cited the recent assembly votes by which Communist China was denied membership and the militant acts of world communism in Hungary and Tibet were denounced.

And Nehru's cup of happiness, almost filled by the action on Tibet by an organization which refused to censure him for the seizure of Portugese India by force, will overflow when he is honored by the projected visit of the wife of the President of the United States.

[Excerpt from the New York Times, Dec. 30, 1961]

Tshombe Says U.N. Jets Back New Congo Assault

Elisabethville, the Congo, December 29.—President Moise Tshombe charged today that a new attack had been opened against North Katanga by troops of the Central Government with the assistance of the United Nations.

The President of secessionist Katanga Province made protests and appeals for aid to President Kennedy, the United Nations Acting Secretary General, U Thant, the British Government and Premier Cyrille Adoula of the Congo.

There was no confirmation of the attack from United Nations sources.

(A United Nations spokesman in New York said reports had been received in the last few days of minor skirmishes in the area. But he categorically denied that the United Nations force was participating in any joint military operations with the Congolese, or had given any help to Central Government forces in the skirmishes.)

CONGO LEADERS IN PACT

Mr. Tshombe agreed in a meeting with Mr. Adoula last Friday at Kitona to surrender his independence and recognize the authority of the Léopoldville Government, but said later the agreement had to be ratified by the Katanga Assembly.

He reported the new attack at a news conference as the Adoula Government and the United Nations mission waited to see if he intended to carry out the agreement.

Mr. Tshombe said two battalions and two commando companies of the Congo Army attacked villages near Kongolo, about 400 miles north of Elisabethville and forty miles south of the Kivu provincial border. The United Nations helped mount the attack, he charged, by providing transport and support with Indian Canberra jet bombers.

From the previous pattern of military movements in the area it seemed likely that any Congolese force from Kivu would be under the command of Gen. Victor Lundula. General Lundula was army chief for the late Premier Patrice Lumumba and for several months supported Mr. Lumumba's political successor in Stanleyville, Antoine Gizenga, but recently swore allegiance to Léopoldville's army chief, Gen. Joseph D. Mobutu.

Following a cease-fire between United Nations and Katangan forces last September, when General Mobutu's army attempted an invasion of Katanga from Kasai Province, General Lundula's troops assembled in Kivu for a similar attack.

The United Nations announced last Saturday that it would accept 1,000 of General Mobutu's men in the United Nations Army. Reports from Léopoldville said today, however, that an advance guard of 90 men to have been flown 3 days ago to Kamina, 250 miles southwest of Kongolo, had not yet moved. The Adoula government apparently was having second thoughts about putting its soldiers under United Nations command.

The Katanga Assembly is scheduled to meet here Wednesday to consider ratification of the Kitona Agreement with Mr. Adoula. Some informed Katanga sources believe it is likely to agree in principle to the Kitona Agreement—provided the Congo's provisional Constitution is modified to give Katanga wide home-rule powers.

It is almost certain to do whatever Mr. Tshombe bids it do. In theory it consists of 60 elected deputies, plus appointed chiefs, with 27 of the deputies from Mr. Tshombe's Conakat Party and 25 from the opposition Balubakat. But 8 seats never have been filled and the opposition deputies long ago walked out.

In the last day or two, tension between the Katangese and the United Nations has increased, and some Katangese have been reacting against United Nations patrols, roadblocks and arrests.

United Nations spokesmen said African townships outside Elisabethville had been isolated and many arrests made to prevent attacks on anti-Tshombe Baluba tribesmen and to halt looting.

[Excerpts from the New York Times, Jan. 20, 1962]

Attack Reported at Congo Mission—40 Girls Imperiled at School—Burning Houses Sighted

(By David Halberstam)

Léopoldville, the Congo, January 19.—Rebel Congolese troops have apparently overrun a Roman Catholic mission station at the Katanga-Kivu border town of Sola, the United Nations said tonight.

Two United Nations jets flew over the mission station and the pilots saw two Congolese soldiers rush for cover in a church building. The pilots also saw two military trucks on the mission grounds, and several houses burning in the town.

(Church officials in Leopoldville told the Associated Press that there were 40 teenage African girls at the mission's teacher-training college and a European staff of 6 white priests and 5 or 6 white nuns of the Franciscan Order.)

The jets were sent by the United Nations after a report from G. C. Senni, the International Red Cross representative in Elisabethville, that the Congolese troops were planning to attack the mission.

The United Nations spokesman said everything possible would be done to stop the rebel troops.

But the spokesman added that it would be tactically difficult to move troops into the area. The United Nations has no paratroops at its disposal here and no troops within 200 miles of Sola. Troops would have to be moved in by helicopter.

The rebel Congolese are believed to be the same troops accused of slaying 19 Roman Catholic clergymen and a number of civilians at the north Katanga town of Kongolo, January 1.

Col. Alphonse Pakassa, commander of the troops at Kongolo and Kindu, where 13 Italian airmen were murdered November 11, was arrested yesterday in Stanleyville by Gen. Victor Lundula.

Earlier in the day here, the United Nations promised to give all military aid necessary to the Central Government to apprehend the soldiers if reports of the Kongolo slayings were true.

The United Nations spokesman refused to give details on what form the military aid would take. But he said that the United Nations and the Central Government were conferring on the situation.

At the request of the Central Government the United Nations sent a plane to Stanleyville to transport Antoine Gizenga, the deposed vice premier, to Léopoldville. He will be questioned about the fighting in Stanleyville over the weekend and will face possible punitive action.

Mr. Gizenga requested the plane. The United Nations said his departure depended on an agreement with the authorities of Eastern Province, who have started legal proceedings against Mr. Gizenga.

The United Nations reported that factional clashes had broken out between Congolese soldiers in the North Katanga town of Albertville.

The United Nations said that the commander of the troops and five officers had been placed under United Nations protection and would be flown to General Lundula in Stanleyville.

The spokesman added that the trouble apparently started after the commander ordered five of his men shot. The 5 soldiers were part of a group of 50 men arrested earlier in Kabalo for rebellious behavior.

The troops at Albertville, at Kongolo, and at Kindu were among those who left Stanleyville last year for an invasion of Katanga Province. They have caused disturbances in virtually every town in the area. While General Lundula was their nominal commander, the troops at Kindu and Kongolo were considered to be more loyal to Colonel Pakassa.

[Excerpts from the New York Times, Jan. 22, 1962]

Katanga Reports Villages Burned—Central Government Rebels Blamed in New Attacks

Elisabethville, the Congo, January 21.—The secessionist Katanga Government reported today that central Congolese troops had entered central Katanga, burned villages and massacred women and children.

The assertion was made in a communique signed by President Moise Tshombe. It said the troops had gone into the district of Kilwa, about 250 miles from Elisabethville, where they were repulsed by Katangese police troops.

In a veiled reference to the United Nations, the communique said the Katanga Government held responsible for the alleged massacres "those who facilitated the entrance to Katanga and Premier Cyrille Adoula, who called this a police action."

Travelers arriving in Elisabethville from the north said central Congo troops were invading the territory in patrol strength but did not occupy the areas affected.

GENERAL CURBS VIOLENCE

Gen. Victor Lundula, commander of the Congolese troops in Eastern Province, is nominally in command of rebellious troops believed responsible for recent massacres. The general has been cooperating with the central government in an effort to prevent new violence.

On January 1, Congolese rebels murdered 19 Roman Catholic priests and workers at Kongolo, 20 miles south of Sola. At Sola, 13 priests and nuns were missing from a mission station that was attacked and burned by rebel Congolese troops. It is believed they may have escaped.

General Lundula went to Kongolo to investigate and arrested Col. Alphonse Pakassa, commander of the troops at Kongolo and Kindu. It was at Kindu that 13 Italian airmen were slain November 11.

PRIESTS MAY HAVE FLED

LÉOPOLDVILLE, THE CONGO, January 21.—Bishop Richard Cleire of Kasongo, in Kivu Province, said here it was possible that the six priests and seven nuns at the Roman Catholic mission station at Sola had managed to flee before the station was overrun by rebel Congolese troops.

But a Katanga Government communique issued in Elisabethville said the rebel soldiers were continuing their pillaging and killing in northern Katanga.

The communique gave no figures for the number of dead, but said an entire jungle area called Kiona-Ngoy had been overrun, with men, women, and children massacred and houses destroyed.

Usually reliable sources in Elisabethville said two rebel Congolese army companies left Kongolo Friday to attack a mission and village at Bulula, 20 miles east of Kongolo.

Northern Katanga was left without United Nations troops when fighting broke out in Elisabethville in early December. The rebel Congolese drifted in from Eastern and Kivu Provinces.

Bishop Cleire said there were usually two cars at the mission in Sola. The priests and nuns could have escaped to Albertville on Lake Tanjanyika, he said.

"But we have no confirmation that they left or arrived in Albertville," the bishop said. "All we can do now is hope that after the New Year's Day massacre (in Kongolo) they took heed and left. They may also have left earlier when told about the advance of the troops."

REBEL TROOPS HOLD MISSION

LÉOPOLDVILLE, January 21.—The United Nations said today that the Roman Catholic mission at Sola was apparently occupied by Congolese troops.

A United Nations spokesman said two Indian Canberra jets flew over Sola today and the pilots reported that the mission and college appeared to be in the hands of Congolese troops.

In addition to the staff of nuns and priests at the mission, about 40 teenage African girls attended a teachers' training college here.

[Excerpt From the Washington Post, Oct. 30, 1961]

LIFTING OF KATANGAN'S VISA SCORED BY ACLU

The American Civil Liberties Union said yesterday that the cancellation by the United States of the visa of the director of the Katanga Information Service was a clear infringement of free speech and due process of law.

In a letter to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Patrick Murphy Malin, executive director of ACLU, urged that the cancellation be rescinded or that the information service director, Michael Struelens, be granted a new visa.

Struelens' visa was invalidated on October 4 "on the ground that he had entered the United States as a newspaperman and not as an information officer," ACLU said.

Malin said that when Struelens first obtained a visa in Brussels in 1960 and that when he had it renewed in Brazzaville last August "the American consuls, in their own handwriting, wrote that Mr. Struelens was coming to the United States as director of the Katanga Information Service."

Malin also said that Struelens was treated unfairly when he was requested to appear at the New York office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service on October 4.

An ACLU investigation showed, Malin said, that Struelens went to the office in response to a request from officials who said that they wanted to look at his visa.

But, Malin went on to say, "when Mr. Struelens appeared, the visa was invalidated, without any statement specifying the reasons for the action or giving him an opportunity to defend himself."

Immigration regulations provide that "if practicable" a person "be notified of the proposed action and given an opportunity to show cause why his visa should not be revoked or invalidated."

"We are also concerned," Malin added, "about the impact of the State Department's action on the vital first amendment principle of freedom of speech."

Malin said that Struelens' visa was canceled after Members of Congress and other public figures had used material supplied by the Katanga Information Service as a basis for criticism of United Nations policies in the Congo.

In his letter Malin declared that "the definite impression has been created that the visa was revoked because of the information and opinion presented by Mr. Struelens."

"Unless this impression is corrected," Malin added, "the State Department faces the charge of censorship."

Katanga is one of the Congo provinces that sought to remain independent from a Central Congolese Government. Belgian investments in Katanga are heavy. It has been frequently charged that Belgium still controls Katanga, although it and the rest of the Congo have been nominally independent for more than a year.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 314)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to the reciprocal trade agreements program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am informed that the message on trade negotiations has been read in the House. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD without having been read, and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Twenty-eight years ago our Nation embarked upon a new experiment in international relationships—the reciprocal trade agreements program. Faced with the chaos in world trade that had resulted from the great depression, disillusioned by the failure of the promises that high protective tariffs would generate recovery, and impelled by a desperate need to restore our economy, President Roosevelt asked for authority to negotiate reciprocal tariff reductions with other nations of the world in order to spur our exports and aid our economic recovery and growth.

That landmark measure, guided through Congress by Cordell Hull, has been extended 11 times. It has served our country and the free world well over two decades. The application of this program brought growth and order to the free world trading system. Our total exports, averaging less than $2 billion a year in the 3 years preceding enactment of the law, have now increased to over $20 billion.

On June 30, 1962, the negotiating authority under the last extension of the Trade Agreements Act expires. It must be replaced by a wholly new instrument. A new American trade initiative is needed to meet the challenges and opportunities of a rapidly changing world economy.

In the brief period since this act was last extended, five fundamentally new and sweeping developments have made obsolete our traditional trade policy:

The growth of the European Common Market—an economy which may soon nearly equal our own, protected by a single external tariff similar to our own—has progressed with such success and momentum that it has surpassed its original timetable, convinced those initially skeptical that there is now no turning back and laid the groundwork for a radical alteration of the economics of the Atlantic alliance. Almost 90 percent of the free world's industrial production (if the United Kingdom and others successfully complete their negotiations for membership) may soon be concentrated in two great markets—the United States of America and the expanded European Economic Community. A trade policy adequate to negotiate item by item tariff reductions with a large number of small independent states will no longer be adequate to assure ready access for ourselves—and for our traditional trading partners in Canada, Japan, Latin America, and elsewhere—to a market nearly as large as our own, whose negotiators can speak with one voice but whose internal differences make it impossible for them to negotiate item by item.

The growing pressures on our balance-of-payments positions have, in the past few years, turned a new spotlight on the importance of increasing American exports to strengthen the international position of the dollar and prevent a steady drain of our gold reserves. To maintain our defense, assistance and other commitments abroad, while expanding the free flow of goods and capital, we must achieve a reasonable equilibrium in our international accounts by offsetting these dollar outlays with dollar sales.

The need to accelerate our own economic growth, following a lagging period of 7 years characterized by three recessions, is more urgent than it has been in years—underlined by the millions of new job opportunities which will have to be found in this decade to provide employment for those already unemployed as well as an increasing flood of younger workers, farmworkers seeking new opportunities, and city workers displaced by technological change.

The Communist aid and trade offensive has also become more apparent in recent years. Soviet bloc trade with 41 non-Communist countries in the less-developed areas of the globe has more than tripled in recent years; and bloc trade missions are busy in nearly every continent attempting to penetrate, encircle, and divide the free world.

The need for new markets for Japan and the developing nations has also been accentuated as never before—both by the prospective impact of the EEC's external tariff and by their own need to acquire new outlets for their raw materials and light manufactures.

To meet these new challenges and opportunities, I am today transmitting to the Congress a new and modern instrument of trade negotiation—the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. As I said in my state of the Union address, its enactment "could well affect the unity of the West, the course of the cold war and the growth of our Nation for a generation or more to come."

I. THE BENEFITS OF INCREASED TRADE

Specifically, enactment of this measure will benefit substantially every State of the Union, every segment of the American economy, and every basic objective of our domestic economy and foreign policy.

Our efforts to expand our economy will be importantly affected by our ability to expand our exports—and particularly upon the ability of our farmers and businessmen to sell to the Common Market. There is arising across the Atlantic a single economic community which may soon have a population half again as big as our own, working and competing together with no more barriers to commerce and investment than exist among our 50 States—in an economy which has been growing roughly twice as fast as ours—representing a purchasing power which will someday equal our own and a living standard growing faster than our own. As its consumer incomes grow, its consumer demands are also growing, particularly for the type of goods that we produce best, which are only now beginning to be widely sold or known in the markets of Europe or in the homes of its middle-income families.

Some 30 percent of our exports—more than $4 billion in industrial goods and materials and nearly $2 billion in agricultural products—already goes to the members and prospective members of the EEC. European manufacturers, however, have increased their share of this rapidly expanding market at a far greater rate than American manufacturers. Unless our industry can maintain and increase its share of this attractive market, there will be further temptation to locate additional American-financed plants in Europe in order to get behind the external tariff wall of the EEC. This would enable the American manufacturer to contend for that vast consumer potential on more competitive terms with his European counterparts; but it will also mean a failure on our part to take advantage of this growing market to increase jobs and investment in this country.

A more liberal trade policy will in general benefit our most efficient and expanding industries—industries which have demonstrated their advantage over other world producers by exporting on the average twice as much of their products as we import—industries which have done this while paying the highest wages in our country. Increasing investment and employment in these growth industries will make for a more healthy, efficient and expanding economy and a still higher American standard of living. Indeed, freer movement of trade between America and the Common Market would bolster the economy of the entire free world, stimulating each nation to do most what it does best and helping to achieve the OECD target of a 50-percent combined Atlantic community increase in gross national product by 1970.

Our efforts to prevent inflation will be reinforced by expanded trade. Once given a fair and equal opportunity to compete in oversea markets, and once subject to healthy competition from oversea manufacturers for our own markets, American management and labor will have additional reason to maintain competitive costs and prices, modernize their plants, and increase their productivity. The discipline of the world marketplace is an excellent measure of efficiency and a force to stability. To try to shield American industry from the discipline of foreign competition would isolate our domestic price level from world prices, encourage domestic inflation, reduce our exports still further, and invite less desirable governmental solutions.

Our efforts to correct our adverse balance of payments have in recent years roughly paralleled our ability to increase our export surplus. It is necessary if we are to maintain our security programs abroad—our own military forces overseas plus our contribution to the security and growth of other free countries—to make substantial dollar outlays abroad. These outlays are being held to the minimum necessary, and we are seeking increased sharing for our allies. But they will continue at substantial rates—and this requires us to enlarge the $5 billion export surplus which we presently enjoy from our favorable balance of trade. If that surplus can be enlarged, as exports under our new program rise faster than imports, we can achieve the equilibrium in our balance of payments which is essential to our economic stability and flexibility. If, on the other hand, our surplus should fail to grow, if our exports should be denied ready access to the EEC and other markets—our oversea position would be endangered. Moreover, if we can lower the external tariff wall of the Common Market through negotiation our manufacturers will be under less pressure to locate their plants behind that wall in order to sell in the European market, thus reducing the export of capital funds to Europe.

Our effort to promote the strength and unity of the West are thus directly related to the strength and unity of Atlantic trade policies. An expanded export program is necessary to give this Nation both the balance-of-payments equilibrium and the economic growth we need to sustain our share of Western military security and economic advance. Equally important, a freer flow of trade across the Atlantic will enable the two giant markets on either side of the ocean to impart strength and vigor to each other, and to combine their resources and momentum to undertake the many enterprises which the security of free peoples demands. For the first time, as the world's greatest trading nation, we can welcome a single partner whose trade is even larger than our own—a partner no longer divided and dependent, but strong enough to share with us the responsibilities and initiatives of the free world.

The Communist bloc, largely self-contained and isolated, represents an economic power already by some standards larger than that of Western Europe and hoping someday to overtake the United States. But the combined output and purchasing power of the United States and Western Europe—nearly a trillion dollars a year—is more than twice as great as that of the entire Sino-Soviet world. Though we have only half the population, and far less than half the territory, we can pool our resources and resourcefulness in an open trade partnership strong enough to outstrip any challenge, and strong enough to undertake all the many enterprises around the world which the maintenance and progress of freedom require. If we can take this step, Marxist predictions of "capitalist" empires warring over markets and stifling competition would be shattered for all times—Communist hopes for a trade war between these two great economic giants would be frustrated—and Communist efforts to split the West would be doomed to failure.

As members of the Atlantic community we have concerted our military objectives through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We are concerting our monetary and economic policies through the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. It is time now to write a new chapter in the evolution of the Atlantic community. The success of our foreign policy depends in large measure upon the success of our foreign trade, and our maintenance of Western political unity depends in equally large measure upon the degree of Western economic unity. An integrated Western Europe, joined in trading partnership with the United States, will further shift the world balance of power to the side of freedom.

Our efforts to prove the superiority of free choice will thus be advanced immeasurably. We will prove to the world that we believe in peacefully "tearing down walls" instead of arbitrarily building them. We will be opening new vistas of choice and opportunity to the producers and consumers of the free world. In answer to those who say to the world's poorer countries that economic progress and freedom are no longer compatible, we—who have long boasted about the virtues of the marketplace and of free competitive enterprise, about our ability to compete and sell in any market, and about our willingness to keep abreast of the times—will have our greatest opportunity since the Marshall plan to demonstrate the vitality of free choice.

Communist bloc nations have negotiated more than 200 trade agreements in recent years. Inevitably the recipient nation finds its economy increasingly dependent upon Soviet goods, services and technicians. But many of these nations have also observed that the economics of free choice provide far greater benefits than the economics of coercion—and the wider we can make the area of economic freedom, the easier we make it for all free peoples to receive the benefits of our innovations and put them into practice.

Our efforts to aid the developing nations of the world and other friends, however, depend upon more than a demonstration of freedom's vitality and benefits. If their economies are to expand, if their new industries are to be successful, if they are to acquire the foreign exchange funds they will need to replace our aid efforts, these nations must find new outlets for their raw materials and new manufactures. We must make certain that any arrangements which we make with the European Economic Community are worked out in such a fashion as to insure nondiscriminatory application to all third countries. Even more important, however, the United States and Europe together have a joint responsibility to all of the less-developed countries of the world—and in this sense we must work together to insure that their legitimate aspirations and requirements are fulfilled. The "open partnership" which this bill proposes will enable all free nations to share together the rewards of a wider economic choice for all.

Our efforts to maintain the leadership of the free world thus rest, in the final analysis, on our success in this undertaking. Economic isolation and political leadership are wholly incompatible. In the next few years, the nations of Western Europe will be fixing basic economic and trading patterns vitally affecting the future of our economy and the hopes of our less-developed friends. Basic political and military decisions of vital interest to our security will be made. Unless we have this authority to negotiate and have it this year—if we are separated from the Common Market by high tariff barriers on either side of the Atlantic—then we cannot hope to play an effective part in those basic decisions.

If we are to retain our leadership, the initiative is up to us. The revolutionary changes which are occurring will not wait for us to make up our minds. The United States has encouraged sweeping changes in free world economic patterns in order to strengthen the forces of freedom. But we cannot ourselves stand still. If we are to lead, we must act. We must adapt our own economy to the imperatives of a changing world, and once more assert our leadership.

The American businessman, once the authority granted by this bill is exercised, will have a unique opportunity to compete on a more equal basis in a rich and rapidly expanding market abroad which possesses potentially a purchasing power as large and as varied as our own. He knows that, once artificial restraints are removed, a vast array of American goods, produced by American know-how with American efficiency, can compete with any goods in any spot in the world. And almost all members of the business community, in every State, now participate or could participate in the production, processing, transporting, or distribution of either exports or imports.

Already we sell to Western Europe alone more machinery, transportation equipment, chemicals, and coal than our total imports of these commodities from all regions of the world combined. Western Europe is our best customer today—and should be an even better one tomorrow. But as the new external tariff surrounding the Common Market replaces the internal tariff structure, a German producer—who once competed in the markets of France on the same terms with our own producers—will achieve free access to French markets while our own producers face a tariff. In short, in the absence of authority to bargain down that external tariff, as the economy of the Common Market expands, our exports will not expand with it. They may even decline.

The American farmer has a tremendous stake in expanded trade. One out of every seven farmworkers produces for export. The average farmer depends on foreign markets to sell the crops grown on 1 out of every 6 acres he plants. Sixty percent of our rice, 49 percent of our cotton, 45 percent of our wheat, and 42 percent of our soybean production are exported. Agriculture is one of our best sources of foreign exchange.

Our farmers are particularly dependent upon the markets of Western Europe. Our agricultural trade with that area is 4 to 1 in our favor. The agreements recently reached at Brussels both exhausted our existing authority to obtain further European concessions, and laid the groundwork for future negotiations on American farm exports to be conducted once new authority is granted. But new and flexible authority is required if we are to keep the door of the Common Market open to American agriculture, and open it wider still. If the output of our astounding productivity is not to pile up increasingly in our warehouses, our negotiators will need both the special EEC authority and the general 50-percent authority requested in the bill described later in this message.

The American worker will benefit from the expansion of our exports. One out of every three workers engaged in manufacturing is employed in establishments that export. Several hundred times as many workers owe their jobs directly or indirectly to exports as are in the small group—estimated to be less than one-half of 1 percent of all workers—who might be adversely affected by a sharp increase in imports. As the number of job seekers in our labor force expands in the years ahead, increasing our job opportunities will require expanding our markets and economy, and making certain that new U.S. plants built to serve Common Market consumers are built here, to employ American workers, and not there.

The American consumer benefits most of all from an increase in foreign trade. Imports give him a wider choice of products at competitive prices. They introduce new ideas and new tastes, which often lead to new demands for American production.

Increased imports stimulate our own efforts to increase efficiency, and supplement antitrust and other efforts to assure competition. Many industries of importance to the American consumer and economy are dependent upon imports for raw materials and other supplies. Thus American-made goods can also be made much less expensively for the American consumers if we lower the tariff on the materials that are necessary to their production.

American imports, in short, have generally strengthened rather than weakened our economy. Their competitive benefits have already been mentioned. But about 60 percent of the goods we import do not compete with the goods we produce—either because they are not produced in this country, or are not produced in any significant quantity. They provide us with products we need but cannot efficiently make or grow (such as bananas or coffee), supplement our own steadily depleting natural resources with items not available here in quantity (such as manganese or chrome ore, 90 percent or more of which must be imported if our steel mills are to operate), and contribute to our industrial efficiency, our economic growth, and our high level of consumption. Those imports that do compete are equal to only 1 or 1½ percent of our total national production; and even these imports create jobs directly for those engaged in their processing, distribution, or transportation, and indirectly for those employed in both export industries and in those industries dependent upon reasonably priced imported supplies for their own ability to compete.

Moreover, we must reduce our own tariffs if we hope to reduce tariffs abroad and thereby increase our exports and export surplus. There are many more American jobs dependent upon exports than could possibly be adversely affected by increased imports. And those export industries are our strongest, most efficient, highest paying growth industries.

It is obvious, therefore, that the warnings against increased imports based upon the lower level of wages paid in other countries are not telling the whole story. For this fear is refuted by the fact that American industry in general—and America's highest paid industries in particular—export more goods to other markets than any other nation; sell far more abroad to other countries than they sell to us; and command the vast preponderance of our own market here in the United States. There are three reasons for this:

(a) The skill and efficiency of American workers, with the help of our machinery and technology, can produce more units per man-hour than any other workers in the world—thus making the competitive cost of our labor for many products far less than it is in countries with lower wage rates. For example, while a U.S. coal miner is paid 8 times as much per hour as the Japanese miner, he produces 14 times as much coal—our real cost per ton of coal is thus far smaller—and we sell the Japanese tens of millions of dollars worth of coal each year.

(b) Our best industries also possess other advantages—the adequacy of low-cost raw materials or electrical power, for example. Neither wages nor total labor costs is an adequate standard of comparison if used alone.

(c) American products can frequently compete successfully even where foreign prices are somewhat lower—by virtue of their superior quality, style, packaging, servicing, or assurance of delivery.

Given this strength, accompanied by increasing productivity and wages in the rest of the world, there is less need to be concerned over the level of wages in the low-wage countries. These levels, moreover, are already on the rise and, we would hope, will continue to narrow the current wage gap, encouraged by appropriate consultations on an international basis.

This philosophy of the free market—the wider economic choice for men and nations—is as old as freedom itself. It is not a partisan philosophy. For many years our trade legislation has enjoyed bipartisan backing from those members of both parties who recognized how essential trade is to our basic security abroad and our economic health at home. This is even more true today. The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 is designed as the expression of a nation, not of any single faction, not of any single faction or section. It is in that spirit that I recommend it to the Congress for prompt and favorable action.

II. PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

New negotiating authority: To achieve all of the goals and gains set forth above—to empower our negotiators with sufficient authority to induce the EEC to grant wider access to our goods and crops and fair treatment to those of Latin America, Japan, and other countries—and to be ready to talk trade with the Common Market in practical terms—it is essential that our bargaining authority be increased in both flexibility and extent. I am therefore requesting two basic kinds of authority to be exercised over the next 5 years:

First, a general authority to reduce existing tariffs by 50 percent in reciprocal negotiations. It would be our intention to employ a variety of techniques in exercising this authority, including negotiations on broad categories or subcategories of products.

Second, a special authority to be used in negotiating with the EEC, to reduce or eliminate all tariffs on those groups of products where the United States and the EEC together account for 80 percent or more of world trade in a representative period. The fact that these groups of products fall within this special or dominant supplier authority is proof that they can be produced here or in Europe more efficiently than anywhere else in the world. They include most of the products which the members of the Common Market are especially interested in trading with us, and most of the products for which we want freer access to the Common Market; and to a considerable extent they are items in which our own ability to compete is demonstrated by the fact that our exports of these items are substantially greater than our imports. They account for nearly $2 billion of our total industrial exports to present and prospective Common Market members in 1960, and for about $1.4 billion of our imports from these countries. In short, this special authority will enable us to negotiate for a dramatic agreement with the Common Market that will pool our economic strength for the advancement of freedom.

To be effective in achieving a breakthrough agreement with the EEC so that our farmers, manufacturers, and other free world trading partners can participate, we will need to use both the dominant supplier authority and the general authority in combination. Reductions would be put into effect gradually in stages over 5 years or more. But the traditional technique of trading one brick at a time off our respective tariff walls will not suffice to assure American farm and factory exports the kind of access to the European market which they must have if trade between the two Atlantic markets is to expand. We must talk instead in terms of trading whole layers at a time in exchange for other layers, as the Europeans have been doing in reducing their internal tariffs, permitting the forces of competition to set new trade patterns. Trading in such an enlarged basis is not possible, the EEC has found, if traditional item-by-item economic histories are to dominate. But let me emphasize that we mean to see to it that all reductions and concessions are reciprocal—and that the access we gain is not limited by the use of quotas or other restrictive devices.

Safeguarding interests of other trading partners: In our negotiations with the Common Market, we will preserve our traditional most-favored-nation principle under which any tariff concessions negotiated will be generalized to our other trading partners. Obviously, in special authority agreements where the United States and the EEC are the dominant suppliers, the participation of other nations often would not be significant. On other items, where justified, compensating concessions from other interested countries should be obtained as part of the negotiations. But in essence we must strive for a nondiscriminatory trade partnership with the EEC. If it succeeds only in splintering the free world, or increasing the disparity between rich and poor nations, it will have failed to achieve one of its major purposes. The negotiating authority under this bill will thus be used to strengthen the ties of both common markets with, and expand our own trade in, the Latin American Republics, Canada, Japan, and other non-European nations—as well as helping them maximize their opportunities to trade with the Common Market.

The bill also requests special authority to reduce or eliminate all duties and other restrictions on the importation of tropical agricultural and forestry products supplied by friendly less-developed countries and not produced here in any significant quantity, if our action is taken in concert with similar action by the Common Market. These tropical products are the staple exports of many less-developed countries. Their efforts for economic development and diversification must be advanced out of earnings from these products. By assuring them as large a market as possible, we are bringing closer the day when they will be able to finance their own development needs on a self-sustaining basis.

Safeguards to American industry: If the authority requested in this act is used, imports as well as exports will increase; and this increase will, in the overwhelming number of cases, be beneficial for the reasons outlined above. Nevertheless ample safeguards against injury to American industry and agriculture will be retained. Escape clause relief will continue to be available with more up-to-date definitions. Temporary tariff relief will be granted where essential. The power to impose duties or suspend concessions to protect the national security will be retained. Articles will be reserved from negotiations whenever such action is deemed to be in the best interest of the Nation and the economy. And the four basic stages of the traditional peril point procedures and safeguards will be retained and improved:

The President will refer to the Tariff Commission the list of proposed items for negotiations;

The Tariff Commission will conduct hearings to determine the effect of concessions on these products;

The Commission will make a report to the President, specifically based, as such reports are based now, upon its findings of how new imports might lead to the idling of productive facilities, the inability of domestic producers to operate at a profit, and the unemployment of workers as the result of anticipated reductions in duties; and

The President will report to the Congress on his action after completion of the negotiations. The present arrangements will be substantially improved, however, since both the Tariff Commission recommendation and the President's report would be broader than a bare determination of specific peril points; and this should enable us to make much more informed use of these recommendations than has been true in the past.

Trade adjustment assistance: I am also recommending as an essential part of the new trade program that companies, farmers, and workers who suffer damage from increased foreign import competition be assisted in their efforts to adjust to that competition. When considerations of national policy make it desirable to avoid higher tariffs, those injured by that competition should not be required to bear the full brunt of the impact. Rather, the burden of economic adjustment should be borne in part by the Federal Government.

Under existing law, the only alternatives available to the President are the imposition or refusal of tariff relief. These alternatives should continue to be available.

The legislation I am proposing, however, provides an additional alternative called trade adjustment assistance. This alternative will permit the executive branch to make extensive use of its facilities, programs, and resources to provide special assistance to farmers, firms, and their employees in making the economic readjustments necessitated by the imports resulting from tariff concessions.

Any worker or group of workers unemployed or underemployed as a result of increased imports would, under this bill, be eligible for the following forms of assistance:

1. Readjustment allowances providing as much as 65 percent of the individual's average weekly wage for up to 52 weeks for all workers, and for as many as 13 additional weeks for workers over 60, with unemployment insurance benefits deducted from such allowances to the extent available;

2. Vocational education and training assistance to develop higher and different skills;

3. Financial assistance for those who cannot find work in their present community to relocate to a different place in the United States where suitable employment is available.

For a businessman or farmer adversely affected by imports, there should be available:

1. Technical information, advice and consultation to help plan and implement an attack on the problem;

2. Tax benefits to encourage modernization and diversification;

3. Loan guarantees and loans otherwise not commercially available to aid modernization and diversification.

Just as the Federal Government has assisted in personal readjustments made necessary by military service, just as the Federal Government met its obligation to assist industry in adjusting to war production and again to return to peacetime production, so there is an obligation to render assistance to those who suffer as a result of national trade policy. Such a program will supplement and work in coordination with, not duplicate, what we are already doing or proposing to do for depressed areas, for small business, for investment incentives, and for the retraining and compensation of our unemployed workers.

This cannot be and will not be a subsidy program of Government paternalism. It is instead a program to afford time for American initiative, American adaptability, and American resiliency to assert themselves. It is consistent with that part of the proposed law which would stage tariff reductions over a 5-year period. Accordingly, trade adjustment assistance, like the other provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, is designed to strengthen the efficiency of our economy, not to protect inefficiencies.

Authority to grant temporary tariff relief will remain available to assist those industries injured by a sudden influx of goods under revised tariffs. But the accent is on adjustment more than assistance. Through trade adjustment prompt and effective help can be given to those suffering genuine hardship in adjusting to import competition, moving men and resources out of uneconomic production into efficient production and competitive positions, and in the process preserving the employment relationships between firms and workers wherever possible. Unlike tariff relief, this assistance can be tailored to their individual needs without disrupting other policies. Experience with a similar kind of program in the Common Market, and in the face of more extensive tariff reductions than we propose here, testifies to the effective but relatively inexpensive nature of this approach. For most affected firms will find that the adjustment involved is no more than the adjustment they face every year or few years as the result of changes in the economy, consumer taste, or domestic competition.

The purpose of this message has been to describe the challenge we face and the tools we need. The decision rests with the Congress. That decision will either mark the beginning of a new chapter in the alliance of free nations—or a threat to the growth of Western unity. The two great Atlantic markets will either grow together or they will grow apart. The meaning and range of free economic choice will either be widened for the benefit of freemen everywhere—or confused and constricted by new barriers and delays.

Last year, in enacting a long-term foreign aid program, the Congress made possible a fundamental change in our relations with the developing nations. This bill will make possible a fundamental, far-reaching and unique change in our relations with the other industrialized nations—particularly with the other members of the Atlantic community. As NATO was unprecedented in military history, this measure is unprecedented in economic history. But its passage will be long remembered and its benefits widely distributed among those who work for freedom.

At rare moments in the life of this Nation an opportunity comes along to fashion out of the confusion of current events a clear and bold action to show the world what it is we stand for. Such an opportunity is before us now. This bill, by enabling us to strike a bargain with the Common Market, will strike a blow for freedom.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 25, 1962.*

GREAT BASIN NATIONAL PARK IN NEVADA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1760) to establish the Great Basin National Park in Nevada, and for other purposes.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the pending business is S. 1760, the so-called Great Basin National Park, located within the State of Nevada.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate agree to the committee amendments en bloc.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield to my distinguished friend from Idaho, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the Senator intend to give an explanation of the bill at this point?

Mr. BIBLE. Just as soon as the committee amendments have been adopted en bloc I shall give a brief explanation of the bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection?

There being no objection, the committee amendments were agreed to en bloc, as follows:

On page 2, at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "5 miles over unsurveyed land to a point which is due east of the northeast corner of section 1, township 12 north, range 67 east;

"Thence due west 1 mile to a point; thence due north approximately 2 miles to a point which is due east of the easterly common corner of sections 24 and 25, township 13 north, range 67 east; thence due west 1½ miles to a point;" and insert "7 miles over unsurveyed land to a point which is due east of the northeast corner of section 25, township 13 north, range 67 east; thence due west 2½ miles to a point;"; on page 4, line 2, after the word "approximately", to strike out "three-quarters" and insert "one-half"; in line 4, after the word "of", where it appears the first time, to strike out "the south half of"; at the beginning line 6, to strike out "south one-sixteenth latitudinal" and insert "east-west quarter"; in line 7, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to strike out "northeast corner of the south half of the southeast quarter" and insert "east quarter corner"; in line 9, after the word "approximately", to strike out "one-quarter" and insert "one-half"; on page 6, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "124,500" and insert "123,360"; on page 8, after line 5, to strike out:

"SEC. 7. Where any Federal lands included within the Great Basin National Park were legally occupied or utilized on the date of approval of this Act for grazing purposes pursuant to a lease, permit, or license, issued or authorized by any department, establishment, or agency of the United States, the person so occupying or utilizing such lands, and the heirs, successors, or assigns of such person, shall upon determination of such lease, permit, or license, be entitled to have the privilege so possessed or enjoyed by him renewed from time to time, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe, for a period of twenty-five years from the date of approval of this Act, and thereafter during the lifetime of such person and the lifetime of his heirs, successors, or assigns, but only if they were members of his immediate family on such date, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided,* That grazing privileges appurtenant to privately owned lands located within the Great Basin National Park established by this Act shall not be withdrawn until title to lands to which such privileges are appurtenant shall have vested in the United States, except for failure to comply with the regulations applicable thereto after reasonable notice of default. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as creating any vested right, title, interest or estate in or to any Federal lands."

And in lieu thereof to insert:

"SEC. 7. Where any Federal lands included within the Great Basin National Park are legally occupied or utilized on the date of approval of this Act for grazing purposes, pursuant to a lease permit or license issued or authorized by any department establishment or agency of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior shall permit the persons holding such grazing privileges on the date of approval of this Act, their heirs, successors, or assigns, to renew the privileges from time to time subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe: *Provided, however,* That no such privilege shall be extended beyond the period ending twenty-five years from the date of approval of this Act except as specifically provided for in this section. The Secretary shall permit a holder of the grazing privilege to renew such privilege from time to time during the holder's lifetime beyond the twenty-five-year period, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, if (1) the holder is the person who held such privilege on the date of approval of this Act, or (2) the holder is the heir, successor, or assign of such person and was a member of that person's immediate family, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, on the date of approval of this Act. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as creating any vested right, title, interest, or estate in or to any of the Federal lands. The Secretary, by regulation, may limit the privileges enjoyed under this Act to the extent that they are appurtenant to the private lands owned by the persons who held such privileges on the date of approval of this Act, and may adjust such privileges to preserve the park land and resources from destruction or unnecessary injury. Grazing privileges appurtenant to privately owned lands located within the Great Basin National Park established by this Act shall not be withdrawn until title to lands to which such privileges are appurtenant shall have vested in the United States, except for failure to comply with the regulations applicable thereto and after reasonable notice of any default."

On page 10, after line 16, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 8. There are hereby eliminated from the Humboldt National Forest all those lands comprising the Snake Division of the forest which lie in:

"NEVADA

"MOUNT DIABLO MERIDIAN

"Townships 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 north, range 68 east;

"Townships 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 north, range 69 east; and

"Townships 10, 11, 12, and 13 north, range 70 east."

And, on page 11, line 2, to change the section number from "8" to "9"; so as to make the bill read:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That in order to preserve for the benefit and inspiration of the people a representative segment of the great basin processing outstanding ecological resources and significant geological and scenic values, there is hereby established the Great Basin National Park in the State of Nevada which, subject to valid existing rights, shall consist of lands and interest in lands within the following described boundary:

"Commencing at the quarter section corner of sections 17 and 20, township 11 north, range 70 east, Mount Diablo Meridian, Nevada; thence west 1½ miles along the south boundaries of sections 17 and 18 to the westerly common corner of sections 18 and 19; thence due west 8 miles over unsurveyed land to a point; thence due north over unsurveyed land to a point which is due east of the easterly common corner of sections 5 and 8, township 11 north, range 68 east;

"Thence westerly over unsurveyed land to said easterly common corner of sections 5 and 8; thence north along the east boundary of section 5 to the northeast corner of said section; thence due north approximately one mile over unsurveyed land to a point which is due east of the easterly common corner of sections 25 and 36, township 12 north, range 67 east, thence due east one mile over unsurveyed land to a point; thence due north approximately 7 miles over unsurveyed land to a point which is due east of the northeast corner of section 25, township 13 north, range 67 east; thence due west 2½ miles to a point; thence due north approximately 3 miles over unsurveyed land to the quarter section corner on the south boundary of section 6, township 13 north, range 68 east; thence 2 miles north through the center of section 6, township 13 north, range 68 east, and section 31, township 14 north, range 68 east, to the quarter section corner common to sections 30 and 31;

"Thence east 1½ miles along the south boundaries of sections 30 and 29 to the common corner of sections 28, 29, 32, and 33; thence north 2 miles along the east boundaries of sections 29 and 20 to the common corner of sections 16, 17, 20, and 21; thence east 1 mile along the south boundary of section 16 to the common corner of sections 15, 16, 21, and 22; thence north 1 mile along the east boundary of section 16 to the common corner of sections 9, 10, 15, and 16; thence east 3 miles along the south boundaries of sections 10, 11, and 12 to the easterly common corner of sections 12 and 13 on the east boundary of township 14 north, range 68 east;

"Thence north approximately three-quarters of a mile along the west boundary of township 14 north, range 69 east, to the westerly common corner of sections 7 and 18, said township and range; thence east approximately one-half mile along the north boundary of said section 18 to the north quarter corner of said section 18, thence south approximately one-half mile along the north-south quarter line of said section 18 to the northwest corner of the southeast quarter of said section 18;

"Thence east approximately one-half mile along the east-west quarter line of said section 18 to the east quarter corner of said section 18; thence south approximately one-half mile along the east boundary of said section 18 to the southerly common corner of said section 18 and section 17; thence east approximtaely one-half mile along the north boundary of section 20 to the north quarter corner of said section 20;

"Thence east approximately one-half mile along the north-south quarter line of said section 20 to the north quarter corner of section 29; thence east approximately one-half mile to the northeast corner of said section 29; thence north approximately 4.89 chains along the west boundary of section 28 to the northwest corner of said section 28; thence east approximately one mile along the north boundary of said section 28 to the northeast corner of said section 28;

"Thence south along the east boundaries of sections 28 and 33, township 14 north, range 69 east, and of what probably will be when surveyed section 4, township 13 north, range 69 east, to the east quarter corner of said section 4; thence east approximately two miles along the east-west quarter lines of sections 3 and 2 to the east quarter corner of said section 2; thence south approximately one-half mile along the east boundary of section 2 to the common corner of sections 1, 2, 11, and 12.

"Thence east approximately two miles along the north boundaries of said section 12, township 13 north, range 69 east, and section 7, township 13 north, range 70 east, to the common corner of sections 5, 6, 7, and 8; thence south 5 miles along the west boundaries of sections 8, 17, 20, 29, and 32, to the southerly common corner of sections 31 and 32, township 13 north, range 70 east; thence east 1 mile along the south boundary of section 32 to the northerly common corner of sections 4 and 5, township 12 north, range 70 east;

"Thence south 1 mile along the west boundary of section 4, to the common corner of sections 4, 5, 8, and 9; thence east 1 mile along the south boundary of section 4, to the common corner of sections 3, 4, 9, and 10; thence south 5 miles along the west boundaries of sections 10, 15, 22, 27, and 34, to the common corner of sections 3 and 4, township 11 north, range 70 east, and sections 33 and 34, township 12 north, range 70 east; thence west 1 mile along the north boundary of section 4, to the common corner of sections 4 and 5, township 11 north, range 70 east, and sections 32 and 33, township 12 north, range 70 east;

"Thence south 1 mile along the west boundary of section 4, township 11 north, range 70 east, to the common corner of sections 4, 5, 8, and 9; thence west one-half mile along the north boundary of section 8. to the quarter section corner common to sections 5 and 8; thence south 2 miles through the center of sections 8 and 17 to the quarter section corner common to sections 17 and 20, township 11 north, range 70 east, the point of beginning, containing about 123,360 acres.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior within the boundaries of the Great Basin National Park, as described above, is authorized to procure by purchase, by donation. with donated funds, or by such means as he may deem to be in the public interest, lands and interests in lands. The Secretary is authorized further to convey Federally owned lands and interests in lands within the park in exchange for non-Federal lands and interests in lands of approximately equal value within the park if, in his judgment, such exchange is in the public interest. Federal lands lying within the boundaries of the Great Basin National Park, as established pursuant to this Act, and hereby transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for preservation and administration as a part of such park.

"SEC. 3. The Lehman Caves National Monument, established on January 24, 1922, by proclamation of the President pursuant to authority contained in the Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225), is hereby abolished. Lands and interests in lands heretofore comprising such monument shall, from the date of approval of this Act, be a part of the Great Basin National Park.

"SEC. 4. The Great Basin National Park shall be administered pursuant to the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), entitled 'An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes', as amended.

"SEC. 5. Nothing contained herein shall affect any valid existing claim, location, or entry under the land laws of the United States or the right of any such claimant, locator, or entryman to the full use and enjoyment of his lands.

"SEC. 6. Within the Great Basin National Park, all mineral deposits of the classes and kinds now subject to location, entry, and patent under the mining laws of the United States, exclusive of the land containing them, and minerals subject to leasing under the mineral leasing laws of the United States shall be subject to exploration and disposal under such laws, with right of occupation and use of so much of the surface of the land as may be required for all purposes reasonably incident to the mining or removal of the minerals: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe such general regulations for the control of these activities as he deems necessary to preserve the scenic, scientific, and recreation values of the area. The provisions of the Act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), as amended, shall have no application within the Great Basin National Park.

"Sec. 7. Where are any Federal lands included within the Great Basin National Park are legally occupied or utilized on the date of approval of this Act for grazing purposes, pursuant to a lease, permit, or license issued or authorized by any department, establishment, or agency of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior shall permit the persons holding such grazing privileges on the date of approval of this Act, their heirs, successors, or assigns, to renew the privileges from time to time subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe: *Provided, however*, That no such privilege shall be extended beyond the period ending twenty-five years from the date of approval of this Act except as specifically provided for in this section. The Secretary shall permit a holder of the grazing privilege to renew such privilege from time to time during the holder's lifetime beyond the twenty-five-year period, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, if (1) the holder is the person who held such privilege on the date of approval of this Act, or (2) the holder is the heir, successor, or assign of such person and was a member of that person's immediate family, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, on the date of approval of this Act. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as creating any vested right, title, interest, or estate in or to any of the Federal lands. The Secretary, by regulation, may limit the privileges enjoyed under this Act to the extent that they are appurtenant to the private lands owned by the persons who held such privileges on the date of approval of this Act, and may adjust such privileges to preserve the park land and resources from destruction or unnecessary injury. Grazing privileges appurtenant to privately owned lands located within the Great Basin National Park established by this Act shall not be withdrawn until title to lands to which such privileges are appurtenant shall have vested in the United States, except for failure to comply with the regulations applicable thereto and after reasonable notice of any default.

"Sec. 8. There are hereby eliminated from the Humboldt National Forest all those lands comprising the Snake Division of the forest which lie in:

"Nevada

"MOUNT DIABLO MERIDIAN

"Townships 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 north, range 68 east;

"Townships 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 north, 69 east; and

"Townships 10, 11, 12, and 13 north, range 70 east.

"Sec. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the bill now before the Senate, and as chairman of the Interior Committee subcommittee that processed this legislation, I am much pleased to have this opportunity to comment on it and to commend it to my colleagues.

The term "Great Basin" refers to that aggregation of about 100 separate basins and their associated mountains in which drainage generally does not reach the sea. It includes all but the extreme western and south portions of my own State of Nevada, the western half of Utah, a section of south-central Oregon, and two small portions of California. The principal characteristics of the Great Basin today are the isolated mountain ranges separated by desert plains. The total area of the basin is about equally divided between ranges and basins.

There is no more outstanding example of Great Basin physiography than that portion of the Snake Range that is proposed for establishment as a national park under the provisions of S. 1760. At the present time there is no characteristic portion of the Great Basin in the national park system. As cosponsors of this legislation, my colleague, Senator Cannon, and I are extremely enthusiastic about the prospect of this truly outstanding area being established as the first national park in our State.

I wish it were possible for all Members of the Senate to see this marvelously scenic area in the Snake Range. Within the area proposed for park development are 14 mountain peaks with elevations in excess of 10,000 feet. The tops of six of these peaks stand a mile or more above the adjacent lowland deserts. Wheeler Peak, which dominates the southern Snake Range, is 13,063 feet high and towers nearly a thousand feet above the nearby second highest peak. These peaks and others nearby are pyramidal in form, or were before glaciers carved cirques, or amphitheaters, in their flanks. This aggregation of mountains, some with spectacular vertical walls and alpine lakes, presents a most inviting scene which is somewhat unbelievable in its arid setting. With the exception of those associated with the salt-encrusted sinks, all natural phenomena associated with life in the Great Basin are exemplified within this proposed park area. Herein exist an amazing variety of plantlife, ranging from those identified with lowland deserts to types of vegetation representative of the Canadian and Arctic regions.

Within the proposed boundaries of the Great Basin National Park is Lehman Caves National Monument. This unit of the park system would be abolished as such and would become a part of the park.

With all deference to my friends from other States, in which great caverns are located, such as in the State of Kentucky and the State of New Mexico, I must state that the cave, the subject of the pending bill, is actually one of the most beautiful in the world. When properly developed, I am sure it will compare favorably with the celebrated Carlsbad Cavern in the State of New Mexico.

Fortunately, this splendid area is easily accessible to the public. U.S. Highway 6-50, the scenic transcontinental highway across Nevada, crosses the Snake Range just north of the proposed area. One of the main north-south traffic arteries in Nevada, U.S. Highway 93, skirts the west side of the Snake Range. Ely, Nev., some 70 miles to the west, is served daily by United Airlines.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands, I have become particularly conscious of the costs of land acquisition in connection with the development and improving of our national parks. One aspect of this Great Basin proposal that is most gratifying to me is the relatively modest land acquisition cost. While some 123,000 acres will eventually comprise this park, only 2,100 acres of non-Federal land are involved. Estimated costs for land acquisition approximate $150,000, or $30,000 annually during the 5-year acquisition program. The balance of the land to be incorporated in the park is presently in Federal ownership. The greater part of this acreage is now in the Humboldt National Forest and is administered by the U.S. Forest Service. The balance of the land, some 5,000 acres, is public domain land administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

S. 1760 affords protection to all individuals having valid existing rights within the proposed exterior boundaries as of the date of enactment of the proposed legislation.

Section 5 of the bill makes that very clear in this language:

> Sec. 5. Nothing contained herein shall affect any valid existing claim, location, or entry under the land laws of the United States or the right of any such claimant, locator, or entryman to the full use and enjoyment of his lands.

Mr. President, I may say that located within the proposed national park are a number of patented mining claims and claims which are held on open location. These claims would be completely protected under the provisions of this particular section of the law.

I would likewise comment that new activity, if there should be new mining activity in this particular area, would be permitted, subject to the provisions of section 6 of the bill in accordance with general regulations designed to protect scenic, scientific, and recreation values in the area.

The grazing of livestock in this proposed park would be eliminated eventually, but the bill affords interim recognition and protection to those permittees having grazing privileges at the present time on U.S. forest and public domain land within the suggested boundaries.

Mr. President, public hearings on this legislation have been held both in Nevada and in Washington, D.C. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The recommendations of the Department of the Interior have been incorporated in the bill by way of amendments which were adopted en bloc just a few minutes ago.

The Department's cost data statement and facts concerning our park programs, including the effect they may have on our overall budgetary requirements, are contained in the committee report, beginning on page 11.

The overall cost will be approximately $5.2 million including, first, the cost of the land, which will be some $150,000. Two witnesses from the Department have indicated that the cost of the eventual development and full use of the proposed national park would be in the neighborhood of $3.8 million over a period of 5 years. In addition, the operational costs are estimated at approximately $230,000 to $240,000 a year.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. What is the Senator's understanding as to the continuation of hunting and fishing on the land after it has been incorporated into the park system?

Mr. BIBLE. Fishing would be permitted. I may say, though, that there is very little fishing. This is really desert area. There would be very little fishing; however, fishing will be permitted in the same manner as it is at the present time. There are a few streams. There are some upland lakes which are attractive in the spring of the year. There would be no change in the fishing.

Hunting would be prohibited. There has been an annual harvest, if my memory serves me right, of some 105 to 110 deer. Such hunting would be prohibited immediately.

Mr. AIKEN. Then there has been a comparatively small take of deer on the land?

Mr. BIBLE. In relation to the total number of deer which are taken in places that are open throughout the State of Nevada, 110 is really a small number. There has been some dispute, I should say in complete honesty and frankness, about the number of deer taken from this particular area. However, as best we have been able to check it, based on the average annual take, the number would be approximately 110 deer a year, because there is no boundary within which it can be said that deer are taken. The best testimony is that an average of 110 deer a year have been taken from this area over the past 5 years.

Mr. AIKEN. Fishing would be permitted under the laws of the State of Nevada?

Mr. BIBLE. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Is there any forest on the land?

Mr. BIBLE. There is a reasonable amount of forest. The testimony showed that there had been some use of it. There were a couple of little sawmills, one located over the border in the State of Utah. The amount of timber removed from this particular area has been almost negligible.

Mr. AIKEN. Was there opposition from sawmill operators?

Mr. BIBLE. Actually, the sawmill operators as such consist of, I think, either two or three farmers, who occasionally go in and saw some timber for their own use, either for fenceposts or for burning or other operations. But there were no going, operating sawmills there, and there are none there now.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator. I asked the question in connection with other proposals of the Park Service which would seem to be, perhaps, more applicable to eastern conditions.

Mr. BIBLE. This area is located in the Great Basin. It would be a rather unusual type of national park. It would be truly a desert national park.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield to the Senator from Idaho, the very able and influential ranking member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the Senator. The Senator from Nevada has referred to the special consideration, if not the concessions, which have provided in the bill for continuing grazing and mining operations within the area of the proposed national park. Does not the Senator feel that these concessions may in some way establish a precedent which may plague us in the future, as the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs considers the creation of other national parks?

Mr. BIBLE. I certainly hope that it is not true. Mining has already been permitted in some of the national parks—for example, within Mount McKinley National Park, I believe, and also in Glacier Bay National Monument, and also in the Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument and in the Death Valley National Monument. I recognize that mining is not permitted in many of the national parks—for instance, it is not permitted in Yellowstone Park or Grand Canyon National Park or Yosemite National Park, to name a few. But mining has already been permitted in some of the national parks, and I believe that is not a disservice to the national park concept. Neither do I think this part of the bill would establish a precedent. For example, in connection with the Cape Cod National Seashore, which was established during the last session, the homeowners are permitted to live in the park area and to continue to do so and to hold their land in fee simple for an indefinite period of time. That area is a national seashore, but it is very much in the nature of a national park.

Likewise, at Point Reyes National Seashore, in California, which was passed by the Senate at the last session—dairy farming will be permitted in the central area. Similarly, in the proposed Padre Island National Seashore—the measure creating it is still in committee—oil and gas producing operations will be permitted to be carried on.

So I say frankly that I do not believe this provision will come to plague us. I believe there are some such areas in which mining will do no harm; and if the Senator will visit these areas I believe he will observe that many of them will not be harmed by permitting mining.

Mr. DWORSHAK. It seems to me that we are gradually establishing a new concept of national parks which is rapidly closing the gap between national forest areas and national parks. Can the Senator from Nevada tell us how many acres of the former Federal forest areas in his State will be included in the proposed new park area?

Mr. BIBLE. Yes, I shall be happy to state that figure. Of this 123,000 acres, substantially the largest amount is at the present time composed of national forest land. I believe it amounts to 116,000 acres, out of the total of 123,000 acres. At any rate, it is the greater part of the national park area.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Can the Senator from Nevada tell us why the establishment of this park would be to the benefit of the people of his State, as compared with the uses which in the past have been made of the area when it was national forest land?

Mr. BIBLE. Yes. I believe the status of a national park will increase the national significance of the area, and I believe it will thus become more attractive to those who travel in the West. We in Nevada conceive of this park as being part of a group of great western scenic attractions located in Utah and Nevada. For example, it will tie in very well with Zion National Park, Bryce Canyon National Park, Lake Mead Recreational Area, and Grand Canyon National Park, which is located in northern Arizona. I am convinced that the establishment of a national park in this area will give it far greater attractiveness and will make it of far more national significance than if the land continued to be operated by the Forest Service.

I may say that until the present time, until an attempt was made to create a national park in the area, the whole area rather fell into disuse. But when the Forest Service found that a national park may be created there, the Forest Service showed intense interest in improving the area itself. But I am convinced that it would be better to establish a national park there.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Let me say to the Senator that although I am not in the confidence of the officials of the executive branch of the Government, I believe that the Forest Service officials did register vigorous opposition to elimination of the national forest area and the inclusion of this land in a national park. Is that correct?

Mr. BIBLE. I do not know that I would characterize it as "vigorous opposition"; but they maintained that the area could be operated equally well under their jurisdiction—in other words, under the Forest Service. That statement is made in the Department of Agriculture's report which last year was made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 16, pages 21343–21344. I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the RECORD be printed at this point, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 26, 1961]

ESTABLISHMENT OF GREAT BASIN NATIONAL PARK, NEV.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on September 12 the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] filed Report No. 983 relative to S. 1760, a bill to establish the Great Basin National Park in Nevada, from the Committee on

Interior and Insular Affairs. The committee's report did not contain the report received by the committee from the Department of Agriculture on the bill. On behalf of the Senator from Nevada, I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the report on S. 1760 received from the Department of Agriculture, dated June 20, 1961, be printed as a part thereof.

The Presiding Officer. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report is as follows:

Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C., June 20, 1961.

Hon. Clinton P. Anderson,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator Anderson: This is in response to your letter of May 5, 1961, for a report on S. 1760, a bill "to establish the Great Basin National Park in Nevada, and for other purposes."

Approximately 94 percent of the lands making up the national park that this bill would create are national forest lands and have been under the jurisdiction and management of this Department for more than 50 years.

We believe that the public interest has been, and would continue to be, adequately served by retention of the lands in national forest status and continued management under principles adopted by the Congress for the national forests in the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of June 12, 1960. We further believe that the bill could have undesirable results from the standpoint of both the national parks and the national forests. However, if the Congress concludes that the creation of a national park from these national forest lands is desirable, the Department of Agriculture will not raise objection if the bill is amended as hereinafter recommended.

S. 1760 would (1) establish a specifically described area of land in eastern Nevada as the Great Basin National Park, (2) transfer federally owned lands within the described area to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for preservation and administration as a part of such park, (3) authorize the Secretary of the Interior to procure by purchase or donation, or with donated funds, lands or interests in lands within the park, (4) authorize the exchange of federally owned lands within the park area for non-Federal lands or interests in lands of approximately equal value within that area, (5) abolish the Lehman Caves National Monument, which is within the described area, and make it a part of the Great Basin National Park, and (6) prescribe that the park be administered pursuant to the act of August 25, 1916, entitled "An act to establish the National Park Service and for other purposes," as amended.

The bill would also provide that the establishment and administration of the national park would be subject to the following provisions: (1) Valid existing claims, locations, or entries under the land laws of the United States would not be affected by establishment of the national park; (2) all mineral deposits of the classes and kinds now subject to location, entry, and patent under the mining laws of the United States, exclusive of the land containing them, and minerals subject to leasing under the mineral leasing laws of the United States would be subject to exploration and disposal with right of occupation and use of so much of the surface of the land as might be required for all purposes reasonably incident to the mining or removal of the minerals; and (3) where Federal lands included within the national park were legally occupied or utilized at the time of enactment for grazing purposes, the person, his heirs, successors, or assigns, would be entitled to renewal of such grazing privileges for a period of 25 years or during the lifetime of the person or those of his heirs, successors, or assigns who were members of his immediate family on the date of approval of the act. With respect to the latter the bill specifically provides that nothing therein "shall be construed as creating any vested rights, title, interest, or estate in or to any Federal lands."

The 117,100 acres of national forest land which make up almost all of this proposed national park are a part of the Snake division of the Humboldt National Forest, created by Executive Order No. 908 on July 1, 1908. As a part of the national forest system these lands and their resources have been, and are being, protected, husbanded and made available for utilization under the multiple-use principles applicable to national forest lands.

The recreational resources are getting increased use each year. To accommodate the 51,000 recreation visits in 1960, picnic, camping, and trailer parking facilities have been provided. Additional facilities are planned to meet future needs as these develop. The timber resources, though not large, would sustain an annual sustained cut of 1 to 1½ million board feet. Some 1,200 Christmas trees are sold annually, and an estimated 6,000 pounds of piñon nuts are harvested in good years. The area provides key summer range for 2,811 sheep and 857 cattle under national forest grazing permits. The mineral resources have been prospected and are being developed under the general mining laws. The area's estimated game herd of 3,000 mule deer has been actively hunted each year by some 500 hunters. The water resource is characteristic of high mountain ranges that rise out of desert surroundings. It provides domestic water and water supply for some 10,000 acres of nearby farms and ranch lands.

This Department believes that the land and resources of this area and the demands for resources and services meet the criteria for national forest land; that our administration of this area has been in accord with the policies and directives of Congress; and that such administration has been a direct benefit to the surrounding economy and people.

Normally, national parks serve two primary purposes—preservation and recreation. They are not normally open to mineral exploration and development, to livestock grazing, nor to hunting under State laws; likewise, the timber in national parks is not available for commercial utilization.

Under S. 1760, however, special provisions are included which would permit continuation of prospecting and mining and livestock grazing. The minor amount of fishing in the area would also continue as in other parks. These special provisions of the bill would dictate the same type of use for the proposed national park that the area now receives as a national forest with the exception that the small amount of logging now underway would be precluded and hunting would no longer be permitted under State laws. Some form of hunting could, we understand, be carried on under regulations of the Secretary of the Interior. Arrangements to allow this have been under consideration.

Enactment of this bill to establish a national park with these specially permitted uses would make the park similar in its objectives to the national forests and would partially destroy what has been the traditional and well-understood distinction in both purpose and management between the national parks and the national forests. This, we believe, to be undesirable.

The uses that would be permitted in the proposed park and their similarity to the national forest uses that are now underway indicate that no special purpose would be served by converting this area from national forest to national park status. It is possible that advocates of a national park seek primarily to attach the national park name to this area with the hope of capitalizing commercially on that name by developing sufficient additional tourism.

We believe the national forest can make fully as great a contribution in developing recreation resources. We recognize the upsurge in demand for outdoor recreation opportunities. Over the past several years we have intensified the development of recreational areas within the national forests; we have increased our informational program to bring to the public attention the availability of these facilities; we are giving increasing emphasis to the public information services provided in such areas. The increased use of and interest in national forest recreation areas is clearly demonstrating both the awareness of the public of these areas and the value of them to local communities in attracting tourists.

If the bill were enacted with the boundaries essentially as now proposed, it would leave in national forest status about 55,000 acres located primarily at the south end of the park. This acreage would be isolated from other parts of the Humboldt National Forest. We believe it would be desirable that this residual area be added to the park or even more preferably be returned to public domain. The Department of Agriculture believes that it would be undesirable to continue this acreage in national forest status and recommends that the bill be so amended.

The apparent intent in establishing the boundary at the north end of the park was to follow the national forest boundary. There is, however, one place in section 18, T. 14 N., R. 69 E., where the boundaries do not coincide. We recommend that the bill be amended to correct this discrepancy.

The above recommendations can be accomplished as follows:

Page 3, line 23, change "three-quarters" to "one-half".

Page 3, line 25, strike the words "the south half of".

Page 4, line 2, strike the words "south one-sixteenth latitudinal" and insert the words "east-west quarter".

Page 4, line 3, strike the entire line and insert in lieu thereof "east quarter corner".

Page 4, line 4, change "one-quarter" to "one-half".

Page 9, following line 2, add a new section 8 as follows:

"Sec. 8. There are hereby eliminated from the Humboldt National Forest all those lands comprising the Snake Division, being situated in townships 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 north, range 68 east; townships 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 north, range 69 east; and townships 10, 11, 12, and 13 north, range 70 east, Mount Diablo Meridian."

Page 9, line 3, renumber present section 8 as section 9.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

Orville L. Freeman.

Mr. BIBLE. In the report it is stated that they believe that the public interest has been and will continue to be adequately served by retention of the lands under the control of the Forest Service; and they analyze the national park bill, and conclude by saying that if the bill were to be enacted, they would not have objection, provided certain specific amendments were adopted. Those amendments were adopted. They take out of the jurisdiction of the Forest Service a parcel of land lying to the south of the park, and put it under the administration of the Bureau of Land Management, as public domain.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to address several questions to the able Senator from Nevada.

First, I wish to read from lines 12 to 16 of section 2 of the bill, beginning on page 6:

> SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior within the boundaries of the Great Basin National Park, as described above, is authorized to procure by purchase, by donation, with donated funds, or by such means as he may deem to be in the public interest, lands and interests in lands.

Does that mean that if the Secretary of the Interior deemed it to be in the public interest, he could exercise the right of eminent domain?

Mr. BIBLE. I think the answer is definitely yes. For example, if he were to find that the operation of a patented mining claim might interfere with the best use of the national park, he could, by means of condemnation, acquire for the park such interests.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. How does that square with the provisions of sections 5 and 6 of the bill, particularly the provisions of section 5, which reads as follows:

> SEC. 5. Nothing contained herein shall affect any valid existing claim, location, or entry under the land laws of the United States or the right of any such claimant, locator, or entryman to the full use and enjoyment of his lands.

If the Secretary is to have the power of condemnation, would not he be able to condemn such entries?

Mr. BIBLE. I believe he would be able to do so as a matter of law, in accordance with this particular provision of the act. The section to which the Senator from South Dakota alludes—section 5—represents the committee's attempt to make it abundantly clear that anyone who has an existing valid claim will be protected. We intend that these titles will be respected by the U.S. Government; they do not fall or end by reason of the enactment of a bill creating a national park.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But what good does it do to have the bill set forth that such a person has a valid claim, if in another paragraph of the bill it is provided that the Secretary may procure it by such means as he deems to be within the public interest? For example, he could condemn it.

Mr. BIBLE. The only means which could be used would be condemnation, under due process of law, and on paying the value determined by the court or by a jury, as the case might be. The power to condemn property is authorized to give full effect to the land acquisition program. Such authority as is created in section 2 could well be brought to bear on the interests otherwise protected by section 5 but only, in my judgment, if the utilization of the protected right became grossly inconsistent with the basic or essential purposes for which the park is being established.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, if this matter is acceptable to the people of Nevada and to the Senator from Nevada, I would not dispute it.

However, if this were to be a precedent or were to be applicable to other States, I personally would have some reservations. I would not want a park to be created in a State when, in one part of the act it stated, "We will recognize the claim," and in another paragraph it stated, "The Secretary can practice the right of condemnation." I would give the Secretary the right to purchase or exchange, but I would personally not want the Secretary to have the right of condemnation for this particular purpose.

I note that in section 6 of the bill mineral deposits are dealt with, and the language proposes—

> Minerals subject to leasing under the mineral leasing laws of the United States shall be subject to exploration and disposal under such laws, with right of occupation.

And so forth. Would the Senator care to state whether that language would limit the development of claims to prospecting and removal of the minerals, and yet not permit the milling of the minerals?

Mr. BIBLE. I would be of the opinion that this provision was primarily for prospecting or developing and for actual mining. I would not think the provision carried with it the right to have a mill site or any other elaborate practice that was not directly associated with the actual mining.

I may say that the problems which the Senator from South Dakota raises, and those which the Senator from Idaho commented upon, are good suggestions. They are problems which concerned the committee a great deal.

I think one has to know this particular area and the geology of it to understand whether or not this provision is going to cause any problem in the future. Let me illustrate. For many years explorations have taken place on the western slopes of this particular park. First explorations for uranium took place. Now it is thought that beryllium may be discovered. To make it abundantly clear that there would be no conflict as to the prospecting and mining for beryllium, we excluded the particular section of the park that gave some prospect for development of the beryllium. It was carefully worked out and negotiated.

I would think that if the bill were enacted into law today, hereafter if a prospector were to go into that area and stick a pick into the ground and by chance find some type of mineral wealth, his activity would be limited to prospecting and mining. I think he could put a mill there only if the Secretary of the Interior said it would not disrupt the overall, paramount use of the area as a national park.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator's reference to beryllium is of interest. Ninety-five percent of beryllium produced in this country is produced within 15 miles of my hometown. We are thought to be the beryllium capital of the country. However, in view of the growing uses for beryllium, we would certainly have no objection to exploring for beryllium in other parts of the country.

I raise the question, however, because, in connection with a reserve made some years ago in the Black Hills of South Dakota, within a national forest area, specifically within the so-called Norbeck Wildlife Reserve, we attempted to work out regulations and legislation which would make it possible for the prospecting and the mining of minerals, but not permit milling, on the ground that the use of the streams for milling in the particular recreation area would defeat the purposes of creating the park.

As the Senator from Nevada has pointed out, one needs to know the geology and conditions of a particular area to know how various developments would affect them. It may be that milling would not be objectionable to the purpose of the Great Basin National Park. I have thought it was desirable, where we could, however, to preserve for future generations, and for the present generation, the opportunity to remove minerals, particularly those of strategic or critical importance to the country, and that it should be possible to look for them and remove them if it could be done without necessitating the development of mills or processes which would clutter up or perhaps defeat the purpose of the park. That was the reason why I raised the question.

Mr. BIBLE. I think it is a timely question, and I think the colloquy and discussion are very helpful. In my considered judgment, if some strategic or critical mineral were to be discovered sometime in the future, prospecting and mining would be permitted. I doubt whether the Secretary of the Interior would or could or should permit the location of a mill within the confines of the park. I do not think the mining would be stopped.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I read the language as meaning only mining and removal. I rather hoped the limitations of the regulations would be consistent with the needs to conserve the purpose of a national park.

Mr. BIBLE. I think they would be. There is very little water feeding down into the streams, and it is rather seasonal, because this area is in the heart of the Great Basin area, where the climate is extremely dry and rainfall exceedingly scarce. I doubt if a mill could be located within the confines of the park at that altitude. It would not be a good millsite.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. One other question has to do with the committee amendments in section 7. I note, at the bottom of page 9, that a 25-year continuation of grazing rights is provided. This language is contained in section 7:

> Subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, if (1) the holder is the person who held such privilege on the date of approval of this Act, or (2) the holder is the heir, successor, or assign of such person and was a member of that person's

immediate family, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior of the date of the approval of this Act.

For the purpose of clarity in the RECORD, it is intended that the only extension of the grazing privilege shall be to one who was a member of the person's immediate family who was the original holder of the grazing privilege?

Mr. BIBLE. I think that is correct, with this qualification: that provision goes only to the protection beyond 25 years. The immediate family would be protected for lifetime.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. During the period beyond the 25-year period, the protection is only for a member of the immediate family, and heir, successor, or assign. Is that correct?

Mr. BIBLE. That is correct. This language is adopted word for word from the language written into the Grand Teton National Park Act, and has had some basis of experience. It has worked out reasonably well.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator realizes that when we deal with legislation of this sort affecting any of the Western States, certain precedents or principles are written into the act and they become advisory or precedents in other States.

While I would have some reservations to the bill if applicable to my State, if the bill is acceptable to the Senator from Nevada and the people of Nevada, I shall interpose no objection. I wanted the RECORD clear as to the intent and purpose.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. I think the discussion has been very helpful. I appreciate his views. I think they have cleared the RECORD in this respect.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. It seems important, if the recreational needs of the people are to be met, that there be an expansion of our system of national parks and other publicly held recreational grounds. Though it may be easy to establish a national park out of lands in the national domain, yet some expansion is needed in other areas where entirely different conditions prevail. In establishing principles and rules for the use of national parks which may be chosen in the future, is it not highly important, and probably necessary, to establish those rules and principles in accordance with conditions which prevail where it is proposed to establish a new park?

Is it not almost impossible to lay down blanket rules which would be applicable all over the country, without committing grave injustices and possibly putting large numbers of people out of their regular employment?

Mr. BIBLE. I could not agree with the Senator from Vermont more. I think the examples of two of the bills which we passed last year are illustrative of the point the Senator is making.

Many years ago people would have said we could not permit dairy cows and national parks to go together, but this is exactly what may happen in the State of the distinguished senior Senator from California, north of San Francisco, in the Point Reyes area.

Many people would have said we could not create a seashore or a national park in an area as populous as the area of Cape Cod, which lies to the east of Boston, but nevertheless this has been done.

The Padre Island bill may become law. It is before the committee for consideration. It would permit oil wells to be developed out in the gulf or on the island and to exist side by side with a very attractive long spit of the island which runs more than 80 miles along the gulf, from Corpus Christi to Brownsville.

All of these are a recognition of the different criteria which are found on the eastern seaboard and on the Pacific coast, as well as on the gulf.

I could not agree more. There may be different problems, if there is a national park in Vermont, and the criteria certainly would not be the same as those to be applied to the desert area of the Great Basin National Park.

Mr. AIKEN. That is why I am so interested. The Secretary of the Interior is suggesting a national park in a sparsely populated area in Vermont.

I understand that in the establishment of the Cape Cod National Park the small villages within the area are to be permitted to continue their existence.

Mr. BIBLE. That is exactly correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Instead of losing their means of living, the people in those villages will probably find it enhanced.

I believe also, in the setting up of the Cape Cod National Seashore, the fishing and the hunting will be continued. I think I am correct in that statement.

Mr. BIBLE. I am not sure with respect to hunting, I say in complete honesty. Fishing and shell fishing are permitted. The Senator could well be correct as to the hunting. I am not completely advised on that point. I shall be glad to discus it with the Senator after I check the record. I do not wish to make any mistake. I do not recall offhand, whether we permitted hunting. We did permit fishing, and we did permit shell fishing. I do not know about the hunting.

There are five towns involved in the Cape Cod area. They will continue to exist and to operate. They will have their governing councils and town form of government, the same as now.

Mr. AIKEN. And the towns and communities, I believe, are each authorized to appoint members of an advisory committee for the operation of the park.

Mr. BIBLE. That is exactly correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know whether it is important to know whether hunting is permitted in the park or not. The fact remains that if Congress decided hunting should be permitted it could be permitted.

Mr. BIBLE. My best recollection is that we left the issue to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. AIKEN. When we consider the establishment of recreational areas, wilderness areas, or national parks in the East, we have to consider entirely different conditions from those existing in the West. That is why I say, in the expansion of the park system, it will be virtually impossible to lay down rules to apply to all the areas which are in the national park system.

Mr. BIBLE. I agree with the Senator from Vermont. I thank the Senator very much for his participation and the contributions he has made to the discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, before any final action is taken with respect to the bill, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD the statement of my junior colleague. I had hoped my colleague would be able to be present and to participate in the discussion. He has been detained at a committee meeting. I ask unanimous consent that the statement prepared by my junior colleague, Senator CANNON, who is a cosponsor of the bill,' may be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOWARD W. CANNON

It was my privilege to cosponsor, along with my colleague, Senator BIBLE, the bill now before the Senate. S. 1760 would establish a national park in the Great Basin region in Nevada.

Many people think of Nevada as a land of large open spaces, which it indeed is. But it is much more than that. Within the State are many tree-covered mountain ranges and fresh water lakes. This bill would designate one such area as a national park. The site, lying within the Great Basin region, is the culminating point of the Giant Snake range. It is a unique region of startling contrasts. It encompasses desert valleys and mountain peaks rising more than 13,000 feet toward the sky; the plant and animal life are characteristic of five of the seven life zones of the world; the Lehman caves, already designated as a national monument, include what Secretary Udall has described as "some of the most delicately beautiful cave formations thus far discovered anywhere."

Fourteen peaks within the park area have elevations of over 10,000 feet, and six of these stand a mile or more above the surrounding plains. The most monumental of these heights is Wheeler Peak, which is snow capped during most of the year. The sheer beauty of these peaks is enhanced by vertical cliffs 1,000 feet high and majestic amphitheaters carved into the mountainside by prehistoric glaciers. The area boasts an icefield which has many characteristics of a glacial formation, and a unique body of moving rock which geologists have defined as a rock glacier.

On the summits of these mountains can also be found mountain mahogany, manzanita, sagebrush, and bristlecone pine which have been estimated to be over 4,000 years old. Perhaps most striking in beauty are the three alpine lakes which nestle within these rugged surroundings.

I have described some of the features from which visitors to the park would benefit. Equally important from an economic view is the benefit which would accrue to the community of Ely upon the establishment of this park. Ely is largely a one-industry community, and the diversification which would be afforded by the park would help to boost a stilted economy. The community has repeatedly suffered from the curtailment in mining activity. The park would create new opportunity and new employment. Most important, it would preserve an area which cannot be duplicated on this continent.

In an effort to satisfy those who claim that a park would adversely affect grazing, hunting, and mining, there has been modification and refinement of the bill we are presently considering. The National Park Service has made a genuine effort to make those adjustments which would minimize the adversity and yet not impair the administration or the attractiveness of the park. The boundaries have been redefined to exclude the best grazing areas, and provision has been made for the continued use of range under permits now held. The bill also contains provision, of course, for the eventual termination of those privileges.

A rather unique, though not unprecedented, provision has been made for the continuation of mining and mineral leasing activities. These activities would be allowed, but there could be no acquisition by locators or entrymen of title to the land.

During field hearings on this legislation in December 1959, I assured my constituents that the degree of adversity which might result from park designation would be minimized. I am convinced that this has been done to the full extent consistent with sound park management practices.

A great amount of work has gone into this bill. The National Park Service has been most cooperative; the Great Basin Park Association, formed to foster the establishment of the Great Basin National Park, has worked tirelessly to generate support; and the committee has reported a good bill. It is my view that we need to take steps to protect areas within our national borders possessing attractive and utilitarian features. If we fail to do so, they will gradually be overrun and reformed until they no longer exist for the benefit and pleasure of future generations.

Dr. Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service, has graphically illustrated this danger. He said, "The inexorable march of progress brings many and varied benefits for which all can be deeply thankful. But inevitably the march imperils other values, old and often deeply loved. This surging tide of modern progress has rolled over vast areas of our pristine * * * country, wiping out, one after another, the natural open spaces so long serene and undisturbed. Houses, business, resorts of all kinds continue ever more rapidly to invade, disturb, and destroy the very beauties we seek most to enjoy."

I hope that Senators will take this opportunity to add to the national park system the legend of the Great Basin. If they do, future generations will laud their foresight and thoughtfulness.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1760) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve for the benefit and inspiration of the people a representative segment of the great basin possessing outstanding ecological resources and significant geological and scenic values, there is hereby established the Great Basin National Park in the State of Nevada which, subject to valid existing rights, shall consist of lands and interest in lands within the following described boundary:

Commencing at the quarter section corner of sections 17 and 20, township 11 north, range 70 east, Mount Diablo meridian, Nevada; thence west 1½ miles along the south boundaries of sections 17 and 18 to the westerly common corner of sections 18 and 19; thence due west 8 miles over unsurveyed land to a point; thence due north over unsurveyed land to a point which is due east of the easterly common corner of sections 5 and 8, township 11 north, range 68 east;

Thence westerly over unsurveyed land to said easterly common corner of sections 5 and 8; thence north along the east boundary of section 5 to the northeast corner of said section; thence due north approximately one mile over unsurveyed land to a point which is due east of the easterly common corner of sections 25 and 36, township 12 north, range 67 east, thence due east one mile over unsurveyed land to a point; thence due north approximately 7 miles over unsurveyed land to a point which is due east of the northeast corner of section 25, township 13 north, range 67 east; thence due west 2½ miles to a point; thence due north approximately 3 miles over unsurveyed land to the quarter section corner of the south boundary of section 6, township 13 north, range 68 east; thence 2 miles north through the center of section 6, township 13 north, range 68 east, and section 31, township 14 north, range 68 east, to the quarter section corner common to sections 30 and 31;

Thence east 1½ miles along the south boundaries of sections 30 and 29 to the common corner of sections 28, 29, 32, and 33; thence north 2 miles along the east boundaries of sections 29 and 20 to the common corner of sections 16, 17, 20, and 21; thence east 1 mile along the south boundary of section 16 to the common corner of sections 15, 16, 21, and 22; thence north 1 mile along the east boundary of section 16 to the common corner of sections 9, 10, 15, and 16; thence east 3 miles along the south boundaries of sections 10, 11, and 12 to the easterly common corner of sections 12 and 13 on the east boundary of township 14 north, range 68 east;

Thence north approximately three-quarters of a mile along the west boundary of township 14 north, range 69 east, to the westerly common corner of sections 7 and 18, said township and range; thence east approximately one-half mile along the north boundary of said section 18 to the north quarter corner of said section 18, thence south approximately one-half mile along the north south quarter line of said section 18 to the northwest corner of the southeast quarter of said section 18;

Thence east approximately one-half mile along the east-west quarter line of said section 18 to the east quarter corner of said section 18; thence south approximately one-half mile along the east boundary of said section 18 to the southerly common corner of said section 18 and section 17; thence east approximately one-half mile along the north boundary of section 20 to the north quarter corner of said section 20;

Thence south approximately one mile along the north-side quarter line of said section 20 to the north quarter corner of section 29; thence east approximately one-half mile to the northeast corner of said section 29; thence north approximately 4.89 chains along the west boundary of section 28 to the northwest corner of said section 28; thence east approximately one mile along the north boundary of said section 28 to the northeast corner of said section 28;

Thence south along the east boundaries of sections 28 and 33, township 14 north, range 68 east, and of what probably will be when surveyed section 4, township 13 north, range 69 east, to the east quarter corner of said section 4; thence east approximately two miles along the east-west quarter lines of sections 3 and 2 to the east quarter corner of said section 2; thence south approximately one-half mile along the east boundary of section 2 to the common corner of sections 1, 2, 11, and 12;

Thence east approximately two miles along the north boundaries of said section 12, township 13 north, range 69 east, and section 7, township 13 north, range 70 east, to the common corner of sections 5, 6, 7, and 8; thence south 5 miles along the west boundaries of sections 8, 17, 20, 29, and 32, to the southerly common corner of sections 31 and 32, township 13 north, range 70 east; thence east 1 mile along the south boundary of section 32 to the northerly common corner of sections 4 and 5, township 12 north, range 70 east;

Thence south 1 mile along the west boundary of section 4, to the common corner of sections 4, 5, 8, and 9; thence east 1 mile along the south boundary of section 4, to the common corner of sections 3, 4, 9, and 10; thence south 5 miles along the west boundaries of sections 10, 15, 22, 27, and 34, to the common corner of sections 3 and 4, township 11 north, range 70 east, and sections 33 and 34, township 12 north, range 70 east; thence west 1 mile along the north boundary of section 4, to the common corner of sections 4 and 5, township 11 north, range 70 east, and sections 32 and 33, township 12 north, range 70 east;

Thence south 1 mile along the west boundary of section 4, township 11 north, range 70 east, to the common corner of sections 4, 5, 8, and 9; thence west one-half mile along the north boundary of section 8, to the quarter section corner common to sections 5 and 8; thence south 2 miles through the center of sections 8 and 17 to the quarter section corner common to sections 17 and 20, township 11 north, range 70 east, the point of beginning, containing about 123,360 acres.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior within the boundaries of the Great Basin National Park, as described above, is authorized to procure by purchase, by donation, with donated funds, or by such means as he may deem to be in the public interest, lands and interests in lands. The Secretary is authorized further to convey federally owned lands and interests in lands within the park in exchange for non-Federal lands and interests in lands of approximately equal value within the park if, in his judgment, such exchange is in the public interest. Federal lands lying within the boundaries of the Great Basin National Park, as established pursuant to this Act, are hereby transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for preservation and administration as a part of such park.

Sec. 3. The Lehman Caves National Monument, established on January 24, 1922, by proclamation of the President pursuant to authority contained in the Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225), is hereby abolished. Lands and interests in lands heretofore comprising such monument shall, from the date of approval of this Act, be a part of the Great Basin National Park.

Sec. 4. The Great Basin National Park shall be administered pursuant to the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", as amended.

Sec. 5. Nothing contained herein shall affect any valid existing claim, location, or entry under the land laws of the United States or the right of any such claimant, locator, or entryman to the full use and enjoyment of his lands.

Sec. 6. Within the Great Basin National Park, all mineral deposits of the classes and kinds now subject to location, entry, and patent under the mining laws of the United States, exclusive of the land containing them, and minerals subject to leasing under the mineral leasing laws of the United States shall be subject to exploration and disposal under such laws, with right of occupation and use of so much of the surface of the land as may be required for all purposes reasonably incident to the mining or removal of the minerals: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe such general regulations for the control of these activities as he deems necessary to preserve the scenic, scientific, and recreation values of the area. The provisions of the Act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), as amended, shall have no application within the Great Basin National Park.

SEC. 7. Where any Federal lands included within the Great Basin National Park are legally occupied or utilized on the date of approval of this Act for grazing purposes, pursuant to a lease, permit, or license issued or authorized by any department, establishment, or agency of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior shall permit the persons holding such grazing privileges on the date of approval of this Act, their heirs, successors, or assigns, to renew the privileges from time to time subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe: *Provided, however,* That no such privilege shall be extended beyond the period ending twenty-five years from the date of approval of this Act except as specifically provided for in this section. The Secretary shall permit a holder of the grazing privilege to renew such privilege from time to time during the holder's lifetime beyond the twenty-five-year period, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, if (1) the holder is the person who held such privilege on the date of approval of this Act, or (2) the holder is the heir, successor, or assign of such person and was a member of that person's immediate family, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, on the date of approval of this Act. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as creating any vested right, title, interest, or estate in or to any of the Federal lands. The Secretary, by regulation, may limit the privileges enjoyed under this Act to the extent that they are appurtenant to the private lands owned by the persons who held such privileges on the date of approval of this Act, and may adjust such privileges to preserve the park land and resources from destruction or unnecessary injury. Grazing privileges appurtenant to privately owned lands located within the Great Basin National Park established by this Act shall not be withdrawn until title to lands to which such privileges are appurtenant shall have vested in the United States, except for failure to comply with the regulations applicable thereto and after reasonable notice of any default.

SEC. 8. There are hereby eliminated from the Humboldt National Forest all those lands comprising the Snake Division of the forest which lie in:

NEVEDA

Mount Diablo Meridian

Townships 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 north, range 68 east;

Townships 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 north, range 69 east; and

Townships 10, 11, 12, and 13 north, range 70 east.

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CLAIM OF GEORGE EDWARD BARNHART

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1065, H.R. 6025.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6025) to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of George Edward Barnhart against the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 6025) to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of George Edward Barnhart against the United States, which has been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 1, at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "May 8, 1951" and to insert "December 31, 1946".

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the report of the Committee on the Judiciary succinctly states the purpose of the bill, as follows:

> The purpose of the proposed legislation, as amended, is to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of George Edward Barnhart, of Altadena, Calif., against the United States for the unauthorized manufacture, use, or sale by or for the United States since December 31, 1946, of inventions covered by several enumerated patents of and owned by said George Edward Barnhart. Defenses of the United States based on laches, lapse of time, or any statute of limitations are waived and nothing herein shall be construed as an admission of liability on the part of the United States.

Briefly, the facts are these: George Barnhart, for the duration of the war, gave to the Government, gratuitously, an irrevocable, nonexclusive, royalty-free license to permit the Government use of certain patented inventions pertaining to inventions concerning airplane wing construction, airfoil construction, and control, and airplane construction, and also involving such areas as flaps and hydraulic control systems. This was a gallant, patriotic thing for this citizen to do.

Subsequent to the declaration, on December 31, 1946, of the cessation of hostilities of World War II, Mr. Barnhart sought a return of the patents. A dispute arose as to what was covered during what period of time.

Mr. Barnhart seeks redress on his allegation that after the war was concluded the Government continued to use the benefit of his own patented discoveries, which he had given to the Government during the war, all of which facts are set forth in the report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an excerpt from the report printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> On July 31, 1942, Mr. George Edward Barnhart gratuitously granted to the United States an irrevocable, nonexclusive, royalty-free license under a number of his patents, including those cited in the present bill, which was duly recorded on August 5, 1942. The rights granted were to remain in full force and effect for the duration of the war.
>
> Subsequent to the declaration, on December 31, 1946, of the cessation of hostilities of World War II, Mr. Barnhart sought return of the patents or a royalty-bearing license in substitution for the royalty-free license. He was advised by the Patents Branch of the Office of the Judge Advocate General that since the war had not been officially terminated the interests, vested in the Government for the duration of the war, constituted Government property which could not be disposed of gratuitously by administrative action. That position was confirmed on June 24, 1949.
>
> On August 16, 1950, Congress enacted Public Law 694 (81st Cong.; ch. 716, 64 Stat. 448; 50 U.S.C. App. 2371) which provided for cancelation of such licenses granted to the Government by private holders of patents and rights thereunder. On May 8, 1951, the Secretary of the Air Force, upon Mr. Barnhart's application and acting under the authority granted in said act, canceled the license effective on that date and not retroactively to December 31, 1946, as requested by Mr. Barnhart.
>
> Mr. Barnhart made repeated claims against the Government for damages for unauthorized use or infringements of his patents and on January 5, 1959, filed a petition claiming damages therefor in the U.S. Court of Claims (case No. 4–59). The United States prevailed on its motion to dismiss claims founded on patents 1,854,444; 1,974,407; and 2,005,965, as barred by reason of expiration of said patents more than 6 years prior to the filing of the petition.
>
> During the presentation of evidence before the subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, which considered the merits of this bill, it was asserted that the remaining claims in said action have as a practical matter been seriously affected by the aforesaid ruling of the court inasmuch as two of the remaining patents in the suit expired 2 days less than 6 years prior to the filing of the petition, hence permitting infringement claims to be adjudicated for a 2-day period; one patent expired May 5, 1953, permitting adjudication for a 5-month period; one expired February 16, 1954, allowing an 11-month period; and one expired May 16, 1956, allowing adjudication for 29 months.
>
> The patents which are the subject matter of this legislation pertain to inventions concerning airplane wing construction, airfoil construction and control, and airplane construction, and involve such areas as flaps and hydraulic control systems.
>
> Mr. Barnhart had a long and consistent interest in aviation, having, at the age of 14, in 1909, built and flown a glider, and in succeeding years, built and flown biplanes, pusher-type airplanes, and prototypes of modern aircraft. At the beginning of World War II he had accumulated about 64 patents, most of which dealt with improvement to aircraft. He presented all of them for the war effort and on July 18, 1942, the Government accepted 19 of them "for use during the war effort" and received from Mr. Barnhart the aforesaid royalty-free license "for the duration of the present war."
>
> Following the declaration of cessation of hostilities until he instituted suit in the Court of Claims, Mr. Barnhart persistently contended that the Government made improper use and infringed on said patents and sought damages therefor. He sought administrative relief and also information on which to determine the amount of damage ascertainable through determining the number of airplanes produced during said period and which information he also sought through court procedure after the suit was instituted.
>
> The House report in its consideration of this case states as follows:
>
> "It is apparent to the committee that Mr. Barnhart was motivated by patriotism in

giving the Government royalty-free use of his inventions for the period he thought was during hostility rather than, in fact, for the duration of the war. It is the opinion of the committee that the Government interest in said patents did vest in the Government for the duration of the war except that on May 8, 1951, they were duly relinquished under the provisions of law and the interest revested, on that date, in Mr. Barnhart. From said date until suit was instituted on January 5, 1959, Mr. Barnhart had several opportunities to institute court proceedings because of the number of occasions that he asserted claims and the investigation and denial of them by the Air Force on each occasion. However, the committee recognizes that there can be a strong likelihood of believing that there was merely one continuing claim and repeated reviews thereof."

"Therefore, in consideration of all the foregoing, the committee concludes that, on the basis of fairness, equity, and justice, defenses of laches, lapse of time, or statute of limitations should be waived as they relate to Mr. Barnhart's claims against the United States since May 8, 1951, and recommends that this legislation, as amended, be considered favorably."

The committee, in its consideration of this claim, has amended the bill to restore the date of December 31, 1946, as the bill was introduced, in lieu of the date of May 8, 1951, as recommended by the House. The purpose of this amendment is to prevent the consideration of any infringement prior to December 31, 1946. The committee does not insert that date for the purpose of fixing December 31, 1946, as the commencement of any alleged infringement but, on the contrary, believes that the actual date is a matter for the court to decide, whether it be December 31, 1946, May 8, 1951, or some other date which the court may deduce from the evidence presented. In other words, the committee considers that the date upon which the patents should have been released and reassigned to the claimant is an open question for the decision of the court.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, justice delayed is justice denied. The bill should have been passed last year. There was no opposition on this side. One of my colleagues on the Democratic side did object to the passage of the bill. Therefore, it was put over. The bill is now before us by motion. It now ought to be passed and sent to the President.

Mr. President, the committee recommends the bill. I regret that the Department of Justice filed an adverse report and that the Department of Commerce made no recommendation at all. I urge that the committee position be adopted by the Senate.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 6025) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CHANGE OF NAME OF THE PLAYA DEL REY INLET AND HARBOR, VENICE, CALIF.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1095, H.R. 157.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title.

The **CHIEF CLERK.** A bill (H.R. 157) to change the name of the Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif., to the Marina del Rey, Los Angeles, Calif.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, all of us who are interested in the very highest standards of American education were heartened by the words of President Kennedy's state of the Union message.

The President described at some length the current needs and goals of the American educational system.

To me, however, the heart of his statement was in these words:

> But excellence in education must begin at the elementary level. I sent to the Congress last year a proposal for Federal aid to public school construction and teachers' salaries. I believe that bill—which passed the Senate and received House committee approval—offered the minimum amount required by our needs, and in terms of across-the-board aid, the maximum scope permitted by our Constitution. I, therefore, see no reason to weaken or withdraw that bill; and I urge its passage at this session.

This is a very definite statement of the position of the administration. It is brief, concise, and it could not be more clear.

The question then becomes: Will Congress fulfill its obligation to American education by adopting this proposed legislation?

We again have the opportunity to take action that will do much more than make the 87th Congress one of the truly historic Congresses in our history.

Passage of such proposed legislation would be clear-cut evidence to the parents, the children, and the educators that we are prepared, at last, to bolster the very foundations of our national strength.

I use the word "again" with some sadness and frustration—but not resignation.

The Congress has abdicated its responsibilities to general education on countless occasions in the past.

Time after time bills have come before the Senate and the House to provide the vital fertilizer of Federal funds to the grassroots of education—the elementary and secondary levels.

Those of us who were advocating this legislation long before sputnik rose into the skies, and changed the course of world history, were heartened by the furor caused by this scientific achievement.

There was a sort of national guilty conscience over the lack of attention given to American education, and we hoped this would provide the impetus needed.

It did, to some degree.

We passed the National Defense Education Act, for example, to stimulate and improve the teaching of defense-related subjects in the area of higher education.

Even more importantly, we seemed on the verge of a major breakthrough in Federal aid to general education.

In 1960 the Senate passed S. 8 to provide assistance to the States for school construction and teachers' salaries, which was the first general-aid bill to pass this body in more than a decade. An outlay of $925 million was proposed for each of 2 years.

The same year the House passed its version of a school-aid bill, providing $400 million a year for 4 years.

Thus, for the first time in the history of our country, both the Senate and the House demonstrated by their votes their acceptance of the principle of Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools.

I need not recite at this point the details of the sorry parliamentary situation that prevented these bills from going to the usual Senate-House conference, and thus blocked final enactment.

But this past year the Senate reaffirmed its endorsement of Federal aid by passing S. 1021 by a vote of 49 to 34 and sending it on to the House.

This is the measure to which President Kennedy referred in his state of the Union message.

Another passage in his remarks on education also caught my attention. He said:

> Eight million adult Americans are classified as functionally illiterate. This is a disturbing figure reflected in selective service rejection rates. And I shall recommend plans for a massive attack to end this adult illiteracy.

I agree with President Kennedy that this is disturbing. In fact, I find it shocking that 8 percent of our adult population is illiterate.

The President is right that we should launch a "massive attack" on this situation.

But simple logic indicates that the only real answer to this problem is to launch an even more massive attack on the major cause of this illiteracy, and the semi-illiteracy that encompasses many more millions of our people.

This naturally leads us right back to the premise that both our immediate and long-range educational needs require strengthening of our elementary and secondary school systems.

The subject of illiteracy raised by the President reminded me of an interesting discovery we made during research into the history of Federal aid to education.

One of the very first general school-aid bills, a measure known as "A bill to aid in the establishment and temporary support of the common schools," passed the Senate in 1884. It was sponsored by Senator Henry Blair, a Republican from the great State of New Hampshire.

Whereas our modern bill, S. 1021, would allocate funds to the States based on a combination of need and school-age population, S. 398 of the year 1884, would have distributed the funds according to the illiterate population of each State.

One can only speculate, but with considerable certainly, whether a President of the United States need speak of 8 million illiterate in 1962 had that bill passed in 1884.

It is interesting to note that Senator Blair, using the census of 1880, reported the rate of illiteracy then as 9.8 percent.

President Kennedy's report of 8 million "functionally illiterate" today represents an illiteracy rate of about 8 percent.

While the statistical bases for the 1884 and 1962 figures are not exactly the same, the conclusion is distressingly clear: We have made shamefully little progress in stamping out illiteracy and semi-illiteracy.

This demonstrates the most serious consequence of our delays in taking that action which, if we are to meet the challenges of the future or even survive as a nation, can only be considered inevitable.

Each year that action is postponed—action to end overcrowding of classrooms or to provide the needed quantity and quality of teachers—means millions of children permanently deprived of sound education.

Interestingly enough, many of the same States that would have received the most funds under Senator Blair's illiteracy formula of 1884 would still receive the major share if they were to be distributed on the same basis today.

The trouble, of course, goes much deeper than whether or not a person can read, or whether he reaches adulthood with a fourth-grade education or less.

Millions of normal children who each year finish high school and even go into the colleges have received what can only be described as a poor education.

Yes, they are literate, but do they read more than the comic strips or the paperback trash in the drugstores?

Are they taught to use their power to think? To be creative? To provide an intellectual atmosphere for their own children?

Today we still hear the cries that this is not the business of the Federal Government, that this is solely the responsibility of the community and the State and the parent.

Let us return to the report filed in the Senate nearly 78 years ago by Senator Blair. This is a remarkable document that bears re-reading today.

Senator Blair addressed himself to this very point of the responsibilities of the Federal Government "to assist in the education of the people when necessary, for its and their own preservation."

Senator Blair's report of 1884 said this in part:

> Our leading proposition is that the General Government possesses the power and has imposed upon itself the duty of educating the people of the United States whenever for any cause those people are deficient in that degree of education which is essential to the discharge of their duties as citizens either of the United States or of the several States.
>
> This does not imply that a like power and even more imperative duty do not require the people of every State to educate its own citizens. It is a power not hostile but friendly to the States.
>
> Nor is it a power to be exercised unnecessarily. It should be exercised only in extremity, and when manifestly essential to the local, and therefore ultimately to the general welfare.
>
> As the State may not engage in war * * * so the United States should not enter upon the duty of qualifying the citizen to bear his responsibilities to the Nation and to the State until the local power is shown to be inadequate or negligent and the necessity is apparent and imperative. But the power is there.

To relate these words to today, one may ask whether there is evidence that the States are unable to meet the full measure of their educational responsibilities to their citizens.

I think the record over the years, from 1884 on, is replete with evidence that they are unable to do so, and that most would welcome assistance from the Federal Government.

On January 3, the Office of Education announced the encouraging news that the national classroom shortage had been reduced by 15,300.

This indicates the strong efforts of the States to provide adequate facilities for the students.

But two factors temper any great enthusiasm over this accomplishment.

First, according to the Office of Education report, the shortage of public elementary and secondary classrooms is 127,200, an intolerable level.

Secondly, the report states that "the gain may be shortlived, owing to an expected decline in classroom construction this year, in the face of continuing large enrollment increases."

The report says that public school enrollment has set a new high of 37.5 million, up 1.2 million over 1960. Projections for next fall indicate an increase of another million.

While the number of teachers in the public schools rose by 55,000 over 1960, a total of 89,700 full-time teachers are reported as not having met full certification standards for teaching.

It would seem clear from these modern figures that Senator Blair's proposition of 1884 is still distressingly accurate.

His statement of that year went even deeper into the philosophy of Federal responsibilities, noting that government for the people and by the people requires a higher degree of intelligence on the part of the citizens than any other form. He asks:

> How, then, can the republican form of government exist and continue to exist unless from generation to generation, in perpetual succession, the citizen sovereigns are educated?

Then follow these cogent remarks:

> This primary duty of society to its individual membership is by the law of nature imposed, in the first instance, on the parent. But the parent cannot fully discharge it. What then?
>
> Society, through the established forms of government, interferes and performs what the parent fails to perform. Is this any violation of the right of the parent? No one pretends it.
>
> It is merely the doing of that which, for the good of the child, the parent and the whole social fabric must be done.
>
> No parent has the right to say that his child shall remain ignorant. He has no right to breed firebrands and death to the society of which he is a part, and to which he owes everything himself. Here is the foundation of the right of compulsory education on the part of the State.

Mr. President, no one disputes that the world of today is vastly more complex than it was in 1884.

We have a pretty good idea, from the fantastic changes and events of the past 77 years, what is in store for us in the next half-century.

Already we consider the circling of our globe by a manmade satellite an almost commonplace event.

It is not a question of if man can reach the moon. It simply is a matter of when.

If we fail to provide the best possible education for our children, we will fall behind not only in the dramatic scientific achievements, but we also will jeopardize the quality of the very leadership we need for our Nation in the years ahead.

I have mentioned here two of the basic questions that arise when we discuss Federal aid to education, the need and the responsibility of Government in this area.

There is no doubt in my mind that both of these questions have been answered very positively. There is a need. We do have the responsibility.

There is still another argument raised, a relatively new argument, and one that probably can be assigned a major share of the blame for the failure to adopt a school aid bill last year.

That is the question of religion, and whether the nonprofit religious schools should share in the use of public funds assigned to school purposes.

This is a dangerous argument, not because of its logic, but because it tends to divide our American people along religious grounds. That kind of division we can never afford.

My own position on this is that religious schools do not have the constitutional right to use Federal grants for construction or teachers' salaries.

If they have the right to share in these funds, then logic would dictate that they would have the same right to share in local school tax funds, distributed by States and communities.

Yet those religious leaders who demand partnership in any Federal legislation do not make that argument at the local level.

This is despite the fact that local school taxes are, and have been for many decades, the basic source of school support.

But no effort has been made by the religious schools to share in the use of these funds for any major purpose.

I have no objection if Congress wishes to make funds available for loans to the nonprofit and religious schools at a low rate of interest.

But I have the impression that even this will not satisfy these religious leaders, that they simply are against Federal assistance to public schools. They took that position very clearly.

Why? Because they fear that the competition from better-supported public schools will detract from their own institutions?

Perhaps this would happen. But that is not our concern or our responsibility. We are in competition with the world, and the sooner we build our educational system to meet that competition the better our chances for survival.

If there is a legitimate legal question over this issue—and many agree that there is—let it be settled in the courts, and not in a dog-in-the-manger attack on Federal aid.

The courts can settle the issue after Congress passes a Federal aid bill; and while it is being thrashed out in the courts, our children can be enjoying the long-overdue benefits of the program.

I would say to those religious leaders who block Federal aid that they must bear a heavy burden on their consciences and are exacting a high price for their personal prejudices.

Mr. President, I began these brief remarks by quoting from President Kennedy's state of the Union message.

The President said he could see no reason to weaken or withdraw the bill passed by the Senate last year and sent to the House. He concluded by stating:

> I urge its passage at this session.

Since he made his remarks on January 11, however, the political air between Capitol Hill and the executive department has been charged with considerable static that the administration does not really mean what it says.

These reports have it that no push will be made on general Federal aid, and that the education record will be made this year with an innocuous bill to assist higher education.

This, of course, is the easy approach. It requires no great effort; it attracts no great opposition; and it accomplishes very little. I reject this approach.

Mr. President, when we deal with the education problems of our Nation, it is necessary to establish certain priorities.

By anyone's measurement, the greatest need in education is at the level which represents the foundation of our educational system—the elementary and secondary schools.

But time after time the interests of the schoolchildren have been sold out by following the easy, uncomplicated approach of bolstering higher education.

Each time a higher education bill is passed, general aid legislation is pushed back still further, postponed again while the needs and the population multiply.

In 1958, the National Defense Education Act was the answer of Congress to the unmet needs of education.

This year, according to the reports, Congress and the administration are prepared to settle for the higher education bill now on the Senate Calendar as the latest sop to education needs.

I do not say these bills are worthless. The National Defense Education Act was a valuable program, and I was proud to support it.

I supported the current bill on the calendar (S. 1241) in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. But I supported it as a companion to the general aid bill (S. 1021), not as a substitute for it.

Under these circumstances, and in view of the priority needs of education, I intend to oppose the higher education bill until general aid legislation is given the consideration that we have every right to expect.

I think the President of the United States paid a great compliment to the Senate when he said he was satisfied we had passed the kind of bill he wanted, and he called for action on the part of the other body of the Congress so that the bill the Senate passed could become law.

I recognize the argument that the Senate, at least, met its responsibility by passing the general aid bill last year and sending it to the House.

That is true, but I believe that all energies in the education field—administration and congressional alike—should be directed toward freeing that bill for the President's signature, rather than by dissipating our strength with a relatively minor and noncritical handout to higher education.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that when public funds were first provided for public school education in the United States, many persons took the position that education should not be for the mass of the people, but should be only for the wellborn and the rich. But that view did not prevail. Have we come full circle? Are we returning to that position? Is education too good for the masses? Must Congress pass Federal aid to education only for higher education? I do not think the American people will be satisfied with that kind of performance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "School Aid: Line of Action," published in the New York Times of January 18, 1962, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a press release of the Office of Education, dated January 3, 1962, and significant portions of the supplement to Senate Report No. 101, of March 10, 1884, submitted by Senator Henry W. Blair, of New Hampshire, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 2 and 3.)

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Jan. 18, 1962]

SCHOOL AID: LINE OF ACTION

President Kennedy and Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK have agreed to ask for Federal aid to higher education as a separate measure from the proposed air for public elementary and secondary schools. This separation makes sense because different problems and issues are involved.

The danger implicit in the Speaker's announcement is, however, that the relatively noncontroversial aid for college construction and scholarships will turn out to be both the first and the only education aid measure to be passed in this session. All present indications are that this is what will happen.

It is therefore particularly important for the President now to let there be no misunderstanding about the real priorities. Higher education and talented students need and deserve Federal support; but the basic strength of American education must be reinforced from the ground up. The loss of talent in the sciences and technology, as well as in all the other vital fields, about which the President this week expressed concern, begins in the schools. It is in the schools that the chain reaction either of national growth or decline will be set off.

The agreement to start with college aid is acceptable only if the leadership to get general school aid enacted is so determined, purposeful, and courageous as to leave no question about the nature of the goal.

EXHIBIT 2

PRESS RELEASE BY U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

JANUARY 3, 1962.

In the wake of a new record in classroom construction, the national classroom shortage as reported by the 50 States and the District of Columbia has been reduced by about 15,300 rooms, the Office of Education announced today.

There are indications in the reports, however, that the gain may be short-lived owing to an expected decline in classroom construction this year in the face of continuing large enrollment increases.

The eighth in a series of annual surveys conducted with the cooperation of State education agencies showed a shortage of 127,200 public elementary and secondary classrooms at the opening of school last fall, compared with 142,500 a year ago.

Public school enrollment last fall reached a new high of 37.5 million—up 1.2 million over fall enrollment in 1960. Classroom construction between the fall of 1960 and the fall of 1961 also hit a new high—72,200 rooms, as against 69,000 the previous year.

Next fall, enrollments will again go up by more than 1 million, but according to reports from the States, construction this year is expected to fall to a total of about 62,700 rooms.

The Office of Education emphasized that national totals obtained through the annual survey are not exactly comparable from year to year because of various changes that have occurred in methods of collecting or compiling the data in a number of States.

About two-thirds of this year's reduction in the shortage was reported by 18 States for which the data are less comparable with last year's than in the other States.

The Office of Education pointed out that such discrepancies are inherent in a national survey of this kind. However, the agency said, the survey has been improved over the years and is now considered to be on a sounder basis than ever before.

The States reported that 18,700 rooms were abandoned during 1960–61 because of population shifts, consolidation of school districts and obsolescence of buildings. The average for the last 4 years has been 17,600.

The current shortage of 127,200 classrooms as reported by the States consists of 60,200 needed to relieve overcrowding and 67,000 needed to replace unsatisfactory facilities.

Approximately 1,694,000 children were in excess of normal classroom capacity, and an estimated 2 million children were attending school in unsatisfactory facilities.

From the fall of 1960 to the fall of 1961, the number of children enrolled in excess of normal classroom capacity was reduced by less than 200,000, according to the State reports.

These children, the Office of Education pointed out, are not the only ones whose education is handicapped by inadequate classroom capacity, inasmuch as all of their classmates share the same crowded quarters.

The number of classrooms built in the last 6 years has averaged 69,100 rooms a year—a level only a little above that needed to take care of increased enrollments and replace classrooms abandoned each year.

As a result, the backlog of need as reported by the States has also remained relatively stable for several years—143,200 rooms in 1957; 141,900 in 1958; 135,264 in 1959; 142,500 in 1960.

Of the 37.5 million pupils enrolled last fall, 24.7 million were in elementary schools and 12.8 million in secondary schools. The total enrollment increase of 1.2 million was 3.4 percent greater than a year ago. Most of the increase was in secondary schools.

The survey showed 1,463,000 full-time and part-time classroom teachers this fall in the Nation's public schools, 871,000 at the elementary level, and 592,000 at the secondary level. This was a gain of 55,000 or 3.9 percent over the 1960 total.

State departments of education reported in the survey that 64,500 elementary and 25,200 secondary full-time teachers have not met full certification standards for teaching. The total of 89,700 such teachers represents a decrease of 2,600 or 2.8 percent from the number in the fall of 1960.

The proportion of teachers with less than standard certificates was reduced from 6.6 percent of the Nation's total teaching staff a year ago to 6.1 percent currently.

EXHIBIT 3

EXCERPTS FROM SENATE REPORT NO. 101, 48TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, MARCH 10, 1884, BY SENATOR BLAIR

The committee unanimously approve the amount proposed to be appropriated in the bill and its distribution on the basis of illiteracy, and a majority recommend its passage in its present form.

The matter following is largely from a presentation of the subject made by the chairman of the committee on a former occasion, for which, as matter of argument, the committee as a whole is not responsible, but the statistical tables and calculations having been prepared with considerable labor and care, and being substantially unchanged by later information, the same is incorporated with this supplementary report.

We propose to inquire into the nature and extent of the powers and obligations of the National Government to assist in the education of the people when necessary, for its and their own preservation; to develop and illustrate the actual condition of popular education in this country as revealed by the census of 1880, and from other reliable sources, and thereby to demonstrate the necessity of national aid to common schools at the present time; to explain the several measures pending in Congress having that end in view, and to briefly give reasons for supporting Senate bill No. 398, as in our belief best calculated to secure the object desired by the advocates of all.

The United States are conceded by all to be a unit and a sovereignty within the scope of the powers expressly granted or necessarily implied in the written Constitution. The only real question between those who have held to the national idea on the one hand and that of State sovereignty on the other has been as to which had the right to decide upon their relative jurisdictions and to establish their political boundaries when in dispute. Upon this question we do not now propose to enter, because it is not essential to the maintenance of the argument on this occasion. Our leading proposition is that the General Government possesses the power and has imposed upon itself the duty of educating the people of the United States whenever for any cause those people are deficient in that degree of education which is essential to the discharge of their duties as citizens either of the United States or of the several States wherein they chance to reside.

This does not imply that a like power and even more imperative duty do not require the people of every State to educate its own citizens. It is a power not hostile but friendly to the States. Nor is it a power to be exercised unnecessarily. It should be exercised only in extremity, and when manifestly essential to the local, and therefore ultimately to the general welfare. As the State may not engage in war unless "actually invaded, or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay," so the United States should not enter upon the duty of qualifying the citizen to bear his responsibilities to the Nation and to the State until the local power is shown to be inadequate or negligent and the necessity is apparent and imperative. But the power is there.

There is no truth better established or more generally admitted than that the republican form of government cannot exist unless the people are competent to govern themselves. The contrary doctrine would be an absurdity, a contradiction of terms. What is the republican form of government but government of the people by the people? But how can the people govern, how exercise sovereignty, except they have the knowledge requisite to that end? Sovereignty requires as much intelligence when exercised by the people as a whole as when exercised by a single individual; it requires more. The monarch governs according to his will, not necessarily with that broad intelligence demanded by the public good. Government for the people by the people implies that degree of popular intelligence which will enable the masses of men to comprehend the principles and to direct the administration of government in such way as to promote the general welfare. Republican government, therefore, requires a higher degree of intelligence on the part of the sovereign than any other form. That sovereign is the whole body of the people. How then, can the republican form of government exist and continue to exist unless from generation to generation, in perpetual succession, the citizen sovereigns are educated?

But the question is deeper still. How can civilization exist without education? What is civilization but the result of education—of the development and training of the powers of the individual? All human progress and happiness are, in the higher and broader sense, but education, which confers the capacity both to do and to enjoy. If, then, to educate is to civilize, the great duty which society owes to the individual is to educate him, and the benefit thus conferred he is bound to return.

This primary duty of society to its individual membership is by the law of nature imposed, in the first instance, upon the parent. But the parent cannot fully discharge it. What then? Society, through the established forms of government, interferes and performs what the parent fails to perform. Is this any violation of the right of the parent? No one pretends it. It is merely the doing of that which, for the good of the child, the parent, and the whole social fabric, must be done. The right of the mass, that is, of the State, is paramount even to that of the individual, inasmuch as the general welfare—the safety of the people—is the supreme law. No parent has the right to say that his child shall remain ignorant. He has no right to breed firebrands and death to the society of which he is a part and to which he owes everything himself. Here is the foundation of the right of compulsory education on the part of the State.

If the parent fully exercised his right to properly educate his child there would be no occasion for the interference of the State; but he fails to do it. Benevolent voluntary effort comes to his aid. This also fails. What then? The law of self-preservation at once asserts itself in behalf of the State as well as of the individual, and for the welfare of both it must put forth its power. These principles are fundamental and are so plain that their assertion may seem superfluous. But we now come to an important question in the argument.

What in our complex system of government constitutes the "state," the organization in which reside the right and duty to educate the individual when the parent and voluntary agencies fail? The term "state" has various significations, but as used in this connection it is thus defined by Mr. Webster, and by the writers upon law: "A political body or body politic; the body of people united under one government, whatever may be the form of the government."

Mr. Bouvier says:

"In its most enlarged sense it signifies a self-sufficient body of persons united together in one community for the defense of their rights and to do right and justice to foreigners. In this sense the state means the whole people united into one body-politic, and the state and the people of the state are equivalent expressions."

[There can be no doubt that under our system the word "State" includes the combined powers of both the United States and of the several States of whose Union the former is composed.] The territory which constitutes the one includes the many. The citizens of the many are individually and identically the citizens of the nation at large. Every citizen of the United States who resides in a State is a citizen thereof. "All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside." The rights and powers of the great community of 50 millions of people who constitute the citizens of the United States and of the several States are vested in the Government of the United States, in the governments of the several States, or in the people themselves. Although these three depositories of rights and powers are "distinct like the billows," yet they are "one like the sea." Distinct in their several jurisdictions, yet they constitute one great whole, and act together harmoniously for the individual and common good, each independent of the other in its sphere, like the independent yet concurring powers of nature in the realms of physical life, where—

All are but parts of one stupendous whole,
Whose body nature is, and God the soul.

It is only as we use the word "state" in this complete sense that the people of the United States, who are also the people of the several States and of the territories, constitute "a body of persons united together in one community for the defense of their rights, and to do right and justice to foreigners."

Now, the right of self-defense, which is the right of self-preservation, is the right to live and to be. The right of the people to be at all implies and includes the right to constitute and maintain the state—that is to say, government—and to prescribe its form, for human existence is impossible without government. The governing power must know how to govern or it cannot govern. Can a man do that which he knows not how to do? The people have distributed the functions of government between the national and the sectional or the State authorities, and have retained in themselves the initial exercise of all power through the ballot. The ballot is the republican form of government both in the Nation and in the State.

Intelligence is necessary in the individual, who is the sovereign, in the one as well as the other. The right and duty of the national portion of the Government to preserve itself and of the individual to preserve it and to exert his sovereignty through its forms perpetually are absolute. It is the right and duty of the whole to preserve the whole, and the right and duty of the whole to preserve the whole implies the preservation of all the parts by that whole, to the existence of which all the parts are necessary. It is not necessary that a man should have written permission to live. He needs no license stamped or sealed to give him the right to breathe.

His creation implied all that. Just so the people, when they created governments, both of State and Nation, republican in form, and bade them multiply their blessings and replenish the earth with their civilizing and ennobling activities, necessarily gave them the breath of life and the inherent power to preserve that life. To have written into the constitutions of the States or of the National Government the right of self-preservation would have been as superfluous as to have required a written order for the sun to shine, for water to run down hill, or for any created thing to obey the law of its being. But the right to educate the child throughout the Nation is the right to preserve the Government and the Nation. That right cannot be curtailed. It is geographically coextensive with the jurisdiction of the Government itself, and self-preservation compels its exercise by the National Government whenever there is failure for any reason on the part of the parent and the State.

OBLIGATION TO GUARANTEE GOVERNMENTS REPUBLICAN IN FORM

Still again. The whole people of the United States, that is to say, the Nation, by the primary act of the masses and by the act of their State governments, have commanded in the written terms of the constitutional law of the land that "the United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government." How is that obligation to be fulfilled? Must its performance await revolution, and must destruction precede preservation? Is it a guarantee of possession to stand by while war and tempest obliterate, and then endeavor to restore? Is reconstruction the only or is it the better way in which the obligation to guarantee a government republican in form to the States of this Union can be discharged? Is not the ounce of prevention still worth the pound of cure? Does not the duty to guarantee imply the right to prevent and to preserve even more strongly than to restore? Prevention might be possible when restoration would prove to be impossible.

It is a conceded proposition that where a duty is imposed all the power necessary to its performance is conferred, and the choice of means, so far as there is no prohibition, goes with the power.

If all this be so, what doubt can there be, not only of the power, but also of the absolute duty of the National Government, to perform its obligation of guarantee in the only effective way in which it is possible? When does the obligation to guarantee attach? Did it not commence with the adoption of the Constitution, and is it not continuous in its operation? Does it not attach, as a right in the territories, which are inchoate States? Does it not follow every movement of the concurrent life of the Nation and of the States, and enter into all their constitutional and inseparable relations?

Not to educate is to destroy. It follows inevitably that not to educate is to break the guarantee of republican government to the States. If the parent and the State fail to educate the citizen, does not this clause of the Constitution compel the Nation to educate its child?

THE GENERAL WELFARE

But Congress has express power "to provide for the general welfare of the United States," and to exert its utmost power of taxation to promote that which was one of the six greatest ends enumerated in the preamble, and to secure which the Constitution itself was ordained and established by the whole people of the United States of America. That people well understood that without intelligence it would be impossible "to preserve the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity." It goes without argument to say that in no way can the general welfare be so promoted as by the general diffusion of knowledge and the discipline of the mental powers of the masses of the people, which can only be accomplished by common schools maintained by governmental power.

Governments are but agencies established by society to secure the happiness of its individual members. Whenever they cease to promote the end for which they were created they should be destroyed, and whenever and so far as they fail they should modify or reverse their action.

If in the past the National Government has not borne its due proportion of the burdens of the education of the people, or if new conditions have arisen which require of it a degree of cooperation with the several States not hitherto necessary in securing to all citizens of the Republic that degree of intelligence which is indispensable to the safety of society and to the happiness of the individual, who is at once the subject and the sovereign in both local and national administration, then the time has come for a new departure, and the withes of straw must yield to the expanding limbs of the giant who is arousing himself for the labors of the time which has already come.

But it must not be forgotten that the fathers and mothers of this Republic never conceived of the possibility of its existence except as its foundations should be laid upon knowledge and virtue, and that the promotion of sound learning was deemed to be the fundamental duty of the national power. The time would fail to speak of the founders of the colonies, and of the constant efforts which they put forth from New Hampshire to Georgia to establish schools and colleges for the education of those who were to enjoy the rights of citizenship within their respective borders. The Revolution was the outgrowth of the school, the college, and of the free worship of God. The constitution of every State as well as the Declaration of Independence and the whole theory of the national polity depend upon the possession of knowledge and virtue by the people at large.

Hence Washington never ceased by word and deed to enforce this great truth upon his countrymen. Adams and Franklin and Jefferson and Madison and Hamilton and Clinton and Rush, and the whole galaxy of the immortals who cradled the Nation, dwelt continually and emphatically upon the primary necessity of the universal intelligence of the masses to the perpetuation of their freedom and happiness. Nor did they confine their efforts to precept alone. The Congress of the Confederation, as well as the General Government under which we now live, at an early day proclaimed their duty and exercised their power to apply the property of the Nation to promote this great interest of all. One-sixteenth part of the public lands was devoted to the education of the children of the coming States from the foundation of the Government; three-score years afterward the amount was doubled, and from time to time during the century nearly which has elapsed since the Ordinances of 1785 and 1787 the Nation has contributed of its resources to the establishment and maintenance of the public schools.

The messages of Washington and other early Presidents, who, with their associates, created and defined the national powers, and the responses of both branches of Congress, are full of the recognition of the obligation of the General Government to encourage and foster universal education, and as he passed from the scene of official life the Father of his Country solemnly adjured the American people "to promote as an object of primary importance institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge."

The promotion of learning and science, and the appropriation of the public money for that purpose, has always been recognized as within the scope of national power. Measures for the establishment of a national university have been supported by our leading statesmen, and appropriations of public money and other property have been from time to time made to establish or assist institutions like the agricultural colleges, observatories, the Smithsonian Institution, and exploring expeditions by land or sea, all which implies the possession of the undoubted power, as well as the disposition, to apply the resources of the National Government to these high purposes whenever in its judgment the general welfare will be conserved thereby. But even if all this were untrue, the case would remain the same.

Laws are silent in war. They were silent in the conflict through which we have just passed. But what is meant by this? Not that all laws are silent; but that minor regulations which appertain to more quiet times are suspended in the overmastering presence of the great first law of self-preservation

In this sense, which is the true sense, laws may become silent in peace as well as in war. We are now in peace, but if there be laws which forbid the education of the illiterate millions of the American people by the outstretched arm and bursting Treasury and innumerable intellectual and moral agencies of the Nation at large, then those laws should, and in presence of the uprising sentiment of the people I may say they shall, be silent in this land until by the diffusion of knowledge, and of the power which knowledge gives to every child within our borders, peace may be made perpetual. Universal intelligence never makes war. Only ignorance is convertible into brute force. Ignorance is slavery. But for ignorance there would have been no slave. But for ignorance among the nominally free there would have been no rebellion. The contest we now wage is with that still unconquered ignorance of both white man and black man in all parts of the country which hurried us by remorseless fate to fields of death for 4 long years. Besides this we confront the demands of hordes incoming from beyond both great oceans, and of the advancing generations of men.

Whenever the State or the local community is able to sufficiently instruct its youth it should do so, and the national aid should be invoked only when made necessary by local neglect or inability. But this burden is primarily one of taxation. Civilization must be paid for. Education is the insurance upon civilization. It must be kept up everywhere, for the risk is everywhere. To leave the child of the pauper uneducated is to incur as great risk of destruction by the fires or floods of ignorance and crime as if he were the scion of wealth and place. So, too, in the nicely balanced forces and relations of localities, the neglect of a county or a township may in some vital emergency destroy the institutions of the whole country by remote or even by immediate results. Hence there must be no admission of the doctrine that the general power can yield the right to educate when necessary to the general good. This power is indispensable to preserve the parts as well as the whole.

If these principles are true, we are next brought logically to the consideration of the actual condition of the United States and the territories thereof in respect to the education of the people. This must be done that we may determine intelligently the question whether the Nation should appropriate and, either directly or through State agencies, apply the public money for that use.

LINCOLN BOYHOOD NATIONAL MEMORIAL, IND.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 2470.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2470) to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BIBLE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BIBLE, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. ALLOTT conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have in mind addressing the Senate today on the subject of my trip to the Soviet Union several months ago. However, the subject with which I shall deal now—namely, the situation of the Jews in the Soviet Union—was not the only subject of my visit there. I was concerned with the issue of East-West trade, as a member of the Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee; but that is the subject of a report which I am making to that subcommittee, which will come out quite soon. Hence, I shall not deal with it today.

Today, Mr. President, I shall confine my statement to the status of the people of Jewish faith who are Soviet citizens in the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, there is cause for great concern in the reports of continued pressures by the Soviet Union on the Jews in that country.

Soviet leaders have developed a double standard of thought and action toward Soviet Jews which places them in a unique and unprecedented category. This standard rejects them at one and the same time as a Jewish nationality and also as assimilated citizens of the Soviet Union. In this way—that is, by rejecting them as a nationality and also as within the confines of what I think is euphemistically called the Soviet Constitution—they are effectively deprived of the rights to which they are entitled under the Soviet system of nationalities, and, also, they are not treated as Soviet citizens in the same class with others. Thus, Jews have no adequate system of Jewish schools, no Hebrew or Yiddish language courses, no theater, publishing house, or other Jewish cultural facilities. Their existence as a people—in religious terms—is in deadly peril.

All the rigid Soviet protestations—and they were made to me, personally—that there is no Jewish problem in the Soviet Union and that anti-Semitism is against the law—as it is, according to statute law in the Soviet Union—cannot disguise the fact that the plight of its Jewish citizens is grave and complex.

Indeed, even during the past weekend we had indications that the pressure and the attacks on the Jews in the Soviet Union are continuing. The obviously trumped-up accusations of spying in synagogues create new elements of danger in addition to those that have already existed. Mr. President, a little later in my remarks to the Senate I shall actually detail those charges, and shall state why—couched as they are in the obscurist language of the Marxist-Leninistic idiom—they constitute a great danger to the people there.

When I was in the Soviet Union during the last 2 weeks of November I went into this question of the state of the Jews and of Jewish life and culture in the Soviet Union. This had become a matter of great interest in the United States and elsewhere in the free world, in view of the pretensions of the Communists that the Communist society is both classless and free of bigotry or discrimination. The free world had learned of the trial and conviction of three veteran Jewish leaders of the Jewish religious community of Leningrad; and of similar arrests and imprisonment of Jewish religious leaders in Moscow. Some of the sentences were as severe as those handed down under Stalin when in 1948 he inaugurated his infamous purge of Jewish intellectuals and writers. This was confirmed by the Soviet newspaper Pravda, which said the accused men had been in communication with a foreign power—meaning the Embassy of Israel.

These charges were most vehemently denied. Later in my remarks I shall deal with the latest of such publications in the Russian newspaper Trud, and also with the denials published in the American press and, indeed, in the world press.

Other reports disclosed that Soviet authorities had quadrupled a special tax against clergymen, which was especially hard on Hebrew rabbis, because of the lack of any real means of payment, disbanded the governing council of the Moscow Jewish seminary, the only remaining one in the country, dismissed its director, and placed full responsibility for the seminary's 12 students in the hands of the chief rabbi of Moscow. Although the special tax affects all clergymen, it works a special hardship on Soviet Jews, because they are not permitted to organize regionally or nationally in the way other religious groups are allowed to do in order to meet the financial burden.

Soviet officials do not talk about Jews in the U.S.S.R., nor did anyone in the Jewish community itself dare to talk about the situation. As I have said before, anti-Semitism is against the law in the Soviet Union, but we are seeing a course of conduct which is anti-Jewish and amounts to the same thing. The anxiety which pervades the Jewish people in the Soviet cities I visited is quite obvious.

I may say that physically, at least, worship in Moscow and in Odessa, which I also visited, was apparently uninhibited. There is only 1 major synagogue in Moscow and only 1 small one, although about 500,000 Jews live in the city, and on the Saturday morning when I attended the services at the Moscow Synagogue, there was a very large congregation of worshippers. I made considerable inquiry of people who I thought would have some light to cast on the situation, but it is no exaggeration to say that even for me a blanket of silence has fallen on the entire Jewish community in the country.

Jews are recognized as a nationality in the Soviet Union—althought not given the rights accorded other nationalities in the U.S.S.R., and despite more than 40 years of pressures and restrictions of all kinds to discourage religious identification, and despite the 1948 purge and the ridiculous but tragic "doctor's plot" of 1952—notwithstanding all those facts and the attempts to isolate the Jews in the U.S.S.R. from other Jewish communities throughout the world, 2,268,000 persons voluntarily declared themselves to be Jews in the January 1959 census. In addition, Mr. President, 472,000 gave Yiddish as their native tongue.

In spite of Soviet claims of religious freedom, there is clear evidence that Jews and the Jewish religion suffer greater limitations and restrictions than any other religious group. Synagogue buildings have been closed and supplies needed for religious worship cannot be obtained. No Hebrew Bibles are printed, and prayer books are almost irreplacable. Means for training rabbis and communal officials are inadequate, and, unlike other religious groups, Jews are not permitted to establish national organizations.

The cultural life of the Jewish community is also restricted very sharply, and the Yiddish literature in books, theater, periodicals and newspapers has virtually been entirely wiped out since Stalin began his purge of Jewish intellectuals in 1948. There is one Yiddish newspaper that appears every 2 weeks, but it is antireligious and represents little more than a Soviet newspaper in the Yiddish language. Nevertheless, in the 1959 census, 472,000 Jews as stated above, had the courage to declare that Yiddish was their native language.

Mr. President, I think it is extraordinary, considering the atmosphere in which they live, that they had the courage to declare that Yiddish is their native language.

One of the really amazing phenomena of the Soviet Union is that young people of the Jewish faith—engineers, scientists, and other professionals—still want to attend services in a synagogue even though many of them are unable to read the Hebrew prayers. In spite of the Communist campaign for atheism, which has been carried on for over 40 years under the Soviet system, these young people want to be identified with their Hebrew faith.

There are no leaders of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union in the sense that we have them in this country—nothing like the B'nai B'rith or the Jewish philanthropies—but the few remaining synagogues do have their recognized leaders. They are not necessarily given the title of president and executive vice president, but they are identified with a particular synagogue in a leadership capacity—and their names are listed with the Soviet authorities. The Soviet regime has cracked down on the leading among these respected synagogue leaders, primarily as a warning at this time that it will tolerate no agitation for the emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel.

This is my judgment and conclusion from what I saw and heard.

At this point I should like to read to the Senate a translation of an article in the Moscow newspaper, Trud, dated the 19th of January. It is an article by N. Ehrlich and is entitled "Zionism—A Mask for Spies." This article tells, allegedly, about the espionage activities of members of the staff of the Embassy of Israel in Moscow.

The article states:

> Facts show that the subversive activity of members of the Israeli Embassy against the Soviet Union is conducted with the knowledge of the Israeli Government and on the orders of their transoceanic masters.

The article continues:

> Being in complete economic and political dependence on the U.S. imperialists, the Israeli Zionists have completely subjugated their home and foreign policy to the interests of the transatlantic bosses. The Zionist organizations and parties of Israel have actually become branches of the American intelligence service.

Here we have the propaganda effort to link the Jewish people with foreign agents and thus to develop and inculcate in the hearts of their fellow countrymen the traditional pattern which obtained under the czars just as it now obtains under the Soviet leaders—the use of protestations in an endeavor to develop hostilities against a whole group of people on the bare allegation that they are allies, in some way, with foreign powers threatening the security of their own country.

The article continues in the same vein, speaking of the leaders of synagogues who have been convicted in Soviet courts in secret trials. Their names are given.

These are the charges against them:

> Soviet citizens Pechersky, Dynkin, and Kaganov, recruited by the members of the Israeli Embassy, have recently been exposed. It has been irrefutably established during the trial that besides collecting and handing over spy information to the Israeli diplomats, the traitors Pechersky, Dynkin, and Kaganov spread rumors and inventions slurring the Soviet political and public system and circulated anti-Soviet literature published in Israel, which they received secretly from staff members of the Israeli Embassy, Prat, Sharett, and others. They have also confessed, the author continues that the tape with recordings of slanders against Soviet life confiscated from them were specially prepared for their masters, who planned to use it for anti-Soviet propaganda.

Then the article ends up with what is, in the lexicon of this country, the way of countries which have a tradition for pogroms, which is true of the Soviet Union, as it was back in the czarist days, an extremely inflammatory paragraph which is most alarming for the future. I read now the translation of the article:

> The Soviet people are incensed by the behavior of the Israeli diplomats, who are using their trips in the U.S.S.R. and meetings with Soviet citizens for subversive activity. It is high time for the Zionist provocateurs to realize that their subversive activity against the Soviet Union arouses the wrath and contempt of all Soviet people, regardless of nationality.

These are very incendiary words, and it is why I think the world has a right to view with alarm what is going on in the Soviet Union with respect to this matter.

It is significant that there has been a denial and denunciation of the alleged charges upon which the Jewish religious leaders were convicted.

Knowing, as we do, the tremendous concern of the Government of Israel for the approximately 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union, it is inconceivable that it would do anything to jeopardize their status in that country.

In addition, it is conceivable that a trial, prepared and carried out in secret, following the purges, the so-called doctor's plot, and other evidence of repression which has taken place in the Soviet Union, can be anything but another piece of propaganda in the Soviet Union, where there is strong fear that there will be great demand that the Jewish people who wish to go may leave the Soviet Union and where there may be some strong agitation on their part to do so.

It is evident from the construction of the wall in Berlin to what methods and extremes the Communists will go in order to avoid, if they can, clear evidence of what a fraud and deception is the alleged Communist paradise.

I continue now with my analysis.

It is for all these reasons that I consider protest on a world scale against these prosecutions to be a very necessary action. Last year the United Nations Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities adopted by a vote of 11 to 1—the Soviet delegation opposed—a resolution condemning discrimination against minorities and recognizing Jews as an ethnic minority.

Essentially the current plight of Soviet Jews grows out of the unwillingness of the Kremlin to recognize them as a national or ethnic minority, notwithstanding their legal qualification as such. Communist leaders deny Jews this status, considering them to be an integral part of the whole Soviet people, but at the same time they discriminate against them as members of a group in cultural, political, military, and economic life.

In all forms of life the Jews in the Soviet Union are discriminated against. They are particularly discriminated against in the political area. They are absolutely out of the Foreign Service. In military areas their activities are very circumscribed, as is their opportunity to teach in schools and colleges. Where the Soviet Union needs them, as it does in physics and other highly important scientific professions—there they have a place. In medicine, for instance, they have a place. But it is a place gained only because of the urgent need of the Soviet Union, and the price paid is an absolute inhibition to the idea of going anywhere else.

The Soviet leaders pride themselves in the fact that they are not subject to the same antisemitism which was endemic in czarist Russia. The Soviet rulers are very sensitive to any charge of antisemitism. That is a very important thing for the world to remember. Therefore, all the more reason for worldwide protest when it is so justified.

The fact is that prosecution of Jewish religious leaders has occurred and that discrimination does exist as an element in what is in effect the Kremlin's anti-Jewish course. All signs indicate a steadily deteriorating situation that was signaled by the prosecution of Jewish community and religious leaders in Leningrad and Moscow last October, and unless the free world makes known its strong disapproval of these Soviet measures, the continued existence of Jews in the U.S.S.R. may be in grave danger. The immediate intent of Soviet authorities in taking these measures is apparently to warn Jews that it will not tolerate any emigration of Jews to Israel or any pro-Israel agitation toward that end—the long-range purpose, I am convinced, is quite clearly the liquidation of Judaism and Jewish consciousness in the U.S.S.R.

Protests on this basis, therefore, must be frequent and strong enough to break through the Iron Curtain barrier and reach the Communist rulers in the Kremlin.

In this same vein, I applaud the recent action of the Rabbinical Council of America, the leading orthodox Jewish organization of rabbis, in appealing to the United Nations for the release of the imprisoned Russian Jewish leaders. I believe this protest should be emulated by many other groups.

I have received a partial transcript of what the Rabbinical Council of America said at its midwinter convention, January 17, 1962. It appealed to the United Nations to seek the relief of Jewish religious leaders now in prison in Russia primarily because of their religious convictions.

They said that the entire world "can only be repelled by the fact that religious heads of the Jewish community have been placed under charge and imprisoned. It is an imperative duty of the United Nations to implement the human rights of these individuals and to secure their relief. An appeal has been directed to the Soviet Government to make real the general worship of its 3 million Jewish citizens stating that the reputation of Soviet Russia can only be enhanced by the relief of the imprisoned religious leaders."

Also, I think it is fair to say that we in the United States owe a real debt of gratitude to a crusading newspaperman who first brought the information to light, to the world, with respect to the prosecutions of these Jewish religious leaders in the Soviet Union. I refer to Rowland Evans, Jr., of the New York Herald Tribune, who first broke the story that he has consistently followed through.

I shall ask unanimous consent that various newspaper pieces written by Mr. Evans may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the other members of the American press, who, with great generosity, have given tongue to this story, carried on the investigation with respect to it, and reported the story as it has developed in fact within the Soviet Union and in reports emanating from the Soviet Union. This is journalism at its best in giving public information and public enlightenment.

Mr. President, before I make a few general observations, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD with my remarks the report by the American Jewish Committee entitled "Jews Behind the Iron Curtain: January 1 to March 31, 1961"; the report by Rowland Evans, Jr., entitled "Told for the First Time, the Fate of a Jewish Leader in the Soviet," in the New York Herald Tribune, November 6, 1961; the editorial entitled "Spirit of Stalin" from the Jewish Chronicle of London, November 10; the report by Dr. Nahum Goldmann, president of the World Zionist Organization, entitled "The Jewish Condition in Russia," which appeared in the Jewish Forum, November 1961; and the New York Herald Tribune report on November 18 headlined "Aroused Conscience—Rabbis' Pleas to U.N.: Free Russia's Jews."

There being no objection, the report, articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEWS BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN: JANUARY 1 TO MARCH 31, 1961

This report discusses events affecting Jews behind the Iron Curtain from January 1 to March 31, 1961.

THE SOVIET UNION

Criticism of Soviet discrimination against the Jews continued to make news. The Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations, representing B'nai B'rith in the United States, the Board of Deputies of British Jews, and the South African Board of Jewish Deputies, submitted to the U.N. Subcommittee on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities evidence that Soviet Jews are deprived of outlets for religious, cultural, and educational expression. Its memorandum showed that the present is far worse than the twenties and early thirties, though some improvement has followed Stalin's death in 1953.[1]

U.S. Senator KENNETH KEATING addressed a letter to the chief American delegate to the U.N., Adlai Stevenson, suggesting the possibility of a U.N. remedy for the plight of the Soviet Jews. Ambassador Stevenson forwarded Senator KEATING's letter to the State Department with a request that the matter be studied further.[2]

The World Zionist Congress, meeting in Jerusalem, expressed its concern about the future of Soviet Jews and requested the Soviet Government to permit emigration to Israel and to make possible a normal religious life for Soviet Jews.[3]

Former Israeli Prime Minister Moshe Sharett, a member of the Jewish agency executive, expressed anxiety about antisemitic articles in the Soviet press.[4]

A conference of Italian intellectuals and political leaders of various political leanings and representing the major religious denominations met in Rome to discuss the problem of Soviet Jewry. Like the conference convened by Dr. Nahum Goldmann in the fall of 1960 in Paris (see "Jews Behind the Iron Curtain," July 16–Oct. 15, 1960, pp. 4–5) it discussed the many areas of national and communal life in which the Jews are discriminated against. It presented a resolution to the Soviet Ambassador in Rome requesting "revocation of the Soviet ban against Jewish schools, theaters, and newspapers" and called upon the Soviet Government to "repress the publication of anti-Jewish attacks" in the Soviet press. It also appealed to the Soviet Government to permit the emigration of Jews. One of the speakers at the conference, a prominent Communist senator, Umberto Terracini, of Jewish origin, attempted to defend Soviet policy by citing the Soviet creation of a Jewish autonomous region in Birobidjan. He asserted that the present situation of the Soviet Jews stemmed from their refusal to settle there, and added that the Stalinist terror had affected Jews and non-Jews alike. The Italian press paid considerable attention to the conference.[5]

The Jewish Student Union of France, which is considered leftist, adopted a resolution expressing its concern over "the deprivation of legal rights" suffered by Soviet Jews. As a result of the resolution, the French Student Union, of which the Jewish group is an affiliate, planned to call upon the Soviet Government to stop its discriminatory policies against the Jews.[6]

The Moscow radio in its broadcast to North America denied the existence of any anti-Jewish discrimination in the Soviet Union and asserted that Jews enjoy the same opportunities as other national and religious groups. The broadcast, as usual, mentioned Jews prominent in the Soviet hierarchy, presumably as proof of those opportunities. The broadcast was made in response to the petition filed with the U.N. mentioned earlier.[7] The 1960 Paris conference on the Soviet Jews was attacked in the Soviet journal New Times. An article by Zinovy Sheinis, who specilizes in anti-Israel propaganda, accused Nahum Goldmann and other Zionist leaders of a "lying campaign against the Soviet Union." The author charged that the conference was supported by the United States and West Germany and that the real goal of the meeting was not to help Soviet Jews but to intensify the cold war.[8]

The August 1960 newspaper story in Dagestan, which alleged that Jews use Moslem blood for ritual purposes (see "Jews Behind the Iron Curtain," Oct. 16–Dec. 31, 1960, pp. 1–2), continued to attract much attention. A group of leading Jews in Dagestan, including a deputy to the Supreme Soviet of that republic, declared that the Dagestani Jews enjoy full equality and experience no discrimination whatever. They conceded that the publication of the article was a mistake—for which its irresponsible author was disciplined, they added—but maintained that this was an isolated exception and that harmony prevailed.[9] The Moscow correspondent of the Communist New York Morning Freiheit, Solomon Rabinovich, after visiting Dagestan, wrote that the article, which according to him was really a letter to the editor by a retired pensioner, was universally denounced by the Dagestanis, including the Moslem clergy. Saying that his visit to several local synagogues had showed him that the Jews were not interfered with in the practice of their religion, he alleged great progress by the mountain Jews under the Soviet regime, with all political and cultural opportunities open to them. According to him, Russian translations of books by mountain Jewish authors are published locally.[10]

Andre Blumel visited the Soviet Union again and was received by the Minister of Culture, Ekatarina Furtseva. The basis for this meeting was laid during Blumel's previous visit to Russia (see "Jews Behind the

---

[1] New York Post, Jan. 8, 1961; Jewish Telegraphic Agency, Daily News Bulletin, Jan. 31, 1961.

[2] J.T.A., Daily News Bulletin, Feb. 10, 1961.

[3] New York Times, Jan. 10, 1961.

[4] J.T.A., Daily News Bulletin, Feb. 15, 1961.

[5] Ibid., Mar. 27, 1961; Jewish Chronicle (London), Mar. 31, 1961.

[6] J.T.A., Daily News Bulletin, Jan. 9, 1961.

[7] Jewish Observer and Middle East Review (London), Jan. 20, 1961.

[8] New Times (Moscow), January 1961.

[9] Jewish Chronicle, Feb. 3, 1961.

[10] Ibid., Mar. 31, 1961.

Iron Curtain," Oct. 15–Dec. 31, 1960, pp. 2–7), and the purpose was to persuade her to permit greater cultural autonomy to Soviet Jewry.

This mission ended in complete failure. Furtseva cited not very relevant figures which purported to demonstrate Jewish equality and mentioned a number of recently published Jewish works as proof of the cultural opportunities available to the Jews. Blumel reminded her that in the last census about half a million Jews declared that their native tongue is Yiddish and he proposed that publication in that language be resumed, contrasting the present lack of facilities for Yiddish with the period of Lenin. Furtseva replied that "the Jews themselves will probably be offended if we push them back to this Yiddish past." She also remarked that "privileges" for Jews might arouse resentment among the other minorities. Finally she said that any concessions to Jewish culture would be not for internal reasons, "but in order to please our friends outside of the U.S.S.R." [11]

Evidently in order to please those friends, it was announced that a magazine in Yiddish—Soviet Homeland—edited by the Yiddish writer Aaron Vergelis, would start publication in June. The initial printing is to be some 25,000 copies, but the secretary of the Writers' Union, Alexei Surkov, suggested that the number might be increased in the future. Surkov also stated that this literary magazine is for authors writing in Yiddish, and that in addition the Union of Soviet Writers will continue to sponsor translations of Yiddish works into Russian. Present with Mr. Surkov at a conference in London was Alexei Adzhubei, Nikita Khrushchev's son-in-law and editor in chief of Izvestia, who stated that there are no obstacles for Jews who wish to speak, read, or learn Yiddish, but that there are few such Jews in the Soviet Union today and still fewer who wish their children to learn it.[12]

At a meeting of the central committee of the Soviet Communist Party on agriculture, Nikita Khrushchev read a letter from a Jewish woman, formerly chairman of a collective farm, asserting that she has been dismissed from her post because of her Jewish origin. According to Blumel, Khrushchev said: "It is intolerable that antisemitism should persist in a Communist state," and ordered that she be reinstated.[13]

A deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the Byelorussian Republic, Ye. Margolin, was recalled from his position by the overwhelming majority of the voters of his district, accused of machinations and padding accounts as chairman of a collective farm in the Minsk district. He was dismissed from his job and expelled from the party and his case was turned over to the criminal authorities.[14] While the recall of a deputy in the Soviet Union is not unknown, it is extremely rare.

It was reported that only in six large Soviet cities did the Jewish communities obtain permission to bake matzoth this year. Elsewhere permission was refused, and the Israeli chief rabbinate sent matzoth to the chief rabbi of Moscow for distribution to Jewish communities unable to bake their own.[15]

The Soviet Academy of Sciences published a pocket book entitled "The Reactionary Nature of Judaism: A Short Survey of the Origins and Class Character of the Jewish Religion," by I. M. Shakhnovich, who had previously published studies against Judaism. The book, of which 17,000 copies were printed, depicts Judaism as a reactionary religion serving the interests of the rabbis and Zionists. It also represents Jewish organizations and leaders as traditional opponents of progressive movements of the working class. However, the author thinks that it is losing its hold over the masses.[16]

Ilya G. Ehrenburg was awarded his second Order of Lenin by the Soviet Government on the occasion of his 70th birthday,[17] and the Soviet press reviewed his creative activity. It was pointed out that, while he had occasionally strayed from the straight Communist path, he was usually able to find the right solutions to problems, his main concern always being justice and happiness for the masses. His antiwar writings were emphasized, as was the fact that despite his age Ehrenburg is still very active in the peace movement.[18]

About 1,500 writers, artists, and other Soviet intellectuals attended a celebration honoring Ehrenburg. Addressing the audience, the writer declared that although he is a Russian writer, he is "a Jew and intend[s] to remain a Jew as long as a single antisemite is left." He said that he is proud to be designated a Jew on his passport and reminded his hearers, some of whom participated actively in the anticosmopolitan campaign in Stalin's last years, of the bitter atmosphere that prevailed in those days.[19]

In his memoirs, published in a Moscow literary journal, Ehrenburg unmistakably alludes to the fate of the great poet Osip E. Mandelstam, a Jew. Mandelstam disappeared during the purges of the 1930's. Ehrenburg says he died in 1940, in some unspecified, remote place.[20]

The Yiddish singer Emil Horowitz won first place in the Moscow competition for singers of popular songs. Horowitz has a traveling troupe.[21] A play entitled "Good Luck," by the Yiddish playwright Motel Saktsier, was staged in a large auditorium in one of Moscow's leading hotels.[22]

Ralf Gerrets, Jan Viks, and Aim Mere were tried in Tallinn, Estonia, accused of having organized and participated in murders of civilians and prisoners of war during World War II. They were implicated in the murder of 125,000 in Estonia, including some who were brought there from other countries. Mere, now in England and tried in absentia, was the chief of the Estonian security police in charge of punitive operations; Gerrets was assistant commandant of the Jagala concentration camp, and Viks was a guard in that camp. Besides their other crimes, they were specifically charged with the mass murder of Estonian, Polish, Czech, and German Jews. They were all sentenced to death, and Gerrets and Viks were in fact executed.[23] The Soviet Foreign Ministry dispatched a note to the Australian Government requesting the extradition of Ervin R. Viks as a war criminal accused of participation in mass murders in Estonia.[24]

SOVIET POLICY ON ISRAEL AND THE MIDDLE EAST

An article in Trud, "Assemblage of Bankrupts," subjected the December 1960 World Zionist Congress to a vicious attack. It describes the congress as having taken place in an atmosphere of moral and spiritual crisis for Zionism, and then procedes to give the Soviet version of the historical background of Zionism, characterized as a reactionary nationalist ideology designed to distract the Jewish masses from the class struggle. It claims that Zionism is historically tied to imperialism and alleges that Zionist leaders exhorted their followers to fight against the Soviet regime after the Bolshevik revolution. It also claims that deals were then made with the pogromist leaders of the White armies. It further charges Zionist organizations with supplying the Nazis with war material on condition that it be used only against the Soviet Army.

In the new State of Israel, the article continues, power was seized by ultrareactionary Zionist elements, headed by Ben-Gurion, which, supported by American imperialists, turned Israel into a tool of imperialistic monopolies. The Arab minority as well as the Jews from Afro-Asian countries are alleged to be repressed and discriminated against, and the Israeli treatment of national minorities is said to border on racism. It is allegedly through fraud, blackmail, and the use of religious prejudice that the Zionist propagandists succeeded in persuading some unsuspecting people to come to Israel, where, instead of the promised paradise, they found unbearably harsh conditions. The Zionists are accused of being in the forefront of the anti-Soviet campaign and of spreading vicious lies about the Soviet Union. The article cites an American Jew who visited Russia recently and who discovered with his own eyes the falseness of Zionist propaganda. According to this man, Soviet Jews lead a happy life and enjoy complete equality. Against this background, Zionist demands for the emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel are deemed absurd. The Zionist leaders are dismissed as obedient lackeys of the American imperialists and the partners of Nazis, now occupying high positions in West Germany, whose hands are stained with the blood of millions of Jews.[25]

In another Trud article, "Rotten Goods From Under the Coattails," one N. Erikh contends that the archivist of the Israeli Embassy in Moscow, Jacob Kelman, engages in activities incompatible with his diplomatic status. It was charged that in frequent trips throughout the Soviet Union, Kelman talks to Soviet citizens and slanders Soviet life and conditions, and that often he distributes publications which libel the Soviet Union. Kelman is alleged also to attend a synagogue regularly in order to force the worshipers to take illegal anti-Soviet literature, especially Vestnik Israilia ("Israel Courier"), a Zionist magazine printed in the Russian language in Israel. Often, it is alleged, this propaganda is wrapped in prayer shawls given to worshipers. The members of the Moscow synagogue protested Kelman's behavior to the Council on Religious Affairs and demanded that the Soviet authorities punish him for his misdeeds.[26] A spokesman for the Israeli Foreign Ministry, rejecting the allegation, stated that the Soviet Embassy in Israel is free to distribute information about the Soviet Union to Israelis who ask for it.[27]

The Soviet press published a statement by the Israeli Communist Party claiming that the resignation by David Ben-Gurion in December 1960 was due to a crisis in the reckless governmental policy.[28] It was announced that the Israeli Communist Party, under the leadership of its secretary-general, Solomon Mikunis, was considering the party's role in the forthcoming Knesset election campaign. Preparations were also made for the 14th congress of the party, from May 31 to June 3.[29]

---

[11] Ibid., Feb. 3, 1961; J.T.A., Daily News Bulletin, Jan. 31, 1961; Ha-Aretz (Jerusalem), Jan. 29, 1961.

[12] New York Times, Feb. 12, 1961; Jewish Chronicle, Feb. 24, Mar. 3, 10, 1961.

[13] Jewish Chronicle, Feb. 10, 1961.

[14] Pravda, Mar. 15, 1961.

[15] Jewish Chronicle, Mar. 31, 1961.

[16] Ibid, Feb. 10, 1961.

[17] Pravda, Jan. 24, 1961.

[18] Izvestia, Jan. 26, 1961.

[19] Jewish Chronicle, Feb. 17, 1961.

[20] New York Times, Feb. 12, 1961.

[21] Folks-shtimme (Warsaw), Feb. 4, 1961.

[22] Ibid., Mar. 4, 1961.

[23] Pravda, Mar. 7–12, 1961; Izvestia, Mar. 7–12, 1961; New York Times, Mar. 31, 1961.

[24] Izvestia, Feb. 26, 1961.

[25] Trud, Jan. 6, 1961.

[26] Ibid., Mar. 16, 1961.

[27] J.T.A., Daily News Bulletin, Mar. 17, 1961.

[28] Pravda, Feb. 2, 1961.

The Soviet press reprinted reports in the Italian Communist newspaper L'Unita about the mass arrests of 200 Communist and Communist sympathizers last December in Egypt. Together with 800 other "progressives" arrested earlier, they are confined in a camp in the desert. The Soviet press deplored the contradiction between United Arab Republic President Gamal Abdel Nasser's anti-imperialist stand and his arrest of "the best fighters against imperialism." This, they say, tends to weaken the struggle for Arab independence and progress.[30] The Soviet press also reprinted, from the London Daily Worker, an appeal from the Egyptian Communist Party asking help for these political prisoners and claiming that they are subjected to brutal treatment, including physical torture, as a result of which many of them have died.[31]

The third anniversary of the formation of the United Arab Republic was hailed in the Soviet press and a reception was held at the United Arab Republic Embassy in Moscow.[32] An exchange of appropriate felicitations took place between Khrushchev and Leonid Brezhnev, on the one hand, and Nasser, on the other.[33]

Before his departure from the Soviet Union, the United Arab Republic ambassador in Moscow, Mohammed al-Kouni, paid farewell visits to Khrushchev and other Soviet officials.[34] Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister V. S. Semenov visited Cairo and was received by United Arab Republic leaders.[35]

The August 1960 agreement on Soviet aid for construction of the Aswan Dam was ratified by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet.[36] The Soviet press published a lengthy article on Aswan by Professor I. Komzin, the chief Soviet expert.[37] Five diesel generators and other heavy machinery were sent from the Urals region to Aswan.[38]

The Bolshoi Ballet and the Leningrad Opera gave a number of performances in Cairo and Alexandria and met with enthusiastic receptions.[39] An exhibit of Soviet farming and highway machinery opened in Cairo.[40]

The Iraqi military attaché in Moscow gave a reception marking the Iraqi Army Day which several Soviet leaders attended.[41] The August 1960 Soviet-Iraqi agreement on economic and technical cooperation was ratified by the Soviet Union.[42] The Soviet press published accounts of technical assistance given Iraq.[43]

The Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee sent a message, entitled "We cannot remain silent," to Iraqi President Abdul Karim Kassim, protesting the arrest and trial of "progressive figures" and union leaders. Petitions by "the Iraqi public" for the release of political prisoners held without charges were published in Moscow.[44]

The Soviet Union helped Yemen in constructing port facilities at Ahmedi. On completion of the project, the Soviet press featured articles by V. Bakayev, minister of merchant marine, and G. Pyasetsky, who was in charge of the Soviet specialists. A Soviet delegation arrived in Ahmedi to participate in the ceremonies.[45]

POLAND

The Polish Government allocated a million zlotys (there are about 100 zlotys to the dollar) and the Social and Cultural Association of the Polish Jews pledged an additional 750,000 zlotys to pay for a monument to Jews killed in the Treblinka concentration camp. It is estimated that the total cost of the monument will be about Zl10 million. A special commitee, consisting of representatives of governmental and municipal authorities and of Jewish organizations, was charged with building the memorial.[46] A monument is to be erected in Lublin in honor of 46,000 Jews murdered by the Nazis there, and an appeal was made to all surviving Lublin Jews in Poland and abroad to help in its building. Sculptors were asked to submit plans for the monument to a special committee.[47] A monument was built in the town of Wroclawek in honor of Jews murdered there during the war, and a public meeting was held for its dedication. Representatives of the government and of the association spoke.[48] Jewish writers, artists, and photographers have begun a campaign to register all the Jewish historical monuments in Poland, including synagogues, cemeteries, and streets and houses of Jewish interest.[49]

A new Jewish cooperative was organized in Warsaw to deal in services; it will employ about 250.[50] The Association of the Polish Jews undertook a campaign to increase the number and activities of the "artistic circles" affiliated with the 27 local units of the association.[51]

An exhibition of works by the painter Rafal Chwales was opened in the building of the ministry of culture in Warsaw. Many of his paintings deal with Jewish themes.[52] A Jewish writer and actor, Horacy Safrin, was awarded the order of Polonia Restituta by the government on the 40th anniversary of his work.

Among other things, Safrin is an outstanding translator of Shakespeare and other English classics.[53] The dean of the Yiddish theater in Poland, Abraham Morewski, celebrated his 75th birthday and was awarded the Polonia Restituta at special ceremonies in the Yiddish State Theater.[54] The Yiddish theater in Poland staged Sholem Aleichem's "Thirteen Barrels of Ducats." The performance was received very well and in reviewing it the Polish press stressed that the play succeeds in bringing to life a world which is gone forever.[55]

The 13th issue of the Bulletin of the Chief Commission for the Study of the Hitlerite Crimes in Poland includes a detailed study of "The Liquidation of Jews in Camps in Poland," which contains a number of documents published for the first time.[56] At a meeting of the International Oswiecim (Auschwitz) Committee in Warsaw, the chairman, Professor Robert Weitz of France, emphasized that the chief function of the committee was still the intensive search for war criminals. Hope was expressed that the trial of Adolf Eichmann would disclose evidence implicating those of his collaborators not yet brought to justice. Other speakers stated that out of a thousand war criminals listed by the committee, the West German authorities had succeeded in arresting only 16. A monument in Auschwitz to all who died there was also discussed. About 630 artists from all over the world took part in a competition for planning and designing it.[57] The Polish press published the Israeli indictment against Eichmann.[58]

RUMANIA

The chief rabbi of Rumania, Dr. Moses Rosen, has been reelected a deputy to the Rumanian parliament as representative of the Jewish minority. In a pre-election broadcast Rabbi Rosen called on all Jews to vote in order "to manifest their solidarity with the policy of the regime." Several other deputies believed to be Jews were also elected.[59]

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

The Czechoslovak Government allocated Kcs10 million (about $1,300,000) in the 1961 national budget for repairs to religious buildings, including synagogues. Only synagogues in the large cities would be given subsidies. The government also permitted the reopening of a number of synagogues for Sabbath and festival services. In those places where the old synagogues have been destroyed or converted to other use the local authorities are to provide suitable accommodations for the worshippers.[60]

BULGARIA

Israel consumer goods, especially sweaters and knitwear, are being sold for the first time in the largest department store in Sofia, the capital of Bulgaria. It was agreed that the Bulgarian circus would give a number of performances in Israel. The Central Board of Bulgarian Jewish Communities adopted a resolution at its annual meeting protesting against payment by Israel for defense counsel for Eichmann and demanding severe punishment for him.[61]

EAST GERMANY

In the first issue of the Union of Jewish Communities of East Germany's official monthly, Nachrichtenblatt, the leading editorial asserted that although the number of Jews in the eight Jewish communities of East Germany is small, Jewish religious and communal life is making vigorous progress.[62]

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Nov. 6, 1961]

TOLD FOR THE FIRST TIME, THE FATE OF A JEWISH LEADER IN THE SOVIET

(By Rowland Evans, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—One of the most prominent Jewish leaders in Leningrad has been arrested, tried and sentenced to 12 years in jail for consorting with so-called foreign agents and other treasonable activities, it may now be reported on good authority.

The secret trial was held at Leningrad on or about October 9, and lasted 4 days. So far as could be learned on a recent tour of Russia by this reporter, no word of the trial appeared in the Soviet press.

Sources of the information that Gedalia Rubinovich Pechersky was arrested last June and convicted in October for crimes against the state were of undoubted veracity. They cannot be revealed, for the obvious reason that to do so might expose the sources to political harassment.

---

[29] Trybuna Ludu (Warsaw), Mar. 25, 1961.

[30] Pravda, Feb. 5, 1961.

[31] Ibid., Feb. 5, 1961.

[32] Ibid., Feb. 21, 23, 1961.

[33] Ibid., Mar. 5, 1961.

[34] Ibid., Feb. 5, 8, 9, 14, 1961.

[35] Ibid., Feb. 24, 1961.

[36] Ibid., Jan. 27, 1961.

[37] Ibid., Feb. 21, 1961.

[38] Izvestia, Feb. 24, 1961.

[39] Pravda, Feb. 17, 1961.

[40] Izvestia, Mar. 31, 1961.

[41] Pravda, Jan. 7, 1961.

[42] Ibid., Jan. 11, 1961.

[43] Ibid., Mar. 17, 1961.

[44] Ibid., Feb. 8, 10, 1961.

[45] Ibid., Mar. 25, Apr. 2, 1961; Izvestia, Mar. 26, 1961.

[46] Jewish Chronicle, Mar. 31, 1961.

[47] Ibid., Feb. 24, 1961.

[48] Folks-shtimme, Feb. 4, 1961.

[49] Jewish Chronicle, Mar. 24, 1961.

[50] Folks-shtimme, Jan. 21, 1961.

[51] Ibid., Jan. 21, 1961.

[52] Ibid., Mar. 18, 1961.

[53] Ibid., Feb. 2, 1961.

[54] J.T.A., Daily News Bulletin, Mar. 23, 1961.

[55] Folks-shtimme, Jan. 21, 1961.

[56] Trybuna Ludu, Feb. 4, 1961.

[57] Ibid., Mar. 27, 1961.

[58] Ibid., Feb. 23, 1961.

[59] Jewish Chronicle, Mar. 17, 1961.

[60] Ibid., Jan. 6, Feb. 17, 1961.

[61] Ibid., Mar. 3, 1961.

[62] Ibid., Mar. 31, 1961.

Two lesser Jewish leaders in the Leningrad area were arrested with Mr. Pechersky. Information available to this reporter indicates that their last names are Dynkin and Kaganov, but efforts to learn their full names were unavailing.

One of the oddest aspects about the Pechersky case, and one that particularly disturbs Western observers, is that the secret trial took place just before the opening of the 22d Communist Party Congress in Moscow.

One of the chief purposes of the congress, as is now well known, was to continue and intensify the drive against the crimes of the Stalin era and to democratize the Communist Party apparatus. It was Stalin who in 1948 ended all manifestations of separate cultural life for the Jews.

The 3 million or so Russian Jews comprise the 11th largest cultural minority in the Soviet Union, out of a total of perhaps 150 cultural and ethnic minorities, many of which are permitted to run their own schools in their own languages, publish their own newspapers, and engage in similar cultural enterprises.

Shortly after Stalin took administrative measures to end virtually all Jewish communal activities, except the right to worship in synagogues, an estimated 450 Jewish writers, artists and intellectuals were arrested and eventually executed.

Since Stalin's death in 1953, this policy has been relaxed somewhat. Since 1959, for example, five Jewish classics were published and some Jewish variety shows and amateur theatrical troupes permitted. A bimonthly literary journal named Soviet Homeland started appearing in September of this year.

Mr. Pechersky was the former lay chairman of the Leningrad Jewish religious community. For years he was the outspoken advocate of Jewish religious life. Whether he is an isolated victim of special circumstance, or whether the action against him may be part of a new campaign against Jews could not be established. Reliable sources of information are both scarce and understandably reticent. But the history of Soviet discrimination against Russia's Jews offers evidence to support the view that the Pechersky trial, disclosed for the first time in this report, could be a harbinger of a new anti-Jewish campaign.

Last year, according to information from several unconnected sources, authorities closed up to a dozen synagogues in towns and cities off the beaten track of the tourist.

THE BLACK YEARS

The 5 years following Stalin's repressive measures in 1948 were known by Russian Jews as "the black years," culminating in the notorious "doctor's plot" which was exposed as a fraud shortly after Stalin died.

With the accession of Nikita S. Khrushchev's collective leadership in 1953, and the execution of Beria, the notorious chief of the secret police, restrictions on the Jews eased, but a strong pattern of discrimination remained. The new leaders have consistently sought to blame the "doctor's plot" on Beria, but in fact it was Beria who unmasked the plot as a fraud.

The reported closing of up to a dozen synagogues last year and the arrest and 12-year sentence of Mr. Pechersky hint at the possibility of a new and concerted campaign. On this point, however, one can only speculate.

Mr. Pechersky was elected chairman of the Leningrad Jewish community after Stalin's death, with the approval of the Leningrad head of the State Committee for Religious Affairs. His stubborn and public battle for Jewish rights, however, apparently forced his demotion in 1956 to the post of deputy chairman. In those 3 years he had succeeded in repairing the premises of the Leningrad synagogue, establishing the ritual slaughtering of fowl and gaining official approval for the baking of matzoth for the Feast of the Passover.

STRIPPED OF DUTIES

A year later, Mr. Pechersky was stripped of this lesser title and of all official duties in the Jewish life of Leningrad. He continued his public pressure for reforms and was a prominent figure, not only to Leningrad Jews, but also to important foreign visitors who toured the synagogue, which for years has served as a showplace to tourists.

The Jewish community in Leningrad is known for its aggressive stand and its stubborn struggle to restore and preserve Jewish traditions. All told, there are 250,000 Jews in Leningrad, not all of them practicing or religious Jews. This Jewish population is second only to Moscow's, where 500,000 Jews live. In all the Soviet Union, 2,268,000 citizens voluntarily declared themselves as Jews in the 1959 census, out of the estimated total Jewish population of 3 million.

On this reporter's 8,000-mile tour of the Soviet Union, there were indications of efforts to discourage contact between foreign tourists and religious Jews. There also have been recent signs that discrimination against Jews has become a controversial political matter among Soviet citizens.

The Literary Gazette, published in Moscow, recently reproduced a column by Yevjeny Yevtushenko, the 28-year-old poet who is much in fashion with the intellectual rebels of Moscow, entitled "Babi-Yar," an indictment of anti-Semitism that specifically lamented the failure of the Soviet Government to erect a memorial to thousands of Jews slaughtered by the Nazis in Kiev during the war and tossed into a ravine at Babi-Yar.

In Moscow recently, Yevtushenko was almost mobbed by thousands of youthful idolators who wished to hear him speak. He mounted a platform to read a poem called "You Can Call Me a Communist," in which he says he will remain a Communist to the end "but never become an unctuous bootlicker." His poem "Babi-Yar" includes these words:

"Let the 'Internationale' sound out when the last anti-Semite on earth is buried."

[From the Jewish Chronicle, Nov. 10, 1961]

SPIRIT OF STALIN

Whatever the real meaning of the decanonization of Stalin for the Russians, for the Jewish minority in the Soviet Union the situation continues to deteriorate. The arrest, secret trial, and the imprisonment of three leading Leningrad Jews on alleged charges of consorting with foreign agents demonstrate once more Soviet determination to terrorize still further the Jewish minority and especially to isolate the Jews even more completely from any contacts with their coreligionists abroad.

As all communal Jewish life in Russia has been strictly forbidden, it is only natural that a Jewish visitor from Britain or the United States should seek contact with fellow Jews through visiting the synagogues where, despite difficulties, Jews still congregate. To restrict these contacts the Soviet authorities have resorted to a ruthless closing down of many synagogues throughout Russia. Now they have adopted a new and even harsher policy of repression and intimidation, one that must have come as a shock not only to Jews but even to those of Russia's friends abroad who still refuse to believe that the Jewish minority has been singled out for suppression in a manner not far different from the methods practiced by Stalin. The charges against the unfortunate Jewish leaders of maintaining contact with foreign agents are as reminiscent of Stalin's days as the secret trial and the harshness of their sentences.

Some further light on the whole shocking affair is thrown by a report that the trial took place in Leningrad at the beginning of October, and that the heavy sentences might have been influenced by a courageous public demonstration of thousands of Jews outside the Leningrad synagogue during the High Holy Days. These large gatherings of Jews during festive seasons have been an irritant in the Kremlin for the past few years. These demonstrations, like the vote of 500,000 Jews who, during the last census, declared Yiddish to be their mother tongue, made manifest the unyielding spirit of Russian Jewry and a growing determination on the part of a large section, including youth, to remain Jews irrespective of Russian propaganda and oppressive measures. The Jews who gathered around the Leningrad synagogue singing Jewish folksongs and dancing Jewish dances adopted a manner of protest that should convince even the most ruthless persecutors of the futility of trying to suppress a people's identity and spiritual aspirations.

Three Leningrad Jews have been made to pay the bitter price for their community's stubborn refusal to yield to repression, and their arrest and sentence must give fresh cause for disquiet and protest. For whatever the effect, it is the moral duty of us all everywhere to continue to protest against the policy of discrimination practiced against Jews, the weakest and most defenseless minority in the U.S.S.R. While Stalin's body has been banished from the Kremlin, for the millons of Jews in Russia his spirit lives on.

[From the Jewish Forum, November 1961]

THE JEWISH CONDITION IN RUSSIA

(By Dr. Nahum Goldmann, president, World Zionist Organization)

(On August 22 the first Yiddish language magazine in 13 years—Sovietische Heimland—made its debut, an event hailed as another retreat from Stalin's anti-Jewish policy. Atheistic, 130 pages long, and a bimonthly of 25,000 copies, it is supposedly addressed to the 2 million Jews living in the Soviet Union. Loyal Jews of course are still wondering why the Stalinist policy continues to apply to Hebrew and to Judaism particularly. The following article by one of Jewry's most eloquent statemen is therefore of special significance.—THE EDITOR.)

A general antireligous campaign is being conducted in the Soviet Union, but where the Jewish religion is concerned its character is particularly unpleasant. At times, outrightly anti-Semitic. Rabbis and other officials of the Jewish faith are depicted as crooks and speculators and the mere publication of names of Jews attending services or serving as members of local synagogue committees intimidates believers.

In view of deeply rooted survivals of traditional anti-Semitism—the existence of which is acknowledged by Soviet officials themselves—it is no surprise that this leads to deplorable consequences, as happened in the notorious Daghestan case. Be it as it may, this is quite incompatible with an officially proclaimed line that atheist propaganda and education should be conducted with "cultured, tolerant, and scientific methods."

Visitors to the Soviet Union continue to report severe shortages of Jewish prayerbooks, sacraments, and other objects of the faith. Though some facilities are granted to a few communities, the religious needs of Jewish believers in most parts of the Soviet Union are neglected. There is no Jewish religious central organ or body to concern itself with the requirements of isolated Jewish communities and synagogues scattered over the U.S.S.R., nor is there any provision for religious exchange between Soviet rabbis and their colleagues elsewhere. Judaism consequently experiences greater discrimination there than other religious denominations.

No signs of improvement can, unfortunately, be traced in the field. On the contrary. There has been a wave of synagogue closures in the past year, more often than not preceded by an unbridled anti-Jewish religious press campaign mostly on the local level. Since September of last year, synagogues have been closed in Stalino, Kasaviurt, Kobuleti, Saratov, Rezina, Kremenchug, Poltava, Viliki-Luki, Soroka, Novgorod-Volinski, Kalinovits, Tukkum and Czernovits.

Nor has there been improvement relating to the Jewish national and cultural life. No national Jewish institution or organization in the whole U.S.S.R. Nor any relaxation of the taboo on Jewish schools, Jewish clubs, Jewish societies, and other Jewish institutions. In short, no organized or systematic Jewish activity, social or cultural.

The growing Jewish generation has no means whatever to learn the history of its people, or to become acquainted with the life of its Jewish brethren abroad. Though Soviet-Jewish writers still write in Yiddish—some even managing to publish their works in Communist Yiddish publications outside the U.S.S.R.—there are no such facilities in the Soviet Union itself. The several works of contemporary Yiddish writers that have seen the light of day in Russia have thus far been cleared for Russian translations only.

We need not, however, overlook occasional moments of relief in the Soviet blank of Jewish creative life. Evidence from Soviet publications and from observations made by foreign visitors, somehow indicate that thousands of Jews continue to crowd the scattered Yiddish folklore concerts. Theatrical perfromances occasionally given by Yiddish amateur troupes seem to play to packed houses. After an absence of Jewish publications for many years, three books in Yiddish were issued 2 years ago. The collected works of classical Yiddish writers like Sholem Aleichem, Mendele Mocher Sforim, and Peretz were, it is reported, sold out. A Birobidzhan Almanac in Yiddish and Russian was published last year. Two Yiddish books are promised—the selected works of David Bergelson, Yiddish writer executed with other Jewish men of letters in August of 1952, and a volume of poems and letters by Asher Shwartzman, Soviet Yiddish poet killed in the 1919 civil war.

And as you may have seen in the newspapers, the Yiddish bimonthly "Sovietishe Heimland," has appeared in an edition of 25,000—and by its admission, atheistic. But these concessions only emphasize the void in Jewish national creative life. They become significant only because they point up—implicitly—that the Soviet authorities themselves admit a hunger for Jewish culture in their country. For if there are potential readers for literature by writers like Sholem Aleichem, Peretz, Mendele—even Bergelson and Shwartzman—there must be a potential readership for Jewish books of all kinds. Not the least by writers who share the experiences and preoccupations of the present generation. * * *

In the face of such evidence, Soviet authorities can no longer argue that they need not provide facilities for Jewish cultural life because the Jews do not need them. When the Soviet authorities further argue that Jews are granted facilities for a Jewish cultural life, their claim is unimpressive—especially when in the whole Soviet Union there is not one Jewish school. Not even in cities comprising hundreds of thousands of Jews. Nor is there a single public school where Jewish language and history are on the curriculum. Jewish kids, in other words, have no opportunity there to learn something of their national heritage.

Still there seem to emerge new nuances in the Soviet attitude toward Hebrew. In the 1959 issue of the minor Soviet Encyclopedia, for example, Hebrew is no longer defined as a "dead" language which "reactionaries" are trying to revive, but as a "cult" language—as a literary medium in several European and American countries and as the State language of Israel. And the official catalog of dictionaries issued in Moscow this year makes mention of a forthcoming publication (100,000 copies) of a Hebrew-Russian dictionary. Compiled by Prof. F. L. Shapiro and edited by Professor Grande, it will contain 30,000 words. When we recall how Hebrew was altogether taboo in the Soviet for a long stretch, this is indeed a welcome development.

Moreover, for religious Jews, I need not add, Hebrew has the added significance of being the language in which our religious rituals are conducted. Without the knowledge of it, we cannot read our prayers.

But it is not clear at this point what such minor concessions signify. Are they symptoms of a genuine reconsideration of Jewish cultural rights? Or a mere gesture to world opinion?

After an appeal was made to Soviet authorities to enable Soviet Jews whose families had been separated by the war and the Nazi holocaust to reunite with their kin, Premier Khrushchev at a press conference in Vienna (July of last year) declared that the Soviet Government had, in principle, nothing against family reunification. But he doubted, he said, whether there were people who wanted to leave the Soviet Union to join their relatives abroad. This after applications covering tens of thousands of individuals had been submitted. (Only a negligible number received favorable attention, by the way.)

Now that the Eichmann trial has revived memories of the tragedy experienced by millions of Jews, our appeal to the Soviet Government to do something in that direction might find greater response and understanding than the Premier's reply indicates.

Until recently the Soviet line of argument was rigid. Adamant. Unyielding. "There is no Jewish problem in the Soviet Union," said the authorities. "Soviet Jews, like all other Soviet citizens enjoy full rights. They occupy outstanding positions in science, music, the arts. If the Jews do not have their own cultural life it is because they themselves do not have need for such. They are not territorially administratively concentrated and, consequently, cannot have any schools or cultural institutions. They have totally integrated themselves with the local population. They have as many synagogues as they want. They have no contacts with world Jewry because they neither belong to nor have anything in common with the Jewish people outside the U.S.S.R., etc."

Such specious arguments have been repeated on other occasions. Khrushchev declared to the French Socialist delegation in May 1957: "The Jews speak Russian, Ukrainian, and so on, in accordance with the part of the country they reside in. Even if Jewish schools were opened very few volunteers would be willing to attend them. The Jews are dispersed throughout the whole of the Soviet Union. It is impossible to open a university in the Jewish language. There would not be enough students. As to the Jewish or Hebrew languages, there exists no demand for such."

And in an interview on July 24, 1957, the Premier was quoted again: "Our position is that it depends on the will of the Jews. If they want to create a state within our borders like Birobidzhan nobody is against this and it exists to this day. But the initiative must come from the Jews there. They could have their own language, schools, and traditions. The State language would be Jewish and they would have the benefits of anything they wanted. But to set up separate schools all over Russia would be too expensive."

And the Jewish-born Russian writer Ilya Ehrenburg, at another press conference, in Brussels a year later, declared: "There is no need for Yiddish culture in Soviet Russia. Jewish youth does not understand the language. There was a time when in Russia there was a big concentration of Jewish people who spoke Yiddish. After the Hitler persecutions those people did not exist any more and there was no necessity for the Yiddish language."

And an interview with Serge Groussard last year again quoted Khrushchev as saying: "A real Jewish cultural community is no more realizable than a political community. The Jews are interested in everything, probe deeply into everything, debate everything, and end by having profoundly different opinions."

And a declaration of Mikoyan, Khrushchev's deputy, at a press conference in New York, a year later, reiterated: "The Jewish population has merged with the Russian in Russian culture so fully that Jews participate in general culture and literature, on the Russian stage and in Russian literature. There is no Jewish problem in the Soviet Union at all. This problem is created by those who wish to impede good relations."

Continuing this line a year later, M. Kammari, Soviet academician and member of the CPSU CC, was quoted by the Jewish Observer and Middle East Review: "The Jews in the U.S.S.R. feel themselves completely free and equal with all other citizens without distinction as to nationality. They do not want to set themselves apart from the peoples among whom they live. They do not want to create their own special schools, theaters, etc."

Numerous cracks, however, began to appear last year in this wall of opposition.

The claim that Soviet Jews have no need for a Jewish culture seems to have disappeared from official Soviet and Communist communications. The Western Communist press, for example, official Soviet information bulletins issued abroad and such Soviet outlets as newspapers Trud and New Times spare no effort to inform the world of a flourishing Jewish cultural life in the Soviet Union. The success of Yiddish concerts and plays is described at length and in detail. The issuance of a Yiddish book or a translation of Yiddish poetry is given publicity.

To judge, for example, from a recent article entitled "The Assemblage of Bankrupts," Jews appear, after all to be a nationality. The author dwells on Jewish achievements in various fields, frankly boasts that "books and newspapers in the Jewish language are issued in the Soviet Union and a number of theatrical collectives perform there."

While in another article, entitled "Jews in the Soviet Union," editor Aaron Vergelis of the new Sovietishe Heimland writes: "We make no fuss about our cultural achievements for we believe that our achievements speak for themselves. When stories are written in our country about the big Jewish choral groups—in Riga, for instance, one of them has 100 members—we speak of them simply as choirs. Our many Jewish dramatic societies—in Leningrad or Vilnius, for example, can with justice be called proper theaters. And consider the galaxy of Jewish professional singers or reciters who have appeared on the scene in the Soviet Union. Can anyone imagine so large a number of first-rate masters of Jewish art developing their talent in a country that sneers at Jewish culture? This applies also to Soviet

Jewish literature, which in recent years has found its way to the millions of Russian readers—not to mention Yiddish editions, which go to Jewish readers too."

And "Sovietishe Heimland" is not a minor incident. Whereas there was "no need" for such a publication 2 years ago, the need for it has now been officially acknowledged. The very issuance of a Yiddish publication is a striking acknowledgment that there is a thirst for Jewish culture in the Soviet Union. These minimal "Jewish" concessions only point up the need for a genuine Jewish culture—in the form of Jewish schools, Jewish institutions, a truly Jewish press in Russian, Yiddish and Hebrew.

Such facilities are available to all other nationalities there. The Armenian Socialist Soviet Republic, for example, which celebrated its 40-year jubilee last May, found Premier Khrushchev proudly boasting: "The motherland has opened broad prospects of work and creative activity of service to the people for thousands of Armenians, who at one time, for various reasons and owing to circumstances, were deprived of their homeland. A hard fate has scattered the Armenian nation all over the world. Many people did not withstand the hard struggle for existence; many today are still forced to continue the hard drudgery of work in bondage. I have been told that Armenians living in exile wrote a song about a swallow which comes back to Armenia every year in the spring and brings greetings from the exiles in the various countries. On its return, this swallow tells the people a lot of good things about your Republic. That is why Armenians are keen to come back to their motherland. They return to socialist Armenia where they have every opportunity of comparing their homeland's past with its present and of comparing what socialism and capitalism offer to mankind. Returning to the homeland, especially when a man was born and grew up abroad and lived the greater part of his conscious life there, is a complex process. These people, after all, have been for a long time under the influence of bourgeoisie propaganda, bourgeoisie rules and standards of living. In a word, they have been forced to live by the laws of the jungle. Patience and determination are necessary to instill the new qualities of the Soviet man in these people. But one thing is certain: Soviet Socialist Armenia is now the center, the magnet which is attracting the best daughters and sons of the Armenian people. Republican organizations must continue to show solicitude about the work and life of people returning to the homeland."

To mark that "national" occasion, Rachia Kochar, celebrated Armenian author and member of the Armenian CPCC, wrote: "Those who do not know us say that the Armenian loves a wandering life, that this is a trait of his character. We know that such an opinion is unfair. The Armenian toiler loves his native country, his land, his water, his draft oxen, his sun and fruits, loves them with an ardent love and irresistible yearning. How numerous are the songs in which the Armenian farmer glorifies his soil and its fruit, calls his bullocks his brothers: 'Pull dear bullock of dear brother.' This love and longing calls home the Armenian toilers from all corners of the globe. They preserve their language and their culture. Far from the motherland, they open Armenian schools and libraries, issue Armenian newspapers and journals, speak to their children in their native tongue so that the latter, on coming to Armenia, should not be dumb citizens in their native land, where the most ancient and forever young Armenian language rings purely and freely."

To which we might add:

There is a great similarity between the circumstances of the two ancient nations—the Jews and the Armenians. Both experienced the ruin of their State in ancient times. Both suffered centuries of persecution and exile. Both have been scattered all over the world.

We hope and pray, therefore, that the day will come when the Soviet leaders will no longer find it difficult to see the Jews in that light and speak of them in that tone. We, therefore, appeal to the Soviet Government to grant religious Jews the rights officially stipulated in the Soviet Constitution and conceded to all other religious denominations.

Let us break through the wall of silence. Let us begin open discussion and exchange of opinion. We say to the Soviet authorities—let us, by all means, encourage rethinking of the uniqueness of Jewish history—a reevaluation of the Jewish conditions in the Soviet Union.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 18, 1962]

AROUSED CONSCIENCE—RABBIS PLEA TO U.N.: FREE RUSSIA'S JEWS

(By Jo-ann Price)

LAKEWOOD, N.J.—Leaders of this country's Orthodox Jewish rabbis, incensed and anxious over the jailings of Jews in the Soviet Union, yesterday asked the United Nations to seek their release.

A strongly worded statement, issued by the cochairmen of the midwinter conference of the Rabbinical Council of America, an influential organization of 300 rabbis, said that "the entire world can only be repelled by the fact that religious leaders of Russia's estimated 3 million Jews have been incarcerated for alleged treasonable activity."

It was released by Rabbi Samuel Landa, of Ozone Park, Queens, Jewish Center, and Rabbi Fabian Schonfeld, spiritual leader of Young Israel Synagogue, in Kew Gardens Hills, Queens, as the conference ended at the Brunswick Hotel.

The statement commended the New York Herald Tribune for exposing recent anti-Jewish incidents and arrests in the Soviet Union. The stories written last November by Rowland Evans, Jr., of the Herald Tribune Washington Bureau, and others that followed them, "aroused the conscience of the civilized world with regard to these grave and unjustified invasions of the basic principles of human justice," the rabbis said.

Reports that seeped through the Iron Curtain and were documented January 7 by Label A. Katz, of New Orleans, president of B'nai B'rith, have told of a steady assault on Jews in the Soviet Union since last June. Incidents included a quadrupled tax assessment on the clergy, dismissal of the director of the Moscow Yeshiva, and the disbanding of the Vaad Yeshiva, governing council of the Moscow Seminary.

Among the imprisoned Jewish leaders were Dr. Gedalia Rubinovich Pechersky, of Leningrad, and other ranking lay leaders of synagogues in the capitals of five Soviet republics. Little has appeared in the Soviet press about the anti-Jewish drive.

Many Jewish organizations have strongly protested the anti-Semitic acts by Soviet authorities but the Rabbinical Council is one of the few that has directed its appeal to the United Nations. Others have been the Religious Zionists of America and the Jewish Labor Committee. The United Synagogue of America, representing 1.4 million Conservative Jews, has asked the United States to inquire into the arrests. Most Jewish groups have urged the Kremlin to stop them.

Rabbis of the Rabbinical Council have about 1.5 million people in their congregations, many of whom are just a generation or two away from Russia and some of whom bear painful memories of Nazi atrocities.

Mr. JAVITS. Now, Mr. President, I have a few general observations.

The time which I spent in the Soviet Union has helped to convince me that it is critically essential to get the maximum amount of information about the free world and its views through to the Russian people. They should be told now how we feel about the prosecution of Jewish leaders. They do not have the facts now, and what they get in their press and radio is heavily colored by Government propaganda.

In spite of this—and it is a revelation to anyone who goes there—the Russian people are very receptive to anything which comes from the United States in the way of a statement of our position. I was there when President Kennedy's interview with Alexei Adzhubei, editor of Izvestia, Khrushchev's son-in-law, was published.

It made a remarkable impression on the people themselves who had an opportunity to read it, in Moscow and in the Moscow area, and upon the foreign diplomatic corps. It was, generally, a very real contribution to our relations with the Soviet Union. It did not perform a miracle. It did not change the situation materially. However, it did have an effect, and indicated this is the right line of action to pursue.

Even leading officials in the Soviet Union were compelled to state that the tone of the interview, notwithstanding that they thoroughly disagreed with it, was the right tone and certainly not calculated to do anything other than to attempt to heal the breach between us, which is so serious for the world, rather than to exacerbate it.

Mr. President, I think it is critically important that we make a very great effort on getting through with authoritative information.

In this connection, I regard it as highly important to increase our cultural exchange activity with the Soviet Union. I ascertained, when I was there, that the Soviet authorities are willing to go further in exchange of radio, television, publications, motion pictures, artists, and athletes. At least they say they are ready to go further. Knowing of their negotiating habits, when we reach the point of actual negotiation perhaps we will find a lot of worms in with the fishhooks. Nonetheless, that is their expressed desire.

In that connection, I should like to inform my colleagues that a great deal was made during my visit of the desirability to provide for visits to the United States by members of the Supreme Soviet, which is in name, at least, their supreme legislative body.

In my view they certainly are not legislators in our sense, nor are they to be equated with Members of the Congress in the authority which inheres in their offices, but they are regarded as influential people in the Soviet Union and it is a fact that a good many of them do wish to come to the United States to see for themselves, to ask questions, and to be received. I think this interest can be beneficial and that we ought to take advantage of it. Some people fear that they would spread hostile propaganda, but nonetheless we must remember that we wish to go to Russia, also, to have a look for ourselves. On balance, this kind of exposure, it seems to me, would be in our favor.

While the members of the Supreme Soviet can come here now, they claim that those who have come have not been able to see our legislators and our Government officials.

Exploration is now being made to see if congenial arrangements can be worked out by which members of the Supreme Soviet who are truly important in the life of their country may be received here in a way that will give them an opportunity to see some of our Members of the Congress and also officials in our executive department; provided reciprocal courtesies are extended to U.S. officials visiting the Soviet Union. Arrangements for this exchange could be included in the overall cultural exchange agreement now being negotiated with the Soviet Union and be covered therefore in its protective terms.

In this way, I think we can make our impact felt on the Russian people to a much greater degree than we do at present. On the one hand, we must make emphatic our protest against Soviet discrimination against Jews and any other religious minorities in the Soviet Union; on the other, we must make it possible for more influential Russians to be exposed to our society, the way in which we run our Government and to the men who help run it.

Mr. President, these are by no means two inconsistent positions, for what they represent is the effort to pry open this fiction but nonetheless grave reality, when one is actually there, of the Iron Curtain.

It is extremely important that by its silence the world should not repeat the mistakes it has so tragically made in the past with respect to the incidence of an anti-Jewish situation which exists now, I am convinced, in the Soviet Union. Rather the world should protest in the most distinct manner, especially bearing in mind the sensitivity of the leaders of the Soviet Union to any charge of anti-Semitism and the pride which they take in the fact that they live in an allegedly classless, unbigoted society.

The protest should be utilized on a large scale in the world to break through to them and to the Russian people the sense of indignation and outrage felt by the free world when it sees even some indications of an anti-Jewish policy. I am convinced that such indications are very real and present, and there is a situation of very serious peril.

Secondly, we should give every opportunity, consistent with the security and protectiveness which we have a right to expect from the administration on these agreements, for Soviet people of importance to come out and have a look at the world and the United States in particular. I am confident that we can do so without any material jeopardy to the issue of security.

A good many Senators have spoken to me about the remarks I have made today and have given me a great sympathetic feeling of identity about their own views with those I have expressed. For the record, I should like to read a very brief note sent to me by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who had an opportunity to read the remarks which I prepared for today. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 24, 1962.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: The report which you propose to make to the Senate on Thursday, January 25, is an excellent document and I believe you are rendering a distinct service to the Congress and to the country in making this report.

Sincerely,
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the question might be asked as to why the report I have made is being made at this time, in view of the fact that no particular proposed legislation is before the Senate, and that I do not recommend particular proposed legislation as an aspect of my report. I have made the report because the Senate is famous in the world for many things, but it is perhaps most famous as being a forum in which ideas of freedom, including protests against its deprivation, and a sense of denunciation of injustice have always found a great receptivity and a real home.

I should like to conclude what I have said, which has been necessarily somewhat detailed because one must always state one's evidence before coming to a conclusion, by saying that I believe there is real peril to the Jewish people in the Soviet Union. I believe that this peril pictures the great weakness of this monolithic state in that it is often completely ambivalent in terms of its protestations of principle and doctrine and the development of its actual practice.

Finally, there is no way in which this shell can be cracked. There is no way in which what happens can be exposed to the view of the people of the world except in another forum. There is no forum in the Soviet Union, except one which might be secured at the peril of one's liberty and life, in which such facts can be disclosed, conclusions drawn, and the protest called for.

I feel a great sense of honor in being a Senator of the United States and to have an opportunity on the floor of the Senate, in terms of the international policy of our Nation and the whole thrust of the free world, to lodge a protest, to present evidence, and to express the hope that, first, it may be taken up feelingly and with conviction by other peoples as well as our own and, second, that it will, because of the unanimous view of the free world and the sense of outrage which it feels, break through even the hard shell placed around the Soviet Union by those who hold its destinies.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I commend the Senator from New York for performing the service which he has rendered the Senate today. I think it is very important that we counteract some of the propaganda which comes out of the Soviet Union and is intended to work to our disadvantage. According to the Russian Government, people are persecuted in virtually every other part of the world, particularly that part of the world which we know as the Western World. We do not have access to the facts relating to the persecution which goes on within the Soviet Union itself. So I know I have learned things from the Senator's statement that I had not realized before, and I am sure that as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the news go out from this Chamber, a great many people in this country will get a better understanding of what is going on behind the Iron Curtain, as it is called, and perhaps feel a little more keenly about the problem than they they have done before.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who is one of our most respected Members, for his very gracious words. I point out that it is very necessary to have such factual disclosures because of the way the Russians dress these things up in a secret trial. One might, if he merely read and ran, think that those accused people were some horrible criminals who were traitorously running away with the secrets of the Soviet Union. One might so conclude until he reads between the lines and begins to appreciate not only the fabrication but also the barbarism of the deceit which is being practiced on the world in order to make leaders of a religious community appear to be criminals. It is bad enough that they are being persecuted and kept in jail for years on end. We saw some who had spent as many as 10 years in jail, and other similar persecution. That is bad enough. But to make them out as traitors and immoral men because of secrecy and propaganda is really compounding the outrage.

As I said before, I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from Vermont; and I am grateful for the privilege of being able in this most august forum to register the protest I have and to disclose the facts which I have disclosed.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. I wish to add my voice to that of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] in commending the senior Senator from New York for the very excellent job that he has performed today on the floor of the Senate. I know the task required him to spend many hours, days, and weeks in documenting the evidence that he has brought before the Senate. He has rendered a service in my opinion not only to the Senate and the people of this country, but to all mankind.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. I recall especially his long and eminent service as Assistant Secretary of State, which, it seems to me, gives him a very special reason for speaking. The distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who is a distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has also a special reason for speaking. I am very grateful to them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL subsequently said: Mr. President, the distinguished senior U.S. Senator from New York is not only a very able American legislator; he is a very competent lawyer. His powers of observation, I think, are quite beyond question, and are the result of long years in the practice of his profession. The visit which he made to the Soviet Union several months ago gave, therefore, to an extremely well equipped observer, adequate opportunity to see what takes place within the Soviet Union relative to discrimination against the Jewish people who live there.

The people and the Government of the United States are compassionate. They abhor discrimination against human beings, whether the discrimination exists—as, unhappily and all too often, it does exist—in our own country among our own fellow citizens, or wherever else it may take place throughout the globe.

Thus, when our able colleague tells the Senate there is clear evidence that the Jews and the Jewish religion suffer grievous limitations and restrictions in Soviet Russia, it gives us in this Chamber and in the country reason to pause and to ponder.

The Senator refers to a series of criminal trials within the Soviet Union, as a result of which punishments, sufficiently evil to be in the Stalin fashion, were meted out to some Jewish people and leaders now in Russia. Thus he points to one more brutal act inflicted upon human beings by an atheistic, communistic government.

The Senator points out how communication, in several new forms, might add some hope toward the elimination of some of the paths of violence and of indefensible discrimination by the Communist leadership against their fellow men. Thus he gives dubious food for thought.

I simply wish to have the RECORD show that, along with other Senators who stood here earlier to salute him for his labors and for his report, I express my sentiments of congratulations for a service well performed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to my colleague. I have already expressed my gratitude to my colleagues from Vermont and Kentucky who spoke in the same vein. It is but another reflection of the deep understanding of our international situation, as well as the sense of justice which pervades our Nation, that the Senator has given tongue to these sentiments at this time. I thank my colleague.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my able friend.

MANAGEMENT OF THE ELK HERD IN THE NORTHERN PART OF YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, officials of at least two Department of the Interior agencies and three States continue to be concerned with the 27-year-old—and continuing—problem of managing a great natural resource, the elk herd in the northern part of Yellowstone National Park.

According to the National Park Service, the herd numbers 10,000, double the number biologists say the range will carry.

Although disagreement with the reduction program has been a matter of record in my office since 1953, it reached new heights this winter—and culminated in protests from the State administration of Montana and Wyoming, and offers to take all the elk which could be trapped.

There were charges that officials of the National Park Service and Yellowstone National Park were dishonest and incompetent with respect to management of the elk herd and preservation of the related soil, vegetation, and wildlife resources.

Last month, Supt. Lon Garrison of Yellowstone and other Park Service and Interior Department officials met with Acting Governor Gage and members of the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission on this problem.

I ask unanimous consent that a background statement prepared by the National Park Service for that meeting be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANAGEMENT OF YELLOWSTONE'S NORTHERN ELK HERD

INTRODUCTION

There seems to be a general belief in the minds of those who criticize the National Park Service's policies on control of the northern elk herd that our objectives as stated in November 1961 are unfounded and radical departures from previous thinking. There are also more than hints that our control program is not based on scientific data, that our control methods do not include all measures that are effective.

This statement is intended to show that the control program is based on many years accumulation of sound scientific data, that the 1961–62 program is no radical departure from previously stated objectives, and that definite progress is being made toward bringing the northern herd into balance with its range. This statement is made with full realization that its reader appeal is low and cannot be expected to still the cries of emotional critics whose knowledge of or interest in the facts is secondary or lacking. It is directed to those readers who do want to know the basis for Service policy and its history of development.

Fundamentally, there are four elements in the management of Yellowstone's wildlife—the land, the plants that grow upon it, the animals that utilize plants directly or indirectly, and the weather.

Weather is beyond our control as is the production of soil, but soil is our capital. Whatever management plan is adopted its foundation stone must be soil conservation for once soil cover is lost, discussion of herd size or range management is completely futile. Centuries are required for replacement of topsoil.

Conservation of plant cover is next in importance. Plants stabilize soil and contribute to its formation. Mistakes in management of plant cover can be rectified in a man's lifespan if the soil remains unharmed, but it is better to err on the conservative side of plant and soil protection than risk loss of the soil.

These elements are too often neglected by those whose only interest is hunting elk, yet the elk and other animals constitute the one element of the pyramid whose manipulation can either save or destroy the plants and soil. Here again the conservative view is essential even if unpopular. For if the animal population exceeds the carrying capacity of its range, the plant cover is damaged or lost, erosion produces soil loss, the carrying capacity decreases, and so the spiral down accelerates until something breaks this chain of events. With an elk herd that something is usually heavy winter kill on a devastated winter range.

Numbers: Too large herds have roamed Yellowstone for more than 40 years and have produced range deterioration and erosion mainly in winter range. Early superintendents' reports discuss elk, and estimates of herd size are revealing:

In 1897: "I believe that more than 5,000 winter in the park and that at least 15,000 leave the park in autumn to winter in the lower country."

In 1909: "A conservative estimate would place the number of elk in the park at between 30,000 and 40,000."

In 1912: "27,801 animals were counted inside the park, and 2,300 were observed just outside and, therefore, belonging to the same herd, making a total of 30,101 that actually belonged to the winter herd of the park."

These 1912 figures refer to the northern herd only.

In 1914 the northern herd numbered 35,209 according to a census taken between April 11 and May 2. This figure is the peak recorded. In the winter of 1919–1920 the inevitable happened; an estimated 25,000 elk were reduced to 11,000 by winter kill, and never again did the northern elk herd reach 20,000.

Appendix A tabulates data concerning the elk control program since its beginning in 1934–1935, however, these figures require some explanation. Hunter kill figures are quite accurate through 1955–56 because most of them are based on checking station counts. Trapping and kills by rangers are based on daily reports of trapping and shooting teams. Winter kill figures are based upon counts of dead elk made by rangers in the field. The lack of figures beyond 1954–55 reflects insignificant winter kills in recent years.

Herd counts are not very accurate until the helicopter surveys of 1956 and 1961. Before then counts were made on foot or horseback and were subject to many errors such as:

1. Too loose definition of areas each counter was to cover.
2. Too large areas for counters.
3. Estimation of large bunches in forested areas.
4. Estimation of large bunches in motion.
5. Movement of elk from one area to another during the count.

RELATIONSHIPS TO OTHER SPECIES

Bison, moose, bighorn sheep, antelope, and mule deer are other grazing and browsing animals which must compete directly with elk to survive. Bison and moose have no difficulty because of comparable size. However the smaller species are currently in potential trouble. A complete ecological study is needed to authenticate observations that bighorn sheep populations appear to be declining on this range; mule deer barely holding their own; and antelope in real difficulty because in late winter herds of elk compete for the already damaged sagebrush range.

Whitetail deer and beaver are no longer found in the Lamar Valley of the northern Yellowstone elk winter range and assumptions are reasonable that elk competition contributed to their disappearance. Other species may well go the same route.

The actual objective is healthy range with all animal species together available for public enjoyment and for such enjoyment in all future years.

SCIENTIFIC STUDIES

There is scant basis for the statement that the National Park Service elk control program is not based on scientific study. To the contrary, it is probably safe to say that no herd save the one in Jackson Hole has received such long and detailed study. From 1911 to the present there has been continuous observation and study of Yellowstone's northern elk herd with some recent progress in range restoration. These studies rather faithfully reflect a trend from wanting to produce large numbers of elk for preservation of the species to gradual realization that the herd was larger than its range could support.

The first outstanding scientific report on Yellowstone's elk problem resulted from the Graves-Nelson study in 1917.

1. Col. Henry S. Graves was Chief Forester of the Forest Service and Dr. E. W. Nelson was Chief of the Bureau of Biological Survey. Even though these gentlemen were interested in building up elk herds instead of reducing them, they were quick to recommend that the elk population in all of the Yellowstone National Park region should remain at their present numbers estimated to be 40,000 to 45,000 elk. Among their other recommendations were two that bear mentioning here: that special studies of elk habits be undertaken, and that close cooperation exist between States and Federal Government in elk management.

The recommendation of special studies brought W. M. Rush to Yellowstone in December 1928. From his arrival until April 1932, Mr. Rush studied the elk and their range. Mr. Rush was a longtime employee of the Forest Service whose knowledge of biology and the Yellowstone herd made him the best man for the investigations. His findings were included in a 1932 report entitled "Northern Yellowstone Elk Study," published by the Montana Fish and Game Commission.

2. Several of his conclusions have been fundamental to our present management policies. He found that the winter range had deteriorated fully 50 percent since 1914 due to overgrazing and drought and that on more than half the range sheet erosion had taken place to a depth of 1 to 2 inches.

Cheat grass (Bromus tectorum) and rabbitbrush (Crysothamnus), indicators of overgrazing, were spreading over the lower range. All brouse species were heavily overgrazed by elk, and even sagebrush was going fast.

Mr. Rush considered artificial feeding undesirable for several reasons that are valid today. He found that elk quickly became dependent on feeding and refused to rustle feed, thus becoming "paupers." Congestion on feeding grounds favored transmission of diseases. Furthermore, artificially fed animals were in poorer condition than ones who rustled all winter.

Rush, like Graves and Nelson before him, was trying to find a way to increase carrying capacity of the range, yet he, too, stated in his recommendations that "No means should be taken to increase the present size of the elk herd until range conditions materially improve. Size of the herd at present between 12,000 and 14,000." He stressed continuing range studies and better census methods as vital to proper conservation of the elk and their range.

Scientific studies were continued by park rangers with range and wildlife management training along the lines indicated by Rush.

Study plots and transects were established; winter ranges were mapped at regular intervals, and finally it became clear that some positive control plan had to be adopted to manage the northern herd. And so it was in 1934 that the first real elk control program was devised.

This program called for a reduction of the northern elk herd by 3,000 animals. Principal reliance was placed on trapping within the park and hunter kill outside the park during a Montana season extended to permit hunting when elk were outside the park. Finally, if these methods failed to bring about the necessary reduction, elk would be killed by park rangers. The objective was achieved.

For a good summary of the range studies from 1934 to 1938, a report entitled "Northern Yellowstone Winter Range Studies, 1938," by District Ranger Rudolf L. Grimm is highly recommended. Having more data on hand than his predecessors, Grimm was able to make better estimates as to the carrying capacity of the park's winter range. He expressed forage requirements in elk units and, converting the requirements of deer, bighorn, and bison to these units, arrived at a carrying capacity of 7,000 elk for winter range during the average winter month.

Grimm recognized that the months of February and March were times when available range was below winter month averages and only about 5,000 elk could be supported. He thought that 6,300 was a good compromise figure for the elk carrying capacity of the northern herd's winter range within Yellowstone National Park. His figures were based on the winter of 1937–38 but similar calculations for 3 preceding years showed carrying capacities to be of similar magnitude.

Grimm's studies reinforced Rush's conclusions regarding overutilization of winter range. He, too, found far too many elk on a damaged range. On the positive side, he noted improved plant growth during both 1937 and 1938 seasons, but he attributed the improvement to favorable weather rather than a smaller elk herd.

Dr. W. B. McDougall, coauthor of the definitive book on Yellowstone plants and a recognized authority, made several general observations in 1943 about the winter range. These are simple and readily understandable.

3. He said the only way to bring about any large-scale aspen recovery would be to reduce the numbers of browsing animals to a very low minimum. He found abundant evidence of range deterioration but also noted that practically nowhere had deterioration gone so far as to prohibit reasonably rapid recovery under favorable conditions. Perhaps McDougall's most interesting observation is as follows: "It would be practically an impossibility to determine the carrying capacity of the Yellowstone winter range. There are too many variable factors. The climatic conditions vary greatly from year to year and with these varying climatic conditions not only the amount of forage produced but the total acreage of range utilized varies greatly. Indeed, climate seems to be a much more important factor in the fortunes of the range than numbers of elk, except that the numbers of elk is a controllable factor and the climate is not. Seemingly the most we can say is that when the range is found to be deteriorating there are too many animals and when it is not deteriorating there are not too many animals."

Such a statement clearly shows the need for studying trends in plant growths and other factors of range productivity. In 1948 a Park Biologist position was established and Walter H. Kittams began a series of studies that are continuing today. These studies are aimed at determining the response of vegetation to easing grazing pressure as the elk-control program reduces numbers to 5,000 animals. In a report dated February 28, 1958, Kittams noted good forage production on low winter range of the northern herd and grass utilization much less than usual during the spring 1956–spring 1957 period.

4. A similar cautiously favorable report covered the following year.

SUMMARY OF SCIENTIFIC STUDIES

The most obvious result of the scientific studies to date has been a continuous decrease in the numbers of elk that observers thought the winter range of the northern herd could support, 12,000 to 14,000 in 1932, 6,300 in 1938, 5,000 in 1950. Also there has been increasing attention to other species which share the winter range of the northern elk herd. The emphasis has shifted from trying to increase winter range by land acquisition and cultivation of suitable land to manipulating the size of the elk herd and following the response of vegetation. From attempts to produce maximum elk herds we have moved toward developing a balanced ecology wherein each species plays an important part.

We know that sometimes since the early 1930's the general decline of Yellowstone Range conditions was checked and that considerable local recovery is evident in places where the elk control program has been most effective. True, aspen and other browse recovery is less than it should be, and much of the range is still overgrazed, but we know we are moving in the right direction in our management plan for range recovery.

CONTROL MEASURES

There are five ways man can control the size of the northern elk herd. These are by (1) public hunting outside the park; (2) public hunting inside the park; (3) trapping live elk inside the park; (4) direct reduction inside the park by rangers; (5) biological controls.

If man does not exercise these controls, nonselective controls such as disease epidemics and winter kill will come into play and do the job with resultant calamity.

PUBLIC HUNTING OUTSIDE THE PARK

When elk control began, the best reduction measure was considered to be public hunting along the north boundary of the park. This has proved true as is borne out by the figures; of a total reduction of 60,400, 40,745 elk were killed by hunters.

There are, however, two considerations beyond control of the National Park Service which may decrease the efficiency of this method.

First, in mild winters the elk may not leave the park in sufficient numbers to permit a large hunter kill.

Second, since large numbers of elk rarely leave the park until after the Montana hunting season has closed, the State must reopen the season if a kill it to be made. While the Montana Fish and Game Commission has cooperated fully in the past by reopening the season in the Gardiner area, there is growing reluctance to continue this procedure year after yaer. As of this writing, December 15, 1961, there are about 1,000 elk outside the park in the normal hunting area. The State has given no indication that the season will be reopened.

LIVE TRAPPING

Since 1934 the National Park Service has trapped 5,765 elk, most of which have been planted in surrounding States to establish or supplement resident herds. Through excellent management by State agencies, these herds have grown about as large as they can, and have reached elk carrying capacity of the range they occupy. The Forest Service is most reluctant to have more Yellowstone elk planted on nearby national forests, and State agencies are encountering stiffening resistance from stockmen to plant on private lands. Animal diseases such a brucellosis, anaplasmosis, tularemia, leptospiriasis, and red water may be factors which can affect future live plants.

There is also grave doubt that a trapping program would ever take the annual increment to a herd of 5,000 elk which would amount to 1,000 or more each year. Trapping success is dependent upon scarcity of natural forage and severe winters. Elk won't enter the traps unless they are very hungry. Mild winters or improving range conditions will tend to decrease trapping success which in the best trapping season (1955-56) accounted for only 645 elk. The evidence suggests that live trapping can only supplement other control measures.

SHOOTING BY RANGERS

This control method has much to recommend it. It can be increased or decreased at any time, can be concentrated at specific locations or on sex groups, avoids the losses of other wildlife. Ranger shooting teams are highly trained men who know how to operate in the park in the worst weather. They are equipped with specialized equipment for winter work, can utilize Service quarters as operating bases. In short, they are the most efficient control tools, but because of small numbers operating under difficult conditions they find it difficult to achieve the large kills produced by hunters outside the park. There is considerable public objection to this on sentimental grounds and furthermore, the Service, as a matter of policy, favors hunting outside the park over killing inside by ranger teams.

PUBLIC HUNTING WITHIN THE PARK

This method is prohibited by law in addition to being contrary to National Park Service policy. There are several good reasons for this. Hunting during the park visitor season is unthinkable and after November 1 the weather makes hunting hard and dangerous. Winter wilderness hunting has a romantic sound but it is not really much fun in bitter zero weather and deep snow. The record of dead moose, bears, coyotes and birds plus elk killed and not utilized resulting from elk hunts in Grand Teton National Park is indicative of what would happen in Yellowstone should hunting be allowed, and the picture is not encouraging.

It is also impossible to say what other uses of Yellowstone National Park might be advocated once elk hunting were permitted. If elk, why not bear, deer, moose, pronghorn, and bighorn? If hunting, why not mining and logging, or dams to raise the elevation of Yellowstone Lake? These hard questions may make the National Park Service appear cynical, still Cassandra has been disregarded before.

But the heart of the matter is simply this: Most people in America do not want hunting in their national parks any more than they want mining or logging, and the parks belong to all America.

BIOLOGICAL CONTROLS

This is an almost unknown field yet one which is worth watching. If some method could be developed whereby the rate of elk reproduction could be controlled our problems would be solved. Whether such methods will be developed or when cannot be answered now but must wait on future scientific research.

SUMMARY

We see then that control of the Yellowstone northern elk herd has depended primarily upon hunter kill outside the park for the bulk of herd reduction, that live trapping and shipping can supplement this kill, and kill by ranger teams can be depended upon to make up any reduction deficit that appears. Only reduction by ranger teams is within control of the National Park Service. Hunter kills outside the park depend on weather and the State of Montana; trapping success depends on weather. Biological controls are not a sound possibility at the present time.

HELPFUL SUGGESTIONS

From time to time the National Park Service receives suggestions from sincere sportsmen. These usually concern methods of driving elk out of the park or into traps. Most of these methods have been tried and have failed, but it is tough sledding to convince the public that elk won't drive.

The Service put a line of men across the Gardiner Valley at Lava Creek and started a drive toward the north boundary. The elk moved north for a short time as a herd but, tiring of the game, they scattered around and through the drivers back to where they had been.

Again, a line of men, horsemen, and crews in weasels tried a drive on Deckard Flat. Firing guns and flares they began the drive. As before, the herd started to move out but soon panicked, milled wildly, then charged the drive line through flares and even shotgun blasts which were used in a vain effort to turn them.

Attempts with planes and helicopters have not been markedly more successful. If the elk are willing they can be driven; if not, they can't.

PUBLIC INFORMATION

There is every evidence that the National Park Service has been openly informative about its plans for elk control. Service representatives have met with State and Federal agencies to discuss mutual problems and have gladly appeared before conservation and sportsmen's groups to present plans.

The reports of the Absaroka Conservation Committee contain full details of elk management plans from 1943 to 1954 and frank discussions of them. Press releases have been issued and public meetings held to keep the public informed.

POLICY, MANAGEMENT, AND ELK

It is National Park Service policy that Yellowstone National Park present to its visitors a vast wilderness area in as natural a state as possible. This requires that animal populations live in harmony with their environment and each other, that imbalances must be corrected by natural controls if possible, by man if not.

The elk control program is designed to reduce an overlarge herd of elk which has caused deterioration of its winter range. Based on experience and scientific study over 30 years, the program places primary reliance on hunter kill outside the park with trapping and ranger shooting teams operating inside the park. Except for changes in emphasis caused by weather, there has been no change in control methods since 1934. The reduction goal—a northern elk herd of 5,000—is solidly based on scientific studies. There is absolutely no evidence that the herd is too small; to the contrary all evidence indicates the herd is still too large.

The National Park Service cannot fly in the face of all evidence and halt the control program to appease a few critics. "Stop the slaughter of Yellowstone elk," is a fine, emotional battlecry, guaranteed to make headlines, and rally the boys. Another good one is, "Save the elk." In all honesty and humility the Service asks, "How?"

Should the National Park Service sacrifice its capital, the soil, in a vain effort to save a few hundred elk for a winter or two so they can die of starvation? No responsible authority questions the poor condition of the range or the fact that more elk will wreck it. Should the National Park Service confine its work inside the park only to live trapping when experience suggests strongly that this spells ruin of the range because enough elk simply can't be trapped?

If in the final judgment of the years of study and experience, the experts, and the administrators should prove utterly wrong, has any permanent damage been done? No. Natural reproduction on understocked range will restore any desired herd size in 5 years.

The major objective for the northern Yellowstone elk herd remains as it has for 50 years: To have a healthy herd of elk in balance with its range and with all other species which use the same range so that the natural ecological picture can be presented to park visitors.

APPENDIX A

Record of elk reductions, northern Yellowstone elk herd, Yellowstone Park, Wyo.

Period	Hunter kill	Direct field reduction	Live trapping	Winter kill	Total reduction	Actual spring count
1934-35	2,598	223	444		3,265	10,647
1935-36	2,287	(1)	551	89	2,933	10,112
1936-37	257	394	180	15	846	10,281
1937-38	3,587	[1] 11	225	89	3,912	8,794
1938-39	2,971		307	533	3,811	10,976
1939-40	122		16	68	206	
1940-41	275		12	10	297	
1941-42	2,071		145	108	2,324	
1942-43	6,539	691		872	8,102	
1943-44	125		10	100	235	8,235
1944-45	403			300	703	
1945-46	2,094		73	250	2,417	
1946-47	3,069		76	475	3,620	8,513
1947-48	970		39	375	1,384	
1948-49	2,837		49	300	3,186	7,815
1949-50	40	518	316	184	1,058	
1950-51	1,265	500	312	217	2,294	
1951-52	3,198	52	563	500	4,313	
1952-53	110	[1] 7	165	50	332	
1953-54	422	171	216	241	1,050	
1954-55	763	[1] 13	593	289	1,658	
1955-56	3,900	1,974	645	?	6,519	[2] 6,963
1956-57	345	717	227	?	1,289	
1957-58	50	530		?	586	
1958-59	372	1,051	319	?	1,742	[3] 4,848
1959-60	50	674	135		859	
1960-61	25	1,287	147		1,459	[3] 8,150
Total	40,745	8,825	5,765	5,065	60,400	

[1] Taken for museum specimens or biological studies.

[2] Helicopter.

[3] Plane.

NORTHERN YELLOWSTONE ELK HERD ESTIMATED POPULATION, 1892–1961

The following estimates of the number of elk in the northern Yellowstone herd for the years shown are the most accurate available. It must be understood that these are estimates, and that over such a long period correspondence, news releases, etc., may have included figures somewhat varied:

Year:	*Estimated number*
1892	25,000
1893	25,000
1897	15,000
1907	25,000
1908	25,000
1909	30,000
1910	30,000
1912	30,100
1913	32,200
1914	35,300
1916 [1]	29,500
1923 [1]	14,500
1926	14,000
1927 [1]	13,000
1928 [1]	14,200
1929	13,300
1930	10,600
1931	10,600
1932	10,600
1933	12,500
1934 [1]	13,000
1935 [1]	11,000
1936 [1]	11,000
1937 [1]	9,700
1938 [1]	11,000
1939	10,800
1940	12,000
1941	12,500
1942	11,700
1943 [1]	9,100
1944	10,500
1945	11,500
1946 [1]	10,700
1947	9,600
1948	12,400
1949 [1]	11,000
1950	12,000
1951	12,000
1952	9,200
1953	10,600
1954	11,500
1955	11,800
1956 [1]	8,300
1957	8,200
1958	9,000
1959 [1]	7,200
1960	7,600
1961 [1]	10,000

[1] Years in which actual count was made; figure printed is estimate based on count.

Mr. METCALF. With support from many wildlife groups and sportsmen's clubs, the Park Service began a herd reduction program in 1949. In November 1960 Superintendent Garrison reported that this program was getting results. While "we still have too many elk, we can see the goal of a wildlife population in balance with the range and within itself becoming closer to reality," he said.

Seeking additional information on the problem and the proposals, I called upon Mr. John J. Craighead, of Missoula, Mont., leader of the Montana Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit, a joint venture of Montana State University, the Montana Fish and Game Department, the Wildlife Management Institute, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

I ask unanimous consent that the report of Mr. Craighead and seven other wildlife biologists be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT REGARDING THE MANAGEMENT OF THE NORTHERN YELLOWSTONE ELK HERD

As professional wildlife biologists, we are concerned with the current attempts by well-meaning but ill-informed citizens to prohibit the National Park Service from carrying out sound, long-range plans for managing the northern Yellowstone elk herd. The issue is too vital to sacrifice well-established principles of resource management for expediency, or the self-interest of minority groups.

The current controversy regarding the proposed reduction of the northern elk herd in Yellowstone National Park involves two basic considerations: Should elk numbers be reduced? If so, how should this be accomplished? Over the years sufficient data concerning range conditions and elk numbers have been gathered to indicate that the elk must be drastically reduced to get and to keep them in balance with the available winter forage. This necessitates an annual reduction program. Long-range cooperative plans to accomplish this have been in effect with some success since 1954.

The basic responsibility for the conservation, welfare, and management of wildlife and its habitat within our national parks rests with the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. National parks are seldom complete natural units; the larger hoofed animals migrate in and out, thereby creating problems requiring coordination of control and management with adjacent State and Federal land management agencies. In the case of the northern Yellowstone elk herd, responsibility for the game animals does not pass to other agencies until the elk leave Yellowstone Park.

The elk range damage problem was first made a matter of public record in 1911, although severe winter elk losses had occurred throughout the 1890's. The relationship between range condition and elk welfare was not fully understood at that time. As range use patterns rapidly changed with the settlement of the lower Yellowstone Valley in Montana, elk were forced to remain in the park on unsuitable range for longer periods during the winter and migrations occurred only during the most severe winters. Eventually the combination of overuse of winter ranges outside the park and hunter harvests at the boundary served to disrupt the migrations until at present very few elk leave the park in winter. Range damage within Yellowstone has become intensified until many other resource values within the park are being jeopardized.

Elk reduction has been achieved by three methods—trapping and transplanting, hunter harvest along the north Yellowstone boundary in Montana, and direct reduction by rangers within the park. The Park Service has cooperated with adjacent States in trapping elk but it has become increasingly difficult to dispose of the animals to States that lack suitable winter range for elk. At best trapping and transplanting is a slow, costly, inefficient method and too often merely shifts the problems elsewhere. The dangers of creating additional game range problems, and depredation on private lands are serious. Compounding the problem is the high cost of such programs with no possibility of a satisfactory solution. All the elk trapped and moved in the past 40 years represent less than the 5,000 proposed as the reduction goal for this one winter.

The hunter harvest in Montana to date has accounted for approximately 75 percent of all the animals taken from the herd over the years. This removal by hunting as well as by all other means has not been enough to take care of the annual increase each year. Elk have not left the park in sizable numbers for 5 years. When they do migrate, considerable pressures are exerted in Montana to close the seasons to stop the firing-line type of slaughter and this can be expected in the future. The hunt, when allowed to continue, is at best a low quality hunt unattractive to many sportsmen.

There is no assurance that public hunting within the park can effect the necessary reduction and it would invariably create some other extremely knotty problems in park management and administration. A high quality hunt in the fall would require many outfitters and wardens as well as large numbers of packhorses to set up hunting camps and to transport meat. Such livestock could be fed hay but would also utilize the already heavily grazed mountain parks and meadows. A winter hunt would require oversnow vehicles, a high degree of supervision and in all probability road hunting and firing-line situations would develop.

The hunting public would in a sense obtain vested rights—the right to say each year how the elk and perhaps other game should be harvested—whether the rare grizzly and other game species needing protection would become the target of the rifle originally intended only for elk. Is it reasonable to assume that hunters would support sound management within Yellowstone when for decades small vocal minorities have successfully opposed vitally necessary management of the Jackson Hole herds in Wyoming and the Gallatin and Sun River herds in Montana? Is it safe to assume that other self-interest groups will not see in this a precedent for actively seeking special privileges in this and other national parks?

Direct reduction is the most efficient and only reliable method for achieving the necessary harvest. In 1953 at a joint meeting of the Federal and State management agencies along with interested sportsmen (Absoraka conservation committee), the Park Service agreed to face up to this responsibility and local support for achieving the desired reduction was promised. In 1955 the Montana Wildlife Federation studied the area and the proposal, and offered full support. For the past several years this plan has been followed with some success and with greater promise for the future. Suddenly this fall the support seems to have vanished. States that didn't want elk for transplanting last year or the year before suddenly offered to take all they can get; this, despite poor growing seasons, livestock competition, and local elk range problems of their own that remain unsolved.

The Park Service has stated that with minor financial assistance their personnel can conduct an effective direct reduction program designed to go into operation each year after trapping, and hunting outside the park have been tried. It appears that the Yellowstone Park administration needs financial support to properly implement this plan. Necessary funds and facilities should be provided and the Park Service encouraged to do the job. More importantly, the Park Service should be receiving the full support of the adjacent State and other Federal agencies. Every year action is postponed merely serves to allow further damage to the range and to the elk. Such delays also increase public opposition and misunderstanding.

The elk, their habitat, other wildlife, the soil, and the values these create for all visitors to Yellowstone National Park are endangered. The solution is not to open a national park to public hunting; but to diligently pursue the management objectives set up for this herd after years of study and planning. This and similar problems of wildlife and resource management in our national parks must be successfully handled by the National Park Service in cooperation with adjacent resource management agencies. The northern Yellowstone elk problem is extremely complex; it can be solved only when the American public, land administrators, and policymakers recognize that it requires continuous research, continuous management, continuous public education, and annual appropriations of public funds in proportion to the magnitude of the task.

W. Leslie Pengelly, Montana State University; Clyde M. Senger, Montana State University; Richard D. Taber, Montana State University; Wesley R. Woodgerd, Wildlife Research Unit; John J. Craighead, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; P. L. Wright, Montana State University; Robert Hoffmann, Montana State University; George F. Weisel, Montana State University.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, subsequently, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall accepted the offer from Montana and Wyoming to take all available live-trapped elk. His telegram to the Governor of Montana is dated December 13, 1961. I ask unanimous consent that his telegram may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., December 13, 1961.

Hon. DONALD G. NUTTER,
Governor of Montana,
State Capitol, Helena, Mont.:

I welcome the news that Montana will accept all available live-trapped elk from the northern Yellowstone herd. This decision will ease our management problems. As you know, last summer the Park Service was advised by your game officials that Montana elk stocks were then near their maximum efficient limits. Because we had similar word from Wyoming, we did not give as much emphasis to a transplant program as now appears indicated by your assurances and similar assurances from Wyoming that each State can now take all the elk we can live trap.

We appreciate the cooperation we have had from your wildlife experts, who agreed with us that a drastic reduction of the northern herd was necessary, so that there would be forage available for the remainder of the elk, and bison, deer, and other species. We regret that we could not come to agreement on sportsmen participation in the program. In addition to the basic policy consideration which has always deterred public hunting in national parks, there are also the management problems, involving vehicle access, controlling numbers of participants, and the like.

We know that reduction by shooting is distasteful, even with the elaborate measures we have taken to assure the resultant meat supply goes to charitable institutions, Indian reservations, orphanages, and other welfare agencies. Your cooperating with the live-trapped transplant program will keep the less desirable shooting control to a minimum.

It is true that there has been insufficient public information on the reduction program. I would be indebted to you if you would designate an experienced wildlife management official of your State to represent you on an advisory board which I am creating to advise me and the Yellowstone National Park superintendent on wildlife management and related problems. I am making the same request of the Governors of Idaho and Wyoming.

Previously, officials of your State expressed concern about transplants as a possible source of brucellosis elk infection on cattle ranges. I hope this concern has now disappeared. We will, of course, cooperate in a testing program involving the trapped elk.

With mutual cooperation, and joint efforts for public information, I am sure we can minimize the prospect of wholesale starving of elk and other wildlife in severe winters.

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, with acceptance by the Secretary of the Interior of the offer of Montana and Wyoming to take all available live-trapped elk, stockmen and another Interior Department agency—the Bureau of Land Management—came into the picture. As the Park Service has pointed out, elk are a dominant species, able to exist even after they have destroyed the natural habitat of other animals. Some ranchers object to having elk share the range with livestock. Elk are big and tough. They carry knives—and brucellosis.

Under date of December 21, 1961, I received a letter from Mr. E. A. Moore of Dillon, Mont., district manager, Bureau of Land Management.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT,
Dillon, Mont., December 21, 1961.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: For your consideration, this office has been asked to submit the recommendation and resolution adopted by the district advisory board, concerning the elk problem in and near the Yellowstone National Park. The recommendation and resolution adopted at the meeting held in Dillon, Mont., December 11 and 12, 1961, is as follows:

"That the elk herds in overstocked areas be reduced by the quickest and most feasible method, to the grazing capacity of the available forage, as determined by those agencies responsible for the resources involved and such herds be maintained within the proper grazing capacity: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Advisory Board of Montana 5, Bureau of Land Management,* That the National Park Service and the Fish and Game Department be requested to plant elk in this district only upon written consent of the landowners and land management agencies in the area logically affected by subsequent redistribution and drift of said planted elk or in lieu of the above, adequate fence be constructed to confine elk to the plant site of deeded land."

Sincerely yours,

E. A. MOORE,
District Manager.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, typical of the response of stockmen is the following resolution, received January 1, 1962, from the Southwestern Montana Stockmans Association:

RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTHWESTERN MONTANA STOCKMANS ASSOCIATION

Whereas there has been considerable publicity and needless controversy over the disposal of surplus elk in the Yellowstone Park herd; and

Whereas an unusual weather cycle for several years has contributed both to the buildup of said herd and to the deterioration of ranges both inside and outside the park; and

Whereas the present resident elk herds in southwestern Montana are already large enough to be causing material damage to private lands and feed supplies in the area; and

Whereas the State Fish and Game Commission has agreed to take trapped elk for planting in areas of the State that can support them through cooperative agreements with public land agencies and private land owners: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Fish and Game Commission, the Forest Service, and the Bureau of Land Management be commended for their stand in planting elk only where the range will support them; and be it further

Resolved, That until range conditions improve no further elk plants be made in this area.

BILL GARRISON,
President.

JANUARY 3, 1962.

An eloquent spokesman for those who oppose reduction of the elk herd is Mr. Clair Malvaney, of Gardiner, Mont., who wrote a poem which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR HERITAGE

(By Clair Malvaney, Gardiner, Mont.)

Along the upper Yellowstone
  Lies a vast and wild domain,
Where wildlife unmolested
  Bred a herd of national fame.
For among those lofty mountains
  And down each grassy slope,
Ranged the great north elk herd
  And a few fleet antelope.

This great northern herd of elk,
  It ranged both far and wide,
From the upper Maiden Basin
  Right up for the Great Divide.
With the first fleeting snowflakes
  That came with the early fall,
One could hear the echoing bugle
  Of the bull elks' mating call.

Echoing through the mountains
  As the moon waxes full,
Bugle after echoing bugle,
  Challenging, each bugling bull.
The world stops, awed, enchanted,
  Through the night and early morn,
A feeling like being awakened,
  Or of a great new day being born.

By the middle of September
  You hear the report of a gun,
Which interrupts the serenading,
  And now the hunting has begun.
The old head hunter pauses,
  And he listens, if he's wise,
For the bark of the cow elk
  Or the bugling of his prize.

With the coming of the hunter
  The elk move slowly down
Into Yellowstone National Park
  So as to be on safer ground.
As the snow drifts surely deepen,
  And the weather begins to change,
The leaders of each gathering herd
  "Ride point" toward their winter range.

Down from old Bull Mountain
  Or the high Horse Creek Plateau;
Out from the Granite Mountains
  As the herds continually grow,
Around from Castle Lake they come
  When they hear the hunter's blast,
The hunters think, "They disappeared,"
  Yes, safe in the park, at last.

The migration of the northern herd
Became a legend far and wide
Before the coming of the railroad,
Yankee Jim, or Jim McBride.
Before the billowing snowfall
Became too crusted or deep,
Down the tumbling Yellowstone
They started their annual trek.

From up around Little Pebble Creek,
Soda Butte, and Muddy Lamar,
Out of Slough and Crevasse Basins
They drift in from afar.
Through the Oregon or Buffalo Pass
They come, then spreading around,
They feed, drift, then feed again,
Ever heading for lower ground.

Some, they cross the Yellowstone
And out on Deckard's Flat,
Grass is good, but they understand
The Thirty-Thirty's rat-a-tat-tat.
Some take up Baldy Mountain,
Others headed for Pine Creek slopes,
Some were caught on Eagle Creek
And were shot by hunters, like dopes.

Some are killed on Travertine Flats,
Still others more ably led
Break a trail up Phelps Creek
And through over the Nigger Head.
They'll meet at the forks of Trail,
If the hunter would but hasten,
Some they'll kill, but the others
Will head toward the Maiden Basin.

Some come through the Turkey Pen,
Others will choose Snow Pass,
Then drift down north of Sepulcher
To steal Tony Stermitz's grass.
Some will pass around Electric Peak
On out by Sports Man Lake,
Maybe along the Specimen
Or the other routes they take.

Some elk come through Beady Gulch,
Some over Slip and Slide,
Past Rigler's and the O.T.O.
Thus over the next divide.
The hunters kill their quota
As the herds come drifting through,
But in some of the milder winters
The kill might be very few.

We raised a herd of buffalo
And turned them loose to roam,
Their hay from the Buffalo Ranch,
Which was their mountain home.
The herds grazed unmolested.
There were moose and deer galore
Who never heard of a ranger,
And there was always room for more.

This famous northern elk herd
Full 20,000 strong,
Was the pride of you and I
Until the ranger came along.
For with the going of the swaddle
And the retiring of Jim McBride,
With the loss of men like "Harry the Tresh"
All horsesense in the park has died.

And now we have this bookworm,
Mother Nature's first Boy Scout,
Who quickly counts the blades of grass,
And this, he figures out;
He comes up with a deficit,
No ranger is wrong, alas!
So now the dwindling northern herd
Grows fat on minus grass.

They drive off all the settlers
From their hard earned, watered lands.
To turn the forage into weeds
To feed their phantom bands.
They love the mangy coyote,
The rangers' one true friend,
They turn him loose to range and kill
After they marked his little end.

The Buffalo Ranch has horses,
The stalls and the ranges full,
A cross between old Sea Biscuit
And the wily Sitting Bull.
Sea Biscuit, so to stalk the elk.
He is so fast and fleet;
Sitting Bull, so he can squat
Until the ranger takes his seat.

To make room for horses
The coyote and his ilk,
The wise old would-be ranger
He decides to kill our elk.
They are now too few to migrate
And far too wise to be run,
So into their protected rangeland
There's a ranger with a gun.

A ranger whom they trusted,
As they lie, contented, serene,
Deep in their winter refuge
It's shameful, disgustingly mean;
The ranger who betrayed a trust
Who has lost his self-respect,
Out to slaughter the very herds
We had paid him to protect.

So listen, all you tourists!
Maybe you hear that shriek of pain,
This is just your precious ranger
Killing your trusting, protected game.
No longer safe, no refuge near,
Our herd is doomed to roam,
No longer can they lie serene
For they no longer have a home.

Today our rights stand challenged,
By a few sore bigoted men,
No longer may I hold them
With this fast but bleeding pen.
Speak up! Or forever hold the tongue
For with your candid remark,
Lives or dies your great north herd,
Who migrate via Yellowstone Park.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, first let me reaffirm my longstanding belief that the United Nations with all of its imperfections is the best mechanism so far devised to keep the peace. Despite its shortcomings, it has successfully dealt with many complexities and conflicts arising in today's world.

Since 1945 there has been an almost explosive growth of new nations. The United Nations of 1945 was a banding together of 51 nations to combine their power and influence and place it at the service of the charter's aims—peaceful settlement of disputes, the independence and security of nations, including the small and the weak; cooperation for economic and social progress and for the advancement of human rights; self-government and self-determination for dependent peoples; justice and respect for international law. The authors of this charter could hardly have anticipated the speed of the vast independence movement, or the turbulence that would sometimes attend it. Today the U.N. body is formed of 104 members, many of which are Soviet influenced. Of the original 51 members only 11 were from Africa or Asia; today, of the 104 members 50 are from Africa and Asia.

I quote two paragraphs of a letter from the Secretary of State dated January 19, 1962:

> For 16 years the United Nations has served the national interest of the United States as well as the interests of most of its other members, through its many regular functions and its peace-keeping functions. There are, of course, strict limits to United Nations action, limits set by the willingness of its members to support extensions of the United Nations' executive role.
>
> But the United Nations' growing capacity to act goes well beyond its much publicized military operations. It provides various kinds of advice and self-starting aid for all of its less developed members. It also provides a wide range of peaceful setttlement procedures, ranging from single representatives of the Secretary General to peace observation teams, mediators, conciliation commissions, and the general supervision of progress toward self-government. The peacemaking role of the United Nations serves our interest because many of the disputes contain the seeds of war. While some of the crises taken to the United Nations continue to be dangerous, in many instances the trend has been reversed.

In spite of my continuing support of the United Nations, I have grave apprehension concerning the proposal of the United Nations to offer $200 million in long term bonds to meet its present financial crisis. I also have misgivings about the wisdom of committing the United States to the purchase of one-half of the total bond issue. It is too easy to follow the primrose path of deficit financing. I believe there is an alternative method which might well be employed by the United Nations in solving its fiscal dilemma.

Article 19 of the United Nations Charter denies to any member nation the right to vote if it is more than 2 full years in arrears in its payments. This has been construed as meaning its payments to the regular annual budget, and not special assessments for such operations as the Emergency Force or the Congo undertaking.

I may say that there is a caveat in article 19 of the United Nations, allowing a member to vote if the question of arrears is beyond the control of the nation. If a small country has an exceedingly difficult economic situation to contend with, or is faced with a great national catastrophe, it could be allowed to vote even though it was more than 2 years in arrears in its general assessment.

An examination of a list of countries in arrears on November 30, 1961, is quite interesting. We find that Hungary, for example, was in arrears on its annual assessment $476,000. Its regular budget assessment per annum is $288,500. It is apparent that the total owed by Hungary is just under the 2-year assessment; therefore, Hungary continues to vote. Of course Hungary along with other satellite countries in the Communist bloc has refused to pay anything toward the support of the Emergency Force in the Middle East or the Congo operation.

Of all the 104 members of the United Nations, only the following were paid up in all three accounts—Annual Budget, Emergency Force and Operation Congo—on November 30, 1961: Australia, Canada, Ceylon, Denmark, Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, and the United States.

Thirteen nations of 104 were paid up.

I ask unanimous consent that a table showing amounts owed by various countries as of November 30, 1961, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.N. PAYMENTS AND DEBTS

The following table lists the 99 of the U.N.'s 104 members who were responsible for the payments to the regular U.N. budget, the U.N. Emergency Force in the Middle East and the U.N. operation in the Congo when the assessment list was tallied by the U.N. last November 30. U.N. statistics did not then include figures for the 5 newest members admitted last fall: Sierra Leone, Mongolia, Mauritania, Syria, and Tanganyika.

	Annual budget assessment	Arrears	U.N. Emergency Force arrears	Congo arrears
Afghanistan	$41, 217		$38, 415	$26, 416
Albania	27, 478	$14, 535	33, 373	27, 298
Argentina	762, 517	736, 049	873, 930	488, 708
Australia	1, 229, 644			
Austria	295, 389	62, 036	80, 458	634, 210
Belgium	893, 038	57, 212	43, 245	1, 495, 973
Bolivia	27, 478	55, 050	37, 324	27, 298
Brazil	700, 691			449, 082
Bulgaria	109, 912	24, 986	125, 586	109, 190
Burma	54, 956			15, 899
Byelorussia	322, 867	290, 782	393, 591	693, 207
Cambodia	27, 478	24, 746	3, 722	235, 555
Cameroun	27, 478	27, 098	15, 452	2, 131
Canada	2, 136, 421			
Central African Republic	27, 478			7, 925
Ceylon	68, 695			
Chad	27, 478	31, 098	15, 452	8, 990
Chile	185, 477	160, 056	87, 037	118, 875
China	3, 441, 630	6, 274, 483	4, 022, 703	3, 927, 969
Colombia	212, 955	192, 212	106, 392	136, 486
Congo (Brazzaville)	27, 478	31, 098	7, 968	10, 056
Congo (Léopoldville)	27, 478	31, 098	4, 206	8, 990
Costa Rica	27, 478	30, 667	21, 660	17, 611
Cuba	171, 738	148, 757	186, 992	170, 609
Cyprus	27, 478	31, 098	4, 206	8, 990
Czechoslovakia	597, 648	112, 665	709, 019	1, 283, 171
Dahomey	27, 478	31, 098	382	935
Denmark	412, 171			
Dominican Republic	34, 348		9, 356	80, 129
Ecuador	41, 217	26, 918		26, 416
El Salvador	34, 348		17, 150	22, 013
Ethiopia	41, 217	37, 120	64, 177	26, 416
Federation of Malaya	116, 782			33, 680
Finland	247, 303			356, 612
France	4, 396, 493			7, 216, 191
Gabon	27, 478			7, 925
Ghana	48, 087	43, 307	6, 514	30, 918
Greece	157, 999	21, 419	155, 891	101, 263
Guatemala	34, 348	207, 638	17, 134	22, 013
Guinea	27, 478	3, 000	7, 484	27, 298
Haiti	27, 478	63, 916	13, 735	17, 611
Honduras	27, 478	45, 179	7, 673	17, 611
Hungary	288, 520	476, 283	348, 802	286, 624
Iceland	27, 478		3, 722	7, 925
India	1, 689, 902	139, 999	[1] 749, 138	
Indonesia	322, 867			206, 930
Iran	144, 261			67, 458
Iraq	61, 826		74, 944	61, 420
Ireland	109, 912			
Israel	96, 173	86, 614	26, 196	61, 638
Italy	$1, 545, 642		$421, 001	$3, 318, 544
Ivory Coast	41, 217	$367		
Japan	1, 504, 425			1, 084, 695
Jordan	27, 478	24, 746	33, 373	27, 298
Laos	27, 478	24, 746	3, 722	17, 611
Lebanon	34, 348	30, 934	24, 498	34, 121
Liberia	27, 478		3, 931	
Libya	27, 478	24, 746	33, 373	27, 298
Luxembourg	41, 217			
Madagascar	41, 217	27, 824	3, 154	12, 698
Mali	27, 478			7, 925
Mexico	487, 736		513, 399	484, 530
Morocco	96, 173	158, 728	26, 879	95, 541
Nepal	27, 478	24, 746	25, 611	17, 611
Netherlands	693, 822			
New Zealand	288, 520			
Nicaragua	27, 478	40, 349	5, 754	17, 611
Niger	27, 478	31, 098	4, 206	8, 990
Nigeria	144, 261	52, 500	22, 084	41, 605
Norway	336, 607			
Pakistan	274, 781	140, 000		79, 247
Panama	27, 478	23, 366	27, 506	17, 611
Paraguay	27, 478	60, 797	29, 611	17, 611
Peru	75, 565		92, 582	48, 430
Philippines	295, 389	133, 013	82, 518	189, 319
Poland	941, 124	818, 569	1, 208, 150	1, 342, 070
Portugal	137, 390			136, 308
Romania	233, 564	70, 347	344, 414	501, 468
Saudi Arabia	41, 217		54, 012	40, 946
Senegal	41, 217	39, 504	6, 309	13, 569
Somalia	27, 478	31, 098	7, 968	10, 056
Spain	638, 865		801, 444	639, 667
Sudan	41, 217		69, 811	26, 416
Sweden	954, 863			
Thailand	109, 912			
Togo	27, 478		4, 206	8, 990
Tunisia	34, 348			9, 905
Turkey	405, 302			
Ukraine	1, 236, 514	1, 113, 581	1, 479, 085	2, 664, 835
Union of South Africa	384, 693			825, 949
Union of Soviet Republics	9, 356, 287	8, 408, 843	12, 774, 084	20, 088, 253
United Arab Republic	219, 825	152, 738	311, 920	218, 380
United Kingdom	5, 344, 487			1, 926, 697
United States	22, 332, 810			
Upper Volta	27, 478		7, 968	10, 056
Uruguay	82, 434	69, 327	22, 973	52, 833
Venezuela	343, 476	305, 896	46, 528	220, 138
Yemen	27, 478	45, 346	33, 373	27, 298
Yugoslavia	240, 433			238, 853

---

[1] Services of Indian contingents in the United Nations Emergency Fund will be credited toward unpaid contribution.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, the General Assembly of the United Nations at the same time it authorized a bond issue, asked the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion on the question of whether special assessments are mandatory obligations of member governments as are the annual budget assessments. It is my understanding that the legal authorities in our own State Department believe that a favorable decision will be rendered. The decision is expected in May.

In anticipation of such a decision would it not be wiser to meet the financial crisis in the United Nations by means of short-term borrowings? If the Court says a nation has to pay its special assessments within 2 years or lose its vote, many nations will pay up.

Among the nations most enthusiastically supporting the United Nations policy in the Congo about which I have many misgivings, there are many who have contributed little or nothing to the military operation there. Surely many of them can and would pay up under the pressure of being disenfranchised.

I know the agrument is made that Russia and the satellites will not pay up, and if they lose their vote, that they will pull out of the United Nations and lead to its disintegration. I cannot follow the logic of this argument. Russia and its satellites can pull out whenever they please. Russia has remained in the United Nations because continued membership best serves its national purpose.

I think the United States should at least take the lead in the United Nations to find some short-term method of meeting its current debts. I would certainly rather see the United States purchase $100 million worth of 2-year, 2-percent notes from the United Nations than the long-term bonds now contemplated. If at the end of 2 years the member nations had not made good on their assessments, the bonding method could then be considered. If the International Court decides as I think it will in May, the United Nations fiscal dilemma may be resolved by the spring of 1964.

The Congress is being asked to increase our own debt ceiling to $308 billion. I hate to see the United Nations resort to the dangerous policy of financing its operation through long-term funded debt. Special problems will continue to arise and special costly programs will be needed. In 1957 it was the Gaza strip; in 1961 it was the Congo. What it will be in 1965, none of us knows, but there will be trouble somewhere, and funds will be needed to implement a program. In supporting the long term bond issue, the State Department points out that annual repayments to cover the costs of servicing and retiring the bonds will amount to about $10 million. It is said that this amount would be raised by a modest increase in the regular assessment budget. In that way all nations would contribute to the Congo costs.

I think the Russians are too clever to fall for that. The Russians could easily withhold 3 or 4 percent of their annual assessment, explaining that none of their payments should be applied to the liquidation of the bonded indebtedness. If Russia or any other nation followed such a policy, they would have 20 or 30 years of grace before their annual budget assessment account was in arrears by 2 years. Russia's annual assessment is $9.3 million. On November 30 Russia owed $8.4 million. This was, of course, for the regular administrative assessment. If Russia withheld 3 or 4 percent of its new annual assessment, it could run along for many years before its account was $18.6 million, twice its annual quota, in the red.

I would hope, Mr. President, if the hour is not too late, that serious consideration be given to a short term method of getting the United Nations fiscal house in order. I am convinced that the people in many of the countries now behind in their payments to various United Nations accounts are unaware of this situation. Surely, many of the smaller countries that vigorously support the United Nations Congo policy can meet the modest payment assessed against them.

Most private clubs follow a fairly standard procedure in collecting dues and accounts from members. If a member is in arrears, his name is posted, and the unfavorable publicity of such posting generally results in the payment of the indebtedness. If this fails, the member is suspended; and if arrears continue, ultimately expelled. The U.S. Information Agency might well bring to the attention of the people of the defaulting nations the fact that they are in default.

Long-term deficit financing for current costs, emergency or regular, would establish a dangerous precedent in the United Nations. Could not this same method be used for public works projects by the U.N. in underdeveloped countries? Could not a huge U.N. technical assistance program be financed by bonds? If we buy half of the Congo bonds, how can we ever explain our refusal to buy half of any future bond issue?

I wish to elaborate on this point. Spokesmen for the administration say that this is a one-shot or a one-time operation, that it will never happen again. We do not know what will happen. We do not know what the costs of the United Nations will be. But once we establish a precedent of buying one-half of the bonds, the same spokesman will come to us the next time and say, "Well, we will have to do it again." The next time it may be a billion dollars, not $200 million, and we will be expected to take one-half the bonds because we took one-half in the first place. No one will understand our motive if we do not. The prestige of the United States will drop if we do not again take half the bonds.

Mr. President, I call on Senators who are members of the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Foreign Relations, to study seriously the full impact of long term deficit financing for the United Nations. Surely there must be a better way.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. MORTON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I compliment the Senator from Kentucky for suggesting at least one alternative to suicide for the United Nations. The fact is that in December the United Nations owed $108 million. By June 1962, that debt will have increased to $170 million. With the Congo costs running from $8 million to $10 million a month, it is perfectly obvious that a $200 million bond issue would carry the Congo operation through only until November, when more money would be required. In the meantime, the issuance of bonds would establish a precedent not only for financing the police actions of the United Nations, but also a precedent for financing the regular operations of the United Nations.

As the bond method becomes popular, more and more countries will become slack in paying their assessments, so perhaps the assessments would be cut, and the U.N. would simply revert to selling bonds, of which the United States would be expected to buy one-half, as we are asked to do now. If we buy any bonds at all, other countries may expect us to buy more than half. I had some experience in that field a year and a half ago, when I was a member of the Appropriations Committee at the United Nations.

The Senator from Kentucky is exactly correct in saying that we might expect the United Nations to vote appropriations running as high as billions of dollars and ask the United States to purchase bonds to pay the cost. I cannot think of any clearer road to suicide than to start on such a course.

There are other alternatives, of course, but before we consider alternatives, I should think it would be advisable to get the facts. Apparently the United Nations does not have the best bookkeeping system in the world. Up to this point it has been impossible to find out whom the United Nations owes and what it owes for. Some representatives of our Government and of the United Nations are working on that question at the present time. They hope to have an answer for us some time in the near future. I certainly hope they will, because that is a very important question.

The Senator from Kentucky is also correct in saying that we should await the opinion from the World Court of International Justice before we take action. I believe the World Court will find that the assessments for the costs of the Congo operation and the Gaza Strip police action are as binding as are assessments for the regular costs of the United Nations. If they are not, then the United Nations is really in immediate trouble and probably could not stand up very long.

As the Senator from Kentucky has said, it is true that article XIX of the charter provides that members who become in arrears in their dues to the amount of the last 2 full years will lose their votes. The catch in that is that although Russia would be likely to lose her vote under article XIX some time within the next 15 or 18 months—and other members of the Soviet or Communist bloc would probably lose theirs also—Russia would still retain her membership, particularly her membership in the Security Council, as well as her permanent membership with full veto power. There is no provision in the charter, that I know of, which would deprive Russia of her veto power over any action the other members of the U.N. might wish to take.

However, I feel that if an earnest endeavor is made to collect the assessments from all the members of the United Nations, most of them will pay them. In fact, some of the countries which are now in arrears simply have not made their last payment. For instance, in December, Great Britain was in arrears more than $2 million. There is no doubt that Great Britain will pay that amount and not run any danger of losing her vote. Great Britain, Canada, the United States, and the other countries which the Senator from Kentucky named are stanch supporters of the United Nations. We have kept the United Nations going by advance payments of our assessments and by other support which we have given. Nevertheless, it is essential that the assessments be collected from those members who believe in the United Nations, who realize that they have responsibilities in the United Nations.

Then some means must be found to deal with the few recalcitrants who remain. Personally, I would rather have them out of the United Nations completely than to have them remain in the organization, refusing to pay their assessments, but still making as much trouble as possible for the members who do take their assessments seriously and conscientiously.

I agree that Russia would be very loath, indeed, to leave the United Nations or to lose her voice or her vote in the U.N. It is worth too much to her.

I sincerely appreciate what the Senator from Kentucky has said on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. MORTON. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his cogent comments. I know that he as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations will give this proposal careful study. I think long-range deficit financing is really a primrose path to tread, whether we buy bonds in a proportion of 40 or 60 percent, or whatever the proportion may be. It seems to me that for us to do so would establish a precedent which would go on and on and on.

As the Senator from Vermont knows from his experience as a delegate to the General Assembly, there is much support for the transferring of our technical assistance program to what is called UNTA—the United Nations Technical Assistance program—and, of course, at the same time for Uncle Sam to pick up the tab.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. MORTON. I think there are many advantages to having technical assistance handled through the United Nations; but, on the other hand, it would be all too easy to say that this is a matter which can be handled through the sale of bonds. After all, Mr. President, how would such bonds be sold? Directly or indirectly, the credit of the United States would be involved, because we would purchase a large share of them; and, in addition, as the principal supporter of the United Nations, we would have an obligation to support the bonds which others might purchase.

Today we have hundreds of billions of dollars of contingent liability which we do not think of when we talk about our national debt. The proposed United Nations bonds would be another vast contingent liability on the credit and the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. President, I do not want to see the United Nations go down the drain because of its fiscal dilemma, whatever it may be. I agree with the Senator that we must ascertain to whom the money is owed and for what it is owed. But I agree that the issuance and sale of such bonds would not be a solution of the problem of handling either the current expenses or the unusual expenses of the United Nations. After all, there will be other unusual expenses in the future.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHANGE OF NAME OF THE PLAYA DEL REY INLET AND HARBOR, VENICE, CALIF.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 157) to change the name of the Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif., to the "Marina del Rey, Los Angeles, Calif."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is H.R. 157.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the Senate committee report on the pending business be printed at this point in the Record. I have marked the appropriate paragraphs.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to change the name of the small-boat harbor at Los Angeles, Calif., now known as Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif., and also known locally by other names, to Marina del Rey, Los Angeles, Calif.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif., is located on Santa Monica Bay, Los Angeles County, on the coast of California, 20 miles northwest of Los Angeles Harbor, and 410 miles southeast of San Francisco Bay. The project was authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 1252), in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document 389, 83d Congress. The project is nearing completion.

The Federal plan of improvement provides for establishment of a harbor for light-draft vessels, consisting of an entrance channel and basin which will provide protected berthing facilities for about 7,000 small craft and for parking 2,500 trailer-mounted craft. The portion of the project in which the Federal Government participates is the main entrance channel, main harbor, revetments, and protective jetties. The side channels, bulkheads, relocations, smaller sheltered berthing areas, tide gates, access roads, parking areas, and necessary land required are to be provided at local cost. The Federal participation is limited to $2,350,000, or about 10 percent of the cost of the entire project.

The name "Playa del Rey—The King's Beach" has come down from the days of the early Spanish settlement and is not considered descriptive of the harbor, which is a marina for small craft. In addition, other names have been used locally which has caused confusion.

Local interests, particularly the Department of Small Craft Harbors and the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County, Calif., have requested that the name of the Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor be changed to Marina del Rey.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

The committee is in accord with the desires of local interests and recommends enactment of H.R. 157, which would change the name of the Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif., to the Marina del Rey, Los Angeles, Calif., since this project is a harbor exclusively for the use of small craft. The committee is not aware of any opposition to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 157) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO THE STATE OF WYOMING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 889, H.R. 3879, and that it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 3879) to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the State of Wyoming for agricultural purposes certain real property in Sweetwater County, Wyo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is the intention of the leadership to withhold action on this measure pending the return of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], who is absent on official business and at the request of the administration. I make this announcement only to indicate to the Senate that there will be no action taken on this proposal until the arrival of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRAFFIC DISASTER AT GREELEY, COLO., DECEMBER 14, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, on December 14, 1961—less than 2 weeks before Christmas—the worst traffic disaster in the history of Colorado occurred near the city of Greeley. On that cold bright morning, a schoolbus was struck and sliced in two by a streamliner, overdue on its way to Denver.

Twenty schoolchildren were killed. An additional 14 children were seriously injured. This accident has shocked and horrified the people of Colorado who, I believe, are determined to see that all within human power is done to insure that such a disaster shall not happen again.

It is perhaps ironic that, at the very time of the crash, the Interstate Commerce Commission was engaged in a thorough investigation into the prevention of rail-highway grade-crossing accidents involving trains and motor vehicles. This study, still in progress, is of a very great importance. The regulations and legislative recommendations which will result from the ICC study should go a long way toward insuring that all possible safety precautions are taken at grade crossings.

In both 1959 and in 1960, I called upon the Commission to initiate such a study as this. I was therefore most pleased by the action of the ICC, on February 6, 1961, in initiating the investigation. It has long been needed.

This need was never more tragically demonstrated than it was by the school bus disaster at Greeley.

Gov. Steve McNichols, the Colorado Public Utilities Commission, and other State officials have carefully investigated the causes of this accident. There is much to be learned from their study, much which will be of value to the ICC in its investigation of grade-crossing safety standards. For this reason, I addressed a letter on January 16, 1962, to the Honorable Rupert L. Murphy, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I request unanimous consent that this letter be made part of the Record at this point:

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

January 16, 1962.

Hon. Rupert L. Murphy,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Murphy: As you know, over past years, I have called upon the ICC to launch a complete investigation into the prevention of rail-highway grade-crossing accidents involving trains and motor vehicles. I have long felt the need for a full review of our safety standards in this regard is imperative.

I was therefore most pleased when the Commission on February 6, 1961, saw fit to begin such a study. It has long been needed. This study is currently in process.

The importance of this subject was tragically and forcefully brought home to all Coloradoans on Thursday, December 14. On that day in Greeley, Colo., a schoolbus was sliced in two at a grade crossing by the streamliner City of Denver.

Twenty children were killed, 13 more hospitalized.

This is the worst tarffic accident in the history of our State.

It is an accident that could have been prevented.

The Colorado Public Utilities Commission, the Governor, and State officials have carefully investigated the causes of this accident. I deem it of the highest importance that the results of this study be heard by the Commission as part of its investigation No. 33440. I request, therefore, that a hearing be held by the ICC in Denver, Colo., so that the lessons learned from this appalling disaster will be made a part of the Commission study.

It is my understanding that the commissioners engaged in this study will be holding hearings in California in the near future. I suggest, therefore, that the Denver hearing be held as part of the commissioners' western trip, as they return from the west coast.

Kind regards.

Sincerely,

John A. Carroll.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I was most pleased to receive a reply from the Chairman on January 17, and I ask unanimous consent to make this reply part of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Interstate Commerce Commission,
Bureau of Safety and Service,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1962.
Hon. John A. Carroll,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Carroll: This has reference to your letter of January 16, 1962, requesting that an investigation be made of the Greeley, Colo., train-schoolbus accident which occurred on December 14, 1961, and that it be made a part of the investigation into the prevention of rail-highway grade-crossing accidents involving trains and motor vehicles covered by docket No. 33440 currently in progress.

A recommendation has been made to the appropriate division of the Commission for the holding of a hearing in the Greeley, Colo., accident and if approval is obtained, such a hearing will probably be held at Greeley on February 8, 1962. Every effort will be made to have all pertinent information received at such hearing made a part of the proceeding in docket No. 33440. In this respect it should be pointed out that a hearing in the investigation instituted by docket No. 33440 is to be resumed on January 23, 1962, in Washington, D.C., while the recommended hearing in the Greeley accident will not be held until February 8, 1962, that being the earliest available date for the Commission.

Regarding the holding of future hearings in California in docket No. 33440 I wish to advise that while this matter was discussed at a prehearing conference and at past hearings in that docket no definite conclusions have been reached in this respect; although some of the parties to the proceeding expressed a desire to have continued hearings in California. This question will be opened for discussion at the January 23 hearing and undoubtedly a definite answer will be forthcoming at that time or shortly thereafter.

If I can be of any further assistance, do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely,

Rupert L. Murphy,
Chairman.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I was informed on Wednesday that this hearing will now definitely take place on February 8, at 10 a.m. in the Greeley City Hall. I am confident that hearing will be of great value to the Commission.

As an example, Mr. President, of the great concern felt by the people of my State and of their desire to see that shortcomings are eliminated from present safety standards, I ask unanimous consent to introduce into the Record at this point, three editorials from Colorado papers, from the Denver Post, the Rocky Mountain News, and Arapahoe Herald.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Denver Post, Dec. 17, 1961]

Schoolbus Safety Can Be Improved

A manslaughter charge has been filed against Duane Harms, 23, driver of the Greeley schoolbus which was struck by a train, killing 20.

This is the obvious thing to do. Harms was the person whose actions appear to be most directly responsible for what happened.

But we say this, also: Harms was not alone.

He was not alone because there were plenty of other people—and plenty of public jobholders—who had a hand on that steering wheel almost as firmly as did Harms, if only symbolically.

It is easy to blame people and conditions in retrospect. And yet there are a few observations about the unsafe condition of that crossing that invite the suggestion that somebody's safety standards were out of joint.

The road crosses the tracks at an extreme diagonal. Looking to the right, as Harms did, obviously was difficult. He told authorities that he looked in the rear view mirror as part of his check of track conditions.

With testimony indicating that Harms possibly did not come to a complete stop, this is no excuse. And yet the conclusion is inevitable that this angle crossing may have added to the dangerous condition which exploded at 8:01 a.m. Thursday.

In correcting this situation and others like it, wherever they exist, Coloradans ought to ask these questions:

Should not school officials be required by law to report any unsafe bus route conditions to the county commissioners? One former school official contacted said he, as a superintendent, made annual studies of road safety. He says he received good cooperation from the commissioners in correcting bad conditions, including unsafe crossings.

One Weld County commissioner told the Denver Post all he remembers discussing with school officials last fall was the district's complaints about "rough roads and the need for gravel."

And are all county commissioners, themselves, sufficiently awake to the problem?

What, also, about the Colorado Public Utilities Commission? Its authority seems fairly broad in regulation of a utility as the operation of that utility affects public safety.

Actually, the PUC has ordered some flasher signals installed north of Denver.

Apparently more are needed, although the cost of installing them at all crossings (at $20,000 per mainline flasher) would be prohibitive.

Straightening out diagonal intersections might also be worth investigating. The State highway department, for example, discourages angle crossings on State highways.

One possibility seems to have merit: requiring flashers at crossings where two critical factors are involved; schoolbus routes and high-speed trains.

This would cut down the area of expense considerably. Not many rail lines are really high-speed affairs, and not all the crossings involve schoolbuses.

There are many things that need to be done. Many agencies need to get together and find out how such tragedies can be averted.

The atmosphere should not be—and we know it will not be—to fix blame. It will be correction. And we suspect that Duane Harms, himself, would go happily to jail if he could feel assured that the public was taking a hand to try to make sure nothing like this happens again.

[From the Rocky Mountain News, Dec. 17, 1961]

To Prevent Another Tragedy

The tragic schoolbus accident near Greeley last week has focused attention on another frightening statistic.

In the first 10 months of 1961—January through October—there were 63 accidents involving schoolbuses in Colorado. And on just 1 day last week, the State patrol recorded three schoolbus accidents in the Denver area, all fortunately without injuries.

It is true that in these accidents on the record through October, there were only 21 injuries and 1 fatality.

But that is a near thing. It would have been so easy—just a few seconds either way for the bus or for the train—to have missed the shocking tragedy which claimed 20 lives.

As long as there can be near-misses, the danger of such tragedies exists. So long as these are possible, the boys and girls on their way to and from classes are not completely safe.

It would be difficult to put too much stress on the need for full and complete training for all drivers of schoolbuses. What may be adequate for other drivers, including those holding chauffeur licenses, can still be inadequate for the drivers in whose care the lives of children are placed.

Driving a schoolbus is a tremendous responsibility. Not only must the driver handle the vehicle safely, but he must watch over and control his young charges and, at the same time, be on the lookout for outside hazards. This is certainly expecting a great deal of any individual.

That means the utmost care must be taken in selecting drivers. And they must be given the most complete instruction—including full training in all aspects of safety.

Even that, however, will not always be adequate.

It seems to us worth the trouble—and expense—to make certain that schoolbuses cross railroad tracks only where they have protection, mechanical or human.

A full stop at crossings is a minimum. Even a stop with the driver walking out in front of the bus for an unobstructed view of the tracks is not fully protective.

In most cases there certainly should be flashing lights or even mechanical arms to protect crossings which are being used by children and by buses.

Most city schools organize safety patrols—utilizing children themselves—to help protect the boys and girls at street crossings.

Perhaps some form of this safety patrol idea can be devised to add safety at otherwise unprotected rail crossings.

It is no use blaming the driver, or anyone else, for the tragedy at Greeley. Rather let us look to the shortcomings in the present methods and precautions and see that this tragedy is not likely to be repeated ever again.

[From the Arapahoe Herald, Dec. 19, 1961]

TWENTY PUPILS DIE

After a tragedy like the one at La Salle, Colo., last week, everyone starts asking what can be done to prevent railroad crossing deaths.

Several suggestions have been made.

Mature bus drivers should be hired when possible. Men and women in their thirties or forties have developed a sense of caution and they still have good reflexes.

The rule about stopping at crossings is good, and it is generally observed. What is not strictly followed is the requirement to open a door on the bus so that the driver may hear a train's whistle. We have recently observed three different Greyhound bus-drivers, and all consistently opened the door after the bus was a full yard on the tracks.

Motorists in private cars should turn off the radio and open the window before crossing the rails. A woman called us this week and complained that the bell at the Main Street crossing sometimes doesn't ring even though the red lights flash. She admitted that she never rolled down a window to let the sound in.

The most dangerous type of crossing is the diagonal one, such as at La Salle or at the South Prince Street tracks in Littleton. Motorists see trains better if they approach at a 90° angle.

Some crossings are more dangerous than others. In 90 years, no one in a vehicle has been killed at Main Street despite the traffic volume. But on West Tufts Avenue, the death toll has been high. Since 1948, 12 persons have died there. Eastbound traffic cannot readily see northbound trains owing to a building. One newcomer recently had a train zip behind him just as he cleared the Tufts Avenue tracks. He sold his nearby house the next week.

Grade separations, like that at Hampden Avenue, are the ideal answer. But they cannot be built on all roads. Even automatic lights have been too expensive thus far. But some day the armament race will slow down and the Government will need to look around for peacetime projects. It can spend a few billion on underpasses, interchanges, and warning signals in order to provide jobs for defense workers.

Meanwhile the average citizen must realize that he has a serious responsibility for looking after the safety of his own family.

Mr. CARROLL. Lastly, Mr. President, I would say a word about the driver of this tragic schoolbus. Twenty-three-year-old Duane Harms almost miraculously escaped serious injury. He is now charged with involuntary manslaughter.

Young Mr. Harms has written me a letter—a letter which I feel all Senators will want to read. This letter speaks for itself. It speaks of the urgency of insuring that such an accident shall not happen again. Mr. Harms rightly says:

> This tragedy will never be forgotten, but I feel something should be done.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be made a part of the RECORD at this point:

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREELEY, COLO., *December 29, 1961.*

Senator JOHN A. CARROLL,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CARROLL: As you recall on December 14, 1961, I was the driver of the schoolbus at Greeley, Colo., where 20 children lost their lives. This tragedy will never be forgotten, but I feel something should be done.

I have received over 100 letters from all parts of the U.S.A. and the general opinion is: There are hazards on every bus route and especially at railroad crossings, which have been ignored. Surely something can be done and I am asking you to support or introduce some law that might correct such a situation. No one knows but the driver the responsibility that is involved in handling a bus load of children when windows are frosted. We cannot erase the tragedy, but we can certainly profit by this so that a tragedy like this may never happen again.

I will appreciate anything that can be done and I will be glad to help in any way I can.

Thanking you for the above favor I remain.

Sincerely yours,

DUANE HARMS,
JUDY HARMS.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as everyone familiar with Federal elections knows, many qualified Americans are systematically denied the right to vote—a century after the enactment of the 15th amendment.

Those responsible for this unconstitutional practice employ various means for denying the vote to men and women whose color, race, or origins they consider objectionable. Intimidation is one means; and in an attempt to protect Americans from such intimidation, whether physical or economic, the Congress enacted the civil rights laws of 1957 and 1960.

Another means by which the vote is unlawfully denied to qualified persons is the so-called literacy test. In many localities, these tests—often fair and nondiscriminatory on the surface—are used to prevent certain of our citizens from voting. The President of the United States, in his state of the Union address, spoke of the "insidious" use of these tests—and insidious it is. It saps at the strength of our democracy, and cannot be defended by anyone concerned with the fundamental rights of all Americans.

I do not think the requirement of literacy for voter qualification should be abandoned altogether. It is vitally important that those who select the men and women responsible for the operation of the Government be able to understand the questions on which they make their decisions.

But what must be prevented is the unfair and discriminatory use of these tests which results, not in determining whether a person can read, but in perpetuating the denial of the right to vote solely on the grounds of race, color, or national origin.

Therefore, I am, today, introducing a bill to prohibit the arbitrary use of literacy tests to deny the right to vote to citizens of the United States, including the natural-born, Spanish-speaking citizens both of the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The bill does not attempt to eliminate literacy as a proper and reasonable qualification for voting. It prohibits arbitrary or unreasonable tests which do not simply test literacy, but instead contain vague and indefinite standards. Our experience is that such tests can be and have frequently been used to deprive citizens of their right to vote without distinction because of race or color.

The bill would require States which use literacy tests to use an objective test. The test is whether a citizen has completed six grades of an accredited school in any State, the District of Columbia, or Puerto Rico. This is a recognized standard of literacy which has long been used in the maintenance of our national statistics.

The bill is limited to the imposition by the States of qualifications to vote in Federal elections. This is clearly a matter of national and congressional concern, and not solely of interest to the various States.

The purpose of the bill has had the endorsement and support of the Republican as well as the Democratic Party, and the unanimous recommendation of the Civil Rights Commission.

The need for congressional action in this field is apparent from the finding incorporated in the bill that literacy tests have in fact been misused to deprive citizens of this country of their right to vote because of their race. There can be no disagreement that it is proper and appropriate for Congress to take all necessary action to eliminate such practices in the United States.

If enacted, the bill would also prevent the denial of the right to vote to Spanish-speaking citizens who may be literate, well educated and informed, but who are not permitted in some areas to participate in the democratic processes of the country because they were born and educated in a part of the United States and its related territories where Spanish is the historic and chosen language of the people. The vast majority of these Spanish-speaking citizens of the United States have available to them all the information necessary for an informed citizen in Spanish-language radio and press. There is no reason why they cannot vote intelligently on issues and candidates. The legislation is necessary to make it possible for them to do so.

I express the hope that the committee to which the measure is referred will hold hearings shortly so that the Attorney General and others interested in the question can be heard, and so that witnesses both for and against the measure can be given the consideration which the proposal calls for. In my opinion it is only fair that a proposal of this kind receive quick and serious consideration in the committee which will have jurisdiction over it.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the bill to which I have referred in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the bill will be recevied.

The bill (S. 2750) to protect the right to vote in Federal elections free from arbitrary discrimination by literacy tests or other means, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and other Senators), was received, and read twice by its title.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am happy to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. First, I wish to express my appreciation to the majority leader, who with his customary courtesy gave me notice of the fact that he would do precisely what he has done upon the floor of the Senate today, having in mind, as I know he did, the fact that at the end of the previous session I substantially stated to the Senate that I would submit an amendment to a bill upon another subject in order to make it, as it were, the first sign that we had to have such legislation in the present Congress. I did not see the President asking for such a measure.

So first I express my appreciation to the majority leader for having in mind my deep interest in the subject.

Second, I ask the Senator if he will be kind enough to inform me whether or not the bill is an administration bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The bill is an administration bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think the action of the majority leader will be of very great satisfaction in many quarters. We have had a little problem in New York concerning our Spanish-speaking citizens, but our courts have thoroughly taken care of that question.

I think the distinguished Senator from Montana knows me well enough to know that what I am about to say is not said in any sense of presumption or trying to read into a situation any condemnation, but in view of the experience that we have had with measures of this kind before committees of the Senate. We know we have had to proceed in civil rights matters pretty much by taking off the calendar bills which come over from the other body. Can the Senator give us any assurances upon the subject of hearing, consideration, report, and an opportunity for action in the Senate upon the measure? I repeat that I know the Senator from Montana knows me well enough to know that I am serious. I know the Senator's good faith is complete, and that he would have action on the bill tomorrow if he could. But I wonder what assurance he can give the Senate on those subjects.

Mr. MANSFIELD. At the moment I can give the distinguished Senator from New York no assurance, because I have not discussed the subject with any member of the Judiciary Committee, to which I assume the proposal will be sent. But the Senator has heard me make a plea on the floor of the Senate for early hearings so that administration representatives and other witnesses on both sides of the question may be heard. It would be my intention, if the request were not given consideration after an appropriate time, to offer the proposal as an amendment to a measure pending before the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. Then the Senator in practical effect is saying to me—and again I speak in comradeship, because our objective is the same and I do not ask the Senator to agree—that he would propose to do exactly what I had in mind to do, with all the authority which he has as majority leader and in pretty much the same way I had in mind to do it, if we do not get satisfaction through the committee process within a reasonable period of time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The statement of the Senator is, generally speaking, correct. I would not want to be held too specifically to this general idea.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to ask the Senator another question, if he will indulge me again, again stating my deep interest in the subject, and in view of the fact that I have always been a foremost advocate of making the subject one of bipartisan consideration, and have, as the Senator knows, worked closely with Senators on his side of the aisle on civil rights matters, and hope always to do so. Are we to assume from the bill the Senator has introduced that this represents a change in what seems to be the policy of the President, not to send civil rights legislation to Congress, either in the last session or in this session?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would not say that this signified a change in any degree in the attitude of the President. He made it quite plain last year that he would like to use the authority vested in the Executive, together with the two civil rights bills which were passed by Congress in previous years. He has exercised that authority with vigor and discretion. I believe also that he has made an extremely good record in the field of civil rights during his first year in office.

The Senator from New York may recall that in the President's state of the Union address this year the President referred to the matter of literacy as a qualification, and in that connection I believe he used the word "iniquitous."

He also referred to the question of the abolition of the poll tax, I believe he said through a constitutional amendment, although I am not certain in that regard.

So I would say that this represents a steady advance in the administration's position, and that the President now intends to continue to use his Executive power; but that, in the light of events, based in part on the recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission, he has become extremely interested—on the basis of his state of the Union address—in seeing to it that such matters as the poll tax and literacy tests ought to be given early consideration.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Senator will indulge me further, I believe the Senator's bill is not in the form of a proposal following the constitutional amendment process. It is, as I understand, a proposal for a piece of straight legislation, a proposal to change statutory law. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. With respect to literacy, this is a proposal which I welcome, because I deeply feel that this is the route to take, rather than to follow the constitutional amendment process.

It will be remembered that on the question of the poll tax I received a very substantial number of votes a few years ago, decisively showing that that matter could be dealt with by law.

I am delighted that the Senator has introduced his bill. I compliment him upon his action. I do so regardless of whether it cuts the ground out from under me. That is quite another matter. I do not say that unkindly. The important thing is that this is being done. If the President of the United States is behind it, it makes it even more important than if I were for it. I am delighted that the Senator has introduced the bill. I have one other question to ask the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Before the Senator proceeds, I should like to say that the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has for many years been trying to get a measure passed by both Houses of Congress seeking to take the constitutional amendment route to correct the poll tax situation.

I honor him for the courage he has shown in this respect. I personally have held to his belief that that is the best way to handle the poll tax matter, namely, through a constitutional amendment. I do not believe it would take the States very long to muster the required three-fourths vote to make that amendment a part of the Constitution.

Mr. JAVITS. I would say to the Senator that now I am arguing as a lawyer when I say that the adoption of the statutory route for the measure which the Senator from Montana has presented to the Senate this afternoon is a very clear precedent as to what ought to be done in the matter of the poll tax; and I say this without asking the Senator's agreement, because he has expressed his view.

With respect to that point I should like to ask the Senator one further question. I have the right to assume, therefore, that this measure, as an administration measure, will stand by itself, and that it is not necessarily an indication of the President's intention to submit other civil rights measures to Congress, or that we will have any other messages on this subject—and of course the Senator has a right to state his position, and is not bound to reply with a yes or no answer—but the fact is that the Senator is telling us that this introduction of an administration measure means that the measure stands by itself in respect of civil rights legislation. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well, I am not in the habit of having words put in my mouth. Any 1 of the 100 Members of the Senate has a right to assume what he wants to assume, and is not limited in that respect.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Finally, I should like to say—and I can do this independently in my own time, although I am sure the Senator will indulge me further at this time—that I do not believe that this measure represents the totality of what must be done in terms of legislation if we are to redeem the pledge which the President made to the country in his campaign so far as civil rights are concerned, and if we are to do what must be done in terms of civil rights for our Nation's people, from the standpoint of either domestic policy or foreign policy.

Nonetheless, whatever may be its effect on what I had in mind to do, which I expressed very clearly, I am delighted that this step has been taken. I believe it represents recognition that this can be done by law, and that legislation is necessary in this field, rather than to take the constitutional amendment route—and that Congress must get into the act, as it were, if civil rights are to be assured; further, that Executive action is not enough.

I pledge myself, first, without in any way inhibiting my intended action, to cooperate in making certain that this gets done, as outlined by the Senator from Montana in complete good faith; second, that I shall continue to do everything I can to bring about the enactment of other legislation which is also essential in the civil rights field.

I thank the Senator for his graciousness in yielding to me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from New York. I say once again, as I have said many times, that he is consistent in his views. I hope this matter may be considered on a nonpartisan or bipartisan basis, because there is nothing much to be gained by either party making a political issue out of this subject, and that there is much to be gained by the people if we work together in trying to bring the issue to a head.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to address a parliamentary question to the Chair. Has it been decided to which committee the bill will be referred?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has not been referred as yet. It will have to be studied, and conclusion will have to be reached as to where it will be referred.

Mr. CARROLL. Reference has been made to the possibility that it will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not know. I assumed that.

Mr. CARROLL. I wish to commend the President of the United States, the administration, and the majority leader for bringing the issue before Congress now. The forthright statement of the majority leader is to be commended. After ample time has been given to a study of the bill and after hearings have been conducted, if the committee does not take action on the matter within a reasonable length of time, the majority leader has in a sense given notice that he intends to pursue the matter in other ways. I understood him to say he hoped it would be handled through regular procedures. If it is not, it will be presented, perhaps, in the form of an amendment later. I hope that will not happen. Is that the position of the majority leader?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. I have heard the colloquy between the majority leader and the able Senator from New York with respect to whether this bill represents a change on the part of the exective branch of the Government.

Obviously it represents a change, because the President has used his Executive powers very effectively in the past year, but now, as appears from the statement of the able Senator from New York, there is proposed a basic change in statutory law, which can only be accomplished through the legislative branch.

I therefore commend the President of the United States and the majority leader. As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, if the majority leader desires cosponsors on the bill, I would be happy to have my name added as a cosponsor of it.

It is a significant step forward. It is a step which is taken at the proper time. As to whether there will be other legislation on this important issue—and I have supported such proposals as have other Senators—we shall cross that bridge when we come to it. I think it is important that this step has been taken today. If the majority leader is looking for cosponsors, I shall be happy to place my name on the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should be delighted to have any Senator who desires to do so join in the introduction of this measure. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie at the desk until 12 o'clock tonight for that purpose.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, that being the case, I should like to have my name entered at this time in support of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall read the bill with the deepest interest. If it meets the test of the recommendation of the Federal Civil Rights Commission, and if it is agreeable to the majority leader, I, too, should be pleased to add my name, if the majority leader would find that congenial to him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It would be very congenial.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Following the splendid lead of the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], I simply wish to get the facts very clearly. My parliamentary inquiry is this: I gather that the bill which has just been introduced has been received by tacit unanimous consent, this not being the hour when bills are normally introduced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. That is quite all right with me and, I know, with every other Senator here. However, at what point in the legislative business will the determination be made by the Presiding Officer as to the committee to which the bill will be referred?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will have to be by the unanimous consent procedure, because the Senate is not in the morning hour, and any business transacted outside the morning hour must be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as in the morning hour, I should like to have the bill presented and a judgment made by the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asks the indulgence of the Senate for some time in which to examine the bill, so that it may be appropriately referred. Would the Senator from Montana care to ask for unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk until Monday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in compliance with the suggestion of the Presiding Officer, I ask unanimous consent that the bill recently introduced remain at the desk until Monday. In the course of the regular proceedings, the Chair would be prepared, I assume, to make known its findings as to the committee to which the bill will be referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. I have no objection, but I wish to propound another parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Montana is granted.

The Senator from New York will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JAVITS. At what time on Monday—not as to hour, but at what point of the proceedings—will the Chair make its determination?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. During the morning hour the Chair will announce the reference.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the rules permit any Senator who felt aggrieved by the decision of the Chair to take an appeal from the ruling of the Chair at that time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A Senator may appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have just listened to the interesting remarks made by the distinguished Senator from New York. I hope he is not considering ways and means to delay the measure, because the sending of the bill to committee is the regular procedure to get action, so that the Senate can face up to the proposal as soon as possible. If action is not forthcoming, other means will have to be found by which the proposal can be brought to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The last thing in my mind is to delay this measure. I am so desirous of having it enacted that I myself had intended to propose it to another bill under the very liberal procedure we have in this body on that subject. I think the majority leader understands my concern. I do not blame him at all for making the statement he has made, so that his views may be clear in the RECORD.

My desire is not to see the bill buried in a committee from which it is very unlikely to emerge. It is for that reason that I have had the practice made very clear, not only for myself, but also for the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], who opened the subject, and for other Senators who are not here today. We have a rather slim attendance today, and we are coming to the end of the day. My desire is to afford all Senators an opportunity to contribute their wisdom as to how best we can redeem the feeling of assurance that the majority leader has given us that he wishes to have the bill acted on at the earliest time and with real expedition.

I thank the Senator from Montana for allowing me the time to make this statement.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. I wish to compliment the distinguished majority leader for presenting this timely bill. I ask that my name be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the proceedings which have just taken place, I ask that the bill lie at the desk for additional cosponsors until and including Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly about the budget of the Kennedy administration, as submitted earlier this month to the Congress.

To my way of thinking, this budget is eminently sound, and I shall support it. In speech after speech on the floor of the Senate since I first became a Member of this body, I have supported the principles of fiscal responsibility. I believe that in times of high and rising national income, such as the present, the budget should be balanced.

When I speak of the budget, I refer to the rather mythical instrument which has always been presented to the country as the fiscal program of the administration. I use advisedly the word "mythical," because the budget about which we read in the newspapers and hear on the television and the radio is only one of four budgets, and in many ways is the least important one. Yet, as a result of the conventional wisdom over the years, this budget—which violates practically all the sound principles of accounting—is the one on which we in the Senate and our colleagues in the House of Representatives take our stand and make our appeals to the country.

Actually, Mr. President, what is needed here in the Congress and at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue is a capital budget—the kind of capital budget under which every well-run city in the Nation now operates.

When I was mayor of Philadelphia, a distinction was made—as it had been made for many, many years—between the operating budget and the capital budget. The concept is a simple one. The operating budget deals with expenditures for current services. The capital budget includes expenditures for capital improvements and for debt charges, other than interest, to retire loans for capital improvements, which must be paid off on an annual basis over a period of years.

Since I first came to the Senate, I have supported the efforts of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to persuade our colleagues to establish some kind of intelligent and understandable budgetary procedure similar to—as I have said—that now in effect in most well-governed cities in the United States. To date, our efforts have met with no success. We will persevere; and we hope that before both of us leave the Senate—and I trust that will not occur in the coming fall—it will be possible to reorganize our fiscal procedures in such a way that there can be presented to the country, in reasonably simple form, the true anticipated fiscal operations of the Government of the United States.

Actually, Mr. President, the conventional budget, which has received so much attention during the last week or so, is not the one which is important. The important budget is the one known as the national income accounts budget; and the figures on which this budget is based are readily available in the President's budget message. But, unfortunately, they are never stressed; and, therefore, the average citizen, the average voter, and the average newspaper or television or radio reporter is so accustomed to presenting the budget in conventional terms that this national income accounts budget is almost always ignored. The latter budget really throws the most light on the influence of the Government's fiscal policy on the condition of business and the condition of the economy. I commend a study of it to both my colleagues in the Senate and our constituents. One who examines it will see that the President estimates that for the fiscal year 1963—the year for which he has submitted his budgetary figures—the Federal Government will take out of the economy $116 billion, and will put back into the economy $112 billion. These are really the basic figures on which we determine the extent of our fiscal responsibility.

As I have already stated, the conventional budget is largely a myth, because it treats an appropriation for a loan or a self-liquidating project in exactly the same way in which it treats an appropriation for a grant or for the payment of personal services. No sane man would do that in making up his individual budget, nor would any sane corporation do it, inasmuch as such a procedure is clearly misleading.

To return to the national income accounts budget, we see from the figures I have already referred to that the surplus anticipated is, not $500 million, but $4 billion. These figures show that the budget is not inflationary, and that it will not become inflationary even if the $500 million surplus were to be eliminated by congressional and executive action. We would have to provide, by action taken at this session of Congress, for an increased payout of more than $4 billion above what the President has recommended, before we would find that the real budget—the national income accounts budget—was out of balance.

There are those who criticize the President's budget, among them able Members of this body, and they say that, in conventional terms, it will not be balanced, and they have predicted a deficit which they suggest may be as high as $5 billion. They may be right, but if so it will be because the present business recovery does not progress as rapidly as the President expects it to. If that business recovery falls off and we find profits declining and unemployment increasing, that is just the time when we would not want a balanced budget. So, if they are right, our fiscal position will still properly meet the needs of the time.

I for one do not think the President has underestimated the strength of the recovery which started within a few months of his taking office, but I find it reassuring, on reading the budget message, to note that he is aware that the economy can always turn down and that he is prepared to take measures, accordingly, to deal with that situation if it should arise.

Among those measures would be the standby public works bill, which is similar in principle to bills which I introduced in the last Congress and again last year, and the discretionary power which he asks, and which I will support, to reduce taxes at a time when we find ourselves clearly in a recessionary period.

Mr. President, I would not be candid with my colleagues if I pretended that these views were original with me. They are set forth more eloquently than I could do in an article written earlier this week by that distinguished and much respected columnist, Walter Lippmann, in his column "Today and Tomorrow," entitled "Philosophy of the Budget."

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lippmann's article may appear in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILOSOPHY OF THE BUDGET

(By Walter Lippmann)

The 1963 budget, which the President has just delivered to Congress, is likely to be remembered as a considerable landmark. That is not because of its size, which in spite of our special responsibilities for defense is, as compared with the other budgets of the Western World, about normal in relation to our population and our wealth.

This 1963 budget is noteworthy because for the first time in our history it states that the balancing of the budget—whether with a surplus, a deficit, or with neither—is a question of economic policy and of deliberate decision. It is not, as so many regard it, a question of right and wrong.

It happens that the estimates for 1963 show a trifling surplus in what is known as the administrative budget. But what is much more significant is the President's statement that "under present economic circumstances a moderate surplus is the best national policy."

It follows that if present circumstances were different, if there were not a recovery from the 1960–61 recession, a moderate surplus would not be the best national policy. On the contrary, the best national policy would be, as it has been in the past year, to choose to have a deficit sufficiently large to overcome the recession.

I am well aware that the economic philosophy of the budget is unfamiliar to many and that they look on it as dangerous and wicked. But the fact is that while Mr. Kennedy is the first President to make it the avowed official American fiscal policy, it has been the unavowed working philosophy of every administration, Democratic and Republican, since the great depression some 30 years ago.

It used to be a heresy to ask whether a budget should or should not be balanced with a surplus or a deficit. In this generation to ask the question has become the new orthodoxy.

Its central theme is that in the business cycles of recession and recovery, the budget can be and should be used to make the downswing short and shallow and the recoveries long and noninflationary. How can this be done? By using as a balance weight what the Government takes away from the taxpayers and what it pays out in salaries and contracts. The general rule is that in a recession there should be a deficit and in a recovery there should be a surplus. In the modern fiscal philosophy the budget should be used to balance not so much itself as the economy.

How this works is not made altogether clear by the budget we are all talking about, the budget that is called by the experts the administrative budget.

There are two main reasons why this kind of budget does not tell the real story. For one thing, it states the receipts from taxes when they are collected and not when they are incurred. Yet corporations and larger taxpayers are saving for taxes and therefore withholding money from the economy during the whole fiscal year.

And second, the administrative budget excludes the trust fund transactions because they do not require appropriations from Congress. Yet these transactions for highway grants-in-aid, for unemployment compensation and for social security payments, amount to almost $25 billion a year. They have a large impact on the ups and downs of the business cycle.

There are in use, as a matter of fact, two other budgets—the consolidated cash budget and the national income accounts budget. It is this latter budget that throws the most light on the influence of the Government's fiscal policy on the condition of business.

What does the national income accounts budget show? It shows that for the year ending July 1, 1960, the Federal Government took from the public a little over $94 billion and paid out to the public about $92 billion. For the year we are now in, which ends in July 1962, the Government is estimated to be taking away $105.6 billion and paying out $106.1 billion. For the fiscal year 1963 (which begins on July 1, 1962) the estimates are that the Government will take in $116 billion and pay out about $112 billion.

These are the significant figures about the budget and what they show is that—as regards Government spending—the present fiscal policy position is not inflationary, in fact it is mildly deflationary.

The budget is being severely criticized by such men as Senator Byrd and Senator Keating. They are predicting that the budget will not, as the President predicts, be balanced, and that there will be a deficit that may run as large as $5 billion.

They may be right. But if they are right, they will be right primarily because the President is overestimating the strength of the present business recovery. If he is doing that, then the decision to balance the budget will have come too soon.

He will have made the same kind of mistake that President Eisenhower made in 1959 when he imposed deflationary measures on the economy, which was recovering but had not recovered fully from the recession of 1957–58. President Eisenhower's mistake, it will be remembered, deepened the recession and thus brought about the famous $12.5 billion deficit in 1960.

I am not intending to suggest that the President has made this mistake. There is impressive expert support for his decision. But it is reassuring to read in the budget message that he is aware that he may have made a too optimistic prediction and is prepared to take measures accordingly.

RELATIONS WITH CASTRO

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, we are presently concerned about the progress of the Punta del Este Conference, dealing with what action, if any, the Organization of American States should take with respect to Fidel Castro and the Cuban Government.

I rise to commend the President and the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, for the position they have taken at that conference. It now seems clear that we will not get everything we want. I do not think either the President or Secretary Rusk ever did feel we would get what we really want; but it now appears—and I hope my prognosis is not unduly optimistic—that, in all likelihood, Secretary Rusk will come back with a resolution of the Organization of American States which will expel Fidel Castro's Communist government from that Organization and, at the very least, rebuke it for having become the declared agent of a foreign power dedicated to the overthrow of free, non-Communist governments everywhere.

If that is to occur, it will be a substantial accomplishment, for which I hope the President and his very able Secretary of State will receive appropriate credit.

I have become somewhat impatient with the primitive approach of many of our conservative friends, who seem to believe that all the problems of the world are simple indeed, and if we are only prepared to fight and move with Marines and troops and airplanes to assert the American position around the world, and in Cuba in particular, all will be well. They seem to view, not only foreign affairs but frequently American affairs, as if this were a college football game in which cheerleaders labeled "Administration Supporters" and "Administration Opponents" lead the teeming stands in encomiums and "boo's" when particular moves are made on the chessboard of the world and its foreign affairs, much as moves are made by the opposing quarterbacks on football teams.

Mr. President, this is an endearing view of the world, and it must make an appeal to all of us who like to think of preserving a little bit of what things were not so many years ago, before we came into public life and entered the Senate; but I suggest that this primitive approach to international problems is not only unrealistic, but quite disconcerting to the country, and I would plead for the intelligent support of the President of the United States and his Secretary of State in the way they are handling our Latin American affairs at the Punta del Este Conference.

Let us never forget that it was in the Declaration of Independence, one of the two foundation documents of our country, that the first reference was made to the necessity for a decent respect for the opinion of mankind.

I should very much dislike to see the day when American policy at home or abroad was conducted by these cynics who have no regard for world opinion and who believe we can bludgeon our way into peace and security by doing what seems to be in the hard-boiled, short-range interest of the United States of America.

Let us think what would happen if we were to take that fatal step, which I am so happy the President of the United States has refused to take, sending troops and the Navy and the Air Force into Cuba. The uproar of world opinion would be tremendous and adverse. We might well find the Soviet Union moving the next day into Iran. I have no doubt the present efforts, which I trust will be successful, to bring peace to the wartorn nation of Laos, would immediately collapse. The inter-American system would be irretrievably damaged. What happened to Castro himself and Cuba would be a relatively minor result compared to the wave of anti-Yankeeism which would sweep Latin America and much of the rest of the world. The reaction would probably be similar to the wave of anti-Indianism expressed here and elsewhere when that country, which, with us, had professed for so long such high ideals and such an interest in the opinion of mankind, entered into Goa and conquered that small dependency of Portugal by force.

We would be entangled in a guerrilla war nourished from outside of Cuba. In my opinion, it would be very like the long, drawn-out guerrilla warfare in Malaya, which took the British many years to overcome. I submit there is no reasonable ground for thinking that an intervention in Cuba could be a short, swift, clean-cut operation. It would be an entanglement which would cost us seriously in lives and wealth of the country.

I commend the President and the Secretary of State for the actions they are taking and the policies they have laid down with respect to Cuba before the Organization of American States. We can all hope it will be successful.

Again, candor requires the comment that these views are not entirely my own.

Again, I support them wholeheartedly. Again, I tip my hat to Walter Lippmann, whose column on dealing with Castro, published in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON DEALING WITH CASTRO

(By Walter Lippmann)

The conference of American foreign ministers in Uruguay has not concluded its work as this article is written. Moreover, it is being reported meagerly in this country and it may therefore be some time before we can come to an informal conclusion about it.

But it is not too soon to say that there is being created here an artificial and misleading standard by which to judge what is going on. Much too often the issues at Punta del Este are treated in terms of the United States winning or losing—if the condemnation of Castro is very severe and is accompanied by an all-around rupture of diplomatic relations and of trade relations, we win; anything less than this is something of a defeat.

This is, I believe, much too simple a view of a great and extremely difficult, of a quite unprecedented, problem in the history of the American states. The problem is how to contain and isolate Castro's revolutionary interventions, how to turn the Cuban Government from its attempt to become a full satellite of Moscow, how to convert it into a good and reliable member of the hemispheric system.

This will not be done by strong words in a resolution. Strong words never stop any revolution. Almost certainly it cannot be done by breaking off diplomatic relations in this hemisphere. The more Cuba becomes a part of the Soviet and Chinese system, the more it will use their channels to other states. It cannot be done by a general trade embargo. For 80 percent of Cuba's trade is now with the Communist bloc and the rest is with Mexico, Canada, and Western Europe. Cuba's trade with the other American states is negligible. Castro, we must remember, is not nearly so dependent on the Western Hemisphere as was Trujillo.

There is no good reason for crying out that we have been defeated because the biggest countries in South America will not vote for sanctions that would make big headlines in the United States but could have no substantial and decisive effect on Castro's regime. What, then, can be done that is worth doing?

The first thing to do is, as Brazil has been arguing, to lay a sound juridical basis for the containment of Castro. Existing hemispheric law was drafted by men who were thinking of the Second World War. They were thinking of the threat which had been posed of a Nazi or Fascist conquest of South America. If that were the present danger, if there were real danger of a Soviet military establishment in Cuba, those old treaties would still be quite useful. But the existing law is not directed accurately against the methods of the cold war, and it takes a lot of stretching to make the existing law fit Cuba's economic relations with the Soviet Union, or Cuba's agents and infiltrators in South America.

There is every reason to think that we can work out with the active assistance of the big countries of South America a statement of hemispheric law which fits the problem of Castro.

With a law amplified and clarified, we can move with general consent to organize inter-American machinery, in which we would take an active part, to expose and counter Castro's agents in this hemisphere. Moreover, while we cannot blockade Cuba, we can establish surveillance by sea and air and, without violating Cuban airspace, we can keep close watch on the military situation for signs of active Soviet intervention. For this it will probably be better that some diplomatic relations are maintained.

This is a general policy of containment, patiently, persistently and actively administered. There is one alternative to it. That would be for the United States to occupy Cuba, overthrow Castro, and set up a Cuban government that we like. There are many among us who favor doing this. If it were done, there would at first be very considerable rejoicing and enthusiasm among those who do not look beyond the excitement of the moment.

Once when the church bells were ringing in London to celebrate the beginning of a war, a statesman who had opposed the war said "today they are ringing the bells. Tomorrow they will be wringing their hands."

A United States occupation of Cuba would have enormous and far-reaching consequences. Although there are people who affect to think that there is no such thing as the opinion of mankind, or that a decent respect for it is unmanly, the uproar around the world would be tremendous. The inter-American system would be smashed. Whatever happened to Castro himself in Cuba, Castroism, fused with anti-Yankeeism, would rage throughout the hemisphere.

And we, in the meantime, would have entangled ourselves in a guerrilla war nourished from outside Cuba. It would be like the British war in Malaya, like the French wars in Indochina and in Algeria. There is no reasonable ground for thinking that intervention in Cuba could be a short, swift, and clean-cut operation. It could not be. It would be a lasting entanglement.

Believing this, believing that intervention would be a calamity, I can see no alternative to a policy of vigorous and alert containment.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KUCHEL AT LUNCHEONS AND DINNERS OF VARIOUS CALIFORNIA BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES COUNCILS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, during the first week of January, I was honored to be invited to speak before five regional luncheon and dinner meetings held in various parts of California under the auspices of the Building and Construction Trades Councils of our State.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a partial text of my comments, used in my address at these several functions.

There being no objection, the partial text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR KUCHEL

I am far more honored than I can tell you in being invited to speak before an audience such as this on this wonderful occasion. Over the years I have come to know many of you very well, and to have for you and your fellow members of the building and construction crafts a great and growing respect and, if I may say so, a growing friendship as well. Since Earl Warren honored me by making me a U.S. Senator almost a decade ago I have attended most of your annual conferences in Washington since they commenced some 8 years ago. Each of those occasions has given me an opportunity to talk to your representatives, to compare views, to become acquainted with your problems, and to be acquainted, too, with the highly important, unique, and complex character of the construction industry in America and the splendid role that it has played over the years in building our beloved country. And I look forward to meeting with you once again this spring in our Nation's Capital. Meanwhile, I repeat my gratitude for your invitation to meet with you this week in California. The reasons for my gratitude are many and I am sure you understand them.

Mr. President, we love our country, we respect its institutions and we pray that we, the people, and our Government, and our friends around the world, together may work for an honorable peace and for the freedom of mankind. As Americans we are dedicated to the preservation of our Republic. We are grateful for our own freedom. We are ready to make any sacrifice to preserve it. And in the unique system of free competitive enterprise which has built our country into the strongest, greatest nation on the globe, you and the free labor movement in America have played, and continue to play, your own proud and honorable part. Management and labor, in good and growing comradeship, have forged ahead, in time of peace, and have built new homes and buildings, new highways and reservoirs all across the land. And in time of war and emergency, American labor and management have together fashioned the strong sinews of defense which, throughout our history, have permitted our soldiers and sailors and airmen to vindicate our faith in our system and to emerge victorious over evil.

Thus, not alone in the building of America, but also in its preservation, the labor movement has represented a powerful partner in the protection of our freedom. And in the perilous days through which this present lifespan passes, trade unions in America continue as stanch defenders of our American way of life.

To the Communists, the labor movement in any country constitutes an inviting target. Labor in America early saw the evil of communism and the stealth and subversion by which it has ever tried to subjugate and to destroy the liberties of man. The American people are grateful for the vigorous Americanism and for the vigorous anticommunism which you successfully practice.

Mr. Chairman, all of us in this room, all of us in America, stand together in our unflinching determination to keep the freedom which the Constitution guarantees to each of us. We live at a time in history, accurately described as "a balance of terror." There is no place on this globe either safe or immune from the hazard of nuclear extermination. Nuclear tipped missiles, now in existence, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, are able, with varying accuracy, to zero in to any part of the world. The nuclear arsenal of the United States is far stronger than that of Communist Russia. That is the judgment of the military and civilian leaders in our Government best qualified to say. We intend to keep it that way. We seek peace with justice. We seek to deter aggression by maintaining an unwavering superiority of our nuclear weapons, our capacity to deliver them and, indeed, of our entire military establishment.

As I talk to you we are bringing into operational status new nuclear weapons and new bases from which to launch them in strategic areas all across America and beyond. We are speeding up the process, and one of the reasons for this is the laudable and patriotic decision which the leaders of your crafts took in announcing that, no matter what the cause, or legal provocation, your unions would not exercise their right to strike at any of the missile or space sites at which they labor. We are engaged in the most deadly serious business our country has ever known. With your faithful and constant adherence to your voluntary no-strike pledge on missile bases, my fellow Americans, we shall demonstrate that an aggression against America would swiftly and surely turn the land of the aggressor nation into a sea of fire.

You are interested, of course, in my views respecting legislation affecting organized labor. I try to call them as I see them. If you will let me say so, I try to represent the interest of the people. I am glad that on many issues in which you and your fellow members have a deep concern that we were able to share a common view. Let me recall some of them.

We were united in our opposition to the misnamed right-to-work proposal which would have meant no rights and little work.

We were united in believing there was a need for a balanced, equitable law requiring public disclosure for certain practices engaged in by both management and labor.

We were united in believing that prehire agreements in the construction industry should be entitled to the same recognition as collective bargaining agreements entered into in other industries. And the Congress, and the President, in 1959, agreed with us. After all, your agreements had been regarded for a hundred years as legal, binding obligations in your industry, until a rule, evolved with industrial plants in mind, placed them in jeopardy. Prehire agreements are universally regarded as indispensable in this industry. Why should they not be entitled to the same protection as agreements in other industries?

We expressly approved union-operated hiring halls. They have always been regarded as fulfilling the needs of both employees and craftsmen in the construction field. They have performed, in addition, a desirable social purpose. We gave effect to the principle of seniority in your industry. Seven day union security provisions were approved. Unions and employers were permitted to enter into agreements, in their own self-interest, to protect and preserve wages and working conditions established by local collective bargaining agreements at the site of construction. Finally, we specifically legalized vacation, apprenticeship and other training programs.

In the fashioning, gentlemen, of this record of progress, I have been pleased to participate from the outset, both as a sponsor and as an active advocate.

We were united in believing that national labor policy should operate in precisely the same fashion on all organized labor, and that it is indefensible and wrong to provide industrial unions with one set of rights but to subject craft unions to a different standard. Thus, we believe that President Eisenhower and President Kennedy were both correct in urging, in simple justice and fairness, that building tradesmen be treated equally with other workers in this land. There ought to be one labor policy, not two. Eisenhower recommended the so-called on-site amendment. I supported it. Indeed, the then Senator, now President Kennedy, and I were the co-sponsors of Eisenhower's oft-repeated legislative proposal.

We have been united in demanding revision and extension of the Davis-Bacon Act so that community wage standards cannot be undercut by fly-by-night operators using cheap labor, often imported from another State.

We were united in demanding that the prevailing wage law apply to the 41,000-mile interstate and defense highway construction program—the largest construction project in the history of man. May I recall, with considerable pride, that your speaker led the fight on this, supplied the swing vote in committee, and stood on the Senate floor, a little lonely at first, but with sufficient help as the months went by, until finally this fight was won.

In the United States with over 70 million Americans in the labor force, and in California with almost 6½ million people in our own labor establishment, the issues I have enumerated are neither narrow nor parochial. I frankly believe the position I took on them is the position that men of goodwill ought to take. I believe they are in the public interest. If I did not believe so, I would oppose them. And I apologize to no one for the record I have made. I believe it is a good record.

Last year I supported wages and coverage legislation by which over a 3-year period, workers covered under the law, will receive a minimum of $1.25 an hour. As of today, under the new law, they receive a minimum of $1.15 an hour. That means the minimum wage is $46 a week today. I have been denounced for voting for this law, under which in September 1963 covered workers will receive a minimum salary of $50 a week. I wonder how many of those who wrote denunciatory letters to me receive $50 a week or less?

Last year I supported legislation providing for Federal aid to education. You and I cannot justify the fact more than 1 million American children are being shortchanged by half-day school sessions. Neither do the national platforms of the Republican and Democratic Parties. I devoutly believe in local control of education. I also believe that the education of our youth constitutes a vital part—perhaps the most vital part—of the future of our country. I recall the words of Jefferson: "If you expect a country to be ignorant and free, you expect what never was and never will be."

You will remember the controversy which raged in the country in 1959. Investigation had established that some in labor had violated their trust. The facts demonstrated that there were evil instances of illegal agreements between some in labor and some in management who together conspired against the people. New legislation was introduced to deal with the problem. New legislation was needed. There were some who wanted no law at all. There were others who under the banner of reform sought to wipe out not only the abuses but also the rights of labor as well. I remember the Senate debate on the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act in 1959. I remember when with very little discussion the Senate adopted an amendment sponsored by Senator McCLELLAN, of Arkansas, ostensibly providing a bill of rights for labor. As I read and reread what we had approved, it appeared to me that a mistake had been made, so great a mistake, indeed, that there was an honest question under the McClellan amendment whether a union might have the right to expel pro-Communists or felons from its memberships. At any rate, on behalf of a number of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, I offered a substitute bill of rights the next day.

I endeavored to correct the inequities of the McClellan amendment. After a vigorous and searching debate, the Senate adopted my substitute by a vote of 77 to 14, with every member of the Republican leadership and every member of the Democratic leadership present and voting supporting me. Indeed, Senator McClellan himself supported my substitute. I was seeking fairness in labor legislation. I was endeavoring to represent the public interest, and that, I believe I did.

At any rate, the Senate thought so. The amendment I offered provided for equal rights within a labor organization, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom from arbitrary financial exactions, protection of the right to sue, and safeguards against improper disciplinary action. My cosponsors and I sought to deal with the subject realistically. We sought to write this legislation in terms of common sense rather than of uncommon abuse. We sought reasonable Federal recognition. We recognized that the greatest protection of a union member against potential abuse should not be simply by enumerated statutory rights, but also by a recognition of "reasonable" rulemaking power in the union itself. We wanted to fashion a bill of rights for labor which would permit the thousands of local unions in the country, most of whose officers are unsalaried, to discharge their responsibilities, to respect the rights of members, and to do it all without having a lawyer at their side constantly.

I am a lawyer. I like my profession. But I did not want to support labor legislation which might accurately be termed as the "lawyer's relief act of 1959."

Several questions which arose last year in the Congress will be before us again this year. You gentlemen will be interested in them as citizens, as Californians, and as trade unionists. They have to do with the defense of the Nation and they also have to do with jobs.

I have no doubt that the President acting on the recommendations of Secretary of Defense McNamara will urge the Congress to appropriate more money for the Defense Department than he urged last year; and last year's defense appropriation represented the largest peacetime military budget in our history. I have no doubt that the American people will completely approve whatever level of spending may be necessary to defend our country and to deter aggression. Part of the law of the defense budget provides that the Defense Department shall award defense contracts on the single basis of what bidder can give to the military the best, most efficient, and most economical military hardware or weapons systems. Under the law, firms in California have been awarded defense contracts of approximately 24 percent of the total. Some of my colleagues in the Senate from other parts of the country don't like that. They want to take California's defense business away from us for the benefit of their own constituents. The other day my friend from New York, Senator JACK JAVITS, and other New Yorkers, cried out against Secretary of Defense McNamara awarding contracts to California firms and not to New York firms. In the last session other Senators joined Senator JAVITS in sponsoring legislation, the effect of which would be to treat our fellow Californians unfairly. Not very many weeks ago the Governors of Missouri and Oklahoma joined in the shrill cry to deprive California defense firms of equal treatment under law in defense business. I regret to prophesy that others from varied parts of the country will join the attack.

I have said many times I have a duty to demand equal treatment for my Californians, no more and no less. And, of course, the Senators from any State have the same duty, no more and no less. But I shall continue to object with vigor any attempt to push or prod, or bully, the Defense Department into treating Californians unfairly under the law.

Shortly after President Kennedy took the oath of office he directed the Defense Department to channel contracts to firms located in labor surplus areas. I denounced that directive as illegal. In March the Comptroller General of the United States confirmed my position. Subsequently I arranged an appointment with the President. He assured me that our people in California would receive fair treatment. And I feel assured they will. I think the problem for you and me in this field is essentially one to be disposed of on the floor of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives.

Another vexing problem will recur, I am afraid, this year. In the last session some of my eastern colleagues attempted to repeal the 25-year-old 6-percent differential statute for Pacific coast shipbuilding. They almost succeeded. We prevented them from doing it by one vote on a rollcall. Without this statute, ship construction on the west coast would deteriorate to nothing. There is no other way to equalize cost differentials between East and West by reason of transportation expense. I anticipate my eastern colleagues once again will try to slap us down. And, once again, I shall fight to protect the legitimate interests of the people of my State.

Perhaps the greatest area of controversy, and perhaps the most important, in this year's Congress, will occur in our deliberations on trade policy and aid policy. In the coming months, I want to discuss these in detail with the people of our State. Suffice to say, on this occasion, that I believe in an expanding foreign trade, that I do not believe our country can live in isolation, economic or otherwise, but that in the trade debates, I shall never forget that I am an American Senator representing the American people, and dutybound to promoting their welfare.

On aid policy, I firmly believe our mutual security program, as adopted over the years by Congress, has been in the interests of our own American security. I supported it under Eisenhower. I shall continue to support it under Kennedy.

The policy of mutual security is written into the law: "To strengthen friendly foreign countries" and "to continue to make available to other free countries and peoples, upon request, assistance of such nature and in such amounts as the United States deems advisable and as may be effectively used by free countries and peoples to help them maintain their freedom."

But some of the Presidential recommendations and executive branch administrative decisions, I reject with finality.

I opposed the administration's proposal of last year that Congress authorize assistance to the governments of Communist European satellites. I still do.

I oppose the sale of military equipment, whether obsolete or not, to any Communist nation, in the Soviet orbit or not, and that specifically includes the regrettable Yugoslavian plane contract.

I object to the recently announced decision to loan $133 million to Ghana for a reservoir and an aluminum smelter. In my view, Ghana is not a friendly foreign country in the terms of the mutual security law.

Ghana is a totalitarian country. It has a one-party parliament. President Nkrumah's political opponents are in jail. Its trade unions are government controlled with a vengeance. Upwards of 300 Soviet bloc technicians are now stationed in Ghana, and more are shortly expected. And today, as we sit here, Moscow is training young Ghana military personnel on Soviet military reservations.

Nkrumah calls Khrushchev a champion of the African cause and a true friend of the oppressed peoples of the world. At Belgrade, he announced support of the Soviet Union position on issues ranging from Berlin to nuclear testing.

We do not strengthen the free world by strengthening the Communist world. I want our country along with our allies to extend a friendly, helping hand to governments and to peoples who value freedom and who decline to fawn or grover before Khrushchev.

We seek a just peace. We seek to help those who share our prayers for it. We seek freedom for mankind. And together, we, our allies, and those distraught but courageous states who join with us will move forward to attain these cherished goals.

I recall Churchill's words: "Humanity will not be cast down. We are going on—swinging bravely forward along the grand high road—and already behind the distant mountains is the promise of the sun."

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, if I may exercise the responsibility of the minority—a rather rare situation these days—I move that the Senate stand in adjournment, pursuant to the order entered on Tuesday, until Monday next.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the responsibility rests lightly on the ample shoulders of my friend from California, and I join in that motion.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the order entered Tuesday, January 23, 1962, adjourned until Monday, January 29, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, January 25, 1962:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John M. Steeves, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Afghanistan, vice Henry A. Byroade.

C. Allan Stewart, of Arizona, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Venezuela.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Vice Adm. Edward Nelson Parker, U.S. Navy, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Kenneth H. Tuggle, of Kentucky, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1968. (Reappointment.)

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Harold C. Woodward, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1962, vice Jerome K. Kuykendall.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Francis A. O'Neill, Jr., of New York, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1965. (Reappointment.)

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Andrew M. Bacon, of Louisiana, to be Comptroller of Customs, with headquarters at New Orleans, La.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Craig Pottinger, of Arizona, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 26, with headquarters at Nogales, Ariz.

U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

I. FOR APPOINTMENT

To be senior surgeon

* William Y. Chen

To be surgeons

Harry Allen
James E. Banta
* John D. Egan
William D. Hawley

To be senior assistant surgeons

Joan M. Altekruse
William L. Ashburn
Gerald D. Aurbach
Roger Berry
Maurice B. Burg
Alan J. Cooper
Paul C. Cronce
John L. Cutler
Alexander W. DeMasi
Roger A. Feldman
Robert G. Godersky
Ernest Hamburger
Joseph S. Handler
William R. Hardy
Sol Herman
Mark M. Kartchner
Joel V. Levy
Lloyd A. LeZotte, Jr.
Lawrence L. Marvin
Michael W. Moseson
Robin R. Nichols
William E. O'Malley
Bernard W. Palmer
Jack E. Pickering
William C. Roberts
Lewis M. Roch, II
Walter P. Savage
Jack Shapiro
Joseph T. Sobota
Evert M. Vander Stoep
George S. Walter

To be dental surgeon

Milton E. Schaefer

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

John G. Battles
Eugene R. Berg
Robert W. Bolton
James W. Brown
Karl J. Hettwer
James B. Hoaglin
Herschel S. Horowitz
Merlyn B. Johnson
Thomas L. Louden
Robert C. McAlexander, Jr.
James A. McTaggart
Albert J. Munk
Regis M. Nairn
Dale W. Podshadley
Sydney T. Pollard, Jr.
Donald L. Popkes
Thomas W. Ragland
Charles R. Robinson
Norman A. Roswick
John W. Vitamvas
John O. Wilson
Ralph A. Frew

To be senior sanitary engineers

Robert W. Jones III
William Q. Kehr
William A. McQuary

To be sanitary engineer

Martin A. Bauer, Jr.

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

Richard E. Reavis
Paul W. Weiser

To be assistant sanitary engineers

Albert W. Bromberg
Sandler H. Dickson
Donald G. Fox
Richard W. Gerstle
Richard D. Grundy
Richard E. Jaquish
Lee R. Lunsford
William T. Sayers
William L. Wagner
Carlton S. Wilder
Walter R. Wilson

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers

William L. Brinck
Dale S. Bryson
James R. Buchtel
Ronald F. Coene
Joseph R. Franzmathes
Roger C. Grimm
Elwyn Holtrop
Donald T. Oakley
Maris Pubulis
Barrett N. Sinowitz
Charles E. Tharp
Charles H. Wentworth III

To be senior assistant pharmacists

Edgar N. Duncan
Harry A. Hicks
Edward S. Thompson

To be assistant pharmacists

Linton F. Angle
Fred Angres
Max D. Dooley
Robert L. Duvall
Curtis G. T. Ewing
Clarence L. Fortner
Ronald D. Gilbert
Thomas B. Poux
James L. Snowden
Clair G. Wetmore
Gary J. Wold
Larry A. Wood

To be junior assistant pharmacists

Gordon R. Aird
Nancy B. Finch
John T. Gimon
Jules M. Meisler
Robert E. Miller
Andrew J. Passeri, Jr.
James A. Resko
Robert J. Schollard

To be senior scientist

Frederick F. Ferguson

To be scientist

Robert J. Ellis

To be senior assistant scientists

Carlton M. Clifford, Jr.
Arthur D. Flynn
William J. Goodwin, Jr.
Alfred R. Grzenda
Allan Hirsch
Eskin Huff
Julius A. Kasel
James G. Kelly
Micah I. Krichevsky

To be assistant scientist

Mars Y. Longley

To be sanitarian

Edison E. Newman

To be senior assistant sanitarians

Norman A. Geiger
Maurice Georgevich
James E. Martin
Roger O. Olmsted
George E. Prime
Thomas C. Sell
Robert A. Stevens
Robert W. Wilson

---

*Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

To be assistant sanitarians

Bobby F. Craft
Dale J. Johnson
David B. Moses

To be senior assistant veterinary officer

Jerry F. Stara

To be nurse officers

Dolores R. Basco
Helen Grosskopf
Germaine S. Krysan

To be dietitians

*Merme Bonnell
Lois M. Gamble
Jeanne M. Reid
Alice M. Stang

To be senior assistant dietitians

Phyllis M. Charest
Maureen A. Doherty
Mary E. Ferrell
Vilma C. Grassi
Esther C. Namian

To be assistant dietitians

Betty L. Beach
Elizabeth K. Witter

To be senior assistant therapist

Walter S. Sekiya

To be assistant therapists

Frank H. Troske, Jr.
Carol A. Wendell

To be health services officers

Rebecca C. Chavez
Joel J. Vernick

To be senior assistant health services officers

Charles P. Froom
Carol A. Lewis

To be assistant health services officers

Virginia C. Davis
Richard A. Mackey

II. FOR CONFIRMATION OF APPOINTMENT

To be senior surgeons

Walter C. Clowers
Charles M. Grace
Charles E. Horner
Alan L. Klein
Leon Sokoloff
Patrick J. Sullivan
George N. Wagnon

To be surgeons

Henry M. Gelfand
F. Gentry Harris
Ray H. Hayes
Lyman C. Wyne

To be senior dental surgeons

Albert C. Adams
Paul N. Baer
Oscar B. Tate
Gerson Wasserman

To be dental surgeons

William O. Engler
Colie H. Millsap, Jr.

To be senior sanitary engineers

Israel Bernstein
Norman E. Tucker
Charles L. Weaver

To be sanitary engineer

Clarence E. Cuyler

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

James G. Gardner

To be assistant sanitary engineer

Thurman B. Sauls

To be senior scientist

Joseph H. Schubert

To be scientist

Norman A. Clarke

To be sanitarian

John H. Fritz

To be veterinary officer

Winston M. Decker

To be nurse officers

Margaret F. Carroll
Bernadette T. Mesi

To be health services officers

Delbert L. Nye
Rachel S. Simmet

III. FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be assistant sanitary engineer

John E. Hagan III

In the Army

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298:

To be first lieutenants

Alley, Frank M., Jr., O85828.
Andrews, John De M., O87993.
Appleton, Forrest W., O92153.
Arwood, Thomas B., O90217.
Barnard, Robert H., O85852.
Barnes, William R., O85853.
Barrett, William M., O85859.
Bellaver, Richard F., O85881.
Borgmann, Wayne A., O85910.
Borstorff, Allan R., O85911.
Boysen, John H., O85919.
Brehner, Donald R., O94739.
Brown, Richard L., O85940.
Buckner, James L., O85950.
Butts, William T., O92170.
Byrd, James E., O85963.
Calhoun, George H., O85964.
Campbell, Donald W., O91784.
Caplick, William J., O85970.
Clark, Vernon L., O94280.
Clary, William T., O88629.
Coffman, Joe P., O85999.
Covington, Dwight H., O94281.
Curtis, George R., O86034.
Dahill, John B., O86039.
Daniel, Howard, Jr., O86042.
Dennis, John A., O86057.
Domal, Stanley J., O86072.
Donaldson, Orlow B., 3d, O86073.
Downey, Hal W., O86083.
Downing, William R., O86084.
Durham, Thomas F., 3d, O86101.
Eklund, Robert G., O91816.
Evans, Jaye H., O87510.
Finnerty, Ronald E., O92188.
Fluke, Eugene C., O86148.
Fox, Morton, O88379.
Frazier, Larry D., O86158.
Freeman, Monroe E., Jr., O93408.
Fudge, Eugene E., O86166.
Geiger, Arthur H., O89060.
Gracey, Lloyd F., Jr., O85755.
Graham, Charles McM., O91846.
Grassi, Robert H., O86197.
Gray, Harlen E., O88708.
Greene, Therman R., O86200.
Gregg, William G., O86202.
Groves, Charles D., O86207.
Groves, Michael D., O85551.
Harrington, George S., Jr., O89660.
Hayes, Richard E., O86238.
Hillen, John F., Jr., O85569.
Hobar, Basil J., O86266.
Horton, Franklin N., O86280.
Horton, Lowrey P., O89376.
Huggins, Bobby R., O86287.
Hunt, James W., Jr., O89224.
Jackson, George B., Jr., O94473.
James, Theodore K., O86313.
Jayne, Robert K., Jr., O86316.
Johnson, Harold D., O86329.
Johnson, Richard G., O94090.
Johnson, Stanley R., O86331.
Jones, Julius E., O86338.
Jordan, George W., Jr., O86341.
Kane, John S., O92206.
Karegeannes, Harry G., O92207.
Kelly, Edward J., O89523.
Keyes, Billy G., O86360.
Kimball, William D., O92079.
Kincaid, William L., O85429.
Kline, Gary L., O86377.
Krizan, William A., O86390.
Krupa, Stephen A., Jr., O91304.
Kuehl, James L., O86392.
Kuhn, William K., Jr., O94479.
Lawson, Owen D., O85602.
Ledbetter, Homer M., Jr., O86408.
Lindberg, Robert J., O87838.
Lovell, Don E., O86430.
Luzietti, John E., O94316.
Lyles, Billy A., O94484.
Markofski, Donald K., O86456.
Matchette, Claude R., O86473.
McGranahan, Kenneth L., O94320.
McInerney, Bernard M., O89253.
McNabb, Jerry W., O86503.
McNutt, Joel W., O86505.
McPeek, Donald F., Jr., O86506.
Megehee, Daniel B., O86509.
Mellon, James T., O85437.
Miles, Elwyn C., Jr., O93469.
Mitchell, Thomas P., O94492.
Moe, Donald W., O85623.
Morris, George A., O86549.
Morrow, Douglas C., O93061.
Neal, Samuel L., Jr., O86569.
Nee, John R., O91807.
Niven, Charles P., O86577.
Ondecker, Lawrence W., O94327.
Oliver, Robert T., O86593.
Parker, Purvis L., O89600.
Parks, James D., Jr., O87873.
Patrick, Horace B., O92111.
Phelps, Keith A., O94633.
Phifer, Thomas K., O86630.
Phillips, Harold E., O94635.
Pierre, Russell, Jr., O86636.
Provenzano, Robert J., O85642.
Pruett, Billy R., O85072.
Rath, Peter F., O89579.
Rawlings, Charles S., O93073.
Reddin, Thomas E., O86672.
Richardson, Joseph B., O89135.
Robinson, Robert R., O86695.
Rosamond, John B., O88905.
Rugenstein, Edgar H., O86708.
Salley, Robert W., O86715.
Sanders, Clarence B., Jr., O86717.
Sauvageot, Jean A., O91378.
Schultz, Kenneth R., O90469.
Schumann, Reinhard H., O89597.
Schwartz, Paul R., O94340.
Secrest, Bobby P., O92248.
Sherrell, Wilson J., O86757.
Singer, Lawrence A., O91383.
Sisterman, Lawrence E., O86768.
Snow, Quentin E., O88497.
Sparling, Darryl E., O86796.
Swain, Richard C., O92129.
Taylor, Paul W., O88970.
Taylor, Ralph W., O86846.
Taylor, William D., O86847.
Tew, Clyde A., O86851.
Thompson, John T., Jr., O94503.
Urciuoli, George R., O93094.
Vinett, Peter A., O86896.
Vitale, Michael L., O92267.
Vogl, Raymond E., O94354.
Wakelin, John D., O94507.
Waldrop, John C., O86902.
Wales, Wayne F., Jr., O85459.
Walker, Clifford M., Jr., O89307.
Wall, Kenneth L., O86903.
Watts, Thurman, O85279.
Welker, John J., O86921.
Wheeler, Albin G., O93100.
White, William L., Jr., O86929.
Wigner, Larry R., O94509.
Williams, Stuart H., O92273.
Wilson, Carroll R., O86941.
Wilson, Gifford D., O94802.
Wilson, Henry W., O86943.
Windham, William J., O86946.
Woods, Roy S., Jr., O86956.
Wright, Randolph M., O85708.
Wright, Willie F., O86960.
Young, Carl L., O86970.
Zahn, Kenneth C., O86973.
Zierak, Robert A., O86976.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Ashwood, Carl R., O88555.
Brady, Patrick H., O88015.
Crow, Kenneth E., O86025.
Harling, John T., O94303.
Harris, Leonard G., O94087.

---

*Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Hatfield, Earl P., O94463.
Heller, Kyle M., O88730.
Helser, Carl W., O88095.
Hopkins, Richard L., O88743.
Johnson, Harry D., O94766.
Laird, Stewart W., O86399.
Lampe, Christian F., O88415.
Lander, Robert J., O88779.
Loring, Douglas M., A88797.
Schiefer, Donald D., O94642.
Short, Edward A., O88204.
Summary, Robert J., O93085.
Tuten, William R., 3d., O94656.
Walker, Marvin E., O93096.

To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Hart, Suzanne D., N3054.
Tresselt, Elizabeth E., N3063.

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Nelson, Nancy L., L585.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3292.

To be captains, Judge Advocate General Corps

Rarick, David (AGC), O83617.

To be first lieutenant

Schulze, Howard D. (MSC), O84266.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287 and 3288.

To be captains

Connell, Thomas E., O1883672.
Dillard, Douglas C., O948755.
Jackson, Wallace L., O991180.
Johnson, William D., Jr., O4009950.
Langston, Gary E., O4009822.
Palenchar, Andrew E., O4005340.
Semerling, Ronald F., O1931808.
Shelby, Frank F., O2014622.
Smith, George K., O1702302.
Walker, William A., O1881717.
Wilson, Virgil H., O2021123.

To be first lieutenants

Buswell, Arthur T., O4064472.
Finch, Kenneth W., O4074806.
Jones, Luther E., O4035817.
Lotz, Thomas M., Jr., O4067038.
Lynch, Eugene S., O2298339.
Riovo, Jose A., Jr., O4063757.
Willis, Carlton, O5304286.

To be second lieutenants

Berriman, Edward T., Jr., O5207281.
Berthiaume, Paul D., O5006746.
Chamberlain, Craig R., O5307189.
Dalton, Clarence E., II, O5311773.
Farley, Joseph I., Jr., O2302244.
Frost, Dean R., O5213347.
Gray, Ronald E., O5307217.
Greenwood, Henry V., O5508876.
Hall, William N., O5307343.
Hicks, John A., O5504352.
Hughes, Patrick R., O5211811.
Hunter, Andrew H., O5704916.
Kerr, James E., O5403296.
Kershaw, Theodore G., Jr., O5405757.
Kieffer, George W., O5207739.
Lazdowski, Walter P., O5209217.
Markham, William E., O5310637.
Meisel, John L., O5211701.
Moore, Charles L., O5308997.
Mullenix, Ronald O., O5404960.
Piccolo, John A., O5005920.
Reiber, Carl F., Jr., O5005416.
Smith, David K., O5310459.
Soderstrom, Robert C., O5405699.
Szabo, Richard M., O5006132.
Walton, David J., O5010820.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3292, 3294, and 3311:

To be captain, Army Nurse Corps

Hankins, Cecile J., N797164.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Brown, John S., O5408318.
Janiga, Richard G., O5518111.
Lewis, Jack A., O5500379.
Lord, Raymond Y., Jr., O5012525.
Lowery, Rodney K., O1942268.
Swanson, Charles N., Sr., O4043843.
Thomas, Philip C., Jr., O5306781.
Willford, John W., O5301210.

To be captain, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Rodriguez, Simon Y., O2293278.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Carson, John W., Jr., O4044620.
Marlowe, Julius F., Jr., O2284031.
Scheetz, Walter L., O2290161.

To be captain, Women's Army Corps

Johancen, Mary G., L2300933.

To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Haupert, Irene T., N2302409.

To be first lieutenant, Dental Corps

Stegall, Robert G.

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Johnson, Jeremy R., O5001878.
Lockwood, Gary E., O2304292.
Poore, Roger S., O5304573.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Cohen, Harvey M., O4085307.
Deadrick, Lonnie E., Jr.
Sauer, Gerald F., O2305198.
Thuss, Charles J., Jr., O2300790.

To be first lieutenant, Veterinary Corps

Bratthauar, Robert E., O2300661.

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Mathews, Charlotte L., L2291662.

To be second lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Corbett, Mary J., N5407248.
Kerry, Hazel, N5411300.
Norton, Frances L., N5407465.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Jones, Ronald C., O5703982.
Kearns, William J., O2298414.
Mereness, Fenton R., Jr., O5006059.
Sandifer, Calvin P., VI, O5309980.

To be second lieutenants, Women's Army Corps

Carroll, Sallie L. E., L2302305.
Watson, Donna, L2302225.
Weber, Donna M., L2302371.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288 and 3290:

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Baker, John W., II
Barbour, Michael C.
Brennan, Richard E.
Conway, Brian J.
Curtis, James H.
Ernst, Barry L.
Gary, Dennis T.
Gee, Langston
Gerukos, John
Gordon, Thomas J.
Hallisey, John
Harvey, Edward A., Jr.
Howland, Elvin B.
Kendall, John L.
Kerner, George
Kovach, Frank
Kullbom, Merrill C., Jr.
Laible, James P.
Leone, Richard J.
Malt, Sherwin H.
Mance, William W., Jr.
Martin, Robert E., Jr.
McDermott, Arthur A.
McGowan, John J.
Miller, Dennis D.
Moody, Michael A.
Powell, Fredrick C.
Radcliffe, John H.
Ramirez, Oscar, Jr.
Reinert, John F.
Roedel, Paul E., Jr.
Rowlette, Lemuel A.
Simpkins, Charles M.
Snyder, Charles W., Jr.
Streeter, Charles L.
Thompson, Jerry L.
Truscott, James J.
Wallette, Alonzo V.
Weigand, Denis M.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Acuff, Alfred M., Jr.
Affourtit, Rene
Albertella, Raymond C.
Alexander, Franklin D.
Allison, William C.
Amick, Robert L., Jr.
Applebaum, Lawrence
Armstrong, Marvin C., Jr.
Arnold, Preston T.
Asherman, Richard E.
Austin, Ralph E., Jr.
Baggett, Fred K.
Baker, Richard H.
Banks, Stephen J.
Barber, Don W.
Barnes, John W.
Barquin, Brian L.
Batchelor, David K., Jr.
Battaglioli, Victor J.
Bax, Maurice F.
Bayer, James W.
Beck, Joseph W.
Belanich, Joseph F., Jr.
Bell, Eldered N., Jr.
Bellinger, Robert A.
Beltz, Charley L.
Bender, Charles D.
Benedict, Michael J.
Bence, William J.
Bickert, Dale J.
Biggs, Danny J.
Biggs, Henry D.
Bitler, William D.
Blackwell, David E.
Bonabolonta, Julius J.
Bonneau, William R., Jr.
Bonner, Harold S.
Boose, Donald W., Jr.
Bowen, Paul J.
Bowers, George W.
Bowman, William R.
Brennan, William A.
Brewer, Charles R.
Brick, William B.
Briggs, David S.
Bristol, Donald F.
Brown, Keith I.
Brown, Kenneth M.
Brown, Tony R.
Bruce, Gene D.
Brumfield, Wetzel D.
Buckley, James M., O5706523
Bulger, Dennis B.
Bungay, David J.
Bunton, Terry R.
Burchill, Howard R.
Burkholder, Warren S., Jr.
Burns, Gary M.
Byrne, William F.
Caggiano, Patsy G.
Call, William A., Jr.
Cambareri, Ross A.
Camp, Joseph W., Jr.
Campbell, David B.
Campbell, James A. B.
Canelos, William A.
Carley, John H.
Carlow, Richard D.
Carmolli, Nicki H.
Charbonneau, Ronald J.
Chase, Benjamin O., Jr.
Chatham, Ronald L.
Colan, Albert R., Jr.
Coleman, Alan B.
Coleman, Bennie L.
Colson, David A.
Cone, Edward E., Jr.
Conklin, William H.
Conners, David C.
Corliss, William K., Jr.
Couture, John F.
Coy, Dale E.
Croce, Paul A.
Cummings, Edward J.
Cummings, John W.
Cunha, Herbert
Curry, John L., Jr.
Curtis, Anthony M.
Curtis, Richard M.
d'Ambrogio, William J.
D'Andrade, Walter C.
Davis, Ryland P., Jr.
Deaton, Sterling W.
DeFanti, David J.
Deigert, Richard
DeLuca, Donald P.
DeMarco, Francis H., Jr.
Deveaux, William P.
DiEduardo, Joseph
Dittamo, Hector T.
Dodson, Billie R.
Dolan, David
Donovan, Timothy H., Jr.
Dopp, George G. B.
Dow, Peter T.
Drummond, Donn C.
Ducatte, Maynard R.
Dunn, David R.
Dunnington, Joseph C.
Dunton, James G.
Edwards, Floyd W., Jr.
Eger, John M.
Eller, James M.
Elliott, Thomas N., Jr.
Erway, Douglas K.
Erwin, Bobby D.
Evans, Richard A.
Even, Donald G.
Fardal, John E.
Farmer, Michael B.
Farris, James L.
Faxon, Robert M.
Feerick, Martin S., Jr.
Felter, Joseph H., Jr.
Fernandes, Alfredo J., Jr.
Ficalora, Paul B.
Firestone, Terry J.
Fischer, John G., IV
Fisher, Lawrence D.
Forcier, David N.
Fournier, Maurille J. P.
Freitag, Merle
Frick, Thomas N.
Gagnon, Richard J. E.
Garde, Daniel F.
Garvin, Richard F.
Gauthier, John A.
Gerard, Jacques B.
Giese, George H., Jr.
Gilbert, John R.
Gilmore, Gary B.
Glaser, Donald S.
Goetz, Arthur D.
Gorbea-Frontera, Roberto
Gorcys, Gregory N.
Greason, Earl S., 3d
Green, Joe C.
Greer, Peter R.
Grilli, Michael R.
Guinn, Jack L.
Hahn, Wade E.

Hale, William R.
Hall, Peter G.
Hall, Thomas F., Jr.
Hamilton, Robert E.
Hanley, Bruce M.
Hanson, John R.
Hardy, Rodolph D., Jr.
Hargen, Joseph
Hargus, Herschell H.
Harrison, Phillip T.
Hassett, Paul M., Jr.
Hatch, George S.
Healey, Dermot T.
Heer, Bernard C., Jr.
Heiler, Lee A.
Heinschel, Robert F.
Hellmuth, Robert W.
Hendrix, Paul V.
Henriksen, Thomas H.
Henry, Noah W., III
Hertel, Guy S.
Hickok, Philip J.
Hicks, Billy W.
Highfill, Gary W.
Hinds, Paul T.
Hines, Charles A.
Hitch, James K.
Hobbs, Gary L.
Hodder, Clinton A.
Holland, James R.
Horan, David C.
Howard, John W.
Huser, Herbert C.
Infantino, Robert L.
Ingersoll, John T.
Ivey, Oliver T., Jr.
Jackson, Larry L.
Janssens, Gerald R. J.
Johnson, Edward C., Jr.
Johnson, Kenneth M.
Johnson, Robert P.
Jones, Alan B.
Jorgensen, John F.
Kapelka, Stephen R.
Kay, John R.
Kehoe, John C., III
Kelly, David G.
Kennedy, John P.
Keup, Robert A.
Kizer, Carl S.
Krueger, Don E.
Krumanocker, Lawrence B.
Kueny, Joseph J.
Landrum, Benson F.
Lang, Walter P., Jr.
Larson, Kermit E., Jr.
Lasecki, Ronald P.
Laubenheimer, Russell J.
Lavoie, Wilfred G.
Lawless, William J., Jr.
Lawrence, William D.
Lawton, Allen E.
Lefelar, Robert A.
Leitao, Clifford D.
Lemon, David L.
Leonard, William E.
Leonhardt, Thomas C.
Lewis, Alan D.
Lewis, Peter C.
Liepis, William J.
Liphard, Arthur F.
Long, Hugh W., III
Longwell, Dennis C.
Lundy, James I.
Lyle, James M.
Lynds, Robert E.
Lyons, William T.
MacDonald, John M., Jr.
Maceyka, Edward A.
MacNamara, Gervase
Madish, Daniel T.
Mahoney, Hugh D.
Maier, Nelson H., Jr.
Majewski, Francis E.
Mallion, Richard J.
Mancuso, Frank N.
Mange, Richard C.
Manley, John R.
Mannix, Timothy
Manzi, Joseph F., Jr.
Marangola, Joseph C.
Marble, Kenneth A.
Masington, Nicholas, Jr.
Mason, Keith L.
Mason, Robert W.
Mason, Tommy R.
Matje, Robert W.
Maurer, George H.
Mayoras, Donald E.
McAndrew, James M.
McDade, Joseph E., Jr.
McFarland, Lewis G.
McFerron, Darrell A.
McGill, Brian J.
McGough, Joseph T., Jr.
McGrade, Harold J., Jr.
McIntosh, Robert D.
McKenna, Gerard M.
McQuade, Walter J., Jr.
Melander, Harold W.
Meler, Thomas R.
Mennerich, Dennis N.
Meshinsky, Edward
Mayer, Ronald J.
Miers, Kenneth L.
Miller, Eugene J.
Mingus, Thomas M., O5706306
Mitchell, Geoffrey S.
Moore, Earnest R.
Morgan, Paul B.
Mortensen, Ernest J.
Mott, William H., 4th
Mottola, Louis F.
Mullen, Edward F., Jr.
Murphree, John D.
Murray, Henry K., Jr.
Myers, Larry R.
Mylod, James P.
Najjar, Alphonse L.
Neale, James F.
Newman, Ralph E.
Newman, William F.
Niederfringer, Stephen C.
Nivica, Gjon N.
Noel, Albert E.
Northrop, Edward D., Jr.
Norton, James B.
Oberholzer, John A.
O'Connor, Dennis M.
O'Hagan, Patrick J.
O'Neill, Malcolm R.
Orenstein, Stanley A.
O'Rourke, Thomas C.
Orr, David H.
Oswald, Robert W.
Oualline, Charles E.
Pappalardo, Salvatore, Jr.
Parise, Joseph F., Jr.
Parker, John C.
Parlow, Robert J.
Parowski, Paul R.
Partyka, Gerald S.
Paulison, Robert P.
Payne, Robert K.
Peay, James H. B., III
Pepi, Jerome S.
Perrine, Charles H.
Peters, William C.
Peterson, Leon L.
Pezzullo, Joseph A.
Pike, Charles R.
Popkoski, Edward S.
Popp, Douglas M.
Porter, Jeffrey B.
Porter, Michael D.
Portmann, Joslyn V.
Posk, Joseph P., Jr.
Powell, Paul E.
Prezioso, Anthony A.
Pritchard, Arthur H., Jr.
Queen, Charles E.
Raines, Austin M.
Raquet, Charles A.
Read, Donald B.
Redmond, Lawrence A.
Redmond, Robert C.
Reed, James L.
Reed, Theodore R.
Reed, Walter B.
Reidy, Robert D.
Remenicky, James P.
Remling, Arthur A., II
Rencurrel, Ronald B.
Renigar, Frederick H.
Rethore, Bernard G.
Richardson, Hugh B.
Richardson, Willoughby F., III
Riggs, Harold E.
Rippee, Eldon T.
Rising, Stephen P.
Risor, Robert L.
Robinson, George L.
Roche, John H.
Rogers, Douglas H.
Rosson, Samuel I., Jr.
Rubery, Daniel J.
Rush, Terry J.
Salerno, Jerry A.
Salmon, Bardwell C.
Salvitti, Joseph M.
Samuels, Seymour, III
Saulnier, Philip J.
Savas, Andrew
Sawin, Frederick G.
Schmeelk, John
Schmiederer, John M.
Schroder, John K.
Senuś, Leon J.
Shadrick, Kirk W.
Shaw, Edward F., Jr.
Shaw, Stanley L.
Shein, Jeffries
Sheridan, John T.
Shestople, Nicholas
Short, Albert V.
Silvey, Bedford J.
Simpson, William N., III
Sims, Thomas L.
Sinclair, Roger L.
Smith, David B.
Smith, John C.
Smith, Samuel W.
Sneed, Thomas A.
Sobieski, Henry F.
Sobke, John F.
Sproul, Robert H.
Stanley, Arthur T.
Steinle, Peter E.
Stevens, Dale M.
Story, Jonathan, III
Streeter, Raymond C.
Strohbehn, Edward L., Jr.
Sutton, George E.
Szydlo, Robert B.
Tambling, David F.
Tanski, Chester J., Jr.
Tate, Raymond A.
Tate, Robert A.
Templeton, Geoffrey B.
Thees, John D.
Thompson, Lawrence E.
Thompson, Richard C.
Tragakis, Christopher J.
Trainor, Francis E.
Troup, Emile W. J.
Turcotte, Gerald V.
Turner, Harvey E.
Tyson, Robert D.
Ulmer, Jerry W.
Underwood, Harry W.
Vance, George W.
Van der Kieft, Michael L.
Vannes, Clayton L.
VanStone, John S.
Vaughan, Arvin M.
Veselka, Reynold
Vest, James A.
Vogel, William M.
Voss, James G.
Vozka, David
Wagner, William J., Jr.
Walker, Harvey C., Jr.
Walsh, William E.
Walton, Elmer D., Jr.
Ward, Francis E., Jr.
Ward, John D.
Warder, Francis P., Jr.
Washington, Billy J.
Webster, Lynn C.
Weigand, Gerald L.
Weigand, Robert W.
Weiss, Robert M.
Wellman, Allen C.
Wells, Douglas E., Jr.
Werner, Walter J.
Wheeler, Dale D.
Wheeler, Robert A.
Whitaker, Chester J.
Whitaker, Donald W.
Whitehead, Charley L.
Wilbur, Paul A.
Wilcox, Keith B.
Williams, Dock H.
Willis, Deral E.
Wilson, Charles S.
Wilson, Joe J.
Winn, Robert B.
Wintermantel, James C.
Winters, Kenneth T.
Wise, Eric W.
Wolf, Robert L.
Wood, Calvin S., Jr.
Wood, William W.
Woolever, Ronald J.
Word, Larry E.
Wrobleski, Dennis A.
Wuchler, Walter H.
Yardas, Douglas A.
Young, William G.
Zelez, Gordon N.
Ziegler, William F.
Zima, Ernest I., Jr.
Zwicker, Gary L.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, January 25, 1962:

Coast and Geodetic Survey

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be lieutenant commanders

Clinton D. Upham
Floyd J. Tucker, Jr.
Dale E. Westbrook

To be lieutenants

Donald W. Moncevicz
Donald R. Tibbit
Charles G. Elliott
Gerald C. Saladin
Raymond L. Speer
Clifford W. Randall
Renworth R. Floyd
Joe P. Pennington
Robert L. Sandquist
K. William Jeffers
Harold E. McCall
James S. Midgley
John M. Doherty
Billy M. Keltner
Charles H. Nixon
Melvin J. Umbach
Meinrade H. Schilly

U.S. Coast Guard

The following-named persons to the rank indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard:

To be lieutenants

Richard F. Eiden
William P. Penney
Rudolph T. Sommer
Roger F. Frawley
Richard M. Connor
Lee I. Levy
Charles H. Jehle
Costa J. Alton
John C. Hanson
Karl F. Welty, Jr.

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Robert A. Janecek
Oliver W. Barber, Jr.
Alan C. Peck
Kenneth F. Franke
Ernest Bizzozero
Bobby G. Kingery
Richard C. Walton
Hugh J. Milloy
David H. Freeborn
Marvin N. Bromen
Bruce G. Lauther
Lawrence Graham

To be chief warrant officers, W-4

Clavis W. Baum
Frank J. Recely
John T. Dailey
Raymond L. Barnett
Eugene Linnemann
Robert P. Stalcup
Elton W. Grafton
Homer E. S. Williams
Jack K. Ridley
Marion G. Rubado
Fletcher R. Peele
Manuel L. Bent
Leon A. Anderson
George B. Schack
Albert DeCosta
Albert J. Bates
Malcolm Versaw
William H. A. Herbst
John W. Colby
Irving T. Bloxom
Ernest L. Killian
Robert H. Burn
Leonest L. Tillett
Leroy H. Hermon
Gilbert W. Coughlan
Joseph J. Dobrow, Jr.
Henry A. Cook
Alfred M. Livingston
John Chartuck
John P. Ryan
William E. White, Jr.
Suell R. Grimm
Roland R. Davis
James W. Freeman
Edward E. Lewis
Oliver F. Rossin
Louis M. Piermattei
James W. Lockhart
Russell M. Young
Ellis M. Moore
Kenneth E. Payson
Martin J. Connolly, Jr.
Harvey J. Hardy
Gene D. Vecchione
Harry V. Hardy
Robert E. Sadler
Robert H. Kollmeyer
Henry L. Cotton
Roy L. Singleton
Andrew Kirkpatrick
Alexander M. Grant
Oliver T. Henry, Jr.
Foister E. Blair
William Keokosky
Nevette A. Gardebled
John E. Giles
George A. J. Michaud
Edward Petroski
Meredity D. Hazzard
Earlie W. Shelton
Frank Jakelsky
Robert H. Wiggins
Lawrence E. Wagner
Henry E. Ask, Jr.
Roy V. Sogaard
Norris D. Hickman
James T. Mead
Robert P. Ellard
Philip E. Barnard
Harold H. Rohr
Kenneth G. Sherwood
Elwood S. Hudson
Harold Eveld
Clinton A. Gregory
Walter R. Terry
Lloyd L. Franklin
Francis C. McCracken
Howard A. Carande
Charles U. Staska
Edgar W. Thomas
Stanley J. Salabor
David D. McCormick
Sterling Fulcher
Byron A. Barr
John A. Packard
Robert F. Anderson
Melvin H. Eaton

To be chief warrant officer, W-3

Kenneth L. Heinzen
George A. Knapp
Mark Fitton, Jr.
William H. Bellow
Frank H. Steinheiser
William H. Fraser
Leslie M. Furst
John H. Olsen
John H. Coppens
Eugene E. Moore
Raymond W. Gifford
Jay E. Law
Richard "M" Burdick
Frank A. Coleman
Eugene B. Cox
Robert E. Mooring
Donald O. Nelson
Charles W. Wicks
Eugene D. H. W. Willett
William F. Miller
Joseph J. Zagiba
Richard G. Thompson
Fred Permenter
George E. Rongner
John T. Renfroe
Albert DeBrase
Andrew Pietrykowski
Hugh B. Houston
George E. Carriveau
Donald E. Phillips
Karl M. Ashby
Elmer E. Johnson
John H. Bettis, Jr.
Maurice T. Hedgecock
James F. McLaughlin
Bob Nelson
Edward B. Eaton
Paul R. Cornell

Howard R. Tarr, Jr.
Eugene K. Kindschi
Robert E. Gardner
Clayton W. Collins, Jr.
Ralph G. Isacson
Joseph J. Bookout
John Rekuc
Harold R. Margrave
Francis W. Sullivan
Horace F. Hey
Leo Frey
Gordon W. Ault
Eric G. Bragg
Leonard L. Bouler
Robert L. Wilson
James B. Gill
Clifton Cuthrell
Cleo Hack, Jr.
Albert V. Carver
Mack E. McGuffin
Hubert F. Midgett
Hull O. L. Tanner
John E. Simpson
Wilson F. Jones
Boyden B. Bonnicksen
Oscar A. Erickson
Claude A. Broadus
James D. Toler
Donald C. Davey
William A. Shaffer, Jr.
Roy M. Schwanekamp
Kirven L. Dunn
Robert L. Walters
Darrell "B" Sinift
Joseph F. Baranowski
Edmund A. Novak
Lester H. H. O'Neil
Jerome R. Morton
Richard R. Anthony
Jack W. McDonald
Charles F. Potter, Jr.
William W. Muessel
George R. Brower
Robert L. Hatfield
Euclid L. Wade
Clark A. Johnson
Eugene W. Darcy
Dorris L. Steele
Eugene R. Lockhart
Ivan J. Anderson
Richard A. Krueger
Ernest N. Yaroch
Duane A. Force
Wallace N. Anderson
Joseph C. Waldrop
Daniel L. Knauss
Floyd J. Mulheren
Jack G. Smith
Charles W. Oldham
Mortimer Jeffords

To be chief warrant officers, W–2

James F. Coen
Louis R. McDowell, Jr.
Kenneth G. Allen
Lawrence R. Fillinger
Charles A. Carroll
William P. Goldwire
Jerry H. Hedgecock
Thomas B. Lain
William H. Goetz
Loyal Walley
Eugene D. Freeman
Warren K. Wordsworth
Louis J. Lusson
Hugh J. Milloy
Robert A. Roy
Roland E. Huggins
Emanuel Schneider
Alex Z. Walker, Jr.
Karl K. Drum
Russell A. Cahill
Seaborn W. Jones
Earl D. Johnson
Robert D. Askew
William B. Sobeck
Archie Brookshire
William J. Irrig
Austin C. Mee, Jr.
Edward P. Lewy
Robert V. Ricard
James R. Ingram
Edwin M. Custer, Jr.
Jimmie J. Davis
Jack A. Massey
Harry D. Smith
Fred V. Reed
Paul J. Bouchard
Daniel C. Mania
Richard H. Hicks
Marvin N. Bromen
Bruce G. Lauther
Robert E. Potts
Robert E. Diller
Harold E. Stanley
Billy R. Mull
John A. Donnelly
Charles R. McFarland
Leroy W. Peterson
Carl W. Snyder, Jr.
Philip M. Lebet
Edward A. Walsh
Samuel T. Buckman, Jr.
Ronald H. Youngman
Dean L. Webster
Hubert T. Blomquist
John D. Drewer
Robert L. Barr
Jackie R. Gore
James E. Mitts
Peter D. Van Horsen
Russell F. Mills
Ronald E. Wille
William F. Hunter
Harvey R. Little
John D. Ransom
Francis J. Honke
Robert M. Terkelsen
Peter F. Sterbling, Jr.
Richard H. Hill
Cecil L. McManus
Raymond H. Spoltman
Richard C. Tims
James F. Tutwiler
Elbert W. McKinney
Kenneth E. Wadman
Ernest R. Gronlund
Robert G. Carnilla
Willis A. Roderfeld
Paul W. Bicking
Alfred K. Rausch
Edward L. York
Francis W. Kelly
Edward B. Midgette
Douglas H. Derr
Robert L. Thompson
James E. Smith, Jr.
Ellsworth N. Slater
Richard J. Kilroy
Jack W. Dugan
Warren B. Barrett
Frederick W. Cressman, Jr.
Marvin J. Portwood, Jr.
James O'Connell
Arthur L. Jayroe
Elwood T. Elder
Patrick J. Flynn, Jr.
James N. Hodges
Dewey E. Sutton
Parker J. Pennington
Edward W. Kostbade
Charles D. Mills
James K. Beebe
Carl F. Baker
Charles L. Francis
John T. McGilly
Colt Rodgers
Cluese Russell
Robert E. DeMichillie
Charles R. Wilson
James H. Tyner
Charles R. Finn
Edward Schertzer
Harry F. Sanborn
John R. Alford
Albert R. Bennett
Paul R. Harp
Raymond J. Gorman
Glendon Grantham
Earl A. Ericksen
Robert A. Jones
Richard R. Terhune, Jr.
Charles F. Coolidge
Donald E. Grant
Robert C. Hilker
Cordus C. Bough
Eugene E. Doyle
Earl L. Dickson
Glenn E. Basham
John A. Marino
Robert A. Murrell
Arthur M. McIver
Omer L. Foster
Kenneth C. Garrison
Franklin L. Fountaine
Donald E. Dean
Dale T. Butler
Lyman R. Oliver, Jr.
Frederick R. Cooper, Jr.
Donald L. Conlon
Charles D. Pearson
Richard D. Bundy
Robert Casale
Harry V. Walker
Thomas E. Hilton
James F. Kaneaster
Gerald E. Palmer
Stephen Peckiconis
William T. Vanderberg
Richard A. Gill
Lennox A. Johnson
John H. Wiechert
Ivan B. Aiken, Jr.
Donald D. Luedke
Robert V. Bouck
John T. Watson
John W. Gates
George P. Spaniol
Blanchard M. Pierce
Truxton W. Payne
Robert D. Goodenough
Dalton L. Burrus
Elwyn C. Evans
Richard E. Eastman
John D. Kakalia
Edwin L. Mapp, Jr.
Robert D. Bowen
Richard J. Harding
Stanley W. Mead
William W. Southern, Jr.
William L. Broadwell
Francis V. McMahon
Charles W. Brandon
Fred E. Grombacher
Sewell G. Loggins
Jesse E. Sparks
Forrest W. Ringsage
Paul L. Cargile
Earl R. Schattenberg
George E. Prather
William H. Bacon
Franklin H. Doughten
Kenneth W. Bates

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Isaiah 43: 10: *Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, and my servants whom I have chosen.*

Almighty God, grant that in the achievements of each day we may bear clear and unmistakable witness that we are Thy servants and have Thy spirit of generosity and good will toward all mankind.

Inspire us with a deep and sincere concern for the desperate needs of our generation and the confident assurance that Thy grace is abundantly able to sustain us in our longings and labors to meet them.

May it be the goal of all our desires to give humanity the opportunity to bring to fulfillment and fruition those capacities and capabilities with which Thou, their Creator, hast endowed them. Thine be the glory forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 6]

Abbitt
Alger
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Avery
Baring
Barrett
Bass, N.H.
Becker
Belcher
Blatnik
Blitch
Boggs
Bow
Breeding
Bromwell
Broomfield
Buckley
Burke, Mass.
Cannon
Carey
Celler
Chiperfield
Clark
Coad
Conte
Cook
Cooley
Curtis, Mo.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Derwinski
Dole
Dooley
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Finnegan
Flynt
Forrester
Garland
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gilbert
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Harsha
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hemphill
Hoffman, Mich.
Hosmer
Ichord, Mo.
Inouye
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Jones, Ala.
Judd
Kee
Keith
Kilburn
Kirwan
Kunkel
Landrum
Lankford
McCulloch
McDowell
McSween
McVey
MacGregor
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Meader
Merrow
Miller, N.Y.
Moorhead, Pa.
Morrison
Moulder
Multer
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Norrell
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Neill
Patman
Pilcher
Powell
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rutherford
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott
Seely-Brown
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Shriver
Sisk
Slack
Spence
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Tupper
Ullman
Vanik
Van Pelt
Waggoner
Watts
Weis
Whalley
Widnall
Yates
Zablocki
Zelenko

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 306 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 314)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Twenty-eight years ago our Nation embarked upon a new experiment in international relationships—the reciprocal trade agreements program. Faced with the chaos in world trade that had resulted from the great depression, disillusioned by the failure of the promises that high protective tariffs would generate recovery, and impelled by a desperate need to restore our economy, President Roosevelt asked for authority to negotiate reciprocal tariff reductions with other nations of the world in order to spur our exports and aid our economic recovery and growth.

That landmark measure, guided through Congress by Cordell Hull, has been extended 11 times. It has served our country and the free world well over two decades. The application of this program brought growth and order to the free world trading system. Our total exports, averaging less than $2 billion a year in the 3 years preceding enactment of the law, have now increased to over $20 billion.

On June 30, 1962, the negotiating authority under the last extension of the Trade Agreements Act expires. It must be replaced by a wholly new instrument. A new American trade initiative is needed to meet the challenges and opportunities of a rapidly changing world economy.

In the brief period since this act was last extended, five fundamentally new and sweeping developments have made obsolete our traditional trade policy:

The growth of the European Common Market: An economy which may soon nearly equal our own, protected by a single external tariff similar to our own—has progressed with such success and momentum that it has surpassed its original timetable, convinced those initially skeptical that there is now no turning back and laid the groundwork for a radical alteration of the economics of the Atlantic Alliance. Almost 90 percent of the free world's industrial production (if the United Kingdom and others successfully complete their negotiations for membership) may soon be concentrated in two great markets—the United States of America and the expanded European Economic Community. A trade policy adequate to negotiate item by item tariff reductions with a large number of small independent states will no longer be adequate to assure ready access for ourselves—and for our traditional trading partners in Canada, Japan, Latin America, and elsewhere—to a market nearly as large as our own, whose negotiators can speak with one voice but whose internal differences make it impossible for them to negotiate item by item.

The growing pressures on our balance-of-payments position have, in the past few years, turned a new spotlight on the importance of increasing American exports to strengthen the international position of the dollar and prevent a steady drain of our gold reserves. To maintain our defense, assistance and other commitments abroad, while expanding the free flow of goods and capital, we must achieve a reasonable equilibrium in our international accounts by offsetting these dollar outlays with dollar sales.

The need to accelerate our own economic growth, following a lagging period of 7 years characterized by three recessions, is more urgent than it has been in years—underlined by the millions of new job opportunities which will have to be found in this decade to provide employment for those already unemployed as well as an increasing flood of younger workers, farmworkers seeking new opportunities, and city workers displaced by technological change.

The Communist aid and trade offensive has also become more apparent in recent years. Soviet bloc trade with 41 non-Communist countries in the less-developed areas of the globe has more than tripled in recent years; and bloc trade missions are busy in nearly every continent attempting to penetrate, encircle, and divide the free world.

The need for new markets for Japan and the developing nations has also been accentuated as never before—both by the prospective impact of the EEC's external tariff and by their own need to acquire new outlets for their raw materials and light manufactures.

To meet these new challenges and opportunities, I am today transmitting to the Congress a new and modern instrument of trade negotiation—the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. As I said in my state of the Union address, its enactment "could well affect the unity of the West, the course of the cold war, and the growth of our Nation for a generation or more to come."

I. THE BENEFITS OF INCREASED TRADE

Specifically, enactment of this measure will benefit substantially every State of the Union, every segment of the American economy, and every basic objective of our domestic economy and foreign policy.

Our efforts to expand our economy will be importantly affected by our ability to expand our exports—and particularly upon the ability of our farmers and businessmen to sell to the Common Market. There is arising across the Atlantic a single economic community which may soon have a population half again as big as our own, working and competing together with no more barriers to commerce and investment than exist among our 50 States—in an economy which has been growing roughly twice as fast as ours—representing a purchasing power which will someday equal our own and a living standard growing faster than our own. As its consumer incomes grow, its consumer demands are also growing, particularly for the type of goods that we produce best, which are only now beginning to be widely sold or known in the markets of Europe or in the homes of its middle-income families.

Some 30 percent of our exports—more than $4 billion in industrial goods and materials and nearly $2 billion in agricultural products—already goes to the members and prospective members of the EEC. European manufacturers, however, have increased their share of this rapidly expanding market at a far greater rate than American manufacturers. Unless our industry can maintain and increase its share of this attractive market, there will be further temptation to locate additional American-financed plants in Europe in order to get behind the external tariff wall of the EEC. This would enable the American manufacturer to contend for that vast consumer potential on more competitive terms with his European counterparts; but it will also mean a failure on our part to take advantage of this growing market to increase jobs and investment in this country.

A more liberal trade policy will, in general, benefit our most efficient and expanding industries—industries which have demonstrated their advantage over other world producers by exporting on the average twice as much of their products as we import—industries which have done this while paying the highest wages in our country. Increasing investment and employment in these growth industries will make for a more healthy, efficient, and expanding economy and a still higher American standard of living. Indeed, freer movement of trade between America and the Common Market would bolster the economy of the entire free world, stimulating each nation to do most what it does best and helping to achieve the OECD target of a 50 percent combined Atlantic community increase in gross national product by 1970.

Our efforts to prevent inflation will be reinforced by expanded trade. Once given a fair and equal opportunity to compete in oversea markets, and once subject to healthy competition from oversea manufacturers for our own markets, American management and labor will have additional reason to maintain competitive costs and prices, modernize their plants, and increase their productivity. The discipline of the world marketplace is an excellent measure of efficiency and a force to stability. To try to shield American industry from the discipline of foreign competition would isolate our domestic price level from world prices, encourage domestic inflation, reduce our exports still further, and invite less desirable governmental solutions.

Our efforts to correct our adverse balance of payments, have, in recent years, roughly paralleled our ability to increase our export surplus. It is necessary if we are to maintain our security programs abroad—our own military forces overseas plus our contribution to the security and growth of other free countries—to make substantial dollar outlays abroad. These outlays are being held to the minimum necessary, and we are seeking increased sharing from our allies. But they will continue at substantial rates—and this requires us to enlarge the $5 billion export surplus which we presently enjoy from our favorable balance of trade. If that surplus can be enlarged, as exports under our new program rise faster than imports, we can achieve the equilibrium in our balance of payments which is essential to our economic stability and flexibility. If, on the other hand, our surplus should fail to grow, if our exports should be denied ready access to the EEC and other markets—our oversea position would be endangered. Moreover, if we can lower the external tariff wall of the Common Market through negotiation, our manufacturers will be under less pressure to locate their plants behind that wall in order to sell in the European market, thus reducing the export of capital funds to Europe.

Our efforts to promote the strength and unity of the West are thus directly related to the strength and unity of Atlantic trade policies. An expanded export program is necessary to give this Nation both the balance-of-payments equilibrium and the economic growth we need to sustain our share of Western military security and economic advance. Equally important, a freer flow of trade across the Atlantic will enable the two giant markets on either side of the ocean to impart strength and vigor to each other, and to combine their resources and momentum to undertake the many enterprises which the security of free peoples demands. For the first time, as the world's greatest trading nation, we can welcome a single partner whose trade is even larger than our own—a partner no longer divided and dependent, but strong enough to share with us the responsibilities and initiatives of the free world.

The Communist bloc, largely self-contained and isolated, represents an economic power already by some standards larger than that of Western Europe and hoping someday to overtake the United States. But the combined output and purchasing power of the United States and Western Europe—nearly a trillion dollars a year—is more than twice as great as that of the entire Sino-Soviet world. Though we have only half the population, and far less than half the territory, we can pool or resources and resourcefulness in an open-trade partnership strong enough to outstrip any challenge, and strong enough to undertake all the many enterprises around the world which the maintenance and progress of freedom require. If we can take this step, Marxist predictions of capitalist empires warring over markets and stifling competition would be shattered for all time—Communist hopes for a trade war between these two great economic giants would be frustrated—and Communist efforts to split the West would be doomed to failure.

As members of the Atlantic community we have concerted our military objectives through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We are concerting our monetary and economic policies through the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. It is time now to write a new chapter in the evolution of the Atlantic community. The success of our foreign policy depends in large measure upon the success of our foreign trade, and our maintenance of Western political unity depends in equally large measure upon the degree of Western economic unity. An integrated Western Europe, joined in trading partnership with the United States, will further shift the world balance of power to the side of freedom.

Our efforts to prove the superiority of free choice will thus be advanced immeasurably. We will prove to the world that we believe in peacefully tearing down walls instead of arbitrarily building them. We will be opening new vistas of choice and opportunity to the producers and consumers of the free world. In answer to those who say to the world's poorer countries that economic progress and freedom are no longer compatible, we—who have long boasted about the virtues of the marketplace and of free competitive enterprise, about our ability to compete and sell in any market and about our willingness to keep abreast of the times—will have our greatest opportunity since the Marshall plan to demonstrate the vitality of free choice.

Communist bloc nations have negotiated more than 200 trade agreements in recent years. Inevitably the recipient nation finds its economy increasingly dependent upon Soviet goods, services, and technicians. But many of these nations have also observed that the economics of free choice provide far greater benefits than the economics of coercion—and the wider we can make the area of economic freedom, the easier we make it for all free peoples to receive the benefits of our innovations and put them into practice.

Our efforts to aid the developing nations of the world and other friends, however, depend upon more than a demonstration of freedom's vitality and benefits. If their economies are to expand, if their new industries are to be successful, if they are to acquire the foreign exchange funds they will need to replace our aid efforts, these nations must find new outlets for their raw materials and new manufactures. We must make certain that any arrangements which we make with the European Economic Community are worked out in such a fashion as to insure nondiscriminatory application to all third countries. Even more important, however, the United States and Europe together have a joint responsibility to all of the less-developed countries of the world—and in this sense we must work together to insure that their legitimate aspirations and requirements are fulfilled. The "open partnership" which this bill proposes will enable all free nations to share together the rewards of a wider economic choice for all.

Our efforts to maintain the leadership of the free world thus rest, in the final analysis, on our success in this undertaking. Economic isolation and political leadership are wholly incompatible. In the next few years, the nations of Western Europe will be fixing basic economic and trading patterns vitally affecting the future of our economy and the hopes of our less-developed friends. Basic political and military decisions of vital interest to our security will be made. Unless we have this authority to negotiate and have it this year—if we are separated from the Common Market by high tariff barriers on either side of the Atlantic—then we cannot hope to play an effective part in those basic decisions.

If we are to retain our leadership, the initiative is up to us. The revolutionary changes which are occurring will not wait for us to make up our minds. The United States has encouraged sweeping changes in free world economic patterns in order to strengthen the forces of freedom. But we cannot ourselves stand still. If we are to lead, we must act. We must adapt our own economy to the imperatives of a changing world, and once more assert our leadership.

The American businessman, once the authority granted by this bill is exercised, will have a unique opportunity to compete on a more equal basis in a rich and rapidly expanding market abroad which possesses potentially a purchasing power as large and as varied as our own. He knows that, once artificial restraints are removed, a vast array of American goods, produced by American know-how with American efficiency, can compete with any goods in any spot in the world. And almost all members of the business community, in every State, now participate or could participate in the production, processing, transporting, or distribution of either exports or imports.

Already we sell to Western Europe alone more machinery, transportation equipment, chemicals, and coal than our total imports of these commodities from all regions of the world combined. Western Europe is our best customer today—and should be an even better one tomorrow. But as the new external tariff surrounding the Common Market replaces the internal tariff structure, a German producer—who once competed in the markets of France on the same terms with our own producers—will achieve free access to French markets while our own producers face a tariff. In short, in the absence of authority to bargain down that external tariff, as the economy of the Common Market expands, our exports will not expand with it. They may even decline.

The American farmer has a tremendous stake in expanded trade. One out of every seven farmworkers produces for export. The average farmer depends on foreign markets to sell the crops grown on 1 out of every 6 acres he plants. Sixty percent of our rice, 49 percent of our cotton, 49 percent of our wheat, and 42 percent of our soybean production is exported. Agriculture is one of our best sources of foreign exchange.

Our farmers are particularly dependent upon the markets of Western Europe. Our agricultural trade with that area is 4 to 1 in our favor. The agreements recently reached at Brussels both exhausted our existing authority to obtain further European concessions, and laid the groundwork for future negotiations on American farm exports to be conducted once new authority is granted. But new and flexible authority is required if we are to keep the door of the Common Market open to American agriculture, and open it wider still. If the output of our astounding productivity is not to pile up increasingly in our warehouses, our negotiators will need both the special EEC authority and the general 50-percent authority requested in the bill described later in this message.

The American worker will benefit from the expansion of our exports. One out of every three workers engaged in manufacturing is employed in establishments that export. Several hundred times as many workers owe their jobs directly or indirectly to exports as are in the small group—estimated to be less than one-half of 1 percent of all workers—who might be adversely affected by a sharp increase in imports. As the number of jobseekers in our labor force expands in the years ahead, increasing our job opportunities will require expanding our markets and economy, and making certain that new U.S. plants built to serve Common Market consumers are built here, to employ American workers, and not there.

The American consumer benefits most of all from an increase in foreign trade. Imports give him a wider choice of products at competitive prices. They introduce new ideas and new tastes, which often lead to new demands for American production.

Increased imports stimulate our own efforts to increase efficiency, and supplement antitrust and other efforts to assure competition. Many industries of importance to the American consumer and economy are dependent upon imports for raw materials and other supplies. Thus American-made goods can also be made much less expensively for the American consumers if we lower the tariff on the materials that are necessary to their production.

American imports, in short, have generally strengthened rather than weakened our economy. Their competitive benefits have already been mentioned. But about 60 percent of the goods we import do not compete with the goods we produce—either because they are not produced in this country, or are not produced in any significant quantity. They provide us with products we need but cannot efficiently make or grow (such as bananas or coffee), supplement our own steadily depleting natural resources with items not available here in quantity (such as manganese or chrome ore, 90 percent or more of which must be imported if our steel mills are to operate), and contribute to our industrial efficiency, our economic growth, and our high level of consumption. Those imports that do compete are equal to only 1 or 1½ percent of our total national production; and even these imports create jobs directly for those engaged in their processing, distribution, or transportation, and indirectly for those employed in both export industries and in those industries dependent upon reasonably priced imported supplies for their own ability to compete.

Moreover, we must reduce our own tariffs if we hope to reduce tariffs abroad and thereby increase our exports and export surplus. There are many more American jobs dependent upon exports than could possibly be adversely affected by increased imports. And those export industries are our strongest, most efficient, highest paying growth industries.

It is obvious, therefore, that the warnings against increased imports based upon the lower level of wages paid in other countries are not telling the whole story. For this fear is refuted by the fact that American industry in general—and America's highest paid industries in particular—export more goods to other markets than any other nation; sell far more abroad to other countries than they sell to us; and command the vast preponderance of our own market here in the United States. There are three reasons for this:

(a) The skill and efficiency of American workers, with the help of our machinery and technology, can produce more units per man-hour than any other workers in the world—thus making the competitive cost of our labor for many products far less than it is in countries with lower wage rates. For example, while a U.S. coal miner is paid 8 times as much per hour as the Japanese miner, he produces 14 times as much coal—our real cost per ton of coal is thus far smaller—and we sell the Japanese tens of millions of dollars' worth of coal each year.

(b) Our best industries also possess other advantages—the adequacy of low-cost raw materials or electrical power, for example. Neither wages nor total labor costs is an adequate standard of comparison if used alone.

(c) American products can frequently compete successfully even where foreign prices are somewhat lower—by virtue of their superior quality, style, packaging, servicing, or assurance of delivery.

Given this strength, accompanied by increasing productivity and wages in the rest of the world, there is less need to be concerned over the level of wages in the low-wage countries. These levels, moreover, are already on the rise, and, we would hope, will continue to narrow the current wage gap, encouraged by appropriate consultations on an international basis.

This philosophy of the free market—the wider economic choice for men and nations—is as old as freedom itself. It is not a partisan philosophy. For many years our trade legislation has enjoyed bipartisan backing from those members of both parties who recognized how essential trade is to our basic security abroad and our economic health at home. This is even more true today. The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 is designed as the expression of a nation, not of any single faction, not of any single faction or section. It is in that spirit that I recommend it to the Congress for prompt and favorable action.

II. PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

New negotiating authority: To achieve all of the goals and gains set forth above—to empower our negotiators with sufficient authority to induce the EEC to grant wider access to our goods and crops and fair treatment to those of Latin America, Japan, and other countries—and to be ready to talk trade with the Common Market in practical terms—it is essential that our bargaining authority be increased in both flexibility and extent. I am therefore requesting two basic kinds of authority to be exercised over the next 5 years:

First, a general authority to reduce existing tariffs by 50 percent in reciprocal negotiations. It would be our intention to employ a variety of techniques in exercising this authority, including negotiations on broad categories or subcategories of products.

Second, a special authority, to be used in negotiating with the EEC, to reduce or eliminate all tariffs on those groups of products where the United States and the EEC together account for 80 percent or more of world trade in a representative period. The fact that these groups of products fall within this special or "dominant supplier" authority is proof that they can be produced here or in Europe more efficiently than anywhere else in the world. They include most of the products which the members of the Common Market are especially interested in trading with us, and most of the products for which we want freer access to the Common Market; and to a considerable extent they are items in which our own ability to compete is demonstrated by the fact that our exports of these items are substantially greater than our imports. They account for nearly $2 billion of our total industrial exports to present and prospective Common Market members in 1960, and for about $1.4 billion of our imports from these countries. In short, this special authority will enable us to negotiate for a dramatic agreement with the Common Market that will pool our economic strength for the advancement of freedom.

To be effective in achieving a breakthrough agreement with the EEC so that our farmers, manufacturers, and other free world trading partners can participate we will need to use both the dominant supplier authority and the general authority in combination. Reductions would be put into effect gradually in stages over 5 years or more. But the traditional technique of trading one brick at a time off our respective tariff walls will not suffice to assure American farm and factory exports the kind of access to the European market which they must have if trade between the two Atlantic markets is to expand. We must talk instead in terms of trading whole layers at a time in exchange for other layers, as the Europeans have been doing in reducing their internal tariffs, permitting the forces of competition to set new trade patterns. Trading in such an enlarged basis not possible, the EEC has found, if traditional item-by-item economic histories are to dominate. But let me emphasize that we mean to see to it that all reductions and concessions are reciprocal, and that the access we gain is not limited by the use of quotas or other restrictive devices.

Safeguarding interests of other trading partners: In our negotiations with the Common Market, we will preserve our traditional most-favored-nation principle under which any tariff concessions negotiated will be generalized to our other trading partners. Obviously, in special authority agreements where the United States and the EEC are the dominant suppliers, the participation of other nations often would not be significant. On other items, where justified, compensating concessions from other interested countries should be obtained as part of the negotiations. But in essence we must strive for a nondiscriminatory trade partnership with the EEC. If it succeeds only in splintering the free world, or increasing the disparity between rich and poor nations, it will have failed to achieve one of its major purposes. The negotiating authority under this bill will thus be used to strengthen the ties of both "common markets" with, and expand our own trade in, the Latin American Republics, Canada, Japan, and other non-European nations, as well as helping them maximize their opportunities to trade with the Common Market.

The bill also requests special authority to reduce or eliminate all duties and other restrictions on the importation of tropical agricultural and forestry products supplied by friendly less-developed countries and not produced here in any significant quantity, if our action is taken in concert with similar action by the

Common Market. These tropical products are the staple exports of many less-developed countries. Their efforts for economic development and diversification must be advanced out of earnings from these products. By assuring them as large a market as possible, we are bringing closer the day when they will be able to finance their own development needs on a self-sustaining basis.

Safeguards to American industry: If the authority requested in this act is used, imports as well as exports will increase; and this increase will, in the overwhelming number of cases, be beneficial for the reasons outlined above. Nevertheless ample safeguards against injury to American industry and agriculture will be retained. Escape-clause relief will continue to be available with more up-to-date definitions. Temporary tariff relief will be granted where essential. The power to impose duties or suspend concessions to protect the national security will be retained. Articles will be reserved from negotiations whenever such action is deemed to be in the best interest of the Nation and the economy. And the four basic stages of the traditional peril-point procedures and safeguards will be retained and improved:

The President will refer to the Tariff Commission the list of proposed items for negotiations;

The Tariff Commission will conduct hearings to determine the effect of concessions on these products;

The Commission will make a report to the President, specifically based, as such reports are based now, upon its findings of how new imports might lead to the idling of productive facilities, the inability of domestic producers to operate at a profit and the unemployment of workers as the result of anticipated reductions in duties; and

The President will report to the Congress on his action after completion of the negotiations. The present arrangements will be substantially improved, however, since both the Tariff Commission recommendation and the President's report would be broader than a bare determination of specific peril points; and this should enable us to make much more informed use of these recommendations than has been true in the past.

Trade adjustment assistance: I am also recommending as an essential part of the new trade program that companies, farmers, and workers who suffer damage from increased foreign import competition be assisted in their efforts to adjust to that competition. When considerations of national policy make it desirable to avoid higher tariffs, those injured by that competition should not be required to bear the full brunt of the impact. Rather, the burden of economic adjustment should be borne in part by the Federal Government.

Under existing law, the only alternatives available to the President are the imposition or refusal of tariff relief. These alternatives should continue to be available.

The legislation I am proposing, however, provides an additional alternative called trade adjustment assistance. This alternative will permit the executive branch to make extensive use of its facilities, programs, and resources to provide special assistance to farmers, firms, and their employees in making the economic readjustments necessitated by the imports resulting from tariff concessions.

Any worker or group of workers unemployed or underemployed as a result of increased imports would, under this bill, be eligible for the following forms of assistance:

1. Readjustment allowances providing as much as 65 percent of the individual's average weekly wage for up to 52 weeks for all workers, and for as many as 13 additional weeks for workers over 60, with unemployment insurance benefits deducted from such allowances to the extent available;

2. Vocational education and training assistance to develop higher and different skills;

3. Financial assistance for those who cannot find work in their present community to relocate to a different place in the United States where suitable employment is available.

For a businessman or farmer adversely affected by imports, there should be available:

1. Technical information, advice, and consultation to help plan and implement an attack on the problem;

2. Tax benefits to encourage modernization and diversification;

3. Loan guarantees and loans otherwise not commercially available to aid modernization and diversification.

Just as the Federal Government has assisted in personal readjustments made necessary by military service, just as the Federal Government met its obligation to assist industry in adjusting to war production and again to return to peacetime production, so there is an obligation to render assistance to those who suffer as a result of national trade policy. Such a program will supplement and work in coordination with, not duplicate, what we are already doing or proposing to do for depressed areas, for small business, for investment incentives, and for the retraining and compensation of our unemployed workers.

This cannot be and will not be a subsidy program of Government paternalism. It is instead a program to afford time for American initiative, American adaptability and American resiliency to assert themselves. It is consistent with that part of the proposed law which would stage tariff reductions over a 5-year period. Accordingly, trade adjustment assistance, like the other provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, is designed to strengthen the efficiency of our economy, not to protect inefficiencies.

Authority to grant temporary tariff relief will remain available to assist those industries injured by a sudden influx of goods under revised tariffs. But the accent is on "adjustment" more than "assistance." Through trade adjustment prompt and effective help can be given to those suffering genuine hardship in adjusting to import competition, moving men and resources out of uneconomic production into efficient production and competitive positions, and in the process preserving the employment relationships between firms and workers wherever possible. Unlike tariff relief, this assistance can be tailored to their individual needs without disrupting other policies. Experience with a similar kind of program in the Common Market, and in the face of more extensive tariff reductions than we propose here, testifies to the effective but relatively inexpensive nature of this approach. For most affected firms will find that the adjustment involved is no more than the adjustment they face every year or few years as the result of changes in the economy, consumer taste, or domestic competition.

The purpose of this message has been to describe the challenge we face and the tools we need. The decision rests with the Congress. That decision will either mark the beginning of a new chapter in the alliance of free nations or a threat to the growth of Western unity. The two great Atlantic markets will either grow together or they will grow apart. The meaning and range of free economic choice will either be widened for the benefit of freemen everywhere—or confused and constricted by new barriers and delays.

Last year, in enacting a long-term foreign aid program, the Congress made possible a fundamental change in our relations with the developing nations. This bill will make possible a fundamental, far-reaching and unique change in our relations with the other industrialized nations—particularly with the other members of the Atlantic community. As NATO was unprecedented in military history, this measure is unprecedented in economic history. But its passage will be long remembered and its benefits widely distributed among those who work for freedom.

At rare moments in the life of this Nation an opportunity comes along to fashion out of the confusion of current events a clear and bold action to show the world what it is we stand for. Such an opportunity is before us now. This bill, by enabling us to strike a bargain with the Common Market, will "strike a blow" for freedom.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 25, 1962.*

MARITIME INDUSTRY DISPUTE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, I am reporting to the Congress about the recent labor dispute in the maritime industry.

A strike took place at 12:01 a.m., June 16, 1961. Although only the ships in port and the employees on such ships were immediately affected, the dispute involved virtually all American shipping companies, some 70,000 employees and about 900 ships and affected the trade and commerce of every Atlantic, Pacific, and gulf port in the United States.

On June 26, by Executive Order 10949, I established a Board of Inquiry, consisting of the Honorable David Cole, Chairman, Judge Samuel I. Rosenman and Prof. James J. Healy, to inquire into the issues involved in the dispute and report to me on or before June 30, in accordance with the provisions of section 206 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended. I subsequently extended the time for the submission of the initial report of the Board of Inquiry to July 3.

That report concisely presented the facts with respect to the dispute and the positions of the parties as required by law.

On July 3, acting on my instruction, the Attorney General filed a petition in the District Court for the Southern District of New York seeking an injunction against the continuance of the strike. A hearing was held on the Government's motion for a temporary restraining order on July 3, and the court, after finding that the strike affected a substantial portion of the maritime industry, and that it would imperil the national health and safety if permitted to continue, temporarily restrained the strike activities until July 8. A stay of that order sought immediately by the unions was denied by Circuit Judge Clark. (*United States* v. *National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, et al.*, 292 F. 2d 190, CA 2, July 8, 1961.)

A hearing was held on the Government's motion for a preliminary injunction on July 7, and the temporary restraining order was extended until July 12. Two days before this order was to expire, the court found that it had been "abundantly and overwhelmingly established" that the strike was affecting a substantial portion of the industry, and if permitted to continue would imperil the national health and safety. In addition, it rejected the contention of the National Maritime Engineers' Beneficial Association and the International Organization of Masters, Mates and Pilots that, because their membership consists of "supervisors," their participation in the strike could not be enjoined. (*United States* v. *National Maritime Union of America, et al.*, 196 F. Supp. 374, S.D.N.Y., July 10, 1961.)

The unions appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, which, in an opinion issued August 22, affirmed the lower court's decision. (*United States* v. *National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, et al.*, 294 F. 2d 385, CA 2.)

Pursuant to section 209(b) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, as amended, I reconvened the Board of Inquiry. The Board held meetings with the parties and obtained the information required for its further report of the current position of the parties and the efforts which had been made for settlement, including a statement by each party of its position and a statement of the employer's last offer of settlement. This final report of the Board of Inquiry was submitted to me September 1.

On September 25, the Attorney General moved the district court to discharge the injunction, which motion the court that day granted effective September 21.

I am happy to report that settlements were reached by all parties to the dispute.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 25, 1962.*

ELEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 315)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with illustrations, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, 81st Congress, I transmit herewith the 11th annual report of the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 25, 1962.*

TENTH SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF OPERATIONS UNDER THE INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL EXCHANGE AND TRADE FAIR PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1956—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 9 of Public Law 860 of the 84th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the 10th semiannual report of operations under the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 25, 1962.*

CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8900, ASSISTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 527, Rept. No. 1292), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8900) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, and to authorize financial assistance for undergraduate study in such institutions, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority Member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS UNDER CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday next may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

NEXT MEETING DATE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when the postal rate increase bill was before the House on Tuesday of this week the majority saw fit to limit debate on a substantial number of important amendments to 1 minute and 30 seconds. I was under the impression that the schedule of work for this week must be exceedingly heavy if it was necessary to apply a virtual gag procedure to an important bill increasing revenues—in effect a tax upon the American people—by some $600 million, at least more than half a billion dollars.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we have this heavy workweek I think we should go on into Friday.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I object to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF JANUARY 29

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to inquire of the distinguished majority leader concerning the program for the following week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAHILL. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ALBERT. There is no legislative business tomorrow. For next week, on Monday, the program is undetermined.

On Tuesday we will have H.R. 8900—Schools, College Academic Facilities Act.

For Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday we will have S. 320—Interstate Commerce Act, Registration of State Certificates.

This announcement is made subject to the usual and general reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. CAHILL. I thank the gentleman.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT ON TRADE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the President, in his message on trade, has sounded a ringing challenge to the Congress and to the country. This is the most important matter the Congress has been asked to consider since the Marshall plan. Both our continued economic progress and our position as the free world's leader demand this bold new approach to world trade. We must commit the economies of the free world to a common effort in our struggle for economic as well as military strength and in our common fight against communism. We must capitalize now on the rise of the European Common Market. We must harness that great economic power with our own to pull together as freedom's greatest weapon.

It is indispensable not only to our balance of payments but to the expansion of our trade, the development of our agriculture and industry, the growth of our economy and the maintenance of our high living standards. Can we, by choice and by democratic process, muster the initiative and be the vanguard of change rather than submit later in the wake of events? This is our challenge, our opportunity to prove to the world the worth of democracy.

I know we will all join together at this historic moment.

EUCLID (OHIO) "Y" PHYSICAL FITNESS DAY

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I had a very interesting experience recently in Euclid, Ohio, watching several hundred youngsters between the ages of 9 and 15 receiving physical fitness tests at the "Y". Sit-up, divers stance, standing broad jump, shuttle run and chinups were included. The results were excellent, showing the youngsters to be above the national average even though not high enough to be classified in top physical condition.

This particular program was developed to give parents an accurate record of the physical fitness of their children, to increase a mutual pride between parents and children in this basic area of living, and to develop an awareness on the part of the children, the parents and the community of the need for more planned, coordinated physical activity programs. Euclid's Youth Physical Fitness Day starts a precedent that many others will follow for it highlighted the fact that the American Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, has established definite standards which our young people will want to attain.

As part of my remarks, I would like to include the following article from the Euclid News Journal of January 18, describing the day's events:

Y Fitness Event To Attract Many

Euclid's Youth Physical Fitness Day this coming Sunday, January 21, is attracting county and national interest and receiving the support of many local civic leaders and organizations. The Euclid Exchange Club and the Chamber of Commerce have added their support to the purposes of the program.

Congresswoman Frances P. Bolton and Mayor Kenneth J. Sims will be among the prominent figures in government who will be in attendance at the Euclid "Y" on Sunday. In addition to local civic leaders such professional athletes as Bob Gain, Bernie Parrish, Bill Willis (assistant director Cleveland Recreation Commission), John Wooten, Rich Krietling, Dick and Ed Modzelewski and Frank Clark.

The basic tests which will be given children between the ages of 9 and 15 who are accompanied by an adult are as follows:

1. Situps—test of flexibility and endurance.
2. Divers Stance—test of balance.
3. Standing Broad Jump—test of power.
4. Breath Holding—test of endurance.
5. Shuttle Run—test of agility.
6. Chinups—test of strength.

These tests will be scored and graded by percentile on established standards according to Robert VandeVeer, Y Physical Director who is in charge of testing.

As an added optional test the committee has been very fortunate in obtaining John Miller, Willoughby, East Cleveland school districts speech and hearing specialist who will give hearing tests to any children whose parents might request it.

The program will start at 1:30 p.m. Sunday, January 21, at the Euclid Y, 631 Babbitt Road.

THIS IS THE PROBLEM

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, few people not directly affected by the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions have concerned themselves with the circumstances which brought them about, or the far-reaching impact they will have on our civilization.

One person, Carleton Putnam, probably because of an inquisitive mind and a desire to preserve the integrity of race, has made a penetrating study of these problems. He is quite aware of the fact that these decisions were politically motivated, and predicated upon unsubstantiated and unproven allegations, deliberately slanted psychological treatises, and an obvious obsession with the hoax of equalitarianism.

Under unanimous consent, I include as part of my remarks the text of an address delivered by Mr. Putnam at Jackson, Miss., on October 26, 1961; also a brief biography of Mr. Putnam, prepared by Dr. W. D. McCain, president of Mississippi Southern College:

Who Is Carleton Putnam?

(By Dr. W. D. McCain, president, Mississippi Southern College)

It is both a pleasure and a privilege to tell you something of Carleton Putnam's background. He is a man who has won distinction in many fields—as a businessman, flier, scholar, historian, writer, biographer, and philosopher.

Carleton Putnam was born in New York City in 1901. His first American ancestor on his father's side arrived in Massachusetts from England in 1634. On his mother's side, his first American forebearer landed in 1636—also in Massachusetts, and also from England. He is directly descended from the grandfather of Israel Putnam, George Washington's first major general, and from the brother of General Rufus Putnam, Washington's engineering officer and founder of the Ohio Colony.

His grandfather Putnam was a judge of the appellate division of the New York Supreme Court. His grandfather Carleton was a New York publisher. His father received the silver star citation for gallantry in action against insurgent forces in the Philippines at the age of 20, remained to found the first American newspaper in the Philippines, and was killed in action in the 1st World War at the age of 39.

Putnam graduated from Princeton in 1924 with a degree in science, having taken honors in history and politics, and having been an editor of the Nassau Literary Magazine. He received a law degree from Columbia in 1932.

Only 1 year after graduating from Columbia—in 1933—he founded Pacific Seaboard Air Lines with an investment of $25,000. I think that proves something about him—a young college graduate establishing a business of that magnitude in the depths of the depression. This airline originally operated between Los Angeles and San Francisco, but moved to the Middle West in 1934, and changed its name to Chicago and Southern Air Lines.

He continued as its president until 1948, at which time he became chairman of the board and moved to Washington, D.C., to begin work on a four-volume biography of Theodore Roosevelt. In 1953, he merged Chicago & Southern with Delta Air Lines and became chairman of the board of the merged companies. At the time of this merger, Chicago & Southern was valued at $10 million and its routes had grown from the initial 450 miles of the California company to a mileage of over 5,000, serving 12 States and 6 foreign countries.

He lived for 7 years in Memphis, Tenn., during his association with Chicago & Southern. During the rest of his life, his home has been either in New York City or Washington, D.C., but he has traveled a good deal throughout North America, the Caribbean, and Europe, having also visited Africa, the Middle East, China, Japan, and the Philippines.

He began flying for pleasure in 1930, and has held a pilot's license ever since, being now a commercial pilot with instrument and multiengined ratings.

He published a contemplative autobiography of his aviation career in 1945 entitled "High Journey, a Decade in the Pilgrimage of an Air Line Pioneer."

In 1958, the first volume of his biography, "Theodore Roosevelt," was published by Scribners, and won universal acclaim from critics and historians. The Chicago Tribune called the book "Magnificent—a good thing for scholarship, and a good thing for America."

The Evansville (Ind.) Courier & Press wrote, "From here it is apparent that Carleton Putnam will be to Theodore Roosevelt what Douglas Southall Freeman was to Robert E. Lee. And that's about as high as you can go in that field."

The New York Times Book Review termed the work "vivid and convincing * * * a biography of first importance."

"Remarkable" was the word used by the New York Herald Tribune Book Review, while the Christian Science Monitor called Putnam's book "an outstanding success * * * a masterful portrait."

The Detroit News hailed Putnam's "sheer brilliance of presentation," and the Washington Post described the book as "a major contribution to American history and to American literature."

Atlantic Monthly called the biography of TR "Admirable, formidable, decidedly likeable." The Saturday Review found it "immensely entertaining * * * infinitely engaging."

"Putnam has done a valuable service to our age of conformity," the Houston Post declared. "No one can read this book and not have serious fears about our loss of individualism."

"A well-organized, highly evocative study," said the Dayton News. The Chicago Daily News critic termed the work "a masterpiece * * * unquestionably the best biographical portrait yet written."

"A superlative exercise in definitive biography," the Newark News agreed, while the Baltimore Sun noted the book's "brilliance of description and narrative."

Putnam "presents a constructive and inspiring challenge to every serious-minded believer in democracy," the Wichita Falls Times added. "The timeliness of this outstanding biography can hardly be measured."

Such applause from the critics makes the next book even harder to write, since a high standard has already been set which the author must meet in his next work.

In Putnam's case, the next book was his justly-celebrated "Race and Reason"—a book he hadn't planned to write.

The now-famous Jutman letters to the President and Attorney General, expresing indignation over forcible integration, were widely distributed throughout the Nation. As a result, Putnam heard from thousands of interested citizens, including many persons prominent in scientific and academic circles. Many of the letters asked questions which required answers not then readily available in published form.

So, "Race and Reason" was published early this year. And you know the rest. The book has been hailed by critics, educators, scientists and public officials throughout the Nation. It has become a best seller, filling the need for a clear presentation of the South's position in terms the North can understand.

How did "Race and Reason" impress the critics? Did it measure up to the standard achieved in Putnam's earlier biographical work?

A recent tabulation of published reviews of "Race and Reason" answers this question in no uncertain terms. With a total of 248 reviews of the book published to date in this country and overseas, the reaction is better than 90 percent favorable—an almost unprecedented showing for a book dealing with such an emotion-laden subject.

A total of 220 reviewers were favorably impressed by "Race and Reason," 8 were noncommittal; and only 20 unfavorable reviews have been published. This amazing record is all the more remarkable if one considers that four of the unfavorable reviews appeared in Negro newspapers which could scarcely be expected to view the book objectively.

Perhaps this response indicates that our northern friends are finally willing to listen to reason on the matter of race. If this be the case, they will find abundant food for thought in "Race and Reason."

THIS IS THE PROBLEM

(By Carleton Putnam)

Chairman Williams, Governor Barnett, Governor White, Mayor Thompson, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for your welcome. I can assure you it's warmer than I'd be likely to get in the North tonight. I'm always interested to notice how enthusiasm for integration goes up exactly in the proportion that experience with the Negro problem goes down. Everywhere, all over the world today, you'll find the amateurs telling the professionals what to do about this subject.

I come to you, in a sense, as an intelligence officer from behind the "paper curtain." I am obviously honored by your invitation to speak tonight, by the great courtesy and kindness of the compliment paid me by your governor in this plaque. I suppose any publisher—as well as any author—would love to see this on one of the pages of the New York Times Book Review as an advertisement. It might make quite an impression. I'm not sure that there has ever been a case in our history where a book has had a proclamation of this kind devoted to it.

Of course, personally, and apart from anything I have written, I am grateful for this chance to refresh my point of view among people of your outlook. We obviously share certain ideals that we have inherited from the early days and which we intend to preserve. Those ideals are timeless. They are not affected by winds of change. They are as steadfast as our self-respect, our independence of mind, and our love of our homes and our families.

Mississippi is the heartland of the struggle for racial integrity. You are not an unkindly people—but you are an experienced people. You know your own conditions. Unlike some cities of the South, the newspapers of Jackson are not controlled by northerners. You have not fallen victim to the ceaseless barrage of false science, false sentimentality and false political theory with which the North, and some part of the South, are being inundated. Your leaders are not selling your heritage or your children for a bloc of votes.

Nor are you persuaded by the fantasy that, in order to please everybody all over the world, you must give away everything your forefathers earned for you over a thousand years of effort and self-discipline. You may be willing to give money within reason to please the Congo, but you are not willing to give your children. The capital of Mississippi is still in Jackson. It is not in Leopoldville.

For all this, as I say, I am grateful. But at the same time I cannot close my eyes, any more than you can close yours, to the realities of the situation. In spite of the unassailable logic of your position you are under harassment and attack from all sides. The dean of the Harvard Law School fumes with fury at the mention of Mississippi. The kindly housewife in Wisconsin turns away at the name of Jackson. I am sure you often wonder why. And since there's an old adage that to get anything done you must first define the problem, I am going to inquire, What is the problem in this case?

Some of you may answer, "It's the Supreme Court decision of 1954." Others are wont to say, "It's the power-hungry centralists trying to destroy the rights of the States." Still others will say that "It's minority group pressure or Communist infiltration."

Now, in my judgment, to some extent all of those things are true. All of them are problems, but they all exist because of something else. If you could correct the fundamental difficulty, these others would disappear. And I speak from an embroilment in this matter, as you know, of about 3 years now, from Seattle to Miami and from Maine to California.

When I think about this underlying problem, I think about a night on the Outer Banks of North Carolina some 8 or 10 years ago. I was sitting after dinner one summer evening looking at the ocean and talking to a friend. He was a graduate of the Yale School of Forestry; he was also a writer of western adventure stories. He was an expert chess player. He was one of the leaders in the United Nations conservation movement and in world forestry. I mention these things because I want to make clear that he was a man of above average training and experience, and had some knowledge of science.

The conversation drifted around to the race problem, and at one point this man said to me: "Of course, you realize it has now been proved that there is no difference between the brain of a white man and a Negro. As far as any differences exist between the races, these must be accounted for exclusively by environment and lack of opportunity."

I confess that at the time, this remark startled me. I had given no thought in those days to our racial situation—that was long before my embroilment began. So I didn't argue. But after my letters to the President and the Attorney General were published, I became involved in correspondence and personal conversation with countless people from many walks of life throughout the North, the Midwest, and the West. And it didn't take me long to realize that this comment of the man on the Outer Banks was typical of northern opinion—that is, it characterized the thinking of those who were willing to accept the Supreme Court's decision in 1954 and everything that has happened since.

These people all believed that in spite of conditions in Africa, in spite of what we see of the Negro masses in the United States, in spite of what we find in Haiti, where the Negro has had every opportunity to develop a stable, free society, this race is simply the victim of adverse circumstances. In fact, they believe the fault is mostly the white man's.

And since they believe the fault is mostly the white man's, they think it's up to the white man now to do something about it. We must call in religion to help us redeem ourselves. We must call in the sociologists. We must reeducate our children in the colleges. We must even reinterpret the Constitution of the United States so that we can put Negro children in schools with ours. Perhaps in that way we can relieve our consciences. And it's only right that the South should suffer most, because the South, they believe, is the most guilty.

Ladies and gentlemen, there is the problem. Don't think for one minute that the Supreme Court would have handed down its decision in 1954 if it hadn't been counting on this point of view among great numbers of people up North. Don't think for an instant that our minority pressure groups would succeed if they weren't floating on an ocean of tacit public acceptance. Yes, the politicians are betraying you for the Negro vote, the centralists are grabbing power away from the States in this field, but the reason they're able to do so is because the white majority is confused, hypnotized, misled and beguiled into standing aside and letting them get away with it.

Now I don't suppose I need to point out that it makes a great difference whether a man is where he is because of what he is, or whether he is what he is because of where he is. It matters greatly whether a man is no good because he has spent his life in the slums, or whether he has spent his life in the slums because he's no good. It matters in our sense of guilt about him; it also matters in what we can do about him. Moreover, when we substitute a race for an individual in such a situation, it makes a decisive difference in the chances we can take in our own exposure to that race.

So the question is crucial. Is the Negro the creation of his environment or is his environment the creation of the Negro? To put it more precisely, taking the problem on the racial scale, are the Negro's limitations hereditary, and thus only subject to change over a great many generations? Or are they exclusively a matter of surroundings and thus curable in this generation? Are they genetic and thus transmittable to our descendants if we intermarry? Or are they environmental and thus of no consequence to future generations? To that question the North answers with a resounding "Environment," and the Supreme Court echoes with its decision on the schools.

Well may you ask, how did all this happen? How can a view so contrary to observation and experience have captured so large a public? Almost everyone is ready to admit that heredity makes a difference in individuals within a single race, and to maintain that the process stops when we compare averages and qualities between races is a strange and forced bit of wishful thinking. Science, of course, does not dismiss anything because it seems strange and forced. But the burden of proof is clearly upon those who would deny the obvious, and this burden of proof no equalitarian scientist has been able to sustain.

Under these circumstances then, how can we account for the mirage that floats before the eyes of the North? To explain it I'm going to have to go back about 30 years. The idea that all races are equal in their natural endowments and in their adaptability to our Western culture took root in America in the classrooms of Franz Boas at Columbia University in the late 1920's. With Boas, as students or assistants, we find the names of Otto Klineberg, Melville Herskovits, Gene Weltfish, and Ashley Montagu. Gene Weltfish later became a member of certain organizations cited by the Attorney General as subversive and publicly announced that she had evidence to prove that the United States had used germ warfare in Korea. Some of the others were doubtless sincere, though perhaps biased by their personal backgrounds. I'm not sure about all of them. After Boas died, Columbia brought in Ralph Linton, who dismissed all of Boas' employees who had no tenure, and the university finally dropped Weltfish on the grounds of "too long" tenure.

But the Boas group, in America at least, was the beginning of the environmental ideology as far as science was concerned. Russia made its contribution in Lysenko, who claimed wheat could be turned into rye, and these men drew to them other scientists with leftist inclinations in Europe and the United States. They built up quite a clique at Harvard and Columbia and other universities here and abroad. As the New Deal came along and we went further left in the United States, they fitted in with the climate.

It was a time when the underdog more and more was becoming king, and men with socialistic and equalitarian ideas were willing to go to absurd lengths to pay him homage. The outgroups in this country, after a long, hungry spell, were beginning to feel their oats, and were gaining favor with the ingroups. These things made it possible for the Boas clique to become the dominant academic power. It wasn't long before they were able to dictate policy, and eventually a whole generation of American young people were delivered into their hands.

Persecution of scientists who disagreed with them became one of their techniques. In Russia, of course, this was easy. Scientists who contradicted Lysenko were simply arrested. In the so-called free world, the matter had to be handled a bit more subtly. It will be apparent to you that I cannot here tonight name names. It is because there is risk of persecution that I cannot call specific witnesses. But I can cite cases and I can ask that you accept my word for their genuineness.

So I will mention the southern anthropologist who wrote me using such terms as "avoidance" and "suppression" and "discouragement" of research. I will cite the northern sociologist who, having made a public statement on the nonequalitarian side, went back to his university and was told: "We won't fire you. That would be too obvious. But as long as you stay here you will never get a promotion and you will never receive a raise in pay." I will mention the middle western psychologist who wrote me: "Where in the United States could a psychologist, sociologist or anthropologist find work if he openly espoused the theory of racial inequality?" I will give you my experience with one of the world's most distinguished anthropologists who asked me after I had seated myself in his living room in a northern city: "Are you sure you haven't been followed?" And I will add still another scientist who said, "I can't commit academic suicide. I still have work to do. But, when I retire."

The process wasn't always one of suppression. Sometimes it was one of prostitution. Back in the middle of the New Deal days, a friend of mine was assistant naval attaché at Caracas, and while he was stationed there he met three anthropologists who were returning from Africa. These scientists told my friend they had been sent to Africa with the blessing of the President of the United States, but with specific instructions that they were to return with equalitarian findings. "Go to Africa, study the natives, and discover that they have all the natural endowments of white men." Those were their orders. Needless to say, the anthropologists were a bit disgruntled—they told my friend their actual findings had been quite the opposite. What they told the President, I don't know.

At this point I'm going to turn to the northern press, to the northern television and radio broadcasting networks, and ask them: What do you think of this business? I'm going to ask Luce and Jackson of Time and Life, and Dryfoos and Sulzberger of the New York Times: How much longer are you going to vilify the South and divide this Nation on the basis of evidence spawned under these conditions? Do you call this academic freedom? And if we don't have academic freedom, what kind of freedom do we have?

And what about some of you so-called southern newspapers? I salute the Jackson press, but what about Atlanta? What about Dallas? What about Memphis? How much effort have you given to studying the facts in this situation? I'll say to you editors who are the servants of northern masters, I'd rather quit my job than betray the people in my hometown. I'd rather die poor than mislead my neighbors about something as important as this. I'd rather starve than corrupt the thinking of the father and mother across the street. Men who will do that sort of thing are in the same class with the businessmen who favor integration because they fear resistance may hurt their pocketbooks. I wouldn't want to sell my descendants' future for 30 pieces of silver, but there's no accounting for taste these days.

As a matter of fact, Mississippi is the heartland of resistance to integration, yet Jackson County has just been chosen as the site for a $125-million oil refinery and southern Mississippi has been picked for a space facility. But I hate to even mention that. Are we going to balance our children's future, the very integrity of our civilization, against a dollar sign?

I shall come back to this subject later. First I'd like to explore a few other parts of the picture. The followers of Boas had no difficulty, for instance, in capturing the United Nations, because it goes without saying that at the United Nations the wish-fulfilling attraction of the environmentalist doctrine reached its height. You might expect committees to be set up at the U.N. to prove all sorts of equalitarian theories, and that is precisely what you do find. You find it most noticeably in the UNESCO statements of 1950 and 1951 on the subject of race, signed by a long list of scientists which is flaunted in the faces of the North at all times. The first statement in 1950 was signed by Klineberg, Montagu and Myrdal, the Swedish Socialist (we don't find Weltfish) and by a man named Ginsberg for England and Levi-Strauss for France, Juan Comas signed for Mexico, and there will be more to say about him in a moment.

You may wonder why it was found advisable to issue a second statement so soon after the first. The published reason was that some of the contentions in the first statement and some of the terms used "were much criticized, especially by physical anthropologists and geneticists." (They're the ones that know the most about this subject.) Then we read: "They (the scientific critics of the first statement) also declined to acknowledge as a proved fact that there are no mental differences between racial groups and stressed that there was insufficient evidence to support that view * * *." So they issued a second statement in 1951 which carried water on both shoulders a little more skillfully and made it possible to bring a few more signatures under the tent.

Let me give you an example. On one page we find this sentence: "Available scientific knowledge provides no basis for believing that the groups of mankind differ in their innate capacity for intellectual and emotional development." On the page directly opposite we read: "It is possible, though not proved, that some types of innate capacity for intellectual and emotional responses are commoner (sic) in one human group than another." Is it surprising that the president of one of the scientific societies most concerned with this subject wrote me a few weeks ago: "The two contradictory statements invalidate the whole thing. * * * The fact that a certain person signed it means little about his personal convictions."

So much for the United Nations. But remember that public opinion in the North doesn't have a chance to analyze the situation as we are analyzing it here. All they are given in the propaganda they read is the equalitarian statement, and all they get is a general impression of agreement. Remember, too, what I said at the outset about the burden of proof. A scientist cannot deny the obvious (what we see when we look at Africa, or Haiti, or at our own crime statistics), plus all the evidence of history, without himself accepting the burden of proof. You don't abandon all the experience of mankind, flaunt established tradition and annihilate the status quo on the basis of an ideological guess. You don't crucify the South on a cross of equalitarian propaganda.

This propaganda, I must emphasize, has two parts. Its proponents are not satisfied with preaching a wish-fulfilling gospel. They try to persuade you and the people of the North that all other scientists agree with it. And let me show you how false that is. You have, first of all, the four distinguished men who signed the introduction to "Race and Reason." In July of 1961, one of these men, Dr. Henry Garrett, wrote an article from the nonequalitarian viewpoint for the Mankind Quarterly. Thereupon Garrett and the Mankind Quarterly were attacked by our friend Comas of the University of Mexico in an article in Current Anthropology. The editor of Current Anthropology, one Sol Tax, first submitted Comas' article to 21 scientists for their comments, and these comments were published with the article.

The selection of the 21 scientists by Sol Tax and the resulting cross section of opinion gives us a strange sort of ballot on this issue—not a secret ballot, nor one in which the voters acted as free agents. Reading their remarks is an interesting exercise in how to escape committing oneself. In fact, I had to scrutinize each opinion carefully, coupling it sometimes with what I knew from the voter himself, to find out what it implied. Giving the benefit of the doubt in every case to the equalitarian side, I would estimate that 14 of the 21 agreed with Comas, which looks offhand like a two-thirds endorsement of equalitarianism. The trick here is that 6 of the 21 voted from behind the Iron Curtain. They are scientists living in Communist countries, where the party line requires strict conformity. Eliminate those six names and you see what happens to the ratio. It becomes eight to seven. And you started with a list of voters selected by an equalitarian.

I place only minor emphasis on this episode, because I don't believe that in the present climate of fear of reprisal and general timidity we can get a count of scientists that means much. We laymen will have to read the books on each side, understanding the background against which they are being written, and make up our own minds where the truth lies. Having done this myself, I'd be willing to put the matter in the hands of any intelligent jury. I might caution such a jury against being misled by the natural effort of certain scientists to avoid hurting anybody's feelings. I'd also want to clarify the meaning of certain terms the scientists use.

If you can bear with me while I give you another example, I'd like to offer a case that covers both of these points. It is coming to be recognized that there is a relationship between the fissuration—the grooving—of the frontal lobes of the brain and the higher forms of human activity—the capacity for analytical reasoning, foresight, self-control, judgment, and abstraction. The number of fissures or sulci gives us a sort of index of that kind of intelligence. (You will find the subject developed in Ward C. Halstead, "Brain and Intelligence.") In comparing fissuration or sulci as between white and Negro brains, C. J. Connolly, professor of physical anthropology at Catholic University, has this to say in his "External Morphology of the Primate Brains": "The sulcal features occasionally alleged to be characteristic of the Negro brain in all cases are not supported in this study. For example, the opinion that the frontomedical sulci are few in number in the Negro brain fails to be verified. They are sometimes highly developed in the Negro brain * * * (up to this point, what more could an equalitarian ask? Then Father Connolly quietly closes his sentence) * * * at most it is a matter of frequency differences."

Now, of course, the frequency differences are the whole point. When a scientist talks about frequency differences in a case such as this he means that the averages differ, and the average is what we care about when we're dealing with a race. No one questions that there are overlaps in performance between the races, and one would expect to find overlaps, so to speak, in the structure of the brains. Yet the unwary layman might well be misled by Connolly's statement.

Again Connolly says: "The fissural pattern of the frontal lobes differs in a general way in the two races though one could not distinguish a particular brain as belonging to a particular race on the basis of a difference in fissuration of the frontal lobes." And again we must say, "Of course." The nonequalitarian does not claim that individual Negroes present any particular or universal limitation. It is entirely a matter of averages. You cannot tell an individual Negro brain from an individual white brain, but if you had a hundred random Negro brains on one side of this room and a hundred white brains on the other side you could tell which group was which. And that's the issue where racial interbreeding is involved.

Finally, having done his best to avoid hurting the Negroes' feelings, having given the equalitarians something they can pull out of context and quote in New York, Connolly sums the matter up for us in these words: "As to racial differences to morphological feature was found to be exclusively characteristic of either the white or Negro brain. It would be quite erroneous, however, to conclude from this fact that cerebral differences do not exist in the two races. There is first of all a difference in the frequencies of morphological features in the sulcal pattern such as has been illustrated. * * * The differences in frequencies combined with other morphological features such as the shape of the brain and the relative size of its parts are of anthropological significance."

In other words, we have no difficulty in reading between the lines, nor actually on the lines, with these truth-oriented scientists—once we recognize what they are up against. Sometimes we have to put two and two together, or even two scientists together, as in the case of Halstead and Connolly. One scientist may not be willing to say it all. But with a little practice we soon learn the code.

At the same time, let's not underestimate the openings for equalitarian deception in this area. Unless the layman is alerted, it's easy to deceive him, and the northerner is deceived. The too-simple statement that you can't tell an individual black brain from a white brain is only one example. The equalitarians have all sorts of plausible cliches they inflict on the northern public. They will repeat, for instance, that the difference within a race are greater than the differences between races, as if this fact had some relevance. Over and over we must point out that of course there is overlap, of course some Negroes surpass some whites, of course the differences within are greater than between. This does not change the fact that when the graph of variation of one is laid against the graph of variation of the other, in those capacities involved in adapting to our civilization, the black as a whole falls below the white as a whole. And again we must emphasize: there you have the danger in interbreeding. Marry those two graphs and the white must come down.

I might say here that "Race and Reason" has been in circulation for 6 months and there has yet to be any serious attempt to attack it scientifically. At least none has come to my attention. There have been a few reviewers who have referred to the book as full of errors and contradictions, but unfortunately none of these reviewers have had the time to point the errors or contradictions out. The nearest attempt was an article in the Eugenics Review signed by a doctor in the Public Health Service and the gist of his attack was as follows: "With respect to the sort of hereditary variations that might influence adaptation to civilization, an individual's manifest traits are the best guide to his genotype. * * * Thus, even when intermarriage is in question, science demands that each person be considered on his merits."

Now if that statement is science, then I'm speaking tonight in Italian. Such a comment in effect negates the influence of heredity entirely, except as it may express itself in one individual in one generation. It assumes that a brilliant son of a stupid father may not in turn have a stupid son—a position that no trained geneticist would accept for a moment. Perhaps the writer expects to give his assertion plausibility by his phrase "with respect to the sort of hereditary variations that might influence adaptation to civilization," but I must point out that the fissuration of the frontal lobes is just as much a matter of heredity as skin color.

The writer also makes the epigrammatic remark that "marriages are contracted between individuals, not between races," forgetting that when enough individuals marry, the races in effect do marry, that much of the breeding is nonselective, and that the end result is a wide distribution of Negro gene-traits through the white race. This is what accounts for the general deterioration always found in the resultant mulatto culture.

At the risk of being accused of a lack of modesty, I am tempted to tell those of you who may wish to use "Race and Reason" as a tool in this controversy that Dr. Ruggles Gates, who signed the introduction, has no superior in the field of human genetics, that he is the author of the definitive work in this field and that he was kind enough to write Dr. Garrett a personal letter last March in which he spoke in a not entirely uncomplimentary way of "Race and Reason." One of his comments is printed on the jacket of the paperback edition. Until we get something more solid than the article in the Eugenics Review, I am content to rest my case on that comment.

Now, I turn to still another part of the picture. The situation would be bad enough if we had only to deal with these left-wing pseudo-scientists. But we are faced with something else. Out of the scientific cloisters exudes a doctrine which seeps into the churches, into the press, into the movies and other mass media, until all the instruments for molding public opinion are corrupted.

Let me give you a rather startling illustration. In my hand I hold a pamphlet, written by one Father C. J. McNaspy, S.J. (Society of Jesuits). It's called "Let's Talk Sense About the Negro." It bears the nihil obstat of Austin B. Vaughan, S.T.D., and the imprimatur of Francis Cardinal Spellman. We are told that these guarantee the pamphlet's freedom from moral error. Yet on page 14 we find these two sentences: "If some Negroes show tendencies toward delinquency, if they suffer from lack of ambition, lack of drive, apathy—we may blame this on the environment we have compelled him [sic] to live in, not on some imagined inferiority in his biology. This is not my opinion; it is the conviction of all scientific psychologists and anthropologists."

Ladies and gentlemen, no one wants to stress the importance of environment more than I do, no one wants to improve the Negro's environment more than I do, but it would be difficult to conceive of a more profound, a more complete or a more inexcusable falsehood than Father McNaspy's last sentence. The whole statement is the rankest sort of unqualified environmentalism coupled with the assertion that all scientists agree with it. I don't have to go back and quote Professors Gates, Garrett, George, Millot, Le Frou, Connolly, Hardin, Shuey, McGurk or Gayre to you now. But apparently Father McNaspy knows nothing about them. I can't bring myself to believe he knows. Yet if he doesn't know, he should. He had no business putting out a pamphlet like this unless he'd made some study of the subject. You may say, what about your friend on the Outer Banks? And my answer is, he wasn't publishing a pamphlet.

Or take this article by the Episcopal bishop of Michigan. It's an attack on "Race and Reason" in the Detroit News of June 4, 1961, in which the bishop, one Richard Emrich, brings Abraham Lincoln into the argument, and notice the way he does it. He says, "Abraham Lincoln's clear mind can lead us to see the heart of this struggle which is still America's chief agony. (The Bishop doesn't pause to consider who started this most recent agony.) The logic of segregation, discrimination, or exclusion leads to the destruction of all civil liberties everywhere. Why? Because, says one man writing about Lincoln, 'the essence of his position was that the principle of exclusion has no inner check; that arbitrarily barring one minority from the exercise of its rights can be both a precedent and a moral sanction for barring another and that it creates a frame of mind from which no one can expect justice or security."

To examine the minor error in this thing first, am I correct in my recollection that our American Republic has been in existence since 1787, that between that time and 1954 we have grown from very small beginnings to be the leading free society of the world and that during all of that time we had segregated schools in the South? And if I am correct in my recollection, may I ask Bishop Emrich what he means when he says, "the logic of segregation leads to the destruction of all civil liberties everywhere?" Jesus tells us to love God with all our minds as well as with all our hearts, and I ask Bishop Emrich: "Where was your mind when you wrote that sentence?"

But in my judgment this is the minor fallacy in the quotation from the bishop. You notice he talks about Lincoln's clear mind and then he phrases matters in such a way that you get the impression that what he quotes next is practically a citation from Lincoln on segregation. Actually, Emrich's words are, "Says one man, writing about Lincoln, 'the essence of his position was—' " and so forth. Certainly I don't have to tell this audience what Lincoln actually said about the Negro: "I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races." True, that was in 1858. By the end of the Civil War, Lincoln had made it plain that he hoped "very intelligent" Negroes might be given the franchise by the State governments, and I would not hesitate to assume that today Lincoln would favor a franchise on the same basis—for "very intelligent" Negroes under the control of the States. However, there is no indication anywhere that Lincoln today would approve forced social integration of whites and blacks in the South. Yet Bishop Emrich deliberately offers us what some unnamed person thought Lincoln thought, when he had on the record what Lincoln actually said.

I have difficulty in understanding the mentality of men who misrepresent Lincoln's position on the Negro. In fact, I'm inclined to quote further here from Lincoln for the benefit of both the bishop and the editor of the Detroit News. On September 16, 1859, Lincoln in a speech was commenting on an editor who had distorted his views, so where I quote "editor" you can supply "of the Detroit News" and you can also supply "Bishop Emrich." I now quote from Lincoln: "Having shown you this, there remains but a word of comment on that newspaper article. It is this: that I presume the editor of that paper is an honest and truth-loving man, and that he will be very greatly obliged to me for furnishing him thus early an opportunity to correct the misrepresentation he has made, before it has run so long that malicious people can call him a liar."

Is Bishop Emrich as well as Father McNaspy the victim of ignorance? We can only hope so, because otherwise the moral deterioration in our churches is alarming to say the least. Earlier this evening I addressed a question to the leaders of the northern press. I now address myself to the clergy and to them I say: There has been no case in history where whites and blacks have integrated without destruction of the white civilization, and there is no human right greater than the right of a civilization to defend itself against such destruction. That right you would watch the Federal Government take forcibly from the South while you sit with your hands folded in prayer. I'm tired of empty phrases with no thought behind them, I'm tired of the sort of combined ignorance and stupidity shown by your McNaspys and your Emriches, I'm tired of your timid conformity with the popular drift.

And finally, I'm tired of your milk and water suggestions that we pass the buck to God while you support a policy which forces the white children of the South against the wishes of their parents into associations they understand better than you do. You pose as idealists, yet you hide behind the skirts of religion while you condone a crime against 50 million Americans.

There are two things in this state of affairs that I want to stress. One is that the environmental ideology is false—or perhaps I should say that it is the worst kind of a half-truth, which can do more damage than a fallacy. The second thing is that nevertheless this fallacy, this half-truth, has gained complete possession of the northern and western mind. Some, perhaps many, of the leaders in our press, our clergy, our entertainment, our colleges, and our politics may recognize the fallacy and either through timidity or cupidity are pressing on with it just the same. But my experience has satisfied me that the great majority of northerners are simply misled. I'm talking now of the inarticulate masses of the people who only speak at the polls. The scientists, educators, editors, and churchmen make it easy for the northern politicians, who nowadays would much prefer to do what they think a misinformed public wants than bother to inform them correctly.

I am reminded by contrast of a comment that was made on the duty of statesmanship by quite a different kind of leader a generation ago. This leader remarked: "People used to say of me that I was an astonishingly good politician because I divined what the people were going to think. This really was not an accurate way of stating the case. I did not divine what the people were going to think. I simply made up my mind what they ought to think, and then did my best to get them to think it." If we had leaders like that today, we wouldn't be in this mess. Certainly we haven't got such leaders in the North or in the Federal administration, and the question now is, can the South supply them?

Let me restate the situation: We have in the North a great body of public opinion hypnotized by the belief that all the Negro's limitations are environmental, that the only reason he does not appear to be the white man's equal in every respect is because the white man has forced him into an inferior environment—has held him back as they say—and this belief includes conditions in Africa as well as America. Once you accept that idea, it follows logically that white men ought in justice and morality to take every possible step by way of restitution to correct this environment, even at the expense of disadvantage to themselves.

Over the last several years I have talked or corresponded with thousands of sincere, intelligent Americans and I have found this point of view almost universal. I have had it repeated often enough so that I can assure you it permeates our northern society as a whole. They read an occasional book on science, the books that are kept at the front of the bookstores, and there they find the environmentalist view. They go to a movie and they get it there. On Sundays they hear it preached in church. When they turn on TV they hear news and documentaries and plays all slanted in the same direction. Their children come home from school with books written by environmentalists. I could go on forever. The point is: You have a completely indoctrinated society in the North. On that indoctrination the integration movement rests. It gives it all the sanctions of a moral crusade. It makes it shine, like the Holy Grail. And what is the South doing about it? It is talking about something completely beside the point, it is concentrating almost exclusively on the subject of States rights.

Citizens of Mississippi, I give you this as axiomatic: The Supreme Court's decision on desegregation simply follows the trend of public opinion in the North and West, and the average man in the North and West doesn't give a damn about States rights in the face of his belief that the South is committing a wrong against the Negro.

You might as well try to use States rights to justify mass murder.

And the northerner goes further—when you talk about States rights he thinks to himself, "Sure, the southerner is willing enough to plead States rights when he wants to browbeat and oppress the Negro—but when it comes to getting his hands in the Federal Treasury, he sings a different tune." In other words, this line of defense not only doesn't do you any good up North, it does you harm.

I don't have to repeat that I am completely in sympathy with the principles of States rights. I only say it's out of place in dealing with your racial problem. Or, if you prefer, let's say you've tried it and it hasn't worked. In my opinion, there is just one solution now to this problem: Tell the North over and over again that you're fighting for the integrity of your civilization. Remind them that there has never been a case in history where whites and blacks have lived together, without segregation, in such numbers as you have in the South today, and have failed to intermarry. Remind them that such intermarriage has always resulted in the deterioration of the white civilization. Point out to them that the facts of science, when viewed through unbiased eyes, support the facts of history. Show them that the historical evidence is what you would expect to find from the scientific evidence, the genetic nature of the latter accounting for the deterioration apparent in the former. Make clear that you have in most cases done all you could—and a lot more than most—to improve environment for the Negro, and that you intend to do even more. Continue forward in that area, but when it comes to social segregation, say to the North: "Here we stand four square."

I need scarcely remark that you should prepare yourselves to meet the reflex action you will get from the North. I've met it so often and found it so stereotyped and superficial that it's hard to take it seriously, but it must be met. When they say to you, "But we can't hold the Negro back," answer, "Any race that is held back by segregation is held back by associating with itself, and such a race had better do something about itself, instead of demanding that another race also be held back by forced association with it."

Or when they suggest that your children don't have to marry Negroes just because they must go to school with them, call their attention to the gradually erosive effect of the equalitarian ideology implicit in this movement. Remind them that it is not solely a question of the impact on one generation but upon a series of generations, each becoming a little less aware of what's involved. Tell them that time and familiarity, coupled with the hypnotic repetition of the equalitarian doctrine, can slowly make black seem white and something which at first repelled seem eventually acceptable. Paraphrase Alexander Pope's famous quatrain for them:

"Here is an evil of such frightful mien,
That to be hated needs but to be seen;
Yet seen too often, familiar with its face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace."

Be on your guard against the leftist who is obsessed with the idea of "change," who wants "change" just because it's fashionable, and who talks continually about "winds of change." Remind him that every burglar who breaks into a house wants change. He wants to change the possession of the savings and heirlooms of the owner who earned or conserved them through the years. And sometimes nations and races want to do the same thing.

Straighten out the North on this all-men-were-created-equal concept. Explain that that phrase has never referred to cultural, social, or genetic equality except in Communist countries. Our history is full of evidence on the point, but if you want it in a page or two you'll find it in "Race and Reason."

And don't let them seduce you with this notion that your "image before the world" will be damaged by segregation. It goes without saying that riots are damaging, but what these equalitarians are trying to tell you is that segregation itself is damaging. All you have to do is to ask them which is more important—to keep the integrity of your civilization—to conserve the standards and traditions your forefathers developed through a thousand years—or to please some African who thinks freedom is a package you go down and get at the post office? Remind them that if a thing is wrong, you don't do it to please anybody. Put your heel on this spirit of appeasement, this idea that we must run twittering around smoothing the fur of folly—which is the surest way to gain everybody's contempt.

Most important of all, do what you can to persuade southern leaders—Governors, mayors, and Federal representatives—to take advantage of their national radio and television time to put these points across to the northern public. The newspapers and magazines are full of items against you every day. TV can't completely shut you out, however, when some crisis brings one of your leaders into national attention.

It's so easy to see opposition of a politician or scientist or a minority group leader and say "Well, we've got to attack there and we must fight him and it's getting so hopeless." The point is that the only reason he's succeeding is because he's floating on a tide of the masses of the American people who have a false conception of the humanitarian side of this matter. That's why I urge you, at every opportunity that presents itself, to take advantage of the opportunity to quash this environmentalist point of view.

And don't deceive yourselves that the South as a whole has tackled this particular problem. I remember a short while ago, when the eyes of the Nation were on a southern city at the opening of the school year, the Governor of the State appeared on a national television network at prime twilight time. He had the entire country watching. And he called a newspaper reporter to him. He said "Come here a minute." It was quite a dramatic setting.

Then he asked, "Would you want your daughter to marry a Negro?" He had the beginning of a point. But by itself meant absolutely nothing. I could almost hear the northern audience saying, "Well, why not? There's nothing the matter with the Negro except he hasn't a chance." Or else asking, "Why can't you control your children?" Or more likely saying, "That old gag! We've heard that one before." The chance to say something really convincing was wasted because there was no appreciation of what the problem was.

Perhaps the most tragic example of what I have in mind—although similar things are happening somewhere almost every day on a lesser scale—occurred at the Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles in July a year ago. There the South really had the Nation captive in front of its television sets. It was superprime nighttime at a super-exciting convention. And the South had a whole hour to state its case. My wife and I sat in front of our set and we thought "By golly, this is going to be it. At last they've gotten through the paper curtain, the TV curtain, all the other curtains." And so the hour began. James Gray made an excellent presentation of the legal side of the South's case, and we felt that next would surely come the fundamental issue. And the hour went on, and it went on, and it went on. And then it was over. And the South, which had the most at stake and ought to have known the subject best, had uttered not one word on the most vital issue in the world today. A succession of southern leaders had gone across the platform talking about how "my great-grandpappy had been a member of the Democratic Party." The hour was over, and my wife turned to me and said, "This is a disaster."

Can nothing be done to convince southern leaders, Governors, Senators, Congressmen, mayors, to use their precious airtime, whether it be at a riot or on "open end," to strike back at this dishonesty, this creeping paralysis of mind, this ignorance? What's wrong? What's holding them back? Why do so few have the discernment of your leaders here in Mississippi?

All of us know that no war was ever won by staying on the defensive. When it comes to the racial issue, the States rights argument is both defensive and evasive. On the other hand, the racial integrity issue—which you in Mississippi, more than any other State, have made an issue—puts the attack into your hands where it belongs.

There you have an issue that has just as much moral sanction, just as much power, just as much of the Holy Grail appeal as any issue on earth. You won't find a pastor in any church in America who can choose a text to surpass it. There is your cause. With that cause history is on your side, science is on your side, righteousness is on your side—I'll go so far as to say the American people are on your side, if you'll arouse them and inform them.

Challenge the parents of America. Say to them: "Do you have any doubt about the genetic foundation of life? Look in that crib tonight and answer the question." Say to some of these well-meaning and blind northern leftists: "If you must take money out of the pocket of the man who earned it and put it into the pocket of the man who didn't, that's one thing. That may sometimes be justified. (But, less often than you think.) Go ahead, if you must, and spend other people's money, but, you hypocrites, stop trying to spend other people's children."

If I were in a southern Governor's shoes, those are some of the things I'd say. And here are a few more. I'd suggest to the American people that they examine the personal backgrounds and political leanings of the Myrdals and the Herskovitses and I'd ask, "Do you see any indication of political bias in their books? Read some of them. Do you think their science is nonpolitical in its motivation? Do you see no personal motives in any of this?"

I'd remind my audience that Clyde Kluckhohn, the Harvard anthropologist, recanted before he died. And then I'd call attention to this statement signed by Professors Gates, Gayre, Garrett, and George: "We do not believe that there is anything to be drawn from the sciences in which we work which supports the view that all races of men, all types of men, or all ethnic groups are equal and alike, or likely to become equal or alike, in anything approaching the foreseeable future. We believe on the contrary that there are vast areas of difference within mankind not only in physical appearance, but in such matters as adaptability to varying environments, and in deep psychological and emotional qualities, as well as in mental ability and capacity for development. We are of the opinion that in ignoring these depths of difference modern man and his political representatives are likely to find themselves in serious difficulties sooner or later."

And I'd say further to the American people: "All right, here you have the Myrdals and the Herskovitses, the Klinebergs, and the Ginsbergs on one side, and there you have the Hardins and the Georges, the Gateses and the Garretts on the other side. And in front of you, staring you in the face, you have the Congo with its chaos, you have Angola with its hidden horror, you have Haiti with its comic opera government, and you have America's crime and relief statistics. Do you mean to tell me we're holding this race back. I say to you we've done more for this race in two centuries than they've done for themselves since the beginning of the world. If they hadn't been brought over here as slaves to white men, they would have been slaves to other Negroes and many of them would have died in Africa as human sacrifices. You nation of sheep. Have you no minds of your own? Can't you see through this hoax? How much longer must we be offered up on the altar of your gullibility?"

Those are some of the things I'd say to the American people if I were a southern Governor and had some national TV time. I'd ask them, "How many stable, free societies can you name, in all history, that had any substantial mixture of Negro genes? Not one. And yet you want us to try the experiment again. All right, my northern brothers, you try it. If you're fools enough, you try it. But don't come down here and tell us what we've got to do."

In conclusion, let me ask a favor, and also give you a word of comfort. First the comfort:

I learned last week that within the next 6 months there will be an announcement of what I would consider a major breakthrough in anthropology. It will go to the core of this racial equality business. It will come from a scientist of unimpeachable standing and if it is substituted for Myrdal in footnote 11 of the Supreme Court's decision of 1954, I do not see how the Court can refuse to reverse itself. The announcement will be attacked, but once you have it in your hands, take the ball and run for a touchdown. Marshal this and all the other evidence, and carry a new case to the Supreme Court.

Now for the favor:

Please don't whisper to yourselves, "Isn't it too late? Haven't we lost this fight?" If you take the road we've been discussing tonight, it's not too late. It's never too late to go to the heart of this kind of an issue, because when you do eternal forces come over to your side. There's something about lifting a banner like this and keeping it clean that attracts the unseen as well as the visible hosts. And if there was one quality that characterized the breed that built America it was that they were not afraid to slap the devil in the face. They didn't sit down and bargain with him, or offer him sacrifices. When men do that, the forces of righteousness, seen and unseen, desert them.

> In the last analysis, however, if you want to be faithful to the Founding Fathers, you won't ask whether you're going to win. That's not your affair. The fight is your affair. Do the best you can. I'll put it in the words of George Washington himself: "Erect a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hands of God."

DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower issued a proclamation before leaving office naming the new airport facility at Chantilly, Va., the Dulles International Airport. I understand from reading the press that the present Federal Aviation Administrator believes that this should be limited to the terminal building only because the name may not meet with the favor of foreign visitors coming into the United States. To have the Congress express its feeling on this matter I therefore introduce a joint resolution, as follows:

> JOINT RESOLUTION DESIGNATING THE AIRPORT CONSTRUCTED AT CHANTILLY, VA., UNDER THE ACT OF SEPTEMBER 7, 1950, AS THE "DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT"
>
> That the airport constructed under the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of the public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia," approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 770), as amended, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Dulles International Airport," in honor of the late John Foster Dulles, a renowned diplomat and statesman, whose public service was dedicated to the ideals of democracy and the cause of freedom and peace throughout the world. Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which such airport is referred to shall be held to refer to such airport by the name of "Dulles International Airport."

The late John Foster Dulles served his country long and admirably. His distinguished career as a public servant extended from World War I until his untimely death. He served under Presidents of both political parties at their request and was respected by all of the nations of the world.

It is my hope that the Congress will adopt this resolution and perpetuate the name of this great American.

TO BUILD UP SHRUNKEN PENSIONS OF U.S. EMPLOYEES IN RETIREMENT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, after a man or woman has worked as a civil employee of the U.S. Government for a dozen years, he finds himself committed to its service for the rest of his life, unless he loses his job through a reduction in force.

He is in a sense trapped by the deductions of 6½ percent taken from his salary for the civil service retirement fund. He cannot move to a job in private industry and take this pension credit with him to strengthen his old-age and survivors insurance account, which is beginning at a later date in his life.

So, he must continue in Federal employment in the hope that when he retires, he will have adequate security for the years during which little or no additional income will be available to support himself, and his wife, or to support his widow.

Working for the Federal Government should be a career—and not a sacrifice. Yet many Federal retirees, who devoted 30, 40, and even more years of faithful service to the Government and the people of the United States, find themselves on an annuity treadmill, where their pension benefits fail to keep up with the cost of living.

This depreciation is due to the fact that Congress has abandoned its custom of increasing annuities of retirees to match cost-of-living increases awarded to active employees. With the prices of food, rent, clothing, medicine, and other necessities climbing beyond reach of their fixed pensions, retirees have had to make drastic economies in order to pay for their living expenses. The resulting distress and hardship have weakened the original purpose of the U.S. civil service retirement system to provide retirement security above the subsistence level, for employees who have given the productive years of their lives to the service of the Federal Government. The decline in the purchasing power of these annuities has been matched by a deterioration in the pride and the morale of retired civil servants who cannot understand why the Government has not kept faith with them.

The disappointment of some has changed to bitterness. "If I had the chance to relive my life, I'd never seek a career in the employment of the U.S. Government," one of them recently confided to me. "There are more rewards in private industry, more recognition of one's ability and loyalty."

To make up for the disillusionment and the straitened circumstances that deprive retired civil employees of the security and the happiness they have earned, I believe we should amend the Civil Service Retirement Act through enactment of H.R. 3987.

I introduced this bill nearly a year ago, on February 7, 1961. Its objective is to increase the annuity of each retired employee who, on the date of this act is receiving or entitled to receive an annuity from the civil service retirement and disability fund. The increase shall be 20 percent of the amount of such annuity, not in excess of $1,500, and by 10 percent of the remainder of such annuity.

Furthermore:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each annuity payable from this fund shall be increased whenever (1) there is a general adjustment of salaries of classified employees or of postal employees, or (2) the formula for computing annuities of retiring employees generally is liberalized. * * * Such increase in annuity of a retired employee or Member shall operate to increase the annuity of his survivors proportionately.

An increase in benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act is necessary for the relief of retired civil employees whose pensions have been squeezed by the rising cost of living.

SOLUTION TO SOME OF PROBLEMS OF AIR TRANSPORTATION

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, no one will deny that a strong and financially sound transportation system is essential if our Nation's economy is to be sound and progressive. Consequently, the public, the investors, the Congress, and the executive branch of our State and Federal Governments have become increasingly alarmed by the economic ills which afflict the railroads and the air carriers of our country.

As a member of the Transportation and Aeronautics Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I have been and am deeply concerned with the adverse earnings position of our railroads and commercial air transport companies. These two great segments of our vitally needed transportation system appear to have reached a blind economic alley and insurmountable adverse earnings wall.

It has seemed to me that the answer to the problems of the railroads and airlines can only be found if government and these two essential transportation media are willing to cooperate openly, candidly, and constructively to find sound and permanent solutions to the complex, basic problems which must be solved if ultimate nationalization is to be avoided.

Consequently, it was with great pleasure that I read an address, "Our Imposed Problems and Their Solution," by Mr. W. A. Patterson, president of United Air Lines, before the Wings Club of New York on January 12.

This is a timely, constructive, informative, and interesting speech by a man who has been with United Air Lines for over 31 years, the last 27 of which he has been president of that fine airline, and who deservedly enjoys a distinguished reputation for industrial statesmanship.

Because of the number and variety of legislative proposals now before the Congress affecting transportation and the rumored imminency of the President's message on transportation, I am inserting Mr. Patterson's address as part of

my remarks, and earnestly urge all Members of both Houses to read it carefully and thoughtfully:

OUR IMPOSED PROBLEMS AND THEIR SOLUTION

(An address by William A. Patterson, president, United Air Lines, before the Wings Club, New York City, January 10, 1962)

Last year, for the first time since 1948, the combined trunkline operations resulted in a net loss, estimated as high as $30 million. This is approximately 6 times the industry loss in 1948 and it has aroused about 10 times as much advice on what is wrong and how it should be corrected.

Doctors have gathered around the patient to diagnose and prescribe treatment. Some say, adopt a Spartan regime in cabin service, penalize no-shows, and pool your ground equipment. Others say, sell harder, invade the automobile travel market, tap the mass market. This one says, your trouble is overcapacity, and that one says, you're suffering from jet age growing pains.

I'm sure you're familiar with the various contentions on the cause and cure of airline problems. The advice is generally well meant and it reflects some fraction of the truth, but the question is—who decides when the doctors disagree?

Disagreement—diversity of opinion—is no novelty in the air transport industry. More often than not, it is a dominant characteristic of the industry. Conflict of thought and freedom of expression are necessary to arrive at the truth.

I have had honest disagreement with the philosophy of the Civil Aeronautics Board at various times in the past. And it would be strange, indeed, if I had been in continuous agreement with every person who has ever served as a Board member. I have known many of them as capable, intelligent gentlemen, and I have never doubted that their motives are every bit as sincere as mine. But a problem exists and it will not be solved by the sincerity with which we hold opposing views.

The airline problem, actually, is related to a larger problem which is sometimes overlooked in concentrating on our own immediate cares. The larger problem is that common carrier passenger transportation has been slipping for many years. In 1947, for example, the railroads, buses and airlines operated almost 71 billion passenger miles. In 1960 the total was less than 62 billion.

Overall slippage of common carrier passenger business has not been of pressing concern to the airlines in the past because of extremely vigorous growth. Industry traffic volume in the decade of the fifties just about tripled. But a large part of the growth represents diversion from surface carriers, particularly the railroads. And the harsh fact is that the airlines have been getting a larger and larger share of a total volume that is steadily dwindling.

The villian, so to speak, is the private automobile. A decline of approximately 13 percent in common carrier passenger-miles since 1947 has been accompanied by an increase of more than 140 percent in intercity automobile passenger-miles. This trend has been stimulated by the construction of toll roads, superhighways, and cars designed for greater speed and driving comfort.

The shrinkage in common carrier business has not gone unnoticed by the CAB. Its researchers and economists also have observed that some 90 million people have never taken a trip on an airplane. The airlines, accordingly, have been urged to siphon off automobile travel and to develop a market among those 90 million. This advice is well intended but I maintain it is more of a pious hope, rather than a realistic goal to be profitably achieved by human effort.

It's a mistake to assume that those 90 million constitute a market merely because they exist and have never been airline customers. A potential market of any worth must meet other criteria. Now elaborate studies can be made to determine the size, depth, and shape of a market but I have a simple rule of thumb which is generally reliable. It consists of three questions: First, is the desire there? Second, is the need there? And, third, does this particular market have the means?

Business travel, as you know, is the backbone of our operations. More than two-thirds of our volume is derived from that source. If you apply the rule of desire, need and means, it is clear that the business traveler meets the test squarely on all counts.

In considering the 90 million who have never flown on airlines, great numbers obviously can be ruled out on any one of the main counts. Some haven't the desire to fly and no amount of advertising can awaken the desire. Others haven't the need—the pattern of their lives is such that they just don't have to go anywhere.

Many of the 90 million have jobs that keep them in shops, offices, and factories. They may have the desire to travel but, unlike the business traveler, there is no connection between their everyday work and the necessity to travel. The only time their desire to travel can be reasonably exercised is during vacation periods, assuming they have the means.

What about the means?

It has been suggested that the airlines should make special efforts to develop a market among those with modest annual incomes—on the order of $5,000. In support of this view, some economists have said that as much as 10 percent of that $5,000 is budgeted for travel. Now, $500 is a sum worth going after, but I have no proof it is there, waiting to be claimed by the airlines.

The person with a $5,000 income must pay out a substantial portion for food, clothing, and other necessities. Housing alone—the servicing of mortgagees, rental payments—claims about 25 percent of the average income. And there are other costs that grow in relation to family size, such as education and medical care.

But let's assume that 10 percent remains for travel. And having accepted that assumption, I'd like to offer one of my own: I am convinced that the 10 percent, 8 percent—whatever it happens to be—is irretrievably earmarked for the family car. It pays the monthly installment. It buys gas, oil, and tires. And when vacation time comes along, the man with a $5,000 income is going to use what he already has for travel—the automobile. And he'll take the kind of vacation on which he can be accompanied by his wife, children and vacation equipment, if he wants it.

To further control costs, he's going to bypass the luxury hotels and the fashionable resorts. Chances are, he'll seek some out-of-the-way place, remote from cities and airline service. Now, he could get from an airport by renting a drive-yourself car but this is not inexpensive and he has a limited budget.

So we come back to the automobile.

A CAB spokesman has expressed the opinion that airline fare reductions would woo motorists from the highways. Ostensibly with this in view, one of the trunklines several months ago proposed a jet fare reduction of 25 percent. We protested. Other airlines joined us and the fare was rejected by majority vote of the Board members.

Such experiments—in the absence of proof they can succeed—are perilous at a time when the economic health of the industry is impaired. They have a ring of hasty improvising about them—as though created in a spirit of let's try it and see if it works.

I haven't a closed mind on experimentation but I am reluctant to risk the interests of our stockholders by participating in untested schemes. Surely no one in his right senses is averse to tapping a vast new profitable market—if the market is there. Now, some people think the market is there and some are sure it's not there. I have a proposal on how to settle this difference of opinion.

The Federal Government and private industry invest billions each year in research to develop new techniques, procedures, and products. No reasonable person questions the value of this effort. Things are tested in the laboratory and by consumer panels to determine their potential worth before heavy investments are made. I suggest adoption of similar methods by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

It should not be too difficult to arrange actual field tests and learn, for example, if low fares can attract a large volume of motorists and result in airline profits. Routes could be carefully isolated for control purposes, with costs, traffic levels and other factors under thorough study for a suitable period. And, just as laboratory research is underwritten, the carriers taking part in the experiment could be subsidized for any losses.

So, very seriously and constructively, I recommend field studies and pretesting of various theories which some CAB officials hold. The airlines cannot reasonably be expected to experiment at their own expense, especially when a profit cushion is lacking. And the airlines should not stand accused of being opposed to low fares that—in some unexplained and so far unproved way—might restore their economic health.

The facts available to us show that past low-fare experiments have failed to generate the high volume required to offset the revenue reduction and the costs of providing the service. I'll give you cases—omitting, of course, the recent youth fare which, as with our own youthful years, passed very soon.

As many of you know, some time back we reduced Hawaiian fares by 25 percent and we promoted this bargain for 4 years. Travel increased 24 percent—and that's a considerable increase—but it was still 1 percent less than the volume required to break even on the discount. Let's also remember that, apart from fares, the growth occurred in a period when public interest in Hawaii began to quicken and expand.

Some years ago we established coach fares, offering a 25-percent differential between coach and first-class service. Coach travel has grown, yes, but not as a result of tapping a new market. Its growth has been accompanied by a steady decline in first-class travel. One expands while the other contracts. We know that hundreds of corporations have instructed their representatives to travel by coach. For every four who shift to coach, we have to get one new passenger to break even.

Last year the trunklines gained about 1 percent over 1960 by flying 29½ billion passenger miles. Fifty-seven percent of the total was coach travel. In 1960 it was 49 percent and just 6 years ago it was 35 percent. The reduction in revenue due to this kind of inward growth has contributed to the industry's present financial condition.

When did the trouble begin? Well, the date is fairly well fixed in a recent CAB document which points out that a declining rate of earnings has been experienced over the last 6 years.

What happened approximately 6 years ago?

Let me refresh your memory. In the period from July 1955 to December 1956, the CAB decided 15 proceedings that changed the operating authority of every domestic airline. These decisions piled more than 21,000 miles of extra competition on the industry and the stage was set for a large part of our present problems.

The New York-Chicago case, the Denver Service case and the Southwest-Northeast case were all decided in the fall of 1955. And there are others continuing down to recent times. I mention these specifically and by date to illuminate a further point.

The year 1955, you may recall, was a year of decision in still another way. Beginning in the early 1950's, British progress with the Comet was watched with great interest and there was growing speculation on when the U.S. airlines would commit themselves on jet aircraft.

Some of our critics implied we were dragging our feet—allowing British technology to pass us by while we wrung every last penny out of the piston-engine plane. Actually, as you know, the major airlines were conducting an intensive evaluation of jet aircraft. In our case, thousands of man-hours were spent in economic studies, consulting with manufacturers and working up specifications.

We ended the jet speculation in October 1955, by ordering the DC–8 and shortly thereafter the other trunklines began making their commitments. Because of the leadtime required to manufacture jet aircraft and place them in service—about 4 years for the DC–8—our order was based on what studies and forecasts indicated the market would be in the sixties.

Our analysis of the future market was well drawn in terms of foreseeable conditions, and I'm sure that our competitors made theirs with equal care. But, no matter how well drawn—all the research and planning was disrupted by route award piled on route award. To give a few examples—two airlines flew the New York-Chicago route, now there are four; two airlines flew the New York-Washington route, now there are nine; one airline flew between Denver and the west coast, now there are four.

I could continue this rollcall with city-pairs across the Nation, but let's consider for a moment the economic effects.

Three years ago the nonstop market between San Francisco and New York was served by United and TWA. We were operating with a 54-percent load factor, which indicated there was ample room for growth. Aircraft were on order to accommodate that growth. These facts failed to carry, however, and American Airlines was authorized to fly the San Francisco-New York nonstop. The award diverted $13 million from United and TWA.

Any jubilation this may have occasioned at American was brief. Within several months three airlines were authorized to fly the southern transcontinental route which American had been serving without competition. These awards diverted approximately $16 million from American.

Aside from obviously creating excessive competition, multiple route awards produce various inefficiencies that help build up airline costs. As an example, airlines receiving new routes sometimes purchase additional planes to compete against the carrier or carriers already serving the route with an adequate fleet. Or again, a carrier faced with added competition is well advised to reduce flight frequencies at the stations concerned. Fixed costs remain the same but the ability to spread the handling costs per passenger over a greater number of flights is severely limited. In other words, the operation is less efficient.

One of the standard replies to protests about route awards and excessive competition is that the CAB has merely awarded what the airlines have requested. That is true, but I must point out that regulatory power includes the power to hold individual interests in check. If overly ambitious, disruptive demands are not brought into shape and balance by the CAB, then who will do it? Under the Civil Aeronautics Act, it is an express duty of the Board to foster sound economic conditions and maintain competition to the extent necessary to assure sound development.

I don't wish to seem presumptuous in mentioning this responsibility, nor would I have my remarks interpreted as critical of any Board member. My usage of the word "Board" itself is in an impersonal sense, referring to an accumulation of policies and decisions, rather than to a group of officials. The gentlemen who presently constitute the Board have inherited problems of great magnitude and my sympathies are with them.

I was encouraged several months ago when airline representatives were invited to discuss the situation with CAB officials in Washington. I hoped that the main cause of the industry's affliction would be laid open and skillfully treated. Instead, what I regard as mere surface symptoms were marked off for treatment.

Now, I regard small economies as part and parcel of ordinary, everyday, good business housekeeping. It's important to keep operations tidy by detecting petty waste and inefficiency. But it's more important to detect opportunities for major savings that can be achieved through research and the use of new machines and techniques. This type of economy advances and improves air transportation.

Understanding this, you will understand my disappointment when the Washington sessions resulted in discussions of meal service, pooling ground equipment, no-show penalties, and the like. Such matters are worth consideration but why not plunge into the main areas for improvement and economy? The idea of discussing types of meal service at a time when industry losses were nearing $30 million struck me as incongruous. It seemed we were invited to concern ourselves with trivia.

It would be far more rewarding, for example, to explore ways in which traffic control can be smoothed out to reduce holding periods and terminal delays that cost the airlines many millions annually. Surely science—electronics, engineering—can produce a better system with enduring benefits that would far outweigh any amount of menu juggling.

I'll cite one more:

As captive tenants of airports, the airlines are subject to fiscal policies that are increasingly burdensome. Neither controls nor uniformity exist in determining costs. United's bill for landing fees and terminal expenses was about $1,800,000 in 1952. For the current year, it will amount to $16,500,000, exclusive of $7,250,000 for hangar rents. Our airport costs for 1963–64 will border on $20 million—an increase of 1,000 percent over 1952. Surely, this is an area worth looking into.

But the problem of excessive competition overshadows all other problems, and I have yet to hear of any program to remedy the situation. Lately, there's been much discursive and hopeful talk about mergers. To hear some tell it, a merger is a mystical union that melts away problems and the two merged companies live happily ever after. We've been given to understand that the CAB is kindly disposed toward mergers. But, so far as I know, a rationale has not been worked out. No criteria have been established as to what kind of merger is desirable. Will any old merger do? Obviously not.

A merger between two weak airlines will merely spread the weakness. By the same token, a merger between two strong, aggressive airlines can produce such strength that weaker carriers will be forced into bankruptcy or back to subsidy, if they can get it. I doubt that any policy designed to reduce competition by forced or planned bankruptcy would meet with congressional acceptance.

Now what is a good merger? Well, I would place the United-Capital merger in that category. Capital was spared bankruptcy and no competing carrier has been brought to the brink of financial disaster as a result of the merger. Greater efficiency has been achieved. Outmoded aircraft have been withdrawn and jets are continuing to be placed in service on Capital's former system. And the result is clearly in the public interest.

I believe that the Civil Aeronautics Board should assert leadership at this time by determining what kind of mergers are best for the public, the industry and the stockholders of the companies involved. Guidelines must be set up and objectives clearly defined to prevent blunders and senseless combinations that could aggravate an already sorry situation.

I would be remiss if I left you today with gloom hanging in the air. I've talked frankly of our problems. I've not minimized my concern, nor have I skirted the issue of regulatory responsibility, as I see it.

But this industry has great vitality, as shown by its past development and the confidence with which the challenge of jet conversion was accepted. It retains that vitality in spite of burdens, reverses and imposed problems. We need sound judgment now, patience and the good sense to avoid hasty cure-all remedies.

In a recent speech in Connecticut, Mr. Boyd, the CAB Chairman, was frank and accurate in discussing excessive competition. Judging from his comments, we are in agreement on the fundamental problem. The question is, What can be done to correct it? Excessive competition is solidly imbedded in the industry's structure and there is no fast or easy way to root it out. The CAB is entitled to every constructive idea we can offer.

I have devoted many hours of thought to possible solutions, but I come full circle when I reflect on the tedious procedures that must be followed. For example, I visualize the Board holding public hearings that would stretch out day after day, week after week, while the parties gave detailed testimony. And I know of no way to dispense with such hearings, if the final decision is to be honest and just.

Then, after the decision is announced, I visualize a series of court actions. I don't think we could criticize the delay that would occur. Due process must be observed, and anyone involved would have the right to be heard. Management, understandably, would make every effort to protect the interests of stockholders.

A more direct alternative method would be to conduct a thorough study of excessive competition and clarify what should be stripped away to produce balanced competition and economic health. The next step would be to achieve airline agreement on a withdrawal policy, so that those who were last to begin service on a route would be the first removed. Perhaps the subtractions could be offset by gains in other areas and, of course, such possibilities would be analyzed in the basic study.

This alternative method also would take considerable time and in that period the position of the airlines would deteriorate further. Consequently, only one realistic course is open in the interim—and that is to provide temporary fare increases as a measure of relief while legal analysis and factfinding are in progress.

Most of you know that United filed for an increase in November, amounting to about 7 percent. This would have yielded less than what we need to consider ourselves a financial success. It was a moderate request but it was suspended. However, the CAB approved a 3-percent increase, which is acceptable, but we plan to refile for the 7 percent. And, in connection with that refiling, we look forward to a full public hearing.

The hearing should include facts already on the record and also cover those points in business philosophy, service, and costs which have been subject to a clash of opinion. It is my fervent hope that the proceedings will reconcile the opposing points of view and bring about an understanding that will enable the industry to advance and prosper. Conflict of thought has constructive uses, as I mentioned earlier, but when continued aimlessly year after year it is damaging and disruptive.

I have great regard and affection for this industry I've been talking about today. In the 1920's I worked in a bank and the prospects were good, but I left the bank to join the Boeing Airplane Co. I was optimistic about air transportation when many looked upon it as a doubtful enterprise with a vague, uncertain future.

I was optimistic then, ladies and gentlemen, in the 1920's, and on this day in January 1962, I continue optimistic.

PRESIDENT'S CALL FOR FREE TRADE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the trade message from President Kennedy today is truly a ringing call for free trade—a ringing call for one-worldism, and a ringing call for a brandnew built-in welfare program for industry, business and labor in this country.

I am opposed to it.

A FIVE-POINT PROGRAM TO IMPROVE AMERICA'S POSITION IN WORLD COMMERCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SANTANGELO). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter and tables and a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a distinct honor to be able to address the House today following President Kennedy's eloquent message on America's role in the stream of international commerce. Mr. Kennedy's message brings renewed hope to the free world that reasonable men can reach reasonable agreement in the community of free nations.

There is no question however that we here in Congress will have a tiger by the tail when we take up renewal of American trade agreements with the free world later in this session.

I had the honor of visiting six European capitals during the recess, where I discussed the effect of the European Common Market on the American economy.

Mr. Speaker, based on my observations in Europe, I should like to discuss today a five-point program which, in my judgment, must be considered if we are to consider all the aspects of the international trade problems confronting the United States and the free world.

Regardless of what action Congress finally determines, it is apparent that some segments of the American economy may suffer as Europe's industrial potential unfolds, while other segments of the American economy may greatly benefit from common trade association in Western Europe.

Congress will be faced with a most difficult challenge in drawing the fine balance to sustain American employment without closing the door to foreign competition.

My discussions with business leaders, labor representatives, and government officials in Europe lead me to the conclusion that Americans will have to use all of their Yankee ingenuity to meet the increasing economic challenge of the rest of the free world.

Member nations within the European Common Market are experiencing this same problem on a smaller scale. In London, Lord Rootes, auto manufacturer who is frequently called the Henry Ford of England, said he is not afraid that removal of trade barriers will cause French and Italian auto producers to squeeze him out. He said confidently:

> We'll have to work harder at selling our cars.

It should come as no surprise, as postwar Europe and Japan develop their industrial complex, that many of the business advantages which the United States has enjoyed for several decades will be confronted with stiffer competition.

There is a tremendous drive for economic expansion throughout free Europe, now experiencing an unprecedented prosperity. European businessmen quite confidently predict that as trade barriers within the Common Market are removed, and as Western Europe's production increases, there will be a more intense drive by European manufacturers not only for world markets, but for American markets.

While this development should quite properly be of concern to the United States, we can find comfort in the fact that economic revival in Western Europe has virtually eliminated any fears that our European allies could fall into Communist hands, short of aggression.

Communism is suffering a tremendous philosophical setback through the whole Western sector of Europe where the people are intent on developing their economies within the basic framework of free enterprise.

It would be a mistake, however, to ignore the fact that there are some fundamental weaknesses in the Common Market which may not come to light unless and until the European economy suffers a readjustment such as our own American economy experiences during economic cycles. When I asked various spokesmen with whom I dealt in Europe whether the concept of free trade within the Common Market nations would be met with the same degree of enthusiasm if there were labor surpluses in any of the member nations, as we are now experiencing in the United States, I found the answers not very conclusive.

Most spokesmen said they would meet this problem when they were confronted with it, but many argued that with expansion of trade within the Common Market, they do not anticipate any serious setbacks in the foreseeable future. My own judgment and experience leads me to believe this latter group is overly optimistic.

There is no question in my mind that large industrial centers like Chicago will want to study the complex nature of the European economy because sooner or later it will have a direct bearing on the employment of these industrial centers.

The electronics industry in Chicago already is experiencing serious problems as a result of foreign competition.

The same can be said about the textile industry in Chicago, and I could not help but conclude that other industries in Chicago would experience similar difficulties when I saw large factories in Europe producing component parts which only a few years ago were the mainstay of Chicago's diverse industry.

In West Berlin, despite the tensions created by the Communist wall, a large modern factory is producing component parts which are being shipped throughout the world for assembly in local markets. I saw the same activity in England, France, Switzerland and Italy.

I also had an opportunity to view American factories built in Europe with American capital.

It would appear to me that the great danger which confronts America as Congress begins debate on the renewal of trade policies with the free world is the tendency to oversimplify the complexity of this problem. I can recall no single piece of legislation which will require a greater degree of study, debate and careful scrutiny than renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in 1962.

It is clearly apparent to me that survival of a capitalistic system as we Americans know it may very well hang in the balance. President Kennedy will have to marshal all the resources at his command to explain to the American people the complex nature of this problem.

The people of Chicago and Illinois have a particularly vital stake in seeing to it that Congress enacts legislation which will not close the stream of foreign commerce, but at the same time will not open floodgates so that small industries, in particular, could be wiped out.

Aside from the complex nature involving the political aspects of international commerce and the very difficult question of balance of payments, foreign exports from the Chicago area in 1960 provided jobs for an estimated 178,000 people. Nationwide, the Department of Commerce estimate that international trade activities, including services, provided 4½ million jobs for Americans.

Nevertheless, while our Nation's foreign exports continue to create a sizable number of jobs for Americans, I have received protests from Chicago employers that foreign imports are seriously curtailing their production and causing layoffs of workers.

I believe that every American recognizes the fact that the United States cannot completely close off its channels of commerce to the free world, but by the same token, those Americans who are being affected by increasing foreign competition should quite properly look to their Congress and their President for some avenues of assistance.

On the basis of my observations, I believe the time has come when we must appraise this problem of economic survival in a free world along a much broader basis than just a discussion of reciprocal trade agreements. President Kennedy has quite properly indicated that he will ask Congress for a more liberal trade policy in international economic relations. The increasing purchasing power of the free world can very well provide for America the impetus it needs for economic growth, but we cannot avoid the fact that as we seek foreign markets, foreign markets will seek to compete for our own Nation's purchasing dollar.

It appears to me the problem must be approached from two directions: the United States must provide the leadership in the free world to establish a set of ground rules which will permit free nations to compete among themselves within a spirit of equity; the United States must also recognize the fact that our own American industrialists must be given a greater degree of latitude in meeting the competition of foreign imports. I would hope that as the debate on reciprocal trade agreements begins in Congress, we can give consideration to the following aspects of this problem:

INTERNATIONALLY

Adoption by the free world of an international fair labor standards agreement, which would be based on capital investment, wage standards, cost of raw materials, and profits per unit of output.

It is my belief that the American worker is perfectly willing to match his skill and productive capacity against any foreign worker, if he is assured that there is some ratio of equality in wage standards.

A suggestion has been made by Frank Darling, president of Local 1031, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers in Chicago, that the United States might lead the way in reducing or even completely eliminating restrictive tariffs and quotas to those nations which make a sincere effort to at least partially increase their wage standards so that American workers will be competing on a more equitable basis with their foreign counterparts.

The International Metal Workers Federation, in Geneva, an affiliate of the International Association of Machinists, has completed an exhaustive survey of the possibility for the free world to adopt a code of international fair labor standards and, while fully recognizing the complex nature of such a proposal, has concluded that it is indeed possible of achievement. I shall include the report in its entirety at the conclusion of my remarks. I believe Mr. Al Hays, president of International Machinists Union in America, deserves particular praise for initiating the study. As far as I know, this is the only such study available in the world today. Mr. Hays has performed a tremendous public service in helping finance the study which was made under the direction of Mr. Adolph Graedel, general secretary, International Metal Workers Federation, in Geneva.

I was particularly impressed with the fact that virtually everyone in Europe in a responsible position, with whom I discussed this type of an approach to international trade agreements, stated that such a course would be desirable for the free world to explore.

It would appear to me that by advocating adoption of minimum wage standards geared to specific industries and countries and based on local problems and local currencies, the United States would be giving full meaning to our basic foreign policy by raising the standards of working people throughout the free world, thus putting the lie to false promises of international communism.

Minimum wage standards have worked well in the United States and I feel confident that properly drafted, they can work in the rest of the free world.

It would appear to me that the U.S. Congress would be inclined to adopt more liberal trade policies if we had some assurance that the free world will at least make an effort toward bringing wage standards into closer harmony with those under which American industry must compete for world markets.

DOMESTICALLY

First. Revision of tax laws relative to depreciation to permit the earlier replacement of obsolete equipment.

It was most interesting to me to see the very liberal tax laws which European industry enjoys to develop its industrial potential.

While undoubtedly a faster writeoff on plant investment may in some instances lead to automation, the fact remains that a good part of Europe's industrial complex is competing for world markets which the United States held for a long time simply because they are able to produce better products with more modern equipment.

I am confident that the American worker can improve his productivity considerably, given the proper tools with which to work.

In my discussions with European labor leaders and industrialists, I could only conclude that the United States is the only large industrial country which has not modernized its tax laws in a manner to encourage heavy capital expenditures. In looking at the modern European plants which have been built since the end of World War II, one cannot help but conclude that a vast segment of our American industry is working with tired and obsolete equipment.

While the European manufacturers speak with confidence that they can meet successfully the economic challenge of Soviet Russia, too frequently this type of confidence seems to be lacking in American industry. It would appear to me that we must give American industry a greater degree of freedom to put American ingenuity to work at full capacity. I doubt if this can be done with an obsolete tax structure which too often penalizes expansion and discourages modernization.

I should like to call your attention to an article which appeared in last Sunday's New York Times and which describes how accelerated writeoff is bringing new vigor to the textile industry hard hit by foreign competition. I ask unanimous consent the article be placed in the RECORD in its entirety at the conclusion of my remarks.

Second. Improve facilities for small American manufacturers to display their wares in foreign markets.

I visited the modest American Trade Center which the U.S. Embassy has opened in London. The Embassy had no appropriation for this purpose and established the center primarily on a somewhat temporary basis in order to give American manufacturers at least some place to display their products. The center is working out very well, and it appears to me there are thousands upon thousands of small manufacturers in America who, while they cannot afford to maintain their own offices or display showrooms in the major markets of the world, would avail themselves of a trade center maintained by the American Government.

It is my hope that Congress will seriously consider an appropriation for this purpose so that the small businessman of America will be given a better opportunity to compete in the European stream of commerce. Large American corporations maintain such facilities in many parts of the world, but the small industrialist of America has been left out of international competition because he lacks display facilities.

My visit to the American Trade Center in London convinces me that Europeans are ready and willing to buy American products for resale if they are made more readily available. The experience of our Trade Center in London, in my judgment, justifies the opening of similar centers, particularly for the small American businessman, throughout the free world.

Third. An increased effort to improve the quality of American workmanship.

I believe that American industry should eliminate speedup techniques, and the American labor movement should foster a program of encouraging workers to develop a greater spirit of pride in their craftsmanship.

This point is best brought out by the results of a survey among employers in the German Federal Republic regarding the reasons for their success with exports, which I saw in Bonn. Eighty-five percent of engineering firms in West Germany quoted good quality as the reason. With 42 percent, price came a long way behind; followed by service to customers, 33 percent; advertising, 28 percent; and prompt delivery dates, 27 percent. Government export promotion schemes came last, with 5 percent.

Perhaps another example are the Scandinavian countries which, I have been told by European manufacturers who buy their products, have the highest degree of quality in their products. It is interesting to note that while the Scandinavian countries are the lowest tariff countries in Europe, because of the high respect for their products, they have built up the highest standard of living on the European Continent.

Fourth. Additional assistance to those American companies who suffer temporary setbacks because of competition from foreign imports.

This assistance could include additional tax benefits, more liberal loan policies through the Small Business Administration for converting to different products, and Federal assistance in retraining displaced workers. I believe, however, that it is only fair to point out that a similar approach to industry hurt by foreign imports within the European Common Market has not yet met with too much success. In virtually every country I visited, the spokesmen told me that this type of assistance usually comes too late and is thwarted by an unnecessary bureaucracy which administers it.

A recent survey by the Department of Commerce regarding the meaning of foreign trade to the State of Illinois showed that 80 percent of all the people engaged in manufacturing in the State of Illinois are employed by firms in nine major manufacturing classifications, each of which sell at least part of their products directly to foreign markets. There is no question that foreign trade can mean employment for many of our citizens in Illinois. However, with the changing industrial complex of the free world, the same survey showed that many Illinois producers will be adversely affected. Some examples and the number of plants—many of them in Chicago—affected are: certain types of machine tools, 50 plants; aluminum sheets and circles, 20 plants; hand tools, 5 plants; plumbing, brass goods, 10 plants; wire products (fences, nails, barbed wire), 6 plants; men's dress shoes, 4 plants; shoe uppers, 16 plants; fancy leathers, 11 plants; leather handbags and pocketbooks, 7 plants; cotton textile mill products, 33 plants; knit goods, 15 plants.

The survey did not reflect the impact of foreign competition on the electronics industry, which in Chicago alone employs 196,000 people and constitutes the largest single industry in the city of Chicago.

We can see from these figures that there is no simple solution to the increasing problem of international trade within the free world. However, I am firmly convinced that unless freemen are able to resolve the differences and evolve international trade agreements based on a spirit of fair competition, many of our economic allies may very well have to seek their markets behind the Iron Curtain, thus weakening our position and strengthening communism.

Too many of our allies already are dealing with Iron Curtain countries. It would appear to me that the greater opportunities we provide for the free world to trade among itself, the greater success we will have in demonstrating to the world the false economic idealogies preached by the Kremlin.

This is the great challenge which confronts President Kennedy and Congress in the next session.

The articles previously referred to are as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 21, 1962]

Textiles Industry Cheered by Easing of Tax Regulation

(By William M. Freeman)

The textile industry, which consistently wears a pessimistic face while its customers in the clothing and apparel field consistently present an optimistic appearance, took heart for the future last week.

The specific cause was a further broadening by the administration of special tax relief for the industry.

In October the White House and the Internal Revenue Service made it possible for textile manufacturers to write off the cost of equipment used in spinning thread and making cloth in a much shorter period than was allowed previously.

Last week a new depreciation schedule was announced for sewing and cutting equipment used in making a wide variety of clothing. On the average, the new setup permits the owner of a machine to claim tax deductions for depreciation over a period 40 percent shorter than before.

MORE TO COME

There is more to come. The White House said similar revisions were in process for equipment used to make hosiery, knitwear, and other products.

The most important change in the latest schedule covers sewing machines and allied equipment, which the White House said represented about 70 percent of the apparel industry's total investment. A new sewing machine can be written off in a return filed January 15 or later in 9 years instead of 15, as before.

The action points up the recognition by Washington of the textile industry's troubles, which range all the way from equipment to problems of discounting, merchandising, and selling.

William I. Kent, chairman of the executive committee of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, told the Senate Commerce Subcommittee last week that a trend to liquidation continued in the wool textile field in 1961, with a large worsted mill and other important units closing down.

Imports of wool products generally have continued at high levels, he noted, although the industry was struggling to make sales in the first half of 1961.

Mr. Kent, who is president of the Kent Manufacturing Co., Clifton Heights, Pa., and who operates a cloth mill in Charlottesville, Va., and a worsted spinning mill in Pickens, S.C., urged support for comprehensive quotas by countries and categories on imports of wool textiles and apparel.

R. Dave Hall of Belmont, N.C., president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, which, despite its name, covers textiles of all fibers, called for exact ceilings on textile imports. He urged the use of a formula by which other nations could share in the future growth of the U.S. market, along with proportionate reductions in the event of a decline. He also suggested an overall allowance for textile imports, with provisions for shipments from new sellers abroad to be offset against shipments from established suppliers.

Mr. Hall urged the acceptance of a multination agreement for control of textile traffic and the avoidance of bilateral agreements such as this country now has with Japan.

RULING SOUGHT

Mr. Hall noted that the unified industry was seeking an official ruling from the Office of Emergency Planning that textile imports were adversely affecting the national security. He said that such a finding would give President Kennedy "the flexible powers he needs in working out varying remedies" not only for cotton textile imports but also for goods made of wool, manmade fibers and silk, in the form of apparel or textiles ready for cutting.

Textile distributors have problems of their own. Some distributors deal with discount houses and some do not, and there is a split among wholesalers as to which way their salvation lies.

Some feel that doing business with short-markup discounters does not produce as much income as dealing through conventional merchandisers. Their opponents argue that the conventional type of business is dwindling and that the discounters are achieving ever-increasing volume.

The general feeling at the convention of the National Association of Textile and Apparel Wholesalers here last week was that the best way to fight the discounter and so preserve a better markup was to limit selling efforts to fewer and better moving lines. This has been the pattern in one industry after another, with the consumer finding less choice but at more attractive prices.

EXAMPLE GIVEN

By way of example, the recent acquisition by Revco Discount Drug Centers of the Standard Drug Co.'s outlets in the Cleveland area brought sharply reduced prices on cigarettes. At the same time, consumers lost the opportunity of buying paperback books, New York newspapers, and similar items, since Revco concentrates on drugs, cosmetics, vitamins, and prescription items.

This is what has been taking place in one type of outlet after another, but not without opposition. In Cleveland, the Ohio Association of Tobacco Distributors, whose members sell cigarettes and make a profit, cannot compete with an organization such as Revco, which sells them as a loss leader, although it calls them a convenience item.

A hearing is set for January 29 before Common Pleas Judge Arthur H. Day on whether Revco should be forced to increase its cigarette prices.

The ruling is likely to have an immediate effect, if only by implication, on all discount selling. In Ohio the basis of the action is the Cigarette Sales Act of 1941, which sought to prevent price wars. There has been no test of the law in the civil courts.

FAVORED ITEMS

Discounters like textile and apparel items, since sheets and pillow cases, towels, clothing, hosiery, and so on for a long list of articles are worn or used by just about everyone. For the most part, they also run to national brands, which are heavily advertised, giving the discounters a price level from which to cut. In this respect they are similar to cigarettes, since the prices are well known and a cut price is an obvious bargain.

Sol Berger, president of Colonial Corporation of America, which makes popular-price shirts and blouses under its own name and for private label merchandisers, made this comment on the outlook:

"I think 1962 should be a banner year for manufacturers and retailers in the soft goods industry. The low level of inventories of both apparel makers and retail outlets has spurred a marked upsurge in our orders. However, because of competition from discount outlets, both manufacturer and other types of retail stores will have to increase efficiency in order to make their profits grow at a comparable rate with sales volume.

"Some ray of light for the textile industry is seen in new synthetics and in new blends of synthetic and natural fibers, along with more imagination in fabric design.

"One of the developments that is stirring interest is the appearance of blankets made by a tufting process. It consists of a product with a high, dense acrylic pile surface tufted on a cotton sheeting, which serves as the backing. Both sides of the backing are tufted so that the finished blanket resembles a conventional woven product."

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
London, January 23, 1962.

SECRETARY OF STATE:

Toy exhibition opened today with largest initial attendance to date, about 150. This result attributable to (1) lively advance interest by United Kingdom trade (2) excellent preshow publicity (3) quality of United States participants and their products. Quality of attendance exceptional. Fact that all exhibits, except one, are attended by United States or United Kingdom representative, has made exhibit most effective and resulted in favorable comments.

Four separate type reactions noted: (1) Hobbycraft participants reported particularly brisk interest because of design, quality and only marginal price disadvantage, (2) firms with broad general lines report large number of trade contacts at all levels with most visitors much impressed by creativity and originality of design and high quality of toys. While some prices appear high believe there are respectable sales possibilities for many general line items, (3) majority of trade visitors are pessimistic on sales possibilities for electrical train, doll and metal toy lines but a few judge some of these may find moderate sales in specialized shops on originality. These lines face greatest price disadvantages of any items in exhibition and United Kingdom market already has large representative selection of these available, (4) existing United Kingdom agents much impressed by quality and size of attendance. All found several potential new customers. Some took moderately large orders and all have promise of further orders.

In summation, exhibition will give United States participants wide look at United Kingdom market, opportunity for their own market analysis and in many cases opportunity to pick and choose among potential agents. Eventual sales volume, however, difficult to predict.

Preshow advertisements in about 10 trade journals paid dividends. So did feeding out good material furnished by participants to trade press which resulted in good stories. Several good exclusive stories obtained in press as well as wide photo coverage. Excellent TV coverage on both commercial and BBC–TV has sparked national and provincial press coverage and we expect excellent press coverage of opening day.

BRUCE.

INTERNATIONAL METALWORKERS' FEDERATION—REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL FAIR LABOR STANDARDS

(By the International Metalworkers' Federation Secretariat)

FOREWORD

In compliance with instructions given by the executive committee at its meeting held in Vienna, on March 18, 1959, arising out of a proposal made by the United Automobile Workers of America, the International Metalworkers' Federation secretariat submits to the central committee this report on international fair labor standards.

In drawing up the present report, the IMF's primary concern has been to preserve a realistic and objective approach, combined with an endeavor to present a fundamentally trade-union solution.

The introductory section I represents an attempt to set forth the economic background into which any proposed agreement on international fair labor standards would need to fit.

Section II shows how an agreement on international fair labor standards would serve to complement the action programs hitherto advocated by the International Metalworkers' Federation.

The broader aims of an agreement on international fair labor standards are set out in section III.

Section IV illustrates, by means of specific cases, the problems involved in an agreement on international fair labor standards.

Again out of a sense of realism, a special section V analyzes the practicability of suggestions for an agreement on international fair labor standards.

Our conclusions as to the scope for the trade unions to achieve the aim of fair labor standards, by action they can take in their own field of operation and through governments and their international institutions, are to be found in the final section VI.

Appendix I contains suggestions for an agreement on international fair labor standards, which would need to be submitted to an international agency, such as GATT, for instance. Detailed explanations on the mechanics of the proposed agreement follow the draft text.

To elaborate one of the conclusions in section VI, appendix II gives an example of a proposed trade adjustment program.

In drafting the text for a proposed agreement, the IMF secretariat has been in close contact and consultation with experts of the GATT secretariat and the International Labor Office. From these bodies assurances have been received, in unofficial contacts with a leading officer of the former organization and with several ILO departments, that the IMF's suggestions might provide a practicable basis and should offer possibilities for convincing governments of the need to take action on international fair labor standards along the lines proposed.

I. THE WORLD ECONOMIC SITUATION AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

For economic, social, and political reasons the crucial problem for the free world is the gap between living standards in industrialized countries and those in the economically developing countries. At all costs that gap must be narrowed as rapidly as possible by expansion and reorganization of the economy in the developing countries, as well as by a gradual improvement of those regions' living standards, at present deplorably low.

The second problem of decisive importance for the future of the free world is the need to insure that, with all these vast wants unsatisfied, both in the poorest and the more highly developed parts of the world, there should be no relaxation of productive efforts. In particular, the industrialized countries must maintain such a state of trade as will guarantee to them full employment and provide the economically more backward countries with the two primary conditions vital for their development—assistance in the form of capital and industrial equipment, as also markets for their constantly growing production.

Thus economically underdeveloped countries and the advanced nations both have major problems to solve. All of them must strive for growing cooperation and mutual economic assistance, designed to expand international trade so as to promote the prosperity and well-being of all nations.

Unfortunately, in the first half of 1958 trade developed contrary to these economic and social aspirations which, in the long run, will decide the future of the free world. It is appropriate, therefore, to analyze briefly the world economic situation and its tendencies, for the purpose of pinpointing the problems facing the democratic countries and the free trade-union movement. In this respect special responsibility rests on the metal industry, the key to economic progress, and hence on free metalworkers' unions.

A. Problems of economically underdeveloped countries

A Social Situation That Is Untenable and an Offense to Human Dignity

Two-thirds of mankind—almost 2 billion inhabitants of our globe—are still largely untouched by economic progress and rising standards of living. Some 1.2 billion of them live in non-Communist parts of the world. Most of them, like their forefathers before them, are vegetating on bare subsistence levels, a prey to disease and every kind of hardship. In those countries infant mortality is high and the average expectation of life is only 30 years, compared with almost 70 in European countries.

Dangerous Trend in International Trade

The gap between living standards in industrialized countries and those in nations still on the threshold of economic development is widening alarmingly.

In 1938 trade between industrialized and underdeveloped countries accounted for 54 percent of world trade, but in 1957 that percentage had dropped to 50 percent. This means that industrialized countries have expanded economically and have increased the volume of trade between them, a development which the retarded countries have been unable to follow.

In 1938 exports of economically backward nations to industrial countries represented 28 percent of world trade, while goods exported by the industrialized to the undeveloped parts of the world made up only 26 percent of the total; in 1957, the position was reversed, with underdeveloped countries' purchases from industrialized nations amounting to 27.5 percent of world trade, and their sales to only 22.5 percent.

Thus the economically weak countries' position in world trade has deteriorated, so that they are no longer able to earn, out of their own resources, the foreign exchange they need to procure imports for the maintenance and development of their economy.

The following figures illustrate the situation: In 1938 the economically underdeveloped countries, in their trade with industrialized nations, had a credit balance of $600 million (expressed in 1938 prices); in 1950, as a result of the considerable rise in commodity prices, which had advanced 42 percent more than industrial products, the underdeveloped countries had $2,800 million credit balance in their trade. By contrast, in 1957 there was a $5,200 million deficit in the underdeveloped nations' balance of trade with industrialized countries.

According to GATT's latest report on the development of world trade, the total value of nonindustrialized countries' exports fell in 1958 by $1,376 million, to $32.19 billion. These countries' imports, which already from 1952 to 1956 had increased at a faster rate than exports, declined in 1958 by $1,331 million, chiefly due to austerity measures designed to compensate for the unfavorable effects of the lower prices for basic products and the reduction of dollar reserves. Despite such countermeasures, the deficit in all nonindustrialized countries' balance of trade remained very high.

Among the nonindustrialized nations, those hardest hit by the recent recession were oversea territories in the sterling area. The deficit in their balance of trade rose from $342 million in 1955, to $678 million in 1956, $1,609 million in 1957 and further to $1,695 million in 1958. In fact, in the last of these years it would have been $1.13 billion even higher, had not the Middle East petroleum exporting countries, hitherto belonging to the sterling area (Kuwait, Iraq, Bahrein, and Qatar), shown large returns from petroleum exports.

This continued deterioration in underdeveloped countries' balance of trade has latterly, indeed, become so serious as to give cause for fears that, sooner or later, these

nations' excess of imports over exports may reach such proportions that their financial resources will no longer suffice to keep even the most vital trade going. This trend is highly dangerous. The underdeveloped countries have no reserves. If they are unable to increase their exports at a normal rate, they cannot maintain a proper flow of imports. They will be forced to slow down their present rate of industrial development, which in many instances is already inadequate to prevent the steady whittling down of living standards under the pressure of increasing population.

India offers a typical example in this respect. Its new 5-year plan is gravely threatened and cannot be achieved, even in part, unless the industrialized countries substantially increase their financial aid. In Pakistan the population is growing faster than the national income. Accordingly, living standards have fallen further, with a consequent accentuation of the appalling want in the country.

Decline in Traditional Exports of Economically Underdeveloped Countries

Up until the present, exports from the developing countries consisted mainly of foodstuffs, raw materials, fuel (especially petroleum), while they had hardly begun to export manufactured products.

For some years now, trade in those basic products has tended to become stabilized and such exports are expanding less rapidly than are exports of industrial products. There are various reasons for this. The quantity of raw materials required per unit of manufactured goods is declining. Raw materials and energy which, in 1938, accounted on the average for 33.5 percent of the value of manufactured products, made up only 2[illegible] percent of their value in 1954, because industrial products are more highly developed and have a smaller raw material content. Moreover, branches of industry such as chemicals and engineering, which are constantly progressing, consume less in the way of raw materials from the economically underdeveloped countries than does the textile industry for instance. Finally, the industrialized countries themselves are producing more raw materials and energy than they used to do.

In addition to all this, natural products must now face growing competition from substitute materials, such as nylon, synthetic rubber, plastics, etc. Another case in point is aluminum, which is taking the place of copper and lead, and contains a smaller part by weight of natural material, to say nothing of the fact that bauxite is cheaper than these other metals.

GATT's report, relating to the years 1957 and 1958, notes the fact that world trade in industrial products has grown considerably faster in recent years than has trade in basic products. It also states that the setback to world trade which occurred in 1958 affected basic products to a greater extent than industrial products. The share of total world trade made up of industrial products rose from 46 percent in 1953 to 51 percent in 1957 and to 52 percent in 1958. The value of industrial products exported throughout the world increased from 1953 to 1957 by 54 percent, to reach the sum of over $50 billion, from which peak it declined by 3 percent in 1958. By contrast, world trade in basic products rose during the same years by only 31 percent, to reach $49 billion, but in 1958 it fell back by as much as nearly 9 percent. The rapid expansion in world trade in industrial products, as against the much slower growth in basic products trade, finds expression in the figures for commerce between the industrialized nations and the volume of goods those states supply to nonindustrialized countries.

All these factors explain why demand for products exported by the underdeveloped countries is tending to weaken. The decline in volume of exports helps to worsen the terms of trade. This is an almost fatal phenomenon and it may be wondered whether it is not possible to reverse this trend which is causing underdeveloped countries' exports to fall back, first of all in relative value, then perhaps in absolute value.

In view of the limits to uninterrupted development of exports of basic products, the broadening of these countries' markets entails a need for them to open up outlets for their manufactured products, either in other underdeveloped countries, or even in industrialized nations.

The Problem of Semi-industrialized Countries

A very special problem is posed for semi-industrialized countries, among which are, according to the U.N., Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Australia, India, South Africa, Finland, and Yugoslavia. At the pressent time, these countries account for 80 percent of industrial production outside the territories which are, properly speaking, industrialized. The rate of growth of exports of basic products from these countries has slowed down, whereas the underdeveloped countries are maintaining that rate at a normal level. It is interesting to note that the relative fall in exports for the entire group of economically weak countries is almost solely due to the eight semi-industrialized nations.

The share of these semi-industrialized countries' exports in world trade has, as a matter of fact, fallen from 9.6 percent to 6.6 percent, whereas that of other underdeveloped countries remained at about 18 percent. Production of primary materials by the eight semi-industrialized nations has risen by only 12 percent since the war, compared with a 53-percent increase for countries still at the very start of industrialization. It will be seen, then, that economic development and industrialization in these eight countries have, to a large extent, been accompanied by a tapering off in their production of exportable goods, and hence a decline in their share of developing world trade. On the one hand, it has been a fortunate coincidence that the semi-industrialized countries have slowed their primary production down at a time when the industrial countries are no longer prepared to absorb as large a volume of agricultural products and other raw materials as in the past, since the most needy countries have thus been able to avoid the losses they would have suffered if they had had to face the competition of countries now attaining a certain level of industrialization. On the other hand, however, this has not solved the underdeveloped countries' balance of payments problem, and it is the semi-industrialized countries which are feeling this problem most acutely. Efforts to develop industries have induced these nations to consume some of their raw materials themselves and restrict exports of such materials, while at the same time they have become more dependent on imports of industrial equipment. This means that they cannot continue their efforts unless they can sell on the international market the manufactured products which necessarily represent their industries of the future. The other retarded countries which have not yet really embarked on industrialization will go through an equally critical period, which gives some indication of the magnitude this problem will assume in the future.

Economic aid alone is not enough

The most immediate means of counteracting the fatal effects of the deterioration in the position and terms of trade of the economically weak nations is to be found in economic aid from industrialized countries. In this connection, some thought should be given to the vastness of the needs and the paucity of aid. An alarming revelation comes from GATT, which has estimated **that the drop in raw material prices in 1958 exceeded the amount of all forms of assistance granted by industrialized to underdeveloped countries during that year.**

In other words, the recession in the United States and the setback to trade in Western Europe had the effect of canceling out the benefit which economic aid from the industrialized nations should normally have had. Such aid as was given did not permit the economically weak countries to narrow the immense gap between their economies and those of the advanced nations. It served merely to prevent the difference in living standards from growing too much more marked, to the less developed countries' disadvantage. However, it did not stop the growth of unemployment and underemployment due to demographic pressure in those countries. The free world must not blind itself to the fact that, while aid to the economically retarded countries has indeed enabled shaky ground to be held, it cannot deal effectively with the structural problems that must be solved if there is to be any tangible improvement in the situation.

The problem of loans

Economic aid is granted frequently and to a large extent in the form of loans. The economically underdeveloped nations receive such loans from the United States, Western Europe, Communist countries and international organizations. These loans come either from governments—$2,800 million in 1956–57 from free nations—or are advanced by industrialists who supply the developing countries with industrial equipment, a contribution which had a net value of $1,400 million in 1956. Although some of these loans are advanced by governments, rather as donations, with little expectation of repayment, there is also a wide variety of short, medium, and long-term credits. All that such loans can do is to put off the day of reckoning, but not solve the fundamental problem. Some day a loan must be repaid, and even if the rate of interest is low or nonexistent, the principal will still have to be repaid. And how can such loans be repaid, except by the recipients exporting goods or services—that is, by a better integration of these countries into international trade?

Undoubtedly international loans are most helpful. They give borrowing nations a useful respite, but provide no final solution, especially as these loans are insufficient to finance basic structural changes in the economies of the countries concerned.

Special attention, too, should be directed to private investments, the volume of which is steadily growing. However, even though some of the profits are used on the spot, lenders certainly intend later on to call in both the capital invested and the profits made. Moreover, such investments are dictated by the economic interests of the companies or businessmen who lend the money, and their interests do not always coincide with those of the countries in which the investments are made. For instance, in the case of investments made by American industry in underdeveloped countries, it will be noted that such operations are directed mainly to the exploitation of oilfields or mineral deposits, while investments in other sectors are relatively insignificant. For some time now, a certain change of front has been coming about, inasmuch as powerful industries with international connections, such as the electrical goods industry, have been establishing subsidiaries abroad, equipped with the most modern means of production. As they produce within economies lacking in purchasing power adequate to absorb their goods, such subsidiaries figure as competitors on industrialized nations' traditional foreign markets. Desirable as it may be for efficient industries to be set up in economically weak countries, all the same their establishment should not be commanded by the financial power of large international corporations, nor be restricted to branches where the profit motive predominates over considerations of a healthy economic structure in the country concerned. Hence such investments do not aim primarily at enhancing the general prosperity of countries in process of development, nor do they contribute necessarily to raising their level of social well-being.

Orientation of the Economy Toward Integration of World Trade

It is obvious that the economically developing countries must reorient their economies, so as to fit better into the pattern of world trade. This aim may be achieved by diversification of their production, to include lines which they are well suited by nature to produce, thanks to the availability of raw materials that would otherwise be exported without having undergone any manufacturing process, and thanks to exploitation of potential sources of energy. This necessitates development of the country's economic infrastructure and a certain amount of planning as regards private investments, in order to open up markets for the future.

At the same time this integration in world trade cannot come about unless living conditions and purchasing power are improved in such countries, thus providing broader sales outlets in those nations to match the growing volume of goods they are offering on the world market.

In addition, fresh and genuine efforts must be made to sign international agreements for the stabilization of commodity prices and markets. In this manner the economically developing countries will obtain the benefit of a sounder basis for their traditional exports, which will facilitate the considerable effort they must make to diversify their economy by industrialization.

Future Prospects

According to a study effected by GATT, commodity exports of underdeveloped countries in 1953–55 were worth $13 billion. It is likely that in 1973–75, if there is no change in industrial countries' agricultural policy, imports required will be worth $14.5 billion, or 15 percent more, which is clearly less than the probable development of imports the retarded nations will need to finance modest economic progress. Countries most seriously affected will obviously be those which export agricultural products that can be grown in the temperate zone, but all the underdeveloped countries generally speaking run a danger of seeing their income from exports shrink distressingly, and, with it, their means of executing economic development programs. In their turn, industrialized nations will find their export outlets for manufactured goods and machinery, so much in demand in retarded countries, dwindling away.

The importance of markets in the developing countries is shown by estimates of the U.N. Economic Commission for Europe. The commodity producing nations absorb 94 percent of European exports of energy generating equipment, 89 percent of their exports of agricultural machinery, 93 percent of railway rolling stock and 75 percent of most other types of plant and machinery.

This development means that the free world faces one of two alternatives. Either the underdeveloped nations will have to abandon their economic development programs, or some solution will have to be found for the problem of maladjustment in their balance of payments. It is unthinkable that populations in those countries should be kept in their present state of want and that demographic pressure there should be allowed to go on without there being any hope of improving the lot of this vast section of humanity.

For economic, social and political reasons, some rapid solution is vital, especially as the Western World must counter the risk of extention of Communist influence in economically weak countries. As a matter of fact, Eastern Europe and Communist China have become important trading partners for the underdeveloped countries. If the problem is not solved within the framework of an agreement between the Western and the underdeveloped nations, the latter will be tempted to seek a way out by means of an agreement with the Communist countries and will turn, first of all economically and then politically, toward the nations that follow the Communist line.

The Communist Regime's Trump Cards in Trade With Economically Retarded Countries

Such a danger is all the greater, inasmuch as existing structural conditions may promote development of this kind. The U.S.S.R., its satellites in Europe and China, have channeled their economic development in a diametrically opposite direction to that of the West, by forcing on heavy industries, perhaps to an excessive degree. Today, by slowing down even very slightly their rate of military output, they can make available a considerable surplus of the capital goods and machinery needed by underdeveloped nations for their economic advancement. On the other hand, the Communist countries have neglected to develop their primary production and, still more so, their output of consumer goods. As regards output of primary products, they have adopted the same process as have most semi-industrialized countries; their industrialization has proceeded at the expense of primary production, besides which they have devoted greater efforts than have the semi-industrialized nations to building up heavy industry.

At the present day, therefore, Communist countries are in a position, on the one hand, to deliver almost all the plant and machinery required by underdeveloped countries and, on the other hand, to absorb almost limitlessly the agricultural products, raw materials and even the industrial consumer goods which the underdeveloped or semi-industrialized nations wish to export and have difficulty in selling to the West.

Thus there is coming about, between the underdeveloped and Communist countries a stream of trade strangely reminiscent of that witnessed at the beginning of the 19th century between Great Britain and the raw material producing countries. At that time, Britain had developed its consumer goods industries and put a brake on agricultural output; it exported its surplus of manufactured products and purchased almost all its foodstuffs and raw materials from underdeveloped countries. Soviet Russia, Eastern European countries, and Communist China, without having consciously intended to do so and simply as a result of the direction in which their economies have been developing, now find themselves in the same key position as was occupied by Britain at the start of last century. Those countries are now in a position to increase more and more their trade with underdeveloped nations, and there is a possibility that trade with Communist countries in the East may progressively come to occupy the place in underdeveloped nations' trade that was formerly held by trade with the West.

The growing volume of Soviet trade, especially with underdeveloped countries, is made clear by 1958 import and export figures which, at 34,600 million rubles ($8,650 million) were 3.9 percent above 1957 figures. Trade with other Communist countries rose by 4 percent—from 24,500 million rubles to 25,500 million, and with the rest of the world by 3.7 percent—from 8,800 million rubles to 9,100 million. The biggest increases in Soviet trade with non-Communist countries occurred in South America and Southeast Asia. Trade with Uruguay was up by 65.7 percent on 1957, India 43 percent, Indonesia 53.5 percent, Malaya 138.4 percent, and Japan 122 percent.

A typical instance is the new Japan-Soviet trade agreement, which was signed in December 1958. The greatly increased volume of trade provided for in that treaty reached half the annual figure of $77 million agreed on within the space of 5 months only from the date of signing the treaty.

Economic aid from Communist countries

Contrary to the practice followed with American aid, nations in the Eastern bloc, with very few exceptions, do not make donations, but rather grant credits, bearing low rates of interest, as a rule 2½ percent, which represents favorable terms by international standards, or in exceptional cases, as little as 2 percent. In addition, experts are sent out to such countries to provide technical assistance. According to the Dillon Report, in the second half of 1957 no less than 2,300 technicans and engineers spent 1 month or longer in 19 different countries. Reversing the case, some 2,000 technical staff and students from the developing nations attended Soviet universities or spent time in appropriate factories in the same year.

Looking at the matter from another angle, the grants of credit which are the usual form of Soviet-Chinese economic aid place developing nations in a somewhat unfavorable position, and indeed one which is often criticized by them, since such credits are not made available for the purchase of goods to be freely selected, but must be used to procure goods from the Soviet Union only, in fact almost exclusively products of the heavy industry, if not armaments. On top of this, such credits are mostly subject to the condition that they must be repaid, when they fall due, in production goods. With such restrictive terms, these credits, despite the low rate of interest of 2½ percent or 2 percent do not always seem particularly advantageous. Besides, there have been instances where goods promised could not be delivered because the country granting the credit had to meet its own investment needs first, and where the quality and choice offered by Soviet goods was criticized. The prices charged are quite unrelated to international competition, being unilaterally determined by the Soviet Union. Insofar as nations which accept credits are forced to concentrate their exports for a long time to come on the Soviet-dominated area, in order to repay such credits, they forfeit the chance to maintain their traditional position on free markets.

From July 1954 to February 1958 the Sino-Soviet bloc granted to developing countries credits, both medium and long-term, worth $1,947 million. Of these, $1,569 million were credits for economic purposes, while $378 million were for military aid. By way of comparison, it may be noted that up till the present the World Bank has granted to over 30 developing countries credits roughly equal in amount to aid granted by the Soviet Union. In addition, American credits, offered both by the Government and by private bodies, to 20 countries in Asia and the Middle East from 1954 till February 1958 amounted to some $3 billion.

Despite the potential threat, referred to above, represented by the possibility of the Soviet Union's trading with nations in process of development, its export capacity and hence its scope for increasing credits to such countries outside the Eastern bloc remain limited, although the gross social product of the Soviet Union has been increasing at an annual rate of about 7 percent. However, its industrial production has been rising faster than the gross social product, which was estimated in 1957 to be about $170 billion. The industrial capactiy of the Eastern bloc is bolstered up by highly industrialized nations, such as Czechoslovakia, Eastern

Germany, and Poland. China, despite the less developed state of its industry and its low living standards combined with rapidly increasing population, has also contributed to increase the industrial potential of the Eastern bloc. With an estimated gross social product of only $40 billion, China's share must remain relatively modest.

The political complexion of economic aid from the Eastern bloc is well illustrated by the fact that the only nonrepayable advances made by Communist China, totaling $55 million donated to Ceylon, Egypt, Cambodia, and Nepal, were granted in return for those countries' recognition of the Peiping government.

If the West fails to find a proper solution for problems involved in the trade gap between the industrialized and underdeveloped nations, the latter will not stop their economic development, but will simply trade rather with Communist-thinking nations. This is hardly a pleasant prospect. For the West, besides the purely economic and commercial consequences of this reorientation of trade, entailing the loss of important markets for its engineering industries, there would be a far more serious danger—not only for the West, but also for the underdeveloped countries themselves—that a major part of the world would become economically dependent on countries where the political outweighs the economic motive. Ultimately the underdeveloped nations would fall into the clutches of communism, thus missing the chance to evolve a state of well-being while at the same time safeguarding freedom and human dignity.

Hesitation of Economically Weak Countries To Fall Into Communist Orbit

If the underdeveloped countries were to supply their vital industries with plant and machinery purchased from Communist countries, the latter could bring effective political pressure to bear by ceasing their deliveries. From one day to the next a totalitarian country can stop its imports or exports, thus upsetting the whole economic life of any nation which may have been so rash as to become utterly dependent on that particular supplier.

Accordingly, tempting as they may be, offers made by the Eastern European countries to certain nations in Asia and elsewhere are not always accepted by the developing countries, which hesitate to equip themselves with plant and machinery obtained in Eastern Europe. For industrialized countries in the free world, this represents a factor favorable to economic cooperation, but it is one which imposes certain obligations on them.

For instance, India, while it has agreed to have a steelworks built and equipped by Russian engineers and financed with Russian credits, has at the same time concluded deals with Western German and British firms for the construction of two other steelworks included in its program, apart from extensions to be made with U.S. aid at an existing steelworks. It might seem that this prudence was not inspired solely by technical considerations, but that India felt it was wise not to let its industry depend exclusively on supplies from a country in which trade is dictated by political objectives.

If countries which benefit by financial aid from totalitarian nations feel such doubts, might not the Western countries find it to their best interests to prevent the problem of underdeveloped nations' trade imbalance being settled by understandings with the Eastern bloc? While it may seem an easy way out to let trade grow with the East at the expense of trade with the West, this abdication would have extremely serious political and economic repercussions for the whole of the free world.

How To Remedy This Situation

Faced with these problems, the free world must take action. One form of possible action is already underway, but it is unfortunately inadequate. That is financial aid. In spite of the ingenious granting of donations for humanitarian purposes and loans advanced either by international banks or special funds, such as SUNFED, at very low rates of interest, up till the present little more than mere stopgaps have been provided. If financial aid is to constitute a lasting solution, the industrialized nations must be prepared to take all the underdeveloped countries under their wing, not for 5 or 10 years, but for an indefinite period, and they must undertake to make good the deficit in the underdeveloped countries' balance of trade, since that deficit is unlikely to be compensated for in any other manner within the near future.

With this in view, efforts to promote international coordination of development aid should be encouraged. Moves to that end are now underway, through the establishment of an International Development Association, which would be closely linked with the World Bank. Such a multilateral institute, in which highly industrialized nations, especially Western European countries, would participate side by side with the United States, could provide funds for development projects in countries in process of industrialization, these funds to be repayable in local currencies, as is the practice in the American Development Loan Fund. This latter body, which suffers from the disadvantage of being purely American, would be replaced by the International Development Association, thus making it possible to "internationalize" development aid, which would offer advantages, not only of a financial, but also of a political nature.

A second measure to facilitate the provision of such aid would be a world investment convention, which would fix the rules of conduct for the granting and acceptance of credits to underdeveloped countries, and which all nations concerned would be free to join. Such a convention is the proposal advanced by an all-party committee of Members of the British House of Commons, under the chairmanship of Mr. Creech Jones, former Colonial Minister in the Labor government. The committee's report stresses that a world investment convention should pay as much heed to the rights of borrowers as of lenders, for the former fear exploitation as much as those who provide capital fear confiscation or unfair discrimination.

Also to be borne in mind is the need for industrialized countries, by wise economic policy, to prevent at all costs any setback or recession in their economies which, as the recent past has proved, strikes a direct blow at underdeveloped countries. It is through economic expansion and constant prosperity in industrial countries that the conditions will be created and the necessary means will be found to promote the economic development of retarded nations.

Once again, it is well to repeat, among measures required to be taken, the need to conclude international agreements for the purpose of stabilizing commodity prices and markets.

The experience of recent years shows that semi-industrialized countries are reducing their exports of primary products, but have available exportable surpluses of manufactured products, such as textiles and other consumer goods. If structural changes come about in the retarded countries' economies, the industrial nations will have to adjust their economies also, either by reducing protectionism in certain branches which, by the nature of things, are in a state of decline, or by lowering the sometimes excessive taxes levied, for instance on coffee, tea, and cocoa.

Clearly those sections of advanced nations' economies which suffer from the repercussions of such structural changes must be assisted by the community as a whole in their efforts to convert to other forms of activity and to reabsorb their labor in jobs with a more secure future.

As they stimulate, or even deliberately bring about readjustment in their economies, the advanced nations must develop their plant and machinery producing industries, for these will provide exportable surpluses; at the same time, they must slow down expansion of certain consumer goods industries, including some forms of manufacturing, which should be prepared to face growing competition on their home markets.

Any trade policy that aims at mutual prosperity demands a minimum amount of solidarity. No country can refuse the advantages of the international division of labor without endangering its own living standards, nor can any country enjoy those advantages unless it is willing to cooperate closely with others.

Obviously it is not by donations and financial aid alone that the industrial nations will solve the extremely knotty problem of raising living standards in retarded nations to acceptable levels, for the imbalance outstrips in magnitude the resources of national treasuries. There must be closer and frank collaboration between the two groups of countries, in order to insure that their economies are dovetailed in world trade patterns.

The pursuing of this aim constitutes a political problem of primary importance, which governments and enlightened sections of the population should explain to public opinion, in an attempt to solve it as rapidly as possible. In the absence of early correction of the trend to imbalance in trade between industrialized and underdeveloped countries, the consequences may be very grave indeed for the free world.

B. Problems in economically advanced parts of the world

Now that attention has been directed to economic developments in poor countries and the problems involved there for the free world, it is necessary, so as to throw light on all aspects of world economy and their effects on the various individual nations and regions, to point out the economic position of advanced parts of the world, as regards its general trends.

First of all it must be remembered that the group of economically weak nations contained in Asia, Latin America, the West Indies and Africa account for more than three-quarters of the population in the free world; their people number 1.2 billion human beings who live under appalling conditions. Apart from that group, there are Australia and New Zealand, whose exports are largely made up of agricultural produce. Australia, for instance, regards the meat and wool checks as a major item in its balance of payments, as does New Zealand, together with income from dairy products. However, the per capita national income of these two countries is among the highest in the world, being greater than that of most European countries. Two countries in the midst of striking industrial development are the Union of South Africa and Japan. The latter, despite its industrial population's low living standards, is ranked in Asia among the most important industrial nations.

Specific problems connected with the state of trade and trading relations must be faced in the most advanced parts of the free world; namely, the United States and Western Europe. In view of the growing importance these problems are assuming for the labor movement, it is becoming vital to analyze carefully a situation which is, to some extent, absolutely new since the economic reconstruction of Europe.

Key Position Occupied by United States and European Economies in State of World Trade

It is an old saying that if the American economy sneezes, European economy catches a cold. This proved to be correct in 1958, when the recession in the United States was followed in Europe by stagnation, indeed a downturn in trade, which revived simultaneously in both continents.

Since the 1958 recession in the United States and the trade setback in Europe caused such a deterioration in underdeveloped countries' economic situation that financial aid, even though on an increased scale, was insufficient to compensate fully for the adverse effects on the needy countries' balances of payments, it is vital for the two industrialized continents to pursue an economic and trade policy designed to avoid to the utmost possible extent any unfortunate turn of trade.

Western Europe Is the Cornerstone for Developing Countries

After the United States had so generously aided in the revival of European economy, this has reached the point where its activity has become more important than that of the United States for the economically underdeveloped lands. In Western Europe the trade-to-production ratio is much higher than in North America; Western Europe's trade is also much more diversified, both as regards range of products and its structure related to the various geographical regions.

Total f.o.b. value of imports in 1953–55 was 30 percent of the value of production in Western Europe, compared with 9 percent in the United States and Canada. Taking the United States alone, the percentage was as low as 6.5 percent. In absolute figures, U.S. imports in 1957 were valued at $12,921 million, as against $46,973 million for imports of OEEC countries.

The fact that Western Europe is much more dependent than is North America on imports, as may be seen from the above figures, is likewise made clear by the greater diversity of those imports, especially of basic commodities. As a matter of fact, imports into North America, especially the United States, are concentrated mainly on a relatively limited number of basic products.

Hence the number of countries that supply goods to Western Europe is much larger than those which sell to North America. In 1953–55, Western Europe's imports accounted for 45 percent of the total value of exports from nonindustrialized regions, especially those having basic products for sale, whereas North American imports made up only 22 percent of those countries' exports.

Taken on the whole, variations in the volume of imports are largely in keeping with fluctuations in the volume of industrial output, both in Western Europe and North America. (See table below.) This means that any given fluctuation one way or another in the industrial activity of Western Europe would have wider effects on basic products supplying countries' export income—and hence on international trade—than the same amount of fluctuation in the state of trade in North America. Thus the maintenance of prosperity and continuity of economic development in Western Europe is a key factor for world economy as a whole, in particular for nonindustrialized regions which derive almost the whole of their income from exports.

Volume of imports and industrial production from 1948 to 1956

[1953=100]

	United States		Western Europe	
	Imports	Industrial production	Imports	Industrial production
1948	78	78	73	69
1949	76	72	79	79
1950	92	84	89	86
1951	91	90	96	95
1952	96	93	93	95
1953	100	100	100	100
1954	93	93	111	110
1955	103	104	125	120
1956	111	107	134	125

The following figures illustrate Western Europe's growing importance as a prop to general efforts to promote development of economically retarded areas. From 1953 to 1957, imports into Western Europe increased by 65 percent, as against a 17.5 percent increase in American imports and a 41 percent increase in imports of the free world in general.

Structure of Trading Relations Between the United States and Western Europe

Trade between the United States and Western Europe, especially the six Community countries, is marked by a surplus of European imports of basic commodities and investment goods, while for consumer goods and semifinished articles European exports to North America are strikingly in excess of imports of those goods into Europe.

This points to a structural equalization which has developed more and more in recent years between the advanced economies of these two continents. Care must be taken not to upset the balance, so as to prevent either side, but especially Western Europe, which is more susceptible to fluctuations in its partner's economy, from suffering setbacks in the state of trade, both in their own interests and in that of overall world economy. On the other hand, it is clearly rather risky for European economies to build up their markets, above all for durable consumer goods, in North America, for this would render them too sensitive to economic fluctuations there. The reason why Western Europe is directing such branches of trade, like the automobile industry, preferably to the U.S. market, is that the developing countries do not possess the purchasing power necessary to absorb these nonessential products. It may be also that Western Europe's own purchasing power is not growing fast enough to keep up with the development of certain durable consumer goods industries.

The high index for the volume of U.S. imports in 1950 results wholly from raw materials and semifinished products imported on account of stockpiling of strategic materials.

Every effort must therefore be made to enable the retarded countries to progress rapidly and earn the foreign exchange they need, by trading with advanced countries in the free world, so they can absorb a growing share of Western Europe's manufactures. Europe would be deluding itself if it were to seek to practice a policy of self-sufficiency in trade with the United States, as a measure of protection against the effects of any economic fluctuations in America, for it should bear in mind that the nonindustrialized countries will not be able to absorb all the output of its manufacturing industries. The economies of the two advanced continents should thus be made to serve as a mutual stimulus in their efforts to achieve expansion. This means that they must agree on a positive solution for problems which may arise in any branches where one continent's manufacturing industry may do injury to the other's, for lack of adequate markets in third countries still in the initial stages of development. It will greatly help to solve such problems if Western European countries and North America can succeed in maintaining their economies in a state of expansion.

If, on the other hand, trade between the United States and Western Europe were to meet obstacles, that would make it difficult for Western Europe to market its manufactured products and would force European countries to trade to a much greater extent with countries in the Eastern bloc. Hitherto, however, such trade has proved extremely difficult, because the U.S.S.R. and its satellites cannot offer the goods Western Europe needs most, and also because of the absence of a reliable basis for trade, so that buyers cannot count on receiving regular supplies in major quantities. Besides this, trade relations between Western European and Communist countries are on an individual bilateral basis, thus creating difficulties in the way of settling reciprocal trade accounts. Austria, for instance, has had to grant to the five Danubian Communist states large credits, which it is having much trouble in getting reimbursed. Last but not least, there would be a risk of protests against dumping by Communist countries in Western Europe; indeed, this has already created no slight trouble for various European countries' industries.

Economic Integration Must Come About in a Setting of Expansion

If Western Europe wishes to insure balanced trading relations with the United States, it must integrate its national economies in order to strengthen its position. In this manner, it will broaden its domestic market by supplying goods on better terms to its consumers. What will the effects of such economic integration be on third countries?

A study made by GATT has shown that, from 1951 to 1955, the liberation of inter-European trade has not caused imports of products of European origin to increase faster than imports from other sources. The reason for this trend is to be sought in the marked and constant improvement that took place in the state of trade during those years.

In prosperous times, unprotected imports—that is, imports which do not enjoy any preferential tariffs, such as those from the Commonwealth—have been able to develop satisfactorily, with the result that the special treatment granted by Common Market countries to their oversea territories should not prove too serious a handicap, in good times, to other commodity exporting nations.

This makes plain the crucial importance of the steady development of economic activity among the six, as also among other Western European countries. That development must be a long-term one and must cover the whole transitional period which will lead, after 12 to 15 years, to the ultimate achievement of the Common Market. It is true that the probable effect of the Common Market on the various products and various countries will of course be very different from one to the other. However, the GATT study concludes that there is reason to think, generally speaking, that the Common Market will have beneficial effects on international trade and that the harmful effects of the discrimination inevitable during the transitional period will be reduced to a minimum, subject to the reasonable assumption that, during that period and subsequently, the Common Market will make a positive contribution to maintaining and even speeding up the constant increase in ouput of all the six countries together.

If, on the other hand, plans for economic integration in Europe were to be executed under unfavorable conditions, the developing countries would be exposed to trade discrimination of a kind likely to prejudice their advancement seriously.

As the second largest industrial producer in order of size and as the territory most dependent on imports, Western Europe, by achieving a healthy development of trade thanks to economic integration, will be able to turn its wealth in the form of its men of science, technicians and highly skilled labor force to good account for a valuable contribution toward placing world economy on a sound footing.

Striking Increase in U.S. Private Investments Abroad

In the past, the United States experienced dynamic development of its economy, thanks to rapid expansion of its domestic market. After the Second World War, the collapse of Germany, the accumulated need in European countries that lay in ruins, and destruction in Japan, induced the United States to take a greater interest in the international market. Since that time, the cold war has stimulated exports. However, the free countries, which were short of hard currency, were temporarily forced to impose rather severe restrictions on imports from the dollar area, which has caused American companies to invest large sums of money abroad, where they have set up subsidiaries. Those investments were channeled into the production of raw materials and the building of factories for fabricating purposes, which served the interests of U.S. foreign trade.

This policy began to take clear shape as long ago as 1950, and has assumed marked proportions in recent years, for such investments rose from $1,211 million in 1955 to $2,980 million in 1956, $3,211 million in 1957 and $2,924 million in 1958. Even assuming (as the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. estimates) that there is a 5 percent increase in the 1959 figure over that for 1958, this will still mean that American oversea investments in 1959 will be 5 percent lower than in 1957. However, according to the same source, prospects are that there will be a certain decline in such investments in 1960. Although the finished goods manufacturing industry is expected to invest $957 million abroad in 1959, equal to 26 percent more than in 1958, that figure will probably fall back in the following year to $888 million. As always, oil company investments account for the lion's share.

Apart from American investment interest in Latin America, India, and Japan, the establishment of subsidiaries is at present concentrated on Europe. In 1960 the finished goods manufacturing industry will place 47 percent of its foreign investments in European countries, whereas in 1957 and 1958 more than 50 percent of those investments went to Canada and South America, with less than 40 percent for Europe. American firms reckon on being able to benefit from the economic expansion expected as a result of European integration, besides which they seek to protect themselves in this way against the disadvantages of the six-country customs union. In actual fact, these countries' tariffs on imports from non-Community countries like the United States will be maintained and indeed, in some instances, even increased as a result of uniformity in their rates. The free trade area among the Outer Seven European countries will also lead to the gradual abolition of tariffs amongst themselves, but will not bring any decrease in tariffs imposed in trade with the outside world.

These U.S. investments have already grown to such an extent that the turnover of American subsidiaries abroad is already considerably higher than the value of American exports. It is primarily big American firms which are engaging in such operations, through branches, commercial companies, or plants working with American patents, often with large American capital invested. Ninety-nine percent of major American enterprises have interests abroad, either in the form of direct shares of some other type of activity.

It is primarily oil companies, steel firms, nonferrous metals producers, automobile firms, rubber manufacturers, internationally integrated electrical engineering corporations, agricultural machinery makers, pharmaceutical and foodstuffs firms which are establishing productive facilities abroad. Some 3,000 American firms have invested large sums of money in production and distribution facilities abroad, to say nothing of the existence in oversea territories of American research institutes, sales organizations, and branch banks. Investments already made amount to nearly $59 billion. Their 1958 turnover figure was $30 billion, while nonmilitary exports for 1958 were worth $17 billion, compared with $12 billion in 1949.

American industry's interest in the European market is evidenced by the two following examples. The first is the establishment of a roller bearing factory, set up in Colmar, France, by the Timkim Co., and the second is the building of a chemicals plant in Italy, with the participation of the Edison Co. of Milan. These new installations will serve as a base for American companies' operations within the Common Market.

As regards projects for European integration on a wider scale than that of the six countries, mention may be made of the efforts of the Aluminum Co. of America and the Reynolds Metals Co. to gain control of the British aluminium industry.

The stiffest competition by American capital in Europe is occurring in the petroleum and electrical engineering industries.

Other instances of intensified American investment activity throughout the free world are the construction by Kaiser Steel of an aluminium plant in India and the establishment by Ford of a motor vehicle factory in Australia to compete with General Motors.

U.S. Economy Face to Face With Greater Foreign Production

In its commercial dealings, the American economy constantly shows an excess of exports over imports, as also an excess in invisible earnings. This is illustrated by the following figures:

[In millions of dollars]

	Credit balance in trade	Credit balance in invisible earnings [1]
1950	1,009	1,856
1951	2,921	3,534
1952	2,481	3,757
1953	1,291	2,355
1954	2,445	3,849
1955	2,753	4,304
1956	4,530	5,981
1957	6,036	8,354
1958	3,263	5,232

[1] Excluding defense expenditure abroad and U.S. military aid to other countries.

The United States also accounts for an important share of world exports of manufactured products, as may be seen below:

[Percentage of total value]

	United States	Great Britain	Germany	Japan
1951	26.5	22.0	10.0	4.3
1952	26.2	21.6	12.0	3.8
1953	25.9	21.3	13.3	3.8
1954	25.1	20.4	14.8	4.7
1955	24.5	19.7	15.4	5.1
1956	25.2	19.1	16.4	5.7
1957	25.4	18.1	17.5	5.9
1958	23.2	18.0	18.6	6.0

Despite a relative decline in these exports, the drop in 1957 was only 1.1 percent compared with 1951. Thus the United States is holding its ground fairly well, if compared with Great Britain, especially if growing competition from the German Federal Republic and Japan is taken into account. On the other hand, losses suffered by the United States in 1958 are considerable, which shows that it was most affected by the difficulties in world trade in that year.

The proportion of the world total represented by all kinds of exports from the United States was 17.2 percent in 1958, which meant only a slight loss compared with the 1950 figure of 17.7 percent, but was a greater setback as against the higher percentages achieved in 1956 and 1957. Year-to-year figures are:

U.S. share, as percentage

1950	17.7	1955	17.1
1951	18.5	1956	18.7
1952	18.4	1957	19.4
1953	17.0	1958	17.2
1954	17.0		

Part of the decline in U.S. exports in 1958 was due to a cyclical decline in raw materials, fuels and metals. Another factor was the great dependence on the Canadian market, where imports of manufactured goods decline rather sharply during recession periods. The 1958 export figures look particularly unfavorable if compared with 1957, when U.S. exports reached an unusually high level, owing to the Suez crisis. It is very likely that, as world economy resumes its expansion, American exports, especially of manufactured goods, will again improve their position considerably.

These figures show that establishment of production facilities abroad has not led to any real difficulties as regards either exports or the balance of payments.

In considering the above figures on the U.S. relative position in world trade in postwar years, two other important aspects have to be taken into account. Firstly, the recent GATT report reveals that the U.S. share of world production (excluding Eastern Europe, U.S.S.R. and Communist China), which was 44 percent in 1948, had dropped by 1954 to 40.5 percent. This means that despite its strong position in world production, since 1948 the United States has been steadily losing its power of expansion. The loss in its share of world production, however, is at least as great, if not greater, than the loss suffered in its share of world trade.

Secondly, the U.S. share in world production (again excluding Eastern Europe, the U.S.S.R. and Communist China) was 30 percent in 1938 and, for the same year, its share in world trade, according to GATT, was 11 percent. Thus the United States is still in a greatly improved position, as compared with prewar years.

This whole evolution shows that American management's arguments that inflation is cutting them out of world markets are unfounded. Another proof that such claims have no justification may be found in the Consumer Price Index worked out by the ILO. Taking 1953 as 100, the index for May 1958 is: United States 108, Great Britain 120, France 121, Germany 111, Sweden 119, and Japan 108.

With the revival of productive power in other countries, the United States will, of course, be more exposed to international competition.

Notwithstanding the positive factors in favor of the U.S. economy, it has shown a constant deficit in its general balance of payments ever since 1950, except for 1957, the year following the Suez crisis. That deficit has evidenced itself in a decline in gold reserves, as illustrated below.

Gold reserves ***held by the United States***

[In millions of dollars]

Year	Amount	Year	Amount
1952	23,252	1956	22,058
1953	22,091	1957	22,857
1954	21,793	1958	20,582
1955	21,752		

The reasons for this deficit are, on the one hand, the increased exodus of capital to finance private investments abroad and, on the other hand, the rise in loans and military equipment supplies, combined with the U.S. economic aid program, the amount of which has increased from $4,742 million in 1950 to $3,449 million in 1958. To these factors must be added the relative rise in imports, partly due to greater purchases of manufactures, especially from Japan and Western Europe. The value of American imports is:

	In millions
1951	$10,921
1955	11,410
1956	12,645
1957	13,108
1958	12,913

Bearing these various factors in mind, the permanent deficit in the U.S. balance of payments and its steady loss of gold cannot be regarded as disturbing signs, and all the more so since there has been an unbroken influx of gold into the United States during postwar years, a situation which is now being corrected. Moreover, as noted above, the return of that gold is partially due to the investment of capital abroad, investments which, in coming years, will bring in fresh earnings of foreign exchange.

As a matter of fact, the United States is an important lender of capital to world economy, its holdings abroad amounting to $58.9 billion, not counting the Treasury's stocks of gold. That sum of money, which compares with only $20.8 billion of foreign holdings in the United States, constitutes a source of growing revenue to swell the credit side of the U.S. balance of payments, and testifies to the strong position of the American dollar.

This tendency to increase exports of private American capital and Government expenditure in foreign curency is a development which would be desirable in itself, since it provides a stimulus to economic activity throughout the world. The only thing is that care must be taken to see that these investments are well placed in the economic and social interests of beneficiary countries, and that Government aid represents true economic aid, with no strings of a military nature tied to it. These two conditions are being satisfied to a limited extent only, so that some remedy is needed, if the free world's position is to be strengthened.

Growing Competition From Abroad and Its Effects on Employment in the United States

For the American economy as a whole and for American labor in particular increasing imports of finished products present a special problem. Abroad there have grown up manufacturing establishments which are fully competitive with American products, even on their own domestic market, from the point of view of technical perfection, inventive skill, and quality.

So as to be competitive and attain the maximum profitability, modern firms in Europe and Japan are seeking to expand their sales on the world market, even for special products sold in relatively limited numbers. For these such a broad economic area as the United States is of particular interest. A further factor that weighs with them are the better conditions for payment, for their exports to developing countries mean taking great risks in some cases, and supplying goods on credit. How far they are more favorably placed as a result of having lower production costs than those in the United States is a matter which would have to be ascertained in each case individually. Whereas in some instances they may enjoy an advantage through lower wages, not fully outweighed by lower productivity, this is certainly not generally true. Other factors, such as higher material costs and capital charges, may also tip the scales against European industries. Cost of transport to the United States and distribution costs, which are higher in this market for exporters, must likewise be taken into account. However, it may be a point in favor of European exports that, in certain sectors, they are thrusting into a market on which a handful of powerful corporations maintain arbitrary price levels, now threatened by these exports.

Among these exports, however, are now to be found products of subsidiary companies erected abroad through private American investments. In various cases such subsidiaries serve not only to open up new markets, but often import goods into the United States at considerably lower than domestic prices. In so doing, they do bring a threat to American production and to the jobs of labor employed in the industries affected. By the capital gains they make through their subsidiaries, however, the big corporations can escape some of the consequences. This kind of development is proceeding especially in light electrical engineering.

An instance of this investment policy by American companies is to be found in transistor radio production. International General Electric, a section of General Electric, has announced a new export program. The corporation has signed with the Tokyo Shibara Electric Co. Ltd. an agreement whereby the Japanese company, in which General Electric has a dominant interest, will undertake production of transistors, electric appliances, valves, radio and television sets, to be offered for sale on the markets of third countries with the trademark "General Electric, Made in Japan." Vacuum tubes and transistors which, 3 years ago, American companies were supplying to Japan, are now being purchased from Japan by those same companies.

Another instance is the Wright Sewing Machine Co., which has transferred some of its production to Japan and is now importing products bearing its own name from there.

Pressure of foreign competition in the U.S. market is most striking in the automobile industry. Here much of the competition is coming from European automobile factories which are independent of American capital, such as the state-owned West German Volkswagen works, the nationalized Renault works in France, Fiat in Italy, etc. The two first-named firms, in particular, account for a significant share of sharply increased European exports. In addition, however, British General Motors and the German Opel works, in which substantial American capital is invested, have a large share in the increased exports. The Opel works, wholly owned by the American General Motors Corp., in the financial year 1958 exported out of its enormous profits DM66.25 million as a cash dividend to the sole shareholder in Detroit, besides which it increased its share capital by DM40 million, which is equivalent again to a handsome increase in net worth.

The European motor industry's success on the American market is attributable to the demand for small cars. The price, which can be substantially lower for a smaller car, even if it has advantages of quality and other features, but still not mean unfair competition, is not the only deciding factor. Other aspects, such as practical shape of the car, more in keeping with the customer's taste, better qualities for easy handling and parking, and lower maintenance costs also weigh heavily. The extent to which these factors have been responsible for the success of European automobile exports to the United States will become evident as soon as the big American manufacturers put their own small cars on the market. Already high sales figures for the Rambler and the small Studebaker, even at the depth of the recession, show that these factors do play a major part. It is perfectly feasible that the big American auto corporations, which last year also suffered a resounding setback with their direct exports, may with their new models not only achieve increased sales on the domestic market, but again become competitors to be reckoned with on the world market.

The importance of such factors as quality and suitability of products in competition may be illustrated by the results of a survey among employers in the German Federal Republic, regarding the reasons for their success with exports. Eighty-four percent of engineering firms quoted good quality as the reason. With 42 percent, price came a long way behind, followed by service to customers with 33 percent, advertising with 28 percent, and prompt delivery dates with 27 percent. Government export promotion schemes came last, with 5 percent.[1]

As a good argument against higher tariffs, one may quote the example of Scandinavian countries which, although the lowest tariff countries in Europe, have built up the highest living standards on the continent.

These examples make it clear that protectionist arguments cannot be lightly cited, as is constantly done by industries in importing countries, but that accurate, objective inquiries are requisite in each individual case. First of all, there is a need to ascertain what will be the long-term, structural effects of imports. Here the primary subject of inquiry must be whether competition that is unfair on account of the labor standards in relation to productivity does actually represent a threat to the importing country's industry, as regards both its present and future employment opportunities, and future wage trends consonant with improvements in productivity to be achieved subsequently.

In their attitude to trade policy, American companies are extremely inconsistent, depending on their own individual interests. Whereas in light electrical engineering they pursue a policy of free imports, since they indemnify themselves through their foreign capital interests, in the heavy electrical equipment sector, on the other hand, they speak for protectionism, by demanding preferential treatment in the awarding of contracts, by virtue of Government authorities' verdicts, so as to be able to maintain their high prices without risking loss of business.

Greater sales of foreign products on the American market, especially if they lead to keener, but fair, competition, must be regarded as a positive factor. Such increased sales could put a stop to arbitrary price policies in certain monopolistic price sectors.

Where, however, competition is unfair, due to wages in the foreign firm being far too low in proportion to the level of productivity, or where the case concerns transfer abroad of a section of production in order to benefit by lower labor standards and possibly lower taxation there, then American labor is being placed at a disadvantage, which is not in the economic interests of the importing country and must therefore, in all justice, be put right through effective measures. Success in export trade due to low wages is of no benefit to labor in the exporting country either; on the contrary, it exposes those workers to constant pressure on wages. Nor does the transfer of production facilities elsewhere than any given company's country of origin benefit labor in developing territories. In such countries, labor standards continue to be kept low, regardless of modern means of production, for after all those low labor standards are the very factor which leads to transfer of facilities. Nor does it serve the best interests of the developing nation's economy as a whole, because, with exports of this nature, it can only create difficulties in the path of industrialized countries' economic development, without the country to which facilities are transferred being able to integrate itself into world trade by developing a market of its own.

---

[1] Percentages total more than 100, due to repetitions of some factors.

Assimilation of Productivity as Between Individual Large Production Units in Different Countries

As a result of the far-flung international ramifications of big corporations, especially in various branches of the metal industry, there has come about with some products a certain uniformity in productivity advances in the various countries. Though this leveling up may perhaps not always apply as between countries' entire branches of industry, it certainly may be noted as between leading firms. Extensive new production units in Western Europe have been erected in recent years in keeping with the latest technical knowledge, so that they attain a standard of competitiveness above the average for the given country's industry. Such plants are being built in the developing territories as well. As this leads to productivity levels as between leading plants in particular branches of industry approximating, at high rates, more closely to one another, labor costs and fringe benefits in the various countries are coming to be a factor of growing importance, side by side with differences in background conditions, some of them determined by nature, such as in the supply of materials and energy. On the other hand, labor costs are dwindling in relative importance, as a result of steadily progressing rationalization and higher investment outlay.

Now the very plants which are trying to make higher productivity possible by greater sales of products, which must be offered on the export market, are the most modern, high-capacity establishments. If such plants attain a rate of productivity far higher than the average in their branch of industry and, even more, higher than that throughout the economy as a whole, they obtain a competitive advantage based on labor costs that are far too low in relation to this higher than average productivity. Such firms are in a position to grant labor standards that are exemplary by comparison with the social conditions prevailing in their country, for the latter are generally related to the national average level of productivity. Even so, these firms can still enjoy a substantial advantage in total labor costs and fringe benefits over socially more progressive countries, because, in terms of their productivity, labor's share of total business returns remains unduly low, since even model labor standards are always kept to a scale largely determined by general economic conditions.

This is a problem which does not concern the United States alone. The more progressive European countries face similar problems within an integrated European market and, to an even greater extent, in their trade relations with the developing countries.

Need for Guarantees to Insure Fair Labor Standards

The aim of free trade must be to stimulate countries' economies by the exchange of wealth between nations, and enable them to develop rapidly and achieve general prosperity. Efforts to bring about free trade, however, can succeed and broaden the world's markets only if purchasing power in advanced countries can be maintained and further improved, and is not undermined by competition based on lower labor standards which cannot be excused on the grounds of other disadvantages suffered by any industry or a considerably lower level of productivity.

It is essential for equivalent social progress, improving the lot of the millions of people living in dire want, to go hand in hand with the relative increase in developing countries' productivity and the reinforcement of their economies. If productivity shows relative improvement in some branches only of developing nations' industry, appropriate steps must be taken to spread these economic benefits over such countries' populations in general.

If economically quite unjustifiably low labor standards in the developing countries threaten relatively high labor standards and job opportunities in the advanced nations, this will cause suffocation of purchasing power, which will do an ill service to the objective of economic and social improvement throughout the world.

The industrialized countries have their own grave problems. They must do their utmost, while making sure that their economies lose nothing of their dynamism, to bring about between the supply of goods produced, expansion of capacity, and growth of purchasing that proper balance necessary to maintain economic progress and a healthy state of trade. Should the developing countries oppose them with an economic competition not concerned with the expansion of those countries' own domestic markets through the social progress which could be achieved thanks to better means of production, then the free world would head for a serious economic crisis, with all its social and political consequences.

In order to steer clear of this danger, some guarantees must be created for the recognition and observance of fair labor standards. Such guarantees will be decisive in bringing about the prior conditions for healthy development of world economy, which must be achieved by closer economic cooperation, a freely growing world market, and the raising of all nations' living standards to a level consonant with human dignity.

II. Trade union action on economic problems of the free world, particularly in the field of trade policy

In the past, the IMF has kept the economic situation under constant review and has initiated an economic policy appropriate for the unions, as was done especially at the 1957 Congress and at a central committee meeting which took place in the midst of the American recession in 1958, and which called for the drafting of principles for an economic policy dedicated to full employment and social progress.

The IMF's Position as Defined Up Till the Present

At its Congress in 1957, the IMF directed attention to the vast and growing gap existing between living standards of the people in economically highly developed and underdeveloped countries. The IMF insisted on rapid and comprehensive aid to counter the basic reasons for poverty. Side by side with that aid, the trade unions in industrialized nations have a special obligation to give their support to the nascent unions in less favored countries. Democratic unions there must be guaranteed full trade union rights and their constructive social activity must be promoted. Contacts and close cooperation between all trade unions in the free world should be extended.

In a second resolution, the IMF Congress welcomed steps being taken toward economic integration in Europe and closer economic cooperation throughout the free world, subject to the democratic trade-union movement being given an effective voice in all bodies set up for that purpose. In particular, the IMF insisted that the liberalization of trade shall not take place on the basis of unfair competition arising from inadequate wages and working conditions.

The necessity for continued and substantial economic progress was the main subject dealt with at the central committee's meeting last year. The IMF then stressed that, in view of the rapid technological progress and the greatly expanded volume of capital investment that has taken place in recent years, the maintenance of a dynamic balance between the ability of industry to produce and the ability of people to buy was vital.

Against the background of the difficult economic situation prevailing in 1958, the IMF, in its declaration of principles, again focused attention on the need for effective cooperation with the economically underdeveloped countries. As a prior condition for their independent development and their unbroken progress, markets for these countries' products must be enlarged and trade in raw materials placed on a stable basis.

For the future, trade expansion with social safeguards

As an individual aspect of these broad economic problems, including the need for aid to economically retarded countries, greater purchasing power for all peoples and expansion of trade, the IMF is now turning its attention to the specific problem of a larger volume of trade based on the acceptance of fair labor standards everywhere.

Expansion of trade entails the human problem of effective assistance to economic activities and workers affected by competition due to increased imports. If free trade is to act as a stimulus to general economic development, a greater volume of trade between the free nations must be accompanied by the progressive dovetailing of their production patterns, thus achieving a certain degree of international division of labor. To this end, negative measures of protectionism must be discarded. Instead, economies must be brought under pressure, with due regard for prevailing conditions, to render industries threatened by competition truly efficient, or such industries must be abandoned in favor of other more promising and more economic activities.

Subject to international fair labor standards being guaranteed and to firms and labor affected by increased imports being appropriately adjusted to fit into the new economic conditions, trade can be expanded, without hardship to any party concerned, to create new employment opportunities and better living everywhere.

III. Broader aims sought through the establishment of international fair labor standards

International fair labor standards are to:

(a) encourage the progressive lowering of international trade barriers, while at the same time protecting workers by avoiding the danger that exploitation of workers in some countries will undermine labor standards in others;

(b) help the trade union movement in all countries to raise wages and social conditions to levels compatible with advancing productivity in the particular industry and in keeping with the country's resources and state of development at large;

(c) give the world's consumers the benefit, to which they are entitled, of the widest possible choice of goods, produced under conditions of healthy competition and with due regard for fair labor standards.

The main features of these aims of international fair labor standards are that no employer would be able to gain a competitive advantage, due to his ability to deny employees a fair share of the fruits of their labor, and such standards would be of benefit to both advanced and economically less developed countries alike.

On the one hand, international fair labor standards will guarantee that purchasing power keeps in balance with production capacities, thus maintaining the prosperity of industrially advanced countries; on the other hand, they will protect the employment of workers in countries where productivity is still low, bring them a share in productivity increases, and thereby generate economic growth with more and better jobs.

International fair labor standards along these lines would serve to promote the kind of competition that would make possible progressive and safe lowering of trade barriers.

(See appendix I for suggested agreement and detailed explanations of its clauses.)

IV. Problems involved in an agreement on international fair labor standards

The free trade union movement has repeatedly declared itself in favor of efforts to reduce trade barriers, as a means to greater prosperity for all. This objective stands high, not only in IMF but also in ICFTU policy. Among national trade unions, the European organizations are in the vanguard of forces actively urging intergration through a unified market in Europe, to be brought about against a background of world trade expansion. On the other side of the Atlantic, the AFL-CIO executive council only recently reaffirmed its position in favor of removal of barriers to trade among the free nations, in order to contribute to nations' economic progress and welfare. True to this line of thought, among the IMF's affiliates, the United Automobile Workers of America, the United Steelworkers, the Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers and the International Association of Machinists have refused to allow themselves to be used as a foil for employers' advocacy of protective tariffs. At the beginning of the recent recession in the United States, the AFL-CIO unions strongly supported the 4-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, which the U.S. Congress authorized last year.

Need for Accurate and Sufficient Information

Trade union members have always been deeply concerned that, as a protection for all labor, their fellow workers elsewhere should enjoy adequate standards, whereas the employers' tactics, on the other hand, have been to point to lower labor conditions abroad, for the purpose of resisting further social progress. The comparative data on wages and working conditions collected over the years by the IMF have served the purpose, among others, of preventing the unions from being misled by management's figures and allegations. It must be recognized, however, that comparisons limited merely to labor costs are not enough in themselves. It is equally important to analyze and compare other factors in the economy, such as productivity, material costs, capital charges, etc., if accurate conclusions are to be drawn.

While the unions are alive to the danger of accepting management's assertions about the competitive threat represented by lower wages in other countries, at the same time they cannot stand idly by and allow higher living standards and social safeguards in any economy to run the risk of being undermined by labor conditions elsewhere that are lower than those countries' industries could afford, in the light of their national resources and general state of development. Especially if we are to embark on an era of freer and expanded trade, this must be a subject of still greater concern to the trade union movement.

Arising out of these considerations, a primary conclusion which presents itself to the unions is, therefore, the need for accurate and sufficient information on labor standards, with due regard for all the economic circumstances surrounding any industry. This in itself implies the existence of a very wide field of investigation, to make clear the magnitude of the problem involved in establishing International Fair Labor Standards.

Regard for Varying Stages of Development in Different Countries

The next stage, once full understanding of all aspects of the problem has been obtained, would be to enunciate a correct definition of international fair labor standards. Here the fact cannot be overlooked that trade goes on between nations in very different stages of development, from the technologically highly advanced industrial structure of a country such as the United States, or of countries, perhaps generally less highly industrialized, in Europe, right down to nations still on the threshold of industrialization.

We must arrive at a definition of international fair labor standards which is applicable to all cases and which can contribute to solving the various problems of the free world, as set out in the first chapter of this report, for, as we show there, our destinies will depend on the manner in which we bridge the gap between living standards, in these varying economic backgrounds.

First we will attempt to analyze the problem in the light of information available, illustrating the different conditions in which industry must develop in the United States and economically retarded countries.

Cost Structure in Two Industries in the United States and Central America

The Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations has undertaken a study of the cost structure in the ammonium nitrate and glass container industries in the United States and in Central America.

According to this study, wage rates appear to be similar in El Salvador, Costa Rica and Honduras; converted into U.S. dollars at the official rate of exchange, the hourly rates for the following categories of workers and the monthly rates for engineers are approximately: semiskilled and unskilled workers, 25 to 30 cents; skilled workers, 50 to 60 cents; mechanics, 70 cents; secretaries, $1; engineers, $500 to $600 (per month).

In Guatemala, wages for workers in similar categories appear to be substantially higher, the difference being of the order of 30 to 50 percent.

If allowance is made for indirect payments and benefits in kind, it would appear that wage rates for manual workers in Central America, except Guatemala, are about one-sixth of those in the United States, and salaries of skilled and clerical workers and of professional staff are some one-half to one-third of corresponding rates. Taking into account the relative proportion of skilled and clerical workers and professional employees to manual labor, the average level of remuneration in Central America, except Guatemala, can be taken as approximately 25 percent of the United States level in the case of the nitrogenous fertilizer industry and 20 percent in the case of the manufacture of glass containers.

Labor costs are determined by both wage rates and productivity. Little direct information is available on the latter aspect. On the basis of related evidence, the productivity of labor in a Central American country was evaluated at somewhat less than two-thirds of that in the United States. Important aspects in assessing the productivity of labor are an inefficiency factor termed newness of equipment, due to the inexperience in labor in handling new machinery, as also the effect of climatic conditions.

Taking together the difference in wage rates and in productivity of labor, unit labor costs in Central America are of the order of 40 percent in the fertilizer industry and 32 percent in the glass container industry, measured against corresponding costs in the United States.

As to raw materials, most of these and other supplies have to be imported. No domestically produced fuel oil or natural gas is available. The price of imported heavy fuel oil in Central America is approximately 2.5 times higher than the price of the calorie equivalent in natural gas in the United States. In the case of other imported materials—and most of the materials and chemicals used in making the two items under consideration have to be imported—the price spread is considerably smaller, between 30 and 50 percent above U.S. prices. The cost of domestically produced raw materials is assumed to be the same or perhaps slightly higher. Poor quality and lack of uniformity in raw materials of domestic origin contribute, however, to higher costs of production.

As regards capital outlay, the cost of imported equipment delivered at the site will be between 30 and 40 percent higher than in the United States. On the other hand, according to information collected in the region, the domestic cost of installing equipment and constructing buildings would be approximately the same. The overall investment outlay in fixed capital is about 25 percent higher than in the United States.

The individual elements of costs relating to capital have the following characteristics.

The rate of depreciation is taken to be the same in Central America as in the United States, on the assumption that the lifetime of equipment and buildings is identical. Since the value of invested capital is estimated to be 25 percent higher in Central America than in the United States, the absolute cost of depreciation will also be 25 percent higher.

In regard to maintenance costs, labor costs in Central America have already been estimated at 32 to 40 percent and cost of imported equipment at 130 to 140 percent of U.S. figures. On the basis of the U.S. practice of allocating equal amounts for labor and spare parts costs, maintenance costs would appear to be 80 to 90 percent of the U.S. figures.

The total of the other two items, miscellaneous charges (taxes, insurance and so forth) and normal remuneration of capital, is estimated to be 40 percent higher than in the United States in relation to the value of invested capital, or 75 percent higher in absolute terms (allowing again for the fact that the value of invested capital is estimated to be 25 percent higher in Central America than in the United States.)

Combining the four cost elements in capital outlay and taking into account their relative share in total costs, capital costs in absolute terms will appear as 45 percent higher in the fertilizer industry and 35 percent higher in the glass container industry.

The summary given below of indexes for the three main components of costs in the Central American industries is most revealing:

Indexes of costs by main categories in 2 industries in Central America

[U.S. costs equals 100]

Cost components	Fertilizer industry	Glass container industry
Labor	40	32
Raw materials and supplies	200	150
Capital (all elements)	145	135

The next tables compare production costs for different plant sizes in the two industries, as between the United States and Central America:

Estimated cost of production of ammonium nitrate, by capacity of plant

[U.S. dollars per short ton of ammonia content, at 1957 prices]

Capacity of plant (short tons of daily output)	Labor		Raw materials and supplies		Costs relating to capital		Total	
	United States	Central America	United States	Central America	United States	Central America	United States	Central America
50	46.0	18.4	27.0	54.0	117.4	170.2	190.4	242.6
100	28.8	11.5	27.0	54.0	89.3	129.5	145.1	195.0
150	23.0	9.2	27.0	54.0	75.6	109.6	125.6	172.8
300	17.2	6.9	27.0	54.0	57.3	83.1	101.5	144.0

Estimated cost of production of beer bottles, by capacity of plant

[U.S. dollars per gross, packed, at 1957 prices]

Capacity of plant (number of bottle-molding machines)	Labor		Raw materials		Costs relating to Capital		Total	
	United States	Central America	United States	Central America	United States	Central America	United States	Central America
1	3.09	0.90	2.40	3.60	3.02	4.07	8.51	8.66
2	2.31	0.74	2.40	3.60	2.54	3.43	7.25	7.77
4	1.93	0.62	2.40	3.60	2.13	2.88	6.46	7.10
6	1.80	0.58	2.40	3.60	1.93	2.60	6.13	6.78
12	1.67	0.54	2.40	3.60	1.62	2.19	5.69	6.33

This comparison indicates the following points: The share of labor costs in total production costs is substantially lower in Central America than in the United States; thus, because of the substantially lower wage rates prevailing in Central American countries, the share of labor in total costs in a fertilizer plant with a daily production of 150 tons would be only about 5 percent in Central America as compared with close to 20 percent in the United States. In the glass container industry, for a plant equipped with six molding machines, these figures would be 8 to 9 percent, as compared with close to 30 percent.

Total production costs in Central America compare much more favorably with those in the United States in the glass container industry, which is more labor-intensive than the fertilizer industry. The cost of production of glass containers is some 2 percent higher than in the United States for a plant of the smallest capacity (having one molding machine) and some 11 percent higher for a relatively large plant (having 12 molding machines). In the fertilizer industry the cost differential would be within the range of 27 to 42 percent, according to size. The rise in production costs with the reduction in size of plant appears to be generally more attenuated in Central America than in the United States.

Conclusions

These two case studies point to some fundamental differences in the starting point for industrial development as between already highly developed and less developed countries, as a result of which the factor of labor costs is not fully comparable in both types of countries. The latter must give first consideration to providing suitable employment for an inexperienced labor force, often with too high a proportion unemployed; then, too, they must adjust their economic planning to the scarcity and high cost of capital available and, in many instances, to disadvantages as regards raw material supplies and their transport, and in particular, energy which, although potentially plentiful, may still require development.

These handicaps lead the United Nations to recommend, as a conclusion drawn from these studies, that "some industries—especially those which could make more intensive use of the relatively cheap labor resources—could be established in comparatively favorable conditions and would deserve special attention." Consequently, it is the opinion of the United Nations that a glass container industry, for instance, would be in a good position in this respect.

This brings us to a point on which we should perhaps search our consciences. Is it more important for less developed countries to provide higher paid jobs for a limited labor force, or should they not rather be given an opportunity, within justifiable limits, to take advantage of relatively cheap manpower to start industries which will absorb the maximum amount of labor, thus providing more jobs for populations which could in this way be given at least some kind of livelihood? Surely this is urgently necessary, in view of the continued growth of unemployment and underemployment in such countries, despite all efforts at industrialization in recent years.

The need to maximize employment opportunities and to use the available capital as sparingly as possible implies that, in less developed countries, consideration should be given to adapting the relative use of labor and capital in industry to the endowment in those factors. An attempt was made in the above studies to show that a lower level of mechanization than is customary in industrialized countries, besides generally corresponding to considerations of national economic policy, would permit a reduction of costs.

The problem of size of industrial plant is thus related to that of capital intensity, inasmuch as it involves consideration of the possible advantages of replacing some equipment by manpower; that is, that is of substituting technological processes of a lower level of mechanization for more capital-intensive ones. It was noted that some ancillary stages in the production process, such as handling of materials, permit such substitution without in any way affecting the efficiency of the process or the quality of the product. This would require a certain reorientation of present research in design by producers of equipment; in fact, in many cases it would run contrary to the present tendency in design research, which aims largely at economy in the use of labor.

Similarly, it was mentioned that the life expectancy of equipment may be varied within fairly broad limits. Longer life means increased maintenance and repairs, and as these are relatively labor-consuming activities, it was suggested that in underdeveloped countries it would be economically desirable to prolong the life of equipment beyond the stage considered normal in the industrial countries. An extension of the lifetime of equipment through greater maintenance and repairs could lead to considerable savings in capital and accordingly affect the relative shares of capital and labor inputs in favor of the latter factor. On the other hand, lack of experience among maintenance staffs in underdeveloped countries tends rather to shorten the life of plant and machinery.

In any case, raw material and capital costs are primary considerations, to be taken into account to a much greater extent in underdeveloped countries than in economically advanced countries, and all the more so because, as these examples show, labor costs represent a far lower proportion of total costs than do raw material and capital costs.

It must also be borne in mind, when examining cases where labor costs make up a low share of total costs, that wages must be measured in terms of purchasing power and that in underdeveloped countries consumer wants are vastly different from those of consumers in highly developed industrial societies. Climatic conditions, too, can have an important effect in altering the pattern of living costs. Consumption patterns will of course develop as industrialization gradually proceeds, but it would be unwise, indeed impossible, to force the pace on either count. Precipitate development would lead only to inflation and would not solve unemployment problems.

The Problem of International Fair Labor Standards in the Light of Information Available in the Steel Industry

The foregoing United Nations case studies, used to analyze basic problems involved in an attempt to work out criteria for international fair labor standards, bring out specific problems of economically underdeveloped countries. Although these are cases outside the metal industry, the problems would be the same whatever the industry concerned, and any proposed agreement on international fair labor standards would need to be applicable to all forms of economic activity, with due allowance for special factors affecting individual products.

We now attempt to analyze the problem with specific reference to the iron and steel industry. The IMF's recent studies of wages and the financial position of the largest steel companies in the free world enable us to draw some important conclusions with regard to an industry in which U.S. employers are vociferously complaining about lower labor standards in other countries, which allegedly prevent them from granting further improvements to U.S. steel labor. Through the IMF's studies, information can be obtained that is pertinent to fair labor standards in relation to the industry's position in the United States, Europe, and economically underdeveloped countries.

Comparison of wages expressed in various forms

If we compare wages, not in terms of mere money, but in terms of earnings made by workers and wage costs to the industry, calculated at both official rates of exchange and in purchasing power parities, the IMF's data bring us to the following indexes, measured against U.S. figures:

	Net hourly earnings based on—		Wage costs based on—	
	Official rates of exchange	Purchasing power parities [1]	Official rates of exchange	Purchasing power parities
United States	100	100	100	100
Great Britain	29	41	26	38
German Federal Republic	24	30	30	36
France	20	25	27	33
Japan	12		13	

[1] Purchasing power parities used here are based on figures calculated by the Federal Statistical Office of the German Federal Republic.

These figures show that, in every instance but one, European wages move up in relation to U.S. wages, in any comparison based on other than net hourly earnings at official rates of exchange. The sole exception is wage costs in Great Britain based on official rates of exchange, because the British wage cost figure does not take social security benefits paid by the state and financed out of general taxation fully into account. The percentage of improvement in these countries' wage position is as follows in the next table:

	Percentage by which wages paid in European countries improve their relative position as against U.S. wages if the comparison is based, not on net hourly earnings at official rates of exchange, but on—		
	Net hourly earnings purchasing power parities	Wage costs	
		Official exchange rates	Purchasing power parities
Great Britain	+41½	−10	+31
Germany	+25	+25	+50
France	+25	+35	+65

It must of course be frankly admitted that such presentations of figures involve many factors that may be variously interpreted, but they do nevertheless give a reasonably reliable indication of the countries' relative position in regard to the various aspects of earnings and wage costs. Expressed as indices, in terms of wage costs calculated on the basis of purchasing power parities, European countries are better off by an average of 50 percent than if their workers' net hourly earnings at official rates of exchange are compared with earnings in the U.S. steel industry. In absolute money terms, the wage discrepancy between the United States and European countries is reduced by roughly one-fifth.

Comparisons of this kind again illustrate the need to consider, not nominal wages, but real wages and actual living standards. If two countries have comparable living standards, but nominal wages in one of them are lower than in the other, thus giving it an advantage in export trade, such a difference may be partly due to the exchange rate fixed for its currency. That rate will be determined by the strength of the currency and by considerations relating to the balance of payments and prices for goods imported and exported. Currency dumping by any country is a different matter and such practices should be exposed. Some countries may enjoy a certain advantage due to geographical influences on their consumption patterns, though these are difficult to assess. One the other hand, it is in these same countries that climatic influences will always have the effect of lowering productivity.

The Raw Materials Factor

The IMF's information on the steel industry throws light on other important aspects of the problem. Our study on the financial situation of the largest steel companies in the free world indicates that the proportion of firms' total revenue devoted to labor costs is 36.3 percent in the United States and 21.8 percent in Great Britain, whereas the proportion accounted for by material costs is 39.3 percent in the United States, compared with 54.6 percent in Great Britain.

Such a comparison makes it plain that material costs in Great Britain account for an additional 15.3 percent of turnover, while labor costs are only 14.5 percent lower in terms of turnover. This provides clear enough proof that certain wage differences between countries can be attributed, to a decisive extent, to natural conditions and to the advantages and disadvantages existing in nature in the location of individual firms or whole industries.

This is confirmed by a comparison of prices in the various countries for the most important raw materials used by the steel industry, for, according to United Nations statistics, in 1957 British coal was 200 percent dearer than American coal, German coal 190 percent dearer and Canadian coal 145 percent dearer. The reason is that, in spite of the much higher wages paid to miners in the United States, that country has much larger and more easily mined reserves of coal, compared with Europe, where coal has to be mined at great depths and under difficult conditions. Other important factors affecting the position are, of course, the ferrous content of ores, cost of electricity, supplies of scrap and cost of transport. In regard to practically all these factors, American firms are favorably placed.

Also extremely important is the fact that a difference in raw material prices affects the position much more than do differences in total labor costs, for raw materials account for half or even more of costs measured against total proceeds, whereas labor costs make up only one-quarter or, in most cases, even one-fifth only of total revenue, except in the United States, where they account for over one-third of turnover. In metal fabricating, the incidence of labor costs is greater than in the steel industry, but raw material and capital costs will always remain decisive elements.

It must be remembered, then, that advantages in raw materials and other elements contribute to determining the profitability of an industry. National average profitability rates for the steel industry are 7.4 percent in the German Federal Republic, 9.8 percent in Great Britain, and 12.4 percent in the United States. It is these profitability rates (net profits plus depreciation as a percentage of total revenue) which represent the margin out of which higher wages and salaries must come. Countries which have natural advantages can therefore afford to pay higher wages than countries which are less fortunate in this respect.

Conclusions

Our purpose in pointing out that these factors should be taken into account in any assessment of international fair labor standards is not that they should be invoked as an excuse for reducing wages in exporting countries, but to provide an argument for use in any importing country where, due to such natural advantages, a certain wage advance is justified. We would state clearly that it is a fallacy to think wages can be harmonized throughout the world, even if all countries attain the same rate of productivity. A case in point is the U.S. steel industry, where the differential in American wage costs in comparison with those abroad is not entirely due to higher productivity alone, since other countries also possess very modern steelmaking plants, but is due also to advantages in raw material supplies.

Moreover, the American steel industry, despite its high wages, still shows a high rate of profitability and this, combined with the fact that its prices are, on the average, competitive, proves that U.S. steelworkers' wages could be higher still, thanks to the various advantages enjoyed by their industry.

At the same time, the postulate of international division of labor, based on natural advantages possessed by the different countries, also has its limits. It is clearly unrealistic to restrict any country to producing only those goods for which it is well equipped by nature, for this would lead to its economy being too little diversified and therefore unduly vulnerable to fluctuations in the sectors on which it has specialized. For this very reason, there is a call for diversification of many underdeveloped countries' economies, as a means to higher living standards for their peoples.

On the other hand, natural disadvantages may not be quoted as an excuse for unjustifiably low wages, as long as high profits are being made and a large volume of profits is being reinvested.

This aspect is illustrated by conditions prevailing in the Mexican steel industry. Here the 16.3 percent higher than American share going to material costs is more than outweighed by labor costs which, in terms of turnover, are 23.9 percent lower than in the United States, and wage costs are only one-sixth of those in the United States. A proof that wage costs are far lower than would be justified by disadvantages of location is that total labor costs, as a ratio of undistributed profits and depreciation, are only 0.8:1 in Mexico, as against 4.2:1 in the United States, and wages in Mexico are not even as much as three times higher than dividends paid, while in the United States they are 9½ times higher than dividends, and in Great Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany, and France, they are from 14 to 16 times higher. This is an indication that in spite of the great investment needs of the Mexican steel industry, excessively large profits, in relation to wages paid, are taken out of the industry.

In determining whether the share going to labor is a fair share or not, consideration must be given, especially in underdeveloped countries, to the investment policy pursued, whether by private enterprises independently or at the Government's behest. In the largest Brazilian steel company, which is state-owned, almost 40 percent of the total revenue in 1957 was used for depreciation and reinvestment. Indeed, investments even extended to other economic sectors, since this money was used, for instance, to build a Simca automobile factory with state participation. Chile, too, shows a depreciation rate of over 10 percent of turnover. Here again, we face the problem of priorities as between investments to create necessary job opportunities, and higher wages for workers in a highly profitable industry. An additional complication would arise when, in such high-profit industries, wages are already above the national average, so that management and government both oppose wage increases on the grounds that they would further distort the national wage pattern.

To sum up, raw material costs and natural advantages must be taken into account as factors in assessing international fair labor standards and must be viewed in the light of profitability rates (the figure for both distributed and undistributed profits combined), and profits actually pocketed by owners. Also to be considered is whether the amount of undistributed profits is justified in relation to capital outlay and investment needs.

How Productivity Differentials Counterbalance Varying Wage Costs in Main Metal Manufacturing Sectors

Some wage-cost differentials

To spotlight further problems involved in arriving at international fair labor standards, we give below indexes of total wage costs, based on official exchange rates, for a number of countries, measured in terms of U.S. wage costs. These figures are derived from IMF studies; those for mechanical and electrical engineering refer to 1957, for shipbuilding to 1956, and for the automobile industry to 1955:

Indexes of total wage costs

[United States=100]

	Mechanical engineering	Electrical engineering	Automobile manufacturing	Shipbuilding
Austria	20	19	17	
Belgium	35	32	28	[1] 27
Denmark	34	30	28	30
France	35	33	30	35
German Federal Republic	26	23	22	23
Great Britain	33	28	30	29
Italy	25	23	19	22
Netherlands	23	22	18	19
Norway	36	34	28	30
Sweden	47	42	44	45
Switzerland	35	33	29	
Israel	39	36		
Japan	11	11		

[1] 40 ships repaired.

This table shows the European wage costs are generally equivalent to between one-quarter to one-third of U.S. wage costs. If purchasing power were taken into account, Austrian and Dutch wage costs, which are about one-fifth of those in the United States, would move up in relation to U.S. wage costs to a relatively greater extent than would those of other European countries.

If European wage costs are calculated on purchasing power parities, they may be regarded as varying between 35 to 50 percent of U.S. wage costs. Another important feature is that the differential between European and Japanese wage costs at official rates of exchange is at least as great as the gap between American and European wage costs.

More or less considerable differences exist, of course, from one sector to another. This is already evident from the differences prevailing between the various branches of the metal industry. If the gap between European and U.S. wage costs appears to be somewhat greater in the automobile industry, it must be pointed out that two leading European motor manufacturing countries, France and Great Britain, have all the same wage costs (at official rates of exchange) equal to some 30 percent of those in the United States, though Germany is further behind and Italy is at a relatively low level. However, these figures are for 1955 and it is likely that, in view of the boom in the European motor industry, these two latter countries have since improved their relative wage position. This is certainly true of Germany, where the reduction of working hours has brought some of the largest wage increases of recent years in Europe. The reason why wage cost differentials between the United States and Europe are generally greater in this sector than in others is that American auto workers' wages are substantially higher than those of their fellow workers in other metal fabricating sectors. Although the same is generally the case in Europe, the auto workers' lead is proportionately less marked.

The productivity factor

In establishing international fair labor standards, a primary factor to be taken into account is the difference in productivity levels. Any agreement on fair labor standards must be designed to insure that the remuneration to labor will keep in step with advancing productivity as far as possible throughout the industry in which it is employed or, in the case of firms whose productivity is exceptionally high, there may be justification for wages to be tailored to conditions in the particular firm. In any event, the effort to bring wage costs into line with productivity cannot deter management from increasing productivity further, since higher wages encourage mechanization and greater output cannot fail to bring greater returns to capital. The spending power of higher wages geared to higher productivity will boost the entire economy and permit absorption of increased output.

Unfortunately, adequate information on productivity is seriously lacking. At this point, where we confine ourselves to indicating the size of the problem, but without quoting precise, up-to-date figures, such as would need to be collected if specific cases were dealt with under an International Fair Labor Standards Agreement, we can refer to some information available which conveys a general idea of the significance of existing gaps in productivity levels.

We therefore take advantage of a study which has just been issued. This is a comparison of national output and productivity in Great Britain and the United States, which was undertaken jointly by the OEEC and the Department of Applied Economics of the University of Cambridge.

This study, which deals mainly with 1950, as later precise information was not available, shows that average output per American worker in 1957 was 2.2 times greater than that of his British counterpart, compared with a factor of 2.1 for 1950. According to the experts, any alteration since 1950 has not altered the picture radically, any changes being rather in favor of the United States. Hence, data in the report may be considered as relevant for our present purposes.

Using a base of 100 to represent output per British worker, the average for all 44 categories of U.S. industries is 269.

As this difference in productivity is not fully matched by differences in wage rates (as the ratio of average unit labor costs for the 44 U.S. industries which is 3.56: 2.80, shows) the net cost (or value added) ratios show a considerable advantage in favor of Great Britain. The net cost element in this ratio is taken to mean capital, labor costs, and profit per unit of output, but does not include raw material costs. In other words, these three factors together give an average net cost ratio of 3.65: 2.80 for the United States.

The total of capital and labor costs and profit per unit of output measures only a part of the final price. In general, basic raw materials are relatively cheaper in the United States, so that, because of lower material costs, many industries for which the United States shows processing costs relatively higher than those of Great Britain are, nevertheless, highly competitive. Thus British export industries, according to the experts, usually require net cost (i.e., processing) ratios to be in their favor, in order to offset higher material costs.

Twelve out of the 44 U.S. industries covered by the report show a productivity index between 150 and 210. The center group of 14 industries, with the U.S. productivity index ranging between 220 and 274, includes several sections where Great Britain and the United States compete in world markets—manufacture of electric motors and generators, tires, tubes, and tobacco among other products. But in the remaining 16 industries, including the production of paint, paper, and electrical household equipment, the United States holds a substantial advantage, despite the higher wage levels operating.

There is a general tendency for the United Kingdom to show up relatively best in those industries which are fairly old, established, and which have grown at a slow rate during the past few years—shipbuilding, linen and woolen textiles. These, however, are the industries most affected by competition from Japan. The United States, on the contrary, is often seen to greatest advantage in those industries which are growing most rapidly—automobiles, radios and chemicals.

We now present, in the form of indexes, the main conclusions of this comparison of national output and productivity, insofar as they are relevant to the subject of this report. In so doing, we confine our figures to branches of the metal industry.

Relative position as between Great Britain and the United States of wages, output per worker, unit labor costs, and net costs in selected branches of the metal industry in 1950

[Great Britain=100]

	U.S. wages	Output per U.S. worker	U.S. unit labor costs	U.S. net costs [1]
Shipbuilding and repairing	321	111	289	286
Tools and implements	372	190	196	204
Iron and steel foundries	331	202	164	142
Metalworking machinery	396	221	179	153
Generators, motors, transformers	356	239	149	166
Steel works and rolling mills	314	269	117	121
Wire drawing	342	339	101	111
Radio	339	400	85	104
Electrical household equipment	395	412	96	128
Agricultural machinery, except tractors	342	429	80	80
Automobiles, trucks, tractors	336	466	72	88
Metal cans	477	561	85	111

[1] Net costs include capital and labor costs together with profits per unit of output, but exclude raw material costs.

These most revealing statistics show that unit labor costs in the U.S. shipbuilding and repairing industry are almost three times higher than in Great Britain. This is due to the fact that the Americans' productivity advantage in this industry is very slight only, firstly because American output in 1950 was only 40 percent of British, and secondly, because British shipyards are older established and therefore certainly have some advantage in experience. This industry is no doubt a clear case where British wage costs are unfair in relation to those in the United States. It should not be forgotten, however, that U.S. shipbuilding wages are not designed to be competitive on the world shipbuilding market, and are in fact maintained at a high level by Government subsidies, while employment for American shipyards is more or less guaranteed by Government restrictions on the purchase of foreign-built ships by American shipowners. At the same time, another aspect of this case is that British shipyards, like others in Europe, are forced to build ships for the world market, where they face such competition as that from Japan.

Two other sectors where there might be grounds for complaints of unfair labor standards in Great Britain, again in relation to American wages, are the tool and implement industry and metalworking machinery construction. Indeed, these are the sectors in which the Americans complain of stiff European competition through low prices. It is also a sector where, even in the United States, there are many medium-sized and smaller firms catering for special customer requirements. Thus the Americans cannot here enjoy advantages derived from mass production to the same extent as in other cases.

American employers have therefore resorted to various means of self-defense. Some, especially smaller producers with no export market, would like to have the protection of higher tariffs. Larger, export-oriented firms are less inclined to such a solution, because they fear retaliation against their export business. Other means of holding the market which some producers are employing include cost-cutting, standardizing parts and redesignating machines for greater simplicity and customer appeal.

Another important defense line of big firms is an attempt to establish new production units or acquire interests in firms abroad, in order to maintain and expand export markets. An example of this trend is the purchase of a 50-percent interest by Kearney and Trecker in a British company it had previously licensed to make its tools. According to U.S. employer sources, companies representing half of U.S. machine tool capacity have worked out some kind of foreign deal, and the proportion is expected to grow to 75 percent in a couple of years.

Some of these forms of employer defensive action can do considerable harm to American labor in this industry. It would thus seem, on the basis of available information, that some agreement on international fair labor standards would be applicable in this sector.

Another industry in which there have been many complaints of unfair labor standards abroad, and attempts in the United States to exclude imports, is the generators, motors and transformers sector. In this case U.S. unit labor costs are roughly 50 percent higher than British and their net costs, not counting raw materials, are two-thirds higher. Here also there would appear, on the face of it, to be some cause for the Americans' feeling that their labor standards are being undercut. At this point, the question of whether American labor is actually suffering as a result of foreign competition arises. The electric equipment makers concede that the volume of competing imports is small. In the last 7 years, installed capacity of foreign generating equipment came to about 370,000 kilowatts, or only about one four-hundredths of total U.S. capacity. Imports of all electrical products are at present running about $100 million annually; the U.S. exports seven times more than it imports in this category.

Despite American manufacturers' denials that increased foreign competition has any bearing on the matter, recently announced price reductions, amounting in the case of General Electric to 2½ to 13 percent, which will be immediately followed by Westinghouse and the others, may undoubtedly be attributed to price pressure from abroad. In an industry such as this, where a few large producers entirely dominate the market, there is all the greater temptation for those few to make theirs an administered-price industry. Allegations of this kind would seem to be confirmed by complaints from local, Federal and State agencies that, in the electrical equipment industry, U.S. manufacturers submit identical prices in bids for contracts.

Any suggestion that there is a threat to the employment of American labor in this sector as a result of foreign price competition loses force, in view of estimates that electric generating capacity in the United States is growing by 15 percent a year. The vitality of the market is proved by a recent Westinghouse announcement of $25 million expansion in its generating equipment plants. In plant rearrangement it will use new tools and new production techniques. It was certainly most fortunate that some foreign competition was able to make its effect felt at a time when the market was expanding rapidly and when otherwise the manufacturers might have been greatly tempted to exploit the favorable trading conditions. This situation forced American productivity up and thereby created a need for new electrical goods manufacturing equipment, thus also providing additional employment opportunities for the machine construction industry.

In other sectors also, steel for instance, increased pressure of prices from abroad should have a salutary effect on such administered-price industries and should help to bring about price reductions, before which there can be no justification for complaints on the score of foreign competition.

As regards steelmaking and wire drawing, the slightly higher than British unit labor costs in the American steel industry, as already suggested, represent no handicap to the U.S. industry's competitive ability. This was recognized by the American authorities themselves when they dismissed four U.S. companies' complaints about foreign competition in the market for wire products and nails.

The table showing the relative position as between Great Britain and the United States makes it clear that U.S. industries have the greatest productivity advantage in durable consumer goods, where their productivity is from 4 to 4½ times more than that in Great Britain. This productivity is influenced by the fact that American output in these industries is many times greater than in Great Britain. For instance, in 1950, in electric household equipment and radios it was about 8 times the British output, and in automobile, truck and tractor manufacturing, output was 13 to 16 times greater than in Britain. The United States thus derives a considerable productivity advantage from its mass production, on a scale as yet unequaled anywhere else in the world. As the table shows, in all of these sectors the U.S. unit labor cost is lower than in Britain, so that these data suggest there could be no question here of unfair labor standards to the detriment of the United States.

The correlation between mass production and productivity which is so strikingly revealed here, will enable Europe to make good some of its leeway in productivity, as the European market broadens.

With regard to radio and household equipment manufacturing, it is interesting to note that the U.S. advantage in unit labor costs is more than outweighed, especially in the latter case, by the two additional factors, higher capital outlay and higher profits. European industries might thus be competitive, despite the great productivity advance enjoyed by the United States, in view of the fact that costs of raw materials do not affect the position as greatly as in less labor-intensive industries. In addition, where steel, the price of which varies relatively little throughout the world, is the main raw material used, the raw material cost factor will again be of minor importance. In high energy consuming industries, however, the United States enjoys a substantial advantage.

In the case of agricultural machinery and automobiles, the difference in unit labor costs for 1950 is one-fifth and more than one-quarter respectively. It may therefore be assumed that even today American unit labor costs have not overtaken the British level and, in any case, have not exceeded it, especially as there were substantial wage increases, not only in the American, but also in the British industry during these years.

Although the experts maintain that the productivity differentials which existed in 1950 still remain largely unchanged, it is nonetheless possible in motor manufacturing, for instance, in view of the proportionately greater recent increase in British output, that the differential has been somewhat reduced. Even if, as the experts say, the gap in overall productivity in the United States and the British industries has not altered greatly, individual British firms may have achieved a striking advance as a result of installation of modern equipment, but here again American firms have made sustained efforts to keep their lead. This is indicated by the fact that net costs which, apart from profits, include capital expenditure for modernization and research, are shown in the table to be 22 percent higher in relation to British costs than are unit labor costs.

Collective Bargaining To Remedy Labor Standards in International Corporations

Our remarks here concerning the effect of productivity on unit labor costs relate more specifically to Great Britain. The lower productivity in Britain has a striking effect, as shown here, in raising unit labor costs in comparison with American costs. This is true of all the European countries, though it must be remembered that in their cases productivity will compare more favorably with Britain's in some cases, and in others again less favorably. In certain countries, such as Western Germany, particular industries or firms may, as a result of war destruction, have been completely rebuilt in keeping with the latest technical knowledge, so that their productivity is better able to stand comparison with that of the United States. In such cases, the lower wages paid in Europe, combined with a level of productivity not too far behind that in America, will lead to disparities in unit labor costs that might be considered to represent unfair labor standards.

One important conclusion presents itself. Apart from comparisons of industrywide productivity, it would be most useful to have productivity comparisons between principal firms in exporting and importing countries. It is possible, for instance, that plants of such firms as General Motors European subsidiaries have a productivity rate much nearer that of GM's American plants than would appear from industrywide statistics. Thus wages in a GM subsidiary plant might be substandard as compared with those of the firm's main producing units in the United States.

It is particularly in the case of such worldwide corporations as these that the trade unions should themselves, or with the help of independent economic institutes with which they have connections, undertake this type of productivity and wage comparisons, to obtain collective bargaining material. Sufficient information on output, number of employees, hours worked and wages of these firms is available to permit of such studies. Where data show that conditions throughout any industry would not justify complaints on the score of unfair labor standards, but it can be proved that unfair standards do nevertheless exist as between leading production units in the particular sector, it is up to the trade unions to correct such individual situations by collective bargaining.

Action through collective bargaining to remedy unfair labor standards as between leading firms which compete in each other's markets offers the advantage that other aspects besides unit labor costs can receive much closer attention than would be the case if those unfair labor standards were the subject of negotiation under an international agreement, which would be mainly concerned with industrywide conditions. Important among these other aspects is the financial position of a particular firm, with special reference to its profits. The German company, Adam Opel, for instance, which is wholly owned by the American General Motors Corp., in 1958 recorded total profits, including profits brought forward from previous years, of DM248.4 million ($65.9 million), a sum which exceeds the firm's original capital and reserves. It paid dividends of DM125 million ($30 million), equal to 62.5 percent of original capital, and left a further DM124 million carryover of profits to the next year.

In the case of another German motor manufacturer, Daimler-Benz AG, profits before taxes amounted to DM300 million ($71 million), which is equal to 72 percent of the original capital. On the strength of such profits, the company had no trouble in increasing dividends from 12 to 18 percent.

Such facts should receive full consideration in any assessment of firms' ability to increase labor's share, proportionate to productivity, thus reducing any differentials in unit labor costs which may exist.

Wages Related to Productivity of Individual Firms, Entire Industries or Nations as a Whole

One problem that cannot be overlooked in any attempt to equalize unit labor costs as between any two countries arises when the particular industry in one of those countries has a much higher level of productivity than the average throughout the economy, with the result that wages proportionate its productivity would be out of proportion to the general wage structure. This is generally the chief consideration in European wage patterns. The trade unions seek to share among all the Nation's workers the social gain accruing from overall productivity advance. This contrasts with the usual conception in the United States, where the general principle is for labor to take out in wages all that the industry can afford and is willing to pay. Plant-by-plant bargaining serves to implement this policy. It leads to large, prosperous enterprises setting the pace for wages throughout their industries. In European countries union policy favors rather industrywide levels, and wage demands are therefore adjusted to less profitable firms' ability to pay. This, especially in recent years, has given management ever greater opportunities to grant, as a paternalistic gesture, wage increases subject to no contractual guarantee.

Another handicap in some European countries is that it is more or less tacitly agreed that the highest wages should be paid in coal mining, an industry now generally involved in economic difficulties. If investigations connected with fair labor standards were to lead in Europe to greater pressure on high productivity enterprises in a strong financial position, this might inject more dynamism into bargaining policies, which would become more flexible and more consistent with the actual position of individual firms. Gains for workers in more advanced industries, by the very distortion of the wage structure to which they lead, would have an economically desirable effect in providing some leverage for negotiating general wage increases.

In addition, social benefits, such as shorter working hours, guaranteed incomes, longer vacations, equal pay for men and women, which the trade unions seek to obtain in high productivity industries first, but which they try to extend as soon as possible to workers in less prosperous industries, are also important factors in improving general labor standards.

High Profits Should Finance Price Reductions as Well as Wage Increases

Where huge profits are being made, like those quoted for two German motor manufacturers, from a German point of view there should be a price reduction, in addition to an adjustment of wages to productivity. The same applies of course to the American automobile industry where, notwithstanding higher U.S. wages, a reduction in prices could well be borne by the industry and would have beneficial effects throughout the economy.

It has been estimated by experts that the selling price of leading makes of German cars, including the Volkswagen, Opel Rekord and Mercedes 180, could be reduced by 20 percent without in any way weakening those firms' financial position. Assuming that the present cost price of a standard Volkswagen is about DM2,500, this would mean that the selling price of DM4,600 (until 1955 DM5,400) could be cut by some DM920.

Unfortunately, the tendency is for firms, rather than reduce prices under pressure of international competition and thereby run the risk of curtailing their profits, to maintain price levels which give them a low breakeven point, even when operating at low capacity.

It is a fact that in European countries wages in the metal industry, especially the booming motor vehicle sector, are among the highest in their economies. This must certainly be borne in mind in any comparison of European and American unit labor costs. One important economic and even political problem, which we have outlined in the first chapter of this report, comes into the picture here. This is the need to avoid any action which would hinder expanding industries in the two industrialized continents, on whose continued expansion the development of the rest of the free world depends.

V. Feasibility of action under an agreement on international fair labor standards

Possible Source of Background Information for Action by Unions

It will be seen from the preceding section of our report that the process of investigation into cases of unfair labor standards and the drawing of correct conclusions based on those investigations is the key to the efficacy of the whole. Such inquiries, as already stressed, could provide trade unions with arguments for use in their collective bargaining.

Action which the proposed agreement on international fair labor standards could require governments to take should have two main purposes. One would be, where it is justified and necessary, to protect, by withdrawal of tariff concessions and special compensatory tariffs, the wages and jobs of workers with higher living standards. The other would be, by exposing unfair labor standards, and imposing the tariffs suggested, to give an impetus for the improvement, as fast and as far as possible, of living standards in countries shown to have inadequate standards. This would conceivably provide trade unions with a lever for progressive action.

Throughout this report we have laid the utmost stress on the furnishing of data, because the outcome of negotiations between countries would be based on the information supplied. Factfinding, even by a competent agency, will not in itself be equivalent to a decision on any case. As with economic affairs in general, action proceeding out of such information will depend on the interplay of forces as between management, commerce and labor; they will make their influence felt through their governments, with which the ultimate decision rests, in the light both of overall economic considerations and reciprocal trade relations with other countries concerned in any particular case.

Unsuitability of Quotas

Our suggestions for action by governments include, for importing countries, the withdrawal of concessions already granted, their refusal to grant new concessions to exporters having unfair labor standards, the suspension of obligations, or the imposition of a compensatory tariff. For obvious reasons, there is no hint of quotas, a form of retaliatory action generally recognized as causing contraction of trade. Quotas are plainly indefensible as a form of economic action, all the more so because, once introduced, they are extremely difficult to abolish, chiefly due to their being imposed by administrative, not parliamentary action. Firstly, they serve merely to eliminate competition on any import market by a low-wage country, whilst a compensatory tariff would permit the exporter to try to maintain the volume of exports, but at a corrected price level. Secondly, by restricting an export market, quotas would tempt exporters to raise prices in that market where they are assured of sales for a limited quantity of products, and the added margin of unit profit would probably simply go into the pockets of manufacturers and traders.

Action Doubtful Where Retaliation Might Ensue

In recent years, a number of governments have enacted antidumping legislation, but have never been able to implement it for the following two reasons, which represent major weaknesses also in any agreement on fair labor standards, and could render it impossible of application. If trade unions in an importing country complain that a particular industry is being hurt by low prices due to unfair labor standards abroad, and finally induce their government to take the matter up with the exporting country, the latter may in the meantime have corrected its price level, thus putting a stop to further complaints from unions in the other country, even though the price correction may well be brought about through higher profits to employers, not better wages for workers, in the exporting country. In such cases, an investigation should still be called for. If this is no longer possible under the terms of the agreement itself, then trade unions should be able, for instance through the ILO, to expose such cases of exploitation of labor. Annual reviews of the state of labor standards would give at least some assurance that, once a case of unfair labor standards is exposed, the employers cannot correct prices to their own exclusive benefit.

The second weakness is that, even where there is justifiable cause for complaint, importing countries may hesitate to seek correction of unfair labor standards, or may withdraw their objections, where they feel that the exporting country is in a position to retort by restriction of imports of other products which it purchases from the would-be plaintiff country.

Besides this, no government is blameless and may similarly refrain from action on unfair labor standards elsewhere if it has reason to apprehend counteraccusations of state subsidies or other enticements to its own export industries. Norway, for instance, which enacted antidumping legislation in 1954, dealt with 15 complaints from its home industries, but took no action on any of them, although the conditions required by the law were satisfied in several, because it found action to be unpracticable.

Below we give a table which shows that the overwhelming majority of applications for enforcement of antidumping legislation or countervailing duties was rejected by the governments which had passed such legislation.

	Items affected by antidumping decrees in force	Number of rejected requests
Australia	9	101
Rhodesia and Nyasaland	3	4
South Africa	[1] 22	211
Sweden	1	9
United States	2	96
	Items affected by countervailing duties in force	
Belgium	[2] 3	10
South Africa	[3] 2	3
United States	12	62

[1] Plus 7 special duties.

[2] 1 item includes several textile products.

[3] 1 item includes several metal products.

It is hardly to be expected that an international fair labor standards agreement would fare any better.

Fair Labor Standards and Communist Countries

A further problem which must not be overlooked is the difficulty of implementing an agreement on fair labor standards under the world political conditions now prevailing. The free nations would face great hazards in working out and bringing into operation any such agreement as long as some of the numerically and industrially powerful nations continue their present practices of offering goods at political prices, unrelated to the real cost of production. Basic data from such countries, requisite for implementation of an agreement, would be either lacking or untrustworthy. Nor could there be any prospect in those cases of forcing corrective measures, through trade union action, to insure fair labor standards. Already there have been numerous instances where Russia has delivered or undertaken to deliver goods to a particular market, but has later ceased such supplies or transferred them elsewhere, at the dictates of its political and economic aims.

Where such an agreement as that proposed would be impracticable for these political reasons, the free world would have to try to protect itself against price undercutting from the Eastern bloc by antidumping measures like those provided for in GATT and in the various countries' national legislation, although this too presents difficulties. To provide even this measure of protection, actual prices of goods from the Eastern bloc could, in the absence of proper data, be estimated only, by analogy with other countries' export prices. Certain bilateral agreements between Communist and non-Communist countries have already been so designed as to provide protection against dumping.

Need for Realism in Proposed Agreement

It is important that an agreement on international fair labor standards be as realistic as possible and be conceived in such a way as to convince exporting and importing countries of its generally beneficial effects. It should of course also comply with practices established under GATT. One of these practices is that no complaint can be raised unless a country can prove that conditions elsewhere are causing or threatening material injury to its industry. Viewed realistically, too, unless factors such as the general state and resources of exporting nations' economies were specifically allowed for in its terms, no proposal for an agreement would receive the two-thirds majority required at GATT.

Other situations which might militate against implementation of an agreement on fair labor standards might conceivably arise when a lower standard country, for instance in Europe, exports goods to the United States and thereby inflicts damage on the U.S. industry in question. In response to complaints, the European country might well point to its need to compete on the world market against an even lower standard industry, for instance, that of Japan. It would be plainly difficult to require the government of the European country to force its industry to try to draw level with American labor conditions in such triangular situations.

There are, however, other considerations which speak in favor of some instrument like an agreement on international fair labor standards. For instance, a number of countries have not yet extended to Japan the most favored nation clause, because they consider Japanese export prices as equivalent to dumping. Were a fair labor standards agreement of this nature in operation, products could be dealt with individually, taking all aspects into account, so that Japan could benefit in practice by most-favored-nation treatment in justified cases.

The existence of a fair labor standards agreement would, in the unions' eyes, be preferable to actions such as are now being taken under agreements between Japan and Western Germany and Canada, for instance, whereby Japan is voluntarily undertaking itself to restrict its exports of goods to which the importing country reacts in a particularly sensitive manner. Such self-imposed export restriction agreements are fundamentally only protectionism in another form, with the quotas imposed, not by the importing, but by the exporting country. Self-imposed export taxes would fall into the same category. It is significant that agreements of this nature at present apply chiefly to textile products, where the unfair labor standards factor looms especially large. While this type of action provides relatively easy protection for any importing country's industry, provided that indirect imports via third countries can be effectively controlled, it does nothing to encourage better labor standards in the exporting country, which thus eludes any of the pressure that might arise from a fair labor standards agreement.

Although it would probably be extremely difficult, in most cases, to take action under an agreement on international fair labor standards, even once it had found universal acceptance, such an instrument would have the merit of showing up in the international forum instances where action would be necessary. It would thus cause governments to search their consciences and would point the moral in particular situations, for it would set a standard by which no government would wish to fail too patently. By the mere fact of its existence, it could exercise a beneficial effect, even if it were not implemented to the letter.

On its own, however, an agreement on international fair labor standards would not be enough. Freer trade with proper social safeguards, accompanied by efforts to achieve better living standards everywhere, must come about as the result of manifold forms of action, which will be enumerated in the next section. Apart from any government action that may be required, advances in this field will lie largely in the hands of trade unions, which will have to serve as the motive force for progress.

VI. CHANNELS FOR ACTION TO PROMOTE INTERNATIONAL FAIR LABOR STANDARDS IN EXPANDING FREE TRADE

At the conclusion of this analysis of problems involved in the removal of trade barriers in such a way as to promote economic and social progress in all countries, we propose that the IMF initiate action on international fair labor standards through the various channels or by the means enumerated in this section.

In order to start the ball rolling, IMF affiliates, in cooperation with their national trade union centers, should take the matter up with their governments. Yet under the International Sugar Agreement and the European Economic Community, governments have already admitted that there should be fair labor standards, but without setting them down in any clear definition or making any provision for action to insure their observance. Hence it would be proper for the trade unions, which are the organizations best fitted for such action, to put pressure on governments to adopt some more tangible conception of what fair labor standards should mean and how they should be put into effect.

Immediate action should be taken by the IMF itself, as well as through the ICFTU, its regional organization for Europe, and trade union representatives within the European Economic Community and the Coal and Steel Community to have basic inquiries and some studies with regard to international fair labor standards undertaken without delay. Action through governmental agencies may be summarized as follows:

In GATT

A proposal for a basic agreement on international fair labor standards might be submitted to GATT, as the overall international trade organization for the free countries. Such an agreement would lay down the principles of fair labor standards, methods of objective investigation and forms of progressive action by governments to encourage free trade, with the necessary social safeguards, and with the intent to raise living standards everywhere.

A small international office within GATT, or at the disposal of GATT, should be set up to undertake the case studies and periodic reviews which the agreement requires. (Detailed proposals for such an agreement are attached to this report.)

In Regional Economic Institutions

International organizations for regional economic cooperation or integration already established, such as OEEC, the European Economic Community, and the European Coal and Steel Community, or any such institutions for economic cooperation which may be set up in Europe or elsewhere in the free world as for instance, the impending South American free trade area, should incorporate the principles of this agreement in their treaties and implement them insofar as they are competent to do so.

Departments dealing with manpower and social problems which exist in these institutions should be instructed and properly equipped to undertake investigations required for factfinding on international fair labor standards.

The Organization for European Economic Cooperation, with the assistance of the European Productivity Agency, the Economic Commission for Europe, and the European Coal and Steel Community, should undertake studies of productivity levels in various branches of industry in their member countries, as also comparisons of unit labor costs. They should also try to assess as early as possible the probable repercussions of freer trade in their member countries.

In the United Nations Organization

International fair labor standards should be introduced as an item for consideration at the U.N. Economic and Social Council. The Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the U.N. should undertake basic studies, especially on the problem of which industries are to be set up in economically underdeveloped countries so that they can produce goods which can best find an outlet in an expanding world market and at the same time absorb the maximum amount of manpower under conditions consistent with international fair labor standards.

In the International Labor Organization

The principles of international fair labor standards should be enunicated by the ILO in the form of a convention or recommendation to be ratified by all member countries, so that in any country whose government has not been willing, upon the request of trade unions or employers, to lodge a complaint on account of unfair labor conditions, the trade unions and employers can make representations to the ILO and have that organization expose the matter.

The ILO should undertake basic studies on international fair labor standards.

The IMF should raise the subject of international fair labor standards at forthcoming sessions of the ILO Metal Trades and Iron and Steel Committees, in order to have the problem studied in the various branches of industry individually.

In International Commodity Agreements

Existing international commodity agreements, or any which may be set up in future, should require recognition of the principle of international fair labor standards and make provision for procedure to get such standards enforced in relation to the particular commodity for which they are responsible.

The International Sugar Agreement already contains a general commitment whereby "participating governments shall seek to maintain fair labor standards in the sugar industry," but does not set forth procedure to be followed.

In International Financial Institutes

The World Bank, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Finance Corporation, the investment and social funds of the EEC, and governments generally should grant loans, subject to the condition that types of production and services developed by such funds be operated in accordance with international fair labor standards.

To have an agreement on international fair labor standards recognized by the abovementioned international institutions will, however, take time and may encounter numerous difficulties.

Need for Direct Trade-Union Action

The trade unions would be deceiving themselves if they were to leave the problem at this and imagine that governments, by international cooperation, will resolve what are fundamentally labor problems. Increasing wages to conform to fair standards has always been and will remain a trade-union problem, which the unions must solve through their strength, activity, knowledge of facts, and negotiating skill.

We would therefore stress the following forms of trade-union action. The unions should—

1. In accordance with such principles as those enunciated in the IMF's program of action, seek to obtain shorter working hours, guaranteed incomes, etc., and give active support to free trade unions in economically underdeveloped countries, to enable them to improve their poor living conditions and obtain a fair share in the product of their economies;

2. Make studies, either independently, for instance in the IMF's industrial departments, or through research and economic institutions with which they are connected, in the first stage to elucidate the whole problem of unfair labor standards and, at the second stage, to inquire into labor standards as between main exporting units in given sectors;

3. Apply results of their own or other institutions' studies in order to try, through collective bargaining, to bring about international fair labor conditions and, at a later stage when data is available through investigations conducted under an agreement on international fair labor standards, use the results in trade-union work;

4. Pay special attention to international fair labor standards as between international corporations and their subsidiaries in the various countries, and assist each other in bargaining;

5. Induce all governments to ratify ILO conventions promptly or fulfill commitments they have given within the European Economic Community, for instance, with regard to equal pay for work of equal value for men and women, and other social objectives; and

6. Take active interest in their governments' trade negotiations, with the general objective of opposing negative protectionism and promoting higher labor standards everywhere.

In addition to advocating international fair labor standards, the IMF should, at the international level and through its affiliated organizations in the various countries, urge that everything possible is done to avoid hardship to workers displaced through more rational international trade patterns and to give them opportunities for retraining and employment with a sound future, which could be achieved through appropriate assistance to firms and whole communities requiring adaptation to changes in economic structure. (Detailed proposals for such a trade adjustment program are attached to this report.)

To help such transitions to be made smoothly, the unions should urge governments to analyze on an industry-by-industry and product-by-product basis the effects which freer trade might be expected to have on employment.

All these forms of action which the unions themselves can take, combined with appropriate intervention by governments and international institutions, can insure that expansion of trade between economies in which workers receive their fair share will bring general and broadly based prosperity.

APPENDIX I

PROPOSAL FOR AGREEMENT

1. The contracting parties recognize:

(i) That all countries have a common interest in the achievement and maintenance of fair labor standards related to nations' productivity and economic growth, and thus in the improvement of wages and social conditions, as those circumstances may permit;

(ii) That unfair labor conditions, particularly in production for export, may create difficulties in international trade which nullify or impair benefits accruing from the progressive reduction of tariffs and other barriers to free trade; and

(iii) That, especially in view of the universal rapid advance of technology, the nonobservance of international fair labor standards can have serious repercussions on the level of employment in socially advanced countries, generally hinder purchasing power from developing at the same rate as production capacity, and thus endanger prosperity everywhere.

2. Therefore, with reference to article XXIII of GATT, the contracting parties recognize that the exportation of goods produced under unfair labor standards and introduced into the commerce of another country creates special situations, which the parties must take into account in striving for the elimination of obstacles to free trade.

3. A special situation due to unfair labor standards is deemed to exist where such standards cause or threaten material injury to an industry in the territory of a contracting party, whether the importing country directly concerned or a third party with an important share in the particular export market, if:

(i) total labor costs (including all forms of employer payments to or on behalf of employees, whether in the form of direct wages, contractual fringe benefits or benefits required by legislation) incurred for employees engaged in production and manufacture of the item exported are below average standards prevailing in the country of origin as regards those branches of the economy concerned in the manufacture of the product in question;

(ii) total labor costs prevailing in those economic branches producing the article for export are well below standards generally accepted in the exporting country;

(iii) average unit labor costs in the various stages of production of the article exported are proved to be far below those prevailing in similar production sectors in the importing country, unless, in branches vital to the exporting country's economy, much higher costs for raw materials and supplies, capital charges, and investment needs offset lower wages, provided that profit margins are not excessive.

However, a special situation shall not be deemed to exist if lower wages in the exporting country, having regard to purchasing power, national consumption patterns, and social security services, provide a living standard comparable with that in the importing country.

4. The question of whether and to what extent a special situation due to unfair labor standards, as defined in section 3, does or does not exist shall be settled by consultation between the importing and exporting countries, and any third country whose interests on the importing country's market may be adversely affected. Results of such consultations shall be communicated to a competent international organization, such as GATT, or, in case of a dispute between countries belonging to a customs union or a free trade area, to organs of the body concerned. Should the parties fail to reach agreement, or in the absence of prior consultations, the plaintiff country shall bring the matter up before the most competent international organization (GATT, the six-country European Common Market, organs of any free trade area that may be established, which will have accepted in their treaties the principles enunciated in this document), whereupon the organization with which the complaint is lodged will initiate procedure through an appropriate organ, to make recommendations to the countries concerned within a period of 8 weeks. This period might be extended, subject to agreement by the parties, in which case the competent body would permit plaintiff countries to take measures to safeguard their position. Should the competent body fail, or not be equipped, to provide sufficient information, it should consult with the International Labor Organization, in order to ascertain whether or not there is a case of unfair labor standards.

5. The exporting country shall supply necessary information on total labor costs, or shall take position on data in the importing country's possession with reference to the labor conditions complained of. The exporting country must also show what is the economic situation in sectors producing the article exported, the structure of those sectors, the technological development of the principal exporting firms, cost of material, investment and fiscal charges, and profitability. Further factors to be taken into account are the quality of the article exported and the skill of workers involved.

The importing country which lodges a complaint under the terms of this agreement must, on the basis of valid data, prove that the exported article is causing or threatens material injury to its national production. If the complaint refers to damage inflicted on a third country having an important share in the market for that article in the importing country, it will rest with that third country to furnish the proofs in question.

Where a complaint is lodged in virtue of section 3(iii), the vital policies and economic and social conditions of the exporting and importing countries, and/or those of any third country which may be involved, shall be compared, insofar as these affect the sectors in question.

In international comparisons of wage and fringe benefits, the purchasing power and consumption patterns in the exporting and importing countries as also, where applicable, in third countries, shall be taken into account. Apart from official rates of exchange, purchasing power parities shall be utilized or, in the absence of these standards of measurement, other acceptable methods for comparing living standards shall be adopted.

6. If these investigation procedures and the ensuing negotiations demonstrate the existence of a special situation within the meaning of section 3, the importing country may take appropriate action and/or urge the exporting country, within a given length of time, to implement corrective measures with a view to establishing fair labor standards, in accordance with the terms of section 7. The same would apply if another exporting country with an important share of the market for the article concerned faces actual or potential substantial damage; it can ask importing countries to take such action on its behalf.

7. Appropriate action by a plaintiff country, where claims that unfair labor standards exist in the industry of any exporting country have been substantiated, as required by the foregoing clauses in this agreement, can consist of the withdrawal from the exporting country concerned of tariff concessions granted in the past, the refusal to apply to it new tariff concessions granted to other countries, or the suspension of other obligations.

Such action may be taken immediately or may be postponed, provided that the exporting country undertakes to redress, within a specified period of time and either at a single step or by progressive stages, the labor conditions complained of. Those conditions shall be the subject of annual review, in order to ascertain whether they are actually being corrected.

Where immediate protective measures are taken by the importing country, they shall be relaxed and ultimately withdrawn, as the exporting country proceeds step by step to improve its labor standards.

Where protective measures have been postponed, the importing country shall retain the right to apply them, should the exporting country fail to improve its labor standards, according to the specified timetable.

In cases where it is not possible for an importing country to take such protective measures, or where these would be insufficient to protect its industry in question from the harmful effects of unfair labor standards in the exporting country, that importing country may impose a special compensatory tariff, to be equal to the amount that would be added to the labor costs of the employers for production of the goods they sell for export, if they were to meet the required labor standards, having due regard for tariffs already in existence. The amount of the special compensatory tariff each year would be based on the difference between the actual wage level in the industry and the level that would be required for that year under the step-by-step program of wage adjustments mentioned above.

8. Revenue derived from the special compensatory tariff imposed by importing countries shall be paid into an international economic development fund (International Bank for Reconstruction and Development), whose duty it would be to use such funds for specified purposes, preferably for investment projects of a social nature or projects designed to build up the economic infrastructure of countries in process of development. A condition for such use of the funds would be that wages and social conditions in the services and production units so established be consistent with fair labor standards.

9. The contracting parties accept as implicit in this agreement recognition of the workers' right to freedom of association and an obligation to promote genuine collective bargaining, as a vital condition for the establishment of fair labor standards within each country.

10. The application of corrective measures to insure international fair labor standards may not hinder healthy expansion of any given production sector in the exporting country; rather should such standards promote its development, hand in hand with an improvement in living standards compatible with technological progress and the growth of that country's economy generally. These are the principles which should inspire negotiations under this agreement.

Accordingly, if the exporting country can prove that wages and social conditions have already been substantially improved in sectors that produce the article exported, or are expected to improve as a result of undertakings given in contracts, or if that country announces its readiness to encourage or bring about such improvements at an early date, these endeavors shall be duly taken into account and every possible effort shall be made to negotiate so as to restrict the application of protective measures.

The mechanics of an agreement on international fair labor standards and detailed problems involved

In this section we comment, paragraph by paragraph, on our proposal for an agreement on international fair labor standards.

Recognition of the Principle of Fair Labor Standards

First of all, it would be necessary for the nations to accept the principle that international trade competition based on substandard labor conditions is unfair and should be eliminated. Paragraph 1 of our proposed agreement would imply acceptance of such a principle. In the first place, contracting parties are called upon to recognize their common interest in the achievement and maintenance of fair labor standards related to productivity and the economic growth of a country, and thus in the improvement of wages and working conditions as these circumstances may permit.

In a second part of section 1, the reasons for that common interest are set forth, inasmuch as unfair labor conditions may create difficulties in international trade, which would nullify or impair benefits accruing from the progressive lowering of tariffs.

In a third part of the same paragraph, a further reason quoted for that common interest is that, especially on account of advancing technology, nonobservance of fair labor standards may have serious economic and social repercussions.

Unfair Labor Standards as a Special Situation Under Article XXIII of GATT

As a form of procedure for complaints about unfair labor standards, within the framework of existing international agencies, we propose that governments invoke article XXIII of GATT, which provides that in case of situations other than those specified by GATT (an infringement of fair labor standards would constitute such a situation), contracting parties could make representations of proposals to other members and bring the matter up within the machinery of GATT, the U.N. Economic and Social Council or any other competent international organization. GATT is the appropriate body for mention here, since it takes precedence in matters of regulation of trade over such other international agencies as the OEEC or the European Economic Community, whose member governments are bound by their obligations to GATT. However, with only slight alterations, the agreement could be made applicable to other organizations as well as GATT.

Suggested Definition of International Fair Labor Standards

Three criteria for the determination of unfair labor standards are suggested. Labor standards in the exporting country would be deemed to be unfair if total labor costs were substantially below average standards prevailing in the particular industry or in the economy generally of the exporting country, or if average unit labor costs are proved to be far below those prevailing in similar production sectors in the importing country, subject always to the condition that those labor standards cause or threaten material injury to a plaintiff country.

The obligation on an importing country to prove allegations that it is being hurt by unfair competition by another, which is already an established practice in the GATT organization, would need to be incorporated into a fair labor standards agreement, if there is to be any prospect of its acceptance.

This provides some measure of assurance to exporting countries that all aspects of the case receive due consideration, such as their supplying a particular class of goods to meet the needs of a market for which the importing country itself does not adequately cater, while at the same time it gives an opportunity for importing countries to prove that an imported article, perhaps of inferior quality, is displacing products of their own industries.

Paragraph 3 (i) and (ii)

These first two standards, we believe, can hardly meet with any objection. It is without doubt as much in the interests of labor in the exporting country as of labor in the importing country that substandard conditions in both the individual industry and the national wage structure be eliminated at the earliest possible date.

The second criterion would lead to pressure for better wages in low-standard industries, thus helping to reduce the differential between them and the country's more progressive, pace-setting industries.

Paragraph 3(iii)

In this third criterion, the remuneration to labor is measured in terms of the industry's productivity. Any comparison should therefore be based on unit labor costs; i.e., total average hourly labor costs multiplied by man-hours required to produce one unit.

An agreement on international fair labor standards should be designed to preserve any natural advantages, such as closer access to raw materials, that an industry in one country might enjoy over another country, but it should aim at eliminating unnatural advantages based upon exploitation of labor. To such aims, however, there are economic and social limits, which are illustrated in section IV of this report. As the steel industry, for instance, is vital to the economy both of European countries and Japan, its prices must be competitive, so that it can survive against the U.S. industry, with its better natural advantages. Hence it must be given a fair chance, even though higher raw material costs inevitably react on the relative position of components in its price structure, despite the existence of a high level of productivity and well organized, active trade unions in the industry.

A further handicap to some countries, mainly economically underdeveloped nations, are higher charges on investment capital and greater investment needs for the establishment or expansion of industry and the higher costs such countries face in creating the necessary infrastructure.

These various factors must be taken into account in determining whether wages in any exporting country are unfairly low in the light of its economic background, subject of course to the condition that an appropriate share of the proceeds is actually put into development work, and not into employers' pockets.

Any branch of industry which is not vital to a country's economy and faces natural handicaps as regards supplies should not be permitted, under an agreement on fair labor standards, to survive on the basis of low wages.

Since it is manifestly difficult to compare wages in terms of mere money, and official rates of exchange are often far from reflecting accurately the purchasing power of any given currency, some attempt should be made to compare wages in terms of actual living standards and the degree of social security provided.

Procedure for Determining Whether or Not Unfair Labor Standards Exist

Paragraph 4

This paragraph sets forth procedure for a country to follow in lodging a complaint on the grounds of unfair labor standards in any exporting country. The suggested procedure is along the same lines as that laid down in the GATT treaty, in cases where any contracting party feels that its advantages under GATT are being nullified or prejudiced, or the aims of the agreement are being defeated (art. XXIII). The present suggestions are limited to bringing up before GATT complaints of infringement of fair labor standards as defined in this model agreement. In section VI we have suggested other means by which trade unions can seek to have unfair labor standards denounced and redressed.

This paragraph sets out two forms of procedure; either a complaint on a bilateral or multilateral basis, leading to consultations between the governments concerned without involving GATT at the outset, subject, however, to an obligation on those governments to communicate the results to GATT; or, in case of failure of the countries concerned to reach agreement or if the matter is considered of general interest, an approach can be made to GATT, which would have to undertake an inquiry and make recommendations. A time limit of 8 weeks is set for these inquiries, in order to prevent unduly protracted procedure.

In the event that GATT is unable to obtain sufficient information, the matter could be referred to the International Labor Organization for factfinding. As a matter of fact, under article XXIII GATT is already entitled to consult the ILO, a course of action which it would normally adopt. If questions relating to wages or productivity are raised, the ILO's relation to GATT would be similar to that of an expert giving evidence before a court. In order to insure continuity in any particular case, it would be preferable for the decision to remain with GATT, which would take into account other elements than wages and productivity. On the other hand, in order to preserve for the ILO the functions which are proper to it, this paragraph states that, where necessary, the ILO shall be consulted on matters within its jurisdiction.

Reference is made in section VI to the possibility of the ILO taking some direct action.

Complaints along these procedural lines could be raised, in place of GATT, with any other competent international organization, such as OEEC or the European Economic Community, which have their own manpower and social departments, capable of making the necessary investigations.

Paragraph 5—Furnishing of information

A crucial feature in the determination of whether or not unfair labor standards exist is the availability of adequate and truly comparable data from the various countries concerned. Therefore we spell out in this suggested agreement the obligation of exporting and importing countries to supply such data. If any agreement on fair labor standards is to be practicable, it should include, as an appendix to this paragraph 5, specific details as to industry coverage, the exact type of information to be used, and the methods of measuring and comparing such factors as output, manpower input and average hourly labor costs. Also, the international agency competent to determine what are fair labor standards would need to have at its disposal a staff of experts to decide these extremely intricate questions.

Below we cite some of the factors vital for an adequate statistical background, in order to show that, although very complicated, these problems can be coped with by scientific methods of investigation.

One specific problem is industry coverage. Industry definitions should be wide enough to cover as much as possible of the total production process for any article under consideration, without classifying in one industry commodities which are produced under significantly different conditions or for entirely different uses. The three-digit industry classifications adopted by the Economic and Social Council of the U.N. would probably prove satisfactory in most cases. The commodity lists of GATT might also help.

It is self-evident that output would have to be measured in terms of units produced, not in monetary terms. Those units would have to be expressed in terms of comparable sizes and quantities, but a major difficulty would still be to compare units produced in terms of quality. This clearly leaves open a wide field for subjective judgments.

In measuring manpower input, of course not only actual production employment would need to be taken into account, but also technical and research services, etc., especially as, the higher the state of technological development, the higher is the proportion represented by the latter. A further factor to be borne in mind is the degree of concentration in industry as between different countries. Calculation of labor input would have to make full allowance for work performed by subcontractors, who may not be classified within the industry under consideration. The criteria used in defining industry coverage would be applicable here.

Average hourly labor costs would be taken to mean all payments made by the employer, either directly to the employee or on his behalf. They would therefore include straight-time hourly wages, shift and overtime premiums, incentive payments, employer contributions to social insurance (insurance against illness, old age, accident, disability, maternity, unemployment, etc.), whether required by law or by contract, vacation and holiday pay, other leave of absence with pay, family allowances paid by the employer, payments in kind and bonuses. All these elements of remuneration to labor in any particular firm or whole industry under consideration, divided by the respective total man-hours worked, would constitute average hourly labor costs. Difficulties arise in regard to Britain and the Scandinavian countries, for instance, where social security is largely financed out of general taxation.

In order to compare average hourly labor costs in two countries using different currencies, it would be necessary to express the rate of labor costs in one country in terms of the other's currency. The exchange rate used for this purpose would be the rate prevailing at the time of the actual transaction and recognized by the International Monetary Fund.

In section 5 consideration is also given to international comparisons of purchasing power and consumption patterns in exporting and importing countries and, where applicable, in third countries. Such comparisons may be effected through purchasing power parities, which could be established for that particular purpose, and would need to be kept constantly up to date, so as to reflect divergent trends in living costs in the various countries. The European Coal and Steel Community has worked out such purchasing power parities and has proved their suitability for purposes of making this kind of comparison.

Experts with the international factfinding agency responsible for working out data on unfair labor standards should be able to devise appropriate solutions for problems stated here, in order to provide some measure of comparable data as a basis for substantiating or disproving charges of unfair labor standards. Equally difficult problems have been solved by various national statistical agencies, and some fragmentary international studies have been made.

The factfinding agency should have the advice of a consultative tripartite body, with experts representative of governments, employers and trade unions. Bodies so constituted are to be found in various countries, for the purpose of advising official agencies which work out cost-of-living indexes, etc.

Types of Action Open to Plaintiff Countries With a View to Introduction of Fair Labor Standards in Exporting Countries (Par. 6)

In virtue of this paragraph, the contracting parties would accept the importing country's right to take appropriate action and/or to urge the exporting country to implement corrective measures with a view to establishing fair labor standards.

This section specifies that the same right would apply to any other exporting country with an important share of the market in the importing country; such third countries might call on the importing country to take action on their behalf.

Paragraph 7

This paragraph is so phrased as to lay principal stress on action to improve unfair labor standards wherever they are shown to exist, and less stress on retaliatory or protective measures by importing countries whose industries are suffering injury. Thus it reinforces the underlying purpose of the agreement, which is to create the conditions for the expansion of free and fair trade. In accordance with this general aim, provision is made for exporting countries to be allowed some time in which to bring their conditions up to standard. Annual reviews will enable the parties concerned to ascertain what progress is being made.

The problem is of course highly complex. While an exporting country may be called on to reduce the differential between its own labor standards and those prevailing in the importing country, the latter's standards may continue to improve, in addition to which differences in the rate of productivity growth would further alter the countries' relative position. Annual reviews would help to show the effect of these various factors on differences in unit labor costs. To illustrate the working of the agreement, we assume the following case as an example.

The relative initial position of unit labor costs in two countries might be 100 in the importing country and 80 in the exporting country. The importing country may have asked the other to rectify its labor costs within a period of 5 years, which would mean that the exporting country would have to make good an average leeway of four points each year. If, after 2 years, the exporting country has advanced by only two points, the importing country might either withdraw certain tariff concessions in regard to that country, suspend other obligations, or levy special compensatory tariffs or, if it had taken such retaliatory measures from the outset, it would not relax them, as it would do if the exporting country had actually improved its relative position by 8 points within 2 years. At the time of each annual review, consideration would of course also be given to the various other factors, such as national resources and relative development of purchasing power.

In this example, we have assumed that unfair labor standards existed as defined under section 3(iii). Where infringement of fair labor standards occurs within the meaning of section 3 (i) or (ii); i.e., if wage costs are substandard in relation to the exporting country's own wage structure, it would seem that the importing country should take more severe action to force the exporter to remedy the position as quickly as possible. However, by calling for remedial action step by step, the agreement provides a safeguard against sudden disruption of the internal price structure in the country complained of.

The countermeasures provided under section 7 do permit the importing country, as circumstances require, to take more drastic action. These various types of possible action are the following:

First, the importing country may withdraw from the exporting country concerned tariff concessions granted in the past, may refuse to apply to it new tariff concessions granted to other countries, or may suspend other obligations; in practice this means that the importing country would not apply to the exporter in question the most favored nation clause under GATT.

Second, the importing country may levy a special compensatory tariff. The latter measure would be taken in case unfair labor standards exist with regard to products on which no concessions have been made so far or are envisaged by the importing country, because its national industry is already conscious of a threat from abroad. This type of action might therefore be frequently resorted to. The compensatory tariff could be adjusted in amount at every stage, so as to be equivalent to the differential between fair and unfair labor standards in the export industry concerned, but avoiding any undue accumulation of this tariff on top of those already in existence.

Another possible form of action would be an export tax, which the importing country would require the exporter nation to levy itself on the producer in question. This would offer the advantage, especially in the case of an economically underdeveloped country, that its own government would collect penalties levied on account of unfair labor standards and the country's exchange position as a whole would benefit by the higher price charged for the goods. Proceeds from export taxes could be applied for improving general social standards and services in exporting countries. Another advantage is that the employers might be willing to increase the wages paid, instead of paying the tax to the government. At first sight, it might appear that this type of remedial action is preferable to the others. However, it suffers from the defect that there it little likelihood of its being put into practice. Even once figures proving the inadequacy of labor conditions have been established, the government of the exporting country might cast doubts upon their reliability, and might in any case not be prepared to penalize its own export trade.

Moreover, export taxes on employers on account of unfair labor standards would be impracticable, if not levied uniformly, but only on goods to be shipped to plaintiff countries. Since the differential between labor standards in the exporting and a number of importing countries would vary in each case, the amount of the tax would have to differ accordingly. To check up, already in the production stage, on the destination of goods would involve too much redtape and would be ineffective. Finally, where trade is between underdeveloped countries, wages which are unfair for industrialized nations would no longer be unfair in terms of standards prevailing in another underdeveloped importing country, which would be only too happy to obtain needed goods as cheaply as possible. For all these reasons, there is no likelihood whatever of any proposal for export taxes of this kind being accepted by the two-thirds majority required at GATT.

Use of Revenue from Compensatory Tariffs—Paragraph 8

In this paragraph we suggest appropriate uses for revenue derived from compensatory tariffs. The proposed applications for such revenue adhere to our principle that importing countries should not benefit by extra revenue from tariffs, but that the whole emphasis should be on the remedying of substandard conditions in exporting countries.

We propose that importing countries pay revenue derived from special compensatory tariffs into an international economic development fund, to promote development subject to specified conditions. The purposes to which such funds would be applied should be preferably investment projects of a social nature or projects designed to build up the economic infrastructure of developing countries. A condition for their use would be that wages and social conditions in the services and production units so established be consistent with fair labor standards.

This proposal has the advantage of leading to redistribution of funds to quarters where the need is greatest, for proceeds of special compensatory tariffs would go, not necessarily to the exporting country directly concerned, but also to other nations for whose development the international fund has a duty to cater. It would mean, for instance, that the compensatory tariff which the United States might levy on goods from a European country would be channeled for the benefit, not of an industrialized country, but of an underdeveloped nation, which would thus receive aid for the purchase of equipment from industrialized countries. The last condition specified, namely, that wages and social conditions in the services and production units established with these funds be consistent with fair labor standards, is of course a vital feature.

Workers' Right to Freedom of Association and Genuine Collective Bargaining (Par. 9)

Since the trade unions are the proper bodies to serve as the motive force for the establishment of fair labor standards in any country, it would be only right for an agreement on international fair labor standards to include an obligation on governments to guarantee workers' freedom of association and to promote genuine collective bargaining. With regard to Communist countries, we have explained elsewhere that this agreement could not be applied in any case, and antidumping measures would be the only instrument that could be used in trade with such countries.

The Primary Aim—Healthy Expansion With Improved Living Standards (Par. 10)

This paragraph sums up again the principles which should inspire negotiations under the agreement. On no account may any corrective measure taken under the agreement hinder healthy expansion in any production sector which can be competitive while at the same time giving its workers fair labor standards, nor in any sector which, though it suffers from disadvantages, is vital to an economy and must subsist, but not at the expense of the labor employed in it. The main emphasis lies on development of industries in line with improved living standards, compatible with technological progress and the growth of countries' economies generally.

Two recommendations in keeping with these principles are made. Firstly, importing countries able to prove that unfair labor standards elsewhere are threatening their industries should take due account of recent efforts, or anticipated efforts, in exporting countries to improve wages and social conditions in the industry concerned. Secondly, contracting parties should do their utmost to negotiate so as to refrain as far as possible from protective measures, provided that there is a show of goodwill on the exporting country's part to bring about proper improvements at an early date.

The whole agreement is therefore designed to promote higher living standards everywhere, as a basis for a greater volume of free and fair trade among prosperous nations.

Proposed trade adjustment program

Despite the existence of fair labor standards, more rational international trade patterns may hit some industries hard, through the impact of increased imports resulting from tariff reductions. If increased trade and a continued gradual reduction of tariff barriers are in the national interest, then it must also be in the national interest to help the firms, communities and workers adversely affected to adjust themselves to the increased imports with a minimum of hardship. This is the basic purpose of a trade adjustment program which the American trade unions are putting forward.

The objective of this proposal is not to subsidize the affected groups or to compensate them for injury. Instead, the aim is to help them to become adjusted to increased imports either by assisting them to make more effective and efficient use of their present facilities or by development of new lines of production which would offer business opportunities to firms and communities, and employment opportunities to workers.

The trade adjustment program, which is envisaged simply as an additional form of action in existing escape clause procedures, would mean that, after a Tariff Commission finding of injury or threat of injury resulting from increased imports, the provisions of this program could be invoked instead of raising tariff duties.

The program recommends specific action on behalf of workers, industrial enterprises and communities. It recommends:

For Workers

1. Increased supplementary unemployment compensation benefits.
2. Earlier (at the age of 60) retirement for recipients of old-age pensions under U.S. social security law.
3. Retraining for new job opportunities.
4. If necessary, transportation for entire families to new areas of employment.

For Industrial Enterprises

1. Loans through the Small Business Administration for the adjustment of such business enterprises and communities to economic conditions resulting from the trade policies of the United States.
2. Appropriate departments and agencies of Government will supply "technical information, market research, or any other form of information and advice which might be of assistance in the development of more efficient methods of production and the development of new lines of production."
3. Accelerated amortization would be permitted to business, industrial enterprises necessary for "* * * the development of new or different lines of production by an eligible business enterprise or a more balanced economy in an eligible community."

Communities or industrial development corporations within the communities may apply under the program for:

1. Loans which are available to communities and industrial development corporations on the same basis as they are available to business enterprises,
2. Technical information, market research and any other form of information and advice, which are available to the community on the same basis as to industrial enterprises, as long as such information is designed to develop a more balanced and diversified economy in the community.

We quote the program set out above as an example of the type of measures which would offer a useful means for supplementing measures to facilitate adjustments in a particular country affected by structural changes due to the development of international trade. It embodies social safeguards which the IMF should advocate for implementation in conjunction with the enforcing of international fair labor standards.

PROPOSED SECRETARY OF URBAN AFFAIRS

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. **BYRNES** of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am astonished at the crude attempt of the President to inject a race issue into what is essentially a matter of public policy. I refer to the unusual, perhaps unprecedented, announcement at the Presidential press conference yesterday of the name of the man who would be appointed Secretary of Urban Affairs in the even such a post were created.

There are honest differences among us as to the merits of the proposal to create the proposed new Department. Such an agency, if created, will be with us for a long time. Its effects, good or bad, will be felt long after the first Secretary has departed the governmental scene. The question of who will be appointed to that office has no relationship whatsoever to the question of whether it is wise public policy to create the new Department.

Yet, the President, at a press conference at which the major news development was his announced intention to press strongly for the new Department, saw fit to announce his intention to appoint Robert Weaver, a distinguished Negro, to a post which does not yet exist.

This is a raw effort to enlist the justifiable pride of American Negroes in Mr. Weaver on the administration's side in a legislative controversy. It is a callous attempt to use American Negroes in an effort to confuse the real issues.

The President, as a candidate for election, deplored attempts to have him name his Cabinet officers before he was in the position to appoint them. Yet, it is clear he is not in a position to appoint Mr. Weaver as Secretary of a department that does not yet exist at this time. Furthermore, the President, as a candidate, said on October 17, 1960:

> I am not going to promise a Cabinet post or any other post to any race or ethnic group. That is racism at its worst.

The President has now, by the obvious timing of his announcement, promised a nonexistent Cabinet post to a large racial group. I leave it to him to define what kind of racism that represents.

I received yesterday a telegram from the president of the New York State NAACP and as part of my remarks I would like to include that telegram and also my reply to it.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

DOCTOR REED'S WIRE

Representative JOHN W. BYRNES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Very disturbed to read press report that Republican policy committee will oppose Urban Affairs Cabinet post. Such a decision will be interpreted as Republican opposition to a possible Negro Cabinet appointment. Urge immediate reconsideration.

Dr. EUGENE REED,
President, New York NAACP.

REPRESENTATIVE BYRNES' REPLY

Dr. EUGENE REED,
President, New York NAACP:

Your wire of yesterday suggested that the recent action of the House Republican policy committee opposing creation of a Department of Urban Affairs will be interpreted as Republican opposition to a possible Negro Cabinet appointment.

It is clear from your wire that attempts will be made to inject the race issue into what is essentially a question of public policy. Any such attempt will be of disservice to the Negroes of America because it constitutes nothing more nor less than an effort to use them for political advantage.

The question of a man's appointment to a Cabinet post should be based solely upon his qualifications; his race, creed, or color should not enter into the matter. By the same token, the question of the creation of a new Cabinet post should hinge entirely upon the merits of the proposal; the race, color, or creed of the possible appointee to the post has no bearing upon the basic issues involved. As I deplore any attempt to defeat the Urban Affairs proposal on the basis that a Negro will be appointed to the post, likewise I deplore every attempt to advance it on the same grounds.

The action of the Republican policy committee was confined entirely to the merits of the proposal. It opposes the new department as a dangerous attempt to centralize more power in the Federal Government at the expense of the individual States. The committee's concern was with broad public policy, not with the narrow question of political appointment.

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **RYAN**. Mr. Speaker, I listened with surprise to the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] concerning the President's press conference. It seems to me, if anyone is injecting an extraneous issue, it is the gentleman from Wisconsin. The question which we must determine is whether or not it is important in 1962 to have a department of the Federal Government concerned with urban matters and urban problems. I submit that it is important. I am the author of a bill for the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, today two-thirds of the American people are living in our cities, and it is high time we had a department to study comprehensively the many and complex problems with reference to urban matters. What could be more logical than the appointment to head such an agency of a man who has had under his jurisdiction the entire housing program of our Nation. The appointment of Robert Weaver would be an excellent appointment and one to be commended.

WHAT THE FREE WORLD NEEDS: A EUROPEAN PAYMENTS BALANCING PROGRAM

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. SANTANGELO). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, back in 1947 there occurred a mighty and unselfish effort to solve cooperatively the economic problems of the free world. With its industry and agriculture at a standstill, with its trade disrupted, with its international payments frozen, the ancient states of Western Europe sat down in Paris in the Committee for European Economic Cooperation to plan for their recovery. Out of their deliberations emerged the European recovery program.

Today, the miracle of Western Europe's recovery is there for all to see.

Cities have been rebuilt and are burgeoning, harbors are filled with ships, streets and roads are jammed with shiny new automobiles. Shop windows display a wealth of consumer goods including home appliances, once a near monopoly of prosperous American families. Wages and salaries are hitting new peaks, and there are more jobs than jobseekers in many of these countries.

The figures confirm impressions. Since 1953, industrial production has risen 87 percent in France; 98 percent in Germany; 111 percent in Italy; about 40 percent in Belgium; and 59 percent in the Netherlands. Even in the relatively slower growing Sweden and United Kingdom, industrial output has gone up 35 and 31 percent, respectively. These figures compare with an increase of 25 percent for the United States.

The Common Market countries—France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands—have more than doubled their exports since 1953. In 1961, these countries exported goods worth $29.7 billion compared with our own exports of $20 billion. In fact, the shoe is now on the other foot. Large U.S. surpluses in the late forties—Europe's dollar shortage—have given way to large U.S. deficits, averaging more than $3 billion for each of the last 4 years—the dollar glut.

U.S. gold reserves fell $4.5 billion from 1953 to 1961, while our dollar liabilities to foreigners rose more than $9 billion.

Western Europe, meanwhile, was increasing its reserves of gold and foreign exchange by about $14 billion, or almost exactly the amount of the U.S. loss.

In 1961 we lost another $800 million in gold, and our gold stock is down below $17 billion, of which more than $12 billion is pledged as the gold cover for our currency. Short-term debts owed by the United States already exceed $18 billion.

Plainly, our incurring endless deficits year after year can only serve to weaken the world's key currency, the dollar.

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, for the countries of Western Europe once again to convene an emergency session, as they did in 1947. But this time, the task will not be to evolve a European recovery program. Rather, what is needed is a determination by the European countries to work out a European payments balancing program. Such a program could eliminate at one and the same time America's persistent payments deficits and Europe's persistent payments surpluses.

Before spelling out this proposal, I should like to remind Members of the nature of our contribution to Europe in the last 15 years; of the new responsibilities for the free world that have been thrust upon Europe; of Europe's failure to meet those responsibilities in such diverse fields as trade, foreign aid, military defense, and international payments; and of this country's largely unsuccessful efforts to inspire the countries of Europe one by one to do their part. Then let us see whether a cooperative effort—the old 1947 approval—may not be what is needed.

WHAT WE DID FOR EUROPE

Except in the polite exchanges of diplomacy, Europeans rarely mention the massive transfer of real and financial resources from this country to Western Europe through the Marshall plan and similar programs.

Western Europe, other than Greece and Turkey, still has to its credit net assistance of $39.5 billion from the United States. Nearly half of the $85 billion we have given or lent to the world since the end of World War II was transferred to what has become an area second only to the United States in economic strength in the Western World. Our assistance was massive and thorough, mainly because we could not see how our mutual strength could be maintained and increased without a better balance between the economies of the United States and its closest allies. Locking up the world's supply of gold at Fort Knox and doling out dollars in amounts which would have to be spent quickly in purchases here appealed neither to sense nor to sentiment.

But aid as such does not tell the whole story. Our objective was not merely to restore Europe to what it was before, but to help build sister economies with which we could have truly interdependent, mutually strengthening, economic and political relations. It was consistent with this objective to encourage closer cooperation among the European countries and to view a former enemy as a welcome friend. It was consistent to allow quotas on dollar imports, restrictions on money flow to the United States, and even the accumulation of financial reserves in the process. When the cold war intensified and it became necessary to rearm, we not only provided men and material resources from this country, but we tried to spend as much money as possible in Europe, even to paying for the use of roads by our military vehicles. As our aid to other areas of the world increased, we encouraged many of these recipients to spend their aid money in Europe.

Our program was pushed along by a genuine feeling of kinship. But we were not motivated by sentiment alone. We had—and still have—the conviction that "capitalism is one country" would be a foolish and untenable aim. We strove to create equals with whom we could trade on equal terms, share our strength to aid poorer nations, and contribute jointly to a better defense of the expanding frontiers of the free world.

This era of United States-European relations is now over. Europe is strong and growing stronger at a pace substantially faster than our own. It, therefore, faces a whole complex of responsibilities that for many years the United States faced alone.

EUROPE'S NEW FREE WORLD RESPONSIBILITIES

The United States does not expect gratitude for past favors from Europe, nor does it need to ask for aid out of weakness. What the United States and the rest of the free world do expect are a sense of responsibility and a sense of common purpose on the part of the European countries.

What is good for Europe cannot be the sole criterion today any more than narrow self-interest could have been the proper criterion for postwar U.S. policy. The boundaries of the free world do not end at the European Continent. They go beyond the shores of the North Atlantic. Other oceans and other lands lie within the dominion of the free world community.

Since this is so, any major economic or political decision taken in Europe, as well as in the United States, must be measured in terms of the welfare of the larger community. The obligations of newly affluent Europe, like those of the United States, are to maintain an adequate common defense, to give meaningful aid to developing nations, and to see to it that the growth of one is not at the expense of the other or of the community at large.

Since World War II, the United States has steadfastly traveled away from narrow nationalism and isolationism in its major actions affecting other countries. Europe has renounced colonialism and has traveled toward erasing national economic boundaries on the Continent. These are huge steps forward. They have been approved and applauded by the United States.

But it must be said candidly that Europe does not yet have a world view. Its sense of responsibility has not grown in pace with its prosperity and growing power. Its actions in certain major policy areas are not reasuring and, persisted in, may diminish or nullify U.S. efforts in the free world community.

WHAT EUROPE COULD DO AND HAS NOT DONE

The measure by which prosperous Western Europe still fails to live up to its responsibilities is readily seen in the U.S. balance of payments with continental Europe. During the third quarter of 1961, we were in deficit to Europe by $1.5 billion, which, continued for a year, would mean an annual loss to Europe of $6 billion.

The deficit was not due to our inability to sell goods to European customers. Indeed, we had a merchandise trade surplus—an excess of U.S. exports to Europe over imports—of $532 million in these 3 months. But this favorable balance failed by a huge margin to cover $2 billion in other payments to Europe, mainly because of large tourist expenditures, private capital investment, money transfers to Americans living in Europe, troop pay and other defense expenditures, and short-term capital movement.

These figures are for the most recently available quarter. They may overstate the extent of the current dollar outflow to Europe. But there is no question that the balance is tipped toward Europe by a substantial margin. For four quarters ending September 30, 1961, our deficit to Europe amounted to $2.5 billion, despite the fact that our trade surplus in this 12-month period was nearly $2.9 billion.

It would be in the national interests of the principal European countries to correct this serious situation—to bring payments on both sides of the Atlantic into balance. A continuing deficit in the U.S. balance of payments, large gold losses, and a piling up of short-term claims on the United States, shake confidence in the dollar and directly affect European dollar monetary reserves.

There are many constructive steps Europe could take. First, they could substantially lower their traiff walls so as to buy more goods and services from the United States. They could also open their markets to Japanese exports. Japan's extra earnings would tend to be spent in the United States for more food, raw materials, machinery and other goods. Second, they could greatly enlarge foreign aid expenditures on an untied basis, and try to channel purchases to the United States. Third, they could, directly or indirectly, pay much more for the defense of Europe. Fourth, to protect the dollar while all these adjustments were being made, the more prosperous European countries could join in an adequate international credit agreement.

We must look at the facts. Today, and for the last 6 months, our payments deficit has been running at the rate of $3 billion a year—as bad as it ever was.

Yet we have done about everything that we can do by ourselves—at least, everything nondestructive—to cut down on our deficit. We have done our best to expand our exports. We have had no inflation at home. We have cut down duty-free purchases by American tourists from $500 to $100. We are slowing down growth at home in order to prevent short-term capital from being lured abroad by higher interest rates.

We have done what we can. The rest is up to Europe. But Europe has not been willing to accept its responsibility. Let us look at the record in four important areas:

1. TRADE

By greatly increasing imports from the United States, Europe could go far to balance dollar inflows from tourist spending, U.S. military expenditures, capital investments, and other sources. This would require the abandonment of remaining quotas on dollar imports and substantial tariff reductions by the European countries without asking for compensatory reductions by the United States.

Instead, by forming a customs union, the six countries of the Common Market—Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg—have gained tariff advantages over the United States. The advantages come from the fact that member countries of the union will gradually reduce their tariffs to each other while working toward a common set of duties toward the outside world. These built-in advantages—discriminations against outsiders—cannnot fail to affect U.S. exports adversely. Moreover, since there is every likelihood that the customs union will soon expand to include the United Kingdom and the remaining European countries, Western Europe will have combined to place obstacles to an expansion of imports from the United States just when more imports were needed.

One way to have a customs union and to minimize discrimination would be by agreeing on a set of common tariffs with a substantially lower incidence than those now levied by the individual countries. This did not happen. The Common Market tariffs are arithmetic averages of member country rates or higher.

Another way would be to offer very large reductions in the common tariff in exchange for much smaller reductions by other countries. This also has not happened. In the negotiations just concluded in Geneva, it is reported that the Common Market countries have offered 20-percent reductions on a majority, but not all, of their nonagricultural duties. Even with this reduction, U.S. exports will tend to go down and not to go up, as the Common Market reduces the internal tariff to zero and establishes the common external tariff. Moreover, since the Common Market exacted some reductions in U.S. tariffs during the negotiations, U.S. imports from Europe may go up while U.S. exports are declining, thus further increasing Europe's payments surpluses.

Besides insisting on tariff protection at levels that disregard the imbalance of payments, Europe in other ways avoids increasing imports.

Germany, with over-full employment and confronted with the need to import labor from other countries, persists in protecting a high-cost, inefficient domestic coal industry and in limiting annual coal imports from the United States to 5 million metric tons. Its domestic consumption is more than 110 million tons annually. An expansion in coal exports of 10 million tons per year could mean an increase in U.S. efforts of $100 million.

Germany, which exports $6 million of certain kinds of leather to the United States, holds down imports of similar leather from the United States to $50,000 per year.

The Common Market countries want more tariff protection on wheat, feed grains, and other agricultural commodities important to U.S. trade. The argument among the countries now turns on how high that protection should be. Again, this attempt to increase agricultural production through higher tariffs comes when labor shortages in European industry are multiplying, and a shift out of inefficient agriculture to industry would be advantageous.

Five countries in Europe—the United Kingdom, France, Austria, Belgium, and the Netherlands—refuse to grant most-favored-nation treatment to imports from Japan. As a result, Japan's exports to all of western Europe come to about $500 million per year, largely on a tied, bilateral basis, compared to about $1 billion to the United States. If Japan could sell more freely in Europe, it would be able to spend more in the United States for food, raw cotton, and other products of which we are the dominant supplier.

2. FOREIGN AID

Until very recently, Europe's bilateral foreign aid expenditures consisted almost entirely of grants or loans to colonies, former colonies closely tied to the mother country's economy, or export credits and guarantees. Almost none of the aid was given in a way which could result in purchases outside the aid country, and so did nothing to correct payments imbalances. Moreover, there is considerable question whether aid to a colony is any different from national expenditure to promote development in a country's own territory.

France gives about $800 million annually in oversea aid, an impressive 1½ percent of GNP, but a substantial part of this consists of grants and loans to Algeria, still an integral part of France. The rest of the French aid program goes mostly to African countries which have only recently won their independence from France.

Until 1960, Germany gave virtually no foreign aid, unless reparations and indemnities to Israel are counted. In 1960, it began a program of long-term development loans. In 1961, Germany took steps to permit increased aid by enlarging development loan commitment authority by about $1.5 billion. It remains to be seen how rapidly these funds are disbursed, to what extent loan recipients are permitted to buy outside Germany and whether new authorizations will be made as the present financing is used up.

British aid at first glance appears to bear about the same relationship to gross national product as that made available by the United States, namely, about one-half of 1 percent. However, British aid goes almost entirely to its colonies and to the Commonwealth, with the requirement that the money must be spent in Great Britain.

Italy's aid has consisted largely of reparations to Yugoslavia and Ethiopia, grants to Italian Somaliland (newly independent), and exporter credits.

Apart from the new program in Germany, there appears to be little prospect for foreign aid of the kind which would help the U.S. balance of payments.

3. MILITARY EXPENDITURES

The United States spends about $3 billion per year outside this country for defense. Nearly half of this is spent for the defense of Western Europe. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, we spent more than a billion dollars in Germany, France, and Italy. Three of the countries which have gained most in reserves from us in recent years.

To reverse this flow, the countries which are in current surplus payments positions could increase their troop support in NATO, making it less necessary for this country to send troops from the United States; pay for local base operating expenses, such as pay for civilian personnel, land rental costs, construction, and locally purchased goods and services; and purchase their own equipment and materials from the United States. This does not seem an unreasonable suggestion, since the NATO member countries as a group spend about half as much as the United States for defense in relation to GNP. In 1960, NATO member countries defense expenditures were 5.4 percent of GNP, while that of the United States was 9.3 percent. The ratio of defense expenditures to GNP for France was 6.8 percent; Germany, 4.3 percent; Italy, 3.7 percent; and United Kingdom, 7 percent.

It is now reported that German arms purchased in the United States will be increased. But this alone will be nowhere near sufficient to offset U.S. military spending in Europe.

4. STANDBY CREDIT AGREEMENT

An adequate international credit arrangement is needed so that ample potential support for the dollar would be available while payments adjustments were worked out between the United States and Europe.

A new credit agreement was proposed by the International Monetary Fund and the United States. The credit agreement which was recently adopted, subject to the ratification of the 10 participating countires, was that of the French Government, and it constitutes only a first step toward what is necessary.

The IMF has ample lending resources in dollars and sterling, but not in the currencies of the other leading industrial countries. A new agreement, therefore, was sought to permit the IMF to have standby borrowing authority for more French francs, Dutch guilders, German marks, and other hard currencies.

While the agreement actually worked out provides $4 billion in nondollar currencies, this supplementary credit reserve is not assured because each country is to be its own judge on whether it can loan its currency when it is asked. If, for example, the United States should apply, and Germany, France, and Italy were each of the opinion that its current or prospective needs made it impossible to lend any money, less than $2 billion in nondollar borrowing authority would be left.

An adequate agreement would have made it possible, under appropriate standards and procedures agreed to in advance, for credit to be quickly available when needed. This was the recommendation of the Joint Economic Committee Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments. To date, the European countries have not agreed. As someone said, Europe appears willing to give "all aid short of money."

THE OLD WORLD TO THE RESCUE

The main reason why our hard-core deficit continues at $2 to $3 billion a year is the unwillingness of our European friends and allies to face up to their responsibilities.

Part of the fault may lie with the way we have gone about enlisting the support of the Europeans. Largely, we have proceeded by approaching one country at a time. This leaves it to the leaders of each country to evade their responsibility because each can think of a hundred reasons why it can do no more.

One country, for example, which has never had is so good, has been putting us off on the basis that our payments deficit is just a temporary U.S. problem, and that it will correct itself automatically. Another foreign office propounds the view that America's deficits are the results of our alleged fiscal and monetary irresponsibility, and that if we will only live right all will be well with our balance of payments.

Other Europeans point out that the average American's income is still much higher than the European's, a point of view which ignores the balance-of-payments aspect of our problem.

The European recovery program of 1947 was a success because all the countries got together and agreed what should be the share in the program of each one. Europe's response to the balance-of-payments problem of the sixties must equally be a joint operation.

The heads of state and their deputies should sit down together in 1962, as they did in 1947. Whether they do this through the medium of NATO (though this lacks such countries as Sweden, Switzerland, and Austria), or the OECD or by themselves, is not important. What is important is that they do it.

The United States should be there as a friendly observer.

The goal should be to eliminate the $2 billion to $3 billion annual U.S. deficit and the $2 billion to $3 billion annual European surplus. It should be up to the Europeans whether this is done by picking up more of the defense burden, by furnishing more untied foreign aid, by reducing trade barriers, or by some combination of these.

Let the Europeans make these decisions, as they did in 1947. The important thing is that the answer be one that disposes of the $2 billion to $3 billion imbalance.

I am confident that our European friends do not want the balance redressed by such methods as our retreating into higher tariffs, or in having controls over American tourists or American capital exports, or by our shirking our obligations for military defense or for foreign aid. But it is for the Europeans to tell us that they do not want any of these reactionary solutions by providing us with forward-looking solutions of their own.

This is Europe's greatest opportunity since 1947. We who welcome the leadership of a revitalized Europe can hope that the opportunity will not be missed.

POLITICS IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] on yesterday called attention to the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture was asking the Extension Service to enter the political arena to help shape future farm policies and programs. This is a bold-faced attempt to turn a nonpartisan educational agency into a medium for dissemination of political propaganda. I am also reliably informed that ASC committeemen are being told that they will be expected to support the administration's farm proposals or resign.

I now find that the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation is also getting into the political picture. According to a news story which appeared on the front page of the Des Moines Register of January 20, 1962, the new State director of FCIC for Iowa, Justin C. Dee, has made it very plain that FCIC agents in Iowa are expected to help promote the administration's farm programs, and that they are not to talk against such programs. At a recent meeting of Iowa FCIC agents, Mr. Dee is quoted to have said as follows:

> You FCIC agents as representatives of the Department of Agriculture, can encourage farmers to participate in farm programs when you are contacting them about crop insurance. You are expected to help promote the programs enacted by the Congress. I do not want to hear any reports where you are talking against these programs, irrespective of which USDA agency is administering the program.

It is becoming more apparent each day that we are dealing with one of the most ruthless political machines in the history of this country. The Kennedy administration now seems to be engaged in using the Department of Agriculture for political purposes. This type of operation most assuredly will be resented by the farmers of America who do not want to be the political pawns of any administration.

THE COMMUNIST FORCE

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, it is of the utmost importance that Americans who wish to learn more about the Communist force that seeks to destroy our way of life know that valuable reference material exists.

There are many books and pamphlets published on the subject, but they all do not measure up to the standard of reliability that is demanded by the very nature of the conflict.

To provide a helpful guide to our citizens on reading in this field I am placing the following bibliography in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Because a book or other publication does not appear on this list is not an indication it is unreliable. A considerable number of good works are omitted because the list would otherwise become too unwieldy.

I believe this is the first comprehensive bibliography of this type placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD since the then Senator Richard M. Nixon inserted "Bibliography on World Communism," prepared by the American Legion in 1952.

The list that follows was prepared by Karl Baarslag, former director, Countersubversive Activities Commission, American Legion, for the All American Conference to Combat Communism, and was published by the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, a member of the conference, in pamphlet form with an introduction. Copies may be obtained from the Catholic War Veterans, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Books marked with an asterisk are especially recommended by the compilers for high school and public libraries. I have added two titles at the end because of their importance, "Cold War and Liberation" and "Congress and the American Tradition."

I wish to include two speeches I made in the Congress dealing with the enemy. "The National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee," given on May 3, 1961, is an exposé of that Communist front which today is one of the most active in the country. The second, given on June 12, 1961, "H.J. Res. 444—The Victory Resolution," includes two sections of documentation; first, "Declarations of Hostile Intent by the World Communist Movement," and second, "Findings, Resolutions, and Condemnations of the World Communist Movement in U.S. Law, Presidential Proclamations, and Treaties Binding on the United States."

[Titles preceded by an asterisk (*) are especially recommended for high school and public libraries]

BOOKS

"Black Book on Red China." Hunter, Bookmailer, 1958, $2: An authority on Chinese communism gathered firsthand reports at Hong Kong from refugees on what life is like under the Communists. Excellent source material on the Communist destruction of Christian churches and persecution of religions behind the Bamboo Curtain.

*"Brainwashing in Red China." Hunter, Vanguard, $3.75: Hunter was the first American to bring back the whole horrible story of Communist mass braintwisting to make their victims actually believe that white is black and that criminality is really "building a new and better world." Important.

"Child of the Revolution." Leonhard. Regnery, 1958, $6.50: The son of a poor German Communist family is brought up by the Soviet secret police to become a trained and cynical apparatchik and Russian. An absorbing adventure story with keen psychological insights.

*"Century of Conflict." Possony. Regnery, $7.50: Probably the single most important book on this list. Should be in every library in the land. Public, high school, and college. The whole range of Communists' tactics and every facet of the whole complex pattern of Communist plans for world conquest.

"Communism and Christ." Lowry. Morehouse-Gorham. A minister who gave up his pulpit to devote his full time to furthering education on communism, writes what is one of the best general summaries on the basic antagonism separating two worlds—Christianity and communism.

"Communism and Christianity." D'Arcy. Devin-Adair, 1957: A Catholic priest considers the fundamental moral problem posed by communism and the task of all Christians in defending their common faith against it.

*"Communism in Our World." Caldwell. John Day, 1956, $2.75: A small but excellent little book written especially for 12 to 16 age group. Just what is communism is graphically explained by an expert in simple English. Should be in every school library.

"The Fallacy of Communism." Saar. Meador, Boston, 1956: An Estonian refugee only in the country a few years sums up in simple English the basic fallacies and hidden dangers of communism. An elementary treatise excellent for 12 to 16 age group.

*"Democracy Versus Communism." Colgrove. Van Nostrand, 1957: The Institute of Fiscal and Political Education commissioned Dr. Colgrove, a recognized anti-Communist scholar, to prepare a special textbook for school use. A few minor defects but in the main still one of the best works available explaining to students the basic differences and values between democracy and communism.

*"Guide to Anti-Communist Action." Bouscaren. Regnery, 1959: A distinguished political scientist and nationally known authority on communism draws up a blueprint for intelligent and effective counter-subversive action.

HIGHLY RECOMMENDED

*"The Freeman's Library." Hazlitt. Van Nostrand: A bibliography of the world's outstanding literature on human freedom and individual liberty. Some 550 classics from Aristotle to Rebecca West are listed and described. Should be in every library.

"I Led Three Lives." Herbert Philbrick. Grosset & Dunlap, Inc., $1.49: Philbrick's own story of how he found himself being used in a communist youth movement, reported to the FBI and was instructed to remain and serve his country as an undercover agent. The thrilling story of his life as a Communist—FBI undercover agent—a respectable businessman.

"I Was a Slave in Russia." Noble. Devin-Adair, 1959: An American boy, born in Detroit, is trapped in Nazi Germany at the end of World War II. Accused by the Soviet secret police of the usual phony charge of espionage, young Noble is sentenced to 9 years in Soviet slave labor camps. One of the few Americans ever to survive to tell his incredible story to the West. Exciting reading.

"I Was a Spy." Miller. Bobbs Merrill, 1960: Unfortunately a badly misnamed but otherwise excellent book by a housewife who penetrated the Communist Party as undercover agent for the FBI. Fascinating and yet instructive story. Girls will enjoy this book immensely. Authentic—revealing.

"Lost Illusion" (paperback). Utley. Regnery, 1960, $1.25: The heartwarming autobiography of an idealistic young English girl who fell for communism in college, married a Russian, bore a son in the land of the Soviets only to see her husband vanish into the night in tow of the dread GPU never to be seen again. A paperback reprint of a book first published in 1948.

"In the Name of Conscience." Khokhlov. McKay, 1959, $4.50: A trained and disciplined Soviet secret police officer is assigned to murder a leading German anti-Communist. His wife, a Christian, sacrifices her own life and that of their infant son to urge him to defect to the West and tell all about the total immorality of the Soviet leadership. One of the truly great books of our time. Belongs next to Whittaker Chamber's monumental "Witness."

*"Masters of Deceit." J. Edgar Hoover. Holt, 1958, $5: The Director of the FBI tells the whole story of communism in America, how Communists operate, and how best to protect oneself against their machinations and trickery. One of the most important books on this subject to appear in a long time.

*"Primer on Communism." Cronyn. Dutton, 1957: A paperback which answers 200 questions on communism. Highly recommended for school and classroom use in grade and high schools. Life under communism as taken directly from Soviet sources.

*"Our Secret Allies." Lyons. Duell, Sloan, Pearce: The famous writer on communism, Eugene Lyons, whose "Assignment in Utopia" first ripped the propaganda veil off the hideous face of communism makes a strong case for the people of Russia as offering the Achilles heel through which the whole rotten structure of communism can some day be toppled to the ground. A most important work.

*"The Naked Communist." Skousen Ensign Publishing Co., Salt Lake City, 1958: Probably one of the best all around handbooks on the whole subject of communism. Excellent for teaching and textbook use. Easily readable, large type, no tedious quotations from Marxist sources. Highly recommended.

"The Hidden Russia." Krasnov. Holt & Co., 1960: The grandson of a Czarist general and famous writer is trapped by the Russians in Yugoslavia at the end of the war. His father and grandfather were hanged by the Soviets while he spent 10 years in Soviet horror camps. Finally released a few years ago he lived just long enough to write this most remarkable and worthwhile book before dying last year in South America. Not for queasy stomachs.

*"The Continuing Struggle." Walker. Athene Press, 1958: A scholarly yet highly readable treatise on Red China by one of America's leading authorities. Makes a most effective source of authentic material on whether or not we should recognize Red China. Will demolish pro-Communists and other apologists for Mao Tse-tung who argue "but after all the Communists do exercise effective control over mainland China." A most important work.

"The Story of Mary Liu." Hunter. Farrar, Strauss & Cudahy, 1957: The deeply moving story of a Chinese Christian girl whose faith enabled her to triumph over both a terrible physical handicap and the diabolic persecution of the Communists bent on eradicating every vestige of Christianity in China. Excellent book for girls.

*"The Techniques of Communism." Budenz. Regnery, 1954: The former editor of the Daily Worker who in 1945 left the Communist conspiracy to return to the religion of his youth compiles what is still one of the best handbooks on Communist operating methods. Highly readable—very important.

*"The Web of Subversion." Burnham. John Day, 1954: One of our leading authorities on communism summarizes in a compact and fast-reading book the entire sickening story of Communist espionage and infiltration into our Government started way back in 1934 by an obscure and almost unknown party functionary, Harold Ware. One of the best books available in a field now adequately covered by a considerable library.

*"You Can Trust the Communists." Schwarz. Prentice-Hall, 1960: The famous Australian physician turned anti-Communist lecturer produces his first book on the subject. Takes you inside the Communist mind as very few other books ever have been able to do. One of the most important books published since "Witness."

*"Witness." Chambers. Random House, 1952: Still one of the truly great autobiographies of this century. A latter-day Dante writing with brilliance takes you on a personally conducted tour to the lower depths and inferno of underground communism. No amount of reading in communism can be considered complete without "Witness." An absolute "must" for those who find it hard to understand "why anyone should want to become a Communist."

IMPORTANT RECENT BUT ADVANCED BOOKS

The following titles should be found on the shelves of any important college library. While not necessarily too abstruse or "heavy" most of them do presuppose some basic preparatory reading. These titles have been used at the National War College seminars for Reserve officers and represent the consensus of a group of outstanding authorities who arranged the curriculums and compiled the recommended reading lists.

"Protracted Conflict." Kintner, Cottrell, Strausz-Hupe. Harper, New York, 1959: A companion volume to "Century of Conflict." One of the 10 most important books ever written on the cold war.

"American Strategy for the Nuclear Age." Neff and Hahn. Anchor, New York, 1960: Another volume of the "10 most important books" in this field. A symposium on all aspects of the crisis of our time by 30 or more of the country's top experts. Very, very important.

"Neither War Nor Peace." Seton-Watson. Praeger, 1960, $7.50 (see page 4): A penetrating analysis of the titanic problem of survival posed for the West by world communism.

"Imperial Communism." Bouscaren. Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C., 1953: A highly readable summary for student level on all aspects of world communism.

"The Soviet Secret Police." Wolin & Slusser. Praeger, 1957: Probably one of the best compendiums available on the secret state within a state—the Soviet secret police and its farflung network covering the world and reaching into every crack and crevice of Western society. The side of communism which most Communists do not know anything about.

"Soviet Espionage." Dallin. Yale University Press, 1955. Not quite up to Slusser and Wolin but nevertheless a highly readable general history of the main activity of the Soviet secret police all over the world—espionage and terror.

"Peaceful Coexistence." Kulski. Regnery, 1959: Another of the 10 most important books on communism written by a great scholar and renowned authority on the Soviets. Very important to any comprehensive understanding of just what Khrushchev is trying to put over with his "peaceful coexistence" confidence game.

"Communist China and Asia." Barnett, Harper, 1960: A detailed appraisal of the challenge posed to this country by the rapidly rising Communist state of Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai. Very important.

"The Language of Communism." Hodgkinson. Pitman, New York, 1954: A British expert compiles a very important glossary of Communist idiom, "Aesopian language," and "newspeak." A codebook as it were without which the beginner has the greatest difficulty penetrating Communist obscurantist lingo.

"In Every War But One." Kinkead. Norton, 1959: A deeply disturbing analysis of why so many American POW's in Korea succumbed to Communist brainwashing and became "progressives."

"Shanghai Conspiracy." Willoughby. Dutton: The amazing story of the greatest spy in all history, Dr. Richard Sorge, written by Gen. MacArthur's former chief of intelligence. Absorbing.

*"For the Skeptic." Munson. Bookmailer, New York: A very valuable digest of the highlights of some 22,000 pages of congressional reports and hearings on all aspects of Communist espionage, subversion, and infiltration of the Government at policymaking levels.

*"America Faces World Communism." Bouscaren. Vantage: Excellently prepared work on the Communist problem facing this country by one of our outstanding experts.

*"Key to Peace." Manion. Heritage Foundation: A positive answer to communism written by one of the great constitutionalists, Dean Clarence Manion. Distributed nationwide to the schools by the American Legion.

*"Wedemeyer Reports." Wedemeyer. Holt: Firsthand account and memoirs of a great American soldier whose report on China and Korea was suppressed for several years. Should be in every library. Very important book.

"Tito—Moscow's Trojan Horse." Draskovich. Regnery: A Yugoslav diplomat and authority on communism debunks the myth that Tito is some sort of decent humane Communist whom we can lure away from Moscow. Excellent historical reference work.

"The Conscience of the Revolution." Daniels. Harvard University Press: Another brandnew and very important book. The little known story of opposition within the monolithic state of the U.S.S.R.

Other titles—Fiction

"Nineteen Eighty-four." Orwell. Harcourt: Also reprinted in paperbacks. A former British Communist and brilliant satirist describes what life will be like under the universal Communist state. One of the most important books available to those seeking an insight into Communist mentality.

"A Ride to Panmunjom." Thorin. Regnery: A young Navy pilot falls into Communist hands during the Korean war. First-hand and first-class account of Communist brainwashing by one who learned how to beat it out of his own resources and character. Written as a novel, it is practically an autobiography.

"The Fall of a Titan." Gouzenko. Norton: The Soviet code clerk who defected in Montreal in 1945 to make the first revelations of Soviet mass espionage against the United States in time of war writes a powerful, first-rate novel on the Communist system.

Other titles—Nonfiction

"Beyond Containment." Chamberlin. Regnery, 1953: Still one of the best primers on Communist power manipulation. Chapter VI extremely valuable because of its masterly exposé of 10 basic fallacies about communism still held by many leading Americans.

"A Concise History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union." Reshetar. Praeger, 1960: Fills a longfelt need for a detailed and objective history of the Communist Party of Russia. Based almost entirely on official Soviet documents with Communist mythology and hokum carefully filtered out.

"How Communists Negotiate." Joy. MacMillan, 1955: An American admiral learns the hard way across the negotiation table just how Communists operate. A very important book, particularly for those old-fashioned Americans who still believe that men of good will can settle their differences no matter how far apart they may be, "if they will only get together and talk things over."

"Red Star Over Cuba." Weyl. Devin-Adair, 1960: A former Communist in the same underground cell as Alger Hiss documents the incredible story of State Department bungling over Fidel Castro. Weyl proves that Castro was a trusted Communist as far back as 1949. Very important book. New, 50-cent paperback has chapter on the tragic Cuban invasion.

Government reports

(Most of the following titles can still be secured directly from the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.)

"The Communist Conspiracy," basic Communist documents in five volumes, 1956, $5.60.

"Handbook for Americans," the Communist Party, how it works: Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, 30 cents.

"Congressional Investigations of Communism," a summary index of all publications; 1918–55, $1.25.

"Crimes of Khrushchev," four parts, House Committee on Un-American Activities, 70 cents.

"The Great Pretense," a symposium on the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of Russia, 45 cents.

"Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications," HCUA, 1957, 45 cents.

"Language as a Communist Weapon," Possony. HCUA, 1959, 20 cents.

"Patterns of Communist Espionage," HCUA, 1959, 25 cents.

"The Shameful Years," 30 years of Soviet espionage in the United States, HCUA, 1951, 25 cents.

"Soviet Total War," two volumes, a symposium by some 120 authorities on all aspects of the Communist threat, HCUA, 1956, $2.75. (An invaluable compendium which should be in every library.)

"The New Role of National Legislative Bodies in the Communist Conspiracy," HCUA, 1961, 20 cents.

PAMPHLETS

"Communism, America's Mortal Enemy," Dr. Fred Schwarz. "Tactics and Methods of Communism," Dr. J. B. Matthews. "How the Communists Control Thoughts and Attitudes," Herbert Philbrick. "Communist Indoctrination," Maj. William Mayer. (All four may be secured for a dollar from the National Education Program, Searcy, Ark.)

"Communism—A Disease," Dr. Fred Schwarz, 10 cents. (Dallas Freedom Forum, Post Office Box 7351, Dallas, Tex.)

PERIODICALS

"Counterattack," 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., $24 per year.

"Freedoms Facts," All-American Conference, 917 15th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., $3 per year.

"Communist Line Bulletin," Institute for Community Education, Rose and Oak Streets, Flushing, N.Y., $3 per year.

"For God and Freedom," The Christian-form, 1030 Perry St., N.E., Washington 17, D.C.

"The Firing Line," American Legion, Post Office Box 1055, Indianapolis, Ind., $3 per year.

"The Tablet," 1 Hanson Place, Brooklyn, N.Y., $4 per year.

HIGHLY RECOMMENDED

"A Forward Strategy." Strausz-Hupe, Possony. Harper, 1961, $5.95: A companion volume to the very important "Protracted Conflict" published in 1959. Undoubtedly the single most important book to a full understanding of the present world crisis. A complete blueprint on how to reverse the long trend of reverses and defeats suffered by the West at the hands of advancing world communism.

"Brainwashing from Pavlov to Powers." Hunter. The Bookmailer, New York: Latest work by an acknowledged authority on a diabolic new "science"—brainwashing. Indispensable to any understanding of why Communists and most of their work still continue to baffle and befuddle the so-called best brains on our side.

"The Soviet Design for a World State." Goodman. Columbia University Press, 1960, $6.75: Probably one of the best college level textbooks available on aspects of Soviet power techniques. Should be in every college library.

"American Might and Soviet Myth." Campaigne. Regnery, 1960, $3.95: Some plain hard facts to dispel the present pessimistic and defeatist attitude assumed by so many of our leaders vis-a-vis the Soviets. Should be in all high school libraries.

"The Edge of War." Atkinson. Regnery, 1960, $6: One of our leading scholars of Communist power techniques reduces to laymen's language the problems facing us today and what we must do to avert ultimate disaster.

"The Challenge of Coexistence." Kovner. Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C., $3.25: A timely and important book explaining just what Khrushchev and the Communists have in mind when they insist that we have no other alternative but a global nuclear holocaust if we do not accept what they call "peaceful coexistence." For high school and college libraries.

"The Moulding of Communists." Meyer. Harcourt Brace, 1960, $5: A most important work by one of our outstanding authorities setting forth just how a strange new human type, the dedicated hard-core Communist, is drop-forged in the ideological steel mills of communism. Recommended for college libraries but its terminology is a bit tough for high school level and the average reader.

ALSO RECOMMENDED

"Ten Years of Storm." Chow Ching-wen. Holt, Rinehart & Winston, $6: Another very important contribution to the now well-filled library of documentation on Red China. Indispensable to anyone preparing to argue against recognition of Communist China. Suitable for both high school and college use.

"The Communist Persuasion." Winance. P. J. Kennedy, $4.50: A Catholic priest learns first hand through torture and unbelievable degradation just what the Chinese Communists mean by "brain cleansing of bourgeois errors." Highly readable.

"American Communism and Soviet Russia." Draper. Viking, $8.50: The best of the series financed by the Fund for the Republic on all aspects of communism in American life.

"Khrushchev, the Making of a Dictator." Paloczi-Horvath. Atlantic, Little-Brown, $4.95: The well-known Hungarian writer makes a worthwhile contribution to the otherwise well-hidden biography of Stalin's successor to the Soviet purple. Well written.

"Cold War and Liberation." John F. O'Conor. Vantage, New York, $7.50: Completely indexed and referenced, this is one of the most valuable books to appear in recent years. It traces the failures of the free world's policies in regard to the World Communist Movement from its takeover of Russia to the present and draws important conclusions from those failures.

"Congress and the American Tradition." Burnham. Regnery: A clinical study of the gradual erosion of the constitutional powers of Congress and the importance of Congress to the maintenance of our unique American political system as a bulwark against the Communist onslaught.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, Raymond Moley has presented a very penetrating analysis of back-door Federal aid to education in the January 29, 1962, issue of Newsweek magazine. This excellent article points out that H.R. 132 should receive the close inspection of every Member of the House.

We are currently arming the Federal bureaucrats with many wedges to massively inject themselves into every State and local school district. Unless adequate safeguards are presented to this bill we will give one more tool to those who want a monolithic national educational policy.

PERSPECTIVE: SCHOOL AID IN NEW DRESS

(By Raymond Moley)

There is now pending in the House Rules Committee a bill (H.R. 132) to make channels available and to provide Federal subsidies for educational television. This legislation passed the Senate last year almost without notice and with little or no comment. But while the Federal money involved is relatively small, as the bill becomes better known it promises the same controversial issues which ended in the defeat of President Kennedy's omnibus Federal-aid-for-schools proposal last September.

The radio-TV spectrum is a relatively scarce and strictly limited natural resource controlled by the Federal Communications Commission. The FCC has reserved 268 channels for educational purposes. Only 54 are in use at the present time. The argument is that State and local public agencies must have subsidies from the Federal Government to avail themselves of these channels because it is costly to provide the technical and other facilities to use them effectively.

The bill would authorize total appropriations of $25,520,000 to be used in matching funds provided by:

"(a) an agency or officer responsible for the supervision of public elementary or secondary education or public higher education within [the State],

"(b) the State educational television agency,

"(c) a college or university deriving its support in whole or in part from tax revenues, or

"(d) a nonprofit community educational television organization."

TOOL FOR CONTROL

The restriction of Federal grants to public schools would exclude private schools of all sorts, just as was true of the lost Federal aid plan of 1961. Because of discrimination, the groundwork is thus provided for another strong protest from churches supporting their own schools.

A much more serious aspect of this proposal is the immense tool which such an educational facility would provide for Federal control of the content of education by the Federal bureaucracy, in this case by the U.S. Office of Education. It invites brainwashing of children, students, and the public by a Federal bureaucracy.

The same bit of hypocritical semantics barring control by the U.S. Commissioner of Education is present in this bill that has been in all Federal-aid-to-education bills in the past. But just as was the case in last year's bill, actual control will be contrived to put the materials devised by an educational elite in Washington into whatever is called education.

ENDLESS POSSIBILITIES

The U.S. Office of Education, quite unwisely from its point of view, could not wait until the bill might pass in the House unnoticed as it did in the Senate, but issued a report by one of its perennial panels which revealed how, under the National Defense Education Act, it would plunge into the business of telling States and local agencies what to teach. The report says that a "nationwide talent search and training program" is needed, etc. And everyone knows that whatever is "nationwide" is the USOE.

Under the provisions of the bill it is easy to see that as the federally subsidized channels are used up the Commissioner of Education will be the dictator as to who shall get these limited resources. And when the channels are all used, there will be none left for private schools. There is also a gadget for further Federal control in that the Commissioner of Education would plan and encourage interstate groupings of the users of the channels.

Ultimately, there would be monolithic control of a vast means of educating the American people. The possibilities are endless.

Finally, there is no need for Federal subsidies. Private institutions, including foundations, have the money and the willingness to help local agencies make use of these channels.

No one questions the immense advantage of using radio and television in education. One gifted teacher could supplement the efforts of hundreds of average classroom instructors. But the channels available should be allocated without discrimination, without Federal subsidies, and with no possibility of monolithic control. Control of educational facilities should remain where it is, at the State and local level.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the legislative program and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE] may address the House today for 45 minutes.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INTRIGUE IN THE CONGO

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE] is recognized.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, on September 12, 1961, under a like condition, I requested permission to address the House on the question of developments I felt were upcoming in the Congo. I concluded that address with words urging this body to launch an investigation into the policies of the United Nations and the United States in the Congo. I concluded with these words, "This cannot wait until next year. The time to act is now." Only a few days after that address, the Congo literally exploded into violence, bloodshed and tragedy. We did not act in the last session. While we had left our Chamber here and gone back to our various districts, my staff and I continued with a deep interest in the developments in the Congo. That interest and research continues to this day. I would prefer to have the opportunity to stand before my colleagues in the House with words of praise and commendation for positive action, for real accomplishments—but I cannot do that because the facts speak otherwise. It is important at this stage, as many areas of public opinion are being barraged with the idea that a successful coalition is imminent in the Congo, that we look at some of the facts and the backgrounds of the individuals involved. It is important to refer back to the address I made, again on September 12, wherein I named two individuals in particular in the Central Congo Government. One was Antoine Gizenga, and the other Christophe Gbenye. In recent days we have seen many headlines directed toward the man named Gizenga. There seems to be a line being perpetrated that action in recent days aimed toward bringing Gizenga into custody proves the inherent strong anti-Communist position of the Central Congolese Government.

I would direct to your attention the second name, Mr. Gbenye. Who is this man? What is his background? What is his role in the existing Central Congo Government? Before independence was achieved in the Congo, in meetings with the Belgians, the now currently recognized Soviet stooge Patrice Lumumba suggested three proposed cabinets. While others appeared in various posts in these cabinets, one man appeared in the same spot in all three recommended lists. This man was Christophe Gbenye, and the post was the Interior Minister's slot in every case.

Those who are familiar with the takeover tactics of the Soviets are well aware that almost without exception the position which they seek in attempted coalition governments is the post of the Interior Secretary. The reason is very clear, tragically clear: The Interior Secretary controls the internal police. Antoine Gizenga was not even included on one of these lists. Gbenye was the one man whose name was included in all these lists, not Gizenga. Gbenye was the one that Lumumba, the pro-Soviet stooge, held firm on in this key position, always insisting on his being in this point of control. Again I repeat the fact that the internal police would be under Gbenye's control as Lumumba's Interior Minister.

When Lumumba passed from the scene and Gizenga set up his regime in Stanleyville, who was the Minister of the Interior? The same Christophe Gbenye. Strangely enough, when the United Nations and this means the United States, because our representatives actively worked with them, and our tax money paid for it—when the U.N. set up the central government at Leopoldville last August, who was to get this same position? Christophe Gbenye. Christophe Gbenye is found in the same key position. He became Premier Adoula's Interior Minister. There it is, in ABCD order. This alphabetical ABCD of the Communist takeover includes the entrenching of a trusted agent in top control of the armed men who soon can take the road of terror and arrests to begin the elimination of internal opposition.

But knowing Lumumba's stooging for the Soviets, taking their money with which to bribe his way to victory—something pointed out by Stewart Alsop in his fine articles in the Saturday Evening Post on Africa last year, I am sure the Soviets would not let Lumumba put just anybody into the Interior Minister's seat.

The distinguished gentleman from Connecticut in the other body, Senator Dodd, Democrat, said in the Senate last September that Gbenye was trained in Communist Czechoslovakia.

Let us look for a moment at this man Adoula, now Prime Minister of the central government. At the so-called neutralist conference in Belgrade he stated: "We will follow the policies of the late Patrice Lumumba."

Again, may I point out that Lumumba was the Soviet man.

Does this offer the U.N. and the United States much hope in view of Lumumba's pro-Soviet policies? Does Gbenye's being Adoula's Interior Minister offer us less reason for concern?

How strong is Adoula in his own government, even assuming he wants to work with the free world and against Soviet interests in the Congo? It is clearly demonstrated by recent events that Adoula cannot control the Parliament or Congolese troops.

What has been the relationship between Adoula, Gizenga, and Gbenye? There may be a lot of confusion here in the public mind because of the lack of background on these three men.

Our attention has been concentrated on Gizenga, and the illusion created that there has been a strong successful move toward freedom in the Congo.

Let me reiterate. Christophe Gbenye was a member of Patrice Lumumba's political party. This is Gbenye, the man who is now Interior Secretary. Antoine Gizenga was the founder of a rival Congolese party. When Lumumba was killed, Gizenga claimed the mantle of power since he had been No. 2 to Lumumba in a coalition government. But Lumumbists controlled the Parliament, and Gbenye, not Gizenga, was in Lumumba's party.

In recent months Gbenye has tried to establish himself as the true successor within Lumumba's own party; in other words, as Lumumba's political successor. This is most important. Thus, the votes in Adoula's Parliament that censored Gizenga for isolating himself in Stanleyville cannot necessarily be construed as votes for Prime Minister Adoula against Gizenga. It is much more wise to consider them as Gbenye-controlled-voted against Gizenga.

While Adoula once worked with Lumumba in 1958, by July 1959, he had split off from him and joined a moderate secessionist wing of Lumumba's movement. By the time of independence in June 1961, Adoula was completely out of Lumumba's party, having joined the Parti de l'Unite Nationale Africaine headed by Jean Bolikango. Last August he whas chosen as a compromise Premier who fitted in between the faction of President Kasavubu and the forces of Antoine Gizenga. Consequently, it would seem likely that the Lumumbists in Parliament owe much more loyalty to Gbenye, the Interior Minister, who has remained a loyal Lumumbist, than to the party-jumping Adoula who first opposed Lumumba within the party, then joined an opposition party.

Hence, I say again it would be most unwise to assume that the overwhelming votes recently cast against Gizenga are votes for Adoula and his policies. Far more likely they are votes controlled by Gbenye.

Now, let us go back to Mr. Adoula. What do we know of Prime Minister Cyrille Adoula? According to the U.N. supporting Africa Report of July 1961, published by the respected African-American Institute, "Adoula is an outspoken anticlerical Socialist who is far closer ideologically to Gizenga than he is to the conservative, Catholic viewpoint of Prime Minister Ileo—he got much of his early political education from mentors in the Belgian Socialist Party, and his Marxism is not that of Eastern Europe."

Joseph Ileo was the Prime Minister whom Adoula replaced when the U.N. set up the new coalition Government of the Congo last August. Antoine Gizenga, of course, is the notorious pro-Soviet Vice Premier of that U.N.-sponsored Government, who since its establishment withdrew to Stanleyville, and recently has been brought back to Leopoldville under censure of the Central Government.

What else do we know about Adoula? He has been characterized as a very capable man. The very able gentleman from Connecticut in the other body, the most outspoken critic of this administration's Congo policy, has said of Adoula, after meeting him, "I am convinced, from certain of his statements, that he is strongly anti-Communist."

Now, I have the highest regard for the gentleman in the other body, and I am truly grateful for his magnificent work in this area, and I would go further and say he deserves the eternal gratitude of all Americans and freedom fighters everywhere. However, on this matter of Adoula I am constrained to differ to a degree. I am, like the gentleman from Connecticut in the other body, hopeful that Tshombe and Adoula can work out a just peace in the Congo, but I see no evidence to show that Adoula is making any compromise, nor is our State Department. The pressure is still all on Tshombe and Katanga.

Some of Adoula's deeds are these. He accepted Gbenye as his Interior Minister. Historically, by this fact alone, I cannot evaluate this deed as the act of an enlightened anti-Communist. He could be anti-Communist, but he is a Socialist, and Socialists all over the world are notoriously susceptible to Communist persuasion to work with them in coalition governments. At any rate, Adoula was willing to become Prime Minister with Gbenye as his Interior Minister.

Now, contrast this with the position of the truly anti-Communist Lao Prince Boun Oum. The one thing holding up President Kennedy's efforts to set up what he calls a truly neutral Laos is the firm resistance on the part of this wise prince against the incredible pressures of the American diplomat Averell Harriman, and Soviet Union's Georgi Pushkin, an incongruous alliance, to let a so-called neutral be, Interior Minister and another the Defense Minister. President Kennedy even brazenly suspended for a time our economic aid to Laos as part of this pressure.

My colleagues should remember that such compromises on the part of the esteemed Jan Masyryck lost him and the free world the entire country of Czechoslovakia. It fell to the Communists without a shot being fired because Communists were allowed to take over the key ministries in the Government, most importantly, the post of Interior Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, certainly Cyrille Adoula is not ignorant of the power of the Minister of Interior and the Minister of Defense, for he himself held the joint position of Minister of Interior and Defense in the Congo Central Government before being elevated to the post he now holds.

What else do we know about Adoula? For a period of months after General Mobutu stepped into the picture and restored some order in the chaos of Lumumba's first days in office, the representatives of the Soviet bloc, at Mobutu's orders, were kicked out and stayed out of Leopoldville. Now there is the action of a clearly strong anti-Communist. But what happened? These Soviet bloc envoys found a welcome in Stanleyville under the canopy of the Gizenga-Gbenye regime, and there stayed until late in September 1961, Adoula welcomed them back.

Mr. Speaker, Prime Minister Cyrille Adoula, identified as, and I quote, "an outspoken anticlerical Socialist," allowed them to come back to Leopoldville. Is there anyone who does not know the machinations of the Soviets in Africa, and the hand they have played in the Congo as they manipulated Lumumba and Gizenga? Is not Adoula's welcoming them back to the seat of government in Leopoldville a strong indication not only that the Soviet hand is still stirring deep in the Congolese political pot, but that Cyrille Adoula is not strong enough to handle the Communists in the same way Mobutu did, to show clearly that he wants nothing to do with them?

Or, on the other hand, if Adoula did not really want to recognize the Soviet bloc, but others like Gbenye pressured him to do so, then he is proven to have a weak hold indeed over the regime which he heads.

Mr. Speaker, along this line it is highly important to note that there was a strong indication of Adoula's shakiness right after the outrageous massacre of the 13 Italian airmen at Kindu. In the light of our State Department's attempts to have us believe things are progressing nicely now that Adoula and Tshombe are talking, let us not forget that Adoula could fall from power at any minute, and it could be done in a seemingly democratic manner, should Gbenye and the Lumumbists loyal to him in the Parliament decide to simply vote Adoula out of office. The setup is all there, ready made.

After the Kindu massacre, the New York Times correspondent, David Halberstam, reported from Leopoldville on November 25 an important development. The U.N. and Adoula had announced intentions of disarming—remember this—the 2,000 Congolese soldiers at Kindu in an effort to locate the guilty soldiers and prevent further outrages. Let me state that right now as I am speaking here, those guilty troops are still unpunished, and actually continue to pillage, rape, and murder innocent people in the Congo. Reporter Halberstam reported that the U.N. had dropped its plan and supported a proposal by Adoula to move the guilty soldiers to another city, probably Leopoldville, for punishment.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I request permission to insert in the RECORD the article to which I have referred.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

U.N. DROPS PLAN TO DISARM CONGOLESE AT MURDER SITE

(By David Halberstam)

LEOPOLDVILLE, THE CONGO, November 25—The United Nations gave up today its plan to disarm the 2,000 Congolese troops at Kindu in a hunt for the killers of 13 Italian airmen. Instead, the United Nations announced that it would support a plan of the Congolese Government to move the guilty soldiers to another city, probably Leopoldville, for punishment.

The United Nations decision, made public here today, was contained in a letter from Dr. Sture C. Linner, United Nations representative here, to Premier Cyrille Adoula of the Central Congolese Government.

In effect, it marked a change in United Nations policy for two reasons.

PLAN CALLED IMPRACTICAL

First, the feeling was growing here that the United Nations' plan was tactically impractical, since it might lead to widespread bloodshed between Congolese troops and United Nations personnel.

Second, the move represented a gesture to domestic Congolese politics. If the United Nations had handled the case and punished the guilty, it was said, the already shaky Adoula government would be made extremely susceptible to pressure from the left.

There would also be charges, it was said, that the United Nations was punishing an entire garrison of brave Congolese soldiers who would thus be prevented from fighting the real Congolese enemy in secessionist Katanga Province.

It was believed that if the United Nations insisted on disarming the soldiers around Kindu, Premier Adoula might face a vote of censure in the Congolese Parliament.

In his letter, Dr. Linner conceded that it would be "inopportune" to attempt to disarm the Kindu garrison.

Both the United Nations and Premier Adoula retreated from earlier statements when Mr. Adoula met strong opposition in Parliament on the plan to disarm the garrison. Thus, on Thursday, Mr. Adoula sent Dr. Linner a letter that called the United Nations plan to seal off the area "impractical." The Premier insisted that the Congolese Government was capable of bringing the guilty men to justice.

After the airmen were captured and slain November 11, the United Nations announced that it would take "energetic action" whether the Congolese Government cooperated or not.

SOLDIERS HEAD FOR KATANGA

Feeling is growing in most quarters here that with each passing day it will be increasingly difficult to find the guilty soldiers. They are known to have headed for the Katanga border. If necessary, they will shed their uniforms and head for the bush, it is believed.

Mr. Adoula has told Dr. Linner that the central Congolese Government is convinced that approximately 200 men from 2 units are responsible for the crime.

Dr. Linner agreed to Mr. Adoula's proposals after lengthy communications with U Thant, Acting United Nations Secretary General in New York. But he renewed the United Nations proposal for a joint United Nations-Congolese commission to investigate the case.

Mr. Adoula has said the commission is unnecessary. The United Nations has appointed its five members to the commission, but so far the Congolese have appointed none. It is believed no Congolese wants to serve.

At Kindu, the United Nations has found itself ensnarled in a command conflict between the Malayans and Ethiopians in its force. Its contingent there is also considered too small to complete a sealing-off operation.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious from this report that Cyrille Adoula is the leader of the so-called Central Government of the Congo in name only. He obviously does not have the support he must have if he is to have things his way. His proposal to disarm the soldiers responsible for the killing of the Italians was beaten down in his own Parliament. Adoula knuckled under to this pressure. But let us note the New York Times report again on one point. Its exact words were:

> If the United Nations had handled the case and punished the guilty, it was said, the already shaky Adoula government would be made extremely susceptible to pressure from the left.

Mr. Speaker, this is the government the United States is depending upon in the Congo. We have tried to support utter weakness by destroying solid strength. Logic would have called for our envoys to convince Tshombe that the strength of his forces was needed in the Central Government Parliament to help Adoula resist this leftist pressure. Instead, we sent in troops and jet planes with blazing guns and rockets to mow down the forces of the one man that we now say Adoula needs most.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see how, upon close inspection, we can buy such a line from our State Department. Does our State Department really want a Tshombe-Adoula agreement? If this is the case, it would seem logical to invite Tshombe to visit the United States at the same time Adoula comes here, in the next few weeks. But our State Department has evidently not even considered making such an invitation to Tshombe, the visa of whose representative the Department canceled so brazenly without cause last year.

Mr. Speaker, it would appear that the State Department wants to completely remove Tshombe from the scene. Now, this could be wrong, but evidence indicates otherwise. The State Department continues to press for a Central Government with no powers left to the provincial governments as far as I can determine.

As an example, we have hardly heard a word about it in the press, but the Central Government has arrested another provincial leader and stripped him of his powers. This is Albert Kalonji, the leader of the South Kasai peoples.

Mr. Speaker, on January 13 the Brazzaville radio in the Republic of the Congo, carried this report:

> The representatives of the South Kasai peoples have taken action to secure the release of their leader, Albert Kalonji, who has been interned since December 28. We remind you that 400 Baluba tribal chiefs who came to Leopoldville to demonstrate their sympathy for Kalonji were also arrested by the Leopoldville authorities.

My colleagues might question as I do the reasons for this arrest. But they might question it even further, as I do, when they realize that Moscow's attitude is anti-Kalonji as well as anti-Tshombe. In a broadcast to Europe on January 15, 1962, Moscow radio said, and I quote:

> LEOPOLDVILLE.—The command of the U.N. Forces in the Congo, busy as it is with intrigues and provocations against the national patriotic forces in Oriental Province, is endlessly tolerant of the actions of the separatists in the provinces of Katanga and Kasai. Enjoying absolute impunity, the armed thugs of the Kasai puppet, Kalonji, continue their outrages.

Now, I do not stand here to take a position for or against Kalonji. I do not think, however, that we can miss the implications of Moscow's position. Moscow clearly does not like Kalonji. In the doubletalk about the U.N. intriguing against Gizenga in Oriental Province, the Moscow propagandists lie about the U.N. tolerating separatists in Katanga and Kasai.

We know the bloodshed was in U.N. action against Katanga, not in Stanleyville against Gizenga.

And we know that the Central Government has arrested Kalonji, leader of Kasai and 400 of his tribal chiefs.

It is interesting to note that the moderate wing of Lumumbists that Adoula once joined was led by Albert Kalonji.

Kalonji has in the past led a secessionist movement in South Kasai Province. But he made his peace with the Central Congo Government months before Adoula was named Premier.

My point is simply this, Mr. Speaker. Why has the government of Adoula—which cannot or will not punish murderers in the ranks of its army—waged war against Katanga and now moves with a heavy hand against Kasai—when both of these provinces' leaders have been under attack by Moscow?

As I said in my speech last September 12 on this floor, Cyrille Adoula told the neutralist conference in Belgrade last year that he would follow the policies of the late Patrice Lumumba.

The other points I have made about developments under Adoula should all cause us great concern. We are a long way from peace in the Congo. We have compounded tragedy upon tragedy, misassessment upon misassessment. What tomorrow? History screams at us to study and learn the techniques used in Czechoslovakia and in other areas. Why are we acting the way we are in Laos under the illusion of a coalition government which cannot and will not work except to turn it over to the Communists?

Why do we pursue these policies in the Congo? How long, oh how long shall we continue to be deceived?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Thompson of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today, Thursday, January 25, 1962, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Doyle, for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, January 30.

Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. Sikes (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 30 minutes on Thursday, February 1.

Mr. Reuss (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 30 minutes today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Dent.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Cahill) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Rousselot.

Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Beermann.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hechler) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Johnson of California.

Mr. Macdonald.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8847. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that a distribution of stock made to an individual (or certain corporations) pursuant to an order enforcing the antitrust laws shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital; and to provide that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 26, 1962, at 12 o'clock.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1598. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the 11th Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education on the administration of Public Laws 874 and 815, 81st Congress, as amended, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961, pursuant to Public Laws 874 and 815, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1599. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the first semiannual consolidated report of balances of foreign currencies acquired without payment of dollars as of June 30, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 87-195; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1600. A letter from the Acting Assistant Director of Lands and Minerals, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report relating to all compensatory royalty agreements affecting oil and gas deposits in unleased Government lands which were entered into during calendar year 1961 under authority of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 226(g)), pursuant to the requirements of rule III, clause 2, of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1601. A letter from the adjutant general, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting the proceedings of the 63d National Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, held in Little Rock, Ark., September 17–21, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 316); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 527. Resolution for the consideration of H.R. 8900, a bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, and to authorize financial assistance for undergraduate study in such institutions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1292). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.R. 9895. A bill to provide for grants to States and local governments for the purpose of constructing needed public works and improvements in areas of unemployment; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 9896. A bill to authorize a 2-year program of Federal financial assistance for all elementary and secondary schoolchildren in all of the States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 9897. A bill to amend title II of the National Housing Act to enable the Federal National Mortgage Association to provide special assistance in the financing of fallout shelters constructed with FHA-insured loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 9898. A bill to waive section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the holding of court at Bridgeport, Conn., by the U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 9899. A bill to provide that the permanent membership of the House of Representatives shall be 438 Members in the 88th Congress and each Congress thereafter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 9900. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States through international trade agreements and through adjustment assistance to domestic industry, agriculture, and labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 9901. A bill to amend sections 302 and 409 of the Sugar Act of 1948 to permit certain past production of sugarbeets to be taken into account by the Secretary of Agriculture in making certain determinations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 9902. A bill to waive the limitations and restrictions of section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the holding of court at Fayetteville, Ark., by the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Arkansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 9903. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Antidumping Act, 1921, to provide for greater certainty, speed, and efficiency in the enforcement thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9904. A bill to amend section 104 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALGER:

H.R. 9905. A bill to rescind and revoke membership of the United States in the United Nations and the specialized agencies thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 9906. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Arts Agency in the U.S. Office of Education to aid in the creation and understanding of, and education in, the fine arts; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 9907. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to establish a Communications Satellite Authority to provide for the unified public control and operation of the space communications program of the United States; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.J. Res. 608. Joint resolution designating the airport constructed at Chantilly, Va., under the act of September 7, 1950, as the "Dulles International Airport"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. Res. 526. Resolution naming the office buildings of the House of Representatives the "Joseph G. Cannon Office Building," the "Nicholas Longworth Office Building," and the "Sam Rayburn Office Building"; to the Committee on Public Works.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to limit contributions to the United Nations by the United States in proportion to its pro rata share based upon population, and to prohibit the United States from making any further loans by participating in the issuance or buying of any bonds issued by the United Nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 9908. A bill for the relief of Yoshiko (Kuba) Hudson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 9909. A bill for the relief of Stavros Tserpes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

H.R. 9910. A bill for the relief of Edward T. Paca; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9911. A bill for the relief of Lucy P. T. Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 9912. A bill for the relief of Hideme Kawabata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 9913. A bill for the relief of Amelia and Eugeniusz Cierzszko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 9914. A bill for the relief of San-Man Inn of Manning, Inc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 9915. A bill for the relief of Umberto Brezza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

President Speaks on Rightwing Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the Wall Street Journal of January 25 several interesting remarks made by President Kennedy at his January 24 press conference in response to a question concerning rightwing groups. I think the President's remarks bear repeating for the benefit of all Members of the House.

Every American wants to be sure that we are properly united in our effort not only to resist the Communist conspiracy but to go on the offensive for the concepts of freedom that we so fiercely hold in this country. Evidently, the President recognizes the merit in contributions that rightwing organizations are making in our country through their patriotic and anti-Communist activities.

Under unanimous consent I include that portion of the article in the Wall Street Journal relative to this subject in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE RADICAL RIGHT

Question. Mr. President, considering that the one ingredient in all these radical right organizations seems to be anti-Communist or possibly superpatriotism, would it be feasible or useful for you, or even for the Republican leaders, to appeal to these people to stop tilting at windmills and to make a common cause against the enemy? My question really is: Do you think there is any merit in this idea?

The PRESIDENT. Well, I did attempt in my speech at Seattle, and my speech in Los Angeles, and in other speeches, to indicate what I consider to be the challenges the United States faces, and I would hope that—there have been others who have done the same thing, and I think we should keep that up. And I am hopeful that we can turn the energies of all patriotic Americans to the great problems that we face at home and abroad. The problems are extremely serious. I share their concern about the cause for freedom. I do think we ought to look at what the challenges are with some precision and not concern ourselves on occasions with matters such as character integrity of the Chief Justice or other matters which are really not in question.

Let's Repudiate Extremism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a great deal about extremism these days. Of course, not too much about socialism, communism, welfarism or any of the extremes which would basically alter our heritage but rather about those who are anti-Communist, pro-Constitution and pro-American. There are some extremists in our society. We all agree. The guns of the left have been turned on conservatives rather than extremists, however.

Some groups, such as the ADA, have even gone to the point where they have started to ask us to repudiate any group which in their opinion might be "extremist" in nature. The majority party's leadership at a recent $100 plate dinner in Washington announced that they would make "extremism" an issue in this election.

Some groups have delved into the past and obtained letters that some so-called extremist might have written years ago and have left no stone unturned to hang this tag on those of a different political persuasion.

Mr. Speaker, in looking through the old files of the Democratic Digest, official publication of the Democratic Party, I find this article on page 28 of the March 1936 issue:

AMERICAN GUILLOTINE

The original guillotine which decapitated King Louis XVI, loyal friend of the American Colonies when they needed a friend, was sold in France on St. Valentine's Day for $167.

With American liberties at stake it might not be inappropriate to buy that guillotine and set it up in front of the new judicial temple which frowns across the park that separates it from the Capitol.

Shades of the "impeach Earl Warren" movement, Mr. Speaker. It would seem that those who merely want to impeach a Supreme Court Justice—or even the Chief Justice—are rank moderates. Of course, we must remember that this was in conjunction with the all-out attack on the Supreme Court of the thirties following the NRA decision.

I assure you that if you read the issues of the Democratic Digest you will agree that there is nothing jocular or facetious about the presentation of the article, "American Guillotine." Of course, this was extremism of the left and as everyone knows, that is not the dangerous kind. Yes, let us all go forward and repudiate extremism.

Question of Tariff and Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, knowing full well the question of tariffs and trade is going to be debated with little or no consideration as to the economics of the problem, I would like to present facts covering at least one industry in Pennsylvania, which is the second largest shoe manufacturing State in the Union.

I know by this morning's papers that Adlai Stevenson, our Ambassador to the U.N., in an address last night at Bloomington, Ill., set aside all consideration of the economics and pleaded for consideration of this important question on the basis of a moral issue with the emphasis that it is a moral issue to Americans only.

The President has just given his economic message. He predicts good times—reduced unemployment, balanced budget. He asked for social reforms in education, unemployment compensation, antidiscrimination, retraining programs for workers displaced by imports, Youth Employment Opportunities and Training Act, tax reforms, closing loopholes, expense accounts, and so forth. Further, he has asked for faster depreciation writeoffs for automation to make our industry competitive with imports, $3 billion for Latin America, alliance for progress, $100 million for U.N. bonds. On the U.N. bonds, the President explained that it would save the United States 33⅓ percent on its commitments to the U.N. for Congo action, and so forth, if we bought bonds which were payable by all the nations who now refuse to pay any special assessments. If the proposal does this, it has a very good chance of passage.

In the main, I favor the proposals of the President. However, as Representatives in Congress represent all types of districts—farming, mining, agriculture, manufacturing—a close study will have to be made after the bills have been introduced and reported by committees.

All in all, it promises to be a very busy and eventful year here on the banks of the Potomac. Coupled with elections at home and the heavy legislative calendar, the Members will be crowded for time to really study all the bills introduced.

It appears that the trade program will be the hottest issue this session. Although all the heavyweights of press, radio, TV, banking, government, politicos, big business, some of our top labor leaders, plus the legislative leadership, are for the President's trade program, it will not pass in the form proposed by Mr. Ball, Mr. Herter, or any other advocate of the original proposal.

This is true because right now, before the bill has been finalized, I make these predictions as against what was proposed and supported by the trade advisers to the President. They proposed joining with the Common Market. The President has agreed not to ask for this. However, the promoters will be back again. They will have to come back with the Common Market issue to cover up the failure of the tariff cutting program if the President uses the powers given him.

They proposed no peril point or escape clause hearings. It will be a miracle if this passes. They proposed no congressional power over any tariff cuts made by the State Department acting for the President. This will have a rocky road and my prediction is that Congress will not give up all its prerogatives on trade policies.

To correct an impression given by some erroneous reporting from Washington, I want to make clear that my Committee on Impact of Imports on American Employment will run until all its work is done, no matter how long the reporting and printing, and so forth, takes. The only hearings that may still be held will be when we get more specific information from various departments, lobbyists, foreign trade associations, and so forth, on how many Americans get jobs from exports.

The only official report to date is the one put out by the United States-Japanese Trade Council, showing how many jobs are created in the United States by the Japanese purchases. They claim the creation of 190,000 jobs in the United States.

They do not say how many jobs are displaced by all the Japanese-made goods that fill almost all the stores in town. If they can measure how many they create, how about how many they take away? Of course, the figures are used without too much sense. For instance, they say they buy $32 million-plus worth from Mississippi and create 11,000 plus jobs. They then say they buy $60 million worth from Pennsylvania and create 4,820 jobs. It looks a little off base to say that—at minimum wage levels—two-thirds of the purchase price of the goods from Mississippi represents wages.

Even if 50 percent of the selling price is labor, Pennsylvania workers would have to get $6 an hour while Mississippi workers would earn about 70 cents. It is a little hard to believe.

One thing you can be sure of and even the most rabid freetrader must admit that the money loss to the American wage earner is $3 for every item—from the Common Market—imported containing $1 worth of foreign labor. The formula is simple. We pay an average, with fringe benefits, of $2.96 an hour while the eight major European countries pay an average of 85 cents an hour, fringes and all.

If an article costing $2 to an importer contains $1 of foreign labor this means 3 times 1 or $3 is denied an American worker for the same labor contract. By this kind of "trade" we lose $3 million in wages plus salaries on every $2 million worth of products imported from the Common Market and about $6 million on every $2 million imported from Japan and Hong Kong. As a minimum, we must export three times as much as we import in the area of high-labor content products. This is particularly serious when we note the change in the character of our exports as against the imports.

In the last 10 years, the ratio of manufactured goods to nonmanufactures has completely reversed:

In 1950, we imported 37 percent manufactured goods; 53 percent other goods.

In 1960, we imported 61 percent manufactured goods; 39 percent other goods.

As each nation increases its industrial capacity, this trend will accelerate unless high cost areas by some measure, customs, or otherwise, gives its products an equal opportunity competitively in the marketplace. This is even more damaging in the imports of consumer goods where labor and management costs amount to 50 percent or better of the cost of a product. This being true, how can any advocate of a no-tariff policy argue that we are importing less than we export without measuring exports and imports on the volume of goods, costs of imported goods as compared to our costs, the displacement of income in the form of wages and salaries, plus the impact of this differential upon the economy of the community in income losses to service industries, professionals, tax revenues, and local, county, State, and Federal governments?

You will note that I have tried to stay within the impact upon our wage economy since my study has been confined to that area of interest in our trade policies. When it comes to the problems of our international diplomacy, I admit I have rather strong opinions but will refrain from detailing my opinion other than to make a few observations that show the difficulty in determining trade policies based upon international relations.

The science of economics proves that the economy within an industrial complex rests upon the five pillars of economic reason. They are: First, investment; second, production; third, payrolls; fourth, consumption; and fifth, profits.

One depends upon the other and each supports the others in this formula. With one or more of the pillars growing at a more rapid rate of one or more failing to maintain its equal growth, the economy becomes unbalanced and the national welfare in all of its many phases becomes jeopardized. On the other hand, a most inexact science is the science of diplomatic relations between nations.

In this science its operation is affected by the wisp of the human deportment, national aspiration, and political revolutions. When the communities' economic necessities are subjected to the play of diplomacy, the welfare of the community shifts with the winds generated by conditions over which the five pillars of economic stability exercise a minor influence. I respect certain needs of our diplomacy and accept the effects upon our economy.

My complaint is that we lack something in our national life when we fail to repudiate the costs of the diplomatic considerations embodied in our trade policies. Let us not sell the public a trade policy based on nonexisting economic advantage. Rather, let us show the public the cost to the economy of the Nation for the benefits to be derived from diplomatic considerations as they affect the trade policies.

Some of us who oppose any further depreciation of our economic stability may very well become supporters of the trade proposals if we know what we are buying with self-inflicted unemployment and economic recessions. The present statistics of our trade volumes are not to be considered as anything but a temporary status. There are forces at work in this year of our Lord that are neither natural, normal, nor permanent.

In a later presentation I shall make known these influences and these interests. In closing this phase of my remarks, let me assure you that there is a solution to this age-old problem. This solution will give consideration to the diplomatic, the military, and the economic requirements of our Nation. This solution will give consideration to international public relations, the creation and maintenance of international good will between peoples as well as nations, the welfare and requirements of the free world in its struggle with ideologies that deprive peoples and nations of their liberties, their freedoms, and above all, their abilities to better their economic well-being.

It can be done and must be if we are to survive, to prosper, and fulfill the hope held out, not alone to our peoples, but all the peoples of the earth for a better way of life.

At this point, I will review a few statistics affecting your industry which proves my contention that in the field of industrial economies we are in a losing game in foreign trade.

The fact is that the advocates of our new trade policies admit this very fact when they exempt from the powers to cut tariffs without regard to the economies of the industries affected, the agricultural industry and the textile industry.

The shoe industry is one of the examples of the dangers involved in a noneconomic tariff policy. The following figures show three specific statistics that are a matter of record:

Total imports by period years (all footwear except certain specials and rubber boots)

1954	$6,247,000
1957 (year after 4-year extension)	16,378,000
1960	121,478,000

Imports of slippers (housewear) effect of wage differentials by countries

	1954	1957	1960
From—			
Japan	$12,368	$72,600	$2,015,000
Canada	1,388,000	365,900	203,000
All countries	1,500,000	818,000	2,828,000

You will note that as Japan's capacity to export expanded and Canada's wage levels were raised, Canada lost its export trade to the United States.

Exports from the United States

1954	$4,053,000
1957	3,542,000
1960	2,266,000

These are examples of the most inflexible rule of commerce and trade both internally as well as externally. Production will flow to lowest cost production areas and sales will flow to the highest income areas.

In closing, let me assure you this is a most serious problem and will require all our energies to find a solution.

A Matter of Life and Death in Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one of the saddest human frailties is the failure to appreciate the value of something until it is rare—or more often—until it has vanished.

Today Americans are making a valiant effort to preserve their own vanishing wilderness, many people are alert to the danger, Congress is working on legislation, and much progress is being made.

Unfortunately another great continent, with the most wonderful animal population of all, is in imminent danger of losing this irreplaceable heritage, perhaps even in the next decade.

Most people, even in Africa, are unaware of the fact that the great herds of zebra, giraffes, lions, and the rest of the fascinating animal life on the Dark Continent are disappearing so rapidly. This fact was substantiated when the German team, Bernhard and Michael Grzimek, performed the incredible task of counting the animals in the great Serengeti National Park.

The search for an all-Africa conservation policy would provide an opportunity for the new African nations to work together peacefully for a goal in which all have a common interest.

The Secretary of Interior, Hon. Stewart L. Udall, has written an excellent article entitled "A Matter of Life and Death in Africa," which was printed in the September issue of the National Parks magazine. In it, he vividly expresses the urgency of this situation, the reasons why we in the United States should be concerned, and what can be done to help the Africans avert this disaster.

Because I feel that this is a matter of great importance I have asked leave to include Secretary Udall's remarks and the editorial comment thereon in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

A MATTER OF LIFE OR DEATH IN AFRICA

(By Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior)

(NOTE.—Somewhere last night, a lion arose from his dinner, and mane rippling, strode into the red night sky. A hyena barked once, barked more softly, and then sighed silently as the evening's cool touched the earth under him. A hippopotamus' gray folded eyelids closed in nocturnal oblivion, and even the ubiquitous cuckoo made no sound. The teeming life of the veld spent last night as it has millions of nights before, in motionless slumber among the grasses.)

We men never cease to be awed by the natural world, by animals living untouched by the booms and bricks, the speeches and straws of our own civilizations. Many of us have never seen the great grasslands of the African Continent; but we want to, and should we never realize the opportunity, we hope our sons and daughters will one day "stand silently as the setting sun makes the veld red with fire."

Perhaps we remember our own continent as our grandparents have described it to us, unfenced and with buffalo, antelope, and timber wolf living where God and evolution had placed them. Settlers were too quick to think that earth was made for them alone rather than for all creation; and, too late, we their descendants realize that we will never know those irreplaceable forms of life.

The wilderness and wildlife resources of the world are part of mankind's natural heritage. They belong to no man, neither to keep nor destroy, but are life's gift to all. Too often men, in their ignorance, have made a wasteland of the planet that Astronaut Alan Shepard looked down upon in awe not long ago to exclaim: "It is beautiful"

Nowhere in the world is the future of wildlands and wildlife more uncertain than in continental Africa. Africa's great plains of mammals are no less fragile, no more everlasting, than were ours of a hundred years ago. Africa's population is exploding as is the rest of the world's, and more people means ever more land necessary for homes and crops. People often appreciate something of value only when it has become rare—and more often and sadly, when it has vanished.

Africa is far away, its natural resources known only sketchily, and often inaccurately, by the rest of the world. Even those working most closely with African resources find staffs too small and research too incomplete to be accurate. For example, it had long been assumed that the vast Serengeti National Park in Tanganyika held more than a million head of thriving wild mammals: lions and cheetahs, Thomson gazelles and kurdus, wildebeest and giraffes. Not until Bernhard and Michael Grzimek flew their little zebra-striped plane back and forth in 500-yard strips over the entire vast park, painstakingly counting every animal head, did the world learn that the abundant million is, in fact, only 365,000.

Might this also be true of the wildlife of the Congo? And what about all the other countless herds south of the Sahara? Do they exist in unlimited abundance? Do they exist at all?

Even the establishment of a national park does not assure protection of the natural resources within it. Often, as recently in the case of Serengeti, long after the park has been established it is discovered that the official boundaries do not encompass the annual migratory paths of the animals. There is no way to tell a zebra where it should migrate. It searches for succulent grasses, and goes where they may be found. Outside the park boundaries it is subject to numerous forms of predation, and as long as the boundaries do not cover the mammal's natural paths it can never be assured protection.

Even within the parks and reserves, wildlife cannot be guaranteed safety. It has been said that game preserves "look impressive on maps, and the plans and brochures describing them are a splendid sedative for allaying the fears of European and American naturalist organizations." Authorities usually live too far from the areas they administer and are too few to begin to control the widespread poaching that occurs in the dew of the dawn. The volumes of official regulations governing the preserved areas have never been disseminated nor enforced among the Africans who wander throughout these areas. They scarcely know the regulations, and they most certainly do not understand them.

Africans near the reserves know they can receive a few pence on the black market for elephant ivory, hooves for wastebaskets, and zebra tails for fly swatters; so they cruelly snare and slaughter for illegal recompense. Then perhaps a wealthy white Westerner drives his station wagon of trophy hides and heads through a native village, having gutted the landscape, while at the same time other whites are telling the same Africans that hunting is forbidden. The paradoxes are many, and do not earn respect for white regulations, worthy though they may be.

Western contact, at most, has brought the African an awareness of economic gain, and has little communicated itself in the realm of nonmaterial values. The African has no developed ethic toward the mammals with which he has so long shared the horizon. Poachers can be arrested and forced to pay fines, but punishment seldom helps them comprehend the reason for preserved areas.

It is important that Westerners understand the problems pressing upon the world's rich heritage of African wild lands and wild life. But it is even more important that the people of the continent itself understand the intrinsic values that can so quickly be lost through ignorance or thoughtlessness. We do little for our fellow men if we do not help them become wise before making the mistakes we have made.

Recent events of colonial upheavals, self-determination of African nations, and all the problems and vicissitudes of administrations in their infancy have left little time for cognizance of conservation needs. Yet this very fact has made obvious the opportunity to begin conserving now, and not lose whatever has been gained through the worthy efforts of the devoted few who have established the present parks and reserves in Africa. New countries have all the more reason to develop and manage their cultural assets. Their mark in history is already being made. What would our impression of Greece be if her ancients had not left the Parthenon for posterity? Would the world not howl now if Athenians tried to tear down the ancient treasure to make room for a new cattle pasture or housing development?

Although wildlife conservation is a matter of ethics and great esthetic appreciation to some, to the present day African it is a matter of practical necessity. The African is struggling to achieve a degree of material development comparable to that of the Western World, but he is generations late in beginning. At this stage he has little time for sentimental values, but these can be preserved as the contemporary African meets his vital economic needs.

It would be a tragic economic as well as cultural waste, if American leadership did not recognize the potentials of its great land reserves. The roving mammals are an unprecedented tourist attraction, which, under careful and proper management, can draw vitally needed revenue. Africans need food, and disease-resistant, protein-producing, indigenous mammals are a far more practical source of this necessary food than imported domestic cattle that are not adequately adapted to the environment.

Africans need the opportunity to learn the reasons and techniques of sound multipurpose wild-land management. Not only are technical experts needed in quantity, but political leadership of the countries, and the people themselves, are manifestly in need of conservation understanding.

Americans should provide Africans with conservation education opportunities and scholarships here, as well as trained faculties and technical experts in Africa. We have given technical assistance and educational opportunities to Africans for direct economic development, but America has much more to give than just the knowledge of how to create dollars. If Americans lament that their "image" abroad is too materialistic, and continue to miss the opportunity to help Africans understand and preserve their wildlife heritage, they can only blame themselves.

Right now there are more than 3,000 Africans, potential social and political leaders of the emerging nations, studying in American colleges and universities. Ten of them were recently selected for a pilot program, sponsored by the African Wildlife Leadership Foundation, Inc., the Afro-American Institute, and the National Park Service, to travel to Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks in order to have a study experience of what the national parks are, and what they mean to the American people. Our parks are one of the finest manifestations of the values of democracy, and these young leaders are having the oportunity to work closely with the ranger staffs and to know the daily routine of national park interpretation and protection. None of these students is now planning a career in park management, but they will be educated citizens, making decisions in their countries, and will at least have some understanding of park values.

This is only one step. Many more need to be taken to insure that future generations may one day "stand silently as the setting sun makes the veld red with fire."

Editorial Comment: New Approach to a Critical Problem

In an article appearing in this issue of National Parks magazine, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall points up the grave threat which now hovers over many of the great mammal species of Africa—the elephant, the white rhinoceros, the mountain gorilla, the zebra, the giraffe, and many other fabled representatives of a once-rich African faunal life. Secretary Udall discusses how a beginning has been made, albeit on a small scale, in driving home the need for a sound multipurpose wildlife management program in Africa while there is still wildlife left to manage.

A further approach to the problem of preserving at least a representation of many endangered large animal species of Africa has recently been made in the formation of a group, headed by U.S. Tax Court Judge Russell E. Train, of Washington, D.C., which will attempt to raise money to send African students to American colleges for the purpose of studying conservation. Only thus, the group feels, can the indifference and the apathy of many Africans toward a vanishing part of their natural heritage—and indeed, toward a substantial source of desperately needed tourist money—be overcome.

The African Wildlife Leadership Foundation, as the recently formed group is known, hopes to obtain financial support throughout the United States. It has already made its first grant—to Perez Malande Olindo, 22-year-old native of Kenya, East Africa, one of the great game areas of the African Continent. Olindo will study biology and wildlife conservation at Central Missouri State College.

For the large mammals of Africa, the hour is late; a fact that was recognized by Judge Train when he noted that the odds on the success of such an African conservation program were terribly long. Nevertheless, it seems quite clear that a program of this kind represents the last chance for survival for many of the large African mammals, so important both esthetically and scientifically. Every sensitive person, whether conservationist by title or not, will hope that the new organization's work will prosper.

P. M. T.

Historical Sites—Preserve Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to note to my colleagues a marked increase in the efforts of citizens groups to preserve historical sites. After years of crying in the wilderness, preservationists are beginning to be heard. The excerpts from two newspaper releases confirm this:

Savannah (Ga.) News, December 28, 1961:

> Plans for special legislation to create a historic zone in downtown Savannah to preserve the heart of the city were disclosed yesterday by Mayor Malcolm Maclean.
>
> The proposal for legislation, reviving the long-discussed plan, was submitted to the mayor by the Historic Zoning Committee of the Trustees of Historic Savannah Foundation, Inc.

St. Paul, Minn., as quoted from the Little Rock (Ark.) Arkansas-Democrat, January 4, 1962:

> As a safeguard against possible destruction of landmarks in urban renewal projects and in construction of industrial plants, expressways and parking lots, St. Paul, Minn., has a committee making a survey of historic sites.

I wish to recommend the reading of the latest issue of Historic Preservation, the quarterly of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. Historical sites and urban renewal is the general theme of this issue. Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall is quoted as stating:

> New York is not alone in suffering from the ills of the supermetropolis. In varying degrees, megapolis poisoning has become a national syndrome. The cure does not lie merely in prescribing more operations on the face of America. Let us be content to look at our age. * * * The time has come to provide machinery in our laws for the automatic preservation of such historic sites when they fall into the surplus or unneeded category; that provision be made, not for their sale, but for their addition to our great system of national parks and memorials, or their transfer to independent groups or patriotic organizations which have an interest in their preservation for time and generations to come.

Articles in the newspapers this past week have taken note of the fact that the Liberty Bell is being repaired but it will not be rung again. A number of factors, including the touching of the bell by millions of visitors to Independence Hall, have combined to silence the ringing of the bell whose famous inscription reads:

> Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto the inhabitants thereof.

We must make every effort to preserve the great symbols of America's heritage. I believe that it is no more progress, in the American sense, to destroy a previous monument erected to American freedom, than it is to chip away at the foundations of our Constitution. It is with these thoughts in mind that I include a speech entitled "Historical Sites—Preserve Them," which was delivered by me at the Boston College Economic and Educator's Seminar:

Historical Sites—Preserve Them

What we are basically concerned with here today is the preservation of the American tradition.

The problem before us is the perpetual emphasis in the American tradition by keeping before our people the massive, historic relics of our past.

This means buildings rich in historic sentiment and inspiration.

This means battlefields that tell the story of sacrifice and hold up examples of patriotism and honor to our youth.

It means, above all, an atitude of mind that keeps these monuments and mementos of our past in reverence and esteem.

In our respect for the grandeur and the glory of our past rests our survival for the future.

The project is, of course, a national project.

But history and geography have come together to make certain areas of our country especially rich and abundant in mementos of the American tradition.

Boston and its environs is one of these areas.

In our State we have a sensitivity and an awareness that makes us keenly and particularly conscious of the character, the stamina, the independence, the rugged patriotism that gave us birth as a nation. It is this awareness that we want to share with the whole country and indeed with the whole world.

With this in view I put all the resources of my office as the Massachusetts Congressman from the Eighth District behind Federal legislation to keep alive in our people the magnificent image of their past. And it is with this motivation that I sought to make so plain and clear the portrait of America before the world, that our enemies would find it doubly difficult to distort the true meaning of our country before the people of all countries.

As I see it, a major weapon in this incredible cold war—especially in the contest for the minds of men—is the preservation of the visual and inspiring evidences of our history as revealed in the ennobling architecture and places of our history.

Thus it was that I introduced three major pieces of Federal legislation to give effect and meaning for this purpose.

I hope with all my heart that my purpose is your purpose.

What are these measures?

The measures rather mundanely are called H.R. 5983, H.R. 5984, and H.R. 5985.

Taken in their totality the bills of course are national in their scope. The Congress of the United States—which must decide upon their passage—is representative of our whole country.

Yet I do not seek to deny that their benefits may be said to be, in some outstanding respects, local. And for that I do not apologize.

I point out that while Boston is one of the major beneficiaries of these bills—and the areas around Boston—my bills do ample justice to other areas, edifices and places that should receive Federal attention in order that the ruthless hand of so-called progress may not reduce to rubble and oblivion our great national landmarks, wherever they may be.

The idea is to perform a national service for the American people and for freedom everywhere at a moment in history charged with crisis. The idea is to make the American people themselves conscious of their immense contribution—in free institutions—to the civilization of the West. The idea is to thwart the propaganda that defaces the picture of our country before the world. The idea is to prevent visual, living, documented proof, some of it in brick and stone, in hill and squares and heights and halls—in churches and statehouses—in homes and military sites, that freedom was for the American people always the inner soul of their being.

Not only would our own countrymen see and learn and understand from these truths expressed in stone and mortar, and locale, but visitors by the millions from abroad, would come to know the elementary truths of our tradition.

That is and remains my principal purpose.

Thus specifically there is the bill designated as H.R. 5983 introduced in this 1st session of the 87th Congress. This is the bill that seeks to provide for the preservation of buildings in the Nation's Capital which are of historic and cultural importance. Through this bill we shall see preserved some of the influence of George Washington in shaping the architectural destinies of our National Capital. The Founding Fathers lived and thought and planned on the grand scale. And the structures this bill seeks to keep for posterity give proof of a grandeur of mind that explains the beauty of our Capital.

That's bill No. 1.

Bill No. 2 is H.R. 5984. In this bill I aim to amend the Historic Sites Act of 1935. This bill seeks to provide for the preservation of buildings of regional or local historical or cultural significance. It too, as in all kindred legislation, has some other provisions. Counties and cities throughout the country will be asked, by the Secretary of the Interior, to furnish him with a list of historic sites, buildings, and objects which possess value as commemorating or illustrating the history of such county, city, town, or surrounding area. Certain agencies, private as well as governmental, are asked to participate in making determinations as to the historic or cultural value of the sites and places itemized. After public hearings the adjudication will be made in accordance with the 1935 act.

The bill declares—I quote: "It is the sense of the Congress that such list should be consulted with respect to all projects throughout their planning stages, and to the maximum extent practicable, all sites, buildings, and objects contained therein should be preserved."

Bill No. 3 in this three-sided legislative effort, is H.R. 5985.

This, too, is simple, brief, direct—and, it seems to me—effective.

This bill amends the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to provide for the preservation of federally owned buildings which are of historical, architectural, or cultural significance.

All this bill does is check the thoughtlessness that relegates distinguished Federal buildings—that have historic meaning—to the crudities of the building wrecker. It covers Federal real property in all the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The bill protects historically desirable properties in any of these areas from being declared surplus property or otherwise sold or knocked down or discarded, until the Federal Administrator under the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949, shall have taken into consideration their historical, or architectural significance.

That's the status of this legislation as I speak.

I wonder if you will agree with me that what this legislation seeks to do: The preservation of the American heritage, is in fact a prodigious educational endeavor. We are not collecting museum pieces. We are not consolidating the Nation's real estate holdings. We are not providing entertainment and picnic grounds.

We are, ladies and gentlemen, preserving American history.

I believe it is no more progress, in the American sense, to destroy a precious monument erected to American freedom, than it is to chip away at the foundations of the Constitution of the United States.

There is no statistic to me so frightening, so dramatically appalling than the statistic that came to me the other day.

This is the statistic that one-fourth of the historically important buildings in existence in the United States in 1941 have been destroyed. What lends an unbelievable sense of indignation to this fact is that this destruction was done designedly by programs and projects financed either in whole or in part by the Federal Government.

This, it seems to me, is a form of cultural suicide.

For even an enemy in war to burn the Capitol of the United States and put the White House to the torch has been counted as infamy by many generations. Yet lesser symbols are as precious in the making of a nation and their destruction by our own hands an offense against ourselves.

We would never take choice instruments of our freedom, the documents we cherish and that 10,000 people see every day in the Capitol of the United States, and actually, by bureaucratic order, with deliberation, throw them into the fire.

The legislation that I introduced and that I have been talking about will prevent such mistakes.

John Kenneth Galbraith, of Harvard, now our Ambassador to India, speaking more as an educator than an economist, made a comment in the article in the New York Times magazine, in October of 1960, that I find especially to the point. Professor Galbraith summed up one of the points of view in Adam Smith's work "Wealth of Nations." I quote: "* * * the building and maintenance of 'public institutions' and 'public works,' as a function of the State, was surpassed in importance only by provision for the common defense and the administration of justice. Thus, he ranked immediately after the warriors and lawgivers the builders and architects of his time."

If I had to choose the two places in the United States which should serve more especially as examples of the fervor to preserve our American heritage, the two places are—in my judgment—the city of Boston and its historic environs and the Capitol itself. If we in Washington and we in this State and city hold our unique and irreplaceable relics sacred and holy and forever free from demolition, we shall have set an example the rest of the country will rightly follow. But it is up to us here at the very center of these previous reservoirs of our past to create and emphasize a trend, a respect, a sense of history, that may then become the symbol of a national will.

We must not permit the cold and unimaginative eye of the historically blind to determine the destiny of our great historic monuments. Suppose some people, insensitive to the significance of a historic scene, had wiped out our old statehouse, or Faneuil Hall, or the Old North Church, in the name of progress? What a tremendous spiritual and yet, at the same time, economic loss our State of Massachusetts would have suffered.

It is up to us, and now is the time to speak up.

The Historic Sites Act of 1935 already arms the Secretary of the Interior, through the National Park Service, with the power to use his office to the ends I have been discussing. The legislation I have introduced merely strengthens his hand. The effect of this legislation of 1935 is extremely pronounced. The current celebration of the Civil War Centennial is made possible in no small part by the work of the National Park Service in preserving high points in the Civil War as war memorials. This is not only educational and extremely worthwhile, but it is not without its intelligently motivated, if wisely handled, economic side. The vicinity of historic sites is one of the most effective processes—visual, graphic, memorable—for studying history. It must be by its very nature 10 times more effective than history studied from a book, however valuable that may be. For if, as a wise Chinese said, one picture is worth a thousand words, how much more impact does the preservation of a historic site have on an open mind rather than a wordy description of the history of the preserved place?

It is my information, predicated upon data furnished me by chambers of commerce, that some $9 billion will be spent by tourists viewing historic scenes of the American Civil War during this centennial celebration.

Nine billion dollars.

Here is a primarily educational enterprise, saturated with historical significance, that provides as a byproduct this highly beneficial and desirable economic good.

All of this seems to me a lucrative and alluring device, apart from the standpoint of the national prestige, for reversing the flow of gold, and returning it or keeping it inside our own shores. There is within our cities and our outer areas so much to be seen, to be recalled, to be remembered, to be revered. The scene of the Boston Massacre just outside the Town House on that memorable day in March 1770, should be a mecca for tourists. This house is probably the most important public building in American history prior to the Declaration of Independence. In saying that, I am quoting from the "Final Report of the Boston National Historic Sites Commission to the Congress of the United States." I could make similar appraisals of Faneuil Hall, of North Square, of the Christ Church, or the Old North Church, of the military significance of Dorchester Heights and Bunker Hill. Nor are we less concerned about the Shirley-Eustis House or Shirley Place, and the Old Corner Bookstore, or Thomas Crease House. Here is the luster and brilliance of the past. You here need not be reminded of the Old South Meeting House and the Lexington-Concord Battle Road. The latter was made the subject of a special report by the Boston National Historic Sites Commission. And the Congress has since authorized, as you all know, the Minuteman National Historical Park in the towns of Lexington, Lincoln, and Concord. These are impressive results and we are all proud of them.

But much more needs yet to be done.

The report I have just quoted mentions historic properties of particular importance and survival value that lie on the fringe of the city of Boston, or in neighboring cities and towns—within a radius of some 12 miles of Boston proper. Some of these precious properties need the strong financial arm of the Federal authority for their maintenance and preservation.

A notable example of a privately achieved restoration that deserves high praise is that of the ancient iron works in Saugus, Mass. This dates back to the 17th century. The modern iron industry made this possible through the efforts of the American Iron and Steel Institute of New York. This industrial manifestation of history is significant becaue it was here in Saugus three centuries ago that "the successful, sustained, and integrated production of cast and wrought iron was first achieved within the limits of the United States."

It happens that my effort as a Representative from Massachusetts is on the Federal level. This is the most important of all fields for the preservation of every form of America. A national pattern of preservation and a national staff and system and standards will in the end prove most efficient and economical. But I plead as much for every facet of government and private endeavor, State and local, to pitch in for the promulgation by this method of all the glories and grandeurs of American history.

That's our central objective: the preservation of the American tradition.

Role of Milk in the American Diet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday the National Conference on Milk and Nutrition met here in Washington.

Constructively, the conference reviewed and evaluated—as well as attempted to deal with—some of the difficult problems involved in the major role of milk in the diet of American people.

Among other discussions, the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, delivered a thought-provoking address on major problems in this field.

Last year, the Nation produced about 125 billion pounds of milk. Of this amount, the output of Wisconsin, the No. 1 milk-producing State, was about 18 billion pounds.

Despite a 2-billion-pound increase in production over the previous year, however, there was a 2½-percent decrease in the consumption of milk.

According to predictions, the output will be higher for 1962—possibly amounting to 127 billion pounds nationally, unless realistic creative actions are taken to increase consumption, as well as to find other constructive utilization for milk, we can expect even greater surpluses.

Believing that Secretary Freeman's remarks deserve the consideration of Congress, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROLE OF MILK IN THE AMERICAN DIET

(Address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman prepared for delivery at the National Conference on Milk and Nutrition, Inter-Departmental Auditorium, Constitution Ave., Washington, D.C., January 23, 1962, 9:30 a.m.)

Abraham Lincoln, in recommending the Department of Agriculture be established, said it would be the department of the people. His words of 100 years ago were never more true than they are today. We are meeting here at a conference called to discuss a question in which the interest of all the people—the farmer, consumer, businessman, and worker—are closely entwined.

It is a question which began to be heard last spring when, for the first time, it was noticed that milk consumption on an overall basis was declining nationwide. By the end of the year, the trend was clearly established. The consumer had used about 3 billion pounds less of milk than in 1960.

And like all basic changes in our complex society, this one affects all the people—the farmer, consumer, businessman and worker. It is important that we know why this happened and what its effect will be.

The dairy industry in the past decade has seen many changes, but the magnitude of this particular development was totally unexpected. Let us then stand back a step and take a careful look at what is taking place in the dairy industry and what it means.

Like all other farming occupations, dairying has undergone a quiet, but dramatic, revolution in the productive capacity of the individual farmer.

During the 5 years between 1954 and 1959, for example, 4 out of every 10 dairy farms ceased to operate as milk producers. Those farmers who remained in dairying, however, added one cow on the average for every three already in the herd. And, every one of those milk cows produced in 1959 a gallon and a half of milk for every gallon and a quarter in 1954.

Until 1961, the increase in population generally consumed the increase.

What has happened in the dairy industry is being repeated, of course, in the production of virtually every farm commodity. It has meant that while 32 out of every 100 farmers left agriculture during the decade of the 1950's, output per hour of farmwork has tripled.

As a result, with fewer people and fewer acres in production, the American farmer—spurred on by the new developments in technology and the discoveries of science—can actually produce more food and fiber than ever before.

The end is not even within sight. A study made recently by agricultural experts here in the Department predicts that by 1980, American agriculture will be able to meet all its commitments at home and abroad with 50 million fewer acres than are being cultivated today.

I believe most people would concede that under such conditions as have existed and will exist, the farmer is being subjected to unique economic pressures.

But in dairying, a third force has been added. Instead of a steady, gradual increase in consumption to be expected with a growing population, the total volume of milk and dairy products used by Americans has decreased this past year.

This development has implications far beyond the immediate economic effect on agriculture, on those who handle milk and dairy products and those who look to the dairy farmer as a market for production machinery and material.

Its most serious implication may well be in the long-term effect it can have on the health and vigor of the people and the Nation.

If there are times when it may appear that the Department is overly concerned with the economic prospects of the farmer, let it be understood that our responsibility is to the whole population, with strong emphasis on the problems of the farmers.

I am concerned when a new—and unexpected—development arises which will affect a complex industry. If this development brings a change which will benefit the Nation but requires an adjustment, then we should seek ways to make the adjustment with as little disruption and dislocation as possible.

If, however, a development occurs for reasons which are not clearly established or for which there is no broad agreement scientifically, then I am concerned lest we force adjustments which we will later regret.

I am particularly concerned when anything as basic as nutritional health could be placed in potential jeopardy.

I am sure these are some of the questions which also trouble you, and I hope that through this conference today we can begin to explore them and to direct wider public attention to them.

Let me outline in brief some of the specific areas of concern:

First, we have become extremely weight conscious in this country in recent years. If the drop in milk consumption is related to this question, we ought to be greatly concerned. Weight control involves the extent to which we use our muscles as well as the amount of food we eat. Food alone should not be expected to carry the entire burden. Insofar as we reduce calorie intake, it should be of foods important cheifly for calories—not of foods that carry indispensable proteins, minerals, and vitamins. The American people should not make wrong changes in their dietary habits to prevent or cure obesity.

Nutritional authorities tell us that we need to know much more than we do today about the place of butter and other kinds of fat in meeting the nutritional needs of people. They also tell us that there should be no drastic modification in diets until nutritional research can point the way with more certainty and in more detail. We know that extremes in amount used of any one kind of food may lead to trouble. Moderation and variety are two words to remember in thinking about the relationship of diet and long-term well-being.

Unquestionably, there are many people who, on competent medical advice, must certainly follow special diets. But there are countless others—both young and old—who now do not receive adequate nutrition, particularly those essential building blocks of life for which milk is the best and most convenient source. Infants and growing children especially need milk and dairy products in their diet because of the large amounts of calcium and high-quality protein required to keep up with the growth needs.

Milk contains three important nutrients—calcium, riboflavin, and protein, in addition to other essential food elements—which people get too little of for their best nutritional health, and usually because they do not get enough milk.

In fact, milk makes it easy to get the calcium and riboflavin we need. In this Nation's food supplies, milk provides about two-thirds of all the calcium, nearly half of the riboflavin, and a fourth of the protein.

Another reason that milk is a necessary food source is that it contains many different nutrients in highly beneficial balance which meet one of the basic requirements of good health. The nutrients work together efficiently to meet the body's needs.

The decline in milk consumption last year was small when compared with the total supply of milk—barely 2.5 percent. But coming at a time when it is known that milk and dairy products help fill essential nutritional needs, I think everybody should be concerned.

The second area of concern relates to the basic responsibility of the Department to the generations of the future—to insure the productivity capability of our farming resources and to provide adequate food at reasonable cost.

The soil and water resources of this Nation, together with the most efficient system of agriculture history has yet known—the family farm—have helped make the American the best nourished person of all time.

The dairy industry has a vital share in the mission of American agriculture, for dairy products are a dependable and economical source of good nutrition.

The dairy farm is an exceptionally efficient means of utilizing soil and water resources to meet human needs. The dairy cow can crop the land that is too steep, too soft, too irregular for the plow and combine. Grassland agriculture yields abundant harvests of meat and milk, without the cost to the future of erosion and soil exhaustion.

The dairy industry—from farm and barn to grocery shelf and the kitchen refrigerator—performs an industrial and economic miracle. It furnishes consumers with basic food products that are highly perishable, yet reach the consumer fresh and pure and at moderate cost.

It encompasses more independent and competing enterprises than any other single industry in our economy. There are about 1 million farmers who sell milk, and over 400,000 of them receive more than half their income from dairying. Cash receipts from dairying last year were almost $5 billion. The processing and handling of dairy products before they reach the retail level provides jobs for almost 300,000 persons with an annual payroll of more than $1.3 billion.

The dairy industry is a worthy example of American agriculture, and it should be maintained and strengthened. Thus, anything which may cause it to change should be considered seriously and with cold logic, for it is a vital and highly integrated part of our national economy.

If its products endanger national health, then we should not be afraid to face that fact and the adjustments it entails; but we should not be so fearful of the unknown that we hasten to make a change which in itself may damage the physical health of our people and the economic health of the Nation.

I believe the industry already recognizes that the impact of science and technology on dairying has created a situation where the dairy farmer receives less for his investment and labor than do most other agricultural producers. For example, the return per hour of work for the operator and his family in 1960 in the major dairy regions of the country varies from less than 50 cents an hour to no higher than 67 cents.

There is a growing realization that the adjustment which will provide greater economic reward, while reducing Government expenditures to stabilize milk prices, is a program of supply management.

Thus, the industry is willing to consider changes which will improve the economic health of their industry and their community, and which will insure an adequate supply of milk and dairy products while reducing the cost of Government programs.

But, given the weight of all available evidence as to the nutritional needs of the American people, the adjustments which may be required by the current drop in consumption and the increasing productive capacity must include vigorous efforts to encourage the use of milk in the interest of good and balanced nutrition for our population.

That also is the purpose of this conference—to explore the opportunities which our abundance of milk and dairy products gives to us to raise our dietary standards, and to improve the health and vitality of our people.

I can only underscore the importance of the task you will soon undertake by saying that your concern as well as mine is shared by the President. He has felt this strongly, and we are honored that he would come personally to be with us and to speak to us.

With his leadership, we can, I believe, begin to place many of the forces now affecting the health of our people as well as the economic future of dairying in a much clearer perspective.

European Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, during late November and early December 1961, at the direction of Chairman VINSON, of the House Committee on Armed Services, I visited Western Europe and the Near East for the purpose of making an on-the-spot evaluation of U.S. and Allied defense forces and other factors that affect our future peace and security.

NEED FOR INSPECTIONS

Let me say at the outset of this brief report, Mr. Speaker, that this trip has convinced me more than ever that it is of the utmost importance for Members of Congress to go abroad for the purpose of seeing for themselves what is going on, how our money is being spent and which of our programs should be dropped, improved or continued as is. We simply cannot sit here in Washington making decisions for spending huge sums of tax money for defense and foreign aid with information received solely from Government employees or members of our armed services. Some of our friends delight in calling these inspections "junkets"—or even worse. Some take particular pleasure in heaping scorn and ridicule on those Members who travel outside the country to find out what is going on. These same people, however, are always the first to blame Congress for failures in our oversea programs. All Members should be urged to find out firsthand what is going on in the world at every opportunity.

GENERAL

These countries were visited: Great Britain, France, West Germany, East Germany, Italy, Israel, Jordan, and Spain. By using commercial airlines, buses, railroads, subways, taxis, and trolleys almost entirely, it was possible for me to see Europe as the average traveler sees it and also to meet and talk with the man on the street wherever I went. Inspections were made of all NATO and American defense installations in the areas covered. Discussions were held with Allied and American military and civilian personnel of varying levels of command and rank. However, my conversations and observations were by no means limited to the military sphere alone. Many civilians in each country visited helped to give me an all-round, balanced picture of local conditions.

It was my good fortune to have as my military escort, Lt. Col. Harry J. Salsbury, U.S. Army, who proved to be an unusually able and perceptive officer. His excellent planning, guidance, and counsel throughout this tour was invaluable to me.

EUROPE

Mr. Speaker, Berlin, without question, was the most tense place in Europe. My stay there was marked by long talks with Allied and U.S. military and civil officials, as well as with West Germans and even some East Germans, too. At my own request, I inspected the entire length of the wall separating East from West Berlin which was constructed last August by the Communists. The feelings aroused by the wall are impossible to describe. Nothing in modern history quite compares with it. To me, it is a sign of Communist weakness, not strength; of their failure, not success. Somehow it makes one feel that the Communist world must be the largest concentration camp ever known to mankind or there would be no wall or barbed wire. The contrast between free, prosperous, and progressive West Berlin on one side of the wall and drab, dull, and disillusioned East Berlin on the other is the most dramatic tribute to free enterprise and initiative in the world today.

By permitting the East Germans, under Soviet goading, to construct this wall unchallenged, we enabled them to stop for all practical purposes the flow of skilled workers and professional people to the West; to effectively halt the flow of information to us from behind the Iron Curtain; to pull down a shade before the eyes of millions of persons behind the Iron Curtain who had looked enviously at our "showcase of freedom" in West Berlin.

NEAR EAST

The visit to Israel and Jordan, my first to the Near East, was a revelation. Most Israelis are European refugees of varied backgrounds. The spirit and mood of the people closely resemble that here in the United States. The State of Israel, with a population of 2 million, has a land area about the size of New Jersey.

While there, I talked with Gen. Moshe Dayan; Shimon Peres, Deputy Minister of Defense; Nathan Bar-Yaakov, director of the U.S. desk in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; and Israel Meir, his assistant. I also had an opportunity to hear Prime Minister Ben-Gurion eloquently address the Knesset—Parliament. About 25 percent of the people in Israel live in kibbutzes, or communal cooperatives, which are organized usually for agricultural purposes. As Israel improves economically, and personal income rises, these kibbutzes may not be as widely used in the future as they are now, according to local opinion.

It is almost impossible to visualize a nation that has received so few of nature's favors as has Israel. Centuries ago, the land was almost entirely denuded of its forests. There are no real fresh water resources except those shared with unfriendly neighbor nations. That is why the inexpensive desalination of sea water, when available, will have such great future significance. Not only are the nations on all of their borders potential enemies, but a sizable and restless Arab minority lives within Israel.

Financial help from the sale of Israel bonds in the United States, reparations from West Germany, and foreign aid from us have helped immensely in the surprising development of trade, industry, and agriculture.

This small, new nation is a monument to man's determination to live free from persecution and prejudice no matter how great the hardships. Mr. Speaker, the spirit there is very contagious and exhilarating.

The atmosphere in Jordan, on the other hand, I found to be most depressing. Its people are poorly clothed, schools are few, health standards are low and the economy seems to be standing still. Quite a contest to busy Israel.

Here are brief summaries of my findings in the military, economic, and political fields.

MILITARY

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces are in excellent condition, admirably trained and well armed. The basic concept of NATO is as sound and valid as ever. The quality of the leadership, contributed by all of the nations, remains very high.

Unfortunately, there is a general misconception in the United States with respect to the relative strength of NATO in comparison with the Soviet bloc in conventional military ground forces. Americans must face the fact that the combined conventional strength of the U.S.S.R. and its satellites considerably exceeds ours on the land mass of Europe.

I found the morale of American forces was high. However, as new U.S. troops arrive, this morale is declining for the simple reason that new arrivals are forbidden to bring their dependents with them, while those servicemen whose families are already there are permitted to keep their families with them for the duration of their tour of duty. Just what caused this order to be issued is unclear. Because it was issued in October, it could not be based on fear of war as a result of the August-built Berlin wall. If it is an economy move, it is a most unwise one. This order does more harm than good and should be rescinded.

No real evidence of imminent conflict could be found in Europe that would justify the abrupt action by the President last October when he called up reserve units and individuals. There was administrative failure to use good judgment in excusing hardship cases. The lack of preparation at many installations for the proper use, equipping and training of the reserves called was inexcusable. This must not happen again.

ECONOMIC

It is in the economic field where the most dramatic changes have occurred in Europe in the last few years. The six-nation European Common Market has without doubt brought great gains to the member nations, and additional nations may soon join. There is virtually full employment in the Common Market area, where the rate of economic growth now exceeds both that of the United States and the Soviet Union. Spain, although modest growth is evident there, lags far behind the Common Market countries economically.

The progress and prosperity of the free enterprise system in Europe is proving to be the greatest stumbling block for the Communists to overcome in their attempts to subvert modern industrial nations. This most likely explains why their efforts are now primarily directed at new and underdeveloped nations.

POLITICAL

It is now evident to all who follow the international scene that there are deepening divisions between men and nations in the whole Communist world. To exploit these divisions, our own policies must be clear and strong.

There is a general disillusionment with the United Nations throughout Western Europe. No longer is the U.N. regarded there as the major instrument for finding solutions to the world's really knotty problems. The U.N.'s tolerance of aggression in the name of anticolonialism, the fiscal irresponsibility of many of its members and the uncertain voting record of some of the new, small, undeveloped, member nations, have made it progressively more ineffective in the eyes of many officials in London, Paris, Bonn, and Rome.

The importance of West Berlin to the free world as a symbolic island of freedom more than a hundred miles inside the Communist empire is greater than ever. West Berliners, as well as U.S. and allied military personnel, are still bewildered by our permitting the unchallenged construction of the wall. Berlin is the world's most conspicuous testing ground for measuring our determination to prevent Russian takeover by the "slice-by-slice of the salami" method.

CONCLUSIONS

First. NATO is still a solid cornerstone for our European policy and the most effective means of checking Communist aggression. The leadership and training of NATO and American forces in Europe is excellent.

Second. Free Berlin must not be bartered away. If necessary it must be defended with all our resources. Failure to do so will encourage the Soviets to take over all of Europe. World confidence in the integrity of the United States would be destroyed for at least a generation.

Third. The regulations forbidding families from joining servicemen now being sent to Europe should be rescinded.

Fourth. The Reserve callup of last fall was unnecessary because no real emergency existed. Those reservists who are serving at great personal and family sacrifice should be relieved from active duty immediately and replaced by volunteers and draftees as needed.

Fifth. The growth, prosperity, and unity of the free world require us to explore every possible avenue of economic cooperation not only with the European Common Market but all other free and friendly nations everywhere.

Sixth. We must carefully reexamine the record of the United Nations to determine how it can be improved or what else we might do to help attain world peace and security.

BRIEFINGS CONDUCTED FOR CONGRESSMAN OSMERS

London, England: Adm. Harold P. Smith, commander in chief, U.S. Navy in Europe, and commander of the U.S. naval forces, Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean; Col. C. A. Thompson, deputy chief, MAAG/England; Mr. Frank Wisner, political division, American Embassy; Lt. Comdr. R. P. Sluyter, escort officer.

Paris, France: Gen. Lauris Norstad, SACEUR and commander in chief, EUCOM; Lt. Gen. E. H. Underhill, chief of staff, EUCOM; Mr. J. P. Perez, headquarters EUCOM, escort officer.

Heidelberg, Germany: Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, commander in chief, USAREUR; Maj. Gen. W. H. Nutter, chief of staff, USAREUR; Lt. Col. Lloyd W. Brown, U.S. Army, escort officer.

Frankfurt, Germany: Mr. Hugh T. Cunningham, political division, American Consulate.

Berlin, Germany: Maj. Gen. Albert Watson, U.S. commander, Berlin; Brig. Gen. Frederick O. Hartel, commanding general, Berlin command; Capt. F. J. Fogh, U.S. Army, escort officer.

Verona, Italy: Maj. Gen. Eugene F. Cardwell, commander in chief, SETAF.

Rome, Italy: Capt. R. H. Blair, U.S. Navy, deputy chief, MAAG/Italy; Maj. Madison D. Hartley, U.S. Air Force, escort officer.

Tel Aviv, Israel: Col. Bill J. Tutin, Army attaché; Maj. William H. Norris, assistant Army attaché.

Naples, Italy: Rear Adm. Donald T. Eller, acting chief of staff, AFSOUTH; Cmdr. B. B. Holt, escort officer. (Participating in briefing were officers from the United Kingdom, France, Italy, Greece and Turkey.)

Madrid, Spain: Col. Robert C. Williams, Army attaché; Brig. Gen. Gines Perez, U.S. Air Force, deputy chief, MAAG; Capt. James A. Smith, U.S. Navy, deputy chief, JUSMG; Col. Robert T. Calhoun, commander of Torrejon Air Base; Maj. Thomas F. Hogan, U.S. Air Force, escort officer.

Rota, Spain: Capt. H. T. Hazelton, commander in chief, Rota Naval Station; Capt. G. H. Webber, U.S. Navy; Lt. J. R. F. Bowers, U.S. Navy, escort officer; Comdr. James J. Mayer, U.S. Navy, escort officer.

Electrical Energy From Shasta Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Bureau of Reclamation and the Shasta Dam Area Public Utility District, which is in the Second Congressional District of California, concluded a contract permitting the district, an agency of local government, to continue to serve its community with dependable, reasonably priced electrical energy generated at Shasta Dam.

The Senator from California, CLAIR ENGLE, has expressed quite well my thoughts and those of the people in the vicinity of Shasta Dam concerning the ironic situation where the people living in the shadow of one of our greatest reclamation projects were experiencing difficulties obtain electrical energy from that project.

I respectfully request that Senator ENGLE's letter to the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, and an editorial published January 15, 1962, in the Sacramento Bee be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., January 23, 1962.

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary, Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR "STEW": Please read the enclosed editorial from the Sacramento Bee on the Central Valley project power contract recently executed with the Shasta Dam Area Public Utility District. I want you to know that I feel exactly the same about this contract.

It has the merit of continuing direct service to a public customer that has had direct service from Shasta Dam for 15 years; it eliminates the overload on the small Toyon transmission line; it follows the pattern of standard Reclamation power contracts in other areas; it is the least expensive way for the Government to serve the district and for the district to serve its customers; thereby saving money for both taxpayers and ratepayers—all without any Federal appropriation for construction.

I congratulate you and your staff and the district officials who worked it out.

With best personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

CLAIR ENGLE,
U.S. Senator.

VICTORY IN SHASTA

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall's action in signing a contract with the Shasta Dam Area Public Utility District should end that agency's long fight to get electric power directly from Shasta Dam.

The contract permits the district to build a transmission line from the Government's generating plant and to buy power on a 1 mill per kilowatt-hour discount basis, which is the same wheeling fee paid the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. for carrying power on its lines.

As Government contracts go this one is for peanuts. The line will be about 10 miles long and will cost around $180,000. The amount of power it will tap will be only a drop in the bucket compared with the total Shasta hydro output. But the principle is a big one.

The Shasta Dam Area Public Utility District, which includes the tiny communities of Central Valley, Project City, Toyon, and Summit City, has had to fight for its life every step of the way against the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and the private power lobby in Washington, D.C.

Citizens of these communities built the first line themselves but as the population grew so grew the need for a larger power allocation and bigger facilities. Federal funds for the line were included in the budget in 1959, but were withdrawn when the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. offered to wheel the power for a price.

Tiring of waiting for congressional action, the citizens took steps to do the job themselves. For their courageous battle and for their way of pulling themselves up by their own bootstraps, they deserve a round of applause.

Farm Price Fixers Are in the Saddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from an article in the Farmers Union Herald, November 20, 1961, by Mr. M. W. (Bill) Thatcher, general manager, Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn., and president, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives:

> We also have troubles in the Department of Agriculture. More and more this Department is moving into the field of marketing. Less and less do your cooperatives market your grain. We store grain for you and for the Government but more and more the Government takes grain out of storage and disposes of it in a socialistic fashion.

This quotation bears out my contention that in the midst of the somewhat confusing reports and policies of the present administration, one clear course seems to be emerging in the field of agriculture—an attempt at the Federal fixing of prices.

This is the only way that one can interpret the actions already taken by this administration as they affect agricultural prices and the requests for even greater authority in fixing farm prices.

It is rather an amazing situation which we find in Washington when on the one hand the Department of Justice is prosecuting the electrical equipment manufacturers because they are accused of fixing prices, and yet at the same time the powers of the Secretary of Agriculture are used to do exactly that. Not only that, but he is requesting additional authority to increase his scope of price fixing.

Step by step Secretary Freeman is attempting to destroy even the limited free market for agricultural commodities and to fix prices. Let us examine several examples of this effort:

First. When the emergency feed grain bill was before the Congress, many Congressmen including myself pointed to the fact that farmers were in the midst of marketing their 1960 crop of corn and other feed grains. There was fear that the Secretary of Agriculture would use the extraordinary powers proposed in that measure to force down the cash price of corn by the sale of tremendous Government stocks on the free market. The Secretary gave pious assurances that he would not do this. He said as follows:

> You may be sure that we will not administer this program so as to reduce the income received by farmers prior to October 1, 1961, from sales of feed grains from the 1960 crop, below that they would have received if this program had not been enacted.

However, as soon as the feed grain bill became law, the Secretary proceeded to sell tens of millions of bushels of feed grains under the pretext that this was corn "threatened with going out of condition." However, any reasonable analysis of the corn that was sold reflects the fact that much of it was No. 1 and No. 2 corn not subject to that threat.

The price fixers have caused the price of 1960 crop corn to be at least 10 cents a bushel below the level it should be—below what the free market would have paid. The price fixers have taken tens of millions of dollars out of the pockets of corn producers.

The objective was obvious—the objective was to break the price of corn in order to drive farmers into the new corn program.

Second. Never at any time has the merchandising operation of all segments of the grain trade, including the cooperatives, been in such great danger. The grain trade, not only has to face tough competition from other merchandisers, but also the greatest giant of them all—the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The grain marketing system in the United States, if allowed to function, is the most efficient of all organizations ever devised in the mind of man. The Department of Agriculture is moving more and more into the field of marketing. As the USDA expands its scope, there is less and less room for the merchandising operations of the normal grain trade, and by normal grain trade I mean both private firms and cooperatives.

The small country elevator who normally sold to a feed manufacturer or to a corn processing plant is being replaced by a Government bureaucrat who can sell corn directly. The assembler of corn is fearful of owning corn because he knows that Secretary Freeman in his anxiety to hurt the corn noncooperator—60 percent of the corn producers—can break the price, and as a matter of fact has already done so. He has forced the market price of corn down to only 58 percent of parity. In his own State of Minnesota he has forced the price down to the lowest in the Nation—83 cents per bushel.

Secretary Freeman goes around the country waving a banner marked "The Free Market Must Be Destroyed." No one—no farm organization—can support a man waving a flag designed for massive Government interference and price destruction.

The Secretary is buying corn at $1.20 per bushel plus interest, plus carrying charges, plus bureaucracy, and selling corn at less than $1 per bushel. What a travesty. For the first time in history we have a Secretary of Agriculture whose objective is to drive the price of corn down.

Third. What has this done to farmers? First, the prices received by farmers for all commodities during the 1961 marketing year were 79 percent of parity—the lowest in 22 years.

Second, the tremendous outpouring of corn from CCC stocks has forced corn prices down, and now livestock prices are following. The prices received by farmers for livestock items on December 15 were 8 percentage points below a year earlier. The Secretary has said in testimony before the House Agriculture Committee that cheap feed means cheap livestock. Unfortunately, he had accomplished both. Bear in mind that livestock provides 56 percent of cash farm income.

It is about time that the Secretary took stock of what he is doing to the American farmer and the highly delicate competitive system of marketing and merchandising grain. The bureaucrat with an unlimited checkbook should not be allowed to substitute for the private and cooperative grain trade.

We built the greatest agricultural system in the world by producing for demand, now that the Federal farm price fixers are in the saddle we see this magnificent system threatened by a philosophy that advocates producing for Government.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 26, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I Samuel 12: 24: *Fear the Lord, and serve Him in truth with all your heart: for consider what great things He hath done for you.*

Almighty God, grant that we may be more worthy and appreciative of the blessings of Thy grace and goodness with which Thou art daily supplying our many needs.

Show us how we may courageously use and implement those spiritual values and virtues of faith, hope, and love which Thou hast ordained for the building of a finer social order and a nobler civilization.

May our President, our Speaker, and all the Members of this legislative body be guided in some special way by the eternal truth and wisdom of God.

Hear us in the name of Him who is our Redeemer and Saviour, our Lord and Master. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 157. An act to change the name of the Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif., to the Marina del Rey, Los Angeles, Calif.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6025. An act to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of George Edward Barnhart against the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1760. An act to establish the Great Basin National Park in Nevada, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 2470) entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BIBLE, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. ALLOTT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. **BOGGS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE DONALD G. NUTTER, GOVERNOR OF MONTANA

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. **OLSEN**. Mr. Speaker, the people of Montana, and indeed the entire country, were shocked today by the news of the tragic death of Donald G. Nutter, the Governor of Montana.

Governor Nutter was killed yesterday evening in a plane crash in a mountain canyon north of Helena, capital city of Montana.

Killed along with the Governor were his executive secretary, Dennis B. Gordon; Montana Agriculture Commissioner Edward C. Wren, and a three-man crew of Cliff Hansen, Andy Devine, and C. W. Ballard.

The news was terribly shocking and saddening to me, too.

Governor Nutter and I represented opposing political parties—and opposing philosophies of what is the best government for Montana and America.

But no one would deny that he was a good Christian and an able leader. Governor Nutter was aggressive and outspoken in the beliefs he stood for—and he never wavered from them.

Above all, he was an honorable and an honest man.

A Republican, the Governor took office 1 year ago this month. Before his election, he was a lawyer in Sidney, Mont., a State senator from his county for two terms and Montana State Republican chairman.

It is a terrible irony that an airplane took his life. For he had given so much of his life in behalf of his country, as a B-24 bomber pilot during World War II.

He had a distinguished war record. He flew 62 combat missions and had more than 500 hours of combat time. He spent nearly 4 years in the old Army Air Corps, 13 months of that time in the China-Burma-India theater.

And he was the holder of the Air Medal with clusters and the Distinguished Flying Cross with clusters.

In short, his was a lifetime of unstinting public service.

I wish to express my deepest sympathy and regrets to the Governor's family and to the families of the men who died with him. Montana will miss him, I will miss him, his country will miss him.

Mr. **BATTIN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BATTIN**. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, January 25, the State of Montana and the Nation lost a great man when a National Guard C-47 crashed near Wolf Creek, Mont., and killed Gov. Donald G. Nutter. Also killed in this tragic accident were Dennis Gordon, his administrative assistant, Ed Wren, the commissioner of agriculture from Montana, Cliff Hansen, the pilot, Andy Devine, the copilot, and Sgt. C. W. Ballard, a member of the crew.

This is a great personal loss to me, for I had known the Governor for many years, worked closely with him in the arena of politics, and had been associated with him in a social and friendly way.

Governor Nutter was a man of determination. During World War II he was a B-24 pilot and flew 62 combat missions and had more than 500 hours of combat time. He spent 39 months in the old Army Air Corps, 13 months of that time in the China-Burma-India theater. He was holder of the Air Medal with clusters, as well as the Distinguished Flying Cross with clusters.

After coming home from the war and at rather a late age in life, the Governor went to the University of Montana where he was graduated in law. Don practiced law for a number of years in Sidney, Mont., and was very active in community affairs. He served in the State Senate of Montana for two terms and was the State Republican chairman.

He was a man of strong convictions and complete dedication to his country. He was at times controversial, but this never stopped him from doing what he felt was in the best interest of the State and Nation.

In his personal life Governor Nutter was a good husband, a good father, and devoted to the things that all of us envy. He was a Christian man who believed in God and the hereafter and acted during his life in such a way that he did honor to his family, his church, and his community.

Don was fortunate to have married his wife, Maxine, and together they charted a course and worked harmoniously.

Don and Maxine's son, Johnny, is a wonderful boy, who, I am sure, will take the lessons of his father and carry on in a tradition that will be a credit to his father and mother.

Words at a time like this are hard to come by and seem so inadequate. My family and I, as well as the other people of Montana and the Nation who had the pleasure of knowing Donald G. Nutter, extend to his family and his loved ones their sincere sympathy in this, perhaps their greatest hour of need.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD, and that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life, character, and public service of Governor Nutter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

BOTH POLITICAL PARTIES SHOULD ABOLISH THEIR NATIONALITIES DIVISIONS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, within the last 48 hours we have witnessed a flareup of political discussions debating the problem of minorities and the use of that problem for political purposes.

These discussions do not contribute to the unity of the American people which is so vitally necessary at this critical hour of our national existence.

It is this thought that prompts me to rise today and to make a proposal to all Members of this House and to the two great political parties they represent. I assure you that I am making this proposal in complete sincerity and only after the most careful consideration.

I propose that the Democratic National Committee and the Republican National Committee abolish their nationalities divisions.

I make this proposal not in the interest of the Democratic Party, surely not in the interest of the Republican Party, nor in the interest of any other political group or faction. I make it only in the interest of our country, an interest which all of us recognize should always supersede party interests, as vital as those interests are—and should be—to all of us.

I make this proposal because I believe that the nationalities divisions of our political parties are bad for our country. They are a divisive influence. They are an indirect, but nevertheless formal, recognition of an unsupportable thesis—the idea that certain groups in this country have legitimate interests based on ties with foreign countries. This thesis I reject, as I am sure all of you do.

The citizens of this country—all of them—no matter where born, or when, and no matter how recently they have become residents of the United States—are Americans. As such, their devotion and loyalty should be to the United States only. When they voice their opinions on matters of policy or legislation, it should be as Americans with the welfare of this country a primary concern.

The retention of the nationalities divisions by the Democratic and Republican Parties is incongruous and paradoxical, to say the least, in view of these same parties' platforms and proclamations over the years. For about as long as I can remember, both parties have been decrying and denouncing special interests; they have been denouncing and expressing horror at discrimination, segregation, and every other departure from full equality for all citizens which is based on race, creed, color, nationality, or any similar factor.

How and why, then, can they—and should they—retain institutions based on the proposition that various groups of Americans are basically different, unequal in their national interest, unequal in their patriotism, and needful of special appeals based on the accident of foreign birth or parentage to make them support one American political party rather than another, or one policy or bill rather than another?

Can the Democratic and Republican Parties retain their nationalities division and, at the same time, claim that they are being consistent with their repeatedly proclaimed opposition to discrimination of all kinds? I think not.

The formal emphasis on national origins implicit in the existence of the nationalities divisions is completely contrary to the tradition and spirit of this Nation and its Constitution—the idea that no citizen should be tested at any time, on any matter, on the mere basis of nationality, race, or religion.

The nationalities divisions are, as I said before, divisive. Certainly, we do not want mere conformity in this country, but our Nation, like all nations, if it is to survive, needs a certain homogeneity and solidarity within its body politic. All its citizens, particularly those of foreign birth, need to be fully integrated into American life—politically, culturally, and socially.

The tendency of the nationalities divisions is to delay and retard this integration. They foster the retention of interests based on non-American factors—factors which, in some instances, are contrary to the best interests of our country. They have a tendency to perpetuate rather than end the idea that a person is a German-American, Irish-American, Italian-American or Chinese-American—with emphasis on the German, Irish, Italian or Chinese rather than on the American—when, of course, they should be Americans first and foremost.

It has now become trite to say that this country is a melting pot. Nevertheless, it is that to a very great extent. All of us will readily grant that this Nation has been greatly enriched by contributions from the many national cultures represented in this melting pot. At the same time, however, because this country is a melting pot with very large groups of citizens from numerous other nations, all of us must see that the preservation within these groups of interests and ties based on foreign countries, is surely harmful and could be dangerous. On the basis of birth and ancestry alone, there are very large groups in the United States who have such differing and, in some cases, strongly conflicting interests, that it is impossible to develop a logical and consistent foreign policy based on those interests and also the best interests of the United States.

I do not claim that this condition exists today but there can be no doubt that, in certain periods of our history, on certain issues, foreign interests of this type have worked to the detriment of the United States.

I want to make it clear that I do not believe that such interests always work contrary to our Nation's welfare. On some occasions they have unquestionably served the best interests of our country. The point I want to emphasize, however, is that whether these interests have been good or bad for the United States, they were based on foreign ties rather than our own country's welfare—and that is not good.

I am not so naive as to believe that new citizens of this country can forget—immediately and completely—their homelands and their ties to them. I do not want them to do so, for such would be contrary to human nature. But I do believe that, without question, their political ties with the old country should be severed just as soon—and as completely—as possible.

There is no nation in the world that has as many foreign-language publications as the United States has. I believe these publications serve a definite purpose. They are a means by which new citizens, unfamiliar with our tongue, can inform themselves about their new homeland, the United States, and keep abreast of developments in this country and throughout the world. Without these publications, our newly arrived citizens from non-English-speaking countries would be deprived of a valuable aid in helping them know and love America.

One of our defense needs today is better and more widespread knowledge of foreign languages. Our foreign language press is an aid to progress in meeting this need. At the same time, however, I believe all of us would agree that foreign-language publications, when they impede and retard the integration of the foreign born into the American way of life and serve as excuses for failure to learn our language—as they sometimes do—then such publications take on a not so desirable aspect. As instruments for teaching a second language in the United States, they are good. As instruments for impeding the learning of English, they are bad—for knowledge of this country's language is vital to full integration and understanding of our way of life.

It is also true that first-generation children resent the use of foreign-language newspapers by their parents when their parents, after years of residence here, have not learned the English language and do not read American newspapers. This creates in first-generation children a feeling that they and their parents are still somewhat foreign and not quite completely American—particularly if these publications are critical of the United States primarily because of their interest in a certain foreign nation.

The nationalities divisions of our political parties tend to strengthen the foreign-ties element in the foreign-language press. Their existence is an additional influence working against the full integration of the foreign born. This is another reason they should be abolished.

I think we should also face up to the fact that, to a great extent, the nationalities divisions exist for only one reason—to get the Polish or the Italian, the Puerto Rican, Irish, Spanish, Chinese, Mexican, or some other nationality vote, for one or the other of our political parties.

I say that the only vote the Democratic or Republican Parties should be interested in is the American vote.

There are other reasons why the nationalities division should be abolished. For one thing, many minorities in this country resent—and properly resent—propaganda aimed at them on the basis of their foreign birth. They perceive that such propaganda is actually an indication that they are not fully accepted as Americans, that they are somehow different and not quite in the same fold as the native born and those with deep roots in this country. The very existence of the nationalities divisions is comparable to our political parties saying to such people: "We want your vote, but we know you are not really completely American. Therefore, we have to appeal to you through non-American issues."

The functions of the nationalities divisions are an insult to these people who consider themselves as good Americans as anyone else and who want others to do the same.

Obviously, of course, those who are accepted as 100-percent American by the Democratic and Republican Parties also resent such propaganda. In it they see political parties—for sheer political gain—appealing to minority groups which are not quite fully American, and trying to corral their bloc votes on some non-American issues. This tends to foster prejudice against the national minorities, thus creating further divisive influence within our national life.

Another reason why they should be abolished is because the nationalities divisions are an indirect aid to the U.S. Communist Party and to Moscow.

A basic Communist tactic is the old one of divide and conquer. Today the Communists are trying not only to split the United States from its allies and thus destroy NATO, SEATO, and our other international defense alliances but they are also, as in the past, continuing their efforts to fragmentize society within each target country.

The U.S. Communist Party in its fragmentation work strives to pit labor against management, religion against religion, Negro against white, civilians against the military, youth against adults. It also endeavors to destroy our national unity—and thus weaken us for the kill—by splitting us on nationality lines, utilizing nationalities groups and foreign ties and interests to promote its subversive aims.

Let me cite an example. The International Workers Order was a Communist organization formed in the 1930's. Ostensibly, it was a fraternal benefit insurance society. It had about a score of subdivisions, each one designed to entrap American citizens on the basis of their foreign birth or parentage. For those of Spanish lineage there was the Cervantes Society; for Russians, the American-Russian Fraternal Society; for Croats, the Croation-Benevolent Fraternity; for Jews, the Jewish Peoples Fraternal Order; for Greeks, the Hellenic-American Brotherhood; for Poles, the Polonia Society, and so on down the line, embracing as I said before, about a score of national minorities in this country.

What did these IWO societies do? They sold cheap insurance. This was their bait. But they also peddled Communist propaganda which was based in large part on their members' ties with their home countries and was designed to promote among them a feeling of resentment against the United States, of sympathy for communism, and of separateness from other Americans, thus preventing their development as loyal American citizens.

Another example: the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, the oldest extant Communist front in the United States. Its origin dates back to the 1920's. The primary purpose of this group is to provide legal and financial assistance to foreign-born Communists who run afoul of the laws of the United States, to prevent their deportation if possible and generally to weaken our immigration laws, particularly as regards their security provisions.

This group has an additional function, however—that of preventing the foreign born from becoming fully integrated into American society. This group's literature exaggerates the difficulties new arrivals and the foreign born have in this country. It harps on the theme that they are second-class citizens and fosters antagonism toward the Government within nationalities groups. Its very name is an implication that the foreign born need protection from the U.S. Government.

In order to promote its fragmentation work, the Communist Party has set up numerous other fronts based on the national origins of various groups in this country. Along the same lines, it has established a string of foreign language, Communist-controlled newspapers and magazines. The purpose of these publications, as well as of the party's nationality fronts, is to make the various nationality groups a dissident faction residing in the United States rather than true citizens of this country. Through these publications and fronts the Communist Party tries to develop within these groups loyalty to the country of their birth if it is Communist-controlled, sympathy for Communist elements within that country if Moscow has not yet succeeded in conquering it and, of course, sympathy for the Soviet Union and the Communist Party in this country.

The international Communist apparatus is also active in this same fragmentation work on nationality lines in the United States. A large part of the millions of items of propaganda literature sent into this country each year from Moscow, Peiping, Prague and other Communist centers is printed in foreign languages and makes appeals based largely on foreign ties.

A top Communist Party official, in his report to the 15th national convention of the U.S. Communist Party, stated:

> The largest single force in the key industries of the country are the nationality groups of the first and second generations * * *.
>
> How to forge the united front and win the first and second generations of the nationality groups, not only in the economic issues but also in the fight for peace, poses a very special problem.

This statement, I believe, is an indication of how much emphasis the U.S. party of treason places on subversion built along nationality lines. As many of you know, the Communist Party, like the Democratic and Republican Parties, has a special nationalities group. It is called the nationalities commission.

Realistically, we must face the fact that, in some respects, the United States—because it is a melting pot—is more vulnerable to Moscow's fragmentation techniques than many other target countries in the world which are our allies. This country, for example, does not have the same racial unity which characterizes Japan, Italy, Greece, Turkey, and many other nations. Compared to these countries, ours is a young polyglot nation made up primarily of immigrants from other parts of the world, particularly Europe. For this reason, Moscow and its U.S. arm carry on more fragmentation work along nationality lines in the United States than in any other country. This explains why the Communist Party always opposes any restrictions on immigration. It always wants a large new element in the U.S. population, hoping that this element will provide it with opportunity for successful fragmentation work.

Realistically, too, we must face the fact that the retention of nationalities divisions by the Republican and Democratic National Committees assists this Communist activity, at least indirectly.

It is indeed ironic that, in a certain sense, the Republican and Democratic Parties have these divisions for the same reason that the Communist Party does—to get the support of the nationality groups—and that, like the Communists' nationalities commission, they serve to divide and fragmentize our society. It is also unfortunately true that, in the past, some Members of the Congress have addressed functions of our nationalities divisions, have girded themselves with the armor of the angels by decrying discrimination based on "race, creed, color, or national origin" as cruel, immoral, wicked, undemocratic, and intolerable and then, after thus winning the emotional support of their listeners, have proceeded to attack the security laws of this Nation on the specious ground that they are based on prejudice and discrimination.

Would anyone here say that such actions were in the national interest—and that our political parties should provide platforms for such performances?

Finally, the nationalities divisions should be abolished because they tend to foster pride of foreign nationality rather than of U.S. citizenship. Admittedly, every nation on earth has its heroes and histories of which every one of their citizens can be justly proud—as long as they are citizens of those nations. But again, citizens of the United States should take pride and they should glory primarily in the heroes and history of this country. The nationalities division, by playing up the foreign element in the backgrounds of large groups in this country, militate against this.

In 1956, the late Antonio M. Fernandez, Representative at Large from New Mexico, was asked to serve as a vice president and as the head of the Hispanic-American section of the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee. Mr. Fernandez declined the appointments, and resigned from the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee, saying that although he appreciated the honor, he could not accept it for both personal and political reasons. He wrote in part as follows to the executive director of the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee on July 28, 1956:

> For one thing, in my State political organization any political pressures along racial lines are frowned on by those of us who are not of English descent as well as by those who are. It is a very touchy subject, and as you may have already learned from other sources we prefer that insofar as the Spanish-speaking people in New Mexico are concerned, no overt efforts should be made to organize those people along nationality lines.

In 1957 I was invited to serve on the executive committee of the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee. I, too, declined the position for reasons which I informed the chairman of the Democratic National Committee "are as basic as the very title 'nationalities division.'"

I also stated in my letter:

> I have long opposed the concept of minority or nationality groups as entities somehow distinct from the American people as a whole. From this concept arises the notion that the interests of these different groups of Americans are at variance with the interests of the rest of the Nation and that these separate groups must be dealt with independently rather than as part of a unified people.
>
> Beyond this, I have found that men and women who have come to this country in search of a freer, better way of life take pride in their membership in the American society and resent efforts to separate them from it.

The concluding paragraph of my letter stated:

> I think that if you will examine this matter more closely you will see that, in perpetuating the idea of nationalities and minorities, you are at the same time perpetuating an instrument of division among people whose greatest pride lies in becoming a part of our beloved Republic.

Gentlemen, if it is right and logical to have nationalities divisions in our political parties, then it is also right and logical to have a religions division, a racial division, and a color division which would subdivide, shall we say, into different sections for those of the white race, black race, and yellow race. I am sure, however, that under no conditions would the Democratic or Republican Parties today agree to the formation of such groups. We recognize, it seems, discrimination based on religion, race, or color, but, largely for political reasons, we have blinded ourselves to discrimination based on national origin.

I think the time has come for all of us to ask ourselves if we are really against discrimination based solely on a man's race, religion, or national origin. If we are, let us stop our indirect fostering of such discrimination and division. Let us end the life of our nationalities divisions which are no more than instruments for the preservation of such division and discrimination and which, by their very existence, make a mockery of the professed platforms of our two great political parties.

GOVERNMENT CENSORSHIP OF TOP MILITARY EXPERTS

Mr. **ARENDS.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ARENDS.** Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt in any of our minds today as to why we must have the best possible weapons and equipment in all of the Armed Forces—locked as we are in vital competition with the Communists. Without a doubt our ability to maintain a qualitative weapon superiority over the Reds may mean our survival for years to come.

The Communist offensive has forced nations that glory in free institutions to join in defending these priceless values. This is why—and the simple, sole and irrefutable reason—we and our allies arm to counter the Communist threat. Since the days of the bloody Red revolution, the Soviets have ceaselessly increased their weapon capabilities against the day when, in Khrushchev's words, they will bury us.

We must field new and improved weapons systems more rapidly if we are to retain a military advantage over the Soviets and with it the military strength and flexibility to support a viable and effective foreign policy.

Diplomatic dealing without powerful cards is always bluff at best and cannot stand a showdown.

I believe that if we surrender certain of our rights today, then inevitably, and soon, we shall lose what rights remain.

My remarks, up to this point, are not original. I cannot take credit for a single word that I have spoken. But I fervently believe in the truth and validity of every word.

What I have just read was made up of paragraphs that were deleted or drastically changed by Government censors from the speeches of Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Army Research and Development. These paragraphs are not classified and appeared in the New York Times of January 25.

I have engaged in this exercise to show the foolishness of what passes for Government censorship of our top military experts, and to underscore the important message that former President Eisenhower sent to the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee. As General Eisenhower has written, "Those of us who over the years have had to deal directly with the Communist leaders and system believe—unanimously, I think—that the more our people can be brought to comprehend the all-encompassing nature of the threat, the stronger will be our determination to preserve freedom at home, and the greater will be our national willingness to sacrifice to advance freedom throughout the world."

I deeply regret the remarks of President Kennedy at his press conference—January 24—in defense of party-line expressions being dictated to our topmost military officials. The contrary opinion of General Eisenhower has my wholehearted support. I feel President Kennedy has been ill advised on this subject.

MIRACLE OF MOUNT ELBERT

Mr. **ASPINALL.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ASPINALL.** Mr. Speaker, the American public is well known for its generosity in donating to a multitude of deserving causes almost every day of the year. Every once in awhile, one of these projects stands out from the other worthy causes because it catches the imagination and pulls at the heartstrings of America. One such fund-raising project is now underway, prompted by the recent and tragic snow avalanche in my district in the State of Colorado. The project, sponsored by the radio station, KBRR, the newspaper, the Herald Democrat, and the American Legion Post No. 7 in the community of Leadville, Colo., is called: the Miracle of Mount Elbert. As my colleagues may know, on Sunday, January 21, 1962, a snow avalanche swept down from Mount Elbert crushing a number of cabins and resulting in the death of seven persons. A man and his wife survived under all that snow and, though injured, were subsequently rescued. Their two sons and another family of five, perished. Also dug out from under the snow was a dog that, shortly after rescue, gave birth to seven puppies. Those seven puppies are being auctioned to the highest bidders on a nationwide scale with all moneys going toward paying expenses and establishing a welfare fund for the two survivors. The victims cannot be restored to life, but perhaps this project can, in some measure, supply hope and courage for the saddened parents. I commend this project to the attention of my colleagues and Americans everywhere.

ELMER B. STEVENS, RESIDENT ENGINEER, THATCHER FERRY BRIDGE PROJECT

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks, and include an article.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the October 6, 1961, issue of the Panama Canal Review, the official magazine published in Balboa Heights, C.Z., by the Panama Canal Company, there appears a very informative and interesting article concerning Elmer B. Stevens, the efficient engineer acting for and on behalf of the Panama Canal Company in the construction of the Thatcher Ferry Bridge across the Panama Canal at Balboa.

The name bestowed by Congress on this great inter-American bridge enterprise honors former Congressman Maurice H. Thatcher, only surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, and former Member of this body; and also in historic perpetuation of the name of the Thatcher Ferry across the canal, which will be supplanted by the bridge when completed.

The bridge is being constructed to carry out agreements between our Government and that of Panama, made in recent years. The entire Thatcher Ferry Bridge project, with the approaches involved, will be constructed at an estimated cost of $20 million.

Representative Thatcher, while serving in the Congress, was the author of legislation which provided for the establishment of the indicated ferry and connecting west side zone roadway—the ferry and roadway being officially named in his honor because of his half century of service in and out of Congress, and formerly as Commissioner and Civil Governor of the Canal Zone, in behalf of the Panama Canal enterprise and the entire Isthmus of Panama.

The carriageway of the bridge will be considerably over 300 feet above the mean sea level of the canal at the Pacific entrance of the canal, thus providing ample clearance for all vessels which may utilize the canal.

The bridge will constitute a most important link in the Inter-American Highway system and will serve, through the indefinite future, the transportation needs of both the Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama, as well as the inter-American traffic system.

As shown in the article, Engineer Stevens is a man of distinguished engineering ability, and the fact that he was chosen for the important job of seeing to it that the bridge and its approaches are constructed in strict accordance with the plans therefor, testifies to his undoubted capacity and character.

The work of the bridge enterprise, after some delay, is expected to be fully completed by next fall, and the bridge thereupon, free of all tolls, open for traffic.

Under leave accorded, the indicated article is included herewith as a part of these remarks:

[From the Panama Canal Review, Oct. 6, 1961]

ELMER B. STEVENS: BRIDGEMAN FOR CANAL

Watchdog for the Panama Canal Company on the $20 million Thatcher Ferry Bridge project at Balboa is Elmer B. Stevens, a quiet, self-effacing civil engineer who joined the Panama Canal organization in 1936 and who probably has had more bridge experience than any other man in the Engineering and Construction Bureau.

From the time he was graduated from the University of Vermont with a civil engineering degree until he joined the bridge project, Mr. Stevens has spent a good part of his working time designing and building bridges. Because of his early association with the canal office engineers, there have been times, however, when he says people have regarded him as a housing engineer and, therefore, a suspicious character.

Elmer, or "Steve," as he is known to his many friends and coworkers, was appointed in 1959 to the position of resident engineer for the bridge project and in this capacity is responsible for carrying out the designer's concept of the project to its physical completion. He reports to Col. Matthew C. Harrison, the canal's engineering and construction director and contracting officer.

Riding herd on the activities of the various contracting firms which have been employed on the construction of the bridge and its approaches as well as acting as liaison man between the canal authorities and the men building one of the largest bridges south of the Rio Grande is only part of Steve's job.

Steve has found that he also must be prepared to deal diplomatically with visitors and others seeking information and, in the process, convince the public that construction problems are not as bad as some laymen are inclined to think.

He points out that cofferdams are, after all, only construction accessories and not part of the final product. He also notes that even though the bridge substructure is being completed about 5 months behind schedule this has not delayed the final completion schedule of the Thatcher Ferry Bridge.

With one phase of the bridge work reaching a successful conclusion, Steve is prone to recall some of the lighter moments of the past 2 years. There was the time that a load of concrete grout pelted—but did not injure—a group of Balboa Heights engineers who were inspecting the bottom of a cofferdam. And the time a barge was sunk by an endless stream of wet concrete despite desperate efforts of contractor's employees to close the gate of the concrete mixing plant's loading hopper.

Recently, Steve has been sharing the successes and defeats of substructure construction with Walter Cathey, project manager for the joint contracting firms of Fruin-Colnon, LeBoeuf & Dougherty. Mr. Cathey, a retired construction man working as a consultant, was called to the bridge job about a year ago by the contracting firm and gets along with Steve just fine. Mr. Cathey, says Steve, is one of the finest rigging men in the construction business, and that is high praise in anyone's engineering language.

As proof of Mr. Cathey's ability as an expert on bridge substructure construction, Steve cites the fact that five difficult cofferdams have been completed without mishap or delay since Mr. Cathey arrived.

In contrast to many construction men, Steve seems shy and soft spoken. But when visitors or coworkers get out of line or tend to become obstreperous, they quickly find that Steve is made of sterner stuff and is well able to hold up his end of the argument.

This ability probably was inherited from his father, a hard-working, devoted Baptist minister who had a pastorate in DeLand, Fla., where Steve was born, and who subsequently took his family to Sioux City, Iowa, and later Vermont.

Steve went to high school in Sioux City, but received his degree in civil engineering from the University of Vermont. He was married in 1923 to a girl from Grafton, Vt. The following year he took his first job with the Fort Pitt Bridge Works of Pittsburgh, Pa., making shop drawings and layout on a $5 million bridge being built across the Monongahela River.

This was only the beginning of many years of work connected with bridge building. For 2 years he was with the bridge department of the New York Central Railroad in Cleveland, Ohio, where he worked on the design of several railroad bridges. He then spent 5 years with the Cincinnati Union Terminal Co. as one of the principal bridge designers of a $43 million project to bring seven railroads into a new high-level terminal area. A half-mile-long conveyor bridge from Baton Rouge to the Mississippi River and a long-span $6 million highway viaduct for the city of Cincinnati were two other projects with which he was associated before joining the canal.

His first job in the Canal Zone was with the former office engineers, but much of his time was spent on bridge work and civil engineering. For 5 years he was in direct charge of both the design and inspection of wartime projects totaling $40 million.

Except for a short break in his service in 1945, Steve has been with the canal organization for the past quarter century. For 9 years, prior to his appointment as resident engineer for the bridge project, he was chief of the structural branch. During this period, he spent at least 3 years on the design, inspection, and studies of both existing and proposed bridges. He designed the Gatun locks swing bridge and made the cost estimate for the bridge at Balboa, on which the appropriation was based. With most of the work under contract, that original estimate still holds.

Although the Gatun locks bridge was considerably smaller than many of the bridge contracts with which he has been associated, Steve is justifiably proud of this part of his bridge career because of the special engineering difficulties which it entailed.

He also is proud of a letter he received from Col. Craig Smyser, former engineering and construction bureau director, who stated his sincere appreciation for Steve's, "fine engineering analysis and detailed design."

Colonel Smyser expressed what is probably the lament of all civil engineers when he said that he was sure Steve had long since sadly realized that the engineer or architect is generally forgotten in hailing the accomplishments of the builder. "No one knows," he said, "the undoubtedly poor civil engineer who worked out the details for Xerxes' bridge across the Hellespont and Colonel Goethals is honored more for the completion of the Panama Canal than the design."

This month the last of the six water piers of the Thatcher Ferry Bridge was nearing completion and the substructure work was coming to an end. Superstructure work was on schedule, and, except for contracts for the approach paving which are due to be awarded in October, the end of the bridge construction in late 1962 was in sight.

Also in sight was the end of Elmer B. Stevens' career with the canal enterprise. The job as resident engineer for the bridge project probably will be the last he will hold with the organization. Steve hopes to retire sometime in 1963 and after that may spend some time gossiping with Indians from the upper Bayano region of the Darien, with whom he has been on good terms for many years, having made a number of trips into the area to visit with them. He also hopes to continue his engineering career, although on a somewhat less strenuous schedule.

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY AND THE MINUTEMEN

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a speech by Mr. SHELLEY.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring our colleagues' attention to an excellent address, delivered by my good friend, the distinguished Congressman from San Francisco, Calif., JACK SHELLEY, at the 81st annual alumni banquet of the University of San Francisco.

In the course of his remarks Congressman SHELLEY alerts Americans to the dangers posed to our country by extreme rightest groups such as the John Birch Society and the Minutemen, as well as the threat of infiltration by international communism.

In particular, Mr. Speaker, I would like to note Congressman SHELLEY's statement that extreme rightist members become "more despicable by their hysterical attacks on the loyalty of that great American, Chief Justice Earl Warren." They, Congressman SHELLEY points out, like the elements on the radical left, try to hide truth behind clouds of irresponsibility and a storm of hate and malice.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Congressman SHELLEY's observations call for serious reflection on our part, and I commend them to our colleagues' attention:

How do I say it? How can I express the honor I feel to be here—to be selected to address all of you tonight? I am deeply moved, and tremendously happy to be home again at the University of San Francisco.

It's always a great night when the grand guys who were lucky enough to attend the University of San Francisco get together. There are always a million stories, a lot of them mine, all starting: "Do you remember the time when * * *."

The snapshots come out of the wallets and we get a look at the kids that were born, the cars that were bought, and the fish that were caught since we last got together.

And I don't want to take the spotlight away from all the new kids and grandchildren and exaggerated fish stories. Truly, I could reminisce for hours about the old days—some of the old football stories—particularly, when I see so many of my old teammates and classmates here tonight.

But just for these few minutes, let's remember, really, why we're here tonight. We're here to salute the great institution from which we got our starts—the University of San Francisco.

And don't worry. I'm not going to make a lecture out of this. What I want to do—just as simply as I can—is to express my own thanks, the thanks of one member of the law class of 1932, to the university that I love, with a sincere hope—a knowledge—that I speak for all of you, too.

It would be easy to make a long list of reasons why each of us is indebted to the University of San Francisco.

We all know that the great educators have written shelves full of books on the proper role of a university. Personally I feel that most of the best of them were writing about what I have seen the University of San Francisco stand for and do over a period of many years.

The faculty of my day—Fathers Flynn, Buckley, Carroll, Feeley, Corkery, Kavanaugh, Malone, White, Moots, and the two Fathers Whelan; Bill Breen, Bill Sweigert, Harold Caulfield, Charlie Knight, and Joe Farry (the rule in Shelley's case) and the late Jim Harrington and Ben McKinley—Ed Keil (the first time I heard "Harvard" pronounced "Hah-vahd"). In the last 2 years I have become very accustomed to this pronunciation, in fact, catch myself using it.

The faculty of U.S.F. in my day made it clear—and the faculty today still makes it clear—that education is a tool, or possibly a divining rod, to be used in a lifelong search.

And what we are looking for is what a reporter would call the facts, what a lawyer would call the evidence, and what a philosopher would call the truth.

To my mind, this is the role of a university. In teaching the facts, the technique, and the procedures by which professional and nonprofessional men and women earn their livelihoods, a university must instill a kind of disciplined thinking.

It is this discipline that enables the student, years later, when his hair has thinned and turned gray, to continue to scrutinize, to judge carefully, and to evaluate accurately.

Whenever I find myself confronted with a complicated or confused problem, I make a serious effort to apply what I learned while at U.S.F.: to return to the fundamentals involved in the facts of the problem. As a young man in the labor movement, I was often told by Michael Casey, the real founder of the San Francisco labor movement, "Jack, my boy, when the sledding becomes rough, reduce the problem to fundamentals, and you will find the right answer."

This advice, in itself, was an application of what the good fathers tried to teach us, and are trying to teach today.

This discipline that a great university instills—a university such as the University of San Francisco—is directed toward making it possible for the graduate to more easily recognize falsehood; to more readily find the truth.

This has been the function of the university we salute tonight since 1855, when four Italian-born Jesuit Fathers opened the doors to St. Ignatius College downtown on Market Street.

Sure, they were Italian-born Jesuits—the Irish didn't have a corner on the Jesuit order in those days.

That was more than a century ago. And for all that time the Jesuit Fathers in San Francisco have worked tirelessly to prepare young San Franciscans, young Americans, for their adult roles, in a world rocked by titanic forces: America's bloody Civil War; the birth of Marxism; World War I; the start and collapse of the League of Nations; the great depression; the scourge of fascism and nazism; the horrors of World War II; the founding of the United Nations; and the challenge from communism.

With these as the background of her first century, the University of San Francisco has continued to contribute men of character and devotion to the public service, the learned professions, and the arts. Her sons have been trained to give leadership and balance to every community in which they work and live. After the training, the rest is up to each man individually as to what he makes of it.

Look back to the modest beginnings on Market Street. You would see, even then, young men learning to defend the truth that the state is the servant, not the master, of its citizens. You would see young minds being trained in the magnificent art of logic, the ultimate weapon against brainwashing.

And now, the University of San Francisco has embarked on her second century, with a firm program to expand its contributions to a world which sorely needs men who seek truth and abhor falsity.

Probably never before in the history of the world, or in the history of our country, has it been more difficult to winnow out the facts to find the truth. The professional distorter of fact and truth runs rampant nationally and internationally.

And never has it been more important that the truth be found and recognized as truth.

Around the world, the Communists are busily and all too successfully distorting America's aims and our deep and honest hope for peace. Never before in mankind's long and occasionally glorious history has any nation so willingly picked up the troubles of far-off people—and given so generously for wholly humanitarian reasons, as has the United States.

And yet within our own country, the extremes of right and left are clouding the truth, obscuring facts, and carrying banners of falsehood as if they were something of which to be proud. Deliberate distortions are placed on pedestals formerly reserved for honest appraisal.

We all know that intelligent national policy cannot be set without an understanding of the problems.

No doctor can prescribe without diagnosis. No lawyer can build his case without careful preparation. No legislator or administrator can adopt a policy without study and research for the basic facts.

What I find alarming today, however, is the blithe refusal to start from the facts and proceed to policy. Too many persons today—both on the far right and far left—start from lies and proceed to hysteria.

I do not argue with different opinions. I welcome the give and take of honestly opposed political views. I have long observed in Congress that our best laws are usually the result of good, healthy fights between sincere political opposites.

I do know that we will survive as a nation only so long as we know the truth and live and teach and legislate in its light. Distortion and lies deserve no place in America's arsenal against Communist lies and distortions.

How close this comes to home when we consider recent attacks on a great former Governor of California. We hear a new radical group of the far right screaming stories of his disloyalty, of all things, and demanding his impeachment from the Supreme Court.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I receive mail from many Americans in a variety of States. In my files I have more than 4,000 letters demanding that Chief Justice Earl Warren be impeached. However, not a single letter has made one charge or accusation of misfeasance or malfeasance in office or any charge that the Chief Justice has violated his oath of office. They are nothing more or less than epistles of hate and expressions of hysteria from people who do not seek the facts or the truth. In this connection I find it significant that over 95 percent of these letters have come from California. This 95 percent has come from an area about 500 miles south of San Francisco. Thank God these epistles of hate have not come from this area where U.S.F. is located and the educators at U.S.F. have labored these many years.

Now let me tell you that during his political life, Earl Warren and I were on opposite sides of the political fence. We had some pretty good go-arounds between the two of us. But our differences were honest differences in policy, and they were based on honest facts.

The John Birchers become more than despicable by their hysterical attacks on the loyalty of that great American, Earl Warren. By this tactic, the Birchers become a danger as great as those who spread the false gospel of communism.

Among the frightening phenomena of our day are the self-styled minutemen—wild-eyed characters who are already busy recruiting their private army. We hear reports of mock skirmishes—training, they claim, for the defense of their liberties. These superpatriots, by their own admission are in violation of the Constitution which refuses private armies even to individual States of the United States.

We see bigots slandering the efforts of those who are fighting to end the curse of racial discrimination—that great blight in the attainment of our cherished democratic ideals. This is our supreme domestic challenge—to create a society of genuinely equal opportunity for all Americans regardless of race, religion, or nationality, in employment, in housing, in education—in every aspect of community life.

All of this seems to be bad enough. But when we look at the extreme left, we see equally diligent efforts to divide and sap our national strength.

All of us here tonight recall, I am sure, the call resounded in late 1945 and 1946 throughout the United States to "bring our boys home"; to drastically reduce our Armed Forces for tax savings. This movement was capitalized on by leftists to reduce our position of preparedness—this in a world still unsettled, a world critically ill.

We in the United States heeded this siren call. Did the Soviet Union? No, she retained her armament posture and continued from that time to develop her strength.

It goes without saying that we all seek a just and lasting peace—however, in pursuit of this goal we should not allow ourselves to fall prey to what can well be a leftist trap which would result in unilateral disarmament of the United States alone.

Our long held and firm desire to achieve world disarmament must continue to a basic policy goal of the United States; however, we must not be unwittingly pushed into this new siren call to unilaterally disarm. If we succumb once again to this cry, we allow the subversive left at home to capitalize on the basic fear in the heart of every American parent—fear for the lives and futures of their children. This is a fear shared equally by our President and Mrs. Kennedy for their children, I am sure.

Recently I have been confronted by persons who expressed the thought that they would rather be Red than dead.

This philosophy is abhorrent—it is founded in fear and lack of faith and is complete surrender. Where does this idea come from? It's another weapon in the leftists arsenal of psychological warfare to break down confidence, create fear, and eventually destroy our freedoms.

We have seen in a few situations attempts of deeply indoctrinated leftists to maneuver labor-management crises into chaos with a cynical disregard for the moral obligations involved and the existing machinery by which valid issues can be negotiated.

It is equally true that to the right we find enemies of labor seeking to break the efforts of workingmen to unite for their legitimate interests. For example, there are still those who will let a crippling strike drag on in order to destroy an honest union.

This then, is the climate in which we find ourselves, with the light of truth too often hidden behind clouds of irresponsibility and storms of hate, malice and fear.

If the climate is to be improved, if we are to find our way safely through this maze of falsehood, truth must lead the way.

There are newspapermen among us tonight who bear heavy responsibility for finding and passing on the truth. They must not only be untiring in their efforts to seek out the facts, but they must be painstaking in their skill with words so that facts are reported precisely and accurately.

There are teachers among us, and their responsibility is to build curiosity among young people and an eagerness to find the truth.

Recently Father Richard Vachon, assistant professor of law at U.S.F., wrote in an eastern law journal about the role of an attorney. I feel it applies to the judiciary as well. Father Vachon said, "Amid the sober realities of the age it is ever more clear that the lawyer must resume his leadership not merely of the bar, but of society itself." To attain this goal, the lawyer or judge from U.S.F. must be ever zealous in his dedicated pursuit of the truth.

Those of us in public life have the obligation to get the facts and find the truth in public issues—and this in spite of the avalanche of propaganda and mechanics of pressure to which we are subjected day in and day out.

But it is not enough that journalists, teachers, lawyers, and legislators carry the fight. We need engineers, and the car salesman and the scientist who looks into the microscope. We need the mechanic; the truckdriver; the longshoreman; the housewife; the businessman and every segment of our society.

Fortunately, we of U.S.F. were trained to distinguish, to judge. We were trained to shun intellectual and political intemperance—whether of the left or right.

Look about you in this room ladies and gentlemen of U.S.F., and see the different generations which bear witness to the consistency which which our alma mater has transmitted the religious and political traditions of the Western World.

We learned from her that all men's institutions—political, legal, social, economic—spring from moral and spiritual convictions about man's nature and his destiny.

Thus it happens that tonight, when the world we know lies under such a heavy burden of doubt—doubt about the future, doubt about its capacity to resist what it most opposes, doubt about its staying power and its will to defend its deepest convictions—all of the past of this university comes to focus.

The darkness of doubt or despair may trouble some.

It does not trouble us. For we know. We know in our minds and our hearts and our souls precisely what the nature of this crisis is. We know what is at stake.

For the conflict between the free world and the slave world runs far beyond the merely political or social or economic organization of human society. It runs beyond the freedom and the rights of the human person.

It is not simply a contest for the minds of men.

It is the supreme struggle for their very souls.

The enemy moves in with brainwashing, with deceit, with the most plausible blandishments followed abruptly by the tactics of terror.

He aims his efforts at making us doubt two things. Do we have the capacity to resist? Is what we defend worth defending?

Each man must ask himself these questions in the deepest recesses of his mind and soul.

For we cannot escape answering.

Do what we will, try as we will, we cannot evade or avoid an answer.

And upon that answer depends the survival of every noblest and highest value we possess—our very lives, our families, our homes, our associations and institutions—yes, our very civilization itself.

Fortunately, our university has taught us that unless man is free to worship God, he has no freedom whatsoever.

She has taught us respect for the virtue of patriotism. She has shown us the panorama of history. She has taught us to see those shining figures whose courage in the darkest, hopeless moment turned disaster into victory and reaffirmed the fact that man is neither the creature nor the slave of blind chance.

This awareness of history makes us realize that our courageous President, John F. Kennedy, is confronted with decisions of importance—with problems, the resolution of which might well decide the fate of freedom for centuries to come. He is meeting these issues with valor and intelligence. President Kennedy, as all of us, must face the grave problems of our times by applying those very principles of integrity and right reason which has been U.S.F.'s priceless gift to its students.

From the humble beginnings, the painful struggles of earlier years, the university has now to face her second century calm and assured. A citadel of strength—moral and intellectual strength—in a world unsure, timid, doubtful of its own convictions or its will to defend them.

God was good—to you and to me—when He led us to the doors of the University of San Francisco. We owe to her every support to make her second century even stronger in this troubled and confused world.

It is my prayer that God continue to bless us—so that we may put to use what we learned here—to His greater glory—to the greater glory of America—and to the greater glory of a civilized, humane, free society.

GENERAL ELECTRIC IN SYRACUSE PLAYS VITAL ROLE IN GLENN'S SPACE TRIP

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Riehlman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, without a doubt almost every pair of eyes in the Nation will be focused on Cape Canaveral this coming Saturday when Marine Lt. Col. John Glenn makes his earth-orbiting space flight. And for every pair of eyes thus focused there will be a heart riding along with Colonel Glenn in that space capsule.

We are all tremendously proud of our astronauts and of the thousands of people whose devoted efforts have gone into making this shot possible.

We in Syracuse are justifiably proud of the outstanding role played by General Electric Co. in our space program, just as we are proud of GE's overall contribution to our national security.

I am including at this point an article which appeared in the Syracuse Post-Standard on January 23, outlining in greater detail General Electric's contribution to Colonel Glenn's upcoming flight.

When Marine Lt. Col. John H. Glenn goes into orbital flight this week, a Syracuse industry will play a vital role in launching the astronaut into outer space.

The General Electric Co. has developed a radio command guidance system for the Mercury-Atlas rocket which will carry Glenn into the hoped-for three-orbital flight.

This radio guidance system performs two functions, GE officials say, that of "guidance and supplying data to the National Air and Space Agency to assist in orbit determinations."

The Mercury-Atlas will be guided by radio commands of the system and will transmit a signal to cut off its rocket engines when the precise conditions required to insert the craft into orbit are achieved.

Technicians at General Electric say that in this three-orbital Mercury flight, a small addition in the velocity could send the spacecraft into a larger orbit. To put the spacecraft into an earth-orbit, a velocity in excess of 17,400 miles per hour is required. The Mercury spacecraft is scheduled to go into orbit near Bermuda, at an altitude of about 100 miles.

And here is where GE's radio guidance system comes into effect.

Three small black boxes or beacons, two of which are similar to two-way radios, will be attached to the rocket.

The Mercury-Atlas vehicle will then be automatically tracked by radar on the ground which will follow signals from these black boxes, or beacons, on the spacecraft. The radar determines range and position.

The radio guidance system also has a rate subsystem which automatically will determine the velocity and acceleration of the Mercury-Atlas.

According to a G.E. report, this will be done by three rate antennas which will receive signals from guidance equipment aboard the Atlas launch vehicle.

SPLIT-SECOND REPORT

The guidance system, in turn, will take the information it receives on position and rate and process it through a computer on the ground to derive corrections in the flight path of the spacecraft. These corrections will be sent as commands to the Mercury-Atlas by the guidance system.

The entire process, G.E. spokesmen say, takes but a fraction of a second.

When conditions are right and the proper velocity and angle of flight are achieved to put the Mercury-Atlas into a precise orbit, the guidance system will signal the Atlas to turn off its engines.

WILL ENTER ORBIT

At this point, the spacecraft will separate from the Atlas vehicle and enter its prescribed orbit in free flight.

Glenn's spacecraft will be tracked by 18 Mercury network stations around the world which will instantaneously relay communications back to the Mercury Control Center at Cape Canaveral.

Retrorockets will be fired to slow down the Mercury spacecraft as it approaches the west coast of North America and begin to start reentry.

Following three orbits, the spacecraft would begin to enter the atmosphere over southern Florida and land in a predesignated area 1,000 miles southeast of Cape Canaveral.

DATA FROM G.E. SYSTEM

"Trajectory computations will be made by a computer at the Space Computing Center, NASA, Goddard Space Flight Center, Washington, D.C. G.E.'s radio guidance system also supplies data which assists in these orbital computations," the company's spokesman said.

The Defense Systems Department of Syracuse's General Electric Co. has been responsible, under Air Force contracts, for the design, development, production, installation, tests and checkout of radio command guidance systems at Cape Canaveral and various missile bases throughout the country.

NAME KEY PERSONS

Key persons who have made significant technical contributions to the program include Richard L. Shetler, general manager of the department; J. K. Records, manager of instrumentation and guidance product section; Dr. Lewis J. Neelands, consultant in the D.S.D. responsible for the technical direction of the radio guidance program; and R. P. Sutter, manager of products service for D.S.D. which is responsible for all radio guidance facilities at missile bases.

Others include W. T. Chapin, L. M. Barker, R. S. Grisetti, who is manager of advanced engineering, C. R. Woods and E. B. Mullen.

FOREIGN-BORN AMERICANS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, as a naturalized American, born in the old country, I want to subscribe 1,000 percent to the remarks made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walter] in the House today.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE INVESTIGATION OF PRIME LOAN RATES PART OF LONG-TERM INTEREST BY THE ANTITRUST DIVISION IN PRESERVATION OF COMPETITION IN BANKING AND PREVENTION OF UNDUE CONCENTRATION IN THE BANKING INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. My Speaker, considerable attention has been called to the recent activities of the Antitrust Division in the field of banking. Since the Kennedy administration took office a year ago, there have been a number of actions brought by the Division challenging bank mergers. More recently, there has been activity directed against price fixing in the banking business. We have heard criticism from Comptroller of the Currency James J. Saxon about the Department's activity in this field. However, there can be no doubt but that the Antitrust Division has clear jurisdiction in the field of banking to challenge violations of either the Sherman or the Clayton Antitrust Acts. Moreover, while there was a long period of time during the 1950's when few antitrust cases were filed against banks. the interest of the Antitrust Division in preserving competition among financial institutions and the general application of the antitrust laws extends back at least to 1947, when the famous Investment Banking case was brought.

Highlights of antitrust activity in the banking field were ably presented before the Independent Bankers Association January 22 by Mr. George D. Reycraft, Chief of Section Operations of the Antitrust Division. This address provides such important background information on the relation between antitrust and banking that I include it in the Record herewith:

Antitrust and Banking

(By George D. Reycraft)

It is a great pleasure for me to be able to meet with the members of your association to discuss with you some of the current issues involving antitrust and banking. As your president has suggested, the principal theme of my remarks will be the Bank Merger Act of 1960—what were its aims and what has it accomplished? Since no discussion of the relationship of antitrust and banking at this time would be complete without a reference to several other matters which are now current, I will take the liberty of expanding my remarks beyond the strict limits of the Bank Merger Act.

Approaching the broad subject of antitrust and banking, first of all, why is it that the Department of Justice after many years of apparent inactivity in this field considers the preservation of competition in banking to be so important that it is now devoting as much time to this field as to any other single area of activity in our entire economy? Following a consideration of this area of antitrust policy, I would like to relate to it the Department's activities under the Bank Merger Act and discuss our approach to that act. Finally, you should be aware of the issues which have been raised by the case filed against three banks in Clinton, N.J., and of the general applicability of the antitrust laws to all phases of commercial banking.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ACTIVITY IN THE BANKING FIELD

The interest of the Department of Justice in the preservation of competition and independence of decision in banking is not as recent as the attention given this activity in the past year would seem to indicate. As early as 1947 when the Antitrust Division became heavily involved, although unsuccessfully, with the investment banking industry, the Department of Justice has recognized the importance of preserving competition among our financial institutions. The decision of the district court in that case did not take issue with the basic competitive premise which led to the initiation of the litigation but concluded that the history of investment banking as developed in the record of the case indicated a panorama of competition and did not support the charge of industrywide conspiracy. Whether we agree with that factual conclusion or not there appears to have been no real dispute as to the importance of competition among financial institutions and the general applicability of the antitrust laws to them.

Later, in the Sears, Roebuck and Grant cases, the effects of interlocking directorates maintained by investment bankers on the boards of competing companies led to important decisions by the courts. As Judge Weinfeld expressed it in the Sears, Roebuck case involving the interlocking directorates of Sidney J. Weinberg:

"Congress had been aroused by the concentration of control by a few individuals or groups over many gigantic corporations which in the normal course of events should have been in active and unrestrained competition. Instead, and because of such control, the healthy competition of the free enterprise system had been stifled or eliminated. Interlocking directorships on rival corporations had been the instrumentality of defeating the purpose of the antitrust laws. They had tended to suppress competition or to foster joint action against third party competitors. The continued potential threat to the competitive system resulting from these conflicting directorships was the evil aimed at."

In the legislative field, the Department of Justice has for many years supported such bills as the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 and numerous predecessors of the Bank Merger Act of 1960. In 1957, the Attorney General asked Congress to amend the Clayton Act to make clear that it applies to all bank acquisitions and not only to those accomplished by the acquisition of stock or other share capital. In January 1957, the Attorney General said that the "need for more effective curbs on certain bank mergers," was "recognized by the President of the United States, this Department, and interested banking agencies alike. * * *" In 1957, the Comptroller of the Currency said:

"We are in accord with the general purpose of H.R. 5948 (amending Clayton Act, sec. 7, to cover bank assets, as it now does bank stock acquisitions). We have no objection to the principle that the acquisition of one bank by another through purchase, merger, or consolidation should not be permitted if the effect of the acquisition may be substantially to lessen competition. It is no less important to have competition in banking, when this can be done soundly, as it is in other fields of commerce and industry."

The Department of Justice was very active, as you know, in supporting the enactment of the Bank Merger Act of 1960, although it fell short of the type of legislation the Department thought was desirable to deal completely with the problem.

On March 30, 1959, the Department of Justice filed a complaint attacking the acquisition by Firstamerica Corp. of the stock of California Bank. This month, in accordance with the stipulated settlement of that case, Western Bancorporation, the successor to Firstamerica, has announced that all of the stock in First Western Bank & Trust Co. will be sold to a purchaser not now in the banking business within a few months. This means a newly independent bank with assets of nearly $600 million and 65 branches will result.

So I think you will agree that the interest of the Department of Justice in preventing excessive concentration in banking is not an interest which was developed in the past few months. Rather, the actions which have been taken such as filing the five bank merger cases and the complaint against service charge price-fixing represent the culmination of many years of concern by the Department with these problems. Despite some views to the contrary, we think there is no doubt that the public interest requires the preservation of competition in banking and the prevention of undue concentration of banking assets in a few hands.

It has been said that an industry which has about 14,000 members could not reasonably be argued to be unduly concentrated and that the large number of existing banks should be taken as prima facie evidence of a high degree of competition.

You gentlemen know far better than I of the highly localized nature of banking and that it is really quite meaningless to tell residents even of large cities that there are 14,000 banks in the United States which will serve them if they will only present themselves at the loan desk or the teller's window. Even among the largest banks such as those involved in the Philadelphia and New York merger cases, the great majority of their business originates within the geographic area immediately adjacent to the bank's offices. Thus in Philadelphia about 75 percent of both banks' loans to individuals were to persons who lived in the counties in which the banks had offices. Of course, as loans and customers grow larger in size the opportunities for alternative choices become greater. But for the vast majority of individuals and for small and medium-size businesses the alternatives are those which exist within their own city or town.

The vast number of commercial loans made in the United States are made to smaller sized business. Thus, in 1955, member banks of the Federal Reserve System made 503,000 commercial loans to businesses of under $50,000 assets; 415,000 such loans to businesses between $50,000 and $250,000; 126,000 such loans to businesses between $250,000 and $1 million; 38,000 such loans to businesses between $1 and $5 million; 11,000 loans to businesses of from $5 to $25 million; 4,000 loans to businesses between $25 and $100 million, and 6,000 commercial loans to businesses of over $100 million in assets. Substantially the same pattern appears in the 1957 survey.

Small and medium size business is more dependent on commercial banks for the funds it needs than any other segment of borrowers.

Small and intermediate sized business has very little opportunity to obtain external funds from institutional investors such as insurance companies, pension funds, and other financial intermediaries, nor does it have any better opportunity to derive short-term working capital from savings and loan associations, mutual savings banks, and similar savings institutions. The commercial bank is the primary, and in practice the only regular, source for the recurring short- and intermediate-term financing needs of small- and intermediate-sized business.

The fallacy in reciting the number of banks which have charters to make out a prima facie case for the existence of competition is quite clear from the fact that one of these 14,000 banks holds 4½ percent of all the bank assets in the United States. One percent of the 14,000 banks holds over 50 percent of these assets. And when mergers occur within this 1 percent group on the ground that they need to be bigger, one may wonder what the fate will be of the remaining 99 percent and the 50 percent of the bank assets they now hold.

As far as the Department of Justice is concerned, it has long been our view that the preservation of competition requires the preservation of competitors who are able to engage in it. This does not mean that the antitrust laws guarantee the survival of the inefficient or the business which is unwilling to compete. But preservation of a fair opportunity to compete is a major goal. As Judge Hand said some years ago in the Aluminum case, Congress was not actuated in enacting the antitrust laws by economic motives alone. As Judge Hand put it:

"It is possible, because of its indirect social or moral effect, to prefer a system of small producers, each dependent for his success upon his own skill and character, to one in which the great mass of those engaged must accept the direction of a few. These considerations, which we have suggested only as possible purposes of the act, we think the decisions prove to have been in fact its purposes."

So even if it could be demonstrated that a larger unit is more efficient in some degree than a group of smaller units, efficiency alone is not our goal. The antitrust laws were intended to preserve a society in which the individual counts and in which economic power is dispersed throughout our society. This does not mean that normal or vigorous growth is viewed with suspicion by the Antitrust Division. Indeed, it is our conviction that it is the active enforcement of the antitrust laws which preserves the opportunity for such growth.

The wisdom of maintaining a system which distributes economic power throughout our society would seem to require little elaboration in a country which was founded on the application of the same principle to political power. Carrying out this principle our Constitution provides for a system in which no one of the three branches of our Federal Government is able to operate without significant checks by the other. In recognizing that most aspects of government should be conducted by the States and their subdivisions, our form of political organization maximizes the opportunity for decisionmaking at the level of government which most directly involves the people. This system provides for a distribution of power which is designed to release the maximum energies and abilities of the people. The growth of our economic system has paralleled our political system in its general development. In some industries, due largely to a failure to enforce the antitrust laws during the first quarter of the century, significant and substantial departures from this model have occurred.

The objectives of the antitrust laws are among the most conservative of any of our national legislation. They were designed to conserve an economic and political system in which the decisions are made by many and not by a few. They were designed to conserve the opportunity of the small as well as the large to engage in our economic life. They were designed to conserve an economy in which government regulation is adopted only when competition has failed. They were designed to make competition the great regulator of our economy.

Those who want to change our system by concentrating economic power in a few hands through mergers and the formation of holding companies have a heavy burden to sustain. It is not sufficient for them to say that this is the fastest and easiest way to increase their size or that they need to merge because there are others which are bigger. There are about 14,000 banks which are smaller than our largest bank and if this argument is accepted by the bank regulatory agencies or the courts all effective bars on bank mergers would be gone.

These are the reasons the Department of Justice considers the preservation of a vigorous competitive banking system to be among the forefront of our goals.

BANK MERGER ACT OF 1960

The aims of the Bank Merger Act of 1960 are most clearly set forth in the preamble to S. 1062, which was enacted as an amendment to section 1828 of the FDIC Act. The preamble said the purpose of the bill was "to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide safeguards against mergers and consolidations of banks which might lessen competition unduly or tend unduly to create a monopoly in the field of banking."

The Senate report which accompanied the bill stated that its purpose was "to provide for control of all mergers by asset acquisition by banks under the jurisdiction of the

Federal banking agencies under uniform and clear standards calling explicitly for consideration of both banking factors and competitive factors but without giving sole and controlling effect to any single factor." The Senate report expressed the view that controls over bank mergers at that time were incomplete and confusing, particularly with respect to competitive factors which may be involved.

The factors which are required to be considered in granting or withholding consent to mergers under the Bank Merger Act of 1960 are the financial history and condition of the bank, the adequacy of its capital structure, its future earnings prospects, the general character of its management, the convenience and needs of the community to be served by the bank and whether or not its corporate powers are consistent with the purposes of that act. These are the purely banking factors and are to be considered along with the question whether the effect of the merger might be to lessen competition unduly or to tend unduly to create a monopoly. The act requires each of the regulatory agencies which has final jurisdiction to pass on the matter to obtain reports from the other two banking agencies on the competitive and monopolistic aspects of the acquisition, as well as from the Attorney General.

It was proposed during the discussion on the bill that the banking agencies be authorized to request the views of the Attorney General, but would not have required them to do so in every case. This suggestion was rejected by the committee and, because it was the committee's opinion that it would be both appropriate and desirable in every case except an emergency involving a probable failure of one of the merging banks, for the banking agency involved to get a report from the Attorney General on the competitive factors involved in the merger, such reports were made mandatory. The Senate committee report also expressed concern that the large number of mergers in recent years, the vast resources involved in these mergers, and the increases in the size of the largest banks, particularly those which have grown through mergers, all give rise to concern for maintenance of vigorous competition in the banking system and in the industry and commerce served by the banking system.

A reduction in the number of banks and the loss in competition between merged banks also gave the committee considerable concern. In 1950, there were 89 banks absorbed by other banks, in 1951 there were 78 absorbed. By 1955, 231 banks were being absorbed annually through mergers and consolidations. Altogether, between 1950 and 1959 there were 1,491 banks absorbed through mergers or consolidations. On the other side of the coin, 876 new banks were also authorized but the new banks that were authorized neither offset in numbers the banks absorbed nor in the size and importance of the assets available for banking purposes. Between 1950 and 1958, there were 731 national banks absorbed and 601 State banks absorbed. Between 1950 and 1958, a total of $11,303,595,104 of assets of national banks and $15,127,365,052 of State banks were absorbed by merger. Thus, over $26 billion of banking resources were absorbed through mergers or consolidations in the 8-year period from 1950 through 1958 alone. This represents about 10 percent of the assets of all commercial banks.

It has been suggested on occasion that banks should not be required to compete like other segments of the national economy. Despite the fact that banks differ in many ways from other types of commercial activity, there appears to be no real question that competition is an appropriate and desirable goal for banking as in other areas. While some of the aspects of commercial banking, such as the interest of depositors in the security of their deposits, require that no bank be permitted to fail, and under existing regulations, bank failures have been reduced virtually to zero, nevertheless, the ordinary rules of competition can work to a considerable extent in the banking field. The Senate committee said in its report on S. 1062 the following:

"Vigorous competition between strong, aggressive, and sound banks is highly desirable; lack of competition, restraints on competition, and monopolistic practices are undesirable. Competition in banking takes many forms—competition for deposits by individuals and corporations and by personal and business depositors; competition for individual, business, and governmental loans; competition for services of various sorts. Competition for deposits increases the amounts available for loans for the development and growth of the Nation's industry and commerce. Competition for loans gives the borrowers better terms and better service and furthers the development of industry and commerce. Vigorous competition in banking stimulates competition in the entire economy, in industry, commerce, and trade. There is no question that competition is desirable in banking, and that competitive factors should be considered in all aspects of the supervision and regulation of banks."

Preservation of competition does not require unrestricted competition to the extent that failure of a bank will be tolerated as the end result of vigorous and aggressive competition. Banks cannot be permitted to fail and under existing Federal regulation, there is very little danger that they will.

The Department of Justice has no quarrel with those bank mergers which are required because there is a reasonable probability of the ultimate failure of the bank to be acquired or where there is genuinely inadequate management to the extent that the acquired bank's future prospects are possible failure, where an acquired bank is a problem bank with inadequate capital or unsound assets and its acquisition may be the best means of dealing with the situation or where the acquired bank has no adequate provision for management succession or its management is incompetent.

If an acquired bank is an uneconomic unit or too small to meet the needs of its community by providing loans of sufficient size, or by providing needed banking facilities, merger may be one answer, but it is not the only answer. To the extent that banks are undercapitalized, serious consideration should be given to the possibilities of raising capital through means available to all businesses to do so. But none of these situations should be assumed to exist. There should be a strict burden of proof on the banks applying for merger to meet one of these requirements. We submit that it was not Congress' intention to submerge considerations of competition just because the banking factors were satisfactory and argued neither for nor against the merger.

The accomplishments of the Bank Merger Act of 1960 are difficult to assess at the present time.

Since the act was passed there have been approximately 223 approvals by the banking agencies of mergers and 12 denials. Three national bank applications have been disapproved and nine State bank applications. Approximately 44 applications are being processed and hearings have been held on several of them. As you know, four of the approved applications are in litigation at the present time.

One important accomplishment which can be traced to the Bank Merger Act of 1960 is the decision by the Comptroller of the Currency to hold open hearings on bank mergers which have particular public importance and as to which the expression of views has been requested by interested parties. The hearing which was held on the First National City application and the National Bank of Detroit application represent important steps forward procedurally.

Equally important has been the decision of the Federal Reserve Board to announce the vote of the Board on applications submitted to it, and to hold hearings on bank mergers of particular public importance.

General Application of the Antitrust Laws to Banking

I would next like to depart from the area of mergers to discuss the application of the antitrust laws to banking generally. I suggest that there is no serious doubt that the Sherman Act applies to banking to the same extent to which it applies to all other commercial activity in the United States. This means that price fixing in terms of service charges, interest rates, or any other charges which banks impose would violate section 1 of the Sherman Act. It means that allocation of customers by geographic area or by types of customers would be a per se violation of the antitrust laws. It means that agreements with correspondents not to compete with them for banking business is a per se violation of the antitrust laws. It means that monopolization of banking would violate the antitrust laws.

As you are probably aware, the Department of Justice last month filed its first action charging banks with agreeing on the service charges to be made to their customers. This action involves the not unusual charge of price fixing, but does represent the first application of the antitrust laws to banks involving this type of activity. There are other investigations pending in the area of service charges. You should be aware that while the action filed in New Jersey was filed as a civil suit under section 1 of the Sherman Act, the Sherman Act does provide for criminal penalties, including $50,000 fine and 1 year in jail for individuals violating the act. It is the normal practice of the Department of Justice in proceeding against per se violations of the antitrust laws to proceed by way of indictment. Inasmuch as the Clinton case was the first of its type it was the Department's conclusion that a civil action would be appropriate.

You may be interested in consulting the September 1946 Supplement to Paton's Digest, edited by the American Bankers Association and which deals with bankers' legal problems. Among other things that opinion says: "The effect of a clearinghouse rule fixing a minimum scale of uniform charges for collecting out-of-town checks is to control the price of this type of service in that locality. If this type of service is considered trade or commerce within the Sherman Act, then it would seem to be a violation per se under * * * the *Socony Vacuum Oil Co.* opinion (310 U.S. 150 (1940))."

So you will see that on occasion the American Bankers Association does agree with the Antitrust Division.

In conclusion, I suggest that greater competition in banking in the smaller cities of our country is as important to the preservation of our free enterprise system as in our larger cities. The opportunities and alternatives available to individuals and businesses located in small towns are usually far more restricted than in our major cities. I suggest that neither the Independent Bankers Association nor the Department of Justice can consistently advocate competition in banking in larger cities without applying these principles with equal force in all cities and towns.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. PATMAN for 15 minutes today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Walter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Moss) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Lankford.

Mr. Fogarty in two instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1760. An act to establish the Great Basin National Park in Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 157. An act to change the name of the Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif., to the "Marina del Rey, Los Angeles, Calif."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 29, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1602. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting a copy of the report of the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held in Washington, D.C., September 20–21, 1961, pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 331 (H. Doc. No. 317); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1603. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the quarterly report of Federal contributions for the quarter ending September 30, 1961, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1604. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

1605. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report of the status of construction, alteration, or acquisition of public buildings authorized, pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 610(a)); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1293. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9916. A bill providing for the Surgeon General of the United States to establish a hospital in the State of New York especially equipped for the treatment of persons addicted to the use of habit-forming drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 9917. A bill to amend title II of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide special pay for members of the service bands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 9918. A bill to donate to the Zuni Tribe approximately 610 acres of federally owned land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS (by request):

H.R. 9919. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Marble Canyon project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 9920. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide that the insurance premiums on FHA-insured one- to four-family mortgages shall be waived by the Federal Government where the mortgagor is a serviceman inducted or called to active duty in the Armed Forces after 1960, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 9921. A bill to extend the purchase programs for mica and beryl ores to June 30, 1965; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 9922. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the furnishing of hospital and medical care (including outpatient treatment) to peacetime veterans suffering from noncompensable service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 9923. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to revise the rates of disability and death pension authorized by the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9924. A bill to amend section 411 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional dependency and indemnity compensation payments to widows with one or more children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9925. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit for 1 year the granting of national service life insurance to veterans of service after October 7, 1940; to provide a double indemnity feature in such insurance; to permit for 1 year veterans with service-connected disabilities less than total to obtain disability income protection under such insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 9926. A bill to codify, with certain amendments thereto, chapter 19 of title 5 of the United States Code, entitled "Administrative Procedure"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.J. Res. 609. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting the U.S. Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Proposed Code of Federal Administration Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 26, 1962

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following statement:

Representative Francis E. Walter announced today that the Special Subcommittee on Administrative Law of the House Committee on the Judiciary would shortly consider a number of bills concerned with the administrative and regulatory agencies. One of these, an elaborate revision of the Administrative Procedure Act drafted by a committee of the American Bar Association, was introduced today by Mr. Walter, chairman of the special subcommittee.

Mr. Walter in the 1940's led the movement to establish a uniform administrative procedure which would protect the rights of individuals before the Federal agencies. He was the sponsor of the Walter-Logan Act which was enacted by the Congress and vetoed by the President in 1941. Five years later as chairman of the Subcommittee on Administrative Procedure he led in the passage of the Administrative Procedure Act.

In introducing the American Bar Association's proposed code of Federal administrative procedure, Mr. Walter made the following statement:

"There is universal agreement that the administrative and regulatory agencies of the Federal Government have enormous power and by their policies and decisions affect the well-being of great industries and the everyday life of our whole people. There is equal agreement that the great regulatory agencies have not functioned as effectively as they should, and have failed in many instances to serve the public interest and need. Among those who have been personally involved in the process there also is a strong sense that the entire administrative and regulatory process has proved unsatisfactory in many respects as it touches the rights and interests of individual citizens.

"The time has come for the Congress to act on both fronts. It must insure that the agencies, especially those which are in effect arms of the Congress, perform their major function of policymaking with greater effectiveness. And it must insure that the rights of individual parties to agency proceedings are properly guarded.

"The bill I have just introduced is primarily designed to secure fair treatment for anyone involved in the administrative process, both before the agencies and on review in the courts. In many respects it does no more than restate the intention of Congress in passing the Administrative Procedure Act in 1946 and correct the misunderstandings of that act and its purposes by the agencies and courts.

"While I do not agree with the bill in every detail I have introduced, I feel it will serve as an excellent basis for consideration and discussion out of which should come improvements in the law as it now stands.

"When the present law was enacted in 1946 it was contemplated that it would be reviewed in the light of experience. We have now had enough experience to know the changes that are needed to protect our people in dealing with the administrative agencies of our Government.

"We also must consider other changes in the existing laws which will have the effect of enabling the agencies, particularly the independent agencies, to achieve their broader public objectives more successfully. Certain of their problems and difficulties have been established in the course of very thorough hearings by a number of committees. The Subcommittee on Administrative Procedure intends to seek practical solutions to those problems so far as they may be within its jurisdiction.

"In an economy so complex as ours, the continued failure of the agencies to make policy wisely and with imagination is likely to involve our people in recurring crises as workers, investors, and consumers.

"It is the duty of the Congress to do everything in its power to see that these crises with their accompaniment of confusion and breakdowns and losses should not occur."

Partnership in Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 26, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by me at the National Hemophilia Foundation luncheon at the Statler-Hilton Hotel, New York City, on January 13, 1962:

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND, AT NATIONAL HEMOPHILIA FOUNDATION LUNCHEON ON SATURDAY, JANUARY 13, 1962, AT 12 NOON AT THE STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY

It is a great pleasure for me to be invited to address a group whose interests in improving the Nation's health run parallel to my own. Not only are we all interested in assuring a healthy and prosperous Nation, but the efforts of such voluntary health agencies as the National Hemophilia Foundation illustrate the kind of hand-in-hand cooperation with the Federal Government which is particularly gratifying to those of us who are privileged to play a role in the development of Federal health programs.

In this period when some are wondering if the increasing role of the Federal Government in research may perhaps be a threat to other sources of research support. I would like to give you some impression of the ways in which Federal activities are cooperative and supplemental without being dominating. I can select no better instance of partnership in health—governmental and voluntary—than the National Hemophilia Foundation.

Let me say that my own interests in the fields of medicine and health have grown with the years. I have been in Congress, representing the Second District of Rhode Island, for over 20 years now, and for a major part of that time I have had the rare opportunity and responsibility of being chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In this period I have become increasingly aware of the ever-greater impact that the Federal research expenditures are having on research programs in the life sciences.

For those who fear a suppression of private expenditures as Federal activity increases in support of biomedical research, I can only say that there are so many problems of disease remaining before us that there are problems enough for all.

For those who say that the percentage of non-Federal funds has greatly decreased in relation to Federal funds, over the past 20 years, I have a ready answer. While the percentage of non-Federal funds has decreased, there has at the same time been a remarkable increase in the actual amount of non-Federal assistance to medical research. In 1940, some $42 million was spent by non-Federal sources for medical research; today the amount is estimated to be around $335 million. It seems to me that this is clear proof that Federal funds have stimulated, rather than suppressed, private expenditures for medical research.

For those whose doubts linger, let me come back to this foundation, whose board of trustees and those present today represent several thousand dedicated workers doing their part to combat one well-known but rare disease.

By its nature, hemophilia is a rare disease. Yet every literate man knows that its influence may well have changed the course of European history because Queen Victoria happened to carry the gene of this disease, and through her daughters carried it into the reigning houses of Spain and Russia. The bleeder's disease may appear in any family; when it appears in a family in high position—such as the last czar of Russia—it may promote the interests of a Rasputin and influence vast events. But wherever it appears it visits tragic difficulties which those of us more fortunate hardly realize. Perhaps it is well for us to try to imagine what it would be like to be afraid that the common, everyday task of brushing one's teeth might expose us to the possibility of a dangerous loss of blood. This frightening prospect is just one of the daily burdens of the sufferer from hemophilia.

It is one of the purposes of your foundation to disseminate just this kind of information. The greater the public understanding of the disease, the greater the support of research in hemophilia.

The work done by your foundation since its inception in 1948 is impressive indeed. As members of this group you have been responsible for the raising of thousands of dollars to be used in the treatment and care of the afflicted, through your several State and local groups.

Although you are a relative newcomer in the field of public health, I am sure that the families with afflicted children never questioned the newness of your help but were grateful that someone was interested enough to give them assistance as well as helping to supply the large quantities of blood so often needed.

Although you are a relatively small organization in the field of public health, I am sure that the husbands with hemophilia never questioned the size of the organization that helped them get and hold a job so that they could be useful and productive members of society. It is not the size of an organization that is important: it is the quality and effectiveness of the organization. These qualities are needed in the alleviation of human suffering. And this foundation has been able to fill a human need which others have left unanswered.

It would be difficult to say which of your many activities is the more important. The grants and funds given for research and fellowships are important, but not more so than the financial assistance you give to hemophilia victims. Your registration of all hemophiliacs, your educational efforts with them, and your help in the maintenance of blood and plasma banks are equally important and beyond mere praise—a worthy effort of which you may be justly proud.

But all of our efforts in medical research are completely overshadowed by the problems of disease and disability still confronting us. I would like to restate my views, briefly, here, today.

The conquest of communicable diseases in the first half of this century has shifted the emphasis in medical research to the chronic, metabolic and degenerative disorders. Apart from the tragedy and unhappiness they cause, disease and disability are estimated to cost this Nation $35 billion a year. Only through medical research and its application can these losses be reduced.

In the 1930's it became apparent that a major trend in the country was toward an aging population, with more and more people subject to chronic diseases whose control would be more and more essential. Accordingly, Congress in 1937 established a National Cancer Institute, and by 1949 six additional research Institutes had been authorized for the investigation of other specific disease categories. I am, of course, referring to the National Institutes of Health, the chief research arm of the Public Health Service. The chronic diseases are reflected in the names of some of these Institutes—Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases, Cancer, Heart, Mental Health, Neurological Diseases and Blindness. And this is proper, in my view, when you realize that there are more than 70 million people in this country with one or more chronic diseases.

The role that the National Institutes of Health plays in biomedical research today is a significant one. While it is carrying on scientific work in its Institute laboratories—there are 8,700 workers at the NIH—it is supporting individual investigators throughout the Nation. To realize the pervasiveness of this influence one has only to scan the medical literature.

Now, hemophilia is one of the chronic diseases I was talking about which NIH is combating. Practically all of the leading research scientists working on hemophilia in the United States today acknowledge the support of the Public Health Service. This support is coming from a variety of Institutes and Divisions at NIH, and covers a wide spectrum of research in hemophilia.

Again, one of the leading centers for the care and study of hemophilia has grown up here in New York City under the auspices of a variety of organizations. This is at Mount Sinai Hospital, and I am proud to note that the Public Health Service supports many of the investigations at this center.

I was also happy to learn that the National Hemophilia Foundation is supporting a project at Mount Sinai to develop a more effective means of the production of blood plasma through a new "deep freeze" project. I understand that it is hoped that by freezing and storing the blood plasma at minus 93° C.—instead of minus 20° or 40° C.—a more efficient product will be produced which will retain a high degree of coagulation factor and will store for longer periods.

Meanwhile, I have learned, the clinical center at NIH is pursuing studies on the biochemistry of blood coagulation with particular reference to the development of better forms of therapy for various congenital and acquired blood diseases.

It was tremendously reassuring to me to learn that even so rare a disease as hemophilia is being attacked by joint Federal and private efforts. This working together to overcome a common scourge is the kind of cooperative effort that is moving us all forward in our advance against illness and disease. This is an excellent example of the very kind of Government and nongovernmental cooperation which we in Congress hope to stimulate.

I am convinced that the remarkable progress that we have made in the past has been the result of this sort of sustained, cooperative effort among a variety of organizations at the local, State and National level. Many factors lie behind this remarkable growth. Among these factors is the public's interest in health, as manifest in increased tax-supported programs as well as in the rise of the national voluntary health organizations.

As I have observed this increased interest and confidence grow through the years I have come firmly to believe that every American shares with me the desire to do everything possible to assure the best medical care, treatment, and rehabilitation for all our citizens who may be physically afflicted. By doing so we may avert some of the annual loss in human productivity, which contributes to the mainstream of our economy, but this is not our sole or even main obligation.

For, as our Nation has assumed new leadership in the medical sciences, we have demonstrated our adherence to the moral principle that human lives are inherently precious. We then have the obligation to uphold our American heritage of humanitarian concern for the handicapped—as the National Hemophilia Foundation has been so successful in doing.

In this connection, I cannot say too much in favor of the importance of the personal services that the foundation offers to hemophilia victims and their families. Local clinics and patient services mean much to a person who may need continuing care throughout life. Families have to be helped in their internal adjustments; employment and other social problems must be solved. Research and patient services are recognized by this foundation to be two phases of one program.

I am pleased to learn that the executive committee of the foundation has decided to broaden its program to include victims of a number of rare blood diseases related to hemophilia. As I understand it, all persons afflicted with inherited deficiencies of the coagulation factors will now be included in the foundation's research program. This represents your desire to serve more people who have similar problems, and it also reflects your desire to keep in step with the expansion of the Nation's total medical research effort, as outlined by the President in his message to Congress last year.

Medical science is making great strides, however small they may seem, at times, in its conquest of the dread diseases. We know much more than we knew 10 years ago, or 5 years ago, or even a year ago. But to continue to know more we must have many new research facilities, and many, many more trained investigators.

As President Kennedy said last year, "The next 10 years will require a vast expansion of this Nation's present total effort in medical research, if knowledge is to keep pace with human progress."

He concluded, in part, that "The health of the American people must ever be safeguarded; it must ever be improved. As long as people are stricken by disease which we have the ability to prevent, as long as people are chained by a disability which can be reversed, as long as needless death takes its toll, then American health will be unfinished business."

We cannot afford to slow down the research momentum that has been so carefully and painstakingly built up over the years. That is why I urge you to join me in telling the people in your organization, in the areas where you have a voice, how important it is that nothing interfere with the rising tide of medical research in this Nation.

It is, of course, gratifying to know of the President's deep personal interest in health and medical research, and I believe he is most serious in his desire to direct our best efforts toward the improvement of the Nation's health. I am fully confident that the administration will move to forward research for the benefit of all of the American people.

For my part, I shall do what I can in Congress to support medical and health related research in Governmental agencies. We cannot do without some of these Federal activities. I might mention here the recent discovery by Federal agents that unsafe blood was being processed and mislabeled in the New York area. This discovery was made because the Government maintains standards for the production of blood products which can damage or kill if they are not properly handled. Every manufacturer and every product must be approved by the Public Health Service. Fortunately the blood was detected to be faulty, in time, so that there were no fatalities or illnesses. The significance of this action will be clear to you, who work with people who must have quantities of unadulterated blood to save their lives. I think all Americans are reassured to learn that a branch of the Federal Government is safeguarding the interest of any one of us who, at any time, may have to use blood and blood products. I hope that this fact, and not the publicity over the discovery of defective blood, is the fact that remains with the American public.

I am convinced, that with research support continuing to expand, with all of us working together, there is good reason to believe that science will find the cure for hemophilia and other chronic diseases.

There are some areas of hope for a cure for hemophilia, I am told. Research may reveal a dietary supplement that may control the disorder. There is some progress in the attempt to isolate the antihemophilic factor in the blood. There are prospects for improved treatment of hemophilia, especially in the case of improved antihemophilic globulin.

But, and I repeat, to continue this progress and increase the prospects for improved treatment, we must not allow ourselves to slow down in our research efforts. Through the activities of the Federal Government, through the voluntary agencies—and, as with this foundation, through the joint activities of both—we share in the responsibilities and the rewards of the conquest of disease. Only by working harder than ever, and by working in harmony, can we succeed.

The Future of Our Service Bands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 26, 1962

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation which, if enacted, would provide for special pay for the members of the U.S. Army Band, the U.S. Navy Band, the U.S. Marine Corps Band, and the U.S. Air Force Band.

I am convinced that it is imperative that the legislation I have proposed be enacted immediately. The reasons have best been stated by Mr. Phil Fuller in the September 1961 issue of "The School Musician," and I quote:

> 4. It is important to citizens of this country that they be represented by the best and when these four major bands represent us at diplomatic, military, Government, and civic functions they should mirror the highest standards of musical and ceremonial artistry and dignity achievable in this world. This is even more true today than ever before because every minute detail of U.S. activity is now compared to their counterparts in foreign countries—Russia, in particular. This is one phase of American diplomacy which can be superior at a very low cost to the Government.

I would like to furnish a short explanation as to why the situation today has become acute. Prior to 1960, all services in general had made the determination that messing facilities were not available for bandsmen at their permanent duty stations. As a result, they were allowed to pay a subsistence allowance "when rations in kind are not available"—$2.57 per day—instead of at the rate authorized, "when permission to mess separately is granted"—$1.10 per day. As a result of the Comptroller General's decision, on March 2, 1960, the individual services have been denied authority to pay more than the lower rate of $1.10 per day. This has meant a loss to each individual bandsman of approximately $44 per month.

In addition to this, there have been increased demands for participation by the bands for military occasions, civic occasions of national importance, and worldwide tours under the sponsorship of our State Department. Therefore, expenses incurred by the bandsmen for uniform maintenance and meal arrangements while on tour have continued to increase. The Department of Defense has completed a special study of the problem and this summer adopted a general policy in opposition to preferential treatment, including pay, for members of the service bands. The Defense Department believes that mere membership in these organizations, because of the distinction and prestige accompanying such membership, should be sufficient to attract new members and retain older, experienced members as enlistments expire. The Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mr. Carlisle P. Runge, in his letter to me of June 9, concludes by stating: "It would seem desirable to evaluate the validity of this contention before initiating any action in the premises." The contention referred to by Mr. Runge is that without special treatment new recruits will not be obtained and, most importantly, present band members with over 5 years' experience will not reenlist, but will elect to associate with symphonic orchestras or become professional teachers.

It was my hope that the Defense Department, on its own, would initiate a change in policy, which I believe the facts clearly demonstrate to be impera-

tive. Such has not been done, and therefore, after extended discussions with the leaders of all four bands, I have concluded that if legislation such as I have proposed is not enacted in this session of the Congress, the quality of music offered by the bands will suffer. I have received from each band leader questionnaires suggested by me and filled out by each member of all four service bands. I feel this statistical information supports completely the validity of my contention.

The Health of Our Nation Is a Key to Its Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 26, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address which I delivered at the fall meeting of the Rhode Island Society of Dentistry for Children, Providence, R.I., on October 2, 1962:

Remarks of Hon. John E. Fogarty, U.S. Representative, Second Congressional District of Rhode Island, at Fall Meeting of Rhode Island Society of Dentistry for Children, Johnsons Hummocks Restaurant, Providence, R.I., Monday, October 1, 1961, at 7:15 p.m.

I am delighted to be here today, in my home State of Rhode Island and with a group that includes many personal friends.

President Kennedy has said that the health of our Nation is a key to its future.

As you know, Congress doesn't always see eye to eye with the President, and we've been known on occasion to even disagree with Mr. Kennedy. But on the matter of health and research, I can assure you, gentlemen, there is complete unanimity in Washington.

In fact, during the past several years Congress has given practical expression to this view by substantially increasing the appropriations for the National Institutes of Health which—as the research arm of the Public Health Service—have the primary operating responsibility for Federal participation in the advancement of medical and dental sciences.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I have long held the position that no reasonable opportunity for pressing the attack on disease should be lost or delayed because of lack of funds. This policy has enthusiastic public support, and my colleagues in the Senate have consistently joined in appropriating funds to support a wide-ranging research program.

As you know, the National Institute of Dental Research is one of the seven Institutes that comprise the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md. In a little over a decade this Institute has become an international focal point for biologic research in dentistry. And today, it is the fountainhead of new knowledge where all segments of the dental profession—particularly those dealing with children such as most of you do—may look for better methods of diagnosis and treatment for our citizens of tomorrow.

From my vantage point on the House Appropriations Committee, I have watched the progress of this Institute with a great deal of interest, and with, if you'll forgive me, a good measure of personal pride, for I have been actively involved with its appropriations since the Institute was born in 1948.

Some idea of the growth of the Nation's dental research and training programs today can be seen in the Institute's appropriation history. Ten years ago their total budget was somewhat less than $2 million. In 1956 it was still below $3 million. The following year, 1957, it jumped to $6 million, and by last year it had ascended to a little over $15 million. Just last month a joint House-Senate conference approved a budget of almost $17½ million for the current fiscal year. This is a 300-percent increase over the 1957 budget, and tonight I would like to discuss some of the broad implications of this level of support for dentistry.

But first I want to depart for a moment and say a few words about dental health in general. We all know that the American public is interested in good health—yet the high prevalence of dental neglect among both children and adults is indeed a sad commentary. National statistics indicate that very limited attention is being paid to children's teeth at the most crucial period for protecting them against damage in later life. Public apathy about adequate dental care is difficult to understand. One obvious explanation is the fact that many individuals simply do not feel that such care is important. In 1 recent report on 16 communities in California, for example, only 3 percent of a large group of 17-year-olds were free of dental decay.

Not totally unrelated to this public apathy, I am sorry to say, is the occasional indifference of the local professions. The sophisticated public of today expects their dentists and their physicians, and the professional societies to which they belong, to initiate and take part in local and statewide health programs. They like to feel that someone cares about the health of their community as a group. Such programs—if successful—require active participation and forceful leadership from the professions—the kind we see at work right here in the great State of Rhode Island, and the kind we have represented here tonight. The Rhode Island Society of Dentistry for Children is dedicated to improving the dental health of our young citizens, and almost a quarter of all practicing dentists in the State are active members of this society. Moreover, I happen to know this is the highest percentage of participation in any State in the Union. Each of you here—by virtue of your profession, your specialties, and your affiliation with this great society—possesses a depth of knowledge about the oral health status of children. You probably know that in this country less than one child in eight needing orthodontic treatment is now being cared for. You may also know that children born with cleft lips and palates are accumulating at a rate of about 8,000 per year, and only a fraction of these tragically afflicted children are receiving the extended care needed for rehabilitation. I would wager that most of you know there is a handicapped child born somewhere in this country every 15 minutes, and the number of persons so afflicted is close to the 5 million mark. In our small State alone, it is estimated that between 13,000 and 15,000 families have an intimate knowledge of this problem. So pressing is the problem, that President Kennedy has recommended that we establish a new National Institute of Child Health and Human Development that would include a center for research in child health as well as other broad-ranging health research activities.

Proper dental care for the handicapped child is a unique problem of national importance, and here I want to say that I am extremely proud of the pioneering efforts of our own Samuels Dental Clinic in this specialized field. Their programs, under the able direction of Dr. Michael Messore, and with the enthusiastic support of this society, have in the space of 3 years established an outstanding reputation throughout New England and other parts of the country.

Also, I am proud that the State of Rhode Island was the first in the country to include a definite orthodontic program in its public welfare services. This, too, came about through the pioneering efforts of your society and the Samuels Dental Clinic.

History shows that the dental profession has consistently responded to the challenges of providing and maintaining necessary oral health for those who desire these services. Public health educational programs that emphasize dental care have stressed the importance of routine examinations and treatment. A better understanding of oral disease, improved concepts of preventive dentistry, the development of newer techniques, and the increased use of auxiliary personnel have all made it possible for the profession to offer more and better service in spite of the decreasing dental-population ratio.

Yet, there still remains an astonishing backlog of untreated dental problems. There are ominous signs of early periodontal problems in half of our 20- to 30-year-old citizens, advanced pyorrhea in half of the middle-aged population, and serious involvement with virtually every one by the time they reached retirement. Nationally, dental decay affects almost everyone, including 90 percent of school age children, and the accumulation of untreated teeth far exceeds the capacity for treatment. And, if I haven't made my point, it is a disquieting commentary that almost one-third of all who reach middle age today are without any natural teeth. Obviously the dental profession has not yet accomplished its primary objective, the prevention of oral disease. And until this is done, the dental health needs of the country can never be adequately met.

The key man in any effort to provide dental care to more people has been and will always be the dental practitioner and particularly those specializing in children's dentistry. However, to simply maintain the present level of dental care in a rising population, without allowing for an increase in demand for care, would require at least 134,000 dentists by 1975. This is about one-fourth more than can be expected at the present rate of graduation for dental schools. Today the ratio of dentists to population is adequate to provide about a third of our people with comprehensive care. Superficially, the solution would seem to be to triple the number of dentists. But even if this were a lasting solution, and it is not, it is not easily done. because dentistry is in direct and ofttimes unsuccessful competition with the other professions for promising students.

The fluoridation of community water supplies has and will continue to have a profound and beneficial effect on oral health in the years ahead. Since 1950, the dental profession has had this potent weapon that reduces tooth decay by at least 60 percent. Yet in the entire country less than 25 percent of the people are protected by this safe, economical, convenient, preventive measure, and most of these people live in the larger cities. Only 5 percent of the towns under 2,500 persons are now fluoridating their water, and it has been estimated that at the present rate of acceptance, the goal of 100 percent fluoridation will not be reached for over a century. Incidentally, when I argue for fluoridation—and I often do—I know my house is in order, because 9 out of 10 persons in the State of Rhode Island are now receiving fluoridated water. But until a larger segment of the American public ceases to be impressed by the arguments of health and other faddists, that fluoridation is dangerous, immoral, unconstitutional, or unscriptural, the true potential of the health measure will remain untapped.

These things I have mentioned—increasing the number of dentists, educating the public, accepting fluoridation—they are all a necessary part of the dental health picture. But, gentlemen, they will never be enough, for in the final analysis they are only stopgap measures.

The American Council on Education in their recent report on the status of dentistry in the United States pointed out that one scientist, if he should discover a means of preventing or reducing periodontal disease, for example, might do more for the Nation's oral health than several thousand practitioners.

This essentially is the philosophy of Congress with regard to support of our Nation's research and training programs. Such programs, supported by Federal grants have in recent years become the most effective driving force behind our total national effort in the dental sciences. A great variety of studies now underway in dental schools are generating important scientific knowledge, and new programs continue to exemplify the increasing scope of dentistry.

Many areas of research need are constantly being brought to the attention of my committee through citizens' testimony. One of these, for example, is in the field of congenital anomalies, where we are now giving particular attention to the study of the cleft lip and palate syndrome. Grants already awarded place emphasis on an integrated team approach to the cleft palate problem and, quite importantly, they are also designed to train investigators and practitioners in this complex field of inquiry.

Recognizing the manpower problem and the opportunity to increase the quality of dental services by the use of auxiliary personnel, Congress appropriated funds last year for the establishment of a new training program for undergraduate dental students. These grants are made to dental schools to establish, as an integral part of their undergraduate course, formal programs for teaching students to work effectively with chairside assistants. Here, the long-range purpose is to offset a decline in the supply of dental services. I might add that one of the important pilot studies that provided a sound basis for this national program was carried out at Woonsocket here in the State of Rhode Island. Scientists working in the new $4 million dental research laboratory in Bethesda (we just dedicated that building last May) are probing ever closer to the cause of the major oral diseases. For example, in testimony before my committee this year I was told that the specific bacteria that cause tooth decay in certain animals have now been identified. These scientists also suspect that human dental decay may be caused by a single bacteria, and if this proves to be the case, the problem of its eventual control by vaccination or chemotherapy is certainly within the realm of possibility.

The comprehensive health program which President Kennedy outlined in his message to Congress this year includes specific recommendations for substantial Federal aid to education, and there are many congressional proposals that would make Federal funds available for the building of more schools and the training of more dentists. I have again this year introduced legislation providing for wide-ranging support for dental and medical education. I have also proposed legislation that will not only bring us closer to the goal of more adequate supply but will also help us attain higher standards of dental education. One of these is a scholarship bill that will permit dental schools to select applicants of high intellectual promise from an increased number of applicants stimulated by the availability of scholarships. The second of these bills would provide operating grants to schools, make it possible to provide for expanding enrollments, and supply necessary funds to improve the quality of instruction.

In conclusion, even though I am not a dentist, I am immensely proud of my honorary membership in the American Dental Association. I am certainly not a scientist, but I have followed with keen interest the progress of dental research both in Government laboratories and in our Nation's dental schools. I am not a dental educator, although, I think I recognize the problems of molding a dental curriculum 'that will serve both the needs of general practice and research. But while I am perhaps none of these things, I do share a special obligation to understand your needs, and to legislate in their behalf.

As I look around this year, it seems as never before, that public health, particularly better health for our children, is very much in vogue, and this is good. I say it has been in vogue in this State and this community for a long time—due to the high professional skills and the quality of leadership associated with organizations such as the Rhode Island Society of Dentists for Children.

Gentlemen, it has been a distinct pleasure to be with you this evening.

SENATE

Monday, January 29, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, as with our hands filled with the perplexing tasks of the present we turn to Thee for strength, may our eyes not be oblivious to the beauty that blooms by the side of today's pathway—for the glory of the way, as well as its obligations, is Thy gift.

And now as our earth spins in space and another day is before us, so soon to be behind us forever, we know that only this once can we seize the day for which now we crave Thy blessing and approval.

May we live it in the light of the yesterdays into whose labors we have entered, as the past warns us by its errors, informs us by its achievements, and inspires us by its sacrifices.

In our stewardship of today, and of the days to be that may be granted, we are thankful for the friends whose faith calls out the hidden best that is in us, for children who call us by the holiest name men and women may ever know, and for the challenge to our utmost, in which we rejoice as strong men preparing to run a race.

Thus, before our little day ebbs out and our work is done, with patience and courage may we serve the present age our calling to fulfill.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 25, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 157) to change the name of the Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif., to the Marina del Rey, Los Angeles, Calif., and it was signed by the Vice President.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Francis A. O'Neill, Jr., of New York, to be a member of the National Mediation Board.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of 1 general, 4 lieutenant generals, and 1 major general, for special assignment in the Army; 1 general, and 4 lieutenant generals to be placed on the retired list of the Army; 1 officer to be a temporary brigadier general in the Army; 4 lieutenant generals for special assignment in the Air Force, and 1 general to be placed on the retired list of the Air Force; 120 officers in the rank of brigadier general and major general, for temporary and permanent appointment in the Air Force; the permanent promotion in the Navy of 26 rear admirals, and permanent appointment in the Marine

Corps of 5 major generals and 8 brigadier generals. I ask unanimous consent that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The nominations are as follows:

Maj. Gen. Robert John Fleming, Jr., U.S. Army, for appointment as Governor of the Canal Zone;

Lt. Gen. Paul DeWitt Adams, U.S. Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President;

Maj. Gen. Samuel Leslie Myers, U.S. Army, Maj. Gen. John Phillips Daley, U.S. Army, and Maj. Gen. William Wilson Quinn, U.S. Army, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenant generals;

Augustus G. Elegram, for appointment as a temporary brigadier general in the Army of the United States, and for reappointment as colonel in the Regular Army of the United States, from the temporary disability retired list;

Gen. Bruce Cooper Clark, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), and sundry other officers, to be placed on the retired list;

Charles B. Brooks, Jr., and sundry other officers of the Regular Navy, for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral;

Leroy J. Alexanderson, and Grant G. Calhoun, officers of the Naval Reserve, for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral;

Alpha L. Bowser, and sundry other officers of the Marine Corps, for permanent appointment to the grade of major general;

Thomas F. Riley, and sundry other officers of the Marine Corps, for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general;

Gen. Charles P. Cabell, (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general;

Maj. Gen. Bruce K. Holloway, Regular Air Force, Maj. Gen. James Ferguson, Regular Air Force, Maj. Gen. Harvey T. Alness, Regular Air Force, and Maj. Gen. Thomas S. Moorman, Jr., Regular Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenant generals;

Maj. Gen. John S. Hardy (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Air Force; and

Brig. Gen. Don Coupland, Regular Air Force, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I also report favorably the nominations of 397 officers in the grade of lieutenant colonel and below, for promotion and appointment in the Army. All of these names have already appeared in the Congressional Record. In order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and, without objection, the nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Georgia.

The nominations are as follows:

Therese A. Quinby, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Ronald P. Abreu, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Clifton F. Vincent, for reappointment as a captain in the Regular Army of the United States, from the temporary disability retired list;

Robert C. Hamilton, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States; and

John R. Allen, and sundry other distinguished military students, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, also from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of 27 major generals and 51 brigadier generals for temporary appointment in the Army. I ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations are as follows:

Brig. Gen. Carl Darnell, and sundry other officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

MEMBER, BOARD OF GOVERNORS, FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George W. Mitchell, of Illinois, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of 14 years from February 1, 1962.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

AMBASSADOR

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William E. Stevenson, of Colorado, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Philippines.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ENVOY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William A. Crawford, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Rumania.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Fred Korth, of Texas, to be Secretary of the Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John A. McCone, of California, to be Director of Central Intelligence.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I I ask that this nomination be placed at the foot of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Neil E. Harlan, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frederick G. Dutton, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNDER SECRETARIES OF STATE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George W. Ball, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George C. McGhee, of Texas, to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

REPRESENTATIVE ON THE POPULATION COMMISSION OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dr. Ansley J. Coale, of New Jersey, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William C. Foster, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Adrian S. Fisher, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PRESIDENT'S SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE AND ADVISER ON AFRICAN, ASIAN, AND LATIN AMERICAN AFFAIRS, AND AMBASSADOR AT LARGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, to be the President's special representative and adviser on African, Asian, and Latin American affairs, and Ambassador at Large.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. AMBASSADORS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of ambassadors.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of ambassadors will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the action taken by the Senate in confirming these various nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

TRANSACTION OF LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, as in legislative session, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Officers Assigned to Permanent Duty in the Executive Element of the Air Force at the Seat of Government

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that, as of December 31, 1961, there was an aggregate of 2,280 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report of Board of Visitors to U.S. Naval Academy

A letter from the Secretary to the Board of Visitors, U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Federal-Aid Airport Program and Program for Establishment of Air Navigation Facilities

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, copies of the fiscal year 1962 Federal-aid airport program, and the program for the establishment of air navigation facilities (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Commerce.

Statement of Receipts and Expenditures of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.

A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of receipts and expenditures of that company, for the year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Amendment of Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, Relating to Title III

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Audit Report on St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, for the period July 1, 1959, through December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Audit Report on Federal National Mortgage Association

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal National Mortgage Association, Housing and Home Finance Agency, fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Utilization of Certain Aircraft Engines as a Source for Spare Parts

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the utilization of excess R3350-26WA aircraft engines as a source for spare parts by the Department of the Navy, dated January 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Proceedings of Annual Meeting of Judicial Conference of the United States

A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held at Washington, D.C., September 20-21, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Financial Report on the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association

A letter from the secretary, the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of the financial transactions of that association, for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Status of Public Buildings

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the status of construction, alteration, or acquisition of public buildings, dated December 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

Disposition of Executive Papers

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Archivist of the United States on a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Federal Communications Commission, expressing the respect and sorrow of the Commissioners on the untimely death of the late Senator Andrew F. Schoeppel; ordered to lie on the table.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and myself, I present a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of South Carolina memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact as promptly as possible S. 1795 or H.R. 6789, or similar legislation, authorizing Duke Power Co. to construct a dam across the Savannah River, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

Concurrent Resolution Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Enact as Promptly as Possible S. 1795 or H.R. 6789, or Similar Legislation Authorizing Duke Power Co. To Construct a Dam Across the Savannah River

Whereas Duke Power Co. has announced plans for constructing a giant 2-million-kilowatt steam-electric generating plant on the Savannah River in Anderson County, S.C.; and

Whereas, in order to form a pool for condenser cooling water for this plant, it is necessary for Duke Power Co. to construct a dam across the Savannah River; and

Whereas, before this dam can be constructed, congressional approval is required, and bills for such approval, designated S. 1795 and H.R. 6789, were introduced on May 3, 1961, and are now pending in both bodies of the Congress; and

Whereas the proposed Duke Power Co. 2-million-kilowatt generaitng plant would be a great asset to the economy of South Carolina and the surrounding area in that it will not only involve construction costs of approximately $280 million and will create needed jobs during both construction and operation, but will annually add to the economy an estimated 10 billion kilowatt-hours' production, 3½-million-ton coal consumption at a cost of $26 million, $2½ million payroll, $7,450,000 State and local taxes, and $9,200,000 Federal income taxes; and

Whereas the General Assembly of South Carolina, in furtherance of its belief in the importance of this proposed project to the State of South Carolina, desires to urge the Congress promptly to enact the necessary enabling legislation authorizing the construction of this dam: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to enact, as promptly as possible, S. 1795 or H.R. 6789, now pending before the Congress, or similar legislation authorizing Duke Power Co. to construct across the Savannah River a dam necessary for its proposed steam plant; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the following officers and Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress: the Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairmen of the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives, each Senator from South Carolina, and each Member of the House of Representatives from South Carolina.

Attest: I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the South Carolina House of Representatives and concurred in by the Senate.

INEZ WATSON,
Clerk of the House.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. BURDICK, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. Res. 273. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2751. A bill for the relief of Susan Gudera, Heinz Hugo Gudera, and Catherine Gudera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 2752. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to assist the States of Maryland, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia to reestablish their common boundaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 2753. A bill for the relief of Duk Man Lee and Mal Soon Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY (by request):

S. 2754. A bill to establish a uniform national policy concerning rights to inventions under contracts with the U.S. Government; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2755. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 2756. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes; and

S. 2757. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free entry of records and diagrams of engineering and exploration data not imported for sale or general distribution; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii:

S. 2758. A bill for the relief of Mesepa (Naesepa) and Tuileau, both of Aloau Village, American Samoa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 2759. A bill to provide for further research relating to new and improved uses for farm and forest products and for development of new crops, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 2760. A bill for the relief of Yuk-Kan Cheuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 2761. A bill for the relief of Lily Jinghua Pan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S.J. Res. 149. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to designate the week of May 6, 1962, as "International Castings Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

NATIONAL PATENT POLICY IN GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a uniform national policy concerning rights to inventions under contracts with the U.S. Government.

This bill constitutes the redrafting of S. 2601, which I introduced during the last session of Congress.

There is much concern in industry circles, in Government offices and all over the country with regard to the title to patents resulting from Government contracts. The question is a very important one. If the taxpayers are paying for research—from which patents result—should they be entitled to keep the patents? On the other hand, if the industry contributes much of its know-how to the development of these patents, should they be entitled to compensation for their efforts? And finally, how do we make certain that patents developed in the course of Government-sponsored contracts reach the American public? Is industry likely to develop products to which they do not have patents and where anybody could compete with them? Which answer would better serve the public interest?

The Patents Subcommittee has before it several bills designed to deal with the patents problem. I believe that the bill introduced by me today will begin calling attention to the need to reevaluate and to balance the interests of both industry and the public.

This bill was prepared originally by a committee of the Milwaukee Patent Law Association. It is the belief of those responsible for the drafting of this bill that this bill will answer the need for clarification of patent rights arising out of Government-sponsored research. Several other bills are already pending before the Senate Patents Subcommittee, they all represent different points of view in connection with this important issue, and I hope this bill will help focus attention on other important aspects of this legislation.

I request unanimous consent to have the bill and the accompanying analysis of its provisions printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2754) to establish a uniform national policy concerning rights to inventions under contracts with the U.S. Government, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Invention Act".

SEC. 2. Congress recognizes—

(a) that the United States patent system was established to encourage inventions and discoveries and the disclosure and commercial use thereof; and

(b) that the general welfare and the promotion of science and the useful arts are better served by taking advantage of the incentives provided by the patent system:

(1) to encourage industry's participation in Government sponsored research and development; and

(2) to achieve greater commercial exploitation of Government owned inventions and discoveries.

SEC. 3. The Patent Act of 1952 is hereby amended by adding to title 35 of the United States Code, chapter 27, the following:

"§ 268. Licenses to the Government

"(a) The property rights to be secured by the Government through any agency thereof with respect to inventions made in the performance of Government contracts (excluding agreements between the Government and its individual employees and consultants) shall, except as provided in section 269 hereof, be a nonexclusive license to practice such inventions. Such contracts shall not require that title to said inventions shall vest in the Government. No such license to the Government shall convey any right to the Government to provide services or supplies to the general public in competition with the contractor or its licensees.

"(b) Unless separately negotiated no license shall be acquired by the Government with respect to the contractor's inventions which are at private expense—

"(1) designed, engineered, tested, or used; and

"(2) patented or made the subject of a pending application for United States Letters Patent.

"§ 269. Title in the Government

"The Government may, notwithstanding section 269(a), contract for title to inventions made in the performance of a Government research and development contract in which:

"(a) the contract is for the development of a new field of technology as to which there is at the time of the contract no significant, non-Government experience to build upon; or

"(b) the contractor is to function primarily as an administrative agent of the Government; or

"(c) the contract is for the development of a product in a form suitable for commercial use and the availability of said products for public use does not depend upon patent incentives.

"§ 270. Sale of Inventions by the Government

"(a) The Government may sell outright to the highest bidder Government-owned inventions including any acquired under section 269 hereof. When the Government proposes to sell any such invention, public notice identifying the invention for sale and specifying the terms of sale shall be given in the Federal Register and in the Official Gazette of the United States Patent Office at least ninety days prior to the date set for the opening of bids. An opportunity shall be given to any interested person, firm, or corporation, to submit a bid, such bid to be sealed.

"(b) Any such sale shall be subject to the right of the Government at all times to make use of the invention for governmental purposes only.

"(c) All proceeds from the sale of such inventions shall be paid into the United States Treasury for the general use of the United States.

"(d) Any unpatented invention which the Government proposes to sell as provided in section 270(a) hereof and which is not sold within twelve months from the date of the first public notice of the proposed sale, shall then be dedicated to the public and notice to that effect shall be published in the Federal Register and in the Official Gazette of the United States Patent Office, such notice to be published for four consecutive weeks. Any patent(s) issued for a Government-owned invention that has been dedicated as provided by this subsection (d) shall be deemed to have been dedicated to the public on the date the patent issued.

"(e) Any patent(s) covering a Government-owned invention (whether the patent(s) was secured before or after the invention became the property of the Government) and which is not sold as provided by section 270(a) thereof within twelve months from the effective date of the patent(s) issued for a Government-owned invention or from the date the Government acquired title to the patent(s) for an invention that was patented when the invention became the property of the Government, shall then be dedicated to the public as provided by section 270(d) hereof.

"(f) Any patent(s) covering inventions which are owned by the Government on the date this Act becomes effective and which are not sold as provided by section 270(a) hereof within twelve months after said date, shall then be dedicated to the public as provided by section 270(d) hereof.

"(g) Any person who desires a license under an invention and/or patent(s) purchased from the Government may file a petition for such a license in a United States district court and the court may declare the invention and/or patent(s) to be affected with the public interest and grant the petitioner a nonexclusive license on royalty terms and conditions deemed reasonable by the court, if the court finds as a matter of fact that the following conditions precedent exist—

"(1) the owner of such invention has not diligently acted to commercially exploit the invention; and

"(2) that a license to the petitioner will result in such exploitation; and

"(3) the said petitioner cannot otherwise obtain a license from said owner on reasonable royalty terms for such exploitation; and

"(4) the Government policy of achieving commercial exploitation of such inventions will not be accomplished unless said petitioner is granted the license."

SEC. 4. (a) The Space Act of 1958 is hereby amended by repealing section 305.

(b) The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 is hereby amended by repealing section 152.

(c) All sections of Acts in conflict with this Act are hereby repealed.

The analysis presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF BILL TO ESTABLISH A UNIFORM NATIONAL POLICY CONCERNING RIGHTS TO INVENTIONS UNDER CONTRACTS WITH THE U.S. GOVERNMENT

The accompanying bill constitutes a rewriting of S. 2601 having its principle purpose to eliminate the section 270 providing for "Licenses by the Government" of Government-owned patents and to substitute therefor a new section 270 providing for "Sale of inventions by the Government."

The present bill provides in section 270 for the sale of all Government-owned patents to the highest bidder at terms set by the Government, and subject at all times to the reservation of a right in the Government to make use of the invention for governmental purposes. All bids are to be sealed and submitted upon appropriate notice in the Federal Register and the Official Gazette of the U.S. Patent Office.

All proceeds from the sale of patents are to be paid directly into the Treasury for general use and not earmarked for credit to the agency from which the sale arises.

Sections 270 (d), (e), and (f) provide in general that all Government-owned inventions and patents are to be dedicated to the public if they are not sold within a given specified time. This recognizes the fact that the Government should not at the same time create a monopoly and enforce it against the public. Consequently, if the Government is to retain title to it the patent in effect becomes a nullity and should be dedicated.

Section 270(g) spells out conditions under which any member of the public may obtain a license from one who has purchased a patent from the Government, thus making sure that any commercially valuable invention thus sold by the Government will be put to use and not suppressed.

The new bill on a whole satisfies the needs of the Government and the public with less of an administrative problem and without the danger of any Government agency being put in the position of creating a monopoly and then negotiating a return for it.

The system of selling property by means of sealed bids is well known to the Government and is employed every day by various Government agencies. It is eminently fair and should produce the best price to the Government without the dangers of negotiation.

The bill has the added advantage that those inventions that may have commercial value will receive the normal patent incentives toward initiating commercial use of them thus permitting our patent system to continue to work for the benefit of the public in those fields of research in which the Government is itself interested.

The bill has the same objectives as those given for S. 2601 and has been drafted to overcome certain objections raised by industry and attorneys to the idea that the Government should ever create a monopoly and then negotiate with members of the public to grant licenses for a price. This puts Government research directly in competition with private industrial research and also encourages possible disregard of the principles of patentability of invention in the granting of patents for which the Government may receive a negotiated royalty income. Furthermore, under S. 2601 the administrative problems of negotiating royalty producing licenses were not taken care of.

A minor change is a restatement of section 269(c) to more clearly specify the principle intended to apply in cases where the Government may desire to take title.

NEW AND IMPROVED USES FOR FARM AND FOREST PRODUCTS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for increased uses of agricultural products and for creation of new industrial uses of agricultural products and to promote new crops.

For several years the Congress has received bills attempting to implement the findings and the purposes of the study by the President's bipartisan Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products.

In 1958 several Senators, including myself, introduced proposed legislation on this subject. The Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee took the various bills introduced and combined the better qualities of each into a committee bill. This committee bill passed the Senate practically without dissent. The House failed to act.

Again in the 86th Congress I introduced this bill and I was supported by several Senators. The Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported the bill unanimously, and in 1960 the Senate passed the bill with only one or two dissenters despite opposition from former Secretary of Agriculture Benson.

In the House of Representatives Mr. Benson was more successful, and the House substituted its version for the Senate bill. I realize there must be compromise in legislation, but in this situation there was no compromise. Therefore, we did not meet in agreement in conference and the proposed legislation died with the end of Congress.

Last year I introduced S. 173 for myself and several other Senators providing basically for the same legislation we had passed in the Senate in the 86th Congress. This bill is now pending in one of the Senate agriculture and forestry subcommittees and we have taken no action upon it. Since introducing S. 173, I have been in conference with several interested groups, individuals and the Department of Agriculture. On the basis of these conferences I have drafted a new bill covering the same subject, which I have sent to the desk for introduction. The name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] also appears on the bill.

This bill incorporates most of the declarations and findings contained in S. 173 and S. 714 which were introduced in the first session of this Congress last year. This matter of agricultural research with particular emphasis on finding new industrial uses of agricultural products is tremendously important. I would like to reassure Members of Congress and other citizens interested in agricultural research that this legislation carries no purpose or intent of diminishing the importance of the other agricultural research programs already in progress. Certainly, we do not wish to undertake this program if it would cause any reduction in research programs now underway, particularly those eradicating plant disease and insects.

All real friends of the farmer are going to concentrate on ways of helping him, rather than on dissipating their energies on details of how we help him. Aid for agriculture is the main point; if we enjoy the luxury of differing as to method we must not hinder progress toward assisting our national agricultural industry. I am sure that all of us are in agreement on this basic idea: our Nation's farmers are the backbone of the national economy; and in helping them, we help ourselves. I may feel that my ways of rendering assistance are better than the next fellow's; but this is not going to deter me one whit from giving my wholehearted support to a compromise program that carries with it the hope of bettering agriculture.

Research is the key that unlocks many doors. When we view the surpluses of agricultural products, we realize the urgent need for wider and more intensive research for new uses for those products and for new products that will yield paying crops.

Research is a multiplier that increases multiple uses on basic products. I never cease to wonder at the work of George Washington Carver, whose genius was able to develop more than 100 byproducts from the humble peanut. Who knows what untapped secrets nature has stored up in other everyday products?

Yes, research is a creative force, generating progress, sparking productivity, promoting comfort, adding to total living. Research creates wealth through inventiveness, and ministers to man's welfare.

Behind any successful manufacturing company we find a substantial research program. The more successful the company, the more funds are being poured back into the business, through the medium of research. Fiscal analysts tell us one of the best ways to determine the future prospects of any given company is to read its financial statement and learn what part of its earnings is being plowed back in the form of research. Companies that fail to provide adequate research programs soon wind up "in the ditch." The leading corporations are strong on research.

Mr. President, we must do for research in agriculture what industry does for its research. We cannot, in national self-interest, afford to do less. Every dollar invested in agricultural research will come back manifold, and the beneficial effects will pour into all segments of the economy.

Judging by commercial standards, the ratio of expenditures for research to the total dollar value of the Nation's agricultural products is relatively small. More, much more, needs to be done.

The bill I am introducing contains certain authority that is not now available to the Department of Agriculture, but which I believe is necessary if agricultural research is to produce the expected results. This includes authority for research grants, student fellowships, scholarships, and similar aids to strengthen graduate training.

There is widespread recognition that a prosperous agricultural industry is one of the basic necessities of a strong America. Farmers are one of the most important consumer groups in America. For our Nation to be prosperous, the farmer has to be in a position to buy the products of industry. It is true that the number of farmers in America has decreased in recent years, but statistics show that purchases by farmers for production and consumption have increased.

The President's bipartisan Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products stresses the economic importance of the farmer in the following words:

> Two-fifths of the Nation's total economic activity arises from agriculture and related business functions.

Mr. President, the broad objectives of the measure we are now considering were outlined in the report of the afore-mentioned Commission. After a thorough study and survey of the agricultural industry, the Commission made major recommendations looking toward comprehensive research to bring about the greatest possible industrial uses of agricultural products.

In its report, the Commission said:

> In the past 25 years agriculture often has been researched right out of its natural domain. Industry will continue to explore the unknown in search for new products and new uses for old products. Nothing is plainer in the economic pattern of today than that agriculture must compete in areas of basic and applied scientific research. Agriculture should be enabled to compete as an equal, in the contest for consumer acceptance. It is now losing by default.

The Commission was created in accordance with section 209 of Public Law 540, 84th Congress. It filed an interim report on April 17, 1956, and its final report on June 15, 1957.

Altogether, the Commission made eight pertinent recommendations, and also obtained suggestions through correspondence with experiment station directors and more than 350 industrial executives. The work of the Commission was well planned and comprehensive.

In its report, the Commission stated it found it necessary to obtain quickly:

> 1. An adequate assessment of the current state of industrial utilization research.
> 2. A sound appraisal of its possibilities.
> 3. Adequate understanding of the obstacles to further development.

To this end, the Commission set up task groups or special committees in the following areas:

Corn wet-milling, cotton, crop residues, industrial alcohol from grain, industrial uses for grain other than alcohol, dairy products, forage crops, forest products, fruits and vegetables, hides, skins, and animal byproducts, new and special crops, oilseeds and animal fats, poultry products, rice, sugar, tobacco, white potato products, wool, and mohair.

Not the least important of the Commission's conclusions of its studies was the last, which reads:

> The dynamic forces which created American industrial development must be motivated in the farm economy.

Mr. President, it is noteworthy that the Commission's first recommendation called for a substantial increase in research funds, and did so in the following language:

> The Commission proposes as its first and most necessary recommendation that the funds for industrial uses research be increased to not less than three times the amounts ($16,145,000) currently available; and that additional sums be provided, as herein suggested, for new crop research, trial commercialization, development, and incentives.

Immediately following this, the Commission recommended that the facilities of the Department of Agriculture be fully utilized in furthering the research program, as well as land-grant colleges, experiment stations, universities and colleges, private research organizations, and foreign institutions. There followed a recommendation for research grants and fellowships, scholarships, and similar aids that, while furthering research projects, would also increase the supply of trained scientists.

Special emphasis was put by the Commission on the new crop projects with the purpose of creating durable, additional markets, and for rapid disposal, through industrial channels of accumulated surpluses.

The Commission found that the current industrial outlets for the products of the total farm acreage, estimated to be less than 7 percent, are undeniably small.

One of the most encouraging leads to be developed by the Commission was the prospect of a major crop for the South—bamboo. This product has shown great potential in the paper field, as well as in furniture and plastics. I am pleased to report that preliminary experimentation and work with this crop have already been started in South Carolina and Georgia by private firms, and through the Clemson College Edisto experiment station, near Blackville, S.C.

A whole regional economy can be uplifted and transformed through the development of some such good, new pay crop. We all know what has been accomplished with the soybean—the commercial markets it commands, the jobs it has created, the payrolls it accounts for. Who knows how many such undiscovered commercial products await in the darkness that can be pierced only by the searchlight of research. Is it any wonder that we approach this research program with enthusiasm and great expectations—holding as it does, vast vistas of opportunities?

In my opinion, no proposed legislation that has come before the Senate in recent years is more important from the farmers' standpoint.

We must enact this bill in order to step up our research. The Congress has appropriated billions of dollars for foreign aid; much of it has gone for research in foreign countries. It is inconceivable to me that this opportunity to help our own people and our own economy would not be availed of.

I hope this agriculture research bill will pass Congress this session. There is tremendous need for agriculture research. Such research can help our farmers and industries find new sources of income and production.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill lie on the desk for 1 week, in order that Senators who may wish to consponsor it with me may have an opportunity to do so. I have received several requests regarding cosponsorship.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from South Carolina.

The bill (S. 2759) to provide for further research relating to new and improved uses for farm and forest products and for development of new crops, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF BILL PROVIDING FOR RESEARCH ON INDUSTRIAL USE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Section 1 incorporates most of the declarations and findings contained in S. 714, introduced in the 87th Congress, 1st session.

Section 2 authorized the Secretary of Agriculture, independently or in cooperation with public and private organizations and individuals, to conduct research to expand markets and uses for farm products and to develop new crops.

Section 3 provides authority, which the Department does not now have or the use of which is restricted, to make grants to research institutions and individuals, provide graduate fellowships, to enter into contracts or cooperative arrangements, and to grant exclusive licenses, subject to the limitations prescribed in the bill.

Section 4 authorizes establishment of not to exceed 100 positions for scientific or professional personnel, at rates not in excess of those established for Public Law 313 positions.

Section 5 comprehensively defines "agricultural products" and "farm and forest products" as used in the bill, to be the same as in the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1626).

Section 6 provides an appropriation authorization and for the use of foreign currencies available to the Secretary under Public Law 480.

Section 7 specifically states that the authorities contained in the bill are in addition to other authorities.

DESIGNATION OF WEEK OF MAY 6, 1962, AS "INTERNATIONAL CASTINGS WEEK"

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution requesting the President to designate the week of May 6, 1962, as "International Castings Week" in recognition of the 29th International Foundry Congress and its theme of "Castings Technology for World Progress."

The International Foundry Congress, which will convene in Detroit at that time will be attended by thousands of technicians, metallurgists, engineers, and the operating managers of cast metal plants from the United States, Canada, and more than 48 other countries.

This international event occurs every year and is sponsored by the International Committee of Foundry Technological Associations, and I believe it would be fitting testimony to the assembly of this great technological group in the United States that that week be so designated to honor the event as well as the distinguished scientists and technicians who will be in attendance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 149) authorizing the President of the United States to designate the week of May 6, 1962, as "International Castings Week," introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROTECTION OF RIGHT TO VOTE IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS—LIMITATION OF SPONSORSHIP OF BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the sponsorship of the bill (S. 2750) to protect the right to vote in Federal elections free from arbitrary discrimination by literacy tests or other means, be limited to the majority leader and the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY FOR PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS TO FILE REPORTS SUBSEQUENT TO JANUARY 31, 1962

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for permission for the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Government Operations Committee to file reports concerning last year's work after the January 31 deadline which would normally prevail.

There are three reports. The first two, those concerning our hearings into work stoppages at missile bases and gambling and organized crime, have been drafted and are now under study by the committee members. I ask for a delay until the 1st of March in order that adequate consideration may be given to the reports by the committee members.

The third of these three reports relates to a labor matter concerning which there is prosecution now pending in Federal court. We have been asked by the Department of Justice to postpone the filing of this report in order that the court proceedings in this matter may not be prejudiced. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the filing date of this report concerning certain aspects of the investigation of the Teamsters Union be extended to June 1, 1962.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POSTAL REVISION ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a proposed amendment to H.R. 7927, the Postal Revision Act of 1961. This bill was approved by the House of Representatives on January 24, 1962, and is now before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee for consideration.

The purpose of my amendment would make it very clear through legislation that the Post Office Department will not be permitted to deliver franked mail in cities unless it is addressed to a specific street number. Such a move is only fair and would emphasize what I believe to be the feeling of the Senate regarding the use of congressional junk mail as we have expressed ourselves in the past.

I want to make it very clear that I am not criticizing the use of the franking privilege by Members of Congress in answering the correspondence with their constituents or in the discharge of the proper functions of their office.

However, at a time when the Congress of the United States is considering raising the postal rates for the American public, it seems to me to be completely inappropriate and contradictory to be asking additional special privileges for ourselves. The provision authorizing—or more accurately, perhaps, expressing congressional approval of—the handling of congressional junk mail by the Post Office Department was put into law in the dying moments of the 1st session of the 87th Congress when the House of Representatives amended a supplemental appropriations bill and sent it to the Senate on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. The Senate had no choice but to approve the amendment and the Post Office Department now has a congressional directive to deliver franked mail 'to every householder in our cities even though the letter bears neither a name nor an address.

Mr. President, this constitutes an unconscionable abuse of the franking privilege which is so necessary to the proper conduct of a congressional office, because it allows Members of Congress to use a free mailing service to do things which ordinary citizens and businesses cannot do even if they pay for it.

I believe that in a very real sense the integrity of the Congress of the United States is at stake here. In the passage of this postal rate revision bill we will be asking American citizens to pay more for mailing a first-class letter, we will be asking business establishments to pay more for the circulation of advertising material, generally referred to as junk mail, and we are asking newspapers and magazines to pay higher rates for the handling of their publications in the mails. Yet, unless this amendment to the bill is adopted, we will be telling the American people that the Congress wants them to pay higher rates for postal services while at the same time extending to ourselves a privilege that other American citizens cannot even buy at the higher rates. We will be saying in effect, that we plan to flood their mailboxes with political propaganda from now on, and they will pay for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CONSTRUCTION, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF LOWER TETON RECLAMATION PROJECT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be included as a cosponsor of S. 2643, a bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the lower Teton reclamation project in the upper Snake River Valley, and for related purposes, introduced by my colleague from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] on September 26, 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of Jacob D. Beam, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE PARK

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am pleased to be able to announce to the Senate that Senate subcommittee hearings on the bill to establish the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Park, S. 1797, have been set for February 26 and 27 here in Washington. This is the bill, in revised form, which I introduced on August 28, 1961, with the cosponsorship of Senators MOSS, GRUENING, MCCARTHY, NEUBERGER, METCALF, and HUMPHREY.

I want to express my gratitude to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and to the members of the subcommittee, for their gracious consent to schedule these hearings at this earliest possible date in the session. Threats to destroy additional portions of this beautiful and irreplaceable dunesland are upon us, and it is therefore of the utmost importance that we have this opportunity to place before the Congress and the people the case for saving the dunes.

Mr. President, no conservation question is at this time more urgently important to the people of the Midwest as saving the dunes from destruction. The unique recreational and scientific value of these remaining duneslands has become very well known. Indeed, many members of the Interior Committee have personally inspected the areas covered in this bill, and as recently as last summer, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] joined local Indiana public officials, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, and me in a close examination of the proposed park site. Following his tour of the area, Secretary Udall announced his unqualified view that the dunes area described in this bill is fully suitable for a national park and that action to save the area is urgent and desirable.

As I have pointed out many times, Mr. President, the population of the great midwestern area adjoining the Great Lakes is expanding rapidly. In the metropolitan belt stretching from Milwaukee to Michigan City, there are now 7 million people. Yet this populous area lacks a large national park to serve the recreation needs and nature interests of its people.

Mr. President, these hearings will provide the Congress with the full story of the long attempt to preserve this priceless area for the people, and will show the strong support of Indiana and Midwest citizens for saving this resource, the unfortunate and, in part, scandalous attempts by selfish interests to destroy the dunes, and the overwhelming agreement of conservationists on the values of the area.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS OF HARRISON L. WINTER TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF MARYLAND, AND J. ROBERT ELLIOTT TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled for Wednesday, February 7, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

Harrison L. Winter, of Maryland, to be U.S. district judge, district of Maryland; and

J. Robert Elliott, of Georgia, to be U.S. district judge, middle district of Georgia, vice T. Hoyt Davis, retired.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearings may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcomittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert C. Zampano, of Connecticut, to be U.S. attorney, district of Connecticut;

Daniel T. Donovan, of Washington, to be U.S. marshal, eastern district of Washington, term of 4 years, vice Darrell O. Holmes, term expired;

Harry D. Mansfield, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal, eastern district of Tennessee, term of 4 years, vice Frank Quarles, deceased; and

Almeric L. Christian, of the Virgin Islands, to be U.S. attorney for the Virgin Islands, term of 4 years, vice Leon P. Miller.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the Committee, in writing, on or before Monday, February 5, 1962, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from radio broadcast by himself over Wisconsin stations over the weekend of January 27–28, on the subject of a national food reserve.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Introductory remarks by Mr. RANDOLPH; remarks by Senator RANDOLPH in introduction of Herr Wilhelm G. Grewe; and remarks by His Excellency Wilhelm G. Grewe the Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany.

THE LATE PAUL BUTLER, FORMER CHAIRMAN OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, among the great leaders in American political life who passed from the scene in 1961, few will leave so enduring a mark as Paul Butler, former chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

His death, on the next to last day of the year, came at a time when the fruits of his labors were in full harvest. For it was Paul Butler, more than any other man, who insisted that the Democratic Party live up to its true faith, during the years of Republican administration in Washington in order to keep itself fit for the full responsibilities of government, whenever the American people turned again to it to make a new surge forward in the life of our country. Most of the programs, at home and abroad, which now give a sense of lift and purpose to the country, had their origins in the hard thinking which he encouraged and contributed while serving as national chairman of the Democratic Party.

Mr. Edward Folliard has written a synopsis of the stormy career of this remarkable man, which was published in the Washington Post on December 31, 1961. The article also contains numerous tributes to the memory of Paul Butler which should be noted here.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the text of the article appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATIC LEADER BUTLER GLORIED IN POLITICAL COMBAT

(By Edward T. Folliard)

Paul M. Butler, former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, who died here yesterday of a heart attack at the age of 56, was a fearless political warrior who gloried in combat.

In his 5½ years as Democratic national chairman, he was under fire from leaders of his own party as well as leaders of the Republican Party. He never flinched.

Chairman Butler caused an uproar in March 1960, when he predicted that the then Senator John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, would win the Democratic nomination for President if he defeated Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, in the Wisconsin primary. He made the prediction at a background dinner with a dozen or so political reporters at the National Press Club.

In writing about Mr. Butler's prediction, the reporters at the dinner abided by ground rules and referred to him simply as a Democratic "leader" or "top party strategist."

As so often happens in such cases, however, a newspaper that was not represented at the private dinner reported that it was Mr. Butler who predicted Kennedy would get the Democratic presidential nomination if he triumphed over Humphrey in Wisconsin.

The revelation infuriated backers of Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas, and of others who were after the presidential nomination. The late Speaker Sam Rayburn jumped on him, as did Senator Humphrey and others.

Former President Harry S. Truman refused to attend the 1960 Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles, because, as he put it, Mr. Butler had prearranged the convention in favor of Senator Kennedy.

After the Los Angeles convention had settled on a Kennedy-Johnson ticket, the Democrats stopped their quarreling, closed ranks, and opened a drive that gave their party the White House for the first time in 8 years.

In his role as chairman, Mr. Butler did much in paving the way for victory. However, as is the way in American politics, he had to give up his strategic role to another. This was Senator Henry "Scoop" Jackson, of Washington, who was nominee Kennedy's choice for chairman.

President Kennedy said in Palm Beach yesterday that he was "most grieved to learn of the untimely death of my friend Paul Butler." He called Mr. Butler a courageous leader of the Democratic Party during some of the party's most difficult hours and added: "His wise counsel will be sorely missed."

Senator Mike Mansfield, of Montana, Democratic leader of the Senate, said of Mr. Butler: "Despite the controversy which whirled about his head while he was national chairman, he was a good chairman and the party will miss him deeply."

John M. Bailey, now chairman of the Democratic National Committee, noted that Mr. Butler had been national chairman longer than any man with the exception of James A. Farley.

Representative John Brademas, Democrat, of Indiana, Mr. Butler's Congressman and a personal friend, said Butler was a man of "resolute courage and integrity and without question the most outstanding person my home community in Indiana has ever given to American public life."

The chairman of the Republican National Committee, Representative William E. Miller, of New York, said, "the Democratic Party has lost a vigorous and loyal advocate and the Nation an outstanding citizen."

WORKED DURING COLLEGE

A slender, gray-haired man who did not smoke or drink, Mr. Butler was born at South Bend, Ind., June 12, 1905. He helped earn his way through Notre Dame University by working as a reporter for the South Bend Tribune. He was graduated from law school in 1927 and soon moved onto the political arena as a precinct worker.

He moved up the political ladder from precinct chairman to county chairman to district chairman—and, then, in 1952, ousted Frank McHale as Democratic national committeeman from Indiana.

Mr. Butler was elected chairman of the Democratic National Committee in 1954, succeeding Stephen A. Mitchell, of Illinois.

A very serious man, he said he had one hobby—football. He loved the sport and rarely missed a game at Notre Dame.

DANGER ON THE RIGHT

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in the Saturday Evening Post of January 13, 1962, there was published an article entitled "Danger on the Right," written by me. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Danger on the Right

(By Senator Stephen M. Young)

Recently at a Washington dinner party a well-known ultraconservative Congressman became the center of attention with a blazing denunciation of "homegrown Communists who chew away at the foundations of our Republic." A veteran diplomat from a European Embassy, sensing my impatience, leaned toward me and said, "One thing has always puzzled me about you Americans. You have nightmares about Communist demons burrowing from within. Yet," the diplomat continued, "for years, American Fascists have grown increasingly dangerous and nobody seems disturbed, least of all your Congressmen."

The diplomat's criticism was all too true. I have been in politics for half a century and have fought the radicals of the right in Ohio and in Congress. I have never known them to be as strong, as well-financed, or as successful as they have been the last few years.

On the floor of the U.S. Senate last April I said that, in my judgment, "the Fascist John Birch Society and others like it are as serious a threat to our security and way of life as internal communism." I will go even further. I believe the radical right today is an even deadlier threat to our democratic traditions and institutions than are the American adherents to communism.

The American Communists try to infiltrate our political parties, our schools, our mass media, our entertainment, and our labor unions—all institutions of the free society—in order to further the cause of the international Communist conspiracy. Their ability to achieve their purpose has diminished steadily over the last 15 years through harassment by Government agencies and congressional committees and by exposure in the public press. It is estimated that today there are fewer than 10,000 Communist Party members in the Nation.

Although the danger from internal communism has been lessening, the radicals of the right—in Europe they would be called Fascists—are trying to destroy the civil liberties and institutions which are the foundations of freedom. They accuse everyone who disagrees with their brand of "Americanism" of being a Communist. They try to wreck the integrity of our Supreme Court. They stir resentment against our participation in the United Nations. They want the income tax repealed. They try to block all foreign-aid programs. They vilify foreign-born and minority-group American citizens. They spread seeds of suspicion in communities throughout the Nation.

The great danger today rises from the fact that millions of well-meaning Americans embrace their programs as valid solutions to the deeply complex problems which confront our Nation in an age of swift change and social upheaval.

Curiously America has always been fertile soil for rightwing radicalism. Side by side with our democratic traditions has run a persistent mistrust of democratic practice. More than 100 years ago the American Party, better known as the Know-Nothing Party, pricked the vulnerable nerve of antiforeign sentiment. On an anti-Catholic, anti-immigrant platform, the Know-Nothings elected Senators and Congressmen and controlled State governments for several years. Their Presidential candidate in 1856, former President Millard Fillmore, captured one-fifth of the popular vote.

The influence of early American rightist hatemongers has remained in robust good health for a century. Their heirs of the past few decades have been legion. They wore hoods and lynched Negroes as Ku Klux Klan members in the 1920's. They goose-stepped among the fascistic silver shirt and Fritz Kuhn's German-American bund and joined Father Coughlin's Christian front in the 1930's. Today they read as gospel Gerald L. K. Smith's Jew-baiting hate sheet, "The Cross and the Flag," or have been swept into the John Birch Society, in my opinion the most dangerous organization in the United States today.

There are nearly 1,000 radical rightwing organizations in the Nation, some like Lincoln Rockwell's American Nazi Party, numbering a few hundred, but others like the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, claiming 4 million members—a claim considered by experts to be only slightly inflated. Many of these organizations regularly distribute massive quantities of wildly irresponsible literature, some of which comes to me in the mail, attached to letters from constituents. A typical leaflet sent to me recently was from the American Council of Christian Laymen.

The illustration on the cover showed a Communist hammer and sickle superimposed over the cross of Jesus, and the headline asked ominously, How Red Is the National Council of Churches? ' The tract claimed that the National Council of Churches is saturated with leftwingers, citing as "proof" that "the National Council receives large sums from Jewish and other non-Christian or anti-Christian groups."

Who are the people who accept this or other types of propaganda disseminated by the rightwing lunatic fringe? They are the frightened and the frustrated; the bitter and the vindictive; the twisted zealots and well-meaning cranks; the malicious cynics and confused innocents; the people who have nightmarish fears of a radical bogey, who suspect eggheads, who hated and still hate the New Deal or who hate anyone who is "different."

Who are the leaders of the radical rightwing groups? Many are sincere believers in their causes of hate. But others are cold opportunities who have carved lucrative careers by playing on the prejudices of their adherents. Some leaders burn out in a matter of months. But some—like Gerald L. K. Smith, Verne Kaub, Merwin K. Hart, Joseph Kamp, Conde McGinley, and Allen Zoll—have been around since the 1930's.

Their stock in trade is a primitive anticommunism which separates Americans into good and evil and divides issues into black and white. Those who agree with them are the good guys—loyal Americans. Those who disagree are the bad guys—Communists, Pinkos, Reds. Under the guise of jousting with alleged Communists, these groups undermine our basic institutions and try to reshape America into a totalitarian-Fascist state.

Their tactics are the big lie and the wanton smear. The disorders they create arise when they try to inject into community life their oversimplified approach to bewildering national problems. Unable to impeach Chief Justice Warren, they are willing to settle, temporarily, for the head of a schoolteacher in Maine or a clergyman in Texas. The demagogs of the right sell their followers the diagnosis that internal communism is the disease which causes all ills, and then prescribe local vigilante action as the cure.

Unfortunately vigilantism is based on contempt for law and justice and is unjust itself. It strikes fear in a community and intimidates not just those singled out for punishment but their neighbors as well. In such a fearful situation democracy is broken down.

Recently in Anaheim, Calif., rightwingers smeared a district school board member. Joel Dvorman's "crime" was that, as an active member of the American Civil Liberties Union, he held a chapter meeting at his home which was addressed by a man who has tried to build sentiment for abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

A community vigilante committee launched a campaign for Dvorman's recall from the Magnolia District School Board. Three of the eight-man committee were members of the John Birch Society.

Dvorman, 36, father of three children and a veteran of World War II on 40-percent pension for disability incurred in combat, then became the target of a vilification campaign which split the community into two camps.

The recall committee publicly attacked the ACLU as "flagrantly subversive" and charged that Dvorman was "taking part in Communist activities." Their literature blanketed Anaheim, and they conducted a highly organized letter campaign to the area press.

Whispering campaigns accused Dvorman of atheism and of using the mails to distribute lewd literature. Even the bright red door of Dvorman's home became ammunition for the hatemongers. Citizens were put on notice that, as a member of the school board, the politically suspect Dvorman helped determine what textbooks their children would read. In the end hysteria and fear won, and Joel Dvorman lost his position on the school board.

The strategy of the rightwingers was essentially the same in Anaheim, Calif., in 1960, as in Englewood, N.J., in 1951, or in Houston, Tex., in 1954, or in scores of other communities throughout America. Spurred by national organizations, local superpatriots have conducted textbook investigations for subversive materials or have probed faculties for subversive educators.

One of the architects of the crusade to control what is taught in public schools is Allen Zoll, whose vituperative pamphlets appear in every community where schools are under fire. Zoll trained at Father Coughlin's knee in the Christian front and hawked hate material for professional anti-Semites Merwin K. Hart and Joseph Kamp. In 1948 Zoll launched the National Council for American Education and named as his chief lieutenant Verne Kaub. Together they unleased hundreds of community watchdog groups to stand vigil on the schools. They keep dossiers on thousands of American educators and have smeared hundreds of them.

Though they operate in various parts of the country and seem to be working independently, the ringleaders of the right are a closely knit fraternity. A series of meetings caused some of them to converge on Washington during one week last April. The Constitution Party met Wednesday, April 12. The Soldiers of the Cross, another rightwing organization, held its meeting Wednesday night. The Congress of Freedom, a federation of rightist groups, occupied the program for Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. Reports I received showed that all three conclaves were marked by similar emotional speeches. Those who attended the meetings heard, and in some cases applauded, statements such as these:

"Foreigners are running the country."

"The clergy is riddled with Communists. Pull them from their pulpits if necessary."

"The best way to get rid of our problems would be to kill all the damn niggers and Jews". [Shouted from the audience.]

"Eisenhower and Warren conspired with the Communists."

"Water fluoridation is a Communist plot. Fluoride weakens the mind and induces docility. The first areas to be fed fluoride are near our universities. This is tied in with the professors who want to abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee."

"Dossiers are being compiled on 6,000 American educators who have Communist affiliations."

The fact that no more than 100 persons attended any of the meetings of the three organizations makes it appear they were talking only to themselves. But what they say in their meetings diffuses throughout America in leaflets and newsletters and finds receptive listeners in countless homes. Such propaganda is the ammunition which explodes in communities all over the Nation during controversies which often start as healthy local differences of opinion.

When I express my conviction that the John Birch Society is the most dangerous organization in America, I perhaps give it an importance it does not merit. But I do not think so.

The Birch Society has introduced a new intelligence to the lunatic fringe by developing a formal structure more sophisticated than any other rightwing group. It has evolved secretive community-level cells, just as the Communists do. Its leader, Robert Welch, maintains rigid control of programs and activities. Because of its secret nature, the society has drawn into its ranks and into its leadership ultrarespectable business and industrial leaders who shun participation in the more clamorous rightwing groups. They have money and influence and are willing to use both for the organization. The monetary support of these business leaders, plus that of the ordinary Birch member, brings the society an estimated income of more than $1,500,000 a year. And since its founding in 1958 the society is believed to have attracted more than 60,000 members.

At a recent press conference Attorney General Robert Kennedy said of the Birch Society, "I think that they are ridiculous, and I don't think that anybody should pay too much attention to them. I think that they make no contribution to the fight against communism here in the United States; in fact, I think, if anything, they are a hindrance. It seems to me it is an organization that is in the area of being humorous."

In my opinion, the Attorney General underestimates the John Birch Society.

Its relative respectability makes it the one organization around which the entire radical right may coalesce to achieve fascistic goals. The John Birch Society is in position to accelerate the steady chipping away of traditional civil liberties and to deepen the mistrust of our democratic institutions.

Fortunately the John Birch Society lacks two conditions which are vital to the achievement of its goals. It has neither a charismatic leader nor a positive program. I saw and heard its leader, Welch, on a recent television news-panel show. He strikes me as a singularly colorless man, lacking personal or intellectual force. The organization's program is characterized by the negativism that has long marked the radical right. The John Birchers are basically "againsters." But if the Birch Society could weld a program of positive socioeconomic action to the ancient list of negatives on which the radical right has relied, it might expand enormously in influence and numbers.

So far the major deterrent to the spread of the John Birch Society is the light of exposure from one of America's greatest institutions, the free press. Already the press has alerted the Nation to the presence of the Birch group, to its policies and its goals. Americans were repelled by Welch's charge that former President Eisenhower and Chief Justice Warren are "willing tools" of communism. And Americans are learning to mistrust other Birch assertions. America has enough headaches in finding a course of action to meet the encroachments and challenges of international communism and Soviet and Red Chinese imperialism. We don't need the radical right to complicate matters. Every picture of a race riot, North or South, fomented by rightwing extremists, every American smeared by fellow Americans for his political beliefs, every reckless charge against responsible Government officials by the demagogs of the right do more to serve the aims of international communism than 5,000 American Communists could do.

Speaking of the radical right, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, warned that "attributing every adversity to communism is not only irrational but contributes to hysteria and fosters groundless fears. The way to fight it is to study it, understand it and discover what can be done about it. This is neither the time for inaction nor vigilante action."

There is plenty of room in the United States for responsible conservatism. What a dull country it would be if we were all liberals. But the groups I have described, and the vicious methods they employ, are irresponsible and destructive.

There are, after all, basic criteria any organization in a free society should meet. It should define with accuracy and without demagogy the areas of its concern; it should at least respect the right of opposing views to be expressed; it should present its alternatives responsibly and within the democratic framework; it should attempt to educate and persuade, not obfuscate and incite.

The radicals of the right fulfill none of these criteria. They are at odds with the purposes which are our strength and our hope—freedom and democracy.

I do not propose that committees of Congress caravan about the country conducting investigations into the activities of the radical right. I believe we have had enough investigations into the political beliefs of free American citizens.

I do propose, however, that all Americans who cherish liberty and democracy become alert to the danger from the right and defend in their communities the right of their neighbors to speak their views, however unpopular they may be. Free discussion is the lamp that lights democracy. Its glow must not be dimmed under a shroud of fear.

THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in the last session I supported the program of the Peace Corps and went along with its personable and really outstanding Director, Sargent Shriver, supporting the appropriation he sought. Now may I confess my faith and confidence has been somewhat shaken, although not shattered.

As a Senator of the United States, Mr. President, in referring in a questioning and critical manner to the Peace Corps, I fear that, like Moses on Mount Horeb, I am treading on holy ground. In the fifth chapter of Joshua it is written: "And the captain of the Lord's host said to Joshua, 'Loose thy shoe from off thy foot; for the place whereon thou standest is holy.'" Also in Exodus, chapter 3, I believe, Moses as he was directed, "came to the Mountain of God, even to Horeb."

Well, Mr. President, my shoe is loosed off my foot and I report to you sir, that I take a dim view of officials of the Peace Corps directing subordinates that they may, when they see fit, classify reports and memorandums "top secret," "secret," and "confidential," "not for publication," and all that sort of thing, ad nauseam.

In my judgment, Sargent Shriver, Director of this outfit, should back up, repudiate, and withdraw any directive of this sort—immediately.

My constituents and I, as their public servant, are entitled to know the facts regarding the successes and failures of this governmental agency concerning which there has been so much favorable propaganda.

Does anyone really claim that the Peace Corps is a policymaking agency of our Government? This noble experiment may go the way of another so-called noble experiment if its Director enforces a protective screen against reporting regarding the work, or failure to work, of the teachers, thoughtful, dedicated individuals and "do-gooders" who are enrolled in the Peace Corps. Let the people know the truth.

I seriously question the claim, if such claim is advanced by officials of the Peace Corps, that the enrolled youths, young men and women, or the Peace Corps itself sometimes conduct "very delicate diplomatic negotiations with many different countries."

We have a State Department and a Foreign Service and Ambassadors of the United States everywhere in the world. No nation, emerging or established, however remote, seems to be off limits to an American Embassy and to members—plenty of them—of our diplomatic corps, and the sun never sets on our military missions. Let us call a halt to any claim that the Peace Corps has authority to conduct "very delicate diplomatic negotiations with many different countries." I have confidence in our Armed Forces and in our State Department. Their activities, directives, and reports may frequently be classified "top secret," "secret," and "confidential." However, Mr. President, let us have no classified "top secret," "secret," "confidential" and "not for publication" emanations from publicity men of our Peace Corps. In fact, if the Peace Corps does the job we expect of it, and for which our taxpayers are paying, I know of no reason for their need of publicity men.

Mr. President, in support of my views, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial recently published in the Daily News of Washington, D.C., a Scripps-Howard newspaper.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR WHOSE EYES ONLY?

Peace Corps activities, it develops, can be classified "top secret," "secret," "confidential," "not for publication" and all that sort of thing.

What have we here—another policymaking outfit of the Government operating behind the old protective screen when it chooses? We thought the Peace Corps was going to be perfectly transparent as it went about its deeds of openhanded goodness in the underdeveloped countries.

But hardly so, according to a spokesman as quoted by the United Press International. It seems the secrecy order is necessary because Sargent Shriver's youths or the Corps itself sometimes conduct "very delicate diplomatic negotiations with many different countries."

We thought that business was reserved for the State Department and Representative JOHN MOSS' House Information Subcommittee seems justified in asking how come. The only "delicacy" we've heard so far is the question of whether Peace Corpsmen should be sent to Japan, or whether Japan wants them. Admittedly it is a sort of delicate question whether Japan is an underdeveloped nation, what with its unprecedented industrial boom—to the extent that we send five Cabinet members there to learn how a country can get so prosperous.

The Moss committee should take a stiff-necked look at this use of the "top secret" stamps.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Peace Corps is now nearly 1 year old. It is, so to speak, on a shakedown cruise in international waters. I am sure we wish it a peaceful, smooth, successful voyage. Frankly, though, I believe the Peace Corps already has hit a reef.

It was disturbing and disappointing to me to read recently that Peace Corps officials apparently wish to hide under the protective blanket of secrecy.

Peace Corps officials evidently have received permission to classify documents and reports as "top secret." The grounds, as one Peace Corps spokesman put it, according to the Washington Post of January 23, 1962, are that the Peace Corps conducts "very delicate diplomatic negotiations with many different countries."

Mr. President, it is fair to wonder what delicate diplomatic negotiations the Peace Corps is charged with, and why should its negotiations be cloaked under the top secret privilege?

If any organization and its activities should be completely open to public scrutiny, it is the Peace Corps.

In enacting legislation creating the Peace Corps, the Congress specifically stated its purpose is to help promote a better understanding of the American people on the part of the peoples served and a better understanding of other peoples on the part of the American people.

We had high hopes for the success of the Peace Corps in helping do away with misery, squalor, hunger, and disease in underdeveloped areas of the Western Hemisphere and elsewhere, and incidentally to prove to people the world over we were not Yankee imperialists, but that ours is a way of life to enable people of all races, traditions, and cultures to live together in peace, friendship, and contentment and to restore to downtrodden peoples their simple dignity as creatures of God. This purpose is not served by secrecy. Secrecy does not promote understanding. It limits it.

Nothing is to be gained by giving another new bureaucracy the privilege of secrecy, and I maintain that nothing would be lost by denying it this privilege. The Peace Corps should not even be operating in any area remotely concerned with secrecy.

It was represented to me that it sends representatives to another country only upon invitation. Though negotiations obviously may be necessary, what could possibly be so delicate about them that they must be kept secret from the American public? Shades of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Beyond its delicate negotiations, Mr. President, the Peace Corps—according to the order granting it top-secret status—has "a primary responsibility for matters pertaining to national defense."

The definition of national defense has to be stretched beyond credibility to accept this line of reasoning.

What relationship does the Peace Corps bear to our national defense? I see none in sending groups of Americans to underdeveloped nations to teach, or to help build public works. By these standards we could constitute the Cub Scouts of America as a Government agency and give them top secret status on the grounds of national defense.

In the early flush of enthusiasm over the idealism of the Peace Corps, it was believed volunteers would live at the same level as citizens of the countries to which they are assigned. In view of this, I was shocked to read in the December 25, 1961, issue of Newsweek magazine the following quote from a young Peace Corps man serving in Ghana: "I've got a huge bungalow with three bedrooms, living room, dining room, family-size kitchen, huge bath facilities—the works."

A Peace Corps Public Affairs Division pamphlet declares housing for volunteers overseas will be simple and unostentatious, and in view of the fact that it costs American taxpayers approximately $9,000 a year to maintain a Peace Corps volunteer, this Corps man's status comes as startling news.

The young man goes on to say:

> I have a cook-steward who fixes the meals, washes, irons, and markets. Except for the twenty-two 40-minute periods that I teach each week, my time is my own.

Mr. President, when we consider the hours of work our fellow Americans put in at their daily tasks, and when we Senators consider—though we are not complaining—the hours of work we put in attempting to be good public servants, it is a little startling to read about this young man, who said, "Except for the twenty-two 40-minute periods that I teach each week, my time is my own."

Mr. President, though I am sure this is an exception, this enrollee of the Peace Corps is enjoying a vacation instead of participating in a noble experiment in international relations.

In Ghana, it should also be pointed out, Peace Corps volunteer teachers receive nearly $2,000 a year living expenses from the Ghanaian Government, presumably to permit them to live on a scale comparable to native teachers, few of whom I am sure have a combination cook-steward. How much does the Philippine Republic pay to each Peace Corps man in addition to the salary and expenses paid by American taxpayers?

As stated earlier, Mr. President, the Peace Corps, only a year old, is still on its shakedown cruise. In general, it has been greeted with enthusiasm, and deservedly so. It is capable of a splendid contribution to international understanding. Let the people know the truth. Is this an outfit of teachers and do-gooders who are serving their country for $75 a month rendering a real and needful public service? Or, in various underdeveloped countries are Peace Corps men being paid additional salaries? If so, this money, to tell the truth, also comes from our foreign assistance funds. My constituents have a right to answers to questions as to the total cost of this program. What are the fringe benefits Peace Corps men receive?

May I further suggest that if a number of young men and women of the Peace Corps are returned to this country because of disability incurred in line of duty by disease or accident, American citizens are entitled to know the facts—whether it is contemplated disability claims are likely to be paid and pensions awarded during the coming 50 years or more. What provision is contemplated for the care of former Peace Corps men who may suffer disability as long as they live following their service overseas of 1 or 2 years? I shall not be around to help foot the bill, but millions of our children and grandchildren will sweat and pay, and they deserve to receive and should receive consideration.

In each country where the Peace Corps has been invited and is functioning I ask that a complete report be made public at frequent intervals and that our people be fully informed as to the total compensation and fringe benefits paid to each person overseas including payments made by various governments in addition to the cost directly borne by our citizens.

AGREEMENT TO VOTE ON THE NOMINATION OF JOHN A. McCONE TO BE DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senate, I should like to propound a unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have discussed, with those who are interested in the nomination, the proposal I intend to make. I am in receipt of a request from a Senator who is very much interested in the pending nomination. This colleague of ours states he would deeply appreciate postponement of the final vote on the McCone nomination "until my return." It is my understanding that this Senator is due to return at 9 o'clock this coming Wednesday morning. In view of his request, and based on the fact and my understanding, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the McCone nomination be undertaken at 2 o'clock on Wednesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I had an experience with the consent matters, I wish to say to my colleague, the other day, when I was sitting out in the lobby and a unanimous-consent request with respect to a matter which interested me was made and granted and that was the end of that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I think he is referring to me as the guilty party. I was guilty. I did promise to notify the Senator, but I forgot.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I was not quite finished. I never consider my friend, the Senator from Montana, as ever guilty to me. I respected what he did. I know he forgot. I am sure of that. I have no doubts about it.

I wish to ask the Senator a question. Of course, I shall not insist with respect to this unanimous-consent request, because I have given him no notice, but it does seem to me we ought to have a practice in the Senate that every time there is a unanimous-consent request of this character for a vote, which cuts off debate, we should have a live quorum. I think the very least we can do, in the interest of the minority alone, if one would say that, is to give everybody a live notice that a very important decision is going to be reached by unanimous consent.

As it is, Members at their peril leave the floor for 30 seconds, and a very important decision which affects them may then be taken.

I shall not object, of course. I only address these comments to the majority leader as a request, as a suggestion from one brother in arms to another. I hope it will be given what I think is fair consideration, because it really is essential in order to protect all Members when we go into a busy session with lots of very important decisions to be made by unanimous consent.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think the Senator's request is worth consideration. I shall be most happy to discuss it with the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT FOR RECOGNITION OF THE SENIOR SENATOR FROM LOUISIANA AT THE CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS, JANUARY 30, 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, one of our colleagues, the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], makes a trip every year to various parts of the world, and comes back with voluminous and detailed reports. It has been my belief that for all too many years we have not paid enough attention to the reports by our distinguished colleague. I should like, therefore, to ask unanimous consent at this time that at the conclusion of the morning hour tomorrow the senior Senator from Louisiana be recognized to make a report which I think will be worth the attention of all Members of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have asked the Senator to yield so that I may understand the request. There will be proceedings, I say to my colleague, in connection with the morning hour tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. Which might involve some debate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. Do I correctly understand that that debate is to take place before the unanimous-consent request is to take effect?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. The unanimous-consent agreement would take effect at the conclusion of the morning hour or the morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

BILL OF RIGHTS CONTEST WINNERS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, every year the South Chicago Chamber of Commerce conducts an essay contest on the subject of Americanism. Some of these essays are extremely well done. I have been advised by Mr. Vincent L. Knaus, chairman of the Americanism Committee of the South Chicago Chamber of Commerce, that Mr. Richard Sklenar, 10239 Morgan, a sophomore at Chicago Vocational High School, won first place and a $100 U.S. savings bond, in the second annual Bill of Rights essay contest sponsored by the chamber.

The winners in second and third place are Miss Sara Gold, 9830 Van Vlissingen, Bowen, Ill., who was presented with a $50 U.S. savings bond, and Miss Joanne Kaufman, 9678 Luella, also of Bowen, who was presented a $25 U.S. savings bond.

Congratulations to these young people who realize the importance of Americanism.

I ask unanimous consent that the prize-winning essay be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILL OF RIGHTS CREATES STRENGTH

(By Richard Sklenar, Chicago Vocational High School)

All Americans have much to be thankful for. Perhaps the one thing we should revere most is the Constitution of the United States of America. Here is the most important document ever written. Not only does it outline our system of government, but it safeguards the liberties of a free and democratic people.

The heart of the Constitution is, of course, the Bill of Rights. Here is an anthology of democratic principles set down by our American forefathers, yet borrowed from the great thinkers of the old world. This is perhaps the first instance of our international melting pot here in America.

Public apathy seems to be at an alltime high. Yet, even though this is an important factor, we must realize the God-granted rights entail many responsibilities. We fail to realize that our greatest threats lie in the future. Repeatedly brave Americans have died to safeguard these rights, yet we tend to forget this one important fact in our hectic lives.

Why is the Bill of Rights important? There is one very simple reason. It is the lifeblood for this democratic republic. Our entire lives are based on the Bill of Rights.

Just what rights does the Bill of Rights give us? To enumerate them all would be a near impossibility.

I will elaborate only upon the 1st and 10th amendments contained in the Bill of Rights. All are of the greatest importance; but to me, these seem to be the greatest magnitude.

The first amendment of the Constitution guarantees our freedom of religion, speech, and the press, and the right to assemble and petition. Herein lies the secret of our success. Communism could take a lesson from this amendment.

We are here granted the right to religious peace of mind—to worship the God that gave us this heritage in any way we feel proper.

We are also given the right of free speech. That is, we can say what we want to, when we want to. People may not agree with us, but they may "defend to the death our right to say it."

Too, we are granted the right to print what we please. If we choose, we can speak out against Government policies and not fear banishment to the windswept steppes of Siberia.

Under the first amendment, we are also granted the right to assemble and petition. We can assemble freely and discuss any matter whatsoever. If necessary, we can petition the Government and ask for changes we deem necessary.

Yet we must realize that, with these manifold rights, come equally numerous responsibilities:

Religious freedom, yes; heresy from the pulpit, no. Freedom of speech, yes; treasonous statements, no. Freedom of the press, yes; slanderous and libelous statements, no. Assembly, yes; but not riot and insurrection. Petition, certainly; but not unreasonable and unconstitutional imposition.

And so the first amendment has been analyzed. From it we learn a trait of human behavior: man needs to express himself; and government that tries to supress him will not long endure. The magnitude of its importance is almost unlimited.

The 10th amendment to the Constitution is equally important. It declares that powers not delegated to the United States are reserved to the States and the people.

Here is a most unique governmental condition. The actual power of the government is vested in the people. Even democratic Rome, in all her glory, never let the people tell the senators what to do. Public opinion forms the basis of our Government.

Someone has said that love and marriage "go together like a horse and carriage"—or, more appropriately, like rights and responsibilities.

Herein lies our greatest responsibility. To mold ourselves into outstanding citizens with unsurpassable judgment is of the utmost importance, for we are entrusted with safeguarding our country for 10 times 10 thousand generations of posterity.

By having faith in what is right and just I cannot foresee our faltering in our task. No matter what the obstacle may be, united under the Bill of Rights, we shall wax strong and prosperous.

GREEK LETTERS AND GREEK PRESS WEEK

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on many occasions I and many of my colleagues in the Senate make use of quotes from the Greek and the Latin to emphasize our argument on the floor of the Senate. These two classic languages are the basis for the predominant number of words that we use in our everyday conversation. One hundred years ago Latin and Greek were taught in most all the colleges and many high schools in the United States and although that situation does not prevail today there has been a renaissance in teaching both Latin and Greek in colleges and high schools throughout the country. Most of the parochial schools for many years have taught both of these subjects.

The last week in January of each year is designated as Greek Letters and Greek Press Week and throughout the country the various Greek Orthodox communities commemorate this week with special programs stressing the importance of Greek letters and culture on our civilization. The Greek newspapers as do other foreign language newspapers play an important role in encouraging the study of the foreign languages in this country which has become much more prevalent in this era of atomic and space age.

I extend good wishes on Greek Letters and Greek Press Week.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, our very distinguished friend and colleague from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] delivered a very memorable address on the subject of community development and the proposed Department of Urban Affairs at the Roosevelt Hotel in New Orleans before the convention of the National Association of County Officials. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

(By U.S. Senator JACK MILLER, Republican, of Iowa)

In discussing the subject, "Responsibility of the Federal Government in Community Development," I propose to first discuss the responsibility already assumed by the Federal Government; then to give you my ideas of what this responsibility should be in the future, including my reaction to the proposed establishment of a new Department of Urban Affairs.

Let me start out by advising you that, as a Republican, I believe in the preservation of the sovereignty of our States—limited only by constitutional considerations as interpreted by the courts. I will be among the first to recognize the existence of problems affecting the health and well-being of our citizens, and I will remain unsatisfied until these problems are solved. Moreover, I do not believe that the way to solve them is to move slowly in the hope that some of them will naturally fade away. I believe in prompt action. At the same time, however, this does not automatically require me to support solutions which tend to make the States mere political subdivisions of the Federal Government.

Through this splendid workshop on community development, you have become more familiar with the various programs of the Community Facilities Administration, the Urban Renewal Administration, the Area Redevelopment Administration, and the Small Business Administration. Indeed, many of you have already been working on projects in your own counties and parishes which involve these Federal agencies. Congress has become increasingly concerned since World War II over the economic and social conditions of the American people. Just as on the international scene there has been growing unrest of people in the underdeveloped nations for a better standard of living, right here within our own borders there has been a growing unrest accompanied by increasing demands of our own people for a better standard of living.

There has been a tendency on the part of some to blame the States and their legislatures for the situation. Counties and cities are increasingly demanding more home rule. Some columnists write that the failure of State legislatures to reapportion themselves so that people living in metropolitan areas will have equal voting power (in at least one house of the legislature) to that of their neighbors in rural areas is to blame; that as a result, people in the metropolitan areas have had no choice but to run to Washington to seek solutions to their problems. In turn, the Federal Government (through the Congress) has taken on the responsibility for improving the standard of living of these people through vast programs, supported by billions of dollars and administered by thousands of Federal officials. Thus far, however, these programs have been couched in language which recognizes State and local government responsibility.

For example, the area redevelopment legislation which Congress enacted last year was designed to bring all the resources of Federal, State, and local governments to bear on the problems of unemployment and underemployment, affecting one-fourth of all the counties of the United States. The act says: "Maintenance of the national economy at a high level is vital to the best interests of the United States, but some of our communities are suffering substantial and persistent unemployment. This causes hardship to many individuals and their families and detracts from the national welfare by wasting vital human resources. To overcome this problem, the Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, would help areas of substantial and persistent unemployment to take effective steps in planning and financing their economic redevelopment."

These Federal programs also stress the role of private business in their implementation. For example, in the Housing Act of 1949, Congress first declared as follows: "The general welfare and security of the Nation and the health and living standards of its people require housing production and related community development sufficient to remedy the serious housing shortage, the elimination of substandard and other inadequate housing through the clearance of slums and blighted areas, and the realization as soon as feasible of the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family, thus contributing to the development and redevelopment of communities and to the advancement of the growth, wealth, and security of the Nation." Then, the act says: "The Congress further declares that such production (of housing) is necessary to enable the housing industry to make its full contribution toward an economy of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power, private enterprise shall be encouraged to serve as large a part of the total need as it can; Government assistance shall be used where feasible to enable private enterprise to serve more of the total need."

However, inasmuch as Federal money is involved, all of these programs are accompanied by standards of regulations under which State and local governments are to exercise their responsibilities. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is directed to give consideration to the extent to which appropriate local public bodies have undertaken positive programs for preventing the spread or recurrence in the community of slums and blighted areas and for encouraging housing cost reductions through the use of new materials, techniques, and methods in land and residential planning, design, and construction through increased efficiency in residential construction, and elimination of restrictive practices which unnecessarily increase housing costs. It is interesting that the act spells out what kind of programs these local public bodies are to follow in meeting those objectives: "adoption, modernization, administration, and enforcement of housing, zoning, building, and other local laws, codes, and regulations relating to land use and adequate standards of health, sanitation, and safety for buildings, including the use and occupancy of dwellings."

It is unfortunate that some local governments have not fulfilled their responsibilities in these areas, as a result of which the Congress felt it necessary to write such provisions into the act. However, it is natural to expect that those who appropriate Federal money for community development would want some assurance of reform to make sure that this money will get results. We have a parallel situation in the case of our foreign aid development loan program where interested governments are being required to reform their land, taxing, and administrative systems in order that the development loan program will bring about a higher standard of living for the local people.

This is where we are today. Now where should we go? One step that has been recommended has been the establishment of a new Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs. One of its strongest advocates is Senator JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania, a former mayor of Philadelphia. Here is the case he makes:

"The proposal reflects the magnitude of the task and an impatience with the fragmentary and ineffectual efforts of some States and cities to stem urban blight. Slums are spreading faster than they are being cleared. There are reported 11 million substandard housing units in American cities. Blight is eroding commercial and industrial real estate, because when deterioration begins, business and industry join the exodus of upper-income families, increasing the complexities cities must cope with and decreasing the financial resources they need. Transportation to and from the cities and traffic problems are getting worse. There are problems of pollution, water shortage, police and fire protection, education, welfare and recreation. Juvenile delinquency, the breakdown of the family, and incidence of emotional illness continue to rise. Community facilities thus become the responsibility of government. Debt limitations and inadequate tax resources, caused by a shrinking economic base, keep cities from doing the job of urban renewal themselves. It is not the Federal Government whose financial structure is under the greatest strain, it is our State and local governments. Federal debt has risen around 5 percent in the last 14 years, while State and local debt has more than quadrupled, far outstripping the rate at which the incomes of these governments and their citizens have risen. Tax resources are not adequate for the expensive job of urban rehabilitation. Typically, a sizable percentage of the metropolitan area's inhabitants live in the suburbs and come to the city for jobs, forcing the city to supply all manner of services to meet their daytime needs. At night, they return to the suburbs, taking with them their pocketbooks and the tax money that formerly—before the city's spread—would have helped pay for the police and fire protection, the traffic control, the roads, and the bridges that they require by day. The American way of life has changed radically in the past 50 years. It will obviously continue to change in the years ahead. By 1975 three-fourths of all Americans will live in urban areas. It seems incredible that one of the world's oldest democracies, the world's richest industrial nation and the world's No. 1 power should permit millions of its citizens to live in poverty, disease, and misery, but we do. We are a nation of underdeveloped cities, and there is a new frontier of asphalt lying in wait."

This is, indeed, a challenging statement. I could agree with it. However, I don't plan to vote for a Department of Urban Affairs. Granted that there are serious problems; granted that we must do something about them. This doesn't automatically lead us to a Department of Urban Affairs. It would be a sad day if one must accept this solution under penalty of otherwise being "against cities." If, indeed, by 1970 three-fourths of the American people will be in urban areas, is there supposed to be one Federal department to look after their interests, leaving the other departments to look after the interests of the other one-fourth of the people? Also, more than downtown urban problems exist. There are problems of suburbia. There are problems of counties. Indeed, according to the Census Bureau there are 212 metropolitan areas in the United States and of these 164 are encompassed in 1 county and 28 in 2 counties. There are problems in the small towns and rural areas too, already recognized by the area redevelopment legislation. If there is to be a new Federal agency, it should be responsive to the honest hopes and needs of American citizens living in all of these areas.

Granted that coordination is desirable to avoid duplication and overlapping of activities of various Federal offices working in the area of community development, this doesn't necessarily require a new Cabinet department. We crossed this problem in the work of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. Recognizing that some 20 different Federal agencies are involved in one way or another with programs relating to outdoor recreation, and that a coordinating agency was desirable, we merely recommended establishment of a Bureau of Recreation within the Department of the Interior. Similarly, a Bureau of Community Affairs could be established, without resorting to a new Cabinet-level office.

However, I am more concerned over the direction our Federal solutions to these many problems of community development are heading. My concern is not lessened by this further statement of Senator CLARK:

"Fortunately," he says, "We have reached a point with the problems of the cities—as I daresay we have with other national problems, such as education and medical care for the aged—where the obvious need for action outweighs any exaggerated, if not imaginary, concern for the foundations of the Republic."

I say to you that fortunately we have reached the point where there is genuine concern that, if we keep on, the day is not far off when the cities, the counties, and finally the States themselves will be so dependent on Federal money and Federal administration that they will have become, for all practical purposes, mere subdivisions of the Federal Government. Maybe problems of urban renewal, area redevelopment, community facilities, and education will all have been solved—though I doubt it. Perhaps free enterprise will somehow manage to exist—though I doubt it. But there will be no 50 sovereign States to hold in check the power of a centralized, Federal Government.

However, we don't have to make such a choice. We don't have to choose between our Republic on the one hand and a decent, wholesome life for our people on the other. And it is wrong for the Federal Government to put the American people in a position of having to make such a choice.

Granted that malapportionment of our State legislatures and lack of home rule are responsible for the takeover of more responsibilities by the Federal Government. Granted that responsibility is a two-way street; that where the States fail, the people are going to demand that the Federal Government step in. There is another problem which is inseparably connected with responsibility and that is the problem of money. It will not do to leave all of the problems of community development and education to the State and local governments, because their taxing and borrowing resources are largely at the saturation point. At the same time, this doesn't mean that money from the Federal Government must go directly to the cities, the counties, and the school districts. There is another way, and that way is to have the Federal money go directly to the States, from whence it was collected in the first place. Tie it down with some reasonable standards, if necessary, to get results, but let's have our cities, our counties, and our school districts look to their State capitals for the money—not to Washington.

I realize that my suggestion cannot be carried out overnight. It will not be easy to reverse the present trend. And it will take time to reapportion State legislatures which, in my opinion, is going to have to be a part of the package. However, new programs, such as Federal aid to education, should be cast in the manner I have suggested. Present programs can be continued for awhile, but they should not be administered in such a way as to discourage self-help—and there is considerable room for this. Eventually these programs can be phased out, being replaced by others in which the States, receiving money that has been taken from them by the Federal taxing powers, play the pivotal role in providing decent, wholesome living conditions for their citizens. This is the policy recommended in the report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, where we said: "The States should play the pivotal role in providing outdoor recreation opportunities for their citizens. They are the most logical units to provide the flexible approach required to satisfy varying needs. States can assess their own needs and take action accordingly. They can be particularly effective in stimulating counties and municipalities to take both separate and joint action to meet important problems. Through their regulatory power, the States can also play an effective role in stimulating private enterprise. Finally, they are the most effective avenue through which Federal aid can be channeled to meet varying needs."

Last year, during the debate over the controversial Federal aid to education bill, I offered an amendment which would have followed this policy. Instead of appropriating millions of dollars for a new Federal program, with its accompanying bureaucracy and eventual Federal standards and controls, this amendment would have taken 3 cents of each 8 cents per pack Federal cigarette tax and passed it directly to the treasuries of each State in which this tax money was collected "for education purposes." Thus, by one small amendment, a blow for education could have been struck—but the program would have caused school districts to look to their State capitals—not to Washington. It would have thereby struck a blow for the sovereignty of our States.

A long time ago, Thomas Jefferson warned that the power to tax is the power to destroy. When he uttered those prophetic words, I doubt that he was thinking only of individuals and businesses. He was also thinking of the sovereign States which formed this Republic, to whom are reserved all powers not delegated to the Federal Government. Today we continue to pledge allegiance to the American flag and to the Republic for which it stands, but at the same time we are witnessing the dilution of the power and responsibilities of our States through the Federal taxing power. The way to stop this trend is to return more of this tax money to the States—directly to the treasuries of the States, not to the political subdivisions of the States. Then the States will have the wherewithal to carry out their responsibilities to their people, and it will be unnecessary for the Federal Government to assume those responsibilities. Is this desirable? Is this worth fighting for? I think it is. You and I know that government closer to home is closer to the people. Given the wherewithal, it is more responsive to their needs, and it is much more subject to the controls which guarantee their freedom.

In closing, let me again express my appreciation for the kind invitation to appear before you. The delegation from my home State will, I am sure, inform you that I have long held a very special place in my heart for county officials. To me, you represent government which is close to the people—one of the heritages of the American way of life. And your presence here at this workshop demonstrates that you intend to keep on fulfilling your responsibility to preserve the American way of life.

COMMUNISM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on occasion I have formalized some observations on the subject of communism. Recently I did so and this statement appeared in the December issue of the Acme Steel Co. News, a house organ which is circularized among all employees of the company.

I present those views now with the request that they be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNISM

(By Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois, U.S. Senate minority leader)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following nonpartisan article on the menace posed to our lives and liberties by international communism was specially written for the Acme Steel News by one of America's most distinguished statesmen, Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois, U.S. Senate minority leader. Senator DIRKSEN's long and brilliant career of public services to our State and Nation lends added weight to his observations. We hope that you will read, remember, and act upon his sage counsel, particularly his warning against complacency toward the threat of communism. We are proud to be able to bring this direct expression of Senator DIRKSEN's views to readers of the Acme Steel News.)

Every American must be alert to any threats to our inherited freedoms as set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States of America. We must be concerned over the threats of communism, or any "ism," which has for its objective the desecration of our freedoms.

For a great number of years there has been a complacency in this country toward the Communist conspiracy and Communist threat that has led me and some of my colleagues in Government to become gravely concerned over what must be done to make each citizen eternally vigilant—the price he must pay for freedom. This freedom did not come easily to the people of America. The history of the United States, which is tremendous in accomplishments, is not yet two centuries old, but it seems that many who have read the history of this great country have forgotten the untold sacrifices made by our ancestors and the blessed freedoms and privileges that we have inherited from them and which we enjoy. We must never forget, nor let our descendants forget, the courage, the determination, and the forthrightness our ancestors had, through faith in themselves and faith in their God, to establish and preserve a country with freedom and justice for all. They suffered, shed blood, and sacrificed unmercifully for these rights. May we never look to our country to keep us—we must develop the traits of those before us who built our country so we may preserve her and build her to even greater heights.

GRASSROOTS AWARENESS

Since the Communist fencing of the border between East Berlin and West Berlin, there has been a slight ray of hope in the awakening by some of the people in this country of the gigantic threat to world survival by the international Communist conspiracy. It is refreshing to see—from the grassroots of our Nation—individuals, as well as civic, fraternal, religious, business, and labor groups, becoming alarmed at this Communist threat, at the lack of knowledge and appreciation of what Americanism is and what each individual must do to maintain and strengthen this great Nation that has inspired nation after nation throughout the world to new freedoms since it was established on July 4, 1776.

This disquiet all over the country is reflected in the seminars and conferences being held in many parts of the United States on communism. Some of these seminars have drawn as many as 7,000 people, all paying a small admission or tuition fee to attend a series of lectures by experts on the subject of communism.

I regard it as the tragedy of our time that ordinary Americans, the so-called little people, show a remarkable sense of alarm and deep concern about communism and the threat it poses to our future, while so many of our leaders, in whose hands our fate rests, still seem totally incapable of understanding or grasping just what Communist mentality, psychology, and operating methods imply. Scarcely a day goes by that I do not read an article or editorial or hear a speech by some nation's leaders which betokens a totally hopeless failure to understand communism. All of our failures, all of our reverses, all of our dismal frustrations stem directly from this amazing inability of so many of our otherwise highly qualified leaders to understand communism.

In order for our people at the grassroots level to be able to do a fully effective job in this earth-shaking battle between Americanism and communism, our people and our leaders must fully understand the basic philosophies of communism and distinguish them from the erroneously glowing tributes that some people pay to communism.

Let us think about the differences of basic principles and philosophies between Americanism and communism.

FREEDOM OF RELIGION

One of the most precious of our basic freedoms in the United States is freedom of religion. The Communist approach is diametrically opposite. The Marxist hostility toward religion involves strong propaganda against it. It says: "We must know how to combat religion, and in order to do so we must explain the source of faith and religion among the masses materialistically. The fight against religion must not be confined to abstract ideological preaching or reduced to such preaching. The fight must be linked up with the concrete practical work of the class movement."

The limitations under which religious institutions operate in Russia are disclosed by the criminal code of the RSFSR, Moscow, 1957:

"1. The teaching of religious beliefs to minors in any kind of school is forbidden (art. 122).

"2. Religious rites, observances, and the presence of religious images are prohibited in state and public buildings (art. 126).

"3. All religious organizations must be registered with the Government, which has the right to refuse registration (law on religious combinations, Apr. 8, 1929).

"4. Such organizations may not print and sell religious books without Government permission.

"5. General meetings of religious organizations require the permission of local government organs.

"6. These local organs have the right to remove any official of the religious group.

"7. Religious organizations are forbidden to engage in any activity except the performance of rituals.

"8. The activity of the clergy and members of the cult is limited by law to the locality where they are registered.

"9. Religious organizations are forbidden to own land, buildings, or precious metals."

It is therefore elementary that the Communist conspiracy will eliminate religious freedom in any country that comes under Communist domination. This has happened in both Christian and non-Christian nations.

FREEDOM OF SELF-DETERMINATION

One of the greatest hypocrisies of the Communist conspiracy is their alleged urging of self-determination of nations in Africa and Asia and other parts of the world while at the same time they are holding millions of freedom-loving peoples under bondage within the so-called Iron Curtain. This applies to Poland, and Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, and, yes, to Cuba, just 90 miles from the south tip of Florida. It is my hope and prayer that the freedom-loving people of the world will demand through the United Nations that the Soviet Union, or any nation which holds its people under bondage, permit those who are behind the Iron Curtain to dwell under a form of government of their own choosing. Only when all men are free will the tensions that now face us be eased and fade into the past.

FREEDOM OF LABOR AND THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

Another hypocritical picture is the statement made by Karl Marx and emphasized by the Communist leaders today claiming a terrestrial paradise for labor under communism. He stated:

"In the Communist society, where every one has no exclusive circle of activity but can train himself in any branch he wants to, society regulates general production, and just by that makes it possible for me to do one thing today and another tomorrow; to hunt mornings, fish afternoons, raise cattle evenings, criticize after dinner, in whatever way I please, without ever having to become a fisherman, a herdsman, or a critic." [1]

Just the opposite is true. In the Communist Soviet Union the worker is chained to his job by various government regulations, such as "the departure from an enterprise or office as well as a transfer from one enterprise or office to another may take place only by virtue of the permission granted by the director of the enterprise or the head of the office." [1]

In 1861 Karl Marx threatened the free world with his statement, "For the destruction of capitalism—a heavy progressive and graduated income tax; abolition of all right of inheritance."

And in 1920 V. I. Lenin said, "As long as capitalism and socialism exist, we cannot live in peace; in the end, one or the other will triumph—a funeral dirge will be sung over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism."

Then, in 1961, Soviet Premier N. S. Khrushchev said, "In working out our strategy and tactics for the future, we again rely for advice on Marx, Engels and Lenin."

Communism has raised its ugly head. Its aim is the destruction of our way of life by destroying our free enterprise system, bankrupting our economic system, and debasing the moral and religious standards of our country.

---

[1] "Contradictions of Communism," a Senate report by the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and other Internal Security Laws, to the Committee on the Judiciary, 86th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 17 and 18.

BELIEF IN THE DIGNITY OF MAN

Early in 1950 President Eisenhower stated our goals for the future, when he stressed "the individual is of supreme importance; the spirit of our people is the strength of our Nation; courage in principle, cooperation in practice make freedom possible; the purpose of Government is to serve, never to dominate; and, to stay free, we must stay strong."

These are facts. They must be realized. Individually and collectively, let America never say die.

THE CONDITIONS OF FREEDOM

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in the State of Utah, as in most other States of the Union, debate has been in progress concerning the conditions of freedom in our country. Many organizations have discussed the subject, including the question of what freedom those in the military might have in discussing political points of view.

The University of Utah has organized a Great Issues Forum, at which the question of freedom has been discussed. Recently two papers were read to that forum, one by Daniel J. Dykstra, the academic vice president of the University of Utah, and the other by Mr. Jack H. Adamson, dean, college of letters and science, and associate professor of English at the University of Utah.

These papers, it seemed to me, represent a point of view that should be brought to the attention of the Senate and to the people of our country as we proceed with this great debate. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the two papers be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the papers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONDITIONS OF FREEDOM

(By Daniel J. Dykstra, academic vice president, University of Utah)

The late Learned Hand, writing in 1930, observed that man "is tied to all men, as all men are tied to him, in a web whose threads no eye can follow and no fingers can unravel." Time has accentuated the validity of this comment, and in its validity rest the complications and ramifications of the topic with which the Great Issues Forum will be concerned during the next few months.

The day is far past when we can conceive of an individual molding his fate independent of his fellow man. His acts occur in a context of relationships, and thus, of necessity, they cast a shadow on many and in turn what many do cast a shadow on him. It is understandable, therefore, that individuals are sensitive, in varying degrees, to the attitudes and actions of others, for in such attitudes and actions rests their own well-being.

These observations have even greater validity in the area of international relations. While we have traditionally underestimated our degree of involvement in world affairs, events since World War II have served to alert all who have respect for facts to the realization that the destiny of the United States is inextricably tied to the ebb and flow of world events. Laos, South Vietnam, Berlin, Formosa, Egypt, Cuba, Korea, Syria, and the Congo are names which ring as harsh, discordant reminders that waves of cause and effect stemming from incidents throughout the globe reach our shores with undiminished force. We may dream nostalgically of a simpler day, but such dreams are quickly dissipated by the grim presence of reality.

This interdependence of people and nations naturally has an impact in terms of freedom; in terms, that is, of the right of each to think, to speak, and to act independently of others. Unfortunately, this interaction in modern society cannot be ignored and even those of us who plead for broad latitude in terms of individual choice recognize that because of it limitations do and must exist. Our difference with those who would be more restrictive is therefore a variance in degree, but that degree is a matter of fundamental significance.

It would, of course, be unrealistic to assume that citizens of this country could experience the events and developments of the past 30 years without reassessing the proper role of the individual to his government and to other members in society. We have witnessed this reassessment in terms of many congressional investigations concerned with internal security, in a series of legislative enactments, State and National, aimed at various associations and activities, and in a host of court decisions relating to individual rights. More recently we have witnessed this reassessment in terms of many private groups who are actively engaged in making pronouncements on what is "American" and what is "un-American," what is "patriotic" and what is "not patriotic."

Before commenting on the significance of these activities, it is appropriate to include a brief reminder of the premise on which our Government was founded. That premise is simply that a society functions best when its members have a maximum degree of freedom; freedom to speak, to write, to associate as their judgment dictates. A profound belief in this concept prompted the adoption of the first eight amendments to the Constitution. The first amendment spells out in explicit terms five areas in which individuals are to be free from congressional prohibitions. That amendment states: Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; nor shall Congress make any law which abridges freedom of speech, or the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, or the right to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. This profound respect for the individual is further reflected in subsequent amendments which prohibit unreasonable searches, which assert that no person in a criminal case shall be compelled to be a witness against himself, which guarantee due process of law, and which unequivocably state that an accused has the right to be confronted by his accusers.

In making these pronouncements, the framers of the Constitution were seeking to perpetuate a philosophy which centered not on the authority of Government but rather on the rights of each member of society. They were, in Justice Jackson's words, hoping to withdraw certain rights "from the vicissitudes of political controversy, to place them beyond the reach of majorities and officials and to establish them as legal principles to be applied by the courts."

The Justice's words suggest a further observation concerning the purpose which motivated the adoption of the Bill of Rights. These amendments were not designed as a charter to protect the rights of majorities, for majorities are usually capable of self-protection. They were designed to encompass the unorthodox, the nonconformist, the lonely person whose views are fighting to be heard. They were, to use the words of the great Justice Storey, adopted as an "important protection against unjust and oppressive conduct on the part of the people themselves."

From what has been said, it is obvious that the motivating force which prompted those who founded our Government was the assumption that a maximum degree of individual freedom was the best guarantee of an enlightened society. It is also apparent that they assumed that such freedom would give strength and sustaining power to a newly formed government. That freedom entailed risks, they well knew, but these risks they were willing to accept, for they also knew from personal experience that the dangers inherent in authoritarian government were far greater. Furthermore their respect for man's dignity, for his mental and spiritual wellbeing, for his peace of mind, for the unfolding of his personality gave them no real alternative to the choice which they made.

The passage of time has lent validity to their judgment. While many governments have come and gone, ours has continued through wars, depressions, and other crises for over a hundred and seventy years. For the most part, we have, during this period, remained faithful to our heritage. There have, however, been exceptions. One need but recall the Alien and Sedition Acts of John Adams' administration, the suppression of habeas corpus proceedings during the Civil War, the restrictions on liberty during World War I, and the Palmer raids of the early 1920's to recognize that on occasion we have resorted to actions not wholly compatible with our pronouncements on individual liberty. Whether any such actions were necessary is a matter for conjecture. The fact is we did indulge in them, and we did so in the belief that by so doing we were enhancing our security.

It is in this observation that I find greatest concern for the status of freedom in our time. Heretofore, most actions which were restrictive of liberty were associated with emergencies which were of a transient nature. There was thus reason to hope that their passing would produce a restoration of individual rights. Fortunately, such hopes were well founded for, with few exceptions, our society hastened to reassert its established beliefs after each crisis had run its course.

It would be reassuring to state that this pattern will continue, that any concessions made today in the name of security will be a temporary adjustment. A realistic appraisal does not warrant such optimism. It must be recognized that the world of the present is not the world of 50, of 25, or even of 10 years ago. Increased interdependence coupled with the development of grim and fantastic weapons capable of mass destruction make it folly to assume that current emergencies are of a temporary nature. Many nations have the capacity to build crisis on crisis and the evidence of the past few years suggests that certain of these countries are not reluctant to utilize such power. We cannot, therefore, sacrifice certain freedoms on the easy assumption that within a short time they will be restored, for if anything seems predictable, it is that we face many years of uncertainty and conflict.

The question which thus confronts us is whether in an age such as this we can adhere to the basic faith upon which our Nation was founded, that faith which rests its confidence in the individual and his freedom. This is, I believe, today's crucial issue. What is more, it is being resolved by the struggle currently in existence between those who would narrow the areas of personal liberty and those who seek to prevent such construction. It is this tug-of-war which is shaping the blueprint for tomorrow's society.

In appraising this struggle, it must be recognized that it is not to be characterized by sudden and dramatic episodes. Rather the danger to liberty lies in the gradual erosion of individual rights. As Justice Jackson has observed, "traditional freedoms are less in danger of any sudden overthrow than in being gradually bartered or traded for something else on which the people place a higher current value."

Because areas of freedom are thus restricted, there exists the very real possibility that the withering of rights may proceed for years before its impact is fully realized. In truth, it is my impression that many who today plead for restrictive action in the name of security do so without recognizing that they are contributing to the chipping away of rights, rights which heretofore have been our proudest boast. Justice Douglas was unfortunately correct when he observed: "History shows that the main architects of repressive laws were often men of good intentions."

A closer look at the contemporary scene may emphasize some of the observations already made. It may also serve to illustrate that the current conflict concerning freedom is more than an academic discussion; that even as it proceeds repercussions result which have a direct impact on our Nation's welfare.

Those concerned with present developments are aware that today's resurgence of voices which view with suspicion and alarm concepts which they have labeled as unacceptable are to be contrasted with the forces that asserted themselves a decade ago. The drive for conformity in the early 1950's was sparked primarily by a few individuals and by congressional investigations. Present activities are, however, characterized by numerous private organizations representing many people operating in a variety of ways. This means that the forces of restriction are broader based, are more diffuse and are more deeply entrenched than was formerly the case.

Before making further comment, it should be clearly understood that I am not questioning the right of any person or any private organization to espouse the views to which I make reference. Furthermore, I am of the impression that most of these voices are motivated by a genuine concern for our welfare and for our security. I do, however, believe that their endeavors are fraught with dangers; that in balance they are self-defeating and productive of harmful consequences.

These consequences are admittedly intangible and difficult to assess. This does not mean that they are insignificant. On the contrary, the fact that they must be measured in terms of suppressed ideas, in terms of fear and suspicion, in terms of unspoken criticism, and in terms of support withdrawn from worthy objectives such as the promotion of civil rights, is in itself evidence of their gravity.

One does not have to search far to find specific examples. It is my impression that the reason we hear such limited discussion of this country's policies in respect to Communist China is the fact that proponents of any modification fear that the voicing of their views will result in accusations of disloyalty. For comparable reasons, it is difficult to find objective and unemotional assessments of our relationship to the Soviet Union and it is equally difficult to hear constructive appraisals of the work of the House Un-American Activities Committee. When we recall that the premise on which our society operates is that solutions are best found in free and unintimated exchange of views, it is apparent that significant dangers lurk in the limited discussion of these and other significant topics.

A further reason why the current buildup of suspicion and intimidation should be of much concern is that it is producing two seemingly antithetical results. One product is rash, ill-timed action; the other is a paralysis of action. In reference to the first product, I point out that at the very time we should be exercising restraint and carefully exploring new ideas, policymakers and organs of public opinion are being prodded into extreme pronouncements and rash decisions. Do I overdramatize? I submit the Cuban fiasco as a prime illustration.

Equally dangerous, however, is the possibility that loose charges of subversion and disloyalty are and will produce inaction. It is understandable, for example, that many members of our State Department are reluctant to voice new proposals or to modify existing policies. To do so may simply result in further harassment. The result is that instead of flexibility, there is rigidity, instead of new ideas, old solutions are repeated ad nauseam.

The above comment is not to suggest that the State Department is beyond criticism. Far from it. Its policies should be carefully analyzed and subjected to extensive discussion. My plea is simply that we refrain from wild, irresponsible accusations unrelated to the merits of any given policy. Such criticism serves no constructive purpose and can only lead to unfortunate results.

Another consequence stemming from the clamor currently being voiced by both extremes of the political spectrum is that it is making people reluctant to engage in the promotion of significant activities. The "guilt by association" advocates have convinced many individuals that organizations are to be judged not by their goals but rather by the political views of each and every member. Thus many are reluctant to engage in the battle for racial nondiscrimination for fear that in doing so they may find themselves in the company of one who has been labeled as a radical. Others are equally reluctant to join battle with the forces urging vigilance in respect to other individual rights, and I fear from recent comment that the day may not be too remote, in fact it may already be here, when this same reticence will exist in respect to groups organized to support the United Nations and its objectives.

Please do not assume from these observations that I am unaware of the fact that Communists and other nefarious political forces have on occasion infiltrated and manipulated groups ostensibly dedicated to civil rights, nondiscrimination and other worthy goals. Obviously this has been and is being done. To conclude, however, that all organizations devoted to these causes are suspect, and that therefore all their members are to be viewed with suspicion, is wholly unwarranted. Such suspicion, with the accompanying reluctance on the part of many to lend support to meritorious objectives, is too high a price to pay. In an age when the pursuit of worthy ends must have collective support in order that progress may be made, we cannot afford to hurl charges indiscriminately at groups or individuals committed to their attainment, nor can we realistically decline to support just causes because they happen to correspond with the announced objectives of the Communists.

An additional product of the current wave of unrest is its impact on academic freedom. While this is not unrelated to the limited public discussion of certain grave national and international issues to which reference has already been made, it is, nonetheless, sufficiently distinctive to warrant special comment. No educational institution can be true to itself without freedom of inquiry and freedom of discussion. If members of its faculty are afraid to explore the avenues of truth wherever they may lead and are discouraged from engaging in the analyses of controversial topics, it is self-evident that it cannot perform its proper role as a center for the exploration and dissemination of knowledge and for the development of critical thought. Its faculty under such circumstances must of necessity be frustrated and lose its vitality; its students, also of necessity, will be untrained for that independent appraisal of complex issues so essential to a vigorous society.

In considering this aspect of the contemporary scene, it must be recognized that limitations placed on academic freedom in one area of inquiry will have an immediate impact in other areas. Ideas and subject matter cannot be carved into parts, one part labeled acceptable, the other part unacceptable. Concepts are innextricably related to other concepts and thus prohibition of discussion and investigation in one sphere automatically means prohibition of discussion and inquiry in other spheres. It thus is evident that what appears initially as a limited restriction soon mushrooms into a broad prohibition. To recognize the validity of this observation it is only necessary to recall the many activities and views which were considered suspect before the wave of hysteria which swept this country in the early 1950's began to subside.

It will of course be argued by those who currently express anxiety as to views which they consider unorthodox that they are not seeking to subvert academic freedom. This underestimates the impact of their activities. When liberal views are equated with communism, when conclusions are suspect because they do not square with preconceived ideas, when whole areas of discussion are considered unsafe, academic freedom is being restricted and the pursuit of knowledge is being hampered.

In expressing alarm at these developments, I want to stress that my concern is not confined to their impact on the academic community. Of greater importance is the fact that academic scholarship and opinion cannot be suppressed without affecting the national interest. This is especially true in a society which has come to rely upon educational institutions for research, for facts, for analysis, and for opinions. To curtail by intimidation or other means the sources from and through which these results emanate will inevitably restrict both the quality and the quantity of information available to society and its functioning agencies.

It is hoped that these comments will not be construed to imply that I consider the views of any faculty member beyond criticism. Quite the opposite. The whole foundation of academic freedom rests on vigorous, searching criticism of any concept which is advanced. To deny this is the antithesis of freedom of inquiry and discussion. My objection is simply directed at the individuals and groups currently critical of academic endeavors who direct their shots not at the validity or invalidity of various proposals but rather at the persons advancing them. In too many instances, these critics, while ignoring the merits of ideas with which they are not in sympathy, answer with broad, loose personal charges which by their very nature arouse suspicion and fear. That this is occurring will, I believe, be supported by most close observers of the academic scene.

A further device utilized by those whose actions promote apprehension and misunderstanding is that of gross oversimplification of history and of national and international issues. This is objectionable first of all because it violates the integrity of knowledge. To explain, for example, Cuba and China solely in terms of Communist-anti-Communist ideologies and activities without recognizing the complex social, economic, and political backgrounds out of which their present governments emerged only serves to promote and perpetuate historical distortion. More unfortunately such explanations obscure the truly significant lesson that is to be learned from these experiences for they conceal and deemphasize the conditions which give rise to authoritarian control. This observation is also valid in reference to those who seek to reduce all contemporary problems, no matter how complex, to a clash of conflicting philosophies. Oversimplified explanations lead to oversimplified solutions. In turn, these result in false hopes and prevent the exploration and discussion of realistic remedies.

Before concluding, it is appropriate to comment on another observation all too frequently heard in this day of uncertainty. This observation, stated in a variety of ways, is simply that true "Americanism" consists of but a single path. This monistic concept automatically means that those who differ are tarred with the brush of suspicion. It also means that there is little room for the nonconformist, the unorthodox, the reformer. Furthermore, it overlooks the basic fact that heretofore our strength has been in pluralism, in the fact that as a society we have encouraged diversity of opinion in the belief that from such diversity we can distill those concepts which have the greatest merit.

Harold Taylor, former president of Sarah Lawrence College, has expressed this point of view in the following words:

"Our greatest strength as a country lies in the fact that we have a diversity of opinion and diversity of people. We can absorb and use ideas of all kinds provided we keep ourselves in a situation in which every idea can have public expression. What has given this country's thought its vitality in the past is the continued struggle of men and women to gain acceptance for their own views, and the continual push of a variety of minority opinions. What marks our history from that of other countries is the way in which we have been able to avoid an orthodoxy, to remain openminded and flexible, to absorb radical ideas in the flow of social process and to put them to work when they are needed."

In concluding, I want to stress that what has been said should in no way imply that I am unaware of the perils which confront us. Quite the opposite is true. It is because of such awareness that I urge, as I do, respect for our traditional freedom and for the dignity of the individual. To sacrifice such respect in this critical period will weaken our confidence in one another, will promote hostility between groups and between individuals, will distort our vision and lessen our resolve; will, in truth, make us less able to cope with the crisis of our times.

What I am saying is simply that our strength is in our freedom. Allen Barth in his book, "The Loyalty of Free Men," recognized this fact in the following words:

"Individual freedom is a means, an invaluable means, toward national security and survival. It is an end as well—a supreme end which the Government of the United States was instituted to secure. Faith in freedom as a means and as an end must be the ultimate touchstone of American loyalty, of the loyalty of all free men."

NEED OUR SUSTAINED POSTURE OF DEFENSE ENDANGER OUR FREEDOMS?

(By Jack H. Adamson, dean, college of letters and science and associate professor of English, University of Utah)

From the beginning, the American was doomed to come to terms with bigness. He was never to know the small, communal intimacies of a Swiss canton where borders and boundaries continually made precise and secure definitions of property, of government and of the possibilities of life itself. He came to a land that was too big to manage. Again and again he tried to limit the scope of his problem by declaring that the boundary of this Nation ought to be the Allegheny Mountains, the Great American Desert (whatever that was supposed to be), or the Rocky Mountains; but as fast as he absorbed and came to terms with Ohio or Oregon, some adventurer wished to purchase Alaska, annex Louisiana or conquer Texas. The reasons for the latter, especially, continue to prove puzzling.

In the 19th century the industrial revolution begot a similar bigness in corporations and industry. The intricacies, needs and potentialities of big business helped bring on big government which, although a much newer phenomenon, begins to seem to many people to be a kind of Leviathan of the deep, ready to devour everything else. Bigness in industry and bigness in Government both have called, and continue to call, for restrictions and limits, new rules and a new set of attitudes, for changes in laws and in our mode and practice of government.

But the newest bigness in American life is in the sphere of the military establishment. Here the problem is scarcely 10 years old and therefore it has not begun to engender the severe reactions which, in the past, have arisen to meet the shifts of power in business and Government. But such reaction is bound to come; in my opinion it is already overdue. This altogether unprecedented new source and focus of power in the military establishment will overflow and fill up other areas of our national life unless, by legislation or by an effort of the national will we consciously erect new barriers or revitalize older attitudes which will contain this new power structure in ways which accord with the history of our Nation, the intent of its founders and the spirit of its laws. And we must begin to do this now, for in recent times the military establishment has begun to depart, in certain radical ways, from its traditional functions.

In his final message to the Nation before leaving office, President Eisenhower said:

"This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence—economic, political, even spiritual—is felt in every city, every statehouse, every office of the Federal Government. We recognize the imperative need for this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications.

"In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

"We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together."

Before I discuss further the implications of this new power structure, I should like to place the role of the military into some kind of historical perspective. Our Founding Fathers inherited a mistrust of militarism that almost bordered on the pathological. Much of the Bill of Rights was a direct result of the American experience of a tyranny in their former homeland, an invasion of their civil liberties that would have been impossible if the King of England had not had a standing army to enforce his decrees and prevent resistance to his unlawful acts. Because of their historical memories, the legislators of the State of Pennsylvania stated in the bill of rights of their constitution "that standing armies are dangerous to liberty, and ought not to be kept up in time of peace." A similar declaration was embodied in the constitution of the State of North Carolina. The framers of the Constitution for the United States tended to be of a similar mind and they were inclined to try to provide for the common defense with a militia, with volunteers, and to reject the idea of a standing army. Further, they made it a part of the Bill of Rights that every colonist was entitled to have his own musket or squirrel rifle; that is, to bear arms in his own defense.

This tendency to reject a standing army disturbed the leading Federalist Alexander Hamilton, and he argued the case for a small but permanent army in the Federalist papers. He based his case on a single, persuasive, overriding reason. Whatever dangers such an army might bring, and Hamilton acknowledged that they were considerable, the dangers were even greater without it. I think that he was right then, and I think that what he said is still true today. We cannot, at the moment, in the face of the threat of force from the Communist bloc, abolish or even seriously diminish our Military Establishment. For the moment, and probably for the foreseeable future we must live with it. But we must try to live with it as wisely and as warily as possible.

Hamilton knew well enough why the colonists rejected the idea of a Federal army. The colonists, he said, remembered how Charles II and James II had used a standing army to deprive their ancestors of their civil liberties. Hamilton's explanation is partly true, but as Robert Frost has said, "There is always something more." And the something more in this case was the historical events Hamilton alluded to and also a tradition and a vision.

The tradition and the vision concern the role of the English yeoman archer in the great battles of Poitiers, Crecy, and Agincourt in the 14th and 15th centuries. In these battles, the massed chivalry of France, noblemen encased in armor and mounted on chargers, advanced with insolent and arrogant pride against relatively small numbers of English freemen, yeomen, archers, whose right arms could draw their bows of yew the full length of yard-long arrows. These yeomen loosed shaft after shaft, first at a distance in a silvery arc and then at closer range, with a deadly hissing accuracy that penetrated buckler and breastplate, that overthrew horse and rider. Unarmored and with only improvised fortifications, they won England's great battles by the strength of their arm and the keeness of their eye. And when they returned to England, they did not return as serfs. Men who had proved their manliness and courage on foreign fields were not to be enslaved at home. When the vision of the yeoman archer became embodied in the legends of Robin Hood, it became clear that this newly won independence was the most treasured thing in the life of the yeoman and that it made him the equal to the Sheriff of Nottingham or any of the nobles of the land. Although the legends were historically false, they did not falsify the vision of the people of England who came to rely not upon large military establishments but upon the freedman who owned and worked his own land and who wore across his shoulders a weapon which he could afford or even make himself and one which he had so brilliantly mastered.

This ancient dream continued to animate the American colonists; only here it was the yeomen farmer whom Jefferson counted on to keep alive the spirit of freedom. Here it was the freeman, not with the bow and arrow, but with the musket, the flintlock, and later the rifle, and no one was able to convince the American people or the Congress for over 100 years that the freeman bearing his own arms was not this Nation's best defense. But the dream, alas, ultimately died; the vision faded into the common light of day. In fact, the very tenacity with which we clung to this dream, as Hamilton once remarked, and as I shall demonstrate, on more than one occasion very nearly cost us our freedom.

In addition to this dream, there were perhaps three historical events which, more than any others, haunted the minds of the American colonists. The first concerned Oliver Cromwell's new model army. At the beginning of 1647, the English Civil War had been won by the Puritan Party. The vanquished Royalist Army, the army of King Charles I, was disbanded, but what of the victorious army? The Puritan Parliament proposed to disband it, but without adequate guarantees for long arrears of pay and with no plan for the absorption of the veterans into the civil life of the nation. Of course, there was always Ireland, and a bright parliamentarian proposed that the victorious veterans might go fight in that unhappy land under some different commanders. There the rate of attrition from plague, ague, and Celtic kerns might be sufficiently high that the Puritan Parliament could cease to worry about the Puritan veterans. But the army had other ideas. Deeply resentful of the manifest ingratitude of the nation, the army began a kind of grassroots political movement that had enormous implications for the future. First, each regiment appointed two political representatives who were called agitators, and these agitators were instructed to secure two things. First, of course, the back pay and second, liberty of conscience. As one writer of the times said, "Some of the soldiers do not stick to call the Parliament men tyrants." It was Cornet Joyce, in direct collusion with the military agitators, who seized the person of the King. In June 1647, army units advanced and threatened the city of London, demanding as condition for their withdrawal that 11 Presbyterians should be expelled from Parliament. These 11 voluntarily withdrew in order to save the city. But this was only the beginning. Sensing that a majority in the duly elected Parliament was hostile to it, the army, under the leadership of Colonel Pride, conducted a purging of the Parliament known as "Pride's purge." In this purge, over 100 members of Parliament who were favorable to the King, which meant that they were opposed to his execution, were expelled from Parliament, and the King was ultimately executed. And so Englishmen learned something about a standing army which they and their colonial descendants never forgot: that no element of civil government, neither the Parliament elected under the majesty of law, nor the sacred person of the sovereign, could withstand the threat of force which a standing army embodied. They learned, for the first time, how necessary it is that the civil should control the military.

Their second lesson came about 40 years later under James II. A rebellion by the Duke of Monmouth had been made an excuse for a large increase in the standing army. When James II came to the throne he demanded more troops and Parliament refused him. Their fear of a standing army was greater than their loyalty to the King. Nevertheless, James was able to use his army to intimidate the courts and to make them entirely subservient to his will, to destroy academic freedom in Oxford University, and to attempt, although with less success, to destroy it at Cambridge. But what was most terrifying of all, he used the threat represented by the standing army to attempt to impose religious views and opinions. For this latter, especially, his people never forgave him and ultimately they overthrew him. The lesson embodied in this entire affair was one of the principal political maxims which the colonists carried across the sea, and the maxim was: Standing armies always threaten civil liberties.

There was a third historical memory which the colonists never relinquished and that was the famous Popish plot which occurred during the reign of Charles II, in 1678 to be exact. This whole plot demonstrated an extremely unsavory condition which existed in late 17th century England: the reliance of the government on paid political informers, that is men who, for money, reported to the authorities, their suspicions, conjectures or facts, about other men whose political views were considered unreliable.

This plot was the invention of such a paid political informer, Titus Oates, who was, says the historian J. R. Green, "One of those vile imposters who are always thrown to the surface at times of great public agitation." The instability of this man's personality is shown by the fact that he was initially a Baptist minister who became a Catholic convert. He entered a Jesuit house and was expelled for misconduct. He thereupon made an affidavit saying that the Catholics were going to kill King Charles II and subvert the Protestant religion in England. This was heady stuff and those who wished to believe it promptly did so. The entire nation might not have got too excited if it hadn't been for the remarkable slaying of Sir Edmondsbury Godfrey, the magistrate before whom Oates had given his information. This magistrate was found in a field near London with a sword run through his heart by some person or persons unknown. A panic ensued and with it there came a total suspension of civil liberties for a substantial minority of the English nation. Two thousand Catholics were placed in prison and a proclamation ordered every Catholic to leave London. This extraordinary abrogation of civil rights probably has no parallel until 1941 when the U.S. Government excluded the Japanese from the west coast. The commanding general's final report referred to all individuals of Japanese descent as "subversive," as belonging to "an enemy race" whose "racial strains are undiluted." So it was in 17th century England. An exclusion bill was passed in Parliament which prohibited any Catholic from holding a seat in either House of Parliament, and this bill remained in force for over a century and a half.

But soon this plot began to wane, as plots based on hysteria rather than fact inevitably must. Suspicions concerning the reality of the plot were voiced in Parliament and so the Government did a remarkable thing. It offered a reward for anyone coming forward with evidence to support the plot. A man named Bedloe came forward and took the money. In exchange for it he swore to knowledge of a plot for the landing of a Catholic army which was to engage in a general massacre of Protestant civilians. Naturally Titus Oates felt the need to restore his own position as chief informer. Consequently he charged the Queen with intent to murder her husband. I thought that hysteria and falsehood could scarcely go further until I read, recently, of a group in Phoenix who have charged Senator GOLDWATER with being a Communist and then I felt that I knew what my own English ancestors must once have felt and thought.

As a result of this new information a proclamation enjoined the arrest of every Catholic in the realm and then a series of judicial murders began which soon horrified the conscience of the English people and brought them to their senses. Then there ensued a revulsion against the whole device of paid informers and political police that left a mark on the literature as well as the laws of the 18th century. For example, Jonathan Swift, in the first book of "Gulliver's Travels" tells us that the people of Lilliput have fortified their state against informers. If a man is accused falsely of a crime against the state, his accuser is to be put to death immediately. The lands and goods of the false accuser are then to be sold and the proceeds given to the one falsely accused.

And so the framers of our Constitution carefully worked safeguards into the Bill of Rights and into our legal system in order that the abuses to which political police and paid informers are so peculiarly subject, might be avoided and the individual protected. It is well to remind ourselves, first of the abuse of civil liberties embodied in paid informers and political police, and then of the safeguards which were devised. First, the political informer may often be an unstable personality given to fanaticism and excess. Second, such a person, led by a profit motive, may completely ignore the rules of fairplay and the spirit of the due process of law. Finally, the charges of such persons may prove extremely useful to demagogues and extremely dangerous to minorities.

The safeguards, if observed, were adequate. There are actually many more provisions than I shall name, but four of them seem to be particularly important.

1. No one is to be punished unless his conduct is in violation of a law in force at the time his acts are committed. Ex post facto laws are incompatible with civil liberties.

2. The accused must, as the most elementary demand of justice, be apprised of the nature of the charge made against him and the identity of his accuser.

3. The accused must be allowed to confront his accuser in open court, to examine the accuser, witnesses and materials used against him. If there are reluctant witnesses, the court may use its authority to bring them in.

4. Finally, there is a presumption of innocence until proof of guilt is established by due process of law, not by suspicion, not by hysteria, not by association, not by prejudice but by due process of the fullness of justice and the majesty of law.

And so if I may conclude this historical excursion, I would affirm without hesitation that the two most potent fears of the Colonial American were his fear of a standing army and his fear of the abrogation of the due process of law. It remains to be seen how we, the descendants of that American, have managed to preserve and foster the safeguards he erected against these fears.

With the kind of background which I have presented, I should now like to examine the two military systems that faced one another in the Revolutionary War. The British Army had long since lost the vision of the freeman who had left the plow to take up the bow. It was officered by the younger sons of noble or wealthy families who had purchased their commissions. The enlisted men could roughly be divided into two groups. The first were the mercenaries upon whom American romanticism has poured so much scorn. They were men, for the most part, who chose a military career because none better was open to them and they proved, in many engagements, to be superior to volunteers, as professionals are always better than amateurs. The other enlisted men constituted the royal army, the standing army which the colonists refused to have in America, the professional long-service soldiers and seamen who could be hired, threatened, or impressed into doing the Nation's fighting.

The Americans who faced them were Colonial citizens. Many of them had served in their local militias. As is well known, the Massachusetts colony resorted to the famous device of the minutemen. The youngest and most active on the militia rolls were placed in special companies to be ready at a minute's notice; the more sedentary warriors were consigned to "alarm companies," to be used only if things were truly alarming.

Note the irony here. The American forces embodied the old British dream of the yeoman landholder resisting invasion; the British, on the other hand, with their lobsterbacks or redcoats, embodied the idea of the professional army. And so if dreams come true, we should easily have won. But the fact is that the British had a real advantage that Washington was soon to discover. Their professional force was enlisted for a long period of service; the Colonials on the other hand were volunteers who had enlisted only for the campaign. That meant the summer fighting season and their terms were scheduled to run out at the end of the year. The congressional committee which reviewed this alarming situation assumed that it could get these troops to reenlist. It was never more mistaken. The troops went home as their terms ran out, and often took with them the muskets and equipment so desperately needed. This is what Hamilton meant when he said that our fear of a professional army had almost cost us our liberty. And this led Washington to formulate a new philosophy concerning military service. He spoke of the extraordinary and reprehensible conduct of these men who went home when their enlistment was up without further regard to the safety of the Nation. Toward the end of the war he asked for a regular long-service army, like that of the British, and larger enlistment bonuses on the grounds that interest and not patriotism could bring men to serve for the long pull. He noted further that the original passion for liberty seemed to have faded and that self-interest remained the only motive to which the State could appeal in securing the duty of its citizens. The dream of the yeoman-soldier was already slightly tarnished.

General Washington said one other thing which was portentous for the future. Shortly after taking command in 1775, he was presented with the case of an officer who wished to resign his commission because he believed that he had not been given sufficient rank. Washington wrote him:

"In the usual contests of empire and ambition, the conscience of a soldier has so little share that he may very properly insist upon his claims of rank but in such a cause as this where the object is neither glory nor extent of territory, but a defense of all that is dear and valuable in life surely every post ought to be deemed honorable in which a man can serve his country."

The British regular, in other words, fought for empire, the Colonial citizen for "all that was dear and valuable in life". If this were so, then surely the state had a military claim on every citizen. The whole democratization of war is implicit in Washington's statement and that democratization, the total claim of the state upon its citizens for military service is now with us. Universal military training is the logical result of Washington's position.

There is certainly one good side to this which we might mention in passing. The citizen who has served his country in order to defend all that is dear and valuable in life has a claim upon the state. And to this fact a number of veteran's benefits may be traced such as the GI bill or free hospitalization for veterans who have service-incurred disabilities. But even more important, the service rendered by the Japanese and Negro citizens in World War II and in the Korean war gave them inescapable claims upon the state. I personally consider this far more important than anything the courts have done in the elimination of racial discriminations.

There now begins a pattern in American military affairs which I would like to trace out. First the American people historically rejected Hamilton's plea for a professional army and tried to get by with militia. These militia could not be used for foreign adventures but only to repel invasion. Further their enlistment period was for 3 months only. The disaster suffered by Arnold and Montgomery at Quebec on December 31, 1775, was largely owing to the fact that they had to engage battle before they were ready in order not to lose their troops whose time was to expire the next day on January 1. Again at the end of 1776, Washington lost almost all of his troops because their enlistment was up and had to build a new Army in the face of the enemy.

During the War of 1812, the British were attempting to take New Orleans. The Federal Government, with no army of its own, called upon the States for their militiamen. Massachusetts attempted to refuse on the ground that her troops could only be called to repel invasion and Massachusetts wasn't being invaded. The Governor of Vermont sent his regrets with the same excuse.

During the Mexican war in 1845, Zachary Taylor got 10,000 militiamen from Louisiana and Texas. When their 3 months were up they left him. General Winfield Scott, in 1847, came to know firsthand what General Washington had once undergone. When he climbed to the plateau of Mexico and began to ready the final battle, his volunteer units went home and he had to suspend operations until they could be replaced. The green and untried replacements ultimately suffered heavy losses.

This pattern continued during the Civil War. The Volunteer Corps of 75,000 men went home after 3 months. New York's 7th Regiment went home immediately after the Battle of Bull Run, not because they were cowards but because their time was up, just as I came home from Korea in 1952 because I had served my hitch.

Then came World War I and the Americans still refused to abandon the militia or volunteer system. And by now this refusal was becoming dangerous. Both France and Germany kept some 800,000 men in their armies in peacetime. When mobilization was complete, the Germans had 1,750,000 men in the field. And so military men began to ask if we should not democratize war in America, make it the duty of every able-bodied man. In 1914, Wilson replied in the negative.

"It is said in some quarters that we are not prepared for war. What is meant by being prepared? Is it meant that we are not ready upon brief notice to put a nation in the field, a nation of men trained to arms? Of course we are not ready to do that; and we shall never be in time of peace so long as we retain our present political principles and institutions."

He then continued in the language of the old American dream, the dream of the yeoman-farmer and his squirrel rifle.

"We must depend in every time of national peril not upon a standing army nor yet a reserve army, but upon a citizenry trained and accustomed to arms."

On June 3, 1916, there was a National Defense Act. Thirteen days later, the entire National Guard of the United States was called out under its provisions, and for the first time in American military history, they came not as 3-month volunteers who could only repel invasion, nor as volunteers serving a limited term, but as conscripts obligated to accept whatever duties and obligations the Federal Government should demand of them.

In a few months, the Defense Act was scrapped and a draft act was passed. "It is a new thing in our history," said President Wilson, "and a landmark in our progress." He continued in words that some of the draftees might have hooted at, "It is in no sense a conscription of the unwilling; it is, rather, a selection from a nation which has volunteered in mass."

Was this a landmark in our progress? Well, sadly enough, it probably was, if war was to be the permanent condition. But what of our long history of fierce defense of civil liberties against the threat of standing armies?

Faced with the Kaiser's armies, the American people simply did not talk about it. They broke a long and honorable historical pattern because they thought they had to. And let it be a part of the record that the intervention of our armies did avert the defeat of the British and French and assured for a short time, how pitifully short, the ascendance of the democratic world.

I have traced out one long historical pattern and the breaking of that pattern in the face of war. Let me now trace out another one its ultimate end. After every bitter experience of the untrained militia and the short term volunteers, the leaders of the Nation tried to get the people to permit them to maintain a small trained army during peacetime. After the Revolution, Hamilton said, "Although a large standing army in time of peace hath ever been considered dangerous to the liberties of a country, yet a few troops, under certain circumstances, are not only safe, but indispensably necessary." He then asked for 4 regiments of infantry and 1 of artillery or 2,631 men in all. Congress then debated the issue and on June 2, 1784, it directed the discharge of all troops in the service of the United States except for "25 privates to guard the stores at Fort Pitt and 55 to guard the stores at West Point, with a proportionate number of officers," none of whom was to be above the rank of captain. The Congress concluded with what might be called, until recent times, the principal American military axiom: "Standing armies in time of peace are inconsistent with the principles of republican governments."

After the War of 1812, the Congress immediately reduced the Army from 38,000 to 10,000 men and in 1820 ordered the Secretary of War to cut it down to 6,000. The cut was made but not even this force could be maintained because enlistments dwindled. This fact pleased William H. Sumner who wrote to President John Adams in 1823, "The militia is intended for defense only; standing armies for aggression as well as defense. The history of all ages proves that large armies are dangerous to civil liberties."

This pattern continued after the Mexican War and the Civil War. In the first year the latter ended, a million men were mustered out. By 1869, the National Army consisted of only 25,000 men and it remained at approximately that strength until the Spanish-American War. After World War I, even the pacifistic Wilson was inclined to think that we should maintain a standing Army of some size. But the Congress noted that there had been over 11,000 desertions by NCO's and enlisted men from the Regular Army not to mention the regular resignations. By 1927 the standing Army had dwindled to 120,000 men.

Again after World War II, there was a rush to disarm. Some blamed this on Communist agitation, and quite likely there was some of that. But the hurry to leave when war is over is a long-established American historical pattern. No Communist ever talked to me, and I couldn't wait to get home. In any case, by 1948 our 13 million troops had shrunk to 1,374,000. In 1948, the military men, quite justifiably alarmed, in my opinion, considering the state of the world, asked for universal military training. Congress, following its historical pattern, refused to grant it but did reenact selective service, and, fearful of a large Military Establishment, placed a ceiling of $15 billion on military expenditures. By 1950 the Korean war was on and the ceiling was lifted to $60 billion where it has remained ever since. When the Korean war was over, we broke our historical pattern by not demobilizing and by making no cutbacks in military expenditure. In 1951 the Universal Military Training and Service Act was passed. Technically we were not at war and this was then universal peacetime conscription. The Reserve Act of 1955 continues this state of affairs.

I hope it is clear that I am not blaming anyone for all of this. We have had enough loose talk about plots and evil motives without my adding to it. I have tried to show that an open society, fiercely proud of its civil liberties, finally, in the face of external military power and in the face of a great fear which that power engendered, gradually broke many of its own historical patterns concerning the role and function of the military, especially in peacetime.

Again and again we have heard our Nation's leaders say, "This is something new in our history." And it is this very newness, this lack of experience in living with new conditions, this very uncertainty of trying to establish new patterns in place of broken ones that justifiably makes us all apprehensive. This, let me repeat, is the principal danger: the establishment of a new source of overwhelming power at the same time in which we have destroyed the historical patterns which have hitherto controlled this power.

First, let us look for a moment at the size of the monster we have made. Last year we collected $78 billion in Federal taxes. Of this amount, $45 billion went into defense outlays; veterans' benefits took $5 billion; and the interest on the national debt, which is largely a result of military expenditure, was $9 billion. Perhaps we should add to this $2 billion for foreign aid and we have the total cost of making war or being prepared to make war. It adds up to $62 billion out of the total of $78 billion, or about 80 percent of our total Federal budget.

Let us see what this means in terms of science. From 1955 until 1959 we spent about $2 billion for scientific research. About $120 million, or 6 percent, went into basic research. Nearly all of the rest went into military technology.

In addition to these vast expenditures, we are keeping about 3 million men in uniform. To keep the ranks filled we have laid an 8-year military obligation on all young American males.

Industrial corporations have grown proportionately. Of the total military budget of 1961, some $21 billion was spent on procurement. About three-fourths of this staggering total went to 100 corporations. Three corporations got more than a billion each. General Dynamics received $1.26 billion; Lockheed and Boeing each received slightly more than $1 billion. General Electric and North American Aviation received just under $1 billion.

Please keep in mind that 86.4 percent of this total was awarded without competitive bidding. So the question naturally arises of influence peddling, of a combine of military-industrial power. The Hébert Investigating Committee in 1959–60 found that more than 1,400 retired officers were employed by the top hundred corporations which spent three-fourths of the $21 billion. There were 261 generals or admirals among them. General Dynamics, the corporation that received the largest amount of defense money, also had the largest number of retired officers on its payroll, 187 to be exact, including 27 generals and admirals.

Please understand that I am not making any accusations or even insinuations. I simply point to a dubious situation which we have not yet come to grips with. Surely, all this can make us sympathize with the statement issued by that stanch New Englander, Senator Ralph E. Flanders, Republican, of Vermont:

"It is not only that we are sacrificing to defense our standard of living and the free independence of our economic life, we are sacrificing our freedom itself. We are being forced to shift the American way of life into the pattern of the garrison state."

I have tried to trace the gradual relinquishment of the dream of an armed citizenry more jealous of its civil liberties than fearful of foreign tyranny, a dream that has gradually and unavoidably faded under the increasing threat of foreign enemies. I have tried to show something new among us, a shift of power so immense, so demanding on our national economy and energy, so all encompassing in its universal claim on our lives, our loyalties, and our liberties that we must at least alert ourselves to the area of danger and try to minimize as best we can the inherent threats to our freedom.

First I should like to take up the problem of the political police. Prolonged international tension provides the rationale for the existence of a political police force, the FBI. That sedition and subversion must be controlled is not, in my judgment, open to question. But unfortunately they cannot be controlled without the use of self-incrimination, condemnation by association, without tests for utterance or received opinion. As Walter Millis has said, "Disloyalty or sedition are matters of the inner mind and emotions, and these are accessible to the investigator in no other way." And so the Government agencies, on numerous occasions, have asked for a prosecution of American citizens, but have been reluctant to produce the accusers in open court or to allow defense counsel to examine the evidence and testimony on which charges were based. The reason for acting in this way was a perfectly logical one. The FBI relies heavily on a system of paid informers. If the identity of these people is disclosed, their usefulness in preventing subversion or sedition is at an end. But if their identity is not disclosed, there results a serious infringement on the rights of the individuals, the door is opened to all kinds of abuses, and the entire spirit of the due process of law is compromised.

Naturally the courts sooner or later had to meet this problem and, in a number of important decisions, *Parker* v. *Lester* (Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals) and in the Supreme Court cases of Sweezy, Watkins, and Jencks, our Federal judges weighed the extremely critical matter of national security against the extremely critical matter of individual rights. In the Jencks case, they informed the Justice Department, in effect, that they must, if they intended to prosecute, make an open confrontation of accuser and accused in court, that the defense must be able to examine witnesses, and that previous statements of informers (presumably available only in secret files of the FBI) must be made available to the defense. In other words, the courts, in effect, said to the governmental agencies charged with protecting us against subversion, "You must decide whether you will prosecute and by so doing open your files and reveal your sources of information, or whether you will protect those sources and allow a suspected subversive to continue to go free."

Surely no one will deny that this was a real dilemma, that the requirements of due process hamper the work of our political police in a way that it does not hamper the political police of the Communist state. And so it is not surprising that it was these very decisions, made with a painful awareness of the perils to freedom both from political subversion and from failure to observe due process, that led to the formation of certain private and voluntary political police associations which, without official knowledge or concurrence, and without observing any of the safeguards of due process, collect dossiers on various American citizens and circulate these dossiers sometimes quite indiscriminately to employers, superiors, or associates. Generally this is done without observing the most elementary decency of informing the person in question that he is being accused.

The people engaged in this ugly business appear to believe quite sincerely that they are good Americans fostering the liberties of this Nation. But it is a radically new and menacing development in American life. For centuries it has been known in many lands and under many governments where the people had no adequate protection of the laws. But like universal military training, like standing armies in peacetime, it is something new with us. It is an ancillary development of the garrison state and we ought to oppose it.

The second great point of danger to our liberties as a result of the rise of the garrison state is the massive involvement of the military in domestic politics. Again this is something entirely new, such a radical departure from our historical traditions that I am unable to understand why Americans are not outraged by it.

All over the Nation, military commanders are presiding at "seminars" which involve the political indoctrination of civilians. One military commander, General Walker, an admitted member of the John Birch society, tried to influence the voting of his troops. Lieutenant Stephen Huffaker, a native Salt Laker, while in the service gave speeches to more than 60 groups in California. He said, among other things, that his listeners must not believe the American press because it was pro-Communist. It should be noted in passing that Lieutenant Huffaker had previously worked for the Deseret News and therefore presumably knew at firsthand what he was talking about. And he asked these questions: "Do you want Federal aid to education? Do you want Federal aid to churches? Do you want socialism?" In other words, he equated a part of the domestic program of this and previous administrations with communism.

Senator STROM THURMOND, who fanatically defends this new role of the military in our national life, has recognized clearly that the military is engaged in domestic politics and he is willing to uphold such engagement. Senator THURMOND himself, incidentally, is a general in the reserve:

"If the military teaches the true nature of communism, it must necessarily teach that communism is fundamentally socialism. When socialism, in turn, is understood, one cannot help but realize that many of the domestic programs advocated in the United States and many of those adopted, fall clearly within the category of socialism."

The conclusion is inescapable. Senator THURMOND sees it as the duty of the military to indoctrinate the public in domestic politics. Our Founding Fathers would have turned over in their graves.

In military-sponsored seminars in Pensacola, San Antonio, Glenview, Ill., Houston, Tex., Corpus Christi, Tex., as well as other places, rightwing speakers have implied that Gen. George C. Marshall and President Harry Truman were traitors and that those who support the programs and policies of the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations are either pro-Communists or Communist dupes.

To my mind, this involvement of the military in domestic politics is the clearest immediate danger that the vast Military Establishment poses. How far are we from the situation in Algeria where the French military are engaged in a mutiny against their legal government? I think that we are quite far, and I hope we are, but I also recall that the revolt of the military brass against the current attempts of Secretary McNamara to establish authoritatively the civilian supremacy over the military was referred to by Senator STUART SYMINGTON, himself one of our chief advocates of military preparedness, as a disloyal operation. Those are ugly words; I hope that they are not true. But of one thing I am sure. The Military Establishment has no business in domestic politics; it never did; it never will. And the time is now for the kind of emphatic, precedent-setting expression of the national will which will check this one dangerous overflow of power into an area of the national life which has hitherto successfully resisted it.

I should like to point up a profound irony here. Our English and Colonial forefathers feared a standing army because they thought that it could be used to execute the will of a tyrant and deprive citizens of their liberties. But the real danger now is that the Military Establishment will unite, not with a tyrant, but with the masses, with an irrational political third estate. It is the people who threaten the liberties of the people.

Let me define the term "third estate." It originally meant the third of the three classes of people whose consent was necessary for legislation: the nobles, the clergy, and the commons. The commons, in those ancient and desperate times, were not often moved by reason; they were subject to hungers and fears; they understood best what we would call belly politics. Their desperations, their irrationalities, their failure to pursue principle or policy, and their dogged adherence to their emotional proclivities often earned the contempt of the nobles and the mistrust of the clergy.

We are often misinformed about the extent of the third estate among us today. Life magazine noted with some surprise a few years ago that there may be as high as 14 million members of the religious third estate in America, those who are not members of any of the major churches, but who belong, rather, to pentecostal groups who speak in tongues, who thirst for revivalism, who demand the strong wine of miracle and ecstasy, of doom and gore, of cosmic threat and cosmic assurance. And although the boundaries shift, there is also a political third estate, a group profoundly alienated from the major parties, from the traditional patterns, and from the historical context of the Nation. Among these people there is a high degree of frustration, a readiness to hate, a hunger for scapegoats at sacrificial enemies, a need for the kind of certainty and assurance that only oversimplification can give. At the moment, elements of the Military Establishment are ferventily allied with this political third estate. And there, at the moment, lies the second real danger which we confront as a result of our large Military Establishment.

I should like to make a little further analysis of our political third estate. The philosophers of existentialism have acquainted us with a new phrase, "existential anxiety." This existential anxiety they distinguish from ordinary fear. Fear, they say, has an object or an apparent cause. We may fear disease or impotence or especially we may fear death as we discover how brief a moment we have in the sun before we shall all "lie down in darkness."

Existential anxiety is distinguished from ordinary fear by the fact that it has no apparent object or cause. Or at least we could say this, the sum of our anxiety and fear is greater than the sum of the objects or causes which produce that anxiety. But, unfortunately, it takes a certain intellectual sophistication to grasp such an idea. For people of the third estate, fear is very real; and if fear exists there must be a cause, an object, a reason. And so objects are sought. Now if one were to determine that the chief object of his anxiety were Russia, he might, without being a neurotic, decide to hate Russia, unless, of course, by some chance he were a Christian. Then he would need to look for a different solution. But more neurotic solutions would be to find the enemy, not 3,000 miles away, but all around you, in the same church, the same school, the same family. We are close to paranoia here as everyone must surely recognize, and it is the people who have adopted this neurotic solution with whom an important segment of the Military Establishment has chosen to ally itself at this critical moment in our history.

I have pointed out two areas of danger: The rise of political police activity and the involvement of the military in domestic politics. Now I should like to suggest two areas of activity which I think we very much need to strengthen. I cannot, at this time, undertake to say how it will or ought to be done. I shall merely express my feeling that these are directions in which we need to go.

First, I should like to see us encourage and strengthen the religious element in our culture which is generally called the prophetic element, that element which stresses the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man; which is wise, tolerant, committed to human and social values and which refuses to accept hatred and total annihilation as the means and end of human endeavor. America has frequently been moved by leaders of the religious third estate: Billy Sunday or Amy Semple McPherson, but, as a nation, we have never known what it is to have a living image of a prophetic religion comparable to that which Gandhi provided for the Hindus or Martin Buber for the Jews or Albert Schweitzer for German Protestants. I believe that the religious people of this Nation would respond to a sane, kindly, decent, and devoted religious leadership which would show us as immediately and as intimately as Gandhi showed his Hindu contemporaries the beauty of holiness, the power of love, and the impotence of hate.

Second, I should like to see a recrudescence of the old Puritan virtues. I think I know as well as any man the limitations of the Puritans and the many failures in their character and society. But they held basically to one terrible and magnificent tenet: the individual's responsibility to his own conscience. And with it there went a sense of vocation, of calling, of stewardship, a feeling that he was engaged in a life fraught with great meaning and that it became him to acquit himself well. It is a slackening in our moral fiber that disturbs me: the high incidence of crime and juvenile delinquency; racketeering in the labor unions; price fixing in business; payola, the Madison Avenue complex, corruption and greed, the gradual acceptance of the most hideous forms of violence, a gradual acquiescence in the total demands of the garrison state.

We need a rededication to humane values, to moral and ethical living. I wish that some Gandhi would arise to lead us, but suspect that he will not. But there is still left for each of us the course of action recommended in an old proverb that came from one of the wisest peoples the world has produced, the Jews. There is an old rabbinic proverb which says, "Is there need of a man? Be thou that man."

THE SURRENDER OF AMERICAN RIGHTS AND SOVEREIGNTY

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. Every day more and more people share a growing concern for the preoccupation of the State Department and some people in high places with the issue of disarmament. I think we all look forward to the day when men will "beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks." But at a time when Western civilization is confronted by an extreme militaristic threat looking toward world conquest, I think it is naive and unrealistic to be preoccupied with the question of disarmament. We know that the Communist conspiracy has no intention of coexisting with us. We know that they are bent on domination of the whole world. I think we show weakness in the eyes of all other nations at this time in talking of disarmament.

In this connection, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a very fine editorial entitled "One, Two, Three—Surrender," by Ken Thompson, editorial staffwriter, published in the Dallas Morning News of January 23, 1962.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE, TWO, THREE—SURRENDER

(By Ken Thompson)

One of the most incredible documents ever to emerge from the foggy corridors of the State Department is a bulletin entitled "Freedom From War: The U.S. Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World." As skeptical as I have always been of the measure of good sense and loyalty within the State Department, I never would have believed that these people we call our diplomats could so completely and unabashedly advocate the surrender of American rights and sovereignty until this bulletin appeared.

What it amounts to, in effect, is the official U.S. position on the subject of disarmament. More specifically, it is the basis of proposals which have already been submitted to the United Nations by the United States.

Although this bulletin was published last fall and is available for just 15 cents from the Government Printing Office in Washington, there has been very little attention paid to it.

Why, I cannot tell you, for it is certainly the most fantastic, harebrained blueprint for surrender on record.

Old Nikita himself might just as well have written it. And if more of the American people knew about this scheme there would be a nationwide uproar that would make the reaction to the Alger Hiss scandal look like another era of good feeling by comparison.

Last September President Kennedy addressed the United Nations and spoke of the desire of the United States to reach an agreement on disarmament. His stand has been echoed by Adlai Stevenson, our chief delegate and Ambassador to the U.N.

Where Kennedy and Stevenson spoke in general terms, the State Department bulletin deals in specifics. It supplies the terms for those vague goals the administration hopes to gain through the U.N.

What are these terms? The State Department document summarizes the proposals as a "new program (which) provides for the progressive reduction of warmaking capabilities of nations and the simultaneous strengthening of international institutions to settle disputes and maintain the peace." This program is broken down into three phases or parts.

In the first phase, all nuclear weapons tests by nations would be prohibited, production of fissionable material stopped, strategic delivery systems reduced, and conventional arms and armed forces would be cut.

In the second phase, present stocks of nuclear weapons would be reduced, further cuts would be made in armed forces, armaments, and delivery systems, and military bases and facilities would be dismantled. At the same time, a peace force would be established for the United Nations.

In the third and final phase, all nations would possess only those forces, nonnuclear armaments, and establishments required for the purpose of maintaining internal order; they would also support and provide agreed manpower for a U.N. peace force.

This force would be fully functioning, and would be sufficiently strong to overpower any individual nation or combination of nations resisting its will.

There you have it. One, two, three, bingo. The U.N. rules the world.

And who rules the U.N.? That is the question. If for one moment old Nikita thinks he isn't going to rule the U.N., you can bet your last kopec he's not going to fall for a trap like this.

As soon as he and Mr. Nehru, Mr. Nkrumah, Mr. Sukarno, and a few other scoundrels count enough votes to come up with a winning combination, such a proposal will be a natural for them, and there won't be any more kopecs left for us to count. That's the beauty of the system—from Mr. Khrushchev's point of view, of course. It's heads he wins, tails we lose.

And speaking of votes, one of the most interesting—if most frightening—aspects of this proposal is the lineup on an 18-nation negotiating body in the U.N. which soon will be considering this disarmament scheme.

Originally, this committe was composed of five Western nations (Britain, Canada, France, Italy, and the United States) and five Soviet bloc nations (Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania, and the U.S.S.R.). But the sharp division of these two factions resulted in a complete deadlock, and on June 27, 1960, the Soviets walked out.

Then somebody came up with the bright idea of adding eight independent nations to the committee as a compromise—two Asian, two African, two Latin American, one Middle Eastern, and one European.

The future of this country—and of the free world—may very well depend upon how those eight nations line up.

At the moment the future is looking very dark. For from Asia, they picked Burma and India; from Africa, Nigeria and Ethiopia; from Latin America, Mexico and Brazil; Egypt from the Middle East, and Sweden from Europe.

Five of these nations—a clear majority—recently voted in favor of seating Red China in the U.N. and kicking Chiang out. These five nations are Burma, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, and Sweden.

Moreover, Mexico was the only Latin American nation (other than Cuba, of course) to oppose flatly a resolution by the Organization of American States calling for a Foreign Ministers' Conference on the Cuban threat of Communist invasion of the hemisphere.

Brazil, which refused to support this same measure by abstaining on the vote, has already proclaimed its disapproval of any measures which the Foreign Ministers might take to deal with Castro. The Brazilian Government has officially called upon the United States and other hemisphere nations to coexist with Cuban communism.

How many friends does this leave the United States on the all-important U.N. Disarmament Committee? You count 'em. I'm sick.

AN EDUCATION PROPOSAL

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in view of the impending debate over the higher education bill, I should like to comment on one aspect of this problem.

The Senate bill, S. 1241, provides for Federal grants of up to $1,000 a year for needy and deserving students. This Federal scholarship provision is in the Senate bill in spite of the fact there is mounting evidence that the other body will not accept a scholarship program and will undoubtedly stall on any efforts to pass one.

Rather than a brandnew program for which 50 State commissions will have to be established and for which administrative costs of between 12 and 15 percent of total funds will be involved, I would like to see the Senate undertake an expansion of the fine and flourishing loan program that is now in existence, under the National Defense Education Act. What I would like to see is an expanded loan program, with the present forgiveness provision of up to 50 percent extended for all those who go into any kind of academic teaching, for all those who maintain an academic standing in the top quarter of their class, and for all those who go on to achieve a higher degree.

A program organized along those lines would have a far wider impact than the proposed scholarships. Between 60,000 and 100,000 students in the top third of their high school classes fail to go on to college every year for financial reasons. A scholarship program cannot make a dent in this need unless it is of astronomical proportions, but a loan program, with revolving funds, can really meet a significant portion of the demand over the years. Moreover, such a program, based on loans with forgiveness provisions rather than outright grants would provide for just the type of incentive that is needed in education legislation. Federal dollars alone will not solve the problems of education, but funds intelligently directed to encourage and reward and promote excellence in education can serve a useful purpose.

Mr. President, I strongly suspect that regardless of what bill the Senate passes on higher education, the proposal that will eventually emerge from conference and compromise will, at the most, be a loan program with forgiveness provisions. I would express the hope that, during the course of the debate on this measure, it may be possible to consider seriously such a loan program rather than one which is bound to be more expensive, more bureaucratic and less effective than a well conceived loan effort.

DISCRIMINATION IN HOSPITALS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have previously called attention to discrimination in hospitals throughout the country against Negro patients and doctors which has created a problem of increasing gravity. Negro doctors meet obstacles to practice and advancement in their profession at every step of the way. Some hospitals bar Negro patients altogether. Some limit the number admitted and segregate them in basement and attic wards.

For this reason I have offered an amendment to the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act which would bar Federal funds from hospitals which discriminate against Negro patients. My amendment would eliminate from the Hill-Burton Act, the provision for "separate but equal" facilities. In many communities so-called Negro hospitals are sometimes the older outworn and rundown hospital buildings that were turned over to Negroes after a modern new white hospital had been built. Often they are overcrowded, poorly equipped and undermanned.

Correspondence I have had with Father Ludger Martin, C.P., of the Passionate Fathers Mission in Birmingham, Ala., illustrates the tragic conditions spawned by the "separate but equal" system. Under heartrending conditions and almost insuperable obstacles that would long ago have broken the spirit of a less God-fearing man, Father Martin has carried on with his work of healing the sick.

I was so touched by this appeal that, although this is remote from my own special interest, I sent a personal financial contribution to Father Martin.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the Record with my remarks excerpts from his letters and enclosures, his letter to me of September 27, 1961, his enclosed form letter to philanthropic foundations, an excerpt from a form reply to foundations, his letter to me of October 26, 1961, an excerpt from his letter to me of November 4, and a news dispatch in the Birmingham Post-Herald, November 2, 1961

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Passionist Fathers Missions,
Birmingham, Ala., September 27, 1961.

The Honorable Jacob K. Javits,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Javits: I'm taking the liberty of writing you about something that is very dear to my heart—our hospital for the colored. By this I do not mean that it is a segregated hospital; or an integrated one either. But by force of circumstance, it is what it is. We have no choice in the matter, with so little bed space.

You will notice the enclosure of a letter I have written to foundations. And a marked copy of our little bulletin. This whole idea was the result of an accident whereby I was hospitalized for about a month in our Holy Family Hospital, and during that time I had occasion to speak to the Sisters, and to learn more fully the real situation here. I think after you read this enclosed letter, and the bulletin, that you will agree that we have a tragic situation here.

Also, this further accomplished fact—Sister Philip Maria, the administrator of our hospital called me the other day, to tell me that the university hospital (attached to the School of Medicine of the University of Alabama) has taken away the last remaining bed space that was allotted to colored private cases. Now, that space will be used only for clinical cases. Isn't this a further tragic thing in the light of the great lack of bed space for colored? Now, there must be less than 1 bed available to colored, for every 1,000 of these unfortunate people.

Is there anything that you can do for us, Mr. Javits? We certainly can expect no local help with the racial problem being what it is. As a matter of fact, the action on the part of the university hospital actually looks like retaliation for any attempted action toward integration in hospital bed space. Isn't this tragic in the face of real human needs, in time of suffering and illness? God help us and our country, when the color of skin becomes more important than the basic human virtues of compassion and help—the only ennobling qualities that make men any different from clawing beasts.

May I have the pleasure of hearing from you?

Sincerely,
Father Ludger Martin, C.P.

Passionate Fathers Missions,
Birmingham, Ala.

Gentlemen: Only recently I learned of your foundation. May I presume you will at least consider kindly our cause? I pray God, your officers and trustees will consider a grant to us—after they read or hear the story I have to tell.

The matter concerns an addition to our Holy Family Hospital for the colored in this area. It is part of our main mission here in Birmingham. The Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, Ky., came at our request in 1941 for the specific purpose of founding a hospital. From 1943 to 1953, houses or shacks were gradually put together for a small frame hospital. From 1946 to 1953, the Sisters were able to take maternity cases but no others, since they had no laboratories, X-ray, etc. Then, seeing the grave need of a general hospital, in 1952 local friends of all faiths were asked to put on a public campaign; they responded, but at the same time told us we could expect no further help in the future, for anything—addition, equipment, etc. So, together with a grant of two-thirds of the funds through the Hill-Burton Act, we were able to build our present 58-bed hospital, now fully accredited and staffed chiefly by Negro physicians and nurses.

Let me quote from the monthly statistical patient report of the Birmingham Regional Hospital Council, so you will realize why we feel an addition to our hospital is so urgent, and why we approach you for a grant. In the 10 hospitals in this area, there are 1,762 beds for white patients; but only 574 beds allotted to Negro patients. Yet, this area has almost 700,000 people in it, about equally divided 50–50 percent between white and colored people. Most of these hospitals do not or will not take OB colored patients. So with the 26 beds in our Holy Family Hospital, there are actually only 73 OB beds for maternity cases for about 350,000 colored people. Subtract 134 beds for colored children in a Crippled Children's Hospital, in a newly dedicated Children's Hospital and a few beds in others, and that leaves 367 beds for medical and surgical cases available for all these colored people. Can you imagine how many cases of real and grave illness go unattended here? The colored people have long been so patient, not expecting anything but the very least. And when they are able to receive hospital care, where do you think they are put? With few exceptions besides our Holy Family Hospital, they are put in the hospital basements, with exposed steampipes, etc. Do you think such bed space is very conducive to physical recovery and mental outlook? The colored people will tell you, if you gain their confidence, they are so tired of being put in basements and hardly treated as human beings. Can you blame them? Do you see why we would like to put on an addition?

Public health authorities and the medical profession here are becoming alarmed at the large percentage of new-born infant losses and miscarriages among Negro mothers—too few beds for proper care and deliveries. Most deliveries of Negro babies must be in the homes. Often the doctors have to travel long distances, so cannot be on time. So often now, our staff doctors call in for bed space for a patient needing immediate medical care or surgery, and he must be told: "Sorry, doctor, there's not a bed available. You'll have to wait." What can the Sisters do with only 32 beds for such cases? Doesn't this situation, indeed, call for an addition to our hospital?

Holy Family Hospital is the only one here in which Negro medics and surgeons are allowed to practice. If their patient must be hospitalized and is to enter another hospital than ours, that patient must be turned over to a white doctor. Negro doctors are not allowed on any staff but Holy Family. How can they become proficient in the art of healing or in surgery without hospital affiliation? How many promising doctors and surgeons leave this area, or will not come near it, when they learn of this situation? Think what it would mean, both to the colored people and colored doctors, if we could go ahead with this addition of at least 130 beds. What it would mean to this whole community in health and so many other things. With our small hospital, we cannot have interns and resident doctors, cannot take emergency cases therefore. This 130-bed addition (in our overall plans) would provide for both. There is no hospital in this whole area providing nurses' training for colored girls—they must go out of State. But this addition would at least be the nucleus with its larger staff of doctors for an eventual school of nursing. Don't you think a grant is in order?

These conditions I mention are more or less a part of the heritage of the abject poverty in the South following the tragic years of the Civil War. They are also a part of the heritage of a longstanding dual system called segregation. We still live with both, while trying to carry on the spiritual and corporal works of mercy, and the simplest elementary principles of common human decency in caring for the sick and the afflicted, as we would like to be cared for ourselves.

I hope I have not bored you. Rather I hope and pray God, these facts find a deep response in your soul. Help us to do something about a very dire need, and please—consider a grant to Holy Family Hospital for an addition. May these words ring true in your hearts! "As long as you have done it to the least of my brethren, you have done it unto Me." Your reward will be in the giving—only the things we give away do we keep.

God bless you.

Father Ludger Martin, C.P.

Passionist Fathers Missions,
Birmingham, Ala., October 26, 1961.

The Honorable Jacob K. Javits,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Thank you, Mr. Javits.

I had mentioned in my previous letter to you that I was appealing for our Holy Family Hospital for the colored. Perhaps this was misleading to some from whom I had hoped for help—that they took this to mean that our hospital is segregated, that we are just continuing what this whole South has been practicing; and so, these people wanted no part of it. Please let me assure you—our hospital is not a segregated hospital, in the accepted sense of that word. But if we help the colored almost exclusively, it is by force of circumstance—no one else will help them and none others come, except like myself. Our work has been in the best sense of the word "humanitarian"—taking care of these needy people when no one else will provide for their needs.

We had received help from the Government through the Hill-Burton Act, for the original unit of our small hospital—and this could not have been done had there been question of restricted practices and discrimination against white patients.

I am enclosing further material, so you can see just what we are up against. Please notice the article from our local morning paper about disbursement for hospitals in Alabama. You can be sure our Holy Family Hospital will receive no help from this Hill-Burton hospital and medical fund, since it will be disbursed from Montgomery. And by the same token that our hospital is not segregated, all the hospitals that will share in this disbursement are definitely on a segregated basis; and I am wondering how they can share in these funds, except by the finagling by the State officials and the Alabama Board of Health.

God bless you.

Father Ludger Martin, C.P.

Passionate Fathers Missions,
Birmingham, Ala.

Thank you for your gracious letter some time ago. While it may be outside the limits and scope of your foundation's interests to help with our hospital, still will your board of directors consider these further facts of our case?

What really is more important than the alleviating of immediate human suffering and miseries? You can, indeed, if you only would. Let me explain:

1. There is no place in this large city where colored M.D.'s and surgeons, no matter how qualified and brilliant, may practice, except at our hospital. Colored doctors are not admitted to the Alabama Medical Association, even if they already belong to the American Medical Association. This is Alabama. Therefore, they leave as fast as possible—no future for them here. Birmingham loses the best medical brains among young colored doctors, because of this. This situation we are trying to remedy by our proposed addition to Holy Family Hospital—to provide a place for resident and interning young doctors.

2. There is no school of nursing attached to any hospital in the whole State of Alabama that takes colored girls to train to be registered nurses. The Veterans' Administration Hospital at Tuskegee, Ala., does offer a 4-year course, and colored students graduate with a B.S.N. But most girls want to become R.N.'s, which is a 3-year course. And they do not, most of them, have the funds for the longer course.

Isn't this a tragic situation, when the need is so great for good doctors and nurses, that they are almost forced out of the State? Capable, sympathetic girls who would make excellent nurses must go out of this State to realize their ambition. We are losing the best personnel among the colored both to the State and to vital human services. Again, this is Alabama and its attitude to the colored.

3. Again, with only 367 beds available to the colored people in this area, needing serious medical and surgical care among the almost 350,000 Negroes—what other community of this size has so little to offer them in their misery? And most of this bed space for them is in the existing hospital basements. What a psychological block to their recovery, when they do find a possible bed.

Our small 58-bed hospital of Holy Family does offer humane bed space for them, as good as is available anywhere; but it is inadequate.

(And no medical school in the whole State that admits Negro students—isn't this quite a situation.)

Sincerely,

Father Ludger Martin, C.P.

Passionists Fathers Missions,
Birmingham, Ala., November 4, 1961.

The Honorable Jacob K. Javits,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Javits: I'm enclosing a copy of an article which appeared in our Birmingham Post-Herald, November 2. The University Hospital here has been approved by the State board of health for a grant of $1 million from the Hill-Burton funds. And you can be sure this will be used on a segregated basis, under the present act as it exists, without your amendment.

Did I tell you that the University Hospital recently took away the few remaining beds allotted to the colored, and these are to be turned into use for clinical cases only? In other words that hospital will no longer take private cases of Negro patients.

God bless you.

Father Ludger Martin, C.P.

[From the Birmingham Post-Herald, Nov. 2, 1961]

Two Million Dollars OK'd in Hospital Funds

More than $2 million allocated by the State board of health yesterday to three hospitals and a retirement home in Jefferson County will result in almost $4 million in hospital construction in the Birmingham area.

The State board of health allocated the money to the institutions from the $6.5 million of Federal Hill-Burton funds. The remainder of the $6.5 million will go to hospitals throughout the State.

The Jefferson County allocations were:

One million dollars toward a rehabilitation center at University Hospital; $1 million for a Bessemer hospital; $300,000 to a nursing home at Fairhaven, Methodist home for the aging; and $128,000 to build an outpatient department for an eye hospital in the medical center.

MOBILE HOSPITAL

Dr. D. G. Gill, State health officer, said the board allocated more than $1 million to a general hospital in Mobile, and made other allocations to the Holy Name of Jesus Hospital in Gadsden, and to hospitals in Greensboro and Luverne.

The allocated funds have to be matched by the recipients.

Dr. Robert Berson, vice president of health affairs for the University of Alabama, said University Hospital will match the $1 million with a $500,000 gift given to the hospital by Mr. and Mrs. Frank Spain.

Dr. Berson said construction of the rehabilitation center will start within a few months between 17th and 18th Streets, between 6th and 7th Avenues, South, at a cost in excess of $1,800,000. The structure will be located opposite the Children's Hospital.

TO HOLD 46 BEDS

The rehabilitation center will contain 46 beds for inpatients and will include extensive service for outpatients. The center will be for all types of cases.

The rehabilitation center will also concentrate on educational activities, such as training of physicians, nurses, and therapy.

The city of Bessemer was allocated $1 million to build a general hospital. Mayor Jess Lanier said last night that the people of Bessemer in 1958 passed a $800,000 bond issue to pay their share of the program.

Mayor Lanier said he had been trying to get the funds for the hospital since 1951. The city will receive $500,000 this year and the rest next year.

HOSPITAL SITE

The new hospital will be built on 40 acres of land owned by Bessemer located adjacent to the city limits on the Tuscaloosa highway. The cost will be about $1.8 million. Mayor Lanier said the hospital should be completed in a year.

Mayor Lanier said the new hospital is badly needed in Bessemer. "Our statistics show that we have 1 bed for every 1,200 people," he said. "The new hospital will save many Bessemer people the trouble of going to a Birmingham hospital because of lack of beds in Bessemer," he said.

Eye Foundation, Inc., received $128,000 to build an outpatient department eye hospital.

James A. Simpson, a trustee in the foundation, said that the new hospital will be built on the corner of 18th Street and Eighth Avenue, S. He said the foundation has assets to match the grant, and the foundation will begin accepting bids on construction before January.

The hospital will have 51 beds and a large outpatient clinic, and will accept both charity and private patients.

The foundation will operate a charity eye clinic in connection with the hospital. Doctors in the area will give their services free at the clinic and the hospital for charity patients.

The hospital will be open to all qualified eye doctors and will permit the centralization of advanced eye equipment, making it unnecessary for patients to go to other medical centers for unusual kinds of treatment.

Fairhaven, Methodist home for the aging, received $200,000 for a nursing home.

John W. Williams, director of the home, said last night that a nursing wing will be built to the present building located on the old Atlanta highway, at an approximate cost of $300,000.

Williams said the home has the matching funds, and will begin construction on the wing "as soon as we get the money."

The Baptist and Methodist hospitals in Birmingham had asked the State health board to allocate them $3.4 million each, but no grant was made.

Dr. J. Paul Jones, of Camden, is president of the State board of health.

FOREIGN TRADE—EXPORTS AND IMPORTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a critically important survey which has just been released by the Department of Commerce. It shows the enormous stake which the various States have in foreign markets. The leading States are New York, Illinois, California, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. Each of them has tremendous exports, well exceeding the billion dollar mark. In New York it is $1,417,400,000. Illinois is very closely behind it with $1,407,800,000.

The significance of all of this is that in the trade debate—on which, in terms of principle, I am very much on the side of the President—there is always the tendency to take the position—and I believe quite properly and fairly—that we must be cautious in terms of advantages for domestic production.

One must balance against that, in deciding on a policy, the enormous stake we have in imports. The Department of Commerce, under Secretary Hodges, has rendered an outstanding service to the country in terms of our policy. Quite apart from the problem of balance of payments, our enormous economic self-interest far exceeds, by fourfold or fivefold, the interests of businesses which may be disadvantaged by imports.

As I stated a moment ago, New York, Illinois, California, Ohio—I observe the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] in the Chamber—and Pennsylvania, each having a stake of more than $1 billion, are the preeminent States in that regard.

I repeat, we must, and I am certain we will, show every solicitude for the worker and the business which may be disadvantaged by imports, by providing every safeguard we humanly can. But we cannot do this by averting our gaze from the enormous stake, even domestically, in terms of the employment, wealth, income, and production which are inherent in the export industries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article relating to the Department of Commerce report.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPORTS TALLIED FOR EVERY STATE—NEW YORK LEADS IN SURVEY BY COMMERCE DEPARTMENT OF PRODUCT VALUES

WASHINGTON, January 28.—The Department of Commerce, in a new move to support President Kennedy's tariff-cutting proposals, issued today the first State-by-State breakdown of exports of manufactured goods.

The tally showed that the States with the biggest stake in manufacturing for foreign markets were:

New York, $1,417,400,000; Illinois, $1,407,800,000; California, $1,302,600,000; Ohio, $1,299,400,000; and Pennsylvania, $1,189,500,000.

All figures were for 1960 and were based largely on a census questionnaire distributed to manufacturers last year.

For the country as a whole, the 1960 value, at the producing plant, of goods destined for export was $15,454,300,000.

FIRST STUDY

This was the first analysis of its kind and will be followed by detailed reports on the impact of international trade on economic conditions in more than 140 congressional districts. The first of the district studies will be completed in mid-February.

A major battle of the 1962 congressional session will center upon President Kennedy's request for broad authority to negotiate substantial reciprocal tariff cuts with the nations of Western Europe. In some cases, tariffs would be eliminated.

The report said about 6 million Americans were employed in manufacturing plants that produced for export. Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges said in a statement:

"The figures bolster our conviction that exports create jobs, help keep our living standards high, and strengthen our ability to maintain our strong ties with the free world."

BREAKDOWN GIVEN

The survey gave these values of exports of manufactured products by States (in millions of dollars):

Maine, $37.5; New Hampshire, $54.7; Vermont, $28.1; Massachusetts, $435.2; Rhode Island, $65.9; Connecticut, $385.9.

New York, $1,417.4; New Jersey, $897; Pennsylvania, $1,189.5; Ohio, $1,229.4; Indiana, $483.6; Illinois, $1,407.8; Michigan, $898.7; Wisconsin, $411.4.

Minnesota, $176.4; Iowa, $243; Missouri, $193; North Dakota, $2.4; South Dakota, $7.4; Nebraska, $41.9; Kansas, $96.6.

Delaware, $28.4; Maryland, $216.9; District of Columbia, $7.7; Virginia, $338.3; West Virginia, $156.1; North Carolina, $391.8; South Carolina, $121.8; Georgia, $230.8; Florida, $158.8.

Kentucky, $178.4; Tennessee, $220.1; Alabama, $109.2; Mississippi, $77; Arkansas, $50.7; Louisiana, $254.1; Oklahoma, $98.9; Texas, $836.6.

Montana, $3.9; Idaho, $15.6; Wyoming, $0.7; Colorado, $48.4; New Mexico, $26.5; Arizona, $29.3; Utah, $45.8; Nevada, $5.4.

Washington, $582.8; Oregon, $87.1; California, $1,302.6; Alaska, $4; Hawaii, $15.5.

THE PASSING OF THE LOS ANGELES MIRROR

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Palm Springs (Calif.) Star, in its weekend edition of January 11–14, 1962, has published an article written by Virgil Pinkley, editor and publisher of that newspaper, relating to the discontinuance of the publishing of the Los Angeles Daily Mirror.

Mr. Pinkley was the founding editor of the Los Angeles Mirror, which recently closed its doors. He was connected with that newspaper from 1948, the date of its inception, to 1957. Prior to 1948 he was the general manager of European activities of the United Press. He had been with that news agency for 19 years when he was asked by the Times-Mirror newspaper to take the editorship of the Mirror. He took that position and for 9 years served in the capacity of editor. In 1957, due to circumstances which are not divulged in the editorial, Mr. Pinkley resigned that position.

Mr. Pinkley took the editorship of a newly created newspaper, and in the course of 9 years developed a subscriber circulation of about 320,000. The Mirror was a thriving newspaper, dynamic in its approach to problems, and indicated that it had the basic structure necessary to succeed. In 1957, Mr. Pinkley left the Los Angeles Mirror. That newspaper, which had grown from nothing to a subscribership of 320,000, closed its doors 2 weeks ago.

In his article in the Palm Springs Star, Virgil Pinkley gives his views concerning the shutdown of the Los Angeles Mirror. To me, his approach to this problem is not applicable solely to the development in Los Angeles; it is applicable generally to the newspaper problem throughout our country. I have read his article, and because I believe it is extremely impressive, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIRGIL PINKLEY GIVES VIEWS ON THE MIRRORS' SHUTDOWN—PAPER'S FORMER PUBLISHER TELLS CAUSES, BACKGROUND

(By Virgil Pinkley)

The passing of a newspaper is a sad development.

This is especially true if the newspaper is one you have given 9 years of your life to, as I did to the Los Angeles Mirror.

I was its founding editor and publisher in 1948. The Times-Mirror Co. had asked me to resign my vice presidency and general European managership of the United Press, and bring to a close a career of 19 years I was most privileged to have with that fine international news-gathering agency, to return to Los Angeles and become the first head of the Mirror.

For 9 years I gave the newspaper, its staff, and its owners all the loyalty, dedication, and hard work of which I was capable, coupled with whatever professional skills I might possess. I attempted from the first edition to be fair with the public—all groups and segments—and to present objectively both sides of any newsworthy situation.

THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY THOUSAND CIRCULATION

I left the newspaper more than 4 years ago, in October 1957, with the publication vigorous and moving ahead. Staff morale was high. The newspaper had gone from no circulation to 320,000 sold copies daily in 8 busy, challenging, and difficult years. It published more than 17 million lines of paid advertising in that final year.

The Mirror then had the largest home delivered circulation of any afternoon newspaper in the entire West. Its classified advertising section was nearly three times the size of its immediate competitor, the then 80-year-old Herald Express. We were behind the Herald Express only a few thousand in circulation. The Mirror was a crusading newspaper insofar as it was possible to crusade. No apologies need to be made for our basic policies in the beginning, our concept of news and how it should be presented, for the awards and honors which we were fortunate to receive, or for the fact that the Mirror attempted to meet its full responsibilities as a part of a free press.

The record and progress of the Mirror for 9 years were impressive. It is indeed too bad that this progress did not continue. I had hoped with all my heart that the paper would grow, and prosper and serve.

MANY JOBS LOST

So, the demise last week of the Mirror and Hearst's 59-year-old Examiner bring a heavy heart and a deep feeling of nostalgia. Also, I have deep regret that so many fine newspaper men and women have lost their jobs.

Los Angeles and southern California really needed and continue to need a newspaper of the character and type first envisaged for the Mirror. The Times-Mirror Co. had vision and financial courage in starting the Mirror.

It is too bad that America's third city (and one day to become our largest) and a county with more than 7 million people now have only two daily newspapers and that their basic policies are fairly similar. Real all-out newspaper competition now becomes virtually a thing of the past in Los Angeles. The public is the real loser in this unfortunate series of events. In our magnificent system of competitive free enterprise we need first-class competition in all phases of our business life, newspapers and mass media communications included.

Why did the Examiner and the Mirror fail, or the arrangement which has now been effected come about?

MANY REASONS

There is no easy and short answer. The reasons are many. Permit me, however, to pass on my observations and conclusions based on 30 years of daily newspaper experience at home and overseas, including the 9 valuable and fruitful years spent at the Mirror.

What I am going to write will not win me any Pulitzer prizes, nor are these views likely to lead to my being requested to address a meeting of publishers. Self-criticism in most industries or business is unpopular and this is especially true of newspapers.

Whenever a newspaper fails, and especially a metropolitan daily, the reason most popularly advanced is that costs have outraced income, or that economics dictated such a course. This may be true to a considerable degree, but it is not the entire answer and it begs the issue.

For a newspaper to succeed, especially a new one in a competitive market such as Los Angeles was, it must have even above financial means, an editorial policy which adds up to its filling a need of the public. It must have character and a personality—a sharp identity. There must be a need and a purpose.

Great newspapers start from an editor's chair—and from no other point.

LITTLE FEEL FOR NEWS

Today more and more newspapers, especially in metropolitan markets, are directed by former bankers, lawyers, labor negotiators, public relations experts, promoters or third and fourth generation heirs of the founder. These people, in most instances, watch the box office returns. They have little feel or flair for news—the basic content of any newspaper. Few of them have ever covered police beats, sat on a rewrite desk, written editorials, made up a front page or read proof. They are not editorially trained, or if they are, the experience is one of short duration.

Now a few of these men develop a good sense of news or they have the intelligence and courage to give an editor whom they trust a completely free hand at all times on all issues. They do not permit friends, wives, business associates or other members of their families to interfere.

Most meetings of publishers these days are given over largely to discussions of newsprint costs, the growing problem of unions and rank featherbedding, how to reduce their respective fields by merging newspapers or buying out competitors, or how to live with television and radio. Little time, thought and effort go into how better newspapers—much better ones—can be produced. Little is said about increased community and area service and help for the people living in them.

Then in addition to a host of increased costs, newspapers are confronted with changes in American life. Transportation and communications and urban living are not considered sufficiently. Newspaper practices and policies tend to become rigid and deny flexibility. Research in the industry is held to a minimum. Publishers fight change and they are slow, for example, to adopt and use color in editorial or advertising content although their chief rivals—television, magazines and outdoor advertising—have done so at an amazing rate.

CAN'T BE EVERYTHING

Many metropolitan newspapers try to be all things to all men. They contend they can cover fringe cities and towns within several hundred miles of their plants. This is not possible.

No newspaper can serve a community so well as the truly local newspaper. Its staff live and work in the city. Their children attend schools and churches there. Its members pay taxes and vote for or against school bonds, new sewers, or to defeat a corrupt or incompetent public official. The newspaper they produce usually works for the town or city and champions its best and orderly progress. The metropolitan or county newspaper cannot do this. It is foolish to contend that it can. No metropolitan newspaper can carry the type of news which interests most local town and city citizens in depth or sufficient detail.

Metropolitan newspapers can and do provide interesting and worthwhile coverage on the national and international scene. But they tend to depend too much on syndicated material, press service coverage, and boiler plate material. Many of them do not cover well the news of their immediate area.

Too many publishers in trying to reduce expenses turn first and most frequently to editorial staffs and costs and to promotions. And for years newspapers have tended to promote everybody's business but their own. Note the space and gratis coverage they give radio and television, sports, and news about many products with little or no reciprocity.

Newspapers are slow to raise their advertising or circulation rates. This is not so with television, magazines, or outdoor advertising.

COSTS HAVE RISEN

During the past dozen years the price of newsprint, the basic material used, has gone up two to three times. Wages especially by unions, have soared and today they are among the highest paid in the Nation. Much overtime and idle time which are paid for are involved. The Guild, or newspaper union of editorial workers, has tended to make bricklayers out of promising newspaper men and women. Newspapers today lack some of the enterprise and vitality of years past. There is immediate need for more personal journalism and for campaigns and crusades.

When the Hearst newspapers were in their glory, they conducted one campaign or crusade after another. They were fed a constant stream of ideas by William Randolph Hearst who was a genius in many ways, although I personally detest his yellow or purple journalism which today is described as senational and sexy. No one has come along to really take his place.

Hearst journalism was most popular in America from 1900 to 1930. During that time the "Chief" not only sent message and idea after message and idea at any hour of the day or night to his editors, but he put together a tremendous stable of big-name writers, such as Arthur Brisbane, Damon Runyon, O. C. McIntyre, H. R. Knickerbocker, Floyd Gibbons, and Karl H. von Wiegand.

But then strong and vigorous newspapers in Milwaukee, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Baltimore, and elsewhere took out after the Hearst papers. They nibbled and came away within a reasonable time with much of the Hearst circulation and advertising and went from third or second position in their respective fields to first.

HEARST EMPIRE SHRINKS

Americans apparently have become tired of Hearst journalism. The decline has been in progress for years, and the Hearst newspapers have become fewer and fewer. Unless they are given far more local autonomy, improve their news coverage considerably, and are run by editorially trained men or editors with complete authority, this withering and dying process undoubtedly will continue.

The Mirror went under because people could not be induced to buy the Times twice in the same day. As the months and years went by, the Mirror was made to look more and more like the parent morning publication, the Times. If people desired the Times, they wanted to purchase the real thing, not a capsule afternoon synthetic.

Times policies and management did not necessarily get the required job done at the Mirror. A sparkplug—a whole team of them—was required. The paper had most of the basic built-in charges and costs of long-established and big moneymaking publications such as the Times, but without the advertising and circulation rates or volume. But then the Times did not, either, during the first 5 or 10 years of its life. Strong and growing nearby afternoon newspapers, television, and radio all added obstacles and competition.

The deaths of the Mirror and Examiner are most unfortunate, and they need not have occurred in the big, rich, and sprawling Los Angeles market. There are many questions being raised about the way the two papers closed, the manner in which the news was presented in the two surviving newspapers, who possessed all the facts for weeks and no mention being made about possible sales efforts.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR OWEN BREWSTER, OF MAINE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, on Christmas Day, December 25, 1961, a former Member of this legislative body passed away. Those who served with him in the Senate will never forget him, for he made a very deep and lasting impression with his service in the U.S. Senate.

Without doubt he was one of the most dynamic leaders ever produced by the State of Maine. Without doubt he was a man truly dedicated to his country, his State, his family and the people he represented.

I speak of the late Owen Brewster, of Dexter, Maine, with whom it was my privilege to serve in Congress for 12 years, 4 of which were in the Senate. During the past few years, the friendship between Dorothy Brewster, his widow, and Owen Brewster and myself grew to greater understanding and meaning—and in his passing I can truly say that I lost a very good and valued friend.

At the time of his death I expressed my condolences to Mrs. Brewster and the members of the family, and I do so again today. Perhaps the best measure of the depth of my feeling was in the fact that I made a hazardous air flight to Maine in order to be able to attend the funeral, with the plane that I was in circling over Bangor, Maine, for 3 hours before being able to land in the thick fog and low ceiling that closed up after the hazardous landing almost as quickly as it opened up so marginally for the almost split-second-timing landing.

Many appropriate observations have been made about Owen Brewster. They have been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in earlier proceedings of the House of Representatives. There is nothing of significance that I can add to what has already been observed.

But I do believe that the finest piece as yet written about the late Owen Brewster was the article written by that eminent journalist, John Gould, editor of the most fearless newspaper in the State of Maine, the weekly newspaper, the Enterprise, which is published in Lisbon Falls, Maine.

John Gould has captured the character and the spirit of the late Owen Brewster as no other writer or speaker has. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that his article which appeared in the Enterprise be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point, and I invite the attention of all Members of the Senate to it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUSTA, MAINE.—The Christmas passing of Senator Owen Brewster (he was born on Washington's birthday) was followed by the due obituaries and testimonials, but something of the man's great talent was lacking in the coverage. Owen Brewster was a politician, in the truest and better meanings of the word, and was far and away the keenest, most agile and most perceptive mind Maine has had in this field in this century. Perhaps since James G. Blaine.

He had his enemies—or perhaps it is kinder to say those who felt no love for him—but even those who least admired him had respect for his political acumen. Since he was graduated from Bowdoin College in 1909, with a Harvard law degree 2 years later, his life was devoted to Maine politics, and the lives and affairs of every Maine citizen have been affected by his policies and actions.

After some local Portland offices and a turn at Augusta, he emerged in 1924 as a Republican candidate for Governor. The era was leisurely enough. Percival Baxter was rounding out his two dignified terms, and the status quo seemed secure. Brewster lost in the primaries. But he called for a recount, and with disarming generosity suggested that certain votes in his favor had been illegally cast. The court agreed, and Brewster's total was reduced. But then, he argued, if these votes for him must be thrown out, then certainly these other votes for his opponent must also be thrown out. The reason, of course, was precisely the same reason already agreed to. Brewster was declared the winner, and he went on to two terms in Augusta.

In 1961, when Kennedy votes in Illinois were disputed, national Republican leaders conferred with Owen Brewster, who turned over to them his file of 1924 events in Maine—the cases were almost identical.

But what Brewster had done in Maine wasn't done in Illinois. The national leaders decided to sleep on their rights.

A Dexter man lately said Senator Brewster was living up on the hill and not doing much now. Little did Dexter, seemingly, know the great many interests Brewster kept alive. His long accumulation of political ties, and his lawyer's career of gathering clients, left him fully as busy in retirement as ever. But he was well aware of animosity toward him, and he knew in which areas he could appear to help a cause and in which areas he would do better to remain behind the scenes.

A typical instance of this came in 1961, when he wanted to help John Reed's cause. The sheer arithmetic of the ballot box was his meat. Frank Coffin was a graduate of Bates; John Reed was a graduate of the University of Maine. If all the Bates people voted for Coffin and all the Maine people voted for Reed, the outcome was obvious. This called for organization and direction. Brewster came down off Zion Hill with the idea, set it in motion, and went back up on the hill. He proposed that there was one logical man to head up this—had once defeated Barrows—relations were not well cemented. In the end, of course, Barrows became head of that club, the organization was effected, and the election proved the pudding. Brewster never publicly seemed involved—and as a Bowdoin man he naturally couldn't care less about the academic issues. To him it was politics and he played the game with a know-how best tested by the outcome.

In defeat, he had a lawyer-politician attitude, gathered his forces for the future, and laid plans. Just before his passing he was working on an exposé of Maine highway matters, hoping to embarrass Senator MUSKIE in 1964. This was like him. His Republican colleagues were hardly yet thinking about 1962. And although he is gone, some of the material and arguments he prepared will appear in 1964—even if the electorate never recognizes them as such.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the eloquent words of commendation expressed by the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and also to join with her in extending condolences to Dorothy Brewster, who is a close personal friend of Mrs. Mundt and myself.

I had the pleasure of serving with Senator Brewster, as did Senator MARGARET SMITH, both in the House and in the Senate. I considered him a very articulate and effective representative, not only of Maine, with its many different interests in Washington, but also of the great American tradition. Senator Brewster invariably was found on the pro-American side of any issue involving the security, safety, or progress of the country. His contributions as a public servant are many.

I am confident that his memory will live long, not only in Maine but throughout America. As a Senator and as a Representative during many periods of turbulence, he served his country faithfully and well. I join with others in mourning his passing.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to join with the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] in paying tribute to Owen Brewster. Senator Brewster was for many years a valued and conscientious Member of this body. He came to the Senate at the same time I did, and I was privileged to work with him during the years he was a Member of the Senate.

After he left the Senate, he was most thoughtful and helpful to those of us who remained and was always willing to give us the kind of information which, perhaps, we would not have been able to secure otherwise, by reason of his contacts with the outside world. When I say "world," I mean "world," because he knew and understood the situations which existed all over the world. He was most thoughtful indeed, and his relations with his fellow Members were friendly and kindly.

I join with the distinguished Senator from Maine and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota in paying tribute to Senator Brewster.

DEATH OF GOV. DONALD NUTTER, OF MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at this hour—1 o'clock p.m., Washington time, 11 o'clock a.m., mountain time, in the chamber of the house of representatives, in the State Capitol, in Helena, Mont., services will be conducted in memory of our late Governor, Donald Nutter. Governor Nutter and two other State officials—the State commissioner for agriculture, Edward C. Wren; and the Governor's executive secretary, Dennis B. Gordon—along with the crew of a C-47 National Guard transport plane, were killed on Thursday of last week. This tragic and terrible accident occurred in the region of Stemple Pass, to the north of Wolf Creek Canyon, in Montana. It was a tragic accident, because in only 5 minutes more the plane would have been over the mountains and on its way to its destination in Cut Bank, Mont.

Mr. President, my colleague the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and I are shocked, grieved, and deeply sorry that Montana's 15th Governor, Donald G. Nutter, of Sidney, Mont., was taken in this manner. Governor Nutter was a resident of Sidney, and a graduate of the Sidney schools and of Montana State University Law School. He is survived by his wife, Maxine; his son John, age 13; and his mother, Mrs. Anne Nutter, of Sidney.

Governor Nutter had a distinguished war record—serving in the old Army Air Corps. He undertook 62 combat missions during the Second World War, and served for 13 months in the China-Burma-India theater.

Dennis B. Gordon was the Governor's executive secretary.

Edward C. Wren was the State commissioner of agriculture. He was a Cascade County rancher and farmer, and was extremely active in legislative and farm affairs. Like Mr. Gordon, Mr. Wren is survived by a wife and family.

The pilot of the plane, Maj. Clifford E. Hanson, was formerly of Missoula. He leaves a wife and two daughters. His home was in Great Falls.

The copilot of the plane, Maj. Joseph Devine, was originally from Iowa. He leaves a wife and four children. He also lived in Great Falls.

M. Sgt. C. W. Ballard, another Great Falls man, and a member of the crew, was a member of the Montana All-State football team in 1940. He leaves a wife and one son, Marc.

Mr. President, this is indeed a terrible loss to all of Montana. We cannot find words to express our sorrow over it.

It is true that so far as the Governor was concerned, he and I belonged to different political parties. But I can say that I personally always found the Governor to be a man who put his cards on the table. One always knew where he stood; there was never any doubt in the mind of anyone about the positions which our late Governor took on any issues during his term in office.

On behalf of Mrs. Mansfield and myself, I wish to express our extreme sorrow at his passing, and extend our condolences to his wife, to his son, and to his mother.

Mr. President, I also wish to express the same condolences and our great sorrow to Mrs. Wren and her son, to Mrs. Gordon and her children, to Mrs. Hanson and her two daughters, to Mrs. Devine and her four children, and to Mrs. Ballard and her son. All of these outstanding men will be greatly missed. May their souls rest in peace.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I join my distinguished colleague, the majority leader, in paying tribute to our State's late Governor, Donald G. Nutter, and his staff and the fine members of the crew of the National Guard plane who were killed in the accident the majority leader has described.

I have known Governor Nutter since he was a basketball referee in eastern Montana. Everything he did, he did well. He is still remembered as one of the fairest and best referees ever to serve in our State.

Governor Nutter had a wonderful war record. It is ironic that after all the missions he had flown during the war, he was killed in an air accident which could have been avoided if only a few more minutes had been available.

I knew Governor Nutter as a legislator, and later as the Governor. I regarded him at all times as my friend. It is true that we differed in our political party membership, and sometimes in our political philosophy. But he was a man of integrity, who always fought fearlessly and fairly for the things in which he believed; and he was always friendly when the battles were over.

It is a great tragedy that so high and distinguished an official is taken. It is a most serious tragedy to his family, to our State, and to its institutions.

Lieutenant Governor Babcock will carry on, however, in the traditions for which Governor Nutter stood.

I join the distinguished majority leader in extending the sincere sympathy of Mrs. Metcalf and myself to Mrs. Nutter and the family, to Mrs. Wren and the family, to Mrs. Gordon and the family, and to the wives and families of the crew of the plane—Major Hanson, Major Devine, and Sergeant Ballard.

We regret exceedingly that we could not be present at the ceremony today, which began a few minutes ago in the house of representatives chamber in Helena, Mont.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I should like to join the Senators from Montana in expressing our grief and sorrow at the tragic passing of the late Governor Nutter, of Montana. I have not been personally acquainted with the Governor, although I have met him; but I am aware of his outstanding achievements and his contributions to sound, constructive government. The people of Idaho have profound respect for Governor Nutter and for the work he has been doing during his short term as chief executive.

On behalf of the people of Idaho, I wish to extend our condolences to the State of Montana and its people, and also to express our sympathy to the Governor's family.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Idaho for his remarks on this occasion.

CENSORSHIP OF SPEECHES BY MILITARY LEADERS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in yesterday's edition of the Washington Evening Star there is an illuminating article, written by Cecil Holland, setting forth some examples of censorship of military leaders' speeches, which have been developed during the course of the present hearings before the special subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee. It seems to me, Mr. President, that much of this unfortunate controversy could have been eliminated if there had been a requirement that censorship policy be clearly defined and be made a matter of public record. In such a circumstance, our military speakers would know what the policy was, and could have their speeches drafted accordingly. Moreover, if the publicly announced censorship policy appeared to be too soft or indecisive, so far as the American people are concerned, sufficient pressure could then be brought to bear on the Congress and the White House to have it changed appropriately.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Holland's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EXACT WORDS IN CENSORSHIP

(By Cecil Holland)

(Censorship as practiced in the Pentagon and in the State Department has come under fire. At hearings last week on charges that military leaders have been muzzled, the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee was told that references in speeches to communism often were toned down. Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, retired Chief of Naval Operations, testified he thought changes made in many of his speeches were capricious. Gen. Thomas D. White, former Air Force chief, described them as unnecessary. Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, chief of Army research and development, said some of the changes made in his speeches gave him cause for wonder about the motivation involved. These are some examples of the actual blue pencil of the censors at work on the speeches of the three officers as presented at the hearings.)

From drafts of Admiral Burke's speeches from January 1, 1961, to August 6, 1961.

Original: "The Communists, however, are not going to abandon their relentless drive toward world empire even though they dare not risk the inevitable retaliation that a nuclear war would bring."

Revised: "Potential aggressors, however, cannot be expected to surrender their objectives without a struggle."

Original: "Today the United States is engaged in a grim competition with an alien philosophy that has taken over whole countries without firing a shot. That is why the only real way to increase the strength of our Nation is to strengthen what is under attack—to strengthen the individual."

Revised: "Today, as in the past, the only real way to increase the strength of our Nation is to strengthen what is under attack—to strengthen the individual."

Original: "Challenge of communism—Communist challenge—the Communist threat."

Revised: "Challenge of competing ideologies—challenge—the threat.

From General White's speeches from September 21, 1960, to April 25, 1961:

Original: "Since the Air Force's future offensive and defensive missions, as we reach farther out into aerospace."

Revised: "Since the Air Force's future missions, as we reach farther out in aerospace."

Original: "Approximately 90 percent of the general war striking power."

Revised: "A very large percentage of the deterrent power."

Original "These same forces could also contribute substantially to a general war effort."

Revised: "These same forces could also contribute substantially to a major aggression."

Original: "The Soviet economic-military potential is guided by a regime which can count on the backing—however unenthusiastic—of the Russian people. In addition, the Soviets have another great intangible resource which can best be described as gall. They are showing ever-increasing confidence—even arrogance—in their military and scientific strength and growth of their influence, spawned and perpetuated in brutal wars, dedicated to the mission of world revolution—their fervor for subversion and force makes them believe that Communist domination of the world is inevitable. They are further strengthened in this belief by their close partnership with Communist China."

Revised: "Furthermore in any revolution of the Communist threat we cannot disregard the close partnership between Soviet Russia and Communist China."

Original: "The unquestionable capacity to repel and decisively counter any attack."

Revised: "The unquestionable capacity to decisively counter any attack."

Original: "Weapon systems have been developed to overpower either."

Revised: "Weapon systems have been developed to overcome either."

From General Trudeau's speeches covering the period from August 1, 1961, to December 8, 1961:

Original: "On toward the turn of the century—world communism."

Revised: "On toward the turn of the century—Sino-Soviet communism."

Original: "There are voices today which whisper that the vicious, dangerous, and false doctrine of peaceful coexistence and expediency."

Revised: "There are voices today which whisper that the vicious, dangerous, and false doctrine of aggression masquerading as peaceful coexistence and expediency."

Original: "If the Russians can mobilize 1,000 scientists and a billion dollars to seize space, we must equal and surpass this effort or lose space."

Revised: "If the Russians can mobilize 1,000 scientists and a billion dollars to try to dominate space, we must equal and surpass this effort or give them a free hand."

(Some passages were deleted entirely and not revised or deletion was suggested. Some examples from the speeches of the three officers follow:)

Admiral Burke's speeches: One speech dealing with the destructive forces of communism at work in southeast Asia, Africa and Cuba was censored in its entirety.

For just this sort of free, unrestricted thinking has produced most of the remarkable accomplishments throughout our Nation's history. And it is precisely this kind of free discussion of alternative solutions to our problems that we must rely on for our future progress.

General White's speeches: Current Communist propaganda to the world concentrates on the same central theme which it has always emphasized, the destruction of capitalism, colonialism, and imperialism. But, under this guise, they really intend the destruction of everything which does not bend to their will. * * *

If our cold war efforts fail, armed conflict could occur * * * as has happened in the past. The Korean and Taiwan actions are examples.

Furthermore, the Soviets have demonstrated by their intensive research and development programs that they unquestionably seek a clear military advantage over the free world alliance at the earliest possible date.

General Trudeau's speeches: The three sputnik satellites lend substance to Communist claims of an intercontinental ballistic missile and their lunar probes should clinch them.

SHIPMENTS OF ARMS TO CUBA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the January 26 edition of the Des Moines Register there is an interesting article entitled "Contain Castro's Cuba," written by Mr. Walter Lippmann. I believe a reading of this article would be helpful in evaluating this thorny problem. However, I should point out that I must disagree with Mr. Lippmann's statement that we cannot blockade Cuba. We can, Mr. President. For a year and a half I have been advocating that we do so, in sofar as war materiel is concerned. Our policy should be: "No war materiel in and no war materiel out," permitting trade with other nations on other items as the policy of those nations dictates. I think it is very shortsighted to have permitted 50,000 tons of war materiel to be shipped into Cuba already, thus placing those Cubans who might wish to rise up against their Communist dictator in in the same position as that of the Hungarian patriots who could not beat off tanks with sticks. How long must this be permitted to continue, Mr. President? Are we to sit idly by while more war goods are shipped in, for eventual reshipment to support Castro-type uprisings in other Latin American countries? Are we to sit idly by until the threat posed against this country by Mig's and missiles with nuclear warheads becomes so unbearable as to require direct intervention as a matter of self-preservation? Mr. Lippmann's containment by surveillance suggestion would, I fear, merely lead to the very situation of direct intervention which he so persuasively argues against at this time.

I ask that Mr. Lippmann's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTAIN CASTRO'S CUBA

(By Walter Lippmann)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Conference of American Foreign Ministers in Uruguay has not concluded its work as this article is written. But it is not too soon to say that there is being created an artificial and misleading standard by which to judge what is going on. Much too often the issues at Punta del Este are treated in terms of the United States winning or losing: If the condemnation of Fidel Castro is very severe and is accompanied by an all-around rupture of diplomatic relations and of trade relations, we win; anything less than this is something of a defeat.

This, I believe, is much too simple a view of an extremely difficult problem. The problem is how to contain and isolate Castro's revolutionary interventions, how to turn the Cuban Government from its attempt to become a full satellite of Moscow, how to convert it into a good and reliable member of the hemispheric system.

STRONG WORDS CAN'T STOP IT

This will not be done by strong words in a resolution. Strong words never stop any revolution. Almost certainly it cannot be done by breaking off diplomatic relations in this hemisphere. The more Cuba becomes a part of the Soviet and Chinese system, the more it will use their channels to other states.

It cannot be done by a general trade embargo. For 80 percent of Cuba's trade is now with the Communist bloc and the rest is with Mexico, Canada, and Western Europe. Cuba's trade with the other American states is negligible. Castro, we must remember, is not nearly so dependent on the Western Hemisphere as was Rafael Trujillo.

There is no good reason for crying out that we have been defeated because the biggest countries in South America will not vote for sanctions that would make big headlines in the United States but could have no substantial and decisive effect on Castro's regime. What can be done that is worth doing?

A BASIS FOR CONTAINMENT

The first thing to do is, as Brazil and Argentina have been arguing, to lay a sound juridical basis for the containment of Castro. Existing hemisphere law was drafted by men who were thinking of World War II. They were thinking of the threat which had been posed of a Nazi or Fascist conquest of South America.

If that were the present danger, if there were real danger of a Soviet military establishment in Cuba, those old treaties would still be quite useful. But the existing law is not directed accurately against the methods of the cold war.

There is every reason to think that we can work out with the assistance of the big South American countries a statement of hemispheric law which fits the problem of Castro.

ESTABLISHING SURVEILLANCE

With a law amplified and clarified, we can move with general consent to organize inter-American machinery, in which we would take an active part, to expose and counter Castro's agents in this hemisphere.

Moreover, while we cannot blockade Cuba, we can establish surveillance by sea and air and, without violating Cuban airspace, we can keep close watch on the military situation for signs of active Soviet intervention.

This is a general policy of containment, patiently, persistently, and actively administered. There is one alternative to it. That would be for the United States to occupy

Cuba, overthrow Castro, and set up a Cuban Government that we like.

WRINGING HANDS

There are many among us who favor doing this. If it were done, there would at first be very considerable rejoicing and enthusiasm among those who do not look beyond the excitement of the moment.

Once when the church bells were ringing in London to celebrate the beginning of a war, a statesman who had opposed the war said, "Today they are ringing the bells. Tomorrow they will be wringing their hands."

A U.S. occupation of Cuba would have enormous and far-reaching consequences. Although there are people who affect to think that there is no such thing as the opinion of mankind, or that a decent respect for it is unmanly, the uproar around the world would be tremendous.

IT WOULD BE SMASHED

The inter-American system would be smashed. Whatever happened to Castro himself in Cuba, Castroism, fused with anti-Yankeeism, would rage throughout the hemisphere. And we, in the meantime, would have entangled ourselves in a guerrilla war nourished from outside Cuba.

It would be like the British war in Malaya, like the French wars in Indochina and in Algeria. There is no reasonable ground for thinking that intervention in Cuba could be a short, swift, and clean-cut operation. It could not be.

Believing this, believing that intervention would be a calamity, I can see no alternative to a policy of vigorous and alert containment.

THOMAS JEFFERSON AND THE KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the January 20 issue of the Washington Evening Star, the lead editorial, in commenting on some of the speechmaking at the recent Democratic rally here in Washington, deftly points out how readily the President follows the example of Thomas Jefferson where it will suit the purposes of the New Frontier and how readily Thomas Jefferson will be ignored when to do so will also serve those purposes. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNMENTIONABLE

The speechmaking at Saturday night's Democratic rally was in the best partisan tradition. The past was reviewed with pride and the future appraised with hope. If the political opposition ever did anything worthwhile, it evidently escaped the notice of the Democratic orators. After all, the party faithful had not shelled out $100 a plate to hear about the virtues, if any, of the G.O.P.

We were especially interested in the remarks of President Kennedy. He linked the major programs of his administration with those of former Democratic Presidents—Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry Truman. He also remarked that in determining that the United States will not be second in space, we follow Thomas Jefferson who sent Lewis and Clark to explore the Northwest.

The President, however, did not allude to other areas in which his administration, as well as those that preceded it, would have no desire to follow Thomas Jefferson. Particularly, we have in mind a Jefferson statement as quoted by C. Northcote Parkinson in his little book, "The Law and the Profits." Mr. Jefferson commented, as follows:

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. * * * To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with public debt. * * * We must make our choice between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude.

"If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and comforts, in our labor and in our amusements. * * * If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labor of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy."

Naturally, while ringing Thomas Jefferson into the act, there would be no inclination to mention his views on economy by spokesmen for an administration which is urging Congress to raise the national debt ceiling above the $300 billion mark.

FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in today's issue of the Wall Street Journal the lead editorial, entitled "Political Magic," makes some very cogent observations regarding the First Annual Report of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers, pointing out the pitfalls that can exist in a report which deals rather loosely with such terms as "productivity," "unemployment," and "gross national product."

One of the most surprising matters pointed out in this most excellent editorial is the fact that in commenting on gross national product the Council of Economic Advisers includes Government spending as a part of the total output, rather than taking into account only nongovernmental spending.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL MAGIC

Economic jargon can be confusing at best, but in the mouths of Government economists it is sometimes something far more serious. Mere words become shibboleths, and the shibboleths become the excuse for policies of the most far-reaching consequences.

The current case in point is the First Annual Report of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers, wherein repeated reference is made to terms like "productivity," "unemployment," and "gross national product." Though each is an extremly slippery concept, the economic advisers are quite prepared to use them glibly, with too little examination of their meaning.

They muse, for example, about the virtues of rising productivity. And they suggest, as a guide for noninflationary wage behavior, that wage increases in each industry not exceed the trend rate of productivity increases in industry in general.

That is all very nice, perhaps. But what is productivity? The advisers give the usual definition, "output per man-hour." Only in the most oblique way do they even hint that productivity rises as a result of more and better equipment for workers to work with. That is, as a result of the increasingly costly capital investment of management.

Yet this is the very key to productivity. It is certainly misleading, to say the least, to talk about rising industrial productivity and rising industrial wages as though they were all mainly the outcome of extra intellectual or physical effort put out by workers. The Government would do better to refrain from devising national policy "guides" based on this kind of misapprehension.

A much more direct "trigger" of Government action is the unemployment rate. The economic advisers spend some time making clear that they are against involuntary unemployment—do they think anyone is for it? And somewhere along the line they seem to admit that unemployment is a far more complex phenomenon that the official figures would indicate. In human as well as economic terms, for instance, it makes a good deal of difference whether the unemployed person is a housewife with a working husband or a man who has been the family's sole support.

Yet, despite the inadequacy and sometimes perversity of the unemployment measuring sticks, the economic advisers have no hesitation in accepting and using the percentage rates. Given a specified rise in the rate, they want the President empowered to pour out fresh billions of Federal spending on public works. Whatever one thinks of this dole approach, it seems strange to make the official unemployment figure the trigger for massive Government intervention without first trying to develop an accurate measure of actual unemployment.

But perhaps the weirdest shibboleth is a good old gross national product. It is truly wonderful what semantic tricks Government economists can play with this supposed measure of the Nation's total output of goods and services. For one thing, they can show you that Federal outlays are stationary or even declining—as a percentage of GNP—when the plain fact of the matter is that they are increasing hugely.

One reason the GNP lends itself so shamelessly to such verbal legerdemain is that it includes Government spending as part of total output. Since most Government spending is nonproductive, that is an erroneous device, but it makes things easier for economic advisers. Let Government spending increase, and they can point to a rising GNP and hence—presto—economic growth.

Nowhere in this report is there a candid recognition of the crux of the matter: that this rapidly growing burden of Government is pressing ever more heavily on the Nation's real growth potential. On the contrary, we are assured that much, much more public investment is needed to spur economic growth.

Thus the Council of Economic Advisers, sometimes subtly and sometimes not, are making a major pitch for an extensive further nationalization of American life. It is perhaps their privilege to make that plea, though their adroit manipulation of slippery semantics is open to question.

What at least seems clear from this first report is that if the President's advisers are no economic magicians, they are nonetheless highly skilled political economists.

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, according to some naive and superficial analyses, President Kennedy has pulled off a master stroke of political strategy against the Republicans in the matter of his proposed Department of Urban Affairs. One idea seems to be that if one is against establishing a new Department of Urban Affairs he is against cities. Another is that inasmuch as the President has further proposed to name Dr. Robert Weaver, a Negro, to the new Cabinet post, when and if it should be established, a stand against establishing a new Department of Urban Affairs is a stand against Negroes.

Ideas such as this reveal a low regard for the intelligence of city voters, and particularly of Negroes, coupled with a purpose to use these groups as a political football. Before the master strokers in the White House brag about the great victory they think they have won, they ought to reflect on the damage such strategy causes to the unity of our people—a unity so necessary in our fight against communism. They will discover, moreover, that master strokes such as this result in a loss of respect for the Democratic Party among the American people. The voters of the big cities are intelligent enough to recognize a phony political maneuver. So are the Negroes, who, having been fooled by promises of legislative action on civil rights legislation, are not about to be fooled on this one. They know that five Republican Senators, myself included, spoke in favor of Dr. Weaver's nomination to be Housing Administrator. And they will know, therefore, that because some of us, myself included, are opposed to a Department of Urban Affairs does not mean that we are opposed to Dr. Weaver, much less to Negroes.

Lest the merits of this controversy be lost altogether, I would hope that the President might read the statement of the Reverend Robert G. Howes, bishop's representative for community relations, Catholic Diocese of Worcester, Mass., appearing at pages 201 to 203 of the hearings report on legislation proposing to establish a Department of Urban Affairs, before the Senate Committee on Government Operations. Reverend Howes had this to say:

> I, too, deplore the ravages of uncoordinated planning in our metropolitan areas. I, too, concur that some sort of Federal action might help remedy the situation. Given a valid end, though, I wonder if there is not a danger in attaching a kind of extra legem sacrosanctness to a particular means advanced purportedly to achieve that end. I would hate, for instance, to suppose that one cannot rise to explore these proposals further without bringing down on one's head the accusation of being against cities. I would hope the suggestions now before you have not already attained a status like that of motherhood which only fools question.

Father Howes then went on to develop some points and questions which make it clear that the President's proposal would not result in a balanced, overall awareness of our metropolitan problems, of which we are in need.

Elsewhere in today's Congressional Record appears my speech in New Orleans on January 23, the day before the House Rules Committee acted to kill the President's proposed bill to establish a Department of Urban Affairs. At the time this speech was given, I had no knowledge of what action the Rules Committee might take respecting this bill, and my reasons for being in opposition to the bill were as sincere then as they are now after the various side issues of partisan politics and racism have been injected by the proponents. I might add, Mr. President, that my position rests on the merits and not on side issues developed by those who are afraid to rest their case on its merits.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record at this point an article appearing in yesterday's Washington Post by Mr. Jack Bell, of the Associated Press, which sets forth the reaction of Mr. Louis Lautier, Negro special assistant to the National Republican Chairman, pointing out how Mr. Weaver is being used as a pawn in the political chess game which the proponents of the Department of Urban Affairs are now playing.

In the January 27 edition of the Washington Evening Star is an excellent analysis of the situation entitled "A Slick Political Operation," written by Mr. Gould Lincoln, and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lincoln's column be printed in the Record.

Another keen analysis appeared in the January 26 edition of the Washington Evening Star, this one written by Mr. William S. White, entitled "Gamesmanship on Urban Issue," which shows the weakness of the merits of this proposal. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. White's article be printed in the Record.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial appearing in the January 25 edition of the Sioux City Journal, pointing out that one of the likely byproducts of a new Department of Urban Affairs would be the further dilution of local government powers and the creation of a more highly centralized Federal Government.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 28, 1962]

GOP Sees Politics on Urban Department

(By Jack Bell)

Some Republicans took a States rights position yesterday in continued opposition to President Kennedy's proposal for an Urban Affairs Department—and one accused the Chief Executive of gutter politics.

Senate Minority Leader Everett M. Dirksen, of Illinois, indicated in an interview that Republican leaders will contend that the establishment of any such department would invite cities to bypass the States in dealing with the Federal Government.

"Do we want to set up a department for direct dealings between Washington and the municipalities, which are adjuncts of the States?" he asked.

He answered his own question by saying he doesn't believe this would be wise.

Dirksen said he doesn't believe that Mr. Kennedy has succeeded in putting the Republicans on a political spot by announcing that if a new department is created he will appoint Housing Administrator Robert C. Weaver to head it as the first Negro Cabinet member.

Mr. Kennedy took this course after blaming the Republicans for a House Rules Committee vote shelving legislation to create the department. Five Republicans joined with four Southern Democrats in a 9–6 vote against sending the measure to the House floor.

The President reacted quickly by announcing he would set up the new Department by Executive order—which is subject to veto by either branch of Congress.

Mr. Kennedy's course was described by Louis Lautier, Negro special assistant to the Republican National Chairman, as an example of "gutter politics." Lautier said in a statement that Weaver "is merely an unhappy pawn in a political chess game."

"The Republican vote in the House Rules Committee not to send the bill to the House floor was based on the demerits of the issue," he said. "The bill was a fraud—it would not solve the problems of urban communities but would create a large and sprawling bureaucracy."

Lautier said political maneuvering by the President is aimed at throwing up a smokescreen to "hide the failure of President Kennedy to keep Democratic platform and candidate Kennedy's campaign promises to ban racial discrimination in federally assisted housing."

Mr. Kennedy has delayed issuing any such order until what he said would be the proper time.

Not all Republicans are expected to go along with Dirksen and House Minority Leader Charles A. Halleck, of Indiana, in their opposition to the reorganization plan.

Senator Jacob K. Javits, Republican, from New York, among others, has said he favors creation of a new Urban Department.

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 27, 1962]

The Political Mill

(By Gould Lincoln)

A SLICK POLITICAL OPERATION

President Kennedy's political strategy to get a yes-or-no vote in the House of Representatives and the Senate on his proposal to create a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is likely to bring such a result, especially in the House. But at the same time it raises a question: good government versus politics. The issue is whether the Federal Government should take over more and more functions and activities which properly are duties and responsibilities of the local and State governments. Aside from this, there is the President's apparent determination to ignore Congress and its legislative processes if necessary to get his will in the creation of a Government Department whose head will have Cabinet status—a new Department which eventually will go far beyond the matters of housing and urban renewal recommended in the administration's bill. The House Rules Committee tabled the measure Wednesday by a vote of 9 to 6, denying it consideration by the House unless through a petition signed by 218 Members or on a Calendar Wednesday.

Creation of the proposed Department not only would bring about the appointment of undersecretaries, assistant secretaries and a large number of lesser employees, fattening the already huge Federal payroll, but it might put the Federal Government in position to tackle (and control through Federal appropriation) transportation, policing and many other matters now reserved to local governments.

TACTIC AGAINST GOP

It was entirely clear from the President's statements in his Wednesday afternoon press conference, after the House Rules Committee's action, that he hoped to put at a disadvantage the Republicans who avowedly are seeking to increase their votes in the big metropolitan centers and regain some of the Negro vote, which in recent years has gone overwhelmingly Democratic. For the President apparently believes that the populations of the cities, as well as their mayors and other elected officials, will be glad to turn over to the Federal Government some of the problems that burden them today. Further, he announced at his press conference he intended to appoint a Negro, Robert Weaver, head of all the Federal housing agencies, if and when he is able to set up the new Department. Mr. Weaver thus would become the first of his race to hold full Cabinet office—another evidence of the Kennedy administration's desire to give recognition to Negroes.

Whether the President can get away with his maneuver to bypass the House Rules Committee remains to be seen. The Republicans in the House have been pretty solidly opposed to creation of the new Department on the ground that the Federal Government should not further extend its bureaucracy over the affairs of the people and concentrate all forms of government in Washington, the National Capital. Also they are not inclined to be impressed by the promised appointment of a Negro to Cabinet office.

They contend that the President, if he desired, could do much more for the extension of civil rights, so far as the Negroes and other minorities are concerned, by really pressing for enactment of further and stronger civil rights legislation. They join with certain liberal Democrats in saying that Mr. Kennedy has been treading lightly in the matter of such legislation.

In addition, they point out that President Kennedy, when organizing his Cabinet, offered the Office of Postmaster General to Negro Representative WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Chicago, who, for reasons of his own, declined and stayed on in the House.

DEFEAT POSSIBLE

At the present writing, it appears the President may lose his fight in House or Senate or both. Admittedly the vote may be close. When the President has submitted his reorganization plan for a Department of Urban Affairs, it will remain before Congress and automatically establish the new Department, unless it is vetoed by a majority vote in one of the Houses of Congress within 60 days.

When former President Eisenhower sent to Congress his proposal for creation of the newest Federal Government Department—that of Health, Education, and Welfare—it was followed by a bill for creation of such a Department. Congress acted promptly and passed the bill. The Kennedy administration, faced with defeat in the House Rules Committee and a possible lengthy filibuster in the Senate, discarded the idea of pressing for favorable action in Congress and decided to take the chance of a veto of the new Department. The House Rules Committee divided in its vote to table the administration's bill for the new Department, five Republicans and four Democrats to six Democrats supporting the bill. The committee is composed of 10 Democrats and 5 Republicans

The Democrats are doing their best to make it appear that the Republicans are opposing the creation of the Urban Affairs Department in order to prevent appointment of a Negro to the Cabinet. It is a slick move and likely to be so recognized. As already stated, the President, when he first picked his Cabinet, offered a place to a Negro. The appointment didn't stick. At that time, it was suggested in some quarters that the whole operation was carried out with tongue in cheek.

[From the Evening Star, Jan. 26, 1962]

GAMESMANSHIP ON URBAN ISSUE—KENNEDY TACTICS EXPECTED TO EMBARRASS REPUBLICANS MORE THAN DEMOCRATS

(By William S. White)

A bit of old-fashioned domestic political gamesmanship—an unfamiliar thing in Washington for many months because of the iron pressures of endless foreign crises—has raised its head.

No one is altogether sorry; life has been far too grim around here for a long time.

This is the central meaning of President Kennedy's proposal to create a Cabinet Department of Urban Affairs and Housing by Executive order, and so bypass a resisting Republican-southern Democratic coalition in the House of Representatives.

Four deep southern Members of the House Rules Committee joined all five of its Republican members in refusing to clear a legislative bill to set up such a Department. Mr. Kennedy has elected to put all the blame on the Republicans and to be rather silent about the fact that four dissident Democrats joined them in opposition.

The President is simply taking the opportunity to twist the tail of the GOP elephant. For the Republicans have long been proclaiming their eagerness to get closer to the urban voting centers and to minority groups generally. And it is precisely these centers and groups that are most interested in the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs.

Moreover, to add a second twist to the tail, the President has underlined that he wants a Negro, Dr. Robert Weaver, to head the new Department and thus become the first member of his race to enter the Cabinet.

Mr. Kennedy may or may not get his plan through Congress. To do the thing by Executive order he must submit a scheme, under his general powers to reorganize the Government, which would become effective unless directly voted down by either House.

But whether or not he gets it through is less important politically than the chance it gives him to put the Republicans in both Houses generally on the record—and on the spot.

The action, or inaction, of the House Rules Committee puts only a handful of Members on the record. This little affair alone would make a pretty thin and cloudy issue for the coming congressional elections and the 1964 presidential election.

The heart of the new maneuver, from the President's viewpoint, is that it will not embarrass his own party nearly so much as it will embarrass the Republicans. The bulk of Democrats are for the bill anyhow. Too, the plan does not involve any direct Presidential attack on the congressional leadership of either party. The people the President is reaching for are rank-and-filers. Thus he will not alienate the top GOP leaders, whose help he will need in more serious enterprises.

What the tactic really does is to permit the President to handle his southern problem in Congress simply by ignoring it and talking sadly instead about his Republican problem.

As to the basic merits of the issue: It is not easy to see why a new Cabinet Department should be created especially for city people, though such a Department no doubt would hardly cause a collapse of the Republic by nightfall. The pained cries of proponents that 70 percent of the people are urban and are now somehow not represented in the Cabinet seem a bit odd.

This can be so only if it be assumed that city folk presently have no representation in the State Department, the Treasury Department, the Justice Department, the Commerce Department, the Labor Department, the Post Office Department, the Interior Department, the Defense Department, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—and the White House. It is all, in short, a good case of non-Madison Avenue hucksterism, of creating "consumer demand," so to speak, where none existed before.

[From the Sioux City Journal, January 25, 1962]

URBAN AFFAIRS CABINET POST

The mayor of Omaha, Nebr., said the other day he will oppose creation of the proposed Department of Housing and Urban Affairs if it means more Federal control over cities. His point is well taken. Already cities in Iowa, for example, are subject to many controls placed upon them by the State legislature. City governments in the Hawkeye State are not free agents by any means, having to contend with numerous State statutes, some applying directly to cities within specified population brackets.

Since the cities are creatures of the State, it is logical that the State assume certain jurisdiction. We are inclined to agree with some officials of the cities, however, that in Iowa at least there seems to be more than enough State control in existence.

Under such circumstances, the entry of a new control element—the Federal Government—could prove burdensome to cities. There is little doubt in our mind that if President Kennedy's proposal for a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs is accepted by Congress, Federal controls are bound to come.

Mayor Dworak, of Omaha, said he would go along with the new Federal Cabinet post only if the Department was of an advisory nature to study municipal problems, adding that he is against the trend of municipalities to ask the Federal Government to cure all the ills of the cities. It is unlikely, however, that the Kennedy administration would settle for an advisory-only type Department, and if Federal money is channeled to the cities, controls will follow.

A Federal Housing and Urban Affairs post more than likely would result in a further dilution of local government powers and create a more highly centralized Federal Government, which from our point of view is too centralized already.

GOVERNMENTAL FISCAL POLICIES

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, we are continually receiving literally hundreds of requests for new money spending programs in this body each day from various groups, both within and without our Nation's borders. Today I invite the attention of my colleagues to a request of a different nature—a call for more fiscal responsibility and soundness.

While it would be a pleasure to be able to approve every fund request made of us, I am certain that most of us agree that spending our Government into bankruptcy would not only soon make impossible the granting of any fund requests, but might actually cause cancellation of some programs now operating. Thus it is essential that all Americans be made aware of the fiscal limitations of their Government; and I feel that groups like the Associated Taxpayers of Idaho are doing an outstanding job in face of many obstacles.

I ask unanimous consent that the news release and policy statement of the Associated Taxpayers of Idaho be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Associated Taxpayers of Idaho declared today that only a fiscally responsible Congress, determined to evaluate the Government's financial requirements on the basis of reasonable, but tough, spending priorities, could insure that the new Federal budget just submitted by President Kennedy would remain in balance.

The new budget for the fiscal year 1963, which begins next July 1, forecasts net budget receipts in that fiscal year will total $93 billion. It estimates that Federal expenditures (exclusive of trust fund expenditures for highway construction, social security, etc.) will total $92,537,000,000, and that there will be a surplus of $463 million.

Noting that the revenue and spending levels must be predicted 18 months in advance of the fiscal yearend, Max Yost, executive manager, spokesman for the statewide citizen taxpayer organization, cautioned that the fiscal budgetary result will depend in large measure upon maintenance of a healthy economy, and upon the fiscal actions of the session of Congress just under way.

"Citizens of Idaho have no small stake in the new budget," Yost said. "Idaho's share of the $92.5 billion total of estimated Federal expenditures will amount to $240,596,200."

(This estimate is based upon a formula for allocating the Federal tax burden among the States, developed by the tax foundation, a national research and citizen education agency.)

"There is a need for Congress to apply stern priorities in considering Federal spending programs," the statement continued. "Expenditures for protection purposes—defense, international affairs, and related national security programs—will total $55,686,000,000 under this new budget. These programs will cost Idaho's taxpayers an estimated $144,783,600. Our share of the $9,398,000,000 budgeted for interest on our huge national debt will amount to another $24,434,800.

"The remainder of the estimated spending total—$27,797,000,000—is for domestic civil benefit programs and general government activities. Idaho's share of these expenditures is an estimated $72,272,200. It is significant that spending for these nondefense programs has been steadily rising, even in these times of international tensions and crises.

"The implications are clear. Insuring the balanced budget just submitted by President Kennedy—a budget in precarious balance at best—can only be achieved by a fiscally responsible Congress, supported by our citizens, which is determined to evaluate the Government's financial requirements on the basis of reasonable, but tough, spending priorities—providing for the essentials, postponing the merely desirable, and rejecting nonessential or unsound spending programs."

The following statement of governmental fiscal policies was adopted at the association's 15th annual meeting, December 13, 1961. The association will follow this policy vigorously during 1962 in its work with local, State, and Federal levels of government:

"STATEMENT ON GOVERNMENTAL FISCAL POLICIES

"Government today is so big and complicated that its operations demand the application of the best and most thorough fiscal controls. The Associated Taxpayers of Idaho, recognizing the unprecedented expansion of government and its corresponding tax impact strongly recommends the following:

"1. A dedication of fiscal responsibility at all levels of government to provide: an annual budget review which will relate receipts and expenditures; the elimination of deficit financing at the Federal level, except in times of grave emergency; and the elimination of expenditures outside the budget through trust funds and other devices which bypass traditional appropriation procedures.

"2. That the facts be given to the people of the entire problem of government financing, particularly the projection of future costs of new and contemplated programs, to give the taxpayers a realistic price tag of the function or proposals.

"3. That the operation of State and local governments be strengthened, decreasing the reliance on so-called grant-in-aid programs, and that the demands to match Federal funds be decreased, thus restoring the balance of power among the levels of government.

"4. That equity be the guiding principle in levying of taxes of all levels of government.

"5. That the emphasis on productive jobs is a critical challenge of the 1960's and all phases of government should be directed accordingly.

"The Associated Taxpayers of Idaho vigilantly demand that mounting military budgets, caused by the critical international situation, be closely scrutinized and that any increases that may be deemed necessary be offset by an equitable control of domestic civilian spending.

"The Associated Taxpayers of Idaho strongly disagrees with the expressed theory that public spending should be enlarged in relation to private spending. Our American system of free enterprise has flourished under the concept of private ownership of property, individual initiative, and limited government. Further encroachment by government at all levels can only lead to curtailment and destruction of personal liberties, individual incentive, and our productive capitalistic system."

REPORT ON SHIPMENTS OF STRATEGIC GOODS TO THE COMMUNIST BLOC

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, during the congressional recess the Internal Security Subcommittee had under study the operations and effectiveness of U.S. export controls on shipments of strategic goods to the Sino-Soviet bloc. For this purpose partly in conjunction with Senator DODD and staff members, I spent considerable time discussing with U.S. Embassy officials and some representatives of other countries the problems confronting us in carrying out existing arrangements and programs. Information obtained as a result of these conversations raises serious questions with regard to whether our present control programs are working effectively.

In my view, in the present state of world affairs, it would be inexcusably shortsighted for the United States or any free-world country to cooperate in building up the military or economic strength of the Communist bloc. In the light of the continued and, at times, increasing belligerence of the Soviets and their Chinese cohorts, it is obvious that every increase in Communist strength increases the threat to our own security. I just cannot fathom the apparent willingness of some members of the free-world community to contribute valuable equipment and know-how to the Reds which may be used against all of us.

In Berlin, the United States, French, and British soldiers are functioning under wartime alert conditions just a few yards from a powerfully armed potential enemy. We have separated families, interrupted schooling, and imposed other severe hardships on tens of thousands of American reservists to bolster our Berlin garrison and our general combat readiness. We have given repeated assurances of our readiness to fight, if necessary, to preserve Berlin's freedom. In Asia, the fighting began many years ago and smolders even at this moment in Laos and Vietnam, where we today have casualty lists.

In the face of this military crisis, some of our allies persist in sending planes, electronic equipment and other strategic items to those who have vowed to bury us. In a shocking display of a double standard, nations seemingly ready to ask the ultimate sacrifice from their young men are unwilling to interfere with profitable trade opportunities with the adversary. I believe there would be an overwhelming outcry of indignation if all the people were fully aware of the facts. No one can possibly justify a business-as-usual attitude at a time of such grave danger.

No one should underrate the military or economic capabilities of the Sino-Soviet bloc. No one can deny their ability, without any help from the West, to develop and maintain a tremendous military machine and an increasingly productive economy. There is danger, however, in overrating, as well as in underrating, the potential foe. Despite the spectacular Soviet scientific achievements in the past decade, every expert I have consulted agrees that the Communists crave our technology and products and can offer very little of value to the West in exchange. Western trade with the bloc is not a balanced proposition in which the West gets as much as it gives. More typically, it is a question of exchanging machine tools for feathers and electronic equipment for furs. It is incredible that despite the economic advantages of the West, the Reds have been able to set conditions in trade which give them every possible benefit in the exchange.

The Reds are strong, but their efforts surreptitiously, as well as openly, to obtain a host of special items from the United States and our allies give every evidence that even they believe that we are stronger. In any event, when your opponent is strong to begin with, it is suicidal to help make him stronger if you can avoid it.

Whatever shortcomings there may be in U.S. programs, it must be acknowledged that the United States has done more than any of our allies in attempting to curb the flow of strategic materials to the Communist bloc. Responsibility for the present situation does not lie primarily in U.S. policies, but in the failure of our allies to cooperate fully. For this reason I am dismayed by reports that a preinaugural Presidential task force under now Under Secretary of State Ball has recommended a virtual scrapping of the existing embargo on exports of strategic materials to nations of the bloc. I cannot believe that either the President or the Congress will accept this recommendation. If anything is to be scrapped, I hope it will be this task force report and not continued American efforts to prevent the Communists from building up their war potential and industrial power with our help.

In my opinion, the free world has missed an opportunity to utilize trade as a powerful weapon on our side of the struggle. Our trade advantage should be employed to the maximum extent possible to win concessions from the bloc and to further Western objectives. Certainly nations willing to fight should be willing also to take the initiative in promoting an economic counteroffensive against the Communists. If this involves some sacrifice of profits or other temporary benefits, it is a price we have to pay to help assure the ultimate victory of freedom over communism. Furthermore, it is not too much to expect such sacrifices when we are asking thousands of young men and women to be ready to sacrifice their very lives to preserve the outposts of freedom throughout the world.

This is no time to talk about scrapping export controls on shipments to the bloc. On the contrary, we should be considering ways of making these controls more effective. Getting the closer cooperation of our allies must be our No. 1 objective in this regard.

During our trip, we conferred with officials in the United Kingdom, France, West Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Austria, Italy, Switzerland, and Israel. The situation varies in each of these countries, but I would like to highlight briefly some of the conditions we found:

CURRENT BLOC PROCUREMENT FROM THE WEST

About 25 percent of the commerce of the Communist-bloc nations is with countries outside the bloc. All of this trade is carefully planned and regulated by state agencies within the bloc. In the U.S.S.R. all foreign commerce is under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Foreign Trade, who is also a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. Bloc trade generally is coordinated by the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, which meets in Moscow weekly. Foreign trade is skillfully planned by the bloc countries to enable them to reap the greatest possible advantage out of every transaction. Such trade is related closely to Soviet political and military objectives, and ordinary commercial considerations sometimes are completely ignored.

The long-range objective of the Communists naturally is to develop economic self-sufficiency in order to avoid any dependence on the West. Nevertheless, they are ready to utilize as much advanced Western technology and supplies as we are willing to exchange for surplus bloc goods. Almost 80 percent of all Sino-Soviet-bloc trade with nonbloc nations is with the industrial countries of the West, the principal bloc imports being manufactured goods and machinery and equipment. The principal bloc exports to the West, in contrast, are raw materials, food, beverages, tobacco, fats, and oils.

In recent months bloc countries have procured from the West such items as a 525,000-volt transformer, electronic equipment for four reversible cold rolling mills, computers, 50,000-foot altimeters, two mass spectrometers for use in nuclear and electronic research, instrumentation and control equipment for an oil refinery, electrical machinery for jet aircraft, high voltage testing equipment, a $12.6 million hydropower station for a plant on the Soviet-Norwegian border, a sheet metal press, complete equipment for a plant in Rumania to produce 100 trucks per month, equipment for an automated plant for manufacture of dielectric cardboard—used in insulating wires and cables—an aluminum rolling mill, a plant to produce railway wheels and allied products, complete equipment for a cellulose plant, precision machine tools, a semichemical pulp plant, a plant producing hydrogen cyanide, a sodium hydroxide plant, 50,000 tons of synthetic rubber, a complete asphalt plant, a complete nylon plant, a highly automated polystyrene plant, a polyethylene plant worth over $30 million, a nylon tire cord plant, 3 large urea plants, optical lens grinders, papermaking machinery, a 5,500-ton lifting capacity floating dock, a complete cement plant with a daily output of 1,800 tons, almost 35 vessels including more than 15 tankers, diesel engines, earthmoving machinery, over 150 excavators, hundreds of tractors, almost a thousand railroad cars, copper rods, steel plates, 240,000 tons of steel pipeline, natural gas pipeline, precision tubing, ball bearings, and 500 tons of lacquered tinplate.

All of these transactions and dozens of others occurred within a period of 18 months, and similar procurement continues to this very moment at a rate of over a billion dollars a year. There is no doubt of the importance of such items in building up sectors of the Sino-Soviet economy. Their contribution to the welfare of the bloc has been conceded even by Khrushchev. Unquestionably, over a period of years the NATO countries have made a substantial contribution to Communist growth and power by being major suppliers of advanced technology and machinery to the Sino-Soviet bloc.

There are no signs of a change in this situation. In recent weeks, for example, the United Kingdom has concluded an agreement for the sale of six Vicker's Viscount planes to Red China. These planes can easily be used to transport Communist troops to Vietnam, Laos, Korea, and other hot spots. Moreover, the planes are equipped with radar and navigational equipment, which is on the COCOM strategic list for embargo to the Sino-Soviet bloc. COCOM—the Coordinating Committee for International Controls—is an international agency, in which we participate with our allies, which coordinates and enforces unanimously agreed upon controls on shipments to Communist countries.

I have urged the Department of State to take whatever steps are possible to prevent these Viscounts from ever being delivered to Communist China, and the Department has made strong objections to the British. The United Kingdom, however, appears not only to be determined to fulfill this order, but to fill additional Red orders for similar products. This attitude on the part of our principal NATO ally undermines the whole strategic control system and is bound to encourage similar deals by other countries.

If this international control system of trade with the Sino-Soviet bloc collapses, the Reds will have scored a major victory. A unilateral U.S. embargo can have only a limited impact, and it is simply inequitable to impose the whole burden on American industry and workers. There is a situation in my own State now in which an American-based subsidiary of an international company has been denied an export license for the shipment of papermaking machinery to the U.S.S.R., even though the same equipment can be made and shipped by other foreign companies with impunity. The American concern, moreover, is located in an area of substantial unemployment, which makes the burden even more severe. I can well understand the feeling on the part of the company and its employees that the denial of an export license under such circumstances makes them pay a heavy price with little return to U.S. interests.

A unilateral control system also raises tremendous enforcement problems, even with regard to products on which the United States may have a substantial monopoly. Once the goods leave the United States, it is practically impossible for us to control their use or transshipment without cooperation from other countries. There have been thousands of cases of diversion since our control machinery was set up in 1948, and while the critical areas may change, this trend continues unabated to this day. Some countries, including our closest allies, actually resent any effort to enforce our unilateral controls against transshipment of U.S.-origin goods as interference in their internal affairs, and with some exceptions none will give us any formal cooperation.

These difficulties are no justification for authorizing the sale to the Sino-Soviet bloc of any U.S. goods which our experts rate strategically important. Our objective instead must be to induce our allies to accept similar controls and narrow the differences between the United States' positive list and the international list administered by COCOM. This could perhaps best be done by assigning the control function to NATO while continuing to enlist the participation of non-NATO countries, such as Japan, which is a member of COCOM. Such a move would serve to emphasize the close relationship between the economic and military aspects of the cold war and perhaps would encourage greater exploitation of our economic advantages in achieving our objectives.

TRADE TACTICS IN GERMANY

West Germany offers a concrete example of the ability of the West to employ economic measures to advantage. In 1960, Soviet East German agents began interfering with access to Berlin of West German civilians, contrary to Four Power agreements on Berlin. As a result, the West Berlin administrator of the Interzonal Trade Agreement, which regulates trade between West Berlin and East Germany, gave notice that the agreement would be terminated by December 31, 1960. This was equivalent to saying that there would be an embargo on trade with East Germany unless the harassment of civilian traffic to West Berlin from the Federal Republic ceased.

The result of this announcement was prompt and dramatic. The harassment did cease, and there apparently have been no instances of interference by the Soviets and their East German agents with such travel to West Berlin since that date. It is obvious that the Soviets were more deeply concerned about the repercussions on East Germany of a halt in goods from the West than they were in continuing to interfere with access to West Berlin from the Federal Republic. This experience illustrates better than any theoretical arguments or statistical tables the importance of Western goods to the bloc and the possibilities of exploiting our trade advantage to protect and advance free world rights.

This experience also raises a question as to why similar measures were not taken when the Soviets erected their prison wall around East Berlin. This hideous structure—a monument to the weakness and barbarism of the Communists—was a much more drastic infringement of Four Power agreements on access to West Berlin than were the provocations in 1960. An economic squeeze in 1961 similar to that employed with such effectiveness in 1960 might have had tremendous impact. Doubt is sometimes expressed as to whether the Soviets are convinced of our determination to fight for Berlin if necessary despite the solemn pledges which have been made. Maybe the Soviets are skeptical about the willingness of the West to risk a military showdown when it still appears to be unwilling to risk a much less perilous economic showdown. Of course, we are ready to fight for Western rights in Berlin, but how can we possibly justify sending troops to battle before we have exploited to the full the possiblities of achieving our goals by an economic squeeze on the bloc?

It is my strong conviction that a Western economic initiative would improve prospects for a favorable settlement of differences with the Soviets. We should have learned by now from a dozen examples that firmness is the most constructive attitude in dealing with the Communists. The Communists are most certainly waging economic warfare against the West. An economic counteroffensive against them could pay richly in the allied effort to advance peace with freedom not only in Berlin but throughout the world.

CONTROLS ON CUBA

Cuba, on which the United States has imposed a total embargo, is not treated as a Communist bloc country by COCOM. This means that our allies are free to fill any gaps in Cuban imports which may result from the unilateral U.S. embargo.

There is no longer any doubt of Cuba's complete fidelity to communism, and its formal recognition as a bloc country by COCOM should certainly be pressed by the United States. Information gathered during my trip suggests that no such effort has yet been made by the Department of State. It is difficult to understand the Department's reluctance to enlist the cooperation of the COCOM countries in our efforts to cut off strategic trade with this Communist satellite now that its status is recognized by everyone and its adherence to communism has been conceded by Castro himself.

It is not enough to ask our allies to prevent evasion of the U.S. embargo. They should be expected to join forces with us against trade in strategic goods with this puppet state just as we have all joined together in barring such trade to other bloc countries. The fact that Cuba is so close to the shores of the United States is no reason for it to be omitted from the international control system the allies have imposed upon every other satellite state.

Furthermore, we cannot rely on our allies to enforce unilateral U.S. policies with regard to Cuba any more than they enforce unilateral U.S. controls in other areas of the world such as Red China. As I have noted, we get less than full cooperation under such circumstances, since the other countries take the position that they are under no obligation to enforce U.S. laws within their territory. Adding Cuba to the COCOM list, on the other hand, would commit each COCOM country to a policy of at least avoiding shipments and transshipments of strategic goods to this Red outpost in the Western Hemisphere.

MOBILIZING PUBLIC OPINION

These observations certainly raise serious questions about the willingness of our allies to carry out necessary measures to effectively regulate trade with the bloc. There should be no misunderstanding, however, about the extent of free world solidarity in the struggle against tyranny. The nations of the free world are united in their fundamental objectives, and I would not want anything I have said to suggest that the Western alliance is weak or divided.

I have been discussing only one aspect of the broad and multifaceted free world alliance. I am convinced that on this question of trade with the bloc we have not achieved the cooperation of our allies which the situation justifies. This is not because those with whom we have joined together to defend freedom are soft on communism or will be unwilling to stand with us when our determination is put to the test.

It is not a difference in objectives that is at the root of the problem. The difficulties arise out of less lofty considerations. To put the matter directly, most of these difficulties arise out of the unwillingness of the governments involved to deny to private economic interests profitable opportunities for trade with the bloc. They appear to be unusually vulnerable to potent domestic pressure and most fearful of the domestic political repercussions of any effort to join in a more effective economic squeeze against the Communist bloc.

Personally, I find it hard to believe that any people who cherish freedom would accept the present conditions if they were fully aware of the implications. Even Switzerland, which avoided the ravages of both World Wars and scrupulously maintains its neutrality to this day, is the scene of a genuine citizens' movement to curb trade with the East. In recent months signs have appeared in store windows throughout Switzerland reading "No More Trade With the East. In this store no commodities are sold which were manufactured behind the Iron Curtain." In one town in Switzerland, Thun, the signs were decorated with drawings by teenagers after hearing the nature of communism explained to them in the schools. According to reports which have appeared in the Swiss press, this boycott, though only recently started, has shown remarkable success.

The United States must do its best to convince not only allied officials, but the people of the free world of the dangers inherent in present bloc trade policies and the advantages to the West of employing trade as a cold war weapon. Instead, the United States has allowed these problems to become shrouded in secrecy and most people simply are unaware of the functions of organizations like COCOM and the dangers to its effectiveness posed by such transactions as the United Kingdom's sale of Viscounts to the Red Chinese. Some of these issues involve military and other security matters and must, of course, be classified. But we have cooperated in imposing a veil of secrecy on many transactions not for security reasons but simply to avoid embarrassment to nations willing to make questionable deals with the Reds.

This attitude effectively prevents any mobilization of public opinion against such transactions. Perhaps if U.S. diplomats showed less concern for the sensitivities of our allies, our allies would show more concern for our own sensitivities, and in the process, all of us would be more apt to pursue the course dictated by principle rather than expediency. I may be overly optimistic about the reaction of the free world community to a full and frank disclosure of the facts, but the countries of the world, committed to free institutions, really have no choice. Free people have to be told the truth. There is no other way of preparing them for the sacrifices which they may be called upon to make to perserve their freedom.

ALASKA'S POWER NEEDS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, Alaska, which has had the benefit of only one Federal hydro power project which was authorized some 15 years ago and supplies the metropolis of Anchorage with electric current as well as the two neighboring REA cooperatives, the Chugach and the Matanuska, will soon be running short of power. The problems and needs of west-central Alaska, which is also the so-called railbelt area, have been the subject of a series of articles published in the Fairbanks News-Miner. I have presented the first four of these articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that the fifth article be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINE-MOUTH POWER STUDY AUTHORIZED BY USIBELLI

(By Paul Lien)

Working toward a common goal to relieve the power shortage in Alaska, towns along the railbelt have gone together to form a power pool for the purpose of studying this problem and to find a solution.

Hydroelectric plants have been suggested at both Rampart and Devil Canyon, but they are long range projects, and will take many years to build.

In an effort to get quicker interim power, badly needed, focus was brought to bear on using mine-mouth steamplants, which could possibly provide a reasonable interim source of power.

Usibelli Mining Co., Inc. of Fairbanks, authorized Parsons-Stefano, a joint venture, to make a study for the purpose of constructing a mine-mouth powerplant at Usibelli coal mines on Healy Creek between the towns of Healy and Suntrana in the Alaska railbelt area.

Two sizes of units were presented; namely, 22,000-kilowatt and 33,000-kilowatt plants.

Unit costs of energy of the 22,000-kilowatt plant were expected to be 11.07 mills per kilowatt-hour bus bar (bus bar is a conductor carrying electric current) and would be delivered to Fairbanks for 13.07 mills per kilowatt-hour.

The unit costs of energy of the 33,000-kilowatt plant are expected to be 10.39 mills per kilowatt-hour and 12.39 mills per kilowatt-hour delivered to Fairbanks.

The Parsons-Stefano report further stated that projected kilowatt requirements from recent studies by the Federal Power Commission and other agencies for the Greater Fairbanks area indicated the growth rate will require an additional 40,000 to 50,000 kilowatts to be delivered by 1970.

PROJECTED INCREASE

This was conservatively based on a projected 10 percent per year rate of increase in power consumption. Historical energy sales for the previous 8-year period were said to substantiate this.

No consideration was given in the report to the projected increased requirements need in the areas presently supplied by Golden Valley Electric Association outside the greater Fairbanks area. It was conceived that this demand could be even more.

Accelerated load growth rapidly developing in the Greater Fairbanks area, combined with the extension of power to the adjacent areas shows that a shortage will develop unless increased supply is provided, according to the Parsons-Stefano study. They said the problem was further aggravated by the fact that much of the present generating equipment has an increasingly high operating and maintenance cost and is rapidly approaching complete obsolescence and retirement.

LOW COST

In conclusion the Parsons-Stefano report stated the mine plant at Healy was feasible as a low cost source of power for supplying the Fairbanks area. It further concluded that it would be competitive with any known source of power likely to be proposed as an interim supply, pending developments such as the Rampart Dam project, or similar large hydroelectric projects producing very low cost power.

It was recommended that a further study be made so financing can be secured and action taken without delay.

Estimated cost of the 22,000-kilowatt plant was estimated to be $5,600,000, and the 33,000-kilowatt unit $7,400,000.

Ten years was given to amortize the loan.

If a 20-year amortization period was set up and Rural Electric Administration funds used costs to the consumer would be lower.

Power from the 22,000-kilowatt plant would be delivered in Fairbanks for 10.34 mills per kilowatt-hour, and from the 33,000-kilowatt plant for 10 mills per kilowatt-hour.

FARMERS—REAL HEROES IN FIGHTING INFLATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that in a few days the President of the United States will send to Congress his farm message, asking for a substantially changed farm program. The position of the farm worker with respect to the rest of the economy and society has been badly misunderstood by much of the public and badly distorted by the Nation's press.

I bring these points up because yesterday the New York Times revealed that the price index, the cost of living, had increased one-half of 1 percent during 1961.

This was the smallest increase in the price level since 1955. Prices were as nearly stable as they have been at any time during the past 6 years.

Any analysis of what happened to prices over the past year discloses, in my judgment, that the real hero of price stability is the farmer. The fact is that last year every major component of the cost-of-living index other than food increased—most of them substantially. For example, medical care increased by almost 3 percent. Reading and recreation increased 2½ percent. Apparel, transportation, housing—all of these elements in the cost of living—increased. But the cost of food declined. It declined almost 1 percent—0.8 percent. The reason for the drop in the cost of food is, of course, that the farmer is doing a more efficient and productive job than he has done before. The farmer has consistently, over the last 15 years, improved his efficiency and productivity more rapidly than has any other element of American society. This lower cost of production of food last year was the prime element in maintaining stable prices.

The fact is that we American consumers are better fed at a lower real cost than ever before. We talk about the fact that prices for food have over the past 30 years increased. All prices have increased in this generation. But when we recognize how much wages have increased, we can see, I think, how the farmer and his efficiency have benefited the economy.

One hour's factory work buys 83 percent more round steak, 120 percent more milk, 138 percent more oranges, or 169 percent more bacon than in 1929.

In the past 30 years we have had this real increase in the living standards of Americans because of the great strides in productivity and efficiency by American farmers. Yet it is an unfortunate fact that the incomes and living standards of farmers have not kept pace with other sectors of our prosperous economy.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I commend the able senator from Wisconsin for making his statement today. The farmer is always the butt of criticism. I noticed the other day that a particular stockpile which we seldom if ever hear criticized, namely, the stockpile of metals, minerals, and materials, is worth many billions of dollars more than the stockpile of agricultural products. These stockpiles, in both cases, are owned by the taxpayer.

Would not the able Senator from Wisconsin agree as he pursues ably his policy of defending the farmers of this country on the floor of the Senate, that there will probably be more need, in case of hostilities for agricultural surpluses than there will be for any surplus of metals and minerals?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Missouri. I think that of all the Members of the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Missouri is certainly one of the very best qualified to speak on this subject. He is a recognized expert on national defense and is also an expert on agricultural problems.

There is no question that the American people simply cannot live without food. In the event of a nuclear disaster, one of the real problems of our society will be the question whether we will starve to death or carry on. It will be necessary for our people to have food in order to live. The fact that we have some surpluses of wheat and feed grains and dairy products will be an important element of strength in our national defense, as the Senator from Missouri points out. Perhaps it will be more important than any strategic mineral element.

I am extremely interested to learn that the surplus in minerals is even higher than it is in food.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It is billions of dollars higher, and that does not include the additional very heavy stockpile cost of machine tools.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for another question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In most countries of the world, 90 percent of the people are engaged in the production of food; yet there is a shortage of food. In our country, only 11 percent of our population is engaged in the production of food, but we have a surplus in agricultural products.

We want to win friends around the world. Should not the surplus our farmers have built up be considered an asset, and a method of obtaining good will for which we are paying a great deal of dollars at this time?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It should, indeed. It is my understanding that much of the foreign aid or foreign assistance program has been administered through the use of our surplus food. As a matter of fact, the farmer has been in a real sense a very vital, perhaps the greatest, contributor to our foreign aid program. Few people realize that that is so. Much of the cost of the foreign aid program is charged against the farm program. The farmer is criticized at home as a burden upon the taxpayer although what he has been able to provide in such abundance has been immensely useful for people overseas—people who are so hungry they lack the vitality necessary to do the work to make their economy grow and develop.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield further?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is it not true, first, that the balance of payments problem is a serious one from the standpoint of the management of our present fiscal policies in this country; that one of the reasons for this is the great amount of assistance we give in dollars, not only to the countries themselves, but also in the cost of the large amount of military personnel we maintain abroad, along with their dependents. Therefore, would it not be true that if partially instead of dollars, we used this great agricultural surplus, that in itself would materially assist in the solution of the balance of payments problem we are facing today?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Missouri is absolutely correct. I think the administration is doing the best it can. The record I have seen is that the administration has vastly improved and extended the Public Law 480 program and other oversea food distribution programs, recognizing, of course, that it is necessary to proceed with some care, so as not to disrupt the markets and destroy the possibility of agricultural advantages in other countries.

This is a very constructive suggestion. I feel the farmer has contributed greatly toward the trade and balance-of-payments programs.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. Not only is he an expert in the field of agriculture and food, as I have observed from serving with him on the Agriculture and Forestry Committee, but he has also had great experience in the fiscal and financial field.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. President, measured by the industrial worktime to earn it, food costs far less than in other countries. Studies made in 1958 in major cities of the United States and in Western European countries prove our great advantage.

The real test is, How long does a man or a woman have to work to earn enough to buy food? That is the real indication of how the farmer serves the consumer.

To buy a loaf of bread took two to four times as much work in those European countries as it did in the United States. It took 5 minutes of work to buy a loaf of bread in the United States; it took 20 minutes in Austria; nearly 12 minutes in France; 13 minutes in West Germany, and 16 minutes in Italy.

How about the Communists in Russia? In Moscow, in 1959, it took four times as much work as it did in New York City to buy a pound of beef rib roast or a quart of milk; eight times as much work to buy a dozen eggs; nine times as much work to buy a pound of butter.

Mr. President, it seems to me that these are the facts and figures which should be brought to the attention of the American people as the farm program comes before Congress. I understand the President will send to Congress a vast farm program designed to reduce the overall cost of farm price supports. I enthusiastically support that objective. That must be done because the cost of the farm program has been too big; there is no question about it. However, at the same time, we must recognize that farm income is much too low—far lower than it should be in view of the risk to the farmer, the investment he must make, the number of hours he has to work, the enormous increase in his efficiency; and, in the second place, I think we should recognize the very substantial and real contribution which the American farmer has made to price stability and to combating inflation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table I have had prepared by the Department of Agriculture, showing the amount of working time required by city workers and farmers to buy certain commodities.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Department of Agriculture figures on comparison of working time required by city worker and farmer to buy certain commodities

Commodity	City worker	Farmer
1 quart of milk	6.7 minutes	16.7 minutes.
1 pound of round steak	27.3 minutes	66.7 minutes.
1 pound of bread	5.4 minutes	13.3 minutes.
$50 suit	21.6 hours	52.8 hours.
$150 washing machine	64.7 hours	158.4 hours.
A year's supply of farm food.	457 hours	1, 120 hours.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the farmer has to work three times as long to buy the food itself which he produces. Most farmers are not diversified, whether they are wheat farmers or chicken farmers or dairy farmers—regardless of their farm production. It is a rare farmer who produces most of the food, or even a major part of the food, which he consumes.

When we compare how long a farmer has to work with the working hours of a nonfarmer, we find that a farmer has to work about three times as long to buy the food he consumes as a nonfarmer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the New York Times describing the performance of the consumer price index be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRICE INDEX UP 0.5 PERCENT IN 1961—RISE SMALLEST IN 6 YEARS

(By Peter Braestrup)

WASHINGTON, January 26.—The Consumer Price Index last year showed its smallest annual increase since 1955, the Labor Department reported today. The increase was one half of 1 percent over 1960.

At the same time, the average factory workers' purchasing power reached a record; with last month's figure being 7 percent higher than that of December 1960.

Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg declared that "this significant and encouraging trend bids well for a continued and growing soundness of our national economy."

Other Democratic officials including President Kennedy, have lately shown similar pleasure in discussing the price stability during the first year of the Kennedy administration.

The Consumer Price Index measures changes in the prices of hundreds of types of goods and services on which persons in cities typically spend their money.

Using the 1947–49 price average as a base of 100, the December index registered 128.3. This was a decline of one-tenth of 1 percent below the November level and two-tenths percent under the record set in October high. Most of last year's increase in the index occurred in July. The overall rise was attributed largely to continued increases in the cost of services—including medical care, and recreation—and higher prices for used cars and other durables.

These increases outweighed a lesser decline for nondurables, mainly food and gasoline to produce the overall December-to-December rise in the index of 0.5 percent. The increase was equivalent to a nickel out of $10.

In 1955, the index fell slightly from 1956. Each year since then it has risen by at least 1 percent and as much as 4 percent. In 1961, Department of Labor spokesmen said, moderate wage increases, adequate supplies to meet demand, and price competition from imports in some industries helped limit the index's rise.

MORE STABILITY EXPECTED

Robert J. Myers, deputy commissioner of labor statistics, said that the price index for this month and February might rise slightly but the year's outlook was for continued price stability.

The relative stability of the composite index in the last 12 months reflected, as always, a mixture of ups and downs in various spending categories.

Food showed a rise of eight-tenths of a cent, while restaurant meals went up 2.4 percent. Rents showed a 1.1 percent rise, while housefurnishings showed a six-tenths percent decline. Medical care went up 2.9 percent, and used cars went up 13.7 percent.

In December alone, used car prices dropped nearly 3 percent, and gasoline and new car prices also dropped. This decline in transportation costs led the slight overall December decline in the index. Seasonal increases in fresh vegetable costs and higher prices for some meats offset other declines to produce a net 0.1 increase in retail food prices.

SPENDING MONEY AT RECORD

In December, factory workers continued to receive record weekly spendable earnings—after deductions for Federal taxes—of $85.17, about the same as in November. This figure was higher by about $5.80 than in December 1960, when the workweek was 1.8 hours shorter, because of the recession, and hourly earnings were 8 cents lower.

Because of the near-stability of prices, factory workers' buying power in December was up about 7 percent from December 1960.

For the year as a whole, spendable earnings averaged $82.18 a week for factory workers with three dependents and $74.60 for a worker without dependents. These figures were about $2 or almost 3 percent higher than in 1960.

About 260,000 workers will get cost-of-living pay increases based on the December index figures. These include about 230,000 long-distance and local truck drivers, and about 30,000 aircraft workers, mostly employed by Douglas Aircraft Co.

CITY'S INDEX UP 0.1 PERCENT

Higher retail prices for food, housing, and personal care more than offset December declines for apparel, transportation, reading, and recreation and other goods and services in New York City.

Louis F. Buckley, regional director of the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics, reported that the city's all-item price index was 126.9, one-tenth of a percent above the November level.

The December index was a return to the high established last October. Housing at 133 was a new high. During 1961, all groups except personal care and other goods and services were above 1960 levels.

Consumer Price Index—U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics

[1947–49=100]

UNITED STATES

	Index for December 1961	Percentage change from—		Point change from November 1961
		November 1961	December 1960	
All items	128.2	−0.1	+0.5	−0.1
Food [1]	120.4	+.1	−.8	+.1
Housing [2]	133.1	+.2	+.6	+.2
Apparel	111.0	−.2	+.4	−.2
Transportation	149.3	−.8	+1.9	−1.2
Medical care	162.6	+.1	+2.9	+.2
Personal care	134.8	+.4	+.8	+.5
Reading and recreation	125.3	+.1	+2.5	+.1
Other goods, services	133.7	−0	+.8	−.1
NEW YORK CITY				
All items	126.9	+0.1	+0.5	+0.1
Food [1]	122.3	+.2	−.4	+.2
Housing [2]	133.0	+.3	+1.3	+.4
Apparel	110.6	−.5	+0.6	−.6
Transportation	148.1	−.7	+0.3	−1.1
Medical care	150.9	0	+2.0	0
Personal care	124.9	+1.2	+1.1	+1.5
Reading and recreation	128.5	−.5	+1.1	−.7
Other goods, services	131.9	−.1	−1.2	−.1

[1] Includes restaurant meals not shown separately.

[2] Includes home purchases and other homeowner costs not shown separately.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION ALLOWS 50-PERCENT EXEMPTION TO SBIC $500,000 LOAN LIMITATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like again to review briefly the $500,000-size limit on loans and investments by small business investment companies, which was enacted during the past session, and was signed into law by the President on October 3, 1961. I discussed this subject in the Senate on January 18, at which time I inserted in the RECORD the full correspondence I had had with John Horne, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, concerning its implementation and interpretation of this restriction.

It is my view that the proposed regulation published by the SBA in the Federal Register of November 15 did not carry out the plain intent of Congress. That regulation contained a blanket 50-percent exemption for SBIC loans and investments over $500,000.

But what the law now provides—and I was the author of the amendment which changed the law—is that—

> Without the approval of the administration, the aggregate amount of obligations and securities acquired and for which commitments may be issued by any small business investment company under the provisions of this chapter for any single enterprise shall not exceed (1) 20 percent of the combined capital and surplus of such small business investment company authorized by this act, or (2) $500,000, whichever is the lesser.

The plain language of the last phrase, which was added by the amendment; namely, that the small business investment companies cannot invest or loan more than $500,000—it seems to me makes perfectly clear the congressional intent—in other words, that they shall not loan more than $500,000.

The preceding part of the paragraph, which states, "without the prior written approval of the SBA," has been in the law since the inception of the SBIC program, and modifies the opportunity for such a firm to loan more than 20 percent of its capital and surplus. There have been very few instances in which the Small Business Administration has permitted that to be done, although I am certain that a number of small business investment companies would like very much to have an opportunity to invest more than 20 percent of their capital and surplus in a single situation. But the Small Business Administration has given no significant relief from this restriction.

But when it comes to the $500,000 limitation, which, of course, has its effect on the big small business investment companies, and was designed clearly to prevent small business investment companies from making loans to larger businesses, then the Small Business Administration takes the position that 50 percent can be exempt from the congressional provision. Mr. President, that is simply unconscionable. It is very, very difficult for me to understand what goes on in the mind of the Administrator of the SBA when he permits so clear an evasion of the congressional provision.

Mr. President, in my statement of January 18, I cited a number of cases in which such big loans of more than $500,000 had gone to businesses which were anything but small businesses. The rich capital opportunities and tax advantages available to SBIC's should be used to assist genuinely small businesses, not the multimillion-dollar, multiunit operations that SBIC's tend to put their above $500,000 investments into.

The Administrator of the SBA, Mr. John Horne, has now written to me again, to state that he intends to give final effect to the regulation as proposed on November 15—including the 50-percent exemption. I ask unanimous consent that his letter of January 24, 1962, with the text of the regulation, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr BURDICK in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter and the regulation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington D.C., January 24, 1962.

The Honorable WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: At your request, we have again reviewed in detail the regulations proposed in the Federal Register under date of November 15, 1961, with reference to the $500,000 limitation contained in Section 7(a) of the Small Business Investment Act Amendments of 1961.

Following your initial correspondence, you will recall that Mr. Fine, Deputy Administrator for the Investment Division, and I communicated with your office and after some delays occasioned by your absence from this city, we were extended the courtesy of a visit with you on December 18, 1961. At that time we discussed in detail not only the proposed regulation, but also the historic background of the need for small business long-term financing and the legislative history of the 1961 amendments to the Small Business Investment Act.

Following this conference, we communicated with you on January 5, 1962, and again on January 17 with reference to specific inquiries you made of the Small Business Administration regarding this legislation.

In addition to the correspondence from you, we have received communications from other members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives suggesting views differing from yours with reference to the adoption of the regulation entitled 107.708(a). Thus it is impossible to issue a regulation on this matter which would be satisfactory to all members of the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees and of the Congress. Naturally, I am concerned that there is disagreement between you and me on the matter, but I hope you will understand my position.

As can well be imagined, pending the adoption of a regulation on section 304, the industry has been in a state of uncertainty. They feel, as do I, that we must regulate on this subject as soon as possible so that they may have knowledge as to the rules under which they must operate.

I shall not review again the contents of my letter of December 2, 1961, to you explaining our position on the proposed regulation. Having throughly and thoughtfully considered all of the facets of the problem, it is my considered judgment that we should adopt the regulation as proposed on November 15, 1961.

I am this date forwarding to the Federal Register for publication the proposed regulation in the form enclosed.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

JOHN E. HORNE,
Administrator.

TITLE 13. BUSINESS CREDIT AND ASSISTANCE

CHAPTER I. SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Part 107. Small business investment companies

[Amendment 2]

Miscellaneous amendment

There was published in the Federal Register on November 15, 1961 (26 F.R. 10702), a notice of intention to amend, among others, § 107.708 of part 107 of subchapter B, chapter I of title 13 of the Code of Federal Regulations as revised in 26 F.R. 8232–8242.

Interested persons were given an opportunity to present their comments or suggestions pertaining thereto to the Investment Division, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., within a period of 21 days of the date of publication of the notice in the Federal Register. After consideration of all such relevant matter as was presented by the interested persons regarding the proposed amendment, the amendment of regulation as so proposed is hereby adopted as set forth below.

Because of the necessity for promptly applying the proposed amendment to the program authorized under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, as amended, the subject amendment of regulation shall become effective upon publication thereof in the Federal Register.

The Regulations Governing Small Business Investment Companies (26 F.R. 8232–8242) is hereby amended by:

1. Deleting the heading of § 107.708 and substituting in lieu thereof "Aggregate limitation on investments and loans"; as amended, the heading reads as follows:

"§ 107.708 Aggregate limitation on investments and loans

2. Adding a new paragraph (a) to § 107.708 and by lettering the present paragraph under § 107.708 as (b). As amended, § 107.708 reads as follows:

"§ 107.708 Aggregate limitation on investments and loans

"(a) Without the prior written approval of SBA, the aggregate amount of funds loaned to, or invested in equity securities of, any single small business concern, or for which commitments may be made, shall not exceed 20 percent of the combined paid-in capital and paid-in surplus of any licensee (including in such licensee's capital and surplus the outstanding amount of any SBA loans under section 302(a) of the act) or $500,000, whichever is the lesser. Such $500,000 limitation shall apply only with respect to loans made to and equity securities acquired from a small business concern by a licensee on or after October 3, 1961, but shall not apply with respect to any loans made, or equity securities acquired, pursuant to a commitment issued before such date. Furthermore, the $500,000 limitation shall not apply so long as 50 percent (amount invested, disbursed, or committed) of the equity securities acquired and loans made by a licensee after October 3, 1961, meet such $500,000 limitation.

"(b) Without the prior written approval of SBA, no more than five licensees may, by participation or otherwise, provide equity capital, or long-term loans to any single small business concern unless the total financing involved is $300,000 or less."

JOHN E. HORNE,
Administrator.

JANUARY 24, 1962.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS UPDATES SEASONAL ADJUSTMENTS OF EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in his testimony before the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics of the Joint Economic Committee—and I am chairman of the subcommittee—Mr. Ewan Clague, the Commissioner of Labor Statistics, provided information on seasonal adjustments of unemployment data. As part of his testimony he presented seasonally adjusted rates of unemployment and seasonal adjustment factors revised on the basis of data running through September 1961. He stated that it was the intention of the Bureau to use these figures throughout 1962.

In a letter which I received on January 27, 1962, Mr. Clague states that he intends to revise the figures on the basis of data running through December 1961, and to use these more up-to-date figures in 1962.

Since the hearings of the subcommittee have already gone to press, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Clague's letter and the accompanying table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, Joint Economic Committee, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: You will recall that on December 18, 1961, I testified before your Subcommittee on Economic Statistics of the Joint Economic Committee. As part of my testimony, I presented seasonally adjusted rates of unemployment and seasonal adjustment factors revised on the basis of data running through September 1961. At the time of my testimony it was our intention to use these figures throughout 1962.

Since then, we have established that it is feasible to revise the figures on the basis of data running through December 1961, and we propose to use these slightly more up-to-date figures in 1962. The changes from those I furnished you in December are small, but I thought you might like to have the new figures and a comparison with those presented before. These are shown in the enclosed tables.

Sincerely yours,

EWAN CLAGUE,
Commissioner of Labor Statistics.

TABLE 1.—*Estimates of seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment (percent of seasonally adjusted labor force)*

Year and month	Published rates using data through June [1]	Rates using data through September 1961 [2]	Rates using data through December 1961 [3]
1960—January	5.3	5.3	5.3
February	4.8	4.9	4.9
March	5.5	5.4	5.4
April	5.1	5.2	5.2
May	5.1	5.1	5.1
June	5.4	5.4	5.4
July	5.5	5.4	5.4
August	5.8	5.7	5.8
September	5.7	5.7	5.7
October	6.3	6.1	6.1
November	6.2	6.2	6.2
December	6.8	6.7	6.6
1961—January	6.6	6.7	6.7
February	6.8	6.9	6.9
March	6.9	6.8	6.8
April	6.8	6.9	6.9
May	6.9	7.0	7.0
June	6.8	6.8	6.9
July	6.9	6.9	6.9
August	6.9	6.8	6.8
September	6.8	6.8	6.9
October	6.8	6.7	6.7
November	6.1	6.1	6.1
December	6.1	6.0	6.0

[1] Figures currently published using seasonal factors based on data through June 1960. The seasonal factors involved were issued at beginning of 1961.

[2] Figures using revised seasonal factors based on data through September 1961. The seasonal factors involved were presented to the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics on Dec. 18, 1961.

[3] Figures using revised seasonal factors based on data through December 1961. The factors involved will be used throughout 1962 and will be published next month

TABLE 2.—*Seasonal adjustment factors for unemployment, by component group, based on data through June 1960, September 1961, and December 1961*

Month	Male, 14 to 19 years	Male, 20 years and over	Female, 14 to 19 years	Female, 20 years and over
	As published at the beginning of 1961 (based on original data through June 1960)			
January	96.5	124.6	73.8	110.6
February	95.2	131.9	75.2	108.6
March	91.0	124.6	76.2	103.0
April	85.0	108.1	88.3	99.3
May	93.0	94.7	110.0	99.4
June	172.6	92.8	203.0	100.3
July	141.7	90.9	149.3	102.4
August	99.4	84.9	99.4	99.7
September	76.9	79.3	86.0	96.0
October	75.8	77.0	73.5	93.8
November	82.9	90.3	92.8	97.9
December	89.8	101.1	72.7	88.5
	As presented to the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics (based on original data through September 1961)			
January	93.0	125.3	73.2	108.1
February	91.1	128.8	73.8	109.0
March	94.0	125.2	79.8	106.1
April	87.0	105.5	89.0	100.2
May	94.3	92.9	109.6	98.2
June	176.1	91.7	212.0	101.0
July	139.7	91.5	142.0	104.1
August	101.4	87.0	97.6	99.4
September	77.8	79.5	86.7	93.1
October	77.4	78.2	76.4	93.6
November	80.3	90.4	88.1	97.8
December	88.6	103.6	72.6	89.6
	As revised (based on original data through December 1961)			
January	92.9	125.8	74.1	107.9
February	90.9	129.4	74.3	108.8
March	93.9	125.5	80.1	106.0
April	88.1	105.1	86.1	99.2
May	92.8	92.9	105.9	97.3
June	178.3	90.6	210.8	102.9
July	139.6	91.5	142.2	104.2
August	101.3	87.1	98.4	99.4
September	77.7	79.5	87.7	93.1
October	77.5	78.3	77.5	93.5
November	80.3	90.6	89.1	97.8
December	88.5	103.8	73.7	89.5

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL'S RUSS LYNCH ANALYZES WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the distinguished out-of-doors and conservation writer of the Milwaukee Journal, Russell G. Lynch, recently tackled one of the biggest, most complex, and most important problems in the field of resource development: namely, water. In a series of three expertly written and very well researched articles, Mr. Lynch documented the dismaying mixture of politics, persuasion, and subsidy, and the serious absence of overall planning, that characterizes the pattern of water-resource management and development in our Nation.

Mr. Lynch is second to none in his understanding of this problem. He is the author of "Our Growing Water Problems," which he prepared in 1957-58. This undertaking gave him a significant acquaintance with the water problems, and the laws relating thereto, in every State. In preparation for these articles he traveled the length of the Mississippi, he attended a meeting of the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee, and he visited the headquarters of the Southeastern Basin Study Commission. He has examined the wealth of documentary materials and publications in this field, and has gone beyond and behind them, to interview many of the individuals most directly concerned. In brief Mr. Lynch knows whereof he writes.

His articles have been studied with keen interest in the agencies most directly concerned. Even where Russ Lynch's criticisms come to roost most directly, the experts and individuals involved respect his knowledge, integrity, and ability. It is my understanding that they consider him one of the best informed people in the country on water-management problems. I hope some direct contact between these Government personnel and Mr. Lynch can be arranged in the near future.

Because of the importance of this subject, I ask unanimous consent that the articles by Russell G. Lynch, from the Milwaukee Journal, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD,

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Dec. 26, 1961]

KENNEDY TACKLES TOUGH WATER MANAGEMENT PROBLEM—QUESTION OF RESOURCES POLICY HAS DEFIED EFFORTS OF PRESIDENT FOR DECADES; STATE HAS REAL INTEREST IN IT

(By R. G. Lynch)

President Kennedy, both in Congress and within the executive branch, is tackling resource problems that for four decades have defied the efforts of Presidents and the recommendations of a long succession of commissions and committees.

Wisconsin residents have a real interest in his proposals. Along with Federal taxpayers everywhere, they have provided cheap electricity, cheap water for irrigation, cheap water freight rates and higher property values in flood plains for relatively few favored countrymen.

With a prospect that their burden for water developments may triple, at the very least over the next 40 years, they have reason to demand more realistic appraisal of projects and to insist that freeloading be eliminated where possible.

NO WATER POLICY

The Nation actually has no water resources policy or any adequate coordination of its various programs. Decisions involving 20 billions of tax dollars too often have been dictated by pressure groups seeking something for nothing and pushed through Congress by means of logrolling.

Agencies responsible for the various programs have outlined potential activities for the next 40 years at estimated costs that appear to total about $70 billion not including extensive waste disposal works. And if the estimating is no more reliable than in the past, the actual cost could double this figure.

Water projects involve heavy subsidization, ranging from and estimated 40 percent for public power to 75 percent for irrigation and upward of 90 percent for navigation and flood control. Regional and local public power users share the subsidy for irrigation in 17 Western States, with a possibility that some of their share eventually may be shifted to the taxpayers.

SOME TREMENDOUS RESULTS

This Federal spending has produced real and sometimes tremendous results. Living standards have been raised in economically backward areas. Reclamation fostered the West's development. Public power boomed the Pacific Northwest and opened up the Tennessee Valley. Tragic, costly floods have been curtailed. Opportunities for recreation have increased.

But analysts, Congressmen, and even the agencies carrying on the programs are calling for changes. Reclamation has become very expensive and the obsession for irrigation is handicapping industrial and recreational development of much greater importance to some parts of the West.

Flood control has created more potential for damage by fostering flood plain developments.

It has been suggested by authoritative sources that railroad, truck and pipeline services might be more economic in some areas than navigation projects, and that public power could be provided more cheaply with steam plants than hydroelectric installations.

COMMUNITIES RELUCTANT

The freeloading accompanying the programs has had serious results.

It has made communities reluctant to help themselves. The Miami and Muskingum Valleys of Ohio have been cited as "before and after" examples. Before Congress opened the Treasury door, Miami people paid for their own flood protection; afterward, Muskingum residents held out for Federal financing.

Very few States finance any organized water resource planning.

Worst of all is the pressure that Federal subsidization creates for projects that cannot pass any real test of national desirability, whether it involves economic gain, welfare, or income distribution. One of the national objectives is the diversion of income from the haves to the have nots.

PRESSURE DISTORTS JUDGMENT

The pressure has distorted judgment of proposals and interfered with comprehensive river basin development for all desirable purposes.

This is not one man's opinion. The Federal activities have been surveyed by numerous national commissions and committees and examined critically by engineers, economists, political scientists and geographers of leading universities, including some at the University of Wisconsin.

Reports of these investigators add up to a shocking indictment, obscured though it is by polite and academic language and dry statistics. Piling fact upon fact, they have shown that water resource developments have involved irresponsibility and misrepresentation amounting to outright fraud.

If the same juggling of the books had been done by private interests at the same tremendous cost to the Government, it would be a national scandal beyond compare.

PACKAGE PLAN SEEKS TO PLACATE ANY OPPOSITION—IT ALSO IS DESIGNED TO ENLIST SUPPORT OF MAJOR AGENCIES, RECOGNIZING THAT THEY WILL CONTINUE TO EXIST

The Kennedy administration is making a shrewd approach to the thorny task of coordinating water resource programs and developing a national policy. The President's moves are calculated to enlist powerful forces and placate potential opposition.

His package offers something to the water development agencies, to defenders of State rights, to advocates of more dam building and to interests that want fish and wildlife, recreation and other nonmonetary benefits given more consideration.

A big boost for the public power also is contemplated. Hydroelectric production is to be supplemented by steam-generated power and western public power complexes are to be connected with long-distance transmission lines to make markets for presently unsalable power.

CONSOLIDATION SUGGESTED

The Washington correspondent of a national news service speculated recently about another Presidential attempt to bring the water development agencies together in the Interior Department.

Such efforts in the past antagonized the agencies and frustrated Presidents back to Harding, bringing defeat even to so powerful an executive as Franklin D. Roosevelt. The agencies have close alliances with strong congressional blocs.

Kennedy actually is moving in the opposite direction. He is seeking the support of the major agencies and appears to be getting it. Spokesmen for the Army Engineers, the Reclamation Bureau, the Soil Conservation Service, and the Public Health Service described features of his bill in unmistakably favorable terms at a Columbia Basin meeting in September, both publicly and privately.

One of them commented pointedly that the President's bill recognized that the agencies were going to continue to exist and carry on their respective programs.

WOULD CREATE COUNCIL

The administration bill would create a Water Resources Council at Cabinet level to review and coordinate projects. This is expected to result in decisions which the present interagency committee on water resources (ICWR) is unable to make.

The bill would empower the President to create river basin commissions, but only at the request of one or more States. Another effort to win over State rights defenders is a provision for Federal aid to States for organizing their own water resource planning agencies.

CRITERIA STUDY ARRANGED

Kennedy also has made significant moves within the executive branch. Last March he had his new Budget Director arrange for a study by top water resource economists of the criteria for evaluating projects. The panel, headed by Maynard M. Hufschmidt of Harvard University, presented a searching analysis of Government objectives in a June report.

Evaluation methods determine whether or not Federal investment in a project is justified.

The Budget Bureau heretofore has made the rules for the executive branch. After Eisenhower became President, it issued more restrictive criteria for the guidance of the agencies (circular A-47 of December 1952).

Proponents of dams that could not qualify screamed until Congress established its own, easier criteria. Eisenhower subsequently vetoed rivers and harbors bills and forced the elimination of some projects.

FUNCTION IS TRANSFERRED

Kennedy has marked circular A-47 for the wastebasket. He took this function away from the Budget Bureau and turned it over to the ICWR. This in effect gives the agencies responsibility for making their own rules.

At the President's request, the ICWR is revising the rules to provide more leeway for figuring benefits from fish and wildlife, recreation, pollution dilution and other things of somewhat intangible monetary value.

This invites support from conservationists, sportsmen, and municipalities with waste disposal problems. And, of course, from proponents of new projects, for these additions to total benefits will qualify projects now marginal and even submarginal.

The bars will be let down for a lot of dam building unless brakes are provided at the same time. The Hufschmidt report contains some pertinent suggestions, and it is in the hands of the ICWR committee.

UNCLE SAM HAS BEEN ANGEL FOR RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT WHILE BENEFIT AND COST ESTIMATES HAVE BEEN JUGGLED

Something for nothing is the crux of the water resource problem.

Until the late 1930's, substantial State and local contributions were required toward flood control and navigation works and full repayment was demanded of water users. With the 1938 Flood Control Act and a series of reclamation acts starting about the same time, Uncle Sam became the angel for almost all water resource development.

Congress generally requires a showing that estimated benefits from a project will exceed cost amortized over the useful life, but it encourages very optimistic figuring and the justification often is fictitious.

Benefits include such things as increased crops from land irrigated or protected, flood property damage prevented, savings on power and freight charges. The Eisenhower administration insisted on direct benefits and limited the useful life estimate to 50 years. Congress asked for a showing of indirect benefits, too, and for periods up to 100 years.

BENEFITS ARE PADDED

Prodded by pressure groups, the agencies have padded benefits and trimmed costs in their estimates. Sometimes after they have reported projects unfavorably a congressional committee has said, "Try again," and more figuring has produced a semblance of justification.

Each major agency has its own powerful lobby and its own separate committee in the Senate and in the House—committees packed with loyal supporters. This has resulted in approval of uneconomic, overlapping and sometimes conflicting projects, as well as some duplication of expensive survey efforts. Such conflicts continue in the present Congress.

Congress has written off $17 million on reclamation projects that turned out badly and extended repayment time on others. A great deal more may have to be written off if repayment out of power revenues, postponed for 40 years, does not materialize.

MANY FELT UNJUSTIFIED

Otto Eckstein, Harvard University economist, told a Senate committee a few years ago, "There is very strong evidence that less than half of the projects can be justified." A University of Chicago economist, Edward F. Renshaw, concurred after exhaustive analyses of the major programs.

Clarence A. Davis, an Eisenhower Under Secretary of Interior, has said that some Federal projects would not have been built if the agency responsible had checked with other agencies first.

An Agriculture Department watershed official, Carl Brown, told a San Francisco reclamation meeting that dams had been built "where the quality of the water or the quality of the land, or both, is so poor that permanent irrigation agriculture is most improbable," and also where water was being used chiefly to grow surplus crops.

The crops, he said, might be needed 20 years hence but meanwhile the reservoirs were "slowly dying" of sedimentation.

SOME 200 PERCENT ABOVE ESTIMATES

Renshaw analyzed 34 irrigation projects and reported that actual costs averaged more than 200 percent above estimates that had been submitted by the Reclamation Bureau.

A $44 million estimate for the Colorado-Big Thompson diversion had become a $159 million cost by the time the project was completed in 1959. On the basis of the estimate, irrigators will repay the Government only $27 million.

Henry C. Hart, University of Wisconsin political scientist, reported that the Army Engineers estimated in 1948 that the Missouri River navigation channel was only $42 million and 5 years from completion. But 7 years later the engineers had spent $45 million more and completion was still $104 million and 10 years away.

Economists for a Truman survey commission found in the early 1950's that annual savings from barge navigation on the Missouri would be less than one-third of the engineers' estimate.

ESTIMATES WERE JUGGLED

A House committee inquired into this and learned that the division engineer, to obtain a desirable benefit-cost ratio, had juggled the estimates of the engineers' economists. He added about 5 million tons to average annual freight movement and moved up the date of realization by 30 years. This boosted the estimated benefits from $4.9 million to $13.4 million.

The Missouri Basin Survey Commission's economists also found only $963,000 of average annual benefits from bank protection, where the corps had estimated $11.8 million.

Economists' recommendations for remedying these things include requirements of more local participation, repayment by beneficiaries, and cost estimates that include more realistic interest charges and allowance for the lost opportunities for private investment.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Dec. 28, 1961]

RIVER BASIN PLANS FUTILE—INABILITY TO MAKE DECISIONS RESULTS FROM THE LIMITED INTERESTS OF U.S. AGENCIES AND THEIR VETO POWER

(By R. G. Lynch)

For 15 years, the United States has been working in river basins with an organization that resembles the United Nations, and has been about as futile at making major decisions. This organization is the interagency committee (IAC), which President Kennedy hopes to make effective by transforming it into a Presidential commission.

River basin planning and development for all desirable purposes must be carried on with the thought always in mind: What will be best for the whole basin, all things considered?

This approach has proved impossible for IAC's in five basins or regions. An IAC is made up of representatives of six agencies with restricted, sometimes overlapping or conflicting responsibilities, and of basin States that are at odds over sharing water or hydroelectricity.

SOME HAVE VETO RIGHTS

The agencies, like U.N. major powers, have veto rights. The States, like lesser U.N. nations, can speak their pieces and then go along.

The Army Corps of Engineers and the Reclamation Bureau have been rival dam builders for many years, making competing surveys of rivers.

The Bureau and the Agriculture Department have feuded for leadership in establishing irrigation agriculture. At a House hearing in the 1940's, a Congressman commented that the Bureau seemed bent on setting up its own agriculture department. Five years later the "Ag" Department was accused of trying to create its own reclamation projects.

PROJECTS ARE CHALLENGED

The corps attempted for a time to beat down the upstart Soil Conservation Service and its small watershed program. Sniping continued in the last decade. During studies of the Arkansas Red and White Rivers, the corps called SCS estimating methods faulty and SCS showed that the corps was using the same methods.

More recently, the corps challenged a dozen small watershed projects which involved a lot of free drainage for farmers. The corps required landowners to pay for such benefits and argued that national policy should be uniform.

The Budget Bureau agreed and held up the projects, but a Senate committee told the corps and the Bureau to mind their own business, that Congress wanted it that way.

Such inequities, incidentally, characterize the whole, broken up Federal program. The engineers have reclaimed more land by flood protection than the Bureau has by irrigation. Irrigators share water costs; flood protection is free. Great Lakes shippers' freight charges help pay for the St. Lawrence Seaway. Rivals on big rivers pay nothing to maintain access to the sea.

The Fish and Wildlife Service has been bucking the corps, the Bureau and the Federal Power Commission (FPC) because their projects often may ruin habitat.

The sixth IAC member, the Public Health Service, has been concerned about the effect of dams on water flow necessary to dilute wastes. Missouri River dams, for example, have caused a serious nuisance problem, with water deterioration detectable all the way down to Kansas City.

VETERANS ON COMMITTEE

Those who sit around the interagency committee table are veterans of these wars—men who have proved their ability to defend the policies and welfare of their agencies. And they tend to judge their performance at the table by their ability (1) to resist changes in their agencies' policies and (2) impose their agencies views on the rest of the group.

Hence the major IAC failure: Inability to make decisions.

A lesser difficulty, but keenly felt, is the lack of IAC funds and staff. The group depends on handouts of money and loans of personnel from the member agencies. Few participating States are organized to make any substantial contributions.

President Kennedy's bill seeks to remedy these defects by (1) extending Presidential authority to commissions which would replace IAC's; (2) providing staff and funds and (3) fostering more State participation, both in planning and making decisions.

U.S. INTERAGENCY SYSTEM FAILS TO RESOLVE BASIN PROBLEMS

No comprehensive river basin plan has resulted from interagency committee operations.

The first went to work in the Missouri Valley in 1945 on the so-called Pick-Sloan plan, a hasty merger of Army Engineers and Reclamation Bureau plans.

Probably the most competent of many criticisms was a Missouri Basin Survey Commission report in 1953. Nine of the eleven Commissioners were basin residents. Included were three members of each House of Congress, farm organization leaders, an engineering school dean and a newspaper editor.

The Commission employed a technical staff and held 17 hearings all over the basin. It found a lack of balance and a lack of coordination.

RECOMMENDED LOCAL GROUP

It unanimously recommended the creation of a five-man commission of basin residents, appointed by the President, to direct the development of the basin's resource potential, with authority to review Federal agency plans and integrate their budgeting.

The Columbia Basin Interagency Committee went to work in 1946 after both the engineers and the Reclamation Bureau had surveyed the basin. Planning there has been much better than in the Missouri basin, but development has been hampered by lack of agreement.

More than 100 basin leaders met with the interagency committee in June 1959 and discussed the shortcomings. There was praise for its function as a forum for group thinking and public dissemination of facts and for the data compiled by its subcommittees.

But Governor Hatfield, representative of Oregon, said the IAC had been notoriously silent on many controversial issues and called for a strong and fearless committee, willing to face up to the issues.

IAC IS CALLED STERILE

L. C. Binford, former chairman of the Oregon Water Resources Board, said that the IAC had tremendous potential "but it has been for practical purposes sterile (and) there is a terrific vacuum in planning for Columbia River development."

Gen. Allen F. Clark, Jr., then division engineer for the Army corps in the basin, commented that the IAC's "greatest weakness is to be found in the lack of pressing for regional plans by member agencies and integration of those plans into a comprehensive regional plan."

The third continuing IAC, in the Pacific-Southwest region, has not had the responsibility for planning. It keeps member agencies and States informed of each other's activities.

Two temporary IAC's worked in the Arkansas-Red-White basins and the New England-New York region. Their reports to Congress have gathered dust for 5 years. A description of the ARW's troubles, by a participant, will suffice:

"The effort got underway with a great deal of fanfare, with meetings at all principal population centers and an elaborate system of staff subcommittees.

"Then the interagency wrangles began and continued with increasing ferocity to the end. Early in this period, disgust and disinterest set in. Fewer and fewer principals found time to attend meetings.

"The final report, produced after the expenditure of several million dollars for traveling expenses, office space, paper, etc., was hammered out by a hard corps of few men from the principal Federal agencies, desperately charged with the responsibility of finishing the report."

NO SHINING BLUEPRINT

"It was a tremendous compendium of engineering data and generalities on policies, halfheartedly endorsed by the member agencies. No one held it up as a shining, living blueprint for advancing the economic welfare of the Southwest.

"The New York-New England group went through similar motions with a similar ineffectual result. The two experiences give almost incontrovertible proof of the futility of this kind of planning."

Two Commissions created by Congress in 1958 also have been at work. The membership is similar to the IAC's, but the members, appointed by the President, theoretically are free to speak and vote on policies, independent of their agencies and States. Each Commission has its own funds and a staff.

One Commission reported last fall on eight Texas rivers. Its main interest appeared to be to get as many reservoirs as possible. It followed the Missouri basin formula of pasting together Army corps and Reclamation Bureau reports, avoiding conflict by assigning four rivers to each. Its final plan devotes one paragraph to fish, wildlife, and recreation.

The other Commission, for southeastern rivers, has a year's work left on an entirely different kind of study. Its executive director, George E. Tomlinson, evidently hopes to make a contribution to comprehensive basin planning with a new approach, based on projecting the region's economy in proportion to national predictions.

ANTIDOTE WAS SOUGHT FOR RIVER VALLEY AUTHORITIES

The interagency committee came into being as an antidote for the valley authority, which is opposed by Federal agencies and their lobbies, public utility interests and State rights advocates.

The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) was created in 1933 and has been an outstanding success at comprehensive basin development, copied by many foreign nations.

For a time it seemed that this would mark the start of a national program. The 1934 Congress asked President Franklin D. Roosevelt for a survey of rivers for multiple purpose legislation. He appointed a Cabinet committee. Ten basins were recommended for broad planning. A natural resources planning board started the task.

Meanwhile opposition made headway as Roosevelt's power waned. In 1942 Congress abolished the planning board and in 1944 it turned a cold shoulder to his proposal of a Missouri Valley authority. Instead it accepted a Missouri basin program which consisted of rival plans of the Corps of Engineers and the Reclamation Bureau, pasted together.

With the demise of the planning board, the Defense, Interior, and Agriculture Departments and the Federal Power Commission had formed an interagency committee in Washington in 1943. This group set up the first basin IAC for the Missouri Valley in 1945. Columbia basin and Pacific-Southwest IAC's followed in 1946 and 1948.

These three have functioned on a continuing basis. Others operated temporarily in the Arkansas-Red-White basins and the New England-New York region. President Truman created them in 1950, with a rebuke to Congress for singling out the corps to survey the two regions.

Aware of the IAC's deficiencies, Congress tried something different in 1958, when it created study commissions for Texas basins and rivers of four Southeastern States.

President Kennedy proposes to adopt the commission idea and improve upon it.

JOURNAL ASSIGNS WRITER TO SURVEY URGENT ISSUE

An urgent internal problem of the Nation, water management, awaits action when Congress reconvenes. Pending are President Kennedy's water resources bill, a compact among Delaware basin States and western demands for federation recognition of State jurisdiction over water rights. Because of the importance of the proposed legislation, the Journal assigned R. G. Lynch, its reporter on natural resource matters, to write a series of articles, which begins here. Lynch is the author of "Our Growing Water Problems," published and distributed nationally by the National Wildlife Federation. Its preparation in 1957-58 gave him some knowledge of water problems and laws in every State.

He has toured the lower Mississippi Delta and cruised the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers from New Orleans to Chicago. He has toured the North Dakota area of the proposed Garrison irrigation diversion. He attended a September meeting of the Columbia basin interagency committee and in November visited the Atlanta (Ga.) headquarters of the southeastern basins study commission.

He has interviewed and corresponded with informed men on all of the major river basin committees and commissions and with key personnel in Washington, D.C. He has examined reports, books, and papers, including some unpublished material.

References are made in his articles to material from "Muddy Waters," by Arthur Maas, Harvard University Press; "The Dark Missouri," by Henry C. Hart, University of Wisconsin Press; "Toward Responsible Government," by Edward F. Renhaw, Idyia Press, Chicago; publications of Resources for the Future, Inc., and the Conservation Foundation; proceedings of the western resources conference, published by the University of Colorado Press.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this year we celebrate the 44th anniversary of the historic independence day of the great Ukrainian people. It is a sad fact of history that the liberty-loving people of the Ukraine experienced freedom and self-government for only 2 years, from 1918 to 1920. This brief period of independence was the culmination of a struggle for self-determination which began in the 17th century, and endured for more than 300 years. The people of this nation struggled against great odds to establish their homeland as a free, independent state. Repeatedly their efforts were blocked by their neighboring states. When they finally succeeded, in 1918, it was to be for a heart-breakingly short period. Yet the people of this nation continue to believe in and yearn for freedom and independence.

Americans of Ukrainian descent, in Wisconsin and elsewhere in our Nation, look back through these 44 years to the time when their country was independent. All of us today know and admire their marvelous cultural attainments, their personal self-reliance and strength, and their devotion to freedom and independence. These are treasured American traits, as well. We are all the better for having them added to our national character.

The great Ukrainian poet, Taras Schevchenko, by his life and by his writings, reminds us all of the greatness and the unfulfilled hopes of his people. On this anniversary of Ukrainian independence, I salute his memory, and the memory of a nation, which though briefly independent, has left its mark on history.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of executive business.

DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nomination of John A. McCone, of California, to be Director of Central Intelligence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, what is the pending nomination?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination of John A. McCone, of California, to be Director of Central Intelligence.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Madam President, in introducing this nomination to the Armed Services Committee, the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], said with reference to the Office of Director of the Central Intelligence Agency:

> This office is perhaps second only to the Presidency in its importance.

Certainly it is.

This is one of the most important confirmations which the Senate is called upon to make. In my opinion, it ranks in importance ahead of most Cabinet confirmations for several reasons: the importance of the work of the CIA, the relative freedom of action given the head of the CIA and to his subordinates, and the lack—a very serious lack—under existing practice, of any continuing direction of or effective review of CIA activities by the Congress.

I have in the past supported and advocated establishment of a joint committee of the Congress to exercise continuing supervision over the activities of the CIA, somewhat in the same manner that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy operates. If such a committee existed, the choice of the head of the CIA and Senate confirmation would not be so critical as it is.

There is no regular or normal procedure in existence or in use today by which committees of the Congress are consulted or informed of CIA activities. During a discussion of a proposed Joint Committee on Central Intelligence on the floor of the Senate on April 9, 1956, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] asked:

> How many times does CIA request a meeting with the particular subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee and the Armed Services Committee?

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], a member of both committees, replied:

> At least twice a year that happens in the Armed Services Committee and at least once a year it happens in the Appropriations Committee. I speak from my knowledge during the last year or so.

Obviously there is no regular procedure. Certainly there is no indication of any kind of current and continuous supervision and consultation.

Intelligence activities raise special problems and need special attention. I would like to quote significant passages from an article by Harry Howe Ransom in the New York Times magazine, May 21, 1961:

> Central Intelligence today has three principal functions: intelligence collection, its analysis and communication to policymakers, and clandestine foreign political operations. The increasing necessity of these activities is attributable to three major reasons.
>
> From earliest times, an intelligence apparatus has been an indispensable part of the paraphernalia of a great world power. The worldwide responsibilities of the United States today require both a system for keeping the complex details of world politics under constant surveillance and an instrument for secret foreign political action.
>
> A second reason is that national policy decisions are based, increasingly, upon predictions of foreign political, economic, and military developments 5 to 10 years hence. This fact is a consequence of the long leadtime in developing weapons systems and of the need to make economical use of finite resources to implement long-range foreign policy objectives.
>
> Consequently, an intelligence system today is asked an incredibly wide range of urgent questions, answers to which can be obtained sometimes only by devious methods. When will Communist China test an atomic device? What future has the economic integration of Europe? How stable is the Government of South Vietnam? What course will Sino-Soviet relations take?

These are among the questions to which Mr Ransom has pointed as examples of the kinds of things Central Intelligence is expected to be concerned about and on which it is expected to make some judgments and some recommendations.

> A third reason derives from modern military-technological developments. Intelligence, it often is said, has become the first line of defense. Accurate and rapidly transmitted information is an absolute requirement for an effective strategy of deterrence. Strategic striking forces must have an accurate dossier of potential enemy targets. And essential elements of information always must be available to thwart an enemy's possible surprise knockout blow.

He continues with these words:

> Short of declared war, however, secret operations are widely regarded as a dirty business, unfitting America's open, democratic—and formerly isolationist—society. Events of recent years have, nonetheless, revealed to the public at least the top of the iceberg of a vast secret intelligence program.
>
> Distasteful or not, secret operations have become a major underground front of the cold war. The accelerating pace of cold warfare in Laos, South Vietnam, Thailand, the Congo, Latin America, and elsewhere increases the pressure for greater American involvement in the secret "black arts."
>
> One's attitude toward these activities will depend, finally, upon one's assessment of contemporary international politics and of the requirements for the common defense. President Kennedy recently declared that the cold war has reached such a stage that "no war ever posed a greater threat to our security." If they take that as a valid assessment, most Americans will assume, although doubtless with misgivings, a wartime attitude toward secret operations.
>
> Whatever one's view, the existence of a secret bureaucracy poses special problems in the American system of government. Knowledge is power. Secret knowledge is secret power. A secret apparatus, claiming superior knowledge and operating outside the normal checkreins of American democracy is a source of invisible government.

I suggest that this is a most significant statement in the article by Harry Ransom.

He continues:

> How then can the controls of a democratic system be imposed upon the intelligence system while maintaining the secrecy required for its successful operation? Secret operations must remain immune from some of the normal checks, especially publicity. Heavy dependence must be placed upon politically responsible officials to exercise control.
>
> In a parliamentary democracy, such as Great Britain, the problem is less acute.

The problem is less acute in Great Britain than it is under our system of government.

He continues:

> Parliamentary government unifies executive and legislative responsibility under majority-party leadership. When Ministers are also Members of Parliament, responsibility for management of secret functions is reinforced.
>
> British intelligence services, too, are so organized that secret political operations overseas are entirely separate from political and military intelligence functions. An agency for secret operations is supervised by a special Cabinet subcommittee. The point is that all are under firm political authority.

This essay describes the situation in British intelligence activities. The control of the activity and the direction of it is quite different from that which exists in the United States today.

Charles Wilson, as Secretary of Defense, described this danger at a press conference in 1957 with these words:

> You see, what I get for my purpose is an agreed-on intelligence estimate. I have to take that, or I would have to bore through an enormous amount of detail myself to try to say that they were wrong or right. I accept what they say.

The statement or comment by Charles Wilson indicates one of the fundamental problems, namely, that original intelligence estimates or decisions which are made at a relatively low level begin to move through channels and to pick up momentum as they move along until, at the point of final decision, it is extremely difficult to change the direction or to bring a movement or an action to a halt.

Hanson Baldwin, as military commentator for the New York Times, wrote in his column of January 15, 1956:

> If war is too important to be left to the generals, it should be clear that intelligence is too important to be left to the unsupervised.

Walter Lippmann, looking at the same problem from a slightly different point of view, wrote soon after the recent change of personnel in the State Department that reform of the CIA should seem easier and more necessary.

For—

He said—

> the CIA should cease to be what it has been much too much, an original source of American foreign policy. That is what has gotten it into trouble, and that is what needs to be cured.

Mr. Allen Dulles once said:

> In intelligence you have to take some things on faith.

I acknowledge the truth of this, but also acknowledge and insist that faith is no excuse for lack of knowledge or for failure to seek out facts; nor should it be accepted as a convenient device for shunning responsibility.

If Walter Lippmann, Harry Ransom, Charles Wilson, and Hanson Baldwin are right, Congress must be concerned since it, along with the President, has responsibility for determining foreign policy.

In any case, the head of the Central Intelligence Agency will take on great responsibilities and acquire great powers which, at least insofar as Congress is concerned, he can exercise with little or no supervision. Under the law, he can withhold titles, salaries, or numbers of personnel employed by the Agency. He can approve the entry into the United States of certain aliens and of their families, subject to concurrence of the Attorney General and the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization. He will have authority to expend funds without regard to the provision of law and regulations relating to the expenditure of Government funds on vouchers certified by him alone.

These are unusual powers, and powers which Congress traditionally has not yielded easily. But they are, I think necessarily, granted in this case.

A part of the CIA's work is the preparation of the national intelligence estimates which are used as important guides in the formulation of foreign and defense policy. The CIA is an evaluator as well as a collector of facts. This Agency should find and present the facts as they are and interpret them with full objectivity.

The Director of the CIA is Chairman of the U.S. Intelligence Board. Other members represent the Defense Department; the intelligence components of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; the National Security Agency, the Atomic Energy Commission, the FBI, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the State Department.

The head of the CIA briefs the National Security Council at each of its meetings and is always asked to remain for the ensuing discussion.

Customarily, at least, he is asked to remain for the ensuing discussion.

Although the head of the CIA is not a member of the NSC, he does remain and participates in the discussions.

What is the statutory or legal basis for the operation of Central Intelligence? Quoting again from the Harry Ransom article:

> The CIA's functions are specified, broadly, by Federal statutes, defining the Agency as an instrument of the Presidency. The CIA's operational guidelines are some two dozen codified National Security Council intelligence directives, approved by the President. Actions such as the U–2 flights and the Cuban expedition must be approved specifically by the President. In the past he has had the advice on such matters of a special NCS subcommittee on clandestine operations.
>
> A second potential check has been the President's eight-man Board of Consultants on Foreign Intelligence Activities. This was established early in 1956, after a Hoover Commission study expressed concern about the possibility of the growth of license and abuses of power where disclosures of costs, organization, personnel, and functions are precluded by law.
>
> The first Chairman of this group, composed largely of distinguished industrialists and former armed services officers, was James R. Killian, Jr., then president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. President Kennedy recently reappointed Dr. Killian to the chairmanship of a reconstituted Board after a 2-year interval in which Gen. John E. Hull, retired Army officer, presided.
>
> Central Intelligence is subject today to three major criticisms. They involve questions of control by responsible authority, the efficiency of existing organizations, and the problem of secrecy.

We attempt to determine how much should be kept secret, how much information should be made available to the public, and how much should be made available to Congress itself. It is true that the Central Intelligence Agency officially operates under Presidential directives and is supervised in a general way or checked upon by interdepartmental groups from the National Security Council. They participate in both interpreting intelligence data and in authorizing covert operations. But the principal intelligence adviser and the highest authority remains the Director of Central Intelligence, who is armed with extraordinary secrecy inside the Government and with a secret budget.

I think we must acknowledge that ours is a government of laws and not of men, in one sense, but we must acknowledge, too, that this is a government of men as well as of laws, and in the important positions of policy determination, and in originating ideas in the field of foreign policy, there is certainly a flow of authority from the President down and there is also a flow from those appointed by him or who are put in important positions of trust and decision upward through the channels to the President himself.

Quoting further from Mr. Ransom:

> In a complex world of fast-moving events and in a Washington intelligence community where CIA professionals are increasingly influential, too few sources of countervailing power exist. This particularly is a problem with covert operations in which the Presidency is largely dependent upon the CIA for information on what is being done or what needs doing. The danger of self-serving by the Agency is great. CIA may, without careful policy guidance, write its own ticket.

That is true of all Government agencies, and I see no reason to believe that it would not also be true of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask the Senator from Minnesota if he knows of any instances in which the Central Intelligence Agency has carried out in the field a policy directly contrary to the policy of the State Department.

Mr. McCARTHY. There have been a number of reported cases in which the Central Intelligence Agency activities were reported to be counter to what the State Department advocated. In other cases the Agency carried on a policy without any direction or knowledge on the part of the State Department.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Minnesota remember the speech which Colonel Nasser delivered at Alexandria, Egypt, in July 1956, I believe?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; I do.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in that speech Colonel Nasser said that a high representative of the U.S. Government had come to him and said that the State Department was sending out Mr. George E. Allen, who later became Ambassador to Greece, to make a protest to him about some of his actions in connection with the Suez Canal, and that this high official of the American Government then told him to pay no attention to Mr. Allen and to disregard what he said? I do not believe I have the clipping with me concerning the incident, but I am certain that Nasser followed out that advice, and at one time said he was tempted to kick Mr. Allen downstairs.

In November 1956, when I was in Cairo, I thought the man in question was probably the former Ambassador to Egypt, Mr. Byroade, who was transferred from Egypt to the Union of South Africa. But I found upon inquiry—and I believe this information has since been confirmed—that it was not Mr. Byroade at all but a regional representative of the CIA who bears the name of a famous American family.

Does the Senator from Minnesota know anything about that incident?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am familiar with the story. So far as I know, there has been—and perhaps this is in keeping with the operation of the Agency—no attempt to repudiate or to deny essentially the story that the Senator has related, which has been about for a long time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I checked very carefully with the Embassy in Cairo. Representatives of the Embassy were united in saying that it had not been Mr. Byroade—but it had been the regional representative of the CIA. Whether that action was taken without the knowledge of the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, which I suppose may well have been the case, is it not in all probability an illustration of the CIA and the State Department moving exactly at cross purposes in a very crucial situation?

Mr. McCARTHY. It would certainly be an example of what the Senator suggested. Since the Senate has a particular responsibility in the determination of the policies to be carried out by the State Department, we need to be particularly concerned to be sure that Central Intelligence is not carrying out a contrary policy. I am sure the President and the State Department, too, representing the executive branch of the Government, also need to be concerned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in that case the advice which was supposedly given by the CIA made Colonel Nasser much more intransigent than he would otherwise have been which helped to aggravate the crisis over Suez?

Mr. McCARTHY. That was certainly the interpretation which was placed upon the reported incident.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It is true, is it not, that the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and the Secretary of State both report to the President of the United States?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota would not wish to saddle on any new incumbent to the position of Director of the Central Intelligence Agency any possible mistakes of the past, as outlined by the Senator from Illinois, would he?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think the remarks of the Senator from Illinois could be interpreted as putting any burden of guilt upon the newly named head of the Central Intelligence Agency, or even on the former head of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, may I pursue my inquiry further?

Mr. McCARTHY. If I may finish, the remarks of the Senator from Illinois were addressed to the question of certain procedural relationships, and were by way of illustration of a possible situation in which both the President and the State Department, as well as Congress, would have been called upon to face an action which neither had really approved.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If President Kennedy believes, as apparently both my distinguished friends from Minnesota and my friend from Illinois believe, that some things have not gone well in Central Intelligence, there would be no criticism of the President for attempting to improve the management of the Central Intelligence Agency through change in the management, would there?

Mr. McCARTHY. No, on my part, I am sure there would be no such criticism, and I think in this case I could likewise speak freely for the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JACKSON. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I wish to clarify one point. There seemed to be some implication that there is a lack of constitutional control over the head of the CIA. Did I correctly understand the Senator? Did I understand correctly that the Senator meant to say that?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have been trying to say that for 2 weeks.

Mr. JACKSON. Wherein is there a lack of constitutional control? It may not be what it should be, but wherein is there a lack of constitutional control?

Mr. McCARTHY. I raised four or five areas in which I thought serious question could be raised as to whether there was constitutional justification or treaty justification or justification under any action taken by Congress or concurred in by Congress. I made reference to action in Iran against Mossadegh.

Mr. JACKSON. I do not wish to talk about individual instances. I do not believe we should, frankly, in public discuss some of these matters, whether they are true or false.

The Senator referred to the British system. I must say that under the British system only the Prime Minister knows who is the head of intelligence. They do not discuss these matters in the House of Commons. Insofar as we discuss this subject I believe we ought to follow the ancient rule of intelligence that silence is golden.

When we criticize specific intelligence operations in open session, we are ourselves guilty of a lack of understanding of the problem. Certainly these details should not be discussed on the floor of the Senate. Of course we can talk about constitutional control. As I say, there may be an opportunity to improve the operations of intelligence, but details with respect to intelligence should not be discussed on the floor of the Senate.

The head of Central Intelligence reports to the President. Congress does supervise the Agency. There is a question whether Congress has done the kind of job of exercising control at times that it should have done in that connection. Perhaps this control can be improved.

But the head of CIA is under the President, and responsible to him, and he does report to the National Security Council. Therefore, I do not understand the contention that there is no constitutional control.

Also, there is congressional control. Whether that control is what it should be is another question. However, I do wish to emphasize that we should be careful when we discuss in public any specific activities of CIA. Such discussion may be unwittingly giving aid and comfort to the enemy, in a sense.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. In the sense, I mean, when we speak of specific examples of intelligence activities. These are things that can be used against us.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I merely called to mind a speech which Colonel Nasser made at Alexandria, and which was blazoned to the world. There was no secret about this. The statements in that speech have never, so far as I know, been denied in the slightest degree. They tended to reflect badly upon the diplomatic service. Upon investigation, however, the evidence became clear that it was not the diplomatic service which was at fault, but the local, regional representative of the CIA. Therefore, I was not betraying any secrets with respect to any matters which were not already known, but indicating where the responsibility lay.

Mr. JACKSON. I have the utmost confidence in the junior Senator from Minnesota. I merely say that if we get into any of these illustrations, like the situation in Egypt, we give authoritative affirmation or denial by someone in Government, and that is later used in certain places against our Government.

This is what we must be careful about. That is my only observation.

There is plenty of room for a proper discussion of the organizational structure of CIA. However, I believe we should be careful about dealing with particular activities.

This is my opinion. I have the utmost respect and confidence in the Senators who have raised this issue.

Mr. McCARTHY. I appreciate the admonition.

Mr. JACKSON. I do not know of anyone who has been more conscientious and sincere in trying to bring about proper control over the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency than the junior Senator from Minnesota. I know that the Senator from Illinois likewise is taking a keen interest not only in this matter but in all matters affecting national security. I wanted to make these observations for our own good. I know that my comments will be taken in that spirit.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I agree with the main precept of the distinguished Senator from Washington. I am a member of two of the three committees to which the Central Intelligence Agency reports in the Senate, and have heard something of this story with different interpretations. I do not know which is true. I do submit for the Senator's consideration the fact that whether or not it is true the Central Intelligence Agency, because of its character and type as indicated by the Senator from Washington, will not have a chance to give its side of the story from the standpoint of what happened in 1953, I believe it was——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Nineteen hundred and fifty-six.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I was in Cairo the latter part of October or first part of November of this year. I thought that the Agency's operation, from what I heard, was satisfactory at that time. In any case, Mr. Dulles, the former head of CIA—and this is true of any other member of CIA—will not have a chance to affirm or deny whether statements made this afternoon on the floor of the Senate are correct or not correct.

Mr. JACKSON. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator from Missouri has raised a pertinent point. In order to have an authoritative denial or statement from the Agency, the Agency would have to enter public discussion, which would itself be an improper operation of the Agency. That is my point.

The Senator very properly raises some questions which are obviously of proper concern of Congress. His interest in making sure that there is appropriate constitutional control, and more effective and adequate control, and reporting by the appropriate committees of Congress, is a very worthy subject for Congress to consider, and I commend him for what he has done in this connection, not only for what he has done today, but what he has been doing for several years now.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Missouri for their observations and comments, and for the questions they have raised. For myself, I would say I have not been particularly critical of the Central Intelligence Agency for its operation in the way of its intelligence gathering. I think that perhaps they have been unjustly criticized by some Members of Congress and perhaps in the public judgment that has been pronounced upon them. I do believe, however, there is involved here a fundamental juridical question. The Constitution establishes the responsibility of Congress with respect to the determination of foreign policy, at least major foreign policy, and with respect to that determination there was a time that we in Congress could do this by ratifying treaties. We no longer can operate effectively by the treaty route. We still have the responsibility with regard to the declaration of war, but we no longer declare war. We fight police actions and we carry on what are called cold wars.

Does this mean that because of a changed mode of political conflict Congress has lost any responsibility under the Constitution? Is that the situation, Madam President, or does it, rather, require that we give some thought to procedures? After all, we have a representative democracy, and in major decisions, whether domestic or international, some concurrence and some participation on the part of Congress has clearly been involved from the very beginning.

It was in connection with these points that I cited the practice in the British parliamentary system. I do not mean to say that every Member of Parliament was consulted. In the British system the Members of Parliament picked a cabinet on intelligence.

It may be said that this involves a very complex procedure. However, I do not believe it is so complex that we could not work out some procedures through which we could be satisfied that Congress had been consulted, or at least men picked by Congress had been consulted, and through them Congress had participated in some degree in these basic decisions. Even if we picked only men who had presented themselves for the Presidency, we could make up a full committee out of the Senate alone. The same kind of committee probably could be made up even of vice presidential candidates. We would have more on the committee than we needed, if we limited the committee to the usual choice of those who felt that they themselves could be entrusted with these important decisions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one who has been a member of two of the committees which have had to do with the Central Intelligence Agency for the last half dozen years, at least, I have felt that no information that we asked for was concealed from us. Whenever a suggestion was made as to whether there was anything more we should be told, or any information which we might need, we always received it. As one member of the committee, I have felt that we should give our very best possible advice and judgment to the Central Intelligence Agency if we felt it was not being properly administered or that the procedures were not being properly carried out.

This subject was argued several years ago, when Senator Barkley was a Member of the Senate and took a very active part in the discussion. I think that if the question comes up at the present time, as it has been raised by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota, we can discuss the question of procedure again, and we should. Certainly, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services and as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I would welcome the appearance of the Senator from Minnesota before those committees in executive session to give us the detailed suggestions that he might have.

As the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] have said today, the question, as I see it, is whether the gentleman who has been named for this position is qualified to hold it. That is the primary question before the Senate today. When a new man takes office, we can then consider the question of improving the management of the agency. I think the record will show that we discussed that question when the Senator from Minnesota was before the Committee on Armed Services.

Certainly we ought to make every effort possible to improve the Central Intelligence Agency in these very difficult times. However, I think the primary objective today is to determine whether the man who has been nominated is qualified, and to decide the question affirmatively or negatively. Then we can take up the question of procedure and determine whether the agency is fulfilling its duties. These questions can be considered by the committee in executive session, so that the intelligence can and will be kept on a level which will not result in the giving away of information, either through procedural discussions or in other discussions.

I appreciate what the Senator from Minnesota is seeking to do and wishes to do. As one Senator from the other side of the aisle, I certainly would be very glad to be helpful in trying to solve this problem, because I have heard the subject discussed for the last 6 or 8 years, at least, if not more.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. The question of whether the nomination should be approved by the Senate depends, in my judgment at least, to a large extent on the nature of the role the nominee will fill. It depends on the nature of the authority he will exercise over the activities of the agency. For this reason, I think it is not exposure, exactly, because most of the procedures are quite well known; but at least a review of the way in which the Central Intelligence Agency is directed or is not directed. It is a question of whether or not there is a kind of failure under the Constitution—as I think there is—in that Congress is not fully enough involved in preliminary decisions of major consequence, such as going into Iran or Cuba, or some of the other areas in which the CIA is supposed to have been very active. These facts, these questions, have a bearing upon whether or not the nomination should be confirmed. If the Director's role is very limited and is carefully supervised, then we should not impose the same standards of judgment upon him. However, if he is to be given a great deal of supervisory authority, then I think the qualifications of character, and such things as that, takes on additional importance. It is for that reason I had hoped to establish a kind of general pattern upon which the membership of the Senate might make a solid judgment with regard to the nominee.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Would not the distinguished Senator from Minnesota agree that the amount of authority and responsibility which the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency ought to have, and would have, would be the decision of the President of the United States?

Mr. McCARTHY. It would depend in large measure upon the President of the United States; yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator has mentioned character. Would he not agree that the question of character, as well as the question of ability, would both be one which the President of the United States would want to consider very thoroughly before he submitted a nomination of this importance to the Senate for approval?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am sure that is so; and I am certain the President has made a careful examination, according to his lights, of the qualifications of the nominee. At the same time, there is a clear obligation imposed on the Senate to pass an independent judgment. The Constitution provides that this shall be done. So I do not think we can feel that we are in any way offending the President or the office of the Presidency in taking a thorough, careful look at any nomination which the President sends to the Senate for confirmation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is it not true that nominations of Mr. McCone have been before this body twice in the past, once under a Republican President, and once under a Democratic President; that the nominee was examined carefully with respect to his holdings, his character, and his ability; and that both times his nomination was confirmed unanimously by the Senate for public office?

Mr. McCARTHY. So far as I know, that is true.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. But we are now being asked to confirm his nomination to another office, one which the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has described as second in importance to the Presidency. If that is the case—and I think it is very close to being the case—again we need to make a more careful examination of the nominee than we would if he were being appointed to some other position. We might have a man who is a fine drummer, but that would not qualify him to play first violin. I think there is a little of this kind of sensitivity or complexity involved in the performance of the directorship of the Central Intelligence Agency.

The question of supervision and direction, and of the effectiveness of them, on the part of the executive branch of the Government has been raised by a number of special committees and a number of special inquiries.

Harry Ransom, in the article to which I referred earlier, said:

> In its 6 years of existence, the President's Board of Consultants on Foreign Intelligence Activities, recently renamed the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, has functioned more as a polite alumni visiting committee than as a vigorous watchdog. With one professional staff assistant and a single secretary, the board has been able only sporadically to oversee the 15,000-man CIA.
>
> Congressional surveillance has been much the same.

Theoretically, the President—with occasional help from consultants—controls this powerful, huge, and expensive Central Intelligence Agency. But the President is the nominal head of hundreds of agencies; he cannot be kept fully informed at all times of the activities of the CIA. Consequently, very great powers are vested in the Director of Central Intelligence. How these powers have been used and how they are likely to be used are most important questions. Has the CIA in the past carried out actions without constitutional justification, without the authority of statute or of resolution or of treaty commitments? Whether these activities or operations turned out well or badly, whether in the long run or in the short run they advanced or improved the position of the United States is secondary to the basic question of legality or constitutionality of procedure.

We in the Senate need to be concerned about the propriety of the procedure.

The Central Intelligence Agency was credited with having helped oust Mossedegh from the premiership of Iran in 1953. History has not yet demonstrated that that was the wisest policy, and probably never will.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator from Minnesota.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on the Middle East and Southeast Asia, I spent considerable time in Iran last fall. I agree with the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]—and believe this was mentioned when the Senator from Minnesota was before the committee—namely, that it would have been a mistake if Mossadegh had continued in that position.

I have been following the reports, including classified reports with respect to Iran; and developments there with respect to the new Prime Minister. I cannot see how this discussion can be of service to the United States.

I also mentioned, when the Senator was before the committee, that I doubted the CIA took credit for the overthrow of Dr. Arbenz as President of Guatemala, because our Ambassador to Guatemala at that time told me personally he felt he had had the most to do with it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not question really whether the CIA did it or whether the ambassador did it. The question of the justification for the action in terms of some juridical basis remains open to question, in either case. I am not saying that the CIA in either of these cases was operating independently or without approval by the State Department. But this basic question would run to it, regardless of whether the action was carried out or participated in by the CIA or without its participation. The fundamental juridical question of control would exist even though the Central Intelligence Agency was not involved in those activities, in which there was some involvement on the part of our Government itself.

Similar questions have been raised with regard to Vietnam, and also of course more recently in regard to our support of the invasion of Cuba, last year. The basic question of the justification remains—regardless of whether we have success or whether we have failure—in regard to some of these operations and some of these activities.

Madam President, I think the Constitution quite clearly provides that Congress shall have a part in declaring war. However, as I have already said, in the modern world, war is seldom declared, instead, there are defensive actions and police actions. Nevertheless, the Constitution still provides, in my opinion, that the Congress has a definite responsibility in connection with such actions or actions to continue or to overthrow the governments of other nations.

Congress has acted to give the President authority through the United Nations. It has granted him wide authority under the NATO treaty, and somewhat less clearly under the SEATO treaty. The Congress approved the Middle East resolution in anticipation of the Lebanon action.

I believe there is a constitutional need for consultation with Congress by the President or by his agents and, beyond that, for some expression of concurrence or some manifestation of concurrence by Congress or by men chosen by the Congress to speak for it, somewhat more clearly and more positively than is provided for under existing law or under existing practice. A joint committee may not be the best means. Perhaps some other device could be developed. Perhaps we could fix greater responsibility on the Armed Services Committee, and could say to it, "You are to speak for us and to represent us, and we expect that you will be consulted and that there will be conferences and consultations with you." Or we could say that this shall be taken care of by the Foreign Relations Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee, which have been chosen by Congress, and we could specify such responsibility for them, and could give formal approval to their participation and concurrence. But that has not been done.

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Has it occurred to the Senator that possibly the nomination should be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee? As Mr. McCone has testified, his task as he sees it is merely to receive reports from all over the world and to evaluate them. In that case—if he is prophesying correctly—then his task ceases to be a cloak-and-dagger operation as it has in part been, and becomes merely a source of information and guide to our foreign policymakers. Therefore, would not it be more appropriate for the Foreign Relations Committee, rather than the Armed Services Committee, to pass on this nomination?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think one could make a strong case for that.

The activities of the Central Intelligence Agency are more in the realm of areas in which the Foreign Relations Committee exercises jurisdiction. Of course it is true that the CIA was established by legislation which was handled by the Armed Services Committee, and that in fact the Central Intelligence Agency more or less continues intelligence activities which were developed in various branches of the armed services, for the most part during the war. So there is that legislative background and there is that tradition. Therefore, I suppose one could argue either way—that there is this tradition and there is this precedent which would justify referring the nomination to the Armed Services Committee, and that there are also the activities of the CIA, in its operational aspects, which I think relate to matters which are carried on more in the field of foreign policy, rather than in the field of military operations. So the question is a mixed one.

Mr. JACKSON. Madam President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield again to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I wish to add to what the Senator from Minnesota said in response to the question asked by the Senator from Alaska, namely, that the other intelligence undertakings by the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Department of Defense, make up the intelligence community, and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency is chairman of the Intelligence Board and is the coordinator of all of these. So there is a heavy military overtone which by tradition and custom has always been a part of the responsibility of the Armed Services Committee, and, prior to its creation, part of the responsibility of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG of Missouri in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to say to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] if I may, that the CIA was set up as a follow-on of the OSS, which conducted our intelligence activities during the war.

As the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has stated, the CIA is a civilian agency which collaborates and cooperates with the three military services, and—in addition to what the Senator from Washington has said—with the State Department, in working out the intelligence information from various countries and giving it to the Chief Executive of our country—the President of the United States.

I was present and helped to draft the present CIA Act; and that was done, as I have said, to set up this agency to collaborate with the inteligence agencies, particularly of the military, in time of peace, because we felt that at that time the OSS—which I think was never established by law, but was established by Executive order—had ceased to function, because the fighting part of the war was over. I think I am correct in that statement. I know we drafted the CIA act with a great deal of care and with the intention of there being cooperation with the agencies which are strictly military agencies.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. In commenting on the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts, it should be noted, as the Senator from Massachusetts has pointed out, that the CIA is the successor of the OSS, which operated in time of war, and was, therefore, a cloak-and-dagger type of agency. Now, while it is true that there is now a state of undeclared war, a cold war of sorts, it seems to me that we certainly should look into the question of whether the Foreign Relations Committee should not have as much jurisdiction over CIA as has the Armed Services Committee.

Let us assume that that had been the case, so that during the last year the CIA had been reporting, to the extent it does report at all, to the Foreign Relations

Committee instead of to the Armed Services Committee. I see present on the floor the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who had the wisdom to oppose the attempt to invade Cuba. Possibly, if the CIA had consulted him and had obtained his views, we might not have participated in that tragic error.

As I stated before, it seems to me, in view of the fact that Mr. McCone has declared that his function, as he sees it, will be merely that of collecting information all over the world and evaluating it, which is distinctly a matter of foreign relations more than it is anything else, certainly the Foreign Relations Committee should have as much jurisdiction over CIA's activity rather than Armed Services, notwithstanding that the jurisdiction was originally placed in the Armed Services Committee. Or perhaps even better there should be joint jurisdiction of both those committees.

I hope that before the consideration of this question is concluded, Congress will have the wisdom to create an oversight committee, by which the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees may monitor and control this now completely uncontrolled agency which is now responsible to no committee of Congress and is unique in that respect, wielding a responsibility and power which is absolutely unrivaled in our democracy, a power which is vested in a man who as head of CIA, according to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], is second only in importance to the President in the power he wields.

To allow such power to go unrestricted and without any reference to the committees of Congress which have supervision over foreign relations, when, in effect, CIA will be reporting on foreign affairs in many countries all over the world, both inside and outside the Iron Curtain, seems to me to be wrong.

I hope, before we conclude, some action will be taken by Congress so that it may have some supervision over the agency, with whatever restrictions are necessary to protect the national security.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may most respectfully say to the Senator from Alaska that today the CIA is responsible to the Committee on Armed Services and it is responsible to the Commitee on Appropriations. Certainly the past Director of that Agency reported at least two or three times each year to those various commitees. Therefore, those committees, or certain members of their subcommittees, have entire knowledge of the activities of the Agency, the extent of the organization, and the cost of the organization.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. Am I correct in my assumption that the Senator from Minnesota, notwithstanding that which has been said most recently by the Senator from Massachusetts, believes that there ought to be closer supervision by the Congress over the activities of the CIA?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, that is the opinion of the Senator from Minnesota.

If I may respond to the Senator from Massachusetts, I think the basic legislation which was enacted and which was developed in the Armed Services Committee was sound legislation in terms of the concept of the Central Intelligence Agency at the time that law was drafted. One of the points I raised is that the Central Intelligence Agency, in its operations at least, is carrying on activities which are far beyond what was contemplated in that legislation when it was drawn. It is not a question, really, of only CIA, but a question of whether or not CIA performs functions which are, in a sense, uncovenanted. That question runs to the functions of the State Department. The CIA seems to be the principal agent in these more or less unjustified, at least juridically unsustained, actions. So at a time when we are considering confirmation of the employment of the head of the Central Intelligence Agency, I think we should consider this question.

Mr. BARTLETT. Acknowledging that there might, and probably would, be 99 other opinions as to what ought to be done, is it the Senator's conclusion that this closer supervision might best be obtained by the establishment of a joint committee?

Mr. McCARTHY. I said earlier in my remarks——

Mr. BARTLETT. I am sorry I was not here at the time.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to repeat the statement, with some additional remarks. I am not satisfied that a joint committee is best to accomplish the purpose I have referred to. First, however, I do not know of any better method that has been proposed. Second, we have had rather good experience with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I am sure the Senator will recall that, when that committee was established, charges were made that Members of Congress could not be trusted with this kind of information, that there would be leaks, and that Congress could not exercise continuing supervision over activities as involved and as technical as those in the atomic energy field. Yet I think the record bears out the statement this Joint Committee has worked out reasonably well. I think it would perhaps not be out of turn to say that it could be tested in other areas and other jurisdictions.

Mr. BARTLETT. If the Senator will permit me one further observation, and perhaps a question, the Senator has mentioned that there has been an implication that the whole Congress cannot be trusted with secrets relating to the CIA and the Atomic Energy Commission. I wonder how far down, in the Senator's opinion, this information could be safely disseminated. We live in a strange world. In days gone by, I suppose every Member of Congress could ascertain everything about every Government agency. Whether it should be done or not, it is not being done now.

I wonder if the Senator has any idea as to where the cutoff point might properly come.

Mr. McCARTHY. As the Senator knows, we are held responsible for everything done within the Government, even though oftentimes we do not have much authority over what is done. It is considered ill-advised to admit that we do not have as much responsibility as we seem to have. But it is my opinion that we could to some extent bridge the gap between responsibility and real power or effective access of power related to our responsibilities if we, the Congress, could determine that these particular persons could be trusted, in the same way as in England members of Parliament pick members for the cabinet out of their own parliamentary body, and those persons direct intelligence activities.

Mr. BARTLETT. As it is now, those secrets would be reposed in those belonging to a certain committee or committees and from the vantage point of seniority. Is that a correct evaluation of how it is?

Mr. McCARTHY. I would not say necessarily that it should be by seniority.

Mr. BARTLETT. No. I say that is the way it is done now.

Mr. McCARTHY. Seniority has some bearing on it; I really do not know about that. However, evidently the determination of who should be given this information is not a determination made by Congress except in rather vague language of the act which established the CIA, but it is primarily a kind of selective determination by the executive branch of the Government itself.

Mr. BARTLETT. In summation, then, I might remove myself from this colloquy by stating that the Senator entertains the belief that if some Members of Congress can be trusted with the awesome secrets relating to atomic energy so might other Members of Congress, constituting a joint committee, be entrusted with the secrets having to do with the CIA.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the Congress is deserving of a test in several other areas.

Mr. BARTLETT. We should give the Congress a try?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. I do not like to repeat my good lines, but I suggested earlier if we had doubts we could limit the appointees to this committee and select them only from men named as possible presidential candidates.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is a line worth repeating.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from Alaska. He generally appreciates my good lines. I thought I might risk stating that once again.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may ask the senior Senator from Massachusetts a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. My good friend, the senior Senator from Massachusetts, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, said a few minutes ago that the Committee on Armed Services more or less supervised the CIA, and that the CIA reported to the committee. What is the extent of the report? Do the committee members go into any details, or are they merely given a brief summary of expenses, the number of people employed, and so on?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I say on the floor of the Senate that we spend several hours and go into many details of operations, of expenses, of administration, and so on. I would not wish to say more on the floor of the Senate.

I say as one member of the committee—I speak only for myself, but I think I can speak for the others also—we have never been refused any information of any character for which we have asked.

Mr. McCARTHY. If I may have the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts, I should like to ask a question.

The Senator would not say, however, would he, that the committee exercises a kind of continuing supervision in any way comparable, let us say, to what the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy exercises in its field of jurisdiction?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say that we could do more than we have done if we felt it were necessary to do it. There has never been any limit of supervision, so to speak, placed upon our efforts by the past Director of the CIA, and I am sure none would be placed on us by the future Director of the CIA. I have never heard of any limitation that was put upon us.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the Senator from Massachusetts realize that in certain countries the CIA operates with complete independence of the Chief of Mission, and that our diplomatic representatives are not even informed of what the CIA agents are doing in the country?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would deny that. I would deny that, but I would prefer not to say anything more on the floor of the Senate. I should be glad to discuss it with the Senator from Alaska in conversation, as to what I do know.

Mr. GRUENING. Well, I have been so informed by a responsible member of the diplomatic service in a country where this particular situation exists.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have not studied this as much as has the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. Does the existing law specifically require the CIA to report to the Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think it does. At least, it is implied that they should be in some way responsible. At least, the practice has been for the CIA to report to the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not ask the Senator for the practice.

Mr. McCARTHY. We shall have to ask the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am asking for information as to what the law itself does require by way of reporting to any committee. I am not informed as to that.

Mr. McCARTHY. We should have to ask the Senator from Massachusetts, who is a member of the committee and helped to draft the law. My opinion is that the CIA really is required to report only to the President. We can check the statute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask the Senator whether he is going to discuss, a little later, the particular experience of the present nominee for this particular position, or whether that will be the subject of his talk?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. I intend to make some comments with respect to his qualifications and preparation for the position.

The man selected to head the CIA should, I believe, understand and appreciate the great powers which are given to him and be aware that, at least in the past, either on its own decision or with executive approval, the CIA has carried on activities which were of questionable constitutionality or legal justification. In my opinion he should be prepared to discuss these things in the proper surroundings.

He should realize, too, that in the future he may be called upon or challenged or tempted to conduct similar operations. The director of the CIA should be sensitive to the danger of such proceedings.

A man selected to be the head of the CIA should, if possible, be experienced in intelligence work. He should be a good administrator. He should have an adequate understanding and awareness of the problems of foreign policy, of the difficulties and complexities. He should be concerned—if we could have an ideal man—as to the ethics of the methods and means by which he, his agents, and operators seek their goals, either in the gathering of information or in carrying on what have come to be called "operations."

I shall not attempt a judgment or recommendation with regard to the question of experience in intelligence of the nominee, as there are no clear standards which can be applied.

The nominee has the reputation of being a good administrator. I am not prepared to challenge that. Nearly everyone whose nomination is sent to us has a reputation of being a good administrator.

The question of knowledge of foreign policy is one which can be passed upon only in very general terms and by very subjective standards. I would feel more confident in passing on this appointment if there were a more extensive record of the views of the nominee. He is, according to one columnist, hard boiled; according to the Economist, a man of temper; according to Newsweek, a tough man; according to the Wall Street Journal, hard driving.

These are not undesirable qualities in the head of the CIA. They are not the only good qualities possessed by the nominee, but they are the qualities which have been especially stressed in newspaper comment. Taken by themselves, they are not enough to qualify a person for this difficult and sensitive office.

The Director of the CIA should be more interested in finding evidence and passing objective judgment on it than in attempting to polarize opinions or to support a set position.

Mr. President, I quote again from the Henry Howe Ransom article:

> Secret intelligence must never be more or less than an instrument of national policy. Its control should remain primarily a responsibility of the Presidency, but Congress also must assume a more carefully defined and active surveillance role. And the Department of State, particularly, must be aggressive in weighing gain from success, against cost of failure, in every proposed major secret operation.
>
> A second major criticism is that the CIA places under one roof the separate functions of intelligence collection, its analysis and underground foreign political action.
>
> Those who would organize and carry out a proposed secret operation should be separated in the decisional process from those who supply and interpret information to justify the plan. * * *
>
> Planners and operational commanders notoriously come to view the plan as an end in itself. They gradually develop a state of mind that is receptive only to intelligence data that justify the plan's practicability. A distorted view of reality often results. * * *
>
> No greater challenge confronts American society than responding to the question of how the United States can engage successfully in protracted cold warfare without sacrificing the principles defended.
>
> As an open democratic society, the United States has to recognize its handicaps in some form of competition with the closed societies of totalitarian regimes. It would be unwise to attempt to match the proficiency of Communist regimes in subversion as the avenue to the attainment of national objectives. There is no point in America's fighting totalitarianism by imitating it.

That point brings me to the serious problem which faces the Senate, not only in this case, but in many other cases.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The able Senator from Minnesota has read at length from an article, as I understand it, written by Mr. Harry Ransom, and published the 21st of May 1961. I have asked the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], if he knows who Mr. Ransom is, and he says he does not. I have asked the ranking member of the committee on the other side of the aisle, who is on two of the three committees involved with the Central Intelligence Agency, if he knows who Mr. Ransom is, and he, too, says he does not. I confess to my able friend from Minnesota that I do not know who Mr. Ransom is either, and inasmuch as he is being quoted at such great length as an authority in this field, I would ask two questions.

First, who is Mr. Ransom?

Second, has Mr. Ransom had any extended or practical experience in the field of intelligence? I do not ask these questions to be in any way critical of Mr. Ransom. I merely ask them for the information of the Senate.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not quoting Mr. Ransom particularly because he is an authority but rather because I thought what he had to say was to the point and had bearing upon the discussion. I think he is currently on the staff of Vanderbilt University. He has written what I believe is perhaps the most thorough book inquiring into the whole question of the organization and the operation of the Central Intelligence Agency.

But I would not ask any Senator to accept what Mr. Ransom has said because he said it, or even because perhaps my quoting him would be any kind of endorsement of him, but rather only upon the basis of whether or not his statements, the questions which he raises, and the proposals which he makes, are pertinent to the problem which the Senate is considering today.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Has Mr. Ransom ever had any experience in any of the intelligence apparatus of the United States?

Mr. McCARTHY. So far as I know, he has not, but I may be mistaken. He may have had some intelligence experience.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As I understand, the point the Senator from Minnesota is making relates to a division within the so-called intelligence community between the gathering of the information and its analysis and operation.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That subject has been widely discussed in the press by many writers. I do not happen to know Mr. Ransom personally.

I wish to ask the Senator a question on another subject.

Does the Senator from Minnesota know whether or not it is true, for example, in a country such as Great Britain, that the two functions I have stated are separated?

Mr. McCARTHY. So far as I am familiar with the operation there, they are separated.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That has been the traditional method.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; in Great Britain.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As I mentioned a moment ago, the Senator is really discussing the operation of the CIA itself, and whether or not it is properly constituted, a question in which I am very interested. Will the Senator discuss the particular experience and qualifications of the appointment being considered by the Senate? As I understand, the question before the Senate is not whether the CIA is properly constituted, but whether the appointee is qualified to head the Agency. Is that not correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is quite correct. As I indicated, the role which the CIA now plays has a bearing upon whether or not the nominee is qualified to carry out this kind of complicated and difficult directorship.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I made that statement because at one time I was a cosponsor of a measure and very sympathetic—and still am—to the idea of a joint committee or some other committee which legally would have responsibility for the supervision of the CIA. However, I am fearful that this body will not have an opportunity to pass upon that question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So the only question is on the qualifications of the appointee for the job.

Mr. McCARTHY. To exercise supervision over the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was very curious about the Senator's views on that subject.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct. The question is whether or not we think the appointee is qualified to direct the CIA as it is now constituted, as it now operates, and as it is likely to operate in the immediate future. I say that it would be impossible to find a man who had all the necessary qualifications. I should like to cite two or three considerations which I think Senators who are called upon to act upon the nomination need to consider.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I share the view, and perhaps the apprehension, of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. It is quite possible that the appointee of the President—in fact, the President himself—is not entirely satisfied with the past operation of the Central Intelligence Agency. If what I have said is true, I am sure that the able Senator from Minnesota does not wish to hang around the neck of Mr. McCone, whose appointment is the question before the Senate for discussion, any of the past possible sins or transgressions of the Central Intelligence Agency, I am sure he would be the first to agree that Mr. McCone has had no connection with them whatever.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Missouri has stated my position on that question correctly.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. To return to the point I was making, relating to the attempt to establish some general standards, I said that the man selected to head the Central Intelligence Agency should be aware of the great powers which are given to him. Since he may be called upon—and will certainly be called upon—to operate in an area in which the question of constitutionality and the question of right or wrong will sometimes be very difficult to determine, he should, if possible, be experienced in intelligence work. As I said, he should be a good administrator. He should be concerned with the methods and means by which he, his agents, and operators are seeking their goals in gathering information and in carrying out what has come to be called operations.

It is against those four or five general standards that we must make our decision with regard to the nominee. As I have indicated, I would not attempt to pass judgment with regard to the question of his experience in intelligence. In testimony before the committee it was indicated that Mr. McCone had little or no experience in that field. As I have said, there really are no clear standards to be applied by which he might be judged. We cannot say, "Here is a man who has been highly successful," as could have been said about Allen Dulles. In my judgment he should be a man who has taken a stand or at least who has views on some of the broad and complicated policy questions that have been known.

For my part, I would feel much more confident in passing on the appointment if there were a more extensive record of his views on these complicated questions. He has spoken very little, so on that point I could not make any recommendation. I would have to say that this factor is unknown.

So far as concerns the question of the constitutionality of some of the actions, either participated in by CIA, attributed to CIA, or perhaps only carried on by the State Department, I raised this question before the committee. I suggested that they might wish to ask certain questions of the nominee, and the questions were asked. I quote from a letter which Mr. McCone himself sent to the chairman of the committee in answer to a number of questions which I had raised and which in turn had been asked of him by the committee:

> Senator McCARTHY's third question asks for my views as to the authority for some of the actions attributed to the Central Intelligence Agency in the field of foreign affairs within recent years. Many events have been attributed to the Central Intelligence Agency over the years, and it would be impossible for me to have the facts on these matters, but I certainly do not accept that because they are attributed to the Central Ineligence Agency the Agency is responsible for them.

This charge was not made. This was not in the question I had suggested to the committee.

Mr. McCone continues:

> The Senator's question appears to go to the basic juridical or constitutional authorities of the executive branch, and this involves profound legal questions which, since I am not a lawyer, I do not feel competent to debate. It is my understanding, however, that the President has wide powers in the field of foreign relations and within the framework of the Constitution is empowered to do what he deems to be necessary to protect and promote the national interest. At the present time, in my opinion, the national interest is best served by taking steps to deter the encroachment of communism.

Does this mean that he would justify any step or any action, constitutional or extra-constitutional or unconstitutional in deterring communism?

I would not say that this is his position, but it is the statement that he made in answer to the letter:

> At the present time, in my opinion, the national interest is best served by taking steps to deter the encroachment of communism.

This is a fine, general statement of policy, but what is needed is some refinement and somewhat more specific statement with relation to the involvement of the Central Intelligence Agency, as has been charged in the press and in other places:

> As provided by law the Central Intelligence Agency operates under the direction of the National Security Council which is advisory to the President and of which he is Chairman and, therefore, it is but one of the arms in the complex of establishments which are involved in the President's conduct of foreign policy.

He went on to say that he intended to carry out to the best of his abilities all the duties assigned to him.

No full or pertinent answer, it seems to me, was made to the question of constitutionality. It may be that we should not expect the head of CIA to give such an answer, and perhaps it is an unreasonable demand or an unreasonable suggestion. However, it seems to me that he should have given some thought to it, or that when he is being considered for appointment we might properly ask of him this question as to what his opinion is with respect to the juridical basis for some of these actions. In this case his answer does not cover what I hoped he would cover in answer to this question.

My fourth question was:

> What is the nominee's judgment as to methods which can be justifiably used by the Central Intelligence Agency?

Mr. McCone replied:

> The very nature of the question is such that I believe I cannot respond to it, particularly in the light of the responsibility imposed upon me by law to assure the protection of intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure.

I can see that there would be need for secrecy. I did not have in mind that he should express an opinion on a specific situation. I had hoped that there might be some discussion of a theoretical situation, as to what methods he thought might be justifiable. We could raise a theoretical question with reference to stirring up a revolution behind the Iron Curtain when it had no opportunity of succeeding, even though the suppression of the revolution by the Russians would give us propaganda value in some other part of the world.

This is a rather gray area, I know, and one in which I did not expect him to answer specifically or give a specific moral judgment or make a fine ethical distinction. However, this is an area in which a decision must be made, without attempting to apply a theoretical situation to a particular case. It may be that Mr. McCone would be willing to carry on such a discussion in private, but judging from what he said I cannot be sure of that.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. As I understand the question asked of the appointee by the able Senator from Minnesota, it was as to what were his views as to the authority for some of the actions attributed to the Central Intelligence Agency in the field of foreign affairs within recent years. If I were asked the question, I would not know how to answer it.

The Central Intelligence Agency has been identified as almost entirely responsible for the Cuban situation. Based on the record to which I listened carefully, and which, as the Senator knows, some Members discussed on the floor, I can not agree.

This is a very delicate field. I approach it with caution, even in commenting that much.

The next question the Senator asked of the nominee was as to the methods which can be justifiably used by the Central Intelligence Agency.

I do not see how the head of what is known to be a covert, as well as an overt agency, and which has been set up on that basis to protect the freedom of this country, could possibly answer that question.

As the Senator from Minnesota knows, I have great respect for his opinion. However, let me read that question again.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, what was that question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. It is question No. 4.

This would involve such matters as whether a member of a foreign service could be influenced in any way. I can think of many other matters, and so can you other Senators. I just do not understand how a man could answer that question?

He knows the nature of the oath he takes when he takes the office, as he has twice in the past. I ask the Senator from Minnesota to give consideration, if he were nominated for this position, to what his answer would have been to this question:

> What is the nominee's judgment as to methods which can be justifiably used by the Central Intelligence Agency?

The Senator, realizing, of course, that this nominee would report to the President of the United States.

Mr. McCARTHY. Well, I did not expect the nominee to give an answer in terms of every specific and possible action that might be taken. However, some time ago Mr. C. D. Jackson made a speech in which he said, as I recall the quotation, that we should proceed as fanatics, with no holds barred and no questions asked.

If this had been the nominee's answer I would have had to say that here is a person who is insensitive to the question of methods. We must be very careful not to attempt to justify the use of any methods or any means because we feel our objective is good in the matter of communism or fascism. I would expect him to make a statement in which he would make a distinction between right and wrong, even in this difficult area in which the Agency must operate. I did not expect him to make a particular, fine judgment. However, it was not unreasonable to expect a man to indicate at least the framework of principle or pattern of principle within which he would attempt to make this hard and difficult judgment or recommendation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I believe Mr. C. D. Jackson, to whom the able Senator has referred, is the publisher of a well-known magazine, and has been out of the Government for years.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Has that anything to do with Mr. McCone?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Missouri asked me to give an example of the kind of answer that I would make in the circumstances. I said that this is the kind of answer, if it had been given to us, would, in my opinion, have been completely unsatisfactory. The Senator asked me what kind of answer I might have given to that question. I cited all this as an example. I do not say it is Mr. McCone's approach. It is not my approach. I do not believe even that it is really the approach of Mr. C. D. Jackson.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator did not read the last sentence in the fifth paragraph of the statement of Mr. McCone, incident to that question. Was there any reason for not doing so?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think so. I thought I had read it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If I am incorrect, I apologize.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think I made reference to it. I may not have completed reading it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. May I read it?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. I do not think it is really pertinent. I have no question that Mr. McCone would not knowingly violate his oath of office. The statement really does not relate to my question, because I do not expect that he would even have had to say this in answer to me. However, I should like to have the statement complete in the Record. As a matter of fact, if I may have unanimous consent to do so, I should like to have the entire letter printed at this point in the Record.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator. I was about to make the same request.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Central Intelligence Agency,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1962.

Hon. Richard B. Russell,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Russell: I am happy to respond at the Armed Services Committee's request to the statement Senator Eugene J. McCarthy made on January 18, 1962, at the opening of the committee's hearings on my nomination to the position of Director of Central Intelligence. I shall respond directly to the specific questions posed by Senator McCarthy at the end of his statement, but as other portions of the statement were considered during the hearings I shall also set forth my position in regard to them.

The first question asked if the Central Intelligence Agency is to be reorganized and if so in what respects. I have been and I am studying the organization of the Agency very intently. The present pattern of organization of the Agency is the result of years of study by competent people, both within the Government and outside consultants, and in my opinion it is not a bad pattern of organization. However, I believe that in all departments of the Government there is an evolution in management procedures and opportunity for improvement, so I think that some changes will be indicated in the Agency organization. I would propose to discuss any important changes with our congressional subcommittees.

During the hearings before your committee I read into the record a letter from the President concerning the scope of the responsibilities he has asked me to assume, and the President stated therein that he would expect me to delegate to a principal deputy as I may deem necessary so much of the direction of the detailed operation of the Agency as may be required to permit me to carry out the primary task of the Director of Central Intelligence. This, of course, I intend to do, and while I will have overall responsibility for the Agency, I am studying what delegations of authority should be made to the Deputy Director of Central Intelligence.

Senator McCarthy's second question asked what bearing such changes would have upon the duties of the head of the Central Intelligence Agency and upon the operation of the Agency. Any changes made in Agency organization will have no bearing on the duties of the Director of Central Intelligence, the scope of whose responsibilities is set forth in the Presidential letter mentioned above. The authority of the Director has been neither enhanced nor diluted, and I believe the purpose of the President's directive is to make clear that the Director of Central Intelligence is his principal intelligence officer to exercise the dual role set forth in the law, to be responsible for the direction of the Central Intelligence Agency itself, and to assure the coordination of the intelligence community as a whole. The one change that has been made is in connection with the coordination function. The Director of Central Intelligence is Chairman of the U.S. Intelligence Board, which is composed of the heads of all the intelligence components of the Government, and I have placed the Deputy Director of Central Intelligence on that Board to represent the views of the Central Intelligence Agency in connection with any matters considered by the Board. It appeared to me that if I served as Chairman and as such as the President's representative and the Deputy as the Agency's representative was the advocate of the Agency's viewpoints, I would be in a position to take a more objective point of view. This new arrangement was approved by the President in the letter referred to above.

Senator McCarthy's third question asks for my views as to the authority for some of the actions attributed to the Central Intelligence Agency in the field of foreign affairs within recent years. Many events have been attributed to the Central Intelligence Agency over the years, and it would be impossible or me to have the facts on these matters, but I certainly do not accept that because they are attributed to the Central Intelligence Agency the Agency is responsible for them. The Senator's question appears to go to the basic juridical or constitutional authorities of the executive branch, and this involves profound legal questions which, since I am not a lawyer, I do not feel competent to debate.

It is my understanding, however, that the President has wide powers in the field of foreign relations and within the framework of the Constitution is empowered to do what he deems to be necessary to protect and promote the national interest At the present time, in my opinion, the national interest is best served by taking steps to deter the encroachment of communism. As provided by law the Central Intelligence Agency operates under the direction of the National Security Council which is advisory to the President and of which he is Chairman and, therefore, it is but one of the arms in the complex of establishments which are involved in the President's conduct of foreign policy. I intend to carry out to the best of my ability all duties assigned, and I must assume that no such assignment would cause me to violate my oath of office to support and defend the Constitution.

Senator McCarthy's fourth question concerns my judgment as to methods which can be justifiably used by the Central Intelligence Agency. The very nature of the question is such that I believe I cannot respond to it, particularly in the light of the responsibility imposed upon me by law to assure the protection of intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure.

Senator McCarthy's fifth question was to the extent of my involvement, if any, in what had been described or reported as "leaks" from the Atomic Energy Commission with reference to the moratorium on nuclear testing. I know of no instance where I personally or any of the Commissioners were charged by anyone with leaking anything either on this subject or any other subject of a classified nature. There were leaks in this area, but there were none that were attributed to the Atomic Energy Commission.

Senator McCarthy's sixth question inquired as to the facts with regard to the charge that I attempted to have scientists fired at the California Institute of Technology. Ten scientists at Cal Tech signed a statement concerning suspension of nuclear testing. I differed strongly with their position and felt that the manner in which the statement came out tended to imply that it was an official Cal Tech position. I wrote my letter stating my strong disagreement to 1 of the 19 scientists directly, Dr. Thomas Lauritsen. To the best of my recollection I did not send copies of this letter to the university or officials thereof, and the file carbon which I retained does not indicate any distribution. I would be less than candid if I did not say that my views concerning this matter were known to many people. However, I did not officially or unofficially request the dismissal of any or all of the scientists by the institute, and none were dismissed as a result of any action by me.

The general thrust of Senator McCarthy's statement was the need for greater congressional supervision of the Central Intelligence Agency, and early in his statement he said there is no regular or normal procedure in existence or in use today by which committees of the Congress are consulted or informed of the Central Intelligence Agency's activities. There are, of course, subcommittees of the Armed Services Committees of both the Senate and the House, constituted as CIA subcommittees, and there are subcommittees of the Appropriations Committees of both the Senate and the House, constituted to consider the Central Intelligence Agency's appropriations matters. The Central Intelligence Agency has been at all times responsive to the calls of these subcommittees and in addition has brought to their attention matters the Agency felt should properly be considered by them. I will continue this policy and this relationship with these subcommittees.

Senator McCarthy's statement quoted a comment by Hanson Baldwin that intelligence is too important to be left to the unsupervised. In addition to the relationship with the subcommittees of the Congress set forth above, the Agency reports to the National Security Council and is subject to direction by the National Security Council. There are precise interdepartmental arrangements for consideration of certain of the Agency's activities so that the President and the Secretaries of State and Defense can apply policy guidance and be adequately informed.

Senator McCarthy also sets forth a quotation from Walter Lippmann stating that the Central Intelligence Agency has been much too often an original source of American foreign policy. I do not consider that the Director of Central Intelligence is a policymaking position. The chief function of the Agency is to obtain all possible facts from all sources and after proper evaluation disseminate them to the President and other appropriate policymakers. I might be asked my personal views, and if so I would feel free to give them, but do not conceive that it is proper for the Director of Central Intelligence to volunteer in regard to questions concerning the national policy. Within the intelligence structure there are, of course, from time to time, policy questions concerning organization or methods, but these are not related and therefore must be clearly differentiated from matters of national policy and are settled internally through the mechanism of the U.S. Intelligence Board.

I trust the foregoing will serve the needs of the committee.

Yours very truly,

John A. McCone,
Director.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Minnesota has raised the question of the constitutionality of actions, and so forth. I have been looking up the law. I believe that chapter 343 of the Acts of the 80th Congress, section 102(a), beginning on page 497, is still the present law regarding the Central Intelligence Agency. I wish to call attention to subparagraph (d) of section 102, which defines its duties. If the Senator from Minnesota will permit me to do so, I should like to read the five duties.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should be glad to have the Senator from Massachusetts do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I read as follows:

> (d) For the purpose of coordinating the intelligence activities of the several Government departments and agencies in the interest of national security, it shall be the duty of the Agency, under the direction of the National Security Council—
>
> (1) to advise the National Security Council in matters concerning such intelligence activities of the Government departments and agencies as relate to national security;
>
> (2) to make recommendations to the National Security Council for the coordination of such intelligence activities of the departments and agencies of the Government as relate to the national security;
>
> (3) to correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to the national security, and provide for the appropriate dissemination of such intelligence within the Government using where appropriate existing agencies and facilities: *Provided*, That the Agency shall have no police, subpena, law-enforcement powers, or internal-security functions: *Provided further*, That the departments and other agencies of the Government shall continue to collect, evaluate, correlate, and disseminate departmental intelligence: *And provided further*, That the Director of Central Intelligence shall be responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure;
>
> (4) to perform, for the benefit of the existing intelligence agencies, such additional services of common concern as the National Security Council determines can be more efficiently accomplished centrally;
>
> (5) to perform such other functions and duties related to intelligence affecting the national security as the National Security Council may from time to time direct.

I call especial attention to subparagraph (5):

> (5) to perform such other functions and duties related to intelligence affecting the

> **national security as the National Security Council may from time to time direct.**

That would put the CIA directly under the National Security Council, to perform whatever actions the National Security Council asked the CIA to do, as I interpret that sentence.

Mr. McCARTHY. Of course, the question of constitutionality would arise so as to determine whether the CIA performed duties which the National Security Council had not directed, and also whether the National Security Council may have directed things which were extra-constitutional, and in which the proper participation of Congress itself was not provided for. So it is a basic question of the involvment of Congress and its participation in decisions, some of which I think, under the Constitution, were not intended that Congress be involved, and that this question would still run through the State Department, the National Security Council, and the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Secretary of State himself is a member of the National Security Council. Certainly we would hope the President would not authorize, through the National Security Council, anything to be done that was not constitutional.

Mr. McCARTHY. Perhaps we should ask for representation from Congress on the National Security Council. This might be an alternative to a joint committee on intelligence.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think that matter has been discussed in the past and decided in the negative.

Mr. McCARTHY. Conditions change. I think it was Edmund Burke who said that for every political decision or situation, the number of factors involved is infinite; therefore, the number of decisions that might be right is also infinite.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. First, I desire to congratulate the Senator from Minnesota for his discussion this afternoon. I think the issues he has raised and the questions he has propounded ought to have been raised and propounded. While it is true that he—and, for that matter, all the rest of us—must, because of the very nature of the Agency which is the subject of the discussion, proceed, as it were, through the dark, darkly, yet he has brought out here points which I think will, in the long run, result in an improved functioning of the CIA. For that reason, if for no other, the country is indebted to the junior Senator from Minnesota.

I was very favorably impressed by the statement Mr. McCone made before the Committee on Armed Services, not once, but two or more times, in response to questions; namely, that he does not believe it to be the duty of the CIA to formulate policy. His description of the purpose of that organization is, as I recall his thinking about it, to collect intelligence and data. That seems to me to be vitally important. If rumors are to be believed, that has not always been true in the past.

My understanding of the situation is that foreign policy is to be conducted by the President, with advice and guidance coming principally from the Department of State, and that the contributions of the Central Intelligence Agency are to be made in the supplying of intelligence information upon which those decisions can, as we hope, be properly made. But if there are two or sometimes, as is rumored, more organizations, especially in areas abroad, where we seek to influence people and governments, setting out different policies and guidelines, only confusion and sometimes chaos will result.

That is why I was especially pleased to hear Mr. McCone define the chief purpose, as is revealed in the printed hearings on his nomination, of the CIA as being a gatherer of facts.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from Alaska for his comments.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It is somewhat academic, but I think there is merit in the suggestion of the Senator from Minnesota for congressional representation on the National Security Council. At one time a distinguished former Member of this body, the Honorable James W. Wadsworth, introduced a bill to that effect. It had to do with making the Vice President a statutory member of the National Security Council. The proposal was opposed by the administration at that time, because it was considered that the Vice President was a member of the legislative branch, not the executive branch.

But I think there is merit in the idea, and I hope that at sometime the able Senator from Minnesota will develop any further thoughts he may have on that.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

On this point I think it important that Senators give attention to the entire matter of procedure. I think that sometimes we believe democracy is self-operating and that we do not need to worry very much about it or about what the channels are and what the juridical basis is, and we are inclined to believe that it will take care of itself. I was not a supporter of the famous Bricker amendment; but I do not think the only question involved was isolationism, because there were also questions of the authority of Congress and the involvement of Congress in some of the decisions. So I think we should give attention to this problem, not only in regard to the CIA and foreign problems, but also in regard to matters in domestic fields.

Mr. President, I have only one more related set of remarks to make. These have to do, not with this particular case, but with the entire function of the Senate in its role in acting on nominations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Minnesota has made a learned presentation in regard to the CIA and supervision of it by the Congress, and other related matters. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Minnesota opposes confirmation of the pending nomination; or is he raising questions now because he believes this is the proper time to raise questions in regard to this subject, when the question of confirmation of a nomination is before the Senate?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts that several other Members have been concerned about some other related problems, and I should like to hear them express their views. But it is my feeling that whereas I would not say the nomination of Mr. McCone should be rejected on the basis of any one of the specific points which have been made against confirmation of his nomination, yet the total pattern or configuration is such that if it were for me to make the decision about confirmation of his nomination or rejection of his nomination, I would have to vote "No." So unless I am persuaded otherwise in the course of time—and of course, as Edmund Burke said, little time remains, for we must vote on this question the day after tomorrow, Wednesday, and even though I do not think many Members would base their decision on my declaration of position, yet I would have to say that as of now I am not prepared to vote in favor of confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Whereas I agree on many subjects with the Senator from Minnesota, let me say very fervently and categorically that I disagree with him on this one, and I shall vote in favor of confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. McCARTHY. In view of the Senator's previous remarks, I assumed that he was likely to reach that conclusion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on this point, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. A moment ago I thought the Senator from Minnesota would proceed to discuss the affirmative reasons which had been advanced in regard to the question of confirmation of this nomination. Do I correctly understand that the Senator has completed that part of his presentation?

Mr. McCARTHY. I thought that by indirection I had made those points. Certainly I do not dispute some of the claims made for the nominee or about his fine record, as pointed out by the Senator from Missouri. I can only say that I have in mind a different point.

As regards the administrative experience of the nominee, I am not in a position to challenge, or at least I am not inclined to challenge, any of those statements.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Minnesota has said he has no knowledge of the nominee's views in regard to matters of foreign policy?

Mr. McCARTHY. I say that I am not informed in regard to his position on many matters of complicated and difficult foreign policy, and this is information which I should like to have.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did the Senator ask questions of the nominee himself on this subject?

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not. I said that I should like to have the committee ask questions on that. But I think the procedure in the committee is not to have other Senators ask questions there. Is that correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Armed Services Committee was very glad to have the Senator from Minnesota submit questions. The Senator from Arkansas has brought up a pertinent point, because the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee permitted questions in any detail the Senator from Minnesota wanted to ask them. Some are part of the record, beginning with page 32, listed from 1 to 6. The answers were given by Mr. McCone in the letter which members of the committee received; and it is now part of the hearing record.

I would say, with great respect to the Senator from Minnesota, that if there were any specific questions for the purpose of challenging the nominee's capacity in this field, and his knowledge of foreign policy—which, as the Senator knows, is reasonably extensive, based on positions he has held in the past—inasmuch as the Senator from Minnesota has now declared his intention to vote against confirmation of the nomination, I would have hoped the questions would have been asked of the nominee at the committee hearing, so that before the Senator from Minnesota took the floor he would have had answers to any questions he cared to ask.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall yield in just a moment.

First, let me say that the questions to which the Senator from Missouri refers were included in my statement and were suggested to the Armed Services Committee as relating to an area about which they might wish to ask questions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what I wished to ask about. Did any member of the Armed Services Committee question the nominee in regard to this aspect of foreign relations?

Mr. McCARTHY. So far as I know, there were no questions there in regard to matters which can be defined as matters of foreign policy or relating to foreign problems.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not the Senator think it is rather unusual that the committee did not ask questions about such matters, which are of primary concern to it?

Mr. McCARTHY. I had hoped they would, because the public record is very scanty.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Minnesota is not a member of that committee; is he?

Mr. McCARTHY. No, I am not a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So the record does not show that any member of the Armed Services Committee asked about these matters; does it? I am asking the Senator that question.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; not in what I consider a sufficient way to go into such complicated matters.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to refer the Senator from Minnesota to the committee hearings at the top of page 42. From that page I quote the following statement by Mr. McCone:

> As I said, from the standpoint of my competence in office, it is my responsibility to report facts, and, furthermore, I think I should avoid, so far as possible, being drawn in on a personal basis into any policy discussions because that, to an extent, may have some effect on what people, the validity that people might attach to the facts.
>
> However, I would expect that because of the various areas of activity that I have had in Government in the past, that maybe my personal opinion may be asked on some subjects. But in my role as Director of Central Intelligence, it would be beyond my competence to deal with policy.

That was brought out at least two or three times during the discussion; and certainly in the past the former Director, Mr. Dulles, said clearly that he had never expressed himself on matters of policy. He said it was his duty to obtain the facts and to give them to the policymakers, who are the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and so forth.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator believe a nominee to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency can properly testify before a congressional committee, in open session, his views with respect to matters relating to his programs and policies, as he views them in regard to our intelligence activities in the various foreign countries?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know that it would have been necessary for him to discuss all of these in open committee sessions. I would not have been opposed to having the committee hold some executive sessions or limited sessions, if need be. But to satisfy myself, at least, I should have liked to have had a knowledge of his stand on some of these issues with which the Central Intelligence Agency will have to deal.

I think this raises a rather serious question in regard to what is the real role of the Senate in regard to acting on the question of confirming Presidential nominations—for instance whether the Senate is to take the position that the point of view of the nominee has no relationship to the question of confirmation, and should not be inquired into.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In open session——

Mr. McCARTHY. If so, that limits the role of the Senate to checking and ascertaining whether the nominee is honest, and whether he has FBI clearance, and perhaps whether under certain conditions he has a health certificate. In that event it could be said there is no need for the Senate to inquire into these other areas.

There is no need to hold extensive hearings, in my opinion, for important decisions to cover these three points; but, traditionally, the Senate has looked into the matter of the point of view of a nominee. Let us take the Secretary of State. It may be pointed out that he simply is the instrument and agent of the President, so why should we ask him what his policies are? It could be said that this man is purely the representative of the Executive.

With respect to the appointment of a former Secretary of Agriculture, we Democrats went into that question extensively with respect to Ezra Taft Benson. Why did we not then say that he had nothing to do with policy; that he was simply the channel, the instrument, and was pure and undefiled? We raised the question of point of view and policies in many other areas that are not as important as they are in the determination of policies of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I say, just as emphatically as I can, from my knowledge of CIA and its activities over the years, that if Mr. McCone had made a statement on policy questions and had said, "I believe that this is the wrong policy, and this is the right policy," it would have affected my opinion very materially as to whether he was the right man for this kind of position to which he has been appointed. His job is not to express policy positions, but to get facts on which the policymakers can act. If they do not have the facts so they can do a job, he should get more facts or resign, or be asked to resign because he is not doing his job of getting the facts.

I say that most respectfully to the Senator from Minnesota, because in this instance it is distinctly against the nominee's qualifications for the position for one chosen to express himself on policies of the Government. That is my understanding of the situation.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think if we could be sure that he was going to be completely neutralized from now on, it might be the ideal. If he replied that he had no views or has had no views on policy problems that have been before us, it would be another matter. But I do not think the Senator would argue that Mr. McCone is a man who has no views or has had no views, so it is a matter of some significance to know what they are or have been. We can move from that point to determine whether or not he would let those views affect what he might do as the head of the Central Intelligence Agency. I say we would not accept a man as head of the Rural Electrification Administration and say we did not care what his views are. The Senate would not respond to that kind of appeal. I recognize that these remarks would not apply to the head of this Agency as they would to the head of the REA; but, in terms of procedure, I would be opposed to a man who had expressed certain views on the questions of policy in a field in which he was going to be active, because, in the formal sense, he would be expected to carry out the laws of Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Foreign Relations Committee did not ask a new Secretary of State for his ideas and position and feelings on foreign affairs matters, I think it would be derelict in its duty. That would be true with respect to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with respect to one's agricultural policies. But in this case it is not, I repeat, a policymaking job; this is an effort to find a man who is capable of getting the facts, administering the Department, picking out good men to work under him, so that they can get the facts and give those facts to the President, the National Security Council, and, when asked, to the Congress.

Mr. McCARTHY. The record shows that this Agency has been a policymaking one and has had a great influence on policy. If such complete neutralism could be achieved, I think the Senator's case could be made. I was going to conclude with a statement which is really an answer to the question the Senator raised earlier. In this case the whole somehow is greater than the sum of its parts, and I am inclined to oppose the nomination.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Minnesota had an interview with Mr. McCone, did he not?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. At the Senator's request?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think it was at his request.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Did the Senator find Mr. McCone evasive?

Mr. McCARTHY. No. I think he answered essentially in the same way he answered before the committee and in the letter which he subsequently sent to the committee when the committee suggested—I do not know whether it was a suggestion or not—that he answer in response to my question, which the committee presented to him.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The only reason I mention this conference is because of a discussion before the committee. I had felt the Senator from Minnesota was stating Mr. McCone attempted to discharge these professors.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have not raised that question here today.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I know the Senator has not. I am raising it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have made no point about evasiveness with respect to any question.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I asked the Senator that question because I wanted it clear in the RECORD that he had not requested the discharge of these men and none were discharged.

Mr. McCARTHY. Insofar as I know, what the nominee said in answer to the various questions, not only in that hearing, but before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, presented a picture of one in whom there was no evasion or misrepresentation of fact.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. There may be a few side facts that may not have been presented, but, so far as questions went in that field, I would not say he has not completed the record.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I brought that question up because the question was asked. Are there any fields in which the Senator believes the nominee was evasive?

Mr. McCARTHY. At present, no. It is not a question of evasiveness. I have made no charge of evasiveness, but I raised some questions which had been raised, to which satisfactory answers were given in the hearings, and in part raised them here because they deserved special consideration in reference to facts in controversy with respect to the head of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

In the record the Senator from South Dakota asked the nominee about his position; whether he was a policymaker; and he said "No." I am sure it was the feeling of his predecessor that he should not be a policymaker.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks two documents, one a letter from John A. McCone addressed to the Honorable RICHARD B. RUSSELL, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, dated January 19, and an article entitled "The Secret Mission in an Open Society," by Harry Howe Ransom. At the time the latter article was written Mr. Ransom was on the faculty of Harvard, if I may correct my earlier statement. He has since moved from Harvard.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1962.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: I am happy to respond at the Armed Services Committee's request to the statement Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY made on January 18, 1962, at the opening of the committee's hearings on my nomination to the position of Director of Central Intelligence. I shall respond directly to the specific questions posed by Senator MCCARTHY at the end of his statement, but as other portions of the statement were considered during the hearings I shall also set forth my position in regard to them.

The first question asked if the Central Intelligence Agency is to be reorganized and if so in what respects. I have been and I am studying the organization of the Agency very intently. The present pattern of organization of the Agency is the result of years of study by competent people, both within the Government and outside consultants, and in my opinion it is not a bad pattern of organization. However, I believe that in all departments of the Government there is an evolution in management procedures and opportunity for improvement so I think that some changes will be indicated in the agency organization. I would propose to discuss any important changes with our congressional subcommittees.

During the hearings before your committee I read into the record a letter from the President concerning the scope of the responsibilities he has asked me to assume, and the President stated therein that he would expect me to delegate to a principal deputy as I may deem necessary so much of the direction of the detailed operation of the Agency as may be required to permit me to carry out the primary task of the Director of Central Intelligence. This, of course, I intend to do and while I will have overall responsibility for the Agency, I am studying what delegations of authority should be made to the Deputy Director of Central Intelligence.

Senator MCCARTHY's second question asked what bearing such changes would have upon the duties of the head of the Central Intelligence Agency and upon the operation of the Agency. Any changes made in Agency organization will have no bearing on the duties of the Director of Central Intelligence, the scope of whose responsibilities is set forth in the Presidential letter mentioned above. The authority of the Director has been neither enhanced nor diluted, and I believe the purpose of the President's directive is to make clear that the Director of Central Intelligence is his principal intelligence officer to exercise the dual role set forth in the law, to be responsible for the direction of the Central Intelligence Agency itself, and to assure the coordination of the intelligence community as a whole. The one change that has been made is in connection with the coordination function. The Director of Central Intelligence is Chairman of the U.S. Intelligence Board, which is composed of the heads of all the intelligence components of the Government, and I have placed the Deputy Director of Central Intelligence on that Board to represent the views of the Central Intelligence Agency in connection with any matters considered by the Board. It appeared to me that if I served as Chairman and as such as the President's representative and the Deputy as the Agency's representative was the advocate of the Agency's viewpoint, I would be in a position to take a more objective point of view. This new arrangement was approved by the President in the letter referred to above.

Senator MCCARTHY's third question asks for my views as to the authority for some of the actions attributed to the Central Intelligence Agency in the field of foreign affairs within recent years. Many events have been attributed to the Central Intelligence Agency over the years, and it would be impossible for me to have the facts on these matters, but I certainly do not accept that because they are attributed to the Central Intelligence Agency the Agency is responsible for them. The Senator's question appears to go to the basic juridical or constitutional authorities of the executive branch, and this involves profound legal questions which, since I am not a lawyer, I do not feel competent to debate. It is my understanding, however, that the President has wide powers in the field of foreign relations and within the framework of the Constitution is empowered to do what he deems to be necessary to protect and promote the national interest. At the present time, in my opinion, the national interest is best served by taking steps to deter the encroachment of communism. As provided by law the Central Intelligence Agency operates under the direction of the National Security Council, which is advisory to the President and of which he is Chairman and, therefore, it is but one of the arms in the complex of establishments which are involved in the President's conduct of foreign policy. I intend to carry out, to the best of my ability, all duties assigned, and I must assume that no such assignment would cause me to violate my oath of office to support and defend the Constitution.

Senator McCarthy's fourth question concerns my judgment as to methods which can be justifiably used by the Central Intelligence Agency. The very nature of the question is such that I believe I cannot respond to it, particularly in the light of the responsibility imposed upon me by law to assure the protection of intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure.

Senator McCarthy's fifth question was to the extent of my involvement, if any, in what had been described or reported as leaks from the Atomic Energy Commission with reference to the moratorium on nuclear testing. I know of no instance where I personally or any of the Commissioners were charged by anyone with leaking anything either on this subject or any other subject of a classified nature. There were leaks in this area, but there were none that were attributed to the Atomic Energy Commission.

Senator McCarthy's sixth question inquired as to the facts with regard to the charge that I attempted to have scientists fired at the California Institute of Technology. Ten scientists at Cal Tech signed a statement concerning suspension of nuclear testing. I differed strongly with their position and felt that the manner in which the statement came out tended to imply that it was an official Cal Tech position. I wrote my letter stating my strong disagreement to one of the 10 scientists directly, Dr. Thomas Lauritsen. To the best of my recollection I did not send copies of this letter to the university or officials thereof, and the file carbon which I retained does not indicate any distribution. I would be less than candid if I did not say that my views concerning this matter were known to many people. However, I did not officially or unofficially request the dismissal of any or all of the scientists by the institute, and none were dismissed as a result of any action by me.

The general thrust of Senator McCarthy's statement was the need for greater congressional supervision of the Central Intelligence Agency, and early in his statement he said there is no regular or normal procedure in existence or in use today by which committees of the Congress are consulted or informed of the Central Intelligence Agency's activities. There are, of course, subcommittees of the Armed Services Committees of both the Senate and the House, constituted as CIA Subcommittees, and there are subcommittees of the Appropriations Committees of both the Senate and the House, constituted to consider the Central Intelligence Agency's appropriations matters. The Central Intelligence Agency has been at all times responsive to the calls of these subcommittees and in addition has brought to their attention matters the Agency felt should properly be considered by them. I will continue this policy and this relationship with these subcommittees.

Senator McCarthy's statement quoted a comment by Hanson Baldwin that intelligence is too important to be left to the unsupervised. In addition to the relationship with the subcommittees of the Congress set forth above, the Agency reports to the National Security Council and is subject to direction by the National Security Council. There are precise interdepartmental arrangements for consideration of certain of the Agency's activities so that the President and the Secretaries of State and Defense can apply policy guidance and be adequately informed.

Senator McCarthy also sets forth a quotation from Walter Lippmann stating that the Central Intelligence Agency has been much too often an original source of American foreign policy. I do not consider that the Director of Central Intelligence is a policymaking position. The chief function of the Agency is to obtain all possible facts from all sources and after proper evaluation disseminate them to the President and other appropriate policymakers. I might be asked my personal views, and if so I would feel free to give them but do not conceive that it is proper for the Director of Central Intelligence to volunteer in regard to questions concerning the national policy. Within the intelligence structure there are, of course, from time to time policy questions concerning organization or methods, but these are not related and, therefore, must be clearly differentiated from matters of national policy and are settled internally through the mechanism of the U.S. Intelligence Board.

I trust the foregoing will serve the needs of the committee.

Yours very truly,

John A. McCone,
Director.

Secret Mission in an Open Society

(By Harry Howe Ransom)

Silence is the golden word of intelligence. Recent events, however, have trumpeted U.S. foreign intelligence activities at full volume and high fidelity for all the world to hear. What has come through is disturbing.

The Central Intelligence Agency's misfortunes have engendered the publicity which an efficient intelligence system always seeks to avoid. The fact that disclosures have been made in itself represents a failure. The nature of the disclosures raises troublesome issues, but the central question in the current White House and Capitol Hill investigations is, What is the role of the secret intelligence apparatus in a democracy?

Few would deny the necessity of intelligence activities. After the American U-2 aircraft was downed in Russia last year, President Eisenhower publicly confessed to the world that the United States—pursuant to authority granted in the National Security Act of 1947—seeks intelligence in every feasible way. The espionage side of this activity he described as a distasteful but vital necessity for security against surprise attack and for effective defense planning.

The Cuban fiasco, however, has revealed in unprecedented detail another side of CIA activities—clandestine political operations designed to subvert an unfriendly government.

Central Intelligence today has three principal functions: Intelligence collection, its analysis and communication to policymakers, and clandestine foreign political operations. The increasing necessity of these activities is attributable to three major reasons.

From earliest times, an intelligence apparatus has been an indispensable part of the paraphernalia of a great world power. The worldwide responsibilities of the United States today require both a system for keeping the complex details of world politics under constant surveillance and an instrument for secret foreign political action.

A second reason is that national policy decisions are based, increasingly, upon predictions of foreign political, economic, and military developments 5 to 10 years hence. This fact is a consequence of the long leadtime in developing weapons systems and of the need to make economical use of finite resources to implement long-range foreign policy objectives.

Consequently, an intelligence system today is asked an incredibly wide range of urgent questions, answers to which can be obtained sometimes only by devious methods. When will Communist China test an atomic device? What future has the economic integration of Europe? How stable is the Government of South Vietnam? What course will Sino-Soviet relations take?

A third reason derives from modern military technological developments. Intelligence, it often is said, has become the first line of defense. Accurate and rapidly transmitted information is an absoluate requirement for an effective strategy of deterrence. Strategic striking forces must have an accurate dossier of potential enemy targets. And essential elements of information always must be available to thwart an enemy's possible surprise knockout blow.

Much of such information is held in tightest security by the Iron Curtain countries, requiring a systematic effort to ferret it out. Similar information is freely available to the Communists from our open society.

Americans have not flinched at espionage or underground political action in wartime. A favorite national hero is Nathan Hale, who spied in the American Revolutionary cause. In World War II, the Office of Strategic Services was, deservedly or not, considered most romantic.

Short of declared war, however, secret operations are widely regarded as a dirty business, unfitting America's open, democratic—and formerly isolationist—society. Events of recent years have, nonetheless, revealed to the public at least the top of the iceberg of a vast secret intelligence program.

Distasteful or not, secret operations have become a major underground front of the cold war. The accelerating pace of cold warfare in Laos, South Vietnam, Thailand, the Congo, Latin America and elsewhere increases the pressure for greater American involvement in the secret black arts.

One's attitude toward these activities will depend, finally, upon one's assessment of contemporary international politics and of the requirements for the common defense. President Kennedy recently declared that the cold war has reached such a stage that "no war ever posed a greater threat to our security." If they take that as a valid assessment, most Americans will assume, although doubtless with misgivings, a wartime attitude toward secret operations.

Whatever one's view, the existence of a secret bureaucracy poses special problems in the American system of government. Knowledge is power. Secret knowledge is secret power. A secret apparatus, claiming superior knowledge and operating outside the normal checkreins of American democracy is a source of invisible government.

The American democratic system, however, is based upon the concept of visible, identifiable power, subject to constitutional checks and balances. One important check is the citizen's right to know what his Government is doing. Another is the existence of a free press to inform him.

How, then, can the controls of a democratic system be imposed upon the intelligence system while maintaining the secrecy required for its successful operation? Secret operations must remain immune from some of the normal checks, especially publicity. Heavy dependence must be placed upon politically responsible officials to exercise control.

In a parliamentary democracy, such as Great Britain, the problem is less acute. The difference is attributable to four factors.

First, Britain has been a world power for several centuries. Over the years a degree of confidence in the professionalism of secret operations has developed.

Second, parliamentary government unifies executive and legislative responsibility under majority-party leadership. When Ministers are also Members of Parliament, responsibility for management of secret functions is reinforced.

A third mitigating factor is "the Establishment." That political leaders, intelligence chiefs and lords of the press often have common social ties facilitates consensus on necessary secrecy.

Fourth, the existence of the Official Secrets Act inhibits the publication of secret information by imposing legal sanctions on the press. Additionally, a special Government press arrangement exists under which British editors are sometimes asked upon receipt of Government defense notices, to refrain voluntarily from publishing specified sensitive information.

British intelligence services, too, are so organized that secret political operations overseas are entirely separate from political and military intelligence functions. An agency for secret operations is supervised by a special cabinet subcommittee. The point is that all are under firm political authority.

Totalitarian regimes, with their absolute control of the press, suppression of opposition and centralized government, have few of the problems of disclosure and control experienced by open societies. The Soviet Union is thought to possess the largest intelligence system in the world; its existence is never avowed by Communist leaders.

Even in dictatorships, however, problems exist. The interpretation of foreign intelligence doubtless is often distorted by the rigid ideology. And it is also a fact of history that the secret intelligence apparatus often has been a vehicle for internal political conspiracy. Invisible power is a potential threat to constituted authority whatever the form of government.

Aware of the danger of secret power within government, the President and Congress have attempted to surround the CIA and related secret apparatuses with controls. These are designed to reconcile the conflicting requirements of secrecy and of democratic control.

The first of these mechanisms derives from the fact that the CIA's functions are specified, broadly, by Federal statute, defining the agency as an instrument of the Presidency. The CIA's operational guidelines are some 2 dozen codified National Security Council intelligence directives, approved by the President. Action such as the U-2 flights and the Cuban expedition must be approved specifically by the President. In the past he has had the advice on such matters of a special NSC Subcommittee on Clandestine Operations.

A second potential check has been the President's eight-man Board of Consultants on Foreign Intelligence Activities. This was established early in 1956, after a Hoover Commission study expressed concern about the possibility of the growth of license and abuses of power where disclosures of costs, organization, personnel and functions are precluded by law.

The first chairman of this group, composed largely of distinguished industrialists and former armed-services officers, was James R. Killian Jr., then president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. President Kennedy recently reappointed Dr. Killian to the chairmanship of a reconstituted board after a 2-year interval in which Gen. John E. Hull, retired Army officer, presided.

While the CIA's huge annual budget—estimated at more than half a billion dollars—is not subject to normal legislative review, three Congressional standing subcommittees on central intelligence in fact exist as a third potential checkrein.

The Senate and House Armed Services Committees both have subunits assigned as watchdogs over the CIA. The Senate subcommittee combines senior Senators from the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees. The House maintains a separate Appropriations Subcommittee, some members of which have been privy to such secrets as the atomic bomb (Manhattan project) appropriations during World War II.

The working principle of the intelligence system in the United States was expressed some years ago by Allen W. Dulles, Director of Central Intelligence:

"In intelligence you have to take certain things on faith. You have to look to the man who is directing the organization and the result he achieves. If you haven't got someone who can be trusted, or who doesn't get results, you'd better throw him out and get someone else."

Central Intelligence is subject today to three major criticisms. They involve questions of control by responsible authority, the efficiency of existing organizations and the problem of secrecy.

True, the CIA operates under Presidential directives, and interdepartmental groups from the National Security Council downward participate both in interpreting intelligence data and in authorizing covert operations. Yet the principal intelligence adviser to the highest authority remains the Director of Central Intelligence, armed with etxraordinary secrecy inside the Government and with a secret budget.

In a complex world of fast-moving events and in a Washington intelligence community where CIA professionals are increasingly influential, too few sources of countervailing power exist. This particularly is a problem with covert operations in which the Presidency is largely dependent upon the CIA for information on what is being done or what needs doing. The danger of self-serving by the Agency is great. CIA may, without careful policy guidance, write its own ticket.

In its 6 years of existence, the President's Board of Consultants on Foreign Intelligence Activities, recently renamed the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, has functioned more as a polite alumni visiting committee than as a vigorous watchdog. With one professional staff assistant and a single secretary, the Board has been able only sporadically to oversee the 15,000-man CIA.

Congressional surveillance has been much the same—infrequent meetings of uncommonly timorous subcommittees. The attitude of veteran legislators assigned to these units is exemplified by one who declared:

"It is not a question of reluctance on the part of CIA officials to speak to us. Instead, it is a question of our reluctance, if you will, to seek information and knowledge on subjects which I personally, as a Member of Congress and as a citizen, would rather not have."

As astute politicians, Members of Congress realize the possible national embarrassment if they formally approved espionage or covert political action that fails and is disclosed. Yet even were Congress less inhibited about monitoring secret operations effectively, none of the subcommittees has adequate staffs today for thorough surveillance.

Secret intelligence must never be more or less than an instrument of national policy. Its control should remain primarily a responsibility of the Presidency, but Congress also must assume a more carefully defined and active surveillance role. And the Department of State, particularly, must be aggressive in weighing gain from success, against cost of failure, in every proposed major secret operation.

A second major criticism is that the CIA places under one roof the separate functions of intelligence collection, its analysis and underground foreign political action.

Those who would organize and carry out a proposed secret operation should be separated in the decisional process from those who supply and interpret information to justify the plan.

This unification appears to have been a major defect in the Cuban misadventure. It may explain both the prediction that Cubans would rise to assist the exiles in overthrowing Castro and the policy decision that the venture was feasible.

Planners and operational commanders notoriously come to view the plan as an end in itself. They gradually develop a state of mind that is receptive only to intelligence data that justify the plan's practicability. A distorted view of reality often results.

Another example is the unexpected intervention of the Chinese Communists on a large scale in the Korean war in November 1950. Hard intelligence was available that the Chinese Communists were infiltrating North Korea, with a strong possibility of major intervention. Yet the operational plan of General MacArthur's forces to drive north to the Yalu went ahead disastrously in disregard of available information that should have given pause. The decisional system should be insulated against this common cause of self-delusion.

Persuasive reasons possibly can be advanced for not placing covert foreign political and intelligence (informational) functions under separate agencies. If so, the dangers inherent in combining them should be recognized and appropriate safeguards provided.

A third and related criticism involves secrecy. Democracy cannot work without a free press. Expanding Government secrecy increases the danger of official manipulation of opinion and concealment of shortcomings of an incumbent leadership. Secrecy also vitiates the party and electoral system and reduces the meaningful autonomy of Congress. Yet again intelligence activities by definition require secrecy.

In the face of this dilemma, CIA's secrecy today has become ambiguous. This may be the fate of any secret apparatus within America's open society. But only in America have intelligence officials become famous personalities eager to mount the public rostrum. The director, deputy director and other CIA officials in recent years have made frequent public speeches, some containing implicit policy recommendations. The CIA leadership should become again publicly silent and unquestionably nonpolitical. Anonymity is the only proper role.

Another aspect of the CIA's ambiguous secrecy is that major operations that fail often produce, as we have seen, public confessions from highest authority. On the other hand, secret missions that succeed often are known to the press but voluntarily censored.

For example, the CIA played a dominant role in the overthrow of Premier Mossadegh in Iran in August 1953, after his abortive attempt, in league with the Communist Tudeh Party, to exile the pro-Western Shah. This role has never been officially admitted.

Another example is CIA's involvement in the 1954 Guatemalan episode. In an operation resembling on a smaller scale the recent Cuban expedition, the CIA aided the successful counter-revolution against the regime of Col. Jacobo Arbenz Guzmán, which the U.S. Government regarded as Communist-dominated. The American press remained silent. Perhaps the inevitable penalty for failure is disclosure.

Self-restraint on the part of the press and of Congress in dealing with justifiably secret information will come at that point when confidence is restored in the professional quality and unquestioned subordination to political authority of secret operations.

It remains to be said that America's foreign policy headaches around the globe today stem less from information or organization deficiencies than from lack of clearly articulated foreign policy objectives beyond anticommunism. Many of the aforementioned problems of the intelligence system would solve themselves, given a clearer consensus about America's world purpose and specific policy objectives.

No greater challenge confronts American society than responding to the question of how the United States can engage successfully in protracted cold warfare without sacrificing the principles defended.

As an open democratic society, the United States has to recognize its handicaps in some form of competition with the closed societies of totalitarian regimes. It would be unwise to attempt to match the proficiency of Communist regimes in subversion as the main avenue to the attainment of national objectives. There is no point in America's fighting totalitarianism by imitating it.

It is equally important to recognize that any Communist competitive advantage in cold warfare comes not alone from centralization, secrecy and rigid discipline. More important is the existence of a Communist purpose, clear objectives and refined doctrines for implementing them.

In a world still lacking universal acceptance of law and order based upon government by consent, the United States will sometimes face compelling requirements to engage in distasteful—indeed, illegal—secret operations. What is crucially important in a democracy is that plans, policies and programs for such reflect the deliberate, informed and purposeful decisions of responsible political authority.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it stand in adjournment to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF JOHN A. McCONE TO BE DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of John A. McCone, of California, to be Director of Central Intelligence.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the question of conflict of interest continues to beset Congress session after session, and it does develop some rather awkward and embarrassing situations not only for Members but also for those who are appointed to come into the Government service because they have extraordinary talent and competence to render service to the Government.

In the instant case we are considering a very distinguished citizen. I do not believe there can be any doubt about the fact that he is a distinguished citizen. He was first nominated by the President in September of 1961. I believe the oath was administered at the White House by Chief Justice Warren in the latter part of November.

At the time the designation was made by the President of the United States, there was certainly a glowing statement with respect to John A. McCone and the confidence of the President in his capacity to discharge his responsibility as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

I took a little look at this problem, and I puzzled over it, largely because I am a member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, which committee has held some hearings and heard some testimony with respect to certain conflict-of-interest bills; one sponsored by the administration, one sponsored by the two distinguished Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING], and one which was reported by the House Committee on the Judiciary and which has been languishing on the House calendar I believe since July of last year.

I wish to use this nomination as a backdrop for what I say on the matter.

Mr. McCone, as I recall, is 60 years of age. I have talked with him on occasion and discovered that he is a mild-mannered man, a man of mild speech but of great competence. He was graduated from the University of California I believe in 1922.

The character of the man is evidenced pretty well by the fact that notwithstanding an engineering degree he became a riveter in an iron works. When a fellow is willing to start at the very bottom notwithstanding the great amount of engineering data and knowledge he has absorbed in college, I think it is pretty good testimony to his character and to his willingness to start at the bottom and to come up the ladder. By rapid stages he did come up the ladder, finally to help set up, in partnership with others, a business of his own.

For a long time Mr. McCone has devoted his talents, together with those of his associates, to the business of building troopships, of building refineries, of building all manner of facilities which are produced of steel.

Sooner or later a man like that was bound to get into the Government service. I think that high talent recommends itself. It is not at all surprising that three Presidents—President Truman, President Eisenhower, and President Kennedy—have availed themselves to Mr. McCone's service.

He came to the Government in an advisory capacity I believe in the Truman administration, and showed aptitude and competence in the whole field in which the Air Force operates. He did a lot of work in the field of Air Force procurement, and he received the Civilian Service Award with high honors in 1951.

It was not surprising that in due course President Eisenhower should choose him to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission. Certainly he rendered great service there.

He went back to private life, and President Kennedy then discovered his competence in many fields and thought he would prove very useful in directing the affairs of the Central Intelligence Agency.

This subject of conflict of interest is always a difficult problem, to say the least, about which one can scarcely talk without having it said that he is speaking in derogation of a person. That is the last thing I would undertake to do. It is a subject of interest to the Congress. I am raising the question only to excite some additional interest in the necessity that the Congress modify and clarify acts which have been on the books almost going back to the Civil War which in their application, if they were strictly applied, would provide some of the most fantastic results anyone could imagine.

I noticed in the House report on one of the acts on the books today that if a mail carrier assisted his mother in making out some kind of a pension application as to which Federal funds were involved he would be in violation of a Federal law and could be prosecuted, as existing law stands today.

This nomination has had attention, and a great deal has been written about Mr. McCone by Mr. Pearson. I think I have read most of the articles. A lot of the material was in quotation marks. Some of it was arrogated to our late distinguished and lamented friend, Senator Bridges. It was taken out of the RECORD.

I am sure that as people in the country read these observations it disturbs them even as it disturbs us. I came into the Chamber one noon recently and talked to a Member of the Senate. I said, "Did you see Mr. Pearson's article today?" He said, "I did." I said, "I am terribly disturbed and distressed about it. I do not quarrel with the articles as such, but I am thinking in terms of their impact on the thinking of people all over the country and what is our responsibility in undertaking to bring about a modification of the things which are on the statute books at the present time."

I know the nomination before the Senate will be approved. I say right now that I shall vote to confirm the nomination of Mr. McCone. However, this nomination directs attention to the fact that without undue delay both the House and the Senate now ought to direct some really vigorous efforts to the business of revising the conflict-of-interest statutes with which we are presently dealing.

There are eight of these, and they fall roughly into four categories. The first would include officers and employees who act in behalf of an outside interest in dealings with the Government. I think an example probably would be a military officer who assists a private company in obtaining, let us say, a defense contract. That is one category with which existing law deals.

Another category would incude the officials and employees acting for the Government in any kind of a transaction or deal in which they have a personal interest. We have had some examples of that over the years. I would not wish to specify particularly, and to let it appear that I was invidious about it, because I think if anybody wishes to go to the history books he can easily find those cases.

There is a third class, which includes those persons who were once upon a time officers and employees of the Government and who have left the Government, who represent some private concern, and who probably have made representatives in behalf of a contract or an undertaking prior to the lapse of the 2-year period which is required. In some cases it could be an inadvertence. In some cases it might be deliberate. But in any event there is law that is directed against a violation on that score.

Finally we have another category: Officers or employees who take pay from a private source for Government work, as in the case of an attorney, being paid by the Government and serving the Government, but also accepting pay from an outside source for work done for the Government.

Those are the statutes in general that we have today, and they are obfuscating, prolix, and difficult to determine. Certainly it is difficult for a layman, or his counsel back home, to determine precisely what he has to do in order to cleanse himself in the eyes of the statutes now on the books if he were to serve his Government.

The weakness in this entire setup is apparent. Look at the cases in which Government could well use the part-time services of people who are admittedly expert in their fields. Why should they, for part-time service, under existing law, agree to divest themselves of their interests, make a full disclosure of their holdings, and be interrogated and cross-examined on every holding that they have? Then they would always be subject to have raised the possibility that they forgot something, and might become guilty of perjury. Such talents as they have are denied to the Government if a man refuses under those circumstances to march before a committee of Congress and say, "I am sorry. I have lived my life pretty well. I have become an acknowledged expert in the field in which I operate. I am willing to serve my Government. I am willing to come for a month, 3 months, or 6 months. But I am not willing to come and lay everything on the board because I do not have to, because I have made my mark in industry and business, and I do not care to go through that ordeal."

Then, of course, still another weakness is that under existing law public officials can retain many private interests that are probably incompatible with their duty. That subject has not been explored too deeply, but certainly ought to be clarified so the average citizen could himself, without the benefit of counsel, look at a lawbook and say, "This I could do. This I cannot do. This kind of position I could accept without getting into difficulty."

Finally there is the unwillingness of men of stature who would be glad to serve their Government but were not, and perhaps could not, in justice to themselves and their families, always divest themselves of all their holdings. That is no easy undertaking, and yet what a burden it is upon the conscience of a man to whom the country has been good, who would like to serve his Government, but who simply must say, "I am sorry. What Government demands by way of questioning, cross-examination, and divestiture of interest and all the other things that I see recited on the front page is too much for me. So I shall not subject my family to whatever that interrogation may disclose. I would prefer to sit back and pursue my vocation as I have done before."

We have statutes on this subject that go back to 1873. I trust the Committee on the Judiciary, on which I serve, will now find inspiration for accelerated action out of the very confirmation that is before us, and hasten the proposed modifications of existing law so that it will be much easier for patriotic and steadfast citizens who wish to serve their Government to come into Government service.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, my sole purpose in rising today is that my attention has been directed to a portion of the testimony before the Committee on Armed Services in the case of Mr. McCone, in which a Senator present at the hearing said that in his opinion the inquiry which the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy had held in 1958 with reference to some action in connection with the teachers in California was perhaps not as thorough as it might have been, or at least the published reports of the inquiry were somewhat short of satisfactory.

I only wish to say that the one who raised that question is one of our fine Senators, my close personal friend, and I find it extremely difficult to comment on the subject. I only hope that what I say can be dissociated from the other remarks which he made.

I do wish to say that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—certainly the Senate section of the committee—in my opinion has not been notorious in failing to investigate individuals. We have had many witnesses before the committee. I think the members of the committee have been careful in asking important questions.

On the particular subject to which I refer, while the published record does not show all the questions which were asked, I can assure Senators that a great many questions were asked, carefully probed, and not all that appeared ever reached the surface.

For example, the President of the United States nominated a man from Iowa to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission. The investigation by the FBI was not as recent as it might have been. It was reasonably complete, and that investigation did not reveal anything with reference to the nominee which should have caused him any trouble.

At the same time, the then Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy received a great many letters with reference to the nominee, and when it was impossible to get any further information on him, the then chairman, at his own expense, sent an investigator out to see if some additional information might be developed.

We had the assistance of a great Iowa newspaper, which I believe had been friendly to the nominee, but that newspaper also was anxious to find the facts. We studied them as carefully as we could. Subsequently we hired a special investigator as a member of the committee staff.

I wish to point out that though the nomination was sent up by a Republican President, every Republican member of the committee voted to employ the special investigator, because every member of the committee wanted the investigation to be complete. When the special investigator had finished his work it developed that the nominee desired to have his name withdrawn, and it was withdrawn. He had been involved in a banking transaction which was not frightful, but which had developed a little difficulty that he recognized might have been embarrassing to him at some subsequent time.

The point I wish to make is that the Joint Committee never published any report on all the investigations we went through. It never tried to show how many hours of work the committee put in on this problem. If one would look at the evidence turned in by the Joint Committee, he might say that the committee did nothing because the nomination was presented to it and subsequently withdrawn.

Now let me turn to another nomination, the nomination of Sumner Pike, made by a Democratic President. The first nomination was sent up on October 28, 1946, a recess appointment. The nominee took the oath of office. Then the full nomination was sent to the Senate. The nomination was sent to the Senate section of the Joint Commitee. The committee reported favorably upon him, and the nominee was confirmed. But he came up for another term of office, and that particular time there was some objection to some of the things he had done. The Joint Committee had long open hearings, and then in executive session voted five to four to report the nomination adversely. Such action was taken. The Senate reversed the action of the Joint Committee and voted to confirm the individual.

I only point out that the Joint Committee did not merely take its work as a matter of course and go on their way. They made a careful study of the question.

There has been reference to a good deal of material that developed about Mr. McCone. It happens that in the files of the Joint Committee one would not find all the material that was gathered on Mr. McCone in the first days of the study.

I have a file before me which shows the name of a very distinguished former Member of the Senate, the late lamented Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. Bridges. I went to him because of the investigation that he had caused to be conducted by his committee. He did what people expected Senator Bridges to do, namely, he turned over to me such information as he had. I went through every piece of this information carefully and thoroughly. I asked the other members of the Joint Committee to sit with me in questioning Mr. McCone. Although the printed record of the hearings may not reveal in great detail the testimony that was taken, I can assure all Members of the Senate that a very careful check was made on all matters to which we had reference in connection with the matters that have been under discussion.

Another matter that I did not make public was the financial statement of Mr. McCone.

In meeting with Mr. McCone in the office of the then majority leader, Senator Knowland of California, I asked him for a complete financial report of everything he owned. He submitted it to me. He said he believed he did not need to do so, because he had already submitted one to the White House, which had been checked fully, and there had been no difficulty in connection with it. I still asked him for a complete financial report. He submitted it.

We went over that report very carefully. Mr. McCone and I went over it very carefully and other members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy joined us. It is a hard thing to review a man's financial resources and not rush out and publish everything about it. It is interesting to find an individual who owns a great many stocks but who lives modestly and plainly and does not display the fact that he is a man of substantial wealth.

We looked at the report very carefully. We made up a list as to which we said that those were stocks that he ought to sell. I told him we thought he should sell those stocks. Of course I was not sitting in judgment. I had no authority to say that he ought to sell them. However, it bothered my conscience to have confirmed any man owning stocks in companies which may have contracts with the Atomic Energy Commission. I told him:

> You are likely to have some business dealings with these firms when you are on the Atomic Energy Commission.

He was surprised that I should say that with respect to one of these companies. He thought that that company never had had any business transactions with the Atomic Energy Commission, but it had. When he looked at the list, he said:

> I do not object to these; I will sell these stocks.

He did sell them. Then we came to another group of stocks. I said:

> These are not in a black and white class. This is a particularly difficult ground we are now on with respect to these stocks. However, if I were you, I would dispose of these stocks also. I agree that they are not in any way in conflict, but I think I would dispose of them also. I think you will feel better if you did so.

There was no argument about it. He put a checkmark next to every one of them. He said:

> I will dispose of these also.

Then we came to stocks that we thought he could safely hold, in which his interest was not such as to conflict with his responsibility on the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the Senator will allow me to interpose at this point I should like to say that the nominee feels the same way about it at this time. Reading from the RECORD at the point where Senator SALTONSTALL was interrogating the nominee and where the Senator from Massachusetts had asked a question about the nominee's holdings. The nominee says:

> In 1958, I turned the management of the shipping company over to others, and disassociated myself entirely. I then at that time placed the stock of those companies in trust in a bank, which was an irrevocable trust, revokable only when I left the Government.
>
> Now, I have not placed that stock back in trust. I am perfectly willing to do so.

The witness said this on January 18, 1962.

Then, later in the testimony, with respect to this trust he said:

> I have no objection to the establishing of an irrevocable trust if there is reason to do so. I felt the peculiar wording and restrictions of the Atomic Energy Act made it advisable to establish that trust at that time.

Mr. ANDERSON. I only say to the Senator from Missouri that this is not the class of stocks to which I refer. I shall come to them in a moment. There was a certain class of stocks that he could own openly or—I believe lawyers use the expression—notoriously. So there was not any possible conflict with respect to those stocks.

Then we came to a fourth group of stock, and I said:

> I think on these, Mr. McCone, you ought to make a trust arrangement, so that you will not have any custody of them. The reason for it is that the Atomic Energy Act is peculiar. It does not permit a member of the Atomic Energy Commission to have any other business.

This was a 100 percent wholly owned company. While he was not going to devote any time to its management, I nevertheless said to him:

> You do not want the charge to be made that as president and sole owner of the stock you had to be engaged in another business.

Therefore, he moved this stock into a trust arrangement.

Not only did he put them in a trust, but he submitted the trust agreement not only to the lawyers, but also to any member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy who wanted to look at it, to see if it was sufficient. I commended him for it, and I commend him now.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. My only point in bringing it up was that the nominee was completely willing to do whatever the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy thought should be done with respect to these holdings, which, as we both know, is not the case with all potential nominees. He did exactly what the chairman of the Joint Committee thought was right, and he also expressed the same thought before the Armed Services Committee, namely, that if the chairman and the committee thought it was the right thing to do, he was entirely willing to do it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator. I only say to him that this was not the action of the Joint Committee. It was merely the suggestion of the chairman of the Joint Committee. I said that I thought he would feel better if he made this disposition. He did exactly what was suggested. I made that suggestion, and he complied with it. That was typical of our entire dealings with him.

While it is true that not everything that took place appears in the record, there were many things that do not appear in the record that we did do.

I should like to give another case that came before the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. At one time a very fine scientist was suggested for membership on the Atomic Energy Commission. He was appointed by President Eisenhower, so we were not under any obligations to be extremely careful.

Some Members of Congress know that the Senator from New Mexico has not always been extremely careful in his relationship with people who get appointed. Here was a man who was named to membership on the Commission. I was tremendously interested because I had known of the man's work at Los Alamos. He telephoned me while I was in New Mexico and asked me if he could come to talk to me before his name was submitted. Of course, I was happy to have him do so. Dr. Von Neumann came to see me and read a long list of things that he had done which some people regarded as being foolish and which he felt would cause some people to classify him as being an extreme liberal, and he wanted to know if I thought that was bad. I assured him that I did not so regard it. I said to him:

> If your name comes before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, you will have to speak on every one of these subjects and discuss every one of them.

At a later date he did come before the Joint Committee in executive session and discussed every one of these things to which some people might have taken exception.

The things that he had done were based upon the fact that he had come into substantial amounts of money because of his inventive mind. If a friend was in need and came to him, he tried to help him.

We therefore examined Dr. Von Neumann in secret at first. Then in order that no one would be able to say that we did not cover the subject completely we held an open hearing, at which the able junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] carefully phrased the questions and put them to the witness, so that the subject could be completely covered but without drawing other people into it.

We frequently do not put into the record everything that happens and everything that takes place. However, I wish to assure everyone that everything was carefully done. It is all very much like the case of an iceberg; not all of it is above the surface. Question after question was put to the witness carefully and thoughtfully, so that he might have a chance to testify as to what his relations had been and what had happened.

As many persons know, Mr. McCone was well liked by the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I was in a strange situation, because people had worried that we might not get along together. I thought we got along splendidly. Other members of the committee thought the same.

So, as Mr. McCone was finishing his term of service in 1961, and Dr. Seaborg was coming in to succeed him, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy had a special meeting in an afternoon. At that meeting, Mr. McCone gave his final report. At the very outset of it, I announced to the members of the committee that I hoped we might treat the session in two sections, one which would relate to Mr. McCone's final report, the other which would deal with our own expressions of feeling toward him. I wanted to make it posible to declassify the minutes of the executive meeting and let them go into the record.

In my letter of February 13, 1961, I wrote to Mr. McCone, who was then in Los Angeles, having left the Government:

> DEAR JOHN: As we both know so well, public life and service has both rewards and penalties, pleasure, and regret.
>
> It is my pleasure to send you a transcript of the words of praise and friendship extended to you by the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in our meeting on January 18. It is my regret that we will not be facing each other across the conference table again.
>
> There is little I can add to what was said that last Wednesday except to stress the sincerity and unanimity in our appreciation of the contribution you have made to the country.

I then submitted to him a copy of the minutes of the meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of my letter of February 13, 1961, and the portion of the minutes of the executive session which was informal.

There being no objection, the letter and minutes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY,
February 13, 1961.

Hon. JOHN A. MCCONE,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR JOHN: As we both know so well, public life, and service has both rewards and penalties, pleasure, and regret.

It is my pleasure to send you a transcript of the words of praise and friendship extended to you by the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in our meeting on January 18. It is my regret that we will not be facing each other across the conference table again.

There is little I can add to what was said that last Wednesday except to stress the sincerity and unanimity in our appreciation of the contribution you have made to the country.

Sincerely,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE SESSION (INFORMAL), MEETING NO. 87-1-1, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18, 1961, OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy met, pursuant to call, at 2:30 p.m., in the committee room, the Capitol, Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON (chairman) presiding.

Present were: Senators CLINTON P. ANDERSON (presiding), JOHN O. PASTORE, ALBERT GORE, HENRY M. JACKSON, BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, HENRY DWORSHAK, and WALLACE F. BENNETT; Representatives CHET HOLIFIELD, MELVIN PRICE, WAYNE ASPINALL, WILLIAM BATES, and JACK WESTLAND.

Committee staff present: James T. Ramey, executive director, John T. Conway, George F. Murphy, Jr., and Carey Brewer.

Representatives of the Atomic Energy Commission: Hon. John A. McCone, Chairman; Hon. John S. Graham and Hon. Loren K. Olson, Commissioners; A. R. Luedecke, General Manager; Dwight A. Ink, Assistant General Manager; A. D. Starbird, Director, Division of Military Application; Howard C. Brown, special assistant to the Chairman; and Richard X. Donovan, special assistant for congressional relations.

Chairman ANDERSON. The meeting will come to order.

Today we meet with Mr. McCone for the last time prior to his leaving the chairmanship of the Commission on Friday. The purpose of our meeting is to permit Mr. McCone to give us his views on the status of the atomic energy program and the questions and problems which we face.

I would like to suggest that we withhold accolades as to Mr. McCone's abilities and accomplishments until the end of our session today in order to permit him to proceed in an orderly manner with his presentation. I will say, however, at this point that the relationship between Mr. McCone and me personally and, I believe, the other members and the staff of the Joint Committee has been most cordial and constructive throughout the 2½ years he has been with the Commission.

I understand you have a prepared statement, Mr. McCone, which you will file with the committee, but that you will talk to us in a more summarized way from notes.

We have with us here today, also, General Starbird, who will be leaving the Commission in a week or so as Director of the Division of Military Application. We are going to miss his great participation and we are also going to miss his important contributions to the program.

Following our session we expect to have some refreshments and I hope that everyone will stay for a brief social gathering with Mr. McCone, the other Commissioners, General Starbird, and the staff of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. McCone, will you please proceed?

Chairman MCCONE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to reserve for the end of my statement my comments as to the very warm and sincere feeling I have toward this committee and all of the members and the manner in which they have treated and cooperated with me.

(There followed a discussion of the various atomic energy programs which appears in a separate, classified transcript.)

I would like to close by thanking you, Mr. Chairman, and you, Mr. HOLIFIELD, and every member of this committee for the wonderful cooperation, friendship, and support you have given me. It has been a very gratifying and pleasing experience.

I want to thank Mr. Ramey and the staff also for the cooperation they have given us.

Chairman ANDERSON. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, I have tried to terminate your report only because I wanted every member of this committee, who wished to do so, to have an opportunity to put some words in the permanent record.

May I say first of all this has been a very pleasing and heartwarming experience for me. I have enjoyed working with you.

Incidentally, I am in the same situation as you are. I am leaving the chairmanship of this committee and will not return to it. Therefore, I am grateful for this opportunity to express in this closing year of my chairmanship the pleasure I have had in associating with you and to thank you for your many courtesies and constant understanding which I appreciate most sincerely.

Mr. ASPINALL, who could not remain, left a statement which he asked be inserted in the record at the appropriate place. This will be done.

Representative HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say this to Mr. McCone. I value highly the service you have rendered ever since you came on the Commission in 1958. I have never worked with a man whom I thought was more dedicated or applied himself more industriously and energetically to a position in the executive branch of the Government. I think you have rendered a great service. I appreciate the personal association I have had with you and the frankness and candor with which you have answered our questions and responded to our requests for information.

As you leave your place in the executive branch, I am confident that you do so with the high regard of all of our members. I want to take this opportunity also to say that Mr. PRICE, who had to return to his office because of constituents, asked me to include him in my remarks and in those other laudatory remarks he knew would be made today. He shares in the high regard we all have for you.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Mr. Chairman, it is a little difficult for each member of the committee to say the same thing in a different way, yet we all want to join in what has been said.

From a personal standpoint I want to say to you—and for the record—that you have brought as high a degree of capability and understanding to this job as an individual could bring. You are not a physicist, but you are an engineer of ability and you have a practical fundamental grasp of the subject matter and a capacity to get into these scientific matters from the standpoint of your background and training.

You have brought to the Commission the highest degree of business judgment—practical business judgment. I think that has been very important. After all is said and done, in my view the Atomic Energy Commission is not a scientific agency purely. It is an industrial production agency. It requires a combination of a high ability to grasp the scientific phases of the matter and a high degree of practical business, administrative and production knowledge. You not only have this combination of abilities, but you have displayed it unusually well.

There is no one who has occupied a position on the Commission who has enjoyed greater confidence or trust than you have. That is a matter of common agreement on this committee.

You have been extremely forward looking in your attitude and your devotion to this program. I met Dr. Seaborg outside just a few minutes ago and we recalled some of the early days in the committee, the whole project and some of our associations at that time. We both agreed the picture doesn't look the same today as it did 14 years ago. I don't know what it will look like in another 10 years, but I do believe your forward looking attitude in the programs which you have sponsored will have a great effect on the programs in the indefinite future.

I wish you well in the future. I wish you continued success. I hope you will have the satisfaction you deserve from again serving your Government in a most vital way.

Senator Pastore. I associate myself with all of the statements that have been made.

However, let me say this. You have become, in my opinion, a model of what a dedicated and devoted public servant should be. There was a time in this committee when I was rather apprehensive at the relationship between the executive branch and the legislative branch. I think it has been through your strong personality and through your temperament that much of that disturbed atmosphere has been cleared. This committee has renewed confidence in the executive branch, for which you should take a great deal of credit.

I dislike to see you go, but after all you have your reasons. It has been a very illuminating and refreshing experience for me to be associated with you. I remember our very cordial relationship in Geneva. There it was my privilege to meet Mrs. McCone, the very charming and devoted lady who, I think, may be largely responsible for what you are. I congratulate you and I wish you many, many years of good health, success, and happiness.

Representative Aspinall. Mr. Chairman, I too wish to join in the words of commendation which are being directed to the retiring Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

I desire to thank Chairman McCone personally for the loyal, constructive, able, and effective service which he has once again rendered to his Nation and fellow men. The members of this committee, of the Congress, of the administration, and of the Nation shall be forever indebted to Chairman McCone for his dedication to service and the wise counsel and leadership which he has provided for the nuclear energy program during his encumbency of the office.

As he leaves our association, I wish for him life's better blessings—good health and sweet happiness. I sincerely hope that the association we have had together shall not be brought to an end, but, rather, that we shall find ourselves in his company ofttimes in the days and years ahead of us.

Senator Gore. Mr. Chairman, my predominant feeling today is a sense of loss both of a personal nature and of a public nature. Few men can bring to public service the personality and the intellectual capacity which Mr. McCone possesses and of which he has given so generously.

Senator Pastore referred to the improved relationship between the Commission and the committee. That was much to be desired. I would that I could have some of the gentleness of manner which Mr. McCone nearly always demonstrated. [Laughter.]

And yet I love the Irish in him. It is there. I am glad it is there. The trouble is that—to make an invidious comparison—it is in me too much.

It is with genuine regret that I see you leave public service, John McCone, and if I have my way about it, you won't have the luxury very long. I think this country needs you. I shall undertake to persuade somebody to persuade you to get back into the service of the country.

Representative Bates. Mr. Chairman, I will not detain the committee with any extensive remarks. I have expressed personally to John the great respect I have for him and the work he has done.

I came on the committee about the same time he became Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. I did so with some consternation, having read in the newspapers of the bitter controversies which existed between some members of the Joint Committee and the Atomic Energy Commission. I have no firsthand knowledge of those circumstances and could not, and see no need to, pass judgment on the situation as it existed at that time. I do, however, wish to state that the extraordinary administrative qualities of John McCone brought about an atmosphere in these relationships that was pleasant and harmonious. He had that innate quality of balance that permitted him to be firm in principle, yet cooperative in understanding alternative points of view.

He has gained our respect and our admiration. He can leave his assignment with a great deal of pride. My only regret is that the country will lose the services of a distinguished servant and patriot.

Senator Jackson. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I can't stay for the reception after this meeting.

However, I do want to express my appreciation to Mr. McCone for the fine job he has done as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. This is not his first service to the country. He has served in many other capacities. I remember particularly his outstanding work as Under Secretary of the Air Force at the same time Mr. Lovett was Secretary of Defense.

I want to say, Mr. McCone, that while we may not agree on every aspect of the atomic-energy effort, I do believe you have brought to the office a high degree of competence with your background as an engineer in private life and your administrative experience. You have handled your job well under what have been trying and difficult circumstances at times.

I personally wanted to come here today and express my appreciation for the service you have rendered the country.

Senator Dworshak. Mr. Chairman, I share the sentiments which have already been expressed by my colleagues, and I consider it a tragic loss that you are leaving the service of the Government at this time.

It has been a real pleasure for me to have the opportunity to work with you. You have dispelled the feeling I had 4 years ago when I became a member of the committee that we were to face constant turmoil and dissension in the relations of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Joint Committee which naturally impaired the progress which I have strongly desired be made in this field.

I want to express also the appreciation of the people of my State of Idaho for the very fine understanding you have displayed and the sympathetic cooperation you have extended in the management of the Idaho installation of the Atomic Energy Commission.

While recognizing the personal sacrifice you have made in leaving your home and your business in California to assume this great responsibility, I do share the hope of my colleagues that because of your dedication as an American patriot you will find it possible to assume other responsibilities in the future and continue to help our Government solve many of the problems which so strongly affect the security of our Republic.

Representative Westland. Mr. Chairman, after all of these statements that have been made, it is rather difficult to think of anything further to say.

I, like Mr. Bates, have been on this committee for 2 years. I consider it a real privilege to have served with this committee and to have been associated with you. I appreciate the many questions you have answered in words of one syllable; answers that have helped me to learn something about this industry and the problems facing the Nation in the atomic energy program.

There is no question in my mind, John, but that you have brought great prestige, nationwide to the Atomic Energy Commission, some of which has rubbed off on this committee, and has helped the atomic energy program in the United States and perhaps throughout the world.

I have admired you particularly for your stability in your decisions. Once made you have stood by them despite occasional contrary opinions from equally high levels in government. Having decided what you believed to be the right course for this country, you have maintained that position. To me this is a great character building example for, perhaps, all of us.

I have only one thing to add—I would say that I am sure your golf game will improve after you get away from this job. [Laughter.]

Senator Bennett. John, you have heard all of these encomiums and these suggestions. It is my job to sum up and I will do it with the Biblical phrase, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Chairman Anderson. Although this is something which has not been done before, I would like to ask permission to have these statements that have been made today transcribed in a separate record which would then be sent to Mr. McCone.

If there is no objection, that will be done. The meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon at 4:35 p.m. the meeting was adjourned.)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I could place in the Record a great many other things. I simply wish to say that I believe the committee carefully considered Mr. McCone's qualifications before he officially became the nominee. Before his name was announced, I had sat down and gone over a great many things with him in the presence of the Senator from California, Mr. Knowland, and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper]. Then I had had other extended conversations with him, trying to bring out facts which I thought were essential. If the Joint Committee did not do its work, then I am sorry; but I fully believe as much care was given to Mr. McCone's nomination as probably any committee in Congress ordinarily would pay to the usual nomination.

We were happy to see how the nomination worked out. We were very happy with the work Mr. McCone displayed. I think we tried to be extremely cooperative. I believe Mr. McCone tried to carry out the instructions of the President and, at the same time, deal with the committee, which was dominated by the opposite political party. It is a very difficult situation to carry out the wishes of a President who is of one political party and to deal with a committee composed of members, a majority of which are members of another political party. However, I think the nomination worked out very well.

I am happy to say that I enjoyed visiting with Mr McCone and watching what he did. I, for one, wish to pay tribute to the fine way in which he operated as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

I have served for many years on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, both in this body and in the House. I know that what the Senator from Mexico has said today regarding the thorough investigation made prior to the action taken by the Joint Committee in approving unanimously Mr. McCone's nomination is true. I think it is unfortunate that these allegations are being dredged up all over again, after two committees, prior to the consideration of Mr. McCone's nomination by the Committee on Armed Services this year, had acted unanimously on his appointment, first, as Under Secretary of the Air Force in, I believe, 1948, and later, in 1958, when he was appointed Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. President, it is not easy to get able and qualified men to serve in the area of national security. I have always been of the opinion that such men should be selected without regard to their partisan backgrounds. I have felt that the main criterion for consideration should be their ability and qualifications. I took this position before I was chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and I have taken the same position ever since. As a matter of fact, I took that position during the course of the campaign itself. The President of the United States stated very clearly during the course of the campaign in 1960 that he would select men in the area of national security without regard to party.

The President had many such precedents for the service of able men. In the Wilson administration, in the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and in the Truman administration men have served who were not members of the Democratic Party.

From personal experience on the Joint Atomic Energy Committee I know a good deal about Mr. McCone's ability and his knowledge in the field of national security. I believe we are fortunate in being able to bring into the Government a man with Mr. McCone's background and experience.

Mention has been made earlier of some of the offices which Mr. McCone has held and in which he has served his country. I believe the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] went into some detail in that respect. Suffice it to say that Mr. McCone served on the so-called Finletter Committee, the Air Policy Commission, in 1947. He served as a special deputy to the then Secretary of Defense, James Forrestal; then as Under Secretary of the Air Force; and subsequently as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Some persons have said Mr. McCone has not had experience in the field of intelligence. The point is that we need a man who has the judgment, commonsense, and administrative ability to deal with the many problems which arise in the position of Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. At least in my judgment, Mr. McCone has had experience in the broad area of national security that few people in Government have had. He is a good administrator.

I must also add that during his service as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission Mr. McCone foresaw what the Soviets would do, especially in the area of nuclear testing. The campaign against Mr. McCone stems, in fact, not from concern over the unfounded allegations of conflict of interest, but really because of concern for his hard, tough policy in relation to the Soviet Union. I know of my own knowledge how right Mr. McCone was concerning what the Soviets would do in the field of nuclear testing. He was honest and forthright in his dealings with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. He gave us his point of view. He stated his opinions candidly, fairly, and objectively. He took a position which was in disagreement with that of some members of his own administration.

I am confident that Mr. McCone as head of the Central Intelligence Agency will act from a broad, rich experience which will make it possible for him to serve effectively in this area. He will be intellectually honest in his judgments in evaluating the information which will be entrusted to him. We are indeed fortunate to have a man of his capacity willing to serve the country during this troublesome period.

Much has been said concerning an alleged conflict of interest. These allegations have been made before, as I have indicated, and have been unanimously rejected by three different committees, including the Committee on Armed Services, which heard his testimony. We had all the information before us. Some persons simply wish to bring out matters which have been completely refuted. These matters are raised now as part of the campaign against Mr. McCone—a campaign which stems mainly from disagreement with the hard policy he has always taken with reference to difficult decisions which must be made in the area of national security affecting our relations with the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I am confident that Mr. McCone will be an able and an effective Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and that he will faithfully discharge his duties in the interest of our national security. If there is an area in Government where we need men who are tough and hard and able administrators, rich with good sense and good judgment, and who will indeed take a hard, tough position, it is in the Central Intelligence Agency.

I am confident that Mr. McCone will be worthy of the trust—and it is indeed a great trust; it could be the security of our country—that we place in his hands when he undertakes to do this job. I can only say that it would be a tragedy if Mr. McCone were to embark on his new position with a substantial vote against him in the Senate.

Mr. President, we should give Mr. McCone a unanimous vote. I only hope that Senators who speak in regard to the nomination of Mr. McCone will weigh carefully their words and will make sure that they do not attempt to use arguments in the area of so-called conflict of interest as a means of justifying their opposition to him. If they believe he is not qualified they should state wherein he is not qualified.

But I hope and trust that the Senate will give Mr. McCone an overwhelming vote of confidence, so that when he embarks on his duties as Director of the Central Intelligency Agency he will know, and the country will know, that he has the full confidence and support of the Senate, which are so essential in connection with the doing of a very taxing and difficult job—one which is most difficult under even the best circumstances.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I associate myself with the remarks of the able Senator from Washington, one who has had so much experience working with the nomineee in broad and classified matters.

I shall speak briefly on this nomination before the vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE COLLEGE ACADEMIC FACILITIES AND SCHOLARSHIP ACT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, tomorrow in the House of Representatives, and later this week in the Senate, there will come before the Congress, for debate, the College Academic Facilities and Scholarship Act, which in this body is Senate bill 1241. The chairman of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is unfortunately detained, because he is serving as a member of our delegation at the Punta del Este Conference, in Uruguay. He has obtained, on a State-by-State basis, statistical information which in his judgment would be of assistance to each of the Senators participating in the debate, and also would be helpful to the Members of the other body when they initiate their debate, tomorrow. He has asked me to have this material placed in the RECORD at his request, in order to help us in our consideration of this important matter.

The information developed consists of such items as current and projected college enrollment, financial assistance to students administered through the colleges and universities, data on the public junior colleges of each State, estimated expenditure of colleges and universities for student higher education, and college age population data.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the material to which I have alluded be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

College Academic Assistance Act—Fact Sheet

ALASKA

	United States	Alaska
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	2,990
Increase over 1960 ... percent	7.8	+29.3
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	1,123
Increase over 1960 ... percent	10.4	+23.1
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students ... percent	60.4	100.0
1st-time students ... do	63.7	100.0
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	4,523
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	121
Amount	$98,157,544	$39,615
Average	$341	$327
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	28
Amount	$50,151,908	$11,375
Average	$434	$406
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	
Amount	$14,362,182	
Average	$274	
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	None
Number of institutions, 1960	317	
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	
Increase over 1960 ... percent	16.5	
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data; latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18-24 years of age	$147	$54
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	59.3
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$2,600,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$1,700,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$10.16
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.3
Current funds per person 18-24 years of age	$81	$52
Percent of college-age versus total population	9	
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population ... percent	19.6	
Property taxes as percent of personal income	3.7	
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	
If apportioned on basis of total degree credit enrollment, Alaska could borrow approximately		$232,326
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	15
Amount	$17,500,000	$10,500
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal years 1963-66	187,500	111
Amount	$131,250,000	$77,700
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$24,998
State matching requirement	$87,962,288	$49,996
Total for public junior college construction	$137,962,288	$74,994
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

ALABAMA

	United States	Alabama
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	47,967
Increase over 1960 ... percent	7.8	+4.6
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	13,041
Increase over 1960 ... percent	10.4	+12.5
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students ... percent	60.4	74.7
1st-time students ... do	63.7	66.5
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	89,075
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	3,152
Amount	$98,157,544	$753,250
Average	$341	$239
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	2,053
Amount	$50,151,908	$756,397
Average	$434	$368
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	200
Amount	$14,362,182	$50,866
Average	$274	$254
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	None
Number of institutions, 1960	317	
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	
Increase over 1960 ... percent	16.5	
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Alabama could borrow approximately		$3,727,084
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	519
Amount	$17,500,000	$363,300
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187,500	3,889
Amount	$131,250,000	$2,722,300
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$1,192,055
State matching requirement	$87,962,288	$1,480,050
Total for public junior college construction	$137,962,288	$2,672,105
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

College Academic Assistance Act—Fact Sheet—Continued

ARIZONA

	United States	Arizona
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	38,239
Increase over 1960 percent	7.8	+11.3
1st-time students 1961	1,026,087	10,081
Increase over 1960 percent	10.4	+11.8
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students percent	60.4	97.8
1st-time students do	63.7	98.6
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	66,737
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	2,029
Amount	$98,157,544	$867,727
Average	$341	$428
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	812
Amount	$50,151,908	$410,302
Average	$434	$505
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	70
Amount	$14,362,182	$14,100
Average	$274	$201
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	2
Number of institutions, 1960	317	2
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	6,540
Increase over 1960 percent	16.5	+7.0
IV. Other information (based on 1957–58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18–24 years of age	$147	$103
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments percent	43.7	65.0
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$16,000,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$10,900,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$10.04
Current funds as percent of personal income percent	0.4	0.5
Current funds per person 18–24 years of age	$81	$89
Percent of college-age versus total population	9	10.35
Total higher education and enrollment versus college-age population percent	19.6	25.87
Property taxes as percent of personal income do	3.7	4.3
Sales tax do		3.0
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Arizona could borrow approximately		$2,971,208
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	160
Amount	$17,500,000	$112,000
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963–66	187,500	1,197
Amount	$131,250,000	$837,900
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$344,697
State matching requirement	87,962,288	588,735
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	933,432
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

ARKANSAS

	United States	Arkansas
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	27,719
Increase over 1960 percent	7.8	+0.7
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	9,640
Increase over 1960 percent	10.4	+24.3
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students percent	60.4	73.4
1st-time students do	63.7	73.4
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	48,643
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	2,755
Amount	$98,157,544	$589,110
Average	$341	$214
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	1,411
Amount	$50,151,908	$512,830
Average	$434	$363
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	240
Amount	$14,362,182	$62,722
Average	$274	$261
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	None
Number of institutions, 1960	317	
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	
Increase over 1960 percent	16.5	
IV. Other information (based on 1957–58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$106
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments percent	43.7	58.5
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$12,900,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$12,900,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$7.36
Current funds as percent of personal income percent	0.4	0.6
Current funds per person 18 to 24 years of age	$81	$85
Percent of college-age versus total population percent	9	12.13
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population percent	19.6	10.07
Property taxes as percent of personal income do	3.7	2.3
Sales tax do		3.0
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Arkansas could borrow approximately		$2,153,794
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	306
Amount	$17,500,000	$214,200
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187,500	2,292
Amount	$131,250,000	$1,604,400
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$727,969
State matching requirement	87,962,288	841,286
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	1,569,255
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

College Academic Assistance Act—Fact Sheet—Continued

CALIFORNIA

	United States	California
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3, 891, 230	499, 505
Increase over 1960 percent	7. 8	+11. 5
1st-time students, 1961	1, 026, 087	152, 654
Increase over 1960 percent	10. 4	+14. 3
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students percent	60. 4	83. 8
1st-time students do	63. 7	89. 9
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6, 959, 000	870, 154
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying to the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287, 589	12, 599
Amount	$98, 157, 544	$4, 887, 313
Average	$341	$388
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115, 450	7, 215
Amount	$50, 151, 908	$3, 847, 127
Average	$434	$533
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52, 322	2, 358
Amount	$14, 362, 182	$502, 920
Average	$274	$213
III. Public Junior Colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	62
Number of institutions, 1960	317	60
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458, 296	245, 487
Increase over 1960 percent	16. 5	+13. 6

	United States	California
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population, 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$170
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments percent	43. 7	69. 1
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1, 732, 600, 000	$340, 700, 000
Total current funds only	$1, 267, 900, 000	$205, 400, 000
Current funds per capita	$7. 50	$15. 17
Current funds as percent of personal income	0. 4	0. 6
Current funds per person 18 to 24 years of age	$81	$147
Percent of college-age versus total population	9	7. 47
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population percent	19. 6	35. 52
Property taxes as percent of personal income do	3. 7	4. 4
Sales tax do		3. 0
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300, 000, 000	
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, California could borrow approximately		$37, 500, 000
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25, 000	1, 898
Amount	$17, 500, 000	$1, 328, 600
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187, 500	14, 237
Amount	$101, 250, 000	$9, 965, 900
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50, 000, 000	$3, 349, 834
State matching requirement	87, 962, 288	6, 699, 668
Total for public junior college construction	137, 962, 288	10, 049, 502
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

COLORADO

	United States	Colorado
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3, 891, 230	49, 707
Increase over 1960 percent	7. 8	+4. 5
1st-time students, 1961	1, 026, 087	13, 400
Increase over 1960 percent	10. 4	+9. 0
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students percent	60. 4	80. 0
1st-time students do	63. 7	84. 4
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6, 959, 000	92, 416
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent oi all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287, 589	4, 942
Amount	$98, 157, 544	$1, 295, 962
Average	$341	$262
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115, 450	1, 501
Amount	$50, 151, 908	$780, 745
Average	$434	$520
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52, 322	185
Amount	$14, 362, 182	$41, 646
Average	$274	$225
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	7
Number of institutions, 1960	317	7
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458, 296	5, 687
Increase over 1960 (percent)	16. 5	+22. 6

	United States	Colorado
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18-24 years of age	$147	$159
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments percent	43. 7	50. 4
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1, 732, 600, 000	$21, 900, 000
Total current funds only	$1, 267, 900, 000	$16, 700, 000
Current funds per capita	$7. 50	$10. 29
Current funds as percent of personal income	0. 4	0. 5
Current funds per person 18-24 years of age	$81	$102
Percent of college-age versus total population percent	9	8. 00
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population percent	19. 6	29. 91
Property taxes as percent of personal income do	3. 7	4. 8
Sales tax 2 percent.		
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300, 000, 000	
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Colorado could borrow approximately		$3, 862, 283
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25, 000	234
Amount	$17, 500, 000	$163, 800
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187, 500	1, 754
Amount	$131, 250, 000	$1, 227, 800
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50, 000, 000	$456, 597
State matching requirement	87, 962, 288	913, 194
Total for public junior college construction	137, 962, 288	1, 369, 791
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

College Academic Assistance Act—Fact Sheet—Continued

CONNECTICUT

	United States	Connecticut
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	55,319
Increase over 1960 percent	7.8	+8.8
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	13,995
Increase over 1960 percent	10.4	+29.6
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students percent	60.4	39.2
1st-time students do	63.7	31.2
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	98,748
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, National defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	4,264
Amount	$98,157,544	$2,450,901
Average	$341	$575
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	1,252
Amount	$50,151,908	$534,515
Average	$434	$427
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	1,360
Amount	$14,362,182	$492,627
Average	$274	$362
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	None
Number of institutions, 1960	317	None
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total, degree-credit students	458,296	None
Increase over 1960 percent	16.5	None

	United States	Connecticut
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$212
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	24.2
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$25,700,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$11,500,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$5.08
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.2
Current funds per person 18 to 24 years of age	$81	$60
Percent of college-age versus total population	9	7.45
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population percent	19.6	24.02
Property taxes as percent of personal income	3.7	3.7
Sales tax	....	3.0
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	....
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Connecticut could borrow approximately	....	$4,298,341
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	316
Amount	$17,500,000	$221,200
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187,500	2,367
Amount	$131,250,000	$1,656,900
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$517,854
State matching requirement	87,962,288	1,035,708
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	1,553,562
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

DELAWARE

	United States	Delaware
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	8,002
Increase over 1960 percent	7.8	12.0
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	2,494
Increase over 1960 percent	10.4	46.5
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students percent	60.4	85.9
1st-time students do	63.7	71.3
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	13,848
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Schoarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	850
Amount	$98,157,544	$316,062
Average	$341	$372
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	178
Amount	$50,151,908	$44,270
Average	$434	$249
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	19
Amount	$14,362,182	$3,700
Average	$274	$195
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	None
Number of institutions, 1960	317	....
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	....
Increase over 1960 percent	16.5	....

	United States	Delaware
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18-24 years of age	$147	$114
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	54.2
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$4,400,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$3,200,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$7.42
Current funds as percent of personal income percent	0.4	0.2
Current funds per person 18-24 years of age	$81	$83
Percent of college-age versus total population percent	9	7.14
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population percent	19.6	19.68
Property taxes as percent of personal income do	3.7	1.2
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	....
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Delaware could borrow approximately	....	$621,763
A similar amount would be avalable during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	56
Account	$17,500,000	$39,200
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187,500	418
Amount	$131,250,000	$292,600
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$69,069
State matching requirement	87,962,288	138,138
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	207,207
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

College Academic Assistance Act—Fact Sheet—Continued

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

	United States	District of Columbia
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	46,895
Increase over 1960 ... percent	7.8	0.9
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	7,106
Increase over 1960 ... percent	10.4	3.8
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students ... percent	60.4	9.6
1st-time students ... do	63.7	12.3
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	90,258
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	1,524
Amount	$98,157,544	$933,963
Average	$341	$606
B. National Defense Student Loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	1,028
Amount	$50,151,908	$591,196
Average	$434	$575
C. Other Student Loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	235
Amount	$14,362,182	$98,817
Average	$274	$420
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	None
Number of institutions, 1960	317	None
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	None
Increase over 1960 ... percent	16.5	None

	United States	District of Columbia
IV. Other information (based on 1957–58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18–24 years of age	$147	$238
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	6.6
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$1,800,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$1,800,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$2.31
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.1
Current funds per person 18–24 years of age	$81	$22
Percent of college-age versus total population	9	------------
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population ... percent	19.6	------------
Property taxes as percent of personal income	3.7	2.5
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	------------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, District of Columbia could borrow approximately	------------	$3,643,788
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	79
Amount	$17,500,000	$55,300
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963–66	187,500	594
Amount	$131,250,000	$415,800
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$89,164
State matching requirement	87,962,288	178,328
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	267,492
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

FLORIDA

	United States	Florida
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	79,660
Increase over 1960 ... percent	7.8	8.9
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	23,566
Increase over 1960 ... percent	10.4	19.1
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students ... percent	60.4	66.4
1st-time students ... do	63.7	71.0
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	130,203
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959–60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	3,373
Amount	$98,157,544	$1,639,757
Average	$341	$486
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	2,262
Amount	$50,151,908	$798,911
Average	$434	$353
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	219
Amount	$14,362,182	$56,975
Average	$274	$260
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	24
Number of institutions, 1960	317	16
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	21,237
Increase over 1960 ... percent	16.5	+74.1

	United States	Florida
IV. Other information (based on 1957–58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18–24 years of age	$147	$93
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	55.6
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$37,500,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$27,100,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$6.56
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.3
Current funds per person 18–24 years of age	$81	$65
Percent of college-age versus total population	9	7.20
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population ... percent	19.6	17.64
Property taxes as percent of personal income	3.7	3.2
Sales tax ... percent	------------	3.0
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	------------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Florida could borrow approximately	------------	$6,189,661
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	543
Amount	$17,500,000	$380,100
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963–66	187,500	4,074
Amount	$131,250,000	$2,851,800
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$1,205,416
State matching requirement	87,962,288	2,041,288
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	3,246,704
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

College Academic Assistance Act—Fact Sheet—Continued

GEORGIA

	United States	Georgia
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	51,955
Increase over 1960 ... percent	7.8	3.5
1st-time students 1960	1,026,087	14,579
Increase over 1960 ... percent	10.4	7.0
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students ... percent	60.4	67.3
1st-time students ... do	63.7	66.1
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	97,565
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959–60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	3,203
Amount	$98,157,544	$799,894
Average	$341	250
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	2,271
Amount	$50,151,908	$753,575
Average	$434	332
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	512
Amount	$14,362,182	$139,773
Average	$274	273
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	8
Number of institutions, 1960	317	9
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	5,308
Increase of 1960 ... percent	16.5	−0.4

	United States	Georgia
IV. Other information (based on 1957–58 date, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18–24 years of age	$147	$79
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments ... percent	43.7	39.9
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$19,800,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$17,900,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$4.85
Current funds as percent of personal income ... percent	0.4	0.3
Current funds per person 18–24 years of age	$81	$45
Percent of college-age versus total population ... percent	9.0	10.42
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population ... percent	19.6	11.59
Property taxes as percent of personal income ... do	3.7	2.50
Sales tax ... do	----------	3.00
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	----------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Georgia could borrow approximately	----------	$4,036,955
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid. 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	552
Amount	$17,500,000	$386,400
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963–66	187,500	4,139
Amount	$131,250,000	$2,897,300
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$1,245,608
State matching requirement	87,962,288	1,676,788
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	2,922,396
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

HAWAII

	United States	Hawaii
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	11,697
Increase over 1960 ... percent	7.8	12.5
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	3,248
Increase over 1960 ... percent	10.4	20.8
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students ... percent	60.4	87.6
1st-time students ... do	63.7	78.8
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	20,181
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959–60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying to the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	322
Amount	$98,157,544	$70,230
Average	$341	$218
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	23
Amount	$50,151,908	$54, /95
Average	$434	$2,382
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	----------
Amount	$14,362,182	----------
Average	$274	----------
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	None
Number of institutions, 1960	317	None
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	None
Increase over 1960 ... percent	16.5	None

	United States	Hawaii
IV. Other information (based on 1957–58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18–24 years of age	$147	$59
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	59.5
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$4,500,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$3,600,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$6.48
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.3
Current funds per person 18–24 years of age	$81	$50
Percent of college-age versus total population	9	----------
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population ... percent	19.6	----------
Property taxes as percent of personal income ... do	3.7	----------
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	----------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Hawaii could borrow approximately	----------	$908,869
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	109
Amount	$17,500,000	$76,300
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963–66	187,500	817
Amount	$131,250,000	$571,900
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$221,968
State matching requirement	87,962,288	417,567
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	639,535
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

College Academic Assistance Act—Fact Sheet—Continued

IDAHO

	United States	Idaho
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	12,412
Increase over 1960 ... percent	7.8	7.5
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	4,533
Increase over 1960 ... percent	10.4	7.5
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students ... percent	60.4	78.7
1st-time students ... do	63.7	73.1
B. Project enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	22,408
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959–60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	1,120
Amount	$98,157,544	$207,154
Average	$341	$185
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	487
Amount	$50,151,908	$182,277
Average	$434	$374
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	141
Amount	$14,362,182	$19,300
Average	$274	$137
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	3
Number of institutions, 1960	317	3
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	2,888
Increase over 1960 ... percent	16.5	+14.7

	United States	Idaho
IV. Other information (based on 1957–58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$138
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments ... percent	43.7	67.1
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$7,400,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$6,600,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$10.27
Current funds as percent of personal income ... percent	0.4	0.6
Current funds per person 18 to 24 years of age	$81	$113
Percent of college age versus total population ... percent	9	10.39
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population ... percent	19.6	15.22
Property taxes as percent of personal income ... percent	3.7	4.8
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Idaho could borrow approximately	------	$964,425
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	116
Amount	$17,500,000	$81,200
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963–66	187,500	872
Amount	$131,250,000	$610,400
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$263,722
State matching requirement	87,962,288	414,760
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	678,482
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

ILLINOIS

	United States	Illinois
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	216,577
Increase over 1960 ... percent	7.8	8.2
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	56,297
Increase over 1960 ... percent	10.4	15.3
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students ... percent	60.4	51.8
1st-time students ... do	63.7	61.6
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	388,799
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959–60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	19,810
Amount	$98,157,544	$5,147,854
Average	$341	$260
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	5,077
Amount	$50,151,908	$2,420,575
Average	$434	$477
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	4,090
Amount	$14,362,182	$777,418
Average	$274	$190
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	14
Number of institutions, 1960	317	13
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	38,077
Increase over 1960 ... percent	16.5	+24.3

	United States	Illinois
IV. Other information (based on 1957–58 data) (latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$173
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments ... percent	43.7	42.0
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$105,400,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$78,000,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$8.08
Current funds as percent of personal income ... percent	0.4	0.3
Current funds per person 18 to 24 years of age	$81	$94
Percent of college-age versus total population	9.0	8.01
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population ... percent	19.6	21.40
Property taxes as percent of personal income ... do	3.7	3.8
Sales tax ... do	------	2½
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Illinois could borrow approximately	------	$16,828,249
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	1,332
Amount	$17,500,000	$932,400
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963–66	187,500	9,996
Amount	$131,250,000	$6,997,200
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$2,201,526
State matching requirement	87,962,288	4,403,052
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	6,604,578
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

College Academic Assistance Act—Fact Sheet—Continued

INDIANA

	United States	Indiana
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	105,294
Increase over 1960 percent	7.8	11.21
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	26,100
Increase over 1960 percent	10.4	6.3
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students percent	60.4	61.2
1st-time students do	63.7	58.0
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	183,926
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying to the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	8,589
Amount	$98,157,544	$2,722,302
Average	$341	$317
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	3,428
Amount	$50,151,908	$1,588,011
Average	$434	$463
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	1,515
Amount	$14,362,182	$302,487
Average	$274	$200
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	1
Number of institutions, 1960	317	1
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	618
Increase over 1960 percent	16.5	+25.6

	United States	Indiana
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18-24 years of age	$147	$164
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments percent	43.7	46.6
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$49,800,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$38,500,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$8.55
Current funds as percent of personal income percent	0.4	0.4
Current funds per person 18-24 years of age	$81	$94
Percent of college-age versus total population	9	8.72
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population percent	19.6	20.26
Property taxes as percent of personal income do	3.7	3.9
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Indiana could borrow approximately		$8,181,449
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	681
Amount	$17,500,000	$476,700
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187,500	5,105
Amount	$131,250,000	$3,573,500
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$1,367,583
State matching requirement	87,962,288	2,633,272
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	4,000,855
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

IOWA

	United States	Iowa
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	61,154
Increase over 1960 percent	7.8	6.6
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	17,632
Increase over 1960 percent	10.4	7.0
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students percent	60.4	49.8
1st-time students do	63.7	45.7
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	111,414
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
I. General enrollment information		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	8,206
Amount	$98,157,544	$2,122,963
Average	$341	$259
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	2,388
Amount	$50,151,908	$1,198,150
Average	$434	$502
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	651
Amount	$14,362,182	$160,562
Average	$274	$247
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	16
Number of institutions, 1960	317	16
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	3,772
Increase over 1960 percent	16.5	+17.7

	United States	Iowa
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18-24 years of age	$147	$170
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	52.5
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$29,500,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$28,600,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$10.29
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.6
Current funds per person 18-24 years of age	$81	$125
Percent of college-age versus total population	9	9.17
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population percent	19.6	19.55
Property taxes as percent of personal income	3.7	4.8
Sales tax percent		2.0
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Iowa could borrow approximately		$4,751,727
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	449
Amount	$17,500,000	$314,300
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total schalorships for fiscal year 1963-66	187,500	3,369
Amount	$131,250,000	$2,358,300
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$995,678
State matching requirement	87,962,288	1,746,521
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	2,742,199
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

College Academic Assistance Act—Fact Sheet—Continued

KANSAS

	United States	Kansas
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3, 891, 230	56, 148
Increase over 1960 ... percent	7. 8	7. 9
1st-time students, 1961	1, 026, 087	16, 987
Increase over 1960 ... percent	10. 4	12. 5
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students ... percent	60. 4	80. 5
1st-time students ... do	63. 7	74. 2
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6, 959, 000	101, 114
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287, 589	5, 980
Amount	$98, 157, 544	$1, 184, 454
Average	$341	$198
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115, 450	1, 961
Amount	$50, 151, 908	$954, 207
Average	$434	$487
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52, 322	2, 310
Amount	$14, 362, 182	$397, 891
Average	$274	$172
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	14
Number of institutions, 1960	317	14
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458, 296	6, 043
Increase over 1960 ... percent	16. 5	+18. 7
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$173
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments ... percent	43. 7	57. 3
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1, 732, 600, 000	$27, 800, 000
Total current funds only	$1, 267, 900, 000	$23, 000, 000
Current funds per capita	$7. 50	$11. 17
Current funds as percent of personal income ... percent	0. 4	0. 6
Current funds per person 18 to 24 years of age	$81	$120
Percent of college age versus total population	9	8. 15
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population ... percent	19. 6	26. 37
Property taxes as percent of personal income ... do	3. 7	5. 6
Sales tax ... do	----------	2. 00
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300, 000, 000	----------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Kansas could borrow approximately	----------	$4, 362, 756
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25, 000	328
Amount	$17, 500, 000	$229, 600
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187, 500	2, 460
Amount	$131, 250, 000	$1, 722, 000
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50, 000, 000	$667, 575
State matching requirement	87, 962, 288	1, 202, 817
Total for public junior college construction	137, 962, 288	1, 870, 392
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

KENTUCKY

	United States	Kentucky
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3, 891, 230	51, 784
Increase over 1960 ... percent	7. 8	8. 3
1st-time students, 1961	1, 026, 087	14, 583
Increase over 1960 ... percent	10. 4	11. 7
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students ... percent	60. 4	65. 3
1st-time students ... do	63. 7	63. 8
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6, 959, 000	92, 833
II. Financial assistant to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent. National defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287, 589	4, 109
Amount	$98, 157, 544	$1, 095, 813
Average	$341	$267
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115, 450	2, 065
Amount	$50, 151, 908	$744, 040
Average	$434	$360
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52, 322	389
Amount	$14, 362, 182	$102, 104
Average	$274	$262
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	1
Number of institutions, 1960	317	1
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458, 296	631
Increase over 1960 ... percent	16. 5	+10. 9
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$86
Percent of college and university current income for students higher education from States and local governments	43. 7	38. 0
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1, 732, 600, 000	$21, 100, 000
Total current funds only	$1, 267, 900, 000	$12, 000, 000
Current funds per capita	$7. 50	$3. 98
Current funds as percent of personal income	0. 4	0. 3
Current funds per person 18 to 24, years of age	$81	$42
Percent of college age versus total population	9	10. 74
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population ... percent	19. 6	12. 07
Property taxes as percent of personal income	3. 7	2. 9
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300, 000, 000	----------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Kentucky could borrow approximately	----------	$4, 023, 668
A similar, amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25, 000	458
Amount	$17, 500, 000	$320, 600
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187, 500	3, 434
Amount	$131, 250, 000	$2, 403, 800
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50, 000, 000	$996, 594
State matching requirement	87, 962, 288	1, 304, 900
Total for public junior college construction	137, 962, 288	2, 301, 494
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

College Academic Assistance Act—Fact Sheet—Continued

LOUISIANA

	United States	Louisiana
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	62,312
Increase over 1960 percent	7.8	9.0
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	14,722
Increase over 1960 percent	10.4	−1.4
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students percent	60.4	75.1
1st-time students do	63.7	80.7
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	110,996
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	11,390
Amount	$98,157,544	$1,750,003
Average	$341	$154
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	2,466
Amount	$50,151,908	$1,114,175
Average	$434	$452
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	406
Amount	$14,362,182	$47,123
Average	$274	$116
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	None
Number of institutions, 1960	317	None
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	None
Increase over 1960 percent	16.57	None
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$142
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments percent	43.7	66.5
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$42,600,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$33,500,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$11.08
Current funds as percent of personal income percent	0.4	0.7
Current funds per person 18 to 24 year of age	$81	$112
Percent of college-age versus total population	9	9.98
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population percent	19.6	15.84
Property taxes as percent of personal income	3.7	2.3
Sales tax percent		2.0
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Louisiana could borrow approximately		$4,841,705
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	462
Amount	$17,500,000	$323,400
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187,500	3,462
Amount	$131,250,000	$2,423,400
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$1,039,695
State matching requirement	87,962,288	1,446,513
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	2,486,208
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

MAINE

	United States	Maine
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal occupational, adult education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	13,687
Increase over 1960 percent	7.8	8.0
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	4,012
Increase over 1960 percent	10.4	9.7
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students percent	60.4	61.2
1st-time students do	63.7	54.3
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	24,635
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	1,901
Amount	$98,157,544	$715,825
Average	$341	$377
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	625
Amount	$50,151,908	$257,599
Average	$434	$412
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	388
Amount	$14,362,182	$80,850
Average	$274	$26
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	1
Number of institutions, 1960	317	1
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	101
Increase over 1960 percent	16.57	+12.2
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$118
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments percent	43.7	30.8
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$8,000,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$3,600,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$3.94
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.2
Current funds per person 18 to 24 years of age	$81	$43
Percent of college-age versus total population	9	9.91
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population percent	19.6	11.74
Property taxes as percent of personal income	3.7	4.8
Sales tax percent		3.0
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	
If apportioned on basis of total degree credit enrollment, Maine could borrow approximately		$1,063,494
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	141
Amount	$17,500,000	$98,700
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187,500	1,058
Amount	$131,250,000	$740,600
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$329,504
State matching requirement	87,962,288	522,826
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	852,330
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

College Academic Assistance Act—Fact Sheet—Continued

MARYLAND

	United States	Maryland
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3, 891, 230	59, 931
Increase over 1960 percent	7. 8	14. 2
1st-time students, 1961	1, 026, 087	12, 338
Increase over 1960 percent	10. 4	4. 2
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students percent	60. 4	62. 1
1st-time students do	63. 7	66. 6
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6, 959, 000	101, 949
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959–60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287, 589	3, 559
Amount	$98, 157, 544	$1, 623, 566
Average	$341	$456
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115, 450	1, 446
Amount	$50, 151, 908	$665, 662
Average	$434	$460
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52, 322	239
Amount	$14, 362, 182	$68, 375
Average	$274	$286
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	10
Number of institutions, 1960	317	10
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	$658, 296	$5, 430
Increase over 1960 percent	16. 5	+25. 4
IV. Other information (based on 1957–58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$125
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43. 7	49. 0
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1, 732, 600, 000	$25, 200, 000
Total current funds only	$1, 267, 900, 000	$20, 500, 000
Current funds per capita	$7. 50	$7. 32
Current funds as percent of personal income	0. 4	0. 3
Current funds per person 18–24 years of age	$81	$76
Percent of college age versus total population	9	8. 09
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population percent	19. 6	18. 89
Property taxes as percent of personal income	3. 7	3. 1
Sales tax percent	----------	3. 0
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300, 000, 000	----------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Maryland could borrow approximately	----------	$4, 656, 699
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25, 000	387
Amount	$17, 500, 000	$270, 900
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963–66	187, 500	2, 905
Amount	$131, 250, 000	$2, 033, 500
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50, 000, 000	$683, 199
State matching requirement	87, 962, 288	1, 366, 398
Total for public junior college construction	137, 962, 288	2, 049, 597
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

MASSACHUSETTS

	United States	Massachusetts
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3, 891, 230	138, 167
Increase over 1960 percent	7. 8	3. 0
1st-time students, 1961	1, 026, 087	34, 930
Increase over 1960 percent	10. 4	−3. 8
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students percent	60. 4	17. 1
1st-time students do	63. 7	21. 3
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6, 959, 000	260, 475
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959–60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287, 589	12, 557
Amount	$98, 157, 544	$8, 530, 023
Average	$341	$679
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115, 450	3, 978
Amount	$50, 151, 908	$1, 793, 651
Average	$434	$451
C Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52, 322	4, 376
Amount	$14, 362, 182	$2, 390, 845
Average	$274	$546
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	4
Number of institutions, 1960	317	3
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458, 296	1, 691
Increase over 1960 percent	16. 5	+89. 8
IV. Other information (based on 1957–58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$267
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43. 7	8. 3
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1, 732, 600, 000	$18, 100, 000
Total current funds only	$1, 267, 900, 000	$11, 400, 000
Current funds per capita	$7. 50	$2. 39
Current funds as percent of personal income	0. 4	0. 1
Current funds per person 18–24 years of age	$81	$27
Percent of college-age versus total population	9. 0	8. 17
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population percent	19. 6	30. 04
Property taxes as percent of personal income	3. 7	5. 2
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300, 000, 000	----------
If apportioned on basis of total degree credit enrollment, Massachusetts could borrow approximately	----------	$10, 735, 714
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25, 000	688
Amount	$17, 500, 000	$481, 600
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963–66	187, 500	5, 160
Amount	$131, 250, 000	$3, 612, 000
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50, 000, 000	$1, 369, 953
State matching requirement	87, 962, 288	2, 739, 906
Total for public junior college construction	137, 962, 288	4, 109, 859
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

College Academic Assistance Act—Fact Sheet—Continued

MICHIGAN

	United States	Michigan
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational), adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	169,822
Increase over 1960 ... percent	7.8	6.0
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	37,821
Increase over 1960 ... percent	10.4	2.5
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students ... percent	60.4	78.7
1st-time students ... do	63.7	76.7
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	311,276
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	13,477
Amount	$98,157,544	$3,380,260
Average	$341	$251
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	4,105
Amount	$50,151,908	$1,976,763
Average	$434	$482
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	7,796
Amount	$14,362,182	$1,408,490
Average	$274	$181
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	15
Number of institutions, 1960	317	15
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	23,567
Increase over 1960 ... percent	16.5	+16.7

	United States	Michigan
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$187
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	60.9
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$107,400,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$90,700,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$11.82
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.5
Current funds per person 18 to 24 years of age	$81	$141
Percent of college-age versus total population	9.0	8.50
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population ... percent	19.6	20.99
Property taxes as percent of personal income	3.7	3.9
Sales tax ... percent	----------	4.00
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	----------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Michigan could borrow approximately	----------	$13,195,339
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	1,124
Amount	$17,500,000	$786,800
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187,500	8,437
Amount	$131,250,000	$5,905,900
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$2,220,705
State matching requirement	87,962,288	4,441,410
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	6,662,115
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

MINNESOTA

	United States	Minnesota
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	83,174
Increase over 1960 ... percent	7.87	9.8
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	23,876
Increase over 1960 ... percent	10.4	23.1
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students ... percent	60.4	74.1
1st-time students ... do	63.7	71.3
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	147,183
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	5,677
Amount	$98,157,544	$1,541,561
Average	$341	$272
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	2,933
Amount	$50,151,908	$1,273,852
Average	$434	$434
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	1,905
Amount	$14,362,182	$583,626
Average	$274	$306
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	9
Number of institutions, 1960	317	9
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	2,949
Increase over 1960 ... percent	16.5	+14.1

	United States	Minnesota
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data) (latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$168
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	52.6
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$44,800,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$33,500,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$10.12
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.5
Current funds per person 18 to 24 years of age	$81	$118
Percent of college-age versus total population	9.0	8.83
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population ... percent	19.6	23.10
Property taxes as percent of personal income	3.7	5.0
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	----------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Minnesota could borrow approximately	----------	$6,462,703
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	551
Amount	$17,500,000	$385,700
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187,500	4,130
Amount	$131,250,000	$2,891,000
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$1,261,501
State matching requirement	87,962,288	2,270,785
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	3,532,286
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

College Academic Assistance Act—Fact Sheet—Continued

MISSISSIPPI

	United States	Mississippi
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	38,572
Increase over 1960 .... percent	7.8	8.7
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	13,773
Increase over 1960 .... percent	10.4	19.9
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students .... percent	60.4	81.5
1st-time students .... do	63.7	81.2
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	68,894
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	2,793
Amount	$98,157,544	$536,820
Average	$341	$192
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	2,085
Amount	$50,151,908	$581,545
Average	$434	$279
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	98
Amount	$14,362,182	$21,041
Average	$274	$215
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	17
Number of institutions, 1960	317	17
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	9,345
Increase over 1960 .... percent	16.5	20.4
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of college and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$80
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	55.4
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$16,700,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$12,400,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$5.78
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.6
Current funds per person 18 to 24 years of age	$81	$60
Percent of college age versus total population	9.0	11.91
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population .... percent	19.6	10.84
Property taxes as percent of personal income	3.7	3.1
Sales tax .... percent		3.0
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Mississippi could borrow approximately		$2,997,083
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	345
Amount	$17,500,000	$241,500
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187,500	2,589
Amount	$131,250,000	$1,812,300
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$804,742
State matching requirement	87,962,288	843,225
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	1,647,967
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

MISSOURI

	United States	Missouri
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	88,790
Increase over 1960 .... percent	7.8	8.1
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	26,433
Increase over 1960 .... percent	10.4	15.0
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students .... percent	60.4	46.9
1st-time students .... do	63.7	53.7
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	159,570
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying to the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	7,860
Amount	$98,157,544	$2,147,339
Average	$341	$273
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	3,301
Amount	$50,151,908	$1,370,419
Average	$434	$415
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	1,599
Amount	$14,362,182	$402,010
Average	$274	$251
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	6
Number of institutions, 1960	317	6
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	4,968
Increase over 1960 .... percent	16.5	9.5
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$142
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	34.1
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$29,100,000
Total current funds only	$1,237,900,000	$21,500,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$5.12
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.3
Current funds per person 18 to 24 years of age	$81	$59
Percent of college-age versus total population	9.0	8.71
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population .... percent	19.6	19.75
Property taxes as percent of personal income	3.7	3.0
Sales tax .... percent		2.0
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Missouri could borrow approximately		$6,899,072
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	590
Amount	$17,500,000	$413,000
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187,500	4,427
Amount	$131,250,000	$3,098,900
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$1,146,261
State matching requirement	87,962,288	2,270,621
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	3,416,882
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

College Academic Assistance Act—Fact Sheet—Continued

MONTANA

	United States	Montana
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	13,869
Increase over 1960 percent	7.8	6.0
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	4,029
Increase over 1960 percent	10.4	4.8
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students percent	60.4	86.4
1st-time students do	63.7	84.5
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	25,400
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	3,649
Amount	$98,157,544	$322,385
Average	$341	$88
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	482
Amount	$50,151,908	$192,832
Average	$434	$400
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	164
Amount	$14,362,182	$19,560
Average	$274	$119
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	2
Number of institutions, 1960	317	2
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	204
Increase over 1960 percent	16.5	−44.1
IV. Other information (based on 1957–58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$171
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	74.8
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$13,500,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$11,900,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$17.80
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.9
Current funds per person 18–24 years of age	$81	$208
Percent of college-age versus total population	9.0	8.79
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population	19.6	17.55
Property taxes as percent of personal income	3.7	5.8
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Montana could borrow approximately		$1,077,635
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	109
Amount	$17,500,000	$76,300
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963–66	187,500	817
Amount	$131,250,000	$571,900
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$226,601
State matching requirement	87,962,288	408,281
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	634,882
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

NEBRASKA

	United States	Nebraska
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	33,434
Increase over 1960 percent	7.8	0.1
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	8,922
Increase over 1960 percent	10.4	8.8
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students percent	60.4	70.2
1st-time students do	63.7	68.6
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	64,858
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	3,552
Amount	$98,157,544	$521,848
Average	$341	$147
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	1,113
Amount	$50,151,908	$509,613
Average	$434	$458
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	462
Amount	$14,362,182	$111,255
Average	$274	$241
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	4
Number of institutions, 1960	317	4
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	1,275
Increase over 1960 percent	16.5	+1.6
IV. Other information (based on 1957–58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$166
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	55.0
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$17,100,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$14,700,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$10.32
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.5
Current funds per person 18–24 years of age	$81	$124
Percent of college-age versus total population	9.0	8.49
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population percent	19.6	22.22
Property taxes as percent of personal income	3.7	5.4
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Nebraska could borrow approximately		$2,597,855
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	219
Amount	$17,500,000	$153,300
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963–66	187,500	1,643
Amount	$131,250,000	$1,150,100
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$460,961
State matching requirement	87,962,288	850,877
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	1,311,838
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

College Academic Assistance Act—Fact Sheet—Continued

NEVADA

	United States	Nevada
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	4,738
Increase over 1960 percent	7.8	14.4
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	1,152
Increase over 1960 percent	10.4	13.7
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students percent	60.4	100.0
1st-time students do	63.7	100.0
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	8,072
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	133
Amount	$98,157,544	$31,000
Average	$341	$233
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	45
Amount	$50,151,908	$31,000
Average	$434	$689
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	----------
Amount	$14,362,182	----------
Average	$274	----------
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	None
Number of institutions, 1960	317	None
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	None
Increase over 1960 percent	16.5	None
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18-24 years of age	$147	$99
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	74.8
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$4,600,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$2,600,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$10.08
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.4
Current funds per person 18-24 years of age	$81	$98
Percent of college-age versus total population	9.0	6.49
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population percent	19.6	13.84
Property taxes as percent of personal income	3.7	3.4
Sales tax percent	----------	2.0
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	----------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Nevada could borrow approximately	----------	$368,147
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	33
Amount	$17,500,000	$23,100
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187,500	251
Amount	$131,250,000	$175,700
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$48,596
State matching requirement	87,962,288	97,192
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	145,788
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

NEW HAMPSHIRE

	United States	New Hampshire
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	13,624
Increase over 1960 percent	7.8	7.3
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	3,620
Increase over 1960 percent	10.4	2.4
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students percent	60.4	53.8
1st-time students do	63.7	46.1
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	24,635
II. Financial assistant to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities (the institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students; of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	1,961
Amount	$98,157,544	$1,162,282
Average	$341	$593
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	748
Amount	$50,151,908	$257,842
Average	$434	$345
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	291
Amount	$14,362,182	$114,142
Average	$274	$392
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	None
Number of institutions, 1960	317	None
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	None
Increase over 1960 percent	16.5	None
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$235
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	25.3
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$4,600,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$3,700,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$6.48
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.3
Current funds per person 18 to 24 years of age	$81	$72
Percent of college age versus total population	9.0	8.56
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population percent	19.6	21.84
Property taxes as percent of personal income	3.7	5.2
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	----------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, New Hampshire could borrow approximately	----------	$1,058,598
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	88
Amount	$17,500,000	$61,600
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187,500	659
Amount	$131,250,000	$461,300
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$201,118
State matching requirement	87,962,288	$362,355
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	$563,473
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

College Academic Assistance Act—Fact Sheet—Continued

NEW JERSEY

	United States	New Jersey
1. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	92,727
Increase over 1960....percent	7.8	8.4
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	21,172
Increase over 1960....percent	10.4	6.4
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students....percent	60.4	47.2
1st-time students....do	63.7	40.6
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	166,111
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	4,949
Amount	$98,157,544	$2,576,331
Average	$341	$521
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	1,853
Amount	$50,151,908	$933,728
Average	$434	$504
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	1,071
Amount	$14,362,182	$379,776
Average	$274	$355
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	1
Number of institutions, 1960	317	1
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	1,040
Increase over 1960....percent	16.5	+22.2

	United States	New Jersey
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$103
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments....percent	43.7	29.5
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$25,400,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$17,500,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$3.15
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.1
Current funds per person 18 to 24 years of age	$81	$38
Percent of college age versus total population	9.0	8.32
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population....percent	19.6	17.05
Property taxes as percent of personal income	3.7	4.4
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	....
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, New Jersey could borrow approximately	....	$7,204,980
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	717
Amount	$17,500,000	$501,900
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187,500	5,374
Amount	$131,250,000	$3,761,800
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$1,317,316
State matching requirement	87,962,288	2,634,632
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	3,951,948
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

NEW MEXICO

	United States	New Mexico
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	19,253
Increase over 1960....percent	7.8	10.1
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	4,934
Increase over 1960....percent	10.4	17.5
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students....percent	60.4	94.7
1st-time students....do	63.7	92.0
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	33,960
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying to the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	1,385
Amount	$98,157,544	$340,882
Average	$341	$246
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	559
Amount	$50,151,908	$277,974
Average	$434	$497
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	11
Amount	$14,362,182	$1,050
Average	$274	$95
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	1
Number of institutions, 1960	317	1
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	319
Increase over 1960....percent	16.5	19.5

	United States	New Mexico
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$99
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	68.3
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$9,800,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$9,000,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$11.23
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.6
Current funds per person 18 to 24 years of age	$81	$94
Percent of college-age versus total population	9.0	10.58
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population....percent	19.6	16.78
Property taxes as percent of personal income	3.7	2.1
Sales tax....percent	....	2.00
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	....
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, New Mexico could borrow approximately	....	$1,495,977
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	131
Amount	$17,500,000	$91,700
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187,500	984
Amount	$131,250,000	$688,800
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$278,807
State matching requirement	87,962,288	433,094
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	711,901
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

College Academic Assistance Act—Fact Sheet—Continued

NEW YORK

	United States	New York
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	370,619
Increase over 1960 ...percent	7.8	5.5
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	67,389
Increase over 1960 ...percent	10.4	3.1
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students ...percent	60.4	32.2
1st-time students ...do	63.7	35.7
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	682,191
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959–60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	21,381
Amount	$98,157,544	$12,202,752
Average	$341	$571
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	9,926
Amount	$50,151,908	$5,235,216
Average	$434	$527
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	2,746
Amount	$14,362,182	$1,134,987
Average	$274	$413
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	13
Number of institutions, 1960	317	9
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	4,424
Increase over 1960 ...percent	16.5	+72.7

	United States	New York
IV. Other information (based on 1957–58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18–24 years of age	$147	$204
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	26.0
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$120,600,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$87,100,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$5.41
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.2
Current funds per person 18–24 years of age	$81	$66
Percent of college-age versus total population	9	7.96
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population ...percent	19.6	24.41
Property taxes as percent of personal income	3.7	4.3
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	----------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, New York, could borrow approximately	----------	$28,797,466
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the Act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	2,035
Amount	$17,500,000	$1,424,500
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963–66	187,500	15,268
Amount	$131,250,000	$10,687,600
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$3,284,375
State matching requirement	87,962,288	6,568,750
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	9,853,125
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the Act.		

NORTH CAROLINA

	United States	North Carolina
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	77,481
Increase over 1960 ...percent	7.8	12.1
1st-time students. 1961	1,026,087	23,211
Increase over 1960 ...percent	10.4	15.4
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students ...percent	60.4	56.2
1st-time students ...do	63.7	51.2
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	134,309
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959–60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying to the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	7,461
Amount	$98,157,544	$2,141,379
Average	$341	$287
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	3,961
Amount	$50,151,908	$1,282,310
Average	$434	$324
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	575
Amount	$14,362,182	$149,570
Average	$274	$260
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions:		
1961	331	4
1960	317	4
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	2,061
Increase over 1960 ...percent	16.5	+16.3

	United States	North Carolina
IV. Other information (based on 1957–58 data) (latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person, in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$104
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	36.3
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$34,000,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$22,700,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$5.18
Current funds as percent of personal income	.4	.4
Current funds per person 18 to 24 years of age	$81	$48
Percent of college-age versus total population	9.0	11.05
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population ...percent	19.6	11.88
Property taxes as percent of personal income	3.7	2.3
Sales tax ...percent	----------	3.0
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	----------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, North Carolina could borrow approximately	----------	$6,020,351
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	715
Amount	$17,500,000	$500,500
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963–66	187,500	5,365
Amount	$131,250,000	$3,755,500
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$1,604,690
State matching requirement	87,962,288	2,098,138
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	3,702,828
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

College Academic Assistance Act—Fact Sheet—Continued

NORTH DAKOTA

	U.S.	North Dakota
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3, 891, 230	14, 201
Increase over 1960 ... percent	7.8	6.1
1st-time students, 1961	1, 026, 087	4, 769
Increase over 1960 ... percent	10.4	13.9
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students ... percent	60.4	96.8
1st-time students ... do	63.7	96.8
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6, 959, 000	26, 027
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying to the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287, 589	859
Amount	$98, 157, 544	$169, 790
Average	$341	$198
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115, 450	600
Amount	$50, 151, 908	$273, 841
Average	$434	$456
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52, 322	291
Amount	$14, 362, 182	$118, 767
Average	$274	$408
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	4
Number of institutions, 1960	317	4
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458, 296	1, 419
Increase over 1960 ... percent	16.5	+26.4

	U.S.	North Dakota
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$158
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	74.3
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1, 732, 600, 000	$9, 900, 000
Total current funds only	$1, 267, 900, 000	$8, 700, 000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$13.51
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.9
Current funds per person 18 to 24 years of age	$81	$155
Percent of college-age versus total population	9.0	9.77
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population ... percent	19.6	17.71
Property taxes as percent of personal income ... do	3.7	6.1
Sales tax ... do	----------	2.0
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300, 000, 000	----------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, North Dakota could borrow approximately	----------	$1, 103, 432
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25, 000	109
Amount	$17, 500, 000	$76, 300
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187, 500	817
Amount	$131, 250, 000	$571, 900
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50, 000, 000	$266, 793
State matching requirement	87, 962, 288	394, 596
Total for public junior college construction	137, 962, 288	661, 389
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

OHIO

	United States	Ohio
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3, 891, 230	188, 016
Increase over 1960 ... percent	7.8	7.4
1st-time students, 1961	1, 026, 087	48, 001
Increase over 1960 ... percent	10.4	7.5
Percent in public institutions, fall, 1961:		
Total students ... percent	60.4	56.0
1st-time students ... do	63.0	53.5
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6, 959, 000	340, 156
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287, 589	14, 629
Amount	$98, 157, 544	$5, 196, 910
Average	$341	$355
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115, 450	5, 095
Amount	$50, 151, 908	$2, 248, 885
Average	$434	$441
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52, 322	2, 161
Amount	$14, 362, 182	$587, 203
Average	$274	$272
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	None
Number of institutions, 1960	317	None
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458, 296	None
Increase over 1960 ... percent	16.5	None

	United States	Ohio
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$139
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments ... percent	43.7	31.5
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1, 732, 600, 000	$75, 700, 000
Total current funds only	$1, 267, 900, 000	$40, 900, 000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$4.44
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.2
Current funds per person 18 to 24 years of age	$81	$50
Percent of college age versus total population ... percent	9.0	8.15
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population ... percent	19.6	19.60
Property taxes as percent of personal income ... do	3.7	3.3
Sales tax ... do	----------	$3.00
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300, 000, 000	----------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Ohio could borrow approximately	----------	$14, 609, 031
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25, 000	1, 329
Amount	$17, 500, 000	$930, 300
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187, 500	9, 968
Amount	$131, 250, 000	$6, 977, 600
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50, 000, 000	$2, 610, 497
State matching requirement	87, 962, 288	5, 220, 994
Total for public junior college construction	137, 962, 288	7, 831, 491
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

College Academic Assistance Act—Fact Sheet—Continued

OKLAHOMA

	United States	Oklahoma
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961: does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	59,623
Increase over 1960 percent	7.8	3.5
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	17,036
Increase over 1960 percent	10.4	14.4
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students percent	60.4	79.9
1st-time students do	63.7	83.1
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	111,831
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying to the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	3,661
Amount	$98,157,544	$870,646
Average	$341	$238
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	2,787
Amount	$50,151,908	$1,007,692
Average	$434	$362
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	1,417
Amount	$14,362,182	$409,888
Average	$274	$289
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	13
Number of institutions, 1960	317	12
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	6,201
Increase over 1960 percent	16.5	+11.9

	United States	Oklahoma
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$134
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	60.4
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$21,600,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$21,200,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$9.54
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.5
Current funds per person 18 to 24 years of age	$81	$100
Percent of college age versus total population	9.0	10.01
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population percent	19.6	22.66
Property taxes as percent of personal income percent	3.7	2.9
Sales tax percent		2.0
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Oklahoma could borrow approximately		$4,632,767
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	390
Amount	$17,500,000	$273,000
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187,500	2,924
Amount	$131,250,000	$2,046,800
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$851,614
State matching requirement	87,962,288	1,345,155
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	2,196,769
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

OREGON

	United States	Oregon
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	47,786
Increase over 1960 percent	7.8	10.1
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	15,778
Increase over 1960 percent	10.4	34.1
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students percent	60.4	78.5
1st-time students do	63.7	76.7
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	84,343
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying to the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	3,665
Amount	$98,157,544	$1,005,413
Average	$341	$274
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	1,211
Amount	$50,151,908	$599,032
Average	$434	$495
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	457
Amount	$14,362,182	$220,246
Average	$274	$482
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	1
Number of institutions, 1960	317	1
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	345
Increase over 1960 percent	16.5	+12.7

	United States	Oregon
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only) per person in the population 18-24 years of age	$147	$182
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments percent	43.7	64.3
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$29,300,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$22,000,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$12.64
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.6
Current funds per person 18-24 years of age	$81	$156
Percent of college-age versus total population	9	9.06
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population percent	19.6	22.86
Property taxes as percent of personal income do	3.7	4.4
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Oregon could borrow approximately		$3,713,020
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	270
Amount	$17,500,000	$189,000
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187,500	2,023
Amount	$131,250,000	$1,416,100
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$570,922
State matching requirement	$87,962,288	$1,141,844
Total for public junior college construction	$137,962,288	$1,712,766
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

College Academic Assistance Act—Fact Sheet—Continued

PENNSYLVANIA

	United States	Pennsylvania
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	204,401
Increase over 1960 percent	7.8	6.9
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	48,526
Increase over 1960 percent	10.4	10.4
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students percent	60.4	24.1
1st-time students do	63.7	27.0
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	371,332
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	21,180
Amount	$98,157,544	$10,018,138
Average	$341	$473
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	7,648
Amount	$50,151,908	$3,189,988
Average	$434	$417
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	1,701
Amount	$14,362,182	$642,123
Average	$274	$377
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	1
Number of institutions, 1960	317	1
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	253
Increase over 1960 percent	16.5	+8.1
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$152
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	22.9
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$39,500,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$36,600,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$3.32
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.2
Current funds per person 18 to 24 years of age	$81	$41
Percent of college age versus total population	9.0	8.86
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population percent	19.6	17.21
Property taxes as percent of personal income	3.7	2.50
Sales tax percent	------------	4.0
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	------------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Pennsylvania could borrow approximately	------------	$15,882,162
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	1,631
Amount	$17,500,000	$1,141,700
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187,500	12,233
Amount	$131,250,000	$8,563,100
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$3,435,281
State matching requirement	87,962,288	6,870,562
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	10,305,843
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

RHODE ISLAND

	United States	Rhode Island
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall, 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	19,842
Increase over 1960 percent	7.8	2.1
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	5,697
Increase over 1960 percent	10.4	3.3
Percent in public institutions, fall, 1961:		
Total students percent	60.4	44.2
1st-time students do	63.7	36.1
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	37,787
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	2,024
Amount	$98,157,544	$1,074,272
Average	$341	$531
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	840
Amount	$50,151,908	$342,954
Average	$434	$408
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	198
Amount	$14,362,182	$102,363
Average	$274	$517
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	None
Number of institutions, 1960	317	None
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	------------
Increase over 1960 percent	16.5	------------
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$152
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	24.1
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$14,800,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$3,600,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$4.30
Current funds as percent of personal income	.4	.2
Current funds per person 18 to 24 years of age	$81	$45
Percent of college-age versus total population	9.0	7.82
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population percent	19.6	23.26
Property taxes as percent of personal income do	3.7	3.8
Sales tax do	------------	3.0
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	------------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Rhode Island could borrow approximately	------------	$1,541,743
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	116
Amount	$17,500,000	$81,200
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187,500	872
Amount	$131,250,000	$610,400
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$225,955
State matching requirement	87,962,288	443,929
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	669,884
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

College Academic Assistance Act—Fact Sheet—Continued

SOUTH CAROLINA

	United States	South Carolina
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3, 891, 230	32, 749
Increase over 1960 percent	7. 8	3. 8
1st-time students, 1961	1, 026, 087	9, 879
Increase over 1960 percent	10. 4	3. 2
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students percent	60. 4	55. 5
1st-time students do	63. 7	45. 9
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6, 959, 000	61, 239
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying to the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287, 589	3, 029
Amount	$98, 157, 544	$787, 435
Average	$341	$260
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115, 450	1, 758
Amount	$50, 151, 908	$609, 466
Average	$434	$347
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52, 322	705
Amount	$14, 362, 182	$115, 855
Average	$274	$164
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	None
Number of institutions, 1960	317	None
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458, 296	None
Increase over 1960 percent	16. 5	None

	United States	South Carolina
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18-24 years of age	$147	$75
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43. 7	51. 8
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1, 732, 600, 000	$12, 300, 000
Total current funds only	$1, 267, 900, 000	$12, 300, 000
Current funds per capita	$7. 50	$5. 34
Current funds as percent of personal income	0. 4	0. 4
Current funds per person 18-24 years of age	$81	$49
Percent of college-age versus total population	9	11. 11
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population percent	19. 6	10. 61
Property taxes as percent of personal income do	3. 7	2. 0
Sales tax do	----------	3. 0
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300, 000, 000	----------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, South Carolina could borrow approximately	----------	$2, 544, 630
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25, 000	369
Amount	$17, 500, 000	$258, 300
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187, 500	2, 766
Amount	$131, 250, 000	$1, 936, 200
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50, 000, 000	$856, 840
State matching requirement	87, 962, 288	1, 003, 231
Total for public junior college construction	137, 962, 288	1, 860, 071
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

SOUTH DAKOTA

	United States	South Dakota
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3, 891, 230	15, 270
Increase over 1960 percent	7. 8	5. 3
1st-time students, 1961	1, 026, 087	4, 977
Increase over 1960 percent	10. 4	14. 5
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students percent	60. 4	69. 9
1st-time students do	63. 7	64. 4
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6, 959, 000	28, 184
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying to the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287, 589	2, 016
Amount	$98, 157, 544	$383, 258
Average	$341	$190
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115, 450	873
Amount	$50, 151, 908	$297, 942
Average	$434	$341
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52, 322	569
Amount	$14, 362, 182	$128, 911
Average	$274	$227
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	None
Number of institutions, 1960	317	None
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458, 296	----------
Increase over 1960 percent	16, 5	----------

	United States	South Dakota
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18-24 years of age	$147	$181
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments percent	43. 7	54. 8
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1, 732, 600, 000	$7, 400, 000
Total current funds only	$1, 267, 900, 000	$7, 200, 000
Current funds per capita	$7. 50	$10. 50
Current funds as percent of personal income	0. 4	0. 6
Current funds per person 18-24 years of age	$81	$124
Percent of college-age versus total population	9. 0	9. 24
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population percent	19. 6	21. 54
Property taxes as percent of personal income do	3. 7	6. 3
Sales tax do	----------	2. 0
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300, 000, 000	----------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, South Dakota could borrow approximately	----------	$1, 186, 494
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25, 000	111
Amount	$17, 500, 000	$77, 700
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187, 500	835
Amount	$131, 250, 000	$584, 500
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50, 000, 000	$261, 998
State matching requirement	$87, 962, 288	$388, 927
Total for public junior college construction	$137, 962, 288	$650, 925
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

College Academic Assistance Act—Fact Sheet—Continued

TENNESSEE

	United States	Tennessee
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	64,579
Increase over 1960 ... percent	7.8	2.2
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	18,425
Increase over 1960 ... percent	10.4	−9.0
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students ... percent	60.4	57.8
1st-time students ... do	63.7	55.7
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	122,757
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying to the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	5,109
Amount	$98,157,544	$1,277,287
Average	$341	$250
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	2,713
Amount	$50,151,908	$928,938
Average	$434	$342
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	1,206
Amount	$14,362,182	$388,980
Average	$274	$323
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	None
Number of institutions, 1960	317	------------
Enrollment (degree credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	------------
Increase over 1960 ... percent	16.5	------------
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 date) (latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$105
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments ... percent	43.7	35.7
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$20,700,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$15,500,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$4.53
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.3
Current funds per person 18 to 24 years of age	$81	$46
Percent of college-age versus total population ... percent	9.0	10.95
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population ... percent	19.6	14.33
Property taxes as percent of personal income ... do	3.7	2.5
Sales tax ... do	------------	3.0
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	------------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Tennessee could borrow approximately	------------	$5,017,853
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	531
Amount	$17,500,000	$371,700
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187,500	3,982
Amount	$131,250,000	$2,787,400
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$1,219,694
State matching requirement	87,962,288	1,597,025
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	2,816,719
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

TEXAS

	United States	Texas
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	198,784
Increase over 1960 ... percent	7.8	7.0
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	53,594
Increase over 1960 ... percent	10.4	10.5
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students ... percent	60.4	68.2
1st-time students ... do	63.7	73.0
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	360,755
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying to the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	13,298
Amount	$98,157,544	$3,140,374
Average	$341	$236
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	6,180
Amount	$50,151,908	$2,423,366
Average	$434	$392
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	4,135
Amount	$14,362,182	$689,715
Average	$274	$167
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	30
Number of institutions, 1960	317	31
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	30,377
Increase over 1960 ... percent	16.5	+6.9
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$110
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	52.0
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$78,100,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$68,400,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$7.61
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.4
Current funds per person 18 to 24 years of age	$81	$75
Percent of college-age versus total population ... percent	9.0	8.88
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population ... do	19.6	20.44
Property taxes as percent of personal income ... do	3.7	3.5
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	------------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Texas could borrow approximately	------------	$15,445,715
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	1,268
Amount	$17,500,000	$887,600
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187,500	9,513
Amount	$131,250,000	$6,659,100
III. 5 year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$2,401,135
State matching requirement	87,962,288	4,044,476
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	6,445,611
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

College Academic Assistance Act—Fact Sheet—Continued

UTAH

	United States	Utah
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3, 891, 230	35, 574
Increase over 1960....percent	7. 8	5. 6
1st-time students, 1961	1, 026, 087	10, 112
Increase over 1960....percent	10. 4	14. 7
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students....percent	60. 4	65. 3
1st-time students....do	63. 7	61. 3
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6, 959, 000	65, 415
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying to the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287, 589	3, 088
Amount	$98, 157, 544	$420, 119
Average	$341	$136
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115, 450	739
Amount	$50, 151, 908	$318, 737
Average	$434	$431
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52, 322	304
Amount	$14, 362, 182	$99, 606
Average	$274	$328
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	2
Number of institutions, 1960	317	2
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458, 296	3, 225
Increase over 1960....percent	16. 5	16. 4

	United States	Utah
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18–24 years of age	$147	$210
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43. 7	45. 0
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1, 732, 600, 000	$11, 300, 000
Total current funds only	$1, 267, 900, 000	$10, 100, 000
Current funds per capita	$7. 50	$12. 03
Current funds as percent of personal income	0. 4	0. 7
Current funds per person 18–24 years of age	$81	$113
Percent of college-age versus total population	9. 0	9. 52
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population....percent	19. 6	34. 88
Property taxes as percent of personal income	3. 7	4. 1
Sales tax....percent	----------	2. 0
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300, 000, 000	----------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Utah could borrow approximately	----------	$2, 764, 135
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25, 000	150
Amount	$17, 500, 000	$105, 000
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963–66	187, 500	1, 123
Amount	$131, 250, 000	$786, 100
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50, 000, 000	$352, 132
State matching requirement	87, 962, 288	576, 597
Total for public junior college construction	137, 962, 288	928, 729
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

VERMONT

	United States	Vermont
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3, 891, 230	10, 053
Increase over 1960....percent	7. 8	12. 4
1st-time students, 1961	1, 026, 087	3, 435
Increase over 1960....percent	10. 4	15. 2
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students....percent	60. 4	45. 7
1st-time students....do	63. 7	41. 6
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6, 959, 000	17, 398
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying to the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287, 589	1, 513
Amount	$98, 157, 544	$623, 341
Average	$341	$412
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115, 450	609
Amount	$50, 151, 908	$229, 317
Average	$434	$377
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52, 322	432
Amount	$14, 362, 182	$100, 082
Average	$274	$232
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions:		
1961	331	None
1960	317	----------
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458, 296	----------
Increase over 1960....percent	16. 5	----------

	United States	Vermont
IV. Other information (based on 1957–58 data) (latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person, in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$259
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments....percent	43. 7	29. 0
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1, 732, 600, 000	$3, 300, 000
Total current funds only	$1, 267, 900, 000	$3, 300, 000
Current funds per capita	$7. 50	$8. 89
Current funds as percent of personal income	0. 4	0. 5
Current funds per person 18 to 24 years of age	$81	$96
Percent of college-age versus total population	9. 0	10. 00
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population....percent	19. 6	21. 20
Property taxes as percent of personal income....do	3. 7	4. 8
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300, 000, 000	----------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Vermont could borrow approximately	----------	$781, 128
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25, 000	66
Amount	$17, 500, 000	$46, 200
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963–66	187, 500	492
Amount	$131, 250, 000	$344, 400
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50, 000, 000	$139, 861
State matching requirement	87, 962, 288	220, 453
Total for public junior college construction	137, 962, 288	360, 314
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

College Academic Assistance Act—Fact Sheet—Continued

VIRGINIA

	United States	Virginia
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	61,908
Increase over 1960 percent	7.8	6.8
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	18,258
Increase over 1960 percent	10.4	8.4
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students percent	60.4	66.6
1st-time students do	63.7	60.0
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	112,597
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959–60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying to the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,580	5,803
Amount	$98,157,544	$2,157,219
Average	$341	$372
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	2,146
Amount	$50,151,908	$837,262
Average	$434	$390
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	768
Amount	$14,362,182	$208,440
Average	$274	$271
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	None
Number of institutions, 1960	317	------------
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	------------
Increase over 1960 percent	16.5	------------

	United States	Virginia
IV. Other information (based on 1957–58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$92
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	41.9
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$29,900,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,800,000	$21,400,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$5.83
Current funds as percent of personal income percent	0.4	0.3
Current funds per person 18 to 24 years of age	$81	$52
Percent of college-age versus total population	9	9.06
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population percent	19.6	13.73
Property taxes as percent of personal income do	3.7	2.6
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	------------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Virginia could borrow approximately	------------	$4,810,313
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	522
Amount	$17,500,000	$365,400
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963–66	187,500	3,917
Amount	$131,250,000	$2,741,900
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$1,022,616
State matching requirement	87,962,288	1,605,895
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	2,628,511
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

WASHINGTON

	United States	Washington
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	70,743
Increase over 1960 percent	7.8	7.2
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	21,780
Increase over 1960 percent	10.4	20.6
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students percent	60.4	76.8
1st-time students do	63.7	79.1
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	128,185
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959–60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	4,240
Amount	$98,157,544	$961,934
Average	$341	$227
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	1,936
Amount	$50,151,908	$849,198
Average	$434	439
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	66
Amount	$14,362,182	$20,436
Average	$274	$310
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	10
Number of institutions, 1960	317	10
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	13,251
Increase over 1960 percent	16.5	+11.1

	United States	Washington
IV. Other information (based on 1957–58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$165
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	70.7
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$45,600,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$35,200,000
Current funds per capital	$7.50	$13.25
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.6
Current funds per person 18 to 24 years of age	$81	$142
Percent of college age versus total population	9.0	8.29
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population percent	19.6	22.58
Property taxes as percent of personal income	3.7	2.60
Sales tax	------------	4.00
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	------------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Washington could borrow approximately	------------	$5,496,802
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	405
Amount	$17,500,000	$283,500
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963–66	187,500	3,035
Amount	$131,250,000	$2,124,500
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$819,235
State matching requirement	87,962,288	1,638,470
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,278	2,457,705
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

College Academic Assistance Act—Fact Sheet—Continued

WEST VIRGINIA

	United States	West Virginia
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	31,610
Increase over 1960...percent	7.8	5.2
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	8,911
Increase over 1960...percent	10.4	6.0
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students	60.4	75.9
1st-time students	63.7	72.5
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	58,386
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	1,922
Amount	$98,157,544	$486,922
Average	$341	$253
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	1,129
Amount	$50,151,908	$470,931
Average	$434	$417
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	386
Amount	$14,362,182	$73,825
Average	$274	$191
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	1
Number of institutions, 1960	317	1
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	654
Increase over 1960...percent	16.5	15.2

	United States	West Virginia
IV. Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$125
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	73.4
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$16,400,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$15,900,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$8.13
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.5
Current funds per person 18 to 24 years of age	$81	$101
Percent of college-age versus total population	9.0	12.28
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population...percent	19.6	10.74
Property taxes as percent of personal income	3.7	1.8
Sales tax...percent	------------	2.0
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	------------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment West Virginia could borrow approximately	------------	$2,456,129
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	337
Amount	$17,500,000	$235,900
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187,500	2,524
Amount	$131,250,000	$1,766,800
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$755,446
State matching requirement	87,962,288	1,072,028
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	1,827,474
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

WISCONSIN

	United States	Wisconsin
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs):		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	81,773
Increase over 1960...percent	7.8	8.8
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	20,993
Increase over 1960...percent	10.4	7.6
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students...percent	60.4	71.1
1st-time students...do	63.7	74.1
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	146,000
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959-60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying to the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, national defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	5,926
Amount	$98,157,544	$1,707,121
Average	$341	$288
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	2,557
Amount	$50,151,908	$1,133,975
Average	$434	$443
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	825
Amount	$14,362,182	$311,450
Average	$274	$378
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	22
Number of institutions, 1960	317	23
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	3,366
Increase over 1960...percent	16.5	+17.5

	United States	Wisconsin
IV Other information (based on 1957-58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18 to 24 years of age	$147	$140
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	50.1
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$42,900,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$29,500,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$7.65
Current funds as percent of personal income	0.4	0.4
Current funds per person 18 to 24 years of age	$81	$91
Percent of college age versus total population	9.0	8.62
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population...percent	19.6	18.68
Property taxes as percent of personal income	3.7	5.0
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	------------
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Wisconsin could borrow approximately	------------	$6,353,844
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	608
Amount	$17,500,000	$425,600
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963-66	187,500	4,557
Amount	$131,250,000	$3,189,900
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$1,285,476
State matching requirement	87,962,288	2,463,836
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	3,749,312
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

College Academic Assistance Act—Fact Sheet—Continued

WYOMING

	United States	Wyoming
I. General enrollment information		
A. Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961; does not include almost a million additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students, 1961	3,891,230	7,117
Increase over 1960 percent	7.8	8.3
1st-time students, 1961	1,026,087	2,021
Increase over 1960 percent	10.4	9.2
Percent in public institutions, fall 1961:		
Total students percent	60.4	100.0
1st-time students do	63.7	100.0
B. Projected enrollment, 1970	6,959,000	12,735
II. Financial assistance to students, 1959–60, administered through colleges and universities. (The institutions replying in the study had more than 98 percent of all degree-credit students. Of the enrollment represented, scholarships were received by 8.7 percent, National defense student loans by 3.5 percent, and other institutional student loans by 1.6 percent.)		
A. Scholarships awarded through institutions:		
Number awarded	287,589	1,265
Amount	$98,157,544	$277,366
Average	$341	$219
B. National defense student loans:		
Number awarded	115,450	134
Amount	$50,151,908	$60,240
Average	$434	$450
C. Other student loans through institutions:		
Number awarded	52,322	21
Amount	$14,362,182	$2,000
Average	$274	$95
III. Public junior colleges		
Number of institutions, 1961	331	5
Number of institutions, 1960	317	5
Enrollment (degree-credit, fall 1961, does not include about 250,000 additional students in terminal-occupational, adult-education, and other programs).		
Total degree-credit students	458,296	2,129
Increase over 1960 percent	16.5	+ 0.4

	United States	Wyoming
IV. Other information (based on 1957–58 data, latest available)		
Estimated expenditures of colleges and universities for student higher education (instructional and related costs only), per person in the population 18–24 years of age	$147	$172
Percent of college and university current income for student higher education from States and local governments	43.7	69.6
State and local funds for student higher education:		
Total current and capital funds	$1,732,600,000	$4,800,000
Total current funds only	$1,267,900,000	$4,800,000
Current funds per capita	$7.50	$15.49
Current funds as percent of personal income percent	0.4	0.7
Current funds per person 18–24 years of age	$81	$172
Percent of college-age versus total population	9.0	9.77
Total higher education enrollment versus college-age population percent	19.6	17.83
Property taxes as percent of personal income do	3.7	4.9
Sales tax do		2.0
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, Wyoming could borrow approximately		$552,998
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		
II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	52
Amount	$17,500,000	$36,400
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963–66	187,500	390
Amount	$131,250,000	$273,000
III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges		
Fiscal year 1962:		
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$102,256
State matching requirement	87,962,288	204,512
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	306,768
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

OUTLYING PARTS

	United States	Outlying parts
PROVISIONS OF S. 1241		
I. 5-year program of loans for academic facilities		
Fiscal year 1962 authorization	$300,000,000	
If apportioned on basis of total degree-credit enrollment, could borrow approximately—		
Puerto Rico		$2,227,843
Guam		107,849
Canal Zone		40,948
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.		

II. Scholarship aid, 5-year program	United States	Canal Zone, Guam, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands
Fiscal year 1962:		
Number of scholarships	25,000	250
Amount	$17,500,000	$175,000
Fiscal year 1966:		
Total scholarships for fiscal 1963–66	187,500	1,875
Amount	$131,250,000	$1,312,500

III. 5-year program of grants for public junior colleges	United States	Guam	Puerto Rico	Virgin Islands
Fiscal year 1962:				
Federal allotment authorization	$50,000,000	$19,611	$579,326	$7,381
State matching requirement	87,962,288	19,741	581,509	7,437
Total for public junior college construction	137,962,288	39,252	1,160,835	14,818
A similar amount would be available during each of the 4 succeeding years of the act.				

DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of John A. McCone, of California, to be Director of Central Intelligence.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I intend to address myself briefly, tomorrow, to the question of the proposed confirmation of the nomination of Mr. McCone to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

However, I should like at this time to have printed in the RECORD, first, a copy of a memorandum on the conflict-of-interest point, prepared at my request by the Office of the Legislative Counsel. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR CLARK

This memorandum is written in response to your telephone request to this office on January 26, 1962, regarding the conflict-of-interest implications which might arise in the event that Mr. John A. McCone, who has been nominated by the President for the office of Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, is confirmed for that office by the Senate.

According to information furnished this office by you, Mr. McCone has substantial financial holdings in Standard Oil of California, Trans-World Carriers, and other shipping interests. Such information does not indicate whether Mr. McCone is an officer of any company or business organization, and it is not known to what extent, if any, the Central Intelligence Agency transacts business with those companies in which Mr. McCone holds a financial interest.

PROVISIONS OF LAW INVOLVED

Any conflict of interest likely to arise in the case of the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency (hereafter referred to as CIA) as a result of financial holdings by him of the nature referred to above would probably occur in connection with purchases and contracts made by the CIA. The conflict-of-interest statute which would be brought into question in such a situation is section

434 of title 18, United States Code, which provides:

"§ 434. Interested persons acting as Government agents

"Whoever, being an officer, agent or member of, or directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of any corporation, joint-stock company, or business entity, is employed or acts as an officer or agent of the United States for the transaction of business with such business entity, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both."

The procurement authority of the CIA is contained in section 3 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 403a-403j). It provides:

"PROCUREMENT AUTHORITIES

"SEC. 3. (a) In the performance of its functions the Central Intelligence Agency is authorized to exercise the authorities contained in sections 2(c) (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (10), (12), (15), (17), and sections 3, 4, 5, 6, and 10 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (Public Law 413, Eightieth Congress, second session) [now contained in chapter 137 of title 10, U.S.C.].

"(b) In the exercise of the authorities granted in subsection (a) of this section, the term "Agency head" shall mean the Director, the Deputy Director, or the Executive of the Agency.

"(c) The determinations and decisions provided in subsection (a) of this section to be made by the Agency head may be made with respect to individual purchases and contracts or with respect to classes of purchases or contracts, and shall be final. Except as provided in subsection (d) of this section, the Agency head is authorized to delegate his powers provided in this section, including the making of such determinations and decisions, in his discretion and subject to his direction, to any other officer or officers or officials of the Agency.

"(d) The power of the Agency head to make the determinations or decisions specified in paragraphs (12) and (15) of section 2(c) and section 5(a) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 shall not be delegable. Each determination or decision required by paragraphs (12) and (15) of section 2(c), by section 4 or by section 5(a) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 [now contained in chapter 137 of title 10, U.S.C.], shall be based upon written findings made by the official making such determinations, which findings shall be final and shall be available within the Agency for a period of at least six years following the date of the determination."

It should be noted that the term "Agency head" as used in section 3(d) above is defined in subsection (b) to mean the Director, or the executive of the Agency.

Mississippi Valley Generating Case

The most recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States construing the provisions of section 434 of title 18, United States Code, is the case of the *United States* v. *Mississippi Valley Generating Company* (364 U.S. 520 (1961)).

In that case one Wenzell was an unpaid part-time consultant to the Bureau of the Budget in connection with preliminary negotiations which eventually led to a contract for the construction and operation of a powerplant to provide electric power for the Atomic Energy Commission. At the time such negotiations were being carried out Wenzell was also an officer and shareholder of an investment banking firm which was expected to profit, in the event the contract negotiations were successful, by becoming the financial agent for the project to be undertaken under the contract. The Court held that there was a conflict of interest on the part of Wenzell and that:

"Section 434 forbids a Government agent from engaging in business transactions on behalf of the Government if, by virtue of his private interest, he may benefit financially from the outcome of those transactions" (p. 562).

The Court was careful to emphasize that the holding quoted above was limited to the specific facts presented in that case. However, that case being the most recent one interpreting section 434, statements made therein by the Court (three Justices dissenting) must recessarily be relied upon in any attempt to determine the applicability of section 434 to a different set of circumstances.

The majority opinion discusses in some detail the origin, purpose, and scope of section 434. In that discussion the Court said:

"First. In determining whether Wenzell's activities fall within the proscription of section 434, we think it is appropriate to focus our attention initially on the origin, purpose, and scope of the statute. Section 434 is one of several penal conflict-of-interest statutes which were designed to prohibit Government officials from engaging in conduct that might be inimical to the best interests of the general public. It is a restatement of a statute adopted in 1863 following the disclosure by a House committee of scandalous corruption on the part of Government agents whose job it was to procure war materials for the Union armies during the Civil War. The statute has since been reenacted on several occasions, and the broad prohibition contained in the original statute has been retained throughout the years.

"The obvious purpose of the statute is to insure honesty in the Government's business dealings by preventing Federal agents who have interests adverse to those of the Government from advancing their own interests at the expense of the public welfare, *United States* v. *Chemical Foundation* (272 U.S. 1, 16). The moral principle upon which the statute is based has its foundation in the Biblical admonition that no man may serve two masters, Matthew 6: 24, a maxim which is especially pertinent if one of the masters happens to be economic self-interest. Consonant with this salutary moral purpose, Congress has drafted a statute which speaks in very comprehensive terms. Section 434 is not limited in its application to those in the highest echelons of Government service, or to those Government agents who have only a direct financial interest in the business entities with which they negotiate on behalf of the Government, or to a narrow class of business transactions. Nor is the statute's scope restricted by numerous provisos and exceptions, as is true of many penal statutes. Rather, it applies, without exception, to 'whoever' is 'directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts' of a business entity with which he transacts any business 'as an officer or agent of the United States.'

"It is also significant, we think, that the statute does not specify as elements of the crime that there be actual corruption or that there be any actual loss suffered by the Government as a result of the defendant's conflict of interest. This omission indicates that the statute establishes an objective standard of conduct, and that whenever a Government agent fails to act in accordance with that standard he is guilty of violating the statute, regardless of whether there is positive corruption. The statute is thus directed not only at dishonor, but also at conduct that tempts dishonor. This broad proscription embodies a recognition of the fact that an impairment of impartial judgment can occur in even the most well-meaning men when their personal economic interests are affected by the business they transact on behalf of the Government. To this extent, therefore, the statute is more concerned with what might have happened in a given situation than with what actually happened. It attempts to prevent honest Government agents from succumbing to temptation by making it illegal for them to enter into relationships which are fraught with temptation (*Rankin* v. *United States* (98 Ct. Cl. 357)).

"While recognizing that the statute speaks in broad, absolute terms, the respondent argues that to interpret the statute as laying down a prophylactic rule which ignores the actual consequences of proscribed action would be a violation of the time-honored canon that penal statutes are to be narrowly construed. But even penal statutes must be 'given their fair meaning in accord with the evident intent of Congress' (*United States* v. *Raynor* (302 U.S. 540, 552); *Rainwater* v. *United States* (356 U.S. 590, 593); *United States* v. *Corbett* (215 U.S. 233, 242)).

"In view of the statute's evident purpose and its comprehensive language, we are convinced that Congress intended to establish a rigid rule of conduct which, as we shall now demonstrate by analyzing each of the elements of the statutory prohibition, was violated by Wenzell" (pp. 548–551).

Particularly worthy of note in the foregoing excerpt (third paragraph) is the Court's construction of the statute to the effect that it establishes an objective standard of conduct, and that there is a violation of the statute whether or not positive corruption is involved and whether or not any actual loss is sustained by the Government. The Court indicated that the language of the statute establishes a rigid rule of conduct for Government officers and employees.

The Court rejected the argument of respondent that since Wenzell did not participate in the terminal negotiations which led to the final agreement his actions were too remote and tenuous to be considered "the transaction of business" within the meaning of the statute. In rejecting the argument the majority said:

"To limit the application of the statute to Government agents who participate only in the final formation of a contract would permit those who have a conflict of interest to engage in the preliminary, but crucial stages of the transaction, and then to insulate themselves from prosecution under section 434 by withdrawing from the negotiations at the final, and often perfunctory stage of the proceedings. Congress could not possibly have intended such an obvious evasion of the statute" (pp. 554–555).

This statement by the Court makes it quite clear that an agent of the Government who participates only in the formative stages of a contract may be guilty of conflict of interest even though he does not participate in the terminal negotiations. It does not resolve the question of whether an agent who participates only in the terminal negotiations, particularly if the participation is nothing more than perfunctory, transacts business within the meaning of section 434. It would not be unreasonable to conclude, on the basis of the Court's statement concerning the lack of knowledge of a conflict of interest on the part of Wenzell, that its ruling would be the same in both instances. With respect to that aspect of the case the Court said:

"However, even assuming that Wenzell did not think there was a conflict, that fact is irrelevant. As we have shown, the statute establishes an objective, and not a subjective standard, and it is therefore of little moment whether the agent thought he was violating the statute if the objective facts show that there was a conflict of interest" (p. 560).

In the Mississippi Valley case, the respondent asserted that Wenzell's activities did not fall within the statute because the corporation of which he was an officer had no more than a mere hope that it might receive the financing work if the contract negotiations were successful. Again, the Court rejected the argument saying that:

"If a contract between the Government and the sponsors was ultimately agreed upon, there was a substantial probability that, because of its prior experience in the area of private power financing, First Boston would be hired to secure the financing." (p. 555).

This language suggests that certainty of financial gain is not a necessary element of section 434, but that a substantial probability of such gain will suffice under that section. Indeed, the Court in its technical holding held if a Government agent may benefit financially from his transactions he violates the statute (p. 562).

Discussion

Obviously, section 434 would not come into operation if the CIA, during the period of Mr McCone's service as Director, were to have no business transactions with any of the companies in which he may be financially interested. Accordingly, the question to be considered here is whether an individual serving as Director of the CIA would come within the provisions of section 434 if the CIA were to transact business with one or more of the companies in which that Director holds substantial financial interests.

It is believed that the criminal sanctions of section 434 could not be successfully invoked against an officer or employee of the Government, even though that officer or employee possesses substantial financial interest in a company with which the department or agency in which he serves does business, if that officer or employee takes no part in the transaction of that business and has no supervisory or overriding authority with respect to the transaction of that business. The opinion in Mississippi Valley appears to be grounded upon the premise that the chief evil at which section 434 is directed is not the mere fact of the possession by a Government officer of a private financial interest in a business entity, but his undertaking to act on behalf of the Government in a business transaction with a business entity in which he has such an interest. Therefore, assuming that Mr. McCone in his capacity as Director of the CIA could divorce himself completely from any business transactions involving those companies in which he holds a pecuniary interest, he would certainly escape any conflict contemplated by section 434. Whether he could in fact (1) remove himself from all questionable transactions to the degree necessary to insure that no conflict of interest would arise, or (2) remove himself from all questionable transactions and perform the functions of the CIA in the best interests of the Government are questions of fact and policy which must be determined by the President and Senate and, therefore, cannot be answered here.

Conclusions

Although the Court in the Mississippi Valley case was careful to limit its holding to the facts before it in that case, the expressions therein contained would seem to support the following inferences:

1. If Mr. McCone were to serve as Director of the CIA, section 434 of title 18, United States Code, could have no application unless, during his incumbency, the CIA did in fact have business transactions with one or more of the companies in which he then had a financial interest.

2. If in his capacity as Director of the CIA Mr. McCone were to participate on behalf of the Government in a business transaction with a company in which he is financially interested and from which he might realize financial gain, the provisions of section 434 would become applicable whether or not Mr. McCone believed his actions to involve a conflict of interest.

3. The meaning of the term "transacts business," as used in section 434 has not been fully determined. Clearly a direct or indirect personal participation at any stage in the negotiation or execution of a particular contract on behalf of the Government would be included. The decision in Mississippi Valley suggests that the giving of approval to a contract negotiated by others probably would be regarded as such a participation. What other forms of action taken by a Government officer with respect to a contract which may be regarded as participation remains undecided.

Respectfully submitted.

Hugh C. Evans,
Assistant Counsel.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Central Intelligence Agency rules on employee conduct—dealing with conflict of interest, and dated August 29, 1961—be printed at this point in the Record, in connection with my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I first look at the document?

Mr. CLARK. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I have a copy of the document of which the paragraphs of the able Senator from Pennsylvania are a part. This document was not furnished by the Central Intelligence Agency to the nominee. He therefore knew nothing of the rules in the document. Fortunately the nominee is completely in the clear because of his position before the committee.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor, and has been kind enough to yield to me.

Mr. CLARK. Of course if the Senator from Missouri does not want this information in the Record, and if he therefore wishes to object, I shall be happy to withdraw my request. But these particular rules have been furnished at my request——

Mr. SYMINGTON. No, Mr. President; the Senator from Pennsylvania misunderstood. He is very fair. My point is that these rules and regulations, part of which the able Senator is placing the Record, were not given by the CIA to the nominee.

Mr. CLARK. I never said they were.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I know; but I mention this because the nominee has been entirely willing to abide by the committee of the Senate before which he has now appeared, as he was before the other committees before which he previously appeared.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his courtesy in yielding.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Missouri for his courtesy to me, which is always very great, indeed.

Let me ask whether the Senator from Missouri desires to object to the request I have made.

Mr. SYMINGTON. No, Mr. President. I simply wished to make this point for the Record.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. President, I renew my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Central Intelligence Agency Rules on Employee Conduct, August 29, 1961

Pursuant to Executive Order 10939, issued May 5, 1961, calling on "each department and agency head (to) review or issue internal directives appropriate to his department or agency to assure the maintenance of high ethical and moral standards therein," the CIA issued rules on "employee conduct" on August 29, 1961. The rules contain the following sections:

"III. SPECIAL PROVISIONS

"b. Conflicts of interest.

"(1) Definition.—A conflict of interest is defined as a situation in which an Agency employee's private interest, usually but not necessarily of an economic nature, conflicts or appears to conflict with his Agency duties and responsibilities. The situation is of concern to the Agency whether the conflict is real or only apparent."

* * * * *

"(3) Regulatory provisions.

"(c) Financial Interests. Employees may not (a) have direct or indirect financial interests that conflict substantially, or appear to conflict substantially, with their responsibilities and duties as Agency employees."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record, in connection with my remarks, a memorandum prepared by the Office of the Legislative Counsel for the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] at the time when the nomination of Mr. McNamara to be Secretary of Defense was presented, because I believe there is some similarity between that situation with respect to possible conflict of interest because of stock holdings and the situation in regard to the nomination of Mr. McCone to be Director of Central Intelligence Agency.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[U.S. Senate, Office of the Legislative Counsel]

Memorandum for Senator Byrd of Virginia

Re possible conflict-of-interest aspects of a trust agreement proposed to be executed by a designee for appointment as Secretary of Defense

This memorandum is transmitted pursuant to your request for comment as to possible conflict-of-interest aspects of the trust agreement returned herewith.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

It is understood that Mr. Robert S. McNamara, formerly president of the Ford Motor Co., and recently designated for appointment as Secretary of Defense, has indicated that he contemplates entering into a trust agreement in that form for the purpose of placing his personal affairs in such condition that action taken by him in the performance of the duties of the Office of the Secretary of Defense would not place him in violation of the Federal statutes commonly referred to as conflict-of-interest statutes.

For present purposes, the principal features of the proposed trust agreement may be described as follows:

1. Mr. McNamara would transfer to the corporate trustee designated in the agreement certain identified property, and such other property as Mr. McNamara might transfer later to the trustee.

2. For the duration of the trust, the trustee would have full power to invest, reinvest, manage, and control, subject to the investment directions of an investment adviser designated in the agreement, all property transferred by Mr. McNamara to the trustee.

3. The trustee would be authorized to invest the trust property (in conformity with directions received from the investment adviser) "principally in common stock and equity securities," and would not be limited as to any particular class or category of securities.

4. During the existence of the trust, the trustee would pay, from the income and principal of the trust property, to Mr. McNamara and to other persons and organizations designated by Mr. McNamara, such sums as may be prescribed from time to time in written directions given by Mr. McNamara.

5. During the existence of the trust, and while Mr. McNamara serves as Secretary of Defense, neither the trustee nor the investment adviser would disclose to Mr. McNamara or to any other person "any information concerning the investments of the trust estate," except that such information could be given:

(a) to brokers, agents, attorneys, and other persons with whom trust business is transacted;

(b) to Mr. McNamara to the extent required by him "for making reports or returns to any government authority"; and

(c) to Mr. McNamara to the extent that such information reflects the "net income and taxable income of the trust estate."

6. Mr. McNamara would reserve the right at any time to:

(a) alter or revoke the trust agreement;

(b) remove or replace the trustee; and

(c) cause a new investment adviser to be designated.

ASSUMPTIONS MADE

For the purposes of this memorandum it will be assumed that under the proposed plan:

1. Mr. McNamara would not serve concurrently as Secretary of Defense and as an officer, agent, or member of any business entity which transacts business with the Department of Defense.

2. Mr. McNamara, before assuming the office of Secretary of Defense, would dispose of all personal financial interests which might give rise to conflict-of-interest implications, and that during his service as Secretary of Defense he would acquire no such interests other than those which might be acquired by the trustee under the terms of the proposed trust agreement;

3. The trust agreement would be continued in effect without material change by Mr. McNamara during the period of his service as Secretary of Defense;

4. No requirement of State or Federal law would necessitate the disclosure by the trustee to Mr. McNamara of information concerning the identity of corporations or other organizations in which investments had been made by the trustee;

5. Mr. McNamara would not seek or acquire any such information from any other source during his service as Secretary of Defense;

6. Mr. McNamara, while serving as Secretary of Defense, would take no action incident to the procurement of any contract or the prosecution of any claim which might be in violation of section 281 or 283 of title 18 of the United States Code; and

7. While serving as Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara would receive no "salary" from any source other than the United States, "in connection with his services as such an official," prohibited by section 1914 of title 18, United States Code.

STATUTE INVOLVED

Upon the assumptions which have been made, any conflict-of-interest implications of the trust agreement which has been described would appear to arise from the provisions of section 434 of title 18, United States Code, which provides:

"§ 434. Interested persons acting as Government agents

"Whoever, being an officer, agent, or member of, or directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of any corporation, joint-stock company, or association, or of any firm or partnership, or other business entity, is employed or acts as an officer or agent of the United States for the transaction of business with such business entity, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than two years or both."

DISCUSSION

1. The question presented

There is no indication that Mr. McNamara would continue as an "officer, agent, or member" of any business entity after his appointment as Secretary of Defense. Accordingly, it would seem that the question for consideration is whether his beneficial interest in any securities acquired by the trustee under the proposed trust agreement might bring him into conflict with the section quoted above.

The trust agreement indicates that it is contemplated that the trust property would be invested principally in "common stocks and equity securities." To the extent that such investment were to be made in business entities having no business transactions with the Department of Defense, no problem would occur. However, the proposed trust agreement contains no express limitation with regard to the class of business entities in which trust funds may be invested. Accordingly, it is possible that such funds might be invested in concerns which will be engaged in transacting business with the Department of Defense during Mr. McNamara's service as Secretary. Therefore, the present inquiry requires consideration of the question whether any such investment might bring Mr. McNamara into conflict with the provisions of section 434.

2. Significance of a beneficial interest in securities

If, under the terms of the trust agreement or through any other means, Mr. McNamara were to acquire knowledge of the identity of any corporation in which the trustee had invested trust funds through the purchase of share capital and which was transacting business with the Defense Department, his possession of a beneficial interest in securities of that corporation probably would bring section 434 into application.

In a previous memorandum construing section 434, dated January 19, 1953, this office expressed the following view:

"The evident purpose of that section was to prevent an officer or employee of the United States from transacting business with a corporation or other entity in such a way that his action might result in direct or indirect personal gain through the acquisition of money or some other thing of value. Inclusion of the word 'indirectly' in the phrase 'directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of such corporation' suggests that the section extends to private gains which flow recognizably from profits or contracts even though the gains pass through other hands or instrumentalities before realization by the officer concerned.

"In the light of the relationship existing between a corporation and its shareholders, it seems quite clear that the interest of a shareholder in a corporation is of the kind included within that phrase. However, as a criminal statute, section 434 will be strictly construed, and it is very doubtful that the bare existence of such an interest would be regarded as sufficient ground for the visitation of criminal consequences. A clear showing of the presence, in a material degree, of the substantive evil at which the section is directed would seem to be a necessary element of proof. The existence of a nominal or trivial interest, such as the possession of a single qualifying share, or the possession of naked legal title to shares in which the beneficial interest is held by others, probably would not be enough. But a showing of an actual and beneficial interest of such magnitude as to demonstrate a probable influence upon the official actions of the officers concerned would seem to be sufficient."

The foregoing expression assumed knowledge by the shareholder of the identity of the corporation in which his investment was made. It also suggested the probability that the courts might apply to the interest of the shareholder a quantitative test of the magnitude of his interest in determining the application of section 434 to particular cases. The validity of that suggestion has been thrown into question by expressions contained in the majority opinion of the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Mississippi Valley Generating Co.*, No. 26, October Term, 1960, decided January 9, 1961. In that opinion it was stated that section 434 established "an absolute standard of conduct" which leaves no room for equitable considerations (pamphlet opinion, pp. 37, 43). A discussion of possible implications of that opinion is set forth hereinafter.

3. Significance of the element of knowledge

The novel element presented by the instant case arises from the provisions of the trust agreement which (with stated exceptions) appear to be intended to insulate Mr. McNamara from knowledge as to the identity of any business organization in which the trust funds may be invested. That element presents the question whether the possession of such knowledge by Mr. McNamara would be necessary to bring section 434 into application.

Section 434 does not expressly condition its application upon a showing of knowledge by a shareholder of the existence of his interest in a business organization with which he may transact business as a Government officer. Read literally, the section would apply to such a case notwithstanding the fact that the officer concerned in fact had no such knowledge. Any relief from the rigor of such a rule would require an interpretation under which the element of knowledge would be read into section 434 as a matter of congressional intent or as a requirement necessary to sustain its validity. The legislative history of section 434 provides no answer to the question whether Congress intended such knowledge to be an element of the crime described therein, and no opinion of any Federal court appears to have given express consideration to that particular aspect of section 434. That question was not directly involved in the determination by the Supreme Court of the recent case of *United States* v. *Mississippi Valley Generating Co.*, No. 26, October Term, 1960, decided January 9, 1961.

In some instances the courts will read into a criminal statute a requirement of knowledge that is not set forth by explicit language contained in the statute. In other instances the courts will decline to do so, and will enforce the statute acording to its literal terms. See Sayre, Francis B., "Public Welfare Offenses," 33 Columbia Law Review 55

(1933). Determination whether a criminal statute falls into one or the other of those categories frequently is difficult. As stated by the Supreme Court in *Morissette* v. *United States*, 342 U.S. 246, 260 (1952):

"Neither this Court nor, so far as we are aware, any other has undertaken to delineate a precise line or set forth a comprehensive criteria for distinguishing between crimes that require a mental element and crimes that do not. We attempt no closed definition, for the law on the subject is neither settled nor static. * * *"

In that case the Court held that intent was an essential element of an offense charged under 18 U.S.C. 641 which provides in part that "whoever embezzles, steals, purloins, or knowingly converts" property of the United States is punishable by fine or imprisonment even though intent is not an element specifically prescribed by the statute. The Court said (pp. 260–262):

"Stealing, larceny, and its variants and equivalents, were among the earliest offenses known to the law that existed before legislation; * * * State courts of last resort, on whom fall the heaviest burden of interpreting criminal law in this country, have consistently retained the requirement of intent in larceny-type offenses. If any state has deviated, the exception has neither been called to our attention nor disclosed by our research.

"Congress, therefore, omitted any express prescription of criminal intent from the enactment before us in the light of an unbroken course of judicial decision in all constituent states of the union holding intent inherent in this class of offense, even when not expressed in a statute. Congressional silence as to mental elements in an Act merely adopting into federal statutory law a concept of crime already so well defined in common law and statutory interpretation by the states may warrant quite contrary inferences than the same silence in creating an offense new to general law, for whose definition the courts have no guidance except the Act. * * *"

The Court in the Morissette case, however, reaffirmed the decision in the case of *United States* v. *Valint*, 258 U.S. 250 (1922), which held that knowledge was not a necessary element in a violation of the Narcotic Act of December 17, 1914 (38 Stat. 785). In so doing, the Court recognized and discussed the evolution of a class of legal offenses which have become known as "public welfare offenses" in which intent is not an element necessary to the particular offense involved. Commenting upon such offenses, the Court said (pp. 255–256):

"This has confronted the courts with a multitude of prosecutions, based on statutes or administrative regulations, for what have been aptly called "public welfare offenses." These cases do not fit neatly into any of such accepted classifications of common-law offenses, such as those against the state, the person, property, or public morals. Many of these offenses are not in the nature of positive aggressions or invasions, with which the common law so often dealt, but are in the nature of neglect where the law requires care, or inaction where it imposes a duty. Many violations of such regulations result in no direct or immediate injury to person or property but merely create the danger or probability of it which the law seeks to minimize. While such offenses do not threaten the security of the state in the manner of treason, they may be regarded as offenses against its authority, for their occurrence impairs the efficiency of controls deemed essential to the social order as presently constituted. In this respect, whatever the intent of the violator, the injury is the same, and the consequences are injurious or not according to fortuity. Hence, legislation applicable to such offenses, as a matter of policy, does not specify intent as a necessary element. The accused, if he does not will the violation, usually is in a position to prevent it with no more care than society might reasonably expect and no more exertion than it might reasonably exact from one who assumed his responsibilities."

The offense described by section 434 appears not to be one "well defined in common law," or one for which the state courts "have consistently retained the requirement of intent." It does not appear to be a penal provision having as its main purpose the punishment of an individual for a wrong committed by him, but rather a provision of law enacted primarily for the purpose of protecting the public against persons who might compromise their positions as officers or employees of the Federal Government for their own personal gain. As such, it would appear to fall into the category described by the Supreme Court as "public welfare offenses," with respect to which the courts will not read in a requirement of knowledge which is not expressly set forth in the statute. The reasons for belief that section 434 is to be so regarded are described more fully in the following paragraphs of this memorandum.

4. Implications of the Mississippi Valley Generating Company case

The Mississippi Valley Generating Company case, referred to above, involved the application of section 434 to the activities of one Wenzell who, while serving as a temporary employee of the Bureau of the Budget and contemporaneously as an officer and shareholder of a banking corporation, participated on behalf of the United States in negotiations looking toward the formation of a Government contract in the execution of which that banking corporation might have been expected to participate. The Court held (3 justices dissenting) that section 434 "forbids a government agent from engaging in business transactions on behalf of the Government if, by virtue of his private interests, he may benefit financially from the outcome of those transactions" (pamphlet opinion, p. 40), and that on the showing made in that case Mr. Wenzell had violated the provisions of that section. Accordingly, it determined that the contract could not be enforced against the Government (pamphlet opinion, pp. 40–44).

The narrow, technical holding of the majority in that case is not directly determinative of the question considered in this memorandum. However, the majority and minority opinions of the Supreme Court in that case do contain the most recent and the most comprehensive expressions of the Court with respect to the application of section 434.

The following extract from the majority opinion (pamphlet opinion, pp. 26–29) demonstrates the broad scope given to that section by the Court:

"First. In determining whether Wenzell's activities fall within the proscription of Section 434, we think it is appropriate to focus our attention initially on the origin, purpose, and scope of the statute. Section 434 is one of several penal conflict-of-interest statutes which were designed to prohibit government officials from engaging in conduct that might be inimical to the best interests of the general public. It is a restatement of a statute adopted in 1863 following the disclosure by a House Committee of scandalous corruption on the part of government agents whose job it was to procure war materials for the Union armies during the Civil War. The statute has since been reenacted on several occasions, and the broad prohibition contained in the original statute has been retained throughout the years.

"The obvious purpose of the statute is to insure honesty in the Government's business dealings by preventing federal agents who have interests adverse to those of the Government from advancing their own interests at the expense of the public welfare. *United States* v. *Chemical Foundation*, 272 U.S. 1, 18. The moral principle upon which the statute is based has its foundation in the Biblical admonition that no man may serve two masters, Matt. 6:24, a maxim which is especially pertinent if one of the masters happens to be economic self-interest. Consonant with this salutary moral purpose, Congress has drafted a statute which speaks in very comprehensive terms. Section 434 is not limited in its application to those in the highest echelons of government service, or to those government agents who have only a direct financial interest in the business entities with which they negotiate on behalf of the Government, or to a narrow class of business transactions. Nor is the statute's scope restricted by numerous provisos and exceptions, as is true of many penal statutes. Rather, it applies, without exception, to 'whoever' is 'directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or ,contracts' of a business entity with which he transacts any business 'as an officer or agent of the United States.'

"It is also significant, we think, that the statute does not specify as elements of the crime that there be actual corruption or that there be any actual loss suffered by the Government as a result of the defendant's conflict of interest. This omission indicates that the statute establishes an objective standard of conduct, and that whenever a government agent fails to act in accordance with that standard, he is guilty of violating the statute, regardless of whether there is positive corruption. The statute is thus directed not only at dishonor, but also at conduct that tempts dishonor. This broad proscription embodies a recognition of the fact that an impairment of impartial judgment can occur in even the most well-meaning men when their personal economic interests are affected by the business they transact on behalf of the Government. To this extent, therefore, the statute is more concerned with what might have happened in a given situation than with what actually happened. It attempts to prevent honest government agents from succumbing to temptation by making it illegal for them to enter into relationships which are fraught with temptation. *Rankin* v. *United States*, 98 Ct. Cl. 357.

"While recognizing that the statute speaks in broad, absolute terms, the respondent argues that to interpret the statute as laying down a prophylactic rule which ignores the actual consequences of proscribed action would be a violation of the time-honored canon that penal statutes are to be narrowly construed. But even penal statutes must be 'given their fair meaning in accord with the evident intent of Congress.' *United States* v. *Raynor*, 302 U.S. 540, 552; *Rainwater* v. *United States*, 356 U.S. 590, 593; *United States* v. *Corbett*, 215 U.S. 233, 242. In view of the statute's evident purpose and its comprehensive language, we are convinced that Congress intended to establish a rigid rule of conduct which, as we shall now demonstrate by analyzing each of the elements of the statutory prohibition, was violated by Wenzell."

The majority opinion clearly indicated that violation of section 434 requires no showing of any harm actually sustained by the Government, saying (pamphlet opinion, p. 37):

"It may be true, as the respondent asserts, that none of Wenzell's activities to which we have alluded adversely affected the Government in any way. However, that question is irrelevant to a consideration of whether or not Wenzell violated the statute. As we have indicated the statute is preventive in nature; it lays down an absolute standard of conduct which Wenzell violated by entering into a relationship which made it difficult for him to represent the Government with the singleness of purpose required by the statute."

The majority took the view that knowledge by Mr. Wenzell with regard to the existence of a conflict of interest arising from his duality of allegiance was immaterial, saying (pamphlet opinion, pp. 38–39):

"However, even assuming that Wenzell did not think there was a conflict, that fact is irrelevant. As we have shown, the statute establishes an objective, and not a subjective standard, and it is therefore of little moment whether the agent thought he was violating the statute, if the objective facts show that there was a conflict of interest."

The majority also rejected the contention that equitable considerations should preclude the application of section 434, saying (pamphlet opinion, pp. 39–40):

"The thrust of the arguments made by the respondent and adopted by the Court of Claims is that it would be unjust to apply the statute to one who acted as Wenzell did in this case. We cannot agree. The statute is directed at an evil which endangers the very fabric of a democratic society, for a democracy is effective only if the people have faith in those who govern, and that faith is bound to be shattered when high officials and their appointees engage in activities which arouse suspicions of malfeasance and corruption. The seriousness of this evil quite naturally led Congress to adopt a statute whose breadth would be sufficient to cope with the evil."

In declining to permit the contract in question to be enforced against the Government, the majority stated (pamphlet opinion, p. 41):

"As we have indicated, the primary purpose of the statute is to protect the public from the corrupting influences that might be brought to bear upon Government agents who are financially interested in the business transactions which they are conducting on behalf of the Government. This protection can be fully accorded only if contracts which are tainted by a conflict of interest on the part of a Government agent may be disaffirmed by the Government. If the Government's sole remedy in a case such as that now before us is merely a criminal prosecution against its agent, as the respondent suggests, then the public will be forced to bear the burden of complying with the very sort of contract which the statute sought to prevent. Were we to decree the enforcement of such a contract, we would be affirmatively sanctioning the type of infected bargain which the statute outlaws and we would be depriving the public of the protection which Congress has conferred."

The majority regarded its determination of nonenforceability to be a necessary consequence of the public policy underlying section 434, saying (pp. 42–43):

"The Court of Claims was of the opinion that it would be overly harsh not to enforce this contract, since the sponsors could not have controlled Wenzell's activities and were guilty of no wrongdoing. However, we think that the court emphasized the wrong considerations. Although nonenforcement frequently has the effect of punishing one who has broken the law, its primary purpose is to guarantee the integrity of the federal contracting process and to protect the public from the corruption which might lie undetectable beneath the surface of a contract conceived in a tainted transaction. Cf. *Crocker* v. *United States,* 240 U.S. 74, 80–81. It is this inherent difficulty in detecting corruption which requires that contracts made in violation of Section 434 be held unenforceable, even though the party seeking enforcement ostensibly appears entirely innocent. Cf. *Hazelton* v. *Sheckells,* 202 U.S. 71, 79. Therefore, even if the result in a given case may seem harsh, and we do not think that such is the case here, that result is dictated by the public policy manifested by the statute."

The emphasis given by the majority opinion of the Supreme Court in that case to (1) the remedial purpose of section 434, (2) the absolute standard of conduct established thereby, and (3) the immateriality of such factors as actual harm sustained by the Government, corrupt intentions on the part of the Government officer concerned, equitable considerations, knowledge by the actor that he was engaged in activities having conflict of interest implications, or the harshness of consequences which might flow from a strict application of the letter of the statute, suggests that it is more than a mere possibility that the Court might hold that absence of knowledge by a Government officer of the identity of a business organization in which he has a beneficial financial interest would not preclude the application of section 434 to his action in transacting business on behalf of the Government with that organization.

That view is suggested also by the manner in which the Court stated its technical holding. As formulated by the Court (pamphlet opinion, p. 40), its holding appears to lay emphasis upon the prohibition of action taken by an officer in transacting business on behalf of the Government with an organization "if, by virtue of his private interests, he may benefit financially from the outcome of those transactions." This suggests that the chief evil at which the statute is directed is not the possession of a private financial interest by a Government officer in a business entity, but the action of such an officer in undertaking to act for the Government in any dealing with such an organization while he possesses such an interest therein.

Viewed in that light, the expressions of the majority in the Mississippi Valley case suggest more strongly the probability that the Court might consider as immaterial the factor of knowledge by the officer of the existence or nature of his private financial interest. So regarded, the majority opinion would stand for the general proposition that it is the affirmative obligation of one who undertakes to act for the Government in the transaction of business with a private business organization to insure by all means available to him that he does not in fact have a direct or indirect pecuniary interest in that organization.

The minority opinion in the Mississippi Valley case does not appear to be in conflict with that view. Mr. Justice Harlan, writing for the dissenting justices, invited attention to the fact that decision with regard to the element of knowledge in section 434 was not required in that case (pamphlet opinion, p. 3, footnote 3). However, he indicated agreement with the majority of the Court as to the basic purpose and effect of the section by stating (pamphlet opinion, p. 4):

"The policy and rationale of the statute are clear: an individual who negotiates business for the Government should not be exposed to the temptation which might be created by a loyalty divided between the interest of the Government and his own self-interest; the risk that the Government will not be left with the best possible transaction is too great."

The apparent ground for the dissent of three justices was their conviction that section 434 had been misapplied by the majority because at the time of the performance by Mr. Wenzell of his activity on behalf of the Government there was no certainty that the bank corporation with which he was associated would engage in the performance of any contract which might be entered into through the participation of Mr. Wenzell.

If, in a case such as that of Mr. McNamara, a Government officer were to participate in the transaction of business on behalf of the Government with business organizations in which he had in fact a financial interest, and the Court thereafter were to hold his knowledge thereof was immaterial, such a holding would throw into question the validity of all contracts entered into by that officer with such business organizations.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is considered not improbable that, on the basis of the expressions of the Supreme Court in the Mississippi Valley case, a Federal criminal court might regard the provisions of the trust agreement proposed in the case of Mr. McNamara to be ineffective to preclude the application of section 434 of title 18, United States Code, to any situation in which he were to represent the United States in a transaction with a business organization in which the trustee under that agreement then held securities for the benefit of Mr. McNamara.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN C. HERBERG,
Senior Counsel.

JANUARY 14, 1961.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a statement of facts prepared by my staff, at my request, from the hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee, dealing with Mr. McCone's financial holdings, including stock in Standard Oil of California, in which the nominee is a substantial stockholder, and certain shipping interests be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF FACTS FROM HEARINGS BEFORE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE ON NOMINATION OF JOHN A. MCCONE, JANUARY 18, 1962

1. STOCKHOLDINGS IN STANDARD OIL OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. McCone stated that he owned a little in excess of $1 million of stock in Standard Oil of California (hearings, p. 55). He stated that the company had "extensive reserves in Arabia and in the offshore island in the Persian Gulf of Bahrein, and also extensive reserve in Sumatra, and Venezuela" (p. 67).

Standard Oil of California is one of the four companies which makes up the Arabian-American Oil Co. (Aramco), along with the Texas Co., Standard Oil of New Jersey and Mobil Oil. Aramco, according to Mr. McCone, does have relationships with the governments of Arabia and Bahrein (p. 69).

(Note: Standard Oil of California 8/1/61 report to stockholders lists Mr. McCone as owning 18,318 shares and as receiving 915 additional shares by way of stock dividend. Total holdings: 19,233 shares.)

2. SHIPPING INTERESTS

Mr. McCone stated "I have direct interest in Trans-World Carriers. * * * I have personally acquired and own now the great majority of the stock in San Marino Corp. and Joshua Hendy Corp. and, therefore, through the sole ownership of Joshua Hendy, practically half of Trans-World Carriers at this point." (p. 66)

Joshua Hendy is exclusively engaged in the shipping business; in carrying ore to the South American trade; and in United States intercoastal trade, principally in chemicals. The company owns three or four ships in the intercoastal trade (pp. 68–69).

Senator CASE of South Dakota indicated that the ships in Mr. McCone's shipping enterprise and affiliated interests are engaged in carrying oil for Standard Oil of California (p. 67).

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I intend tomorrow to address myself more fully to the problem as to whether the Senate should or should not confirm this nomination. I put these memorandums in the Record now so that all Senators may be advised of them when the debate resumes tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn, under the order agreed to, until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and, as in legislative session (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under the order previously entered, the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 30, 1962, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 29, 1962:

U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

Jacob D. Beam, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

U.S. Marshal

Alvin Grossman, of New York, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of New York for the term of 4 years, vice George M. Glasser.

In The Army

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. Earle Gilmore Wheeler, O18715, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), in the rank of general.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, January 29, 1962:

Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System

George W. Mitchell, of Illinois, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of 14 years from February 1, 1962.

Diplomatic and Foreign Service

AMBASSADOR

William E. Stevenson, of Colorado, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Philippines.

ENVOY

William A. Crawford, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Rumania.

Secretary of the Navy

Fred Korth, of Texas, to be Secretary of the Navy.

Assistant Secretary of the Air Force

Neil E. Harlan, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

Assistant Secretary of State

Frederick G. Dutton, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Under Secretaries of State

George W. Ball, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of State.

George C. McGhee, of Texas, to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

Representative on the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations

Dr. Ansley J. Coale, of New Jersey, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

William C. Foster, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Adrian S. Fisher, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

President's Special Representative and Adviser on African, Asian, and Latin American Affairs, and Ambassador at Large

Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, to be the President's special representative and adviser on African, Asian, and Latin American affairs, and Ambassador at Large.

Diplomatic and Foreign Service

U.S. AMBASSADORS

John O. Bell, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Guatemala.

John H. Burns, of Oklahoma, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Central African Republic.

Parker T. Hart, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Yemen, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Kuwait.

William J. Handley, of Virginia, a Foreign Service Reserve officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Mali.

Ridgway B. Knight, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Syrian Arab Republic.

Henry R. Labouisse, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Greece.

Armin H. Meyer, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Lebanon.

Raymond L. Thurston, of Missouri, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Haiti.

John M. Cabot, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Poland.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Philippians 4: 19: *My God shall supply all your needs according to His riches in glory by Christ Jesus.*

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, may we daily approach Thy throne of grace and goodness, humbly and gratefully, for in Thee alone do we find the answer to our deepest longings and fondest hopes.

May it be the purpose and passion of our life to minister to the needs of struggling humanity and to strengthen the bonds of appreciation and understanding, of cooperation and fellowship, of peace, and good will.

Unite us more firmly and faithfully with all who are heroically striving to safeguard our heritage of liberty.

Help us to clearly comprehend that freedom can only be the sure and abiding possession of those who have the willingness and the courage to defend it.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 26, 1962, was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Graham B. Purcell, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

BIRTHDAY TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF PRESIDENT WILLIAM McKINLEY

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and accomplishments of William McKinley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, William McKinley, Jr., was born at Niles, Ohio, January 29, 1843. For many years, through the courtesies of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, we have on this day paused for a few minutes to pay tribute to this great American who spent many years in this Chamber of the House of Representatives where he made great contributions to the progress and development of industrial America.

As a young man he taught school. At the age of 18 he joined the 23d Regiment of the Ohio Volunteer Infantry as a private soldier and 4 years later was mustered out as a major of the same regiment. In 1867 he was admitted to the bar of Ohio and practiced in my home city of Canton, Ohio, and later served as prosecuting attorney of Stark County, one of the counties in my congressional district.

He was elected as a Republican to the 45th Congress and served for three terms and presented his credentials as a Member-elect to the 48th Congress but was succeeded by Jonathan H. Wallace who successfully contested his election. He was again elected for three consecutive terms to the 49th, 50th, and 51st Congresses and was defeated for reelection in 1890.

He had served on the great Ways and Means Committee and as chairman of that committee, and it was his activities in the passage of the McKinley tariff law which caused his defeat to Congress but later his election to the Presidency of the United States. It was charged against him that because of the McKinley tariff, prices of commodities had risen in the United States and because of this increase in the cost of living, McKinley lost favor with the voters of his district. But shortly thereafter by reason of the tariff the conditions improved and McKinley's popularity again rose high throughout the State of Ohio and he was elected and reelected Governor of the State.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that during McKinley's service in the House of Representatives he at one time was a candidate for the speakership but was defeated by his good friend Thomas B. Reed of Maine. And when he was nominated in the Republican convention for the first time for the President of the United States his closest rival was the then Speaker of the House Thomas B. Reed, of Maine. Had McKinley not been defeated for reelection to the House of Representatives, he probably never would have been President of these United States.

I think it is well known throughout the Nation that McKinley was a fine Christian gentleman, and there is a great tradition in my area of his loyalty and devotion to an invalid wife. Ida Saxton McKinley, well known as a beautiful and talented young lady, the daughter of a leading citizen of the community, suffered ill health shortly after the marriage to William McKinley. When serving as a Representative in Congress, Congressman McKinley made it a point to live in an area where he could call to visit with his wife several times during the day, and when he was Governor of Ohio reserved as their living quarters rooms in the Neal House across the street from the Capitol where from time to time he could look out of his window and wave to her. It was known that each day as he walked to his office he would always stop after crossing the street to turn to acknowledge Mrs. McKinley's goodby with a little salute. When he became President and as her health continued to fail he had hourly reports from his beloved wife. And when he was shot down by an assassin's bullet his first thoughts were to protect her from the knowledge of the attack.

There is much that we could say, Mr. Speaker, of William McKinley and his service in this House, and in the record of the proceedings of the Congress both during the period of time that he served here and since then in these tributes to him, there are great records of his patriotism and his devotion to this House and to the Nation.

Today, however, Mr. Speaker, because of events in which our citizens are interested I should like to briefly discuss a phase of McKinley's service which I find has not been referred to before in these memorials. When he was elected President of the United States in 1896 the Nation was suffering from a depression and from a period which caused great concern to the statesmen of that day. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to his inaugural address on March 4, 1897. Permit me to quote from this address:

> In obedience to the will of the people, and in their presence, by the authority vested in me by this oath, I assume the arduous and responsible duties of President of the United States, relying upon the support of my countrymen and invoking the guidance of Almighty God. Our faith teaches that there is no safer reliance than upon the God of our fathers, who has so singularly favored the American people in every national trial, and who will not forsake us so long as we obey His commandments and walk humbly in His footsteps.
>
> The responsibilities of the high trust to which I have been called—always of grave importance—are augmented by the prevailing business conditions entailing idleness upon willing labor and loss to useful enterprises. The country is suffering from industrial disturbances from which speedy relief must be had. Our financial system needs some revision; our money is all good now, but its value must not further be threatened. It should all be put upon an enduring basis, not subject to easy attack, nor its stability to doubt or dispute. Our currency should continue under the supervision of the Government. The several forms of our paper money offer, in my judgment, a constant embarrassment to the Government and a safe balance in the Treasury. Therefore I believe it necessary to devise a system which, without diminishing the circulating medium or offering a premium for its contraction, will present a remedy for those arrangements which, temporary in their nature, might well in the years of our prosperity have been displaced by wiser provisions. With adequate revenue secured, but not until then, we can enter upon such changes in our fiscal laws as will, while insuring safety and volume to our money, no longer impose upon the Government the necessity of maintaining so large a gold reserve, with its attendant and inevitable temptations to speculation. Most of our financial laws are the outgrowth of experience and trial, and should not be amended without investigation and demonstration of the wisdom of the proposed changes. We must be both "sure we are right" and "make haste slowly." If, therefore, Congress, in its wisdom, shall deem it expedient to create a commission to take under early consideration the revision of our coinage, banking and currency laws, and give them that exhaustive, careful and dispassionate examination that their importance demands, I shall cordially concur in such action. If such power is vested in the President, it is my purpose to appoint a commission of prominent, well-informed citizens of different parties, who will command public confidence, both on account of their ability and special fitness for the work. Business experience and public training may thus be combined, and the patriotic zeal of the friends of the country be so directed that such a report will be made as to receive the support of all parties, and our finances cease to be the subject of mere partisan contention. The experiment is, at all events, worth a trial, and, in my opinion, it can but prove beneficial to the entire country.

McKinley having called a special session of the Congress with the cooperation of both parties saw recovery come during his first term in the White House, and after his reelection in 1900 McKinley again addressed his countrymen on March 4, 1901, with the second inaugural address and, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I again quote from that address:

> When we assembled here on the 4th of March 1897, there was great anxiety with regard to our currency and credit. None exists now. Then our Treasury receipts were inadequate to meet the current obligations of the Government. Now they are sufficient for all public needs, and we have a surplus instead of a deficit. Then I felt constrained to convene the Congress in extraordinary session to devise revenues to pay the ordinary expenses of the Government. Now I have the satisfaction to announce that the Congress just closed has reduced taxation in the sum of $41 million. Then there was deep solicitude because of the long depression in our manufacturing, mining, agricultural, and mercantile industries and the consequent distress of our laboring population. Now every avenue of production is crowded with activity, labor is well employed, and American products find good markets at home and abroad.
>
> Our diversified productions, however, are increasing in such unprecedented volume as to admonish us of the necessity of still further enlarging our foreign markets by broader commercial relations. For this purpose reciprocal trade arrangements with other nations should in liberal spirit be carefully cultivated and promoted.
>
> The national verdict of 1896 has for the most part been executed. Whatever remains unfulfilled is a continuing obligation resting with undiminished force upon the Executive and the Congress. But fortunate as our condition is, its permanence can only be assured by sound business methods and strict economy in national administration and legislation. We should not permit our great prosperity to lead us to reckless ventures in business or profligacy in public expenditures. While the Congress determines the objects and the sum of appropriations, the officials of the executive departments are responsible for honest and faithful disbursement, and it should be their constant care to avoid waste and extravagance.
>
> Honesty, capacity, and industry are nowhere more indispensable than in public employment. These should be fundamental requisites to original appointment and the surest guarantees against removal.
>
> Four years ago we stood on the brink of war without the people knowing it and without any preparation or effort at preparation for the impending peril. I did all that in honor could be done to avert the war, but without avail. It became inevitable; and the Congress at its first regular session, without party division, provided money in anticipation of the crisis and in preparation to meet it. It came. The result was signally favorable to American arms and in the highest degree honorable to the Government. It imposed upon us obligations from which we cannot escape and from which it would be dishonorable to seek escape. We are now at peace with the world, and it is my fervent prayer that if differences arise between us and other powers they may be settled by peaceful arbitration and that hereafter we may be spared the horrors of war.
>
> Intrusted by the people for a second time with the office of President, I enter upon its administration appreciating the great responsibilities which attach to this renewed

> honor and commission, promising unreserved devotion on my part to their faithful discharge and reverently invoking for my guidance the direction and favor of Almighty God. I should shrink from the duties this day assumed if I did not feel that in their performance I should have the cooperation of the wise and patriotic men of all parties. It encourages me for the great task which I now undertake to believe that those who voluntarily committed to me the trust imposed upon the Chief Executive of the Republic will give to me generous support in my duties to preserve, protect, and defend, the Constitution of the United States and to care that the laws be faithfully executed. The national purpose is indicated through a national election. It is the constitutional method of ascertaining the public will. When once it is registered it is a law to us all, and faithful observance should follow its decrees.
>
> Strong hearts and helpful hands are needed, and, fortunately, we have them in every part of our beloved country. We are reunited. Sectionalism has disappeared. Division on public questions can no longer be traced by the war maps of 1861. These old differences less and less disturb the judgment. Existing problems demand the thought and quicken the conscience of the country, and the responsibility for their presence, as well as for their righteous settlement, rests upon us all—no more upon me than upon you. There are some national questions in the solution of which patriotism should exclude partisanship. Magnifying their difficulties will not take them off our hands nor facilitate their adjustment. Distrust of the capacity, integrity, and high purposes of the American people will not be an inspiring theme for future political contests. Dark pictures and gloomy forebodings are worse than useless. These only becloud, they do not help to point the way of safety and honor. "Hope maketh not ashamed." The prophets of evil were not the builders of the Republic, nor in its crises since have they saved or served it. The faith of the fathers was a mighty force in its creation, and the faith of their descendants has wrought its progress and furnished its defenders. They are obstructionists who despair, and who would destroy confidence in the ability of our people to solve wisely and for civilization the mighty problems resting upon them. The American people, entrenched in freedom at home, take their love for it with them wherever they go, and they reject as mistaken and unworthy the doctrine that we lose our own liberties by securing the enduring foundations of liberty to others. Our institutions will not deteriorate by extension, and our sense of justice will not abate under tropic suns in distant seas. As heretofore, so hereafter will the Nation demonstrate its fitness to administer any new estate which events devolve upon it, and in the fear of God will "take occasion by the hand and make the bounds of freedom wider yet." If there are those among us who would make our way more difficult, we must not be disheartened, but the more earnestly dedicate ourselves to the task upon which we have rightly entered. The path of progress is seldom smooth. New things are often found hard to do. Our fathers found them so. We find them so. They are inconvenient. They cost us something. But are we not made better for the effort and sacrifice, and are not those we serve lifted up and blessed?
>
> We will be consoled, too, with the fact that opposition has confronted every onward movement of the Republic from its opening hour until now, but without success. The Republic has marched on and on, and its step has exalted freedom and humanity. We are undergoing the same ordeal as did our predecessors nearly a century ago. We are following the course they blazed. They triumphed. Will their successors falter and plead organic impotency in the Nation? Surely after 125 years of achievement for mankind we will not now surrender our equality with other powers on matters fundamental and essential to nationality. With no such purpose was the Nation created. In no such spirit has it developed its full and independent sovereignty. We adhere to the principle of equality among ourselves, and by no act of ours will we assign to ourselves a subordinate rank in the family of nations.
>
> We face at this moment a most important question—that of the future relations of the United States and Cuba. With our near neighbors we must remain close friends. The declaration of the purposes of this Government in the resolution of April 20, 1898, must be made good. Ever since the evacuation of the island by the Army of Spain, the Executive, with all practicable speed, has been assisting its people in the successive steps necessary to the establishment of a free and independent Government prepared to assume and perform the obligations of international law which now rest upon the United States under the Treaty of Paris. The convention elected by the people to frame a constitution is approaching the completion of its labors. The transfer of American control to the new Government is of such great importance, involving an obligation resulting from our intervention and the treaty of peace, that I am glad to be advised by the recent act of Congress of the policy which the legislative branch of the Government deems essential to the best interests of Cuba and the United States. The principles which led to our intervention require that the fundamental law upon which the new Government rests should be adapted to secure a government capable of performing the duties and discharging the functions of a separate nation, of observing its international obligations of protecting life and property, insuring order, safety, and liberty, and conforming to the established and historical policy of the United States in its relation to Cuba.
>
> The peace which we are pledged to leave to the Cuban people must carry with it the guaranties of permanence. We became sponsors for the pacification of the island, and we remain accountable to the Cubans, no less than to our own country and people, for the reconstruction of Cuba as a free commonwealth on abiding foundations of right, justice, liberty, and assured order. Our enfranchisement of the people will not be completed until free Cuba shall "be a reality, not a name; a perfect entity, not a hasty experiment bearing within itself the elements of failure."

It will be seen from these two inaugural addresses that McKinley was faced with many of the problems that face us today—taxes, tariffs, our gold reserve and Cuba—and that through the strength of the people and these legislative Halls, answers were found.

I am reminded, Mr. Speaker, of the mottoes on the front of the Archives Building on Pennsylvania Avenue, which say, "What is past is prologue," "Study the past." It seems, Mr. Speaker, there is much in the life and accomplishments of William McKinley that we may well study and follow in these troublesome days.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yeld?

Mr. BOW. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for the fine and stirring address he has given on this the 119th anniversary of the birth of President William McKinley. I would like to associate myself with his remarks. President McKinley received great enjoyment on many occasions when he visited in my district. He came to know the Berkshires of western Massachusetts when he studied law in Albany, N.Y., not too many miles away from those scenic mountains. During his term as Governor of Ohio, he came up to Massachusetts for his first visit since his college days. At that time, in 1892, he came for a short vacation and visited the town of Adams. This was really the first time that the people of western Massachusetts became familiar with their future President, since naturally a visit from a Governor attracted a certain amount of attention. After being elected to the Presidency, McKinley returned to the Berkshires as the guest of Senator Winthrop Murray Crane and Secretary of Navy John D. Long. On one of these trips, after becoming familiar with the area and being sincerely welcomed by its people, President McKinley laid the cornerstone of the library in Adams. The story goes that he wandered freely through the towns and hills of the Berkshires talking frankly with the people he met to the point that they considered him one of their own. Soon after President McKinley's untimely death at the hand of an assassin, Adams commissioned a statue that was erected in the square of that city on October 10, 1903, and remains there today as a symbol of their affection for him. I think it is only appropriate, therefore, that I add to your comments today these short remarks on behalf of the people of Adams, Mass., in memory of President William McKinley.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the tribute being paid today to a former President of the United States, William McKinley, of Ohio. Indeed, I believe we may find valuable lessons for today's hectic world in William McKinley's career.

For example, Mr. Speaker, Members may not be aware that when William McKinley was a Member of Congress from Ohio he was gerrymandered out of his seat. The record shows, however, that by virtue of this very action, Congressman McKinley went on to be elected Governor of Ohio.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the political heirs of Mr. McKinley in my Empire State of New York will find that on that score history will repeat itself this year.

PHANTOM ACRES

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a week from today, signup will begin on the 1962 feed grains program. In the 1961 program, "phantom acres" were permitted, resulting in $150 million needless waste.

In fact, printed regulations governing the program caused most of the waste by inviting 5-percent exaggeration in crop history. Will the same "phantom acres" be permitted again this year, with another $150 million down the drain?

In my January 18 letter to President Kennedy—Congressional Record, January 18, 1962, pages 563–565—I pointed to the quick and easy way to prevent this needless waste: by requiring the USDA, in administering the program, to live within the crop history data supplied by its own high-esteemed crop reporting service.

THE GAP IN MEDICAL CARE

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to call attention to the editorial and remarks I have made regarding it, which I am putting in the daily Record, because it deals with a bill that is coming up tomorrow providing educational facilities. It relates to the need for more doctors in the United States. I believe it is well worth reading before you make your final decision on that bill.

THE DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a bill to create a Department of Urban Affairs, as I understand, was voted out by the Committee on Government Operations. That bill, of course, can be brought before the House under the Calendar Wednesday rule if Chairman Dawson of that committee desires to avail himself of it and the leadership wants to permit the House to have an opportunity to debate the bill.

I would suggest that the leadership of the House follow that procedure for two reasons: One, by following that procedure you permit the House to amend the bill; and, two, you avoid any question of the constitutionality of using the Reorganization Act for a purpose for which it was never intended; it was enacted to provide for housekeeping amendments but not amendments with regard to policy.

The Rules Committee cannot block legislation from the floor of the House. The Calendar Wednesday rule was embodied in the rules for that purpose. Let us get done with this political chicanery that is going on.

FOREIGN EXCHANGE STUDENTS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I have had a good deal to do with foreign students and I know how difficult their lives here are.

I am delighted to see in the Christian Science Monitor the story of three college boys who have gone to work on it. They have gone from college to college and they have a tremendous job.

The article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 23, 1962]

REPORT FROM KANSAS: PEACE CORPS IN REVERSE

(By Godfrey Sperling, Jr.)

Three young men are getting ready to race around the United States in an effort to set up a national project that rivals the Peace Corps in its possibilities for bettering world understanding.

This is no idealistic youthful fling. Active support, which means financial support, too, is coming from the powerful people-to-people program, headed by Dwight D. Eisenhower and ably implemented by a number of the Nation's top leaders. Finances and direction come from Joyce C. Hall and his Hallmark Foundation.

One of the young men, the one who thought up the project, is William Dawson, a senior at the University of Kansas. The others are Rafer Johnson, the Olympic decathlon champion, and Rick Barnes, former student body president at the University of Kansas. These young men will soon be consulting with student leaders from the colleges and universities of the 50 States in meetings set up by the Governors of these States. The goal: more effective student organizations for making international students a part of the college and community in which they are staying.

It was only a year ago that young Dawson became concerned about the international students at the University of Kansas. He found them living in ghettos, tunneling their way through their student experience—not getting to know Americans or the way Americans do things. In correspondence with a number of colleges and universities throughout the country, he found there really was no effective program of integration for such students.

Young Dawson, with other student help and student funds, then went to work on the University of Kansas campus. Many of the foreign students needed jobs, in order to come back to school this fall. By scurrying around the State, Dawson and his friends found 56 summer jobs for these visitors. Then they arranged a number of visits and tours for the individual foreign students, into homes, factories, farms. Foreigners of both white and dark skins were, with this student impetus, given a special welcome into the community life of Lawrence, Kans. The citizenry's welcome soon extended to invitations for students to live with them. The ghetto was broken down.

"Think of the possibilities," says young Dawson. "These are the people who will be with their nations' leaders when they go home. Previously they always had negative or inadequate impressions of us. Now they can feel our warmth, and return to their countries with a friendly feeling toward us.

"Right now there are about 70,000 foreign students in America. This number is increasing by 10,000 to 15,000 each year.

"So we can reach these foreign friends of ours right here in America. And it won't cost the Government a cent."

Dawson stresses that the project be kept student oriented. In the main the funds for the campus programs will come from the students themselves.

Only in the organizing phase, of moving from State to State and talking to campus leaders, will people-to-people funds be used.

Already Dawson has set up pilot projects in all the universities of the Big Eight Conference, of which the University of Kansas is a member. In a late December meeting of these universities, campus leaders, gathered at Lincoln, Nebr., agreed to move ahead rapidly in this job of campus integration.

The project has many facets. Part of it is a brother-sister program. Each arriving international student, upon making application to the university, is corresponded with by personal letter from an American student. His American brother then meets him upon his arrival and helps him become oriented—finds housing for him, takes him to social functions, shows him how to use a phone and how to get his laundry done, etc., helps him become accustomed to our way of life.

The Dawson-Johnson-Barnes team will be moving fast now. Each college and university will be asked to set up its program this spring. Then again, next fall, these young men will tour the colleges of the United States—seeing to it that the programs are moving ahead at a fast pace.

College programs for the international student are no new thing, but often the objective has been to make the foreigner happier among those of his own country—or among other foreigners. Integration, certainly on any extensive basis, is something new.

With the exhilaration that accompanies pioneering work, Bill, Rafer, and Rick will soon be on their way.

WHY A NEW DEPARTMENT?

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, Raymond Moley, in a column which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, January 28, has very effectively pointed out the fallacies of establishing a new Department of Urban Affairs with a seat in the President's Cabinet alongside such veterans as State, Treasury, and Justice. Mr. Moley points out that the many interests which the Federal Government now has in local government almost entirely pertain to individual aid in health, education, and welfare. We already have a department to care for that aid, so why establish a new department?

Believing Mr. Moley's column will be of interest to the entire House membership, under unanimous consent I include it in the Record as a part of my remarks:

WHY A NEW DEPARTMENT?

(By Raymond Moley)

The ever-increasing Federal control of local and State government is now proposed to be formalized in a new Department of Urban Affairs, with a seat in the President's Cabinet alongside such veterans as State, Treasury, and Justice. There is no reason in tradition or logic in such a departmentalization. The many interests which the Federal Government now has in local government almost entirely pertain to individual aid in health, education, and welfare. We already have a department to care for that aid.

Let us look at the Departments now in the Cabinet.

The first Cabinet was composed of the heads of departments created in the first year of the Republic. They were the Secretaries of State, Treasury, War (meaning Army), Navy, and Justice. These were charged with the administration of powers specifically designated in the Constitution. In 1829 the Post Office Department, which had been in the Treasury, was given Cabinet rank.

Then, as time went on, the vast properties of the Nation acquired by purchase and conquest and other means had become so large that in 1849 their administration demanded an Interior Department.

Up to that time, the reasons for separate departments were essentially Federal, because of constitutional provisions and ownership.

A change began in 1862, when a vast economic interest was recognized in the creation of the Department of Agriculture.

Then, after 41 years, in 1903 two other interests were recognized in the creation of a Department of Commerce and Labor. In 1913 this was divided into the Departments of Commerce and Labor, respectively.

These three latecomers—Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor—were interests in the sense that the private businesses of the Nation had assumed an interstate character of such importance that the Federal Government's regulation and aid needed attention.

It was believed that these three divergent private interests with millions of Americans in them would have a person at the Cabinet table who would speak for them, and also that these department heads would be able to speak to the interests thus represented in the name of the National Government at Washington.

The vast expansion of our military forces, together with the changed character of military power by the rise of airpower, brought about the consolidated Department of Defense in 1947.

Until that year, the logical reason for a Department was well defined. But after the great depression, there was a new philosophy of personal aid by direct Federal contributions. The recipients of such aid were not in the real sense private economic interests. Nor were the private associations or State and local agencies engaged in education, health, and welfare such interests. They were numerous but not homogeneous. Only in the fact that they all wanted Federal money could they be classed as an interest. Nor could the ministration to their wants be called a Federal function. Almost always when one of these new Federal burdens was assumed, it was regarded as temporary. And so the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare became a catchall for a vast spending congeries of bureaucracies.

Just what the Secretary of the HEW Department represents before the country and in the Cabinet is hard to understand. For the head of a big department is more than the administrator of a vast bureaucracy. Perhaps he would say he is the keeper of the great soft heart of Uncle Sam. The red, white, and blue Santa Claus. The friend of the friendless, the hope of the hopeless, and the help of the helpless. But, like Everest, he is there, and it's too late to do anything about it.

But the concept of a Department of Urban Affairs would mean another kind of definition of a representative. Cities are separate agencies of government. Is the Secretary of such a Department to be the lobbyist in chief for the mayors and councils of cities? If so, could not this be done better by getting all the city officials together and have them select a member of their group to live in Washington? Is the proposed new Secretary to have a hand in planning and running the great sprawling urban districts in the land? If so, we have progressed a long way toward a unitary government.

The fact is that his Department would merely be a satellite planet split off from the great sun of beneficence which is the HEW. It would be another convenient means of getting city votes. Why are city people different from other people? In short, why not leave the bureaus where they are, in the HEW?

If the purpose of such a Department is to tell the cities how to run their affairs, one might well suggest that running the city of Washington by a congressional subcommittee has not been a howling success.

MILITARY SPEECHMAKING

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the present national interest in military speechmaking is a clear indication of the changing role of the military in our life. Twenty-five years ago it would have been inconceivable to presume their right to energize the American people with speeches. Today, it is not only accepted. This is not even in issue.

The question is not being raised of their right as military men to comment on politics, but what it is proper or not proper to say. Tacitly, the press and other leaders of opinion have granted to the military the right to be heard in the political arena.

The presumption is easy to grant because the locus of their speechmaking is the evil of worldwide communism. This is all very well, but it is only the beginning of the matter. What remains is how far the denunciation can extend. For the reverse side of this coin to many military speechmakers is the American scene and the alleged moral decay taking place in our country which requires energizing. The conflict over what may or may not be proper will go on forever in an ever-widening pool. There will be a continuing tug of war over definitions, adjectives, participial phrases, dependent clauses, as military men of various experiences seek to energize American citizen audiences. The unfortunate censors will be steadily bedeviled by the no man's land between what may be said about communism and what the military speechmakers believe can be said of it. The censor, whoever he is and whatever his decision, will be held up to the light as silly, frivolous if not downright incompetent or subversive.

In today's arena, with the press silent to a man in the debate, the censor's job has been made an impossible one. There will be few volunteers to pick up the red pencil, and those assigned to the job will be suitably reluctant to carry it out. On one hand the choices open to them will be pitiless indeed, but even more so the glare to public judgment and disgrace.

There are many in and out of the military who believe that soldiers gave up certain citizen rights, and these strictures were accepted as a price to be paid for the democratic continuity of the United States. In their time, the creators of the American Constitution had on all sides ample evidence of the troubles besetting those countries who chased after the man on the white horse.

To assume now, as many in the military apparently do, that there are not sufficient Americans on the civilian side, attacking the evil that is communism, and that military officers have the duty to energize American citizens is indeed a curious commentary. It shows a lack of confidence in the citizen and in the civil government and the ability of the political representatives to amply provide the warning. It means either a loss of confidence, or it is an effort to say much more than would be permissible were it not properly decked out in anti-Communist clothes.

If certain officers feel Americans so need their energizing efforts, the correct course would seem to lie in resigning their commissions and pursuing this mission as civilians where they can be subjected to the argument of the civilian arena.

That the present mode of conduct is accepted and that no one addresses the fundamental issue is most assuredly proof of great changes in the relationship of the military to civilian society.

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, it was charged on the floor of the House January 24 that Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman is attempting to bring the Agricultural Extension Service into the political arena, that he is setting up a system for the party line conditioning of 4-H Club members.

This allegation, based upon an Associated Press story which had its origin in Washington, is without factual foundation.

Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 2 days before this news story was called to the attention of the House, the Secretary of Agriculture signed the following memorandum addressed to each of the Nation's State extension directors:

> During the past weekend, the Associated Press carried a story stating that I was asking the Cooperative Extension Service to "enter the political arena to help shape future farm policies and programs." I want you to understand clearly that this is not what I have said or implied.
>
> The AP story refers to a talk I gave before the Federal Extension Service at their annual conference on January 10. At that time I specifically stated that Extension should not

get into politics. You received a copy of my prepared text from Dr. York. I did state that there is an urgent need for economic, social and structural readjustments in agriculture—a need which cannot be met by merely shoring up prices and incomes from year to year. Such social and economic adjustments can come about only through public discussions of the problems and various alternatives. This means a big educational job must be done—and the Cooperative Extension Service should logically carry major responsibility for this.

This in no sense indicates that I expect Extension to get into the political arena. It is a job of presenting facts, alternatives, and promoting free discussion among both farm and nonfarm people so they may make sound decisions on policy in a democratic manner.

The Cooperative Extension Service—as a part of the Department, the land-grant system, and local government—is in a unique position to carry out this important educational job. I am certain you will do this in a most effective and objective manner.

Mr. Speaker, I think it safe to assume that Extension Service officials at every level will accept the views of the Secretary of Agriculture on the basis of his own statements rather than news service interpretations of them.

Too, those who would anticipate the partisan political indoctrination of our 4-H Club boys and girls by any Secretary of Agriculture, at any time, certainly downgrade the thousands of farm men and women who serve as volunteer 4-H Club leaders. These are the leaders with whom the boys and girls spend most of their 4-H activity time. Some are Republicans, some are Democrats, some are independents. All are freedom-loving Americans with the highest concept of public service—they give unselfishly of their abilities and their energies and their time to the boys and girls of their neighborhoods. Some are Democrats who serve as leaders for children from the homes of Republicans, and some are Republicans who serve as leaders for children from the homes of Democrats. They are not on anybody's payroll—their rewards are the satisfaction that comes from service and, in some areas, a pin to wear after 10 or 20 or more years of volunteer club leadership.

These volunteer leaders have made 4-H one of the greatest youth organizations in the world and they are in the program to help build citizens, not partisans. Any Secretary of Agriculture who does not accept that fact is in for a lot more trouble than politicians can make for him.

Secretary Freeman has made it clear he has not, does not now, nor does he intend to inject politics into either the teaching or learning phases of the Agricultural Extension Service programs.

We can turn our attention to more realistic, and significant, phases of agricultural problems. They need, and merit, this attention.

Most of them, I believe, are impressively outlined in the speech the Secretary made before the annual conference of the Federal Extension Service, and I am adding it to my comments for the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY FREEMAN

Many Extension leaders recognize today that Extension Service has been far more effective in developing and spreading improved production techniques than in assisting the adjustment of agriculture to the accompanying social and economic changes.

The belief has been that a constantly increasing level of productivity and efficiency will bring the farmer an income adequate to compensate him for his labor, managerial skill, and to repay the investment in land, equipment, and such items as fertilizer.

The experience of the past decade, a period when the productive efficiency of the farmer increased at a revolutionary pace, has shown that this belief is naive if not unfair to the farmer.

Time has shown the result of increasing efficiency in agriculture is, logically, that the benefits of scientific and technological advances pass through the farmer to the general public.

This aspect of agriculture is not to be lamented, for the production of adequate food and fiber at reasonable prices for the American people is the true goal of all the factors which have made the American farmer the most productive man of the soil in the history of the world.

This is the only public policy which could be followed, for the cost of research, the land-grant college system, the Extension Service, and all aspects of the Department of Agriculture have been and are an investment by the public of its funds to maximize the public well-being.

But, in the same light, it has never been public policy to expect the farmer or the rural economy to produce without adequate compensation the food and fiber which has contributed so substantially to our high standard of living.

It is this long-neglected area of public policy toward which we are now directing our attention. It does not mean that we intend to deemphasize the continuing need for increased efficiency and productivity. Attention to these needs should continue as strongly as before, but only in perspective to the enlarging emphasis on public policy designed to strengthen the agricultural economy and to insure that it can continue to put new technology into practice for the benefit of all Americans.

Through this enlargement of emphasis, we are seeking to update agricultural policies and programs as they affect the farmer. In effect, we seek to begin bridging the gap between conditions as they exist today and the public policy which has not changed as conditions have changed.

There is an urgent need for economic, social, and structural readjustments in agriculture—a need which cannot be met by merely shoring up prices and incomes from year to year. And the Extension Service at the Federal and State levels can play a vital and important role.

The role of Extension in a food and agricultural program of the 1960's has been the subject of much thought by those in Extension. I want to direct my remarks to that topic, but first let me outline in brief the direction of that program as the administration views it, including some of its general parts.

It is obvious, or should be so, that neither the Congress or the people will continue to support programs which require increasingly larger expenditures which result only in increasingly larger accumulations of commodities.

It is equally obvious that the productivity of the American farmer is going to increase tomorrow just as it did yesterday. We are just beginning the era of the agricultural revolution, and both science and technology have many surprises to show us.

Under these circumstances, there are perhaps three alternatives which the American people have to choose from. There can be, as some persons have suggested, a complete elimination of all programs in order that farm prices could seek their own level in the marketplace.

Given the massive productive capacity of agriculture today, prices would not seek a level; they would sink within a very short period of time to a level of more than a third below where they currently rest. Farm income would drop even further.

This would entail a vast waste of capital during the brief, fierce struggle for survival among farmers, and the loss of resources in terms of people, communities, and land would be severe. It is difficult to imagine how anyone can consciously advocate such a course of economic disruption, institutional destruction, and human suffering. It will achieve an adjustment, but the price would be higher than anyone willingly will pay.

The second alternative is one which I have already discussed very briefly. We can continue the programs in vogue during the 1950's which allowed unlimited production with a guaranteed price support. The fact that our current efforts to live with an abundantly productive agriculture are complicated by massive carryovers of commodities; grain in particular speaks for itself. The public will not continue to pay the price of such programs without achieving better results in reducing the current surplus and providing long-term tax savings.

The third alternative is to develop policies of managing the abundant potential of agriculture, combining this approach with programs to first expand domestic and international uses for food and fiber and, second, to develop the most practical and efficient use for land and water resources.

Its aim would be to preserve and strenghthen the family owned and operated farming system we have perfected as the most efficiently productive agricultural unit known to man. In essence, this is the primary goal for, by doing this, we insure that the benefits of science in agriculture will continue to be used to the advantage of the public.

There has never yet been presented to the Congress or to the people of this country a complete and comprehensive program for a food and agriculture policy to do this. In the past, as the approaching crisis of abundance affected first one commodity and one area and then another, public policy was developed to deal with one or several commodities.

It is clear that the crisis of abundance is at hand. We can, with relatively little effort, substantially increase the amount of any given commodity. It has been estimated, for example, that we can produce all the food and fiber we need in 1980 on 50 million fewer acres of land than now are in production.

It is time then that we develop a clear, overall program which views agriculture as it exists today and which projects for its need over the long haul as a complete and integrated whole.

This administration intends to present such a program of food and agriculture to the Congress. It is, in general, a triangular program, each side of the triangle equally as important as the others and each dependent on the others.

One side of the triangle is the program to develop the most practical and efficient use of land resources. Its goal is to provide adequate food for all, to conserve soil and water, to provide recreational resources and to insure that land resources are used and will not lay idle.

We will hold a National Conference on Land and People here at the Department to discuss and study this general area which includes the rural area development program, building adequate family farms, retraining programs for rural areas and other projects designed to expand prosperity in the rural economy.

The second side of the food and agriculture program emphasizes food and its uses, both in an affluent society and in a world which cannot satisfy its food needs.

A second national conference, this one on food and people, has been held in the Department to discuss how we can expand domestic and international uses of food and fiber. There currently are underway vastly expanded programs at home—direct distribution of food, the food certificate program, school lunch—and abroad—food for peace and food distribution programs of private and public agencies—to increase the use of food where it serves a constructive purpose.

There also will be continued emphasis on the development and expansion of international markets for American food and fiber, recognizing that the current level of exports will require constant attention to maintain it while we seek to promote its growth.

The third side of the triangle is the program for commodity management. Even before the last session of the Congress ended, the Department had begun an exhaustive series of meetings with various commodity groups, and these meetings have continued on through into the new year as we seek to consult and advise with as wide a cross-section of producers and processors as possible in developing individual commodity programs. I doubt that any program which has been presented to the Congress has been conceived with as broad consultation as the one the administration will propose this year.

It should be so, for at no time has agriculture or the farmer stood at such an important crossroad. Given the most optimistic conditions to achieve the desired result under the programs for land and food use, we must accept the blunt fact that American agriculture will produce for the foreseeable future more food and fiber than can be efficiently and effectively used.

In this general reorientation of agricultural policy, where, you ask, does the Federal Extension Service—the Cooperative Extension Service—fit in? What is its role?

First, if Extension is to continue in its historic role as the educational arm, then obviously it will assume much broader responsibility than it has in the past.

Cooperative extension has primarily been a program of continuing education, but education directed at helping people solve specific problems or adjust to immediate circumstances. I think it is clear that the problems of agriculture cannot be met by continued emphasis on increased productivity, so the role of extension will become more multiple purpose than has been the case.

There will be those inside and out of Extension who will criticize you for looking to new horizons, but I submit that neither you, nor I, nor anyone honestly concerned with agriculture can avoid this challenge. Some would prefer to avoid it because it deals with controversial matters, because it relates to the formulation of public policy, because it deals with matters that cannot be proved or disproved by chemical analysis or controlled experiments.

You cannot avoid the challenge. It deals with the welfare of human beings, with the future of our resources and our children, with principles and ideals relating to human dignity, and with values we regard as vitally important.

We cannot allow machines to displace men, either in agriculture or industry, without providing those men with the opportunity to find and qualify for other employment.

We cannot allow most of our ablest young farmers to be forced out of agriculture—the one industry absolutely essential to human survival—because farming offers economic incentives so much lower than other occupations.

Nor can we allow such trends as the increased need for capital and credit in farming to jeopardize the continued existence of our owner-operated family farm system.

We know that answers formulated by experts and farm leaders will be not enough. Research for increased productivity was not enough. The knowledge and techniques developed by experts and engineers had to be brought to the farmer himself. Programs to update the whole of agriculture can be assisted by experts, but they cannot be adopted by them.

Thus, one of the biggest tasks ahead will be one of education, of public discussion, of arriving at sound decisions on policy in a democratic manner through participation by farmers, and by the nonfarm public as well.

This is one of the prime roles of Extension in a food and agriculture program of the 1960's. Extension will need to expand its techniques of education in problem solving to a wider audience. Consumers need to understand that progress from research benefits them more than it does the farmer. The public needs to understand farm problems more thoroughly, particularly in their relation of these problems to the Nation's economy.

Extension Service has contributed greatly to the progress of agriculture during the past 50 years, and I am confident that it can in the decade ahead contribute as much to the need for decisionmaking. It must if it is to continue to hold its rightful place in American life.

Another prime role of Extension in the decade ahead also involves an expansion of its education function as this relates to the organization and the activities of the rural area development program.

In addition to seeking broader public understanding of the need for resource adjustments in agriculture, Extension will be called upon to direct attention in the rural community to the need for social and economic progress.

This effort will include such programs as are necessary to help rural areas make complete and efficient use of human and physical resources to increase family income and the general level of living. It will affect such things as community services, helping young people to get a good education to prepare for the occupation or profession they wish to follow, developing adult education programs so people who cannot find full employment in agriculture—and who seek other ways to earn their livelihood—can get special training.

Extension has been given a most responsible role in providing the organizational leadership for the RAD program on the local county and area level. It means that you will be responsible for bringing the vast resources of the Department, the agencies of State governments and the land-grant colleges to the assistance of the rural community.

I cannot overestimate the importance of the RAD program. This administration will not tolerate any program which seeks to drive people off the land. Rather, we seek to preserve the many values of rural life for those who live in rural areas and for the Nation as a whole. But the chance to earn a decent American standard of living is the right of every citizen, and where the resources of a community are so limited as to make this virtually impossible we will seek to strengthen those resources.

I am pleased to see that the Federal Extension Service is beginning to meet this challenge of total economic development, and that there is recognition it will require considerable reorientation of thinking, organization and emphasis.

Extension deserves the praise of every American for the job it has done in helping agriculture and the American farmer to achieve the phenomenal record of productive success. It now has a much greater opportunity for service in the search for social and economic progress in the rural community.

The need is clear, and I urge you to begin without delay.

A DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, as I walked into the Chamber this morning, I heard the distinguished gentleman from Missouri refer to an act of the President as one of "political chicanery."

I want to commend the President of the United States for an act of political courage and judgment.

He is utilizing the powers voted to him by this, the 87th Congress. He is giving the Members of this House an opportunity to record themselves on one of the most significant proposals of this session. He is acting to give us the right denied by the Committee on Rules, notwithstanding the overwhelming approval by the legislative committee reporting the original legislation to create the Department of Urban Affairs.

I serve as a member of that legislative committee. I believe it to be a committee of sound judgment, in no way forced to yield to any other committee in demonstrating the soundness or the responsibilities of its actions. So I welcome the course chosen by the President, a legal, a proper course, to permit every Member of this House to record himself in a manner that makes it unmistakable to the people to whom he is accountable just precisely where he stands.

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of attention to the statement made by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss]. I, too, am a member, and have been a member for a great many years, of that great House Committee on Government Operations. I would just like to remind the House that the Committee on Government Operations has had before it year after year not one, but as many as three and four different bills, to create a Department of Urban Affairs, and that great Committee on Government Operations, usually controlled by a heavy Democratic majority, in its innate wisdom, after at times holding hearings on this legislation, has failed or refused to take any action to report any such bill to the floor of the House until this year. After all, Members of the House, the facts speak for themselves. The records are clear on this matter. So, following the intent and the purpose of the Committee on

Government Operations throughout the years, there were those of us on that great committee who sustained the usual position taken by our committee, and opposed the legislation this year, and continue to oppose it. We did not change horses in the middle of the stream.

REORGANIZATION OF DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as you so well know, the American people have been anxiously awaiting the reorganization of the Defense Establishment for the past 15 years in order that, first of all, it may be effective in its missions and also that it may be efficient and economical.

During the past 10 years numerous committees, subcommittees, study groups, the Hoover Commission and others have pointed out the great waste in the defense agencies. A year ago the Procurement Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am a member, pointed out the scope of the military activities which, as everyone knows, costs in the magnitude of $50 billion a year and also the degree of waste in and amongst them.

I have just received a copy of a statement made by the office of Lt. Gen. Andrew T. McNamara, Director of the new Defense Supply Agency, that he has assumed command of 46 agencies and offices heretofore engaged in common supply and common services to the operating forces.

General McNamara indicates that large economies are possible through the establishment of the new Defense Supply Agency and as an example mentions that steps have been taken toward standardization of a few common supply items with an economy of about $1,400,000. The items are semidress uniforms, combat boots, fatigue uniforms, belt buckles, inspectors' and meatcutters' frocks, and women's wear. These are but a few of the almost 4 million items which have been cataloged in the defense supply systems and to indicate the possibility of savings I am also advised that a new electronic supply agency will be established on July 1 and it will be possible to reduce over 1 million items by some 30 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I bring this matter to the attention of the House at this time since Secretary McNamara is using his authority under the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958 to eliminate waste in common supply and service areas. Since the American people have been asking for this kind of action for many years I hope that they will rally to the support of Secretary McNamara since he has some hard decisions to make and the issuance of directives establishing the new organization does not assure success.

There will be many contractors, Members of Congress, and their constituents, who will be disappointed at individual actions that must be taken. But it should be realized by everyone that large savings are only possible by eliminating something, somewhere.

The release of the Department of Defense of January 1, 1962, follows:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., January 1, 1962.

Lt. Gen. Andrew T. McNamara, U.S. Army, Director of the Defense Supply Agency, has assumed command of 46 agencies and offices previously managed and supported by the military services and engaged in providing common supplies and common services to the operating forces.

DSA employs 13,724 personnel in its coast-to-coast operations. Of that total the headquarters in Washington, D.C., will be staffed, in mid-January, by 244 civilian personnel and 66 officers selected from all of the services. The field elements have 12,830 civilian employees and 564 officers and enlisted personnel.

Six Defense Supply Centers commanded by General McNamara buy, store, and issue on a wholesale basis food, clothing and textiles, medical, petroleum, construction and general supplies. They manage an inventory of 279,000 line items valued at $1,989 million. Estimated sales to the military services are expected to reach $2,679,600,000 this year while purchases by the centers will amount to approximately $2,554,100,000.

The totals will increase during calendar year 1962 as the Agency takes over additional field activities. On April 1 next DSA will become responsible for industrial supplies and on July 1 for automotive supplies. On July 1 also the newly established electronics supply center will begin to manage selected items of materiel.

When these additional functions come under DSA control, the number of line items managed will increase to 1,360,000, inventory value will rise to $3,467 million, annual sales to more than $3 billion and purchases to $2,933,900,000.

On January 1, 1962, the field organization consisted of the following elements:

Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio, commanded by Brig. Gen. Philip F. Kromer, Jr., U.S. Army.

Defense Clothing and Textile Supply Center, Philadelphia, Pa., commanded by Maj. Gen. Oliver C. Harvey, U.S. Army.

Defense General Supply Center, Richmond, Va., commanded by Maj. Gen. Victor J. MacLaughlin, U.S. Army.

Defense Medical Supply Center, Brooklyn, N.Y., commanded by Rear Adm. W. L. Knickerbocker, U.S. Navy.

Defense Petroleum Supply Center, Washington, D.C., commanded by Rear Adm. T. L. Becknell, Jr., U.S. Navy.

Defense Subsistence Supply Center, Chicago, Ill., commanded by Maj. Gen. Hugh Mackintosh, U.S. Army.

Defense Electronics Supply Center, Dayton, Ohio, commanded by Brig. Gen. William W. Veal, U.S. Air Force, who is now developing plans for the inception of management of electronics materiel July 1, 1962.

Defense Traffic Management Service, Washington, D.C., commanded by Maj. Gen. I. Sewell Morris, U.S. Army.

Defense Logistics Services Center, Washington, D.C., directed by Mr. Herman C. Hangen.

The Logistics Services Center includes the former Armed Forces Supply Support Center, the U.S. Army Property Disposal Center, the Defense Surplus Bidders Control Office in San Antonio, Tex., and Defense surplus sales offices which annually dispose of wornout or obsolete weaponry and equipment for the entire Department of Defense.

Surplus sales offices are located in Seattle, Wash., Oakland, Lathrop, McClellan Air Force Base, San Diego, Norton Air Force Base, and Barstow, all in California; Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Ariz., Ogden, Utah, Pueblo, Colo., Fort Bliss, Kelly Air Force Base, and Forth Worth, all in Texas; Tinker Air Force Base, Okla., Fort Leavenworth, Kans., Rock Island and Granite City, Ill., Memphis, Tenn., Brookley Air Force Base, Ala., Jacksonville, Fla., Albany and Forest Park, Ga., Brooklyn, N.Y., Norfolk, Va., Lexington, Ky., Baltimore, Md., Dayton and Columbus, Ohio, Philadelphia, Chambersburg, and Marietta, Pa., Fort Dix, N.J., Newport, R.I., and Schenectady, N.Y.

The Logistics Services Center will occupy permanent headquarters in Battle Creek, Mich. in late 1962.

The Traffic Management Service supervises the movement of personnel and property for the entire Defense Department.

The Industrial Supply Agency is directed by Rear. Adm. J. S. Dietz, U.S. Navy, and is located in Philadelphia, Pa. Admiral Dietz presently reports to the Secretary of the Navy. His Agency will become a Defense Supply Center under DSA April 1.

The Automotive Supply Agency is directed by Brig. Gen. F. J. Thorlin, U.S. Army, and is located in Detroit, Mich. General Thorlin presently reports to the Secretary of the Army. His agency will become a Defense Supply Center under DSA July 1.

Key personnel of the jointly staffed headquarters include:

Rear Adm. Joseph M. Lyle, U.S. Navy, Deputy Director; Maj. Gen. Roy T. Evans, Jr., U.S. Army, Executive Director, Logistics Plans and Systems; Rear Adm. Charles A. Blick, U.S. Navy, Executive Director, Production and Procurement; Maj. Gen. Donald L. Hardy, U.S. Air Force, Executive Director, Supply Operations; Maj. Gen. Francis C. Gideon, U.S. Air Force, Executive Director, Logistics Services; Brig. Gen. Paul R. Tyler, U.S. Marine Corps, Deputy Director, Supply Operations; Col. John Kenderdine, Deputy Director, Materiel Management; Mr. R. C. Moot, Comptroller; Mr. Walter Ingerski, Manpower Director; Mr. Clarence Short, special assistant; Mr. Robert M. Lemke, counsel.

The headquarters has begun a study to extend integrated management to industrial production equipment, with an inventory of more than 250,000 items valued at $5 billion. DSA will later study the extension of management responsibilities into aeronautical spare parts and chemical supplies.

Headquarters elements are located in the Munitions Building, 19th Street and Constitution Avenue; Barton Hall, on Independence Avenue, and a temporary building adjacent to Fort McNair, all in Washington, D.C. Cameron Station, Va., has been selected as the permanent headquarters. Some personnel will be relocated at that site in the summer of 1962.

The Agency's mission has been stated in these terms:

"Under the Secretary of Defense, in the continental United States, and at wholesale distribution level—

"To promote continued sound progress in the integration of common supply and common services within the Department of Defense.

"To provide responsive common supply and common services to support the missions of the operating forces of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps."

General McNamara estimates that his Agency will be able to reduce the supply inventory initially by approximately $200 million and will also reduce annual operating expenses by approximately $25 million. He has outlined a five-point program of specific objectives in these areas:

1. More rapid standardization of common supply items. In the closing months of 1961 annual savings of about $1,400,000 were achieved by standardizing semidress uniforms, combat boots, fatigue uniforms, belt buckles, inspectors' and meatcutters' frocks, and women's wear.

2. Development of a streamlined distribution system which may involve bringing more depots directly under DSA. This plan will be submitted to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara by April 30.

3. Fully exploiting the potential of automatic data processing to improve supply and services management.

4. Investigating the feasibility of standardizing stock levels and requirements computation.

5. Seeking opportunities for economy and greater effectiveness by consolidating procurement offices, administrative and support services.

As he announced these goals, General McNamara said:

"We are starting with a lean, hard-core organization. With the assistance of our able and experienced field commanders, the continued cooperation and support of the military departments, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Congress and others who already have been of great help, I am completely confident that we will achieve our objectives—effective logistic support of the operating forces of all the military services in war and peace and providing that support at the lowest possible cost to the taxpayer."

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the occasion which prompts my remarks this morning is one which gives me great personal pleasure, and I am sure it is one in which every Member of the House will rejoice. We have been advised today that extensive tests undertaken by his physician have shown that the physical condition of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], has improved, and that he will be able to answer the mandates of his constituents and his colleagues that he extend his service in this body by seeking reelection next year in his new, enlarged district in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House recognizes in the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] the qualities of an extraordinary man. His district has recognized these qualities in returning him to this House 15 consecutive times. The Nation has recognized the mettle of this man who has faced up to the Communist menace and probably done more to expose it than any other Member in the history of this House. His work on the Committee on Un-American Activities and on the Committee on the Judiciary has been of rare quality. His service has been gilded by distinctive accomplishments of the highest national importance.

Our great Speaker in his press conference this morning expressed what I am sure is the feeling of every Member of this body, his own personal delight that Congressman WALTER has reconsidered his decision to retire and to seek reelection.

Mr. Speaker, we are all delighted that the condition of TAD WALTER's health is such that he is able to make this decision. His district is delighted, I am sure, and I know this House is delighted that he will remain with us and that in succeeding Congresses we will continue to be the beneficiaries of his great talents, He is one of the tall oaks of this body, one of the great men of this generation. The country and the free world need him. We are delighted with the decision he has made today.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, a colleague of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to the majority leader for giving me this opportunity and for the announcement he has just made. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] is one of my oldest and dearest friends in this House, and was even before either of us came to this House. His office, in the years that I have been here, was and is still directly across the hall from mine. His district in Pennsylvania is adjacent and contiguous to mine. It is indeed a happy occasion for us to know that his health has so improved that he will be able to continue the rigorous and vigorous leadership of the great Committee on Un-American Activities; that he will continue to serve as the ranking Democratic member of the great Committee on the Judiciary, and that in the years ahead we may feel certain that he will continue to serve and to make new great contributions to the laws of this Nation which will come from his effort, from his voice and from his pen.

Mr. Speaker, I saw him just over the weekend, and I can report to you, Mr. Speaker, that any day this week he is in fit and proper condition to return to his first appearance on the Washington scene, as the famous first baseman for the Georgetown University Ball Club. He is in great shape indeed. The best proof in the world of that—and this is a challenge to his enemies—is to test the temper of his steel. Certainly the message from the first President of our Nation was heard by him and he, too, from the chair of the Un-American Activities Committee, admonishes each speaker as he always says to himself in his heart and to us in ours, "Place none but Americans on guard tonight." As has been said of another distinguished citizen, "You will know him by the enemies he has made."

This is a happy day for me and his friends. It is most happy for his district, where every paper and civic organization in the entire district rose in arms and demanded that this distinguished statesman and this leader return to this House.

Mr. Speaker, not only do I compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] upon his sound judgment, but I congratulate my country upon his good fortune that he will be with us for many years.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the kind, gracious, and proper things our distinguished majority leader has said about our colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] with whom I have had the privilege of serving for many, many years in Congress, where I have watched him make the good fight, seldom partisan, in behalf of true Americanism and good and sound government.

Mr. Speaker, he has proven himself to be a true patriot in his defense of the American way of life. He has been my personal friend throughout the years. TAD WALTER has only one fault, or, perhaps, there is only one thing about him, I might criticize. That is the fact he has not seen fit to be a Republican rather than a Democrat. I can assure TAD that any time he wishes to recant and leave the great party with which he is now affiliated, we will be very happy to receive him with open arms on this side of the aisle.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rejoice in the decision of our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], to remain with us and to seek and win reelection again this year. We all know that there is great temptation, after being here a long time and when one's health is involved, to seek the easier life of retirement. We know also that the arduous duties of our friend, TAD WALTER, would be overpowering and overwhelming for a lesser man.

I have had the good fortune of serving on two committees with him these past seven terms: the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Un-American Activities. He has mastered the art of legislation to a degree unsurpassed by any other Member and some of the most important laws enacted during this generation bear his name. The Administrative Procedures Act, the Walter-McCarran Immigration and Nationality Act, the Displaced Persons Act, the Delaware River Compact, combining the natural resources of Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, and Delaware to achieve comprehensive development of the whole Delaware River Basin—these and many others are monuments to his legislative craftsmanship. Yes, and in the field of our internal security, the Foreign Agents Registration Act and the Internal Security Act of 1950 resulted from his chairmanship of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It is not only a pleasure but an inspiration to work on committees under his leadership. He is a tower of strength and this body would not be the same without him.

We are thankful not only for his good health, but for the fact that he will remain with us. His district, his State, his country and particularly this body will be better off for it. May he be with us for many, many terms to come.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear the announcement by our distinguished majority leader and to join with him and my other colleagues in commending the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walter] on his decision. In his several important capacities as a Member of the House and of my party he has, over the years, extended countless courtesies to me and, I dare say, to many of my colleagues from New York and elsewhere. There may be those who differ with him philosophically, but it cannot be gainsaid but that he has always displayed the gracious geniality of a gentleman, the inexhaustible and effective energy of a good legislator and a dedicated citizen of his country.

We, the people of this country and of his district, are the better for his decision. My hope is that he shall remain in the service of both for many years to come.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the distingished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished majority leader and the gentlemen who have preceded me bring good news to the House.

I have had the privilege of serving as a colleague of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walter] for 18 years, and can speak with authority as to the influence he has in assisting Members to arrive at honest decisions on important legislative matters.

He is an able, effective, and respected leader who has contributed toward the adoption of much legislation of great importance to the security of this Nation.

His work has been outstanding on the Committee on the Judiciary and as chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

I am sure all Members feel as I do—that the Congress and the Nation stand to gain by the decision of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walter] to remain in public service. In my mind there is no question but that the people of his home district rejoice in his decision.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I was most happy this morning to be informed of the decision of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman of Pennsylvania [Mr. Walter], again to seek reelection. I want to join with my colleagues today in paying tribute to this great American. I wish to commend the good judgment of the people of his district for having urged him during the past few months to again place his name in nomination and to continue to represent his great district.

As a Californian I wish to say that there are many, many thousands of people in my State, though far removed from the district which the gentleman from Pennsylvania represents, who are fully familiar with the great work he has done, with his greatness as a legislator and with his devotion to duty and to American principles. Certainly I, for one, am most happy to join today in congratulating the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walter] upon his decision to again return to this great body.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I certainly rejoice with the majority leader and my other colleagues of this House that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walter] has decided after a conference with his doctor to seek reelection. I do not know of any Member of this House who has rendered greater service to the people of this great country. His devotion to duty, his loyalty to America, and his many qualities of leadership has endeared him to all of us.

At this critical period we need more men like our distinguished chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee.

I am happy that his health will permit him to serve again and I trust that he will be with us for many years to come.

Mr. McSWEEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. McSWEEN. Mr. Speaker, the news that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walter] has reconsidered his plans for retirement is good news for America and good news for the free world. I am glad that Chairman Walter will continue in the House. He has befriended me, and, of course, I am personally glad to see him remain with us. It is also very gratifying to learn that he has regained his good health. I hope he will enjoy this good health for many years to come.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to learn that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walter] is going to run for reelection. He is my friend and my neighbor. He is an extremely valuable man in the House.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have addressed the House on this subject may have permission to revise and extend their remarks; and I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, news that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walter] would offer for reelection was most gratifying to me. Officially and personally I have worked with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walter] for many years, frequently counseling with him concerning measures in the Judiciary Committee and always seeking him out for advice on measures destined to combat communism at home and abroad. He has been generous to the utmost and any success which I may have had in these and other fields could not have come, or at least not so fully, without his assistance. His most recent generous gesture to me came last fall when my people in Galveston, Tex., needed a speaker for Know Your America Week—a countywide celebration which drew many hundreds of attendants. When I asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walter] for advice as to who might fill that assignment he said: "I will do it myself if you want me." He flew all the way to Texas and did the job in his customary magnificent way. When it was first intimated that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walter] might retire, I felt very badly indeed. Now that he has changed his mind I am delighted. I congratulate his constituency, State and the Nation.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I was highly pleased to learn of the decision of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Hon. Francis E. Walter, to offer again for reelection to the House of Representatives. I have known the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Francis Walter, ever since I have been a Member of the House or Representatives and I knew of his distinguished record of public service long before I came here. I regard him not only as an outstanding and useful member of the Congress, but I share the view of many others that he is an outstanding American whose heart and mind both are attuned to the highest good.

I have served with him on the Judiciary Committee of the House, as well as the Committee on Un-American Activities. He is the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, and the chairman of the latter committee. His position in the House of Representatives combined with his extraordinary talents are of such a nature that the country would greatly miss his services.

I am highly pleased to know that he has consented to serve with us again and I have every confidence that the people of his district will see fit to return him by an overwhelming majority.

RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND PORTUGAL

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I have requested a few minutes time today to discuss the disturbingly poor relations that now strain to the limit, I fear, the traditional friendship between this country and our oldest ally—Portugal.

In order for the Congress to have a better understanding of this situation, I invite the attention of my colleagues to an article written by Charles J. Lewin, editor and general manager of the Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass., which has been given wide circulation by United Press International.

This distinguished journalist has been a student of Portuguese affairs for many years. He has just returned from several weeks in Lisbon and has written a report that will be helpful in considering this difficult situation.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert the article in the RECORD, along with a story from the January 25 issue of the Standard-Times by Don Larrabee, who questioned the President at his last press conference about the status of our negotiations for bases in the Atlantic. Mr. Larrabee's story provides further, valuable background on the matter of United States-Portuguese relations.

Mr. Lewin writes that the historic friendship and spirit of cooperation between the United States and Portugal, which has been a bulwark of our European alliances, is now strained to a dangerous level. To a great extent this is true, he notes, because of our failure to effectively protest the aggressive Indian takeover of the tiny Portuguese enclave of Goa.

Our relations with Portugal become understandably important when it is realized that, in addition to our common alliance in NATO, our Government now leases strategically located air bases from the Portuguese in the Azores Islands.

Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson recently termed one of these bases, "perhaps the single most important one we have anywhere."

The leases on these mid-Atlantic bases expire this year. Mr. Lewin quotes high Portuguese officials as predicting "hard going" when negotiations for the renewal of these leases begin.

I feel strongly that it is important the Congress understand what has caused this breach in United States-Portuguese relations and how the trouble can be corrected.

Thank you for your attention. I respectfully refer you to the RECORD and the articles I have mentioned: "Lisbon Stands Firm, but Hopes for Better Relations With the United States"; and "President Is Hopeful on Azores Bases":

[From the Standard-Times, Jan. 23, 1962]

LISBON STANDS FIRM, BUT HOPES FOR BETTER RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES

(By Charles J. Lewin)

Relations between the Governments of the United States and Portugal are at a strained, dangerous level.

This is the view of high officials in the Portuguese Government.

Some say relations never have been as bad as they are now.

They hope conditions will change for the better in 1962.

But they believe this is unlikely if the United States continues to vote against Portugal on important issues in the United Nations and encourages enemies of the Lisbon Government.

Statements emphasizing the seriousness of the situation were made to me by high Portuguese Government officials during a week that I have just concluded in Portugal.

I interviewed four ministers of state: Dr. Alberto Franco Nogueira, minister of foreign affairs; Dr. Jose Goncalo Correia d'Oliveira, minister of state and deputy premier to Dr. Antonio de Oliveira Salazar; Prof. Adriano Moreira, minister of oversea provinces; and Dr. Moreira Baptista, national secretary for information.

Also, I had conversations with Dr. Joao A. Bianchi, former Minister and Ambassador from Portugal to Washington during 1933–47; Dr. Luiz Esteves Fernandes, Portuguese Ambassador in the United States from 1950 to 1961; U.S. Ambassador C. Burke Elbrick, probably the most popular American in Lisbon for his understanding of the Portuguese, and scores of other Americans and Portuguese.

Without exception, officials predict the United States will have hard going when negotiations get underway on renewal of American airbase leases on the strategic Portuguese Azores Islands in mid-Atlantic. The leases expire at the end of the year; talks are scheduled to begin soon.

Lisbon officials take as their text a recent statement written by Dean Acheson in the Yale Review. The consultant to the Kennedy administration and former U.S. Secretary of State wrote: "The ally (Portugal) has made available to us an airbase which is, perhaps, the single most important one we have anywhere."

Despite domestic troubles that they attribute to a core of 25,000 Communists in a nation of 10 million persons, Lisbon officials believe the country is united behind the Salazar foreign policy.

"As Pearl Harbor was to the United States, so Angola has been to Portugal," one minister asserted. The loss of Goa on the border of India has not affected the government, the people or the economy of continental Portugal as much as the revolt in Angola on the west coast of Africa or the danger signs in Mozambique, a province on the east coast.

ROME OF THE EAST

"Goa was the Rome of the East, a holy land for the Catholics of Asia," a state secretary said. "But it meant little to us in the way of commerce, compared with Angola and Mozambique."

Three thousand soldiers under the colors of Portugal gave up their arms when 30,000 Indians marched across the Goan border. But thousands of Portuguese are fighting in Angola—one authoritative source said 80,000 men are on duty in that province.

Nevertheless, people of influence in Portugal are bitter at the United States for the way it reacted to the Goan crisis.

Dr. Salazar, in the speech which was read for him to the National Assembly January 3, said the United States "was in fact very active both in Washington and in New Delhi in its attempt to dissuade the Indian Union from attacking Goa. It seems that President Kennedy even wrote to the Indian Prime Minister, while the last appeal to dissuade Nehru by the American Ambassador in New Delhi was made no more than 2 hours before the order to attack was given."

LISBON NOT ADVISED

But one of Salazar's chief aides said he was puzzled by the fact that the U.S. Government had not given Lisbon a copy of Kennedy's message to Nehru, the usual practice, he said. As to the last-minute appeal of U.S. Ambassador John Kenneth Galbraith, it was his understanding that Galbraith told Nehru he was talking as one anticolonialist to another. Galbraith lacked sincerity and vigor in his presentation, according to this version.

Portugal is on a war footing, without doubt.

Boys from thousands of families are in the armed forces.

There is universal conscription.

An extra tax has been placed on purchases of luxury items, hotel bills and other expenditures.

NO SIGNS OF UNREST

There are no outward signs of disorder or unrest.

Lisbon is in a building boom, but cleaner than most American cities. There are no hoodlums on the streets, day or night.

During a 2-day trip into the interior, during which I visited the university city of Coimbra, the famous fishing village of Nazare and many rural towns, I saw fewer police and soldiers than one would see on a similar trip in the United States.

If the Salazar government is in truth a dictatorship, it is not a heavy-handed one.

GOOD GOVERNMENT NOTED

A Portuguese official quoted to me the following from an editorial in the January 2, 1962, London Daily Telegraph and Morning Post, not notably a pro-Salazar newspaper: "Between 1910, when the monarchy fell, and 1926, when Dr. Salazar first took office as minister of finance, Portugal knew 8 presidents, the most promising of whom was assassinated, and 44 ministries. Economically, the country had been, if possible, in an even worse position than it was politically ever since the civil wars of the early 19th century.

"No one will pretend that the present regime in Portugal is in any British sense democratic. It has, however, produced good government and economic stability. * * * Dr. Salazar has sought nothing for himself personally. He is alleged, by such foreign critics as oppose his government on principle, to have treated his political enemies with harsh injustice. It is safer to suggest that the Portuguese dictatorship has a better record in the matter of political imprisonment than any parallel regime, whether of the right or of the left, in the modern world."

DETERMINATION VOICED

The Salazer government is determined to retain Angola and Mozambique to the end of time, in the words of a Government minister, "even if it means suicide."

Any other course, it believes, will result in a Communist takeover, placing mid-Europe in the grip of a Red pincers—with Russia and East Germany on the east and a Communist-dominated Iberian Peninsula on the west.

Should this happen, the Azores bases will be lost to the United States without a negotiation.

Why, then Portugal asks, through its ministers, does the United States pursue a policy that weakens the strongest anti-Communist nations in Europe—Portugal and Spain.

Why does the Kennedy administration put the interests of African tribesmen above the interests of America's old ally, Portugal?

Why did it permit Nehru to seize Portugal's ancient Province, Goa, 463 years a member of the Portuguese union, without an effective protest?

Why has it driven Lisbon to the point that Portugal now refuses to shed the blood of one Portuguese soldier if Russia forces NATO into a war over Berlin?

These are the questions the Salazar government asked me.

[From the Standard-Times, Jan. 25, 1962]

President Is Hopeful on Azores Bases

(By Donald R. Larrabee)

WASHINGTON, January 25.—President Kennedy has voiced strong hope that the Portuguese Government will continue to allow the United States to use its huge air base on the strategically located Azores Islands when the current lease agreement expires at the end of this year. Importance of the base to this country and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was underscored by the President at his news conference yesterday in response to a question by the Washington Bureau of the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times.

The question was prompted by remarks made by high Portuguese officials to the editor of the Standard-Times, Charles J. Lewin.

During a recent visit to Lisbon, Lewin said in an exclusive story distributed nationally on Tuesday by the Associated Press and United Press International, these officials told him the United States will have hard going when negotiations get underway soon for renewal of the lease. They said relations had been dangerously strained by U.S. votes in the United Nations condemning Portugal's policies toward its oversea territories.

In the light of these reports, the President was asked if he expects the Government to have any difficulty negotiating renewal of the Azores lease. In reply, the Chief Executive left no doubt that the middle-Atlantic base is vital to the security of the free world.

"I think the Azores base is very important to us and to NATO and the negotiations will take place this year. We're hopeful that they will continue to permit us to use this base upon which 75 to 80 percent of our military air traffic to Europe depends. So that in these rather critical times, that base is extremely important to us.

"I am hopeful," the President added, "that it will be possible for us to reach an agreement with the Portuguese for our continued use of it, but that's a matter to be negotiated between the countries."

The United States has been using the Azores base since World War II and has had a firm leasing arrangement since 1951. This was renewed in 1957 for a period ending in December 1962.

State Department officials said no date has been fixed for negotiations.

In recent months, the United States has been voting in the United Nations for resolutions calling on Portugal to adopt changes in policy and practices toward its oversea territories.

At the moment the U.N. has before it an Afro-Asian resolution calling on Portugal to recognize the right of the people of Angola to self-determination. In his published account, Editor Lewin said a Portuguese official told him Angola was to Portugal what Pearl Harbor was to the United States—it had united the people of Portugal behind the government of Premier Salazar. He reported that Portuguese officials said the Government was determined to hold Angola, on the West Coast of Africa, and Mozambique, on the East Coast, to the end of time, even if it meant suicide.

The Question and the Answer

Question. Mr. President, assuming the American airbases in the Portuguese Azores are vital to our security, could you explain to us whether you expect the Government will have any difficulty negotiating leases—renewed leases—on those bases this year, especially in light of reports from Lisbon of our strained relations with Portugal?

Answer. I think the Azores base is very important to us and to NATO and the negotiations will take place this year. We're hopeful that they will continue to permit us to use this base upon which 75 to 80 percent of our military air traffic to Europe depends. So that, in these rather critical times in Europe, that base is extremely important to us.

I'm hopeful that it will be possible for us to reach an agreement with the Portuguese for continued use of it, but that's a matter which will be negotiated between the countries.

ASSESSMENTS FOR UNWARRANTED FLIGHT CANCELLATIONS

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call your attention, and the attention of my colleagues in the House, to a bill which I introduced today, permitting passengers to collect an assessment from airline companies in case of unwarranted flight cancellations and undue delay to airlines. This bill requires the Civil Aeronautics Board to issue regulations by which the aggrieved traveler collects an assessment of $5 or 50 percent of the fare, whichever is more, whenever a domestic flight is canceled or unduly delayed due to reasons other than the weather or inability to meet Federal safety standards. I have introduced this bill to counterbalance a recent Civil Aeronautics Board ruling—Order No. E–17914—which permits the airlines to assess "no show" passengers in a similar ratio as my "no go" bill would assess the airlines.

If passengers are required to pay assessments to the airlines for not meeting their flight reservation commitments, it is only fairplay that the airlines pay an assessment to the passenger when they fail to live up to their part of the ticket agreement. Almost everyone who has traveled by air has been adversely affected as a direct result of the poor ontime performance of air carriers. This legislation is designed to protect the traveling public against these unnecessary cancellations and delays which often result in their discomfort and expense.

The ontime record of our major airlines in 1960 was so poor that one had less than a 60–40 chance that his flight would leave either on time or within 15 minutes of schedule. I am sure that the American traveling public would rather forgo the so-called benefits in travel frills or faster speed records in return for greater certainty as to ontime performance.

Most of the cancellations and long delays are due to factors which are under the direct control of the airlines and which could be corrected by proper planning. A substantial amount of this poor ontime performance may be ascribed to carelessness and laxity; lack of adequate standby facilities, the overtaxing of airplane equipment, the overscheduling of certain aircraft, and the poor routing of traffic at peak hours. The condition can be—and should be—remedied. Delays will continue to occur when airport and airplane capabilities are exceeded.

The issue of demanding better ontime performance should not be confused with a CAB ruling requiring airlines to submit monthly arrival performance reports. This ruling—part 234 of the Economic Regulations—Flight Schedules of Certified Carriers, Realistic Scheduling Required—was made in an effort to deter erroneous scheduling tactics and misleading public releases of time performances. These statistics do not provide any direct information on the problems of ontime scheduling; these reports do not include cancellations of flights but merely detail "block to block" time. Under the present laws there are very few reliable statistics relating to overall ontime performance. These statistics should be required to be submitted to the CAB.

I am sure that the traveling public could document the significant amount of cancellations and delays. Last week a flight from Washington to Boston, for which I had purchased a ticket, was canceled with no prior notification by the airline. To prove that this was no fluke, a different airline did the same thing on a return flight, Boston to Washington. I might add that no prior notification was given on that occasion either.

My bill will not only provide a deterrent against poor planning of the use of equipment and facilities by the airlines, but should make for higher standards of responsibility to the American public by these airlines. While the country awaits this higher standard, the air passenger should not be the defenseless victim of the present "no go" policies of the airline management.

THE UNIQUE CONTRIBUTION OF THE PATENT SYSTEM TO AMERICAN CIVILIZATION

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Roudebush] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege as a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics to have witnessed some of the important developments of American research.

The American Colonies established their own patent system long before the advent of the American Revolution. It appears that the first patent issued in America was granted in 1646 by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to Joseph Jenks for improved sawmills and scythes. In 1652, a patent was granted in Virginia to George Fletcher for a process of distilling and brewing with wooden vessels. This would appear to be one of the earliest chemical process patents.

Probably the origin of the constitutional provision with respect to patents stems from South Carolina which afforded general protection to inventions by an act for the encouragement of the arts and sciencies. The language therein contained a provision that inventors of useful machines should have the exclusive privilege of making and vending their devices for 14 years.

The American patent system was developed in parallel to that of Great Britain, whose Parliament in 1654 enacted legislation endowing inventors with the sole right to their inventions for a period of 14 years. Its fruitfulness had been demonstrated by the work of Newcomen and Watt in the perfection of the steam engine which played a major role in establishing Great Britain's industrial supremacy.

It is extremely doubtful whether our present programs in many fields of science and technology would have been possible if our forefathers had not provided for the establishment of a patent system in the Constitution itself.

As we look back on the formative years of the American Republic, each of us must be impressed by the fact that the American colonists, far removed from the cultural centers of Europe, were dedicated to the ideals of liberty and personal freedom. What is perhaps even more remarkable is that most of their leaders were very young—many of them in their early twenties.

The Constitution of the United States came into effect with its ratification by North Carolina on November 21, 1789. Article I, section 8, provides that the Congress shall have the power to "promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries."

The first patent law was enacted during the First Congress and was approved by President George Washington on April 10, 1790. The original law provided as a primary condition of a patent grant that the applicant should have invented or discovered a "useful art, manufacture, engine, machine or device, or any improvement therein, not before known or used." The law also required that the inventor submit a detailed specification of his invention. This condition was imposed "to the end that the public may have the full benefit thereof after the expiration of the patent term."

Another provision of the law was that the invention should be deemed by the administrators of the law "sufficiently useful and important." The administrators were the Secretaries of State and of War and the Attorney General. Although the Secretary of State, Thomas Jefferson, was concerned with the complex problems of establishing the foreign relations of our new Republic, he nevertheless personally devoted a considerable portion of his time to the detailed work of examining patent applications.

Thomas Jefferson was himself a distinguished inventor. He detested monopoly grants of a perpetual nature that tended to vest rights and privileges in a few of our citizens at the expense of all others. However, he was a firm supporter of the patent system because it granted to authors and inventors the exclusive rights to their own efforts for only a limited period. He supported the patent system because it provided an incentive for discoveries which would later become a part of the public domain.

Mr. Speaker, a statement by a former Commissioner of Patents, Conway P. Coe, is relevant, and I include it in my remarks at this point:

> Americans generally detest monopoly in the true sense of the term because it makes possible the ruthless exercise of power. Indeed, the American Revolution was precipitated by popular resentment of the monopoly on tea held by the East Indian Co. It would therefore have been exceedingly strange if, only a few years later, the delegates sent to the Constitutional Convention by Massachusetts and the other Colonies should have been willing to sanction an equivalent form of monopoly under the new government they were creating. In the 16th and 17th centuries a king or queen of England could reward a favorite by granting him a monopoly on salt or some other necessity of life. This beneficiary of royal favor was not, of course, the discoverer of salt. That came ready made from the hand of the Creator eons before the advent of man. What the darling of His or Her Majesty received was the power to compel others to use salt solely of his supplying and only on terms of his dictation.
>
> But a patent is no such monopoly. It is a reward for the invention or discovery of something new, something before unknown, something added to the sum total of human knowledge, utility, well-being, and which the inventor or discoverer, despising the lure of money or fame, might have withheld from his fellow men. By the monopoly that goes with a patent, then, the Government recompenses and, for a limited time, protects the inventor or discoverer who gives to the world the use and benefit of his invention or discovery. This is a kind and a degree of mutuality that negatives monopoly in the old or the current concept. Monopoly in the latter sense of the term gave to an individual or a group complete dominion of something already existent. A patent awards monopoly to the producer of something original, something superadded to the common store. So it is that two things bearing the same name need not be of the same nature.

The Congress in 1935 created a Sesquicentennial Commission to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the formation, ratification, and establishment of the Constitution. A former distinguished Member of this body, the Honorable Sol Bloom, a Representative from the State of New York, was appointed Director General. The Commission prepared an authoritative review of the history of the formation of our Federal Union. In referring to the powers granted to the Congress by the Constitution, it states that, and I quote:

> Under its power to confer upon authors and inventors "the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries" Congress has powerfully stimulated the inventive faculties of the American people.

It is significant that America's leaders have attributed so much of our present industrial strength to the American patent system, which in many ways is unique among the industrial nations of the world. Mr. Speaker, I shall quote statements by American Presidents of both political parties whose judgment has been vindicated by the achievements of our people.

Most of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle subscribe to the political doctrines of Thomas Jefferson. He said:

> The issue of patents for new discoveries has given a spring to invention beyond my conception.

The first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, said:

> The patent system added the fuel of interest to the fire of genius.

More recently, a Democratic President whose memory is greatly revered, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, said:

> The American patent system has promoted countless applications of the arts and sciences to the needs and well-being of our people.

The most recent Republican President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, said:

> Soundly based on the principle of protecting and rewarding inventors, this system has for years encouraged the imaginative to dream and to experiment—in garages and sheds, in great universities and corporate laboratories. From such explorations on the frontiers of knowledge has welled a flood of innovations and discoveries which have created new industries and reactivated old, giving more and more Americans better jobs and adding greatly to the prosperity and well-being of all.

Mr. Speaker, while the Congress was in adjournment, the Nation celebrated American Patent System Week, which started October 15, 1961. President Kennedy in proclaiming this fitting commemoration of the American patent system said:

> Whereas in the year 1961 there will be granted the 3 millionth patent since enactment of the Patent Act; and
>
> Whereas the grant of a patent is a traditional incentive for the promotion of the useful arts and thereby contributes notably to the well-being of people everywhere; and
>
> Whereas encouragement of invention is essential to the continued economic and technological development of this Nation.
>
> Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week of October 15, 1961, as the American Patent System Week; and I invite the people during that week to commemorate the American patent system which, by affording protection and encouragement to inventors as envisaged and authorized by the Constitution, contributes so greatly to the encouragement of inventive genius.

President Kennedy's statement represented the sense of the Congress and particularly of our own Committee on the Judiciary.

Last August 8, the distinguished chairman of that committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], submitted House Report No. 871 which authorized the celebration of the American patent system. This report included the following pertinent statements, and I quote:

> July 4, 1961, marked the 125th anniversary of the Patent Act of 1836, which created the present examination system for granting patents and which established the U.S. Patent Office as a separate and distinct bureau with a Commissioner of Patents as its head. It is expected that the 3 millionth patent under this act will be granted in September 1961.
>
> The patent grant has been a traditional incentive for the promotion of the useful arts thereby benefiting the welfare of the people of the United States and the world. This function of the patent grant has assumed added significance in view of the present day necessity of maintaining the technological lead and increasing the rate of economic growth of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the American patent system has provided the inspiration for other countries to establish their own procedures to encourage scientists, inventors, and others who possess creative talents. Switzerland is one country whose citizens have contributed to scientific progress. It has served as a citadel of freedom in every recent world conflict. The record shows that its patent system was first established in 1888. The legislation was inspired by a visit to this country by a Swiss shoe manufacturer who was also a commissioner to the Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition in 1886. He was so impressed with the American patent system that on returning home, he told his countrymen, "We must introduce the patent system. America has shown us how. May our sister Republic serve as our model in this." It is also of some interest that one of the first examiners in the Swiss patent office was Albert Einstein.

In 1900, a Japanese commissioner visited this country and upon his return he reported, "We have looked about us to see what nations are the greatest, so that we can be like them." We said, "What is it that makes the United States such a great nation?" and we investigated and found that it was patents, and we will have patents.

Although most Americans associate Mark Twain, with his literary accomplishments, it should be noted that he, too, was an inventor and had applied for and received three patents. I am sure that many of my colleagues have read his work entitled "A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court." May I remind you that his character, "Sir Boss" who had supplanted Merlin the Magician, remarked that "a country without a patent office and good patent laws is just a crab and cannot travel anyway but sideways and backways."

Mr. Speaker, our country must always travel forward, and all the evidence I have seen supports the continuation of sound patent policies. The contribution of our patent system to America's acknowledged leadership as an industrial nation is of such importance that I intend from time to time to discuss with my colleagues on the floor of the House other aspects of this important constitutional provision. I believe it has played a vital role both in times of peace and times of war in advancing the welfare of the American people.

WRECKAGE OF THE ESCAPE CLAUSE

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the trade agreements legislation in the present session, great interest will center in the escape clause and its administration.

This clause, as Members will recall, was adopted as an amendment to the Trade Agreements Act in 1951. I had the honor of presenting the amendment to this body. It was adopted by a one-sided vote.

I am sorry to say that the administration of the escape clause under past administrations has been not only extremely disappointing but has provided us with a measure of the attitude of the executive branch, or more specifically, the State Department, toward congressional action. The law has been all but nullified in the process of administration. Tariff Commission has been reluctant to hold hearings for proof of injury arising from increased import competition attributable to tariff cuts, and the White House, in turn, has rejected well over half, in fact, two-thirds of Tariff Commission recommendations, when the Commission did find serious injury to exist.

Altogether the chances of an industry to obtain relief under the clause are overwhelmingly in the negative, that is, about 10 to 1. A congressional law that gets only 10 percent effectiveness in its administration is very close to being a dead letter.

Yet Congress has on several occasions amended the escape clause to assure better administration. This effort has been without results. The cases brought by industry have continued to get the same negative treatment. The word of Congress has failed to impress either the Commission majority or the State Department.

When these results are read in the light of the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate our foreign commerce and to make the tariff, they take on aspects of veritable contempt of Congress by the executive branch.

Now some people talk of eliminating the escape clause altogether. This would represent an ignominious retreat. The exact opposite is needed. I am pleased to note that the President has recommended the retention of the escape clause. We need an escape clause that will do what the clause was intended to do in the first place, namely, provide a remedy against overzealous and foolhardy tariff-cutting by the bureaucrats. I intend to urge the Ways and Means Committee to retain the escape clause idea in any new legislation written in the field of international trade.

Mr. Speaker, an enlightening article on this subject has come to my hands and I hope that all Members will read it. It was prepared by Mr. O. R. Strackbein, who has had close contact with the escape clause since its enactment. As chairman of the Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, Mr. Strackbein has been able to observe the administration of the clause at first hand.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I offer the article above referred to:

THE ESCAPE CLAUSE: WHAT IS WRONG WITH IT? WHAT SHOULD BE DONE ABOUT IT?

(By O. R. Strackbein, chairman, the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy)

The escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act suffers from two ruinous defects that have prevented it from accomplishing its purpose.

The principal cause of the breakdown of the clause is centered in the White House. The President's unlimited discretion in overriding Tariff Commission recommendations has resulted in a turndown of two Commission recommendations out of every three.

The second source of the breakdown is to be found in the Tariff Commission itself. About 60 percent of the cases that have been processed by the Commission have resulted in a negative finding.

Between these two millstones, the interest of domestic producers, including industry, agriculture, and labor, have been ground to pieces. The composite result has been a rejection of nearly 90 percent of the cases.

Of 130 cases since 1948 the Tariff Commission has recommended relief in only 40 cases. The White House rejected 23 and acted favorably on only 13. Four cases are still at the White House awaiting a decision.

The failure of the Tariff Commission is also found in the broad discretion that the law bestows on it. This play of discretion has permitted the personal political philosophy, sympathies or aversions of Commission members to play too great a role in their interpretation of the criteria of injury.

Since members of the Commission are appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation, this latitude of Commission discretion permits an unjustified degree of Presidential influence in a field that belongs exclusively to Congress under the Constitution. Each of two Commissioners reaching conclusions on the same set of facts may come to an opposite decision, simply because of their personal views and sympathies. Since Presidential appointments are not made in a vacuum, the background, international political outlook and other evidence of alinement of prospective appointees may be examined before a nomination is made.

If the President is so minded he may pack the Commission with members who will be amenable to his views and predilections rather than independent judges. If then the Commissioners have a wide latitude of discretion, the interest of the executive rather than that of Congress will prevail.

As a result of these two wide latitudes of discretion through which escape clause cases must pass, the administration of the clause has produced effects that are wholly at odds with Presidential and other high executive assurances to Congress and to the public with respect to its purpose and the results that might be expected of it.

These assurances were given on every occasion when the Trade Agreements Act was up for renewal by Congress and it may be assumed that these promises helped materially in obtaining congressional approval of the trade agreements program from time to time.

Now, after 10 years of the statutory escape clause, it must be clear that there is no effective intent in the executive branch to honor these solemn assurances and promises, and that they were monitored and issued by the State Department not with the idea that they would be kept but as a means of obtaining further congressional approval of the program.

The core of the contention that the President should continue to exercise the power of veto over Tariff Commission recommendations, as extended to him by Congress, is to be found in the observation that he has more to think about than the Commission. The statute lays down the criteria by which the Commission is to be guided, and this is as it should be. Constitutional authority cannot be delegated properly without the establishment of clear guidelines. To issue a blank check would represent a clear violation of the Constitution.

Yet it is argued that when a recommendation from the Tariff Commission reaches the President he may bring to bear considerations that are entirely extraneous to the statute, such as the effect of a proposed tariff increase upon foreign relations. In effect, this represents an amendment of the law by the President.

Since it is only because of the statute that the President is invited to participate in administration of the escape clause, the invitation cannot properly be construed as vesting the President with additional power not expressed in the law.

How may the President then properly enlarge the statute once a Tariff Commission recommendation reaches him by reading into it what it does not contain?

The statute provides a remedy against serious injury or a threat thereof if certain criteria of injury are fulfilled, and these criteria are confined to tests of injury.

Now it is said that the President is not bound by such a narrow field of considerations. Apparently he may reach out in the air and amend the statute.

This represents strange legal philosophy, indeed. Apparently there is no limit to the grounds on which the President might upset the Commission's recommendation. He might use any pretext that might come to his mind.

The fact is that under this bizarre interpretation the power of Congress to regulate foreign commerce and to establish and modify import duties, collapses the second that a Tariff Commission recommendation is sent on its way to the White House. That is precisely the interpretation under which the escape clause has been administered.

This procedure helps explain the debacle of the escape clause and the deep cynicism its administration has engendered. A wholly ugly disrespect of rights and of constitutional probity is involved.

It is now clearly established that the executive branch has gravely abused its power, wrecked the law, and broken faith with the Congress during this 11-year period. The escape clause has not remotely done what various Secretaries of State, Under Secretaries, and Assistant Secretaries, have solemnly assured Congress in hearing after hearing, that it would do. The law has been extended under false pretenses under reliance on these assurances.

The State Department has been so hungry for power and so engrossed in serving the wishes of other countries that it has evidently not paused or bothered to read the escape clause in its proper context; or, having read it, the Department has treated the congressional intent and the Department's own words before congressional committees with disdain and contempt.

There can be no other explanation of the sharp and shocking discrepancy between the fair words spoken by Secretaries of State and their assistants before the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, on the one hand, and the record of the Department under the escape clause and its insistence upon the President's wide latitude in upsetting the Tariff Commission, on the other. The two cannot be reconciled.

It is obvious that the State Department seeks to use the regulation of foreign trade as an instrument of diplomacy and has seized the Trade Agreements Act and its escape clause in particular as a means of doing so.

The denial of a remedy under the escape clause to domestic industry and its workers when serious injury from imports is incurred or threatened is a position that neither the State Department nor the President can justify.

Every member of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) is aware that we, no less than all its other members, reserve the right whenever we enter into a trade agreement to restore the duty to its unreduced level if the lowered rate causes serious injury to a domestic industry. GATT itself has an escape clause.

Therefore nothing more should be involved than a finding of fact by a duly constituted public agency, proceeding under lawful processes. If the degree of injury called for in the escape clause is then found to exist, the remedy should follow as a matter of course.

Any aggrieved import interest, or foreign exporter, may have recourse to the Customs Court. He may allege improper procedure by the Tariff Commission, failure of the Commission to obtain all the facts or that the facts do not support the Commission's conclusion, etc. He may have his day in court.

Certainly the State Department is not justified in saying that if we raise the duty or impose an import quota as a remedy under these circumstances that any member of GATT has a right to resent our action or to invoke retaliatory measures.

We go beyond these processes of law in actual practice: we compensate the countries that ship to us the particular item on which we have raised the duty by reducing the duty on other items that we import from them in roughly equal volume. We thus make good any damage that might have resulted from the duty increase imposed under the escape clause.

The incontrovertible conclusion from these observations is that what really actuates the Department of State is a deeply imbedded philosophy of free trade; and that in throwing its weight against tariff increases whenever these are recommended by the Tariff Commission, it substitutes its trade philosophy for the law; and does so in complete disregard of the solemn assurances given to the Congress and to the country by the various heads of the State Department itself over a period of years under various administrations. It cannot sustain the claim that it must oppose tariff increases under the escape clause either to satisfy other members of GATT or to overcome any question about the sincerity of the liberal trade policy of this country.

These pleas are devoid of the least merit and represent no more than an effort to conceal the real motives, which arise from the personal trade philosophies of the officials concerned and from their conviction that the State Department rather than Congress should regulate the foreign commerce of this country.

The result of this disingenuous position or duplicity of the Department of State by which it has turned one face to congressional committees and to the public while in the conduct of its business it has worn an entirely different face, has been the betrayal of the escape clause. Implicit in this is hostility toward domestic industry.

It is this latter face that would indict any American industry as inefficient if it cannot compete with imports. This is also the face that would confer upon imports the right of eminent domain in this country and saddling our Government with the burden of rehabilitating industries that might be driven to the wall by imports, even though the competitive advantage of the latter were derived from nothing more virtuous than the payment of the low wages in other countries.

It may be considered a settled fact that so long as the President continues to have the authority to override the Tariff Commission's recommendations under the escape clause, the remedy for the errors of the tariff-cutters will continue to be a false bait as it has been these past 10 years. A remedy that is only 10 percent effective is no remedy worthy of the name. If an antibiotic remedy for a disease were no more effective it would go off the shelves as an outright failure.

The escape clause today is a monument to duplicity, cynicism, and a Machiavellian attitude toward governmental probity and integrity. The effect produced by prolonging its life on the same plane would be evil and most deplorable. In point of sound policy the clause should be retained but amended to wash out of it the objectionable elements.

The executive branch has been entrusted with this congressional function for a decade. The record has been one of shameful betrayal of a delegated power, and the delegation should be withdrawn.

Considering the nature of the escape clause, which is a multilateral reservation, with its invocation contingent on a factual development, there was no reason for involvement of the Chief Executive in its administration in the first place. Now it is clear that it was an unfortunate mistake.

As for the Tariff Commission's impartiality it is more than a coincidence that the majority has found against a remedy more often than not; and such findings have been in conformity with the climate of opinion in the White House.

The sharing of congressional authority with the Executive in such a manner that the Executive influence soon predominates represented a resignation or abdication of its constitutional power by Congress. The influence of the appointive power as represented by the President's appointment of Tariff Commissioners can best be counterbalanced by restricting the latitude of the Commission's interpretative powers. This means that the criteria of injury in the escape clause must be made more precise. The presence of certain factual conditions must be given controlling weight in the findings.

Otherwise the President, though he were no longer authorized to veto the recommendations of the Tariff Commission, would be able to achieve the same end through his appointive power; and Congress would nearly as surely lose its control as under the circumstances as they are today, with the Presidential veto in force.

UNREASONABLE LITERACY REQUIREMENTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to prohibit the application of unreasonable literacy requirements with respect to the right to vote.

Section 1 of my bill sets forth four findings of the Congress. It states, first, that Congress finds that the right to vote is fundamental to free, democratic government, and that it is the continuing responsibility of the Federal Government to secure and protect this right against all unreasonable and arbitrary restrictions.

The bill states, in the second place, that Congress finds that the right to vote of many persons has been subjected to arbitrary and unreasonable restrictions on account of race or color; that literacy tests have been extensively used to deny the suffrage to otherwise qualified persons because of their race or color; and that existing laws are not adequate to guarantee the enjoyment of this basic right without discrimination.

The bill further states, third, that Congress finds that illiteracy is rapidly disappearing in the United States, that the quality of elementary education furnished by the Nation's schools is of high caliber, that persons completing six grades of education in a State-accredited school can reasonably be expected to be literate; and that any literacy test that denies the right to vote to any person who has completed six grades is arbitrary and unreasonable.

The bill states, finally, that Congress finds and declares that its enactment is necessary to make effective the guarantees of the Constitution, especially those contained in the 14th and 15th amendments, by eliminating or preventing arbitrary and unreasonable restrictions on the franchise which occur through the denial of the right to vote to persons with at least six grades of education.

Section 2 of my bill amends the Revised Statutes so as to provide that all citizens of the United States who are otherwise qualified to vote at any election by the people shall be entitled and allowed to vote at all elections without distinction of race, color, or previous condition of servitude and without being subjected to any literacy test beyond the completion of the sixth primary grade in a school accredited by any State or by the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that enactment of this bill will go far to democratize the American electorate. According to the Book of the States, the constitutions of 20 States have literacy tests for voting. In six Southern States: Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, Virginia, and Alabama, the constitutional requirements are built up by legislation and practice to exclude Negroes from the franchise. As Prof. V. O. Key has written of the Southern States in general:

> Every local registration officer is a law unto himself in determining the citizen's possession of literacy, understanding, and other qualifications. No State agency knows what these officials do or how they interpret the requirements.

Probably the worst feature of a literacy requirement is that, unless fairly administered, it can become a vicious instrument of discrimination.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special order heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. Roudebush, for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Karsten.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Conte) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Alger.

Mr. Siler.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Dingell.

Mr. Celler.

Mr. Breeding.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 30, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1606. A letter from the president, Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., transmitting the 33d annual report of the work and operations of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961, pursuant to 22 United States Code, 278a (H. Doc. No. 260); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

1607. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal National Mortgage Association (FNMA), Housing and Home Finance Agency, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (H. Doc. No. 318); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1608. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (H. Doc. No. 319); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1609. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on the progress of the liquidation activities of the national defense, war, and reconversion activities of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, pursuant to Public Law 163, 83d Congress, as amended, and with Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1610. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the report for July–October 1961 on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1611. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the President to take possession and assume control of transportation systems in time of national emergency"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1612. A letter from the Secretary, the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association, transmitting a report of the audit of the financial transactions of the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 662, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1613. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting the Annual Report of the Civil Aeronautics Board covering fiscal year 1961, pursuant to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1614. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Annual Report of the U.S. Weather Bureau for fiscal year 1961, pursuant to Public Law 657, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1615. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the calendar year 1961, on positions in grades 16, 17, and 18, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1616. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of customs and immigration laws,' to increase the amounts authorized to be expended"; to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELCHER:

H.R. 9927. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, to provide for allotments to producers in individual Federal order markets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 9928. A bill to prohibit the application of unreasonable literacy requirements with respect to the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 9929. A bill to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or use in commerce of any motor vehicle which discharges unburned hydrocarbons and other noxious gases in amounts dangerous to human health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9930. A bill to allow to corporations an exemption of $25,000 for income-tax purposes, and to provide that the combined normal tax and surtax rate of 38 percent shall be applicable to corporations having taxable incomes of less than $50,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9931. A bill to exempt from the Federal income tax income received by individuals who have reached age 65 if their adjusted gross income does not exceed $3,500 in the case of married couples or $2,000 in the case of single individuals; and to increase all personal income tax exemptions from $600 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9932. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for the payment of benefits thereunder to certain Gold Star Mothers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 9933. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I at the monthly rate of $100; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 9934. A bill to amend title IV of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require the Civil Aeronautics Board to issue regulations relating to the cancellation or undue delay of the scheduled flight of certain aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 9935. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PILLION:

H.R. 9936. A bill to provide for the construction of a new Federal building in Buffalo, N.Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 9937. A bill to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide additional funds for farm housing loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. Res. 528. Resolution creating a nonlegislative select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the aged and aging; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact as promptly as possible S. 1795 or H.R. 6789, authorizing the Duke Power Co. to construct a dam across the Savannah River; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the legislature of the territory of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to enacting legislation to provide the territory of Guam with a locally elected chief executive; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the legislature of the territory of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to expressing appreciation for the enactment of legislation advantageous to the territory of Guam and its people; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 9938. A bill for the relief of Emilio Vazuez Rouco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9939. A bill for the relief of Martina Imperial Romero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9940. A bill for the relief of Antoine Ozbolt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 9941. A bill for the relief of Park Chan Ho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 9942. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William W. Johnston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 9943. A bill for the relief of Stella McKee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Kentucky Mountains Marksmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, this is terrible. We shot at the moon last week and missed it more than 20,000 miles.

Now the moon is tremendous. It is over 2,000 miles wide and that is quite a target. It is usually shining like a new dollar most any time when you might want to shoot at it. But why anyone should ever want to shoot at the moon is beyond my comprehension. The moon is beautiful and romantic. It is friendly and inspiring. It is helpful and generous. It gives light and affects the tides. It promotes courtship and saves electricity. And if you should actually hit the moon as a target, what would you accomplish? You really ought to feel sick in the stomach and woebegone like that time when you shot a doe, a young debutante deer. It was so helpless and beautiful, a creature of the Lord. And yet you shot it.

But what I started out to deplore was aiming at a bright, 2,000-mile-wide target and, of all things, missing it by 20,000 miles. I think the Lord may be shaming us. Like the current bestseller says, "You may shoot at bluejays, but to kill a mocking bird is a sin." So, we may well shoot at Castro and Khrushchev and poverty and unemployment, but to shoot at the moon may well be a sin.

Now the Kentucky mountain people thrust me into orbit and landed me up here in Washington. It was no trouble at all. They are deadeye dick on hitting their target. I actually have people in Clay County, Ky., that can drop a squirrel out of a tree at 100 yards. I have one girl that can hit a running rabbit with a rifle at a hunter's reasonable distance. What would they think if I told them that some experts down in Florida fired a big shot at the big moon way out yonder and actually missed it by more than 20,000 miles distance from the bull's-eye target? Some of them would say, "What's the country coming to—shooting at the moon? And where has marksmanship gone—missing an elephant's south end while swinging at it with a big bass fiddle?"

Well, if we should pull off this foolishness again at a cost of more millions of dollars to taxpayers, then I suggest we call in the shootingest men we got, the squirrel hunters from southeastern Kentucky or maybe a few World War I veterans from Breathitt County, Ky., where they had no World War I draft whatever because their boys came out of the hollows, volunteered and filled up the quotas without any law at all except the law of self-respect, the law of Americanism, and the law of real good marksmanship that has always marked the men of the Kentucky mountains.

Kansas Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, the people of the great State of Kansas today observe their annual Kansas Day. Throughout the State, Kansans will pause in their daily activities to mark this important occasion with reverence and deep thought, with reflection on the past and the future.

A particular emphasis is attached to Kansas Day this year, since the State observed its 100th birthday during the year just past, and celebrated with centennial programs in every community, rural and metropolitan.

The history of Kansas is the history of the United States. A courageous and hardy people recognized the potential of the Great Plains in the center of the Nation. With faith in God, in the land and in themselves, they endured hardships beyond measure to pass on to us the greatness and good life that is ours today.

The faith and determination of our forefathers still lives with the people of Kansas. The next 100 years will witness continued growth and prosperity in our State, and the same proud pulse will beat in this "heart" of the Nation.

I know that my colleagues join me today in paying tribute to Kansas and its people.

Army Transportation Materiel Command

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, during recent months there has been considerable discussion both in and out of the Congress concerning the mounting cost of defense procurements in general and of sole source, or negotiated, procurements in particular.

In view of this fact, it is noteworthy that one large military agency, headquarters of which are maintained in St. Louis, has accomplished, and is continuing to accomplish, singularly striking results in the alleviation of this major problem area.

I refer to the Transportation Materiel Command which exercises logistical responsibility for the U.S. Army insofar as the procurement, supply, and maintenance of transportation equipment for our ground forces is concerned.

Acting upon its own initiative, this agency last year launched an intensive attack upon the basic reason for the bulk of sole source procurements of this nature: the lack of sufficient technical data in the hands of the procuring agency to make competitive bidding possible. Its effort, known as Project Breakout, has resulted to date in an appreciable reduction of negotiated contracts and in a proportionately greater flow of procurements to firms in the category of "small business."

In accomplishing the latter objective the Transportation Materiel Command has been assisted materially by the St. Louis and Kansas City offices of the Small Business Administration with which it enjoys a close and effective working relationship. This cooperation between the two Federal agencies has been particularly productive in bringing new contractual opportunities to firms in labor surplus areas of the country.

I am informed that, to date, Project Breakout has resulted in monetary savings to the Government of $801,290, a figure which represents the difference between the previous sole source costs and the present costs of the same items on a competitive bid basis. Still more gratifying are estimated savings of $8,246,680 which will accumulate during the supported life of the items broken out so far under this project.

As further evidence both of its determination and of its sincerity, the Transportation Materiel Command last April initiated a series of what it calls "procurement fairs" at which items broken out of their previous sole source category are put up for competitive bid for the first time. These events have been held on a weekly basis since July 28 and have proved increasingly beneficial.

It was my pleasure, and that of Representative PRICE of Illinois who accompanied me, to attend one of these fairs recently as guests of Maj. Gen. William B. Bunker and of the chief of his Directorate of Procurement and Production, Col. M. F. Boyd. We both were impressed with the large attendance of businessmen assembled there and with the well-ordered, businesslike atmosphere which prevailed throughout. Here were procurement opportunities never previously offered on a competitive basis and the firms represented obviously welcomed the opportunity to secure technical data and other details preparatory to submitting bids.

I have been informed that the Transportation Materiel Command is rapidly accelerating the pace of its breakout program with a current weekly average of about 125 items, an achievement which requires exhaustive engineering review of technical data and the acquisition of additional data essential for competitive bidding.

I have been no less gratified to learn that this agency has instituted a rigorous policy of retaining for the Government all proprietary rights as well as technical data involved in future new procurements; a policy which inevitably will result in a steadily diminishing ratio of negotiated contracts.

One of the items under consideration when Representative PRICE and I visited the Army Transportation Materiel Command was a spacer sleeve used on the Bell HU-1 helicopter. This item had previously been procured from the original manufacturer at a price of $4.96 with delivery date of 240 days. As a result of the bidding at the conference, in which five of eight bids received were less than $5, an award was made to a small business firm for a price of $1.40 each with a 45-day delivery date. While the savings on this particular transaction amounted to only $85, it does represent a savings of over 70 percent in the previous price paid.

This overall program which I have outlined is one which merits the commendation of all who have been familiar with this problem and who are concerned, as I have certainly been, with the conservation of the taxpayers' money allotted for defense purposes.

In addition to the substantial savings which I have enumerated, the Transportation Materiel Command has benefited materially from an average reduction of approximately 75 percent in the production leadtime previously recorded on a sole source basis. Neither the quality nor the quantity of the items affected has been permitted to suffer in the process.

My presentation of the facts which I have cited in some detail is sufficient evidence of my conviction that here is a program, proven under exceptionally trying circumstances, which is worthy of emulation by other Government agencies—both civilian and military—in their procurements of goods and services.

Establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have been much disturbed by the opposition to establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs. Today when 75 percent of our people live in cities, and 63 percent of our population lives on 10 percent of our land, adequate concern should be given to the problems of our cities and their residents. In 1860, 80 percent of our population was rural. Today less than 30 percent is rural farm and nonfarm.

We have a Department of Commerce to assist business, and a Department of Labor to look after the interests of our workers. The Department of Agriculture assists the small fraction of our population which engages in agricultural pursuits. Parenthetically, I might point out that the budget of the Department of Agriculture is $5,836 million. The whole Federal budget devoted to housing and urban problems is $832 million. I do not downgrade nor oppose the need for a Department of Agriculture, on the contrary I have been one of the strongest supporters of programs to assist the farmers. I ask, however, only that consideration be given to the problem of the large percentage of our population which lives, works, and dies in urban areas. Today's urban areas stretch for hundreds of miles almost uninterrupted by any open country. Rapid urbanization has been going on, and it is likely this process will speed up even more with attendant problems mushrooming. Speedy urbanization has given the cities enormous problems in water supply, water and air pollution, sewage disposal, transportation, crime and fire protection and prevention, streets and highways, education, recreation, housing and slum control, planning and zoning, public health and welfare. No city has resources, economic or technical, adequate to cope with these problems which generally flow across city, State, and county lines. Indeed, every American city is plagued with severe financial problems nearing the crisis stage. We must approach these by coordinated governmental action which can be accomplished efficiently only under a Department of Urban Affairs. The problems of cities are now being worked on by the Federal Government in almost every area. Federal programs now deal with air and water pollution, airport construction, educational facilities, disaster relief, civil defense, medical and hospital facilities, water pollution control, highway, public welfare assistance, housing, urban renewal, and a legion of other areas of concern to our city people. Establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs will of itself create no new and vast spending programs. If increased spending follows it will be because the Congress, the elected representatives of the people, have so voted and ordained, and because the plight of our cities demands it. We do seek to have consideration of our problems upgraded to the Cabinet level.

Who will be head of this Department is secondary, the establishment of the Department is of first importance. It is equally important, however, that there should be no discrimination on racial or other grounds in selecting a Cabinet officer to head this Department any more than it should exist in hiring clerks, custodial help, or intermediate executives. Mr. Robert Weaver is the selection of the President of the United States to head this Department. He deserves to be considered on the basis of his qualifications and ability. It is grossly improper to consider him in any other light. It is equally a great wrong to oppose a Department of Urban Affairs simply because Mr. Weaver might head that agency, or because Mr. Weaver happens to be a Negro.

Mr. Weaver has an outstanding record in the field of housing and urban affairs, in which he is a nationally recognized authority. He has given distinguished service as head of the largest Agency in the projected Department of Urban Affairs, where he has compiled a record as an extraordinarily capable administrator, indeed probably being the best one this Agency has had.

I vigorously support the action of President Kennedy in initiating the establishment of this Cabinet level agency under the provisions of the Reorganization Act. I condemn the bigots who have injected the question of race into the establishment of this Department to defeat a measure so clearly in the public interest.

National Food Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we as a nation, are blessed with an abundant and invaluable food resource. The efficiency and high productivity of the American farmer has created a plentiful supply of food to meet—in fact far exceed—the needs of our people.

By contrast, there are hundreds of millions of people around the world living on inadequate diets.

Food then can—and should—not only serve us well at home; but also be utilized more effectively in support of our foreign policies.

Over the weekend, I was privileged to discuss the need for an improved food policy over Wisconsin radio stations. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of my ideas printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator Wiley Proposes National Food Reserve

Friends, our Nation today finds itself faced by broadscale challenges in many fields—at home and abroad.

Now, I would like to discuss with you a problem of major significance—not only to farmers—but to folks in the cities—or wherever you may live: that is, better utilization of our national food resources.

By mechanization and efficiency, the farmer—in Wisconsin and elsewhere in the Nation—has created the greatest food-production plant in the world. By a high level of productivity, he has provided an adequate—in fact, a surplus—supply of good, healthful foods for consumers, at moderate prices.

Unfortunately, however, the blessings of plenty have also become an economic headache. Why? Because the stockpiling of surpluses has become costly to the taxpayer; and, also, price depressing for the farmer.

Currently, the $4½ billion worth of surpluses—including dairy products, grain, and other commodities—for example, cost over $1 million for storage alone.

The situation, too, threatens to get more serious. According to agricultural experts, the Nation—by 1980—just 20 years ahead—may be able to meet domestic and foreign needs with 50 million acres less than are now being cultivated. In dairying, also, the trend is toward fewer—though larger—dairy farms—with the output per cow increasing; since 1934, for example, output has climbed from 4,000 pounds per cow to 11,000 pounds in 1960.

How can we not only more effectively handle the surpluses, but also better utilize our valuable and abundant food resources for the future? Generally, we need more creative efforts to further improve the already high dietary standards of our people; and, particularly, lift the nutritional levels of the minority still, unfortunately, existing on inadequate diets; attempt to maintain a relatively good supply-demand balance; as possible, find more industrial and commercial uses for dairy and other food commodities; and, generally, utilize food more effectively both in domestic and foreign policies.

The Nation, I believe, should also seriously consider the establishment of a national food reserve. The purpose would be to more effectively and flexibly use food to serve our nutritional and strategic goals. How could such a reserve be established? By the following steps:

1. Authorizing a study by the Department of Agriculture, Office of Emergency Planning, and the Office of Civil Defense of the Defense Department, to determine the kind and size of food reserve that would best serve (a) the Nation, as a whole, in case of attack or other national emergency; and (b) our citizens, individually, under such circumstances.

2. The development of a concentrated food package, by cooperative efforts of Government and private enterprise, to meet emergencies—individual and national.

3. Citizens—individually, and as families—as well as school, municipal, or other community units, could be encouraged to invest in such a food reserve.

4. Uncle Sam, too, could accumulate a strategic reserve, to provide a safe, flexibly movable, nonspoiling and noncontaminated food supply for citizens, in event of war; feed starving people in case of flood, famine, hurricane, or other natural disaster—at home and abroad; and, generally, more effectively utilize food for humanitarian or strategic purposes in support of national policy.

Overall, the establishment of a national food reserve would, I believe, give Americans a sense of food security, not only in the event of national, but also economic, emergency; help to resolve our surplus problem; brighten the economic outlook for the farmer; and, generally, serve the interests of our citizens and the Nation.

Previously, I have suggested such a program to Federal agencies.

Although the need was recognized, adequate steps have not yet been taken to develop a realistic program.

Consequently, I shall again urge Federal agencies to give more realistic participation, guidance, and leadership to fulfilling these needs of the Nation.

Moreover, I believe that free enterprise—particularly those involved in food processing—could well serve the Nation by broader research and production in this field.

At present, a number of enterprises have tackled the problem; however, a great deal more needs to be done.

CONCLUSION

This, then, is a brief review of the food picture.

If we, individually, and as a nation, rededicate ourselves to the challenge, I believe we can more effectively and creatively utilize this invaluable resource to better serve us in the future.

Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany, Herr Wilhelm G. Grewe, Addresses Chamber of Commerce in Charleston, W. Va., on the Implications of the Berlin Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, 20 years ago last December 11, Nazi Germany declared war on the United States. At that time the city of Berlin was a symbol for much of the world of the cruelty and oppression of Hitlerism. Today Berlin is the symbol of a divided world; West Berlin is a living memorial to the free human spirit and a token of America's commitment to the freedom of Western Europe.

This change has been accompanied also by a revolutionary change in the attitudes of the American people regarding our national involvement in the affairs of the world. Symptomatic of this change was the thoughtful and receptive response given by members of the chamber of commerce in Charleston, W. Va., to a recent speech by Herr Wilhelm G. Grewe, Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany.

Ambassador Grewe, whom I was privileged to introduce to the citizens of our State capital city, addressed himself to the Berlin crisis and the implications it holds for the unity of the Western alliance. He offered a forthright and penetrating analysis which was communicated directly to the hearts and minds of his West Virginia audience. I ask unanimous consent that my introductory remarks and excerpts from the address of Ambassador Grewe be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by Senator Jennings Randolph, Democrat, of West Virginia, Introducing Herr Wilhelm G. Grewe, Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the Federal Republic of Germany, at the Annual Chamber of Commerce Dinner, Civic Center, Charleston, W. Va., November 9, 1961

Early last month the New York Times published an eloquent and moving editorial on the Berlin wall. The writer adopted for his theme the lines from Robert Frost's poem, "Mending Wall," in which the poet declares: "Something there is that doesn't love a wall," and adds: "Before I build a wall I'd like to know what I was walling in or walling out."

The Times editorial answered the poet's question in the present instance by stating that at Berlin "Oppression is being walled in; intolerance, hatred, fear—these are being walled in. What is being walled out is freedom of the body, of the mind, and of that soul that the Communists will not admit exists. The wealth of culture, the hope of the future, tranquillity of spirit, the joy of living—these, too, are being walled out."

Mayor Willy Brandt of Berlin has declared that the wall must come down. And so it must. But not only the wall of concrete blocks and barbed wire, but also those invisible walls of fear and distrust and hatred which divide the German nation and torture the people of many lands.

Twenty years ago, under the Third Reich, such walls existed between Germany and those countries which are now her allies. Yet in the brief span of 15 years, Western Germany has—under the leadership of such men as your speaker tonight and with the assistance of the United States—demolished those walls and undergone a miracle of economic, political, and moral reconstruction.

At the present moment of crisis, and in the months and years ahead, we in the United States, Britain, and France must not violate that trust with the German people on which the free Federal Republic has been built. Nor may we violate the hopes of the people of East Germany that they will someday be reunited with their families and friends in the West under a free, democratic, and independent government.

There are few men, in Germany or America, who have contributed more to the harmonious relations between our two countries during the past decade than has Ambassador Grewe. As a former professor of public and international law at the University of Freiburg, and later dean of the faculty of law, Herr Grewe was called to Bonn to head the German delegation which negotiated the termination of the occupation statute in 1951. He continued in this role and participated in all the negotiations until the ratification of the Paris Treaties in October 1954.

As observer for the Federal Government at the Geneva Conference in 1955 and speaker of the West German advisory delegation to the Foreign Ministers Conference at Geneva in 1959, Ambassador Grewe extended his knowledge and insight into the relations between the Soviet Union and the Western allies.

As Ambassador to the United States since 1958, Herr Grewe has worked with diligence and great effectiveness in strengthening United States-German relations in the cause of maintaining peace with honor and advancing the rule of law in a troubled world. It is my genuine privilege and pleasure to present His Excellency, Herr Wilhelm G. Grewe, Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the Federal Republic of Germany.

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY WILHELM G. GREWE

The events of August 13, were really a very hard blow to Berlin. Up to that date, Berlin was still a living unit. There were more than 500,000 border crossings each day. Now there are less than 500. Nevertheless, the vitality and viability of West Berlin is by no means shattered. It is very remarkable that for the last month (October 1961) 1,990 persons settled in West Berlin whereas the corresponding figure in October 1960 was 642. Since August 13, more people moved into West Berlin than left the city.

This is not only a Berlin crisis but a new crisis in the general context of the cold war. The fact that Khrushchev is not satisfied with the erection of the wall in Berlin shows very clearly that he has further reaching aims in mind. Namely, the permanent division of Germany into three parts; neutralizing West Germany and dismantling the NATO alliance; and finally the humiliation of the United States as the leading power firmly committed in Berlin. If we lose this struggle, it would mean, therefore, a fatal blow to the whole Western alliance. If Berlin would fall into the hands of the Communists, they would hold the symbol of German unity in their hands.

Khrushchev does not want to risk general war for Berlin, but he is determined to go very close to the brink. If it would come out that the West has the weaker nerves, it would not only mean to lose Berlin but to submit to new Soviet blackmail next year at another spot. The note to Finland has already indicated that there are other appropriate targets for the next attack. Maintaining strong nerves does also mean that one should not be afraid to negotiate.

An Antitrust Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made before the section on Antitrust Law of the New York State Bar Association in New York City, January 25, 1962:

As a New York lawyer, it is a great pleasure for me to speak before a distinguished group of New York lawyers, as well as before those no less distinguished guests who may have come from outside our State. As chairman of the House Antitrust Subcommittee and of its parent House Judiciary Committee, I am well aware of your keen interest in the antitrust laws. If there are times when we have had differing views as to the policy, direction and meaning of those laws, it may be of solace to you to know that I, also, have had to search, examine and revise many of the proposals that have come before me.

At the threshold the question might be asked "Why should there be any antitrust legislative program?" The indisputable answer is that we, in this country, for many years, have recognized the absolute necessity of a competitive economic system. We have turned our back on the easy way of cartels and monopolies, on price-fixing, on allocation of markets. We believe in the right of men to be free of artificial restraints upon their liberty to engage in business and to practice a calling. We believe that competition gives the most for the least, that it permits one to be relatively free from Government regulation, and obviates the pressures that have led to nationalization of industries in other countries; and we believe that it has contributed to the expansion of a mobile social structure in the sense that equality of opportunity is a reality denied to other countries which deny competition as part of their economic structure.

Liberty in the field, without some guidelines, without some sanctions, cannot prevail any more than it could in traffic controls. The common law has had to have the aid of statutory law.

The statute of monopolies of 21 James I represents a legislative expression of antitrust policy to which even today we owe a great deal; and, according to Holdsworth, "The principle that trade should be free from arbitrary restraints is implied in the clauses of Magna Carta which relate to the liberty of the subject, and to trade."[1] In those days the King was a dispenser of monopolies, and his attempt to persuade the English people that what was good for the King was good for the country met with considerable resistance. In recent years a similar attempt by a former officer of our largest industrial empire has met with an understandably chill reception. I might add that England, after being forgetful of the tradition of the statute of monopolies and of its early common law, has turned its face toward a more competitive economy only during the last two decades, with the aid of a number of statutory enactments. Whether in the absence of a counterpart of the Celler-Kefauver section 7 of the Clayton Act, that face can turn very far, is questionable. I note that according to a recent newspaper announcement, Imperial Chemical Industries has offered to buy Courtoulds, Ltd., Britain's leading manufacturer of synthetic fibers. This would give ICI control of more than 90 percent of synthetic fiber manufacturing in Britain. As a partner in many a cartel it is not surprising to find ICI justifying the proposed acquisition on the ground it would avoid "duplication of effort."

In this country, in 1884, three justices of the Supreme Court concurred in the statement that the case of monopolies and the statute of monopolies: "form one of the constitutional landmarks of British liberty, like the petition of right, the Habeas Corpus Act, and other great constitutional acts of Parliament. They established and declared one of the inalienable rights of freemen which our ancestors brought with them to this country. The right to follow any of the common occupations of life is an inalienable right; it was formulated as such under the phrase 'pursuit of happiness' in the Declaration of Independence, which commenced with the fundamental proposition that 'all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' This right is a large ingredient in the civil liberty of the citizen. To deny it to all but a few favored individuals, by investing the latter with a monopoly, is to invade one of the fundamental privileges of the citizen, contrary not only to common right, but, as I think, to the express words of the Constitution."[2]

By the end of the 19th century, however, the ravages of huge trusts and of their sponsors to our economic system impelled the enactment of the Sherman Act of 1890. With a wisdom for which that Congress deserves much praise, that statute, in the words of the Supreme Court, "has a generality comparable to that found to be desirable in constitutional provisions."[3]

Since that time other antitrust statutes have been enacted by Congress, some of which have been general in nature, some have been of a more specific nature. An example of the former is the Clayton Act of 1914. An example of the latter is the Bank Merger Act of 1960.

Your chairman has stated that, "The first unifying principle of the statutes in the field of antitrust law, whether it be expressed in the classic simplicity of the Sherman Act or in the ornate verbosity of the Robinson-Patman Act, is that their general objective is to insure to our Nation a competitive economy."[4] He has also said, "Our antitrust laws, however, have been written more with our hearts than with our heads."[5] To which I might reply that we try to use both.

We, in the Congress, are accustomed, on the one hand, to be condemned for sponsoring legislation, which, we are told, is too general because it does not single out anything, and on the other hand, to be impugned for sponsoring legislation, which, we are told, is too specific because it singles out something. Antitrust bills now pending before Congress are of both types.

I should like to say a word on this question of "certainty." I like certainty as well as the next man—albeit not to the point of monotony. But the current quest for certainty in national and international affairs, in social and economic matters, and in legislation can go too far. From Judge Learned Hand I borrow the acute observation that, "No human purpose possesses itself so completely in advance as to admit a final definition."[6]

Recently the Wall Street Journal published an editorial centering around what Prof. William H. Petersen had called the impreciseness of language in the amended section 7 of the Clayton Act—the Celler-Kefauver amendment. Neither the learned professor nor the Journal noted that, in 1914, Congress was so precise in using the word "stock" that it took 34 intervening years of deflation of statutory purpose and of frustrating corrective effort to add "asset" acquisitions to the scope of the statute. The same groups that complain about the impreciseness of the Clayton Act, fought us tooth and nail when we sought to make the act more precise by including asset acquisitions.

Precision becomes a matter of what we knew yesterday, of what we know today. But when we attempt to enumerate items of such knowledge into legislation, someone usually leaves something out, and the resulting 15-page bill is likely to engender as much interpretative legislation as a broader one-paragraph enactment. The more one tries to be specifically inclusive, the more likely one is to exclude, quite inadvertently, something important. Moreover, legislation, generally, must and should embody some anticipation of the future. Tomorrow is only 1 day later than today. We have not yet learned, however, to anticipate always precisely so that today's legislation will cover tomorrow's needs. Even when a specific problem does arise requiring remedial legislation, we can never be sure that an appropriate bill will be enacted timely or at all. One can never anticipate every contingency.

---

[2] *Butchers' Union Co.* v. *Crescent City Co.*, 111 U.S. 746, 762 (1884).

[1] Holdsworth, Industrial Combinations and the Law in the 18th Century, 18 Minn. L. Rev. 369, 371 (1934).

[3] *Appalachian Coals, Inc.* v. *United States*, 288 U.S. 344, 359–60 (1933).

[4] Van Cise, Understanding the Antitrust Laws (1958), p. 2.

[5] Id., p. 1.

[6] The Speech of Justice [Dillard, The Spirit of Liberty (1960) 13].

Legislation which I have sponsored in the antitrust field has run the gantlet of committee hearings and discussion on the floor of Congress. This distillation process has, at times, led to some changes in the bills as initially introduced. All this is part of our democratic process, which I welcome. What I do not welcome is the frequent Cassandra-like chorus of doomsday prophecy when any remedial antitrust legislation is proffered. This same propensity, I am told, is manifested, when antitrust violators are brought to book in the courts. I would remind you that the Sherman and Clayton Acts were regarded as quite drastic when enacted. Too drastic, we are told sometimes, for adoption by foreign countries, contemplating antitrust legislation. Yet, today these acts are commonplace parts of our general body of law. The need for some sort of antitrust legislation has become generally recognized, moreover, in industrialized countries. The Scandinavian countries have been active in enacting such legislation since World War II. Antitrust provisions have become part of the basic enactments binding the European countries which make up the Common Market.

I think you will agree that if the economic forces of the marketplace be perverted against the interests of the public, the elective as well as the appointed representatives of the people may have to take action in their respective spheres to vindicate the public interest. Gentlemen, if your clients would have less legislation and less regulation, let them pay more than lipservice to the competitive philosophy and policies of this Nation.

Before turning to the antitrust bills pending before my committee, I cannot pass by the opportunity of noting that even the Russians have recognized the importance of our antitrust laws. I suspect that the only important matter upon which your Arthur Dean and Mr. Semyon Tsarapkin could agree, at Geneva, was the desirability of Mr. Dean returning to this country to argue in the Brown Shoe Company appeal, before the Supreme Court last month that the Celler-Kefauver Act be given a narrow scope.

The Democratic platform of 1960, prepared by a drafting committee of which I was a member, contained the following pertinent highlights:

"We favor requiring corporations to file advance notice of mergers with the antitrust enforcement agencies.

"We favor strengthening the Robinson-Patman Act to protect small business against price discrimination.

"We favor authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to obtain temporary injunctions during the pendency of administrative proceedings."

All three of these pledges, authored by me, have been carried out into bills now pending before my committee.

Thirty-two bills were assigned to my Antitrust Subcommittee during the first session of the 87th Congress. The subcommittee considered 17 of these bills during 15 days of public hearings. One bill, H.R. 9096, involving telecasts of professional league sports contests, was enacted.

Hearings were held last year before my committee on H.R. 6689, the civil investigative demand bill. This bill would provide a means for the Department of Justice to have access to documents in the course of an investigation instituted to determine whether the antitrust laws have been violated. The companion Senate bill, S. 167, was adopted, with amendments, by the Senate in the closing days of the session. It is now pending before my subcommittee. The American Bar Association has approved the idea of a civil investigative demand statute. The drug bill, which has had extensive hearings on the Senate side; three bills to increase penalties for violations of the Sherman Act; a bill to broaden the interlocking director prohibitions of section 8 of the Clayton Act; and a number of bills pertaining to the Robinson-Patman Act, are among the other bills pending before my committee. Some of them already have had an extensive legislative history.

As you can see, bills pending from the first session of this Congress represent a legislative program of considerable scope, although, undoubtedly, not all will receive equal attention. Like wine, some of the bills before my committee will gain in strength and flavor. Others may ferment from controversy to the point where they are unusable, while some may become dull from lack of interest.

I should like to refer to a few bills which have evoked considerable interest. H.R. 71 is a bill which would prevent manufacturers of motor vehicles from financing and insuring the sales of their products. After 6 days of hearings, the subcommittee ordered H.R. 71 reported to the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment that would limit its applicability to passenger automobiles, including station wagons. A motion to reconsider this action remains pending.

Four identical bills, H.R. 2882, H.R. 3563, H.R. 6058, and H.R. 6698, would require prior notification of important corporate mergers and acquisitions. They would also authorize the Federal Trade Commission to apply to the courts for preliminary injunctions against mergers of doubtful legality.

I believe that existing antitrust laws have kept our competitive climate generally healthful. But finite men make finite laws. I am receptive to improvements in our antitrust laws. Like Aristotle, I believe that even though a law be written it should not always remain unchanged.

Recently, the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals held that section 3 of the Clayton Act did not reach television time tie-ins because that statute speaks in terms of commodities.[7] I understand that other decisions have similarly indicated that section 3 is not as broad as it should be. I have asked my staff to make a preliminary inquiry into the desirability of a remedial amendment.

In another recent decision,[8] arising out of the notorious electrical equipment cases, Judge Kirkpatrick reluctantly held that the benefits of section 5 of the Clayton Act—use of a judgment in a Government case as prima facie evidence—did not apply to a plea of nolo contendere. The judge felt compelled to say in this connection: "I never could myself quite grasp the logic of this distinction between nolo contendere and guilty and why one is permissible in evidence in a civil suit and the other is not. * * * I think the weight of authority really compels me to strike those allegations, although if I were entirely free and it was a new question, I might feel otherwise about it."

I have asked my staff to look into this matter also, since I share, along with Judge Kirkpatrick, difficulty in understanding why a nolo plea, often accepted over the Government's objection, should be of such benefit to a defendant and of such detriment to a plaintiff.

There is also another important aspect of any legislative program. The Antitrust Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, has general investigative, as well as legislative, jurisdiction over antitrust matters. This means that it must be alert to see that the Nation's antitrust laws are vigorously enforced. Investigation may reveal that an enforcing agency has not made adequate use of the statutory tools which it possesses, or that it needs additional legislative implements. In 1955 our Antitrust Subcommittee issued a "Report on Corporate and Bank Mergers." The report concluded that the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice had made only a "token gesture" at enforcing the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act of 1950. Since that time the record of both of those agencies has been much more impressive in this respect.

I have appeared in opposition to the application of the First National City Bank to acquire the National Bank of Westchester with its numerous branches. The Comptroller of the Currency ruled against the proposed merger. Previously I had opposed the consolidation of the Bankers Trust Co., of New York, with the County Trust Co., of Westchester, with its numerous branches. The proposed merger was denied. I have also appeared before the Federal Reserve Board to urge that it preclude the Morgan Guaranty Holding Co. from laying hands upon six of the largest banks in upstate New York. I hope that the Board will reject this application.

Our investigation into certain consent decrees and consent decree negotiation procedures led to our recommendation that notice be given by the Government to interested persons prior to presenting a proposed consent decree to the court. I am pleased to see that the Department of Justice has taken steps to implement that recommendation.

Last year we held informative hearings on a program for development of a satellite communications system, a problem of fundamental national importance. We sought and will continue our efforts to prevent A.T. & T. from securing monopoly control over ownership and operation of the system.

Nearing completion and publication is a comprehensive report by the Antitrust Subcommittee containing a summary and analysis of its lengthy hearings and its detailed legislative recommendations for dealing with ocean shipping problems, for strengthening the competitive provisions of the Shipping Act and related laws, and for establishing an effective regulatory system.

A current important investigation by my committee, which I hope will lead to legislative recommendations, is concerned with concentration in news media. The announcement of two important newspapers in Los Angeles that they were ceasing publication has triggered an investigation by my committee. We seek to ascertain the reasons for such cessation. Particularly, we wish to discover whether any violation of the antitrust laws was involved in this simultaneous dual collapse. More broadly, my committee is also concerned with the growing trend toward concentration of ownerships of all the news media. This is an ominous tendency.

Democracy can be preserved only if its citizenry is informed, as Judge Hand has said, "from as many different sources, and with as many different facets and colors as is possible."[9] In too many cities and towns there is only a single newspaper now. And in many cities TV, radio, and newspapers are joined in a single proprietorship.

Legislative proposals may come from almost any source. Sometimes proposals for antitrust legislation are inspired by a new situation in our evolving economy, to which congressional attention had not been earlier directed. Sometimes, as Milton Handler has said, "where administration discloses defects or limitations in the laws drafted by Congress with which the techniques of interpretation are unable to cope, the remedy is to request supplemental legislation."[10]

---

[7] *Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.* v. *Amana Refrigerations, Inc.*, Trade Cases, Par. 70, 142 (C.A. 7, Oct. 30, 1961).

[8] *City of Fort Pierce* v. *Westinghouse Electric Corp.*, Trade Cases, Par. 70, 143 (E.D. Pa. Oct. 23, 1961).

[9] *U.S.* v. *Associated Press*, 52 F. 2d 362, 372 (S.D.N.Y., 1943), aff'd 326 U.S. 1.

It is too early to delineate clearly the ultimate features of an antitrust legislative program for this session of Congress. From what I have said, however, you may rest assured that there will be an antitrust legislative program on the House side of Congress, and I welcome freely your comments, advice, and suggestions. I want to hear from you. None of us can disengage ourselves from the impact of antitrust matters, either as implemented or tragically ignored.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of January 27, 1962:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

JANUARY 27, 1962.

The Postage Revision Act of 1961, the first major legislative bill of this session passed by voice vote, that is without a record vote of each Member's position. The demerits of the bill are exceeded by the demerits of no bill. Without a bill, the postal deficit would be $830 million this year. This bill (1) will decrease the deficit approximately $700 million; (2) transfer $250 million postal cost to General Treasury expenses as public service (for the blind, etc.); (3) prevent Communist literature being distributed free by the Federal Government (this amendment against the administration's wishes); (4) increase first-class mail 1 cent per letter, and up second-class (magazines and newspapers) and third-class (bulk mailings and circulars).

The bill will not (1) cover any deficit resulting from other postal expenses being increased, as for example, pay boosts; (2) equalize mail users' burden since 70 percent of the increase is borne by first-class mail; (3) nor is it expected that the Senate will accept this bill; it may well be weakened; (4) it was hastily thrown together by floor action rather than in committee, a much greater chance of inequities thus being created (for example, small business may be hurt by the increased cost. We don't know); (5) was passed without a record vote, so the public will never know who was for it or against it. It is my belief that there should be a record vote on every piece of major legislation. The Republican leadership should not, as I see it, join in agreements to prevent record votes on controversial issues. On the record I would have voted for the bill, but I am quick to admit it was not a good bill. As I saw it, the good outweighed the bad, but at best, this is a sorry example of how to legislate.

The Ways and Means Committee is now working on the President's tax proposals, covering (1) investment credit; (2) entertainment expenses; (3) mutual fire and casualty insurance companies; (4) domestic corporations receiving dividends from foreign corporations; (5) exclusion for income earned from sources outside the United States; (6) gain from disposition of depreciable personal property; (7) tax treatment of cooperatives and patrons; (8) withholding on interest, dividends, and patronage dividends; (9) information with respect to certain foreign entities; (10) Treasury proposal on "tax havens." This key committee is composed of 25 members—15 Democrats and 10 Republicans. Eight States have two members, nine have one representative each on the committee, geographically covering all areas of the Nation. Texas is one of those fortunate to have two.

The Dallas Federal Building continues to get attention as it has since I was a member of the Public Works Committee 7 years ago. Patiently I am continuing the effort to (1) get the GSA and the Bureau of the Budget to recommend a budget supplementary request to include the project in the fiscal 1963 budget; (2) get the Appropriations Committee to approve the expenditure.

The cost of Government is now taking $1 out of every $4 of total U.S. spending. At the rate we are going it will not be very long before private property as a share of the Nation's economy will be nonexistent. The President's glowing Economic Report does not offer hope of fiscal responsibility nor a stable economy. The President sees a prosperous year ahead and promises a balanced budget, at the same time urges approximately 70 new ways to spend money, or for ways that spending plans already approved can be increased. Report in U.S. News & World Report shows the prospect of a $100 billion budget within 3 years. Budget outlook: Year to end June 30: Outgo, $89 billion; income, $82 billion; deficit, $7 billion. Year to start July 1: Outgo, $92.5 billion; income, $93 billion; surplus, $500 million. Cash budget, adding social security, highways, other special spending: Year to end June 30: Outgo, $111 billion; income, $102.5 billion; deficit, $8.5 billion. Year to begin July 1: Outgo, $114.8 billion; income, $116.6 billion; surplus, $1.8 billion. A realistic look shows the President is overoptimistic—chances are the outgo will be higher and the income lower. That isn't the whole story of taxes. Add State and local taxes for the year to start July 1: About $50 billion. Federal: $115 billion. Total cash spending by governments: $165 billion.

Government spending is not the answer to a sound economy. The answer is in giving the people their head and allowing our private enterprise system full opportunity to operate instead of trying to smother the people and the system in government.

This is the real issue in this election year. This year the people will decide on what kind of system under which they want to live, that of free enterprise where all the people are free to exercise individual initiative in creating a better life for themselves and their posterity, the system under which we have attained the best life for more people than any other nation in history, or a planned economy, where the Government takes all you have and returns to you what it believes you need—end result, a Socialist-Communist system.

Action this week: Introduced Alger bill (H.R. 9905), to withdraw from the United Nations.

---

[10] Handler, Annual Review of Antitrust Developments, 16 Record of Association of Bar of City of New York, 385, 408 (1961).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 30, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. George R. Davis, minister, National City Christian Church, offered the following prayer:

Eternal and unfaltering light of the ages, unfailing friend of man, to Thee we commend this historic Chamber, and these Representatives of a free but anxious Nation, set in a troubled world. We know they have Thy blessing. We are assured Thou wilt direct them. Thy comfort shall sustain them. Under trying pressures we trust they and their families shall be secure.

Make them to be increasingly worthy and able citizens of the wider world. And save them from mediocrity, shallowness, narrow parochialism, and deadly fears. If we the people must be to some extent the human judges of the performance of the men and women who here conduct our affairs, grant us to judge with intelligence, understanding, and good will toward them. Keep all of us from losing heart in our quest for the city of God, through Him who has called us to follow His way. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1962—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 320)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

In my special message on housing of March 9, 1961, and again in my message on the state of the Union earlier this year, I recommended the establishment in the executive branch of a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, of Cabinet rank. This plan would fulfill that recommendation.

The times we live in urgently call for this action. In a few short decades we have passed from a rural to an urban way of life; in a few short decades more, we shall be a nation of vastly expanded population, living in expanded urban areas in housing that does not now exist, served by community facilities that do not now exist, moving about by means of systems of urban transportation that do not now exist. The challenge is great, and the time is short. I propose to act now to strengthen and improve the machinery through which, in large part, the Federal Government must act to carry out its proper role of encouragement and assistance to States and local governments, to voluntary efforts and to private enterprise, in the solution of these problems.

The present and future problems of our cities are as complex as they are manifold. There must be expansion: but orderly and planned expansion, not explosion and sprawl. Basic public facilities must be extended ever further into the areas surrounding urban centers; but they must be planned and coordinated so as to favor rather than hamper the sound growth of our communities. The scourge of blight must be overcome, and the central core areas of our cities, with all their great richness of economic and cultural wealth, must be restored to lasting vitality. New values must be created to provide a more efficient local economy and provide revenues to support essential local services. Sound old housing must be conserved and improved, and new housing created, to serve better all income groups in our population and to move ever closer to the goal of a decent home in a suitable living environment for every American family. We will neglect our cities at our peril, for in neglecting them we neglect the Nation.

The reorganization plan I am transmitting would establish a new executive department to be known as the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. To the Department would be transferred the existing programs and responsibilities of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. These programs include an extraordinary range of diverse yet closely interrelated activities: insurance of mortgages to finance the construction of homes and the ready interchange of existing homes, as well as their modernization and improvement; financial aids to local communities in comprehensive local planning, in slum clearance and urban renewal, and in the conservation and rehabilitation of neighborhoods and whole urban areas; advances and loans to assist in the planning and construction of needed public facilities; loans to assist in meeting the needs of our hard-pressed colleges and universities for student and faculty housing; financial aids in the search for solutions to the baffling problems of urban mass transportation; a variety of tools to stabilize and encourage liquidity in the private mortgage market; financial assistance in providing decent housing for low-income families; and others still.

Widely different as these Federal programs are in subject matter and in techniques, they all affect the lives and welfare of families in our cities and their surrounding areas, and they all impinge in one degree or another on each other. None can or should stand by itself. The basic purpose of this plan is to establish a Department which will bring a maximum degree of coordination and effectiveness to the planning and execution of all of them.

Our cities and the people who live in and near them need and deserve an adequate voice in the highest councils of Government. The executive branch and the Congress need an adequate instrument to assist them in the formulation and execution of policy concerning urban affairs and housing. States and local governing bodies urgently need an agency at the departmental level to assist them in formulating and carrying out their local programs for dealing with these problems. All these needs can best be met through the establishment of the department provided for in this reorganization plan.

It should not be assumed that these are matters of concern only to our larger cities. Hundreds of smaller cities and towns are located on or near the fringes of rapidly growing urban areas. The problems of the cities affect them today, and will be theirs tomorrow. Hundreds of other smaller towns and cities not now affected will be so situated a few short years hence. Thus, the smaller towns and cities have a stake in this proposal as vital as, and only a little less immediate than, that of our large urban centers. This plan is addressed to their needs as well as to those of the major cities. Likewise, it should be emphasized that the Department will have important activities of service to the States. The establishment of this Department does not connote any bypassing or reduction of the constitutional powers and responsibilities of the States under our Federal system of government. Rather, the States must assume additional leadership in the future in dealing with problems of urban areas, and the Department will maintain close working and consultative relationships with them. An example of this relationship can already be found in the urban planning assistance program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency which provides matching funds for use by States to aid municipalities and State, metropolitan, and regional planning agencies facing rapid urbanization. Grants may be used by the States themselves to prepare statewide comprehensive plans for urban development. Just as the programs of the Department of Agriculture have strengthened the role of the States in measuring and helping solve the problems of their farmers, so the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing will provide additional opportunities for the States to play a strong role in the development of their urban communities.

As the Senate committee noted in its report on S. 1633 (S. Rept. No. 879, 87th Cong., 1st sess.), "A Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is needed to provide Federal leadership to solve the problems emerging from the transformation of the American scene from a predominantly rural society to a vast urban complex. More than two-thirds of the American population now lives in metropolitan centers. The figure is multiplying. It is compounded of explosive population growth resulting from an increased birth rate, a declining death rate, and rapid migration of people from rural areas to cities, towns, and villages." The importance of our Nation's metropolitan areas entitling them to representation at the Cabinet table is further emphasized by the great amount of tax revenues they contribute to the Federal Government. For example, in 1959, taxpayers in the 10 largest metropolitan areas paid over $13 billion in taxes or 35 percent of the total amount of individual income tax.

The need for such a department has been increasingly recognized in recent years. A proposal for a Cabinet department substantially similar in nature was advanced at about the same time that the first consolidated Federal Housing Agency was established, 20 years ago. Since then, year by year, both the executive branch and the Congress have taken successive steps to create a more coordinated agency with a fuller range of tools to attack these problems. No fewer than five reorganization plans submitted by my predecessors have contributed to this process. On the legislative side, the Congress has enacted major legislation in the field of urban affairs and housing in every year but one since 1946. The time is here to take the next needed step.

First, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 would establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, to be headed by a Secretary who would be assisted by an Under Secretary, three Assistant Secretaries, and a General Counsel. All of these officers would be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. There would also be in the Department, as in many others, an Administrative Assistant Secretary appointed from the classified civil service by the Secretary, with the approval of the President.

Second, the plan transfers to the Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing the functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and its Administrator, including the administration of the programs of the Urban Renewal Administration and the Community Facilities Administration and the authorities now vested by law in the Public Housing Administration and its officers.

Because of its magnitude in our economy and the immediacy of its impact on our people, housing has been and will continue to be the heart of this complex of related programs. In recognition of this fact, the plan provides for the transfer of the Federal Housing Administration as an entity to the new department. Provision is also made for the continuance of the existing office of Federal Housing Commissioner, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Commissioner would continue to head the Federal Housing Administration under the supervision and direction of the Secretary as head of the department.

Finally, in view of its special legal status as a mixed-ownership corporation, the Federal National Mortgage Association would be transferred to the department without change. The Secretary would serve as Chairman of the Board of the Association, as the Housing and Home Finance Administrator now does. No change in the organization or functions of the Association within the department affecting its secondary market operations could be made unless the Secretary finds that such change would not adversely affect the rights and interests of owners of outstanding common stock of the Association.

In accordance with the spirit and intent of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, this plan promotes the better execution of the laws, the more effective management of the executive branch of the Government, and the expeditious administration of the public business. It aims to promote economy and increase efficiency to the fullest extent practicable. Its significance in the pursuit of these purposes must be judged in the light of the magnitude and significance of the programs affected.

The various programs with which the new Department would be charged involve Federal investments of billions of dollars, and contingent liabilities of billions more. The quality of administration of these programs has profound effects on land values and tax revenues in local communities throughout the country. The operations of these programs figure importantly in the vitality of the general economy. The policies that govern them play a major role in determinations of national fiscal and monetary policy. Their management in the most effective and coordinated way possible, therefore, will yield economies in the broad sense far outweighing the amount involved in the administrative cost of their operations. And even in the latter area, I am convinced that economy and efficiency will be importantly enhanced by the improved coordination which this reorganization plan will make possible.

For all the reasons herein set forth, I have concluded that the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is urgently needed to permit me to discharge most effectively the responsibilities in this area placed upon the President by the Constitution and by the statutes respecting these matters enacted by the Congress.

After investigation, I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended. I have also found and hereby declare that by reason of these reorganizations it is necessary to include in the reorganization plan provisions for the appointment and compensation of the new officers specified in section 2 of the reorganization plan. The rates of compensation fixed for these officers are, respectively, those which I have found to prevail in respect of comparable officers in the executive branch of the Government.

Although the taking effect of the reorganizations provided for in the reorganization plan will not in itself result in immediate savings, the improvement achieved in administration will in the future allow the performance of necessary services at greater savings than present operations would permit. An itemization of these savings in advance of actual experience is not practicable.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 30, 1962.*

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, we have received today from the President a reorganization plan which would establish in the executive branch a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, of Cabinet rank. This plan is, of course, the means by which the President hopes to effect the same program which failed even to reach the House floor when the Rules Committee denied a rule to H.R. 8429.

One of the country's foremost authorities on the subject of urban affairs is County Executive Edwin G. Michaelian, of Westchester County, N.Y. During the last session of Congress he was one of two witnesses to appear on behalf of the National Association of County Officials before the Senate committee considering S. 1633, a bill to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. In presenting the NACO position, Mr. Michaelian stated that "whenever possible, dealings between county and other local governments and the Federal Government should be channeled through an appropriate State agency. We oppose the establishment of a Federal Department of Urban Affairs on the grounds that it would further weaken the States and would tend to create an unwieldy bureaucracy of the type found in many foreign countries."

I also oppose this extension of Federal authority and control into an area which is and ought to remain the responsibility of State and local government. When the reorganization plan comes before the House I intend to spell out my opposition in greater detail. In the meantime, I would like to recommend to the Members of this body the statement Mr. Michaelian made for the NACO, which follows:

> Mr. Chairman, we are grateful to you for your kind invitation to appear here today on behalf of the National Association of County Officials. I am Edwin G. Michaelian, elected county executive of Westchester County, N.Y., and a member of the board of directors of the National Association of County Officials.
>
> NACO directly or through our State associations of county officials in 44 States represents elected and appointed policymaking officials in nearly every county in the country.
>
> The legislation before your committee proposes that Congress, with the approval of the President, promulgate a far-reaching comprehensive national policy for housing and urban affairs. A Cabinet rank Urban Secretary would be created to make urban studies, develop and recommend to the President urban policies, coordinate urban activities, and provide technical assistance and leadership to States and localities in urban affairs.
>
> NACO has considered this matter carefully and on August 17, 1960, in Miami Beach, Fla., reaffirmed our American county policy on this point, which reads as follows:
>
> "1-4. Whenever possible, dealings between county and other local governments and the Federal Government should be channeled through an appropriate State agency. We oppose the establishment of a Federal Department of Urban Affairs on the grounds that it would further weaken the States and would tend to create an unwieldy bureaucracy of the type found in many foreign countries."
>
> We have never taken a position on the creation of a Department of Housing.
>
> ### POSITION SUMMARIZED
>
> While we recognize and strongly support the need for continuing Federal participation in the staggering problems of urbanization, we believe that first priority is for the Federal, State, and local governments to jointly develop a continuing national urban policy that identifies and implements the respective roles of each level of government and of private citizens in urban affairs. This should perhaps be the responsibility of the existing congressionally created and presidentially appointed Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations whose representatives are from all levels of government and the public.
>
> There is also a need for continual study and redefinition of the particular role of the National Government and we respectfully suggest that Congress may wish to consider the creation of a joint congressional Committee on Urban Affairs. Finally, there is urgent need to coordinate the administration of literally hundreds of Federal urban activities that are and must continue to be scattered among every single Federal agency. This responsibility rests constitutionally with the President. We would suggest that the Executive Office of the President be greatly strengthened by the creation of a Special Urban Assistant to the President and that he be provided with sufficient staff and free access to the Cabinet table. This could develop into a Bureau of Urban Affairs comparable to the Bureau of the Budget, a staff area of the President, in the Executive Office of the President.
>
> We examine now the present bill and some of the arguments advanced by proponents of a Department of Urban Affairs.
>
> ### DEVELOPING A NATIONAL URBAN POLICY
>
> The many statements in the proposed National Urban Affairs and Housing Department set forth in section 3 of this bill are indeed noble and worthwhile. Our association continues to support Federal aid for urban renewal, community facilities, airports, planning grants, water pollution control, air pollution control, urban highways, and many other projects. Although this section does not at this incident assign any additional functions to the proposed Department, it nevertheless gives the impetus for such future assignment. We would recommend, rather than declare, national policy in advance of the enactment of some future Federal program that it should be considered concurrently with the substantive portion of the future legislation.
>
> In considering our national urban policy, we think that it is important that all levels of government have a part. As evidence of our counties' deep involvement in urban affairs, we would submit our policy statement and our urban county congress proceedings.
>
> Often, for example, there is a tendency to equate urban with the central city. This misses the point that at the present time, approximately 50 percent of our citizens in the 217 metropolitan centers live in the central city while 50 percent live in the suburbs. The Advisory Commission reports, for example, that observed trends indicate that between 1950 and 1980, while the total population of metropolitan areas almost doubles, the population of central cities may increase only 30 percent, while that in the metropolitan rings may increase by 180 percent. These suburbanites are, generally speaking, provided municipal services by our urban counties.
>
> The central cities are actually dropping sharply in population. Washington is down 6.9 percent, Boston 15.4 percent, Pittsburgh 11.2 percent, and Buffalo 8.9 percent.

There are some 17,000 cities, 3,000 counties, and many towns, villages, and other local units in addition to the 50 States that are involved in urban affairs.

If our counties were allowed to participate in the development of our national urban policy we would specify that insofar as possible dealings between the Federal Government and local governments should be channeled through the States. This, in spite of the fact that our urban counties are often more underrepresented at the State legislature than are large cities. We feel that we have a vital stake in the preservation of our Federal systems.

We would also want to more sharply define what is urban and what is not.

CENTRAL CLEARINGHOUSE

The argument is made that there is need to concentrate urban affairs in a single department so that there is a single place for a local government official to go when he has an urban problem. This is something that we all wish were possible but the Government is just too big, and putting a lot of things in one department does not necessarily mean that it will be easy to get access. The present bill, for example, proposes to place all housing matters in a single department and yet two major programs that contribute 63 percent of the residential mortgage financing are not included in the new Department—we refer to the Federal home loan bank system and veterans' home loan program.

In point of fact, the present Housing and Home Finance Agency has had Cabinet status for some time in the sense that the Administrator has been invited to sit in Cabinet meetings when housing problems were discussed—and yet—any local official can tell you that from experience the various housing agencies are located in many places in Washington.

SPOKESMAN FOR URBAN AFFAIRS

The argument is made that the farmers have a Secretary of Agriculture who is their spokesman at the Cabinet table and that a similar Cabinet officer must be created to be spokesman for urban affairs. In the first place, history has taught us that the farmers have not always felt that the various Secretaries of Agriculture spoke for them. In the second place, there is the inference that an Urban Secretary would take the urban point of view on all things. This ignores the fact that Cabinet officers must, of course, support the policy of the President. To cite an example: In the last session of Congress, the American Municipal Association, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, NACO, and several other associations representing urban officials strongly endorsed Federal aid to airports located on the national airport plan. It was the view of the President that the Government should gradually withdraw from this area. Had we had a Secretary of Urban Affairs it is not likely that he would support an expansion of the airport program regardless of how important this was to the development of urban areas.

One proponent of a Department of Urban Affairs, Dr. William C. Wheaton, writing in the December 1959 Civic Review, dismissed this alternative very effectively:

"Of the arguments against a Federal department dealing with urban problems, only one appears to have any substance. This is the contention that a Department of Urban Affairs would be a monster embracing most of the activities of the Federal Government. Indeed, that would be the case if we were to try to consolidate in one department all Federal programs dealing in any way with urban areas. We would then have within such a department a Division of Labor, a Division of Business, a Division of Health, Education, and Welfare, a Division of Conservation, and so on. This argues persuasively against a department dealing with all urban affairs."

Combine this with the ability to cut off Federal aid and this indeed would be a most powerful Federal office.

Still on this same problem of coordination, many county officials have raised the question of whether or not this new proposed Department might actually complicate coordination problems. Water and sewage are the key to urbanization. If, for example, you moved the water pollution control grant program to Urban Affairs, wouldn't you create coordination problems with other public health programs in HEW? with the State water pollution control agencies?

From the point of view of a local official trying to build a section federally aided of urban highways, imagine the coordination problem if the Director of Urban Construction is in the Department of Urban Affairs. First, he has to get approval of the highway location from the State highway department. This, in turn, must be approved by the district engineer in the Bureau of Public Roads in the Department of Commerce. Next, it would have to be approved by a field unit of some type in the Department of Urban Affairs. Those of you who have had experience with the location of local Interstate 70 (or Maryland 240) know that the problem of coordination now is endless.

COORDINATION

The Urban Secretary under this legislation is to coordinate urban affairs and the Federal agencies are not to be transferred to his Department under the terms of the present bill, which merely transfers some of the housing functions to the new Department. Congress may well discover that if this bill passes it has created an impossible administrative problem.

How for example is the Urban Secretary to coordinate Federal activities that are located in other Federal agencies? We have had national experience on this point and it is not encouraging. When the Bureau of the Budget was first created to coordinate Federal budgetmaking, it was a subunit of the Treasury. It just isn't practical for one Cabinet officer to coordinate his coequals in the Federal system (particularly from the junior status of the new Urban Secretary). It was found necessary, of course, to move the Bureau into the Executive Office of the President where the Bureau Chief reports directly to the only man who can make ultimate administrative decisions and terminate controversy.

The other alternative, and the one that some proponents of this legislation apparently envision, is that existing urban functions be transferred to the new Department. Indeed bills that have already been introduced in Congress, and other proposals that have been made, would envision placing in the Department some responsibility for public health, highway, railroad, airports, water and air pollution, juvenile delinquency, unemployment, civil defense, fire protection and prevention, education, and open space.

CHANGING CONCEPT OF FEDERAL ORGANIZATION

Perhaps the basic difficulty in trying to identify the exact role of a proposed Department of Urban Affairs lies in the fact that the existing 10 departments of government and all other Federal agencies are organized on a functional basis and the new Department would be organized on the basis of where people live. In the case of a function of government such as delivering the mail it is easy to decide what constitutes the limits of the function. Switching to place of residency as a basis for organization leaves you without a logical place to stop in assigning responsibilities and functions. As has been clearly demonstrated, we are overwhelmingly a nation of urban dwellers and so, logically, most Federal activities dealing with American citizens would tend to be concentrated in urban areas and be involved in urban affairs.

It is interesting to note that in the matter of civil defense, the President, faced with a similar dilemma of a problem so vast in its implications that it concerns nearly every department of the Federal Government (and States and localities, too) chose to reject the oft-made proposal of creating a new Department of Civil Defense and instead chose to reduce the staff of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization to a small planning body, and is delegating specific civil defense responsibilities to existing Federal functional agencies. This is not unlike the suggestion we have advanced here on urban affairs.

We feel the establishment of such a department may well empower large metropolitan cities to deal directly with the Federal Government, bypassing not only the States but local communities as well. In other words, it could create a new channel of communications, not only with respect to items concerning metropolitan problems but also lead to an extension of same to include various Federal grants now channeled through the States to local municipalities. Those of us at local government level have grave concern that the proposed Department, once set up, might strengthen the hand of the metropolitan core city to the extent that it would be in a position to dominate, because of its close association with the Federal Government, other local municipalities who operate contiguously to or within the periphery of the core city's metropolitan area.

If it is established, there should be sufficient safeguards to protect the rights of the States and home rule of the municipalities involved and a definition of the powers, functions, and area of operation, lest it become so powerful and dominant an agency of the Federal Government that it would endanger our Federal system.

SUMMARY

Should we not utilize and strengthen such tools of government already existent before embarking upon a new and untried system or setup? We believe the key to the solution of our urban problem is the joint Federal-State-local development and implementation of a national urban policy. This should be accomplished through agencies such as the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and a suggested Joint Congressional Committee on Urban Affairs. The President, with a strong staff assistant leading a small Bureau of Urban Affairs in the Executive Office of the President, could coordinate all the Federal agencies having urban responsibilities.

PRESIDENT FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Americans who have occupied the office of President of the United States from the time of George Washington have all been outstanding men. Some of them have been extraordinary men.

Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the House, through a special order procured by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], commemorated the life and services of a great American from Ohio, President William McKinley. Members showed their appreciation and respect for the great service of this great President by wearing red carnations which had been furnished by the Ohio delegation.

Today, through the courtesy of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], we are wearing white carnations to commemorate the administration and service of another of the great Presidents, the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It is doubtful whether in all the history of our country the service of any American has had a greater impact upon his day and generation and upon the welfare of the people of our country than that of the late Franklin Roosevelt, one of the greatest Presidents of all time, great in war, great in peace, and great in the hearts of his countrymen.

The New Deal legislation which developed here in the Congress of the United States during his administration set the pattern of legislative activity during ensuing years. The major legislative measures under consideration during the present session of Congress are projections from and expansions of basic laws enacted during the Roosevelt administration. One of these is the Trade Expansion Act, which is a natural successor of the first Reciprocal Trade Act passed under the administration of Franklin Roosevelt. Another is the medical care bill under social security. Here again we have an extension, an important and logical extension, of the great principle of the Social Security Act which was passed during the Roosevelt administration and signed by President Roosevelt.

Here was a man who understood the problems of his day. Here was a statesman who perhaps as much as any of the great Presidents in history foresaw the direction which our country must take if it was to meet the challenges of the future. Here was a President who left legislative landmarks that reach almost every important segment of American life, rural and urban, labor and management. Here was a great man who was loved by the American people, who was their articulate spokesman, who understood them and who responded with statesmanship of rare quality to their common needs. Here indeed was one of the extraordinary men of our history, one of the greatest statesmen of all time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks; and that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, a generation of Americans which does not remember the circumstances of Franklin D. Roosevelt's presidency is now coming of age; the great depression and the Second World War are matters of history to them, not memories of immediate and intense personal experience. It is increasingly important, therefore, that we pause annually to commemorate the birthday of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

At a time when world peace seems a dream, we must remember the days when dignity and self-respect seemed only dreams to millions of Americans. We must remember that Franklin D. Roosevelt gave us the faith to make dreams realities. And I think it vastly important to recall what he did to restore our economy and lead us through war: how he acted in accordance with the traditional democratic institutions of our Nation—expanding the fabric of rights and limitations to meet the grave challenges of the times.

Mr. Speaker, the memory of Franklin Delano Roosevelt should renew our confidence in the strength of our institutions and should give us courage in these difficult times.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, permit me to join with my colleagues in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the life and memory of one of the greatest men this country has produced, the great President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Today on the 80th anniversary of his birth we may gain inspiration from this man of great courage, great ability, and of action. Franklin Delano Roosevelt took the reins of leadership of the United States at a low point in our national history and successfully guided the country through some of its most trying times. President Roosevelt was never afraid to act in the national interest. He was never afraid to fight to protect and promote the public welfare. He was a people's President, and the name of Franklin D. Roosevelt shines as one of the brightest lights that has guided our Nation.

Today as we honor this great past President, we are fortunate to have as our Chief Executive a man who respects and honors the democratic traditions and principles of government. The important record of service that President Roosevelt achieved in his lifetime continues to benefit the Nation and the world long after his death. He was indeed the "happy warrior" whose place in the hearts of the people of our country and the Nation is assured.

JIM BENNETT AND 25 YEARS OF DEDICATED SERVICE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that one of our most distinguished and dedicated public servants, James V. Bennett, this week completes 25 years as Director of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons. He was first appointed to that important post on February 1, 1937. I can recall but few men who have served as the head of a major agency as long, and it is particularly significant when one considers the difficult, often thankless, task that Jim Bennett has. Many other men would have long since given up in sheer futility. But Jim Bennett accepted the problems of our prisons as a personal challenge and turned his stewardship into a record of exceptional achievement.

I first knew of Jim in the latter 1920's when as a management analyst for the old Bureau of Efficiency he was loaned to the Congress to investigate the Federal prisons. At that time these institutions were a disgrace to the Federal Government. Their deficiencies and irregularities repeatedly came to the attention of the Congress and the Committee on the Judiciary. With Jim Bennett's assistance the Congress was able to pinpoint what was wrong with our prisons and what could be done to improve them. He helped to write the legislation which in 1930 created the Bureau of Prisons and set forth its future course of development. Upon rereading the old congressional report which analyzed the shortcomings of our prisons and outlined the corrective steps which needed to be taken, I find that the events of the next 30 years faithfully followed the plan which the Congress endorsed. Jim Bennett must be given full credit for the manner in which he has fulfilled the mandate of the Congress, first as Assistant Director of the Bureau from 1929 to 1937, and, over the next 25 years, as its Director.

During those same years Jim Bennett has been a steadfast friend and helpful adviser to our Committee on the Judiciary. Although burdened with many responsibilities he has given freely of his time, energies, and ideas whenever I as friend and chairman have called upon him. His assistance was particularly invaluable in developing the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act in 1938, the 1948 statutes providing psychiatric services for the mentally ill charged with crime, the Federal Youth Correction Act in 1950, and the indeterminate and diagnostic sentencing statute in 1958. The latter two bills bore my name. More recently he has been of considerable aid to me in studying the problem of representation for indigent defendants in our Federal courts and in working out a proposal for adapting the public defender concept to the Federal jurisdiction.

But it is what he has done for our American prisons that will stand as his enduring monument. When he came upon the prison scene, our Federal institutions were neglected abodes for the wretched. Prisoners were cast aside like broken tools, never to be used again. Today the same Federal penal system is a model for all the nations and all the world to follow. Jim Bennett did more than improve the living conditions of Federal prisoners, more than improve their food and provide them with clean and decent quarters. He gave meaning to their prison experience and an opportunity for self-improvement and reformation. He provided honorable employment and vocational training to men who previously had served their sentences in stultifying idleness. He provided professional staffs to identify the problems which brought the offenders to prison and to develop programs to resolve or at least alleviate those problems. Jim did many other things as well to give the prisoner hope for a better and more useful life where once he could only serve out his time with a searing sense of hopelessness.

To accomplish these things Jim Bennett built up an expert and capable career service. Before he became associated with our Federal prisons, they were staffed by appointees without civil service status who regarded their work as nothing more than locking steel grilles and counting shuffling files of men. Inevitably these appointees were afflicted with a corroding sense of dissatisfaction and failure. Jim looked for men who wanted to be more than guards, and in developing programs for rehabilitating prisoners he gave his personnel a sense of pride and an esprit de corps which comes out of the knowledge that they are engaged in a work with the high purpose of salvaging human lives. Today there are no guards as such in the Federal prison system; while security duties are carried out efficiently, the prison workers gear their efforts toward changing the liabilities of our society into assets.

Because the Federal prison system now occupies its pinnacle of professional competence, Jim Bennett's advice and assistance are universally valued. It is a rare day when a Governor, a State prison commissioner, or a foreign prison official does not call at his office for advice on correctional problems. At their request he has traveled to many States and nations to study their institutions on the spot and to propose economical and practical means for improving facilities and programs. He has made the Federal institutions available to them as a training ground for their own prison personnel. Jim has also been active in international organizations, including the United Nations, in uplifting prison standards the world around.

But it is his accomplishments with the Federal prison system that have had perhaps the most profound influence on other prison systems, by giving them a guide to follow and a mark to shoot at. Penological theorists, for example, had long pondered the establishment of an open institution, a prison without walls, bars, or guns. It was Jim Bennett who had the courage and the technical know-how to give this idea reality. As a result of the successful operation of the Federal open institution at Seagoville, Tex., the idea has been adopted by other correctional systems and is most enthusiastically regarded by the underdeveloped nations, who cannot afford expensive prison fortresses of the traditional type. Secretary Gene Zuckert of the Air Force used the idea when, as an Undersecretary for Manpower in 1952, he organized the famed retraining group at Amarillo, Tex., to salvage court-martialed offenders. The Seagoville concept has also been adapted for use on every air base confinement facility. The savings to the taxpayer, both in costs of institutional construction and in terms of offenders reclaimed for productive lives, are of course tremendous. Jim Bennett's contributions are humanitarian, but they are also immensely practical.

The same humanitarianism is reflected in his concern over the quality of justice. Aware that men with similar characteristics and convicted of similar offenses were often committed to prison with widely disparate sentences, he has worked untiringly to help bring about more evenhandedness in our system of justice. As I have already commented, he helped me to approach this problem by developing improved sentencing procedures which would enable prisoners to be released when they were ready to lead useful lives rather than at the end of a flatly specified time. Now recognized as an expert on the problem of sentencing, he is invited by many courts and judicial groups to advise them in their search for ways of improving the administration of justice. He has also written extensively on this subject, as on other subjects related to his field, and the footnotes of legal and correctional literature are abundantly sprinkled with his name.

Jim Bennett is not one of those humanitarians who are concerned with mankind only in the abstract. He is humanitarian in his dealings with the individual. He has a personal interest in the welfare of each prisoner he encounters in his frequent inspections of Federal institutions. Many of them write to him, in prison or after their release, concerning their problems and accomplishments. He takes time out to respond, not because he regards it as his job but because he wants to. He worries when they run into difficulties in reestablishing themselves in their communities, and he shares their pride when they have made some achievement. More than one probation officer has received a check from him, invariably with instructions not to reveal its donor, to help out a parolee who is having a difficult struggle. Occupied with the affairs of an expanding penal system, he nevertheless undertakes to find a job, to give advice, or to make an unpledged loan—as his handsome wife Marie finds out when the household budget comes up short—to troubled ex-inmates who stop by his office.

Jim Bennett wastes little time reflecting on past accomplishments. It is the future that commands his attention. With youthful optimism he has often talked to me about his hopes for improvements yet to come in the field of corrections. He envisions a more extensive use of parole and probation with the development of better predictive devices, for he believes that institutions should be used only when community resources cannot meet the problem that the individual offender represents. He contemplates the final conversion of prisons into full-fledged treatment centers. With more efficient diagnostic techniques to guide programs of treatment. He thinks that community agencies should join hands with the prison in treating the family and the neighborhood where the basic problems of the offenders so often lie. He sees the evolution of the present halfway houses for juveniles into community centers for adult prisoners as well, where they can work at honest jobs in the community and at the same time receive supplemental corrective therapy. He hopes that someday society will cease sending to prison the offenders whose real problems are those of alcoholism, mental illness, or retardation, and physical disability. These and similar types of offenders, he believes, should be treated by agencies other than the prison, and I think that none of us can disagree with him. I will not discourse further on his ideas for the future, but I do want to point out that Jim Bennett is not a man who is content to rest on his laurels. It is characteristic of him that, with one job done, he sets his sights on another distant goal. And he means to reach it.

Jim Bennett is at the peak of his abilities and I am sure that he will make many more contributions to the welfare of his nation. I hope to see him in his office on the other side of Louisiana Avenue for many years to come. It will be reassuring to me, as I know it will be to all of us, to know that a man with his experience and ability is guiding the destiny of our prison system and persisting in the efforts to improve the administration of justice. I am proud of my friendship and association with Jim Bennett; and his many other friends in the House of Representatives will, I am sure, join with me in recognizing and commending his 25 years of solid achievement as Prison Director. It is men of his caliber, working quietly and earnestly and with little compensation other than the satisfaction which comes from helping others, who make the United States a better nation for us all.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I happen to be chairman of the special subcommittee dealing with penal institutions. It has been my pleasure over the years to work with Jim Bennett. He is a dedicated man and is probably the outstanding criminologist of our generation. I join with my chairman in extending him good wishes on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of his service to the Federal Government.

NBC'S DISSERVICE TO NEWBURGH, N.Y.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday night a TV program, entitled "White Paper No. 9—The Battle of Newburgh," was shown over a nationwide hookup.

The city of Newburgh, through its city council, gave permission to the network to take the pictures and get interviews in the city. The city council made only one stipulation, that the whole matter be treated impartially and factually. To this the network readily agreed.

The city of Newburgh now feels that their trust has been betrayed and their city harmed by the program, and I have received a telegram from the city manager to this effect. I have made some inquiries and find that the sentiments expressed in the message voice the feelings of the vast majority of the citizens of Newburgh. The telegram reads as follows:

> NBC "White Paper No. 9—The Battle of Newburgh" was totally lacking in objectivity and scholarship. It was hopelessly biased and misleading and did grievous damage to the city of Newburgh. The pledge of NBC director, Arthur Zegart, to be impartial and not harm the city was broken in shameless treachery. This attempt to whitewash the evils of welfare and destroy the cause of social reform will fool no one. NBC has done a gigantic disservice to the cause of impartial public enlightenment.
>
> JOSEPH McD. MITCHELL,
> *City Manager, Newburgh, N.Y.*

JAMES BENNETT COMPLETES 25 YEARS' SERVICE AS DIRECTOR OF FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join the distinguished Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], in paying tribute to Mr. James Bennett on this occasion, his 25th year of public service as Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

I had the privilege of working for a number of years with Mr. Bennett in the Department of Justice. I know something about the accomplishments he has made as Director of the Bureau. He is a man who has an enlightened approach to the subject of penology. He is a recognized world expert on the subject; and, indeed, on several occasions has been invited to other countries to address their local bodies and to instruct them as to the proper way in which to run a bureau of this kind.

He has been a faithful and devoted public servant; and to him and to his dear wife, Mrs. Bennett, we extend congratulations and best wishes for the future.

COLLEGE ACADEMIC FACILITIES ACT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 527 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8900) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, and to authorize financial assistance for undergraduate study in such institutions, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown]. And at this time I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Committee on Education and Labor for bringing to the floor of the House H.R. 8900. Our colleague the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green] should be especially congratulated on the outstanding work she has done over the years to enlighten the Congress and the people of our Nation of the necessity to provide for adequate facilities for all American students in order that they may secure the best education possible.

The American public is gradually learning that all our educational institutions will be one of the decisive battlefields in the fight for liberty and existence between the Communists and the free world. J. Edgar Hoover of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a foremost authority on communism said, and I quote:

> The successful Communist exploitation and manipulation of youth and student groups throughout the world today is a major challenge which free world forces must meet and defeat.

The people of the world and especially in the Western Hemisphere need more knowledge of history on the Communist movement. This can only be accomplished by sending out mentally equipped college graduate teachers, technicians, scientists, and experts in all fields of economic endeavors. The Communist leaders are terrified at knowledge and truth coming to the minds of millions in undeveloped countries. They will not allow truth to come to the ears of their own people and will strive to keep the light from all others. Last November the newspapers published statements of Castro in a 5-hour speech from Havana, Cuba, made at the graduation exercises of 800 college students. These schools are under the control and supervision of the Soviets.

This legislation, H.R. 8900, is a short step in the right direction. It will make possible for thousands of talented and industrious young folks of our Nation to secure the type of education which they will need in the future for our Government to compete with the highly organized propaganda machine of the Communist world.

H.R. 8900 is to assist all institutions of higher education in meeting an urgent need for expansion of their academic facilities. It seeks to accomplish these objectives through a 5-year program of grants and loans for building classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related academic and service facilities; also, it would authorize matching grants of $180 million annually and long-term loans of $120 million annually for construction of academic facilities.

Higher education in the United States faces both a crisis and a challenge in the coming decade. College enrollments, totaling 3,600,000 students in 1960–61, are expected to increase by more than 1 million, or 30 percent, in the next 5 years. By 1970 there is anticipated a gain of 66 percent over current enrollments. It is believed that the needs are so immediate that Federal assistance is warranted and required.

Institutions of high education are confronted with the task, within the next decade, of nearly doubling facilities it took three centuries to build. Failure to perform this task would force the colleges to turn away thousands of prospective students. The Nation could scarcely afford this waste of its intellectual resources at a time when its growing population and increasingly complex civilization will require many more physicists, chemists, mathematicians, public health workers, and other college-educated specialists.

Since 1950 the Federal Government has aided colleges and universities to build dormitories and other revenue-producing buildings for their students through the college housing program. Some 600 higher education institutions, both public and private, have obtained loans totaling nearly $1.5 billion under that program. H.R. 8900 moves a step forward by further aiding higher education institutions in constructing classrooms and other academic facilities.

The estimated cost of all programs in this bill, including administrative expenditures, is approximately $1.5 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 527.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. Is the fund provided in this bill within the appropriations budget for the current year?

Mr. MADDEN. I will have to ask the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green] to answer that question, whether this is set out in the budget or not.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Yes. To the best of my knowledge it is set up in the budget. The budget for fiscal 1963 contains funds to cover this bill.

Mr. BECKER. How are you going to finance this? Is it going to be through the back-door issuance of Treasury bonds?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. If the gentleman will look at page 17 of the bill, the committee felt that this eliminates the back-door spending. Beginning in line 12 it is stated:

> The maximum aggregate principal amount of such notes and obligations outstanding at any one time shall be such amount as may be specified from time to time in appropriation acts.

Mr. BECKER. Well, it says on line 9, though, I might point out, "In order to obtain funds for loans under this part B the Commissioner may from time to time issue notes and obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury." So, this is back-door spending, despite what the bill says in the next sentence. This states it is back-door spending, and it is not in the budget appropriation for this year. The reason I ask this is simply because I have taken the position of voting against the increase in the national debt limit in recent years because of the back-door spending issue, and regardless of the merits of this bill, I would be forced to vote against this legislation because it is back-door spending and not in the budget for which we ask the people to tax themselves.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I would like to point out that there will be no money appropriated for loans unless the appropriation act provides for it. There is no back-door spending in this bill. I think the record ought to be clear. You cannot have any loan even until there is an appropriation act approving it on this floor.

Mr. BECKER. How much is there in the budget, of the $180 million per year?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That has nothing to do with whether it is back-door spending.

Mr. BECKER. In other words, it does not have anything to do with where the money is coming from.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. We are talking about whether we get it through the Treasury or an appropriation act.

Mr. BECKER. I do not care about that. I want to know where the money is coming from.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 7]

Alford
Avery
Bass, N.H.
Battin
Chiperfield
Colmer
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Dulski
Ellsworth
Feighan
Ford
Gavin
Hagan, Ga.
Harrison, Va.
Hébert
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Hosmer
Jarman
Jones, Mo.
Loser
McDowell
McVey
May
Merrow
Miller, N.Y.
Moulder
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rostenkowski
Rutherford
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Shriver
Springer
Steed
Thompson, N.J.
Ullman
Van Pelt

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 390 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, on this rollcall I was present, but I failed to answer when my name was called.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's statement is made a part of the RECORD.

COLLEGE ACADEMIC FACILITIES ACT

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], has explained, this resolution makes in order the consideration of the bill H.R. 8900, which is a bill to furnish financial aid to institutions of higher learning, and it provides 2 hours general debate. A motion to recommit, either with or without instructions, will be in order.

I would like to discuss, if I may, for just a minute or two some of the provisions of this bill, and then some of the other matters concerning higher education I feel should be taken into consideration in connection with this legislation, and perhaps also in reference to other legislation that seemingly will come before the House in the future in connection with Federal Aid to Higher Education.

First of all, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House, if I may, to the title of this bill, and let me read it to you:

> To authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, and to authorize financial assistance for undergraduate study in such institutions, and for other purposes.

What does that last phrase mean? It means, of course, a reference only and solely to a provision in the original bill under which the Federal Government could give college scholarships at a cost of some $900 million. The legislative committee struck that out of the bill, but it left it in the title. In hearings before the Rules Committee, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], chairman of the subcommittee, very graciously stated she would not offer any amendment to restore that particular provision to the bill.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. At the proper time I intend to offer an amendment to strike from the title the words "and to authorize financial assistance for undergraduate study in such institutions."

Mr. BROWN. I am happy to hear that. I hope the House will adopt the amendment to be offered by the gentlewoman because I was ready to point out that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], who is not only a lady of charm but of splendid character as well, has publicly stated that as chairman of that subcommittee she would not introduce any legislation to restore the proviso or provisions for the Federal Government to give these scholarships at such a high cost. However, I did have that fear.

After consultation, I have learned in all probability any amendment to put back into this bill the provision for scholarships would be ruled out on a point of order as not germane to the bill itself, but that over on the other side of the Capitol it would be easy, under this present title, to restore such language and we would get it all back in conference.

I have seen some very strange and peculiar things happen in House-Senate conferences. So I am very happy that the gentlewoman has made the statement she has.

I would like to go to page 17 and to one other matter in this bill; that is, as to whether or not it does permit backdoor spending for these loans that are to be made.

Now, the bill reads, starting on line 9, page 17:

> In order to obtain funds for loans under this part B, the Commissioner may from time to time issue notes and obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Now, I do not know whether that is back-door spending or not. I know that explanations can be made, but if that is not back-door spending, it is certainly the nextdoor neighbor to it, because that is the way nearly $120 billion of American funds have been obligated, out of the Treasury, in past years in one way or another. Either you just go down and sign a note or an I O U, whatever the language, but it still results in taking money out of the Treasury without regular annual appropriations. Now, I am through on that point.

I want to talk about something else. Just a day or two before this bill came before the Committee on Rules—and earning an honest part of my living from the newspaper business and I follow the newspaper press wire reports rather closely; in fact, I am a subscriber for these different wire services—I had delivered to my desk, as usual, this particular item by the UPI, to which I subscribe, or my paper does:

> WASHINGTON.—Chairman ADAM C. POWELL of the House Education and Labor Committee—

I think you ought to have this information—

> advised that 40 Federal agencies are spending close to $2 billion yearly—

That figure has now been increased to somewhere around $2.4 billion or a little better, I understand—

> on education, said today he is blowing the whistle on further major school aid legislation until a study shows where all the money is going.
>
> It's unbelievable, the New York Democrat said of the estimate which he said was based on a preliminary check by Representative EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, chairman of a Subcommittee on Higher Education.
>
> Pending the study—which he said should be completed by summer—POWELL said he got White House clearance today for a decision to delay action on President Kennedy's $900 million college scholarship bill.
>
> Also to be sidetracked until the survey is done will be any effort to revive the President's controversial program of Federal aid for construction of public primary and secondary schools, POWELL told a reporter—

I presume that also applies to teachers' salaries—

> not affected by the announced go-slow decision is a measure already en route to the House floor to put $1.5 billion over 5 years

> into loans and grants for construction of college classrooms, libraries, and laboratories.

That is this particular bill—

> This bill is expected to come to a vote in the House shortly.

And it is before us now—

> POWELL and Mrs. GREEN outlined the study in a White House conference today with Theodore C. Sorensen, special counsel to President Kennedy. POWELL said Sorensen concurred in the decision to delay any further big push on schools until Mrs. GREEN'S subcommittee has finished its survey.
>
> He said the object is to avoid fragmentation of the Government's education efforts, which he said now are so widely scattered that more Federal funds are being spent in this field outside the Health, Education, and Welfare Department than in it.
>
> Some congressional sources viewed POWELL'S announcement as more of a justification than a basis for the decision by House education experts to abandon, at least temporarily, the President's scholarship bill.
>
> They contended the scholarships already have been sidetracked for fear there was not enough support yet to approve them. They said no real effort was planned anyway to emphasize the general construction bill.

That is quite encouraging to us—

> This measure foundered in the House last year on the rock of controversy over contentions that parochial schools also should be cut in on the Federal help.
>
> POWELL said Mrs. GREEN'S preliminary check turned up Federal education outlays of $1.7 billion and that when the full story is told the figure "probably will run to $2 billion."

Now, I understand it is $2.4 billion that is being spent annually on higher education by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, "he said"—and this is quoting Mr. POWELL again—"that he and Mrs. GREEN sought and got assurance from Sorenson that Federal agencies would cooperate in her study, which make up these different spending programs.

He said some agencies—he did not name them—heretofore have balked at answering her inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, I read this to the membership of the House because it is very interesting and it is very illuminating. I do this because none of us know, including the great Committee on Education and Labor which is dealing with this legislation, just where Federal money is being spent on higher education, or just how much. They say 40 or more agencies are involved—40 or more different agencies of the Government are spending money on higher education right now. Yet you and I as Members of the House of Representatives are being told, in our correspondence and in the messages we receive from some of those who want more from the Federal Treasury, that we do nothing for higher education.

Mr. Speaker, we have, I understand, pending at this time now before the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of this House a bill to deal with the need for Federal aid for medical and dental schools, and related activities such as the training of technicians, nurses, and so forth. I think every one of us can agree we do have a great shortage of physicians and other medical and, perhaps, dental specialists in this country. I undestand that bill would also take in many limited practitioners. I do not know whether it would take in "naturepaths" or not, but that it would many others.

Some have even said we need more veterinanians, especially on Capitol Hill, which may or may not be true.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it may be just as important for us to think about Federal aid to medical schools than it is to think about Federal aid to general higher educational institutions.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. POWELL, when he appeared before our committee, was very honest and frank in answering questions propounded to him by the chairman of the committee. He advised us that while this report was true, in its general terms, that he did not rule out the possibility of bringing in additional education legislation not mentioned specifically here. One of the measures he discussed before our committee, which he indicated will probably soon come before the Congress, is Federal aid for scientific schools and different classes of colleges and universities. What did he tells us? That there is a great need for more scientists because of NASA—whatever that outfit is called—which is getting ready to "shoot the moon." He said representatives of that agency had advised him and his committee they would soon need 14,000 more scientists in order to get to the moon, which is a very interesting situation.

Then we discussed other matters which might come before Mr. POWELL'S committee.

Mr. Speaker, why am I calling this to the attention of Members of the House? Because this is only the first bill we will have before our committee, or before the House, to deal with Federal aid to higher education in which we, of course, are all interested. However, it raises the probability, in my opinion, that the Congress must pick and choose as to where we can give this Federal aid, where it is most needed, and what schools should be involved. Already, of course, we have the National Defense Act; already we are loaning money for building dormitories through the Public Housing Act, and we are spending hundreds of millions—perhaps billions—through the Defense Department on education. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is making numerous grants to different higher institutions of learning for medical research and other related activities. The National Science Foundation is also making many such grants. Mr. Speaker, we could go on and on. I am sure Mr. POWELL, being the honest man that he is, did not overstate the present situation when he said that more than 40 different agencies of Government are engaged one way or the other in rendering financial and other aid to higher education.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken the floor this afternoon in connection with this rule to alert the House to the situation which confronts us, and to also agree absolutely with the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] and with Chairman POWELL, that there is a great necessity for a complete and thorough congressional study of the Federal aid programs for higher education which now exist, before we go too far in enacting other legislation, taking it piecemeal, bite by bite, which of course sometimes makes it easier to swallow.

But it also makes me wonder if all these present aid programs are to be continued if these new bills, mentioned by the chairman when before our committee—new Federal aid bills for higher education—are to be brought before this House, just how the President—and I want to help him—is going to balance his budget; or where we are going to get the money, or whether or not these young people whom we educate in these Federal aid institutions will be able to earn enough money to pay off the huge national debt we have been amassing over the years by continually spending more money than we take in.

And you may or may not have noticed the official statement of yesterday from the Federal Treasury that our national debt had reached $297,900 million, just $100 million, or even a little less, under the temporary debt limit, and almost $13 billion above the permanent debt limit written into law by this Congress.

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BROWN. Briefly.

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I am a trustee of a small Baptist nonprofit, religious, sectarian school down in Kentucky. Will this bill provide grants for my college?

Mr. BROWN. As I understand, it may not include grants, but it does include loans for such schools.

Mr. SILER. The bill says grants.

Mr. BROWN. It also says 60 percent for grants and 40 percent for loans. I may be wrong, but as I read the bill, the grants would not apply to private schools, but the loans would.

Mr. SILER. That would be at a subsidized rate?

Mr. BROWN. Forty percent, with at least 25 percent of the total amount requested to be furnished by some other source, such as the church or some other group.

Mr. SILER. Believing that this would violate the church-state principle I am very much opposed to it.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL].

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I am one who firmly believes that it will augur well for the Nation when the Congress of the United States takes the question of education out of the field of politics. For the last few years Federal aid to education has become a really hot issue here.

It is my opinion that of all the bills before the Committee on Education the bill before us today, the legislation offered by Mrs. GREEN is by far the most important piece of legislation we have in the field of education. I know there are those who do not agree with me. I know that this is a rewrite of Mrs. GREEN'S bill of last year with which in part I was not in agreement; that is, with her scholarship provision.

But higher education is an absolute prerequisite of today and tomorrow for the social and economic development of the world. It will be a condition of our national survival. Everyone must be educated to the limit of his potential. If not, he will be a liability to society; that is, if he cannot and does not get this education. Education is the greatest resource a country can have. It is its capital. There can be no oversupply of educated people.

Consider our problems with regard to our needs today. In the field of medicine we need more doctors, nurses, teachers, technicians, and research experts. Whatever field we go into we need more; we need more chemists, we need more physicists, we need more accountants. We need everything you can possibly think of. What is the problem facing us? I live in a district in which within 15 miles from my home there are 70,000 undergraduate students in colleges; approximately 130,000 to 150,000 students are taking graduate work; and over 200,000 are going to college in my area.

What has happened? A survey has been made recently. Within the shadows of my home is Harvard University. It is my understanding that Harvard University has no further intention of expanding. Why? Because today for every student who attends Harvard University it costs the university $800 over and above the tuition the student pays; in other words, the college must get it from endowment funds, the college must get it from gifts, the college must get it from subscriptions. So this great university, Harvard, has no real intention of expanding in the future because they cannot afford to.

Down the street from Harvard is the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, one of the great technical schools of the world. For every pupil that goes to MIT it costs MIT between $1,400 and $1,600 over and above what the pupil pays as tuition.

Where is the money going to come from? Endowments? Money is coming from endowments now. Subscriptions? Money is coming from subscriptions now. They have not any intention of any great expansion program.

Further inquiry showed there are only four schools in Greater Boston or in New England that intended to expand: Those were Boston College, Boston University, Northeastern, and Brandeis. The Ivy League schools, and other colleges such as Williams and Amherst, have no intention of expanding because they run into the same problems that Harvard and MIT run into.

We have an obligation to educate the youth of America. By 1965 at the present rate we in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts—and there are 166 colleges in New England, more than any other section of the Nation—in Massachusetts this past year 4,000 students, graduates of high schools, were unable to get into college. They have the ability, they have the marks, they have the desire, they have the money, but there was no room for them; and by 1965 it is said that figure will increase to 20,000.

This is not just a local issue for Massachusetts alone; this issue is in every backyard of every Congressman in the United States. So there is an obligation to educate the youth of America. How are you going to do it? You cannot get aid from cities, you cannot get aid from States, because fundamentally all have the same tax base, which is real estate; and we are overtaxed. If democracy is a success, and I believe it is a success, we must provide for the future of American youth. Where does the obligation fall? The obligation falls upon the Federal Government to move in and participate with private institutions and with public institutions, because this is an obligation that we in America have. The leaders of this Nation in the future are going to be the youth who are being educated today. We have been in a cold war, we have been in a hot war, we have been in a limited war.

The war of the future could well be the war of the minds of the youth of tomorrow. It is our duty and our obligation to see that they are educated. In my personal opinion I think this is a fine bill and I think it is an obligation upon this Congress to pass it.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I hope the gentleman from Kentucky is on the floor for I think he does not quite understand the bill. The money provided in the bill is available to any college or university in the country. It is a 60–40 basis, 60 percent grants, 40 percent loans; I would say to my colleague from Kentucky that in his own congressional district he has, if my information is correct, three universities, or three colleges, one Baptist and two Methodist. During the last few years his own congressional district has received in loans and grants from the Federal Government a total of $461,953. So we are not setting any precedent; the Government is not embarking upon a new program. This is a program we have had in effect. Through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Baptist college received $84,514; the Bennett College, Methodist, $7,084; and Union College $70,355, and $300,000 in housing grants. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. I just want to say to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, that I can understand his pride in his own State and the number of colleges and universities, but the gentleman from Ohio now speaking can probably understand this problem better than most Members on the floor, because Ohio, a little State out in the Midwest, has the greatest number of colleges and universities of any State in the Union, with Massachusetts second.

Mr. O'NEILL. Then the gentleman is in an excellent situation to understand the problems in our State and I hope we may have his support in trying to solve them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, before voting on this bill we should consider this aspect very carefully: Is this proposal actually a step forward for private higher education?

A generation ago the Federal Government had very little to do with these private institutions. They were truly private in character, deriving their income entirely from tuition, endowments, and other gifts.

Today these colleges and universities have become so involved with various Federal spending programs that several of them have staff members who spend most of their time coordinating relations with the Federal Government.

They have access to surplus property of all types, borrow at low interest for dormitory construction, receive grants for research and study by students and faculty, and receive funds for student loans.

The fact that today we have before us a proposal for $400 million in new loans and grants typifies the trend of recent years. The tendency is to add to the scope of Federal spending for higher education, both private and public.

No one can doubt that the need exists for more college facilities. On the other hand, no one can seriously suggest that this bill would tap some magic new source of money. Ultimately the resources must come from individual citizens and business firms, whether the money takes the route of voluntary contributions or taxation.

From the standpoint of private institutions, the tax route is dangerous. If it continues, these schools will lose their private character.

As they tap new public sources of revenue, their private sources will dry up. Individuals and business firms which traditionally contribute to private institutions will say, "If my college can get 25 percent of its income needs from the Federal Government, why not 50 percent or 100 percent?"

As private schools lean more heavily on tax sources, they come under the thumb of government. They lose their independence of judgment and action. They gradually blend into the facade of public education.

Federal aid ultimately means Federal control. This is just as true in higher education as it is in primary and secondary education. It would be irresponsible for any level of government to provide funds without controlling how they are used.

If private institutions of higher education are worth preserving—and I believe very deeply they are—then we would better go slow on bills such as the one before us today.

My own college, Illinois College, of Jacksonville, Ill., last year issued this thoughtful comment:

> The real danger lies in the elimination of the private sector of higher education which has contributed so much to American life. No one would deny the need for tax-supported institutions, but no careful viewer

of the American scene can conclude that it would be in the best interests of America for all higher education to be tax supported. The only escape the private colleges have from becoming tax-supported institutions is the generous contributions of churches, corporations, alumni, and friends. There is plenty of evidence that the needs of Illinois College and others of its kind can be met through philanthropic contributions, and in this direction lies the wise course which will preserve in higher education the essential element of independence which has kept America strong.

Although Illinois College has participated in these Federal programs, it can also see clearly their insidious character.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, as my very good and able friend, our former colleague, Robert Rich, would say—"Where are you going to get the money?"

I want to call to your attention that Federal aid programs such as the one we are considering today are based on the fallacy that Uncle Sam is everybody's rich uncle, whose pockets are inexhaustible; and that when you secure Federal aid you are receiving something for nothing. Why fool ourselves? We all pay the bill.

The truth is that we, his nephews and nieces, all support our Uncle Sam who over the past 25 years or so has run up the biggest debt in our history—approximately $298 billion that must be paid by the American people earning the money to pay the taxes to retire the debt. What a legacy to leave to future generations. If we paid it off at the rate of $3 billion a year, it would take 100 years to pay the debt.

The trouble is that Uncle Sam has been spending our money and in effect we have signed the notes for the hundreds of billions of dollars he owes.

The surest way to increase his debts and add to this gigantic debt is to embark on a new program such as we are considering here today, H.R. 8900 which would authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, and so forth of needed academic facilities. It looks like "a foot in the door" and I am against the Federal Government being in the education field in any way, shape, or manner.

Every dollar spent on Federal aid will come, sooner or later, from the pockets of American taxpayers, whether it is under the supervision of the Federal or the State government.

As in the case of every other Federal aid program, many of these dollars will be skimmed off the top to pay more Federal officials to distribute the payments, to administer the program, to think up more rules and regulations which may well result in more delay and redtape.

It is the habit of Federal supervisors to make dollars shrink instead of stretch. If there is ever a necessity for stretching dollars, it exists now in making the tax dollar go as far as possible.

Federal aid is always accompanied by a greater or lesser degree of Federal control. It is the opening wedge toward having directors in Washington tell them what they can do and what they cannot do.

A large part of the problem we have today is one of self-discipline on the part of the Government and on the part of the American people themselves. The Government within the executive branch must make a constant effort to curtail and eliminate nonessential expenditures. Special groups, rather than popular demand, are responsible for the push behind most Federal aid programs. The American people themselves must make an effort to curtail the constantly new and expanding demands upon the Federal Government for services, benefits, and free money—for the people themselves must pay the heavy taxes to the Federal Government before the Government can return it for these various programs.

Once a program of Federal aid is established, it almost invariably continues to grow and become more expensive.

To the outside groups which worked for its establishment and continue to support it, there is added another group within the Government. This is the group who administer the program—and who keep pressing for more money for it.

Each bureau within an agency is ambitious to build a little empire—with more employees to supervise, with higher salaries for the top men, with more money to spend, at the expense of the taxpayers. Larger and larger budgets result—such as the huge spending program proposed this year.

But the time has come for the American public to realize that we all pay the bill on all Federal aid programs.

Every taxpayer in America must pay his part for all of these programs. Federal aid and giveaway programs by Uncle Sam must be paid for. The taxpayer thinks he is getting something for nothing in these Federal aid programs. In reality he is footing the bill for every one of these programs that is put through.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote against the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there is one feature in this bill that I think would pave its way a little more smoothly if the committee would eliminate it. Under the loan provision of the bill there is a provision for Treasury loans, which are commonly known as back-door spending. It has an ameliorating sort of a clause in back of it that I do not exactly understand, but there are a good many Members of this House who have expressed themselves on rollcall votes a number of times as not supporting any measure that called for Treasury loans or back-door spending. I take this time to express the hope that the committee itself will work out some provision in the bill to eliminate the back-door spending and make this on a straight appropriation basis. Now, there are a number of measures I know that have been in here where a right plausible excuse has been given. It was not plausible to me because I just do not believe in back-door spending and I do not think it is ever justified. I do not think that the Constitution permits it. Of course, when you speak of the Constitution nowadays nobody pays very much attention to you.

Mr. Speaker, I know there is strong sentiment here that we should get rid of this back-door spending. I can perceive of no plausible excuse for it in this bill. If there is excuse for it anywhere, it certainly does not exist in this bill.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Virginia yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Rules Committee is absolutely correct. The committee deleted the language in the present bill which covers the elimination of back-door spending. However, in order to remove any cloud around this bill, with the approval of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], Congressman SMITH of Iowa will introduce at the proper time an amendment which will take care of that matter.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am very glad to hear that.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have about a minute of time left. I would like to be mutual about this thing, and ask a question of the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the committee [Mr. POWELL]. I believe the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] stated when he was before the Rules Committee when this bill was up, that there were some 43 agencies of Government dealing with public education, and that the gentleman's committee had reached the conclusion that it was time this thing was brought together in a sensible, orderly program, and that the gentleman's committee would make an investigation to that effect; is that correct?

Mr. POWELL. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I congratulate the committee on that action, and I do hope we will get an early report on that subject. As a matter of fact, it seems to me that it would not be inadvisable to postpone some of these educational programs until we find out which way we are heading, and where we are going, and where we are going to wind up.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman for the position which he has taken, and to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor for making the statement that the bill will be amended so as to take out the back-door spending item. It certainly will make the bill more palatable. I raised this question at the beginning of the debate on the rule.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, during the 25 years that I have been a Member of this House, the Federal budget has increased from a little less than $6 billion a year to the requested $92.5 billion. The Federal debt has risen from approximately $18 billion to $298 billion, or whatever it is.

Mr. Speaker, those things have happened in the last 25 years. Of course, the Federal taxes have increased in the same proportion. Is it not time to stop, look, and listen before we authorize further spending?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL]. I was not aware that Harvard University was operating. I thought it had probably closed down, since all the faculty is in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question about the supergrade provision in this bill. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee why 10 supergrades are provided?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. This bill was introduced in August and on October 4, I believe, a bill was signed into law that came out of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House. Recently I had a discussion and a conference with the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS] and we have agreed that we are going to delete that section when the proper time arrives. I certainly do not want a bill coming out of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House that is in conflict with the law, as of October 4, 1961.

Mr. GROSS. I simply wanted to call the gentlewoman's attention to the fact that this provision runs afoul of the law with respect to supergrades.

Mr. Speaker, apparently we are going to rewrite this bill on the floor of the House. This section, then, is going to come out?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. The gentlewoman from Oregon is going to offer an amendment to take this section out?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. If the gentleman will yield, I do not think we will rewrite the bill on the floor of the House. This is a committee bill, and it was approved by the committee. However, we consider the suggested amendment as a perfecting amendment, and will offer it in that way.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask a question of the gentlewoman, or the chairman of the full committee, Mr. POWELL, regarding the interest rates which are contained in this bill. Is the top interest rate 2¾ percent?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The formula on the interest rate is patterned after the college housing interest rate, and I believe the interest rate at this time is 3⅜ percent.

Mr. GROSS. The gentlewoman is aware that this Government is faced with a stupendous task in this calendar year of refinancing $56 billion of Government obligations that are coming due. That figure, I am informed, is within $200 million of the alltime record of refinancing in any one year.

How does the gentlewoman think this Government is going to be able to refinance obligations totaling $56 billion at 2.5 percent interest when the commercial banks are now paying 4 percent on savings deposits left for a period of 12 months? Does the gentlewoman believe there is any 2.5 percent or 2¾ percent money available to the Federal Government?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that the picture is not very pretty to look at the richest man in the graveyard. We are engaged in a cold war, and if we are going to win this cold war, we are going to have to compete with the young people in the colleges and universities of this country.

Mr. GROSS. That has nothing to do specifically with the subject of interest rates. Will the gentlewoman tell me where the Government is going to borrow money at 2½ or 2¾ percent?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that I think this country is great enough, rich enough, and powerful enough so that we can meet any challenge which the Soviets and the Communist world throw at us.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the Government is not now going to get money for refinancing its obligations at 2½ or 2¾ percent interest. I do not think anyone in this Chamber can say otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for obligations upon the U.S. Treasury of well above $1 billion. With the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] I ask the question of where this Nation, already head over heels in debt, expects to get the money? It will be noted that the simple question of how it is expected to borrow the money at an interest rate of 2½ or 2¾ percent goes unanswered.

This legislation will open the door wide to Federal aid to education and those who have spoken so soothingly of bipartisan support for the bill should be the first to admit it, and admit they have joined in rounding a big curve on the road to raiding the Federal Treasury for a general Federal aid to education bill.

For these and other reasons I want the RECORD to show that I am opposed to this bill.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor. In view of the fact that there is judicial review in this bill for the State commissions, would the gentleman be disposed to accept an amendment that would provide judicial review of the Davis-Bacon Act in the setting of all wages in this country, from which ruling of the Secretary of Labor there is no recourse, not even in the courts of this land? Would the chairman extend that to the Davis-Bacon Act?

Mr. POWELL. That question is not before us now. There will come a time in this session when amendments to the Davis-Bacon Act will be before this body.

Mr. ALGER. This would be an appropriate time, does not the gentleman think so?

Mr. POWELL. Not now, when we are considering higher education.

Mr. ALGER. I would suggest that this is exactly the time that we should do it and extend judicial review to the Davis-Bacon Act, which we should have had all along.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND], a member of the committee.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, some of us who are opposed to this particular bill have at times been accused of, or it has been implied, that we are opposed to education as such. Everybody in this House is in favor of education, especially those of us who have been pretty close to the picture, pretty close to the management of some of our colleges and know some of their problems. May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the colleges of this great country have done a perfectly magnificent job up to now. They are turning out around a million students a year. Many of the colleges have said that they have no need for additional space just now. The great State universities are expanding rapidly and are well financed with taxpayers' money. Whether the taxpayers' money should come to Washington and then go back, is the issue. That involves, of course, control. Many people try to tell us that Federal aid does not carry with it control. Mr. Speaker, control has to go right with the money. It is the obligation of this body to see to it that the taxpayers' money is properly expended for the purposes for which it was voted. The obligation to control is there. The Supreme Court has said that when the Federal Government subsidizes anything it has the right to control. So there is no issue there.

With any Federal aid bill must go control. There are plenty of precedents for that. I suggest that in the National Defense Education Act, which has been mentioned, when it was said there are no major controls, I thumbed through and found six or eight of them. It is full of controls. It has to be. The Federal aid to education in the national defense education bill has been highly praised by a great many people. However, you may recall that it was enacted under the pressure of the sputnik panic. We had to do something to get more engineers and scientists, more engineers and scientists, more engineers and scientists. Then let us look at the way this law has operated. There were a great many controls. True, the designation of the courses under the National Defense Education Act included, I find, classical languages. That means extinct languages, of course. It included Latin-medieval-humanistic philology; contemporary literature; American literature; medieval and renaissance English literature; literature of the drama; bibliography and textual criticism; 20th century British and American literature and criticism; and English: folklore; dramatic art; speech and drama; theater and speech; church music; musicology; religion, under which there are included Biblical and Judaeo-Christian studies, church history and Christian ethics, history and philosophy, religion studies; and under American studies, folklore. Also there are included under art, history thereof. I am reliably informed that folk dancing and basket weaving are included. Also school administration, and a great many other subjects which it would be difficult for us to imagine would develop engineers and scientists. Many of these are fine, worthy, and valuable courses, but do they develop engineers and scientists?

I agree that we need engineers and scientists, but when we give the educators authority to line up courses they go very far afield and the taxpayers' money finances hundreds of thousands of students for these types of courses.

The need for this legislation, of course, is a paramount issue; that will be shown by a number of the proponents of the bill, I am sure. However, a lot of people have claimed that today the need does not exist for added facilities, that the educationists are planning now only for a future need. I suggest also that in the title there is an obvious error. I have an amendment which I intended to introduce at the proper place, which would definitely strike from the title, "and to authorize financial assistance for undergraduate study in such institutions." This should prevent the effort of the other body to include the grandiose plans for student aid included in the administration's request. I am informed, however, that the gentlewoman from Oregon, the sponsor of the bill, has agreed to move it.

This is Federal aid to education, Mr. Speaker. I am reminded of a story of the little girl who did not like spinach. Her mother said: "This is broccoli." The little girl said: "You call it broccoli; but I call it spinach, and I will not have it." This is Federal aid to education and there is no denying the fact.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A further message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

BILL TO PROVIDE APPROPRIATIONS FOR VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION IN ORDER TOMORROW, JANUARY 31

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a joint resolution providing appropriations for the Veterans' Administration may be in order for consideration tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 529

Resolved, That JOHN M. ASHBROOK, of Ohio, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PURCHASE OF UNITED NATIONS BONDS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 321)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith for the consideration of the Congress a suggested bill "to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor." This bill would authorize the appropriation of up to $100 million for the purchase of United Nations bonds.

The United Nations is faced with a financial crisis due largely to extraordinary expenditures which it incurred in fulfilling the pledges in its charter to secure peace, progress, and human rights. I regard it as vital to the interests of our country and to the maintenance of peace that the capacity of the United Nations to act for peace not be inhibited by a lack of financial resources.

Some members have failed to pay special assessments levied for peacekeeping operations in the Middle East and in the Congo, claiming that these assessments are not binding upon them. The shortage of operating funds thus created has reduced the working capital fund of the United Nations to zero and compelled it to hold back on the payment of bills and borrow from United Nations agencies.

Prudence and good management require all institutions—public or private, national or international—to keep their affairs in good financial order. The Secretary General of the United Nations therefore urged the adoption of, and the members approved by a large majority, a three-point plan to relieve the cash deficit and to avoid the need for makeshift financing of emergency operations designed to keep or restore the peace:

Point one is to cover anticipated expenses for the United Nations operation in the Congo and for the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East through the end of the present fiscal year. The 16th General Assembly approved a new appropriation for these purposes, assessed against all members.

Point 2 is to resolve all doubt as to whether delinquent members must pay special assessments for the Congo (ONUC) and Middle East (UNEF) operations, or face the loss of their voting rights. To this end, the United Nations General Assembly requested from the International Court of Justice an advisory opinion as to whether these special assessments, like regular assessments, are expenses of the Organization legally binding on all members by the terms of the United Nations Charter.

It is the opinion of the United States that special assessments voted by a two-thirds majority of the General Assembly are obligatory. We anticipate a decision by early summer of this year. If our view, which is shared by most of the members of the United Nations, is confirmed by the Court, then all members will have to pay their dues or lose their right to vote in the General Assembly. It is only fair that members that participate in the privileges of membership should participate also in its obligations.

Even if the Court's opinion goes as we believe it should, the United Nations would still be faced with a serious cash problem, aggravated by any further delays in collecting back dues from those who have not been willing to pay the special assessments. Consequently,

Point 3 of the United Nations financial plan is to acquire a special fund to relieve the present cash deficit by paying off current bills and debts, and by setting aside a reasonable reserve to help finance United Nations peacekeeping operations in future emergencies.

For this purpose the General Assembly has authorized the Secretary General to issue $200 million worth of United Nations bonds repayable at 2 percent interest over a 25-year period with annual repayments charged against the budget of the United Nations. All members are assessed a share of that budget.

If this program is successful, the United Nations will be in a vastly improved financial position. It is my judgment that this plan is sound both for the United Nations and for its members. These bonds will be repaid with interest at the rate of approximately $10 million a year, as part of the regular assessment. Every nation—including the Soviet Union—will thus be required to pay its fair share or lose its vote. And the United States will be obligated, in the long run, to meet only 32 percent of these special costs instead of the nearly 50 percent we are presently contributing to the special operations of the United Nations.

I ask that the Congress act now to back the United Nations by authorizing the purchase of these bonds. Failure to act would serve the interests of the Soviet Union, which has been particularly opposed to the operation in the Congo and which voted against this plan as part of the consistent Communist effort to undermine the United Nations and undercut its new Secretary General. For without the bond issue, either the United Nations' executive arm will wither or the United States will be compelled to pay a larger share of the costs of operation than is reasonable for any one member of an international organization.

The central purpose of the United Nations is to keep the peace wherever possible and to restore the peace whenever it is broken.

The United Nations has received the support of both political parties since its inception.

By emergency action the United Nations turned back aggression in Korea.

By emergency action the United Nations brought a halt to war in the Middle East over 5 years ago, and ever since has safeguarded the armistice lines.

By emergency action the United Nations has prevented large-scale civil war and avoided great-power intervention in the Congo.

We shall spend this year nearly one-half of the Federal budget for national defense. This authorization represents an investment of one-tenth of 1 percent of that budget in the peacekeeping capacity of the United Nations.

Whatever its imperfections, the United Nations effectiveness and existence are an essential part of the machinery to bring peace out of this world of danger and discord.

I earnestly hope that the Congress will give early and favorable consideration to this request.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 30, 1962.*

COLLEGE ACADEMIC FACILITIES ACT

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8900) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, and to authorize financial assistance for undergraduate study in such institutions, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 8900 with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS] for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8900, a bill to authorize the assistance to institutions of higher education, in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of academic facilities.

I would like to inform this body that the bill comes out of the Committee on Education and Labor with bipartisan support. Not all of the members of the minority voted in favor of it, but a considerable group did. The final passage was 22 to 6.

I could not go any further without complimenting the gentlewoman from Oregon who has done such a great job on this bill and other legislation coming before her subcommittee.

I would like to reply to my good friend of almost 20 years, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. He knows what I am going to say because I said this to him in the colloquy that was held before the Rules Committee. While it is true that some of us feel that there is an overlapping in the spending of funds in the field of higher education by some 40 Federal agencies, totaling at least $2,200 million per year and that this overlapping leads to a fragmentation of our educational impact, I would like to point out that money is being spent in the field of scholarships and grants but not in the field of building academic facilities.

This is the first time that this body has considered a bill to build academic facilities; therefore, we come to you, in the language of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN], with an utterly new program.

The population explosion will confront our schools of higher learning with a 30-percent enrollment increase by 1965, and with a 100-percent increase by 1970. At the same time, the demands of the Nation challenge our colleges and universities to produce needed scientific personnel.

There are 8.7 million college-age youths in our country. In the school year 1960–61 only 3.6 million of them were in college. How many of the 5 million youths could find no place? How many of them just did not have the money it costs?

The Committee on Education and Labor believes that the needs are so great and so immediate that Federal assistance is required.

We are committed to a national effort in space technology and defense that will soon reach beyond our education effort to fill. I was alerted to this possibility 7 years ago, when Benjamin Fine wrote in the New York Times about the needs of higher education and warned us that we could not wait until the horse was stolen to lock the barn door. I called this to the attention of the Committee on Education and Labor, of which I was a member, and introduced legislation to increase the supply of scientific and technical manpower in the United States. These bills were buried in the committee. Mrs. GREEN's effort to investigate Federal expenditure for higher education was also buried. Today we are, therefore, 7 years behind.

I now say again that our need for ever-increasing numbers of engineers and other scientists, for physicians, for teachers, for mathematicians, is of the most urgent dimension. The fact is that whatever the differences between the two dominant powers of the world—the United States and Russia—we are required to compete with the Soviets whether we wish it or not.

The Special Subcommittee on Education, chaired by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], traveled to Russia last fall. They found, among other things, that while the United States is training almost twice as many college graduates as the Soviet Union, we are far behind them in training engineers and people in the applied and theoretical science fields, including agricultural science and medical science.

I am frankly terrified at the picture just presented to us by Dr. Nicholas DeWitt. His recent book, Education and Professional Employment in the U.S.S.R., makes it painfully clear that we are not producing engineers, physicians, and some other specialists at any rate that will allow us to maintain a posture of strength before the world. Unless we work with all deliberate speed, we cannot hope to put a man on the moon within 10 years. Russia produces three times as many engineers as this country does. I emphasize this field of learning because it is the one of greatest application to our national commitment to the conquest of space and to our vital research and development projects.

Last fall I appointed five members of the Committee on Education and Labor to serve as an advisory group to study the problems of higher education and recommend priorities of effort to solve some of the problems.

To meet expanding enrollments, the colleges are being forced to drain their general funds and to increase tuition and other fees. This spiral can only end in the cost of higher education being so prohibitive that only a fortunate few of the upper class or the well-to-do will be able to go to college. We cannot afford such a state of affairs at a time when our country needs more, not less, trained manpower than ever before.

Since 1950 the Federal Government has aided colleges and universities to build dormitories and other revenue-producing buildings for their students through the college housing program. It is fair to say that, at this point, many colleges can house their students but cannot educate them. The gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND], a member of my committee, is in error when he says that the facilities of the colleges and the universities are adequate. Even such an eminent school as Johns Hopkins, has room in its dormitories but teachers find difficulty in finding classroom space.

I do not support this bill today only to justify a comparison of our achievements with those of our adversaries. This measure is justified on its own merit and on our own need to educate better citizens as well as better scientists and soldiers.

The bill before us does not address itself to the problem of scholarships. It is my hope, however, that an appropriate student assistance program to meet the problem of the able but extremely needy student will be considered later in conjunction with future review of the operation of the existing student loan program under the National Defense Education Act.

Another measure of great urgency we hope to bring before this House will recommend the establishment and expansion of technical institutes for the training of semiprofessional technicians. Experts maintain that we should be training at least one technician for each graduating engineer. We are now producing only about one for every four.

It is my hope, also, that this House will later consider legislation to extend student loans under the National Defense Education Act to medical and dental students and interns. These are what I call the areas of neglect in the field of higher education. The long period of training and the high cost of getting that training represents years of hardship to the young men and women who undertake to become doctors and dentists. We have been warned here, too, that the alarming decline in applications to medical and dental schools shows no sign of an upward swing and we will be in serious trouble a few years hence.

We must start on these emergency and modest programs immediately, and consideration of H.R. 8900 today is the first of the priorities we will urge upon you. Such programs will pay back in actual return far more than they cost because we will have at least mounted an initial attack against the growing obsolescence of our present support to higher education, an obsolescence that is a luxury this country cannot afford.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8900. I do it because of the information that the Special Education Subcommittee, on which I have been serving the last year, has received in the testimony and the hearings we held and also because of the information from individuals connected with our various higher education institutions throughout the country which appeared before the advisory group that Chairman POWELL just spoke of. Practically to a man, these individuals came to us and said the highest priority of assistance in education, especially in higher education, is assistance for college academic facilities such as we have in this proposal.

This is true no matter whether they were involved in the fields of science or math or languages or in the humanities. This was a priority to them.

Mr. Chairman, in looking at the needs it has been pointed out time after time that the enrollment in the next 5 years will increase by about one-third, and that very probably by 1970 they will have doubled from what they are at the present time. Now, how can we best assist higher education? I think it is through this piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that this is not the bill which was recommended last year by the President. His recommendation was for loans similar to what we presently have for college dormitories and income-producing buildings. But, after listening to the testimony for some time we realized that the recommendation of such men as Dr. Hovde of Purdue University or Dr. Flemming, who was formerly the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, was right; that if we were going to give them assistance which would actually accomplish what we needed, some of the money had to come in the form of grants because the income-producing buildings have a way of repaying their loans. However, there are only two places that the schools receive their money with which to pay for classroom facilities—that is, classrooms, laboratories or libraries—and that is either through increased tuition or holding down the salaries of the professors. We felt that neither is advisable. So in order to enable them to go before their State legislatures or to wherever they endow their colleges and universities, we are saying for every $2 you put up $1 will be put up by the Federal Government as an inducement and encouragement for them.

Mr. Chairman, the big bulge of enrollment which came after the war in our elementary schools and which is now in our high schools will hit the colleges and universities. They will have to make provision for these students at a rapid rate, much more rapid than they have had to do in the past. For this reason, I believe we need this kind of assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that grants as provided in this bill are needed if we are going to give the actual assistance which is needed. This was not recommended by the President, however, I will point out that under the President's recommendation there actually would have been grants, but they were hidden. Under his proposal a huge scholarship program was provided and for every Federal scholarship recipient $350 in addition would have gone directly to the institution. In my opinion it would be a bit of a subterfuge to give grants to institutions in this way and there would have been no way to channel it only to institutions which increased enrollment. In the present budget which the President recommended there was $300 million for loans. However, there was also in his budget the money for the grants to the institutions, the whole thing totaling, as I understand it, $900 million for the year. So we are not going outside the budget by recommending this amount of money and this kind of assistance for the colleges and universities.

Mr. Chairman, under the formula on which this money will be granted to the States, the grants will go in a fashion similar to the Hill-Burton funds, dividing one-half of the money according to the number of students in the State in grades 9 through 12, and the other half according to the number of students who are already in higher education. As we studied it, it is our opinion that this is the fairest formula we could come up with. This money will only go to institutions which increase their facilities to take care of increased enrollment. It will not go to any institution which has decided that its enrollment will stay the same size as it is at the present time.

The loans will be provided in the same manner as the college dormitory loans are presently administered.

Mr. Chairman, some of the Members of the House might ask why is this a Federal responsibility? Why should the Federal Government get further into education than it has in the past? We all know when some say that they are against Federal aid to education, that if they were really true to the cause, they would introduce legislation to repeal all of the present laws which give aid to education. With reference to higher education this country has felt for a long time that there is a Federal responsibility. It began in a substantial amount in 1862 when the Land Grant College Act was passed. Incidentally, at that time it was also given not only to public institutions but to Cornell, a private institution as well. When one looks at aid at the present time one will realize that MIT, which is also a private institution, considers that 80 percent of the money to be coming from the Federal Government because of the number of research grants which MIT receives. But, one might also say, how can the gentleman from Minnesota now speaking be so strong in his opposition to Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools, as he has indicated in the past, and yet wholeheartedly support this bill? It is because I feel if education is going to progress at the rate it should we need to pass this legislation. If the Federal Government is going to assume the responsibility it has for the strength of this Nation, this must be passed. I say that for this reason: In elementary and secondary education a political subdivision has the responsibility for the education of the young people in its community. Perhaps some of the students are going to a private institution or parochial school. When the people in the community, through their school districts, have the responsibility, any shirking of that responsibility is going to be to their detriment as well as to others in their State and throughout the country. With reference to higher education there is no similar political subdivision which has that responsibility. One might say, "Well, the States have it. If the private institutions and if the junior colleges are not providing it, the States have it."

To those of us who come from the Midwest or the West, this seems to be true, because in the western part of this country 80 percent of the students in higher education go to a public institution, while 20 percent go to a private institution. However, just the reverse is true in the eastern part of this country, where 80 percent of the students in higher education go to private institutions, and 20 percent go to public institutions.

It is for the reason that there is no specific political subdivision with the responsibility that we provide that the grants and loans can go to any institution that is accredited in a State, be it a junior college, a community college, a private college, a college level technical institute, a church college, or one of the State universities and colleges that we have in most States. We believe that in this way we can best improve the kind of higher education and training that has worked so well in this country and which I believe has put us ahead of every other country in the world, even the Soviet Union.

In order to provide the kind of aid institutions of higher education need, it was determined from testimony that the money should be divided 70 percent for grants and 30 percent for loans. This was after a thorough study made by a number of organizations. However, in legislation we compromise and the compromise that our committee reached in this bill was that 60 percent of the money should be used for grants and 40 percent for loans.

Also it was indicated that in some instances it would be advisable to permit the Federal Government to make 50-50 grants to some institutions. However, again as a compromise, we agreed that the matching should be up to one-third by the Federal Government and at least two-thirds by the local area, be it the State or the people who endow the colleges. I believe this is the kind of legislation all of us can wholeheartedly support. I think this legislation gives Federal assistance in the area of higher education in a way that protects academic freedom. I can see no encroachment by the Federal Government in this legislation over and above any we may have at the present time. The institutions of higher learning hold dear above everything else their right to make their own decisions and when all of them come out in support of this legislation it is significant. I have not received a letter from one institution in opposition, so I think we are on the right track.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. One point that gives us great concern is the fact that our large population centers with their great universities give access to their youngsters to a school quite readily. But in the outlying areas we have a different problem. Has there been some consideration given to the junior colleges; for example, Worthington, Minn., where we have a junior college, and Fergus Falls, so that the distribution may be equitable?

Mr. QUIE. Many of us have junior colleges in our districts. A concern was evidenced in committee by many members who represent junior colleges or community colleges, as to whether these colleges would justly share in this money. While some of us were considering writing in specific language to make sure that they would receive it, we did get assurances from the people involved in the higher education field and from the Department that there was nothing to prohibit them from receiving the money and that there is such an emphasis now on junior and community colleges that they will share equally with other institutions. As the grants are allocated a priority is set up by a commission on higher education in each State. In this case the commission on higher education can better understand the needs and problems of the State than could the Commissioner of Education here in Washington if he were to set that priority.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the gentleman and also commend him for the excellent job he has done in this committee.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. On page 17 of the bill there is reference to a sum of $120 million and a reference to the calendar years 1962 to 1965. Is this a 3-year program or is this a 5-year program, as indicated by the report? The language is a bit confusing to me.

Mr. QUIE. This is a 5-year program.

Mr. BOW. It is anticipated this will carry $120 million for a 5-year period rather than as shown in the part of the bill to which I have just referred?

Mr. QUIE. This is an authorization for 5 years. The Department will come to the committee and prove how much they need for each year. They may submit evidence for next year that they need $120 million and for each year they must submit their proof.

Mr. BOW. I was confused by the language in the bill. It is the intent to set this up on a 5-year basis, then?

Mr. QUIE. That is right.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman has referred to the fact that there is in the budget an amount to cover this figure. Am I correct?

Mr. QUIE. That is right.

Mr. BOW. On an examination of the budget I find it is in the budget as a budgetary item of appropriation rather than obligational authority. Is it the intent of the committee to change this language from what appears on page 17 to make it a direct appropriation?

Mr. QUIE. That is right. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] I understand has developed language for this purpose and will offer it as an amendment when the bill is read.

Mr. BOW. So this will be changed to an appropriation rather than as it is written now.

Mr. QUIE. I understood from the chairman of the committee that the gentleman from Iowa will offer such an amendment.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may need.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Oregon is recognized.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, the bill H.R. 8900 comes to the floor as a result of a true bipartisan effort to draft legislation that will meet what we members of the committee feel is an urgent national need. I cannot express too strongly my own appreciation for the support that the chairman of the full committee has given to me and to the other members of the subcommittee as we have tried to wrestle with some of the very controversial features of this legislation.

May I also express to the other members of the subcommittee my appreciation for their untiring efforts? I know of other subcommittee chairmen who might disagree with me, but I still do not hesitate to say that I think no other committee is more fortunate in having so many capable, competent, dedicated people as I have had the pleasure of working with on this subcommittee. People such as the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] are truly interested and truly concerned about the educational needs of this country. Diverse as our views sometimes are, our goals are the same.

I am grateful, too, to the committee staff members for their untiring efforts.

As I said, not only did this legislation receive bipartisan support on the committee but, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] has already pointed out, this year and in the preceding year this kind of legislation, or legislation for institutions of higher education has received the support of President Kennedy, President Eisenhower, Secretary Ribicoff, Secretary Arthur Flemming. All of these gentlemen have asked for greater participation in the program of higher education.

In 1958 President Eisenhower said:

> The high quality of professional personnel in science, engineering, teaching, the languages and other critical fields are necessary to our national security effort.

President Kennedy about a year ago had this to say:

> If our youth are to have an opportunity to develop their intellectual capacities to the fullest, steps must be taken immediately to increase available facilities for higher education and to relieve both the students and the universities of impossible financial burdens. * * * If our colleges and universities fail to do their job—

Said President Kennedy—

> there is no substitute to fulfill this responsibility. The threat of opposing military and ideological forces in the world lends urgency to this task.

Very recently, Secretary Flemming, now president of the University of Oregon, indicated his strong support for the bill before us today. The following is the text of a press release by the University of Oregon News Bureau, reporting President Flemming's statement:

> Strong support has been given by Arthur S. Flemming, University of Oregon president and former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to a Federal bill to aid higher education.
>
> He declared in a press conference: "We are either going to increase sharply our investment in higher education, or we are going to deny some of our young people the opportunity of a college education and dilute the quality of that education for many others." He continued:
>
> "In the fall of 1965 there will be 800,000 more students wanting a college education

than are on our campuses today. This is just 3½ years from now. There are two courses of action open to us:

"1. We can reduce the 800,000 figure to a lower figure by arbitrarily raising our standards of admission.

"If we do, we will be denying hundreds of thousands of our young people the opportunity of achieving their highest potential.

"If we do, we will be depriving the Nation of manpower resources that it will desperately need in the years that lie ahead.

"2. We can make provision for sharp increases in both public and private expenditures for higher education.

"If we do, we will be responding to the opportunity that confronts us to help make and keep our Nation strong.

"In the days and weeks which lie just ahead, the Nation will be deciding which course of action it intends to follow."

President Flemming was HEW Secretary in the Republican administration of Dwight D. Eisenhower. His statement indicated strong support for a bill backed by the Democratic Kennedy administration. He declared:

"There is pending before the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives a bill that was reported to the House by its Committee on Education and Labor as a result of the work of a subcommittee chaired by Mrs. EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Portland, Oreg.

"This bill would authorize the use of $300 million a year for 5 years to accelerate the construction of academic facilities such as classrooms, laboratories, and libraries on the campuses of our public and private institutions of higher education.

"Each year 60 percent of this amount, or $180 million, would be made available for matching grants, and 40 percent, or $120 million, would be made available for loans. The bill also authorizes the establishment of a program of Federal scholarships.

"Personally, I believe that Mr. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, the new Speaker of the House, and Mrs. GREEN are to be commended for taking steps designed to insure a consideration of this proposal early in this new session of the Congress. I am confident that if it is permitted to come to a vote it will receive wide bipartisan support.

"I believe that every citizen who is concerned about our Nation meeting its future manpower needs, and that every citizen who believes that our Nation should provide every young person who can profit from it with the opportunity for a high quality college education, should indicate to his or her elected representatives in the Congress that he believes this bill should pass.

"Unless this bill does pass, some young men and women who could profit from a college education are going to be denied that education.

"The States and the supporters of private colleges are going to have to raise their sights far higher than they have when it comes to expenditures for higher education.

"They cannot, however, do it by themselves. The Federal Government must use some of the revenue sources that are available to it in order to help the States and the private colleges measure up to their opportunities for service."

Mr. Chairman, in recognition of the great need for scientists and engineers, Dr. James Van Allen has warned that our national ambitions in space explorations have already outrun our scientific competence.

And I am also well aware of the reports that were referred to earlier in the discussion of this afternoon, reports that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration will need 13,000 additional scientists and engineers for its man-on-the-moon project, not counting those who will be needed by industry working under the NASA contracts.

The President's Science Advisory Committee in 1960 had this to say:

> The function of the universities is one of absolutely critical importance to the national welfare.

After all, the universities are the source of tomorrow's scientists.

And this report continued in another place:

> The truth is as simple as it is important: Whether the quantity and quality of basic research in graduate education in the United States will be adequate or inadequate depends primarily upon the Government of the United States
>
> From this responsibility the Government has no escape; either it will find the policies and the resources which permit our universities to flourish and their duties to be adequately discharged or no one will.

The Science Advisory Committee that issued this report in 1960 is not made up just of members of the faculty or administrators of our colleges and universities. They are from many sources as the Members of this Committee know. We have representatives from the Rockefeller Institute; from the Bell Telephone Laboratories; chemistry professors; the chairman of the corporation of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Mr. James R. Van Allen; representatives from the High Energy Physics Laboratory; from Stanford University; from the University of California, at Berkeley; from the Oak Ridge National Laboratory; from the Research Laboratory of Electronics; from Combustion Engineering, Inc.; and many distinguished individuals. And it seems to me we should listen to what they are saying.

In another part of the report they had this to say:

> Partnership between the universities and the National Government is the indispensable basis of first-rate university work in science. The partnership is a fact. It has done much more good than harm. It seems certain to grow in importance unless the American people decide to accept a second-rate standing in terms of power, of comfort, and of knowledge.

At another point this Science Advisory Committee said:

> The dramatic expansion of science in this country has outrun our ability to provide up-to-date space and equipment for either research or teaching—still less for the two together.

As the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] so very ably stated, presidents and representatives of colleges and universities and institutions across the country did come before our committee, and they testified day after day and time after time as to their critical needs.

Nor has the support of the leaders of American education been limited to testimony before our committee. I am sure that many of my colleagues have had the same experience that I have had, and that they, too, have received thoughtful, persuasive letters from leading educators in support of this legislation. The following are only a sampling of the letters and telegrams I have received from educators and interested citizens in every part of the Nation in support of H.R. 8900:

SALEM, OREG., *January 29, 1962.*

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
U.S. Representative, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Understand House bill 8900 authorizing $180 million grants and $120 million loans annually for 5 years for construction academic facilities is scheduled for debate on Tuesday, January 30. We are desirous that this bill make funds available for community college construction.

LEON P. MINEAR,
Superintendent, Public Instruction.

GRINNELL, IOWA, *January 29, 1962.*

Representative EDITH GREEN,
Chairman, House Subcommittee on Education, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Strongly endorse H.R. 8900, and appreciate your efforts toward House consideration.

JAMES H. STRAUSS,
Dean of College, Grinnell College.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 27, 1962.*

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully urge your support of colleges facilities bill without amendment. It will be of great benefit to all Oregon colleges and universities.

CROWN ZELLERBACH CORP.,
EDWARD P. STAMM.

PORTLAND, OREG., *August 31, 1961.*

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Bill to provide Federal assistance for construction of college classrooms, laboratories, and libraries considered of vital importance here. Respectfully urge your efforts in behalf its passage.

JOHN R. HOWARD,
President, Lewis and Clark College.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 26, 1962.*

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on progress of legislation providing loans and grants to institutions of higher learning. Be assured of our fullest support.

M. A. F. RITCHIE,
President, Pacific University.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 26, 1962.*

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge your support of the colleges facilities bill as recommended by the House Education Committee and reported out by the House Rules Committee which includes the matching loans as well as grants.

RICHARD H. SULLIVAN,
President, Reed College.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 26, 1962.*

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
Member, U.S. Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Encourage support colleges facilities bill including grants, loans, recommended House Education Committee; reported Rules Committee.

THOMAS A. LEUPP,
President, Cascade College.

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 26, 1962.*

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge your wholehearted support of college facilities bill as recommended by House

Education Committee. As reported out by Rules Committee the making of loans and grants for facilities construction would be major step in solution of critical problem of higher education.

HOWARD J. KENNA,
President, University of Portland.

OREGON STATE SYSTEM OF
HIGHER EDUCATION,
Eugene, Oreg., January 26, 1962.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
Congress of the United States,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR EDITH: First of all, let me tell you how much all of us in the field of higher education appreciate your devoted service to this cause.

The purpose of this letter, however, is not to compliment you, but to urge you on to new efforts. H.R. 8900, your bill designed to assist in the construction of additional higher education facilities, is vitally needed here in your own State of Oregon.

This fall our enrollment increase was more than double the budget estimate—an overall 15 percent as against a legislative appropriation allowing for 6.7 percent. Last fall, Oregon public colleges enrolled 28,951 students. Conservative estimates indicate that 10 years from now, in 1972, this enrollment will approach 50,000.

We are already in desperate need of new classroom buildings, additions to our libraries, new laboratories and special purpose facilities. As you know, the State may, for the first time, be facing a small deficit in place of the surplus with which we had been blessed since the war years. Even with the best will in the world it would, I believe, be impossible for the legislature to provide the buildings which we need now and which we shall need during the coming decade. We estimate our capital construction needs for academic facilities during the next decade at more than $41 million. This figure does not include dormitories, student centers and other construction which can be financed on a self-liquidating basis.

We are particularly interested, of course, in part A of your bill, grants for construction of academic facilities. Passage of this might make it possible for us to extend greatly any appropriations made to us by the Oregon Legislature.

As public institutions supported by the State, we do not have authority to borrow money for the construction of academic facilities; nor, if we were so empowered, would it be possible for us to arrange repayment. We are, therefore, dependent upon the passage of part A in the hopes of augmenting, by at least one-third, the too small resources of the State for construction.

The figures I have quoted you above are an urgent indication of our need. Due to careful planning over the past 10 years, the board has managed to keep abreast of current needs until we were swamped by this year's heavy enrollment. In my opinion, if we do not have Federal aid within the next 2 or 3 years, we will have to deny educational opportunities to a great many young Oregonians who could profit from college.

We understand that you are also supporting a bill extending Federal aid in the form of scholarships. We are, of course, interested in the passage of this legislation also; however, since the State of Oregon underwrites about two-thirds of the cost of a student's education, direct scholarships to cover students' tuition would create a hardship upon our publicly supported institutions. It is our hope that any scholarship bill would include some relief for the institutions.

Cordially yours,

R. E. LIEUALLEN,
Chancellor.

HAMILTON, N.Y., *January 26, 1962.*

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on success in clearing H.R. 8900 for House action. The aid it would provide for expansion of academic facilities is so urgently needed that passage now would give new heart not only to educators but to all citizens who share your concern to assure educational opportunities for our youth. Best wishes and good luck.

EVERETT CASE,
President, Colgate University.

CLARKE COLLEGE,
Dubuque, Iowa, January 27, 1962.

Mrs. EDITH GREEN,
Chairman, House Subcommittee on Education, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: The faculty of Clarke College joins me in thanking you for your great service to higher education by getting H.R. 8900 out of committee and past the Rules Committee of the House.

Never before in the 119 years of its service to young women and to the country they represent has Clarke faced a more imperative need for expansion of academic facilities.

The Government aid given for dormitories has been invaluable. But classrooms and laboratories are needed, too. This bill may insure them.

For your interest and your efforts, we are most grateful.

Sincerely yours,

Sister MARY BENEDICT, B.V.M.

As the gentleman from Minnesota pointed out, in 1960 we had about 3,610,000 students in colleges and universities. One year later, in 1961, this number has grown to 3,891,000. That is an increase of 7.8 percent in 1 year. As the gentleman from Minnesota said, by 1965 this number will increase to over 5 million, about a 30 percent increase in 5 years, and by 1970 to 6,959,000, an increase of 78 percent in 10 years time. These are the latest figures which were available to the members of the committee.

May I say to my colleagues that the situation is not one that may or may not occur. It most certainly will occur, and no amount of wishful thinking can alter the course of events. Let us never forget that the basic cause of this crisis in higher education is also a tremendous national asset.

Our academic facilities must be tremendously expanded if we are to train the scientists, the engineers, medical doctors, teachers, nurses, and so forth. We must have, in the opinion of the committee, more libraries, more laboratories, more classrooms. It has been estimated by experts of the country that the colleges and universities across the United States will need $15.4 billion for new facilities, plus additional money for renovation and replacement of obsolete buildings. This figure of $15 billion plus does include the better use of the space that is now available.

May I also say it is not a completely dismal picture. There is the encouraging evidence that support is increasing, from industry, from private foundations. There has been a doubling of gifts and grants for capital facilities. During the past 10 years the tuition and required fees have increased about 75 percent. In my judgment, and I think also in the judgment of other members of the committee, these tuition fees cannot increase much more, if at all, without substantially decreasing the opportunity for able students who cannot even now afford to attend our colleges and universities. We must not get the tuitions up so high we will keep these brilliant students away from the doors of our institutions.

But considering all of these sources of revenue, the increased borrowing, the anticipated higher contributions from State, local, and private sources, the best figures available to the committee indicate that by 1965 there will be a gap of $1.5 billion between the aggregate needs and the resources available. In 10 years there will be a gap of $2.5 billion. That assumes we continue with our college housing program. We now help provide places for students to sleep and to eat. It is the recommendation of the committee that the most important thing is providing the places for them to work, which is something to which we should now turn our attention. To accomplish this purpose, the committee has recommended for your consideration the bill before you. The gentleman from Minnesota has already advised you that the figure is 60 percent for grants and 40 percent for loans. The grants are on a matching basis, with the Federal Government providing one-third of the grant and the States and local institutions required to put up the two-thirds.

The loan provision provides $120 million. This is for each of 5 years. In response to the question which was raised a moment ago by the gentleman from Ohio, I think a rereading of the language on page 17 will indicate this is $120 million for the first year, then an additional $120 million for each of the next 4 years. I may also say that we have included the requirement that at least 25 percent of the funds shall come from non-Federal sources. There is provision for a State agency that will set the criteria and that will determine the priority within each State.

I have already said in response to questions that have been raised that at the proper time I intend to propose the deletion of section 126 in regard to positions under the Classification Act. An amendment will also be offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] in regard to back-door spending.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to my majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I want to compliment the gentlewoman upon her statement. This bill is a landmark in the history of statutory law. It is certainly a landmark in the history of legislation. I am sure this is the most important matter, if it becomes law—and I hope and believe it will—in this field since the National Defense Education Act was originally enacted. Further, I wish to say that had it not been for the persistency and the hard work and the effort of the gentlewoman from Oregon, I do not believe that the bringing of this bill to the floor would have been possible.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the majority leader for his kind statement.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I was interested in the statement by the gentlewoman about the gentleman from Minnesota that the matching funds would be not more than 66⅔ percent. I believe that is true, is it not?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Yes; 33⅓ from the Federal Government and 66⅔ from the State and local institutions.

Mr. HARRIS. I was interested in observing the manner of approach to it. I wanted to ask a question with reference to it in part A. You referred to the Federal share of the funds in connection with grants in a number of places. However, in part of part A you refer to the development cost; that it shall not exceed 33⅓ percent of the development cost. Then on page 28 you define the term "Federal share" a percentage not in excess of 33⅓ percent of the development cost of a project covered by an application for a grant for the construction of an academic facility under part A of this act. Now, as I read this, it appears to me that this is applicable only to the development cost feature; is that true?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. If you turn back to the definition of development cost on page 27, it includes the construction cost and also the acquisition of land.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; I appreciate that, but the point I was trying to get at is this. I had the impression that the matching requirement was for both the development cost as well as the actual construction cost.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The construction costs are considered a part of the total development cost, and the total Federal share shall be not more than one-third of the total development cost. Now, the State agency may decide, in setting up priorities, in the case of an institution that had a lot of wealthy donors, shall we say, or a big sum of money, that it would require them to put up more than two-thirds, but that would be up to the State agency.

Mr. HARRIS. What I am trying to find out is this: Any applicant, that is, any institution that applies for assistance under this program must have matching funds as much as one-third.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Must have matching funds as much as two-thirds.

Mr. HARRIS. I was under the impression that the Federal share would have to be two-thirds.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. No, the Federal share is one-third and the State or the local institution's share is two-thirds.

Mr. HARRIS. In other words, the Federal Government under no condition will put up more than one-third of the total cost, development cost as well as actual construction cost, of any project?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Under part A under the grants. This same institution might borrow under the loan section of the bill part of that money.

Mr. HARRIS. I am interested in this because our committee has just concluded hearings with reference to the construction of medical facilities. We have this particular problem to consider, and I was trying to find out just what the approach was here with reference to the construction item, but I could not determine just what was meant. If I understand this correctly, the bill provides that the Federal Government, insofar as grants are concerned, shall not put up more than one-third of the total cost of the project?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. But then the bill provides for loans whereby the applicant may apply for a loan in order to apply on its two-thirds of the total cost?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. That is right. However, there is the one additional requirement, that 25 percent must come from non-Federal funds, but the same institution might have a grant and a loan.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentlewoman from Oregon very much. I appreciate the information which she has given me.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion may I say that it is true that taxes are often burdensome. It is also true that without education there would be far less national wealth to tax. It is true that we as a people now spend about four percent of our gross national product in education. It is also true that if we wisely spent twice that much to achieve higher quality it would be more than worth the cost.

Mr. Chairman, Alfred North Whitehead in 1916 had excellent advice for us in 1962:

> In the conditions of modern life the rule is absolute: The race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. Not all your heroism, not all your social charm, not all your wit, not all your victories on land or at sea, can move back the finger of fate. Today we maintain ourselves. Tomorrow science will have moved forward yet one more step, and there will be no appeal from the judgment which will then be pronounced on the uneducated.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I shall be very glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from Ohio.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to extend my congratulations to the gentlewoman from Oregon for a very fine legislative effort. I am wondering whether it is the intention of this bill to limit the grant section to construction only. I notice that in the loan section it is stated that loans may be made for construction, including rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of academic facilities. Can there be a grant loan, or will there be grant loans available for construction; that is, construction which would include rehabilitation, alteration, and conversion?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Yes. In section 122(c), the term "development costs" is defined as including "the acquisition of the land on which the facility is located and of necessary site improvements to permit its use for such facility." This applies both to loans and grants.

So, it could be used for rehabilitation, renovation, or the site acquisition itself.

Mr. ASHLEY. Both the grants and the loans?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. That is correct.

Mr. ASHLEY. I thank the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. It is my impression that under this legislation, for instance, the city of Chicago could obtain this Federal assistance to develop its junior college program. Am I correct in that assumption?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. There would be a State agency. When you say "the city of Chicago" there would be a State agency which would be set up within the State and any institution would make application for a loan or grant to that State agency.

Mr. PUCINSKI. But a city-owned junior college would be entitled to this assistance if it applied through the State agency?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. You are quite right. This bill is designed to include junior colleges as long as they are accredited.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, H.R. 8900, which would provide $300 million in grants and loans during each of the next 5 years for the construction, rehabilitation and improvement of needed academic facilities.

The problems confronting our institutions of higher education today are enormous. These problems, furthermore, have been well documented in the hearings and report of the Special Subcommittee on Education, under the able leadership of my good friend, the distinguished Member from Oregon, Mrs. EDITH GREEN. I am personally familiar with the serious nature of these problems as well, since both the Berkeley campus of the University of California and Oakland City College, as well as a private law school, are in my district.

The many studies conducted by agencies of the Federal Government, State commissions and independent agencies are in general agreement as to the problem higher education in America faces today.

In brief, college enrollments are in the process of doubling. Between 1958 and 1965 they are expected to increase by at least 1 million full-time students, and a corresponding increase is expected between 1965 and 1970.

Almost without exception, the studies conducted in this field indicate that even when traditional sources of income—such as student tuition and fees—have been stretched to their limit, a large gap will remain; a gap which the Federal Government in recognition of the importance of higher education to our way of life, must fill.

Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed that the provision for undergraduate scholarships has been deleted from this bill. Each year more than 60,000 of our most able and gifted high school graduates are unable to attend college for financial reasons. I sincerely hope that legislation to provide scholarships for these qualified young people will be enacted shortly.

Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding this defect, this is a good bill. It is vital for the future development of our Nation and is consistent with our tradition of Federal assistance to higher education dating back to the Morrill Act of 1862. I urge that this important legislation be passed by the House without delay.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire whether the terminology "accredited college" would exclude institutions that might provide education after high school of a terminal nature, and whether they would not qualify for that category? I am thinking about the great number of dropouts where many may not be qualified for academic training but who yet might be trained for useful work, especially after high school.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I would say to my friend from Ohio that this was a matter which was discussed for a long period of time. We were reminded of some of the experiences, however, which we had under the GI bill. We felt we had to have some form of accreditation. I think most of us will agree that there were many fly-by-night institutions set up under that program.

Therefore, on page 29 we provide the definition under paragraph (f) (3) which provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, or provides not less than a 2-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree.

Then, in paragraph (4) there is stated the following: "is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association."

Mr. VANIK. Would it not be helpful if this language were extended to include institutions that are operated by a public agency, by public authorities such as city boards of education, or county boards of education?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. This would include such institutions if they were operated by a city so long as they met this criterion.

Mr. VANIK. It might still have to be accredited?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Yes. I might say that there is legislation now pending before our Committee on Education and Labor which is being considered for technical schools. I do not think anyone would quarrel with the tremendous need for more technicians whom I suspect would be trained in the kind of institution which the gentleman from Ohio is describing, but we felt that should not be included in this bill.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentlewoman. I certainly appreciate the committee's effort in this legislative field.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and I would also ask unanimous consent that the remarks of my colleague the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] follow the remarks here, and also the remarks by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, we are presented today with an opportunity to contribute to the strength and continued progress of the United States. I want to pay a sincere and deeply felt tribute to my friend, as well as colleague, Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, author of the measure before the House. She and her colleagues on the commitee have done an outstanding job in preparing and bringing to the floor this measure, which, as we know, is a key one in the President's program to meet the challenges of the sixties. It is a pleasure and a privilege to express my support of the bill and to add my voice to that of Congresswoman GREEN and others in urging its passage by the House.

This bill, H.R. 8900, in authorizing assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education, goes to the heart of America's greatness. It recognizes that our future depends in large part on our ability to provide superior educational facilities for our people.

We are all well aware of America's population growth and of the rapid increase in enrollment in our schools. Evidence confronts us in every community. Between 1957 and 1961 enrollment at the University of Oregon, for example, increased by 53 percent. At the college level, nationwide, it is estimated that enrollments will increase over current figures 30 percent by 1965 and 66 percent by 1970. Unless the institutions of higher learning double their facilities within the next 10 years, many students will be denied the opportunity to continue their education. The problem, moreover, is not simply to squeeze additional students onto college campuses; it is also to provide the number and type of facilities which will allow these students to develop their potentialities to the maximum.

We know that education today requires more than a teacher, a group of students, and a room full of chairs. As we prepare our young people for the more complex demands of a modern society, we must utilize new equipment and new instructional aids. In recent years the pressing need for improved science education has become apparent. Modern science courses cannot be taught in rusty laboratories. Nor can students in the liberal arts study effectively without an adequate library.

H.R. 8900 looks beyond today's students, who need and deserve the best education we can give them. It looks to parents, who in many case have made great sacrifices to provide for their children's education. It looks to college teachers and administrators, who are striving to maintain high levels of instruction. These are dedicated and conscientious people, but they need help to do the job. And finally, the bill looks to future generations of Americans who will benefit from what we do now.

It is both necessary and proper that the Federal Government should extend assistance to the colleges and universities across the land. Despite strenuous efforts by public and private institutions to finance the enlargement of facilities, they are not keeping pace with the demand for college education. Our country has a long tradition of assistance to higher institutions of learning. All of us, whether we live in Oregon or Maine or Arizona, have been the beneficiaries of these programs, because the advantages of an educated populace do not stop at State lines.

I am particularly pleased that the definition of an "institution of higher education" in H.R. 8900 includes those colleges providing not less than a 2-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward a bachelor's degree. The community colleges occupy an increasingly important position in our country's educational system, indeed they are a uniquely American institution. In addition to making higher education more widely available, they are responsive to individual and local needs. They cannot be considered apart from the needs of all institutions of higher learning. In 1961 I introduced H.R. 16, providing a program of Federal grants-in-aid to the States to encourage and assist in the expansion of public community junior colleges. I sponsored similar legislation in the 85th and 86th Congresses. Although the bill before us now limits the legal authority of community colleges to participate in the grant and loan program, it is a significant recognition of their usefulness and an important step toward their expansion.

In Oregon, the lesson of preserving our natural resources has been driven home. We have learned, sometimes the hard way, that water and soil and timber resources can be depleted to the irrecoverable loss of all the American people. We have learned to plan for the future. Can we do less for our most precious resource of all—our human resources?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 8900, the administration's proposal to assist our colleges and universities in financing the construction, rehabilitation, and improvement of needed academic facilities.

The crisis and challenge which confronts our institutions of higher learning is a formidable one. Within the next 10 years the need for new buildings and facilities will equal all of the structures that have been built on the Nation's campuses since the American Revolution. The cost of providing classrooms, for prospective students over the next 10 years will alone amount to almost $13 billion. When one adds the cost of new residential buildings to house these students the total is increased to all but $19 billion.

It is reliably estimated that even with increased borrowing and expected higher contributions from State, local, and private sources, the Nation's institutions of higher education will fall short of meeting its needs by $1.5 billion in 1965, and $2.5 billion in 1970. Without the extension of the important college housing program the gap would climb to $2.9 billion by 1965 and to $5.2 billion by 1970.

The bill before us would assist in closing this gap by providing loans and matching grants, totaling $300 million annually, for 5 years, to institutions of higher learning.

By no means does this legislation set any new precedent or threaten the Federal control of our colleges and universities in any way. Since 1950 the Federal Government has aided colleges and universities in building dormitories and other revenue-producing buildings through the college housing program. Since its enactment this legislation has made possible some 600 loans to public and private institutions of higher education totaling nearly $1.5 billion.

Just last year, Albright College, a small but excellent liberal-arts college in my district, received a loan of $980,000 to provide needed dormitory space for its increasing enrollments. Albright has recently announced new plans for improving its science laboratories, and building new classrooms, and new library facilities. The proposal before us today would assist Albright together with other colleges in providing the best educational facilities for their growing student bodies. By alleviating the heavy financial burdens of these new projects, Federal assistance would enable the college to use more of its resources for increasing faculty salaries. Thus, Albright would then be in a better position to maintain and attract outstanding topflight professors.

The youth of the Nation are our most valuable natural resource. At a time when the Soviet Union is educating every qualified youth, we cannot sit back and let them take the lead in the race for space, for new scientific discoveries, and for creativity in the humanities, arts, and social sciences. Unless this Nation acts now, we cannot hope to have an adequate number of teachers, businessmen, diplomats, engineers, and scientists that will be needed in the years ahead. I urge the adoption of H.R. 8900.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentlewoman from Oregon and the members of that great Committee on Education and Labor on this great advance in the educational field. I think it is a pioneering effort, and I think the United States is going to profit by the expansion of facilities and the creation of new facilities.

Mr. Chairman, I support with pleasure H.R. 8900. This bill authorizes assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation or improvement of academic and related facilities. Academic facilities include classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related instructional research or administrative facilities. Excluded from the term academic facilities are those facilities intended primarily for events for which admission is to be charged, gymnasiums, or facilities which are specially designed for physical education, athletic or recreational activities. Also excluded are facilities to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship.

This measure will bring about an expansion of present facilities both private and public, creation of new facilities so that no high school graduate with talent and ability will be denied because of lack of facilities or inadequate facilities.

This measure provides a program of grants supplying $180 million for a period of 5 years and loans totaling $120 million. Federal grants cannot exceed one-third of the development cost of the project and thus the local government in the case of public institutions of higher learning or in the case of private institutions, there will be joint cooperation in obtaining these additional facilities. Tuition fees, endowments, or other contributions do not suffice to cover the cost of higher education of a student. Federal assistance is a necessity in view of the fact that local governments have reached the limits of their capacity to assist institutions of higher learning.

The loan provisions of this bill have been patterned substantially after the loan provisions of the college housing program. The loans for construction or expansion must be repaid within a period of not more than 50 years with interest at current rates of interest which presently is 3½ percent.

H.R. 8900 is the first of the priorities in legislation to make certain ultimately that every person who has the capacity, interest to continue his higher education may not be denied such educational opportunities because of lack of funds or because of lack of facilities. While this bill does not provide scholarships, it provides the funds to expand facilities in which gifted students can study. Today many colleges, because of the housing provisions, can house their students but do not have classes in which to teach them.

Five million Americans of college age cannot attend higher education because facilities are unavailable or because they lack funds. Today Russia encourages education and is producing three times as many engineers as we are producing. In an expanding universe, where our eyes, vision, and plans project beyond the limits of this world, it is our duty to provide facilities in which our youth can prepare to face the new horizons.

With higher education offered in new facilities our youth can face and meet the challenge of the future. Without higher education our youth will be relegated to limbo and others more progressive, more enterprising, will prevail.

I trust that this very needed bill will receive overwhelming approval.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased today to support H.R. 8900, the College Academic Facilities Act, which authorizes matching grants of $180 million annually and long-term loans of $120 million annually for construction of academic facilities for higher educational institutions.

Under this program, a college, university, or a higher education building agency may make 50-year loans at interest rates comparable with those in the college housing program and qualify for grants up to one-third of the development cost of such academic facilities.

Under the grant section of this legislation, Ohio will receive an annual allotment in the sum of $9,570,976 per year for the next 5 years, or a total allotment under this bill of $45,289,880.

It seems to me that this new Federal legislation should provide the State of Ohio with sufficient incentive to proceed toward the establishment of junior colleges under State and local auspices. As a matter of fact, serious consideration should be given to establishing more than one junior college in the Cleveland area.

In a district such as mine, I am astounded by the great number of qualified high school graduates who are denied the privilege of higher education because they are not in a financial position to meet the rising costs of higher education in local institutions and who are denied admission to local colleges because they cannot meet the vigorous competition which currently exists and which is expected to become even more keen in the next several years.

A junior college is critically needed to meet the needs of these talented young people and more adequately prepare them for the more limited areas of employment.

Junior colleges for Cleveland and other parts of the State of Ohio are a tremendous bargain under this bill because this legislation will make possible the construction and development of academic facilities at 66⅔ percent of their total costs. For example, it makes construction and development possible with a 25-percent non-Federal downpayment, 33⅓ percent Federal grant, and the balance by Federal loans. Thus a $1,200,000 facility could be constructed with a non-Federal initial fund of $300,000, a $400,000 Federal grant, and a $500,000 Federal loan.

It is my hope that Cleveland and the State of Ohio will move forward to meet the challenge and the opportunity which this bill presents.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentle lady. Mr. Chairman, I hope that H.R. 8900 will be overwhelmingly approved this afternoon.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, as a very vigorous opponent of general Federal-aid-to-education measures, may I at the outset express my strong endorsement of this legislation. I think it is worthy and necessary. I am somewhat pained, I might say, to hear my colleagues on both sides of the aisle use arguments that I feel are good, substantial and legitimate in other circumstances, against this particular piece of legislation. I, too, oppose control imposed from the top by the Federal Government over our school systems. But I would point out to those of our colleagues who have reservations in this respect that the Federal Government has been aiding higher education for a very long time. Although there are antecedents to the Morrill Act of 1862 we Republicans, I think, can point with pride to the fact that aid to higher education started on a substantial basis by the Federal Government in 1862 under Abraham Lincoln. Today the Federal Government provides about $2½ billion in aid to higher education. This amounts to 20 cents out of every dollar that our institutions of higher education spend today.

To quote the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Ribicoff, in his testimony before our committee:

> Federal funds now flow to institutions of higher education for purposes ranging from the building of dormitories to the construction of high-energy accelerators, from research into possible cures for cancer to research into better ways of teaching French, from the training of specialists in nuclear medicine to the education of college teachers of English.

Privately controlled institutions of higher education now get 16 percent of their money, their current operating funds from the Federal Government.

My esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], raised a question which I would like to clarify with our subcommittee chairman. The bill provides aid for the construction of academic facilities. It is my understanding that this is not limited to undergraduate facilities; that funds provided here may be used to construct graduate buildings, provided the funds are given to a university which gives a bachelor's degree or a 2-year certificate, and also provided that priority be given to increasing undergraduate enrollment; am I correct?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The gentleman from New York is correct. On page 7, line 15, the bill stipulates that these funds will be used for buildings which will "result in an urgently needed substantial expansion of the institution's student enrollment capacity"; and then on the following page, the bill provides that we "shall give special consideration to expansion of undergraduate enrollment capacity." So I would interpret it, as has the gentleman from New York, that we prefer that the funds shall be used for the expansion of undergraduate enrollment, but we do not limit it to that.

Mr. GOODELL. In other words, this money could definitely be provided for the construction of a medical school, a graduate medical school, or a graduate engineering school, or any other graduate school of this nature if it is under a university that gives a bachelor's degree or a 2-year certificate?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The language of the bill would not exclude graduate schools, but it would be up to the State agencies to set their priorities.

Mr. GOODELL. We do emphasize the priority here is undergraduate.

Mr. Chairman, this morning I read in the paper with some interest a reference to Republican support of a Democratic bill. I would like at this time to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] for the very substantial amendments which he offered, and which were adopted, to the President's original proposal that came to the Congress. This is in my opinion a bipartisan bill. I do not consider it a bipartisan Democratic bill. I do not think the two expressions quite go together. Basically the argument could be made, since the substantial changes suggested by Republicans were made in our subcommittee, that if it is a bipartisan-partisan bill, it is a bipartisan Republican bill. I will not make that claim. But I do want to commend my colleague, Mr. Quie, for the very substantial contribution he has made, particularly in switching this from an exclusively loan program to a grant-and-loan program.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I should like to point out that our colleague from New Jersey [Mr. Frelinghuysen] in 1959, introduced a bill somewhat similar to this.

This was the Eisenhower bill. I will say that our side was considering special legislation in this field.

Mr. GOODELL. I also recall that our colleague from New Jersey [Mr. Frelinghuysen] made a substantial contribution in the past, although, in the past, Congress has not acted on these Republican proposals presented by Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Getting back to the bipartisan approach, may I simply raise a red flag of warning: This bill includes aid only for academic facilities. We know that the President's original proposal included student assistance and scholarships. As all of you know, Mrs. Green's subcommittee, including myself, went to Russia last fall; and I also participated in an advisory group on higher education which has made some very specific recommendations as to student assistance in higher education institutions. I would hope that we are not going to accept in conference without having hearings on the advisory group recommendation the original proposal for scholarships that were sent here by the President last year prior to our study.

I have assurances from the other side of the aisle that is not their intention to bypass this House and go into conference and accept scholarship provisions from the other body; but we cannot get assurances that they will not do this if circumstances in their opinion justify it.

The warning that I raise is that if we go to conference and if we accept scholarship provisions or student aid provisions as a part of this bill and it comes back to the House of Representatives I believe that Republican and Democrats alike will consider this a violation of the position that we have taken on bipartisan support of this bill. I believe you will thereby seriously jeopardize and endanger the entire program.

I do not say this because I am opposed to student assistance. I favor some forms of student assistance. I say it because our group feels that we should have a hearing on this question in the subcommittee of which the gentlewoman from Oregon, Mrs. Green, is the chairman, and that then in due order, not prematurely, but in due order it will come to the floor in the form of a new student assistance program. If it comes back here from the conference with student assistance in it I think it would jeopardize and probably defeat this bill. Certainly I would feel myself obliged to oppose it right down to the last if such provisions are in the bill.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield.

Mr. QUIE. One of the problems the gentleman will recall was the cost of administering the program in the past. Is it not true that the cost of administering this program will be substantially less than the one we considered originally that was originally introduced?

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman means the cost of administering this kind of grant and loan program is substantially less than the original loan program?

Mr. QUIE. The cost of administration, not the cost of the program itself.

Mr. GOODELL. Yes, it is my understanding that the cost of administration will be considerably less.

Mr. QUIE. One section of title A would have granted assistance by the Federal Government in the first 2 years to a maximum of $3 million a year, but after 2 years the cost of the State commissions themselves will be the costs borne by the States themselves and not by the Federal Government.

Mr. GOODELL. That is correct; that was another suggestion I believe we, as Republicans, made so that the States should take over the State commission's administrative costs after 2 years.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, like many others who preceded me, I, too, rise in support of this legislation. While I consider it significant that we have a bill of this character, I do not think we should overemphasize its importance as a landmark. I think we should congratulate ourselves in that it is basically simply an extension and broadening of a proven program of Federal assistance to institutions of higher education; namely, the college housing program.

I consider it both desirable and a matter of urgency. As the gentleman from Minnesota just pointed out, I introduced a bill back in the year 1959 which would have used a somewhat different approach to achieve the same objectives that we hope to achieve in this bill. I regret that we have delayed so long on a matter of this kind.

It seems to me a move in the right direction if we get the language stricken from the title of the bill, with reference to assistance to undergraduates. By doing this we shall have eliminated a possible source of controversy.

I mention this question of scholarships because these were provided for in the bill previously considered by our committee last year. Because of a sharp division of opinion about scholarships, the present bill was developed. It happens that in the past I have favored a Federal program of scholarship aid, to enable more of our young people to get a college education. Yet I have felt from the beginning that one of the reasons we got so little education legislation enacted last year was because we insisted on mixing the two together; different proposals in a single legislative basket. The bill that our committee originally reported included not only aid to academic facilities but also a program of Federal scholarships. I myself would be inclined to favor such a program, but there is no connection between scholarship aid and assistance in the construction of buildings.

I was pleased the chairman of our full committee stated that in his view specific recommendations would be forthcoming from our committee only after we make a further study of the situation. He feels, as do I, that we should evaluate the scholarship program in connection with the loan program authorized under the National Defense Education Act.

We must have a clear understanding that we consider further study of this question important, because the only major concern that I have heard expressed here about this legislation is one over which we have little or no control. That is, that the other body may insert a program which has no relevance to facilities; namely, a program of scholarship. If that should occur, we will be unable to assert ourselves as to what we would consider a proper scholarship program. If the record as to what we consider important is made clear, we can at our leisure develop a suitable program and bring it up for the consideration of the House at a later date.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. The advisory group, which we have spoken of many times, has recommended student assistance which is different than recommended for grants. If we were to accept whatever scholarship provisions were in the Senate proposal in conference, and the House accepted the conference report, this would preclude the House from ever considering the recommendations that were given us by our advisory group.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I agree with the gentleman. It is because there are varied and controversial elements involved that the committee should give this whole problem a square look.

Mr. QUIE. I feel very strongly about the right of the House to consider the financial assistance now given to undergraduate citizens. I would have to oppose a conference report in the event they brought it out with other substantial provisions precluding the House from considering it as a whole.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I hope we will not be faced with that necessity, at this stage of the session, with months to consider legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from New Jersey 5 additional minutes.

Mr. QUIE. One of the reasons why I am concerned can be pointed to in a letter that I wrote to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on June 9, last year. I received an answer from Secretary Wilbur J. Cohen, in which he pointed out something that we must take to heart as Republicans too. He stated:

> Ten years ago the U.S. Office of Education had relatively little impact on education in this country. Its total budget in 1950 was approximately $35 million and most of these dollars were for grants to promote vocational education. In the last decade, and particularly in the last 3 years, the responsibilities of the office have grown by leaps and bounds as the Nation has become aware of the importance of education to the Nation's primary interests and even survival. Its budget has risen to $539 million in 1961 with the prospect of increasing to more than $1,500 million if both the elementary and secondary and higher education assistance acts are enacted by the Congress.

We are talking about administrative costs, not the cost of the program. For this reason I want to make sure the House has a voice in any additional aspects of the program that are enacted into law.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I would like to emphasize in connection with the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota and my own previously that I certainly am not recommending that we accept wholeheartedly all of the findings of the advisory group, unless these should be considered prior to final enactment in the House. I emphasize the fact that this procedure would have no opportunity to consider the total problems of student assistance. I would like to point out that we did make inquiry of the Parliamentarian as to the germaneness of amendments offered here today to this bill to provide student assistance in one form or another, perhaps along the line of the advisory group and perhaps along other lines. We were advised that such amendments would not be germane today to this bill. This means that if this bill goes to conference and scholarships or other types of student assistance are added in conference, it will come back here without the House of Representatives having an opportunity at any time to go into the bill as to the proper provision for student assistance. We will have it on a take-it-or-leave-it basis at that point. That is the reason, basically, that I feel so strongly that we must oppose it if it takes that form.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would like to say that apparently a priority label has been given to this bill. The chairman of this committee has referred to this as one of the islands of neglect, and that is why he feels justified in bringing it to the floor at this time. My question—and it is one that I have not been able to find an answer to, though I have requested it from the administration: Has a decision been made to abandon what President Kennedy last year referred to the need for a balanced educational program? He said, as I recall, that one-sided aid is not enough. Has a decision been made to abandon any further effort to get a general aid to education program up for consideration in the House?

The press reports that Mr. Ribicoff, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, only 24 hours after the state of the Union message this year, stated that a general aid to education program has low priority. Again, according to the press, the White House is said to agree with Chairman Powell of our committee that Congress should go slow on major education legislation.

A decision, which I consider regrettable, apparently has been made to abandon even consideration in committee what should be done in this field. I regret that. I recognize, of course, that there are many controversies involved in developing a suitable program. Nonetheless, along with the building of additional facilities at the college level, the question remains what we should be doing about facilities at the elementary and secondary level. Should we not also consider the more controversial question as to what we should do about teachers' salaries? I do not think we should abandon, without even a test of strength on the floor of the House, the question of whether we should or should not move in these areas.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am sure the gentleman from New Jersey shares my hope that the school construction bill should also be supported on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I can assure the gentlewoman I can imagine no bipartisan support for the bill that was advocated by the administration last year. It has been my hope that we could evolve a quite different approach which would deserve some bipartisan support.

The question has been raised most vigorously whether further study is not needed in the field of overlapping of present expenditures in the field of education. It has been asserted that, pending such a survey, we should slow down on any further legislation.

I should like to point out—and I shall ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Record—that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has developed a study which indicates in some detail what Federal activities are presently underway. I would suggest that those varied activities should not surprise us and should not deter us from sound programs of action. We should not rest on our laurels because we pass a single bill. There are many needs still unmet and much still remains to be done if our response is to be adequate.

The following tabulation, to be found in a 1961 publication entitled "Federal Funds for Education," was prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 1.—*Financial support of Federal programs for education: 1950–51 to 1958–59*

Department or agency and program	Academic level [1]	Amount of Federal support, by year (thousands of dollars)				
		1950–51	1952–53	1954–55	1956–57	1958–59
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Total	----	2,511,829	1,416,898	1,571,535	1,968,246	2,413,18
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	----	111,370	310,575	392,240	457,277	737,864
Office of Education:						
Office administration	ES, H, A	2,879	5,149	3,506	4,871	8,229
Civil defense education	A	----	----	45	58	----
College housing loans program	H	----	----	----	----	----
Cooperative research	H	0	0	0	941	2,752
Fellowships for the study of mentally retarded children	H	0	0	0	0	0
Morrill-Nelson and Bankhead-Jones funds for land-grant colleges	H	5,030	5,030	5,052	5,052	5,052
National Defense Education Act of 1958:						
College student loans	H	----	----	----	----	----
Programs for guidance, counseling, and testing	ES	0	0	0	0	9,677
Fellowships to prepare college teachers	H	0	0	0	0	5,294
Improvement of statistical services of State educational agencies	ES	0	0	0	0	367
Language development	H	0	0	0	0	5,010
Science, mathematics, and foreign language instruction	ES	0	0	0	0	50,630
Loans to nonprofit private schools for science, mathematics, and foreign language instruction facilities	ES				•	
Utilization of new educational media	H	0	0	0	0	1,600
Public library services for rural areas	ES, A	0	0	0	1,440	5,218
School support in federally affected areas	ES	16,727	200,084	214,507	172,835	215,666
Vocational education	ES, H, A	26,685	25,366	30,351	37,063	44,638
Federally aided corporations:						
American Printing House for the Blind	ES	125	185	215	240	410
Gallaudet College	ES, H	368	503	674	3,162	972
Howard University	H	4,262	4,047	7,654	3,686	4,636
Food and Drug Administration:						
Consumer and industry education	A	----	----	----	----	----
Training for State and local officials	A	----	----	----	----	----
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation:						
Training of individual rehabilitants	H, A	----	----	----	----	----
Research and demonstration projects	H	----	----	299	1,999	4,600
Training and traineeships	H	----	----	790	2,938	4,790
Public Health Service:						
Communicable Disease Center	A	----	370	396	567	760
Education in hospitals	ES, H, A	191	187	181	216	215
Education of public health personnel	A	----	----	633	1,150	1,272
Indian health	A	----		----	179	283
Research fellowships	H	----	2,014	2,558	5,416	10,154
Traineeships and training grants	H	----	7,977	11,488	30,836	60,203
Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center	H	----	127	149	357	318
St. Elizabeths Hospital training for staff and volunteer workers	H	----	----	----	----	----
Social Security Administration:						
Children's Bureau training program	H	477	695	482	596	2,665
Bureau of Public Assistance consultation and training	H, A	----	----	----	----	660
Surplus Property Utilization Division allocations for education	ES, H	54,626	58,841	113,260	183,675	292,366
Department of Agriculture		171,154	195,693	245,071	398,399	383,556
Agricultural Extension Service	H	32,141	32,117	39,800	50,030	53,885
Revenue from national forests and submarginal lands	ES	8,435	17,490	16,871	29,080	22,880
School lunch and milk	ES	118,082	133,540	169,291	290,431	275,945
State agricultural experiment stations	H	12,496	12,546	19,109	28,858	30,846
Department of Commerce		5,292	4,024	2,632	2,884	3,493
Census training for foreign technicians	H	----	----	----	----	82
Maritime Administration schools	H	5,292	4,024	2,593	2,836	3,266
Meteorological education and training	H	----	----	39	48	41
Training in the National Bureau of Standards	H	----	----	----	----	104
Department of Defense		25,507	40,714	47,955	69,569	300,877
Service academies	H	13,648	15,956	16,351	23,480	38,503
Education for military personnel at civilian institutions	H	6,724	7,089	5,699	8,800	9,324
Education for off-duty personnel	H, A	5,135	8,683	9,370	10,579	12,081
Education for civilian employees	H	----	----	----	2,095	3,074
Education of dependent children overseas	ES	----	8,911	16,421	24,375	29,699
Operation of school buses	ES	----	----	----	----	435
Education for the native population on the Pacific islands	ES	----	----	----	----	103
Medical education for national defense	H	----	75	114	240	405
Research assistantships in educational institutions	H	----	----	----	----	207,253
Department of the Interior	----	45,834	58,834	80,263	90,794	113,577
Alaska public works program	ES, H	101	3,397	3,250	1,363	1,047
Bureau of Mines safety training program	A	780	837	850	898	1,200
Education for children of National Park Service employees	ES	14	20	27	29	38
Education in American Samoa	ES, H, A	----	----	----	----	218
Education in the Pribilof Islands	ES	26	34	35	43	51
Education in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	ES, H, A	290	300	250	410	399
Education for Indians in the United States	ES	27,118	30,117	37,541	49,433	59,348
Revenue from sale of public lands	ES	17,505	24,129	38,310	38,618	51,276
Department of Justice	----	389	422	461	530	1,416
Bureau of Prisons general and social education	A	----	----	----	----	436
Bureau of Prisons correspondence courses	A	----	----	----	----	60
Bureau of Prisons vocational training	A	389	422	461	530	686
FBI National Academy	H	----	----	----	----	9
Police training schools	A	----	----	----	----	225
Department of Labor	----	3,927	5,188	5,236	5,940	10,941
Apprenticeship and training	A	3,183	3,324	3,160	3,399	4,009
Foreign visitors program	H	744	1,864	2,076	2,541	3,167
Testing, counseling, and placement services	ES	----	----	----	----	3,765

See footnote at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Financial support of Federal programs for education: 1950–51 to 1958–59*—Continued

Department or agency and program (1)	Academic level [1] (2)	Amount of Federal support, by year (thousands of dollars)				
		1950–51 (3)	1952–53 (4)	1954–55 (5)	1956–57 (6)	1958–59 (7)
Department of State			37,402	40,100	47,751	57,811
Educational exchange program	H		23,360	19,768	18,605	26,590
Country missions	H, A		14,042	20,332	29,146	31,221
Interuniversity contracts	H					
Department of the Treasury		1,800	2,565	2,506	3,350	5,212
U.S. Coast Guard Academy	H	1,768	2,513	2,435	3,265	4,068
Education of dependent children overseas	ES	0	0	13	23	37
U.S. Coast Guard officer postgraduate and specialized training	H	32	52	58	62	56
Internal Revenue Service training for enforcement personnel	A					1, 51
Atomic Energy Commission		18,908	25,221	24,479	30,717	51,047
Contract research	H	13,487	17,352	19,431	21,284	39,628
Fellowships	H	1,055	696	229	413	925
Expenditures for public schools	ES	3,682	6,780	4,410	4,097	4,958
Other training	H	684	393	409	4,923	5,536
Canal Zone		2,300	2,635	2,910	3,647	5,019
Public education	ES, H, A	2,300	2,635	2,910	3,647	5,019
District of Columbia		2,728	2,310	5,063	5,077	7,742
Public education	ES, H	2,695	2,277	5,016	5,027	7,680
Capitol Page School	ES	33	33	47	50	62
Education in public welfare institutions	ES					
Federal Aviation Agency		101	348	266	461	1,036
Aviation training of foreign nationals	H	100	345	244	432	994
Tuition payments for employees in nondepartmental institutions	H	1	3	2	9	14
International Civil Aviation Organization Fellows	H			20	20	28
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation					7	14
Employee education	H				7	14
Library of Congress		1,000	1,000	1,000	1,067	1,368
Reading material for the blind	A	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,067	1,368
National Aeronautics and Space Administration		710	618	675	580	5,023
Training and research centers	H					47
Research at educational institutions	H	710	618	675	580	4,976
National Science Foundation			3,220	10,109	34,952	122,820
Basic research	H		1,813	8,009	15,268	45,950
Research facilities	H				5,382	15,580
Fellowships	H		1,366	1,784	3,354	13,071
Institutes, course content improvement, and special projects	ES, H		41	316	10,948	48,219
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization					707	1,741
Civil defense resident and extension schools	A					529
Training and education contributions to States	A				707	1,212
Small Business Administration						
Management training	A					
Tennessee Valley Authority		593	557	485	582	593
Cooperative research, tests, and demonstrations	H	593	557	485	582	593
Veterans' Administration		2,120,216	725,572	710,084	813,955	602,036
Vocational rehabilitation	H, A	176,875	57,769	40,770	30,598	22,307
Education and training	H, A	1,943,341	667,803	664,514	773,906	566,366
War orphans educational assistance	H, A	0	0	0	2,351	7,663
Fees to educational institutions	H, A	0		4,800	7,100	5,700

---

[1] Academic levels: ES—Elementary-secondary; H—Higher education; A—Adult education.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS].

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I, too, am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 8900 and to add my own congratulations to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Special Education, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] whose concern, intelligence and energy are chiefly responsible for the shaping of this legislation and bringing it to the floor of the House of Representatives today.

I want also to dive into this partisan sea in which we all seem to be swimming this afternoon, and to say how pleased I am that Democrats and Republicans are recognizing that higher education is of such an order of priority that we can join in strong support of legislation to provide for academic facilities for the colleges and universities of our country.

Mr. Chairman, reference has already been made to the fact that several members of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives—the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], and I have for the last several months served on a bipartisan Advisory Group on Higher Education which was named by the Chairman of the full Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The discussions which the members of our group have had during the last several months with outstanding university educators and administrators have convinced us that the American university community is to a really remarkable degree united in its agreement that a Federal program to help finance the construction of classrooms, libraries, laboratories and other academic facilities is not only essential, it is the No. 1 priority in higher education today.

Mr. Chairman, I have here, for example, a telegram that I have just received from the distinguished president of Purdue University, a great land-grant university in the State of Indiana, Dr. Frederick L. Hovde, advising me of his very strong support of H.R. 8900. Dr. Hovde points out that funds for academic buildings must be made available now if the new buildings we must have are to come into the stream of construction by the years 1964 and 1965, when the number of high school graduates in my own home State of Indiana jumps 25 percent in the year 1964, and another 15 percent over that figure in 1965.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said here today that there is no need for this legislation. This is, I am pleased to note, a minority view here this afternoon, but I would urge those who do hold this view, to look at some of the statements that have been made in recent weeks by the representatives of the American Council on Education.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. GOODELL. Would the gentleman clarify the expression when the gentleman uses the world "minority" to the extent that the gentleman is not referring to the minority party?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I will be delighted to do that, especially for my friend from New York.

When I use the word "minority" this afternoon, I mean a minority of Republicans and a minority of Democrats. I am just partisan enough to point out, however, this afternoon, that the minority on the Republican side has been somewhat more vocal in opposing this legislation than the minority on our side. I hope the gentleman will excuse me for at least that degree of partisanship.

Mr. Chairman, I was saying that members of the American Council on Education, the chief spokesman for colleges and universities in our country, have overwhelmingly indicated its desire for a program of grants and loans for the construction of academic facilities. I hope very much that the widespread recognition of the need to which we have all referred this afternoon will be reflected in the vote today.

Mr. Chairman, the impact of growing enrollments in the coming decade in the United States and the challenge to American scientific and technical education have already been cogently described both by the Chairman of the full Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell], and by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green], and by other members of the Committee on Education and Labor on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, I want once again to point out the strong support of this type of legislation from all kinds of institutions of higher learning in this country, large and small, old and new.

Mr. Chairman, I should like at this point to ask the distinguished Chairman of the Subcommittee on Special Education, the gentlewoman from Oregon, [Mrs. Green], this question, which I know is on the minds of many of the Members of the House:

What are some of the precedents for Federal aid to colleges and universities in the United States? What are the precedents for Federal aid to higher education?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, in response to the question the gentleman from Indiana has raised, there is considerable precedent. I have a summary of all of the grants and the loans that have been made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, by the Department of Defense, by the National Science Foundation, by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and by the college housing program. Let me give you one example, if I may, with respect to the district which is represented by the very distinguished minority leader on the House Committee on Education and Labor [Mr. Kearns]:

I find that in his district, for example, that Allegheny College received $58,860 from HEW; from the National Science Foundation it has had grants of $358,370, and it has received over $1 million from Housing and from NASA. This one college has received $1,733,000 from various Federal agencies.

I would also say to my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania that he is indeed fortunate in his district because the Federal Government, through its various agencies, has awarded to 7 private and public colleges a total of $6,077,970, most of it in the last 5 years. With the exception of housing, all of it was awarded in the last 5 years.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Congress from the depths of my heart, and congratulate myself.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I can cite 435 other examples where the Federal Government today has given substantial grants and loans to colleges and universities throughout this country. So, we are not breaking new ground. The precedent is there, and we simply believe that there should be a greater participation by the Federal Government in view of the urgency of the times.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this bill because I think the figures stated in the report of the Committee on Education and Labor with regard to the pressure on college enrollments in the next 8 years are so persuasive that it does require immediate action of this House.

This bill is in a tradition which in my own State of Maryland predates the Federal period of history, goes back into our colonial history when we had aid to higher education. It follows the tradition of the land-grant colleges and of the National Defense Education Act. Not all of the aims of an adequate program for higher education are included within this bill. I am sure there are some features which some of us will find undesirable, but I still think it is a bill which is urgently needed and which we must support. I would, however, second the plea of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Frelinghuysen], that once we have acted on this bill, and acted favorably, we do not consider that the job is done. There is a great deal left to be done and I hope that we will continue to see that we finish up what is needed in this area of assistance to higher education.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Hiestand].

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, this bill is presented to us as an emergency measure. It is said that we are in a crisis; therefore, whatever we do in an emergency need not be permanent. May I suggest that we have always had a shortage of scientists and engineers. We shall probably always have a shortage of scientists and engineers. I know of no time when we did not. In the depths of the depression we may have had a surplus of all types of labor, but in my judgment this is not a crisis. I know that is a good argument for the enactment of a great many bills—a crisis, and that it is a temporary measure. But this is a permanent measure. Once we get this program established it will be permanent and it will keep on growing forever, at least as far as we can see. The people of America will be stuck with it.

We always have needed engineers and scientists. It reminds me, as I mentioned before, of the sputnik crisis, the panic that ensued when sputnik went up, and the hue and cry for scientists and engineers was terrific then. Some passed the National Defense Education Act and still we are short of scientists and engineers. And why? Because this control that the Federal Government has and which it has to have, as I mentioned in discussing the rule, has included some fantastic courses, these humanities courses. They are wonderful and valuable and fine, but as for creating scientists and engineers, I cannot see them.

I am sure that the Members of this House realize that the taxpayers' money is supporting a lot of education for which there was no authorization in the Defense Education Act. And yet it is full of controls. There are some 12 controls and a number of them are put down in the Defense Education Act. We cannot say that we do not have to have controls. We do have to have them. It is our obligation and it is our right, according to the Supreme Court. Whatever the Federal Government does, it has the right and obligation to control.

I wonder, then, what is the motive for this Federal aid? I am wondering if somewhere along the line there is not simply the motive to get control. I wonder whether we have pondered that one. Why Federal aid? The colleges have done a magnificent job under the free enterprise system. They are doing a magnificent job. They have been, as has just been mentioned, supplied with generous Federal funds for many special purposes. If that money has been well spent, why do we need to double or triple or quadruple it, or multiply it by 10 times? This is a very serious question.

Also, we are told that this is not really Federal aid to education of the objectionable type, because it all goes only into construction of facilities.

May I suggest that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] at the very outset said this is just a beginning of a great Federal program, and various others have implied that this is only a toe in the door. May I suggest that this advisory group which has been mentioned got out this little pamphlet "Congressional Action for Higher Education." In this pamphlet, Mr. Chairman, are items of a great Federal program for education, for academic facilities, like this one, for science equipment, for language equipment, but also for supply and quality of teachers at all levels. Teachers at all levels. Mr. Chairman, if this does not mean Federal control of all education I just wonder what it does mean.

Then we have the National Defense Education Act national language program vastly to be expanded; the faculty development program, vastly to be expanded; the financial assistance to students to be expanded, the student loan fund, assistance to exceptionally needy students, incentives to academic achievement. Many of these things are desirable, but why the Federal Government? Assistance for professional and graduate students and basic research.

These are things that we agree are desirable, but why is the Federal Government in it at all when the States, counties and communities, and private schools have been doing such a magnificent job?

Federal Government construction is well known to be and is provided in this bill to be far more expensive and wasteful than construction by college authorities, especially where they have had a difficult time getting the money, or State colleges. We find in these latter instances they spend their money carefully and wisely.

I also notice that this is a program of grants and loans. May I suggest that there may be a question in some of our minds why an institution should ever borrow money that it has to pay back when it can get an outright grant.

This bill has many, many weaknesses. It is much more expensive, less efficient, and more wasteful than at present.

On this matter of whether the public wants Federal aid to education, somebody called me on the telephone the other day and asked if this bill was coming up, and asked if I was in favor of it. I said, "No, I am not." Well, could you use some help? I said, "Yes, but do not send any to me, send it to somebody else; my position is well known." Despite that fact I had a pile of over 70 telegrams that arrived just yesterday and today. I am astonished that the people should be so excited so suddenly. They are opposed to Federal aid to education. And I said before in the discussion of the rule, whether we call it aid to education or not, whether we say this just takes in higher education, it is still a fact that it is aid to education and we shall all be indicted for favoring it, if we do.

I am opposed to the bill, and I hope it will be defeated.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON], a very competent and capable member of the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in enthusiastic support of the measure under consideration.

Have my colleagues ever realized that we have only one inscription on the walls of this entire Chamber? It is over the clock above the Speaker's dais, but we are all so interested in many matters that I doubt if many of us have observed it or studied it. I have, and I wish to read it at this time. It reads:

> Let us develop the resources of the land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

In my opinion our greatest natural resource is the youth of our country. There is no greater institution that we in Congress can build up than our colleges and our universities. We must not waste the talent of our youth; we must see to it that every young person who has the capability of learning be given the opportunity to learn.

We have heard a lot about fighting communism; and, of course, we must fight communism by producing the greatest scholars and the greatest scientists.

However, in the long run, our place in civilization will be determined not by the number of tanks we produce, not by the number of guns we have, but the type of the culture we have, the type of educational system that we can produce.

We have a great opportunity before us today. This bill has been called the toe in the door or the foot in the door. I hope it is; I hope it is the beginning of a giant step forward, because I will be happy to take it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO].

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, this past fall I traveled to the Soviet Union with a special committee of the Committee on Education and Labor. We paid particular attention to the Russian educational system. I came back from that trip encouraged as to the quality of American education, compared to what I saw in Russia. But what disturbed me most of all was the attention and dedication of the Russian people to the importance of education.

I sometimes wonder whether we Americans are paying enough attention to education, to what education means to us in the world today and what it will mean in the future. Throughout Europe, particularly in Russia, governments realize the tremendous significance and the increasing importance that an educated body of men and women in all fields means, and the tremendous importance and effect they will have on the future of the world.

Sometimes I fear we in America take education for granted, leaving it to individual support and meanwhile, resting on the belief that education is properly a private matter. True, education is of concern to the individual who seeks it. But in addition to the private benefits that individuals get from education there is also a public benefit. The public has an interest in it because if this country, the greatest Nation in the world, does not continue to train people in all aspects of human knowledge, if we do not make sure that we have an educated body of youth coming along at all times in increasing numbers, then we, as a nation, will be at a tremendous disadvantage.

Speaking specifically of the bill at hand, there are several things I would like to stress. First, the bill will generate and encourage non-Federal spending in the field of education. By virtue of the limitation of Federal participation to one-third of the cost it will mean that for every dollar the Government spends there will be 2 extra dollars spent by non-Federal sources. You may say, "Sure, they will borrow it from the Government under the loan section of the bill." But the point is they must repay that loan; and, in addition, we have a limitation that only a percentage of the two-thirds non-Federal money can be borrowed from the Government. There must be a portion which will be non-Federal money.

The other point I would like to make is that it will stimulate an increased growth in those particular institutions which are going to carry the great burden of educating the more than two and a half million additional young people that will come along by 1970. I happen to represent the city of New Haven. When you speak of New Haven, automatically you think of the fact that Yale University is there. But Yale, Harvard, and the large institutions of this country are not going to expand sufficiently to carry this burden. In New Haven, do you know that there is New Haven College, Albertus Magnus College, Quinnipiac College, and Southern Connecticut State College?

These are the new, young, growing colleges which need assistance. They do not have the endowments that the large universities have. But they are going to take upon themselves the obligation and the duty of educating those two and a half million additional people coming along in the next 8 years.

This bill is just a beginning. There are many other problems in education. I think the people who create smokescreens, such as the question of Federal control of education, the cost of education and its effect on the budget, are not facing the problem head on. The fact is we must have the facilities for our increasing population. We must do additional things for education, as has been mentioned today by prior speakers. We must assist the States and the universities in upgrading the quality of teachers and the quality of instruction.

We must see to it that needy students, those who cannot afford a college education, may obtain it. These are some of the problems we must solve with the assistance of the Federal Government, not with its control but with its assistance.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIAIMO. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. We intended in this legislation to include all institutions of learning. However, it has been brought to my attention that so far as some universities are concerned, when we define an institution of higher education, as on page 29, that we might leave out the branches of the universities. I am under the impression that we meant the branches as well.

Mr. GIAIMO. I agree with the gentleman. I am under the same impression. I think the gentlewoman from Oregon also agrees with us and is under the impression that a branch college is a part of the institution, therefore it would be counted in as part of the main institutions and would receive the benefits of this bill.

Mr. QUIE. Would the gentleman yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon to answer that question?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Yes; we certainly intended that this legislation shall cover the branches as well as the main university.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook].

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make several points here today. First of all, I will say that our subcommittee, of which I am a member, grappled with this rather difficult problem, and I am very much convinced that the bill we have here today is a great improvement over what we had offered by the administration. However, I think it would be wise to point out several things which should be considered at this time.

On page 7 of the report under "Eligibility" it is rather interesting to note that in paragraph (a) it says that an institution, to become eligible, must show that "it is unable to borrow money from other sources on equally favorable terms." I wonder, for example, who here thinks that we are going to find any institution that will be able to borrow money on "equally favorable terms." We are, in effect, saying that the Government is going to have the best terms.

We are saying that everybody should look to the Federal Government for the best terms available, and therefore the best route for making improvements in academic facilities.

On page 6 of the report it says:

> The applicant must further show that the project (a) will not be used primarily for events for which admission is charged to the public * * * (c) is not used and will not be used for "sectarian instruction" or as a place for "religious worship," and (d) is not used and will not be used primarily in connection with any part of the program of a school or department of divinity.

In section 108 and section 122, subparagraph (2), paragraph (B), there is set out a remedy for recapture of payments where these uses are not in accordance with what is stated here. I would point out, however, if there is any religious institution on which that demand would be made within the 20-year period, it would be rather hazardous for the U.S. Government to endeavor to gain back or to bring back any payments that have gone to that institution. So, I think in most cases we will have to admit this is meaningless.

While the provisions of H.R. 8900 can be challenged on the basis of the failure of its advocates to present any evidence of lack of classrooms on college campuses today or in the near future, its most conspicuous weakness is administrative. Any Congressman who votes for this measure, in effect, will have placed the college presidents of his district in a most serious dilemma and will, at the same time, invite the most undesirable type of State politics to be introduced into the expansion of the colleges of his district.

The very serious questions of priority in allocating these funds were carefully avoided by the officials of the Office of Education through the authorization of State commissions charged with the responsibility for setting up the criteria—standards and methods—by which to determine what college building projects were eligible for assistance under the proposed program.

While the administering agency of the Federal Government can thus duck the responsibility for the repercussions of this program, it should be of considerable concern to the Congressmen who must return to the scene of the conflict to campaign for reelection.

Both the loans and grants proposed under H.R. 8900 will bring on this confusion and conflict.

College officials who succeeded in getting top priority for grants will still have the problem of raising two-thirds of the costs of the building from other sources, since the Federal share is limited to one-third of the total development costs of the building. Not all of these remaining two-thirds could be borrowed from the loan program, for it is specifically required that at least one-fourth of the development costs be financed from non-Federal sources.

Even assuming that building campaigns could be conducted by college officials to raise the one-fourth from alumni or business corporations, college officials have no equity or other means of guaranteeing the repayment of the Federal loans—and the bill specifically requires that Federal loans be limited to applicants unable to secure loans from other sources on terms as favorable as authorized in the bill. The use of tuition fees to amortize such loans is both unwise and uncertain and—in the case of public institutions—few, if any, State legislatures would commit future legislatures to budgetary items guaranteeing repayment of Federal loans.

For the average college official this then adds up to the following frustrating set of conditions: If he successfully wages a highly political battle to get priority from the State commission for a grant for a classroom building, he must then conduct a successful campaign to raise one-fourth of the building costs from outside sources before he would be eligible to receive a loan from the Federal Government to make up the remainder of the costs, and then he would be hard put to present the security and guarantee of repayment of the loan.

Equally important, the specter of constitutionality is raised by introducing the grant concept into the overall program proposed by the bill. By making 60 percent of the Federal program grants, it is clearly indicated that the loan program is expected to supplement the grants, and hence almost all buildings constructed will be determined by the eligibility established through these State commissions for grants. Hence the whole program would fail if the constitutionality of direct tax support for religious institutions were raised.

The Senate has carefully avoided this possibility in S. 1241 by limiting title I to loans, and by clearly indicating in title III that the grants were to be available only to public community-junior colleges. It will be interesting to see how H.R. 8900 is reconciled to their bill.

As recently as Tuesday of last week, a Senator known to be favorable to Federal financing of education, nevertheless, clearly indicated in remarks in the Congressional Record, pages 808–809, the view that Federal grants for religious institutions are unconstitutional.

He pointed out in the case of Everson against the Board of Education that the first amendment of the Constitution definitely means that neither the State nor the Federal Government "can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another."

Justices Frankfurter, Jackson, and Burton concurred with Justice Rutledge in stating that the first amendment was intended to "create a complete and permanent separation of the spheres of religious activity and civil authority by comprehensively forbidding every form of public aid or support for religion. In view of this history no further proof is needed that the first amendment forbids any appropriation, large or small, from public funds to aid or support any and all religious exercises."

Regardless of the construction placed by the President or others on the constitutionality of loans of tax funds to assist religious educational institutions, it should be clear that outright grants are of doubtful constitutionality and we will surely be inviting litigation.

It therefore appears that confusion and controversy will be brought on in the higher education systems of many, if not all, States if either loans or grants for non-revenue-producing college facilities are offered to them by the Federal Government. Since there has been no demonstrated need for any emergency action by the Congress to stimulate college classroom construction, and Federal funds are already available to colleges and universities to enable them to build any needed dormitories, cafeterias, or other revenue-producing facilities, the program proposed under H.R. 8900 is unnecessary and will lead to undesirable consequences.

However, the bill presented here is a great improvement on the administration proposal. That proposal called for all loans and no grants but there was a subterfuge. It would have given to the college $350 per student on scholarship, in effect a direct grant. Many of us believe the Senate will include scholarships when they vote on the measure before that body. At any rate this is a typical foot-in-the door deal. The sponsors imply there is a new source of money for schools in this bill. Federal money is not magic money but it is a good vehicle to bring about control of our private institutions of higher education.

Mr. Chairman, I include several articles as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times]

PEPPERDINE POINTS THE WAY TO SELF-RELIANCE

(By Morrie Ryskind)

Some time ago I chronicled in this space my horror at the discovery of a small Western college whose doctrines are so inimical to the welfare of the welfare state that, if spread, they might—heaven forbid—throw us back to the Dark Ages when Americans were obsessed with the notion that the individual, and not the Government, knew what was best for him. I had thought that the high priests of the National Education Association had exorcized all such evil spirits with their methodological incantations and that none had escaped the inquisition. Alas, no.

I mean no disparagement of the NEA, whose noble work, especially in preparing our youngsters for higher education, no one recognizes more than I. College entrance tests indicate that not only can a lot of our Johnnies not read, but that they are unable to compose an essay of 100 words without serious errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation and have been taught more about UNESCO than about the three R's.

That the NEA has been able to accomplish all this in spite of starvation wages, lack of prestige, tenure and vacations of only 3 months—and in schools built by the local communities and not the Federal Government—is proof enough of its dedication.

But the devil never rests, and there was little Pepperdine College in Los Angeles, still unconverted after 25 years and still shamelessly preaching the heathenish gospel of self-reliance. I attended a black mass held under its auspices at which BARRY GOLDWATER presided and actually heard them sing the praises of work and thrift and pay homage to our primitive Constitution, that outmoded instrument which Senator FULBRIGHT has described as designed for an 18th century agrarian society.

I was still shaking my head in violent disbelief of my senses, much as an anthropologist might if he suddenly came upon a colony of Neanderthal men whom civilization had completely bypassed, when the biggest blasphemy of all was uttered. The paleolithic president of the college rose to announce that Pepperdine was building a new dormitory, to be completely financed by floating a loan among private citizens and without a penny of Federal grants.

There is a point at which, no matter how tolerant you are, heresy becomes treason, and I could take no more. I fled to my typewriter and wrote a devastating exposé of the whole tawdry proceedings, predicting that the whole weight of the establishment would shortly fall on Pepperdine for thus violating the cardinal commandment.

For the problem is not, are we getting enough school construction?—the evidence is overwhelming that we are getting that at the local level at a rate even above what the NEA has demanded—but how to get the Government into the act. Only in that way can the State take over the schools, and—equally important—only in that way can the collectivistic scholars take over the State.

Sure enough, shortly afterward, the establishment excommunicated Pepperdine in a report made by the Research Department of the California Teachers. True, a subsequent report—due either to oversight or fear of a libel suit—omitted Pepperdine's name from the list of the banished, but the aim had been achieved. Everybody sees the front-page banner that headlines a juicy morsel, but nobody sees the retraction made on page 18 a month later. Mention Pepperdine even today among faithful and eyebrows are sure to be raised.

But apparently this is not an isolated case. I have just received an announcement from Rockford College in Rockford, Ill., informing me of the development of a new $15 million campus "without seeking any construction funds from the Government."

Nor, adds the president, "will we ask for the presently available building loans with their token, subsidized interest rates."

Says one trustee: "Rockford has been maintained by private support for 114 years as an independent institution. We are bound to lose that independence if we turn to the Federal Government for funds." And another: "If we ask the Government to quit spending money at such a high rate, we can't ask for a handout in the same breath."

And that last, if you please, from the chairman of the city board of education.

It can happen here. The infiltration is obviously far wider than any of us had ever suspected, and a whole generation of youngsters may be infected unless we put our attention to the job at hand. Let us forget about the Brandenburg Gates till we have eradicated the enemy within our own gates. To arms, men of the NEA.

[From the Bulletin of Wheaton College]

NO FEDERAL SCHOLARSHIPS, THANK YOU

(By President V. Raymond Edman)

MY DEAR PRESIDENT EISENHOWER: Originally, Mr. President, it was my thought to write to our Congressman from the 14th Illinois District, the Honorable Russell W. Keeney, and express to him as our Representative how we at Wheaton College feel about Federal aid to higher education, especially in the matter of scholarships. However, in our district we have had the sorrow caused by the untimely death of Mr. Keeney, a fellow citizen and neighbor here in Wheaton, and a very highly respected citizen and public servant. I am therefore taking the liberty of addressing these observations to you.

The advocates for Federal aid to education are vocal and well organized. We are familiar with their arguments for immediate aid to the colleges and universities, lest we be overwhelmed by the rising tide of enrollments, or die because of rising costs that may prove to be beyond our means.

We appreciate the perplexity and peril in which institutions of higher learning find themselves, but we do not think we should become panicky. The colleges have been in difficulties in days past, in the depression, for example; but we tightened our belts and toughened our spirit to overcome that ordeal.

We here at Wheaton, along with some others, perhaps a minority, do not favor panaceas such as Federal scholarships and grants-in-aid. Our persuasion is based upon principles fundamental in the American way of education.

I. NOT A FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY

We do not believe that basically education is a responsibility of the Federal Government. We do not hold that article 1, section 8, paragraph 1 of the Constitution which grants to the Congress "the power to lay and collect taxes * * * and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States" includes education. That responsibility was left very wisely to the individual States and the local districts thereof.

The thought of the Founding Fathers regarding education was well stated in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, made the very same year the Constitution was framed. You will recall that basic statement of national policy declared that "religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools, and the means of education shall be forever encouraged." To that laudable end the ordinance made provision for the reservation of land designed to support public education, both elementary and higher.

II. A FAMILY RESPONSIBILITY

We hold that the primary responsibility for the education of the children rests with the individual family. The family is the God-ordained unit of human society. In the last analysis, the strength of any government is based upon the strength of the family.

It should be the desire of the parents that their children have every available educational opportunity. Such desire may require great sacrifice and hardship on the part of their parents, but their investment will be infinitely worthwhile.

It should be the motivation of the children to secure an education. If they lack the inner urge to prepare themselves thoroughly for life, no amount of outward advantages and encouragement can help them.

Few factors can be more constructive in building unity and cooperation than the mutual desire of all the family to help in the education of the children. We here at Wheaton find that many of our finest young people come from godly homes of modest circumstances, in which fathers and mothers love their children, pray for them, sacrifice for them, and encourage them. The children, on their part, are appreciative of the affection and confidence of their parents and do their part diligently in their studies and employment so as to achieve a college education.

We think the Federal Government should join the colleges and the churches in the effort to encourage building strong American homes, which in turn will be the bulwark of a free America. The dependence of parents and children should be upon God and themselves, and not on the Federal Government. By cooperation and courage, by effort and enthusiasm, by faith and frugality, the children can achieve the education they desire and need.

Therefore, we believe that Federal scholarships, good as they may seem on the outside, can be a real handicap to the highest interests of the American people.

III. A LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Next to the individual family, the local community, the county, and, finally, the State should be responsible to provide adequate facilities for public education. Such persuasion on our part dates back to the very beginnings of American history. The Pilgrims and Puritans who settled in New England in the 1620's and 1630's gladly assumed the responsibility for the education of their children. Although beset by hardships on their farms and in their tiny towns and bedeviled by Indians on the frontier, the settlers of Massachusetts passed a law as early as 1642 requiring each town to provide compulsory education for the children of the community. Perhaps it would have been a vain effort for the Puritans to look to a distant Parliament in Great Britain for educational subsidies. Be that as it may, they saw their own problem and resolved it by their own efforts, and at their own expense. In that way they established the American pattern for public education.

It is our strong persuasion, Mr. President, that this original responsibility for education should be kept at the local level. There is no substitute for the endeavor of freemen to provide education for the children of their own community. Bureaucracy can build bulging budgets but not school buildings and public spirit for education.

IV. PHILANTHROPY AND ECONOMY A NECESSITY

It is our persuasion that careful planning by the private colleges and generous philanthropy by our fellow Americans, either individuals, industry, or foundations, can face up to the present challenge in higher education. Many of the colleges which are in dire financial distress can help themselves immeasurably by a review of their policies and practice, by a reduction in expenditures brought about by increased efficiency of operation, and by a realistic tuition schedule. Why go on in inefficiency, wastefulness, and indifference?

In that regard, Mr. President, may I say that we at Wheaton for years have continued on a balanced budget. We hold no illusion that we can spend ourselves into prosperity. Neither do we think that businessmen should have confidence in an institution that is not careful and conscientious in the use of funds entrusted to it. We have a continuing study on economy and efficiency so that we make the most of the stewardship that is entrusted to us by the Christian friends of the college.

It is our observation that industry is willing and able to help the colleges that are doing their best to be efficient and effective in their work. Industry and individuals have the right to make careful inquiry into the financial integrity and efficiency of a college, so as to be sure that its academic program is effective and its financial policies and practices are sound.

American philanthropy, Mr. President, as represented by industry, foundations, and individuals, can and will provide the scholarship aid which is needed for earnest and deserving American young people and also give the colleges proportionate aid for the education of our youth. The national merit scholarship program, the Ford Foundation scholarships, General Motors scholarships, and the many others granted by American agencies provide the incentive and enterprise needed in the instruction of our college students. The Federal Government should encourage that movement for scholarship aid by industry. I believe strongly, Mr. President, that our American young people should know that scholarship aid comes from American industry and ingenuity; therefore, it is most proper that the real sources should have recognition and appreciation. Federal scholarships will create the illusion that the bounty arises from the Federal bureaucracy. The Government as such produces no wealth. It only spends the money which we citizens contribute in the form of taxes. We at Wheaton find that we have to keep teaching our students this basic truth because of the false impression that has been created to the effect that anybody can get most anything from Washington.

Federal money is originally our money. It is produced by our enterprise, energy, inventiveness, efficiency; by our sweat, and sometimes by our tears. Our money should be a sacred trust to the Federal Government. Government is a necessity, but it should not be a luxury.

Therefore, Mr. President, I recommend you allow the American people the responsibility and the privilege of providing the education for their own young people. We concur in the opinion of your Committee on Education Beyond the High School in its second report which reads in part:

"Despite some strong reasons in its favor, the Committee does not recommend instituting a large-scale program of Federal scholarships at this time. The Committee believes that it could lessen the growing efforts of others; it could accentuate the danger that enrollments will rise faster than the faculties and facilities needed to care for them, and it would not represent the most effective means by which such Federal assistance as may be needed could be used to aid both students and institutions right now.

"The Committee is encouraged by the marked recent expansion of scholarships supported by private foundations, corporations, labor unions, service clubs, individuals, and by State and local governments. There is need for much further expansion, both at the graduate and undergraduate level. If these programs should later prove to be inadequate, the Committee believes a Federal scholarship program to fill the gap is inevitable. Right now, however, it seems likely that the Federal Government can help most in other directions."

Therefore, Mr. President, we believe the Federal Government should encourage free enterprise to help freedom-loving American people solve their own problems of education. We believe the Federal Government has enough to do without being concerned about our kindergartens and colleges. We promise you that the privately supported Christian colleges and American industry will not fail nor shirk their responsibilities.

V. A COMMENDATION

May I commend you most highly, Mr. President, for the statement with which you introduced your education message to Congress on January 27:

"Education best fulfills its high purpose when responsibility for education is kept close to the people it serves—when it is rooted in the home, nurtured in the community and sustained by a rich variety of public, private, and individual resources. The bond linking home and school and community—the responsiveness of each to the needs of the others—is a precious asset of American education.

"This bond must be strengthened, not weakened, as American education faces new responsibilities in the cause of freedom. For the increased support our educational system now requires, we must look primarily to citizens and parents acting in their own communities, school boards and city councils, teachers, principals, school superintendents, State boards of education and State legislatures, trustees, and faculties of private institutions."

We are apprehensive, however, of what follows in that message. We realize there is an emergency; but we are not convinced that "the Federal Government must also undertake to play an emergency role," as you declare. What begins as an "emergency" can become the accustomed procedure within a very brief time.

We and the young people we teach would do better to be exercised by the emergency which is upon us, toughened by the difficulties and decision we must face. Thus the colleges, with the cooperation of industry and individuals, can make a realistic and real contribution to the America of tomorrow.

May I add a word, Mr. President, on Wheaton's position regarding the contribution that the privately supported colleges are giving to America in this mid-20th century? Recently I was asked by radio station WGN in Chicago to speak on that topic as part of the program "Talks for Our Times." Here is the substance of that message:

THE CONTRIBUTION OF CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS IN MID-20TH-CENTURY AMERICA

Christians are an indispensable bulwark for the defense of American freedom.

Colleges like Wheaton are Christian because they have been founded by godly men and women in the fear of God for the purpose of educating their young people. This education includes not only the organized fields of human learning, but even more important, the Christian theistic view of the world, of man, and of man's culture in the light of Biblical and natural revelation.

Christian colleges, founded by freemen, are directed and staffed by freemen to the end of giving our young people freedom from ignorance, superstition, fear, and tyranny.

Christian colleges are independent of Government control or subsidy, and are dependent upon Almighty God and His people for their maintenance and enlargement. Thus they are free to teach the truth as they find it in the Bible and in the world around about us. Christian schools are free from the imposition of politicians and the blusterings of bureaucrats.

They are free to be themselves, and they propose to perpetuate that freedom for American youth.

The contribution of the Christian schools in mid-20th-century America can be best understood in the basic principles enunciated in the Declaration of Independence. On July 4, 1776, the Founding Fathers of our Republic declared:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed * * *."

"These truths are self-evident"—so obvious that they have no need of proof.

"All men are created"—we are created beings, the creatures of the Almighty; human beings, and not mere animals. We are free moral agents, responsible to our Creator and to our fellow men.

"Created equal": This equality is political, not intellectual, physical, nor economic. We are equals before the law.

"Endowed by their Creator": These rights are intrinsic to the human family because they were conferred by Almighty God, and not by the Government. Therefore, these rights given to us in the creation cannot be denied by Government.

"Life": Life is sacred because it is from the creative hand of God, and only for just causes can it be denied to the individual citizen.

"Liberty": The heritage of freemen.

"The pursuit of Happiness": Each is free to define the good life for himself, and free to achieve it. All this liberty is under law, for obedience to law is the highest freedom.

"To secure these rights": Government is by the consent of the governed to the end that our God-given rights are made sure. Our inheritance is a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," and not the tyranny of communism.

Christian schools are dedicated to the presentation of the gospel which makes men free, and to the perpetuation of the American way of life with all its liberty. The contribution of Christian schools to American life is more urgently needed today than it was in 1776. Human tyranny is more terrible now than then. Human bondage behind iron curtains and in slave labor camps is more burdensome than then. Freemen are less certain about their rights and their heritage of liberty than they were then.

In a very real sense the children in Christian schools, and their parents as well, are to be "Sons of Liberty," as courageous and uncompromising as were the followers of Sam Adams in 18th-century Massachusetts.

Freemen are free because they are responsible to a faithful Creator and to their fellow human beings. They are free because the open Bible is a lamp of liberty. They are free because life, liberty, and the good life are rights given by the Creator. They are free because government is by the consent of the governed in the fear of God.

To perpetuate this freedom the Christian colleges of mid-20th century America must be strengthened, and by all means kept free of Government control or subsidy.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 8, 1961]

Baptist Unit Rejects U.S. School Loans

(By Bicknell Eubanks)

Dallas.—Texas Baptists have broadened their traditional stand on absolute separation of church and state by turning a cold shoulder to Federal loans for its various educational and eleemosynary institutions.

The executive board of the Texas Baptist Convention agrees that Federal loans to church-supported schools, colleges, and charitable institutions, even though repaid with interest, violate the tradition of separation of church and state.

It is a stand which could cost the Texas Baptists millions of dollars.

The Baptist move is interesting at this time because there is a move in Washington now to allow Federal aid to private, including parochial, schools.

The action came in the form of a recommendation to the Texas Baptist Convention. While the executive board does not officially represent the Texas group as a whole, since individual Baptist churches operate independently, the action of the board, which has 191 members, might be interpreted as a fair reflection of the churches' sentiments in general.

SPELLS OUT PROPOSALS

The board voted to recommend that the convention adopt the recommendation which states that Federal loans to religious organizations for construction of schools, hospitals, or orphanages, "or for any other purpose under any circumstances," violates the Federal Constitution.

The most bitter opposition to the recommendation came from several board members who expressed doubt that Texas Baptists would be able to meet the cost of building college dormitories. Only 10 or 15 dissenting votes were cast out of the 191 members of the executive board.

It is not binding on the Texas Baptists, unless their State convention adopts the directive at its fall meeting.

On the matter of borrowing from the Government, the report insists that "since a church and its institutions cannot be separated, it is clear that the use of public credit for building church institutions is in effect using public taxes for religious purposes."

EFFECT REVERSED

Baptists were responsible for an amendment to the Hill-Burton Act which provides for loans instead of grants to religious institutions. The report said this provision had been intended to bolster the wall between church and state. It had an opposite effect, according to the report.

Leading the forces which favored the directive was Dr. W. A. Criswell, pastor of the First Baptist Church in Dallas, one of the largest churches in the world in membership. He told the board that if Baptists want to "stop the unwearying drive of the Roman Catholic hierarchy" to obtain funds for its institutions, "we must keep clean hands and a clean house."

Dr. E. N. Jones, a former college president, said such action might be costly. He agreed that all Baptists are committed firmly to separation of church and state. He warned, however, that many Baptist colleges are near their capacity in dormitory space and will have to limit enrollments unless new dormitories can be built. He said that if Baptist colleges have to raise dormitory fees, they might price themselves out of competition with State institutions.

CONTRACTS—NOT LOANS

Dr. Jones is a former president of Texas Technological College, a State school in Lubbock.

The committee report says grants for research purposes do not violate separation of church and state. It suggests they be called contracts, not grants. It says also that loans and grants to individual college students are all right.

It explains that tax exemptions of church properties do not violate separation of church and state and can be justified on the ground that "the power to tax is the power to destroy." It says special postal privileges are not a violation, either, since the entire postal system is, in effect, subsidized.

Excerpts From the Pamphlet "Federal Aid to Education"

(By L. M. Gould, president, Carleton College)

The whole scheme of Federal aid serves to perpetuate the illusion that the Federal Government can do for the people what the people cannot do for themselves. We are easily blinded by the immediate advantage of Federal subsidy. Too many politicians help our people to beguile themselves with the illusion that subsidies and similar appropriations are outright gifts. The long look is difficult, but Federal aid is now and has always been a misnomer. There is no such thing, for every dollar must come from the taxpayers in the 48 States. The Federal Government produces nothing. Federal aid means paying large brokerage fees to the Federal bureaucrats for handling our own money for us.

The greatest illusion about the whole problem of direct Federal aid is that we could or should have it without Federal control. As Senator Taft stated so clearly in 1943, Federal aid without Federal control would be contrary to the very nature of our Government. To defend the authority of Congress to appropriate moneys without exercising supervision over their expenditure would be to defend the principle of irresponsibility in Government. The question was settled clearly by a unanimous decision of the Supreme Court in the October term, 1942, *Wickard* v. *Filburn*, which states, "It is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes."

One of the conventional arguments of the protagonists for Federal aid to education is that such Federal aid as we have had has not involved any controls. I have already pointed out that this kind of aid is not parallel to that proposed. Even so, Federal subsidies in the field of agricultural education have completely killed private initiative in that field. There are no private agricultural colleges in America today. Furthermore, this support has fastened a system of military training on the country. The institutions which receive such aid are required to offer military training. I am not objecting to military training. I am simply pointing out that this is a kind of Federal control.

The tendency of a federally controlled educational system would inevitably be to emphasize the views of the particular party in power. The bureaucratic control which the Federal Government could exercise over the selection of textbooks and the control of curricular matters would make this easy. Federal subsidy would inevitably become a political weapon. We all know that any political party in power uses every means at its disposal to perpetuate itself in power.

Democracy needs many voices. If free enterprise means what the words imply, it is only such if there be many different competing voices. Where there is but one voice, we have monopoly. When government speaks with but one voice, the result is political tyranny. But nowhere does democracy need to speak with so many voices as it does in education. The strength of American education has been its variety. We need our public schools and our private schools, our junior colleges, our independent colleges of liberal arts, our professional and technical schools, and our independent and tax-supported universities. We need them all. Only by preserving such variety can we keep equal opportunity for all—opportunity for each according to his desire and his capacity. Forcing all our educational institutions into a common mold would defeat the very purposes of democratic education. It would not be equalizing educational opportunity it would be standardizing opportunities with resultant drab uniformity and monotony.

Justice Holmes once said that the chief source of our strength was "free trade in ideas." Such "free trade" can only flourish in such a varied educational system as we now have.

[From Changing Times, December 1961]

Colleges Have Room for 40,000 Freshmen—Changing Times Survey Finds January Openings

More than 40,000 freshmen can be admitted by colleges across the country for the second term beginning in January, according to Changing Times, the Kiplinger magazine. In its fourth annual survey of 4-year accredited colleges, the magazine found that although most of these openings are at the large urban colleges, several small liberal arts institutions offer places, too.

"If you didn't get into college in the autumn but are qualified, chances are you can gain admission to an accredited college for the spring term in January," the editors of the magazine advise. "Surprisingly, the number of colleges reporting room for students was greater this year than last, probably because of new building programs."

Results of the survey, published in the current edition of the magazine, show that of the 459 institutions which replied, 249 had space for 30,000 more freshmen than actually registered for the fall term. "But, all told, only about 30 percent of the openings reported were for students who could live on campus," the article adds.

The Changing Times questionnaire asked colleges to say what types of students might apply with some hope of acceptance. "Most, of course, want students with good marks, good test scores and evidence of 'leadership' and strong motivation," the magazine reports. "But many colleges also want to spread their geographic representation. And a sizable number are willing to consider C or C-plus students.

"Generally," the article states, "expenses are up over last year. Estimated total costs for campus students at Whittier, for example, (not counting travel and personal expenses) went from $1,600 to $2,000; at George Washington in District of Columbia, from $1,700 to $1,848; at Berea from $500 to $550; at MIT from $2,616 and $2,800; at Bennington from $3,000 to $3,050."

The magazine also queried colleges on acceptance of transfers, and found that the schools which responded accepted around 21,000 sophomore and 17,000 junior transfers this year, and expect to take around 23,000 sophomore and 22,000 junior transfers next year.

The editors of the magazine predict that from now on applications will pour into admissions offices at a steadily increasing rate, with a sharp jump around 1964 and a steeper climb after that. Nevertheless, they state, there undoubtedly will be quite a few openings again next autumn, and those reporting vacancies this year are pretty good bets for next year.

A complete report, listing over 450 accredited 4-year colleges which took part in the survey, their openings and typical total expenses, is available for 75 cents from Changing Times Reprint Service, 1729 H. Street NW., Washington 6, D.C.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair states that the time remaining to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS] is 9 minutes, and the time remaining to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] is 10 minutes.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG].

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I came to the floor today with an open mind as to this legislation determined to do what I believe to be in the best interests of our people and of our colleges. I have just called the presidents of three of the colleges in my district in Wisconsin and I would like to report the result of my conversations.

All three emphatically voiced opposition to this bill. They did so because they are fearful that loans will mean Federal interference in their affairs. They feel that if the Federal Government would spend less for unnecessary programs—which are always declared to be necessary to meet critical needs—the money left in the States could purchase more per dollar than if it goes by way of a Washington bureau.

As to the grants—two of the presidents were flatly opposed, stating the people will meet the needs without Federal Government handouts. The other said that if the grant is one-third they could make up that amount as well as the two-thirds and that the control of that one-third would be far out of proportion to what is received. All were fearful that this program would be the "foot in the door" for increasing Federal funds for salaries. Finally, all three insisted that the academic agencies do not speak for them in that at no time have they ever had an opportunity to discuss the issues on which these agencies speak out so vociferously.

On the basis of the expressed opinions of those who would certainly be in a position to receive the so-called benefits the bill would provide, I must oppose the bill.

I believe in education as much as any Member of this body. I believe, however, in education free from the hands of political control. Let us encourage our institutions to go forward. Let us not force them to be drawn into a Federal program that will mean control.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to voice my support of H.R. 8900, a bill which would provide much needed and vital assistance for higher education in America.

I also want to commend the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], for her vigorous leadership on this proposal.

The proposed measure would authorize Federal financial assistance for college academic facilities through a program of matching grants and long-term loans for the construction of academic facilities. In accomplishing this purpose, the bill would authorize the appropriation of $180 million for fiscal 1962 and each of 4 succeeding fiscal years for grants and a sum of $120 annually for loans for each of 5 fiscal years. In the House report on the proposal, it is estimated that the cost of all programs of the bill, including administrative expenditures, is approximately $1.5 billion—House Report No. 1064.

H.R. 8900 represents a sound means through which the Federal Government may assist our colleges and universities which are laboring today against a number of handicaps to quality education. I hardly need to enumerate for this body the varied facts of our time which issue forceful challenges to American higher education.

Again and again notable authorities in the field of education and education administration have directed the attention of the Congress to the major conditions which underscore the need for the speedy enactment of a program of Federal aid to higher education.

We well know that the explosion of new knowledge, the explosion in population, and the explosion in the demand for specialists and quality college graduates are three such major crises in higher education. Education directly affects our progress as a free people and our hopes for more abundant living. As President Kennedy stated in his message on education to the Congress: "Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education. Our requirements for world leadership, our hopes for economic growth, and the demands of citizenship itself in an era such as this all require the maximum development of every young American's capacity."

These words of the President have been echoed by professional and lay study groups concerned with education throughout the Nation. When the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Ribicoff, appeared before the Special Subcommittee on Education of the House Education Committee to report on the reasons for President Kennedy's sense of urgency about the construction of academic facilities as a major area of need, he emphasized:

> The facts that support the need for prompt assistance to colleges and universities for the construction of physical facilities can be identified very specifically and briefly.
>
> First, the Nation's colleges and universities must spend, between now and 1966, at least $8.6 billion for physical facilities, in order to accommodate increased enrollments and to provide adequate facilities for the numbers of students they now have.
>
> Second, projections of anticipated resources for investment in physical plant by these institutions, taking into account every source of income now anticipated for this purpose, indicate that resources will fall short of facilities needed to the extent of $2.9 billion by 1965, $3.5 billion by 1966, and $5.2 billion by 1970.

Mr. Ribicoff went on to point out:

> It is conservatively estimated that enrollments in higher education will increase from 3,610,000 in the fall of 1960 to 6,006,000 in the fall of 1970. The accommodation of this increase of 2.4 million will cost the Nation's colleges and universities some $15.4 billion for added facilities. In addition, they must remedy present deficiencies.

These facts and figures in Secretary Ribicoff's statement are supported by a detailed study by the U.S. Office of Education which presents the physical facilities needs of American higher education, 1961–70. They are facts and figures which cannot and must not be ignored.

At the outset I called attention to the fact that numerous professional and lay groups concerned with education have urged action by the Congress for Federal assistance in meeting higher education needs. On January 23, of this year, the American Council on Education, American Association of Junior Colleges, Association of American Colleges, Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, and the State Universities Association joined in a statement on higher education legislation. In this statement it is pointed out:

> All major elements of higher education are united in support of Federal action to provide optional loans or matching grants for assistance in the construction of college classrooms, laboratories, and libraries. The specific legislation for such academic facilities which most nearly represents the judgment of colleges and universities and their national organizations is embodied in H.R. 7215 and H.R. 8900, bills voted out in 1961 by the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Moreover, the five-group statement reported:

> Careful and extensive studies have demonstrated that no program can offer the kind of overall assistance needed unless it includes both matching grants and low-interest loans.

H.R. 8900 would provide just that—a program of grants and low-interest loans, The bill provides for the allocation of one-half of the proposed grant funds to the States in the same ratio as the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education in the State bears to the total national enrollment, with the other half of the grant sums allotted in the same ratio as the number of students in grades 9 to 12 in the State bears to the total of such students in all States. Under the loan provisions of the act, the Commissioner is authorized to make loans to institutions of higher education to construct academic facilities to be repaid over a period up to 50 years.

The grant and loan features of H.R. 8900 make the legislation flexible and thereby enable colleges and universities to participate in a manner most fitting to their needs. For example, it is pointed out in the House report that initially only loans for academic facilities were included in the bill. However, many institutions of higher education would not be able to fully participate in such a loan program for the construction of non-income-producing facilities without raising student tuition fees and eliminating contemplated teacher salary increases. Moreover, the Special Subcommittee on Education reported that many institutions of higher education were limited by restrictions in State constitutions which prohibited the borrowing of money for the construction of non-income-producing facilities.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 8900 embraces the basic recommendations by the President for aid for college classroom construction. Moreover, through its flexible program of grants and loans it is a measure which can be meaningful to a large number of our institutions of higher education. I believe that the measure should be promptly considered and enacted by this Congress.

I should like to address myself at this time to another phase of the total needs of higher education in America. This important problem is not met by H.R. 8900. I refer to the need by large numbers of our high school graduates for financial assistance in meeting the cost of higher education.

Only a few weeks ago we learned of a publication by Nicholas DeWitt, an associate of the Russian Research Center, Harvard University. The DeWitt study, published by the National Science Foundation, "Education and Professional Employment in the U.S.S.R.," points up the all-out emphasis the Soviet Union is giving to the education and training of individuals especially in fields related to science and technology. Since the release of the DeWitt study, President Kennedy has made a special appeal to parents, teachers, and school boards to give serious attention to the development of American talent.

We well know, of course, that prior to the DeWitt study, and for many years even prior to the 1957 sputnik, educators were very much concerned with the need to emphasize quality education for the especially demanding and difficult challenges which confront us.

Studies prepared by public and private agencies have for some time focused upon the loss to America of much valuable talent and skill because of the economic barrier to higher education for many superior high school graduates. In his statement during the first session of this Congress before the special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor former Secretary Fleming reported:

> These studies about the need for financial assistance by qualified high school graduates are in substantial agreement on the following points:
>
> 1. Despite the remarkable growth of college enrollments, experts estimate that from 160,000 to 200,000 youths of high ability annually fail to attend college and that from 60,000 to 100,000 of these might be reached if financial assistance could be made available to them.

And at the same time the tuition charges of colleges and universities continue to rise. A recent study prepared by the American Council on Education about tuition increases shows, for example:

> In 14 large privately controlled institutions, the tuition and fees charged * * * were 278 percent above those charged in 1928; a comparable figure for room and board was 82 percent.
>
> Increases in tuition and fees range from a low of 187 percent for resident students in * * * 12 small publicly controlled institutions to a high of 354 percent for the 14 medium sized privately controlled institutions. Room and board increases range from a low of 82 percent in * * * 22 men's institutions to a high of 126 percent for * * * 20 large publicly controlled institutions.

On the question of the cost of higher education to the parents, the study goes on to point out:

> In terms of costs to the parents, the accelerated rate is even more impressive when one determines the proportions of these increases for selected periods of time.
>
> As a rough approximation, one can say that of the total increase in tuition and fees between 1928 and 1960, one-third of the increase occurred in the last 4 years; one-third in the preceding 8 years, and one-third in the preceding 20 years."[1]

On the basis of even the briefest attention to the various factors affecting the cost of college, one must conclude that scholarships for qualified students are also a priority for education. It is my hope, therefore, that this Congress will meet the problem of college classroom construction and scholarships for capable high school graduates through appropriate legislation. Let us begin with the enactment of H.R. 8900.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8900. Before giving my reasons for supporting this worthwhile measure I want to highly commend the gentlewoman from Oregon, Mrs. GREEN, the subcommittee chairman, the members of the subcommittee, and certainly would not want to leave out the chairman of the full committee, Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, for their hard work, extreme foresight to our needs, and the expeditious manner in which they have brought this bill out of the Rules Committee so early in the session. I also want to thank our leadership for their support.

Mr. Chairman, legislation authorizing additional assistance to institutions of higher education for construction, rehabilitation, and improvement of academic and related facilities is long over due. I am fortunate enough to represent a district in southern Illinois that is the home of Southern Illinois University. When I came to Congress 8 years ago, this school had an enrollment of less than 4,000 students. Today the enrollment at two campuses is over 15,000 students. Growing pains is not the word. We have found a great need for additional classrooms, additional dormitories, and other related buildings. The people of Illinois have fulfilled their responsibility by recently floating a large bond issue in an effort to keep pace with the large influx of students; however, additional finances are sorely needed. This bill that will provide loans and grants will be of tremendous help to institutions such as Southern Illinois University. As Chairman POWELL so ably pointed out on the floor today, we are at least 7 years late with this legislation. A journey of a thousand miles starts with the first step—so let us begin.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to pay tribute to the excellent work done by the subcommittee that has prepared and handled this bill. Then, too, I would like to compliment the Members who have stayed here throughout the debate and who have thus become well informed as to the provisions of this important bill. Furthermore, at this time I would like to say that I am very happy to see standing behind the rail the former chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, Mr. Graham Barden, for whom I know we all have great respect.

Mr. Chairman, as this debate comes to a close I feel that we on the Committee of Education and Labor—and I include the chairman of the committee as well—have made an obligation and a promise to this body today that the bill as it has been presented truly represents what we intend to have written into law.

Therefore, I feel that every one of us who is fortunate enough to be a member of the conference committee will carry this obligation to the conference room and we must hold the line on decisions and not permit new provisions pertaining to scholarships to be added to it.

Then, too, I want to say that I feel that in adopting this legislation, for which I shall vote, we will be avoiding the pitfalls of the legislation that was presented to us here under suspension of the rules at the end of the last session. This bill gives us an opportunity, as Members of Congress, to support legislation for higher education which this country can well avail itself of.

Again I want to compliment the members of the subcommittee, especially those on the minority, for the fine work they have done in presenting this legislation. And now I would like to discuss a few of the more important provisions of this bill and reemphasize some of the reasons I believe it should be enacted.

This bill will provide both loans and matching grants to institutions of higher learning for the construction of academic facilities. The total cost of the 5-year program will be $1.5 billion. Of this amount $600 million, or $120 million per year will be for loans and $800 million or $180 million per year will be for grants.

The grant funds will be distributed among the various States under the following formula. One-half will be given on the basis of present college enrollment in the State, and one-half will be given on the basis of student enrollment in the State in school grades 9 through 12.

The loan money will be distributed on the basis that no single State can receive more than 12½ percent of the total amount of the loans under the program. Moreover, all loans must be repaid within 50 years and the interest rate will be 3½ percent. To be eligible to borrow the money, the applicant must show that it is unable to borrow money from other sources on equally favorable terms. Finally, not less than one-fourth of the cost of the proposed project must be financed by non-Federal funds.

---

[1] "Is Education Becoming Too Expensive?" a graphic study indicating fixed charges to the student are rapidly on the rise, by Elmer D. West, director, Office of Statistical Information and Research, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1961.

Further restrictions on both the loaning or granting of the money are to the effect that to be eligible the applicant must show that the project will result in urgently needed expansion, or if it is a new institution that it will result in newly created enrollment capacity. Moreover, the facility that is to be constructed cannot be a gym, athletic, or recreation facility and cannot be used for sectarian instruction.

Mr. Chairman, this type of Federal assistance is urgently needed.

As ranking minority member, I have heard literally weeks of testimony regarding Federal aid to education. In all this testimony there has been only one area of general agreement—the area of Federal aid to higher education for the construction of academic facilities.

Colleges and universities—both public and private—will be faced with a 30-percent enrollment increase by 1965. At the same time, the advent of the space age has created an immediate and urgent demand for more engineers, scientists and highly trained technicians. To meet this crisis additional academic facilities must be constructed now.

The Federal Government has historically supported and assisted higher education. As early as the 4th Congress a resolution to establish a national university, as recommended in President Washington's speech, was reported by the select committee.

Subsequently the so-called land-grant college bills were enacted which donated land to the States for colleges.

This has been followed by the GI bill, college housing loans, and the very sucsessful National Defense Education Act.

Finally, this bill does not become involved in the controversy over aid to private schools. This assistance would flow to public and private schools alike. No differential is made. As it is restricted to colleges and universities there is no constitutional question. Historically, private colleges have received Federal assistance and have carried a tremendous part of the higher education burden.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this most important piece of legislation.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, there are now more than 2,000 institutions of higher education providing education acceptable toward a degree. Approximately 600 of these institutions limit their offering to a 2-year program. Of the some 1,400 colleges and universities offering at least a 4-year program, one-third have enrollments below 500 students and an additional one-fourth have enrollments between 500 and 1,000. Slightly more than 10 percent of the 4-year colleges and universities have enrollments in excess of 5,000 students.

In West Virginia, there are 20 colleges and universities, consisting of 2 private junior colleges, 7 private liberal arts colleges for a total of 9 private institutions, and 11 State-supported institutions, consisting of 1 junior college, 1 technical institute, 7 teachers colleges, and 2 universities. Of the 20, 2 have enrollments below 500, 10 have enrollments from 500 to 999, 6 have enrollments from 1,000 to 2,499, and 2 have enrollments in excess of 2,500. Range in enrollments is from 163 in Greenbrier College to 8,282 in the University of West Virginia.

I have the privilege of representing six of these small colleges.

Not only does the small liberal arts college provide work leading to the bachelor's degree, but it also provides the basic educational background for study toward advanced degrees.

According to the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, many good small colleges have been operating below capacity, while some of the larger institutions must turn students away because of lack of facilities. Staffed by highly dedicated faculty, many of the small colleges offer good basic programs and some diversification, sometimes in classes too small to be really economical, especially in junior and senior level subjects.

Nevertheless, as a result of careful management and effective fund drives among alumni and friends, many of the private liberal arts colleges are able to compete with the out-of-State tuition charged in public universities. Students from these colleges have been transferring successfully to other institutions at both the graduate and undergraduate levels for years and their alumni have distinguished themselves in areas of service as well as in industry and government.

With a minimum of assistance through facilities loans, these institutions are in a position to absorb some of the increasing enrollments at a smaller total cost of additional facilities than if completely new institutions were constructed. In scattered communities throughout the country, these institutions offer expansion possibilities now, at a minimum of expense, thereby helping to stretch further the funds needed to establish new institutions in other localities.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN].

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8900, known as the College Academic Facilities Act, and to compliment my neighbor the gentlewoman from Oregon on her work and service to higher education today.

I now ask consent to place in the RECORD a telegram received from one of our own institutions of higher education, Washington State University. This telegram attests to the need for funds to help such institutions meet the growing need for facilities to accommodate ever-increasing enrollments.

I am particularly happy to note that junior colleges will be eligible for assistance under this legislation, as the State of Washington has been outstanding in the junior college field. We feel that they make a great contribution to the education of the young people of our State.

Also at this time, I wish to place in the RECORD a wire received from the officers of the Washington State Division of the American Association of University Women, expressing their strong support for H.R. 8900.

Finally, I sincerely trust that the committee will continue to study all needs of education at all levels and the relative abilities of various subdivisions of government to finance such programs. We need more knowledge, for example, of each State's ability to tax.

Hon. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

President C. Clement French is away from Pullman but he would wish me to advise you that Washington State University's major capital outlay requirements, housing, dining, and other student revenue producing facilities excluded, will require expenditure of $5,700,000 annually during the next 6 years. Substantial part of projects provide for academic facilities. It is totally unlikely that State tax sources can provide even reasonably adequately for this institution specifically or for higher education generally in State. WSU is legally in a position to borrow some $6 million pledging tuition income for debt service payments but it is important that State sources, Federal grants and Federal loans are necessary if the enrollment increase is to be accommodated in appropriate quarters. Your vigorous support of H.R. 8900 is most important, in my judgment, to higher education in Washington and is earnestly requested.

S. TOWN STEPHENSON,
Dean of Faculty, Washington State University.

Hon. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Your support is asked for H.R. 8900, authorizing Federal loans and grants for construction of academic facilities.

Respectfully,

Mrs. R. R. MORRISON,
Higher Education Chairman, Washington State Division, American Association of University Women.
Mrs. AMOS GREGSON,
State Legislative Chairman.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the great unanimity of opinion that we seem to find on the floor today would seem to indicate that every time we have a meeting of the Education and Labor Committee, it is just a love feast. I want to assure everyone that such an idea involves gross exaggeration. The members of the committee have very deep convictions, and I do not know of any time before that I have known of so much unanimity of opinion as we find here today. This indicates that we must have a good bill before us.

As far as the total needs of the country is concerned in the field of education, this bill is like entering a mule in the Kentucky Derby. But at least the mule is going in the right direction. It is not claimed to be an answer to all education problems. But I think there is something more important to this legislation than how far we are going to go; the important thing is that we are headed in the right direction. We cannot say this about all legislation we have had in the past. We need to develop college facilities and expand the facilities so that with freedom of choice, a student can get the education he or she needs.

We are accumulating in this country right now 500,000 per year of unemployed, unskilled workers. At the same time we have shortages in most of the professional categories, especially in the field of electronics. What we need is to get additional college facilities so that those who have the capability of doing college work can get an education. Even if they are among those fortunate enough to not need financial help, they cannot enroll unless there are classroom facilities. Some of these 500,000 unemployed that are accumulating each year could find extremely useful places in industry if they have an opportunity to develop their talents.

I think this bill really goes in the right direction. If we preserve freedom of choice and still secure enough technicians we must have sufficient facilities available that the talented young person can choose his field of activity rather than to have his talents diverted.

I urge the adoption of H.R. 8900.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER].

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, lest my other colleagues feel there is a unanimous consent here in this bill today. I rise to state my express disapproval of this proposed Federal aid to education, recognizing the fact that, to a large extent, progress in times gone by and progress in years to come, have been and will be directly related to our educational accomplishments and advancements.

There are those about this land today who feel that American education is at a standstill. I do not agree.

The Communists have said down through the years that they could conquer Americans without firing a single shot if they could destroy our faith in first, the courts of our land; second, our churces; and, third, our educational system.

People all over this country pushed the panic button when Russia beat us to the so-called punch and launched the first sputnik. We have lost a great deal of respect for our courts. Some even have lost respect for our churches.

Now it appears even the Congress of these United States has lost faith in our education system. I, for one, have not lost faith because I know it is not nearly so bad as some would have us believe. In fact, it is unsurpassed by any education system anywhere in the world.

We must only come to the realization that here in these United States we must accomplish with guidance that which the Communists seek to accomplish by regimentation and force.

Would any of you have it otherwise?

H.R. 8900 is Federal aid to education and you cannot explain it any other way.

I do not believe the statistics presented as a part of this presentation setting forth the need for this legislation. I do not believe that our education system has failed or is failing to meet the challenge of the times. I do not believe that the facilities or our higher education system are, for the most part, being utilized to the fullest extent.

I do not believe—as an advocate and stanch believer in fiscal responsibility—that the Federal Government is even as able as the local and State governments to put additional money into education. I do not believe the proponents of this bill even believe that controls will not be ultimately attached to this legislation.

I do not accept the premise that the States are unable to meet the needs of our growing education system.

I do not believe it is constitutional to make these loans or grants to church-supported schools, and I do not believe there is any wisdom attached to granting to the Commissioner of Education the powers authorized by this legislation. In short, I do not believe there is now, nor will there ever be, a need for this additional Federal aid to education except for those who are willing to admit to themselves, and to those who look on, that they are not capable or worthy of providing the youth of the States in these United States the education they so richly deserve.

I say to you that those of you who are willing to accept this Federal aid to education are saying for all to hear, "I'm not capable of providing for my own. Bring on the welfare."

Finally, let me say that I am completely opposed to Federal aid to education because there is no reconciliation in my mind for Government participation in the affairs of education. I believe the Constitution to mean what it actually says and not what some would have it say.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, though the bill we are discussing today will do much to help provide needed classrooms and laboratories at our universities, I believe the bill is extremely weak in one respect: it neglects the growing problem of the gifted student who is financially unable to obtain an education.

Every year thousands of qualified high school graduates ask our colleges and universities for scholarships or other kinds of financial aid—and, far too often, these talented youngsters are unable to get any kind of financial help.

Every year more than 150,000 young men and women in the top academic brackets do not go on to college simply because they and their parents cannot afford it. This happens despite the fact that some scholarship programs do serve to aid a limited number of outstanding students. This is a terrible waste of valuable manpower.

The University of Wisconsin is one of many centers in the country which is doing its best to drive forward with the task of providing real education for these and other students in the sixties. I know that a well designed Federal scholarship program would do much to assist this and other great universities around the country. I would urge that the Senate approach to this bill—which includes scholarship assistance—be given careful consideration by the House.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 8900, the College Academic Facilities Act, that is before us.

It is my strong belief, from personal observation of the needs of universities and colleges in my heavily populated State of New Jersey, that there is a pressing need for this legislation and that it is long overdue.

I agree wholeheartedly with the committee report declaration that higher education in the United States faces both a crisis and a challenge in the coming decade because of the so-called population explosion that is facing our universities and colleges.

It is a challenge that our institutions of higher education cannot meet alone. It is a challenge that our States and local governing bodies find difficult to answer because of so many other pressing needs.

This legislation will furnish definitive and constructive help to our universities and colleges in meeting the challenge and filling the demand of our country for scientists, engineers, doctors, teachers, and other needs for educated personnel.

Through this legislation our institutions of higher education will be assisted in expanding their academic facilities—the building and improvement of classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related academic and service structures.

It is my sincere hope that this body will give overwhelming approval to this bill. We can no longer procrastinate. The time, and need, for action is now.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8900, which would authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation or improvement of needed academic facilities, such as classrooms, laboratories and libraries.

In the 28th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, which I have the honor to represent here in Congress, there are five institutions of higher learning which would qualify for assistance under this action: the University of Pittsburgh, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Duquesne University, Mount Mercy College, and Chatham College.

Because of the tremendous expansion of college student populations, each one of these institutions is engaged in major capital improvement programs. Accredited junior and community colleges in Allegheny County would also be entitled to participate under the program.

These institutions provide education not just for Pittsburghers, or even Pennsylvanians, but for students from all over the United States. The problem of providing good education for the young people of our Nation is, therefore, not a local but a national problem.

H.R. 8900 recognizes this fact, but of necessity makes an allocation of the funds based in part on present student enrollment in assisting institutions.

Based on the total enrollment of 26,350 students in the 5 Pittsburgh institutions, or 13 percent of Pennsylvania's college population, the 5 Pittsburgh institutions should be entitled, over the

5-year period, to Federal grants of more than $7 million which, when matched with State and local funds and Federal loans, would mean $21 million for expansion and improvement of higher education in Pittsburgh over the next 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, we in Pittsburgh are proud of the fine educational opportunities offered by Pittsburgh colleges. We are proud of the improvements made by them to date. We want to help them expand and improve their facilities for the benefit of Pittsburgh, the tristate area, and the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to give their support to this important piece of legislation.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 8900, providing for a loan and matching grant program of Federal assistance to our institutions of higher learning, represents a considerable improvement over the original administration proposal in this field. That improvement came about, in great part, as the result of constructive suggestions made by the Republican members of the House Committee on Education and Labor during committee deliberations. One of the more active participants in this effort was my colleague from New York—and my congressional neighbor—the Honorable CHARLES E. GOODELL, of Jamestown, and he is to be highly commended for this service.

As a result, the bill has the united support of almost all of our Nation's colleges and universities as well as the associations that represent them nationally. It also has—as was demonstrated here today—strong bipartisan congressional support which is certainly refreshing after last year's inconclusive battle over Federal aid to education at the elementary and secondary school level.

I think that bipartisan support comes about because Congress is now dealing in an area of demonstrable—as compared to political—need, and in that segment of our national educational effort wherein the Federal Government has a legitimate and proper, as well as a traditional, role to play. In large measure, the task of providing education beyond the high school level is performed by institutions which are interstate if not national in character. As we all know, college and university students come from many States—not just from the State in which the institution happens to be located. They come, in increasing numbers, from foreign countries as well and it is good that they should. And so it is neither logical nor reasonable to expect local or State governments to provide all of the support needed by such institutions.

And, although alumni giving and industrial support of our private institutions of higher learning is reaching toward new heights, it is altogether too optimistic for anyone to assume that these traditional sources can supply all the funds needed to provide for the enrollment explosion which these colleges and universities face together with their publicly operated counterparts. College enrollments, totaling 3,600,000 students in 1960-1961, are expected to increase by more than 1 million, or 30 percent, in the next 5 years. By 1970, an estimated 6,006,000 students will be seeking admission to colleges and universities, a gain of 66 percent over current enrollments.

In view of America's ever-increasing demand and need for scientists, engineers, doctors, teachers, and other educated personnel, Federal assistance, here, would seem to be not only warranted but required in order to help close a widening gap between actual need and the maximum contributions that can be expected from State, local, and private sources.

To meet the needs of my own congressional district, I am pleased to note that funds will be available—in a combination of matching grants supplemented by loans where needed—not only for our Elmira College and rapidly growing Harpur College, but for Corning Community College and for Broome Technical Community College, as well. Nearby Cornell University and Ithaca College will also benefit. Over $16 million in matching grant funds will come to New York this next year under this program, plus up to $15 million more in long-term loans. These moneys, as allocated among the various institutions of higher learning in our State according to a table of priorities as determined by a State agency, can be used to construct, acquire, or improve academic facilities of all types, and for the equipping thereof, it being specifically stated, however, that no such moneys can be used for projects of an athletic or recreational type, or where admission might be charged to the public, or where used for sectarian instruction or as a place of religious worship, or in connection with any part of the program of a school or department of divinity.

Although the church-state problem here involved would appear to be a minor one—at least as compared to that involved in the lower education bills where school attendance is compulsory—I am of the opinion that it might have been better clarified than in the bill before us; however, if the Senate does not take the time to do so, whatever objections I may have here may well be overcome by wise administration of this new program in a manner consistent with President Kennedy's often-asserted support of the principle of separation of church and state.

On the floor, the bill was further improved by removal of the original provisions which would have permitted what is known as back-door spending in connection with the loan program. I supported that amendment, because I think this is the only fiscally responsible course for us to follow, and I am pleased to note that the Federal dollars needed to go forward with this program after July 1 are already provided for in President Kennedy's so-called balanced budget.

One final thought: The bill provides the usual self-serving declaration against Federal controls, which is belied—in part—in another provision of the bill that authorizes Federal control over construction projects to the extent that the same will be undertaken in an economical manner, and will not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials. Thus, while I think the national interest dictates my support of this bill, it is worth noting that independent pursuit of truth and knowledge is always difficult even under the best of conditions, and that it would be well if our Nation's educators, at the level of higher learning into which the Federal Government now moves deeper than ever before, will remain constantly vigilant to insure that the independence of their institutions remains inviolate.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, so far as this Member is concerned, there is no point in debating the various provisions of this bill, the College Academic Facilities Act, when several basic premises are incorrect, a poor foundation for good legislation and impossible of correction.

Specifically, I refer to the error of our talking about Federal money to stimulate education. There is no Federal money, since the money for this and other Government programs comes from the only source of all public money, that is the taxpayers' pockets in the local communities. Not only is there no Federal money, the Federal Government is in debt hundreds of billions of dollars, and President Kennedy is demanding increased spending in seventy or more new areas beyond the already stupendous scope of Federal spending.

Second, the public expenditure of the taxpayers money by the Federal Government, unfortunately, is killing the private expenditure. Federal spending, therefore, will not supplement private spending but ultimately will replace it to the detriment of our higher educational institutions. Much like have your cake and eat it, the advocates of this bill want all the blessings of private contributions to our institutions of higher learning, but also want to augment the private effort with public expenditures. This is erroneous, the public expenditure will replace, not supplement, the private expenditure to the detriment of better education.

Third, Federal regulations in any bill involving Federal expenditures are right and necessary to safeguard the taxpayers Federal investments, but are wrong when imposed in the educational field.

Education of freemen must be kept free and that means also free of Federal Government control. The applicants appealing to the State commissioner, the setting of priorities, the State commissioner appealing to the Federal Government for the Federal allocation comprise a framework of almost unlimited Federal regulation depending on the whim of the Federal Government representatives who administer the program.

Fourth, the necessary separation of church and state now conflicts with the denominational schools of higher education receiving loans or grants. Witness the language in both the bill and report—page 6, first paragraph of report—and in the bill:

> The term "academic facilities" shall not include * * * any facility used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship or any facility that is used or to be used primarily in connection

with any part of the program of a school or department of divinity.

Fifth, one clear-cut example of Federal regulation and the miscarriage of regulation is amply demonstrated by the imposition once again of the Davis-Bacon law whereby the Secretary of Labor determines the wages that will be paid the workmen that construct these educational facilities and from whose arbitrary decisions there is no recourse in court. He is the prosecutor, the judge, the jury, regardless of the merits or the need for Davis-Bacon wage-setting provision. No one can disavow the unquestioned Government control that accompanies the taking of Federal funds. This is but one example.

Unfortunately, poor legislation such as this, that is, the errors that result from the Federal Government invading a field not constitutional and not the role of the Federal Government, results in clouding the issue of who is for better education and how best is it to be obtained. In opposing this bill, of course, I am not disapproving higher education for any and all who seek it. I yield to no one in appreciating the need for education and for all of us to help as best we can to see that our youth get the finest education that is possible.

Education is not something to be granted or given by the Federal Government. The Federal Government cannot give anything to anyone that it does not first take away from the taxpayers. Further, education must be sought and wanted by the student. Students, like all of us, get out of their studies only what they put in. They must want and seek the education. In this country our private financial sources can meet this need without enforced taxation.

It is tragic that in a society grown great through freedom we now endeavor to stay great by enforced taxation, Federal programs, and the substitution of Federal Government schemes for private initiative.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I have been greatly troubled by the proposals contained in H.R. 8900. I am very much interested in doing all that I can to assist colleges and college students, but I feel that there are constitutional limitations upon the action which the Congress may take.

Another thing that bothers me about this legislation is that it proposes an expenditure of more than $1 billion during the next 5 years at a time when we are being asked to raise the authorized debt limit of the Federal Government in the amount of $10 billion.

These are some of the considerations that impel me to vote "No" on the bill.

I have had several communications from fine private citizens and college officials in the country urging me to vote for the legislation. I have also had communications from outstanding people urging that I vote against the proposal. The decision which I have made has been based upon my own judgment after carefully listening to all of the debate on the legislation.

I would like at this point to include as a part of my remarks a letter which I received today from Dr. Charles F. Carroll, superintendent of public instruction of North Carolina, who is one of the Nation's outstanding educators and Christian laymen. Dr. Carroll's letter is as follows:

January 29, 1962.

Hon. Basil L. Whitener,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Whitener: It is my understanding that the Rules Committee has given approval to H.R. 8900 authorizing $180 million grants and $120 million loans annually for 5 years for construction of academic facilities for public and private, including sectarian, colleges and universities.

I contend that churches and religious bodies establish and operate schools and colleges and universities for the primary purpose of propagating their respective doctrines and creeds. Therefore, I believe that direct or indirect financial support in any manner for such educational operations is in reality support for a particular religion, creed, faith, and practice.

If my contention is correct to any degree, is not a grant of public money to a sectarian college or university in absolute violation of this principle of separation of church and state? I feel it is.

Does a grant of public money to a nonpublic college or university violate sound public policy?

Finally, with respect to a loan by the Federal Government to any nonpublic school or college or university, what safeguard is there against eventual forgiveness? I feel very strongly there should be eternal vigilance in this connection.

Thanking you for your consideration of the foregoing aspects of a very significant piece of legislation, and with all good wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours,
Charlie,
Chas. F. Carroll,
State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, certainly we have had many examples of Federal aid to education in the past in various forms. We could mention the Land Grant Colleges Act, the Smith-Hughes Act, the Veterans Education and Training Act, the donation of surplus properties for purposes of education following the war, the Rural Libraries Act, and the school hot lunch program, among others. Certainly, also the National Defense Education Act, in which loans for college students have been made available, is a significant milestone in the advancement of education. Grants by the National Science Foundation for scientific studies and scientific research likewise represent significant steps and advances for education. The college dormitories loan program has contributed much to the building of dormitories for colleges throughout the Nation, including colleges and universities in my own State of Tennessee. I can specifically mention Tennessee Tech, a splendid technical college in the district which I have the honor to represent and Middle Tennessee State College, another splendid college in my district.

I have favored these programs and I favor the general principle of Federal aid to education, without Federal control. My concern with the present bill is that a large measure of Federal control is implicit in the bill and that funds can be used and may be used for other than purposes of public education. We should maintain inviolate the principle laid down in the Constitution of separation of church and state, and although a statement is made in the report that none of the funds authorized in the pending bill are to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship, and that the funds are not to be used primarily in connection with any part of the program of a school or department of divinity. I have an honest concern these funds can and may be improperly used in violation of this announced principle and the provision of the Constitution.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, it is specifically stated in the bill that the Federal Commissioner of Education may reject any application submitted by a State commissioner of education.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the bill and shall cast my vote against the pending measure.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to include in the Record today the text of an excellent address on higher education delivered by the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Special Education, the gentlelady from Oregon [Mrs. Edith Green], the author of H.R. 8900.

The address of Mrs. Green was delivered on January 23, 1962, in Washington, D.C., at a meeting of the American Council on Education.

The text of her address follows:

Speech to the American Council on Education, January 23, 1962, Washington, D.C.

(By Hon. Edith Green, of Oregon)

When Alexander Pope said "Hope springs eternal in the human breast"—he must have had some members of the Education Committee in Congress in mind—for it seems as if we've been trying to obtain passage of education bills ever since Pope wrote that line in his "Essay on Man."

I am particularly pleased to appear before this group today, because I know that the American Council on Education is greatly concerned with, and dedicated to, the cause of better education in our Nation, both today and in the crowded years ahead.

In my 7 years of service on the House Committee on Education and Labor, I frequently have regretted the lack of closer communication between the academic community and the Congress.

Certainly we must find ways of working together even more closely if we are to achieve national legislation to assist our colleges and universities in meeting the national needs.

STATE OF EDUCATION

As chairman of the subcommittee handling higher education legislation, may I say that we have appreciated the expert testimony—the wise counsel of presidents, administrators of colleges and universities, and of the spokesmen for the American Council on Education. We have looked to you for the facts on the state of higher education today, and on its future needs. And, we particularly appreciate the unanimity expressed today in support of H.R. 8900—the legislation to provide Federal assistance for constructing college academic facilities.

We are talking, not about a need that may or may not occur, but about one that most certainly will occur. No amount of wishful thinking will alter the course of events—the colleges and universities will be asked to double enrollments in the next decade.

We hope this legislation will help you in meeting the demands that our country and our Federal Government is making—certainly it is not the key which will solve all problems since grants have to be matched and loans must be repaid. But I, for one, sincerely believe that it will help.

Now the time is drawing near for a decision in Congress on this bill. As you know, the House Rules Committee will hold a hearing tomorrow on this bill, H.R. 8900. I am hopeful that the Rules Committee will act favorably on it and that the bill may be brought before the House for a vote soon.

If the Rules Committee clears the bill—and I believe that it will—then we will again turn to you for help. We need your assistance in alerting your colleagues to the progress of the legislation. And if your colleagues are interested in the passage of this bill, it is urgent that they so advise the Congressmen from their districts.

PROBLEM OF ATTENTION

There are, as of today, 432 Members of the House of Representatives. There are only seven members of the subcommittee which conducted hearings on this legislation and these seven are closely acquainted with the needs of higher education. On the full Committee on Education and Labor there are 31 Members. But there are 401 other Members of the House who cannot give so much study in this area and who are not as cognizant of the situation confronting higher education institutions. Therefore—I again suggest they would be glad to know your views.

H.R. 8900 may not represent perfection to you, but in my judgment it is the best bill possible from a legislative standpoint. I never have seen a major bill in Congress that did not include some compromise, or compromises, which were necessary in order to pass any legislation at all. This bill is no exception.

Originally, only loans were proposed for construction of urgently needed classrooms, laboratories, and libraries. Later the subcommittee included grants, too, after hearing convincing testimony that a loan program, alone, would not do the entire job of aiding colleges and universities—particularly the State institutions—in providing the classrooms needed to accommodate the students of the sixties.

The subcommittee, after considerable discussion, reached a compromise that earmarked 60 percent of the bill's total funds for grants, and 40 percent for loans. Some of us originally wanted a 50-50 division between grants and loans. Others preferred a 70-30 ratio. But in the end, the academic facilities provision, containing the 60-40 compromise, received a unanimous vote in the subcommittee.

H.R. 8900 covers both public and private colleges and universities. To any who may object to inclusion of the private institutions, may I say that I have compiled a list of present Federal grants and loans to higher education institutions, public and private, denominational and nondenominational. This list shows that the Federal Government has been lending money, under the college housing program, to denominational colleges for the past decade. The National Science Foundation has awarded research grants to these colleges—and so has the National Institutes of Health. And the National Defense Education Act makes no distinction between public and private colleges in advancing funds for student loans, or providing for graduate fellowships.

This list, giving a breakdown of loans and grants by States and congressional districts, will be published later as a committee document.

SCHOLARSHIPS NOT INCLUDED

Today, I shall not discuss scholarships for college students, because scholarships are not included in H.R. 8900. I have read with interest the report of your scholarship advisory group, headed by Dr. John F. Morse. Later, I may ask you for additional counsel on this subject as we turn to possible legislative proposals.

Returning to H.R. 8900, there are two questions which have been asked most frequently about specific wording in the bill—questions relating to the definition of "academic facilities." One question is whether we may be going farther than the committee intended in barring Federal funds for facilities used for sectarian instruction. We are asked whether this might be interpreted to exclude classrooms for a philosophy course that might include some study of various religions.

May I say that the subcommittee discussed this point at length and concluded that funds should not be spent for classrooms for courses with any sectarian instruction whatsoever. If a college administrator wants to schedule such courses, I am sure that he can manage to locate them in another building—one not constructed with the aid of Federal funds.

Another frequently asked question relates to the ban against using funds in the bill for gymnasiums, stadiums, or other facilities specially designed for athletic activities. I must say that I never have had so many athletic coaches visit my office as I have since this bill was approved by the subcommittee. I never knew before what close friends the athletic coaches here in the East are with those in my own congressional district in Oregon.

Let me emphasize that the subcommittee is not opposed to the President's physical fitness program. We are not against football or basketball games. But we feel there is an urgent need for classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and we intentionally limited the bill to this pressing need.

As far as athletic facilities are concerned, it has been my observation that local groups, alumni organizations, and State legislative bodies have been quite successful in obtaining funds for these athletic facilities, also.

If I may digress for a moment, we have heard a great deal of discussion on the need for a talent search to find the brilliant students who might not go on to college, and to encourage them to obtain a higher education. I wish that the scientists, the mathematicians, the heads of humanities departments had the budget that football and basketball coaches have in their talent search.

QUALIFICATIONS

On two occasions in recent years, a coach from the Air Force Academy has visited my office to ask if I would appoint a young man from my congressional district to the Academy. On his first visit, I told the coach that my appointments were based on the results of civil service examinations and if the young man received the highest score, he would be appointed. Then I asked the coach why he was interested in this youth. "Well, he's a good football player," the coach replied. The following year the coach returned and asked if I would at least name the young man as an alternate so they could send him to a prep school to prepare him for the Academy. I explained that he was almost at the bottom of the list academically. This didn't seem to make a great impression—he was still a good football player.

"Tell me," I asked him, "does the physics department at the Air Force Academy have a budget comparable to the athletic department's for scouting possible cadets?"

I did not get a very responsive reply.

Now, may I take a few moments to express to this group some concerns I have—concerns as an individual interested in our educational system, and concerns as chairman of the subcommittee handling higher education legislation.

In recognition of the great need for scientists and engineers, Dr. James Van Allen has warned that our national ambitions in space exploration have outrun our scientific competence. I am aware of reports that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration will need 13,000 additional scientists and engineers for its man-on-the-moon project—not counting those who will be needed by industries working under NASA contracts.

CONCERN FOR BALANCE

But I am concerned whether, in the emphasis we are placing on mathematics, science and engineering, we are neglecting other important fields.

At the time the National Defense Education Act was being drafted, a minority of us argued unsuccessfully that our fundamental concern should be to invest sufficiently and wisely in the development of highly skilled and broadly responsible men and women who will make possible, not only scientific and military progress, but advances in the humanities and in all the fields of mankind's highest endeavors.

We surely have reached the time when the understanding of human behavior and the complexities of the human mind and emotions is important to our Nation's survival and to our future as a leading nation.

My second concern, as the reports on scientific manpower needs come to us, is: Are we using our highly trained scientists and engineers to the maximum extent, or do the cost-plus contracts encourage hoarding of these skilled people? If we have a serious shortage, could better use be made of the ones we now have? Also—with the cost-plus contracts—allowing very high salaries—are colleges and universities placed at such a great competitive disadvantage that education may really suffer. If so, what is the remedy?

Another concern is whether research grants given in the interests of national security are changing the role of the universities. I am interested in a question raised by the science adviser to President Eisenhower: "Are universities going into the business of handling research contracts, rather than education?"

When several higher education institutions receive more than 50 percent of their total operating budgets from Government research grants, what is the total impact upon the institution? Is it devoting the kind of effort, the amount of energy necessary for the education of students?

CONTROL AND THE MILITARY

My fourth concern deals with the increasing attacks from right-wing groups, and the effect they may have on academic freedom. I cannot understand why those people who cry out most loudly against any Federal aid for schools, on grounds that it would lead to Federal control of curriculum and personnel, are the very ones who now are the most vocal in defense of the military educating the public. I always have opposed curriculum planning by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and I'm equally opposed to having it planned by the Pentagon or related groups.

Finally, let me mention one other concern I have, and that is the need for an overall survey of the role the Federal Government is playing in higher education at the present time.

Today, Chairman Powell assigned to our Special Subcommittee on Education the task of making an overall study of all educational programs of the Federal Government. This is a subject in which I have been greatly interested for some time. A brief preliminary study which I made nearly three years ago showed that about 35 Federal agencies were involved in educational programs of various kinds. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare actually handles less than half of the Government's total educational programs. The Department of Defense has a sizable segment of these programs, and so does the Department of Agriculture.

I have compiled a list of all the education bills which were introduced in the House of Representatives during the 85th Congress. Only slightly more than half of these were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. The others went to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Armed Services Committee; in fact, every committee in the House had jurisdiction over some educational bill.

We want to look into all these educational programs to find out if overlapping exists, if our educational dollars are being spent wisely, and, more importantly, if the programs are serving the needs of the Nation today.

INCREASE FOR DECLINE

For example, we keep increasing funds for agricultural extension work at a time when the census shows that the rural population is declining while the urban population increases. The Department of Commerce today told me that in the last 10 years there had been an increase of 29 percent in urban population and a decrease of eight-tenths of 1 percent in rural population. Are these additional funds for agricultural extension really necessary, or would the money be better spent upon an urban extension program? I don't know; but we hope to find the answers.

We are awarding scholarships worth several thousands of dollars per man per year in our military academies. Is the education the cadets are receiving commensurate with this expenditure? Outside of the Academies—how many young men are being educated by the military and where and for how much? Again, I don't know the answer, but it is something we may well wish to look into.

The National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, the Atomic Energy Commission, and, more recently, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration award fellowships or training grants to the colleges and universities. Is there any duplication here? These are separate agencies whose work falls under the jurisdiction of several different congressional committees.

These are but a few examples of the areas which might be covered in an overall study of Federal educational programs. We hope to undertake this study immediately. In the meantime, we have no intention of delaying action on this urgently needed legislation.

In conclusion, may I say that there are many of us in Congress who will join you in working for those perfect schools we may never attain. But if we fight only for the attainable, we will reach for less.

As President Kennedy said: "Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education." We appeal to you to help us speed this legislative process by your active support in the immediate weeks ahead. Thank you.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in enthusiastic support of the bill which is before us today. I have, since 1949, served as a trustee of Huntington College of Huntington, Ind. For many years, I served as a member of the executive committee of that institution. I have had a very close association with the other four colleges in my district. I know of their need. It is an ever-pressing need.

These colleges are relatively small, private schools. They are staffed and administered by dedicated, conscientious people using their limited resources carefully and diligently but fighting a discouraging battle in their attempts to fulfill the purpose for which they exist, namely to educate our young people. They are well aware of the challenges of the present era. They are deeply aware of the limitations the lack of finances impose upon them in their attempts to meet these needs, these challenges, and upon the fulfillment of their purposes.

In my State, by 1964, the number of high school graduates jumps 25 percent and then another 15 percent in 1965. This means a tremendous increase in college enrollment, for in addition to increased interest in higher education, we will be confronted with an increase in those eligible to enroll in our colleges and universities.

This bill is a step forward in our attempts to keep up with an ever-increasing need for library, classroom, and laboratory facilities.

The development of the human mind has been the strength of our democracy. It will continue to be so. To neglect every opportunity to enlarge upon our efforts in this regard would not be worthy of our heritage nor a fulfillment of our promise for the future.

Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, let us take note of the fact that this is not an ordinary bill. It is an urgent appeal and effort to support our higher educational system, to enable it to meet the extraordinary, imperative, and definitely foreseeable needs of first priority that will be placed upon it within the next few years and, indeed, in many respects and places are now being placed upon it.

To be sure, this Nation is facing a serious challenge from the Communist bloc nations that could, in some conceivable circumstances, present a situation of gravest danger. While we are satisfied and assured, as well as we can be, in this rapidly moving scientific age, of our current ability to provide reasonably for the national security and to visit havoc, indescribable and awesome, upon any aggressor, we must also recognize that we are engaged in a fierce, overall competition to determine whether, in the long run, we will be able to maintain our position in the world against those who propose to test our resources and our strength by every means within their power.

We are clearly aware of the dire consequences of one scientific breakthrough and all that it might imply. On the other hand, we have no reason to believe that this type of breakthrough may not well be multiplied in our favor, and it would not be beyond reasonable expectation that the advantages we now enjoy may increase both in number and in quality and widen still further the impressive gap in national potential, as well as military capacity, that now separates the free world from the slave world.

But we cannot shut our eyes to the dire and most serious plight of our colleges, the continuing and altogether unbelievable pressure upon their facilities caused by the population explosion and by the normal advances of civilization.

Nor can we be unmindful of, or oblivious to the inability of our colleges and higher institutions of learning, both in the humanities and the scientific fields, in the undergraduate, as well as the graduate, levels to cope successfully with the quickening flood of young Americans seeking to seize the opportunity for adequate higher education which has for so long been the proud boast of this Nation.

Already, thousands and thousands of young men and women are feeling the pinch of inadequate facilities and the pressure of steadily rising standards that are denying to very many fine, aspiring young people these days the cherished training which they seek.

Moreover, in the engineering and scientific fields, where our needs are so crucial, and our stakes are so high, we must make sure that we build educational facilities and patterns that will not only afford opportunities for our youth, but will encourage them and attract them toward careers in science and technology, so vital to the defense, as well as the broader purposes of advancement and progress which are dynamically moving our Nation forward to incredible heights.

I believe that the evidence clearly shows that these are burdens of a serious and very onerous nature that our higher educational system is no longer able to carry and at the same time adapt itself to the critical needs and requirements of present and future that will continue to be felt with sharper impact as the Nation moves forward in the almost miraculous progress of the space age.

The evidence shows that the normal resources of colleges and universities and technical and other specialized schools can no longer carry these heavy burdens. Private philanthropy can no longer carry them. The States and subdivisions of government can no longer do this vast and compelling job adequately.

The time has come for this Congress to tackle the challenging problems of education with boldness, imagination, and courage. This bill will not do the full job, but it will be an excellent start and will lay the groundwork and foundations for other direct assistance and support by the Federal Government in the field of higher education, and of education in general, which is of such great moment and consequence to us all.

I am sure that the membership of this great deliberative body whose able Members are drawn from every part of our country is prepared to grapple courageously with these critical problems of adequate education and training for our youth and I have every confidence that this bill will pass with an overwhelming vote. I urge that end upon the Members of the House.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, in the light of the current and increasing Communist challenge, there is nothing more obvious, to meet and turn back this challenge, than our national need to perseveringly produce more and better trained scientists, engineers, doctors, teachers, and other educated personnel.

This measure before us is designed precisely to provide this Nation with the most urgent and essential services of these specially trained and disciplined people in the various sciences and arts.

The only possible source from which such personnel can come are institutions of higher education, and the authoritative testimony that has been revealed clearly shows they cannot do the job with their current resources; they need material, help, and encouragement. The cold statistics tell us that the current college enrollment of over 3½ million students is bound to increase by more than 1 million in the next 5 years, and practically double by 1970.

To meet the pressing demands of today, and prepare for the enrollment crush of tomorrow, these higher educational institutions must rehabilitate and expand their academic facilities or else they will be forced to turn away thousands of qualified applicants and deprive the Nation of their trained talents during the most perilous hour of our history.

To avoid such catastrophe, this measure authorizes assistance, in the form of loans and grants, to these higher educational institutions for the construction and improvement of classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related facilities fundamental to the operation of modern collegiate and graduate institutions and production of technically trained personnel.

The loan provisions of this measure have been patterned substantially after the loan provisions of the college housing program which has already contributed so much to our national progress in this area. The eligibility requirements are clearly defined and in the exact vein of programs already tested and accepted.

The prohibitions against any attempt or form of Federal control in the methods of instruction or administration of any educational institution involved are clearly defined and amply sufficient to prevent any Federal interference. That is certainly what practically all of us want to closely guard against, and the language of this measure surely accomplishes it.

The objectives of this bill, and the means defined to accomplish them, are firmly in accord with the foundation traditions of American policy and progress, and I earnestly hope the bill will be approved without extended delay.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, one of the finest editorials I have seen on the need for the passage of H.R. 8900, which the House of Representatives today considers, is the following editorial, entitled "College Aid Measure," which was published in the January 20, 1962, issue of the La Porte (Ind.) Herald-Argus. The editorial follows:

College Aid Measure

The U.S. Senate will begin debate shortly on a $2.7 billion college aid measure which has been reported out of committee to the Senate floor. Backed by strong administration support, the bill has an excellent chance of passage in the Senate but in the House the issue may be in doubt or a compromise measure may be the ultimate fruit.

The bill recognizes some hard educational facts of life; that there are already 3.9 million young people in institutions of higher learning and that this number is expected to reach 7 million by 1970 while colleges and universities struggle to keep up with the overwhelming need for more classrooms, more equipment, more dormitories, more campus. Also that by the U.S. Office of Education estimates 60,000 of 100,000 high school seniors graduating in the top third of their classes this May and June won't go to college because of financial reasons. And this goes on every spring.

The Senate bill calls for $1.5 billion over a 5-year period for construction of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries. These funds would be disbursed in the form of low-interest loans to be paid off by the colleges over a long period of time. A companion bill stalled in the House would offer both loans and outright grants because of financial limitations of many colleges and universities making it impossible or difficult for them to undertake heavy loan obligations. (There is already a law whereby colleges can borrow funds to build dormitories and dining halls or other revenue-producing buildings. Nearby Valparaiso University has taken advantage of this loan law several times.)

The Senate measure would also provide for about 212,000 4-year scholarships of up to $1,000 a year to be awarded by State education officials to talented but needy students. This would cost about $924 million. The Senate bill also calls for $250 million in matching grants to help build public junior colleges.

One reason the Senate bill, with its loans-only provision, will probably pass is that Catholic colleges and universities would probably be eligible for loans but not for outright grants.

If they are to cope with the enrollment explosion of the coming decade colleges and universities must have hundreds of millions to expand. And if we are going to make sure as a people that the highest possible number of young people with the best brains and the most solid character get their chance in college halls then we must do more to dissolve the financial barriers which confront many of these students.

Congress should make sure that legislation to help meet these tremendous needs is enacted this session.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, in closing debate on this bill I can think of nothing more fitting than to read a telegram which was just received during this last hour by our esteemed Speaker of the House, one of the strongest supporters of aid to education. All last year the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] was one of the most enthusiastic supporters of this bill for academic facilities for colleges and universities across this land. His interest in education and universities in his own State is well known. His help on this bill has been tremendous. Through his effective leadership, this bill was scheduled for floor action during this first month of this session.

As I said, he received this telegram just a very short time ago from the president of Harvard University and has asked me to read it:

Cambridge, Mass., *January 30, 1962.*

Hon. John W. McCormack,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge you support House bill 8900 concerning Federal assistance in construction of college classrooms, laboratories and libraries. Passage this bill especially important to enable U.S. public institutions to meet enrollment demands. Although Federal aid for building construction is only a first step in long range need to support higher education it is the most important legislation in field of higher education now before you. All major associates of public and private colleges endorse this legislation and hope for your support in its passage.

Nathan M. Pusey,
President, Harvard University.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "College Academic Facilities Act".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

Sec. 2. The Congress hereby finds that the security and welfare of the United States require that this and future generations of American youth be assured ample opportunity for the fullest development of their intellectual capacities, and that this opportunity will be jeopardized unless the Nation's colleges and universities are encouraged and assisted in their efforts to accommodate rapidly growing numbers of youth who aspire to a higher education. The Congress further finds and declares that these needs are so great and these steps so urgent that it is incumbent upon the Nation to take positive and immediate action to meet these needs through assistance to institutions of higher education in providing classrooms and other academic facilities.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is there going to be any attempt made here to limit debate to a minute and a half on amendments to this bill?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I assure the gentleman that neither the Chairman nor I have any desire to close anyone from debate.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill reads as follows:

PART A—GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ACADEMIC FACILITIES

Appropriations authorized

Sec. 101. (a) In order to enable the Commissioner of Education (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Commissioner") to make grants to institutions of higher education for the construction of academic facilities in accordance with the provisions of this part A, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $180,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years. In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for making such grants the difference (if any) between the sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence for preceding fiscal years and the aggregate of the sums which were appropriated for such preceding years under such sentence.

(b) Sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall remain available for reservation as provided in section 107 until the close of the fiscal year next succeeding the fiscal year for which they were appropriated.

Allotments to States

Sec. 102. (a) Of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 101 for any fiscal year (1) one-half shall be allotted by the Commissioner among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-half as the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education in such State bears to the total number of students enrolled in such institutions in all the States; and (2) the remaining one-half shall be allotted by him among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the number of students enrolled in grades nine to twelve (both inclusive) of schools in such State bears to the total number of students in such grades in schools in all the States. For the purposes of this subsection, (A) the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education shall be deemed to be equal to the sum of (i) the number of full-time students and (ii) the full-time equivalent of the number of part-time students as determined by the Commissioner in accordance with regulations; and (B) determinations as to enrollment under either clause (1) or clause (2) of this subsection shall be made by the Commissioner on the basis of data for the most recent year for which satisfactory data with respect to such enrollment are available to him.

(b) The amount of each allotment to a State under this section shall be available, in accordance with the provisions of this part A, for payment of the Federal share (as determined under sections 106(b)(3) and 122(d)) of the development cost of approved projects for the construction of academic facilities within such State by institutions of higher education. Sums allotted to a State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, shall remain available for reservation as provided in section 107 until the close of the next fiscal year, in addition to the sums allotted to such State for such next fiscal year.

(c) All amounts allotted under this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years, which are not reserved as provided in section 107 by the close of the fiscal year for which they are allotted, shall be reallotted by the Commissioner, on the basis of such factors as he determines to be equitable and reasonable, among the States which, as determined by the Commissioner, are able to use without delay any amounts so reallotted. Amounts reallotted under this subsection shall be available for reservation until the close of the fiscal year next succeeding the fiscal year for which they were originally allotted.

State commissions and plans

Sec. 103. (a) Any State desiring to participate in the grant program under this part A shall designate for that purpose an existing State agency which is broadly representative of the public and of institutions of higher education in the State or, if no such State agency exists, shall establish such a State agency, and submit to the Commissioner through the agency so designated or established (hereafter in this part A referred to as the "State commission"), a State plan for such participation. The Commissioner shall approve any such plan which—

(1) provides that it shall be administered by the State commission;

(2) sets forth, consistently with basic criteria prescribed by regulation pursuant to section 105, objective standards and methods (A) for determining the relative priorities of eligible projects for the construction of academic facilities submitted by institutions of higher education within the State, and (B) for determining the Federal share of the development cost of each such project (unless such plan provides for a uniform Federal share for all such projects);

(3) provides (A) for assigning priorities solely on the basis of such criteria, standards, and methods to eligible projects submitted to the State commission and deemed by it to be otherwise approvable under the provisions of this part A; and (B) for approving and recommending to the Commissioner, in the order of such priority, applications covering such eligible projects, and for certifying to the Commissioner the Federal share, determined by the State commission under the State plan, of the development cost of the project involved;

(4) provides for affording to every applicant, which has submitted to the State commission a project, an opportunity for a fair hearing before the commission as to the priority assigned to such project or as to any other determination of the commission adversely affecting such applicant; and

(5) provides (A) for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State commission under this part A, and (B) for the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this part A.

(b) The Commissioner is authorized to expend not exceeding $3,000,000 during each of the first two fiscal years of the program under this part A in such amounts as he may consider necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plans approved under this part A, including expenses which he determines were necessary for the preparation of such plans.

Eligibility for grants

Sec. 104. An institution of higher education shall be eligible for a grant for construction of an academic facility under this part A only if such construction will, either alone or together with other construction to be undertaken within a reasonable time, (1) result in an urgently needed substantial expansion of the institution's student enrollment capacity, or (2) in the case of a new institution of higher education, result in creating urgently needed enrollment capacity.

Basic criteria for determining priorities and Federal share

Sec. 105. (a) As soon as practicable after the enactment of this Act the Commissioner shall by regulation prescribe basic criteria to which the provisions of State plans setting forth standards and methods for determining relative priorities of eligible construction projects, and the application of such standards and methods to such projects under such plans, shall be subject. Such basic criteria (1) shall be such as will best tend to achieve the objectives of this part A while leaving opportunity and flexibility for the development of State plan standards and methods that will best accommodate the varied needs of institutions in the several States, and (2) shall give special consideration to expansion of undergraduate enrollment capacity. Subject to the foregoing requirements, such regulations may establish additional and appropriate basic criteria, including provision for considering the degree to which applicant institutions are effectively utilizing existing facilities, provision for allowing State plans to group or provide for grouping, in a reasonable manner, facilities or institutions according to functional or educational type for priority purposes, and, in view of the national objectives of this Act, provision for considering the degree to which the institution serves students from two or more States or from outside the United States; and in no event shall an institution's readiness to admit such out-of-State students be considered as a priority factor adverse to such institution.

(b) The Commissioner shall further prescribe by regulation the basic criteria for determining the Federal share of the development cost of any eligible project under this part A within a State, to which criteria the applicable standards and methods set forth in the State plan for such State shall conform in the absence of a uniform statewide Federal share specified in or pursuant to such plan. The Federal share shall in no event exceed 33⅓ per centum of the development cost of a project covered by an application approved under this part A.

Applications for grants and conditions for approval

Sec. 106. (a) Institutions of higher education which desire to obtain grants under this part A shall submit applications therefore at such time or times and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, and such applications shall contain such information as may be required by or pursuant to regulation for the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to make the determinations required to be made by him under this part A.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve an application covering a project for construction of an academic facility and meeting the requirements prescribed pursuant to subsection (a) if—

(1) the project is an eligible project as determined under section 104;

(2) the project has been approved and recommended by the appropriate State commission;

(3) the State commission has certified to the Commissioner, in accordance with the State plan, the Federal share of the development cost of the project, and sufficient funds to pay such Federal share are available from the applicable allotment of the State (including any applicable reallotment to the State);

(4) the project has, pursuant to the State plan, been assigned a priority that is higher than that of all other projects within such State (chargeable to the same allotment) which meet all the requirements of this section (other than this clause) and for which Federal funds have not yet been reserved;

(5) the Commissioner determines that the construction will be undertaken in an economical manner and will not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials; and

(6) the Commissioner determines that (in addition to the assurance required by section 121 and such assurance as to title to the site as he may deem necessary) the application contains or is supported by satisfactory assurances—

(A) that Federal funds received by the applicant will be used solely for defraying the development cost of the project covered by such application,

(B) that sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal portion of such cost and to provide for the effective use of the academic facility upon completion, and

(C) that the facility will be used as an academic facility during at least the period of the Federal interest therein (as defined in section 108).

(c) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Commissioner may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulation, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

Amount of grant—Payment

Sec. 107. Upon his approval of any application for a grant under this part A, the Commissioner shall reserve from the applicable allotment (including any applicable reallotment) available therefor, the amount of such grant, which (subject to the limits of such allotment or reallotment) shall be equal to the Federal share (ascertained by him under section 106(b)(3)) of the development cost of the project covered by such application. The Commissioner shall pay such reserved amount, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine. The Commissioner's reservation of any amount under this section may be amended by him, either upon approval of an amendment of the application covering such project or upon revision of the estimated development cost of a project with respect to which such reservation was made, and in the event of an upward revision of such estimated cost approved by him he may reserve the Federal share of the added cost only from the applicable allotment (or reallotment) available at the time of such approval.

Recovery of payments

Sec. 108. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that, if a facility constructed with the aid of a grant or grants under this part A is used as an academic facility for twenty years following completion of such construction, the public benefit accruing to the United States from such use will equal or exceed in value the amount of such grant or grants. The period of twenty years after completion of such construction shall therefore be deemed to be the period of Federal interest in such facility for the purposes of this part A.

(b) If, within twenty years after completion of construction of an academic facility which has been constructed in part with a grant or grants under this part A—

(1) the applicant (or its successor in title or possession) ceases or fails to be a public or nonprofit institution, or

(2) the facility ceases to be used as an academic facility, or the facility is used as a facility excluded from the term "academic facility" by section 122(a)(2), unless the Commissioner determines in accordance with regulations that there is good cause for waiving the application of this paragraph to such facility or use,

the United States shall be entitled to recover from such applicant (or successor) an amount which bears to the then value of the facility (or so much thereof as constituted an approved project or projects) the same ratio as the amount of such Federal grant or grants bore to the development cost of the facility financed with the aid of such grant or grants: *Provided*, That the authority to waive the application of paragraph (2) of this subsection shall not apply to any case in which a facility (A) is used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship or (B), although not used for a purpose described in clause (A), is used primarily for any part of a program of a school of divinity (as defined in section 122(a)(2)). Such value shall be determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such facility is situated.

Administration of State plans

Sec. 109. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this part A, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State commission submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State commission administering a State plan approved under this part A, finds—

(1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 103(a), or

(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify such State commission that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this part A until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

Judicial review

Sec. 110. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under this part A, or with respect to his final action under section 109(b), such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located, a petition for review of such action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

(b) Upon the filing of the petition referred to in subsection (a) of this section, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(c) The judgment of the court affirming or setting side, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United State Code. The commencement of proceedings under this section shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commissioner's action.

PART B—LOANS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ACADEMIC FACILITIES

Lending authority

Sec. 111. The Commissioner may, in accordance with the provisions of this part B, make loans to institutions of higher education or to higher education building agencies for construction of academic facilities.

Loan limit for any State

Sec. 112. Not more than 12½ per centum of the funds provided for in this part B in the form of loans shall be used for loans to institutions of higher education or higher education building agenices within any one State.

Eligibility conditions, amounts, and terms of loans

Sec. 113. (a) No loan pursuant to this part B shall be made unless the Commissioner finds (1) that not less than one-fourth of the development cost of the facility will be financed from non-Federal sources, (2) that the applicant is unable to secure the amount of such loan from other sources upon terms and conditions equally as favorable as the terms and conditions applicable to loans under this part B, and (3) that the construction will be undertaken in an economical manner and that it will not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials.

(b) A loan pursuant to this part B shall be secured in such manner, and shall be repaid within such period not exceeding fifty years, as may be determined by the Commissioner; and shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Commissioner which shall not be more than the higher of (1) 2¾ per centum per annum, or (2) a per annum rate that is one-quarter of 1 percentage point above the rate of interest paid by the Commissioner on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in subsection (d) of this section.

(c) In order to obtain funds for loans under this part B, the Commissioner may from time to time issue notes and obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury. The maximum aggregate principal amount of such notes and obligations outstanding at any one time shall be such amount as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts, but the amount so outstanding at any time shall not exceed (1) the initial sum of $120,000,000 until June 30, 1962, inclusive, and (2) thereafter, $120,000,000 plus such additional sums as are equal to a rate of annual increase of $120,000,000 in such initial sum as of July 1 of each of the calendar years 1962 to 1965, inclusive.

(d) Notes or other obligations issued by the Commissioner under this part B shall be in such forms and denominations, have such maturities, and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury which shall be not more than the higher of (1) 2½ per centum per annum, or (2) the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the issuance by the Commissioner and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations of the Commissioner issued under this part B and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such notes and other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States.

(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commissioner such sums as may be necessary, together with loan principal and interest payments made by institutions of higher education or higher education building agencies assisted hereunder, for payments on notes or other obligations issued by the Commissioner under this section; but the amount of any such payments received after June 30, 1966, from institutions of higher education and used by the Commissioner as payments on notes or other obligations issued by him shall not constitute a basis for obtaining equivalent funds from the Treasury in order to make new loans under this part B.

General provisions for loan program

Sec. 114. (a) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this part B the Commissioner, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, shall—

(1) prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended; and

(2) maintain an integral set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, and no other audit shall be required: *Provided*, That such financial transactions of the Commissioner as the making

of loans and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such financial transactions shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government.

(b)(1) Funds made available to the Commissioner pursuant to the provisions of this part B shall be deposited in a checking account or accounts with the Treasurer of the United States. Receipts and assets obtained or held by the Commissioner in connection with the performance of his functions under this part B, and all funds available for carrying out the functions of the Commissioner under this part B (including appropriations therefor, which are hereby authorized), shall be available, in such amounts as may from year to year be authorized by the Congress, for the administrative expenses of the Commissioner in connection with the performance of such functions.

(2) The Commissioner is authorized (A) to prescribe a schedule of fees which, in his judgment, would be adequate in the aggregate to cover necessary expenses of making inspections (including audits) and providing representatives at the site of projects in connection with loans under this part B, and (B) to condition the making of such loans on agreement by the applicant to pay such fees; and, if such fees are prescribed, the Commissioner's expenses for such purposes shall be considered nonadministrative. For the purpose of providing such services, the Commissioner may, as authorized by section 123(b), utilize any agency, and such agency may accept reimbursement or payment for such services from such applicant or from the Commissioner, and shall, if a Federal agency, credit such amounts to the appropriation or fund against which expenditures by such agency for such services have been charged.

(c) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this part B, the Commissioner, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, may—

(1) prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this part B;

(2) sue and be sued in any court of record of a State having general jurisdiction or in any district court of the United States, and such district courts shall have jurisdiction of civil actions arising under this part B without regard to the amount in controversy, and any action instituted under this subsection by or against the Commissioner shall survive notwithstanding any change in the person occupying the office of Commissioner or any vacancy in such office; but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Commissioner or property under his control, and nothing herein shall be construed to except litigation arising out of activities under this part B from the application of sections 507(b) and 2679 of title 28 of the United States Code and of section 367 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 316);

(3) foreclose on any property or commence any action to protect or enforce any right conferred upon him by any law, contract, or other agreement, and bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or any other sale any property in connection with which he had made a loan pursuant to this part B; and, in the event of any such acquisition (and notwithstanding any other provisions of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real property by the United States), complete, administer, remodel and convert, dispose of, lease, and otherwise deal with, such property: *Provided*, That any such acquisition of real property shall not deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil or criminal jurisdiction in and over such property or impair the civil rights under the State or local laws of the inhabitants on such property;

(4) enter into agreements to pay annual sums in lieu of taxes to any State or local taxing authority with respect to any real property so acquired or owned;

(5) sell or exchange at public or private sale, or lease, real or personal property, and sell or exchange any securities or obligations, upon such terms as he may fix;

(6) obtain insurance against loss in connection with property and other assets held;

(7) subject to the specific limitations in this part B, consent to the modification, with respect to the rate of interest, time of payment of any installment of principal or interest, security, or any other term of any contract or agreement to which he is a party or which has been transferred to him pursuant to this section; and

(8) include in any contract or instrument made pursuant to this part B such other covenants, conditions, or provisions (including provisions designed to assure against use of the facility, constructed with the aid of a loan under this part B, for purposes described in section 122(a)(2)) as he may deem necessary to assure that the purposes of this part B will be achieved.

PART C—GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR LOAN AND GRANT PROGRAMS

Labor standards

SEC. 121. (a) The Commissioner shall not approve any application for a grant or loan under this Act except upon adequate assurance that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on construction assisted by such grant or loan will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5), and will receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times the basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of eight hours in any workday or forty hours in the workweek, as the case may be; but, in the case of any nonprofit educational institution, the Commissioner may waive the application of this subsection in cases or classes of cases where laborers or mechanics, not otherwise employed at any time in the construction of the project, voluntarily donate their services for the purpose of lowering the costs of construction and the Commissioner determines that any amounts saved thereby are fully credited to the educational institution undertaking the construction.

(b) The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in subsection (a) of this section, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

Definitions

SEC. 122. As used in this Act—

(a)(1) Except as provided in subparagraph (2) of this paragraph, the term "academic facilities" means structures suitable for use as classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related facilities necessary or appropriate for instruction of students, or for research, or for administration of the educational or research programs, of an institution of higher education, and maintenance, storage, or utility facilities essential to operation of the foregoing facilities.

(2) The term "academic facilities" shall not include (A) any facility intended primarily for events for which admission is to be charged to the general public, or any gymnasium or other facility specially designed for physical education or athletic or recreational activities, or (B) any facility used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship, or (C) any facility which (although not a facility described in the preceding clause) is used or to be used primarily in connection with any part of the program of a school or department of divinity. For the purposes of this subparagraph, the term "school or department of divinity" means an institution, or a department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

(b)(1) The term "construction" means (A) erection of new or expansion of existing structures, and the acquisition and installation of initial equipment therefor; or (B) acquisition of existing structures not owned by the institution involved; or (C) rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement (including the acquisition and installation of initial equipment, or modernization or replacement of built-in equipment) of existing structures; or (D) a combination of any two or more of the foregoing.

(2) The term "equipment" includes, in addition to machinery, utilities, and built-in equipment and any necessary enclosures or structures to house them, all other items necessary for the functioning of a particular facility as an academic facility, including necessary furniture, except books and except items of current operating expense such as fuel, supplies, and the like; the term "initial equipment" means equipment acquired and installed in connection with contruction as defined in paragraph (1) (A) or (B) of this subsection or, in cases referred to in paragraph (1)(C), equipment acquired and installed as part of the rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of an existing structure which structure would otherwise not be adequate for use as an academic facility; and the terms "equipment," "initial equipment," and "built-in equipment" shall be more particularly defined by the Commissioner by regulation.

(c) The term "development cost", with respect to an academic facility, means the amount found by the Commissioner to be the cost, to the applicant for a grant or loan under this Act, of the construction involved and the cost of necessary acquisition of the land on which the facility is located and of necessary site improvements to permit its use for such facility, but excluding any cost incurred before, or under a contract entered into before, the enactment of this Act. There shall further be excluded from the development cost—

(1) in determining the amount of any grant under this Act, an amount equal to the sum of (A) any Federal grant which the institution has obtained, or is assured of obtaining, under any law other than this Act, with respect to the construction that is to be financed with the aid of a grant under this Act, and (B) the amount of any non-Federal funds required to be expended as a condition of such other Federal grant; and

(2) in determining the amount of any loan under this Act, an amount equal to the amount of any Federal financial assistance which the institution has obtained, or is assured of obtaining, under any law other than this Act, with respect to the construction that is to be financed with the aid of a loan under this Act.

(d) The term "Federal share" means a percentage (as determined under the applicable State plan) not in excess of 33⅓ per centum of the development cost of a project covered by an application for a grant for the construction of an academic facility under part A of this Act.

(e) The term "higher education building agency" means (1) an agency, public authority, or other instrumentality of a State authorized to provide, or finance the construction of, academic facilities for institutions of higher education (whether or not also authorized to provide or finance other facilities for such or other educational institutions, or for their students or faculty), or (2) any corporation (no part of the net earnings of which inures or may lawfully inure to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual) (A) established by an institution of higher education for the purpose of providing academic facilities for the use of such institution, and (B) upon dissolution of which all title to any property purchased or built from the proceeds of any loan made under part B of this Act will pass to such institution.

(f) The term "institution of higher education" means a public or other nonprofit educational institution in any State which—

(1) admits as regular students only individuals having a certificate of graduation from a high school, or the recognized equivalent of such certificate;

(2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond high school;

(3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree; and

(4) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association listed by the Commissioner pursuant to this paragraph or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfers, by not less than three institutions which are so credited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited: *Provided, however*, That the requirements of this paragraph (4) shall be deemed to be satisfied in the case of an institution applying for assistance under this Act, if the Commissioner determines that there is satisfactory assurance that upon completion of the project for which such assistance is requested, or upon completion of that project and others under construction or planned and to be commenced within a reasonable time, the institution will meet such requirements. For the purposes of this paragraph the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of education or training offered.

(g) The term "high school" does not include any grade beyond grade 12.

(h) The term "nonprofit educational institution" means an educational institution owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

(i) The term "public educational institution" does not include a school or institution of any agency of the United States.

(j) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

Federal administration

SEC. 123. (a) The Commissioner may delegate any of his functions under this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

(b) In administering the provisions of this Act for which he is responsible, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon.

(c) The Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, may appoint one or more advisory committees to advise and consult with the Commissioner with respect to the administration of any of his functions under this Act. Members of any such committee, while attending conferences or meetings of the committee, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare but not to exceed $75 per diem, and while away from their homes or regular place of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. The provisions of section 1003 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 shall apply to members of such committees.

Method of payment

SEC. 124. Payments under this Act to any individual or to any State or Federal agency, institution of higher education, or any other organization, pursuant to a grant or loan may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, and with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

Administrative appropriations authorized

SEC. 125. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary for the cost of administering the provisions of this Act, including the cost of payments for the administrative expenses of State commissions.

Supergrades

SEC. 126. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized, subject to the procedures prescribed by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1105), to place a total of ten positions in the Office of Education in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule in addition to positions placed in or authorized for such grades in such Office prior to the enactment of this Act. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grades by subsection (b) of such section 505.

Prohibition against Federal control

SEC. 127. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as authorizing a department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or condition with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any educational institution.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. GREEN of Oregon: Page 2, line 19, strike out "1962" and insert "1963".

Page 2, line 23, strike out "1963" and insert "1964".

Page 4, line 16, strike out "1962" and insert "1963".

Page 4, line 21, strike out "1963" and insert "1964".

Page 17, lines 17 and 20, strike out "1962" and insert "1963".

Page 17, line 21, strike out "1965" and insert "1966".

Page 19, line 6, strike out "1966" and insert "1967".

Page 32, line 16, strike out "1962" and insert ""1963".

The question is on the committee amendments offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. GREEN of Oregon: Beginning with line 21, on page 32, strike out everything down through line 6 on page 33, and renumber section 127 as section 126.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Iowa: On page 17, strike out all beginning at line 9 and running through line 10 on page 19, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) In order to enable the Commissioner of Education to make loans to institutions of higher education for the construction of academic facilities in accordance with the provisions of this part B, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $120,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years. In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for making such grants the difference (if any) between the sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence for preceding fiscal years and the aggregate of the sums which were appropriated for such preceding years under such sentence".

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this applies to the loan provision exactly the same appropriations procedure as under the grant section. If you will look at the bill, on page 2 you will find exactly the same language, with the exception that we substituted "loans" for "grants." We thought when we originally considered this matter, that we had treated it adequately, with reference to this matter of back-door financing. As a matter of fact, we did better than with this amendment. But some people have an aversion to the word "Treasury." Since our goals were the same and to have complete unanimity of opinion, we offer this amendment.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. This, then, substitutes the $120 million that will be appropriated. Is that correct, for the fiscal year ending 1963 and the subsequent years?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is correct.

Mr. BECKER. That has nothing to do with the provision on grants in aid of $180 million? That will be in addition?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is right.

Mr. BECKER. Are there any provisions in the budget this year to take care of any of these funds?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. There is $300 million in the budget this year.

Mr. BECKER. Then none of this is deficit spending. That is all in the budget, the so-called balanced budget that has been proposed?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes, that is right. We provide for $120 million in loans and $180 million in grants. That is $300 million, and that is in the budget.

Mr. BECKER. It is in the budget?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If the tax revenues are not sufficient to meet the spending, then there will be a deficit.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. And if the tax revenues are in excess, then there will not be.

Mr. GROSS. But there will be some deficit spending.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am among those who have some concern about this bill. I appreciate the tremendous effort that the committee has put into the bill, but I am apprehensive, frankly, and right up to this time I have not made up my mind just exactly how I am going to vote on this particular measure.

One thing, Mr. Chairman, that worries me greatly is the idea of separation of church and state. That worries me. One reason I have opposed a new all-out program of Federal aid to education, to build public schools, to pay for schoolteachers' salaries, is this troublesome question of church and state. The important thing to me is to do that which I think is right and what is best for my beloved country. I know each of you feels the same way. So you can understand and you can appreciate my apprehension.

I feel that this is a new program. I first thought this was an established program, that there was no new pattern. I know the great university that is in my own home city, and the junior colleges in my district have received money from the Federal Government. The fact that we do have Federal programs is an accomplished fact. The question now is—what of the future?

Now, in particular, is it not true that for the first time under the provisions of this bill we give grants for academic facilities, and we also give grants for the first time for academic facilities for sectarian schools; is that correct or is it not correct? Can someone answer that question for me? Let me ask the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon, for whom I have tremendous respect, that question. I know we have other programs. I know the gentlewoman in her fine discussion a few minutes ago talked about all of the various programs we have, but this is the question: Is this not a new program? For the first time do we not make provisions for grants to sectarian schools for facilities?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. No. I would like to say to my colleague from Florida that this is not the case. Grants have been made by the Federal Government to all types of colleges and universities, private, public, church-related, and non-church-related, for the past 20 years.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am grateful to the gentlewoman, and if this bill passes I am going to ask her to give my schools just as much as she gets for her schools. But the point I am worried about is this: If this does not establish some kind of a precedent and if it does not establish some kind of a new or different type of program. For example, I know we have a college housing and students' loan program—fine, splendid programs. Now, in this bill, we have not only a loan program for college housing but we have a loan program for facilities that are not income producing in secular institutions; is that not true?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am sorry; I could not hear the gentleman.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As I say, heretofore we have had fine programs for college housing, loan programs, but now is it not true that we have a loan program in addition to college housing for other academic facilities in secular institutions that are not income producing?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. That is exactly correct. As I stated a few moments ago, during the past years we have provided places for students to sleep and eat but we have not provided the classrooms in which they could work. In the gentleman's own State of Florida we have provided funds for Stetson University, in the district represented by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG]. Stetson University received during the past 5 years $105,416 from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Now, that might be part loans and part grants. This is a church-related college. This same college received from the National Science Foundation $193,205 as well as funds from other sources amounting to $2,926,000.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am most grateful. I will try to be the catalyst to answer questions.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I would simply say that there are hundreds—I think that would be a conservative estimate—hundreds of colleges in the United States that are church related or other private colleges, as well as public colleges, that have received both grants and loans in substantial amounts during the last several years.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would not the gentlewoman say that is from old programs, the National Institutes of Health, National Defense Education Act, college housing, but now we are getting into a new field? For the first time we are getting into the field where they are going to get money to build libraries let us say in secular institutions. I am trying to establish to my own satisfaction whether or not this is a new departure, because if it is, how in the world can I be consistent in the position I have taken previously? This is a personal problem I have, and I believe others have the same problem.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I wonder if the gentleman has any idea of the millions of dollars now being contributed by the National Institutes of Health in the form of research grants to these very same schools the gentleman is now talking about to do very important research in the fields of science and medicine. There has been no question of religious conflict in this kind of work.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is true, but again, as I recall, it is one kind of a program, and what I am worried about is getting into an entirely new field of using tax money to support secular education. I appreciate the observation which the gentleman has made.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HIESTAND. I greatly respect the opinion of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] but I disagree. This is a new program.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I shall be delighted to yield further to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, we have been making grants—outright grants—to colleges and universities for various kinds of research projects through various Government agencies for many years. The only difference is whether the money is going to be spent for a particular research facility or whether it might be spent for a classroom at another location on the same campus. I see no new ground-breaking precedent here. As I said, we have supplied the bricks and mortar and the lumber for dormitories in which the students might sleep and eat. I see no difference in supplying the classrooms and laboratories in which the students are taught. That is the primary purpose of our colleges and universities.

Mr. Chairman, the American Civil Liberties Union, an organization which is concerned, I think, in this area, declared on August 21, 1961, that it sees no constitutional bar to the granting of Federal building loans or grants to church-related colleges and universities which concentrate on higher education rather than the inculcation of religious dogma. The testimony before the subcommittee established, in my opinion beyond any shadow of a doubt, that this bill would not accomplish its purpose, as far as the public institutions are concerned, if we did not make grants. There are 44—or at least over 40—States that have legal restrictions on loans for non-revenue-producing facilities. So, if we limit this bill to loans, we would be denying the land-grant colleges and the State universities of over 40 out of the 50 States the opportunity to participate in this program. I think there is an overwhelming amount of evidence for making both the grants and loans available.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the gentlewoman from Oregon. She has made a very convincing statement.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana for the purpose of asking the gentlewoman from Oregon a question if the gentlewoman from Oregon would care to answer.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Would the gentlewoman choose to say that she sides with the American Civil Liberties Union rather than with the opinion of the President of the United States on what is constitutional and what is not?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am not siding with anyone here. The President of the United States has recommended both grants and loans for medical colleges and dental colleges. I have not heard the President of the United States make any statement to the effect that grants and loans to institutions of higher education are unconstitutional. I do not know what the President's position is with reference to the constitutionality of loans and grants to higher education institutions. I think none of us is able to decide this. Constitutional lawyers argue on both sides of the question. There has been a dearth of Supreme Court test cases. I suppose that we could resolve ourselves into a 435-member Supreme Court and make a decision. But the precedent that has been established convinces me that this is the program we should enter into immediately.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have a concern for this legislation, as I have for all Federal aid legislation, but a concern somewhat dissimilar to that of my colleague from Florida, for whom I have the highest respect. I do not have the same concern he has about the question of separation of church and State in Federal aid to education legislation. What I am basically concerned with is simply this, and through the years I have been here, Federal aid to education has been discussed. It is not so much the question of appropriating dollars, that we seem to think we can solve all the evils and problems of the Nation—by appropriating more and more money—or in the field of education like building more and more classrooms and more and more college facilities. I think we should remember the testimony on this subject, by Admiral Rickover before the Appropriations Subcommittee of the House of Representatives in 1959. He said what we must have is better basic education in our school systems, starting with the grammar school, through the secondary school, and up through the higher education level.

Mr. Chairman, with reference to all this legislation—the bait—offered for Federal aid to education, is getting better teachers, by just spending more money.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is fundamental that unless our basic educational programs are changed and bettered, unless the standards are greatly improved, we cannot turn out better teachers. Mr. Chairman, we have great teachers throughout our country, based upon the education they received in schools.

Mr. Chairman, two Commissioners of Education, one under President Truman and one under President Eisenhower, took the same identical position that unless we improve the basic systems of education, we are not by appropriating more dollars going to have better education itself.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder how many Members know that the Federal Government today is supporting some 400 programs of Federal aid to education? This is in our educational systems, in our colleges, in our military and in foreign countries all over the world, which amounts to billions of dollars. I think I am correct in making that statement because it is in the report that there are 400 programs and with these billions of dollars, what has happened to our basic education?

Why are we not turning out mathematicians; and technicians; why are we not turning out more doctors; why are we not turning out the professional people we need? Simply because we are not putting hard core educational standards into effect. I am quite sure the chairman of the Committee on Education and members of the committee must know that colleges throughout our country, in the past 5 years, have had to reduce their standards. We have had to reduce standards of entry because the standards of education in the schools sending students to colleges, have not met the college standards.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that unless we take into consideration not the spending of dollars alone, but the matter of urging high basic standards of education we are not going to improve anything by building more college facilities, more dormitories, or more classrooms throughout this country. Otherwise we are just going to get the same type of education we have today. I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that as laudable as this legislation may seem, we must first get at the root of the problem, and improve our basic education and not just appropriate dollars.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the most important argument for Federal aid to higher education is that the intellect of the young is an essential natural resource that must be developed as equipment for future service in society. Economic justification for Federal assistance is a secondary point.

Our college-age population is expected to double over the next 10 years, and already our institutions of higher education are crowded. Although the colleges and universities themselves are making every possible effort to extend quality instruction to the maximum number of students by better utilization of faculty and facilities, the present capacity can care for only a small percent of the expected increase in student body. The need for additional funds for instruction has already taken precedence over physical facilities to the extent that about 12 percent of our college and university buildings are in need of replacement and another 10 percent are in need of serious renovation. This is in addition to the need for new construction to enlarge existing institutions or establish new ones in strategic geographic locations. The traditional sources of State revenues and private philanthropy, while making great efforts, will not be able to keep pace with demands of the magnitude expected. Many States with the least resources out of which to pay are already making the greatest effort, percentagewise, in support of higher education.

Increased tuition, when it rises faster than the cost of living as it has for a number of years, defeats the ultimate national goal by making college impossible for many. Presently, with the advent of junior colleges and with increasingly high tuition in private colleges, about two-thirds of the Nation's college students are in public institutions; and it is estimated that much of the anticipated enrollment increase in the next decade will occur in public colleges and universities, with the problem of financing falling on the already overburdened State governments unless the Federal Government gives some assistance—and gives it now.

In the fall of 1961, Rhode Island had almost 20,000 degree-credit students enrolled in its 11 colleges and universities. This was an increase of only a little over 2 percent over that of the previous year, compared with 7.8-percent increase in the Nation as a whole. Forty-four percent of the degree-credit students in Rhode Island were in its two public institutions.

Rhode Island property taxes as a percent of personal income are slightly higher than the national average, and we have a 3-percent sales tax; but still the demands for public service in the State are such that we simply do not have the money needed to expand low-cost public higher education to the extent this is needed if Rhode Island is to provide its share of the human resource development needed for the country's growth.

We have no public junior colleges and only two institutions designed specifically to offer terminal-occupational training below the bachelor's degree. In a State as heavily populated and as heavily urbanized as Rhode Island, we are desperately in need not only of funds with which to expand the facilities of existing institutions but, more especially, of funds with which to extend within commuting distance of more of our young people higher education programs of a type and quality to insure that none of our vital human resources are wasted.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. HALL: Page 23, strike out part C establishing labor standards, including section 121 (a) and (b).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I feel that there is a major inconsistency in this bill, to wit: On page 7 of the report it states under paragraph 2(c) that the construction will be economical and it will not be elaborate or of extravagant design or materials. This presumes, Mr. Chairman, that neither shall there be an expenditure for elaborate or extravagant labor costs. Yet page 14, section 121 of the report states that "before making a loan or grant the Commissioner will obtain assurances that the laborers and mechanics employed by contractors—and subcontractors—in working on a project will be paid wages at rates as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act."

The history of that act in my State of Missouri—especially in rural areas—has been that it has artificially increased labor costs on public works projects by imposing wage scales in metropolitan areas on smaller communities where such construction is planned or instituted. Undoubtedly, this will increase construction costs and seems directly contrary to the "economy" statement on page 7. It would seem that "wage standards," should be "prevailing wages," in individual areas with local determinations based on normal bargaining between employer and the union representatives without third-party interference, on the part of the Government.

The Missouri prevailing wage law had a drastic effect on local school construction and caused definite increases to the taxpayers for such construction, thereby causing a limited amount of funds to construct "less building." The Federal law generally tends to be even more arbitrary than the State law. In any event, I feel that there should be an effort by all of the Congress to strike out part C establishing labor standards, including section 121 (a) and (b) on page 23 of this bill.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that this section is already the law in similar construction legislation which this body has passed in more or less the same form, as in the Hill-Burton Act, the College Housing Act, Depressed Areas Act, and in somewhat similar form even in the Highway Construction Act. Therefore, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HALL) there were—ayes 39, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8900) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, and to authorize financial assistance for undergraduate study in such institutions, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 527 he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HIESTAND. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. HIESTAND moves that the bill H.R. 8900 be recommitted to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 319, nays 80, answered, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

YEAS—319

Adair
Addabbo
Addonizio
Albert
Andrews
Anfuso
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Ayres
Bailey
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bass, N.H.
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Beckworth
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Blitch
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bonner
Bow
Boykin
Brademas
Bray
Breeding
Brewster
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown
Broyhill
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Burke, Mass.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cannon
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clark
Coad
Cohelan
Collier
Conte
Cook
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, James C.
Davis, John W.
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Dominick
Donohue
Dooley
Downing
Doyle
Dulski
Durno
Dwyer
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Fenton
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Garland
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gilbert
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harrison, Wyo.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Herlong
Holland
Horan
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord, Mo.
Inouye
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Md.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kearns
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kowalski
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Lane
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
McCulloch
McDonough
McFall
McIntire
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mack
Madden
Magnuson
Mailliard
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Meader
Miller, Clem
Miller, George P.
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Mills
Minshall
Moeller
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorehead, Ohio
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Murphy
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Norblad
Nygaard
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Pelly
Perkins
Peterson
Pfost
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Randall
Reece
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Roudebush
Roush
Ryan
St. Germain
Santangelo
Saund
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Shelley
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Spence
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tupper
Udall, Morris K.
Vanik
Van Zandt
Vinson
Wallhauser
Walter
Watts
Weis
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—80

Abbitt
Abernethy
Alexander
Alger
Andersen, Minn.
Anderson, Ill.
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Berry
Betts
Bruce
Burleson
Church
Clancy
Cramer
Cunningham
Dague
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Evins
Fascell
Findley
Fisher
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gross
Haley
Hall
Hemphill
Henderson
Hiestand
Hoeven
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Kilburn
Kilgore
Kitchin
Lennon
Lipscomb
McMillan
McSween
Mahon
Martin, Nebr.
Mason
Matthews
Michel
Murray
Norrell
Passman
Poage
Poff
Ray
Rousselot
Rutherford
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherer
Scott
Short
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Taber
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Tuck
Utt
Waggonner
Weaver
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Winstead

NOT VOTING—34

Alford
Avery
Battin
Casey
Chiperfield
Colmer
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Ford
Gallagher
Hébert
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Hosmer
Jarman
Loser
McDowell
McVey
May
Merrow
Nix
Rains
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Tex.
Rostenkowski
Selden
Sheppard
Smith, Miss.
Springer
Thompson, N.J.
Ullman
Van Pelt

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. May for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Casey against.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Rogers of Texas against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Avery.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Battin.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Ford.
Mr. Alford with Mr. McVey.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Loser with Mr. Van Pelt.

Mr. FORRESTER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. GREEN of Oregon: Amend the title so as to read:

"To authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities."

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert certain material following my remarks during the debate on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. ASHBROOK have permission to include extraneous matter in his remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

WHY PURCHASE U.N. BONDS?

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, we are receiving a message from the President today, requesting Congress to authorize the purchase of $100 million of United Nations bonds, to help bear the expense of those countries which have failed to pay their just share. Before we agree to purchase of these bonds, let the United Nations invoke article 19 of the United Nations Charter and challenge the right of defaulting countries, more than 2 years in arrears, to vote in the General Assembly. There are many other matters to be taken into consideration as to world operations today such as:

The United States shipping to Egypt, during the past year, 200,000 tons of corn 250,000 tons of dry milk, 20,000 tons of fat, and 18,000 tons of cottonseed and soya oil. Egypt, receiving these benefits from the United States directly, has kept the Suez Canal closed to a great ally of the United States and a fellow member of the United Nations; namely, Israel.

Along with the benefits accruing to nations, membership in the U.N. entails an obligation to respect the rights of member nations as well as to refrain from acts of aggression. India, another recipient of our beneficence, resorted to aggression in Goa to serve its national purpose.

Are these the things we are supposed to pay for by the purchase of these $100 million of U.N. bonds?

The United Nations is forcing the issue in the Congo, why not in India and in Egypt?

Mr. Speaker, I can hardly see the logic of purchasing these bonds, to carry the burden for some 87 defaulting nations, some of whom I have mentioned above, are in violation of provisions of the United Nations Charter. Are we not, by this process, aiding and abetting these acts? Are we not then, financing the very things we oppose in principle?

I notice in today's issue of the New York Times, where Great Britain intends to purchase $12 million worth of United Nations Bonds, by the end of 1963. In deciding the amount and timing of the purchases, Mr. Heath, Lord Privy Seal, emphasized that the Government will take into account the cash requirements of the organization and the extent to which other countries contribute.

This is certainly attaching strings with no definite agreement to purchase.

I cannot conceive how we, the United States, can further condone the actions of the Soviets, India, Egypt, Indonesia, and others by paying their share of dues and assessments in the United Nations, by the purchase of these bonds and at the same time maintain our own sense of morality.

THE 1963 BUDGET FOR AMERICAN INDIAN PROGRAMS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include a statement by Mr. HALEY.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement presented to the members of the subcommittee on Indian Affairs on January 29 by the Honorable JAMES A. HALEY, of Florida, chairman of the subcommittee. Chairman HALEY's statement points up some of the significant problems facing Congress and the Departments of the Interior and Health, Education, and Welfare in administering the affairs of the 380,000 Indians presently under Federal jurisdiction.

Within a few weeks the House will be asked to approve the budget for the Indian program for fiscal 1963. I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress some pertinent data relative to the cost and scope of the program with which we on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs concern ourselves in forwarding legislation to the House for consideration.

In this respect, Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on the manner in which Chairman HALEY handles Indian legislation. No piece of Indian legislation is either too large or too small for Mr. HALEY. He studies each bill and proposal with skill and patience. He is firm, yet fair, with the Indians and their spokesmen as they present their testimony to the subcommittee, and he is generous with his time when they call at his office to discuss their problems.

This is especially commendable for a Member of Congress who has fewer than 100 Indians in his district. We are indeed fortunate that Mr. Haley continues year after year as subcommittee chairman.

Mr. Speaker, our Indian population is increasing more rapidly than other segments of our population. Their needs are increasing proportionately. The cost of our Indian program is mounting year by year. The combined budget request for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Division of Indian Health for fiscal 1963 is $262 million. This represents an expenditure of approximately $700 on behalf of every Indian man, woman, and child. I seriously doubt that we are receiving full value from our expenditures. It is time that Congress and the Federal authorities sit down together and arrive at an overall policy that is more in keeping with present day needs than the one we have been working with during the past 30 years.

Mr. HALEY's statement to the subcommittee follows:

STATEMENT FOR MR. HALEY RELATIVE TO INDIAN AFFAIRS EXPENDITURES FOR 1963

Fellow members of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, since this is the first meeting of the Subcommittee of Indian Affairs during the second session of Congress, I would like to make a short statement to bring the Indian program into perspective. I invite Commissioner Nash and other representatives who are here this morning from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to advise me if I am wrong in some of my data.

A recent news release from the Bureau of Indian Affairs stated that the annual growth rate for the Indian population during the 1950's was about 2.5 percent as compared with 1.7 percent for the entire country.

The best available estimate of the indigenous population of what is now the United States, excluding Alaska and Hawaii, for the year 1500 is about 846,000. The 1960 census showed 509,147 Indians living in the same area. At that time, practically all Indians were fullbloods.

Today the Indian population differs from that of the 1500 period. While fullblood Indians probably predominate on reservations in Arizona and New Mexico, they constitute a small minority elsewhere. On some reservations like the Turtle Mountain Reservation in North Dakota, for instance, a fullblood is rarely found.

Actually, there is no such a person as an Indian as far as a legal distinction is concerned. We in Congress have been derelict in not establishing a blood quantum requirement. In North Carolina's Eastern Band of Cherokees, only a 32nd degree of Cherokee ancestry is required for membership. In other states a person is considered an Indian if he is so thought of by the persons of his community. In some cases a person is identified as an Indian merely on the basis of his membership in a tribe or band. Now an Indian can terminate or abandon his membership in a tribe or band and, thereby, cease to be an Indian for all legal purposes whenever he wishes to do so.

The total number of Indians now residing on reservations under Federal jurisdiction is approximately 285,000 according to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The native population of Alaska includes about 14,000 Indians and 29,000 Eskimos and Aleuts.

I often, and I assume you do also, receive letters from irate constituents who are asking why Congress and the Federal Government do not do something for the Indians. In the 85th Congress our subcommittee made a detailed study of the relationships between the Federal Government and the American Indian. This Committee Print No. 38, proved to be a best seller and is now almost a collector's item. In the 86th Congress our subcommittee prepared a follow-up study of the indirect services and expenditures by the Federal Government for the American Indian. In this study, Committee Print No. 14 distributed widely in 1959 and 1960, we discovered that Indians received benefits from several departments and agencies of the Federal Government in addition to those they receive as American citizens. Obviously the first two departments we think of as being engaged in Indian business are Interior and Health, Education, and Welfare. The latter handles Indian health and sanitation programs through the United States Public Health Service which has established a Division of Indian Health. Other departments and agencies making sizable contributions to Indian service include Justice, General Accounting Office, Library of Congress, Smithsonian Institution, Department of Labor, the Indian Claims Commission, and to some extent the several arms of the Department of Defense.

In 1959 Indian affairs expenditures by the Departments of the Interior and Health, Education, and Welfare were approximately $158,500,000 as compared with $60 million in 1949 and $47 million in 1939.

Now, I have just had occasion to review the request of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Division of Indian Health in the Departments of the Interior and Health, Education, and Welfare, respectively, found in the 1963 budget. The Bureau is asking for $197,381,000 to run its share of the Indian program from July 1, 1962, to June 30, 1963. The chief items of expenditure are:

Education and welfare services	$82,827,000
Resources management	34,417,000
Construction	54,765,000
Road construction	17,000,000
General administration	4,372,000
Miscellaneous	4,000,000
Total	197,381,000

Indian Health Division in Public Health Service is asking for $65,054,000 for its contribution for the Indian program. The chief items are for:

Hospital and health service	$55,834,000
Health facilities construction	9,220,000
Total	65,054,000

The total amount for these two departments is about $262,435,000. The 1962 Budget provided for something in the neighborhood of $227 million. The 1963 Budget request calls for an increase of about $35 million unless my arithmetic is wrong. The other agencies of our Federal—not State or local—Government will provide perhaps $4 million in addition to this figure.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs employs at least 12,000 in the field and central offices, and the Division of Indian Health over 5,500. A great many of them are trained and fully qualified Indians who are doing a splendid job.

Now let us see how many Indians will benefit from these expenditures. The Bureau advises me that about 380,000 Indians living on or near reservations will share in these expenditures. In other words, there are about 380,000 Indians for whom the Bureau of Indians Affairs and the Division of Indian Health have some responsibility. These Indians include high-ranking Government and military personnel, oil company executives, college professors, as well as skilled and unskilled laborers. Let me hasten to add that by far the largest number fall into the category of unskilled laborers. If we divide the $262,435,000 by 380,000, we find that there will be about $700 expended on behalf of each Indian. In addition to this amount, each Indian will receive the same benefits that are accorded non-Indian American citizens.

I made this statement this morning because it may assist other members of the subcommittee in answering constituents who are unhappy over the manner in which many of our Indian citizens are living either on reservations where it is practically impossible to eke out a livelihood or in communities where they have migrated in hopes of bettering themselves economically.

THE REFUGEE "FAIR SHARE" LAW

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues, I wish to include in the RECORD at this point the third semiannual report of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization relating to the administration of the so-called "Fair Share Act," Public Law 86–648, under which the Attorney General is authorized to parole certain refugees and subsequently grant them permanent residence in the United States. Commissioner Farrell's report reads as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., January 15, 1962.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: During the third 6-month period from July 1, 1961, through December 31, 1961, operations under the act of July 14, 1960 (Public Law 86–648), continued in the seven countries in which, on the recommendation of the Secretary of State, operations had been commenced during the first and second 6-month periods, viz, Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, and Lebanon. The number of refugees who registered under the act had been unexpectedly low during the first two periods, and declined further during the third 6-month period, a total of 3,635 registrations having been received during the period.

Including the third period, the number authorized by statutory "fair share" totaled 13,416 and the total number of refugees who had registered since the beginning of the program exceeded this number by only 744. Comparative figures for the first three periods are tabulated below:

	1st	2d	3d	Total
Authorized by statutory fair share	5,571	3,705	4,140	13,416
Pending beginning of period	0	500	1,059	
Registered during period	6,334	4,191	3,635	14,160
Total registered (pending plus received)	6,334	4,691	4,694	
Found qualified for parole	[1]4,570	[1]1,737	3,015	9,322
Rejected or otherwise closed	[1]1,264	[1]1,895	1,390	4,549
Pending end of period	500	1,059	289	

[1] These figures have been adjusted from the figures shown in previous reports to reflect (in addition to cases previously reported as rejected or otherwise closed) cases closed through abandonment after tentative approval.

During the period covered by this report, 3,015 refugees were found qualified for parole. Criteria continued to be basically the same as used for visa issuance and immigration examination of immigrants. Processing of applicants continues to include interrogation by experienced immigration officers, medical examination including X-rays by physicians of the United States Public Health Service, fingerprinting of all applicants 14 years of age and over, and the examination of the records of security, intelligence and other agencies of this Government, as well as the records of countries of residence abroad.

The application of these criteria resulted in 736 denials of parole applications during the period covered by this report, as follows:

Ineligible	120
Security risks	102
Criminal	10
Medical rejects	3
Immorality	25
Undesirability	74
Split families (spouses and children left behind in country of origin)	93
Firmly settled	130
Spouses and children of above principals	179

In the processing of applications pending and received during the third period, 654 were closed because the applicants had taken advantage of resettlement in other countries or had withdrawn their applications for other reasons.

The following is a tabulation of the registrations received in the various countries since the beginning of the program:

Country	In camp	Out of camp	Total
Austria	721	1,222	1,943
Belgium		1,052	1,052
France		4,443	4,443
Germany	544	2,119	2,663
Greece	362	209	571
Italy	2,038	492	2,530
Lebanon		958	958
Total	3,665	10,495	14,160

To insure the carrying out of the basic purpose of the law, that the United States take its fair share of UNHCR mandated, emigrable, admissible refugees, who are not firmly resettled in their countries of present residence, with a view to the abolition of the refugee camps insofar as that is practicable by joint international effort, the priorities in considering applications, as set out in the report of July 13, 1961, were followed. Due, however, to the continuing small number of registrants during the third period, all categories were reached for processing before the period ended. Only 289 had not been interviewed. The following is a tabulation of the registrations received during the period, in the order of the established priority classifications:

1. Status of refugee acquired prior to Jan. 1, 1958	862
(a) Camp residents	123
(b) Out-of-camp residents	739
2. Status of refugee acquired since Jan. 1, 1958	2,773
(a) Camp residents	680
(b) Out-of-camp residents	2,093

Information compiled through the comprehensive camp survey by Service officers during June 1961, as set out in the report submitted for the second period, has been brought up to date and reflects the following:

Country	Federal camps	Other camps	Non-national refugee population	UNHCR eligible refugees	Current INS registrations
Greece	2	0	283	283	65
Italy	4	0	3,564	2,580	510
Austria	38	78	2,824	1,668	75
Germany	42	432	8,468	7,252	118

While some progress in closing so-called camps in the various countries is indicated, the "camp population" has not greatly decreased. Although two nonnational refugee camps in Italy have been closed or inactivated, the number of refugees in Italy has increased slightly. All but approximately 400 nonnational emigrable refugees in Italy are presently under some program for resettlement outside of that country. These persons have only recently arrived in Italy. There are only two camps remaining in Greece, one for Greek ethnics, which has a population of approximately 200, and the other for all other refugees. The 83 inhabitants of the latter constitute a very small percentage of the potential camp capacity. The ethnics have been given many opportunities to emigrate but remain in Greece by their own choice and live in the refugee camp because of a scarcity of low rental housing. The number of camps, both government operated and others, has been reduced in Austria. Housing is becoming available for persons who have been residing in these so-called camps. There continues to be a labor shortage in the Austrian economy. Refugees who can be considered for immigration have been given many opportunities to leave Austria and registrations are expected to continue very low and limited primarily to persons who recently arrived with documents and ask for asylum, and Yugoslavs who are granted political asylum. Some progress has been shown in closing camps in Germany, but as stated in the last report, when adequate housing is made available to nonnational refugees, it is either declined in favor of the low rent afforded by the substandard housing in these camps, or the camp space vacated in the camp is occupied by German refugees from East Germany. Since the number of Germans escaping through Berlin has been reduced from several thousand each month to practically none, the housing shortage will become less acute, and employment will be even more readily available in the booming economy of West Germany. There are no camps in France, Belgium or Lebanon.

The largest number of registrations has continued to be received from refugees in France, which is a country of initial asylum of recent fugitives or expellees from the Middle East and Yugoslavia. Approximately 600 registrations were received in Lebanon from persons who recently left Egypt and Syria. The largest potential number of refugees appears to be persons in North Africa and the Middle East who may leave that area to enter France and Lebanon.

Operations under this law during the period covered by this report have substantiated the observations set forth in the last report that the number of refugee-escapees in Europe, who desire to migrate to the United States, has been overestimated and that no U.S. legislation in the general area of immigration, no matter how broad in scope or how thoroughly and conscientiously implemented can result, in itself, in the elimination of refugee camps as the term is popularly applied.

Information from the cooperating U.S. voluntary agencies indicates that in many cases difficulty has been encountered in obtaining the necessary assurances of housing and employment.

Of the refugees approved for parole by the end of the third period, 114 were approved under section 2(b) of the act as "difficult to resettle" cases. An additional 380 have been referred to the voluntary agencies for documentation under this section.

The Congress has approved private laws authorizing permanent resident status for two aliens in the United States, with the provision that the number of refugees who may be paroled into the United States under the act of July 14, 1960, shall be reduced by a like number.

Upon receipt of assurances of housing and employment, 6,916 refugees had been referred to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration for transportation to the United States and 4,925 had arrived in the United States as of December 31, 1961. In compliance with the provisions of section 2(a) of the act, detailed reports received on individuals paroled into this country since May 15, 1961, are attached.

Sincerely,

R. F. FARRELL, *Commissioner.*

UNITED STATES MUST AID COLLEGES

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the needs of our talented young people; the obligation of the Nation to develop its intellectual resources; and the security of freedom which is threatened by the top priority given to education in the Soviet Union; require a massive effort to expand the facilities for higher education in the United States, as provided for in H.R. 8900, the College Academic Facilities Act.

College enrollments, which totaled 3,600,000 students in 1960–61, are expected to increase by more than 1 million, or 30 percent, by 1965.

Educators are bracing themselves to meet the demand of an estimated 6 million students who will be seeking the opportunity of a higher education by 1970.

Just to provide classrooms for them, our colleges and universities will have to spend $12.9 billion by 1970. This figure climbs to $18.8 billion when the cost of new residential buildings is added. Even with increased borrowing, and anticipated higher contributions from State, local, and private sources, these efforts will fail to close the gap by $1.5 billion in 1965, and $2.5 billion by 1970.

Unless help is forthcoming from the Federal Government, there will be no room for many youngsters who have proved their qualifications for a higher education. They and the Nation will suffer from this underdevelopment of college-educated specialists.

In the longrun competition between freedom and communism, the relative availability and excellence of the opposing educational systems, may well decide the issue.

The College Academic Facilities Act is a giant step forward in facing up to that challenge with determination and realism.

A beginning was made in 1950, when the Federal Government initiated the college housing program. Since then, some 600 higher education institutions, both public and private, have obtained loans totaling nearly $1.5 billion, to build domitories and other revenue-producing buildings for their students.

Now the urgent need is for assistance in constructing classrooms and other academic facilities.

Originally, the Special Subcommittee on Education confined itself to the question of providing loans for academic facilities. But testimony at the hearings brought home the fact that many schools and colleges would not be able to participate fully in a loan program for the construction of non-income-producing facilities without raising student tuition fees and eliminating contemplated teacher salary increases.

Both the opportunity for, and the quality of higher education, would be affected by a program limited to loans.

Therefore, as reported favorably by the subcommittee, the bill will provide matching grants of $180 million per year for 5 years for construction and/or rehabilitation of academic facilities (classrooms, laboratories, libraries, administration, maintenance, storage, and related facilities). In addition, long-term loans of $120 million a year, will be authorized for the same purpose. Loans must be repaid within 50 years; and will bear interest at a rate not more than the higher of 2¾ percent per year, or one-fourth of 1 percent above the interest paid by the Commissioner to the Treasury.

Under "grants," which account for 60 percent of the total amount authorized, the applicant must show that the project will result in an urgently needed expansion of the applicant's student enrollment capacity.

Applicants must also show that the project (a) will not be used primarily for physical education or for events for which admission is charged to the public, (b) is not used or will not be used for "sectarian instruction" or for "religious worship," or (c) will not be used primarily in connection with any part of the program of a school or department of divinity.

Governed by a fair formula, it is possible to determine the annual share of each State, based on 1957–58 data.

Of the $180 million in grants, the colleges and universities of Massachusetts would be alloted $6,207,530, ranking 8th among the 50 States, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands.

Our institutions of higher learning must nearly double—within 9 years—facilities it took three centuries to build.

The College Academic Facilities Act will open the door to new classrooms, laboratories, and libraries that will train the teachers, scientists, engineers, doctors, dentists, public health workers and other educated personnel who are essential for our security—and progress.

NEED TO AUTHORIZE WORK RELIEF UNDER TEMPORARY AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN PROGRAM

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, a serious inadequacy exists in the temporary aid to dependent children program enacted last year. This inadequacy stems from the position taken by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that the practice of requiring able-bodied welfare recipients to participate in community work relief programs as a condition of receiving assistance would have to be abandoned in the case of benefits under the TADC program.

I have introduced a bill designed to correct this situation. It provides that receipt of welfare assistance under the temporary aid to dependent children program could be made contingent upon participation in local work relief programs.

I think it is important that this bill be given serious consideration, particularly in view of the administration's apparent desire to make the TADC program permanent.

The aid to dependent children program, title IV of the Social Security Act, has been in effect since 1936. Prior to the 1961 amendments, title IV provided for Federal participation in State plans to aid children who had been deprived of parental support or care by reason of the death, continued absence from the home, or physical or mental incapacity of a parent.

On May 8, 1961, the President signed into law the bill establishing as a part of title IV a temporary program of aid to dependent children of unemployed parents.

Since 1936 the law has required disbursements under ADC to be in the form of money payments and an initial ruling by the Social Security Board in February 1936, set forth in a letter specifying how money payments were to be used, stated that "Such funds may not be used for payments of wages to a child or in compensation for work done or services rendered by him." This has remained through the years as the accepted interpretation of the term "money payments" as used in section 406(b) of the Social Security Act.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare stated last year that the old Social Security Board's ruling had been reviewed several times since 1936 and each time had resulted in a decision that the language of the law did not provide authority for matching such payments as assistance.

The same definition of assistance governs under the new TADC program as governs all of a State's plan under the rest of title IV. The Public Assistance Bureau has made this clear, specifying in a letter dated May 26, 1961, that "any amounts paid to unemployed parents of needy children as wages or compensation for work done or services rendered are not appropriate for Federal financial participation, because such amounts are not assistance as defined in the Social Security Act."

The effect of this ruling is as follows: If a State wants to take advantage of the TADC program by transferring eligibles from its own home relief rolls, none of the funds paid such persons under TADC can be used either as compensation for participation in a work relief program or as a debit against which subsequent work relief could be credited. The Department feels there is no authority to use Federal funds to match amounts paid to an eligible parent for work perfomed or services rendered. In other words, an able-bodied man cannot be asked to work in return for any welfare benefits coming from Washington.

Prior to enactment of the temporary extension last year, no program of federally aided public assistance had been made available to able-bodied recipients who were able to, and could reasonably be expected to, participate in a work-relief program. What were the other federally aided public assistance programs? Old age assistance; aid to dependent children deprived of parental support by reason of the death, continued absence from the home, or physical or mental incapacity of a parent; aid to the blind; and aid to the permanently and totally disabled. No reasonable person could expect welfare recipients under any of these categories to participate in a work-relief program. In TADC we have for the first time a Federal public assistance program under which the recipient could be expected to perform work in return for relief.

The purpose of the TADC program appears to me to be to get assistance into the hands of needy children and their families that otherwise might not be available under programs in which the Federal Government participates. The purpose is to take care of a need, in this case a need caused by the inability of the family breadwinner to gain employment. The primary interest of the taxpayer has been served when this hardship has been alleviated. When this primary purpose has been accomplished it is difficult to understand a further assertion that it is in the interest of either the taxpayer or the recipient to require an able-bodied man who receives a welfare payment to remain idle rather than requiring him to perform a useful function in return for that payment. Experience has proven the contrary.

The basic purpose of the TADC program appears to be no different than that attributed to the State relief programs which it has in many instances supplemented. It stands to reason that the same justification for work relief which holds true in the case of State welfare programs, and which is apparently accepted by Federal welfare administrators, would be equally applicable to an assistance program in which the Federal Government participates.

Work relief programs are designed to cut the cost of government, to encourage relief recipients to help pay their way, to help these recipients gain self-respect, and to destroy the something-for-nothing philosophy. These are valid objectives no matter what level of government underwrites the program through which assistance is given to the needy of a community.

I think it is high time this unrealistic restriction is taken off the use of Federal funds.

WHERE DID THE ACREAGE COME FROM?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the annual summary crop report for 1961 it appears that the reduction in acreage devoted to major crops—from 1960 to 1961—was considerably less than the acreage retired under the 1961 feed grain program.

For the United States as a whole, the net reduction in acreage of 59 crops was only 55 percent as great as the acreage retired under the feed grain program. The discrepancy between the acreage placed under feed grain contracts and the reduction in acreage devoted to 59 crops totals 11.9 million acres. The reduction in acreage of all hay for harvest was only 161,000 acres.

This indicates that more than 11.7 million acres of land that was in rotation pasture, idle, or in noncropland uses in 1960 was either planted to crops or placed in the feed grain program in 1961.

In Illinois the reduction in acreage devoted to seven major cash crops was only 32.6 percent of the acreage placed in the feed grain program. In Iowa the reduction in acreage devoted to eight major cash crops was only 34.7 percent of the acreage placed in the feed grain program. The record was somewhat better in Indiana, Minnesota, and Nebraska.

Detailed figures supporting the above comments are attached.

Planted acreage changes in selected crops, United States, 1960–61

	Actual (thousand acres)	Percentage
Corn, all purposes	−14,746	−18.0
Sorghum for grain, silage and forage	−5,222	−26.7
Oats	983	3.1
Barley	186	1.2
Sweet potatoes	2	1.0
Wheat	729	1.3
Flaxseed	−488	−14.2
Rice	4	.2
Dry edible beans	−1	−.1
Dry field peas	28	8.7
Sugarbeets	151	15.4

Planted acreage changes in selected crops, United States, 1960–61—Continued

	Actual (thousand acres)	Percentage
Soybeans, grown alone for all purposes	3,682	15.1
Rye	43	1.0
Peanuts, for harvest	19	1.3
Tobacco, for harvest	32	2.8
Potatoes, Irish	109	7.7
Cotton	507	3.2
Total, 17 crops	−13,982	−5.4
Reduction in corn and sorghums	−19,968	−19.7
Increase in soybeans	3,682	15.1
Net change in other crops	1,522	.8
Net change in 59 crops planted or grown	−14,764	−4.5
Acreage signed up under 1961 feed grain program (corn and grain sorghums)	26,688	
Discrepancy between the acreage retired under the 1961 feed grain program and the net reduction in acreage devoted to 59 crops	11,924	
Reduction in 59 crops as a percentage of acreage signed up under feed grain program		55.3
Change in acreage of all hay for harvest	−161	−.2

Planted acreage changes in selected crops, United States, 1960–61

ILLINOIS

	Actual (thousand acres)	Percentage
Corn, all purposes	−1,919	−18.4
Sorghums, for grain, silage, and forage	−9	−47.4
Oats	421	22.0
Barley	5	6.8
Rye	7	3.9
Soybeans grown alone for all purposes	602	12.0
Wheat	146	9.0
Total, 7 crops	−747	−3.9
Reduction in corn and sorghums	−1,928	−18.5
Increase in soybeans	602	12.0
Change in 4 other crops	579	15.3
Net change, 7 crops	−747	−3.9
Acreage signed up under 1961 feed grain program (corn and grain sorghums)	2,293	
Reduction in 7 crops as a percentage of acreage signed up under feed grain program		32.6
Change in acreage of all hay for harvest	−129	−5.9

IOWA

	Actual (thousand acres)	Percentage
Corn, all purposes	−2,184	−17.3
Sorghums, for grain, silage and forage	−36	−57.1
Oats	386	9.0
Barley	−2	−6.7
Rye	−5	−16.7
Soybeans, grown alone for all purposes	837	32.0
Flaxseed	−2	−12.5
Wheat	−12	−8.8
Total, 8 crops	−1,018	−5.1
Reduction in corn and sorghums	−2,220	−17.5
Increase in soybeans	837	32.0
Change in 5 other crops	365	8.1
Net changes, 8 crops	−1,018	−5.1
Acreage signed up under 1961 feed grain program (corn and grain sorghums)	2,936	
Reduction in 8 crops as a percentage of acreage signed up under feed grain program		34.7
Change in acreage of all hay for harvest	−151	−4.3

INDIANA

	Actual (thousand acres)	Percentage
Corn, all purposes	−1,086	−20.1
Sorghums, for grain, silage and forage	−10	−32.3
Oats	−34	−4.0
Barley	5	9.4
Rye	30	15.8
Soybeans, grown alone for all purposes	320	13.0
Wheat	88	7.0
Total, 7 crops	−685	−6.7
Reduction in corn and sorghums	−1,096	−20.2
Increase in soybeans	320	13.0
Changes in 4 other crops	89	3.8
Net change, 7 crops	−687	−6.7
Acreage signed up under 1961 feed grain program (corn and grain sorghums)	1,383	
Reduction in 7 crops as a percentage of acreage signed up under feed grain program		49.7
Change in acreage of all hay for harvest	7	.5

MINNESOTA

	Actual (thousand acres)	Percentage
Corn, all purposes	−1,024	−15.0
Oats	−158	−4.0
Barley	36	4.0
Rye	26	33.3
Dry field peas	6	75.0
Soybeans, grown alone for all purposes	233	11.0
Flaxseed	−30	−5.1
Wheat	86	9.0
Potatoes, Irish	19	17.6
Sugarbeets	17	21.2
Total, 10 crops	−789	−5.1
Reduction in corn	−1,024	−15.0
Increase in soybeans	233	11.0
Change in 8 other crops	2	.03
Net change, 10 crops	−789	−5.1
Acreage signed up under 1961 feed grain program (corn and grain sorghums)	1,554	
Reduction in 10 crops as a percentage of acreage signed up under feed grain program		50.8
Change in acreage of all hay for harvest	487	13.9

NEBRASKA

	Actual (thousand acres)	Percentage
Corn, all purposes	−1,171	−17.0
Sorghums, for grain, silage and forage	−569	−28.0
Oats	−76	−6.0
Barley	−50	−16.8
Rye	−8	−2.9
Dry edible beans	−3	−4.1
Soybeans, grown alone for all purposes	115	69.7
Wheat	33	1.0
Sugarbeets	14	20.2
Potatoes, Irish	−2	−12.2
Total, 10 crops	−1,717	−11.9
Reduction in corn and sorghums	−1,740	−19.5
Increase in soybeans	115	69.7
Change in 7 other crops	−92	−1.7
Net change, 10 crops	−1,717	−11.9
Acreage signed up under 1961 feed grain program (corn and grain sorghums)	2,408	
Reduction in 10 crops as a percentage of acreage signed up under feed grain program		71.3
Change in acreage of all hay for harvest	−105	−2.1

RACE, COLOR, OR CREED SHOULD NOT BE ONLY QUALIFICATION FOR JOBSEEKERS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I view with misgivings the announcement from the Department of Labor that a program for reporting compliance with nondiscrimination in Government contracts on racial and other minority groups will go into effect March 31. I can think of no way to more effectively destroy our scientific and technical capability; to hamstring the spirit of free enterprise; to throttle individual effort and ingenuity than to force through Government edict the employment of people whose only qualification is that they are members of a minority group. The Constitution says:

> There shall be no discrimination because of race, color or creed.

I foresee under this directive a situation where race, color, or creed may become the only qualification for employment. I question that any organization which must depend for continuity upon sensationalism and bias can make a contribution to the national effort and this I fear will be the outcome of efforts to justify the existence of this program. Initially 38,000 manufacturers with 50,000 plants are going to be harassed by questionnaires, crusaders, and just plain meddlers. This directive requires manufacturers employing 50 or more people and holding Government contracts worth $50,000 or more with the Federal Government to file a detailed report on what they are doing about employment discrimination and how many minority group members they employ. As a part of the program, the Government can terminate a contract if willful noncompliance is found, recommend criminal prosecution, publish the names of manufacturers or unions that fail to comply and recommend that Government agencies not do business with those firms failing to comply. Nothing is said anywhere in the directive about a manufacturer's right to hire people who will do an honest day's work and who know the job they are hired to do.

WASTE IN MILITARY HOUSING PROCUREMENT

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend to the attention of the House a yearend report by the Comptroller General which comprises a review of housing allowances paid to U.S. military personnel occupying rental guarantee housing projects in France.

The report is a spot check of housing allowances in certain parts of France where American military personnel are stationed. It reveals that payments of excessive housing allowances of more than $2,345,000 occurred through sloppy business procedures in the past 6 years in France alone.

On the basis of this small sample, I believe it is safe to say that the taxpayer may have overpaid many millions of dollars through inefficient operations in military housing abroad. Housing allowances which are higher than actual rents, allowances based on unjustifiably high utility costs, poor administration, and ineffective review by higher authorities have cost the taxpayer dearly.

I think we would do well to note the following comment by the Comptroller General:

> In view of the significance of our findings on a review that was restricted to a relatively small segment of the oversea housing for which housing allowances are prescribed, excessive payments in the past at other oversea locations may also have been extensive.

The Comptroller General mentions a number of instances in which the Department of Defense has heeded advice of the Comptroller General as to better ways of doing business. In one of these, mentioned in the report, $750,000 has been saved. The military authorities deserve the highest praise for their acceptance of these recommendations.

However, even a casual glance at the record indicates that the Department of Defense has not always taken its responsibilities seriously and has not been quick to adopt businesslike practices. I believe the Department of Defense has much to learn from the businesslike audits of the Comptroller General, and I would like to specifically endorse the recommendation he makes that periodic internal audits or inspections of rental cost reports be undertaken. Such continual auditing by independent agents would stimulate better practices and save large sums of money in operations throughout the world.

I feel I can do no better than to close by quoting these significant passages from the Comptroller General's report:

> Although action has been taken by the Department of Defense during the past year to improve the processes for establishing worldwide housing allowances, we believe that, in order to assure the continued validity of reported costs, it is necessary to have the reports subjected to independent review and verification in the field. We are, therefore, recommending that the Secretary of Defense arrange for such periodic reviews at the installation level.

I hope that this recommendation will be acted upon without delay.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, denial of equal employment opportunity to millions of loyal citizens of the United States comprises today one of the most pressing internal problems of our Nation. Indeed, there can be little doubt that this internal problem also exerts an adverse effect upon the international relations of the United States.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to submit a news article which appeared today, January 30, 1962, in the Washington Post. The article announces March 31, 1962, as the effective date of a program for manufacturers to report compliance with nondiscrimination clauses in Government contracts.

I should like, further, to commend President Kennedy and his Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for this forthright implementation of the principle of equal employment rights. I might add, however, that the announcement shows certain limitations of executive authority. Believing that no American should arbitrarily be denied the opportunity to make a living because of age, race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry, the Special Subcommittee on Labor, of which I am chairman, has recently concluded extensive hearings. The Committee on Education and Labor, under the chairmanship of the Honorable ADAM C. POWELL, of New York, is presently considering a subcommittee print of proposed Federal equal employment opportunity legislation. The executive branch has made clear its intention to implement protection of some Americans from discrimination in employment. Surely it makes clear commonsense for the legislative branch, the Congress, to afford the same basic protection to all Americans.

ANTIBIAS LAWS IN JOBS GO INTO EFFECT MARCH 31

(By Phil Casey)

The Kennedy administration took a big step yesterday toward curbing discrimination in employment among the Nation's larger industries.

Assistant Secretary of Labor Jerry R. Holleman announced that a program for reporting compliance with nondiscrimination demands in Government contracts will go into effect March 31.

Manufacturers employing 50 or more people and holding contracts worth $50,000 or more with the Federal Government will be required then to file a detailed report on what they are doing about employment discrimination and supply statistics on just how many Negroes and members of other minority groups they employ.

The administration is setting no exact standard for industry to meet.

NO NUMBERS GAME

"This is no numbers game," said Holleman, who is executive vice chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. "A numbers game can be a dangerous thing."

Nevertheless, the compliance report's answers to the detailed questions will indicate, he said, whether an employer is living up to his contractual pledge not to discriminate in employment.

This report is for manufacturers only. A separate report will be devised soon for construction and public utilities doing business with the Government.

The President's Committee worked nine months on the report, attempting to devise a system that wouldn't prove too unwieldy for either the Committee or for the manufacturers, said John G. Feild, the Committee's executive director.

BARS ALL DISCRIMINATION

President Kennedy's executive order creating the Committee provides for a clause in Government contracts prohibiting discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

Under the contracts, the Government can terminate a contract, if willful noncompliance is found, recommend criminal prosecution, publish the names of manufacturers or unions that fail to comply, and recommend that Government agencies not do business with those firms failing to comply.

The program will cover about 38,000 manufacturers with about 50,000 plants employing 15.5 million workers, Feild said.

As the program develops, Holleman said, the Committee plans to issue certificates of merit to employers showing the least-discriminatory policies and the greatest progress.

Though annual reports will be demanded only of the larger firms, all manufacturers doing business with the Government can be compelled to send in special compliance reports. No firm doing business with the Government is exempt from the moral and legal obligation to comply with the nondiscrimination clause in the contracts, Holleman said.

USE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, after a good deal of thought I have decided to join my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], in pressing for a reorganization of the House rules relating to the use of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, I have today introduced a resolution, originally drafted and introduced by the gentleman from Missouri, which requires that in the printing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD there be a change in type face for those items which appear in it, but which were not spoken on the floor of the House. This would permit those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to be able to distinguish between that which has been orally stated on the floor of the House and that which has not.

I have looked with growing concern on the practice of Members of the House inserting statements in the RECORD which appear to have been delivered on the floor when in fact they were not, and for all anyone knows, the Member was in his office, back home in his district, or sitting in an air-cooled movie. I am old fashioned enough to believe that oral debate is still the best method of discovering the truth on any subject. It seems to me that the floor of the House is the proper place for Members to state a public position on any important matter which later appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The floor of the House is, as the gentleman from Missouri stated, "the testing ground of ideas, the place in which a proposal must stand or fall on its merits. It is also one of the major channels by which information of what occurs in the Halls of Congress gets back to the people, either directly or through the news media."

It is no secret that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD does not accurately reflect floor debate. And we know, too, that a speech given in a special order, after the legislative business is completed, may be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as though orally given, even though the Member did not appear. Under the rules of the House a Member may, by leave of the House, revise or extend his remarks, putting into the Record matters which were never said on the floor. For example, these comments which I now make were inserted in the body of the Congressional Record by permission but were never made orally on the floor of the House of Representatives by me. I do this deliberately in order to dramatize the point I am making. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] made his point by the same means.

I would agree also with the gentleman that we do not wish to end the practice of permitting Members to make insertions and extensions of remarks in the Congressional Record without actually being present. This is a privilege that was given with good reason. Without it, the remarks on important subjects of 435 Members of this body could not, by the simple limitation of time, be made part of the Record. Indeed, without the privilege, time better used in the presentation of legislative matters for consideration could be consumed in reading a great deal of less important material into the Record. So the practice has a solid base. All that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] and I ask is that the Record reflect the difference between something actually said on the floor and something inserted at a later time. This can be done by a simple change in type face.

By the same token, I do not wish to shut off the other use of the privilege—the original use as I understand it—of permitting a Member to put into more cogent language his statements made in the heat of debate. This is often necessary for the reasons of clarity. But in this area, too, abuses have arisen and the rule that the gentleman from Missouri and I have suggested would be applicable here also.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to presenting an honest record of debate and other proceedings on the floor of the House, I suspect that this proposal would have two collateral and highly beneficial effects.

First, it would undoubtedly cut down on the amount of unnecessary material that now appears in the Congressional Record, which in turn will save the taxpayers some money.

Second, it might stimulate greater attendance in the House of Representatives. Hopefully, the new rule would make it less attractive for Members to stay in their home districts on Mondays and Fridays, appearing in Washington for only 3 days and 2 nights in the middle of the week, as is the practice now of the well known "Tuesday to Thursday" club. Because of greater attendance, the proposed new rule might spur the House into high gear earlier in the session, thereby sparing some of the agony and some of the blunders made possible by leaving matters until the end of the session in the hot summer or early fall.

I should like to congratulate the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] on his thoughtful presentation of the problem in the past, and I am pleased to join him in his sensible approach toward a solution.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE AND IZVESTIA

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, more than 3 weeks ago, the Tribune invited Izvestia to send one of its editors to Chicago to write a column a day for the Tribune in exchange for a column a day in Izvestia to be written by a Tribune editor in Moscow. Both writers were to be published uncensored.

Neither the Chicago Tribune nor anyone else has had any answer from Izvestia. It is a matter that I hope Mr. Alexei Adzhubei, the editor of Izvestia, will clear up during his present visit to Washington. The Chicago Tribune quite properly raises the question whether the Soviet Government, which controls Izvestia and all other means of communications in the Soviet Union, is afraid to let the Russian people read anything but the Kremlin's dogma.

Mr. Adzhubei has an excellent opportunity to demonstrate to the world just how sincere he is in advocating better understanding between East and West, by announcing—as editor of Izvestia—an acceptance of the Tribune invitation. Any effort by Mr. Adzhubei to delay a decision on the pretext that he must further consult with his advisers in Russia must lead us to the obvious conclusion that editors of the Soviet press have little, if anything, to say about the management of their publications in Russia.

Once this assumption is forced upon us by Mr. Adzhubei's continued silence, then we must properly draw the final conclusion that our Government is wasting its time in extending any special courtesies to this Soviet visitor because he is not free to report his observations in the Russian publication he serves as editor, regardless of what he might say to the contrary in this country.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, these conclusions can very easily be avoided by the simple devise of Mr. Adzhubei showing the Chicago Tribune the courtesy it is entitled to and responding to its invitation. In any event, his response would be interesting although we have long ago learned that those problems which communism cannot resolve, its exponents conveniently sweep under the rug by ignoring them.

I think the Tribune suggestion would give the entire world an opportunity to see how much diversity of views the Soviet system can stand.

The article referred to follows:

We're Still Awaiting Izvestia's Reply

On January 3, more than 3 weeks ago, the Tribune invited Izvestia to send one of its editors to Chicago to write a column a day for us in exchange for a column a day in Izvestia to be written by a Tribune editor in Moscow. Both writers were to be published uncensored.

The first response from Moscow was an unofficial statement by someone on Izvestia's staff, saying that no formal offer had been received. Accordingly, we sent a formal offer to Alexei Adzhubei, Izvestia's editor. Again no reply was received directly from Izvestia, but we were told, through United Press International's correspondent in Moscow, that Mr. Adzhubei was in Cuba and the decision would have to await his return.

We are still waiting. To newspapermen the world over, accustomed as they are and must be to making decisions speedily, it will seem strange that Russian editors must take so long to come to a conclusion.

We make no secret of our belief that the Russian Government that controls Izvestia and all the other means of communication in Russia is afraid to let the Russian people read anything but the Kremlin's dogma. We made our proposal, in part, to test this thesis. The longer Mr. Adzhubei remains silent the more probable it becomes that he and his father-in-law, Mr. Khrushchev, do not dare risk even one column of dissenting opinion a day for fear the Russian people will be subverted by it.

It isn't as if the Communist regime were so new in Russia that its leaders wished to prove their worth to their people before subjecting themselves to a little criticism. The bolsheviks have been in power, now, for 45 years, during which they have built a huge army and police force, increased the country's economic power, killed off tens of thousands of former comrades who were, or were thought to be, unfriendly to the regime, and exiled hundreds of thousands of others. You'd think that by this time the regime would not quake in its boots at the mere thought of an exchange of contributing editors with a foreign newspaper.

We thought there was at least a slim chance that the offer would be accepted. The long silence of Mr. Adzhubei suggests all too plainly that we were wrong.

MEMBERSHIP IN COMMUNIST ACTION ORGANIZATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. Doyle] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a copy of a bill I filed today, H.R. 9944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduced a bill, H.R. 9944, amending the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, the effect of which is to outlaw the Communist Party of the United States by making membership per se therein a criminal offense. The bill makes punishable the continuing or subsequent membership in any Communist-action organization after it is found to be such by a final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board. By reason of the recent decision by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the Communist Party of the United States of America, Petitioner, against The Subversive Activities Control Board, decided June 5, 1961, which upheld the Subversive Activities Control Board findings by which the Communist Party of the United States was determined to be a

Communist-action organization, my bill therefore, after its effective date, would make punishable continuing or subsequent membership in the Communist Party in the United States. The bill would necessarily repeal the registration requirements of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 relating to Communist-action or Communist-front organizations, but it preserves the plan and the procedures of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 in all other respects.

It is to be recollected that the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, which is title I of the Internal Security Act, established the Subversive Activities Control Board. That Board has the function of making a judicial determination on petition of the Attorney General, as to the character of certain organizations, whether Communist-action, Communist front or Communist infiltrated, as defined in the act. In proceedings on the petition, all parties in interest are accorded a full and open hearing in an adversary proceeding, with right to counsel, confrontation and cross examination of witnesses, and right of appeal to the highest courts.

Upon a final determination of the character of the organization, certain consequences follow under the act relating, for example, to employment in Government and defense facilities, disabilities under the National Labor Relations Act, tax exemptions, passports, and the dissemination of unlabeled propaganda. These functions of the Board and the consequences set up in the act are fully preserved in my amending bill filed on January 29, 1962. The amendment, however, repeals the requirements relating to registration by certain Communist organizations and members, but makes membership in any organization found by final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board as Communist-action thereafter to be punishable by fine or imprisonment or both. The bill, I believe, is so drawn as to meet all constitutional requirements and procedural due process.

At this point I wish to make it crystal clear that while it is true that I have been a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee for about 15 years now this present bill is not a bill from the House Committee on Un-American Activities; that committee has not considered the bill and, therefore, has not approved or endorsed the bill in any manner. However, I wish to state my appreciation to the legal staff of that important committee for their timely, generous and able advice and draftsmanship of the bill on legal and constitutional requirements and procedures. In like manner I wish to thank the House Legislative Counsel's office for their similar and most generous and able assistance.

This bill in no way amends or affects that portion of the Smith Act which by recent interpretation of the Supreme Court, in the case of Julius Irving Scales, Petitioner, against The United States, decided June 5, 1961, makes punishable "active and purposive membership" in the Communist Party. The bill sets up a separate offense which differs from the Smith Act membership clause as a matter of degree, in the same sense that the offense of assault and battery compares to the offense of aggravated assault and battery in the criminal law.

This bill, I believe, sets up an effective and expedient method of dealing with such crimes as membership in the Communist Party, eliminating protracted trials, many times necessarily resulting from present procedures and requirements, some of which are of months and even years of duration under the existing Smith Act.

The procedural advantages of my bill in cases of prosecutions for Communist membership, as contrasted with prosecutions under the Smith Act is, I believe, readily apparent. The relevant section of the Smith Act provides as follows:

> Whoever organizes or helps or attempts to organize any society, group, or assembly of persons who teach, advocate, or encourage the overthrow or destruction of any such government by force or violence; or becomes or is a member of, or affiliates with, any such society, group, or assembly of persons, knowing the purposes thereof—
>
> Shall be fined, etc.

Under the Smith Act, therefore, in membership prosecutions in the Communist Party of the United States the Government has been compelled in each and every case against each and every separate defendant to prove as follows: to wit: First, that the defendant knowingly became or is a member of the Communist Party; second, that the Communist Party in the United States is such a society as advocates and teaches the overthrow and destruction of the U.S. Government by force and violence; third, that the individual defendant knew of such purposes of that organization; and fourth, that he actively and purposively participated as a member of such organization in such activities. Every separate prosecution requires repetitive proof of each of the foregoing, in each and every case. Therefore, experts and countless witnesses are required to testify on behalf of the Government of the history and nature of the Communist Party in the United States, over and over again. The proceedings are often necessarily protracted, and subjected to all the frustrations that can be devised by Communist attorneys, as occurred in the New York Smith Act trials before Judge Medina commencing in 1948. I believe it will be found by experience that most of all this repetitive proof is eliminated by the bill which I have introduced.

For, once a determination has been made as to the nature and purposes of the Communist Party organization in the United States under the procedure clearly set up in the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 as amended, and which I have heretofore referred to, and which organization has been found by final order of said Board to be Communist action, that major issue is laid at rest in the instant case. Thereafter, in separate prosecutions, the Government is merely faced under my bill with proving the one basic fact which is that the defendant knowingly continues his membership in the Communist Party of the United States; or, becomes a member in such Communist-action organization after such final order of the Board, and, thus the Government has thereby satisfied its burden of proof in membership prosecutions. There is no need to repeat that proof as to the nature of the organization and as to the defendant's knowledge of its nature and purposes, for that fact has been previously established for all membership prosecution cases, by reason of public notice of the preliminary findings of the Subversive Activities Control Board thereof has been given. It is presumed that the defendant's continuing or subsequent membership in such organization is with full knowledge of what has been previously determined by the Board and which has been proscribed by law. It should be apparent, therefore, most trials will be effective, expeditious, and comparatively inexpensive. We shall conserve the time and energies of our courts and investigative agencies and will clearly and definitely accord the defendant, in each case, all of the advantages of his constitutional rights and due process under law.

In the case of the Communist Party of the United States of America, Petitioner, against The Subversive Activities Control Board, decided June 5, 1961, hereinbefore referred to, the Subversive Activities Control Board has already found and made a final determination as to the nature of the organization involved, and the Supreme Court of the United States in that case affirmed the findings of that Board in that case to the effect that the Communist Party of the United States is in fact a tenacle of the world Communist movement; a conspiratorial agency engaged in deceit, espionage, terrorism, and organizational activities to accomplish its avowed purpose of overthrowing by force and violence the Government of the United States and establishing in the United States of America and throughout the world a Communist, totalitarian dictatorship under Soviet Union domination and control. These findings by the Board were based upon voluminous and conclusive evidence developed and proved in over 10 years of trial and litigation, before the Board and our courts, before both of which the defendant was at all times represented by legal council of its own choosing. This destinymaking decision by the Supreme Court of the United States on June 5, 1961, is, in my mind, no doubt well known to every active Communist or Communist sympathizer or Communist organization or conspiratorial agency of any sort engaged in deceit, espionage, terrorism, and organizational activities in violation of the Court's edict, and I surmise is probably fairly well known throughout the Communist world.

As a result of this world Communist conspiracy, of which the Communist Party, U.S.A., is an integral part and from which it takes its direction and does its bidding, we are compelled to spend billions in our national defense and to counter subversive aggression; to endanger and in many cases to sacrifice the lives of thousands of our young men in our military services; we expend our resources which should have been dedicated and devoted to other truly useful and humanitarian purposes. Under such circumstances, certainly anyone who continues his membership in this Communist conspiracy or becomes a member of an organization in the United States found to be Communist-action, should justly be punished. For, he is, by such action, knowingly strengthening the organizational structure of the world Communist movement and thereby contributing to its odious and ugly purposes. I can see no possible legal obstacle or reason why a conspiratorial group organized to steal our liberty and property should not be punished for such activity, an activity which is far more dangerous and inimical to the interests of our society than an isolated criminal band of bank robbers.

While it is true that the caption of the bill does not specify that one of the purposes of the bill is to outlaw the Communist Party of the United States, nevertheless, I believe that desirable result will naturally flow from the text of the bill itself. For the text and purpose of the bill applies to any and every Communist-action organization in the United States, whether under the name of Communist Party or not. For instance, if the Communist Party of the United States of America changes its name, or any segment of the Communist Party of the United States changes its name, and deletes any and every indication of the fact so far as its name is concerned that it is a Communist Party organization or tries to so shape its name that the word Communist does not appear therein, I believe this bill is so drawn by the help and aid of my able legal advisers in the premises that any organization which is in fact a Communist-action organization in the United States will be encompassed and, therefore, in fact outlawed as well as any member of any such organization will be successfully prosecuted and upon due proof required will suffer the just penalties provided, set forth in section 15 (a) and (b) of this bill.

I believe that the penalties provided in my bill are just and reasonable and in keeping with the necessity to protect our national security against the Communist-action conspiracy, therefore section 15 (a) and (b) of the bill provides as follows:

SEC. 15. (a) Any individual who violates any provision of sections 5, 6, or 10 of this title shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both, for each such violation. Any organization which violates any provision of section 10 of this title shall be fined not more than $10,000 for each such violation.

(b) Whoever, on or after the effective date of the Subversive Activities Control Act Amendments of 1962, knowingly becomes or remains a member of any organization, with respect to which there is in effect a final order of the Board determining it to be a Communist-action organization, without regard to whether such order became final before, on, or after such effective date, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

Let us hope that when it becomes appropriate to consider this bill and enact it into U.S. statutes it will further strengthen the sinews of all freedom loving people in the United States of America, and their just determination to declare through law within constitutional limits that the people of the United States are united in their just and sound decision that those persons in the United States who are found to be in violation of the provisions of this bill shall be made aware in advance that if they are found to be in violation of this bill by reason of their continuing or subsequent membership in any Communist-action organization that then they can expect that the American people will not tolerate nor welcome their continued deliberate violation of the law of our beloved land.

H.R. 9944

A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to provide penalties for becoming or remaining a member of Communist-action organizations, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Subversive Activities Control Act Amendments of 1962".

SEC. 2. Subparagraph (b) of paragraph (3) of section 3 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 782(3)(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) any section, branch, fraction, or cell of any organization defined in subparagraph (a) of this paragraph."

SEC. 3. Section 4 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 783) is amended by striking out subsection (f).

SEC. 4. Subsection (a) of section 5 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 784(a)) is amended—

(1) by amending that portion of such subsection (a) which precedes subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) When there is in effect a final order of the Board making a determination that any organization is a Communist organization, it shall be unlawful—

"(1) For any member of such organization, with knowledge or notice that such order has become final—"; and

(2) by amending that portion of paragraph (2) of such subsection (a) which precedes subparagraph (A) of such paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) For any officer or employee of the United States or of any defense facility, with knowledge or notice that such order has become final—".

SEC. 5. Section 6 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 785) is amended to read as follows:

"DENIAL OF PASSPORTS TO MEMBERS OF COMMUNIST ORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 6. (a) When there is in effect a final order of the Board making a determination that any organization is a Communist organization, it shall be unlawful for any member of such organization, with knowledge or notice that such order has become final—

"(1) to make application for a passport, or the renewal of a passport, to be issued or renewed by or under the authority of the United States; or

"(2) to use or attempt to use any such passport.

"(b) When there is in effect a final order of the Board making a determination that any organization is a Communist-action organization, it shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the United States to issue a passport to, or renew the passport of, any individual knowing or having reason to believe that such individual is a member of such organization."

SEC. 6. Section 9 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 788) is amended to read as follows:

"PUBLIC REGISTER OF COMMUNIST ORGANIZATIONS; REPORTS TO PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

"SEC. 9. (a) The Attorney General shall keep and maintain in the Department of Justice a register of Communist organizations which shall include the name and address of each organization with respect to which there is in effect a final order of the Board making a determination that such organization is a Communist organization. Such register shall be kept and maintained in such manner as to be open for public inspection.

"(b) The Attorney General shall submit to the President and the Congress on or before June 1 of each year (and at any other time when requested by either House by resolution) a report with respect to carrying out of the provisions of this title."

SEC. 7. That portion of section 10 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 789) which precedes paragraph (1) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. It shall be unlawful for any organization with respect to which there is in effect a final order of the Board making a determination that such organization is a Communist organization, or for any person acting for or on behalf of any such organization—".

SEC. 8. Section 11 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 790) is amended to read as follows:

"DENIAL OF TAX DEDUCTIONS AND EXEMPTIONS

"SEC. 11. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no deduction for Federal income tax purposes shall be allowed in the case of a contribution to or for the use of any organization if at the time of the making of such contribution there is in effect a final order of the Board determining that it is a Communist organization.

"(b) No organization shall be entitled to exemption from Federal income tax, under section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, for any taxable year if at any time during such taxable year there is in effect a final order of the Board determining that it is a Communist organization."

SEC. 9. Subsection (e) of section 12 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 791(e)) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) It shall be the duty of the Board, upon application made by the Attorney General or by any interested party under section 13 of this title, to determine whether any organization is a Communist organization."

SEC. 10. Sections 13 and 13A of such Act (50 U.S.C. 792 and 792a) are amended to read as follows:

"PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE BOARD

"SEC. 13. (a) Whenever the Attorney General has reason to believe that any organization is a Communist organization, he shall file with the Board and serve upon such organization a petition for a determination that such organization is a Communist organization. In any proceedings so instituted, two or more affiliated organizations may be named as joint respondents. Each such petition shall be verified under oath, and shall contain a statement of the facts upon which the Attorney General relies in support of such petition. Such proceedings shall be set for hearings at the earliest possible time and all proceedings therein before the Board or any court shall be expedited to the greatest practicable extent.

"(b) Any organization which by a final order of the Board has been determined under this section to be a Communist-front organization may, not oftener than once in each calendar year, and any organization which by a final order of the Board has been determined under this section to be a Communist-infiltrated organization may, within six months after such determination, make application to the Attorney General for the cancellation of such determination. Within sixty days after the denial of any such application by the Attorney General, the organization may file with the Board and serve upon the Attorney General a petition for an order canceling the determination that such organization is a Communist organization.

"(c) Upon the filing of any petition pursuant to subsection (a) or subsection (b) of this section, the Board (or any member thereof or any examiner designated thereby) may hold hearings, administer oaths and affirmations, may examine witnesses and receive evidence at any place in the United States, and may require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, papers, correspondence, memoranda, and other records deemed relevant to the matter under inquiry. Subpenas may be signed and issued by any member of the Board or any duly authorized examiner. Subpenas shall be issued on behalf of the organization which is a party to the proceeding upon request and upon a statement or showing of general relevance and reasonable scope of the evidence sought. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such documentary evidence may be required from any place in the United States at any designated place of hearing. Witnesses summoned shall be paid the same fees and mileage paid witnesses in the district courts of the United States. In case of disobedience to a subpena, the Board may invoke the aid of any court of the United States in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence. Any of the district courts of the United States within the jurisdiction of which such inquiry is carried on may, in case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person, issue an order requiring such person to appear (and to produce documentary evidence if so ordered) and give evidence relating to the matter in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. All process in any such case may be served in the judicial district whereof such person is an inhabitant or wherever he may be found. No person shall be held liable in any action in any court, State or Federal, for any damages resulting from (1) his production of any documentary evidence in any proceeding before the Board if he is required, by a subpena issued under this subsection, to produce the evidence; or (2) any statement under oath he makes in answer to a question he is asked while testifying before the Board in response to a subpena issued under this subsection, if the statement is pertinent to the question.

"(d) (1) All hearings conducted under this section shall be public. Each party to such proceeding shall have the right to present its case with the assistance of counsel, to offer oral or documentary evidence, to submit rebuttal evidence, and to conduct such cross-examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts. An accurate stenographic record shall be taken of the testimony of each witness, and a transcript of such testimony shall be filed in the office of the Board.

"(2) Where an organization declines or fails to appear at a hearing accorded to such organization by the Board pursuant to this section, the Board may conduct such hearing in the absence of such organization and may enter such order or determination under this section as the Board shall determine to be warranted by evidence presented at such hearing. Where in the course of any hearing before the Board or any examiner thereof a party or counsel is guilty of misbehavior which obstructs the hearing, such party or counsel may be excluded from further participation in the hearing.

"(e) In determining whether any organization is a 'Communist-action organization', the Board shall take into consideration—

"(1) the extent to which its policies are formulated and carried out and its activities performed, pursuant to directives or to effectuate the policies of the foreign government or foreign organization in which is vested, or under the domination or control of which is exercised, the direction and control of the world Communist movement referred to in section 2 of this title; and

"(2) the extent to which its views and policies do not deviate from those of such foreign government or foreign organization; and

"(3) the extent to which it receives financial or other aid, directly or indirectly, from or at the direction of such foreign government or foreign organization; and

"(4) the extent to which it sends members or representatives to any foreign country for instruction or training in the principles, policies, strategy, or tactics of such world Communist movement; and

"(5) the extent to which it reports to such foreign government or foreign organization or to its representatives; and

"(6) the extent to which its principal leaders or a substantial number of its members are subject to or recognize the disciplinary power of such foreign government or foreign organization or its representatives; and

"(7) the extent to which, for the purpose of concealing foreign direction, domination, or control, or of expediting or promoting its objectives, (i) it fails to disclose, or resists efforts to obtain information as to, its membership (by keeping membership lists in code, by instructing members to refuse to acknowledge membership, or by any other method); (ii) its members refuse to acknowledge membership therein; (iii) it fails to disclose, or resists efforts to obtain information as to, records other than membership lists; (iv) its meetings are secret; and (v) it otherwise operates on a secret basis; and

"(8) the extent to which its principal leaders or a substantial number of its members consider the allegiance they owe to the United States as subordinate to their obligations to such foreign government or foreign organization.

"(f) In determining whether any organization is a 'Communist-front organization', the Board shall take into consideration—

"(1) the extent to which persons who are active in its management, direction, or supervision, whether or not holding office therein, are active in the management, direction, or supervision of, or as representatives of, any Communist-action organization, Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2; and

"(2) the extent to which its support, financial or otherwise, is derived from any Communist-action organization, Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2; and

"(3) the extent to which its funds, resources, or personnel are used to further or promote the objectives of any Communist-action organization, Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2; and

"(4) the extent to which the positions taken or advanced by it from time to time on matters of policy do not deviate from those of any Communist-action organization, Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2.

"(g) In determining whether any organization is a Communist-infiltrated organization, the Board shall consider—

"(1) to what extent, if any, the effective management of the affairs of such organization is conducted by one or more individuals who are, or within two years have been, (A) members, agents, or representatives of any Communist organization, and Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2 of this title, with knowledge of the nature and purpose thereof, or (B) engaged in giving aid or support to any such organization, government, or movement with knowledge of the nature and purpose thereof;

"(2) to what extent, if any, the policies of such organization are, or within three years have been, formulated and carried out pursuant to the direction or advice of any member, agent, or representative of any such organization, government, or movement;

"(3) to what extent, if any, the personnel and resources of such organization are, or within three years have been, used to further or promote the objectives of any such Communist organization, government, or movement;

"(4) to what extent, if any, such organization within three years has received from, or furnished to or for the use of, any such Communist organization, government, or movement any funds or other material assistance;

"(5) to what extent, if any, such organization is, or within three years has been, affiliated in any way with any such Communist organization, government, or movement;

"(6) to what extent, if any, the affiliation of such organization, or of any individual or individuals who are members thereof or who manage its affairs, with any such Communist organization, government, or movement is concealed from or is not disclosed to the membership of such organization; and

"(7) to what extent, if any, such organization or any of its members or managers are, or within three years have been, knowingly engaged—

"(A) in any conduct punishable under section 4 or 15 of this Act or under chapter 37, 105, or 115 of title 18 of the United States Code; or

"(B) with intent to impair the military strength of the United States or its industrial capacity to furnish logistical or other support required by its Armed Forces, in any activity resulting in or contributing to any such impairment.

"(h) After hearing upon any petition filed under this section, the Board shall (1) make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and its conclusions with respect to the issues presented by such petition, (2) enter its order granting or denying the determination sought by such petition, and (3) serve upon each party to the proceeding a copy of such order.

"(i) When any order of the Board making a determination that an organization is a Communist organization becomes final as provided in section 14(b) of this title, the Board shall publish in the Federal Register a statement of the substance of such order, and publication of such statement shall constitute notice to all members of such organization and to the public that such order has become final.

"(j) When any order has been entered by the Board under this section with respect to any labor organization or employer (as these terms are defined by section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and which are organizations within the meaning of section 3 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950), the Board shall serve a true and correct copy of such order upon the National Labor Relations Board and shall publish in the Federal Register a statement of the substance of such order and its effective date.

"(k) When there is in effect a final order of the Board determining that any such labor organization is a Communist organization, such labor organization shall be ineligible to—

"(1) act as representative of any employee within the meaning or for the purposes of section 7 of the National Labbr Relations Act, as amended (29 U.S.C. 157);

"(2) serve as an exclusive representative of employees of any bargaining unit under section 9 of such Act, as amended (29 U.S.C. 159);

"(3) make, or obtain any hearing upon, any charge under section 10 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 160); or

"(4) exercise any other right or privilege, or receive any other benefit, substantive or procedural, provided by such Act for labor organizations.

"(l) When an order of the Board determining that any such labor organization is a Communist-infiltrated organization has become final, and such labor organization theretofore has been certified under the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, as a representative of employees in any bargaining unit—

"(1) a question of representation affecting commerce, within the meaning of section 9(c) of such Act, shall be deemed to exist with respect to such bargaining unit; and

"(2) the National Labor Relations Board, upon petition of not less than 20 per centum of the employees in such bargaining unit or any person or persons acting in their behalf, shall under section 9 of such Act (notwithstanding any limitation of time contained therein) direct elections in such bargaining unit or any subdivision thereof (A) for the selection of a representative thereof for collective bargaining purposes, and (B) to determine whether the employees thereof desire to rescind any authority previously granted to such labor organization to enter into any agreement with their employer pursuant to section 8(a)(3)(ii) of such Act.

"(m) When there is in effect a final order of the Board determining that any such employer is a Communist-infiltrated organization, such employer shall be ineligible to—

"(1) file any petition for an election under section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended (29 U.S.C. 157), or participate in any proceeding under such section; or

"(2) make or obtain any hearing upon any charge under section 10 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 160); or

"(3) exercise any other right or privilege or receive any other benefit, substantive or procedural, provided by such Act for employers."

SEC. 11. (a) Subsection (a) of section 14 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 793(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "subsection (g), (h), (i), or (j) of section 13, or subsection (f) of section 13A," in the first sentence of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (h) of section 13"; and

(2) by striking out the next to the last sentence of such subsection.

(b) Subsection (b) of such section 14 (50 U.S.C. 793(b)) is amended by striking out "section 13, or subsection (f) of section 13A", and inserting in lieu thereof "section 13".

SEC. 12. Section 15 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 794) is amended to read as follows:

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 15. (a) Any individual who violates any provision of sections 5, 6, or 10 of this title shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both, for each such violation. Any organization which violates any provision of section 10 of this title shall be fined not more than $10,000 for each such violation.

"(b) Whoever, on or after the effective date of the Subversive Activities Control Act Amendments of 1962, knowingly becomes or remains a member of any organization, with respect to which there is in effect a final order of the Board determining it to be a Communist-action organization, without regard to whether such order became final before, on, or after such effective date, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(c) No application or petition filed under subsection (b) of section 13 for cancellation of a determination that any organization is a Communist organization shall cause any prosecution commenced under this section to abate or affect any such prosecution for any offense committed during the time the final order or determination of the Board relating to that organization is in effect".

SEC. 13. Sections 7 and 8 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 786 and 787) are hereby repealed.

SEC. 14. (a) The amendments made by this Act shall not affect that portion of any final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board, issued before the effective date of this Act and remaining in effect on such effective date, determining that any organization is a Communist-action, Communist-front, or Communist-infiltrated organization, and such final order shall, for the purposes of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 as in effect on and after the effective date of this Act, be held and considered to remain in effect as a final order of the Board making a determination that the organization involved is such a Communist organization until such determination is canceled as provided in the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 as in effect on and after the effective date of this Act.

(b) No proceeding instituted before the Subversive Activities Control Board under section 13 or 13A of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, and no judicial review proceeding instituted under section 14 of such Act, before the effective date of this Act, and pending on such effective date, shall abate solely by reason of the amendments made by this Act.

SEC. 15. (a) The foregoing provisions of this Act shall become effective on the ninetieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) The effective date of this Act shall be the date computed under subsection (a) of this section.

LEAD AND ZINC ACT OF 1962

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL, in the introduction of the Lead and Zinc Act of 1962. The passage of this legislation is a must if we are to continue to have a domestic lead and zinc mining industry.

Missouri produces more lead than any other State in the Union. My district, the 8th Congressional District of Missouri, produces approximately 125,000 tons of lead each year, which represents about 40 percent of the output of mines in the United States in each of the past 10 years. A lead smelter located at Herculaneum, Mo., has a capacity of about 115,000 tons of lead each year, and the value of the output is approximately $25 million. In 1952 better than 3,000 men were employed in lead-mining operations in my district. Today there are only 1,389 employees. National Lead Co. closed down its mining operations in Fredericktown, Mo., last year, leaving only the St. Joseph Mining Co. as a producer in the district. St. Joseph Lead Co. has also had to curtail its operations, having recently closed the mines at Bonne Terre, Mo., after nearly 94 years of operation. The payroll of St. Joseph has decreased from 2,555 in 1952 to 1,389 in 1961. The current price of 10 cents a pound threatens to cause further mine closings. Something must be done to aid this industry which has an investment of over $100 million, valued in terms of replacement costs.

The major cause of present conditions is the flood of all excessive amount of lead and zinc imports into this country in recent years. Our import policies have not been sound, and they have resulted in tremendous damage to our mining economy. Unneeded imports into this country since 1956 have reduced the share of the domestic producers of our annual market requirements of newly mined lead to approximately 40 percent. The result has been a surplus of metal stocks, lowered prices, mine closings, an extremely unhealthy industry, and widespread suffering of mining employees.

The Lead and Zinc Act of 1962 would provide an import tax on lead and zinc as follows:

First. A permanent tax of 2 cents per pound on lead and zinc metal and 70 percent of this, or 1.4 cents per pound, on ores and concentrates.

Second. A removable tax of the same amount on both metals that is applied if the domestic market of either metal goes below 13½ cents per pound and is removed when the market prices rise above 14¼ cents per pound.

Third. A compensatory tax on the lead and zinc content of imported manufactured goods. This is 2 cents per pound in addition to present levies with an increased amount on two zinc items. Lead and zinc entering the United States as manufactured goods directly displaces domestic mine production. These duty rates are proposed by the U.S. manufacturers of lead-zinc products.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of this bill is essential if we are to equalize present levels of low world mining costs compared to those under the higher living standards of the United States. Our Government has subsidized foreign production through barter purchases for our stockpiles and through development loans for foreign minerals exploration and plant expansion. It is now time for this body to correct the present inequities and establish a long-term stable lead-zinc mining industry so vital to our Nation.

IMPORTANCE OF MILITARY PROCUREMENT

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I take the well of the House today to address my colleagues on a subject of great importance to each and every one of us. That subject is military procurement.

At best any barrel of apples, no matter how carefully selected and handled, will contain a few rotten ones. If all are found to be sound at first, it is only a matter of time until some rotten ones will appear. Such is to be expected. I certainly do not expect military procurement to be ideal, but I can see room for much improvement.

My interest in military procurement stems from very sad experiences I have had in recent years. The old game of having friends of influence placed in authoritative positions is being worked to an excessive degree. Specification writing and rewriting, readvertising for bids until the right one is in the favored position is being practiced.

Mr. Speaker, I have much evidence in hand to indicate that a great number of questionable practices are hidden behind the disguise of highly secret, confidential, restricted, or some other such word or phrase. These practices in my opinion are costing the American taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

Today I want to add another term, "collusion." I have every evidence that there are collusions in the procurement operations that are extremely expensive to our taxpayers and nauseating to would-be manufacturers. They are especially nauseating to me for I would like to see every legitimate manufacturer have an opportunity without submitting to undercover or illegitimate practices.

For many months I have been reviewing procurement transactions. In many instances the taxpayer has been penalized by contracts for services and materials which are delivered to the Government at prices a great deal higher than the value involved.

Mr. Speaker, one cannot condemn a company for seeking contracts according to the rules laid down in Washington regardless of how nauseating the deals may become.

On September 19, 1961, I spoke about the Navy Department Bureau of Ships Contract NObsr-85109 which was awarded without competition to a firm I designated "company R." This contract covered technical and professional engineering services in a highly classified security area in the preparation of specifications for Navy electronic equipment. It was only a small contract, the total price of which was approximately $500,000.

Two men, Navy contracting officers, in the Navy Bureau of Ships authorized this transaction in secret, restricted the bid for the service to a single firm, company R, and justified all this with a certification that "No other firm in the United States could do the job like it should be done."

These two men opened the bid in secret, awarded the contract in secret, and later extended the job for another year by simply modifying the previous contract; and this, too, was done in secret. Their names are Koch and Foley; these two civil servants who awarded $500,000 to company R, which allowed it to—

First. Hire Navy personnel to work in civilian capacities, recommending what types of electronics equipment the Navy should buy.

Second. Secure an inside track on any procurement actions that might stem from such recommendations.

Third. Guarantee a profit on the entire operation.

I have been successful in obtaining information from the General Accounting Office which indicates why it was so important for Koch and Foley to give this contract to one particular firm. That they did so is no reflection on the manufacturer. Company R simply played the game by the rules.

Company R used a host of retired naval personnel to create a friendly atmosphere where they could assure themselves a profitable contract doing the work of preparing specifications. I might add here that literally dozens of other firms would be happy to perform this same task at no charge, simply for the ancillary benefits certain to follow in subsequent procurement action. This takes for granted such firms would have the facilities to produce the items of electronic equipment around which they, themselves, wrote the specifications.

The fantastic part of all this is that the Koch and Foley team allowed company R an average of $56 per man per day for this service. The General Accounting Office report that I attach to my remarks—table No. 2—shows how much each man was actually paid by company R.

Add it up for yourself. Your answers will be the same as mine. Company R paid retired naval personnel and others about $300,000, a service for which company R received $481,000. This work could have been done for far less money by existing naval personnel who are currently stationed in the Navy Department, and it could have been accomplished by private industry at a lesser charge, but the Navy spent almost a half million dollars of taxpayers' money to do the work which simultaneously put company R in the catbird seat to pluck off the juciest contracts that would stem from the action.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert at this point tables furnished me by the General Accounting Office which show the identity of those employed by company R under contract NObsr-85109 and their prior service connection, termination of naval service, and pay scale.

TABLE 1.—*Employees of company R performing engineering services for the Bureau of Ships, Department of the Navy, under contract NObsr 85109*

Name	Prior Navy service	Rank or rating	Date of discharge from the Navy	Date employed by R
F. W. Smith	Yes	Commander	Jan. 31, 1958	Feb. 25, 1958
H. L. Constant	Yes	do	Mar. 17, 1958	June 1, 1958
J. A. Volk	Yes	do	Apr. 28, 1957	Apr. 17, 1961
J. E. Husband	Yes	do	Dec. 1, 1960	Feb. 13, 1961
R. C. Johanson	Yes	Chief warrant officer	Apr. 30, 1961	May 8, 1961
A. Cerasoli	Yes	Gunners mate, 2d class.	Oct. 16, 1945	Mar. 6, 1961
S. K. Day	Yes	ETC	Feb. 1, 1957	Feb. 6, 1961
R. E. Green, Jr	Yes	Lieutenant commander.	Mar. 1, 1961	Feb. 13, 1961
L. W. Van Antwerp	Yes	Rear admiral	Dec. 1, 1958	Dec. 1, 1958
N. Cherok	Yes	Lieutenant commander.	Jan. 1, 1961	Jan. 5, 1961
C. A. Brenner	Yes	ET2	Apr. 19, 1961[1]	[1]May 4, 1959
J. Masse	No			June 20, 1953
R. Waldron	Yes	Lieutenant (junior grade).	July 10, 1959	Feb. 13, 1961
F. X. Burwell	No			Apr. —, 1948
L. D. Johnson	Yes	Radioman, 2d class	Dec. 12, 1938	Dec. 18, 1948
D. N. Whitenight	No			Mar. —, 1959
D. R. Preecs	Yes	ETCS	Jan. 20, 1961	Feb. 1, 1961
E. J. Smith	No			Jan. —, 1952
D. H. Heasty	Yes	Ensign	July —, 1946	Nov. —, 1948
C. L. H. Rusche	Yes	CRT	Sept. —, 1946	Mar. —, 1951
P. Rohatyn	No			Apr. 17, 1961
R. Peterson	Yes	Chief warrant officer (W-4).	Feb. 28, 1959	June 15, 1959
D. S. Place	No			Apr. 14, 1960
J. A. Broyles	Yes	ET1	Oct. 26, 1959	Jan. 16, 1961
W. L. Bunch	No			Jan. 19, 1959
H. J. DeMattis	No			May 19, 1961
T. Gillenwater	Yes	Lieutenant commander.	Dec. 31, 1957	June 9, 1958
P. M. Gormley	No			Apr. 12, 1958
J. Roman	No			Apr. 11, 1960
M. Williamson	Yes	Captain	July 1, 1960	Sept. 15, 1960
W. McAllister	No			Feb. 27, 1961
C. E. Manley	No			Apr. 7, 1956
J. R. James	No			Feb. —, 1956
J. P. Getty	No			Feb. —, 1959
G. Hunt	No			July —, 1959

[1] We were advised that Mr. Brenner's discharge from a Navy Reserve status was effective Apr. 19, 1961, but that he was released from active Navy duty several years earlier.

NOTE.—We were advised by T. D. Hobart, Chief Engineer of the Electronics-Electrical Design Branch of the Bureau of Ships, that he had inquired and found that none of the above personnel had been employed by the Department of the Navy in a civilian capacity.

TABLE 2.—*Company R employees working at the Bureau of Ships under contract NObsr-85109*

Name	Prior Navy service	Rank or rating	Annual salary at June 30, 1961	Amount of salary charged to contract NObsr-85109 to Aug. 31, 1961	Name	Prior Navy service	Rank or rating	Annual salary at June 30, 1961	Amount of salary charged to contract NObsr-85109 to Aug. 31, 1961
C. A. Brenner, Jr	Yes	ETN-2	$8,112.00	$5,040.52	L. D. Johnson	Yes	RM2/c	$8,949.00	$7,942.68
J. A. Broyles	Yes	ET-1	8,580.00	5,006.94	C. E. Manley, Jr	No		5,873.92	5,720.94
W. L. Bunch, Jr	No		7,027.80	6,467.86	J. Masse	No		8,032.44	7,234.09
F. X. Burwell	No		8,072.22	8,411.48	W. McAllister	No		7,574.06	2,475.89
A. Cerasoli	Yes	GM2/C	10,463.00	3,099.10	R. Peterson	Yes	CWO-4	9,507.00	6,755.64
N. Cherok	Yes	Lieutenant commander	8,944.00	5,572.80	D. S. Place	No		10,982.40	10,952.81
H. L. Constant	Yes	Commander	8,900.00	8,512.64	D. R. Preecs	Yes	ETC-2 senior chief electrical technician.	7,410.00	3,877.77
S. K. Day	Yes	ETC chief radio	13,000.00	5,066.72					
H. J. DeMattia	No		9,567.22	2,707.39	P. Rohatyn	No		13,000.00	3,525.00
J. P. Getty	No		5,067.40	3,611.33	J. Roman	No		10,982.40	9,986.77
T. Gillenwater	Yes	Lieutenant commander	8,491.00	7,987.80	C.L.H. Rusche	Yes	Chief radio technican	11,758.00	4,750.05
P. M. Gormley	No		8,680.10	9,294.79	E. J. Smith	No		10,434.06	8,805.27
R. E. Green, Jr	Yes	Lieutenant commander	8,398.00	4,328.75	F. W. Smith	Yes	Commander	9,338.00	5,156.10
D. H. Heasty	Yes	Ensign	9,535.00	2,876.78	L. W. Van Antwerp	Yes	Rear admiral	9,418.00	5,089.90
G. Hunt	No		5,244.20	4,680.50	J. A. Volk	Yes	Lieutenant commander	8,580.00	3,085.50
J. E. Husband	Yes	Commander	10,140.00	6,384.00	R. Waldron	Yes	Lieutenant (jg.)	7,474.00	3,724.17
J. R. James	No		6,035.64	6,336.09	D. N. Whitenight	No		8,281.52	8,746.64
R. C. Johanson	Yes	CWO/W2	9,368.00	2,900.57	M. Williamson	Yes	Captain	7,471.00	7,236.54
COMPANY R EMPLOYEES WORKING AT CONTRACTOR FACILITIES UNDER CONTRACT NObsr-85109									
D. G. Alex	No		9,766.38	6,983.80	R. L. Lauria	No		9,204.00	3,047.88
J. Aquilino, Jr	No		8,840.00	2,584.00	J. M. Leopold	Yes	AETM 2/C	11,510.00	789.67
D. Apperson	Yes	SO/2	7,292.00	560.96	R. H. Liggett, Jr	No		4,212.00	243.00
G. Ascher	No		9,029.02	2,771.68	R. E. Little, Jr	Yes	CWO-3	7,713.00	444.96
W. Aydlotte	No		4,160.00	288.00	E. Longenecker	No		10,773.10	6,845.55
J. M. Boggott	No		3,380.00	162.88	E. MacLaren, Jr	Yes	Chief aviation electrical technician.	8,929.00	4,481.44
R. Bodenheimer	Yes	Lieutenant commander	9,178.00	291.26					
J. F. Byrne	Yes	Rear admiral	10,400.00	3,620.00	D. H. Marsh	No		8,837.92	407.91
S. Caine	No		4,896.32	1,122.00	J. L. McIver	Yes	Gunners mate 3/C	7,198.00	415.33
R. L. Caton	No		3,640.00	210.00	F. F. Merrill	Yes	Lieutenant commander	10,140.00	3,744.00
G. L. Chandler	No		5,115.24	137.70	N. P. Miller	No		5,120.70	1,287.15
K. A. Clark	Yes	RNM 1/C	9,059.00	8,281.05	J. E. Morris	Yes	Lieutenant	6,760.00	5,258.50
T. E. Conley	No		3,432.00	204.06	B. Y. Ng	No		3,640.00	412.13
Robert Cosehen	Yes	Lieutenant (jg.)	8,320.00	2,480.00	E. L. Oakley	No		6,762.08	658.80
C. Drummond	No		5,460.00	703.50	K. Ohamoto	No		7,394.66	2,393.28
K. E. Early	No		4,212.00	1,463.97	T. M. Orndorff	No		6,110.00	1,081.19
C. M. Fisher	No		12,287.86	9,088.44	W. A. Pharres	No		11,091.86	2,396.86
S. R. Fox	No		3,640.00	1,582.02	G. T. Price	No		4,409.60	118.72
H. Franklin, Jr	Yes	ET2	5,717.00	4,345.12	D. F. Quinn	Yes	ET-1	5,258.00	472.23
J. Friderickson	No		8,630.44	1,910.52	G. R. Reinhart	No		3,380.00	117.52
J. E. Galliher	No		3,640.00	476.00	H. C. Rollandim	No		7,663.76	574.86
C. G. Grapes	No		4,253.60	246.63	R. Rountree	No		6,158.10	2,942.67
J. L. Grissom	Yes	ET	8,750.00	2,828.57	H. J. Rue II	Yes	Lieutenant commander	10,962.00	1,306.96
E. B. Hagerman	No		10,400.00	3,040.00	G. B. Schaff	No		3,640.00	125.13
T. J. Hammer	Yes	ET-3C	10,400.00	1,860.00	E. N. Schumacher	Yes	FTC	8,431.00	680.90
W. A. Hilleary	Yes	HM3	6,618.00	1,017.96	J. C. Smith	No		7,436.00	2,545.32
K. L. Howard	No		10,633.48	7,966.07	T. J. Smith	Yes	SP(K)D1	8,222.00	104.38
J. A. Hughes	No		6,188.26	185.64	J. W. Spratlen	No		11,271.26	5,219.47
E. B. Johnston	No		12,297.74	271.53	J. H. Sutter	Yes	ET-2	6,319.00	2,455.16
R. P. Kasuzas	No		5,592.08	1,874.25	A. C. Tamburino	No		5,616.00	2,842.40
A. Kennedy	No		4,056.00	160.00	R. C. Wise	No		4,382.04	267.00
M. J. Krenitsky	No		3,640.00	242.00	J. M. Woythal	No		7,096.70	4,576.47
D. E. Longchamp	No		7,703.54	2,921.88					

NOTE.—There were 29 other company employees who performed services under contract NObsr-85109 but who had had less than $100 of their salary charged to this contract at Aug. 31, 1961.

SOCIAL AND CRIMINAL PROBLEMS OF DRUG ADDICTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 90 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most tragic social and criminal problems facing America today is that of drug addiction. The extent of this scourge, especially the infestation of thousands of American teenagers, has been superbly presented in a constructive, revealing series of articles recently published in the New York Journal-American.

I believe this series to be one of journalism's most valuable contributions to public service in recent times. It is more than an exposure of a stark, frightening reality—it is a clarion call for official action on every level of government.

Mr. Speaker, the monster of drug addiction must be destroyed. There must be stronger enforcement of existing laws, enlightened programs for hospitalization and aftercare, and an immediate attack on the source of supply—the pusher. As one who has long been in the fight against the dope evil—for many years as a New York State Senator, and now, as a Member of this House—I am convinced that the effort to wipe out this scourge must be a Federal, State, and local partnership. All levels of government must take an effective part in the offensive against this malignancy.

It is the obligation of this Congress to review this growing problem and to determine the most effective role the Federal Government should play in the elimination of this evil.

The Journal-American series has spurred tremendous interest. Its startling revelations are of great significance—not only to the people of New York, but they should be the concern of all the people of America.

These articles were initiated by this alert, public-spirited newspaper as a result of the dynamic perception of members of its staff, in the finest tradition of American crusading journalism. Several months ago, the Journal-American's ace newsman and assistant managing editor, James D. Horan, conceived the idea of exposing the vicious traffic in narcotics which has doomed countless thousands of teenagers. Enlisting the aid of Dom Frasca and John Mitchell, certainly two of the Journal-American's finest reporters, Horan descended quietly and unobtrusively—but decisively—on the circle of degradation and destruction, on the hopeless world of the teenaged addict. For weeks, the team toured various sections of New York City, carrying concealed tape recorders and posing as ordinary citizens, out for kicks. The horrors they unearthed are documented in these widely acclaimed articles.

The Journal-American series proved that there are no social limits to drug addiction—it can hit anywhere, anytime, anyplace. The picture is an ugly one—one of depravity, degradation and defeat. But it is only through such revelations as this series that an alarmed public can be informed of the true magnitude of this disease which threatens our society, and will demand action to defend themselves and their children. It is the responsibility of this Congress to answer these demands.

The public and official reaction to this series was immediate and electric. In succeeding days, I shall ask for permission to present some of the overwhelming response to the further attention of the House.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I would like to present this series of articles, which began on Sunday, January 7, 1962, and commend them to the especial attention of my colleagues and the American people, through the forum of the Congress of the United States. By bringing these articles to the floor of the House, I sincerely hope to focus attention on this problem. It is a grim picture and one which calls for immediate action.

[From the New York Journal-American, Jan. 7, 1962]

DOPE—DANGER TO OUR TEENAGERS

The devastating effects of narcotics are being felt today in nearly every corner of the city. From Coney Island to Crotona Park—and beyond into the suburbs—heroin and other habit-forming drugs are being peddled to youngsters by unscrupulous pushers who derive a lucrative livelihood from the ranks of the so-called walking dead.

In no other city of America is the situation as grave. Narcotic use by youngsters has declined since 1950 in Chicago, is up slightly in Los Angeles—but nowhere near the level of use that exists today in New York.

Seventeen percent of all narcotics arrests in this city now involve persons under the age of 21.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, citing the addict's increasing effect on crime rates, has warned:

"Of all the corruptors of youth, none is more terrible than the dope peddler who entices children to try narcotics. Such a calculated assault on the standards of youth should be met by the forces of good within each community, united behind stern law enforcement and punishment."

In response to the urgency of Mr. Hoover's warning, the New York Journal-American today begins a series of public service articles with a special report on the problem—and a blueprint for positive action, designed not only to stamp out the purveyor of illicit drugs, but also to help the youthful addict become cured and regain his rightful place in the community.

[From the New York Journal-American, Jan. 7, 1962]

DOPE—DANGER TO OUR TEENAGERS: 4,000 YOUNGSTERS ADDICTED TO NARCOTICS—PUSHERS EXPLOIT CITY'S STUDENTS

(By James D. Horan, Dom Frasca, and John Mitchell)

Teenage dope addiction in New York City is spreading like an epidemic.

Never before have so many adolescents found narcotics so easy to obtain.

Marihuana, heroin, cocaine, barbiturates: a diet of human degradation served up by the underworld to lure a new generation into the pit of addiction.

In New York City, those drugs are destroying the lives of more than 4,000 youngsters.

Four thousand "walking-dead"—not yet old enough to vote, but not too young to "mainline" or "skin-pop" their way to an early grave. And there are others. At least 4,000 additional young boys and girls tentatively toy with marihuana "reefers" (cigarettes) in cellar clubs and vacant lots, street corners and school basements.

After a 3-month survey, the New York Journal-American is able to establish the following facts:

Illicit drugs and habit-forming cough syrups containing codeine, an opium derivative, are being used commonly by some students in the schools of New York City.

Heroin and marihuana can be obtained with ease by youngsters in candy stores, tenement halls, private rooms—anywhere the pushers operate, which means almost everywhere.

"Pot" (marijuana) parties are as easy to attend as to arrange in Greenwich Village, mecca of thrill-seeking adolescents.

Youngsters from Connecticut, New Jersey, and upstate New York are being supplied with habit-forming drugs by pushers in New York City. Police report teenage narcotics use is on the increase in the suburbs.

The number of deaths attributed to narcotics has multiplied fourfold in New York City in the last decade.

TEEN ADDICTION SEEN ON THE RISE

Police statistics provide further evidence that teenage narcotic use is on the rise. In 1958, 1,014 persons out of a total of 7,195 arrested for narcotics violations were under the age of 21—one out of every seven.

In 1960, the last full year for which statistics are available, the ratio was 1,296 under the age of 21 out of a total of 7,769 arrested—or one out of every six.

In no other category of crime, with the single exception of auto theft, do young people play so large a role as they do in the use and possession of narcotics.

Narcotics, in turn, breed other crimes: burglary, robbery, shoplifting, purse snatching, prostitution. Deputy Chief Inspector Edward F. Carey, director of the Narcotics Bureau, estimates drug addicts are responsible for $200 million a year in property losses in New York City.

"That's $200 million lost each year through thefts and burglaries," Inspector Carey said. "I'm convinced addicts perpetrate at least 35 percent of all the crimes committed in this city."

The inspector bases his estimate on the assumption that nearly all addicts, unable to hold a steady job, must turn to crime to pay their one-way fare into oblivion.

The fare is not cheap. A dollar or more for a "reefer." For a "fix" (a shot) of heroin, $3 to as much as $15, depending on the drug's purity—the degree to which it has not been cut by mixtures of milk, sugar and quinine.

HABIT CAN COST VICTIM $100 A DAY

One 20-year-old addict interviewed by these reports said his heroin habit was costing him $60 a day. There are reports that others spend as much as $100 a day.

What addiction costs the adolescent in dollars is insignificant compared to the cost to his health. Today in New York there are 20-year-old addicts who have been using drugs since they were 15. They look like alumni of a Nazi concentration camp.

Their teeth are beginning to rot. Their gall bladders are inflamed. Their skin is turning yellow. Their stomachs are malfunctioning. Their veins are collapsing like wet spaghetti.

They twitch, they gasp for breath, they shake with pain. They suffer hallucinations more horrible than any that have ever danced before the eyes of an alcoholic.

And someday, long before their time, they die, as 200 addicts died in 1960 alone in a very specific way: death attributed to narcotics.

Dr. Milton Helpern, chief medical examiner, told this newspaper the number of deaths due to narcotics has been increasing yearly in New York City. He said the number has multiplied fourfold since 1950—from 57 that year to 200 in 1960.

"Most of these deaths," said Dr. Helpern, "involved addicts in their early years—the twenties chiefly." He conceded that to reach the fatal stages of addiction, many of these drug users would have had to take up narcotics in their teens.

"It's a grave situation," he said. "When all the records are in, I expect the number of narcotics deaths in 1961 will have exceeded the 1960 mark by at least 50."

Some 40 percent of the Nation's estimated 60,000 addicts are centered in New York.

First-class neighborhoods are no longer immune from the scourge. The police department reports narcotics have lately fallen into the hands of adolescents in some of the city's most fashionable areas.

NARCOTIC SCOURGE BREEDS IN SLUMS

But it is in the slums that the problem has reached its most serious proportions. An official study during the years 1949–52 found that 10 percent of the youths of Harlem in the 16–20 age group were using some form of drugs. The percentage may be even higher today.

Mark T. Southall, Democratic district leader of the 12th A.D. North, which encompasses most of Harlem, charged at a legislative hearing last month that the use of marihuana by teenagers in his district was "almost as prevalent as the use of regular cigarettes."

In the Greenpoint section of Brooklyn, a similarly depressed area, the consumption of drugs by teenagers has become almost as commonplace as their consumption of soft drinks.

Once the student drug user becomes a confirmed addict, however, the chances are he drops out of school. From here, he is on his way to ruin.

Depending on circumstance and his personality, he may do one of several things. Perhaps, without troubling anyone but his heartsick parents, he will stalk off twitchingly in the ranks of the walking dead.

Or beat his pensioned mother with a broomstick, as did addict David Malbin of Brooklyn whenever he demanded her money for his narcotics.

Or blast a Nassau policeman to death with a shotgun, as did Robert Moll last March 22 as he fled from the scene of a supermarket robbery in Manhasset, Long Island, the blood not yet dry on the skin puncture of his latest injection of heroin.

In their survey of this growing social problem, Journal-American reporters posing as drifters and "beat joint" habitues observed and talked to dozens of young drug users throughout the city.

Many narcotics users spoke freely of their experiences. They explained what types of drugs they used, how they used them, even why they used them.

But not one revealed from whom he got his reefers or his "horse"—the junkie's term for heroin. Not one disclosed the identity of a pusher.

To control narcotics that is what law enforcement agencies must know: Who is pushing it? And who is supplying the pusher?

"You can't stamp out the narcotics problem," says Deputy Police Commander Walter Arm, "unless you dry up the source. And that's an international question."

"What we're concentrating on in the city is the supplier. But with 24 ships and more than 50 oversea flights arriving in New York every day, with hundreds of trains and thousands of buses and cars coming in daily, we'd need a million men to stop the supplier from getting his drugs."

Meanwhile, 4,000 young New Yorkers are dying on their feet—every one of them a marcher among the walking dead.

[From the New York Journal-American, Jan. 7, 1962]

A Blueprint for Positive Action To Save Our Youth

How can New York City curb the flow of illicit drugs to its children? What can be done to rehabilitate the addict with "a monkey on his back?"

To formulate a positive program that would help prevent the victimizing of adolescents by ruthless drug peddlers and speed the return of the youthful addict—in fact, any addict—to his rightful place in society, the New York Journal-American has solicited suggestions from law enforcement officials, legal and medical experts, civic groups, State legislators, and Federal officials.

From this survey emerged the following blueprint designed to save your child from destruction by narcotics:

THE PUSHER

1. Increase the penalty for the sale of narcotics.

Pushers convicted of selling narcotics in New York State may be sentenced to jail for 5 to 15 years. In Ohio, the minimum penalty is 20 years. As a result, addiction in Ohio has decreased 80 percent.

Recommendation: Legislate immediately for a mandatory minimum jail sentence of 20 years in New York State on conviction of illicit drug sale.

2. Stiffer jail terms for those who sell drugs to persons under 21.

The pusher who sells drugs to a minor in New York is liable for a jail sentence of only 7 to 15 years. The minimum term is only 2 years longer than that which applies to pushers who sell to adults.

Recommendation: Legislate for a minimum mandatory jail sentence of at least 25 years in New York for those who sell drugs to minors.

3. Facilitate issuance of search warrants to police officers.

Recent rulings by the U.S. Supreme Court regarding illegal search and seizure have made it more difficult for law enforcement officers to apprehend those suspected of illegal possession of narcotics.

Recommendation: Action by the legislature and judiciary to:

Eliminate the requirement that police must be positive of the validity of a search at night. Issue warrants to them if they can establish reasonable cause for the necessity of a search or raid after dark.

Establish the magistrate sitting in Manhattan night court as the regular source for search warrants requested by police in any borough at night. This would unsnarl the redtape that now develops when police officers attempt to obtain warrants from magistrates in their respective counties.

THE ADDICT

1. Create a government agency to deal directly and exclusively with addicts.

Addicts in New York State are the stepchildren of a half-dozen government agencies, each of which has duties and responsibilities totally unrelated to drug addiction.

Recommendation: Establishment of a State office of narcotics control, whose director, appointed by the Governor, would have broad powers to create diagnostic and treatment centers in existing hospitals, and to administer an aftercare program.

2. Require compulsory registration of addicts.

Police estimate addicts are responsible for 35 percent of the crimes committed in New York City. Two out of every three burglaries are committed by addicts.

Recommendation: Require fingerprinting and photographing of all addicts as an aid to law enforcement in New York City.

3. Substitute quarantine and aftercare for criminal punishment.

Jail does not cure the addict, nor do 6 brief months at Riverside Hospital, the city's treatment facility for young addicts.

Recommendation: Establish (a) a maximum security narcotics hospital and (b) a regional system of federally administered work camps in which young addicts can be quarantined from the urban influences that have contributed to their addiction.

Persons arrested and convicted for the use or possession of narcotics (where there is no presumed intention to sell it) should be committed to this special hospital providing they are adjudged addicts by a qualified physician.

Addicts with serious medical or pathological complications would remain in the hospital until released by a panel of physicians, or for a maximum of 3 years. Once released, they would be placed on probation for 2 years, with compulsory aftercare treatment.

Addicts less seriously "hooked" would remain in the hospital through the detoxification (withdrawal) period. Then they would be transferred to a work camp for at least 1 year.

The work camp would provide the addict with vocational training and outdoor labor in the fresh, country air—an intensive rehabilitation program designed to return him to his place in society.

Adult addicts paroled from the security hospital or from one of the work camps should be discouraged from returning to their old haunts, where environmental factors and former associates might lure them back to the narcotic habit. The aftercare program should be designed so that the paroled addict is encouraged to relocate himself, preferably outside the city in which he formerly lived.

[From the New York Journal-American, Jan. 8, 1962]

Greenwich Village: Hub of the Young Addicts

(By James D. Horan, Dom Frasca, and John Mitchell)

Greenwich Village is the mecca of the city's teenage dope addicts. They can buy narcotics of every description on street corners, in coffee houses, in taverns, and in private cellar clubs.

"Pot parties"—marihuana smoking parties—are commonplace. The guests range from girls of 13 to college youths. The hosts are pushers, most of them addicts themselves, and a midtown restaurant owner and a nationally known art director.

Both men recruit teenagers in the village for their wild parties which end in debaucheries. Evidence of their activities were obtained by the New York Journal-American in a series of recorded telephone conversations which have been turned over to the police department.

These reporters, posing as drifters or beat joint habitues, spent a week in Greenwich Village, mingling with teenage addicts, pushers, and juveniles from the metropolitan suburban areas seeking kicks.

What they witnessed were scenes of youthful degradation, misery, heartbreak, and hopelessness.

In the early hours of a recent morning, in a smoky, grimy private club located in the neighborhood of West 10th Street, a young blonde girl—who we will call Debbie—summed up the life of all teenage addicts in the village:

"I live in a $10-a-week room. I sleep all day and get up late in the afternoon. The first thing I do is to look for pot. If one of the kids have some, my problems are solved for that day. But God help me if I can't get any. Then I'm down, really down. My mouth feels like it is filled with cotton. My nerves are shot. I can't sit still. I can't keep my thoughts on one thing. That's when I start biting my nails."

She held up one hand. The nails had been bitten badly.

"Once I was broke and had to go without a fix for 2 days. By the time I got some I was ready to take the gaspipe. Once I did but the girl next door smelled the gas and they got me out. Sometimes I wish they hadn't * * *."

She reached inside her bag and took out a reefer. She lighted it and inhaled deeply, holding the smoke, then slowly letting it seep out from between her lips. After a few minutes she was smiling and relaxed, then began giggling.

"No problems tonight, honey," she called out to a passing couple.

When she left, the reporter asked another teenager sitting next to him:

"How old is she, about 20?"

"Fifteen, daddy-o and plenty of living," the girl replied.

The reporters visited 12 different spots. In each one teenagers were openly smoking marihuana against a background of throbbing bongo drums and wailing jazz. In addition to reefers, heroin—"horse"—was available for those who wanted bigger kicks.

One of the principal drug drops is a coffee shop located in the heart of the Village. It is known to every teenage addict in the Village. The owner will supply, through Harlem racketeers, every drug from marihuana to heroin.

If you are known he will openly sell you reefers and heroin. However, the addict must accompany him through the back door into a small yard.

A FACE AT THE DOOR, JUST LIKE A SPEAKEASY

This is the addict's "shooting gallery." Reporters watched a steady procession of teenage boys and girls entering the yard. When they came out they were obviously high.

The weirdest place visited by the reporters in their tour was a "private club" located in a cellar.

Admittance was reminiscent of the prohibition speakeasy. There was a knock on the door. A face appeared in the small diamond-shaped glass in the door. The reporters, in the company of the addict, were carefully scrutinized. After a moment the door was opened.

The lookout cordially greeted the addict and the reporters who were identified as "friends."

The lookout put out his hand. "Fifty cents each, folks."

After they paid, the reporters and their guide were escorted to a small table. The room, 26 by 15, was literally trembling with sound from a blaring juke box. The lights were dim. On the postage-size dance floor couples moved slowly to the music while off to one side, two boys and a girl were doing a mad solo dance. Their eyes were closed, their fingers snapping, their bodies twisting and jerking.

AND A GIRL GOES OUT TO GET THE SCRATCH

"They just had a fix," the girl guide told the reporters. "That kid over there has been on horse for a year. He's one of the best shoplifters in the city."

In a moment the reporters were joined by a young girl who threw her arms around the guide; it developed they were old friends.

"Man, do I need a fix," the newcomer said. She beckoned to the lookout who came over to the table.

"What kind of pie do you have?" she asked.

The lookout grinned. "Apple, cherry, and lemon."

"I want to pick my own piece," she said.

"For real?" he replied.

"For real," she said.

He took her to the kitchen in the rear of the club. In a few minutes the girl stormed back to the table.

"What's the matter—?" she was asked.

"He wouldn't give me a fix on the cuff," she said. She clenched her hands. "I just have to have a fix, honey," she said. Suddenly she jumped up and left.

"Where's she going?" the reporters asked.

The guide said, "To get scratch for a fix."

"How's she going to get it?"

The girl gave the reporters a silent look. The question was answered.

KIDS CAN HAVE A BALL IN SYD'S APARTMENT

During their tour of the Village drug drops the reporters constantly heard of "Syd's pot parties." It developed that "Syd" was a midtown businessman who is an important source of drugs for youngsters.

"The kids love Syd," one teenager said. "He always has plenty on hand and you can have a ball in his apartment."

The reporters' investigation of Syd's activities showed how youngsters hooked by drugs slide down the ladder of moral degradation, with a big assist from Syd.

A 17-year-old girl, who had been to some of Syd's "parties" allowed her telephone conversation with Syd to be taped.

ART GALLERY DIRECTOR 'WAY OUT' FOR KIDS

Here are excerpts from the taped conversation, which has been turned over to the police:

He: "Hello, honey. How are you?"

She: Hello Syd this is * * *"

She: "Long time no see. When's the next party?"

He: "I'm setting something up. Why don't you call me in a few days? By the way, who can you bring along?"

She: "You going to have plenty of pot, right?"

He: "Sure—pot and everything."

The girl then gave Syd the names of three teenage girls who had been at his parties previously and said she would bring them along. Syd agreed.

He: "Call me in a few days and I'll have the thing set up."

She: "I'll do that."

Syd: "You call me and we'll all swing, baby. (He lowered his voice to a whisper.) I have some crazy stuff up here * * * real crazy."

Another important source of drugs for teenagers who visit the Village for "kicks" is a well known director of a Manhattan art gallery. He is middle aged and was described by several youthful drugs users as being "way out." He is always eager to supply drugs to teenagers.

This is how he spoke to a teenage girl who permitted her telephone conversation to be taped. The call was made to his luxurious East Side apartment at 1 a.m. The tape also has been given to the police.

He: "Are you coming over now?"

She: "I'm with * * * I like to get nice and high tonight."

He: "Bring her along * * * I have plenty of candy."

She: "I can't. I sent my friend out to get some pot."

He: "But I have it here for you * * * grab a cab and come over and we'll get nice and high."

She: "Maybe tomorrow * * * if you want me to."

He: "Of course * * * but you're not listening to me * * * I have some right here * * * you don't have to stay long * * * you can take it with you."

She: "Let's make it tomorrow."

He: "You're an idiot, a real idiot * * * I got it here * * * why wait * * * taxis ride, don't they * * * I'll give you the money for the cab * * * you will be back before your friend returns."

She: "Let's make it tomorrow."

PUSHERS EASY TO FIND IN GREENWICH VILLAGE

In their tour of the Village these reporters saw scores of youngsters using drugs. Pushers are easy to find. The current price scale for reefers is a dollar to a dollar and a half. The difference in price is the quality of "grass" used in the cigarette. Heroin is $5 a fix. If the youngster has the "works" the hypo and the syringe—the cost is usually $4.

Reporters observed that the Village is excellently policed, especially on weekends. However, the flood of narcotics concentrated within this relatively small area is so great it would take a small army of undercover police agents to ferret out the pushers.

The racketeers who supply the teenagers have an uncanny ability to spot a police officer. How they are constantly on the alert for the law was demonstrated for one reporter who had gained access to an "exclusive"—for drug users—private club.

He was firmly but politely asked to remove his coat and place it on a rack. In the few seconds it took him to hang up the coat, the lookout had carefully but unobtrusively "frisked" him. He had patted the reporter on the back, brushed against him and even straightened his tie—all movements to see if he was a plainclothesman carrying a gun.

And as for the addicts, they maintain an undying loyalty to the pusher.

One puts it this way: "Without him I'm dead."

He was 16 and has been using heroin for a year.

[From the New York Journal-American, Jan. 9, 1962]

IS YOUR TEENAGER SAFE?—FATHER CHAINED SON IN FIGHT AGAINST DOPE

(By James D. Horan, Dom Frasca, and John Mitchell)

It was in the quiet of the afternoon. The stocky man in the gaudy sports shirt tiptoed down the narrow tenement alley. He peered up at the half-open window on the first floor, looked about, then carefully tossed a small cellophane bag through the curtains.

He lifted himself on tiptoe and whispered: "Can you reach it, Johnny?"

There was a muffled reply; the man hurried out the alley and disappeared.

Inside the room an emaciated 18-year-old boy stretched out on the floor as far as he could, reaching out for the tiny package. It was at his fingertips. Panting, gasping for breath, he clawed frantically forward, his fingernails digging into the carpet.

Finally he got it between his thumb and forefinger. Carefully, he pulled it to him. With his trembling hands he tore open the package, took the hypodermic needle and slowly injected the heroin into his scar-marked arm.

When it was finished he stretched out on the floor. He knew it wasn't any use to try to reach the bed.

The chains that bound him to the radiator weren't long enough.

The nightmarish story of how Johnny, the 18-year-old addict, was chained to the radiator of his bedroom, was told by his heartbroken father as he sat in their neat, four-room apartment on Manhattan's Lower East Side.

His face was furrowed with grief. His hands trembled and although he fought back the tears they slowly trickled down his cheeks.

"My wife is dead, we live alone," he sobbed. "My son is an addict. I go to work as a mechanic every day. When I found out that Johnny was on dope I did everything I could to keep him off the streets and away from the pushers. But it was hopeless. First he sold everything he had, even his dead mother's heirloom ring. Then when that was gone he stole things right here in the apartment.

"Nothing was safe. When he couldn't steal any more from me he stole from others. There was only one thing left to do—chain him like a dog to a radiator while I was out of the house."

He buried his face in his hands and shook with sobs.

"Do you know what I am saying? That I chained my own son, my flesh and blood. But this didn't do any good. The pushers got to him anyway. They would throw the stuff and the needle through the window. When I came home I would find him on the floor, glassy eyed, slobbering like a sick thing. Eighteen years old—just eighteen."

Rage took the place of grief. He shook his fists and cried out:

"Murderers. That's what they are—murderers of children. If I can get my hands on them I'll kill them. As God is my judge I'll kill them."

One of two clergymen who first heard the man's story explained why the pushers gave the boy dope when they knew he couldn't pay them while he was manacled to the radiator.

"The distributors need pushers, the most reliable ones are those in their debt—helpless addicts who themselves need drugs. So what the pushers did for this boy was to get him so deep in their debt and so relying on them as to his source of drugs that he would have to do anything they wanted. When the father came to me with this horrible story I didn't believe it at first. But he convinced me—he brought the chains to the rectory."

The priest also said he did everything he could to get Johnny to shake his habit "but it seems the words of God or the chains of man haven't helped this poor, pitiful 18-year-old boy."

What of the chains?

The clergyman shrugged. "The father has given up hope. He no longer chains his son."

How drugs have destroyed another family was told by a 21-year-old wife and mother of three in her tenement apartment on De Graw Street, in Brooklyn. She expects her fourth child next month.

Her young husband has long been an addict. He needs $30 a day to buy heroin. Recently he was given a 6-month suspended sentence for stealing shirts valued at $7.50 from a Brooklyn department store. He told police he stole the shirts to get money for "a fix."

HE'S LIKE AN ANIMAL UNTIL HE GETS A FIX

"Please—you have to help us; my children's lives are in danger," she told these reporters. "If I knew the pushers I would kill them. My father-in-law, a wonderful man, recently had a heart attack over his worrying about Joe.

"My sister-in-law, Joe's sister, had a nervous breakdown last month over this. My children are nervous wrecks. Our family is being ruined. He's like an animal when he can't get a fix. He has beaten his father and he beats me regularly. The last time he beat us both was Thanksgiving Eve."

Joe's mother, a worn-looking woman, broke in:

"The other addicts come in and make sure he has stuff. I went after one with a bread knife to get rid of him."

A pretty 4-year-old girl danced into the room. The reporters were shocked to see one side of the child's face a deep black and blue.

The wife hugged the child to her. "He did this this morning," she cried. "Now do you see what I mean? Now will you help me? Good God, what will become of us?"

The reporters investigated Joe's background and found from police reports and neighbors that he has been an addict since he was 15. He had started on marihuana and graduated to heroin. His mother had him committed to Riverside Hospital twice when he was a teenager but each time he went back on drugs.

As the mother said:

"When he came out they made sure he had free drugs. This was to get him back on the stuff. He is my son but I wish the police would commit him or somebody would do something for him. I would rather see him dead than the way he is. He has not only destroyed himself but he is slowly killing his father, his wife and his children, and me."

THE TEARS DON'T FLOW—"I'M ALL CRIED OUT"

Probably no other courtroom in the city contains more tragedy and human misery than Narcotics Term Court, 80 Lafayette Street. Reporters sat with Judge Abraham Roth and obtained an unprecedented view of the impact youthful drug addiction has on families.

There are no hysterics, tears don't flow. As one father said, "I'm all cried out."

More than 200 young men and women, all under 20, passed through this court last year on their way to Riverside Hospital, North Brothers Island, where they hoped to shake the habit.

"The tragedy is, their chances of licking it are infinitesimal," Mrs. Louise Hamilton, the court's admission clerk, pointed out. "Most of them never lick the problem. They're in the hospital for 6 months or so free from drugs and then they come out and back to the old pressures, the old friends who are still using drugs. Six months just isn't long enough."

Typical of the youthful addicts who came before Judge Roth was Eddie, an 18-year-old addict who appeared with his mother, a sad-eyed woman. The boy, under the influence of a heavy dose of barbiturates which he had taken before he left for court, appeared in a daze. He swayed in the chair and twice court attendants had to grab him as he started to fall out of the witness chair.

"How long have you been using drugs, Eddie," the judge asked.

The young man looked up glassily. When he spoke the words came out like wet gauze. "Four years. More or less."

"How did you take it?"

Eddie, blinking, jabbed a finger at his forearm.

"Intravenous?"

Eddie nodded. Then his head slumped forward on his chest.

"Please send him to the hospital, Judge. Please," his mother pleaded.

The judge nodded. Inside Mrs. Hamilton's office Eddie's mother held his hand and said in a dull voice:

"Why? Can you gentlemen tell me why? Is it because I can't give him all the money he wants? Since he was born we were always close. We went everywhere together. Then his baby brother came. Eddie was jealous but he didn't have to be. I never stopped loving him. Why? Why did this have to happen to him?"

When a reporter asked her how Eddie started on drugs her face tightened.

I'M GOING THROUGH MY PURGATORY NOW

"He got the stuff at school. The pushers used to stand right outside of Flushing High School and sell the kids reefers. From that he went on heroin and other horrible drugs."

Eddie does not come from a slum area. His mother is educated and literate. Their home is middle class. He enjoyed a normal childhood, no gangs, no scrapes with police. He had a talent for art and his teachers predicted a fine future as a commercial artist.

Then he fell in with a new crowd, "not bad boys, but wild," as his mother said. They turned to marihuana for kicks. Heroin was next.

"One day I came home from the store," Eddie's mother said, "and I found him in bed. There was a needle on the floor and a bloody patch of cotton where he had stuck himself. Then I knew why he had been becoming irritable and nervous. I had thought it was just part of his growing up. Five years ago his father and I were divorced. Maybe that's the answer—no father. What has this done to me?" She shook her head. "I'm going through my Purgatory now, gentlemen * * *."

Then Eddie lurched up to join seven other teenagers, all bound for Riverside. They got into an elevator with their fathers and mothers. One man broke down and hugged his wan-faced son. The boy seemed in a daze. Outside they filed into a gray department of hospitals van.

Eddie's mother called out:

"Be good, Eddie, please be a good boy, I love you, son."

But Eddie never answered. His head was bowed. He was deep in the timelessness of his opiate dreams.

[From the New York Journal-American, Jan. 10, 1962]

IS YOUR TEENAGER SAFE?—FIVE YOUNG ADDICTS TELL TRAGIC STORIES

(By James D. Horan, Dom Frasca, and John Mitchell)

A pool hustler, a teenage bank clerk, an auto mechanic, a young father, and a high school student: five New Yorkers as different from one another as any five individuals could be.

Except for one thing. Each of them is a user of narcotics.

In a series of unprecedented tape-recorded interviews with these reporters, the youths (their real names must be withheld) poured out the details of their lives and troubled times, painting a haunting portrait of the private degradation of dope addiction.

Here are their case histories and questions and answers of their recorded talks.

Alvin D. ———, male, white, single, 6-foot, and scrawny (narcotics have dropped his weight from 170 down to 135).

Father: deceased. Mother: a sometimes prostitute (two arrests).

Education; 2 years at a vocational high school (until he decided it was easier to take a fix than an exam; then he pawned his textbooks for a hypodermic needle).

"Question. Alvin, what type of dope have you been using?

"Answer. Heroin.

"Question. Is that what you call it? Heroin?

"Answer. No. Call it smack.

"Question. And you always take it in the arm?

"Answer. Yeah. And sniff it. But mostly in the arm.

"Question. How did you get started, Alvin? How did you get hooked?

"Answer. Ah, I don't know. Just happened, that's all, You walk around up near East 117th Street and there it is. And they're pushing it and you take it for kicks. Like a drink, you know.

"Question. Where did you get the smack, Alvin.

"Answer. Around.

"Question. Where?

"Answer. Friends.

"Question. Your friends are pushers?

"Answer. No. Just friends, you know.

"Question. Where did you get your needle? What do you call it, the spike? The works?

"Answer. Yeah. The works I got from a friend, too. I hocked my books and bought the works. No problem.

"Question. How much did you have to pay for smack? How much a day?

"Answer. Oh, maybe eight bucks.

"Question. For one fix?

"Answer. No. For a bag. That's maybe three fixes, you know.

"Question. How would you get the bag of smack, Alvin? What was the procedure?

"Answer. Well, the way I went about getting it, I'd walk down to the corner and just look around and pretty soon you know who's the connection and who isn't. So then I pass him the money and he lays the bag down somewheres. Look on top of a garbage can, you know.

"Question. How did you get the money for smack? Did you have a job?

"Answer. I was a delivery boy.

"Question. Isn't that a pretty expensive habit for a delivery boy?

"Answer. I hustled. I went up to the pool halls and hustled, you know.

"Question. Nine ball pool?

"Answer. No. Eight ball. And when I didn't hustle I sold things for a friend. You know, radios and things.

"Question. So you were a fence?

"Answer. I guess so.

"Question. Why do you want to kick the habit, Alvin?

"Answer. Well, it's like this. I want to be like my father. He's dead. But he was a good man. I'm tired of running, mister. I want to catch my breath."

"MY MOTHER'S BEEN CRYING"

Joe L., 18, a clerk in a Lower Manhattan bank, commutes from Queens, often threatened with loss of his job for chronic absenteeism.

Father: A municipal employee.

Mother: Possessive, nervous, a diabetic who spends considerable time in medical clinics.

Education: 4 years of high school.

Future: Unknown.

"Question. Why do you want to go to Riverside Hospital, Joe?

"Answer. My mother, she found my guns.

"Question. Your guns? You mean zip-guns?

"Answer. No. My needles. She found them in my pocket and she wants me to go to the hospital.

"Question. How long have you been on dope?

"Answer. About a year.

"Question. What made you take dope the first time, Joe?

"Answer. Oh, you get around with different people * * * maybe people a little older than you. And if you're young, you know, pretty soon your mind gets pretty tantalized. And then, after you've tried it, you find it gives you a real nice high.

"Question. A nice high?

"Answer. Yeah, like drinking whisky. Only better.

"Question. How does your family feel about it, Joe?

"Answer. Are you kidding? It's busted them. My mother's been crying ever since she found my guns.

"I'LL NEVER KICK IT FOR GOOD"

Manuel S., 19, auto mechanic from West Harlem.

Parents: Separated.

Education: Grammar school.

"Question. What kind of narcotics have you been using, Mannie?

"Answer. Pot.

"Question. Marihuana?

"Answer. Yeah.

"Question. You don't use heroin?

"Answer. Yeah; use that, too.

"Question. Anything else?

"Answer. Yeah. Speedballs (a mixture of cocaine and heroin).

"Question. You're going to Riverside, Mannie. Do you think you can kick the habit and stay away from it?

"Answer. I can kick it for a while, man. Yeah. But I'll never kick it for good.

"Question. Do you want to?

"Answer. Sure I want to. But wanting's one thing. Doing's another."

"NARCOTICS DON'T SOLVE ANYTHING"

Richard M., 20, married 2 years, father of a 5-month-old girl, works part time as an apartment superintendent's helper in Brooklyn. Wife: pregnant.

"Question. How did it start, Richard? What made you take dope?

"Answer. I don't know. I have problems.

"Question. Family problems?

"Answer. I have so many problems I don't like to count them.

"Question. You figured dope could help you solve your problems?

"Answer. Narcotics don't solve anything. They just let you forget.

"Question. Does your wife want you to go to Riverside?

"Answer. Yes. She said 'Look. You get straightened out and then we'll work things out.' She wanted to walk away from me.

"Question. But she stuck with you, didn't she?

"Answer. No. She left me. She's staying with her mother until I get myself fixed up.

"Question. Fixed up, Richard?

"Answer. I guess that's the wrong word for it. You know what I mean.

A FUTURE? "I CAN'T SEE ANYTHING"

Saul K, 16, a high school student in the Bronx, both parents gainfully employed, lives in a solid middle-income neighborhood.

"Question. You smoke pot, Saul? How many reefers a day?

"Answer. Five, maybe six.

"Question. Why?

"Answer. In the beginning, for kicks. Now, I don't know. I just do it.

"Question. Where do you get the money for reefers?

"Answer. My allowance.

"Question. Is your allowance that big?

"Answer. No. Sometimes I borrow from friends.

"Question. Have you ever been in any trouble, Saul?

"Answer. No. But once I stole some tires.

"Question. To get money for pot?

"Answer. That's right.

"Question. You look older than 16. Level with us, now. Aren't you really about 25?

"Answer. No. Honest. I'm 16. I guess that's what it does to you. Makes you look older.

"Question. Does it affect your health?

"Answer. I used to be a pretty good basketball player, you know? Now I can't even run half a block to catch a bus.

"Question. What kind of future do you see for yourself, Saul?

"Answer. I can't see anything, mister. I can only see as far as today."

[From the New York Journal-American, Jan. 11, 1962]

NEW YORK DOPE PUSHERS CARRY SCOURGE TO YOUTHS IN SUBURBS

(By James D. Horan, Dom Frasca, and John Mitchell)

Drug peddlers in New York City are supplying adolescents from the suburbs with heroin and marihuana, the New York Journal-American has learned.

As a result, the scourge of addiction among teenagers and young adults is spreading rapidly to the tree-lined streets of some of the Metropolitan area's most exclusive communities.

A survey of law enforcement agencies reveals:

Harlem and Greenwich Village are the prime sources of narcotics supply for youths in the commuter counties of Westchester, N.Y., and Fairfield, Conn.

Narcotics deaths, unheard of in Suburbia 10 years ago, have occurred among youths in Stamford, Conn., and scattered towns of Westchester County.

In New Jersey, adolescent drug users have been multiplying annually for the past 8 years, particularly in larger towns such as Plainfield.

"It's definitely a new situation," said Plainfield Police Chief Arthur Phillips. "Ten years ago there just wasn't such a thing as a teenage drug user in Plainfield. Last year we had to arrest two under the age of 15."

Seven other youthful drug users were arrested in Plainfield last year during a single week. Two of them were picked up with the "works"—needles and heroin decks—in their possession.

"All of them," Chief Phillips said, "admitted they were getting their narcotics in New York City".

He was not the only law enforcement officer interviewed who identified this city as the source of drugs for suburban youngsters.

Assistant District Attorney Thomas A. Facelle, Jr., of Westchester County, disclosed that youths from Yonkers, Mount Vernon, and New Rochelle are obtaining narcotics during Saturday night visits to Greenwich Village.

GET DOPE IN CITY

"They are also getting it in Harlem and the Bronx," he said. "The number of users has been increasing steadily since about 1953.

"We have been surprised to find that this problem does not respect any particular economic group. It has touched some of our better homes," the prosecutor noted.

Mr. Facelle said several young people in Westchester died last year from overdoses of narcotics. He identified two as a 19-year-old Mount Vernon youth and a 23-year-old White Plains mother.

Capt. Ignatius Montagnino of the Stamford, Conn., Detective Bureau, reported still another fatality from drugs—a 16-year-old boy "hooked" for less than 6 months on heroin obtained in New York City.

TRAILED ADDICTS

"I have personally followed known addicts from Stamford to Harlem and observed them there on the streets," said Captain Montagnino. "It was obvious why they were there—and it wasn't to see the sights."

From Mineola, county seat of Nassau, Police Commissioner Andrew Kirk reported youthful drug addiction was not only on the increase but was beginning to infiltrate some of the county's more prominent families.

"Hicksville and Elmont are two towns that we have been watching very closely," he said. "The problem has been grave in these communities from time to time."

And where do youths of Nassau obtain their habit-forming drugs?

"New York City," said Commissioner Kirk. "Where else?"

COME FROM JERSEY, TOO

Newark police estimate that 98 percent of the heroin obtained by addicts in their geographical jurisdiction comes from distributors headquartered east of the Hudson—in other words, New York.

They added, however, that adolescent drug addiction is not regarded as a serious problem in Newark.

"We are more concerned with the milder forms of narcotics among teenagers," said Capt. Richard Murphy of the juvenile bureau. "There seems to be a lot of kids over here who are taking codeine-base cough syrup and seconal tablets for kicks."

North of Newark, in the Palisades community of west New York, the Reverend Leonard P. Spanburgh estimated that "at least" 1,000 youths in north Jersey have fallen victim to the drug habit.

[From the New York Journal-American, Jan. 12, 1962]

TWO THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED AND FIVE ADDICTS—40 "CURES" AT A COST OF $400,000 EACH

(By James D. Horan, Dom Frasca, and John Mitchell)

New York City taxpayers are picking up a bill of more than $400,000 to produce a single "cure" of adolescent drug addiction.

Of 2,505 cases handled by Riverside Hospital, the city's treatment center for young addicts, only 40 can be listed as "cures," according to confidential psychiatric reports.

And any one of these 40 could resume the drug habit at any time.

This is the record of an institution that cost the city more than $1 million for equipment and renovating work merely to open its doors 11 years ago.

Since then it has operated on an average of approximately $1,400,000 a year.

Altogether, the taxpayers have shelled out more than $16 million for an experiment that has demonstrated beyond any doubt the ineptness of the city's program in the fight against the slow death of drug addiction.

Most city officials have come to realize it is not too late to do something about it. But they are moving slowly, very slowly.

Mayor Wagner announced nearly 3 years ago that Riverside would be closed eventually. His decision was backed by the board of hospitals. The plan was to provide facilities for young addicts in municipal hospitals where treatment and research could be improved.

It is still just a plan.

Department of Hospitals Commissioner Ray E. Trussel told the New York Journal-American:

"The gradual relocation of Riverside patients to State and local research centers will be accomplished."

But neither Commissioner Trussel nor any other city official was able to say when this would be completed. There is obviously no time schedule.

In a survey of Riverside, this newspaper found that the 40 "cures" listed in psychiatric reports pertain to adolescents who have remained off drugs for 3 or more years following treatment at the hospital.

HUMANE TREATMENT POLICY ESTABLISHED

However, their ability to kick the habit has not stimulated the optimism of medical authorities trying to combat the enormous problem.

Dr. Trussel himself said:

"There is no established cure for any significant proportion of narcotic addicts."

Dr. Victor Breth, who took over as medical superintendent of Riverside 1 year ago, said hospital records show 105 former patients have stayed away from drugs for at least a year.

But he hastened to add that they cannot be considered cured by any stretch of the imagination.

Conversely, this indicates the majority of patients resumed the use of drugs within a year after leaving the hospital.

LOT OF REPEATERS RETURN TO HOSPITAL

Dr. Breth declined to disclose these figures. But he did admit: "We have a lot of repeaters at Riverside."

To help stop repeating as well as beginning addicts from getting narcotics, U.S. Senator **KENNETH KEATING**, Republican, of New York, today recommended that the New York Journal American's "Blueprint for Action" be carefully studied at all levels of government.

In Washington, the Senator praised the blueprint's imaginative approach, which in part calls for a mandatory minimum 25-year prison term for pushers selling dope to youths.

Sherman Patrick, research consultant for the health department, conducted a survey of results and procedures at Riverside a year ago. Today he says:

"I'm afraid I have to disagree with these reports of 105 cures. My conclusion, after interviewing many of these so-called cures, is that practically all of them were never true addicts in the first place. If they were not addicts, then they cannot be counted as 'cures.'"

Located on the northern tip of the East River on North Brother's Island, Riverside Hospital is actually a series of dilapidated buildings with a capacity for handling 140 patients.

Officially, young addicts are admitted to the hospital voluntarily. However, many of them—after getting into trouble—are often nudged into Riverside by judges who give them the choice of going away to a reformatory or signing into the hospital.

Patients admitted the first time must agree to remain there 6 months. The "repeaters"—those returning for a second or third time—must accept a 3-month confinement.

This period of treatment is considered "extremely inadequate" by many medical authorities. They insist young addicts should be hospitalized for a much longer time—possibly a year or more, depending on the degree of addiction.

The inadequacy of Riverside was also underscored by a tour of the premises.

Though Dr. Breth and his assistant, Miss Ruth C. Mock, work doggedly to help the young addicts, the fact is the hospital is badly understaffed.

PATIENTS ARE ALLOWED FREEDOM OF GROUNDS

The introduction of young addicts to Riverside is a dismal experience. For 72 hours, they are confined to a small building that was once a morgue. It is here that they undergo the often agonizing "withdrawal" which addicts must endure when they are unable to get drugs. It is not unusual for two or three of these newcomers to be crowded into a room no larger than 8 by 10.

Some of the medical equipment is so obsolete that one doctor told this newspaper "any accredited hospital would not accept it for nothing."

Some girls are pregnant when they are admitted to the hospital, but they are not segregated from any patients who have made any measure of progress.

No attempt is made to divide patients into age groups. A boy of 12 or 13 can readily befriend an addict who is 6 or 7 years older.

Yet Riverside is not without a few supporters. Dr. Emanuel Rubin, director of the hospital's psychiatric services, said:

"We have a well-developed program at Riverside.

"During the past few years, many changes have been made. We have a good school program and attempts are being made to improve the vocational training of patients.

"There is hope. We are looking forward to the development of more research programs."

[From the New York Journal-American, Jan. 13, 1962]

QUARANTINE AND AFTERCARE KEY TO DOPE PROBLEM—A BLUEPRINT FOR ACTION NOW

(By James D. Horan, Dom Frasca, and John Mitchell)

Quarantine and aftercare.

These two words are the keynote of the New York Journal-American's "Blueprint for Action" to help the youthful addict regain his rightful place in society.

Quarantine and aftercare for the victims of New York's dope peddlers—rehabilitation instead of retribution.

In its "blueprint" this newspaper urges the immediate establishment of additional hospital facilities and workcamps for addicts who have been arrested by police.

In New York State today, however, there are only 325 hospital beds set aside for the treatment of drug users.

Existing State workcamps for juvenile delinquents will not accept youths with histories as users of narcotics.

As a result, more than 4,000 addicts will be placed behind prison bars in New York City alone this year unless steps are taken now to provide facilities for their rehabilitation.

In Albany, legislative maneuvering is already underway to enact new provisions. Paralleling this newspaper's recommendations, these legal provisions would permit arrested addicts to elect hospital treatment rather than jail.

On Monday, State Assemblyman William C. Brennan, endorsing the Journal-American's program, called for legislation to create an additional 2,000 hospital beds for addicts in New York State.

His bill would also establish a maximum security hospital for arrested addicts—a facility where they would undergo detoxification (withdrawal) before being placed on probation or transferred to a rural workcamp.

Most informed observers of the narcotics problem believe many of these badly needed beds for addicts already exist in the State's mental hospitals.

Queens District Attorney Frank D. O'Connor told these reporters that in the 5-year period from 1955 to 1960 bed occupancies in the mental hospitals of New York numbered 5,000 because of the rapid patient turnover due to tranquilizers and therapy.

Some of these beds, it was noted, might easily be allocated for the treatment of addicts.

This newspaper's proposal that a regional system of work camps be established has already won strong support from Deputy Chief Inspector Edward Carey, head of the police department's bureau of narcotics.

Appraised of the proposal, Inspector Carey said:

"We who deal with the addict in the streets of New York know him as well as anyone—and we are convinced what he needs more than anything else is to get away from the city—as far as possible.

"I cannot think of any better environment for the addict than a work camp in the country, where he can lead a productive life, enjoy healthful exercise, and start to build a future for himself."

Inspector Carey agreed that the work camps could be maintained for a reasonable cost if the Federal Government were to establish them on inactive military reservations.

Under the plan, municipalities such as New York would pay a small per diem stipend to the Federal Government to defray the cost of staff salaries.

The camp program would not only include outdoor labor of an agricultural or forestry nature but also recreation and vocational training.

"That's very important," said Inspector Carey. "It does no good to return the addict to society if he is ill equipped to handle a job."

The inspector said a work camp for female addicts would be of particular value to the city of New York.

"It would relieve some of the pressures of overcrowding at the Women's House of Detention," he said.

One recommendation which Inspector Carey added to the Journal-American's plan is that persons released from a work camp be required to submit to a nalline test at any time during their probation.

A nalline test is a medical procedure to determine the presence of narcotics in a person's blood system. According to Inspector Carey, it could be required of the former addict by any peace or probation officer who suspects he has returned to dope.

If the test were positive, the "backslider" would be returned to a rehabilitation facility.

In the area of aftercare this newspaper has called for the creation of a State office of narcotics control with a director appointed by the Governor. One of the most important functions of such an agency would be to administer a system of aftercare clinics.

NEED FOR AFTERCARE HELD MOST IMPORTANT

Almost every official to which these reporters turned in their 3-month study of the narcotics crisis said it was the present lack of such aftercare facilities that weakened the earlier benefits of hospitalization.

An office of narcotics control would be empowered to establish out-patient clinics for addicts in existing hospitals and settlement houses.

Other steps which this newspaper has urged in its "Blueprint for Action" are:

A stiffening of the statutory jail term for narcotics pushers—minimum mandatory term of 20 years (25 years for those who sell dope to minors) instead of the existing term of 5 to 15 years.

Registration of all addicts with the police department as a deterrent to crime. Police estimate addicts are responsible for more than 35 percent of New York City's crimes because of their need to finance the costly dope habit.

One of the most important points in the blueprint—in the eyes of law enforcement officials—is the recommendation that New York's restrictions on search and seizure by police be eased.

Beclouded by legal technicalities, the problem of search and seizure in the area of narcotics law enforcement boils down to this:

It is virtually impossible for narcotics squad detectives to obtain search warrants to raid a narcotics hangout after 10 p.m.

If they succeed in gaining the ear of a magistrate, which is frequently impossible outside the Borough of Manhattan, they must convince the jurist that their intent to search a premises is based on positive information.

Though information may come from the most reliable source, detectives have been denied a search warrant on such a minor technicality as their failure to supply the magistrate with the full name of the suspect.

In its blueprint, this newspaper urged legislation that would establish a magistrate sitting in Manhattan night court as the regular source for search warrants for the entire city.

It also called for easing of restrictions in such a way that police could obtain a search warrant if they have reasonable cause for a search—rather than positive information.

NEGOTIATION FROM A POSITION OF STRENGTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, whenever this country negotiates with Russia I believe we should negotiate from a position of strength. When this House voted last week with only two dissenting votes to deny the use of U.S. mails to Communist political propaganda, it put America in a position of strength.

Some very interesting things are now going on.

The New York Times this past Sunday said the United States and Russia will open cultural exchange discussions here in Washington tomorrow. The same article contains the following statement:

> For instance, hundreds and sometimes thousands of copies of Amerika has [sic] been returned by Russian authorities as unsalable; despite abundance [sic] evidence of quick sellouts and even black-market sales of the Russian-language magazine in all parts of the Soviet Union.
>
> The United States wants the circulation limits on Amerika and the Russians' English-language magazine U.S.S.R. raised from 50,000 to 100,000 with the additional right of free distribution of copies that are not sold.

Of course, this is one reason why the House included the political propaganda provision in the rate bill. What earthly sense would there be in making our mail services available for Russian propaganda when the magazine Amerika is not even distributed in accord with the agreement now existing between the United States and Russia for the distribution of that publication?

This is not all that is going on. The President's press secretary, Mr. Salinger, flew to Paris over the weekend and met with M. A. Kharlamov, Mr. Salinger's counterpart in the Russian Government. This morning's Washington Post report on this meeting contains the following paragraph which may or may not be correct:

> Salinger and Kharlamov did not confine themselves to the reported idea of exchanging television broadcasts permitting the two K.'s to address directly each other's citizenry. The range was much broader and might be described as dropping propaganda in favor of a free exchange of information. This would include an end to jamming of Voice of America programs and appearance of American publications on Russian newsstands.

Now we learn that Mr. Salinger is back in Washington; and today President Kennedy, Mr. Salinger, and Mr. Khrushchev's son-in-law, who is also the editor of Pravda, are having lunch together.

Now I certainly do not believe that the inclusion of the mail restriction on Communist political propaganda caused all these conferences. Let me make that clear. But, I do believe that this House has demonstrated that unless there is reciprocity of which we are absolutely certain, we do not intend to continue to permit Iron Curtain propaganda to be distributed in the United States at the expense of our taxpayers.

If reciprocity is truly granted, and if we have the reciprocal right of inspection to prove it, if the Voice of America is unjammed in Russia, if American newspapers and magazines appear on the newsstands of Russia, this House will indeed have helped strike a blow for the free exchange of information and ideas among all countries of the world.

DANGEROUS TREND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, there is now occurring throughout the Government and particularly in the U.S. Department of Agriculture a most disturbing trend. It is a trend which is turning this huge agency, one of the largest in Government, into a massive propaganda machine. It is a trend which raises a serious threat to the intellectual integrity of the many thousands of able and patriotic career employees of the Department. It is a trend which portends great danger to our basic institutions of free speech and communication. It is an unhealthy trend. It should be recognized, diagnosed, and stopped before it does irreparable harm to American agriculture, the most important segment of our economy.

This year we are celebrating the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Department of Agriculture and the land-grant college system. We can be truly proud of the solid relationship that has been established over the years between U.S. Department of Agriculture and the State land-grant colleges. They have worked together on a century of progress. And the cornerstone of this progress was the freedom from partisan politics.

Secretary Freeman is changing this, however, and it gives me great concern to see what seems to be a well planned and coordinated effort to require all the 90,000 employees of the Department and its affiliated agencies, be they National, State, or local, to spend their valuable time in promoting controversial and unsound political solutions to the problems of agriculture.

Let me cite some examples: In the Des Moines, Iowa, Register of January 20, 1962, the following headline was carried: "Don't Fight Farm Plans, Agents Told."

The story went on to say:

> Agents for the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation were instructed Friday not to talk against farm programs. This fact emerged from a clear-cut statement of policy by Justin C. Dee, new State director of FCIC for Iowa. After his statement, given at the Corporation's annual meeting in Des Moines, Dee said he knew of no case where an agent had talked against Federal farm programs in the past. "I just wanted to make it clear how we felt about this," Dee stated.

This news story then goes on to recount Mr. Dee's admonitions as to what the Corporation's employees in Iowa can or cannot say. Shocking as this may seem, it is the rule and not the exception in USDA these days. As the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. LAIRD] pointed out last year on page A2409 of the April 12, 1961, daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the loyalty oath was becoming the password of the New Frontier.

The new chairman of the Wisconsin ASC committee was quoted by the press as saying:

> We need and we shall find people who are and will be dedicated in the promotion of this new approach. Let there be no doubt about that.

Just a few days ago on January 10, 1962, Mr. Freeman himself began his drive toward turning the Federal Extension Service into a gigantic political action committee. In describing his new "triangle" farm bill which will presumably be submitted to Congress soon, he admonished the Extension Service with this statement:

> There will be those inside and out of Extension who will criticize you for looking to new horizons, but I submit that neither you nor I nor anyone honestly concerned with agriculture can avoid the challenge. Some would prefer to avoid it because it deals with controversial matters, because it relates to the formulation of public policy, because it deals with matters that cannot be proved or disproved by chemical analysis or controlled experiments.

Thus—

Mr. Freeman continued—

> one of the biggest tasks ahead will be education, of public discussion, of arriving at sound decisions on policy in a democratic manner through participation by farmers, and by the nonfarm public as well. * * * Extension will need to expand its techniques of education in problem solving to a wide audience.

In conclusion, Mr. Freeman said:

> I am pleased that the Federal Extension Service is beginning to meet this challenge of total economic development, and that there is recognition that it will require considerable reorientation of thinking, organization, and emphasis.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I think we should bear in mind just what the Federal Extension Service does. In cooperation with the States, it has taught greater agricultural production efficiency; it has worked for better marketing, utilization, and distribution of our farm abundance; it has worked hard to conserve soil and water; it has made significant contributions in the area of farm and home management and family living; and it works directly with thousands of young people in the 4-H Club program to create sound health, hands, heads, and hearts in our rural youth.

What Mr. Freeman is saying is that this great agency should be used to propagandize the people of this Nation. And let me say right now that I for one do not want to see the 4-H clover replaced by a Freeman triangle. And do not think for one minute that the official sales line is not being carried out. Let me read from a copy of the official instructions issued by the Illinois State ASC Committee to show you just how the present administrators are poised to lobby for an administration-sponsored national turkey order:

> It is very important that county offices compile a complete list of producers and handlers in the event a referendum is called. We have therefore obtained and attach the names and addresses of people on the mailing list of the Illinois State Turkey Growers Association. The listing should be helpful in compiling your list of producers and handlers of turkey candling eggs and turkeys.

Some small solace could be taken, I suppose, if these propaganda tactics were limited to only USDA. The Washington Star of January 24, 1962, snuffs out even this faint hope when Joseph Young reported as follows:

> CAREERISTS ARE TOLD TO SPEAK OUT TO DEFEND ADMINISTRATION'S STAND
>
> The Kennedy administration has told Government career officials they are expected to make speeches advocating and defending administration policies and laws. At the direction of President Kennedy and his

> Cabinet, Civil Service Commission Chairman John Macy has formulated a policy for Government careerists which brings them into the policy sphere of operations.

In spite of a longstanding statutory ban on the use of appropriated funds for publicity and propaganda to influence legislation pending in the Congress, this entire administration is pushing, shoving, encroaching, and forcing its career civil servants to join in ballyhooing proposals and programs they may not in good conscience believe in.

What is to be the position of these lifelong employees if they embroil themselves in partisan activities to the extent called for by this administration? Where would the career man in USDA who publicly advocated Mr. Benson's philosophy be today and where would he be in the next administration if he publicly advocated Mr. Freeman's policy today? Such forced labor throws up a serious impediment to the effectiveness of our entire civil service system. How can career employees maintain their professional integrity under such circumstances? How can they be expected to be political chameleons changing their political views every 4 years?

Let me bring this into a little sharper focus by relating this whole situation to several concrete examples. Last year Mr. Freeman presented the Congress with the most fantastic scheme that I have witnessed in my 20 years as a Member of the House of Representatives. As you recall, it would have authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to impose the strictest controls in the history of agriculture on every farmer and on every farm commodity produced in America after inaction by the Congress for 60 days and by a rigged referendum in which those farmers eligible and the choices available would both be set by Mr. Freeman. This highhanded plan even envisioned a 1962 wheat program without any congressional referral whatsoever.

Luckily for American agriculture, this monstrous proposal known as title I of the omnibus farm bill was killed in both the House and Senate Agriculture Committees by a bipartisan effort. And this was done in spite of a great deal of propaganda by the Secretary and his staff. Had Mr. Freeman's mandate to the Extension Service been in effect last year, presumably the entire effort of these dedicated and capable public servants would have been thrown into the fray. Extension Service employees would have been forbidden to speak against it—on the contrary, they would have been forced to speak favorably—or forever hold their peace. The same would have been true for the rest of USDA, including the ASC and FCIC.

Last fall we witnessed a shocking spectacle at the South Dakota State Fair where an exhibit sponsored by the State ASC showed two trains—one entitled "supply management" rolling along while the other train labeled "free enterprise" was wrecked and derailed. I will be glad to make this picture available to any Member of the House to see. Can we assume this is the type of education which Mr. Freeman wants the Extension Service to promote and the type of policies Mr. Kennedy wants the career employees of the Government to openly and publicly support?

I know this much, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture official responsible for this debacle has not been disciplined in the least for his participation in the construction of this disgusting exhibit, and I challenge the Secretary of Agriculture to set forth what steps he has taken in official instructions to the other ASC offices to prevent another such incident.

In conclusion, the Congress, the public, and the career employees of the Department of Agriculture and other Government agencies should be aware of this unhealthy trend which seeks to propagandize and brainwash the farmers of America and the people in general.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, by virtue of House Resolution 46, agreed to on February 6, 1961, the Select Committee on Small Business was again re-created consisting of 13 members, 7 from the majority party and 6 from the minority. The following members were appointed to serve on the committee: Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, chairman; Representative JOE L. EVINS, Democrat, of Tennessee; Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Democrat, of New York; Representative SIDNEY R. YATES, Democrat, of Illinois; Representative TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma; Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California; Representative DALE ALFORD, Democrat, of Arkansas; Representative WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, Republican, of Ohio; Representative ARCH A. MOORE, JR., Republican, of West Virginia; Representative WILLIAM H. AVERY, Republican, of Kansas; Representative H. ALLEN SMITH, Republican, of California; Representative HOWARD W. ROBISON, Republican, of New York; and Representative RALPH HARVEY, Republican, of Indiana.

Inasmuch as we are now beginning the 2d session of the 87th Congress, I wish to give the House of Representatives a resume of the activities of its Small Business Committee during the first session.

Since small business comprises more than 95 percent of the U.S. total business population, its problems merit careful consideration. That is, perhaps, one of the principal reasons why the House Small Business Committee has been reconstituted during each Congess since 1941. The public policy regarding small business was stressed by the Congress through the enactment of the Small Business Act which states in part:

> It is the declared policy of the Congress that the Government should aid, counsel, assist and protect, insofar as is possible, the interests of small-business concerns in order to preserve free competitive enterprise.

I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues that the House Small Business Committee is, to a large extent, a service committee for the Members of the House of Representatives; the chairman gives personal attention to problems submitted to the committee by a Member of the House of Representatives; and the committee and its staff have supplied valuable assistance to the Members in connection with a very wide variety of small business problems. All requests for assistance were accorded priority in accordance with committee policy in order that the Members would be able to report back to their constituents without delay. Even during the adjournment of the House, this casework continued unabated and the committee's staff was kept available at all times to serve promptly those Members requesting such help.

ECONOMIC POSITION OF SMALL BUSINESS

I feel that most people will agree that the perpetuation of the family farm, small business, and the local bank, are the three cornerstones of the American free enterprise system. It is also true that no free society can survive on any foundation other than one which guarantees a maximum of industrial enterprise, and a minimum of power in the hands of the few.

Small firms play a vital role in the maintenance of active competition, upon which our economy is based. A prosperous and healthy small business community is one of the truly essential bulwarks of American democracy That is the reason I view with alarm the trend toward monopoly that has been developing in recent years. Reasonable observers can agree that should this trend continue unchecked, the source of our Nation's vitality and prosperity and the competitive character of its economy is certain to disappear with disastrous consequences not only to small business, but to all Americans.

The destruction of locally owned, independent small business firms is, in large part, the result of predatory pricing practices of some large, nationwide corporations which are taking over the businesses of the small and independent, locally owned firms which are being destroyed.

IMPACT OF TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS AND CHARITABLE TRUSTS

The Select Committee on Small Business has undertaken a study of the impact of tax-exempt foundations and charitable trusts on the economic structure—dealing, in part, with problems facing small business as a result of competition from foundation-controlled enterprises. Such a study is important to small business as well as to the whole economy. Shortly before the close of the 1st session of the 87th Congress, the committee agreed to carry on the study initiated by me.

It has been pointed out to the committee that certain foundations not only engage in money lending on a large scale, but have substantial interests and, in many cases, control of business in the following fields, among others: soft drinks, mortgages, real estate, gasoline service stations, oil and gas, baking, utilities, retail, textiles, lumber, meat packing, restaurants, insurance, coal mining, and commercial laboratories.

One thing is already quite clear in the first stage of the study. Tax-exempt status for over 45,000 foundations is in itself a major national problem, when so little is known about the effect of that exemption on such a large scale. Last August, I informed the Members that the number of tax-exempt foundations filing form 990-A had increased from 12,295 at the close of 1952 to 45,124 at the end of 1960, an increase of 367 percent. The number of exempt foundations increases daily. It is the duty of Congress to know the resultant effects on our Nation's economy and to determine what should or should not be done about it.

AVAILABILITY OF COMMERCIAL BANK CREDIT FOR SMALL BUSINESS

The Small Business Committee has a dual interest in the commercial banking situation. First, it is concerned with the availability of commercial bank credit for small business, and second, it is concerned with the survival of small independent banking—a significant sector of small business. Inquiries were initiated regarding regional concentration of commercial banking, growth of chain, holding company, and branch banking, the bank merger movement and its impact on concentration in banking, availability of bank credit for small business, and related subjects.

MERGERS AND SUPERCONCENTRATION

In addition to the attrition in small business caused by business failures and lagging entry of small business firms into various business activities, independent small business has shown a sharp decline due to the merger movement. Preliminary studies were made as to the scope and character of the merger movement in industry and trade, with particular reference to mergers and acquisitions made by the 500 largest industrial and 50 largest merchandising corporations during the years 1950–61. These studies will consider questions of whether present antitrust laws are sufficient to cope with the ever-growing merger movement and the establishment of huge conglomerate corporations.

STAKE OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS IN THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

Studies were begun as to the extent to which big business has entered the European Common Market by the export of capital, the extent to which small business may be faced with a tariff wall surrounding the European Economic Community, the industries in which small business has the greatest stake in export trade, particularly with the European Economic Community, and the extent to which small business will face cartelized competition in the European Economic Community.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS SPONSORED BY INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS

Although the House Small Business Committee is not a legislative committee as such, its members have introduced a variety of measures to aid the small business segment of the economy. Examples of some of the legislative proposals made may be cited.

Several members of the committee introduced bills in the House similar to H.R. 127, which I sponsored, to prohibit discriminatory pricing practices and to outlaw sales at unreasonably low prices, including those at levels below cost. These bills were introduced as the result of testimony previously received by the committee which disclosed a great number of instances in which big business corporations were making sales at prices below cost for the sole purpose of ruthlessly destroying competition. It was also found that when small businesses were eliminated because of such pricing practices, the prices of the commodities involved immediately rose to higher levels.

A number of committee members also introduced proposed legislation similar to that sponsored by Representative Tom Steed, H.R. 1233—which was superseded by H.R. 8830—to empower the Federal Trade Commission to issue temporary cease-and-desist orders in view of the fact that long delays have generally been involved in the administrative process of regulatory agencies. It was felt that in order to prevent the destruction of many small businesses during the pendency of proceedings before the Federal Trade Commission, that such an important agency as the FTC should have the power, in certain instances when necessary and after due notice and hearing, to be able to issue such interlocutory injunctive order.

As a result of hearings held by Subcommittee No. 2, its chairman, Representative Abraham J. Multer, submitted H.R. 5487 to permit patent holders to bring civil action against Government contractors who infringe their patents while carrying out Government contracts. At present, a patent holder may neither sue an infringing Government contractor for damages nor obtain an injunction prohibiting such infringement. This fact, in many instances, deprives a small business of the fruits of its inventiveness. Small business must rely upon its creative ingenuity to survive and prosper and, if denied this, it has lost a most potent weapon in its struggle for survival.

Other legislative proposals include H.R. 3563 to amend sections 7 and 15 of the Clayton Act in order to aid the various commissions, boards, and the Department of Justice in the enforcement of law. This bill would strengthen sections of the Clayton Act dealing with corporate mergers and acquisitions. Its purpose is to provide a basis for more effective antitrust enforcement by enabling the FTC or other appropriate agency and the Attorney General to examine business transactions having potential anticompetitive effects before they are effected; and, importantly, to enable the Federal Trade Commission to successfully perform its statutory function of administering the antimerger section of the Clayton Act with authority to seek injunctions to maintain the competitive status quo. In short, the bill would require prior notification of corporate mergers and acquisitions where the acquiring and selling corporations have combined capital, surplus and undivided profits in excess of $10 million book value.

In order to facilitate the work of the committee, it was decided that the major portion of its program should be conducted by its several subcommittees which are: Subcommittee No. 1, under the chairmanship of Representative Joe L. Evins, organization and operation of the Small Business Administration; Subcommittee No. 2, under the chairmanship of Representative Abraham J. Multer, small business and Govern procurement; Subcommittee No. 3, under the chairmanship of Representative Sidney R. Yates, foreign trade, foreign aid, and basic metals; Subcommittee No. 4, under the chairmanship of Representative Tom Steed, taxation; Subcommittee No. 5, under the chairmanship of Representative James Roosevelt, distribution problems affecting small business; Subcommittee No. 6, under the chairmanship of Representative Dale Alford, advertising and growth opportunities for small business; Special Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry, under the chairmanship of Representative Tom Steed.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1

Subcommittee No. 1 on the organization and operation of the Small Business Administration is composed of Representative Joe L. Evins, of Tennessee, as chairman, Representative Sidney R. Yates, of Illinois, Representative Dale Alford, of Arkansas, Representative Arch A. Moore, Jr., of West Virginia, and Representative William H. Avery, of Kansas.

Inasmuch as the Small Business Administration was established by Congress for the prime purpose of rendering aid and assistance to small business concerns, it seems obvious that without adequate appropriations that important agency could not function. During June 1961, the committee was alerted to the fact that the appropriation for the Small Business Administration was severely cut, which would have directly affected the Small Business Administration's financial assistance program. In view of the then increasing tempo of the work of that agency, particularly in connection with the Small Business Administration's several lending services, the need for the prompt restoration of such a cut became obvious. An amendment was, therefore, offered to the appropriations bill in order to restore such funds, which amendment was accepted and favorably voted upon by the House.

The subcommittee and its staff continued its study of the policies and procedures applied by the Small Business Administration, including especially its activities regarding the Small Business Investment Act. As a result, I introduced H.R. 8870 in the House and a companion measure, S. 902, was presented in the Senate. After differences in the two versions of the bills were resolved, the Small Business Investment Act was amended and subsequently became Public Law 87–341. The major changes accomplished are as follows:

First. To encourage the formation and growth of small business investment companies, the Small Business Administration may purchase up to $400,000 in subordinated debentures on a matching basis with private funds. These additional funds are available not only to new companies but also to those small business investment companies already licensed and operating.

Second. The Small Business Administration may lend no more than $4 million to any one small business investment company under the provisions of section 303(b) of the act.

Third. Banks may now invest up to 2 percent of their capital and surplus in small business investment company stock, an increase from the previous 1-percent limitation.

Fourth. No SBIC may lend or invest more than $500,000 in any one small business concern, except with SBA approval.

Fifth. SBA is given extensive power to investigate SBIC's, to suspend their licenses, and to issue cease-and-desist orders against them.

Sixth. SBIC's may now cooperate with other investors and lenders, incorporated or unincorporated, in supplying funds to small business concerns. Prior law permitted such SBIC cooperation only with banks or other lending institutions.

Seventh. SBA is given an additional $75 million for its SBIC revolving fund.

The House Small Business Committee views with considerable satisfaction the general upsurging in the number of proposals to form small business investment companies and the increase in the total licenses issued to operate such companies. The widespread confidence in small business investment companies as a new medium appear to justify the expectations of those who originally framed this legislation that it will stimulate the flow of private equity capital to small business firms.

The subcommittee rendered considerable help to Members of the House involving their constituents' matters which were pending before the Small Business Administration. Some of these problems involved proposals to form small business investment companies, applications for needed financial assistance, interpretation of applicable statutes, as well as other matters under the jurisdiction of that agency.

Conferences were held with appropriate officials of the SBA relative to the granting of loans to small businessmen in economically depressed areas and for assistance with a view toward rehabilitating such places. Proposed plans were explored to enable small communities to become self-sufficient and self-supporting. Discussions were held with SBA officials with respect to the establishment of graduated standards covering the size of small businesses and the percentage of unemployment in distressed areas. Exploratory meetings were also held relative to the extension of the research grant programs of the SBA.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2

Subcommittee No. 2 is charged with the responsibility of studying and investigating the many problems of small business in relation to Government procurement. Those appointed to the subcommittee are Representative Abraham J. Multer, of New York, as chairman; Representative Sidney R. Yates, of Illinois; Representative Tom Steed, of Oklahoma; Representative H. Allen Smith, of California; and Representative Howard W. Robison, of New York.

In view of increasing military budgets, it was deemed imperative to maintain a continuing surveillance of the policies, practices, and procedures of the spending agencies so that a fair and equitable portion of those budgets go to small business.

Responsible military officials have repeatedly stated the mandate of the Congress—that small business be assured a fair and equitable share of Government business—was being implemented. However, in practice, this has not always been the case. In the course of the subcommittee's studies and investigations, it encountered the weapons system concept. This is the theory that by reason of the sophisticated nature of modern weapons, greater know-how, professional staffs, facilities, and financial resources are required for their production, which it is asserted is beyond small business capability.

This concept eliminated small business from much Government procurement and its application to procurement practices has resulted in awarding ever-increasing amounts to big business. In effect, the weapons system concept constitutes a big business set-aside. Its impact upon the economy may be most severe and it ought to be employed with judicious caution.

By way of demonstration, the subcommittee found that although the value of all military prime contracts awarded in October 1961 increased to $2.3 billion from $1.2 billion in October 1960, the share awarded to small business decreased from 20.7 percent in October 1960 to 14.9 percent in October 1961. It, therefore, became necessary to exert every effort in increasing the share of small business procurement in those areas not included in the weapons system concept. In this manner, the exclusion of small business from prime contract weapons system procurement can be compensated. It was hoped that small business could increase its share of military prime contract awards for experimental, developmental, test, and research work. In October 1961, the value of these prime contracts increased to $482.3 million from $379.7 million in October 1960. During this same time, the share of small business in this work decreased from 3.3 percent in October 1960 to 1.8 percent in October 1961. This research and development area has received the attention of this subcommittee which hopes to develop suggestions to reverse the continuing decline of small business participation in this type of procurement.

In the course of its studies, many instances of prejudice and bias against small business have been called to its attention. The subcommittee has attempted to evaluate these instances and to isolate, if possible, the existence of a comprehensible pattern or attitude.

In some instances, fortunately rare, it was felt that such bias and prejudice reflected the personal attitude of the procurement officer. In the great majority of instances, however, it was concluded that the unfriendly manifestations were the product of the inertia and resistance to change, built into the mammoth procurement system which made it easier to deal with big business. The subcommittee believes this to be the prime enemy of small business in Government procurement. The procurement system must accommodate itself to small business; its personnel must be indoctrinated with the significance and importance to the well-being of the Nation, and its economy—that it must possess a healthy, dynamic small business community. Subcommittee No. 2 proposes to continue its studies and investigations in this area, and hopes to report to the House specific recommendations to deal with this problem.

It is believed that an important antidote to the problem of decreasing prime contract awards to small business, attributable to the weapons system concept, is to increase subcontract awards to small business on the second, third, and lower tier levels. Many felt that the Congress may have to address itself to this problem. By its very nature, subcontracting raises many challenging problems which need to be solved, if small business is to be assured a fair and equitable share of military procurement.

The necessity for securing more subcontracts for small business becomes apparent when it is noted that the value of prime contracts for civil works to small business, in October 1960, amounted to 53.6 percent of total awards, compared with 21.3 percent for military functions; but had dropped to 37.9 percent by October 1961 for civil works and to only 15.4 percent for military functions.

One of the apparent obstacles to an increase in the awarding of subcontracts to small business lies in the renegotiation process. Contracts for weapons systems tend to involve amounts so large as to usually require renegotiation. Understandably, the renegotiation board does not allow the prime contractor to make as much profit on work which is subcontracted as upon that which the prime contractor does himself. This has seemed to discourage the letting of subcontracts.

No valid reason can be seen why the percentage of military awards to small business should not ultimately be equal to the percentage of civil awards. Subcommittee No. 2 will continue to study and investigate this problem and hopes to suggest a program that will achieve this result.

Studies were also made of the Department of Defense directive relating to the transportation of household goods of military personnel and the manner in which the Department of Defense has been implementing that directive.

The subcommittee was instrumental in seeing that protection was provided for the proprietary rights of several small business subcontractors dealing with prime contractors and the Air Force. In another instance, the subcommittee assisted a small business contractor by securing prompt payment from the Department of the Army which was legally due him, thereby enabling him to stay in business and avoid bankruptcy. These are just a few examples of the assistance rendered to small business.

The subcommittee considered and studied the apparent unfavorable competitive position in which American manufacturers find themselves when competing with foreign firms. It appeared that manufacturers in the United States are subjected to close inspection tests and continuing surveillance as to the quality of the various components they make, as contradistinguished to the positions in which foreign manufacturers find themselves.

These foreign companies need only submit a preproduction sample, and are not bound to the same onerous procedures as are the American companies.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3

Subcommittee No. 3 on foreign trade, foreign aid, and basic metals consist of the following members: Representative SIDNEY R. YATES, of Illinois, as chairman; Representative JOE L. EVINS, of Tennessee; Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York; Representative ARCH A. MOORE, JR., of West Virginia; and Representative RALPH HARVEY, of Indiana.

Problems associated with the aluminum industry in relation to the recommendations previously made pertaining to the price of molten metal, alleged price squeeze, discriminations between integrators of basic metals and the small nonintegrated fabricators and processors, were subjects of continued study by the subcommittee.

The subcommittee took particular note of a certain merger in the aluminum industry and requested the Assistant Attorney General of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice to make a thorough and complete investigation because of the impact it might have on small business.

The two civil antitrust suits which the Government brought against the Aluminum Co. of America and the Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Co. were closely followed by the subcommittee. Those actions, which were filed in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, sought to compel Alcoa to divest itself of the Cupples Products Corp. which it had acquired previously, and to bar Kaiser from consummating its planned acquisition of the Kawneer Co. The concentration which exists in the basic aluminum industry threatened to be repeated in the architectural products business as the two large fully integrated companies began acquiring small manufacturers in that field. The effects of the disposal of the Government extrusion facility at Adrian, Mich., by sale to Harvey Aluminum, upon the aluminum industry and the problem of making public information pertaining to export shipments also received the subcommittee's attention. In addition, the subcommittee considered the impact of the proposed construction of an aluminum rolling mill by Alcoa, Bridgeport Brass, Scoville, and Cerra corporations, as a joint venture on the structure of the aluminum rolling industry.

The subcommittee studied the probable effects of proposed legislation making credit risk insurance available for American exporters and creating the establishment, with private capital, of a Federal Chartered American Export Credits Guaranty Corporation.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4

To Subcommittee No. 4 was assigned the investigation of the effects of imports of foreign crude oil upon the domestic petroleum industry. The subcommittee as originally constituted consisted of Representative TOM STEED, of Oklahoma, as chairman; Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York; Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California; Representative H. ALLEN SMITH, of California, and Representative RALPH HARVEY, of Indiana. Inasmuch as coal is also an important part of the total energy picture, the subcommittee decided to likewise consider how that industry is affected by petroleum imports. It quickly became evident that the scope of the investigation into the oil import program, with its many new phases which manifested themselves, required an enlarged subcommittee. Accordingly, Representative DALE ALFORD, of Arkansas, and Representative ARCH A. MOORE, JR., of West Virginia, were added.

The investigation disclosed that, due to the rising levels of imports of foreign crude oil, the domestic oil industry is in an unhealthy economic state. It also appeared that the objectives of the mandatory oil imports program have not been achieved, thereby causing a weakening of the domestic oil industry and fostering monopolistic control.

Statistical data and other pertinent information regarding oil imports was collated from questionnaires sent to the various segments of the petroleum industry as well as from information supplied the subcommittee by the regulatory bodies of petroleum-producing States. This proved of invaluable assistance to the subcommittee in its investigation.

After a very comprehensive study of the problem, which included field investigations, the subcommittee held hearings in Washington, D.C., from November 20 through November 29, 1961. Testimony was received from witnesses representing the Interior, State, Defense, Labor, and Commerce Departments, and from the Office of Emergency Planning. The subcommittee also heard testimony from officials of a number of State regulatory and oil conservation boards and commissions.

The subcommittee also received testimony from representatives of various trade associations and from individuals engaged in every phase of the petroleum industry. The vice president of the Sinclair Oil Corp. was also heard. In view of the rather tense international situation, the witnesses stressed the urgent need for giving national security of the United States priority consideration in connection with the energy picture as a whole. It cannot be questioned that, in wartime, dependence cannot be placed on foreign oil. A healthy, domestic oil industry, capable of supplying both the civilian population and the military forces, is essential to national security.

The chairman of Subcommittee No. 4, Representative TOM STEED, emphasized that the investigation will be completely objective so as to ascertain the facts, in order to evaluate the impact of alleged excessive imports of foreign oil and petroleum products upon the domestic industry and the national security.

The subcommittee made plans to resume the hearings at an early date in order that it may have as complete a picture as possible of the situation. In the interim, the subcommittee has been studying the testimony already presented.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5

Subcommittee No. 5 on distribution problems affecting small business consists of Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California, as chairman; Representative TOM STEED, of Oklahoma; Representative DALE ALFORD, of Arkansas; Representative ARCH A. MOORE, JR., of West Virginia, and Representative WILLIAM H. AVERY, of Kansas.

The subcommittee received a number of complaints from operators of service stations alleging coercion, lease cancellations, discriminatory pricing, and other unfair practices considered to be prejudicial to their continued operation. The information and evidence advanced by these service station operators was received and studied in the light of the previous investigations and hearings held by the subcommittee.

Some of the complaints received referred to a California gasoline price war. Here the station operators alleged that discriminatory pricing was being applied in an attempt to injure competitively the small business station operators. Upon the request of the subcommittee chairman, the Federal Trade Commission promptly initiated a field investigation into the situation.

A number of conferences were held with officials of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and of the Federal Trade Commission in order to explore means whereby relief could be more expeditiously granted to small business in situations where urgently needed.

The various reorganization plans applicable to certain regulatory agencies were analyzed to determine in what manner they might affect small business.

At one of the executive sessions of Subcommittee No. 5, the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission appeared and ways and means were explored as to the manner in which more expeditious relief could be obtained by small businessmen from that agency. As a result, the recommendation was made that a liaison be established between the Federal Trade Commission and the Small Business Administration, whereby the latter's many branch and regional offices could receive and transmit complaints to the FTC. That recommendation has been followed and has been fully implemented, thereby affording small businessmen virtual branch offices of the FTC in every section of the country.

One of the special problems presented to the committee by representatives of small business was that regarding difficulties faced in securing adequate working capital. It was alleged that small business cannot survive and grow unless it can find the capital needed for use in its operation, expansion, and also to pave the way for little and local businessmen to own the enterprises so many of them merely operate on behalf of absentee owners.

In order to ascertain the status regarding the financing problems, the subcommittee sent four different questionnaires to: first, petroleum suppliers; second, petroleum dealers; third, petroleum jobbers and wholesalers; and fourth, associations of grocers, shoe, and appliance dealers. The response to these questionnaires was most gratifying and the subcommittee is at present collating and analyzing the results which these questionnaires reflect. In the treatment of any illness, it is first necessary to diagnose the malady before applying any remedy. This the subcommittee is endeavoring to do and trusts that it will be able to make suitable recommendations to resolve the problems involved in financing for small business.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 6

To Subcommittee No. 6 was assigned the responsibility of investigating advertising and growth opportunities for small business on television and radio. This subcommittee is composed of the following: Representative DALE ALFORD, of Arkansas, as chairman; Representative JOE L. EVINS, of Tennessee; Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California; Representative WILLIAM H. AVERY, of Kansas; and Representative HOWARD W. ROBISON, of New York.

The subcommittee had been informed that many radio and television stations and networks require that advertisers utilize either their entire networks, or a major portion thereof, at prime broadcasting times and thereby exclude small business. The subcommittee investigated this allegation and conducted hearings on December 6 and 7, 1961.

The subcommittee was especially interested in determining whether the policies and activities of broadcasting stations, radio and television networks are such as to deny adequate access to advertising by small business concerns desirous of using such powerful media and whether there is need for amendment of the Communications Act and any of the antitrust laws.

The subcommittee is now analyzing and studying the testimony of the various witnesses that were heard during these hearings.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS PROBLEMS IN THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

The Special Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry was exceedingly active during the 1st session of the 87th Congress, inasmuch as milk and dairy products are the most important foods used. The following are the members of that subcommittee: Representative TOM STEED, of Oklahoma, as chairman; Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California; Representative DALE ALFORD, of Arkansas; Representative HOWARD W. ROBISON, of New York; and Representative RALPH HARVEY, of Indiana.

All during the first session Members of the House made requests for field investigations regarding pricing practices in the dairy industry. In accordance with such requests, extensive investigations were made in southern Illinois; the St. Louis, Mo., area; Detroit and Flint, Mich.; central and Upper Peninsula of Michigan; Minneapolis, Minn.; Denver and Colorado Springs, Colo.; and other sections. As a result of these field investigations, information was developed indicating that the large dairies initiated drives to fix prices of their products below the cost of production so that independent small business dairies would be forced out of business. Also, the on-the-spot investigations indicated that large multiple-market chain dairies, at times in apparent collusion with large, chain grocery supermarkets, continued their drive to keep prices down below cost levels with disastrous consequences to the small business segment of that important industry.

It was noted that often as a direct result of the subcommittee investigation, prices to the small business processor of milk products immediately increased. The subcommittee is continuing to carefully observe conditions prevalent in the industry and that it will expose any illegal practices it finds.

The results of the investigation of the subcommittee point to the urgent necessity for the enactment of H.R. 127, a bill to prohibit sales at unreasonably low prices, and H.R. 8830, which would give the Federal Trade Commission power to issue temporary cease and desist orders.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS PROBLEMS IN THE POULTRY INDUSTRY

During the early part of the first session of the 87th Congress, the condition of the poultry industry in the United States worsened to the point where Representatives from the various poultry States were inundated by their constituents with cries for help. Therefore, a Special Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in the Poultry Industry was formed consisting of Representative TOM STEED, of Oklahoma, as chairman; Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California; Representative DALE ALFORD, of Arkansas; Representative WILLIAM H. AVERY, of Kansas; and Representative RALPH HARVEY, of Indiana.

The poultry industry was reeling under the impact of overproduction and low prices. This industry had developed an unusually high degree of production efficiency. From 34 million birds in 1934, production soared to 1.8 billion in 1960, with an anticipated 2 billion in 1961. Gross income from broilers in 1960 exceeded $1 billion. Through the years, more and more broilers have been grown under contractual arrangements with feed dealers and broiler processors, with resultant change in risk and decision-making away from the farmer.

But meanwhile, broiler prices dropped from over 30 cents per pound in the late 1940's to a low of 9 cents in the late spring and summer of 1961. It is estimated that the production cost amounted to 14 cents per pound. This substantial negative price spread between production cost and market price persisted, with resultant dire consequences to the farmer and other members of the industry. In this connection, it is interesting to note that at the beginning of the legislative year, when the Congress was considering the omnibus agriculture bill of 1961, sentiment in the poultry industry appeared to be against inclusion. Accordingly this industry was specifically excepted from the provisions of the bill and was not able to employ the apparatus provided by the act to meet such problems as overproduction and below-cost prices.

Hearings were held by the subcommittee in Washington, D.C.; Neosho, Mo., and Indianapolis, Ind. These hearings gave the industry a public forum in which to reassess its previous position, and were attended by many Members of Congress who were anxious to make known the plight of their constituents, and who desired to submit recommendations for their alleviation.

Representatives of the Department of Agriculture, trade associations, farmers, feed manufacturers, processors, and all other segments of the industry were heard. It is contemplated that another hearing may be held in Washington to let the Department of Agriculture make known its assessment of the problem and recommended solutions. In due course a report of these hearings, together with proposed recommendations for the solution of the problems in this industry, will be made to the House.

OTHER INVESTIGATIONS

Another special subcommittee was appointed, under the chairmanship of the Honorable TOM STEED, for the purpose of considering certain small business problems arising from the sale and distribution of agricultural commodities.

An extensive staff investigation was made as a result of complaints received from growers of tomatoes and other produce in the Rio Grande Valley of Texas. Charges were made that, in the marketing and distribution of tomatoes and fresh vegetables, unfair trade practices were followed and prices paid to growers which were below production costs, thereby causing serious financial losses to producers.

These producers alleged that the chain foodstores dominate the market and, unless the monopolistic practices are exposed and stopped, they and small-business distributors face bankruptcy.

As a result of the facts disclosed by the field investigation, the subcommittee held public hearings during June 1961 in McAllen, Tex. The testimony showed that certain unfair trade practices were being followed in the marketing and distribution of tomatoes, with the result that prices to growers have been forced to a level below the cost of production, thereby causing disastrous consequences to producers and small-business distributing firms. During the hearings, it was alleged that competition in the purchasing of tomatoes has been substantially lessened, due to the consolidation of buying and distribution facilities into fewer and fewer hands.

Upon the request of a Member from the State of Florida, a field investigation was conducted in that State regarding certain conditions and practices allegedly causing the dissolution and bankruptcy of the small business farmers and growers operating in that region.

CONCLUSION

This detailed report outlines the broad scope and wide variety of subjects covered during the 1st session of the 87th Congress of the Select Committee on Small Business and its staff.

The progress made is gratifying and should provide a basis for considerable satisfaction on the part of all the members of the committee.

DONATION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY FOR EDUCATION, HEALTH AND CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Monagan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has just issued statistics to the Special Subcommittee on Donable Property of the Government Operations Committee, of which I am the chairman since your resignation, which show that the Nation's health, education and civil defense units received surplus property, at acquisition cost, amounting to $323,354,716 during the calendar year 1961. They also received real property amounting to $37,452,028 during this period.

It is gratifying to note, Mr. Speaker, that every State in the Union and the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico received large quantities of personal property. There were only six States that received less than $1 million worth of property and the smallest of these was Nevada which received the amount of $783,011.

There has been a decrease in the volume of the small common-use items available to the donable property program during the past year of approximately $80 million owing to the improvement in the management of the Government's property by the Defense Supply Agency of the Department of Defense and by the General Services Administration. This necessitates increased effort on the part of those responsible for the donable program to modify, convert, adapt and cannibalize complex equipment items for schools, health institutions and civil defense requirements.

The scope of the program makes it one of the most important Federal aids to education. Based upon the month of December 1961 approximately 73 percent of the property goes to educational institutions of all kinds, 11 percent to hospitals and related health institutions, and 16 percent to civil defense.

For those who are unfamiliar with the operation of the program I might state that the military departments, particularly, but other agencies to a smaller extent, declare excess several billion dollars' worth of property annually. After all Federal agencies have had an opportunity to utilize the property, the balance is made available to tax-supported and tax-exempt education, health, and civil defense units throughout the Nation. During the past 7 years surplus personal property in the amount of $2 billion has been donated for these meritorious purposes. I should state that this property has come at a time of great need for our institutions.

Chairman Dawson of the Government Operations Committee established the Special Subcommittee on Donable Property in 1955 and has continued it to the present time.

The other members of the subcommittee are the Honorable Ross Bass, Tennessee, and the Honorable Richard S. Schweiker, Pennsylvania.

The report from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the calendar year 1961, by States, follows:

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations and real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions, calendar year 1961

[Acquisition cost]

States	Personal property	Real property	Total
Total	$323,354,716	$37,452,028	$360,806,744
Alabama	11,142,628	99,854	11,242,482
Alaska	962,867	17,295	980,162
Arizona	2,287,864	----------	2,287,864
Arkansas	3,000,546	297,164	3,297,710
California	42,150,763	829,102	42,979,865
Colorado	5,586,728	28,285	5,615,013
Connecticut	5,344,962	----------	5,344,962
Delaware	846,493	----------	846,493
Florida	14,834,324	6,783,759	21,618,083
Georgia	8,744,390	334,241	9,078,631
Hawaii	1,779,727	39,233	1,818,960
Idaho	1,248,869	----------	1,248,869
Illinois	8,856,932	3,825	8,860,757
Indiana	6,481,127	41,195	6,522,322
Iowa	2,240,302	----------	2,240,302
Kansas	3,194,758	163,563	3,358,321
Kentucky	4,176,245	1,493,002	5,669,247
Louisiana	4,890,154	327,577	5,217,731
Maine	2,708,433	92,475	2,800,908
Maryland	6,597,754	32,600	6,630,354
Massachusetts	12,696,579	12,879	12,709,458
Michigan	10,448,593	2,869,236	13,317,829
Minnesota	3,643,141	266,711	3,909,852
Mississippi	8,201,639	----------	8,201,639
Missouri	4,293,074	222,117	4,515,191
Montana	827,034	----------	827,034
Nebraska	2,212,731	185,750	2,398,481
Nevada	783,011	112,406	895,417
New Hampshire	1,267,398	----------	1,267,398
New Jersey	3,592,418	----------	3,592,418
New Mexico	2,168,819	207,614	2,376,433
New York	16,201,229	1,892,303	18,093,532
North Carolina	9,649,513	4,286,841	13,936,354
North Dakota	1,255,965	----------	1,255,965
Ohio	15,361,516	97,090	15,458,606
Oklahoma	4,727,658	5,075,356	9,803,014
Oregon	4,167,272	7,550	4,174,822
Pennsylvania	14,871,335	140,466	15,011,801
Rhode Island	1,709,565	188,800	1,898,365
South Carolina	3,823,573	11,456	3,835,029
South Dakota	970,412	151,851	1,122,263
Tennessee	6,691,555	110,187	6,801,742
Texas	15,862,962	3,641,519	19,504,481
Utah	3,914,949	54,357	3,969,306
Vermont	3,082,141	----------	3,082,141
Virginia	13,153,446	1,682,012	14,835,458
Washington	6,129,296	5,330,082	11,459,378
West Virginia	2,957,727	----------	2,957,727
Wisconsin	7,896,040	160,803	8,056,843
Wyoming	817,566	63,690	881,256
District of Columbia	964,920	2	964,922
Puerto Rico	1,935,773	97,780	2,033,553
Virgin Islands	----------	----------	----------

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Alford (at the request of Mr. Mills), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. Albert), on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Wilson of Indiana, for 20 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Conte), for 90 minutes, today.

Mr. Cunningham (at the request of Mr. Conte), for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Hoeven (at the request of Mr. Conte), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Farbstein, on tomorrow, for 15 minutes.

Mr. Patman, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Shelley, for 30 minutes, tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Walter and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Lane and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. Hansen and to include extraneous matter in her remarks on H.R. 8900 while in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Brademas.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Conte) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Younger.

Mr. Rousselot in two instances.

Mr. Alger in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Edmondson) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Celler.

Mr. Boykin in three instances.

Mr. Dent in two instances.

Mr. Powell.

Mr. Harding.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 157. An act to change the name of the Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif., to the "Marina del Rey, Los Angeles, Calif."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.)

the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 31, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1617. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 3 of the act of July 21, 1961 (75 Stat. 216, 217), and pursuant to rule XL of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1618. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 216 of title 38, United States Code, relating to prosthetic research in the Veterans' Administration"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1619. A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting a copy of a balance sheet of Potomac Electric Power Co. as of December 31, 1961, filed with the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, pursuant to 37 Stat. 979; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1620. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the annual report of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission for 1961, pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

1621. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to Congress on positions established in GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, during the calendar year 1961, pursuant to section 503(a) of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1622. A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a statement of receipts and expenditures of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1961, pursuant to the act of March 4, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOYLE:

H.R. 9944. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to provide penalties for becoming or remaining a member of Communist-action organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 9945. A bill to amend section 1371 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow certain testamentary trusts to qualify as shareholders in electing small business corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 9946. A bill to regulate archeological exploration in the Canal Zone; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DURNO:

H.R. 9947. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Merlin division, Rogue River Basin project, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARDING:

H.R. 9948. A bill to provide for the construction of the Lower Teton division of the Teton Basin Federal reclamation project, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 9949. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 9950. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $2,400 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 9951. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9952. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 9953. A bill to amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 9954. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1924 (ch. 270) (43 Stat. 463), relating to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission as amended by the National Capital Planning Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 781) (40 U.S.C. 71); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By McSWEEN:

H.R. 9955. A bill to extend and amend the conservation reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 9956. A bill to amend the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, so as to provide that the standard time established thereunder shall be the measure of time for all purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 9957. A bill to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (72 Stat. 1274, 5 U.S.C. 73b-3), relating to travel expenses of civilian officers and employees assigned to duty posts outside the continental United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 9958. A bill to remove the ceiling on the authorization for appropriations for the government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 9959. A bill to extend and amend the conservation reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 9960. A bill to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid compliance with certain support orders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9961. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to permit payments thereunder to be made to dependent children, within the temporary program of aid to dependent children of unemployed parents, even though such parents are required to perfom services in a work relief program as a condition of such aid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 9962. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide an extension of the period within which certain educational programs must be begun and completed in the case of persons called to active duty during the Berlin crisis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 9963. A bill to extend certain benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States during World War I and the Mexican border campaign during the period beginning May 9, 1916, and ending with the conclusion of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 9964. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to convey certain real property to the Montara Sanitary District the period beginning May 9, 1916, and end-of San Mateo County, Calif.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 9965. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 9966. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H.R. 9967. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 9968. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 9969. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 9970. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 9971. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 9972. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ICHORD of Missouri:

H.R. 9973. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.R. 9974. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARDING:

H.R. 9975. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 9976. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 9977. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 9978. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 9979. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Br. Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL:

H.R. 9980. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 9981. A bill to amend the act of August 6, 1947, to extend the functions of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 9982. A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 9983. A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 9984. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 9985. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on table tennis tables, balls, nets, and paddles shall be imposed on sales at retail instead of on sales by the manufacturer, producer, or importer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 9986. A bill to prohibit the application of unreasonable literacy requirements with respect to the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 9987. A bill to amend section 3679(b) of the Revised Statutes to permit the acceptance by the United States of certain services voluntarily performed for the United States without overtime pay therefor by officers and employees thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FINO:

H.J. Res. 610. Joint resolution designating December 1, 1962, as Civil Air Patrol Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.J. Res. 611. Joint resolution to amend title II of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide special pay for members of the U.S. Army Band, the U.S. Navy Band, the U.S. Air Force Band, and the U.S. Marine Corps Band; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MEADER:

H. Res. 530. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

H. Res. 531. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H. Res. 532. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 transmitted to Congress by the President on January 30, 1962; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. Res. 533. Resolution providing for an International Castings Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H. Res. 534. Resolution to amend the rules of the House of Representatives on the use of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to extending congratulations from the people of Guam to the Honorable JOHN WILLIAM MCCORMACK, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, which was referred to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BREWSTER:

H.R. 9988. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mae G. Fromm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 9989. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan C. Jacobe, and their four children, Angela Jacobe, Teresita Jacobe, Leo Jacobe, and Ramon Jacobe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9990. A bill to amend the act of September 13, 1961, entitled "An act for the relief of Benjamin Schoenfeld"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9991. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Schoenfeld; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9992. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of Lawrence Nestor against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 9993. A bill to authorize the award of the Distinguished Service Cross or other appropriate decoration to Maj. Nick D. DeMaria; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9994. A bill for the relief of Miss Marianna Chmara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 9995. A bill for the relief of Dwight W. Clarahan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 9996. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emily Perry King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 9997. A bill for the relief of Dr. David T. Huang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 9998. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ernst Badian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H.R. 9999. A bill for the relief of Filippo Raccuglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 10000. A bill for the relief of Georgios (George) Theoharis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 10001. A bill for the relief of Om Chaudhry and his wife, Push Chaudhry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

233. Mrs. ST. GEORGE presented a resolution of the Rockland Business & Professional Women's Club of New York State, Inc., relative to the Federal income tax system as now administered, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

◆

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 30, 1962

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, walking as Thy children along the path of duty in this new chance for service that dawn has brought us, we would feel and heed the pressure of Thy life upon ours; we would listen for Thy voice and hearing make Thy will our own with the assurance that in all our choices we do the things that please Thee.

In Thee is food for all our hunger, light for all our darkness, strength for all our tasks, and love which never faileth to purge the selfishness which spoils life's music.

Thou knowest that this is our faith. Make it, we pray, our living experience. Help us to harness our creed to our private and public practice. This day in all our human contacts make us eager to be fair and kind; and when evening comes, may we have the reward of Thy favor and the peace that passeth understanding. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 29, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

AUTHORIZATION AND APPROPRIATIONS FOR PURCHASE OF UNITED NATIONS BONDS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 321)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith for the consideration of the Congress a suggested bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor. This bill would authorize the appropriation of up to $100 million for the purchase of United Nations bonds.

The United Nations is faced with a financial crisis due largely to extraordinary expenditures which it incurred in fulfilling the pledges in its charter to secure peace, progress, and human rights. I regard it as vital to the interests of our country and to the maintenance of peace that the capacity of the United Nations to act for peace not be inhibited by a lack of financial resources.

Some members have failed to pay special assessments levied for peacekeeping operations in the Middle East and in the Congo, claiming that these assessments are not binding upon them. The shortage of operating funds thus created has reduced the working capital fund of the United Nations to zero and compelled it to hold back on the payment of bills and borrow from United Nations agencies.

Prudence and good management require all institutions—public or private, national or international—to keep their affairs in good financial order. The Secretary General of the United Nations therefore urged the adoption of, and the members approved by a large majority, a three-point plan to relieve the cash deficit and to avoid the need for makeshift financing of emergency operations designed to keep or restore the peace:

Point 1 is to cover anticipated expenses for the United Nations operation in the Congo and for the United Nations emergency force in the Middle East through the end of the present fiscal year. The 16th General Assembly approved a new appropriation for these purposes, assessed against all members.

Point 2 is to resolve all doubt as to whether delinquent members must pay special assessments for the Congo (ONUC) and Middle East (UNEF) operations, or face the loss of their voting rights. To this end, the United Nations General Assembly requested from the International Court of Justice an advisory opinion as to whether these special assessments, like regular assessments, are "expenses of the Organization" legally binding on all members by the terms of the United Nations Charter.

It is the opinion of the United States that special assessments voted by a two-thirds majority of the General Assembly are obligatory. We anticipate a decision by early summer of this year. If our view, which is shared by most of the members of the United Nations, is confirmed by the Court, then all members will have to pay their dues or lose their right to vote in the General Assembly. It is only fair that members that participate in the privileges of membership should participate also in its obligations.

Even if the Court's opinion goes as we believe it should, the United Nations would still be faced with a serious cash problem, aggravated by any further delays in collecting back dues from those who have not been willing to pay the special assessments. Consequently,

Point 3 of the United Nations financial plan is to acquire a special fund to relieve the present cash deficit by paying off current bills and debts, and by setting aside a reasonable reserve to help finance United Nations peace-keeping operations in future emergencies.

For this purpose the General Assembly has authorized the Secretary General to issue $200 million worth of United Nations bonds repayable at 2 percent interest over a 25-year period with annual repayments charged against the budget of the United Nations. All members are assessed a share of that budget.

If this program is successful, the United Nations will be in a vastly improved financial position. It is my judgment that this plan is sound both for the United Nations and for its members. These bonds will be repaid with interest at the rate of approximately $10 million a year, as part of the regular assessment. Every nation—including the Soviet Union—will thus be required to pay its fair share or lose its vote. And the United States will be obligated, in the long run, to meet only 32 percent of these special costs instead of the nearly 50 percent we are presently contributing to the special operations of the United Nations.

I ask that the Congress act now to back the United Nations by authorizing the purchase of these bonds. Failure to act would serve the interests of the Soviet Union, which has been particularly opposed to the operation in the Congo and which voted against this plan as part of the consistent Communist effort to undermine the United Nations and undercut its new Secretary-General. For without the bond issue, either the United Nations' executive arm will wither or the United States will be compelled to pay a larger share of the costs of operation than is reasonable for any one member of an international organization.

The central purpose of the United Nations is to keep the peace wherever possible and to restore the peace whenever it is broken.

The United Nations has received the support of both political parties since its inception.

By emergency action the United Nations turned back aggression in Korea.

By emergency action the United Nations brought a halt to war in the Middle East over 5 years ago, and ever since has safeguarded the armistice lines.

By emergency action the United Nations has prevented large-scale civil war and avoided great-power intervention in the Congo.

We shall spend this year nearly one-half of the Federal budget for national defense. This authorization represents an investment of one-tenth of 1 percent of that budget in the peace-keeping capacity of the United Nations.

Whatever its imperfections, the United Nations' effectiveness and existence are an essential part of the machinery to bring peace out of this world of danger and discord.

I earnestly hope that the Congress will give early and favorable consideration to this request.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 30, 1962.*

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Upon request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee and the Committee on Government Operations were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, at the conclusion of the morning hour the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is to address the Senate.

RIGHT TO VOTE IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS—JURISDICTION OF COMMITTEES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. RUSSELL. Reserving the right to object, what would be the order of business which would be before the Senate if the unanimous-consent request were agreed to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request is not debatable, the Parliamentarian informs the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. What?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request is not debatable.

Mr. RUSSELL. I made a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The call for the quorum has not been rescinded.

Mr. RUSSELL. Well, then, I object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will continue the call of the roll.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 5 Leg.]

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Bush
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Case, S. Dak.
Church
Clark
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Douglas
Dworshak
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickey
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan
Keating
Kefauver
Kerr
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, Hawaii
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith, Mass.
Smith, Maine
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Wiley
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. SMATHERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent on official business to attend the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of American States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there is pending on the desk before the President of the Senate a bill for reference. It is S. 2750.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will suspend until the Senate is in order. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there is pending upon the desk of the Vice President for reference S. 2750. I respectfully request that at the Chair's convenience the decision upon the reference of the bill may be announced, rather than that the bill be referred without announcement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York has raised a question as to the reference of the Mansfield bill, S. 2750.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is the Mansfield-Dirksen bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Mansfield-Dirksen bill, S. 2750. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, section 137, provides:

> SEC. 137. In any case in which a controversy arises as to the jurisdiction of any standing committee of the Senate with respect to any proposed legislation, the question of jurisdiction shall be decided by the Presiding Officer of the Senate, without debate, in favor of that committee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter which predominates in such proposed legislation; but such decision shall be subject to an appeal.

The Mansfield-Dirksen bill, S. 2750, is a bill to protect the right to vote in Federal elections free from arbitrary discriminations by literacy tests or other means. It amends the Civil Rights Act of 1957, the subject matter of which was within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

A jurisdictional question having been raised, and the senior Senator from New York having asked for a ruling, the Chair is required under the law of the land and the rules of the Senate to refer it to the committee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter which predominates in the bill.

The bill in question proposes a substitute for subsection (b) of section 131 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, and, in the main, provides that no person shall be subject or attempt to subject any other person to the deprivation of the right to vote in any Federal election, and defines the term "deprivation of the right to vote."

The bill does not confer upon a person the right to vote. That right already exists. It has for its purpose the prevention of discriminations against the right of a person to vote; in other words, it relates to the enforcement of his right to vote.

After a careful and thorough study by the Senate Parliamentarian, the Assistant Parliamentarian, and other parliamentary authorities, the Chair is informed by all consulted that under the historical precedents of the Senate, bills dealing with civil rights, civil liberties, court proceedings, and enforcement of the laws, have universally been held to be within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Chair believes that he should give due consideration to the precedents heretofore established and follow those precedents unless otherwise determined by the Senate. Therefore, the Chair refers the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not wish to lose the floor. Hence, would the Senator from Montana ask unanimous consent that I shall not lose the floor?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New York may yield to me without his losing his right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana asks that the Senator from New York may yield to him without the Senator from New York losing his right to the floor. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the distinguished senior Senator from New York and the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and other interested Senators.

Therefore, on the basis of their approval and, I hope, the approval of the whole Senate, I ask unanimous consent that on any appeal that may be taken from the decision of the Presiding Officer on the reference of S. 2750, debate be limited to 90 minutes, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the appeal, and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 15 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As I understand, there is before the Senate at the present time an appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the information of the Senate, so that it will be on notice, I intend to offer a motion to table the appeal of the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I similarly, in deference to my colleagues, suggest that if such a motion to table is offered I shall respectfully ask from my colleagues in the Senate a record vote, the yeas and nays.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is the right of the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, it is not a light matter to appeal from the ruling of the Chair. I do so only because as a lawyer I am convinced that this bill ought to be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and because I believe it is high time that we argue out the question of whether a civil rights bill must of necessity go to the Judiciary Committee, where, history has shown, it gets no action and is pigeonholed.

In short, I think the substantive question involved is, Shall we get action and hearings, or shall we not? The adjectival or procedural question involved is, according to the rules and precedents of the Senate, Should this bill be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration? In my opinion, it should be. A considerable number of bills have been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration which also seek amendment of and have reference to the 1957 Civil Rights Act. There are also bills which deal with the obstructions and encumbrances to the right to vote, which inhibit violation of the right to vote afforded by the 15th amendment—such, for example, as the bills relating to the elimination of the poll tax as a qualification for voting—which have been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

However, it seems to me the essential question is decided for us by the provisions of the law itself, which states that jurisdiction shall go to that committee whose jurisdiction over the subject predominates. I emphasize the word "predominates."

A study of the particular measure which is now before the Senate indicates that it is the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration rather than the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary which definitely predominates. Let us look first at the question of jurisdiction. The jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, under which the Vice President's reference is made, relates to subsection (k) on page 32 of the Standing Rules of the U.S. Senate, as follows:

> 1. Judicial proceedings, civil and criminal, generally.
> 2. Constitutional amendments.
> 3. Federal courts and judges.

Nothing is said there about civil rights measures. What we are talking about when we refer civil rights bills to the Committee on the Judiciary is that they constitute constitutional amendments or are predominantly based upon judicial proceedings, civil and criminal.

On the other hand, the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules is very specific on this score. I quote now from subparagraph (d) of its authority, found on page 36 of the Standing Rules of the U.S. Senate. The Committee on Rules and Administration has jurisdiction over:

> (d) Matters relating to the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress; corrupt practices; contested elections; credentials and qualifications; Federal elections generally; Presidential succession.

First and foremost, let us read the title of the bill. That is generally what determines these questions in the majority of cases. The title reads: "To protect the right to vote in Federal elections free from arbitrary discrimination by literacy tests or other means."

It seems to me, therefore—and my case on this appeal is based upon the following statement of principle—that this is a clean elections bill, a bill to eliminate a corrupt practice which is a burden on Federal elections, and therefore is a measure intended to implement the Fifteenth Amendment, which deals with voting.

Be it said very significantly that if one is going to relate the words of the bill to the words of the jurisdiction of committees, then certainly the bill ought to be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, because the bill itself is confined to Federal elections. "Federal elections" generally are the very words of art used in the authority given to the Committee on Rules and Administration, rather than in the authority given to the Committee on the Judiciary. Therefore, it seems to me very clear that if we are going to follow the "preponderate" rule—and we must—then clearly the "preponderate" rule, from the title of the bill, from the limitation of the bill, it being confined to Federal elections, and from the words of the bill, which name Federal elections and other particular and specific aspects of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the bill should be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Also, let us understand that this is not a constitutional amendment. The arguments which have been made—and there have been many—that the literacy test qualification cannot be made standard except by a constitutional amendment, are not germane to this argument, because the Chair has to take the bill as it is, and the bill is based on legislation. So whether it ought to be or ought not to be a constitutional amendment, the fact is that the bill does not propose a constitutional amendment; it is simply a legislative measure and therefore qualifies entirely for being referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Let us again look at the bill. The bill speaks. The bill, in reciting subsection (b) of section 1, speaks of "corrupt influence"—again the very words of art used in the terms of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The bill provides in subsection (a) of section 1, in its general findings of the fact, "that all qualified citizens have the opportunity to participate in the choice of elected officials." Again, that is affirmative of the right to vote, rather than negative of trying to prevent persons from interfering with the right to vote.

Further on we have the following reference, which it seems to me is conclusive. Section 1, subsection (f), of the bill reads as follows, in speaking of Congress: "and its power to protect the integrity of the Federal electoral process."

That recital is so important that I shall reread it: "and its power to protect the integrity of the Federal electorial process, Congress has the duty to provide against the abuses which presently exist."

This clearly indicates the intent of the author of the bill to make it a clean elections bill, a bill against corrupt practices. It is a bill which calls upon the power of Congress, in the words of the bill, to protect the integrity of the Federal electoral process. Under the precedents of the Senate, that is precisely the kind of bill which has, time and time again, been referred to the Commitee on Rules and Administration.

During this Congress, five bills—the so-called clean elections bill, which passed the Senate at the end of the last session, S. 604—and four other bills, all relating to corrupt practices in Federal elections, were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, notwithstanding the fact that the contents of those bills were penal provisions and amendments to the Federal Criminal Code. That negates the proposition that any bill providing penalties, either civil or criminal, must be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, two bills to prohibit poll taxes or other property as conditions for voting—S. 478 and S. 1259—were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

It seems to me that is a very clear analogy that I made of the burden on the voting right, which is sought to be dealt with by this bill. But more conclusive than that, even, is that four bills dealing with voting registrars were also referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration: S. 2814, S. 2684, S. 2719, and S. 2783. The Committee on Rules and Administration held rather extensive hearings upon those bills in 1960. It seems to me that a reading of the bills demonstrates that there we were dealing with specific amendments to the 1957 Civil Rights Act. Nonetheless, because the bills dealt affirmatively with the voting right and burdens on the voting right, they were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

In my opinion, this argument is based soundly upon the law. It is also based upon a very important question of policy, because I believe that there is room for legal argument, which is what we are having now. I have cited some of the points which I think are very persuasive in terms of reference of the pending bill to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The Chair might have decided either to refer the bill to the Committee on Rules and Administration or to the Committee on the Judiciary. The Chair decided to refer the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary, where all our history demonstrates, that has been no action on such bills. Let us remember that a bill very similar to the pending bill, similar, for practical purposes, in terms of whether we can get action on it or not, has been languishing in the Committee on the Judiciary since January of last year.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. May I finish this point? That is true notwithstanding the fact that the bill is sponsored by more than 20 Senators on both sides of the aisle. That bill was introduced as a specific bill—a single bill—on January 17, 1961, and the Committee on the Judiciary has taken no action whatever on it.

Now I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the able and distinguished senior Senator from New York whether he had made any request for a hearing on that bill of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe we have made requests both for hearing and for departmental reports. We do that normally in the case of all the bills we introduce.

Mr. ERVIN. Does the Senator from New York affirm that he has made any request of me, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, for a hearing on that bill?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not say that at all, because normally our requests would go to the chairman of the full committee, not to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. ERVIN. Well, I am chairman of the subcommittee; and normally Senators who make such requests about such a bill make them of me. The Senator from New York has not made such a request of me. I do not know what requests may have been made of the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield, to permit me to make a clarification?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I am a member of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. Let me say that, as the chairman knows, as a member of that committee I have been pressing to have a higher priority given to all the civil rights bills that are before the committee. We have dealt with the constitutional rights of the criminally insane, the mentally ill, and the Indians and may soon have hearings on the rights of soldiers and immigrants. These are important subjects and I have fully participated in all of our hearings and reports. But we have given civil rights legislation no attention or priority. I am sure that the distinguished Senator from North Carolina will agree that as a member of his subcommittee I have been pressing very hard for a higher priority for all the civil rights bills, including the one to which the senior Senator from New York has been referring.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to my colleague from New York.

Let me say that I have little doubt about the proper conclusion to be drawn. It is based upon the history of civil rights measures which have been referred to the Judiciary Committee, which has traditionally been the graveyard for such bills. Therefore I reach the conclusion that if this bill is referred to the Judiciary Committee, it will suffer the same fate.

Mr. President, when we consider this matter, let no one be fooled by the parliamentary complexities involved in this question. Legally, as I have said, a case can be made for reference of the bill to either committee. The Chair has chosen to make out the case for reference of the bill to the Judiciary Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time the Senator from New York has yielded to himself has expired. If the Senator from New York desires to continue his remarks, will he state the additional time he desires to yield to himself?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes, Mr. President; I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as I was saying, let no one be fooled by the parliamentary complexities involved in this question. The ruling which sends the bill to the Judiciary Committee sends it—in view of the arguments which can be made on both sides and which are being made here today—to what I consider a graveyard, in the final analysis, in connection with a close question. Therefore I think it proper to take the position that the decision in regard to this matter becomes a parliamentary decision. Many members who have made campaigns on civil rights matters have a right to know the facts of the matter now before us.

I am convinced that the bill should be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. The vote to be taken on the appeal I have made will be a test of whether the efforts of the administration to obtain the passage of civil rights legislation are real efforts to obtain the passage of such legislation or whether they are merely gestures. History teaches us that, Mr. President.

On the subject of the struggle over the so-called filibuster rule, the majority leader of the Senate made the following statement in this Chamber as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 1, page 520:

> I wish to assure the Senate that this proposition will receive such consideration, and that I shall leave no stone unturned to see to it that a measure of the kind proposed by the Senator from New Mexico is reported to the Senate at a later date. And, further, the minority leader joins with me in assuring the Senate that we shall do everything in our power to bring such a measure to a vote in this body.

Mr. President, when was that bill reported to the Senate? The parliamentary processes in connection with the bill began in January. The bill reached the floor of the Senate on September 5, when the Senate was again "under the gun" of adjournment, and when it was then impossible, in my opinion and in the opinion of many other Members of the Senate, for the Senate really to go into the matter with any hope of achieving a result.

Of course, the majority leader is subjected to all the vicissitudes that may occur in connection with what happens in this body and also in connection with what happens in the committee to which the bill is referred, and I am not for a minute questioning his good faith; I am merely calling attention to the mandate of history, which shows unquestionably in my opinion, that if the bill is allowed to go to the Judiciary Committee, it will be buried there again. When the majority leader introduced the bill last Thursday he stated that—

> It would be my intention, if the request were not given consideration after an appropriate time, to offer the proposal as an amendment to a measure pending before the Senate.

Mr. President, if "an appropriate time" means that the bill will be brought before the Senate 10 or 15 days before adjournment, then we know from experience that nothing much will happen in connection with the bill. But if "an appropriate time" means that the measure will be brought up in 30 days or in some reasonable time of the sort, then we know that something can be done by the Senate in connection with the bill. However, experience shows that this measure will not receive a hearing in the Judiciary Committee. Yet it is obvious that this matter should be explored and considered, as the majority leader has said.

Mr. President, how better can this subject be explored and considered than by its being referred to the committee of which the majority leader is chairman? Therefore, it seems proper that the bill be referred to that committee, so we can be assured that the bill will receive the treatment that many Senators want the bill to receive and the treatment that the country wants the bill to receive.

It is obvious that the enactment of civil rights legislation requires help from Congress. The President has agreed as to that. This measure represents the first thing he has done on that score. After my colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and others made it clear that we would move to tack such measures onto other bills, the President said, in effect, "Hallelujah! That is great."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The additional time the Senator from New York has yielded to himself has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. But, Mr. President, this is no time to put the bill down the drain by means of a committee procedure that in the past has been so promising of that very result.

It is for this reason that I believed an appeal had to be taken. No Senator likes to take an appeal from a ruling when the ruling is made, first, by the Chair; second, by the Vice President of the United States; and third, by the former majority leader, who also was an outstanding Senator. Nevertheless, there are many who feel strongly about this key issue; and it is obvious that the legislative path will lead nowhere if this measure is referred to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. President, if the majority leader's words "an appropriate time" mean precisely what they seemed to mean last year when we talked about rule XXII, when we found that "an appropriate time" meant that Senate consideration of the bill was delayed from the beginning of the session, when we could have done something about rule XXII, to the end of the session, when we could not do something about changing rule XXII, then, Mr. President, I am all for putting my faith in the majority leader, because he is chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and there he can give this measure a hearing; and he has promised to give it a hearing there in the efficient way he always does.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. The Senator from New York with his customary clarity and force has presented the question so clearly that I think very little more need be said. He has made his point under the rules and precedents of the Senate, which I think clearly justify reference of this particular measure to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

As the Senator from New York does not question the propriety of reference to the Committee on the Judiciary also, neither do I. But I believe it would be impossible to deny that there is an exact precedent as between this bill and the bill relating to voting registrars. Neither of these bills attempts to give a substantive right to vote. As the Vice President said in his ruling, that is something that exists anyway, and it does not have to be given to anyone by law.

Both of these measures were for the purpose of implementation of that right. It seems to me the rulings and references of bills dealing with voting registrars to the Committee on Rules are squarely precedents for the reference to the Committee on Rules of the pending bill.

So, as the Senator from New York has so well said, it comes down to a question of policy. Where do we want this bill to go, it being a bill that could properly be referred to either committee?

The Senator from New York has clearly pointed out the results of reference to either committee. Our experience last year was another in the long experience of frustration in efforts to change rule XXII. We had specific assurance then from the majority leader, which we have not now, as to when he intends to bring it up if the Committee on the Judiciary should fail to act. Under the circumstances we are left in, it is up to us in the Senate who take a responsibility in this matter to take those steps which we feel should be taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the majority leader does not wish to yield any time now. I yield 5 minutes to my colleague from New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is essential that this legislation be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

I am in the rather unique position of serving on both the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Rules and Administration. I therefore can speak with perhaps unusual authority on this question. In my judgment a reference of this bill to the Judiciary

Committee would be sentencing it to a slow and sure death. That committee already is serving as a burial ground for more than a score of civil rights bills—some of which were introduced more than a year ago. There is no more hope that the committee would allow this bill to live than that it will resurrect any one of these other dead measures which it now inters.

The Committee on Rules and Administration, on the other hand, under the chairmanship of the majority leader, can reasonably be expected to give prompt and sympathetic consideration to this measure. I am sure that the opponents, as well as the proponents, will be given an opportunity to be heard. There may be amendments—but we would have every reason to hope that the bill would be reported to the Senate in plenty of time to resist whatever verbal assault may be mobilized against it.

I believe in orderly procedure and would not support this appeal if I was not convinced that referral of this bill to the Committee on Rules and Administration was entirely consistent with the rules and precedents of the Senate.

Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate expressly provides for the reference to the Committee on Rules and Administration of all proposed legislation relating to the "election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress" or "Federal election generally." There is no such provision in rule XXV with regard to the Committee on the Judiciary, that committee's only relevant jurisdiction being limited to judicial proceedings, constitutional amendments and civil liberties. If S. 2750—the pending bill—can fairly be said to relate primarily to Federal elections, then certainly under the plain language of rule XXV it should go to the Committee on Rules and not to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The ruling of the President is inconsistent with the past practice with regard to a host of similar bills. In the 86th Congress, for example, at least seven bills growing out of the recommendations of the Commission on Civil Rights were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I participated in the hearings on these bills. Four of these—S. 2684, S. 2719, S. 2783, and S. 2814—would have authorized the appointment of temporary Federal registrars in areas in which citizens were being denied the right to vote because of race or color. Two of these—S. 2722 and S. 2785—provided for the preservation of voting records, and another—S. 2535—would have established a congressional election commission to supervise the conduct of Federal elections where violations of voting rights were found. It is obvious that these bills related in part to civil liberties and to judicial proceedings, the criteria for the Committee on the Judiciary. But because they related predominately to Federal elections, they went to Rules not Judiciary, and no objection whatever was made to such reference at that time.

Historically, almost all such bills have gone to the Committee on Rules. Other pertinent examples are bills to abolish poll taxes, bills to amend the Hatch Act or the Corrupt Practices Act, bills prescribing the time of elections and conventions, bills relating to primaries or election practices or election costs—all of which have gone to the Committee on Rules—not the Judiciary Committee.

There is no difference in nature sufficient to justify a difference in referral between this bill on literacy tests and bills on Federal registrars, poll taxes or the preservation of voting records. As an original proposition it would appear to be utterly inconsistent with the language of rule XXV and these precedents to refer this literacy bill (S. 2750) to the Judiciary Committee. With all due deference to the President's ruling, in my opinion it is contrary to the law of the land and the precedents of this body to send this bill to its demise in the Judiciary Committee. Certainly no such ruling was compelled.

The only argument which can properly be made against the referral of this bill to the Rules Committee is that a similar bill (S. 480) introduced by my colleague, Senator JAVITS, early last year was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, where, by the way, it has since rested without the slightest disturbance.

In my opinion it was a mistake to refer this bill to the Judiciary Committee, and we should have challenged the ruling of the Chair then as we are doing now.

In any event, there are several important distinctions of parliamentary significance between the two measures. The titles of the bill are different, S. 480 emphasizes the prohibition of unreasonable literacy tests, while S. 2750 emphasizes protection of the right to vote in Federal elections. In their findings, more significant differences appear—S. 480 deals only with the abuse of literacy tests; S. 2750, in contrast, refers to "discrimination and other corrupt influences." In scope, also, there are substantial distinctions. S. 480 deals only with literacy tests used for racial discrimination; S. 2750, however, deals also with language barriers to voting—a subject which the Commission on Civil Rights said was "not strictly within the scope of the Commission's authority." In addition, S. 480 is based on the power of Congress to enforce the 14th and 15th amendments, while S. 2750 explicitly refers to the power of Congress "to protect the integrity of the Federal electoral process." Finally, in their substantive provisions, S. 480 applies to State and local as well as Federal elections, while S. 2750 applies solely to Federal elections; S. 480 prohibits only unreasonable literacy tests—S. 2750 prohibits any application "of standards or procedures more stringent than are applied to others similarly situated" as well as unreasonable literacy tests.

It is apparent that there are substantive differences in these measures, that there is clear authority for a reference of S. 2750 to the Committee on Rules where it will receive proper consideration, and that there is no requirement that it be referred to the Judiciary Committee. If we are really interested in seeing something more become of this bill than an empty gesture—our course is clear. We must vote for this appeal and to overrule the decision of the President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield 2 additional minutes to my colleague.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York is yielded 2 additional minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I was interested in the statement of the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] when he introduced the bill, that if the appropriate committee did not report this bill to the Senate within an appropriate time, he would move to add it to some other measure before the Senate. I would in no way want to press the distinguished majority leader, but if he could elaborate on what he means by "appropriate time," it seems to me it would be very helpful.

We were faced in the last session with a similar pledge when some of us attempted to change the present cloture rule. As a result, the effort was put off in the beginning of the session, but it was not until the very end of the session that the subject was brought up. By that time, the threat of extensive debate was able to defeat the rules change; whereas, if it had been brought back early in the session, that would not have happened.

It would be helpful to me if the majority leader would amplify his reference to an appropriate time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana does not wish to yield time at the moment——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, does the Senator have any more Senators to whom he wishes to yield time?

Mr. JAVITS. I do. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the right to vote is guaranteed by the Constitution. It is a supremely precious American prerogative shared by all citizens. Nevertheless, the right to vote has been rather shamefully shunted aside and rendered meaningless in many parts of this country. What an ugly commentary on our beloved Republic.

The Republican national platform adopted in Chicago in 1960 promised the American people that it would sponsor "legislation to provide that the completion of six primary grades in a State accredited school is conclusive evidence of literacy for voting purposes."

On January 17, 1961, the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and others of us on this side of the aisle, with some Members from the other side, joined in introducing a measure to carry out that particular beneficient promise. It was sent to the Judiciary Committee, and in the intervening 12-month period it has languished, and there, I guarantee you, Mr. President, it will die. That is the constant, lamentable, never changing fate each civil rights bill, of any kind, receives when it goes to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

I do not quarrel with the ruling by the Presiding Officer, under the rules, but I am sure the Presiding Officer will not quarrel either, with the appeal, also under our rules, that has been taken by the able Senator from New York and the rest of us, for the reasons he has lucidly explained in the comments he made a few minutes ago. The Senate has the right to send the bill—any bill—to any committee it chooses. And, in my view, the Rules Committee is perfectly equipped, by jurisdiction and by its membership, to deal with the provisions of this bill, dealing as it does with elections and the right to vote.

If the proposed legislation, sponsored by the majority leader—and joined in by our Republican leader—a demonstration that we, many of us, maybe, I hope, a majority of us, continue to believe the proposed legislation ought to be enacted into law—now again goes to the Judiciary Committee, it will be simply a meaningless gesture. It will die there, just as surely as the almost identical bill we introduced a year ago is dying there.

This is an opportunity for Members of the Senate to exercise the rights they have under the rules which guide the Senate to make a decision as to where the proposed legislation ought to go. If Senators believe the proposed legislation ought to be enacted into law, then they will agree with the Senator from New York, they will set aside the ruling of the Presiding Officer, and they will send the measure to the Committee on Rules and Administration, where it will have an opportunity honorably to be heard and honorably to be sent to the Senate for approval.

If Senators do not believe in the proposed legislation they will uphold the ruling of the Chair, they will let the measure go to the Judiciary Committee, and there, in exactly the same fashion that has been followed with regard to the proposed legislation introduced a year ago, the bill will be destined for an untimely and regrettable end.

Mr. President, there is a clear responsibility of Senators if they are interested in equal treatment under law. Do not permit the right to vote continue to be a shameful mockery anyplace in our land. Come along with my colleague from New York and others of us. Give this bill an honorable opportunity of survival which is its due. Send it to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Connecticut.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am glad to associate myself with the position of the distinguished Senator from New York, the distinguished Senator from California, and the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. I support the motion of the Senator from New York that the bill be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. President, I have served in the Senate now nearly 10 years. The question of civil rights has been "kicked around" year after year after year, and we have never had a decent opportunity to vote on it.

The bill which was introduced by the able majority leader and minority leader would give us that opportunity. If the bill goes to the Committee on Rules and Administration we shall have that opportunity. Therefore, I very much hope the Senate will sustain the appeal of the distinguished senior Senator from New York, and I shall certainly support him.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Michigan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, this is a question to which one finds it appropriate to address himself under these circumstances.

I have listened with great care to the discussion led by the senior Senator from New York. It is my feeling that logic suggests the bill could go either to the Committee on the Judiciary or to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I think that is rather clear from the discussion.

I think the question then is, How intense is the desire to see the bill acted upon? For one, I have an intense desire to see the Senate act and act favorably upon the proposal. For this reason, Mr. President, it seems to me desirable that we seek to direct consideration of the bill by the Committee on Rules and Administration. For that reason I suggest that we should—and always reluctantly—support the motion on the appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I hope the majority leader will yield the Senator 2 minutes. The Senator from Pennsylvania wishes to have 5 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I do not see the majority leader in the Chamber. I wonder who controls the time in support of the ruling of the Chair, so that I may ask for an additional 2 minutes, for a total of 5 minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, speaking first as a lawyer, and with deep regret because of the high regard I hold for the present occupant of the chair, the distinguished Vice President of the United States, and for the Parliamentarian and the Assistant Parliamentarian, who have advised him, I am compelled to say that in my judgment as a lawyer the parliamentary ruling was incorrect and that the bill should have been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The distinguished Vice President said in his ruling:

> Bills [such as that now pending] dealing with civil rights, civil liberties, court proceedings, and enforcement of the laws, have universally been held to be within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

In my opinion this statement is not entirely correct. Bills dealing with civil rights have on many occasions been referred to other committees.

I am presently the principal sponsor of a series of six civil rights bills, two of which have been referred on the advice of the same Parliamentarian to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on which I serve. The first deals with the controversial subject of school desegregation and the second deals with those civil rights involved in fair employment practices legislation. Civil rights is the heart of both bills, and yet both bills were referred last year, without objection, to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, where they are presently pending. I hope the committee will authorize public hearings on both bills soon.

Formerly, in 1949 and 1950, proposed FEPC legislation, clearly civil rights in nature, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and hearings were held on the bills.

I have before me a document entitled "Federal Registrars," containing hearings on S. 2684, S. 2719, S. 2783, and S. 2814, and other bills introduced in the 86th Congress, all of which deal with civil rights matters, the question of voting rights being involved. Every one of these bills was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

I think it is difficult to substantiate the contention that all civil rights bills are automatically referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and I think the precedents in the record prove that this is not the case. Several of the bills to which I have referred involve amendments to the Civil Rights Act of 1957.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I do not think that precedents sustain the ruling of the Chair, nor do I think the rules of the Senate sustain the ruling.

I refer to Senate standing rule XXV (o)(1)(D) which provides that matters dealing with "Federal elections generally" should be referred not to the Committee on the Judiciary, but to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

It is true that an argument can be made, as has been made, that the bill should be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, but I do not believe that conscientious and objective lawyers who carefully studied the question would have much doubt in coming to the conclusion that by far the stronger case lies in support of a reference to the Committee on Rules and Administration and not to the Committee on the Judiciary.

I regret that the Presiding Officer has ruled as he has. Unhappily, this is not the first time I have differed with my very distinguished and very good friend, the Parliamentarian, who unfortunately does not always agree with me. Perhaps he is right and perhaps I am wrong, but in support of the argument I have been making, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a memorandum dated January 30, 1962, entitled "Arguments for Reference of S. 2750 to Rules Committee on Appeal From Ruling of Chair Referring to Judiciary Committee."

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Arguments for Reference of S. 2750 to Rules Committee on Appeal From Ruling of Chair Referring to Judiciary Committee

1. Legally, both have claims to jurisdiction. Test is set by section 137 of Reorganization Act of 1946: "That committee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter which predominates in such proposed legislation."

(a) Under rule XXV(k) of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction over "judicial proceedings, civil and criminal, generally," and, concededly, this bill on its face consists of an amendment to a subsection of section 1971, title 42, United States Code, which in another subsection provides for civil action by the Attorney General to protect citizens' rights to vote.

(b) But everyone concedes that jurisdictional lines of committees necessarily overlap, and the claim of the Rules Committee is quite clear on the face of the bill: Rule XXV(o)(1)(D) calls for referral of all proposed legislation relating to "the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress; corrupt practices; contested elections; credentials and qualifications; Federal elections generally; * * *" S. 2750 is entitled "To protect the right to vote in Federal elections free from arbitrary discrimination by literacy tests or other means" and is entirely concerned with Federal elections and who may vote in them; section 1(b) consists of a finding relating to freedom of Federal elections from discrimination and "other corrupt influence"; and section 1(f) asserts the "power" of the Congress "to protect the integrity of the Federal electoral process."

2. Legally, the Rules Committee has the stronger claim to the substance of the bill:

(a) The bill relates only to Federal elections, not to elections for State or local offices. Congress' inherent power to regulate the election of its own Members is vested in the Rules Committee even though its power to regulate other elections may not be.

(b) There are strong precedents for Rules Committee reference: During this Congress five bills, S. 604 (which passed the Senate), S. 1555, S. 1623, S. 2080, and S. 2426, all relating to finances and corrupt practices in Federal elections, were referred to Rules, notwithstanding penal provisions and amendments to the Federal Criminal Code. Also, two bills prohibiting poll taxes or other property conditions for voting, S. 478 and S. 1259, were referred to Rules. The majority leader's own bill, S. 228, relating to presidential primaries, has been referred to Rules. And in the 86th Congress, S. 2814, dealing with voting registrars, was also referred to Rules. There are no contested precedents for reference to either Judiciary or Rules in the area of elections.

3. Most importantly, since both committees have a colorable legal claim, the question before the Senate on appeal from the ruling of the Chair is primarily one of policy: Does the Senate want action on this bill or does it not?

(a) Upon introduction of the bill its principal sponsor, the majority leader, has, to use his words, "made a plea on the floor of the Senate for early hearings so that administration representatives and other witnesses on both sides of the question may be heard." The majority leader is chairman of the Rules Committee and therefore in a position to assure such prompt action on a bill referred to his committee. It is clear that no action on the bill will be taken in committe if it is referred to Judiciary: virtually the same literacy test provision was first referred to that committee as part of S. 3829 which was introduced on August 19, 1960, in the 2d session of the 85th Congress. No action whatever was taken on it. It was reintroduced by itself as S. 480 on January 17, 1961, and again that committee has taken no action whatever on it. In 1960, when the Civil Rights Act was passed by the House, it was referred to Judiciary with directions to report within 5 days; even then that committee failed to include recommendations in its report.

(b) The majority leader, when asked about the possibility of inaction on S. 2750 last Thursday, said that, if his request "were not given consideration after an appropriate time," it would be his intention "to offer the proposal as an amendment to a measure pending before the Senate," the very procedure to which civil rights proponents have had to resort in the past. This is clearly an inadequate procedure because the Senate then has no opportunity to obtain the benefit of committee consideration of the measure, and arguments can then be made that the committee should have further time to act; that bills are inadequate unless screened in committee; that the pending measure is too unrelated even without a role of germaneness; or that the pending measure is too important to risk defeating with a controversial amendment.

CONCLUSION

The President * * * has asked in his state of the Union message for some civil rights legislation, mentioning * * * poll taxes and literacy tests. These were only two of the many recommendations of the Federal Civil Rights Commission in its voting report for 1961; the voting report was only one of five reports containing many legislative recommendations. At least the Congress should be able to pass this one measure promptly and in the usual manner.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield half of my remaining time, which I understand to be 6 minutes, to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas]. I therefore yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Illinois, who I understand wishes to use his time in a colloquy with the majority leader.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York has 6 minutes remaining. He now yields 3 minutes to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield 2 or 3 minutes also?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Illinois 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not wish to make a speech, but I do wish to address a question to the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield]. He introduced his bill last Thursday, January 25. In colloquy with the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] he expressed his desire that the Senate Judiciary Committee schedule early hearings. He then went on to say:

> It would be my intention, if the request were not given consideration after an appropriate time, to offer the proposal as an amendment to a measure pending before the Senate.

I am sure we all have great trust and faith in the Senator from Montana and in the sacredness of his pledged word. But we also know that opinions differ as to the proper interpretation of words. I am wondering if the Senator from Montana would be willing to define more precisely what he means by "after an appropriate time," and if he would say that he would move the proposal as an amendment to a measure pending before the Senate if the Judiciary Committee should fail to report the bill, either pro or con. I further ask the Senator from Montana if he would be willing to say that if after 30 or 60 days the Judiciary Committee had not reported the bill, he would then pledge himself to offer the proposal as an amendment to some measure pending before the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the inquiries raised by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, I think that the effect of his request would be to circumscribe quite drastically the flexibility which, in my opinion, the leadership must exercise. As I said last Thursday, when the bill was introduced, I believe that there should be hearings in the Judiciary Committee. I made a request to that effect at that time, and I stated that if no action was forthcoming by that committee within a reasonable length of time, it would be my intention to bring the matter to the floor of the Senate. To elucidate a little further on that particular aspect of the question raised, it would be my hope and intention that it could be applied as an amendment to a bill before the Senate. Thirty days is too short, too circumscribed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What about 60 days, then?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Sixty days is too short. I believe we must allow a little leeway both in the committee and on the floor of the Senate. I dislike to be pinned down on a question of this nature because I think it is bad practice, generally speaking. But I will say to my distinguished friend from Illinois that it would be my intention to undertake some kind of action on the proposal in the period between the 60 and 90 days. That is about as definite assurance as I can give, and I would not go any further than that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The statement of the Senator would apply if the Judiciary Committee did not report the bill, either favorably or unfavorably?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It would, indeed. However, I hope that in the meantime hearings will be held before the appropriate subcommittees of the Judiciary Committee and that action will be taken by the full committee. I point out to my friend from Illinois that the proposal of the Senator from New York [Mr.

JAVITS] to attach a measure to a pending bill is still available for use at any time and on any basis the Senator wishes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I very much appreciate the statement of the Senator. I never like to engage in combat if it is not necessary. So the assurance given that if the Judiciary Committee does not report the measure out in the space of 90 days, the Senator from Montana will move to have his bill considered directly by the Senate itself. I understand that is what he has said.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. It is my opinion, and my opinion only, that if the bill were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration it would take as long, if not longer, to report a bill from that committee. I repeat, that is my own personal opinion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Speaking only for myself, I would say that the assurance given is adequate. I do not know what the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] wishes to do, but I was not only prepared, but eager, to vote for the appeal of the Senator from New York. But in view of the assurance given, I personally do not think his appeal is necessary to get action on the subject. I do not know whether he feels that it is necessary or not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield about 2 minutes in order that I might ask him a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Georgia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Montana may be aware that some of us think that in order to attain the objective of the bill, the Constitution must be amended in the manner prescribed by the terms of that document.

I was not so naive as to think that we would get by in an election year without the South being cast in its traditional role of a political football. That is SOP—standard operating procedure—in the quest for minority votes in politics today. We try to be humble and modest and we southerners are therefore generously permitted to supply the votes necessary to elect Presidents and Vice Presidents of the United States on a Democratic ticket. I wonder if the Senator would be gracious enough to state whether or not he would notify those of us who think that the Constitution still has some relevancy and is worthy of mention 2 or 3 days before he moves to bring this measure before the Senate. May we rely upon having at least 48 hours' notice before the axe of the executioner is poised?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will say to my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Georgia, that he will have more than 48 hours' notice. He will have as much notice in advance as is possible, because I believe that is the only way to operate on the basis of equality in this Chamber.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. My cup of gratitude runneth over. We will try to respond by being present and discussing the issue.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield approximately 10 minutes to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, first I will say something about my cosponsorship with the majority leader of the bill that has been introduced and under reference to the Judiciary Committee, and then I shall say something about the appeal that is presently before us. I shall not support that appeal.

On July 27, 1960, the delegates to the Republican National Convention in Chicago adopted a platform which contained a pledge to secure "legislation to provide that the completion of six primary grades in a State accredited school is conclusive evidence of literacy for voting purposes."

That is about as specific as any pledge can be.

On July 12, 1960, delegates to the Democrat National Convention in Los Angeles adopted a platform containing a pledge "to support whatever action is necessary to eliminate literacy tests and the payment of poll taxes as a requirement for voting."

These pledges were separately and independently developed.

Here then, is the general concurrence of both major political parties with respect to the literacy test as an instrument for restricting the voting privilege.

The Republican Party pledge is quite specific and I direct especial attention to the fact that it pledges action through legislation and not by a constitutional amendment.

I am aware of the fact that to nullify the literacy test of a State, insofar as it applies to State and local elections, might give rise to a constitutional question. I am aware of the language of the 14th, 15th, and 17th amendments to the Constitution. I am aware also of the fact that they admit of various interpretations.

This has been considered by the platform drafters of both parties and also by the Civil Rights Commission. Protection of the right to vote is of paramount importance. Accordingly, I am joining with the distinguished majority leader in the cosponsorship of a bill which would make it unlawful to deny in any Federal election—that point deserves emphasis—the right to vote to any person because of his performance in a literacy test or other examination if such person has completed the sixth primary grade in any accredited public or private school.

This proposal is in accordance with and in pursuance of the civil rights programs initiated by the Republican platform of 1952 and carried forward since that time.

Mr. President, the bill in question is amendatory of the parent act, and that is the Civil Rights Act. That act, when a bill, was referred to the Judiciary Committee, and properly so. The present bill is an amendment to the parent act, and therefore has also been referred properly, I believe, by the Chair.

Much has been made of the fact that the Judiciary Committee is an adorned cemetery for a civil rights bill. One can be very unhappy about how a bill is received and handled in a committee. However, I am not sure that that is a warrant for departing from what I believe to be a settled precedent here. Properly speaking, the bill should go to the Judiciary Committee.

I would not be so bold as to affront the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary. He has been eminently affirmative always, and we do not have to look very far or go very far to find out where our distinguished friend the chairman of the subcommittee stands. The whole world knows where he stands. That is not the problem here. If we fail to observe what I believe to be a very firm precedent, it may rise up in another day to haunt us. I do not like to be in that very unhappy position. I do not confess the pessimistic spirit uttered by some Senators that it is impossible to get any action on the bill.

To be sure, the cloture approach is available, even though it may fail. However, I wish to say now for myself, even as the majority leader has indicated, that, consonant with the lapse of a reasonable amount of time, other action will be contrived.

I assure the Senate now that if perchance early hearings do not eventuate and early action does not come out of the subcommittee and the full committee—and I do not peg it in terms of weeks or months, but rather with the business of the Senate and of the subcommittee and of the committee as a background—I intend to pursue, under the rules of the Senate, every device at my command to get action. My name would not be on the bill today if I did not believe it ought to be enacted into law.

Therefore, there is available to every Senator, since we have no germaneness rule, an opportunity at any time within reason to offer the bill as an amendment to any pending bill in the Senate.

I must be candid with the Senate, so that a Senator will not sneak up on my blind side and say, "You should have given us some warning that you would try to hook this bill onto a bill that has come out of the Labor Committee or out of the Agriculture Committee or out of the Interior Committee or out of the Commerce Committee." I am not going to be selective in my choice. Once before we hooked a bill onto the Stella school district bill. How that little school district made history before we got through.

I am not going to limit myself to any bill reported by any committee whenever

I think the time is propitious and when I think the opportunity is here, because that is when I intend to propose the bill as an amendment to another bill. Every Member of the Senate should be on the alert now that that might come at any time after the lapse of a reasonable amount of time. Therefore, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], can alert his committee and hold hearings, no matter how long or short they may be.

There is nothing complicated about this matter. It is not a prolix bill in view of all the testimony that has been taken over the years on the whole subject of civil rights. Our distinguished friend from North Carolina will treat us fairly, I am sure. I shall watch, I shall wait, and then in due course I shall give notice—and I may say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], that I will be glad to give 10 days' notice or 2 weeks' notice—that I anticipate that a reported bill will be selected as a suitable vehicle and proper instrument to which to attach the measure which is now being referred.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois. Our ranks are a little thin these days and we are hard pressed to keep two men on guard here each and every hour and moment of the day, to avoid surprise attacks and ambuscades by those who are interested in this issue for reasons moral or political—I assume some of them are interested in it from what they consider a moral standpoint. It will avoid our having to stand here all the time and watch. I appreciate the Senator's assurance. I can assure him that we appreciate the assurance we will be notified. When we receive the notice we will endeavor to be on hand when the hour strikes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I believe it would be a real disservice to the Senate and to Senators who embrace the general viewpoint of the distinguished Senator from Georgia if he did not receive ample notice. I do not believe it is necessary for a Senator to have to be vigilant and to man the floor hour after hour and day after day because there is the danger that suddenly by surprise attack something will be offered. I intend to see to it that ample notice is given.

Mr. RUSSELL. I share the Senator's view with respect to surprise, and I hope all Senators will listen to what the Senator has said and to the remarks of the majority leader, if he shares that view, that that will be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Illinois. First I wish to aline myself with what the distinguished minority leader has said, and to assure the Senator from Georgia and all other Senators, regardless of their position, that at no time under any circumstances that I can foresee will there ever be a sneak attack on any group or any Senator, and that on all occasions, insofar as it is possible, all individual Senators concerned will be notified of actions being contemplated by the leadership.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The whole world knows that the majority leader is a man of probity and character and keeps his word. I trust in a modest degree I share something of that same reputation.

So speaking for myself, I give that assurance to the Senate. I want to see the bill passed; but also I want to see the precedents observed, if at all possible. For that reason, I feel impelled——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think the Senator should say "amenities"; it has not always been the precedent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That could well be. After I get the fine shade of meaning of the word "amenities" out of Webster, I may have that changed in the Record. But I am glad to share the viewpoint entertained by the Senator from New York with reference to the ruling of the Chair, because I think that ruling is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, before the Senator from Montana proceeds, will he yield for two questions which might enable us to come to some conclusion which would be satisfactory to all?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. After all, we are fencing a little bit. I do not think that is propitious for any of us. First, there is a question of a hearing. Can we get any assurance from the chairman of the subcommittee, who appears to have authority—although I was not aware of the fact that that is the way the Committee on the Judiciary was run, but I am delighted it is—that there will be hearings upon this measure within the time which the majority leader has described as an appropriate or a reasonable time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. If I may answer, before calling upon the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], chairman of that particular subcommittee, it is my understanding that as to all the civil rights bills introduced by various Senators on both sides of the aisle, none of the authors has requested hearings on such bills, except in the case of the bill to provide for an extension of the Civil Rights Commission. So I would not be willing to put the chairman of that subcommittee in the position of making a definite promise at this time, because he is an honorable man and will take note of the requests made by the leadership on this question. He is aware of what will happen if hearings are not held. I have every confidence, although I have not spoken to him about it, that hearings will be held.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as one Senator who is concerned with the subject, I herewith request hearings on S. 480, pending before the subcommittee.

May I ask one other question of the majority leader, so that we may be perfectly clear in our understanding? Will the majority leader tell us specifically—because we had such a specific statement on one occasion from the distinguished Vice President, who is now presiding, and it worked, and we actually had civil rights legislation in 1960—will the majority leader tell us that in the period between 60 and 90 days from today there will be brought before the Senate for action the bill which he has introduced, S. 2750, either as a bill or as an amendment to some other bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have made that statement in response to a question raised by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas]. When the bill was introduced on Thursday last, I indicated that that would be the procedure. I reiterate again what I have said twice previously.

Mr. JAVITS. But does the Senator reiterate what I have just asked him? The Senator may not be a lawyer, but he is using language that lawyers often use if they do not wish to answer specifically. It seems to me we cannot fence about these things.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am not fencing. I have said it is my intention to request hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary, or an appropriate subcommittee thereof; that if no action is taken within a 60- to 90-day period, I will do my best to see to it that the proposal is attached to a bill pending before the Senate. I cannot give a definite, absolute commitment, because if something extraordinary arose, I would feel that I would have to have that much leeway.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to pursue this colloquy. "No action" means that a bill has not been reported. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. If a bill is reported, will the Senator proceed with the bill upon the same understanding; namely, that within 60 to 90 days, again subject to any earth-shaking event—which we all understand might, in the national interest, dictate——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this colloquy is all coming out of my time. I have not had a word to say on this subject.

Any bill which is reported by the committee will be taken before the policy committee for action. To the best of my knowledge, there has never been a bill of any nature before the policy committee which was not reported.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I associate myself with the request of the Senator from New York to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], chairman of the subcommittee, that there be early hearings. I trust that this statement will serve as a formal request to that effect.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator from Illinois for saying that my position on so-called civil rights bills is well known. My position is based upon the fact that I have never yet seen a so-called civil rights bill which was not calculated, if not intended, to sell constitutional truth to serve the political hour.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston].

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the proposed legislation sponsored by the administration seeks to change, by statute, the qualifications for voters which previously have been laid out by the writers of the Constitution. This proposal would say to the 50 States that a sixth grade education can be the only literacy test that any State can apply to any voter as a prerequisite to voting.

Article I, section 2 of the Constitution of the United States says:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.

This, in itself, is plain language, needs no further interpretation. The language is clear and distinct, giving unto each State the absolute authority to determine the prerequisites for voting. Although this section was amended by the 17th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the 17th amendment in no way removes this right from the States. The 17th amendment to the Constitution states:

> The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

Mr. President, it is clear to even the most liberal thinker—if he applies legal and constitutional thinking to his reasoning—that we cannot amend the Constitution of the United States in the Senate and take away these rights which belong to the individual States.

Mr. President, the Washington Post newspaper, a publication in this city with which I am seldom found in agreement because of its liberal leanings, published Monday morning, January 29, an editorial entitled: "The Federal Right To Vote." This editorial in the Washington Post underscores the unconstitutionality of the amendment proposed by the administration and to the Senate by our distinguished majority leader, who has been joined in this effort by the distinguished minority leader. The Washington Post, I am sure, seeks to remove from the powers of the individual States not only what is sought in this bill, but even other rights given the States by the Constitution. With this I am in disagreement with the Washington Post, but even the Washington Post recognizes the unconstitutionality of the proposal to amend the Constitution in this manner.

Some Members of this body think that we legally can amend the Constitution. This, then, in itself places constitutional confliction on this legislation. We have in the organization of the U.S. Senate a Judiciary Committee to determine such matters. In the Judiciary Committee we have a Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. The Judiciary Committee is made up of some of the most distinguished legal minds in the country, and, in my opinion, this proposed legislation should be referred to this committee for study.

Mr. President, the question is on whether or not this bill will be referred to the Senate Committee on Rules or the Senate Judiciary Committee. It has been proven beyond question that this is a constitutional matter. In addition to that, there is a question that this is a legal matter. To say the least, it changes the statutes and, to tell the truth, it amends the Constitution of the United States. Under the rules of the Senate and the Reorganization Act it is clearly outlined that all matters relating to constitutional amendments, the revision of statutes of the United States, civil liberties, and, in fact, any other category that this proposed legislation could possibly fall into, must be referred to the Judiciary Committee. Nowhere can I find any authority for the reference of this type legislation to the Committee on Rules. It is obviously a proposal for a constitutional amendment, and no other committee in the Senate, in my opinion, has any authority in this matter.

In the interest of sound government I beseech that the Senators insist that this measure take the normal route, and refer it to the Senate Judiciary Committee. There is a grave constitutional question involved.

Mr. President, I ask that the article entitled "The Federal Right To Vote," from the Washington Post of January 29 be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 29, 1962]

THE FEDERAL RIGHT TO VOTE

Senate Majority Leader MANSFIELD is right in seeking to carry out the pledge of the Democratic Party in its 1960 platform "to eliminate literacy tests and the payment of poll taxes as requirements for voting," but he has chosen a method of doubtful constitutionality. The bill which the majority leader has introduced provides that a sixth grade education shall be the only literacy test for voters in presidential and congressional elections. It seeks to change by statute the qualifications for voters laid down in the Constitution.

The Founding Fathers appear to have left Congress no room for maneuver on this point. Article I, section 2, of the Constitution provides very pointedly that the electors (voters) in each State who are entitled to vote for Members of the House "shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." When the 17th amendment for the popular election of Senators was adopted in 1913 this precise language about the qualifications of electors was repeated. Congress does have authority to alter State laws prescribing "the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives," but this carries no suggestion of any right to prescribe voter qualifications different from those specified in the Constitution.

It is significant that President Kennedy originally selected Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK and Representative EMANUEL CELLER to translate the Democratic platform on civil rights into legislative form and that last year they introduced a proposed constitutional amendment which would forbid the States to abridge the right of any citizen to vote because of failure to pass a literacy test. There may be good reason to object to the complete elimination of literacy tests. Nevertheless, amendment of the Constitution is the proper tool for effectuation of this reform.

Since a constitutional amendment appears to be necessary, there is a powerful argument for making it comprehensive enough to guarantee all citizens the right to vote without discrimination. Congress could sweep away the poll tax, all unduly restrictive educational requirements and any other obstructive devices by simply amending article I, section 2, and the 17th amendment so as to give itself full authority to fix the qualifications of voters in Federal elections.

Doubtless there was good reason to leave this question solely in the hands of the States in 1787. No such reason exists in 1962. Certainly a Government exercising the power and influence that are currently evident in Washington should have authority to determine who shall vote in its elections and to make its policies effective. It would be a mistake, of course, to write any kind of educational requirement for voting into the Constitution, but it would be wholly reasonable to assign to Congress the whole subject of voter participation in Federal elections, while leaving the States free to control their own elections.

An administration move along this broad front would be far more satisfactory, in our opinion, than an attempt to legislate on voter qualifications in the face of a specific constitutional mandate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in reference to the queries that have been raised, I call the attention of Senators as a body to the fact that it is the responsibility of the combined leadership to schedule proposed legislation. The distinguished Senator from Illinois, the minority leader, and the Senator from Montana, who occupies the position of the majority leader, intend to continue to operate on that basis. We intend to be responsible for the handling of the business of the Senate and to do so in line with our commitments and with what we think will be in the best interests of the Senate.

In the absence of compelling reason to the contrary, it seems to me most desirable that this body follow orthodox procedures in considering matters which come before it. We introduced a measure having to do with literacy tests in connection with voting rights in Federal elections. The Chair has ruled that this measure should be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

It is within the right of every Senator to challenge a ruling of the Chair; but it is also within the right of every Senator to challenge the challenge. I do so for these reasons:

First, the operative part of the bill amends section 1971(b) of title 42 of the United States Code. This section bears the heading "Voting Rights—Race, Color, or Previous Condition Not To Affect Right To Vote." The right to vote, being based on article I, section 2, and the 15th amendment of the Constitution, is a constitutional right. Rule XXV of the Senate Rules provides that the Committee on the Judiciary shall have jurisdiction over civil liberties; and pursuant to that conferment of jurisdiction the Committee on the Judiciary has established a Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. This subcommittee has in the past conducted extensive hearings in the field of voting rights.

Second, this bill amends a section of the code—1971(b) of title 42—which was originally part of the Civil Rights Act of 1957—as title 4 of that act. The Civil Rights Act of 1957, which was H.R. 6127 of the 85th Congress, 1st session, was never referred to a Senate committee, but was instead placed on the Senate Calendar under the provisions of rule XIV. The proponents of this procedure recognized that, absent objections under that rule, the bill would have been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Third, subsection (c) of section 1971, title 42, makes provision for an action by the Attorney General for preventive relief whenever a person or persons has deprived, or is about to deprive another of rights secured by subsection (b)—which is amended by this bill. Subsection (c) was the heart of the Civil Rights Act of 1960, which, in the form of H.R. 8601, was in fact referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee. Consequently the enforcement power for subsection (b) was referred to the Judiciary Committee—March 24, 1960.

Earlier in this Congress—to wit, on January 17, 1961—the Senator from New York for himself and 12 other Senators, introduced a bill to prohibit the application of unreasonable literacy requirements with respect to the right to vote. This bill, S. 480, was referred, without objection being raised by either its proponents or opponents, to the Senate Judiciary Committee. Examination of S. 480 shows that it is very similar to S. 2750. Indeed, a Senator reading both bills would be compelled to say that or if S. 480 were referred to the Judiciary Committee, S. 2750 should also be referred to that committee.

While the question of reference is not without its controversial aspects, it seems relatively clear that this bill should be referred to the Judiciary Committee under the injunction of the Legislative Reorganization Act that a bill should be referred to "that committee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter which predominates in such proposed legislation"—section 137.

It would seem to me, therefore, that in the interests of orderly procedure, the challenge to the Chair's ruling should be rejected, and this bill should go to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the ranking member of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, if it becomes the will of the Senate to refer the bill to the Committee on Rules and Administration, of course I will do all I can to provide adequate hearings.

In 1957, I supported the distinguished Senator from California, Mr. Knowland, in bringing to the floor the so-called Civil Rights Act, which was the first one in a long time.

However, today we are faced with quite a different problem—namely, the question of whether we shall vote to override the ruling of the Vice President and whether we shall take action contrary to the wishes of the majority leader, who has a definite responsibility for programing the work of the Senate.

I believe that the reasoning stated by the Vice President is well grounded, and I believe that a vote to overrule his ruling would not be justified.

I also place great reliance on the statement made by the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. All of us know he will do what he has said he will do in regard to working out these matters in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, paragraph (D) of the rule pertaining to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the rule (No. XXV) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> (D) Matters relating to the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress; corrupt practices; contested elections; credentials and qualifications; Federal elections generally; Presidential succession.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, in my hurried study of this proposal, I find that the bill, as introduced, merely recites, in section 1, certain facts and grounds for legislation, and that the real meat of the proposal is in section 2. I doubt very much whether that falls in the category of a measure dealing with elections generally. It would amend a criminal statute providing punishment for interfering with the rights of other persons. It is not a proposal dealing with elections generally, their conduct, the times and places for holding them, and so forth.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall support the ruling of the Vice President and the position of the majority leader in connection with this matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, the ranking member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, for the statement he has made in support of the ruling made by the Chair.

Mr. President, it would be my hope that that committee would hold hearings on this measure promptly and report back promptly to the Senate. That is the responsibility of every committee on a matter of such significance, a matter which the administration is anxious for the Congress to consider. Members ought not to place themselves in the position of prejudging what other Members will or will not do. Certainly, I will not place myself in that position. It is my intention, as I said at the outset, to uphold orthodox procedure in this body, including the rulings of the Chair, in the absence of overriding reasons to the contrary. When such reasons clearly exist, then it would be my expectation that the bridge can be crossed when we come to it.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to vote "nay" on the appeal from the Chair's ruling of referral.

Mr. President, at this time I yield back all remaining time available to me except 2 minutes; and I yield now to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. MILLER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I support the position taken by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and other Senators who have addressed themselves to this matter in support of his appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I support the position taken by the majority leader.

One point that has not been brought out in the course of this very excellent debate is that there is serious question regarding the constitutionality of the bill. In that case, it seems to me the Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction over such questions, should have an opportunity to determine whether, in fact, the bill is unconstitutional.

I do not condone for a moment discriminatory practices regarding the precious voting privilege; but that does not mean that this bill would take care of such discriminatory practices.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the excellent lead editorial published today in the Wall Street Journal. The editorial is entitled "The Voting Privilege." It points out some of the very serious problems which must be considered in that connection, and does a very good job in pointing out that literacy can be a very appropriate test for the voting privilege.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 30, 1962]

THE VOTING PRIVILEGE

Though some of our readers may be surprised to learn it, we are the possessor of an official certificate from the State of New York testifying that we can read.

We achieved this because New York requires every voter to be able to read the English language, and strangers within its gates are required to so prove by taking a test. The test takes only a few minutes and is quite simple. Though the incident resulted in some joshing from our friends, it never occurred to us that the State of New York was curtailing our civil liberties by assuring itself we could follow public issues in the native language before giving us the privilege to vote on the determination of those issues.

But now we are being told by the President of the United States, and a number of other political leaders, that it is a wicked thing to make literacy a test for voting.

This is, in fact, but the latest among a series of moves, all put forward in the name of democracy or civil rights, to challenge any and all requirements for voting which the Constitution allows the several States to establish.

Under assault is the requirement in some States that a voter must be a taxpayer; that is, at the very least he must pay a $1.50 poll tax so that he must contribute something to the public funds before voting how to disburse them. Even the more general requirement that voters should have arrived at an age of maturity—at least be 21 years old—has been assailed as an infringement on the rights of teenagers.

The immediate cause of this latest attack on literacy requirements, of course, is the unhappy fact that among some minority groups there is widespread illiteracy in English. Many Puerto Ricans cannot speak it, much less read it. Among Negroes the literacy rate is far below that of the general population. And as any Army recruiting officer can tell you, there are other people who can't read their native tongue well enough to understand the simplest instructions. The politicians' immediate interest is that all these add up to many potential voters who would be grateful to the politician who won them the voting privilege.

Yet there is more at stake in the argument than the sheer demogoguery of wooing mass voting blocs. What is being assaulted is the whole concept that responsible democracy rests upon responsible voters; the child, the moron, the illiterate, the ignorant, the man who contributes nothing to the commonweal, the voice of each of these should be counted equally with the voice of the literate, the educated, the intelligent, and the informed.

Society, in this view, must not be permitted to protect itself with even the most rudimentary rules to make voting a privilege of those who have at least an elemental understanding of, and make some contribution to, the society in which they are privileged to live.

It would be fruitless to remind those of this persuasion that the American experiment owes its success to the wisdom of those who, in drawing its basic Constitution, knew the dependence of democracy upon a responsible citizenry and wrote in many more voting restrictions than we today would dream of. The reminder would not be persuasive because, among those people, traditional wisdom is hooted at.

But anyone ought to be able to look around and ask a few simple questions.

We have in our own house two teenagers who are highly literate, well-educated for their age and intelligent enough to hold the promise of being good citizens. Yet what parent is so blind as not to see that in their teens the young are still groping, and that fully responsible citizenship requires an understanding that is not yet theirs?

Like many people in this age of travel we have moved from one community to another. And though we be officially literate, what responsible judgment could we bring to a mayoralty election or to a referendum on some civic question until we had lived a space in the neighborhood? That we be barred from voting until there is some presumption of understanding is not an infringement of our civil rights but a protection both for ourselves and for the community.

We have our opinions, to be sure, on the affairs of Italy and of France. But our halting French and our total ignorance of Italian ill prepares us for intelligent voting on the issues which trouble those countries. To say, in our own country, that fluency in Spanish or some other language prepares a man to understand our political issues is speciousness. So what then of a man literate in no language?

For an answer you need only look around at the world where emerging nations are struggling with the problem of creating ordered democracy among people who have not yet grasped—through ignorance or apathy—that responsible democracy requires a responsible citizenry. The simple truth, which we suspect every man with commonsense knows in his heart, is that voting ought to be a privilege to be earned and that society must place upon it some restrictions to protect itself against the mob and the demagogs who would prey upon it.

To cast a ballot is a proud thing, and as a nation we ought to work hard to make that possible for all. But the way to do it is to lift up the underprivileged and not to heed those who would debase the privilege.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on the question of sustaining the ruling of the Chair, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been requested. Is there a sufficient number?

Obviously there is a sufficient number; and the yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have only 1 minute remaining under my control.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Ohio.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I contemplate voting in support of the position taken by the Senator from New York. I shall do so on the basis that it is my judgment that the measure referred to deals predominantly with voting rights. It is a fact that as an incident of that treatment of voting rights, some judicial procedures are under discussion. But there can hardly be any bill which comes before the Senate which—regardless of its substance—does not have incidentally related to it penalties and proceedings in court.

On the basis of this statement, Mr. President, I shall cast my vote in support of the argument made by the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute, and then I shall be through.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am impressed with the statements made by the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Illinois. I point out that here we shall be voting, in reality, on the question of the time and the opportunity for the Senate to act. I believe that if we consider all these arguments at their face value—I refer to the arguments as to what the Judiciary Committee will do and the arguments as to what the Senator from Montana will do—then Senators who take my view of the matter are in duty bound to vote to put this matter in the hands of the majority leader, in which case he will take into his own hands control of the proceedings both in that committee and, later, here on the floor of the Senate.

I honor his assurances, I am confident he is going to perform them, but I deeply believe we can perfect this procedure by sending this bill to the Rules Committee; and I hope the Senate will vote accordingly.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

The Senator from Montana has 8 minutes——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yielded back all my time except 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator yielded back all his time except 1 minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this debate has been quite illuminating. I hope the Senate will not sustain the appeal made by the Senator from New York and will sustain the ruling of the Chair, which is based on parliamentary findings, in the reference of the bill to a certain committee of this body. I think if we were to follow the procedure advocated by the Senator from New York, the result, in time, would be chaos, so far as the administration of the Senate is concerned; so I hope the tried and true and right method will be used.

I therefore move to lay on the table the appeal of the Senator from New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana to lay on the table the appeal of the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from California, [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Tennessee, [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico, [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea" and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent on official business to attend the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of American States.

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 25, as follows:

[No. 6 Leg.]

YEAS—61

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bennett
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case, S. Dak.
Church
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dworshak
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gruening
Hayden
Hickey
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan
Kefauver
Kerr
Long, Hawaii
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy

McClellan
McGee
Metcalf
Miller
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—25

Beall
Boggs
Bush
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Clark
Douglas
Fong
Hart
Hartke
Javits
Keating
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
McNamara
Morton
Neuberger
Proxmire
Scott
Smith, Mass.
Smith, Maine
Symington
Wiley
Williams, N.J.

NOT VOTING—13

Allott
Butler
Capehart
Carlson
Chavez
Cooper
Dodd
Engle
Gore
Hickenlooper
Humphrey
Monroney
Morse

So Mr. Mansfield's motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection with the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] a member of the Civil War Centennial Commission, vice the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis], who has found it necessary to submit his resignation.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Reprograming of Certain Funds for Renovation of Michoud Ordnance Plant, New Orleans, La.

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, its decision to reprogram certain funds for the renovation of the Michoud Ordnance Plant, New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Progress Report on Liquidation of Activities of Reconstruction Finance Corporation

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of the liquidation activities of the national defense, war and reconversion activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for the quarter ended December 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Interim Report on Research Progress and Plans of U.S. Weather Bureau

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, an interim report on research progress and plans of the U.S. Weather Bureau, for the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Title 10, United States Code, Relating to Presidential Control of Transportation Systems in Time of National Emergency

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the President to take possession and assume control of transportation systems in time of national emergency (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of Civil Aeronautics Board

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Purchase of United Nations Bonds

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a paper written by the Bureau of International Organization Affairs, dated January 19, 1962, relating to the proposed purchase by the U.S. Government of United Nations bonds (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Audit Report on Federal Prison Industries, Inc.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Audit Report on Public Housing Administration

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Administration of Forest Management Activities by Portland Area Office, Bureau of Indian Affairs

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of administration of forest management activities by Portland area office, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, dated January 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Examination of Procurement of Special Tooling for the B-58 Airplane Program

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of procurement of special tooling for the B-58 airplane program under Department of the Air Force negotiated cost-plus-incentive-fee contracts with Convair, a division of General Dynamics Corp., Fort Worth, Tex., dated January 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Amendment of Act Relating to Customs and Immigration Facilities

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of customs and immigration laws," to increase the amounts authorized to be expended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

Report of Atomic Energy Commission

A letter from the Chairman and members, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Sixth Guam Legislature; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Resolution 249

"Resolution relative to respectfully petitioning and memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States for legislation to provide the territory of Guam with a locally elected chief executive

"Whereas the people of the territory of Guam have been living under American administration ever since the island's acquisition from Spain in 1898, and as a result of learning to live in an American run community, the people of Guam have been educated over the years in democratic practices and procedures and as they have learned of democracy and its ideals, the United States has generously opened up ever larger areas of public control, thus in 1950 granting U.S. citizenship and a locally elected legislature; and

"Whereas as part of the American administration of this territory, public education has been made available to all at no or little cost, our schools being fully accredited and our students accepted in mainland institutions with the result that our younger population has had the opportunity to be educated in democracy and in the principles of American self-government and with the further result that this educational process has made us all eager to assume even greater responsibility in the field of local government; and

"Whereas the proof of our devotion to the ideals of American democracy in which we had been educated and raised over the years is best given by the services rendered by so many of our young people in the Armed Forces of the United States both in peace and in war, these soldiers, sailors, and airmen fighting and dying not as mercenaries but as American citizens dedicated to the principles for which our country stands; and

"Whereas following the boon of American citizenship and a limited degree of self-government extended by the said Organic Act so generously enacted by the Congress of the United States, the people of Guam have demonstrated their adherence to the principles of American democracy both in the administration of their civil government and in the manner and conduct of their election contests, which leads the people of Guam to believe that they have established sufficient political maturity to enable them to request the privilege of electing their own Chief Executive; and

"Whereas Guam is aware that, traditionally, American territories as opposed to States are governed by an appointed Governor and an elected legislature in the interim before formal organization as a State and acceptance into the Union, but this pattern does not appear to be appropriate for this territory since no one locally expects or aspires to statehood and that therefore to continue with an appointed Governor while awaiting acceptance into the Union is deemed a forlorn hope as the likelihood of statehood is neither high nor even desirable; and

"Whereas in the recent past, various high officials, both of the executive and congressional branches of the Federal Government, have expressed the belief that Guam is ready to assume the responsibility of electing its own Chief Executive, which statements have been made a matter of record both in the territory of Guam and in our Capital, and which have led many of the residents of

Guam to hopefully anticipate the granting of such a privilege: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Sixth Guam Legislature, in view of the foregoing does hereby respectfully petition and memorialize the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to initiate and enact legislation to provide the territory of Guam with a locally elected Chief Executive; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution do also serve as a further acknowledgment and expression of gratitude on behalf of the people of Guam for the magnanimous grant of citizenship and limited self-government heretofore given to the territory; the sentiments of this resolution being in no way intended to criticize the United States of America and its Government for its direction and control over the affairs of this territory since its acquisition from Spain, but embodying a heartfelt request that in response to the attempts of the people of Guam to live up to the goals of American democracy, the further grant that the selection of the chief official of this territory be placed in the hands of the voters of Guam; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Speaker certify to and the Legislative Secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House, to the chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, to the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and to the Governor of Guam.

"Duly adopted on the 22d day of January 1962.

"V. B. BAMBA,
"*Legislative Secretary.*
"A. B. WON PAT,
"*Speaker.*"

A Declaration of Paris, adopted by the Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations, in Paris, on January 8, 1962; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., of Detroit, Mich., relating to the observance of the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian independence; to the Committe on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] and myself, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations upon the death of Congressman Samuel Taliaferro Rayburn. This resolution was passed by the general assembly at the January session, A.D. 1962, and aproved by the Governor on the 11th day of January 1962.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 1094

Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations upon the death of Congressman Samuel Taliaferro Rayburn, for 2 decades Speaker of the House of Representatives in Washington, D.C.

Upon November 16, 1961, there died Samuel Taliaferro Rayburn, for 2 decades Speaker of the House of Representatives in Washington, D.C.

He was 79 years old and had been a Representative from the Fourth District of Texas for 49 years. Pioneer "Sam" Rayburn was one of the last of a generation of American politicians whose early life was spent in pioneer surroundings, settling on politics as a career early in life. His life revolved around the House and national politics. Long before he left Washington for the last time, he had said "I am satisfied. My political career has climaxed everything I ever hoped or trusted it might be, so that when I leave here I will leave without any regrets."

The Nation mourns his passing—one of the great leaders of all time—and in this evaluation of his highly specialized prestige, the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations adds its acclaim; directing the secretary of state to transmit to the next of kin a duly certified copy of this resolution.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 2762. A bill authorizing the modification of the general plan for flood control and other purposes on Red River, Tex., Okla., Ark., and La., below Denison Dam, Tex. and Okla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Louisiana when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2763. A bill for the relief of Marie Karoline Dollar and Alex Peter Pedersen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2764. A bill to make the civil forfeiture provisions of section 222(h) of the Interstate Commerce Act applicable to unlawful operations and safety violations by motor carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN (by request):

S. 2765. A bill to amend section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946; to provide for regulation by the President of the employment of experts or consultants or organizations thereof; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FONG:

S. 2766. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tom Pon Shee (also known as Tom Pon Ma Cheung); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 2767. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways in order to require the approval of the Secretary of the Interior to surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates for projects on the Federal-aid highway systems for the purpose of protecting fish and wildlife and recreation resources; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. METCALF when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2768. A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 2769. A bill for the relief of Renato Granduc O'Neal and Grazia Granduc O'Neal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ENTITLED "STUDY OF ADMINISTERED PRICES IN THE DRUG INDUSTRY"

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 287); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary two thousand additional copies of Senate Report Numbered 448, Eighty-seventh Congress, first session, entitled "Study of Administered Prices in the Drug Industry", a report issued by the Committee on the Judiciary and made by its Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly pursuant to S. Res. 52, Eighty-seventh Congress.

MODIFYING EXISTING AUTHORIZATION OF FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, sometime ago several necessary flood control projects were authorized by the Congress, but unfortunately up to this time they have not been accomplished because the language of the authorization required local contributions beyond the financial ability of the local people to meet.

It is my feeling that the language requiring these local contributions did not express the recommendation of the engineers who made the study, but rather it was a requirement that was added on as the project approached higher authority.

Every public works project which is authorized for construction contains certain provisions of local cooperation. All of these involve considerable expense to the people. These include the furnishing without cost to the United States of all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction of the project; frequently the construction at the expense of the local people of such things as bridges and approaches and the making of necessary relocations or alterations of public utilities required for the project; frequently the rehabilitation of drainage systems; and always holding and saving the United States free from damages resulting from the construction work and operating the works after the project is completed.

In my opinion, these things are sufficient to represent the contribution of the local interest and many times the fulfillment of these conditions is an expensive, laborious, time-consuming, and complicated process that must be completely undertaken before the actual construction can commence.

Accordingly, I am introducing a bill to remove local contribution factors from three authorized flood control projects: First, the McKinney Bayou project in Arkansas and Texas; second, the Maniece Bayou project in Arkansas; and third, the East Point project in Louisiana.

In my opinion, the adjustment of the authorizations of these projects along the lines recommended by this proposed legislation is necessary for the proper progress of the work of flood control in the Red River Valley.

Mr. President, I introduce the bill and ask for its appropriate reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2762) authorizing the modification of the general plan for flood control and other purposes on Red River, Tex., Okla., Ark., and La., below Denison Dam, Tex. and Okla., introduced by Mr. LONG of Louisiana, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

APPLICABILITY OF CIVIL FORFEITURE PROVISIONS OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT TO UNLAWFUL OPERATIONS AND SAFETY VIOLATIONS BY MOTOR CARRIER

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to make the civil forfeiture provisions of section 222(h) of the Interstate Commerce Act applicable to unlawful operations and safety violations by motor carriers, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Commission requesting the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2764) to make the civil forfeiture provisions of section 222(h) of the Interstate Commerce Act applicable to unlawful operations and safety violations by motor carriers, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., January 25, 1962.
The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MAGNUSON: I am submitting herewith for your consideration 40 copies of a draft bill, together with a statement of justification therefor, which would give effect to legislative recommendation No. 4 in the Commission's 75th Annual Report.

We would very much appreciate your assistance in having this bill introduced and scheduling a hearing thereon.

Sincerely,

RUPERT L. MURPHY,
Chairman.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

This proposed bill would give effect to legislative recommendation No. 4 of the Interstate Commerce Commission as set forth on page 186 of its 75th annual report as follows:

"We recommend that section 222(h) be amended so as to (a) extend the civil forfeiture provisions therein to unlawful operations and safety violations by motor carriers, (b) permit the Commission to institute forfeiture actions directly in the courts, and (c) increase substantially the amount of the forfeitures prescribed."

JUSTIFICATION

The purpose of the attached draft bill is to provide the Interstate Commerce Commission with a more effective means of combating the spread of illegal and so-called "gray area" motor-carrier operations which are sapping the strength of the Nation's regulated common carrier system. It is also designed to aid the Commission in its stepped-up motor-carrier safety enforcement program.

Under existing law, procedures for dealing with certain motor-carrier violations are often slow and cumbersome, and frequently ineffective. Criminal prosecutions, for example, must be brought in the district in which the violations occurred. Thus, in the case of multiple violations by a carrier with extensive territorial operations, it may be necessary to institute separate actions in several district courts if all of the violations are to be covered. Civil forfeiture proceedings, on the other hand, may be instituted in the district in which the carrier maintains its principal office, where it is authorized to operate, or where it can be found. Moreover, less time is needed for investigating violations because of the difference in quantum of proof required in such proceedings.

Under the proposed amendment a civil forfeiture action could be brought against a for-hire motor carrier for transporting property without a required certificate or permit. Such action would be available whether or not the carrier had taken steps to give the operation an appearance of legality, but the principal enforcement advantage that would accrue would be when the operator, by means of an alleged vehicle lease or an alleged purchase of the commodity hauled, has attempted to give the operation an appearance of private carriage. More specifically, an owner of a vehicle may enter into a vehicle lease arrangement with a manufacturer, under which the manufacturer allegedly uses the vehicle in private carrier operations. Such arrangements range all the way from a bona fide lease of a vehicle, at one extreme, to the most obvious sham at the other. No enforcement action is, of course, involved in the case of a bona fide lease. The obvious shams, however, are the subject of criminal prosecution.

While there are a number of vehicle arrangements which the Commission believes to be illegal for-hire carriage by the vehicle owner, it is doubtful that a criminal conviction could be secured because of the necessity of showing knowledge and willfulness and proving guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. In addition, in a criminal proceeding there can be no appeal from an acquittal. Such cases are now handled in the civil courts, but an injunction against such operations in the future is all that can be secured. The possibility of a civil injunction action, where there is no pecuniary penalty or criminal stigma involved, has very little effect as a deterrent to would-be violators. A civil forfeiture action, such as that proposed, carrying with it substantial monetary penalties should, on the other hand, have a strong deterrent effect against questionable leasing arrangements.

Operations sometimes referred to as "buy and sell" operations are very similar in effect. By allegedly purchasing merchandise the transporter represents the operation to be private carriage. As in the case of leasing arrangements these operations have many variations, some of which present close questions as to whether the operation constitutes for-hire carriage. Some are obviously illegal for-hire operations and are handled as criminal cases. Others, however, are not so clearly unlawful as to warrant criminal action for the reasons stated above in connection with questionable leasing arrangements, but which, in the Commission's view, are nevertheless unlawful. Such operations may be continued for substantial periods during the pendency of a civil injunction proceeding and before a cease and desist order is issued by the court. If the proposed amendment were enacted a number of these cases could be made the subject of a civil forfeiture action in which, if successful, the operator would suffer a money judgment or forfeiture.

Enactment of the proposed legislation would also greatly facilitate the Commission's enforcement activities in the important area of motor carrier safety. Although a very high percentage of cases involving violations of the Commission's safety regulations are disposed of by pleas of guilty or nolo contendere, investigations looking toward such prosecutions are nevertheless extremely time consuming because of the necessity of proving to the court every element of the alleged criminal offense. Since the quantum of proof required in a civil forfeiture proceeding is not as great as that required in a criminal action, a substantial amount of the time that must now be spent in preparing for criminal prosecutions in such cases could be devoted to handling a larger number thereof under the recommended forfeiture procedure.

The Commission's efforts at more effective and expeditious enforcement would also be greatly enhanced if it were authorized to institute forfeiture proceedings directly in the courts instead of proceeding through the Department of Justice as it is now required to do. Delays would be avoided not only by eliminating the mechanics involved in taking the extra step, but also by the elimination of such delays as may be caused by the time consumed in convincing the U.S. attorney that an action should be filed.

These proposed amendments, coupled with a substantial increase in the amount of the forfeitures prescribed, would strengthen the Commission's hand considerably in dealing with some of the principal factors contributing to the decline of regulated common carriers.

AMENDMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES ACT OF 1946, RELATING TO PRESIDENTIAL REGULATION OF CERTAIN EMPLOYMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, to provide for regulation by the President of the employment of experts or consultants or organizations thereof, and for other purposes.

This bill is introduced at the request of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and is intended to provide general authority for the employment of individuals or organizations of experts and consultants; Presidential regulation of conditions under which individuals or firms may be procured, used, and compensated for such services, and to remove inconsistencies and confusion relative to the compensation of such individuals.

This draft legislation would place in effect the recommendations contained in the Bureau of the Budget's report on "Employment of Experts and Consultants in the Executive Branch," submitted to the Subcommittee on General Government Matters of the House Committee on Appropriations under date of January 16, 1961.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to the President of the Senate from the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget, dated August 31, 1961, which sets forth additional justification and background on this proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2765) to amend section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946; to provide for regulation by the President of the employment of experts or consultants or organizations thereof; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MCCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. MCCLELLAN is as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF
THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., August 31, 1961.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are submitting the enclosed proposed legislation amending section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) for the consideration of the Congress. This draft bill would provide: (1) general authority for the employment of individual or organizations of experts and consultants without the need for additional authority in appropriation or other acts; (2) Presidential regulation of the conditions under which individuals or firms may be procured, used, and compensated for such services; and (3) that all authorizations in other statutes for use of experts and consultants be subject to Presidential regulation issued under section 15 unless specifically exempted by statute. A section analysis is also enclosed with this letter.

This draft legislation would place in effect the recommendations contained in the Bureau of the Budget's report on "Employment of Experts and Consultants in the Executive Branch," submitted to the Subcommittee on General Government Matters of the House Committee on Appropriations on January 16, 1961. That report, a copy of which is enclosed, contains detailed justification for the proposed legislation.

The proposed bill would remove inconsistencies and confusions in connection with various authorities for obtaining the services of experts and consultants, and would authorize the President to establish general executive branch policy with respect to such services. The Bureau of the Budget recommends favorable action by the Congress on this draft bill.

Sincerely yours,
ELMER B. STAATS,
Acting Director.

DRAFT OF A BILL TO AMEND SECTION 15 OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES ACT OF 1946; TO PROVIDE FOR REGULATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE EMPLOYMENT OF EXPERTS OR CONSULTANTS OR ORGANIZATIONS THEREOF; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 810, 5 U.S.C. 55a), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The head of any department may procure the temporary (not in excess of one year) or intermittent services of individual experts or consultants (including stenographic reporters) by appointment as employees of the United States without regard to the civil service or classification laws.

"(b) The head of any department may procure the temporary (not in excess of one year) or intermittent services of experts or consultants or organizations thereof, including stenographic reporting services, as independent contractors and, except in the case of stenographic reporting services by organizations, without regard to advertising requirements of 10 U.S.C. 2304; section 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5); section 302 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, 63 Stat. 393, as amended (41 U.S.C. 252); or any similar law requiring advertising.

"(c) The President shall establish such regulations and require such reports as he deems appropriate relative to procurement, utilization, and compensation of the temporary or intermittent services of experts or consultants or organizations thereof under the provisions of this section or under any other law: *Provided,* That the compensation of individuals appointed under subsection (a) and contractors whose services are procured under subsection (b) of this section shall be reasonable by comparison with that paid them by other Government and non-Government clients, and by comparison with rates charged the Government by similarly qualified individuals or organizations."

SEC. 2. Any reference in any other Act to section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U.S.C. 55a), shall be construed to include the amendments to such section made by this Act.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF SECTION 15 OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES ACT

SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1: Subsection (a) of the amendment would authorize department heads to procure the temporary (not in excess of 1 year) or intermittent services of individual experts or consultants and individual stenographic reporters, by appointment as employees of the United States, without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act. It differs from the present provision of section 15 in that it permits appointment as temporary employees, it does not contain a legislatively imposed maximum rate of pay, and it does not require supplementary provisions in other general or appropriation acts in order to use the authority.

Subsection (b) would authorize the department heads to procure similar services of experts or consultants or organizations thereof, including stenographic reporting services, as independent contractors. Such services, except stenographic reporting services by organizations, could be obtained without regard to the other laws requiring advertising of contracts.

Subsection (c) would direct the President to establish such regulations and require such reports as he considers appropriate relative to the use of experts and consultants by the agencies. It would make those regulations applicable to expert and consultant services procured under this provision or any other act, to the extent consistent with each act. Such other acts would include the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, the Armed Services Procurement Act, and other individual agency authorities. A proviso would require that the compensation of employees and contractors be reasonable by comparison with that paid them by other Government and non-Government clients, and by comparison with rates charged the Government by similarly qualified individuals or organizations.

Section 2: This would provide that any reference in any other act to section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act would be construed to include the amendents provided in section 1 of this act.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 23, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO HIGHWAYS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to require the approval of the Secretary of the Interior to surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates for projects on the Federal-aid highways systems, for the purpose of protecting fish and wildlife and recreation resources.

Highway construction is ruining many superb fishing streams. The problem which this legislation seeks to correct was well stated in a letter to me, dated January 9, 1962, from Director Walter J. Everin, of the Montana Fish and Game Department, in response to my request for information on stream damage, as a consequence of highway construction. Mr. Everin said:

As indicated by the enclosed reports we have made several requests to the Montana Highway Department that sections of proposed highways be rerouted to avoid damaging trout streams. To date we have not had a major request granted. The highway department has cooperated in saving a few natural stream meanders but only when there was no additional cost involved or the cost was negligible. In at least one instance a highway was routed into a trout stream to avoid the cost of moving a powerline.

Only on national forest land has adequate consideration been given to stream preservation during highway routing and construction. This is due, of course, to the fact that permits must be obtained before construction can be undertaken on national forests.

The basic problem is that by State law the highway department chooses the routes and makes decisions as to what considerations are important. There appears to be little question but that routing a highway up a stream valley is often the cheapest from the point of view of highway construction alone. Then, too, Congress has exerted pressure to keep Federal-aid highway construction as economical as possible.

The highway department maintains that the Bureau of Public Roads will not approve the additional costs involved in saving streams. We have been told that the highways could be built away from streams but that the public has given no indication of being willing to pay the extra costs.

Fishermen spent $36 million pursuing their sport in Montana last year. In other words, fishing is important enough to the State's economy alone that it should not be allowed to dwindle away for lack of concern. Good fishing depends, more than anything else, on good habitat, that is, natural stream meanders, pools, riffles, clean water, etc. At least 75 percent of the trout creeled in Montana originate from natural spawning. This is the fishing we are trying to protect from ruin due to stream alteration. Once lost it cannot be replaced.

Part of the answer, it appears to us, is legislation that will protect fish habitat when projects are built with Federal funds.

Eugene B. Welch, pollution control biologist for the Montana Fish and Game Department, concluded a recent study of changing fish habitat by stating that Montana trout streams "are slowly being eaten away by legitimate processes carried on under the guise of progress. Individually the losses do not appear great in most cases; however, grouped they are staggering."

In his report, "Destruction of Natural Fish Habitat Is Ruining Montana's Fishing Streams," November 15, 1961, Welch describes highway construction as the most destructive type of channel realinement. Welch reported that on 24 streams or segments of streams surveyed in 1961, 78.4 miles of original channel were lost. Meanders were cut off and the water diverted into new, shorter, straightened channels. The water velocity is thus increased and, in many cases, the stream bank—which has been cleared of vegetation—is eroded, causing sedimentation downstream.

This problem exists in many States. Welch reports that where there were once 1,200 miles of trout streams in the Black Hills of South Dakota, there are now only 160 miles remaining that will support trout. South Dakota biologists attribute the major portion of this loss to highway construction and the sediment pollution it produces. The President's Pollution Control Advisory Board considers highway construction as a major cause of sediment pollution and stream destruction. I shall place in the RECORD, following these remarks, an article concerning a controversy over road routing in Utah.

I hasten to point out, Mr. President, that Montana continues to furnish the best trout fishing in the world, in the Madison, Gallatin, Big Hole, Beaverhead, Yellowstone, Rock Creek—near Missoula—Spring Creek—which runs through Lewistown—and other streams.

Of course, we all want good roads. They are being built. But I am alarmed by the destruction of an irreplaceable resource, sport fishing streams, by road routing and construction. I hope, Mr. President, that this matter will receive the attention of the Congress this year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert, immediately following these remarks, the Welch report to which I have referred; an article, "Logan Canyon Portends National Road Implications," which appeared in the December 15, 1961, issue of Conservation News, published by the National Wildlife Federation; an article, "Detrimental Effects of Highway Construction on a Montana Stream," by Arthur N. Whitney and Jack E. Bailey, published in 1959 in Transactions of the American Fisheries Society; recent reports by the Montana Fish and Game Department on the effect of proposed interstate routes in the Dillon-Armstead and Helena-Wolf Creek areas of Montana; and the text of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the articles, reports, and bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2767) to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways in order to require the approval of the Secretary of the Interior to surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates for projects on the Federal-aid highway systems for the purpose of protecting fish and wildlife and recreation resources, introduced by Mr. METCALF, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The articles, reports, and bill are as follows:

DESTRUCTION OF NATURAL FISH HABITAT IS RUINING MONTANA'S FISHING STREAMS

(By Eugene B. Welch, pollution control biologist, Montana Fish and Game Department, November 15, 1961)

What is happening to Montana's fishing? Is it declining because of increased fishing pressure? Or is it because the Fish and Game Department isn't planting enough fish? These two possibilities can be ruled out because about three-fourths of the fish caught are wild fish and in even the most heavily fished streams, the wild trout populations are underharvested. These facts have prevailed in the face of increased trout stocking.

Records show a sevenfold increase in the catchable trout stocking program over the 10 years from 1948 to 1958. With all of these fish being planted it would seem our streams would soon be full of trout and fishing would be getting better and better. Why doesn't this happen? Biologists have shown that habitat is the key to good trout fishing. That is, a stream must have adequate cover for trout, preferably brush and undercut banks which are formed by a meandering stream. The stream must have adequate spawning conditions—this means little or no sediment pollution. And adequate food conditions must prevail—which again means little or no pollution of any form (sediment, organic waste, pesticides, or industrial waste). Yes, trout are fussy, and if any of these ingredients for good habitat are missing, a desirable trout fishery, the type that lures anglers from all over the United States to Montana, will also be missing regardless of how many hatchery fish are planted. However, if adequate habitat is available, wild trout can maintain a fishery, in most streams, without stocking.

Realizing the extreme importance of Montana's wild trout fishery and the fact that two-thirds of the Montana anglers prefer stream fishing, what is being done to preserve these streams so they will produce trophy trout for future generations? Tourists are not attracted by large reservoirs with expanses of exposed mud flats—that is not the kind of trout fishing Montana is famous for. It is the productive trout streams like the Madison, Gallatin, Big Hole, Beaverhead, Yellowstone, and Rock Creek (near Missoula), to name a few, that have branded Montana as a famous trout fishing State. The reason they have been productive is because the right kind of habitat has been present.

What is happening to our trout streams? They are slowly being eaten away by legitimate processes carried on under the guise of progress. Individually the losses do not appear great in most cases; however, grouped they are staggering. What are these processes? They are as follows:

1. Channel realinement by highway construction, railroad construction, individual landowners, municipalities, and various Federal agencies. Highway construction is the most destructive.

2. Dewatering of the natural streams for irrigation. Without water it is not possible to raise fish. If only the flow is cut for one day—the protection is taken away from the fish revealing it to predators or else the fish dies from increased water temperature and oxygen reduction.

3. Sediment pollution from overgrazing, irrigation waste water, logging, or mine wastes. Sediment seals the fate of fish by decreasing reproduction and the food supply. It does not kill fish directly under natural conditions.

4. Other forms of pollution: industrial waste, pesticides, etc.

5. Stream bank destruction, such as brush removal, overuse by cattle, diking for flood protection, and bank stabilization with car bodies, steel riprap, etc. These all have the effect of removing the all-important cover from the bank which is necessary for trout.

How extensive are the processes of habitat destruction in Montana? How many miles of stream have been affected? To partially answer these questions we might look at highway construction and the impact it has had and will have on several streams in the State. Twenty-four streams, or segments of streams (see appendix), were surveyed during 1961 and were found to have lost at least 78.4 miles of their original channel to highway construction. Meanders were cut off and the water diverted into new, shorter, straightened channels. The water velocity is thus increased and in many cases the streambank (which has been cleared of vegetation) is eroded, causing sedimentation downstream.

What effect does straightening the channel have on the fish population, the water is still there even though the area is reduced? Studies have shown that as much as 94 percent of the fish 6 inches long and over can be eliminated from a section of stream that was straightened to follow the highway. Even if the stream is given several years to recover there are still only 4 catchable-size trout where there once were 10. The removal of brush cover (coincident with highway construction) has been shown to decrease or even eliminate a fish population.

South Dakota biologists have shown where there were once 1,200 miles of trout streams in the Black Hills, a renowned recreation area, there are now only 160 miles remaining that will support trout. They attribute the major portion of this loss to highway construction and the sediment pollution it produces. The President's Pollution Control Advisory Board considers highway construction as a major cause of sediment pollution and stream destruction.

A pilot study was run by the fish and game department on the Little Big Horn River in which all types of channel alteration were considered. A total of 54 miles (45 percent of the total length) of original stream channel were lost or altered to the point of being unsuitable for trout.

A few words might be said about stream improvement. Stream improvement devices have not been found to take the place of natural cover. Michigan has been the leader in this field and they have given up widespread use of improvement structures as too costly with too few dividends. They have gone to improvement of the entire watershed under the theory that a stream depends on a well-vegetated watershed in addition to an undisturbed flood plain and without them it is not possible to improve a stream. With a good watershed producing water of sufficient quality and quantity the natural meandering of the stream will create desirable trout habitat. Of course, the stream has to be allowed to meander. Michigan has chosen to treat the real cause rather than the symptom.

Montanans must take action if the valuable trout streams of the State are to be preserved. With proper consideration and direction our trout streams can remain in a natural, productive condition long after highways have come and gone. However, if highways are built at the expense of the trout stream, Montana will soon be holding a postmortem similar to that on the now ruined trout streams in the Black Hills of South Dakota.

APPENDIX

Summary of channel changes caused by highway construction on 24 streams surveyed in 1961

Stream	Nearest landmark	Miles of stream lost
North Fork, Blackfoot River.	Ovando, Mont	0.50
Bitterroot River	Florence, Mont	1.00
Skalkaho Creek	Hamilton, Mont	.37
West Fork, Bitterroot River.	do	.34
East Fork, Bitterroot River.	do	1.83
Bridger Creek	Bozeman, Mont	1.00
Big Spring Creek	Lewistown, Mont	1.80
Clark Fork River (below Drummond to Missoula).		21.17
St. Regis River	St. Regis, Mont	12.00
West Gallatin River	Bozeman, Mont	6.52
Little Big Horn River	Hardin, Mont	1.78
Boulder River	Boulder, Mont	3.70
Deep Creek	Townsend, Mont	4.17
Sheep Creek	White Sulphur Springs.	2.53
Belt Creek	Monarch, Mont	4.40
Bison Creek	Boulder, Mont	.45
Beaverhead River	Armstead, Mont	.55
Do	Pipe Organ Lodge	[1] 1.62
Lower Prickley Pear Creek.	Clancy, Mont	2.15
Newlan Creek	White Sulphur Springs.	.70
Otter Creek	Raynesford, Mont	2.85
Prickley Pear Creek	Wolf Creek, Mont	[1] 5.49
Cut Bank Creek	Browning, Mont	[1] .25
Rocky Creek	Bozeman, Mont	[1] 1.50
Total		78.40

[1] Proposed.

LOGAN CANYON PORTENDS NATIONAL ROADS IMPLICATIONS

Regional Forester Floyd Iverson, when interviewed by TV newscasters about the refusal of the Forest Service to grant a permit to improve a highway in Logan Canyon, Utah, stated that the action could have national effects. A large segment of citizens would hasten to add beneficial effects. Mr. Iverson told the Utah Highway Department and the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads that his agency is under increasing fire from groups throughout the Nation who protest marring of the natural beauties of forest lands.

Thus a series of negotiations has come to an apparent plateau for the time being. The highway department and Forest Service have worked on plans to improve the highway and still retain the scenic beauties and fishing for which Logan Canyon is famous. News releases state the two agencies are about $125,000 apart on a 4⅓-mile section of canyon highway. The meeting held on November 22 came to an impasse when neither side felt it could compromise further on the basic issues involved.

If authorities see fit to put the $125,000 addition into the project, what then? Just this—it still ends up being a compromise as far as the scenic values and retaining proper conditions for fish life are concerned. The decision to allow even this much destruction is causing a wave of wincing among people who know the fragile nature and importance of trout streams. How firm can one stand in the way of progress and still be practical?

Details of negotiations in this case are difficult to report. According to press releases from Salt Lake City, the State highway commission has, in a period of weeks, changed its mind several times on how to handle this negotiation.

The Logan Canyon case may be a promise that whenever new or improved highway projects are contemplated on forest lands the Forest Service will resist pressures to insist on all of the numerous land uses being taken into account. Increasing pressure for road rights-of-way, reservoir sites, energy and communication lines, public use areas, commercial operations, recreation facilities, and other uses will require increasing careful planning and long-range viewpoints so a hodgepodge of cluttered countryside will not occur on these Federal lands as is so often the case on lands where no such control exists.

It is reported that the State, with the blessing of the Bureau of Public Roads, in the planning figured about $125,000 more to preserve the canyon's beauties and stream over what ordinarily would go into this road. Incidentally, three-quarters of the total road costs for this project will come from Federal funds. Without the Forest Service being in a position to require compromise, the additional funds for preservation probably would not have even been considered. Unfortunately, no such agency exists for most lands on which highways are being built. While many highways use lands not critical in nature and while roadside beautification is improving, attrition is still hardly the word to describe what is happening to many public values due to road building.

The Forest Service can take a firm stand in these matters only as long as the public is willing to support them. Using the words "in the public interest" rings off key when uttered by individual public servants without concrete visible verbal and written support from individuals and groups which constitute this public. Floyd Iverson and his staff deserve praise for the Logan Canyon position. It may influence road building on forest lands in many States.

DETRIMENTAL EFFECTS OF HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION ON A MONTANA STREAM

In 1955, it was learned that plans for highway improvement in Granite County, Mont., would involve some channel changes on Flint Creek. This stream is a tributary of the Clark Fork of the Columbia River. The fish population in several sections of Flint Creek had been inventoried annually each spring by electric shock census as part of a Federal aid investigations project (Montana F-13-R) initiated in 1954.

Flint Creek averages about 20 feet in width, 6 inches in depth. It has holes up to 4 feet deep, and has an average flow of about 15 cubic feet per second. In its original condition good trout cover was provided by overhanging willows and undercut banks (fig. 1). Rainbow trout (Salmo gairdners), cutthroat trout (Salmo clarks), eastern brook trout (Salvelinus fontinalis) and mountain whitefish (Prosopium williamsoni) are the game fishes in this study area.

A 230-volt direct current portable generator, used for fish population census, was efficient at capturing approximately 90 percent of the large sized (6 inches total length and over) game fish present in Flint Creek, as indicated by recaptures of tagged trout. Sections of the stream to be shocked were blocked off with one-half-inch mesh seines placed a measured distance (usually 300 feet) apart.

The new highway construction was begun in the fall of 1956 and continued through the summer of 1957. A bulldozer was used to remove brush, scour the stream bed and straighten approximately 350 feet of the channel of Flint Creek (fig. 2). Such channel changes are common along new highway construction in mountainous terrain and affect many miles of stream each year in Montana.

Nearly the same 300-foot section of stream at the highway construction site was sampled each spring from 1955 through 1957. Fish taken in 1955 and 1957 were enumerated, weighed, measured, and recorded (table 1). Those taken in 1956 were counted and recorded only as over or under 6 inches in total length. All fish captured were returned alive to the study area. Numbers of large sized trout captured were 75 and 69 in 1955 and 1956 respectively. Only six large sized trout were found in this section in 1957, after the channel changing phase of the highway construction had been completed.

The reductions shown in table 1 were 94 percent in both numbers and weight of large sized game fish. In small sized game fish (under 6 inches total length) these reductions were 85 percent in number and 76 percent in weight.

ARTHUR N. WHITNEY.
JACK E. BAILEY.

TABLE 1.—*Game fish captured by electric shocker from 300-foot section of Flint Creek, Mont., 1955 and 1957*

Species	1955		1957	
	Number	Pounds	Number	Pounds
Large-sized fish:				
Rainbow and cutthroat trout	68	12.63	6	1.19
Eastern brook trout	7	3.86	0	0
Mountain whitefish	16	2.25	0	0
Total, large-sized fish	91	18.74	6	1.19
Small-sized fish:				
Rainbow and cutthroat trout	46	1.32	6	.26
Eastern brook trout	6	.17	2	.10
Mountain whitefish	1	.04	0	0
Total, small-sized fish	53	1.53	8	.36
Total, fish, all sizes	114	20.27	14	1.55

SPORT FISHERIES RESOURCES AND THE PROPOSED INTERSTATE HIGHWAY BETWEEN MOUTH OF BELL CANYON AND BARRATTS SIDING

(Report by Montana Fish and Game Department, Helena, Mont., March 13, 1961)

The proposed route for the interstate highway in the Dillon-Armstead area involves several channel changes and other factors that will affect the fishery of the area.

One project (FAPI-15-1 11-37) concerns that portion of the proposed road between S28, T9S, R10W and S9, T11S, R10W. This construction will require channel changes on the Beaverhead River in T9S, R10W, sections 28, 32, and 33. It is our understanding that this portion of the construction will be put up for bids within the next month. Therefore, it appears that the fish and game department was advised of this project too late for recommendations or suggestions that would reduce the loss to fish habitat in the Beaverhead River.

The plans show an interchange at the Clark Canyon damsite and another at the south end of the Red Rock Arm of the reservoir. Between these 2 points, a distance of 5 miles, there will be no way for a fisherman to get to the reservoir. Over $1 million of the costs of the Clark Canyon Reservoir project are allocated to fish and wildlife benefits. Therefore every effort should be made to insure that adequate access to the reservoir is provided.

The proposed interstate highway between Pipe Organ Lodge and Barratts Siding involves extensive channel changing. Between stations 777 and 784 a 700-foot artificial channel will replace approximately 850 feet of streambed. The proposed route goes around the base of Pipe Organ Bluff and there is no reasonable way of avoiding this stream loss. A 700-foot change is also proposed between stations 973 and 980.

The most serious changes are between stations 852 and 937. The three changes in this area total 6,950 feet of artificial channel that will replace something over 7,000 feet (1.3 miles) of natural streambed. Part of the old streambed will be retained between stations 930 and 937 to provide drainage for

Grasshopper Creek. However, the quality of this portion of the channel for fish habitat will be greatly reduced. An alternate survey was made away from the river bottom between a point near station 820 and the mouth of Grasshopper Creek. This route would cause only one-fifth as much fish habitat loss as the proposed route; however, an evaluation by the highway department indicates it will be more expensive due to extra excavation and other work necessary to meet interstate highway standards.

Trout fishing in the Beaverhead River ranks high not only in Montana and the northern Rocky Mountain region but nationally as well. In fact, in a recent survey by a national outdoor magazine it was listed among the 100 best trout streams in the country.

The greatest importance of the Beaverhead River fishery lies in the fishing pressure it can absorb in future years. A combination of population increases, more leisure time, and better highways will result in greatly increased fishing pressures on Montana trout streams. Fish habitat must be preserved if the State and Nation's recreation needs are to be met.

It is anticipated that the Beaverhead River could easily support fishing pressures of 50 fishermen per mile each day or an annual total of 12,000 fisherman days per mile. Using the 1948–54 average fisherman expenditure of $7.38 per day, gives this stream a potential value of nearly $90,000 per mile per year. This is a minimum figure since this stream could support heavier fishing pressure and the estimated daily expenditure of $7.38 is undoubtedly below present or future costs.

Due to the importance of the Beaverhead River, the Montana Fish and Game Commission requests every consideration be given to following the alternate route which stays out of the river bottom between station 820 and the mouth of Grasshopper Creek.

The Effects on Fish and Game of Proposed Routes for the Interstate Highway From Helena to the Vicinity of Wolf Creek, Mont.

(Report by Montana Fish and Game Department, Helena, Mont., January 30, 1961)

A multi-million-dollar highway construction program is in progress in Montana. Good roads generally assist hunters, fishermen, campers, picnickers and others reach the site of their outdoor recreation. However, the quest for faster, better roads often results in the ruination of fish habitat in streams and, in the case of limited access highways, bars access to outdoor recreation areas.

The proposed interstate highway between Helena and the vicinity of Wolf Creek could cause excessive losses to fishing and hunting due to the possible location of a four-lane, limited access highway in Wolf Creek Canyon.

Information furnished by the Montana State Highway Commission indicates three possible routes for this highway. The west and middle routes follow closely along Prickley Pear Creek from Sieben through Wolf Creek Canyon. The east route crosses the Missouri River and follows the east shore of Holter Lake until it meets the present highway. This latter route would have considerably less detrimental effect on fish and wildlife habitat than the other two. Following are evaluations of the effects of these three highway locations on (1) fish and (2) game.

COMPARATIVE EFFECTS OF THE THREE PROPOSED HIGHWAY LOCATIONS ON FISH

The proposed east highway location would involve no loss of stream channel and could provide much improved access to Holter Lake and the surrounding recreational area. Over much of the proposed route this area is now accessible only on foot or horseback. The middle route (the route most favorably considered by the highway commission) would destroy 4 to 6 miles of natural stream channel and greatly restrict access to the undamaged section of stream in Wolf Creek Canyon. The west route involves even more fish habitat destruction.

Two-thirds of the people fishing Montana waters prefer stream fishing to lake or reservoir fishing as indicated by their fishing habits. Prickley Pear Creek rates relatively high on the statewide stream evaluation. (Stream Classification Committee, 1959.) It is in the class III group, designated as of interest to a large portion of the State. There are only 3,900 miles of stream in Montana in this or a higher class. Most fishermen on Prickley Pear Creek are from Great Falls and Helena. This stream plus the Prickley Pear Creek through Clancy (which will also be subjected to severe fish habitat losses due to interstate highway construction) contribute a sizable amount of the stream fishing in this area.

A fish population study was conducted on the Prickley Pear Creek in Wolf Creek Canyon during the summers of 1949, 1950 and 1951 (Stefanich, 1952). Six 600-foot sections were randomly selected and found to have an average of 211 pounds of game fish per mile—a good population. The habitat was excellent for trout and whitefish except in relatively short stretches where it had already been destroyed by channel changing during highway and railroad construction. Observations in the sections studied, indicated that Prickley Pear Creek varied from 15- to 60-feet wide with maximum depths from 6 inches to 8 feet. There was a gradient of 41-feet per mile and the highest temperature recorded was 67° F. There was a good interspersion of pools and riffles with good cover provided by undercut banks and overhanging brush. Food production was good and adequate spawning areas were available.

Based on creel census estimates, 2,072 to 3,377 fishermen trips were made in the canyon in 1951 and again in 1952. This is about 230 fishermen per mile per summer. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Nicholson, 1957) estimated the average daily expenditure by cold water fishermen in the Missouri River Basin during the period 1948 to 1954 was $7.38. Using this figure the 2,072 to 3,377 fishermen on the 12-mile stretch of stream spent $15,291 to $24,922 annually or approximately $1,700 annually per stream mile.

The real value of Prickley Pear Creek lies in its potential as a fishing stream. The number of fishermen trips in the Nation and in Montana is expected to expand in the next few decades. In fact, in the past 10 years Montana fishing pressure has increased at about twice the rate of the general population increase. Increased numbers of fishermen coupled with destruction of many additional miles of fish habitat by dewatering, road construction, pollution, etc., will result in greatly increased use of all remaining fishing streams.

It is anticipated that Prickley Pear when managed for full utilization can furnish 6,400 man-days of fishing per mile each year. This estimate is based on present concentrations of fishermen on streams in more heavily populated States. Using the $7.38 per day fisherman expenditure figure gives Prickley Pear Creek a potential annual value of approximately $47,000 per stream mile. Either inflation or deflation could alter the potential annual value. It is anticipated that if the habitat of Prickley Pear Creek is maintained, the fisherman use will steadily increase from the present use to this full utilization.

An interstate highway through Wolf Creek Canyon has two possible routes (1) primarily east of the stream and (2) primarily west of the stream.

The east route through Wolf Creek Canyon would involve approximately 3,240 feet of channel change along with a serious reduction in access to the stream, parking areas, and picnic areas. This would greatly decrease recreational use of the stream. The access limitation could be alleviated if the old Mullan Road were reopened.

The west route through the canyon would result in 4 to 5 miles of additional channel change over and above that of the east route. These 4 to 5 miles would be in the most productive part of the stream. This channeling would reduce the fish habitat in the 12 miles of stream involved by at least one-half. Whitney and Bailey (1959) found that channel changes on Flint Creek due to highway construction near Philipsburg resulted in a loss of 94 percent (by number and weight) of game fish 6 inches and longer in affected stretches of the stream. Cutting the cottonwood trees along the river, as planned in connection with the west route, would reduce shade and cover important to fish life and to the recreation minded public. This route would probably involve a series of drops or dams in the stream to reduce the stream's velocity. Possibly these could be designed to permit fish passage and provide pools which would mitigate some of the fish habitat damage caused by stream straightening. It is anticipated that in time these pools would fill with sediment.

COMPARATIVE EFFECTS OF THE THREE PROPOSED HIGHWAY LOCATIONS ON GAME

Deer, elk, and mountain goats are the chief big game species found in the mountainous sections of the area between Helena and Wolf Creek. Important game birds are blue and ruffed grouse. Waterfowl, both ducks and geese, are commonly found on the section of Holter Lake adjacent to the east route.

Hunting is an important recreational activity in this area, particularly in the vicinity of Wolf Creek Canyon.

Difficulty in getting off the interstate highway to hunt big game and mountain grouse in the section between Sieben and Wolf Creek (Wolf Creek Canyon) would represent a definite wildlife management detriment in the selection of either the middle or west routes.

The exchange at the mouth of Lions Creek would aid in access to one of the more important hunting sections of the Wolf Creek Canyon area. A very substantial amount of the canyon area would still remain inaccessible, however.

Definite big game and game bird hunting benefits would be gained by the selection of the east route. A big game area of major importance on the east side of Holter Lake that is now definitely underharvested would be made much more accessible to sportsmen by the interstate highway. Waterfowl hunting on Holter Lake would become more important with improved access.

In summary, either the middle or west routes would seriously limit access to presently important big game and mountain grouse hunting areas in Prickley Pear Canyon.

Conversely, both big game and waterfowl hunting would be improved by the increased access made available in the construction of the east route.

DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The route along Holter Lake is by far the most desirable from the outdoor recreation viewpoint. Improved access would be provided to an area that now has very limited access, and greatly increase the use of Holter Lake as a recreation area. Even more important, damage to Prickley Pear Creek and the reduction of access to hunting could be avoided.

The Highway Commission is dedicated to the policy of building the best roads possible at least cost. This often means straight routes through narrow canyons which crowd formerly valuable streams into sluice-like runs of little value to fish life. Wildlife and esthetic values in this program, we feel, have not been given sufficient consideration. Roadbuilders should assume a responsibility toward maintaining certain other values when considering the routing of highways.

Funds financing roadbuilding come from the same public that enjoys outdoor recreation. In Montana one-third of the population fishes or hunts. There is no estimate of how many others simply enjoy esthetic values such as the beauty of a natural trout stream.

Due to serious wildlife losses the Montana Fish and Game Department takes the stand that the interstate highway between Helena and the vicinity of Wolf Creek should not be routed through the Wolf Creek Canyon.

LITERATURE CITED

Nicholson, A. J., 1957: "Summary of Sportsmen's Expenditures, Missouri River Basin." Fish and Wildlife Service Special Science Report, Wildlife No. 35, 15 pages.

Stefanich, F. A., 1952: "The Population and Movement of Fish in Prickley Pear Creek, Montana." Transcript from American Fisheries Society, volume 81, 1951, pages 260 to 274.

Stream Classification Committee, 1959: A classification of Montana fishing streams, 1959, published by Missouri River Basin Studies of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

Whitney, A. N., and Bailey, J. E., 1959; "Detrimental Effects of Highway Construction on a Montana Stream." Transcript from American Fisheries Society, volume 88 (1), pages 72 to 73.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 106 of title 23 of the United States Code, relating to surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates for the Federal-aid highway systems, is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(d) (1) All surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates submitted to the Secretary under this section shall be submitted by the Secretary to the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary shall not approve any project under this section until the Secretary of the Interior approves the surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates for such project as being satisfactory in the interests of conserving fish and wildlife and recreation resources in the area of the project.

"(2) In order to carry out his functions under this subsection the Secretary of the Interior (A) may conduct such investigations, surveys and research projects as he deems necessary, and (B) shall consult with and give consideration to the recommendations of the appropriate agencies of the State submitting such project.

"(3) Funds made available under the provisions of section 104(a) for administration and research shall also be available for investigations, surveys, and research carried out by the Secretary of the Interior under this subsection."

AUTHORIZATION AND PURCHASE OF UNITED NATIONS BONDS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, at the request of the administration, I am introducing a bill to authorize the appropriation of up to $100 million for the purchase of U.N. bonds.

This bill will be given careful study by the Committee on Foreign Relations. On behalf of Chairman Fulbright, I announce that 1 week from today on Tuesday, February 6, public hearings by the committee will commence at 10:30 a.m. in room 4221 in the New Senate Office Building. The first witness will be the Secretary of State. Persons interested in appearing before the committee should give notice to the clerk of the committee.

For one to understand fully the current financial crisis of the U.N. requires the study of many financial records, tables of assessments, accounts payable, and the like. The staff of the committee and that of the House Foreign Affairs Committee have been working with the Department of State to compile in a convenient committee print factual information which is pertinent to this bill. This material will be available for distribution sometime next week.

The U.S. representative to the U.N. voted last December with the large majority of nations which approved the U.N. Secretary General's three-point plan to relieve the deficit of the organization. In his state of the Union message on January 11, President Kennedy announced that he would ask the Congress to approve participation by the United States in a special plan to finance the expenses for the U.N. operation in the Congo and for the U.N. Emergency Force in the Middle East for a period of 18 months beginning June 30, 1962. Today the President transmitted to the Congress a special message explaining and justifying the bill which I am now introducing.

Thus, Mr. President, for several months there has been much discussion of the so-called U.N. bond issue. Some have taken this opportunity to review the history of the U.N. and to weigh its prospects. No doubt the Committee on Foreign Relations will examine many aspects of the functions of the U.N. I for one welcome a broad assessment of the work of the U.N. and the worth of this institution to the United States and to all nations.

In 1945 when the Senate was considering the question of the adherence to the Charter of the U.N., I believe that only two negative votes were cast. Since that time both Democratic and Republican administrations and Congresses have given strong support, financial and otherwise, to the U.N. President Kennedy in his message today recounted some of the past crises which the U.N. has gone through. I suspect that there exists among the people of the United States today a large reservoir of good will and support for the United Nations organization.

This bill, Mr. President, symbolizes the turning point to which the U.N. has come. Are members of the U.N. willing to pay the cost of having the organization carry out the peace-keeping operations which the organization has decided to undertake? Some members have been dodging their responsibilities. The United States has lived up to its responsibilities. The question now is whether the United States should help to buy a little time so that a sufficient number of other members of the organization can close the gap between their demands upon the United Nations and their financial support of the United Nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor, introduced by Mr. Sparkman, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE TO FILE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for filing the report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare called for by Senate Resolution 86, 87th Congress, 1st session, be extended from January 1 to February 28, 1962.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL PATENT POLICY IN GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS—REFERENCE OF BILL TO COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, yesterday the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Wiley] introduced the bill (S. 2754) to establish a uniform national policy concerning rights to inventions under contracts with the U.S. Government. Since the bill involves the Space Committee and other committees of Congress, I discussed the question with the majority leader, the minority leader, and the sponsor of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that when the Judiciary Committee finishes considering the bill that it be referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COLLEGE ACADEMIC FACILITIES AND SCHOLARSHIP ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LAUSCHE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1241) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of Tuesday, January 30, entitled "No Urban Portfolio Needed."

I am in full sympathy and accord with the views expressed in that editorial and hope very much that the Senate will vote to disapprove a plan to create a Department of Urban Affairs.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO URBAN PORTFOLIO NEEDED

The otherwise clear-cut question whether this country needs a Department of Urban Affairs at Washington has, unfortunately, been obscured by the controversy over whether Robert C. Weaver, a Negro, should head the Department. Let's forget about Dr. Weaver—at least for the moment—and address ourselves to the issue of whether it is desirable to establish another huge Department of the Federal Government, headed by a man with Cabinet rank.

If the people of this country want to take another giant step in the direction of surrendering control of their local affairs to the National Government, they will support the creation of this new Department. If however, they want to retain control over what is left to them in this area, they will oppose the setting up of this Cabinet position with all their might.

A recent article in Nation's Business says, with much reason:

"By establishing a direct line of communication from the mayor's office to the center of the Federal Government, it would soon become the most powerful and expensive Cabinet post. The authority of Governors, State legislatures and other local levels of government would be demolished.

"Although the backers of the proposed Department put most of their stress publicly on the need for Federal coordination, planning and research, they have in recent years been in the forefront of every fight to enlarge present Federal welfare programs—housing, urban renewal, community facilities, water treatment plants, airports and schools. They have battled vigorously to get Uncle Sam deeply involved in dozens of new areas."

And that is exactly what will happen, if this Department is set up in Washington. Furthermore, it is nonsense to say that no existing Cabinet officer is concerned with urban affairs, and that the cities ought to have a member of the Cabinet who can provide guidance in the solution of their problems. Actually, such members of the Cabinet as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor are largely concerned with the problems of the thickly populated areas.

Opponents of the bill point out that if further attention to such regions is needed, it can be provided by a coordinating official in the Budget Bureau or White House, without any huge bureaucracy set up to lobby for new spending.

Both the Governors' conference and the National Association of County Officials have expressed themselves in opposition to the proposed new Department of Urban Affairs. They feel that it would tend to destroy remaining functions retained by States and localities.

So there are plenty of valid reasons for opposing this proposal, wholly aside from the identity of its executive head. President Kennedy has made what is generally conceded to be a political 10-strike by announcing that Robert C. Weaver will be appointed to the post. All who oppose the new Department are thus put in the false position of being racists or white supremacists, since Dr. Weaver is a colored man. They are also charged with being against doing anything for the urban areas.

This may place the Republicans and some Democrats on the spot politically. On the other hand, the New York Daily News, with the largest circulation in the United States, has accused President Kennedy of "using Weaver in a bald and brassy effort to buy Negro votes," and it adds that he thereby "insults the intelligence of Negro voters." The paper went on to say that creation of the projected Department "would freeze a new horde of bureaucrats onto the Federal payrolls and the taxpayers' backs," and in all likelihood would "encourage cities to crawl to Washington for solutions of problems they should solve on their own."

The creation of this Department must be defeated, if the steady encroachment of the Federal Government into local and State affairs is to be halted.

THE PHILADELPHIA BANK MERGER CASE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, we have all been reading and hearing a great deal in recent weeks and months on the subject of the relation between the antitrust laws and banking, especially bank mergers and the Bank Merger Act of 1960.

One of the most important developments in this field was the decision of Chief Judge Clary of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, handed down on January 15, 1962, in the case entitled "United States of America against The Philadelphia National Bank and Girard Trust Corn Exchange Bank."

The proposed merger had been approved by the Comptroller of the Currency under the Bank Merger Act. The Justice Department sued for an injunction against the merger, alleging that it violated section 1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act and section 7 of the Clayton Antitrust Act. The Judge denied the request for an injunction and dismissed the Justice Department suit.

This is the first decision involving the Bank Merger Act. It is the first decision involving the relation between the Bank Merger Act and the so-called antitrust laws. It is, as far as I am aware, the first decision under the Sherman and Clayton Acts dealing with a bank merger by consolidation, as distinguished from a stock acquisition.

The trial of the case was extensive, and Judge Clary wrote a thorough and comprehensive opinion which I think it is appropriate to call to the attention of the Senate. I should like, in addition, to make a few comments with respect to Judge Clary's decision.

Judge Clary first held that the approval of the merger by the Comptroller under the Bank Merger Act did not preclude a review under the antitrust laws. In other words, he held that the Bank Merger Act did not, in and of itself, supersede the antitrust laws with respect to bank mergers approved under it.

Judge Clary next considered whether section 7 of the Clayton Act applied to a bank merger not accomplished by a stock acquisition, and he held that section 7 was not applicable. This agrees with the position taken by the Banking and Currency Committee on several occasions, including our report on the Bank Merger Act in 1959, and it agrees with the position taken by Judge Barnes in 1956, Attorney General Brownell, and Judge Hansen in 1957, Deputy Attorney General Walsh in 1959, and Acting Assistant Attorney General Bicks in 1960.

Judge Clary went on to consider the facts of the merger as explained at the trial before him and considered the application of section 1 of the Sherman Act and section 7 of the Clayton Act—on the assumption that it was applicable. The opinion contains an interesting discussion of the product market or line of commerce and the geographic market or section of the country which must be found for purposes of section 7 of the Clayton Act. Judge Clary also examined the question of competition and the effect of the merger upon competition, and came to the conclusion that there was no reasonable possibility that competition, either in Philadelphia itself or elsewhere in the country, would be lessened or that the merger would tend to create a monopoly in the Philadelphia area.

Accordingly, the complaint was dismissed. I understand that the Justice Department has not yet decided whether to appeal.

Judge Clary did not discuss in the course of his opinion the question which I raised, in the remarks I made on the Senate floor on July 20, 1961—the question whether the Sherman Act is applicable to banking in general or to bank mergers in particular. In view of his decision, it was not, of course, necessary for Judge Clary to take up this point.

In my remarks on July 20, I pointed out that the assumption that the Sherman Act applies to banking and to bank mergers is based on a seven judge decision in *Southeastern Underwriters Association* case (322 U.S. 533), holding that insurance is subject to the Sherman Act. I pointed out that Mr. Justice Frankfurter dissented, along with Chief Justice Stone and Mr. Justice Jackson, on the ground that in 1890 it was universally considered that insurance was not commerce and, therefore, the Sherman Act did not apply to insurance. I pointed out that in 1890 every lawyer, including Senator Sherman, knew that banking was not commerce because the Supreme Court had said so in a long line of cases beginning in 1850. I questioned, when a case involving the applicability of the Sherman Act to banking might come before the courts, and eventually before the Supreme Court, whether the courts would follow the four judges who formed the majority in the Southeastern Underwriters Association case, or whether they would follow the views of the three judges who dissented, whose views were in my judgment adopted by the Supreme Court in the Supreme Court's decision in *Toolson* v. *New York Yankees, Inc.* (346 U.S. 356). In that case the Court took the position that, if there was to be a reversal of 30 years of practice under the Sherman Act, in effect an amendment to that act, the Congress should make the change and not the Court.

I believe that Judge Clary's opinion in the Philadelphia case is an important landmark in the field of banking law. I believe Senators will want to examine the full opinion carefully in order to know the exact facts and the exact rulings which Judge Clary has made. I ask unanimous consent that a few brief excerpts from the opinion be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Government here has brought an action—the first of its kind—to prevent the merger of two strong Philadelphia banks, and on the ground that this merger will (1) violate the Sherman Act by restraining trade, and (2) violate the Clayton Act by lessening and/or destroying competition and tending toward a monopoly. The court believes that the Government's general theory of the case should be set out in brief, broad outline before coming to the specifics.

The Government's case was predicated upon the premise that the banks involved were legally restricted to having offices in geographic limits. Starting with that assumption, the Government introduced a wealth of statistical data, the accuracy of which has not been questioned, which would show that a very large percentage of the deposits and loans originated in the restricted geographical area. Based strictly upon this premise, and applying the principles heretofore enunciated in industrial cases, the Government argues that these percentages are all persuasive, show a high degree of concentration of the market involved, and that it is therefore the duty of the court to prevent this clear, apparent restraint of trade, destruction of, or restriction of competition, and tendency to monopoly by prohibiting the merger.

The court accepts the statistics introduced as showing exactly what they demonstrate on the figures used, but, as will be pointed out later when discussing the specifics, refuses to accept the conclusions which the Government asks the court to draw.

In support of its contention that this merger is illegal, the Government attempted to show by the testimony of two university professors that the merger would have a profound adverse effect upon the banking system of this area, actually restrict credit, and permit price fixing for banking services. This attempt was far from successful. The professors had individual theories of the effect of the merger on the monetary system of the United States and of this area, which were completely destroyed on cross-examination, particularly as relating to the Philadelphia situation.

The Government also attempted to establish, by opinion testimony of smalltown bankers, that the contemplated merger would adversely affect not only the banking situation in Philadelphia, but generally throughout the country, including their own small towns. Their testimony was practically a rehash of the testimony they gave before both the House and Senate committees considering the Bank Merger Act of 1960. There they strongly urged the Congress of the United States to forbid further bank mergers and to maintain the status quo of the banking system of the United States. They attempted to have Congress limit prospective mergers to the very narrow situations where economic necessity would make a merger absolutely imperative.

For example, they conceded that where a bank was on the verge of insolvency, a merger should be permitted with a strong solvent bank for the protection of depositors and the general public. They also agreed that where ineffectual management was demonstrated, again it would be in the public interest to merge the bank with a strong progressive bank, again for protection of depositors and the public. With these two and other minor exceptions, not necessary to outline here, they fought vigorously to have the Congress absolutely forbid all other mergers. This the Congress refused to do, and, in the opinion of this court, properly so.

Commercial banking, despite the attempt of the Government in this case to have the court consider it an ordinary line of commercial endeavor, comparable to the ordinary industrial organizations, is a specialized branch of what the court chooses to term the financial industry. It is completely regulated. It may not, as an industrial plant might, establish a branch of operations where it pleases. By virtue of both State and Federal authority, it must keep its assets liquid, as will be hereinafter discussed. It may charge for its principal services (lending of money) a maximum prescribed by law. It may not pay interest on demand deposits and is limited by law to the amounts which it may pay for savings or time deposits. It may not go out and buy raw materials and manufacture products and attempt to extend its market. Its stock in trade is money and the only way that it can generate its stock in trade—money—is to create demand deposits which it may lend to individuals, corporations, or organizations. It is the commercial bank, even though strictly regulated, which comprises the backbone of the monetary system of the United States. To place it in and consider it as part of the commercial and industrial field, as contrasted with the financial, would be to ignore the realities of the situation.

Both the Government and the defendants have, in support of their respective contentions, cited the only antitrust case law available and all such cases were decided under the Sherman and subsequent acts. All involve only commercial and industrial organizations. While the court recognizes the validity of the broad principles of law therein enunciated, it certainly does not follow that those principles should be applied with the same force and effect to a regulated industry as to one in the so-called "free enterprise" field. The Congress of the United States has, in fact, in the industrial and commercial field, usually exempted regulated industries from the application of the antitrust law and in the public interest.

It is significant to note that in the Bank Merger Act, the Congress of the United States has included as one of the controlling elements, and an important one, for consideration in the determination of governmental approval of bank mergers, that same public interest. This court does not believe, as the Government would have it, that this was a mere passing reference without practical significance and actually completely irrelevant to a decision of this case, but, on the contrary, feels that the inclusion of this public interest concept is an important element in the congressional approach to monetary regulation.

* * * * *

In summary, it can be said that although the merger will increase concentration to the percentage figures given, the merged bank would have no power to control the price and supply of credit, nor could it dominate the market in any manner. And, although a direct substantial competitor will be eliminated, the only competent testimony upon the subject establishes that competition will be more vigorous after the merger. Also, although the commercial banking field is not an easy one to enter, it cannot be concluded that a new bank will not be established in the four-county area in the future. Finally, although the defendants have engaged in prior mergers, these mergers have had valid business purposes as the motivating force.

Viewing all this collectively, the court can see no reasonable probability that competition among commercial banks in the four-county area will be substantially lessened.

Moreover, it is difficult to perceive a reasonable probability that this merger will tend to create a monopoly in commercial banking in the four-county area. Certainly, every time one bank in an area is eliminated, the path toward an eventual monopoly or oligopoly is shortened. This can be said for the most insignificant combination. But this does not mean that a monopoly is inevitable.

Especially is this true in the area of bank mergers. Every future merger in the four-county area will be subject to the close scrutiny of the appropriate State and Federal agency. At some point any trend, if discernible in the future, will be checked. Although some of plaintiff's witnesses, for the most part independent bankers from smaller communities throughout the country, were of the opinion that approval of this merger would trigger others in the four-county area, as well as the remainder of the United States, this court is not prepared to concur. The competitive situation that exists in the four-county area, with the many alternatives available to a prospective customer, leads to the inescapable conclusion that any tendency to monopoly or oligopoly at this stage is nonexistent. What happens in the future must be left to the appropriate Federal banking agency, and, if necessary, to another court at another time. All that is being said is that this particular merger will not tend to create a monopoly.

* * * * *

RÉSUMÉ

As before stated, this is the first action tried after the passage of the Bank Merger Act of 1960. The controversy inherent in the case between coordinate branches of the executive department of Government is to be regretted. Congress, in passing the Bank Merger Act, deliberately fixed the responsibility of approving or disapproving proposed mergers of national banks in the Comptroller of the Currency. This responsibility was fixed despite vigorous protests of individual bankers and the Department of Justice. The Comptroller of the Currency then, by act of Congress, was of necessity required to consider the reports of the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Attorney General, with respect to the competitive factors involved. All three of these Departments of Government reported that in the opinion of their experts, the consummation of the proposed merger would adversely affect competition in the Philadelphia area. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation concluded that the merger would not be adverse in the regional, national and international field of competition. With these reports available to him, and after considering them, the Comptroller, in pursuance of his statutory duty, reviewed them and despite their content, approved the merger as not involving undue concentration of banking power, not tending toward a monopoly, not destructive of competition in the commercial banking field, and definitely in the public interest. The court, after a full trial, agrees completely with the conclusions of the Comptroller of the Currency.

This is one of the few instances in which one department of the Government, after having been consulted and its advice not being followed, has challenged in the court the findings of a coordinate department of the executive branch of the Government on the basis of disagreements between departments of our Government. And what is the expertise of these three dissenting coordinate branches of the executive department that prompted this challenge? The courts have uniformly held that once Congress has reposed its confidence in the expertise of a particular department, the courts should not substitute its judgment in the place and stead of the department involved. The Government has asked this court, without the production of a single shred of evidence, and on the basis of reports no more illuminating than that of the Comptroller of the Currency, to give legal effect to the conclusions of the dissidents, rather than the department charged with the responsibility.

This court fails to see how any court, without some factual basis being laid therefor, could accede to any such request and this is all the more true in this particular case where experienced, substantial bankers throughout this entire area have appeared in open court, subjected themselves to searching cross-examination, and have unanimously demonstrated that the proposed merger would not cause an undue concentration of banking, would not tend toward a monopoly, and definitely would increase the vigor of competition which the Congress of the United States from the passage of the Sherman Act down to the present date has, by law, attempted to foster.

The court was not impressed with the attempts of the Government to show that banking is of minor importance in the life of a community generally and of almost absolute unimportance in the business life of the community. The Government, in its attempt to establish this contention by testimony that no single particular individual industrial organization had ever entered a particular territory because of the presence or absence of banking facilities, has ignored the industrial history of the United States. Should one ever speculate as to whether any industry would enter a community without banking facilities, the answer would be completely obvious. Historically, banking facilities have preceded industry in every community.

The Government also attempted to show that by combining the lending limits of all Philadelphia banks, borrowers in the larger categories could be well accommodated. This ignores again the realities of the situation and the positive testimony that in the larger industries, there is a decided reluctance on the part of financial officers to be made the subject of participating loans. With the originating bank, there is also an aversion to these loans as it requires considerable negotiation and technical handling which is to be avoided wherever possible.

The evidence demonstrated beyond peradventure of doubt that the Philadelphia area, plus parts of Delaware and New Jersey, and also New York City, as well as most of the Northeastern part of the United States, is the area of active competition for Philadelphia commercial banks and for the proposed merged bank. The testimony discloses that the competitive effect upon all Philadelphia commercial banks will be minimal. The larger bank, however, will be able to compete on better terms and in a better atmosphere with the banks of other cities and States that have been draining this area of banking business which might well be and perhaps properly should be handled here, and which cannot be handled under present circumstances. That it will benefit the city and area has been established clearly by a fair preponderance of the evidence as has been set forth in the findings of fact of the defendants previously affirmed.

There is nothing in this record which supports the averments of the complaint that the proposed merger involves an unlawful combination in restraint of trade; would result in or tend toward monopoly, or violate the provisions of the Clayton Act, if applicable; and the proposed merger certainly violates no provision, either express or implied, contained in the Bank Merger Act of 1960.

Since the proposed merger contains none of the defects alleged in the Government's case and will be in the public interest, it follows that judgment must be entered in favor of the defendants and against the plaintiff.

TVA'S TRIBUTARY PROGRAM

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the proposed budget for fiscal year 1963 which President Kennedy recently submitted to the Congress envisages an important and historic step for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

It is proposed that the TVA spend $2.5 million during the coming fiscal year to begin work on the multipurpose development of the Beech River in west Tennessee. What distinguishes this resource development project from others in which TVA has heretofore engaged is: First, it represents TVA's first major move in the development of tributaries of the great Tennessee River; and, second, it calls for a sound new demonstration of the partnership for progress that has always existed among the TVA, State, and local people in the Tennessee Valley.

One of the most enthusiastic and articulate advocates of the principle of tributary development by the TVA has been one of the Nation's great newspapers, the Nashville Tennessean. Therefore, it speaks with energetic authority in its comments of the Beech River project in an editorial appearing in that newspaper on January 19, 1962.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TVA's Tributary Program Modest, but Sound, Start

In his budget message to Congress yesterday, President Kennedy proposed a $2.5 million appropriation next year to initiate a tributary stream development program in the Tennessee Valley.

Under this proposal, developed by the Tennessee Valley Authority following a couple of Presidential promptings, the Beech River watershed of west Tennessee would be developed with a series of 14 small multipurpose dams and 80 miles of channel improvement, at an estimated total cost of $6 million.

It is a modest beginning. But it is a start. And a sound principle has been established for completion of the river basin development job upon which TVA embarked more than a quarter century ago.

The financing proposals suggested are entirely sound. Local and State participation are involved, it is true, but recognition is given to two facts upon which this newspaper has predicated its insistence that capital financing and planning originate at the Federal level:

1. Local governments in Tennessee simply do not have sufficient revenue sources to undertake the broadly based basin-type development which commonsense and good conservation practices dictate. With demands growing upon the State for more revenue for education, highways, etc., it is likely Tennessee, too, would find difficulty raising the needed funds.

2. TVA, long since created for the very purpose this proposal entails, is the proper agency to develop the plans, to control projects which are an integral part of the mainstem system, and therefore to supply the capital funds necessary.

In its announcement of the Beech River program, TVA has taken note of the lack of local revenues, but there is nothing at all amiss in its suggestion that "under this plan the portion of the system which is primarily beneficial to the local area would pay for itself." And we know by long experience that this sort of development produces both the benefits and the local revenues mentioned.

It was our hope that TVA would embark on a bit more ambitious plan such as the Elk River basin offers. But it seems the directors want to utilize the Beech River watershed program as something of a pilot project, and we see nothing wrong in this as long as they do not forget there are other areas of perhaps more significant need.

We shall, therefore, continue to press for a broadening of this program with its multipurpose functions, designed to lend greater emphasis to the conservation-development role of the Authority.

In a conservative Congress, approval of the TVA-Presidential request is not assured, of course. It is therefore imperative that the valley delegation, which has a vast future stake in this program though only one congressional district is immediately involved, stand united behind the traditional principles to which the people of this State and valley adhere.

NEED FOR A REVIEW OF NATION'S TRANSPORTATION INDUSTRY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, more than any similar event of recent years, the merger agreement by the Pennsylvania and New York Central railroads has pointed up the need for an overall review of the Nation's transportation industry.

Several days ago I proposed such a review by a Presidential commission. Now I note that the Nashville Tennessean, in an editorial on January 19, 1962, suggests that the Interstate Commerce Commission undertake a review of the entire rail system. However we may differ as to detail, we agree on the need for a study not confined to this proposed merger alone, and on the principle that monopoly must be avoided, competition preserved and the public interest protected.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial appear at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Railroad Systems Review Needed

Formal agreement to merge the Nation's two largest railroad systems—the Pennsylvania and the New York Central—is symptomatic of deep-rooted troubles in the entire rail industry which foreshadow other consolidations.

The two lines, which together represent some $5.4 billions in assets, have agreed on merger terms. Many obstacles, including approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission, lie ahead, however. These could delay action possibly 2 years or more.

Both lines had rough going last year, although the Pennsylvania managed to end the year in the black. The merger, which would result in a 20,000 mile network formed by the two parallel systems, is estimated to save $100 million a year.

Many of these lines' financial troubles stem from overcapacity and excessive duplication of service. Few would argue that elimination of these weaknesses would, of themselves, bring about the kind of monopoly in railroad operation which made creation of the ICC necessary.

In various stages of negotiation are other mergers, including the Atlantic Coast Line and Seaboard Air Line; the Great Northern, Northern Pacific, and Chicago, Burlington, and Quincy; the Norfolk and Western and Nickle Plate; and the Chesapeake and Ohio and the Baltimore and Ohio. Each of these mergers would result in multimillion dollar operating cost economies.

The dilemma of the railroads, in fact, has reached such proportions that a piecemeal attack by separate consideration of individual merger plans is no longer adequate. What is indicated is a comprehensive review by the ICC of the entire rail system.

It should be reshaped to meet the demands of the times, with primary emphasis on protection of the public interest.

This means preservation of real competition, and protection of shippers, passengers, railroad workers, and the towns the roads serve. Crippling of the Nation's lifelines must be prevented.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO VOTE AT 2 P.M. WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 31, 1962, ON THE NOMINATION OF JOHN A. McCONE TO BE DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Montana may proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senate will recall that some time earlier it gave its consent to vote on the McCone nomination at 2 o'clock this coming Wednesday. The request was made on the assumption that the American congressional delegation to the Punta del Este Conference would return to Washington, D.C., at 9 a.m. Wednesday morning and that therefore the rights of a Senator would be well protected if the vote were taken at 2 p.m. that afternoon.

Due to the fact that the Punta del Este Conference is still in session; that decisions have not been reached; that a particular member of the delegation asked that the vote on the nomination be held up until his arrival; at this time, in furtherance of that request and in view of the circumstances involved, on the basis of the absence of a Senator due to a Presidential appointment in effect to enable him to attend a conference, I wish to ask that the vote on the McCone nomination be held over until 2 o'clock on Friday next.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall object. It will be the first time in 17 years I have objected to a unanimous consent request. I shall object because I believe this is an extremely important agency and I believe that we should act upon the nomination promptly. The nomination has been held over now for more than a week since the Committee on Armed Services reported the nomination unanimously.

Because of the importance to our national security and because of all the problems involved, I object.

I say to the distinguished majority leader that I believe it is quite clear the nomination of the gentleman will be confirmed, but in order to be courteous to any Senator who is away on a Presidential Commission I shall be glad to give that gentleman a live pair if I am told by the majority leader that there is any member of that Presidential Commission who is a U.S. Senator who wishes to vote against the nomination of Mr. McCone. I say now publicly to the majority leader, if he will give me his word that man wishes to vote "Nay" I shall give the Senator a live pair, but I object to further postponement of the vote on the nomination.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Massachusetts, and I shall keep his suggestion in mind. He is always kind and considerate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, in view of the request made by our absent colleague, that the vote on the McCone nomination be deferred from 2 p.m. on Wednesday next until 2 p.m. on Thursday next.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I share the same feeling of distress about objecting. I know many Members have made plans contingent upon the vote coming on Wednesday as originally scheduled.

I am very reluctant to object. I think in the interest of the Senate, and the implied commitments that were made, I would have to object. I would also tender my services and offer a live pair to the Senator in question, because I presume his vote would be opposite mine. I make that tender now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not know how our absent colleague would vote. He did request, though, that the vote be held up until his arrival. We have tried to comply with that request. The time was set for 2 p.m. on Wednesday next. It appears that there is no possibility of obtaining a further extension. So at this time I will make no further request. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] for his offer.

AID TO HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, last fall I acted as an intermediary in a very important exchange of correspondence between Dr. Elmer Ellis, president of the University of Missouri, and the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Education.

Dr. Ellis in this correspondence raised a number of objections to S. 1241 as reported.

He questioned its program of loans only for the construction of academic facilities. He also questioned its provisions for the States rather than institutions of higher education to determine who receives scholarships. In place of S. 1241, he offered a number of alternative suggestions to aid higher education.

Since this bill will be laid before the Senate soon, I believe all Senators will find this correspondence of great interest. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that Dr. Ellis' original letter, the reply of the senior Senator from Oregon, and the further letter of Dr. Ellis be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Office of the President,
University of Missouri,
Columbia, Mo., September 19, 1961.
Senator Edward V. Long,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ed: I notice that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has approved a version of Senate bill 1241 which is directly contrary to the interests of all State universities and colleges.

1. It offers loans but not grants for construction of academic facilities. This is absolutely of no use to any public institution in Missouri and almost no private college or university.

2. It offers grants for construction of academic facilities only to public community colleges. This is highly discriminatory against 4-year colleges and universities, public and private, and is highly discriminatory against certain States that do not have many junior colleges. While we will have more in Missouri in the future, still States like California, Iowa, and Texas, which have a great many, would get most of this money. Moreover, why should the Federal Government discriminate against 4-year institutions if that is what other States need?

3. The bill would establish a Federal scholarship program administered through State commissions rather than through the colleges and universities. Personally, I have no particular enthusiasm for big scholarship programs but if we are to have it, it is far more sound and much cheaper to administer it through the universities and colleges rather than through a State commission. Colleges and universities administer the present loan program of the National Defense Education Act without criticism.

I would be glad to enlarge on any of these points if you wish. I think, however, it has become a very bad bill and should not be passed in this form under any circumstances. I am certain it is bad for the State of Missouri.

Cordially,

Elmer Ellis.

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Labor
and Public Welfare,
October 5, 1961.
Hon. Edward V. Long,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator: Thank you for bringing to my attention and that of my subcommittee the September 19, 1961, letter addressed to you by President Elmer Ellis of the University of Missouri.

The points raised by President Ellis parallel views expressed by other educators in our hearings on S. 1241. I would only point out that, as indicated in the testimony of President Case of Colgate, which may be found on page 287 of the hearings, the committee did receive testimony that the loans are needed, are one practical way of meeting the urgent demands of academic facilities and would be used to the full extent of the $300 million a year authorized for the 5-year period.

It is true that President Case would welcome matching grants to institutions of higher education. However, as I am sure you realize, in view of the controversy which has enveloped other educational bills this past session, it might be most difficult to enact an across-the-board grant proposal.

These difficulties can be summarized somewhat as follows:

If grants to public institutions of higher education only were to be adopted then strong protests could be expected from nonpublic institutions of higher education on the grounds of discriminatory treatment. It would be said that "the unity of higher education" was threatened. If grants are proposed for both private- and church-related institutions of higher education serious objection could be expected to be heard from a broad spectrum of the American public which holds, with sincere conviction, that such a course in all probability would be repugnant to the first amendment of the Constitution. Furthermore, the claim could be made, and with considerable justification, that if such benefits were to be conferred upon both public and private institutions of higher education, then in all equity equivalent benefits should be made available to the nonpublic or church-related secondary and elementary schools. I am aware that there are those who would attempt to draw a strict distinction between elementary and secondary education on the one hand and higher education on the other, based upon the criterion of compulsory attendance. While I am cognizant of this line of reasoning, I find it personally very difficult thus to segmentize the Constitution. I have no doubt, however, that interest-bearing loans can meet the constitutional test, and that, as indicated by testimony, such a loan program would meet a current and pressing financial need of many institutions for instructional facilities. I suspect that present legal barriers under State law would be quickly overcome if the loan money were to be made available.

With respect to the grants contained in S. 1241 for the encouragement of junior college construction, I would point out the testimony presented to us indicated that publicly controlled community colleges are expanding in 41 States. In the fall of 1959, these colleges enrolled approximately 12 percent of the degree-credited students attending institutions of higher education. I would also point out that in committee the needs of junior colleges were given sympathetic consideration by Senators on both sides of the aisle. Evidently there is a strong public demand in a great many States for this segment of our higher education system. Enactment of S. 1241 in the form recommended by the committee will, I am convinced, do much to encourage the establishment of junior and community colleges. Traditional 4-year institutions, I feel, will also benefit from this trend since the first 2 years of collegiate work taken at the junior college institution will enable many students to determine during that period what further formal education would be helpful to them. I believe that the community college is essentially a complementary rather than a competitive institution to the 4-year school.

With respect to the third point raised by Dr. Ellis, I am sure that you can appreciate the advantages to the student selected for a scholarship of being able to determine for himself the institution which best serves his unique and individual needs. Since there is no requirement that a student awarded a scholarship by a State scholarship commission pursue his education within the boundaries of the State in which he takes the examination, the student will have open to him a greater variety of educational choice than would be the case if institutions were to administer the program. In this area, I grant that sincere differences of viewpoints can and do exist, but it was the committee judgment that State scholarship commission program would enable more students in all geographic areas to receive better educational benefits than under alternative arrangements suggested to the committee.

One blunt point in this connection should be made, and that is that the State scholarship commission concept would be more advantageous to talented members of minority groups than the proposal advocated by President Ellis.

I realize that this has been a somewhat lengthy reply to your inquiry, but I feel that both you and Dr. Ellis would appreciate receiving a full explanation of the committee position.

With kindest personal regards.

Cordially,

Wayne Morse,
Chairman, Education Subcommittee.

University of Missouri,
Columbia, Mo., November 9, 1961.

Senator Edward V. Long,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Long: I have read Senator Morse's letter with great interest. I certainly appreciate the courtesy of his reply which shows the care and consideration he is devoting to these problems.

The legislation recommended originally by the American Council on Education and others was a series of proposals that had been worked out by the various national organizations of universities and colleges. It was a compromise among different types of institutions and among regions and States. While no one would claim it was perfect, it certainly was a program that would promote higher education substantially and at the same time would not discriminate or favor one group as against another. The action of the subcommittee of course upsets all these compromises, and while it makes some of its own, the result is a series of proposals that would heavily favor some types of universities and colleges and some States and regions. It would do so far more, I am sure, than Senator Morse and his subcommittee realize.

Missouri, I must add, is one of the States that will get virtually nothing out of the legislation as they propose to pass it. Let me take up the points in order.

The decision concerning loans, or loans and grants, for academic facilities I realize is a difficult one because of the church-State relationship. However, the "loans only" are of no value to public institutions. We are not prohibited by law in Missouri from using them but none of us would resort to them because the only way we could repay loans would be to raise our student fees beyond what they are now; and we do not feel that is a statesmanlike way to meet the problems of higher education, as it would further restrict access to educational opportunity. The loan feature would be of use only to a few private institutions and for the most part to those private institutions that are now the best financed, not to those that are in greatest need.

The second point is in regard to limiting to community colleges the grants for construction. As you will recall, I have been a principal advocate for State aid to these colleges in Missouri. Because of our new law we will now have some expansion but not much. The possibilities of its help here are trifling compared with those States that have developed great programs in the junior and community colleges. There is nothing in the Senator's statement that would indicate why 4-year institutions should be eliminated from these grants of funds. States such as Missouri depend much more on 4-year colleges and will continue to do so for many years. Of the college students in Missouri less than 6 percent are in public junior colleges, and the 4-year colleges are now growing much faster. At best we might increase the junior college percent to 9 in 10 years. In contrast, in California 45 percent of college students are in public junior colleges now. According to the Senator's letter, nine States would get nothing. Many others, such as Missouri, would get almost nothing. But California would get aid for nearly half of its college students.

Senator Morse is mistaken, I am sure, in his belief that the establishment of junior colleges relieves the 4-year colleges of needs for buildings. The great benefit of junior colleges is that they add opportunities for higher education to students who otherwise would not have them. This is its major justification and about 90 percent of their attendance is of this type. Let's not forget that the States' needs differ greatly.

If the church-State relationship makes these types of aid as difficult to bring about as the subcommittee seems to feel, I would like to make the suggestion that these proposals for aid for academic buildings be dropped entirely and that instead we go back to our housing legislation that we have been using satisfactorily for several years for both public and private institutions. It is working successfully and presents no problems of this type, but it does have a great weakness in that it forces us to charge our students more than the real costs of the loans.

Under present regulations of the Housing and Home Finance Agency we are required to calculate occupancy for single student dormitories at 90 percent. In addition, we are required to set our room and board rates at a level which will guarantee 1.35 times the required interest and principal charges. I submit that this is not a sound Government policy but follows private banking principles that should not apply in the same way to a program of Government aid to higher education. Unless we can get subsidies from some source the difference between our cost and the actual sinking fund charges raises our rates so that many students cannot afford to live in college housing. If the committee would look into this I am sure they would see that as a practical matter this 35-percent overage could very safely be reduced to 10 percent or less for institutions with good records and the resulting saving would do all the colleges and universities more good than any of these other proposals.

It is not academic facilities that are the great bottleneck. We could make more efficient use of those we now have in many cases, but the great shortage is student housing and many of us instead of having 90-percent occupancy are overcrowded to 115 or 120 percent.

The third point is whether the scholarships provided should be granted by the colleges involved or by a State commission. The admissions procedures of our colleges require close relationships with high school advisers, and it is very simple for them to locate academically able but financially needy students who must have help to secure an education. No State commission, even with an elaborate bureaucracy, can do this as well as the staffs of our colleges. The purpose of the scholarships is to find these students and bring them to college. Only the colleges can do this.

Our present NDEA loan program is handled by the colleges and I do not know of anyone who would argue that it is not being done well that way. If, as the subcommittee contends, the scholarships should be granted by a State commission and be usable anywhere in the country, it would mean that more able boys from Missouri would go to distant, prestige schools and hence would rarely return to Missouri after graduation. There was nothing in the original plan to keep a student from applying to any college he wished; he was free to go where he could qualify. But this State commission plan will encourage students who can well afford to go at home to apply to go to the glamor, distant schools. Much present scholarship money works this way now and it has been bleeding this State of ability for years. The subcommittee's proposal would compound it by adding Federal money for this purpose. It would not help students who cannot now go to a good college but will merely move them to other parts of the country for their education. While some of this movement over the country is excellent, the merit scholarship plan as well as the large funds for scholarships in the prestige institutions already provide for a great deal of such movement; if we add Federal funds for this, the States in the West and the South would be robbed of many more of their most able students. I submit that higher education and national strength will be weakened rather than strengthened by such a program.

If I understand Senator MORSE correctly he believes that a State commission would distribute the scholarships more fairly and with less minority discrimination than would the universities and colleges. Does he really believe that a commission appointed by Governor Faubus would be more fair than the faculty committee of the University of Arkansas? I am sure on rethinking this problem he will realize from his own academic experience that this is a faulty conclusion. Has there been the slightest suspicion that the present loan funds as administered by the colleges discriminate against any group? On the contrary the State commission plan in the subcommittee's bill will not aid additional good students to secure an education but will merely move students now able to get an education in their own States, or nearby, to distant glamour institutions, and increase the strong tendencies that now exist to strengthen certain institutions and regions at the expense of the great majority.

As I proposed an alternate to the aid for educational facilities to get us off dead center here, I would like to propose one for this scholarship fund, and that is to improve the national defense education loan program. So far this program seems to be going very well, although I could suggest a number of minor improvements. But I am entirely convinced it would serve our national purposes better than scholarships if we would—(1) supply more money for loans under this program and (2) take off the institutional maximum which makes it unfair to the students at the large universities such as New York University or the University of California. It will do more good with less cost to the Government than any of the proposed scholarship programs. It likewise involves none of the problems that the subcommittee finds in the proposals recommended to them from various educational groups.

I repeat that the program as now visualized by the subcommittee will do very little good nationally and will certainly discriminate seriously against States such as Missouri. It will waste resources that higher education desperately needs if we are going to carry out our national obligations.

I enclose a copy for Senator MORSE.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER ELLIS.

COMMENDATION OF JAMES V. BENNETT ON HIS 25TH ANNIVERSARY AS DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF PRISONS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I should like to take this occasion to recognize one of our most distinguished public servants, Mr. James V. Bennett, Director of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons. This week is a most appropriate time to do so, for it was exactly 25 years ago this Thursday, February 1, that he was first appointed to the important position which he still holds. Over the past year, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries I have had the opportunity to work with Jim Bennett and to appreciate the difficult and essential assignment that he has fulfilled so long and capably.

Before I came to the Senate I was already familiar with Director Bennett's many contributions to the national welfare. Several years ago he made a survey of Missouri's penal system, and he has been helpful in a consultant capacity ever since. Needless to say, our State penal system has profited immensely from his advice and assistance. He has rendered similar services for several of our communities, including St. Louis.

The revered Senator Tom Hennings, my predecessor in the Senate and on the National Penitentiaries Subcommittee, shared a similar respect for Mr. Bennett. He related to me more than once the many ways in which our Prison Director had helped to uplift and improve the administration of justice. He commented upon several of these achievements in the annual reports of the subcommittee. He was convinced that as long as Mr. Bennett held stewardship of the Bureau of Prisons, our Nation's penal system was in the best possible hands. In the 1959 report our honored Senator from Missouri wrote, among other things, that while he realized that there is no such thing as the indispensable man, Director Bennett "comes as close to this role as any man I have known in public service."

Jim Bennett was an obvious and natural selection for the post of Prison Director in 1937. Ten years previously, as a management analysist for the old Bureau of Efficiency, he was assigned the job of investigating the Federal prisons, then in desparate straits and rocked by recurrent irregularities. He later assisted a congressional committee in drafting a report which led to the legislation creating the Bureau of Prisons in 1930. Appointed an Assistant Director of the new agency, he spent the next several years developing basic legislation to fit the expanding prison system, creating prison industries to provide respectable employment for inmates, and bringing about many profound improvements in our penal system. The Honorable Sanford Bates, who retired as Federal Prison Director in 1937, firmly endorsed his assistant as the logical choice to take over his post.

On February 1, 1937, there were 19 Federal institutions. Today there are 31 in operation, another in the construction stage, and still another on the drawing boards. Under the pressures of successive congressional enactments broadening the Federal jurisdiction over crime, the population of the Federal prisons has grown almost uninterruptedly over the past 25 years, usually more rapidly than available space. The period was also one of repeated national crises, which meant that the needs of the Federal prisons had to be subordinated to the national defense effort. Director Bennett conscientiously did his best to solve or at least to contain the consequent problems imposed up his institutions. He performed the task with stringent economy and at the same time managed to improve the institutional programs designed to salvage the offender and return him to the community better able to assume the responsibilities of citizenship.

During World War II and the Korean war, he geared the industrial activities of the Federal prisons to the exclusive production of articles to meet national defense needs. He refused to seek deferments from military service for any of his personnel, no matter how valuable they might be to his service. He further assisted the Selective Service Administration in developing workable policies for drawing manpower from among the Nation's prisoners and ex-prisoners. He aided the War and Navy Departments in developing their own correctional programs and running their own confinement facilities. After World War II he spent several months in West Germany, reorganizing its prison system and getting it off to a good start. Incident to all these services, he received a number of medals for distinguished public service.

When Jim Bennett was first introduced to the prison field in the 1920's, the Federal prisons were virtually without the rudiments of a rehabilitation program. They were filled with idle men who left prison no better prepared for community life than when they had entered. The institutions were headed frequently by political appointees and staffed by untrained guards who were not even accorded civil service status. Today, largely through Jim Bennett's efforts, the Federal prison system is internationally recognized as superior to any other.

The prisoners enter upon a rehabilitation program on the day of their commitment and it continues until the day of their departure. The Federal methods for classifying prisoners in terms of the problems they present and prescribing programs of treatment to fit those problems has been widely copied. While this treatment is underway the problems of custody and public safety are not neglected. Few men successfully escape from our Federal prisons, and it is no accident that the Federal system has been virtually free of the prison disorders experienced so frequently elsewhere, particularly during the early 1950's. Federal prison employees, now in full civil service status, are brought to peak efficiency through extended and intense training. Jim Bennett expects top performance from his employees, and they give it.

Conceded to be the ranking expert on correctional programs and architecture, Director Bennett has had a national and worldwide influence. At the request of innumerable municipalities, counties, and States, he has given generously from his store of experience and knowledge. Many foreign governments in Latin America, Europe and Asia have sought his advice. As early as 1935 he was a delegate to the International Penal and Penitentiary Congress in Berlin, and in 1950 chairman of the American delegation to a similar congress at The Hague. He served as delegate to the first United Nations Congress on Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders in Geneva in 1955, and as chairman of the American delegation to the second U.N. Congress in London in 1960. Nationally he has been active in so many welfare and correctional organizations that I cannot enumerate them here.

His efforts have done much to improve the quality and fairness of the sentences imposed for crime. He helped to develop the legislation which became the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act in 1938. He labored earnestly over the years to obtain sentencing statutes which would fit the problems of youthful offenders, and to him belongs a good share of the credit for the proposals which, in 1950, became the Federal Youth Correction Act. He helped to draft the 1948 statutes which provide fitting dispositions and psychiatric care for the mentally ill charged with or convicted of crime. In 1958 he worked with Senator Tom Hennings and Congressman EMANUEL CELLER in their efforts to obtain enactment of legislation to make Federal sentencing less inequitable. The final act provided for indeterminate sentences, commitments of defendants for observation and sentencing recommendations, and judicial seminars on sentencing problems. Since 1958 virtually every Federal circuit has sought Director Bennett's participation in those seminars, in a joint attempt to achieve the objective which the Congress directed—a more consistent and fair sentencing practice.

Jim Bennett has found time from his many duties and interests to do a great deal of writing on a wide range of subjects. He has written a book and a later supplement on correctional architecture, and it now serves as a handbook on the subject for the entire correctional field, the only available publication of its kind. Out of the distillation of his experience he has written articles for publication on such subjects as jails, juvenile delinquency, sentencing, the treatment of the mentally ill, narcotics control, prison psychiatry, and many others. His works are widely quoted by others who write in the same fields.

His contributions to the Nation's welfare are too numerous to summarize, but I would like to say a few words about Jim Bennett himself. He has, as a man in his position should have, an intense personal interest in improving the lot of our society's unfortunates. He runs a taut, no-privilege penitentiary at Alcatraz, but he travels frequently to the island to inquire into the welfare and progress of the men confined there. Many of them have eventually straightened out, earned their release, and returned to the community to do well. I am confident that Jim Bennett's personal efforts have had a lot to do with salvaging these men, once considered too dangerous and hostile to be kept anywhere but at escapeproof Alcatraz.

When he visits other prisons in the Federal system, he is never too busy to talk to any inmate who wants to see him, and he seeks many others out for helpful talks. Many of these men write him or call at his office after their release to express their appreciation; while they were serving their terms it was comforting to know that the Prison Director himself was interested in how they were getting along. Some ex-prisoners, down on their luck, shamefacedly report to the Prison Director's office when passing through Washington. Invariably he draws from a small fund he has established through the proceeds of his writings, or if it is exhausted, he digs into his own pocket.

The employees of the Federal Prison Service, too, feels a personal tie to him and a sense of mutual confidence and respect. They are, I might say, far from the best paid in the Government service. But as anyone can attest who has visited a Federal prison, they have an unbelievably high morale, and according to the Civil Service Commission, the lowest turnover in Government.

Jim Bennett has well earned the sobriquet of "Mr. Corrections." He has served in successive Democratic and Republican administrations, but there has never been any doubt about his reappointment. All of the 10 Attorneys General of the past 25 years have enjoyed his loyalty and in turn have come to rely upon him with unreserved confidence to operate the Prison Bureau with a minimum of anxiety to them. Only a couple of years ago, President Eisenhower conferred upon him the President's Award for Distinguished Federal Civilian Service.

I consider it a privilege to be associated with Jim Bennett in my capacity as chairman of the National Penitentiaries Subcommittee. During his 25 years as Prison Director, he has proven a credit to his post, his Nation, and his fellow men.

TRIBUTE OF SENATOR HRUSKA

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] has paid a fitting tribute to Mr. James V. Bennett, who on February 1 will have served 25 years as Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons. I should like to associate myself with the kind words of the Senator.

My opportunity to know Mr. Bennett springs from my service on the Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries of the Committee on the Judiciary and also on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Justice, from which Department the Bureau of Prisons secures its funds.

Through personal contact with him in committee sessions, as well as from visits to many of the institutions in his Bureau, I have come to regard and respect Mr. Bennett as one of our foremost public servants. A reliable test of an official's effectiveness can be found in the loyalty and cooperation extended by the personnel of his department.

On this score, I have commented many times in my reports, following visits to various penitentiaries, on the capabilities, the qualities, the devotion, and the diligence of the many men and women who are engaged in the work of the Bureau of Prisons. They are involved in work which is both difficult and delicate. It is far reaching in its effect and impact upon the lives and fortunes of many persons. It is dangerous work, as well. Yet the staff of the Bureau has a vision and an enthusiasm which constitute a real tribute to their Director, Mr. James Bennett.

The talents and the achievements of Mr. Bennett himself are quite impressive. I should like to pay tribute to his humane philosophy and to the enlightened efforts by which he has succeeded in making the Federal prison system a standard for the world. The Senator from Missouri enumerated Mr. Bennett's qualities and contributions. Again I wish to say that I concur in that statement.

I wish, however, to comment particularly on one of Mr. Bennett's achievements—namely, his many contributions to the literature in the field of penology and its related problems. I am sure that if all of his writings are ever collected in one place, they will be of enormous benefit for many years to come to students and to legislators.

Mr. President, on Sunday there was published in the Washington Post an article by Alfred E. Lewis, a staff reporter, which is very excellent. It includes one statement which I especially like. In referring to Mr. Bennett, Mr. Lewis wrote:

> He has served every minute of it—a prisoner of his own dedication to the plight of the imprisoned—and with no time off for good behavior.

I firmly believe, Mr. President, in giving time off for good behavior, and I also wish to say that I am in favor of the granting of parole, in proper circumstances, to prisoners. But in this case I wish to say that I hope no time off will be given to James Bennett and no parole will be granted him unless he so desires.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the article written by Mr. Lewis be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAMES BENNETT COMPLETES 25-YEAR TERM AS PRISON CHIEF

(By Alfred E. Lewis)

On this coming Thursday, James V. Bennett, 64, rounds out a 25-year term as Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

He has served every minute of it—a prisoner of his own dedication to the plight of the imprisoned—and with no time off for good behavior.

An impressive group of his contemporaries in the penological field are in agreement that his behavior in the post has been exemplary and that he should have no time off because of it.

In a field so replete with controversy and theoretical crosscurrents, this agreement is in itself remarkable. But then, Bennett is in himself a remarkable man.

ONLY REAL REWARD

The only real reward in prison work, he finds, is the knowledge that about one-third of his charges never return.

Bennett feels the general public is too little acquainted with the stories of ex-convicts who have been successfully rehabilitated.

"When an ex-convict reverts to type," Bennett explains, "he usually makes headlines which are very discouraging to us. When a man lets us down everyone is told about it. When he resumes the place in society to which his birthright entitled him, no one hears about it."

Research on the motivations and machinations of the so-called criminal mind, Bennett predicted, will one day enable the penologist to separate with great accuracy the chronic wrongdoer from the one-timer who is as shocked as society is at his transgression.

When a sick man goes to a hospital and comes out ostensibly cured, Bennett said, no one blames the hospital when he has a relapse. Bennett wishes people would start applying the same logical tolerance toward prisons.

More and more jurisdictions are coming to appreciate the value of the Federal Youth Corrections Act which he helped as a penologist to promote and as a lawyer to draft. It calls for indeterminate sentences for youthful offenders whose prospects for rehabilitation appear good.

One of the worst stumbling blocks in the community's duty to assist in rehabilitation of its former convicts, Bennett points out, is his own boss—the U.S. Government, which refuses to hire anyone convicted of a felony.

FAVORS WEEKEND SERVICE

Bennett also favors such innovations as the weekend services of jail sentences for traffic offenses.

The preparation for a prisoner's return to society begins the minute he checks into prison at any one of the 31 institutions under Bennett's supervision.

The entire Federal prison system currently reflects Bennett's belief that restricting man's freedom to move among fellow men comes pretty close to being punishment enough.

REGIMENTATION OUT

Regimentation in every activity has given way to prison freedoms which Bennett's predecessors were certain, almost to a man, were unworkable.

Lock-step cafeteria lines and bucket feedings have been supplanted by informal table arrangements permitting inmates to eat in some measure with mealmates of their own choosing—and at times within a spreadout dining period of their own choice.

Prerelease units were set up to ease the transition for a prospective ex-convict.

As a result, the violent rash of prison riots which spread across the Nation in the early 1950's involved only one Federal institution. Despite the new freedoms, the Federal prison escape rate remains exceptionally low.

In 1960, the survey of the prison health field found the quality of medical services, including psychiatric care, to be at a par or better than that available in most communities.

It is another of Bennett's beliefs that an administrator must administrate personally. To this end he manages to visit at least once a year each of the institutions in his far-flung jurisdiction, inviting suggestions from his field officers—and getting them in profusion from the inmates themselves.

This doesn't leave Bennett a whole lot of time to spend at home, 5840 Marbury Road, Bethesda.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1962 TO CREATE A DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 320)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a message from the President of the United States has been received with reference to the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, which has been read in the House. I ask unanimous consent that the message may be laid before the Senate and referred to the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The message was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

In my special message on housing of March 9, 1961, and again in my message on the state of the Union earlier this year, I recommended the establishment in the executive branch of a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, of Cabinet rank. This plan would fulfill that recommendation.

The times we live in urgently call for this action. In a few short decades we have passed from a rural to an urban way of life; in a few short decades more, we shall be a nation of vastly expanded population, living in expanded urban areas in housing that does not now exist, served by community facilities that do not now exist, moving about by means of systems of urban transportation that do not now exist. The challenge is great, and the time is short. I propose to act now to strengthen and improve the machinery through which, in large part, the Federal Government must act to carry out its proper role of encouragement and assistance to States and local governments, to voluntary efforts and to private enterprise, in the solution of these problems.

The present and future problems of our cities are as complex as they are manifold. There must be expansion; but orderly and planned expansion, not explosion and sprawl. Basic public facilities must be extended ever further into the areas surrounding urban centers; but they must be planned and coordinated so as to favor rather than hamper the sound growth of our communities. The scourge of blight must be overcome, and the central core areas of our cities, with all their great richness of economic and cultural wealth, must be restored to lasting vitality. New values must be created to provide a more efficient local economy and provide revenues to support essential local services. Sound old housing must be conserved and improved, and new housing created, to serve better all income groups in our population and to move ever closer to the goal of a decent home in a suitable living environment for every American family. We will neglect our cities at our peril, for in neglecting them we neglect the Nation.

The reorganization plan I am transmitting would establish a new executive department to be known as the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. To the Department would be transferred the existing programs and responsibilities of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. These programs include an extraordinary range of diverse yet closely interrelated activities: insurance of mortgages to finance the construction of homes and the ready interchange of existing homes, as well as their modernization and improvement; financial aids to local communities in comprehensive local planning, in slum clearance and urban renewal, and in the conservation and rehabilitation of neighborhoods and whole urban areas; advances and loans to assist in the planning and construction of needed public facilities; loans to assist in meeting the needs of our hard-pressed colleges and universities for student and faculty housing; financial aids in the search for solutions to the baffling problems of urban mass transportation; a variety of tools to stabilize and encourage liquidity in the private mortgage market; financial assistance in providing decent housing for low-income families; and others still.

Widely different as these Federal programs are in subject matter and in techniques, they all affect the lives and welfare of families in our cities and their surrounding areas, and they all impinge in one degree or another on each other. None can or should stand by itself. The basic purpose of this plan is to establish a department which will bring a maximum degree of coordination and effectiveness to the planning and execution of all of them.

Our cities and the people who live in and near them need and deserve an adequate voice in the highest councils of government. The executive branch and the Congress need an adequate instrument to assist them in the formulation and execution of policy concerning urban affairs and housing. States and local governing bodies urgently need an agency at the departmental level to assist them in formulating and carrying out their local programs for dealing with these problems. All these needs can best be met through the establishment of the Department provided for in this reorganization plan.

It should not be assumed that these are matters of concern only to our larger cities. Hundreds of smaller cities and towns are located on or near the fringes of rapidly growing urban areas. The problems of the cities affect them today, and will be theirs tomorrow. Hundreds of other smaller towns and cities not now affected will be so situated a few short years hence. Thus, the smaller towns and cities have a stake in this proposal as vital as, and only a little less immediate than, that of our large urban centers. This plan is addressed to their needs as well as to those of the major cities. Likewise, it should be emphasized that the Department will have important activities of service to the States. The establishment of this Department does not connote any bypassing or reduction of the constitutional powers and responsibilities of the States under our Federal system of government. Rather, the States must assume additional leadership in the future in dealing with problems of urban areas, and the Department will maintain close working and consultative relationships with them. An example of this relationship can already be found in the urban planning assistance program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency which provides matching funds for use by States to aid municipalities and State, metropolitan, and regional planning agencies facing rapid urbanization. Grants may be used by the States themselves to prepare statewide comprehensive plans for urban development. Just as the programs of the Department of Agriculture have strengthened the role of the States in measuring and helping solve the problems of their farmers, so the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing will provide additional opportunities for the States to play a strong role in the development of their urban communities.

As the Senate committee noted in its report on S. 1633 (S. Rept. No. 879, 87th Cong., 1st sess.), "A Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is needed to provide Federal leadership to solve the problems emerging from the transformation of the American scene from a predominantly rural society to a vast urban complex. More than two-thirds of the American population now lives in metropolitan centers. The figure is multiplying. It is compounded of explosive population growth resulting from an increased birth rate, a declining death rate, and rapid migration of people from rural areas to cities, towns, and villages." The importance of our Nation's metropolitan areas entitling them to representation at the Cabinet table is further emphasized by the great amount of tax revenues they contribute to the Federal Government. For example, in 1959, taxpayers in the 10 largest metropolitan areas paid over $13 billion in taxes or 35 percent of the total amount of individual income tax.

The need for such a Department has been increasingly recognized in recent years. A proposal for a Cabinet Department substantially similar in nature was advanced at about the same time that the first consolidated Federal Housing Agency was established, 20 years ago. Since then, year by year, both the executive branch and the Congress have taken successive steps to create a more coordinated agency with a fuller range of tools to attack these problems. No fewer than five reorganization plans submitted by my predecessors have contributed to this process. On the legislative side, the Congress has enacted major legislation in the field of urban affairs and housing in every year but one since 1946. The time is here to take the next needed step.

First, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 would establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, to be headed by a Secretary who would be assisted by an Under Secretary, three Assistant Secretaries, and a General Counsel. All of these officers would be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. There would also be in the Department, as in many others, an Administrative Assistant Secretary appointed from the classified civil service by the Secretary, with the approval of the President.

Second, the plan transfers to the Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing the functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and its Administrator, including the administration of the programs of the Urban Renewal Administration and the Community Facilities Administration and the authorities now vested by law in the Public Housing Administration and its officers.

Because of its magnitude in our economy and the immediacy of its impact on our people, housing has been and will continue to be the heart of this complex of related programs. In recognition of this fact, the plan provides for the transfer of the Federal Housing Administration as an entity to the new Department. Provision is also made for the continuance of the existing office of Federal Housing Commissioner, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Commissioner would continue to head the Federal Housing Administration under the supervision and direction of the Secretary as head of the Department.

Finally, in view of its special legal status as a mixed-ownership corporation, the Federal National Mortgage Association would be transferred to the Department without change. The Secretary would serve as Chairman of the Board of the Association, as the Housing and Home Finance Administrator now does. No change in the organization or functions of the Association within the Department affecting its secondary market operations could be made unless the Secretary finds that such change would not adversely affect the rights and interests of owners of outstanding common stock of the Association.

In accordance with the spirit and intent of the Reorganization Act of 1949 as amended, this plan promotes the better execution of the laws, the more effective management of the executive branch of the Government, and the expeditious administration of the public business. It aims to promote economy and increase efficiency to the fullest extent practicable. Its significance in the pursuit of these purposes must be judged in the light of the magnitude and significance of the programs affected.

The various programs with which the new Department would be charged involve Federal investments of billions of dollars, and contingent liabilities of billions more. The quality of administration of these programs has profound effects on land values and tax revenues in local communities throughout the country. The operations of these programs figure importantly in the vitality of the general economy. The policies that govern them play a major role in determinations of national fiscal and monetary policy. Their management in the most effective and coordinated way possible, therefore, will yield economies in the broad sense far outweighing the amount involved in the administrative cost of their operations. And even in the latter area, I am convinced that economy and efficiency will be importantly enhanced by the improved coordination which this reorganization plan will make possible.

For all the reasons herein set forth, I have concluded that the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is urgently needed to permit me to discharge most effectively the responsibilities in this area placed upon the President by the Constitution and by the statutes respecting these matters enacted by the Congress.

After investigation, I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended. I have also found and hereby declare that by reason of these reorganizations it is necessary to include in the reorganization plan provisions for the appointment and compensation of the new officers specified in section 2 of the reorganization plan. The rates of compensation fixed for these officers are, respectively, those which I have found to prevail in respect of comparable officers in the executive branch of the Government.

Although the taking effect of the reorganizations provided for in the reorganization plan will not in itself result in immediate savings, the improvement achieved in administration will in the future allow the performance of necessary services at greater savings than present operations would permit. An itemization of these savings in advance of actual experience is not practicable.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 30, 1962.*

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, today the President of the United States sent to Congress Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962. In my opinion this plan would merely elevate the Housing and Home Finance Agency to a Department status. Obviously, its initial major objective is to bestow Cabinet rank on the present Administrator of that agency.

In presenting the plan, the President is making use of procedures authorized under the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended. This reorganization plan procedure is being employed by the President in an effort to obtain what the Congress has thus far denied and been unwilling to grant and establish by the normal and regular legislative processes.

The plan is designed to deal with metropolitan and big city affairs. Since the Reorganization Act does not permit the creation of new functions, urban affairs could not be included in the plan. Therefore, in my judgment, the plan falls far short of accomplishing all of the objectives sought by the President in the legislation that the House Rules Committee rejected. It is also quite significant that the plan, as submitted, includes about 30 percent of the housing functions of the Federal Government. It does not include and would not incorporate into the proposed new Department the Home Loan Bank Board nor the veterans and military housing which comprise 70 percent of the Federal Housing operation.

It, therefore, seems to me that the provisions of the plan are probably more inadequate and less desirable than are the provisions of the proposed bill which the House Rules Committee rejected.

HOSPITALITY TO STUDENT VISITORS

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is not always possible for our countrymen, indeed, the world at large, to know of the many fine impressions which the United States makes on student visitors. All too often the reverse is true. I ask unanimous consent that

a letter written by an exchange student from abroad be printed in the Record. Quite probably, many other letters of a similar nature are written but never see the light of day.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

November 24, 1961.

Mr. E. Russell Linch,
Cultural Attaché,
American Embassy,
Beirut, Lebanon.

Sir: My tour to some parts of the United States of America this summer was of great benefit for me. It gave me a good opportunity to study, observe, and exchange views with unofficial people as well as with those who are concerned with the international relations. In this tour I have found that the Americans, in general, are generous, hospitable, kind, and eager to know about other people. It is true, as one may expect in other countries, that the common man does not know much about the people of other countries, but the mere fact that he tries to learn and satisfy his curiosity will in the long run lead him to know better. I was also impressed by the freedom of expression and the sense of tolerance in the United States of America. This attitude, I think, will eventually lead to experimentation and thence to the right solution of any problem. To me, it is this attitude which made the United States of America socially and materially more advanced than any country in the world. What impressed me most was the scientific achievements and how the benefits of these achievements are shared by all.

As an Ethiopian, to tell the truth, the color problem in the United States of America was one of the main problems to attract my attention. When I was assigned to go with the group to North Carolina I was hesitant to go there. But in the South things were not as bad as I have expected it. In the contrary, I have enjoyed the South. Most of the white southerns whom I met were very kind, generous, and liberal minded, who believe that the color problem should be solved once and forever. Those people were so strong in their belief that I, compared to them, was moderate. My visit to North Carolina convinced me that nearly all the people there agree on the evilness of the problem and the necessity of solving it. They only disagree on the method to be used.

* * * * *

During my stay in the States I was able, to certain extent: to satisfy my own interests. An ample opportunity was given to me to meet some educators and youth counsellors in Raleigh, Duke University, a high school in Chicago, Georgetown University, and the School of Education in University of New York. In all these institutions I was able to discuss the modern problems of education some of which I will be facing in the future. So may I ask you to convey my gratitude to all those educators who were of great help to me by sharing me their long experiences.

As far as the group is concerned I would like to make two comments. First, though there were some good elements in the group but still I think that the group was not harmonious and lacked a sense of belongingness. This may be due to the fact that we come from different schools, backgrounds and have different expectations to be gained from the tour. Second, because some members of the group did not speak English they could not communicate with the people on an intellectual level. As the result many a time our discussions were descending into a lower level of chatting lacking any sense of seriousness.

As for the tour in general is concerned I came out with the following conclusions:

1. The American people are eager to build a healthy relationship with peoples from other countries. They do this by trying to understand the other peoples' point of view about them (the Americans) and how could they be of any help in any situation.

2. The freedom of opinion and the responsible individual freedom which is practiced in the States is a guarantee always to lead to the right solution to any problems. And this will keep the United States of America strong to defend freedom.

In conclusion I would be very pleased if you kindly convey my deep gratitude to all those who took part in giving me the opportunity of this thrilling and rich experience of visiting the United States of America. These, of course, are the American people who for the sake of human understanding and assistance sacrifice a large amount of their income in such projects. It gives me pleasure also to thank those men and women who took the trouble and worked hard to make the groups' stay in the States pleasant. Specially I give my deep appreciation to the American Friends of the Middle East people who used to work without rest to make the group feel comfortable.

Thank you,

Faithfully yours,

Omar Mussa Hajj.

FIVE-YEAR CENSUS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a number of groups and community organizations in New York State have petitioned the Congress for legislation to provide for a quinquennial census.

I ask unanimous consent that several letters and resolutions which I have received on this subject be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas many of the fiscal aspects of town government are directly related to the Decennial Census, conducted by the U.S. Bureau of the Census; and

Whereas the town of Lancaster is a rapidly growing community, and

Whereas a census conducted every 5 years would more equitably reflect a true population count of the town of Lancaster, and more equitably benefit the township in per capita State aid: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Town Board of the Town of Lancaster hereby requests congressional action to implement the taking of a Federal census every 5 years; and further be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Jacob K. Javits and Kenneth B. Keating, U.S. Senators, to John R. Pillon, Representative in Congress, to John H. Cooke, State senator and to Julius Volker, member of the State assembly.

Town of West Seneca,
West Seneca, N.Y., December 7, 1961.

Hon. Kenneth B. Keating,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Keating: The Town Board of the Town of West Seneca, by resolution adopted December 4, 1961, has asked me to contact you and advise that it desires that you do everything in your power to promote Federal legislation to authorize the Federal census to be taken each 5 years.

It is extremely important to municipalities of the State of New York to know the population trends, both to plan for the future and to assist in obtaining adequate State aid.

The following is the text of the resolution adopted:

"Moved by Councilman Kirchberger, seconded by Councilman Stephan, that the town of West Seneca forward letters to Congressman John Pillion and Senator Kenneth Keating requesting that the Federal Legislature authorize a Federal census every 5 years, and that letters also be sent to Senator John Cooke and Assemblyman Julius Volker requesting that the State legislature memorialize Congress to act favorably on the 5-year census, copies of communications to be forwarded to County Executive Edward Rath."

Very truly yours,

Martin E. Funseth.

Albany Chapter,
American Statistical Association,
November 28, 1961.

Hon. John Lesinski,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics, New York, N.Y.

Dear Sir: The following statement is forwarded for inclusion in the written record of the hearings of the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The membership of the Albany chapter of the American Statistical Association includes professional statisticians and economists working in the agencies of the State and Federal Government, in community services, and in private industry.

We believe that a mid-decade census of population would be very useful in many fields of our work and would be valuable to the businessmen of the State. The very rapid growth of certain geographic areas within our State and the important shifts which take place in others progressively lessen the value of the decennial census data for analytical purposes with the passage of time. The lack of validity becomes particularly important during the latter half of the decade. The mobility of our population has become so accelerated in recent years that a quinquennial count appears essential.

More accurate data is needed, especially for planning in the fields of public health, education, industrial location and manpower utilization, urban renewal, housing, public welfare, highway construction, commuter transportation, and State aid to localities. While reasonably good intercensal estimates have been made in the past for the State as a whole, it has not been possible to make satisfactory estimates for smaller ones even for geographic subdivisions as large as counties.

It is highly important that the introduction of an interim census should not be permitted to result in any dilution of the quantity or quality of data secured through the regular decennial census. In order to minimize the cost of a mid-decade census, and to facilitate the earliest possible release of data, it is recommended that a very limited number of items be gathered, specifically: name of individual, sex, age, color, and possibly marital status, and relationship to head of household. It is important that these data be tabulated for minor civil subdivisions and census tracts. Unless data for such minor divisions are made available, there would be no purpose in taking a census in 1965.

Even a population count of such limited proportions is admittedly costly, but the estimated cost of some $50 million on a nationwide basis may well be much less expensive than community planning made inefficient for lack of accurate population data. It is also noteworthy that many localities have found it necessary to spend considerable sums for special censuses between 1950 and 1960. In New York State, for example, $3 million was spent for such special censuses during this period.

I appreciate the opportunity to present this brief statement on behalf of the Albany chapter of the American Statistical Association.

Respectfully yours,
HELEN C. CHASE, Dr. P.H.,
President, Albany Chapter.

ALBANY CHAPTER,
AMERICAN STATISTICAL ASSOCIATION,
Albany, N.Y., January 18, 1962.

Senator KENNETH KEATING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: I would like to present the following statement on behalf of the membership of the Albany chapter of the American Statistical Association with regard to the proposed legislation for a quinquennial census. This chapter has about 160 members, and about 90 percent of them are professional statisticians, economists, research analysts and associated personnel working in the State agencies. Our chapter has considered the matter of a quinquennial census, and has officially notified Congressman JOHN LESINSKI of its position.

No business can function efficiently nor its administrators plan wisely for its conduct without an annual review based on statistical summary. Many private and governmental activities require more frequent reviews. Yet, the Nation as a whole is gaited to a decennial stocktaking of one of its most important assets; namely, its manpower. The population of this country has greatly increased in mobility over the past 20 years. A commonly quoted statistic is that one family in five moves in a year's time and the net result of this mobility is reflected in the decennial census. However, when the mobility is this high, decennial statistics soon become outdated. On a local basis, more current data are needed. Because of rapid growth and despite the 1960 census, the village of Elk Grove, Ill., has already purchased a special census as of November 14, 1961 at its own expense. Many communities are finding themselves in similar predicaments because of rapidly shifting populations.

The chief obstacle seems to be the financial one. Although it is estimated that a minimal census in 1965 would cost approximately $50 million, this expenditure would be reflected in better information for many groups and individuals. Business could make better determinations of available markets. Governments would find it useful in urban renewal, long-range planning for school construction, administration of State aid to local units, highway construction, etc. For individual investigators, the information would provide more current information for research and analysis of sociological phenomenon and economic development. A mid-decade census would reduce the number of special censuses between 1960 and 1970. In the decade between 1950 and 1960, local governments in New York State alone spent over $3 million for this purpose. During that period, 1,170 communities in the United States paid the Census Bureau to conduct 1,529 special censuses at their own expense, and one community in California had 8 censuses during the decade.

Our chapter feels that the need is sufficiently great to warrant the cost. If we can be of any further service, please do not hesitate to call on us for additional information.

Very truly yours,
HELEN C. CHASE, Dr. P.H.,
President, Albany Chapter.

NEIL STAEBLER

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, a well-deserved recognition came recently to a man who has received many honors and commendations for the great contributions he has made to making our political processes more effective in this country.

I speak of Mr. Neil Staebler, now Democratic national committeeman from Michigan, who served for more than 10 years as chairman of the Democratic Party in Michigan.

Neil Staebler, on January 20, 1962, was awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree from the University of Michigan. This honor is particularly appropriate at this time, since Mr. Staebler soon will begin a visiting lecturer series on political science at the University of Massachusetts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place the text of the citation accompanying Mr. Staebler's honorary degree in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF CITATION AWARDING HONORARY DOCTOR OF LAWS DEGREE TO NEIL STAEBLER BY THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Neil Staebler: Servant of the public weal, bachelor of arts of the class of 1926. It testifies to Neil Staebler's political skill that his party, traditionally the minority party in Michigan, won a steadily increasing number of general elections during the recent decade when he served as chairman. It testifies to purposes transcending the partisan that he drew the attention of the public to substantive issues and greatly enhanced the role of the citizen-amateur in State political life.

A further measure of his high idealism has been his quietly effective work as founder and director of the Ann Arbor Citizens' Council and as proponent of humane causes nationally. The sources of his every achievement are to be found in his own acute and comprehensive mind and in a personal humility and good will which have captured the respectful affection of all who know him.

In conferring upon him the degree of doctor of laws, the university pays glad tribute to the distinguished abilities and to the blameless and devoted life of this loyal son.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning hour has expired.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO THE STATE OF WYOMING

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 3879) to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the State of Wyoming for agricultural purposes certain real property in Sweetwater County, Wyo.

A REPORT OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY AND OPERATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the agreement entered into yesterday the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] will now be recognized.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, because of a throat ailment I do not propose to address the Senate very long. I rise to present my most recent report on U.S. foreign policy and operations to the Senate. This is the 10th such report for the use of the Committee on Appropriations that I have presented. I have submitted these reports to every department of the Government affected, including, primarily, the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the U.S. Information Service, and those who direct our foreign aid program, which today is known as the Agency for International Development.

Last year I again visited Russia. It was my fourth visit to that country, and during this trip I spent 7 weeks in that huge country. I have had incorporated into my report the complete day by day diary of my trip. I invite Senators to read that diary, as I believe it reflects conditions as I found them in Russia.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have been looking through the diary of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana in the past half or three-quarters of an hour. I have read several pages of it, and I have found it most interesting. I not only intend to take home the copy which I hold in my hands for further reading, but also to supply myself with additional copies of the Senator's report in order that I may send them to various persons who, I think, would find the report of interest.

I commend the Senator for executing the extraordinary task which he imposed upon himself in keeping the diary, and then preparing the report as a whole. Like other Members of Congress who have found the time, I have had occasion to visit countries abroad, but invariably I have found that when I returned, the crowding of the day's events has limited what I was able to do in the way of writing a report. On occasion I have tried to summarize what I had seen on my trip in the countries I visited, especially in reference to the mission of the particular trip. However, I think no Senator has shown greater diligence than that demonstrated by the Senator from Louisiana in preparing such a detailed report. To do so is quite a chore.

As I have gone through the report I have been amazed by the specific information provided. I am sure that it will be useful to every Member of the Senate and to people generally who want a firsthand report of an experienced, capable, and diligent observer.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful for the very kind remarks of my good friend from South Dakota. Returning to my trip, I followed my usual custom and traveled without any staff members accompanying me. I had two interpreters during most of my trip, one American and one Russian, as my diary will show. I kept all the notes which form the basis of my diary, in longhand. From time to time I sent these daily reports to my Washington office, and there they were transcribed, and they form the basis of my report.

On this most recent trip to Russia I visited 12 of the 15 so-called Russian republics. I took 6,750 feet of 16 millimeter motion pictures, all at my own expense, in an effort to show the American people, and particularly my colleagues in the Senate, what I found in Russia.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. I, too, have been reading the report of the Senator from Louisiana since it came to my hands only today. On previous occasions I have read his diaries as he prepared them on visits to various countries of the world. Immediately prior to a visit I made to the Soviet Union I leaned very heavily on the diary the Senator from Louisiana had prepared on his previous visits, to give me a background for understanding what I was to see there.

I join the Senator from South Dakota in saying that no one has served the Senate and the people of the country more diligently than has the Senator from Louisiana in making such detailed and very interesting notes and observations about the countries he has visited. He has been diligent in his effort to visit all areas of the world, but particularly places that are not so commonly visited by people from the United States, and places that have great importance to our country because of the international situation which prevails.

I was particularly interested, in skimming through his account of his visit to Russia, to notice that he had some problems that were perhaps related somewhat to a trip we made there in 1959.

I regret most deeply that there has been a misunderstanding about exchange visits with the Soviets relating to hydroelectric installations and transmission of electricity, the field in which we were interested when we went to Russia. I have heard from Mr. Novikov by letter two or three times since I returned, and I have done everything I could to try to clear up this misunderstanding. I regret that it exists. I believe we should make a determined effort to see to it that we are not at fault by provoking petty reprisals, one against the other, and creating misunderstandings, which seems a rather childish thing to do. Despite these difficulties, the Senator from Louisiana still managed to see a great deal of Russia and to report in detail on it. I commend the senior Senator from Louisiana very highly for the work he has done.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank my good friend from Utah. Since he has mentioned his own trip there, I believe I should elaborate a little on that portion of my report.

When I left the United States on October 1 last year my itinerary to Russia had been more or less agreed upon. After I reached Moscow and before I started on my trip through Russia, I was called upon by Mr. Zhukov—and he is not related to the famous Russian general in any way—who is the head of the cultural department in Russia. He informed me that it would be necessary to change the itinerary that had been agreed upon. I asked him why. He said that they had to change their policy because of what had recently happened between his department and our State Department in Washington. It seems that there has been a great deal of correspondence between Mr. Zhukov's office and the State Department with reference to an exchange of delegations between Russia and the United States to visit high dams in the two countries.

While this exchange of cablegrams was going on, the distinguished Senator from Utah headed a delegation to visit the high dams and other facilities in the Soviet Union. When the Russians decided to permit the so-called Moss Committee to visit Russia, it was understood, as I was informed by Mr. Zhukov, that Mr. Novikov, who heads the Ministry for Construction of Hydroelectric Power Stations in the U.S.S.R., would be permitted to send a reciprocal delegation to our country.

However, our State Department took the position that the Moss delegation was not an official delegation and, therefore, did not count; that, in order for the Russians to be permitted to come here, another American delegation had to be sent to Russia.

I was quite disturbed and upset when I looked over the correspondence in this case and when I was informed by Ambassador Thompson about what had happened. I immediately cabled President Kennedy asking that this matter be rectified. I thought the Russians should have been permitted to visit our high dams, because the Russians had permitted our delegation to visit their high dams. There was no valid reason why the Russians should have been refused permission to come here.

When I came back to our country, I was surprised not to have received an answer from the President, because I know he usually answers correspondence, particularly when it is sent from abroad.

I detailed one of my assistants, Mr. Fellom, to investigate to find out why it was that the President had taken no action in connection with my cable and that of Mr. Thompson. Mr. Fellom did this the early part of this month. What do Senators think I learned? I found that the cablegram was sent to the State Department, and that neither Mr. Rusk nor the President had ever seen it. It was pigeonholed somewhere.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. As I previously indicated, I was most distressed to learn that this situation arose. To return to the experience we had in 1959, it would appear now, in hindsight, perhaps, that the requests were being studied at that time.

The Senator may recall that the delegation with which I went to Russia was sent pursuant to the adoption by the Senate of Senate Resolution 48. We had been in preparation for some time. We departed after having been cleared by Mr. Lacey, who was in charge of the exchange desk at the State Department. He had made extensive arrangements for our itinerary, in which the Army Map Service cooperated. Ours was to be no flash-in-the-pan or surprise visit; it had been prepared over a long period of time. When we left, it was with the cooperation of Mr. Lacey. It was understood that we were the delegation that was to go on the exchange mission to Russia. But when we arrived in Moscow and sought clearance from the Ministry of Power Stations, to make certain that our itinerary was approved by them, for the first time the question was raised: "Are you the exchange delegation?"

We replied, "Certainly; we are the exchange delegation."

The Russians then asked, "How do we know that?"

We replied, "Simply speak to the Ambassador; or we can get the clearance from the State Department. But we are the delegation."

That situation existed for about 24 hours, with their ministries communicating, apparently, with the United States. Ultimately, it was necessary for me to make a telephone call to Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, in which I said, "We are in Moscow, and there is a big stir taking place as to whether we are in Russia as an official delegation or not. Will you please communicate with the Secretary of State and have this fact confirmed?"

Senator FULBRIGHT did so. Within a matter of hours, a cablegram was received—I am sure it could be located—verifying that we were the exchange delegation, and that we were in Russia pursuant to the general agreement which had been negotiated. From that point on, we had no difficulty. We visited the places to which the Senator from Louisiana was denied admittance. We made our trip as completely as we had planned it, with one exception, in that we were permitted to visit some extra places, which we had not planned to see. So the arrangements worked out well for us.

In the course of our conversation with Mr. Novikov and members of his staff, we were asked two or three times when the Russian group, which was to visit the United States in exchange, could see certain places—and they named two or three particular places they wanted to see. We had no authority to say whether they could or could not see them; we simply said that, so far as we were concerned, the United States would cooperate in enabling the Russian delegation to visit any of our installations they wanted to see for scientific reasons. We said we felt certain they would be open to the Russians, and that we would do everything we could to facilitate their visit and to make it as profitable for the Russian delegation as the Russians had made our visit to their installations. The Russians went out of their way to give us engineering information and to have engineers explain everything in detail. They loaded us down with technical data about their dams, generators, transmission lines, and all the material we could possibly want.

When I returned to the United States, I wrote a letter to the Secretary of

State, describing our visit and saying that the officials in Russia were desirous to complete the exchange and wanted to see the particular places which I named. All I received in reply was a sort of general letter, acknowledging that my letter had been received. Nevertheless, I have continued since that time—of course, there has been a change of administration since then—to urge the State Department to facilitate the exchange between the Soviet Union and the United States. We have nothing to hide; we have nothing to fear. We are contributing to a misunderstanding, it seems to me, by erecting a kind of wall from our side, when we are constantly urging the Russians to reduce the restrictions on their side.

I have written to Mr. Novikov on two or three occasions, explaining to him that I have been interested to the extent of communicating with the State Department, urging that the exchange be completed.

I was very sorry to learn from the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana, at the opening of this session of Congress, that this subject was still a sore point and that he had been denied access to some of the places he wished to visit because of the old holdover quarrel which I could see brewing 2½ years ago.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Utah for confirming the view that the Russian representatives felt that the Senator's group was an official delegation. There is no question that the Senator's group was an official delegation, but the State Department took the position that it was not.

This is not the only instance in which the State Department apparently looked for ways to foment discord between our countries. When I made the first leg of my trip, I traveled from Moscow, to Leningrad, to Minsk, to Kiev, to Kishinev, the capital of Moldavia; then on down to Odessa, from there to Rostov-on-Don, and thence to Stalingrad; in fact, to all of southern European Russia as well as southern Asiatic Russia. The itinerary I had arranged was complied with, except that I was denied a visit to Frunze, which is the capital of Kirghizia.

I was also denied a visit to Tallinn, capital of Estonia, and Riga, capital of Latvia.

While I was on my visit in southern Asiatic Russia and southern European Russia, the second leg of my trip was outlined. I was to go from Moscow to Kuybyshev, to Omsk, to Irkutsk, to Bratsk, to Khabarovsk, and thence to Nakhodka, a port on the Pacific. That was agreed to.

Yet, when I came back from southern Asiatic Russia, I was again confronted by Mr. Zhukov with another cable which had been received from our State Department. This time the visit to our country by a party of natural gas experts was refused. There had been an understanding whereby a delegation of natural gas experts from Russia would visit the United States in return for a similar delegation from the United States being permitted to visit gasfields all over Russia. The United States gas delegation visited the gas installations all over Russia. I believe they were denied a visit to one small place, and it was explained to me why that visit was denied. The Russian delegation was supposed to come to the United States last May. The visit was postponed to September. But the September visit was also postponed. However, the State Department agreed that should an application be made at any time up to November 15, 1961, the Russian delegation could visit the United States.

When I returned to Moscow through southern Asiatic Russia, in order to have my itinerary confirmed, Mr. Zhukov said, "Senator, your State Department has gone too far. First, they denied our delegation a visit to the high dams; now they are denying them a visit to your gasfields."

The excuse given by the State Department at the time was that the Russian delegation tour was to be conducted by representatives of a gas association in the United States, but that the gas association said it would not be ready to make the tour until April of this year.

I again sent a cablegram to the President and asked him to have the Department of the Interior arrange a return visit for the Russians. The cablegram I sent, through Ambassador Thompson, was pigeonholed; and I believe, up to now the President has not seen those communications. They are still in the State Department. That is something I cannot understand. Evidently there is someone in the State Department who is holding these communications back and trying to make things as difficult as possible in respect to the exchange programs between ourselves and Russia which for the past 8 years I have been advocating. As I state in this report, I think it is shortsightedness on our part if we do not take full advantage of these exchange programs.

As my good friend the Senator from Utah has correctly stated, the Russians were eager to come here and to have us see their installations. Why we should object and make it impossible for their delegations to visit us, I cannot understand. I must conclude that there are in the State Department and in other agencies of our Government groups which like to keep the pot boiling all the time, perhaps to retain their own job. That is why, in my judgment, we are having a great deal of trouble with the Russians. Irritations such as these cause a great deal of trouble, and they give the Soviet leaders a chance to criticize our Government to their own people.

Mr. President, the good Lord knows that I abhor communism as much as any other Member of this body or anyone else in this country or in the world. But for the past 16 years we have tried to fight communism by pouring billions of dollars abroad.

Through June of this year we shall have spent or obligated in excess of $100 billion in our efforts to fight communism abroad and prevent it from invading our shores and engulfing us. But even after all those expenditures, our relationships with the world as a whole are worse today than they have ever been.

All that I am advocating in my report is that we change our course. The old programs have not worked. We should do what I have been advocating, not only as a result of my latest trip, but also as a result of other visits I have made to Russia and to other parts of the world. In a few moments I expect to read into the RECORD my recommendations. They are not new; I am merely trying to emphasize the things that should be done by us to better our position vis-a-vis our chief antagonists, the Russians.

It has been my privilege as a U.S. Senator to go abroad many times during the past 14 years. I have now visited every country in the world except one—Albania. Yet, I can say without any equivocation that I have never been treated better anywhere in the world than I have been treated by the Russian people. You will note that I said the Russian people and not the Soviet Government. It is my belief that, if possible, we should by all means try to work with the Russian people. This is the weak spot of the communistic overseers of that country.

Anyone who goes to Russia now and visits it, as I have done on four occasions; studies Russian history, and considers how the Russian people lived before the revolution and the physical progress that has been made since the revolution, must be either biased, prejudiced or blind not to see the progress made. You must recognize the progress that has been made. When I say "progress" I point out that it must not be measured by the progress of our country. The Russian people do not live as well as we do, by any means. But when measured by the conditions which existed in Russia in 1917 or in 1928, when the 5-year plans began, and when compared with the situation which exists today in Russia, one must conclude that much progress has been made there.

As I have said, on this trip I visited the major portions of the U.S.S.R. I was permitted to see factories all over the areas which I visited. Great progress in the industrial field has been made since my last visit there, in 1957. There is no question about that. More consumer goods have been manufactured. A little more food has been produced, but the progress in agriculture has not been at the same rate as that in manufacturing.

Mr. President, in my judgment, realistic exchange programs would show the Russian people that there is a better way of life than the one they now have. As I have said many times, this is one of our strongest weapons against world communism. In any fair comparison, our way of life will win hands down. Furthermore, in my opinion, Mr. Khrushchev is the only Russian leader who has in some way responded to the will of the Russian people.

I can demonstrate that by giving example after example to show that more local autonomy is today being given to the Russian people than they have ever had before. I have no doubt that if the people of Russia can be shown that there is a better way of life than the one they now have, they will demand the better way of life, and will get it under the present regime. Today a great deal of trouble is brewing in Russia against Mr. Khrushchev, because—in my opinion—of the attitude he has taken in trying to respond to the will of the Russian people, as he has done in the past.

I should like to be more specific about what I have in mind in regard to the local autonomy. My 1957 report backs up what I shall say now. In a discussion which I had in 1957 with Mr. Mikoyan, the chief economist in the Presidium, and a member of the Presidium, he stated to me that there was then a great deal of trouble in the country in connection with getting the people of the various republics, the oblasts, and the other subdivisions in Russia, to vote to ratify the sixth 5-year plan. In my conversation with Mr. Mikoyan, I said to him "Mr. Mikoyan, I am very much interested in your 5-year plans. I notice that the sixth 5-year plan has not been adopted up to now. Why is that?"

He said, "Well, Senator, to be frank with you, we cannot get the people in the republics, in the oblasts, and the other subdivisions, to ratify our sixth 5-year plan." All this is in the RECORD, Mr. President; I stated it to the Senate in 1957.

I asked him, "What reasons do you assign for their failure to ratify them?"

He replied, "They complain that they want to have a voice in regard to the manufacture of all the goods that are planned for certain areas in Russia."

I asked, "Why?"

He said, "Because we have failed to give to the Russian people the amount of consumer goods we promised; and they want to retain the authority to manufacture goods, without any interference from Moscow."

What happened? By the end of 1957, 2 or 3 weeks after I returned to the United States, a 7-year plan was adopted by the Russians. What did that mean? It meant that the sixth 5-year plan went on a year-to-year basis for 3 years, so that the people could be assured that more consumer goods would be made. The 7-year plan is composed of 2 years from the sixth 5-year plan and 5 years from the seventh 5-year plan. That is how we get the figure of "7."

Under the present procedure, all the planning is done at the Moscow level, but that planning is done from facts and figures that are furnished Moscow by all the factories—the superintendents and workers of those factories—all over the country. Once those figures are gathered, the capability of each factory is established. If a factory manufactures tractors, for example, and in the past it manufactured, let us say, 15 tractors a day, and that factory is told, "You can manufacture 18 a day," the plan is to make 18 a day.

By the same token, if a shoe factory had made a thousand pairs of shoes a week, and the planners at the Moscow level felt that it should manufacture 1,200 pairs a week, that was the planned amount determined for that factory to manufacture each month of the year. But after the plan is agreed upon at the Moscow level, it is not carried out by Moscow. Moscow has nothing to do with the execution of the plan agreed upon. This is left to the superintendents and workers in each factory. That is how it is done now. In addition, the needs of the locality are taken care of first, and the excess production over and above the local need is then distributed to other sections of the country.

I repeat, the reason that was done was that the people demanded it, so they could be assured that the manufacture of consumer goods agreed upon at the Moscow level would be carried out by the people on the local level.

To me, that is a significant change in Russia. In my judgment, an evolution, a decentralization of power, is in progress in the Soviet Union.

I found another change of significance. When I was in Stalingrad in 1956, I visited a large factory that made tractors. At that time, the tractors and all parts for the tractors were made under one roof, or complex. There were some 8,000 parts in the finished tractors; and every bolt, wheel, cog, and gear for each tractor was made under one roof.

When I talked to the superintendent and workers, I expressed my amazement that this procedure was followed. I told some of the workers it seemed to me that much of the making of bolts and smaller parts could be done in other localities than Stalingrad, and production could be increased by the use of assembly line techniques. When I went back to Stalingrad last October, to my surprise they were following the capitalistic system of having the assembly done there and having parts made in other sections of the country. So instead of having the 8,000-odd parts made under one roof, only some 1,000 parts are made in that complex; the rest are made in various parts of Russia. Today it is more or less an assembly plant. As a result, more and more tractors are being constructed.

I do believe, as I said earlier, if we can only show to the Russian people that the capitalistic system is more efficient, we will create much trouble for the Soviet leaders. I do not believe it would hurt to have them come and visit us in this country. Many people complain that they would engage in sabotage. I say to Senators that we ought to let as many Russians come to this country as desire to come, so they can see what we have. We should not be ashamed of it. In order to protect ourselves against sabotage, if necessary, I would advocate having an FBI man go around with everyone who came here. It would pay us to go to that expense. We must show them that there is a better way of life than that which they have now. The only way I can conceive of our being able to do that is to let them come to this great and bountiful country and see for themselves. I am satisfied that, if they can ever be shown, they will make demands of their leaders.

It is my considered judgment, resulting from my visits there, that what has kept Mr. Khrushchev going at the speed he is proceeding now is the fact that in 1957, Sputnik I went up. That feat gave Mr. Khrushchev and his policy a fine boost. When Messrs. Gagarin and Titov were put into orbit, that gave him another big boost. In my judgment, those events took away from the minds of the people the troubles now going on in Russia, and believe me when I say there is much trouble brewing there. Those troubles are more or less personal. They relate to the people themselves, in that today the people of Russia are not receiving wages in keeping with their cost of living.

My report will show—and I shall not take the time to read it—that I visited many factories. I always asked what the average wage of a factory worker was. I asked what the highest pay, the lowest pay, and the average pay were. Those facts appear in this report. It will be seen that the average pay all over Russia is from about 95 to 105 rubles a month.

What does that mean in American dollars? When I was there in 1957, tourists could obtain 10 rubles for $1. The first time I went there, in 1955, the ratio was 4 rubles to $1. But now a ruble costs $1.10. In other words, a ruble is worth 10 percent more than an American dollar.

A person receiving 95 rubles a month would receive $104.50 in our money.

I wish to discuss the cost of living. The only cheap foods in Russia are cabbages, potatoes, and bread. When I say "cheap" I do not mean they are by any means as cheap as they are in America.

In the wintertime, which lasts for a long period, potatoes range in cost from 5 cents to as much as 8 cents a pound, in our money. Bread costs about 20 cents for a 1-pound loaf.

Fifty years ago, back in my hometown of Houma, I used to be a clerk, in a small country general store. I sold sowbelly at 4 cents a pound. Now if a person goes into a store in America to buy sowbelly, he will pay about 36 cents a pound for it. In Russia sowbelly is $1.40 a pound.

A little scrawny chicken, weighing not more than 3 pounds, costs $4.50. That is $1.50 a pound.

A skinny turkey, weighing about 8 pounds, sold for $11 American money. All of that is stated in the report, including where I saw it and the names of the markets involved.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. When the Senator talks about the cost per pound, is he talking about a chicken dressed or a turkey dressed?

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. On the hoof, so to speak.

Mr. ELLENDER. They are not eviscerated. The feathers have been plucked, but they have not been eviscerated.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They are not cleaned.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. The neck is not even chopped off. The head and everything else remain. Only the feathers are pulled off.

Let us consider the cost of meat in Russia. Some people say there is no competition in Russia, since the state owns everything and since the collectives are operated through a state agency, and that the prices ought to be uniform. That is not true. In Moscow, for example, one can go to a state store to get meat at $1.10 or $1.15 a pound. In a collective store, where one can get fresher meat, or in a store where the collective sells for the farmer who produces it on his own little plot, one might pay from 40 to 50 percent more for the meat, because it is fresh.

The meat may be pork, beef, lamb, or mutton. It is all about the same price, and the price is near $1.75 a pound.

When a customer goes to a store to buy some meat, as I point out in the report, the first thing the customer must do is to note the price of the meat. If the price of the meat is 4 rubles for a kilo—a kilo being 2.2 pounds—he will then go to the clerk and pay his 4 rubles and get a receipt for the 4 rubles. He then takes his receipt to the butcher. The butcher does not permit him to select the meat he wants, but grabs the piece of meat hanging before him and cuts off what he thinks will weigh 2.2 pounds. If it happens to weigh 2.3 pounds instead, the butcher does not ask the customer, "Will you pay a little extra for this extra meat I have cut?" No; he cannot do that. The butcher must take from the customer's purchase a little sliver. If the first sliver he cuts off is not quite enough, he must cut off another. He will cut off as many slivers as necessary to be sure that the amount of meat sold is 2.2 pounds.

On the other hand, if the piece of meat does not weigh quite 2.2 pounds, the butcher will then cut a sliver from the big chunk of meat, to add on, until the weight is exactly 2.2 pounds.

I have never seen so many clerks anywhere else as I saw there. I have often reflected that it is no wonder there is no unemployment in Russia. There are too many people doing the same thing in stores. Particularly in keeping accounts and the handling of goods. One has to see to believe.

I go back to the proposition that in Russia today, with the small amount of money paid to the worker, dissatisfaction is bound to mount. It is my belief that this discontent could be accelerated if only we would permit the Russians to come to America and show them how we live, how much our people have as compared to what they have.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. McNAMARA. I think the Senator has established some things very clearly on the cost of living in Russia. I believe at this point in the Senator's presentation it would be interesting, though the Senator no doubt covered it in his report, to know something about the housing situation. Housing is a great part of the cost of living. Could the Senator give us briefly his reaction in regard to housing?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have stated that in the report, but I shall be glad to highlight my findings in this field.

First, as I recall the last figure, approximately 19 to 20 percent of the average salary of a U.S. worker is required for food and clothing. In Russia 80 percent or more of what the worker makes is required to pay for food and clothing. In many cases it takes 100 percent of what the entire family earns. Not only does the head of a family work, but also the mother and many of the children have to work. I found no Russian family who told me the amount necessary to buy food and clothing was less than 80 percent. It was always 80 percent or more.

In respect to housing, I noticed a great difference in housing facilities which have been built since 1957. I saw a number of apartments now being rented, in which bachelor quarters have a bedroom, a nice little kitchen, a bathroom, a toilet, and a clothes closet.

Also, there were two-bedroom apartments with the added facilities, kitchen and so on. I have seen a three-bedroom apartment, with gas and electricity, furnished, which rented for as little as 9 rubles a month. The average is about 7 rubles a month. The rentals for apartments are very cheap in contrast to our own.

In America, as I remember the figures, it takes about one-fifth or 20 percent of the average person's salary to pay the rent. In Russia from 3 to 5 percent of the salary is required for payment of rent.

Mr. President, it is my hope that Senators will read the report. As I said at the outset, I am suffering from a condition in my throat, which might be a good thing, because I could talk from now until tomorrow morning about my trip. Of course, I do not wish to do so.

I went to a great deal of trouble and hard work to do the best I could to bring before the Senate and the American people a clear picture of conditions as I found them in Russia. When I left Washington a few of my colleagues who knew I was going admonished me that I should not go. One of them even went so far as to say, "Senator, we need you here badly. You should not go."

I said, "Why?"

He replied, "Because you might not come back. They may take a shot at you."

Of course, nothing like that happened. I am not going to name the one who made that statement, but I say to him that it is my belief—and I make this statement without fear of contradiction—that a couple is as safe walking the streets of Leningrad or Moscow as in walking the streets of Washington, D.C., or perhaps safer. I make that statement without fear of contradiction, because I have walked those streets alone, not only in Moscow and in Leningrad, but in other places within the Soviet Union, and I was not followed by anyone. I was not stopped from taking pictures or anything of the sort.

I believe that more Senators and Representatives should visit the Soviet Union in the hope that there may develop a new approach for a better understanding of each other between the peoples of the two countries. I think the sooner such an understanding is reached the better off we shall be.

I believe it is useless for us to try to reach agreement with Russia on anything so long as fear exists on both sides of the so-called Iron Curtain. The Russians fear us; we fear them. Unless that fear can be dispelled, I cannot see any hope of agreement on the solution of any serious problems. I do not know of a better way for us to accomplish that objective than through a realistic exchange program.

At this point I should like to read into the RECORD my recommendations. I presume I shall be criticized for these recommendations, but that does not matter. I have made similar recommendations before. I made them in 1955, and I repeated them in the last pages of my report in exhibit 14. I am very hopeful that a little more attention will be paid to my recommendation than has been the case in the past. I sent to the State Department my detailed reports containing all the original data, which had a great deal of classified material. What happened to that material I presume is what happened to the messages I sent to the President last October and November. They were undoubtedly pigeonholed. No one looks at them.

I repeat that I hope Senators will read the report. If in the future, any Senator desires to ask questions about the report or wishes further details concerning it, I will cheerfully respond. These conclusions and recommendations appear on pages 163, 164, 165, and 166 of my report.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Throughout the U.S.S.R. there has been a significant change in the administration of its controlled economy, particularly in the manufacturing industries. The ministries on the Moscow level that formerly initiated, promulgated, and executed all plans for industry have been abolished. There has been substituted the GOS-PLAN, a group which gathers all data as to the capability of all industrial plants throughout the U.S.S.R. and fixes the amount of production for each plant, after consultation with those in charge of actual production at each plant—the manager and workers. After production goals have been agreed upon, they are left in the hands of the local plant manager and the workers for fulfillment, with no interference from Moscow.

In addition, the planned production is so distributed that the needs of the people where the plants are located are first provided for, and the rest of the production is distributed through other parts of the U.S.S.R. through a ministry on the Moscow level.

This decentralization has meant a small degree of autonomy and has resulted in expanded production everywhere. Let me emphasize that this change did not come about because the leadership desired it, but because the people demanded it so as to assure them more consumer goods.

Another change I found significant was that in many areas there has developed some semblance of the assembly-line techniques which have proven so successful in our own country. On my previous visits, I noted that in almost all instances, all parts for any manufactured commodity were made under one roof—that is, in a single factory. Today I find many small Government plants erected in various sections of Russia to produce parts for automobiles, tractors, combines, and other like commodities. These parts are sent to assembly plants, where the finished tractors, automobiles, combines, and other manufactured articles are being turned out. This, too, has resulted in a spurt of increased production.

Significant changes have also taken place on the collective farms. Prior to 1957, a collective farm was completely dependent upon an MTS, a machine tool station owned and controlled by the Central Government, for equipment to plant, cultivate, harvest, and transport all commodities. Under that system, collectives were forced to sell as much as 75 percent of those crops, at a fixed price, to the Government, in advance of production. All that has been changed. Collectives can now purchase and own their own equipment, and all they produce is sold on the open market. I find that even under communism prices fluctuate considerably, depending upon the supply in relation to the demand.

Although I found more food and clothing—in fact, more consumer goods available to the people than on my last visits, most goods are still in short supply. There is considerable discontent, primarily because prices of goods available are high in comparison with wages earned. Even though the disparity in wages and the cost of living is not as marked as on my previous visits, many of the people must still spend their entire earnings for their minimum needs in food and clothing.

I find that no effort is made to assist the individual worker by providing wage incentives, luxury items, and the like. He is helped in a collective way as in the past, by providing for general benefits such as better schools, more hospitals, elaborate cultural centers, spacious parks, and the like. Few workers, I am informed, are enthusiastic or really interested in 10- and 20-year plans. As I pointed out in my diary, and as I have stated many times before, even though it is true that the lot of the average Russian has been greatly enhanced in a physical sense, still he desires more improvement in his standard of living, and I doubt that he will continue to be satisfied with promises of a better life years hence. He has been hearing that tune for many years now, and I doubt that he will much longer be reconciled by it. In short, it is my belief that unless the Russian leadership takes steps now to provide higher pay for factory workers, or in the alternative to lower the price of consumer goods, including food and clothing, discontent will become more and more apparent.

First. I again recommend an expanded and realistic exchange of persons program with the U.S.S.R. We should lean backward in our efforts to promote such a program.

This exchange should not be promoted on the basis of an exchange of one Russian for one American, but I advocate that we permit as many Russians to visit us as desire to come. Care, of course, must be taken that the exchange be bona fide, and not used as a means for infiltration of our borders by Soviet agents. I believe we can insure ample safeguards against infiltration by exercising proper precautions. Visits to our country by Russians from all walks of life would give them an opportunity to see at first hand what a free society has to offer. By the same token, visits to the U.S.S.R. by Americans in all walks of life would give them the opportunity to learn at firsthand what a totalitarian form of government has to offer.

Second. I recommend that unnecessary travel restrictions in our country and the U.S.S.R. be lifted. Any area in our country that is not closed to foreign diplomats should not be closed to diplomats from the U.S.S.R. The same rule should apply to our diplomats in the U.S.S.R. Too often have I observed that areas in the U.S.S.R. opened to British, Italian, French, and other foreign diplomats are closed to American diplomats.

Third. I recommend some trade and a restoration of commercial contacts between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

There was a time when the U.S.S.R. was short in supply of certain minerals, but that condition no longer exists. Now the U.S.S.R. possesses a vast storehouse of strategic materials, and it seems to me we are only cutting off our noses to spite our faces by refusing to trade with Russia, when all other countries of the free world are doing so.

Fourth. I recommend that in dealing with the Russians we continue to "exercise the patience of Job." As I have pointed out, they have always been suspicious of foreigners and difficult to approach. We should by all means endeavor to gain their confidence, else we will never be able to reach agreement with them on any grave world problem. Too often we have bickered with them over trivialties.

Mr. President, in this connection, I went to a great deal of trouble in the study of Russian history. I have placed in the appendix of my report a summary of the development of Russia from its earliest beginings to date to show that the suspicion which now exists among the Russians is nothing new, and that their outlook with respect to religion has likewise existed for a long time.

Fifth. I recommend that all propaganda efforts, through the Voice of America or any other medium, remain completely objective and positive in extolling the virtues of democracy. In other words, as I have stressed before, we should objectively depict the great advantages that our way of life has to offer, without disparaging or criticizing theirs. As I pointed out before, the Russian people have attained, under the present system, a much better way of life than ever before. Our objective should be to show them the superior virtues of ours.

Sixth. I recommend that we offer the same advantages to the Russians in our exchange programs as we provide for the countries of the West. After all, we are supposed to have the West on our side already, so why not try to win over our chief antagonist? Would it not be better to attain our goal in that manner than to continue to spend ourselves into bankruptcy?

As I pointed out before, we have an exchange program on the statute books today under which we spend between $50 million and $55 million. Most of that money is spent with the British and French and Italians—our so-called allies. Of that huge sum less than one-half million dollars is spent on the Russian people and on citizens from other countries behind the Iron Curtain, yet, I believe this is where we need the program the most.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It was my impression—and I ask the Senator to correct me if I am in error—that originally the Bolshevik system was established on the theory that every workingman should earn exactly the same amount regardless of his place in society; in other words, a plant superintendent would earn the same amount of money as the commonest laborer in the plant.

My impression is that the Soviets began to believe that that system, which was in accordance with the pure theory of communism, did not work very well, because it failed to provide the incentive that made one man strive to do better work day in and day out. It is my impression that that system was changed some years ago, and a system conforming more to our own theory, and which incidentally contains some elements of capitalism, was set up. It is my further understanding that now the difference between what a plant worker earns and what the foreman of the plant makes is very great.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. I have found, in talking to doctors, engineers, and mechanics that some doctors earn as much as 1,000 rubles a month, an engineer 800 rubles a month, and a mechanic 700 rubles a month. The mechanic can purchase for himself and his family all the food and fiber that is available out of his salary of 700 rubles. However, the doctor who earns 1,000 rubles has no place to invest this extra money; nor the engineer, who gets 800 rubles. As a result, a great many of the better educated people are wondering, "Why should I spend so much time at school in learning to be a doctor or an engineer, when a mechanic who has spent half the time I have spent at college or school can earn enough to satisfy all his needs of food and clothing?"

On this trip and on past trips I tried to find out whether the person who earns extra money over and above what he needs to buy the food and fiber that is available could invest that money anyplace. I found three ways in which he could invest it.

First, he could invest it in a savings bank. These banks lend money to people whose salaries are not high and who need a few rubles to help them make special purchases. The savings banks pay 2 to 3 percent interest, on deposits.

The second and third ways are lotteries. The first form of lottery is a national lottery run by the Government. A person can buy as many tickets as he desires and pays about 30 kopeks for each ticket. That is about 30 or 35 cents in our money. If he happens to pick the lucky number he wins quite a large sum of money. If his number does not turn up, he loses. That is one form of lottery.

The second form of lottery works in this way: A person buys as many tickets as he desires. Assuming that the tickets sell for 50 kopeks apiece, he can buy a 50-kopek ticket and must also pay a 3-percent insurance fee on the 50 kopeks, which would be 51½ kopeks. Every year the lottery is drawn. If he fails to get the lucky number, the 3-percent insurance fee sees that he gets his original investment back. The interest or insurance that is paid by all those who buy tickets goes to make the pot, less expenses, which the lucky winner gets if his number is drawn. So the Government gets the use of this money in its banks, without interest. The investor puts up the insurance or interest in advance, and he loses it if his number is not drawn. So those two lotteries and the bank investment are the only methods by which the people in Russia can have their money work for them.

I believe that Russia is the only country in the world where such conditions exist. The Government is supreme and all powerful. Everything is owned by the Government. Every acre of land is owned by the Government. No person can own anything, not even a square inch of land, except the clothes he wears and the little food he buys. If he makes enough money to be able to buy an automobile or a television or a radio, he can do that if any are available. In order to be even a bootblack in Russia, it is necessary to work through the Government. In order to be a barber, it is necessary to work through the Government. One cannot be a taxi driver or own his own car so as to engage in the business of taxi driving unless he operates through the Government.

If the people of America could go to Russia and see these things for themselves, they would not want any part of communism. That is why I often wonder why some people in the United States are afraid of communism or of coming in contact with it. I do not believe that any person who has known the fruits of liberty and our way of life would ever succumb to the lure of communism after he has seen how it actually operates. I wish more Americans would go to Russia and see how the system operates. They would come back to America, the same as I have always come back, abhorring communism more and more. The more I go to Russia and see communism in operation, the more I abhor it.

That is why I say that if we could get realistic exchange programs in operation, we could probably do a better job in combating the spread of world communism than by spending ourselves into bankruptcy pumping money into the economics of countries that I sometimes call unworthy allies.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is it not also true that the Soviet Union has made some moves in the direction of permitting the workers on state farms, or at least cooperative farms, to have a little land of their own in order to enable them to raise some of the produce they need, and that that would belong to those who raised it, rather than belong to the Government?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. I point that out in all my reports.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. All of those things are encouraging, in that they are significant signs which indicate that the same things which motivate the American people tend, at heart, to motivate the Soviet people; and that the Russians in considerable degree are pressing, so far as they have the power to press for them, the very kinds of things we have evolved in our country. I am inclined to believe—and the Senator has helped to persuade me in my belief—that we cannot be self-righteous about these things. The Senator is saying, is he not, that the best way is to let the Russians see what we have here, and let them figure things out for themselves?

Mr. ELLENDER. Exactly. Since the Senator has raised the point, I should also say that I learned something significant on this trip while visiting a state farm outside Irkutsk, near Lake Baikal. That state farm contains around 75,000 to 80,000 hectares. A hectare is 2½ acres. Formerly this huge state farm was composed of nine different collectives. The collectives were asked to join themselves into bigger collectives, and they did so. Instead of nine collectives, they consolidated themselves into three collectives. Later the three became a state farm. But before they consented to become members of the state farm, they demanded to retain their little plots, so that they could plant them for their own benefit. Those are the exceptions which are taking place all over Russia today.

These little plots are being retained, and the workers not only produce food for themselves from the plots, but also sell quite a bit of the food. I visited a collective which was near the base of Mount Ararat, in Armenia. I visited one of the many home gardens. It was located on a plot of about three-quarters of an acre. The owner could raise as many chickens, sheep, hogs, or cows as he desired. He was even able to buy feed in order to raise more chickens to sell on the market.

Today the food produced on the small home gardens or plots accounts for 10 or 12 percent of the food produced in Russia. All of it is grown by the individual farmers and is sold by them either directly or through a collective, and all the profits go to the farmers. In my opinion, more and more of that activity would develop if only the Russians could visit us and learn from us what it means to work for oneself, to be your own boss.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator think it might be constructive for the people of the United States to know what is taking place in the Soviet Union, so that so far as the Soviets have something which they have found a way to do better than we are doing it, whether it be the planting of trees or anything else, we could learn about it and try it in the United States, to see whether it is any good?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad the Senator has asked the question, because it reminds me of a little incident which took place at Stalingrad. I met a very intelligent agronomist there. He is a forester. He had just returned from a visit to the United States 3 or 4 months earlier. At times it is quite warm around Stalingrad. Strong east winds erode the land considerably. The rainfall there is under 20 inches annually. The Russians have discovered a way to retain the moisture and prevent wind erosion by growing tree belts.

The Russian agronomist said to me, "Senator, I visited your country. I learned much. However, we prepare our land much better than you do for the planting of our trees." I believed him, because very few trees die there. The Russians take good care of them. I saw some trees which had been planted only 2 or 3 years previously, which were probably twice as large as trees which had been planted in our country for the same length of time. The trees in Russia are better taken care of on an individual basis. But his statement to me was—and he had observed the situation—that the Soviets take more trouble to prepare the soil to plant trees than we do. Although my notes show that I did not agree with him, I am willing to admit now that they have planted their land better than we have with tree belts.

Although the Russians are doing a good job in that respect, and they are learning from us, we ought to continue to invite them to this country to let them see what we have. To me, that is the best way to fight communism, to meet it head on. We will never accomplish anything in opposition to communism if we bury our heads in the sand and ignore it. Nevertheless, I must admit that communism has accomplished for 220 million people a good deal more than I have seen in other countries governed by monarchs and other rulers, in which there were but two kinds of people—the rich and the very poor. The point is, that our way of life can do even more for these people than communism, and this is what we must sell.

As my colleague pointed out a while ago, it is true that at the beginning communism was supposed to treat everyone alike. But they are veering away from that. Today some apprentices are paid as little as 45 rubles a month, and some factory workers are paid as little as 75 rubles a month. In Leningrad, I met a man who wanted to talk to me. He followed me around for quite a while, and waited until I reached a little park not far from the hotel. When I sat down there, he sat next to me. He wanted to know about America and about conditions in America. I asked him, "What do you do?"

He said, "I am a translator."

I asked, "How old are you?"

He said, "I am 27 years old."

I asked him, "Are you married?"

He replied, "No."

I asked, "How much salary do you earn?"

He said, "95 rubles a month."

I asked, "How much education do you have?"

He replied, "I had 10 years in the preparatory school and 4 years in college."

I asked, "You are being paid only 95 rubles a month?"

He said, "Yes."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That would be about $100 a month, would it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, or about $103 a month.

Then I asked him, "How much tax must you pay out of the 95 rubles a month?"

He said, "13 rubles a month."

I asked, "What do you pay that for?"

He said, "Because I am a bachelor, and I must pay the bachelor tax of 7 rubles, and also 6 rubles as income tax—13 rubles altogether."

I asked, "Why don't you get married?"

He replied, "Because it is cheaper for me to pay the 7 rubles bachelor tax than to feed a wife."

That man had been out of college for 4 or 5 years. As a translator he was earning only 95 rubles a month, and he had a tax burden of 13 rubles. He admitted to me that he was having a hard time making ends meet, even though he received a little help from his father and mother, for he was living in their home, more or less rent free.

I found many others in a similar condition—many Russians who were anxious to talk to me, and who talked to me individually. Every now and then, someone on the streets of Leningrad would ask me, "Parlez vous francais?" or I would be asked whether I could speak Spanish. The moment they learned I could speak either French or English, they would wait for a convenient time, and then talk to me. We conversed a great deal about America. In addition, I visited many schools and talked to the children there. All were interested in America.

So, Mr. President, we have a golden opportunity to show off our Nation to the Russian people; we have here a great showcase filled with the fruits of our way of life we could exhibit to them. We should do that by all means. I have been advocating it for the past 7 or 8 years.

Mr. President, on this trip I visited Japan. I think I am the first American who, since the Russian revolution, in the course of a trip around the world, has passed through the entire length of Russia, including Siberia, in returning to the United States. After leaving Moscow, I passed through all of Siberia, and reached the Sea of Japan, at the port of Nakhodka. There, I boarded a Russian ship which took me to Yokohama. The ship was 310 feet long, and had a complement of 110 people, 40 percent of whom were women—cooks and maids who worked on the ship. There were only three passengers—two Japanese and myself. So I traveled by ship to Yokohama. That trip from Nakhodka to Yokohama marks the first time in my seven trips around the world that I traveled by ship rather than by airplane.

Mr. President, I wish I could tell the Senate all that I found in Japan in terms of the assistance we are now giving that country—assistance which I think we should not now be giving Japan, for Japan is now better off than she has ever been before. Yet we are contributing quite a bit—in the form of military assistance—to her economy.

I also visited Formosa. I wish to take off my hat to Chiang Kai-shek. He has done a good job there, and Formosa is now a beautiful island. It is a nice place for tourists; and if any Members of this body desire to spend a good summer or even a good winter, I advise them to visit Taipei. Formosa is a beautiful island. We have spent in excess of $3 billion there, I believe. The economy has grown considerably, and we are gradually lessening the amount of our aid to that area of the world.

From there I went to South Vietnam. I had been there three times before, and on those three previous visits I had had occasion to talk to President Diem. But he would not see me this time—why, I do not know. Much dissatisfaction exists in Vietnam, and much trouble is brewing there. But in my judgment, that trouble stems from inside the country. In South Vietnam there are two areas and two tribes which President Diem has never been able to subdue. One is located, as I recall, northwest of Saigon, and the other is in the southern part. These dissatisfied tribesmen invite some of their North Vietnamese friends to come help them; and most of the trouble that is occurring now in South Vietnam stems from this. Of course, Mr. Diem has asked for more money from us, and has obtained it. It strikes me that it is high time for us to reevaluate our assistance program in that area.

I also visited Vientiane, the capital of Laos. In that capital a fight is going on between three brothers, in their attempts to obtain power. The "outs" are trying to get "in" to get "on the gravy train." We are supporting one of those brothers. The other two are fighting their own brother, in their attempts to "get into the saddle." There, again, Mr. President, all the difficulty results from internal dissensions among the three brothers. The head of the Pathet Laos, which is the Communist Party within Laos, has an army that is a little weaker than the army of the prince we are supporting, and does not have to solicit too long before obtaining aid from North Vietnam. But all of it is done from within, Mr. President. It strikes me that every effort should be made to make that country neutral—not to make it pro-West, because that is where the mistake was made, when we made efforts to make Laos a pro-Western country. That is where we got into trouble.

In Cambodia the Prime Minister is doing well for himself, I think, in getting aid from everyone; but in that area, we are "the bad boys." Why do I say that, Mr. President? As I point out in my report, in my visit to Cambodia, I found that the Chinese have furnished the Cambodians a little more than $40 million, and with that money the Cambodians have built four manufacturing facilities. One of them is a plywood mill. Another is a textile mill. Another is a paper mill for the manufacture of cardboard for boxes and wrapping paper. The fourth is a cement plant. All those facilities have been built by the Chinese, and are producing commodities for the Cambodians, and give the Cambodians work.

The Russians have built a fine hospital there. But what have we spent our money for? We have spent almost $200 million in equipping a large army for Cambodia. Mr. President, why do you think Cambodians want the army there? So they can remain neutral. I think we have spent entirely too much money to maintain an army in Cambodia to maintain neutralism. I think our money has been wasted there. I have not found greater gougers anywhere than I found in Cambodia. Money is simply being wasted. We have there a USIS office, with a total of nine officers scheduled for fiscal 1962. The public affairs officer is a person by the name of Mr. Darrell Price, according to my memory. He is not responsible for the situation there, but the annual rental we pay for a place for his family to live is $10,332. I think it is shameful for us to pay that kind of money in light of the amount of money we are spending in Cambodia.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I recall that 5 years ago last fall I had the pleasure of traveling several weeks with the Senator from Louisiana through Japan, Taiwan, South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand. I have not heard all of the report the Senator is delivering today, because I was downtown, shortly after noon, attending a conference, but I shall read his written report.

I would like to interrogate the Senator on the basis of making a comparison between what we found 5 years ago and what was true last fall. Have the Communists gained a stronger foothold and are they wielding a stronger influence in southeast Asia? Because of the billions of dollars of foreign aid which the U.S. Government has expended in that area, is the situation improving so far as the United States and its prestige are concerned?

Mr. ELLENDER. They are much worse. They have grown much worse.

Mr. DWORSHAK. There has been a constant deterioration in the last 5 years?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have pointed out, we have spent $1⅓ billion in South Vietnam. Prosperity reigns there as it never did before. The Senator would not recognize Saigon any more. They built a hotel there. Now when one wants to get a room in a little place like Saigon he has to pay a high price. I had to pay $25 a day.

Mr. DWORSHAK. They must have learned the Senator was an American.

Mr. ELLENDER. Possibly so. That was done by a few Frenchmen and a few rich Vietnamese. There is prosperity in South Vietnam today. The people are much better off than they have ever been. It would seem to me, since we have helped bring about prosperity, the people should be satisfied; but they are not. There are two areas there which Diem has been unable to get together. The fighting going on there is internal; the "outs" of government are trying to oust the "ins" in the Government.

Mr. DWORSHAK. If what the Senator says is true—and I am sure it is—that the situation is becoming more difficult for us to cope with and we are losing our prestige, then would the Senator recommend that the time is long past due when we should have a complete reappraisal of our foreign aid program, both from an economic and military standpoint, in southeast Asia, or should we continue to spend huge sums of money so that, sooner or later, the United States will lose out completely in southeast Asia and make it possible for the Reds to move in and take complete control?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I intended to read into the Record—and I think this is a good place to do it—my conclusions as to that area. Those conclusions appear at page 165 of my report, beginning about the middle of the page. I read as follows:

> The record shows that by June 30 of this year, 1962, the United States will have spent a total of well over $100 billion in foreign assistance since the inception of the Marshall plan in 1945. Of this huge sum, approximately $13 billion has been spent in the countries of the Far East and southeast Asia covered in my report; namely, Japan, Taiwan, Hong Kong, South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Burma, and the Philippines. Adding to this the $4½ billion spent in Korea for rehabilitation and its military requirements, a total of almost $17½ billion has been poured into the countries of the Far East and southeast Asia by a magnanimous Uncle Sam. With such an outpouring of American dollars into these areas, one would think that by now all of them would be on a sound basis, economically, and that they would be fully convinced that their best interests lie in maintaining close ties with the United States.
>
> With the exception of Taiwan, what do we find? Despite the tremendous "shot in the arm" given to the economies of each of these countries, despite our efforts to help them solve their financial ills, despite our unselfish attempts to bolster their military strength, our prestige throughout southeast Asia continues to be at low ebb, and the only thanks we receive, in most instances, is a threat to go over to the Communist bloc unless we continue to extend aid or even increase our total effort.
>
> We have done all this with virtually no help from our allies in Western Europe. In Korea, in Laos, in Thailand, in Taiwan—in fact, in all these countries we have borne the burden of assistance, not only in dollars, but in men and material where military assistance has been granted.
>
> If this tremendous effort had been successful, we would have no regrets whatsoever for the sacrifices made. But let us take Laos, as an example. That country is more than ever wracked by internal disturbances, and we seem unable to bring any influence to bear in the settlement of differences between opposing factions. To add insult to injury, some of the material which we furnished there is being used in opposing the forces with which we have now become definitely alined. In South Vietnam, as another example, there is still boiling discontent which threatens to erupt at any moment, and the acknowledged leader of that country appears to be almost completely indifferent to our good opinion.
>
> To say that the developments in South Vietnam and Laos as a result of our assistance in that area are disappointing is putting it much too mildly—to me, the developments are shocking and disheartening.
>
> I wish to emphasize what I have said before when I visited these areas of the world—sooner or later we will have to face up to the situation. In my view, there are only two alternatives—either we can go on spending and spending, and in the process ravish our own economy and our resources; or, we can come to grips with reality and alter our course in the Far East and southeast Asia.
>
> Of course, there are those who say we have no alternative, that if we do alter our course, then those nations will go all the way toward communism, and they will be completely lost to the free world. If this view is correct, then why is it that we are the only ones who see the danger? Where are our allies of the free world? Should they not be giving us financial and military support?

Now listen to this:

> Therefore, I recommend that every effort be made to obtain help from our allies, and failing in that objective, we consider a gradual withdrawal of assistance in all fields.

That should be done starting now, unless we can get our allies to assist:

> In the above I am merely reemphasizing recommendations I have made before and I call attention to the appendix exhibit 14, page 333, for further details of recommendations heretofore made by me, not only as they relate to the U.S.S.R., but as they pertain to our programs on military and foreign aid throughout the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point my formal recommendations on three previous trips that I made, with particular reference to the Soviet Union.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Previous Recommendations

This might be a good time to review some of the comments I made following my previous visits to the Soviet Union. Following my 1955 trip I submitted a report to the Senate Appropriations Committee, which included a résumé of my meeting with Anastas Mikoyan. The report read as follows:

"* * * I stated that I believed a more cordial relationship between the U.S.S.R. and the United States was desirable and that this goal was obtainable through the medium of increased exchanges of visits involving industrial, agricultural, and similar delegations. I pointed out that I had been in the U.S. Legislature for nearly 19 years, during which time I had voted billions of dollars to help defeat Hitler in the common cause with U.S. wartime allies.

"I told Mr. Mikoyan that the American people find the mutual suspicions which characterize United States-Soviet relations strange and not in keeping with wartime relations. I said that I felt that these suspicions, and strained relations were due in large measure to misunderstanding. I expressed the belief that frequent exchanges of visits would do much to eliminate these misunderstandings and that while the United States would not expect the Soviet Government to open its arsenals to American inspection, nevertheless I felt that if there was an increase in the movement of Soviet citizens visiting the United States the Soviet people would be able to clear away their suspicions about U.S. intentions. I stated that I came as a humble American citizen to express my thoughts to Mr. Mikoyan in the hope that something good would come of my visit. I added that if Mr. Mikoyan cared to make any comments on my statements I would be glad to hear them.

"Mr. Mikoyan replied that he fully concurred in my statements and that he felt that the American and Soviet peoples had no differences on points of view expressed by me. He stated that the type of system pertaining in individual countries was a matter of choice of the people involved.

"I replied that so far as I knew, the American people as a whole don't care about the system prevailing in the Soviet Union and regarded that as the business of the Soviet people. I did state, however, that somehow the American people have the idea and are concerned that the U.S.S.R. is spreading a doctrine which is harmful to American interests, and that I felt that relations between the two countries would be much more cordial if this fear could be dispelled. I stated that the American people may be wrong in this assumption but that there was, nevertheless, much evidence that the assumption was correct."

* * * * *

"* * * Mr. Mikoyan asserted the belief that if 100 Americans came to study in the U.S.S.R. and returned to the United States that this would not result in the establishment of a Communist regime in the United States. He said that the question of communism versus capitalism is a matter for peoples and not for governments. He said that governments cannot impose doctrines and asked what the Soviet Union can do if people read Communist literature. He said that he thought the differences of opinion and strained relations were the fault of the United States and asserted that the more you attempt to prevent the spreading of a doctrine the more you actually contribute to the propagation of it.

"I explained that in America the rank and file of Communists are not molested, but that the Government is protected by law against those who attempt the violent overthrow of our governmental system. I told him that the views expressed by the imprisoned American Communist leaders to which our Government objected had been obtained from the U.S.S.R; that these Communists had certainly had a fair trial which lasted 8 months, but that the evidence was clearly against them.

"Mr. Mikoyan rejoined that he did not wish to approve or disapprove of the actions of the U.S. Government versus the American Communists. He stated this was not his concern but that of the United States. He added that it was extremely possible that there was a connection between the ideas expressed by the American Communists and the Soviet Union, but that he could not control this. He said there can be no frontiers to ideas. I stated that the American people and our Government do not object to the idea of communism in a country, but do object to any attempt by a country to impose these ideas on others by force. Mr. Mikoyan repeated that this entire affair did not concern the U.S.S.R. I remarked that many Americans had been informed, through various sources, that the peoples of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Hungary, frequently referred to as satellite states, were not free and that communism had been imposed on them by the U.S.S.R. I stated that if this were true, that if the U.S.S.R. had anything to do with the establishment of the governments in Eastern Europe, that this was the type of thing which caused concern and fear in the minds of American people, and that anything that could be done to dispel this fear would lead to improved relations between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

"Mr. Mikoyan said that if the U.S. people have this fear they need to be educated properly. He said that Soviet troops completely withdrew from Czechoslovakia at the end of the war. He said that United States has many bases abroad, whereas the Soviet Union has not and that he believed there were more U.S. troops stationed abroad than Soviet."

In 1956 I traveled extensively through the agricultural areas of the Soviet Union. I also visited many industrial centers. I made numerous comments then which I still believe hold true. I criticized at that time certain agricultural practices being undertaken by the U.S.S.R. as being impractical. I also pointed out industrial shortcomings. The gist of my comments on the Soviet Union are as follows:

"Russian agriculture suffers tremendously from the concentration of production in either collective or state farms. Many of the Russian farmers have no desire to increase production or become more efficient, since they have lost their identity as individual entrepreneurs. The old saying 'What's everybody's business is nobody's business' can be successfully applied to the collective farms.

"As to Russian industry, I saw some modern processes (such as a most unique shoe production line), along with great evidence of expansion, but for the most part, Russian industry seems to be crude and backward when compared with our own. I saw only five different models of passenger cars, two models of passenger buses, one for short and the other long haul, two models of refrigerators, one standard model of trucks. I do not desire to leave the impression that this status may long remain, for great efforts are being made to modernize Russian industry, and to expand production—particularly in the area of heavy industry. Dams, both for navigation and power generation, are being constructed. More factories are rising. The industrial base is being widened, and within the next 5 to 10 years, Russia will undoubtedly become a mighty industrial power. That will come about by the increasing demand for more and more consumer goods.

"* * * I am firmly convinced that it is the Russian educational system that offers the greatest hope for ultimate Russian freedom. The people are beginning to think for themselves and as time goes on, it will be more and more difficult for the leaders to keep them in line.

"Joseph Stalin grew to power in the midst of ignorance and poverty. I am convinced that because of the changed conditions in Russia the people will not permit another despot to assume such powers as those exercised by Stalin.

"As more Russians become educated, they will become less and less prone to accept at face value the propaganda-loaded description of life in the United States which the Red propaganda system dins insistently into their ears. The Russian people are curious by nature; they are becoming increasingly more curious about Americans, about life in America, and about the freedoms we enjoy.

"I therefore recommend that, subject to reasonable security regulations, we broaden our exchange-of-persons program with the Soviet Union, and that we bring more of the Russian people into the United States, to see at firsthand how our people live. I recommend, too, that our Information Service increase its efforts to reach behind the Iron Curtain with the message of freedom. In this connection, it is of vital importance that our magazine, our broadcasts, and so forth, to the people of Russia contain no criticism of their way of life. Although we abhor communism, instead of disparaging it we must stress the positive aspects of our own system. We should say, in effect: 'We give you credit for believing in communism as an economic system; that is your right. But, here is what a free people, living under a democratic system of government, have both in physical and spiritual things.' A better plan would be to extoll the virtues of democracy and completely ignore their system.

"I do not pretend to be a psychologist, but I do know that the surest way to shut the ears of the Russian people to the story of our way of life is to criticize their existing form of government. As the old saying goes, 'You can catch more flies with honey than with vinegar.'

"I am sincere in my belief that by bringing more Russian farmers, more Russian industrial workers, doctors, teachers, more Russian housewives and children and others, to our country, permitting them to see at firsthand how we live and the benefits available to us under a free system, we can demonstrate that communism cannot hold a candle to democracy in furthering the cause of individual freedom or bringing a better way of life. This exchange of persons, coupled with objective reporting of our American way of life, will—I believe—create a mighty force for peace with its genesis among the Russian people, a force which the leaders of Russia could ignore only at their personal peril.

"As a matter of fact, the Russian leadership has done much to make any effort on its part to generate a warlike spirit extremely difficult. Throughout the countryside were posters bearing the legend: 'Peace.' The Russians radio repeated the message that Russia desires only peace. The Russian people have been conditioned to expect peace, and I feel it will be extremely difficult for Soviet leaders to plunge them into a major conflict without creating fearsome conditions within the U.S.S.R., conditions which could perhaps result in a violent reaction among the Russian people.

"The Russian people with whom I spoke believe that the United States fears Russia, and that present American policy is designed with one ultimate objective—the forcible destruction of the Soviet Union. Therefore, they fear us. As patriots (and the Russian people love their land if not their present government), the people of Russia would be willing to fight for their existence. Soviet leadership has capitalized upon this fear; through this medium, they have been able to keep living standards low in order to forge a military machine. If it were possible (and I think it is) to dispel this fear, to eliminate the distrust of American motives among the Russian people, then relations between our two countries would improve overnight. We must make every effort to convince them that our preparations are not for war or aggression, but for defense.

"To illustrate what I am driving at, while visiting the great dam at Stalingrad, I asked the engineer in charge if it were not true that the dam was started in 1950 or 1951 and that suddenly orders came from Russian leaders to stop building the dam. I asked why that was done. He said because the money was needed for other purposes. 'And what were those purposes?' I asked. He said it was political and he did not care to answer. I chided him and said, 'I suppose you spent the money to make weapons of war to fight us.' He smiled, but insisted that the question was political and he would not discuss it further. I then asked, 'When did you resume work?' He said, 'After the Geneva Conference, when your President indicated to the world that America wanted peace and not war.'

"The older Russian citizens with whom I spoke, people who had lived under and could recall the rule of the czars, were unanimous in their belief that 'things are better now than then.' They have more food, more clothing, and a greater sense of their individual worth, as I indicated earlier in my remarks. However, there is much discontent within Russia—discontent that, nourished by exposure to America and Americans, could blossom into such a powerful force that communism could receive a telling blow.

"These factors—increased education, natural curiosity, and a desire for self-improvement—are available to the United States for intelligent use as the foundation for an ultimate rejection by the Russian people of communism as both a way of life and an economic system.

"I therefore regard as most unwise our Government's recent shutdown of exchange of persons between Russia and the United States. I think it was stupid. The reaction of the Russian people, fostered by the Communist propaganda machine, will be: 'America fears us—she fears that we will see her poverty and her ignorance—she does not want us to see how weak she is and how her people are oppressed.' In addition, this action will lend credence to the repetitive pronouncements of Moscow propaganda mediums that the United States wants war, while Russia wants peace. This, of course, will create an atmosphere which could ignite like tinder should even a tiny spark fall.

"Since my return to the United States, I have been referred to by some mediums as having been 'brainwashed' by Khrushchev. This I most vehemently deny. I believe I have noted basic factors which, if only capitalized upon by our country, can result in the destruction of dictatorial rule in Russia. The people of Russia bear within their great masses the seed of American victory in the cold war—a victory which can result not only in benefiting the free world, but in rekindling the light of freedom behind the Iron Curtain. It is now time for us to begin nourishing this seed, to the end that fear will be replaced with trust, ignorance with knowledge, and, ultimately, cold war with warm friendship between the people of Russia and the people of the United States."

Following my 1957 trip I filed another report with the Senate Appropriations Committee. My general impressions of the Soviet Union were as follows:

"Perhaps the most significant aspect of my findings on this visit was change, and, with respect to the various goods and services available to the Russian consumer, the change was invariably for the better. Also, people are more talkative—they were more prone to assert themselves. Generally speaking, I found a much higher degree of contentment among the peoples of Russia than on my previous visits. In addition, I found considerable national pride—a pride which was visibly increased when the people learned of the successful firing of the first space satellite. I was in Russia when the event occurred and the news was made public, and there was much jubilation among the Russian masses.

"Thus, in prefacing any account of my journeys through the Soviet Union, I feel it important to impress upon the committee my three major impressions of postsatellite Russia.

"First, there is an atmosphere of confidence.

"Second, there is apparent domestic contentment, but a rising curiosity about America and an urge to forge ahead of us.

"Third, there is a growing belief among the Russian people that their system is superior in all respects to ours in the West.

"These three factors must certainly receive primary consideration in any policy our Government undertakes vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. But, in considering these factors, they must be read against a background of Russia as it stands today compared with the pre-Bolshevik Russia of the czars.

"Only by measuring present-day conditions in Russia by the comparative yardstick of conditions as they existed a quarter century ago can any proper perspective concerning this vast nation be attained. In addition, the conditions existing in the Soviet Union under communism and the Government's abolition of private property are important circumstances to be weighed before reaching any conclusion concerning future policies toward that country.

"In Russia, the Government is supreme. Nothing else matters—only the Government. Every square inch of land belongs to the Government. All commerce and industry are Government controlled. Under no circumstances is an individual able to go into business for himself, not even as a barbershop owner or a taxi operator.

"Instead, all crafts, in fact, all businesses, are incorporated into state-managed entities where everyone works together for what Soviet leaders declare to be the common good of the state. Revenue-producing investments by the individual of any of his surplus funds are limited primarily to state institutions that lend money. The money deposited by the individual bears a small rate of interest, depending on the length of time it is left on deposit. This type of social and economic organization exists through all strata of Russia.

"Under such a controlled system, in which the welfare of the individual is evidently sacrificed to the good of the state, Russia has been able, within a short span of years, to pull itself up from a weary, downtrodden nation, wracked by internal strife and bearing the heavy burden of a hungry, desperate class of peasant serfs under the old czarist system, to its present leadership of obviously high technological development.

"Many Russian people today may have only black bread, cabbages, beets, potatoes, and a pot of tea—but today it is enough to fill their stomachs. To a hungry population, the mere advance of a crust of bread is an accomplishment—and one, which whether or not we agree with the manner in which it is done, must be recognized as a form of progress.

"From the days of 1916, when almost all of Russia hovered together in abject poverty, in hunger, in a state of serfdom, and serving a fantastically rich nobility, the older people of Russia today can see visible signs of their march forward—toward national pride, better living standards, and industrial development—a march which today places them among the vanguard of the world's nations.

"The younger people, who have known nothing but communism in their lifetime, and who have had no opportunity to observe any other form of government, glory in their country's progress—and in the corresponding rise in the welfare of their fellow countrymen.

"This, above all, we must recognize. And in that recognition we must, I believe, abandon the approach of some who, because they dislike or perhaps fear communism—indeed, I am sure they abhor this system of government as I do—will not hear or even listen to the spoken words of its accomplishments.

"The mark of an intelligent soldier is to recognize the capabilities of his opponent. To mock a foe is to mock yourself.

"Communism will not vanish because we ignore it. Neither will it disappear because we vilify it. It exists. It is functioning.

"It has brought a new way of life to a people once left far beyond progress in the wallow of inner conflict. It has provided a better standard of living—no matter if we care to dismiss it as still far below our own—for an entire nation of people.

"Of course, in the U.S.S.R., there is nothing remotely resembling the freedom of individual choice, action, and enterprise which we in the United States enjoy today. However, it must be recognized that in the Soviet Union such freedom has never existed. Russian history bears ample witness to the lack of what we regard as basic principles of freedom. Under the czars, which is the period with which the typical elder or middle-aged Russian compares his life today, there was no freedom of the press, no freedom of expression, no freedom of economic choice for the average Russian. Opposition to the then-existing Government was ruthlessly ferreted out by a secret police whose methods were not basically different from those used by the Communists.

"Perhaps the most astonishing accomplishment of the Russia of today is its rapid transformation into an industrial empire. That the tremendous growth of Russia's industrial economy has been reached in the short span of one generation testifies to the hard work done by the Russian people. To those who would dismiss, or soften the impact of this achievement by merely pointing out that it was accomplished by a ruthless leadership holding the combined noses of an entire people to the Marxist grindstone, it again must be remembered that compulsion is nothing new to the average Russian. Under the Communists, he exchanged the compulsion of the czarist aristocracy for the compulsion of a totalitarian state. The only change in the picture insofar as Ivan is concerned is that at least part of the nation's increased wealth has trickled down to him instead of all of it remaining in the pockets of a very few persons of supreme social status.

"In other words, in assessing the present temper of the Russian people, not their present leadership, but their people, we must always bear in mind that there are no shades of gray in the picture of Russian development since 1917. Instead, there is only absolute contrast between the days prior to the October revolution and those now upon the colossus of Europe and Asia. The term 'capitalism,' as applied by the Communist leadership in describing the United States, does not reflect the system which our country actually enjoys today, but instead is used as a synonym for the system prevalent in Russia during czarist times. By insisting that all economic systems are either capitalistic (i.e., czarist) or socialist (i.e., that now in effect in the Soviet Union) the Soviet leaders have been able to keep their people convinced that the Russian system today is the ultimate of perfection.

"The Western World is now at a great disadvantage in waging a positive campaign to change this unbalanced and untrue picture laid before the Russian people, because there are not words available to convince them of the progress we have made, of the abundance we enjoy. To the average Russian, a system which would prove more beneficial than the one under which he now lives is inconceivable, simply because he has no knowledge of anything other than absolute exploitation under the czars compared with a much better way of life under communism.

"As it stands, then, we must realize that the Russian people—as of this day, at least—are apparently well content with their way of life. The individual may not have progressed much, by our standards, but he has progressed—he is much better off than he has ever been."

In my 1957 report I also included a formalized presentation of conclusions and recommendations. I think that these, too, are worth repeating in the light of today's events. They are as follows:

"CONCLUSION

"The Soviet Union today is undergoing a process of evolution—not revolution, but evolution. There is a great surge of decentralization taking place. The people are demanding more and more autonomy in the hope of attaining more voice in their local affairs. Sparked by increased emphasis upon universal education—an emphasis which carries with it a growing desire for individual leadership, an eagerness for information, and an abundant curiosity regarding events, developments, and peoples outside the Soviet borders—the present Russian leadership is taking a calculated, but evidently necessary, risk.

"Having placed their people in a position where they are more and more able to think for themselves, the Soviet leadership is gambling with its own future. The time is now ripe for free world action, designed to properly capitalize upon this new advent within the Soviet's borders.

"If, by increased exchanges of delegations in every walk of life—such as engineers, farmers, legislators, scientists, students, teachers, to name but a few—of motion pictures, of television programs, of radio broadcasts; if, by increasing the points of contact between East and West, particularly, the United States and Russia, we can lay the full picture of Western culture, development, and individual freedoms before the masses of Russia, as well as other peoples of the world closely associated with Russia, there is no doubt in my mind that they will become envious of our way of life. They will doubtless become dissatisfied when they learn there is a better way of life than that which they are now enjoying, and, as a result, will develop an urge to imitate ours.

"This should be our primary objective.

"The free world, particularly the United States, secure in the absolute belief that our economic and political systems have nothing to fear from a fair comparison with Soviet-style communism, must leave no stone unturned in placing before the people of Russia and the world an unbiased picture of the way we live. We should—yes, we must—open the way for peaceful competition between the United States and the U.S.S.R., with the understanding that all peoples will be free to choose the form of government under which they prefer to live.

"This is a competition which the free world would most certainly win. It would bring a tremendous victory to us, for either the Soviet leadership would be compelled to give its people a more abundant way of life, or the Soviet people would compel a change in their leadership.

"Either of these alternatives would represent a basic step forward in the winning of the cold war.

"In the past, the tendency in the United States has been to be somewhat apologetic about the abundance we enjoy—to regard our blessings as the result of more good fortune than anything else. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, has consistently credited the progress it has made since 1917 as the result of two things: First, the alleged superiority of the Socialist system, and, second, the constant hard work of the Soviet people.

"Concerning the latter, no effort is spared in Russia to acquaint the people with the progress being made, and to heap praise and credit upon the workers. Propaganda within Russia is one of the chief weapons of the Communist leaders in maintaining the Communist way of life. Radios are installed in all public places, including factories and farms, and they constantly blare out the accomplishments of Russia's economy and its people.

"Awards are made for worker excellence.

"Competition between areas producing the same commodities, or manufacturing the same goods, is fostered. Region vies against region in an endless productivity contest.

"Specific projects—such as the construction of a power dam, for example—are recorded step by step on motion-picture film. First the ground breaking, where thousands assemble, then the river closure, then the installation of the first generator and so on. Awards are made to the best workers at each function.

"These films are then exhibited across the length and breadth of the Soviet Union, with abundant praise heaped upon the 'workers' who made such projects possible and with added emphasis that they are the beneficiaries.

"In the so-called neutralist or other nations experiencing a Soviet economic and political offensive, the progress achieved within the Soviet Union since the advent of communism is constantly cited as an example of what can be accomplished in an underdeveloped area under the socialist system.

"Instead of, in effect, apologizing for our abundance, instead of fostering and following a philosophy dedicated to the proportion that because America has so much it must be shared with those who have so little, the United States should point out that our present national wealth was created and obtained through the hard work and ingenuity of Americans, laboring under a free enterprise system, to tame a wilderness and devote its resources to the betterment of all our people.

"Indeed, it must be remembered that the United States as we know it today is only 5 years older than the Soviet Union as it now exists.

"Only with the admission of Arizona as the 48th State in 1912 did the United States really begin its great rise and progressively forge to the forefront of the world's nations. Russia began its climb with the deposing of the czars in 1917.

"Yet in this relatively short space of time, the United States has achieved a much greater advance than the U.S.S.R. in all fields—without subjecting our people or our economy to the iron rule and inflexible discipline that communism imposes.

"In other words, if it were possible—as I believe it is—for the United States to place its record of achievement beside that of the Soviet Union for the people of Russia to observe, there can be no doubt which would prove the more attractive.

"It is necessary for us as leader of the free nations to realize and understand that the Russians have progressed under their present form of government, and that we must recognize that progress, not disparage it, in our dealings with the Russian people.

"It has become increasingly obvious during recent years that a new approach to the problems plaguing East-West relationships is not only desirable, but urgently necessary, particularly to the United States, upon whom rests the greatest burdens of present policies.

"Since 1948, the year the Marshall plan began, our Nation has spent over $50 billion ostensibly to roll back the Red tide of communism. Initially, these expenditures were designed to restore the war-ravaged nations of Western Europe, in order to place them in a position to be of aid to the free world should the Soviet Union attempt an armed aggression. Later, when proposed goals were reached and even surpassed, the program was transformed from one of rehabilitation into one of development and mutual defense. Huge amounts were supplied to a host of countries to help build armies, for capital development, for technical aid.

* * * * *

"Viewed in the light of these vast expenditures, the record of achievement thus far is a dismal one.

"Europe, fully restored to economic health, and enjoying unprecedented prosperity, still leans on the United States for participation in her home defenses—still refuses to bear her fair share of the free world's burdens, particularly in the Middle East, southeast Asia, Formosa, and South Korea.

"Many other nations which we have assisted lavishly in the past are either actively practicing or moving in the direction of neutralism if not outright alinement with the Soviet Union.

"A few make no bones of the fact that they pursue a policy of pitting the United States against the Soviet Union in order to obtain the maximum aid from both countries.

"Russia, and her satellites—who are our avowed opponents in the global cold war—are not weakening, nor do their policies seem to suffer defeat or even frustration as a result of the heavy-spending approach we have used in the past. On the contrary, some of our advisers contend that the Russians are making gains in the Middle East, in southeast Asia, in Africa, and even Latin America.

"They are increasing their domestic agricultural and industrial bases, as my report amply demonstrates.

"Their technology is constantly improving. Sputniks I and II offer abundant proof of this.

"In almost every imaginable way, by almost any comparison that might be made, the United States today is in a much less favorable position in its international relationships—and particularly in its competitive position with the Soviet Union—than it was in 1948, despite the expenditure of over $50 billion of our dwindling national wealth.

"As I have often stated, our country cannot continue on its present course without inviting not only ultimate international defeat, but national disaster.

"Our present policy involves the continued expenditure of gigantic sums for foreign aid purposes (over and above funds appropriated for the maintenance and modernization of our own Armed Forces); large appropriations for an Information Service; continuation of an almost unbearable and destructive tax rate that threatens to destroy initiative; the constant threat of near stagnation in the proper protection and preservation of our precious natural resources; and the promise of continued neglect of other vital areas of our national economic progress, particularly public power, housing, commerce, and others.

"The recommendation I have advanced for the past 3 years is reemphasized at this time; that is, the time has come—in fact, it may even have already passed—for us to take stock and to take a new look at our foreign policy.

"Given a continued or heightened cold war of indefinite duration, the pursuance of our present policies must eventually result in the strangulation of our free-enterprise system, either by a continued decline of individual initiative and increasing reliance upon Government control and regulation of the economy, or eventual collapse of our total economy under the pressures of constantly growing Government spending and a swelling debt load.

"Either of these alternatives would be disastrous.

"The first would represent an easy default victory by State socialism over the forces of free enterprise, the second would carry with it the full realization of a basic tenet of Marxist communism; namely, that given a long-term crisis to face, the free enterprise (capitalistic) nations must fall of their weight.

"The three visits I have made to the Soviet Union, the impressions I have gained during them, and the information I have gathered, have resulted in the following suggestions, which I offer for the consideration of the committee—indeed, for the consideration of all our people.

"RECOMMENDATIONS

"I recommend that the United States reexamine its approach to the waging of cold war. Recognizing that our actual adversary in this conflict is the Soviet Union, I recommend that this reexamination be undertaken in the light of the following, the implementation of which will help to dispel the fear of each other prevailing among the peoples of the East and the West, and restore mutual confidence, which is necessary if we are to achieve a lasting world peace.

"1. Our information program directed to the Iron Curtain and particularly to the Soviet peoples should be expanded. In this expansion, all propaganda in its traditional forms should be abandoned. Instead, a positive approach should be applied uniformly. No reference to communism per se should be permitted. Accurate, factual reporting of the news and conditions in the free world must be stressed. Every effort should be made to objectively depict the enormous advantages of our way of life, without disparaging the system presently in effect in the Soviet Union or behind the Iron Curtain.

"2. An expanded and realistic exchange-of-persons program between the Soviet Union and the United States should be inaugurated at once. This expansion can be achieved with no additional cost, by simply discontinuing many so-called information programs operated elsewhere that are unnecessary. As detailed in the body of my report, I am convinced that most of the peoples of the Soviet Union are sincere in their belief that the form of government and the economic system under which they live are second to none. This conviction flows from their inability to compare their present-day living standards, industrial and agricultural techniques, cultural progress, and technological development with anything other than those existing within the Soviet Union's borders in prior times. By exchanging delegations, from every walk of life—scientists, technicians, workers, farmers, students, legislators—the people of Russia would have the opportunity to see at firsthand the boundless advantages which a free-enterprise system, founded on the bedrock of representative government, has to offer. In this program, however, extreme care must be exercised. Under no circumstances should a bona fide exchange program be permitted to become a means for infiltration of our borders by Soviet agents.

"3. With the change of emphasis in our cold war policy toward the Soviet Union outlined in recommendations 1 and 2, designed to dispel the fear which exists between the peoples of the United States and the U.S.S.R., and to create a climate of confidence, should also come increased willingness upon our part to meet as often as possible with leaders of Iron Curtain countries, or the Soviet Union. Despite the record of broken promises which prior Soviet leaders have left in the wake of prior talks, our failure to join and participate in top-level conferences—even summit conferences—provides powerful ammunition for the Soviet propaganda machine. It eases the task of Red information agencies to picture the United States to the people of the Soviet Union—along with other lands throughout the world—as unwilling to discuss peaceful solutions of world problems.

"The committee is well acquainted with the desire of all Americans to attain and maintain a lasting world peace, a peace secured in dignity and made lasting through mutual trust. However, our Government's failure to show a willingness to confer with Soviet leaders on the peaceful solution of world tensions is being broadcast throughout the length and breadth of the world as indicative of our aggressive intentions. With a weapon such as this at the command of expert Communist propagandists, we are constantly losing ground in our effort to maintain sympathy for and understanding of our international objectives.

"4. I recommend that our policy of attempting to create full-fledged modern armies in small underdeveloped countries be terminated, and that our assistance be confined to a realistic technical-aid effort. This move would be designed to create a broad base of trained native peoples, a base which would attract private investment capital, or which—at the very least—could properly utilize any government-to-government capital which might later be made available for development purposes. An approach of this type would strengthen the economic stability of the country, while at the same time allowing the country to maintain its prestige and self-respect by standing on its own feet.

"By encouraging underdeveloped countries to maintain military forces far beyond their capabilities to support, we are actually creating conditions tailor made for the advance of communism.

"As the Comptroller General noted in his report to Congress on an examination of the military assistance program on March 31, 1957, the extensions of arms aid to a number of nations has not always been motivated by purely military considerations, nor has the impact of this aid been properly evaluated in advance, or in conjunction with its availability:

"'The military force objectives presently approved for U.S. support in certain allied countries are not always realistic in terms of recipient country manpower and financial capabilities, are not always mutually acceptable to the countries concerned, and are not always motivated by military considerations (report, supra, p. 2).'

* * * * *

"'In a number of countries the United States has programed and is delivering military equipment in excess of that which can be effectively absorbed and utilized by the recipients at their existing stage of development. The recipients either have not been able to use the aid furnished because of their financial and economic incapacity and their manpower limitations or they have not desired to use the assistance for the purposes intended by the United States (report, supra, p. 3).'

"As it now stands the hasty application of great amounts of economic and military aid to newly independent, underdeveloped nations is often working to our extreme disadvantage.

"First, in those nations whose economies are not sufficiently developed to maintain a military force of the capabilities desired by U.S. advisers, the gap in national income created by heavy military expenditures is sought to be filled by America extending so-called defense-support assistance.

"As administered in the past, this type of economic aid has frequently failed to trickle down to the masses. In a number of countries, particularly in the Middle East, and southeast Asia, living standards remain visably unchanged for the great majority of people despite large U.S. expenditures there. There are, in these countries, two economic strata—the very rich, and the miserably poor.

"The latter are, without exception, the object of constant Soviet propagandizing. U.S. policies, requiring the maintenance of large standing military forces, are blamed for low living standards. 'Capitalistic' America is also blamed for lining the pockets of the rich while caring little for the poor.

"In these same countries, as the body of my report demonstrates, the wealthy pay little or nothing in the way of income taxes, or, for that matter, all taxes as compared to us. Thus, as the whole burden of defense and economic growth in a given nation may be ours, so is the blame for that nation's poverty heaped upon our shoulders."

* * * * *

"While I am convinced that the implementation of these recommendations would result in a much higher degree of success than a continuation of our present policies, it is not my view that they will work miracles overnight. On the contrary, the 'new look' I have advocated should take place concurrently with the maintenance of a strong defense by the United States. We must not lower our guard. A modern, efficient Defense Establishment is the best guarantee we have against any attempt on the part of would-be world conquerors to follow the path of aggression instead of peaceful international competition.

"In essence, the burden of my recommendations involves the maximum use of the single greatest resource our Nation possesses—not dollars, but the tremendous abundance of both material and spiritual advantages which freedom has to offer.

"America is the world's greatest showplace for the accomplishments of a free economy dedicated to providing a free people with the highest standard of living in the world.

"With such an exhibit of the fruits of our labors, it should be readily apparent that, in comparison with our growth over the relatively same period of time, Russia's advance has been accomplished despite, rather than because of, the dictates of Socialist theories, and perhaps owes its success more to the hard work of her people than to any tenet or theory set forth by Lenin, Marx, or Stalin.

"Let us open wide the doors to our showplace; let us welcome all who would come to see, to compare, to imitate.

"Let us lay the foundation for trade and a restoration of commercial contacts between the East and the West.

"Let us not apologize for our abundance, but, rather, let us display it to the peoples of the world as an example of what hard work can achieve for all who are willing to work.

"Let us be honest enough to caution those who are to choose between socialism and freedom that such miracles are not wrought overnight, but must come gradually and through self-help.

"Above all other things, let us not fear an honest competition with Soviet communism.

"The approach I have outlined involves only the realization that it is time for our country to choose a more advantageous ground upon which to wage this most critical battle of the cold war.

"We have been confronted in recent years by what amounts to nothing more than an all-out effort on the part of the Soviets to defeat the democratic nations by peaceful means. Rather than see victory go to them by default, I urge our Government to pour its full effort into a massive fight for the minds of men—all men, everywhere."

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator has indicated that we are facing very crucial situations in southeast Asia and that one alternative would be the gradual withdrawal of assistance in all fields.

Surely the Senator knows that instead of the possibility of having a withdrawal of our financial assistance in southeast Asia we are constantly adding to the contributions which we are making, not only financially but also by sending young Americans in uniform, not to wage active warfare, but to serve in many capacities in a military sense.

The question I wish to propound relates to what can be done. The Senator, with my help and the help of others during the past decade, has tried to force the State Department under a Republican administration and the State Department under a Democratic administration during the past year, as well as the foreign aid agency, to take a realistic viewpoint and to recognize we are making little, if any, progress. In fact, we are gradually losing the prestige which is so essential toward helping the beneficiary countries withstand Communist aggression.

What today can be done, if the executive department is blind to the need for taking very effective action? What can we do in this body, for instance, through the Appropriations Committee, on which both the Senator from Louisiana and I serve? We have had little help and support in past years in the endeavor to curtail and control appropriations.

Shall we continue to drift along and ultimately to face a "showdown," as the Senator has forecast, having no friends either in southeast Asia or among our allies in other sections of the world? Then we may be embarrassed and be subject to a challenge which may have a far-reaching impact upon the very survival of our Nation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, my reports speak for themselves on that point.

As the Senator knows, I think some of us have succeeded in trimming a good deal of the foreign aid. We have had assistance from our good friend on the other side of the Capitol, Mr. OTTO PASSMAN, who heads the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which deals with foreign aid. Primarily with his assistance, we have been instrumental in curtailing these programs over the years at least $5½ billion, as I remember the figures.

But that is not enough, Mr. President. We have had programs in some of those areas now for over 15 years. Let us consider South Korea. I did not go there this year for the simple reason there was too much disturbance going on there. As the Senator knows, we called to the attention of the State Department, on our visit there, the waste which was going on as a result of the actions of Syngman Rhee. Many of the newspapers in this country took issue with me, and they accused me of being some kind of an interloper, going out and insulting our good friends. Two years ago it took some 3,000 young students to expose Mr. Syngman Rhee. Only after he was ousted did our people see the waste which had occurred under his administration. I called to the attention of the State Department and the ICA in previous administrations the waste which was occurring, but they took no heed of what I said.

Mr. President, I shall continue to make these trips and I shall be able to say, not too many years from now, "I told you so," because these things will come to pass.

Something should be done now. President Kennedy, as well as the State Department, ought to take my report and try to verify it.

It strikes me we have to take a new approach in our dealings with Russia. We must not continue to do what we are doing now. We have tried these things for 14 years, as I pointed out earlier. We have made little or no progress in our battle against world communism. In addition, we owe more money now than we will ever pay.

Mr. President, today it requires $9.3 billion merely to pay the interest on our debt. I repeat, $9.3 billion is required merely to pay the interest on our debt. Now we are confronted with a request to increase the debt limit to $309 billion.

I believe that now is the time for President Kennedy to take a long, hard look at our overall foreign relations.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator is aware that the President in his budget message has asked for an even larger amount for our foreign-aid program than has been provided in the past few years. On that basis it would appear that instead of curtailing spending and trying to adopt more effective policies in dealing with this serious problem, we are going to continue to keep our eyes closed and be blind to the implications of the entire program. Instead of trying to accomplish more and to stabilize conditions in southeast Asia and elsewhere, we actually shall be trying to get more money to spend to accomplish less and less, and to make these sections of the world more subject to, and more exposed to the aggression of the Soviet leaders.

What can we do in a practical way? As I say, we cannot appropriate more and more money. We have to take some very drastic action, unless we are going to go on and on a few more years and then realize, almost overnight, that the entire program has been an abject failure.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I would hate to admit that the program is a total failure, but I can say that we have simply overdone it. Whenever these advisers of ours abroad got into the act there was no stop to it. As the Senator well remembers, the record shows that we were supposed to withdraw from Western Europe whenever its economy reached 130 percent of its prewar level, but we stayed there until it reached 180 percent of prewar.

Then, lately, what did we find? Why was it necessary for us to send two more divisions to Western Europe? Why was it necessary to call up National Guardsmen and reservists to service? That question answers itself. The answer is that our allies failed to meet their part of the bargain.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I congratulate the senior Senator from Louisiana for the magnificent service he has rendered through the years in turning the focus of his searching examination on what is happening abroad, particularly in relation to our foreign aid program. I think the Senator has rendered an invaluable public service. I only wish that his observations and his judgment were reflected in action by the Federal executive department and by the Congress. I think if that had been done, and if it could be done in the future, we would not only make such foreign aid as we give far more effective but also we would save billions of dollars for the American people.

The principle of foreign aid, as embodied in the Marshall plan, which was a success because it defined its purposes, was limited in duration and achieved its objectives, is a fine principle.

But I think few of the American people realized at that time that the program would become a steadily expanding one, regardless of need, or national orientation and that it would be applied indiscriminately to virtually every new country as soon as that country was born. We have now come to the point where the program has reached dimensions that are staggering, and is increasingly less effective in proportion to the vast sum expended.

In my first 2 years in Congress, I opposed the foreign aid program. I was not opposed to foreign aid as such. I voted against it for three specific reasons, which I stated, some of which to a degree are still valid.

First, I felt that Congress had abdicated its constitutional duty in not checking on the foreign aid programs more thoroughly and in not providing an appropriation procedure such as we apply to even moderate domestic appropriations. In other words, when we wish to build a small project in our own country, that project must be justified for authorization before the appropriate subcommittee and committee of each House. It must then be justified before the subcommittee and then the full Committee on Appropriations of each House. The same process must be repeated in both bodies. But in the foreign aid program in the past some unseen person in the downtown area of the Capital could secure the appropriation of millions of dollars without any similar procedure and check. I thought that that procedure in the foreign aid program was all wrong, and that Congress had in effect abdicated its constitutional mandate to control expenditures.

My second objection, which applied particularly under the Eisenhower administration, was to what I called the double standard. Under that double standard we were told by the administration that many desirable domestic projects, such as pollution control, schoolroom construction, forest rehabilitation, resource development, and much else were inflationary, extravagant, wasteful, and unnecessary; whereas not only were identical programs, and even far more generous programs, authorized in foreign countries, but these we were told were absolutely essential and must not be cut a nickel. I could not abide that double standard.

My third objection related to the obvious waste and mismanagement in connection with the program. Last year we were promised a change. In the first place, under the Kennedy administration the double standard has disappeared. Resource development, Federal aid to education, pollution control, forestry rehabilitation, and much else that is valuable for the folks at home are part of this administration's program, I am glad to say. And as for mismanagement of the foreign aid program the desired reforms have not yet taken place, but our President is keenly aware of the need for these reforms. He has made it clear that he knows the programs had been badly administered, and that he was trying to change them. For those reasons I felt last year that we should give this new administration every opportunity to effect these reforms. So I voted for the foreign aid legislation and appropriations. But we should give further thought that if there is no improvement and if countries we helped turn on us and knife us, as has been evident at Punta del Este during the recent conference, that attitude may have to be revised. At that Conference we have heard that Bolivia, which we have practically supported wholly for many years in an effort to prevent Communist penetration and takeover, has voted against our efforts to exclude communism from the Western Hemisphere. I find it very difficult to understand why we should continue to nurse and aid such countries in an effort to prevent the invasion of communism into those countries, when they fail to cooperate with us and indeed oppose us in that purpose.

So I must reserve my decisions. But I hope that the very wise appraisals and searching judgments which my friend, the senior Senator from Louisiana, has made will result in corresponding attitudes and actions by the administration and by the Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I thank my good friend from Alaska very much. I join him in hoping that the committees in charge of the program of foreign aid, including the Committee on Foreign Relations, as well as the House of Representatives, will take note of these remarks and try to put my recommendations into effect.

Mr. President, there is much more I could say on this subject, but I am scheduled to leave on a plane at 5:30 p.m.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I commend the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for following his yearly custom—and I think it is a very worthwhile custom—in giving a firsthand detailed report on his travels to various parts of the world at the request of and under the supervision of the Committee on Appropriations. I, too, express the hope that not only will all Members of this body read his detailed report, which I have gone into in some detail, and which I intend to study more closely in the future, but also that the proper administrative authorities downtown will do likewise, because the report contains a wealth of information. Certainly the comments, recommendations and suggestions are candid and to the the point. There is no possibility of misunderstanding.

I express the hope again, as I have in previous years, that the most detailed, informative, and worthwhile report of the Senator will be given the consideration which in my opinion is its due. So I compliment and commend the Senator from Louisiana for once again taking the floor of the Senate to give us the benefit of his close observations.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar, under "New Reports."

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Francis A. O'Neill, Jr., to be a member of the National Mediation Board.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Marine Corps.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

ROUTINE NOMINATIONS ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry routine nominations in the Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

The Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of John A. McCone, of California, to be Director of Central Intelligence.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senate is now in executive session, and that the pending business is the nomination of John McCone, of California, to be the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, when the nomination of Admiral Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce was before the Senate for confirmation in 1959, I prepared a memorandum for my constituents, in which I stated my reasons for opposing the nomination. In that memorandum I outlined five characteristics which I believe any nominee for high public office should have if the Senate is to confirm his nomination for that office. Those characteristics are, first, integrity; second, stability; third, good judgment; fourth, adequate experience; and, fifth, associations, which of necessity would involve an inquiry as to whether any conflict of interest under the statute was involved.

I should like to discuss the pending nomination in the light of those standards. First, however, let me say that the nomination of Mr. McCone to be Director of Central Intelligence raises no issue between liberals and conservatives. It has nothing whatever to do with parlor pinks or members of the John Birch Society.

Those of us who support the President in practically all of his policies, as I do, and who with some regret differ with him on occasion, must nonetheless assure ourselves, in my view, that every nominee whom he recommends to us does have those characteristics of which I speak. I hope that everyone who calls himself a liberal and everyone who calls himself a conservative will measure up to the same standard with respect to these five characteristics, because in my opinion they have nothing whatever to do with one's political opinions.

I should like to discuss each of the five characteristics in turn. First, I have no question as to the integrity of the nominee. He is a man who has worked his way to the top of the business community, with not only consummate ability but also without any doubt of any kind being thrown on his honesty and integrity.

Second, I raise no question as to the nominee's stability. He has conducted himself under heavy pressure in an admirable manner during the course of both his private and public service.

I do have some question as to the nominee's experience for this job, and that point I shall discuss in a moment.

I have no question as to the nominee's business judgment. Clearly it is good, for he has made a fortune. I have no question as to his judgment when he served, I believe, under the Secretary of the Air Force or when he served as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

I do have some question as to his good judgment in terms of this particular office to which the President has nominated him. However, I would have to admit that my views in this regard must of necessity be speculative, because we cannot tell until after the event just how the strongly held views of a nominee on certain subjects might well affect his intelligence judgment—not his intelligence, but his judgment in the field of intelligence—and how they might or might not affect the public interest.

I believe that in the area of his associations, namely, the conflict-of-interest statute and its interpretation, there is very serious legal question as to whether it is not necessary for him to dispose of his stock in the Standard Oil Co. of California or, in the alternative, whether in his own interest it would not be wise to do so.

I shall return to that matter a little later in my speech.

First, I wish to discuss the subject of experience. The nominee himself has testified that he had had no experience for this job.

Perhaps this is not particularly important. I certainly had no prior experience before I became city comptroller of Philadelphia, before I became mayor of the city of Philadelphia, or before I became U.S. Senator. I am perhaps arrogant and conceited enough to think that despite that lack of experience I was able adequately to fulfill my duties.

Yet the position which the nominee is to fill upon the nomination of the President is not an elected public office but an appointed one. I believe a very real question arises as to whether it is sound practice to nominate for a position of this sort a man who heretofore has been without experience in the intelligence field.

Certainly this is the first time in the history of the Central Intelligence Agency that this has been done.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I would be happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Missouri, and yield to him continuously. I do have a more or less logical argument I should like to present, but I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

During the hearings when Mr. McCone came before the Committee on Armed Services, Senator SMITH of Maine, noted that all previous nominees had had experience in the intelligence field. I said that that statement, to the best of my knowledge, was incorrect with respect to General Vandenberg. I was incorrect in that statement; General Vandenberg served 6 months, from January to June, 1946, as the head of intelligence on the General Staff. I am saying this to correct the record. As usual, the able senior Senator from Maine knows her facts.

Mr. CLARK. I appreciate what the Senator from Missouri has said. General Vandenberg was never Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, because that office was not created until 1947; and whatever intelligence duties General Vandenberg performed must, I believe, have been before the present statute.

Mr. SYMINGTON. General Vandenberg was the head of the Central Intelligence Agency, to the best of my memory, after Admiral Souers and Admiral Hillenkoetter. The point I wished to make was that General Vandenberg did have some intelligence experience.

In my opinion, no one could have been Under Secretary of the Air Force, which Mr. McCone was at the request of a Democratic President, without having obtained much experience in the intelligence field. No one could be chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, perhaps the most sensitive position in the Government from the standpoint of intelligence except the CIA, without acquiring at least some experience in the intelligence field.

The nature of the positions which Mr. McCone has held under three Presidents—because actually he has been running the Central Intelligence Agency now for 2 months—I think justifies my position.

I now find that General Vandenberg was head of Central Intelligence before that agency became a statutory agency. He followed Admiral Souers and preceded Admiral Hillenkoetter.

The Senator from Pennsylvania is correct in saying that the Central Intelligence Agency was not a statutory agency until 1947.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

I resume my argument with the suggestion that since the Central Intelligence Agency was organized by statute, each of the three men who have been its chief has had substantial experience in the intelligence field before he became Director. The first of those men was Rear Adm. Roscoe Hillenkoetter, who served from May 1, 1947, and was the first statutory Director of the CIA. The second was Lt. Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, who served from October 7, 1950, to February 9, 1953. The third was Mr. Allen Dulles, who served from February 26, 1953, to November 29, 1961.

My position would be that any member of the Armed Forces of the United States of necessity, from the time he has gone through Annapolis or West Point, or whatever preliminary school he attended to qualify him for a commission in the Armed Forces, has an almost daily contact with intelligence, the collection, evaluation, and dissemination of information; and in most cases—and I think this is true of the members of the Armed Forces who served in this capacity as Director of the CIA—has, in one or another of his assignments, been in charge of the intelligence function, with whatever staff or command he might have been serving.

Mr. Dulles, as is well known, served for 2 years as Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency before he became Director; and before that had had a long career in various most important offices affecting our foreign policy, our relationships with other countries, and the whole problem of the intelligence function, which involves, as I say, the collection, evaluation, and dissemination of information.

I do not quarrel much with the views of the Senator from Missouri in this regard. I should merely like to read into the RECORD a question asked at the hearings by the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the nominee's reply, as they appear on page 53:

> Senator SMITH. It is my recollection, Mr. McCone, that all of your predecessors had some prior training or experience in the field of intelligence prior to their appointment as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Will you tell the committee what training or experience you had in the field of intelligence prior to your appointment to that position?
>
> Mr. MCCONE. None.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] may well be correct in saying that Mr. McCone was unduly modest; that in his capacity as Under Secretary of the Air Force and as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission he acquired adequate experience. But apparently the nominee himself thought otherwise.

While I think it unfortunate that for a position which the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] described, perhaps correctly, as second in importance only to that of the President of the United States, the President of the United States has seen fit to nominate an able businessman, who himself says he has no experience in this field, I may also say, along the lines of the speech of the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] yesterday that if this were the only matter in which the nominee was deficient—the only one of the five categories to which I referred before—I doubt that I would, on that ground alone, feel compelled to oppose the nomination.

Before I discuss the two areas in which I have serious reservations respecting the nominee—first, the objectivity of his judgment and, therefore, whether his judgment in the intelligence field will be good; and, second, the conflict-of-interest question—I shall digress for a moment to discuss what is the nature of the position to which the nominee has been appointed by the President, subject to confirmation of the nomination by the Senate. If one is to review the statute under which this agency was created, he does not get much guidance as to the actual workings of the job. Yet I think that in an empirical sense we who have been around Washington for awhile could summarize the job by saying that it consists of three parts: First, a substantial job of collecting, evaluating, and disseminating information with respect both to matters of foreign policy and of national security; second, the job of coordinating the collection, evaluation, and dissemination of information of an intelligence nature by others, such as the intelligence systems of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force—and there are others, which need not be brought out in this debate; third, the operation of covert enterprises, colloquially known around Washington as the "Department of Dirty Tricks."

This is a function which we are told has been engaged in by governments since the beginning of civilization, and perhaps even before then. It is a function which we are told is absolutely necessary to our national security. It is a function in which the ordinary rules of right and wrong, of morality, of fair conduct between men and between nations, go by the board. It is a rather sad function. It is more or less a denial of all of the attributes of man in which we take the greatest pride. It is a function which most of us are most reluctant to see our Government engage in. I think almost every Member of this body would hope that it would not be necessary in the national interest to engage in the work of this "Department of Dirty Tricks." Yet I am not advocating that we no longer conduct such covert operations, whether in connection with the elimination of an unfriendly government in Guatemala—in the hope that our role would not be discovered; or in the conduct of undercover operations in the Middle East, with the assistance of oil companies, in order to try to hold the Middle Eastern oil for the West and to prevent the taking of adverse action by various Arab and Mohammedan governments who occupy territory in that area; or whether it be the overthrow of Mossedegh, in Iran; or the conduct of covert operations in southeast Asia. All of these actions may be necessary in the national interest; I do not say they are not. What I do say is that, first, the President, and, second, the Secretary of State, and, third, at least some Members of Congress—and Congress has the power to declare war—should have knowledge in advance and should be kept currently informed as to what the "Department of Dirty Tricks" has up its sleeve. The last and most notorious incident of that kind was, of course, that in Cuba.

It was said by the nominee and, indeed, by others in the course of the hearings—and, in fact, it has been emphasized—that the Director of the Central

Intelligence Agency plays no part in the making of policy. This may well be true with respect to his primary function, which is the collection, evaluation, and dissemination of intelligence; or with respect to his secondary function, which is the coordination of that work with the work of other agencies of the Government and private interests. But I suggest that with respect to covert operations, the Director of Central Intelligence does make policy, and it is a policy which may affect the lives and the wealth of many Americans.

Mr. President, in this connection I should like to quote from page 42 of the hearings before the Armed Services Committee, where the nominee said:

> As I said, from the standpoint of my competence in office, it is my responsibility to report facts, and, furthermore, I think I should avoid, so far as possible, being drawn in on a personal basis into any policy discussions because that, to an extent, may have some effect on what people, the validity that people might attach to the facts.
>
> However, I would expect that because of the various areas of activity that I have had in Government in the past, that maybe my personal opinion may be asked on some subjects. But in my role as Director of Central Intelligence, it would be beyond my competence to deal with policy.

Mr. President, I suggest that high policy was involved in the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency in each of the areas to which I had previously referred; and I am afraid it may be involved in the future. I hope it will not be; I hope the nominee will stick to the letter of what I have just cited as his view of the functions of his office, because if we are going to engage in these covert operations, they should never be started without the approval of the President and the approval of the Secretary of State; and the President and the Secretary of State should be kept advised constantly as to the progress of those operations, so they could call them off or could change direction at any time if it appeared to be in the national interest to do so. I feel very strongly, too, that under our constitutional system—so different from that of parliamentary countries—it is of the greatest importance that these covert operations be revealed on a classified basis in executive session, if necessary, or by private conversations to important Members, on both sides of the aisle, of both the House and the Senate.

So I have some doubts as to whether the nominee has the temperament, the background, and the kind of mind which qualify him not only to conduct these covert operations—which I say have become in the past, but I hope will not continue to be in the future, matters of policy—but also with respect to the daily reporting to the President of his evaluation of the intelligence which has been collected by the Agency and all other agencies over which he either presides or whose activities he coordinates.

This leads me to another subject, which is the future organization of the Central Intelligence Agency. The nominee told the committee that he had in mind a reorganization of the CIA. For that, I commend him. I suspect—although I do not know—that it is badly needed. I would hope very much that covert operations would be separated administratively from the collection and evaluation function. In my judgment, those covert operations should be divorced from the responsibility of the objective, judicially minded individual who should be the head of the CIA.

I would like to see a far tighter rein kept in the future than has been the case in the past with respect to these covert operations.

Perhaps it was quite appropriate for the nominee to be unwilling to reveal to the committee, at least in open session, what his reorganization plans are; but I would hope that when he is confirmed—and I have no doubt he will be confirmed—he will do what he said he was going to do and tell the appropriate Members of the Senate who should know about these things—and they are not all on the Armed Services Committee, by any means—just what he has in mind with respect to that reorganization, and seek, if not their consent, at the very least their advice.

I turn now to the last of my digressions, which is the question of the responsibility for the supervision of the Central Intelligence Agency by the Congress of the United States.

It was said in the hearings that the Armed Services and the Appropriations Committees of the Congress do exercise a certain supervision over the activities of the CIA. I am in no position to say whether that supervision is adequate or not. I merely raise the question as to whether a far deeper probing and a continuous probing into the activities of that Agency is not only a part of the congressional duty, but also in the national interest. It is true that the Armed Services Committee has handled Central Intelligence matters since the act was passed in 1947. I question whether, so far as congressional supervision is concerned, there is not a much stronger case to be made for having the oversea intelligence functions under the Foreign Relations Committee than under the Armed Services Committee.

I am seriously concerned at the growth in our country, during the last year or two, of a certain militaristic attitude toward the conduct of our foreign affairs. I am concerned that we tend to become unduly emotional in our conflict with communism—and a serious conflict it is. I feel we tend to deal with it in terms of a holy war, just as that which took place for 700 years between the Mohammedans and the Christians, or that which racked Europe in the 17th century as a result of the war between Catholics and Protestants.

I fear that we do not look objectively and calmly at negotiations looking toward peace, at the possibility of disarmament, at the possibility of the strengthening of the United Nations in the interest of peace, at the possibility of following out the President's sound premise for total and complete disarmament, under enforcible world law, laid down in his magnificent speech before the United Nations on the 25th of September.

What does all this have to do with the nominee, one may ask? I think it has just this to do with it. As someone said during the course of the hearings, or in one of the speeches—I guess it was the junior Senator from Minnesota—probably with reference to one of the executive agencies which from time to time looks at the CIA, the surveillance and supervision by Congress which has heretofore been given to the conduct of the operations by that Agency has been more in the nature of the polite inquiries of a visiting committee of alumni looking into the English department of the university from which they graduated than the kind of pretty tough supervision which the committees of this body give to a number of the other agencies of our Federal Government.

Again I say, Mr. President, I am in no position to make a categorical statement in this regard. I merely suggest to our colleagues and, through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to the country, that this is a matter deserving of far greater consideration than we are able to give to it in connection with the consideration of this nominee.

I hope very much, once this nomination is out of the way, the appropriate committees of the Congress will not forget this matter, but will undertake, in consultation with the nominee when he becomes the Director of Central Intelligence, to see what can be worked out together to assure adequate supervision of an agency which, in its very nature, is very difficult indeed to supervise without the revelation of important facts and operations, which revelations might well not be in the national interest.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I shall be happy to yield. I told the Senator from Louisiana I would like to finish my speech. I yielded to him once. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator, but I shall not be too long.

Mr. McCARTHY. The legislation under which the Central Intelligence Agency was established describes it purely as an executive agency and provides for a report to the National Security Council. There is no provision in the law which requires a report to any committee of Congress, and the report, or what is described as a report, to the Armed Services Committee is incidental and is not a matter of determination for Congress, and not a matter of determination of law itself. It is not necessarily arbitrary, but is a choice which is made by the executive agency itself. It is not under any direction by the Congress. The only legislative control exercised under statute is the incidental one which arises from the fact that every executive agency must come at some time to Congress for appropriations; but in most cases requests for appropriations come before the act, which is couched in very general terms, and after the act the power of the Appropriations Committee to determine action is of very little significance, as the Senator knows.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is quite correct.

I call to his attention and to the attention of our colleagues subsection (c) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, which deals with the functions of the Committee on Armed Services. One will read through that subsection and look in vain to find a single peg on which to hang one's hat to ascertain that the Armed Services Committee has the slightest jurisdiction over the agency or intelligence generally; whereas, if one turns to subsection (i) of the same rule XXV, he will find that, under the functions of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the very first subsection is: "Relations of the United States with foreign nations generally"—the report upon which relations, indeed, is the principal function of the Central Intelligence Agency.

I would hope that the leadership on both sides of the aisle would give some consideration to whether the jurisdiction of this agency should not be moved under the Foreign Relations Committee.

I would also hope that the Committee on Government Operations would undertake a very careful investigation of the Central Intelligence Agency in the very near future for the purpose of assessing the effectiveness of its operations; the extent to which it should be reorganized, if at all; and to look very carefully into the question as to whether the "Department of Dirty Tricks" or covert operations should be separated from the intelligence governing functions which, without adequate background to make a considered judgment, I am presently of the view should be done.

I return, Mr. President, to the question of whether the nominee meets those last two characteristics to which I referred in the beginning of my remarks. First is the question of good judgment. My view on that is one which cannot possibly be sustained by a factual argument. I only say that in my opinion the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency should be a man of judicial temperament, a man who can weigh facts and law and opinion, correctly evaluate them, and state tersely and clearly the conclusion which results as he looks at different views.

Allen Dulles was a lawyer, but he was a man of great judicial temperament. He was objective. He was dispassionate. Perhaps he was not the world's greatest administrator, and I am sure he would be the first to admit he was not, but he was a man whose calm, cool, and considered judgment was entitled to the greatest of respect.

I raise the question as to whether Mr. McCone—able, intelligent, honest, stable—is a man of judicial temperament. I suspect that he is not. I am not, myself. I am an advocate. I believe in causes. I am convinced that peace and disarmament is the most important issue before the world today. I admit I cannot assess that problem with the calm, dispassionate objectivity which is desirable.

Mr. McCone is said to believe we should immediately resume nuclear testing in the atmosphere. He has believed this for some years. He opposed the moratorium. He feels it deeply in his bones. He has said so vigorously. I honor him for that opinion. As time goes on, it is becoming apparent that perhaps he is right. I do not think he was right in the first instance, but this is a matter of opinion. After all, when one finds one's self in the present situation, with the Russians refusing even to negotiate any further, with the possibility of the national security involved, perhaps he is right now.

My real question is, Will not that strong, honestly held conviction not only about this question alone but also about a score of other matters, inevitably and perhaps subconsciously affect the objectivity and the validity of the evaluation of intelligence he will give to the President of the United States? If there is even a suspicion that this will be the case, should his nomination be confirmed for this position?

I have said to my friend from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] privately, and I say it now publicly, that I should have been glad to support Mr. McCone to be Secretary of Defense or Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Navy or Secretary of the Air Force, but I have very serious doubts as to whether a man of the temperament of an advocate is the proper kind of man to hold this most important position, in which judicial objectivity is of the highest importance.

Finally, Mr. President, I turn—and somewhat reluctantly—to the question of conflict of interest. I am not one who believes that our present conflict-of-interest laws are either wise or sound. I think they should be drastically revised in the interests of making it easier for able men from the business community and, for that matter, from our great labor unions, to come to Washington, D.C., and to serve the Government without having to be put on the gridiron with respect to theoretical conflict-of-interest considerations. I do say that as long as those laws are on the statute books they should be enforced, and in this instance I have a serious doubt amounting almost to a conviction that the holdings by Mr. McCone of over a million dollars' worth of stock of the Standard Oil Co. of California is both a legal violation of the conflict-of-interest laws but also a very unwise holding for him to continue. I hope very much that within the near future he will divest himself of that stock, not by putting it in an irrevocable trust in which he and his family will continue to have an economic beneficial interest from the holding, but by divesting himself of it by sale. This will be a sacrifice. This will cause him to pay a substantial tax. This will be perhaps unfair. However, if a man wishes to delve into the tortuous politics of the Middle East, where the relationships of the United States with the countries of Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Kuwait, Iraq, and Iran are concerned; if he wishes to inject himself into the tortuous politics of Castroism and his efforts to take over democratically elected governments in Latin America, such as Venezuela; then he should not have a substantial interest in any oil company, which inevitably is deeply involved in both the politics and economics of those countries.

I note parenthetically that the Armed Services Committee required Mr. McNamara to divest himself of his substantial stockholdings before recommending the confirmation of his appointment to the Office of Secretary of Defense a year ago, and the committee did not think Mr. McNamara's offer to place his stock in an irrevocable trust removed the conflict of interest.

I shall read into the RECORD a couple of excerpts from a memorandum furnished to me, at my request, by the legislative counsel which appears in full in the RECORD of January 29, 1962, at pages 1110–1112.

First I refer to section 434 of title 18, United States Code, which deals with "interested persons acting as Government agents" and provides:

> Whoever, being an officer, agent or member of, or directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of any corporation, joint-stock company, or business entity, is employed or acts as an officer or agent of the United States for the transaction of business with such business entity, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

That statute was recently interpreted very broadly by the Supreme Court of the United States in one of the cases arising out of the Dixon-Yates transaction, *United States* v. *Mississippi Valley Generating Company* (364 U.S. 520), in January of 1961. I shall read a couple of excerpts from the opinion of the Court:

> The moral principle upon which the statute is based has its foundation in the Biblical admonition that no man may serve to masters, Matthew 6: 24, a maxim which is especially pertinent if one of the masters happens to be economic self-interest. Consonant with this salutary moral purpose, Congress has drafted a statute which speaks in very comprehensive terms.

I paraphrase to say that the section is not limited in its application to Government agents who have a direct financial interest in the business entities with which they negotiate on behalf of the Government, or to a narrow class of business transactions. I resume the quotation:

> Nor is the statute's scope restricted by numerous provisos and exceptions, as is true of many penal statutes. Rather, it applies, without exception, to whoever is directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of a business entity with which he transacts any business as an officer or agent of the United States.
>
> It is also significant, we think, that the statute does not specify as elements of the crime that there be actual corruption or that there be any actual loss suffered by the Government as a result of the defendant's conflict of interest. This omission indicates that the statute establishes an objective standard of conduct, and that whenever a Government agent fails to act in accordance with that standard he is guilty of violating the statute, regardless of whether there is positive corruption. The statute is thus directed not only at dishonor, but also at conduct that tempts dishonor. This broad proscription embodies a recognition of the fact that an impairment of impartial judgment can occur in even the most well-meaning men when their personal economic interests are affected by the business they transact on behalf of the Government. To this extent, therefore, the statute is more concerned with what might have happened in a given situation than with what actually happened. It attempts to prevent honest Government agents from succumbing to temptation by making it illegal for them to

enter into relationships which are fraught with temptation.

Then as the legislative counsel reviewed this case and the statute in substantially greater detail, he stated:

> The language of the court suggests that certainty of financial gain is not a necessary element of section 434, but that a substantial probability of such gain will suffice under that section. Indeed, the court in its technical holding held if a Government agent may benefit financially from his transactions he violates the statute.

In conclusion the legislative counsel points out:

> If Mr. McCone were to serve as Director of the CIA, section 434 of title 18, United States Code, could have no application unless, during his incumbency, the CIA did in fact have business transactions with one or more of the companies in which he then had a financial interest.

And again:

> If in his capacity as Director of the CIA Mr. McCone were to participate on behalf of the Government in a business transaction with a company in which he is financially interested and from which he might realize financial gain, the provisions of section 434 would become applicable whether or not Mr. McCone believed his actions to involve a conflict of interest.

Finally, the legislative counsel said:

> The decision in Mississippi Valley suggests that the giving of approval to a contract negotiated by others probably would be regarded as such a participation. What other forms of action taken by a Government officer with respect to a contract which may be regarded as participation remains undecided.

I turn now to the brief provisions dealing with conflict of interest which have been adopted by the CIA itself. Let me say that I have been reliably informed by my friend the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], who is present in the Chamber, that the nominee did not know that these regulations of the Agency existed at the time he appeared before the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It does not make any difference whether or not the nominee knew, because he did exactly the same thing before the Senate Committee on Armed Services this time that he did the last time when he appeared before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Both times he offered to do anything the committee thought proper with his securities.

It cannot be construed as a criticism of the nominee that he does not handle his securities in accordance with the wishes of the Senator from Pennsylvania. The criticism should be lodged against the members of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I return to my quotation from the regulations of the Central Intelligence Agency dealing with the conflict-of-interest question. They were printed in the January 29 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 1112, in the third column. I repeat them now:

> (b) Conflicts of Interest.
>
> 1. Definition. A conflict of interest is defined as a situation in which an Agency employee's private interest, usually but not necessarily of an economic nature—

And I stress that language—

> conflicts or appears to conflict—

I stress that language also—

> with his Agency duties and responsibilities. The situation is of concern to the Agency whether the conflict is real or only apparent.
>
> (c) Financial Interests. Employees may not (a) have direct or indirect financial interests that conflict substantially, or appear to conflict substantially, with their responsibilities and duties as Agency employees.

Mr. President, I now state briefly for the RECORD the facts gleaned from the hearings before the Committee on Armed Services with respect to the stockholdings of the nominee. These, too, appear in the January 29 RECORD at page 1115, in the third column:

> Mr. McCone stated that he owned a little in excess of $1 million of stock in Standard Oil of California. He stated that the company had "extensive reserves in Arabia and in the offshore island in the Persian Gulf of Bahrein, and also extensive reserves in Sumatra, and Venezuela."
>
> Standard Oil of California is one of the four companies which makes up the Arabian-American Oil Co. (Aramco), along with the Texas Co., Standard Oil of New Jersey and Mobil Oil. Aramco, according to Mr. McCone, does have relationships with the governments of Arabia and Bahrein.

I interpolate the note that Standard Oil of California in its August 1961 report to stockholders, lists Mr. McCone as owning 18,318 shares, and as receiving 915 additional shares by way of stock dividend. The total value of 19,233 shares, according to New York Times listing for the $54.25 closing price of Standard Oil of California on the New York Stock Exchange yesterday, is $1,043,390.25.

Mr. President, I shall not deal in speculation. I shall not deal in published articles of syndicated columnists. I merely say that I think every well-informed American knows that the American oil companies are deep in the politics of the Middle East. We know also that the Central Intelligence Agency is deep in the politics of the Middle East. It is inconceivable to me that the Central Intelligence Agency representatives in the Middle East should not be in constant contact with the representative of the American oil companies in that area.

It may well be that sometimes the interests of the oil companies and the interests of the Central Intelligence Agency are not in accord, although most of the time they are. It has been widely alleged—and I have no way of knowing whether it is true or not—that in many instances the oil companies have been helpful to the Government of the United States, and no doubt to themselves also, in making arrangements for the Middle Eastern kingdoms and sheikdoms which involve business transactions covering large sums of money. I have no doubt that that will be the condition in the immediate future, for I see no immediate hope for the pacification of that unhappy area of the world; nor do I think it likely that in the years immediately ahead we will be able to avoid the type of covert operation in that area which I personally very much regret but which in all likelihood is in the national interest.

Accordingly, Mr. President, because I am of the view that the nominee by temperament is not qualified to hold a job calling for a judicial temperament rather than that of a protagonist or advocate; because I am concerned about his views toward peace in the world and concerned by his apparent view that there is little immediate chance of achieving it, and that sole reliance on military strength is a better policy—and in this, to be sure, I am paraphrasing, because I have no quotations, and I may be doing the nominee an injustice, although certainly in his public record he is one who has not been an advocate of the kind of policy which in my judgment represents the greatest chance of peace to our country; and finally, because I have come to the conclusion that his holding of stock in the Standard Oil Co. of California violates the law with respect to conflict of interest, I must regretfully oppose the nomination.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise to congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] on his articulate, well-though-out, and brilliant speech.

Although I intend to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. McCone, I believe that the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] have made a very real contribution to our understanding of the problem of the Central Intelligence Agency by the ventilation furnished by this debate.

I was particularly struck by the reference made by the Senator from Pennsylvania to the fact that he had little doubt as to Mr. McCone's ability, and that what was most important were the plans with regard to the organization of the CIA, which apparently is in very great need of reorganization.

I believe there are three areas of possible reorganization. The first was brought out by a picture which was printed in the January 14 issue of the Washington Post, which showed the Central Intelligence Building. An intern in my office counted the number of windows. There are 2,500 windows alone in the building, Mr. President. That fact would indicate that a very helpful start in its reorganization would be a reduction in its size.

The second reorganization, as the Senator from Pennsylvania has suggested, would be the separation of intelligence collection from the operations. Here, too, in the field of intelligence collection, there should be a further separation of covert collection of intelligence from overt research and analysis.

Third, Mr. President, I hope that the watchdog committee proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] may in fact come into being as a result of the debate on the nomination because—although I am misquoting Lord Acton—absolute power corrupts absolutely, but unwatched absolute power corrupts even more absolutely.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Rhode Island in saying I too have been interested to hear those constructive elements in the presentation which has been made this afternoon by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Now back to the subject at hand. Mr. McCone believes, along with others, that the way to maintain peace is to stay strong so we can stay free

The Senator from Pennsylvania dwelt on the personalities of Mr. Dulles and Mr. McCone. I know both. In my opinion Mr. McCone has at least as judicious a temperament as Mr. Dulles and I respect them both.

The question of whether we should or should not take the Central Intelligence Agency away from the Armed Services Committee should not develop into criticism of how Mr. McCone will perform his job.

I have a short memorandum about conflict of interest and McCone's position.

The conclusions of the memorandum submitted to Senator Clark by Mr. Hugh C. Evans, Assistant Counsel, Office of Legislative Counsel, are that there will be a conflict of interest if:

One. While Mr. McCone is Director of CIA, the agency had business transactions with one or more of the companies in which he has, at the same time, a financial interest;

Two. In his capacity as Director, Mr. McCone were to participate on behalf of the Government in a business transaction with a company in which he has a financial interest and from which he might realize financial gain.

If either of the above events were to occur, there would be a conflict of interest.

Prior to the assumption of office, Mr. McCone submitted to the General Counsel of the CIA for examination a list of his financial holdings, to determine if any conflict of interest existed. The General Counsel of the CIA submitted to Mr. McCone a written opinion, stating that no conflict of interest could be found on the basis of his holdings; that the Agency had no contracts with any of the companies in which Mr. McCone owns stock; and that, under existing statutes and regulations, no conflict-of-interest situation existed.

As Mr. McCone testified at page 44 of the hearings, this entire matter was reviewed with the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel, Department of Justice, who concurred in the opinion of the General Counsel of the CIA.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the memorandum of January 15, 1962, entitled "Memorandum on Conflicts of Interest," having to do with Mr. McCone's financial holdings, signed by the General Counsel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

1. We have reviewed the list of Mr. McCone's financial holdings which is attached hereto.

2. Stock ownership as such is not barred by the conflict-of-interest statutes. The problem arises only if a person with pecuniary interest in a company acts as an officer or agent of the United States in the transaction of business with that company (18 U.S.C. 434). The Assistant Attorney General's memorandum to the assistant to the President in connection with Mr. McCone's proposed appointment to the Atomic Energy Commission stated that the mere coincidence of Mr. McCone's employment as Chairman of the Commission and the formation of a contract between the company and the Commission would not involve Mr. McCone in a violation of section 434. In this connection they cited an opinion by Acting Attorney General Rogers of August 5, 1957, in connection with the appointment of Mr. McElroy as Secretary of Defense. In this memorandum Mr. Rogers stated: "Although personal action on the part of the Secretary might pose a serious conflict-of-interest problem under section 434, I know of no judicial decision suggesting that the existence of ultimate official responsibility for all the activities of a department constitutes per se the 'transaction of business' within the meaning of section 434. Moreover, neither the express language of the section nor its legislative history are indicative of such a result."

3. I have had the companies shown on the list of Mr. McCone's holdings checked by the appropriate components of the Agency. We have no business negotiations or contracts within the meaning of section 434 with any of them. We have in the past had research and development and procurement contracts with one company, but at the present time we are merely following certain programs being carried out by the company for possible future interest.

4. I am of the opinion, therefore, that no question of conflict of interest arises out of the financial holdings of Mr. McCone. I have discussed this with the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel, Department of Justice, and he concurred in my opinion.

LAWRENCE R. HOUSTON,
General Counsel.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] placed in the RECORD excerpts from the Central Intelligence Agency's rules on employee conduct, dealing with conflict of interest. This regulation on employee conduct was issued pursuant to the requirements of Executive Order No. 10939, in which the President directed each department and agency head to review and issue internal directives appropriate to his department or agency to assure the maintenance of ethical and moral standards therein. The agency regulation thus issued on August 29, 1961, was designed to acquaint employees and supervisors with proper standards of conduct and to encourage the bringing forward of all situations, even though they might only apparently involve conflicts of interest. It was intended that there be full and careful review of any potential situations involving conflict of interest, to determine necessary actions to be taken if any such situation did exist.

Mr. McCone followed that procedure by submitting to the Agency, shortly after his nomination to the Office of Director of Central Intelligence was announced by the President, a list of his personal holdings so they could be reviewed.

As indicated, after thorough review, by the Agency General Counsel and approval by the Attorney General's office, it was concluded that no conflict of interest was involved.

A Member of this body told me he felt this opinion of the counsel of the Central Intelligence Agency was weak. The memorandum does not read weak to me. But to satisfy myself, I talked to the General Counsel of the Agency concerning the question, and asked him:

> Mr. Houston, some of my colleagues feel that the memorandum on conflicts of interest, which you wrote as of January 15 with respect to Mr. McCone's financial holdings, is weak.
>
> It seems to me that it is a statement which says that he does not have a conflict of interest. Would you be good enough to let me know how you feel about it?

Mr. Houston dictated this reply:

> While the memorandum necessarily discusses in detail the statutory restrictions on conflicts of interest, in writing it we took consideration all Agency policies and regulatory issuances, and in addition the overall position of the Director of Central Intelligence, and I felt that no aspect of these considerations presented a conflict of interest, and the memorandum so concludes.
>
> I still believe this is the correct conclusion.

Let me say again that if there is any difference, it is a difference with the Armed Services' Committee, because Mr. McCone has agreed to handle his holdings as the committee believes desirable.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I have carefully read the hearings before the Committee on Armed Services on the nomination of John A. McCone to be Director of Central Intelligence, and have concluded that in the light of his background and wide range of experience in positions of high public trust under both Democratic and Republican administrations, that the people of the United States are indeed fortunate to obtain his services once again.

Mr. McCone's outstanding qualifications, his tested ability and unquestionable character are matched by few men in public service. There is no question in my mind but that he will carry out his responsibilities with the same degree of distinction and honor in which he has performed in past positions of high public trust.

The President of the United States is to be congratulated on selecting an individual with such outstanding qualifications for this important and sensitive post of high public trust.

I shall vote for his confirmation.

AMERICA AND THE SUPERPATRIOTS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to a letter written to the editor of the Sheridan, Wyo., Press. The letter was written by Mrs. Edna Stewart, of Story, Wyo. In the letter she wrote of her faith in America and our basic freedoms, and directed particular attention to what she calls the superpatriots and their arbitrary attitude in regard to who is to judge who is patriotic. The views she has presented in the letter are so well balanced and so stably put that I believe her letter should have much wider circulation than it would receive in the local press. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

READERS' VIEWPOINTS

EDITOR OF PRESS:

For a change, I should like to accentuate the positive, and I will begin by saying I think the United States of America is just fine and dandy the way she is.

Of course nothing in the affairs of men is quite perfect. We seem to have abroad in the land too many disgruntled frustrates who exist and have their being in a perpetual state of hate, fear and suspicion. It would be hard to say just what to do for what ails these people.

Among them is the candymaker from New Hampshire. In one way he reminds me a little of a much greater man than he, the genius industrialist, Henry Ford the first. The latter became somewhat swollen in importance perhaps, for after all he was a very important man. This man outside of his own sphere understood so little about the world about him that he thought singlehanded he could stop World War I by sailing his "peace ship" to Europe. How unrealistic can a man get?

I say to all such men—stick to your lasts.

The word "democracy" is a bad word among the frustrates. They call it "mobocracy" and they are pleased to say that this country is a republic—not a democracy.

Most of us would proudly proclaim it is both.

Some of these people see a Communist behind every bush and resort to name calling. I myself have never seen a Communist or anyone I thought could be one and anyway I'll leave all that to J. Edgar Hoover who seems quite competent. I say to all such people stick to your last and mind your manners. Some of these people believe that special qualities for leadership lie with those whose ancestors have long been on these shores. Shades of Hitler. The master race, remember?

And then, the military heroes. In these spheres you must have a military hero. The Nazis had Horst Wessel and the Birchers have John Birch.

They hate what they call intellectualism. Yes, they may well hate the free play of intellect. They are smart enough to know their natural enemy. With them the people should be told what to do.

Among the superpatriots there are those who want to burn books. Again shades of Hitler. As for me I have every confidence in our teachers and schools and what's in the books. I'll gladly leave it to qualified people. I say to all self-appointed book burners, stick to your last.

The holier-than-thou, smug attitude of these superpatriots could well generate a little heat under the collar if it weren't for the saving grace of humor. Heaven knows, no saving grace of humor exists in their grim midst. But what a target for the Bob Newharts and Mort Sahls of this world and oh the sacrilege of it. Upstarts, fresh from the east side daring to have a hey day with the rock-ribbed patriots. Tut, tut, can such things be?

I say a little humility on the part of these superpatriots would grace them well.

In concluding, I would say that whatever comes the American people will never choose a sawdust Hitler for a leader.

It would be a pleasure to enumerate what some proven patriots have to say about this radical right, the self-proclaimed patriots, but time and space do not allow.

EDNA STEWART.

STORY.

SECRETARY RUSK SUMS UP FREEDOM'S CASE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I was very much impressed by excerpts from the address delivered by Secretary of State Dean Rusk to the Foreign Ministers at the meeting of the Organization of American States now going on in Punta del Este, Uruguay.

In itself, his message constituted such a ringing statement of confidence in the basic operations of a free society and in our competitive capabilities in a jungle world with communism and communism's well-advertised goals, that I believe these excerpts from his address deserve much wider circulation, in order that many more Americans may be able to read them.

I wish to read the concluding paragraph, which is exceedingly eloquent. Secretary of State Rusk said:

> Communism is not the wave of the future. Communists are only the exploiters of people's aspirations—and their despair. They are the scavengers of the transition from stagnation into the modern world. The wave of the future is the peaceful, democratic revolution symbolized for the Americas in the Alliance for Progress—the revolution which will bring change without chaos, development without dictatorship, and hope without hatred.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire report on the address by Secretary of State Rusk be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSK SUMS UP FREEDOM'S CASE

(By Secretary of State Dean Rusk)

(These excerpts are taken from Secretary Rusk's Thursday speech before the hemisphere foreign ministers' meeting in Punta del Este, Uruguay.)

There are those in every land who resist change, who see the society they know as the climax of history, who identify their own status and privilege with the welfare of their people, and who oppose the vital land and tax reforms necessary for the completion of our work. But their resistance is doomed to failure.

The 19th century is over; and, in the 20th, people across the earth are awakening from centuries of poverty and oppression to claim the right to live in the modern world. "The veil has been torn asunder," wrote Bolivar, "we have seen the light; and we will not be thrust back into the darkness." No one can hope to prolong the past in a revolutionary age. The only question is which road we mean to take into the future.

This is not a question alone for this hemisphere. It is a question faced everywhere in the world. On the one hand are those who believe in change through persuasion and consent—through means which respect the individual. On the other are those who advocate change through the subjugation of the individual and who see in the turbulence of change the opportunity of power.

History shows that freedom is the most reliable means to economic development and social justice, and that communism betrays in performance the ends which it proclaims in propaganda. The humane and pragmatic methods of freemen are not merely the right way, morally, to develop an underdeveloped country; they are technically the efficient way.

If there is tension in Berlin today, it is because of the failure of the regime in East Germany and the flight of tens of thousands of its people toward freedom and expanding opportunity.

Recognizing its failure in the underdeveloped world, recognizing that its greatest enemy is the process of peaceful and democratic development, communism in recent years has concentrated—in Asia, in Africa, in the Middle East, now in our own hemisphere—on using the troubles of transition to install Communist minorities in permanent power. The techniques by which communism seeks to subvert the development process are neither mysterious nor magical.

Khrushchev, Mao Tse-tung, and Che Guevara have outlined them in frankness and detail. They seek first to lay the political basis for the seizure of power by winning converts in sections of the populations whose hopes and ambitions are thwarted by the existing order. Then they try to capture control of broadly based popular movements aimed ostensibly at redressing social and economic justice.

In some cases they resort to guerrilla warfare as a means of intimidating opposition and disrupting orderly social progress. At every point the Communists are prepared to invoke all the resources of propaganda and subversion, of manipulation and violence, to maximize confusion, destroy faith in the democratic instrumentalities of change and open up the way for a Communist takeover.

As for its claim to social justice, Chairman Khrushchev himself has given the most eloquent testimony of the inevitability of monstrous injustice in a system of totalitarian dictatorship.

Nothing shows more clearly the failure of communism to bring about economic development and social justice than the present condition of Europe. The bankruptcy of communism is etched in the contrast between the thriving economies of Western Europe and the drab stagnation of Eastern Europe—and it is symbolized in the wall of Berlin, erected to stop the mass flight of ordinary people from communism to freedom.

The proponents of free society need have no apologies. We have moved far beyond the rigid laissez-faire capitalism of the 19th century. The open society of the mid-20th century can offer the reality of what the Communists promise but do not and cannot produce—because the means they are using, the techniques of hatred and violence, can never produce anything but more violence and more hatred.

Communism is not the wave of the future. Communists are only the exploiters of people's aspirations—and their despair. They are the scavengers of the transition from stagnation into the modern world. The wave of the future is the peaceful, democratic revolution symbolized for the Americas in the Alliance for Progress—the revolution which will bring changes without chaos, development without dictatorship, and hope without hatred.

THE TARIFF NEEDS AN ADULT APPROACH

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, yesterday there was published in the Washington Evening Star an article which the distinguished columnist, William S. White, wrote on the tariff problem which will face this body in the days ahead. The article is an appraisal of President Kennedy's trade ideas. Bill White's suggestion is that there is no place for petty partisanship in the consultations, deliberations, and controversies which will arise over the new approach to our trade problems. I believe his article warrants reprinting in its entirety in the Congressional Record, and I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Tariff Needs an Adult Approach—Appraisal of Kennedy's Trade Ideas Is No Place for Petty Partisanship

(By William S. White)

The great, grave issue of this year—and perhaps of many years to come—has now at last been formally put before the country.

This is President Kennedy's long message to Congress asking for unexampled Presidential authority to cut tariffs in vast sweeps. The central purpose is to associate this Nation with the six-nation European Common Market and so to enter a new world of immensely enlarged trade with all its opportunities—and all its possible trials and dangers.

The hour has struck for bigness—for big ideas, for big debates among big-minded men. It is much too late now for littleness—for little ideas, for little disputes among little-minded men, for petty partisanship, for girlish screaming over tags like "liberal" and "conservative," for frantic worrying over who is a Democrat and who a Republican.

For this is not a Republican issue, not a Democratic issue. This is an all-American issue. This is not something to be resolved by two-bit manifestos. This is not to be discussed as though it were a public housing bill or some mere good guy-bad guy contest.

The opportunity is at hand for the most thoughtful, the most adult, the most responsible national debate we have known since World War II. And the duty, as well as the opportunity, for just such a debate is also at hand.

Mr. Kennedy has massively influential support here—from the largest of large business; from the most articulate, generally, of the private voices of this country; from such outstanding Republicans as Dwight D. Eisenhower and former Secretary of State Christian Herter.

The opposition, actual and latent, is more dispersed and, on the whole, less blessed with "names." It is, however, a formidable and honest opposition which is entitled to be heard in full respect and understanding. For it is no good denying that this plan will work some scattered hardship, among communities and industries which have thus far remained economically going concerns only through the assistance of tariff protection.

It is also no good denying that the vast association upon which we propose to embark will raise new problems, economic problems of kinds with which we have not yet dealt. It is also no good denying that the European end, at least, of this proposed new trade association, the Common Market, ultimately will find itself facing poignant new political problems, too. For in Europe this union for trade will reach more and more toward political union as well. In the end will come some undeniable loss or dilution of individual national sovereignty there.

Now, in all the circumstances, it is conceivable that President Kennedy could simply bulldoze his bill through Congress, given the power and prestige of his forces. He could not wisely do this, however. For this is a historic and capital matter entitled to the most earnest and searching scrutiny by Congress and by every responsible adult in this country.

This correspondent, for one, does not hesitate to say that he is for the plan. All his life he has believed that freer world trade would cure most of the world's troubles. Moreover the enormous Western trade grouping in prospect here would make the free world so strong as to make a farce of Khrushchev's threat to "bury" that world by his own slave economy.

But let the protectionists be heard to the end—again, heard in full respect and understanding. For this great national decision will be no good and will not endure unless it has been reached at last in a true, and an informed national consent.

CASTRO AND CASTROISM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, there appears in the Washington Post of today an article in which Walter Lippmann takes his usual objective view of a very controversial and troublesome question now in our midst; namely, that of Castro and Castroism. In the article Mr. Lippmann utters a word of caution to those who would act impetuously, particularly as they react to the attitude of some of our neighbors to the south on the Castro question. It is Mr. Lippmann's view that we should be a little more tolerant and a little more understanding of the caution exhibited by some of our friends to the south of us. I believe that the entire article warrants reprinting in the Congressional Record, and I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

There being on objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Castro and Castroism

(By Walter Lippmann)

The Castro problem is how to deal with a hostile regime without using military force to overthrow it. The Foreign Ministers at Punta del Este have been seeking the beginning of a solution for that problem. Castro has no avowed and quite certainly no genuine sympathizers and supporters among the Governments of the American Republics. But there has been an important division of view as to what it is wise and expedient to do about him.

The division, as we have learned, is between the Republics which lie on the shores of the Caribbean facing Cuba and, with the rather special exception of Mexico, the big countries of South America which are a long way by sea or land from the troubled Caribbean.

I would venture a guess that this geography explains the theoretical differences between the so-called soft and hard positions at the Conference. The Caribbean countries which have taken the hard line, are physically within reach of Cuba. The distances by sea and air are fairly short, and it is rather easy for Castro's revolutionists to infiltrate countries around the Caribbean, to do gun running to local rebel bands among them.

But the big South American countries, which are separated from Cuba in the Caribbean by the Andes Mountains, the jungles and the great hump of Brazil, are not directly threatened by armed intervention. For them the danger of Castro comes primarily from his legend as the Robin Hood who has robbed the rich to help the poor.

Castro does send propaganda and agitators into southern South America. He uses diplomatic facilities if he has diplomatic relations and if not, borrows the facilities of European and Asian nations which are sympathetic with him. But all this activity is of little consequence as compared with the legend of Castroism, the legend that Castro is the friend of the poor.

The soft group of governments have acted as they have acted not because they want to help Castro, and not because they are afraid to anger him, but because they know that legends are not destroyed by strong adjectives. The legend would not be dissolved by breaking diplomatic relations and driving Castro entirely into the underground. The legend would not be destroyed by economic embargoes especially since Cuba has no important trade with Latin America.

From our point of view it would have been a calamity if we had forced the issue to a point where with the backing of the weakest part of Latin America we overrode the views of the strongest part. It would have been a calamity to win such a victory because it would have split the inter-American system, with twice as many Latin Americans opposed to us as were with us.

What we really needed, and perhaps have gotten, is that a preponderant majority of our American neighbors state clearly that Castro and Castroism are hostile to the inter-American system. When that is achieved, the practical question of what to do about Castro is not a matter of words or of sanctions. It is a matter of coordinated and cooperative counterespionage in this hemisphere. That must be largely a secret operation in order to identify and frustrate subversive agents. It cannot be done with a brass band and a television camera but only by close working arrangements among the Governments.

Effective counterespionage can deal with Castro's interventions in this hemisphere. It will not and cannot deal with his legend, with Castroism. Counterespionage will not save the corrupt dictatorships that still remain. It will not save the incompetent democracies. And while there must be counterespionage to make sure Castro minds his own business in Cuba, it is no substitute for doing what the Alliance for Progress has promised to do.

DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of John A. McCone, of California, to be Director of Central Intelligence.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have been listening with much interest to the debate on the question of confirmation of the nomination of John A. McCone to be Director of Central Intelligence.

I realize that this position is a highly sensitive and most difficult one. I do not know Mr. McCone intimately but I do know him to a degree; and I have observed his service as an Under Secretary for the Air Force, in a Democratic administration; as Chairman of the Joint Commission on Atomic Energy, under a Republican administration; and as the appointee under the Democratic administration of President Kennedy to be head of the Central Intelligence Agency—the nomination which the Senate is now called upon to consider, and about which it must reach a decision.

Mr. McCone has proved to be a most efficient, effective, and patriotic servant of this Government. He has served in positions of great trust and responsibility, and he has executed his duties faithfully and well.

There is a question of conflict of interest. It is a most difficult and vexatious question. Under the preceding administration—a Republican administration—I felt at times that something should be done to correct the methods by which we judged men, and which on occasion kept good men out of government, because of their business interests.

It seems to me that there could be found some way whereby a nominee to a high post in our Government could be accorded a greater degree of respect, and whereby he would not be considered to be lacking in integrity because he happened to be wealthy. Nevertheless, the spirit of the conflict-of-interest laws should be maintained, in order that the interests of the public, the Government, and indeed the various nominees to public office may be protected. As I say, the question is a difficult one. It has plagued both Democratic administrations and Republican administrations.

Mr. President, now that I have expressed my feeling on this question, I hope that at an appropriate time the appropriate committees will look into the question of appropriate conflict-of-interest law revision, and will ascertain whether they can clarify the matter and can arrive at better procedures.

I recall the very effective job Mr. McCone performed as Under Secretary of the Air Force. I know how, in the Atomic Energy Commission, he brought a good degree of order out of a difficult situation, and in so doing—at least, such is my understanding—earned the confidence of all members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy; and I am sure he holds that confidence to this day.

The charge has been made that he has not had much acquaintance with intelligence activities. Maybe not. I do not know. But certainly, as an Under Secretary of the Air Force, as Chairman of the Commission on Atomic Energy, he must have had some contact with activities of this kind, and certainly he must have gained considerable experience in intelligence matters related to the security of the United States.

Mr. President, I intend to vote for John McCone, because of the personal faith and confidence I have in him, and because he is the President's nominee; and I think that, under the circumstances, it would be fitting if a substantial majority of this body gave a vote of confidence to this nominee. I am sure the President and the Congress will not be disappointed in his directorship of the Central Intelligence Agency.

I intend to vote for Mr. McCone tomorrow.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad the distinguished majority leader alluded to the necessity for action in this field. Last year the President sent a message to the Congress on the matter of conflict of interest. A bill was submitted by the Attorney General. Some hearings have been held. There are items to be considered in that bill, but it is highly necessary, because the statutes with which we deal now, and that come into play with respect to many nominees, go back as far as the year 1873.

I concur in the majority leader's views in that respect, and I hope the Judiciary Committee, to which those matters have been referred, can, before too long, finish its deliberations and bring these bills to the Senate Calendar.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader about the schedule for the remaining days of the week, and perhaps the early days of next week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, it is the intention to bring up tomorrow, after conclusion of the vote on the nomination of Mr. McCone which will take place at 2 o'clock, three treaties which are on the Executive Calendar—Executive G, the convention between the United States of America and Canada; Executive M, the international convention for the northwest Atlantic fisheries; and Executive N, a protocol dated at Montreal June 21, 1961, relating to an amendment to the Convention on International Civil Aviation.

To the best of my knowledge, these treaties were reported out of the Committee on Foreign Relations unanimously, and I do not know of any opposition to them.

Then it is anticipated that the Senate will go over from tomorrow until Friday, and it is hoped at that time we can take up the bill for higher education, Calendar No. 1053, S. 1241.

It is hoped that following that, on Monday or as soon thereafter as is possible, the money resolutions will be taken up, under the various committees, subcommittees, special committees, and so forth, live and function.

It is anticipated that shortly thereafter consideration will be given to Calendar No. 891, S. 2520, a bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans and Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes.

That ought to bring us pretty close to, if not beyond, the period set aside for the commemoration of Lincoln's birthday, which, to repeat, will include February 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, inclusive, days on which there will be no votes, and perhaps February 8 and February 14. However, so far as the 8th and 14th are concerned, no definite commitments have been made. None will be made. It will depend on circumstances on those days as to whether or not there will be a vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader. That gives us a chance to set personal schedules actually some time beyond that point.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate return to legislative session.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO THE STATE OF WYOMING

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3879) to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the State of Wyoming for agricultural purposes certain real property in Sweetwater County, Wyo.

EXTENSION OF COMPLETION TIME FOR FREE BRIDGE BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1133, Senate bill 512, and that it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 512) to extend the time for completion of the free highway bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of executive business.

DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of John A. McCone, of California, to be Director of Central Intelligence.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I have been reviewing the testimony which was taken by the Committee on Armed Services in the hearings on the nomination of Mr. McCone to be Director of Central Intelligence. In reviewing that testimony, and in looking at the statement of holdings which he filed with the committee in response to my request, a question occurred to me which I think should be raised and which should be brought to the attention of the Senate.

In view of the fact that the voting will take place tomorrow at 2, I regret that I did not look up this point earlier, because, I must confess, I do not have as much information as I should like to have at this time.

During the testimony Mr. McCone gave, it became apparent that the majority of his business interests have to do with the transporting of oil and the transporting of other bulk commerce in world sealanes for one purpose or another.

The question occurred to me this afternoon, as I was looking over the testimony, as to whether or not that established a tax-free status for the income from these corporations and the shipping operations which are his primary business activity.

The Internal Revenue Code, section 883, under the title "Exclusions From Gross Income," provides:

> The following items shall not be included in gross income of a foreign corporation, and

> shall be exempt from taxation under this subtitle:
>
> (1) SHIPS UNDER FOREIGN FLAG
>
> Earnings derived from the operation of a ship or ships documented under the laws of a foreign country which grants an equivalent exemption to citizens of the United States and to corporations organized in the United States.

During the past hour or so I asked my administrative assistant to consult as many tax authorities as he could. It is his tentative opinion that the operation of that section of the statute would exclude from liability for taxation under the income tax laws of this country ships which are under a foreign flag if the flag of that country grants an equivalent exemption to citizens of the United States.

I have not had time to determine whether that would be applicable to ships under the Norwegian flag or to ships under the Panamanian flag, but this becomes a question of considerable importance because of the testimony as to the chartering of ships which are operated by companies in which Mr. McCone is interested.

At page 66 of the printed hearings I asked Mr. McCone the following:

> You have testified that you were the sole owner of Joshua Hendy in the operations of Trans-World Carriers, of which Joshua Hendy apparently owns one-fourth, and Global Bulk one-half. Would you say you had no indirect interest in the operation of Trans-World Carriers?

Mr. McCone replied:

> No; I have a direct interest in Trans-World Carriers, no question about that. Because, as a matter of record, and this is a change from the situation that existed in 1958, I have personally acquired and own now the great majority of the stock in San Marino Corp., and, therefore, through the sole ownership of Joshua Hendy Corp. and the ownership of 85 percent of San Marino Corp., I own practically half of Trans-World Carriers at this point.

That testimony which he gave in answer to my question is at variance with or should be regarded as a modification of his earlier statement, when he was questioned by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] referred to the investigation of a subcommittee in May 1950, and the interrogation at that time, when Mr. McCone was appointed to be the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. The Senator from Massachusetts asked him:

> Have any of the facts which you gave out in your memorandums, in your letters in 1950 and in 1958 to the committees, changed between 1958 and the present time?

Mr. McCone answered:

> No. There has been no change.

However, when I interrogated Mr. McCone with respect to the matter of the ownership of Trans-World Carriers, he said:

> No; I have a direct interest in Trans-World Carriers, no question about that. Because, as a matter of record, and this is a change from the situation that existed in 1958.

I emphasize that by rereading it, because I think Mr. McCone sought to correct his earlier statement when this was called to his attention, but it also has significance because in a subsequent statement he said he owned the great majority of the stock in San Marino Corp. The San Marino Corp. was referred to earlier in the testimony as a Panamanian corporation.

Subsequently in the testimony I asked Mr. McCone:

> Do you know of any working arrangements or partnerships between the Joshua Hendy Steamship Line or its affiliate, Panama Pacific Tankers, and affiliates or subsidiaries of States Marine?

Mr. McCone replied:

> Yes. There are joint arrangements—whether they are with States Marine or whether they are with Global Bulk Carriers, I could not say, but it is a little hard to differentiate between the two or three corporate structures on States Marine side.

I then asked:

> Do you know whether or not there is a working agreement between States Marine and Global Bulk and the San Marino Co. for the chartering of certain ships through Naviors, a subsidiary of United States Steel?

Mr. McCone replied:

> Yes, I believe there is a working relationship; the relationship between Trans-World Carriers and Naviors and Trans-World Carriers is, in turn, owned by the people you have indicated.

As I read from the testimony earlier, Mr. McCone owns practically 50 percent, through his other ownership, of Trans-World.

The following colloquy then occurred:

> Senator CASE. You have a partnership with States Marine directly or through a subsidiary in the operation of any Norwegian-flag tankers built in Japan for Trans-World?
>
> Mr. McCONE. Yes, we do that. We have a tanker that we own jointly that was built in Japan and registered under a Norwegian flag, and we have it under charter from a Norwegian corporation.
>
> Senator CASE. Do you recall the name of that ship?
>
> Mr. McCONE. I was trying to think of it. No, I do not recall it, Senator.
>
> Senator CASE. Is that vessel engaged in transporting oil?
>
> Mr. McCONE. Transporting oil; yes, sir.
>
> Senator CASE. For Standard Oil of California?
>
> Mr. McCONE. For Standard Oil of California; yes, sir.
>
> Senator CASE. Why is it necessary to have complicated arrangements where you build vessels in Germany or Japan, and then leased to Norwegian operators to fly under Panamanian or Norwegian flags rather than U.S. flags?
>
> Mr. McCONE. The vessels are owned by Norwegian companies and they are operated under Norwegian flags, and that is the only way that they could be competitive because of the high costs of American-flag operations.
>
> Our American-flag operations are restricted to the protected areas of trade such as the coastwise and intercoastal trade.
>
> Senator CASE. Do you know where the principal oil reserves of Standard Oil of California are?
>
> Mr. McCONE. In a general way, yes, I do, Senator. I know they have extensive reserves in Arabia and in the offshore island in the Persian Gulf of Bahrein, and also extensive reserves in Sumatra, and in Venezuela.

Mr. President, all this becomes significant as one goes back through the record and notes that the steamship operating companies affiliated either with Joshua Hendy, of which Mr. McCone testified he owned 100 percent, or with other companies in which Mr. McCone owns a majority interest, either directly or through a subsidiary company, are largely Panamanian companies.

Panama Pacific Tankers, in which Mr. McCone owns a substantial interest, is a Panamanian corporation. Its bulk cargoes in world commerce are principally iron, coal, and some oil.

San Marino, in which Mr. McCone owns 85-percent interest, is a Panamanian corporation.

Redwood Corp., of which he is a substantial owner, is a Panamanian corporation. Its business is the worldwide movement of petroleum.

Trans-World, of which Mr. McCone indicated he had 50-percent ownership, is a Panamanian corporation.

These facts lead one to wonder if a part of the problem of the high cost of American-flag operations does not relate to the income tax liability of ships operated under the American flag as well as to other high costs which might be suggested in the statement:

> The vessels are owned by Norwegian companies and they are operated under Norwegian flags, and that is the only way that they could be competitive because of the high costs of American-flag operations.

I cannot say, because time has not been available to run it down through independent sources, and the hearings before the committee on the nomination of Mr. McCone have been concluded.

During the time we were taking testimony from Mr. McCone I asked him at some length about the record which was established by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries under the chairmanship of Schuyler Bland, of Virginia, when the committee interrogated him and conducted an extensive investigation into the profits which were made by Mr. McCone's company as a shipbuilding corporation during the early stages of World War II.

The testimony is set forth in some detail in the hearings on Mr. McCone's nomination, as well as in the original hearings conducted by Mr. Bland. The testimony indicates that the California Ship Building Corp., which was organized by Mr. McCone and some others with about $100,000 capital, in a year declared a dividend of a million dollars, half of which was paid in cash and the other half of which was by subscription to capital, so the capital of the corporation was increasing to $600,000.

The testimony of the Comptroller General was that profits grossing about $44 million were made in a relatively short time by the California Ship Building Corp., using facilities which had cost the Government $25 million.

Mr. McCone is entitled to have it said that he contended at the time, and he contends now, that in addition to the $100,000 of actual cash which he and his associates put into the California Ship Building Corp., they subordinated loans of $2 or $3 million to the corporation. But in any event, a very substantial profit, running into many millions of dollars, was made.

The thing which originally intrigued my interest on this subject was that by some action of the U.S. Maritime Commission, back in about 1946, the operations of the California Ship Building Corp. in this connection were exempted from the operations of the renegotiation statute. The renegotiation statute stemmed from an amendment which I offered to the sixth supplemental defense bill, which was passed in the House of Representatives in April of 1942. At that time it was intended that no exemption should be made from the operations of the renegotiation statute except by a decision of the renegotiation officials, that is, the Price Adjustment Board or other agencies which were its successors. I talked with the counsel of the Renegotiation Board only a few days ago in connection with this subject, and he said that it was clear today that no agency of the Government, aside from the Renegotiation Board, had the discretion to exempt a corporation from operation of the renegotiation statute.

But apparently back in 1946 the Maritime Commission presumed to exempt the operations of the California Shipbuilding Corp. from renegotiation. Whether because of that action or not I do not know, but they made very large profits—profits so large, in fact, that Ralph Casey, who was a representative of the General Accounting Office, testified before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives:

> I daresay that at no time in the history of American business, whether in wartime or in peacetime, have so few men made so much money with so little risk, and all at the expense of the taxpayers not only of this generation but of generations to come.

During World War II it became apparent that Mr. McCone and his associates discovered that one way to make a good deal of money, and make it in a hurry, was to be exempted from the normal operations of renegotiation, or to avoid recoveries by the Treasury Department, the Bureau of Internal Revenue, or the Price Adjustment Board. The question that inevitably comes to my mind in connection with a review of the testimony of these various world shipping operations is that company after company is organized under the laws of Panama, and ships travel either under the Panamanian flag or under the Norwegian flag, if it is a ship chartered by Norway. Mr. McCone has said:

> This is the only way they could be competitive because of the high cost of American-flag operations.

I hope that Mr. McCone will learn of my statements on the floor of the Senate at this time. Because of the time limitation and because of the time fixed for the vote tomorrow, this is the only time at which they could be made. I am not saying that the bulk of the admittedly large wealth which he has accumulated is due to the fact that operating ships under Panamanian corporations or under the Norwegian flag has exempted all of the income from liability for taxes of the United States. But I should like to know whether or not that is the case, for the citation from the Internal Revenue Code which I read earlier clearly exempts from taxation under the head "Exclusion From Gross Income: Ships Under a Foreign Flag." I think that point has a bearing upon the issue, and it is quite apart from what is normally considered conflict of interest.

The conflict-of-interest statute relates to procurement, and it specifically provides that—

> Whoever, being an officer, agent or member of, or directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of any corporation, joint-stock company, or association, or of any firm or partnership, or other business entity, is employed or acts as an officer or agent of the United States for the transaction of business with such entity, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

That is paragraph 434, title 18, United States Code. That provision clearly is restricted to one who "acts as an officer or agent of the United States for the transaction of business with such entity."

I do not suppose that the Central Intelligence Agency will have a great deal of business with these various shipping companies. I do not suggest that the CIA will have a great deal of business with the Standard Oil Co. of California or some of the other firms from whose directorship Mr. McCone has resigned, but in which he still owns substantial interests, in many instances amounting to a million dollars or more. But I do suggest that logical questions in the mind of anyone concerned with the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency are, "Where are a man's interests? What is his background? Is he objective?"

At the outset of my questioning during the hearings, when Mr. McCone was before the Committee on Armed Services, I said to him that I respected his ability. I coveted his ability for the service of the United States, but I hoped that we might be able to determine and demonstrate his objectivity.

I think he was frank with the committee. I did not detect any evasion on any question that was asked. A man is entitled to the use of notes to refresh his memory of incidents that occurred 15 or 16 years ago. But admitting all that, when we remember that at the outset of our hearing the chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services said that he regarded the position of directorship of the Central Intelligence Agency as second in importance only to that of the Presidency of the United States, it becomes important that we feel that the man who is in that position has a complete objectivity, so that he will feel that what is good for the United States is good for the interests he represents.

I need not refer to the fact that a gentleman who was Secretary of Defense a few years ago received some criticism and some opprobrium because he happened to remark that he believed that what was good for General Motors was good for the United States. Of course, the unfortunate thing about his statement was that he did not put it the other way. I think he meant that what is good for America is good for General Motors.

I would like to have complete satisfaction in my own mind that Mr. McCone would not merely say but would feel that what is good for the United States is good for Trans-World Carriers, for San Marino Co., a Panamanian corporation, for Redwood Corp., a Panamanian corporation, for Panama-Pacific Tankers, which is a Panamanian corporation, and for all the shipping companies which are engaged in worldwide commerce.

I have no doubt that if he were asked that question he would say that he really believes that what is good for the United States is good for these companies.

However, the question which every Senator must decide for himself is whether, with this background and with this farflung empire of many shipping companies, which went to foreign countries for incorporation, the many interests which go to other countries to get ships which can fly the flags of other countries because competitive costs in the United States are too high, and possibly because at least some of the income from that shipping interest will be exempt from taxation under the laws of the United States; and after hearing and reviewing the testimony, one can escape some doubt as to whether this worldwide interest may not at some time, as we look over the whole spectrum of world affairs, influence the emphasis of the Director of Central Intelligence Agency either in the gathering of intelligence or in the recommendation for or direction of covert activities.

I have not reached a final decision as to how I shall vote tomorrow afternoon on the nomination. I voted to report the nomination from the committee. At that time I did refer to these questions which I had asked during the hearings. I said I had asked them hoping that it would be helpful in making Mr. McCone sensitive to this area of possible conflict of interest, and hoping that by asking these questions we could perhaps demonstrate his objectivity.

At the conclusion of my questioning I asked him two questions. I asked him whether he would submit a list of his stockownership, as he did in connection with the case of his confirmation for membership on the Atomic Energy Commission. I asked him also whether he would agree to set up an irrevocable trust, as he had done before his nomination for his position on the Atomic Energy Commission was confirmed.

Earlier during the questioning, in response to some questions submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], Mr. McCone said he would have no objection to setting up an irrevocable trust if there were some reason to do so. He did not respond directly to the question when I asked it at the conclusion of my examination. He did say that he would submit the list of his holdings. He did submit that list, and I have had an opportunity to examine the list. I am not violating any confidence with respect to the list, because by going to the printed testimony, particularly with respect to the questions which were directly asked him and to which I have already referred, one can see that all I have said about the background and origin of these corporations and of his interest in them is set forth in the hearings. The list that he filed would be merely confirmatory of what he said so far as ownership is concerned and what is in the hearings.

The list was submitted. I personally do not know whether it would do any good if an irrevocable trust were set up. I do not see that that of itself would matter particularly, because I do not anticipate that he, as the Director of CIA, would act as the procuring agent so far as these companies are concerned in any business between them and the United States.

However, it is that background, that interest, that education, that indefinable awareness of interest and knowledge of conditions in Saudi Arabia and the Middle East which raises the possibility that the disturbed conditions in the Middle East or in the Far East might seem to him to be more important than the disturbed conditions in the Gulf of Mexico or the Caribbean. Would he be more interested in maintaining stable order in Kuwait than he would be in resisting infiltration in Cuba? Would he be more interested in stabilizing Vietnam than Venezuela? I confess that I do not know.

I feel that in the Western Hemisphere, the United States has some special responsibilities. The historic position of the Monroe Doctrine has given us all these responsibilities, and we cannot escape them in this generation even if we so desired. The distinguished delegation which is now in Uruguay is seeking to meet some of the responsibilities of the United States in the Western Hemisphere. I do not see any comparable responsibility for us in some other parts of the world that I might name, although I agree we have responsibilities there.

I close these remarks by saying that I covet for the directorship of the Central Intelligence Agency a man who has the organizing ability, who has the knowledge of world affairs, who has the scientific background, and who has the calm approach to matters that Mr. McCone evidently has. I wish I could be sure. I hope something will help me by tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock to be sure that this man will have that objectivity in every instance to put the interests of the United States—in emphasis, in direction of activities, and in a collection of intelligence—ahead of any of this far-flung shipping empire which he has established.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, it is apparent that the Senator from South Dakota is deeply troubled by the matters which he has discussed this afternoon. For my own part, I, at least, admit an equal concern over those matters and others. As the Senator from South Dakota did, I, too, voted in committee to report the nomination of Mr. McCone.

On this day and at this hour I do not know how I shall finally vote at 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon when the Senate will vote either to confirm or reject the nomination of Mr. McCone as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

I had never seen Mr. McCone until he appeared the other day before the Committee on Armed Services. Of course, on the basis of hearing a man speak for an hour or two, and trying to size him up, as it were, one is not in the best of all circumstances to make an objective evaluation. However, I came away from that meeting with the idea that he is a patriotic man and a devoted man and a man of integrity according to the best of his own lights.

However, the question that I put to myself over and over again is this: Is his conditioning, because of all his previous business history, such as to enable him to give, in the overall direction of this most important Federal Agency, the objective look which, as the Senator from South Dakota has stated, is so imperatively needed?

The Director of that Agency certainly cannot place greater emphasis upon one section of the globe than upon another. He must forget all past and previous private connections and look toward the good of the United States as a whole.

Personally, I have no doubt that Mr. McCone would do his honest best to reach that situation. My questions would only revolve around the point as to whether he could be completely objective. I certainly hope so.

I recall that in committee the other day I asked Mr. McCone about the Arabian-American Oil Co., a company formed by several large U.S. oil companies. I reported to Mr. McCone having heard, as so many of us have, that it has been said that this oil combine has in the past interfered in the foreign affairs of some Middle East nations for the benefit of the oil company.

Mr. McCone's reply was:

> No, I would have no comment because I have not personally read or heard of those allegations. In my trips to the Middle East, I have observed that the Aramco people handled their relationships with the Governments of Arabia and Bahrein Island in a very satisfactory way, so reported to me. I don't know of any interference.

My query now would relate to those words used by Mr. McCone, that the Aramco Co. handled their relationships with the Governments of Arabia and Bahrein Island is a very satisfactory way. Satisfactory to whom? Satisfactory in every case to the Government of Arabia from the standpoint of its own national interest, and satisfactory to the governments of other nations with which this oil company might have conducted private negotiations? I do not assert or even allege that the Arabian-American Oil Co. ever did any such thing. But it has been so reported.

Or, to use again by way of quotation the words "very satisfactory way," was it a very satisfactory way for the oil company itself? We are not informed.

Finally, a most important question relating to all this subject, is, was that a very satisfactory way in each instance for the Government of the United States, for the U.S. national interest?

Mr. President, I do not intend further to labor this point or this issue at this late hour. I had not intended to speak further on the subject. However, I decided to do so only during the time when the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] took the floor to express his doubts, his concern, because my feelings are so close to being identical with his and because I, too, do not know at this time how I shall finally vote.

If it should be, as it may be, as many say it probably will be, that Mr. McCone's nomination will be confirmed, I certainly would want to be in the forefront of those who wish him well in this most significant and critical assignment.

MILITARY RESEARCH IN ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Alaska today is a growing center of research activity. The three military services and many other governmental and private institutions are conducting research and development programs which strengthen the Nation not only in the present but for the future.

U.S. Army, Alaska—the only Army oversea command operating entirely in a northern environment—is the spearhead for the Army's growing research program.

The Army's northern operations concept calls for employment of fully mobile, extremely powerful, streamlined task forces of battalion and brigade size. In the course of training and experimentation to improve its capabilities to form, fight, and support such forces, USARAL generates requirements for new materiel and techniques which are a primary source of guidance for Army cold weather research and development programs. The capabilities which are needed today for northern operations are applicable, in large part, to operations in such other undeveloped regions as the jungles of southeast Asia and might be required for the major battlegrounds of Europe and Asia. Thus the cold weather operations development program is, in fact, a leading edge of the Army's advance into the future.

Mobility is a first order problem of the Army today and in the north—whether North America or northern Siberia—it is a particularly urgent problem. USARAL requirements for very high mobility vehicles have led to investigation of a wide variety of commercial configurations which promise a revolutionary increase in ground mobility over snow, muskeg, and swamp. In the future, ground effect machines and such other radical concepts as the flexwing airplane may find their first practical applications in the broad reaches of the north, where their potential for improvement of battlefield mobility can be brought quickly into practical use.

Since railroads are few in the north—as in many other parts of the world—USARAL has also formulated a concept for a tracked overland train with which a single truck crew can transport 50 tons or more of supplies across country, through swamp and snow. This vehicle will reduce greatly the requirements for roadbuilding by Army engineers and for vehicle operating personnel.

The deep zones of permanently frozen soil which underlie hundreds of thousands of square miles of the Arctic can be tunneled like coalfields. USARAL has developed a concept for constructing storage and other administrative facilities under the surface of the ground within the permafrost. Infra-permafrost construction will be fast and cheap; it will afford good camouflage; and it will provide excellent protection from nuclear weapons and other fire effects on the future battlefield. There is a possibility that this development project will lead to methods which will allow a combat unit to dig itself under the surface of the ground in all regions of the world rapidly; obviously, this would be of the greatest value in nuclear combat.

These concepts are typical of many others in the fields of firepower, communications, combat mobility and support which are directed toward the same objective—more effective and at the same time more economical combat forces.

To meet these requirements, the Army is placing an increasing concentration of research and development effort in Alaska. During the last summer, engineering test teams were transferred from Fort Churchill, Canada, to Fort Wainwright, adjacent to Fairbanks. At Fort Wainwright, Army research activities will have available for the first time, in U.S. territory, a virtually unlimited environmental test area with long, dependable seasons of cold weather, good administrative facilities, and the opportunity for close coordination with combat forces. The Army technical services at Fort Wainwright will conduct engineering tests of new equipment and carry out basic and applied research into northern operations problems. The program for the current winter test season includes a wide range of Engineer, Signal, Ordance, Quartermaster, Chemical, and Medical Corps research projects and equipment tests. The Transportation Corps has also established at Wainwright an activity which is performing trafficability experiments and investigations into vehicle performance problems.

The Corps of Engineers has conducted field study programs in Alaska for many years and these programs are now being increased. In the next few years Army research teams will conduct basic research throughout the State, to increase basic knowledge and to develop applications of basic scientific advances to the military art. Many of these applications will be equally important for nonmilitary activities. The use of permafrost excavations for storage of supplies is one example of the kind of research problem which is of interest to civilian as well as military activities.

An important potential for the future is the opportunity which Alaska offers for establishment of long-distance missile test ranges wholly over U.S.-owned territory.

At Fort Greely, a hundred miles southeast of Fairbanks and Fort Wainwright, the Arctic Test Board and the Chemical Corps' Arctic Test Team test newly developed equipment from the viewpoint of using troops in cold weather. These tests are important not only for operations in Arctic and sub-Arctic areas but for operations of the Army in Temperate Zone winters. It gets as cold in the Temperate Zone as it does in the sub-Arctic—Temperate Zone cold simply does not last for quite so much of the year. For the soldier in the field, 40 below zero is just as serious a problem in Eastern Europe as in Alaska or Siberia.

The research and engineering agencies at Fort Wainwright and the user test agencies at Fort Greely coordinate their efforts closely, and in the future an increasing effort will be made to conduct the engineering tests of the research agencies and the user tests of USCONARC simultaneously. This will save money and effort and, in many cases, may help reduce development leadtime.

One of the important advantages resulting from the conduct of military research work in Alaska is the opportunity afforded research and testing personnel to work directly with operating forces. For example, during U.S. Army Alaska's winter maneuver in February 1962, a large-scale test of the new quick-serve ration will be conducted under the severest possible weather conditions by troops actually engaged in combat training. This is the only kind of test that gives the answer to the final question on any military item—Will it do the job in combat?

The Air Force and Navy are also active in Alaska research activities. The Navy operates the northernmost research facility of the United States, which is not actually in Alaska but in the Arctic Ocean off the north coast of Alaska. This is the ice island Arliss II, which was discovered by Max Brewer, director of the Navy's Arctic Research Laboratory, in May 1961, and occupied by a scientific party in the summer of 1961. Arliss II, which is about 1½ by 3½ miles in size and 80 feet thick, is relatively permanent compared with floe ice and constitutes an excellent base for conducting oceanographic and other studies.

The Arctic Research Laboratory at Barrow—the farthest northern portion of the North American Continent—is operated for the Office of Naval Research by the University of Alaska. The largest effort of the Laboratory is in oceanographic studies. Specific areas of investigation include underwater acoustics, marine biology, geology of ice islands, sea ice micrometeorology, sea ice morphology, meteorological observations, and strain measurements.

In the Fairbanks area, the Air Force since 1947 has operated the Arctic Aeromedical Laboratory. This Laboratory is the aeromedical research facility of the Alaskan Air Command and as such is charged with the solution of Arctic problems of that command. At the same time, and perhaps of more general importance, it is the only human factors laboratory of the Department of Defense located in the Arctic and concerned exclusively with problems of far northern areas. The Laboratory conducts an in-house program of research on Arctic human factors problems. The in-house program is supplemented by contract work performed by various institutions, particularly universities, throughout the country. The Laboratory establishes Air Force requirements for clothing, individual equipment, operating procedures, and training problems for use in the Arctic. It evaluates Air Force clothing and equipment under Arctic conditions and it provides laboratory facilities, logistic support, and technical assistance to visiting research teams and field parties.

The military research and development programs are only part of the total scientific effort in Alaska. The annual proceedings of the Alaska Science Conference have covered in the past 10 years such a wide range of topics as agriculture, botany, and forestry; medicine, physiology, and public health; engineering, industrial science, and aviation; geology and geography; sociology, economics, and education; anthropology; geophysics, meteorology, and oceanography; wildlife and zoology.

The University of Alaska, in addition to operating the Navy's Arctic Research Laboratory at Barrow, has a strong program of research, particularly in the earth sciences—geology, geodesy, and similar disciplines. The Bureau of Public Health and other Federal and State agencies have made and are making major contributions to the understanding of cold weather physiology.

The importance of Alaska as a center of military and civilian scientific effort is great today and is growing steadily and rapidly. In any foreseeable future war, the north will be strategically critical, for self-evident geopolitical reasons. Of even greater ultimate importance is the fact that, as world population increases, the human need to use the lands of the north will increase. Current research and development efforts in Alaska are preparing the way for effective future peaceful use of the vast spaces and the unmeasured natural resources of the northern regions of North America and Eurasia.

DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of John A. McCone, of California, to be Director of Central Intelligence.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon I spoke at some length with respect to the pending nomination and read into the Record a legal opinion furnished me by legislative counsel and also some quotations from the latest opinion of the Supreme Court on the conflict-of-interest question, namely, the Mississippi Valley case, involving the Dixon-Yates question, a case decided in January 1961. I was necessarily called from the floor after I completed my remarks, and the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], made some comments in reply to my talk, to which I do not wish to advert at this time.

He did, however, place in the Record a memorandum on conflicts of interest, dated January 15, 1962, signed by Lawrence E. Houston, General Counsel of the Central Intelligence Agency, and indicated that in his view this memorandum, which ends with the conclusion that no question of conflict of interest arises out of the financial holdings of Mr. McCone, was persuasive to him.

With all deference to the distinguished Senator from Missouri, this memorandum is not persuasive with me, and I urge any Senators who may think it a rod on which they can lean in dealing with the conflict-of-interest question to take a good, hard look at the opinion of the legislative counsel and at the Supreme Court's decision in the Mississippi Valley case before they make up their minds finally. I note that the Court's opinion was not even discussed in the CIA memorandum.

In my opinion—and it is only one lawyer's opinion—the memorandum of the General Counsel of the CIA is very superficial, indeed, and is not persuasive. It states, in part, that the writer of the opinion knows "of no judicial decision suggesting that the existence of ultimate official responsibility for all of the activities of a department constitutes per se the 'transaction of business' within the meaning of section 434," which is the conflict-of-interest statute.

That sentence is carefully worded, indeed, but I suggest it is disingenuous, and that a reading of the Mississippi Valley case would convince any lawyer and many laymen that very broad and rigorous standards of conflict of interest were laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States in that case. This memorandum concludes that the CIA has no business negotiations or contracts, within the meaning of section 434, with any of the companies on the list of Mr. McCone's holdings. This statement is, of course, a pure conclusion of law and depends on the writer's view of the scope and intent of the statute.

I suggest that when one attempts to make up his mind as to whether a genuine conflict of interest exists with respect to the holdings by Mr. McCone of stock in the Standard Oil Co. of California, a wiser legal guide is the Supreme Court of the United States, rather than the General Counsel of the CIA.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to my friend, the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. A short time ago I read into the Record paragraph 434 of title 18, which is the so-called conflict-of-interest statute. As a layman, I think paragraph 434 deals explicitly with acting as a purchasing officer or procurement agent for the United States. The mere fact of holding a position would not result in a violation of the statute, unless one while in a position as an agent of the United States entered into a contract for the United States with a company in which he had a pecuniary interest, under the wording of the statute.

Mr. CLARK. I would respectfully disagree with the Senator from South Dakota; and I urge that before 2 o'clock tomorrow he read the Mississippi Valley case. The conflict question in that case arose from the employment of a Mr. Wenzell as a special consultant for the Bureau of the Budget. At the same time Mr. Wenzell was serving as an officer and shareholder of the First Boston Corp. He participated on behalf of the United States in negotiations looking toward the formation of a Government contract in the execution of which First Boston might have been expected to participate. Mr. Wenzell had, and I quote from the U.S. brief in the case, "nothing to do with the negotiation of the formal contract," involving First Boston. Indeed his Government service ended several months before the contract was concluded.

Nevertheless, the Supreme Court of the United States held that, even though Mr. Wenzell did not participate in the negotiation of the actual contract or business transaction in question, his earlier role in events prior to the contract was a conflict under section 434 and voided the entire contract. So I suggest that a consideration of the bare-bones of the verbiage of section 434 does not tell us the whole story.

If the Senator from South Dakota does not find it convenient to obtain the entire opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Mississippi Valley case, I refer him to the rather generous excerpts from the opinion of Chief Justice Warren in that case which I read into the Record earlier today and also placed in the Record yesterday at page 1110.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I shall be glad to examine that. However, it is my recollection that while Mr. Wenzell had an interest in the First Boston Corp., he also had what amounted to a contract to act as an adviser of the United States.

Mr. CLARK. Yes, but Mr. Wenzell's contract of employment with the Government, referred to by the Senator from South Dakota, was over before the contractual relationship between the First Boston Corp. and the United States of America was established. It is the latter contract which was held void by the Supreme Court because of Wenzell's earlier position.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There could have been a second violation; but I would not rule out the possibility that if Mr. Wenzel was employed by the United States to act as an adviser, if he advised the United States while he served in that capacity and while he also was in a position to serve his own interest, that situation might constitute a conflict of interest.

Mr. CLARK. I urge the Senator from South Dakota to read the opinion in that case. I think that with his perceptive mind he will note its implications, and I believe it will be much more persuasive than what I have stated this afternoon.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That may be. I merely think that regardless of whether there is or is not a legal or a statutory conflict of interest, if a man of his general education and interests and with the stake he had in such things had a blindspot or a prejudice which would lead him to act in a certain way which would be more beneficial to the concerns in which he had a financial interest than to the interests of the United States, such a circumstance might actually involve a conflict of interest.

Mr. CLARK. Of course that concerns me, too. Although I am strongly of the view that Mr. McCone is a completely honest man, yet the conflict-of-interest problem worries me substantially.

What worries me even more is that in my opinion this particular position calls for a judicious and an objective temperament; and I believe that Mr. McCone in his activities and in his Government service thus far has shown himself to be an active protagonist of his private views. So I have grave reservations in regard to his qualifications for this particular office.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania has used the word "objective." I think Mr. McCone will be both objective and judicious in his attitude.

Of course the Scriptures say that where a man's treasure is, there is his heart, also.

Mr. CLARK. The Biblical quotation which was used by the Supreme Court of the United States came from the Gospel according to St. Matthew—namely, "No man can serve two masters." That is in the Supreme Court's opinion.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now stand adjourned until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 31, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, January 30, 1962:

Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia

Frank Hammett Myers, of the District of Columbia, to be judge of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia for the term of 10 years, vice Leo A. Rover, deceased.

Joseph C. Waddy, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, domestic relations branch, for the term of 10 years, vice Frank Hammett Myers, elevated.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 30, 1962:

National Mediation Board

Francis A. O'Neill, Jr., of New York, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1965.

Governor of Canal Zone

Maj. Gen. Robert John Fleming, Jr., O17095, U.S. Army, to be Governor of the Canal Zone, under the provisions of section 6, chapter 1, title 2, Canal Zone Code, to succeed Maj. Gen. William Arnold Carter, O18023, U.S. Army, on or about February 1, 1962.

U.S. Army

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Paul DeWitt Adams, O17306, U.S. Army.

The following-named officers, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Samuel Leslie Myers, O17180, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. John Phillips Daley, O18358, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. William Wilson Quinn, O19283, U.S. Army.

The following-named person for appointment as indicated in the Army of the United States and for reappointment as colonel in the Regular Army of the United States, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 1211, 3442, and 3447:

To be temporary brigadier general

Elegar, Augustus G., O18625.

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be general

Gen. Bruce Cooper Clarke, O16068, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

To be lieutenant generals

Lt. Gen. Donald Prentice Booth, O16395, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Emerson Leroy Cummings, O15500, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Edward Joseph O'Neil, O15952, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Ridgely Gaither, O15970, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Carl Henry Jark, O17556, U.S. Army.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Carl Darnell, Jr., O19213, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Joseph Edward Bastion, Jr., O19162, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Charles Frederick Leonard, Jr., O19829, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Ashton Herbert Manhart, O18773, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Howard William Doan, O20057, Medical Corps (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Claire Elwood Hutchin, Jr., O21092, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Joseph Davis, O18530, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Autrey Joseph Maroun, O19865, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Clifton Ferninand von Kann, O21371, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Winston Lapsley, O19727, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Ruhlen, O19733, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Herbert George Sparrow, O19003, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. James Richard Winn, O19491, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Salvatore D'Orsa, O18866, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Bowes Evans, O19174, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. William Reeves Shuler, O20118, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Bruce Palmer, Jr., O20117, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Bradford Rosson, O23556, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Ralph Edward Haines, Jr., O19849, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Benjamin Franklin Taylor, O20779, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Harvey Julius Jablonsky, O19390, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Ramsey Pugh, O18790, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Robert George MacDonnell, O19361, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Andrew Jackson Boyle, O19924, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Francis Mark McGoldrick, O19857, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Vernon Price Mock, O19906, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Ellsworth Ingalls Davis, O18658, U.S. Army.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Ben Sternberg, O21286, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. David Bennett Parker, O20571, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Jaroslav Thayer Folda, Jr., O21193, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Raymond Peers, O21366, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Seth Lathrop Weld, Jr., O19772, U.S. Army.

Col. William Welby Beverly, O21107, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Frank Alexander Osmanski, O19745, U.S. Army.

Col. Samuel Knox Eaton, O21132, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Henry Lynch, O21237, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John William Dobson, O21851, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Howard York, O21341, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Arthur Sylvester Collins, Jr., O21260, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Carl C. Turner, O31909, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Carroll Hilton Dunn, O21427, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Richard Wayne Whitney, O31855, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Henry Schuldt Murphey, O19338, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Thomas Jay Hayes 3d, O20134, U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Ray Williams, O22962, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Woodrow Wilson Stromberg, O20728, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Frank Wade Norris, O21110, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Kelsie Loomis Reaves, O20777, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William York Frentzel, O19026, U.S. Army.

Col. Andy Archer Lipscomb, O21333, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles Peter Stone, O21376, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Charles Fremont Tillson, 3d, O21196, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Clarence Earle Beck, O21239, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Jefferson Johnson Irvin, O21217, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Edwin Arthur Machen, Jr., O21284, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles Joseph Denholm, O21293, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. David Owen Byars, Jr., O21273, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Dixon Lawlor, O19536, U.S. Army.

Col. Lynn Davis Smith, O29741, U.S. Army.

Col. Charles Stuart O'Malley, Jr., O20682, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Milton Finn, O21252, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Joseph Wilson Johnston, O30462, U.S. Army.

Col. Howard Edward Michelet, O21131, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Francis Johnstone Murdoch, Jr., O19853, U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Leaning Ashworth, O21308, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Wheeler Godfrey Merriam, O30759, U.S. Army.

Col. William Thomas Ryder, O20298, U.S. Army.

Col. Ward Sanford Ryan, O21339, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Frank George White, O21378, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James William Sutherland, Jr., O24202, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Mellard Connor, O20137, U.S. Army.

Col. Harry William Osborn Kinnard, O21990, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William McGregor Lynn, Jr., O21120, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Gamble Schermerhorn, O20610, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Benjamin Otto Turnage, Jr., O20360, U.S. Army.

Col. Oscar Glenn Goodhand, O51511, U.S. Army.

Col. James Thomas McGibony, O20406, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

U.S. AIR FORCE

Gen. Charles P. Cabell 70A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code.

The following-named officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the rank indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be lieutenant generals

*Maj. Gen. Bruce K. Holloway, 1336A, Regular Air Force.

*Maj. Gen. James Ferguson, 1530A, Regular Air Force.

*Maj. Gen. Harvey T. Alness, 1085A, Regular Air Force.

*Maj. Gen. Thomas S. Moorman, Jr., 644A, Regular Air Force.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force to the grades indicated, under the provisions of chapter 835, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. John S. Hardy, 1502A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James V. Edmundson, 1863A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Benjamin O. Davis, Jr., 1206A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Albert P. Clark, 1218A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Lewis L. Mundell, 1286A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert J. Friedman, 1379A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert A. Breitweiser, 1406A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Fred M. Dean, 1450A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Waymond A. Davis, 1470A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Cecil H. Childre, 1551A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Frank E. Rouse, 1595A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Hewitt T. Wheless, 1609A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Henry R. Sullivan, Jr., 1655A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Osmond J. Ritland, 1731A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Keith K. Compton, 1849A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Joseph R. Holzapple, 1897A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. David A. Burchinal, 1936A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James F. Whisenand, 1945A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Glen W. Martin, 1955A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William W. Momyer, 1964A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Richard L. Bohannon, 19067A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Gordon H. Austin, 1207A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Frederick R. Terrell, 1221A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Frederic H. Miller, 1273A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. J. Stanley Holtoner, 1283A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard P. Klocko, 1327A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Ivan W. McElroy, 1338A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Paul W. Scheidecker, 1354A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William G. Hipps, 1358A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John N. Ewbank, Jr., 1381A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Paul T. Preuss, 1407A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William B. Keiffer, 1409A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Walter E. Arnold, 1478A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert F. Worden, 1510A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Clyde Box, 1535A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert G. Ruegg, 1620A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert H. Curtin, 1643A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert B. Miller, 1646A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert E. Greer, 1672A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John B. Bestic, 1682A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Perry M. Hoisington II, 1694A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. George B. Greene, Jr., 1736A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William E. Creer, 1742A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Horace D. Aynesworth, 1771A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Philip H. Greasley, 1821A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph H. Moore, 1836A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John A. Dunning, 1855A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Melvin F. McNickle, 1891A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Gilbert L. Pritchard, 1974A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Reginald J. Clizbe, 2004A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jerry D. Page, 2052A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William E. Leonhard, 18095A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles H. Terhune, Jr., 3424A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert N. Smith, 3783A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Harold E. Humfeld, 3857A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Selmon W. Wells, 3991A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William T. Seawell, 4034A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. George S. Brown, 4090A (colonel), Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Seth J. McKee, 4279A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John C. Meyer, 4496A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jack J. Catton, 4719A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Theodore C. Bedwell, Jr., 19101A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Benjamin A. Strickland, Jr., 19097A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of chapter 839, title 51, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Don Coupland, 1766A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. George B. Dany, 1061A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Dwight O. Monteith, 1205A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Curtis R. Low, 1349A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Henry G. Thorne, Jr., 1514A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James C. McGehee, 1746A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James E. Roberts, 1846A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Aubrey L. Jennings, 19073A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Brig. Gen. Frederick R. Terrell, 1221A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard P. Klocko, 1327A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Paul W. Scheidecker, 1354A, (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William B. Kieffer, 1409A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Walter E. Arnold, 1478A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Clyde Box, 1535A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert G. Ruegg, 1620A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. George B. Greene, Jr., 1736A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph H. Moore, 1836A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Melvin F. McNickle, 1891A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jerry D. Page, 2052A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles H. Terhune, Jr., 3424A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Harold E. Humfeld, 3857A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Selmon W. Wells, 3991A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Seth J. McKee, 4279A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Lee W. Fulton, 1107A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Emmett B. Cassady, 1095A, (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

*Col. Godfrey T. McHugh, 1257A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Duward L. Crow, 18061A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Albert L. Pearl, AO350203, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Norman C. Spencer, Jr., 1220A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Harry E. Goldsworthy, 1631A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Joseph L. Dickman, 1656A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Lewis W. Stocking, 1709A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Charles G. Chandler, Jr., 1842A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Hubert S. Judy, 2032A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John B. McPherson, 2068A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Prentiss D. Wynne, Jr., 1699A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William D. Greenfield, 1899A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Alonzo A. Towner, 19158A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. Kenneth E. Pletcher, 19136A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. Robert W. Manss, 2713A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Lawrence F. Loesch, 4300A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Winton R. Close, 4343A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John D. Lavelle, 4359A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Donald W. Graham, 4361A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Otto J. Glasser, 4368A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Louis B. Grossmith, Jr., 4430A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Harry L. Evans, 4619A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William W. Wisman, 4990A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Jay T. Robbins, 5029A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Joseph J. Cody, Jr., 5126A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Gordon M. Graham, 7761A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William J. Crumm, 8663A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John W. Vogt, Jr., 8709A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Lucius D. Clay, Jr., 8956A, Regular Air Force.

Col. James H. Weiner, 33425A (lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Col. Joseph R. Deluca, 33749A (major, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Col. Richard H. Ellis, 36867A (major, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

(NOTE.—Asterisk (*) indicates officer was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.)

U.S. NAVY

The following-named officers of the Regular Navy for permanent promotion to the grade indicated:

LINE

To be rear admirals

Charles B. Brooks, Jr.
William B. Sieglaff
Joseph W. Leverton, Jr.
James C. Dempsey
John W. Byng
Joseph D. Black
Andrew J. Hill, Jr.
Frederick J. Becton
Francis T. Williamson
Frederick J. Brush
Joseph A. Jaap
Louis A. Bryan
Allen M. Shinn
Alfred R. Matter
Richard S. Craighill
Daniel F. Smith, Jr.
Thomas F. Connolly
Waldemar F. A. Wendt
Charles J. Palmer
Robert B. Fulton II
Charles A. Curtze

MEDICAL CORPS

To be rear admiral

Harold J. Cokely

SUPPLY CORPS

To be rear admirals

Charles A. Blick
John W. Bottoms

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for permanent promotion to the grade indicated:

LINE

To be rear admirals

Leroy J. Alexanderson
Grant G. Calhoun

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade indicated:

To be major generals

Alpha L. Bowser
Avery R. Kier
Sidney S. Wade
James M. Masters, Sr.
Ralph K. Rottet

To be brigadier generals

Thomas F. Riley
Frederick E. Leek
Odell M. Conoley
Philip W. John
William T. Fairbourn
Bruno A. Hochmuth
Roy L. Kline
William R. Collins

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Lt. Gen. Paul DeWitt Adams* to be general, and ending Randall L. Yeargan to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 15, 1962.

*General Adams and five other general officers also appear as confirmed under the individual U.S. Army nominations of this date.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

New York State Benefits From Our Exports to Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, many people fail to realize how much the United States, and the State of New York in particular, benefit from our exports to Japan. In the past 5 years the United States has exported more to Japan than to any other country except Canada. Our commodity exports to Japan amounted to $1.3 billion in 1960, and $1.7 billion in 1961. In 1960, 190,000 jobs were created for American workers by these exports to Japan, and this figure rose to 250,000 jobs last year. By 1970, it is estimated, our national exports to Japan will exceed $3 billion. Except in 1959, the balance of our trade with Japan has been favorable to us since 1950. In 1960 our exports exceeded imports by $200 million; in 1961, by $600 million.

Our own State of New York, in 1960, exported commodities valued at $78 million to Japan, with 6,800 jobs created by this trade. Our exports included: machinery, $25 million; metal scrap, $23 million; chemicals, $9 million; agricultural products, $7 million; photographic goods, $5 million; metal products, $5 million; copper, $3 million; and scientific instruments, $1 million.

If we are to have the benefits of these expanding exports to Japan, we must ever be mindful that trade is a two-way street. If Japan is to continue to take our exports and pay for them, Japan must be able to export on her own behalf. For us to stifle imports from Japan by the erection of tariff walls would be to kill the goose that laid the golden egg. It would deprive Japan of the dollars needed to purchase American goods and would end by forcing Japan into the arms of the Soviet bloc. Japan must export in order to survive economically. If we shut out her products she must seek markets elsewhere—and today this means the markets of Red China and Red Russia.

Resolution in Behalf of Freedom for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

RESOLUTION IN BEHALF OF FREEDOM FOR LITHUANIA, LATVIA, AND ESTONIA

Whereas the Baltic States were occupied by the armed forces of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are desperately struggling to regain their freedom and independence; and

Whereas so many countries under colonial domination have been or are being given the opportunity to establish their own independent states, the Baltic Nations having a great historical past and having enjoyed the blessings of freedom for centuries are now subjugated to the most brutal colonial oppression; and

Whereas the people and Government of the United States of America have a long and established record in aiding oppressed people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America urge the President and the Government of the United States to take all the necessary steps to put the Baltic States problem on the agenda of the United Nations requesting that: (1) The Soviet Union withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; (2) return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave-labor camps; and be it further

Resolved, That the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision.

County Agents, First Congressional District, Saluted by Congressman Boykin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the counties in Alabama's First Congressional District—Choctaw, Clarke, Marengo, Mobile, Monroe, Washington, and Wilcox—made a magnificent contribution to the agriculture of this State last year.

The work that county agents and their assistants carried out with farmers and their families—and all others interested in promoting agriculture—was done in a splendid way.

Annual records point out the agents outstanding accomplishments. Let us look at a few examples. Clarke County Agent O. C. Helms assisted in some way all 1,494 farms in his county during 1961. Mobile County Agent Charles J. Brockway made an excellent record of 2,254 farm visits in his county. In Monroe County, Agent A. V. Culpepper assisted 2,183 out of 2,873 farm families sometime during the year. County Agent D. O. Estes in Washington County was real active in 4-H work. He has an outstanding number of 42 4-H Clubs in the county. County Agent R. M. Barnett in Wilcox County was called on 3,030 times by farmers.

Statistics for the entire district are even more impressive. For example, this district reports to me that county agents have made 11,725 visits to help farmers with their pressing problems. They have distributed 56,083 different bulletins over the counties, and have held 3,293 meetings throughout the district with the attendance totaling about 128,000. District No. 1 also has 191 active 4-H Clubs. This is an average of 27 clubs per county.

Timber was the districts' highest income source. This item brought a total of $14,500,000. The beef cattle total was second with $14,293,000. Other items which contributed to the district's rural income were cotton, dairying, poultry, hogs, sheep, grain crops, peanuts, fruits, vegetables, and other truck crops.

Congressional District 1 throws out to these agents and their assistants a vote of thanks for their outstanding work for the year of 1961.

It is with a great deal of pleasure and appreciation that I salute F. M. Barnett, Charles J. Brockway, A. V. Culpepper, D. O. Estes, F. M. Jones, O. C. Helms, and Matthew Sexton.

Congressman Walter on Nonsked Airline Finances—Installment I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, Congressman FRANCIS WALTER has reviewed the financial reports of nonscheduled airlines certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board in a statement delivered before the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Monday, January 8, 1962. Under unanimous consent, I include the statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE FRANCIS E. WALTER, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES SUBCOMMITTEE ON MONDAY, JANUARY 8, 1962

Gentlemen, I thank you for the opportunity to appear before you on this important matter.

As you know, my interest stems from the Imperial Airlines crash at Richmond, Va., November 8, 1961, in which 29 boys from my district were killed. Initial information about that accident was so disturbing that I began looking in detail into the nonscheduled or supplemental carriers as a group. I have decided that the most helpful contribution I can make to your investigation is to summarize for you the facts I have been able to gather thus far on these companies.

I am very concerned about what I have investigated, and I hope the matters I have discovered will help lead to early legislation that will put this house in order.

It is my understanding that there are now approximately 32 carriers holding authority as nonscheduled or supplemental carriers. Without going into details of the type of authority they possessed earlier, the present authority of approximately 25 of them consists of certificates awarded by the Civil Aeronautics Board in the Large Irregular Air Carrier Investigation, CAB docket 5132, in January 1959. Some of the certificates were for 2 years, the rest for 5. They gave each company unlimited domestic charter right, plus the right to operate 10 round trips per month in individually ticketed business on each of as many domestic routes as a carrier might wish.

The court of appeals held that this award was illegal. Before appeal from this decision could come before the Supreme Court, the Congress, at the end of the session in 1960, passed a law simply extending for 20 months the authority which had been granted by the CAB. The idea was to give Congress time to decide either to let the authority of these carriers expire at the end of the 20 months, or to enact permanent legislation governing the type of authority to be given them. The 20-month law expires March 14 of this year.

The Supreme Court, therefore, did not pass a judgment on the case. It returned it to the Court of Appeals which is retaining jurisdiction pending a decision by the Congress.

The authority of some of the remaining six or seven carriers, which preexisted the Board's decision, was continued pending further hearings on the qualifications of those carriers, and two are new supplements which have been certificated by the Board since its decision in docket 5132.

The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in its Report No. 1177 of September 13, 1961, on H.R. 7318, said of the Board's decision in docket 5132:

"The so-called certificates issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the supplementals were illegal. This illegality was not a mere technical infraction of the act. It was fundamental. The 10-flight individually ticketed grant violated basic principles of the economic regulatory philosophy of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958."

I have made a careful and detailed examination of the past record and fitness of these companies and, while the following is by no means a complete summary, it reveals what I think will cause this committee and the entire Congress the gravest concern.

Before beginning this review, one word about "fitness". The word "fit" is not used by mere chance. It is a word of art. It is probably the single most important word in the entire statute. The Federal Aviation Act, using precisely the same phrase as was in its predecessor, the Civil Aeronautics Act, ever since its enactment in 1938, says in part that "The Board shall issue a certificate authorizing the * * * transportation covered by the application, if it finds that the applicant is fit, willing, and able to perform such transportation properly, and to conform to the provisions of this Act and the rules, regulations and requirements of the Board * * *" (sec. 401(d)(1)).

The statute does not say "somewhat fit", or "partially fit". It says fit. One of the grounds for the Court of Appeals' reversal of the Board's decision in Docket 5132 was precisely on this basis, for the Board did not require that each of the carriers show that it was "fit" to do all the things its certificate would authorize, but instead certificated them as a group, in effect allowing one carrier to "trade" on the qualifications of another. The court, in effect, said that by the plain words of the statute this was obvious error. Moreover, the Board not only said it would not require such high standards of fitness of this group of carriers as it does of others, but it even went further and divided this group into the "more fit", to which it gave 5-year certificates, and the "less fit" to which it therefore gave 2-year certificates. Thus the Board in effect said there are three different standards of fitness.

Now let's look at the record of each of these carriers to see just how fit they are.

First, there is a group of six that reportedly are bankrupt. These appear to be: Arctic-Pacific, Inc.; Aviation Corp. of Seattle (doing business as Westair Transport); Conner Air Lines, Inc.; General Airways, Inc.; Miami Airline, Inc.; Transocean Air Lines.

I want to make clear that I have not yet been able to see the official bankruptcy documents as to each of these carriers. However, I have been informed that each is bankrupt, and the data in balance sheets, sent me by the CAB, certainly indicates this. Miami Airlines, for instance, as of September 30, 1960, reported to the Board current assets of $16,200 versus current liabilities of $316,600. Earned surplus was minus $714,000. This appears to be its latest report to the Board. Transocean, September 30, 1961, reported $1,181,000 current assets, $16,657,000 current liabilities, and a net worth deficit of $18,079,000.

What is the relevance of this? The entire history of air transportation shows that safety is not only intimately related to financial well-being, but, in fact, just plain depends on it. The Civil Aeronautics Act itself arose largely from the bad accident record of carriers that were going broke in the mid-1930's and were consequently shaving maintenance and other expenditures without which you cannot have air safety.

Second, when a company goes bankrupt the creditors are left holding the bag, and in the case of the nonskeds, one of the main creditors has over many long years been the U.S. Government, with unpaid bills for fuel, oil, maintenance, supplies, and services of many kinds. Precisely in the amount that these bills have proved uncollectible, these carriers have obviously been subsidized by the taxpayers of the Nation. In the case of Transocean, for instance, I am advised that the Air Force has stated that $108,497 for fuel and oil alone is uncollectible, while I have a copy of a filing by the Government in the bankruptcy proceedings in which the Government claims over $365,000.

There is no better example of the relationship between safety and financial ability than Arctic-Pacific, whose crash at Toledo October 29, 1960, killed most of the members of the California Polytechnic football team. That carrier also appeared to be shot through with mismanagement and, in fact, downright indifference to whether great risks were taken. Reports were that the pilots took off below minimums, that the management suppressed or destroyed adverse ratings of pilot competence, and that unrecorded flights were conducted. The man behind the company, James Springer, then moved into another air transport operation on the west coast, listing himself as only an expediter in the company's personnel roster, apparently to conceal what later hearings indicated was his actual control of the company. Operations were flown which some pilots refused to fly as being unsafe, and a crash killing seven at Travis Air Force Base led to a CAB hearing last December in San Francisco on FAA action to ground the company.

There is an even larger group of 14 carriers which, while apparently not bankrupt, have revealed in the balance sheet they have most recently filed with the CAB conditions which merit the attention of the committee. Balance sheet dates are June 30 and September 30, 1961.

The carriers are: Airline Transport Carriers, Inc. (doing business as California-Hawaiian Airlines); American Flyers Airline Corp.; Associated Air Transport, Inc.; Coastal Air Lines; Modern Air Transport, Inc.; Overseas National Airways; President Airlines, Inc. (formerly called California-Eastern Aviation, Inc.); Saturn Airways, Inc.; Sourdough Air Transport; Standard Airways, Inc.; Stewart Air Service; United States Overseas Airlines, Inc.; Vance Roberts; World Wide Airlines, Inc.

Here are some facts about each of these companies:

1. Airline Transport Carriers, Inc., doing business as California-Hawaiian Airlines:

Earned surplus (deficit)	$167,000
Net worth (deficit)	99,800

Recently declared unfit by MATS for financial inadequacy, substandard maintenance, and marginal operating ability.

CAB bureau counsel moved on January 3 to reopen the record, in the continuation of hearings in docket 5132 to determine whether this company's authority will be continued, on the ground that investigation of the company's books by the CAB Bureau of Enforcement last October revealed incorrect balance sheets filed with the CAB for both December 1960, and June 1961. Bureau counsel stated that the carrier listed current liabilities as long-term debt, thus distorting its current ratio from an actual 1 to 6.6 to a purported 1.6 to 1.

He added that "in view of the carrier's apparent, and possibly willful violations of the Board's reporting requirement in submitting financial reports, the ability and desire of the carrier to adhere to the Board's rules and regulations becomes subject to much doubt."

2. American Flyers Airline Corp.:

Current liabilities	$252,500
Current assets	107,500
Working capital deficit	145,000
Earned surplus do	49,700
Net worth do	44,700

3. Associated Air Transport, Inc.:

Current liabilities	354,000
Current assets	152,000
Working capital deficit	202,000
Earned surplus do	162,500
Capital surplus do	12,400
Net worth	174,900

Recently declared unfit by MATS for financial inadequacy, substandard maintenance, and substandard quality of service. Official CAB accident reports show that this carrier has had three accidents in the past 4 years.

4. Coastal Air Lines:

Current liabilities	$29,700
Current assets	11,200
Working capital deficit	18,500
Earned surplus do	64,400
Net worth do	55,900

The company did only $6,750 of business in 1961. It owns no flight equipment. Management is at present seeking board approval to sell its supplemental certificate in CAB Docket 12425.

5. Modern Air Transport, Inc.:

Current liabilities	$349,600
Current assets	152,500
Working capital deficit	197,100
Earning surplus do	38,300
Net worth do	37,300

6. Overseas National Airways:

Current liabilities (including overhaul reserves)	2,848,000
Current assets	1,223,000
Working capital deficit	1,625,000
Earned surplus do	987,400
Net worth do	887,400

This financial condition is much worse than that of two carriers which MATS has declared financially inadequate. The carrier owned no flight equipment as of September 30, 1961.

This carrier is subject to a CAB cease and desist order in The Overseas National Enforcement Proceeding, Docket 11154, for violating section 401(a) of the act by conducting foreign air transportation without authority, and section 412 by illegally entering into agreements with foreign air carriers. CAB Order E-16895 of June 5, 1961.

The company has also been involved in repeated attempts to fly charters for charter parties that included individual members of the general public, in violation of the Board's North Atlantic charter policy, which, in line with established precedent, has confined charters to members of bona fide, reasonably homogeneous groups. See, for instance, CAB Orders E-12575, E-12608, E-12654, E-12655, E-12669, E-12742, E-12992 in 1958.

7. President Airlines, Inc. (successor to California-Eastern Aviation, Inc.):

Although I requested of the CAB a balance sheet for each carrier, I did not receive one for President, and therefore assume the carrier has not filed with the CAB as required. I am informed, however, that MATS has recently declared the company financially unfit.

This is the company which stranded the Chicago charter group at Shannon Airport, Ireland, and the Los Angeles charter group in London, last fall. As I recall, the press reported the stranding at Shannon as due to refusal of the airport authorities to release the plane until payment of delinquent landing fees and fuel and oil bills.

On September 10, 1961, a President plane crashed on takeoff at Shannon, killing 83 persons.

To the best of my knowledge, the CAB has not revoked the certificate of this carrier.

(See "CAB and FAA Negligence—Installment II" in today's Record for remainder of Congressman Walter's statement.)

Congressman Walter on Non-Sked Airlines Finances—Installment II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I have placed Installment I of a statement by Congressman Francis Walter concerning financial reports of certain nonscheduled airlines certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board in today's Congressional Record. Under unanimous consent, I include Installment II of same in the Record of this day:

8. Saturn Airways, Inc:

Current liabilities (including overhaul reserves of $46,700)	$720,900
Current assets	69,000
Working capital deficit	605,200

Saturn's balance sheet contains a statement of total liabilities and computation of net worth which is thoroughly confusing and unintelligible to me and I hereby request an immediate audit of it by the CAB. The above statement also reflects a poorer condition than that of the two carriers declared financially inadequate by MATS.

9. Sourdough:

Current liabilities	$12,000
Current assets	6,900
Working capital deficit	5,100
Flight equipment totals only	20,000

The committee may want to pause to consider these figures. What kind of a plane do you own for $20,000?

In a proceeding to revoke this carrier's operating authority for dormancy, the Board, while acknowledging that the carrier had been dormant, held that it would not be in the public interest and that no useful purpose would be served by revoking such authority. Order E-14620 of November 9, 1959. The Board had announced in its 1955 decision in docket 5132, that it intended to revoke carriers for dormancy because of the repeated history of such certificates being acquired by illegal operators who continued their illegal operations under the purchased certificate upon revocation of prior authority. The Board's reason for Order E-14620 was that its decision in docket 5132 was in litigation.

10. Standard Airways, Inc.:

Current liabilities	$387,000
Current assets	251,200
Working capital deficit	136,500
Earned surplus do	23,500

Recently declared unfit by MATS for substandard maintenance and unsatisfactory standards of service.

11. Stewart Air Service:

Current assets reported by the carrier as minus $2,170 with cash on hand of minus $3,251. I have never heard of having an asset that is a minus dollar amount. Current liabilities are $70,594, for a working capital defilt of, I gather, $72,764.

I request a CAB audit and explanation of this balance sheet. This appears particularly necessary, in view of CAB Order E-12877 of August 11, 1958, ordering this carrier to cease and desist from violating the Board's regulations by failing to supply requested revisions, corrections or explanations to financial reports required by the Board. The company had failed to respond to such CAB requests until after docketing of the petition for enforcement in that proceeding.

12. United States Overseas Airlines, Inc.:

Current liabilities	$3,422,500
Current assets	1,526,000
Working capital deficit	1,896,500
Earned surplus do	1,714,000
Net worth do	1,421,700

This is a financial status much worse than that of the two carriers MATS has disapproved on the ground of financial inadequacy.

One of the statutory requirements is that a carrier be fit, willing, and able "* * * to conform to the provisions of this Act and the rules, regulations, and requirements of the Board * * *" (Federal Aviation Act, section 401(d)(1)).

In 1960 there was a finding that this company violated section 403 of the act by exchanging transportation for advertising, publicity and/or promotional goods and services, thus receiving compensation other than the fares specified in its tariffs. Order E-15999, November 7, 1960, docket 10979.

Last month the Board ordered the carrier to cease and desist from operating in excess of its authorized 10 flights per month, in violation of section 401(a) of the act, on each of five of the principal routes of the country: New York-Los Angeles, New York-Oakland, New York-Chicago, Chicago-Los Angeles, and Los Angeles-Honolulu. (Order E-17822, docket 10979.)

13. Vance Roberts:

This appears to be a carrier of a size comparable to Sourdough. Current assets are only $2,942, with total assets only $41,838.

This is one of the two companies newly certificated by the Board subsequent to its decision in docket 5132. It is hard to believe that carriers of this size can be of significant value to the military. In addition, it seems fair to question whether the Government should license a company whose total assets are substantially less than the possible value of its operating authority to some illegal operator seeking to buy such authority with which to resume operations.

14. World Wide Airlines, Inc.:

Current liabilities		$110,700
Current assets		48,200
Working capital	deficit	62,500
Earned surplus	do	238,700
Net worth	do	49,400

In an initial decision of May 24, 1961 (docket 5132), recommending a supplemental certificate for this company despite finding that it "is in a weak financial condition" based on a net worth deficit of $19,160, which is 60 percent less than the net worth deficit shown above, the examiner said, moreover, that the figure of $19,160 probably understated the net worth deficit by at least $105,273 since the asset side included the company's CAB operating authority, valued by the present management at that figure.

A brief history of this carrier follows: Although it has changed hands repeatedly, the CAA at one point when it was controlled by one Eric Pearson in the early 1950's stated that "We will not consider World Wide Airlines, Inc., qualified for an air carrier operating certificate so long as Mr. Pearson is in a position to control or influence the company's actions. * * *" See CAB docket 8680, trial examiner's initial decision of November 6, 1957. Its certificate was revoked June 17, 1954, as the outgrowth of a flight from Los Angeles to Baltimore with an engine not only overdue for overhaul but needing to be changed, and flown by a wildcat crew when World Wide's regular pilots refused to fly the plane. The company did not operate through 1955, 1956, and at least the first 9 months of 1957.

In a proceeding to revoke it for nonuser, the trial examiner noted that, after one abortive attempt at sale of the carrier, Pearson allegedly resold it to Melvin J. Catlett, former chief pilot of SSW, a suplemental which went bankrupt in February 1959 and was suspended by the Board in September 1959 for failure to refund tickets, canceling flights without proper notice, and abandoning its ticket offices without adequate notice to passengers holding tickets and reservations (CAB order E-14490). The examiner indicated a fear that Catlett was only a nominal purchaser, noting that, after Pearson's prior purported sale had gone sour:

"Within a 2-week period, during which the hearing was continued at the request of respondent's counsel, Pearson managed to negotiate the sale of respondent to Catlett. Most unusual about this transaction is the fact that the vendee was not required to put up any cash to seal the agreement. * * * The failure of Catlett to make a downpayment and to show, at the hearing, some evidence of financial fitness suggests the possibility that he may be a nominal purchaser. Thus, contrary to the contention of respondent, the very elements of the Board's reasoning in imposing the 'nonuser' condition in 1955 are present in this case" (initial decision. World-Wide Enforcement case, docket 8680, Nov. 6, 1957).

The examiner also said, citing other cases, that "these cases make is abundantly clear that the Board expects strict compliance with the two consecutive calendar-quarter requirements and that only under exceptional conditions will the Board entertain relief * * *."

These comments by the examiner were in November 1957 and were based on the Board's pronouncement in docket 5132 of a policy of revocation for nonuser. The Board on November 9, 1959, however, dismissed the proceeding on the same grounds as in the Sourdough dismissal. The latest stage is the examiner's decision of May 24, 1961, recommending a certificate, and stating that "the Board has recognized that the service obligations of such a supplemental carrier can be met with minimum financial strength and despite an adverse balance sheet." As of September 30, 1961, the carrier owned no aircraft.

I have previously referred to the problem of illegal combines of carriers formed for the purpose of providing scheduled or daily service while purporting that each carrier in the combine in itself does not operate in excess of its permitted 10 flights per month. This brings us to Blatz Airlines, Inc.; Paul Mantz Air Services (now Paramount Airlines, Inc.); Quaker City Airways, Inc. (now using the name Admiral Airways).

I am sure members of this committee have some knowledge of the Great Lakes-"Skycoach" combine which has been flying with flagrantly excessive frequency, apparently for more than a decade. The authority of the carriers in that combine appears finally to have been revoked by CAB orders, upheld by the Supreme Court. I think there is significant evidence of a plan to shift these operations to some of the carriers named above, just as illegal operators have transferred to other certificates in the past for continued operations despite Board revocation orders.

Lobbyist registrations filed with the Congress last summer appear to show that Paul Mantz, Quaker City, and the Great Lakes combine have the same lobbyists and law firm.

Blatz has in the past carried transcontinental passengers of Currey Air Transport, Ltd., to California destinations beyond Los Angeles, where Currey terminates. This was pursuant to an alleged charter of Blatz aircraft to Currey, which was in the Great Lakes combine. CAB Order E-12987, September 18, 1958, docket 8727. This is a consent cease and desist order which in addition recites many other serious violations of the act by Blatz.

One Charles E. Lewis now purports to own Quaker City. An individual of this name also now heads the Independent Airline Association. See the Washington Post, January 3, 1962, page B-2. It is my understanding that this association of nonskeds has been reported at one time or another to be largely controlled by the Great Lakes combine. As of September 30, 1961, this carrier also owned no aircraft.

The Board in its decision in docket 5132 said of Paul Mantz: "The examiners * * * found the applicant was not disposed to comply with the act and regulations, based upon applicant's illegal participation in the North Star combine * * *. The examiners were clearly correct in their findings of violations, and applicant's participation therein cannot be condoned."

Supposedly the present owner of Paul Mantz Air Services, which as of September 30, 1961, owned no aircraft, is one Theodore J. Bodwell. He has stated that he bought the company from Mantz December 7, 1960. But in a statement to the Congress, July 26, 1961, he said that part of the purchase money came from a loan "of a substantial amount" from one Pierce O'Carroll, of Chicago. Pierce O'Carroll was sole owner and president of Monarch Air Service which was found unfit in the examiners' initial decision of March 29, 1955, docket 5132, in part because of violating the act by participating with Currey and Great Lakes in the Skycoach combine. Bodwell also was a pilot for Great Lakes, beginning in 1953, and became chief pilot in 1959, according to his own statement.

Let us now focus briefly on carriers that the committee may deem unfit purely on safety grounds.

According to the Accident Report, Supplemental Carriers, for 1954 through 1961, by the CAB Bureau of Safety, Capitol Airways, Inc., has had 18 serious accidents, including 13 crashes, in that period. Five of these involved fatalities. The committee is generally familiar with the crash of Imperial, carrying recruits from my district, at Richmond, Va., November 8, 1961, with 77 fatalities. News reports at the time told of engine repair with automobile parts, a girl friend of the crew riding in the cockpit the day before. Also, one of the engines was not operating at the time of the crash and had been bought from an English airline which had discarded it as having been flown too many hours.

I am continuing my investigation of the background of this company.

At this point, gentlemen, I have reviewed 25 of the approximately 32 supplementals, and I am sure that by now the question of what demand exists for their service must have occurred to you.

One of the claims these carriers have repeated over the years is that they are needed by the Department of Defense. It seems to me that in addition to being fit, the other basic test of the Department's need ought to be the equipment they own. Equipment they lease is irrelevant because its availability to the Department of Defense obviously does not depend on the existence of these carriers. Much of it is, in fact, leased from the Department, through the Air Force.

As of September 30, 1961, ignoring DC-3's, C-46's, and 13 DC-4's as being obsolete, 4-engine aircraft of the DC-6 or Constellation type reported as owned by all or virtually all the carriers total 32.

This total must, however, be reduced by eight, two of which have been destroyed in crashes. One belongs to a carrier in bankruptcy, and five belong to companies disqualified by MATS as unfit.

The remaining 24 belong to 7 carriers, 4 of them—American Flyers, Modern, Saturn, and United States Overseas being among those I already have discussed. The semimodern airlift available to the Department of Defense through companies not previously discussed therefore boils down to 13 airplanes owned by 3 carriers.

That is the sum and substance of it—a sharp contrast to assertions made last summer by nonsked representatives of a fleet of around 165 aircraft.

All the facts point to one conclusion: The Imperial Airlines disaster at Richmond has dramatized the financial unfitness, unsafe operations and law violations in the supplemental airline field.

The record makes it clear that we cannot rely on the CAB to regulate this industry and clean up these conditions. I am regretfully convinced that the CAB has emphasized preserving the companies rather than emphasizing the welfare of the public, despite the fact that the public interest is its paramount responsibility under the statute.

I believe it is up to the Congress to see to it that unfit supplemental operators are eliminated and to correct the conditions which have enabled them to exist.

In my judgment this can be done only by narrowing the discretion which the CAB has in regulating these carriers and by sharply reducing the permissible area of their operations. Frankly, gentlemen, I think we are sitting on a powder keg. I urge early congressional action as strongly as I can.

In the meantime, I hereby officially request the Federal Aviation Agency to suspend immediately the air carrier operating certificate of each nonscheduled or supplemental carrier which owes over $1,000 to the Government for any goods or services whatsoever, on accounts more than 30 days old.

If a company does not pay its bills promptly, this must be taken as a prima facie case of such mismanagement of financial weakness that the safety of the operation must be in doubt which the FAA cannot permit.

The only other possible explanation would be that the carrier just did not want to pay. For the Government to grant the right to do business to a company that dodged paying bills it owes to the Government is ridiculous, and cannot be tolerated by Congress.

Gov. Donald G. Nutter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, on January 25, the State of Montana and the Nation lost a great man when a National Guard C-47 crashed near Wolf Creek Mountain and killed Gov. Donald G. Nutter. Also killed in this fatal accident were the Governor's administrative assistant, the Honorable Dennis Gordon, the Honorable Ed Wren, commissioner of agriculture for the State of Montana, and the plane's crew of three.

I would like to express the sympathy, not only for myself but for all of the people of Alabama, to all of the people of Montana, and to Governor Nutter's widow, Mrs. Maxine Nutter and their son, Johnnie.

Mr. Speaker, this was a terrible accident; however, a valuable lesson should be learned from this accident. This accident has been in the making for many years. The Air National Guard has made available, for the purpose of flying Governors and other State officials on official State business, the C-47 aircraft. These C-47's are old, inadequate airplanes. I feel that all C-47's should not be used by chief executives and a more modern aircraft such as the C-54 should replace these aircraft at once.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Department of Defense and the National Guard Bureau to replace these aircraft at once, in order to prevent a recurrence of this accident.

Alabama, on several occasions, has come very close to losing its chief executives through malfunctions of the C-47, both Governor Patterson, our present Governor, and former Governor Folsom, have had to make forced landings due to malfunctions of these aircraft.

Mr. Speaker, this is an intolerable situation, and I feel one that all of us here in the House of Representatives feel should be investigated.

Analysis of "My Life on the Blacklist"—Article by Ring Lardner, Jr., in the Saturday Evening Post, October 14, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, in the October 14, 1961, edition of the Saturday Evening Post, Screenwriter Ring Lardner, Jr., makes a dramatic attempt to cast himself in the role of a martyr for having served a prison term as a result of his contemptuous defiance of Congress during Committee on Un-American Activities hearings on the motion picture industry in 1947. His article, entitled "My Life on the Blacklist," is replete with false and misleading inferences about the Communist conspiracy, and it completely ignores the compelling reasons which prompted the congressional investigation of the film capital. Mr. Lardner now admits that he was a member of the Communist Party at the time he appeared before the committee, but claims that he broke with the party in 1950. His continued active support of Communist causes and ideology up to this day strongly indicates otherwise.

I sent a lengthy, documented reply to the Lardner article to the editors of the Saturday Evening Post, but was advised by them that space limitations permitted the publication of only part of my remarks. For the benefit of my colleagues, I include the full text of my reply to Mr. Lardner in the RECORD:

ANALYSIS OF "MY LIFE ON THE BLACKLIST"—ARTICLE BY RING LARDNER, JR., IN THE SATURDAY EVENING POST, OCTOBER 14, 1961

In an article in the October 14, 1961, issue of the widely circulated Saturday Evening Post, Ring Lardner, Jr., has engaged in the fantastic attempt to create "heroes" out of a group of identified Communists, including himself, who were discharged from employment in the Hollywood motion picture industry.

Lardner's "heroes" are writers, directors, producers, technicians, and other employees in the motion picture industry, who, according to solid evidence obtained by the committee. were simultaneously members of concealed and conspiratorial Communist cells formed by the Communist Party for the purpose of promoting subversive Communist objectives within the industry.

It is significant that Lardner's heroes do not include the sizable number of employees of the industry who were lured into membership in the Communist Party, who eventually left it in disillusionment and disgust, and who subsequently alerted the public and the industry to the designs of the Communist conspiracy by their forthright testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Lardner's eulogies are for those, like himself, who have refused to disclose whether they have been and still continue to be members of the conspiracy when questioned under oath before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Lardner treats with scorn the eminent screen director, Robert Rossen, who according to Lardner "conceded that 'no one individual can even indulge himself in the luxury of individual morality' and proceeded to spill into the record all the names he could think of" during testimony before the Committee on Un-American Activities. Mr. Rossen, who appeared as a witness before the committee on May 7, 1953, did indeed declare that a previous refusal to respond fully to committee questions was based on what he "considered to be individual morality" and he no longer felt he could indulge himself in that luxury. It is interesting, however, that Mr. Lardner carefully restrained from giving the full context of Mr. Rossen's remarks which puts the testimony in an entirely different light:

"I don't think, after 2 years of thinking, that any one individual can even indulge himself in the luxury of individual morality or pit it against what I feel today very strongly is the security and safety of this Nation."

Needless to say, there is also absolutely no reference in the Lardner article to Robert Rossen's testimony regarding the immorality of communism and the methods by which the Communist Party exploited Rossen and his important position in the motion picture industry during his 10 years of party membership. Mr. Rossen had in fact testified that the Communist Party sought, through its members in the motion picture industry, to build the power of the party in Hollywood and eventually influence the very films which were made. He also showed how Communists already within the industry were used to recruit new party members, and how the prestige and financial success attained by party members in the industry were utilized to further the basically subversive Communist objectives in Hollywood.

It might further be noted that Rossen's double role as party member and motion picture director netted the Communist Party no less than $40,000—which is Rossen's estimate of his direct financial contributions to the party and its front organizations. Hollywood was characterized by the committee in 1951 as "one of the principal sources of funds for the Communist Party of the United States."[1] It is regrettable that Lardner's Saturday Evening Post article provides no information on the extent of the Communist Party's financial gain as a consequence of Lardner's own party membership while he drew a $2,000 weekly salary from the motion picture industry.

Lardner's major heroes are the so-called Hollywood 10—a group of motion-picture writers and directors, including himself, who were subpenaed to appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1947, were questioned by the committee on the basis of such solid evidence as their own Communist Party registration cards, but refused to answer any questions pertaining to present or past membership in the Communist Party. The 10 were subsequently convicted of contempt of Congress and in 1950 began serving prison terms after the U.S. Supreme Court refused to review the lower courts' decisions. Lardner also pleads the cause of hundreds of others whose lives have been scarred, he maintains, because they have been denied employment in the motion-picture industry as a result of (1) their failure to answer questions on Communist Party activities when subpenaed as

---

[1] Committee on Un-American Activities, Annual Report for 1951, pp. 7 and 8.

witnesses before the Committee on Un-American Activities, or (2) even though never witnesses, their silence after being identified as Communists by former fellow conspirators in sworn testimony before the committee.

Lardner extols the recalcitrant witness group for having resisted "assaults on freedom of thought" by the Committee on Un-American Activities which he claims is intruding on traditionally private "beliefs and associations" in the realm of a "political activity."

While the courts, including the highest court of this land, have found to the exact contrary in decisions respecting the committee's inquiries in the field of Communist subversion, the falsity of Lardner's position can be demonstrated simply by reference to the testimony of another member of the Hollywood 10.

Motion Picture Director Edward Dmytryk must have qualified for Lardner's "hero" category when he went to jail with the rest of the Hollywood 10 rather than respond to committee questions in 1947 regarding his Communist activities. But Dmytryk certainly fell from grace when he reappeared before the committee on April 25, 1951, for he then frankly discussed the Communist operation in Hollywood of which he (and Lardner) had been an integral part. Mr. Dmytryk does not rate mention in Lardner's article in the Saturday Evening Post. Yet here is what Mr. Dmytryk had to say regarding the chief purposes of the Communist Party in the Hollywood motion-picture industry:

"The first one was to get money. Hollywood is a very wealthy community, and it is a great source of capital.

"The next one was to get prestige.

"And the third and most important one was, through the infiltration and eventual taking over of Hollywood guilds and unions, to control the content of pictures. The only way they could control the content of pictures was to control studios, and the only way they could do that was to completely take over the guilds and the unions."

Mr. Dmytryk's reasons for disclosing the identity of fellow Communists within the motion-picture industry are also pertinent in view of Lardner's sneering portrayal of congressional investigators of subversion as "unordained confessors" who require witnesses to become "informers" and compete in namedropping as a "penance" for "past political misconduct."

A member of the Committee had asked Mr. Dmytryk whether the test of credibility of a witness purporting to be a former Communist who has changed his opinions would be "the willingness to name names, places, and circumstances surrounding such membership." Mr. Dmytryk replied:

"I personally believe so. That is why I am doing it. I think if a man says that he is convinced that the Communist Party is a subversive or criminal organization, that he certainly shouldn't mind giving names.

"I know that there have been comments—I don't mean by the Communists but even among certain progressives and liberals—that people who talk are in effect informers. I heard that so much that I went to the dictionary and looked up the word. An informer, roughly speaking, is a man who informs against colleagues or former colleagues, who are engaged in criminal activity. I think the Communists, by using this word against people, are in effect admitting they are engaged in criminal activity. I never heard of anybody informing on the Boy Scouts."

Mr. Dmytryk's reasons for refusing to answer questions during his first appearance before the Committee in 1947 are also interesting. He had left the Communist Party in 1945, he said, but he had not broken completely with the Communists until 1950. He had been persuaded that the party in this country was not a menace, while at the same time he believed the Committee on Un-American Activities was improperly invading the field of free speech and free thought. The subsequent step-up in the cold war, the outbreak of actual Communist military aggression in Korea, together with revelations of Communist espionage by individuals acting "for love of the party" convinced Mr. Dmytryk that a party encouraging such actions "is treasonable." "I do believe," declared Mr. Dmytryk in 1951, "* * * the Communist Party is conspiratorial, subversive, and even in certain cases treasonable."

In contrast, Ring Lardner, Jr., writing in 1961, refuses to describe the Communist Party as anything more than a "political activity"—

"* * * in whose ranks I had found some of the most thoughtful, witty, and generally stimulating men and women of Hollywood. I also encountered a number of bores and unstable characters, which seemed to bear out Bernard Shaw's observation that revolutionary movements tend to attract the best and the worst elements in a given society."

Lardner unfortunately is less frank with the American public than he has been when he writes for the Communist press, as will be demonstrated later. First, however, some important findings regarding the true nature of the Communist Party should be recalled in view of Lardner's semantics serving to glorify the Communists.

The Committee on Un-American Activities and its predecessor, the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, have conducted investigations and hearings with respect to the Communist operation in the United States ever since 1938, and published committee findings beginning as early as January 1940 have warned the Congress and the American people that the Communist Party was, in essence, "a foreign conspiracy masked as a political party."

In 1950, the Congress of the United States passed the Internal Security Act, thereby setting up certain registration and disclosure requirements for the Communist Party and its front organizations in an effort to protect this Nation from the conspiratorial and deceptive practices of the Communists. In the preamble to this act, which states the necessity for the legislation, there is a finding by the Congress of the United States that the "Communist dictatorship of a foreign country" has established and utilizes in various countries "action organizations which are not free and independent organizations, but are sections of a worldwide Communist organization and are controlled, directed, and subject to the discipline of the Communist dictatorship of such foreign country." These local organizations, the Congress also found, "endeavor to carry out the objectives of the world Communist movement by bringing about the overthrow of existing governments by any available means, including force if necessary, and setting up Communist totalitarian dictatorships which will be subservient to the most powerful existing Communist totalitarian dictatorship" (50 U.S.C. 781).

Under the authority of this Internal Security Act, a newly created quasi-judicial Government agency, the Subversive Activities Control Board, held hearings to determine whether the Communist Party of the United States could properly be designated as a Communist-action organization as above described and thereby become subject to requirements to disclose its membership, finances, etc.

After extended proceedings, during which the Communist Party was afforded such judicial safeguards as the right to present testimony and documentary evidence and cross-examine Government witnesses, the Subversive Activities Control Board, on April **20, 1953, found the Communist Party to be a Communist-action organization within the meaning of the Internal Security Act. The Board declared that:**

"Upon the overwhelming weight of the evidence in this proceeding, we find that [the Communist Party] * * * is substantially directed, dominated and controlled by the Soviet Union, which controls the world Communist movement * * * and that [it] operates primarily to advance the objectives of such world Communist movement."

The Board also found that the Communist Party "* * * has and does at the present time teach, advocate, and carry out activities having for their objective the overthrow of the U.S. Government and other governments which are designated as 'imperialist' by the Soviet Union, pursuant to directives of the Soviet Union, all for the purposes of defending and protecting the Soviet Union and of establishing in the United States (and other countries) a dictatorship of the proletariat patterned after that in the Soviet Union."

Members of the Communist Party "consider the allegiance they owe to the United States as subordinate to their loyalty and obligations to the Soviet Union," the Board further determined. It also had something to say on the subject of misrepresentation of the Communist Party as a purely domestic political activity, which is instructive in view of such misrepresentation in the Ring Lardner article:

"Since the late 1930's, when it was faced with adverse legislation * * * [the Communist Party] has become increasingly diligent and resourceful in its efforts to appear as a domestic political party while continuing its subservience to the Soviet Union." (Subversive Activities Control Board, docket No. 51-101, report and order, April 20, 1953.)

On June 5, 1961, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a decision upholding the constitutionality of the basic registration and disclosure provisions of the Internal Security Act. The decision, which resulted from long-drawn-out litigation brought by the Communist Party to avoid compliance with the act, also gave judicial recognition and sanction to the general findings by the Congress and the specific findings by the Subversive Activities Control Board regarding the true nature of the Communist Party of the United States. Justice Frankfurter, who wrote the majority opinion, referred to Congress findings that the world Communist movement establishes action organizations in various countries dominated from abroad to bring about the overthrow of existing governments and employing methods of infiltration and secretive and coercive tactics. He then declared:

"It is not for the courts to reexamine the validity of these legislative findings and reject them. * * * They are the product of extensive investigation by committees of Congress over more than a decade and a half. * * * We certainly cannot dismiss them as unfounded or irrational imaginings. * * * And if we accept them, as we must, as a not unentertainable appraisal by Congress of the threat which Communist organizations pose not only to existing Government in the United States as a sovereign, independent nation—if we accept as not wholly unsupportable the conclusion that those organizations 'are not free and independent organizations, but are sections of a worldwide Communist organization and are controlled, directed, and subject to the discipline of the Communist dictatorship of [a] * * * foreign country,' * * * we must recognize that the power of Congress to regulate Communist organizations of this nature is extensive."

Although he dissented from the majority opinion on other grounds, Justice Douglas

accepted the specific findings of the Subversive Activities Control Board, regarding the Communist Party with these words:

"The Subversive Activities Control Board found, and the court of appeals sustained the finding, that petitioner, the Communist Party of the United States, is 'a disciplined organization' operating in this Nation 'under Soviet Union control' to install 'a Soviet-style dictatorship in the United States.' Those findings are based, I think, on facts; and I would not disturb them."

An attempt has been made by Ring Lardner, Jr., to appear as a champion of constitutional liberties in his refusal to testify frankly before the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1947. "I had taken the position," Lardner writes in the Saturday Evening Post, "that, while public servants are answerable to the people, citizens cannot be summoned, in the absence of even an allegation of an illegal act, to account to government for their beliefs and associations—matters that have traditionally been an American's own business." Although Lardner admits that he lost the "arguments" by serving a prison term for contempt, he nevertheless seeks to create the impression that he was a martyr to the cause of constitutional liberties. Conversely, according to Lardner's chronicle, the House Committee on Un-American Activities—or the inquisitors and "unordained confessors" as he refers to the committee—is made to appear destructive of civil liberties.

Lardner offers his readers a stirring quotation from a U.S. Supreme Court decision which he fails to explain was rendered in 1943 with respect to the refusal of a member of a religious sect to salute the American flag. But he refuses to remind his readers of a number of important Supreme Court decisions directly involving the power of Congress to investigate and legislate in the field of Communist activities and the effect of such inquiry upon the Communists' first amendment rights such as free speech, peaceable assembly or association.

The majority of the U.S. Supreme Court, for example, in an opinion handed down on June 8, 1959, in the case of *Barenblatt* v. *United States*, upheld the contempt conviction of a witness whose refusal to answer committee questions concerning his Communist Party activities was based on a challenge of the right of the committee to inquire into his "political" and "religious" beliefs or any "other personal and private affairs" or "associational activities."

The Supreme Court majority opinion declared that the committee inquiry had not transgressed the provisions of the first amendment. The Court found that Congress had "wide power to legislate in the field of Communist activity in this country, and to conduct appropriate investigations in aid thereof," a power which, the Court said, stemmed in the last analysis from the right of a society to preserve itself. "Justification for its exercise," the Court noted, "in turn rests on the long and widely accepted view that the tenets of the Communist Party include the ultimate overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence, a view which has been given formal expression by the Congress." Observing that "this Court in its constitutional adjudications has consistently refused to view the Communist Party as an ordinary political party," the Court concluded that "the balance between the individual and the governmental interests here at stake must be struck in favor of the latter" (360 U.S. 109).

Those equipped with the facts regarding the Communist Party's operation in America, and in the Hollywood motion picture industry in particular, can only be repelled by Ring Lardner's narration of how he and other identified Communist writers, actors and directors continued over the course of more than 10 years to trick the motion picture as well as the television industry into employing their services. Lardner's boastful account of how he and other identified Communists continued to maintain connections and make a comfortable living in our Nation's entertainment industry by employing ever-changing aliases and go-betweens; maintaining bank accounts in their false names and even registering in hotels under false names will not be admired as a kind of Robin Hood bravery. It will be greeted with the same scorn Americans hold for the shady dealings of underworld racketeers.

It is hardly by inadvertence that Mr. Lardner fails to inform his readers that he pursued his admittedly "cloak and dagger" activities despite finding by the courts that his discharge from the motion picture industry was justified. When Mr. Lardner was discharged from Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp. following his conviction for contempt of Congress, he sued the film company. Although a jury awarded him damages, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit on November 9, 1954, held that Twentieth Century-Fox was justified in discharging the writer under the "good conduct" clause of his contract; the court held he had violated the contract by having been found guilty of contempt for refusal to tell the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether or not he was a member of the Communist Party (216 F. 2d 844). The Supreme Court of the United States refused certiorari on February 15, 1955 (348 U.S. 944) and denied a rehearing on March 14, 1955 (348 U.S. 965). This denial of certiorari and of a rehearing had the effect of upholding the decision of the court of appeals that Lardner was justifiably discharged.

The only newsworthy aspect of the Saturday Evening Post article by Ring Lardner, Jr., is his public admission that he was indeed a member of the Communist Party when he was summoned to appear as a witness before the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1947. Almost lost in his rhetoric about his alleged concern for constitutional liberties is another admission that his refusal to answer committee questions at that time was also based on the fact that the relationship between members of the Communist Party had been a confidential one. This is certainly a euphemistic reference to the secret and conspiratorial nature of the Communist Party operation, but an important admission nevertheless.

Lardner's admissions demonstrate that the committee was correct in believing that Lardner possessed information which, if presented to the committee in sworn testimony, would assist the Congress in studying possible legislative measures to counteract the subversive efforts of the Communist conspiracy. Unfortunately, Lardner as a Communist did not supply any information which would be helpful to the committee, the Congress and ultimately to the American people.

Lardner alleges in his Saturday Evening Post article that he terminated his membership in the Communist Party when his contempt case was lost (in 1950). But he evades explaining his disaffiliation—declaring the matter had no particular pertinence to this story—and proceeds to deceive the American public with a completely distorted picture of the Communist operation in Hollywood. Mr. Lardner's credibility on the matter of disaffiliation remains to be established, particularly in view of his publicly recorded activities in behalf of the Communists, both before and after the year 1950.

On October 30, 1947, when Ring Lardner, Jr., appeared as a witness before the Committee on Un-American Activities in Washington, D.C., his Communist Party registration card for the year 1944 was read into the record. Public records cited at that time also attested to Lardner's service in the party's complex network of front organizations. These organizations included the Hollywood Writers Mobilization; the American Youth for Democracy; the Civil Rights Congress; the American Friends of Spanish Democracy; Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade; League of American Writers; Artists' Front To Win the War.

Subsequent to Lardner's appearance as a witness, and in the course of the committee's continuing investigation into Communist operations in the California area, Lardner's role in the Communist Party was sworn to by a total of 15 witnesses. These individuals for the most part were motion picture employees and one time bona fide party members who had personally associated with Lardner in party activities in Hollywood in the 1930's and 1940's.[2]

Screenwriter and former Communist Richard Collins told the committee in 1951 that Lardner had been one of the Hollywood Communists instrumental in importing the Communist Party line into the Screen Writers Guild during and after World War II. This important union was actually under the complete control of the Communists for a period, testimony before the committee revealed. Two other witnesses, Charles Daggett and George Glass, who were members of the Screen Publicists Guild in Hollywood, testified regarding Ring Lardner's efforts to recruit them into the Communist Party. Both had agreed to attend party meetings on Lardner's persuasion. Mr. Glass told the committee that he hoped "whatever legislation this committee recommends" would make it impossible for Communists to obtain recruits under false pretenses as to the real nature of the party. Mr. Glass said:

"Persons with humanitarian instincts can get trapped into something of that nature very easily when it is presented to them in that kind of candy coating such as we got at Mr. Lardner's house. We were served communism on a democratic platter" (testimony, p. 2492).

In the years immediately following Lardner's 1947 appearance before the Committee on Un-American Activities, Communist publications record his continued public activity in behalf of Communist-front organizations such as the Civil Rights Congress, the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, and its chapter in Hollywood.[3] These activities, reported for the period 1948–49, are quite understandable in view of Lardner's admission in the Saturday Evening Post that he was still formally enrolled in the Communist Party of the United States. However, if Lardner actually left the Communist Party in 1950, as he claims, it is difficult to believe that disaffiliation also involved "disaffection" in view of his statements in Communist publications after 1950 and his activity in behalf of front organizations of the Communist Party also subsequent to that date.

---

[2] The 15 witnesses and the dates of their appearance before the Committee on Un-American Activities are: Richard Collins, Apr. 12, 1951; Budd Schulberg, May 23, 1951; Frank Tuttle, May 24, 1951; Martin Berkeley, Sept. 19, 1951; Charles Daggett, Jan. 21, 1952; George Glass, Jan. 21, 1952; Sol Shor, Mar. 12, 1953; Pauline Townsend, Mar. 12, 1953; David Lang, Mar. 24, 1953; Max N. Benoff, Mar. 24, 1953; Robert Rossen, May 7, 1953; Roland Kibbee, June 2, 1953; Judith Raymon, Sept. 11, 1953; Stephen Wereb, July 1, 1955; and Virginia Viertel, June 6, 1956.

[3] These organizations were cited as Communist fronts by the Committee on Un-American Activities in its official reports based upon its investigations and hearings. The Civil Rights Congress was also subject to proceedings before the Subversive Activities Control Board, which found it to be a Communist-front organization and ordered it to register as such with the Attorney General.

In view of Lardner's obvious knowledge of Communist Party practices and techniques, he cannot claim to be one of the innocent dupes which usually make up the bulk of supporters of a deceptive Communist-front operation. He knows that Communist fronts extend the Communist Party's subversive influence into segments of our population which would not knowingly abet a Communist enterprise; that they provide a base for recruitment of additional party members and for utilizing the prestige and funds of non-Communists for party purposes. The House Committee on Un-American Activities noted in its annual report for 1951 that four of the Communist-front organization which have operated in the State of California had been able to collect approximately $1 million from members of the Hollywood motion picture industry.

Just what were Lardner's motives, therefore, in continuing activity in Communist-front organizations, such as the following:

1. The west coast Communist organ, the Daily People's World, on September 17, 1951, announced that Ring Lardner, Jr., would be "prominent on the picketline" which would form part of a mass demonstration against hearings then being held in Hollywood by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The demonstration was under the sponsorship of the Southern California Chapter of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, a Communist front officially characterized as such by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Internal Security Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee. The Los Angeles Times of September 18, 1951, reported that Lardner's name appeared, in connection with the demonstration, on a press notice issued by the Arts, Sciences, and Professions Council which described the committee as "subversive."

The Communist Daily Worker declared on November 13, 1952, that Lardner would also be one of the featured speakers at a reception to be held on November 16, 1952, under the auspices of the New York chapter of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

2. A brochure issued by the Civil Rights Congress, New York chapter, listed Lardner as one of those former political prisoners who invited the public to attend a reception sponsored by the New York Civil Rights Congress in December 1952. The Civil Rights Congress was characterized as subversive by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Subversive Activities Control Board also found it to be a Communist-front organization and ordered it to register as such with the Attorney General. In the autumn of 1951, Lardner's name also had appeared as one of the signers of an open letter to the Attorney General of the United States protesting the imprisonment for contempt of court of four trustees of the bail fund of the Civil Rights Congress of New York. The open letter appeared as a paid advertisement in the non-Communist press in October 1951 with the notation that the advertisement was paid for by the "contributions of signers." In its findings regarding the Civil Rights Congress, the Subversive Activities Control Board had observed that the organization, created and established by the Communist Party, had not only raised more than $1 million for legal defense and bail for Communist Party leaders and members, but also employed mass campaigns to arouse support for the party and its policies.

3. In 1952, Lardner endorsed a book printed by the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, which included his statement of support in its publishers' announcement. Long before 1952, the VALB had been cited as a notorious Communist front by the Attorney General, the House Committee on Un-American Activities and its predecessor, the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. After extended hearings on the organization, the Subversive Activities Control Board cited the VALB as a Communist front in 1955, concluding that it was "directed, dominated, and controlled by the Communist Party of the United States."

4. The Communist Daily Worker (Oct. 20, 1954) listed Ring Lardner, Jr., as among the "distinguished personalities" who had appeared on the program during an annual banquet held by the Communist-front publication, New World Review, in October 1954, in New York City. Lardner and others "were there to pay homage to Eslanda and Paul Robeson," the Daily Worker revealed. The Communist-front character of the sponsoring publication, New World Review, has been the subject of official findings by the Subversive Activities Control Board, the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

5. Ring Lardner, Jr., appeared as a featured speaker at a propaganda rally held under the auspices of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee in Newark, N.J., on December 10, 1955. Numerous notices in the Communist Daily Worker proclaimed Lardner would be a speaker at another rally scheduled under the auspices of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee in the Bronx, New York, on October 19, 1956.

The organization was officially characterized as a Communist-front organization by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. The House committee, in its annual report for 1958, noted that the avowed purpose of the organization "is to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities and discredit the FBI" and that it has also "repeatedly assisted, by means of funds and legal aid, Communists involved in Smith Act violations and similar legal proceedings."

6. Lardner authored a book review for the December 1956 issue of Mainstream, which the Committee on Un-American Activities characterized in its 1958 annual report as a monthly cultural and literary organ published in New York under the auspices of the Communist Party. In his book review, Lardner made the following interesting observations regarding the television program based on the experiences of Herbert Philbrick, former FBI undercover agent within the Communist Party:

"But faking in television assumes much more serious proportions than this. * * *

"Or, to take the most flagrant example of all, 'I Led Three Lives' states at the beginning of each episode that it is based on the true experiences of Herbert Philbrick as a police-spy in the Communist Party. Yet each story is conceived and sold, at fiction rates, to the producers by a professional writer in the same way that he might sell an episode to 'Lassie' or 'Superman'. Mr. Philbrick, on whose credibility as a witness men have been sent to jail, earns a tidy income from an outright lie, repeated in his name each week. Theoretically, the Communist Party of Massachusetts could sue for gross libel, but it would have to find a court dedicated to the rare principle of equal justice for all * * *

"The networks have not yet offered their facilities to the Communist Party to reply to the fraud called 'I Led Three Lives.'"

7. Lardner appeared as a featured speaker in New York City on December 6, 1961, at a rally under the joint auspices of the New York Council To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Youth To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee. The National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee, of which the New York council is a branch, and the Youth To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee have been cited by the HCUA as created and directed by the Communist Party.

The above-described activities are hardly consonant with disaffection from the Communist Party. But they are entirely consonant with Lardner's statements to the Communist Party newspaper, the Worker, which were published on March 18, 1956, some 6 years after his alleged disaffiliation from the party apparatus.

In a lengthy letter to the editor of the Worker,[4] Lardner referred to himself as an "American Marxist" and manifested a continued devotion to the cause of the Communist Party of the United States and the world Communist movement which it serves.

For those unfamiliar with the internal situation of the Communist Party as of March 1956, it should be noted that Communists in the United States and throughout the world were debating the merits of their past actions—following the lead of Nikita Khrushchev who had roundly denounced the late Joseph Stalin and many of his policies in a "secret" speech to the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party in February 1956. Communists in the United States argued for a time on whether their role in the world Communist movement required a certain amount of friendly criticism of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union or their continued unwavering support and praise for all Soviet policies. The argument was resolved later in favor of the traditional puppet role for the Communist Party of the United States.

In his letter to the editor of the Worker, Lardner joined in this debate on the side of those Communists who proposed a certain amount of objective criticism of the Soviet Communist Party.

He demonstrated his personal concern with the affairs of the Communist movement in America through such statements as the following:

"You have had some comments in your columns on the worldwide implications of the developments at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, but what this individual reader has missed is an analysis of the meaning of those developments to American Marxists and the Communist Party of the United States.

"But more pertinent for American Marxists, it seems to me, is the possibility that we may have alienated some potentially close allies in an American democratic front by treating any expression of doubt regarding Soviet judicial procedure as an unforgivable sin."

It should be recalled that Khrushchev, in a deliberate effort to smash the Stalin idol, in 1956 confirmed many of the harsh facts about the Stalinist regime which had long been publicized by anti-Communists yet steadfastly denied by the Communist faithful throughout the world. In the course of his denunciations of Stalin as a "capricious" and "brutal" tyrant, Khrushchev confirmed that the late dictator had been responsible for the execution of thousands of completely innocent Communists and non-Communists in the Soviet Union. Trials were rarely granted to these hapless victims, whose death sentences rested solely on false confessions extracted from them by threats or physical torture, Khrushchev admitted in 1956. Such "purges" were conducted periodically in the Soviet Union from 1934 until the very eve of Stalin's death in 1953.

Lardner acknowledged to the Worker his embarrassment at the Khrushchev revelations; he stated that "American Marxists" had an obligation to face up to their own participation in, and lack of critical attitude toward, Stalin's errors. Lardner undoubtedly had in mind his own signature on the "Open Letter to American Liberals" which was issued by American Communists and fellow travelers in 1937 and which ridiculed a demand by many liberals for a complete and impartial investigation of the Moscow purge trials then in progress. Lardner and others had denounced any such investigation as "political intervention in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union with hostile intent."[5]

---

[4] A reproduction of this letter is reprinted in its entirety at the conclusion of this analysis.

Although Khrushchev confirmed the falsity of this Communist position of past years, what is Lardner's chief regret as of March 1956? His concern, as expressed in the Communist newspaper, is over the non-Communist support which the Communists in this country may have lost as a result of a harsh attitude toward non-Communists' expressing "doubt regarding Soviet judicial procedure."

Lardner's statement contains no criticism of Stalin, whose behavior was described as "monstrous" by his former henchman, Khrushchev. In fact, Lardner's communication to the Worker offered possible excuses for the late dictator's excesses:

"Perhaps the cult of personality, as expressed in the near deification of Stalin, was necessary to the unity of the Soviet people during the critical campaign for collectivization, during the great war effort so magnificently personified in his indomitable spirit, and during the reconstruction of a stricken nation in the shadow of a cold war threat. * * *"

With respect to the injustices suffered by thousands of Soviet citizens who were physically exterminated and the millions more who languished in prisons under the Stalin regime, Lardner displays a callousness which is completely incompatible with his pose as a civil liberties crusader in the Saturday Evening Post.

Instead of expressing sympathy for Stalin's victims, Lardner coldbloodedly confined the assessment of Stalin's crimes to (1) those which were "necessary" byproducts of a regime which seeks the general progress, and (2) those which hindered the advance of communism.

"It is admittedly difficult to figure out [Lardner wrote to the Worker] just which errors cited by the Soviet leaders were necessary byproducts of a fateful struggle and which ones may have been actual impediments to the victory of socialism. * * *

"The admission in Moscow that some old Bolsheviks were unjustly treated may raise the issue of whether it is an inevitable part of a revolutionary struggle that individual reputations and even lives be sacrificed to the general progress. * * *"

Such statements contrast strangely with Lardner's self-portrait as a civil liberties devotee in the pages of the Saturday Evening Post. However, a double standard with respect to civil liberties has always been a special feature of the Communist Party's propaganda and agitation in this country. Communists have ceaselessly sought to portray themselves as stanch defenders of constitutional rights supporting every repression of freedom that occurs under the aegis of communism.

In writing to the Worker in 1956, Lardner referred to William Z. Foster, then national chairman of the Communist Party of the United States, as "America's outstanding working-class leader." Lardner's words in behalf of the Communist bloc of nations and the post-Stalin Soviet leadership, furthermore, match the fervency of Foster's own statements at this period. Lardner told the Worker:

"Of course, the Dulles contention that the [20th Soviet Communist Party] Congress revealed the weakness of the Socialist world is ridiculous. I certainly do not question Mr. Allen's [Daily Worker Columnist James S. Allen] characterization of the Congress as a 'dynamic, bold openminded approach to all problems, old and new.'"

In the light of his declarations in the Communist press, Ring Lardner's alleged disaffiliation from the Communist Party in 1950 obviously involved no diminution in his loyalty to Communist objectives. The American public, and the motion picture industry which he admittedly continues to exploit, have every reason to take a skeptical view of Lardner's propagandizing as an ex-Communist until he sees fit to speak frankly to them on the exact nature of his present relationship to the Communist Party—preferably under oath.

American Left Should Reexamine Self, Says Ring Lardner, Jr.

Dear Editor: You have had some comment in your columns on the worldwide implications of the developments of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, but what this individual reader has missed is an analysis of the meaning of those developments to American Marxists and the Communist Party of the United States. I am made more conscious of this lack by James S. Allen's column in the Worker of March 4, in which he writes:

"Marxists abroad are supposed to be embarrassed by the party congress just comcluded in Moscow, according to what I read in the newspaper. I must confess that I have no sense of embarrassment."

Well, I for one am embarrassed. It is admittedly difficult to figure out just which errors cited by the Soviet leaders were necessary byproducts of a fateful struggle and which ones may have been actual impediments to the victory of socialism. But this is not, in a primary and direct sense, our function. Much more urgent for American Marxists is the obligation to face up to their own participation in, and lack of critical attitude toward, those errors.

Perhaps the cult of personality, as expressed in the near deification of Stalin, was necessary to the unity of the Soviet people during the critical campaign for collectivization, during the great war effort so magnificently personified in his indomitable spirit, and during the reconstruction of a stricken nation in the shadow of a cold war threat. But even if that is true, it would still be questionable whether the American Marxist press should have reprinted, without qualification or critical commentary, so many of the cloying panegyrics which marred his 70th birthday celebration.

And in that connection, recalling the damage done in this country through leadership by personality, I wonder if some of the rather maudlin testaments to William Z. Foster on his recent birthday are really the most mature and effective way of acknowledging the respect due America's outstanding working-class leader.

The admission in Moscow that some old Bolsheviks were unjustly treated may raise the issue of whether it is an inevitable part of a revolutionary struggle that individual reputations and even lives be sacrificed to the general progress. But more pertinent for American Marxists, it seems to me, is the possibility that we may have alienated some potentially close allies in an American democratic front by treating any expression of doubt regarding Soviet judicial procedure as an unforgivable sin.

Again, if the Soviet-Yugoslav friction was occasioned at least in part by the unwarranted attempt of one Communist Party to dominate another, on whom did the obligation of objective criticism rest more squarely than on a party detached by distance and immediate interest from the smoke of that battle?

It is enough for Mr. Allen as a historian to say that the Soviet Communists are beginning "a basic reappraisal of their own history in the light of the new requirements of the transition to communism in the Soviet Union and the problems of assuring world peace." Was there not a very strong suggestion in the incomplete reports we have read so far, that distortions of revolutionary history had unfortunate effects in relation to old requirements as well? And don't we have to make a distinction between the changes of emphasis, on the one hand, which may alter our view of the past from one historical period to another, and actual misrepresentation of fact?

Of course, the Dulles contention that the Congress revealed the weakness' of the Socialist world is ridiculous. I certainly do not question Mr. Allen's characterization of the Congress as a "dynamic, bold, open-minded approach to all problems, old and new." But if the relation of force in the world has so changed as to make Soviet Communists reexamine themselves from a position of strength, cannot some of the strength and independent critical judgment rub off on the American left?

Ring Lardner, Jr.

Department of Urban Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, once again the President has demonstrated an appalling lack of understanding of the private enterprise system or what makes people tick.

The establishment of a new Cabinet post for urban affairs is not under any circumstances going to improve urban affairs. Our private economy operating at the local level can do this job far better than any bureaucrat or combination of bureaucrats directed out of Washington, fueled by money which must come from the same localities, since the Federal Government is broke.

Nor does the President's endeavor to enforce his will on the Congress by this reorganization plan come with particularly good grace after the Rules Committee rejected the establishment of such a new Government department. Nor do I believe the creation of a new Cabinet post, no matter how talented the new Cabinet head, will solve anything that cannot be done better at the local level.

This message, as in the case of so many from the White House, shows a complete lack of confidence in the initiative and ability of our people to do for themselves, and on the contrary shows complete confidence in the Federal Government being able to run the lives of the people. I reject this concept of the role of Federal Government in our lives. I happen to believe that people must be left free to improve their own home, their own neighborhood, their own schools, their own city as they see fit with their money, rather than having all this forced on them by the Federal Government using their money.

---

[5] The text and signers of the Open Letter to American Liberals may be found in the Communist-front publication, "Soviet Russia Today" dated March 1937.

Department of Labor To Train Tractor Operators in Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, recently one of my constituents, Mr. Merritt D. Hill, vice president and general manager, Tractor and Implement Division, Ford Motor Co., called my attention to a plan announced by the Department of Labor to train 1,200 farm tractor operators in Mississippi.

This plan, approved by Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg, calls for an 8-week training course costing $435,000 in Federal funds, in addition to administrative expenses. Covered would be 16 counties in the Yazoo Delta of Mississippi.

The Secretary of Labor, in his press release, expressed the hope that the training "would provide workers with year-round employment with daywork provided for members of the operator's family to help achieve rural family stability in the years ahead."

Mr. Hill wanted to save the Federal Government some money and possibly some time. So he suggested to the Secretary of Labor that the approximately 160 farm equipment dealers in the area covered in Mississippi be utilized at a minimum cost to the Federal Government.

He also questioned the necessity of an 8-week course of instruction on how to drive a tractor, as he stated that a high school boy, with car-driving ability, can master a tractor in less than a week.

Further, Mr. Hill pointed out that, using the Labor Department's own press release as a source for data, there simply are not enough tractors to go round for the men who already are tractor operators. An estimated 40,000 persons are now operating the 30,700 tractors in the Yazoo Delta area. The upgrading of 1,200 of these persons would seem to accomplish merely the displacement of 1,200 less well trained men, without any increase in the number of jobs.

In addition, Mr. Hill pointed out that there is now an excess of 9,300 persons at least partially trained in tractor operations for which tractors are not now available.

Mr. Hill offered to come to Washington, or to send one of his firm's experts to our Nation's Capital, to discuss this matter further with the Department of Labor and the Office of Education to see if more efficient training methods could be worked out in a cooperative venture with farm equipment companies, presumably at little or no cost to the Federal Government.

Since his letter to the Secretary of Labor more than 2 weeks ago, Mr. Hill has not as yet even received the courtesy of a reply.

It is too bad that some of the departments of our Federal Government are quick with the requests for information and can compile reams of statistics to justify their expenditures for the coming fiscal year, yet appear to be turning a cold shoulder to a plan which might save them some money, might make their training programs more effective, and which would provide excellent training with up-to-date equipment on the spot.

Secretary of Agriculture Demands Apology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the January 20 edition of the California Farmer contained a letter to the editor from Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and the editor's answer which I think the Members will find quite interesting:

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE DEMANDS APOLOGY

I have at hand the November 4 issue of the California Farmer, and the editorial entitled "Secretary Picks Up Powerful Enemies."

You are right—the packers and the chainstores are powerful enemies, but I would hope that you would agree if they are violating the law, they ought to be made to account for so doing. That such violations existed was disclosed by a very long and thorough investigation by this Department. They are now entitled to and will receive a detailed hearing.

I note your paragraph stating that Freeman acted in a sneaky way because the industry had been promised some kind of private hearing when field investigations were completed at the time the investigations began 2 years ago. You then went on to say that the Secretary violated his promise and smeared the charges all over the Nation through the daily press. Might I remind you that I have only been Secretary of Agriculture for 10 months, not 2 years, and at no time made any such agreement with the packers or chainstores?

Many of us disagree, and on occasion vigorously, as to policies. That a man keeps his word is, however, a very basic and fundamental thing. I have always made it a point to keep mine, and sometimes have resisted great pressure to do so. That you would personally charge me of violating my word, when obviously I have only been here for 10 months, is a piece of perfidy for which you ought to be not only ashamed but publicly apologize. I'll be waiting.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

Thanks, Mr. Secretary, for your letter of December 14. I know your life is particularly hectic, and unfortunately everything seems to be breaking over you during the Christmas season.

I recognize that you stepped into the toughest job in the Nation, second to that of the President, and one job for which there is not an immediate easy answer.

You object to the word sneaky, and I don't blame you, but the fact remains that as undisputed head of your Department you are responsible for everything that comes out of that Department, and I personally would consider it top major policy if I were attacking the Nation's biggest food processors and distributors.

As far as my information is concerned, I acknowledge that you personally did not make the agreement to confer with the packers before breaking the story of your findings, but I think my information is correct that important underlings of your Department did make such an agreement.

My own personal thought is that by stepping in and blasting this story to the press, you created a lot of unnecessary agony. You are either stupid, have poor liaison with your own Department, poor liaison with those you are attacking, or your own underlings have sabotaged you.

This reply is being written during the Christmas season, and I would like to add a personal note. I do apologize for calling you sneaky. I think that was a poor choice of words. I believe you have been sincere, but I am sorry to say in my opinion you have failed in a format of failure tried before you. My State of California is totaling up one of her richest agricultural years, and her biggest gains will be in those crops that are not controlled by the Federal Government. May the future be good to you.

Personal regards,

JACK T. PICKETT.

Brigham Young University Students' Success on the "College Bowl" Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, recently four students from my alma mater, Brigham Young University in Provo, Utah, have thrilled graduates, student body, and friends of the university with their success on the General Electric's "Quick Recall" program entitled "College Bowl."

The Brigham Young University College Bowl team, ably coached by Prof. Robert Thomas of the English department, had disposed of four worthy opponents, including the University of Maryland a week ago Sunday. Last Sunday they were up against an excellent team from little DePauw University, an outstanding small college from Greencastle, Ind. In an exciting game, Brigham Young University students were defeated in their attempt to win their fifth straight game and retire as undefeated champions in this national scholarship contest.

The Brigham Young University team was composed of Capt. Todd Britsch, who is majoring in political science and is an accomplished musician. Todd's father is a professor in the department of English at Brigham Young University and has provided an atmosphere of scholarship and love of fine arts in the

Britsch home. Todd's accomplishments include being a finalist in both the Fulbright and Danforth scholarship contests.

In addition to Todd Britsch, the Brigham Young University team is composed of Dave Stone, Bob Despain, and Mrs. JoJean Loflin, all of whom are outstanding students.

Dave Stone, who was born in Buenos Aires, Argentina, and educated in that country, is presently teaching Spanish and studying English at Brigham Young University.

Bob Despain planned to be an engineer and was studying this field at the California Institute of Technology. However, he soon found he was taking more English than engineering and was advised by one of his professors that Brigham Young University had one of the finest English departments in the West. So Bob Despain transferred to the Utah school.

The fourth member of the College Bowl team, Mrs. JoJean Loflin, is also a senior majoring in English. JoJean's mother was an English teacher and instilled the love of education in her outstanding daughter. Her earliest memories are of reciting poems like "America for Me" and "O Captain! My Captain!"

I am sure that yesterday was not a completely happy day in Provo, Utah, where the student body and townspeople were waiting to greet Brigham Young University's College Bowl team. Some of the glamor of the homecoming celebration was dimmed by their unexpected defeat at the hands of DePauw.

However, our pride in this fine team of young people remains justified, and I would merely remind them to always remember, "The smile when you win comes quick as a whip, but the smile when you lose, that is sportsmanship."

Re United Nations Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, few messages have come from the White House with which I was more in disagreement than the request for the United States to authorize and appropriate up to $100 million for the purchase of United Nations bonds.

Inasmuch as I have introduced a resolution demanding that the United States withdraw from the United Nations, I am in complete disagreement with any further subsidy to the United Nations.

The reasons are manifold and self-evident. Any earlier hope or dreams on our part have long been shattered by a union of nations that seems more bent on destroying freedom and the leader of the free world, the United States, than for any other purpose. This can be proven, to my satisfaction at least, by a simple recitation of the actions taken by the United Nations over recent months, indeed over the years since its inauguration.

The Fourth "R": Red Challenge to American Education, a WSBT-TV Public Affairs Program, South Bend, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the passage by the House of Representatives on January 30, 1962, of H.R. 8900, the bill to provide loans and grants to colleges and universities for the construction of academic facilities is a long step ahead for higher education in the United States. Because this legislation is now being acted upon by Congress, I believe that Members will find relevant the observations of three distinguished American educators with whom it was recently my privilege to appear on a public affairs television program produced by station WSBT-TV in South Bend, Ind.

The panelists were: Dr. Frederick L. Hovde, president of Purdue University; Prof. Paul C. Rosenbloom, of the University of Minnesota, who has been an outstanding contributor to the effort to revise and improve the teaching of mathematics in our schools; and Dr. George Shuster, a noted historian and former president of Hunter College, who is now a special assistant to the president of the University of Notre Dame, the Reverend Theodore Hesburgh.

The moderator of the program was Mr. Harry Kevorkian, of the news bureau of WSBT-TV.

This program entitled, "The Fourth 'R': Red Challenge to American Education," was produced in South Bend following a panel discussion which was arranged there by the Advisory Group on Higher Education of the House Education and Labor Committee.

The transcript of the program follows:

THE FOURTH "R": RED CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN EDUCATION

Mr. KEVORKIAN. The launching of the first Russian sputnik a few years ago, say some educators, was the best thing that could have happened to American education, and now a congressional study group, made up mostly of Congresmen, just returned from a Russian tour, is considering recommendations for legislation which would strengthen American higher education especially in science and technology. The advisory group was formed by the chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. "Concentration by Communists on scientific education," he said, "makes it essential that Congress take action in this field." With us to discuss the potentialities of such a study are Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS, Third District of Indiana, who is chairman of the advisory group; the president of Purdue University, Frederick L. Hovde, a scientist in his own right; professor of mathematics from the University of Minnesota, Paul C. Rosenbloom; and George Shuster, special assistant to Notre Dame president, Rev. Theodore Hesburgh. Dr. Shuster is former president of Hunter College of New York, a historian and considered a leading Catholic educator. To start off, we will ask Congressman BRADEMAS to give us some background of the study group and what they hope to accomplish.

MEETINGS WITH EDUCATORS

Representative BRADEMAS. Harry, the purpose of our bipartisan advisory group on higher education which is composed of five members of the House Education and Labor Committee, is to look into what needs to be done at the next session of Congress, which begins in January, as you know, toward strengthening the universities and colleges of the United States. Our job is to come up with specific legislative proposals; and in order to do this job, members of our group are consulting with outstanding educators from the Midwest and will also be meeting in Washington, D.C., with educators from other parts of the Nation.

Mr. KEVORKIAN. What bearing will your Russian tour have on your considerations?

Representative BRADEMAS. All I can say is, as one person who had a chance recently to see the Russian school system, that I am convinced that the Soviet commitment to education is the fact that they are working very hard at education and they put a great deal of their emphasis on science and technology. This means that we in the United States have to do far more than we have been doing to strengthen our resources for higher education, not only to meet the Soviet challenge, but also because we have to meet the needs of our own economy and our own society.

Mr. KEVORKIAN. I wonder—is it generally agreed among the educators that to strengthen the higher education of America is vital to our national security, Mr. Hovde?

Dr. HOVDE. Well, I think, of course, it has been proved through two world wars, and the subject of history after World War II was over, that the scientific strength of the nation is one of the principal elements with respect to its total security; but science also has a role to play in winning the peace, it seems to me, because the needs of the whole world and people everywhere can be best answered by the application of science and technology to the benefit of people everywhere, provided the people of the world are wise enough to do it. Science has its role to play in solving some of the great problems that not only divide men but also have plagued men for centuries. So the payoff is going to be great if we know how to do it.

Mr. KEVORKIAN. Dr. Shuster, speaking as a Catholic educator, how do you view this?

PREPARING FOR PEACE

Dr. SHUSTER. Well, I think that it is perfectly obvious that in the normal process of human evolution higher education has come to assume an importance which it never had before. The college laboratory, library, classroom is the little red schoolhouse of 75 years ago. This is true the world over. We can neither be prepared for peace, as Dr. Hovde said, nor for war or for whatever may lie between, unless we have met this problem squarely face to face. I myself am much more impressed with developments in Western Europe than I am with those in the Soviet Union. I think that this represents for us the major industrial and intellectual challenge; and, as for my part, I would like to see us be prepared to meet it amicably.

Mr. KEVORKIAN. Then it is a challenge economically or culturally and not necessarily with a power that may want to take us over, when you refer to West Germany as opposed to the Soviet Union.

Dr. Shuster. I think the whole of the emerging new Western Europe. Everything as represented by the Common Market, etc., offers just as much of a challenge to Russia as it does to us, if we say that the first thing we have to do is to prepare for war, I would agree; but we shall all hope that the war doesn't come and, therefore, in the meantime, we ought to focus on preparing for the future, which is as much, I trust, a matter of living into a magnificent new future as it is a momentary halt in the scheme of amity.

Mr. Kevorkian. Professor Rosenbloom, would you like to add to this?

THE ECONOMIC MACHINE

Professor Rosenbloom. Well, certainly one has to be prepared militarily. Still in Khrushchev's addressing the 21st Party Congress, he explained that they would bury us in terms of swamping us economically by 1975 and one of the main elements in this is that he thinks that they can make their decisions from the top while setting up a much more efficient economic machine much faster than we can by 1965 and he is talking about an economic system in which they will have 10 scientists and engineers to every production worker.

Mr. Kevorkian. That brings up a question in my mind—we have heard so much about the missile gap. Do we or will we have an education gap unless we move ahead quickly?

Professor Rosenbloom. Well, of course, this commitment that Congressman Brademas mentioned goes far back—as far back as Lenin's Diaries of 1922, about the necessity for improving the status of the teacher at every level and see to it that, no matter how well the rest of the population fares, the teacher should be well paid, well housed, and have the material comforts of life.

Dr. Shuster. Was this all predicated on the assumption that the teacher was to teach communism only?

Professor Rosenbloom. No, he was looking at the relation between literacy and productivity.

Mr. Kevorkian. To get to our study at hand now, in relation to the legislation which might come out of Congress next year—is there a general agreement among the educators as to what is needed—the number of facilities, the number of teachers, and how much should be spent, Mr. Hovde?

AGREEMENT ON NEEDS

Dr. Hovde. I can say that there is only one area in which you would find almost universal agreement, in the realm of higher education, and that is that a higher educational plan consisting of public and private institutions of all types and kinds must have the facilities to take care of the students that are coming into the institutions during the remaining years of this decade. By 1964 and 1965, this oncoming flood of students from our high schools will reach proportions and will pose problems of admission the like of which we have never seen in our higher educational system before and facilities are required and needed, and they must be started now—we can't delay any longer because it takes 2 to 3 years to plan and build a building and put it on stream, so to speak, and so the highest priority and the highest urgency now, on which there is almost universal agreement, public, State, private, philanthropy, and so on, to build the necessary plan to take the necessary care of the youngsters that come along, and the thesis behind it is a very simple one—we want the opportunity for advanced education of all types and kinds for our youngsters of today, just as we had it when we were young.

Mr. Kevorkian. Congressman Brademas, since there appears to be this agreement, at least on the need for facilities, would this make it politically feasible to get at least that much through?

Representative Brademas. My own judgment is that it will. Indeed, one of the hopeful things that we are talking about—this advisory group on higher education, as I see it—is that there is considerable bipartisan agreement on the part of Members of Congress of both sides of the aisle for Federal support for strengthening the facilities of universities and colleges. For example, on our five member group, there are three Democrats and two Republicans, and I know I am accurate in saying that all five of us, regardless of our parties, support Federal funds in the form of either grants or loans or some combination thereof to the colleges and universities of the country to build academic facilities. At the present time, I think it is interesting to note that colleges and universities can borrow funds from the Federal Government to build housing facilities, dormitories, and dining halls; however, the other need, as President Hovde pointed out, is terrific in the field of libraries, classrooms, and laboratories.

BIPARTISAN

Mr. Kevorkian. I know you are in the early part of your considerations—is there any working figure you have as far as the size of the package in terms of money?

Representative Brademas. Well, let me say this, we have not resolved on what the sum ought to be, but we have some guidelines because, last year, in our committee—the Education and Labor Committee—we favorably reported out with bipartisan support a bill introduced by Congresswoman Green of Oregon, that would have provided over a period of 5 years, if my memory is correct, a sum of $300 million, part of that money to be in the form of loans to colleges and universities for academic facilities and the rest of the money to be in the form of grants to be matched by the colleges and universities. So that gives you some idea of the size of a package that is so seriously considered that it has already been favorably reported by a congressional committee.

Dr. Hovde. But that sum of $300 million is a drop in the bucket, John. I think Mr. Kevorkian wants to know the magnitude of the facilities needed to equip our institutions to take care of a doubling of our total college population by 1970. This has been studied. I think a careful report was made and an examination of this problem was made several years ago and I think the bill is in the billions of dollars, all the money required of all sources.

Mr. Kevorkian. The Council for Financial Aid to Education puts out these figures: that the full enrollment of college students in 1960 was 3.6 million, and, in 10 years—1970—it would be 6.4 million. They propose or say that what we need is $500 million a year for each of those 10 years.

Representative Brademas. I might say that a few days ago a commission for the study of higher education in the South—in the southern part of the United States alone—came out with a report that said that southern colleges and universities would have to spend $2.9 billion a year over the next 10 years, or at least by 1970, if they were going to meet their needs—in the South alone—now, I would be glad to support the funds that we require to do the job, but, of course, we in Congress have to dwell in the world of reality and there many pressures on our Government for funds, defense and all the rest, so we have to be careful about how much money we spend. We would be glad to get as much support as possible. I'll say that.

THREE QUESTIONS

Mr. Kevorkian. I think that we have come up to three important questions with the money that might go out—it is the usual one of, will there be strings—and will there be Federal control with the outlay of Federal money—will we again have the issue over loans or grants to private or parochial schools as we did in the last session and the usual bugaboo of civil rights and segregation of the South. Considering those three problems, how could you overcome them and what are chances for higher education in the next session?

Representative Brademas. Let me make a point on one of the issues—the religious issue—and then maybe Dr. Rosenbloom wants to say something about the issue of control, or someone else. There is a lengthy tradition of Federal support for universities and colleges in the United States, regardless of the denominational religious ties. Now there are historical reasons for this, but the fact of the matter is that Notre Dame and Goshen College—one a Roman Catholic, one a Mennonite College—here in this congressional district have both received Federal support either in the form of scholarships or direct research grants and so on, and there has been no serious questioning of this, and I, for one, would expect to support continuation of this very American tradition.

Mr. Kevorkian. Professor Rosenbloom.

Professor Rosenbloom. There are a number of mechanisms already existing in the Federal Government for such Federal aid without Federal control in ways which benefit the general population, no matter what kind of institution the money is granted to. For example, here at Notre Dame and at Purdue, we have summer programs for inservice education of high school teachers with the Federal grants—essentially, the Federal Government does not tell you what you should do—whether you should have such a program or if so, what you should teach in such a program. You have to make a proposal to the National Science Foundation, saying what you want to do. You compete openly on the basis of merit with institutions from all over the country, and, since you do have among the best programs of that kind, you get the money in preference to some others.

Mr. Kevorkian. Dr. Shuster, will you add anything to that, speaking as a Catholic educator?

NO DISPUTE

Dr. Shuster. Well, I am not going to speak as a Catholic educator, but I would rather speak against a background of a long period in municipal education. Insofar as Federal grants to higher education are concerned, nobody has ever raised a question as to whether they are to go to religious schools, to public schools, to private schools, and I don't think anybody would like you to do so and the reason for that is a simple one—we have, in the United States, over a period of years, developed frank and full and cordial relationships between all segments and sectors of higher education and I think if anybody began to discriminate against one part of our show, the rest of us would rise in protest against the discrimination. This is a magnificent achievement for which America does not always give higher education sufficient credit.

Representative Brademas. Dr. Hovde, I would be interested in your reaction on this Federal control problem. Your institution is one that has received some of that Federal money.

Dr. Hovde. Well, of course historically, Purdue University grew out of the Federal act; namely, the Morrill Act, which we celebrate its 100th birthday, so one can say that, while Purdue University is a State public institution, it had its birth in the Federal act and, of course, we have received moneys for specific programs, particularly in the field of agricultural research and agricultural extension work. Direct appropriations from the Federal Government for many, many years and one can say that the Federal support of these programs has been an unqualified success because, in the technology and science of agriculture, we do lead the world and will continue to do so. In all these years, there has never been, to my knowledge, any kind of Federal control which controls the nature of the teaching, the program, the projects that we worked on, and so forth, and the results have been worth every dollar that has been spent in terms of our being able now to feed our people with only 13 percent of our people on farms. In fact, we have an economy of plenty. This is our problem, rather than the other. In this whole field of Federal aid to education, I can say that there has been no kind of Federal control that is deleterious in any way. Now, one must always admit that, where the money comes from, you have a responsibility to that source and the recipients of Federal money will have a responsibility to our people and our Government in carrying out the general objectives for which the money is named. This is a requirement based on the private institution as well as the public one.

Mr. Kevorkian. Would you agree with that, Dr. Shuster?

POLITICAL LIMITATIONS

Dr. Shuster. Yes. I think I would like to, if I may, add something to what Dr. Hovde said. Just in order to make the situation clear—there are certain things that grow out of Federal assistance to education, which we must accept. For example, insofar as the National Science Foundation is concerned, it cannot make a grant for study in the fields of religion, race, or sex. These are political limitations which are placed on the Federal Government for action in the first place. Once these limitations are announced, in my judgment, there has never been a single instance in which the Federal Government tried to deviate from these things.

Representative Brademas. I might add that it is likely that in legislation that we devise, you can't use any Federal funds to build a chapel or something of that sort.

Mr. Kevorkian. Well, from this area of agreement, I would like to go on to another field, as our time is running short. What about strengthening or aiding high school curriculum leading toward college classwork, especially in science and technology? Are you looking into that also?

Representative Brademas. Yes, we are. And we gave a lot of time to that problem in our panel discussions. The other day in South Bend I talked to a high school principal and he told me that he had just finished talking with one of his chemistry teachers, who just got back from one of the summer institutes sponsored by Federal funds for improving the quality of teachers in science, and this teacher said, "I should not have been permitted to teach chemistry for the last 15 years." He was that far out of date. I think we hope to help improve curriculum course content. We hope to undertake some kind of program that will give teachers a chance to improve their knowledge of what is going on right now in the sciences. I think you've got one of the top experts in the United States in Dr. Rosenbloom here on this subject, so I will defer to him.

NEEDS AND PROGRAMS

Professor Rosenbloom. Well, in the science and mathematics in the schools right now, I think existing Federal programs, at most, would have to be changed qualitatively to handle what needs to be done, except with respect to the undergraduate education of science and mathematics teachers. Here is one area in which existing programs do not take care of the needs. You are going to have to experiment with the kinds of support that you can give to programs to produce more and better teachers of science and mathematics than we now produce. The existing programs on training of teachers are mostly remedial programs for the teachers we already have. On curriculum, existing Federal mechanisms right now can take care of most of the needs in science and mathematics except, as I said, possibly for the amount of money. The most urgent thing that we need, however, is corresponding activities to be going on in the social sciences and the humanities. According to a conference that we held a couple of months ago, the biggest gap seems to be in the social sciences and in the arts.

Representative Brademas. Dr. Shuster smiled at that point.

Mr. Kevorkian. The emphasis on your charge from your chairman is to look into science and technology. Are we going to ignore or disregard the humanities? Should we not encourage philosophers?

Representative Brademas. Yes; I agree that we should; and you put your finger on one of the most difficult problems of all of us as legislators. The emphasis is on science and technology. The National Defense Education Act was passed with a basis of science and technology. This is one I think that will continue to bubble along in this country. Dr. Shuster is a great representative of the humanists and I think he may have something on that.

Dr. Shuster. Well, may I relate a little anecdote. I went to Egypt, came to a temple which was built by Egyptian engineers more than 4,000 years ago. There is, in process, a modern engineering development which will raise this temple 200 feet. That is, pick up the whole mountain and raise it up. Now, if you have an engineering world in which there is no humanity, you have only the second, and I think this is worthy even of the attention of the Congress.

RELEVANCE TO DEFENSE

Professor Rosenbloom. Well, if you want to relate it to national defense, I think I can refer you to Jeremiah and Ezra. One of the things Jeremiah recommended was for national defense. He recommended to circumcise the heart. He recommended to inscribe the law in the soul of each person, and then you have, in Ezra, the practical implementation of this program, by taking literally the words in Dueteronomy, "to teach these words which I command thee this day shall be a part of thy heart and thou shall teach them diligently unto thy children." Each parents responsibility for knowing the law and teaching it to his children.

Mr. Kevorkian. You think something will change in your recommendations as far as toward the humanities?

Representative Brademas. I hope very much that what we do in Congress next year will conduce to the strengthening not only of science and technology in our colleges and universities but to the strengthening of the humanities. The scientists and technologists can perhaps help blow the world apart but it takes the humanists to put it back together again.

Mr. Kevorkian. We will be very interested in seeing how all of this turns out. Thank you, Congressman Brademas, President Hovde of Purdue, Professor Rosenbloom of the University of Minnesota, and Dr. Shuster of Notre Dame.

President Asked To Declare Mobile County a Disaster Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. **BOYKIN**. Mr. Speaker, I have just received an urgent communication from my good friend, Charlie Brockway, the county agent for Mobile, Ala. He has informed me that many of the nurserymen in the First Congressional District were recently hard hit by the freezing weather.

As an example, Mr. Tom Dodd, Jr., of Semmes, Ala., who is one of our larger and more successful nurserymen in the State, has suffered a tremendous loss. This loss is estimated between $300,000 and $500,000. Mr. Dodd employs an average of 100 men per day. But this is only an example.

These men are going to need help to make a comeback from the tremendous losses they have suffered. Mr. Speaker, with the disastrous situation at hand, I urge the President to declare Mobile County a disaster area for this tremendous hardship caused by the recent freeze.

The One-Way Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. **DENT**. Mr. Speaker, the new tariff proposal is now official. It means giving the State Department full power over all import restrictions.

In essence it will eliminate all American tariffs and pave the road for our entry into the Common Market.

The Common Market is the first step to a new nation to be called Euramerica. The drums are already beating for the new country. We will hear more about this just as soon as the new tariff-cutting plan gets underway.

It is logical, because this new tariff plan is a face saver for the disastrous 4-year extension on the trade agreements voted under Eisenhower. The Democrats are being asked to bail out the last administration's trade policies.

The next step will be to use the failure of this present plan to sell the Common Market approach.

It is the old story, when your promise does not hold up, make new ones.

This statement I can make from the testimony in my possession. It takes $3 worth of exports to equal $1 worth of imports in wages in the pockets of American workers and in dollars in the domestic marketplace.

I believe any across-the-board tariff cutting powers, any further reduction in congressional authority in the field of tariffs and customs, any long-term extension of even the present Trade Agreements Act will weaken our economy and in the end, will prove the most disastrous action by Congress in our generation.

I say this without restraint or apology, even in the face of contrary positions by almost every academician, professor, advertising agency, international lawyer, theoretician, political leader, big business, big labor, and big press. Why do I say this and feel so strongly about it? Simply because of our history in trade matters, our present plight after 27 years of tariff cutting from an overall of about 50 percent on dutiable goods to 11 percent, from my own congressional district's experience, from my experience of over 25 years of active legislative work, starting with my chairmanship 26 years ago of a committee from the Pennsylvania General Assembly which studied the flight of industry from Pennsylvania. This committee learned as any other committee has and will learn if it does a thorough job of study and research that, simply put, trade is a commercial venture, goods for trade will be produced in the area of lowest cost production and will be sold in the area of highest prices and greatest consumption.

This is an economic fact and no amount of academic language can hide this when the question before us is the problem of job opportunity, investment, and profit. Most other considerations of the trade problem stem from persons and groups, some sincere, some theoretical, who are convinced that trade is peace, trade is diplomacy, trade is profit, and trade is something the ordinary citizen does not comprehend. It is a great political issue for keeping the people from considering too seriously their problems stemming from chronic unemployment, reduced workweeks, and the feast-and-famine economy of the last decade.

At this very moment, with the great upsurge in our economy in steel, autos, and other production lines, you can sell anything to the American public, the press, and the Congress. However, very few persons in this country will predict a continuing prosperity. When anybody is bold enough—outside of the soothsayers of the Economic Council, State Department, and other Government agencies—to predict a growing economy with any assurance, the following restrictions and ifs are included in the prediction:

First. If there is no steel strike or major work stoppage on the part of the unions.

Second. If we hold the wage and price line.

Third. If industry will modernize, increase production without increasing costs. At this point, you will note the exact opposite position taken by President Roosevelt during the depression. We curtailed production to give consumption and purchasing power a chance to meet production. Today we are forgetting consumption of our production and demanding more production under the misguided theory that we can undersell our foreign competitors in their own markets as well as our own.

Fourth. If we can maintain Government spending at somewhere near the 30 percent of our national product. Without this, our trade balance would be more realistic.

Fifth. If we increase our exports and decrease our imports. This is the dream of all dreams.

Sixth. If we have confidence and let loose of our consumer dollars. This is what our parents were told in the late 1920's and then were humiliated because they had not saved for the rainy day.

These are but a few of the "ifs" that are always put into predictions for tomorrow's successful economic comeback. Frankly, if all the above conditions are met, the best we can achieve is the status quo. There is no room for growth. Unless the wage and profit economy expand with our production of goods, consumption will fall away, and the roots of recession will start sprouting all over again.

I have not touched on the most vital of all the issues that accompany the free trade program being promoted by the State planners for Congress to act upon. This is the area of foreign investment. In a newsletter a few years ago, I predicted the very situation that is now admitted by the same group who fought me when I opposed the Boggs bill (H.R. 5) and who are now opposing me again in my fight against the new trade bill for across-the-board tariff cuts.

I said then that the only reason any American corporation or individual would build overseas would be for profit. I said then that the more investment abroad the more profit, and the harder it would be for Americans to protect our own domestic market, our jobs, our industries, and our way of life. Can any person honestly say I was wrong then or that I am wrong now when I say that foreign investment will be the straw that will break the camel's back in foreign good will and our domestic economy. Most of today's leaders admit to the danger to our economy by foreign investments; few, if any, admit to the danger to our international prestige.

I said, and repeat, that the exploitation of foreign workers would sow the seeds of distrust, revolution, and hatred of the American people. Need anyone review the events to date, the universal appeal of "Go home Yank," of the mobs. They have not yet articulated the battle cry of the militant American labor leaders who fought valiantly and courageously against slave wages, long hours, slums, epidemics, and exploitation of the American worker by the greedy exploiters. Until they do their wage levels will be a threat to American jobs.

Let us take a look at some figures that tell a story that will haunt this administration and the American people unless the President of these United States does what he is capable of, and I believe courageous enough to do. Stop the sowing of seeds of hatred and the exploitation of the very peoples we are spending ourselves poor to help, by a small segment of the American investors.

Here are the figures that should scare every American who knows the depth of the feelings of people who work for exploiters and whose produce is taken without fair compensation. American investments as against incomes from the three investing areas. Latest figures, 1960.

WESTERN EUROPE

Investments, $1,322 million. Income returned to United States, $427 million. Income flowing back to United States, only $1 out of $3 because Western Europe was considered safe investment climate and the rest of profits poured back into expansion, new facilities, and expense accounts.

UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS

Investment, $608 million. Income taken out, $1,474 million. Investors taking no chances. They know the history of Cuba, Mexico, and so forth, on expropriation; so they take all they can out of these countries.

LATIN AMERICA

Investment, $500 million. Income taken out, $770 million. This does not include earnings held back for expansion. Foreign securities with extremely high dividend rates and of moneys loaned at exorbitant rates of interest; in some cases as high as 2 percent per month.

The 6-year totals show that this is about the normal profit of foreign investors.

WESTERN EUROPE

Investments, $5,141 million. Income returned to United States, $2,261 million.

UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS

Investment, $5,552 million. Income taken out, $8,794 million.

LATIN AMERICA

Investment, $3,057 million. Income taken out, $4,379 million.

How long would any American labor union, Congress, or any administration sit still allowing any American production facility an earnings ratio anywhere near the above examples of our friendly aid to friendly nations. Are we helping the underdeveloped areas or are we exploiting them.

The reason we have the demand for a lowering of trade barriers is because our American investors abroad have to sell in the market to make such enormous profits, either directly or indirectly. Not only are we exploiting the foreign worker with our payment of wages from 10 to 30 percent of the going average American wage, but we are exploiting the American economy by underselling the 96 percent of the nonexporting American firms whose higher wages maintain the American consumer economy.

While the State Department talks about good will and containment of communism, let us see what one business executive is quoted as saying in summing up the foreign investment policy.

> It's the opportunity to make big profits that gets us over there, it's a market decision for the great majority of us, not a tax decision (hearing records of Congress on Impact of Imports).

Bluntly put, this means exactly what I have been preaching, exploitation of low wage production, a free American market, exorbitant profits, and the devil take the hindmost. In this case, it can very well be the American unions, American small industry, and, yes, even the Democratic Party.

When a man loses his job he does not often look up a dead mule's throat to see what killed it. Frankly, there is little difference in our approach to the trade and aid programs of the Republican administrations. We may have new slogans and some new faces, but we are doing the same things and for the same peoples.

The public may take the same view as the polly parrot, after spending many years as a pet in a public dancehall, was loaned to a society matron as atmosphere for a private society dance. Looking the crowd over, the wise old bird commented rather wryly, "new girls, same guys."

How long can we face up to the Castros if we go into a nation for the sole purpose of taking out big profits. How can these nations' little people ever become self-sufficient if we put in $1 and take out $2. How can we answer Castros when they point to the low wages paid by American enterprise abroad which, in many cases, are negotiated before the investments are made.

I had a visitor not too long ago, a highly placed labor leader in a European country, who bluntly told me:

> Your American plants in our country are no help to our aims for a higher share of the profits of industry. They make deals, backed by the government and our own manufacturers' groups, guaranteeing not to raise wages above the domestic industries' scales. They give the local industries the leverage to keep us in line. They not only agree on wage terms, but they join the cartel's controlling prices and markets.
>
> Personally, I'm here on a tour of your industries as a guest of the State Department. I came to your office because I've read of your trade fight. One thing you can be sure of, the average workers in my country can't buy our own products, let alone your high cost imports.
>
> You will never undersell us in our market, even if we remove all tariffs. In the first place, do you think your own American enterprises that own so many of our facilities are going to close down to let your domestic plants ship into our market?

At this point, I asked him if our money was needed for development of their economy. His reply rather startled me. He said:

> No. Absolutely no. There are enough rich people in our country to create any production facility we need. They hide their money, one way or another, and use your money. Why, even today, our investments in other countries may equal the investments Americans are putting in our country. You see, Mr. Congressman, it's easier to take exorbitant profits from a foreign country and to exploit a foreign worker than it is in your own country. In my opinion, the wage level of the American will be lowered long before the European wage level is raised.

Much more was said, but one thing I learned that worries me no end. Are we Americans going to be the goats in this international profits race? We are told by the promoters of free trade that unless we join up with the Common Market we are doomed. Nothing could be more idiotic and economically unsound than to tie our high economy up with the European low economy in a free market.

Even our planners admit this because, at this moment, they are setting aside Common Market entry until a future date. I predict that the across-the-board program will not succeed and its very failure will be used as the excuse for demands for entry into the Common Market. When we do join, and unless the American people look at the trees instead of the forest we will join, how then do we treat Latin America, Far East, Near East, Africa, Asia, and Canada.

When we hear of the great potential of the European Common Market because of its lure for expanding sales and profits we fail to consider one very important fact. Wiping out all tariffs between the European market and the United States will not increase our opportunities one-tenth of what we increase the foreign producers' chances in our own market.

We are told that Common Market potential is great because of 300 million consumers, an unsaturated market for cars, radios, and major appliances. What assurance do we have that American enterprise will manufacture these items in the comparatively high wage economy of the United States for shipment to the European market rather than in the European market itself and lacking a protective policy in America, what will stop these same products from coming back to the United States. The Common Market is and will be a protective market. We know or should have known that much when we created it.

Facts show that in most cases of an exporting-importing firm in the United States that has foreign production facilities, their exports to foreign markets are going down while their imports are going up. Back as far as 1954, over 30 percent of all imports into the United States were produced with American backing. Today, no one will give an estimate because if the truth were known, the new trade pact would die aborning. If all we need for prosperity are large markets based upon population, maybe somebody ought to count the people in Red China and Russia.

Because of our open invitation to come one, come all, into our marketplace, every nation seems intent upon working out its own salvation at the expense of our own economy. We have tried being all things to all peoples, and it is paying off in distrust, embargoes, restrictions, double dealing, false promises and above all an utter disregard of our sometimes unsound, but always "noble" intentions.

Look, for instance, at these items gathered from 1 day's mail, and news media:

> Developing countries turn to U.S. research for aid in attracting foreign investments.
>
> Agriculture is offering new incentives for foreign investors—50 percent tax cut for new investments.
>
> U.S. banks helping new business get under way in developing countries.

In essence, these are the "noble" ventures and our high aims exemplified by our policies which all countries are happy about.

However, let us see how they treat us after we have fulfilled our promissory notes of good will and development help.

> Brazil's Chamber of Deputies has delivered a staggering blow to foreign investors. A recent bill cuts drastically the amount of profit to be taken out of Brazil (100 percent), and (20 percent) withdrawal of capital investments in any one year.
>
> U.S. business community shocked, predicting end of foreign companies in Brazil. Penalties range from confiscation of property to prison terms. On top of this, foreign businessmen are barred from raising money locally.
>
> Mexico just recently barred more American cars from the Mexican market and tariff protection for domestic industries reaches as high as 100 percent ad valorem on American imports.
>
> Canada wants more drilling equipment to be manufactured in Canada. Protection is promised to local manufacturers against foreign imports. Wants U.S. companies to license plants within Canada rather than American production being shipped.

Wonder where the freetraders will increase their exports under these arrangements?

> U.S. firms losing orders worth millions. They are out-financed by European competitors.

U.S. business executive says:

> We helped Europe recover, now they have financial reserves. They are giving deals we can't hope to meet.

In fairness, the freetraders ought to explain how we build our exports under these conditions without more Government spending and guarantees.

> Indies Investment Center in New York has 27 industrial proposals to offer U.S. investors.
>
> U.S. Steel, G.E., Westinghouse, Koppers, and others competing for Pakistan's steel development.

How do we export more steel to Pakistan after we build a new steel facility, or do we buy steel from Pakistan to give dollars to pay off the American investor?

Businessmen are told they must sell more abroad. In fact, we have got the "old E" back again; this time it stands for exports. This is necessary because when the American people learn that only 4 percent of American employers are exporters, while 96 percent of the U.S. firms operate within our economy they may not be able to sell the big lie that an export trade makes millions of jobs while imports only replace a few hundred thousand workers.

It seems we are shifting our emphasis from the five pillars of support for our economy: Domestic investment, employment, production, consumption, and profits, to an economy based upon foreign trade, loans at interest and nonreturned foreign profits. When told to export more, one question needs to be answered. How? By subsidies, of course; we export more cotton, wheat, tobacco, and so forth, because we subsidize against the world market price.

With European wage rates about 30 percent of ours, lower taxes, depreciation allowances giving leeway for the most modern production facilities obtainable, with trade walls going higher against imports and suckering the United States into lowering trade walls on their exports, the American exporter is going to have a tougher and tougher job ahead. Average wage of eight European countries, fringes and all, 85 cents an hour, American rate on the same basis is $2.96 an hour.

No one who has studied the 27-year record of our free trade agreements has illusions about what kind of tariff cuts the Common Market will agree to. They will cut tariffs on what they sell and increase or hold the line on products they buy. That, Mr. Speaker, is the real reason for the demand by the agents of foreign countries and exporters and others, for across-the-board tariff cut powers. If they win, then the people will be told that Common Market and United States agree to a 20 percent—or any other figure—flat cut across the board without spelling out the items—or worse, use a basket category.

I have seen some of the proposed cuts and one will mean cutting tariffs on automobiles, but raising customs on machine tools and certain types of finished steel and aluminum. The across-the-board program ignores every concept of economic law, whether it is domestic or international. This is pointed out in a speech made by Secretary Goldberg to the AFL–CIO convention in December.

> There cannot be a single wage policy in the United States. That is perfectly clear. All employers do not begin from the same position or enjoy the same abilities to provide wage increases or have the same success in earning profits.

If this is true and I agree with Goldberg, how then can he or anyone else argue for across-the-board tariff cuts. Do not the same conditions exist? Are not all employers on a different base in their ability to compete with external competitors for markets, the same as they are for wages internally?

It seems either shortsighted, politically inspired, or completely ignorant of the historical economic facts to deny any American industry or its workers a day in court by establishing across-the-board tariff cuts without regard to the "ability to provide wage increases or to earning profits," to quote Mr. Goldberg.

That this fact is recognized even by the proponents of this new so-called broad—sometimes mistaken for bold—approach to tariffs and trade, let us look at recent remarks of the chief spokesman for the new policy, Under Secretary of State George W. Ball.

He said that if we are going to give development capital to underdeveloped nations, it will be necessary for us to help them market their produce. Their work will be mostly in the primary industries like textiles, mining, and light manufacture. Advanced nations like the United States should willingly abandon these industries to the underdeveloped nations, though textiles is our second largest employer. Of course, our Government would have to compensate our abandoned industries, and help transfer them to new activities. Fortunately the machinery for such Federal intervention in industrial new activities and growth has already been voted by Congress in the area redevelopment bill. The Federal Government can now create depressed areas to its heart's content, and buy off the opposition of industry, labor, and local government officials with its development assistance for Americans.

Under Secretary Ball's earlier statement leaves no doubt of the goal—the United States is to give up its economic boundaries and let itself be merged with the world economy, without any ability to protect itself, except through aid provided from Washington.

He asked specifically that the President be given authority, as follows:

> 1. Strike much broader and more ambitious bargains with other governments. No more product-by-product agreements which are too easily followed by Americans.
>
> 2. Direct negotiations with areas, like Latin America.
>
> 3. Federal aid for industries and areas hit by the proposed tariff reductions.

Some of us living in the depressed areas of Pennsylvania and West Virginia would like to know why our distressed areas have not been given new industries, retrained workers, and the prosperity we are promised if we pass this legislation and get hurt by imports. In our areas, we are hurt.

I know that I make myself the target for charges of isolationism, protectionism, and reactionism. I have been labeled by one newspaper as a profile of protectionism. I do not mind and I will admit to some of the charges. I want every American worker to be given the same type of protection we provide for workers in cotton, wheat, peanuts, and so forth. I believe that a glass worker has a right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. In my book, happiness comes from doing the kind of work you like best and feel best suited to, not as in West Virginia's retraining program where coal miners, glass workers, leather tanners, and so forth were being retrained as gas station operators, typists, and waiters on tables.

It has been said that it is isolationism to fight for a coal miner's right to dig coal rather than to let the oil companies make more money importing fuel oil, giving cheaper fuel to New England. If this is true, then why should the West Virginian and Pennsylvanian buy New England products instead of buying shoes, shirts, and small tools from Japan when they sell cheaper than New England products?

There are many protectionists in America. Most of them would fight a lot more viciously than a glassworker if Congress attempted to wipe out State lines in the practice of law, medicine, accounting, insurance, and other protected interests and jobs. These same persons are not only protected by local and State laws, but have a Federal protection against overcrowding of their job opportunities by the Immigration Act. What is the difference in having a high tariff in the form of an immigration embargo on people as against the importation of that person's production?

Does any American believe that we can have free trade without free movement of people? Already the drums are beating for special treatment for special skills and the lowering of work restrictions between nations. In fact, if I believed in free trade, I would demand free immigration at the same time. The one without the other will never achieve the aims of the freetraders, one market, one economy, and in essence, one world.

In my hearings I noted that few persons came forth as witnesses for lower tariffs except those whose personal incomes were influenced or traced directly or indirectly to foreign sources. I have looked over some of the lists of foreign agents and representatives.

In this fight, some of us are going to be forced to fight under very difficult circumstances. I, for one, do not look with pleasure upon the prospect of differing with my President or my political party leaders.

I would be tempted to give up the fight except that the unemployed in my district are very real and very worried. If the cures offered for injuries caused by imports to both industry and labor have any value, then let the proponents prove it before we vote.

If subsidies to industry and retraining workers can take care of the areas distressed by imports, why have not these projects been started. Do it now—prove its value, put the unemployed back to work. I can assure you that if this is done and our people and our economy can better be served by the free trade movement in this year of our Lord, 1962, I shall be the first to take the pledge and vote for the whole venture.

We have 6 months, name the new industries to be created, create them, retrain the displaced worker for his new job, and give him or her the job. This is the only honest thing to do. If it can be done later, why not now.

I close with one prayer, whatever we do, we must do for the good of our country first. First, I am an American; second, I am anything they want to call me.

A Report to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

A REPORT TO MY CONSTITUENTS ON WORK ACCOMPLISHED FOR 1961

Your continued faith and support have caused me to become chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, 1 of the 20 committees in the House of Representatives, U.S. Congress.

My chairmanship (1) represents the results of united voting strength; (2) extends to you, my constituents, your most powerful Federal influence; (3) gives forceful and effective expression of minority problems to the Federal legislative process.

The power and influence of my office has been used, in addition to regular duties, to (1) express your feelings and demands concerning all Federal legislation in the vital areas of education and labor; and (2) declare your discontent with all conditions that deny you the rights of full citizenship.

LET'S LOOK AT THE RECORD

Specific accomplishments in the area of equality in employment and education

Investigations and hearings conducted by the Committee on Education and Labor have revealed that equal opportunities in education and employment are vital to the development of America and indispensable to the economic survival of the Negro and Puerto Rican.

Among the key accomplishments of my committee in this area are:

In Government

1. After investigation and hearing by my committee, the U.S. Department of Labor, District of Columbia Apprenticeship Training Council admitted that each application on file for apprenticeship training were coded to reflect the racial identity of the applicant. As a result of this disclosure the Secretary

of Labor immediately abolished this system of recording.

2. After our investigation of the National Guard, the Pentagon, Washington, D.C., it was revealed that of the 86 officers assigned to the Bureau, there were no Negroes.

The Committee received assurance from the Assistant Secretary of Defense that, "There is no question but that you can be assured that Negro officers will be in the National Guard very shortly pursuant to my direction."

Following this communication and as a direct result of my investigation three Negro officers were assigned to the National Guard Bureau.

3. Upon receipt of a complaint of racial discrimination against Negro employees in the civilian branch of the U.S. Army in Paris, France, the committee dispatched a team to investigate the matter. The investigation revealed that a Negro civilian had received a notice of dismissal and procedures had been instituted to effectuate same.

As a result of the committee's intervention, the employee has been relocated with a promotion.

4. During the course of FEPC hearings by the committee, a representative of the NAACP testified as to discriminatory actions by the State employment office located in Dallas, Tex. Upon receipt of the testimony, and during the course of the hearings, I dispatched a team of investigators to Dallas, Tex., who confirmed the allegation made at the hearing. An order was immediately issued by the State employment agency in Texas terminating the discriminatory practices.

5. On November 29, 1961, I addressed a letter to the President of the United States, stating, "After almost 1 year of trying to work out this problem with the Pentagon, I must now appeal to you. Members of the Defense Establishment continue to use not only the question of the individual's race, but also the race of his spouse. Repeated objections by me have met with no success."

On December 13, 1961, I received a reply from Alfred B. Ditt, Deputy Under Secretary (Manpower) stating "the requirement that a married service school applicant state his wife's race, if different from his own, will be dropped."

In industry

1. The Harlem liquor dispute had been the source of deep tension between the liquor industry and the Harlem community for the past 15 years. Unsuccessful efforts were made in the past by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the State Committee Against Discrimination, the Commission on Inter-Group Relations, the New York State Liquor Authority, the Urban League, and the courts.

As a direct result of my entrance into the matter the dispute was settled on January 4, 1962. The settlement provided for an additional $15 million in gross sales and over $400,000 in commissions to Negro salesmen.

2. The committee caused the reemployment of 260 workers (Negro and white) by the Interstate Container Corp., New York City, after committee investigation revealed that the discharge had been unreasonable.

3. The committee's investigation revealed unfair treatment and other abuses involving migratory laborers by crew leaders in Riverhead, Long Island, New York City, and Glassboro, N.J.

I forwarded letters to Governor Meyner of New Jersey and Governor Rockefeller of New York. In addition, our findings were filed with the NAACP and SCAD.

The New York State Employment Service advised the committee that this condition would not reoccur and that a close scrutiny of all migratory labor camps under their jurisdiction would be maintained.

4. The investigation of the committee revealed that the Aluminum Corp. of America and its subsidiary, Wear-Ever, Inc., discriminated in its hiring policy as to race by refusing to employ Negro salesmen. It was further revealed that the company would not sell to Negroes on deferred credit or budget terms, irrespective of their credit rating.

Through the efforts of the committee, the company announced that as of January 12, 1962, the company hired its first Negro salesman and discontinued is discriminatory credit policy.

In unions

1. Investigation and intervention by the committee led to the acceptance of two Negro carpenters by Local 2710, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, New York City. Prior to the admission of the two Negroes, only one other Negro had ever belonged to the local.

2. Investigation and intervention by the committee caused the acceptance of a Negro youth into apprenticeship training by the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Washington, D.C., after the applicant had repeatedly failed to gain admittance on his own initiative.

3. The committee effectuated the admission that the New York State employment office had committed negligence in causing 33 Puerto Rican migrant workers to be paid less than the proper wage in Virginia and further caused the workers to be subjected to substandard living conditions.

4. After investigation and hearing, it was revealed that the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York conducted a pattern of discrimination in hiring and promotion with respect to Negroes.

This revelation caused the company to announce a new policy granting equality in employment and the introduction of a program to train Negro executives within the company.

FEPC bill

The Committee on Education and Labor is now working on a fair employment practices bill, with the widest scope and most effective enforcement provisions ever introduced in the House of Representatives. This bill prohibits discrimination on the part of labor unions, employers, and employment agencies on account of race, color, creed, or age.

Jobs and salaries

The Committee on Education and Labor is comprised of an integrated professional staff, including educators, lawyers, and specialists conversant with the problems of minorities.

The committee staff of 48 employees had a 1961 payroll of $412,000.

On my personal staff the total 1961 payroll was $47,149.77.

I have secured approximately 45 appointments in various agencies in the city of New York, with a total payroll of approximately $125,000.

Key Negro appointees in the Kennedy administration from New York City

Through my efforts 11 persons from the city of New York received top level appointments in the Kennedy administration with salaries totaling $115,000.

Throughout the Nation

As of September 1961, over 65 Negroes had been appointed to positions ranging from $10,000 to $20,000 a year. A leading official in the Democratic Party involved in these appointments stated: "Adam Powell has played a key part in every one of these appointments."

General legislation

In 1961 my committee reported 23 bills to the House. Of these, 12 became law. This represented a greater volume of bills within an 8-month period than the previous committee reported in the 10 preceding years.

Your stake in key bills

reported by the committee, passed by Congress, and signed into law by the President was:

Salary

1. The first minimum wage legislation since 1938, establishing a minimum wage of $1.25 an hour, and extending coverage to thousands of employees. If you were in this group, your salary was raised.

Our children

2. The Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Act authorized $30 million over a 3-year period, to establish a program for the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency.

Education

3. (a) A new teaching hospital for Howard University. This bill which became law on September 22, 1961, transferred Freedman's Hospital to Howard University. This bill also authorized construction and remodeling to provide a modern hospital with a capacity of 500 beds.

(b) The extension of the National Defense Education Act. Among other things this act provided for: (1) loans to talented and needy college students; (2) Federal financial assistance to States in order to acquire equipment and facilities to promote education in science, mathematics, and modern foreign language.

(c) Extension of aid to Federal-impacted areas. This extended the current law which provides assistance to school districts which are burdened by new or increased Federal activities, such as defense and military projects.

Investigative task force

I have created an investigative task force directly under my jurisdiction with offices located at Foley Square, New York, and in Washington, D.C. The duty of this task force is to investigate discrimination and irregularities in Government, labor, and industry.

To date this task force has received over 2,000 telephone complaints and over 1,000 personal complaints.

In order to more effectively combat the forces of discrimination I have provided space in the committee's New York office for representatives of the New York State Committee Against Discrimination, the National Labor Relations Board, the Wage and Hour Division of the U.S. Department of Labor, and the Bureau of Labor-Management reports. Thus, in New York City for the first time a complainant has access to four distinct agencies, Federal and State working cooperatively to hear his grievance.

The One-Way Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, recently I spoke before a group of Americans interested in all facets of our trade problem.

I drew from testimony and information supplied in the main by Mr. Danny Danenberg of the Western Growers Association for facts relating to the basic problems of agriculture and foreign trade as well as observations on the general welfare.

Following is the main part of this address:

Because I am a public official, I trust that you will not accept this as a speech but, rather, as an extended statement regarding a preservation of a way of life, a way of life that has brought more good things to more people than any other way of life that has ever been conceived. Now let me remind you that the key word is "survival" because these are indeed sobering times.

It is with natural dismay that I note that Government releases for the period ending December 15, 1961, report the lowest farm parity ratio in 22 years. Representing many farmers, I am beginning to wonder if low prices are not closely related to the destruction of our free enterprise system here in America. As I ponder over that situation, I pray with you here today that none of us will see the fall of our free enterprise system and the important role that free American agriculture has played with "freedom of choice" in endowing upon us the highest living standards and made us the leading nation in the free world.

I believe that you will agree that we are in national unity dedicated to these principles. When I say unity, I do not mean unity for the sake of unity—I mean unity between Democrats and Republicans, and Catholics, Protestants and Jews, and labor and management and the poor and the rich. I further mean unity behind a program of determination that all men are entitled to the blessings and opportunities that only a free society can offer. So, as such, we not only have unity of purpose, but we have national unity in their preservation and a willingness to work mightily for this preservation.

The American business community has thrived on free and open competition; and the American business and agriculture community is perfectly willing to invest its money and take its risk, provided it is allowed to enjoy equal opportunity and fair competition. This has not been possible because a posse of planners that carry over from administration to administration set rules of theory which are inadequate and introduce many additional complications, regardless of which political administration is in power.

When this posse of planners argue reciprocal trade, they argue "trade, not aid." When they want to put across foreign aid, they argue, "aid, not trade." When they are confronted with damage to American labor, American agriculture, and American industry by large-volume imports from low-wage-paying nations under the deceptive name of reciprocal trade, they rally to the defense by more Federal meddling and more Federal subsidies. Their motives are their business, but I do say that the time has come when we must fully examine the record because it is a one-way street, and the cure they offer is much worse than the disease.

COMPETITION

The American agricultural and industrial community has thrived on free and open competition. We, at the same time, recognize that the concept of a free market also requires the need for affording reasonable incentives and protection against invisible and uncontrollable conditions and that these incentives and protections should come from realistic policies concerning foreign imports. This implies that in the vital area concerning foreign trade agreements and tariffs, there must be a reexamination and a placing on a truly reciprocal basis.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

That the trade agreements are reciprocal in nature is theoretically true but in practice is translated to numerous instances where foreign countries have nullified concessions granted to us, i.e., tariff reduction, by limiting imports by other methods such as exchanged controls, import licenses, and import quotas. Even today one of the free trading nations, which has a low tariff, restricts imports by simply setting a limit to the amount that may be imported and refusing to grant the exchange for additional imports beyond a set quantity. While European countries also reduce their tariffs, they also resort to other devices to limit imports. A complete review of Agricultural Handbook No. 132, published by the Foreign Agricultural Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, on the subject "Agricultural Policies of Foreign Governments," is a 141-page book which reviews trade policies on agriculture throughout the world, and is an example of proof that reciprocal trade does not exist and that various protective devices are used.

Because of the mistaken notion that our trade policies aid agriculture, I propose to examine the statistical "hocus-pocus" on agricultural exports.

The contention that agricultural exports during the past fiscal year 1960–61 reached record proportions at $4.9 billion; and that 78 percent of this was sent to countries with which we made trade agreements; while imports of competitive agricultural products amounted to $1.8 billion, needs some reexamination. The $4.9 billion export figure is official and need not be questioned. However, in a publication of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, "The Demand and Price Situation," for August 1961, page 9, stated that about 60 percent of these exports received some form of Government assistance. This consisted of outright subsidies such as those that apply to our exports of wheat and cotton of which we exported over $2 million in 1960; outright grants (gifts), etc. Only 40 percent of the total was sold for dollars with no governmental assistance. This part of our agricultural exports was slightly below the previous year.

To attribute our agricultural exports and specifically their expansion to the benefits of the trade agreements program is, of course, wholly unjustified in view of the pertinent factors as above stated. Actually, the need for subsidation in order to export is proof that the trade agreements have not opened foreign markets to our farm productions; we do not have reciprocal trade on agriculture; quite the contrary. Only our subsidies have succeeded in doing that.

Our imports of agricultural commodities are classified by the U.S. Department of Agriculture as supplementary or complimentary. The complimentary imports are those that do not compete with domestic farm products—examples: coffee, tea, crude rubber, cocoa, etc. These are all free of duty. Nevertheless, importation of these products gives the foreign countries dollars with which to buy our products. Once again, the trade agreements program has nothing to do with these products because we have no tariff on these imports.

RECIPROCAL TRADE IN AGRICULTURE AND SUBSIDIES

The above stated that in fiscal year 1961 there was duty-free imports of $1.8 billion, which should give rise to exports of a like volume by supplying other industries with the necessary dollars. This should therefore be deducted from the $4.9 billion of exports for fiscal year 1961, if we seek to determine the influence of our trade agreements program. The export figure then would come to $3.1 billion.

It further stands to reason that this surplus of exports would not have occurred without the subsidation to which we have resorted. The cost of the wheat and cotton subsidies between them come to more than $550 million in 1960. Before we subsidized the exports of raw cotton our foreign market was fading rapidly. Our average exports of cotton from 1950–52 was 5 million bales per year. In 1956 these exports dropped to 2,214,000 bales. Then we began to subsidize the rate of 6 cents per pound in 1957. Exports jumped to 7,598,000 bales. This was followed by another drop in 1958–59 to 3,129,000 bales. On August 1, 1959, we increased the subsidy from 6 cents per pound to 8 cents. Exports again responded. In 1960, our exports leaped back to the 7 million bale level.

What did our trade agreements have to do with this? Nothing. Our record agricultural exports are the result purely and simply of our subsidation and governmental assistance. As recently as fiscal year 1958–59, our agricultural imports exceeded exports by $300 million. Imports were $4 billion; exports $3.7 billion. It is safe to say that the increase in exports has been the direct result of heavier subsidies and other governmental assistance. Witness the U.S. Department of Agriculture report already quoted; namely, "the proportion of unassisted dollar sales was slightly below the previous year," referring to fiscal year 1961 over fiscal year 1960.

ESCAPE-CLAUSE RELIEF

The biggest fraud of all upon a slumbering Congress and an uninformed people is the escape-clause relief fiction. The statement that any concession granted in negotiations is subject to the further safeguarding procedures of the escape clause under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Act when it can be shown that economic injury from imports to domestic producers has resulted from the negotiated tariff reduction ignores the record under the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act regardless of which political administration has been in power. Since its inception in 1947, the record shows that the odds are almost 10 to 1 against getting relief under this procedure. The Tariff Commission itself has failed to find serious injury in 70 cases out of 110. The White House turned down 27 of the remaining cases coming to it from the Tariff Commission with a recommendation for a higher duty. This left 13 cases on which some affirmative action was taken. A summary of investigations on agriculture productions is provided below as initiated under section 7, Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, 1956–60:

Year, commodity, and results:

Garlic, 1957: Escape-clause relief not granted.

Red fescue, 1959: Escape-clause relief not granted.

Lamb, mutton, sheep, 1960: Escape-clause relief not granted.

Cantaloup, 1961: Escape-clause relief not granted.

Watermelons, 1961: Escape-clause relief not granted.

In 1961, the cantaloupes and watermelon growers, assisted by the California Department of Agriculture, presented two very strong cases before the U.S. Tariff Commission for relief from these excessive imports. Although, beyond any reasonable doubt, serious injury was proved, the Commission, consistent with policy, granted no relief and denied the petitions as stated above. It is extremely interesting to note that Congressman BAILEY of West Virginia, the author of the escape clause, stated in Congress on April 27, 1961, and I quote: "Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that the escape clause has been virtually sabotaged by its administration. It has been twisted almost beyond recognition. Its purpose, which is to give relief when a tariff reduction backfires, seems to be forgotten or ignored. Congress has legislated to no avail. We should take a long look before we again entrust the executive with so much power; and we should also pay more attention to the treatment given the laws we pass here by the agencies set up by us to administer them, especially if the executive branch is not in sympathy with the objective of the particular law."

To this every Member of Congress should add a sincere "amen."

EXPORT VALUES AND FOREIGN VALUES

In October 1961 a report by the Nationwide Committee on Export and Import Policy covering the subject of "Import Competition Employment," covered this subject very well by stating, "In weighing these trade statistics we should keep before us the fact that the import values are foreign values, i.e., the sales choice to our importers exclusive of duty, ocean freight, marine insurance, etc. This fact tends to shrink the impact of imports in terms of man-hours required to produce them. For example, in 1960, our imports of shirts were valued at $14 million. What did this mean? What are $14 million dollars worth of shirts? How many shirts? In this country, it would mean 7 to 9 million shirts at factory prices. How many employees would be needed to make that many shirts? But wait. The imports were not 7 million or 9 million shirts, but 24 million. At our value, they would have represented $36 to $48 million. Innumerable other examples could be given. In terms of man-hours required to produce the 1960 imports of $14.6 billion, exports of perhaps triple that value would be required to balance the account."

Is it farfetched fantasy to state that the Nation with the highest economy in the world can fairly compete with foreign producing areas having the advantage of low tariffs and wages often 10 to 20 times less than our American industry. This type of competition poses a real serious problem and one which has been created, whereby these foreign imports result in oversupply and destroy the marketplace. This is not only a serious economic problem for industry, but is one with which labor certainly has a self-interest in as well. I have not argued in the past, nor do I argue now that our labor costs are too high. In preference to this, I would rather say that it is the extremely low wages in the foreign producing areas which have advanced this problem.

In August of 1961, the USDA in Bulletin No. DPS–80 issued the following release. This is important because the hope of the proponents of this destructive legislation cannot win unless the farm members are completely and purposely broadminded:

"Agricultural exports moved abroad at record volume during the fiscal year ending June 30. At $4.9 billion, exports were about 9 percent above the previous year."

"Roughly three-fifths of these exports received some form of Government assistance. A little over 30 percent moved under Public Law 480 and the Mutual Security Act. A somewhat smaller proportion represented assisted dollar exports, receiving subsidies in cash or kind, or sold from CCC stocks below domestic market prices (about 1 percent moved under short-term dollar credits). All wheat and cotton and the major proportion of rice and dairy products were subject to Government assistance. The remaining 40 percent of agricultural exports sold for dollars with no direct Government assistance. In this category are exports of most livestock products, soybeans, tobacco and horticultural products. The proportion of unassisted dollar sales was slightly below the previous year.

Foreign aid, in the form of agricultural commodities or loans, grants and credits of foreign currencies deriving from their sale, represented about two-fifths of the aggregate value of gross economic aid extended by the United States during the past year.

I say there is no farm problem as such; this sounds fantastic, but if the American farmer were permitted to raise and market a major part of the food and fiber that is consumed by the American people, we don't have acres enough today to produce it. The problem is that State Department officials are enticing agricultural imports into this country which have created an agricultural surplus. Permit me to explain briefly what I mean: The ratio of U.S. agricultural exports reached $4.9 billion in 1960, an alltime high and accounted for one-fourth of U.S. exports. Imports are just about in balance with exports; so the experts say that the American farmer is exporting as much as is being imported, but let's look at a few facts.

1. Approximately three-fifths of all agricultural exports included in the export total are very heavily subsidized, such as wheat at 60 cents per bushel, cotton at 8 cents per pound, or were exchanged for foreign currency, or were completely given away to foreign nations under the provisions of Public Law 480. Thus, only about 40 percent of our agricultural exports are sold under a commercial basis, and the 60 percent balance move on some subsidy, grant, loan or give-away basis.

2. During the past 10 years, farm support programs have cost the American taxpayer $26 billion. During the same period, we imported agricultural products valued at $42 billion. While this was going on, we piled up in Government storage 1.1 billion bushels of wheat, 1.4 million bushels of corn, 2.6 million pounds of tobacco, and about 336 million pounds of butter, cheese, and dried milk.

3. The bulk of the feed grains, other than that in Government storage today, has been imported. Our disappearance of feed grains over the past 10 years has been greater than our production, yet, we, as taxpayers, are paying some $20 million a year to store what is termed "surplus" feed grains. It is surplus, to be sure, but not a surplus created by the overproduction of the American farmer. It is "created" by imports. Although my district is considered industrial, my 20-odd years in the Pennsylvania Senate taught me the importance of agriculture to the "common good."

FOREIGN TRADE—FAIR TRADE

Now, if we are to meet Soviet competition in the free world, we can only do it with an economy that is safe and sound. We need international trade, but we must be more selective. Foreign trade should be fair trade. Let us buy much more of the things we do not make, but which we need or can use. We, in Congress, want a good, well-balanced foreign trade and foreign relations policy without leaving American agriculture, American labor, or American industry as sitting ducks at home. May I also add: There is no good or sound reason why American labor, agriculture, and industry, which is in trouble over imports, should not have a logical remedy that will save its industry and safeguard the jobs of our workers in accordance with the American standard of living.

FREE ENTERPRISE FACTS

Foreign policy

From July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1960, the United States has made available to foreign nations a sum of nearly $86 billion in various types of foreign assistance, grants, and loans. We shall make available an estimated $5 billion in fiscal year 1961 for a total of nearly $91 billion. After all types of repayment and returns of grants have been considered, by June 30, 1962, our net foreign assistance program will represent the astronomical sum of $86.5 billion. Such a staggering sum of money is virtually impossible to comprehend.

National debt

This is not a forum to discuss the political existence of some of the economic decisions which are involved. We must be realistic though, and realize that this great Nation is accumulating a national debt which is approaching $300 billion—a figure, incidentally, which is larger than all of the combined national debts of all the nations of the world since the beginning of recorded history.

Foreign policy and trade agreements

There is every indication, as the years go by, that the American economy will be forced to compete with the state-controlled economy of the Soviet Union in many areas of the world. American business can only participate in such competition as it is allowed to grow and expand. The vital area of our foreign policy which has been commingled with trade agreements and tariffs must be reexamined and placed on a truly reciprocal basis if American industry is to compete, not only with our opponents, but also with our friends. The subject of reciprocal trade as it particularly relates to agriculture has been fully stated in a separate part of this report.

In the areas of produce, manufacturing, wages, marketing, research and taxes, we must comment on Government programs which will assist our economy in expanding or which, conversely, will cause it to contract. Under all circumstances, any Government action promoting business stability and growth benefits the Nation as well as industry. Government action, on the other hand, that causes business and industry growth to contract, certainly undermines our economic strength and tends to choke off employment as well as the source of tax revenue on which the Government's own manifold programs depend. We, therefore, feel that there are certain areas which require evaluation because they do have a direct and vital impact upon the free enterprise subject as a whole.

In considering the above problem, I am greatly concerned relative to the impact that foreign competition is having upon American labor, industry and agriculture. I feel that the above observation emphasizes that we, in industry, recognize this as a mutual problem, and as such, a very strong relationship exists in our national economy between the wheels of agriculture, labor and industry. We feel that our self interest is best served by having a vital interest in the factors relating to American labor and employment. This implies that we have strong feelings regarding the fact that trade is a two-way street between labor and industry. We fully recognize that in the marketplace, they represent our consuming public. By the same token, recognition must also be given to the fact that industrial labor and the farmers are the largest purchasers of what American industry and American labor produce. When you find farm income down 25 percent, declining steel production, textile mills shut down, industrial unemployment and depressed areas, it certainly is time to conscientiously call attention to the impact of foreign imports upon our economy. I respectfully request that the significance of this problem be fully recognized, because certainly there is no good or sound reason why American labor, American industry and American agriculture, which are in trouble over imports, should not have a logical remedy that will save its industry and safeguard the jobs of our workers in accordance with our American standard of living.

In concluding, I would like to state my personal economic philosophy as it relates to our free enterprise concept of economic well being:

THE NATION'S ECONOMY RESTS UPON FIVE PILLARS

1. Investment: Without investment, there can be no production.

2. Production: Without production, there can be no payrolls.

3. Payrolls: Without payrolls, there can be no consumption.

4. Consumption: Without consumption, there can be no profit.

5. Profit: Without profit, there can be no investment, and there the cycle starts all over again.

SENATE

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Joseph A. Mason, D.D. minister, Grace Methodist Church, Pekin, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, father of us all, who art the source of all wisdom and the fount of all understanding, we seek Thy presence now, before facing the tasks of this day. Before we grapple with the problems that beset us and the decisions that challenge us, we would pause in quiet confidence to invoke Thy blessings upon the Senate of the United States and upon each of its Members.

Give us grace, O God, to seek Thy will in all decisions and deliberations; keep us ever at tasks too hard for us, that we may be driven to Thee for strength. We may falter, O God, unless Thou dost uphold us; may Thy hand be upon each Member of this great body, to guide, strengthen, and sustain.

As free Americans, we thank Thee for the blessings of liberty and opportunity and justice which are ours; make us worthy of our great heritage, we pray, and keep us true in the responsibilities which are ours. Prosper all counsels which make for the maintenance of rightful and abiding peace; and direct the course of the world in the ways of justice and righteousness.

Endow all who are assembled here with a purity of purpose, and ever enable them to rise above all self-seeking and party zeal, into the larger concerns of public good and human brotherhood. May what they say and do here today and in the days to come remain ever in tribute to their honor and judgment, and grant that they—being devoted to their country—may ever be defended by Thy power, through Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 30, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON U.S. AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACTIVITIES, 1961—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 324)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 206(b) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, I transmit herewith a report for the calendar year 1961, on this Nation's aeronautics and space activities.

During 1961, major attention was devoted to establishing our policy objective of space leadership and to accelerating our efforts toward achieving that objective.

In my message to the Congress on May 25, 1961, I stated that a leading role in space achievements may well hold the key to this country's future. That I reaffirm. Last year, we made necessary decisions and, with the support of the Congress, stepped up the pace of performance. Even greater strides must be made in the coming months and years, and thus the recommended budget which I submitted to the Congress earlier this month contains requests for funds for the fiscal year 1963 space program, totaling $5.5 billion, an increase of $2.4 billion over fiscal year 1962 and $3.7 billion over fiscal year 1961.

It is the policy of the United States that activities in space be devoted to peaceful purposes, and during 1961 we made significant progress in that regard. Such progress included space projects to help keep the peace and space projects to increase man's well-being in peace.

In summary form, the accompanying report indicates the contributions of the various departments and agencies of the Government to a national space program.

John F. Kennedy.

The White House, *January 31, 1962.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 8900) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

The bill (H.R. 8900) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection with the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in order that there may be a clear understanding in regard to the business of the Senate today, following the morning hour, let me say that at 2 p.m. there will be a vote, as previously ordered, on the question of confirmation of the nomination of John A. McCone to be Director of Central Intelligence.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct; under the agreement previously entered into, at 2 p.m. there will be a vote on the McCone nomination.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Reapportionment of Appropriations

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that certain appropriations had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Estimate of Appropriations for Reimbursement of Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund

A letter from the Deputy Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, an estimate of appropriations necessary to reimburse the civil service retirement and disability fund for the amounts paid out of that fund, for the fiscal year 1963; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report of Attorney General on Review of Voluntary Agreements and Programs

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on a review of voluntary agreements and programs, as of November 9, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on Aviation War Risk Insurance

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on aviation war risk insurance, as of December 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Balance Sheet of Potomac Electric Power Co.

A letter from the President, Potomac Electric Power Co., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a balance sheet of that company, as of December 31, 1961 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report of D.C. Transit System, Inc.

A letter from the vice president and comptroller, D.C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, D.C., requesting an extension of time in which to file a report of that company; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report of Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

A letter from the Executive Director, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, dated January 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Amendment of Section 216, Title 38, United States Code, Relating to Prosthetic Research in Veterans' Administration

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 216 of title 38, United States Code, relating to prosthetic research in the Veterans' Administration (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Report on Positions Established in Grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18

A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions established in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18, for the calendar year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF MISSISSIPPI LEGISLATURE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Legislature of the State of Mississippi recently adopted House Concurrent Resolution No. 5 commending the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, for having issued the Department's new regulation authorizing the cotton farmer more freedom and flexibility in skip-row planting.

I would like to take this occasion to add my personal word of appreciation to Secretary Freeman and his Department for promulgating this regulation and assure the Senate that the action will be of great benefit to the cotton industry of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 5

Concurrent resolution commending the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, for having issued the Department's new regulation authorizing the cotton farmer more freedom and flexibility in skip-row planting, and to express appreciation to Mississippi's congressional delegation for their cooperation and assistance in this policy change

Whereas the U.S. Department of Agriculture did, by order of the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, issue its new regulation authorizing cotton farmers to plant their cotton acreage in the manner best suited to each individual operation; and

Whereas the new skip-row regulation, by its constructive action in liberalizing the plant patterns to permit more efficient use of land and equipment under the most suitable method, would allow farmers to average higher yields, better use of equipment, and lower the unit cost per pound of cotton; and

Whereas this new policy of the national administration is welcomed by agricultural groups and farmers' associations as a major step to aid the cotton farmer in his cost-price squeeze and thereby stimulate the overall economy of cotton-producing States and the entire Nation; and

Whereas Senators James O. Eastland and John C. Stennis, Congressmen Thomas G. Abernethy, Jamie L. Whitten, Frank E. Smith, John Bell Williams, Arthur Winstead, and William M. Colmer, in addition to the Delta Council, Farm Bureau Federation, and various other individuals have been of great assistance and encouragement to Secretary Freeman in the adoption of the eased planting regulation believed to be a boost to Mississippi's economy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the State Senate concurring therein), That we do hereby commend the Honorable Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman for his wisdom, cooperation, and forthright demonstrative evidence of his and the national administration's keen interest in farm problems and cotton farmers' plight in their ever-increasing cost-price squeeze and marketing problems; and be it further

Resolved, That the Mississippi Legislature also express its profound appreciation to the entire congressional delegation from the State of Mississippi; and be it further

Resolved, That enrolled copies of the resolution be forwarded the Honorable Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Senators James O. Eastland and John C. Stennis, and U.S. Representatives Thomas G. Abernethy, Jamie L. Whitten, Frank E. Smith, John Bell Williams, Arthur Winstead, and William M. Colmer.

Adopted by the house of representatives January 4, 1962.

Walter Sillers,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate January 15, 1962.

Paul B. Johnson,
President of the Senate.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS OF MISSISSIPPI LEGISLATURE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], and myself, I present, for appropriate reference, two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, and ask that they be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolutions were appropriately referred, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 101

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the United States to authorize Mississippi's new $14 million Veterans' Administration hospital and center to be named in honor of our late Congressman John Elliott Rankin, of Tupelo, Miss., ardent champion of veterans legislation

"Whereas the State of Mississippi has on several prior occasions by legislative resolutions and statute, and State Building Commission action, overwhelmingly supported, in cooperation with the State congressional delegation, the local and national officers of the Veterans' Administration, Jackson Chamber of Commerce, and congressionally chartered veterans organizations, the construction of a modern Veterans' Administration hospital and regional office in Jackson, Miss.; and

"Whereas pursuant to the aforesaid united efforts of these groups and organizations, and general public endorsement, this new facility has been built and will be occupied this month after many years' unselfish and patriotic service; and

"Whereas official minutes of all three veterans organizations in the State of Mississippi have heretofore endorsed both the construction of this magnificent hospital facility in Jackson, Miss., and the Honorable John E. Rankin for his long tenure in Congress as a militant champion and author of most worthwhile veterans legislation including education and training, insured home and farm loans, hospitalization and rehabilitation benefits; and

"Whereas one of these veterans groups, the Disabled American Veterans, did at its executive committee meeting held in Jackson on December 2, 1961, adopt a resolution requesting this new VA hospital to be named the John E. Rankin Veterans' Administration Center as an everlasting tribute to this great Congressman who served with patriotic fervor and militant courage from 1921 to 1953; and

"Whereas the worthy veterans legislation authorized and enacted by the keen mind, parliamentary skill, and unswerving dedication to duty of this great soldier, prosecuting attorney, Congressman, and public servant has been proven nationwide as the greatest investment of its kind the Congress has ever enacted; and

"Whereas Congressman John E. Rankin departed this life on November 26, 1960, and that the enactment of this resolution and the full attainment of the objectives therein set out is only a small token of the respect and tribute the Nation's veterans and the public generally have for this former dean of Mississippi's congressional delegation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Mississippi State Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein)*, That we do hereby memorialize the Congress and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the United States, to name the new Veterans' Administration hospital and center in Jackson, Miss., in honor of the late Honorable John Elliott Rankin, former chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the Congress; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be furnished the widow and daughter of Congressman Rankin, to each member of Mississippi's congressional delegation, to Hon. John S. Gleason, Jr., Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the United States, the Honorable Walter R. Byrd, manager of the VA's regional office in Mississippi, and to the Capitol press corps.

"Adopted by the senate, January 2, 1962.

"Paul B. Johnson,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Adopted by the house of representatives, January 4, 1962.

"Walter Sillers,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*"

To the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 104

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Special Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of the U.S. Senate to conduct a full and complete investigation into the reported censorship and muzzling of America's military leaders, particularly in their efforts to alert their troops and the public to the menace of the worldwide Communist conspiracy

"Whereas the Mississippi Legislature realizes that the chief threat to the security of the State of Mississippi as a sovereign State and of the United States of America as a sovereign nation is posed by the worldwide Communist conspiracy, whose agents are engaged in subversive activities, both internally and externally, to the detriment of our State and Nation; and

"Whereas it is apparent that certain of our country's military leaders have been hampered and rebuked for their efforts to alert troops in their command, and the public generally, to the dangers of Communist subversion, to the extent that one patriotic general officer saw fit to resign his commission rather than submit to continued muzzling and censorship; and

"Whereas we are greatly alarmed and deeply concerned at recent statements attributed to persons in positions of national leadership to the effect that the American people have little, if any, need to be alerted to the menace of the cold war; and

"Whereas to the contrary, we are convinced that the American public must have an understanding of our Nation's problems and policies, in order that the public may communicate its wishes to our national leadership, which in our free society must remain responsive to the wishes of the electorate; and

"Whereas it is our sincere belief that the vast majority of the people of Mississippi, and of the United States, are opposed to the censorship and muzzling of our military leaders in their sincere and patriotic efforts to alert Americans to the dangers of communism; and

"Whereas it has come to our attention that a Special Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of the U.S. Senate has been designated to investigate such censorship and muzzling of the military, under the able chairmanship of the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi, the Honorable JOHN C. STENNIS; and

"Whereas we have further learned that the aforementioned Special Preparedness Subcommittee plans to conduct hearings on the aforesaid subject in the near future: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Mississippi State Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein)*, That the Mississippi Legislature does hereby memorialize said Special Preparedness Subcommittee to conduct a full, complete, and open investigation of this most serious matter, which has a far-reaching impact on our national security and on our continued existence as a free people; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we urge the Special Preparedness Subcommittee to leave no stone unturned in its effort to determine those responsible for the censorship and muzzling of our military leaders, and to make their names known to the American people, without regard to partisan political advantage; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Mississippi Legislature does hereby go on record expressing confidence in the ability of the American people to make correct decisions on matters of important national policy, once the people are informed, and provided that no effort is made by our national leadership to hide the facts from the people to whom they are ultimately accountable; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the chairman of the Special Preparedness Subcommittee, to the senior Senator from Mississippi, to the Representatives in Congress from Mississippi, and to the press.

"Adopted by the senate January 15, 1962.

"PAUL B. JOHNSON,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Adopted by the house of representatives January 18, 1962.

"WALTER SILLERS,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*"

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JORDAN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 235. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ an additional clerical assistant (Rept. No. 1156);

S. Res. 236. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate the postal service and civil service systems (Rept. No. 1157); and

S. Res. 273. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (Rept. No. 1159).

By Mr. JORDAN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without additional amendment:

S. Res. 251. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Commerce to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction, and providing funds therefor (Rept. No. 1158).

By Mr. JORDAN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 268. Resolution authorizing a study of matters pertaining to the revision and codification of the statutes of the United States (Rept. No. 1161); and

S. Res. 276. Resolution to provide additional funds for the study of matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency (Rept. No. 1162).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 160. A bill for the relief of Thomas O. Tate, Jr. (Rept. No. 1163);

S. 1273. A bill for the relief of John Dae Kim (Rept. No. 1164);

S. 1499. A bill for the relief of William John Campbell McCaughey (Rept. No. 1165);

S. 1520. A bill for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Sidor Polkowska (Rept. No. 1166);

S. 1684. A bill for the relief of Merle K Loessin (Rept. No. 1167);

S. 1756. A bill for the relief of the city of Pasco, Wash. (Rept. No. 1168);

S. 2018. A bill for the relief of Robert B. Kasparek, Robert M. Kearney, Richard A. Stokes, J. R. Whitehouse, Jr., and Herbert A. Wolff, Jr. (Rept. No. 1169);

S. 2155. A bill for the relief of Stephen Patrick House, Ellen Myra Rachel House, Thomas Stephen Rendall House, and Jane Ellen House (Rept. No. 1170);

H.R. 2147. An act for the relief of Kenneth Stultz (Rept. No. 1174);

H.R. 2973. An act for the relief of Anthony Robert Lowry (Antonio Piantadosi) (Rept. No. 1175);

H.R. 3710. An act for the relief of Giles L. Matthews (Rept. No. 1176);

H.R. 4194. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ann W. Edwards (Rept. No. 1177);

H.R. 4211. An act for the relief of Alessandro Bottero (Rept. No. 1178);

H.R. 4280. An Act for the relief of Dimitri Elias Sartan (Rept. No. 1179);

H.R. 4876. An act for the relief of Mary C. Atkinson (Rept. No. 1181);

H.R. 5181. An act to amend Private Law 85-699 (Rept. No. 1182);

H.R. 5324. An act for the relief of Dr. Serafin T. Ortiz (Rept. No. 1183);

H.R. 6013. An act for the relief of the Houston Belt & Terminal Railway Co. (Rept. No. 1184);

H.R. 6120. An act for the relief of Francis Ainsworth (Rept. No. 1185);

H.R. 6226. An act for the relief of Arlin David English (Rept. No. 1186);

H.R. 6243. An act extending to Guam the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States (Rept. No. 1187);

H.R. 6644. An act for the relief of Julius Benikosky (Rept. No. 1188);

H.R. 6938. An act for the relief of Dr. Robert E. Hiller (Rept. No. 1189);

H.R. 7473. An act for the relief of Albert R. Serpa (Rept. No. 1190);

H.R. 7740. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sharon Lee Harden (Rept. No. 1191);

H.R. 8325. An act for the relief of Harrison Thomas Harper (Rept. No. 1192); and

H.R. 8779. An act for the relief of George B. Olmstead (Rept. No. 1193).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1397. A bill for the relief of Mate Ivan Jurasic (also known as Mike Jurasic) (Rept. No. 1171); and

S. 1578. A bill for the relief of Edward Yin Liang (Rept. No. 1172).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 2165. A bill for the relief of Jean L. Dunlop (Rept. No. 1173).

By Mr. CARROLL, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 4381. An act for the relief of Walter H. Hanson (Rept. No. 1180).

AUTHORIZATION TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A COMPILATION ENTITLED "SENATE ELECTION, EXPULSION, AND CENSURE CASES FROM 1789 TO 1960"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1160)

Mr. JORDAN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 289) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of a compilation entitled "Senate Election, Expulsion, and Censure Cases from 1789 to 1960," and submitted a report thereon; which resolution was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the compilation entitled "Senate Election, Expulsion, and Censure Cases from 1789 to 1960", compiled by Richard D. Hupman, Senate Librarian, under the direction of Felton M Johnston, Secretary of the Senate, be printed as a Senate document and that there be printed five thousand additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT ENTITLED "REPORT ON THE RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951" (H. DOC. NO. 322)

Mr. BYRD of Virginia from the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, pursuant to section 4(b) of Public Law 86-89, submitted a report entitled "Report on the Renegotiation Act of 1951," which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 2770. A bill to amend section 401 of the act of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 383; 16 U.S.C. 715s), in order to authorize increased payments to counties in which Federal wildlife refuges are situated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 2771. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 2772. A bill to provide for holding a White House Conference on the Impact of Automation, to be called by the President of the United States not later than 1 year from the date of enactment of this bill, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. BOGGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2773. A bill to amend section 503 of the Federal Aviation Act to provide substantive Federal law relating to the validity of conveyances which affect title to or interests in civil aircraft of the United States and related equipment; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S. 2774. A bill to amend section 8 of the Organic Act of Guam and section 15 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, to provide for appointment of Acting Secretaries for such territories under certain conditions; and

S. 2775. A bill to remove the ceiling on the authorization for appropriation for the government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE (for himself and Mr. Kuchel):

S. 2776. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the New Melones Dam and Reservoir, Stanislaus River, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 2777. A bill for the relief of Arild Ericksen Sandli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2778. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chung Sik Keh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 2779. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Commission on Aging and to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development of programs which will benefit older persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. McNamara when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2780. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, in order to authorize certain use of the rights-of-way of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways for passenger rail transit systems in metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2781. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Herbert Clark Hoover, Harry S. Truman, and Dwight David Eisenhower, the three living former Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. Proxmire):

S.J. Res. 150. Joint resolution to continue for an additional 9 months the current support prices for milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Humphrey when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

OPPOSING REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1962

Mr. McGEE submitted a resolution (S. Res. 288) opposing Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. McGee, which appears under a separate heading.)

AUTHORIZATION TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT OF A COMPILATION ENTITLED "SENATE ELECTION, EXPULSION, AND CENSURE CASES FROM 1789 TO 1960"

Mr. JORDAN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 289) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of a compilation entitled "Senate Election, Expulsion, and Censure Cases from 1789 to 1960"; which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jordan, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT, WITH ADDITIONAL COPIES, PAMPHLET ENTITLED "COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION MEETING, LONDON, ENGLAND, 1961"

Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 290); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the pamphlet entitled "Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Meeting, London, England, 1961" be printed as a Senate document and that three thousand additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROPOSED WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON IMPACT OF AUTOMATION

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the holding of a White House Conference on the Impact of of Automation.

For a number of years now, there has been increasing concern demonstrated by growing numbers of our citizens over the immediate effects of technological advances. There are few who disagree that, in the long run, technological progress will benefit us as a nation and add to the personal happiness and prosperity of the working men and women of this country.

At the same time, however, we cannot overlook the fact that these same technological advances have given birth to a group of people I have referred to as the technically handicapped—men and women whose skills are becoming outmoded by modern methods. These people cannot wait for the long-range benefits of automation. When the breadwinner of a family loses his job, and especially when he finds it difficult to gain reemployment because his skills have been displaced by a machine, it is difficult for him and his family to console themselves with the thought that automation will benefit them years in the future.

Many things have been said about this problem, and many committees have been created to study it. But, for the most part, these have been disjointed efforts. Furthermore, there has been little done at the State level where the workers are being displaced and where new jobs must be found or created.

For these reasons, and because I believe the plight of the technically handicapped is one of the most pressing issues of our time, I respectfully submit for the consideration of the Members of the Senate a bill to provide for the holding of a White House Conference on the Impact of Automation. This Conference is to be called by the President of the United States not later than 1 year from the date of enactment of this bill.

The bill also provides for conferences to be held in each State preparatory to the White House Conference, a pattern of action which has worked so successfully in dealing with such other important matters as the problems of our senior citizens.

I am convinced that a White House Conference will stimulate and initiate thinking, planning, and action at the State level to cope with the problems created by automation, and I therefore request your careful consideration of this proposal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2772) to provide for holding a White House Conference on the Impact of Automation, to be called by the President of the United States not later than 1 year from the date of enactment of this bill, and for related purposes, introduced by Mr. Boggs, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

UNIFORM CHOICE OF LAW GOVERNING TRANSFERS OF TITLE TO AIRCRAFT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill brought to my attention by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, to remedy a chaotic situation in the aircraft industry which exists because of conflicting State law as to the validity of conveyances of aircraft and related equipment.

The bill does not change the substantive law of the various States but simply amends the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so that there is a uniform rule as to which State's law applies to a given conveyance, lease, or other transfer of title or interests in such equipment.

At least three rules are now in use, and the uncertainty which this creates in an industry where equipment is constantly in rapid movement across State lines is obvious. The bill would create a uniform rule that the substantive law of the State in which the relevant instrument is delivered is applicable. Comparable provisions already exist in relation to ships and motor vehicles, and I urge that prompt action be taken now to solve this problem in regard to aircraft.

I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum explaining the bill in greater detail be included in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2773) to amend section 503 of the Federal Aviation Act to provide substantive Federal law relating to the validity of conveyances which affect title to or interests in civil aircraft of the United States and related equipment, introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The memorandum presented by Mr. JAVITS is as follows:

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 503 OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide substantive Federal law relating to the validity of conveyances which affect the title to or interests in civil aircraft of the United States and related equipment. This is accomplished by providing that the substantive validity of such an instrument, i.e., a conveyance, lease, mortgage, equipment trust, contract of conditional sale, other instrument executed for security purposes, or assignment or amendment thereof or supplement thereto, is to be determined by the substantive law of the jurisdiction within the United States or its territories or possessions in which such instrument is delivered. Thus, the Federal law would look to the substantive laws (as distinguished from the adjective laws, including recording and filing provisions) of the State in which the relevant instrument is delivered and if such instrument is valid under that law and is in turn recorded under the applicable provisions of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, the instrument would be deemed valid in all jurisdictions in the United States in respect of the property covered by the instrument.

There is an urgent need for the proposed legislation so as to bring order to the chaotic situation with respect to conveyances by and to domestic air carriers.

The laws of the various States differ as to the requirements governing the validity of mortgages, conditional sale agreements, leases, equipment trust agreements and the like. Furthermore, there are at least three theories considered applicable in attempting to resolve the question as to which jurisdiction's laws should be taken into account in determining the validity of many such instruments; namely, (1) the jurisdiction in which the particular property is located at the time the instrument is executed and/or delivered, (2) the jurisdiction within which the instrument is executed and/or delivered, and (3) the residence of the parties to the transaction, particularly the conveyor. Which theory or theories should be adopted regarding a proposed financing of an air carrier incorporated under the laws of one State, maintaining airport facilities and aircraft and related equipment in many States, flying scheduled routes over many more States and seeking the financing from banks located in other States? At the time a chattel mortgage, for example, is given to the banking institution by the air carrier, its airplanes may be located in or over any number of States. Were the parties to such a transaction to follow only the first theory referred to above, at the moment the chattel mortgage on the air carrier's fleet of aircraft (many of which would be in the air) is executed the laws of many States would come into play, and a moment later the laws of different States would apply, notwithstanding any contradiction between the laws of such States. Moreover, there is no real logic in considering the law of State X paramount as to the validity of a chattel mortgage on a specific aircraft when the aircraft is at that moment traveling over the State at a speed in excess of 500 miles an hour and at a height in excess of 40,000 feet.

The proposed legislation would serve to preempt the field as to the substantive validity of such conveyances just as present section 503 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 has, since 1938, preempted the field as to the recording of such conveyances. A provision comparable to the proposed legislation has been applicable to conveyances of U.S.-flag vessels since the enactment of the Ship Mortgage Act of 1920. Similarly, a 1958 amendment to the Motor Carrier Act now provides comparable legislation as to motor vehicles.

The proposed legislation has been drafted within the framework of section 503 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. It applies only to those conveyances enumerated in said section and does not conflict with or impinge upon the other provisions of said section or the act.

U.S. COMMISSION ON AGING

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would establish a permanent and independent U.S. Commission on Aging, which would be concerned full time with the full range of problems and potentialities of America's more than 17 million elder citizens.

Representative FOGARTY is simultaneously introducing an identical bill in the House.

Last March I introduced S. 1359, intended to achieve much the same objectives as in the bill I now present.

However it provided instead for the establishment of a U.S. Office of Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to be headed by an Assistant Secretary for Aging.

Both of these bills also authorize Federal grants to assist the States in the development of programs to benefit older persons.

The new bill would further the well-established principle that each State should have a focal point for leadership in aging by providing grants for a share of the administrative costs of the State planning and coordinating agency.

Despite similarity of objectives, the organizational approaches of S. 1359 and my new bill are obviously quite different.

S. 1359 would strengthen an existing agency; the proposal Representative FOGARTY and I are now making jointly establishes a new agency.

I am well aware that there is ample evidence that the effectiveness of an agency in determining public policy is directly related to its place in the established departmental structure of government.

Sound judgment would, therefore, dictate against creating a new instrument of government if one already exists that can do the job that so urgently needs to be done.

I believe, however, that we do not now have such an agency of government: one that can give full time and attention to the full range of interrelated needs and potentials of older people, serve as their eloquent spokesman, and, because of its independence and high position in the governmental structure, command the wholehearted cooperation of all governmental and nongovernmental agencies in achieving effective action.

Of our established agencies, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has responsibilities in aging that far exceed those of any other existing governmental agency. There is no question about this.

The question is how to achieve the maximum coordinated effort of our full resources, including those of such governmental agencies as the Labor Department, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Veterans' Administration, and of many voluntary organizations working in this area.

Even with the best of intentions by all partners and the most capable guidance by the partner with major responsibility, can we expect the same all-out effort that would result from a more nearly equal partnership.

To achieve maximum cooperative effort do we not need an equal voice in defining our goals and an equal stake in achieving them; equal accountability for failures and equal credit for successes?

The bill I am introducing today, therefore, provides for a high-level independent agency which will devote full time to the total range of needs and potentials of older people, without fragmentation and with balanced perspective, and which will command the respect and full attention of the Nation's total efforts in behalf of the aging.

With the introduction of this measure our Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will have before it alternative proposals for action. I hope that action will be taken during this session of the Congress.

I ask that my bill be held at the desk for 5 days so that such other Senators as may want to join me in cosponsoring it will have that opportunity.

I also ask unanimous consent that a summary of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be held at the desk, as requested, and the summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2779) to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Commission on Aging and to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development of programs which will benefit older persons, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The summary presented by Mr. McNAMARA is as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE BILL TO ESTABLISH THE U.S. COMMISSION ON AGING

It has long been recognized that there is need at the Federal level for an agency concerned full time with the full range of problems of America's senior citizens.

In order that this can be a high-level agency commanding the respect and full attention of the Nation's total efforts in behalf of the aging, the bill provides for the creation of an independent U.S. Commission on Aging. The bill authorizes $2,090,000 for planning grants to the States for establishing or improving agencies organized to meet the problems of the aging in their States and to conduct necessary surveys and studies. It further authorizes $10 million in project grants for community projects and coordination efforts and to expand demonstrations that sustain the creative contributions of the elderly, and $2 million for training personnel and for research and demonstration projects.

A DECLARATION OF OBJECTIVES

The act sets forth a 10-point declaration of objectives for older Americans as the declared policy of the United States to insure for them a life of recognition, independence, and dignity in active retirement. These objectives are:

1. An adequate income for retirement in health, honor, and dignity.

2. Equal opportunity for employment.
3. The best possible physical and mental health.
4. Suitable housing.
5. Services to achieve independent living.
6. Full opportunity for meaningful activity.
7. Efficient, coordinated community services when needed.
8. Immediate benefit from proven research knowledge.
9. Freedom, independence and free exercise of individual initiative.
10. The right to consideration of their needs and potentials without fragmentation.

THE U.S. COMMISSION ON AGING

1. The act establishes a permanent independent Commission, consisting of a Chairman and two other members appointed by the President.

2. Functions of the Commission:

(a) Make continuing studies of problems and potentials of older people.

(b) Develop policy and legislative proposals in aging for submission to the President and the Congress.

(c) Maintain a continuing review of Federal programs in aging and make recommendations for coordinated program development.

(d) Provide technical assistance with respect to organization of programs.

(e) Sponsor and cooperate in conducting conferences, seminars, training and research programs.

(f) Collect, compile and disseminate information on aging.

(g) Continuously assist States and communities in assessing needs and developing approaches and programs.

(h) Actively promote Federal programs in the field of aging.

(i) Serve as a central source of information on recommendations and actions resulting from the White House Conference on Aging and other conferences or hearings.

(j) Administer the grant-in-aid programs established by the act and otherwise carry out the purposes of the act.

ADVISORY COUNCIL TO THE COMMISSION

The act provides for an Advisory Council of 20 members, as follows:

(a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Secretary of Labor; the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency; and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs (or their designees);

(b) Six citizens who are especially competent to deal with the problems confronting aged persons, appointed by the President;

(c) Three members of the Senate, appointed by the President of the Senate;

(d) Three members of the House, appointed by the Speaker of the House; and

(e) Four persons appointed by the Governors' conference.

FEDERAL INTERDEPARTMENTAL COUNCIL ON AGING

The act provides for a continuing Council, with the Chairman of the Commission serving as permanent Chairman, consisting of the heads (or their designees) of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Labor, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Veterans' Administration, and of such other agencies as the Commission designates on a temporary or continuing basis.

GRANT PROGRAMS

The act provides for three types of grant programs to be administered by the U.S. Commission on Aging.

1. Planning grants of $2,090,000 ($40,000 to each State, $10,000 to the Virgin Islands) to assist each State in establishing and initiating the operation of a State agency or improving the operation of an existing agency to:

(a) Plan new or improved programs to carry out the purposes of the act;

(b) Assist communities in planning and developing such programs;

(c) Improve the coordination of these programs and activities; and

(d) Conduct studies to assist in planning and improving such programs.

2. Project grants to the States for community planning and coordination of programs for carrying out the purposes of the act, for demonstrations, training of special personnel (including volunteers) and for establishment of new or expansion of existing programs to carry out such purposes:

(a) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for each of the succeeding 4 fiscal years, the sum of $10 million is authorized.

(b) These funds are to be allotted to the States in accordance with a formula based on the ratio the State's population aged 65 or over bears to the population aged 65 or over in all the States.

(c) The Federal share with respect to a specific project shall not exceed: 75 percent for each of the first 2 years and 50 percent for each of the next 3 years.

(d) Federal sharing in the costs of the State administrative agency is provided, with the Federal share being one-half, subject to a minimum of $15,000 and a maximum of $25,000.

3. The act authorizes grants to public and other nonprofit institutions and organizations for demonstration, research and training projects. The sum of $2 million is authorized for this purpose.

CONTINUATION OF CURRENT SUPPORT PRICES FOR MILK AND BUTTERFAT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution designed to continue for another 9 months the current support prices for milk and butterfat.

The purpose of the joint resolution is to give Congress an opportunity to act upon the proposals which are being submitted today by the President, and which will be placed before the respective Committees on Agriculture of the Senate and House, concerning our total agricultural policies.

In the President's farm message there is a section dealing with dairy products. I believe that, until that section can be acted upon, one way or another, we should not disrupt the economic situation that exists now in the dairy economy.

The purpose of the joint resolution is to sustain for a few months the existing support prices on milk and butterfat until such time as the Congress may take other action or until the 9 months shall expire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 150) to continue for an additional 9 months the current support prices for milk and butterfat, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. PROXMIRE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

STABILIZATION OF MINING OF LEAD AND ZINC—ADDITIONAL SPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, on behalf of the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], I ask unanimous consent that the names of the junior Senator from Illinois, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] be added as cosponsors of Senate bill 2747, to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes, at the next printing of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 612) making supplemental appropriations for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 612) making supplemental appropriations for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Speech by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, at the third annual Christian American Heritage Seminar, John Brown University, Siloam Springs, Ark., November 25, 1961, entitled "Faith and Freedom."

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Address delivered by Representative KENNETH A. ROBERTS at the dedication of an addition to the Anniston, Ala., Memorial Hospital on January 14, 1962.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

Excerpt from address by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, delivered recently before the New Jersey State Board of Agriculture.

HOW TO WIN THE COLD WAR IN YOUR SPARE TIME

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to an article published on Sunday in the New York Times. The article was written by James Reston, and is entitled "How To Win the Cold War in Your Spare Time." In some places in the article we find bits of satire; nevertheless, the article is thought provoking and helpful in ordering our thoughts on some of the issues of the day. I ask that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO WIN THE COLD WAR IN YOUR SPARE TIME

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 27.—The central theme of most thoughtful letters coming into this office these days is that the intelligent individual American feels overwhelmed by contemporary events.

In the recurring question, "What can I do to understand and help?" there is a feeling of intellectual loneliness and even of helplessness. It is as if the thoughtful citizen regarded himself today as a mere spectator in a bewildering world of higher mathematics, complicated technology and mysterious economics.

Nobody who reads about the problems of outer space, or automatic machinery, or the balance of payments, or the Common Market, or the flight of a growing population to the cities, or the cold war can avoid this feeling; and yet there is something that can be done to dispel this loneliness and help the Nation.

THE THREE PROPOSITIONS

As we advance further into the sixties, three things become increasingly clear:

1. The cold war will probably be settled, if it ever is, not by the society with the biggest weapons—though a balance of power must be maintained—but by the society that has the greatest capacity to adjust to the scientific, social and political revolutions of the age.

2. The Western European nations, stripped of their empires, are demonstrating a remarkable capacity to adapt themselves to change. This is marked in the movement toward economic and political unity in Europe and Britain, and in the parallel movement of the United States to create an economic partnership between those Common Market countries and the other trading nations of the Western Hemisphere and Asia.

3. The ability of the United States to take the lead in this process of adjustment is vital to its own security and the security of the rest of the free world, but this whole process cannot proceed much faster than the development of public understanding in this country.

On this decisive third point the thoughtful, detached private citizen has an important role to play in his own community, if he can get help. The problem is to organize the widest possible study of our present economic, social and political assumptions in relation to the convulsive changing facts of the age.

This can be done in every city and village in the land through the creation of study groups in existing organizations of the churches, schools, service clubs and parent-teachers associations—provided factual study guides are prepared and distributed throughout the land.

It is not enough merely to listen to lectures—the fastest-growing indoor spectator sport in America today. The need is for widespread study (1) of the facts in a given situation—say education—and (2) for analysis of alternative courses of action, as if each individual had to decide what was best for the Nation himself.

A nationwide adult education movement of this kind, based on the facts and consequences of change, could have a profound effect on the opinion of the Nation. It could deal at first with the questions involving the visible and pressing interests of the community—education one month, shelters the next, medical care for the aged the next, jobs the next, etc.—and gradually move along to the more complicated subjects of national and international trade.

When Walter Bagehot, the famous editor of the Economist, came to study why some nations had progressed and some declined, he concluded 100 years ago that government-by-discussion was the key.

There is plenty of what Bagehot called "a vigorous moderateness of mind" in the administration in Washington today. In fact, President Kennedy himself is almost the perfect symbol of Bagehot's ideal of "animated moderation." But the central political conflict in the Nation today is between Kennedy, the innovator, and the House of Representatives, the consolidator.

A CHANGED DIALOGUE

This is not to say that Kennedy is right and the Ways and Means Committee of the House is wrong, but merely to suggest that the dialogue be changed and broadened to include everybody who wants to get a better idea of where we are and where we are going.

Let this sort of thing be organized in America, perhaps with the help of a foundation in preparing the pamphlets at the start, and at least some of the frustrations of our time will disappear. The Communists can break the yoke of custom by fiat; we can break it only by open and widespread discussion of the facts.

WHAT TSHOMBE REPRESENTS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter to the editor of the New York Times, published in that newspaper on January 28, and written by Reginald Herbold Green. The letter, which is published under the headline "What Tshombe Represents," refers to Mr. Tshombe and the Katanga Province difficulties, and is highly perspicacious. So I wish to have it printed in the RECORD, for the information of Senators.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT TSHOMBE REPRESENTS—NATURE OF KATANGA'S REGIME, ITS FINANCIAL BACKERS ASSESSED

(Letter by Reginald Herbold Green, assistant professor of economics at Yale recently returned from a year's study in west Africa)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Two central issues of the Katanga question have become obscured in debate over national self-determination, and possible direct involvement of Union Miniére or its employees in Katangan military operations. They are the nature of Moise Tshombe's political base versus that of parties supporting "One Congo" and the Central Government, and the payment of $70 million of duties and dividends to Katanga by Union Miniére, although the money was legally the Central Government's.

Katangan unity has existed only as part of Congolese unity. Tshombe's tribe, the Lunda (including two small allied tribes), is neither a majority nor the largest single tribe (Baluba). In the mining-industrial-urban areas no single tribe predominates, although the Baluba form the bulk of the wage-labor force. Only in the rural portions of Haut-Katanga district are there compact Lunda majorities enclosing non-Lunda towns and mines as islands.

Tshombe's government represents Lunda nationalism or imperialism. Its army and governmental service have been purged of non-Lunda; its ability to enforce order is limited to rural Haut-Katanga, and a few key urban mining centers. The fall of Albertville to a local insurrection and the flight of Elisabethville's 50,000 to 60,000 Baluba to U.N. protection attest to the harshness of the Tshombe government's reign.

ELECTION RETURNS

In the preindependence elections Tshombe's Conakat received 91,116 votes (33.4 percent), Jason Sendwe's intertribal Balubakat Alliance 134,916 (49.4 percent), and others 47,038 (17.3 percent). Of the others, two large groups (A.T.C.A.R., M.N.C., perhaps 8 percent) support Central Vice Premier Sendwe's devotion to "One Congo." The allegiance of many more is cloudy.

The Provincial Government was formed with 28 of 60 elected members (25 Conakat and 3 of 17 others) and 9 of 9 appointed members voting aye. It represents at most 40 percent of the votes cast versus 57 percent for the Balubakat–A.T.C.A.R.–M.N.C. and does not hold a majority of provincial elected deputies. Only one of Katanga's five electoral divisions (rural Haut-Katanga) gave the Conakat a majority; three gave clear majorities to the Balubakat and allies while the last split Balubakat, Local, Conakat in that order. Elisabethville-Jadotville, key to Katanga's economy, gave the Balubakat a 23,112 to 14,684 victory, sending Sendwe to Parliament from Elisabethville city. On this basis one Congo, not Katangan separatism, appears as the will of the Katangan voters.

Tshombe's Lunda regime has operated largely on $70 million of duties and dividends from Union Miniére. Without them it could not have paid its army or purchased arms. These payments clearly violate the Loi Fondamentale and Brussels Accords signed by Belgium and Congolese leaders, including Tshombe.

Duties are specifically listed as Central Government revenues. Former Belgian stockholdings were to go to the Central Government. With no nation—including Belgium—recognizing Katanga as independent, it is hard to view such payments as other than active support to unlawful insurrection.

SUPPORTING INSURRECTION

The question rises as to why Belgium allowed a company on whose board sit government-appointed directors and whose ties to the government have always been close to make these payments.

African attitudes to Katanga and its apologists stem from this record. To them the Lunda imperialist, minority nature of Tshombe's regime is clear, as is its dependence on Union Miniére payments permitted by Belgium in violation of her agreements with the Congo.

The continued existence of the Lunda state benefits only the Lunda and Union Miniére (and by reaction Antoine Gizenga); certainly it injures the Congo as a whole and the anti-Conakat majority in Katanga.

Support for Katangan self-determination is therefore seen as either deliberate or deluded support for tribalist imperialism and monopolist neo-colonialism. This position is neither irrational nor extremist, but based on the nature of Katanga's regime and its financial supporters.

IS THE UNITED NATIONS WORTH SAVING?

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Is United Nations Worth Saving?" The article was written by Gould Lincoln and was published in the Washington Evening Star on January 30. In his extended article Mr. Lincoln answers that question by saying that indeed the United Nations is worth saving.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS UNITED NATIONS WORTH SAVING?

(By Gould Lincoln)

Within a brief time the question: "Is the United Nations worth saving?" will come before Congress in a very tangible, matter-of-fact, down-to-earth way. For Congress will have to decide whether it will agree to President Kennedy's recommendation that this Government subscribe to one-half of the $200 million bond issue which the U.N. proposes to float so it can pay for its forceful action restoring order in the Congo. Obviously, the U.N. cannot continue to function in the red. The bond issue is not an assessment. Nor is it a financially profitable investment for the bonds, which are to run for 25 years and pay 2 percent interest.

One-half this bond issue is a very large share to be taken by one nation out of a membership of 104. But obviously the Communist bloc, led by Soviet Russia, will not subscribe, since it has been opposed to this action in the Congo. And for a good reason in the Communist mind—any successful democratization in the Congo means less opportunity for the Communists to take over this newly independent part of Africa. How far the British and French (who have been lukewarm, to say the least, about the operation) will wish to subscribe remains to be seen. Other than the United States, these are the larger nations able to contribute most to the U.N.

It seems entirely clear that if the United States fails to take up a large part of this bond issue, the U.N. will go broke. While there has been opposition in this country to the Congo operations, particularly so far as the Katanga Province is concerned, this is a time to rally to the support of the United Nations. If we do not like the bond issue, we should find some other way of contributing the necessary funds. But the bond issue is the most feasible method of raising the money yet suggested.

THE COMMUNIST THREAT

It is time for real hard thinking about what will be the situation if the United Nations is allowed to go down the drain—to follow the old League of Nations as the latest effort to find a way to world peace and justice. Where would the loss of the United Nations leave the free world—that part of the world opposed to international communism? The Communist bloc is welded together by a single purpose and that is to take over the entire world. This is true despite the conflicts in opinion which have arisen between Red Russia and Red China and Albania. Their differences are as to the method of seeking to dominate the world. While Russia's Nikita Khrushchev talks of a peaceful coexistence—apparently to lull the free nations to a condition that Communist subversion and conquest may be easier—the Chinese are demanding more direct action.

Without the U.N., will it be easier for the Russian Communists to pick off one free or so-called neutralist nation after another, thus avoiding war and gaining their desired end? Would it be more to the interest of the free world to create a separate alliance, opposed to the Communist bloc? Such a plan has been suggested. Always the Communists seek to pit one nation of the free world against another—to play on the self-interest of one nation as against that of another.

INVALUABLE FOR PEACE

The United Nations was conceived in the idea that, after the Second World War and its terrible cost in life and treasure, it would be possible to create a really workable international organization for peace with justice. The U.N. Charter was written in San Francisco in 1945 and great hopes were expressed for its future. It was only a matter of months, however, until the recalcitrance of the Russian Communist Government came into full view. It has progressed with each year. Nevertheless, the U.N. has proved its value again and again on the side of peace—frequently on the side of the free world.

The U.N. has fought one war—the war to preserve the Republic of Korea. The United States provided nearly all the armed forces and the money to fight that war. We took the lead. Because of our position then in the Far East, only we could take the lead. We could have won a decisive victory had the conflict been carried to the sources of the Communist supplies. In the end, however, the Republic of Korea was preserved and has not fallen to the Communists to date. In that war the Red Chinese provided men and the Russians provided weapons for the Communists of North Korea.

The United States has tried to make the U.N. a real agency of peace. The Communist bloc has tried to use it only for propaganda, and to stall off peaceful settlements in international disputes. This, however, is no good reason for junking the United Nations. It may be necessary to revise the charter of the U.N., and wise to do so. But unless the world is prepared and intends to go to a hot war, the United Nations is worth saving.

WELCH IS SILENT ON CALL TO BACK UP RED CHARGES

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an Associated Press dispatch on the failure thus far of Robert Welch, of the John Birch Society, to back up his assertions about the number of Reds who are alleged by him to be running around in the Government of the United States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 31, 1962]

WELCH IS SILENT ON CALL TO BACK UP RED CHARGES

The Department of Justice has asked Robbert Welch, founder of the John Birch Society, to produce any evidence supporting his charges of Communists in Government.

So far, said an official, Welch has not responded to the request made December 8.

The official, Assistant Attorney General J. Walter Yeagley, Chief of the Department's Internal Security Division, said yesterday that he wrote Welch about a speech Welch gave November 20 in Austin, Tex.

The Assistant Attorney General said news accounts quoted Welch as referring to a comparatively few thousand Communists, concentrated in key departments of the Government.

Yeagley said he wrote Welch, "The charges you make are not to my knowledge supported by the material in the investigative files of Government employees.

"It would be my suggestion that you turn over to the Federal Bureau of Investigation at once such facts as may be in your possession and the sources thereof which you believe establish that certain Government employees are members of the Communist Party.

"If appropriate action is to be taken, it is necessary that such data as you indicate you possess be made available for the use of the Government." Yeagley is responsible for prosecuting anyone who falsely denied Communist Party membership for Government work.

Yeagley said neither he nor the FBI received acknowledgement of his letter to Welch.

The John Birch Society, which Welch heads, is a militantly conservative organization pledged to fight communism.

UNSOLICITED LITERATURE AIMED AT DISCREDITING THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, last week I called the attention of the Senate to the delivery at my office—and, I assume, all Senators' offices—of unsolicited literature aimed at discrediting the United Nations and the participation of this country in that body.

In particular, I received from a Mr. John Hedrick, of Orange, Calif., a gaudy automobile bumper sticker which bore the message, "Help Get the United States Out of the U.N.," which I subsequently tore into little bits and pieces, and urged my colleagues to do likewise.

Evidently my actions received some newspaper notice in southern California, for this week I have received a new barrage of propaganda and several severe reprimands for my conduct in tearing up the stickers.

The latest gimmick being used by those who would sabotage our participation in the United Nations arrived in my mail this week. It is a small button, or pin, which bears the message, "Let's Get Out of U.N." This pin was sent to me with the message, "I will be watching the papers to see what you do with the enclosed pin."

This particular pin came from a member of the Hoiles family, which owns and operates several extremely anti-U.N. newspapers under the name of Freedom Newspapers, Inc. Over the years of their journalistic endeavors they have made such great editorial contributions like forcing the Girl Scouts of America to revise their favorable references to the United Nations in their official handbook. The father of the Hoiles publishing empire has gained a wide reputation for his crusades against public education, and even, I am informed, attacked public education as a violation of one of the Ten Commandments.

These few illustrations, Mr. President, indicate clearly the inane philosophies of some of the persons who apparently are intent upon forcing the United States out of the United Nations. And as I said last week, nothing could please the Soviet Union more than such an irresponsible act.

While it would be impossible for me to tear up this button, as I did the bumper sticker, I do plan to make use of it. It will be returned to the sender, with the suggestion that if these enemies of the United Nations really wish to make points, they should send their pins to the Soviet Union and other enemies of the free world who would relish the collapse of the United Nations.

I hope, Mr. President, that my colleagues will reflect on the sources of this type of propaganda when they receive it in the future.

THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET AND THE TRADE BILL

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article entitled "Clannish Common Market." The subtitle of the article is "Its Members Are Wary of Ties to United States, Other Nations." The article was published today in the Wall Street Journal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I think all of us are sympathetic with the objectives of the current administration in connection with improving trade, which we have been doing during the last 8 or 10 years by gradual, selective, and reciprocal reductions of tariff barriers.

But in connection with the bill the President sent to Congress and the great issue which will be before us for some months, I have felt, and have stated, that there are some other important matters which should be taken into account in considering this entire question. In addition to considering the simple problem of trade relationships between the United States and the six members of the European Common Market, I believe we should remember that the Common Market was established as a mutually protective society for the purpose of advancing the interests of the countries which are its members. Just as when our Nation was formed, our Constitution provided that there should be no tariff barriers between the States, the European Common Market has a similar objective—and a very worthy one. So I make no criticism on that score; but it is clear that there are related issues in connection with the proposed Trade Agreements Act, such as East-West trade, the question of trade with Japan, trade with Latin American countries, which apparently are going to be discriminated against pretty seriously, as Japan will be, and as indeed Japan now is, by the Common Market countries.

The question is raised as to how much of the burden of world responsibilities we can carry, even with the abundant resources at our disposal.

The article says there is no eagerness within the EEC for ties of any sort with nonmembers like the United States, and so on.

In order to improve understanding of this great issue as we go along, we should consider these views as they come to us, as this one did, from Brussels, and other parts of Europe, and elsewhere.

For that reason, I hope my colleagues in both Houses will have an opportunity to glance through the article.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 31, 1962]

CLANNISH COMMON MARKET—ITS MEMBERS ARE WARY OF TIES TO UNITED STATES, OTHER NATIONS

(By Ray Vicker)

BRUSSELS.—"Association with the Common Market involves acceptance of political and social obligations, as well as economic benefits."

So says an official of the European Economic Commission, the Market's administrative unit. His attitude is a prevalent one here at the headquarters of the EEC. Planners of the Common Market see it as a close-knit body of nations with kindred interests, heading toward an ultimate United Europe, and with no welcome mat for large numbers of new members.

True, the planners see a place for Britain, already on the way toward market membership. Many EEC officials also believe Denmark will fit snugly into the Common Market, now composed of Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, France, West Germany, and Italy. EEC officials also regard Norway as a possible member. Beyond that point, however, enthusiasm for new members wanes rapidly.

NO EAGERNESS FOR U.S. TIES

What's more, there's no eagerness within the EEC for ties of any sort with nonmembers like the United States. If President Kennedy gets the broad, new tariff-cutting power he is seeking from Congress, a French official says, it may be possible for the Common Market and the United States to negotiate "as equals" on mutual tariff concessions and political cooperation. But he makes it clear that the United States cannot expect a place in the councils of the EEC or any role in helping to plan policy for the Common Market.

The standoffishness of the EEC may complicate matters for the British Commonwealth. A problem for Britain in its progress toward Common Market membership is its close trade tie to Commonwealth nations, such as Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. These nations may lose their present preferred status in the British market if Britain becomes an EEC member. One possible solution, some Commonwealth officials suggest, would be to aline the Commonwealth nations with the Common Market. But EEC officials, while they see the possibility of some sort of ties with nonindustrial Commonwealth lands of Africa, hold out no hope at all for the rest.

Membership prospects also are bleak for Austria, Switzerland, and Sweden. The neutral stance of these nations does not square with the political programs and aims of the present EEC nations. Another potential member—Ireland—is written off on economic rather than ideological grounds; EEC planners doubt that its industry and agriculture could weather the rugged competition within the market.

Outsiders often tend to regard the EEC's aims as primarily—or even solely—economic. It's true the Common Market is pressing for economic integration of its member nations. Internal tariffs are being progressively eliminated, and a common external tariff is being established against the rest of the world. Trade within the bloc, as a result, is growing rapidly.

But that's only part of the story. Social integration is being pushed, too. For example, restrictions on movement of workers among member nations are being reduced, permitting the unemployed of one country to more easily seek jobs in another country if they choose. Nationalist sympathies thus are being weakened.

All this, in the view of ECC planners, accelerates political unity. "Political unity must come from the bottom, from the people," says a Dutch Government official. "In this age, it can't be imposed from the top, except by force, as is the case in Eastern Europe."

Even the most optimistic EEC planner will concede that political unity is years away. There still is a good deal of debate about the shape of any such unity. Some officials favor only loose federation, with member nations retaining most of their powers. Others hope for eventual establishment of some sort of supranational government, with member nations surrendering a lot of their rights to the central authority.

An important aim now, EEC officials say, is to maintain momentum. Any slowing of the drive for unity could be dangerous, they contend, because inertia then might set in. That's why the EEC's Council of Ministers worked night and day recently to draft a new agricultural policy; if they had allowed existing disputes to linger on, the market's progress could have been halted.

It's this same eagerness to keep the ball rolling that makes EEC officials wary as they ponder addition of new members. A neutral nation such as Sweden, for example, may well agree with all the EEC's economic aims. But unless it chose to give up its neutralism it could play no role in the push toward a United Europe. Therefore, if the Common Market inducted Sweden it would be bringing into its deliberations a dissident or at best a nonactive participant.

IRELAND MIGHT DELAY EEC

Nations such as Canada, Australia and New Zealand, unlike Europe's neutrals, are firmly alined with the West. But these nations—and the same goes for most other countries outside Europe—could have little interest in forging a United Europe, and even less in becoming a disunited portion of any such political grouping.

As for Ireland, Common Market officials fear that pausing to shore up that nation's economy would also delay progress toward political unity. Much the same can be said for other potential members that the EEC men regard as economic weaklings.

The reason the nonindustrial Commonwealth nations of Africa are somewhat more warmly regarded is that such nations, affiliated with EEC in some way, could become valuable sources of raw materials. But Common Market officials say the African nations would have to accept obligations as well as benefits.

These officials stress that the Treaty of Rome, which set up the Common Market, made it clear the market was to be more than a mere customs union. Says Paul-Henri Spaak, Belgian Minister of Foreign Affairs: "The acceptance of the treaty must not be just the acceptance of economic rules, but also the acceptance of a political ideal."

SEAWAY TESTIMONIAL DINNER FOR SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY

Mr. DIRKSEN. The story of U.S. progress has been written by dedicated men of vision, hard work, and relentless efforts to attain worthy goals.

Recently, the citizens of Wisconsin paid tribute to one such outstanding individual, their senior Senator, and our friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

In recognition of his farsighted, spirited leadership in transforming the long-dreamed-of seaway into a reality, the senior Wisconsin Senator was honored with a special testimonial dinner.

For the occasion, tributes were showered upon him by individuals of all walks and strata of life and shades of public and political thinking.

The testimonial reflected how a Senator provided leadership, and, within his lifetime, received just recognition for a mighty project—the Seaway being the greatest engineering feat on the North American Continent—to benefit the people and economy of his State and Nation.

I request unanimous consent to print at this point in the RECORD a representative collection of testimonial tributes paid to the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

There being no objection, the tributes were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Gettysburg, Pa., *October 27, 1961.*

I count it a privilege to salute Senator Alexander Wiley, whose many years of service have produced lasting gains for our country and for the State of Wisconsin.

My comments have a personal cast, because time and time again during my Presidential terms, Alex Wiley moved vigorously and powerfully respecting matters of great importance to the Nation's foreign policy and national security. I recall no instance in which this dedicated Senator ever withheld giving his utmost in behalf of a better and stronger America.

Domestically—and here again, with significant worldwide overtones—Senator Wiley was an acknowledged leader, indefatigable in the struggle for construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway. I share with him the satisfaction that during my administration this great achievement was consummated.

The State of Wisconsin and the people of our country rightly honor this distinguished veteran legislator. To that tribute I add my warm personal congratulations to one who served faithfully and well throughout the period that I was charged with the executive branch of our Federal Government.

Sincerely,

Dwight D. Eisenhower.

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Foreign Relations,
November 2, 1961.

Hon. Alexander Wiley,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Alex: It is my understanding that a testimonial dinner in your honor will be held in Milwaukee on November 27. I want to add my testimony by letter to the testimonial you will receive at that time.

You are respected by your colleagues in the Senate, Alex, for your many attributes of character. You are respected for your patriotism, your humanity, and your dedication to work. And you are respected, too, for your achievements as a Senator on behalf of your State and the Nation.

I would list first among many the great fight which you led as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee to bring to ratification the St. Lawrence Seaway Treaty. By this act of statesmanship you helped greatly to open new vistas of progress for the Midwest and the West, indeed for the entire Nation.

I did not want this occasion to go by without recalling that achievement and without giving renewed expression to my high esteem for you as a friend and colleague in the Senate.

With best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Mike Mansfield,
Senate Majority Leader.

November 3, 1961.

Hon. Alexander Wiley,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Alex: I was so delighted to learn that your constituents are tendering you a testimonial dinner in recognition of your faithful and diligent service in the Senate.

I know of no man in my acquaintance who has so proudly and vigorously represented his State and Nation and stood so firmly on conviction even when it was not the popular stand.

You fully merit the high tribute which the testimonial dinner itself implies and the acclaim which will be so generously bestowed.

To all this let me add my own testament of respect and affection.

With warm personal wishes.

Everett M. Dirksen,
U.S. Senate Minority Leader.

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Appropriations,
November 20, 1961.

Hon. Alexander Wiley,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Alex: It is indeed a pleasure to send you these greetings and best wishes for the occasion at which the citizens of Wisconsin are so appropriately honoring your outstanding service in the U.S. Senate.

As a close associate of yours over the past 23 years, I can testify wholeheartedly that you have rendered dedicated and effective representation in the best interests of your constituents and our Nation.

The vast Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway is but one of the many impressive monuments which will forever remind our Nation of your great contributions to its welfare.

I regret that pressing Arizona affairs prevent me from being there to join the throngs who will greet you, but I assure you that I shall be there in spirit.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Yours very sincerely,

Carl Hayden.

Washington, D.C., *November 27, 1961.*

Senator Alexander Wiley,
Schroeder Hotel, Milwaukee:

Please extend to Senator Alexander Wiley, on the occasion of this testimonial dinner, my heartfelt thanks and congratulations for the years of dedicated service he has given to the great State of Wisconsin, to the United States of America, and to the Republican Party. We who serve with him in the Senate know that without his untiring and inspired efforts the St. Lawrence Seaway, could never have become a reality. His State, his Nation, and his party owe him a great debt of gratitude.

Barry Goldwater,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Armed Services,
October 25, 1961.

Hon. Alexander Wiley,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Alex: I regret very much that I will be out of the country when the testimonial dinner is held by the Milwaukee citizens in your honor.

You have been an outstanding Senator, who has given so much consideration to the women of our country in the statesmanship you have given Wisconsin and the Nation. I trust the people of Wisconsin fully realize your worth and will send you back to the Senate by a tremendous victory.

Sincerely yours,

Margaret Chase Smith,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Foreign Relations,
November 7, 1961.

Hon. Alexander Wiley,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Alex: I am informed that on November 27 you will be the guest of honor at a meeting in Milwaukee arranged by your many friends in Wisconsin. It is altogether fitting that you should be so honored.

My personal association with you over the past 17 years in the Senate and on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, where you have served as chairman, gives me full assurance when I say that your service to your State and to the country has been outstanding.

Your work on the Senate Judiciary Committee, both as chairman and as ranking minority member, has been of the highest order.

The Nation, and particularly your State of Wisconsin and the States of the Middle West, owe you a debt of gratitude for your great and continued effort on the St. Lawrence Seaway. There is no doubt of your position as a major factor in bringing this great work through to completion.

I join with your friends and colleagues in an expression of appreciation for the contributions you have made in many ways.

Sincerely yours,

Bourke B. Hickenlooper.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., November 20, 1961.

Senator Alexander Wiley,
Schroeder Hotel,
Milwaukee, Wis.

Dear Alex: I am very pleased to learn that you are being honored by many of your friends for your great contribution to Wisconsin and the Nation. It is much deserved and it is appropriate that this testimonial should emphasize your great contribution in the creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

I want to add my thanks to those of other Wisconsinites for your never-ending fight to make the seaway dream come true. It should not be overlooked on this occasion that this was brought about when Wisconsin, for the first time in its history, had a Senator who held the highest rank on many important Senate committees ever held by a representative of the State of Wisconsin. This, too, is testimony to the high regard in which you are held by the people you have served so faithfully.

Congratulations and every good wish for the future.

Sincerely yours,

Vernon W. Thomson,
Member of Congress.

November 20, 1961.

Hon. Alexander Wiley,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Alex: It is most fitting that you be honored by your fellow citizens for your efforts in connection with the St. Lawrence Seaway.

I well recall, over the years, your single-minded devotion to the dream of extending the Atlantic coast to the heart of America and the work and leadership you gave to the long struggle which made this dream a reality.

While the thriving commerce and new industry now being generated by the seaway is your real reward, I consider it an honor to join with all Wisconsin in paying tribute to you for the faith and conviction which played such a vital role in the successful outcome of the long battle to bring the vessels of the world to the ports of Wisconsin.

Sincerely yours,

John W. Byrnes.

Board of Harbor Commissioners,
Milwaukee, Wis., November 27, 1961.

Dear Senator Wiley: It is a great privilege to join the civic, educational, business, and labor leaders of Wisconsin in paying tribute to you on the occasion of today's testimonial dinner in your honor.

The theme of the occasion is the St. Lawrence Seaway, and the monumental contribution you have made to Wisconsin, to the Great Lakes region, to the Nation, and to the whole international world of trade, by your effective leadership and guidance of the legislation which brought the seaway to reality as a new instrument of world commerce.

Having been so closely associated with you in the long and oft-discouraging struggle for the seaway, we always welcome the opportunity, publicly or privately, to pay tribute to this, the monumental climax to your legislative career.

We think also, however, of the effective day-to-day service you and your fine staff render to your constituency and to the local governments of Wisconsin. We think of the victorious fight, ably led by you, to prevent downgrading of Milwaukee from a U.S. customs port of entry to a mere subport under Chicago. We think of the effective support we have had from you on every issue, whether it be preserving lake levels or preserving the traffic of Wisconsin ports.

Whether the issues have been large or small, we have had your undivided interest, your guidance and your effective participation in reaching the right solutions. From the privilege of long association with you, I can testify as to the debt of gratitude which the port of Milwaukee and the ports of Wisconsin owe to your dedication and your successful handling of administrative and legislative problems.

Most cordially,

HARRY C. BROCKEL,
Municipal Port Director.

U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS,
Washington, D.C., November 22, 1961.
Senator WILEY,
Testimonial Dinner Committee,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR MR. STEVENSON and MR. FITZGERALD: I deeply appreciate your kind invitation to attend the Wisconsin testimonial dinner next Monday in Milwaukee for Senator WILEY. However, our court will be in session here in Washington on that day, and I do not feel that I should be absent, particularly since we have a vacancy of one judge on our bench.

No man from Wisconsin owes more to ALEX WILEY and his stanch loyalty than I do. I regret that I can only join in absentia with your tribute to a great and valorous leader who stands in the vanguard of a long tradition of distinguished statesmanship from our Commonwealth. May he long continue to represent our State, which he has loved and served so well.

Sincerely,

JAMES R. DURFEE.

NOVEMBER 13, 1961.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: On the occasion of an event held in testimony of your many years of public service, permit me to join with your many friends in recognizing your devotion to public duty.

On this occasion, one calls to mind the many instances of help you have given to the people of the city of Milwaukee and the surrounding area. I specifically recall during my administration as mayor of Milwaukee from 1948 to 1960 that you aided progress in general housing and urban renewal legislation, and that you helped the city over many administrative and legal difficulties in connection with the lower third ward and Hillside project areas. The Hillside project addition is a particular tribute to your efforts for you helped it in its last critical stages.

Your assistance in matters of civil defense, matters relating to interstate gas distribution, the Chicago water diversion fight, and port and harbor developments was timely and invaluable.

Most of all, however, we Milwaukeeans must join with people of many States in congratulating you for your work in making the St. Lawrence Seaway a reality. Your guidance of this project through the Senate was a great triumph which we shall all remember.

May you continue to gain a great sense of satisfaction from these activities for the public good.

Sincerely,

FRANK P. ZEIDLER.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *November 27, 1962.*
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Schroeder Hotel,
Milwaukee, Wis.:

Upon the occasion of this testimonial dinner for you, we, your staff, happily join with fellow citizens in paying well-merited tribute to you and to your unique, outstanding service in the U.S. Senate.

Serving in your office, we have witnessed your wholehearted dedication to your country; your relentless effort to promote domestic progress and security for the Nation; and particularly to serve your constituents; and your deep concern for fulfilling the needs of humanity. As staff members, also, we have observed the high esteem with which you are held by your constituents by executives and members of all branches of the Government and other fellow Americans; and by representatives of countries around the globe.

As a U.S. Senator, you have demonstrated a real sensitivity to the needs of humanity; great faith in spiritual values; an incisive wisdom in "getting to the heart of matters"; an attunement to—indeed, a real search for—new ideas; and a judicious use of humor to give perspective and understanding to sometime difficult situations—or just to lighten the day-to-day workload in the office.

For our experience as laborers for, and with, you in the "Lord's vineyard" and the Senate, then, we say: "Thank you, Senator."

Upon your record of wonderful accomplishments, we say: "Congratulations." And for the future—as the past—we humbly, but confidently, pray that your life—personally and as a U.S. Senator—will continue to be brightened by the respect, esteem, and love of your fellow men and the blessings of God.

YOUR STAFF.

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there appeared in the Wall Street Journal as of this morning a very well-reasoned editorial, under the caption "Why an Urban Affairs Department?" I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY AN URBAN AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT?

A lot more heat than light is being generated around the administration's efforts to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. The President, now that the House Rules Committee has pigeonholed a bill to create the new agency, is trying to win his point by setting up the Department by Executive decree. So it is a good time to review just what this program involves and to see what its implications are.

The proposal provides for transferring to a new Cabinet-level Department the functions of many existing Federal housing agencies. The secretary would be charged with studying the Nation's housing problems and development of urban communities, advising the President, and providing leadership, technical assistance and information to State and local governments.

Proponents of the plan themselves have advanced, unintentionally, persuasive reasons why it is neither desirable nor necessary. For they have said again and again that the plan would create no new Federal programs nor would it alter substantially existing laws on Federal housing and urban development. If that is so, as the National Association of Manufacturers and others have observed, there surely is no crying need for a whole new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

But a much more likely prospect is that the proposed Department would actually be a device by which the Federal Government could extend and consolidate control over its farflung housing and urban redevelopment projects, at the expense of urban areas. Since the plan defines an "urban area" as a city or township of any size, whether incorporated or unincorporated, it would cover a pretty broad territory.

The President himself hinted at the possible extent of this Department's invasion of localities when, commenting on the Rules Committee action, he referred to the administration's "concern for some effective management and responsibility of the problems of two-thirds of our population who live in cities."

The Government might well be concerned. For just such massive intrusions into municipal affairs as a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would be empowered to make have helped to contribute to the urban mismanagement and irresponsibility with which many cities are well acquainted. Too often political machines have become involved with millions of dollars of construction contracts with scandalous results. Nor is the profligate example of the Government itself one that suggests prudent management to municipal governments.

What the cities need far more urgently than Federal concern for their failings is a hard look by their own administrators and citizens at what Federal housing programs already are doing to them. What is happening as the result of paper plans imposed upon them from Washington whether relevant to local problems and conditions or not? What has been the effect of municipal rubberstamping of Federal standards and specifications, imposed under the threat of withdrawal of Federal funds? What has been the effect on cities of swallowing projects which in the absence of local control had been better not begun at all?

That sort of realistic appraisal is the last thing the localities can expect from the Federal Government. And it surely would not come from a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. What would inevitably come are still more and more elaborate paper plans, more Federal standards and specifications, more Federal say-so about where, how, and for what the taxpayers' dollars are used. The only logical end to all this is complete abdication of municipal control over urban development.

It may be vain to expect that the Federal housing and urban improvement juggernaut as it now exists can be rolled back. But its further invasion, under the banner of a new Cabinet-rank Department, can be checked. Now that the President, in a message yesterday, has notified Congress he is setting up the Department, the House or Senate has 60 days in which to reject it. On its merits alone, rejection is what it deserves.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BUSH. There is no time set aside especially for discussing the McCone nomination today, is there?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that the only requirement or order entered by the Senate is that it vote at 2 o'clock.

Mr. BUSH. If there are no other speakers in the morning hour, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 5 minutes——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request for just a moment? I believe there is other morning business. There will be time to discuss the McCone nomination. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] wants time to speak on the nomination. He has informed the majority leader to that effect. We will see that there is a brief quorum call after the morning hour. Then we will go on to the McCone nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, what is the business to come up after the morning hour?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The McCone nomination.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is it under controlled time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. We will vote at 2 o'clock.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will the discussion on the nomination be under controlled time? I wanted 5 or 10 minutes in connection with the introduction of a bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The discussion will not be under controlled time, if the Senator wants to wait until the morning business is concluded.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I will wait.

OIL: MOSCOW'S POLITICAL WEAPON

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a recent article by Mr. Ralph McGill, noted journalist and columnist of the Atlanta Constitution, Atlanta, Ga. The article is entitled "Oil: Moscow's Political Weapon."

Mr. McGill again reminds us of the threat of Soviet economic competition and how the Soviet Union can use this economic power to disrupt normal markets, and, in fact, wage war on the world economy.

Last year I addressed the Senate on this subject and called to the attention of the Senate several instances of the Soviet economic offensive and the effects of that economic offensive upon world markets and commercial enterprises in the so-called free countries.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. McGill's article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL: MOSCOW'S POLITICAL WEAPON—REDS SEEN DRIVING TO UNDERCUT WEST ON PRICES AND ENTRAP NATIONS CITED

(By Ralph McGill)

This is about Russian communism's political use of oil. But first, a preamble.

Domestically, the Communist Party is at its lowest ebb in our history. A number of factors are responsible. One is the common sense of the American people. Marxist theories do not appeal. Nikita Khrushchev has not been a good salesman in the United States, whatever his success elsewhere. If he is trying to catch up with us, as he says he is, then even a fellow who isn't very smart would probably not be interested in something admittedly not as successful as our own system.

The people of this country have been well educated about Communist methods and activities. They are not immature, witless fools, as some of the organizations so determined to teach them their own ideas seem to think. The American people do a very good job of thinking for themselves. J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation have done a magnificent job of keeping the party under surveillance and in producing educational material.

The great danger is from organized Communist military aggression. The next most serious threat comes from communism's use of her own foreign-aid program and economic power as political weapons, subtle or direct. It is not, let us repeat, communistic to support laws against racial discrimination. It is not communism to urge that Negro citizens be allowed to vote. It is not communism to suggest that fluorides in water will deter tooth decay.

The Supreme Court has not been, and is not disloyal. Chief Justice Warren is an able, competent jurist whose allegiance (along with that of the Associate Justices) to the Bill of Rights as written is one of the major bulwarks against communism.

The United Nations is not a Communist organization. The overwhelming majority of commonsense Americans know these things. They are not deceived by hysteria.

The National Petroleum Council has done us a favor. It has put its finger on a massive Communist threat—and it locates it where it is. (It is neither under the bed nor in the schools.)

Robert E. Ebel, an oil and gas expert with the Interior Department, is perhaps the best-informed man in the Western nations on Soviet oil production and uses. The American Petroleum Institute has published his book, "The Petroleum Industry of the Soviet Union."

Expert Ebel shows us how economic communism works; and where. The political power of surplus oil is tremendous. The Soviets now are pricing their oil on political grounds in an effort to upset Western markets. They are having some success. If it should continue, then the nations buying cheap oil later will find themselves dependent on the Soviet supply of oil and other materials as well. (Hitler employed this same technique to obtain economic control of middle European nations before the Second World War.)

The Gas and Oil Journal prints a deadly parallel to reveal the price-spread trap used by the Russians in 1960. The shipments included:

Gasoline: Free world, 8,300 barrels daily at $3.68; Communist nations, 57,000 barrels at $4.46.

Kerosene: Free world, 6,200 barrels a day at $3.40; Communist nations, 16,600 barrels at $4.37.

Diesel fuel: Free world, 67,900 barrels a day at $3.03; Communist nations, 34,900 barrels at $4.44.

Fuel oil: Free world, 100,700 barrels a day at $1.56; Communist nations, 6,100 barrels at $2.38.

Italy was Russia's best customer for crude oil, receiving more than 78,000 barrels a day in 1960. Red China leads in gasoline, kerosense and diesel fuel.

Sweden leads in fuel oil purchases.

This is economic war—as armed aggression in Laos and Vietnam is another kind of war.

We must have faith in our freedom—which is the real secret weapon communism can't match.

We do not need divisive action that seeks to split Americans and make them fear and suspect one another.

INDUSTRIAL USES OF AGRICULTURAL SURPLUSES CAN HELP EVERY FARMER

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, once more we face a new year with the problems of agriculture unsolved.

Several years ago we were plagued with enormous surpluses. Those surpluses are still with us. There has been no magic performed in the last year to cause surpluses and the continued threat of surpluses to disappear, or magic that has brought about a program to enable farmers to make full use of their capacity to produce.

In years gone by our Government has been faced with a problem of huge expenditures in an effort to deal with the agricultural problem. It runs into many billions of dollars annually. This problem has not disappeared. This problem is still with us. In fact, the financial burden of our farm program is greater than it has ever been.

During the past year the basic position of agriculture in our total economy, in some phases, has become more disadvantageous than it was a year ago. The figures released by the Department of Agriculture point out that the farmers' share of the consumer food dollar has been reduced by 1 cent during the last year. A year ago when a housewife spent $1 for food the farmer got 39 cents of it. That was a year ago, but as of today the farmer gets only 38 cents.

It is also a matter of record, having appeared in the public press, that all of the major farm equipment manufacturing companies are going to increase their prices. The farmers of America are the biggest buyers of so-called hard goods. A great deal of the farmer's gross income goes to buy tractors, cultivators, plows, weeders, fencing, and other such items. The trend of our economy in 1961 was such that the farmer is going to have to pay more for all of these things.

A great portion of the agricultural problem is the result of surpluses. In spite of all the years of effort put forth and the spending of billions of dollars we are still plagued by surpluses. These surpluses hang like a cloud over the normal markets and prevent a rise in prices.

A reduction in acreage has not resulted in a satisfactory reduction of surpluses. Many qualified people believe that we have not yet scratched the surface in the matter of productivity. We have reduced and reduced the acres which a farmer may plant in order to participate in the support price program. The individual farmers are not to blame for the situation. If they are to stay in business and make a go of things, they must produce all they can. As always happens when we compel a farmer to reduce and reduce drastically the production of that crop for which his land is best suited, he must find something else to plant or increase the production on the acres allocated to him. Often we go around in circles and make no progress.

If we are to deal with this problem of surpluses and bring a fair and reasonable price to the farmers for their products we must turn our attention to new markets. Some progress is being made and can continue to be made in the matter of exports. There is a limitation, however, in reference to increasing our exports. Many of the countries used to have a scarcity of food and are now self-sufficient or are producing a surplus. The world is producing more of its own food. Here in the United States we are going to be faced with corn production not of 100 bushels an acre, but 200 bushels an acre, and it is not fantastic to say that there will be some production plots that will reach 300 bushels per acre within a few years.

The greatest market for our farm products is right here in the United States. The greatest new market we can find is a market in industry. The American people are using more gadgets, materials, and equipment of all kinds than ever before and that use is increasing daily. Many of these industrial uses can be supplied from raw materials produced on the land.

From our farms we can produce many things industry is now using, and many things industry will use in the future which we have not even thought of at the present time. These industrial uses are not limited to motor fuel and rubber, although I believe with adequate additional research the grains can become competitive with other materials in producing these products. There are literally hundreds of possibilities for making industrial uses of agricultural products. These include solvents, surface coatings, plastics, chemicals, fibers, films, explosives, adhesives, lubricants, insecticides, paints, varnishes, and even paving materials.

For a number of years we have been using more synthetic rubber than natural rubber. The Welsh Commission estimated that within 5 years after the date of their report the consumption of synthetic rubber would increase by 50 percent. Had that increase alone been given to the American farmer and that rubber made from alcohol derived from grain surplus, it would have required 200 million bushels of grain per year. That is how we made our rubber in World War II under the able leadership of the rubber czar, also a distinguished Nebraskan, William Jeffers. When he first started the rubber was so costly it was almost scandalous, but by research and trial and effort the cost of rubber was reduced to a reasonable level.

It has long been my hope that we could use alcohol produced from grain as a part of our motor fuel. Farmers buy a lot of gasoline and tractor fuel. Certainly they should be allowed to produce their own fuel. The number of cars in the country is constantly increasing and likewise the motor fuel market is increasing. European countries have blended alcohol into their gasoline up to 25 percent. Were we to blend alcohol into our gasoline to the extent of 10 percent, it would require more than a billion bushels of grain. In other words, that one use alone could probably solve the grain surplus problem.

However, we face a very definite obstacle in regard to this. It is an economic fact that gasoline can be produced cheaper than alcohol. Consequently, no one selling gasoline is going to turn to a fuel blended with alcohol. In peacetime, under our free American system, we cannot compel them to do so by law.

However, I am thoroughly convinced that a broad program of research will lower the cost of producing alcohol from farm products. At the present time when we make alcohol out of farm products we have a protein residue that is very valuable food for animals. However, with improved methods brought about by research and trial commercialization, it is believed that the alcohol can be extracted and the protein residue will be a fine human food. Its value will then be many times greater than its value for livestock food. The alcohol will then become more or less a byproduct and it can be sold at a price to compete with gasoline for a part of this motor fuel market. So, while a portion of the motor fuel market is not ours at this time, it is not an impossibility from the standpoint of the long-range accomplishments.

The companies supplying motor fuel at the present time have no valid ground for alarm over the inauguration of such a program. They are taxpayers and as such, are interested in a solution of our agricultural problems because agriculture is a sizable item in the budget. Then, too, the farmers are the petroleum companies' best customers and the economic well-being of agriculture is beneficial to all businesses. I would further point out that these same companies will be producing and selling the motor fuel regardless of how that motor fuel might be blended. They will not lose—rather, they will gain. We do not advocate Government-owned plants in connection with any of the accomplishments relating to industrial uses of farm surpluses. The benefits of the research, pilot testing, and trial commercialization, which would be carried on by the Government, would be turned over to private enterprise.

The allwise Creator put on this earth 250,000 plants. We have domesticated and used only 150 of them, not 150,000, but 150. It is a safe guess that thousands of these plants could be produced on the farms of the United States and would make a real contribution to industry as well as to agriculture. Almost every problem solved by man has been solved through research. It is logical to believe that when the farm problem is solved it will be solved through research. The answer lies in finding greater uses for the blessings we have rather than in the negative approach of regimentation, restrictions, acreage reductions, and limited horizons.

In 1956, I secured the adoption of an amendment to the agricultural bill which called upon President Eisenhower to appoint a five-man Commission to recommend ways to increase the industrial uses of our agricultural products. That Committee did an outstanding job. The Chairman of the Committee was Mr. J. LeRoy Welsh, of Omaha, Nebr. The other members were Mr. Karl D. Butler, Charles R. Sayre, George H. Coopers, and Dr. Frank J. Welch. Mr. Wheeler McMillen of the Farm Journal, who has spent years in farm chemurgy and still is vitally interested in such a program, served as executive director of the Commission. Dr. G. E. Hilbert of the Department of Agriculture gave invaluable assistance to the Commission.

The members of this Commission not only served without pay, but for the most part the Commission members, as well as the individuals that they called upon to serve on the task force committee, did not even submit an expense account. A hundred thousand dollars was allocated to the committee, but a large portion of that was returned to the U.S. Treasury. The Commission called in 188 of the country's leaders in agriculture, industry, and science. Eighteen task groups were formed and they brought in a report charting a course to reach an objective sought by everyone interested in the farm problems.

The Commission stated in its report it believed that a greater use of the products of our land could be found in industry through research which could ultimately solve our farm problem. The program envisioned by the committee involved not only research. That is vital and necessary. Research comes first, but it goes beyond research. It calls for a program of trial commercialization and pilot testing. Research for its own sake does not provide the answer. We must have trial commercial programs and pilot testing to pave the way for the uses of these things in industry. The Commission also called for limited assistance on a pilot basis for educational purposes to farmers and industry to try out new processes to use up some of these surpluses not needed for food for man or animal.

The report of the Welsh Commission has never been put into effect. A bill to set it in motion has passed the Senate twice. This legislation did not contain everything that I desired, but it would have inaugurated the program. This legislation has not been enacted because of the vigorous, determined, and persistent opposition to such a program among the bureaucracy found in the Department of Agriculture.

Nothing in the world fights to maintain the status quo, to refrain from changing ways, to hold on to jurisdiction, employees, and little self-made empires as does a Government bureaucracy. I do not condemn individuals in Government. Many of them I know to be fine, dedicated public servants. I do condemn bureaucracy as a system. The first love of the bureaucracy is the bureaucracy itself, not the people that it is supposed to serve. Jobs, more jobs, promotions, more employees so there can be more supervisors and more division heads and section chiefs, more power and more money are the goals of a bureaucracy.

I have stated that one of the biggest needs is research to find new uses of our farm surpluses to the end that these blessings from our Creator can be used for something in addition to food for plants or animals. The research must be applied and that is why we also insist on a program of trial commercialization and pilot testing. No one can deny the value of modern research.

It is because of research that the lifespan has been extended and that the science of medicine has so progressed. It is because of research that we now produce 100 bushels of corn where we used to produce 25 and, as I say, where we will some day be producing 200 bushels and 300 bushels per acre.

As of about 3 years ago industry was spending over $3 billion a year on research. This was about 3 percent of gross sales. The result is obvious in a constant flow of new and improved products such as fabrics, plastics, building materials, surface coatings, detergents, chemicals, and many, many other things.

There has been research for agriculture; the great part of it has been spent on research to find out how to produce more or in other words to add to our surpluses. The money, the talent, and the brains in the laboratories have been used to increase agricultural production, and very little has been spent on finding new uses for the things that were produced. At the time the Welsh Commission was doing its splendid work, they found that while industry was spending 3 percent of their gross sales in research there was being spent for agriculture about one-twentieth of 1 percent of gross sales to find new uses for the products that our farmers produce.

Mr. President, what I am saying today has been said many times on the floor of the Senate. The question before us is, Why is not something done? Why is not legislation passed?

In the first session of this current Congress the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], a member of the Agriculture Committee, who has had a long interest in this program, introduced a bill in which I joined him. A request was made of the Department of Agriculture for a report on the bill. The substance of that report was that the Department of Agriculture opposed the enactment of the legislation. They did not even come in and suggest a modification of the legislation, nor did they recommend its passage with certain changes. The position of the Department of Agriculture led to the only conclusion to be drawn by the Congress—that the Department wanted nothing done.

In answer to the position of the Department of Agriculture, I repeat what I said a moment ago about Government bureaucracy. It is not the servant of the people and it is not interested in the people's problems. Again I stress, I am not talking about individuals, I am talking about a system of bureaucracy. I would like to take time to praise many Government employees both in high and low positions for their dedication and their zeal in the public service, but there is something wrong with our system of bureaucracy.

There is one part of the program recommended by the Welsh Commission and advocated by many Senators and Congressmen that did appeal to the bureaucracy in the Department of Agriculture. We wanted them to do more research, which meant more money and more men. This they have speeded up without legislation. I expect to try to find out what these additional expenditures have been for. I again repeat the charge that the vast portion of the money spent for research is being spent for things other than the finding of new uses for the products the farmers produce. Additional money has been used to enlarge bureaucracies, create more jobs, and more supervisory positions, but the real work of launching a program to find new uses for farm products has not gotten off the ground. This is true in spite of an increased budget.

Under existing law American taxpayers' money can be spent in foreign countries to subsidize research. The Department of Agriculture is engaged in this. I fear that they have not used this opportunity for research on finding new industrial uses to any great extent.

Mr. President, research is so important in today's living that we have almost gone overboard for it. It might be well for Congress to take a good, hard look at all of our research programs. What individuals are doing the research and what are their objectives? Why is it that we put emphasis on one type of research and subdue another? Do our researchers project themselves toward one industry or another and are our industrial interests affecting the course of research? In the field of agricultural research, why is it that the Government spends practically all of its time on production research, whereas much of the remaining time is used in identifying synthetics which can take the place of the products of agriculture? Why is it that our agricultural research is not directed in the main to the identifying of new uses for our vast burden of surpluses? Is it not ridiculous to devote our major agricultural research to greater production and, at the same time, subsidize an area of research to synthesize all the products of our farms?

We are all familiar with conflict-of-interest statutes. Maybe, in a sense, the Congress and the Department of Agriculture are, in a broad general way, guilty of conflict of interest in the field of agricultural research. We spend billions to support the raising of crops and their storage. We spend millions to teach farmers how to increase production. We spend additional millions to find how other industries can give us, by synthesis, all those products of the farms.

Elaborate regulations have been established to avoid situations where individuals can gain specific or privileged knowledge in Government service which may be capitalized after they leave Federal Government. We can reverse this situation by bringing into Government competent research people who are capable of tackling our most serious farm problem, the utilization of surpluses, rather than to support them in efforts which worsen the problem.

This apparent conflict of interest can be reduced by industries which compete in the markets for farm products. They surely have an acute interest in the welfare of agriculture. Without economically sound agriculture, the whole country suffers. Without economically sound agriculture, industry loses its biggest customer, the farmer.

Mr. President, perhaps the time has arrived for the Congress to take a long, thorough look at the Government's research programs and see where we are going.

Recently my attention was called to one of the issues of this past year of the magazine entitled "Industrial Research." In it there is an article entitled "The Synthesis of Food." A subparagraph of the article reads as follows:

> The total energy represented by the food consumed by all the people of the world amounts to only 13 percent of all energy obtained from oil, coal, gas, wood, and waterpower. These materials then can feed the world.

The gist of this so-called learned article is that through research we will not need the farmer any more.

This article contains this significant statement:

> In general, chemists can make any substance that can be grown by plant or animal, and often can produce it more quickly and at lower cost than natural products.

The article talks about the 22 amino acids that go to make up plant and animal proteins and then I find this interesting sentence:

> The principle raw materials for the synthesis of amino acids would be petroleum, wood, nitrogen from the atmosphere and sulphur from mineral resources.

Mr. President, listen to this taken from this article:

> A production of fats would require only petroleum or coal.

Then the article draws this conclusion:

> The progress of synthetic organic chemistry in the past 100 years indicates that synthetic foods ultimately will be developed to the point where they can be produced in such large quantities at so small an expenditure of human effort that they will replace agricultural products. The development will follow the same pattern as synthetic dye, resin, rubber, and fiber, which have replaced or now are rapidly replacing the same or similar materials formerly derived from plants or animals. Already a number of vitamins and two critically important amino acids are being manufactured commercially.

Now, Mr. President, I am grateful to our all-wise Creator for having placed in the various elements the things that can sustain life. That is wonderful. That is great. That same Creator, however, produces seeds for plants and caused animals to be created and put them here for men to use.

A great agricultural industry exists in America. The farmers have done the finest job of any group anywhere in the world. They have a problem on their hands. They are entitled to research so that they can contribute to all the new products of our modern age that are used by industry. Obviously, the individual farmer cannot carry on this research. It is a proper function of Government. If it is carried out together with the other parts of the program envisioned by the Welsh Commission, it can make a major contribution to the agricultural problem and it can save the taxpayers billions of dollars.

Why is it not done? Why cannot bureaucracy serve the people and not continue to serve bureaucracy?

Mr. President, I do not know the man that wrote the article in the magazine, "Industrial Research," from which I quoted. The nub of that article is that man can be fed from the atmosphere and from coal and wood and petroleum and other substances. I charge the author of that article with no wrongdoing. I do not want to, by inference, suggest that there is the slightest deviation by him from the highest standards of ethics or the very best intentions. It was startling to me to learn that the author of that article is a Government official. His salary is paid by the taxpayers. My only purpose in mentioning this is to raise the question as to why are not the great resources and talents and the man in charge of the laboratories paid by the Government of the United States used to help solve the farm program?

Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture has a responsibility in this. He has a responsibility far beyond making speeches at farm groups, although that is important and commendable. He has a responsibility beyond that of providing jobs for worthy party hacks who helped elect his administration, although that too is part of our system. The job of the Secretary of Agriculture is to run the Department of Agriculture. The Department of Agriculture should never run the Secretary.

It is my hope that before the calendar year 1962 is over the Secretary of Agriculture and the Congress will meet their responsibility, both in the interests of the farmers of America and the taxpayers of the country, who pay an enormous bill for an expensive job that is not solving the problem.

The reason I am so convinced that we must look into our research programs to find out what they are working on is that research can be used to destroy agriculture as well as promote agriculture. Research in the past has actually cut down many markets farmers used to have. For instance, in the last 20 years the domestic use of paint and varnish has increased about 100 percent. Use of linseed and other drying oils has increased only about 25 percent. Synthetics made from nonfarm products took their place. If linseed oil were used in paints today at the same rate as in the early 1930's, the United States would need a million more acres of flax. Per gallon of paint, the use of drying oils has dropped more than 40 percent in the last 20 years or so, as they were progressively replaced by synthetic products. Tung oil is affected by the same trend, and that is important to a very great segment of our agriculture economy.

To cite further illustrations of how agriculture has been researched out of a good part of its natural markets, I call attention to these facts. Nearly half of the market for natural fiber such as cotton, wool, flax, and silk, has been taken over by synthetic fibers. Two out of three pairs of shoes are now made partly or wholly of leather substitutes. Two-thirds of the soap has been replaced by detergents which do not use natural fats. In fact, in the last 10 years the use of detergents per person increased from 1 pound per year to 15 pounds per year, while the use of soap decreased from 23 pounds to 8 pounds a year.

I do not condemn research in other fields. Neither do I condemn industries who want to expand their markets through research. My point is that the Department of Agriculture does not lead the way in using research with all of its possibilities of the present day to give to the farmers a fair place in the industrial markets of our country.

Shall modern research be called upon to serve the farmers or to destroy them?

VICE ADM. JAMES ALBERT HIRSHFIELD

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, today, the 31st of January, one of the most distinguished officers in the service of this Nation will retire from active duty after 38 years of service. I refer to Vice Adm. James Albert Hirshfield, U.S. Coast Guard. I have known and admired Admiral Hirshfield for almost 20 years as a friend and as a most respected senior officer in the Coast Guard, of which fine service I am particularly proud to be a Reserve officer. Admiral Hirshfield has a brilliant mind, a brave nature as shown by his World War II award of the Navy Star, and great judgment. His retirement is truly our Nation's loss. Accordingly, in order that his distinguished record may be more properly drawn to the attention of our Nation, I ask unanimous consent that the biography of Vice Admiral Hirshfield be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the biography was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHY OF VICE ADM. JAMES A. HIRSHFIELD, U.S. COAST GUARD, ASSISTANT COMMANDANT, U.S. COAST GUARD

James Albert Hirshfield was born at Cincinnati, Ohio, on July 30, 1902. His family returned to Texas when he was about 6 years old. He attended elementary and high school in San Antonio, Tex., graduating from Main Avenue High School in 1920. From 1921 to 1922 he was a student at the University of Texas where he became a member of the Kappa Alpha fraternity.

He was sworn in as a U.S. Coast Guard Cadet on July 26, 1922, was graduated from the Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn., on September 1, 1924, commissioned an ensign on October 17, 1924, and subsequently was promoted in rank as follows: Lieutenant (j.g.), October 17, 1926; lieutenant, October 17, 1928; lieutenant commander, October 17, 1932; commander, August 17, 1942; captain, December 1, 1943; commodore, June 1, 1945 (reverted to captain, February 12, 1948); rear admiral, October 1, 1951; and vice admiral on June 1, 1960.

Launched from the Academy, he served nearly 9 years of sea duty before being assigned to a shore station. During the first 5 years he served on line and engineering duty with the Destroyer Force of New London, on the *Cummings, Henley, Wilkes, Downes, Fanning,* and *Cassin.* From 1930 to 1931 he served on the cutter *Tallapoosa,* and as executive officer of the destroyer *George E. Badger* at New London.

In January 1932, he was assigned to duty with the chief inspector of hull construction at the Bath Iron Works of Maine, commissioning the cutter *Hermes* in March as her commanding officer on Atlantic patrol duty under the New York division. Transferred to the Norfolk division in June 1933, he served as executive officer of the cutter *Pontchartrain.* He was reassigned in July 1934 to the Coast Guard Academy where he served as an instructor until September 1937. During this period he attended summer postgraduate classes at the law schools of the University of Texas and the University of Chicago. He was then transferred to Coast Guard Headquarters at Washington, D.C., where he attended George Washington Univeristy Law School and received a bachelor of laws degree in June 1939, and was admitted to the bar of the district court of the District of Columbia on January 15, 1940.

From November 1940 to April 1942, he served as commanding officer of the cutter *Onondaga* stationed at Astoria, Oreg. During the following 5 months he served as commanding officer of the maritime training ship *City of Chattanooga.* When this vessel was turned over to the War Shipping Administration in September 1942, he became commanding officer of the cutter *Campbell* on escort convoy duty in the North Atlantic. While escorting a convoy of merchant ships from England to North America on February 22, 1943, the *Campbell* attacked four enemy submarines and spotting a fifth on surface destroyed it by ramming and by gunfire. This was the U-606 from which five prisoners were taken aboard the cutter. Disabled as a result of the ramming, the *Campbell* was towed by the British tug *Tenacity* 800 miles to St. John's, Newfoundland. Although injured during the encounter with the submarine, the then Commander Hirshfield remained in command throughout the engagement and subsequent operations. He was awarded the Navy Cross for "extraordinary heroism and distinguished service" as commanding officer of the *Campbell* and the Purple Heart for injuries sustained in the sinking of the U-606.

Detached from the *Campbell* in May 1943, he served at Coast Guard Headquarters as Vice Chairman of the Merchant Marine Council until February 1945. He then became assistant district Coast Guard officer of the 9th Naval District, Cleveland. On July 1, 1945, he was designated 9th District Coast Guard officer, and promoted to the wartime rank of commodore. (His title was later changed to commander, 9th Coast Guard District).

In September 1950, he was transferred to Coast Guard Headquarters to serve as Assistant Chief, Office of Merchant Marine Safety, and Vice Chairman of the Merchant Marine Council. In October 1951, he was appointed a rear admiral and designated Chief, Office of Personnel, and in December 1952, was assigned the collateral duty of flag officer in charge of Reserve affairs.

On June 1, 1954, Rear Admiral Hirshfield was sworn in as Assistant Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, the position he currently holds. (This appointment was approved by President Dwight D. Eisenhower and confirmed by the U.S. Senate on May 13, 1954.) On April 22, 1958, the Senate confirmed a second 4-year term for Rear Admiral Hirshfield as Assistant Commandant, effective June 1, 1958. On June 1, 1960, he was promoted to the rank of vice admiral in accordance with Public Law 86-474.

In addition to the Navy Cross and the Purple Heart, Vice Admiral Hirshfield earned the following World War II campaign and service medals: American Defense; American

Area; European-African-Middle Eastern Area (1 star) World War II Victory.

Vice Admiral Hirshfield is married to the former Marjorie Mulford Prentis of New London, Conn. They have three children: Mrs. Thomas M. Wallace, James Albert, Jr., and Mary Mulford. The Hirshfields live at 3218 Leland Street, Chevy Chase, Md.

Vice Admiral Hirshfield retired on February 1, 1962, bringing to a close a brilliant career of nearly 38 years in the Coast Guard. In recognition for exceptionally meritorious service as Chief of Staff and as Assistant Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard for two terms, Vice Admiral Hirshfield was presented the Distinguished Service Medal by the Secretary of the Treasury on January 23, 1962.

TWO VOICES FROM THE GRAVE OF FREEDOM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, an old and very distinguished friend of mine, Dr. Peter Zenkl, a refugee from Communist tyranny in Czechoslovakia, recently called to my attention two letters from political prisoners in that captive land which were smuggled out of that hapless country. These telling indictments were recently reprinted in the newspaper Ceske Slovo which is published in Munich, Germany.

Mr. President, I hope that many people will read these very moving letters which serve as a graphic reminder of the degradation which an individual can suffer under an authoritarian regime.

In one letter addressed to the Central Committee of the Communist Party in Czechoslovakia and its First Secretary Antonin Novotny, the wretched prisoner turns the spotlight of truth on the Communist definition of democracy when he asks:

> What was my crime? The inner need of justice and humanity, the need of those liberties which are contained in the Declaration of Human Rights and in every democratic constitution.

In the second letter addressed to the Czechoslovakian National Assembly another political prisoner cries out:

> You have not only taken my liberty—you have deprived me also of my human likeness; I must neither educate myself nor create anything.

He adds:

> Man can be persuaded by humanity only, not by violence.

Mr. President, these letters serve not only to redouble our conviction that those who are presently crushed behind the Iron Curtain must someday be free again—they also serve to nourish our own appreciation of liberties which we enjoy and the strength which these liberties give us in our struggle with the Communists. Again and again we see that ideas are more powerful than any Iron Curtain or wall and that what the Communists fear above all else are books written by freemen and the truth spoken by freemen.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two memorable letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO VOICES FROM THE GRAVE OF FREEDOM

(In this report we quote excerpts from two letters by political prisoners written in the Leopoldov Penitentiary in autumn of this year which found their way to the West afterward. In our view there is no need to doubt their authenticity. The parts of the letters which might give clues to the identity of the authors are omitted for obvious reasons. The first letter is addressed to the "Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and to its First Secretary Antonin Novotny.")

If I could address these lines to the Czechoslovak people on whose behalf you have claimed to act for many years, I would do so. If I could send my appeal to all people throughout the world and acquaint them with your actions I would not hesitate to do so for a moment although I know that your wrath might prompt you to cause my immediate death. This is not possible; the prison censorship would never let my letter pass. Therefore my words are addressed to you and to your conscience. Judge your actions yourselves. Ponder the terrible inhumanity and the wrong in them. Try to understand a human being, his needs, his life. And if you arrive at the conclusion that not every person has to be a materialist and a Marxist, that even he who does not agree with your views has the right to live, show enough courage too to settle your past account and do not change the present into a terrible tragedy and perennial shame of humanity.

What would you say if all those in the free world who strive for the victory of communism were forced to live in the same conditions as those in our country whose goal is democracy? Would you not protest? And what if every Communist would be tried and imprisoned for political reasons in the same way as you try and imprison us, your political opponents? Would you not see arbitrariness in such sentences and deep injustice and inhuman cruelty in the living conditions of those sentenced?

After the Communist coup d'etat you had me condemned to many years of penal servitude by the state tribunal. And what was my crime? The inner need of justice and humanity, the need of those liberties which are contained in the Declaration of Human Rights and in every democratic constitution.

You regard prison too light a punishment for us who are convinced that only in a democratic order man has all the guarantees for a full and happy life. And so you make it even harsher for us. In your jails and concentration camps it is not only that the privileges of political prisoners are not granted but also the right to have our own political and philosophical convictions is denied to us and we are cruelly persecuted for any expression of our creed.

I have spent a number of years in solitary confinement. A higher official of the ministry concerned declared as a welcome when a group of political prisoners arrived in Leopoldov: "You have not come here to serve your sentence but to perish." Overcrowded jails and concentration camps, in a word, graves without crosses and without names—these indict you.

"NATURAL DEATHS" PLANNED

You may aver that a lot has changed in your prisons during the last years. Yes, but only for some. You began to reflect and you invented new, more perfect forms for the liquidation of political prisoners. This is how your mind was working: Much of the suffering, however great, can be concealed or made little of since it is exceedingly difficult to gage its real depth. Death is a serious matter, however, especially if one cannot be sure it can be concealed forever. And so you came to the conclusion it is necessary to avoid certain things—at least for the time being. With the exception of a few cases every death must create the impression of a "natural" end. Would one credit that people are capable of scheming in such a way? Yes, you do, you want us to die but you want us to die a "natural death." And why? The world does not like blood. The time is not right for crematoria and gas chambers.

And the fact that we are dying? You have done everything to prevent anybody from learning about it. You have buried us alive in solitary confinement cells. You try to stifle every word, every shout of ours. You watch carefully lest no pencil or paper should get into our hands, lest we should speak. We are to keep silent for the sake of your undisturbed sleep and so that you can deceive the world more easily. We committed no crime. We are fully entitled to justice and humanity and we are also fully entitled to live. You have thrown us into prisons and concentration camps because of our philosophical, political, and religious convictions. Most of us have been held in prison for over 10 years in conditions which turn our daily life into cruel suffering and lead to our mental and physical liquidation. Are we to keep silent about this?

There was no barbed wire, corridors, dogs, and machineguns in the Leopoldov prison during the first republic or during the Second World War. Only you, the Communists, ordered that the existing fortress ramparts should be reinforced by these, the ramparts which in themselves were a more perfect protection against escape than the prison's walls. Cells with concrete floors, beds of concrete, and small windows near the ceiling where, in semidarkness, filth, cold, and dampness prisoners get food only one day in five, all this Leopoldov experienced only at the time of your "humanity." Apparently all this was not enough and you decided, therefore, in 1959: more cells! This time underground for solitary confinement. Again concrete. In these cells there is no longer even the small window near the ceiling and the cries of the tortured are reliably muted by four walls.

DEATH OF THE MIND

Our lives became hell. When you saw that solitary confinement cannot break us, that undernourishment cannot be stepped up if the appearance of normal death was to be preserved and that tuberculosis and other diseases cannot destroy our bodies quickly enough, you decided that even before our physical death the death of our minds should precede. You murder our souls. We must not possess or use writing utensils legitimately—with the exception of the short time necessary for the writing of a short, strictly censored letter to our family. In 1957 you prohibited our reading books and you have not revoked this inhuman order to this day. By correction, that is by hunger, cold, dampness and filth in the cells which are a shame in the 20th century you punish the reading of newspapers, including "Rude Pravo," of magazines or of anything that might tell us: this is what life is like on the outside, this and that is new in science and technical progress. We live in complete cultural isolation. The right to education and cultural needs is a dead letter of the constitution and of the prison rules in Leopoldov unless the prisoner renounces his philosophical, political and religious convictions or renounces himself.

We are born in the land that cradled Comenius too. You commemorated him recently. You want to appear to the whole cultural world as people worthy of his legacy. At home, however, in Leopoldov you have ordered that not a single book, newspaper or periodical must get into our hands, that we should be buried alive. Life without books in solitary confinement is hard to bear. But we have learned to live while dying. Yet, it cannot but hurt that it is in our nation in which there are people also today with such a negative attitude toward books, human beings and the spiritual heritage of our forebears.

You are forcing us to live between four walls, in a space of 8 square meters for months and years on end. And you have surrounded us with the scum of human society. You have instructed the most depraved of the criminals to attack us in the cells and to insult in our presence everything we hold dear and sacred—our families, the nation and God, our convictions, our faith. All has been perfectly calculated. You mostly chose as our fellow inmates not only people with the worst character but also suffering from serious mental disorders. Many of them deserve pity rather than condemnation. More than one of them has been in a mental institution several times. Even a bad person has the right to medical treatment if mentally ill. The law does not permit the imprisonment of mentally ill people, but you not only incarcerate them but you also abuse them as a means for the "breaking of the spirit" of more than one political prisoner.

Perhaps you will say: No, this is not true. And it is not true either that we are so cruel to the prisoners in Leopoldov. There are not only isolation cells but also common cells there. Indeed there are common cells there. You cannot be without your show window for official visits, you cannot be without a part to be admired for its "humanity." Common cells and modern halls with lathes operated by the prisoners—modern slaves—well-kept paths, flower beds, this is the second, the more humane face of Leopoldov. There is more food there, books, newspapers, and periodicals. And not even a cinema and television for a small number of the "chosen" are missing.

It would be erroneous to assume, however, that these better living conditions are due to humanity. They are a necessity. They are the fuel for the maintenance of a certain inner contentment of those who have become temporarily reconciled with their position as slaves. They are essential to prevent mass demonstrations of resistance and to serve as a means of bending character.

Don't be afraid to face the truth and send a commission to examine the conditions in Leopoldov. Take a look at the "show window" but then enter the new solitary confinement wing. You might begin with the former boilerroom in the cellar and spend a few minutes in the small cells greeting you with stench and filth. Even in the hottest summer you would shiver with cold. There the prisoner must live up to a month, underfed, in torn canvas rags, damp, cold, and filthy. It is there that the prisoner is "disciplined"—and the mentally ill is "cured." And also hunger strikes are broken here. But return to the ground floor and have the correction cells opened for you. Take a look at the ceilings covered with slime, look at the damp walls and remember well the picture of these places. A bed of concrete, a concrete floor with gaping holes, a small hatch near the ceiling. Imagine, 16 hours a day the prisoner paces the concrete floor, from wall to wall, to the door and back, again and again—tens of thousands of steps, 30, 40 and more kilometers covered over 4 meters—filthy, hungry, deeply humiliated in an icy and damp cubicle. If he stays there for 5 days he eats only on 1 of them, he must fast on the other 4.

If you considered this you would not be surprised about the large number of prisoners suffering from tuberculosis in Leopoldov and you would not have to look far for the reasons. Many a one of us is "indebted" to the correction cells and incredible living conditions for tuberculosis and many other diseases. And if you want to consider human dignity? Have the report slips submitted to you by the warden. Although much is distorted in them you will learn at least part of the truth, how many matters are punished by correction in Leopoldov and considered as trangressions of the prison rules. You might ask on the same occasion about physical violence to prisoners, dogs being let loose at them, how many inmates committed suicide in recent years, how many have died under suspicious circumstances and about the annual mortality rate in general.

EXTERMINATION DIVISION

You assert humanity is your highest aim. A different view seems to prevail in Leopoldov. Are those entitled to speak of humanity who, with incredible cynicism, send prisoners to the correction cells just at Christmas, even more often than at other times? Once you are in the new solitary confinement wing do not forget to visit the special regime division in which your hatred goes even further: there the barred prison windows are darkened by additional opaque glass panes with a wire mesh—so that we should not be able to see the sun and the sky—and, moreover, the tiny slots in the doors of the confinement cells previously used to pass our food have been closed by wire. It is for years now that food has been put before us on the dirty corridor floor outside the cells—not even dogs are fed in such a way.

Talk to the prisoners in the special regime division. Ask for details which would give you the exact picture of at least their malnutrition, tuberculosis and mental state. You will hardly find such a degree of malnutrition, such high a percentage of tuberculosis and mental disorders anywhere else in Czechoslovakia. This is the extermination division. We are virtually buried alive there.

And what is our fate to be? This was perhaps most bluntly indicated by what a former warden of the new solitary confinement wing said on two occasions. He said to a man whose state of health was critical and who weighed only 51 kilograms (112 pounds) at that time: "The stronger wins; you all will be finished within a year." And this was addressed to all the other political prisoners as well. On another occasion he promised: "You'll be the first I'll personally shoot dead in your cells in case of something like the Hungarian events happening here." As can be seen, every contingency is provided for.

If a person has to live in a solitary confinement cell for a day, week or even month, this need not be so awful, but there have been people confined to the special regime division for years. More than one of us has had to spend 5 and more years in a solitary confinement cell—a slow death. We tried to achieve improvements, we complained hoping to find—a human being. In vain. Your reply to the truths we told you was even greater hostility and more persecution.

Your morality is horrible. While we are buried alive and dying by your will you protest against the living conditions of prisoners in Greece, Spain, and wherever a single Communist is "suffering." We admit there may be place for improvements regarding the administration of justice also in the countries you mention. But our living conditions are a thousand times worse than those against which you protest. Compare these facts:

Mr. Glezos, the Communist imprisoned in Greece is able to address the world from prison, he can protest and claim his rights by mass and individual hunger strikes without exposing himself to gross physical violence or even death; he is also permitted to send chessmen made by his fellow prisoners to schoolboys in Moscow. We are allowed—under great difficulties—to send a few lines to our mother, father, wife, or children only now and again. A mass hunger strike in Leopoldov is suppressed by all means including the whip, dogs, and firearms. It is regarded as a riot. It is punished in court by several years added to one's sentence and by 10 days' correction imposed by the prison authorities. Individual hunger strikes are punished by 10 days' correction. And to send chessmen anywhere, this is quite out of the question.

Why do you deny the right of freedom to people wherever you rule? Why have our sisters and mothers tears in their eyes, why do children grieve for their fathers and wives for their husbands? Why do we have to die on gallows, in overcrowded prisons, and concentration camps? Why?

Perhaps you will try and sentence me for the truth I have just told you. Perhaps I have signed my own death warrant by my own words. Neither the one nor the other would surprise me. The poet Jiri Wolker says in one of his poems:

> "Death I fear not, death is not bad,
> Death is but part of life that is hard;
> Dying is terrible,
> It's dying that's bad."

Do you really think a political prisoner is afraid of death who knows, if it were up to you alone, he would never return to his family and die sooner or later in the solitary confinement cell? If he were afraid of death perhaps he would no longer be alive today. And the dying? You can only accelerate it by making our living conditions even worse.

I can hardly hope that my lines will meet with proper understanding on your part and might lead to an improvement. Why then have I written them? Only to write them? No, as I said before, they are addressed to your conscience. If there is only a single person among you in whom the terrible hatred has not destroyed everything that makes a being a human being, perhaps he will ponder what I have said. And if these lines get into the hands of an honorable, rationally thinking man I believe he will exert his every effort to make our living conditions human and to restore dignity to our lives.

INTOXICATION WITH POWER

Enough blood has been shed on the road of mankind—the future belongs to humanity. It is not enough to talk about man if the disignation "man" is to be borne proudly—it is necessary, in the first place, to be a human being. But perhaps you are not even capable of this any longer, as proved by much that is happening to us. The intoxication with power and the materialistic concept have instilled in you the idea about the superiority of communism and about the subjection of all who do not agree with communism. You have nurtured in your minds the self-confidence of a new superman, a Communist, who will transform the whole world from its foundations and will conquer the whole universe too. You do not understand and you do not want to understand that you have split the inner unity of man and that you have deprived his life of happiness. Those around you suffer and even you, yourselves, are beginning to feel the consequences of some of your actions. In Leopoldov, there are, beside us, the political prisoners, a great number of criminals and among them several hundred murderers. Never before have there been so many of them in our republic and perhaps never before have there been murderers in our country who have so many lives on their conscience as now. How come, that it is under your rule that the incidence of crime has risen so enormously and that felonies without parallel are committed? The number is legion of families disrupted and of children denied the feelings of warmth in their home. This all is the result of your morality.

Rid yourselves, at long last, of hatred and begin to see the human being again the sight of which has been obscured to you by your soulless materialism. He among you feels like a human being would not only begin to talk about improvements, but by his actions he would try to bring about this:

Much must be changed in Leopoldov. The concrete of correction cells must disappear, books must return to the hands of men. Not even mentally ill prisoners must be buried alive in the solitary confinement cells. The glaring light of bulbs must not hit the eyes of the prisoners at night, nor must they be deprived of sleep by the guards' ire. Physical violence to prisoners and torture shall be considered a felony. Extreme malnutrition is to be abandoned and respect for human dignity will be restored. Humanity will be the ruling word for living conditions and hatred will be considered a crime so that a proper attitude toward people is arrived at. And much must change in the Czechoslovak Republic as well. Man must have the right to live. He has the right of justice, the right of freedom.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR LIFE

(The second political prisoner addresses his letter from Leopoldov to the members of the Czechoslovak National Assembly.)

To you, on whom rests an enormous responsibility for the life of the Czechoslovak citizens by virtue of your position, to you who claim the right to lay down the way of life for all the citizens of our homeland—to you, the members of the Communist National Assembly.

More than 10 years ago I was still a human being. I loved my homeland—I still do so—I worked and lived like most of its inhabitants. When February 1948 came you seized the power in the state. The year 1945 had freed the world and also our nation from the bloody dictatorship of nazism. But the year of 1948 brought with it the installment of the Communist dictatorship in our land. And all those who were not on your side and wanted to live without fear in freedom began to feel persecution heavily and the violation of human rights. Thus you forced them to wage the battle for their rights illegally.

When I was arrested for my anti-Communist activity by the state security organs I was under no illusions that you would treat me as a political prisoner in detention. The cruelty of your jail is beyond the imagination of any cultured and civilized person, however. I am nothing but a number which can be erased. Although I live in central Europe in the 20th century I am held in conditions worse than those of prisoners several centuries ago. For years I have not been allowed to lay my hands on the Bible or any other book. And I must not read newspapers and periodicals, either. Allegedly it was your Minister of the Interior himself who ordered the establishment of a special division at the solitary confinement wing in Leopoldov in October 1957 which was named "Strict Isolation by Order of the Ministry of the Interior" and in which the reading of newspapers, books, and periodicals, as well as the use of writing utensils and cultural facilities, is forbidden.

You have not only taken my liberty you have deprived me also of my human likeness; I must neither educate myself nor create anything. A technical book in my hands you consider a "privilege" I do not deserve and have no claim to. And you want to take my life, too. But apparently you think dying would be too easy with a book in one's hand in which the prisoner might find a friend to comfort him in the solitary confinement cell and to let him forget the reality in which he is living for awhile. Perhaps a mental and spiritual breakdown is to precede death.

This is how you, the Communists, carry out punishment in a way I call inhuman even though I run the risk of more persecution by it. Why am I punished not only by loss of liberty but also by the denial of fundamental human rights and of the right to live? Perhaps because I have never refrained from emphatically protesting and defending the fight of man to think democratically and to enjoy human dignity? Or perhaps because, even after repeated "reeducation" courses in various prisons and concentration camps I protested against your speaking to the world in my name, too. Not only was there no improvement, I was subjected to more persecution.

I would like to work and to devote my whole life, all my strength to work for a happy life of man and of mankind. There is perhaps no greater human tragedy than my sitting in a solitary confinement cell for years and my not working. Nobody gave second thoughts to my attitude and to that of my fellow prisoners. Instead, the fearful wave of your anger was mounting. I was sent to the correction cells for several hundred days under various pretexts: He talked during exercise, a pencil was found on him, he memorized words, he fell asleep at table, etc. Several years spent in solitary confinement should be enough to speak for everything one cannot mention in these lines.

The cruel living conditions are to persuade me of the wrong of my actions and of correctness of the notion that communism is the most just and human order of all times. Can a man form such an opinion, however, who knows that there has never been such a measure of injustice and inhumanity in our land as in the years of your rule, that his own living conditions have never been so bad as now when you decide about them?

VIOLENCE NO PERSUADER

Man can be persuaded by humanity only, not by violence. Faith in God and in justice have always helped me, until now, to bear all the cruelty and hard time in your prison and I believe it will help me also when the hour of death has come, be it facing a mass grave.

You do not believe me? The prerogative of a Member of Parliament entitles you to investigate personally the living conditions in the Leopoldov solitary confinement wing. Find out, for instance, how many despairing people have daubed their eyes with ink graphite during the past 5 years, swallowed nails or other articles, cut their veins, committed suicide. The health records will unveil how many people were suffering from acute malnutrition, how many contracted tuberculosis, and how many went insane. What will be your comment when learning that mentally ill prisoners were put into cells with sane ones? Those of you who would want to discharge their duties properly will discover what correction means in Leopoldov and what living conditions are like there: filthy, torn pallets, covers of the same quality, physical violence, death by shooting, and many other horrors demanding abolition.

What have you brought into life, what have you made of Leopoldov, once a normal prison? Don't be offended by the truth—as you are wont to if it is unpalatable. I have always defended truth and the truth I have described should not arouse your anger and lead to new violence, but it should impel you to put an end to this inhuman reality. All pure human hearts wish for peace, just peace for all nations and all people and thus also for those who want to march toward a happy life along other roads than the one urged and enforced by the Communists: the road of democracy, the road of Christianity and of love toward one's neighbor.

I wish for peace too, a peace which will mean freedom for our nation, liberty and a human life for the political prisoners whose existence in the people's democracies cannot be concealed forever. Sooner or later they return to their families, people come home who did not hesitate to stake their personal liberty in the struggle for the freedom of man. They will tell, they will compare.

Members of the Communist National Assembly, you have assumed great responsibility before the nation and history.

TRIBUTE TO DENMARK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of the great stories of courage and heroism during World War II was Denmark's successful fight to save her Jewish citizens from the Nazis. How the Danes outwitted their Nazi conquerers and provided ways for most of the Jewish population to escape to safety has special significance in the light of the Eichmann trial, but the strength of the democratic spirit in time of great stress which it demonstrates is especially important in these dangerous days.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article by Harold Flender, "The Magnificent Danes," which appeared in the ADL Bulletin, the publication of the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith, October 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MAGNIFICENT DANES

(By Harold Flender)

(Under a heroic king, the people of Denmark fought and largely succeeded at saving Jewish lives under Hitler. A writer seeks to find out: Why the Danes—while so many others failed?)

As the Eichmann trial unfolded, I found that the story of Nazi horror, despite its familiarity, had not lost its power to shock. What particularly depressed me was the reminder of the apathy and toleration—and sometimes approval—of Nazi bestiality by many of the people of the occupied countries, including Austria, Poland, Czechoslovakia and the Ukraine. The rollcall was long and embraced much of Europe.

And then one day, during the trial, mention was made of Denmark and how this small occupied country had saved virtually its entire Jewish population during World War II. The mention was short, the facts given brief. In October of 1943, the Nazis decided to round up Denmark's 8,000 Jews for shipment to death camps. The entire country acted as an underground movement to ferry the 8,000 to Sweden. It was one of the few times Eichmann had been frustrated. He appeared in Copenhagen in a rage—but to no avail. The Jews were saved.

I turned to a book, "October 1943," written by Aage Bertelsen, a Danish pastor and schoolteacher. It tells how he and his wife organized an underground student organization that was responsible for getting hundreds of Danish Jews to Sweden. Mr. Bertelsen had a simple answer when asked why he had risked his life to aid the Jews: "These people were in mortal danger and we had no alternative. We had to do what we did."

Reading "October 1943" confirmed what I had suspected: the story of the Danish rescue of the Jews was a welcome and heartwarming testament of man's humanity to man. I felt that it offered a note of hope to offset the despair evoked by the Eichmann trial testimony and that it should have the widest audience possible—a television audience.

I took the idea to the producer of the CBS–TV religious program, "Look Up and Live." He approved. We would go to Denmark and shoot the story as a documentary film using persons and places actually involved. On the way to Copenhagen, I wondered whether I would find the answer to one question: Why the Danes and so few other people?

This is what I found out.

Germany occupied Denmark on April 9, 1940. After a few hours of fighting, the

Danish forces had to capitulate. Hitler spoke of the Germans' Nordic brotherhood with the Danes. He wanted Denmark to be his model protectorate. King Christian X was allowed to remain as the head of state. The Danish Parliament was permitted to function. The Danish Army, Navy, and police force remained intact. It wasn't until August 29, 1943—following a series of sabotage acts, including the scuttling of the Danish fleet—that the Germans decided to take over completely and rule by decree.

In other German-occupied countries, anti-Semitic laws were usually put into effect immediately. In Denmark, the Germans waited until the fall of 1943 before deciding to round up Denmark's Jews. Hitler's representatives in Denmark, particularly his governor, Dr. Werner Best, were conscious of Denmark's long tradition of religious freedom, and knew that the Danes, while generally a law-abiding and slow-to-anger people, would not tolerate persecution of fellow Danes who happened to be Jewish. King Christian X had long made known his opposition to anti-Semitism. In January 1941, the Germans had tried to blow up the synagogue in Copenhagen. The next day the King made a personal visit to the synagogue to inspect the damage; he also sent its rabbi a letter expressing his regrets at the attempted destruction.

In 1942, the Germans decided to order the wearing of the yellow Star of David by Denmark's Jews. King Christian said that should the order be enforced, he and his entire family would wear it as a sign of the highest distinction. The yellow Star of David was never introduced in Denmark. By the fall of 1943, however, the Germans had decided that the prize of 8,000 Jews was worth the risk of offending the Danes.

In late September 1943, word reached members of the Danish Socialist Party that the Germans were ready to move against the Jews. A surprise raid was being planned for Rosh Hashana—the Jewish New Year. This information was passed on to the Jewish community.

On the day before Rosh Hashana, Rabbi Melchior, chief rabbi of the Copenhagen synagogue, spoke to his congregation. "I told all the members that they had to leave their homes immediately and hide in the homes of gentile friends. But first, I told them, you must warn all the Jews you know, and tell them to warn all the Jews they know, that they must hide."

"The Germans had cut off all telephone service in the city. But the warning was passed by word of mouth—not only by Jews, but by gentiles. Anyone who knew Jews warned them, and, more important, took them into their homes to hide them from the Germans. I went into hiding at the home of a Lutheran minister. Our Torah, our holy books and candelabra were hidden in the basement of a church."

When, on Rosh Hashana, 1943, the Germans raided Jewish homes in Copenhagen, they found them empty. Furious, they arrested top Danish Army and Navy officers, offering to release them in exchange for information leading to the whereabouts of the Jews. Major General Gortz, commander in chief of the Danish armed forces, told the Germans he would not accept the exchange and voluntarily remained in an internment camp at Elsinore. Admiral Vedel, head of the Danish Navy, replied that he could see no advantage to exchanging one Dane for another. He, too, remained in an internment camp.

The Germans issued stern warnings but the Danes remained steadfast. Pastor Ivar Lange addressed a group of confirmation candidates in Frederiksburg Church: "Politics must not be discussed here, because it is punishable. In spite of this, I will tell you that I would rather die with a Jew than live with a Nazi."

On October 3, 1943, the Danish Lutheran bishops sent a letter to the German occupation officials in Denmark. It was also read in every Lutheran Church in Denmark. It said in part:

"Persecution of the Jews conflicts with the humanitarian conception of the love of neighbors and the message which Christ's church set out to preach. Christ taught us that every man has a value in the eyes of God. Notwithstanding our separate religious beliefs we will fight to preserve for our Jewish brothers and sisters the same freedom we ourselves value more than life. The leaders of the Danish church clearly comprehend the duties of law-abiding citizens, but recognize at the same time that they are conscientiously bound to maintain the right and to protest every violation of justice. It is evident that in this case we are obeying God rather than man."

During those early October days, while still in hiding, the Jewish population lived in fear. They knew something of what had happened to Jews in other European countries and did not know whom to trust. There were several suicides among the Jews during those first dreadful days. In Copenhagen, two young sisters hurled themselves under a trolley car. Others took gas. Some poisoned themselves. A brilliant young Jewish scientist gave his children sleeping pills. Then, while his wife held them in her arms, he cut their throats. He cut his wife's throat, and started to kill himself. At the last minute, his courage failed him and he went screaming into the streets, blood gushing. He was picked up by members of the Danish underground who saved his life.

But soon the Jews learned that their countrymen could be trusted to the point of death. Danish groups began organizing for the complicated task of transporting Jews to safety abroad. Danish fishermen were prepared to transport them to Sweden. In Copenhagen, a mild-mannered bookshop owner, Mogens Staffeldt, turned his store into a virtual travel agency to aid the refugees to get to the docks. During the October rescue operation, Staffeldt and other resistance members were so busy getting Jews to the docks that they became annoyed when somebody entered the bookshop to buy a book. Staffeldt and his brother were finally caught by the Gestapo and sent to a concentration camp in Germany. He managed to escape, but his brother died there.

I asked Staffeldt why he had been so involved in the rescue of Jews. He replied: "These people needed help. What else was there to do?"

The most important center in Copenhagen for the rescue operation was Bispebjerg Hospital. Two thousand Jews passed through its gates on their way to Sweden. Bispebjerg's role in the rescue operation started soon after Rosh Hashana 1943, when a Dr. Secher, then a medical student, came across a group of 40 Jews hiding in a little village south of Copenhagen. He appealed to one of his instructors, Dr. K. H. Koster, to help him get the group to fishing boats that would take them to Sweden. Dr. Koster agreed. They planned to assemble the Jews on the hospital grounds and take them to the docks in a canvas-covered truck.

The hospital chapel was selected as the point of assembly. Bispebjerg Hospital grounds are spacious and to get the Jews from the main gate to the chapel without arousing suspicion, a mock funeral was held. The Jews were dressed in black, carried flowers, and followed an empty coffin to the chapel building. Everything worked according to plan except that instead of the expected 40 Jews, 140 appeared for transportation to Sweden.

The initial 40 were transferred from the chapel to the truck. As it pulled away, one of the younger passengers lifted the canvas and thoughtlessly waved a cheerful goodby to his friends left behind. A Gestapo car, which had been parked nearby, started following the truck. The doctors feared that the rescue attempt had been found out. One of Dr. Koster's aids jumped into his car and followed the Gestapo car in order to ram it and permit the truck to escape. Just as he was about to stage his accident, the Gestapo car turned off onto another road. The truck with the refugees was able to go on to the docks without further incident.

At the hospital, Dr. Koster didn't know what to do with the 100 Jews left in the chapel. German soldiers and the Gestapo were on the hospital grounds and he was afraid one of them might wander in. He decided to hide the Jews for the night in the basement of the psychiatric building.

Next day, Dr. Secher delivered 200 more Jews to Bispebjerg Hospital. "I knew then," said Dr. Koster, "that the hospital was going to be an important center in the rescue operation of the Danish Jews. I welcomed the idea, but I knew that we had to get better organized."

Dr. Koster asked head nurse, Signe Jensen, for help in sheltering Jews in staff apartments on the hospital grounds. The nurse spoke to about 40 of her associates who quickly gave her keys to their apartments and moved in with other nurses, sleeping on living room couches, on floors, in bathtubs. The next day, Nurse Jensen received a delegation of angry nurses—angry because they had not been asked to help. They demanded to know what they could do to save the Jews.

Nurse Jensen explained her role to me readily: "When you have a democracy, you must be willing to fight to preserve it. I had been engaged in illegal work against the Germans since April 1940, when they first occupied Denmark. When the Jewish problem cropped up here, I knew I had to help the Jews. They were my countrymen."

The rescue operation conducted from Bispebjerg Hospital had its mishaps. In one case, the Germans raided the operating room of the hospital, found a surgeon operating on a Jew, and machinegunned to death everyone in the room.

Once at the docks, the Jews had to be taken by boat to safe harbor. The Germans used many devices along the docks to try to trap the Jews. Among them were vicious dogs, used to sniff out human cargo. Danish scientists, however, concocted a powder made of dried blood and cocaine, which was dusted on the decks of the fishing vessels and confused the dogs.

Twenty-five miles north of Copenhagen, in Elsinore, scene of Shakespeare's Hamlet, was a rescue group known as the Elsinore Sewing Circle. Among its leaders were Dr. Gerrsfeldt, a physician, Thomod Larsen, a policeman, and Earling Kaier, a sea captain. They rescued many Jewish children. Dr. Gerrsfeldt injected them with a serum that kept them unconscious for hours so they would not cry out during a crucial part of the operation; Larsen carried the unconscious children out to Captain Kaier's boat; Kaier transported them to the Swedish coast. In January 1944, during a raid on the area, Policeman Larsen was shot and severely wounded by the Germans. I asked him why he had risked his life to save Jews. Larsen was puzzled by my question. "These people needed help. How could anyone not help them?"

Ole Lippman, one of the chiefs of the underground movement, said that the Danes' work at saving Jews had a direct bearing on their overall resistance effort. "The Danes are a peace-loving, easy-going people. At first they had been reluctant to take an active part in the resistance movement. But when this happened to the Jews—when people had to hide friends, relatives, and people they hardly knew—they had already taken the first step in illegal activity against the Germans. After that, they figured they might as well go all the way."

In November 1943, sabotage reached its peak in Denmark. The Gestapo chief in Copenhagen reported back to Germany that the Danish resistance movement had intensified because of the German effort to arrest the Danish Jews. At the end of the war, Field Marshal Montgomery wrote that the Danish resistance movement was second to none.

In May 1945, after the German surrender, the Danish Jews came back to their homeland. To Rabbi Melchoir, the welcome the Jews received on their return to Denmark was even more significant than their exodus. "The people of other countries have let their Jews go before and, perhaps, they were happy to get rid of them, especially when Jewish homes, property, money were involved. In such cases, saying 'goodby' is easier than saying 'welcome back.' But when we returned, our fellow Danes did say 'welcome back.' And how they said it—emotionally, with open arms and hearts. Our homes, our businesses, our property, and money had been taken care of and returned to us. In some cases we found our houses newly painted, and there were flowers on the table," he told me. "You cannot imagine how happy it made us feel to be back home. The welcome we received from the King, from everybody, is the most important historic event in modern Danish-Jewish history."

There were examples of courage in all of the occupied countries, but Denmark's record of saving almost its entire Jewish population is unmatched. There is no one answer to the question: Why the Danes? One reason lies in Denmark's geographical proximity to neutral Sweden, and the fact that Sweden willingly accepted all refugees who reached her shores. But this would mean little were it not for the courage shown by the King, the Church, the medical profession, student groups and business organizations that undoubtedly inspired the general population to follow suit.

Beyond that, we must consider Denmark's long tradition of democracy: as early as 1690, the concept of the ghetto was condemned by the Danish Parliament as "inhuman." In 1814, all racial and religious discrimination was declared illegal in Denmark.

The deeper answer, perhaps, is that democracy and humanitarianism go hand in hand.

NEW TRANSPORTATION SERVICE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, recently the Canadian National Railroad announced that it plans to inaugurate a sea train service between Prince Rupert, British Columbia, and Whittier, Alaska, to provide twice-a-month freight service to the Alaska Railroad belt. This means that about 48 freight cars would be moving north each month. Alaskans who have long been awaiting a breakthrough in the Alaska shipping trade that would hold promise of lowering the high costs in Alaska have applauded this announcement. The Greater Anchorage, Alaska, Chamber of Commerce, on January 19, adopted a resolution in support of the Canadian National plans, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas it is the determination of the Greater Anchorage Chamber of Commerce to promote an adequate, virile, and highly competitive economy in Alaska; and

Whereas interests outside of Alaska have raised objections to improved transportation service for Alaska; and

Whereas Alaska is now a sovereign State of the United States and is in no manner subordinate in rights and privileges therein: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Greater Anchorage Chamber of Commerce is proud to support and foster any and all activities which will provide and foster more economical transportation to and from Alaska. In particular, the recent announcement by the Canadian National Railways concerning practical rail service, and faster and more economical barge service to and from Alaska, are steps in this direction.

LIVESTOCK MARKET BUILDER

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the January 20, 1962, issue of the Nebraska Farmer describes the great Union Stock Yards Co., of Omaha, as an institution which is the shadow of its builder.

It would be more accurate perhaps to describe Harry B. Coffee himself as an institution. In the past two decades his leadership has been the driving force behind the phenomenal growth of the Omaha stockyards. Today it stands as the Nation's largest livestock market. And by all indications it will remain the leader in serving the livestock industry.

On the eve of Harry Coffee's retirement as chairman of the board of the Omaha stockyards, Elwin Ranney wrote an excellent article for the Nebraska Farmer. Recalling in vivid and colorful detail the development of Coffee's career, which includes 8 years of distinguished service in the House of Representatives, it comes as a fitting salute to one of Nebraska's true pioneers and beloved citizens.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Ranney's fine article be printed following these remarks in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Livestock Market Builder

(By Elwin Ranney)

They say institutions are the shadows of the men who build them.

On February 1, at the age of 71, a Nebraskan named Harry B. Coffee is retiring, casting a long shadow. That shadow is the Union Stock Yards Co., of Omaha, which, under Coffee's leadership for the past 19 years, has grown to be the Nation's largest livestock market.

It was on February 1, 1943, with the country at war and the livestock industry in the throes of an all-out wartime effort under war-imposed handicaps, that Harry Coffee took over as president of the Omaha stockyards.

Coffee guided the Omaha section of the Nation's great livestock industry through those trying times and, when the war clouds cleared, he set out to build and build and build. That he was successful, everyone connected with the industry knows. The Omaha stockyards became the country's leading livestock market in 1955 and has held that position ever since. Harry retired from the presidency a year ago and has served for the past year as chairman of the board of directors.

What kind of man does it take to do a job like this in the market end of the livestock business?

Well, in the person of Harry Buffington Coffee there are combined really three people—businessman, statesman, and livestock man.

NATIVE NEBRASKAN

A native Nebraskan, Harry grew up on a ranch in the hard-grass country in Sioux County. His forebears were Texans.

Harry's father, Samuel Buffington Coffee, came up from Texas in 1877 to engage in the cattle business in Wyoming with his brother, Col. C. F. Coffee, who had driven a trail herd of longhorn steers from Texas to Cheyenne in 1872 for the Snyder brothers (J. W. and D. H.). J. W. Snyder had married a sister of "Buff" and Colonel Coffee. When Buff arrived in Wyoming, Colonel Coffee had established his first ranch on Box Elder Creek near Cheyenne. Several years later, the colonel sold out and established a ranch in virgin territory in the Hat Creek Valley, Sioux County, Nebr.

Buff Coffee established his ranch in 1879 on Lickett Creek, 7 miles west of the colonel's Hat Creek Ranch and 22 miles northeast of Harrison.

The brothers increased their holdings by getting their cowboy friends to file on homesteads and tree claims. When the homestead requirements had been completed, the brothers would purchase the land.

BORN ON RANCH

On March 1, 1889, Buff Coffee married Elizabeth Tisdale of Georgetown, Tex., and brought her to his Sioux County ranch where Harry, their first son, was born on March 16, 1890.

In 1898, because of greater opportunity for expansion, Buff bought another Sioux County ranch located on the Niobrara river 15 miles south of Harrison. The ranch included 3,000 acres and 5 miles of river, with about 1,000 acres of irrigated meadow. On each side of the river was open, free range which the ranch largely controlled by virtue of its owning the water gaps to the river.

Buff Coffee had mortgaged everything he had to buy and stock this new ranch. Two years later, Buff died of pneumonia, leaving his widow and four children. Harry was 10 years of age at that time. Col. C. F. Coffee was appointed administrator of the estate and took over the management of the two ranches. Buff's family was moved to Chadron, where the colonel and his family lived and where the colonel was engaged in the banking business in addition to his extensive ranch operations.

Colonel Coffee continued to look after the ranches and Buff's family as though they were his own until the estate was settled some 15 years later. After his father's death, Harry was considered the man of the family, a factor which matured his thinking and sense of responsibility early in life. Summers he spent putting in long hours in the saddle working on the ranch. He earned $1 a day.

In Harry's own words, "From the time father died, I had to assume a dad's responsibility. I was doing a man's job as a kid, learned the value of a dollar, where it came from, and how to appreciate it."

The long hours of work instilled an independent discipline, but Harry and his brothers, Guy and Rex, still found fun and recreation. Harry grins when he relates this one:

BREAK HORSES

"On Sundays we'd break horses—got to be pretty good riders. We liked to put on a little rodeo for homestead neighbors, one in particular, because the women would bring out cookies and desserts."

Then there were the jobs like keeping the Texas Longhorn steers out of the meadow. The jittery brutes had a habit of tearing down fences to get what they wanted. Harry whooped one day when he found several hundred in the meadow. There was little he could do during the next few minutes except "watch them tear out a half mile of fence."

Another time, Harry was along on a trail drive moving steers to the railroad shipping point at Andrews. The steers were supposed to go to Omaha. Just as the Longhorns started into the shipping pens, the train puffed around a far bend and whistled. In a very short time, Harry vouches, you could see steers headed back to the ranch from all directions. That trainload was a week late getting to Omaha.

Colonel Coffee held the ranches intact until 1915 when the estate was settled and Rex was put on the Lickett Creek ranch; the ranch on the Niobrara River was incorporated into the Coffee Cattle Co. Harry was president, brother "Chic" (Guy) was vice president and general manager, and sister Edna and their mother completed the corporation.

Harry never forgot the long hours of work on the ranch. It cultivated an unswerving discipline that he exerted toward any job he tackled thereafter. Today, wife Katherine humorously testifies that "Harry is not inclined toward physical endeavor of any kind. He says he worked hard on the ranch. Now he still works hard, but in a big chair with a big desk in a big office. Harry has done a lot of things, but basically I think he's a businessman."

Harry entered the University of Nebraska in 1909, majored in law and received a bachelor of arts degree in 1913.

In college, Harry became acquainted with a graduate who was making a lot of money selling Montana land to Lincoln investors. "If this fellow can sell real estate," Coffee deliberated, "I think I could too." He toured that Montana area but decided there were better land bargains to be sold right in western Nebraska. After college, he returned to Chadron to help organize the Coffee Cattle Co. and to open a real estate and insurance office. Selling ranches was one of his first independent and big-scale business ventures, and it boomed.

Harry took leave of the Chadron business for a 3-month tour of South America in 1915 and for another period, from 1917 to 1919, to serve as a second lieutenant in the air service.

After the war, Harry returned to his Chadron office to sell over $1 million worth of real estate in 9 months.

"I stashed the commissions for later ventures," he remarks.

Always versatile in speculation, Coffee tried a hand in several outside endeavors. Most often, an uncanny sense of business, plus level-headed analysis of situations prompted him to get into a business when it looked good—get out fast when its market slumped.

THE SHEEP BUSINESS

Even some of his best friends may not know that Harry Coffee was once in the sheep business. It was in the middle 1920's with the cattle business in a slump that Harry decided an investment in sheep might pay off. He phoned his brother at the ranch and suggested the possibility to him.

"Sheep," his brother's voice stormed out of the phone. "What the hell do you know about sheep?"

"Nothing," Harry countered, "but I'll send a sheepman along with them."

It turned out that the sheep paid off very well for several years, and the one band increased to three bands of about 1,500 each.

It soon became necessary to find a new location with sufficient pasture for the sheep. As a result, the Coffee Cattle Co. leased about 40,000 acres of land on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in South Dakota and moved the sheep operation there in 1932 during the depression. A few years later, drouth and grasshoppers seared the reservation. White River, one of the main sources of water, dried up and the Coffee Cattle Co. liquidated its sheep business. "From then on," Coffee says, "we stayed strictly with cattle."

HIGH QUALITY HERD

The family kept the ranch until 1950 when it was sold. By that time the ranch had increased to 19,000 acres, the herd had been developed to 300 registered Herefords and 1,200 to 1,500 head of commercial cattle. Harry declares it was one of the highest quality commercial herds in western Nebraska.

Harry has only high praise for the Sioux County hard-grass country where he was reared.

"That area is one of the best for ranching," he says. "The grass—buffalo, grama, blackroot—keeps its nutrition and strength over the winter. Cattle can graze the rugged grass right off the hillsides in winter. The last 7 years there, we fed no hay except to calves—only cotton cake."

Business and civic activities have occupied nearly all of Harry's time most of his life.

"He has had few steady hobbies," says his wife, Katherine, "except traveling; he has seen much of the world."

A little extra excitement has been thrown in on a few of Harry's trips. Upon completing the tour through South America after college, he boarded a British ship in Rio de Janeiro. German raiders chased them during the 21-day trip to the New York Harbor and safety.

In 1921, Harry attended the international convention of Rotarians in Edinburgh and toured for several months in France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, and Holland.

Later, in 1939, as a congressional delegate to the Interparliamentary Union in Oslo, Norway, the Congressman and his wife again saw parts of Europe. That trip was cut short, however, at the advice of author John Gunther who had just returned from Warsaw and Moscow. At a dinner party of the American Minister in Riga, Latvia, Gunther warned them that war was imminent and to get to a neutral area quickly. The Coffees hurriedly departed and spent the night in Danzig, Poland. Newsmen requested an interview at the hotel that evening, which Coffee granted. Asked what the United States would do if war broke out, he replied that he didn't know, but he thought the country should not get involved.

"If war does break out, what do you think will happen to Europe?" came the question. Coffee read his reply in the German and Polish newspapers the next morning on a train ride to Berlin: "Communism will rise from the ashes of that conflagration."

The Coffees reached Switzerland and, the next morning, found that their sailing date had been set ahead. They had but 1 hour to pack and get on the last train to catch the ship. "We beat the war to the ship by 1 day.

"I think," Coffee grins, "that trip was the fastest that any man ever gave his wife through Europe."

Harry's congressional experience began in January of 1935. The year before, Bob Graham, then president of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association, had persuaded Coffee to run for Congress from Nebraska's big Fifth District, then consisting of 32 counties. He served until January 1943.

"I was on the Agricultural Committee all of the time there," Harry recalls. "I went down as a conservative Democrat—inherited that party from my Texas ancestors. However, as a protest against the New Deal philosophy I've been a registered Republican since the fall of 1942, when I supported Kenneth Wherry for the Senate."

Charles O'Rourke, vice president of the Union Stock Yards Co. of Omaha, relates that he first met Harry Coffee in 1935 in Washington, D.C.

"In Congress, Harry was regarded as a livestock spokesman, not just for the big Fifth District of Nebraska which he represented but for the whole livestock industry of the Nation."

About his political philosophy, Harry gets to the point in a hurry. "I believe in the economic theory of supply and demand. I opposed the New Deal philosophy; I opposed the 1940 election of Roosevelt as a violation of the third term tradition.

"When any bill concerning price supports came up in Congress, I always worked to remove any clauses that included livestock, in accordance with the beliefs of the American National Cattlemen's Association and the Nebraska Stock Growers Association. Livestock has remained in a free economy, and it is still the most stable agricultural commodity. Any time you accept any type of supports, you're just putting a rope around your neck. Price supports mean production control. You sacrifice the future for some immediate gain."

It was in Washington, D.C., that Harry first met Katherine Newbranch Douglas, daughter of Harvey Newbranch, long-time editor in chief of the Omaha World Herald. On November 30, 1935, Harry and Katherine were married in Omaha. Harry was then 45.

In 1942, Harry ran unsuccessfully for the U.S. Senate. He finished out his term in the House of Representatives and on February 1, 1943, was elected to the presidency of the Union Stock Yards Co., of Omaha.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a speech given July 9, 1942, as a tribute to Harry B. Coffee by HAROLD COOLEY, of North Carolina, then a Member in the House of Representatives and now chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture. COOLEY said:

"While I have not always agreed with him, I have never had a single occasion to question his sincerity or intellectual honesty. I know that he has at all times been actuated by a superiority of purpose and by a supreme devotion to the ideals and fundamental principles which constitute the very bedrock of our democracy. He has never been willing to sacrifice principles for political expediency, nor for fleeting popularity."

Edgar Howard, an editor of the Columbus Telegram, wrote in his newspaper's editorial columns: "I often hear men ask how come Harry Coffee is so popular in his home district. The question is easy to answer. In the first place, the personality of Harry Coffee is pleasing. In the second place, he is honest. In the third place, he is never a coward."

Harry says, "I'm a stickler for principles. There should be no compromise of principles for the sake of political expediency."

On the 75th anniversary of the Union Stock Yards Co., of Omaha, in 1959, a special enlarged annual report was published, evaluating the progress of the company during the 16-year period beginning in 1943. The records indicated that:

At the end of 1942 the company had no earned surplus. By 1959 earned surplus amounted to $2,409,623.24, and over $7 million had been paid in dividends to stockholders during the 16-year period.

OPERATE AT PROFIT

At the beginning of the period, the South Omaha Terminal Railway Co., a subsidiary of the Union Stock Yards Co., of Omaha, had a deficit of $253,163.84 and no surplus of any kind. It had been operating at a loss. By 1959, after 16 years of operating at a profit, it had an earned surplus of $444,333.06, and had paid its parent company $561,000 in dividends.

The Livestock Exchange Building, a major facility, had for several years operated at a loss. During the 16-year period following, it was placed on a profitable basis and considerable remodeling was completed.

Constant additions and rebuilding throughout Coffee's administration have resulted in a stockyards well kept for the comfort and easy handling of the market animals, with such firsts as the double-deck 650-car auto park with more space than any other such stockyards facility in the Nation, a headquarters building with the latest in restaurant, ballroom, and customer comfort facilities, including air conditioning and automatic elevators.

"Harry's philosophy has always been that the stockyards are to serve the feeder and producer," declares Vice President O'Rourke. "He's preached that theory to employees in creating better service.

"Harry is a bear for work—always has been.

"But the past couple of years he's taken up golf with a passion, and he was hard to live with around here after he shot a hole in one on the country club golf course."

In 1955, Omaha rated first in the Nation in total livestock receipts, finally bumping Chicago for that position and remaining at the top since then.

FINEST IN THE NATION

Today, the stockyards facilities and services at Omaha are recognized as the finest in the Nation. It has become the world's largest livestock market and meatpacking center.

In submitting his final report as president of the Union Stock Yards Co., of Omaha, in February 1961, Coffee repeated his contention concerning livestock marketing:

"As long as it maintains open competition among all buying and selling elements, reflects prices that balance supply and demand, provides services and facilities necessary to handle livestock economically and expeditiously, the Omaha market will continue to be the leader in serving the livestock industry."

Harry has always been active in civic affairs. Since 1943, he has been on the board of governors of the Knights of Ak-Sar-Ben and chairman of the 4-H livestock show. In 1952, he was named King of Ak-Sar-Ben. In 1955 he received the Nebraska Builders Award, the highest nonacademic award given by the University of Nebraska Board of Regents.

He is a trustee of the Omaha Industrial Foundation, a trustee of the University of Nebraska Foundation and a past chairman of the American Stock Yards Association.

In their June convention last year, the Nebraska stockgrowers presented a beautiful hand-tooled leather scroll to Harry Coffee * * * "in recognition of his leadership and contribution to the cattle industry of Nebraska as a rancher, Congressman, and president of the Union Stock Yards Co., of Omaha." Says Harry of the plaque, "This is one of my most highly prized possessions."

As the ex-president and chairman of the board of the Union Stock Yards Co. of Omaha, Harry has assisted the new president, Fred Gilmore, to become acquainted with the position.

STAND AND REVERE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in a few months the Department of Agriculture will observe its centennial. President Kennedy has issued an appropriate proclamation and the event is being marked with the proper observances.

One of the most sagacious journalists in the Midwest, Mr. J. Hyde Sweet of the Nebraska City News-Press, has taken early note of the forthcoming celebration. Mr. Sweet is a former Member of the House of Representatives and a fellow townsman of the Nation's third Secretary of Agriculture, J. Sterling Morton.

Mr. Sweet is something of an iconoclast which makes his lively columns, whether written from Nebraska City or his winter home in Arizona, among the best read in Nebraska. In the January 19 issue of the News-Press he suggests editorially a somewhat different approach to the observance of the Department of Agriculture centennial.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled, "Stand and Revere," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STAND AND REVERE

The Department of Agriculture will be 100 years old in May. President Lincoln in a brief statement establishing what is now this giant, next to Defense, said "the purpose is to acquire and diffuse (good word, that) useful information on subjects connected with agriculture."

By Presidential proclamation of Mr. Kennedy the centennial will be observed throughout the year. It's a good thing, too, and our community should do its best to cooperate.

Agriculture is our No. 1 industry. Whatever we do to help it short of entirely regimenting it, as Mr. Freeman would like to do for political purposes, should be accomplished.

Perhaps we should stress in our own celebration the historic independence and rugged individualism of those farmers still existing who subscribe to the tenets of the Republic as laid down by their fathers, men who had suffered much and knew the value of personal endeavor, for which there is no substitute, certainly not any contrived by the designers of "make America over" in Washington.

A notable Secretary of Agriculture came from Nebraska City. J. Sterling Morton stopped the free distribution of garden seeds, a petty vote-catching device, because they were useless and it wasn't the duty of Uncle Sam to distribute them in the first place. What a switch from today.

In the second place, Mr. Morton turned back into the Treasury the unspent appropriation of his office. Today he would be locked up in an institution, a man entirely unsafe to have around.

Let's celebrate the 100th birthday and feature our own participation in the welfare of the Department.

During it let people go out to Arbor Lodge State Park and stand in reverent silence before the statue of a man who helped make Nebraska a good place to live.

TIME FOR ACTION ON RESIDUAL OIL

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is always at this time of year that the press and our mail from home is filled with comments and complaints about the shortage in supply and consequent increase in the cost of fuels to keep us warm over the winter months.

I think this is an appropriate time to point out that I and many of my colleagues in the Northeast have been urgently calling for the removal of the present quota restrictions on imports of residual fuel oil. This is of vital importance to consumers in the Northeast.

Residual fuel oil is a byproduct of the refining process. American refiners produce as little of it as possible, and an ever-increasing number, using high-grade American crude, crack it into its higher priced components and produce no residual at all. In 1960, 56 percent of our residual oil needs had to be met by imports, largely from Venezuela.

Residual fuel oil is used by heavy industrial plants for heating large buildings and apartment houses and stores, hospitals and schools. Because it is also a primary fuel used by utility companies along the eastern seaboard, the costs of residual fuel are reflected in the electrical bills of every family. The price of this key fuel has risen markedly since quota restrictions were imposed. Today consumers and taxpayers all along the eastern seaboard are feeling the pinch.

Mr. President, it is consistent with the law of supply and demand that fuel oil costs are higher in the winter than at any other time of the year, that they are particularly high when the winter is a cold one, and become outrageously high when the commodity is kept in artificially short supply. Not only are prices on available residual oil getting far out of hand, but also the limitation on imports matched with the declining production of domestic refiners presents to users of this vital commodity the threat of a serious shortage. Unless some relief is obtained, I am informed that a major New York utility supplying power to millions of metropolitan residents will be completely out of oil by mid-February. As another case in point, the New York City Housing Authority has been forced to pay from 89 cents to $1.31 more per barrel than was paid in 1959.

The residual fuel oil quota system was initiated as an emergency measure to see that supplies of this fuel imported into the United States did not run too far ahead of demand. It was not meant, as I understand it, as a means to cut off our source of supply, and thereby run up the price to American consumers.

The domestic oil industry receives no benefits from residual fuel oil restrictions. I have even noted comments by representatives of our domestic oil industry to the effect that the quotas on residual oil are not necessary as far as the industry is concerned and have merely engendered public criticism. They, too, favor removal.

What we need is action. Present high price conditions in the New York area and in the entire northeastern market for residual makes this abundantly clear.

While I represent the people of the State of New York, I speak in this instance for people up and down the eastern seaboard. I mentioned the New York City Housing Authority. Here are some other examples of increased costs since restrictions were imposed in 1959: Boston City Hospital has been forced to pay 58 cents more per barrel; Brattleboro, Vt., Memorial Hospital, 48 cents more per barrel; State Teachers' College, Boston, 49 cents more per barrel. In Jacksonville, Fla., the department of electric and water utilities had only one response to its requests for bids in 1961—added cost, $430,000.

These price increases, in addition to costing oil heat users millions of dollars each year, are damaging the ability of American businessmen to compete with their foreign industries. A Maine paper manufacturer pays 30 cents more per barrel for fuel—a major cost of making paper—than his Canadian competition directly across the border. Japanese businessmen buy residual fuel for 56 cents per barrel less than their American counterparts.

In sum, quotas on residual fuel have meant increased prices and chillier homes, schools, and industries for people all along the east coast.

The Office of Emergency Planning began a thorough investigation of this deplorable situation in June of last year. All interested parties were given every opportunity to submit full briefs and extensive rebuttals on every facet of the problem. All of the facts are now before the administration. These facts overwhelmingly support the contention of Northeastern States that residual quotas have been an expensive experiment benefiting no one. This problem has been studied to death. It is time for a decision.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, is the morning hour concluded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business?

KANSAS PROGRAM OF SOIL CONSERVATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Kansas has for years carried on an outstanding program of soil conservation and the control of water runoff at its source.

While this program has been extensive in our State, there is an ever-increasing and expanding need for greater work in these fields.

The future growth and development of our State will be largely determined by the amount of water that we can conserve for beneficial uses. This, in addition to the preservation and improvement of our soil assures us of a great future in the field of agriculture.

As our Nation's population continues to increase, and as additional acreages of land are taken out for nonagricultural uses and urban development, land will become even more important.

We have been fortunate in our State in having an outstanding State Association of Soil Conservation Districts. At their annual meeting in Emporia, Kans., last November they adopted several resolutions affecting the welfare of the soil conservation districts as to both State and National problems.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution relative to Federal activities be made a part of these remarks.

I also ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by the Brown County Soil Conservation District be included as a part of these remarks, and an editorial from the Hiawatha Daily World, issue of January 18, 1962, and editorials from the Marysville Advocate dated November 23, 1961.

There being no objection, the resolutions and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS RELATIVE TO FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

I

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be asked to appropriate an additional $10 million to service existing Great Plains' contracts and in writing additional contracts.

II

Whereas, Congress does appropriate the funds to operate the Soil Conservation Service and as the demand for technical help to serve the soil conservation districts in Kansas is greater than can be supplied by the Soil Conservation Service, due to the limitations of the conservation operation funds; be it

Resolved, That Congress increase the conservation operation budget to the Soil Conservation Service in order to provide the soil conservation districts in Kansas more technical help; and be it further

III

Resolved, That to facilitate an efficiency in the handling of Soil Conservation Service and ACP budgetary matters, the 5 percent ACP transfer funds be eliminated altogether and that this differential of money be made a direct transfer of Federal appropriations to the Soil Conservation Service.

IV

Whereas it has been necessary to reduce ACP cost-sharing rates on certain practices within the State of Kansas, due to advanced drawing on next year's funds; be it

Resolved, That the Federal Congress increase ACP funds for 1962 and subsequent years; and furthermore be it

V

Resolved, That authorized funds be designated as no-year funds each year for ACP that regulatory steps may be taken to redistribute unexpended surplus funds among States.

VI

Resolved, That the Kansas Association of Soil Conservation Districts go on record and lend support to the following procedural recommendation adopted and approved by the State agricultural conservation program to wit: That when a cooperator signs with the soil conservation district and agrees by contract to carry out a basic conservation plan on his total unit over a limited period of years, a small payment increase be used to establish a reserve fund to permit making an additional payment of 10 percent of the cost-share payment on completion of the farm plan. That the appropriation act authorizing the 1963 ACP be changed to permit the State agricultural conservation program to use the funds now being used as small payment increases for conservation plan completion payments.

VII

Resolved, That the Federal Government participate so far as possible to see that all water storage sites be developed to their fullest potential. That a review be made of cost-sharing of full development of sites for both flood control and storage.

VIII

Resolved, That the grant of easement for cable lines which the Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Air Force is asking the landowners to sign, is taking undue advantage of the Soil Conservation Service and farmer cooperators, on their Atlas missile complex cables, in that they will not allow cooperators to carry on conservation practices above the missile cable. It is unrealistic and unfair to expect the cooperator to maintain 36 inches of undisturbed soil above this cable. We recommend to the above agencies of the U.S. Defense Department that immediate action be taken to make provision for lowering this cable immediately where requested by the cooperator or Soil Conservation Service.

IX

Resolved, That the Kansas Association of Soil Conservation Districts recommends to the U.S. Department of Agriculture that the National Moisture Research Laboratory locate this facility in the State of Kansas, where we have outstanding State agricultural experiment stations.

X

Resolved, That the Kansas Association of Soil Conservation Districts reaffirms its opposition to any amendment of Public Law 566, permitting the assumption of the contracting obligation of local sponsors by an agency of the Federal Government.

A RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE BROWN COUNTY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT AT THE ANNUAL MEETING JANUARY 17, 1962

Whereas the Congress of the United States realizing that the fertile topsoil of the Nation was rapidly being eroded from the land, and knowing that the amount of water that becomes available for use is greatly dependent upon the manner in which the soil is used, enacted a law providing for land and water management intended to make it possible for owners and operators of land to conserve the soil and the water that falls upon it; and

Whereas the owners and operators of farmland are participating in the program provided for by Congress in increasing numbers, making necessary the expenditure of larger amounts to comply with the requirements of the program; and

Whereas the funds appropriated by the last session of Congress are insufficient to meet the demands of the soil conservation program for the present year of 1962:

Therefore. we, owners and operators of farms in Brown County, Kans., in annual meeting assembled, earnestly and respectfully petition Members of the 87th Congress of the United States to make such additional appropriation as investigation may prove to be required to the end that we may be able to fulfill the purposes of the law enacted by Congress and our obligation to future generations, to endeavor to leave the land entrusted to us as good as when we inherited it.

[Excerpt from the Hiawatha Daily World, Jan. 18, 1962]

A resolution passed by the BCSCD at the annual meeting:

"Whereas the Congress of the United States realizing that the fertile topsoil of the Nation was rapidly being eroded from the land, and knowing that the amount of water that becomes available for use is greatly dependent upon the manner in which the soil is used, enacted a law providing for land and water management intended to make it possible for owners and operators of land to conserve the soil and the water that falls upon it; and

"Whereas the owners and operators of farmland are participating in the program provided for by Congress in increasing numbers, making necessary the expenditure of larger amounts to comply with the requirements of the program; and

"Whereas the funds appropriated by the last session of Congress are insufficient to meet the demands of the soil conservation program for the present year of 1962:

"Therefore, we, owners and operators of farms in Brown County, Kans., in annual meeting assembled, earnestly and respectfully petition Members of the 87th Congress of the United States to make such additional appropriation as investigation may prove to * * * be able to fulfill the purpose of the law enacted by Congress and our obligation to future generations, to endeavor to leave the land entrusted to us as good as when we inherited it."

[From the Marysville Advocate, Nov. 23, 1961]

CONGRATULATIONS

Congratulations to the Marshall County soil conservation district on winning the Goodyear plaque for doing outstanding work the past year.

The local district always has been out in front in activities and accomplishments. It is only natural that the group should be honored.

Thousands of acres of land are being saved in the county through the service, and more will be down through the years.

[From the Marysville Advocate, Nov. 23, 1961]

FIGHT FOR SOIL SAVING

The Marshall County farm bureau should be backed by the farmers of the county in the move to incite the Federal Government to return to the $250 million annual allotment for soil conservation work on the Nation's farms.

While billions of dollars are being spent on large dams, it is only sensible that millions go for work to save the soil and conserve the water on the good land.

Farmers have had to keep up a continual fight for funds for soil conservation work, as the Corps of Army Engineers has maneuvered to get funds for huge dams.

It always has been the contention of the Advocate that if sufficient soil conservation work is done on the farms that only a few large dams would be needed. But the large dam program has gone forward at high speed and some soil conservation work has been retarded or neglected.

Unless the farmers and landowners of the Nation continue their fight for funds they will see more and more money going for big dams. It is only sensible and reasonable that the funds be divided.

Now is the time to let the Congressmen and Senators know that the farmers want and will fight for continued appropriations of sufficient nature to save the soil and hold the water where it should be stored.

STRENGTHENING THE CAUSE OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN NEW YORK STATE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD along with my remarks excerpts from remarks made by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller at the opening of the new office of the State Commission Against Discrimination in New York City.

Mr. President, we are very proud of the leadership of New York, under a succession of Governors, beginning with Governor Dewey and working through the gubernatorial administrations without regard to party. There has been great leadership in our State in the field of assuring equality of employment opportunity, as well as in the field of all human rights. Governor Rockefeller indicates our full intention to maintain that leadership, of which I am very proud in terms of our State.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT OPENING OF THE NEW OFFICE OF THE STATE COMMISSION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION, 62 EAST 125TH STREET, NEW YORK, N.Y., SUNDAY, JANUARY 28, 1962

The opening of this upper-Manhattan office of the State Commission Against Discrimination marks a vigorous step forward in the continuing efforts of New York State to assure that all Americans shall enjoy their inherent rights as human beings and as Americans. This office is here as your friend. It is here to serve you, the people—all the people.

And the opening of this office is, it seems to me, an appropriate occasion to announce my plans for further strengthening the cause of human rights in New York State this year. Specifically, my recommendations to the legislature are as follows:

1. To expand the membership of the commission from five to seven members, to strengthen the administrative powers of the chairman, appoint for the first time a vice chairman, increase the budget, and add to staff personnel. All this is proposed for the accomplishment of one objective—to give the people better service by preventing any undue delays in action.

2. To amend the law to make explicit the ban on discrimination by labor unions, employers, employment agencies or their representatives in admission of individuals to apprentice training programs, on-the-job training programs, or other occupational training or retraining programs. Passage of this amendment will be a highly significant step forward in assuring equality of employment opportunity.

3. To close gaps in the section of the law banning discrimination in places of public accommodation by specifically adding to the list of such places in which discrimination is barred.

4. To change the name of the State Commission Against Discrimination to the State Commission for Human Rights.

This is a highly significant step, far more than a mere change of name. For it reflects an evolution in attitude and the affirmative determination of my administration to see to it that all New Yorkers fully enjoy their rights as individuals and as Americans.

This evolution of attitude is suggested by the thought that a citizen of this State does not merely have the right to ask the State to help him because he has been discriminated against; rather, he has affirmative rights inherent to all Americans.

When he comes to this office, or to any office of the commission, he comes with head held high, as an American—and it is up to the commission to do its job of protecting these rights.

The assurance of human rights is a function of prime significance which goes to the very spiritual heritage of this Nation. This office is a symbol of my administration's affirmative determination to carry out this heritage as well as my deep personal dedication to this cause.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of John A. McCone, of California, to be Director of Central Intelligence.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I speak with reference to the nomination of Mr. McCone to be Director of Central Intelligence.

On the floor last evening, I stated that I was looking into the tax status of income received from shipping interests owned by Mr. McCone that were incorporated under the laws of Panama and flying either the Panamanian flag or the flag of Norway.

Reference to the Annotations on the Internal Revenue Code, for paragraph 883, entitled "Exclusions From Gross Income," lists both Panama and Norway among the countries with which "the United States has entered into exchange-of-notes agreements relating to reciprocal exemption from income taxation of shipping and aircraft profits."

It seems evident, therefore, that among the incentives which led to the incorporation of several of the McCone companies in Panama and the flying of their ships or affiliates under the flag of Panama or Norway was the exemption of profits from taxation under the normal levies for American business.

There is nothing illegal about this—the code provides for it. The question arises, however, whether a man with the extensive interests which Mr. McCone has in these foreign shipping companies and their affiliates, and in the companies such as Standard Oil of California which use these lines can divest himself of the natural interest and concern a majority stockholder would have in their fortunes in a disturbed world.

In November 1961, Mr. McCone resigned from numerous directorates, a half dozen or more, preparatory to entering on his duties as interim appointee. But, Mr. President, one may resign as director of Standard Oil of California and forgo a director's salary or fees, but how does he divest himself of interest in the operations and oversea holdings of such a company in which he retains over a million dollar interest?

One may resign as president and director of Joshua Hendy, but how does one shed himself of interest in the stability and success of affiliated foreign corporations in which Joshua Hendy Corp. owns a 50-percent interest and profits from management contracts when Joshua Hendy is 100 percent owned by Mr. McCone?

One may resign from the presidency and directorship of Panama Pacific Tankers, but if one owns all its stock, how does one divorce himself of interest in its worldwide commerce in bulk cargoes, including oil?

One may resign from official connection with San Marino, another Panamanian corporation, but if one has an 85-percent stock interest, will one's attitudes be divorced from a special concern for the sealanes and cargoes it follows?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, though I will not object, I have been waiting for the morning hour to conclude. I hope I may obtain the floor and that I may have unanimous consent also to proceed beyond the time permitted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest that the regular rule of 3 minutes be followed. If the morning hour has then been concluded, I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Executive Calendar, and the Senator from South Dakota may then continue.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I hope the Senator from Minnesota will not object to the Senator from South Dakota proceeding, but I felt that we ought to call attention to the fact that other Senators are present waiting and have been waiting, hoping that the morning hour could be concluded so that we could get on with other business.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota may proceed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. One may never have held officer connections in Transworld Carriers, another Panamanian corporation, but if Joshua Hendy 100-percent owned, in turn owns 50 percent in this Panamanian corporation moving petroleum and other commodities in world commerce, will one's attitudes and areas of interest not be influenced thereby?

Or the same for Redwood Corp., in which Joshua Hendy is a large owner.

Mr. President, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency makes decisions that involve and form the foundation for national policy. He will deploy the agents of the CIA. He will assess the importance of a report of revolution in far corners of the earth. He will evaluate the intelligence that is assembled. He may then direct cooperation or restraint from involvement. Will his instincts be free from his background? Are his shipping interests identical always with those of the United States?

It has been said, Mr. President, that Mr. McCone is a typical example of the great American success story—a man of ability starts from scratch and becomes a man of great responsibility and great wealth. It might be more typical, Mr. President, if the profits had been made with enterprises incorporated under the laws of some State of the United States or with ships sailing under the American flag or businesses founded on American soil. Yet, I do not object to Mr McCone's having made his money by leasing foreign-made ships and flying them under the flags of Norway or Panama, exempt from U.S. income taxes, or, as he put it, where costs can be competitive. The laws permit it. But I do wonder whether his vast empire in that field, builded in the past 20 years, have not cloaked him with a concern for oversea operations that are not those which the average and typical American would have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 2 additional minutes requested by the Senator from South Dakota have expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield for a brief question?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I first conclude my statement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may propound a brief question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senator may ask his question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Where did the Senator from South Dakota obtain the figures of the percentage holdings of stock that he quoted? I do not believe they are in the transcript.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think they are in the record of the hearings. I have not intentionally quoted anything that is not in the record of the hearings.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am not challenging the correctness of the figures given, but merely trying to learn their source.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the Senator will examine the questions and answers in the testimony of Mr. McCone as to the ownership of those corporations, I think he will find all of them in the hearings.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, has morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

COMMISSION ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as in legislative session, on behalf of myself, as chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology. This bill is similar to a bill, S. 1851, reported favorably by the Committee on Government Operations in the 86th Congress, to create a Commission on a Department of Science and Technology. The revised bill contains a broadened declaration of congressional policy and objectives, and places more emphasis upon the need for a study of the problems relating to the improvement of Federal programs for processing and retrieval of scientific information.

The Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations held extensive hearings on bills proposing the creation of a Department of Science and Technology in the 85th and 86th Congresses, with emphasis being placed upon the need for better coordination of the civilian science programs of the Federal Government. These hearings developed the need for further study as to whether or not a Department of Science and Technology should be created, or whether the science functions may be effectively reorganized within the existing structure of the Federal Government without the necessity of creating a new Cabinet post. The objective of the bill I am introducing is to provide the President and the Congress with the necessary information to develop an adequate legislative program to meet the needs of the Federal Government in the increasingly important fields of science and technology.

More than $9 billion have been expended in each of the past 2 fiscal years for research and development by Federal departments and agencies in order to fulfill their missions and to increase scientific knowledge. The proposed budget for research and development for fiscal year 1963 is approximately $12 billion. The Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations has developed, during the 1st session of the 87th Congress, the fact that there are many new problems constantly arising relative to fostering and utilizing science and technology most effectively and economically and in serving agency objectives and meeting national needs. They involve among other things developing and utilizing limited manpower and other resources, establishing effective cooperative relationships between the governmental and private sectors of the Nation, and devising effective organizations to accomplish these purposes.

In its report on research and development in the Federal Government, the Hoover Commission stated that the aggregate sum expended for scientific research and development in fiscal year 1956 probably exceeded $4.5 billion annually, if the programs of our industries and nonprofit institutions are included, of which $2.4 billion was expended by the Federal Government. This compares with Federal expenditures for research and development for fiscal years 1961–62 totaling $9 billion annually, and the proposed budget estimate for fiscal 1963 of approximately $12 billion, or five times the Federal expenditures for fiscal year 1956.

The Hoover Commission in its report stated:

> This organization of research and development in the Government is the largest integrated scientific and technical endeavor that any nation has ever attempted. The program in the departments reach through the realm of abstract science, the evolution of scientific discovery into inventions and improvements. In the military departments the development of inventions and improvements in weapons extends into the test of these improvements; the standardization of design; the development of production programs, the placement and coordination of production; and, finally, production must be accompanied by continuous further research and constant evaluation of results.
>
> The organization of all Government research and development has been a slow growth and a constant realinement to meet every discovery in basic science and the inventions which flow from these discoveries.
>
> Indeed the foundation of the greatest sector of human advancement in modern times is basic research into nature's laws and materials. It is from these sources that come the raw materials of applied science. We owe to basic research the fabulous improvement in the health of the Nation; the greatest industrial productivity known to man; the weapons of defense which have protected our independence; and our knowledge of the laws which govern the universe.
>
> There is no tribute great enough to express the Nation's obligations to its scientists, engineers, and military personnel, for their contributions to our constantly increasing productivity and the strengthening of our national defense. And there can be no relaxation in this effort.
>
> This investigation and report on Federal research and development activities are directed to improvement in organization from the constant lessons of experience. Comments on secondary weaknesses in organization are not intended to disparage this enormous accomplishment but to constructively improve its management, whose major conduct has the approbation of this Commission.
>
> Under the pressures of the world situation these expenditures have progressed rapidly from about $29 million in fiscal year 1940 to the prospective sum of about $2,050 million for fiscal year 1956. The effective organization of this great research and development

> requires the constant integration of military and civilian skills and effective coordination.
>
> The research and development programs for military strength extend across the entire forefront of basic research in the physical sciences and the technologies of their application.
>
> Concurrently all areas of the physical sciences—chemistry, biology, mathematics, and physics—are represented in the basic and applied research programs. The aeronautical, chemical, electrical, electronic, mechanical and metallurgical technologies are all contributors to the development programs, and one or more of them is a component of every weapons development project. The scope of research and development leading to new weapons designs has a subject matter content whose scope is comparable to that underlying the design of facilities for the entire civilian economy. The task force subcommittee has limited its examination to management, organizational, personnel, and major programmatic areas.
>
> While the high quality of the weapons systems resulting from these programs gives constant evidence of successful accomplishment, the report of the task force subcommittee has revealed areas where significant improvement can be made and economy realized.

The Hoover Commission subcommittee report on research activities emphasized the importance of Federal research and development programs, and stated:

> A detailed examination of the activities, by location would be a task of major proportions.

And concluded:

> It would be necessary to assemble a large group of experienced scientists and engineers, including experts from almost every sector of science and technology.

That, of course, is the objective of the bill I am introducing, which contains adequate authority to set up a Science Advisory Panel and such special task forces as may be necessary to evaluate all Federal scientific and technological activities and related private industrial and institutional activities.

The studies made by the staff of the Committee on Government Operations and its subcommittees have further developed much information relative to certain deficiencies in scientific, engineering, and technical information programs, including acquisition, processing, documentation, storage, retrieval, and distribution, and that there is an urgent need for accelerating scientific, engineering, and technical progress in some 30 or 40 Federal agencies which perform some functions in this area.

Mr. President, the objective of the bill I am introducing is to provide for a joint legislative and executive study of Federal scientific and technical activities in order to evaluate the organization and administration of such activities and to recommend improvements in present operations, including minimizing of unwarranted duplication of effort, and effecting necessary reorganization and such other changes as may be warranted in the national interest.

I am convinced that aggressive action in these areas of Federal operation is long overdue, and that some legislation along the lines I am proposing is essential if this nation is to carry out its responsibilities for maintaining an adequate national defense and to promote peace throughout the world.

At his press conference on January 15, President Kennedy stated that one of the most critical problems facing the Nation is the "inadequacy of the supply of scientific and technical manpower." One of the major policies set forth in the bill I am introducing points up the need for the improvement of policies for recruiting, training, and utilizing scientific and engineering manpower, and the bill specifically includes as one of its major objectives the assurance of the conservation and efficient utilization of scientific and engineering manpower. The effective reorganization and coordination of existing and proposed Federal science and technological activities, as proposed by the bill, would tend to eliminate unnecessary duplication and waste of scientific and engineering manpower now being used in duplicating and uncoordinated programs operated or sponsored by the Federal Government.

For the information of the Congress, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a title summary of hearings and reports of the Senate Committee on Government Operations which have a direct application to the legislation proposed in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the summary may be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2771) for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology, introduced by Mr. MCCLELLAN (for himself and Senators HUMPHREY and MUNDT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The summary is as follows:

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY—HEARINGS, REPORTS ON LEGISLATION, SPECIAL REPORTS AND PUBLICATIONS—COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Hearings on S. 3126: To create a Department of Science and Technology (to create Standing Committees on Science and Technology in the Congress); to establish National Institutes of Scientific Research; to authorize a program of Federal loans and loan insurance for college or university education in the physical or biological sciences, mathematics, or engineering; to authorize the establishment of scientific programs outside of the United States; and for other purposes—Science and Technology Act of 1958, part 1, May 2, 6, and 7, 1958.

Hearings on S. 3126: Expansion of Federal program for coordination of scientific information and documentation, title I, and on S. 4039, to authorize the expenditure of funds through grants for support of scientific research (title II of S. 3126), Science and Technology Act of 1958, part 2, June 25 and 26, 1958.

S. Rept. No. 2044 (on S. 4039): To authorize the expenditure of funds through grants for support of scientific research, July 30, 1958. Public Law 934, September 6, 1958.

Committee print: Report on development of scientific, engineering, and other professional manpower (with emphasis on the role of the Federal Government). (Prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, April 1957.) February 13, 1958. (Quattlebaum report.)

S. Doc. No. 90: Science and Technology Act of 1958. Analysis and summary prepared by the staff of the Senate Committee on Government Operations on S. 3126, to create a Department of Science and Technology (to create Standing Committees on Science and Technology in the Congress); to establish National Institutes of Scientific Research; to authorize a program of Federal loans and loan insurance for college or university education in the physical or biological sciences, mathematics, or engineering; to authorize the establishment of scientific programs outside of the United States; and for other purposes, April 17, 1958. (Committee print of same published February 13, 1958.)

Hearings on S. 676: To create a Department of Science and Technology, and to transfer certain agencies and functions to such Department; and on S. 586, to establish a U.S. Department of Science and to prescribe the functions thereof, part 1, April 16–17, 1959. On S. 626, S. 586, and S. 1851: for the establishment of a Commission on a Department of Science and Technology, part 2, May 28, 1959.

Senate Report No. 408 (on S. 1851): Establishment of a Commission on a Department of Science and Technology, June 18, 1959.

Senate Report No. 2498: "Progress Report on Science Programs of the Federal Government," September 9, 1958.

Senate Report No. 120: Science programs—86th Congress, March 23, 1959.

Senate Report No. 113, 86th Congress: Documentation, Indexing and Retrieval of Scientific Information. A study of Federal and non-Federal science information processing and retrieval programs, June 23, 1960. (Committee print of same, May 24, 1960.)

Senate Document No. 15, 87th Congress: Documentation, Indexing and Retrieval of Scientific Information. Addendum to Senate Document No. 113 of the 86th Congress, March 9, 1961.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATION

Committee print: "Coordination of Information on Current Scientific Research and Development Supported by the U.S. Government." Administrative and scientific problems and opportunities of central registration of research projects in science and engineering, April 17, 1961.

Committee print: "Coordination of Information on Current Federal Research and Development Projects in the Field of Electronics." An analysis of agency systems for storage and retrieval of data on on-going work and of views of private companies on indexing and communication problems, September 20, 1961.

Hearings on Federal budgeting for research and development. Agency coordination study. Part I. The Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, July 26 and 27, 1961.

Hearings on Federal budgeting for research and development. Agency coordination study. Part II. Problems of diverse agencies and of a Government-wide nature, July 26 and 27, 1961.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may remain on the desk until the conclusion of business next Monday, to give opportunity to Senators who may desire to do so to add their names as cosponsors of the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I commend the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, with whom I have been privileged to serve on that committee almost every day and week since I have been in Congress. The subject of a scientific and technological information service in our Government and the recruitment of personnel is one that has long occupied the attention of the Subcommittee on Reorganization, of which I have been chairman for a number of years. The reports of the Committee on Government Operations that are referred too are the result of hearings which have been held by the full committee and the subcommittee. The proposed commission is needed. It was needed 2 years ago, I believe. Now with the sponsorship of the distinguished chairman of the committee, I am sure it will be established. I am very pleased to join the chairman of the committee in the cosponsorship of his proposal. I assure him of my wholehearted cooperation to get the bill through any subcommittee to which it may be referred, and also through the full committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend from Minnesota. I know of his keen and intense interest in this subject matter. I know that he recognizes, as do many of us, the need for legislation in this field and for a competent and thorough study of ways and means by which we can coordinate scientific and technological information. I anticipate that during this session of Congress, and I hope at an early date, the committee will hold hearings on the measure and possibly report it for action before this session of Congress adjourns.

DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of John A. McCone, of California, to be Director of Central Intelligence.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, Francis T. P. Plimpton, of New York, Charles W. Yost, of New York, Philip M. Klutznick, of Illinois, and Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York, to be representatives of the United States of America to the 16th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations;

John M. Steeves, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Afghanistan;

C. Allan Stewart, of Arizona, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Venezuela;

Robert McClintock, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Argentina;

William S. Gaud, of Connecticut, to be Assistant Administrator for the Near East and South Asia, Agency for International Development;

Edmond C. Hutchinson, of Maryland, to be Assistant Administrator for Africa and Europe, Agency for International Development;

Seymour J. Janow, of California, to be Assistant Administrator for the Far East, Agency for International Development; and

Teodoro Moscoso, of Puerto Rico, to be Assistant Administrator for Latin America, Agency for International Development.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Walter Pettus Gewin, of Alabama, to be U.S. circuit judge, fifth circuit;

Clarence W. Allgood, of Alabama, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Alabama;

Griffin B. Bell, of Georgia, to be U.S. circuit judge, fifth circuit;

Nathan S. Heffernan, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Wisconsin;

Clinton N. Ashmore, of Florida, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Florida;

John M. Imel, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Oklahoma;

Joseph W. Keene, of Louisiana, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Louisiana;

Richard J. Jarboe, of Indiana, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Indiana; and

Raymond F. Farrell, of Rhode Island, to be Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert D. Smith, Jr., of Arkansas, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Arkansas; and

Charles M. Conway, of Arkansas, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Arkansas.

By Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Talbot Smith, of Michigan, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Michigan.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance:

James Allan Reed, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury;

Ben David Dorfman, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission;

Eugene V. Atkinson, of Pennsylvania, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 12, with headquarters at Pittsburgh, Pa.;

Minnie M. Zoller, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 21, with headquarters at Port Arthur, Tex.;

Sam D. W. Low, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 22, with headquarters at Galveston, Tex.;

Charles H. Kazen, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 23, with headquarters at Laredo, Tex.;

William W. Knight, of Alaska, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 31, with headquarters at Juneau, Alaska;

Samuel S. Wyatt, of Tennessee, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 43, with headquarters at Memphis, Tenn.;

John A. Vaccaro, of New York, to be surveyor of customs in customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N.Y.;

Andrew M. Bacon, of Louisiana, to be comptroller of customs, with headquarters at New Orleans, La.; and

Craig Pottinger, of Arizona, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 26, with headquarters at Nogales, Ariz.

DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I shall vote against confirmation of the appointment of John A. McCone to be Director of Central Intelligence. I shall do so because I do not consider him qualified for this very important position, because:

First. He had no training or experience in the field of intelligence prior to his appointment—while all of his predecessors had.

Second. A very serious question existed in his own mind about his qualifications; yet he did not raise this question with the President of the United States.

These disturbing facts are recorded on page 53 of the hearing record on his nomination, and by his own very terse and unequivocal answers to the questions I asked of him on these points.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record, as a part of my remarks, the portion of page 53 of the committee hearing to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the hearing was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Will you tell the committee what training or experience you had in the field of intelligence prior to your appointment to that position?

Mr. McCone. None.

Senator Smith. In view of your lack of training and experience in the field of intelligence, you are unique, are you not, in comparison with all of your predecessors?

Mr. McCone. I do not know that because I do not know the experience of my predecessors.

Senator Smith. What then makes you feel that you are suitably and adequately qualified to be the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency when you have had no experience or training in the field of intelligence?

Mr. McCone. I think, Senator, that that was a question decided by others than I.

Senator Smith. Who recommended you for the appointment?

Mr. McCone. I do not know.

Senator Smith. Who besides the President talked with you about taking the position?

Mr. McCone. No one.

Senator Smith. Was there not some question in your own mind about your qualifications?

Mr. McCone. A very serious one.

Senator Smith. Did you not raise such a question with the President and others with whom you talked?

Mr. McCone. I raised it in my own conscience, naturally; with my wife. Yes.

Senator Smith. But not with the President?

Mr. McCone. No; I did not raise it with the President.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], who is in a sense leading the opposition to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. McCone, is the author of a resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence, of which I am a cosponsor.

I advance the view, Mr. President, because of the way I intend to vote on the nomination, that the manner in which to deal with any danger that the CIA may be in itself some kind of a State Department, which I thoroughly oppose, is indicated by Senator McCarthy's bill. I think the CIA must be subordinate to the foreign policy of the United States and that its duty is to obtain and to evaluate intelligence information—period; and that goes for its operatives in the field as well as its operatives at home. It is not necessary to deny a man confirmation of his nomination on that score, but instead it is necessary to have an assurance by legislative oversight in the Congress that we intend to make our purpose felt whoever may be the incumbent in the office as the head of the CIA.

The way to accomplish our purpose is to see that what we want gets done in terms of the ultimate purpose, and Senator McCarthy's bill gives us this opportunity.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it is a source of regret to me that I feel obliged to express a serious doubt as to the wisdom of a Presidential nomination. I refer to the nomination of Mr. John A. McCone for the supremely important post of Director of Central Intelligence.

It is not pleasant for me to question the judgment of the President of the United States. Particularly, it is not pleasant when one happens to be, as I am, a great admirer of President John F. Kennedy. It is not pleasant for one who wishes, as I do, whenever possible, to follow where he leads and to support his program wherever possible with vigor and enthusiasm. For John F. Kennedy is not only our President, the leader of our Nation, but the leader of the Democratic Party, to which I belong. So it is natural that I should support him and his policies whenever I can do so, whenever I can reconcile his position and his policies with my conscience, beliefs and judgments. He has already demonstrated, in my view, that he is a great President, and I have had occasion to say so on this floor.

However, the Constitution prescribes certain duties for every Member of the U.S. Senate. Among those duties is to advise and consent to the nominations of officers of the Federal Government when such officers are prescribed by law to be subject to the advice and consent clause of the Constitution.

This office is of greater importance, in my view, than any other office upon whose nomination the Senate is required to advise and consent. This is not merely my opinion. This opinion is widely shared.

Indeed, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the able and highly experienced senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], opened the hearings which he conducted on Mr. McCone's nomination, by stating:

> In this period through which we are passing, this office is perhaps second only to the Presidency in its importance.

The able and distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee not only opened the hearings with that statement—that "In this period this office is perhaps second only to the Presidency in its importance," but he reiterated that opinion later in the hearing—on page 30—and this time without the "perhaps" and without the qualifying clause: "In this period through which we are passing."

> In my opinion—

Said Senator RUSSELL again—

> this position in many respects is second in importance only to the President.

Senator RUSSELL is quite right. No position in the Federal Government is fraught with so much power for good or ill and involves such great responsibility. This is particularly the case as it is the only position in the Federal Government which is subject to no supervision or control by any congressional body. In this one case alone our historic and essential system of checks and balances does not operate.

Now, it will be said that John A. McCone has twice been confirmed before to positions to which he was nominated by other Presidents of the United States. That is true. He served as Under Secretary of the Air Force, and he served as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. And I do not question for a moment the ability of his service in those fields, or the wisdom of the appointments made by two previous Presidents of Mr. McCone to those two important offices, and the wisdom of the Senate in confirming him unanimously for each of those positions.

The Central Intelligence Agency, however, is entirely different. In the slightly more than a year which has passed since John F. Kennedy took office, his otherwise brilliant record, his dynamic record, his record of high purpose and appropriate action, has been marred by two failures. They are failures which may be ascribed to faulty intelligence. There was first the Cuban fiasco. Mr. President, it is impossible to exaggerate the damage, the continuing and expanding damage, the tragic and unrelenting consequences of that failure. It has already changed the history not only of our country, and the history of this hemisphere, but the history of the world. The full consequences of the fatal error committed on the basis of faulty intelligence are going to haunt us and the free world for years to come—perhaps for all time. It may truthfully be said that when the United States subscribed to the launching of the ill-fated attempt to replace Castro with a regime that would represent freedom and democracy and restore Cuba to a regime of liberty and of human dignity, the action was based on the misinformation that the people of Cuba would rise, help depose their dictator, and welcome the returning Cubans who had been the victims of his savage tyranny, his communistic ideology, and his ruthless destruction of all freedoms. Had the information given to President Kennedy been correct, one of two alternative courses could have and would have been followed. First, to halt and cancel the invasion attempt. Or, second, to support the invasion in such a way, with our armed might, that it would have been bound to succeed. I am not prepared to say which of these two courses we should have followed, but obviously it would have been one or the other.

A second failure of intelligence came in the Berlin crisis. Although we have been living with the Berlin situation for 17 years and all kinds of information had been handed the administration by the CIA, the one course of action which the Russians followed, namely, to seal off East Berlin, was not anticipated.

It caught us completely unprepared and flatfooted. Had our Intelligence Agency informed our Government that the barbed wire fence would be erected and then backed by a wall, it would have been possible to arrive at a course of action which would have nullified that Communist victory. But that information was not forthcoming.

The result was another major defeat based on faulty intelligence.

Now, why then is it pertinent, in my view, that the appointment of Mr. McCone is unwise and inadequate to meet the grave situation which our country confronts throughout the world?

In the hearings which were conducted in one day by the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, the senatorial questioning seemed to fall into two categories. Some of our colleagues, impressed obviously by Mr. McCone's previous record, the excellence of which I do not question, contented themselves with praising him highly. On the other hand, other members of the committee asked searching questions. Among these was the distinguished senior Senator from Maine, Mrs. MARGARET CHASE SMITH. The Senator from Maine, after pointing out that the Cuban debacle and fiasco climaxed her very serious reservations about the CIA and the way it was being run, coupled with the fact that the CIA enjoys a virtual immunity from reporting to Congress on its activities and expenditures, stated that there was very little, if any, check placed upon it; that, in effect, unlike any other agency in the Federal Government, the CIA has been given a congressional blank check for its operations and its administration, and that unfortunately, under these circumstances, Congress literally operates in the dark as to the CIA, without reviewing its effectiveness, its justifications, and whether it should be revised and improved, and that indeed Congress operates in the dark and only when it is too late is it possible to learn of the faultiness and damage done. The Senator from Maine then asked the following question:

> Will you tell the committee what training or experience you had in the field of intelligence prior to your appointment in that position?

Mr. McCone replied with one word. That word was: "None."

In other words, here you have the man nominated to head this Agency, which is fraught with tremendous power and responsibility, which is subject to no control or check, who admits, and quite correctly, that he has no experience whatever in the field of intelligence.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this, in itself, should disqualify Mr. McCone for this post. As I said previously, the abilities and qualifications of Mr. McCone as Under Secretary of the Air Force and as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, in which no question of his ability arises, have only a remote pertinence to his qualifications for this far more important responsibility.

The Director of Central Intelligence can, in effect, make policy—national policy and international policy. The CIA can, as the CIA has in the past year, disastrously affect the security of the United States, for the head of the CIA not merely heads a vast Agency which collects information, but it also evaluates information. Within 1 year we have had at least two conspicuous and tragic failures in evaluation.

Of course, the CIA does more than collect information and evaluate it. It plays a part in shaping the destiny of other countries. It plays that part because the information which it provides to our Government, and the evaluation which it presents, has in the past and may again in the future determine our policy toward the governments of foreign countries. It may result, as it has resulted in the past, in withdrawing or granting recognition to a regime in that country. It has in the past, and will again, determine actions we take—political actions and economic actions. It may again bring us to the brink of disaster.

How qualified is Mr. McCone, with no experience whatever, to be the head of this vast network and to keep the President informed?

We have in the RECORD what seems to me to be a somewhat pertinent revelation of some of Mr. McCone's mental processes. Back in October 1956, in the closing days of the presidential campaign, a group of 10 scientists on the faculty of the California Institute of Technology issued a statement calling attention to Adlai Stevenson's suggestion, which he had made in the course of the campaign, that atomic testing should be suspended. It may be recalled that this suggestion of Governor Stevenson's was deplored by President Eisenhower, who felt it should not have been introduced as a campaign issue, and by Vice President Nixon, who referred to it as "catastrophic nonsense." The statement of these 10 scientists was a reasonable one. They were exercising their rights as free citizens to express a view pertinent to the campaign. In addition to being free citizens, they were knowledgeable ones on the issue involved, since they were all physicists and chemists who had firsthand knowledge of the effect of radiation following atomic bomb explosions. Mr. McCone, who was a trustee of Cal Tech and was campaigning vigorously for the reelection of President Eisenhower and against Adlai Stevenson, exploded with wrath at this statement and wrote a caustic letter to Dr. Thomas Lauritsen, professor of physics at the California Institute of Technology, and made his indignation known to the president of that institution and to fellow members of the board.

These two letters appear on pages 23, 24, 25, and 26 of the hearings, and they speak for themselves, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF 10 SCIENTISTS ON ATOMIC TESTING PUBLISHED IN LOS ANGELES TIMES, OCTOBER 15, 1956

For some time Gov. Adlai Stevenson has urged that the United States take the lead and renounce further H-bomb tests for as long a time as other nations likewise refrain from testing these devices. This suggestion has been attacked as advocating a dangerous unilateral action which would permit the Russians to get ahead of the United States in nuclear technology. In our opinion these criticisms have little validity and give inadequate attention to the reasoning that lies behind the proposal or to the urgency of dealing immediately and effectively with the peril that confronts the world as a result of the existence of the H-bomb.

Today we are caught in a nuclear armaments race that threatens to engulf the world. No end of this race is yet in sight. Two nations have already exploded hydrogen devices, a third will do so in a few months. Within a short time it is likely that many countries large and small will possess this capability. With the commitment of more and more national arsenals to this type of warfare, international control becomes increasingly difficult. Even in our own country our Military Establishment is becoming more and more dependent upon nuclear weaponry and the time will soon be upon us when even a limited military action must inevitably drive us into nuclear war.

Time is running out, with an implacability that we ignore at our peril. Yet after 10 years of negotiation, the world has no other guarantee of survival than the tenuous hope that no nation will pull the trigger for fear of committing national suicide.

It appears to us that Mr. Stevenson's proposal might be a useful way to get the negotiations out of the deadlock stage by taking a step which would not endanger our security, which would in no way hinder other areas of nuclear research, which could not be delayed indefinitely by negotiations and which would have a very real significance to most nations throughout the world. At the very least the proposal is one that should be widely debated and discussed for the obvious reason that the control of nuclear weapons is vital to our survival.

Additional advantages of such a step would be:

1. It would decrease our exposure to radioactive fallout and its associated dangers.
2. It might postpone the time when there will be many nations which possess practical H-bomb experience.
3. It would increase our prestige in Western Europe and in Asia.
4. It would provide an important test of Soviet intentions. We must remember that on July 17 Soviet Foreign Minister Shepilov stated that the Russians would be willing to ban H-bomb tests if others agreed.

President Eisenhower has stated that he regrets that the American Government's policy with respect to the testing of large-scale nuclear weapons has been made an issue in this campaign. On the contrary we find it regrettable that discussions of our military strength, of our vulnerability, and of our foreign policy in relation to H-bombs have thus far represented such a small proportion of current political discussions. We must realize that time is running out—that our actions and inactions during the next 4 years may well determine whether our people, our Nation, our civilization live or die.

Our people must not be shielded by their Government from the grim realities that confront us. They must realize how destructive H-bomb explosions really can be. They must realize how easily these devices can be made by other nations. They must realize in full the dangers of radioactive fallout. They must appreciate our vulnerability to ordinary air attack with atomic bombs, let alone to the approaching intercontinental missiles. They must realize all of these things if these problems are to be solved in time.

We believe that the free and open discussion of proposals such as that which has been raised by Mr. Stevenson are essential if we are to extricate ourselves from the vicious circle in which we now find ourselves.

Signers: Dr. Thomas Lauritsen, professor of physics, California Institute of Technology; Dr. Matthew Sands, associate professor of physics, California Institute of Technology; Carl D. Anderson, professor of physics, Nobel Laureate in Physics 1934, member of the National Academy of Sciences; Harrison Brown, professor of geochemistry, member of the National Academy of Sciences, formerly assistant director of chemistry, plutonium project, Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Robert F. McChristy, professor of theoretical physics, formerly physicist, Los Alamos, N. Mex.; Jesse W. M. DuMonde, professor of physics, member of the National Academy of Sciences, during war physicist with OSRD, Air Force, and Navy; Robert V. Langmuir, associate professor of electrical engineering, major field high energy accelerators, physicist with OSRD during war; Charles R. McKinney, senior research fellow in geochemistry, CTT, physicist at Oak Ridge during war, formerly chief engineer of 100 mev betatron at University of Chicago; John M. Teem, research fellow in physics; Robert L. Walker, associate professor of physics, formerly physicist, Los Alamos.

OCTOBER 15, 1956.

DR. THOMAS LAURITSEN,
California Institute of Technology,
Pasadena, Calif.

DEAR DR. LAURITSEN: This morning I read with amazement your statement. It seemed to me the arguments you use concerning renouncing the H-bomb tests are without validity. Indeed, your arguments completely support the position of President Eisenhower and his administration that experimentation and tests must continue until a system of international control is developed.

You mention Foreign Minister Shepilov's statement of July 17, suggesting abandoning of bomb tests; but what you fail to mention is that on almost the day Mr. Shepilov made the statement the Russians were conducting nuclear tests in the interior of Siberia.

You, Dr. Lauritsen, and your associates know the leadtime required to conduct a test. You know that almost a year must transpire from the time the test is decided upon until it is made. This year is consumed in planning, assembling material and construction, and, finally, in the transportation of the device to be tested. Now, if we make a unilateral decision of a type you and your associates advocate and then Mr. Shepilov does as he did last July—turns around and sets off a few hydrogen bombs in their own testing ground—where do we stand? The answer is simple. We have lost a year; we are behind in the race; all of the dangers which you enumerate in your press release have been multiplied; valuable time has been lost; a reckless decision has been taken, and the security of America placed in jeopardy because of it.

You point out that we are caught in a nuclear armament race, that time is running out and that nothing is being done to arrest the competition in this field between nations. You know that President Eisenhower went to Geneva in an effort

> to solve the disarmament question. You know that Secretary Dulles has met repeatedly with the foreign ministers of other countries, including Russia, in attempting to find a reasonable answer to the disarmament problem. You know that the United Nations has had its committees on disarmament in almost continuous session during recent years. You know that President Eisenhower placed Mr. Stassen in his Cabinet and assigned him exclusively to the task of finding an answer to the disarmament riddle. You know that 81 nations are now meeting in New York furthering our President's atoms-for-peace program. You know of these actions but still you state that time is running out and infer nothing is being done. How do you reconcile your position with the facts as I have outlined them?
>
> Your statement is obviously designed to create fear in the minds of the uninformed that radioactive fallout from H-bomb tests endangers life. However, as you know, the National Academy of Sciences has issued a report this year completely discounting such danger. Also you know from your close contact with the tests that one of the important objects of them is to develop techniques for reducing fallout. The tests are to be applauded rather than criticized on this particular ground.
>
> Your proposition that postponement of tests will delay the time when other nations might possess practical H-bomb experience seems to have no foundation. In fact, it is an argument that has for several years been a prominent part of Soviet propaganda, and you apparently have been taken in by this propaganda. No nation, friendly or unfriendly, has so much as hinted that our tests are stimulating their work or, on the contrary, that a unilateral decision on our part to abandon tests would cause them to decrease their emphasis on bomb development.
>
> As far as our prestige in Western Europe is concerned, I have spent much more time in Europe during the past 2 years than you have and have been in touch with the civilian or military officials of practically all Western Europe governments, and I can tell you from personal knowledge that our conduct of tests, H-bomb or other nuclear devices, is not at issue with our prestige in Western Europe.
>
> You infer that our Government shields our people from the realities of the dangers which confront us. This impression is false. President Eisenhower has repeatedly warned us of these dangers. Secretary of the Air Force Quarles dealt with the question at length in addressing the World Affairs Council in Los Angeles on last Wednesday. Secretary Wilson dealt with it last night on TV. Secretary Dulles has discussed the danger time and time again. Mr. Peterson of the Office of Civilian Defense has crisscrossed the country for 4 years warning of the very dangers of which you speak. Vice President Nixon has discussed the subject in Los Angeles and elsewhere in the United States on many occasions. The country has been advised time and time again, that others have developed the H-bomb and the A-bomb, that they are building up stockpiles, that they have aircraft to deliver them. Our people have been repeatedly warned of the dangers—not shielded from the facts as you infer.
>
> Surely the unilateral abandoning of the very tests which are an essential part of any development of this type does not improve the very situation that seems to worry you. On the contrary, it gives the advantage to our adversary and greatly increases rather than decreases the danger of America and the security of our people.
>
> A unilateral decision of the type you recommend might be fatal to our country. It might easily lose for us the precious technical advantage we now hold. Think of the desperate circumstance we would find ourselves in today had we followed the advice of one scientist, Dr. Robert Oppenheimer, a few years ago and abandoned the development of the H-bomb. Democrats and Republicans alike at that time saw the folly of such thinking. I am sure the more thoughtful members of both parties will see the extreme hazards to our national security in the course you recommend and advocate.
>
> I stand steadfastly behind a policy of disarmament when we reach agreement with other nations for a safe and proper procedure of inspection so that we Americans will be sure that, as we take our guard down through agreement with Russia, we will have no defense. This President Eisenhower has advocated time and again. It continues to be his policy; and you, unfortunately, have completely distorted his position in your press release.
>
> Yours very truly,
>
> JOHN A. MCCONE.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it will be noted that in comparing the text of these letters, Mr. McCone charges the scientists with advocating the unilateral abandoning of the H-bomb and A-bomb tests. He says:

> A unilateral decision of the type you recommend might be fatal to our country.

I find nothing in the letter of the scientists which recommends unilateral abandonment. All it does is to recommend action along the lines advocated by Adlai Stevenson, which indicated clearly that unless other nations followed our lead in abandoning atomic bomb testing, we would be free to resume testing.

In the course of his letter, Mr. McCone said:

> Your statement is obviously designed to create fear in the minds of the uninformed that radiation fallout from H-bomb tests endangers life. However, as you know, the National Academy of Sciences has issued a report this year completely discounting this danger.

Mr. President, here is Mr. McCone making a flat statement which scarcely will stand up; yet he is the man who is going to be the interpreter of the vast amount of information which is collected by his staff. Mr. McCone's indignation at the statement of these scientists is not fully disclosed by the hearings, but he made no secret of the fact of his great perturbation, and discussed it with the President of Cal Tech, Lee Dubridge, and some of his fellow trustees.

The fact is that Mr. McCone's evaluation of the letter of the scientists, as shown by his reply to Mr. Lauritsen, in my judgment raises a serious doubt about his objectivity as an evaluator, which will be one of his major functions, if not his major function as Director of Central Intelligence.

If we go back to the statement of Adlai Stevenson, made in a speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 21, 1956, he proposed that we cease atomic testing and urge other nations to follow our example. If they did not do so, we reserved the right to change our policy.

Well, is not that precisely what was subsequently done, or was tried, by the United States? Yet, Mr. McCone denounced these scientists violently, showing a passion which certainly does not reveal the degree of objectivity which should be so essential in the evaluation of reports which will come in from all over the world. With his views so definitely known, how objective can we assume will be the reports of his vast staff?

I need not elaborate this point further at this time; but to me it indicates that there is a good deal of question how valid Mr. McCone's judgment has been in the past and may be in the future.

Indeed, Mr. McCone's subsequent testimony, under cross-questioning, reveals how mistaken his violent indignation at these scientists proved to be. My colleague, Senator BARTLETT, a member of the Committee on Armed Services, also asked some searching questions.

Referring to Mr. McCone's statement in his letter to the scientists that "the National Academy of Sciences had issued a report completely discounting such danger," Senator BARTLETT said:

> And such danger has to do with the radioactive fallout from H-bomb tests.
>
> Do you know—

Senator BARTLETT continued—

> if the National Academy of Sciences has changed its views relating to this since then?

Mr. McCone replied:

> I do not know of any official statement. They put out a report in the spring of 1958 that dealt with the question of the genetic and other effects from radioactive fallout resulting from reference to testing, and, as I recall the report, it tended to minimize the effects at the level of radiation, at the then existing level of radiation or the level to be expected from the tests that had taken place or might be expected if tests were continud at about that level.
>
> Senator BARTLETT. That is, only the tests?
>
> Mr. MCCONE. It relates only to tests, yes, as I recall it.

Now bear in mind:

> Senator BARTLETT. Five years ago, I understand.
>
> Mr. MCCONE. Of course, this subject has been reviewed and reviewed many times, as Senator JACKSON knows, and there are wide differences of opinion among scientists, and sincere differences of opinion, concerning the effects of radioactive fallout.
>
> Senator BARTLETT. But there is no difference of opinion, is there, among scientists as to the dangers that would be inherent in radioactive fallout in case one of these bombs was to be dropped on any nation?
>
> Mr. MCCONE. No I think there is pretty general agreement that there will result an area of intense radioactivity which would be lethal and the extent of that area is dependent upon the atmospheric conditions and the wind and all the rest.
>
> But there is no difference of opinion among scientists as to the fact that there would be serious radioactive consequences from an atomic exchange.

Thus, Mr. McCone admitted that there are wide differences of opinion among scientists and sincere differences of opinion, concerning the effects of radioactive fallout, the very fact about which he had castigated the 10 scientists.

I wonder how valuable the evaluation of complicated and complex information from all over the world would be by a man who violently denounces a group of scholars for merely calling attention to and discussing the question of the damage from atomic fallout, on which he presumably was expert, and then, under cross-examination, is compelled to admit that his original castigation merely presented another point of view on a question on which, he admitted, scientists had sincere differences of opinion.

Finally, there is also the serious question of conflict of interest, which has been raised by others in the course of the debate. The past involvement of Mr. McCone in financial affairs on an international scale cannot be freed from the question as to whether it will not influence his judgments in the future.

Here it is pertinent to conclude with the statement of President Kennedy himself on the conflict of interest:

> No responsibility of government is more fundamental than the responsibility of maintaining the highest standards of ethical behavior by those who conduct the public's business. There can be no descent from the principle that all officials must act with unwavering integrity, absolute impartiality, and complete devotion to the public interest. This principle must be followed, not only in reality, but in appearance, for the basis of effective government is public confidence, and that confidence is endangered when ethical standards falter or appear to falter.

As President Kennedy so truly says, this principle must be followed not only in reality, but in appearance, for the basis of effective government is public confidence, and that confidence is endangered when ethical standards falter or appear to falter.

Nothing that I have said reflects, or is intended to reflect, in any way on the executive ability, integrity and patriotism, as well as devotion of Mr. McCone. Were he being appointed to a high excutive position in the armed services, I would have no hesitation in consenting to his nomination. But in these circumstances, for reasons heretofore stated, I feel regretfully compelled to vote in opposition.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I rise in support of confirmation of the nomination of John A. McCone.

Before I make my own comments on the nomination, I wish to read a statement by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] in connection with this matter. His statement is self-explanatory, and reads as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

> Almost a year ago I made a commitment which makes it impossible for me to be in Washington today, at this time when the nomination of the Honorable John A. McCone to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency is to be considered by the Senate.
>
> While I have no doubt that his nomination will be confirmed overwhelmingly by the Senate, I regret very much that I will not be present, because I support his nomination strongly and would like to be present to cast my vote for confirmation.
>
> His long and distinguished record in the service of the United States attests, more clearly than anything I can say, his ability to serve as Director of the very important Central Intelligence Agency. Twice the Senate has approved him—when he was nominated by President Truman to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, and when he was nominated by President Eisenhower to be Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.
>
> I have known Mr. McCone for 12 years. From his record of service and from my own observation, I know of his exceptional ability as an administrator. He has also always been a profound student of governmental affairs. The record proves that he has directed his administrative and organizational abilities and his powerful mind toward the problems of the agencies with which he has served, and always with the purpose of making them more effective in the service of the United States.
>
> He is a man of integrity and character, and I have never known anyone whose loyalties are more bound to the security and freedom of our country.
>
> As I have said, I have no doubt that his nomination will be overwhelmingly confirmed. But I do want to express my support of him as a man and as a public servant, and to speak of his qualities which are known by those who have served with him and by Members of the Senate.

So much for Senator COOPER's statement, Mr. President.

When this nomination was before the Armed Services Committee, and hearings on it were being held, I made a brief statement myself; and at this time I wish to read it for the RECORD of today. It is as follows:

> Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate President Kennedy upon this nomination. I think it is one of the best that he has made, and I want to congratulate Mr. McCone upon being willing to accept this very heavy burden of responsibility.
>
> It is a heavy burden, and it requires a man of great integrity and courage and trustworthiness and ability, demonstrated ability.
>
> I know of my own knowledge of Mr. McCone that he is the man that possesses these qualities to a marked degree, and I take great comfort in this nomination for that reason.
>
> Furthermore, I know him to be a deeply religious man and one who understands better than most, and I believe as well as any, the nature of the Communist menace with which we are faced. So I believe, Mr. Chairman, that in all respects which can be reasonably taken into account in connection with this kind of an appointment, he is fully qualified and will give a wonderful account of himself in this new post with this great responsibility, which he will shortly assume.

Of course, Mr. President, this agency is not a procurement agency. Therefore, in connection with Mr. McCone's nomination, there is no legal requirement that he divest himself of any of his property. No procurement agency—such as there is, for instance, in the Department of Defense and its subsidiary agencies—is involved in this case.

In selecting a man for this position, as well as for a position in one of the Defense agencies, the emphasis should be placed on character, integrity, responsibility, and general, proven ability.

Mr. McNamara, the very able and distinguished Secretary of Defense, had accumulated wealth in business before he came to that post; but I believe he has proven himself to be one of the best public servants who has served in Washington in many a day; and despite the fact that he has various property as a result of savings during his business career, whether they be in his own name or in his wife's name or in trust, these do not tempt him to betray the interests of the United States. They do not tempt him to do that, because he is a man of character and integrity.

The President of the United States himself is a wealthy man, and so are the members of his family. They might be subject to pressures from selfish interests from without; but they would not yield the interests of their country, because they are people of integrity and character who would place the interests of their country far above any such temptations.

The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon, is a successful man; and I assume that probably he has accumulated considerable wealth, for he was active in business for many years. It is possible that some of his many business friends might wish he would do various things of one kind or another which might benefit their special interests; but certainly they would not approach him with any such request, because they know him to be a man of integrity, character, and responsibility.

So, Mr. President, I think the President has done very well to select Mr. McCone—because the President knows Mr. McCone's high character and integrity and responsibility—to handle this very responsible Agency, as its chief.

Again I congratulate the President on this very high-caliber appointment; and I hope the Senate will confirm the nomination by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the question before the Senate has been a very difficult one for me, and it has caused me much concern. I was not present when Mr. John A. McCone appeared before the Armed Services Committee. I was necessarily absent because my 82-year-old mother had to undergo a surgical operation in Beckley, W. Va., on that day, for the removal of what was thought to be a malignancy. However, I have carefully read the printed hearings which contain the testimony of Mr. McCone before the Armed Services Committee.

I hold a great deal of admiration for the nominee. I admire his courage in taking a strong position against unilateral abandonment of bomb tests. He has exhibited great talent, and he has proved himself to be a resourceful and extremely capable businessman. He does not enter his new position without considerable experience in Washington, and any man who is chosen by three Presidents of the United States to serve his Government is a man for whom we all must have great respect. He was appointed by President Truman to the President's Air Policy Commission. He served as Special Deputy to Secretary James Forrestal. He served as Under Secretary of the Air Force, and he was later a member of Secretary Dulles' Public Committee on Personnel. His most recent Government service was as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission and Chairman of that body. I am constrained to believe that he has served well and capably in these positions. I regret, however, that in his appearance before the Armed Services Committee Mr. McCone indicated that he had had no experience or training in the field of intelligence prior to his appointment as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Although this in itself perhaps would not persuade me to vote in opposition to his confirmation, it is a factor bearing upon my decision.

It is unfortunate that one can scarcely address himself to the subject of conflict of interest without appearing to take the position of accuser or prosecutor. I speak not in derogation, however. I am confident that Mr. McCone is an honorable and upright man. Moreover, I am sure that the President, in nominating Mr. McCone, has satisfied himself, after careful examination, as to the qualifications of the nominee and as to any possibility of conflict of interest. Yet, there devolves upon the Senate a constitutional duty to pass a careful and detached and independent judgment as to this nominee. I do not feel, therefore, that it is any reflection upon the President, or indeed upon the nominee, that we search our own consciences and our own hearts in dealing with the matter before us. It is our high duty and responsibility to bring our own clear judgment to bear upon the subject.

Mr. President, whether or not our conflict-of-interest laws are sound or unsound is not for our decision today. I know that in some instances able men from the business community are inhibited and discouraged from serving in high Government positions because of the necessity of their divesting themselves of all their holdings. Such a necessity constitutes a burden and a sacrifice. Yet, most of us who act as public servants sacrifice in one way or another. While those who have huge stockholdings are not forced to divest themselves of those holdings before becoming a Member of this body or the other body, nevertheless, service in public office comes at a great personal sacrifice to some of us, or perhaps most of us. Some sacrifice the opportunity to enlarge their fortunes. Some sacrifice the attention, the love, and the companionship which they should give to their children. Some of us sacrifice our health. We all pay a price to serve, and yet we are willing to make that sacrifice because we love to serve our Government and our people. Consequently, I cannot be greatly persuaded by the arguments that are sometimes made against the requirement of divestment of holdings.

I realize that the conflict-of-interest requirements imposed upon nominees in the Department of Defense emanate from the magnitude of procurement there and, of course, the situation is quite different in considering the Central Intelligence Agency. Nonetheless, in view of the highly sensitive and vitally important position to which Mr. McCone is being considered today for confirmation, in my opinion it is just as important that there be no possible conflict-of-interest in this instance as if he were being considered for the position of Secretary of Defense.

Mr. McCone, by his own admission before the Armed Services Committee, testified that he holds a little more than $1 million worth of stock in Standard Oil of California. He referred also to extensive holdings in various other large companies, which include the Sequoia Corp., Trans-World Carriers, San Marino Corp., and the Joshua Hendy Corp. Standard Oil of California has extensive reserves in Arabia and Sumatra and Venezuela and elsewhere, and the vessels in the shipping enterprises in which Mr. McCone is interested are engaged in carrying oil for Standard of California.

I think it is a matter of common knowledge that American oil companies are concerned with and involved in the politics of the Middle East and the politics of Central and South America. The Central Intelligence Agency is similarly embroiled in the politics of the Middle East and Central and South America. Mr. McCone indicated, in the course of the hearings before the Armed Services Committee, that Standard Oil of California is a member of the Arabian-American Oil Co. In the hearings, Senator BARTLETT asked the following question of Mr. McCone:

> And, of course, all of us have heard that this company, operating in the Middle East, has at various times intervened or participated or interferred, whatever word should properly be applied, in the operations of governments in those areas and, so far as I know, these are merely allegations, but they have been printed and discussed. Would you have any comment to make upon that situation?

To this question, Mr. McCone replied thusly:

> No, I would have no comment because I have not personally read or heard of those allegations. In my trips to the Middle East, I have observed that the Aramco people handled their relationship with the Governments of Arabia and Bahrein Island in a very satisfactory way, so reported to me. I don't know of any interference.

Mr. President, I am not satisfied with this reply to Senator BARTLETT's question. As to Mr. McCone's having divested himself of his holdings at the time he became a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, I think this was entirely proper. I am pleased to note that he has indicated a willingness to establish an irrevocable trust again, but, in my mind, this would not be an entirely satisfactory solution, because he and his family would continue to have an economic and beneficial interest in the holdings. The fact remains that he has not divested himself of these stockholdings and, as a matter of fact, he has indicated that he does not believe that the situation which made it advisable for him to take this action at the time of his appointment to the Atomic Energy Commission exists in connection with the office of Director of the CIA. Secretary of Defense McNamara, on the other hand, was required to divest himself of his stockholdings, and it was not thought that his offer to place his stock in an irrevocable trust removed the conflict of interest. I think Mr. McCone should sell his stocks.

Mr. President, a quotation from the regulations of the Central Intelligence Agency dealings with the conflict-of-interest question was printed in the January 29 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 1112. I repeat the subparagraph of the section which defines a conflict of interest:

> (b) Conflicts of interest.
>
> (1) Definition: A conflict of interest is defined as a situation in which an agency employee's private interest, usually but not necessarily of an economic nature, conflicts or appears to conflict with his agency duties and responsibilities. The situation is of concern to the agency whether the conflict is real or only apparent.

Mr. President, I do not say that, in Mr. McCone's case, there will be any conflict of interest. Nevertheless, I stress the language in the regulation stating that a conflict of interest is a situation in which an agency employee's private interest conflicts or appears to conflict with his agency duties. The regulation says the agency is concerned whether the conflict is real or only apparent. Mr. President, the conflict may not be real in Mr. McCone's case. The conflict may never become a reality. But it is nonetheless a possibility. That which is a possibility today may become, under certain circumstances, a reality tomorrow. No human being is infallible, and the risk to our country is great. In my judgment, even the appearance or the possibility of a conflict of interest should be nonexistent in the case of Mr. McCone. I hope that a conflict of interest will never eventuate, and I make no appeal to others to vote as I shall; but, until he has divested himself of the holdings to which I have referred, I shall not be willing to support Mr. McCone's confirmation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the President of the United States, pursuant to his constitutional duty, has forwarded to the Senate the nomination of John A. McCone to be the Director of Central Intelligence.

The issue before the Senate is whether the Senate will advise and consent to this nomination.

Mr. President, I assume that most Members of this body would be willing to concede that the President of the United States is entitled to have such persons as he desires to serve in positions of vast responsibility, such as the Director of Central Intelligence, unless the person whose name was forwarded to the Senate had some impediment either in morals or in ability that would disqualify him from serving in that capacity.

I do not think anyone would take the position that a Member of the Senate is justified for capricious reasons, or for no reason at all, in voting against the nominees of the President of the United States for these very important positions.

In the absence of a clear disqualification, I have always resolved any doubts in my mind in this area in favor of the President's right to have associated with him in the executive branch of the Government those whom he desires, and I am supporting the nomination of Mr. McCone. I do this not only because I believe the President is ordinarily entitled to have the man of his choice, but also because I believe Mr. McCone is fully qualified in every respect to discharge the duties of the office and because I believe him to be a patriotic, able, honest, forthright American who only desires to serve his country when occupying any position of public trust and responsibility.

This opinion is based, in part Mr. President, on two hearings that have been held on former occasions to examine into the qualifications of Mr. McCone. Mr. McCone was nominated in 1950 to be Under Secretary of the Air Force. Mr. McCone was examined by the Comimttee on Armed Services, and his nomination was unanimously confirmed by the Senate. Later, some three or four years ago, another President of another political party, President Eisenhower, selected Mr. McCone to serve as chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, an agency of vast importance to the security of these United States. Mr. McCone was carefully examined in great detail by the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and on that committee are men of varied political views. His nomination was unanimously reported by the committee and was unanimously confirmed.

I must say, Mr. President, I have been somewhat disappointed that so many extraneous matters have been dragged into the discussion. I have been somewhat disappointed by the extent to which innuendo has been used and developed by some of those who are opposing the nomination of Mr. McCone. I say that, freely conceding the right of every Senator to vote as he sees fit.

I regret that I have not been able to be on the floor of the Senate during the entire course of this discussion. Ordinarily I would have been present pursuant to the discharge of my duties as chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, but unfortunately the committee has been conducting a series of hearings on the procurement items which must be authorized before the Senate can consider the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense. A number of other items have had my attention, including a foray which was launched against the section of the country from which I come, which in this political year has occupied my time. It has been impossible for me to keep three balls in the air at one time and to watch all of them. I have had to watch them one at a time and to leave the other two at rest.

I have been appalled, on reading the RECORD, to see the extent of misconception which exists in the minds of some Senators as to the nature of the position of the Director of Central Intelligence. When one reads the record of some things which have been said, Mr. President, one could come to the conclusion that the Director of Central Intelligence was a super State Department and that he formulated foreign policy. Reading it further, in other areas, one could come to the conclusion that he was a freewheeling Secretary of Defense who could move around over the world, declaring war on those who incurred his displeasure and toppling over governments by covert means, without any let or hindrance from the chief executive of this country or any responsibility to the Chief Executive of the United States.

Mr. President, the truth of the matter is that this man, while he will occupy an office of vital importance to this country, will not have the power or the responsibility or the duty of formulating foreign policy, and time and again in his appearance before the committee, he disclaimed any intention to attempt to do so. Not only that, but so far as the covert activities of the Central Intelligence Agency are concerned, he stated time and again what we all know is a fact, that no Director of Central Intelligence would think of undertaking any activities anywhere on the face of the earth without the approval and the consent of the President of the United States, who can dismiss him at his pleasure. We all assume that the President of the United States would consult with the Secretary of State when any of the intelligence-gathering activities might be related to the foreign policy of the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield briefly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As the distinguished Senator from Georgia knows, the duty of the Director is to obtain facts. If he had stated to the committee that he felt that it was a part of his job to determine policy, I, for one, would not have supported him. I am supporting the nomination of Mr. McCone wholeheartedly because he understands fundamentally that it is his duty to obtain facts and not to determine policy.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is the duty of the Director to obtain the facts, to evaluate, and then to present them to his proper superiors.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it is ridiculous to talk about the Director's attacking foreign powers over the earth without the knowledge, consent, or approval of the President of the United States. What is really involved in this so-called constitutional discussion does not relate to the competency of John A. McCone to serve as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. It relates to the proper use of the constitutional powers of the President of the United States.

My mind goes back into recent history, when a great debate arose about the power of the President of the United States to send American troops abroad. A document prepared in the Department of State set forth more than 100 occasions when Presidents of the United States of every political persuasion in our history had sent troops into foreign countries without the sanction of Congress or without a declaration of war.

But what is being questioned here is the constitutional power of the President; and Mr. McCone, whose nomination happens to be before the Senate, is the whipping boy.

When he was asked about the extent of his powers, Mr. McCone said in two or three instances:

> I conceive it to be my duty to carry out the orders and commands of the President of the United States.

What other position would Senators have him take? If he would not follow the commands of the President of the United States, whose orders would he follow? Certainly to follow the President's commands would be his duty. He would not tie his hands in any degree. He would not say:

> I am going to investigate the constitutional niceties that might be involved before I let an agent of the CIA go to "X," the capital of "Y," and try to find something about the strength of their military forces.

Mr. President, that kind of action is not the duty of the Director of Central Intelligence. His duty is to serve the President of the United States.

There has been discussion about the work of the CIA being in the field of foreign policy. The position of Director of Central Intelligence was not created indirectly in the field of foreign policy. It was created to serve the President of the United States in his constitutional capacity as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, and to enable him to prevent his subordinates from being caught by surprise by some enemy attack, or being caught by surprise by the strength of some adversary that might secretly build up its military strength to overwhelm us.

I conceive of the office of Director of Central Intelligence being what in the old Army we used to call a G–2. The Director of Central Intelligence is a G–2 of the President of the United States. He is a man who handles the intelligence of the President.

All the talk about Mr. McCone's views on foreign policy and why the Committee on Armed Services did not ask him what he thought about the foreign policy that is being applied in Iraq, Iran, Congo, or somewhere else, is entirely beside the point. If we had sought to elicit such information from Mr. McCone in that area, it would have been highly improper for him to express his views, because the position he was appointed to fill had nothing whatever to do with formulating foreign policy. Had he done so, he would have given any Senator who opposes him additional ammunition to oppose him by saying, "Here is a man who thinks we ought to have taken a given action in the Congo, or done something else in the case of Goa, or we should have acted in a given way in the case of Russia. I do not agree with him. Therefore I shall vote against confirmation of his nomination."

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the distinguished Senator know of any position in the Federal Government that is more sensitive and more strategic than that of Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, which has full responsibility with respect to all the classified data within the control of the U.S. Government with reference to atomic bombs, hydrogen bombs, how many of them we have, and what we are going to do with our friends and what are we going to do about our adversaries?

Mr. RUSSELL. I completely agree with the Senator, who is one of the most able and most knowledgeable members of the Joint Committee on Atomic

Energy. I know he has had an opportunity to observe Mr. McCone in his administration of the important Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. President, of course, we did not go into Mr. McCone's views on every phase of foreign policy. It would have been highly inappropriate for us to have done so, because he is not in a policymaking position. He is in a position in which he undertakes to serve the constitutional Commander in Chief of the United States, the Chief of all the Armed Forces, and to try to furnish the necessary information to keep us from blundering into trouble in this age of fearsome weapons and surprise attacks that would destroy many of us and deliver into slavery those who might be left.

Some of the questions seem to imply some dereliction on the part of the Committee on Armed Services for not going into all of Mr. McCone's views on foreign policy. I assume that if we had done so, the complaint would have been the other way around: "What has the Armed Services Committee to do with foreign policy? Why are they going into all these issues? Why was Mr. McCone cross-examined and asked to express opinions on foreign policy matters? Those questions are in the field of foreign relations."

We must look a little further than that, I think, to see what is the genesis of the very violent opposition to Mr. McCone.

In passing, I wish to say that I regard it as unfortunate that we air on the floor of the Senate all the things that Central Intelligence Agency is reputed to have done or not to have done in foreign countries. I cannot see that it serves any useful purpose. It cannot attach to the competency of Mr. McCone because he was not the Director at the time. But in the very nature of things the Central Intelligence Agency can neither admit nor deny a charge that it is interfering, that, for example, the interference in Iran is with relation to some individual, or that it is interfering in some other country.

If the nominee would say that we are not taking such action, another question might arise—"Why aren't you there seeing what they are doing, since you represent the United States?"

If the nominee were to say, "We are taking such action," it could then be said by those who oppose confirmation of the nomination, "That is an act of undeclared war."

Make no mistake about it. The position of Director of Central Intelligence was created to serve the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States; and should the responsibility go beyond that point, whether by reason of overt or covert operations, it would be exceeding the concept and the purpose for which the position was created.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does not the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of our committee, agree with me that the office of the head of Central Intelligence, as he and I have followed the operation of the agency over the years, requires the qualities of intelligence, understanding of other people, courage, energy, patience, education, and, above all, good administrative ability; and that in the opinion of the President, Mr. McCone has these qualities, because he has been appointed to and has proved himself to possess these qualities in many other positions, such as in the position of Under Secretary of the Air Force under Mr. Finletter, as well as under Mr. Forrestal, when Mr. Forrestal was Secretary of Defense, and also under Secretary John Foster Dulles in the State Department as a member of a commission; that he served by appointment of President Truman and also under appointment by President Eisenhower, as chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission? Mr. McCone has served in these various positions and his nominations to office have been confirmed twice by the Senate. Obviously, he has these qualities which, in my opinion, are necessary qualities for serving under the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, the President of the United States, a position that requires him to acquire information as to facts.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has well outlined the qualities that would be highly desirable in a Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. I would not say that every Director of the Agency in the past has possessed all the qualities the Senator has outlined. However, the Senator has stated what would make a perfect head of the Central Intelligence Agency. He certainly outlined the attributes of character that the President of the United States, the present Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, thought the man possessed when, after careful consideration of a large number of people for this vitally important job, he finally selected John McCone to fill it.

I have no doubt that the President's selection will be well justified in the days that lie ahead. If it is not, the President can get rid of him with the stroke of a pen. He will hold office at the pleasure of the President.

"Oh," say some Senators, "no, we will not have him confirmed; we are not even going to give the President a chance; we are going to stop him with a stroke of the pen in the Senate before he gets into the job by defeating his confirmation."

Of course that is within the right of these Senators, and within the power of the Senate. However, the power to advise and consent can be abused, just as can the power of the executive branch of the Government, or any other power that might be vested in anyone.

I now come to the conflict-of-interest issue. I do not believe that any person familiar with the records of the Armed Services Committee will say that, whatever may have been our derelictions in other fields, we have been soft on dealing with the conflict-of-interest question.

Certainly when the first of the automobile company presidents came before us for confirmation of his appointment we created headlines all over the country because we required him to dispose of his stockholdings; and he is said to have suffered great losses as a result. The present Secretary of Defense disposed of great holdings in another automobile company. In addition, he sacrificed a job that was paying him about 10 times as much as he would be paid as the Secretary of Defense.

I have undertaken to keep up with the statutes, at least—I do not pretend to have read all the decisions that have been rendered—dealing with the conflict of interest. The purpose of the statutes I have read is to prevent any man in a public position handling tax money from doing business with himself, and using money raised through taxes for that purpose. In other words, it is to prevent him from representing the Government on the one hand and, on the other, dealing with himself in some corporation, firm, or partnership in which he has an interest. It is to prevent that kind of relationship that the conflict-of-interest statutes have arisen.

For that reason the Committee on Armed Services did not demand that Mr. McCone divest himself of some of his stockholdings before assuming the position of Director of Central Intelligence as we would have demanded that he do had he been nominated for the position of the Secretary of Defense, for example, in which position he would be engaged in procurement on behalf of the Government or dealing with the concerns in which he owned stock. We did not demand the divestment that was required when he took his position with the Atomic Energy Commission. In that instance the statute requires that the head of the Atomic Energy Commission not hold stock with any company with which the Commission does business. Essentially that is what the law provides. I could not see where there was any conflict of interest on the part of a man who is to be the Director of Intelligence, when he is not engaged in any extensive procurement.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I should like to ask the able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, is it not true that the nominee had received an opinion from the general counsel of the Central Intelligence Agency concurred in by the Department of Justice to the effect that there was no conflict of interest in his case?

Mr. RUSSELL. He did. However, despite the fact that he had received those opinions, he expressed a willingness to do what he had done before. He was very frank with the committee. He said, "I do not see where there could possibly be any conflict of interest. However, if you want me to do it, I will do what I did when I took the position with the Atomic Energy Commission."

If there is any dereliction, it is not on the part of Mr. McCone; it is on the part of the committee. In view of the fact that the CIA has little procurement functions, I, as one member of the committee, could see no necessity for compelling this man to dispose of any stock he held, any more than I could see any necessity in compelling an employee of the Senate, for example, to dispose of his stocks. Senators themselves hold stocks. There is as much likelihood of a conflict of interest on the part of a Senator who holds a great deal of stock in a company with which the Government does business as there is for the Director of Central Intelligence.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. At page 55 of the testimony, Mr. McCone admitted that he owned approximately $1 million of stock in the Standard Oil Co. of California, and that the Standard Oil Co. of California gave to the Hendy Co., of which he was the 100-percent owner, $2 million worth of ocean-carrying cargo business. If Mr. McCone is approved as the head of the Central Intelligence Agency, he will be working in the Far East, where oil problems are many. My question is this: Let us assume that there develops in the Far East some disturbance concerning the expropriation of oil interests, and Mr. McCone acquires that information. Is it possible or likely that that information might influence him in the handling of his holdings in the Standard Oil Co. of California or in the Joshua Hendy Co.?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if a man wishes to think the very worst of Mr. McCone, and if the eventuality which the Senator has outlined were to come about—and we do not know that it will happen—it is also possible that the President of the United States might have something to say about it at that stage of the proceedings. This man is answerable to the President, as is any clerk in the President's office. He can discharge this man at any hour of any day that he so desires.

I have heard that argument before. I have heard it made by Senators on the floor of the Senate three or four times. I am not at all impressed by it. If one wishes to carry that argument out to its logical extension, even to the point of reductio ad absurdum, one would have to contend that any person of the Jewish faith should not serve as Director of Intelligence because he might be influenced by the intelligence he might receive on activities that might occur in Israel; or one might contend that no person of the Catholic faith should serve as Director of Intelligence because he might be influenced by the attitude of the Pope on some question.

That is a remote possibility. However, I say that it is a very frail argument to use against an honest, honorable, patriotic American citizen who has had his name sent to the Senate by the President of the United States.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield. I had hoped to conclude by now.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I surrendered the floor to the Senator from Georgia. I was supposed to be recognized prior to the time he was.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had no knowledge of that. I did not request the Senator from Ohio to surrender the floor to me. I want the RECORD to show that. I had no knowledge of that until this moment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The President of the United States said:

> No responsibility of government is more fundamental than the responsibility of maintaining the highest standards of ethical behavior by those who conduct the public's business. There can be no descent from the principle that all officials must act with unwavering integrity, absolute impartiality, and complete devotion to the public interest. This principle must be followed, not only in reality, but in appearance, for the basis of effective government is public confidence, and that confidence is endangered when ethical standards falter or appear to falter.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did the Senator read from a statement by President Kennedy?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes; I read from his definition of what should be expected of a public servant.

Mr. RUSSELL. Since the President made that statement, he submitted Mr. McCone's nomination to the Senate. I assume he did not think there was any conflict for he would not have sent Mr. McCone's nomination to the Senate.

I realize the necessity for having a very high standard of ethics on the part of all our public servants, but it seems at times these things are stretched so far that it appears to be a crime—a crime with which I could never be charged—to have managed to accumulate a vast fortune, and to do so by one's own efforts.

It is a strange reaction that the public mind throughout the United States today seems to look on a man who makes a great deal of money as if there were something wrong with him. But if he inherits a vast sum of money, the same stigma does not attach. The distinction is hard to follow. In my opinion, we should not discriminate against a man who makes money by his own efforts in favor of one who by chance of birth came into a vast fortune.

I do not hold against Mr. McCone his accumulation of fortune. I believe that if a situation arose whereby his ownership of oil stock conflicted with the policy of the United States, or could conflict with the policy of the United States, in the Middle East, Mr. McCone himself would bring the situation to the attention of the President of the United States, if the President did not have it brought to his attention from other sources. There are a great many persons who, I am sure, would be glad to bring it to the President's attention.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have had the privilege of working closely with and sometimes in opposition to Mr. McCone while he was Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. I consider John McCone to be a capable, courageous, and patriotic citizen. My only regret with respect to this appointment is that Mr. McCone is not 20 years younger, in order that he might contribute more of the faithful and dedicated service of which he is capable.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield 2 minutes to me? I wish to make a short statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I had hoped to conclude my remarks before now. I could have concluded in 15 or 20 minutes and would have done so had I not been interrupted for questioning.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have had a number of requests from Senators for time in which to speak on this important nomination. I know the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services still has some remarks to make.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have almost concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The opponents of the nomination still wish to be heard. I shall ask the indulgence of Senators in order to request that the present unanimous-consent agreement be amended by a new unanimous-consent request, namely, to extend the time for 45 minutes; in other words, to have the vote on the nomination take place at 2:45 p.m.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it is my hope that the vote will be taken before that time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will amend the request and ask that the time be extended 30 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is understood, I assume, that the time will be equally divided.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, is there to be a distribution of the additional time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the time will be equally divided and will be under the control of the chairman of the committee and of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I had almost concluded my remarks. I would have concluded them much earlier had it not been for the questioning. However, I am always glad to yield, particularly on a subject of this kind.

In these troubled times, I doubt that it would be possible to secure an ideal man to fill any public position. That includes even the great office of President of the United States. We all have responsibilities and duties that are beyond our capacity. All we can do is the very best we can with the light and the strength with which providence has endowed us.

In my judgment, this nominee is an honest, patriotic public servant. I believe he will bring to the office certain abilities that will be most helpful in enabling him to report to the National Security Council and to the President of the United States, his Commander in Chief, valuable intelligence information. If I had the slightest doubt about the nominee, considering the importance of the office, I would vote against Mr. McCone.

Many objections have been raised against Mr. McCone. One of them is that he has been in favor of continuing atomic testing in the atmosphere. Yet the same persons who condemn him for that wanted the committee to go into every detail concerning what Mr. McCone thought about that policy. He held that view before he was nominated to this position, but I am certain he has not retreated from it. I am particeps criminis in that viewpoint; I am one who thinks the United States should resume atomic testing.

I have seen it stated that Mr. McCone's hatred of communism was so all-consuming that he could not do a fair job in the Central Intelligence Agency because he would twist and distort matters so as to provoke us into a war with the Soviet Union. I do not believe that. I think Mr. McCone abhors communism. If I did not think so, I would be voting the other way. But I do not believe he will carry into his new position his feelings about differing philosophies of government, as between our free enterprise system and the slave state, in which a man is chained to the wheel of the state, to the extent of influencing his judgment on intelligence. It is impossible for me to think that he would do so. I think he would be fair and objective in his effort to discharge his duties.

The President of the United States has selected Mr. McCone. He has said, in effect, "This is the man I want to serve as my G-2, to furnish me intelligence." I think the President of the United States is entitled to have him.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield 3 minutes to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock has arrived. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, as amended, the time is further controlled. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am going to support and vote for the confirmation of John McCone as head of the Central Intelligence Agency for four reasons.

First, I believe him to be an exemplary American. Second, I consider him to be a very competent individual both in business and government. He is an excellent administrator with a proven record. Third, from my contacts with John McCone, I have always found him to be an individual of impeccable honesty and high integrity. And, fourth, a rejection of Mr. McCone at this time would be a rebuff to President Kennedy in his appointment of an individual in whom he has confidence.

I never knew John McCone until he was appointed by President Eisenhower to be the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. From that day forward, through my own personal contacts with him, I found him to be a man of his word, a very able administrator, and a dedicated public servant. John McCone has never been deluded or deceived as to the Communist menace. I know that had he had his way, we would have had a resumption of underground testing long before President Kennedy was compelled to do so.

Mr. McCone is a man of character and courage. He understands the intrigue and the doubletalk of the Kremlin leaders.

I know of no man who would better head a strategic agency such as the Central Intelligence Agency with greater competence and understanding.

I realize there are those who, for reasons of their own, will, in good conscience, vote against this nomination. But, for myself, having known this man for several years on a very intimate and personal basis, I feel in my heart that the President of the United States has made an admirable choice which I, in complete confidence, can support.

With John McCone as the head of the Central Intelligence Agency, I know that the society of free men and free women can sleep a little easier tonight.

In conclusion, I reiterate what I said on January 18, 1961, without regard to this appointment, when addressing myself to John McCone on his retirement as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. I then said:

> It is with genuine regret that I see you leave public service, John McCone, and if I have my way about it, you won't have the luxury very long. I think this country needs you. I shall undertake to persuade somebody to persuade you to get back into the service of the country.

Mr. President, what I said on January 18, 1961, I have no cause or reason to reject now. Instead, I reiterate my great pleasure over the fact that President Kennedy has seen fit to appoint John McCone to serve in so strategic a position.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hickey in the chair). The Senator from Maine is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. President, I find the approaching vote a difficult one to cast. I have followed carefully the debate on Mr. McCone's nomination; I have reviewed the record. From the evidence we have before us, I cannot justify voting against confirmation; and yet as I support the appointment of a distinguished citizen, I have grave questions about the exact nature of the task he is undertaking and the operation of the Agency he will head.

As the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy] has pointed out, Mr. McCone stated that the Central Intelligence Agency would not be, in his opinion, a policymaking body. But we know from its history and by its very nature that the Agency does influence policy decisions in very critical areas of national defense and foreign relations. To avoid policy advice would require the wisdom of Solomon and the restraint of Job—and today we are not considering either of those gentlemen.

In the past, Congress has not focused sufficient attention on the delicate and critical position of the Central Intelligence Agency in our national policy structure. The Armed Services Committee did not, unfortunately, explore a number of important questions in connection with foreign policy which must occupy the attention of Mr. McCone, and which, if explored, would have provided this body with a more meaningful record on which to make a decision.

What is past is done, however. The President has expressed his confidence in Mr. McCone. There is no sufficient evidence to warrant a rejection of that confidence. The important question goes beyond the issue of Mr. McCone's nomination. That question is the future nature of the Central Intelligence Agency and the relationship of Congress to that Agency.

For these reasons, I wish to give strong endorsement to the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy] that there be established a joint committee of Congress with the specific responsibility of overseeing the operations of the Central Intelligence Agency. We have an excellent precedent in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy; and I urge that we make use of our experience in that field in fulfilling our responsibilities as the representatives of the people of these United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish very definitely to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Maine. If the debate on this nomination has done nothing else, it has clearly given the Members of the Senate an opportunity to go on record in regard to this all-important and much-hoped-for development, which I trust will be consummated at this session.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, at this time I yield to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the office of Director of the Central Intelligence Agency is unique in our Government. It is unique in that the man who holds it is entrusted with the direction of a vast organization which, though it is engaged in worldwide activities of the most sensitive nature, is not subject to the close scrutiny of its appropriations and operations customarily applied to the other agencies of our Government by Congress, by the press, and by the public. The CIA thus exerts a powerful influence on the character and conduct of our foreign relations, without being subject to the processes of consultation and review of its activities by the committees of Congress normally charged with responsibility in this area.

In this instance, neither the Committee on Foreign Relations nor its chairman was consulted about the appointment, and the committee has not been given an opportunity to be informed with regard to the nominee's views about our relations with foreign nations, and especially about the issues involved in the cold war.

The record before the Senate reveals little, if anything, regarding the views or opinions of Mr. McCone about the fundamental policies affecting the security of our country.

In short, I do not feel that I am sufficiently informed about the convictions of this nominee regarding the foreign policy of our Government to endorse them by an affirmative vote.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I regret to find myself in disagreement with the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] on the question of the role of the Senate in relation to the fulfillment of its constitutional obligations and traditional responsibilities. I suppose no other Member of the Senate has given more thought to the relationship of the Senate to the executive branch of the Government than he has, nor has any other Member—at least, among the contemporary group of Senators—given more thought to the question of the responsibilities of the Members of the Senate.

I wish we could be debating here the simple question of relationships and issues, and that we did not have to be dealing with a personality. However, the Constitution imposes on the Members of the Senate the responsibility of passing judgment upon both persons and issues. We have not only a government of laws, but also a government of persons.

If it were true that from now on the Central Intelligence Agency would be operated in such manner that the gathering of intelligence would be its sole function, I would have no question about supporting the confirmation of John A. McCone. Or if he were put in charge of only the intelligence-gathering operations, I would have no hesitation about supporting confirmation of his nomination. If he were appointed to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, I would have no hesitation about supporting his confirmation. Or if he were appointed to be Secretary of the Air Force or Under Secretary of the Air Force, I would have no hesitation about supporting confirmation of his nomination.

However, the Senate is being asked to confirm the nomination of John A. McCone to be the Director of Central Intelligence. At the opening of the hearings, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee said:

> This office is perhaps second in importance only to the office of the President.

Certainly I agree with that statement. However, Mr. President, if the head of this Agency is to have no part in policymaking, then in my judgment this office is not second in importance only to that of the President.

But because there is on the record evidence that at least in the near future the head of this Agency will be in a position to make policy, I believe his views relating to foreign policy and to other important questions, not only in regard to the operations of the Central Intelligence Agency but also in regard to some of the operations which have been carried out in the name of foreign policy, are of fundamental importance for consideration by the Members of the Senate when they are called upon to vote on the question of confirmation.

In our time there has been a revolution in weapons, in communications, in military power, and in the interdependence of nations. All of these factors have given a new dimension to international politics and to war. Even the language in the vocabulary of the past is no longer adequate. The meaning and the conduct of foreign affairs is different than it was when the Constitution was adopted and during the 19th century. The economy and political structure and weapons of other nations relate very much to our own defense. Changes taking place in other countries can lead our Nation to the edge of war or may bring us closer to a time of peace. What role is Congress to play in decisions of this nature?

Sooner or later this question will have to be the basis for a great debate. I think this is a proper time to start that debate. We need new procedures which take into account the responsibilities of Congress in this kind of world, particularly as it is affected by the different methods of cold war as well as by prospects of total war.

We are faced with world conditions when we may have to make a choice between total war and guerrilla warfare, even though we would like to reject war altogether. I believe it is the responsibility of Congress to participate in the determination of questions of this kind, particularly when the activities relate to war, whether it be hot war or cold war.

I note that 8 of the 18 paragraphs of that section of the Constitution which enumerates the powers of Congress refer to matters of defense or war or the Armed Forces.

Paragraph 1 of article I, section 8, states that Congress shall have power to provide for the common defense.

Paragraph 10 of the same section defines and punishes piracies and felonies committed on the high seas and offenses against the law of nations.

Paragraph 11 provides that Congress shall declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water.

Paragraph 12 has to do with raising and supporting armies and the appropriations for that purpose.

Paragraph 13 provides for maintaining a Navy.

Paragraph 14 relates to making rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

Paragraph 15 provides for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions.

Paragraph 16 provides for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States.

The concern in this section of the Constitution is clearly indicated, I think. There is to be congressional involvement in decisions relating to the common defense in its many phases.

We are concerned here not only with passing judgment on what CIA has done and not only with passing judgment upon the performance of the nominee and other officers; we are called upon to pass on a fundamental constitutional question, but to pass upon it under most difficult historical circumstances.

I believe that in our action here in the Senate, the question of whether we trust the President or whether we are loyal to the President should not be raised. A vote against the nominee, in my judgment, could not be properly interpreted as a vote indicating lack of confidence in the President. Rather, it should reflect, and be considered to reflect on the part of each Member of the Senate who may vote against the nominee, as a vote against confirmation because of a constitutional responsibility to make a decision which runs, first, to the determination of foreign policy, and second, to a very special responsibility about the confirmation of a nominee appointed by the President for a position which the chairman of the Armed Services Committee has described as perhaps the second most important office in the land, next to the President.

Each Member of the Senate should ask himself this question: Whether or not, if his vote were to determine whether this nominee would be approved, he would vote for him; and if he is satisfied under those conditions that he would vote for the nominee, he should do so. If he is satisfied under those conditions that he would not vote for him, he should vote against confirmation.

Having considered these questions as best I can, I have concluded that I will vote against the confirmation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished minority whip, the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel].

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, perhaps no citizen among all our countrymen brings more unique or greater qualifications to his heavy new responsibilities than does John McCone. John McCone is an American citizen who has succeeded in the business world and who, as his success continued, amassed a reputation for honor, integrity, courage, ability, and civic virtue among all of those who knew him, particularly those who knew him best. Here, Mr. President, is a sterling citizen, an undeviating patriot, a splendid executive, preeminently qualified to perform excellent service in the vital responsibility for which President Kennedy has chosen him.

Under Democratic administrations and under Republican administrations, John McCone has served the people of the United States, as has been said, in the Pentagon, in the Air Force, in the Department of Defense, in the State Department, in special missions for the Chief Executive of our country, and last, but certainly not least, as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. And it seems to me of transcendent relevance, my fellow Senators, that when the roll is called, every member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy who sits in the Senate will cast his vote in favor of this nominee. They know him far better than most of my colleagues here.

Mr. President, it has been suggested that every Senator weigh carefully his responsibility. I agree. I have weighed mine, and I believe it would be in the interest of the security of the American people if the nominee of the President of the United States were given a unanimous endorsement in this Chamber.

Discussion and debate have been had here as to policy decisions of the CIA. I agree with the able Senator from Georgia. The Central Intelligence Agency Director will serve the Chief Executive of this country. He will do that which the President of the United States asks him to do, no more and no less. He will serve a function indispensable to the security and the defense of this country. And I, for one, think that the appointment which has been made by the Chief Executive of our country does high credit to him, as well as to the nominee whose name is before us at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I listened with considerable surprise to the reasons given by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for his intention to vote against Mr. McCone. I say that because I have the utmost respect for the Senator from Arkansas as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. He has stated he will vote against Mr. McCone because he does not know what his views on foreign policy are.

As I said before, if I knew what the views of Mr. McCone were on foreign policy in detail, and if he had spelled them out, I would be hesitant to vote in favor of his nomination.

Inside the United States we have the FBI. We have a very distinguished leader of that organization, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover. One would not ask Mr. Hoover for his opinion on certain policies, and so forth. He would be asked to get the facts. The same thing applies with relation to the CIA and the Director of it. It is his job to get the facts and evaluate them; to present them almost daily to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and other officials of the U.S. Government. It is not his duty to decide what the Government should do with relation to those facts. It is his job to get the facts and present them so that they are in understandable, clear form, and then the policies are determined by the President of the United States and his Cabinet officers.

I believe Mr. McCone is highly qualified to render the service he has been chosen to discharge. He has received appointments under three different Presidents; President Truman, President Eisenhower, and now President Kennedy. He has received other appointments. I hope the nomination will be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have no further requests for time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back his remaining time?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not regard this to be an appropriate occasion to discuss further the functions of the Central Intelligence Agency. I repeat what I said about the Central Intelligence Agency not being within the field of making foreign policy.

I was somewhat surprised when the distinguished Senator from Arkansas said that because he did not know the nominee's views on the details of foreign policy he would not support his nomination. I would say it would be as logical for a member of the Armed Services Committee to say that because he had not examined or did not know in detail the views on foreign policy of the Secretary of State or one of his assistants that he could not support a nominee, because certainly their views on foreign policy would have a direct bearing on the military strength necessary for these United States to maintain.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator will recall I tried to emphasize that this particular position is unique. I would not have the slightest hesitancy in approving the appointment of Mr. McCone, for example, to be Secretary of State. This is a position subject to review by the committees and by the press. The Secretary of State is subject to constant review and exposure to criticism and comment by nearly everybody. He comes before our committee in open session, in executive session, and so on.

In my opinion this particular position is unique in the Government. I have not approved of the way it has been conducted for years. I joined the distinguished majority leader some years ago in trying to set up a special committee comparable to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. That failed because of the vigorous opposition of the then leader or Director of the CIA. This operation is covert. I would much prefer that the President take full responsibility and not ask us to affirm it unless I know something about the nominee's views. I base my position entirely upon the character of the office, because there is no other office comparable to it.

To say that the position is comparable to that of Secretary of State or Secretary of Labor or to any other I think misconstrues what is my position.

I deny that this office does not have a very major influence upon policy. To state that this is merely a factfinding organization, in my opinion, is not in accord with the facts as I know them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the difference between the Senator from Arkansas and me is very wide in this instance.

There is a review by committees. We had some six or seven hearings last year, including appropriations hearings, on the Central Intelligence Agency. The Senator's complaint seems to be it is not all under his committee and he and his committee do not hear the evidence.

The Senator says that the Secretary of State goes through hearings and has to go before the press and has to appear at public hearings. If the time ever comes when the Central Intelligence Agency is compelled to answer all of these questions in open hearings, and the information is disseminated throughout the world, the harm to our national security would be almost incalculable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no more time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I join in the request for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of John A. McCone, of California, to be Director of Central Intelligence. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If he were present, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. PELL (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. If he were present, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent on official business to attend the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of American States.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 12, as follows:

[No. 7 Ex.]

YEAS—71

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Bush
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Church
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dworshak
Eastland
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Gore
Hart
Hayden
Hickey
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan
Keating
Kefauver
Kerr
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, Hawaii
Long, La.
Magnuson
McClellan
McGee
McNamara
Miller
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Pastore
Prouty
Randolph
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith, Mass.
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Wiley
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—12

Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Case, S. Dak.
Fulbright
Gruening
Lausche
McCarthy
Metcalf
Neuberger
Proxmire
Smith, Maine
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—16

Butler
Capehart
Chavez
Clark
Cooper
Douglas
Ellender
Goldwater
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Humphrey
Mansfield
Monroney
Morse
Pell
Smathers

So the nomination was confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

THE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ADJOURNMENT FROM TODAY TO FRIDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I should like to announce on behalf of the leadership that it is our intention at the conclusion of business today to move that the Senate convene on Friday. It is our hope to be able to begin the debate on the so-called college classroom bill on Friday. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will have returned from Punta del Este by that time, and he will be able to lead off the debate on that important measure.

On Monday, we hope to be able to complete consideration of the college classroom bill. If so, we will then proceed to the consideration of the various committee money resolutions, which have been reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration. I make the announcement so that Senators will have some indication of the work that lies ahead for the weekend and for Monday and Tuesday of next week.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY PER FEDERSPIEL, PRESIDENT OF THE CONSULTATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, it is my honor and high privilege to introduce to the Senate a distinguished member of the Danish Parliament, the President of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, the Honorable Per Federspiel. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I wish to add my welcome to that of the Senator from Tennessee to the Honorable Per Federspiel, the President of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe. He has been the host of many of us in Europe. He represents one of the most auspicious agencies for European unity which exists in a parliamentary sense. He is a great leader. Therefore I wish to express my pleasure and honor at having him in the Chamber.

EXECUTIVE PROGRAM

ESTATE TAX CONVENTION WITH CANADA, INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES, INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I wish to make an announcement for the information of the Senate. I hope Senators will remain in the Chamber so that we may have a yea-and-nay vote on and, I hope, approval of the three treaties which are now pending on the Executive Calendar. I will ask the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] who, I believe, is handling these treaties, if there is any objection to voting on these treaties en bloc, and of course this inquiry applies to every Senator. I mention this point because the treaties cover separate items. I understand there was no controversy over any of them and no opposition to any of them. Would the Senator from Alabama mind giving his response?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The statement of the acting majority leader is correct. There was no opposition. Personally, I have no objection to the treaties being voted on en bloc. However, I do believe it ought to be understood that the subject matter is different in the three treaties. I mean by that that no two of them treat the same subject. One has to do with taxes; another treats of fisheries; the third deals with aviation. I wish it clearly understood that the subject matters are different. However, there has been no opposition voiced to them before the committee or since they have been pending on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama if in any one of these three treaties there is any waiver of the provisions of the so-called Connally reservation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; there is not.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In order that there may be no doubt as to the action we will take, in line with the explanation given by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I ask unanimous consent that the treaties on the Executive Calendar, which will be before the Senate in a moment, be voted on en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course, there will be a yea-and-nay vote on the treaties.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator anticipate any opposition? Representatives of the Navy Department have been waiting in the Armed Services Committee room for more than an hour now.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We will have a yea-and-nay vote. I anticipate no opposition to any one of these treaties.

Mr. RUSSELL. If opposition does develop, will the Senator call me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I wonder if the acting majority leader would be good enough to ask unanimous consent that action on each treaty be shown separately in the RECORD, by showing the supporting yea-and-nay vote for each treaty, so that an adequate record may be made.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We will vote promptly on these treaties.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the treaties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the following conventions and protocol:

CONVENTION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA FOR THE AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION AND THE PREVENTION OF FISCAL EVASION WITH RESPECT TO TAXES ON THE ESTATES OF DECEASED PERSONS

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, desiring to conclude a convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect of taxes on the estates of deceased persons, agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

1. The taxes referred to in this Convention are:

(a) for the United States of America: the Federal estate tax;

(b) for Canada: the estate tax imposed by the Government of Canada.

2. The present Convention shall also apply to any other taxes of a substantially similar character imposed by either contracting State subsequent to the date of signature of the present Convention.

ARTICLE II

Where a person dies a citizen of the United States of America or domiciled in the United States of America or Canada, the situs of any rights or interests, legal or equitable, in or over any of the following classes of property, which for the purposes of tax form or are deemed to form part of the estate of such person or pass or are deemed to pass on his death, shall, for the purposes of the imposition of tax on the basis of situs of property within the taxing State and for the purposes of the credit to be allowed under Article V, be determined exclusively in accordance with the following rules, but in cases not within such rules the situs of such rights or interests shall be determined for these purposes in accordance with the laws in force in the other contracting State:

(a) immovable property (except any right or interest therein by way of security) shall be deemed to be situated at the place where such property is located;

(b) tangible movable property (except any right or interest therein by way of security and except any tangible movable property for which specific provision is made in any subsequent paragraph of this Article), and, in any case, bank or currency notes and other forms of currency recognized as legal tender in the place of issue, shall be deemed to be situated at the place where such property was located at the time of death, or, if in course of transit at that time, at the place of intended destination;

(c) debts whether secured or unsecured and whether under seal or otherwise (including bills of exchange and promissory notes, whether negotiable or otherwise, but not including any form of indebtedness for which specific provision is made in any subsequent paragraph of this Article), shall be deemed to be situated at the place where the debtor was ordinarily resident at the time of death, or, where the debtor is a company, then at the place where the company is incorporated;

(d) deposit accounts with a bank, trust company, loan company, or other similar institution shall be deemed to be situated at the place where the institution or branch thereof in which the account was kept is located;

(e) securities of or guaranteed by any government or municipality shall be deemed to be situated,

(i) if in bearer form, at the place where located at the time of death, or

(ii) if inscribed or registered, at the place where inscribed or registered by the issuer;

(f) shares, stocks, bonds, debentures, and debenture stock of a company, and rights to subscribe for or purchase shares or stock of a company (including any such property held by a nominee, whether the beneficial ownership is evidenced by scrip certificates or otherwise) shall be deemed to be situated at the place where the company is incorporated;

(g) money deposited to the credit of the deceased with an insurance company, money payable under a policy of insurance effected on the life of the deceased or payable under an annuity contract in respect of the death of the deceased, and any policy of insurance or annuity contract in which the deceased had an interest shall be deemed to be situated at the place where the deceased was domiciled at the time of his death;

(h) shares in a partnership shall be deemed to be situated at the place where its business is principally carried on;

(i) ships and aircraft and shares thereof shall be deemed to be situated at the place of registration of the ship or aircraft;

(j) good-will of a business, trade or profession shall be deemed to be situated at the place where the business, trade or profession is principally carried on;

(k) patents, trade-marks and designs shall be deemed to be situated at the place where they are registered;

(l) copyright, franchises, and rights or licenses to use any copyrighted material, patent, trade-mark or design shall be deemed to be situated at the place where the rights arising therefrom are exercisable;

(m) rights ex delicto or causes of action ex delicto surviving to the benefit of the estate of any deceased or his legal representative shall be deemed to be situated at the place where such rights or causes of action arose, and other rights or causes of action so surviving shall be deemed to be situated at the place where, at the time of the death of the deceased, the person against whom the right or cause of action is enforceable was ordinarily resident, or, if a company, then at the place where the company is incorporated;

(n) judgment debts shall be deemed to be situated at the place where the judgment is recorded; and

(o) superannuation and pension benefits payable or granted on or after the death of the deceased in respect thereof shall be deemed to be situated at the place where the deceased was domiciled at the time of his death;

provided that this Article shall not be construed so as to increase the tax imposed by either contracting State.

ARTICLE III

1. Allowance for debts shall be determined in accordance with the laws of the contracting State imposing the tax.

2. Where a contracting State imposes tax by reason of a decedent being domiciled therein or being a citizen thereof, no distinction shall be made between organizations created in that State and organizations created in the other contracting State in the allowance of any deduction authorized by its statute for a bequest, legacy, devise, or transfer made for exclusively religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes.

3. Domicile shall be determined in accordance with the laws of the contracting State imposing the tax on the basis of domicile.

ARTICLE IV

1. Where the United States imposes tax solely by reason of the property being situated therein, the United States shall, if the decedent was domiciled in Canada,

(a) for the purpose of determining the tax rate or rates, take into account only property situated in the United States, and

(b) exempt from tax property situated in the United States where the taxable estate before the allowance of a specific exemption does not exceed $15,000.00, but if such estate exceeds $15,000.00 the amount of the tax shall be the lesser of (1) the amount by which such estate exceeds $15,000.00, or, (2) the tax computed after allowance of a specific exemption of $2,000.00.

2. Where Canada imposes tax solely by reason of the property being situated therein, Canada shall, if the decedent was a citizen of or domiciled in the United States,

(a) for the purpose of computing the tax apply a rate not to exceed 15 percent in respect of the property situated in Canada, and

(b) exempt from tax property situated in Canada where the aggregate value thereof does not exceed $15,000.00, but if the aggregate value exceeds $15,000.00 the amount of the tax shall not be greater than the amount by which the aggregate value exceeds $15,000.00.

ARTICLE V

1. Where either contracting State imposes tax by reason of a decedent being domiciled therein or being a citizen thereof, that contracting State shall allow against so much of its tax (as otherwise computed) as is attributable to property situated in the other contracting State a credit (not exceeding the amount of the tax so attributable) equal to so much of the tax imposed by the other contracting State as is attributable to such property.

2. Where each contracting State imposes tax on any property situated outside both contracting States or in both contracting States, each contracting State shall allow against so much of its tax (as otherwise computed) as is attributable to such property a credit which bears the same proportion to the amount of its tax so attributable or to the amount of the other contracting State's tax attributable to the same property, whichever is the lesser as the former amount bears to the sum of both amounts.

3. For the purpose of computing credit under this Article, the amount of the tax of the crediting State attributable to particular property shall be ascertained after taking into account any credit against or reduction of such part of the tax, except credit authorized under this Article or statutory credit in lieu thereof and except, in respect of the credit allowed by Canada, the deduction from tax authorized by subsection 4 of Section 9 of the Canadian Estate Tax Act. The amount of the tax of the other contracting State attributable to such property shall be ascertained after taking into account any credit against or reduction of such part of the tax, except credit authorized under this Article or statutory credit in lieu thereof, and except credit allowed with respect to death taxes of a political subdivision of such State.

ARTICLE VI

1. Any claim for a credit or for a refund of tax founded on the provisions of this Convention shall be made

(a) within the time limited for the making of a refund of tax by the law of the State to which the claim is made, or

(b) within six years from the date of the death of the decedent in respect of whose estate the claim is made,

whichever is later.

2. Any such refund made by the United States shall be made without payment of interest on the amount so refunded.

ARTICLE VII

1. With a view to the prevention of fiscal evasion each of the contracting States undertakes to furnish to the other contracting State, as provided in the succeeding Articles of this Convention, the information which its competent authorities have at their disposal or are in a position to obtain under its revenue laws in so far as such information may be of use to the authorities of the other contracting State in the assessment of the taxes to which this Convention relates.

2. The information to be furnished under this Article, whether in the ordinary course or on request, may be exchanged directly between the competent authorities of the two contracting States.

ARTICLE VIII

1. The competent authority of the United States shall notify the competent authority of Canada as soon as practicable when the former authority ascertains that in the case of:

(a) a decedent, any part of whose estate is subject to the Federal estate tax, there is property of such decedent situated in Canada;

(b) a decedent, domiciled in Canada, there is property of such decedent situated in the United States.

2. The competent authority of Canada shall notify the competent authority of the United States as soon as practicable when the former authority ascertains that in the case of:

(a) a decedent, any part of whose estate is subject to the estate tax of the Government of Canada, there is property of such decedent situated in the United States;

(b) a decedent domiciled in the United States, there is property of such decedent situated in Canada.

ARTICLE IX

1. If the competent authority of Canada deems it necessary to obtain the cooperation of the competent authority of the United States in determination of the estate tax liability of any person, the latter authority may, upon request, furnish the former authority information bearing upon the matter as such latter authority is entitled to obtain under the revenue laws of the United States.

2. If the competent authority of the United States deems it necessary to obtain the cooperation of the competent authority of Canada in the determination of the estate tax liability of any person, the latter authority may, upon request, furnish the former authority such information bearing upon the matter as such latter authority is entitled to obtain under the revenue laws of Canada.

ARTICLE X

The competent authorities of the contracting States may:

(a) prescribe regulations to carry into effect this Convention within the respective States and rules with respect to the exchange of information;

(b) If doubt arises, settle questions of interpretation or application of this Convention by mutual agreement;

(c) communicate with each other directly for the purpose of giving effect to the provisions of this Convention.

ARTICLE XI

If any fiduciary or beneficiary can show that double taxation contrary to the provisions of this Convention has resulted or may result, such fiduciary or beneficiary shall be entitled to lodge a claim or protest with the contracting State of citizenship or domicile of the decedent. If the claim or protest should be deemed worthy of consideration, the competent authority of such State may consult with the competent authority of the other State to determine whether the alleged double taxation exists or may occur and if so whether it may be avoided in accordance with the terms of this Convention.

ARTICLE XII

The provisions of this Convention shall not be construed to restrict in any manner any exemption, deduction, credit, or other allowance accorded by the laws of one of the contracting States in the determination of the tax imposed by such State.

ARTICLE XIII

1. As used in this Convention:

(a) The term "competent authority" or "competent authorities" means the Secretary and the Minister and their duly authorized representatives.

(b) The term "Minister" means the Minister of National Revenue of Canada.

(c) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

(d) The term "United States" means the United States of America and when used in a geographical sense, means the States, including the former Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

(e) The term "Canada", when used in a geographical sense, means the provinces, the territories, and Sable Island.

ARTICLE XIV

Upon the entry into force of this Convention, the Convention between the United States of America and Canada for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion in the Case of Estate Taxes and Succession Duties signed on the 8th day of June, 1944, and the Convention supplementary thereto signed on the 12th day of June 1950, shall be deemed to have terminated on the first day of January, 1959, in so far as application to estates of decedents dying on or after the last-mentioned date is concerned, but shall continue in effect with respect to the estates of decedents dying prior to that date.

ARTICLE XV

1. This Convention shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Ottawa as soon as possible.

2. When brought into force by the exchange of instruments of ratification, this Convention shall be deemed to have come into effect on the first day of January, 1959, and shall apply only with respect to the estates of decedents dying on or after that date. It shall continue in effect for a period of five years from that date, but may be terminated by either of the contracting States at the end of that five-year period or at any time thereafter provided that at least six months prior notice of termination has been given.

In witness whereof the undersigned, duly authorized thereto, have signed this Convention and affixed their seals.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this 17th day of February, 1961.

For the Government of the United States of America:
Dean Rusk [SEAL]
For the Government of Canada:
A. D. P. Heeney [SEAL]

DECLARATION OF UNDERSTANDING REGARDING THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

1. The Governments parties to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries signed at Washington under date of February 8, 1949, which Convention is hereinafter referred to as the Convention, hereby declare their understanding that the words "fish", "fishes", "fishery", "fisheries", and "fishing" as they appear in the Convention include and apply to mollusks, as well as finny fish.

2. Governments parties to the Convention may become parties to the present Declaration by:

(a) Signature without reservation as to acceptance;

(b) Signature with reservation as to acceptance, followed by acceptance; or

(c) Acceptance.

3. Acceptance shall be effected by written notification to the Government of the United States of America.

4. This Declaration shall enter into force on the date upon which all the Governments parties to the Convention have become parties to this Declaration. Any Government becoming a party to the Convention after this Declaration enters into force shall accept this Declaration, such acceptance to be effective on the same date that such Government becomes a party to the Convention.

5. The Government of the United States of America shall inform all Governments signatory or adhering to the Convention of all signatures and acceptances of this Declaration and of the date upon which this Declaration enters into force.

6. The original of this Declaration shall be deposited with the Government of the United States of America, which Government shall communicate certified copies thereof to all the Governments signatory or adhering to the Convention.

7. This Declaration shall bear the date on which it is opened for signature and shall remain open for signature or acceptance for a period of fourteen days thereafter, following which period it shall remain open for acceptance.

In witness whereof the undersigned, being duly authorized thereto by their respective Governments, have signed this Declaration.

Done at Washington this twenty-fourth day of April 1961, in the English language.

For Canada:
For Denmark:
K. Knuth-Winterfeldt May 2, 1961
For France:
Hervé Alphand May 5, 1961
For the Federal Republic of Germany:
Franz Krapf May 8, 1961
For Iceland:
Thor Thors May 8, 1961
For Italy:
For Norway:
Finn Skartum May 8, 1961
For Portugal:
L. Esteves Fernandes August 5, 1961
For Spain:
M de Yturralde 5 de Mayo de 1961
For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:
M. Menshikov May 8, 1961
For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
Harold Caccia May 5, 1961
For the United States of America: With reservation as to acceptance:
Dean Rusk April 24, 1961

PROTOCOL RELATING TO AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION

The Assembly of the International Civil Aviation Organization,

Having met in its Thirteenth (Extraordinary) Session, at Montreal, on the nineteenth day of June, 1961,

Having noted that it is the general desire of Contracting States to enlarge the membership of the Council,

Having considered it proper to provide for six additional seats in the Council and, accordingly, to increase the membership from twenty-one to twenty-seven,

And having considered it necessary to amend for the purpose aforesaid the Convention on International Civil Aviation done at Chicago on the seventh day of December, 1944,

Approved, on the twenty-first day of June of the year one thousand nine hundred and sixty-one, in accordance with the provisions of Article 94(a) of the Convention aforesaid, the following proposed amendment to the said Convention:

In Article 50(a) of the Convention the expression "twenty-one" shall be deleted and substituted by "twenty-seven",

Specified, pursuant to the provisions of the said Article 94(a) of the said Convention, fifty-six as the number of Contracting States upon whose ratification the proposed amendment aforesaid shall come into force, and

Resolved that the Secretary General of the International Civil Aviation Organization draw up a protocol, in the English, French and Spanish languages, each of which shall be of equal authenticity, embodying the proposed amendment above mentioned and the matter hereinafter appearing.

Consequently, pursuant to the aforesaid action of the Assembly,

This Protocol has been drawn up by the Secretary General of the Organization:

This Protocol shall be open to ratification by any State which has ratified or adhered to the said Convention on International Civil Aviation;

The instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the International Civil Aviation Organization;

This Protocol shall come into force in respect of the States which have ratified it on the date on which the fifty-sixth instrument of ratification is so deposited;

The Secretary General shall immediately notify all Contracting States of the date of deposit of each ratification of this Protocol;

The Secretary General shall immediately notify all States parties or signatories to the said Convention of the date on which this Protocol comes into force;

With respect to any Contracting State ratifying this Protocol after the date aforesaid, the Protocol shall come into force upon deposit of its instrument of ratification with the International Civil Aviation Organization.

In faith whereof, the President and the Secretary General of the Thirteenth (Extraordinary) Session of the Assembly of the International Civil Aviation Organization, being authorized thereto by the Assembly, sign this Protocol.

Done at Montreal on the twenty-first day of June of the year one thousand nine hundred and sixty-one in a single document in the English, French, and Spanish languages, each of which shall be of equal authenticity. This Protocol shall remain deposited in the archives of the International Civil Aviation Organization; and certified copies thereof shall be transmitted by the Secretary General of the Organization to all States parties or signatories to the Convention on International Civil Aviation done at Chicago on the seventh day of December, 1944.

H. DA CUNHA MACHADO,
President of the Assembly.
R. M. MACDONNELL,
Secretary General of the Assembly.

Certified to be a true and complete copy
P. K. ROY, *Legal Bureau, ICAO.*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, only to clarify the parliamentary situation, I ask unanimous consent that the treaties be entered separately in the Journal; that we vote on them en bloc, but, as was indicated, that the votes be set out separately on each treaty. I make that unanimous-consent request at this time, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTATE TAX CONVENTION WITH CANADA

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, the Estate Tax Convention with Canada, which was signed at Washington on February 17, 1961, is designed to avoid double taxation and prevent fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on the estates of deceased persons. It would replace the convention between the United States and Canada dated June 8, 1944, relating to estate taxes and succession duties—Executive G, 78th Congress, 2d session—as modified and supplemented by a convention of June 12, 1950—Executive S, 81st Congress, 2d session.

The new Canadian Tax Convention is basically similar to the 1944 convention and a number of estate tax conventions between the United States and other countries. Among other things, it lays down rules of situs relating to various types of property and property rights; provides for the allowance of decedent's debts by each contracting country in accordance with its own law; deals with the tax treatment of estates of decedents domiciled in Canada whose property is situated in the United States and vice versa; contains estate tax credit provisions and provisions relating to reciprocal administrative cooperation and related matters; and, defines certain terms as used in the convention.

Madam President, last September the Committee on Foreign Relations reported the pending convention favorably to the Senate and recommended that the Senate advise and consent to its ratification. However, the committee's report contained material which had not been subject of public discussion and since there had not been opportunity for interested parties to consider it, the committee decided not to seek Senate approval of the convention until this year. I might add, the Committee on Foreign Relations has not received any adverse comments on the pending convention.

I wish to point out that the Estate Tax Convention with Canada was thoroughly analyzed by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and the analysis is reprinted in the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The convention has been approved by Canada, and both the executive branch and the staff of the joint committee have recommended that it should be ratified.

UNDERSTANDING REGARDING THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES CONVENTION

Madam President, Executive M is a declaration of understanding regarding the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries. In it, the parties to the convention declare it to be their understanding the words "fish," "fishing," "fisheries," and "fishes" used in the convention include and apply to mollusks.

The negotiating and legislative history of the convention made it clear that the words "fish," "fishes," and so forth, were meant to include only the finny fish, such as cod, which were then the only matter of concern to the contracting states. At that time, the scallop fishery at the Georges Bank, about 185 miles from the Massachusetts coast, was fished only by the U.S. nationals. Now, however, about 25 percent of the $10 million a year catch is taken by Canadian fishermen. The purpose of the understanding, therefore, is to bring this scallop fishery within the scope of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention so that the annual yield can be increased through conservation measures. Approval of the declaration will not result in any increase in the cost of U.S. participation on the Commission, nor will additional implementing legislation be required.

The Committee on Foreign Relations held a public hearing on the understanding on January 23 at which no opposition to the declaration was disclosed. Mr. President, the committee urges that the Senate advise and consent to acceptance of this declaration so that conservation of the scallop fishery can go forward.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION

Madam President, Executive N is a simple amendment to the Convention on International Civil Aviation of 1944. This convention established the International Civil Aviation Organization—ICAO. The purposes of ICAO are to develop the principles and techniques of international air navigation and to foster the planning and development of international air transport so as to insure the safe and orderly growth of international civil aviation. Through ICAO the member states seek to achieve uniformity in all matters where uniformity will facilitate and improve air navigation. ICAO functions through an assembly of all members—90 as of January 1, 1962—and a council which acts as a permanent executive body in the 3-year intervals between sessions of the assembly. One of the council's important functions is to pass on and submit to the contracting states technical annexes known as standards and recommended practices dealing with such matters as air navigation aids, airports, rules of the air, licensing of personnel and meteorological information. These standards and recommended practices are adopted by the council by a two-thirds vote of its members and they come into effect for all contracting states unless they are rejected by disapproval of a majority of the entire membership within a prescribed period. A standard, however, has no legal effect within a member state until adopted by it in its own national regulations.

The amendment now before the Senate increases the size of the ICAO Council from 21 to 27 members. The demand for greater representation on the executive council developed out of the growth of ICAO itself. Between 1951 and 1962, the membership of ICAO increased from 57 states to 90 states. The majority of ICAO members favored a concomitant enlargement of the council and, accordingly, the pending amendment was proposed. The Committee on Foreign Relations knows of no objection to this amendment.

Members of the assembly have one vote and so do the members of the council. For the calendar year 1961, the United States was assessed $1,273,517 or 32.95 percent of the total budget.

The United States derives important benefits from participation in ICAO. At a public hearing on January 23, 1962, Mr. Philip H. Trezise, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, testified on this point as follows:

> The U.S.-flag air carriers save time and expense as a result of ICAO's facilitation program, which is designed to cut down many of the formalities for immigration, customs and public health clearance. ICAO furnishes its member countries with accurate information and statistics to assist in the economic development of international air transport. The Organization is also charged with the development of international air law. The ICAO joint support agreements provide for joint financing by more than a dozen countries of air navigation aids and services for the important North Atlantic air routes. Through the medium of the United Nations Expanded Technical Assistance Program and Special Fund, ICAO provides missions and training centers to assist countries where aviation is less developed.

Madam President, the Committee on Foreign Relations reported Executive N favorably and without objection and recommends that the Senate give its advice and consent to its ratification.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I express appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Alabama for his concise statements relating to the treaties, and I urge their support and approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the treaties will be considered as having passed through their various parliamentary stages, up to and including the presentation of the respective resolutions of ratification. The resolutions of ratification of Executive G, 87th Congress, 1st session; Executive M, 87th Congress, 1st session; and Executive N. 87th Congress, 1st session, will be read.

EXECUTIVE G

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Convention between the United States of America and Canada for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on the estates of deceased persons (Ex. G, 87th Cong., 1st sess.), signed at Washington on February 17, 1961.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification?

Mr. **HUMPHREY.** Madam President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. **HUMPHREY.** I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] would each vote "yea."

Mr. **KUCHEL.** I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent on official business to attend the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of American States.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 84, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 8 Ex.]

YEAS—84

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Bush
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Case, S. Dak.
Church
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dworshak
Eastland
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hayden
Hickey
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan
Keating
Kefauver
Kerr
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, Hawaii
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith, Mass.
Smith, Maine
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Wiley
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—15

Butler
Capehart
Chavez
Clark
Cooper
Douglas
Ellender
Goldwater
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Mansfield
Monroney
Morse
Russell
Smathers

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE M

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the acceptance of the declaration of understanding regarding the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, done at Washington on April 24, 1961 (Ex. M, 87th Cong., 1st sess.).

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is: Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification?

Mr. **HUMPHREY.** Madam President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The **PRESIDING OFICER.** The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. **HUMPHREY.** I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce, that if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] would each vote "yea."

Mr. **KUCHEL.** I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent on official business to attend the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of American States.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 84, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 9 Ex.]

YEAS—84

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Bush
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Case, S. Dak.
Church
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dworshak
Eastland
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hayden
Hickey
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan
Keating
Kefauver
Kerr
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, Hawaii
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith, Mass.
Smith, Maine
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Wiley
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—15

Butler
Capehart
Chavez
Clark
Cooper
Douglas
Ellender
Goldwater
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Mansfield
Monroney
Morse
Russell
Smathers

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE N

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of a protocol dated at Montreal, June 21, 1961, relating to an amendment to the Convention on International Civil Aviation (Ex. N, 87th Cong., 1st sess.).

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Butler], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. Capehart] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] is absent on official business to attend the Eight Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of American States.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Butler], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Capehart], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 84, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 10 Ex.]

YEAS—84

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Bush
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Case, S. Dak.
Church
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dworshak
Eastland
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hayden
Hickey
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan
Keating
Kefauver
Kerr
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, Hawaii
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith, Mass.
Smith, Maine
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Wiley
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—15

Butler
Capehart
Chavez
Clark
Cooper
Douglas
Ellender
Goldwater
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Mansfield
Monroney
Morse
Russell
Smathers

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the consent of the Senate to the ratification of the three treaties.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I should like to inquire of the distinguished acting majority leader about the schedule of the Senate for the remainder of the afternoon.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, the remainder of the afternoon will be devoted to routine matters. The Senate is now returning to legislative session; and it will take up the unfinished business, which is Calendar No. 1133, Senate bill 512, to extend the time for completion of the free highway bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada. Following that, the Senate will adjourn until Friday.

As I have already indicated, on Friday the Senate will take up the bill for assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education. We hope the action of the Senate on that bill will be completed by Monday.

Late on Monday the Senate will take up the money resolutions relating to the activities of various Senate committees.

It is hoped that on Tuesday the Senate will take up the welfare and pension fund proposed legislation.

ASSISTANCE TO PUBLIC AND OTHER NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, in order to make the bill the pending business for today, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1053, Senate bill 1241, to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1241) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Works with amendments.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee be permitted to sit during the remainder of the session of the Senate today.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 323)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, the President of the United States has today transmitted to the Senate a message proposing a farm program, which message, I understand, has been read in the House of Representatives. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the message be referred to the appropriate committee, without being read, and printed in the Record.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mrs. Neuberger in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Management of our agricultural resources to meet the triple goals of increased farm income, lower cost to the taxpayer, and reduced farm surpluses continues to be one of the most difficult problems confronting the Nation. A good start was made last year. Net farm income rose $1 billion, and income per farm increased almost $350. Government stocks of farm products were reduced for the first time in 9 years. Budgetary costs were below those that would have been incurred under the programs that were replaced. All this was accomplished at the same time food prices were reduced below their level a year earlier.

But the emergency programs enacted last year are expiring. There is a critical need for permanent legislation to consolidate the gains of 1961 and to provide a realistic and comprehensive program for agriculture in the years ahead—a program with which we can continue to move forward toward full utilization of our abundance. The drift toward a chaotic, inefficient, surplus-ridden farm economy, though halted last year, will resume unless prompt action is taken. In addition, new problems have developed in commodities not covered by the 1961 legislation. Unanticipated changes in consumer demand have produced still further surpluses. A reversion to the former programs for wheat and feed grains will inevitably bring both enormous surpluses and depressed farm income, seriously injuring a large segment of our economy.

OUR INCREASING PRODUCTIVITY

Our rapidly growing capacity to produce far outruns the growth of our domestic and foreign demand for food and fiber. This offers us an opportunity to manage abundance, rather than scarcity, an opportunity that is unique among nations of the world. It is relatively new even for the United States.

Early in this century there was serious question whether agriculture could, with the closing of the land frontier, continue to meet the food and fiber demands of a growing population. The rate of growth in farm output was declining, and food and fiber prices were rising relative to other prices. Public policy emphasized resource conservation and investment, and publicly supported research and education were designed to speed progress in agricultural productivity.

By the mid-1920's these efforts began to bring dramatic results. Agricultural productivity began to rise and farm employment began to decline. But the full implications of this rapid technological progress in agriculture were obscured—first by the depression, then by the Second World War, and then by the Korean conflict. During the depression the overriding problem was the catastrophic decline in demand for farm products, and policy was directed to protecting farm prices and incomes from its consequences. During the war and the Korean conflict, agricultural programs were designed to encourage increases in output to meet emergency demands and to protect farm incomes when these abnormal demands disappeared.

But in the 1950's agriculture felt the full effects of earlier programs to raise productivity. Farm output increased by more than one-fourth while use of labor declined by one-third. Surpluses accumulated and farm prices were brought under increasing pressure. Prices today are lower relative to other prices than during the first two decades of this century, even though crops are now harvested from 40 million fewer acres. The technological revolution in agriculture continues to increase yield at an accelerating rate. Our ability to produce more than the market can absorb will continue as far into the future as we can safely predict, outpacing population growth. Instead of a shortage of cropland, as many have long predicted, it now appears that by 1980 we will need 50 million fewer acres than we have today.

The commodity programs which were designed primarily to meet the emergencies of depression and war have retained for agriculture itself only a small part of these gains from increasing productivity. Most of the gains have been passed on to consumers. We spend less than 20 percent of our income on food; the Western European spends between 30 and 50 percent of his income on food; and the Russian uses 60 percent of his income for this same purpose. But failure to control production effectively has dissipated some of our potential gains to both farmers and consumers by drawing prime resources into the production and storage of surplus commodities.

THE NEED FOR ACTION

Most industries are able to adjust to excess supply or reduced demand by variations in their rate of production. The larger the number of individual producing units and the more inflexible their production schedules, however, the more difficult it is to make the necessary adjustments. Our farm production is composed of millions of separate producers with schedules that must be planned a year or more in advance. Acting individually, the farmer cannot shift readily away from commodities in surplus. Nor will lower farm prices automatically assure reduced farm output, unless those prices fall to disastrous levels and remain there. Historically, lower prices have been met by increased output, in a desperate effort by the farmer to make his business profitable and to stay on the land.

Four independent studies, by Cornell University, Iowa State University, the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, and the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, show how sharp would be the drop in farm prices and farm income if farm programs were abandoned. These studies agree that wheat prices would be sliced almost in half, oats prices 25 percent, barley 28 percent, soybeans 38 percent, grain sorghums 22 percent, and dairy 17 percent. Non-price-supported commodities would also suffer. Livestock commodities would drop 24 percent, egg prices 20 percent, cattle prices 25 percent, hogs 30 percent, and broilers and turkeys even lower than this year.

Nor can the Federal Government be expected to undertake an indefinite program of large and unpredictable budget expenditures to acquire stocks of commodities that we do not need and cannot use. By the beginning of 1961—when the emergency legislation was introduced to reduce inventories—the Commodity Credit Corporation had over $9 billion in loans and inventories. Carrying costs exceeded $1 billion a year.

This large and continuing expenditure did not result in any increased income to the farmer. The 1.5 million efficient family farms which produce 87 percent of our total production are technically progressive, but their return on labor and capital has not kept pace with the rest of the population. Their incomes are highly sensitive to year-to-year fluctuations in farm output, especially when it is unrelated to demand.

The other 2 million or more farm operators who produce 13 percent of all farm products sold have especially low incomes because they own or control too little land or too little capital, and often possess too little skill or managerial ability.

Smalltown and rural America is dependent for prosperity upon the farmer. An improvement in his standard of living and in his income is immediately reflected in an improvement in the economy of the small urban center in his community. Any program should bear in mind this factor.

Our two goals—improving income and reducing costs—can both be achieved only if farm output can be reduced below needs for several years and then be allowed to increase at a rate equal to the growth in demand. That is the framework of logic and fact in which we now propose a broad new farm program—a program in four parts—each equally important and all interdependent.

OBJECTIVES

The new program should use the successful emergency legislation passed last year to establish guidelines and should also rely upon those proven techniques and methods that have been employed in the past. It should be designed:

1. To make maximum use of our productive abundance. Our agricultural resources can advance the cause of peace and freedom throughout the world; they assure Americans of a high standard of living; they can be an important weapon against poverty and disease.
2. To seek a balance between production and demand that will avoid the waste of private effort and public resources. Rice, peanuts, and tobacco already enjoy well balanced programs whose principles can be extended to other crops. Properly balanced, agriculture can make a major contribution toward economic stability. The farmer, the consumer, and the taxpayer can all share in the benefits; without such balance, all may suffer.
3. To provide for conservation of our land and water resources. Land and water not needed to produce food and fiber should be directed to alternative uses of benefit to the Nation.
4. To initiate and expand programs for the development of human resources and renewal of rural communities. Each year 1 million people move from the farm to the city. Many others seek part-time employment to supplement meager returns from farm labor. The hardship and suffering this often entails should be alleviated, and these workers assisted in their efforts to acquire needed skills, obtain jobs, and further their education.

Abundance, balance, conservation, development—these are our commonsense goals—as commonsense as A, B, C, D. The program that follows—an A-B-C-D farm program for the sixties—is designed to meet those goals.

This is a program for maximum freedom and flexibility in the operation of individual farm enterprises. Improvements in farming efficiency as well as shifts among enterprises must not only be allowed—they must be encouraged. They are in the longrun national interest; they are consistent with this program's overall objectives.

The new commodity programs recommended could become effective only after they are approved democratically by a two-thirds majority in a producer referendum. Producers of cotton, tobacco, rice, peanuts, and wheat have long followed this procedure of choosing jointly to exert a measure of control over the production and marketing of their crops, just as industry groups exercise control over the product of their labor and investment. This democratic procedure can be extended to other farm commodities.

I. EXPANDED USE OF AGRICULTURAL ABUNDANCE

Last year there was a greater expansion of our food utilization programs than ever before in our history.

Eighty-five thousand more schools, child-care centers, and camps are receiving fresh milk that previously had no such opportunity. Seven hundred thousand more children enjoy a hot school lunch. Both the quantity and the variety of food distributed to more than 6 million needy persons has been increased substantially.

A pilot food stamp program in eight communities has brought such encouraging results that its administrative expansion in a further trial period to many additional communities is justified and is included in the new budget.

We have also increased our shipments of food to other nations under Public Law 480, thus using our agricultural abundance to combat hunger and contribute to economic development throughout the free world. We have stepped up our emphasis on school lunch programs abroad, thus encouraging both education and better nutrition for the rising generation, on which so much of the future of these new nations depends. We shall continue to expand these programs wherever feasible.

We have markedly increased programs under which U.S. food is used to further projects for social and economic development in emerging nations. Today American agricultural abundance assists such projects in 11 countries, as compared with only 2 in 1960. And more than three-fourths of the local currency accruing from the sales authorized under title I in 1961 will be used for economic development programs.

Our overall shipments under Public Law 480 during this fiscal year will reach an estimated 22 percent more than those of the previous fiscal year.

Last year the Congress extended and improved Public Law 480. In order that our food-for-peace program can be made even more effective in the future I recommend:

(1) An amendment of title II of Public Law 480 to permit shipments of surplus commodities such as dried beans and peas not in CCC inventory;

(2) Provisions to broaden the purpose of title IV to include market development; and

(3) A new title V to promote multinational programs for food assistance, authorizing the President to negotiate and carry out agreements for this purpose with international organizations and other intergovernmental groupings.

II. I RECOMMEND NEW PROGRAMS FOR FEED GRAINS, WHEAT, AND DAIRY PRODUCTS TO ACHIEVE THE PROPER BALANCE BETWEEN PRODUCTION AND DEMAND, AND MODIFICATION OF THE COTTON PROGRAM

FEED GRAINS

For 9 consecutive years, prior to 1961 feed grain surpluses increased. The cost of carrying corn and grain sorghum inventories rose to nearly $500 million in 1961, and the total program cost rose to a record level.

The 1961 feed grain program has reversed this trend. The 1961 crop was 800 million bushels smaller than it would have been without the program. The feed grain carryover will drop for the first time in a decade. A program similar to that of 1961 remains in operation for 1962 only. Without new legislation, the programs which failed us in the 1950's will automatically take effect again in 1963.

The feed grain program I recommend is designed to reduce feed grain output to a level that will maintain prices and incomes in the feed grain and livestock sectors of the farm economy without continuous ever-higher surplus accumulation. This can be accomplished by establishing a mandatory acreage allotment on all feed grains large enough to meet annual domestic and export requirements, for all purposes under all programs, less that amount which is to be deducted from the carryover stocks to reduce them gradually to a level no higher than that required for stability and security. Producers would share in the national allotment on the basis of past production, adjusted for unusual circumstances. Payments for diverted acreage would, of course, continue to be made to support farm income while surplus stocks are being reduced.

Initiation of this program is proposed for the 1963 crop year, subject to approval by a producer referendum.

WHEAT

The problems of wheat production are much the same as for feed grains. Large inventories and high program costs were inherited from the 1950's. The temporary 1962 wheat program is expected to halt the accumulation of wheat surpluses, but the old programs—which have already failed—will become effective again for the 1963 crop unless legislation is promptly enacted.

I recommend a wheat program which will reduce wheat stocks to manageable levels, improve the competitive position of American wheat in world markets, and maintain the incomes of wheat producers. To achieve these objectives, national wheat acreage allotments will be established by estimating the actual requirements each year for milling, seed, and for export, and deducting a number of bushels that will permit us to draw upon our surplus stocks on hand to gradually reduce the carryover to the level required for stability and security. Marketing certificates would be used to assure growers a price-support level between 75 and 90 percent of parity on the domestic allotment and up to 90 percent on the export allotment. The national allotment would be apportioned among all growers, including small growers, on the basis of past wheat acreage. The Secretary of Agriculture will have authority to make payments, which will help to maintain producers' incomes, for mandatory diversion of acreage from wheat to soil-conserving uses, and to offer such payments as an incentive for further voluntary acreage diversion.

Initiation of this program is necessary for the 1963 crop year. As in the case of feed grains, it would be subject to approval by a producer referendum.

COTTON

Cotton suffers chiefly from the attempt to adopt a single legislative program to widely divergent crop needs. There is a sharp conflict between the demand for cheap cotton that can compete effectively with substitute fibers and the need for support levels high enough to assure farmers an adequate income; between the interest of textile mill owners—who face stiffening world competition—in low raw material costs and in the interest of the producer in income sufficiently high to cover his costs; and between our Nation's desire to expand further our world trade in cotton and to hold down a Federal budget already augmented by cotton export subsidies. These conflicts can best be reconciled by a program which establishes a support price upon allotted acreage but permits efficient producers to grow additional acreage at the world price.

I recommend that the Secretary of Agriculture be given authority to:

1. Establish the acreage allotment at a level which would produce the cotton needed for domestic use and such portion of the cotton exports as he may determine.

2. Authorize growers to exceed their farm acreage allotment by up to 30 percent, with the cotton produced on the additional acreage to be marketed under a plan which will net the grower approximately the world market price.

DAIRY PRODUCTS

Milk and dairy products constitute one of our most important sources of nutrients. They are also one of our most valuable farm products, bringing twice the cash income of the basic crops.

Incomes of dairy farmers were improved by the bill passed by Congress late in 1960 to increase the support price for milk from $3.06 to $3.22 per hundred pounds and by the increase in the support price last March to $3.40 per hundred pounds for the current marketing year.

Unfortunately, milk producers now face a serious setback. An unexpected decline in the consumption of milk during the past year, amounting to nearly 3 billion pounds, will result in Government expenditures this year of approximately $500 million to support the prices of dairy products. There is no evidence as yet that this decline in consumption will be reversed in the year ahead. Under the present law, the Secretary of Agriculture is not authorized to set the price support rate for milk above 75 percent of parity unless necessary in order to assure an adequate supply. Under this law, in the present supply situation, the reduced support price must be announced for the marketing year beginning next April 1.

Such a reduction in milk price supports will gravely impair the incomes of milk producers. It will not, however, succeed in reducing Government expenditures to a reasonable and justifiable level. Even at 75 percent of parity—the minimum level specified in the present law—Government costs for supporting prices of dairy products will probably exceed $440 million next year, as production continues to exceed consumption.

New legislation to correct the shortcomings of the present dairy price support laws, is, therefore, urgently required, for the benefit of both farmer and taxpayer. I recommend passage by the Congress of legislation which will: (a) maintain the income of the dairy farmers by establishing support prices of up to 90 percent of parity under a supply management program; and (b) reduce the budgetary expenditures for the dairy price support program to the cost of acquiring dairy products needed for domestic welfare and foreign assistance programs, up to a maximum of $300 million per year, plus the costs incurred in the special milk and school lunch programs.

Each milk producer would be assigned a marketing base equal to his marketings of milk in 1961. His marketing allotment for the current year would reflect a percentage of his base proportionate to his share of the estimated commercial demand and the quantities needed for Government programs in the national interest. Producers who market milk in excess of their allotments would pay surplus marketing fees on such milk, which would be used to purchase and dispose of the surplus products produced from excess milk.

Milk producers would be provided an opportunity to vote upon this program in a referendum. In the event the milk producers reject this program a support price would be established at such a level as to limit budgetary expenditures to $300 million a year. Authority is also requested to include supply management provisions in Federal milk marketing orders when desired by milk producers in markets regulated under such orders.

While this legislation is being considered and implemented, in order to prevent disruption of markets by reduction of price supports to 75 percent of parity as required under the present law on April 1, 1962, I recommend enactment of a joint resolution authorizing the continuation of price supports on dairy products at the current level until December 31, 1962.

III. EFFICIENT CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION OF LAND

The scope of agricultural technology promises abundance tomorrow as well as today. For the first time in our history we can confidently predict that our future food and fiber needs can be met with fewer acres of cropland. In spite of a 65 million increase in population by 1980, our farms will be able to produce all we need with 50 million fewer acres than we have in cropland today.

This prospect offers us an opportunity to take advantage of the unused acres for a wide range of recreational, esthetic, and economic purposes. Land-use changes are not only important to balanced production, they can also supply the growing demand for outdoor recreational areas and wildlife promotion, for woodlots and forests, and for grazing. We can transfer cropland to grass and trees—and we can place greater emphasis on wildlife and recreation development in the small watershed programs.

I recommend legislation to encourage a comprehensive survey of land uses, to undertake a research program on the conversion of land to alternate purposes, and to initiate a series of pilot and demonstration land-use projects. As the pilot plan is evaluated and a permanent program for land use developed, it will be possible for our supply management efforts to place less emphasis on temporary diversion of acreage from the production of specific crops, and more on the permanent utilization of acreage to fulfill other public needs.

An effective land use program also requires the following additional legislation:

1. Amendment of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to expand the agricultural conservation program to include payments and cost-sharing arrangements, under long-term contracts, which would permit changes in cropping systems and land uses for the conservation and development of soil, water, forests, wildlife and recreational resources.

2. Amendment of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to include the use of land acquired under that act for recreational development and wildlife protection.

3. Amendment of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to permit the Secretary to share in the cost of any land acquired by local organizations for operation as a reservoir of public fish, wildlife or recreational development.

4. Modification of the Watershed Act to provide for loans for recreational facilities.

5. Expansion of the authority of the Farmers Home Administration to make loans to farmers for recreational enterprises.

Additional legislation for conservation of our renewable resources is also necessary. These recommendations will be included in a message I will send to the Congress devoted to proposals for the maximum utilization of our land resources.

IV. DEVELOPMENT AND UTILIZATION OF AGRICULTURE'S HUMAN RESOURCES

The Department of Agriculture has launched a series of programs for the development and renewal of rural areas and rural communities. These programs are designed to end rural poverty by offering new opportunities—both agricultural and nonagricultural—to rural people. Activities of the Rural Electrification Administration, the Farmers Home Administration, the Federal Extension Service and other Department agencies are being coordinated under the rural area development program in close cooperation with the Area Redevelopment Administration.

To make the most of the human resources in these rural areas, there is one need that transcends all others—that is education. Education can give them new vistas, new opportunities, new skills in place of the poverty that no price support program will ever remove.

Most of the necessary activities are already authorized by law. However, some additional authority is needed.

In many rural areas, the difficulty of financing adequate safe and sanitary housing and modern community facilities such as water and sewage systems, recreational installations, and transportation, has deterred general community improvement and more rapid industrialization. I recommend, therefore, new legislation to enable the Farmers Home Administration to finance sewage systems and other rural community facilities.

RURAL RENEWAL AND EDUCATION

In some rural areas the general level of economic activity and family income is so low, and the lack of community facilities so acute, that a complete new development operation is the only sensible solution—a program of rural renewal.

For these areas, in addition to the nationwide rural area development program, I recommend a new legislative program under the Area Redevelopment Administration, to provide loans and technical assistance to local public rural renewal corporations. These corporations would aid in developing new uses for land and water, create forest industry parks, assist small farmers in farm consolidation and enlargement, and develop needed public facilities, including outdoor recreation. The bill would permit loans to approved public agencies to acquire, develop and dispose of land for these purposes, and provide for other loans to individual farmers to establish recreational facilities and other income-producing enterprises. Consideration might also be given to making loans available to rural citizens, both young and old, for vocational and other educational training not otherwise available but essential to their preparation for nonfarm jobs.

CONCLUSION

The goals of this program for food and agriculture are goals on which there is broad general agreement.

First, we seek to enable efficient farm operators to earn incomes equivalent to those earned in comparable nonfarm occupations.

Second, we seek continued production of food and fiber at reasonable prices in quantities sufficient to meet the needs of all Americans and to combat hunger and contribute to economic development throughout the free world.

Third, since we seek abundance for our children as well as for ourselves, we must conserve and use wisely our resources of land and water.

Fourth, we seek to end rural poverty. Farm children, and many farm adults as well, need improved opportunities for education and training, to equip them to earn an American standard of living in whatever occupation they freely choose to follow.

We will enjoy the fruits of the technological revolution in American agriculture only if we recognize its implications. We must learn to live with an agricultural economy of abundance rather than scarcity. That is the purposes of the approach I have outlined—a comprehensive, long-range program to replace the present patchwork of short-run emergency measures.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 31, 1962.*

RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1, FOR CREATION OF A DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, I submit and send to the desk a resolution of disapproval of the President's reorganization plan for the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Madam President, I strongly support the President's program. An early vote on this important program is needed. Therefore, my reason for submitting this resolution of disapproval is to insure an early vote by the Senate.

Under the rules relating to reorganization plans, a vote can be taken 10 days after a Member has moved that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of a resolution of disapproval.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 288) was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor the Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1962 transmitted to Congress by the President on January 30, 1962.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I appreciate very much the service rendered by the Senator from Wyoming. The action he proposes is essential if the Senate is to act promptly on the reorganization plan.

There is some controversy over the plan, and I believe there should be hearings and the plan should be thoroughly considered. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Wyoming is a means of expediting the action of the Senate on the reorganization plan, and I very much appreciate the service he has rendered in that connection.

Madam President, yesterday the Senate received from the President of the United States the text of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, establishing a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

As a former mayor of one of the great cities of this Nation, and as the chairman of the subcommittee which last year held extensive hearings on the bill to establish such a Department, I want to commend the President for his action.

Proposals for a department to represent our urban areas at the Cabinet level have been before the Congress for nearly 20 years.

Extensive testimony has been heard on these proposals; and during the first session of this Congress the Committees on Government Operations of both the Senate and the House of Representatives reported such bills favorably.

The time for action is long past; and I am glad the President has acted without further delay.

I expect that we shall see a desperate attempt, by those who have not yet caught up with history, to prevent this reorganization plan from taking effect.

For the good of the Nation, I hope the opposition fails.

Over three-fourths of our population now resides in urban areas. Nearly all the population increase we can expect in the years ahead will be in urban areas.

It is essential that a department be created in the executive branch of the Government to serve as the focal point for the interests of those who live in our urban areas.

And it is essential that those who live in these areas have a spokesman in the highest council of our Nation—the President's Cabinet.

The President's action will be attacked as the opening of a drive to create a new bureaucracy and to inject the Federal Government into local affairs.

Both attacks are unjustified and without merit. The President's proposal creates no new functions or powers. It establishes a department and coordinates activities—to improve efficiency.

The reorganization plan the President has transmitted to us would create only seven new positions—those of the Secretary and the leading officers of the new Department. It would abolish two existing positions.

The net increase of five positions hardly constitutes, to my mind, the threat of a burgeoning bureaucracy. And any further increase would require action by the Congress. The President's plan gives no new powers or functions to the new Secretary.

Neither is there anything in the reorganization plan submitted by the President which would extend the existing functions of the Government, add any new programs, or otherwise involve the Federal Government in activities not now authorized by law.

There are some of us in the Congress who believe further legislation is needed to enable the Federal Government to fulfill its proper responsibilities in regard to urban affairs. But that is not a question raised by the reorganization plan.

All that is involved in this plan are the powers and functions presently assigned to existing agencies and in particular, the Housing and Home Finance Agency. That Agency is already carrying responsibilities as large as and larger than some of our Cabinet departments.

Some of the attacks on this plan will allege that all it does is raise the Housing and Home Finance Agency to the level of a Cabinet department.

But this is not so. In raising the level of government at which these functions will be carried out, the plan also makes possible internal changes that will eliminate duplications and conflicts which have been for years the source of inefficiency and waste.

This is purely and simply a good government measure.

It follows in line with what President Eisenhower did in connection with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is an efficiency and economy measure. I trust that my colleagues in the Senate will judge it in that light. It deserves support and approval.

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, I commend the Senator from Minnesota for his leadership in the effort to create a Department of Urban Affairs.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In schooldays, in the old copybook, I learned that "Tall oaks from little acorns grow." So if this acorn is planted, we can be sure that there will be a tall, flowering oak before we get through, in the form of a well-established and well-manned bureaucracy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's last word was the one that disturbed me. Frankly, I am for strong and tall oaks. I am even for little acorns. What our country needs is management, efficiency, and competence of the kind that can come from a Department of Urban Affairs, so it can cooperate with and work with the municipalities and local officials, and to conduct different aspects of government which are now provided for on the law books, relating to local activities.

I know the Senator believes in that kind of tall and mighty oaks which will give aid to hard-pressed cities.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the bill which the distinguished Senator from Minnesota considered as chairman of the subcommittee, they finally modified the language to include every urban area in the country, whether incorporated or not, so that every community with a handful of people could be in constant contact with the proposed Secretary for Urban Affairs; and if that does not add up to a Cabinet office that will have so many people that it will beggar nearly every other department of government, then I have no familiarity with the proliferation of government after 28 years in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am delighted the Senator from Illinois has brought up this point, because the Senator from Minnesota resisted that amendment. It was offered by none other than the senior Republican member of the committee, who insisted that the strong arm of the Federal Government, to quote an old Republican phrase, be placed in local affairs down to an unincorporated village. The Senator from Minnesota felt this was an urban affairs bill, but he was overwhelmed by the power that was mobilized by the senior Republican spokesman on the committee; and when in an effort to get a bill before us that could receive the judicious and thoughtful consideration of persons like the Senator from Illinois, we let the provision be made a part of the bill. However, it became a part of the bill with agony and protest so far as the Senator from Minnesota is concerned.

If the Senator from Illinois wants to give advice and counsel to his able colleagues who insisted on broadening the scope of the bill, I welcome it. I only wish he had given the same attention to the details of the bill then that he has now. It seems to me his interest is a little late.

Mr. DIRKSEN. All I know is what I see on the Senate calendar. I am sorry that some steamroller overwhelmed my redoubtable friend from Minnesota; but we all knew that what we were going to vote on with respect to that bill was the language that came from the committee. If one wants an exercise in semantics, he ought to read that bill, because it encompasses everything; and if that moonshot gets a little closer, it will take in the moon also. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say to the Senator from Illinois that his grave concern as to the extensive nature of the bill that was on the calendar can now be set aside; that while the Senator from Minnesota was not able to save the Senator from Illinois from the deep concern he shows about 10 months later, the President of the United States has seen fit to take into consideration the concern of the Senator from Illinois about all of the language he worries about; that all of the language which was so well spelled out by his own party member, which was accepted in a spirit of cooperation, in order to get cooperation from a rather recalcitrant minority, has been stricken, and now there will be protection and help and consideration and cooperation only for and with the urban areas which my good friend from Illinois embraces by his comments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My distinguished friend from Minnesota forgets that long ago I served on the first reorganization committee that was ever created by the Congress. That was back in the days of my service in the House. I have followed this subject matter from that day to this. I know what is in the parent act under which the reorganization plan was submitted. I know the latitude which is involved. It is a latitude which is not to be encompassed by Ranger III, which seems to be galloping around the earth somewhere. I went back to the hearings and discovered the scheme will be to use this agency as a core and then to augment its powers. When that is done, we shall see a blooming bureacracy such as we have never seen before.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I only want to add to this colloquy that all of these wearisome observations, these dreadful observations, about a reorganization plan were once made by the Republican leadership when President Truman presented the reorganization plan for the establishment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

When that came before us, one would have thought the Government of the United States was going to move in on every private activity, that there would never again be any such thing as privacy, that the medical profession would be socialized, and that the whole Nation would be in trouble.

Then, by some miscalculation on the part of the public, a Republican President took office. Very quickly this Republican President came to grips with the problem of the economy and the efficiency of our Government, and he presented a plan to establish the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The difference between the two plans was that under the Eisenhower plan it was said they would have a doctor as a consultant, and under the Truman plan the U.S. Public Health Service would have been provided, which Service was headed by a doctor. The other difference was that all the baying at the moon—ranger or no ranger, we should not forget that, like the Republican attack on this plan, it is off course about 23,000 miles and its antenna is pointed in the wrong direction—suddenly became sweet melody of harmony, or economy, of efficiency and of good government.

Goodness sakes; we got the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Having gone through this exercise of the "political twist" I would suggest that my good friend from Illinois give up the ghost, the argument of the past, and join with us in this forward-moving project of the Department of Urban Affairs. Think what it can mean for the State of Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will my distinguished friend yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. All I have to say to my good friend from Minnesota is, "Merry Twistmas." We are going to take all of the time provided under the Reorganization Act, and it will be a rugged discussion. [Laughter.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOLLAND BEFORE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF NATIONAL CANNERS ASSOCIATION, MIAMI, FLA.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, on January 22 I had the great pleasure and privilege of speaking before the annual convention of the National Canners Association at Miami, at which annual meeting they were joined by the Canning Machinery & Supplies Association. Because of the very close link existing between the canning of foods and the agricultural problems of our Nation, its close relation to the commercial problems of our Nation, and its close relation to our foreign affairs in general, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my speech, which the association was good enough to refer to as their keynote address, be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE FOOD PROCESSING INDUSTRY TO A FREE ECONOMY

I am most happy to be among those present at this great annual convention of the National Canners Association in which the canners are joined by the Canning Machinery and Supplies Association. The producers of fruits, vegetables, meats, and seafoods in Florida and elsewhere in the Nation, along with their many affiliated industries, have a very great stake in the continued functioning and prosperity of the forward-looking members of your organizations. We welcome you heartily to Florida and wish for you a full measure of enjoyment while you are here as well as great prosperity and success in the future.

I have very great respect for the National Canners Association and for its efficient functioning at the national level as the agent of the canners of food products produced all over our Nation. Occasionally I have not been in accord with your policies at the Washington level, but more frequently I have been able to cooperate with you to the fullest. I am glad that in the last two strenuous battles through which you have passed I have been able to work very closely with you and naturally I am happy, with you, that you were able to prevail in the main in both of these legislative contests. The first of these contests was the long and continuing effort of various groups in organized labor and other so-called liberal groups which culminated in the passage of the 1961 amendments to the Wages and Hours Act. I am glad that through the combined efforts of many of us we were able to retain badly needed and wholly reasonable provisions by which, as in the original act, the seasonal operations of many processors which handle seasonal perishable products are wholly exempted from the operation of the Wages and Hours Act for 14 weeks and, as to overtime provisions, up to 56 hours a week, are exempted for an additional period of 14 weeks. These 28 weeks give you a reasonable period of time to process most perishable crops.

I am also happy that in the consideration of the so-called "omnibus" agricultural legislation of 1961 we were able to accomplish the exclusion of your industries from coverage under most marketing orders. In both of these contests I thought your position was eminently sound and I am glad to say that the producers of my State and area agreed heartily with you and with me in our stand on both of these issues. You realize, of course, that my first duty in such matters is to endeavor to represent in every reasonable way the interests of the Florida producers of fruits, vegetables, meats and seafoods who, through their labor and investments, are responsible for the production of foods which you process.

And so my first point is to compliment you and those who represent you so capably in Washington on the exceedingly effective fight which you put up to preserve and protect your legitimate interests and the vital interests of the food producers, upon whose existence and prosperity you depend, from the highly unreasonable provisions which were proposed in these two legislative efforts. Your own activity played a large part in defeating these unfair proposals.

My second point is to express the hope that in the future you may continue to work, as in these two recent battles, in close cooperation with the producers of fruits, vegetables, meats and seafoods. This cooperation can only continue so long as your interests and theirs coincide. Together you and they will be able to give needed protection to the producers and to yourselves and likewise to the ultimate consumers of the indispensable food products which you handle. Among these ultimate consumers, of course, are found almost the entire public of our Nation and many millions of people who reside in foreign nations. And so, in fighting your battle and the battle of your producers you also fight for the countless millions who consume the food which you process.

The Encyclopedia Britannica praises canning in the following impressive words: "The method of preserving food in tin or other containers, is probably the greatest of all inventions in modern times. Its effect has been to relieve mankind of dependence upon the annual harvest, since food can be carried over from year to year, or upon the local food supply since canned food can be imported."

Your great industry spans both the seasons and the greatest distances, enabling consumers to obtain almost any kind of food anywhere and at any time of the year. Enthusiastic public acceptance of your many fine products is evidence of the vast improvement in quality that you have attained in relatively recent years. Certainly you have done an excellent job of merchandising because your products are plentifully available in almost every type of retail outlet from small filling stations and country stores to the largest supermarkets. They appear on the dinner tables of both the rich and the poor—and are served both in humble restaurants and in expensive hotels and clubs.

Each week some 50 million shoppers purchase about 400 million containers of canned foods in grocery stores and other market outlets in cities, towns and communities of all sizes throughout the United States. This is a vastly different situation from that which many of us in this room can recall when the grocers' shelves were stocked with a very limited variety of canned foods, some of not too pleasing taste and others of doubtful condition. They were more or less regarded as emergency rations. To leave certain foods in open cans in those days was said to invite disaster, and the accepted practice was to use the contents quickly and completely or else to restore them immediately. Happily your suppliers of containers have overcome the latter problem and have matched the canners' strides in improving the quality of their containers. The combined result has revolutionized both the dietary habits of our people and their marketing practices as well.

The problem of meeting the nutritional needs of our armed services and the maritime industry has been vastly simplified by the canning industry which now makes readily available an abundant supply of wholesome and highly nutritional foods in containers suitable for the purpose of mass feeding. The embalmed beef of Spanish-American War days, fortunately for all military personnel, is a thing of the past. The salt beef, salt pork, and buggy bread of early maritime history is, thanks to your know-how, only a memory kept alive by the writings of a few authors who struggled through seemingly endless periods of substandard diet while at sea.

In those not so good old days the constant battle against scurvy made it necessary for ships putting to sea for long voyages to take on as much fresh fruit and vegetables, commonly citrus fruits, as space would allow. It was carefully rationed as long as it lasted, which was seldom long enough. The British "limey" got his common name because of his daily handout of lime juice. In all probability this dietary requirement brought about the introduction of citrus into our State of Florida by the earliest explorers who may have carefully hoarded seed from fruit consumed at sea and who are known to have brought with them some citrus fruit which they carried in their saddlebags.

Because of the simplicity with which the canning industry completely meets this vital need today, it taxes the imagination to realize that a grave problem concerning it ever existed. So it is that your skill makes it possible for our Armed Forces on land, sea, and air to travel now on well-fortified stomachs.

A new challenge that confronts us, which I know is receiving close attention by your scientists and nutritionists as it is, indeed, by the Government research experts, is the development, processing, and packing of appropriate foods for use in sustaining life in the event of an atomic attack. We are warned by responsible authorities that food growing in an affected area, or food that is unprotected by a suitable container, even if it were not destroyed by the blast, would be unsafe for consumption and some would become unsafe due to subsequent fallout. It is imperative, therefore, that compact, highly nutritional and palatable foods of unique character be developed and made available to our people for such an emergency which we hope and pray will never occur.

As a member of the Space Committee of the Senate I have noted with much interest that your own industry and the Government research people are already working to develop foods to accompany our space explorers in the important efforts which we are now making in space. I know that you are challenged by the thought that our astronauts, including those who may reach the moon, must be fed by even further developed refinements of your present processes and I am sure you will perform well this new and intriguing task for your country.

I doubt that there is general public knowledge of the close relationship, much closer than that of mere producer and purchaser, between agriculture and the canning industry. Consumers probably do not know of the common practice under which much of your industry's annual production is packed from crops grown under contract and that participating farmers are frequently guaranteed a market for their entire production at a price agreed upon before the crop is planted. This is mutually beneficial because the canner, who knows the market for various foods and thus determines what he can profitably process and sell, is assured through contractual agreements with growers of adequate supplies for his operation. At the same time the grower is guaranteed a market for his entire production at a fixed price. This is a unique part of our agricultural industry which was developed by canners and growers and has been in successful operation for many years. I congratulate you upon its success and hope that the arrangement will continue to work to the advantage of the grower, canner, and the consumer. Your payment of approximately $2 billion annually for the raw products which you process plus your payments for processing equipment and for these goods and services, is a substantial part of our agricultural economy which doubtless will continue to expand in the years to come.

I doubt, too, that many people know that approximately half of the acreage producing vegetable crops and one-fifth of the noncitrus fruit and over one-half of the citrus production in the United States is used for processing. For instance, about four-fifths of all tomatoes harvested are canned; about three-fourths of the beets; two-thirds of the green peas; and more than half of the sweet corn.

Your industry also provides an important market for perishable fruits. About half of all peaches, pears, apricots, cranberries and sour cherries are canned. Our own Florida citrus industry received its greatest impetus through the development of the frozen concentrate and various canning processes and today about 65 percent of our orange crop is packed as frozen concentrate. Add to this 15 percent of the production which is packed as canned or chilled juice and we have a total of 80 percent of the entire crop reaching consumers in cans or other containers. Additionally, about 50 percent of our grapefruit production is concentrated or canned. At this point I should like to commend in highest terms our Florida citrus processors, most of whom are members of this fine organization, for the admirable way they have reacted since our recent cold weather in handling a much larger volume of fruit in their plants than would normally be the case. This cooperation will doubtless save the growers from probable losses if they had been forced to sell the damaged fruit in the fresh fruit trade and will save the industry as a whole from the harmful effects of glutting the fresh fruit market.

A very large portion of the total catch of certain fish reaches the consumer in cans. Tuna, sardines, and salmon lead this field percentagewise. The processed packs of shrimp, lobsters and oysters are important in certain localities. Meat, poultry and milk add considerably to your total pack.

I have refrained from quoting the long and tedious figures on the commodities just mentioned. Suffice it to say, they clearly point up the fact that your industries are an essential bridge between the grower and consumer that makes possible low-cost, efficient production and distribution of the high quality foods which the modern consumer demands.

By converting the abundance of our farms, orchards, ranches and waters into relatively nonperishable form, the canning industry has eliminated the waste that would otherwise result from seasonal or local gluts, and has made these perishable foods available to consumers the year around as well as all over the earth.

The importance of food processing and processed foods—of all types—is nowhere more noteworthy than in the foreign field. Not only the basic commodities, but also fruits, vegetables, meats and poultry in large volume have been utilized throughout the world as instruments of foreign aid and, more significantly, they are the choice of millions of foreign people everywhere.

The farm problem in the United States today stems largely from the fact that our farmers are just too efficient. Almost every year we are obtaining a larger output of food and fiber crops from an ever-diminishing acreage. While we have too much food, many areas of the world have food shortages.

This is a significant point, and one which should be taken note of, especially in Europe. There, thanks to the Marshall plan and the many and various aid programs which the United States has sponsored, we are witnessing a great economic recovery, and with it an expansion in population that gives promise that Western Europe will indeed be a larger and increasingly more important market for food products. We must do all within our power to keep it our market.

The population of the six Common Market countries alone stood at 166 million people in 1958 and has been projected at 175 million by 1965. Here is an expanding human group, moving forward on the road of economic and social development in six of the most developed countries of Western Europe.

We in the United States—and particularly those of us concerned with the welfare of the food industry—are observing the development of the Common Market and of its tariff and trade policies with interest and no little concern. The President, in the message he has sent to Congress on reciprocal trade, has asked for a broad new authority to reduce tariffs so that the United States may negotiate with the Common Market for mutually advantageous trade benefits. While tentative tariff agreements have been reached between our negotiators and the representatives of the Common Market countries on a number of agricultural products, our position is not a favorable one in some areas. There is much yet to be accomplished if we are to retain a goodly share of this market. Two important advantages we go into the game with are, of course, quality and abundance.

We must not lose sight of the fact that Western Europe needs our trade as much as we need theirs. The Europeans are not now able to produce all of their food requirements, certainly not in sufficient quality and variety or as efficiently as you and our American farmers. The Common Market therefore presents an interesting opportunity to you—and others in the food industry—to acquire new and expanding markets for your products. The growing population, with its steadily rising economic prosperity and social development, indicates a need for food of all types.

It is gratifying to observe the cooperative efforts of you food processors, your equipment suppliers, farmers, agricultural scientists, livestock handlers and fishermen in producing and bringing to the consumer the most wholesome and attractive processed foods that are to be found anywhere in the world.

I commend you warmly upon your independence and your initiative which has brought your industry to the high position which it holds in our industrial complex. Success such as you have attained is an example of democracy at work and is not possible under a controlled economy as we have witnessed in the failure of Soviet Russia's agricultural industries to come anywhere near meeting the production quotas established for them. Despite all of their management and compulsory farm programs the Russian food supply is far short of its needs and their production averages are only about half of what ours are per acre.

The entire process of supplying adequate food for our people is not simple—it is not easy. But there is great satisfaction to be gained from the knowledge that in our democracy there is a majority which clings tenaciously, as you do, to voluntary teamwork as the best way to attain your goals. It is comforting to know that we can plant what we want—process what we want—market what we want—instead of being told what we must do in each instance and punished if we do not comply.

In the past few years we have met the challenge of those who would regiment our economy through labor controls and through production controls. We have been successful in restraining these efforts by maintaining basic fundamentals. To date we have managed to protect the right of American labor to go and come of its own free will in agricultural employment and we have kept for farmers their right to exercise individual judgment in making up planting and production schedules each year.

There are times when some growers and processors look toward Washington for guarantees of a safe return for their production. Happily a sizable majority prefer to remain free and clear of the encumbrances that go with such guarantees.

Your own success is as clear an indication as we could have of the fact that free enterprise, individual initiative and brisk competition are not passé. I shall hope that you will resist with all your strength, both as individuals and organizations, the well intentioned, but to my way of thinking, misguided efforts to change the order so as to install the ever-heavier hand of the Federal Government at the helm of your businesses.

HIGHWAY BRIDGE BETWEEN LUBEC, MAINE, AND CAMPOBELLO ISLAND, NEW BRUNSWICK, CANADA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1133, S. 512.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 512) to extend the time for completion of the free highway bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I see the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is in the Chamber. She has been much interested in this particular measure. It was acted upon by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and reported unanimously. It would amend Public Law 85-563, extending the time for the completion of a free highway bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Madam President, I introduced S. 512 at the request of the Maine State Highway Commission.

S. 512 amends Public Law 85-563, approved July 28, 1958, which in turn revived and reenacted Public Law 687, of the 84th Congress, approved July 11, 1956. The latter law authorized the State Highway Commission of the State of Maine "to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, across the waters between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada, so far as the United States has jurisdiction over such waters, subject to the approval of the proper authorities of the Government of Canada."

In reviving and reenacting it by Public Law 85-563 in 1958, the Congress set the dates for commencement and completion of the bridge at December 31, 1960, and December 31, 1961, respectively. The bridge is now under construction but the December 31, 1961, completion date has not been met. S. 512 will substitute December 31, 1962, as the completion date.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has approved this bill, and I ask that the Senate pass it at this time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 512) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to revive and reenact the Act authorizing the State Highway Commission of the State of Maine to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada", approved July 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 424), is amended by striking out "1961" and inserting in lieu thereof "1962".

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON AGRICULTURAL POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I have one more item to present. I do not believe there will be too much further discussion today.

I wish to comment briefly on the President's message on agricultural policy which was sent to the respective Houses of the Congress. This is the first total and comprehensive revision of farm legislation since the 1930's. It represents some progressive thinking and proposals in the field of agricultural conservation policies.

The program presents modern legislative standards for modern American agriculture, an agriculture which has geared itself to the science and technology of the day.

Actually, President Kennedy's farm message is more than a farm program. It relates to the more constructive use and conservation of human and physical resources in rural America. It is designed to gear American agriculture both to the domestic and to the international requirements.

Specifically, this program is designed to eliminate waste of land, to eliminate waste of human resources, to eliminate waste of food and fiber resources. It is designed to reduce agricultural surpluses; yes, to reduce the cost of an agricultural program. It is designed to conserve land, to increase agricultural income, to provide new recreational opportunities for a growing population, and to provide new job opportunities for part-time farmers.

It is also designed to improve the diet of our own people and to expand our food-for-peace program on the international front.

This is a far-reaching program which has been worked out carefully by a number of advisory committees to the Department of Agriculture, which committees have represented every aspect of our agricultural economy. Every commodity group has been heard from. The leading spokesmen of American agriculture from every region of our country have been consulted.

This program has within it, I believe, the basic standards and basic principles which are required for a more effective agricultural policy.

Madam President, last week in the city of St. Paul, Minn., the Governor of New York, Mr. Rockefeller, spoke at a Republican fundraising dinner in the St. Paul Auditorium, and he spoke on agriculture, at least eloquently, if not knowingly. He had some rather cryptic and caustic comments to make about the Secretary of Agriculture and the agricultural program.

When a political leader speaks at a political rally, especially at one where the dinner tickets cost $100 apiece, he is expected to deliver a political speech; and that is exactly what Mr. Rockefeller did. To hear him tell it, the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, a three-term Governor of the State of Minnesota, should be characterized as one of those ogres who thrive on the American farmer.

Because of the distorted, and I believe completely inaccurate, picture Governor Rockefeller painted both of the Secretary and of his policies, I should like to set the record straight.

First of all, the Governor of New York must believe that he has political extrasensory perception if he can manage to attack a program even before it is presented to Congress. I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that the Governor's attack was launched, or at least reported, on January 25, and it was only today, on the 31st day of January, that those of us who are here in the Congress and who have been rather close to the present administration and to the Secretary of Agriculture were permitted to see the agriculture program that apparently this extrasensory perception of the Governor of New York was able to detect.

The Governor referred to the tightly policed policies of Secretary Freeman. I can assure the Senate that there are no Department of Agriculture helicopters nor are there any so-called FBI agents hovering over our farmlands. Governor Rockefeller may have his doubts, but Secretary of Agriculture Freeman subscribes to the school of thought that most American people are basically honest and trustworthy and desire to live in freedom, and that throughout the history of the United States the farmer has been a shining example of this principle.

Governor Rockefeller said:

> The productive genius of the American farmer can only be exercised in freedom within a system based on incentive, not on coercion. We see today the beginnings of a far more tightly controlled agriculture with dangerous long-term implications for the freedom and prosperity of our farmers.

First of all, let us discuss the productive genius of the American farmer. The American farmer has created a miracle of production. No other major segment of our economy has made as rapid strides toward efficiency and productivity as has agriculture. I have said a number of times in the Senate that agriculture is America's greatest success story. During the 1950's the output per man-hour in agriculture increased more than three times as fast as nonagriculture production.

This is an outstanding accomplishment. Some people maintain that the constantly increasing level of productivity and efficiency will bring the farmer an income adequate to compensate him for his labor, managerial skill, and to repay the investment in land and equipment and such items as fertilizer. But the experience of the past decade has shown that this belief is unfair to the farmer. Time has shown that the result of increasing efficiency in agriculture is that the benefits of scientific and technological advance have passed through the farmer to the general public, or, in some instances, to those who process farm commodities.

All individuals who perform services and produce goods that are essential to our society have a right to expect the opportunity to gain a proper reward for their efforts, a reward that is commensurate with that earned by others exerting a comparable effort, and certainly nothing is more essential than the products of our farms. Farmers, like those engaged in other forms of enterprise, have a right to expect this equality of opportunity, and if that opportunity does not exist—and the facts and figures show that it does not exist today—it is the legitimate function of the Government to insure the conditions under which it will prevail.

One of the basic features of our free enterprise economy has been the concept of a fair reward for hard work, for application to duty, for efficiency, and for progress. This feature of a fair reward for hard work, for efficiency, for progress, and for application to the job has been notably absent in regard to agriculture.

Governor Rockefeller talked of tight controls. For his edification I should like to explain the use of a producer marketing order program, which is exactly the type of program that is being advanced by the President of the United States and his Secretary of Agriculture.

The producer marketing order programs can be used by producers of many commodities to bring about a more realistic balance between supply and demand where a serious imbalance exists. These programs are producer designed, producer administered, producer financed, and producer voted upon. This is really the exercise of a farmer-designed program—voted upon, acted upon and administered by farmers themselves. Neither the Secretary nor the Department of Agriculture can establish a marketing order program, nor can the Secretary or the Department run one. If producers of a commodity want a marketing order program, under existing law and under proposed legislation, the Department will provide technical assistance and advice. The Department will, at the request of the producers and the industry, hold hearings and conduct referendums. If the producers should propose a marketing order which receives the support of two-thirds of all producers of a particular commodity, then they will have a marketing order.

Years ago Congress established that principle of law, which was supported by Democrats and Republicans alike. In fact, the State of New York has one of the most extensive marketing order programs in the field of dairy production. If the producers of a commodity vote for a marketing order, then they face the real job ahead of making it work. If they do not want one, by their votes there will be no marketing order, and no Department official and no bureaucracy will force it upon them.

The job of the Department at this stage is to insure that the marketing order program is not used to exploit the consumer. That is required in existing law.

Governor Rockefeller also was very highly critical of the emergency feed grain program, which was voted by Congress last year and remains in effect for the 1962 crop. I discussed this subject once before on the floor of the Senate.

The Governor's comments on the feed grain program may have brought a chuckle and a cheer on Wall Street and Fifth Avenue, but they surely did not have the same favorable response out on the marketing roads of rural America or on the main streets of rural towns in rural America, because the feed grain program has worked. It has produced more income for farmers. It has reduced surpluses in the Commodity Credit Corporation holdings. It has cut down the cost of managing those surpluses. It has demonstrated that farmers, when given a fair program, will cooperate. In fact, the percentage of producer cooperation under the emergency feed grain program is the greatest percentage of cooperation and of support for a farm program in the history of this country.

Net farm income in 1961, the calendar year just gone by, is estimated to be over $1 billion higher than in 1960, a rise of 9 percent. A large part of that change can be attributed to the feed grain program, the higher prices of major farm commodities, and to increased cash marketings.

Retail food prices paid by the consumers for meat, poultry, and dairy products, all of which are related to feed grains, inasmuch as feed grains fatten the cattle and fatten the poultry and make possible dairy products, have shown great stability during the period of the program. In other words, the consumers' prices in the retail establishments did not go up, but the producers' prices, the farmers' prices did go up, thus giving greater incentive for cooperation.

Without the feed grain program, the Federal Government would have been required to support feed grains for all producers regardless of the volume of production. Under such conditions, it is apparent that production would have surpassed total consumption by over 600 million bushels, all of which would have passed into Government hands. The program, designed for the 1961 production year and operating under unusually favorable weather conditions, will reduce Government stocks by some 100 million bushels, rather than increasing stocks.

The taxpayer will benefit by millions of dollars in immediate reductions in storage, transportation, handling, and interest charges on grain which is now moving into the market. Government expenditures over the next 9 years approximately will be nearly $600 million less because of the lower level of feed grain carryover.

Madam President, perhaps Governor Rockefeller would like a complete elimination of all farm programs in order that farm prices could seek their own level in the market price. At least that is the burden, that is the tone, that is the impression of the farm message which he delivered in the State of Minnesota. It is difficult for me to understand, however, how anyone can advocate a course like this, a course which will cause economic disruption and a great deal of economic suffering and hardship.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota if it is not a fact that net farm income had increased in 1961 by more than $1 billion over the preceding year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It was the highest net income in 8 years. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I must say that we had 8 sorry, sad years of decline in agricultural income, starting in 1953. I remember standing on the floor of the Senate at that time criticizing the then Secretary of Agriculture because I thought he was wrong. He was wrong. We started out in 1953 with a net farm income of approximately $15 billion. We ended up every year with less income. By 1960 farm income was down to just slightly over $11 billion.

Nevertheless, the population of America had gone up by millions of people. More food was being produced and more food was being distributed, and more was being consumed. Yet the net farm income was down. It appears to me that the record of economic fallacy of the 8 years of Bensonism under the Republican administration is now a black chapter in the economic history of this country. We are trying to reverse that course. The new administration came into office in 1961, with a new Secretary of Agriculture. The best that could be done was to pass some emergency legislation, to stop the downward trend of farm prices, to stop the downward trend of farm income, to stop the liquidation of farm families and their properties. That was done with the cooperation of Congress, under the leadership of President Kennedy and Secretary Freeman.

Now the Secretary and the President have designed a new farm program. It looks to me like a sensible, constructive program. We are not in a position to judge every part of that prgoram until it goes through the process of committee hearings. I do not believe the President would want us to merely cheer and say that everything is wonderful. What we want to do is take a good look at it. I do know this, Madam President, and that is that this is the first comprehensive revision of farm legislation that Congress has undertaken for over 20 years. I know that American agriculture requires modern legislation. Instead of trying to put a strip of adhesive tape on the agricultural structure, which has been whittled at and chipped at and pounded at, and occasionally bruised and broken over 8 years of Republican administration, it seems to me that it is a great deal better to design a new policy, a new program, and look at it in a much more comprehensive manner.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, while the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has been very generous with giving our able President and our able Secretary of Agriculture credit for the increase in the net income of more than a billion dollars in 1961 over 1960 and the year before and the year before that, I wish to commend the Senator from Minnesota for his able advocacy during the 8 long years of Bensonism, particularly for his able advocacy on the floor of the Senate of sound agricultural legislation that paved the way for and laid the groundwork for the type of action that was taken administratively and legislatively in 1961, and which enabled the net farm income to increase, and that enabled farmers to end 1961 with a billion dollars of more farm income than the farmers had enjoyed in 1960 or the year before or the year before. I commend the Senator from Minnesota for his fine contribution to sounder agricultural legislation and sounder agricultural policies of this country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am extremely grateful to the Senator from Texas for his expression and for his cooperation. There has been no regional interest involved here. We looked at the agricultural economy of this country as a fundamental and basic part of the total national economy and the total strength of the country. My only objective is to see to it that people who invest vast sums of money in land and equipment and who have managerial skill and productive know-how and technical competence, people who are hard-working people—and our farmers are indeed hard-working people—will be properly rewarded for their skill, their work, their management, and their capital investment. That is all. We seek this for other areas of our economy. We are entitled to ask the same with respect to the agricultural area.

Madam President, the Republican spokesman addressed a $100-a-plate Republican dinner in Minnesota. Paying $100 for a dinner is a pretty high price to pay. It is quite a tab, Madam President. One can get a very good dinner for that price without having to listen to a great many speeches. At $100 a plate, one does not have to go through the ordeal of having to listen to speeches.

I am in favor of political dinners like this. I do not want to be misunderstood. Political parties must raise money, and there is no better way to do it that I know of than through giving political dinners. The Governor of New York is a great political spokesman for his party. I have a high regard for his ability and for his advocacy. I would like to have this good, fine friend understand agriculture a little better; that is all. It seems to me that in a spirit of friendship and understanding and in a bipartisan spirit of working for the good of our country, some of us who have spent years working on agricultural matters should help this great Governor from the State of New York, who finds it rather difficult to understand the problems of midwestern agricultural producers. I wish to be a good friend to him. That is the main reason why I address myself to this subject today.

I should like to add another word of commendation to the Kennedy administration for what it is doing. I am sure Governor Rockefeller does not want unlimited production with price supports. That was what was being advocated by the former administration. Price supports were low; they were on the cheap side, so to speak, with unlimited production. I remember one act of that prior administration, which I opposed very vigorously on the floor of the Senate. It was to give price supports to approximately 65 percent of parity on all corn that anyone could produce, with no distinction between farmers who complied with acreage limitations and those that did not.

They said, "Just go to it, boys. Wherever you find any ground, plant corn." And they did. They increased corn production by hundreds of millions of bushels and increased acreage by 18 million. I predicted that would happen. I did not have any crystal ball; neither did I have any prophetic vision as such. But it is not necessary to know very much about agriculture to know what would happen under those circumstances. That was the Republican farm program. The idea was simply to price the farmers out of the market. The point was that the farmers knew, when they were getting only about 65 percent of parity, that the only way they could pay their bills was to produce more and more and more. They had to do just that, and the Government had to buy their production.

That was a foolish program; we have scrapped it. We have tossed it out; we do not want anything to do with it.

I am one who believes that if we have a price support program, ultimately there must be some kind of production control or management program to go along with it. I say that because without some kind of balance between production and consumption or production and the basic needs of our domestic and international economies, the goods will pile up, the free market price will go down, economic chaos will result, and the Government will be saddled and loaded with commodities which will have to be stored, shipped, handled, and transported, and the costs will mount up and up and up. We saw that happen. We saw the cost of the agricultural program go up from under $2 billion in 1953 to $8 billion by 1960. With fewer farmers and fewer farms and with a lower farm net income every year, the cost of that program went up and up and up. I will tell Senators why. It was because a philosophy prevailed in Washington, from 1953 to 1961, that we could simply use the process of economic attrition and low prices and squeeze out the producers. That simply will not work; that is all. The taxpayer got squeezed. He had practically all the juice squeezed right out of him.

Madam President, the only logical alternative to such an economic fallacy as I have discussed on the part of the previous administration is to develop policies of managing the abundant potential of our agriculture for domestic and international uses of food and fiber and to develop the most practical and efficient use for land and water resources.

What the Kennedy farm message gives us is not merely a farm program related to farm commodities; it relates those commodities, their production, their distribution, their prices also to the conservation of land, to the use of the land, and to the water resources. Instead of having the land standing idle, with no one to take care of it, some uses are to be made of the land for recreational and grazing purposes.

The Secretary of Agriculture has repeatedly stated that the keystone of the Kennedy administration's managed abundance policy—I prefer to call it a balanced abundance policy—for agriculture is the effort to bring the food abundance of the United States to needy people. There is no amount of food that can be considered surplus so long as people are hungry.

The first Executive order of the Kennedy administration, directed to the Department of Agriculture, was to make food available to the needy of America. Food stamp programs were launched on a pilot basis, and they have been tremendously successful. I stood in my place in the front row of the Senate 3 years ago and fought for the food stamp plan, and was able finally to have it adopted by the Senate. That plan lay at the Department of Agriculture for better than 2 years, unused, untouched, while people went hungry.

When this administration took office on January 20, 1961, almost 6 million people were unemployed in the United States. Some of those families were going without adequate food; they were living on an improper diet. Yet the warehouses of the U.S. Government were overflowing with food. President Kennedy immediately directed that surplus food be made available to the needy. That was his Executive Order No. 1.

Executive Order No. 2 put the food stamp plan into effect, and that plan has worked well. The school lunch program was expanded for our children. The Nation's program of food for peace has been substantially expanded in the short period of time this administration has been in office. It is being expanded even more because of the great needs throughout the world. Efforts are being made to gain tariff concessions for agricultural products in our dealings with the emerging European Economic Community, or Common Market.

Madam President, the Governor of New York would have been in better taste while he was in the State of Minnesota if he had commended one of our leading citizens, the present Secretary of Agriculture, for having waged a brave, courageous, and persistent battle for the interests of American agriculture in the discussions and negotiations with our friends of Western Europe in the Common Market. I ask the Senate: Who was it who stood up, even against people in our own State Department, to fight the battle for the farmer in the European Common Market discussions? Who is it who has gone from country to country, meeting with foreign ministers and heads of government, speaking for American agriculture in the channels of export commerce and export trade? The Secretary of Agriculture is the man.

I might add that I have done a little of that myself. We now have a Secretary of Agriculture who speaks up for the farmer. The farmers know it, too, and they like him.

Some of the rest of us in the Senate have spoken up for the farmers. The farmers need a few spokesmen. They now have such a spokesman in one of the high place in Government. He is the Secretary of Agriculture. By the way, they have a spokesman in the White House, too. I know of no President who has ever done as much to put the stamp of official approval and endorsement or who has given what might be called the world's greatest commercial to a product as President Kennedy did when he addressed the dairy conference recently and called to the attention of the people of American and of the world the great nutritional values to be found in good dairy products, especially wholesome milk, fresh milk.

Many of us have traveled overseas. When we returned to the United States, one of the first things we wanted was a glass of good, cold, fresh milk. There is nothing better. I think our President surely proved himself again to be a generous friend of the farm producer, of the farm cooperative, when he called upon the Nation to consume more milk, to recognize the nutritional value of milk, and to recognize its contribution to the health of the American people.

I was pleased to note that some of our large dairy cooperatives and producers commended, congratulated, and thanked the President and the Secretary of Agriculture for this action. They were most considerate, and their action was very proper.

Madam President, we recognize that in the years immediately ahead the total utilization of our agricultural plant or economy will not equal our capacity or the world's capacity to consume.

Surely we also recognize that if we were to use our plant fully, agricultural economy fully, we would overproduce beyond what could be domestically consumed. So if no action is taken, we can expect the same results in agriculture that we saw during the 8 years which preceded this administration's taking office; namely, falling prices and low farm income. The farmer cannot hope for an adequate income unless we prevent the economic waste and price-depressing effect of producing more than can be used. When I say "producing more than can be used," I mean producing more than can be consumed at home; more can be exported abroad; more than can be used by our own needy people, our schoolchildren, our elderly folks, in what are called welfare programs. This is a part of the use of food commodities.

Also when I speak of what can be used, I include what is needed for our international programs and our food-for-peace program in many countries of the world, because food is an instrument for peace.

Madam President, recently I addressed a food-for-peace conference in San Francisco. I was pleased to observe the fine quality of those who attended that conference. I have not the slightest idea of their political preferences, because the conference was attended by people from all parts of the Western States. But I know that at the conference they came to one mind and one conclusion, namely, that in fighting the battle for freedom and in waging the struggle against communism, a great deal more is done by using food, rather than by the use of fear; and that by having a few less Birchites and a little more powdered milk, a few less of the so-called Christian anti-Communist crusaders, as they call themselves, and a little more food for peace, there might be a little more peace of mind and a little more peace of spirit in the world and there might be a better chance for world peace. I think most Members of the Senate agree as to that. I believe all of us recognize that if our great resources of food and fiber are properly used, they can make a significant contribution to a better world.

Therefore, Madam President, I conclude by noting that farmers working together, through the democratic processes and through their coperatives—and the farm cooperative is a vital part of any farm program, if it is to be successful—and with farmers and farm cooperatives and agricultural producers working with their Government to make free, democratic choices, they can manage their own abundant productive capacity and can put the American agricultural economy on the high road to economic prosperity.

Madam President, I am deeply grateful to the President for transmitting to us today his message. I hope it will be read by everyone who is interested in agricultural policy; and I trust that the White House will send by special delivery, airmail, a copy of that message to our good friend, the Governor of New York, and will ask that he study it most carefully.

Although the Governor of New York undoubtedly thought he was representing the Republican Party in Minnesota—and I have here a photograph of the Governor of New York when he was sitting with the Governor of Minnesota, and I notice that at that time they were eating good American agricultural products—I wish to say that those who wish to help the Republican Governor of Minnesota had better not be so critical of a fair farm program, because out our way there are a great many fine, intelligent farm folks and also a great many fine, intelligent city people. There are about two city people for every person who lives on a farm; but all of them understand the interdependence between a healthy, prosperous farm economy and a healthy, prosperous urban economy. We have learned that lesson in depression and in recession; we have learned a great deal. We have learned that we cannot have a prosperous Nation if one part of America is in trouble. That is why we need a balanced farm program.

Madam President, I call this Kennedy farm program the A B C of agriculture—abundance, balance, and conservation. This is the A–B–C program for American agriculture; and I, for one, am pleased and proud that America's agricultural abundance is being used properly and constructively; I am pleased that we have before us a program which attempts to bring about a reasonable balance between supply and demand; and I am very much pleased that the President has laid before us a program designed to conserve the water resources, the land resources, the human resources, and the capital resources. This program makes good sense.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a statement and release, which I issued last evening, concerning the meeting in St. Paul which was addressed by the Governor of New York, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROCKEFELLER'S MINNESOTA ATTACK ON KENNEDY FARM PROGRAM "SOUR GRAPES"

"Governor Rockefeller's attack last week in St. Paul on Secretary of Agriculture Freeman and the Kennedy farm program may draw loud cheers on Wall Street, but on Main Street in rural America, and in American farm family homes, it sounds like nothing but sour grapes," Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, commented last night.

In a statement issued the day before the anticipated receipt in Congress of the President's farm message, Senator HUMPHREY noted that the Governor of New York "must believe he has political extrasensory perception if he can manage to attack a program even before it is presented to the Congress."

The Senate majority whip challenged Rockefeller to "compare the sorry record of 8 years of Bensonism with the solid accomplishments of only 1 year of a new administration," which he said had managed to:

1. Increase farm income by a billion dollars.
2. Reduce the farm surplus.
3. Decrease the cost of storage.
4. Significantly expand our food-for-peace program.

"Balanced against these achievements, the Republicans can point only to a record of increasing surpluses, increasing costs to the taxpayer, and plummeting farm income.

"Wall Streeters may be convinced by these Republican crocodile tears about the farmer, but rural Americans are not buying it," Senator HUMPHREY declared.

BONDS FOR PEACE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bonds for Peace," which was published today in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BONDS FOR PEACE

With the favorable developments in the Congo providing powerful support for his request, President Kennedy yesterday asked Congress to authorize the purchase of $100 million worth of U.N. bonds in order to rescue the world organization from bankruptcy.

With all its imperfections and occasional lapses, the United Nations has served the interests of peace and freedom that are also the interests of the United States. To abandon it now, to refuse the purchase of the bonds, would, as President Kennedy points out, either wither the executive arm of the United Nations or load the United States with even greater burdens.

It is, of course, true that the organization's financial crisis arises from the refusal of some nations to pay their special assessments. But the bond issue is the best and perhaps the only way to remedy this situation, because the bonds are to be repaid from the U.N.'s general budget.

When the United States spends around $50 billion a year to defend itself and the free world, it would be gross folly to weaken the U.N. for the sake of $100 million and forego its moral and material support for policies we espouse. Only Communist imperialism could profit from that.

TEXAS LOSES JESSE ANDREWS OF HOUSTON, LEADER FOR PROGRESS IN GOVERNMENT AND IN LIFE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, Mr. Jesse Andrews, of Houston, Tex., a leading figure for good in law, business, civic service, and the interests of good government, has passed from among us. He will be greatly missed. His life benefited the economy, the culture, and the progress of his region.

Mr. Andrews lived to the age of 87. His achievements are demonstrable proof that he was one of those exceptional Americans endowed with a rare combination of abilities to plan, to act, and to lead. He was generous, progressive, and magnanimous in words, acts, and deeds. He was a liberal loyal Democrat.

He was my friend. I trusted and valued his counsel, support, and aid, for he was at once a wise man, an understanding man, and, above all, a great man.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the following newspaper articles and editorials and a resolution by the Houston Democratic Women's Club:

One from the Houston Press, of December 29, 1961, entitled "Jesse Andrews Dies; Lawyer, Financier, and Civic Leader."

One from the Houston Chronicle, December 29, 1961, entitled "Jesse Andrews, Lawyer, Civic Leader, Dies."

One from the Houston Post, December 30, 1961, entitled "Jesse Andrews, 87, Dies—Funeral Will Be Monday."

One from the Houston Press, December 30, 1961, entitled "Jesse Andrews."

One from the Houston Post, December 30, 1961, entitled "Houston Indebted to Jesse Andrews."

One from the Houston Chronicle, December 30, 1961, entitled "Last Rites Set Monday for Jesse Andrews."

One from the Houston Chronicle, December 31, 1961, entitled "Jesse Andrews."

And a resolution adopted by the Houston Democratic Women's Club.

There being no objection, the articles, editorials, and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston Press, Dec. 29, 1961]

JESSE ANDREWS DIES; LAWYER, FINANCIER, AND CIVIC LEADER

Jesse Andrews, one of Texas' and Houston's leading figures in law, politics, and finance, died at 8:55 a.m. today in Hermann Hospital, following a lengthy illness.

Services will be at 4 p.m. on Monday at Christ Church Cathedral.

Bishop John E. Hines, Dean J. Milton Richardson and the Rev. Thomas W. Sumners will officiate.

Burial will be in Glenwood Cemetery.

Pallbearers include William A. Kirkland, A. G. McNeese Jr., Malcolm Lovett, John McCullough, Lester Settegast, and Woodley Sherwood.

Mr. Andrews had been in failing health since his 87th birthday last April 9.

He had been hospitalized several times in the last 6 months with kidney and heart ailments.

The tax depletion allowance now enjoyed by the oil industry resulted largely from Mr. Andrews' efforts to first include a similar depletion allowance for the lumber industry in the first income tax law.

Former President Truman referred to Mr. Andrews as "a friend and one of Texas' most noteworthy Democrats."

LONG CIVIC SERVICE

For many years Mr. Andrews had served first as chairman of the influential city planning commission and later as head of the post-World War II planning committee which laid out plans for extensive street, sewer and drainage improvements.

He resigned from the planning commission in 1956 after serving 16 years during which time Houston exploded from a city of 73 square miles and 385,000 population into a metropolis encompassing 165 square miles and 750,000 persons.

PROMINENT IN THREE FIELDS

Mr. Andrews was a prominent figure in three lines of endeavor—and extremely successful in each. These were:

1. Law, where he had been associated for 62 years with Baker, Botts, Andrews & Shepherd.

2. Politics, where it is acknowledged he played a key role in "saving" Texas for the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1944.

3. Finance, where he steered Kansas City's Long-Bell Lumber Co. through a depression era bankruptcy reorganization into a 1956 merger with the International Paper Co.

However, due to the poor state of Mr. Andrews' health in the past months, he had been forced to curtail most of his activities.

CITIZEN OF TWO CITIES

For 18 years, Mr. Andrews was a citizen of two cities—and a driving force in both.

In 1918, he was asked to take a "short trip" to Kansas City for a "week's work" with a client of the then Baker, Botts, Baker & Lovett law firm—the Long-Bell Lumber Co.

The "week's work" ended in 1936 when Mr. Andrews returned to Houston.

During the intervening years, Mr. Andrews steered Long-Bell's $67 million investment through a depression era bankruptcy and reorganization.

BORN IN LOUISIANA

Jesse Andrews was born in Waterproof, La., April 9, 1874, to Mark and Helen McFarren Andrews. His father was a Confederate Army surgeon.

He attended Jefferson College in Washington, Miss., for 2 years (1887–89), was graduated from the University of Texas in 1895 and was admitted to the Texas bar in 1896.

Few of Mr. Andrews' closest friends knew he was a member of the University of Texas' first football team.

As a junior in 1893, Mr. Andrews played guard on that first Longhorn 11 which was undefeated in four contests.

After graduating from the University of Texas, Mr. Andrews said he "looked around" for a city "to grow with."

Said the scholarly, soft-spoken lawyer:

"I knew enough about Houston to realize that Buffalo Bayou would some day be an arm of the sea."

In 1900, he married the former Celeste Bujac, whom he met when both were members of the Christ Church choir.

Their son, Mark Edwin Andrews, was awarded the Legion of Merit as a Navy captain and served on the Navy Procurement Policy Board before being appointed Assistant Secretary of the Navy under James Forrestal.

A LIBERAL DEMOCRAT

An avowed liberal Democrat, Mr. Andrews was a member of the Kansas City University Club, Houston Club, Kansas City Country Club, Texas Club, Kansas City River Club, Houston Country Club and Sigma Alpha Epsilon fraternity.

He was chairman of the board of the Long-Bell Lumber Co.; vice chairman of the Bank of the Southwest executive committee; a director of the South Texas Cotton Oil Co.; a director of the American General Life Insurance Co., and a trustee of the Robert A. Welch Foundation.

Mr. Andrews was a member of the American, Texas and Missouri bar associations, the Houston Committee on Foreign Relations and the Philosophical Society of Texas.

A ZONING BACKER

Mr. Andrews was honored by the city of Houston, May 3, 1960, for "unselfish leadership and far-reaching vision" while on the planning commission.

A longtime backer of zoning, Mr. Andrews often declared:

"I definitely hope we will some day get zoning. But it must be tempered to meet the unusual conditions created by our lengthy wait for it."

Mr. Andrews had lived for the last several years at 1517 Kirby Drive.

Arrangements are being made by Settegast-Kopf Co.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Dec. 29, 1962]

JESSE ANDREWS, LAWYER, CIVIC LEADER, DIES—FOR 16 YEARS HE HEADED HOUSTON PLANNING BOARD

Jesse Andrews, 87, who helped guide the growth and shape of Houston, died at 8:55 a.m. Friday in Hermann Hospital.

For 16 years, Andrews, an attorney, was chairman of the city planning commission.

He was senior partner in the law firm of Baker, Botts, Andrews & Shepherd in the Neils Esperson Building.

ILL SINCE APRIL 9

He had been in ill health with a heart and kidney ailment since his last birthday, April 9.

He leaves his wife, Celeste, and a son, Mark Edwin Andrews. His home was at 1715 Kirby Drive.

FUNERAL MONDAY

Funeral services are scheduled at 4 p.m. Monday at Christ Church Cathedral, 1117 Texas, with Bishop John E. Hines, Dean J. Milton Richardson and Rev. Thomas W. Sumners officiating. Burial will be in Glenwood Cemetery.

The body is at Settegast-Kopf Funeral Home, 3320 Kirby.

In two cities, Houston and Kansas City, Andrews achieved distinction; more so here, perhaps, because of his role in mapping this city's future.

In Kansas City he is credited with saving the multimillion dollar Long-Bell Lumber Co. from bankruptcy in a long, bitter court fight.

Later he was named chairman of the board of Long-Bell.

NEW DEAL DEMOCRAT

The Andrews influence was felt in politics; he was a New Deal Democrat.

He is generally credited with playing a key role in the Democrats carrying Texas for Roosevelt in 1944.

He was one of a group of men who pioneered the principle of the depletion allowance on ores and natural deposits in the income tax law enacted in 1913.

In 1926 the Senate and House agreed on a 27½-percent depletion allowance for the oil industry.

The scholarly Andrews—his preferred reading was Shakespeare and Tennyson—was born in a town named Waterproof, La. His father was a Confederate Army physician.

ON FIRST UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS TEAM

He studied law and played guard in 1893 on the first football team at the University of Texas.

He took his first job as a lawyer for $75 a month with the firm, then named Baker, Botts, Baker & Lovett here in 1899.

A year later he married Celeste Bujac, whom he had met in the choir at Christ Episcopal Cathedral.

During his legal career he spent about 17 years in Kansas City, chiefly as counsel and later boss of the lumber firm he saved.

He returned to Houston in 1935. Andrews resigned from the planning commission in 1956 on his 82d birthday.

During that time he twice participated in vain efforts to adopt a zoning law here.

In May 1960, Houston architects paid him tribute at a dinner in his honor.

Of Andrews, the architects said:

"He always gives more than he receives."

Andrews responded:

"If a genius is one capable of infinite pains, I think all architects are geniuses—and they're delightful hosts."

Perhaps the top tribute to Andrews came from M. E. Walter, then editor of the Chronicle and Andrews' successor as chairman of the planning commission.

Walter noted the commission has never been under fire for a single act that reflected on the integrity of its members.

"And I think this has been due primarily to the leadership exercised by Mr. Andrews and to the high regard in which he is held by the community," said Walter, now editorial consultant and vice president of the Chronicle.

During the Andrews tenure as planning chairman, the city's area increased from 73 to 349 square miles and the metropolitan population grew from about 385,000 to about 1 million.

The commission set up a parks and parkway system, a major street plan, a permanent policy of subdivision development and drew a blueprint for Houston's freeway system.

Andrews, besides his work as chairman of the board and counsel of Long-Bell Lumber, was director and vice chairman of the executive committee of the Bank of the Southwest, a director of the South Texas Cotton Oil Co., and the American General Life Insurance Co., both of Houston, and a trustee of the Robert A. Welch Foundation.

He also was a member of the American, Texas, and Missouri bar associations, the Houston Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Philosophical Society of Texas.

Of Jesse Andrews a colleague said:

"His loss has created a void in this community. He was truly an unselfish man."

Within his immediate family, his loss is perhaps more keenly felt.

"He was an inspiration to us," said his daughter-in-law, Mrs Lavone Andrews, 8 Shadder Way.

"He weighed an issue before giving an opinion. One thing I recall about him: He always insisted we vote at all elections. He never told us how to vote."

[From the Houston Post, Dec. 30, 1961]

JESSE ANDREWS, 87, DIES; FUNERAL WILL BE MONDAY

Jesse Andrews, senior partner in the law firm of Baker, Botts, Andrews & Shepherd, died Friday morning in Hermann Hospital.

His funeral will be held at 4 p.m. Monday in Christ Church Cathedral.

Andrews' health had been failing since his 87th birthday last April 9, and he had been in and out of the hospital several times since. In the intervals of relatively good health he carried on his activities as usual.

Andrews came to Houston in 1896 as a young graduate of the University of Texas law school. In December of 1899 he was employed by the firm of Baker, Botts, Baker & Lovett. He became a partner on January 1, 1906. He became a senior partner in 1920.

He was born in Waterproof, La., in 1874, the son of Mark and Helen McFarren Andrews. He studied at Jefferson College in Washington, Miss., then took a bachelor's degree at the University of Texas and a law degree a year later. He played right guard on the first football team ever organized at the university, in 1893.

As a young lawyer in Houston he was a member of the choir at Christ Church, and there he became acquainted with another member, Miss Celeste Bujac, to whom he was married in 1900. The one son born of this marriage is Mark Edwin Andrews, Houston oil operator and former Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Andrews was chairman of the Houston City Planning Commission for 16 years, resigning on his 80th birthday in 1954. He took part in two efforts to obtain zoning for Houston, one as a member of the first zoning commission during the administration of R. H. Fonville as mayor and the other in 1946 as chairman of the zoning commission.

From 1918 through 1935 Andrews was a resident of Kansas City. He went to Kansas City, as managing partner for the Houston law firm, to be active in the affairs of the Long-Bell Lumber Co.

Because so much timber had been cut in the South, the lumber company was gradually transferring its operations to the Pacific Northwest. A little later it was almost overwhelmed during the depression. From 1930 until the company was merged into the International Paper Co. in 1956, Andrews was in effect its head. He was in charge of a reorganization in 1934 and 1935.

Andrews was credited with a large part in holding Texas for President Roosevelt and the Democratic Party in 1944.

Andrews was chairman of the executive committee of the Second National Bank of Houston, a director of the South Texas Cotton Oil Co., a director of the American General Life Insurance Co. He was a trustee of the University of Kansas City.

He was a trustee of the Robert A. Welch Foundation.

He was a member of the American, Texas, and Missouri Bar Associations and of the Philosophical Society of Texas, also of the University Club, Kansas City Club, Kansas City Country Club, the River Club of Kansas City, the Houston Club, the Houston Country Club, and the Texas Club.

As a young man at the University of Texas, Andrews was initiated into the Sigma Alpha Epsilon fraternity. His fellow members included H. Y. Benedict, who was later the president of the university; George W. Pierce, later the head of Harvard's Cruft High-Tension Physical Laboratory; and James W. McClendon, who later became chief justice of the court of civil appeals at Austin.

The Andrews home here is at 1517 Kirby Drive.

At the services Monday, Bishop John E. Hines, Dean J. Milton Richardson, and the Reverend Thomas W. Sumners will officiate.

Burial will be in Glenwood Cemetery.

[From the Houston Press, Dec. 30, 1961]

JESSE ANDREWS

"Great" is a word that can be used truthfully about few men for rare is the man who measures up both in accomplishment and in personal character to the true meaning of that word.

Not only for what he did but, more importantly, for what he was, Jesse Andrews was a great man. He was one of the greatest that Houston ever produced.

This editorial will make no effort to recount the career of Mr. Andrews who died yesterday at the age of 87. Such a recounting has been done in the news stories of his death, and, in any event, his record is a familiar one to people of Houston.

His was a long life and not only the span of years but his ability in so many fields and the depth of his interest in so many phases of the public welfare gave him a career equal to the combined careers of several successful men.

As a lawyer—62 years with the historic firm now known as Baker, Botts, Andrews & Shepherd—Mr. Andrews was recognized as one of the top attorneys of the Nation.

He was no less successful in a career as a businessman of national importance.

Probably his outstanding accomplishment was the steering of Long-Bell Lumber Co. through a depression—brought bankruptcy when the affairs of this one-time giant in the field of lumber seemed hopeless. It has been generally recognized that what Mr. Andrews did for Long-Bell—and he went from handling the company's legal affairs into actually taking over the direct operation of the company—has been matched in few instances in the Nation.

And Long-Bell was only one of many business and financial enterprises to which Mr. Andrews lent his great talent—not only as a lawyer but as a director or prime adviser.

But these twin careers in law and business—important as they were—made up only a part of the active life Mr. Andrews lived.

His participation in public affairs overshadowed these private careers.

Again, this editorial will not try to recount even the major public fields in which Mr. Andrews was interested and in which he served.

For example, as head of the city planning commission for 16 years, he has had more to do with Houston planning than any other single individual.

But his interest ranged from Houston to State, national, and international affairs. As recounted, he was interested in city planning but he was no less deeply interested and influential in U.S. foreign policy.

Mr. Andrews was not a man who scorned politics—either the philosophical approach to government or active political affairs. And as would be expected in a man of Mr. Andrews' conscientiousness, he followed the dictates of his own conscience in political matters.

Generally in national affairs Mr. Andrews—and it was known that his depression experiences with Long-Bell and other business concerns gravely influenced his thinking—was a liberal Democrat. Yet anyone who would automatically put Mr. Andrews into any political camp would be making a grave mistake. He did his own thinking and his leadership was always for the individual or the movement that he thought best for his city, State, or country.

Then Mr. Andrews was active in foundations—notably the Welch Foundation of which he was trustee—and in organizations devoted to charity or to public betterment.

But even the recounting of both Mr. Andrews' private and public careers still fails to give the full flavor of this man.

The real story is the man himself.

First and foremost, Mr. Andrews was a man of old-fashioned integrity. His standards of conduct were those traditional ones that made our country great.

Mr. Andrews never lived in the past. Though 87 years of age he was active up to just a few months ago and his attitude and approach to affairs was that of a man 30 years younger. Reminiscing and living in the past were not for Mr. Andrews.

But the good things of the past—the character, the integrity, the obligation—were his.

Mr. Andrews was a man of education—a man of culture. Tall, large, he was a man of great dignity. But this quiet dignity could not hide his warmth. No man appreciated friends more—and no man was more careful to see to it that he merited friendship by his thoughtfulness.

Yes—by every standard Jesse Andrews was truly a great man.

[From the Houston Post, Dec. 30, 1961]

HOUSTON INDEBTED TO JESSE ANDREWS

Houston has been fortunate in the number of brilliant men who came here in their early years and who gave unselfishly of their time and effort to its development and betterment. Such a man was Jesse Andrews, who died in his 87th year.

Andrews was chairman of the Houston City Planning Commission for 16 years, resigning on his 80th birthday in 1954. During that time the city grew from an area of 73 square miles to 165 square miles and from 385,000 people to approximately 800,000. In tribute to his contributions as chairman, the Houston chapter of the American Institute of Architects last year honored him at a testimonial dinner.

Andrews was born in Waterproof, La., in 1874, the son of a doctor. He studied at Jefferson College in Washington, Miss., and then entered the University of Texas. He took a bachelor's degree and then a law degree. He came to Houston in 1896 after graduating and began the practice of law.

He was senior partner in the law firm of Baker, Botts, Andrews & Shepherd, which he joined as an employee in 1899 when it was Baker, Botts, Baker & Lovett.

At the university he played right guard on the first football team and was a member of Sigma Alpha Epsilon fraternity. In 1959 Houston alumni of the fraternity presented him its SAE of the Year Award for outstanding service to the community and the fraternity.

Service to his fellow man was a fundamental part of the philosophy of Jesse Andrews. He believed in hard work, diligence, and thrift. He loved Houston and Houston is a much better place because he lived here. The community's debt to him is a large one.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Dec. 30, 1961]

LAST RITES SET MONDAY FOR JESSE ANDREWS

Houston will say a last, sad goodby Monday to Jesse Andrews, a giant in law, politics, and finance who helped make his city great.

Andrews, 87, senior partner of the law firm of Baker, Botts, Andrews & Shepherd, and for 16 years chairman of the city planning commission, died Friday after a long illness.

Funeral services are to be held at 4 p.m. Monday at Christ Church Episcopal Cathedral, 1117 Texas, with Rt. Rev. John F. Hines, bishop of the Episcopal diocese of Texas, the Very Reverend J. Milton Richardson, dean of the cathedral, and Rev. Thomas W. Sumners officiating. Rev. Mr. Sumners is rector of St. John the Divine Episcopal Church.

Burial will be in Glenwood Cemetery.

Andrews, who lived at 1715 Kirby, is survived by his wife, Celeste, and a son, Mark Edwin Andrews, a former Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

A native of Waterproof, La., Andrews was the son of a physician. He attended the University of Texas and was a guard on the school's first football team in 1893.

His first job as a lawyer in 1899 was with the firm in which he remained—then named Baker, Botts, Baker & Lovett.

During his legal career he was sent to Kansas City, and there took on the job of counseling his client, the Long-Bell Lumber Co. and saving the multimillion-dollar firm from bankruptcy.

His successful court fight for a lumber industry depletion allowance set the precedent that later obtained the all-important depletion allowance for the oil industry.

The job in Kansas City took 17 years. When it was finished, Andrews returned to Houston in 1935 and plunged actively into city and State affairs. His work for the Democratic Party in Texas brought tributes from Presidents Roosevelt and Truman.

He was on the planning commission until 1956, when he resigned at the age of 82.

Services are being handled by Settegast-Kopf Funeral Home, 3320 Kirby.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Dec. 31, 1961]

JESSE ANDREWS

Houston lost one of its most famous citizens Friday when Jesse Andrews died at the age of 87. Mr. Andrews headed one of the city's largest and best-known legal firms. He was active in politics, finance, and civic activities.

For 16 years, he served as chairman of the city planning commission. He headed the zoning commission, which prepared a zoning ordinance, and led the fight for its adoption. He headed the postwar planning commission, which prepared an $80 million improvement program for the city, and was enthusiastically approved by the voters.

Mr. Andrews was associated with the law firm of Baker, Botts, Andrews & Shepherd for 62 years. In politics, he was an enthusiastic liberal of Franklin Roosevelt persuasion, and is credited with helping to keep Texas in the Roosevelt column in 1944.

When the depression struck he took charge of the Long-Bell Lumber Co. in Kansas City and guided it through reorganization. In a sense he was responsible for the depletion allowance enjoyed by the oil industry, since he persuaded the lawmakers to include such an allowance for the lumber industry when the income tax law was first adopted in 1913.

A graduate of the University of Texas in 1895, Mr. Andrews played on the university's first football team.

Mr. Andrews was a kindly, courteous gentleman. A man of leadership and vision, he will be mourned by thousands who knew and loved him. It will be a long time before Houston sees another like him.

RESOLUTION BY THE HOUSTON DEMOCRATIC WOMAN'S CLUB

Whereas the greatest strength of a community or nation is the character and integrity of its citizens, and the progress of society depends largely, if not entirely, on the leadership and inspiration of those gifted and dedicated individuals to whom the people as a whole look, much as a navigator in olden times looked to the stars, as fixed and unchanging guideposts; and

Whereas a great Houstonian and American, the Honorable Jesse H. Andrews—attorney, political leader, social builder—who through the years richly deserved and emphatically earned the name "Mr. Democrat," given to him in respect for his achievements as a citizen and a dynamic leader in the Democratic Party, which he loved and faithfully served, and whose cause he many times advanced, is one of those rare individuals upon whose shoulders are placed the burden and responsibility of setting the pace and leading the way for the people; and

Whereas Jesse Andrews has been called unto his fathers and has laid down his burdens at the end of a long and valuable life of service, his passing bringing forth grief and praise from untold and countless thousands of his fellow citizens, and from such stalwart leaders in democracy as U.S. Senator Ralph Yarborough, Vice President Lyndon Johnson, and the late Speaker Sam Rayburn; and we who have worked with him and under his outstanding leadership and inspiration do hold him forever in the highest and warmest esteem: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Houston Democratic Woman's Club do acknowledge its debt to him, and do spread upon its permanent records this solemn expression of love and admiration for Jesse (Mr. Democrat) Andrews, with its pledge to follow loyally and indefatigably in his footsteps toward the fulfillment of the Democratic Party's objective of a greater America.

In witness whereof, we have caused our hands and seal this 18th day of January A.D. 1962, at Houston, Harris County, Tex., hereunto to be affixed.

MRS. HARRY C. AUSTIN,
President.
Miss CHATTIE SLAYTON,
Secretary.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time—and I gather that there is none—I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon, on Friday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, February 2, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 31, 1962:

In the Coast Guard

The following U.S. Coast Guard officers for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Capt. William D. Shields
Capt. Richard D. Schmidtman
Capt. Willard J. Smith

Coast and Geodetic Survey

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be ensigns

Donald Glen Popejoy
Harold Neill Estes, Jr.
Robert Anthony Canse
Thomas Patrick Gilmore
Rolland Lee Lech
Daniel Dignan Sweeney
Herbert Lee Manebridge

U.S. Court of Claims

Oscar H. Davis, of New York, to be associate judge of the U.S. Court of Claims, vice Joseph W. Madden, retired.

In the Navy

Rear Adm. Peter Corradi, Civil Engineer Corps, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

Comptroller of the Currency

The following-named person, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the position indicated:

James J. Saxon, of Illinois, to be Comptroller of the Currency, vice Ray M. Gidney, resigned.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate, January 31, 1962:

Director of Central Intelligence Agency

John A. McCone, of California, to be Director of Central Intelligence.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 84: 5: *Blessed is the man whose strength is in Thee.*

Almighty God, may our hearts expand with pride and gratitude that we are Thy children and the citizens of a country whose national life is rooted in the great spiritual principles of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

Grant that we may have a more daring confidence in the dynamic reality and power of those impressive verities and virtues and recognize our responsibility to help make them regnant in the realm of universal history and in the life of burdened and brokenhearted humanity.

We earnestly beseech Thee that our President, our Speaker, and all who are serving our Nation in the affairs of government may be kept by Thy grace in the ways of honor and integrity. Gird them with faith and fortitude. Give them wisdom and understanding, patience and perseverance as they labor for the dawning of that blessed day when reason and righteousness shall be gloriously triumphant.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

SECRET NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned with developments of the last few days which indicate the President may be indulging in further secret negotiations with the Soviet Union. We are still trying to find out exactly what went on in Vienna when the President met with Khrushchev. Neither the Congress nor the American people have ever been given a frank report of that meeting.

News accounts of the past few days lead me to believe the President is indulging in more secret diplomacy with the Soviets and I am concerned with what direction such meetings may lead our national policy and with the ability of those who may be conducting the negotiations. We learn, from the newspapers, that Pierre Salinger, the President's publicity man, spent 4 hours with the Soviet representative in Paris early this week and then flew home to take part in a White House meeting with Khrushchev's son-in-law, the editor of Izvestia, and is now preparing to make an official visit to Moscow in behalf of the President.

I question Mr. Salinger's background and ability to carry on negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union. He is not an elected official, his appointment on the White House staff has never been confirmed by any legislative body. His responsibility is directly to the President and his sole duty, it would appear from the personal propaganda buildup we have been subjected to over the past year, is to keep the President in the public eye and to improve his Gallup Poll rating. There is nothing in his background, as far as I have been able to learn, which would equip him to conduct any kind of negotiations with the Russians, or to advise responsible officials on foreign policy.

I think it is the duty of the President to tell the Congress if he is engaging in secret diplomacy with Khrushchev. We cannot afford another Vienna. We cannot take a chance that the young and inexperienced White House publicity man will be able to deal successfully with the tough representatives of the Kremlin. We need experienced negotiators, a sound policy based on American self-interest, and honesty with Congress and the American people as to just what is going on and what the President hopes to accomplish.

ADMINISTRATION ANTICS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in Punte del Este, Uruguay, the vote has been taken and Fidel Castro has been given an inaudible slap on the wrist. The two largest countries on the South American continent sat it out on the sidelines. This may mean that Douglas Dillon will head for South America soon to pledge them another $20 billion.

Meanwhile, Pierre Salinger has emerged as the new Secretary of State in negotiations between Moscow and Washington, with stopovers in such waypoints as Paris.

With the moonshot missing, and Astronaut Glenn grounded for another 2 weeks, perhaps there will be room in the newspapers for a report on the Hatfield and McCoy feud in Massachusetts.

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make clear my position on the subject of a Department of Urban Affairs.

First, since I have been a Member of Congress I have introduced legislation to create a Department of Urban Affairs. I have spoken and written at some length on the subject. My experience in the executive branch of the Government under the Eisenhower administration and as a Member of Congress has convinced me that the present Federal structure in respect of urban matters in the executive branch is uncoordinated and scattered. For the sake of housekeeping alone, this move is important in order to collect under one roof the many areas of Federal approaches to urban problems now scattered in a variety of departments, bureaus, and sub-agencies. The bill that I drafted I think is a better bill than the administration's bill. The concept, however, is the same, and I will support the proposed reorganization plan.

Second, this does not necessarily mean an enlargement of the Federal Government, any more than did President Eisenhower's reorganization of the Social Security Agency and other Federal interests into a single executive department, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Third, President Kennedy's injection of a racial issue into the subject of a Department of Urban Affairs is shameful. If the proposal is sound, it should be voted on and passed. If it is unsound, it should not. The proposal should be considered on its merits alone. It is unprecedented that a President would announce his appointee to either an executive agency or a court in advance of the creation of the office. Mr. Weaver, the present head of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, is a New Yorker whom I have long known and admired. He is a leading expert on the subject of housing. He would certainly be an excellent choice to head a Department on Urban Affairs when and if created, and I for one would applaud such a selection. The clear implication of President Kennedy's statement was, however, that he was making the advance announcement of his proposed choice because Mr. Weaver is a Negro, not because he is necessarily the best man. This does a disservice to Mr. Weaver, a dedicated public servant, and to the cause of civil rights and its advancement.

REPORT ON NATION'S AERONAUTICS ACTIVITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 324)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 206(b) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, I transmit herewith a report for the calendar year 1961, on this Nation's aeronautics and space activities.

During 1961, major attention was devoted to establishing our policy objective of space leadership and to accelerating our efforts toward achieving that objective.

In my message to the Congress on May 25, 1961, I stated that a leading role in space achievements may well hold the key to this country's future. That I reaffirm. Last year, we made necessary decisions and, with the support of the Congress, stepped up the pace of performance. Even greater strides must be made in the coming months and years, and thus the recommended budget which I submitted to the Congress earlier this month contains requests for funds for the fiscal year 1963 space program, totaling $5.5 billion, an increase of $2.4 billion over fiscal year 1962 and $3.7 billion over fiscal year 1961.

It is the policy of the United States that activities in space be devoted to peaceful purposes and during 1961 we made significant progress in that regard. Such progress included space projects to help keep the peace and space projects to increase man's well-being in peace.

In summary form, the accompanying report indicates the contributions of the various departments and agencies of the Government to a national space program.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 31, 1962.*

MANAGEMENT OF AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 323)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Management of our agricultural resources to meet the triple goals of increased farm income, lower cost to the taxpayer, and reduced farm surpluses continues to be one of the most difficult problems confronting the Nation. A good start was made last year. Net farm income rose $1 billion, and income per farm increased almost $350. Government stocks of farm products were reduced for the first time in 9 years. Budgetary costs were below those that would have been incurred under the programs that were replaced. All this was accomplished at the same time food prices were reduced below their level a year earlier.

But the emergency programs enacted last year are expiring. There is a critical need for permanent legislation to consolidate the gains of 1961 and to provide a realistic and comprehensive program for agriculture in the years ahead, a program with which we can continue to move forward toward full utilization of our abundance. The drift toward a chaotic, inefficient, surplus-ridden farm economy, though halted last year, will resume unless prompt action is taken. In addition, new problems have developed in commodities not covered by the 1961 legislation. Unanticipated changes in consumer demand have produced still further surpluses. A reversion to the former programs for wheat and feed grains will inevitably bring both enormous surpluses and depressed farm income, seriously injuring a large segment of our economy.

OUR INCREASING PRODUCTIVITY

Our rapidly growing capacity to produce far outruns the growth of our domestic and foreign demand for food and fiber. This offers us an opportunity to manage abundance, rather than scarcity, an opportunity that is unique among nations of the world. It is relatively new even for the United States.

Early in this century there was serious question whether agriculture could, with the closing of the land frontier, continue to meet the food and fiber demands of a growing population. The rate of growth in farm output was declining, and food and fiber prices were rising relative to other prices. Public policy emphasized resource conservation and investment, and publicly supported research and education were designed to speed progress in agricultural productivity.

By the mid-1920's, these efforts began to bring dramatic results. Agricultural productivity began to rise and farm employment began to decline. But the full implications of this rapid technological progress in agriculture were obscured—first by the depression, then by the Second World War, and then by the Korean conflict. During the depression the overriding problem was the catastrophic decline in demand for farm products, and policy was directed to protecting farm prices and incomes from its consequences. During the war and the Korean conflict, agricultural programs were designed to encourage increases in output to meet emergency demands and to protect farm incomes when these abnormal demands disappeared.

But in the 1950's, agriculture felt the full effects of earlier programs to raise productivity. Farm output increased by more than one-fourth while use of labor declined by one-third. Surpluses accumulated and farm prices were brought under increasing pressure. Prices today are lower relative to other prices than during the first two decades of this century, even though crops are now harvested from 40 million fewer acres. The technological revolution in agriculture continues to increase yield at an accelerating rate. Our ability to produce more than the market can absorb will continue as far into the future as we can safely predict, outpacing population growth. Instead of a shortage of cropland, as many have long predicted, it now appears that by 1980 we will need 50 million fewer acres than we have today.

The commodity programs which were designed primarily to meet the emergencies of depression and war have retained for agriculture itself only a small part of these gains from increasing productivity. Most of the gains have been passed on to consumers. We spend less than 20 percent of our income on food; the Western European spends between 30 and 50 percent of his income on food; and the Russian uses 60 percent of his income for this same purpose. But failure to control production effectively has dissipated some of our potential gains to both farmers and consumers by drawing prime resources into the production and storage of surplus commodities.

THE NEED FOR ACTION

Most industries are able to adjust to excess supply or reduced demand by variations in their rate of production. The larger the number of individual producing units and the more inflexible their production schedules, however, the more difficult it is to make the necessary adjustments. Our farm production is composed of millions of separate producers with schedules that must be planned a year or more in advance. Acting individually, the farmer cannot shift readily away from commodities in surplus. Nor will lower farm prices automatically assure reduced farm output, unless those prices fall to disastrous levels and remain there. Historically, lower prices have been met by increased output, in a desperate effort by the farmer to make his business profitable and to stay on the land.

Four independent studies, by Cornell University, Iowa State University, the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, and the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, show how sharp would be the drop in farm prices and farm income if farm programs were abandoned. These studies agree that wheat prices would be sliced almost in half, oat prices 25 percent, barley 28 percent, soybeans 38 percent, grain sorghums 22 percent, and dairy 17 percent. Non-price-supported commodities would also suffer. Livestock commodities would drop 24 percent, egg prices 20 percent, cattle prices 25 percent, hogs 30 percent, and broilers and turkeys even lower than this year.

Nor can the Federal Government be expected to undertake an indefinite program of large and unpredictable budget expenditures to acquire stocks of commodities that we do not need and cannot use. By the beginning of 1961—when the emergency legislation was introduced to reduce inventories—the Commodity Credit Corporation had over $9 billion in loans and inventories. Carrying costs exceeded $1 billion a year.

This large and continuing expenditure did not result in any increased income to the farmer. The 1.5 million efficient family farms which produce 87 percent of our total production are technically progressive, but their return on labor and capital has not kept pace with the rest of the population. Their incomes are highly sensitive to year-to-year fluctuations in farm output, especially when it is unrelated to demand.

The other 2 million or more farm operators who produce 13 percent of all farm products sold have especially low incomes because they own or control too little land or too little capital, and often possess too little skill or managerial ability.

Small town and rural America is dependent for prosperity upon the farmer. An improvement in his standard of living and in his income is immediately reflected in an improvement in the economy of the small urban center in his community. Any program should bear in mind this factor.

Our two goals—improving income and reducing costs—can both be achieved only if farm output can be reduced below needs for several years and then be allowed to increase at a rate equal to the growth in demand. That is the framework of logic and fact in which we now propose a broad new farm program—a program in four parts—each equally important and all interdependent.

OBJECTIVES

The new program should use the successful emergency legislation passed last year to establish guidelines and should also rely upon those proven techniques and methods that have been employed in the past. It should be designed:

1. To make maximum use of our productive abundance. Our agricultural resources can advance the cause of peace and freedom throughout the world; they assure Americans of a high standard of living; they can be an important weapon against poverty and disease.

2. To seek a balance between production and demand that will avoid the waste of private effort and public resources. Rice, peanuts, and tobacco already enjoy well-balanced programs whose principles can be extended to other crops. Properly balanced, agriculture can make a major contribution toward economic stability. The farmer, the consumer and the taxpayer can all share in the benefits; without such balance, all may suffer.

3. To provide for conservation of our land and water resources. Land and water not needed to produce food and fiber should be directed to alternative uses of benefit to the Nation.

4. To initiate and expand programs for the development of human resources and renewal of rural communities. Each year 1 million people move from the farm to the city. Many others seek part-time employment to supplement meager returns from farm labor. The hardship and suffering this often entails should be alleviated, and these workers assisted in their efforts to acquire needed skills, obtain jobs, and further their education.

Abundance, balance, conservation, development—these are our commonsense goals, as commonsense as A B C D. The program that follows—an A B C D farm program for the 1960's—is designed to meet those goals.

This is a program for maximum freedom and flexibility in the operation of individual farm enterprises. Improvements in farming efficiency as well as shifts among enterprises must not only be allowed—they must be encouraged. They are in the long-run national interest; they are consistent with this program's overall objectives.

The new commodity programs recommended could become effective only after they are approved democratically by a two-thirds majority in a producer referendum. Producers of cotton, tobacco, rice, peanuts, and wheat have long followed this procedure of choosing jointly to exert a measure of control over the production and marketing of their crops, just as industry groups exercise control over the product of their labor and investment. This democratic procedure can be extended to other farm commodities.

I. EXPANDED USE OF AGRICULTURAL ABUNDANCE

Last year there was a greater expansion of our food-utilization programs than ever before in our history.

Eighty-five thousand more schools, child-care centers, and camps are receiving fresh milk that previously had no such opportunity. Seven hundred thousand more children enjoy a hot school lunch. Both the quantity and the variety of food distributed to more than 6 million needy persons has been increased substantially.

A pilot food stamp program in eight communities has brought such encouraging results that its administrative expansion in a further trial period to many additional communities is justified and is included in the new budget.

We have also increased our shipments of food to other nations under Public Law 80, thus using our agricultural abundance to combat hunger and contribute to economic development throughout the free world. We have stepped up our emphasis on school lunch programs abroad, thus encouraging both education and better nutrition for the rising generation, on which so much of the future of these new nations depends. We shall continue to expand these programs wherever feasible.

We have markedly increased programs under which U.S. food is used to further projects for social and economic development in emerging nations. Today American agricultural abundance assists such projects in 11 countries, as compared with only 2 in 1960. And more than three-fourths of the local currency accruing from the sales authorized under title I in 1961 will be used for economic development programs.

Our overall shipments under Public Law 480 during this fiscal year will reach an estimated 22 percent more than those of the previous fiscal year.

Last year the Congress extended and improved Public Law 480. In order that our food-for-peace program can be made even more effective in the future I recommend:

(1) An amendment of title II of Public Law 480 to permit shipments of surplus commodities such as dried beans and peas not in CCC inventory;

(2) Provisions to broaden the purpose of title IV to include market development; and

(3) A new title V to promote multinational programs for food assistance, authorizing the President to negotiate and carry out agreements for this purpose with international organizations and other intergovernmental groupings.

II. I RECOMMEND NEW PROGRAMS FOR FEED GRAINS, WHEAT, AND DAIRY PRODUCTS TO ACHIEVE THE PROPER BALANCE BETWEEN PRODUCTION AND DEMAND, AND MODIFICATION OF THE COTTON PROGRAM

FEED GRAINS

For 9 consecutive years, prior to 1961 feed grain surpluses increased. The cost of carrying corn and grain sorghum inventories rose to nearly $500 million in 1961, and the total program cost rose to a record level.

The 1961 feed grain program has reversed this trend. The 1961 crop was 800 million bushels smaller than it would have been without the program. The feed grain carryover will drop for the first time in a decade. A program similar to that of 1961 remains in operation for 1962 only. Without new legislation, the programs which failed us in the 1950's will automatically take effect again in 1963.

The feed grain program I recommend is designed to reduce feed grain output to a level that will maintain prices and incomes in the feed grain and livestock sectors of the farm economy without continuous ever-higher surplus accumulation. This can be accomplished by establishing a mandatory acreage allotment on all feed grains large enough to meet annual domestic and export requirements, for all purposes under all programs, less that amount which is to be deducted from the carryover stocks to reduce them gradually to a level no higher than that required for stability and security. Producers would share in the national allotment on the basis of past production, adjusted for unusual circumstances. Payments for diverted acreage would, of course, continue to be made to support farm income while surplus stocks are being reduced.

Initiation of this program is proposed for the 1963 crop year, subject to approval by a producer referendum.

WHEAT

The problems of wheat production are much the same as for feed grains. Large inventories and high program costs were inherited from the 1950's. The temporary 1962 wheat program is expected to halt the accumulation of wheat surpluses, but the old programs—which have already failed—will become effective again for the 1963 crop unless legislation is promptly enacted.

I recommend a wheat program which will reduce wheat stocks to manageable levels, improve the competitive position of American wheat in world markets, and maintain the incomes of wheat producers. To achieve these objectives, national wheat acreage allotments will be established by estimating the actual requirements each year for milling, seed, and for export, and deducting a number of bushels that will permit us to draw upon our surplus stocks on hand to gradually reduce the carryover to the level required for stability and security. Marketing certificates would be used to assure growers a price-support level between 75 and 90 percent of parity on the domestic allotment and up to 90 percent on the export allotment. The national allotment would be apportioned among all growers, including small growers, on the basis of past wheat acreage. The Secretary of Agriculture will have authority to make payments, which will help to maintain producers' incomes, for mandatory diversion of acreage from wheat to soil-conserving uses, and to offer such payments as an incentive for further voluntary acreage diversion.

Initiation of this program is necessary for the 1963 crop year. As in the case of feed grains, it would be subject to approval by a producer referendum.

COTTON

Cotton suffers chiefly from the attempt to adopt a single legislative program to widely divergent crop needs. There is a sharp conflict between the demand for cheap cotton that can compete effectively with substitute fibers and the need for support levels high enough to assure farmers an adequate income; between the interest of textile millowners—who face stiffening world competition—in low raw material costs and in the interest of the producer in income sufficiently high to cover his costs; and between our Nation's desire to expand further our world trade in cotton and to hold down a Federal budget already augmented by cotton export subsidies. These conflicts can best be reconciled by a program which establishes a support price upon allotted acreage but permits efficient producers to grow additional acreage at the world price.

I recommend that the Secretary of Agriculture be given authority to:

1. Establish the acreage allotment at a level which would produce the cotton needed for domestic use and such portion of the cotton exports as he may determine.

2. Authorize growers to exceed their farm acreage allotment by up to 30 percent, with the cotton produced on the additional acreage to be marketed under a plan which will net the grower approximately the world market price.

DAIRY PRODUCTS

Milk and dairy products constitute one of our most important sources of nutrients. They are also one of our most valuable farm products, bringing twice the cash income of the basic crops.

Incomes of dairy farmers were improved by the bill passed by Congress late in 1960 to increase the support price for milk from $3.06 to $3.22 per hundred pounds and by the increase in the support price last March to $3.40 per hundred pounds for the current marketing year.

Unfortunately, milk producers now face a serious setback. An unexpected decline in the consumption of milk during the past year, amounting to nearly 3 billion pounds, will result in Government expenditures this year of approximately $500 million to support the prices of dairy products. There is no evidence as yet that this decline in consumption will be reversed in the year ahead. Under the present law, the Secretary of Agriculture is not authorized to set the price-support rate for milk above 75 percent of parity unless "necessary in order to assure an adequate supply." Under this law, in the present supply situation, the reduced support price must be announced for the marketing year beginning next April 1.

Such a reduction in milk price supports will gravely impair the incomes of milk producers. It will not, however, succeed in reducing Government expenditures to a reasonable and justifiable level. Even at 75 percent of parity—the minimum level specified in the present law—Government costs for supporting prices of dairy products will probably exceed $440 million next year, as production continues to exceed consumption.

New legislation to correct the shortcomings of the present dairy price support laws is, therefore, urgently required, for the benefit of both farmer and taxpayer. I recommend passage by the Congress of legislation which will: (a) maintain the income of the dairy farmers by establishing support prices of up to 90 percent of parity under a supply-management program; and (b) reduce the budgetary expenditures for the dairy price support program to the cost of acquiring dairy products needed for domestic welfare and foreign assistance programs, up to a maximum of $300 million per year, plus the costs incurred in the special milk and school lunch programs.

Each milk producer would be assigned a marketing base equal to his marketings of milk in 1961. His marketing allotment for the current year would reflect a percentage of his base proportionate to his share of the estimated commercial demand and the quantities needed for Government programs in the national interest. Producers who market milk in excess of their allotments would pay surplus marketing fees on such milk, which would be used to purchase and dispose of the surplus products produced from excess milk.

Milk producers would be provided an opportunity to vote upon this program in a referendum. In the event the milk producers reject this program a support price would be established at such a level as to limit budgetary expenditures to $300 million a year. Authority is also requested to include supply management provisions in Federal milk marketing orders when desired by milk producers in markets regulated under such orders.

While this legislation is being considered and implemented, in order to prevent disruption of markets by reduction of price supports to 75 percent of parity as required under the present law on April 1, 1962, I recommend enactment of a joint resolution authorizing the continuation of price supports on dairy products at the current level until December 31, 1962.

III. EFFICIENT CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION OF LAND

The scope of agricultural technology promises abundance tomorrow as well as today. For the first time in our history we can confidently predict that our future food and fiber needs can be met with fewer acres of cropland. In spite of a 65 million increase in population by 1980, our farms will be able to produce all we need with 50 million fewer acres than we have in cropland today.

This prospect offers us an opportunity to take advantage of the unused acres for a wide range of recreational, esthetic, and economic purposes. Land use changes are not only important to balanced production, they can also supply the growing demand for outdoor recreational areas and wildlife promotion, for woodlots and forests, and for grazing. We can transfer cropland to grass and trees—and we can place greater emphasis on wildlife and recreation development in the small watershed programs.

I recommend legislation to encourage a comprehensive survey of land uses, to undertake a research program on the conversion of land to alternate purposes, and to initiate a series of pilot and demonstration land use projects. As the pilot plan is evaluated and a permanent program for land use developed, it will be possible for our supply management efforts to place less emphasis on temporary diversion of acreage from the production of specific crops, and more on the permanent utilization of acreage to fulfill other public needs.

An effective land use program also requires the following additional legislation:

1. Amendment of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to expand the agricultural conservation program to include payments and cost-sharing arrangements, under long-term contracts, which would permit changes in cropping systems and land uses for the conservation and development of soil, water, forests, wildlife, and recreational resources.

2. Amendment of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to include the use of land acquired under that act for recreational development and wildlife protection.

3. Amendment of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to permit the Secretary to share in the cost of any land acquired by local organizations for operation as a reservoir of public fish, wildlife or recreational development.

4. Modification of the Watershed Act to provide for loans for recreational facilities.

5. Expansion of the authority of the Farmers Home Administration to make loans to farmers for recreational enterprises.

Additional legislation for conservation of our renewable resources is also necessary. These recommendations will be included in a message I will send to the Congress devoted to proposals for the maximum utilization of our land resources.

IV. DEVELOPMENT AND UTILIZATION OF AGRICULTURE'S HUMAN RESOURCES

The Department of Agriculture has launched a series of programs for the development and renewal of rural areas and rural communities. These programs are designed to end rural poverty by offering new opportunities—both agricultural and nonagricultural—to rural people. Activities of the Rural Electrification Administration, the Farmers Home Administration, the Federal Extension Service, and other Department agencies are being coordinated under the rural area development program in close cooperation with the Area Redevelopment Administration.

To make the most of the human resources in these rural areas, there is one need that transcends all others—that is education. Education can give them new vistas, new opportunities, new skills in place of the poverty that no price-support program will ever remove.

Most of the necessary activities are already authorized by law. However, some additional authority is needed.

In many rural areas, the difficulty of financing adequate safe and sanitary housing and modern community facilities such as water and sewage systems, recreational installations, and transportation, has deterred general community improvement and more rapid industrialization. I recommend, therefore, new legislation to enable the Farmers Home Administration to finance sewage systems and other rural community facilities.

RURAL RENEWAL AND EDUCATION

In some rural areas the general level of economic activity and family income is so low, and the lack of community facilities so acute, that a complete new development operation is the only sensible solution—a program of "rural renewal."

For these areas, in addition to the nationwide rural area development program, I recommend a new legislative program under the Area Redevelopment Administration, to provide loans and technical assistance to local public rural renewal corporations. These corporations would aid in developing new uses for land and water, create forest industry parks, assist small farmers in farm consolidation and enlargement, and develop needed public facilities, including outdoor recreation. The bill would permit loans to approved public agencies to acquire, develop, and dispose of land for these purposes, and provide for other loans to individual farmers to establish recreational facilities and other income-producing enterprises. Consideration might also be given to making loans available to rural citizens, both young and old, for vocational and other educational training not otherwise available but essential to their preparation for nonfarm jobs.

CONCLUSION

The goals of this program for food and agriculture are goals on which there is broad general agreement.

First, we seek to enable efficient farm operators to earn incomes equivalent to those earned in comparable nonfarm occupations.

Second, we seek continued production of food and fiber at reasonable prices in quantities sufficient to meet the needs of all Americans and to combat hunger and contribute to economic development throughout the free world.

Third, since we seek abundance for our children as well as for ourselves, we must conserve and use wisely our resources of land and water.

Fourth, we seek to end rural poverty. Farm children, and many farm adults as well, need improved opportunities for education and training, to equip them to earn an American standard of living in whatever occupation they freely choose to follow.

We will enjoy the fruits of the technological revolution in American agriculture only if we recognize its implications. We must learn to live with an agricultural economy of abundance rather than scarcity. That is the purpose of the approach I have outlined—a comprehensive, long-range program to replace the present patchwork of short-run emergency measures.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 31, 1962.*

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION RESOLUTION FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1962

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 612) making supplemental appropriations for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I trust the gentleman is going to take ample time to explain this resolution.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, we will. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and I and the other members of the committee are all here, and we will be prepared to answer any questions that may be asked.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, namely:

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Veterans' Administration

Readjustment Benefits

For an additional amount for "Readjustment benefits," $55,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Loan Guaranty Revolving Fund

An additional amount of not to exceed $115,247,000 shall be available in the "Loan guaranty revolving fund" for expenses for property acquisitions and other loan guaranty and insurance operations under chapter 37, title 38, United States Code, except administrative expenses, as authorized by section 1824 of such title: *Provided,* That in addition to amounts heretofore made available, not to exceed $115,247,000 of the "Direct loans to veterans and reserves revolving fund" shall be available, during the current fiscal year, for transfer to said "Loan guaranty revolving fund" in such amounts as may be necessary to provide for the foregoing expenses.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, may I say to my colleagues that this is really a deficiency for about 13,000 Korean veterans. That is the nub of it.

Mr. Speaker, we have two items in here, one for $55 million to finish out the balance of fiscal year 1962 for these 13,000 Korean GI's on which to go to school. The Veterans' Administration just simply made a bad guess—13,000 more of them took advantage of the GI educational bill than they anticipated. That item is in the amount of $55 million.

Mr. Speaker, the other item goes to what I call taking care of the foreclosed GI home mortgages. The present estimate is that there will be 17,000 of them this year. The liability of the U.S. Government, as you well know, is in the amount of $7,500 each. There are a half dozen reasons why these foreclosures are picking up. They have been picking up for the last 18 months, more accurately, for the last 2 years. They think they have reached the top on the foreclosures. There are some half dozen causes that we can ascribe for this, but the main one is pure economics. These young veterans are living and working, say, in a big factory which has a contract of some type with the Government or some other occupation. The work shuts down, and they are just not able to make their monthly payments. They have been turning back the houses. The Government has to repossess them. In round figures they are losing about $1,000 per house. Last year you will recall that we set up a revolving fund of $120 million to take care of this. What we are doing here is adding to that revolving fund about $115 million. However, we are not making a direct appropriation of that money, and I want to call your attention to that fact. We are merely saying to the Veterans' Administration to go to the Treasury and use what we normally call their back-door spending, of which they have the advantage. They can use that instead of a direct appropriation. Therefore we are not making a direct appropriation for that sum of $115 million.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], a member of our committee.

Mr. BOW. Would the gentleman advise the House with reference to the estimates that were made by the Veterans' Administration as to how many loans would be in default and how far off they have been in their request based upon the estimates of last year?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, as the gentleman knows, they missed it pretty bad. They are off about 7,000. In other words, 7,000 have been picked up this year over last year.

Mr. BOW. In other words, they were off in their estimate?

Mr. THOMAS. That is right.

Mr. BOW. There have been about 8,000 more up for foreclosure this year than they had anticipated last year?

Mr. THOMAS. That is right; the gentleman's figures are correct.

Mr. BOW. And, it is now, as I understand it, 18,000 at this point?

Mr. THOMAS. Right at 18,000.

Mr. Speaker, our very able, genial colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], has expressed a great deal of interest in this matter, and he wants to know in no uncertain terms—and, certainly, we are delighted to give him that information now—whether or not this is going to effect a slowdown or retard the direct loan program to the veterans. The answer is categorically "No." If they need funds, then they can come in here and recommend to the House that we supply those funds.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Let me see if I can get this straight. Do I understand these defaults increased by some 7,500, or 7,000, in a matter of the last 5 or 6 months?

Mr. THOMAS. Not 5 or 6 months; in the last 8 or 10 or 12 months.

Mr. GROSS. During this period when we were supposed to have cured unemployment and were wallowing in so much prosperity these defalcations have increased; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. I would ask the gentleman not to put words in my mouth.

Mr. GROSS. No; I am just asking the question.

Mr. THOMAS. The fact remains they have increased.

Mr. GROSS. Now, I do not expect to get an answer exactly to this question——

Mr. THOMAS. I shall be glad to answer any question the distinguished gentleman cares to ask, if I can.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has said that the Government is losing only $1,000 per case.

Mr. THOMAS. I did not say "only"; I said about $1,000.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman say that that is the average loss?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, if the Government is losing only $1,000, what was the original cost of one of these properties? This does not seem realistic to me.

Mr. THOMAS. The Government's outside liability on one of these GI mortgages is $7,500.

Mr. GROSS. We are seeing a tremendous increase in the rate of defalcations of businesses throughout the entire country, which means that there is something pretty soft in the economy of this country. I am talking about business defalcations now.

Mr. THOMAS. I would like to answer the gentleman's questions, but the gentleman is making a speech now. What the gentleman has said is not true as far as these veterans is concerned, as he can see, if he will look at the record.

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about the general economy, the general business situation in this country. Yet we go on here day after day, as we did yesterday, voting for an outlay of $1.2 billion for educational purposes, with the economy going soft on us. And I do not like it.

Mr. THOMAS. These foreclosures are occurring in about a dozen spots in the country, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman a few moments ago referred in the application of this resolution to so-called back-door spending. Will the gentleman enlarge upon that statement a little?

Mr. THOMAS. The Veterans' Administration has authority to go to the Treasury during the fiscal year 1962 and procure $500 million, without its being voted by the Congress. That is what makes it back-door spending. This is for direct loans. What is involved here is not a direct loan. This is a guaranteed loan. We have no disposition in the committee to interfere with anything. We are not trying to slow down any program. We think this is a sound way to handle the matter under the circumstances. My distinguished friend from Indiana is one of the able members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; and I shall not limit it to that, he is one of the able Members of the House. I think I can speak for the committee and tell you that the program will not be hurt.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am really startled by this report. I had not realized that there was this difficulty in foreclosures on these veterans' loans. I notice on page 19 of the hearings the testimony shows that these are located in Detroit, Chicago, Wichita, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Houston, San Antonio, Lubbock, St. Petersburg, San Francisco, Newark, Dallas, Montgomery, Milwaukee, New Orleans, and Seattle.

Can the gentleman tell me how many foreclosures have actually occurred—how many in number?

Mr. THOMAS. There were 13,881 properties on hand now and by the end of the fiscal year it is expected to be between 17,000 and 18,000.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I have not had a chance to go through the hearings. Do the hearings reveal what lies behind this?

Mr. THOMAS. We spent much time on that; yes, sir. I tried to summarize that a little while ago. I will say to my distinguished friend, it boils itself down to five or six or, perhaps, seven causes. When you get through with it, my judgment is that 95 percent of the foreclosures are for purely economic reasons. Some of them are for social reasons such as divorces, and so on. Some of it is caused by a change in jobs. But, I still think that the main cause is economics—mainly, the loss of a job.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I would like to say this to the gentleman, I hope that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, particularly their Subcommittee on Housing, will get into this thing because I think these figures are quite startling. I heard one of the gentlemen who was interrogating the gentleman from Texas say that this is an indication that, perhaps, our economy is not quite as solid as some of us have thought. Frankly, I am one who does feel that our economy basically is in pretty good shape, and these are startling figures.

Mr. THOMAS. The figures on the national productive record are going up every year, if that is an indication. But, may I say to my good friend, we are getting into a field that is somewhat removed from the little item that we are considering here now.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank my distinguished friend.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. May I ask what is the percentage of foreclosures in relation to the total value of loans in existence? That, I believe, is the point involved here.

Mr. THOMAS. It is very, very small. You have a total of about 5,500,000 loans and while 17,000 foreclosures this year are too many, still on an overall basis it is, of course, very, very small.

Mr. BONNER. I would think that clears up the situation. If we were considering the legitimate business market would there not be that many foreclosures even in the building and loan associations?

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, I would have to guess as to that, but my guess is that there would be more than that.

Mr. BONNER. So, therefore, there is nothing unusual in this figure.

Mr. THOMAS. The figure is very small and nothing to get excited about even though it is bad enough as it is.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Would the gentleman be able to inform us if there will be funds available now for direct loans by the Veterans' Administration to new applicants, if this money is used as is proposed here?

Mr. THOMAS. May I answer the gentleman's question this way. As of today it is around $300 million to $400 million. That is as of today. Come July 1, you will add $200 million more.

Mr. ADAIR. And that amount would be available to the Veterans' Administration for the purpose of making direct loans?

Mr. THOMAS. Absolutely; the gentleman is 100-percent correct.

Mr. ADAIR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, this is not an unusual situation insofar as appropriating money goes. However, it is a most distasteful situation. The matter cannot be handled in any better way than in this manner.

Mr. THOMAS. As usual, my colleague is 100-percent correct.

Mr. JENSEN. There is no better way to furnish the money that is needed for this purpose. I am greatly disturbed, however, as I am sure most of the Members are who know about this matter, when veterans who have served their country and fought for their country are losing their homes. Almost 18,000 of them have already lost their homes through foreclosure. Many of these foreclosures are due to the fact that the veterans have been called back into the service during the past year and hence lost their jobs and were not able to meet the payments. Where those 18,000 veterans and their families now live is a mystery to me. I know they are in bad financial straits. I am sure they and their families are worried and must feel their Uncle Sam does not appreciate their services in times of hot war. I hope that by some manner or means we can stop those foreclosures.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me thank our able and genial colleague for his contribution; he is always helpful.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mrs. HANSEN. In connection with any consideration of appropriations for the Veterans' Administration, I have a strong interest related to the welfare of veterans of the district which I represent.

I have voiced this need many times previously—both before the House and to the Veterans' Administration—and will continue to call attention to it whenever and wherever necessary until that need is recognized and met.

I refer to the need to replace with a modern facility the 21-year-old temporary Veterans' Administration hospital installation at Vancouver, Wash.

It is obvious to me that if the Vancouver hospital is to be operated for an indefinite period in the future, replacement of its outmoded buildings is absolutely essential.

Replacement is essential because its continued operation is essential, as clearly demonstrated by its past excellent record of use and performance, as well as the testimony of veterans' groups from all parts of the Pacific Northwest.

Involved, of course, is the question of priority with related timing of other projects and availability of funds for the hospital construction and modernization program.

I submit that this project merits high priority rating.

To my knowledge, there is only one other such cantonment-type facility still in use in the veterans' hospital system. It is antiquated in both age and layout.

This sprawling installation at Vancouver was hastily built for the U.S. Army in 1941 as a general hospital for the treatment of sick and wounded soldiers through World War II.

After a brief closure at the end of the war, the Veterans' Administration reopened the hospital to provide care for the Pacific Northwest's rapidly expanding veteran population.

The detrimental effects of time and use on an originally temporary installation, added to the architectural advances in hospital design over the past 21 years, surely make this facility at Vancouver as worn out and obsolete as any in the Nation.

My concern for the need for a new hospital at Vancouver is inseparable from my concern for the welfare of veterans generally. I will always support measures and appropriations for their benefit, as I am with the appropriation now before the House.

It is my most earnest hope, however, that the Veterans' Administration will in the near future schedule the replacement of the obsolete hospital buildings at Vancouver.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTRASTATE MOTOR CARRIERS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 451 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 320) to amend the provisions contained in part II of the Interstate Commerce Act concerning registration of State certificates whereby a common carrier by motor vehicle may engage in interstate and foreign commerce within a State. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 9]

Battin
Casey
Celler
Chiperfield
Colmer
Curtis, Mass.
Davis, James C.
Davis, Tenn.
Dingell
Dominick
Fallon
Fogarty
Green, Pa.
Hébert
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Hosmer
Jarman
Kee
Kyl
Laird
May
Merrow
Miller, N.Y.
Powell
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Rostenkowski
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Sikes
Smith, Miss.
Springer
Steed
Thompson, N.J.
Ullman

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and ninety Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INTRASTATE MOTOR CARRIERS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, the majority leader.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

INTRASTATE MOTOR CARRIERS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 451 provides for the consideration of S. 320, a bill to amend the provisions contained in part II of the Interstate Commerce Act concerning registration of State certificates whereby a common carrier by motor vehicle may engage in interstate and foreign commerce within a State. The resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

At present the right to engage in interstate or foreign commerce by an intrastate carrier is automatically obtained by filing its State certificate with the Interstate Commerce Commission. The carrier by such filing is then authorized to engage in interstate or foreign commerce to the same extent that the carrier is authorized to engage in intrastate commerce as described in the particular State certificate filed with the Commission. Such operations in interstate and foreign commerce must, of course, be carried on entirely within the State in which the motor carrier is certificated to operate.

The Interstate Commerce Commission under existing law has no discretion in accepting a State certificate for registration. The certificate must be accepted, registered, and the motor carrier allowed to engage in interstate and foreign commerce. By so doing, such intrastate carrier becomes subject to the regulatory and safety provisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission when engaged in interstate and foreign commerce. The validity of the certificate filed with the Commission depends on its continued validity within the State.

The purpose of S. 320 is to repeal the second proviso of section 206(a)(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act and insert two new paragraphs at the end of section 206(a) which permit State commissions, under a specific procedure applicable with respect to future applications, to grant to motor common carriers operating within a single State the right to engage in interstate or foreign operations within the boundaries of the State in which intrastate authority is being simultaneously authorized, and to provide for the issuance of certificates of registration by the Interstate Commerce Commission to existing carriers engaged in interstate operations under the terms of the present second proviso.

New paragraph (6) proposed by S. 320 would provide that no certificate of public convenience and necessity from the Interstate Commerce Commission would be required for operations in interstate or foreign commerce by a common carrier by motor vehicle operations solely within a single State and not controlled by, controlling, or under a common control with any carrier engaged in operations outside such State under certain conditions. Except for the method of certification, the carrier would be subject to all applicable requirements of the Interstate Commerce Act, such as insurance, the filing of rates, and so forth.

New paragraph (7) proposed by the bill would provide in part that intrastate motor carriers who prior to the act were lawfully engaged in interstate or foreign commerce within the State, shall upon application to the Interstate Commerce Commission and submission of proof of operation, be issued certificates of registration by the ICC authorizing continuance of their operations. The scope of interstate or foreign operations authorized in the certificates must not exceed in scope the services authorized by the State certificates and the certificates of registration shall in general be subject to the same terms, conditions, and limitations as are contained in the State certificates. These carriers will be subject to all applicable requirements of the Interstate Commerce Act, including suspension and termination.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the rule. Amendments to the bill will be offered, some by my colleague on the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, as stated by the gentleman from Texas, this bill does have to do with interstate motor carriers and interstate commerce and providing certain amendments, the purpose of which he has set forth. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate. It is an open rule and the time will be equally divided on both sides of the aisle. When the bill, S. 320, came before the Committee on Rules last year on September 6, a rule was granted which, I believe, was a little bit of a peculiar rule inasmuch as there was some objection to certain provisions of this bill by some of the small carriers with the result that a rule was granted on condition that the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] could work out certain of these difficulties with the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] on amendments so that the bill could proceed, and the bill is here today.

It is my understanding that the amendments of the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] are satisfactory to the small carriers. They are so far as California is concerned. I also understand, and I believe I am correct in stating that the American Trucking Associations agrees with the amendments.

I have just been advised that there is certain language in these amendments that will be objected to by certain members of the committee. I want to bring that to your attention because I cannot say to you now that everybody agrees with all of these amendments.

This is a difficult field. When you get into intrastate and interstate rights with the motor carriers, it is, of course, an extremely confused and important field to them, and a very difficult one because certain intrastate carriers who may have rights in the State of Ohio in turn will have certain Federal rights under the ICC to carry goods that is traveling in interstate commerce. In other words, they may go from Columbus to Akron. That may be a local intrastate right granted to them by the public utilities commission of that State.

Let us say for the sake of argument and to illustrate the point that certain interstate goods travel from Minnesota to Kentucky and go through those two cities. If this local carrier carries them then he has heretofore in all probability been granted rights under ICC consistent with his intrastate rights.

As I understand, the small carriers are afraid they may lose some of these rights. It is a very complicated matter.

The words "prima facie" are carried in the bill. They think that phrase should be "conclusive" rather than "prima facie."

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. The gentleman has mentioned Ohio. As the gentleman probably knows, Ohio with respect to the intrastate trucking industry is very much interested in this legislation. The gentleman knows, I believe, every Member of Congress knows, that practically all interstate highways east and west go through Ohio except those in the extreme southern part of the Nation. This sets up quite a problem because quite a lot of truck traffic originates in Ohio and ends in Ohio; and there is a desire on the part of the trucking organizations of Ohio to have proper language written into this bill to leave them their present rights without any injury to the interstate trucking industry rights.

Mr. SMITH of California. I thank the gentleman.

According to a provision written in the report on the bill, that is one of the purposes of the bill. We realize, of course, that small carriers have certain intrastate rights. This is competitive business. The long haulers are out for certificates of necessity trying to gain rights to carry over the same routes. As I say, the trucking industry is competitive, and no one wants to hurt them in any way, and the bill is not so intended.

I would ask you to listen to the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from California, and if any objections are in the mind of any member of the committee listen to the objections as well as to the arguments in favor of it before making your decision on this particular bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman has made a very good statement on a very difficult and highly complex problem.

There were a good many amendments to which the committee agreed that were included in the bill when it was reported. There were several of the so-called Sisk amendments, around 9 or 10, that were to be considered. The committee has considered all these amendments which the gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk] has proposed. The committee has also considered the action of the American Trucking Associations. Since there are so many amendments involved together with the committee amendment, we discussed the situation with the Parliamentarian, and it was decided that the best thing to do would be to offer a complete substitute, and this will be done.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce this morning directed me to offer the amendment on behalf of the committee. I should like to advise the House that I will on behalf of the committee offer a substitute which will include the amendment the committee adopted and will include all of the amendments which the gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk] has proposed, with the exception of one sentence in one amendment having to do with the revocation of the interstate operating authority. That will be the only question, as I understand, in the course of the debate.

Mr. SMITH of California. Has this been discussed with the gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk]?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, the gentleman from California is fully advised.

Mr. SMITH of California. Do you know if he has objected to the changes the committee has suggested?

Mr. HARRIS. I understand he has no objection to the approach which we are making here. It is an effort to expedite consideration of the bill, by including all of the questions involved in one amendment. To take them up one by one would take the rest of today and perhaps tomorrow.

Mr. SMITH of California. With this language deleted, can the gentleman tell me whether or not the small carriers that have made objections previously, that we thought were cleared up, will now go back and object?

Mr. HARRIS. We are agreeing to all of the amendments that the carriers objected to, with the exception of one procedure contained in one sentence.

Mr. SMITH of California. It has taken some period of time to get these small carriers and everybody together where they agreed. I understood they were not agreed on this particular language.

Mr. HARRIS. We are accepting that.

Mr. SMITH of California. That is taken care of?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, that is taken care of.

Mr. SMITH of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I want to say at the outset I appreciate very much the cooperation and the kindness of the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris], chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and also the subcommittee chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Williams].

I suppose at times they felt I was a bit of a thorn in their flesh, but they have never resented it and have been most cooperative, although at times we have not entirely agreed.

My colleague from California [Mr. Smith] has pretty well outlined the situation as it exists with reference to our carriers in California, and the great number of small truckers operating in that State. After the original amendment was offered before the committee last summer regarding the substitution of "conclusive" in place of "prima facie" as presently in the bill, a number of discussions have gone on in an attempt to completely agree on these particular regulations. Certainly, as the chairman of the committee and the other gentlemen who have spoken indicate, this is a rather complicated subject. I am somewhat presumptuous to even get into it. But there has been grave concern across the country by many hundreds, in fact several thousand small truck operators as to rights they might possibly lose under this new legislation.

As I understand it, under the 1935 act the small operators were grandfathered in on this, and those thereafter who have started business were permitted to handle interstate commerce, even though they were intrastate operators—that is, operating within State lines, and for all practical purposes enjoyed what would amount to a certificate of public convenience and necessity. The bill which we have now, which proposes to substantially change this law, of course was of grave concern to many operators across our country as to whether or not they were going to be denied certain of the rights which they had heretofore had the use of. The language which has been briefly discussed has gone through a great deal of trial and error, so to speak, and a great deal of it changed.

I appreciate the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has outlined the procedure that now will be followed in the substitute bill which will be offered, including all of the committee amendments, plus the amendments which I have suggested, except the one specific amendment which is the heart, I might say, and body of the small truck operators' concern.

May I say that many of these operators have felt over the years that for all practical purposes they have enjoyed certificates of public convenience and necessity and that now under the change of the law unless they are fully protected they could lose substantial rights which now exist. So, after some long deliberations with various common carrier groups across the country, certain amendments were agreed to, but the small truck lines and small operators were not in agreement because they did not fully protect their rights which they at the present time enjoy.

The language which is now in controversy, and the language change I will offer at the appropriate time, is, as I say, the basic foundation of what the small truck owners across the country desire.

Of course, at that time it is my hope that that amendment will be adopted.

I do want to at this time cite the fact that there is agreement today in the trucking industry on this subject, and this has taken some doing, I might say. I want to read for the Record a letter which has been delivered to me within the past hour from the American Trucking Associations, Inc., addressed to me:

> This letter is to explain to you the position of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., on S. 320, a bill to amend section 206 of the Interstate Commerce Act.
>
> As you know, ATA is the national association of the motor carrier industry and is composed of State associations and national conferences representing specialized segments of the industry.
>
> The regulated motor carrier industry has for a number of years been seeking legislation to correct abuses which have grown up in connection with the operations of so-called second proviso motor carriers—that is, operations in interstate commerce within the confines of a single State by motor carriers certificated by the State regulatory bodies.
>
> In line with this policy, ATA has supported legislation of the type encompassed by S. 320 and specifically we have supported S. 320 through its various stages in the Senate and in the House.
>
> As you know, we have submitted some proposed amendments to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and it is our understanding that you intend to offer them on the House floor. Needless to say, we urge adoption of our proposed amendments.

Here I would like to ask you to note particularly this last paragraph, because this deals with a question which will be, as I understand, in some controversy later on.

> We also note that you have made certain additions to our proposed amendments, and this is to advise you that we are agreeable to your additions. At the same time, we want to make it clear that we are opposed to any other substantive amendments.
>
> Respectfully,
>
> John V. Lawrence.

I simply want to make clear that after some 5 months of rather rigorous bargaining and conferences and working together the industry is now together on these particular amendments. And, as I said a moment ago, of course, it is my hope that when the particular amendment which I will, at the proper time, offer to the substitute bill is presented, that that amendment will be accepted.

In essence, what that amendment will do is this: It will require that a right—in this case a certificate of registration—which is granted to these truck operators by the ICC can only be taken away from them by the agency which granted it, and that is the ICC. Without the amendment, this right could be taken away from them by arbitrary action of the commission within the State, and they would have no appeal therefrom. And, in my opinion, based on the provisions of the bill, as it will deal with new operators who will hereafter be entering the business under this law, that is, people who are being grandfathered in, will be discriminated against and treated differently unless this language is adopted.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time because there is only 1 hour under the rule for general debate, and I thought it would be appropriate for the RECORD to contain a further explanation of the problem that our distinguished colleague from California [Mr. SISK] has presented to you.

Under the committee bill, there is no interstate right being taken away from any trucker, small or large, operating as a common carrier wholly within a State under a certificate granted by the State, unless the State takes it away from him.

Mr. Speaker, let me make this plain. Under the second proviso of section 206 (a)(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as referred to, an intrastate motor carrier having a certificate of public convenience and necessity from the State to engage in intrastate common carrier operation between certain points within that State, all the trucker needs to do is to file that certificate with the Interstate Commerce Commission and he automatically is authorized to handle interstate shipments between those same points as are authorized by his State certificate.

Mr. Speaker, I will explain during the course of the debate what has happened during these years and the loophole that makes it necessary to enact this legislation. But, suffice it to say here, the only question remaining to be resolved involves those operators who will be entitled to grandfather rights. What rights does such a trucker have? No. 1, the only right he has is given to him by the action of a State commission. We do not in any way interfere with that. We leave him all of the rights that the State commission gave him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are accepting all amendments which Mr. SISK has offered, except for one sentence. The heart of his amendment, he says, is in this one sentence. It is not at all. The heart of the Sisk amendment—and if you will read the letter that he sent to you—is whether or not we accepted the word "conclusive" in lieu of the words "prima facie" upon the filing of the State certificate under the grandfather clause with the Interstate Commerce Commission. That is the heart of the Sisk amendment. We accepted that.

Mr. Speaker, the carriers then became concerned as to what would happen if the State commission took away their right to operate intrastate. We agreed to a further amendment he offered which provides in effect that if the State takes away any intrastate operating rights, we will let the carrier continue to operate in interstate commerce for a period of 6 months, and give that carrier an opportunity to straighten himself out with his own State commission. That is how far we go in agreeing to the amendments which were suggested by the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK]. So, what he would now have us do further with his new amendment is to go further and say that even though the State takes away the operating authority of the carrier, we would continue his interstate operating authority until it is revoked by the ICC under the usual proceedings this Commission must pursue for the revocation of an operating authority, just as though he had a certificate of public convenience and necessity granted to him by the Interstate Commerce Commission in the first place. That is exactly what is involved, and I believe it is going a little bit far beyond what was intended by anyone.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I would be glad to yield. Let me thank the gentleman for his courtesy. He has been patient insofar as I am concerned, and I appreciate his situation. He is trying to get all he can out of this, and I do not blame him for that.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, let me say, of course, that I return those compliments. As I said a few minutes ago, I do appreciate them sincerely. I made a comment during my remarks on the floor to the effect that there seems to be a discussion here which will probably hinge on this basis:

Is not the crux of our difference whether or not we are giving them something above and beyond what they now enjoy?

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman knows that today, under the present procedure, if the intrastate certificate is taken away from the operator he automatically loses his right to engage in interstate commerce. So the gentleman is exactly right on that.

Mr. SISK. I hope to have some time during the general debate to discuss what is going to happen with reference to carriers who come in hereafter, new carriers coming in under this proposed new act; how they will be handled with reference to the granting of a certificate of registration; because, as I understand your bill, that is going to be granted by the ICC.

Mr. HARRIS. We shall develop all that during the course of the debate.

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WATTS. If I understand your substitute, you are going to grandfather all second proviso carriers into the rights they now have?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. WATTS. And in the event the State authority that granted those rights should cancel or withdraw the interstate authority, upon which the interstate rights were based, you are going to give them a period of 6 months in which to try to straighten out their problem with the intrastate authority?

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WATTS. In calculating the period of 6 months, in the event the State authorities cancel their certificate and they are not able to straighten them out in the 6-month period, and feeling they have been mistreated by their intrastate body, they file a suit in the courts which may take a period much longer than 6 months to determine whether or not they should have them restored by court order, is it the gentleman's intention that the 6-month period shall not start until after that suit is settled?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; if a proceeding is filed in court along the line the gentleman has just outlined, and if that would delay the order of the Commission in canceling the State certificate, the 6-month period would not begin until after the date of the effective order, whether by court decision or by Commission action.

Mr. WATTS. In other words if I understand the gentleman, in the event of a court action which takes a period longer than 6 months, the cutoff date of 6 months would not apply until after the party has had a chance fully to litigate his case in the court?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, that would be the effect of it.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 320) to amend the provisions contained in part II of the Interstate Commerce Act concerning registration of State certificates whereby a common carier by motor vehicle may engage in interstate and foreign commerce within a State.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 320, with Mr. ASPINALL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported Senate bill S. 320, amending the second proviso of section 206(a)(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act and urges the adoption of the bill, as amended, with a substitute amendment which I shall offer by direction of the committee at the appropriate time.

Mr. Chairman, since the enactment of the Motor Carrier Act in 1935, motor common carriers operating in a single State have been permitted, under section 206(a)(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act, to register their State certificates of public convenience and necessity with the Interstate Commerce Commission, and thereby obtain authorization to operate in interstate commerce between the same points as are authorized in their intrastate certificates. All the carrier is required to do is to file with the ICC a short application, an appropriate tariff, evidence of insurance, and appoint an agent for the service of process, and he is in business to handle interstate shipments between points in the State where he is registered.

This carrier does not have to prove to the ICC the need for his service, and the ICC has no discretion at all in the matter. Once the carrier files his application, and meets the other requirements which I mentioned, he must get the interstate authorization for which he applied.

As I have stated, this provision in the law has remained unchanged since 1935. Like so many other good things in life, there are people who will take advantage of a loophole and cause trouble. Abuses have developed which are plaguing the interstate motor common carrier industry. The ICC has reported to the Congress that it has to authorize many, many interstate operations, willy nilly, regardless of the duplication of services which may result. Interstate motor carriers which have certificates of public convenience and necessity from the ICC find that they have increased competition from these purely intrastate operators without regard to the volume of business available.

Let me illustrate the situation by giving an example. Let us take a motor common carrier with interstate operating authority between New Haven, Conn., and Little Rock, Ark. This carrier would like to have a larger gathering area around New Haven. He finds that he cannot prove to the satisfaction of the ICC a need for enlarging his gathering area, because there are other interstate motor carriers now adequately serving the surrounding territory. So he induces his brother, or uncle to buy an intrastate certificate to operate in Connecticut. The brother or uncle then registers this certificate with the ICC, and obtains the right to handle interstate shipments within the State of Connecticut covering not only the city of New Haven but perhaps the entire State of Connecticut. Thus, the two individuals, working together in this manner, can create what is tantamount to a new interstate service without ever having to prove the need for the enlarged service before the ICC.

To illustrate again, let us consider an interstate motor common carrier which holds both a certificate of public convenience and necessity from the ICC and an intrastate certificate from the State in which he operates. This carrier decides to sell his interstate authority, retaining his intrastate certificate. Then, by virtue of the second proviso of section 206(a)(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act, the carrier has a right to register its intrastate certificate with the ICC and again obtain the right to handle interstate shipments within the State. The result is that two interstate operating rights now exist where formerly only one existed. The Commission can do nothing about this practice. It is perfectly legal but it is not proper in our regulatory scheme. By this legislation we are trying to close the loophole. We are trying to bring some order out of a chaotic situation.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides that with respect to future applicants for interstate rights, such applicants will have to make a showing of the need for their service. Interstate rights will no longer be granted willy-nilly simply because the applicant has obtained a certificate of public convenience and necessity to operate within a State. The procedure for expanding a carrier service to include also interstate rights within the State is outlined in the bill.

The very able gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics and who conducted the hearings on S. 320 will discuss this legislation in greater detail.

S. 320 was reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on August 31, 1961. We obtained a rule on this bill but it was not brought up for action last year because the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] had urged that we delay floor action until the second session of the Congress and thereby provide an opportunity for the individuals who still objected to the committee bill to try to work out some compromise amendments. I agreed to that procedure and I urged the carriers concerned to get together to see if they could work out their differences and be prepared to recommend certain amendments that would be satisfactory or nearly satisfactory to all. A serious effort was made in this direction and the American Trucking Associations have recommended certain amendments which the committee, this morning, agreed to adopt. These amendments will satisfy nearly all the objections to the committee bill that I know of.

The bill, as reported, was supported by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the National Association of Railroad Utilities Commissioners and most of the membership of the American Trucking Associations.

As I see it, one of the toughest problems we have facing us is the relative decline of the common carriers in the total transportation picture—a relative decline with respect to both the volume of traffic they handle and with respect to their financial condition. The reason this is so disturbing is that the common carriers are the backbone of our transportation system. They are indispensable to the entire economy in peacetime as well as in time of emergency. They serve all users alike, large or small, without favor or prejudice. Without the common carrier industry, the small shipper would be at a great disadvantage in trying to compete with the large shipper who is able to provide his own means of transportation. Without the common carrier it would have been nearly impossible to move the tremendous volumes of freight, passengers, and military traffic we had during World War II. It is, therefore, essential to maintain and preserve the common carriers in a strong and healthy condition. This bill will help the motor common carrier industry against one of the destructive practices which endanger its stability. I urge the House to pass this bill with the committee amendments.

Mr. Chairman, let me make one further comment on the question which was asked by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky. It would be assumed that the matter referred to and being appealed to the courts, that an order would be issued stating the action of the commission in canceling their certificates. That being true, there would be no effective date of the cancellation until after the litigation had been concluded and a determination made.

Mr. WATTS. May I ask the gentleman one question? Assuming in a particular State the regulatory authorities cancelled a certificate and the man went to court; that there was no method by which he could stay the operation of the cancellation and then the 6 months rolled by, and we will say 8 months after the cancellation the courts ruled that the State authorities had to give him back that which they had cancelled from him—under those circumstances, would he also get back his interstate rights?

Mr. HARRIS. If the court ordered it, yes. If the court reversed the State commission or if the court held for the individual who appealed the case and the court gave him his rights, then he would be entitled to those rights.

Mr. WATTS. In other words, if I understand the gentleman, in the event that the particular trucker I referred to got relief in the local court and got an order restoring his intrastate rights, then his interstate rights that had been cancelled out would automatically come back to him?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, I am sure the answer to that would be "Yes" because his interstate rights are based on the action of the local authorities.

Mr. WATTS. It would be the purpose of this legislation, and it is your understanding that if he got his intrastate rights back by virtue of a court action even though more than 6 months had elapsed, he would as a matter of right, without having to go through a hearing or anything, also get back his interstate rights?

Mr. HARRIS. He would be entitled to that as a matter of law.

Mr. WATTS. That is your understanding?

Mr. HARRIS. That is the way I think it should be.

Now to turn to the committee amendments: All the amendments are for the purpose of protecting the rights of carriers already operating, and that is what we have been trying to do. We feel that it is necessary in order to protect those rights to give them what they asked for, namely, the fact that they have a certificate from the State filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission would be conclusive proof to operate in interstate commerce. We thought the phrase "prima facie" would give them that right, but those who are already engaged in the operation feel that it is not sufficient, and I have been somewhat impressed with the argument. To make it abundantly clear that we are protecting them we are agreeing to the substantive amendment offered by the gentleman from California and others to adopt the language to make it conclusive when these certificates are filed.

In order further to protect them if they get into trouble with their State commission on the intrastate authority we put positive language in the committee amendment. We say in the amendment, in effect, "We will give you 6 months to straighten up your controversy with your commission." That will be thoroughly discussed a little later when the amendment is offered.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Will this legislation affect, and if so, how, an old established intrastate carrier who has not engaged in any of these illegal or unfair practices, but who hopes to continue to operate just as he has operated in the past?

Mr. HARRIS. It will not affect him at all. He has all the rights he has ever been able to obtain, and that he has now.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has, I believe, very clearly outlined the general purpose of this legislation, and has concisely dealt with the areas of the controversies within it. However, I would like to say to Members of the House that after the hearings were conducted last August, and the bill reported by our subcommittee, we learned for the first time that the gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk] was going to offer certain amendments. I believe he circulated the membership of the House with those amendments and included an explanation of the purpose of the amendments. At that time his amendments as they were offered were certainly meritorious, and generally the amendments which the Committee will agree to today, are the subject matter of those amendments which will be embraced in our substitute.

I shall stand to be corrected if this is not so: The new Sisk amendments that have been presented are in some areas a departure from those which were originally submitted a year ago, and those amendments I and some of the others in the House told our motor carriers back in our districts that we could and would support.

This creates a somewhat difficult position for some of us because we are now dealing with amendments which are in fact different than those which were originally offered or submitted by the gentleman from California in the closing weeks of the session a year ago.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. In answer to the gentleman, may I say that he is slightly in error. When I appeared before your distinguished committee last summer, I believe in August, it was to propose a very small amendment, which would substitute "conclusive" for "prima facie." That amendment was not accepted. There was a great deal of discussion, and I may say to the gentleman I have been in an embarrassing position, too. People have called me and asked what my amendments were. Actually, I did not have any; we had not arrived at agreed language. In the last 4 or 5 months there has been continuing discussion in the industry in reference to agreeing to the language. The language which I propose to submit now is the first time there was ever general agreement. I do not think this is in disagreement with what the gentleman has said. But all operators across the country had never agreed heretofore to specific language. The language which I will offer, and which will be incorporated in the law in addition to it, is for the first time language in complete agreement with the industry people.

Mr. COLLIER. Would the gentleman say it would be a fair statement that the present bill, together with those committee amendments that will be offered, and I hope adopted, actually meets about 95 percent of the objections that were voiced by some of the small trucking association operators a year ago?

Mr. SISK. Well, I cannot say too much with reference to a year ago, but certainly it would not be to their feeling at the present time, because I have had communications from some 20 States on this subject; in fact, within the past week long-distance telephone calls from a great many. And I could not agree that the proposed substitute bill would meet the requirements of the small truckers across the country, because they simply have not agreed to this. They are hinging their whole support of this bill on the additional language which I will offer, and I believe I am correct in this.

Mr. COLLIER. I might say in conclusion that the committee has done a diligent job in meeting those objections which were offered by some of the small trucking groups. I do not think there is anything in this bill that will in any manner hurt those operators; in fact, I believe that this bill, with the amendments to be offered, will actually strengthen the motor carrier industry at every level.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I will be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I wish the Members of the House would keep this in mind. The gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk] originally offered a proposal that a certificate of public convenience and necessity issued by the Interstate Commerce Commission be included in this legislation; to grant them outright such a certificate; that is true, is it not?

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, yes, that was the proposal which we had, I believe, about the 1st of January.

Mr. HARRIS. In other words, what the gentleman from California originally asked for is that we do by legislation what the Commission is required to do after fully developing the facts as to public need with reference to common carriers. Everyone knows that the Congress cannot get into the business of issuing certificates of public convenience and necessity. Now, I told the gentleman that we could not take that at all. It would be beyond any comprehension whatsoever, and the gentleman from California understood that. Now, the only question here involved is not what are the operating rights of those who now have a certificate. That is protected. We are in agreement on that. The only thing we are in disagreement on is the method by which those rights must be sustained. Now, the gentleman uses this method through suspension to gain what they tried to get by a certificate of public convenience and necessity. I do not believe this House is going to go along with that kind of a proposal and set a precedent accordingly.

Mr. COLLIER. I thank the gentleman.

I might say that the issue here is in reality whether or not a State, which has granted authority by reason of which this carrier has received the further authority to operate in interstate commerce, that the State commission shall not have the same right to take back that authority which they granted in the first place. To do anything other than that would place us in a position of permitting a carrier to use the State authority to secure rights and then take the position that the State, which granted the right in the first place, does not have the right to withdraw it where there is a violation. If we support this philosophy, I think we would be in an untenable position.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Williams], chairman of the subcommittee which did such a good job in the consideration of this legislation, and I want to compliment the subcommittee for the study and attention that it gave to this highly technical problem.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, the bill S. 320, which the House is considering today, was reported unanimously by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on August 31 of last year, a bit too late for House action during the remainder of the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

As the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris] has stated, the Interstate Commerce Commission favored the bill, the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners favored it, and nearly all of the conferences of the American Trucking Associations favored it. The only objections to it that I know of came from the Local and Short Haul Carriers Conference of the American

Trucking Associations, and certain individual local motor carriers. Their objections are not to the bill in its entirety, but only to certain features of it.

During the adjournment period, an effort was made to come to some agreement, but this effort was only partially successful. Certain amendments will be offered to overcome some objections which, I understand, the American Trucking Associations will accept. However, on one proposal agreement could not be reached, and that is the question as to whether the existing second proviso carriers should be entitled to certificates of registration or certificates of public convenience and necessity to be issued by the Interstate Commerce Commission to cover their interstate operations. The bill provides for certificates of registration.

Mr. Chairman, before I discuss the details of the bill, I should like to make an introductory statement by way of background information. I hope that this statement will make it easier for the Members of the House to understand the problem we are dealing with in this legislation.

INTRODUCTION

The existing second proviso of section 206(a)(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act enables motor common carriers, whose operations are confined to a single State and who have been granted a certificate of public convenience and necessity to operate within the State from their State regulatory bodies, also to engage in operations in interstate and foreign commerce without seeking a certificate of public convenience and necessity from the Interstate Commerce Commission.

At present, the right to engage in interstate or foreign commerce by an intrastate carrier is automatically obtained by filing its State certificate with the Interstate Commerce Commission, and by filing its tariffs, evidence of insurance and designating agents for the service of process. The carrier, by such filing, is then authorized to engage in interstate or foreign commerce to the same extent that the carrier is authorized to engage in intrastate commerce as described in the particular State certificate filed with the Commission. Such operations in interstate and foreign commerce must, of course, be carried on entirely within the State in which the motor carrier is certificated to operate.

The Interstate Commerce Commission under existing law has no discretion in accepting a State certificate for registration. The certificate must be accepted, registered, and the motor carrier allowed to engage in interstate and foreign commerce. By so doing, such intrastate carrier becomes subject to the regulatory and safety provisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission when engaged in interstate and foreign commerce. The validity of the certificate filed with the Commission depends on its continued validity within the State.

PURPOSE AND EXPLANATION OF BILL

The purpose of the bill, S. 320, is to repeal the second proviso of section 206(a)(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 307) and insert in lieu thereof two new paragraphs at the end of section 206(a) which would permit State commissions, under a specific procedure applicable with respect to future applications, to grant to motor common carriers operating within a single State the right to engage in interstate or foreign operations within the boundaries of the State in which intrastate authority is being simultaneously authorized, and to provide for the issuance of certificates of registration by the Interstate Commerce Commission to existing carriers engaged in interstate operations under the terms of the present second proviso.

The new paragraph (6) proposed to be added by this bill to subsection (a) of section 206 of the Interstate Commerce Act provides that on and after December 31, 1961, which date we plan to change by amendment, no certificate of public convenience and necessity from the Interstate Commerce Commission would be required for operations in interstate or foreign commerce by a common carrier by motor vehicle operating solely within a single State and not controlled by, controlling, or, under a common control with any carrier engaged in operations outside such State, if, first, such carrier has obtained from the State commission a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing intrastate operations; second, such certificate was issued after notice to interested persons through publication in the Federal Register of the filing of the application and of the desire of the applicant also to engage in interstate and foreign commerce within the limits of the intrastate authority granted; third, reasonable opportunity was afforded to interested parties to be heard; and fourth, the State commission has considered the proposed interstate and foreign operations and has found that public convenience and necessity require that the carrier be authorized to engage in intrastate operations and also to engage in interstate and foreign operations within the limits of the intrastate authority. Except for the method of certification, the carrier would be subject to all applicable requirements of the Interstate Commerce Act, such as insurance, the filing of rates, and so forth.

Under paragraph 6 of the bill, the Interstate Commerce Commission is empowered to issue certificates of registration and to impose reasonable requirements with respect to the filing of State certificates and other data and compliance with applicable requirements established pursuant to the statutes administered by the Commission as conditions precedent to engaging in interstate and foreign operations under authority of the registered State certificate.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is directed to establish rules under which any person who opposed the authorization of operations in interstate commerce in the State regulatory proceedings may petition the Commission for reconsideration of the decision made by the State commission. Such reconsideration shall be on the record made before the State commission. The Interstate Commerce Commission may affirm, reverse, or modify the decision of the State regulatory body in respect to operations in interstate and foreign commerce.

The new paragraph (7) proposed to be added by this bill to subsection (a) of section 206 of the Interstate Commerce Act provides, in part, that intrastate motor carriers in operation on December 31, 1961, which date will be changed by an amendment, who were lawfully engaged in interstate or foreign commerce within the State, shall upon application to the Interstate Commerce Commission and submission of proof of operation, be issued certificates of registration by the ICC authorizing continuance of their operations. The scope of interstate or foreign operations authorized in the certificates must not exceed in scope the services authorized by the State certificates and the certificates of registration shall in general be subject to the same terms, conditions, and limitations as are contained in the State certificates. These carriers will be subject to all applicable requirements of the Interstate Commerce Act, including suspension and termination.

Paragraph 7 provides that in making such application a notice of intent to engage in interstate and foreign operations accompanied by copies of State certificates will be prima facie proof—and again by a committee amendment this will be changed to conclusive proof—that applicant is lawfully engaged in interstate commerce and the scope thereof.

Under both paragraphs (6) and (7) which would be added to section 206(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act by the bill, certificates of registration issued by the Interstate Commerce Commission would be transferable subject to the limitations contained in section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act dealing with carrier unifications and mergers but they could not be transferred apart from the intrastate rights. A transfer of intrastate rights without a corresponding transfer of the certificate of registration would void the interstate rights.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

When the Motor Carrier Act was passed in 1935, it was felt that transportation of property moving in interstate commerce solely within the confines of a State would be merely incidental to the carrier's intrastate operations and relatively unimportant in comparison with their intrastate operations. It was on this basis that intrastate carriers were granted the right to register their certificates with the Interstate Commerce Commission and engage in interstate and foreign commerce. Under the changed conditions existing today, many such intrastate operators, generally speaking, are not engaged in interstate and foreign commerce as merely incidental to the intrastate commerce operations authorized by the State, but are important links in the routes of connecting carriers that engage extensively in interstate and foreign commerce in numerous States. Not infrequently, State certificates have been obtained for the sole purpose of providing a link in a chain of interstate movements. Thus, rights to engage in interstate and foreign commerce come into being without approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission. In fact, the ICC has advised the committee that there are today some 3,100 carriers registered with the ICC who have obtained their interstate operating rights under the provisions of section 206(a)(1) of the act. This was not contemplated by the 1935 act.

While it was originally a simple matter for the States to handle the granting of intrastate certificates, this is no longer the case. Motor common carriers operating across State lines in more than one State are not eligible to operate under the second proviso. This ineligibility arises because such motor carriers are directly engaged in interstate and foreign commerce and must obtain authority to do so directly from the Interstate Commerce Commission. Nevertheless, many such interstate carriers have obtained, but have not used, intrastate certificates. It appears that frequently these intrastate certificates were transferred to carriers who are eligible to operate under the second proviso in order to facilitate establishments of interstate routes.

There are numerous instances where motor common carriers, holding both interstate operating rights from the Interstate Commerce Commission and intrastate operating rights from State regulatory agencies, have sold their interstate rights, retaining their intrastate rights. Then, under the second proviso, these carriers registered their intrastate rights with the Commission and thereby obtained interstate rights to operate within a State, sometimes over the identical routes over which the carrier had operated under his interstate certificate which he sold. The result is that in each of these instances two interstate rights within the State have been created where only one existed previously, and the Interstate Commerce Commission is powerless to prevent this duplication. Entry of motor carriers into interstate transportation should be based on affirmative findings by a regulatory board or commission that a public need exists for such interstate services.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROBERTS. If the State commission grants a certificate of public convenience and necessity and the carrier has applied for both intrastate and interstate authority, does the opposing party, or do the opposing parties, then have the right to appeal from that State commission decision to the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is the gentleman talking about presently certificated carriers or new carriers?

Mr. ROBERTS. New carriers.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; it is reviewable by the Interstate Commerce Commission if a party in interest who opposed the interstate authorization before the State commission petitions the ICC for review.

Mr. ROBERTS. How would that appeal be carried? Would it be on the record only or would it be de novo?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It would be on the record made before the State commission.

Mr. ROBERTS. One more question, if I may. In the past the Commission has declined to exercise its power under section 207 of the Interstate Commerce Act to grant certificates to second proviso carriers because of the possibility of creating duplicate operations without a showing of need. Since S. 320 would eliminate that abuse, is it your opinion that the Commission may now grant these carriers authority under section 207 on appropriate proof?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me answer the gentleman this way. As the gentleman knows, this amendment which is under consideration by the House does not go to section 207. However, with respect to the question presented, an intrastate carrier who operates solely within the boundaries of one State cannot come in under section 207; he must come in under section 206. Even though he may want to operate in interstate commerce, within a State, he would have to seek his rights under the State regulatory authority, and get his rights by action of the State commission, as outlined in the bill before us at the moment.

Mr. ROBERTS. Does the gentleman think that since S. 320 would eliminate abuses under section 206 there is a possibility that the Commission might begin to exercise its authority under section 207?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am sorry, I cannot answer what the Commission might do; I cannot predict what they might do.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I first want to thank our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, for yielding me time since we are about out of time on this side of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, I might say I do not like to disagree with my distinguished chairman or with my good friend, the chairman of the subcommittee. But here is the situation which I think has not been brought out yet on this particular legislation. When the Motor Carriers Act was passed in 1935, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in its report to the House at that time, a copy of which I have here, recognized the fact that the smaller carriers and those carriers operating within one State which we call the intrastate carriers, and whose permit traditionally reads from points and places within such and such county to points and places within another such county, recognized that the public service commissions had imposed upon those carriers certain regulations at that time with which they had to comply.

As a result of that they recognized the fact that the States could best judge whether or not they should get a certificate from the Interstate Commerce Commission; therefore, there was written into that particular act a provision that in the event the public service commission approved a certificate of convenience and necessity within the State, upon filing proof of that certificate with the Interstate Commerce Commission a certificate of permission to do business in interstate commerce was automatically granted.

While they did not have to go through all the litigation which is necessary to get a certificate of convenience and necessity from the Interstate Commerce Commission, nevertheless, they were subject to all the rules and regulations of the ICC, insurance requirements and the like.

We have a situation as developed in this particular bill in which no intrastate carrier can ever again afford to try to get a license for interstate rights because we have not only taken away the original ease which the law intended to facilitate the transportation business, but we have written regulations in here which say in effect that if the intrastate carrier wants interstate rights he has to file for them; he has a hearing on them; then somebody can appeal and take him up to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and if they cannot satisfy them they can appeal from there to the courts. So the little carrier is being written off the market by this legislation if it is not amended.

The reason the Sisk amendment is important here is because we are bound to have situations—even though we say we have a grandfather clause—we are bound to have situations in which the carrier which obtained the original intrastate permit, which we respect in our grandfather clause, and which under the old 1935 act obtained the interstate carrier has some difficulty with his State commission, say after 10 years of experience. Suppose in that time that small carrier, which this bill is intended to eliminate eventually, suppose that small carrier builds up an interstate business; suppose he gets in political trouble or some other trouble down on the State level; it is argued that for 10 years he has done well but has had his intrastate license revoked. The Interstate Commerce Commission has not brought charges against him, but they say they are going to take away his rights and that they do not care about his investment if the State commission happens to deny his intrastate license. The bill, unamended, will do that.

It is in the power of the States to give this license in the first place under the original motor carrier act, but we have that industry here, and we cannot afford to play with semantics or conjecture as to what might happen. If you read the hearings you will find that the only rereference to abuses about which we have heard so much talk occurs in two paragraphs on page 53, and not one single concrete abuse has been pointed out as a basis for this legislation.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield.

Mr. COLLIER. I wish to clarify one point, if I may. Is it not true that where a State authority may offer whatever reason the State commissior desires to cancel, the carrier still has the alternative of going to the Interstate Commerce Commission and making formal application to secure interstate authority directly from the Interstate Commerce Commission? So, in reality, we are not putting him out of business, as the gentleman indicated, though I do not recommend this procedure.

Mr. HEMPHILL. If the gentleman has had any experience with a small transportation carrier being faced by larger carriers before the Interstate Commerce Commission he will realize that they can litigate the small carrier out of existence, because it costs so much to try to get a certificate from the Interstate Commerce Commission; the cost is almost prohibitive.

The small carrier cannot afford it, and by the time he got the certificate if he could get it, the business opportunities have been denied him so long he cannot get into the business, he cannot meet the competition.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is talking about one thing, I think, and this legislation deals with something else. The gentleman is talking about going to the Interstate Commerce Commission and getting a certificate of public convenience and necessity. What we are dealing with here today is solely an operation within a State, an intrastate operation having to do with intrastate carriers given authority to transport goods which come in interstate shipments. That is the sole problem we are dealing with here today. I think the difficulty the gentleman refers to is with his own State commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I may say to the gentleman, his remarks would cause me to reply in answer to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, when he asked, If the intrastate carrier loses before his own State commission, under this bill what can he do? He has to go back to the Interstate Commerce Commission. That is what he was referring to, because that is where he would have to go if the Sisk amendment is not adopted. If he loses intrastate rights he is going to lose interstate rights and the only way he can get his interstate rights back is to go to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROBERTS. In effect, in this bill you are grandfathering these intrastate carriers in, but you are not giving them all the authority they have had since 1935; is that correct?

Mr. HEMPHILL. That is correct. The difficulty arises from the fact that apparently there exists the concept that since the State can grant it the State can take it away; but in the meantime we have to consider the transportation industry, we have to consider the investments that the small trucker has made to develop his interstate business which he wants to retain, but without anything except his own State ruling he loses that State business and the opportunity for it.

Mr. ROBERTS. His interstate operations might be more than his intrastate operations?

Mr. HEMPHILL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to impose on the time of the House, but I think it is important that we understand that a large group of carriers, small truck operators across the Nation, are being brought in under an entirely new program. There are substantial changes in his relationship with the ICC to what he has had since 1935.

Now, for all practical purposes, these small truck operators have enjoyed the full benefits of certificates of public convenience and necessity since 1935 under the law. The Interstate Commerce Commission and this Congress propose to change certain basic laws and to bring all of the truckers, all of the carriers in the motor transportation business, including the small ones, the intrastate operators who may incidentally handle some commerce or some freight moving in interstate shipments, to bring them under the control of the ICC. That is what we are doing, as I understand this legislation. We are going to do that, and in order to do it, someone came up with a new kind of permit or certificate.

This has created a lot of discussion among carriers across the country. What is a certificate of registration? Everybody knows what a certificate of public convenience and necessity is. It is a valuable document. It is a negotiable document. It is a document that has value. It is salable. What is a certificate of registration, in view of the fact that we for the first time are going to bring them directly under the control of the ICC? Now, they have been enjoying the full benefits of the certificate of convenience and necessity under the 1935 act, but now they are being brought in under a new approach and a new regulation and they are being granted a certificate of registration which, frankly, no one quite knows what it is. But, basically it is a grant of rights by a Federal agency, the ICC. And, the question at issue here is if we are going to treat these carriers who have been in business all during the years in the same manner that we are going to treat new ones hereafter who will be applying, we, in my opinion, must adopt this amendment to be sure that they cannot be driven out of business, their rights cannot be destroyed without a right of appeal to the agency which has granted them this new certificate of registration, and that is all in the world this sentence says: right of appeal to the Interstate Commerce Commission under which they will now be operating, and which they will be responsible to and under which they have been granted this particular right. All we are asking is that before they can be stripped of all rights which they have, by arbitrary action of a State commission or anyone else, that they have the right of appeal to the ICC and that it be considered on its merits and that the ICC take positive action to revoke or terminate that certificate. Now, basically, this is what I understand the amendment will do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman has stated that a certificate of registration in this instance is a right granted by the Federal Government or by the ICC.

Mr. SISK. Is that not true?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, that is incorrect. A certificate of public convenience and necessity is granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission, but a certificate of registration is merely a recognition by the Interstate Commerce Commission of action taken by the State agency or a right given by the State public utilities commission.

Mr. SISK. Then, this would make me question much further some provisions in this bill. The small truck operators across the country asked that we amend this bill to strike out "certificate of registration" and put in "certificate of convenience and necessity" everywhere, because of that very thing. Now, the gentleman makes me even more afraid of this bill than ever.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. COLLIER. I think it is necessary that we define this by using a hypothetical case. Assume there is a shipment of goods or commodities or material that originates in the State of California and it is being shipped, let us say, from San Francisco to San Diego or maybe San Jose. Now, understand this is a shipment that is, because of its nature, in intrastate commerce. For whatever reason, the public utilities commission would determine that this carrier was in violation and chose to revoke the license. We are in sum and substance saying that the commission has the right to do this. But, if this same carrier is moving in the same areas a commodity that comes in from out of the State, we say you may continue to do this. This is totally inconsistent, and it is permitting the carrier in that case to use an authority granted by his State to circumvent really the authority that he has secured under the second proviso from the Federal Government.

Mr. SISK. But he can move that part in interstate commerce only with this certificate of registration. As I understand the provision of the new law, this is going to be a requirement. And, I would like to ask the chairman this question: Is it not true that hereafter, if this becomes law, a truck operator, even though he is an intrastate operator, if he is going to handle any commodity that originated in interstate commerce, he must have a certificate of registration? Is that right or wrong?

Mr. HARRIS. The State must grant him a certificate of registration in order to operate. In obtaining that certificate he must then show a need and there must be a record made of it—I am talking about a new applicant. He must show a public need that the service is required before the State can give him that certificate. Insofar as the present operators are concerned, they do not have to show that there was ever a need for it.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that a great many experts in this field are confused as to what this bill will accomplish. It certainly confuses me. I would like to find out whether the Interstate Commerce Commission can refuse a certificate of registration to a person who is now operating?

Mr. SISK. That is a question, of course, that I would like to ask of the chairman, for this reason——

Mr. HARRIS. If it came from the State commission?

Mr. SANTANGELO. Yes. If he is doing some interstate business.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will yield further, no; the Interstate Commerce Commission cannot refuse it under the present law.

Mr. SISK. However, we are talking about what would happen under the new law if this bill is enacted.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is further confusing the issue. The only difference we have here is with reference to the grandfather rights.

Mr. SISK. We want the people who are in business now under the grandfather rights to have exactly the same rights which they had before, if this bill is passed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am still confused. What rights are implied in the certificate of registration? What rights are there in the certificate of registration?

Mr. SISK. I am glad the gentleman asked the question because, frankly, that is a great deal of concern to the small truck owners all across the country, and that is one of the reasons they want this language. This is to be new terminology in ICC language. Nowhere before has there been published such a thing as a certificate of registration, so I am told. I realize that I am presumptious to get into this argument, because I am not an expert in the transportation field. But is not that true, I might say to the gentleman from Mississippi? There has never heretofore been such terminology used?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. With respect to the question asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO] regarding carriers presently operating under intrastate authority who have not filed for interstate authority, your question was, Would they in the future be permitted to file for certificates of registration and engage in interstate commerce?

Mr. SANTANGELO. My question was this, Could the Interstate Commerce Commission refuse to accept his registration?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not if he files a certificate of registration within 120 days after the enactment date.

If he waits until after this deadline, he must go through the procedures outlined for new applicants under this bill.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Does the gentleman from California agree with me? There is an interpretation to be made. I would like to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] whether or not a man has to show a necessity in order to continue his interstate business?

Mr. SISK. I might say to my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO] that perhaps I am getting a little confused myself, and I might say that confusion with reference to this legislation is not new to me. I might say that the certificate to which the gentleman from Mississippi is referring apparently is a State certificate and not a certificate of registration. I will admit that I am not quite sure what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] was referring to when he answered the question by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO] with reference to the requirement for a certificate prior to this act.

Is the gentleman referring to a State certificate? Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to comment on that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Under the act he has 120 days after the enactment of this act to file his certificate with the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to add further to the confusion, but rather explain fundamentally what is being done and what the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], as I understand his amendment, desires to do. It is to prevent the State utility commission from controlling its own intrastate carriers; because when a State commission denies the right of an intrastate carrier for some reason—whether it is political or something else; if the State commission denies the right of that carrier to move within the State, then the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] wants the right of the carrier to continue to move and carry interstate goods. As far as I am concerned you are imposing on the State a Federal right and denying the State control of their own carriers. In my opinion that is what this bill is intended to do. They are trying to get back to where the State can control their own carriers and if the Sisk amendment is adopted in the form in which he wants it, you are losing State rights. To my mind that is the fundamental principle we are debating today.

Every small trucker who has the right today to operate as he is operating will continue to have exactly those same rights.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, this question is rather intricate, and pretty difficult to understand. I sat in on most of the hearings on this bill.

This bill was introduced in the first place to correct certain inequities. Then our colleague from California suggested further amendments. Amendment was agreed to by the committee, with the exception of one sentence.

The fact is as our chairman has said, that when the State regulatory body revokes the original right which they gave them to operate, then they will allow them to operate for 6 months more on their interstate rights which the State originally gave them. Now if this amendment in this last sentence is allowed to continue in the bill, then to whom are they going to be responsible? They will not be responsible to anyone.

They can tell their State commission to go jump in the lake because they are going to operate altogether under the Interstate Commerce Commission. In this land we operate under the law, and this does not conform with the law of the land.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time and I ask that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second proviso to paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 206 of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended to read as follows: "*And provided further,* That on and after the effective date of this amendment, no certificate under this part shall be required for operations in interstate or foreign commerce by a common carrier by motor vehicle operating solely within a single State and not controlled by, controlling, or under a common control with any carrier engaged in operations outside such State, if such carrier has obtained from the commission of such State authorized to issue such certificates, a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing motor vehicle common carrier operations in intrastate commerce and such certificate recites that it was issued after notice to interested persons through publication in the Federal Register of the filing of the application and of the desire of the applicant also to engage in transportation in interstate and foreign commerce within the limits of the intrastate authority granted, that reasonable opportunity was afforded interested persons to be heard, that the State commission has duly considered the question of the proposed interstate and foreign operations and has found that public convenience and necessity require that the carrier authorized to engage in intrastate operations also be authorized to engage in operations in interstate and foreign commerce within limits which do not exceed the scope of the intrastate operations authorized to be conducted. Such operations in interstate and foreign commerce shall, however, be subject to all other applicable requirements of the Interstate Commerce Act and the regulations prescribed thereunder. Such rights to engage in operations in interstate or foreign commerce shall be evidenced by appropriate certificates of registration issued by the Interstate Commerce Commission which shall be valid only so long as the holder is a carrier engaged in operations solely within a single State, not controlled by, controlling, or under a common control with a carrier engaged in operation outside such State, and except as provided in section 5 and in the conditions and limitations stated herein, may be transferred pursuant to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, but may not be transferred apart from the transfer of the corresponding intrastate certificate, and the transfer of the intrastate certificate without the interstate or foreign rights or the termination or restriction in scope of the intrastate certificate shall terminate, or similarly restrict, the right to engage in interstate or foreign commerce. Such rights shall be subject to suspension or termination by the Interstate Commerce Commission in accordance with the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act governing the suspension and termination of certificates issues by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Interstate Commerce Commission may impose reasonable requirements with respect to the filing with it of certified copies of such State certificates and other appropriate statements and data, and compliance with applicable requirements established by and under the authority of statutes applicable to interstate and foreign operations administered by the Interstate Commerce Commission, as conditions precedent to engaging in interstate and foreign operations under the authority of such State certificate. In accordance with such reasonable rules as may be prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, any party in interest, who or which opposed in the State commission proceeding the authorization of operations in interstate or foreign commerce, may petition the Interstate Commerce Commission for reconsideration of the decision of the State commission authorizing operations in interstate or foreign commerce, and upon such reconsideration upon the record made before the State commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission may affirm, reverse, or modify the decision of the State commission, but only with respect to the authorization of operations in interstate and foreign commerce."

Sec. 2. Subsection (a) of section 206 of the Interstate Commerce Act is further amended by inserting at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(6) Any person who or which on the effective date of this paragraph was in operation solely within a single State as a common carrier by motor vehicle in intrastate commerce (excluding persons controlled by, controlling, or under a common control with, a carrier engaged in operations outside such State), and who or which was also lawfully engaged in such operations in interstate or foreign commerce under the certificate exemption provisions of the second proviso of section 206(a)(1) in effect prior to the effective date of this subsection and has continued to so operate since that time (or if engaged in furnishing seasonal service only, was lawfully engaged in such operations on the effective date of this paragraph during the season ordinarily covered by its operations, and has so operated since that time, except in either instance as to interruptions of service over which such person had no control, the Interstate Commerce Commission shall issue to such person a certificate of registration authorizing the continuance of such transportation in interstate and foreign commerce if application and proof of operations are submitted as provided in this subsection. Such certificate of registration shall not exceed in scope the services authorized by the State certificate to be conducted in intrastate commerce, and shall be subject to the same terms, conditions, and limitations as are contained in or attached to the State certificate except to the extent that such terms, conditions, or limitations are inconsistent with the requirements established by or under the Interstate Commerce Act. If the effectiveness of the State certificate is limited to a specified period of time, the certificate of registration issued under this paragraph shall be similarly limited. Operations in interstate and foreign commerce under such certificates of registration shall be subject to all other applicable requirements of the Interstate Commerce Act and the regulations prescribed thereunder. Certificates of registration shall be valid only so long as the holder is a carrier engaged in operation solely within a single State, not controlled by, controlling, or under a common control with a carrier engaged in operation outside such State, and except as provided in section 5 and in the conditions and limitations stated herein, may be transferred pursuant to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, but may not be transferred apart from the transfer of the corresponding intrastate certificate, and the transfer of an intrastate certificate without the corresponding certificate of registration, or the termination or restriction in scope of the intrastate certificate, shall automatically terminate or similarly restrict the certificate of registration. Such certificates of registration shall be subject to suspension or termination by the Interstate Commerce Commission in accordance with the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act governing the suspension and termination of certificates of public convenience and necessity issued by that Commission.

"All rights to engage in operations in interstate and foreign commerce under the provisions of the second proviso of subsection 206(a)(1) existing prior to the effective date of this paragraph shall cease and terminate, but any carrier lawfully engaged in interstate and foreign operations on the effective date of this paragraph pursuant to such provisions, may continue such operations for 120 days after the effective date of this subsection and, if an appropriate application for a certificate of registration is filed within such period, such operations may be continued pending the determination of such application. The Interstate Commerce Commission shall prescribe the form of such application, the information and documents to be furnished, the manner of filing, and the persons to whom or the manner of giving notice to interested persons of such filings. Issues arising in the determination of such applications shall be determined in the most expeditious manner and, so far as practicable and legally permissible, without formal hearings or other proceedings. A notice of intent to engage in interstate and foreign operations accompanied by certified copies of State certificates filed with the Commission as evidence of authority to operate in interstate or foreign commerce under the former provisions of the second proviso of section 206(a) shall be prima facie proof that the applicant is lawfully engaged in interstate and foreign operations and the scope thereof."

Sec. 3. The effective date of this amendment shall be December 31, 1961.

Mr. HARRIS (during the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Harris:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 206 of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by striking out the last two sentences and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'Pending the determination of any such application the continuance of such operation shall be lawful.'

"Sec. 2. Subsection (a) of section 206 of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"'(6) On and after the date of the enactment of this paragraph no certificate of public convenience and necessity under this part shall be required for operations in interstate or foreign commerce by a common carrier by motor vehicle operating solely within a single State and not controlled by, controlling, or under a common control with any carrier engaged in operations outside such State, if such carrier has obtained from the commission of such State authorized to issue such certificates, a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing motor vehicle common carrier operations in intrastate commerce and such certificate recites that it was issued after notice to interested persons through publication in the Federal Register of the filing of the application and of the desire of the applicant also to engage in transportation in interstate and foreign commerce within the limits of the intrastate authority granted, that reasonable opportunity was afforded interested persons to be heard, that the State commission has duly considered the question of the proposed interstate and foreign operations and has found that public convenience and necessity require that the carrier authorized to engage in intrastate operations also be authorized to engage in operations in interstate and foreign commerce within limits which do not exceed the scope of the intrastate operations authorized to be conducted. Such operations in interstate and foreign commerce shall, however, be subject to all other applicable requirements of this Act and the regulations prescribed hereunder. Such rights to engage in operations in interstate or foreign commerce shall be evidenced by appropriate certificates of registration issued by the Commission which shall be valid only so long as the holder is a carrier engaged in operations solely within a single State, not controlled by, controlling, or under a common control with a carrier engaged in operation outside such State, and except as provided in section 5 and in the conditions and limitations stated herein, may be transferred pursuant to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Commission, but may not be transferred apart from the transfer of the corresponding intrastate certificate, and the transfer of the intrastate certificate without the interstate or foreign rights shall terminate the right to engage in interstate or foreign commerce. The termination, restriction in scope, or suspension of the intrastate certificate shall on the 180th day thereafter terminate or similarly restrict the right to engage in interstate or foreign commerce unless the intrastate certificate shall have been renewed, reissued, or reinstated or the restrictions removed within said 180-day period. Such rights shall be subject to suspension or termination by the Commission in accordance with the provisions of this Act governing the suspension and termination of certificates issued by the Commission. The Commission may impose reasonable requirements with respect to the filing with it of certified copies of such State certificates and other appropriate statements and data, and compliance with applicable requirements established by and under the authority of statutes applicable to interstate and foreign operations administered by the Commission, as conditions precedent to engaging in interstate and foreign operations under the authority of such State certificate. In accordance with such reasonable rules as may be prescribed by the Commission, any party in interest, who or which opposed in the State commission proceeding the authorization of operations in interstate or foreign commerce, may petition the Commission for reconsideration of the decision of the State commission authorizing operations in interstate or foreign commerce, and upon such reconsideration upon the record made before the State commission, the Commission may affirm, reverse, or modify the decision of the State commission, but only with respect to the authorization of operations in interstate and foreign commerce.

"(7) (A) In the case of any person who or which on the date of the enactment of this paragraph was in operation solely within a single State as a common carrier by motor vehicle in intrastate commerce (excluding persons controlled by, controlling, or under a common control with, a carrier engaged in operations outside such State), and who or which was also lawfully engaged in such operations in interstate or foreign commerce under the certificate exemption provisions of the second proviso of paragraph (1) of this subsection, as in effect immediately before the date of the enactment of this paragraph or who or which would have been so lawfully engaged in such operations but for the pendency of litigation to determine the validity of such person's intrastate operations to the extent such litigation is resolved in favor of such person, and has continued to so operate since that date (or, if engaged in furnishing seasonal service only, was lawfully engaged in such operations in the year 1961 during the season ordinarily covered by its operations, and such operations have not been discontinued), except in either instance as to interruptions of service over which such person had no control, the Commission shall issue to such person a certificate of registration authorizing the continuance of such transportation in interstate and foreign commerce if application and proof of operations are submitted as provided in this subsection. Such certificate of registration shall not exceed in scope the services authorized by the State certificate to be conducted in intrastate commerce, and shall be subject to the same terms, conditions, and limitations as are contained in or attached to the State certificate except to the extent that such terms, conditions, or limitations are inconsistent with the requirements established by or under this Act. If the effectiveness of the State certificate is limited to a specified period of time, the certificate of registration issued under this paragraph (7) shall be similarly limited. Operations in interstate and foreign commerce under such certificates of registration shall be subject to all other applicable requirements of this Act and the regulations prescribed hereunder. Certificates of registration shall be valid only so long as the holder is a carrier engaged in operation solely within a single State, not controlled by, controlling, or under a common control with a carrier engaged in operation outside such State, and except as provided in section 5 and in the conditions and limitations stated herein, may be transferred pursuant to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Commission, but may not be transferred apart from the transfer of the corresponding intrastate certificate, and the transfer of the intrastate certificate without the interstate or foreign rights shall terminate the right to engage in interstate or foreign commerce. The termination, restriction in scope, or suspension of the intrastate certificate shall on the 180th day thereafter terminate or similarly restrict the right to engage in interstate or foreign commerce unless the intrastate certificate shall have been renewed, reissued, or reinstated or the restrictions removed within said 180-day period. Such certificates of registration shall be subject to suspension or termination by the Commission in accordance with the provisions of this Act governing the suspension and termination of certificates of public convenience and necessity issued by the Commission.

"'(B) All rights to engage in operations in interstate and foreign commerce under the provisions of the second proviso of paragraph (1) of this subsection, as in effect immediately before the date of the enactment of this paragraph, shall cease and terminate, but any carrier lawfully engaged in interstate and foreign operations on the date of the enactment of this paragraph or any carrier who would have been so lawfully engaged in such operations but for the pendency of litigation to determine the validity of such person's intrastate operations to the extent such litigation is resolved in favor of such person, pursuant to such provisions, may continue such operations for 120 days after such date and, if an appropriate application for a certificate of registration is filed within such period, such operations may be continued pending the determination of such application. The Commission shall prescribe the form of such application, the information and documents to be furnished, the manner of filing, and the persons to whom or the manner of giving notice to interested persons of such filings. Issues arising in the determination of such applications shall be determined in the most expeditious manner and, so far as practicable and legally permissible, without formal hearings or other proceedings. A notice of intent to engage in interstate and foreign operations accompanied by certified copies of effective, lawfully issued or acquired State certificates filed with the Commission as evidence of authority to operate in interstate or foreign commerce under the provisions of the second proviso of paragraph (1) of this subsection, as in effect immediately before the date of the enactment of this paragraph, shall be conclusive proof that the applicant is lawfully engaged in interstate and foreign operations and the scope thereof.' "

Mr. HARRIS (during the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the substitute amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, the substitute, as I have already mentioned, includes the amendments which the committee approved when the bill was originally reported. These amendments clarify the bill and make it a better bill than what was brought to us by the other body. In addition, the substitute includes all of the amendments proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] except the one referred to which we will discuss a little later. The substitute amendment includes also all of the amendments which were recommended by the executive committee of the American Trucking Associations. I have a copy of their recommendations here before me. The gentleman read the letter from Mr. Lawrence. But, I have a copy here of the policy statement that was adopted the week before last when they had their meeting here in Washington in which they made these suggestions and recommendations and followed them up with the amendments which they suggested to carry out the policy statement. The substitute includes all of the amendments recommended by the ATA at that time, which includes the amendments offered by the gentleman from California except the one with reference to suspensions or revocations under the grandfather clause. That is precisely what the substitute includes.

In addition to what was recommended by the committee the substitute makes certain other amendments. Primarily it does three things:

No. 1: It changes the effective date, and no one is in disagreement on that.

No 2: It provides that when a carrier has difficulty with the State commission and his intrastate authority is revoked or suspended, the certificate to engage in interstate commerce shall continue for a period of 6 months, giving the operator an opportunity during that time to get his business straightened out with his local commission.

No 3: Instead of using the words "prima facie," which is the way the committee reported the bill last year, we substitute the word "conclusive," which is the heart of the whole operation insofar as the grandfather rights are concerned in connection with this whole matter.

Mr. Chairman, I urge approval of the substitute.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SISK to the amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS: On page 3, after the word "period," add the following: "If however during the six-month period of termination, restriction in scope or suspension of the State certificate the holder of the corresponding certificate of registration has continuously performed the interstate operations authorized thereunder such certificate of registration can only be suspended, revoked or terminated by the Commission in accordance with the provisions of the Act governing such suspensions, revocations, or terminations of certificates issued by the Commission: *Provided, however*, That under all other circumstances such certificates of registration"—

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to a later section of the bill which is identical in wording to this. It is an amendment to the grandfather section. The first amendment which the Clerk has read refers to another section.

I ask unanimous consent that these amendments be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the second amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SISK to the amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS: On page 7, after the word "period," add the following: "If however during the six-month period of termination, restriction in scope or suspension of the State certificate the holder of the corresponding certificate of registration has continuously performed the interstate operations authorized thereunder such certificate of registration can only be suspended, revoked or terminated by the Commission in accordance with the provisions of the Act governing such suspensions, revocations, or terminations of certificates issued by the Commission: *Provided, however,* That under all other circumstances such"—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I think the general issues have pretty generally been discussed with reference to this particular amendment. I do want to make the comment here that it is my understanding that this amendment is, let us say, nonpartisan, because I have had, I think, about as many friends on the Republican side as on the Democratic side concerned with it.

I would further like to say that I think it does not have much to do with States rights. I was going to comment on the remark made by my good friend from California [Mr. Younger] that I think if we left this thing alone and did not pass this legislation at all we would be staying under State regulation, because what we are doing here virtually is to give the Interstate Commerce Commission the right to interfere in local State matters with reference to interstate commerce.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I have been very much interested in the gentleman's efforts to protect the small carrier. I must confess, however, to some confusion, because of the apparent complexity of detail in the matter of motor carrier regulation.

I would like to ask the gentleman from California whether there is reason to bring into the discussion the matter of annual or time-limit requests for renewal which might bring about revocation through refusal by a State to renew a State permit to a carrier for intrastate commerce operation? How many States do require annual renewal?

Mr. SISK. Let me say to the gentlewoman from Illinois that there are a number of States which do require annual renewal, for example, I think in the State of Kentucky certificates are granted on an annual basis and they must come up for renewal each year.

I believe there are some five or six States in which that is true. If someone has additional information, they might enlighten me.

Mrs. CHURCH. Would it not mean that a State permit could be revoked for reasons other than malfeasance? In other words, is it possible that there might be some preference shown as to who or which company would be granted a renewal certificate.

Mr. SISK. I am happy to say the gentlewoman has put her finger on something which all the truckers are concerned about; that is, whether or not there might be some arbitrary act through these renewals which might occur from time to time, or through some type of unusual disciplinary action in which politics might be played and could force a man out of business. All I am asking for in this one sentence is to give the people that right of appeal to the body which must review and hereafter grant a certificate of registration and justify a cancellation of what in essence is a Federal certificate. They can be driven out of business without any further appeal.

Mrs. CHURCH. The gentleman is trying to inject an ounce of prevention and protection.

Mr. SISK. I might say that is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the gentleman yield to me to answer the gentlewoman's question?

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mrs. Church) Mr. Sisk was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. HARRIS. In response to the question of the gentlewoman from Illinois, the matter has been taken care of in amendments which were suggested and written by the gentleman from California. It is included in the substitute which I have offered here.

Mrs. CHURCH. Will the gentleman be good enough to explain to me exactly how that would operate in the case where cancellation or refusal to renew are concerned?

Mr. HARRIS. After the State commission cancels, or if it is a question of renewal, this amendment grants the operator 180 days to regain authority from the State commission.

Mrs. CHURCH. The operator would have to go back to the authority that refused to renew the license?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Let me conclude by saying there never was any agreement by the conference of short-haul carriers and the other carriers in this country about any amendment less than what I am offering at this time. There has been some confusion. The gentleman from Arkansas has correctly stated that I appeared before the committee last summer because of a great amount of interest in my own local area in reference to this matter. I offered the amendment basically to get away from litigation, which, in my opinion, would have destroyed the small truckers across the country. The eastern, southeastern, midwestern carriers and others have always wanted additional protection. That is what we are seeking to do. During the past 5 months they have been negotiating and working on language which would give to them nothing new. If someone wants to say it is new, go ahead and say it, but all in the world it does, in my opinion, is give these small operators a little protection in order to stay in business.

They are the backbone of the transportation business of this country. They are the feeder lines. They are the haulers who pick up freight from many of the large towns and move it into the smaller communities. They do the same thing on the backhaul, putting into the small areas freight which has moved across the country. As I say, they are the backbone. I want to be frank, I do not believe that this amendment is giving them anything above and beyond what they now have, in view of the fact that the whole legislation itself is picking them up and putting them in a new category, requiring a new certificate, requiring additional compliance and additional justification. Therefore I think it is only simple justice that they be granted this appeal to the agency alone which has the power in the final analysis to grant the authority. With that, I hope the House will adopt the amendment and permit this legislation to become law.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. This virtually leaves them in the same position that they were since 1935, does it not, except, perhaps, they are in a little worse position because they have to take this appeal to the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. SISK. Well, I think in general the gentleman's statement is correct. They have been operating since 1935 basically as though they were operating with a certificate of public convenience and necessity. Of course, that is what they wanted under this act. They felt they were entitled to it. But, the powers that be say "We will never give you that." So they are forced here to accept a certificate of registration, may I say, that no one is quite sure just what it is. I asked a member of the Commission what it was. It is new terminology. This is not a business that lets people get rich overnight. It is hard, tough, competitive business, as everybody knows, and I think they are entitled to this additional appeal.

Mr. KUNKEL. Was there any evidence submitted to show that this previous condition had been causing any real trouble?

Mr. SISK. It is my understanding that there was a great deal of confusion, and I understand that most of the carriers across the country were agreeable to some new language. They felt that there should be better regulation of merchandise traveling in interstate commerce and therefore that there is some justification for the legislation. But, of course, they hope they do not have to give away a lot of their rights and take the chance of being driven out of business, but generally speaking the industry has been agreeable in trying to work this out, and that is what we have been trying to do.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I take this time to ask the gentleman from California a few questions to attempt to get his thinking on this matter and set the facts straight. First, who do you think should determine when there is a violation by a motor carrier of an authority in any State? Should this be up to the State commission who gave the authority, or who should make the determination?

Mr. SISK. I would say if it is an intrastate carrier, yes, the public utilities commission within those States has to make a determination on that. Now, let me hasten to say, not being an authority on this subject and, of course, not being a member of the distinguished gentleman's committee, I am not entirely aware of many of the operations, but this would be, as a layman, my thinking on this issue.

Mr. COLLIER. Do you think that any motor carrier should be allowed to continue to operate in violation of this authority?

Mr. SISK. I would not, if he is in violation, but has ample opportunity to prove whether or not he is in violation. If it is proved beyond question of a doubt that he is in violation, I would say he should be suspended or penalized. Certainly some penalty should attach.

Mr. COLLIER. If, in fact, he has been found guilty of a violation by a State authority, should he then be permitted to continue to operate that portion of his business notwithstanding the fact that he has been found in violation; that is, in interstate business?

Mr. SISK. If he has been required to comply with regulations in interstate commerce and has been required to have certain certificates, or whatever we might call them—registrations or certificates of convenience and necessity, whatever they might be—to the extent he is moving interstate commerce, I would say he would be responsible only to the ICC.

Mr. COLLIER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SISK. That, basically, is what, of course, I am seeking—that he should be responsible to the agency which grants him authority to operate.

Mr. COLLIER. Are we not, under the gentleman's amendment, opening a door whereby a carrier actually could be in absolute violation of his State authority yet would be permitted by reason of this amendment to continue to do business in interstate commerce when, in fact, he has been in violation of intrastate commerce in the same State?

Mr. SISK. No; I could not agree that that could be the result at all. Certainly as I understand the situation, in the first place, of course, if the State public utilities commission suspends his operations for disciplinary action or for whatever purpose, we are providing enough language, plus this additional language, that he can continue to operate for a period of 6 months, during which time this situation is being discussed. The thing, as I understand it, is that the ICC will also take a look at the situation with reference to such a violation. I think there is little doubt but what if a man is violating his routes and violating carrier regulations or whatever the violation is, and willfully doing so, there is not any question but what the ICC could terminate him just as quickly as the State authority. I certainly do not believe that this amendment would in any wise permit open-end violations, and if it did, I would not be for it. I do not for one moment interpret it to be so.

Mr. COLLIER. If the gentleman from California believes that the ICC would move just as rapidly in the case of a violation as would the State agency, then what is the purpose of the gentleman's amendment at all?

Mr. SISK. The purpose of the amendment is to avoid arbitrary or unwarranted action by a State commission probably for, as I indicated to the gentlewoman from Illinois a little bit ago, political purposes on renewal permits, or for many other reasons. The gentleman does know that these things do happen. I want them to have at least the right of appeal from it. Unless we have this language, he will have no right of appeal to set the record straight, and to indicate that possibly unwarranted or unnecessary action was taken with reference to the matter.

Mr. COLLIER. Of course, as we point out in the committee amendment, we still protect him for a 6-month period even after revocation has been taken. He can continue to operate his interstate business. However, we go one step further and we provide that during the time litigation is pending he still may continue to operate.

Mr. SISK. Of course, as the gentleman knows, and as I have repeated this a number of times—this is what most of the small truckers who are operating in good faith expect in this bill; that is, those with whom I have discussed this legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when hearings were being held on this bill before our subcommittee in the first session of this Congress, the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] appeared before the committee recommending one amendment. That amendment was to the effect that State certificates should be accepted as conclusive proof rather than prima facie proof by the ICC in their application for interstate operating authority. In other words, it was his feeling at that time, and he so expressed himself, that this one change would be sufficient to protect the rights—the grandfather rights—of those small carriers presently operating under State certificates. Now, he goes a little bit further. He not only wants to take away from the Interstate Commerce Commission any reviewable authority, by including the word "conclusive" on the basis of the application, but he wants to leave that entirely in the hands of the ICC to determine whether or not they shall have interstate operating rights within the State.

He wants to make the filing of the certificate conclusive proof before the Interstate Commerce Commission of the ability of this carrier to operate. What is the situation when this carrier may be in violation according to the State commission, or the State commission revokes his certificate? The situation as far as he is concerned is different there. He does not recognize the State's authority to take away that which the State has given and which the ICC was compelled to accept. Rather, he wants to bypass State authority and provide that the Interstate Commerce Commission, before revoking this man's interstate authority, after his intrastate authority has already been revoked by the State, and which was initially granted by the State—that the ICC must hold a formal proceeding and hearings as if this had been initially a certificate of public convenience and necessity granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission. That is what he seeks to do with this amendment. In other words, he is asking that the State take action which must be recognized by the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to the application for interstate rights. If he had left the words "prima facie" in, there might have been some argument for his present amendment. But since he left the Commission no alternative but to grant the application based on the State action, then it would appear to me that it would be only fair to let the Interstate Commerce Commission recognize the State's action if the State determines that it is in the public interest to revoke that certificate.

It is my hope, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment will be voted down.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. STAGGERS. I would like to ask my colleague this question. If the State body does revoke the right of a carrier to operate, does not that carrier have the right to go before the courts of that State?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; the carrier may go before the courts, of course.

Mr. STAGGERS. Can the public body be reversed by the courts?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course.

Mr. STAGGERS. He has the full right of a citizen to go before the courts for justice.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the decision of the State commission is reversed then he continues to retain his grandfather rights.

Mr. STAGGERS. He is operating under the laws of the State.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. SISK. Is it not a fact that under this proposed legislation for the first time these second proviso carriers are being brought under the regulation and supervision of the ICC?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is the gentleman talking about under the rights under the grandfather clause or under the new applications?

Mr. SISK. In either case.

Mr. WILLIAMS. With respect to the grandfather carriers the language as provided in the committee amendment does not change, alter, modify, extend or take away anything from these carriers. They will continue to operate as they are presently operating. There is a change, as the gentleman knows, with respect to new carriers. There is a new procedure. What the gentleman wants to do is, in effect, to give to these carriers, by virtue of State action, something which they are not now receiving under the law. He wants to provide that the State may issue Federal certificates of public convenience and necessity; is not that correct?

Mr. SISK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is not that correct?

Mr. SISK. I do not agree with that and I want to ask the gentleman this question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then what is the gentleman after?

Mr. SISK. The gentleman says that for these people who are being grandfathered in, who are now presently operating, we do nothing.

Is it not a fact that within a period of 120 days, they must seek a certain certificate if they are going to continue to move in interstate commerce; is that not correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The applicant for interstate authority has, under the grandfather clause, a period of 120 days from the time of enactment of this legislation to apply for his grandfather certificate from the ICC.

Mr. SISK. It applies to all those people who are at present designated as the so-called second proviso carriers?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. SISK. Then they must seek the certificate within 120 days.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate the attention of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Arkansas, and the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK]. I come from a district in which almost every motor carrier on the east coast operates and has a terminal. I have not had any communications from any of these people, and am surprised considering the importance of this subject. But I have had communications from interstate carriers within the last 24 hours urging me to support the Sisk amendments.

When we were discussing the rule earlier today, I asked the chairman of the committee if this legislation would affect to any degree an intrastate carrier who is not in violation of any of the rules and regulations and against whom no complaint has been made. I understood the chairman to say that this legislation would not affect such an intrastate carrier and that he would not be required to do anything if he already has filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission the necessary papers indicating that he has a certificate of public convenience from the public utilities commission of the State. Then the gentleman from California asked the gentleman from Mississippi some questions which makes me wonder whether I correctly understood the chairman of the committee when he responded to my previous question. I would like to get that cleared up once and for all in the RECORD as to whether or not this legislation, if it passes, without the Sisk amendments, will impose any additional obligations on intrastate carriers who are operating within the law today.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. What I said earlier to the gentleman was correct. Under the present procedure, when an intrastate carrier gets a certificate from his own utilities commission and then desires to engage in transporting interstate goods in connection with his intrastate operations, he files that certificate from the State utilities commission with the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The Interstate Commerce Commission under the second proviso of Section 206 (a) (1) of the Interstate Commerce Act gives him a letter authorizing him then to engage in the transportation of interstate shipments.

This provision requires nothing whatsoever except for the carrier to file that certificate with the Interstate Commerce Commission which in turn gives him the interstate authority automatically.

Mr. JONAS. If he has filed the letter then he does not have to prove to the Interstate Commerce Commission that there is a public necessity and demand for his service?

Mr. HARRIS. No, because this substitute amendment for this legislation carries with it the provision that the filing of the certificate from the State commission is conclusive proof and, therefore, cannot be questioned by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. JONAS. May I ask the gentleman from California if he is of the same opinion?

Mr. SISK. I am in basic agreement with the statement made by the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The object is to make the thing conclusive. I would have appreciated it had he gone a little farther with reference to the carriers who have not filed, and if there is a requirement——

Mr. JONAS. As I understand, they have 180 days in which to file.

Mr. HARRIS. No, no, let us go over that again. We have provided 180 days for the carrier to get himself straightened out with his local State commission if there is a question of suspension or revocation.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. JONAS was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. HARRIS. The carrier has 120 days within which to resubmit his certificate from the Public Utilities Commission of the State with the Interstate Commerce Commission get his certificate of registration under the grandfather provisions of the bill.

Mr. JONAS. If he has previously submitted that does he have to resubmit it?

Mr. HARRIS. I would think he would have to resubmit it; yes.

Mr. JONAS. The intrastate carrier, then, would within 120 days have to file additional papers with the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. HARRIS. Nothing except a copy of the certificate. It is a formality in order to carry out the administration of the act; it is purely administrative.

Mr. JONAS. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word just to clarify one provision of this legislation. We are talking about intrastate and interstate commerce. I think a great number of Members of this House believe when we say interstate that we are talking about the great interstate carriers which move from one coast of this Nation to the other across many States; that is not true. In the case of this legislation we are only talking about interstate carriers within a State. In the interstate commerce of the Nation the carriers have to go before the ICC and get their permission. They are regulated entirely by the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is only the interstate commerce within a State that we are talking about here, yet I am afraid many confuse intrastate and interstate because they are both within the one State.

In considering this legislation do not think of interstate carriers as going between the east coast and the west coast or between the different States of the Union. Such carriers have to go now before the Interstate Commerce Commission of this Nation and be regulated by them and get permits, and are under ICC regulation. So let us not confuse the carriers covered by this bill with those who operate between different States. We are talking only about the interstate commerce within a State when we are talking about this commerce now, and intrastate within the State itself because they handle short hauls or whatever they might want to do within the State.

Since it is within the State, I believe each Member of this House would say that the State body should have regulation of the commerce within the respective States, with the exception of interstate commerce, which is granted by the ICC now to carry freight between the different States of the Nation.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as a layman I would hesitate to get up here and get into a discussion of such a complicated subject as this is, but as one who had a little something to do with truckline operations before I came to Congress—which was right at the time we established the existing procedure of getting Federal authority for those who had nothing but State certificates—it does seem to me we are getting a long way from what actually happened at that time.

I think we are building up a West Virginia mountain out of a very small mole hill.

There are very few people affected by this bill. It is not going to be a thing that will make or break the industry, although it may be serious for a few operators. It is very minor from the industry standpoint.

However, it does seem to me we should keep the record straight. I think the chairman of the committee did get it straight a moment ago when he explained that these interstate rights were conferred by the Federal Government, but he did not emphasize it. If I may say in all kindness, the chairman of the subcommittee indicated and emphasized that it was his view that these rights to engage in interstate commerce within a State which we have been discussing were granted by the several States.

It is this viewpoint with which I want in all kindness to take issue. I know there are many who feel as does my friend from Mississippi, but as I see it there never has been a right to engage in interstate commerce conferred by any State regulatory body, and there never can be under our Constitution.

The Railroad Commission of Texas and the utilities commissions of other States have granted certificates to a great many people to engage in intrastate commerce. That is as far as they could go. They have no power to restrict or limit the right of anybody to engage in interstate commerce, and they have not sought to exercise such a power. Only the Federal Government has that power.

What happened is that in 1935 the Congress of the United States decided that if anybody was going to engage in interstate commerce, whether within a State or without the State, they must make some showing there was a need for that kind of service. They set up two methods of making that showing of need. One was to go before the Interstate Commerce Commission and let that agency determine there was a need for this service. The other was to accept as a fact the findings previously made by a State regulatory agency. The Congress in effect said if there has been a State regulatory agency which had already determined there was a need for service within the State, that was sufficient. In other words we, the Congress, said it here, not some State, but this Congress, said that the Interstate Commerce Commission need not and could not then review the question of public need.

The Congress itself found that a public need existed for interstate service. That is not a finding by a railroad commission or State utilities commission. That is a finding by the Congress. That is a right which was granted by this body and not by any State. No State can grant that right.

That is why I feel, Mr. Chairman, that it is incorrect, it is fundamentally unsound, to suggest that the States have granted these rights. I thoroughly agree that if the State can grant a right, the State can take away that right. But the States never granted these rights. The rights in question were granted by the Congress; and the rights, having been granted by the Federal Government, only the Federal Government can take those rights away. Of course, the States should have the right to take away the right to engage in intrastate commerce, because the State granted that right.

But the State did not grant the right to anybody to engage in interstate commerce. For that reason I am going to vote for the Sisk amendment which I think maintains the division between State and Federal powers in a clear and distinct manner.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. This is my interpretation of it, and I plan to join the gentleman in supporting the Sisk amendment.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in listening to this discussion for the last 2 hours I can certainly appreciate the difficulties our friends in Europe are having in trying to get together on the Common Market. I think the situation is very analogous. While our European allies try to resolve problems within seven nations, we are trying to create law here dealing with interstate commerce between 50 sovereign States within our Republic. I would like to take this time to ask a question of the chairman.

If I understand this legislation correctly, the question here is that under existing law, a State certificate issued by a State commerce commission to a carrier, when filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission, automatically permits him to handle interstate commerce within that State; is that correct?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct. That is the law.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Now, as I understand the particular legislation proposed here today, the purpose of this proposal is to give the Interstate Commerce Commission greater authority and greater latitude in accepting the validity of an application by an interstate carrier, whereas up to now the mere issuance of a State certificate makes it mandatory upon the Federal Commerce Commission to issue an interstate certificate to the same intrastate carrier. Under this proposal the Federal Commerce Commission would have greater control over the issuance of interstate carrier certificates. Do I understand that correctly, sir?

Mr. HARRIS. Insofar as existing carriers are concerned, those who now have authority to operate, no, it does not give them any greater authority. Insofar as the future is concerned, then it does give the ICC the authority to take a look to see whether or not the service is needed if a protest is made to the ICC by a party in interest who appeared before the State commission in opposition to the application of the carrier for interstate rights.

Mr. PUCINSKI. On page 3 of the committee report toward the middle of the page I find this language:

> The validity of the certificate filed with the Commission depends on its continued validity within the State.

Do I then correctly understand this language to mean that under existing law if a State commission refuses, rejects, or withdraws a certificate of an intrastate carrier, his rights under the interstate certificate fall also?

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Now, under the proposal pending before this House today, this would no longer be true. Even though a State certificate had been canceled or invalidated to a carrier by a State utilities commission, he would continue to have rights to operate within that particular State for at least another 6 months on the strength of his Federal certificate; is that not correct, sir?

Mr. HARRIS. On the strength of his certificate.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Now, this is where I wish the Chairman would clarify this point further. I understood during the discussion here today that even though an intrastate carrier handling interstate commerce was denied, for whatever reason, his certificate by the State commission, under the proposal of the committee bill pending before the House, he would have 6 additional months, or 180 days, to continue operating in order to square himself with the State commission; do I understand the committee chairman correctly on that assumption?

Mr. HARRIS. That is true.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Now, even though that State certificate has been withdrawn, under the proposal pending before the House today, he could continue operating for 6 months on the strength of the interstate or Federal commerce certificate which he originally received on the strength of his State certificate; is that not true, sir?

Mr. HARRIS. Under this proposed bill, that is true, but under present law, that is not true.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am grateful to the chairman for his time and patience in explaining this procedure to me. But on the basis of what the gentleman says, what protection are we giving State authorities to deal with carriers who violate the laws in regard to weights, license fees, or infractions, of other local State laws?

What protection are we giving a State to remove those carriers from its State highways immediately rather than having to wait for the carrier to exhaust the 6-month period during which he has protection under the Federal certificate? What protection are we giving to the State, if any, to enforce its own standards without delay?

Mr. HARRIS. We are taking nothing from the States through this with the exception of permitting the operator to operate for a period of 6 months during which he is supposed to get his business straightened out with the State. If he cannot do it within that period of time he loses his interstate operating authority.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The thing that disturbs me about this is the fact that if the State commission finds that a carrier has brazenly violated State regulations and invalidates his certificate, he still has 6 months to operate despite the State action. He may well continue to violate the law, if he so wishes.

I understand under the proposal, the State would have no recourse to deal with him, to get him off the highways for at least 6 more months; is this correct?

Mr. HARRIS. Under the proposal here there is nothing taken away from the State with reference to the requirement of safety on the highways and matters of that kind. They would be dealt with by the State. Insofar as his right to continue operating in interstate commerce there is nothing the State could do about it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. This is the question about which I am concerned. If this man is found to be in violation of State regulations, and if his certificate is taken away, he may continue operating even though under the standards of that State he is in violation? He may continue operating for an additional 6 months under this proposal before us today; is that correct?

Mr. HARRIS. That is true. However, under the Sisk amendment he may continue to operate until a long-drawn-out procedure of revocation has been concluded before the Interstate Commerce Commission, which might be several years.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if it is fair to impose this Federal control and this Federal right of eminent domain, so to speak, upon the States that are trying to maintain safety standards on their highways and protect their roads from overweight trucks. I do not know. Perhaps the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce can answer that question.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I do not feel that there would be too much trouble with meeting the State highway laws and safety rules. We are willing to lean over backwards in protecting those who have been in operation for these years and are presently in operation.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. I would like to point out what the chairman of the full committee has already pointed out, that in view of the question which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] has raised, if he is objecting to this 6-month period of operation after there has been conceivable cause for revocation of the rights, then I would say to the gentleman that he should vote for the committee bill. Actually, the Sisk amendment will compound the felony, so to speak.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am concerned about both the committee bill and the Sisk amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the chairman of the full Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for his courtesy in answering these questions.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate conclude in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, as I see this amendment, what is being attempted is to give to the applicant a right which he did not originally have, because the ICC was forced to grant the original license to move goods in interstate commerce. Now they want to go back and say that because the Interstate Commerce Commission was forced to give this right they cannot automatically take it away. I say that what they automatically gave they can take away automatically. Had they had a hearing at the inception of the grant, then they could rightfully claim the right to have revocation hearings, and so forth, at the end. But that is not the case.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I should like to comment briefly on the statements made a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI]. Of course, any operator, a truck operator or otherwise, who was in violation of safety regulations or highway regulations, and so on, is going to be forced to cease operations. I think that is beside the point. There is certainly no attempt on the part of the Federal Government—the ICC or anyone else—to usurp State police powers. I should hope that that is understood. This is not the question at issue whatsoever. We have based our position on the fact that we feel that the present operators who will be grandfathered in should not be discriminated against, but should be treated exactly as every other second proviso operator or intrastate trucker that moves freight in interstate commerce. That is all in the world they will receive under the provisions of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I regret to find myself in opposition to my chairman and the chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill. It is my understanding that the intrastate and the interstate truckers are in agreement on the Sisk amendment. I am not criticizing my distinguished chairman for not going along in that agreement, but as long as they have agreed I see no reason why we should not take the Sisk amendment in its entirety. I shall support the Sisk amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. CHURCH) there were—ayes 86, noes 34.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ASPINALL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 320) to amend the provisions contained in part II of the Interstate Commerce Act concerning registration of State certificates whereby a common carrier by motor vehicle may engage in interstate and foreign commerce within a State, pursuant to House Resolution 451, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO REVISE AND EXTEND

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks made in Committee of the Whole this afternoon on the bill S. 320.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MR. ALBERT DESIGNATED SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE FOR FEBRUARY 1, 1962

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that he is designating as Speaker pro tempore for tomorrow the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 4355(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. RIEHLMAN, and Mr. MINSHALL.

U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 6968(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. BAILEY, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. BETTS, and Mr. LAIRD.

U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 9355(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. CHENOWETH, and Mr. OSTERTAG.

U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 46 United States Code 1126c, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. CAREY, and Mr. McINTIRE.

U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 14 United States Code 194(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast

Guard Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. DADDARIO, and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

A BILL TO ESTABLISH A FEDERAL COMMISSION ON AGING

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD and to include therewith a bill introduced by me today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, following the opening session of the White House Conference on Aging, in January of last year, I introduced H.R. 2238, to establish a Federal Commission on Aging.

There is a long record of my interest and impatience with the Federal program in aging. This is well documented through the pages of appropriation hearings, with representatives from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the special hearings conducted by Congressman Wier on a Bureau of Aging.

I shall not take time here to outline in detail the challenges and recommendations made to the Department. I was deeply concerned then, and 5 years, 1 White House Conference, 12 regional meetings, and 30 Senate hearings later we find ourselves in the same dilemma—or perhaps a more serious one because we have failed in our promise to the Nation's senior citizens. The whole purpose of the White House Conference was to develop a blueprint for action to meet the known needs of our aging population.

Hearings on H.R. 2238 were scheduled last July and a very imposing array of witnesses were scheduled to appear on behalf of the bill. About this same time a major organizational change was made in the staff on aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Rather than do anything that might detract from affecting long overdue action, I requested a postponement of the hearings to permit the Department to demonstrate its interest and initiate a dynamic program to implement the recommendations of the White House Conference on Aging and to strengthen the hitherto ineffectual activities of the Federal Council on Aging.

It is now my firm conviction that until a high-level agency is created that will command the respect and full attention of the Nation's total efforts, we cannot achieve the goals that we have defined for America's senior citizens.

I am pleased to say that today in the Senate, the Honorable PAT MCNAMARA is introducing an identical bill which will establish the U.S. Commission on Aging. This is especially significant in view of the outstanding service rendered by Senator MCNAMARA's Special Committee on Aging and his firsthand knowledge of the need for a Federal agency devoting full time to the wide range of problems of the elderly.

My bill provides for the creation of the U.S. Commission on Aging, a permanent, independent agency that will authorize grants to States for establishing and improving organizations to meet the problems of the aging, to conduct necessary surveys and studies, and to authorize grants for community projects and demonstration programs that will expand and sustain the creative ambitions of the elderly. Funds will also be available for training personnel and for research in the field of aging.

The bill sets forth a 10-point declaration of objectives for older Americans as the announced policy of the United States to insure for them a life of recognition, independence, and dignity in active retirement. The objectives are:

First. An adequate income for retirement in health, honor, and dignity.

Second. Equal opportunity to employment.

Third. The best possible physical and mental health.

Fourth. Suitable housing.

Fifth. Services to achieve independent living.

Sixth. Full opportunity for meaningful activity.

Seventh. Efficient, coordinated community services when needed.

Eighth. Immediate benefit from proven research knowledge.

Ninth. Freedom, independence, and free exercise of individual initiative.

Tenth. The right to consideration of their needs and potentials without fragmentation.

I am well aware of the many proposals that have been made to contain the total Federal program on aging within the framework of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

All of us are familiar with the repeated attempts to strengthen and reconstitute the programs and to coordinate the interdepartmental interests in aging. Realistically, it has always been regarded as another Health, Education, and Welfare program that did not stimulate or involve the full participation of other departments or agencies that needed to be included in a balanced national program. The urgent demands for equal employment opportunities and suitable housing are but two obvious services that do not, should not fall within the jurisdiction of another department to limit or direct.

A full understanding of the aims and functions of the U.S. Commission on Aging will reveal a recognition and opportunity for each of the Federal agencies to contribute its full potential toward a dynamic action program that will measure up to the standards of a nation of well-informed citizens and the rights of 17 million senior Americans.

H.R. 10014

A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Commission on Aging and to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development of programs which will benefit older persons, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "United States Commission on Aging Act".

TITLE I—OBJECTIVES; DEFINITIONS

Declaration of objectives

SEC. 101. The Congress hereby finds and declares that, in keeping with the traditional American concept of the inherent dignity of the individual in our democratic society, the older people of our Nation are entitled to, and it is the joint and several duty and responsibility of the Governments of the United States and the several States and their political subdivisions and of public and private agencies and organizations to take steps designed to assist our older people in attaining the following objectives—

(1) an adequate income (in accordance with the American standard of living) which permits retirement in health, honor, and dignity after years of contribution to the economy;

(2) full opportunity for gainful employment, with no discriminating personnel practices because of age, for those who are able and want to work;

(3) the best possible physical and mental health which medical science can make available through preventive care, treatment, and rehabilitation, available without regard to economic status;

(4) suitable housing, independently selected, which is designed and located with reference to the special needs of, and is available at costs which, they can afford;

(5) opportunity to achieve the maximum degree of independence and satisfaction in living arrangements through services which make institutional care unnecessary;

(6) full opportunity for meaningful activity within the widest range of civic, cultural, and recreational pursuits;

(7) efficient community services which provide social assistance in a coordinated manner and which are readily available when needed;

(8) immediate benefit from proven research knowledge which can sustain and improve health and happiness;

(9) freedom, independence, and the free exercise of individual initiative in planning and managing their own lives; and

(10) the right to consideration of their needs and potentials, without fragmentation, by a high-level and full-time agency of the Federal Government and of each State to plan and coordinate programs for, and to act as a spokesman on behalf of, older people in achieving the foregoing objectives.

Implementation of objectives

SEC. 102. The Congress further finds and declares that the achievement of the foregoing objectives requires the creation of a permanent United States Commission on Aging, appointed by the President and responsible to him, which would serve as the focal point within the Federal Government for developing national policy; for providing information, guidance, and support to the governmental and nongovernmental agencies with programs in the field of aging; and for sponsoring a balanced nationwide program to achieve such objectives.

Definitions

SEC. 103. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and

(2) the term "nonprofit institution or organization" means an institution or organization which is, or is owned by, one or more corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

TITLE II—COMMISSION; ADVISORY COUNCIL; INTERDEPARTMENTAL COUNCIL

Establishment of Commission

SEC. 201. (a) For the purpose of directing the national effort to carry out the policy set forth in section 101 of this Act, there is hereby established a permanent bipartisan commission to be known as the "United States Commission on Aging" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall consist of three members (not more than two of whom shall belong to the same political party) to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Commission shall consist of individuals who, by reason of their education, experience, or background, have special competence in dealing with the wide range of problems confronting aged persons.

(c) The Chairman of the Commission shall be the member so designated by the President at the time of appointment.

(d) A vacancy occurring in the Commission shall not affect its powers, and such vacancy shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(e) Decisions of the Commission shall be determined by majority vote of the members of the Commission.

(f) The Chairman of the Commission shall be compensated at the rate of $22,500 per annum and each of the other members of the Commission shall be compensated at the rate of $20,000 per annum.

Functions of Commission

SEC. 202 (a) It shall be the duty and function of the Commission to—

(1) make continuing surveys and studies of the problems and potentials of older people and of the extent to which they are being met and utilized, respectively, and make periodic reports to the President and the Congress of the results of such surveys and studies;

(2) develop policy and legislative proposals in the light of the needs of older people, their potential contributory roles, and with reference to the requirements of the economy and of the total population, for submission to the President and the Congress;

(3) maintain a continuing review of the programs of departments and agencies of the Federal Government with respect to problems of the aged, and make recommendations for coordinated program development in the light of newly acquired knowledge, changing needs, and current program evaluation;

(4) assist States, local communities, and other nonprofit organizations in developing programs for the aged, by providing technical assistance with respect to organization of such programs, and by conducting research and demonstrations;

(5) sponsor, and cooperate with other agencies in conducting conferences, seminars, training, and research programs in aging;

(6) collect, compile, and disseminate to interested parties, through periodicals, pamphlets, and other appropriate means, information relating to aging;

(7) continuously assist States and local communities in assessing needs of the aged, developing approaches and programs with respect to problems of the aged, obtaining relevant information, and measuring the progress of such programs;

(8) actively promote the dissemination of information about Federal programs in the field of aging, stimulate interest in and utilization of such programs on the part of States, local communities, and nonprofit organizations;

(9) serve as a central source of information for recommendations emanating from the White House Conference on Aging and other conferences or hearings held by the executive or legislative branches of the Government and for progress made in implementing such recommendations;

(10) administer the grant-in-aid programs established by this Act and otherwise carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) The Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress an annual report on or before January 31 of each year on the operations and activities of the Commission for the preceding calendar year. The Commission may also submit, at such times as it deems appropriate, additional reports to the President, to the Congress, or to any committee of the Congress, or either House thereof, or to any other governmental entity.

Investigatory powers of Commission

SEC. 203. In carrying out its duties under this Act, the Commission, or any duly authorized committee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony as the Commission or such committee may deem advisable. The Chairman of the Commission or any member authorized by him may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before any committee thereof. The Commission shall have such powers of subpena and compulsion of attendance of witnesses and production of documents as are conferred upon the Securities and Exchange Commission by subsection (c) of section 18 of the Act of August 26, 1935, and the provisions of subsection (d) of such section shall be applicable to all persons summoned by subpena or otherwise to attend and testify or produce such documents as are described therein before the Commission, except that no subpena shall be issued except under the signature of the Chairman, and application to any court for aid in enforcing such subpena may be made only by the Chairman. Subpenas shall be served by any person designated by the Chairman.

Staff of Commission

SEC. 204. (a) The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of a Staff Director and such additional professional, clerical, and other personnel as the Commission shall deem necessary or appropriate in carrying out its duties and functions under this Act. All permanent staff personnel of the Commission shall be appointed in accordance with the civil service laws and their compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

Cooperation of Government agencies

SEC. 205. The Commission is authorized to request from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions; and such department, agency, or instrumentality is authorized to cooperate with the Commission, and, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request of the Chairman of the Commission or other member of the Commission designated by such Chairman.

Advisory Council

SEC. 206. (a) For the purpose of advising the Commission on matters of general policy and in otherwise assisting the Commission in the administration of this Act, there is hereby established a council to be known as the "Advisory Council to the Commission on Aging" (hereinafter referred to as the "Advisory Council").

(b)(1) The Advisory Council shall consist of twenty members as follows:

(A) the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or his designee; the Secretary of Labor or his designee; the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs or his designee; and the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency or his designee;

(B) six citizens who are not officers or employees of the United States or any State and who, by reason of education, experience, or background, are especially competent to deal with the problems confronting aged persons, to be appointed by the President;

(C) three Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate;

(D) three Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(E) four citizens who are not officers or employees of the United States, to be appointed by the Governors' Conference.

(2) Members appointed pursuant to clause (B) shall be appointed without regard to political affiliation; of the members appointed pursuant to clause (C), not more than two shall be members of the majority political party of the Senate; of the members appointed pursuant to clause (D), not more than two shall be members of the majority political party of the House of Representatives.

(3) Members appointed pursuant to paragraph (1)(B) shall be appointed for a term of three years; except that, of the members first appointed, two shall be appointed for one year, two for two years, and two for three years; and except that, any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

(c) Any member of the Advisory Council who is not a regular full-time officer or employee of the United States shall, while attending meetings or conferences of the Advisory Council or otherwise engaged on the business of such council, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Commission, but not to exceed $75 per diem, including travel time, and any member of the Advisory Council while away from his home or regular place of business may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(d)(1) Any member of the Advisory Council who is not a regular full-time officer or employee of the United States is hereby exempted, with respect to such appointment, from the operation of sections 281, 285, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99), except as otherwise specified in paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(2) The exemption granted by paragraph (1) shall not extend—

(A) to the receipt or payment of salary in connection with the appointee's Government service from any source other than the private employer of the appointee at the time of his appointment, or

(B) during the period of such appointment, to the prosecution or participation in the prosecution by any person so appointed, of any claim against the Government involving any matter with which such person, during such period, is or was directly connected by reason of such appointment.

Interdepartmental Council on Aging

SEC. 207. There is hereby established an Interdepartmental Council on Aging (hereinafter referred to as the "Interdepartmental Council") consisting of the Chairman of the Commission, as Chairman; the heads of the following executive departments or agencies or their designees: the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Labor, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Veterans' Administration; and the heads of such other executive departments or agencies as the Commission shall designate on a temporary or continuing basis. The Interdepartmental Council shall make recommendations to the Commission with a view to the improvement and coordination of functions and responsibilities of the executive branch of the Government with respect to problems of aged persons or the aging.

TITLE III—ADMINISTRATION AND APPROPRIATIONS

Administration

SEC. 301. (a) In administering this Act, the Commission shall cooperate with and render technical assistance to States, local communities, and nonprofit organizations in matters relating to needs of older persons, provide short-term training and instruction in technical matters relating to services for such persons, and otherwise promote the development and improvement of programs for services on behalf of such persons.

(b) The Commission is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary or desirable in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Appropriations

SEC. 302. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such funds as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

TITLE IV—PLANNING GRANTS

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 401. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated $2,090,000 to remain available until expended, for grants to States for establishing and initiating the operation of a State agency to, or improving the operation of an existing State agency to, and for assisting such agency to—

(1) plan new or improved programs to carry out the purposes of this Act;

(2) assist communities in planning and developing such programs;

(3) improve the coordination of programs and other activities to carry out such purposes; and

(4) conduct studies to assist in planning and improvement of such programs.

(b) The sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted and had approved applications for funds under this title.

State applications

SEC. 402. The Commission shall approve an application of a State for funds for the purposes referred to in section 401 if such application—

(1) designates a single State agency with responsibility for planning and coordination of programs for the aged to assume the full responsibility of administering such funds;

(2) provides for the coordination with other State agencies concerned with the needs of older persons;

(3) provides for an analysis of the needs and potentialities of the older persons of the State and establishes a schedule of priorities of programs and services based on urgency of the need therefor; and

(4) provides that the designated State agency shall make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commission may from time to time reasonably require, and comply with such provisions as the Commission may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

Allotments and payments to the States

SEC. 403. From any sum appropriated pursuant to section 401, an allotment of $10,000 shall be made to the Virgin Islands, and the remainder shall be allotted equally among the other States. Each State which is entitled thereto shall receive an amount equal to its allotment.

TITLE V—PROJECT GRANTS

Appropriation

SEC. 501. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for each of the succeeding four fiscal years, the sum of $10,000,000 for grants to States for projects for—

(1) community planning and coordination of programs for carrying out the purposes of this Act;

(2) demonstrations of programs or activities which are particularly valuable in carrying out such purposes;

(3) training of special personnel (including volunteers) needed to carry out such programs and activities; and

(4) establishment of new or expansion of existing programs to carry out such purposes, including establishment of new or expansion of existing centers providing recreational and other leisure-time activities and informational, counseling, and referral services for older persons and assisting such persons in providing volunteer community or civic services.

Allotments

SEC. 502. (a) From the amount appropriated for a fiscal year under section 501, each State shall receive an allotment which bears the same ratio to such amount as the population aged 65 or over in such State bears to the population aged 65 or over in all of the States, as determined by the Commission on the basis of the best and most recent information available to it, including any relevant data furnished to it by the Department of Commerce. The allotment of any State under the preceding sentence which is less than one per cent of the total of the allotments to all the States under such sentence shall be increased to one per cent of such total, the amounts required for this purpose being derived by proportionately reducing the allotments of each of the remaining States under such sentence, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than one per cent of such total.

(b) The allotment of any State under subsection (a) shall be available for grants to such State to pay part of the cost of projects approved by the State in accordance with its State plan approved under section 503. To the extent permitted by the State's allotment under this section, such payments with respect to any project shall equal 75 per cent of the cost of such project for each of the first two years of the duration of such project, and 50 per cent of such cost for each of the following three years of the duration of such project; except that (1) at the request of the State, such payments may be less than such percentage of the cost of such project, and (2) grants may not be made under this title for any such project for more than five years or for any period after June 30, 1970.

State plans

SEC. 503. (a) The Commission shall approve a State plan for purposes of this title which—

(1) designates the single State agency referred to in section 402(1) as the sole agency for administering or supervising the administration of the plan;

(2) provides for such financial participation by the State or communities with respect to State activities and projects under the plan as the Commission may by regulations prescribe in order to assure continuation of State activities and desirable projects after termination of Federal financial support under this Act;

(3) provide for development of programs and activities for carrying out the purposes of this Act, for furnishing consultative, technical, or information services to public or nonprofit private agencies or organizations engaged in activities relating to the special problems or welfare of older persons, and for coordinating the activities of such agencies or organizations to the extent feasible;

(4) provide for consultation with and utilization, pursuant to agreement with the head thereof, of the services and facilities of appropriate State or local public or nonprofit private agencies and organizations in the administration of the plan and in the development of such programs and activities;

(5) provide such methods of administration (including methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Commission shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods) as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan;

(6) sets forth principles for determining the priority of projects in the State, and provides for approval of such projects, insofar as financial resources available therefor make possible, in the order determined by application of such principles;

(7) provides for approval of projects of only public or nonprofit private agencies or organizations, and for an opportunity for a hearing before the State agency for any applicant for approval of a project;

(8) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of an accounting for Federal funds paid under this title; and

(9) provides that the State agency will make such reports to the Commission, in such form and containing such information, as may reasonably be necessary to enable it to perform its functions under this Act.

The Commission shall not finally disapprove any State plan, or any modification thereof submitted under this section without first affording the State agency designated as provided in paragraph (1) reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Commission, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of a State plan approved under subsection (a), finds that—

(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a), or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commission shall notify such State agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this section (or, in the discretion of the Commission, further payments to the State will be limited to projects under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure), until the Commission is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until the Commission is so satisfied, it shall make no further payments to such State under this section (or shall limit payments to projects under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

(c) A State agency notified as provided in subsection (a) or (b) and dissatisfied with a final action of the Commission under such subsection may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commission, or any officer designated by it for that purpose. The Commission shall thereupon file in the court the record of the proceedings on which it based its action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commission or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently. The findings of the Commission as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commission to take further evidence, and the Commission may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify its previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commission shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

Costs of State plan administration

SEC. 504. (a) There is also authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sum as may be necessary for assisting in paying the costs of the State agency (designated pursuant to section 503(a)(1)) in administering the State plan approved under section 503, including the costs of carrying on the functions referred to in subsection (a)(3) thereof.

(b) From the amount appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for any fiscal year, each State shall receive, subject to the following sentence, an allotment which bears the same ratio to such amount as the population of the State aged 65 or over bears to the population aged 65 or over in all the States, as determined by the Commission on the basis of the best and most recent information available to it, including any relevant data furnished to it by the Department of Commerce. The minimum allotment to any State shall be $15,000 and the maximum allotment for any State shall be $25,000, the total thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the amount allotted to each of the remaining States under the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than $15,000.

(c) From a State's allotment for a fiscal year under subsection (b) the Commission shall from time to time pay one-half of the costs referred to in subsection (a).

TITLE VI—RESEARCH, TRAINING, AND DEMONSTRATION GRANTS

SEC. 601. (a) The Commission is authorized to make grants to public or private nonprofit agencies, institutions, or organizations for special demonstration, research, or training projects relating to the special educational, welfare, recreational, social, economic, or other problems of older persons or the aging. Such grants may be conditioned on such participation by the recipient in the form of money, facilities, or services as the Commission may deem appropriate. In the case of any such grant for a project which the Commission determines will be of special national significance or will be of significance in many communities in the several States, no such financial participation shall be required.

(b) Any grant under subsection (a) for any project made from an appropriation for any fiscal year may include such amounts as the Commission determines to be necessary for succeeding years for completion of the Federal financial participation in the cost of such project as approved by the Commission, except that no grant for any project may include amounts for more than five years or for any period after June 30, 1970.

(c) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

TITLE VII—ADMINISTRATION BY COMMISSION

SEC. 701. (a) If at the close of June 30, 1965, any State shall have failed to formulate a State planning program approved under title IV, the Commission shall have the authority to formulate plans for programs for the aged and aging in such State and to make grants to local communities, and public and private nonprofit organizations within such State for the purpose of establishing and carrying out such programs.

(b) In administering the provisions of subsection (a), the Commission shall, insofar as is possible, be governed by the same criteria in formulating plans for such State, making grants for projects within such State, and otherwise in administering this Act within such State, as would have governed such State if such State had had approved the State plans required as a condition for financial participation under the preceding titles of this Act.

STATEMENT ON A BILL TO ESTABLISH THE U.S. COMMISSION ON AGING

It has long been recognized that there is need at the Federal level for an agency concerned full time with the full range of problems of America's senior citizens.

In order that this can be a high-level agency commanding the respect and full attention of the Nation's total efforts in behalf of the aging, the attached bill provides for the creation of an independent U.S. Commission on Aging. The bill authorizes $2,090,000 for planning grants to the States for establishing or improving agencies organized to meet the problems of the aging in their States and to conduct necessary surveys and studies. It further authorizes $10 million in project grants for community projects and coordination efforts and to expand demonstrations that sustain the creative contributions of the elderly, and $2 million for training personnel and for research and demonstration projects.

A DECLARATION OF OBJECTIVES

The act sets forth a 10-point declaration of objectives for older Americans as the declared policy of the United States to insure for them a life of recognition, independence, and dignity in active retirement.

These objectives are:

1. An adequate income for retirement in health, honor, and dignity.

2. Equal opportunity to employment.

3. The best possible physical and mental health.

4. Suitable housing.

5. Services to achieve independent living.

6 Full opportunity for meaningful activity.

7. Efficient, coordinated community services when needed.

8. Immediate benefit from proven research knowledge.

9. Freedom, independence, and free exercise of individual initiative.

10. The right to consideration of their needs and potentials without fragmentation.

THE U.S. COMMISSION ON AGING

1. The act establishes a permanent independent Commission, composed of a Commissioner and two Assistant Commissioners appointed by the President.

2. Functions of the Commission:

(a) Make continuing studies of problems and potentials of older people.

(b) Develop policy and legislative proposals in aging for submission to the President and the Congress.

(c) Maintain a continuing review of Federal programs in aging and make recommendations for coordinated program development.

(d) Administer grants provided by the act and provide technical and financial assistance in areas not covered by existing programs.

(e) Sponsor and cooperate in conducting conferences, seminars, training and research programs.

(f) Maintain a clearinghouse of information on aging.

(g) Work continuously with States and communities in assessing needs and developing approaches and programs, including active promotion of Federal programs in the field of aging.

(h) Conduct an intensive followup of recommendations and actions resulting from the White House Conference on Aging and other conferences or hearings.

ADVISORY COUNCIL TO THE COMMISSION

The act provides for a Advisory Council of 20 members: 10 appointed by the President, of whom (a) 4 shall be the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Labor, the Administrator of Housing and Home Finance, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; and (b) 6 shall be nongovernmental leaders in the field of aging. Three Members of the Senate, appointed by the President of the Senate; three Members of the House, appointed by the Speaker of the House; four members appointed by the Governors' conference.

FEDERAL INTERDEPARTMENTAL COUNCIL ON AGING

The act provides for a continuing Council, with the Commissioner serving as permanent Chairman, consisting of the representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Labor, the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration, and of such other agencies as the Commission identifies.

GRANT PROGRAMS

The act provides for three types of grant programs to be administered by the U.S. Commission on Aging:

1. Planning grants of $2,090,000 ($40,000 to each State, $10,000 to the Virgin Islands) to assist each State in establishing and initiating the operation of a State agency or improving the operation of an existing agency to:

(a) Plan new or improved programs to carry out the purposes of the act;

(b) Assist communities in planning and developing such programs;

(c) Improve coordination among programs and activities; and

(d) Conduct studies.

2. Project grants to the States to initiate and operate projects to further the policies set forth in the declaration of objectives, in accordance with plans developed by the State agency for planning and coordination. (In the event that there is no such State agency, the Commissioner is empowered to make direct project grants):

(a) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for each of the following 4 fiscal years, the sum of $10 million is authorized.

(b) These funds are to be allotted to the States in accordance with a formula based on the ratio of the State's population aged 65 or over bears to the population aged 65 or over of all the States, with a minimum of $50,000 to each State.

(c) The Federal share with respect to a specific project shall not exceed: 75 percent for each of the first 2 years and 50 percent for each of the next 3 years.

(d) There is provision for Federal sharing in the costs of the State administrative agency (50 percent with a minimum of $15,000 and a maximum of $25,000 on the Federal share).

(e) State plans for such project grants shall be approved by the Commission.

3. The act authorizes grants to public and other nonprofit institutions and organizations for demonstration, research and training projects. The sum of $2 million is authorized for this purpose.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow to file certain reports.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GEN. WLADIMIR B. KRZYZANOWSKI

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this is the 75th anniversary of the death of Gen. Wladimir B. Krzyzanowski, and it is being more appropriately commemorated by the American Polish Civil War Centennial Committee.

Governor Kerner of Illinois has proclaimed this day as General Krzyzanowski Memorial Day in recognition of the service rendered to our Nation by this outstanding citizen.

General Krzyzanowski is typical of the many great foreign-born men who contributed much to the development of our country and certainly enriched our history. He fought valiantly for the principles of our free society, and his devotion to the U.S. Government sets an example to all of us to forever defend our sacred rights.

I wish to point out that General Krzyzanowski was one of the outstanding military figures in the Civil War, and later continued his effective service as the first Governor of Alaska. I wish to emphasize that he is one of the foremost Americans of Polish extraction who served in our Civil War period, and the Civil War Centennial commemoration now taking place throughout the country serves a wonderful purpose in recalling to our minds that wonderful, fascinating, heroic period in American history.

The Civil War Centennial brings to our mind data on events and personages that have played an important part in the history of the United States of over five decades ago. The present generation of Poles in America is first beginning to glean bits of information about the part that Poles played in the great American calamity—the Civil War.

From the very outset of that war, Poles took active part and many of them achieved recognition, advancement, and even honors were heaped upon them.

It is a significant fact for any American-born Pole to know that the first men to fall on both the southern and northern sides were Poles.

Eighteen-year-old Tadeusz Strawinski, son of a Polish exile, lost his life in the Confederate attack on Fort Sumter that opened the Civil War. Those who would care to gaze at the official record of early casualties will find Tadeusz Strawinski heading the list.

On the side of the Union the first officer to fall was Constantine Blendowski, a captain in the service, who was fatally wounded in St. Louis on the 10th day of May 1861. Blendowski was one of the men responsible for the State of Missouri staying with the Union.

All told some 500 Poles lost their lives for the cause of the Union, while scores did likewise for the South. The total enlistment was some 4,000 Poles in the Northern army and about 1,000 in the Southern forces. This represented one-sixth of the entire Polish population in the United States at that time some 30,000.

When you stop to consider the fact that only 14 percent of the entire population was actually engaged in the War, you gain an idea of the self-sacrifice and the patriotism the early Polish settlers already manifested for this country.

The most outstanding Polish figure in the Civil War was Gen. Wladimir B. Krzyzanowski. His own perseverance and remarkable intellect made him rise rapidly from the rank of common soldier to that of general. General Krzyzanowski was born in Poland in 1824. As a boy he was one of the vast body of Polish students who dreamed, ate, talked and fought for Polish independence. The German spies soon were suspicious of his actions and young Wlodzimierz had to flee the country and came to America. Here in America, Krzyzanowski managed to finish his schooling and received a degree as an engineer. Many a present day railroad in the middle west was mapped out by Krzyzanowski himself.

When the war broke out Krzyzanowski organized one of the first companies of soldiers for the Union in Washington, D.C. Peculiarly enough, he himself had no higher rank than that of an ordinary soldier. His modesty was rewarded, however, and the War Office gave him the rank of captain. From captain he rapidly advanced to major and later to colonel of the 58th Infantry Division of New York. The 58th Infantry was famous at the time for having many Poles in its ranks and was known as "The Polish Legion."

Colonel Krzyzanowski's heroism and inspirational leadership at the battle of Cross Keys, fought on the 8th day of June 1862, won for him the rank of brigadier general. Two months later at the famous battle of Bull Run, Brigadier General Krzyzanowski once more distinguished himself with such exceptional service that President Lincoln unhesitatingly appointed him to the rank of general. The Senate, however, failed to approve the appointment because they could not pronounce his name. Krzyzanowski, instead of being disheartened, kept right on using his name, believing that a man's deeds and not his name really mattered after all.

In the murderous battle of Chancellorsville, during the famous attack of Stonewall Jackson, the troops under Krzyzanowski's command were the only troops that kept their ground. During the battle of Gettysburg the same thing happened. Later Krzyzanowski and his men made several forced marches into Tennessee and there for a time occupied the town of Bridgeport, Tenn. Finally, toward the close of the war Congress, in full tribute for the services rendered by the Pole with the unpronounceable name, named Krzyzanowski general of his brigade.

General Krzyzanowski was beloved by every member of his brigade because he shared their troubles, hunger, miseries, joys, and victories. Yet when the occasion demanded, a few words from him was enough to make every man go plunging blindly into enemy fire. At the close of the war the officers and soldiers of his brigade gave him a beautiful sword with the inscription: "With sincere homage to our beloved commander from the officers and soldiers of the 2d Brigade, 3d Division, 2d Corps."

In 1867 the United States bought Alaska from Russia and General Krzyzanowski was chosen as the first administrator of the newly acquired territory that has proved so rich since then. In his later years he served in governmental capacities at Panama and New York.

On January 31, 1887, exactly 75 years ago, the war rigors undermined General Krzyzanowski's health and he died in New York City. At a splendid State funeral General Krzyzanowski was buried, while warm words of praise from the lips of Carl Schurz, Senator and Secretary of the Treasury, lighted up the chill countryside of the southernmost rise of the Greenwood Cemetery in Brooklyn. There on a patch of land that represented the outskirts of Brooklyn, lay General Krzyzanowski for many years. Later on, the Steinwehr Post 192 of the Grand Army of the Republic raised a headstone in tribute to Gen. Wladimir Krzyzanowski, which can be seen today at the Polish Roman Catholic Union Museum in Chicago.

Significant also is the fact that some 10 years after General Krzyzanowski's death, a great wave of immigration brought many Poles out to settle and live in what is known today as South Brooklyn. So within hailing distance of thousands of his own kind, General Krzyzanowski peacefully reposed—after a life of heroism, sacrifice, and patriotism for his adopted country.

Although the earth closed over the mortal remains of General Krzyzanowski, yet his life and deeds were soon to become an integral part of the history of America, and on the 31st day of January 1937, 50 years after his death, the General Krzyzanowski Memorial Committee paid a fitting tribute at the grave of the general.

Later on, on October 13 of the same year, General Krzyzanowski's remains and those of his wife were reinterred in Arlington Cemetery with great ceremony, highlighted by a radio address by President Roosevelt.

Mr. Speaker, Mayor Daley of Chicago also has proclaimed January 31 as Gen. Wladimir B. Krzyzanowski Day in Chicago, and I insert into the RECORD at this time Mayor Daley's proclamation:

> Whereas the Civil War Centennial which is this year being observed nationally, brings to mind events and personages that have played an important part in the history of our country; and
>
> Whereas Gen. Wladimir Krzyzanowski, who was born in Poland in 1824, was one of the great heroes of the Civil War; and
>
> Whereas at the age of 22 he came to America and began the distinguished career which was to take him to the heights of glory; and
>
> Whereas when the war broke out he organized one of the first companies of Union soldiers and was soon given the rank of captain by the War Office and later became a colonel of the 58th Infantry Division of New York which was known as "The Polish Legion"; and

Whereas he participated in the battles of Cross Keys, of Bull Run, of Chancellorsville and Gettysburg, and was promoted to the rank of general by President Lincoln, a recognition later confirmed by Congress; and

Whereas the 75th anniversary of his death will be observed on January 31, under auspices of the American Polish Civil War Centennial Committee: Now, therefore

I, Richard J. Daley, mayor of the city of Chicago, do hereby proclaim January 31, 1962, to be "Gen Wladimir B. Krzyzanowski Day in Chicago," and urge all citizens to join in tribute to the unforgettable service of this great military leader to the unification of our great country.

Dated this 17th day of January A.D. 1962.

RICHARD J. DALEY,
Mayor.

PUNTA DEL ESTE MEETING

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] may extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is with some concern that I noted the headlines in the papers this morning about the events which took place at the Punta del Este meeting.

It seems as if we are trying to convince ourselves that the defeat we suffered at that meeting is somehow a victory, that our failure to win economic sanctions is not as important as our meager victory in winning support for a resolution to kick Fidel Castro out of the Organization of American States.

This, to me, has about the same significance as barring Fidel from membership in the Daughters of the American Revolution.

I do not mean to downgrade the efforts of the Organization of American States, nor the Daughters of the American Revolution. Both are worthy organizations with high purposes and outstanding records of achievement.

But I do deplore our attitude toward our sister Republics in the Western Hemisphere. I do deplore our "holier-than-thou" concept of our own importance.

One reason why we may have lost at Punta del Este is because we told the sovereign nations of Latin America, in effect, "Don't do as we do. Do as we say."

We attempted to bury Castro under a barrage of words when all of us know that Fidel has plenty of words and few accomplishments to show for his subjugation of the people of Cuba.

We pressed for complete economic sanctions against Cuba when our own Government has refused to take action to impose complete economic sanctions on its own.

As an example of what I am talking about, let us consider what happened last year in our trade with Cuba.

In 1961, we sold about $15 million worth of goods to Cuba. On the other hand, we imported some $32 million in goods from Cuba into the United States.

That leaves a net trade deficit of $17 million last year alone at a time when we were asking our sister Latin American Republics to take strong economic action against Castro and at a time when Castro was boasting to the world that he had not only pulled the wool over the eyes of the United States, but his own people in Cuba as well.

This $17 million in Yankee dollars is helping to keep Castro in power and is postponing the day when communism will be rooted out of this hemisphere.

Most of this trade deficit is because of one product, tobacco products for the making of cigars.

Now I am sure that my colleagues here in the House of Representatives enjoy a good cigar after a hearty meal as well as anyone else.

Yet, last year, on September 15, my colleagues and I here in the House decided, in effect, to forego the Havana cigars for the duration. The House passed H.R. 8465 which would have imposed a total ban on trade with Cuba, except for our military installation at Guantanamo Bay, until such time as the President proclaimed in the Federal Register that Cuba no longer was under Communist domination.

This bill, I understand, is still languishing in the Senate.

It is interesting to note that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported this bill to the floor of the House despite the objections of the Department of State.

The reason for this objection? The Department declared in a letter to the committee that the administration already has the power to ban imports and exports between the United States and Cuba, and the Department was then in the process of considering just such a ban on trade.

That letter was dated August 28, 1961. Evidently, 6 months later, the Department still is considering this proposal or else the Department has reached an adverse decision and nothing has been said of it to the House Foreign Affairs Committee or the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

For the edification of my colleagues who may not have noticed this letter or may have forgotten its contents in the long months since our passage of H.R. 8465, I am including this letter in my remarks. I think all will find it educational.

It is a typical example of bureaucracy as usual in a time of crisis. It is a typical example of a failure to face reality, of an effort to beat Castro with paper proclamations, to heat the air with wordy prose and to avoid all effective steps to further the interests, the security, the freedom of ourselves and the people of our neighbor nations to the south.

Can you blame our friends in Latin America for giving us less than wholehearted support when there is such a discrepancy between our words and our deeds?

Can you blame them if we pursue business as usual, bureaucracy as usual, with an enemy who has made no secret of his animosity toward us and freedom for his people?

I cannot.

If we want prompt, effective, vigorous action out of the Organization of American States, then our Government is going to have to show prompt, effective, vigorous action on its own.

There is an old saying to the effect that you cannot demand respect, you command it. We have been demanding and not commanding in our dealings with Latin America. Let us set an example with deeds, not words. Let us set an example through progress, not promises.

Following is the text of a letter addressed to the Honorable OREN HARRIS, chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in regard to H.R. 8465, passed by the House on September 15, 1961:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 28, 1961.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I refer to your letter of August 3, 1961, transmitting three copies of H.R. 8465, a bill introduced by Representative ROGERS which, if adopted, would prohibit trade between the United States and Cuba.

You will recall that the U.S. Government in fulfilling its responsibility to ensure a reliable source of sugar took the major step last year of eliminating imports of Cuban sugar which constituted over 70 percent of Cuba's normal exports to the United States. Controls over exports to Cuba were also instituted last year, effective October 20, barring all shipments of U.S. goods to that country except for certain nonsubsidized foodstuffs, medicines, and medical supplies. Thus, in comparison with 1958, the year prior to Castro's assumption of power, when U.S. exports to Cuba totaled $546.2 million and U.S. imports from Cuba totaled $527.8 million, the current annual rate of exports and imports is about $20 million and $30 million respectively.

Although the volume of trade with Cuba has been reduced drastically, I can assure you that the Department remains deeply concerned that the hostile Castro regime continues to obtain dollar income from sales of Cuban exports in the United States. As you know, existing legislation provides broad authority to accomplish the aim which would be achieved by passage of the legislation proposed by Representative Rogers. The Department feels, therefore, that H.R. 8465 is unnecessary.

The administration has under consideration measures which, if applied, would result in an embargo on U.S. trade with Cuba. I shall be pleased to communicate to you as soon as possible any further developments with respect to this matter.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Please do not hesitate to call on us if we can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

BROOKS HAYS,
Assistant Secretary.

DIGEST OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include therein a digest of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, which I introduced today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am tremendously impressed by the President's farm message to the Congress, and by the realistic appraisal of the long-range, basic problems of agriculture. The President demonstrates broad and sympathetic understanding of the problems confronting the Nation's farmers and of the importance of a prosperous agriculture to the health of our total economy and to the well-being of farm and city people alike.

He shows a determination to remedy the basic ills of agriculture, not just the symptoms of those ills as expressed by overproduction and low prices. He has presented suggestions for legislation. He has not told the farmers or the country he wants this bill or nothing. The bill is a broad outline upon which the Congress, after farmers and others have expressed their views, may perfect programs to deal with what is indeed our emergency of abundance in agriculture.

Farmers should take heart from the President's message.

We are assured that we have a President and that we have a Secretary of Agriculture who want to do something for agriculture. And we have a Congress that will do something, if only our farmers—so widely divided in recent years—will unify behind sound and workable programs, drawn by them in their own interests.

I do not regard the administration bill I have introduced as a blueprint, but as a working document through which our farmers, the administration and the Congress may perfect policies and programs to bring agriculture into an equitable partnership in the Nation's economy and prosperity.

We must have very substantial farmer agreement upon any legislation that is enacted. If farmers and their organizations cannot agree, and go their separate ways, then we shall have no legislation of any lasting benefit to agriculture or to the Nation.

DIGEST OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962

I. LAND-USE ADJUSTMENT (TITLE I OF THE BILL)

1. Amends the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act:

(a) By repealing certain provisions of sections 7 and 8 of the act, the effect of which would be to provide permanent authority for a Federal agricultural conservation program under sections 7 to 17 of that act. Section 8 of the act authorizes a Federal program only until January 1, 1963, after which it is contemplated that the program authorized by sections 7 to 17 would be carried out under State plans approved by the Secretary.

(b) By providing new authority to promote the conservation and economic use of land through long-term agreements with farm operators and owners under which payments would be made for changes in cropping systems and land uses, and for other measures for the purpose of conserving and developing soil, water, forest, wildlife, and recreation resources. This authority could be used without regard to a number of limitations in the present law relating to distribution of funds to States, increases in small payments to producers, limitations on the size of payments, and prohibition against acquiring any right or interest in land.

2. Amends title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to include as a purpose the more economic use of land, including among other specified uses public recreation and fish and wildlife protection; and authorizes the Secretary to acquire any lands, or rights or interests therein, which he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of the title as amended except that land purchases are limited to those which will not have a serious adverse effect on the economy of county or community in which the land is located. The law now authorizes only the acquisition of submarginal land and land not primarily suitable for cultivation. The Secretary is also authorized to dispose of lands acquired under this title, as amended, to any agency or person, except that such authority would not be applicable to lands acquired in exchange for lands acquired prior to the date of this amendment.

3. Amends the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act by providing that when a local organization agrees to operate and maintain any reservoir or other area for public fish and wildlife or recreational development, the Secretary would be authorized to bear the cost of the land, easements, or rights-of-way acquired by the local organization for such reservoir or other area. The Secretary would also be authorized to bear the cost of minimum basic facilities needed for public health and safety, access to, and use of the reservoir or other area for such purposes. There is also included authority for the Secretary to make advances to local organizations from funds appropriated for construction of works of improvement of the amounts required for the immediate acquisition of land, easements, or rights-of-way necessary for the preservation of sites for works of improvement from encroachment by residential, commercial, industrial, or other development.

II. AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT (TITLE II OF THE BILL)

1. Amends title II of Public Law 480 (83d Cong.) to permit acquisition of commodities for title II programs from private stocks.

2. Amends title IV of such law to—

(a) Expand purposes for which sales may be made to include market development.

(b) Authorize Secretary to make sales to private trade for market development purposes in underdeveloped countries.

(c) Provide discretionary rather than mandatory authority under which other friendly supplying countries would be permitted to participate in supplying commodities.

(d) Make certain provisions of title I relating to foreign currency sales (use of private trade channels, special consideration to market development) applicable to sales under title IV of Public Law 480.

3. Adds a new title V to Public Law 480 to authorize multilateral food program through intergovernmental organizations:

(a) Authorizes use of surplus agricultural commodities from CCC stocks or from private stocks.

(b) Authorizes CCC to pay procurement costs, processing, packaging, transportation, handling and other charges up to time of delivery f.o.b. point of export.

(c) President required to secure commitment from international organization that reasonable precautions will be taken not to displace sales of U.S. agricultural commodities.

(d) Requires advance appropriations after June 30, 1963.

III. MARKETING ORDERS (TITLE III OF THE BILL)

1. Permits producer allotments or quotas for milk, turkeys, and turkey hatching eggs as follows:

(a) The allotments or quotas for turkeys and turkey hatching eggs would limit or restrict marketings or other disposition by producers on the basis or marketings during a representative period or current supplies available for marketing.

(b) Producer allotments for milk would be based upon marketings during a representative period and would not place a quantitative restriction on marketings or other disposition by producers but would result in a limitation on the price received for milk marketed in excess of such allotments. Where producer allotments are proposed for an existing milk order fixing minimum prices, coordinating pricing amendments must be considered and producer disapproval of the revised order with allotment provisions would not affect the existing order. If milk quotas are established the supply-demand pricing standard of section 8c(18) would not apply but instead the parity standard now applicable to other commodities would be used, and a standard for pricing milk for fluid use is provided. Provision is made that the Secretary shall suspend milk allotment regulation if he finds that consumer interests are not being protected by reason of excessive prices being received by producers or an inadequate supply of fluid milk being available. Where national quotas are made effective for milk under other statutory authority provision is made for coordinating the penalty provisions of such national quota program with a milk marketing order.

(c) When producer allotments are in effect coordinating handler allotments are authorized.

(d) Special procedure is provided for producers seeking review of allotments which permits the use of local committees.

2. Authorizes marketing research and development programs for milk orders heretofore limited to commodities other than milk with provision that producer approval of such programs shall be separately determined and the cost thereof may be assessed against milk producers.

IV. FEED GRAINS (TITLE IV, SUBTITLE A OF BILL)

1. Secretary would proclaim a national marketing quota for each year equal to the total requirements of corn, oats, grain sorghums, and barley (rye could be included at discretion of Secretary) for livestock feed, human food, seed, industrial uses and exports; less estimated imports and, if CCC stocks are excessive, less such amount as the Secretary determines to be necessary. Secretary could increase quota to assure adequate carryover or to meet national emergency or increase in demand.

2. A national acreage allotment would be proclaimed equal to the number of acres which Secretary determines will, on the basis of expected yields, together with production in noncommercial area and on increased acreages resulting from the small-farm exemption, produce the national marketing quota.

3. The national acreage allotment (less small reserves to take care of "missed" farms and new farms) would be apportioned to the States, counties, and farms on the basis of the average acreage of feed grains produced during the base period as adjusted.

(a) Base period for 1963–65 crops is 1959–60; for subsequent crops, the 2 most recent calendar years for which statistics are available.

(b) Adjustments in farm bases authorized for abnormal conditions.

4. Farms with feed grain base (i.e., average acreage during base period) of 25 acres or less would not be subject to program unless producer elects to be subject to it. If producer does not so elect, he can plant up to his base, but he is not eligible for land-use payments or price support.

5. All producers who have a feed grain base established for their farm would be eligible to vote in referendum except a producer with feed grain base of 25 acres or less who does not elect to be subject to the

program. Two-thirds vote required in order to have quotas.

6. Production on excess acreage of feed grains would be subject to a marketing penalty at the rate of 65 percent of the parity price per bushel.

7. Secretary may permit wheat to be planted as a substitute for feed grains and count it against the feed grain allotment.

8. Producers would be required to devote to conservation uses an acreage equal to the difference between the acreage of feed grains during the base period and the farm acreage allotment for feed grains.

(a) Acreage so diverted must be in addition to the acreage normally devoted to conserving uses, summer fallow and idle land.

(b) A penalty would apply if producer uses the diverted acreage to produce crops, unless the crop is one which is designated by the Secretary as not being in surplus supply or one which will not substantially impair the purposes of the program.

(c) The Secretary may permit the diverted acres to be grazed.

9. The Secretary would be authorized to make payments with respect to the 1963, 1964, and 1965 crops in amounts determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable to producers who divert acreage from feed grains.

(a) The Secretary could permit producers to divert an acreage, in addition to the acreage required to be diverted as explained in item 8, equal to 20 percent of the farm acreage allotment.

(b) Producers may, at their election, divert such acreage, in addition to the acreage diverted as explained in item 8, as will bring the total diverted acreage to 20 acres.

10. Level of price support for feed grains would be between 70 and 90 percent of parity as determined by the Secretary.

(a) If marketing quotas are in effect for feed grains, price support on feed grains would be available only to producers who stay within all acreage allotments on the farm and all acreage allotments on any other farm, and comply with the land-use requirements explained under item 8.

(b) No price support if marketing quotas are voted down by producers.

11. If marketing quotas are disapproved by producers, CCC authorized to sell up to 10 million tons of feed grains for unrestricted use at market prices.

12. Effective date of feed grain provisions: 1963 crops and thereafter.

V. WHEAT (TITLE V, SUBTITLE B OF THE BILL)

1. Secretary would proclaim a national marketing quota equal to total yearly requirements for wheat for human food, seed, and exports; less estimated imports, and, if CCC stocks are excessive, less such amount as the Secretary determines to be necessary. Secretary could increase quota to assure adequate carryover or to meet national emergency or increase in demand.

2. A national acreage allotment would be proclaimed equal to the number of acres which Secretary determines will, on the basis of expected yields, together with production in noncommercial area and on increased acreages resulting from the small-farm exemption, produce the national marketing quota.

3. The national acreage allotment (less small reserves to take care of new farms) would be apportioned to the States and counties, on the basis of the average acreage of wheat produced during the last 5 years. The county allotment would be allocated to farms on the basis of past acreage of wheat, tillable acres, etc.

4 Farms with an average acreage of wheat during 1960 and 1961 (or other representative period) of 15 acres or less would not be subject to program unless producer elects to be subject to it. If producer does not so elect, he may plant up to such base, but he is not eligible for land-use payments or price support.

5. All producers who have a farm acreage allotment would be eligible to vote in referendum except a producer with farm base of 15 acres or less who does not elect to be subject to the program. Two-thirds vote required in order to have quotas.

6. Production on excess acreage of wheat would be subject to a marketing penalty at the rate of 65 percent of the parity price of wheat per bushel.

7. Secretary may permit feed grains to be planted as a substitute for wheat and count it against the wheat allotment.

8. Producers would be required to devote to conservation uses an acreage on the farm in proportion to the amount by which the national acreage allotment is reduced below 55 million acres.

(a) Acreage so diverted must be in addition to the acreage normally devoted to conserving uses, summer fallow and idle land.

(b) A penalty would apply if producer uses the diverted acreage to produce crops, unless the crop is one which is designated by the Secretary as not being in surplus supply or one which will not substantially impair the purposes of the program.

9. The Secretary would be authorized to make payments with respect to the 1963, 1964, and 1965 crops in amounts determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable to producers who divert acreage from wheat.

(a) The Secretary could permit producers to divert an acreage, in addition to the acreage required to be diverted as explained in item 8, equal to 20 percent of the farm acreage allotment.

(b) Producers may, at their election, divert such acreage, in addition to the acreage diverted as explained in item 8, as will bring the total diverted acreage to 15 acres.

(c) The Secretary may permit the diverted acres to be grazed.

10. Each farm would receive a wheat marketing allocation, on which marketing certificates would be issued, equal to the number of bushels obtained by multiplying the estimated production on the allotted acres by the percentage estimated by the Secretary to be the percentage of the wheat crop which will be used during the marketing year for (i) human food in the United States less a portion of the number of bushels reserved for reducing CCC stocks and (ii) that portion of the exports on which the Secretary determines that certificates will be issued.

(a) The marketing certificates would have a value per bushel equal to the difference between the price support on noncertificate wheat and the price support on certificate wheat. Export certificates could have a different value from that of domestic certificates.

(b) Marketing certificates acquired from the producer must be accompanied by an equivalent amount of wheat. Marketing certificates would be required to cover (i) wheat products marketed for human consumption in the United States, and (ii) wheat and wheat products exported.

(c) CCC would be authorized to buy and sell marketing certificates. CCC would be authorized to establish discounts and premiums not exceeding 5 percent of the face value of the certificates in order to encourage the purchase and sale of such certificates through commercial channels.

(d) The Secretary would establish conversion factors to determine the amount of wheat contained in any food product.

(e) Penalties are provided for failure to acquire certificates, and other violations.

11. Level of price support for wheat accompanied by domestic certificates would be between 75 and 90 percent of parity as determined by the Secretary; level of price support for wheat accompanied by export certificates would be no more than 90 percent of parity as determined by the Secretary; and level of price support for noncertificate wheat would be at such level as the Secretary determines appropriate taking into consideration competitive world prices of wheat, the level at which price support is made available for feed grains, and the feeding value of wheat in relation to feed grains.

(a) If marketing quotas are in effect for wheat, price support on wheat would be available only to producers who stay within all acreage allotments on the farm and all acreage allotments on any other farm, and comply with the land-use requirements explained under item 8. If excess wheat is stored, producer may receive price support on wheat produced within allotment.

(b) No price support if marketing quotas are voted down by producers.

12. If marketing quotas are disapproved by producers, CCC authorized to sell up to 200 million bushels of wheat for unrestricted use at market prices.

13. Effective date of wheat provisions: 1963 crops and thereafter.

VI. DAIRY (TITLE IV, SUBTITLE C OF BILL)

1. Removes present requirement that butterfat and its products be supported at a separate level and provides that milk be supported through loans on or purchases of milk and the products thereof.

2. Establishes new criteria for price support and limits the support level to that which the Secretary determines will not result in acquisition of stocks (i) in excess of those which can be utilized in the national interest, including school lunch, domestic levels, and foreign assistance, or (ii) having a total acquisition cost in excess of $300 million if marketing allotments are not in effect, or in excess of $300 million plus an amount equal to the surplus marketing fees collected if marketing allotments are in effect.

3. Authorizes the establishment of producer marketing allotments and a referendum thereon if the Secretary determines that the desired level of support cannot be achieved without marketing allotments. Authorizes the Secretary to review his determination of the national marketing allotment and to (1) increase such allotment if there has been substantial increase in factors upon which it was based and (2), subject to producer referendum, to reduce such allotment if there has been a substantial reduction in any of such factors. If more than one-third of producers vote down the allotment in any such referendum, price support will be at level determined to be in effect without marketing allotments.

4. Provides for:

(a) Each producer to have a marketing base equal to his sales during 1961 or such other 12-month period as the Secretary deems more representative.

(b) Allocation of this marketing base among quarterly or other marketing periods of the marketing year, to match his pattern of marketing in 1961, adjusted so as to permit him to carry out his herd management plan.

(c) Adjustments of the marketing base for abnormal conditions, deficient production areas, and other factors.

(d) Transfer of marketing bases.

(e) Authorize Secretary to use funds available for price support of dairy products to purchase and cancel marketing bases voluntarily offered for sale by producers.

5. Authorizes producer marketing allotments. A national marketing allotment is to be established by the Secretary equal to the quantity of milk needed to meet domestic commercial and welfare needs, and

export requirements, including foreign assistance. A producer's marketing allotment is that percentage as the national marketing allotment for milk during the marketing period is of the aggregate of all producers' marketing bases for such period. The Secretary may establish minimum allotments if such action would not impair effective operation of programs.

6. Provides for:

(a) A surplus marketing fee on all milk marketed in excess of allotments.

(b) Such fee to be in that amount, not more than $2.75, as the Secretary determines necessary to yield a fund sufficient to cover any acquisition costs in excess of the smaller of (i) $300 million or (ii) the acquisition cost of those quantities of dairy products which can be utilized in the national interest, including school lunch, domestic welfare and foreign assistance.

(c) Refunds of any overpayment by the producer of his surplus marketing fee.

7. Establishes a dairy stabilization advisory committee of 21 members, 15 producer-members to be elected from 15 dairy districts and 4 industry members to be appointed by the Secretary from processors, marketers, cooperatives, dairy associations, and farm organizations, and 1 member appointed by the Secretary to represent consumer interests and one from the Department of Agriculture.

8. Provides that the level of support for the 1962 marketing year in effect when this act becomes effective shall not be changed until producers have voted in a referendum on marketing allotments.

VII. GENERAL (TITLE V OF THE BILL)

1. Amends the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 as follows:

(a) Adds long term and short term loans to individual farmers for recreational uses of land.

(b) Adds to section 306 of the act loans and planning authority to associations and public bodies, for development and improvement of sewers, primarily serving rural residents, and for changes in land use for conservation measures, including recreational facilities.

(c) Increases amount of insurance fund available under section 309(f)(1) of the act for making loans to be sold and insured from $10 million made and undisposed of at any one time to $25 million.

2. Amends section 3 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to establish a single fund account to be used for all REA loans. This account would include all appropriations and funds borrowed from the Treasury under authorization contained herein, as well as all funds to be collected under outstanding loans. There would also be transferred to the account all notes, mortgages, and other obligations of electrification and telephone borrowers. The amended section would continue the authorization for appropriations and also for the Administrator to borrow funds from the Secretary of the Treasury. The amounts to be loaned in any one fiscal year would continue to be subject to annual provision therefor by the Congress in appropriation acts. The funds in the account will also be available for the payment of principal and interest to the Treasury.

THE PARTITION OF IRELAND

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Farbstein] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that every people are entitled to express their feelings in connection with their form of government. Who better than the governed should be permitted to decide who should govern them?

Ireland is a geographic unit. Historically, its national unity—in a thousand years—was never questioned until the decree of separation by the British Government in 1920. At that time, the second decade in the 20th century, an act of the Parliament of Great Britain in London decreed that there should be two political entities in Ireland. One of these, Northern Ireland, was to consist of six counties in the northeast section of the island, constituting one-sixth of the whole. The other 26 counties were, under the act, to constitute Southern Ireland. Both were to have separate legislatures but remain a part of Great Britain.

The vast majority of Irishmen, however, were not in favor of this solution of a long-existing problem. The act was the consequence of rebellion against British rule. Armed conflict and assertions of independence had preceded it. Partition was unnatural, a political division imposed by another country.

The principle of majority rule was violated by the partition of Ireland. Had a plebiscite been taken before Ireland was divided, an overwhelming majority would have voted for independence and unity. In Northern Ireland itself there are today Nationalists, who would like to see Ireland united, numbering roughly one-third of the total population of that area. The ratio between the majority and the minority there is vastly different from that in the whole of Ireland at the time of partition. The majority then was estimated at four-fifths. Yet majority rule within Northern Ireland is the argument used to justify perpetuation of the British act.

Although Britain's partitioning of Ireland is said to be based on the pro-British leanings of the 6 counties thus separated from the other 26 of Ireland, the vote in those 6 counties has only been maintained by means of gerrymander. A flagrant manipulation of electoral boundaries has been perpetrated, particularly in the border counties. The strength of the sentiment against partition in the 6 counties of Northern Ireland both before and since division was recognized and feared officially. David Lloyd George, Prime Minister of Great Britain, is quoted as having said in a letter to Sir Edward Carson, dated May 29, 1916:

> We must make it clear that at the end of the provisional period Ulster (that is, Northern Ireland) does not, whether she wills it or not, merge with the rest of Ireland.

As long as the partition of Ireland festers in the heart of the Irish Republic there will be bitterness and dissension between that country and Great Britain. The role of the United Nations is primarily that of keeping the peace, particularly among neighbors. If the United Nations is to be more than simply a forum where the aggrieved may voice their distress, it must take action to dispel dissension, to eradicate trouble spots in the world. A plebiscite under its direction should settle the quarrel over the partition of Ireland for all time.

In this connection I am therefore today introducing legislation calling upon the United Nations to hold a plebiscite on the question of the partition of Ireland as follows:

> Whereas it is the sense of the House of Representatives of the United States that the maintenance of international peace and security requires settlement of the question of the unification of Ireland; and
>
> Whereas the people of all Ireland, including the people of Eire and the people of Northern Ireland should have a free opportunity to express their will for union; and
>
> Whereas the House of Representatives favors the holding of an election under the auspices of a United Nations Commission for Ireland for the purpose of determining the desires of the people of Eire and of Northern Ireland with respect to the unification of all Ireland: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved*, That the House of Representatives hereby requests that the General Assembly designate such a commission pursuant to articles 11 and 35 of the charter which shall establish the terms and conditions of such election.

PRESENT "DAY" POLITICS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Cahill], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, the Post Office Department of the United States has for generations been recognized as a political Department. Usually the biggest fundraiser for the successful political party finds himself rewarded by appointment as the Postmaster General. Thereafter under the direction of the Postmaster General the Department heads usually favor the successful party and its members with jobs, promotions and other forms of political patronage. As far as I have been able to determine, however, the Post Office Department has never stooped to playing politics to the detriment of communities and the thousands of citizens who live in the communities served by post offices.

I have, therefore, taken the floor of the House today to bring to the attention of the Members the facts concerning a particular decision made by the present Postmaster General which to my mind has attained a new low in politics.

In order to do so, I shall set forth chronologically the events, all of which can be readily established by provable evidence from which the Members of this House and the people of this country can draw their own conclusions.

Back in 1959 a group of citizens of Delaware Township, Camden County, N.J., complained to me about the postal service then existing in that township. Delaware Township is located approximately 5 miles from the city of Camden, N.J., and is the largest growing community in the entire Delaware Valley. It has grown in population from approximately 10,000 according to the 1950 census to approximately 35,000 by the 1960 census and is still experiencing the greatest dynamic growth in the entire Philadelphia-Camden area. As a result, a great many of the leading department stores, formerly located exclusively in the city of Philadelphia, have now established themselves in huge shopping centers built in this township. New factories, hotels, department stores, industries and allied enterprises have in the past 5 years invested millions of dollars in this township. All of these businesses depend to a large extent on adequate mail service and particularly on a civic identity. Nothing is more important to a business than a single permanent address.

The complaints of the citizens of Delaware Township as originally made to me in 1959 can be summarized as follows: The community of Delaware Township was for years serviced by seven different post offices. The resultant confusion erupted into complete chaos when additional homeowners by the thousands and new businesses by the hundreds moved into the community. The civic leaders who contacted me represented all segments of the industries and community life and were both Democrats, Republicans, and Independents in their political beliefs.

Requests by me for a single independent post office for this township were summarily dismissed by the local postmaster and later by the regional director as a result of what were termed "surveys." Recognizing the justice of the position taken by these civic leaders, I continued to investigate and found to my surprise that the surveys consisted principally of talking to the seven postmasters whose offices served Delaware Township and whose revenues would be decreased if independent status were awarded to Delaware Township.

The protests to me of the deplorable mail conditions in this community were finalized by a visit to Washington by the mayor of the township, the editors of the two largest newspapers in the south Jersey area, the chief executive of one of the largest businesses in the community, who incidentally is president of the Camden County Chamber of Commerce, and other men and women of similar outstanding civic interest. A meeting at the Post Office Department was therefore arranged to discuss the pressing needs of this community, with presumably competent officials of the Post Office Department. The mayor and the other conferees presented maps, brochures, statistics, pictures, and so forth, attesting to the merits and justice of their cause. Because of the convincing proof submitted, a new survey was ordered and as a result of this survey the Post Office Department notified the community officials that a change in the name of the township would be required if an independent post office was to be awarded. The reason advanced by the Post Office Department was that an independent post office could not be awarded to a community that used the word "township." As a result, the mayor and township officials set upon a course of action to determine an acceptable name. It then became common knowledge to all citizens of the community that in order to get an independent post office a change of name was the only unfulfilled requirement. After many disagreements over the choice of a suitable name it became clear to the township officials that an overwhelming majority of the citizens favored the name "Cherry Hill." Based upon this conviction which was later confirmed by the overwhelming vote of the citizens at a referendum, the Post Office Department was advised that the name Cherry Hill was acceptable and that the name of the community would be legally changed to meet the Post Office requirement.

Thereafter upon acceptance of this name by the Post Office Department the mayor and officials were notified on the 14th day of September 1959 that Cherry Hill had been awarded an independent post office.

Thereafter many conferences were had with the local officials, real estate officers, engineers, and the myriad of employees of the Post Office Department whose job it was to find the best site and the cheapest rent for the new post office. Finally, after a great deal of work and effort, it was agreed that it should be located in a shopping center in the center of Delaware Township.

During all this period of 1959 and 1960, everybody connected with the Post Office Department assumed that the survey made in 1959 was an accurate and correct one, based upon facts. No one, from the Postmaster General of the United States to the postmaster of the smallest of the seven offices affected, raised one single word of objection to the conclusion of this survey. Thus, everyone in Cherry Hill, N.J., and in the entire surrounding area concluded that Cherry Hill would have its independent post office in the early part of 1961. As a result more and more businesses sought to establish themselves in this growing community; more and more people determined to live there.

Everything moved according to plan without complaint or objection from anyone until August 10, 1961. On that date without any prior notice or any opportunity given to any interested civic group to be heard, Frederick C. Belen, Assistant Postmaster General, advised me by letter as follows:

> We have decided that it is in the interest of the postal service, as well as the patrons, to establish the new facility in Delaware Township as a classified branch administratively attached to the Haddonfield post office.

This shocking reversal based on no new facts and decided without any opportunity on the part of any interested citizens to be heard was, I submit, the lowest level of politics reached by the Post Office Department in its long and glorious political history. Needless to say, the public was aroused by this attempt to disavow an absolute commitment made by competent Post Office personnel of a previous administration most of whom are still employed by the Post Office Department. As a result, the Camden (N.J.) Courier-Post, south Jersey's leading newspaper, published an editorial reflecting the community attitude at this outrageous decision. Mr. Speaker, I include at this time the entire editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CHERRY HILL, CARE OF HADDONFIELD?

There may be an excuse for exercising bad judgment but there is none for showing bad faith. In reversing an earlier decision to give Delaware Township an independent post office, the Post Office Department clearly is guilty of both.

Aside from the absurdity of a vast township with a soaring population being served by fringe area post offices, the Federal agency has broken its word in a manner which is difficult to comprehend or justify.

So glaring is the breach of promise, it smacks of back-door politics and behind-the-scenes manipulations at a time which makes the former front look like a major hoax.

With an independent post office authorized for the township at the urging of civic and government leaders in September 1959, with the name Cherry Hill approved, with a site selected, a building designed and construction underway, it is no wonder that Congressman CAHILL is at a "loss to understand" why the township now is being denied its much-needed independent station.

CAHILL, like other indignant persons offended by the Post Office Department's move, will not let the issue rest there. If Postmaster General Day does not offer a satisfactory explanation, CAHILL is not only justified but duty bound to "go to the White House" about it as he has threatened.

For its part, the Department says it is "in the interest of the postal service as well as the patrons to establish new facilities in Delaware Township as a classified branch administratively attached to the Haddonfield post office," but it doesn't say why this is so.

It describes the 1959 authorization as something it was "considering," and that, at its best, is hedging. The Department speaks vaguely of having "received representation" that the name Cherry Hill may not meet with the present wishes of the majority of the patrons involved. That means, simply, that someone has been knocking at the back door. And by the anonymity of the "representation," it could well mean misrepresentation.

Adding insult to injury, a spokesman clouds the issue by asserting the Department "never had a name for the post office" at all, a somewhat childish we-didn't-say-positively position. The spokesman is insisting, however, that the new decision to make it a branch is, indeed, final.

But others can play the Department's game. If enough determination is shown, independence can be won for the new post office and the Department may be shown it didn't mean "positively" final.

The ball will be carried toward that goal in a meeting Tuesday with postal officials, Mayor Weber of the township and others in CAHILL's Washington office.

CAHILL, in his protest, is determined, rightly, to find out what "motive" has prompted this drastic change.

Census figures show Haddonfield and Merchantville, principal mail distribution centers for the township, at little more than 13,000 and 4,000 respectively. Delaware Township is listed at over 31,000 and today probably has more than twice the population of the two smaller municipalities combined.

Delaware Township needs and deserves its own post office. The very unbusinesslike move by the Department has added to the problem. Patrons already have difficulty in listing their addresses and receiving mail. The many new businesses locating in the township almost daily now hesitate to order stationery or list mailing addresses.

It would have been somewhat understandable if the Post Office Department had hedged to the extent of awaiting the results of the upcoming referendum on the change in name from Delaware Township to Cherry Hill, before adopting the name. Although there has been no organized objection to that change, and approval of the ballot question seems assured, it would be logical for the Department to want the names to coincide.

But to deprive the township of an independent office on the basis of a vague "representation" is unthinkable. With construction of the new building in the Ellisburg shopping center expected to be completed in 90 days, to have it turn out to be an affiliate of the Haddonfield post office is fantastic.

Congressman CAHILL, one of the prime movers in establishing the Delaware Township office, puts it in gentlemanly fashion when he says he is "shocked and amazed" at the rescinding decision. To others, it's downright dirty.

As a result of the resulting furor, the Post Office Department agreed to further hearings and once again representative citizens presented a forceful argument supporting an independent post office. At this conference, it was readily admitted by those representing the Post Office Department that to their knowledge this was the only case of its kind in the country. No new facts were presented by any one at that time or any later time which would justify a change in position by the Post Office Department.

Another survey was ordered. And this survey according to the Post Office Department justified their position because the branch post office "saved $25,000." Thereafter the Courier-Post carried the following editorial under date of September 29, 1961:

POLITICAL STALLING IN POST OFFICE DISPUTE

Delaware Township is pressing its case for independent post office status, but the Post Office Department, already reneging on one promise, is engaged now in a delaying tactic which may spell defeat for the township's cause.

If so, the Department will only be compounding what it already has been guilty of in the current dispute. Congressman CAHILL has called it "politics at its worst."

This particular brand of politics, strictly dirty, brings together politicians in Washington and this State as well. It smacks of partisanship, and patronage, of course, is involved.

CAHILL is showing some admirable restraint in asking the township not to jeopardize its chances by drastic action. He is withholding further criticism of the Post Office Department because he does not want to hurt the township's case.

But the Congressman is quite correct in observing that if the township doesn't get its independent post office it would be an unprecedented breach of faith. He notes that plans for it once were well advanced, to the extent that even the plaque was prepared.

There was no inkling of the about-face until the Department announced it had decided to make the new office under construction in the Ellisburg shopping center a branch of the Haddonfield office.

Now the Department has announced it will survey the greater Camden area to determine, among other things, if an independent office is needed for the township. This is destined to consume a 2- to 3-month period, obviously designed to cool the independent fever.

Meanwhile, township officials and plain citizens alike are trying to drive home their point—that the fast-growing township with its climbing population should have a station of its own to replace service from half a dozen fringe area post offices.

Pleas to Senator WILLIAMS, trips to Washington to consult with postal officials and formation of residents and groups into a solid front are among the tactics used in pressing the township's case. Some residents point up the prestige angle of having an independent office and say such status would help consolidate the township's 27 communities and "put it on the map."

But of importance also is the need to improve postal service there and to attract new business and industry as well as add to township prestige.

In addition to these strong arguments, the situation has caused untold confusion among some business people because of the uncertainty of the outcome. Stationery, promotion campaigns and other matters like listing addresses must either await a final decision or be revised at added expense.

Moving from one service zone to another, still within the township but served from outside, causes added confusion. These factors are upsetting to citizens and business people alike.

Completely aside from the issue of an independent station is the question of a name for the post office. Final determination on a proposed new name (Cherry Hill) for the township is to come in a referendum this November.

The disturbing thing is that, insofar as the Post Office was concerned, both matters supposedly were settled earlier. The township was to have its own station bearing the Cherry Hill name. That, of course, was before the political dabbling between here and Washington created an act of bad faith.

I sought without success to elicit from the Post Office Department a logical and sensible reason for the change in attitude but was unable to obtain a single plausible reason. My search was not, however, altogether unrewarding for I soon found out that the independent post office was denied for purely political purposes. The 35,000 citizens of Delaware Township were being punished because I did not belong to the same political party as the Postmaster General.

I was informed by an unimpeachable source that all that was necessary in order to have the independent status of Cherry Hill restored was to obtain a letter from the junior Senator of the State of New Jersey indicating that he did not have any objection to an independent post office. I thereafter wrote the Senator asking that he write such a letter. I received no reply. I sent the Senator a telegram urging that he do this and received no reply.

Things continued with no rational explanation from the Post Office Department except that the branch would save $25,000 a year. This was exploded later on by the Post Office Department's own itemized statement of costs which correctly reflected what the proponents of an independent post office had been saying all along, that is, that the only difference in cost would be the salary of the postmaster. With argument running at white heat, the Courier-Post again on December 13, 1961, editorialized on this unbelievable political maneuver. Mr. Speaker, I include that editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time:

CHERRY HILL POST OFFICE OUTLOOK UNCHANGED

At the meeting called at his request to discuss an independent post office for Cherry Hill, Senator WILLIAMS said he was "appalled" to learn that seven different offices now served the recently renamed township.

That seemed typical of the homework New Jersey's junior Senator had done in preparation for the meeting. Despite the important part he has played in blocking an independent office for the township—a part that he makes no bones about having played—he did not seem familiar with the details of the situation.

Neither, surprisingly enough, did Carson Browning, director of the Post Office Changes Department, seem familiar with all the facts, though he knew mail now is sent to Cherry Hill under seven different addresses. Browning was obviously surprised by the size of the township when shown a map of it, and appeared to have little idea how large it was.

In the view of some of those attending the session, it was "loaded" on the side of WILLIAMS. And it certainly did not result in a meeting of minds on the central issue. WILLIAMS did say, "We're (the editorial "we") always willing to take time to make sure we're not wrong," and that he had asked the Post Office Department to review the case.

But, WILLIAMS said, the information he has now forces him to conclude that "the cheaper and better way" to serve Cherry Hill will not be through an independent post office, but through the branch of the Haddonfield office which will operate in a building now under construction at the Ellisburg Circle shopping center.

The branch office, WILLIAMS said, will cost $25,000 a year less to operate than an independent office. The earlier decision to establish the independent office, he charged, was an arbitrary decision made by some unnamed politician on top and was contrary to field surveys.

In his explanation of the Department's stand for a branch office, Browning told the audience of 300 that it will be called Cherry Hill and will handle 93 percent of the township's mail. (WILLIAMS' office says it will eventually handle 98 percent.) He claimed that it would have everything township residents want except its own postmaster, and offered an involved account of how mail will be processed and how outgoing mail will be handled via the Haddonfield office, though with a Cherry Hill cancellation.

"You deserve a first-class post office, and the Government wants to give it to you," Browning said. "But we feel this is the best way."

Well, of course, papa always knows best. No doubt he does in this case, though he might have difficulty explaining why an adjacent community the size of Lawnside should have an independent post office, while Cherry Hill cannot.

Whatever else WILLIAMS and Browning may have done by their visit here, they did nothing to dispel the belief that politics is behind the situation.

There can be no other reason why the junior Senator of the State, a Democrat, should step in to oppose a decision made under a Republican administration and persuade the new Democratic administration to reverse it.

There can be no other explanation why Williams should obviously be calling the shots for Cherry Hill, and not Senator Case, the State's senior Senator, a Republican, or Congressman Cahill, also a Republican, who with Mayor Weber, another Republican, is leading the fight for an independent post office.

Williams makes no attempt to disguise the fact that he is calling the shots and that his decision is unpopular with the people of Cherry Hill. He does say that an impartial judgment on the issue by the Post Office Department is his desire, and that "he will be guided by the final recommendations of the Post Office Department, if they are reasonable and convincing."

But with Williams, at this stage at least, so obviously against the independent post office, its friends well may wonder how impartial the Department's judgment and recommendations will be.

At this point no one would want to say the odds favor establishment of an independent office for Cherry Hill.

The Courier-Post further pointed out the effect of surveys and pointedly indicated that the surveys were costing more money than the salary of a postmaster. Mr. Speaker, I include the Courier-Post editorial of November 10, 1961, at this point in the Record:

Cherry Hill Vote Versus Post Office Surveys

The Post Office Department, piling survey upon survey in the dispute over an independent post office for Delaware Township—oops, Cherry Hill—now has at its disposal one of the best, duly certified, official surveys taken yet to gage the sentiment in the area the station would serve.

Nearly 9,000 residents over 21 years of age participated in the poll on election day, and by a wide majority the voters changed the township's name to Cherry Hill.

Although it wasn't part of the referendum wording, the political dispute, over whether the township should have an independent office or whether the new Ellisburg building should be a Haddonfield branch, certainly was settled by the outcome.

The Post Office Department, which reneged on its announced intention to provide the independent station, won't easily find a sampling of sentiment to surpass the ballot question.

But Congressman Cahill is probably on target in asserting that the Department's "bigger and better surveys" actually represent "more and more excuses" for its confused stand.

Cahill says the idea of an independent post office was to eliminate confusion brought about by six different sources of delivery. Then it was said a branch would give the same service as an independent office.

"Based upon representations from Washington and Senator Williams," Cahill says, "we believed the township would have only one post office serving all of the township. Now I have been advised the township will be served by the new Cherry Hill branch and the post offices of Ashland, Maple Shade, Marlton, Moorestown and possibly Camden. And a survey is in progress to determine definite postal boundaries for the new postal facility."

Cahill feels that with more surveys it looks like the money Senator Williams said would be saved by a branch will be more than spent in the surveys. Cahill thinks it would be better business all around to forget politics and give the township its independent office.

The fact is the politics involved are ridiculous and getting dirtier all the time, with the participating post offices involved jealously guarding their own revenues, and they don't want to give up their territories.

But this attitude, apparently endorsed by the bureaucrats in Washington, is one of the public be damned and business interests be damned, and it's high time, as Cahill suggests, that these tactics be abandoned. The new Cherry Hill deserves its own post office and the politicians should be able to read that into the election returns.

Then the Courier-Post, convinced as I have been convinced all along that politics was the answer to the Delaware Township Post Office, published an editorial on October 12, 1961, which laid the blame where it properly belonged. Mr. Speaker, I include this editorial in the Record at this point:

Politics and Delaware Township Post Office

Mayor Weber of Delaware Township says he won't attend the dedication ceremony if the new post office at the Ellisburg Circle shopping center is to be a branch of the Haddonfield office.

Most of his constituents will applaud his decision. The new post office ought to be an independent one, as the township was promised—a promise that has been broken because of petty, partisan politics.

Congressman Cahill has minced no words in placing the blame for the broken promise. He lays it primarily at the doorstep of Senator Williams. He calls it a political power play of the Post Office Department and Democrats at the Federal, State, and local level with the object of embarrassing him and Republican officials of the township.

For 3 years Cahill, Senator Case, Weber, and other township officials have been trying to get an independent post office for Delaware Township. The township, third largest municipality in the county, has been getting its mail through the post offices of half a dozen surrounding communities and never has had a proper one of its own. The situation has caused increasing inconvenience to its residents and businesses.

After three surveys, the Post Office Department agreed that the township should have an independent office and promised that it would. A building now under construction at the Ellisburg Circle was to house it.

But not long after the Democratic administration took over at Washington this year, the Department announced the new post office would not be an independent one but would be a branch of the Haddonfield office. The announcement stunned the township.

It brought a statement from Cahill that Williams had scuttled the independent office for political reasons. He said that all Senator Williams had to do was to tell the Postmaster General that he either approved of the post office or did not disapprove of it—and the township would have gotten an independent post office. He said that until the change in national administration Williams had not objected to the independent office.

Cahill says that a fourth survey of the need for an independent office, now underway at Williams' instigation, is unnecessary since the last one favored it. "Unfortunately," he says, "the announcement of a new survey in the Greater Camden area kills rather than kindles hopes for an independent post office."

Williams has refused to comment on Cahill's charges except to say that his "policy is to shun politics in matters like this and I will not join issue on this nonsense."

That is not a satisfactory answer. It is not even polite. It is highhanded and arbitrary.

The evidence seems conclusive that had Williams so much as lifted a finger to help Delaware Township get the independent post office it should have, it would have gotten it. But he did nothing. His inaction bears out the charges of political motivation. How he hopes to make Democratic hay this way is a mystery.

The Post Office Department has made one concession to Delaware Township's outraged public opinion by announcing that the new shopping center post office will be known as the Cherry Hill office, that its patrons can use Cherry Hill as their home address and that mail sent from it will be postmarked Cherry Hill.

That is an aspirin pill that will alleviate one headache for township businesses and residents. But it is only a symptomatic relief and not the cure for their postal ailment, which can only come through an independent post office.

As a result of all of this community strife which was completely unnecessary but which was precipitated by the breaking of the word by an agency of the U.S. Government, the junior Senator from the State of New Jersey and a representative of the Post Office Department appeared personally in Cherry Hill. As a result of that meeting, the people were promised that while they would not get an independent post office at this particular time, conditions would be studied and if in the future the facts warranted it, an independent post office would indeed be awarded Cherry Hill. However, at the meeting the people were assured that one of the primary reasons for their desire to have an independent post office would be fulfilled.

All mail would be addressed to Cherry Hill, N.J. Even though it would be a branch post office of a community whose total population amounts to 13,000 people and which because of lack of available space cannot grow any larger, the residents of Delaware Township would have a singleness of identity. All mail would be addressed to Cherry Hill, N.J. There could be, therefore, no confusion. All business houses could be addressed only as "Cherry Hill, N.J." No other name could be used. The fears and anger of the citizens were therefore to a degree allayed and the mayor and community leaders at least felt that they had saved a part of their just cause.

Quietly and without fanfare the Cherry Hill branch opened this month. To the shock of every resident and particularly of the officials and the civic leaders of the community, the first act of the postmaster was to advise the citizens by mail that it was not necessary that they use the name, "Cherry Hill." They had their choice of two names and thus the assurance that was given the citizens, the promises that were made were once again broken. The singleness of name, with resultant unity and pride of community spirit was again shattered by the breaking of the word of the Post Office Department.

The Courier-Post once again forcefully, correctly, and completely summed up the matter in an editorial under date of January 29, 1962. Mr. Speaker, I include this editorial in the Congressional Record at this point:

CHERRY HILL POSTAL STATUS ERASED

Incompatibility was predicted in many quarters when the Post Office Department, reversing an earlier decision, determined that its new office in Cherry Hill, rapidly developing as a giant of a municipality, would be nothing more than a branch of the station in Haddonfield, already dwarfed by its booming neighbor.

Few thought the roof would cave in so quickly on the head of this absentee management.

But just about the first administrative act by Haddonfield Postermaster Semler after the branch opened at the Ellisburg shopping center was enough to cause the independent-or-branch controversy to erupt greater than ever before.

What Semler did was to send out a form letter to thousands of township residents telling them they may use either a Haddonfield or Cherry Hill mailing address. He noted service would be the same regardless of which address residents chose.

That, we submit, smacks at the very heart of the matter. To those seeking identity for Cherry Hill and a unification of the sprawling multisectioned township, it was like twisting the knife after it struck home.

Here was a municipality, striving for independent mail status and seeking an end to a system which saw service coming in from all sides and going out under half a dozen different postmarks, being told that even under the supposedly improved new setup it didn't matter at all whether the Cherry Hill address was used or not.

It certainly would matter if Cherry Hill was made an independent post office.

Postal status or a rose by any other name might not matter to some, as long as they get their mail, but for most Cherry Hill residents striving for unity and identification for their municipality this latest twist is enough to turn a so-what controversy into a cause celebre.

Cherry Hill Commissioner Gilmour puts it mildly when he protests to Senator Williams that the opening of the new branch was doing nothing to unify the township. Gilmour, who says it's appalling that a municipality would have so many different names assigned to it, feels the fight is for stature and identification.

Gilmour, expressing his consternation, thinks the Semler letter has set the entire cause of an independent post office back to where it started several years ago. He claims, rightly, that civic spirit and municipal cohesiveness cannot be built in this manner. And Gilmour, also rightly, insists that, if the Haddonfield directive is any criterion, independence is the only way "such future disregarding of our interests can be avoided."

Congressman Cahill and Senator Case are among those who support the plea for establishment of a full-fledged independent post office for Cherry Hill. Cahill calls the branch arrangement completely unsatisfactory as far as residents there are concerned and most certainly as far as I am concerned.

And Case is convinced an independent office would provide much better service, despite the claims of the Post Office Department to the contrary. Case calls the branch decision unwise, unsound, and unfortunate.

It's worse than that now, because Senator Williams, considered by many to be the key man blocking independent status, and the Post Office Department are going to have to come up with some new answers, now that Semler has upset their neatly stacked applecart.

Williams had assured one and all that the branch would supply the identity that a town with the growth potential of Cherry Hill needs. The branch wasn't many hours old when Semler wiped out that assurance.

This, Members of the House, I submit, is a sorry display of postal politics. It is unworthy of the thousands of dedicated men and women of the Post Office Department who labor in building up good will for this Department. The act of one or two men here in Washington who make final decisions can destroy, in 1 day, years of hard work by dedicated employees throughout the postal system.

It is my hope that the officials of the Post Office Department, if they look at nothing else in this statement, will examine carefully the editorials of the Courier-Post newspaper. Certainly, these editorials reflect the thinking of a newspaper read by more than 100,000 readers and whose opinion cannot be summarily disregarded as "smacking of politics."

I urge the Post Office Department to reconsider its ill-advised, unwarranted, and unjust decision and restore independent post office status to Cherry Hill, N.J.

ESTABLISHMENT OF U.S. TOURIST SERVICE

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dulski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and revise and extend his remarks and include an article.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **DULSKI**. Mr. Speaker, in the last session of Congress we enacted legislation for the establishment of a U.S. Tourist Service. In that session we also passed legislation to reduce the duty-free allowance for returning American residents, which I endeavored to amend so that our contiguous neighbors to the north and south—Canada and Mexico—would be excluded from its provisions. I was unsuccessful.

Now it has come to my attention that our Tourist Service has no plans to establish even one tourist office in Canada. This lack of consideration is appalling to me. In 1959, for instance, Canadian tourists spent approximately $100 million more in our country than our citizens spent in Canada on tourism. So we ignore this favorable balance of trade and instead of nourishing it, we chop away at the roots of the friendly and cordial relations with our Canadian neighbors. Good friends, on which we can depend, are not always easy to find. I will do everything within my power to persuade our Tourist Service to open tourist offices in Canada, and I urge every interested Member to do likewise.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include the following editorial from the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., dated January 16, 1962, which expresses the views of the majority of the residents along the Niagara Frontier:

CANADA RATES PLACE IN U.S. TOURIST PLANS

Plans to attract foreign tourist travel to the United States should overlook no profitable possibilities.

As provided by Congress, the U.S. Travel Service has been set up to "develop, plan, and carry out a comprehensive program designed to stimulate and encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries for the purpose of study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities."

This provision has the commendable aim of furthering friendly international relations and of increasing the flow of tourist dollars to this country. To promote it the U.S. Travel Service plans the opening of offices in London, Paris, Frankfurt, Sydney, Tokyo, and in Latin America.

Strangely omitted, however, from U.S. Travel Service literature, according to Courier-Express Washington correspondent Lucian C. Warren, is any mention of Canada or the Niagara frontier, and there are no plans to open tourist offices in Toronto, Montreal, Ottawa, or any other Canadian cities.

This seems an inexcusable oversight. Already American tourists spend millions in Canada every year and so do Canadian visitors to the United States, but that is no reason for failure to promote still more tourism from across the border. Americans, particularly along that border, value their cordial relations with their Canadian neighbors and don't want Washington to take them for granted. There always is room for improvement, and to mutual advantage. The U.S. Travel Service seems to be missing a bet in a most important field of endeavor.

POSTAGE STAMP COMMEMORATING LAUNCHING OF U.S. FRIGATE "CONSTELLATION" AT BALTIMORE, MD.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Fallon] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and revise and extend his remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FALLON**. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 165th anniversary of the launching of the U.S. frigate *Constellation* at Baltimore, Md. It is an honor and a privilege for me to do this and I have every confidence that favorable action will be taken on my proposal.

The U.S. frigate *Constellation* is the first ship of the U.S. Navy to be commissioned, to put to sea, to engage and defeat the enemy, to capture an enemy warship, to carry marines, and to institute gunnery practice and shipboard procedure. It is the oldest vessel in the world still afloat.

From the time this magnificent ship was launched, in 1797, until she served as flagship of the Atlantic Fleet in World War II, the story of the *Constellation* is closely associated with the bravest moments of our Nation's history. This historical vessel—built and launched in Baltimore, in the fight of battle was christened with the blood of Maryland heroes serving aboard her. As one of the Navy's most famous fighting ships, she was brought to the U.S. Naval Academy, at Annapolis, Md., and used to train our midshipmen. Naturally, this ship is of great sentimental value to all Marylanders.

September 7, 1962, therefore, will not only be a significant date to the Navy but it will also be a significant date to the people of our great State who took pride in restoring the *Constellation* to her former glory. I hope sincerely that we can act promptly and provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp so that such stamp can be placed on sale aboard the *Constellation* on September 7, 1962.

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, in the President's state of the Union address a new Cabinet post to head a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing was recommended. This formal announcement is one of the most recent and most emphatic recognitions of what has become to be described in very broad and general terms as the urban problem. Behind the brief description of this problem we find it translatable into terms of the stress and strain put on communities and urban facilities by the inordinate concentration of populations in already heavily populated areas—highways, streets, metropolitan transportation systems, sewer facilities, public buildings, schools, hospitals and growth-strained welfare budgets.

In the Housing Act last year we wrote in title VII, section 701(a):

> The Congress finds that a combination of economic, social, governmental, and technological forces have caused a rapid expansion of the Nation's urban areas, which has created critical problems of service and finance for all levels of government and which, combined with a rapid population growth in such areas, threatens severe problems of urban and suburban living, including the loss of valuable open-space land in such areas, for the preponderant majority of the Nation's present and future population.

During several sessions of the Congress, I and other Members representing districts in the Appalachian Mountain area, have risen in this Chamber to urge adoption of legislation directed to alleviation of hardship resulting from persistent and chronic unemployment and generally declining economic activity in our districts. Those who urge attention to the urban problem, and there are compelling reasons for us to give it attention, give no indication that the so-called urban problem is a part and parcel of the economically depressed areas problem. In eastern Kentucky, for example, we have been marketing our most precious product—our people—whose skills and intelligence apparently command somewhat of a priority in the skilled work market. I know of no other school in the United States than can boast that it has 100 percent placement for its graduating technicians and, at the same time, export to areas outside of the State over 60 percent of those graduating. Mayo Vocational Training School in Kentucky can. Yet in surveys made of these temporarily displaced Kentuckians, the great majority have indicated a desire to return to eastern Kentucky if jobs employing their skills could be found. Yes, the Appalachian Mountain region in the United States, involving parts of Kentucky, West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, Alabama, Tennessee, New York, and Pennsylvania are very much a part of the so-called urban problem. Unless we start thinking in terms of improving the economic climate in the Appalachian area—start thinking in terms of upgrading its obsolete public facilities—start thinking in terms of developing its great natural but undeveloped resources of water, soil, and timber, then I fear there is no solution to the problems that concentrations of populations have placed upon our urban centers. By ignoring these vast and once heavily populous mining and timber communities we are adding to the momentum of the exodus of people from these regions to our urban areas.

I vividly recall in 1932 when a President of the United States in his inaugural address said:

> Hand in hand with this we must frankly recognize the overbalance of population in our industrial centers and, by engaging on a national scale, in a redistribution endeavoring to provide a better use of the land to those best fitted for the land. The task can be helped by definite efforts to raise the value of agricultural products and with this the power to purchase the output of our cities. It can be helped by national planning for and supervision of all forms of transportation and communications and other utilities which have a definite public character.

While to some extent these words seem to be addressed to the current problem, the programs that followed served to put the American farmer and the rural area back into the Nation's economy. They were spoken at a time when there were 60 million fewer people in the United States. They were spoken at a time when population concentrations posed no civil defense problem. They were spoken at a time when automobile traffic was still calculated in the hundreds.

With these thoughts in mind, I would address my colleagues' attention to the underdeveloped resources of eastern Kentucky and the areas of other States in the Appalachians. Under criteria presently employed by the executive branch, areas of the Appalachian region are being denied project approvals under the Small Watershed Act and other public works and natural resource development programs. I would urge that we think realistically on the urban and distressed areas problems as being part and parcel of the same national problem of growth—technological change and changed economic circumstances in this new era.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), indefinitely, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CAHILL (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. SELDEN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 1 hour on Monday, February 5, 1962.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DOYLE in two instances and to include appropriate material.

Mr. PUCINSKI.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CEDERBERG.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska.

Mr. WEAVER.

Mr. DOLE.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FOGARTY.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 1, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1623. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriations listed herein have been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1624. A letter from the Deputy Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to an estimated cost of benefit funds necessary to reimburse the civil service retirement and disability fund for the fiscal year 1963, pursuant to Public Law 85-465; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1625. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of the activities relating to providing aviation war risk insurance for the period as of December 31, 1961, pursuant to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1626. A letter from the Chairman, Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, transmitting a report entitled "Outdoor Recreation for America," pursuant to Public Law 85-470, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1627. A letter from the Chairman, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, transmitting a report by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation dated January 31, 1962, concerning the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 86-89, as amended by Public Laws 87-4 and 87-55 (H. Doc. No. 322); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 612. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1294). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 10002. A bill for the relief of civilian employees of the New York Naval Shipyard and the San Francisco Naval Shipyard erroneously in receipt of certain wages due to a misinterpretation of a Navy civilian personnel instruction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 10003. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 10004. A bill to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to extend to imported tangerines the restrictions imposed by such section on certain other imported commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 10005. A bill to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, pharmacists, optometrists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 10006. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 10007. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to widows and children of World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 10008. A bill to waive temporarily section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut holding court at Bridgeport, Conn., and at Stamford, Conn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER (by request):

H.R. 10009. A bill to amend sections 1(19), 5, 32a, 64a, and 67d of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 10010. A bill to improve and protect farm income, to reduce costs of farm programs to the Federal Government, to reduce the Federal Government's excessive stocks of agricultural commodities, to maintain reasonable and stable prices of agricultural commodities and products to consumers, to provide adequate supplies of agricultural commodities for domestic and foreign needs, to conserve natural resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 10011. A bill to repeal the provision of law relating to the mailing of matter by Members of the Senate and House of Representatives under congressional frank with a simplified form of address; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EVINS:

H.R. 10012. A bill to waive section 142, of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee holding court at Winchester, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 10013. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 165th anniversary of the launching of the U.S. frigate *Constellation* at Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 10014. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Commission on Aging and to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development of programs which will benefit older persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 10015. A bill to preserve as a part of the park system of the Nation's Capital the historic waterfront of Georgetown, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 10016. A bill to waive section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the holding of court at Decatur, Ala., by the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Alabama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 10017. A bill to declare a policy as to the existence of public domain in Wisconsin in lands erroneously meandered and lying between the original meander line and the lakeshore, and to protect the rights of landowners whose title to waterfronting property has been brought into question by reason of errors in the original survey; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 10018. A bill to provide for the expansion of the Custer Battlefield National Cemetery; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 10019. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to provide penalties for becoming or remaining a member of Communist-action organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 10020. A bill to modify the project for the Beaver Reservoir on the White River, Ark., to permit construction of certain water supply facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 10021. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Antidumping Act, 1921, to provide for greater certainty, speed, and efficiency in the enforcement thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 10022. A bill to amend section 510(a) (1), Merchant Marine Act, 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 10023. A bill to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BUCKLEY (by request):

H.R. 10024. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of customs and immigration laws," to increase the amounts authorized to be expended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.J. Res. 612. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.J. Res. 613. Joint resolution to continue for an additional 9 months the current support price for milk and butterfat; to the Committee of Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H.J. Res. 614. Joint resolution to continue for an additional 9 months the current support price for milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H.J. Res. 615. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of the National Capital Parks Memorial Board; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Res. 535. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the people of all Ireland should have an opportunity to express their will for union by an election under the auspices of a United Nations Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H. Res. 536. Resolution creating a nonlegislative select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the aged and aging; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 10025. A bill for the relief of Graziella Pasquale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 10026. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Fitzpatrick and Peter D. Power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 10027. A bill for the relief of John F. Polito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.R. 10028. A bill for the relief of Emilie Anselmo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.R. 10029. A bill for the relief of Pedro Adan Generao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 10030. A bill for the relief of Katrina Changyao Chow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 10031. A bill for the relief of the John V. Boland Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Legislative Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I keep citizens of the 10th District of Michigan aware of my views on developments here in Washington through legislative reports. My first report of this session follows:

JANUARY 31, 1962, LEGISLATIVE REPORT FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN

I have delayed this session's first congressional report until the President's state of the Union and budget messages were presented. From the requests in these two messages it is obvious that your Federal Government is headed for unprecedented peacetime spending and a record deficit. The balanced budget promised by President Kennedy is, in my opinion, unrealistic. This view can be substantiated by the anticipated request for authority to increase the debt limit $10 billion so we can borrow more money with which to operate the Government. President Kennedy's new budget includes a request for an additional 46,000 Federal employees. During the first 10 months of this administration 84,831 new employees were added to the Federal payroll. This does not include the thousands recalled to the military service. The administration's request for money for domestic nondefense purposes is 38 percent higher than the amount spent in this category in 1960. While rising costs of national defense have been a substantial factor in budget increases, we now find spending for domestic nondefense purposes an even greater factor in the growing Federal budget.

I recognize that some budget increases may be necessary as our country grows and that our defense requirements must keep pace with technological advances. However, in my opinion the President's requests far exceed these necessities. As an example, his request for a new Department of Urban Affairs is unwise and unnecessary. I can think of nothing we need less in Washington than a new Department. This would establish a new Cabinet member, with all of his assistants, and would undoubtedly add many thousands of employees to the payroll. The House Rules Committee voted down this proposal. Then President Kennedy announced he would form the new Department under reorganization plan authority. Congress has 60 days in which to reject his proposal. He even announced the appointment of the head of this agency—Mr. Robert C. Weaver, a Negro—before Congress authorized the new Department. This is a blatant move to politically blackmail Members of Congress into voting for this new Department by using a vote against it as a vote against a Negro as its head. To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Weaver is a capable man and would be well qualified for the post, if created. This kind of political chicanery is to be deplored.

The President's request for an increase in postal rates passed the House of Representatives. Republicans successfully insisted that the bill contain an amendment prohibiting free mailing of Communist propaganda in this country, a privilege granted by this administration about a year ago. The bill, in addition to increasing first-class rates, substantially increases second class as well as third class (often referred to as junk mail). The present postal deficit is $900 million. The new bill as passed by the House raises $691,300,000 additional revenue.

The President's trade message requests broad authority to reduce our tariffs. World trade is, of course, necessary. However, I am reluctant to grant any President this broad authority which is expressly reserved to the Congress by the Constitution. A visit to almost any store will indicate the flood of imports already coming into our country. How the United States, with its high standard of living—of which we are proud—can compete with cheap foreign labor without some reasonable protection, has yet to be explained to me. We have exported our technological know-how all over the world and have lost our former advantage in this area. I realize this is a complicated subject and I intend to study it thoroughly. The United States already has some of the lowest tariffs in the world, and I am anxiously looking for some indication from the Common Market nations as to their intentions of reducing their tariffs which are, in most instances, higher than ours. In addition to tariffs, many use quotas and other devices to limit our goods going into their countries.

As these and other issues come before Congress, I would welcome your comments.

More Farm Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy's special message on agriculture is more notable for what it does not say than for what it does say. It raises more questions than it answers.

The Nation's wheatgrowers will certainly want to know much more than is set forth in the message about the details of the program proposed for them. They will want to know, first, how much of a further reduction in wheat acreage they will be called upon to take. Will the national wheat acreage allotment be 45 million acres, or 35 million or even 25 million? The message does not specify.

The President says that "marketing certificates would be used to assure growers a price support level between 75 and 90 percent of parity on the domestic allotment and up to 90 percent on the export allotment." Thus, while the range of flexibility in price supports for the domestic allotment is set forth, there is no indication as to how low supports for the export allotment might be dropped. The figure could, presumably, be set anywhere between 0 and 90 percent of parity.

I believe farmers will also want to know how much Government-owned wheat would be removed from inventory each year and dumped upon the market. The authority to do this could be used as a club to depress prices artificially and thereby force farmers to divert additional acres from wheat production.

Farmers will want to know more about the President's proposal to establish a "mandatory acreage allotment on all feed grains." Even the present feed grains plan is supposedly voluntary, although the Government has, in fact, saturated the market with its own holdings as a means of herding farmers into the program. Many farmers utilize on their own farms all of the feed which they produce. Mandatory feed grain production controls would, for these farmers, also become mandatory controls over their livestock operations.

Implied in the section of the message relating to land utilization is the ultimate diversion of perhaps 50 million acres or more of cropland "to recreational, aesthetic, and economic purposes." Farmers, I am sure, will want to know how many of them will be retired from agriculture under such a program.

As the President noted, each year 1 million people move from the farm to the city. If this rate is to be stepped up, perhaps underlying the administration's proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs is the recognition that a new agency will be required to deal with the problems of displaced farmers.

Address by Senator Jennings Randolph, Democrat, of West Virginia, at the Christian American Heritage Seminar, John Brown University, Siloam Springs, Ark.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on November 25 it was my honor to participate in the Christian American Heritage Seminar at John Brown University in Siloam Springs, Ark. The purpose of the seminar was to explore methods and means by which Christian Americans can contribute to the perpetuation and extension of the values of the American heritage.

It was appropriate that this seminar be conducted at John Brown University, an evangelistic and interdenominational institution which offers Bible-centered Christian instruction with the traditional 4-year liberal arts and sciences curriculum.

John Brown University, which is today administered by the dedicated son of the founder, was founded by John E. Brown in 1919. Since its modest beginning in a frame structure in an Arkansas cornfield, this school has become a full-fledged institution of higher learning, offering baccalaureate degrees in the arts, science, music, and education. The faculty members are capable and devoted. Its graduates serve throughout the world in the ministry, in business, and in the professions.

The theme of the seminar in which I participated was "Freedom's Day of Grace," the topic of my address being "Faith and Freedom." I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAITH AND FREEDOM

(An address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, at the Third Annual Christian American Heritage Seminar, John Brown University, Siloam Springs, Ark., November 25, 1961)

Dr. Brown, members of the Christian American Heritage Seminar, faculty and students of John Brown University, and ladies and gentlemen, the founder of John Brown University would, I believe, be truly gratified by this fruition of his early hopes and aspirations.

This joint inquiry being conducted on the theme of "Freedom's Day of Grace" is an authentic manifestation of your university's commitment to the education of the whole person. I hope that my contribution to your seminar will be of some help in exploring the relationship between faith and freedom.

I surmise that the title of the theme of this seminar assumes that freedom is currently enjoying a day of grace—that it has not been granted any eternal or permanent assurance—and that our actions and those of our fellow citizens therefore will determine whether American freedoms and the values of democracy in the world will survive and persevere. In this context, therefore, I ask you to think with me regarding the role of faith in the perpetuation and extension of human freedoms.

I do not speak of faith in the strict or narrow theological sense of the assent of the mind to revealed truth. Rather, I am using the term in the broader sense in which Paul spoke to the Hebrews, that "* * * faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."

In this context I speak of the Christian faith that the individual person and the meanings and values associated with the free human spirit have an enduring significance which surpasses the mundane conditions of our present existence. To explore the relationship between faith of this kind and the cause of human freedom, we must know first the nature of the contest in which freedom is engaged, second, the ingredients of faith, and third, the applications of faith in the political struggle of our age.

The conflict of our era is not merely between capitalism and communism. The basic antagonism between the Soviet-Chinese bloc and the free world lies in our divergent concepts of the nature of man and the nature of history. It is in essence the conflict between our view that man is free to create history, and the dialectical view that history creates man.

Whether man will be bound to the iron chains of circumstance and the inexorable laws of a malignant fate—or whether we will have the freedom to choose a world of our own and create that world in the image we choose—that is the option offered humanity today.

We in the United States have already cast our ballot in the name of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. But let us be quite clear that Mr. Jefferson and the founders of the Constitution did not construe liberty to mean the absolute and unabridged right to do as one pleases and to pursue purely personal pleasures and profit at the expense of others. Nor did they interpret happiness to mean the hedonistic activities and the seminarcotized state so prevalent among some members of our society today.

Liberty, among the early founders of American democracy, meant the freedom to achieve the fullest possible refinement of the human virtues. Happiness meant—and it is our duty thus to reaffirm—the opportunity for fulfillment of the distinctively civilized capacities of man—love, esthetic enjoyment a decent regard for one's fellow man and respect for the truth.

These are the values at hazard in the contest before us. Their loss under the dominance of the Communist autocracy would mean the fixation of human morality at a level less than human. These are the stakes for which we are playing—stakes which are surely high enough to call from each of us the utmost in intelligence, self-sacrifice and determination that he has to give.

Justice Learned Hand once referred to a comment by the historian, James Harvey Robinson, to the effect that mankind arose from the ape because, like the ape, he was always "monkeying around." But man, unlike the ape, was able to remember the results of his meddling curiosity, to record them, and to pass them on to subsequent generations.

America is the rightful heir to this legacy of mankind. For this, I believe, is the nugget of liberty—the right to be meddlesome—to be dissatisfied with the established forms and customs and to search, according to one's own disposition, for ways of creating a better world.

This is uniquely the American heritage, for all Americans are either noncomformists or the descendants of nonconformists—the meddlesome, maverick and malcontented people who in some way—religious, political or economic—opposed the established forms of their society and believed in the ability of men to improve on these forms. They believed in the ability of men to create a new image of man, and they believed in the power of men to fashion society in the light of that image. This is the permanent revolution of America, and this is the revolution feared by autocracy everywhere.

By referring to this as a permanent revolution, I intentionally imply that it is not and will never be finally won. For the rights and responsibilities of democracy are by their very nature, impermanent possessions. And it is for this reason that faith is necessary—faith in the capacity of man to create justice, to abide by truth, and to live with love.

Now what are the ingredients of the faith that we would summon to the task?

First, faith is an intensely personal quality of experience. It must always be faith "in" something or "about" something. In the context of the struggle between communism and the free world, this means that the individual American must have faith that the Government is serving not only him and is concerned not only with his problems and aspirations, but also with the more embracing values of democracy.

This condition imposes a twofold obligation. It requires officials in government—both elective and appointive—to maintain a constant awareness of the function of the state to serve the citizen rather than master him. And it requires the citizen not to give ear to those extremists who would spread fear and suspicion throughout the land by assailing the motives of those in government who disagree with their opinions.

Secondly, faith involves some action, some doing, some participation in the flow of events, for "* * * faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone" (James 2: 17). Therefore, faith in relation to the cause of human freedom means supporting one's beliefs with more than the use of the ballot every 2 or 4 years. This is necessary, but it is not sufficient. For one person, the works of faith may mean participation in the PTA and contributing special efforts to the development of our schools. For another it may mean engagement in the affairs of the League of Women Voters, analyzing and promoting understanding of public issues. For still others, it may mean added contributions of time and energy to the building of a community park, to slum clearance, or to urban renewal programs. But for all, the test of faith in man's ability to create a better world and one in which freedom will prevail is to engage actively in creating that world.

Third, faith requires a sense of assurance that methods can be devised to bring the experiencing of the goals of the individual and society. Assurance here does not mean a conviction of absolute certainty, but rather, a commonsense reasonable expectation by the individual that his lifetime will see some change in the desired direction.

In terms of the world role of American democracy we must work to communicate this sense of assurance to the landless peasant and the impoverished and disease ridden slum dweller of the underdeveloped countries. For these are the people, more than any other whose faith must be sustained by the evidence of accomplishment and improvement in the conditions of their own existence.

Fourth, if faith is to be enduring, a goal must serve as a steppingstone to other goals; it must be part of an ongoing process toward richer and more encompassing ideals. "A goal is a signpost," said the philosopher John Dewey, at the age of 90. It is testimony to the lack of faith on the part of those who proclaim that America must hold to what we have and not venture forth toward new horizons and frontiers. Those patriots who cry alarm and declare that we are on the verge of bankruptcy because we spend three-fourths of 1 percent of our national product on foreign aid, are less than summer soldiers, for they reveal their own fear and distrust of the capacity of America.

Fifth, in order to be maintained, faith requires a sense of significance of the self. The individual must know that he counts for something, that his weight is felt in the determination of events. And he must also have some base of reference, some anchorage point within himself.

Here, perhaps, we encounter the area of greatest vulnerability in American civilization, and also the area where the American Christian heritage has the greatest potential contribution to make to American freedom. There seems little question that the growing complexity and gigantism of American life has in many ways begun to overwhelm the individual, leaving him isolated, alone, and divorced from the currents of action that sweep around him. This may well be the source of much of the apathy, frustration, and hostility that is noted by many critics of American culture today.

The Christian heritage can make its best contribution not by solving the individual's problem on the blackboard of an eternity in another world, but by communicating an understanding of eternity as now. Faith will be renewed to the extent that each invidual harbors the knowledge that he is absolutely unique, that he has a contribution to make in this world that no other can make, and in this knowledge each moment partakes of eternity.

Finally, faith is made viable when hope is confirmed. And hope is confirmed through the experiencing of the consequences of action. If action does not sooner or later offer the sense that hopes are being realized then faith is abandoned and the individual reverts to apathy or to the politics of despair in which he embraces one of the authoritarian alternatives. It is for this reason that democracy must continually probe the limits of new attainment. For even in America there are still pockets of want and deprivation; as these are filled we must reach beyond our own shores to the "have-nots"—materially and spiritually—in other lands if we are to render our own values secure. The sternest lesson in life, in the life of the individual and in that of the Nation, is that there is no security in standing still. The only security is in growth; and the only security for freedom is in the growth of freedom.

And there is no easy alternative. Democracy still remains the most difficult and demanding form of government that man has created. In the history of man's affairs the failures of democracy outnumber by far its successes. It is not a form of society decreed for man by a benificent cosmos—but a way of life which men have won at great cost, and will maintain only with continued courage and imagination. And it is a way of life which men who are less than men have always sought to avoid—as the psychiatrist, Erich Fromm, noted some years ago in his book, "Escape From Freedom."

I do not know of anyone who has better phrased the challenge than did Justice Learned Hand in his essay on "The Spirit of Liberty," written some 20 years ago, when he stated:

"We may not stop until we have done our part to fashion a world in which there shall be some share of fellowship; which shall be better than a den of thieves. Let us not disguise the difficulties; and, above all, let us not content ourselves with noble aspirations, counsels of perfection, and self-righteous advice to others. * * * We shall need the wisdom of the serpent; we shall have to be content with short steps; we shall be obliged to give and take; we shall face the strongest passions of mankind—our own not the least; and in the end we shall have fabricated an imperfect instrument. But * * * the history of man has just begun: in the aeons which lie before him lies limitless hope or limitless despair. The choice is his; the present choice is ours: it is worth the trial."

I have attempted to summarize the nature of the struggle between two civilizations. I have indicated the ingredients of the faith which we bring to the cause of freedom. Now, what principles of action are implied by our democratic faith?

I would suggest five general principles that we might observe in combatting the Communist autocracy and in revitalizing the quality of American democracy.

First, we must maintain our regard for the Anglo-American tradition of the rule of law. For when the respect for law begins to crumble the people become the victims of the perversion of power. In this regard, the intemperate attacks on the Supreme Court that we have occasionally witnessed in recent years have not served the cause of freedom, whatever one may think of some of the Court's decisions.

Second—and this is the cornerstone of Western civilization and the main cultural contribution of the Christian heritage—is the traditional respect for the individual. Nowhere in the lexicon of communism is the word individual acknowledged as meaningful—always it is the masses, the proletariat, the bourgeoise, the capitalist, the progressive, or the revisionist—never is it the average sensible man or woman who experiences the fullness of the emotional and spiritual life.

Third, we must maintain the integrity, and the spontaneity of the good life of friendship, compassion, and love. For this is the very antithesis of the class hatred which the Communists seek to inculcate and on which their subversive designs are predicated.

Fourth, we must seek to extend the principles of civil liberties and economic and social justice to all of our citizens, regardless of race, color, creed, or sex. For only thus can we present to the world at large the true America. And let us not forget that approximately two-thirds of the world's population are composed of people of color—most of whom have only recently been freed from the white man's dominance.

Finally, we must seek to extend these ideals to other nations within the international community and to live with knowledge of the aspirations of others beyond our shores. The true and really permanent revolution was that of 1776—a revolution in the spirit of man, and not in the ownership of the means of production. If we but maintain the faith in the Revolution of 1776, we will have the necessary armament to combat the Communist probes, whether psychological, political, economic, or military.

Yet, important as this struggle is, one may not end on the theme of mere opposition to communism. For while man is always finite, the most significant feature about him is that he always seek the infinite. There is a spirit in him that transcends nature, history, reason, and experience. It seeks what William James called "the wider self through which saving experiences come."

Wherever this experience ends, it begins with a sense of kinship with a larger whole. The Christian tradition has given articulation to this sense through the belief in one Father and one brotherhood of man. The final meaning of the American experiment in government, and that to which our faith in democracy is ultimately directed is that our form of government represents man's greatest advancement yet in making that brotherhood a reality in this world.

Francis E. Walter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I was in attendance upon committee obligation on January 29 at the time that the tribute was made to the Honorable Francis E. Walter, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and other high honors and responsibilities which he holds, as appears on pages 1124–1125 of the Congressional Record of that day. If I had been on the floor I would have cordially joined in a word of tribute about him and of the fact I too was very happy he was looking forward definitely to being back in the Halls of Congress for the 88th session thereof.

It has been my pleasure to serve on the majority side of this very vital Committee on Un-American Activities for going on 15 years and I know that the chairmanship of that important and necessary standing committee of the House is demanding and exacting of the very utmost which a chairman thereof can possibly muster or apply to the committee's obligations and responsibilities. Hon. Francis E. Walter has applied this sort of service and ability to the committee's functioning and since the nature of the work of the committee is such that it demands the utmost attention by a chairman because of emergency matters so frequently coming up of great import and necessary decision, I say it has been remarkable that he has been available to render his wisdom and wise discretion to all those matters as they have arisen and have frequently arisen several times a day.

Since it has been publicly announced by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Morgan Moulder, that he is not seeking reelection to this great legislative body, indications are that if I am reelected to my ninth term in this House at the forthcoming California elections, then I will have the pleasure and responsibility of being the ranking majority member of the committee with Hon. Francis E. Walter as chairman. This relationship, duty and service I look forward to rendering.

I wish the gentleman from Pennsylvania many years of continuing improved health and service in Congress.

Address for Dedication of the New Addition to Anniston Memorial Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on January 14, 1962, Congressman Kenneth A. Roberts made an outstanding speech at the dedication of an addition to the Anniston, Ala., Memorial Hospital. Because I feel that this speech delivered by Congressman Roberts is so worthy, I ask unanimous consent that the entire speech, related editorial, and the newspaper account of the event be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address, editorial, and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Dedicatory Address by Hon. Kenneth A. Roberts, U.S. Representative, Fourth District, Alabama, on the Occasion of the Dedication of New Hospital Addition to Anniston Memorial Hospital, January 14, 1962

I am glad to be at home with you today and to participate in dedicating the new addition to the Anniston Memorial Hospital.

After all the snow, sleet, and ice, I am glad to be here on this beautiful day of sunshine and although I cannot take the credit for it, I am happy that this splendid day has been blessed with good weather.

I appreciate the high honor of being chosen as the principal speaker on this program, but had it been possible for our senior Senator to be here I would gladly have taken second place and would have been happy to say a few words in introducing him to this fine group of people.

We are grateful to Senator Hill for the splendid contribution he has made in the field of health and medical science. I said on one occasion at the dedication of the District Four TB Hospital that I was grateful for the fact that Senator Hill did not follow in the footsteps of his illustrious father, the late L. L. Hill, and enter the medical profession. I know he would be a wonderful doctor, but I feel that in his more than 30 years in the Congress of the United States, he has accomplished even more in behalf of the suffering people than he could have as a member of the profession of the healing arts.

He personally expressed his desire to be present on this occasion and asked me to say that he made every effort to be here, but due to the pressure of affairs in Washington he was unable to be with us today.

I am happy to be Senator Hill's counterpart in the House of Representatives, where, as chairman of the Health and Safety Committee, I have the privilege of steering most of the health legislation which is then acted upon by the Members of the House and sent to the Senate.

Senator Hill is a sound advocate and one of the most able men in the history of our country for better health for all.

I am sure that most of you are familiar with the history of the Anniston Memorial Hospital which is now near completion of step one of a multimillion-dollar expansion program.

I congratulate the hospital board of trustees, the city commission and the county commission for the insight shown in the construction of this basic facility. This unit will someday expand into a 400-bed institution. Completely equipped, this first unit cost over $1.8 million. It was jointly financed by the city of Anniston, Calhoun County, the State of Alabama and the Federal Government through a Hill-Burton grant.

The hospital board of trustees: Mr. Marcus Howze, chairman; Dr. Sam Crabtree; Mr. Richard Monk; Mr. T. J. Laney; Mr. William F. Andrews; and the late Mr. Lee Tanner; the city commission: Mayor George T. Morris, Mr. William S. Weatherly and Mr. Claude F. Dear, Jr.; the county commission: Mr. Dan Gray, Mr. Roscoe Simmons and Mr. Earl S. Morgan, and the administrator, Mr. W. Boyd Jones have done a fine job in providing Anniston with the best of medical facilities. With their continued support and the support of the many interested people and agencies, this is becoming an outstanding medical center serving much of the southeastern area. Even today the Anniston Memorial Hospital is serving many patients from out of the State and many others make long journeys to the hospital from other parts of Alabama to receive the services that are provided here.

Due to the efficient operation of the hospital, charges today are below those of other hospitals of similar size. This being accomplished by working into a complete program of automation that incorporates the use of electronic data processing equipment. Today, medical records, the patient billing, payrolls, inventories and other accounting programs and controls are part of this operation. There are many unique enterprises which make the Anniston Memorial Hospital a leader in the field.

The hospital is now receiving a Federal grant for a study which is the only one of its nature in existence. The study is of the correlation and interrelationship of the general acute hospital, the convalescent hospital and the nursing home. This hospital is now sponsoring a nursing scholarship program and is providing scholarship loans to 10 nursing students in schools of their choice.

One other program which the hospital takes great pride in is the hospital auxiliary. The "Pink Ladies" are doing an exceptional job in and for the hospital.

Another factor that makes Anniston Memorial the hospital that it is, is the outstanding quality of the medical staff serving the hospital. Presently, there is a medical staff of 60 members which includes consultants on all specialties. There are 40 active members of the staff of which over half are board qualified physicians.

The Anniston Memorial Hospital is one which every citizen in the area should feel a great deal of pride and comfort in knowing that they have such a facility serving the needs of the sick and injured. They can look to the future knowing that their health needs will be met by the hospital and its staff.

The final completion of this hospital will probably be done in four steps. The first, which is being completed now, is providing the service areas for the 400-bed complete unit. Included in the new structure will be surgical, obstetrical, X-ray, physical therapy, laboratory, and emergency room departments. X-ray is now an outstanding department and in the near future will incorporate a radioisotope laboratory not now available in most hospitals. X-ray film will be processed by an automatic device called the X-O-Mat which will give a completely processed dry film in 6 minutes. Cutting the time required in X-ray processing will facilitate smoother operations in areas where X-ray findings are mandatory. For special work there will be a Polaroid cassette which will give a processed film under certain conditions within 60 seconds.

The physical therapy department, which will be an added department of the hospital, is a service seldom found in hospitals of this size. This will be the only such institution in this area of Alabama.

The laboratory facilities will be in the new unit and will be equipped to do the latest in laboratory procedures. This laboratory will serve other hospitals in the area in providing specialized work.

This hospital will be completely air conditioned with necessary mechanical facilities for rooms throughout the building to provide the maximum comfort for patients. The latest in heating and cooling equipment is being installed in the new structure. The emergency room is being relocated into the new unit so that it will be in the closest proximity to the major traffic lanes of the city.

The hospital, which is a city within itself, will house modern laundry facilities providing clean and sanitary linens. Each patient in the hospital will use about 10 pounds of clean linen daily. There is adequate storeroom space being provided.

Many hours of planning, selecting colors, matching furniture, working out the traffic flow, and determining the best location of facilities to serve the largest number of people have been incorporated in the planning.

This unit, which we are dedicating today, is a start on an institution which will be modern in every respect and will stay abreast of current medical developments and will bring to Anniston the very latest in hospital treatment.

I would like to pay tribute to the builders, the architect, the contractor, and the workmen whose handiwork we see in this beautiful structure.

This construction is typical of the Hill-Burton program which is an outstanding landmark in the field of health legislation. This program is one form of Federal-State cooperation which proves that there are areas in which the Federal and State Governments may join hands for the benefit of the people.

It is my understanding that out of a total cost of over $1,800,000 for this new addition, the Federal share is in excess of $860,000.

It might interest you to know that for the fiscal year 1962, the Federal Government will contribute for hospital and medical facilities construction in the State of Alabama almost $6½ million.

A hospital is more than bricks and mortar. It is more than furniture and equipment. It is a place where health services are rendered to bed patients and outpatients. It is important not only because of the fact that breadwinners are restored to health but also in terms of our total national economy. Hospital operations are the fourth largest industry in the United States with expenditures over $8 billion annually.

Mankind is in a constant battle against disease and the Congress is constantly trying to find answers to the ravages of cancer, heart disease, arthritis, and other crippling and killing illnesses.

In my opinion, the Hill-Burton Act is now permanent legislation and will be continued into the future as it has won the approval of the Congress. Other efforts will constantly be made to expand medical services to meet new challenges on the health front.

The Subcommittee on Health and Safety on which I serve as chairman is interested in enlarging medical services to the aged and the infirm who need some care but require less than full-time hospital services. We are seeking to provide this care through the Community Health Services and Facilities Act of 1961. This will furnish new and improved home nursing services which will be rendered in nursing homes and in the private homes of the patients.

There are still other ways of looking at a hospital: a hospital is a training facility for the health professions. Interns and residents, registered and practical nurses, therapists, and others receive an important part of their professional training in a hospital. I am particularly glad to know that our own hospital is now sponsoring a nursing scholarship program and is providing scholarship loans to 10 nursing students in schools of their choice.

Our committee is very much aware of the great need for more health personnel: there is a shortage of doctors, dentists, registered nurses, practical nurses, and other health personnel. In a few days our committee will start hearings on legislation recommended by President Kennedy which is designed to increase opportunities for training personnel. The contemplated program provides for the construction of medical, dental, osteopathic, and public health teaching facilities. It also provides for scholarships in these fields.

I have introduced a bill known as the National Defense Nurses Training Act which will provide for grants in the form of scholarships to increase the supply of nurses. This bill is awaiting the report from the Surgeon General's Commission before further action may be expected.

Insofar as practical nurses are concerned, Congress during the last session enacted Public Law 87-22 which extends to July 1, 1965, the program of Federal aid to practical nurse education which was begun in 1956. I am very proud of the fact that the initial authority for this program was included in legislation which was reported favorably by our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and that the program has proved to be an outstanding success.

A hospital is not only a facility for the treatment of diseases. It can also be used as the focal point for programs for the prevention of diseases. Community programs for the inoculation of children against diseases can be based on hospitals as to the extent that adequate facilities for such purposes can be made available. We, on the committee, agree with President Kennedy that every child should have the benefit of modern medical research and feel that improvements in the field of prevention should be made to as many persons as possible. Our committee is planning to consider legislation authorizing Federal grants for community projects which have as their objective the inoculation of entire age groups in such communities against polio, whooping cough, measles, tetanus, and other diseases for which effective vaccines are available.

Our experience in this country with polio vaccine has demonstrated that the availability of the vaccine by itself does not assure that all or even most of those who are in the most susceptible age groups actually will be inoculated. We must find ways to make certain that the fruits of research in the prevention of disease will benefit our entire population, and that large segments of our population will not remain unprotected for whatever the reasons may be: ignorance, lack of diligence, lack of facilities, and personnel, or lack of financial means.

One of the most important efforts on the part of the new administration is the bill on which I will hold hearings calling for the creation of a new National Institute of Health in the field of child health. This institution will do much to improve the lot of handicapped children—the blind, deaf, and retarded child. I believe this new bill will receive almost unanimous support in the Congress.

Research into prevention of diseases, however, is not the only field of prevention in which our committee has been greatly interested. Our hospitals know very well that accidents take a frightful toll, and that many beds are occupied by victims of accidents, automobile accidents, industrial accidents, and accidents in the home. I have introduced a bill which is now pending before our committee to establish at the National Institutes of Health a National Accident Prevention Center. I feel very strongly that expanded research in this field can pay huge dividends not only in preserving human health and happiness but also in terms of dollars and cents saved. The cost of accidents is startling, and we can do a great deal more than we have been doing in order to prevent accidents altogether, or prevent at least the worst physical and economic harm which results from accidents.

Last but not least, we should be thinking of hospitals as places where individuals highly skilled in different health professions learn to work as a team for the benefit of the patients as well as for purposes of improving the performance of their respective specialties. The time has long passed when the lone practitioner treated patients. More and more the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of diseases requires the wholehearted cooperation of the various health professions and the hospital is certainly one of the places where such cooperation is practiced.

A hospital in the best sense thus is a facility which offers endless opportunities for cooperation—cooperation to render services, cooperation to conduct research, cooperation between Federal, State, and local governments and private groups to make possible the construction of these facilities, cooperation to prevent diseases, and cooperation to train health personnel.

In this world of ours where cooperation is so badly needed to assure not only a better life but to assure survival itself, in this world—we are proud yet humble to point to the symbol of cooperation which we are dedicating today.

We Must Not Stop

All Annistonians were filled with a sense of pride Sunday afternoon as they were given the privilege of inspecting our new multimillion dollar hospital. It was well, too, that prime credit for such an excellent institution should have been given to W. Boyd Jones, a leader in that field.

But while we are felicitating some of the other leaders who have made possible this great advancement in public health, it is well to look back and give a tribute to some of the pioneers in hospitalization, whose work should not be forgotten.

Prime credit, in the opinion of this paper, should go to the Sellers brothers who built and operated what was our first accredited institution of that kind. Drs. Bowcock and Huger followed in the wake of the Sellers with a makeshift hospital in the old Barr House at 14th and Leighton.

That institution having been found to be inadequate, another hospital building was erected at 12th and Quintard. But that, too, was found to be too small for our needs, so then the city as a whole undertook the establishment of an accredited hospital at the site now used for permanency.

In this latter movement we should not forget, along with the doctors, the late Gen. R. E. Noble, one-time Acting Surgeon General of the U.S. Army, and the late Col. George O'Connell, who helped get the needed funds, and who later became head of public health in this part of the State.

There were, of course, many others who helped to convert the W. W. Stringfellow home on the old Anniston High School site, into a nursing home, for which purpose the old Sellers building and others are now being used.

There were, also, scores of good citizens who helped to bring into being the excellent structure that was dedicated Sunday. And among them were Senator Lister Hill and Congressman Kenneth Roberts, who are now working together in the Senate and House, and whom we should remember at election time.

Hospital Annex Opened, Immediate Use Is Planned

(By James Chisum)

Hospital authorities expected to begin moving patients into the new addition to Anniston Memorial Hospital today.

Dedication ceremonies were held Sunday for the addition and J. R. Frye, assistant administrator, said some patients entering the hospital this week will be placed in the spanking-new wards and rooms.

Frye estimated that up to 5,000 people toured the four-story addition Sunday afternoon following the dedication ceremonies. Approximately 1,000 persons heard a dedication speech by Representative Kenneth Roberts, remarks by local officials, and symbolic acceptance of the addition by the hospital staff.

The large turnout for the rites was probably due to the pleasing weather—only a bit cloudy when the ceremonies began at 2 p.m., with the sun flashing out occasionally, and the air outside almost balmy after the freezing temperatures of the past week.

Representative Kenneth Roberts, in a brief dedicatory address, lauded the people who had a hand in building the new addition, cited it as an excellent example of cooperation between local, State and Federal governments, and described forthcoming legislation in the field of health.

Early in the speech, the Congressman noted the contributions of Senator Lister Hill.

Citing his gratefulness that the Senator had not become a doctor, Roberts said, "I know he would be a wonderful doctor, but I feel that in his more than 30 years in the Congress of the United States, he has accomplished even more in behalf of the suffering people than he could have as a member of the profession of the healing arts.

"This construction is typical of the Hill-Burton program which is an outstanding landmark in the field of health legislation," he said, adding, "This program is one form of Federal-State cooperation which proves that there are areas in which the Federal and State governments may join hands for the benefit of the people.

"It might interest you to know that for the fiscal year 1962, the Federal Government will contribute for hospital and medical facilities construction in the State of Alabama almost $6½ million," Roberts continued.

He told his audience that hospital operations are the fourth largest industry in the United States and that expenditures in the field total over $8 billion each year.

BILLS ARE LISTED

Pointing to the efforts of Congress in finding answers to the problems of health, the Fourth District Congressman then described a number of bills and acts in the field.

"I have introduced a bill known as the National Defense Nurses Training Act which will provide for grants in the form of scholarships to increase the supply of nurses," he said, adding that the bill is now awaiting a report from the Surgeon-General's Commission before further action can be taken on it.

Referring to the efforts of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—of which he is a member—Roberts said some legislation is designed to prevent diseases.

"Our committee is planning to consider legislation authorizing Federal grants for community projects which have as their objective the inoculation of entire age groups in such communities against polio, whooping cough, measles, tetanus and other diseases for which effective vaccines are available," he said.

"One of the most important efforts on the part of the new administration is the bill on which I will hold hearings calling for the creation of new National Institutes of Health in the field of child health," the Congressman said.

"This institution will do much to improve the lot of handicapped children—the blind, deaf and retarded child," he said, adding, "I believe this new bill will receive almost unanimous support in the Congress."

BILL IS INTRODUCED

The Representative said he has already introduced a bill to establish a "National Accident Prevention Center" at this Institute.

Roberts, a well-known advocate of safety features on automobiles, was presented a plaque at the hospital dedication ceremonies by a nationwide insurance company, citing his "safety crusade."

Mayor George Morris, of Anniston, introduced Roberts. The program also included remarks by Don Gray, chairman of the Calhoun County Commission, who said "We started 12 years ago having meetings about this addition, and this is the result."

Marcus Howze, chairman of the hospital's board of trustees, presided over the ceremonies. He introduced a number of local officials who were present, read a congratulatory telegram, and noted the receipt of others.

The Reverend J. Phillips Noble pronounced the invocation and Dr. R. Laurence Dill the benediction. Members of the emergency and rescue squad and the Boy Scouts helped visitors find a parking place and ladies of the hospital auxiliary assisted in conducting tours of the new addition.

Vice President of the United States Greets Hon. George P. Miller, of California, on His 71st Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased and honored having the privilege of presenting to all the Members of this great legislative body the very significant and gracious letter of commendation by the distinguished Vice President of the United States, Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson, under date of January 30, 1962, to my distinguished colleague from California, Hon. George P. Miller, chairman of the Science and Astronautics Committee of the House of Representatives.

I am sure we all recognize that by previous training and activities and desire to serve, our distinguished colleague from my native State of California is richly endowed with the qualities necessary to be a most able chairman of this very strategic committee.

The P.S. portion of the letter addressed to our distinguished colleague by the Vice President of the United States is in the handwriting of this distinguished American who took the time and trouble and so graciously sent to Hon. George P. Miller this birthday message. I am sure we all join with and cordially concur in the birthday greetings so appropriately conveyed to our California colleague—even though it is belated—on account of his being 71 years young.

The letter follows:

The Vice President,
Washington, January 30, 1962.

The Honorable George P. Miller,
Chairman, Science and Astronautics Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Before you came to the Congress, you expressed in dynamic and effective action your keen interest in and ability to conserve some of nature's gifts to mankind.

It is not only appropriate, it is wonderful to have you, at 71 years young, on the front line of the New Frontier—outer space. It is reassuring to have you, with your interest in conserving the best of this earth, as a leader in conquering the unknown and in shaping it for man's future best interests.

As an individual and as your colleague, I am deeply appreciative of your unselfish devotion and your dedicated service. And, although belated, I wish you a happy 71st and many, many more.

Sincerely,

Lyndon B. Johnson.

P.S.—You have an awesome responsibility as chairman of Space, but you are a just and good man and you will discharge it well.

Rural Radio Threatened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues what could be a crippling blow to the voice of rural America. The Federal Communications Commission is at the moment considering a proposition which could forever silence that voice as we have known it for the past generation or more. If the Commission acts to still this voice, there will be a great void in the lives of the farm citizens of the United States.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to FCC Docket 14419, a proposal to amend rule 3.87, dealing with the so-called daytime-only or daylight broadcasters in this country. The idea is to limit these broadcasters to the period from official sunup to official sundown each day.

I am deeply disturbed by this proposition because it will affect the everyday lives of many thousands of my constituents, and will affect hundreds of thousands of others who have chosen to live in our rural areas. These are the men and women who have plunged their roots deep, not only into the soil of our Nation, but into its history and its future as well.

The farm citizens and residents of small, somewhat isolated communities throughout the country, do not have the benefit of early morning delivery of a daily newspaper. In large part they must depend for early-morning news on the local radio stations which are dedicated to strictly localized service. These stations operate on low power for the most part and serve as their primary market area a very limited community. Because their market area is so limited in scope, they must perform services which are not performed and cannot be performed by other radio stations across the country—or even in cities located close to them.

Many farm families in our State of Nebraska have written to me and have told me that they depend for their daily planning as well as for general world news and entertainment on these local daylight broadcasting stations. The early morning weather reports are of vital concern to every farmer. He must know, for example, how much rain has fallen and how much is likely to fall in the area immediately surrounding his farm and between his farm and the nearest town or the nearest main highway. He cannot afford, through lack of this knowledge, to mire his truck or other equipment in the mud. His knowledge must be precise and it must be strictly localized.

Although every major radio station includes in its coverage area and farm territory some market information, this information usually deals with Chicago or Kansas City quotations. This is material of importance to all farmers. Equally important, however, is precise knowledge about market conditions in his immediate area. The major radio stations just do not have time to provide the market quotations for every small market across America and, so, the farmer is without this vitally needed information unless he can, during the early morning hours, listen to a local radio station.

Again, in many hundreds of cases, the only local radio station is a daytime-only station.

Residents in small towns across the country also gear their daily lives to the information which they can get only through their local radio stations. In many of these communities there are weekly newspapers or afternoon dailies. However, the morning papers must come from some distant point and contain little that is strictly local in the way of news.

Likewise, radio stations located in some distant city do not have the time to devote to the local happenings in some small town in Nebraska. Let me cite an example—just one of many. In McCook, Nebr., there are daytime-only stations which provide local news, weather reports, and other information. The full-time stations, to which the people can listen with the greatest ease, are located in Denver, New Orleans, and Oklahoma City.

It would be impossible for these stations to provide a list of parent-teacher workshops that might be planned for McCook that morning, or some meeting at the Red Willow County courthouse which might be of extreme importance in McCook but would not create a ripple in Denver, New Orleans, or Oklahoma City. Obviously, they must depend in large part—particularly for last-minute changes—on the local stations to provide them with this type of information.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the engineering problems involved in the postsunset hours. Interference mounts rapidly during the minutes immediately after sunset and continues at a high level until about midnight. From midnight on, there is a sharp decline in the amount of interference which a midwestern or western radio station can make in the operation of any station to the east of it. In fact, in the hour or two immediately preceding sunrise, the only possible stations where interference would be any serious factor at all would be those stations in the same time zone with the daylight broadcaster.

This matter has been before the Commission for many years. Dozens of these daylight broadcasters have had their licenses for decades, and they have been renewed from time to time by the Commission. Never, until now, has the question of interference in the presunrise hours been such that the Commission has refused to renew the licenses of these stations on a broad scale.

In Nebraska alone there are some 15 such daylight stations outside of urban Omaha which would be affected directly should the Commission deny them the right to the airwaves prior to actual sunrise. Many of these stations are old-line stations. One, I can cite, WJAC, Norfolk, Nebr., has had a license as a daylight station for some 40 years. There are many others which have served the public for a great length of time.

Under existing rules, these stations, or at least many of them, have the right to open as early as 4 a.m. They do, however, have to close down at sunset, but at least can provide the kind of early-morning broadcasting service needed and appreciated.

These stations depend, in large part, upon this early morning service for their operating revenues. I have been told by one station manager that if his station is cut back to sunrise-sunset operations, it will cost his station some 132 hours of broadcast time monthly. He estimates that this will immediately lower by 20 percent the revenue of this station and because of this, his station will no longer be able to provide early morning service and thus attract the early morning farm audience. Therefore, conservatively it will amount to a further 10 percent cut in revenue because once an audience is lost, it is almost impossible to regain it.

All of this will mean, I am afraid, that his station will have to cut its staff by about 25 percent. This staff cut will mean a further reduction in the amount of service the station can provide, and the circle gets more and more vicious.

This is the story of just one radio station. It applies, as well, to stations throughout the country. It will be repeated time and time again across our land unless the Commission sees fit to follow the history and the tradition of the past and allow these broadcasters to retain their present operating hours.

Mr. Speaker, unless they are allowed to continue providing this service and through that service receive a normal, fair, and reasonable revenue, these stations one by one will go off the air. The voice of rural America will be stilled—all Americans will be the losers.

Legislation To Protect Consumers From Monopolies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues and for those who may be interested, I have prepared an analysis of bill H.R. 9271. This bill amends the Sherman Act, Clayton Act, Norris-LaGuardia Act and Taft-Hartley Act to lift antitrust immunities from labor organizations and to mesh congressional policies in order to preserve desirable union practices and to prohibit those specific acts which are combinations in restraint of trade.

By enumerating specific acts which are to be outlawed by unions and employers, Congress will not only add clarity to what is lawful and unlawful, but will make clear the basic purposes of the act. Among the most important of these is the purpose of preserving collective bargaining as a legitimate and important method of employer-employee relations in America.

The first paragraphs of H.R. 9271 point out the detrimental effects of monopoly, especially national or regional work stoppages caused by combinations of employers which deal with combinations of labor organizations. It recites that monopolistic practices engaged in by labor organizations or by employers, or by both, restrain trade, lessen competition, and lessen local labor-management determination; that Government intervention into strikes does not eliminate monopolistic combinations and practices which are their cause; that in order to prevent monopolistic concentrations of bargaining power, strikes, and interruptions that imperil defense, safety and health, it is intended to establish a national policy to limit combinations of employees of particular employers and their representatives with those of other employers and their representatives and likewise to forbid employers to combine as to collective bargaining matters in a manner forbidden to employees and their representatives.

Section 2 of the bill amends section 1 of the Sherman Act—26 Stat. 209 (1890); 15 U.S.C. 1—which bans every contract, combination and conspiracy in restraint of trade. The amendment specifies that the section shall apply to labor organizations when they engage in such conspiracies, combinations, and restraints by defining the activities covered, which are: first, interferences with or control of production, except by a lawful strike; or, second, limitations on the number of persons who may work at a particular occupation, trade, or calling; or, third, controlling or fixing prices that employers may charge for their goods or services; limiting the area in which or the persons through whom there may be distribution of goods or services; or limiting the number of employers who may engage in a particular business or for whom union members may work—lawful strikes for other objectives are specifically made exceptions; or, fourth, imposing any featherbedding practice causing employers to hire more than needed help, to pay for services not performed or needed, to pay more than once for services, or to restrict the use of products or materials.

Section 3 of H.R. 9271 adds an amendment to section 2—15 U.S.C. 2—of the Sherman Act to make it illegal to monopolize, attempt to monopolize, or conspire to monopolize trade or commerce among the States. The amendment makes illegal collective bargaining arrangements: first, when any employer acts in concert with another employer; second, when any employer and a labor organization act to affect the collective bargaining matters of another employer; third, which permit any labor organization currently representing employees of one employer to represent or attempt to represent employees of another employer; fourth, which allow labor organizations to obtain bargaining concessions from an employer even though such organizations are affiliated with the same federation unless they represent employees only of a single employer.

Section 3 does not forbid bargaining by employers combining with each other or labor unions combining to bargain with employers within a single standard metropolitan area as defined in the Standard Industrial Classification Manual[1] provided that the places of employment in the affected industry within such area do not constitute more than 25 percent of an entire industry and the unit involved has been found appropriate by the National Labor Relations Board. Two or more employers are treated as one under section 3, moreover, where there is common voting stock control and they operate as one employer. An employer and union are therefore organizationally equal in their bargaining.

Both labor organizations and employers are expressly allowed to exchange bargaining information, make surveys and affiliate with national, regional, or international bodies of such as long as the collective bargaining activities are not subject to control, approval, or financial support. Penalties are set forth for violation of section 3.

Section 4 of the bill incorporates references in the Clayton Act (38 Stat. 730 (1914), 15 U.S.C. 17; 29 U.S.C. 52), and the Norris-LaGuardia Act (47 Stat. 70 (1932), 29 U.S.C. 101–115) into the new provisions of H.R. 9271 amending the Sherman Act. The added language provides that the provisions of H.R. 9271 shall have effect without regard to related sections 6 and 20 of the Clayton Act and without regard to the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act.

Section 5 of H.R. 9271 amends relevant sections 6 and 20 of the Clayton Act by specifically providing that they shall not nullify the provisions of the Sherman Act, as amended. Section 6 adds language to the Norris-LaGuardia Act to provide specifically that it shall not apply to activities made illegal by section 1 or section 2(b) of the Sherman Act, as amended.

Section 6 of the bill specifies that it shall have no effect on section 16 of the Clayton Act—such section 16 giving the specific right of injunctive relief with respect to threatened loss or damage from antitrust violations. The Norris-LaGuardia Act's agency rule which requires clear proof of actual participation, authorization or ratification to hold an organization responsible for unlawful acts of officers, members or agents, is made inapplicable to injunction proceedings affected by the section.

Section 7 of the bill amends the Taft-Hartley Act by prohibiting bargaining units which include employees of more than one employer, but allowing such multiple units of employers and organization of employees of more than one employer in single standard metropolitan areas if the places of employment involved do not constitute more than 25 percent of any industry. Provision is also made that where there is common stock control and operation as part of an enterprise, two or more employers may be deemed one employer.

Any labor organization that represents employees of more than one employer may, within 6 months, designate a local or other subdivision as its successor to represent the employees of any such employer. Nothing in the amendment shall authorize or compel the NLRB to combine employees into single units which have been constituted previously as plant, craft, or departmental units.

Section 8 provides that the amendments to the Sherman Act's section 2(b)(3)—which forbid labor organizations from representing employees of more than one employer—is to become effective within 6 months after enactment.

Section 9 specifically protects the right of the individual employee or the right of a group of employees to quit work for any reason or because of dangerous working conditions.

Section 10 states specifically that the NLRB is not authorized or required to place all of an employer's employees in a single unit or to combine former separate plant, craft, or departmental units into one unit; also that parties are not excused from bargaining with respect to a unit defined as appropriate under the amended National Labor Relations Act nor allowed to force any person to bargain with respect to a unit not defined as appropriate.

---

[1] Published by the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census.

Section 11 of H.R. 9271 sets forth for "employer," "employee," "labor organization," and "affecting commerce" the same meanings that the amended National Labor Relations Act gives them.

Section 12 exempts those employers and employees now covered under the Railway Labor Act from the amendments here set forth.

When most of all the employers in an industry deal with a single union, each is reasonably certain that the union will enforce substantially similar demands against his competitors. Consequently, as long as each is reasonably certain that overhead costs will be either absorbed by all firms or passed along to hijack the public in the form of higher prices, each is more willing to submit to the labor organization's demands.

The incentive for an employer to resist unreasonable and extravagant demands is likely to be more if there were greater danger that his concessions might put him at a competitive disadvantage. The employers' lessened resistance reduces materially the protection that employers should provide to consumers against uneconomic demands of labor monopolies.

When employers combine together to bargain collectively, each may be certain that he and his competitors suffer the same costs of labor. There simply are no limits to the concessions they make, passing the costs on to the public, as long as they do not price themselves out of the market. The lessened incentive to resist uneconomic demands because of "equal assessment" against competitors means that the public suffers not only a higher price but also must bear the price of reduced output. Any restrictive practices and featherbedding provisions in negotiated contracts are no less uneconomic than excessive demands. H.R. 9271 will prevent these hindrances and protect the consumer. It will also help to eliminate national emergency strikes.

There are several ways to deal with so-called emergencies due to regional, industrywide, or national strikes. The legislative and executive branches have tried several ways already. In 1946 the President asked Congress to authorize him to draft striking railway employees into the Army and force them to work; in 1947 Congress passed the Taft-Hartley Act which contains an injunction provision which has been used 19 times, although the deficiency of that law is obviously the end of the 80-day injunction period. The President has tried factfinding in steel, but we had a strike anyway. We have tried White House intervention which some call conciliation and others call fascism. The War Labor disputes of World War II provided for seizure but it did not prevent strikes or even discourage them.

But, in all of these attempts, instead of going to the root of our problem we have been trimming off the branches. We have been using expedients and have not attacked the problem itself. H.R. 9271 attacks monopoly power and will indirectly limit the undesirable effects of strikes themselves. It would affect the results of labor monopoly which year after year, with or without the connivance of employers, stifles competition by forcing uniformity of labor costs and increases in excess of productivity upon the consumer. My bill discourages monopolistic combinations by employers or unions to restrain trade.

I would deny the great national and international unions' power to bring pressure to dictate terms throughout an industry or region. I would do this by restoring collective bargaining to the company level, where the employer and the representatives of his employees can bargain and reach agreement in the light of their wishes, their needs, their circumstances; and not according to the dictates of the labor leader far away from the workingman.

I would prohibit employers from combining to accomplish results that, if not disguised as collective bargaining, our antitrust laws would forbid. When employers agree upon threat of strike to a uniform industrywide wage cost, they fix that cost just as surely as they would get together and fix any other cost or the price of a commodity.

I would not abolish national or international unions. I would not forbid them to furnish wage, statistical, or other information to their locals, similar to the manner in which trade associations furnish information to their members.

Let me refer you to an imminent problem in the steel industry. The collective bargaining agreements of the steel companies expire on June 30, 1962. A strike is a possibility and some believe a probability. We are informed that this Nation will suffer an unbalanced Federal budget if there is a steel strike. Everywhere people are asking whether a strike will occur.

There is more to be concerned about than a strike. We must be concerned about price stability and wage stability. We must be concerned about foreign products made of steel competing in price with ours.

The president of the United Steel Workers Union has already served notice that the chief goal of the union is a 4-day, 32-hour workweek with wage increases, as well as fringe increases. But, President Kennedy indicated that he is for a 40-hour week, and that he wants the steel companies to hold the line on prices. He wants unions to hold wage increases down to the gain in productivity to prevent inflation.

Mr. Speaker, will a reduction to a 32-hour week, with a corresponding reduction in output, but with an increase in pay and fringe benefits, hold the line on wages that now average $3.22 per hour—so that prices can be held down? We understand that it will not.

I believe that industrywide use of the Steelworkers power over wages and fringes cannot be challenged under present law. I believe under my proposal that union power can be challenged, and yet collective bargaining and the right to strike to back up demands continued. H.R. 9271 would have each company and union working out its own agreement; agreements would be made with an eye toward competition and not connivance or prior knowledge of a competitor's price of labor. Each union might strike, but making it possible to have different contract expiration dates would make it likely that strikes would be limited in scope to single companies. This Nation would not have to contend with all the companies in an industry involved in a strike causing widespread disruptions of national emergency proportions.

This Nation is concerned with this big union, big power problem. They are concerned with a balance of power between labor and management. They want to preserve capital and labor and collective bargaining with a minimum of Government intervention or interference. Yet, they know that the right to collective bargaining is the right to strike to back up demands made. They want to preserve this right. I believe my bill, H.R. 9271, is worthy of serious consideration because it preserves collective bargaining but meets the problem of monopoly power and national emergency strikes.

The Consumer and the Department of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is heartening to read that the interest of the administration in the consumer and his problems continues. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman recently addressed the New Jersey State Board of Agriculture and a great portion of that address was concerned with the stake of the consumer in the program of the Department of Agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent that a portion of that speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> I suspect that one of the best kept secrets in Washington is that the Department of Agriculture carries out more activities which are of direct benefit or indirect service to the consumer than any other department or agency in the Federal Government.
>
> A congressional committee last year surveyed the various services performed specifically in the consumer's interest and found that one out of every six is a job which Agriculture does.
>
> It may surprise you to know that we spend a greater amount from our annual budget for direct consumer services than any department or agency. In fact, 1 out of every 10 employees in the Department is primarily assigned to protecting or advancing the consumer's interest.
>
> I do not say these things to impress you with the money we spend or the number of things we do. I say these things to make one point which very few people in this

country today fully appreciate: the Department of Agriculture plays an exceedingly important role in the daily life of every American—not just those who live on the farm. Yet, the impression which many urban families have is that the Department of Agriculture is concerned only with farming and, therefore, rarely touches their day-to-day activities.

By the time the Kennedy administration arrived, the farmer had become one of the most misunderstood of Americans and the Department was viewed as more of a gigantic storage bin than a department serving both farm and city.

It is not surprising that many people, particularly those in the cities and off the farms, failed to recognize the magnificent power which the farmer had given the Nation in his ability to produce an abundance of food and fiber—enough so that for the first time in the history of man we can see clearly that famine and hunger no longer need to be feared.

Nor is it surprising that Americans are only beginning to realize that farm products are responsible for one quarter of all exports from the United States. Our country is the leading exporter of food and fiber—and without this trade, our favorable balance of payments would be seriously impaired.

Nor, I suppose, is it surprising that the consumer activities and services of the Department either are taken for granted or are unrecognized, even though without them the American people would have to buy meat without any assurance of quality and would find outdoor recreational opportunities more limited and probably very expensive.

Let me describe for you some of the consumer activities carried out daily in every section of the country under the direction of the Department of Agriculture.

One of the primary reasons that we have a consistently high quality level of meat and poultry available to consumers is the fact that all meat and poultry handled in interstate commerce is inspected by some 5,000 trained inspectors who reject diseased animals and unfit carcasses from processing into food products.

In addition, many of the food commodities purchased in supermarkets and grocery stores are graded and labeled under supervision of Department employees. These grades, such as "USDA Choice" for beef, "Grade A" for poultry, and "U.S. Fancy" for fruit and vegetables, are standards of quality that shoppers can and do depend on.

While agricultural research often is considered primarily of benefit to the farmer, one of the most logical arguments that can be made for it is that the consumer today can buy a wider variety of food and clothing only because of the progress made through research. Because of it, we are constantly developing better strains of crops, livestock and poultry as well as new products to meet changing consumer tastes.

We often hear of industries today which make the bulk of their sales in products not in existence 10 years ago. In agriculture, many of the varieties of crops now being grown were not even known to farmers 10 years ago. Yet they must have them today because the old strains have virtually been wiped out by disease—and without the new varieties, consumers would have less choice and probably higher prices.

Agricultural research has put many familiar food products within the easy reach of consumers. An outstanding example of production efficiency is the country's broiler industry. In 1940 it took 13 weeks to produce a 3-pound broiler. Now only 9 weeks are required and we can do it on half as much feed as in 1940. Most American consumers also have benefited from development of the family-sized turkey and leaner pork products from the meat-type hog.

I am sure that farmers will agree with the economists that the benefits of research to produce more efficiently have largely passed through the farmer to the consumer. Broilers and turkeys, for example, have never been so low in price as in the past year.

Consumers' needs have encouraged the research development of such convenience foods as frozen concentrated fruit juices, potato granules and flakes, powdered eggs, and cake mixes.

Chemists of the Department of Agriculture also have had a leading part in developing the techniques of flame-proofing cotton and making it resistant to soil and rot. It has been made water repellent and wash-and-wearable. Because of these findings, cotton is competing favorably with the synthetic fibers, both in wearing apparel and for industrial uses.

Just last week the Department announced two new developments in treatment of cotton fiber. One is a procedure which will make collars and cuffs on men's wash-wear shirts last longer—a development which will please the wives, I'm sure. The other is a single treatment process that gives cotton wash-wear properties at the same time it dyes, starches, and adds other finishing agents to the fabric.

Thus, I think it is fair to say that agriculture provides many services which are indispensable to the consumer in this day and age, and, in addition, has succeeded beyond the wildest dreams of man's imagination in providing an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable costs.

Since becoming Secretary of Agriculture, I have sought to carry this one simple message to the families of America who live in our cities and suburbs. I consider it one of the most important tasks that we who are concerned with the future of agriculture can undertake.

Food is one of our most abundant and plentiful resources, and it is reasonably priced. It is a bargain in relation to the cost of other things which the American public buys. But after years of being told that the farmer is taking advantage of the consumer, the city dweller is reluctant to believe these facts.

Yet, the facts are there to substantiate that food is a bargain.

The retail value of farm food products, as reported in market basket calculations in 1961, was only 4 percent higher than it was 10 years earlier (1951). Yet living costs generally had risen 19 percent in that same period.

Cause of the smaller rise in food costs was the fact that farm value of that same food declined 19 percent in the 10 years. Breaking it down by commodities, the retail value of dairy products in the market basket was up 10 percent in the 10 years, while farm value was down 6 percent. Most extreme example is poultry and eggs on which retail value dropped 27 percent in the 10-year period and farm value dropped even more—36 percent.

Let me repeat the total figure again: Retail value of farm food products was up only 4 percent in 1961 over 1951 while farm value of the same foods had dropped 19 percent. And this at a time when all living costs had gone up 19 percent in the 10 years.

Would you not say, then, that relatively speaking, food is a bargain? Another way to compare it is with wages for factory labor. In 1947–49 it took 59 hours of pay from factory work to buy a month's supply of food for an average family. Today it takes only 38 hours of factory pay—a third less—to buy the same amount of food.

I believe that we can make the case that the consumer has an important stake in agriculture, but I emphasize that unless we make it no one else will do it for us.

Exactly 100 years ago this year, President Abraham Lincoln established the Department of Agriculture. In signing the act creating the USDA, he spoke of it as "the people's Department." That phrase is even more appropriate today in many ways than it was in Lincoln's time, for ours truly is the people's Department.

The services which agriculture performs in food and forestry are of direct and primary benefit to the consumer. We are considering recommending in this centennial year, therefore, that the name by which the Department is identified be broadened to include these important interests.

I also believe that it is about time now to begin organizing and coordinating the many and varied services which the Department performs for the consumer as a means first, of insuring that vigorous action be continued to protect and advance the consumer's interests where the Department is responsible; second, of providing more adequate information to consumers regarding those services they can get and should expect to obtain; and, third, of pinpointing the need for additional services at the time the need arises.

Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Death of Gen. Wladimir Krzyzanowski, Civil War Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 75th anniversary of the death of Gen. Wladimir Krzyzanowski, highly praised hero of the American Civil War.

It is fitting that we should pay tribute in Congress today to this Polish patriot who came to our shores at an early age, imbued with the ideals of freedom and liberty, and joined the great cause in the Civil War when the very foundation for those freedoms was being threatened by internal strife.

In paying tribute to General Krzyzanowski on this 75th anniversary of his death, we again have an opportunity to reflect upon the men and women of many nations who have contributed so much toward the development of our United States.

General Krzyzanowski was born in Roznowo, Poland. He grew up in an era when his native land, just as today, was enslaved by Poland's warring neighbors. But the indomitable spirit for freedom so characteristic of the Polish people through their 1,000 years of history found true expression in young Krzyzanowski, who, from his early youth, helped organize strong student underground movements to rid his native land of her oppressors.

In 1846, when he was branded a conspirator and hunted by the secret police, the youthful Krzyzanowski fled to America. He came here as a humble immigrant at the age of 22 and immediately took on the difficult task of learning the English language. Under the most difficult conditions, he completed a course in engineering; and because of his physical strength and burning desire to succeed, he took on the tedious job of helping chart railroad lines as our Nation expanded westward.

His career was interrupted by the outbreak of the Civil War, and 2 days after President Lincoln's first proclamation, he volunteered as a private, but quickly advanced to the rank of captain of his own company, which was made up for the most part of men from the Washington area.

There were two basic reasons which prompted this young soldier to join the Union Army at once. First was his strong love of freedom. With the indignity of servitude spent in enslaved Poland as a youth deeply rooted in his memory, Krzyzanowski pledged himself to help save the freedom he came to know and respect in America. The second reason was his knowledge of engineering, which later proved invaluable to the Union Army.

Today, 75 years after his death, General Krzyzanowski's dedication to the cause of freedom is rightfully a source of inspiration not only to Americans of Polish descent, but to all Americans who see our freedoms threatened by the insidious movement of international communism. In his devotion to the dignity of man, his great attributes as a soldier in defense of liberty, his great personal sacrifice on the altar of freedom, we of this generation and future generations can find strength and courage to sustain us in our present hour of danger.

In the fall of 1861, Krzyzanowski took over the command of the 58th New York Infantry, with the rank of colonel. His regiment was attached to Blenker's Division, then encamped at Hunter's Chapel, Va. He took part in Fremont's "hunt" after Stonewall Jackson in the Shenandoah Valley in the spring of 1862, and distinguished himself at Cross Keys on June 8, when he personally, bayonet in hand, led a successful charge on Ewell's Confederates.

Through subsequent changes in the high command in the Army of Virginia, he became commander of the 2d Brigade, 3d—Schurz's—Division, and took part in the second battle of Bull Run.

Official reports speak with the highest praise of his gallantry on the first day of the battle, August 29, when he repelled frequent and fierce assaults of the enemy; on the following day he fought with equal bravery and while showing his men how to face the enemy, had his horse shot under him. Krzyzanowski's valor in this battle was so outstanding that President Lincoln nominated him brigadier general, but, according to Schurz' relation, the Senate failed to confirm the nomination because none of the Senators could pronounce his name.

"Kriz," as Krzyzanowski was popularly called in the Army, did not take this injustice to heart.

> A son of foreign and far-off land—

He wrote in his memoir—

> I fought for ideals, for freedom and liberty.

In the disastrous battle of Chancellorsville, May 2–4, and at Gettysburg, July 1–3, 1863, Krzyzanowski again distinguished himself. Schurz attests that the only real fighting at Chancellorsville, which for about an hour delayed Jackson's progress, was done by foreign brigadiers, Schimmelfennig and Krzyzanowski of Schurz' division, and Buschbeck of Steinwehr's division. At Gettysburg he was active during the entire 3 days of the battle. It was his corps that opened the battle. On the second and third day he occupied the pivotal position at the Cemetery Ridge and took part in the bloodiest struggle; he saved a battery from being captured by the enemy. General Howard, commanding the XI Corps, singled him out for bravery, faithfulness, and efficiency in the discharge of duty.

Krzyzanowski spent part of 1864 defending the Nashville and Chattanooga Railroad, the "cracker line" of the Army. It was a hard task, demanding constant vigilance against guerrilla bands and usually accompanied by hunger and privation. For weeks his troops had to use powder for want of salt; horses died of starvation. On March 2, 1865, after other important military missions in the South, he was breveted brigadier general for gallant and meritorious services. He left the Army on October 1, 1865, with his health impaired.

Upon his return to civil life he occupied various offices in the Treasury Department. Settling in California, he helped Helena Modjeska, the famous Shakespearean actress, in her early American career. There he also met Henry Sienkiewicz, the author of "Quo Vadis," and exerted some influence on his writings. In 1879, he was customs inspector at Panama, and in 1883, received an appointment in the customs office at New York, at which post he died on January 31, 1887. Carl Schurz, who remained his warm friend until his death, delivered the funeral oration at his grave.

Mr. Speaker, we Americans can find strength in the knowledge that the one most significant factor which distinguishes us as Americans from all other social orders in the world today is the fact that our people have come from all corners of the world, from virtually all cultures, from all religions, from all races; and because we believe so strongly in the dignity of the individual, we are closely knit into a single Nation of people working together for the survival of freedom.

Gen. Wladimir Krzyzanowski reflects the full glory of our country—past, present, and future.

Plumbing Research an Environmental Health Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a speech which I delivered at the Plumbing and Heating Wholesalers of New England luncheon, Sheraton-Copley Hotel, Boston, on January 29, 1962:

REMARKS BY HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, OF RHODE ISLAND

I deeply appreciate the privilege of meeting with your organization to discuss problems of mutual interest. Your program chairman, however, took a calculated risk in failing to assign a specific subject for discussion.

With your permission, I should like to direct my remarks to the changing problems of the environment and their increasing significance and impact on health. My reasons are two-fold: First, as an important segment of the building industry, you are in a position to influence directly many of these environmental factors. Second, as hard-headed businessmen and professional leaders in your communities you have a real responsibility for initiating and supporting health programs generally.

The press, journals, and magazines have been filled with dire predictions on the hazards associated with our population explosion, the immigration to metropolitan areas, the mental trauma and difficulties associated with urban living, and other equally disturbing forecasts. We could get quite gloomy about it all, if we didn't remind ourselves that these problems are not entirely new and that, so far at least, the American people have managed to cope with them. Our population has been increasing ever since the first colonists landed not too far from where we are meeting today. Industry has been expanding and as a result has given us the highest standard of living of any nation. The population shift has been going on ever since the first mechanization took place on the farm, as opposed to the songwriters' protestations that Paris was somehow involved.

Let's admit to the changes; let's admit that, for the most part these changes have been desirable. Nevertheless, the changes now taking place create health hazards that are more complex than any we have known before and it is high time for us to devote our attention to the task of coping with them. Let's start thinking about the cities of tomorrow we are building today and how we can make them the places where we want to live. This requires new knowledge and techniques. We must step up research and we must see that the results of research are promptly used in solving the problems at hand.

The role of Government in health is necessarily circumscribed. But it is a legitimate and primary concern of the Congress to establish programs for the study of health problems of national concern. It has been my privilege to be the chairman of the congressional Appropriations Subcommittee that deals with public health appropriations. I have been on that committee for a period longer than any other present Member of the Congress. I am deeply grateful that, together with my House colleagues and with our sister subcommittee of the Senate, chaired by the distinguished Senator from Alabama, the Honorable LISTER HILL, we have had many opportunities to contribute to the betterment of the public health. Over the years that I have worked with health officials, I have been impressed with the changing character of health problems and with the importance of keeping our public health programs adjusted to the problems of today and tomorrow.

Many of you are familiar with the Federal programs of medical research and the advances being made in finding the causes and—hopefully—the cures for cancer, heart disease, mental illness, and others. The National Institutes of Health of the Public Health Service have done a remarkable job not only in conducting research but in supporting research on a nationwide basis—in medical schools, foundations, and universities—to provide the answers we need.

I am proud of my part in getting them the funds they've needed. It is money well spent. For example, we used to have about 2,000 babies every year, born prematurely, who became totally blind when they were just a few weeks old. That doesn't happen anymore. We used to have about 400 babies every year who seemed normal at first but by the time they were 2 or 3 years old were idiots or morons. That problem, too, is on the way out. It used to be that if you were told you had cancer, you figured that was the end. Not anymore. Out of every six people who get cancer now, two are saved; and half the victims could be saved if full use were made of all the knowledge about cancer produced by research. The marvels of heart and brain surgery; the vaccines that protect against polio and soon will protect against measles—all these and other advances have come directly or indirectly as a result of the big push on medical research which began about 25 years ago when we set up the National Cancer Institute, first of the seven big National Institutes of Health. Hundreds of thousands of people have benefitted.

But studying the effect of disease in man is only one part of the job. The other part is studying how conditions in the environment may cause disease. This part—and it is just as important—has been neglected. We are never going to clear up some of the mysteries of disease unless we launch a full-scale study of the health effects of the environment. Why is it that people in some places get certain types of cancer, heart disease and other conditions that are not contagious while people in other places are spared? Take a specific example, cancer of the bladder. In some parts of Egypt this is a big problem and it has been noted that the people in these parts bathe in streams that contain infected snails that cause swimmer's itch. Offhand, you might say, the answer to this one is easy—stay out of such water. But how do you explain the fact that in some places in this country, cancer of the bladder will be twice as prevalent as in other nearby places? Particularly when there are no infected snails and no cases of swimmer's itch in either place? And why are cases of multiple sclerosis almost always found in northern communities, almost never in southern?

I don't think it is just accident that changes in the kinds of diseases that are most threatening to us today have come about just at the time when changes in our environment have been occurring most rapidly.

Let's take a moment to examine what some of those changes have been and what problems they present. The population of the United States now exceeds 180 million. By 1970—8 years hence—it will approximate 215 million, with two-thirds of the population concentrated in metropolitan areas. The impact of this population growth on the building industry of the Nation will be tremendous. We shall have to provide housing and ancillary facilities equivalent to that of 50 cities of the size of Boston, Mass. We will have to adjust to an almost continuous metropolitan area extending from Bangor, Maine, to Richmond, Va. The logistics of the expansion will strain our capacity to provide in adequate quantity and quality the four basic elements of the environment, namely: water, air, food, and shelter.

In fact, we are already finding it hard to meet those four basic needs.

Take water. We have drinking water standards set by the Public Health Service. If water meets those standards, we know it is safe to drink. It used to be that the main thing the standard setters had to worry about was bacteria—germs that would cause typhoid fever and other contagious diseases. Just as we were getting on top of those problems, we learned that a lot of contagious diseases were caused by viruses, which are very much harder to screen out of a water supply. On top of that, the chemical industry began to grow like Topsy and a whole lot of new and potentially dangerous chemicals had to be dealt with. Then, on top of that, came radiation from fallout which also gets into the water supply. Setting water standards that will assure protection against all these hazards is getting harder and harder. And if we don't step up our research on these newer contaminants, the day may well come when setting standards will become just plain impossible. Personally, I'm not sure that day hasn't already arrived.

And it isn't as if we could reach out some place and find water that wasn't affected by all these changes in our civilization. We have just as much, and no more, water as the first settlers had and the only reason we can get by with this limited amount is because we've learned a little about how to treat and reuse it. But we are going to have to learn a lot more because we are using more water all the time. Nature gives us about 600 billion gallons of usable water for daily use, but it doesn't distribute it to our convenience. We now use 320 billion gallons a day and by 1980 we will need to use every drop of the whole 600 billion. Water used to be cheap and plentiful and we became a wasteful nation. Now it is scarce and costly. We wouldn't be thinking about taking the salt out of the ocean if the problem wasn't pretty serious. You know it costs about a dollar per 1,000 gallons to do that.

The problem of air is much the same as the problem of water. "Free as the air," we say, but believe me, getting air that is fit to breathe in a city is far from free. I know. We have a good air pollution control program in Providence, R.I. They are working on the auto exhaust problem. They see that industries don't pollute the air unnecessarily. But even in Providence where we are spending money on this problem and getting good results, we don't have really clean air. No place does. What we most need is control of the stuff that spews out of the tailpipes of the trucks and autos, but this problem seems to get Z priority as far as the auto industry is concerned. Finally, after being prodded and coaxed and threatened, they are at last beginning to move, but it still remains to be seen whether anything short of a Federal law requiring exhaust controls will get the kind of action we need. In Congress we are waiting; but we are also watching.

Cutting down on the pollution caused by auto exhaust won't solve the whole problem. The fact is, we are throwing all sorts of chemicals and other pollutants into the air at a faster rate than the air currents can carry them off and we just don't know what effect all this has. Maybe it is one of the reasons why cancer, heart disease, asthma, and other problems are more common in some places than in others. Maybe it isn't. Until we step up research, we won't know.

After this fine lunch, I hate to suggest to you that there are also a lot of question marks about the food we are eating these days. But there are. Think how the whole process of providing food has changed just in our own lifetimes. All the fertilizers and pesticides used on the crops. All the things that happen to food after it is harvested. For example, those trays of food they serve you on the airliners. The whole tray, except for the salad and maybe one or two other items, is stockpiled—thousands of those trays in every airport in big deep-freeze vaults. Maybe they'll stay there a year, maybe 2 or 3 years before they get loaded on a plane and popped into the quick heating unit by the stewardess who serves you. The whole thing is just about as amazing and wonderful as the jetplane itself. I'm all for it and for all the other changes in food processing and distribution. The only thing that bothers me is that we are making them before we know what the full effects may be. What causes the million cases of food poisoning that are reported to the Public Health Service every year and the millions of others that occur but don't get reported? Are they caused because, somewhere along the line, old-fashioned methods, known to be unsafe, were used? Or are they caused because some new-fashioned method was used before its dangers were discovered? We don't know and, without more research, we aren't going to find out.

Complicating all these problems—water, air, food—is that most baffling of all problems, manmade radiation. The more we study it, the more we are impressed with its dangers. Yet we can't turn the clock back. Peace or war, there is bound to be more and more radiation and the only way we can control its danger is to learn more about it. But we have barely skimmed the surface of knowledge about its health effects.

Even the simple problem of refuse disposal is creating difficulties for our metropolitan areas. Two miles out of Boston Bay is an island which many passing boatmen will agree has admirably earned its name, Spectacle Island. This island over its entire 50 acres has been the recipient for the past 37 years of much of the refuse produced by the city of Boston. It is now stacked to a height of 30 feet. This points up the growing problem all American cities face in disposing of refuse. We are currently spending some $2 billion a year to dispose of our unwanted refuse.

The only real advance that has been made on the refuse disposal problem since the days of our grandparents we owe to your industry. We owe to you that wonderful modern device, the garbage grinder. But even if every home had a garbage grinder—and they ought to have—it would still solve only 25 percent of the refuse disposal problem. Moreover, if we are going to have a garbage grinder in every home, we have to have the kind of sewage systems that can take the load; and in most places, sewage systems are overtaxed already. You can't be for garbage grinders and against improvement and expansion of sewage systems.

I've been talking a lot about research and I've talked in terms of finding out the things we don't know. There is also some value in research that simply proves the things we think we know. It won't be any news to you people that plumbing contributes to health, but believe it or not, the solid proof of it is rather new. Studies down in Prestonburg, Ky., proved conclusively that families have less diarrhea and other intestinal disorders as they have more indoor plumbing. Homes with just one tap of running water had less disease than homes with none; homes with kitchen sinks and bathrooms have still less disease.

What was the point of proving this? You knew it all along. I'll tell you one point—it makes it much easier to get some serious consideration of the proposal to invest Federal funds in plumbing research. The taxpayer is not about to have his money spent for studies that will simply line your pockets. But clear-cut proof that plumbing research will help him, the taxpayer, is something else again. Health is the strongest reason why we need federally aided research on plumbing. But it is not the only reason. Water conservation is another reason. Economy is another. Think of the water that could be saved if 5 gallons didn't go down the drain every time anybody flushed a toilet. Think of the dollars that could be saved if plastic could safely be used for all types of pipes and for bathroom fixtures. Think of all the shelter space that could be saved—and that's money, too, when you have to think in terms of enough added population to fill 50 Bostons in just 8 more years—anyway, think of the housing space that could be saved by wall-hung toilets and other innovations.

With some solid evidence, produced through research, maybe we could even modernize the plumbing codes in this country. Most of those codes were written in the horse-and-buggy days and they haven't been changed since.

You can't separate out these problems. If research produces ways to get good plumbing cheaper, maybe it is going to put a little more money into your pockets, but it is also going to put more plumbing into the homes that need it and that are disease-ridden for lack of it. Some parts of plumbing research, of course, you can screen out and say it is industry's job because it is clearly to industry's benefit. But much of the needed research cannot possibly be stimulated by the profit motive. Yet it is definitely to the public's interest to have it done. It is this part of the job that I think needs the encouragement of Federal aid. And it is one of the things I would expect to see included if we can build up research in this whole field of environmental health to the proper scale.

I have a strong suspicion that a lot of these mysterious viruses, these maladies that get everybody down for a day or two and then go away and are forgotten, may be due to some kind of breaks in our sanitation defenses. Maybe some of the things that get through the water treatment plants aren't as harmless as we think. Maybe something happens as the water travels from the service line to the building to the fixture where it is used. Maybe all this interlacing of water supply and drainage pipes required by all the new houses, apartments, factories, and shopping centers we are building is causing problems we are not even aware of. This is out of my line, I admit, and I wouldn't worry about it if the people who understand these things were working on them. But they aren't. They can't, until we decide that we are going to make the kind of a push on the environmental side that we are already making of the medical research side.

Not that everything depends on research. We could be making a lot more use of the knowledge we already have. There is no reason why we need to let our metropolitan areas grow in the haphazard way they are growing. Everyone knows that it is cheaper, in the long run, and certainly much more satisfactory to plan them. Go to the outskirts of almost any city and you'll see the slums of the future. Talk to suburbanites who thought they were going to save money with their septic tanks and private water systems. Lots of them are still paying but they are also paying for public water and sewage systems. They want to know why they weren't warned that the private system wouldn't work. They're mad. And they have a right to be.

Your industry is intimately and directly involved in the construction of the homes, the factories, the commercial establishments, and the other physical facilities which, when added together, constitute the environment in which our population lives.

You can be tremendously influential in seeing that your communities are planned communities with built-in features that will assure health, beauty, and pleasant living for generations yet to come.

I am confident you are throwing your influence in that direction and that you will continue to do so. And I want to assure you that I, too, am doing and will continue to do everything I can in Congress. I want to be sure that the Federal Government doesn't take on that part of the job which rightly belongs to industry and to States and communities. But I want to be equally sure that it doesn't fail to do that part of the job which only the Federal Government can do.

I urge you, as I urge the people down in Washington, to get on with the job. The longer we let these problems accumulate, the bigger they will grow, and the tougher it will be to deal with them. We've drifted too long. It's time—it's overtime—for action.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Malachi 2: 10: *Have not all one Father? Hath not one God created us?*

O Thou who wert the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, and the God of our fathers, and all their succeeding generations, in this moment of prayer we are joining the saints and the humble in spirit of every country and clime, in praising Thy great and holy name.

We rejoice that in the annals of our national history we have the record of the sincere and simple prayer offered unto Thee in this historic Chamber on this day, 102 years ago, by a beloved and devout spiritual leader of the Jewish faith, who daily poured out his soul in a great passion for righteousness and brotherhood and earnestly prayed that the minds and hearts of our chosen Representatives and of all our citizens might be made the sanctuaries of Thy truth and Thy love.

Grant that at this time of blessed memory we may bow in gratitude and humility as we call to mind the Old Testament benediction then used by Thy servant and which our troubled spirits so greatly need as we seek to continue the pilgrimage of our human life with a faith that is calm and courageous:

"May the Lord bless you and keep you; may the Lord make His face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you; may the Lord lift upon you the light of His countenance and give you peace."

To Thy name we ascribe all the glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 512. An act to extend the time for completion of the free highway bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 305, 85th Congress, had appointed the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] a member of the Civil War Centennial Commission, vice the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], resigned.

THE 102D ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST JEWISH PRAYER IN CONGRESS

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is 2 years today since we observed, in the House of Representatives, the 100th anniversary of the first occasion on which a session of the House was opened with a prayer by a Jewish rabbi. That was one of the great firsts in the development of American democracy. February 1, 1860—102 years ago today—marked the first acknowledgment of the Jewish faith in a formal proceeding of the Congress of the United States. It marked a recognition and acceptance of our differences and was a vital milestone in our growth as a citadel of equal opportunity and justice for all our citizens.

Although members of the Jewish faith had served in Congress prior to 1860, we remember humbly today that this legislative body was in existence for 70 years, opening its daily sessions with prayer, without once listening to a representative of that faith from which so much of our Christian doctrine and worship is derived.

We realize proudly, however, that we have progressed beyond the point at which a prayer by a rabbi was a startling innovation in our procedure. Rabbi Morris Jacob Raphall, spiritual leader of the Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, in New York City, began 102 years ago today a tradition which has lived and grown down into our own time, to the enlargement of our American citizenship and of our religious character. He spoke, on that day, an eloquent invocation upon the opening of the daily session of the House of Representatives. It is fitting that today, 102 years later, our own House Chaplain, Dr. Braskamp, should use the benediction offered by Rabbi Raphall for our opening prayer today.

As the years have gone by, this precedent has been followed and expanded until now it would be a matter of surprise and remark if it were omitted for any considerable period, or if no representative of the Jewish faith were invited to officiate at any major governmental function.

We have progressed, as a people, to a point where religious bigotry is isolated into ever-narrowing factions in our country. People who seek to degrade an individual today solely on the basis of his religion are themselves looked upon with scorn and concern, for the Jewish people among us have served with distinction in the military, in education, in Government, medicine, and law. Their history as Americans, which goes back more than 300 years, is so closely intertwined with the history of other religions in our country that it is impossible to select a specific moment in time and say, "Here and now, this philosophy changed America."

It is fitting that the fabric of our American tradition is an intricate blending of common goals, joined together for strength and unity.

In 1960, at the suggestion of Dr. Abraham G. Ducker, president of Chicago's College of Jewish Studies, we in the House of Representatives honored the occasion of the centenary by inviting Rabbi Israel Goldstein, Rabbi Raphall's successor as spiritual leader of Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, to deliver the opening invocation for that day's session.

He closed his remarks with the beautiful scriptural blessing that had also been used by Rabbi Raphall, and repeated again today by our own Chaplain Braskamp—words prescribed in Mosaic law to be spoken by God's chosen ministers in benediction over the people:

> The Lord bless thee and keep thee. The Lord show His face to thee and have mercy on thee. The Lord turn His countenance to thee and give thee peace.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM RADFORD COYLE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I announce to the House the death of the Honorable William Radford Coyle a former Member of the House of Representatives from Pennsylvania.

Colonel Coyle was an industrialist and public spirited citizen of Bethlehem, Pa., who devoted much of his lifetime as a volunteer worker furthering the interests of his community.

His death at 83 years removed from the Bethlehem scene one of the most energetic men of that community. A recitation of his civic accomplishments would be endless. One immediately thinks of his influence in organizing Company M of the Pennsylvania National Guard, the Boy Scouts, the American Red Cross chapter, the Rotary Club chapters in Bethlehem, and in later years, his guiding hand in the Bethlehem Authority and the Bethlehem Redevelopment Authority, and civil defense organizations.

Colonel Coyle was a native of Washington, D.C., and was a graduate of the U.S. Naval War College in 1900 and the University of Pennsylvania School of Law in 1906. Prior to obtaining a law degree, he served with the Marines.

As a businessman, he was widely known for his work in the coal industry, and at one time served as president of the National Association of Coal Dealers. He served as vice president of Weston Dodson & Co. from 1932 through 1954.

In World War I, Coyle returned to the Marine Corps and with the rank of a major directed the recruit training at Parris Island, S.C.

Colonel Coyle, a Republican, first came to Congress with the 69th Congress in 1925. He also served in the 71st and 72d Congresses.

I know that the full life that Colonel Coyle led, the large number of persons who are happier because he lived, will bring consolation to his widow and children, and to whom I extend my personal condolences.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and character of the late William Radford Coyle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE PUNXSUTAWNEY GROUNDHOG

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker I want to call to the attention of the Members of the House that tomorrow, February 2, is Groundhog Day.

It is regrettable that February 2 falls on Friday this year as I presume the House will not be in session to receive the pronouncement of the great meteorologist—the great prognosticator of the weather, who will make his annual forecast as to weather conditions for the following 6 weeks from his "weather works' den" on "Gobbler's Knob" in the foothills of the Alleghenies. Millions of people are anxiously waiting the word of the world's foremost prophet—the Punxsutawney Groundhog.

The grave question is whether or not he will see his shadow. From what I can learn from the scouts in the vicinity of the windy, snow-covered knoll, where the snow for months has been deep and the cold subzero, the followers of the prophet expect he will quietly emerge from his den, take a quick look, see his shadow, back into his hole, slam the door on the outside world, and we will be in for 6 more weeks of wintry weather.

However, no one can tell what the prediction may be. The chuck and the chuck alone knows the answer.

I might call to the attention of the House that since the Punxsutawney Groundhog ascended the weather throne at Gobbler's Knob nearly a century ago, petty, prevaricating pretenders have pecked peevishly at his position as the preeminent prognosticator; however, little or no attention is paid to the petulant pretentions of these piebald pilgrims parading as progenies of Punxsutawney's peerless prophet.

It may be that the boys up at Sun Prairie, Wis., and at the Slumber Lumber Lodge at Quarryville, Pa., will bring out their nature fakers of a low degree in an attempt to intrude upon the sacred tradition of the one and only Punxsutawney Groundhog in the same objectionable manner as in the past.

So, I feel it is my patriotic duty, not alone to the citizens of the 23d District of Pennsylvania, which I am proud to represent, but to the people of the whole Nation, to alert them to these plagiarizing pseudo chucks who will want to intrude upon the amazing and almost incredible predictions of this foreteller of the weather.

After the Punxsutawney Chuck's announcement on February 2, I trust there will be no brash attempts by the run-of-the-mine fabricators and deceivers—which I deeply resent—to usurp the distinguished and honored position in the weather world occupied by the chuck, the originator of this unique and remarkable weather service—the one and only Punxsutawney Groundhog.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON EXPORT CONTROL

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to announce to the House that the Select Committee on Export Control has concluded its hearings, except for 1 day, and that will be on February 5 next, at which time we will have Secretary of State Rusk before the committee. The meeting has been scheduled for the caucus room in the Old House Office Building.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD an interim statement, pending submission of the report to this body, which I hope we will have prepared and ready for submission in the next 2 or 3 weeks.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of the expressed concern of the people of the United States, as well as that of my colleagues, over the export from this country to Communist countries of vast quantities of strategic commodities, House Resolution 403 was approved September 7, 1961. I was indeed very pleased that my resolution met with such overwhelming approval.

In brief, the resolution established a select committee to make a complete study of the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Export Control Act of 1949 and related acts. It further provided that as soon as practicable, the select committee make a report to the present Congress and submit recommendations as to any desirable changes in legislation now in effect, as well as any changes in the administration of our controls over exports.

My deep concern over licensing commodities for export which could reasonably be considered strategic to any degree to any Communist-controlled country has not lessened in the slightest since the select committee was established and our studies began.

The studies of our committee are not yet complete, but I am hopeful that a factual picture of the entire problem can be obtained at an early date to enable us to submit a report to the Congress promptly thereafter.

The Secretary of Commerce, who was designated administrator of the Export Control Act of 1949 by Presidential directive, consults with the Departments of State and Defense and other interested departments and agencies in carrying out his responsibilities. In so doing files are maintained reflecting factual data relevant to approval or denial of licenses to export various commodities to Communist and other countries. The Department of Commerce apparently in complete accord with the Departments of State and Defense, agreed to furnish the committee with a table of contents generally as to what material was in the files, but refused permission for either the committee or its staff investigators to review the files to determine complete factual data, claiming executive privilege. Where such privilege begins and ends, I do not know. The committee was furnished what were purported to be, in part, a rather substantial number of factual summaries pertaining to approval and denial of licenses to export commodities to various Communist countries.

I do want to particularly emphasize that it is my firm conviction that any enabling legislation, if needed, to strengthen controls over exports of strategic commodities to Communist countries must be based on complete and accurate factual data. The same is true as to any needed changes in administration that are evident.

The refusal to permit access to pertinent files thwarted our efforts. In spite of this, we have made progress in our study both through staff inquiries and committee hearings. The committee heard 3 days of testimony in its October 1961 executive sessions and 4 days of testimony in its open hearings in December. We have listened to detailed testimony from the Departments of Commerce, State, and Defense, through the persons of Secretaries Luther H. Hodges and Dean Rusk, and Deputy Secretary Roswell L. Gilpatric, respectively. In addition, representatives of departments having to some degree lesser responsibilities in the field of export controls testified, including Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Robert H. Knight, General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, and John P. Duncan, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. Many other responsible persons from various departments as well as some from private enterprise have testified. The rather extensive transcript of testimony recorded to date has been supplied to all my colleagues.

I certainly will not at this time endeavor to spell out in detail the results of the committee's study to date, but that will be done as soon as practicable.

Basically, our main control over exports of commodities from this country to countries abroad is exercised under the legislative authority spelled out in the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended.

The Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951—commonly referred to as the Battle Act—supplements that act. It is administered by the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. The act declares it to be the policy of the United States to embargo the shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition and implements of war, to nations threatening U.S. security, including the U.S.S.R. and nations under its domination.

Under the provisions of the Battle Act the strategic items are divided into two parts: Category A items covering arms, ammunition, implements of war, and atomic energy materials, while the category B list contains such items as transportation materials of strategic value and those items of primary strategic significance used in the production of war materials.

The Battle Act calls for the mandatory termination of all U.S. assistance, military, economic, and financial, to countries which knowingly ship category A items to the Soviet bloc. The export of category B items to bloc countries requires termination of aid unless the President, under terms of the act, directs the continuance of aid where unusual circumstances indicate the cessation of aid would be detrimental to the security of the United States.

I was amazed to learn that since the passage of the Battle Act that in not one instance involving category B items has its provisions been invoked. There have been 19 Presidential determinations to continue U.S. assistance to the following countries: Belgium, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Turkey, and the United Kingdom. There have been 14 classified determinations affecting 8 countries. The total value of the shipments covered by the Presidential actions taken has amounted to $87.5 million.

From facts developed by my committee, it is abundantly clear to me that our controls exercised under the Export Control Act and the Battle Act have eroded along with the steady erosion of the controls established by the voluntary international organization known as the consultative group. That group, made up of this country and 14 other nations, has been operating since 1950. Within this same group was founded the coordinating committee, commonly referred to as Cocom. This group of nations has as its basic purpose the denial to the Sino-Soviet bloc of materials, equipment and technical data—including technological services—which would aid the military-industrial mobilization base of that group of unfriendly countries.

It is obvious to me that over the years, as members of the group increased their industrial output, and through a desire to increase foreign trade even with the Sino-Soviet bloc, many of the items on the international list of embargoed commodities were removed even though obviously of strategic importance to the Sino-Soviet bloc countries. In this country, in connection with the enforcement of the Export Control Act, there is maintained by the Department of Commerce a list known as the positive list. Generally, it is a list of commodities that are under a presumption-for-denial for export to Soviet bloc countries. Included in the list are the items appearing on the international or Cocom list and the Battle Act list. Validated licenses must be obtained for shipment of commodities on this list to all destinations except Canada.

I have heard ample testimony and seen an abundance of evidence that as the list established by Cocom erodes, so erodes the Battle Act list and the positive list. What can be done about the weak-kneed position of the Cocom group in maintaining tighter controls? According to State Department testimony, very little. Even though there must be unanimous decision among all members of Cocom as to removal from or returning to or placing a new item on the Cocom list, this country has been persuaded to go along with the group contrary to its desires. Why? Our committee has been advised that not to agree, in many instances, would cause a breakdown of Cocom and, in effect, a weak Cocom is better than none at all.

Too often during our hearings I heard testimony, and I have reviewed numerous cases, indicating that the decision to approve a license to export commodities to the Soviet bloc was obviously based on the consideration "it is strategic still, but we cannot unilaterally control it effectively." As an example, the Department of Defense strenuously objected to the approval of an application for license to export to the U.S.S.R. transfer machines capable of producing 360,000 V-8 engine motor blocks each year. Due to diplomatic considerations a restudy of the application was requested which caused the matter to be reconsidered at the highest level in the Department of Defense. The Secretary of Defense reversed the position of all the experts in that Department and agreed to the approval of the license, as such transfer machines could be obtained from alternative sources abroad. Such machines at one time were internationally embargoed by the Cocom countries, but along the line, for reasons unknown to me, were removed from the list of internationally embargoed items. Fortunately, the applications for licenses to export these transfer machines to the U.S.S.R. are still under study and have not been approved.

At the present time the Department of Commerce is sitting on applications to export many millions of dollars worth of similar strategic commodities to the U.S.S.R. or Soviet bloc countries. As of now, there is no definite indication as to whether these and similar applications will or will not eventually be approved. I, personally, will continue to watch the situation to see what happens. Since my committee was established, there has been a material drop in approval of applications to export commodities to the Soviet bloc countries.

Of major concern to me, however, are the applications approved recently to ship vast quantities of scrap copper, steel and iron scrap, borates, and other seemingly strategic commodities to Communist Yugoslavia. During our early hearings in October the select committee was advised that closer scrutiny was being given to anything going to Yugoslavia due to Tito's recently expressed pro-Soviet attitude at the Belgrade Conference. Why the sudden change in this country's attitude toward Communist Yugoslavia? I do not know. But I am going to make every effort to find out. As for me, a Communist is a Communist in the U.S.S.R., Poland, Yugoslavia, Cuba, or even in this country. Their pronounced purpose, time and again, is to destroy free governments, and as Khrushchev has put it on the line to bury us.

I fully recognize that the President, through the National Security Council, determines the basic policy governing licensing of exports from the United States in accordance with the congressional policies laid down in the Export Control Act. It is within the executive branch that policy as to exports to Communist countries within the extremes of a total embargo and free and unrestricted trade now exists. There is now a total embargo on exports to Cuba with the exception of food and pharmaceuticals, and trade with Communist China, North Korea, and North Vietnam is under total embargo.

I definitely lean toward the extreme of a total embargo to all Communist-dominated countries. I am not convinced beyond extreme doubt that one Communist country is more friendly toward our democratic form of government than another. I am fearful that to follow a policy of practically open trade with a so-called friendly Communist country will eventually cause the free world countries to sink deeper into the quicksands of a world dominated by international communism as expressed by Marx and Lenin irrespective of Khrushchev's present-day peaceful coexistence interpretation.

From facts available to me it appears that the prime consideration in approving or denying applications for licenses to export commodities to the Soviet bloc is whether the item would have a major impact on the military-industrial potential of the bloc countries. Apparently, minimal consideration is given to the effect on the building of the economy or aiding in the economic offensive of the U.S.S.R. To me, this is a highly significant factor. From a strong economy, a country is better able to wage military or economic warfare. In the cold war in which we are engaged, I firmly believe that we cannot ignore either.

There must be some flexibility in the executive branch in exercising controls over exports to our avowed enemies. However, it is my duty and the duty of the Congress to throw the spotlight of public opinion on any abuses of legislative intent. Too often this is done only at the time of heated crises, such as the Berlin crisis, and not continuously during our long struggle to win the cold war.

Having been raised in an investigating environment, I have been particularly curious as to enforcement or lack of enforcement of our export controls. I am deeply concerned over the several hats of responsibility worn in this field. The Department of Commerce relies on a small staff of investigators under its direct supervision to enforce the rules and regulations spelled out pursuant to the Export Control Act. Approximately one-third of the appropriation for the Office of Export Control in the Department of Commerce set up to administer controls goes to the Bureau of Customs in the Treasury Department. The Bureau of Customs checks a small percentage of exports to insure compliance, and to detect irregularities and violations on the part of exporters. As an example, that Bureau inspected only 60 out of 8,000 gift parcels going to the Soviet Union recently. Many thousands of such parcels originate in this country each year destined for Communist countries, including Cuba. What strategic commodities, technical data, or other vital data that could be sent to the U.S.S.R. through such means is beyond imagination.

Possible illegal transshipments of strategic commodities from free world countries to Communist countries including the Sino-Soviet bloc is of vital concern. Who has the prime responsibility? The State Department through its economic defense officers in their posts abroad. The Department of Commerce can ask them to check on transshipments but cannot directly command them to perform this vital function. In fact, only 20 requests emanated from the Department of Commerce during the year 1961 to make postshipment checks to determine possible illicit transshipments out of the thousands of imports by free world countries from the United States.

The subsidiaries of American firms located abroad can export under the laws of the State of incorporation any commodities to the Soviet bloc that are not internationally controlled through Cocom agreement. Under the transaction control regulations issued by the Treasury Department, subsidiaries abroad must obtain a license from the Treasury Department to export Cocom items to the Soviet-bloc countries, defined as Albania, Bulgaria, China—Communist controlled—Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Germany—only those areas under control or administration of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of Poland—Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, North Korea, Outer Mongolia, Poland and Danzig, Rumania, Tibet, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and Vietnam—only those areas under Communist control. There is no control exercised over exports of other commodities by subsidiaries abroad to the Soviet-bloc countries, even though the commodities may be on our list of controlled items.

The Treasury Department enforces the foreign assets control regulations which amounts to a total embargo of Communist China and North Korea.

Both sets of regulations were issued under authority of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

Admittedly, the Treasury Department maintains no list of American-controlled subsidiaries abroad to enable its responsible personnel to detect violations of the regulations now in effect.

I am convinced that they rely on the honesty of the parent company in the United States and the officials of subsidiaries abroad for proper compliance. This would be a satisfactory procedure as far as I am concerned if it could reasonably be assumed that all such persons are completely honest.

As I have previously mentioned, this country has a total embargo on shipments to Cuba except foods and pharmaceuticals. To illustrate how persons endeavor to circumvent the provisions of the embargo through technicalities, a case in point has been called to my attention. This case involved a hatchery in New York State. Before the embargo this hatchery was sending live chickens to Cuba. After the embargo this was prohibited, and exporting hatching eggs to Cuba was also prohibited. This hatchery, however, sent hatching eggs to Canada, and the chickens from these eggs were subsequently sent to Cuba. A responsible Government department determined under the circumstances that no action could be taken.

Another observation I would like to make at this time is whether the Export Control Act is being administered by the proper department. It appears to me that we have a paradoxical situation—the Department of Commerce on the one hand has the responsibility of promoting foreign trade and on the other the control of exports. When the report of the committee is made, I will have more to say on this matter.

Your attention is invited to a letter I directed to Hon. George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State, on January 16, 1961, pertaining to a study by a task force headed up by him as a private citizen. The letter is self-explanatory, and is quoted as follows:

Hon. GEORGE W. BALL,
Under Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As I am sure you are aware, the Select Committee on Export Control was established by House Resolution 403, which was approved on September 7, 1961. I am enclosing a copy of that resolution for your ready reference.

I recently reviewed the contents of a news item appearing in the New York Times under date of January 8, 1962, written by Felix Belair, Jr., captioned "President Is Told Tariff Barriers Threaten West." The item states that you headed a task force which prepared a report for Mr. Kennedy as President-elect on foreign policy.

This committee is vitally concerned with some of the statements appearing in the news item germane to the study being made by the committee relative to export controls. The following are some of the vital points attributed to the report prepared by the task force:

"The report also proposed a virtual scrapping of the existing embargo on exports of strategic materials to nations of the bloc. It favored a new policy that would acknowledge the mutual advantages of expanding East-West trade and that would invite the Soviet Union to join in a code of fair practices for international trade.

"Although it was submitted to Mr. Kennedy as President-elect just before his inauguration, the report remains the basic rationale for the liberalized trade program he plans to ask Congress to approve at this session.

"A complete alteration of U.S. policy on trade with Soviet bloc countries was recommended by the task force. It held this to be imperative not only because the present policy was outmoded and negative but also because it had begun to affect our relations with other industrialized countries as well as with the underdeveloped areas.

"The problem will not go away because Americans consider trade with Communist countries to be 'immoral, dangerous, and of doubtful economic benefit,' said the group. It said such trade would become vastly more important in this decade than in the last because other Western countries had found such trade to be advantageous.

"'As a result,' said the report, 'our allies have refused to follow docilely the tariff discriminations and export limitations on Communist trade imposed by U.S. law.'

"The report observed that present voluntary machinery for controlling strategic export to the Soviet bloc from North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries and Japan had 'all but broken down.'"

In view of the interest of the committee in the contents of this news item quoting portions of the report, an oral request was made by a member of the committee staff of Mr. Frederick G. Dutton, Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, to supply the committee with a copy of the report. Mr. Dutton advised the staff member that the report could not be made available to this committee.

I want to renew the request that you furnish this committee with a copy of the entire report. It apparently has been supplied for publication in the press through one means or another, and I strongly feel that it should be made available to this committee.

In the event you cannot furnish the report to this committee, it is requested that you specifically advise whether or not you have made or intend to make any public statement currently in contradiction of the statements attributed to the report of the task force group which you headed.

In addition, it is requested that you supply this committee with the identity of those persons who comprised the task force, the date the study began, and the date it was concluded.

Your expeditious attention to this request will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

A. PAUL KITCHIN,
Chairman.

The following is a reply I received from Mr. Ball dated January 29, 1962:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 25, 1962.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KITCHIN: I want to thank you for your letter of January 16 concerning the news item in the New York Times of January 8 about a task force report on various tariff matters.

Prior to the inauguration of President Kennedy on January 20, 1961, I was chairman of a group which, at his request, considered various trade and foreign policy problems. Even though I am now an official of the Department, I was acting then as a private citizen, and the report is not in any way a State Department document. As a consequence, I believe courtesy and propriety require that the report requested by the President-elect not be circulated to others by me. In the same spirit I did not and would not provide any part of the report to the New York Times or other outside source.

In my present capacity as an official of this Department, I would, of course, be glad at any time to discuss with you and the committee such matters as you might request concerning U.S. trade abroad or other problems. I recognize the importance of the export studies which you are making and want to be as helpful as possible.

As to the report referred to in the New York Times account, the committee was really a loose group of individuals, and ideas were presented in our studies as suggestive of various problems in the field rather than as representing the unanimous and definitive views of those who participated in the project. Since the time the report was prepared much more work has been put into these problems—with the benefit of an acquaintance with the accumulated experience of the Government—and I believe attention can most usefully be focused on those more recent conclusions.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. BALL,
Acting Secretary.

I was and still am very much concerned as to purported proposals reportedly made as a result of the task force study headed up by Mr. Ball, with particular reference to the statements indicating the report proposed a virtual scrapping of the existing embargo on exports of strategic materials to nations of the bloc. Even though this study was made by Mr. Ball as a private citizen, he is now our Under Secretary of State. I wanted to know whether this report represents his present-day thinking and regret that he could not see fit to specifically express himself. And I still want to know.

My committee in its previous hearings has heard detailed testimony relative to our Government's control over exports by foreign subsidiaries of American companies to countries constituting the Sino-Soviet bloc. To further clarify this matter, I directed the following communication to Hon. Robert H. Knight, General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, on January 19, 1962:

JANUARY 19, 1962.

Hon. ROBERT H. KNIGHT,
General Counsel,
Department of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KNIGHT: At the time of your appearance before our committee on October 30, 1961, you stated the Treasury Department has two sets of regulations under its jurisdiction which have some relation to the control of exports. In part, you enunciated the pertinent restrictions provided by these regulations as follows:

1. The foreign assets control regulations (31 U.S.C., pt. 500) amount to a total economic embargo of Communist China and North Korea by prohibiting, except pursuant to license, all financial and commercial transactions with those countries or their nationals by persons subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

2. The Transaction Control Regulations (31 C.F.R., pt. 505), in simple terms prohibits unless licensed domestic American corporations from purchasing or selling or arranging the purchase or sale to Soviet bloc countries of internationally controlled strategic commodities through their foreign subsidiaries or affiliates. (The countries listed, to which these regulations apply, are: Albania, Bulgaria, China (Communist controlled), Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Germany (only those areas under control or administration of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of Poland), Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, North Korea, Outer Mongolia, Poland and Danzig, Rumania, Tibet, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Vietnam (only those areas under Communist control).)

In order that the record will be crystal clear, it will be appreciated if you will supply specific answers to the following questions:

(a) Does our Government exercise any control over exports by foreign subsidiaries under control of American companies to any countries not listed under items 1 and 2 above? If so, specifically advise the exceptions and under what conditions.

(b) In particular, are there any regulations now in effect which prohibit exports by foreign subsidiaries of internationally controlled commodities to Cuba or Yugoslavia?

(c) What steps could now be taken without additional legislation to legally prevent export of strategic commodities by foreign subsidiaries to Cuba and Yugoslavia?

Your expeditious attention to this request will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

A. PAUL KITCHIN, *Chairman.*

Mr. Knight responded to my letter on January 29, 1962, as follows:

THE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE
TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., January 29, 1962.

Hon. A. PAUL KITCHIN,
Chairman, House Select Committee on Export Controls, Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KITCHIN: I have your letter of January 19, 1962, relating to the impact of the Treasury's foreign assets control and transaction control regulations on trade with Cuba and Yugoslavia by foreign subsidiaries of American firms.

Our Government does not exercise any control over exports by foreign subsidiaries of American companies to destinations other than those listed in items 1 and 2 of your letter. The only qualifications to this statement are: (a) If there is an interest of Communist China or North Korea or nationals thereof in the transaction, it is prohibited in the absence of a Treasury license regardless of the country of destination; and (b) if the goods are of U.S. origin within the meaning of the export control regulations, their reexport to any destination is subject to the requirements of those regulations.

Except as noted above, there are no regulations now in effect which prohibit exports by foreign subsidiaries of American firms to Cuba or Yugoslavia. Such regulations could be issued by the Secretary of the Treasury under the authority of section 5(b) of the Trading With the Enemy Act without the enactment of additional legislation. A decision as to whether such regulations should be issued would be made by the Secretary only after full consultation with the other agencies which are concerned with foreign policy and economic defense measures of this character. In this connection, you may also wish to note that section 620(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 authorizes the President to proclaim an embargo on trade between the United States and Cuba.

I trust that the foregoing information will satisfy your committee's needs in this respect.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT H. KNIGHT,
General Counsel.

Obviously, the control of exports is necessarily a complex procedure, and many factors must be considered at the time of processing each application to export a particular commodity to a Communist country. I, for one, strongly feel that all final decisions must be made with the security of our country always uppermost in our minds.

As previously indicated, a complete report will be submitted to the Congress as soon as our study is concluded. At that time any desirable recommendations for changes in legislation or administrative procedures will be submitted to you.

In conclusion, let me state it is my opinion:

First. The economic phase of this prolonged, tense "cold war" is becoming more important each day. As our military posture and that of the Soviet bloc approach a stalemate, due to the absolute destructive power of each to annihilate civilization in a nuclear military conflict, the economic phase attains the status of a prime and strategic operation.

Second. Continued emphasis must be placed on the vital area of trade with the Sino-Soviet bloc. The cooperation of our Western allies is of paramount importance.

Third. There must be a readjustment of our thinking as regards our present "status quo" attitude. It is imperative that we acquire a realistic appreciation that while we are "maintaining the peace" we may be losing the cold war.

Fourth. A strong and affirmative policy on foods and fibers to the bloc must encompass a philosophy of "peace for food" as well as "food for peace."

THREE MORE PERMANENT HOUSE SEATS—TO MAKE ROOM FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

Mr. **LANE**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. **LANE**. Mr. Speaker, the Decennial Census of 1960 was the 18th in a row since the beginning of a periodic national headcount in 1790. In every census the population showed an increase. With but one exception, whenever new States were admitted to the Union, the permanent membership was enlarged to accommodate them.

If, as a result of the 1960 census, and the admission of two more States, we fail to increase our membership correspondingly, we shall be violating established precedent.

When the size of the House was temporarily expanded from 435 to 437, in deference to the two Representatives from the new States, we recognized the custom and the need for increasing our membership under these circumstances. By withdrawing that provisional addition, we would repudiate an historical procedure based on commonsense and justice.

In fact, there is no valid reason for not authorizing an increase of three seats. The 1960 census revealed that, on the basis of population, Hawaii would be entitled to two seats, and Alaska one.

The present size of the House became 435, following the census of 1910. New Mexico and Arizona joined the Union in 1912.

Almost a half century passed before Alaska and Hawaii came in. As the United States has reached the limit of its geographical expansion, with only a few islands remaining as territories, there is very little likelihood of any more States joining the Federal family. If we honor precedent, by raising the permanent membership to 438, I can see no justifiable occasion in the future, for expanding it beyond that fixed level.

Numerous bills were introduced in the 1st session of the 87th Congress, to increase the membership. These ranged all the way from 3 to 34 additional seats. We have had time since then to gain perspective on these various proposals.

Originally, I believed that an increase of 18 would balance out the different bills submitted, and would help us to arrive at a reasonable compromise that would be supported by the House. I introduced a bill advocating an increase of 18.

However, I finally realized that we could not legislate an increase based on convenience or expediency. We had to have a sound and substantial justification, rooted in the traditions and the practices of the House.

With precedent to guide us, and with the recently admitted States of Alaska and Hawaii in mind, we come to the realistic conclusion that the permanent membership should be increased by three.

Several of my colleagues introduced bills last year, calling for this specific and logical expansion.

I am happy to join with them by introducing a companion bill authorizing an increase of three in our permanent membership.

PRESENTATION OF AN AMERICAN FLAG TO CANISIUS COLLEGE

Mr. **DULSKI**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **DULSKI**. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1962, I was privileged to present an American flag that had flown over our Nation's Capitol to Canisius College, in Buffalo, N.Y., for its ROTC unit.

It was a very impressive ceremony and among the distinguished guests present were:

Rev. James J. McGinley, S.J., president of Canisius College; Dr. Edward M. O'Connor, director of special events, Canisius College; Dr. William F. Kean, dean of evening school, Canisius College; Lt. Col. James F. Greene, Jr., professor of military science, Canisius College; Capt. William Hoar, assistant professor of military science, Canisius College; Capt. Bartholemew Mitchell, assistant professor of military science, Canisius College; Cadet Lt. Col. James F. Neale III, regiment commander; and Cadet Maj. Franklin A. Stachowiak, battalion commander.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address which I delivered on this special occasion:

ADDRESS BY HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI, OF NEW YORK

It is pleasant to be here among so many friends, and to be able to pay tribute to Canisius College.

Some of us may think that among American academic institutions, Canisius College is fairly new. But you have a very ancient tradition behind you here. Among the first whites in this part of the country were the intrepid Jesuit missionaries—and especially Robert de la Salle, who was a Jesuit student. It is very fitting, it seems to me, that you have been tagged "the Griffins," which, as you know, derives from the griffon that appeared on De la Salle's flag flown from the first ship to appear on the Upper Great Lakes. This ship was also called the *Griffon*.

Although traditions are valuable for the inspiration they give to any institution, deeds and accomplishments are given much higher value in this practical age. The industry, the culture, religion, and a general common weal, of western New York, owes an almost irreplaceable debt to Canisius College and its dedicated faculty of today and yesterday.

I am proud of the privilege that is mine today in presenting this American flag, that has flown over the U.S. Capitol, to the Reserve Officers Training Corps of this great college.

While the ROTC program has been a familiar part of the college scene for many years, too few people realize and understand its value and the vital role it plays in the defense of our Nation. When World War II broke out, the United States was able to quickly call thousands and thousands of ROTC graduates from civilian life, many of whom acquitted themselves with honor and distinction. The value of these citizen-soldiers is recognized by no less an authority than the late General George C. Marshall, who said that during World War II, the pool of 140,000 Reserve officers—the vast majority of them being produced by the ROTC—made the difference between defeat and victory. And the ROTC is still performing the very vital mission of providing officers for our country's military needs.

Through colleges, such as Canisius here, flows a continuous stream of America's prospective young officer material. A sound academic foundation of a college education is essential to the development of the dynamic leadership of present and future officers. Yearly, the Army alone requires approximately 14,0000 newly commissioned college ROTC graduates for its several components. Today a total of approximately 225,000 students are enrolled in ROTC programs, and the need for their services was never greater.

The history of the United States shows a record of victories, not defeats, both in peace and war. This leads us to the conclusion that the concept of the citizen-soldier is sound and the ROTC program adequate. Most important of all, it proves irrefutably that the end product is not only the best soldier, but the best citizen.

Today's peacetime ROTC is bigger and better than ever, but it also faces a greater challenge. Increased emphasis on missiles, and the complexities of modern weapons systems and their use have produced special requirements for scientific knowledge.

The ROTC, here at Canisius College, has turned out in the past, and is capable of producing in the future, its proper share of quality personnel required to help lead the Nation's military forces to victory. You, who are participating in the ROTC program, can be proud of the accomplishments of those who have preceded you. To follow in their footsteps is a challenge. I am sure you can and will accept the responsibilities which are inseparable from our great heritage.

Thank you.

NUCLEAR TESTING IN THE ATMOSPHERE

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to your attention today what I feel is one of the most serious problems facing our Nation. This is the matter of nuclear testing in the atmosphere. It was with great concern and alarm that I read the statement that was issued on January 31, 1962, by the American Federation of Scientists and Engineers. I want to make it emphatically clear to the Members of this House and to the American public that I do not question the loyalty and patriotism of these individuals just because they happen to disagree with me on this most vital issue. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have some knowledge of the nuclear weapons capabilities of both the United States and the Soviet Union. I would like to call to your attention also that in 1949 a group of distinguished scientists advised the Atomic Energy Commission against the development of the hydrogen bomb but the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy Committee and some members of the Atomic Energy Commission took a courageous and determined stand and insisted on the development of this weapon which is today used in such sophisticated weapon systems as the Atlas, the Polaris, and the Titan.

It is true that both the Soviet Union and the United States have tremendous nuclear capabilities for destruction. I want to point out also to our learned scientists in the American Federation of Scientists and to the American people that if we do not continue to advance to more sophisticated weapons systems and to strive to perfect our defense against rocket-carried nuclear warheads, in the next few years we will suffer a serious lag behind the Soviet Union.

Practically every scientist and engineer will agree that progress in research and development is made by actual testing and the Soviet Union has recently completed a series of approximately 50 tests in the atmosphere.

THE STRATEGIC STOCKPILE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy says he is astonished that this country has an $8 billion stockpile of strategic materials.

The astonishing thing about this is that the President is astonished.

As a former Member of the House and the Senate he ought to have known of the existence of this stockpile. Or was he too interested in politics to keep himself informed?

One authority on this subject, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan], chairman of the Democrat congressional campaign committee, has spoken on the House floor on several occasions on this subject.

The President denounces the "cloak of secrecy" that surrounds this subject, yet less than a month ago, and by his own order, he threw a cloak of secrecy over the Peace Corps and other agencies of Government.

Yes, Mr. President, some of us are astonished that you are astonished about this strategic stockpile.

DR. CRAWFORD H. GREENEWALT AND DR. CARYL P. HASKINS, CITIZEN REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today two House joint resolutions providing for the reappointment of Dr. Crawford H. Greenewalt and Dr. Caryl P. Haskins as Citizen Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

Their present terms expire April 6, 1962, and their reappointment was unanimously recommended at the annual meeting of the Board of Regents, January 25, 1962.

It has been an honor to serve with these distinguished gentlemen on the Board of Regents, and to report to the House on their devoted support of the Smithsonian.

I wish to include with my remarks the biographical data on Dr. Greenewalt and Dr. Haskins:

Crawford Hallock Greenewalt

Greenewalt, Crawford Hallock, business executive; born, Cummington, Mass., August 16, 1902; son of Frank Lindsay and Mary Elizabeth (Hallock) G.; ed. William Penn Charter School, 1914–18, B.S. in chemical engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1922; D.Sc., University of Delaware, 1940; D. Sc., Northeastern University, 1950; E.D. (honorary), Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, 1952; LL.D., Columbia University, 1953; LL. D., Williams College, 1953; Sc. D., Boston University, 1953; D.C.S., New York University, 1954; degree in engineering, Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, 1954; D.Sc., Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science, 1955; LL.D., Kenyon College, 1958; married Margaretta Lammot du Pont, June 4, 1926; children, Nancy Crawford Frederick, David, Crawford Hallock. With E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. since 1922, assistant director experimental station, chemical department, 1939, chemical director Grasselli chemical department, 1942, technical director, explosives department, 1943, assistant director, development department, 1945; assistant general manager, pigments department, September 1945; vice president, June 1946–January 1948, president since January 1948, director, Equitable Trust Co., 1935–43, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. since 1942, Christiana Securities Co. since 1944. Member, board of directors, Wilmington General Hospital, the Family Society of Wilmington Music School, Winterthur Corp., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Philadelphia Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia Orchestra Association New School of Music. Trustee, Longwood Foundation, American Museum of Natural History, Foxhollow School, Carnegie Institution, Regent Smithsonian Institution. Member, American Institute of Chemical Engineers, American Institute of Chemists, Society of Chemical Industry, American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Natural Academy of Sciences, American Chemical Society, A.A.A.S., American Philosophy Society, Theta Chi, Tau Beta Pi. Clubs: Wilmington, Wilmington Country, Du Pont Country; Royal Bermuda Yacht. Home: Greenville, Del. Office: Du Pont Building, Wilmington, Del.

Caryl Parker Haskins

Haskins, Caryl Parker, administrator, research scientist; born, Schenectady, N.Y., August 12, 1908; son of Caryl Davis and Frances Julia (Parker) H.; Ph. B., Yale, 1930; Ph. D., Harvard University, 1935; D. Sc., Tufts College, 1951, Union College, 1955, Northeastern University, 1955, Yale, 1958; married Edna Ferrell, July 12, 1940. Staff member, research laboratory, General Electric Co., Schenectady, N.Y., 1931–35; research associate Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1935–45; president, research director, Haskins Laboratories, Inc., 1935–55, director, 1955– ; president, National Photocolor Corp. of New York City, 1939–55, director, 1939–56; research professor, Union College, Schenectady, 1937–55; president, Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1956– ; member of board of directors, Schenectady Trust Co.; assistant liaison officer, OSRD, 1941–42, senior liaison officer, 1942–43; executive assistant to chairman, NDRC, 1943–44, deputy executive officer, 1944–45; science adviser, Board of Policy Council, Research and Development Board of Army and Navy, 1947–48; consultant, Research and Development Board, 1947–51, Secretary of Defense, 1950– ; member of President's Scientific Advisory Commission, 1955– . Trustee, Carnegie Institution, Washington, Vannevar Bush Trust, Carnegie Corp. of New York, population council, Rand Corp., Analytical Services, Inc.; regent, Smithsonian Institution, awarded certificate of merit, United States, 1948; King's medal for service in cause of freedom, Great Britain, 1948. Served as lieutenant, Reserve Officers Association, 1930–40. Fellow American Physicians Society, A.A.A.S., American Academy Arts and Sciences, Royal Entomological Society, Great Britain; member, American Geographical Society, American Academy Political Science, Royal Society Arts, Great Britain, American Chemistry Society, Faraday Society, American Association of University Professions, American Society of Zoologists, Genetics Society of America, America Society of Naturalists, Entomology Society of America, Long Island Biology Association, Council on Foreign Relations, American Institute of Physics, American Museum of Natural History, American Philosophy Society, American Political Science Association, American Society of International Law, British Association of Advancement of Science, Foreign Policy Association, Literary Society, Japan Society, Metropolitan Museum of Arts, National Academy of Science, New York, Academy of Sciences, Society of American Military Engineers, New York Botannical Garden, P.E.N., Pilgrims, Sigma Xi, Delta Sigma Rho, Phi Beta Kappa. Episcopalian.

Clubs: St. Botolph, Harvard (Boston); Chemists, Bankers, Century, Coffee House, Explorers (New York City); Mohawk (Schenectady); Metropolitan, Cosmos, University (Washington). Author: "Of Ants and Men," 1939; "The Amazon," 1943; "Of Societies and Men," 1950; contributor to anthologies and technical papers. Home: Hay-Adams House, 800 16th Street, Washington. Office: 1530 P Street, Washington, D.C.

IMPERFECT IS RIGHT

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, Congress cannot in conscience vote $100 million of U.S. Treasury funds for the purchase of United Nations bonds. Such action would only serve to preserve the membership of Soviet Russia and other delinquents—and I use the word advisedly—in an organization whose service to mankind is becoming questioned even by its once most ardent advocates. At the conclusion of these remarks I should like to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of January 14, 1962, as an indication of the reappraisals that are being made in the light of the United Nations record.

There is, of course, the argument that, in order to be consistent, a nation that has contributed $3 billion to Communist Yugoslavia in the past decade or so, should not hesitate to put another $100 million into the U.N. pot. That type of sophistry contains more logic than the other reasons advanced for our underwriting the spy center in New York City.

What the United States must decide, Mr. Speaker, is whether the national interest benefits by our membership in an organization that—by its record of the past year, at least—has for its primary purpose the destruction of colonialism where anti-Communist colonials are involved. But why confine our analysis to the past year? From the time that the United Nations was conceived and organized under the auspices of Josef Stalin and Alger Hiss, there is no record of its serving as a bulwark against communism or to advance the cause of freedom.

Better that we had surrendered our membership during the fiasco in Korea. The very nation that exercised veto power over every attempt at a fair determination of United Nations policies stood firmly behind the bandits of Red China who attempted to overrun the peoples we had pledged to protect in the Korean Peninsula. By one of the strangest dicta in the history of warfare, an opposing force was forbidden to pursue its attackers across a specified line. And what has the United Nations done to release American prisoners who have been held these many long years since the so-called Korean truce? What did the United Nations do to assist in the abortive attempt of Hungarian patriots to free their country from the yoke of their oppressors—or to dissuade the Kremlin from crushing the valiant uprising with tanks manned by Russian personnel?

Mr. Speaker, if one will but list the advances of communism as against the gains of anticommunism since the founding of the United Nations, he will have no difficulty deciding whether to award another million dollars to the exchequer of that organization. Look at what has happened to Tibet, Laos, Berlin, Cuba and Vietnam. In no instance did the United Nations seek to intervene in the cause of freedom. In the case of Goa, Nehru's unwarranted invasion met no objection at the U.N. and is apparently a closed matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if there are any anti-Communist gains of note, they too should be listed in the ledger so that a proper accountancy can be made before another contribution is to come from the American taxpayers' pocketbook. We have been carrying the load for this band of brigands from the start. We had been given to believe that delinquency on the part of a participating nation would result in its dismissal, but now failure to live up to one's obligations would be rewarded by the purchase of bonds by the U.S. Government to cover the deficit. If, as President Kennedy suggests, the bond proposal has any material value, then why does the United Nations not place the issue on the world market for public sale? Here is an opportunity to find out just how popular the United Nations is among the people who are paying for its upkeep. As for the sale of the bonds in this country, we must insist upon a provision that will not permit buyers to write off for tax purposes any losses that might be incurred. If the bonds are sufficiently attractive, they will sell without any such concessions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you will notice that I have made no reference to the Congo in this discussion. The original United Nations position was to bring into submission the one province that sought to avoid the Red beartrap. Later, the U.N. muzzles were pointed in the direction of Oriental. I have not yet had an opportunity to read the evening newspapers, so I cannot be sure of prevailing action to continue the Congo confusion. It is safe to assume, however, that given continued interference rights, the U.N. will provide the mechanism for Communist infiltration and eventual supremacy in the Congo when the dust has cleared.

President Kennedy himself indicated his distrust of or lack of confidence in the United Nations when he dispatched a special emissary to the Congo during the height of the military action against Moise Tshombe.

I will vote against giving the White House authority to tap the U.S. Treasury for $100 million to buy bonds to pay Russia's bills in the U.N. or anywhere else. Failure of the Kremlin to meet its obligations in this capacity would seem to offer an excellent opportunity to get the entire Red delegation out of the United Nations once and for all. So long as this criminal element remains in membership, the United Nations has as much chance of succeeding in the cause of liberty and integrity as a police commission which has murderers, racketeers, and thugs assisting in the formulation of its policies and exercise of its duties.

The Star editorial follows:

IMPERFECT IS RIGHT

The President, in the course of his report on the state of the Union, said that the United Nations is "our instrument and our hope" in keeping the peace. And then he added: "I see little merit in the impatience of those who would abandon this imperfect world instrument because they dislike our imperfect world."

This strikes us as an imperfect analysis of the reasons why many people are losing confidence in the United Nations.

It is true, we suppose, that most of us dislike this imperfect world. Only the village idiot could think it is the best of all possible worlds. But this has very little to do with the public's disenchantment with the U.N. If the President really believes that the disaffection can be attributed merely to dislike of an imperfect world he is deluding himself—and helping to dig the U.N.'s grave.

The reasons, we think, go deeper. The United Nations will not retain respect and support in this country if it is to be influenced by considerations of expediency as opposed to principle. The distinction between that which is right and that which is wrong must be made. The clamorous and often irrational demands of the so-called newly emerged countries cannot be satisfied at the expense of justice to other countries. The U.N. must not become a sounding board and a vehicle for Communist propaganda—aided and abetted by delegates from the nonalined countries who ought to know better, but who apparently do not.

Above all else, as we see it, the United States must not let itself be caught up and swept along in the treacherous currents that are running through the U.N. It was wrong for us to support the resolution on Angola—a resolution which we knew to be inequitable but which we voted for in the hope of harvesting some good will in the Afro-Asian bloc. We were wrong in voting for the unjust resolution of November 24 on Katanga because we did not want the Congolese representative in the U.N. to "go home empty-handed."

Our guess would be that not too many Americans, as of this time, want to abandon the U.N. But the number will increase, and increase rapidly, unless there is a change for the better in the U.N. itself. Mr. Kennedy, instead of blaming it all on dislike of an imperfect world, should be insisting upon and leading the demand for such a change—especially as far as the role of the United States in the U.N. is concerned.

PUBLIC WELFARE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 325)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Few nations do more than the United States to assist their least fortunate citizens—to make certain that no child, no elderly or handicapped citizen, no family in any circumstances in any State, is left without the essential needs for a decent and healthy existence. In too few nations, I might add, are the people aware of the progressive strides this country has taken in demonstrating the humanitarian side of freedom. Our record is a proud one—and it sharply refutes those who accuse us of thinking only in the materialistic terms of cash registers and calculating machines.

Our basic public welfare programs were enacted more than a quarter century ago. Their contribution to our national strength and well-being in the intervening years has been remarkable.

But the times, the conditions, the problems have changed—and the nature and objectives of our public assistance and child welfare programs must be changed, also, if they are to meet our current needs.

The impact of these changes should not be underestimated.

People move more often—from the farm to the city, from urban centers to the suburbs, from the East to the West, from the South to the North and Midwest.

Living costs, and especially medical costs, have spiraled.

The pattern of our population has changed. There are more older people, more children, more young marriages, divorces, desertions, and separations.

Our system of social insurance and related programs has grown greatly: In 1940, less than 1 percent of the aged were receiving monthly old-age insurance benefits; today over two-thirds of our aged are receiving these benefits. In 1940, only 21,000 children, in families where the breadwinner had died, were getting survivor insurance benefits; today such monthly benefits are being paid to about 2 million children.

All of these changes affect the problems public welfare was intended to relieve as well as its ability to relieve it. Moreover, even the nature and causes of poverty have changed. At the time the Social Security Act established our present basic framework for public aid, the major cause of poverty was unemployment and economic depression. Today, in a year of relative prosperity and high employment, we are more concerned about the poverty that persists in the midst of abundance.

The reasons are often more social than economic, more often subtle than simple. Some are in need because they are untrained for work—some because they cannot work, because they are too young or too old, blind or crippled. Some are in need because they are discriminated against for reasons they cannot help. Responding to their ills with scorn or suspicion is inconsistent with our moral precepts and inconsistent with their nearly universal preference to be independent. But merely responding with a relief check to complicated social or personal problems—such as ill health, faulty education, domestic discord, racial discrimination, or inadequate skills—is not likely to provide a lasting solution. Such a check must be supplemented, or in some cases made unnecessary, by positive services and solutions, offering the total resources of the community to meet the total needs of the family to help our less fortunate citizens help themselves.

Public welfare, in short, must be more than a salvage operation, picking up the debris from the wreckage of human lives. Its emphasis must be directed increasingly toward prevention and rehabilitation—on reducing not only the long-range cost in budgetary terms but the long-range cost in human terms as well. Poverty weakens individuals and nations. Sounder public welfare policies will benefit the Nation, its economy, its morale, and, most importantly, its people.

Under the various titles of the Social Security Act, funds are available to help the States provide assistance and other social services to the needy, aged and blind, to the needy disabled, and to dependent children. In addition, grants are available to assist the States to expand and strengthen their programs of child welfare services. These programs are essentially State programs. But the Federal Government, by its substantial financial contribution, its leadership, and the standards it sets, bears a major responsibility. To better fulfill this responsibility, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare recently introduced a number of administrative changes designed to get people off assistance and back into useful, productive roles in society.

These changes provided for:

The more effective location of deserting parents;

An effort to reduce that proportion of persons receiving assistance through willful misrepresentation, although that proportion is only a small part of the 1.5 percent of persons on the rolls found to be ineligible;

Allowing dependent children to save money for educational, employment or medical needs without having that amount deducted from their public assistance grants;

Providing special services and safeguards to children in families of unmarried parents, in families where the father has deserted, or in homes in danger of becoming morally or physically unsuitable; and

An improvement in the training of personnel, the development of services and the coordination of agency efforts.

In keeping with this new emphasis, the name of the Bureau of Public Assistance has been changed to the Bureau of Family Services.

But only so much can be done by administrative changes. New legislation is required if our State-operated programs are to be fully able to meet modern needs.

I. PREVENTION AND REHABILITATION

As already mentioned, we must place more stress on services instead of relief.

I recommend that the States be encouraged by the offer of additional Federal funds to strengthen and broaden the rehabilitative and preventive services they offer to persons who are dependent or who would otherwise become dependent. Additional Federal funds would induce and assist the States to establish or augment their rehabilitation services, strengthen their child welfare services, and add to their number of competent public welfare personnel. At the present time, the cost of these essential services is lumped with all administrative costs—routine clerical and office functions—and the Federal Government pays one-half of the total of all such costs incurred by the States. By separating out and identifying the cost of these essential rehabilitation, social work and other service costs, and paying the States three-fourths of such services—a step I earnestly recommend for your consideration—the Federal Government will enable and encourage the States to provide more comprehensive and effective services to rehabilitate those on welfare. The existing law should also be amended to permit the use of Federal funds for utilization by the State welfare agency of specialists from other State agencies who can help mount a concerted attack on the problems of dependency.

There are other steps we can take which will have an important effect on this effort. One of these is to expand and improve the Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation for disabled people. Among the 92,500 disabled men and women successfully rehabilitated into employment through this program last year were about 15,000 who had formerly been receiving public assistance. Let me repeat this figure: 15,000 people, formerly supported by the taxpayers through welfare, are now back at work as self-supporting taxpayers. Much more of this must be done—until we are restoring to employment every disabled person who can benefit from these rehabilitation services.

The prevention of future adult poverty and dependency must begin with the care of dependent children—those who must receive public welfare by virtue of a parent's death, disability, desertion, or unemployment. Our society not only refuses to leave such children hungry, cold, and devoid of opportunity—we are insistent that such children not be community liabilities throughout their lives. Yet children who grow up in deprivation, without adequate protection, may be poorly equipped to meet adult responsibilities.

The Congress last year approved, on a temporary basis, aid for the dependent children of the unemployed as a part of the permanent aid-to-dependent-children program. This legislation also included temporary provisions for foster care where the child has been removed from his home, and an increase in Federal financial assistance to the aged, blind, and disabled. The need for these temporary improvements has not abated, and their merit is clear. I recommend that these temporary provisions be made permanent.

But children need more than aid when they are destitute. We need to improve our preventive and protective services for children as well as adults. I recommend that the present ceiling of $25 million authorized for annual appropriations for grants to the States for child welfare services be gradually raised, beginning with $30 million for 1963, up to $50 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and succeeding years.

Finally, many women now on assistance rolls could obtain jobs and become self-supporting if local day-care programs for their young children were available. The need for such programs for the children, the children of working mothers has been increasing rapidly. Of the 22 million women now working, about 3 million have children under 6, and another 4½ million have school-age children between 6 and 17. Adequate care for these children during their most formative years is essential to their proper growth and training. Therefore, I recommend that the child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act be changed to authorize earmarking up to $5 million of grants to the States in 1963 and $10 million a year thereafter for aid in establishing local programs for the day care of young children of working mothers.

II. PROMOTING NEW SKILLS AND INDEPENDENCE

We must find ways of returning far more of our dependent people to independence. We must find ways of returning them to a participating and productive role in the community.

One sure way is by providing the opportunity every American cherishes to do sound and useful work. For this reason, I am recommending a change in the law to permit States to maintain with Federal financial help community work and training projects for unemployed people receiving welfare payments. Under such a program, unemployed people on welfare would be helped to retain their work skills or learn new ones; and the local community would obtain additional manpower on public projects.

But earning one's welfare payments through required participation in a community work or training project must be an opportunity for the individual on welfare, not a penalty. Federal financial participation will be conditioned upon proof that the work will serve a useful community or public purpose, will not displace regular employees, will not impair prevailing wages and working conditions, and will be accompanied by certain basic health and safety protections. Provisions must also be made to assure appropriate arrangements for the care and protection of children during the absence from home of any parent performing work or undergoing training.

Moreover, systematic encouragement would be given all welfare recipients to obtain vocational counseling, testing, and placement services from the U.S. Employment Service and to secure useful training wherever new job skills would be helpful. Close cooperative arrangements would be established with existing training and vocational education programs, and with the vocational and on-the-job training opportunities to be created under the manpower development and training and youth employment opportunities programs previously proposed.

III. MORE SKILLED PERSONNEL

It is essential that State and local welfare agencies be staffed with enough qualified personnel to insure constructive and adequate attention to the problems of needy individuals—to take the time to help them find and hold a job—to prevent public dependency, and to strive, where that is not possible, for rehabilitation—and to ascertain promptly whether any individual is receiving aid for which he does not qualify, so that aid can be promptly withdrawn.

Unfortunately, there is an acute shortage of trained personnel in all our welfare programs. The lack of experienced social workers for programs dealing with children and their families is especially critical.

At the present time, when States expend funds for the training of personnel for the administration of these programs, they receive Federal grants on a dollar-for-dollar basis. This arrangement has failed to produce a sufficient number of trained staff, especially social workers. I recommend, therefore, that Federal assistance to the States for training additional welfare personnel be increased; and that in addition, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare be authorized to make special arrangements for the training of family welfare personnel to work with those children whose parents have deserted, whose parents are unmarried, or who have other serious problems.

IV. FITTING GENERAL CONDITIONS OR SAFEGUARDS TO INDIVIDUAL NEEDS

In order to make certain that welfare funds go only to needy people, the Social Security Act requires the States to take all income and resources of the applicant into consideration in determining need. Although Federal law permits, it does not require States to take into full account the full expenses individuals have in earning income. This is not consistent with equity, commonsense, or other Federal laws such as our tax code. It only discourages the will to earn. In order to encourage assistance recipients to find and retain employment, I, therefore, recommend that the act be amended to require the States to take into account the expenses of earning income.

Among relatives caring for dependent children are a few who do not properly handle their assistance payments—some to the extent that the well-being of the child is adversely affected. Where the State determines that a relative's ability to manage money is contrary to the welfare of the child, Federal law presently requires payments to be made to a legal guardian or representative, if Federal funds are to be used. But this general requirement may sometimes block progress in particular situations. In order to recognize the necessity for each State to make exceptions to this rule in a very limited number of cases, I recommend that the law be amended to permit Federal sharing to continue even though protective payments in behalf of children—not to exceed one-half of 1 percent of ADC recipients in each State—are made to other persons concerned with the welfare of the family. The States would be required to reexamine these exceptions at intervals to determine whether a more permanent arrangement such as guardianship is required.

When first enacted, the aid to dependent children program provided for Federal sharing in assistance payments only to the child. Since 1950, there has been Federal sharing in any assistance given to one adult in the household as well as to the child or children. Inasmuch as, under current law there may be two parents in homes covered by this program, one incapacitated or unemployed, I recommend in the interest of equity the extension of Federal sharing in assistance payments both to the needy relative and to his or her spouse when both are living in the home with the child.

V. MORE EFFICIENT ADMINISTRATION

Under present public assistance provisions, States may impose residence requirements up to 5 of the last 9 years for the aged, blind, and disabled. Increased mobility, as previously mentioned, is a hallmark of our times. It should not operate unfairly on either an individual State or an individual family. I recommend that the Social Security Act be amended so as to provide that States receiving Federal funds not exclude any otherwise eligible persons who have been residents of the State for 1 year immediately preceding their application for assistance. I also recommend that the law be amended to provide a small increase in assistance funds to those States which simplify their laws by removing all residence requirements in any of their federally aided programs.

In view of the changing nature of the economic and social problems of the country, the desirability of a periodic review of our public welfare programs is obvious. For that purpose I propose that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare be authorized to appoint an Advisory Council on Public Welfare representing broad community interests and concerns, and such other advisory committees as he deems necessary to advise and consult with him in the administration of the Social Security Act.

No study of the public welfare program can fail to note the difficulty of the problems faced or the need to be imaginative in dealing with them. Accordingly, I recommend that amendments be made to encourage experimental, pilot or demonstration projects that would promote the objectives of the assistance titles and help make our welfare programs more flexible and adaptable to local needs.

The simplification and coordination of administration and operation would greatly improve the adequacy and consistency of assistance and related services. As a step in that direction, I recommend that a new title to the Social Security Act be enacted which would give to States the option of submitting a single, unified State plan combining their assistance programs for aged, blind and disabled, and their medical assistance programs for the aged, granting to such States additional Federal matching for medical payments on behalf of the blind and disabled.

These proposed far-reaching changes—aimed at far-reaching problems—are in the public interest and in keeping with our finest traditions. The goals of our public welfare programs must be positive and constructive—to create economic and social opportunities for the less fortunate—to help them find productive, happy, and independent lives. It must stress the integrity and preservation of the family unit. It must contribute to the attack on dependency, juvenile delinquency, family breakdown, illegitimacy, ill health, and disability. It must reduce the incidence of these problems, prevent their occurrence and recurrence, and strengthen and protect the vulnerable in a highly competitive world.

Unless such problems are dealt with effectively, they fester, and grow, sapping the strength of society as a whole and extending their consequences in troubled families from one generation to the next.

The steps I recommend to you today to alleviate these problems will not come cheaply. They will cost more money when first enacted. But they will restore human dignity; and in the long run, they will save money. I have recommended in the budget submitted for fiscal year 1963 sufficient funds to cover the extension of existing programs and the new legislation here proposed.

Communities which have—for whatever motives—attempted to save money through ruthless and arbitrary cutbacks in their welfare rolls have found their efforts to little avail. The root problems remained.

But communities which have tried the rehabilitative road—the road I have recommended today—have demonstrated what can be done with creative, thoughtfully conceived, and properly managed programs of prevention and social rehabilitation. In those communities, families have been restored to self-reliance, and relief rolls have been reduced.

To strengthen our human resources—to demonstrate the compassion of freemen—and in the light of our own constructive self-interest—we must bring our welfare programs up to date. I urge that the Congress do so without delay.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 1, 1962*.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 326)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I have the honor to transmit the first annual report of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The Agency was established by the act of September 26, 1961, and has thus been in existence for only 4 months. This report, submitted pursuant to law, describes not only its own initial activities, but also the work of predecessor agencies which it is continuing.

The existence of this new Agency is a source of strength to me, in the performance of my responsibility to pursue a new type of world security which will increase our own prospects of living in peace and freedom. I know that this goal is the desire of the Congress and the American people to leave no stone unturned in their search for a peaceful world.

This report of activities indicates that the new Agency is moving surely toward the achievement of greater effectiveness and flexibility in disarmament negotiations. The development of this kind of skill and responsibility is essential to the serious pursuit of security through disarmament.

On March 14, our representatives will meet with the representatives of 17 other nations in a forum established by resolution of the United Nations General Assembly to seek to negotiate a comprehensive disarmament treaty program. When I appeared before the United Nations last September, I submitted a program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world. It is my hope and expectation that the forthcoming conference will make significant progress toward the achievement of the goal of disarmament with effective methods of insuring compliance.

Never before in the history of man has the importance of arms control and disarmament been so great. For this reason, I urge your support of this Agency in the great and difficult tasks which it will face in the future.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 1, 1962*.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS ON CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the acting majority leader if he will inform us as to the program for next week.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the Consent Calendar will be called, and also suspensions. There is one suspension scheduled, S. 383, which deals with the Grand Canyon National Park mining claim.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week. The Private Calendar will be called first on Tuesday, and the following bills will be called up on that day, and thereafter:

H.R. 6360, providing for an additional Assistant Secretary for the Department of Commerce;

H.R. 8617, the Philippine war damage claims bill;

H.R. 8723, the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act; and

H.R. 8399, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

The latter bill will not be called unless a rule is reported.

Mr. Speaker, the order of the measures which I have mentioned has not yet been listed. Further announcement on that will be made on Monday.

Of course, conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I wonder when we are going to get the $100 million, or whatever it is, or $200 million bond issue business? Can the gentleman give us any idea about that?

Mr. BOGGS. The committees have not considered it as yet. It would be difficult to give the gentleman an estimate at this time. I would hope reasonably soon.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON EXPORT CONTROL

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Export Control be permitted to sit on Monday next, February 5, 1962, during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

GEORGE EDWARD BARNHART

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6025) to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine and render judgment on the claim of George Edward Barnhart against the United States, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "May 8, 1951" and insert "December 31, 1946".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understood the gentleman a little earlier in the afternoon, the gentleman said that this matter had been cleared by the members of the subcommittee?

Mr. LANE. That is correct.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A WAR OVER THIS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, one of the trouble spots of the world is Dutch New Guinea where Sukarno, who rules over Indonesia, is making threatening gestures. Sukarno is a dictator who plays footsy with the Reds and who has received great quantities of weapons from them. He has also received much more than his share of American foreign aid. He is another of the neutrals who helps himself from our Treasury while making deals with the Reds. Apparently, no one ever told him the United States has a right to expect a quid pro quo for its largesse. Sukarno is following the pattern ambitious dictators generally follow. In order to make up for shortcomings at home and to keep his subjects relatively pacified, he has to think up new worlds to conquer. Dutch New Guinea fits in well with his plans to solidify himself at home by playing the hero.

American efforts to curb this new-day would-be conqueror apparently have been as weak as water. The U.N. has invited both Indonesia and Holland to talk out their differences. This Holland has agreed to do. Not so the Indonesians. Some of our allies in the far Pacific have indicated a relatively simple solution to this problem. They ask why the United States does not station units of the powerful 7th Fleet across the approaches to New Guinea and say to both litigants:

> There just isn't going to be any war. We are here to stop it. We intend to stop it if it starts. You can settle your differences in the U.N. Take your troubles there, and stop this silly talk about war.

This, of course, is so simple and down-to-earth that it is not going to appeal to the striped-pants boys. After all, it might hurt Mr. Sukarno's feelings and that would never do. Personally, I think it would do Mr. Sukarno and a lot more of his ilk good for someone to tell them just where to stop. Trying to please everybody and trying to avoid offending anyone is about the worst way I know to keep troublemakers in line. Leadership carries with it some responsibility. Sometimes it means kicking the lethargy out of the lethargic; insistence upon quid pro quo for those who are recipients of American aid; pointing up a goal and driving to its realization. It can mean firmness to the point of drawing a line and saying this is as far as you go. Today's growing group of new dictators have not had anyone to talk to them in this fashion. They think they can get everything they want by yelling and kicking up their heels. The American people have just about reached the end of their patience in dealing with this crowd of irresponsibles. The public would welcome stronger diplomacy and stronger leadership from the American State Department.

I am impressed with the job the Secretary of State is doing. And I am impressed by the fact that the President is seeking to lift the State Department to a new level of aggressive determination in the conduct of foreign affairs. But it appears to me there is inertia and resistance to change within that agency which make the job of the President and the Secretary of State doubly difficult.

The U.S. News & World Report of February 5 carries a significant story on Dutch New Guinea. I submit it for reprinting at this point in the Record. It is well worth reading:

A War Over This?

(A war between Indonesia and Holland over West New Guinea would be one of the silliest wars ever fought. That's the way it looks at the scene. There is no good place to fight, and not much that is worth fighting for. As for the natives, they'd rather be let alone. Robert P. Martin of the international staff of U.S. News & World Report, flew into New Guinea as Indonesia's President Sukarno was stepping up preparations to attack. In this cabled dispatch, Martin takes you on a tour of a primitive, poor, forbidding island that is the world's latest crisis spot.)

Hollandia, New Guinea.—To an American long accustomed to the relative backwardness in much of Asia, it comes as a shock to find the Indonesians spoiling for a fight with the Dutch over half the island of New Guinea. This is, undoubtedly, one of the most worthless and underdeveloped pieces of real estate on earth.

Step off a jet transport at the Dutch base on Biak and, in 10 minutes, you are in a village where each morning the fishermen go through magic rituals—to insure a good catch—before setting out in their hand-hewn dugouts.

Or take a 2-hour flight out of the city of Hollandia and you are in the heart of stone age culture where some of the people wear bark girdles and still practice mystic rites.

UPROAR WITHOUT SENSE

The overall impression: Even though the international uproar over New Guinea is very real, it makes little sense.

Indonesia doesn't need west New Guinea. The island is poor in natural resources and will be difficult to develop. It has been a financial drain on the Dutch for years. It has no value to Indonesia's President Sukarno except as a symbol of Dutch colonialism he wants to wipe out.

The Dutch, for the most part, would be happy to get out. But they need a face-saving device so they can give up gracefully, and not under fire.

You don't have to be here long to realize that self-determination for the Papuans—as the natives of West New Guinea are called—is absurd.

There is not a single positive element of civilization, no distinguishing skill or trait, no custom or tool that is common to all the estimated 700,000 Papuans. Tribes and clans—ranging in size from a few hundred people to the largest, which has about 10,000—are isolated from each other. And they like it that way.

CANNIBALS AND CHRISTIANS

Some Papuans are still headhunters and practice cannibalism. But there are also third-generation Christians among other islanders. Most Papuans are very dark, have frizzy hair, and deep wrinkles around their noses and mouths. The greatest barrier separating them is language. There are at least 250 different languages spoken here.

The Dutch are trying to rush through reforms that will give the Papuans self-determination—to decide for themselves whether to stay with the Dutch, join Indonesia, or be independent.

West New Guinea has been renamed West Papua. A 28-member council with limited powers was established last April. West Papua has its own national anthem and a flag that bears a startling resemblance to the Stars and Stripes. Dutch marines are training the first battalion—220 men—of a projected Papuan defense force.

But there still is no Papuan national leader, no hard core of university-trained natives, not even a Papuan newspaper.

An American who has lived here a long time was asked how the Papuans would vote on self-determination.

"First," he replied, "you would have to catch each Papuan, and then you would have to tell him how to vote."

At first glance it appears the Dutch are getting ready not only to stay here but to fight if the Indonesians attack.

Commercial flights from Holland into Biak carry a score or more of young Dutchmen each trip. They wear civilian clothes, but uniforms are packed in their duffelbags. Antiaircraft guns on the bluffs above Biak are manned. An air-raid siren has been installed on the roof of a one-story building, but it has not been tested for fear of frightening the populace.

BOMBERS READY

Rows of new houses for Dutch officers are being built at Biak. A World War II bomber field that is closer to Indonesia than to Biak has been reopened. Every day, American-built planes equipped with radar patrol the waters between New Guinea and Indonesia. A squadron of British-made jet fighters fly practice missions regularly.

The Dutch are contemptuous of the Indonesians' fighting quality. They gave the Indonesians a bloody nose in the latter's first fight for New Guinea. In a 15-minute engagement on January 15, the Dutch sank one Indonesian torpedo boat, routed two others.

But the Dutch are impressed by the quality and quantity of arms and equipment the Indonesian Navy and Air Force now have—supplied them by Russia. A Dutch naval officer said the Indonesian commanders of the torpedo boats demonstrated "good gunnery and good seamanship."

After that January 15 clash, a young Dutch Air Force officer remarked: "If the Indonesians send their air force over we can take them, up to 4 to 1. But 5 to 1 might be a different matter."

Flying along the coast of New Guinea, you can see why Indonesians have not yet invaded the island. The two nearest Indonesian bases are about 500 air-miles from Biak. Biak is on a small, easily defended island, and bars the sea route to Hollandia, the administrative capital.

From the air, New Guinea appears to be a vast tropical forest scarred by bare patches where heavy rains have eroded mountains. Much of the southern coastal belt is swampy lowland—unhealthy and thinly populated. Farther inland are some of the loveliest mountain valleys in the world, cut off from northern New Guinea by a mountain chain that rises to 16,000 feet. Here, glacial icecaps—almost unknown in the equatorial belt—can still be seen.

LACK OF HIGHWAYS

There are no roads through the mountain barrier, Papuan trails, seldom used, wind through the rugged range.

In all of New Guinea there are less than 300 miles of highway, and slightly more than 2,000 buses, trucks, and cars. Most of the road system was part of the military complex the United States seized from the Japanese in World War II and then expanded. Hollandia—once the headquarters of Gen. Douglas MacArthur—contains about a quarter of all the roads.

Commerce is almost entirely dependent on coastal shipping, on very shallow-draft boats for the few navigable rivers, and on airplanes. Twin-engine planes make regularly scheduled stops at 11 airports. Lighter planes go into small landing strips. Some parts of the interior are completely dependent on air drops.

Missionaries in the interior—including several hundred Americans—have developed their own air transport.

THE EASY LIFE

Life in West New Guinea is relatively simple and easy. The Dutch live in red-roofed houses surrounded by small gardens. They have their movies, clubs, and tennis courts.

Papuans in the towns live in huts made of metal scraps left over from the time when the United States had World War II bases here. Those in the interior live in huts made of bamboo and palm leaves. In the swamps and along the coasts, the huts are perched on stilts.

The climate is hot and damp. Even the nights are far from cool. But the Papuan doesn't have to work hard for a living. He gets food from the sago palms. Vegetables and fruits are plentiful. So are fish along the coast. Almost every family has its own pigs.

The Papuans have not mastered pottery. Most grill their food or use bamboo vessels to cook a sago-palm porridge.

How far the Papuans are removed from civilization is shown by the experience of a Dutch marine colonel, Wilhelm Van Heuven, who is in charge of the Papuan self-defense force now being trained at Camp Manokwari. The men all volunteer between the ages of 16 and 20 and with at least 3 years of schooling—arrived at camp underfed and ridden with malaria, leg sores, and other tropical diseases.

"Some of the Papuan soldiers never had a bath in their lives," said Colonel Van Heuven. "They were so fascinated with faucets they would turn them on and let them run for the fun of it. Now that they've solved the mystery of water taps and flush toilets, they take two baths a day.

"When we gave them polish for their brass buttons they smeared it all over their uniforms. Shoes were a problem. None had ever worn them—or much of anything else. We decided to give them shoes because the police have shoes, and if the Army didn't we would have an explosive political problem on our hands."

FOR SIGNALS: BIRDCALLS

The recruits look fine in their sweeping camping hats with black brushes, red bands, and red shoulder boards. In the jungle, they look even better. When the Dutch tried to teach them to use passwords, the Papuans insisted on birdcalls.

The Dutch get along well with the Papuans. But the Papuans are independent minded and dislike discipline. In Biak, for example, almost all the 34 prisoners in the jail are there for drunkenness. The Dutch use the prisoners on street-repair gangs because life in prison with free food would be no penalty.

The Papuans in the coastal towns are friendly and gregarious. Rest temporarily in a village and you are quickly surrounded by laughing natives.

In the interior, the people are more aloof, distrust other Papuans, and live as isolated a life as possible. Human heads and sea shells are currency, often used to buy brides. In some areas wives are killed when their husbands die.

NO LAND OF TREASURE

New Guinea's 160,000 square miles are no treasure house of the East. Oil has been found on the western tip of the island. But output and reserves are so limited, and bringing the oil to the surface is so expensive that production has been stopped. An investment in excess of $130 million—60 percent American and 40 percent Dutch—has been written off.

United States and Dutch companies have shown interest in developing nickel and cobalt deposits. Lumber, cocoa, and copra are potential exports of value. In most of the explored areas of New Guinea, however, the soil is so poor there is little likelihood of making the island highly productive without heavy use of fertilizers. Papuans have shown no interest in developing the country, on their own.

If Sukarno attacks the island, the Dutch will probably put up a good fight—particularly at Biak. Tough, well trained, and confident, they could probably hold out for 3 months.

But they admit it would be a losing proposition in the end. Indonesia has more than 90 million people. The Dutch have only 5,000 to 6,000 fighting men in all of New Guinea. Even among the Dutch who want to stay in New Guinea, there is no feeling that the island is worth fighting for.

Several thousand Eurasians holding Dutch citizenship who fled here from Indonesia in 1957 and 1958 are abandoning their hope of making a new life on the island under Dutch control.

A handful of Dutch businessmen are hanging on. The remaining Dutch are Government officials and technicians. And most of them are becoming reconciled to the idea of leaving, eventually.

DUTCH GIVING UP?

Explained a young Dutchman:

"We committed ourselves to giving the Papuans self-determination. It costs us the equivalent of $30 million a year to stay here. Holland is small, and not a rich country. People at home are tired of footing the bill. When it comes to money, the principle of self-determination means very little to the average Dutchman."

Such talk is becoming common. The best guess here is that, in the end, Sukarno is going to get New Guinea.

EVERY POSSIBLE MEASURE MUST BE TAKEN TO INSURE U.S. MILITARY STRENGTH

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. **FLOOD**. Mr. Speaker, I know that all Members of this body share a common determination to see to it that every possible measure is taken to insure that the United States maintains its military strength at such a point that it will not only act as a deterrent against aggression, but will be a powerful retaliatory force with which to strike back at an enemy should that ever become necessary.

No one quarrels with the idea that we must have all of the men, planes, ships, missiles, and weapons of all kinds which our military leaders assure us are necessary to provide the type of military force the Nation must have. There is no reluctance on the part of any Member of this House to vote for the appropriations necessary to procure and maintain such a force.

But there is another essential ingredient to a sound defense posture, Mr. Speaker, and that is a sound mobilization base to support the Armed Forces. We must never forget this.

Recently there have appeared stories in a number of publications which have alarmed me. These stories report that some people in the Defense Department and the Office of Emergency Planning have concluded that any future war this Nation might have to fight would be of short duration and, therefore, many of the assumptions about defense planning which had dominated official planning in earlier periods could now be safely abandoned. This is said to be true of the imports of oil, both crude and residual. The reasoning behind such thinking is that any future war would be nuclear in nature, and would be over in a matter of hours. Therefore, this reasoning continues, we need not concern ourselves with matters which affect the long haul—such as the maintenance of a sound domestic fuels basis—because the war will be over before demands for fuels and other essential war commodities make itself felt.

Mr. Speaker, I disagree most emphatically with this type of thinking. I trust that it does not run deep in the Pentagon, or that it has not been accepted by those in other agencies charged with the preparation of mobilization planning. I was greatly encouraged by a statement made by the President in a press conference last week. He declared the Nation must prepare itself for any type of conflict—both nuclear and so-called brush war which would take the form of combat such as we have experienced in the past.

I am encouraged by the report in the press of January 23, reportedly a story from the Marine Corps Gazette, and I quote:

> The morning mail of the Marine Corps Gazette contained a letter to the editor last week of the type that every editor likes to receive.
>
> Speaking of the Gazette's January issue, devoted entirely to guerrilla warfare, the enthusiastic high-placed reader wrote:
>
> I read it from cover to cover and was most impressed with its contents. It was an entirely professional appraisal of a matter which demands our earnest attention, for this is the kind of circumstances we may be called upon to face in many parts of the world.
>
> I urge all officers and men of the Marine Corps to read and digest this fine work, for I know this to be a matter of special concern to marines [and] that your professional training is pointed toward making every marine a master of this art. I commend you on this outstanding presentation of a vital subject.
>
> Gen. David M. Shoup, the Marine Commandant, who received a similar letter from the same reader, was even more pleased, if possible, than the marine officers who edit the Gazette. For the White House and Defense Department apparently have been viewing counterguerrilla warfare as an Army specialty.
>
> The letter to the editor was signed by John F. Kennedy, President of the United States.

It is my strongly held belief, Mr. Speaker, that the view expressed by the President is the only reasonable and safe course which this Nation can follow. We cannot afford to gamble on a matter as vital as this.

We cannot, as a nation, afford to take any action that could have a harmful effect on our domestic fuels industries based upon an assumption that because any war in which we might become involved will be short and, therefore, our fuels base is expendable.

I wish to remind this House, Mr. Speaker, that in March of 1959 mandatory controls were imposed by the President upon the importation of both crude and residual oil upon a finding by the then Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, the predecessor agency to the Office of Emergency Planning, and also a Cabinet committee, that imports had reached such proportions that they were threatening to impair the national security.

Both of these two agencies had concluded, after a careful investigation, and a study of increasing imports during the preceding 5 or 6 years, that the domestic fuels industries could not be maintained at a sufficiently high level to meet defense requirements if excessive imports continued. The defense mobilization planners had determined that the maintenance of a sound and expendable domestic fuels industries was essential to national security.

They recognized one fact which is as true today as it was when this determination was made; namely, in time of emergency, and an interruption of oversea fuels supplies, the Nation would have to rely upon the domestic oil and coal industries to supply the vastly increased amounts of fuel and energy this Nation at war would demand. They further recognized that if imports are permitted to take away the markets of these two domestic fuels, and face drastic reductions in operation, the industries would not have the capacity to increase production as it would be needed. This would present the Nation with what could be a fatal obstacle—an industrial and military machine without the fuel necessary to keep it operating at high gear.

There are elements in our Nation, today, Mr. Speaker, who would have us believe that the conditions which prompted the OCDM and the Cabinet committee to reach its conclusions as to the importance of domestic fuels to national security no longer exist. They assure us that controls on imports can be safely abandoned, and even if the domestic oil and coal industries are ruined, or relegated to a standby basis, we have plentiful supplies of oil in other nations which we can use.

When I observe what is even now occurring in the conference of the Organization of American States and I see our distinguished Secretary of State endeavoring to point up the dangerous situation in Cuba and their communistic government and then to note the divergent views of those very countries that should support any effort we make in stopping communistic influence in this hemisphere then I question the philosophy that foreign oil will always be available to the United States.

These people are wrong, Mr. Speaker. They are espousing a cause that could lead to disaster. If we follow the advice and counsel of these people, we will be making our whole industrial complex dependent upon foreign fuel. I say this is wrong, almost criminal. I believe we must place our reliance for the fuels and energy we will have to have in any future emergency not upon foreign sources, but upon the domestic fuels industries. Any other course is folly. It is gambling with the security of this Nation.

When the Defense Appropriations Committee begins hearings in the near future, I fully intend to explore this question with Secretary McNamara and other top Defense Department officials. I am putting them on record today that I want to know if the abandonment of the domestic fuels industries has become a part of defense mobilization planning, as some unidentified spokesmen for these agencies have indicated. If this fallacy has crept into our defense planning, I want to know it, Mr. Speaker, for I intend to do everything I can in the Defense Appropriation Subcommittee and on the floor of this House, to correct what I consider would be a grave mistake of judgment. I will never willingly or silently accept any concept of national security which tries to substitute for our vital domestic supply of fuel an unsafe and undependable supply from oversea nations.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM OF 1960

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. **Arends**] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it was on August 21, 1960, just a year and one-half ago, that Presidential Candidate John F. Kennedy came to Des Moines to participate in a farm conference called by midwestern Democrats. Fresh from his convention victory in Los Angeles a few days earlier, Mr. Kennedy boldly said:

> The problem of the family farmer is the No. 1 domestic issue in the United States today. Our platform pledges positive action to raise farm income to full parity levels. I stand behind that pledge and I intend to make good on it.

The Democratic platform of 1960 spelled out a score of specific promises to agriculture which included the achievement of full parity of income for farmers, loans on basic commodities at not less than 90 percent of parity, preservation of the family farm, easier credit and eradication of long-neglected rural blight. All of this and much more was to be accomplished, according to the Democratic platform, at considerably less cost and under the kindly leadership of a still undesignated Secretary of Agriculture who would be conversant with the technological and economic aspects of farm problems.

From this it should have been evident to all but the incurable skeptics that the perennial farm problem would be solved at last, if only there were a Democrat in the White House. In what was billed as his major farm speech, delivered at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., on September 22, 1960, Candidate Kennedy again placed himself squarely behind his party's agricultural platform. He noted that his "program for agriculture makes no pledge that I cannot keep or that the public interest would not permit." A breath or two later, in this same speech, he declared his own belief "that the American farmer is tired of grandiose promises and unfulfilled pledges and remedial gimmicks."

So ran the solemn pledges, so read the fervent promises made to American farmers by the Democratic presidential candidate and his party in 1960. There were no hedges—no ifs, ands, or buts.

For a full year now, the Kennedy administration has been in power, with commanding majorities in the Congress. The time seems appropriate to weigh the Democratic farm pledges and promises of 1960 against actual performance.

It would be interesting to learn first, whatever became of full parity of income, that shimmering promise held out to farmers such a short time ago? Does "full parity" really mean 79 percent of parity? It seems only fair to ask, since the parity ratio, which measures prices received by farmers against those they pay, averaged 79 throughout 1961. This was the lowest average since the depression year of 1939.

It seems like only yesterday when many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were pointing to the parity ratio as the true yardstick of farm prosperity. Whenever it declined under the previous administration, this was cited as irrefutable evidence of the worsening condition of American agriculture. Forgotten, somehow, was the fact that this same parity ratio dropped more during the final 13 months of the Truman administration than it did during the next 8 years.

Nevertheless, the parity ratio became Ezra Taft Benson's albatross. It became the figure Democratic warriors painted on their shields as they went forth to do political battle in the farm belt. Now that the parity albatross is wrapped about their own necks, administration farm leaders seem content to suffer in silence. The once sacred parity ratio has apparently become a meaningless statistic to them.

But it is still a measuring stick of considerable importance among farmers. It tells them, for example, that their farm operating costs are at an alltime high—up half a billion dollars in 1961 alone, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. And, with another round of wage increases recently negotiated and more in the offing, it is absolutely predictable that farm operating costs will reach new alltime peaks in 1962.

The prices-received component in the parity ratio also tells farmers what they already know—that farm prices, as an average, are lower than they were a year ago when the full parity of income forces assumed command. Prices of hogs, cattle, poultry, and eggs, which make up a great share of total farm income, have consistently run below those of 1960 during the first year of the Kennedy administration.

Despite sharply increased price supports by the new administration for dairy products, and corn, on December 15, 1961, farmers were receiving 10 cents per hundredweight less for milk than they were a year ago, only 3 cents per bushel more for corn. Despite the magnetic force which a 21-cent per bushel increase in wheat price supports should be exerting upon the market now, farmers today are receiving only 12 cents per bushel more for wheat than they were a year ago. Cotton prices have been driven substantially higher than last year. But the short-run income gains which have accrued to growers may well be offset by the long-run loss of markets which is likely to follow. And the mischief which has been done to the domestic textile industry can undoubtedly be better described by my colleagues from New England and the South.

By their own test of full parity of income—a test which the Kennedy administration, and no one else, created for itself—the New Frontiersmen have floundered miserably on the agricultural front.

If the full parity concept has been abandoned, as it apparently has, what then of the Democratic platform pledge of loans on basic commodities at not less than 90 percent of parity? What of Mr. Kennedy's own campaign statement that this platform "makes no pledge that I cannot keep or that the public interest would not permit"?

This was a pledge which could have been honored the first day that the new administration assumed office. The Secretary of Agriculture had then and still has today legal authority to set price supports for the basic commodities at 90 percent of parity by a mere stroke of the pen. But the pledge remains unredeemed. Apparently the 90-percent-of-parity banner which the Democrats waved in the Farm Belt for 8 years has now been folded and put away in the same barrel with the missile gap and the Kennedy campaign pledge to issue an Executive order barring racial discrimination in Federal housing.

Preservation of the family farm? Well, there are fewer family farms now than there were a year ago. The population trend toward the towns and cities and the trend toward larger and fewer farms continues, just as it has for a century or more. Meanwhile, there are reports that this administration is considering a program to convert as much as 68 million acres of cropland to forest, pasture, and recreational purposes. At the same time, we hear of administration plans to help small farmers acquire additional land and thus become more efficient producers. Remember when it was almost heresy to speak of efficiency in agriculture?

The net result of such programs would inevitably be fewer farmers and fewer family farms. The economic impact upon small cities and small towns would be almost incalculable.

Apparently the present leadership of the Department of Agriculture has interpreted Mr. Kennedy's pledge to "get the country moving again" as a literal command to move people from the country.

Easier credit? Farmers generally find interest rates as high as they were a year ago. Only last September, the Department of Agriculture increased the return to lenders who invest in Farmers Home Administration loans from 4 to 4½ percent—a move which certainly does not suggest that farm loan money is getting cheaper.

And what of the long-neglected rural blight? When I was home a few days ago, the countryside looked very much as it did last year—and a mighty attractive picture it was.

Then there was the Democratic platform pledge of a farm program which would cost considerably less. Well, agricultural budget expenditures jumped from $5.2 billion in the last Eisenhower year to $6.3 billion in fiscal 1962—an increase of $1.1 billion. In the budget message recently submitted, the administration estimated agricultural expenditures for fiscal 1963 at $5.8 billion. But this figure is achieved through certain bookkeeping devices and is further predicated upon changes in present farm programs which may or may not be approved. It is my own opinion that actual agricultural outlays for fiscal 1963 will be larger, not smaller, than in fiscal 1962.

Finally, let us examine the pledge to appoint a Secretary of Agriculture conversant with the technological and economic aspects of farm problems. Admittedly, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman is a competent lawyer, with administrative experience as Governor of one of our great States, but I do not believe that even the most ardent admirers would argue that he is qualified, either through practical experience, training, or education, to direct the far-flung $6-billion-a-year operation that is the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

I will concede that more recently Mr. Freeman has given occasional indications that he is learning some of the cold economic and technological facts about agriculture. But I would also submit that his has been the most expensive on-the-job training program in all recorded history.

A few days ago, here in Washington, Mr. Freeman publicly recognized, I believe for the first time, that there are limits to the amount of American food and fiber which can be moved abroad under the food-for-peace program. He indicated that we had perhaps about reached those limits and that anyone who thought we could push much harder on this front had stars in his eyes.

At the very same time, Food for Peace Director George McGovern, who must have a whole galaxy of stars in each eye, sprang upon what must have been a rather startled administration, a global school lunch proposal to feed 650 million children. It is to be hoped that Mr. Kennedy somehow will get his Secretary of Agriculture, his Food for Peace Director and his Budget Director together on this one. Food for peace is in reality only a nice-sounding name for the Republican enacted Public Law 480 by which title it is popularly known.

Today, after a year of opportunity to act, rather than just talk about the farm problem, this administration has succeeded only in further upsetting the relationships between the various segments of agriculture, in destroying commercial markets for food grain producers, in setting the stage for an ultimate collapse in livestock prices and in sharply increasing the agricultural budget. In the development and execution of farm policy, the Department of Agriculture during the past year has been woefully inadequate.

Despite increased Federal outlays of some $800 million to induce the retirement of 25 million acres of farm land during the last year, total crop production for 1961 was only 2 percent below the preceding year. Had it not been for the severe and protracted drought which extended over a large area of the Northern Great Plains States, 1961 crop production would undoubtedly have reached or surpassed the record level set a year earlier.

There also remains to be explained the curious fact that although the Department of Agriculture contracted to pay for the retirement of some 25 million acres from corn and grain sorghum production, its own official crop reports reveal that corn and grain sorghum acreage were actually reduced only about 20 million acres below 1960. The Nation is entitled to a better explanation than it has yet received as to what happened to those 5 million phantom acres.

The tremendous cost of the administration's emergency feed grains program perhaps could have been justified if the plan had achieved its announced objective of sharply reducing surplus feed stocks. If even an appreciable dent had been made in these supplies, there might have been room for debate on the merits of the program. But in the light of the Government's own official reports on 1961 feed grain production, the administration's program must be branded as the most expensive and least effective crop contról plan ever conceived.

Moreover, the Department of Agriculture has administered the feed grains program in such a way as to penalize harshly in the marketplace not only those corn and grain sorghum producers who participated in the program but also the majority of growers who elected to go it alone, without Government help. Through heavy dumping of corn and other feed grains on the commercial market during the spring and summer of 1961, Commodity Credit Corporation artifically depressed prices below the levels which growers would otherwise have received for their previous year's production. Even heavier sales by CCC during the recent fall and winter months have all but excluded feed grain producers from their normal commercial markets, while feed grain prices have been held far below the levels which otherwise would have prevailed. Not only are the noncooperators being penalized but also the cooperators, who find that the Government has preempted the market for the corn which they produced in excess of their historical averages.

Since October 1, CCC has been dumping corn into the marketplace at the fantastic rate of more than 100 million bushels each month. In a single week in December its sales reached 61 million bushels. Perhaps the most certain thing in the world is that CCC will acquire under the loan program, later in 1962, at least 1 bushel of corn at an average price of $1.20 for each bushel of corn it is selling now in the 90-cent to $1 price range. The loss through such an exchange will total tens of millions of dollars and to this must be added the tremendous costs of moving grain in and out of storage and performing the vast amount of bookkeeping incidental to such an operation. The cost of feed grain producers, denied their traditional markets, will be even greater than that suffered by the Government.

Congress must call a halt to Government's present feed grain sales policies before the Nation's farm marketing system is completely wrecked.

The current mess in agriculture embraces not only the feed grains area. It includes wheat, cotton, the entire poultry industry and the dairy industry, to list only a few. It may well include the hog and cattle segments of agriculture before the year ends. The Government's policy of making vast stores of feed grains readily available at bargain basement prices can only encourage unsound expansion in livestock numbers and a subsequent price collapse.

Yesterday President Kennedy submitted to us his message on agriculture, presenting in broad outline his proposed program. A large part of the message was devoted to laudatory objectives, but in his recommendations serious questions arise as to whether they are in keeping with the objectives. His recommendations are far reaching, and it will not be possible to evaluate them until we are able to study, section by section, the actual legislation.

In the last session President Kennedy submitted a message on agriculture, but it was not until the administration's farm bill was introduced that we realized it was actually proposed to delegate such broad powers to Secretary Freeman as to make him "czar of agriculture." After holding hearings on the bill the Committee on Agriculture wisely rejected it, and stopgap legislation known as the emergency feed grain bill was adopted.

While I am not in a position to pass judgment on the administration's new proposal for this session until I have seen the legislation itself, it is apparent to me from the wording of the President's message that the administration still adheres to compulsion as the only way to solve this grave problem. It is this basic element that gives me concern with respect to nature of the administration's program when it comes before us in the form of a bill.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. When the President sent his message up to the Congress yesterday it had in it proposals which would put on agriculture the heaviest controls in the history of agriculture in our country.

Prior to becoming Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman expressed himself as being concerned about the moving of people off the farms. Here we see a plan under which farmers would be moved off our farms at an unprecedented rate. Also we see that the remaining farmers would be told what they could grow, how much they could grow, and where they could grow it.

There are other areas in which the Secretary made recommendations which were contrary to past statements of his beliefs. He had previously stated many times that the recommendations of Secretary Benson for authority to flex price supports were unreasonable. Now he asks for a wider range of flexibility than Mr. Benson ever dared ask for.

One of the worst characteristics of the administration proposals is the all-or-nothing attitudes it expresses. Under the proposed program, farmers would be given the chance to accept either the proposed strict quota system or no program at all. If they reject the quota system the Government will actually be competing against the farmer. The farmers stand to lose everything which they have gained in constructive legislation over the years. This is like asking a man whether he wants life imprisonment or the death sentence. Our present system has faults, but it also has a number of programs which have proven effective.

Let us also remember the lesson taught in the old fable of the dog who, looking into the water, drops the bone he has in his mouth to grab the bone he sees reflected in the water.

After hearing much degrading of the soil bank concept by various members of the Secretary's party it is interesting to note in the agricultural message the statement "to encourage a comprehensive survey of land uses, to undertake a research program on the conversion of land to alternate purposes." This certainly seems to be an acceptance of the soil bank idea.

Indeed, the so-called new farm program appears to be a combination of, first, ideas which many of the Secretary's present supporters and often the Secretary himself have ridiculed in the past, and, second, a system of complete and far-reaching controls.

Let us look at the controls advocated. In the area of feed grain legislation the change from voluntary to mandatory controls is the outstanding characteristic. All farmers would, for all practical purposes, get no protection if the suggested plan were voted down and instead the Government would dump surpluses on the market to force prices down.

The proposals on wheat give the Secretary the power to invoke a certificate plan with two, three, or even four different prices for wheat, depending on its use.

In legislation for dairy products each milk producer would be assigned a marketing base equal to his 1961 milk marketings but Secretary Freeman would, depending on his desires, establish the actual allotment of the farmer at a level lower than the farmer's base. There would be severe penalties for producing more than the allotment. The dairy producers would lose their present dairy programs when they voted in a referendum between quotas and a program something less than they have at present. I, for one, would hate to see the dairy industry lose all of the constructive programs it has gained over the years when faced with the all-or-nothing proposals we have before us.

H.R. 10019: SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 10019, a measure designed to strengthen the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950. It will further limit and control the activities of members of Communist organizations, provide further legal means of apprehending Communists and investigating their activities, and put additional blocks in their methods of purveying their propaganda.

I can think of nothing more cogent to the need of this legislation than the remarks of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, at a dinner in his honor last December. Speaking on the subject "The Faith To Be Free," Mr. Hoover said, in part:

> The most deeply entrenched forces of the underworld in our Nation today are the professionals who comprise the jealously guarded ranks of organized crime. These are the criminal elite, assuming an air of legitimacy, who buy high-priced legal advisers, better termed "lawyers criminal," and "front men" to shield them from proper punishment.
>
> These underworld characters with their criminal scum flout the sacrifices—the blood, the sweat, and the toil of six generations of dedicated Americans—which secured the freedoms they enjoy. These persons wear our constitutional guarantees as a cloak of protective armor. They are unrestrained by those moral considerations which constitute the lifeblood of a democracy. In their eyes, the United States is a haven of rights without responsibilities—of privileges free from obligation to the society which has made them possible. Theirs is a virulent, parasitic existence consuming the lifeblood of the freedom which they would enjoy. * * *
>
> During our generation, a new menace—international communism—has arisen to threaten freemen throughout the world. * * *
>
> We are at war with the Communists and the sooner every red-blooded American realizes this the safer we will be. Naturally, we want to live in peace, but we do not want peace at any price—we want peace with honor and integrity. And we intend to assure it for the future.
>
> The extent of the menace posed by the philosophy of communism is clear cut and obvious. However, it is absolutely necessary that we attack and oppose it calmly, rationally, and objectively.
>
> We must continue to stiffen our national backbone in dealing with the Communists and their dupes, sympathizers, and apologists. If we relax our guard for one moment, we court national disaster.
>
> The atheistic Communist dictatorship now controls one-fourth of the earth's surface and more than one-third of her peoples. The Communist threat from without must not blind us to the Communist threat from within. The latter is reaching into the very heart of America through its espionage agents and a cunning, defiant, and lawless Communist Party, which is fanatically dedi-

cated to the Marxist cause of world enslavement and destruction of the foundations of our Republic.

The Communist Party in this country has attempted to infiltrate and subvert every segment of our society. The party's efforts have been thwarted in this country by the Government's internal security programs, by investigation, and arrest of party functionaries, and by widespread intelligent public opposition to the Communist philosophy.

Recently, the Communist Party in the United States deliberately and flagrantly refused to comply with the U.S. Supreme Court decision which requires it to register as an agent of the Soviet Union with the Attorney General. Thereby, it once again has formally declared itself to be a lawless organization. No longer can its members falsely profess that the party is a legitimate political organization. Nor can its sympathizers and fellow travelers feign innocence of the true nature of the un-American conspiracy which they support. * * *

In the fight to preserve our Republic, it is not enough merely to be against crime, against subversion or against any of the other enemies which weaken the Nation's strength from within. To stand for the American ideal, to work for the cause of liberty and justice—these give true meaning to life in this great Republic.

If we are to effectively resist the eroding influence of communism, it is imperative that all citizens of this Nation exhibit in more positive ways the value and superiority of our form of government over any foreign ideology. * * *

We are living in an age of uncertainty—an age of awesome national peril—an age when the struggle between freedom and totalitarian enslavement is drawing to a climax. We now have need of faith as never before in our Nation's history. We must revive within ourselves the faith of our forefathers, which enabled them to meet and overcome adversity.

Our Nation holds in trust the last hope of a free civilization. Our dedication to truth, justice, and individual dignity must not be compromised. If we are strong enough, and care enough, and maintain our national integrity, this Nation will survive the terrible threat that presents itself today. With God's help, we will meet the challenge of survival. This is the heritage of America.

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF FOREIGN MINISTERS OF THE AMERICAN STATES

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, today our U.S. delegation is returning from Puna del Este. We have just concluded one of the most important and successful meetings of the Council of Foreign Ministers of the American States.

The American delegation has recorded significant achievements for the United States, the Western Hemisphere, and the entire free world. Leading this important mission was our own Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk. Under the severest of stress and conditions, he has shown himself to be extremely capable, intelligent, persuasive and forceful, knowledgeable and patient. With a clear understanding of the human and political factors involved, he emerges as a dedicated leader for the United States, the inter-American system, and the free world. Equal credit must be given to other members of the mission who so ably participated and assisted the Secretary of State.

We would likewise, Mr. Speaker, extend a special approval to the effort of the U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States, Mr. De Lesseps Morrison under test of his first major and perhaps the most important mission on which he will have to serve. Mr. Morrison has shown the firmness and strength, the knowledge, and the capability for the difficult and delicate position which he holds.

Mr. Speaker, this conference, in another aspect, is significant in that Members of the U.S. Congress not only attended but participated actively as members of the mission. From the House of Representatives, there are the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, Mr. ARMISTEAD SELDEN, chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and Mr. CHESTER MERROW, of New Hampshire, of the minority. They added considerable strength to our delegation, as did the Members of the other body, in voicing and urging the sentiments and expressions of the Congress of the United States. They were able to speak in terms and with understanding which is not possible for others to convey in dealing with members of other missions. They could express viewpoints forcefully which could be readily understood in legislative terms. Yet in all this, they have been complimented, as they properly should be, by the Secretary of State and other members of the mission who are warm in their praise of our own colleagues who participated as members of a diplomatic team to obtain the fine results of the conference.

I trust that, with wise discretion and selection, Members of this House will in the future likewise be called upon to participate in future meetings of this kind. While I know none of us desires to encroach upon the jurisdiction, prerogatives, or responsibility of the executive branch, we all recognize the close partnership that exists, which, when utilized properly, can be extremely effective in behalf of the United States. The successful Conference at Punta del Este supports this conclusion.

Starting out under the handicap of not having sure votes sufficient to maintain any position, the results obtained by our delegation are indeed impressive and important. It is safe to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Conference at Punta del Este in January of 1962 is entitled to be recorded as a historic turn in American and inter-American policy, a policy which affects the position of the United States, inter-American relationship, and communism.

Most important is the unanimous condemnation of Cuba and communism and the determination that its presence as a Communist state is incompatible with the inter-American system of democratic governments, and its existence breaks the solidarity and unity of the hemisphere.

While there was unanimity on the principle, there was some difference of opinion concerning the exclusion of the Government of Cuba from the inter-American system. Six nations, including the largest in Latin America, abstained. Getting abstentions on the differences, instead of a "no" vote, is an achievement in itself; however, the vote on this resolution demonstrates clearly to all Americans the major problems involved in dealing with individual, sovereign governments. It points out that which your Committee on Foreign Affairs has stressed many times to this Congress—that the nations of Latin America must not be considered a monolithic society. In our efforts to obtain unity of action, we must understand their independence, their difference of thought, their difference in problems—social, economic, and political—and their desire to achieve their own ends.

However, our Secretary of State very capably placed this problem in perspective when he said:

> The friends of freedom must stand together, for whenever freedom is threatened every man is threatened. But this does not mean we must be unanimous on all points. This is not a meeting of the Warsaw Pact.

Yet the fact that all of the nations agreed on the principle and the majority agreed on the manner in which the principle should be carried out set a very positive, affirmative tone of action in dealing with the Communist Government of Cuba and communism in the Western Hemisphere.

Now without delay, the Organization of American States and its individual organs will proceed to take whatever measures are necessary to exclude the Communist Government of Cuba from participating in the inter-American system.

Thus the first major step has been strongly taken. I firmly believe that our diplomacy must henceforth be respected because of the firm position which the United States took and the achievements which were obtained.

Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, these are first steps and now the United States must pursue in and out of the inter-American system, all avenues not only to strengthen the isolation of Communist Cuba, but to bring to a halt and roll back all efforts of Communist expansion in the Western Hemisphere and restore a democratic government to Cuba, and to the inter-American system of nations.

This feeling and conclusion is entirely inherent in the resolutions adopted at the Punta del Este Conference.

We in the Congress must be ready and willing to support these principles.

A primary objective is the proper implementation of the alliance for progress, an alliance which now has a new meaning in the eyes of Latin American countries, in which they must be considered as full and equal partners in every sense.

In addition, the other body should complete its action on a bill introduced by my distinguished and able colleague and friend from the Sixth District of Florida, Paul Rogers, and cosponsored by me, and unanimously approved by this House, which would deny the use of our interstate commerce system to any goods destined to or from Cuba, thus closing the last vestige of trade and completely carrying out the principle of isolation.

Mr. Speaker, there is an important gap in the totality of our plans in closing of which I have been urging for the 8 years I have been in Congress. It must be closed. The alliance for progress is our long-range proposal to bring strength and vitality and continued democratic independence to all the nations of Latin America; it also has the objective of barring Communist growth and efforts. While I support this program, my concern is the evident gap which exists. Until the program becomes effective enough to be fully understood and realized by the great mass of people of Latin America, the United States needs an intense, perhaps temporary, short-range program to aid the implementation of the alliance for progress and to thwart Communist aims and ambitions in the Western Hemisphere. This program can take many aspects. I shall only mention a few. The administration has already acknowledged and taken action on one phase.

I refer specifically to the increase in the number of hours of special broadcasts to Latin America. However, we are still not matching the effort of the Russian Communists, Chinese, and other satellite countries in their total broadcasts into Latin American. In this effort to mold public opinion, we must match their effort, hour for hour, minute for minute, dollar for dollar. I pledge my support now and I trust you will join me in making available whatever moneys may be necessary to this administration to do this job and I am confident, that all Americans approve.

As part of this same effort, we must undertake strong programs in all informational media, radio, television, movies, newspapers, magazines, and literature of all kinds. There are approximately 325 pro-Communist papers in Latin America; in addition, there are approximately 80 pro-Castro newspapers. While there are more newspapers which are pro-inter-American and democratic, nevertheless, we should strive to reduce the pro-Communist numbers to zero. I need not spell out, Mr. Speaker, all aspects of the intensive short-range program for the total confrontation of communism in the Western Hemisphere which I envision. The facets are understood and obvious to any student of government, politics, or the molding of public opinion.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. delegation returning today from the Conference at Punta del Este should be congratulated by all of us and all Americans for the firm, positive action which has been taken and achieved, collectively, by the free and independent governments of the inter-American system. Now that we have at long last seized this initiative which President Kennedy has insisted upon, we should pursue it relentlessly and never relinquish it.

THE UNITED NATIONS—A FORUM FOR PEACE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include therewith a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that there is a great deal of misunderstanding about the United Nations and its efforts. While at times there may be frustrating deadlocks and even our closest allies may not always agree with us, it is still evident that the United Nations is, in these troubled times, the only possible forum for peace.

Yesterday the President requested our consideration for his proposal to authorize and appropriate up to $100 million for the purchase of United Nations bonds. His reasons for such a request were so clearly spelled out, I see no need to restate them.

There are, however, two additional points I wish to make. The first is that it is my opinion that the overwhelming majority of citizens of the United States feel that the U.N. should be supported, strengthened, and given adequate forces to carry out its mandates. This was confirmed by a recent poll of my constituents, which I reported in the Congressional Record of January 23, 1962. More than 84 percent of those polled believe that the U.N. offers the best hope for keeping peace in the world; more than 88 percent believe the United States should continue its membership in the U.N.; more than 87 percent believe that further strengthening of the U.N. will advance the cause of world peace. I believe, therefore, that my constituents want me to support the President's proposal to resolve the U.N. financial crisis.

To further indicate the soundness of the thinking of my constituents, I would like to quote from a letter I have just received from a missionary in the Congo—a front-seat witness who has written of firsthand knowledge. The letter is as follows:

Leo-Limete, Congo,
January 17, 1962.

Representative James Roosevelt,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Roosevelt: I've been going to write to you for some time. I am a missionary with the Methodist Church and am at present working with my husband in an ecumenical project, Congo Polytechnic Institute. We have been here in Congo since 1949, when we were in Jadotville. We were in the Kasai in the middle 1950's. We lived in Los Angeles for 2 years, most of the time in your congressional district. My husband returned in June 1961, and I arrived in September.

I have been greatly distressed with the reports in various magazines that we are receiving about the conservative tendency of many in the United States to complain and criticize the U.S. foreign policy in relation to the U.N. support in the Congo. We know that many of our missionary colleagues in the Katanga are very pro-Tshombe. But we've been far enough from some of it, and yet do know some of the background, that we feel that the State Department and the U.N. need to be encouraged in their policy. There have been some mistakes, but we all have to learn from experience. We hate to think of what this Congo would be like without the interest and concern of the U.N. and the United States. Since the Congolese were kept from much experience that is now needed to run their country, we feel that the U.N. is doing a fine job in the way of education and experience. It is better to have a U.N. adviser than to have a Belgian, as there is in the Katanga. We hope that you will keep on supporting the foreign policy in this matter and let others know that there are many missionaries who are very grateful for the U.N. and our Government's policy in it all.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. Ruth Robinson.

The second point I wish to bring to your attention is the financial advantage which purchase of such bonds will bring to the United States itself. We are currently paying nearly 50 percent of the special operational costs, as compared to the 32 percent we will be obligated to meet if the U.N. is put in a sound financial position.

To those who believe we cannot afford to buy U.N. bonds there is but one answer—we cannot afford not to.

NATIONAL FREEDOM DAY

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, at this very moment, in Philadelphia's Independence Hall, the Women's Committee for National Freedom Day is conducting wreath-laying ceremonies before the Liberty Bell to commemorate the adoption of the 13th amendment to the Constitution. I commend this occasion to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

National Freedom Day is observed each year on February 1 by act of Congress, under a resolution sponsored by an illustrious predecessor of mine in the House, the late Francis J. Myers, who was at the time one of the top leaders of the U.S. Senate. The legislation was signed into law by former President Harry S. Truman.

It is fitting that Mrs. Harriet Wright Hines is chairman of the observance in Philadelphia today, since it was her father, the late Major R. R. Wright, who founded the National Freedom Day Association and who conceived the idea for this annual observance. Mr. Speaker, on this day nearly 100 years after one of the most important steps our Nation ever took in making our principles of liberty and justice more meaningful, we should all rededicate ourselves anew to the cause of freedom by appropriate observance of National Freedom Day.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FLOOD, for 30 minutes, today, on the question of the importation of fuel oil and national defense.

Mr. BAILEY, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, February 7.

Mr. ARENDS, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. CONTE), for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. STAGGERS (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for 5 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for 30 minutes, on Monday, February 5.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SCHERER.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. CONTE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SEELY-BROWN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCDOWELL.

Mr. POWELL in four instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 512. An act to extend the time for completion of the free highway bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 5, 1962.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1628. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of the pricing of selected spare parts for ARC–34 communication equipment under Department of the Air Force fixed-price contracts negotiated with the Magnavox Co., Fort Wayne, Ind.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1629. A letter from the vice president and comptroller, D.C. Transit System, Inc., relative to requesting the extension of 60 days time in which to file a required report, pursuant to an act of Congress approved March 4, 1913 (Public Law 435); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1630. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to extend and improve the public assistance and child welfare services programs of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 537. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 8617, a bill to authorize the payment of the balance of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946, and to authorize the appropriation of $73 million for that purpose; without amendment (Rept. No. 1295). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 538. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 8723, a bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1296). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 10032. A bill to extend and improve the public assistance and child welfare services programs of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 10033. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 10034. A bill to protect the right to vote in Federal elections free from arbitrary discrimination by literacy tests or other means; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 10035. A bill to promote the conservation of wildlife through the issuance of a national wildlife refuge stamp as a requirement for use of national wildlife refuges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 10036. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 10037. A bill to amend the St. Lawrence Seaway Act to provide that the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation shall not engage in publicity or promotion of the St. Lawrence Seaway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 10038. A bill to provide civil remedies to persons damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 10039. A bill to provide penalties for membership in the Communist Party, and to permit the compelling of testimony relating to such membership and the granting of immunity from prosecution in connection therewith; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 10040. A bill to authorize the improvements for navigation of Pensacola Harbor, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 10041. A bill to establish San Nicolas Island, San Miguel Island, and Prince Island, Calif., as a naval petroleum reserve, to be known as Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 5; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.R. 10042. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the seaward boundaries of the States of Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana as extending 3 marine leagues into the Gulf of Mexico and providing for the ownership and use of the submerged lands, improvements, minerals and natural resources within said boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 10043. A bill to amend Public Law 86–272, as amended, with respect to the reporting date; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H.J. Res. 616. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Caryl P. Haskins as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.J. Res. 617. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Crawford H. Greenewalt as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 10044. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Kung-Fu Sah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 10045. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Reskin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 10046. A bill for the relief of Young Joo Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 10047. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clotilde Ferreira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL:

H.R. 10048. A bill for the relief of the estate of Notah Tayah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

234. Mr. SHRIVER presented a resolution of the Kansas Oil Men's Association strongly opposing any effort to reduce, eliminate, or otherwise tamper with present percentage depletion for oil and natural gas, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

America, the Unwitting Tool of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excellent and thought-provoking address by my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA], delivered at the annual dinner of the Milford Chamber of Commerce.

The address follows:

AMERICA, THE UNWITTING TOOL OF COMMUNISM

(Speech by Hon. WILLIAM H. HARSHA, JR., delivered at Milford Chamber of Commerce annual dinner, January 25, 1962)

It should be obvious to everyone by now that we are engaged in a life-or-death struggle for survival with the international Communist movement We cannot hope to prevail in this struggle unless all Americans in every field of endeavor are absolutely convinced beyond any shadow of a doubt that we are not engaged in a popularity contest with a competing economic system; that we are not faced with certain annoying adjustments which should be made so that we may coexist with a different system of government; but that we are now in a death struggle with an enemy the like of which we have never before encountered.

To fully understand the grave threat of communism, one must understand the weird philosophy of the father of modern communism, Karl Marx. To achieve his goal of welding humanity into a gigantic conformist society, Marx openly professed two requirements.

First, he said there must be total annihilation of all opposition to this society through the destruction of all existing governments, all economics, and all existing concepts.

"This accomplished," Marx wrote, "I shall stride through the wreckage as a creator."

Second, and this is important to remember, the achievement of his goal of totalitarian conformity would require a new kind of human being, one who can be blindly motivated into immediate action by the mere command from his master. This involves, of course, an obliteration of individual free will, ethics, morals, and conscience. The process of creating this type of human being and welding him into a collective society of similar human beings, as Marx visualized, has been carefully implemented since he established the blueprint for communism more than a century ago.

And, unfortunately, the United States has been serving as a catalyst to this implementation.

The Communist philosophy has recklessly, ruthlessly, slyly, and deceitfully wormed its way into the lives of countless millions across the face of the earth today. And, as a cancer, has left disease or destruction of a free society wherever it is permitted the slightest contact.

Communists have repeatedly expressed confidence that freedom can be defeated by nonmilitary methods, notably by subversion and economic competition, or rather economic chaos.

The Communist conspiracy is primarily concerned with a struggle for the minds and souls of men, and a failure to understand this fact renders the individual defenseless against it.

One of the most effective weapons used against us in this onslaught has been the intensive, massive, and vicious Communist propaganda assault on the United States.

Since 1948, the U.S. Customs Bureau has been under orders to screen Communist propaganda coming into this country and to intercept unwanted and unsolicited material. On March 17, 1961, this order was rescinded, which now permits tons of Communist propaganda to flow freely throughout this country. This propaganda is very cleverly and subtly written with the avowed purpose of brainwashing, warping, and destroying the minds of our citizens, both young and old. And the ironic, unbelievable fact is that you, the taxpayer, are subsidizing this effort to destroy the very thing you cherish the most—freedom.

High school and college students throughout the United States are supplied with Communist propaganda delivered free of charge by the U.S. Post Office. The House Un-American Activities Committee reported that "every school and college in the United States is directly or indirectly the recipient of some of these Communist propaganda publications." Thus, the Communists have discovered how to make American taxpayers finance a Red pipeline to the minds of our students.

The U.S. Bureau of Customs in a 12-month spot check of Moscow's literature through New Orleans counted at least 300,000 packages of Communist propaganda destined to schools and colleges. Each package contained 5 to 15 different publications of youth leadership for communism.

New Orleans is one of the lesser ports of entry from the standpoint of Communist propaganda. A heavier volume of this material is coming into the United States via approximately 50 other ports of entry.

The endless lists of our students are compiled and addressed through the World Federation of Democratic Youth, a pro-Communist front organization, and by the International Union of Students in Prague, Czechoslovakia. Both of these major international Communist-controlled youth organizations publish at least 40 periodicals, which are disseminated regularly in schools and colleges.

The Communists' propaganda campaign has all the priority and impressiveness of their missile program. Russia and Red China can produce about 3,600 million books a year, more than 1 book for every person on earth. The Senate Internal Security Committee reported that "the various forms of Communist propaganda throughout the world involve a personnel of about 500,000 and an annual expenditure of approximately $2 billion." This propaganda has created the intellectual climate for the San Francisco student riots against the House Un-American Activities Committee, for the movement of certain Smith College students in petitioning Members of Congress to curtail the activities of this committee, and for the mushrooming on the campuses of Communist fronts in support of unilateral disarmament, Castro, and recognition of Outer Mongolia and Red China, and against nuclear testing, ROTC and loyalty oaths.

Under international postal agreements, the country of origin collects the postage, and our mailmen deliver mail from door to door without any charge in the United States and our territories. With non-Communist countries, this is a satisfactory arrangement because we collect postage here for mail going overseas. With Soviet-bloc countries this reciprocal agreement is a farce. Does anyone believe that Soviet Russia, the master of deceit and prevarication, will deliver first class letters from the United States without first censoring them? Certainly we're not naive enough to believe she will deliver American propaganda to Russian citizens. Our postal deficit for fiscal 1961 was approximately $843 million. Contributing greatly to this deficit is the great volume of Russian propaganda and mail shipped into this country. Less than half of this Red propaganda actually comes from Soviet-bloc nations—the balance comes from subversive groups within the so-called free world.

During the year 1960 there was imported into the United States from Soviet-bloc countries printed matter, whether or not propaganda, averaging 1,341,298 pieces per month. To date there is no accurate count of how much comes to the United States from the free world. The lifting of the ban in March of 1961 will permit additional unsolicited tons of subversive material to be delivered to our citizens. No other country in the free world would permit Moscow's subversive material to be delivered at the expense of its own taxpayers.

We are not only granting the Communists the fullest advantage of our constitutional rights—freedom of expression—but we are also subsidizing that expression and at the same time denying our own citizens that same privilege by muzzling our military experts. The effect of such a confusing and contradictory policy as this is to put ourselves in the position of a catalyst for the Communist movement.

A Mexico city newspaper editorialized that this propaganda situation makes America like "a man who invites a thief to his house and shows him the places where the valuables are hidden."

Our greatest treasures are the minds of our youth. The future of America lies in their hands and we certainly should not allow them to be unwittingly victimized by Communist propaganda subsidized and delivered by U.S. citizens and taxpayers.

We are also unwittingly being duped into economic chaos. I say unwittingly because I choose to be charitable in this instance, but sometimes I wonder. The Communists have publicly stated that it will not be necessary to fire a shot to take the United States—that they will make us spend ourselves into economic bankruptcy, and then we will turn to communism as a solution to our financial problems.

How are they accomplishing this? First of all, by adding to the postal deficit and while we subsidize the Communist propaganda effort in this country on the one hand, we turn around with the other and spend approximately $140 million per year through the U.S. Information Agency trying to combat and defeat Russia's unrelenting propaganda drive against freedom. Second, by creating certain international crises and causing our Government to become emotional about foreign aid expenditures which are a terrific drain on our economy; third, by duping the United States into providing its tax-subsidized farm commodities to feed the Communist governments. When we provide this food to Communist governments at subsidy levels and below market costs, it means simply that we spend your tax dollars to do it and take that money away from some proper governmental expense adding to the deficit, and it means that we strengthen the Communist control of that foreign country and make it possible for the Communists to use their funds in building their military and propaganda machine, and frees Communist farmers to work in missile plants. When we provide foreign aid to Communist countries, it defeats the very purpose for which foreign aid was devised and perpetuates an evil system. We have a policy in the United States of not interfering with the internal affairs of any foreign government. As a result of that policy, we give the aid in the form of money and supplies to the government in control at the time, with the result that the controlling government uses the aid to strengthen its control and dictatorship. The needy and underprivileged are made to conform—they have to conform to exist. Here again, this simply strengthens the Communist domination over these people and releases Communist funds to build up their military and propaganda structure, while at the same time adding to our national debt.

Fourth, every time an international crisis arises, we wind up sending more money, materials and troops overseas; this accelerates our balance-of-payments deficit, and in turn creates demands on our gold reserve, all of which will be reflected in a devalued dollar and inflation. And what are these troops doing? In the instance of Germany, they've been watching the Berlin wall grow higher and the passage narrower.

Every time we vacillate or appease Soviet Russia, she grows stronger in the eyes of the so-called uncommitted world, and we grow weaker, losing prestige and respect among our allies.

Let us never forget that the absolute and positive goal of communism is world domination. And we must remember that every Communist tyrant from the beginning adopted an orderly timetable of world conquest and pursued it with deadly fixation, just as the Kremlin is doing today. Recent successes of the international Communist conspiracy have resulted in its prophecy that time is running out for the free world. Hence, we must coldly and bluntly face the fact that there are but three courses left open to us.

First, we can meekly capitulate as both individuals and nations have done.

The second is pursuing a program of peaceful coexistence at any price.

The third is setting a determined course of opposition to communism wherever it exists.

Perhaps choice No. 2 is not too far removed from the first choice except in time and circumstances.

Most Americans agree that the survival of free nations is dependent upon a determined course of opposition to communism. There are those, of course, who would construe this statement to be a warmongering position. This is, in fact, what the Communists would have all of us believe, for the official statement of the Communist Party of America, as published in "The Fundamentals of Communism," sets forth, and I quote: "Every war of the Soviet Union is a war of defense. Even if it is conducted with offensive means."

We cannot afford to be naive about the fact that communism employs every conceivable tool and every method of deceit, fraud and subversion to achieve its ultimate goal. In short, the ends justify any means. You need only to analyze the statement of Lenin taken from his works concerning the tactics the Soviets would use in preference to outright war in overthrowing any government. He said when directly faced with the question, "What methods can best be used to overthrow a government adverse to communism?" And I quote: "Riots, demonstrations, street battles and detachments of a revolutionary army. Such are the developments of a popular uprising." Sounds familiar, doesn't it—as if I were reading the front page of today's newspaper. And he went on to say that combining a mass political strike with an armed uprising is the most ideal circumstance for a successful insurrection.

Now, what do I mean by a determined course of opposition to communism?

Primarily, this means complete cessation to the coddling of Communists at all levels of our society. Public exposure of Communists and fellow travelers has been criticized by certain groups, but certainly the public has the right to know the identity and activities of those who would wreck our free society.

How often have we witnessed the hypocrisy of those, who, when faced with evidence of their Communist activities, promptly hide behind the very Constitution they seek to destroy? And weakness in dealing with Communist activities within our own society is, in fact, no different than what we have experienced internationally. To conquer communism we must be informed. Information is a vital thing. A person can in fact, neither defend nor attack a philosophy or a way of life unless he possesses information about its precepts. This is especially true of the political and ideological philosophy we call communism. Therefore, our military as well as our political experts must be permitted to speak freely on communism. Certainly they should have the same rights our Constitution grants to Communists.

We must continue to stiffen our national backbone in dealing with communism both within this country and abroad.

Where we have been firm and stood our ground, the Communists have retreated. Where we have displayed weakness and vacillation, we have suffered setbacks, as in Cuba and Laos.

We can expect one crisis after another in the years ahead. The reason is obvious. It is a part of a carefully devised Communist plan to create incidents and situations to influence the United States to spend itself into oblivion. In the world in which we live, trouble spots are easy to create. Hence, as long as we are faced with this situation, it becomes more and more necessary that our policies in dealing with the Communists be right, concise, and above all, firm. We must stop pushing the panic button every time a new crisis is created. We, as a nation, must discard the silly practice of adopting one spending program after another, both domestic and foreign, to meet some new claim of the Soviet Union. We must stop subsidizing any Communist government or aiding and abetting them in any form. Improvisations in both our foreign and domestic policy stimulated by emotion must be discouraged.

Just as the Communist society is not designed to provide the many advantages of free enterprise and freedom of choice, so we, as a nation, must pursue our strength in the light of the longterm benefits and advantages it offers rather than attempt to ape our adversary.

Unfortunately, we have in our midst some timid souls who have so little faith in the strength of our democracy that they would have our country yield to international threats and intimidations. Fear, apologies, appeasement, defeatism, and cowardice are alien to the thinking of true Americans.

If we are to meet and repel the forces of communism we must start acting like Americans and patriots. We must be willing to stand firm and defend our heritage regardless of the consequences.

As William I. Nichols said, "Better brave than slave."

Connecticut's Biggest Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, the mail of a Member of Congress always is interesting, and each of us could provide, and many do in their newsletters and in speeches, select excerpts which are striking and significant for one reason or another.

My own mail I find always interesting. Some of the writers are glad, some are mad, but almost all of them are seeking information, preferably information which pleases them.

One day this week, I received a letter from a young Connecticut citizen who is not a resident of my district, but who sought information on a subject which many of his elders have discussed with great concern.

Because of the widespread interest in this subject, I would like to include now, in accordance with the permission granted to me, the text of a news release which covers the reference which I have made to my young correspondent, and my reply to him:

Congressman Horace Seely-Brown, Jr., had a direct question from a Connecticut schoolboy named Tommy today that went to the heart of what candidates in this November's election may spend hours talking about; and he gave a direct answer.

The eastern Connecticut Republican placed in the Congressional Record today a brief letter from the boy, who lives in a Connecticut town outside Seely-Brown's congressional district which recently has seen the dissolution of its principal industry, founded nearly 100 years ago.

Tommy, whose last name was kept confidential by the Congressman, in accordance with office practice, wrote:

"Dear Mr. Brown: For my social study project, I was asked to write to you and ask you, What is Connecticut's largest problem and what is your solution to it? Would you please answer this letter by return mail.

"Thanking you,

Tommy."

Replying Congressman Seely-Brown said:

"Dear Tommy: Thank you for your letter requesting certain information for your social study project. In my opinion Connecticut's biggest problem is to provide proper and steady employment for those who want to live and work in Connecticut.

"My solution is to create an atmosphere at every level of government which will (1) encourage existing business to expand its operation and thus provide more jobs for our people; (2) prevent business from leaving our State and thereby throwing people out of work, as is presently the case; and (3) encourage new plants and factories to move into our State.

"If I can be of further proper assistance at any time, please let me know.

"With all good wishes.

"Very sincerely,

"HORACE SEELY-BROWN, Jr.,
"Member of Congress."

To Achieve Excellence in Education the Fine Arts Must Have Equal Status in Our Public Schools and Colleges With Such Credit Courses as Science and Modern Foreign Languages, as Well as With Football, Basketball, Automobile Mechanics, Typing, Bookkeeping, and Shorthand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, to achieve excellence in education, the fine arts must have equal status in our public schools and colleges with such credit courses as science and modern foreign languages, as well as with football, basketball, automobile mechanics, typing, bookkeeping, and shorthand.

In his state of the Union message the President said he would recommend to the Congress proposals to stimulate the arts.

Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg, in his December 15, 1961, arbitration award in the Metropolitan Opera dispute, made a number of excellent suggestions for stimulating the fine arts.

I have now introduced a bill, H.R. 9906, which is based on one of Secretary Goldberg's suggestions. My bill, however, would support the arts in the public schools and colleges of this country, and it will provide more than $6,520,000 for this purpose without a cent of Federal appropriations.

Dr. Ralph G. Beelke, executive secretary of the Art Department of the National Education Association, has written to the White House in support of my bill, saying:

> A little over 1 year ago, I visited the Soviet Union as part of a U.S. delegation to study arts education programs. My reaction was similar to the reactions of other U.S. observers of Soviet education in other fields. I was impressed by the strong support given by the Soviet Government to the arts in general and especially to educational programs. Our delegation also had the opportunity to talk with Madam Furtseva, Minister of Culture, and she told us of plans to increase the educational programs in all areas of the arts.
>
> I would not want to recommend that we support the arts and arts education because it is done in the Soviet Union. I would, however, strongly encourage the use of the arts to support and achieve our national goals to the same degree that the Soviets use the arts to achieve their purposes. The views of the two countries relating to the arts differ in the same manner that they differ in other fields. In our country, however, we have not allowed the arts to make the contribution to the strengthening of our national life which they are capable of making. It is time now that we did something about this, for the struggle in which we are engaged is too great for us not to use every means at our disposal to achieve our ends.

It is certainly true, as Secretary Goldberg pointed out, that the principal source of support for the arts now and in the future must be the private citizens who together constitute a vast and widely diverse audience.

If the private citizen is to support the arts to the fullest extent he must be an educated citizen and the fine arts must be an integral and basic part of his education. This was seen by the Founding Fathers, particularly Presidents Washington and Jefferson who were outspoken on the need for the arts in the education of young Americans.

In his first annual address to Congress on January 8, 1790, President Washington said:

> There is nothing which can better deserve our patronage than the promotion of science and literature. Whether this desirable object will be the best promoted by affording aids to seminaries of learning already established, by the institution of a national university, or by any other expedients, will be worthy of a place in the deliberations of the Legislature.

At another point, President George Washington said:

> The prosperity of our country is closely connected with our improvement in the useful arts.

And President Washington declared that:

> The arts and sciences essential to the prosperity of the state and to the ornament and happiness of human life have a primary claim to the encouragement of every lover of his country and mankind.

While I do not think that the $6 million plus provided annually by my bill, H.R. 9906, will really balance the great emphasis given the sciences in our colleges and universities by the more than $2 billion which the Federal Government annually spends on scientific research this relatively small sum will indicate that the Federal Government is finally heeding President Washington's sound advice as to including the arts in the education of our young people.

I introduced H.R. 9906 at the request of Dr. Ralph E. Purcell, chairman of the department of political science, University of Delaware. Dr. Purcell is the author of the highly regarded book, "Government and Art," an authoritative work on the history and development of the art activities of the Federal Government.

I am pleased that Dr. Ralph G. Beelke, past adviser on art to the U.S. Office of Education, and now executive secretary of the art department of the powerful National Education Association, also favors my bill.

I include here explanatory material on H.R. 9906:

THE NATIONAL ART
EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., January 31, 1962.

Re H.R. 9906.
Mr. HENRY HALL WILSON, Jr.,
Administrative Assistant to the President,
White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: In his state of the Union message to the Congress, President Kennedy said that he would recommend bills "to stimulate the arts." A bill supporting the arts was recently introduced into the Congress by Congressman HARRIS B. McDOWELL, Jr., Democrat, of Delaware, and it is my hope that the President will give his support to this legislation as part of his program of arts stimulation.

The bill to which I refer is H.R. 9906, a bill to provide for the establishment of a National Arts Agency in the U.S. Office of Education to aid in the creation and understanding of, and education in, the fine arts. This bill differs from other arts legislation of recent years in that it aims to support the arts where it will do the most good in the long run, namely, school arts programs.

Our association has for years supported efforts to encourage Federal recognition of the arts as an important part of our national life. Last year the association presented a special citation to Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., of New Jersey, for his efforts in this field, and the records of congressional hearings are testimony to our sincerity. We believe, however, that the principle of "reciprocal reinforcement" operates in the arts as it does in other fields and that our cultural life will be vigorous and strong in direct relationship to the strength and vigor of education programs in the arts.

While I cannot speak officially at this time, I am confident that, on the basis of previous resolutions passed in our convention, our association will go on record soon in support of this legislation.

As an individual, I also feel quite strongly about the need for encouraging school arts programs. A little over 1 year ago, I visited the Soviet Union as part of a U.S. delegation to study arts education programs. My reaction was similar to the reactions of other U.S. observers of Soviet education in other fields. I was impressed by the strong support given by the Soviet government to the arts in general and especially to educational programs. Our delegation also had the opportunity to talk with Madam Furtseva, Minister of Culture, and she told us of plans to increase the educational programs in all areas of the arts.

I would not want to recommend that we support the arts and arts education because it is done in the Soviet Union. I would, however, strongly encourage the use of the arts to support and achieve our national goals to the same degree that the Soviets use the arts to achieve their purposes. The view of the two countries relating to the arts differ in the same manner that they differ in other fields. In our country, however, we have not allowed the arts to make the contribution to the strengthening of our national life which they are capable of making. It is time now that we did something about this, for the struggle in which we are engaged is too great for us not to use every means at our disposal to achieve our ends.

I hope you will convey to the President my support of Mr. McDOWELL's bill and my support of the President's program of general arts stimulation. He can be confident that he has the support of art teachers throughout the country in his efforts to

stimulate arts activities. If we can in any way help in these efforts, we hope the President will feel free to call upon us.

Sincerely yours,

Ralph G. Beelke,
Executive Secretary, the National Art Education Association.

H.R. 9906

(In the House of Representatives, January 25, 1962, Mr. McDowell introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor)

A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Arts Agency in the United States Office of Education to aid in the creation and understanding of, and education in, the fine arts

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, **That there is hereby established in the United States Office of Education a National Arts Agency to advance the creation and understanding of, and education in, the fine arts.**

Sec. 2. All writings, including music, now or hereafter in the public domain shall be the property of the United States as copyright owner and be used for the benefit of the public and to advance the creation and understanding of, and education in, the fine arts.

Sec. 3. The United States, acting through the National Arts Agency, shall collect royalties on the writings, including music, which it owns as copyright owner, and utilize the proceeds in such amounts and in such manner, including holding national competitions and festivals in the Nation's Capital, as best to advance the creation and understanding of, and education in, the fine arts, and to pay for administering the program authorized by this Act.

Sec. 4. The President of the United States shall appoint a board of eleven members which shall formulate the policies for carrying out the purposes of this Act. The Board of the National Arts Agency shall appoint a Director and staff to administer such policies. The Commissioner of the United States Office of Education shall be Chairman of the Board of the National Arts Agency, ex officio. Members of the Board of the National Arts Agency shall, while attending its meetings or while engaged in activities authorized by this Act, receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare but not exceeding $75 per diem, and shall be paid travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. Members of the Board of the National Arts Agency shall be appointed from among citizens of the United States who are art educators or who are otherwise recognized for their knowledge of or experience in, or for their profound interest in, one or more of the fine arts.

Sec. 5. This Act shall be known as the "National Arts Agency Act of 1962".

Congressman Harris B. McDowell, Jr., Democrat, of Delaware, this week introduced a bill, H.R. 9906, which would provide more than $6 million annually, without a cent of Federal appropriations, to help achieve excellence in education. The foundation-type program, which the bill would establish, is designed to enrich the curriculum, improve teaching and the training of teachers, and provide other aids to the Nation's public schools and colleges.

It would give the arts equal status with such credit courses as science and modern foreign languages, as well as football and other athletic programs, automobile mechanics, home economics, typing, bookkeeping, and shorthand.

The McDowell bill embodies a concept which has been followed for many years in European countries, notably France.

It provides that all writings, including music, now or hereafter in the public domain shall be the property of the United States as copyright owner and be used for the benefit of the public.

The bill would establish a National Arts Agency in the U.S. Office of Education to administer the licensing which would be required. The U.S. Commissioner of Education would be chairman of the board of the new arts agency, ex officio.

Congressman McDowell said today he had introduced the bill at the request of Dr. Ralph E. Purcell, chairman of the department of political science, University of Delaware. Dr. Purcell is the author of the highly regarded book, "Government and Art," an authoritative work on the history and development of the art activities of the Federal Government.

Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg recently recommended similar though not identical legislation which was introduced in the 85th Congress by Senator J. W. Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Secretary Goldberg said, in his December 15, 1961, arbitration award of the labor difficulties at the Metropolitan Opera in New York City, that:

"At this period when the entire body of copyright law is under study, it would seem appropriate to give further attention to this attractive proposal for supporting the arts."

Congressman McDowell explained that under his bill:

"The United States would collect royalties and utilize the proceeds in such amounts and in such manner, including holding national student competitions and festivals in the Nation's Capital, as best to advance art education in the Nation's schools and colleges."

"It would give the arts equality with such credit courses as science and modern foreign languages, as well as football and other athletic programs, automobile mechanics, home economics, typing, bookkeeping, and shorthand."

It has been estimated that 10 percent of the music broadcast by radio and television stations today is in the public domain and this music would come within the purview of the new McDowell bill.

Labor Secretary Arthur Goldberg, in his December 15, 1961, arbitration award estimated at over $6,520,000 annually the total potential income to be realized from music alone by legislation such as Congressman McDowell introduced this week. He said that the income would be distributed as follows:

Popular music (records), $1,100,000; sheet music (classical), $3,420,000; and classical music (records), $2 million.

Congressman McDowell went on to say: "The Constitution in article II, section 8, provides for the progress of science and the useful arts by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive rights to their respective writings and discoveries.

"U.S. copyright law provides protection to authors and composers for a period of 28 years, at the end of which time protection is granted upon request for an additional 28-year period. In European countries the protection runs for life plus 20 to 50 years.

"After the present period of protection has expired my bill would provide that writings, including music, would become the property of the United States and be used by it to help achieve excellence in education and to raise the quality of education in the Nation's public schools and colleges."

Congressman McDowell concluded by saying:

"I feel I am on safe ground, inasmuch as the Founding Fathers, for instance, Washington and Jefferson, believed that the fine arts were essential in the education of young people. Washington in his will provided funds to establish a national university which would educate young Americans in the fine arts as part of a balanced education program. Jefferson developed legislation for a public system of education which included a public art gallery and a Department of Fine Arts.

"In his first annual address to Congress, January 8, 1790, President Washington said, 'there is nothing which can better deserve our patronage than the promotion of science and literature.'

"At another point Washington declared that, 'the arts and sciences essential to the prosperity of the state and to the ornament and happiness of human life have a primary claim to the encouragement of every lover of his country and mankind.'"

Independence Day of the Republic of Chad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, our warm felicitations to President Francois Tombalbaye, of Chad, and to Mr. Adam Malick Sow, Chad's Ambassador to the United States, and to the country of Chad.

CHAD—courage, honor, amity, democracy. These four letters, and these four qualities stand for Chad, the young African republic which on January 11 celebrated the end of its second year of independence. Here is a fledgling nation which has had the courage to come out from under the protective wing of France and start its solo flight on still wet pinions.

A workman that needeth not to be ashamed is Chad. Herein lies the honor—the honor of diligent, honest toil. The struggle for self-improvement—individual and national—is a noble one, and by the free people of Chad it is nobly pursued.

The people of Chad are diverse in culture, creed, and race. Yet Negro and Arab, Christian, Animist, and Moslem all work together, strive together in friendship toward the common betterment of all. Not content with internal cooperation alone, Chad citizens joined in confederation with two ex-French neighbors, the Congo and the Central African Republic, to form the Union of the Republics of Central Africa. And, not one to bite the hand of its longtime former feeder, Chad has maintained mutually beneficial friendly relations with France.

And by what means is Chad achieving its ends? By those means through which the individual's worth is most

valued, best employed—by democratic means.

Therefore, we pay tribute to the Republic of Chad for its courage, honor, amity, democracy. It has shown wisdom and purpose far beyond what might be expected of a nation so newly on its own.

Speech Commemorating Independence Day of the Republic of Sudan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, January 1, 1962, marked the beginning of the sixth year of independence for the largest—in area—country in Africa—the Republic of Sudan. We pay tribute and send felicitations, on this occasion, to Sudan's President, Gen. Ibrahim Abboud; its Ambassador to the United States, Dr. Osman El Hadari; and to this nation of proud people, for a most commendable record of firm, peaceful, unpretentious progress.

Unlike some of the other newly independent nations, the Sudan has, from its inception on the first day of 1956, placed primary emphasis on economic, not military development. So while other, more foolish young nations amass arms and debts at skyrocketing rates, the Sudan has been quietly forming the most stable economy in Africa. Its leaders have worked diligently to insure that the 12 million Sudanese have bread, not bullets, to eat.

Politically, too, the Sudan has demonstrated a marked degree of stability. Lt. Gen. Ibrahim Abboud, the Sudan's leader since 1958, has suppressed corruption, instituted many social reforms, adopted a foreign policy friendly to all, and, above all, begun to lead slowly toward a constitutional government.

Thus, as it begins its sixth year of independent rule, we take off our hats to the Republic of Sudan—a quiet, friendly, steadfast worker in a world of frenzied foes. "Sudan" may mean "black" in Arabic, but this virile country's future prospects look quite to the contrary.

Commemorating the Independence of the Union of Burma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to the President of Burma, Mr. U Win Mayung; and Burma's Ambassador to the United States, Mr. U On Sein. Earlier this month, Burma, a country old in tradition and young in spirit, celebrated its 14th year of independence. On January 4, 1948, the Union of Burma emerged into the world, a republic destined to play a major role in southeast Asia.

The Burmese are a resourceful people. They are gradually strengthening their country economically. They realize that a sound economy creates a sound nation. In doing this, the Burmese have demonstrated great courage as they have attacked problems that, on the surface, seem insurmountable.

The Government of Burma is extremely proud of its status as one of the great democracies of southeast Asia. Burma follows the parliamentary system, with her government headed by a President and Cabinet. Ever since it achieved independence, Burma has taken a leading role in striving to maintain peace in troubled southeast Asia. Furthermore, her statesmen have become prominent in the attempt to maintain peace in the world. The Nation has gained the well deserved respect of the countries of the important southeast Asian area as well as of the nations of the rest of the world.

As long as the Burmese people are able to combat their problems with the courage exhibited in the past, we of the United States can take comfort in the fact that world peace has an ally in Burma.

Speech Commemorating the Independence of the Cameroon Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, January 1 marked the second anniversary of the independence of the Cameroon Republic, and on this occasion we send felicitations to the President of Cameroon, Mr. Ahmadou Ahjdjo, and His Excellency Aime-Raymond N'Thepe, the Ambassador to the United States.

After many years of control by foreign powers, the Republic became established as one of the first of the newly independent states of Africa.

Along with independence have come problems and responsibilities of government. The 3½ million people of Cameroon are meeting these challenges with the courage and conviction of a people characterized by a courageous motivating spirit. The Government is bravely resisting the efforts of Communist-backed groups intent on creating chaos in the young nation.

The Cameroon Republic is made up of people representing many diverse cultures and attitudes. We should take satisfaction in the fact that the Government is striving to overcome the problems created by these differences.

On this happy occasion, we wish the Cameroon Republic the very best in its hard struggle for peace and prosperity.